

## **LANGUAGE CULTIVATION AND THE CONCEPT OF LINGUISTIC VITALITY IN “KELETI ÚJSÁG”<sup>1</sup>**

**Fazakas Noemi, Assist. Prof., PhD, ”Babeş-Bolyai” University of Cluj-Napoca,  
Sapientia University of Tîrgu Mureş**

*Abstract: “Keleti Újság” [‘Eastern Newspaper’] was a Hungarian daily newspaper published in Cluj-Napoca between 1918 and 1944, and is considered one of the most important periodicals of the period between the two World Wars. Covering a large range of topics, it also includes articles on the Hungarian language, as in 1936 Jenő Dsida, one of the most important poets of the period started a column (or a ‘movement’, as they called it) dedicated to the cultivation of the Hungarian language in Romania, entitled Anyanyelvünkért (‘For the protection of our mother tongue’). My paper discusses the linguistic ideologies behind the articles published in the column as well as the way in which the ethno-linguistic vitality of the Hungarian language as a minority language in Romania is outlined in these texts, together with the impact it had on the readership of the newspaper as very many scholars and everyday readers got involved in the movement for the protection of the language. I also try to identify the attitudes and ideologies regarding the Hungarian language as well as the concept of multi- and plurilingualism.*

*Keywords: “Keleti Újság”, ethno-linguistic vitality, language cultivation, multilingualism.*

### **Introduction: a short history of the “Keleti Újság” newspaper and the political context of its creation**

“Keleti Újság” [‘Eastern Newspaper’] first hit the stands on December 24, 1918 in Cluj-Napoca (on the day the Romanian military forces entered the town), and is one of the longest-published Hungarian daily newspapers of the period between the two World Wars. Its name was changed on June 15, 1944 to *Keleti Magyar Újság*, and its last issue was most probably printed on October 6, 1944. The newspaper was started by the Lapkiadó Részvénytársaság [‘The Publishing Corporation’], the first editor-in-chief being József Szentmihályi, then István Zágonyi.

In the first years of its publication the main stance of the newspaper was a radical civic or democratic one, fighting against conservative and nationalist politics, working for the creation of opportunities in a minority existence and striving to bring together the Romanian and Hungarian population. The majority of articles on public life dealt with the relationships between Romanians and Hungarians, with the issues of the coexistence of the Romanian and Hungarian nations. Imre Kádár writes in his article entitled *El nem mondott pohárköszöntő* [An untold toast] written by the occasion of the premiere of Victor Eftimiu’s play, *Prometheus* at the Hungarian theatre: “We proclaim that our nation has to break away from

<sup>1</sup> This work was possible due to the financial support of the Sectorial Operational Program for Human Resources Development 2007-2013, co-financed by the European Social Fund, under the project number POSDRU/159/1.5/S/140863 with the title “Competitive European researchers in the fields of socio-economics and humanities. Multiregional research net (CCPE)”

the irredentist delusions and needs to find its place in its new state's public life. Nevertheless we unflinchingly proclaim, that our nation needs to insist on the protection of [...] its every right, and must defend its language and culture against every suppressive efforts"<sup>2</sup> (see RMIL 2006). During this period (lasting until 1924 – see Györffy 2010) the newspaper played an important role in providing a framework for Hungarian literary life, for the creation of permanent literary press, as well as in the flourishing of Hungarian literature in Romania.

A radical change occurs in the life of the periodical when it is sold to the Magyar Party (in Hungarian: *Országos Magyar Párt*, in Romanian: *Partidul Maghiar*) in 1927, and from then on it is published as a national pro-Hungarian newspaper. The editor-in-chief after the turn is Endre Szász (until 1939), followed by József Nyírő, the literary editor being Jenő Dsida, followed by Zoltán Finta.

The historical and social context of the creation and publication of the newspaper is quintessential in understanding the role it played in the lives of the Hungarian community in its unsteady political circumstances that brought on so many changes. As Kántor puts it “part of an already formed nation, which had been involved in the process of nation building, suddenly became a national minority. (...) the leaders of the Hungarian national minority in Romania organized their political and cultural organizations on an ethno-cultural basis and promoted a policy of self-defence concerning the nationalizing thrust of the enlarged Romanian state” (Kántor 2006: 255). This resulted in a more intense emphasizing of national identity. As the mother tongue became the primary bearer of the national identity of the Hungarian community, its protection and safeguarding against all dangers (from the inside and the outside) was the main task of the language cultivation movements of the era and also that of the column started in 1936 by Jenő Dsida in *Keleti Újság*.

