

# ENLIGHTENMENT AND NATION-DEFENCE PROFILE OF JÁN ČAPLOVIČ<sup>1</sup>

Marcela Gbúrová<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

Ján Čaplovič (1780 - 1847) was one of the major figures of the Slovak national-revivalist generation, in large part due to the role he played in bridging the professional and language gaps during the reform course of the rulers of the Austrian monarchy, and the struggle of the Hungarian nobility for Hungarian independence in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries due to the search for soft but effective forms of nation-defence activities. This study presents the enlightenment and nation-defence profile of the Slovak patriot Ján Čaplovič who has received minimal attention from the Slovak academic community after 1990s. Although he is not considered a prominent national revivalist, his publishing devoted to ethnographic and national defence issues significantly contributed to Slovaks taking their stance in the multinational Austrian monarchy, in strengthening their ethnic identity, and in fostering the process of codification of their literary language as the most important national identification sign in 1843. The study is divided into three relatively separate but interrelated sections. The first part outlines his enlightenment profile, with special attention paid to its most important component, which was used in his ethnographic and patriotic works. The second part profiles the Slovak national defences of the first four decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century of authors such as Pavol Senický, Juraj Rohonyi, Samuel Hoič, Matej Šuhajda, Ján Chalupka, Jozef Meltzer, Ondrej Soltys, Ludovít Štúr, Ján Francisci, and Michal Miloslav Hodža. Their defences played an important role in supporting active political forms of enforcing the ethnic-emancipatory demands of the representatives of the Slovak nation-forming elite for a more democratic settlement of the contemporaneous conditions in the monarchy, especially in historic Hungary. The last part analyses in detail the national defences of Ján Čaplovič and evaluates their expressive value.

**Keywords:** Ján Čaplovič, Enlightenment, Austrian Empire, Historic Hungary, National defence, Magyarism, Renegades.

## INTRODUCTION

The well-known statement “*Cogito, ergo sum*” by the French mathematician and philosopher René Descartes was a symbol of a new, freer knowledge of

<sup>1</sup> The study is the result of the APVV-20-0334: It is Not True, but It Could Be: Conspiracy theories and hoaxes in the modern development of Slovakia in the European context.

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Arts, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Moyzesova 9, Košice, Slovakia. E-mail: marcela.gburova@upjs.sk.

the world gained through reason, subsequently developed by many, such as Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677), Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716), Blaise Pascal (1623-1662), and later by the proponents of empiricism such as John Locke (1632-1704), Francis Bacon (1561-1626), David Hume (1711-1776), and George Berkeley (1685-1753). This ideational basis gave rise to the pan-European enlightenment progressive movement based on shifting the attention from everything magical and mystical to human reason; to man and his/her freedom in personal and political meaning; to overcoming the conflict between experience and rationality, faith and reason; to natural human rights, democratisation and modernisation of social and political life (Scruton, 1991).

The Austrian Empire responded to these revolutionary changes in the monarchist political establishment by the reform policy of Maria Theresa and her son Joseph II. Most of the reforms adopted were intended to transform the Habsburg monarchy into a modern centralised state. During the reign of Joseph II, the social and cultural situation of citizens, especially serfs, improved, and his reforms helped start the development of business and industry, and alleviate discrimination in the Church. His ambition was to make the State administration more efficient - mainly by introducing German language (1784) as the only internal administrative language. This regulation threatened the existence of many Hungarian officials who could not speak German. As a compensation for this language reform, he introduced a language policy to promote living languages for the nationalities in the monarchy, to introduce them into schools, and to use them for communication with common people. Not all the reform projects were welcomed in the Hungarian estates, especially among the middle and high Hungarian nobility and the Church hierarchy. Emperor Joseph II did not summon the Hungarian Assembly, was not crowned the King of Hungary, but due to his reformist policy, the Hungarian nobility's privileged system of counties and the revenue system, economically and politically convenient for the nobility, disintegrated (Tibenský, 1964). In response to the reform efforts of Joseph II, the Hungarian nobility launched a policy of gradual isolation from Vienna. At the sessions of the Hungarian Parliament held in Bratislava in 1791 and 1792, the nobility rejected the "unification" measures of Vienna, including the use of German as an official language and the use of languages of national minorities. Instead, the Parliament passed the first two Magyarisation acts. These laws marked the beginning of a long and complicated path of non-Hungarian nations to their freedom within historic Hungary. Later on, King Leopold II calmed the political tensions

in the monarchy by implementing a foreign peace policy and a welcoming policy, especially towards the national nobility, and mostly by reconsidering several reforms regarding taxes and real estate - registers (Schulze, 2003; Kačírek, 2011). Politics of the monarchy under the reign of Francis I, and especially under Ferdinand V (Benefactor) was significantly influenced by Klemens Václav Metternich (1773–1859). He, as a Machiavellian politician and a respected diplomat, a supporter of monarchist and conservative State policy, and an enemy of liberal and nationalist principles on the national issue, had a significant impact on how the Monarchy and Europe was organised after 1815 (Kačírek, 2011).

