JEZIKOSLOVLJE
13.2 (2012): 269-298

UDC 81'246.3(436-89)"18/19"=111
81'272(436-89)"18/19"=111
Original scientific paper
Received on 30.03. 2012
Accepted for publication on 30.05. 2012

László Marácz
University of Amsterdam

Multilingualism in the Transleithanian part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (1867-1918): Policy and practice

With the Compromise of 1867, the Hungarian Kingdom received an equal status within the Austrian part of the Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy. Hungary became a sovereign entity within the Habsburg Monarchy. Next to a common monarch from the House of Habsburg who had the title of 'emperor' in Austria and that of 'king' in Hungary, three ministries were in common, including the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Finance and Defence. The Compromise marking the autonomous position of Hungary in the Double Monarchy ended in 1918 with the dissolution of the Habsburg Empire; hence the timeframe of this study (1867–1918). The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was a clear multilingual state in which fourteen languages were officially recognized, including Croatian, Czech, German, Hungarian, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, Romanian, Ruthenian, Serbian, Slovak, Slovene, Ukrainian and Turkish. Although not all the languages were spoken throughout the Empire and sometimes very much restricted to certain regions and local areas, multilingualism was regulated by law. In this paper, I concentrate on multilingualism in the Hungarian, i.e. the Transleithanian part of the Dual Monarchy.[1] I will discuss its language policy and its practice focussing on the primary

[1] It is my conviction that the phenomenon of multilingualism and the phenomena related to it in both parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, i.e. Cisleithania and Transleithania cannot be studied separately. It is obvious that the relation between Vienna, Budapest and the regions in both parts are a kind of power triangle that was inherently connected. In the case of Bosnia or Croatia, Vienna and Budapest were even in competition. Here I am indebted to Nikola Rašić for bringing this to my attention. To achieve a deeper insight into Cisleithania and Transleithania and their mutual relation these cases must be studied in a comparative framework. Also comparing separate case studies, like the multilingual cities of Trieste and Fiume in both parts of the Empire would offer an interesting insight into the policy and practice of multilingualism in the whole Empire. I am indebted to Pieter van der Plank for his critical comments and for carefully reading an earlier version of this paper.

educational system which offers illuminating insight into the multilingual state of affairs in the Hungarian Kingdom. I will be critical of post World War I tradition in historiography claiming that multilingualism was severely restricted in the Hungarian Kingdom and that the non-Hungarian state languages were suppressed being the only reason for causing harsh language and ethnic conflicts.[2] Rather, the analysis of multilingualism in the Hungarian Kingdom is more complex than setting up a simple, bipolar opposition in terms of 'Hungarian' versus 'non-Hungarian.' The language policy of the Hungarian Kingdom stipulated in 'Nationality Law' XLIV (1868), although declaring Hungarian the language of the state, allowed the use of any other official language than Hungarian at the local level, both in government, judiciary, church organizations and schools. The application of this principle did not prevent however the outbreak of language and ethnic conflicts in the period under study.

Key words: dualist Hungary; nationalities; multilingualism; educational policy; asymmetries.

1. The Hungarian Kingdom during the Dual Monarchy

During the Habsburg domination of the Hungarian Kingdom lasting from the roll back of the Ottoman Empire from Central Europe by the end of the seventeenth century and the dissolution of the Habsburg Empire at the end of World War I, the Hungarian Kingdom enjoyed a specific position in the framework of the Habsburg Empire. Although this specific position, including the Lands of the Hungarian Holy Crown of Saint Stephen, named after the first king of Hungary was not always respected by the ruling Hapburgs it was obvious that the Hungarian Kingdom had its own legal system, its own territorial division based on the Hungarian county system and had its own social stratification and ethnic distribution. The Lands of the Hungarian Holy Crown of Saint Stephen included Hungary proper, i.e. the central part of the Hungarian Kingdom matching the central lowlands of the Danube valley, the Principality of Transylvania, the

[2] It is not easy to find unbiased historic studies of the Hungarian Kingdom under dualism. The reason for this is that historiography of the non-Hungarian successor states of dualist Hungary has been dominated by the nationalist paradigm. This favors a bipolar analysis of all the nationality conflicts in the Hungarian Kingdom in terms of the Hungarian versus non-Hungarian nationalities involved. An additional problem is the fact that Marxist historiography in Hungary is biased towards the Hungarian Kingdom under dualism for ideological reasons as well. In some cases, the positions of the Hungarian Marxist tradition match with those of nationalist historiography in the non-Hungarian successor states.

Kingdom of Croatia-Slavonia and the free royal city of Fiume (present-day's Rijeka in Croatia).[3] This structure also formed a territorial unity displaying a peculiar geographically and social-cultural entity in the centre of Europe (Teleki 1923). Although German was functioning as a language of communication also in the Hungarian part of the Kingdom, Latin fulfilled the role of administrative language. In the age of Enlightenment it was the Austrian Emperor Joseph II (1780–1790), the son of Empress Maria Theresa, Queen of Hungary (1740–1780) who tried to conduct an ambitious centralization policy to modernize the Habsburg Lands. As a consequence, the centralization efforts of Joseph II led to a strengthening of the position of the German language in administrative and military communication, although Joseph II had no intention to Germanize the educational system as was feared by the Hungarian nobility (Winter 1968: 23).

The Hungarian Kingdom under Habsburg rule was a feudal society in which the social stratification of the Empire played an important role in the struggle for power. At the core of this power struggle stood the Hungarian king, after the defeat of the Ottoman Empire at the end of the seventeenth century a member of the Austrian House of Habsburg and the Hungarian nobility (Cadzow et al. 1983). The Hungarian nobility traditionally enjoyed a strong position in the Hungarian Kingdom because it controlled the main sources of economic activities, i.e. the agricultural sector (Rady 2000). The different nationalities of Hungary, including most of the ethnic Hungarians, were subordinated as villains to the Hungarian nobility.[4] With the slow disappearance of the feudal society and the awakening of modern nationalism in the beginning of the nineteenth century, this constellation of social power in the Hungarian Kingdom started to change (Bogdan 1989: 88–93). The Hungarian nobility became more and more a driving

[3] In this paper, I will not elaborate on the special relation between Hungary and Croatia-Slavonia during dualism and the state of multilingualism in Croatia-Slavonia. Note that throughout this paper Hungary proper does not include Croatia-Slavonia or Fiume. I refer to the contribution of Lelija Sočanac in this issue for discussion of Croatia-Slavonia within dualist Hungary.

[4] In the first half of the nineteenth century the different nationalities of the Hungarian Kingdom, including Croats, Romanians, Germans, etc. did not possess a national identity. This was true for most of the Hungarian commoners. The Hungarian national identity was represented in fact by the Hungarian nobility. Only after the Ausgleich of (1867) can we speak about national identity of the Hungarians, Croats, etc. It would be better to characterize these nationalities in the early phase of the nineteenth centuries as Hungarian, Croatian, etc. speaking language communities, that is communities bound together by language and mostly by a church denomination. However, for ease of reference I will use Hungarians, Croats, etc. when referring to Hungarian or Croat speaking communities.

force of the modernization efforts. These ambitious efforts also led to a conflict with the House of Habsburg.

The Hungarian nobility, especially the members of the Hungarian Royal Noble Guard that was established by Empress and Queen Maria Theresa in the second half of the eighteenth century opposed the centralization efforts of Joseph II, launched a program of Hungarian Renewal. The Hungarian elites used language as an instrument of resistance against Viennese centralization and bureaucratization (Winter 1968: 119–121). The catalyst of this program became Count István Széchenyi who initiated a number of modernization projects in the first half of the nineteenth century. One of his projects was to make the Hungarian language suitable for the country's administration. For this purpose, the Hungarian Diet of Pozsony (today's Bratislava in Slovakia) honoured a proposal of Count Széchenyi to establish the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1825. One of the goals of the movement of National Renewal was to replace Latin and German as official state languages with Hungarian (Mikó 1944: 20–28). In a series of language acts the Hungarian Diet ordered step-by-step the Hungarian language as the official language of administration (Winter 1968: 23).

In the first half of the nineteenth century the traditional social stratification of the Hungarian Kingdom became less relevant and the concept of the nation was embraced by the different ethnic groups of the Hungarian Kingdom. Instead of manipulating the social classes the Habsburg rulers of Hungary started now to play the different ethnic 'nationalities' against each other in order to maintain control over the Hungarian Kingdom. The Habsburgs had employed this strategy with much success already in the Austrian parts of the Empire. In the Hungarian part, one of the first successful cases of Austrian 'ethnic divide and rule' was the Hungarian Revolution and War of Independence of 1848–1849 (Bideleux and Jeffries 1998). Vienna was however not the only anti-Hungarian force in the Kingdom. In reality most of the nationalities did not want to become Hungarians and found in Vienna a strong representative of their interest. The Romanians and the Croats were not charmed by the Hungarian nationalist ambitions. Hence, the Habsburg could use these forces in order to crush the Hungarian ambitions for a more democratic and independent Hungary.