### Jenő Dsida's role in the language cultivation movements

Jenő Dsida was one of the most prominent representatives of the Hungarian literature in Transylvania between the two World Wars. He was born in 1907 in Satu Mare and died at the young age of 31, in 1938. Besides his literary works and his role played in the organization of cultural and literary life (e.g. editing the cultural magazine entitled *Pásztortűz* [‘Shepherd Fire’]), he worked as a correspondent for the newspaper *Erdélyi Lapok* [‘Transylvanian Journal’] and was also involved in the creation and editing of several newspapers and magazines, for example *Erdélyi Fiatalok* [‘Transylvanian Youth’] and *Keleti Újság*. His activity as the protector of the Hungarian language as well as his literary translations made him one of the most important “fighters of the Hungarian youth movements in Transylvania” (see Cseke 2007).

His activity as a language cultivator has been the subject of several recent studies (e.g. Cseke 2003, 2007; Zsemlyei B. 2008; Zsemlyei J. 1991/2008). His articles written in the topic were mostly published in the column entitled *Anyanyelvünkért* [‘For the protection of our mother tongue’] that he started in the *Keleti Újság* newspaper in 1936. These texts as well as a number of studies in the topic (starting with János Zsemlyei's article *A nyelvművelő Dsida Jenő* [Jenő Dsida, the language cultivator]) were compiled into one volume by Borbála Zsemlyei in 2008.

<sup>2</sup> “Mi azt hirdetjük, hogy népünknek szakítania kell az irredenta lázalmokkal, s becsületesen el kell helyezkednie új államának közéletében. De ugyanakkor törhetetlen hirdetjük, hogy népünknek lehetőleg ragaszkodnia kell [...] összes jogaihoz, s nyelvét és kultúráját minden elnyomó törekvéssel szemben meg kell védelmeznie.” (Translation by the author, F. N.)

Dsida's work in the field of language cultivation and the cleansing of the mother tongue can be considered as part of a larger movement of language protection that started in 1918 as a necessity following the regime change in Transylvania and the minority language context of the changing political background. The movement was initiated by the Transylvanian Museum Society (Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület) at the end of the 1920's. It was greatly influenced by the Hungarian language cultivation activities carried out by Dezső Kosztolányi, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (the Committee for Language Cultivation), as well as the Hungarian newspaper *Magyarosan* ('in Hungarian style') (see Éder 1989: 133) in Hungary. The Transylvanian Museum Society created the scientific forum for the cultivation of the language (involving Lajos György and Attila Szabó T., university professors), however the weekly column created by Dsida Jenő also played an important role in bringing the topic closer to the members of the language community.

Nevertheless the first paper he wrote in the topic was published in 1933 in *Keleti Újság* as a reaction to György Kristóf's article entitled *Charles Dickens vagy Dickens Károly?* ['Charles Dickens or Dickens Károly?'] on the way foreign proper names should be used in Hungarian in literary and other translations, as there used to be a total chaos in the way these names were written (regarding the order of the first name and the surname, as in Hungarian the surname comes first, while in almost every other language the surname is last). Dsida's standpoint opposed that of György Kristóf's, as he argued that such foreign names should be used as the authors themselves write them.

### ***Anyanyelvünkért, or the column 'for the cultivation of our mother tongue'***

A new chapter in Dsida's work as a language cultivator begins with the start of the *Anyanyelvünkért* column in the *Keleti Újság* newspaper on Easter Sunday, 1936, which was to appear on every other Sunday. At the same time the language cultivation committee of the newspaper was established, the members of which included Jenő Dsida, the editor of the column, József Nyirő, György Kristóf and Lajos György (Zsemlyei J. 2008: 6).

The programme of the column was outlined by Dsida in the first article published, entitled *Anyanyelvünkért – A Keleti Újság mozgalmat hirdet és állandó rovatot nyit a romlásnak indult erdélyi magyar nyelv ápolására* ['For the protection of our mother tongue – The *Keleti Újság* starts a movement and a column for the cultivation of the decaying Hungarian language in Transylvania].