With the Monarchy in such conditions, a Slovak native, Ján Čaplovič (1780–1847) devoted his professional life to being a lawyer, ethnographer, supporter of the enlightenment cultural movement, political analyst, and creator of Slovak national defences (i.e. literary works defending the Slovak interests). In his works, he closely monitored and evaluated the enlightenment ideas, the reformist-conservative course of the Austrian monarchy, Hungarian politics, Hungarian parliament, and the journalistic scene throughout the monarchy. He responded to anti-Slovak attacks with his articles in various periodicals, dailies, and independent book-style studies. His personal, ethnographic, national-cultural and political-analytical profile was first presented in 1945 by Vendelín Jankovič (Jankovič, 1945) in his monographic work. Jankovič was the first to acquaint the professional public with Čaplovič - the patriot, who was very prolific in publishing - he wrote and published over 30 books and published over 400 articles in several languages including Hungarian, Slovak, German, and Latin. A substantial part of Jankovič's publishing activities focused on ethnographic and patriotic research of the Slovak and Hungarian population and on the defence of the Slovak nation and its language against manifestations of national and language intolerance on the part of Hungarian political groups. What is notable in relation to his patriotic activity is that at that time such activity was understood quite broadly: as a summary of historical, geographical, scientific, social, legal, and political knowledge of the State or the nation, partially overlapping with ethnographic issues. Many years later, Jankovič's research of Čaplovič's work was followed by other ethnographic and ethnological experts (e.g., Urbancová, 1970), who consider Čaplovič's work to be dominant journalistic activity of him. Special attention should be paid to the translations two ethnographic works by Ján Čaplovič intended for the Slovak public, titled *Ethnography of Slovaks in Hungary* (Čaplovič, 1997), and *On Slovakia and Slovaks* (Čaplovič, 1975). Čaplovič's active participation

in the process of forming the “philosophy of harmony” was also assessed recently by the Slovak philosopher Ondrej Mezsáros (Mezsáros, 2006). In 2012 Serbian professional magazine (Čaplovič, 2012) presented the results of Čaplovič’s cultural and ethnological activities during his stay in the Slavonian town of Pakrac.

The objective of this study is to outline the enlightenment and national defence profile of Ján Čaplovič. The study is based on analysing the available professional sources and the national defences and ethnographically-oriented works by Ján Čaplovič. In addition to ethnological, ethnographic, enlightenment, culturological, patriotic, and philosophical issues, the natiological issues need to be presented here as they are considered significant especially from theoretical-terminological aspects and the political practice in the national issues of historic Hungarian empire between the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the revolutionary years of 1848 - 1849. In addition to the introduction and Čaplovič’s enlightenment profile, the study contains two other parts. The second part is devoted to profiling Slovak national defences from the first four decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century by Pavol Senický, Juraj Rohonyi, Samuel Hoič, Matej Šuhajda, Ján Chalúpka, Jozef Meltzer, Ondrej Soltys, Ľudovít Štúr, Ján Francisci, and Michal Miloslav Hodža. Their defenses played an important role in supporting active political forms of enforcing the ethnic-emancipatory demands of the representatives of the Slovak nation-forming elite for a more democratic settlement of the contemporaneous conditions in the monarchy, especially in historic Hungary. The last part analyses in detail the national defences of Ján Čaplovič (including their annexes), in which he focused on the defence of Slovaks’ rights to national existence, the defence of language as the dominant tool of Slovak national identity and criticism of the renegades of the Slovak nation.

## **1 ČAPLOVIČ’S ENLIGHTENMENT PROFILE**

His path to an enlightened philosophical understanding of the world began in his family milieu. His father, Jonáš Čaplovič, introduced him to the basics of the Enlightenment upbringing, emphasising the importance of education, sensory and intellectual knowledge of the world and values, and the importance of family, ethnic, and State identity. During his studies at the Evangelical Grammar School in Banská Štiavnica (1796–1797), Čaplovič improved in the art of rhetoric, but also in the art of logic and reasoning - the basic components of scientific knowledge of the world (Jankovič, 1945, p. 20). During his stay in Banská Bystrica and Radvaň, he began studying

