Hungaro-German Dual Nationality: Germans, Slavs, and Magyars during the 1848 Revolution

Alexander Maxwell

ABSTRACT

German patriots in the Kingdom of Hungary developed a politics of "Hungaro-German dual nationality," proclaiming themselves both German and Hungarian, drawing on the precedent set by Hungarian Slavs resisting Magyarization. The analysis concentrates on the 1848 Revolution: during each ebb and flow of the revolutionary movement, Hungarian Germans consistently proclaimed their loyalty both to Hungary and to German culture in journalism, poetry, history, and travel writing. Hungaro-Slavic dual loyalty problematizes historiographic assumptions about German "ethnic nationalism."

During the 1848 Hungarian Revolution against the Habsburg dynasty, German-speaking patriots in the Kingdom of Hungary simultaneously proclaimed membership in two national communities: one defined by the Hungarian state and another defined by German culture. Whether understood as German-speaking Hungarians or as Germans living in Hungary, members of this community articulated multiple national loyalties. Nor did the crisis of civil war during the Revolution of 1848 force patriots to choose between Hungary or Germanness: Hungarian Germans of diverse political persuasions claimed a dual nationality. Belief in mutually compatible Hungarian and German national loyalties might be called "Hungaro-German" nationalism.

Hungaro-German dual nationality first appeared in the years before the Hungarian Revolution. It drew on an analogous "Hungaro-Slavism" developed by Hungary's Slavs, and rejected the significantly different "nation / nationality" (*nemzet* / *nemzetiség*) distinction promoted by leading patriotic Magyars (ethnic Hungarians). In March 1848, it flourished during the brief moment of revolutionary euphoria and goodwill. Hungarian revolutionaries became increasingly hostile to the Austrian

German Studies Review 39.1 (2016): 17–39

central government as the revolution progressed; the Habsburg dynasty's German associations strained relations between Magyars and Hungary's Germans. Yet even as the German-Magyar relationship turned to confrontation, German patriots in the Kingdom of Hungary maintained their right to consider themselves Hungarians. In the aftermath of the revolution, some Germans in Hungary even claimed to better represent Hungarian interests than the Magyars themselves.

Hungary's German population included both established communities with medieval roots and comparatively recent migrants. Germans first came to Transylvania and the Zips region at royal invitation during the Middle Ages. Victory over the Ottomans opened new lands for settlement during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[1] By the nineteenth century, both Hungary's official capital Pressburg (Pozsony / Bratislava)[2] and the commercial capital Pest (part of today's Budapest) had large German populations, and farming communities existed all along the middle Danube, particularly in southern Hungary. Speakers of German also lived in Hungary's provincial towns as merchants or bureaucrats.

This study concentrates on the newer German communities on the Hungarian plains, particularly in Budapest. One should be careful about generalizing to the older communities in Transylvania and the Zips, which enjoyed greater status. Nevertheless, Danube Germans enjoyed social respectability thanks to their economic success, the prestige of German literature, and close ties to the Empire's predominantly German-speaking administrators.

Hungary's ethnic diversity helped German speakers feel at home in the Kingdom. Hungary's non-German population consisted not only of Magyars, but large numbers of Croats, Romanians, Serbs, Slovaks, and Ukrainians. Many German intellectuals emphasized Hungary's ethnic diversity. In 1795, Heinrich Grellman claimed that "the properly born and original Hungarians now comprise around two million souls," identifying "the other inhabitants of this country, who number around six million," as Germans, Greeks, Jews, Wallachians, Gypsies, Frenchmen, and Slavs. He concluded that "the *people* in Hungary are very *mixed*. I know of no other land in Europe which has so many nations, and speaks so many languages, in so many dialects."[3] German communities did not stand out for speaking an alien language, they rather contributed to an already complex mixture of languages and cultures.

During the mid-nineteenth century, furthermore, German speakers in Hungary also felt comfortable because ethnicity had not yet become a strongly divisive force in public life. National historiographies in Hungary, inspired by the Czech historiographical concept of *národní obrození*, often describe the early nineteenth century as the period of "national awakening," variously imagined as the Slovak *národné obrodenie*,[4] the Croatian *narodni preporod*,[5] and the Romanian *renașterea națională*.[6] Even historians of Hungary, who normally prefer to speak of the "reform era" (*reformkor*), sometimes speak of the *nemzeti ébredés*.[7] During this period, however denoted, patriots

struggled to arouse popular interest in the national cause, typically with limited success. While this study concentrates on nationalist entrepreneurs, the multiple loyalties promoted by nineteenth-century patriot-entrepreneurs are best understood in the broader context of what Tara Zahra calls "national indifference."[8]

Even in an era of national indifference, however, Hungary's ethnic diversity had consequences. Political rights in Hungary required membership in one of the Kingdom's privileged social estates.[9] Yet all the various social estates had become associated with distinctive religions or languages. When describing Hungary's population in 1829, for example, Christian Stein listed Hungary's main languages as Hungarian, Slavic, Wallachian, and German. Stein also mentioned Greeks, Italians, Jews, and Gypsies, but noted that "only Magyars, Slavs and Germans have rights of an *indigenat* and imperial estate; the other peoples are seen as foreign."[10] Hungarian feudal privileges, in short, were ethnicized.

Insofar as national communities are defined by their excluded others,[11] therefore, the intellectual history of Hungarian nationalism must consider both social and ethnic exclusions. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Hungarian nobility, unusually large by contemporary standards, formed the most important "legal nation" in Hungary. The *natio hungarica*, as defined through legal privileges and imagined by eighteenth-century patriots, encompassed only the aristocracy and the gentry; even though members of the impoverished gentry enjoyed fewer privileges than great magnates. Though Magyars dominated Hungary's nobility, both gentry and aristocracy, they comprised only a minority of the Kingdom's total population.

Hungarian Nationalisms in the Nineteenth Century

The standard narrative of nineteenth-century Hungarian nationalism describes how liberal patriot-nobles, whom Robert A. Kann later described as a "virile, daring, intelligent and ruthless class,"[12] conflated their estate with "the Hungarian nation." Magyar patriots began restricting Hungarian nationality to Magyars, seeking to assimilate all non-Magyars to the dominant ethnicity. The glorification of all things Magyar inspired patriotic cultural work: poets wrote patriotic poetry, or compiled collections of Magyar folk songs.[13] The class-inclusive yet monolingual *Magyar nemzet* (Magyar nation) ultimately dominated Magyar thinking, inspiring schemes for linguistic assimilation, usually called "Magyarization." Magyar patriots generally welcomed assimilators, but for Hungarians unwilling or unable to assimilate, ethnic exclusion slowly displaced estate privilege. Hungary's mostly peasant communities of Slovaks, Romanians, and Ruthenians thus traded one form of discrimination for another. The Croatian aristocracy experienced Magyarization as an unprovoked threat. Magyarization ultimately estranged non-Magyar patriots from Hungary, who in response launched their own national movements, wrote their own patriotic poetry, compiled their own folk songs, and in general promoted their own languages.

Magyarization may be the main story of nineteenth-century Hungarian nationalism,[14] yet other, less studied types of "Hungarian nationalism" also existed. During the French Revolution, a few patriots proposed a class-inclusive and multiethnic Hungarian nation, remembered as the *Hungarus* concept.[15] The *Hungarus* idea differed from the *Magyar nemzet* mostly in its attitude toward linguistic diversity. Proponents of the *Magyar nemzet*, conflating the Hungarian with the Magyar, reserved for Magyars the sole right to describe themselves as a "nation" (*nemzet*) and characterized Hungary's Slavs, Romanians, Germans, and so forth as mere "nationalities" (*nemzetiségek*). Advocates of the *Hungarus* concept, by contrast, celebrated Hungary's many languages. As a typical artifact of *Hungarus* nationalism, consider a multilingual patriotic songbook, published in 1808: professor and polymath Karl Georg Rumy, himself a Zips German, compiled songs in Magyar, Latin, Slovak, High German, and the "Transylvanian-Saxon [German] language" and presented them as works "by and for Hungarians."[16]

Hungary's non-Magyar patriots generally rejected the *Magyar nemzet* and sympathized with the *Hungarus* vision of a multilingual Kingdom. Grellman's study of the Kingdom, for example, dismissed Magyarization as absurd:

> Considering that the non-Hungarian inhabitants of this country exceed the proper Hungarians by at least *three times*; that they have the right to enjoy citizenship *just as long* or *even longer*, that they even outweigh the original Hungarians in all sorts of industry and productivity, the suggestion that Hungary's inhabitants should learn Hungarian is very surprising.[17]

In 1833, Rumy similarly marveled at plans "to take the numerous Slovaks, Germans, Serbs, Wallachs, Rusniaks in Hungary and turn them into Magyars."[18] The more passionately Magyar patriots advocated Magyarization, the more frightened non-Magyars became. By the 1840s, ethnolinguistic tensions had become an important feature of Hungarian domestic politics, with conflict over the administrative language of courts, parliament, local government, and similar public settings. Linguistic tensions continued until Hungary's partition at the end of World War I.[19]

German-speaking Hungarians opposed Magyarization with rhetoric that first originated in Slavic patriotic circles. Magyarization threatened Hungary's Slavs more than its Germans. The German character of the imperial capital, German-speaking imperial institutions, and a prestigious corpus of science and literature partly shielded Germans in Buda and Pest from the threat of Magyarization. Slavs enjoyed no such advantages.