These antagonisms partly engineered by Vienna between Hungarians and non-Hungarians formed the roots of the ethnic conflicts between these groups. The hierarchies between the ethnic groups were sometimes reversed. In the period of dualism after the Compromise of 1867, for example, the Hungarians be-

came the *primus inter pares* when the Viennese Court and the representatives of the Hungarian nobility divided power in the framework of the Dual Monarchy. As a consequence, the non-Hungarian nationalities of the Hungarian Kingdom had to accept Hungarian supremacy in the Transleithanian parts (Bogdan 1989: 113–126).

After the crushing of the Hungarian Revolution and War of Independence of 1848–1849 by the Austrian forces with help of the Tsarist army, the ambitions for a restoration of Hungarian autonomy within the Austrian Empire were frustrated for a few decades. The Hungarians were harshly punished by the Austrian government for their rebellion. Thirteen of their leading generals were executed at Arad and martial law was imposed on the country. Vienna appointed an Austrian governor, Alexander Bach representing the king who ruled the country with a rod of iron. Bach had even the intention to introduce German as the language of communication as a means to teach the Hungarian nobility a lesson. A desperate Count Széchenyi wrote a letter of protest in exile in 1858 against the plans to Germanize the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, an institute that had been established in order to study the Hungarian language and to make the Hungarian language suitable for administrative purposes (Marácz 1996: 67). During the so-called Bach-era the Hungarians moved into passive resistance. The Germanization efforts in the last period of the Bach era were however not very successful in the urban centres where modernization still had to take off. Especially in the period between 1860 and 1866 Hungarian was strengthening its position at the expense of or next to German, even in the circles of German speaking bureaucrats that were selected by the Habsburg themselves (Valjavec 1963: 194–215). In the country-side the situation was completely different. There was less enthusiasm for accepting the Hungarian language and Hungarian identity. The commoners were politically not mobilized, a number of them were illiterates. They were organized by their church denominations along their Romanian, Slovak, Serbian, Croatian and so on languages.

Both camps, the House of Habsburg and the Hungarian national elites led by the aristocracy were, however, willing to conclude a compromise in 1867. For Austria a compromise with Hungary became urgent because Prussia had defeated Austria in 1866 and because Austria refused to participate in the newly erected German Customs Union that was dominated by Prussia. The Habsburgs were looking to the east of their Empire for compensating the loss of power in the West.

The *Ausgleich* of 1867 turned the Empire into a dual structure. The Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy consisted of two parts, i.e. Austria the so-called Cisleithanian parts of the Empire and Hungary, the so-called Transleithanian part of the Empire, i.e. the Hungarian Kingdom. The Dual Monarchy was headed by one and the same monarch, Franz Joseph Emperor of Austria and king of Hungary, abbreviated as *K. und k.* The Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Defence and Finance were incorporated, but apart from that Hungary's status remained equal to Austria's. Consequently, the Kingdom of Hungary became a sovereign state within the framework of the Dual Monarchy. Transylvania and Vojvodina were integrated into Hungary proper. The Kingdom of Croatia-Slavonia enjoyed a separate status that was confirmed by the *Ausgleich* between Hungary and Croatia-Slavonia in 1868. The third equal constituting part of the Hungarian Kingdom was the free royal city of Fiume, present-day Croatian Rijeka.

I restrict my study of multilingualism in the Hungarian Kingdom to the period between the Ausgleich and the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918. Hence, the restriction in time, i.e. the era of dualism has a well-defined starting-point and an end point. In space, the Hungarian Kingdom is defined during dualism as the Transleithanian parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Highly relevant is that dualism brought long term stability in the Central European space which in turn stimulated economic growth. This was a pre-condition for the modernization of the whole Austro-Hungarian Empire but also in particular within the borders of the Kingdom of Hungary. The Hungarian Kingdom though it perpetuated the conservative, semi-feudal structure of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, such as the lack of universal suffrage developed at the end of dualism into a modern state. Thanks to the dual structure legislation and institutions to set up education, health care, infrastructure, the development of urban dwellings, industries, mechanization of agriculture and the development of the army improved rapidly. The development of the modern state caused also new types of social stratifications in the Hungarian Kingdom. A new class consisted of more educated, literary civilians that had enjoyed education and could send their children to school. In section two I study the geo-ethnic distribution and the legislation of multilingualism in this multinational, multi-ethnic and multi-lingual state.

2. Multilingualism in the Hungarian Kingdom

The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was a multi-ethnic, multilingual state in which multilingualism was officially recognized by law. In the Transleithanian part of the Empire the following thirteen languages were officially recognized and used as vehicular languages, including Hungarian, Slovak, Romanian, Ruthenian, Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian, Bunjevac (a Štokavian dialect of Croatian), Bulgarian, Czech, Polish, Roma and Italian (see Lökkös 2000: 28). As we can observe from tables 1 and 2, all these languages were spoken in the three constituent parts of the Hungarian Kingdom, i.e. Hungary proper, Croatia-Slavonia and in the free royal city of Fiume, although the distributions are different (Lökkös 2000: 197):[5]

Table 1. The distribution according to mother tongue in the Hungarian Kingdom in the 1910 census.

Mother tongue	Hungary proper	Fiume	Croatia-Slavonia	Total
Hungarian	9,938,134	6,493	105,948	10,050,575
German	1,901,042	2,315	134,078	2,037,435
Slovak	1,946,165	192	21,613	1,967,970
Romanian	2,948,049	137	846	2,949,032
Ruthenian	464,259	11	8,317	472,587
Croatian	181,882	12,926	1,638,354	1,833,162
Serbian	461,091	425	644,955	1,106,471
Slovenian	75,062	2,336	15,776	93,174
Bunjevac	88,204	5	0	88,209
Bulgarian	22,945	1	321	23,267
Czech	31,198	238	32,376	63,812
Polish	38,179	46	2,312	40,537
Roma	108,825	0	108,825	121,097
Italian	5,037	24,212	4,138	33,387

[5] The statistical data of the 1910 census seem to be too precise. There are several reasons why they should be treated with some caution. Firstly, 25 percent of the population was illiterate and was not able to check its own registration. Secondly, officials of the Hungarian state were supporting the official language policy of the state to strengthen the position of Hungarian. Thirdly, in some cases Hungarian employers did the registration for their employees, most of them non-Hungarians that were housed by them. Fourthly, the Jews were counted as Germans. Most of the Jews were indeed German speaking but not the Jews of orthodox faith. Fifthly, gypsies were massively registered as Hungarian speaking. Hence, this allows me to round-off the exact percentages of the censuses, which makes an overview easier to comprehend.

Other	4,655	496	648	5,772
Non-Hungarian total	8,276,593	43,313	2,516,006	10,835,912
Total population	18,214,727	49,806	2,621,954	20,886,487

Table 2. The distribution according to mother tongue in the Hungarian Kingdom in the 1910 census in percentages.

Mother tongue	Hungary proper	Fiume	Croatia-Slavonia	Total
Hungarian	54.56	13.04	4.04	48.12
German	10.44	4.65	5.11	9.75
Slovak	10.68	0.39	0.82	9.42
Romanian	16.18	0.28	0.03	14.12
Ruthenian	2.55	0.02	0.32	2.26
Croatian	1.00	25.95	62.49	8.78
Serbian	2.53	0.85	24.60	5.30
Slovenian	0.41	4.69	0.60	0.45
Bunjevac	0.48	0.01	0	0.42
Bulgarian	0.13	0	0.01	0.11
Czech	0.17	0.48	1.24	0.31
Polish	0.21	0.09	0.09	0.19
Roma	0.60	0	0.47	0.58
Italian	0.03	48.61	0.16	0.16
Other	0.03	0.94	0.02	0.03
Non-Hungarian total	45.44	86.96	95.96	51.88
Total population	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Before I comment on this statistical data it is important to clarify notions like ‘nation,’ ‘nationality,’ ‘ethnicity’ and ‘language’ and their mutual relations in the Hungarian Kingdom.