the radical Enlightenment reforms of Joseph II and works by European Enlightenment authors. He was particularly interested in the German Enlightenment theologian, bookseller, translator, journalist, and music writer Carl Friedrich Cramer (1752–1807), the French Enlightenment writer Voltaire (1694–1778), and the French Enlightenment philosopher of Rationalism, Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778). Thanks to a deeper study of the political reforms of Maria Theresa and Joseph II, and of the scientific, economic, and law works, he came to a conclusion that the principles of human action and morality came from an empirical knowledge of the factual reality. He referred to the teachings of the Roman Stoics, who argued that the good life of man may only be materialised in accordance with nature or reason. The noetics of Empiricism, formulated by the English philosopher John Locke, impressed him to such an extent that he rejected any kind of cognition other than sensory cognition of the laws of the material world. According to Čaplovič, sensory-laden cognition is a direct perception of the current reality. In this position, he manifested himself as a lawyer for whom the search for an evidentiary situation is more rational than a “spiritual” activity. The philosopher Ondrej Meszáros added in 2006 that when it comes to the modernisation of society Čaplovič emphasised the role of practical philosophy, interpreting the term of “practicality/usefulness” in an instrumental way, i.e. having an immediate benefit for an individual or being of a purposeful nature (Meszárosz, 2006). Naturally, in terms of his one-sided philosophical orientation, these philosophical traditions based on speculative metaphysical knowledge of the world were problematic. He often referred to them by a general notion of “philosophy” and emphasized that scientific institutions should not deal with them (Meszárosz, 2006). It was mainly a philosophy of irrationalism, intuitivism, mysticism, and transcendence, which are based on methods of understanding the world and man as a spiritual intuition, emotion, mystical vision, subconscious, and the like. He considered these philosophical initiatives extremely “useless”, even “meaningless”. He called Scholastic philosophers “fools” whose activities were at the top of human nonsense (Jankovič, 1945).

In the light of his “stoic” attitude to the philosophical tradition of useless talking about the irrelevant things of life and the world, his attitude towards religion and art is quite understandable.

From a young age, he was a supporter of the “natural religion” based on the principle of tolerance of the two largest religions - the Catholic and Evangelical religions. In his adulthood, he only consolidated his conservative attitudes towards religion and the Church. Therefore, for example, he sought

a rational solution in the matter of religious piety and morality: he regarded religious ethics as a source of maintaining order in human society. According to him, Church life should be more guided by the principle of tolerance. For this reason, he was critical of ancient obscurantism; on the contrary, he supported the idea of “positive Christianity,” or voluntary unionism in the Church (Jankovič, 1945).

Čaplovič’s Enlightenment principles of rationalism (purposefulness, usefulness, personality, practicality) did not combine well with the world of art, considered an individual manifestation of the creative ability of man’s spiritual state rather than his manual skills. He responded particularly negatively to the art of poetry, which he considered fiction in verse or an escape from reality. He did not appreciate its importance as one of the most accessible and most effective “advertising” means of spreading the Enlightenment ideas of ethnic cohesion or national-cultural identity, not to mention its influence on the development of spiritual life and aesthetic and artistic conditions of man. Regarding literature of fiction, he appreciated only educational prose, which he considered a good source of self-education for people in various practical fields of technical, economic, and agricultural specialisations. What is also significant is the fact that he was a regular visitor to theatrical performances in Vienna, and during his stay in Slavonia he went to performances presenting farces by his favourite German playwright August Friedrich Ferdinand von Kotzebu (1761-1819). Moreover, he could play the piano and the violin and composed musical pieces he was impressed by the music of the Austrian classicist composer Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756–1791) and the German Enlightenment music writer, journalist and translator, Carl Friedrich Cramer (1752–1807). Perhaps due to his personal relationship to the performing arts, he demonstrated a more positive attitude towards these types of art (more details in: Jankovič, 1945).

Čaplovič also applied the opinions of expediency, reasonableness, and utilitarianism in the evaluation of the natural, social, and human sciences. In his opinion, the natural sciences (mathematics, “science of nature”, geography, physics) were dominant, which also included medicine and technology, and logic and ethics. As a lawyer, he also included the “State law” sciences (“science of the State”, “legislation”) in the system of sciences, as well as linguistics and history. In the 1840s, when he came to a position that religion was the most fundamental principle of “positive Christianity,” he began to understand theology. The fashionable intellectual movement of encyclopaedism seemed not scientific enough to him because of his inclination to mechanical materialism, which works with isolated expertise.

Scientific research should not, in his opinion, be aimed at thoroughly seeking and understanding the interrelationships of this knowledge. Remarkable in this context is his critical reflection on his own research, which he did not even consider scientific, but amateur (Jankovič, 1945). It remains disputable whether to perceive it as something to be taken seriously, or just as a way for him to obscure the imperfections of his own research.

In 1813, Čaplovič entered the service with Count Filip Schönborn, and six years later, he became the director of the count's estates in Mukachevo in Berezh County in Sub-Carpathian Russia (today's Trans-Carpathian region). The service in the wealthy Viennese family lasted during Čaplovič's entire life and greatly impacted his enterprising intellect. By increasing the wealth of the count's family and implementing various legal regulations in its favour (he issued the Latin and German statutes of the Schönborn Employees' and Others Pension Fund (Jankovič, 1945), he earned the trust of Count Schönborn and a higher salary. In addition, he had quite a lot of time for his publishing activities and his travels throughout the Hungarian Empire, thus gaining valuable knowledge of the demographic, national, ethnographic, and cultural peculiarities of the relevant counties, towns, villages and their inhabitants. In addition, he benefited from his position as an economically and intellectually independent publicist, who confidently declared: *"I also write strictly according to my truest convictions and never considering anyone. I honour those who wish me well, but I do not need patrons; for I seek neither advancement nor grace. My office provides enough for me; I am completely satisfied with my position. So I do not have to fawn, flatter or disguise myself."* (Jankovič, 1945, p. 20)