This programme-article includes the main reasons for the creation of the column and its most important objectives: the background of the need for such work is the rapid decay of the Hungarian language in its minority context, the influx of foreign elements into the language as well as the negligence of the speakers (mostly the younger generation, but exclusively) in their choice of words and grammatical structures. The main aims of the column were the safeguarding and fostering of the cleanliness and beauty of the Hungarian language in Transylvania, the featuring of debates and discussions on the most important issues of language use, the revival of what has been forgotten, and, most importantly, bringing the movement of academic language cultivation closer to the readers, and as such making it into a public affair. Dsida also called every "well-intentioned" reader to become part of this movement of great importance, to become its active member by taking part in the competitions to find Hungarian words to replace widely-used foreign words, to express their opinions and to recruit further members.

This first article also features many of the most important language ideologies and metaphors which are used to conceptualize the Hungarian language as a whole and as a minority language. These ideologies will be discussed in detail in the following.

Dsida tried to publish texts on various topics, most of which were written by him, however he included articles from several Hungarian authors from Hungary and from Transylvania (e.g. Géza Fisch, Lajos György, Attila Szabó T., etc. – for further details see Zsemlyei J. 2008: 7). The column featured two more or less permanent language cultivation “sub-columns” as well: *Mit mondjunk helyette?* [‘What should we use instead?’] and *Erre vigyázzunk* [‘Bear in mind’]. The first one included a glossary of foreign-origin words used in everyday Hungarian, together with their Hungarian equivalents. As the editor put it, with the frequent reading and consultation of these short glossaries the speakers would learn and get used to the Hungarian counterparts and eventually substitute the foreign words with them. The second “sub-column” mainly discussed strange expressions, grammatical mistakes, “fashion-words” and errors in the choice of words of the speakers of Hungarian in Romania.

Dsida was the editor of the column until his death in 1938, after which a rapid decline occurred. The language cultivation activities were however continued in May, 1939, the new editor of the column being Géza Nagy, Jr. Our research is limited to the period when Jenő Dsida was the editor of the column.

### Language ideologies and metaphors of the language

In the following we will attempt to outline the ideologies connected to Hungarian, to Romanian and other foreign languages that can be traced in the texts of the articles published in the *Anyanyelvünkért* column. We will also try to identify the metaphors used by the authors when discussing the Hungarian language and its situation.

Newspapers have always played a crucial role in the spread of ideologies and attitudes, forming the opinions and views of their readership. And why are linguistic ideologies and attitudes important? Mostly because they play an important role in the language use and language choice strategies of speakers, and this is even more relevant in bilingual and multilingual settings. In bilingual, especially minority contexts the attitudes of the speakers and the ideologies formulated within the community bare important information on the way the speakers regard such languages or language varieties, as well as on the social and linguistic judgements they formulate (Fenyvesi 2011: 228). Positive or negative attitudes towards their own language variety can be a valid tool of assessing ethnolinguistic vitality of certain minority languages and language varieties. In Baker’s words: “in the life of a language, attitudes to that language appear to be important in language restoration, preservation, decay or death” (Baker 1992: 9).

According to Lanstyák (2009), linguistic ideologies have a broad and a narrow definition: in the narrow sense they include thoughts and systems of thoughts, which serve to explain and validate the facts regarding the state of the linguistic community, of the relationships between languages, etc. In a broader sense language ideologies also include beliefs of the speakers regarding the language, which have not yet been formulated or made aware, but can be outlined based on the behaviour of the speakers (see Lanstyák 2009: 28). In this approach linguistic ideologies are closely connected to the culture of a community, having a significant impact upon the way people think about language as well as upon their linguistic behaviour, influencing linguistic change as well (Lanstyák 2009: 28; Lanstyák 2011).

The writers of the texts published in the column propagated several linguistic ideologies both overtly and covertly. In the following we will try to outline some of these ideologies in the framework created by István Lanstyák (see Lanstyák 2011). As there is no space to discuss all of them, we selected the ones that are the most frequent and portray the general trends in the strive to shape the way the speakers think about the language and the tasks the writers of the articles and the editor of the column imposes on the readers of the newspaper.