The Hungarian Kingdom recognized one nation, the political Hungarian nation. Consider the introductory part of the Law on the Equality of Nationalities Act XLIV. 1868:[6]

> Since all citizens of Hungary, according to the principles of the constitution, form from a political point of view one nation—the indivisible unitary Hungarian nation—of which every citizen of the fatherland is a member, no matter to what nationality he belongs: since, moreover, this equality of right can only exist with

[6] See for the English version of act 1868: XLIV Seton-Watson (1972: 429–433); for the German version Faluhelyi (1946, 5–12) and for the Hungarian version the official website of the Hungarian Parliament (www.1000ev.hu). The provisions of this law were only valid for Hungary proper (compare § 29).

> reference to the official use of various languages of the country, and only under special provisions, in so far as is rendered necessary by the unity of the country and the practical possibility of government and administration; the following rules will serve as standard regarding the official use of the various languages, while in all other matters the complete equality of the citizens remained untouched[7]

The nationality law of 1868 tried to combine a 'civic,' i.e. a Western European interpretation of the nation and an 'ethnic,' i.e. Central and Eastern European interpretation of the nation (Smith 1991: 11–13). Consequently, the Law on the Equality of Nationalities not only distinguishes a 'political civic nation' but also the concept of nationality matching ethnicity.[8] The latter originates from the view characteristic of nineteenth-century's Central and Eastern European nationalism that the 'nation' is first and foremost a community of common descent and a member is organically connected to it (Smith 1991: 11). Note further that this law introduces a special relation between ethnicity, nationality and language. The most important marker of ethnicity, i.e. nationality is actually one's mother tongue. This has to do with the fact that in early-nineteenth-century's Central and Eastern European nationalism the place of law in the Western civic model is taken by vernacular culture, usually languages and customs in the ethnic model. In sum, nationality in this area of Europe was determined quite often on the basis of mother tongue (Faluhelyi 1946: xlv). Hence, the five censuses that were held in the Hungarian Kingdom during dualism, i.e. 1869, 1880, 1890, 1900 and 1910 only inquired about the mother tongue of the persons interviewed and not about their nationality (Lökkös 2000: 27). Following Smith (1991: 11–13, 20), we will adopt the generalization that in Central and Eastern Europe there is a strong correlation between vernacular language and culture on the one hand and ethnicity and nationality on the other hand. Although Smith's generalization is always true when it goes from left-to-right, i.e. if you are of *X* ethnicity, then language *X* is *X*'s mother tongue, it is not always the case vice versa. There are a number of exceptional cases due to the fact that there is no one-to-one matching between ethnicity and mother tongue language or sometimes this matching is not relevant for determining ethnicity. Bi- or multilingual speakers can have more than one mother tongue. This was true in the Hungarian Kingdom as well. In the case of the Serbs and Croats it was hard to decide on the basis of the language criterion only; Serbian or Croatian ethnicity for the languages

[7] I agree with Pieter van der Plank that in a semi-feudal society 'complete equality' is a rather idealistic goal.

[8] The Hungarian language expresses this difference with the term *nemzet* 'nation' and *nemzetiség* 'nationality'.

are quite similar. In those cases also religious criteria had to be taken into account; Serbs having a Greek Orthodox faith and Croats being Roman Catholics (Lökkös 2000: 29). Sometimes there is no strong connection between ethnicity and language as in the case of Roma. Although these cases exist, I will consider them exceptions to Smith's generalization for Central and Eastern Europe. Hence, with respect to tables 1 and 2, the data on mother tongue reflect the ethnicity and nationality of the speakers. Let us now consider these tables once again.

Firstly, note that the total population of the Hungarian Kingdom was 20,886,487 persons and that the biggest group, the Hungarians with 10,050,575 had an absolute majority in Hungary proper of 55 percent and only had a relative majority of 48 percent compared to the other nationalities in the Hungarian Kingdom. The non-Hungarian nationalities together had an absolute majority of 52 percent in the Hungarian Kingdom. In the remainder of this paper, I will concentrate only on the case of Hungary proper. The absolute majority of Croatian within Croatia with 62 percent was much clearer than the absolute majority of Hungarian in Hungary proper. Furthermore, Croatia had its own jurisdiction in agreement with the Compromise of 1868. The free city of Fiume (today's Rijeka in Croatia) is also an interesting case for the study of a multilingual city. The following five languages, including Italian, Croatian, Hungarian, German and Slovene were vehicular languages in Fiume, but the language of business and trade was Italian. I will leave the linguistic situation in the city of Fiume as a case for further research.

Secondly, consider the distribution of the languages. The ethnic map of the Hungarian Kingdom displayed a heterogeneous picture. Although there were a number of mixed regions it was clear that in biggest part of the country there was an absolute or relative majority of some of the nationalities. From the data it can be observed that in 34 and 36 percent, i.e. 70 percent in total, of the territory of historic Hungary there was a bigger than two-third majority of the Hungarian nationality and the non-Hungarian nationalities respectively (Lökkös 2000: 57). The Hungarian Kingdom was divided into eight regions, including: (1) Transdanubia; (2) Western Upper Hungary; (3) Between the rivers Danube and Tisza; (4) Eastern Upper-Hungary; (5) East of the river Tisza; (6) Between the Rivers Tisza and Maros; (7) Transylvania and (8) Croatia and Slavonia. In these regions, the Hungarians dominated the central areas of Hungary proper, i.e. (1), (3) and (5). The Germans lived mostly in the Western part of (1) and the southeastern part of (7). The Slovaks lived in (2) and (4). The Romanians lived

mainly in (6) and (7), i.e. historic Transylvania and the Ruthenians in the eastern parts of (5). The Croats dominated (8). The Serbs lived mainly in (3), (6) (in the regions of Banat and Vojvodina) and (8). The Slovenes in the southern parts of (1) (Lökkös 2000: 238–239). The Hungarians had an absolute majority in (1), (3), (4) and (5). The Slovaks had an absolute majority in (2). The Romanians had an absolute majority in (7) and a relative majority in (6). The Croats had an absolute majority in (8), Croatia-Slavonia.

The regional division of the nationalities can be made more specific by taking into account the counties and the cities with jurisdiction. In the 71 counties of the Hungarian Kingdom, 31 had a Hungarian majority, while in 28 counties there was a non-Hungarian majority. In four of the counties there was a relative Hungarian majority and in eight a relative non-Hungarian majority. The Romanians had an absolute majority in eleven, the Slovaks in nine, the Croats in six, and the Germans and the Serbs each in one county. The Ruthenians had a relative majority in two counties. In 18 of the 31 cities with jurisdiction in the Hungarian Kingdom the Hungarians were in an absolute majority, while the Germans in one, i.e. Sopron, the Slovaks also in one, i.e. Selmecbánya (today's Banská Štiavnica in Slovakia) and the Croats in two cities, including Zagreb and Varasd (today's Varaždin in Croatia) (Lökkös 2000: 98). Only nine towns with jurisdiction had a relative majority, including one Hungarian (Ujvidék, today's Novi Sad in Vojvodina), four German, including Pozsony (today's Bratislava in Slovakia), Temesvár (today's Timişoara in Romania), Versec (today's Vršac in Serbia) and Zimony (today's Zemun in Serbia), one Croatian, i.e. Eszék (today's Osijek in Croatia), two Serbian, including Pancsova (today's Pančevo in Serbia) and Zombor (today's Sombor in Vojvodina) and one Italian, i.e. Fiume (today's Rijeka in Croatia).[9]

Thirdly, Act XLIV. 1868 § 1 on the Equality of the Nationalities declared the Hungarian language as the official language of the state in Hungary proper. This

[9] The study of multilingualism in the cities of the Hungarian Kingdom requires a different approach than multilingualism in the periphery of the Hungarian Kingdom. The cities in the kingdom displayed more aspects of a modern multicultural society due to the fact that they were the points of modernization in dualist Hungary than the peripheral regions. The ethnic separatist movements in dualist Hungarian, like the one of the Romanians or Serbs in Transylvania or Banat were actually anti-modernity movements. For the languages involved this means that the relation between let us say Hungarian and German in multicultural cities was completely different than the one between Romanian and Hungarian in a peripheral region, like Transylvania or Banat. Here I am indebted to Rosita Rindler-Schjerve for raising this issue. See also Mintzel (1998) for discussion of these cases in a wider perspective.