Besides the official service, he dealt intensively with other legal issues - not theoretically approaching a complicated legal agenda, but rather dealing with practical issues of judicial practice in the Hungarian Empire. His intention was to publish them on an ongoing basis. He realised that he could only attract his readers by just commenting on the positive law, i.e. the applicable legal acts and standards. His first publication, published in Latin in 1811 in Bratislava (Čaplovič, 1811), was a practical handbook for county and city courts, as it contained a set of parts of county courts decisions arranged into entries. His other publications (Čaplovič, 1837) were of a similar practical purpose, i.e. devoted to all, especially those from the rural regions, interested in acquiring valuable advice and information on legal resolutions passed by forest landowners associations, arranged in alphabetical order. Čaplovič valued this publication the most (Čaplovič, 1841a), as he managed to stylistically revise the adopted laws in the spirit

of his principles on the interpretation of law. Čaplovič's short shift from the field of positive law to the field of natural law (Čaplovič, 1838), however, was not welcomed by the proponents of the natural law school. Here, Čaplovič questioned two basic theses of the natural law, namely: 1) natural law is a product of reason; 2) it is the basis of any law in force. He questioned the first thesis by enquiring as to who the owner of this reason is from among the social classes of historic Hungary. In the second thesis, he challenged the explanation of the three basic manifestations of the natural law - the right to life, equality, and freedom.

Čaplovič held a rational-utilitarian stance on issues of freedom and equality between people belonging to the legal, philosophical, and political sciences. He believed that a real equality in society was difficult to achieve. The lack in theoretical orientation in the contemporaneous philosophical or political concepts of equality, freedom, and social justice led to him insisting insisted on the anthropological notion of naturally-given biological inequalities of people (physical, intellectual, economic, property, and financial). He considered significant social differences among people to be a natural way of life in society. He claimed that property equality was unnatural and, in fact purposeful. He believed that social inequality could lead to social and status conflicts. He was a supporter of only the so-called relative equality, which argues that an individual should be content with what he or she has acquired during his or her lifetime. He considered freedom a value that only a reasonable individual could appreciate and utilise. On the other hand, an irrational individual is not capable of understanding it, and such individual often confuses freedom with its opposite - anarchy, chaos, and disorder.

This point of view also applied to his assessment of the freedom of the press and the contemporaneous censorship practices that he was very familiar with through his own experience. He believed that a stupid, mischievous, and deceitful press censorship clerk (Jankovič, 1945) could only abuse this type of freedom.

The most important aspect of Ján Čaplovič's Enlightenment profile is apparent from his ethnographic and patriotic works. In his efforts to support the Josephine reform course in the Austrian monarchy, Čaplovič identified himself with one essential reform demand - thorough knowledge of the people of the monarchy, their comprehensive upbringing and education. The importance of this demand lay in the assumption that only an enlightened people are in the position to raise the wellbeing of the entire monarchy. Čaplovič mastered Montesquieu's theory of the influence of material factors



of anthropology based on explaining the biological and psychological characteristics of individual nations and their culture; at the same time, he accepted directions of several Josephine reforms, though preferring only two of them. The first preferred direction was the Enlightenment physiocratic idea of the importance of edification and education of the population of the Hungarian Empire on matters of rationalisation of peasant agriculture and beekeeping. This is proved by Čaplovič's very successful beekeeping handbook, which summarised his findings on rational beekeeping during his stay in Slavonia. This practical handbook was first published in Latin (Čaplovič, 1814a), then in German (Čaplovič, 1814b, 1814c) and in Hungarian (Čaplovič, 1816). Slovak translation was not published in Vienna until 1817 (Čaplovič, 1817). It should be noted that all of Čaplovič's beekeeping publishing activities were very detailed and published by one publisher, Ján Gašperík (Gašperík, 1927). The second preferred reform direction consisted in learning about the customary, but especially the superstition tradition in the family and social life of ethnic people living in historic Hungary. The knowledge of this tradition was confronted with the progress of civilisation in the spiritual and material spheres, which enabled for positive shifts in the cultural equipment of the rural population. Čaplovič had the prerequisites for such work as an Enlightenment rationalist and a traveller with an innate desire to learn about nature and the world of people. It should be emphasised that this area of research was not highly developed theoretically or methodologically at that time. Although he was inspired by some contemporaneous works, including the results of patriotic works by well-known Slovak authors (Matej Bel, Gregor Berzeviczy), he did not avoid certain simplifications and inaccuracies, for example, in the methodology of collecting various statistics of ethnographic character and in the way of their evaluation. He often eliminated this shortcoming by asking the readers to send him their corrections or supplementation of the published data. From today's point of view, the author's request is unacceptable, but at the time, it was not exceptional. Moreover, Čaplovič did not stylise himself in the role of scientist, but, as already stated above, in the role of an amateur researcher.