**Linguistic axiologism:** the belief that the (national) language is a special (national) treasure, which needs to be treated with due respect and care. This ideology is present in almost every article published in the column. Some examples: “unfortunately it is an astonishing fact that we start losing our last remaining treasure: the lavish abundance of the Hungarian language”<sup>3</sup> (XIX/86.); “This attention can be hundredfold demanded by the language of our ancestors in its fate as a minority language”<sup>4</sup> (XIX/96.); “one can start working with the treasures of the language only with the utmost consideration and conscientious solemnity” (XIX/101.)<sup>5</sup>

**Linguistic decadentism:** the belief that the language can decay in the course of its history, however this decay can be halted by language cultivation. The title of the very first article of the column features this ideology: “The *Keleti Újság* starts a movement and a column for the cultivation of the decaying Hungarian language in Transylvania”. Some other examples: the sarcastic “We should destroy the language as much as we can! [...] It seems that in the successor states [i.e. those of the former state of Hungary] the speakers have obeyed this faithfully. Especially the young teachers of Hungarian language and literature”<sup>6</sup> (XIX/236.); “Our cry to save the perishing soundness and cleanliness of our language has been heard by many” (XX/43.)<sup>7</sup> The language is not the only thing that can deteriorate, the language skills, the “feel for language” of the speakers are also exposed to such decay: “It is the sad evidence of the total confusion in our language skills” (XIX/124.)<sup>8</sup>; “Our ‘New Hungarian’ does not sense neither the first, nor the second expression, pinning half of the first to half of the second” (XX/122.)<sup>9</sup>.

**Linguistic destructivism:** the belief that the incorrect (that is the non-standard) use of the language can have a destructive effect on itself, and if the speakers use certain linguistic forms considered to be harmful or use harmless expressions incorrectly, this can hurt the language. Some examples: “We carelessly throw away our most beautiful words” (XIX/86.)<sup>10</sup>; “not only the orthography and vocabulary of the Hungarian children in Romania is bad and deficient, their Hungarian language skills and hearing is also deteriorating. And this is catastrophic” (XIX/135.)<sup>11</sup>; “With these few words the abovementioned two gentlemen have

<sup>3</sup> “Sajnos, megdöbbenő valóság, hogy lassan-lassan abból a vagyonból is kezdünk kikopni, mely utolsónak megmaradt: magyar nyelvünk Pazar bőségéből” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>4</sup> “Ezt a figyelmet a kisebbségi sorban százszorosan megkövetelheti tőlünk őseink nyelve” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>5</sup> “csak alapos megfontolással, lelkiismeretes komolysággal szabad a nyelvkincshez nyúlni” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>6</sup> “Rontjuk a nyelvet, ahogy lehet! [...] Úgy látszik, az utódállamokban ennek híven szót fogadnak. Főként a magyar nyelv és irodalom fiatal tanárai” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>7</sup> “A kiáltást, hogy mentsük meg anyanyelvünk mindinkább veszendőbe menő épségét és tisztaságát, nagyon sokan meghallották” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>8</sup> “Szomorú bizonyítéka nyelvérzékünk tökéletes megzavarodásának” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>9</sup> “Újmagyarításunk sem az egyik kifejezést nem érzi, sem a másikat, felit innen, felit onnan csapja egybe” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>10</sup> “Gondtalan tékozlással szórjuk el legszebb szavainkat” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>11</sup> “a romániai magyar gyermekeknek már nemcsak helyesírása és szókészlete rossz és hiányos, hanem magyar nyelvérzéke és hallása is kezd megromlani. Ez pedig végzetes dolog” (translation by the author, F.N.).

committed a dozen assaults on the Hungarian language” (XIX/248.)<sup>12</sup>; “How many errors we commit, how much we sin against the laws and cleanliness of our language!” (XIX/289.)<sup>13</sup>

**Linguistic idiomism:** the belief that the linguistic forms specific of the language are inherently more correct than the forms present in other languages, as they mirror the “Hungarian mentality” and the “Hungarian approach”. The articles contain many examples for this linguistic ideology, the explanations using the following formulas frequently: “the Hungarian speaker does (not)...” or “it is much more Hungarian to say”, or “the pushing of the German expression of a German thought into the Hungarian language” (XX/55.)<sup>14</sup>; “Does this make any sense according to the way Hungarian sees the world?” (XX/55.)<sup>15</sup>

**Linguistic interventionalism:** the belief that there is need for some extent of conscious intervention in the linguistic processes of a language and for some influence in the linguistic changes. This is the basic idea of the start of the column, and is the aim of the *Mit mondjunk helyette?* [‘What should we use instead?’] sub-column, as it tries to influence the word choices of the Hungarian speakers.