Hungarian Slavs initially responded to Magyarization primarily as Slavs, not as Slovaks, Croats, etc. While Hungary's Slavic borderlands today belong to various

distinct Slavic states (Slovakia and Transcarpathian Ukraine in the north; Serbian Vojvodina, Croatia, and Slovene Prekmurje to the south), the divisions between different Slavic nations held less importance during the nineteenth century heyday of pan-Slavism. For example, several Slovak patriots sought support in Croatia by publishing in the Zagreb periodical *Danica Ilirska*.[20] In 1833, when Samuel Hoitsy anonymously answered the question "Should we become Magyars?"[21] in the negative, both a Slovak poet and a Croat military officer were falsely accused of authorship.[22]

Hungary's Slavs responded to Magyarization with theories of "Hungaro-Slavic multiple nationality," arguing that inhabitants of the Hungarian Kingdom possessed both linguistic nationality defined through language, and also political nationality defined through citizenship.[23] To justify linguistic rights, Slavs distinguished Hungarian citizenship from Magyar ethnicity. Indeed, the necessary distinction between "Hungarians" and "Magyars" first appeared in print in 1820:

> The word *Ungarn* implies all the peoples [*Völker*] living in Hungary; Slovaks as well as Wallachians, Germans as well as Vandals, etc., all are *Ungarn*, because they live in Hungary. *Magyaren*, on the other hand, are only those who form the main nation, those who call themselves the *Magyarok*.[24]

Hoitsy, in his aforementioned tract similarly sought

> to distinguish between "*Magyaren*" and "*Ungarn*," between "*magyarisch*" and "*ungrisch*": when he speaks of "*die Ungarn*," he understands with this term all the peoples living in the country and Kingdom of Hungary; "*Magyaren*," by contrast, are to him the *Arpadier*.[25]

Hoitsy later published a lengthy "Apology of Hungarian Slavdom."[26] By 1848, furthermore, Croats Dragutin Rakovac and Ivan Mažuranić,[27] as well as Slovaks Ľudovít Štúr and Michal Hodža,[28] had published tracts defending Slavic linguistic rights.

Several works articulating Hungaro-Slavic loyalties appeared in German. Indeed, Slavs often appealed directly to Hungarian Germans as potential allies. German thinkers had long stressed Hungary's multiethnic character; Rumy corresponded with leading Slavic thinkers, including Croatian journalist Ludovit Gaj and Slovak poet and pastor Jan Kollár.[29] Writing in a Croatian newspaper in 1841, Slovak author Johann Csaplovics listed Germans as potential victims of Magyar chauvinism in an article denouncing "pseudo-Magyars" who "in their enthusiasm go beyond the law, and not only desire, but seek to compel the *complete magyarisation of all non-Magyars*."[30] Later that same year, Csaplovics emphasized both Slovak and German contributions to Magyar wellbeing: "the Magyar would not be able to cut his bread

or plow his field without the Slovaks and German industry, because he would have no *iron*, which is made by Slovaks and Germans."[31] In September 1848, after the revolutionary confrontation had become bitter, Slovak leader Michal Hodža even appealed to "German brothers" as fellow Europeans, vis-à-vis the Asiatic Magyars: "should we not, if push came to shove, not a thousand times prefer Germanism, i.e. our own Europeanism, to the Uralic-Asiatic Siberianism, which is foreign to us?"[32]

Hungary's Germans also became familiar with Hungaro-Slavic ideas because Hungary's German-language press discussed them at length during the 1840s. For example, when the Croatian newspaper *Ilirske noviny* proclaimed "we would rather be slaves than Magyars!" on December 14, 1841, provoking a heated response from the Magyar journals *Pesti Hirlap* and *Hirnök*, the German-language *Vereinigte Ofner und Pesther Zeitung* covered the story.[33] In 1843, when Hungarian magnate István Széchenyi famously lamented that most "truly ardent" Hungarians became "more or less deaf to the laws of fairness and justice whenever the question of our language and nationality is raised," the *Vereinigte Ofner und Pesther Zeitung* reproduced his speech in full,[34] adding a flattering editorial shortly afterward.[35] German-speaking inhabitants of the Kingdom of Hungary had many chances to hear both Magyar arguments for and Slavic arguments against Magyarization.

Initially bystanders to the Slavic-Magyar dispute, Hungary's Germans increasingly became drawn into the argument by the end of the 1840s. Speakers of German, facing less pressure to Magyarize and generally sympathetic to economic and political reforms championed by the liberal Hungarian nobility, rarely criticized Magyar patriots as stridently as Slavic intellectuals. Magyarization nevertheless offended German patriotic sensibilities, and Hungaro-German rhetoric emerged in the 1840s.

Hungaro-Germanism closely resembled the Hungaro-Slavism that preceded it, and often alluded to Slavs as fellow targets of Magyarization. Franz Schuselka's 1845 tract noted that "no Hungarian city is without a German population,"[36] and insisted that "what the Germans and Slavs perform for Hungary, they do as Germans and Slavs."[37] Such comments closely resemble similar passages from Hungaro-Slavic pamphlets.

Schuselka opposed Magyarization with Germanization, in that he suggested German as the best administrative language for Hungary. German culture ought to dominate Hungary, he argued, because "political servitude has never originated from Germans, only tolerance, justice, freedom, and civilization." If German became Hungary's official language, then Slavs would no longer feel "pressure to become Magyars." Schuselka admitted that "the agreement of the Magyars would be harder to obtain," but optimistically characterized their consent as "not impossible."[38] The suggestion illustrates growing German unease with Magyarization, a vague awareness that Hungary's Slavs had led resistance to it, anxiety that linguistic disputes could destroy Hungary's domestic tranquility, and, perhaps, a failure to appreciate the strong passion with which Magyars promoted their own culture.

March 1848: Hungaro-Germanism in the Revolutionary Moment

Tensions between Hungary's Germans, Magyars, and Slavs turned to confrontation during the 1848 Revolution, an important turning point in Hungarian history. However scholars may formulate the revolution's long term causes, events in France sparked the explosion. News of the Bourbon monarchy's collapse reached Vienna on February 29, during the heady atmosphere of the Carnival season. Student protests led to public demonstrations, which in turn caused a run on Viennese banks. Metternich's unexpected resignation on March 13 emboldened protesters and paralyzed imperial authorities.[39]

The news of Metternich's fall reached Pest the evening of March 14. By the following morning, the young poet Sándor Petőfi had composed his famous "*Nemzeti dal*" (National Song), and novelist Mór Jókai had prepared the "Twelve Points," a list of revolutionary demands. These famous texts were read aloud in the Café Pilvax. In a nod to the Viennese students who had led Vienna's revolution, protesters then walked to the city's medical school and law faculty. Peasants visiting the city for the St. Joseph Day market joined the throng. The growing crowd decided to publish the Twelve Points in defiance of the Habsburg censor, seized a printing press, and persuaded the city council to affix its seal. Before the day ended, patriots had proclaimed their triumph from a window in Buda castle. As news of these dramatic events spread, other Hungarian cities experienced similar upheavals. The emperor Ferdinand agreed to reconstitute the Hungarian parliament before the week was out, and on April 11 granted that parliament extensive powers.[40]

While the leading figures of the March events were all Magyars, German-speaking Hungarians were also swept up in the excitement. On March 15, according to Alice Freifeld, "a few of the patriotic speeches had been given in German."[41] During a similar series of ecstatic revolutionary speeches at the Hungarian parliament in Pressburg, a Hungarian youth used both German and Hungarian to praise the city's militia.[42] The youth in question, Frigyes Szarvady, had been born Friedrich Hirsch, but had chosen to Magyarize himself.[43]

During the early months of 1848, which some scholars call the "honeymoon period,"[44] Magyar patriots expressed great respect for Vienna's students, whose example had inspired Hungary's revolution. Visiting Vienna, Frigyes Szarvady hailed them as "fellow citizens and brothers!" while praising their "love of freedom and attachment to the throne."[45] In early April, the Pest Casino, an important patriotic institution,[46] hosted a gala dinner for "fraternal German students," whom Guido Karácsonyi toasted in both German and Hungarian: "the sons of Árpád and the sons of Tuisto can joyfully embrace."[47] During the 1840s, Magyar patriots had shown their patriotism by scorning the waltz and dancing the csárdás at public balls,[48] but in the first weeks of the revolution, musicians at the Casino played waltzes, csárdáses, and the Marseillaise.