His larger study *Slowaken in Ungarn* (Čaplovič, 1818) deserves special attention here. In thirteen chapters, he sought to prove that a small nation of Slovaks was not lagging behind the large, economically and culturally advanced nation of the English. A special feature of this study is in its comparative method employed, based on the principle of observation: "*Observations have led us to the idea of comparing them to the English and proving that Slovaks in Hungary are what they usually consider the English*

*in Europe and that the unjust views that many recklessly spread about them cannot be correct*" (Čaplovič, 1975). The concept of observation is perceived in the professional community as a scientific technique of gathering information based on deliberate observation of objects (Reichel, 2009), but in our opinion Čaplovič thought more about a general sensory-perceptual method of observing the most diverse areas of activity of the English and Slovaks. For this reason, the evidence he presented to the readers had different informative value and an uneven level of ethnographic scientific validity. It is not just the title of the study ("Half-joking and half-serious evidence that Slovaks are the Hungarian English"), but almost all of Čaplovič's comparisons support this. In his comparisons, the English are presented mostly in short nominal sentences through certain characteristics, life manifestations, social roles, cultural activities, job positions, hobbies, and the like. According to Čaplovič, Slovak raft drivers were equal to English sailors; Slovak lace makers, linen men, sheep cheese producers were similarly skilled merchants as the English merchants; Slovak women were no less beautiful and bright than English women; Slovak men were similarly capable soldiers and hunters as the English ones; Slovaks suffered from the same maladies as the English did - both liked drinking a lot of alcohol. The reader would not have learnt much about the English, but that was not the author's objective either. His ambition was to prove - even at the cost of a more or less adjusted real fact - that Slovaks were most similar to the English from among the historic Hungarian nations. His observations and comparisons were made through fictional statements that contain various ethnographic, historical, geographical, social, and other profiling information on the Slovaks. Despite the fact that Čaplovič did not state the sources from which he drew this information, it is necessary to emphasise his ability to collect and especially to read a lot of valuable material on the contemporaneous profile of Slovaks. This study has an obvious apologetic Slovakophile tendency, which later, in other studies, was not only confirmed, but also extended to the defence of the Slovak language as the basic ethnic-emancipatory tool of Slovaks.

In this context, it is necessary to draw attention to the civilisation paradigm of the Slavic and Slovak world presented a few years later by Štefan Launer (Gbúrová, 2019). In his book *The Nature of Slavdom* (Launer, 1847), Launer did not follow the path of Čaplovič's fictionalised ethnological method. His ethnic-developmental modernisation theory was theoretically re-elaborated and placed in the context of the first half of 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe, in which, according to Launer, four "world historical" nations played a dominant role: Italians, French, English, and Germans. According

to Launer, these nations were the spiritual “pillars” of this age, its highest norm, and authority. Other nations and small nations of Europe, including the Slovak nation, were only their spiritual “pendants”. This fact is of particular importance for the Slavs, who, due to their Indo-European origin, belonged, according to Launer, to the Western European nations mentioned above. According to the world historical order, they had the opportunity to master the cultural legacy of these nations and incorporate it into their national spirit. According to Launer, the first and second levels of European education and Enlightenment were represented by the Germans and the French, the third level by the English, and the fourth one by the Italians. At that time, the English were not, according to Launer, popular among the Slavs because they became allied with the Turks. This was also reflected by other thinkers of the time. For example, Ján Kollár spoke unflatteringly about them as imperialist barbarians who hated everything Slavic. Ľudovít Štúr was a little more lenient in evaluating them, but he too highlighted the English selfishness. Štúr argued that the English would support any European revolution for the sake of their financial gain. They lacked generosity and humanity (Štúr, 1986). In addition, Launer again divided the English equally into Protestants and Catholics. He supported this division by arguing that the Church in England had been reformed, but that almost the entire Catholic administration remained. He mockingly argued that English was “*a disgusting, amorphous, and quite mechanical mix of two languages - German and Latin - and partly the language of the old British, so it had no legs, in brief, it is a real bat of the old and new world*” (Štúr, 1986, p. 53). In determining the typological differences between the French and the English, he emphasised the French Reformation in the democratisation of political and public life and the English Reformation in shipping, “merchandising”, technological progress and industry (he highlighted “steam engines” as “*the most famous flower and work of the English spirit*”), from which England made a large economic and financial profit.