**Linguistic conservatism** is a more general linguistic ideology, according to which the traditional forms and elements of the language represent a special treasure and that their safeguarding is a social, cultural and national interest. It can also refer to the belief that language varieties with more ancient, more archaic forms and usage are more valuable than those, which are more modern, which show more signs of change (due to external influences).

The ancient, archaic character and as such, the special value of the Hungarian language is emphasized throughout almost every article published in the column, and is a major part of Dsida’s programme. Some of the many examples: “And hundreds, maybe even thousands of years ago they used the same word: apple, mother – and they also used an immense multitude of beautiful, savoury Hungarian words as are used today. Our ancestors gathered during the infinity of time these thousands of colourful cubes, little gems, so that we can mix and group them according to the laws and caprices of our thoughts” (XIX/86.)<sup>16</sup>; “As – despite its continuous heaving – the more the language preserves the abundance and cleanliness of its popular sources, the clearer and as such the more understandable it remains, the more appropriate and more beneficial interpreter of the aspirations and spirit of certain social classes and nations and the better mediator of their social needs and ideals it will be” (XIX/183.)<sup>17</sup>

The external influences that threaten the language are conceptualized in the form of the influx of foreign words, expressions and grammatical constructions. The most important sources of such influences are the German language, the English language and the Romanian language, however the threat lies in the fact that foreign words coming from these languages replace fully functional Hungarian words. This ideology is also present in Dsida’s programme article: “We even take a bow to the new foreign words, every one of which drives out a

<sup>12</sup> “A fent említett két úr ezzel a néhány szóval kereken egy tucat merényletet követett el a magyar nyelv ellen” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>13</sup> “mennyi hibát követünk el, mennyit vétünk anyanyelvünk törvényei és tisztasága ellen” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>14</sup> “Német gondolat német kifejezésének magyarba törése” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>15</sup> “Magyar látás szerint van ennek értelme?” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>16</sup> “És évszázadokkal, talán évezredekkel ezelőtt ugyanígy mondták: alma, anyám – ugyanígy mondták a szép, ízes magyar szavak roppant sokaságát. Őseink gyűjtötték össze idők végtelensége alatt ezt a sok ezer színes kockát, golyócskát, hogy mi most keverhessük és csoportosíthassuk őket gondolataink törvénye és szeszélye szerint” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>17</sup> “Hisz minél jobban megőrzi a nyelv – szüntelen duzzadása ellenére is – népi forrásának bőségét és tisztaságát, minél világosabb s így is érthetőbb marad, annál megfelelőbb, játékosabb tolmácsolója, közvetítője az egyes néprétegek és nemzetek törekvéseinek, szellemének s kifejezője társadalmi szükségleteinek, eszményeinek” (translation by the author, F.N.).

honourable, beautiful Hungarian word from its home” (XIX/86.)<sup>18</sup>; “In the first 15 years of the regime change nearly half thousand Hungarian words have become ‘the silent seals on the lips of our dead’” (XIX/86.)<sup>19</sup> This intrusion of foreign words and as a result, the loss of many Hungarian words and expressions is seen as one of the greatest dangers the language faces. There are entire articles written on this topic (e.g. *Az idegen szó műveletlenséget palástol* [The foreign word disguises ignorance] XIX/242. or *A transsylvania magyar szókincset fenyegető külön veszedelmek* [The specific dangers threatening the Hungarian lexicon in Transylvania] XIX/200.), entire sub-columns strive to help substitute such words with Hungarian counterparts, and the “call for proposals” of the column also aimed to find Hungarian words to replace widely spread foreign words.

**Linguistic monitorism:** the belief that in order to learn and use the correct (the standard) variant of the language there is need for a high level of consciousness and attention on behalf of the speaker, and whoever does not meet these requirements, is floppy, lazy, indolent and ignorant. This ideology is also very frequent in the published articles: “How much caution and prudence the correct Hungarian writing needs!” (XIX/242)<sup>20</sup>; “There is need for heroism and even for the power of Hercules to clean this linguistic horse stable, which certainly cannot be achieved by the induction of a language cleansing stream” (XX/55.)<sup>21</sup>.