German-speaking Hungarians continued to express patriotic enthusiasm for the revolution in the months that followed. In late April, "a number of German-speaking Hungarians" gathered at a Pest restaurant "to found a club whose members, as citizens of Hungary, would discuss their civic interests in their usual language." The newspaper *Morgenröthe* justified its existence with Hungaro-German ideas: "the German in Hungary is Hungarian above everything else, but he does very well if he does not wish to forget the language of Schiller, Goethe, Lessing, Leibnitz, and Humboldt."[49] *Morgenröthe*'s correspondent reported that the club "in no way set itself against the Hungarian language, but since . . . a part of Pest's inhabitants did not master this language, they needed to converse in their normal language."[50] In May, *Morgenröthe* delightedly reported that a Magyar had visited the German club and, evidently approving, had applied to join.[51]

As Magyar revolutionary enthusiasm became increasingly radical, at least one Hungaro-German patriot continued to hope that Magyars would recognize the German language as Hungary's means of interethnic communication. In May 1848, the *Pester Zeitung* advocated the use of German so that "the more educated of all Hungarian nationalities" could communicate with each other. The author signed his piece "*ein Ungar*" (a Hungarian), implying a specifically Hungarian patriotism, rather than Habsburg loyalism or pan-Germanism. Indeed, his warnings against "nationalism and separatism in the Hungarian monarchy [!]" suggested a certain indifference to the Habsburg Empire as a whole.[52]

Ethnic tension increased as Hungarians of all ethnicities claimed a share of the Kingdom. Throughout the 1840s, patriots had increasingly proclaimed the puszta the most characteristically Magyar landscape,[53] so non-Magyars claimed other regions for their ethnicity. Slovaks, for example, developed a "cult of the Tatras."[54] Hungary's Germans associated themselves with the Danube, partly because several German communities clustered on its shores, and partly because it connected Hungary to Vienna and the German-speaking heartland. In April 1848, for example, Ludwig August Frankl claimed the river for Hungary's Germans in verse:

Der stolze Strom, durch Euer Land geschlagen
Der euer Heldentaten Zeuge war,
Aus deutschem Herzen ist er frisch entsprungen,
Aus deutschem Land fließt seine Quelle klar.

The proud river that strikes through your country
And was witness to your heroic deeds,
It has sprung from German hearts,
And flows cleanly from its source in German land.[55]

Frankl apparently addressed his poem to an imagined Magyar audience: the title of the poem, "Duna," is the Danube's Hungarian name. Subsequent Hungarian-German journalists followed Frankl's poetry with prose. In 1849, the *Pester Zeitung* symbolically partitioned Hungary between Magyars, Slavs, and Germans by assigning each a characteristic river: "While the Tisza is Magyar and the Drava Slavic, the Danube is mostly German from Devín and Poszony down to Orsova."[56] German claims to the Danube, furthermore, won recognition from other non-Magyar Hungarians. On April 28, 1848, the *Pester Zeitung* printed an appeal from a "Hungarian of Romanian origin" who addressed the Danube as "you magnificent river, from whose paths songs of freedom and friendship waft to us from the German people, mighty and united with us in brotherhood."[57]

The symbolic partition of Hungary into imagined homelands defined by ethnicity raised the possibility of the Kingdom's political partition into separate ethnic states. The March Days, experienced as exhilarating liberation, emboldened Hungarians of all nationalities. Members of non-Magyar communities quickly organized to demand collective rights, most characteristically the use of their language in local administration. The Serbian community in Pest drew up a national petition as early as March 16;[58] Romanian, Croatian, and Slovak councils promulgated similar manifestos on March 24, 25, and 28.[59] Magyar patriots, used to conflating their own interests with those of all Hungary, responded first with exhortations to "brotherhood," then incredulity, then accusations of treason. As the joy of the March Days curdled into recriminations, suspicion, and paranoia, the "honeymoon phase" came to an end.

Hungaro-Germanism during the Hungarian Civil War

Nationalist violence began in the south of Hungary. Hungarian revolutionary leader Lajos Kossuth met with Serbian representative Djordje Stratimirović on April 8 and refused to recognize the Serbs as a "nation," claiming that a nation "must also have its own government." Stratimirović did not insist on a Serbian government, but demanded an end to Magyarization and "recognition" of the Serbs as a nation. Kossuth, famously, called him a traitor, concluding: "the sword will decide between us."[60] On May 13, Serbian patriots in Karlowitz (Karlovác / Sremski Karlovci) declared the "nation of Hungarian Serbs" independent of Kossuth's government and petitioned for the Emperor's protection.[61] Sympathizers from the Principality of Serbia crossed the border to help.[62] Fighting began on May 25, and did not end until August 1849.[63]

During the summer of 1848, liberals in Germany proper generally sided with the Magyars against the Serbs. Throughout Central Europe, German liberals feared Russian intervention, and Prague's pan-Slav Congress, despite its conciliatory language, inspired increasingly hysterical Slavophobia.[64] Friedrich Engels, particularly outspoken in his sympathy for Kossuth, dismissed "those leaders of the South-Slav

movement who tell fables about the equal rights of nations" as either "deluded dreamers" (*Schwärmer*) or "scoundrels."[65] Even less radical Germans expressed sympathy with revolutionary Magyars. In May, Julius Ludwig Klee, writing from Saxony, urged Hungary's Germans to "remain German, be true to your past" before addressing the Magyars directly:

> Magyars! Let us be brothers! Treat the Germans among you and in Transylvania as brothers! Be just to their age-old German nature; they want to remain German. Do not pressure them, do not open the door to an emergency alliance between Germans and Slavs!"[66]

If Magyars respected German distinctiveness, Klee hoped, then Germans and Magyars could both rally against the Slavs.

Germans inside Hungary itself had more dramatic opportunities to promote Magyar-German fraternity by showing their loyalty to Hungary. In September, a "German-Hungarian National Guardsman" stationed in Werbass (Verbász / Vrbas), a predominantly Serbian town in southern Hungary, hoped in the *Pester Zeitung* that Hungary's "two million Germans will stand up as a single man and the 300,000 able-bodied men among them will cry 'Our wealth and blood for Hungary!'" The guardsman described the beating of a German youth, claiming that "captured Germans are beaten even more brutally than the Hungarians."[67] However, he also felt the need to justify the German presence in Hungary:

> We German Hungarians mostly came to Hungary individually, not in compact masses, and certainly not as conquerors. We found a hospitable welcome, and much enduring happiness. I have never heard anybody yearn for the land of his descent . . . We, who have conducted our business here, or own house and land, or who have even been born here, we cannot be anything other than Hungarian.