After this ethnographic project, which was even acclaimed by the publisher of the *Hesperus* magazine (Čaplovič, 1975), Čaplovič began to prepare a three-volume ethnographic monograph on nationalities in Hungary, which, however, was not published. The likely cause was Čaplovič’s political views on a sensitive national theme: his conception of national policy in Hungary was based on the principle of equality of all nationalities, which was in line with the universalist, medieval supranational concept of the Hungarian State-building (“*Natio Hungarica*”), but this principle was contrary to the government policy of the Hungarian nobility. This policy

was aimed at elimination of other nations in historic Hungary political participation. Nevertheless, he succeeded in his goal of writing a synthetic work on the ethnography of Hungary and the Austrian publisher Hartleben published a two-volume book *Pictures from Hungary* (Čaplovič, 1975). This substantially reduced synthesis presented Čaplovič as a Hungarian patriot who sought to process all the ethnographic material on Hungarian ethnic groups in a complex way. He compared their national origins, their history, quantified their population by introducing their religion, physical and mental characteristics, clothing, diet, language, dialect, educational level, customs, superstitions, economy, political life, and geographical profile. Considering the time when the work was published, it should be noted that Čaplovič's ethnographic programme was admirable. Had all of his manuscripts been published (*Ethnography of the Hungarians, Ethnography of the Romanians, Ethnography of the Jews, Ethnography of the Ruthenians, Proposals for the Outline of Ethnography*), he would have been known as the most prolific and well-known ethnographer in historic Hungary. His work *Ethnography of Slovaks in Hungary* (Čaplovič, 1997), which was translated from the German-Latin-Slovak manuscript by Rudolf Brtáň, confirms this.

## **2 SLOVAK NATIONAL DEFENCES**

Apologetics, originally the defence of the Christian faith (more details in: Apologetika, 2021), later became a tool for defending and justifying a certain object of interest (ideological, political, philosophical direction, etc.) using mostly rational arguments. The defenders (apologists) of the Slovak national interests, the authors of apologetic texts, were rather well-oriented in ethnic - political, cultural, economic, and social issues in the Austrian monarchy or historic Hungary from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> and through to the first decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. They knew that Slovakia, unlike Croatia, for example, did not have a protective shield of the estate nation of historic Hungary or an estate awareness of the "nation". This meant that the defenders found themselves in a difficult national-defensive position in the historic Hungarian political area against an intolerant Magyarisation ideology. This ideology aimed at subordination of all non-Hungarian ethnic communities in historic Hungary. The beginning of systematic Magyarisation efforts in legislative terms began in 1791 and 1792 after the Hungarian Assembly adopted Statutory Article No. 7. Subsequently, the Hungarian Assembly with Constitutional Articles No. 4 of 1805, Article No. 8 of 1830, Article No. 3 of 1836, and Article No. 6 of 1840 further extended the rights of Hungarian

in official communication. By adopting statutory article No. 2 of 1844, the Hungarian Assembly introduced Hungarian language as an exclusive State and official language in the entire multinational Hungarian part of the Austrian monarchy. This negatively impacted the development of national ethnic groups living in the territory of historic Hungary (Rapant, 1927; 1937; 1946). In addressing the national issues, two ideological and political currents were created in the Hungarian political milieu at that time: while a more moderate current (represented by Count Štefan Sečeni) claimed the establishment of a Hungarian nation-state by evolutionary cultural and language assimilation of non-Hungarian nations and nationalities. A more radical current (represented by Kossuth) intended to significantly speed up this assimilation process through legislation. Kossuth's liberal-reform wing, which used the press as a modern political weapon, gained a dominant position on the Hungarian political scene in the revolutionary years 1847/1849 (more details in: Kačírek, 2011).

*“At the time of the onset of Magyarisation, the Slovak national community was not ready to fully oppose it. The Slovaks lacked a unified national ideology, they lacked a strong and unquestionable national centre, and under the influence of the social situation at the end of feudalism, there was also a significant nationalisation of the privileged aristocratic and bourgeois strata. The basis of national life was thus limited to the small nobility, the lower clergy, the bourgeoisie of smaller towns, and especially the broad peasant strata.”* (Hrnko, 2021). National defences comprised a part of the awakening Slovak national identification process. They played a significant role in supporting the active political forms of promoting the ethnic-emancipatory demands of the representatives of the Slovak nation-forming elite for a more democratic settlement of the contemporaneous conditions in the monarchy, especially in the historic Hungary. In the period before 1848, national defences were directed mainly against the introduction of Hungarian as the State language. The authors wrote them mostly in Hungarian or German language in order to achieve the desired effect in communication with “hoax”, i.e. semi-true to false arguments and politically incorrect attitudes of the contemporaneous Hungarian press promoting the nationalist course of the Hungarian nobility. A special feature of publishing Slovak defences was the strict censorship policy of Pest (in contrast to the milder Viennese censorship), which prevented Slovak authors from freely expressing their defensive national-emancipatory attitudes. Therefore, most of the defenders usually published „brochures”, i.e. small paperbacks with the subject of banned books. Publishing mostly took place outside the territory of the monarchy,

especially in Leipzig, published by Otto Wigand, where the reach of the Hungarian or Austrian censorship was minimal. In the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Slovak national defences (mainly by Adam František Kollár, Samuel Tešedík, Jozef Ignác Bajza, Juraj Fándly, and others) were aimed at criticising the social policy of the monarchy, lack of improvement of the conditions in the Slovak agricultural countryside and lack of significant modernisation of the economy. However, they did not shy from some contemplations on civilisationally and politically more modern interpretations of terms such as people, nation (status, patriotic, Slovak, Slavic, historic Hungarian, Hungarian), State, ethnicity, etc.