decision was supported by the fact that the Hungarian nationality, i.e. the mother tongue speakers of Hungarian were in the majority with 55 (10,050,575 persons) percent of the total population. Although the other nationalities constituted together 45 percent of the total population, the individual languages, including Romanian sixteen percent, Slovak ten percent and German ten percent, were much smaller than Hungarian. Furthermore, these minority languages were concentrated in specific areas of the Hungarian Kingdom, while Hungarian was the dominant language spoken throughout Hungary proper by more than twenty percent of the population in the seven regions of the country. Hungarian had an absolute majority in 31 of the 63 counties and in 18 of the 31 cities with jurisdiction. Finally, the number of Hungarian speakers was actually higher because Hungarian had also the largest number of L2 speakers, i.e. nine percent, 1.939.987 persons in the 1910 census. This was more than the L2 speakers of German, i.e. eight percent, which is 1,687,388 speakers (Lökkös 2000: 214–215). It is striking that almost one-third of the population could not speak the official language of Hungary proper, i.e. Hungarian. Nevertheless, Hungarian was in fact the only candidate for becoming the *lingua franca* in the Hungarian Kingdom.[10] It was spoken by 57 percent of the total population, which is 11,990,562 speakers. The other candidate, German although enjoying a high status as the dominant language in the Austrian parts of the Empire was spoken by 3,724,823 people, that is, by only 17 percent of the total population of the Hungarian Kingdom. This position of Hungarian was strengthened by the fact that country-wide organizations and companies, like the Hungarian army and the Hungarian state railway companies used Hungarian as the language of command or communication.[11]

[10] Nikola Rašić (personal communication) is of the opinion that German was the *lingua franca* of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. True, German had a strong position in the Austro-Hungarian Empire but it was functioning only as a *lingua franca* among the Austrian and Hungarian elites. In Hungary proper, a general introduction of German already failed under Emperor Joseph II (1780–1790) and in the period of neo-absolutism (1848/1849–1860) under Emperor Franz Joseph I. In both periods, the Hungarians elites resisted the introduction of German as an official *lingua franca*. The introduction of German during dualism would have run counter to the spirit of the *Ausgleich*. If an ethnically bound language such as Hungarian during dualism was unacceptable for the non-Hungarian nationalities, then Latin as a neutral language would have been an option. But Latin as the official language in the Hungarian Kingdom was changed for Hungarian during the age of Hungarian Renewal in 1844. Hence the only option left was Hungarian, the best possibility which turned out to be not good enough.

[11] The Hungarian language was first stipulated as the language of business and command in Law V. 1890 on the *Honvéd* (Hungarian army). Consider § 18. See Faluhelyi (1946: XXVI),

Fourthly, although the Hungarian Kingdom acknowledged a state of multilingualism in which twelve minority languages had an official status next to the Hungarian state language, multilingualism was in fact a state of 'separate' monolingualism practiced in the different national communities. Multilingual speakers were actually a very small minority. A large majority of the inhabitants of the Hungarian Kingdom, i.e. 77 percent, were monolingual only knowing their own mother tongue and being unable to communicate with people outside of their ethnic group. The percentage of speakers not able to communicate with other ethnic speakers was even higher because the pairs, triples, etc. of languages among the bi- or multilingual speakers did not always match, restricting the options for communication. Only 23 percent of the inhabitants, that is, 4,880,000 people were bi- or multilingual. The rata for Hungary proper were somewhat better than the rata for Croatia-Slavonia: 75 percent only spoke their mother tongue in Hungary proper and this was true for 85 percent of the inhabitants of Croatia-Slavonia. Consequently, 25 percent of the inhabitants of Hungary were bi- or multilingual and only 15 percent in Croatia-Slavonia. Among the nationalities the percentages of bi- or multilingual speakers was rather different. A large majority of the Hungarians, the Slovaks, the Romanians, the Ruthenians, the Serbs and the Croats, i.e. 79, 46, 75, 86, 82 and 88 percent respectively did not speak any other language than their mother tongue (Lökkös 2000: 71–72). The only ethnic group having a majority of bi- or multilingual speakers were the Germans with 54 percent, i.e. 1,105,429 of the 2,037,436 Germans. It is fair to conclude that hardly any direct communication between the ethnic groups in the Hungarian Kingdom was possible. Only thirteen percent of the Romanians could speak Hungarian, i.e. 374,106 persons, while only four percent of the Hungarians spoke Romanian, i.e. 400,674 persons. Only 21 percent of the Slovaks, i.e. 418,724 could speak also Hungarian, while only five percent of the Hungarians, i.e. 547,802 people could speak Slovak. This state of separate multilingualism was conserved by the strict organization of society. Firstly, most of the inhabitants of the Hungarian Kingdom, i.e. 81 percent (16,923,000 persons) lived in the country-side in small agricultural settlements.

Rothenberg (1972), Deák (1990), Goebl (1994) and Kardum and Gajski (this issue) for a discussion of the status of languages in the Austro-Hungarian army and the Hungarian army during dualism. According to Deák (1990: 182–185) the number of Hungarian speaking officers in the Austro-Hungarian army grew from 20 percent in 1870 to 34 percent in 1910. This increase had also to do with the fact that after 1880 Jews were allowed to ascend to the rank of officer in the Austro-Hungarian army and they were counted as Hungarian speaking. See Law XLIX. 1907 on the Rules of Railway Service. §1 of this law specifies that only those people can be employed by a Hungarian railroad company that have Hungarian citizenship and have control of the Hungarian language.

Only the Hungarians and the Germans remained with 71 percent and 81 percent respectively under or at this average. Almost all the other nationalities lived in the countryside, including Slovaks, Romanians, Croats and Serbs with 92, 95, 91, and 90 percent respectively. Almost all the Ruthenians, i.e. 99 percent lived in the country-side (Lökkös 2000: 63). Further, the nationalities were often organized in the framework of church denominations. The Hungarian state officially recognized the Roman Catholic church, the Greek Catholic church, the Greek Orthodox church, the Calvinist church, the Lutheran church, the Unitarian church and the Jewish faith. These denominations enjoyed ecclesiastical autonomy (Hévizi 1996). Although the relation between ethnicity and church denomination was not a strict one-to-one correlation in the Hungarian Kingdom, some churches were represented more dominantly than others among the different nationalities. Almost all the Croats, i.e. 99 percent were Roman Catholic. An equally high number of Serbs belonged to the Greek Orthodox church. Almost all the Ruthenians, i.e. 98 percent were Greek Catholic. Most of the Hungarians were either Roman Catholic or Calvinist, i.e. 59 and 26 percent respectively. Most Romanians were either Greek Orthodox, i.e. 61 percent or Greek Catholic, i.e. 38 percent (Lökkös 2000: 65). These church denominations were active in fostering the identity and language of the ethnic groups to which they were attached.[12] One of their most effective instruments in this was the control over the educational system. Finally, one of the main reasons why separate multilingualism existed in the Hungarian Kingdom was due to the liberal Law on the Equality of the Nationalities in the Hungarian Kingdom, i.e. Act XLIV. 1868. The law assigned the nationalities the right to establish their own schools and to choose their own language of instruction in these schools.

Fifthly, the legal situation of the nationalities was regulated in the Law on the Equality of Nationalities Act XLV. 1868. The Law counted 29 paragraphs stipulating individual and collective nationality rights referring foremost—in accordance with Smith's generalization—to the use of the languages of the nationalities. This law next to specifying the Hungarian language as the language of the

[12] The leadership of the Roman Catholic and Greek Catholic (Uniate) church supported the official policy to strengthen the position of the Hungarian language in the Hungarian Kingdom. Hence, the Roman Catholic Germans (Swabians) and Slovaks, the Greek Catholic Romanians, Croats (the so-called Bunjevac) and the Ruthenian elites (pejoratively called Magyarones) were more affected by 'Magyarization' than their fellow German Saxons and Slovaks who were Lutherans and Romanians, Serbs and Ruthenians who were organized by the Greek Orthodox church respectively. Especially the Greek Orthodox church tried to minimize the 'Magyarizing' influences. I will leave the role of church denominations affecting the identity of the nationalities in the Hungarian kingdom for further research.

state to be used in all branches of government and administration (compare § 1) recognized individual and collective rights for the nationalities, i.e. the Slovaks, Romanians, Serbs, and so on, to use all registers of their own mother tongue in offices, schools, courts and in county and communal assemblies. During the whole period of dualism the Law on the Equality of Nationalities and its provisions remained almost unchanged and in force. It was meant as an effective tool for protecting the identity of nationalities, also against homogenization policies of Hungarian nationalism.

The individual rights included the following rights, among others. In county and communal assemblies, everyone had the right to speak their own mother tongue (compare § 3, §24) and to use the non-state languages of the nationalities in the minutes of the county and communal assemblies, if more than twenty percent of the deputies asked for it (compare §2, § 20). The assemblies had the right to communicate internally (compare § 5) and with higher instances of the state and each other in the language(s) of the nationalities (compare §4 in agreement with § 2 and § 20). Further, every citizen had the right to use their own mother tongue in court (compare § 7), to use their own mother tongue in church assemblies (compare § 24), and to correspond with the state and ecclesiastical authorities in their own mother tongue (compare § 23).