He also reported hearing the cry "death and destruction to all Hungarians and Germans" ring out during the night.[68]

Hungarian patriots sometimes acknowledged the contribution of German revolutionaries. Kossuth mentioned the German population in southern Hungary in his declaration of independence, which accused Serbs of "massacring peaceable Hungarian and German inhabitants of the Banat."[69] A generation later, novelist Mór Jókai praised German bravery in a novel about the 1848 Revolution, *A kőszívű ember fiai* (literally "the callous man's sons," but published in English as *The Baron's Sons*). A detachment of German students fight on the Hungarian side, and Hugo Mausmann, a German character, dies a hero's death storming Buda castle. Significantly, however, the Hungarian hero Ödön Baradlay must defend the Germans from Magyar insults,

arguing to Magyar patriots that the "gallant" Germans "deserved friendship." Significantly, Jókai also has Mausmann address Baradlay as "lord patron" (*patrónus uram*).[70]

The Magyar-German relationship evolved alongside the military situation. In October, Alfred Windischgrätz dissolved Vienna's revolutionary National Guard in the name of imperial authority. Hungarian armies tried to help the German revolutionaries in Vienna, but in early November imperial soldiers decisively defeated the Hungarian expeditionary army.[71] Windischgrätz entered Hungary in mid-November, taking Pressburg on December 18.[72] After winning the battle of Moor (Mór) on December 31, Austrian soldiers under Windischgrätz's command, supported by a Croatian army under Ban Josip Jelačić, occupied Buda on January 5, 1849.[73] Pest fell shortly afterward without resistance. The city's Slavs greeted the imperial army as liberators.[74]

Imperial occupation placed Pest's revolutionary Germans in an awkward position, since Habsburg loyalists courted the city's German element as a possible source of support. The loyalist *Wiener Zeitung*, for example, optimistically described the supposed popularity of restored Habsburg authorities in Buda and Pest: "Kossuth's entire party has been vanquished. The German element makes a common cause with well-intentioned [*gutgesinnten*] Magyars."[75] Germans sympathetic to Kossuth could hardly proclaim their support under imperial occupation. Some fled; others refused to cooperate with imperial authorities. One German patriot felt such enthusiasm for the Magyar revolution that he forbade his German servant to speak to him in any language but Hungarian, which apparently "gave rise to comical scenes."[76]

Windischgrätz's loyalties belonged to the Habsburg emperor rather than to any national concept. In his proclamations, Windischgrätz avoided any reference to Hungarian nationhood, because, as Gunther E. Rothenberg suggests, he "wanted to restore the pre-March monarchy."[77] He demanded, for example, that leading citizens of Pest "recognize and pay homage to His imperial and royal apostolic Majesty Franz Joseph as lawful king of Hungary" and ordered citizens of Gran (Esztergom) "to submit in writing to Lord Field Marshall Prince Alfred von Windisch-Grätz, empowered by the command of his Majesty the reigning emperor and king Franz Joseph the First."[78]

As prominent newspapers acquired new editors,[79] however, Windischgrätz allowed loyalist journalists to invoke Hungaro-German dual nationality. Evidently Hungaro-Germanism was to serve as a counterweight to Magyar revolutionary patriotism. When J.S. Seiz took control of the *Pester Zeitung*, for example, he declared the journal "a German organ, devoted to the interests, needs, and legitimate demands of the German element in Hungary." He claimed that "the 1½ million Germans living in the country form a significant part of the total population, the core of civil life, and the elite of the rural population," and praised them as "bearers of European civilization and education."[80] Seiz's revolutionary predecessors had united Magyar and German in revolutionary fraternity, or a Slavophobe brotherhood of arms. Seiz, by contrast, cast Germans as Hungary's teachers and refiners.

Loyalist journalists also tried to boost German self-confidence. "Marlin," one of Seiz's contributors, wanted to "accelerate the development of national consciousness among the Germans in Hungary," urging Hungary's Germans to resist Magyar supremacy: "if we express even a bit of pride, then we will no longer be political pariahs, instead the German in Hungary will be as respected as his language and literature." Marlin depicted Germans as "the mortar of polyglot Austria, and the German language is the tireless translator . . . between the divided tribes."[81] In a subsequent editorial, Marlin then denounced Magyarization, lamenting that "blue-eyed Teutons in Hungarian schools lose the habit of calling *Vivat* and substitute *Éljen* [Hurrah]."[82]

In March 1849, Tobias Gottfried Schröer further appealled "to the Germans in Hungary" with a manifesto for Hungary's renewal from a German perspective. Schröer called for "equal treatment for all estates, all confessions, and all tribes [*Volksstämme*]." He dismissed Magyar claims to hegemony: "The Hungarian can no longer complain that he has lost his independence, he has only lost the unnatural right to rob from other peoples. His gain, however, will be great, because he can join in brotherly relations with previously oppressed tribes." Postrevolutionary Hungary would need its Germans, Schröer argued, because Germans "have been the bearers of a many-sided culture and civilization since their migration." Yet future generations could continue to play this role only with a heightened national consciousness: "we must be *entirely German*, more German than we have been, and make up the difference where we have fallen behind other fellow tribes." Moving to concrete political demands, Schröer stressed German-language education: "We Germans in Hungary are not only justified, but obligated to introduce the German language in the secondary schools . . . if we do not do this, we should straightforwardly declare ourselves worse than our German brothers in Transylvania, than the Croats, Serbs, and Romanians."[83]

Perhaps the most eloquent statement of Hungaro-German sentiment during Windischgrätz's occupation came in verse. An ostensibly autobiographical poem from "T.G.S." emphasized the multigenerational quality of German settlement. The narrator described his father migrating to Hungary "not to beg for bread" but for work "that he was gladly offered." Emphasis on German industriousness rebutted a Magyar trope that ungrateful non-Magyars "eat Hungarian bread" without learning Hungarian, sufficiently widespread to appear in a book of idioms.[84] T.S.G. continued:

Da spricht mein Vater, spricht es laut
Das scheint nicht so zu sein;
Mein Brot hab' ich mir selbst gebaut,
Gekeltert meinen Wein.

To that my father loudly replies
That does not seem to be the case:
I have made my own bread myself,
And pressed my own wine.[85]

Echoing Csaplovics, T.G.S. then claimed that the Magyars themselves reaped benefits from German diligence:

Seit Stephan hat die deutsche Hand
Gar viel gewirkt mit Fleiß
Und in dem schönen Ungarland
Floß gar viel deutscher Schweiß.

Since the days of Stephen, German hands
Have achieved much through hard work.
And in the beautiful Hungarian land
Much German sweat has flowed.

German soldiers had also contributed to Hungary's liberation from the Ottomans:

Und gegen Feindesübermacht
Da brennt auch deutsches Glut
Und in der wilden Türkenschlacht
Floß auch viel deutsche Blut.

And against the enemy's terrible power
German ardor also burned,
And in wild battles against the Turks
Much German blood has also flowed.

T.G.S.'s poem ended with a plea for equality between nations:

Ein jedes *Volk ist ehrenreich*
D'rum ehren wir auch euch.
Doch was im Land sich ehrlich nährt
Ist eins dem Andren gleich.

Each and *every* people deserves honor
That's why we honor you.
But what honestly supports itself in the country
Is equal to all the others.[86]

T.S.G.'s Hungaro-Germanism thus followed the Hungaro-Slavic tradition as established in the 1840s.

The *Pester Zeitung* ceased publication when the Hungarian army retook Pest in April 1849. On June 5, an enthusiastic crowd welcomed Kossuth's return in a gilded carriage.[87] The revolution's success in the capital provoked German communities elsewhere in the Kingdom to renewed expressions of Hungarian patriotism. One German community in the Banat, learning of Kossuth's victory, tore down the imperial flag, raised the Hungarian tricolor, and paraded a Hungarian official around the town in triumph.[88] In Komorn (Komárom / Komárno), a German national guard, the "Deutsche Legion," exchanged their German coats for embroidered Hungarian jackets and enrolled themselves as a German unit of the Hungarian army.[89]

Hungaro-Germanism under Neo-absolutism

Imperial troops definitively expelled Kossuth from Hungary's capital on July 22, when General Julius von Haynau's army occupied Pest. Though a garrison at Komorn defied imperial forces until September 27, the main revolutionary army surrendered at Hellburg (Világos / Şiria) on August 13, 1849. Magyar patriots experienced the Habsburg restoration as a national catastrophe. Haynau, in Freifeld's words "eager to play the role of chastiser,"[90] obliged newspapers to print a proclamation threatening death "at the shortest notice, without distinction of rank or sex, and on the spot where the crime was committed" to any who dared "to insult with word or deed any one of my brave soldiers."[91]