A German-written defence called *Etwas über die Magyarisirung der Slawen in Ungarn* opened a new chapter of the Slovak national defence. It was published in the periodical *Ueberlieferungen zur Geschichte unserer Zeit* at the end of 1821 (Ormis, 1973). Here an unknown author compared two nations in the historic Hungary – the Hungarians and Slovaks. His comparison showed that the ongoing Magyarisation of Slovaks had reduced the quality of culture and morality of the Hungarians. In defence of the Slovaks, he stated several objective and semi-fictional facts highlighting Slovak hospitality, tenacity, and hardworking nature, the renegade character of Slovak yeomen, and the rich lexical and expressive level of the Slovak language when compared to Hungarian language. The article attracted attention in the Hungarian cultural and political milieu, mainly because Alojz Mednyánszky, a well-known Hungarian writer and representative of the nobility published his reaction to it (Ormis, 1973).

The national defence of 1823 by Pavol Senický (Ormis, 1967), dealt with the progressive criticism of the Estates of historic Hungary.

Juraj Rohonyi's national defense written in verse *Palma quam Dugonics, similesque Magyari Slaviae eripere attentarunt, vindicata*, published in Latin in Zagreb (Kabelík, 1926) devoted to the contemporaneous historic Hungarian intellectuals who were fully aware of the governing historic Hungarian language and national policy. Here the author presented his demand for equality between Slovaks and Hungarians as two parts of a single Hungarian nation, referring to the first Hungarian king, Stephen I, who promoted the language and cultural diversity of historic Hungary.

The national defence of *Sollen wir Magyaren werden* of 1833 attracted attention not just by being published in three editions, but especially by the author remaining unknown for a long time. Finally, Albert Pražák (Pražák, 1926) identified the author as an Evangelical priest Samuel Hoič (1806–1868). This defence was the first known defence of the Slovaks

against the Magyarisation policy, especially against the Magyarisation measures of some counties. The authors' basic idea was that his position was not against educating Slovaks in Hungarian language, but against the violent manifestations of Magyarisation against the Slovak population that challenged the basics of their ethnic identity.

Ludovít Matej Šuhajda (1806–1872), a professor at the Evangelical Lyceum in Banská Štiavnica, is the author of another well-known apologetic work, *Der Magyairismus in Ungaren* (published in Leipzig in 1834). The work is predominantly an analysis of prejudices about the Hungarian nation as the dominant nation in Hungary. Moreover, the work introduced terminological natiological issues (theoretical attempt to define contemporaneous terms such as Hungary, homeland, historical nation, nation of the estates, people, "non-Hungarians", State, natural law, or international law) altogether with a completion of some works by Ján Kollár on the nature of Hungarian and the Slavic languages (Ormis, 1973).

A well-known Slovak playwright Ján Chalupka (1791–1871) is the author of several national defences. The he first of them was published in paperback in Leipzig in 1834 under the long title *Durch welche Mittel lässt sich die Verbreitung der magyarischen Sprache unter den Einwohnern Ungarns am sichersten erzielen*. His typical ironic-satirical criticism opened up various contexts of the topic of Magyarisation in the Slovak milieu. His second national defence, which was also published in Leipzig by Otto Wigand in 1841 under the title *Schreiben des Grafen Carl Zay, General-Inspectors of the Evangelischen Kirchen und Schulen Augsburgischer Confession in Ungarn die Professoren zur Leutschau* was Chalupka's response to Count Karol Zay's letter. Zay in an unscrupulous manner and on the incentive of fake data by the Slovak renegade (the Slovak Karol Kramarczik) accused the Professor at the Lyceum of Levoča, Michal Hlaváček, of certain activities (cooperation in publishing the almanac of Slovak students in Levoča *Jitřenka*) disrupting Magyarisation of the Evangelical Church in historic Hungary. Chalupka's answer, which convincingly refuted all of Zay's ideologically motivated false accusations of Professor Hlaváček, was met with a positive publication response in the Slovak national milieu (especially among the Evangelicals), which was, naturally, not appreciated by the Inspector General of the Evangelical Church in historic Hungary (Ormis, 1973).