Churches as the main non-governmental organizations in society played a central role. This is also expressed in the Nationality Law. The churches, and importantly the churches of the nationalities, enjoyed full autonomy in determining the language of their church affairs. They could freely use their language in administration, to draw up registers in their language and to use the language of instruction they wished in their schools within the limits of the Education Act (compare § 14) and to prescribe their language of business in church courts (compare § 10). Churches and congregations had the right to establish their own primary and secondary schools and choose their own language of instruction (compare § 26).

Interestingly, the provisions of the law do not only specify the linguistic rights of individual citizens and non-governmental organizations but also refer to the obligation of state servants to use languages other than the Hungarian state language. The officials of the counties and communal authorities had to employ the language of those state authorities, non-governmental organizations or private individuals (compare § 6, § 21 respectively) that used a language other than Hungarian. In this case, not only the right of the individual citizen to use their

own language in communication with the authorities was guaranteed but also in communications with the non-Hungarian speaking nationalities, because the authorities had to answer in the language in which they were addressed. This was also the duty of judges when pronouncing verdicts (compare § 8). Furthermore, the Law also explicitly referred to the non-discrimination of members of the nationalities in the judicial and administrative offices of the state, especially in the office of the governor of the county, the highest official of the state in the county system (§ 27).[13] The Law wanted to guarantee in this way that in each state office, the languages of the nationalities were represented.

The establishment of schools was of course in the fundamental interest of the Hungarian state and the nationalities. The state, the Minister of Education had the right to prescribe the language of instruction in schools erected by the state but the state had to ensure that citizens of whichever nationality had to obtain primary and secondary instruction in their mother tongue, if living together in considerable numbers. This provision guaranteed that the language of instruction in state schools in territories where the nationalities lived was in their language (compare § 17). Apart from this, the nationalities, individual citizens, communes and congregations had the right to establish their own educational institutions at their own expense. The language of instruction and administration in these private institutions was prescribed by the founders. In practice, the right of the nationalities to establish private schools allowed them to stress their cultural and linguistic autonomy against the Hungarian identity of the state. During the period of dualism cultural and linguistic autonomy in non-state, non-Hungarian schools was guaranteed by law. The Hungarian state language was only compulsory as a subject of instruction in elementary schools from 1879 onwards and specified in the Education Act XVIII. 1879. The introduction of this law however hardly affected the linguistic autonomy of the non-state, non-Hungarian nationality schools (see Faluhelyi (1946: 121–124) for Education Act XVIII. 1879). Let us consider primary education in the Hungarian Kingdom in more detail.[14]

[13] The county governor, in Hungarian *főispán*, was appointed by the Hungarian king acting upon the advice of the minister of Interior.

[14] See also the contribution of Pieter van der Plank in this issue for a detailed analysis of secondary and higher education in the Habsburg Empire.

3. Primary Education in the Hungarian Kingdom

Although the Hungarian legislation on the equality of the nationalities was certainly a liberal law designed by the Hungarian founding fathers of the *Ausgleich* of 1867, i.e. Ferenc Deák and Baron József von Eötvös to protect the nationalities, neither the Hungarians nor the non-Hungarian nationalities were satisfied with it. The Hungarians could not introduce their language being the official language of the state in the whole country because the church schools of the nationalities had the right to choose their own language. By tradition the educational system was in Hungary until 1867 mainly in the hands of non-state agencies like religious denominations (Teleki 1923: 157). The non-Hungarians, in their turn, feared interference from the Hungarian state in what they considered as their autonomous right, the establishment of their own schools. In order to understand this conflicting situation, I will now turn to the case of primary education in the Hungarian Kingdom during dualism.

According to the official data of 1905–1906, the total number of primary schools belonging to the state in Hungary proper was 2,045 (Seton-Watson 1907: 439). This proportion was twelve percent of the total number counting 16,561 schools. In all the state schools the language of instruction was Hungarian, except for one in which the language of instruction was Slovak. The number of private schools mainly managed by the different church denominations was 14,516, that is 88 percent of all the primary schools. In 22 percent, i.e. 3,154 of these schools the language of instruction was non-Hungarian and in ten percent, i.e. 1,665 of these schools the language of instruction was mixed; Hungarian and one of the languages of the other, non-Hungarian nationalities. These schools were not *utraquist* or bilingual schools however (see Rindler-Schjerve (2003) for the functioning of these schools in the Austrian Lands). There were separate classes for pupils with a Hungarian mother tongue and for those pupils with non-Hungarian mother tongues. Consequently, in 32 percent of the cases, the language of instruction was non-Hungarian. For two reasons, it was understandable that the nationalities of Hungary constituting 49 percent of the population felt discriminated. First of all, the Hungarian state did not establish state primary schools, except for one, where the language of instruction was the language of a non-Hungarian nationality. According to § 17 of the Nationality Law (see, Law XXXVIII. 1868) the Hungarian state should have established many more state primary schools with the language of instruction being the languages of the non-Hungarian nationalities in territories inhabited by them and should have taken care of their implementation in a consistent way; at least conforming to the sys-

tem of parallel classes in mixed schools. Because of this neglect, it is fair to criticize Hungarian educational policy during dualism.

Note however, that the number of Hungarian primary schools managed by church denominations compared to the total number of primary schools was 9,698, that is 59 percent in 1905–1906. In these schools, the state could not interfere because of church autonomy. Hence, the state even if it had fulfilled its duties in the existing state primary schools and introducing the languages of the non-Hungarian nationalities as the language of instruction as well would have increased the number of cases of non-Hungarian language instruction with twelve percent maximally. This would have resulted in 44 percent of all the primary schools with a non-Hungarian language of instruction at most remaining behind the proportion of the non-Hungarian nationalities to the total population of 49 percent. Second, the 32 percent of the primary schools teaching in the languages of the non-Hungarian nationalities remained under the proportion of the non-Hungarian nationalities to the total population of 49 percent.[15] This was even more striking in the case of primary schools in which the language of instruction was Slovak and Romanian alone (Seton-Watson 1907: 437). These schools numbered 241, i.e. 1.4 percent and 2,440, i.e. 14.7 percent, respectively, of the total primary schools in 1905–1906. We observe a discrepancy at the expense of these nationalities indeed, if we compare these figures with the distribution of the population of the 1910 census where the Slovaks constituted eleven percent and the Romanians sixteen percent of the total population. I hasten to add however that the discrimination of the Slovaks was much more serious than in the case of the Romanians.[16] This asymmetry between the Slovaks and the Romanians is also demonstrated by the fact that the number of primary schools with Slovak language instruction dropped dramatically during dualism: from 1,822 in 1869, 1,716 in 1880, 1,115 in 1890, 500 in 1900 to 241 in 1905–1906, while the number of Romanian language primary schools remained almost unchanged: 2,569 in 1869, 2,756 in 1880, 2,582 in 1890, 2,309 in 1900 and 2,440 in 1905–1906 (Seton-Watson 1907: 437). Probably this asymmetry is due to the fact that the Hungarians traditionally had a better relation with the Slovaks

[15] Note that Seton-Watson (1907: 438–439) adds the primary schools of the mixed type to the schools with Magyar language instruction only. I do not consider this a correct interpretation of the data. Consequently, his percentage of non-Magyar language instruction is only 19 percent against the 31.3 percent, if we do otherwise.

[16] Seton-Watson (1907: 438) does only present the Slovak figures and is neglecting the cases where there was hardly any discrimination of the nationalities, like in the case of the Romanians.

than with the Romanians, i.e. it was not rendered difficult by religious difference (Teleki 1923: 152). As a consequence, the Slovaks were more willing to send their children to mixed Hungarian-Slovak state or denominational schools, like the Roman Catholic primary schools, whereas the Romanians clung to their exclusive Greek Orthodox or Uniate primary schools, where the language of instruction was Romanian only.[17]

The Hungarian educational policy was criticized in due course for being an important means of Magyarization of the non-Hungarian nationalities living in the Hungarian state. Let us discuss the arguments of the most important critic of dualist Hungary, the British author Robert Seton-Watson presented in his book *Racial Problems in Hungary* that appeared in 1907. A whole chapter of the book is devoted to the policy and practice of the Hungarian educational system (Seton-Watson 1907: 205–233). We get the impression from this chapter that Seton-Watson means by 'Magyarization' the establishment of state schools with Hungarian as the language of instruction only in territories inhabited by non-Hungarian nationalities and the introduction of Hungarian as a subject of instruction in the private schools with non-Hungarian language of instruction. According to Seton-Watson, the whole focus of educational policy during dualist Hungary was on Magyarization "where they [i.e. state primary schools, LM] served to develop Magyar patriotism and to extend by artificial means the boundaries of the Magyar race" (Seton-Watson 1907: 218). The British author even claimed that the extreme focus on the Magyarization policy of the successive Hungarian governments resulted in a bad school system neglecting the state schools in the territories inhabited mainly by the Hungarians (Seton-Watson 1907: 209). We agree with Seton-Watson, as we argued above, that the Hungarian state should have done more to erect state schools with the languages of the non-Hungarian nationalities as one of the languages of instruction or as the only language of instruction in mixed Hungarian-non-Hungarian territories and in territories where the nationalities lived, even if the state would have violated § 17 of the Law on Nationalities Act XLV. of 1868. Above we pointed out, however, that in dualist Hungary most of the schools were run by private non-state agencies, like church dominations leading in fact to a marginal influence of the state in these schools. This was made possible by § 26 of the same law stipulating that private organizations, like church congregations had the right to establish