German-language periodicals again courted supporters from the German population in Buda and Pest. Haynau criticized Pest's inhabitants for supporting "the chimerical edifice of a Hungarian republic" despite being "mostly German in language and customs,"[92] yet, like Windischgrätz, he recognized the need for allies in Hungary's largest city. Variants of the *Hungarus* idea predominated, though demands for ethnic federalization proliferated. On August 1, the *Pester Zeitung*, now a "quasi-official organ"[93] under the direction of Eduard Glatz, symbolically divided Hungary into ethnic homelands. While "the proud Magyars built Kesckemét and Debreczin,"[94] Hungary's Germans had built Pest, a city "almost at the level of Vienna, inhabited by the same human stock, of the same nation according to blood and language."[95] A further story published later that month emphatically boasted of "*all* of the splendid buildings, the splendid shop windows, and splendid vaults! This is *German* culture! *German* efforts have been made, and *German* spirit has flowed, just as the city's inhabitants are German." The same article also rebutted the Magyar trope about Hungarian bread: "After all this hard work, this people must now take the reproach: it eats foreign [Magyar] bread? The Germans are only guests?"[96]

Proponents of multiethnic Hungaro-Germanism unsurprisingly rejected Magyarization. The *Pester Zeitung* defended German-language schools: "I do not wish to

Germanize anybody, I just do not want to Magyarize the Germans."[97] Another article calling for "good intentions," a code word for Habsburg loyalism, articulated loyalist anxieties about Magyarized Germans:

> Those Germans show poor intentions if they wish to Magyarize their children. Does he [the German] do this so that his child moves up in the world? No. Does he do this because one learns more in Magyar schools? No. He does this because he does not wish to know anything about Austria, because he does not wish to be Austrian, but instead the citizen of a sovereign state, a member of a certain sovereign people.[98]

Imperial authorities probably overstated the number of Hungary's Germans who harbored such self-Magyarizing ambitions, but revolutionary upheavals had undermined their sense of security. In 1849, Germans loyal to the dynasty suspected not only Magyars but Hungary's urban Germans of harboring revolutionary Hungarian nationalism.

Revolutionary conflict sometimes gave German rhetoric of multiethnic cooperation a bitter tone. Julian Chownitz's *Handbuch zur Kenntniß Ungarns* provided a seventy-seven page history of Hungary and a thirty-four page history of Hungary's German community.[99] Chownitz had served as an army officer and taught in the Graz military academy before pursuing the literary career he had dreamed of since his youth.[100] Active in journalism throughout the 1840s, he supported the Hungarian revolution in 1848, defending not only Hungary's right to resist Austria,[101] but even Hungary's right to attack Austria and Russia.[102] After the revolution's failure, however, he pointedly reminded the Magyars that they had German Austria to thank for their liberation from the Ottomans. In a nod to Hungary's Slavs, he claimed Magyars had learned agriculture from "Germans and also Slavs, since the latter also possessed their own culture in the era when the Magyars took possession of their land."[103] Chownitz then predicted that

> ultra-Magyarism with its exaggerated aspirations, detached from any achievable aims, has received its death blow from the imperial army's conquest of Hungary, and in the future even the Magyars with their eternal majority will learn to understand that only a brotherly attitude toward the other nations of Hungary can lead to development, whether "material" or something higher.

If the Magyars remained intransigent, Chownitz concluded, "there will be no lack of means to compel them."[104]

Gustav Höfken similarly asserted German rights in Hungary in an 1850 volume urging prospective migrants to seek their fortunes in Hungary instead of America. Höfken painted a rosy picture of German Hungary, but urged "Germans on Hungarian land" to maintain "reading rooms, choral societies, marksmanship festivals, gymnastic

societies and soldiers' unions, with which they remain national."[105] Germans were not the most numerous of Hungary's nationalities, but "exceeded the others in diligence, prosperity, initiative, and civilization, and have behind them a nation with a higher culture."[106] Referring to an 1842 ethnographic map prepared by Slovak savant Pavel Jozef Šafařík,[107] Höfken predicted a bright future for German Hungary: while Magyars live only in a confined territory, "the Germans reproduce more strongly than the Magyars [and] live scattered throughout the country."[108] The "aristocratic dream of Magyar independence" had failed because the Magyars were outnumbered by non-Magyars, but Hungary could still achieve its destiny

> if Hungarians, Slavs, Romanians, Germans, powerful in their unity, in durable confederation based on the complete equality between peoples, erect a rich cultural state on that receptive ground. Only then can the prospect of creating a free federal state between Turkey and Russia be fulfilled, *possibly* under Austria's protection [emphasis added].[109]

Höfken imagined Hungary as a multiethnic state which needed to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of all its peoples. He insisted that "German language and literature, German customs and society should be preserved, expanded, and developed in Hungary," but sought not to Germanize Hungary, but to ensure that "they come to power and honor and remain next to the Magyar and Slavic."[110]

German patriots in Hungary thus took a surprisingly consistent approach to Hungary throughout the turbulent 1840s, including the upheavals of war and revolution: they imagined Hungary as a multilingual and multinational society which should respect German cultural distinctiveness. Before the revolution, German elites reacted skeptically to Magyarization, much as had Hungary's more radicalized Slavs. During the 1848 Revolution, German patriots pledged to sacrifice for Hungary, but insisted on doing so as Germans. During the Habsburg reaction, German royalists praised the German contribution to multiethnic Hungary. Depending on the prevailing political winds, Hungary's urban Germans variously sympathized with Magyars against the Slavs, or with Slavs against the Magyars; with revolutionaries against the emperor, or with the emperor against the revolutionaries. Yet their aspiration to live as Germans in a multiethnic Hungary remained constant.

Hungaro-Germanism as Multiple Nationalism

Hungaro-German expressions of dual nationality problematize traditional understandings of central European nationalism in several respects. They challenge the widespread perception, popular among both experts and nonexperts, that national identities are mutually exclusive. They also undermine the surprisingly persistent belief that German nationalist ideology had a uniquely intolerant or "ethnic" character.

Most Habsburg specialists understand that the rubric of "German nationalism" encompasses more than antisemitism, xenophobia, chauvinism, and racialism. Eli Nathans recently published a monograph extending the insight to Germany itself.[111] Scholars not working in German studies, however, tend to treat an absurdly homogenized "German" nationalism as the paradigmatic example of "ethnic nationalism," whether formulated as Hans Kohn's "Eastern nationalism"[112] or some other variant of the "bad" half of a theory of "Good and Bad Nationalism."[113] A recent study of Turkish nationalism, for example, juxtaposed "cosmopolitan French nationalism" with "anti-western and anti-enlightenment German nationalism."[114] Scholars of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, and Ethiopia have invoked similarly oversimplistic dichotomies.[115] Such caricatures hardly do justice to the complexity of German culture and history.

Scholars specializing in German nationalism generally show more nuance, typically differentiating "German nationalism" by era, political party, and so forth. Nevertheless, the desire to explain the horrors of the twentieth century has caused some German experts to overemphasize nineteenth-century trends that foreshadowed the Nazi catastrophe. Mike Rapport's study of the 1848 Revolution, for example, blamed the "authoritarian tendencies" of twentieth-century Europe primarily on "the catastrophe of the First World War," yet suggested that "one can . . . discern these tendencies in 1848, not as the overgrown jungle that they were to become, but as germinating bulbs."[116] Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Dieter Langewiesche similarly concluded that "the 1848 Revolution ended everywhere in nationalist conflict," suggesting that "the forces arising from the revolutionary idea of nation . . . would transform the European continent in the second half of the nineteenth century and would eventually lead to the First World War."[117] Another recent history argues that "the 1848 Revolutions and the 'coming of age' of German nationalism" ultimately contributed "to the collapse of the Habsburg Empire in 1918, to the demise of the 'first' Austrian Republic in 1938, and to the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia in 1938–39," emphasizing "the frequently horrific and often unintended effects of 'ethnic' nationalism in the multiethnic mosaic of East Central Europe and the Balkans."[118] Scholars seeking to understand twentieth-century violence are understandably curious about possible nineteenth-century origins, and the ethnic violence of the 1848 Revolution does provide some precedent. Nevertheless, chronological precedence is not causality: these texts interpret 1848 not in the context of its own time, but in the context of events nearly a century in the future.