Many other language ideologies can be traced in the articles published in the column, however the above presented ones seem the most frequent and most prominent. The texts also feature several metaphors used in connection with the Hungarian language: the language as fort that needs to be protected and that protects the ones inside it, the language as an ancient oak tree, the language as sculpture or jewel, the language as the multitude of beautiful colourful flowers are only some of them. These all emphasize the value of the language, and through the fact that they objectify it, it is easier to communicate to the readers that it can also be broken, tore down, cut down and destroyed.

In the following we shortly discuss the most important attitudes that can be found in the analysed texts with a special regard to the attitudes towards language contact and the learning of the language of the state.

### **Attitudes towards foreign languages and the language of the state**

The texts also reflect a contradictory attitude towards foreign languages: first these languages are seen as threats to the purity and cleanliness of the Hungarian language, however the language cultivation movement as a whole appreciates the similar language preservation and cultivation movements organized in England, Germany and Italy (see for example the article entitled *Nagy nemzetek példája* [The example of great nations] XX/95.).

Attitudes towards the Romanian language as the language of the state are twofold: on the one hand, as the source of many words, expressions and grammatical constructions that enter the Hungarian language, it is frowned upon. On the other hand, however, several articles emphasize the importance of learning the language of the state, as something that is a

<sup>18</sup> “Még hajbókolunk is az idegen szójövevények előtt, melyek mindegyike egy-egy becsületes szép magyar szót ver ki a saját hajlékából” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>19</sup> “A hatalomváltozás első tizenöt éve alatt közel félezer magyar szó lett ’halottaink ajkának néma pecsétje’” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>20</sup> “mennyi vigyázatosságot és megfontoltságot kíván a helyes magyar írás” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>21</sup> “Hősiesség kell és talán herculesi erő is ennek a nyelvi istállónak kitisztításához, melyet bizony nem lehet egy nyelvtisztító folyam belevezetésével elérni” (translation by the author, F.N.).

necessity and a duty of the citizens of Romania: “The young Transylvanian Hungarian generation is not capable or willing to name basic concepts in Hungarian. They are rightly expected to learn the language of the state, but no one expects them to forget their mother tongue. The Hungarian youth growing up in Transylvania cannot speak either languages correctly: neither Hungarian, nor Romanian” (XIX/86.)<sup>22</sup>; “We advocate that the citizens of the state speak the language of the state, moreover we advocate that they speak it beautifully (...) Whoever speaks Romanian, should speak clearly and beautifully in Romanian. However who speaks Hungarian, should speak clearly and beautifully in Hungarian” (XIX/200)<sup>23</sup>. Thus language contact between the two is not accepted.

An interesting chapter of the attitudes that can be traced in these articles is the question of multi- and plurilingualism. Although – as we have seen above – the importance of learning the language of the state or learning foreign languages, and learning them correctly are stressed in many of the published texts, one of them, written by Albert Márkos (*Hogyan neveljük helyes és tiszta magyarságra?* [‘How to educate our children in clean and correct Hungarian mentality’ XIX/171.]), presents a rather peculiar understanding of multi- and plurilingualism. According to the author, learning multiple languages can have a negative effect on the mother tongue skills of the speakers and especially those of children. He does not support teaching foreign languages to young children at all, as – in his opinion – this will harm the child’s mother-tongue competences and will negatively affect its language skills and thinking processes, especially in the frameworks of institutional education. According to this approach there is only one language a person can somewhat (and not perfectly) acquire, and this is his/her mother-tongue. This however is not in conformity with the previously outlined attitude regarding the learning of the language of the state in addition to the Hungarian language.

### Conclusions: the vitality of the Hungarian language

The series of articles published in the *Anyanyelvünkért* column provide important information on the language cultivation movements between the two World Wars and the way the linguistic attitudes and ideologies of the language were transmitted to the wider community by means of the *Keleti Újság* newspaper. Regarding the representation of the ethno-linguistic vitality of the Hungarian language two confronting standpoints can be traced: on the one hand the Hungarian language spoken in Transylvania is portrayed as something that has been and is being destroyed by outside influences and by the speakers themselves, as something in the process of decaying, dying and disappearing, on the other hand several articles present it as something that has withstood the tempests of the centuries, as something persistent, ancient, tenacious and tough. The entire concept of the column stresses the fact that the language can be revived, its vitality can be restored if the speakers pay enough attention, if they are exigent enough with their own and other people’s language use.