[17] Another interpretation of the same facts is that Magyarization among the Roman Catholic Slovaks was more effective than in the case of the Greek Orthodox Romanians due to the fact that Magyarization was supported by the leadership of the Roman Catholic church, unlike the leadership of the Greek Orthodox church (see also footnote (12) above).

schools and to choose the language of instructions in these schools. The non-Hungarian nationalities, especially the Romanians and the Serbs extensively made use of this right. This is also acknowledged by Seton-Watson stating that the Serbs and the Romanians are more favourably placed than the Slovaks (Seton-Watson 1907: 214). In conclusion, the Nationalities Law which was liberal in intent and content, led to inconsistencies in the educational system while disadvantaging the non-Hungarian languages as languages of instruction. The state should have supported the teaching in and of the languages of the non-Hungarian nationalities in state schools but because of the liberal Law of Nationalities the state only controlled twelve percent of the primary schools. It is true that in these schools the state could have done more to support the languages of the non-Hungarian nationalities as a language of instruction.

Another asymmetrical development between the Hungarian versus non-Hungarian primary schools set in with the Law on the Education of the Hungarian Language XVIII. 1879 that made the teaching of Hungarian a compulsory subject in all primary schools (compare § 1 and § 4). The idea behind this law was to offer all citizens the opportunity to learn the state language, i.e. Hungarian (see Faluhelyi (1946: 121–124) for Law XVIII. 1879). Furthermore, the law also specified that schoolteachers had to have a sufficient knowledge of Hungarian to be capable of teaching in the primary school (compare § 2-3). Although these were reasonable provisions from the point of view of the state, the introduction of this law however, violated §17 of the Nationalities Law and violated the autonomy of the churches. Consequently, I do not agree however with Seton-Watson that the introduction of the teaching of Hungarian, the official language as a compulsory subject a few hours a week was a grave mistake made by the Hungarian state, for in this way the non-Hungarian citizens could have been included in the communicational networks of the state.[18] This would have served their interest as well. Rather, the neglect of the parallel introduction of the languages of the non-Hungarian nationalities as languages of instruction in the territories inhabited by them should have been a serious point of criticism.

However, the Education Law XVIII. 1879 did not fulfil its expectations, as Seton-Watson correctly points out admitting that Magyarization was not effective (Seton-Watson 1907: 219). In 1890, eleven years after the introduction of the law stipulating Hungarian as an obligatory subject, it was either not taught at

[18] Departmental order number 72,000 of 1905 specified that in non-Magyar primary schools with one teacher nine hours a week must be reserved for the teaching of the mother tongue and eight hours for Hungarian.

all or was taught entirely without success in 34 percent of the non-Magyar schools. The source of Seton-Watson, departmental order number 72,000 of 1905, speaks of a percentage of failures even higher than 34 percent. According to this departmental order, the teaching of Hungarian as a subject was unsuccessful in 1,340 of the 3,343 non-Magyar schools, i.e. 40 percent (Faluhelyi 1946: 166). In 1890, 1,600 of the 2,600 teachers in 1879 who had no sufficient knowledge of Hungarian or did not know the language in the non-Hungarian schools, had still no control of the Hungarian language. In 1906, 27 years after the introduction of the Law XVIII in1879, this was still true for 957 of the non-Hungarian teachers. Finally, in 1905 the minister of Culture and Education had to admit that 40 percent of the population of Hungary was still completely ignorant of the Hungarian language and that 83 percent of the non-Hungarian citizens did not speak the official state language.[19]

The successive Hungarian governments during dualism strengthened the asymmetrical developments between Hungarian and non-Hungarian schools by not introducing the compulsory teaching in the languages of the non-Hungarian nationalities as well, at least in the state schools in mixed territories or territories inhabited by them. However, it would have been better to make the language of the non-Hungarian nationalities the compulsory language of instruction as well in all the Hungarian schools in mixed territories and in territories inhabited by the non-Hungarian nationalities. Further, the Hungarian governments intensified their efforts to introduce Hungarian as a compulsory subject of instruction after finding out that this had been unsuccessful. This educational policy suffered from inconsistencies and violated the Nationality Law of 1868. As a consequence, the introduction of Hungarian as a subject of instruction was boycotted and sabotaged in the non-Hungarian schools, mainly private schools, leading to the escalation of the conflicts in the mixed territories and the territories inhabited by the non-Hungarian nationalities. The result of this policy was that the separatist model of education was maintained and strengthened leading in the end to unbridgeable point of views between the Hungarian government and the elites of the non-Hungarian nationalities.

In this vein, act XVII. 1907 on the legal status of the non-state primary schools and the appointment of teachers in communal and denominational schools reinstated the introduction of the Hungarian language as a compulsory subject of instruction in non-Hungarian schools. Note that the language of in-

[19] See Seton-Watson (1907: 219) and departmental order nr. 72,000 of 1905 in Faluhelyi (1946: 219).

struction in the non-Hungarian schools, i.e. the languages of the non-Hungarian nationalities remained unchanged (see for this law Faluhelyi (1946: 187–190)). The law that was promulgated by the minister of Culture and Education, Count Albert Apponyi further implied a stricter control of the policy he wanted to implement, thereby violating the Nationality Law of 1868 and the autonomy of the church denominations in the Hungarian Kingdom. This led to a rising of the tension between the Hungarian government and the leadership of non-Hungarian nationalities. It is useful here to discuss the opinion of Seton-Watson concerning *Lex Apponyi*.

Seton-Watson criticized the linguistic provisions of the law, for the children must be taught Magyar in a manner and for the time prescribed by the minister, "so that the child of non-Magyar tongue on the completion of its fourth school year can express its thoughts intelligibly in the Magyar language in word and writing" (compare § 19). According to Seton-Watson, this provision "opens the door to all kinds of wild linguistic experiments, such as are bound to prove fatal to the general culture of the victims" (Seton-Watson 1907: 230). Here Seton-Watson is simply exaggerating or he is consciously misreading the law because the law does not speak about the introduction of the Hungarian language as the language of instruction but as a subject of instruction. Hence, the language of instruction in non-Hungarian schools remained the mother tongue of the children. His point about violating §14 of the Law of Nationalities of 1868, i.e. the provision of freely choosing the subject of instruction in private schools is more substantial, as I have pointed out above.

Paragraph §1 of Education Act XXVII. 1907 specifies that all teachers in communal and denominational schools are state servants. In §2 their salaries are regulated by binding the salaries of these teachers to a minimum. In this case Seton-Watson, does not credit the Hungarian state for the improvement of the social position of teachers being state officials who enjoy a fixed salary. For Seton-Watson these provisions are only meant as instances of Magyarization making teachers dependent on the state and giving the state a plausible excuse for interference in the autonomy of private schools (Seton-Watson 1907: 228). He rejects the provisions of the Education Act of Apponyi, including: that teachers must have a control of the Hungarian language (§15); that all Magyar instruction in arithmetic, geography, history, civil rights and duties must be sanctioned by the minister (compare §20); that all books of instruction must be approved by the minister (§20); that no books hostile to the state may be used in instruction, and; that the minister is allowed to make inquires into the schools

that neglect the instruction of Hungarian and follow a policy or use books hostile to the state or incite against confessions or social classes (compare §22 and 24). According to Seton-Watson, the right of the minister if there is a second dismissal in connection with the violation of the provisions under §22 to dissolve the school (compare §25) is an arbitrary way for the Hungarian government to put pressure on the non-Hungarian nationalities in dualist Hungary (Seton-Watson 1907: 229).