Hungaro-Germanism, however, suggests an alternative narrative of German multiethnic tolerance. While German patriots in Habsburg Hungary often referred to themselves as "bearers of culture," they consistently propounded inclusive and multiethnic national concepts. Nationalism theorist Anthony Smith has suggested that "language and ethnicity quickly came to exert a greater appeal" among Germans than in other places, which "influenced the course of German nationalist ideologies

in the direction of an ethnic nationalism and a biological determinism."[119] Yet the longing for multiethnic coexistence dominated Hungaro-German thought even during the most strained moments of the 1848 Revolution. Indeed, Hungaro-Germanism during the 1848 Revolution suggests instead that both Magyar and Slav patriots clung more passionately toward linguistic nationalism than Hungary's Germans. During the revolution itself, the Slavic intelligentsias all but unanimously opposed Kossuth's government because of its Magyarization policies, but German patriots found themselves on both sides of the battle. By the 1860s, furthermore, Germans in Hungary showed an increasing tendency toward assimilation.[120] Particularly when contrasted with Magyar chauvinism, Hungaro-Germanism undermines the widespread assumption that German nationalism developed along archetypically or even unusually intolerant lines. If anything, Hungary's Germans stand out for their lack of ethnic nationalism.

Finally, Hungaro-Germanism shows that German patriotic thought drew inspiration not only from Herder, Magyar patriots, and the other usual suspects, but also from Hungary's relatively understudied Slavic patriotic traditions. Intellectual influences did not flow in one way along what Attila Melegh called "the East-West civilizational slope which emerged in the 18th century,"[121] because East-West rhetoric, like other forms of symbolic geography, is best analyzed as a political argument, not sociological description. Slavic theories of dual nationality offered a solution to the political problem that Magyarization posed to German-speaking inhabitants of the Kingdom of Hungary. Hungary's Germans understandably built on ideas developed by other non-Magyars facing the same political problem.

Notes

1. See Mathias Beer and Dittmar Dahlman, eds., *Migration nach Ost- und Südosteuropa vom 18. bis zum Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts. Ursachen, Formen, Verlauf, Ergebnis.* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999); Karl-Peter Krauss, *Deutsche Auswanderer in Ungarn. Ansiedlung in der Herrschaft Bóly im 18. Jahrhundert.* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2003).
2. City names are contentious in Habsburg historiography. I have used German city names, giving Hungarian city names in parentheses. For towns no longer in Hungary, I also give the name used by the current government.
3. Emphasis in original. Heinrich-Moritz Gottlieb Grellman, *Statistische Aufklärung über Wichtige Theile und Gegenstände der Österreischischen Monarchie* (Göttingen: Vendenhoek u. Ruprecht, 1795), 380. Here and hereafter, unless otherwise stated, all translations by the author.
4. Karol Rosenbaum, *Poézia národného obrodenia* (Bratislava: Slovenská akadémia vied, 1970); Peter Brock, *Slovenské národné obrodenie 1787–1847* (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2002).
5. Jaroslav Šidak, ed., *Hrvatski narodni preporod 1790–1848* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1988), particularly Nikša Stančić, "Hrvatski narodni preporod, 1790–1848," 1–30.
6. Damian Hurezeanu, "Renaşterea naţională—fenomen constituitiv al formării Române moderne," *Revista de Historia*, 42, no. 1 (1989): 9–10.
7. Zoltán Sárközi, *Az erdély szászok a nemzeti ébredés korában, 1790–1848* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1963); Endre Angyal and András Gergely, *A nemzeti ébredés kora* (Pécs: Dunántúli Tudományos Intézet, 1974), András Gergely, *A nemzeti ébredés kora 1790–1848* (Budapest: Kossuth, 2009).

8. Tara Zahra, "Imagined Non-Communities: National Indifference as a Category of Analysis," *Slavic Review* 69, no. 1 (2010): 93, 93–119.
9. Egon Radvany, *Metternich's Projects for Reform in Austria* (Berlin: Springer, 1972), 37–38.
10. Christian Gottfried Daniel Stein, *Reise-Taschen-Lexicon für Europa* (Leipzig: Friedrich August Leo, 1827), 469. Possession of the indigenat implied local citizenship and permitted the purchase of land; see Carlile A. Macartney, *The Habsburg Empire, 1790–1918* (London: Macmillan, 1969), 21; John Paget, *Hungary and Transylvania* (London: John Murray, 1834), 2:275.
11. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1996), 6; Andreas Wimmer, *Nationalist Exclusion and Ethnic Conflict: Shadows of Modernity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 1–18.
12. Robert A. Kann, *The Multinational Empire: Nationalism and National Reform in the Habsburg Monarchy* (New York: Octagon, 1983), 1:111.
13. Gábor Mátray, *Magyar népdalok egyetemes gyűjteménye*. 3 vols. (Budapest: n.p., 1852–1858); János Erdélyi, *Népdalok és mondák* 3 vols. (Budapest: Beimel József, 1846–1848).
14. Peter F. Sugar, "The More it Changes, the More Hungarian Nationalism Remains the Same," *Austrian History Yearbook* 31 (2000): 127–155.
15. Ignác Romsics, *Nemzet, nemzetiség és állam* (Budapest: Napvilág, 1998); János Varga, *A Hungarian Quo Vadis: Political Trends and Theories of the Early 1840s* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1993); Moritz Csáky, "'Hungarus' oder 'Magyar,' Zwei Varianten des ungarischen Nationalbewußtseins zu Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatæ: Sectio Historica* 22 (1982): 71–84.
16. Karl Georg Rumy, *Musen-Almanach von und für Ungarn* (Levoča: Joseph Mayer, 1808).
17. Emphasis in original. Grellman, *Statistische Aufklärung*, 381.
18. Letter of July 4, 1833, in Andreas Angyal, "Karl Georg Rumy (1780–1847). Ein Vorkämpfer der deutsch-slawisch-ungarischen Wechselseitigkeit," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena. Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 8, no. 1 (1958/59): 127.
19. Peter Burian, "The State Language Problem in Old Austria," *Austrian History Yearbook*, no. 6/7 (1970/71): 87.
20. Ľudovít Štúr, "Nitra," *Danica Ilirska* 3, no. 22 (1837): 85; "Dopis iz Slavie ugarske," *Danica Ilirska* 5, no. 20 (1840): 80.
21. Samuel Hoitsy, *Sollen wir Magyaren Werden? Fünf Briefe geschrieben aus Pesth an einen Freund an der Theis* (Karlstadt: Johann Prettner, 1833).
22. R.W. Seton-Watson, *The Southern Slav Question and the Habsburg Monarchy* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1969 [1911]), 28; Andrej Rozman, "Die doppelte Schlinge der slovakischen Nationalbewegung," in *Der Prager Slavenkongress 1848*, ed. Andreas Moritsch, Harald Krahwinkler, and Gregor Razumovsky (Vienna: Böhlau, 2000), 98; Ján Ormis, *O reč a národ: Slovenské národné obrany z rokov 1832–1848* (Bratislava: SAV, 1973), 813.
23. Alexander Maxwell, "Multiple Nationalism: National Concepts in 19th century Hungary and Benedict Anderson's 'Imagined Communities,'" *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 11, no. 3 (2005): 385–414.
24. Johann von Csaplovics, "Vaterlandskunde. Ethnographische Miszellen von Ungarn," *Hesperus. Encyclopaedische Zeitschrift für gebildete Leser* 27, no. 20 (1820): 154.
25. Hoitsy, *Sollen wir Magyaren Werden?*, 1.
26. Samuel Hoitsy ("S. H****"), *Apologie des ungrischen Slawismus* (Leipzig: Friedrich Vlockmar, 1843).
27. Dragutin Rakovac, *Mali Katekizam za velike ljude / Kleiner Katechisums für große Leute* (Zagreb: Gaj, 1842); Ivan Mažuranić, *A Horvátok a Magzaroknak* (Zagreb: Szuppán Ferencz, 1848).
28. Ľudovít Štúr ["Ludwig Šlur"], *Das neunzehnte Jahrhundert und der Magyarismus* (Vienna: Wenedik'schen Buchhandlung, 1845); Ľudovít Štúr, *Beschwerden und Klagen der Slaven in*

Ungarn über die gesetzwidrigen Uebergriffe der Magyaren (Leipzig: Robert Binder, 1843). Michal Hodža, *Der Slowak. Beiträge zur Beleuchtung der slawischen Frage in Ungarn* (Prague: Slawischen Centralblätter, 1848).