The language cultivation movement did not stop with Jenő Dsida’s death. However his activity and his role, although not widely known in today’s scholarly literature, was a determining one, which influenced later language cultivation endeavours. One of his most

<sup>22</sup> “A fiatal erdélyi magyar nemzeték sokhelyt már az elemi fogalmakat sem tudja vagy akarja magyarul kifejezni. Méltán követelik tőle, hogy tanulja meg az állam nyelvét, de azt senki sem kívánja, hogy feledje el anyanyelvét. Erdély ma felnövő ifjú magyarjai sehogy sem tudnak helyesen beszélni: se magyarul se románul” (translation by the author, F.N.).

<sup>23</sup> “Hívei vagyunk annak, hogy az állam polgárai beszéljék az állam nyelvét, sőt tovább megyünk: hívei vagyunk annak is, hogy szépen beszéljék. (...) Aki románul beszél, szóljon tisztán és szépen románul. De viszont aki magyarul beszél, szóljon tisztán és szépen magyarul” (translation by the author, F.N.).

important achievements was that he managed to involve the readership of the newspaper in the movement for the protection and revival of the Hungarian language use in Transylvania.

### **Bibliography**

Baker, Colin. 1992. *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon and Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Cseke Péter 2003. Dsida Jenő és az Erdélyi Fiatalok. *Új Forrás*, 7/2007. <http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00016/00087/030714.htm> (last accessed on October 8, 2014).

Cseke Péter 2007. Dsida Jenő, a nyelvvédő. *Korunk*, 18/6, 64–66.

Éder Zoltán 1989. Az erdélyi magyar nyelvvelésről. *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 2/113, 132–140.

Fenyvesi Anna. 2011. Nyelvi attitűdök kisebbségi kontextusban: Erdélyi, Vajdasági és Felvidéki magyar diákok viszonyulása anyanyelvükhöz, az államnyelvhez és az angolhoz. In Hires-László Kornélia, Karmacs Zoltán and Márku Anita (eds.): *Nyelvi mítoszok, ideológiák, nyelvpolitika és nyelvi emberi jogok Közép-Európában elméletben és gyakorlatban*. Budapest–Beregszász: Tinta Könyvkiadó – Hodinka Antal Intézet, 243–250.

Györffy Gábor 2010. Romániai magyar sajtótörténet. In *Romániai Magyar Lexikon*. <http://lexikon.adatbank.ro/tematikus/szocikk.php?id=108> (last accessed on October 9, 2014.)

Kántor Zoltán 2006. Nationalism, nationalizing minorities and kin-state nationalism. In Rüegg, François, Rudolf Poledna and Calin Rus (eds.): *Interculturalism and Discrimination in Romania*. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 249–276.

Lanstyák István. 2009. Nyelvi ideológiák és filozófiák. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle*. XI, 27–44.

Lanstyák István. 2011. A nyelvi ideológiák néhány általános kérdéséről. In Misad Katalin and Csehy Zoltán (eds.): *Nova Posoniensia (A pozsonyi magyar tanszék évkönyve)*, Pozsony: Szenczi Molnár Albert Egyesület–Kalligram Kiadó. 13–57.

*Romániai Magyar Irodalmi Lexikon*. (RMIL) 2006. Vol. I.-IV. Electronic version. <http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03628/html/> (last accessed on October 9, 2014).

Zsemlyei Borbála (ed.) 2008. *Anyanyelvünkért. Dsida Jenő nyelvvelő rovata a Keleti Újságban*. AESZ-füzetek, Anyanyelvvelők Erdélyi Szövetsége, Sepsiszentgyörgy.

Zsemlyei János 2008. A nyelvvelő Dsida Jenő. In Zsemlyei Borbála (ed.) 2008. *Anyanyelvünkért. Dsida Jenő nyelvvelő rovata a Keleti Újságban*. AESZ-füzetek, Anyanyelvvelők Erdélyi Szövetsége, Sepsiszentgyörgy, 5–11.