An interesting provision of *Lex Apponyi* that is not discussed in Seton-Watson (1907) is §18. This paragraph specifies what to do when there is no Hungarian language school in a place where there is a non-Hungarian language primary church school with Hungarian children or non-Hungarian children whose parents wants their children to be instructed in Hungarian. According to §18, for *these* [my emphasis] children Hungarian is to be used as a language of instruction. Education in Hungarian for *these* [my emphasis] children is compulsory, when their proportion to the total pupils of the school is at least twenty percent. It is indeed true that in this case, the Hungarian state violated the autonomy of the denominational school but even in this case we cannot speak about enforced Magyarization because the Hungarian language instruction is compulsory for Hungarian children or children who want to be instructed in Hungarian. Rather, what is at stake here is that in this case again, the Hungarian state respected and even strengthened the separatist education of Hungarian and non-Hungarian pupils.

In conclusion, some of the provisions of the *Lex Apponyi* indeed were restricting the autonomy of church schools, violating the Nationality Law and demonstrated that the Hungarian state wanted to control matters in non-Hungarian schools as well. To suggest however that these provisions were effective tools of Magyarization as evidenced in the work of Seton-Watson (1907) is not convincing at all. This supposed Magyarization is not supported by a more detailed analysis of the population data of dualist Hungary either.

From the censuses data it appears that in a period of forty years beginning from 1869 until 1910, the population in the Hungarian Kingdom increased by 35 percent, i.e. by 5,375,000 people from 15,512,000 to 20,887,000 (Lökkös 2000: 79). In a period of thirty years between 1880 and 1910, the percentage of Hungarian mother tongue speakers grew by seven percent, from 41 percent to 48 percent, while in the same period the non-Hungarian mother tongue speakers dropped by six percent, from 58 percent to 52 percent. In actual numbers, the

Hungarian mother tongue speakers increased by 3,605,088, and became 56 percent of the total inhabitants. The non-Hungarian mother tongue speakers decreased only in percentages but not in absolute numbers. In absolute figures there was an increase of non-Hungarian mother speakers as well. This group grew by seventeen percent, i.e. 1,582,000 people. Consider the following tables (see Lökkös (2000: 222) for the data of the 1910 census):

Table 3. Population growth in the Hungarian Kingdom on the basis of mother tongue from 1880 until 1910.

Mother tongue	1880	1890	1900	1910
Hungarian	6.445.487	7.477.334	8.742.301	10.050.575
non-Hungarian total	9.196.615	9.986.457	10.512.258	10.835.912
Slovak	1.864.529	1.921.599	2.019.641	1.967.970
Romanian	2.405.085	2.604.027	2.799.479	2.949.032

Table 4. Population growth in the Hungarian Kingdom in percentages of the total population on the basis of mother tongue from 1880 until 1910.

Mother tongue	1880	1890	1900	1910
Hungarian	40.95	42.82	45.41	48.12
Non-Hungarian total	58.43	57.18	54.59	51.88

From this data, it appears that in the period between 1880 and 1910 not only the Hungarians grew in absolute numbers but also the Slovaks and the Romanians, although the proportion of the Romanians to the total population grew stronger than that of the Slovaks, who suffered a minor decline during the last ten years of this period. In any case, we can conclude that there was no substantial population drop among the larger nationalities. Hence, the growth of population among the larger nationalities does not support the accusation of an effective Magyarization of the Hungarian nationalities by the Hungarian state during dualist Hungary. Neither does the growth of the number of nationalities speaking their mother tongue only and the marginal growth of Hungarian L2-speakers during dualist Hungary. During dualist Hungary most speakers, but especially the non-Hungarian nationality speakers remained mainly monolingual, while the group of bi- or multilingual L2-speakers of Hungarian only increased marginally.

From the 1910 census, it appears that 77 percent of the total population of dualist Hungary spoke his/her mother tongue only. Note that during dualism the actual number of most of the nationalities who could only speak their mother tongue had increased as well. This was especially the case with the Romanians

and the Serbs (Lökkös: 88–89, 230–232). The Germans and the Slovaks formed an exception to this due to the fact that they lived scattered over the territory of the Hungarian Kingdom. Between 1880 and 1910, among all nationalities the percentage of the mother tongue speakers knowing only their mother tongue decreased, including the Germans from 62 percent in 1880 to 57 percent in 1910, Slovaks from 86 percent in 1880 to 75 percent in 1910 and Romanians from 92 percent in 1880 to 86 percent in 1910. The absolute figures however give another picture. The number of Germans and Slovaks speaking only their mother tongue decreased from 1,220,769 in 1880 to 932,006 in 1910 and from 1,601,367 in 1880 to 1,476,100 in 1910, respectively. The actual number of Romanians however only speaking their mother tongue increased from 2,221,302 in 1880 to 2,527,014 in 1910 (Lökkös 2000: 232). So in 1910, among the nationalities only the Slovaks and the Germans were rather slowly becoming bi- and multilingual, but the other nationalities remained mainly monolingual.

From the 1910 census, it appears that 65 percent of the population of Hungary proper could speak Hungarian and that 35 percent did not master Hungarian at all. So, in 1910, 7,310,270 people could not speak Hungarian (Lökkös 2000: 68). The percentages become even more dramatic, if we consider the numbers of Hungarian L2-speakers among the non-Hungarian nationalities. In 1910, on average, 82 percent of the non-Hungarians could not speak Hungarian. The percentages for the Germans, Slovaks and Romanians were 60, 78 and 81 percent, respectively (Lökkös 2000: 208). In 1880, from the non-Hungarian speakers only ten percent, i.e. 1,597,000 people spoke another language next to their mother tongue. By 1910, this proportion increased to 2,765,000 people, i.e. thirteen percent of the total population. Hungarian functioned for 1,940,000 of these people as an L2 (Lökkös 2000: 88, 230).

I have just discussed the primary school system of dualist Hungary in detail. In conclusion, I would like to suggest that the educational system of dualist Hungary can be best characterized as a separatist model. This model was in line with a general feature of the Hungarian society respecting the existence of different nationalities and their languages. This was also the basis of the liberal Law on the Equality of Nationalities of 1868. Because of this, the educational system was especially controlled by private organizations based on nationality, such as the church denominations. The state was in fact a minor player in the educational field possessing only twelve percent of the primary schools at the end of dualist era. Hence, the Hungarian state even if it had wanted to, could not have changed the separatist model due to customs and Hungarian legislation.

The Hungarian educational policy led to inconsistencies, asymmetrical developments and in some cases to the discrimination of the educational options of the non-Hungarian nationalities. This contributed to escalations of nationality conflicts. These conflicts have been referred to by critics of dualist Hungary, like Seton-Watson as the intentional Magyarization of the non-Hungarian nationalities. Although it cannot be denied that the educational system and the implications of the educational legislation contributed to the escalation of conflicts instead of appeasing them, the claim that the primary school system of the Hungarian Kingdom favoured an effective Magyarization of the non-Hungarian nationalities is rather unmotivated. If some Hungarian policy makers thought that by establishing Hungarian language state schools in mixed territories and territories inhabited by non-Hungarian nationalities, and that by the compulsory introduction of Hungarian as a subject of instruction in non-Hungarian language schools, the non-Hungarian nationalities of Hungary could be effectively Magyarized, then this has turned out to be a fatal misconception. In Central and Eastern Europe there is indeed a specific relation between language and nationality but this language factor is 'mother tongue' and not 'L2'. With the same force however, one can argue that the resistance against the introduction of Hungarian as an L2 in the non-Hungarian primary schools was motivated by the same conceptual misinterpretation. Rather, this false conceptual relation between L2 and nationality has been misused for political power motivations from both sides.[20] Furthermore, from the population statistics and the data on mother tongue speakers, including the high proportion of monolingual speakers among the non-Hungarian nationalities and the marginal growth of L2-speakers of Hungarian during dualism, it clearly appears that the non-Hungarian nationalities were hardly affected by Magyarization, i.e. the Hungarian educational policy did not have the dramatic consequences for the identity of Hungary's non-Hungarians, as has been quite often argued.

4. Conclusions

In this paper, I have argued that in multilingual dualist Hungary ethnic groups being assigned the status of "nationalities" played a dominant role. Their nationalities and languages were recognized both constitutionally and legislatively as

[20] I agree with Seton-Watson (1907: 233) that language and nationality are not related necessarily but in Central and Eastern Europe there is an implicational relation between nationality and mother tongue as I discussed above.

separate entities. Multilingualism in the Hungarian Kingdom was in fact a set of separate languages. As a consequence, the number of bi- and multilingual speakers was relatively low. The educational system in the Hungarian Kingdom was a reflection of this separate ethnic structure of society. Practically, separatist schools existed alone. Only after 1879, was Hungarian introduced as a compulsory subject of instruction in the non-Hungarian nationality schools, although without much success.