29. Angyal, "Karl Georg Rumy," 128–131.
30. Johann von Csaplovics, "Ueber Ungarns Magyarisierung," *Luna. Beiblatt zur Agramer politischen Zeitung*, February 20 and 24, 1841, 57, 72.
31. Johann von Csaplovics, "Mirabilia," *Luna. Beiblatt zur Agramer politischen Zeitung*, September 15, 1841, 310.
32. Hodža, "Vorwort (12 September 1848)," in *Der Slowak*, iv, vi.
33. See *Vereinigte Ofner und Pesther Zeitung*, January 27, 1842, 71.
34. "Der akademische Vortrag des Grafen Stephan Széchenyi," trans. Joseph v. Orosz, *Vereinigte Ofner und Pesther Zeitung*, February 2, 5, 9, and 12, 1843; 91–92, 101–102, 113–114, 135–136; quotation from p. 91, trans. R.W. Seton-Watson, *Racial Problems in Hungary* (London: Constable, 1908), 76.
35. "Patriotismus und Nationalität," *Vereinigte Ofner und Pesther Zeitung*, March 19, 1843, 249.
36. Franz Schuselka (as "Dr. S."), *Ungarn als Quelle der Befürchtungen und Hoffnungen für Oesterreichs Zukunft* (Leipzig: Philipp Reclam, 1843), 25.
37. Dr. S., *Ungarn als Quelle der Befürchtungen und Hoffnungen*, 18.
38. Dr. S., *Ungarn als Quelle der Befürchtungen und Hoffnungen*, 47.
39. Josef Polišenský, *Aristocrats and the Crowd in the Revolutionary Year 1848* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1980), 98–100; see also Heinrich Reschauer and Moriz Smets, *Das Jahr 1848: Geschichte der Wiener Revolution* (Vienna: Waldheim, 1872); Maximillian Bach, *Geschichte der Wiener Revolution im Jahre 1848* (Vienna: Ignaz Brand, 1898).
40. Alice Freifeld, *Nationalism and the Crowd in Liberal Hungary, 1848–1914* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2000), 47–52.
41. Freifeld, *Nationalism and the Crowd in Liberal Hungary*, 49.
42. Weyl, "Preßburgs 14 März 1848," *Pannonia*, March 16, 1848, 115.
43. Domokos Kosáry, *The Press During the Hungarian Revolution of 1848–1849* (Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 1986), 263.
44. Stanley Z. Pech, *The Czech Revolution of 1848* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969), 182; András Gerő, *Modern Hungarian Society in the Making: The Unfinished Experience* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1995), 238.
45. Friederich Szarvady, "Abschiedsworte der ungarischen Reichstagjugend an die Wiener Universitätsjugend," *Pannonia*, March 18, 1848, 118.
46. Alexander Maxwell and Alexander Campbell, "István Széchenyi, the Casino Movement, and Hungarian Nationalism, 1827–1848," *Nationalities Papers* 42, no. 1 (2014): 1–18.
47. "Budapester Zapfenstreich," *Morgenröthe—Politisch-belletristische Zeitung*, April 8, 1848, 68.
48. Robert Nemes, "The Politics of the Dance Floor: Culture and Civil Society in Nineteenth-Century Hungary," *Slavic Review* 60, no. 4 (2001): 802–823
49. *Morgenröthe—Politisch-belletristische Zeitung*, May 12, 1848, 179.
50. "Deutscher Klubb," *Morgenröthe—Politisch-belletristische Zeitung*, April 27, 1848, 127.
51. *Morgenröthe—Politisch-belletristische Zeitung*, May 12, 1848, 179.
52. "Nationalismus und Separatismus in der ungarischen Monarchie," *Pester Zeitung*, May 28, 1848, 3623.
53. Peter Nemes, "Reading the Plains and the Lake: Landscape in Hungarian Travel Literature," *Hungarian Studies* 24, no. 1 (2010): 127–134.
54. Ladislas Sziklay, *Hviezdoslav* (Budapest: Sárkány nyomda, 1941), 24; Alexander Maxwell, "From 'Wild Carpathians' to the Puszta: The Evolution of Hungarian National Landscapes," in *Mythical Landscapes Then and Now*, ed. Ruth Buettner and Judith Peltz (Yerevan: Antares, 2006), 53–77.

55. Ludwig August Frankl, "A Duna," *Morgenröthe—Politisch-belletristische Zeitung*, April 13, 1848, 83.
56. Marlin, "Von deutscher Regung und Siebenbürgen vor dem Jahre 1848," *Pester Zeitung*, February 4, 1849, 5293.
57. "Ein Ungar romanischen Stammes (Wallache) an seine Brüder von den Ufern der Marosch bis ans schwarze Meer," *Pester Zeitung*, April 28, 1848, 3511.
58. Freifeld, *Nationalism and the Crowd in Liberal Hungary*, 64–65.
59. Gerő, *Modern Hungarian Society in the Making*, 95–96.
60. János Majlath, *Geschichte der Magyaren* (Regensburg: G. Joseph Manz, 1853), 2:20–21; see also Wolfgang Häusler, "Die kroatisch-ungarische Konflikt von 1848," in *1848 Revolution in Europa. Verlauf, politische Programme, Folgen und Wirkungen*, ed. Heiner Timmermann (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1999), 222.
61. Tibor Ivan Berend, *History Derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2003), 113.
62. Vasilije Krestić, ed., *Srbi i Mađari u Revoluciji 1848–1849 Godine* (Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka, 1848); Dragoslav Pavlović, *Srbija i srpski pokret u Južnoj Ugarskoj 1848 i 1849* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1986 [Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka, 1904]).
63. Istvan Deak, *The Lawful Revolution: Louis Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848–1849* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979); expanded in its Hungarian translation; István Deák, *A törvényes forradalom: Kossuth Lajos és a magyarok 1848–49-ben* (Budapest: Gondolat, 1994).
64. Lawrence Orton, *The Prague Slav Congress of 1848* (New York: East European Monographs, 1978); Zdeněk Tobolka, *Slovanský sjezd v Praze roku 1848* (Prague: Šimáček, 1901).
65. Friedrich Engels, "Der magyarische Kampf," *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, January 13, 1849; cited from *Karl Marx—Friedrich Engels—Werke* (Berlin: Dietz, 1959), 6:172–173.
66. Julius Ludwig Klee, "Stimmen aus Deutschland," *Pester Zeitung*, no. 683, May 30, 1848, 3629.
67. "Gedanken eines deutsch-ungarischen Nationalguardisten auf dem Vorposten bei Verbáß," *Pester Zeitung*, September 3, 1848, 3979–3980.
68. "Gedanken eines deutsch-ungarischen Nationalguardisten," 3975, 3979.
69. Lajos Kossuth, "Declaration of Independence by the Hungarian Nation," *Select Speeches of Kossuth* (New York: C.S. Francis, 1854), 28.
70. Jókai Mór, *A kőszívű ember fiai* cited from *Összes müvei* (Budapest: Révai testvérek kiadása, 1895), 30:29; English version *The Baron's Sons* (London: Walter Scott, 1901), 221.
71. Letters from Viscount Posonby to Viscount Palmerston of October 29, 31, and November 1, 1848, no. 64, 67, 68, in *Correspondence Relative to the Affairs of Hungary, 1847–49, Presented to both Houses of Parliament* (London: Harrison and Son, 1850), 94, 96, 97.
72. Letters from Viscount Posonby to Viscount Palmerston of November 19 and December 19, 1848, no. 73, 88, *Correspondence Relative to the Affairs of Hungary*, 102, 112.
73. Gunther Rothenberg, "Jelačič, the Croatian Military Border, and the Intervention against Hungary in 1848," *Austrian History Yearbook* 1 (1965): 45–68.
74. Adolph Streckfuss, *Die Ereignisse im Jahr 1849 nebst einer Geschichte der Kriege in Ungarn, Italien, Schleswig-Holstein und Baden, so wie des deutschen Parlaments im Jahre 1848. Erster Teil. Der Freiheitskampf in Ungarn* (Berlin: Albert Sacco, 1850), 1:380–381.
75. *Abend-Beilage der Wiener Zeitung*, January 29, 1849, 97.
76. "Pest am 7. Februar," *Pester Zeitung*, February 8, 1849, 5306.
77. Gunther Rothenberg, *The Army of Francis-Joseph* (Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1999), 33.
78. "Ungarn," *Wiener Zeitung*, January 27, 1849, 250.
79. Streckfuss, *Die Ereignisse im Jahr 1849*, 1:385.
80. *Pester Zeitung*, January 16, 1849, n.p.
81. Marlin, "Pest, den 30. Jänner," *Pester Zeitung*, February 1, 1849, 5281.