Educational policy that reinforced the separate ethnic structure of society suffered from inconsistencies and asymmetries. Although Hungarian was declared the state language in the Law on the Equality of Nationalities of 1868, the same law allowed non-state schools, mostly denominational schools to choose their own language of instruction. Further, the state tried to introduce Hungarian as a compulsory subject of instruction in non-Hungarian schools but it failed to have an eye for the linguistic needs of the non-Hungarian nationalities in accordance with actual and local circumstances. Finally, in Hungarian schools languages other than Hungarian were being taught, especially German and Latin but not the languages of the nationalities. The Hungarian state should however have done more to stimulate the teaching of the languages of the nationalities among Hungarians. Even in mixed schools the teaching of Hungarians and non-Hungarian nationalities in their own mother tongues took place separately. In sum, the educational system was hampered from the start by inherent weaknesses that could not be repaired by the educational policy. Educational policy containing liberal elements worsened the existing ethnic conflicts instead of pacifying them, while stimulating embittered linguistic and political power struggles between the different nationalities and the state.

In conclusion, not only the educational policy of dualist Hungary should have been criticised but the complete system instead, because it suffered from inherent weaknesses. The claims of the separate ethnic groups of Hungary being recognized blocked their full integration into the state system. This state of affairs yielded the worsening of the ethnic antagonisms being one of the main causes for the collapse of dualist Hungary. However, there was no rising social class strong enough that could have changed the system, breaking through the fixed pattern of class, religion and regions. Hence, the educational system preserved the social and regional status quo. Although mixed schools with two or three languages possessed a separatist educational regime these schools could have been a starting point to build bridges between the different nationalities of the Hungarian Kingdom. Hence, it was unfortunate that during dualism their num-

ber after a steady increase, dropped radically between 1900 and 1906: 1,632 in 1869, 2,437 in 1880, 2,878 in 1890, 3,251 in 1900 and 1,665 in 1905–1906 (Seton-Watson 1907: 436). Although the Hungarian educational policy during dualism had its deficiencies, it is unmotivated to label it as 'the Magyarization of the non-Hungarian nationalities.' In this context, "Magyarization" is in fact an anti-Hungarian stereotype that was and is used by critics of dualist Hungary in order to justify the dissolution of dualist Hungary at the Peace Conference in Paris, which ended the First World War (Marácz 1995: 25–41).

References

Bideleux, Robert, Ian Jeffries (1998). *A History of Eastern Europe: Crisis and Change*. London: Routledge.

Bogdan, Henry (1989). *From Warsaw to Sofia: A History of Eastern Europe*. Santa Fe, New Mexico: Pro Libertate Publishing.

Cadzow, John F., Andrew Ludanyi, Louis J. Elteto (1983). *Transylvania: The Roots of Ethnic Conflict*. Kent: The Kent State University Press.

Deák, István (1990). *Beyond Nationalism: A Social and Political History of the Habsburg Officer Corps, 1848–1849*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Faluhelyi Ferenc (1946). *A Dunatáj. Történelmi, gazdasági és földrajzi adatok a Dunatáj államainak életéből*. 1-3.köt. Szerk. Radisics Elemér. (A 3. köt. főmunkatársa Kemény G. Gábor.) Budapest: Gergely.

Goebl, Hans (1994). Die altösterreichische Sprachenvielfalt und -politik als Modellfall von heute und morgen. Umberto, Rinaldi, Rosita Rindler-Schjerve, Michael Metzeltin, eds. *Lingua e politica. La politica linguistica della duplice monarchia e la sua attualitá. Sprache und Politik. Die Sprachpolitik der Donaumonarchie und ihre Aktualität Atti del simposio*. Akten des Symposiums. Instituto Italiano di Cultura, 31. 5.1996. Vienna: Istituto di Cultura, 103–121.

Hévizi, Józsa (1995). *Területi és egyházi autonómia, mint a kollektiv jogok gyakorlásának szintére a történeti Magyarországon*. Budapest: Batthyány Lajos Alapítvány.

Lökkös, János (2000). *Trianon számokban*: *az 1910. évi magyar népszámlalás anyanyelvi adatainak elemzése a történelmi Magyarországon*. Budapest: Püski.

Marácz, László (1995). Western images and stereotypes of the Hungarians. Gerrits, André and Nanci Adler, eds. *Vampires Unstaked: National Images, Stereotypes and Myths in East Central Europe*. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation, 25–41.

Marácz, László (1996). *Hungarian Revival. Political Reflections on Central Europe*. Niewegein: Aspekt.

Mikó, Imre (1944). *Nemzetiségi jog és nemzetiségi politika: tanulmány a magyar közjog és politikai történet köréből*. Kolozsvár: Minerva.

Mintzel, Alf (1997). *Multikulturelle Gesellschaften in Europa und Nordamerika: Konzepte, Streitfragen, Analysen, Befunde*. Passau: Wissenschaftsverlag Rothe.

Plank, Pieter H. van der (1971). *Taalassimilatie van Europese Taalminderheden: Een Inventariserende en Hypothesevormende Studie naar Assimilatieverschijnselen onder Europese Taalgroepen*. PhD. Dissertation University of Utrecht.

Rady, Martin (2000). *Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary*. New York: Palgrave.

Rindler-Schjerve, Rosita, ed. (2003). *Diglossia and Power. Language Policies and Practice in the 19th Century Habsburg Empire*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Seton-Watson, Robert W (1972). *Racial Problems in Hungary*. New York: Howard Fertig.

Smith, Anthony D. (1991). *National Identity*. London: Penguin Books.

Teleki, Count Paul (1923). *The Evolution of Hungary and its Place in European History*. New York: The MacMillian Company.

Valjavec, Fritz 1963. *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, eds. Karl August Fischer and Mathias Bernáth. München: Oldenbourg.

Winter, Eduard (1968). *Frühliberalismus in der Donaumonarchie: Religiöse, nationale und wissenschaftliche Strömungen von 1790–1868*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Author's address:

László Marácz
Department of European Studies
University of Amsterdam
Spuistraat 134
1012 VB Amsterdam
The Netherlands
l.k.maracz@uva.nl

VIŠEJEZIČNOST U TRANSLAJTANIJSKOM DIJELU AUSTRO-UGARSKE MONARIJE (1867.-1918.): POLITIKA I PRAKSA

Sporazumom iz 1867. Kraljevina Mađarska dobila je ravnopravan status u dvojnoj Austro-ugarskoj monarhiji. Mađarska je postala suvereni dio Habsburške monarhije. Uz zajedničkog vladara iz redova Habsburga, koji je imao titulu „monarha" u Austriji i „kralja" u Mađarskoj, postojala su i tri zajednička ministarstva: Ministarstvo vanjskih poslova, Ministarstvo financija i Ministarstvo obrane. Sporazum kojim se uređuje autonomni status Mađarske u Dvojnoj monarhiji istekao je 1918. raspadom Habsburške monarhije, zbog čega se ovo istraživanje bavi upravo tim vremenskim razdobljem (1867.–1918.). Austro-ugarska monarhija bila je višejezična država s četrnaest službeno priznatih jezika: hrvatskih, češkim, njemačkim, mađarskim, talijanskim, litvanskim, poljskim, rumunjskim, rutenskim, srpskim, slovačkim, sloven-

skim, ukrajinskim i turskim. Iako se svi ti jezici nisu govorili u svim dijelovima monarhije i ponekad su bili ograničeni na pojedine regije, višejezičnost je bila regulirana zakonom. U ovom se radu govori o višejezičnosti u mađarskom, odnosno translajtanijskom dijelu dvojne monarhije. Govori se i o jezičnoj politici i praksi s posebnim osvrtom na sustav osnovnog obrazovanja koji može ponuditi uvid u višejezičnost u Kraljevini Mađarskoj. Daje se i kritički osvrt na historiografsku tradiciju nakon prvog svjetskog rata koja tvrdi da je višejezičnost bila strogo ograničena u Kraljevini Mađarskoj i da su ostali službeni jezici, osim mađarskog, bili strogo ograničeni, što je uzrokovalo oštre jezične i etničke sukobe. Međutim, analiza višejezičnosti u Kraljevini Mađarskoj mora biti kompleksnija od puke dvojne opozicije između "mađarskog" i "ne-mađarskog". Jezična politika Kraljevine Mađarske zapisana je u "Nacionalnom zakonu iz 1868., u kojem je mađarski određen kao službeni jezik, no dopušta se i korištenje svih drugih službenih jezika na lokalnoj razini, kako u državnoj i pravosudnoj službi, tako i u crkvenim organizacijama i školama. Primjena ovog principa nije međutim spriječila izbijanje jezičnih i etničkih sukoba u razdoblju izučavanja.

Ključne riječi: dvojna monarhija; nacionalnosti; višejezičnost; obrazovna politika; asimetrija.