82. Marlin, "Von deutscher Regung und Siebenbürgen vor dem Jahre 1848," *Pester Zeitung*, February 4, 1849, 5293.
83. Gottfried Schröer, "An die Deutschen in Ungarn," *Pester Zeitung*, March 20, 1849, 5442–5443.
84. Mór Ballagi, *Magyar példabeszédek közmondások és szójárások gyüjtemenye* (Szarvas: Lipót Réthy, 1850) 1:viii; (Budapest: Heckenast, 1855), 1:viii; see also proverb 5029: "Ha Magyar kenyeret eszel, bescüld meg a magyart," 2:289.
85. T.G.S. "Der deutsche Knabe in Ungarn," *Pester Zeitung*, April 5, 1849, 5499.
86. Emphasis in original. T.G.S., "Der deutsche Knabe in Ungarn," 5499.
87. Robert Nemes, "The Revolution in Symbols: Hungary in 1848–1849," in *Constructing Nationalites in Central Europe*, ed. Pieter M. Judson and Marsha L. Rozenblit (New York: Berghahn, 2005), 45.
88. *Südslavische Zeitung*, May 4,1849, 109.
89. *Südslavische Zeitung*, June 27, 1849, 304.
90. Freifeld, *Nationalism and the Crowd in Liberal Hungary*, 94.
91. "An die Bewohner von Ofen und Pest!," *Pester Zeitung*, July 22, 1849, 5554; contemporary translation from British diplomatic documents, no. 271, letter from Viscount Ponsonby to Viscount Palmerston, 7 August 1849, in *Correspondence Relative to the Affairs of Hungary*, 303.
92. "An die Bewohner von Ofen und Pest!" 5553. Contemporary translation, in *Correspondence Relative to the Affairs of Hungary*, 303.
93. Freifeld, *Nationalism and the Crowd in Liberal Hungary*, 105.
94. "Die Tricolore," *Pester Zeitung*, July 25, 1849, 5287.
95. "Für die Deutschen im Lande," *Pester Zeitung*, August 1, 1849, 5821.
96. "Die Tricolore," 5287.
97. "Pest, am 7. September," *Pester Zeitung*, September 8, 1849, 5961.
98. "Korrespondenzen," *Pester Zeitung*, September 14, 1849, 5985.
99. Julian Chownitz, *Handbuch zur Kenntniß Ungarns* (Bamberg: Buchner, 1851), 1–77 and 78–111 respectively.
100. Julian Chowinitz, *Moderne Wiener Perspectiven* (Leipzig: Reclam, 1843), 1–2.
101. Julian Chownitz, *Ungarns heiliges Recht zum Kampfe gegen Oesterreich und zur Thronentsetzung des Hauses Habsburg-Lothringen* (Frankfurt am Main: Auffarth, 1849).
102. Julian Chownitz, *Ungarns Recht zum Einbruch in die österreichischen und russischen Nachbarländer* (Frankfurt am Main: Auffarth, 1849),.
103. Chownitz, *Handbuch zur Kenntniß Ungarns*, 81.
104. Chownitz, *Handbuch zur Kenntniß Ungarns*, 107.
105. Gustav Höfken, *Deutsche Auswanderung und Colonisation mit Hinblick auf Ungern* (Vienna: Carl Gerold und Sohn, 1850), 205.
106. Höfken, *Deutsche Auswanderung und Colonisation mit Hinblick auf Ungern*, 132.
107. Pavel Josef Šafařík, "Slovanský zeměvid," *Slovanský národopis s mappau* (Prague: Nákladem wydawatele, 1842), addendum.
108. Höfken, *Deutsche Auswanderung und Colonisation mit Hinblick auf Ungern*, 192. Höfken referred to Šafárik's map.
109. Höfken, *Deutsche Auswanderung und Colonisation mit Hinblick auf Ungern*, 133.
110. Chownitz, *Handbuch zur Kenntniß Ungarns*, 205.
111. Eli Nathans, *The Politics of Citizenship in Germany Ethnicity, Utility, and Nationalism* (London: Berg, 2004).
112. Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study of Its Origins and Background* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), 331.
113. David Brown, "Are there Good and Bad Nationalisms?" *Nations and Nationalism* 5, no. 2 (1999): 281–302; Philip Spencer and Howard Wollman, "Good and Bad Nationalisms: A Critique of Dualism," *Journal of Political Ideologies* 3, no. 3 (1998): 255–274; Paul Chamberland, "Deux

nationalismes: Le Bon et le Mauvais," in *L'identitaire et le littéraire dans les Amériques*, ed. Bernard Andrès and Zilà Bernd (Montreal: *Éditions Nota Bena*, 1999), 253–254; Rogers Brubaker, "The Manichean Myth: Rethinking the Distinction Between 'Civic' and 'Ethnic' Nationalism," in *Nation and National Identity: The European Experience in Perspective*, ed. Hanspeter Kriesi, et al. (Zurich: Ruegger, 1999), 55–71.

114. Ayşe Kadıoğlu, "The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of Official Identity," *Middle Eastern Studies* 32, no. 2 (1996): 184.
115. Mary Heimann, *Czechoslovakia: The State that Failed* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), 14; Henrik Lundbak, *Danish Unity: A Political Party between Fascism and Resistance* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2003), 112; Bertus Praeg, *Ethiopia and Political Renaissance in Africa* (Hauppauge, NY: Nova, 2006), 29.
116. Mike Rapport, *1848: Year of Revolution* (New York: Basic, 2008), 405.
117. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Dieter Langewiesche, "The European Revolution of 1848," in *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*, ed. Dieter Dowe (New York: Berghahn, 2001), 11.
118. Robert Bideleux and Ian Jeffries, *A History of Eastern Europe: Crisis and Change* (London: Routledge, 2007), 229.
119. Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism* (Cambridge: Polity, 2010), 42.
120. Mihály Thurner, *Emlékirat Sopron magyarságának és németségének sorsáról* (Sopron: Rábaközi nyomda, n.d. [1919]); Ferenc Glatz, "Bürgerliche Entwicklung, Assimilation und Nationalismus in Ungarn im 19. Jahrhundert," *Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 21, no. 1/2 (1975): 153–169; Ruprecht Steinacker, "Betrachtungen zur nationalen Assimilation des deutschen Bürgertums in Ungarn," *Südostdeutsches Archiv* 22/23 (1979/80): 62–89; Péter Maitz and Tamás Farkas, "Der Familienname als Nationalsymbol. Über den Untergang deutscher Familiennamen im Ungarn des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 36, no. 2 (2008): 163–196.
121. Attila Melegh, *On the East-West Slope Globalization, Nationalism, Racism and Discourses on Central and Eastern Europe* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2006), 97.

Contributors

SACHA E. DAVIS (sacha.davis@newcastle.edu.au) received his PhD in history from the University of New South Wales, and lectures in modern history at the University of Newcastle (Australia). His work has appeared in *Central Europe*, *History of the Family*, the *Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde*, and a number of edited works.

SABINA GROENEVELD (Sabina.Groeneveld@uts.edu.au) is a lecturer in International Studies at the University of Technology, Sydney. Her research interests include various areas of German literature, postcolonial studies, and human-animal studies. Her doctoral research analyzed private texts generated in Qingdao, China, by German colonists during 1897–1914 focusing on the construction of colonial roles.

DANI KRANZ (dani@danikranz.com) is Associate Professor of Sociology and Empirical Research Methods at the Rhine-Waal University of Applied Sciences. She publishes across her areas of interest on topics as diverse as state-assisted return migration programs (with Nir Cohen), ideas of home and homelessness amongst third-generation Jews who grew up in Germany (2015), and intercouples in Israel (2015).

ALEXANDER MAXWELL (alexander.maxwell@vuw.ac.nz) is Senior Lecturer in History at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand and director of the Antipodean East European Study Group. He is the author of *Choosing Slovakia* and *Patriots Against Fashion*. He has published several articles on national awakening in eastern Europe, nationalism theory, and history pedagogy.

KATHARINA ISABEL SCHMIDT (katharina.i.schmidt@yale.edu) is a JSD candidate in law at the Yale Law School and a PhD student in history at Princeton University. In addition to modern German and American legal thought, she is writing on transnational intellectual history as well as on social, political, and legal theory.

CHRISTIAN WILBERS (cawilbers@email.wm.edu) received his MA in English from the University of Münster and his PhD in American Studies from the College of William and Mary in Spring 2016. His dissertation explores transnational aspects of German-American life in the 1920s and 1930s.