The language issue was the most discussed topic in the Slovak national defences in the 1840s. Various supporting activities also helped to open up this topic. Such was the pastoral letter written by Pavel Jozeffy, the parish priest in Tisovec and patriot, who on 6 December 1839 at the Convention

in Nyiregyháza called for an end to the teaching of religion in folk schools in Hungarian language. His argument was very rational: teaching religion in an unfamiliar language that children do not understand is useless to them because they do not learn the values of basic moral religious messages. Jozeffy's attitude found support in the wider Evangelical Slovak community, and even in the Czech opinion-forming magazine *Květy*, which caused his opinion to be published in the book form as well (Ormis, 1973). The defence of the Evangelical pastor Jozef Melczer, who responded to the results of the above-mentioned General Convention of the Evangelical Church of 1841, also pointed out this problem. It abolished Slovak language societies at higher Hungarian Evangelical schools allowing for any alternative ways of teaching Slovak at these schools (Ormis, 1973).

Another national defence written by Ondrej Soltys, in Biblical Czech (published under the pseudonym of Ondřislav z Pravdomlivíc), responded to Law Act No. 8 of 1840, which introduced the legal basis for the next wave of Magyarisation policy on the Slovak territory. The apology spread among Evangelical parishes despite the censorship pointed out, in particular, that the curtailment of the language rights of Slovaks could lead to the gradual disappearance of the language and thus of national identity (Ormis, 1973).

Ludovít Štúr himself also took part in this activity with the book *Die Beschwerden und Klagen der Slaven in Ungarn über die geseltzwidrigen Uebergiffe der Magyaren* (Leipzig, 1843), which was written for pragmatic political reasons of approaching the Hungarian Assembly. Daniel Rapant considered this document and the above-mentioned Hoič's apology to be the two most important national Slovak defences. The central idea of Štúr's text was devoted to internally conditioned relationship between the nation and its language, reflecting the views of German classical philosophy, and local national-ideological ideas and selected some examples of Magyarisation practice. At the same time, Štúr's political position was that declaring a negative attitude towards the enforced Magyarisation could be not enough; it called for permanent elimination of the Magyarisation. Text of the famous Slovak petition of 1842 (Ormis, 1973) was attached as a supporting part of Štúr's writings.

In a vein similar to Štúr's work, the national defence *Zrcadlo Slovenska* (Pest, 1844) is written – in Biblical Czech – by Benjamín Pravoslav Červenák (1816–1842), a co-founder (together with A. B. Vrchovský) of the covert association *Vzájemnosť* (1837) and, following L. Štúr, the deputy Professor at the Department of Czech-Slavic Language and Literature at the Bratislava Evangelical Lyceum.



Radical views on national freedom and democracy were also presented in the national defence brochure *Zrkadlo pre ľud slovenský* (Mirror for the Slovak People) (1847) by Ján Francisci (1822-1905), a Slovak politician, journalist, and promoter of folk monetary institutions, and the mayor of the Liptov County. He published it under the pseudonym "Ľudomil Vrahoborovič" because a pseudonym was then, as we indicated, a well-known form of concealing the copyright identity from potential legal or political sanctions. Its peculiarity lies in the fact that it reflected the political conditions at the time and expressed the cause of the national Slovak defence -however, in a non-traditional literary form. Francisci created the utopic land of Blahoslava inhabited by three nations living side by side - Vol'norád (Slovaks), Silní (Germans), and Psohlavci (Hungarians). The most aggressive of these nations were the Hungarians, who attacked the Slovaks. Francisci emphasised that the role of Slovaks, if they want to free themselves, is to revolutionise against ("have the courage to grab scythes and axes") and get rid of the "oppressors" (Ormis, 1973).

The scientific sources generally agree that the last Slovak national defence of the feudal period in the Estates of Hungary was a paperback book by Michal Miloslav Hodža, one of the three leading representatives of the Slovak national movement (Štúr - Hurban - Hodža), published in the 1940s entitled *Der Slowak*, with the subtitle of *Beiträge zur Beleuchtung der slawischen Frage in Ungarn* (Prague, 1848). In addition to an expert political-historical analysis of the ideology and practice of historic Hungarian nationalism (partly as a parody), Hodža focused on reviving the postulates of Western liberalism in order to make the Slovak nationalist movement more open to German, i.e. "Western", education and to political assistance found in absolutist Russia. (Ormis, 1973; Zuriaňová, 1930; Hodža, 1920).

### **3 ČAPLOVIČ AND HIS NATIONAL DEFENCE PROFILE**

Ján Čaplovič was not just closely monitoring the above national-defence activities of leading personalities of the Slovak cultural and political life with Hungarian political and ecclesiastical power, but also participated in this struggle in both, direct and indirect ways. The indirect ways of defending the Slovak nation are proved by his patriotic-ethnographic works, in which he showed the civilisational vitality of the Slovak ethnic group, its ability to cope not just with Hungarian ethnic groups, but also with advanced European nations. Čaplovič's direct way of the national - defence includes several longer and shorter articles, in which he focused on defending the

right of Slovaks to national self-determination, on defending the language as the dominant tool for building up the Slovak national identity, and on criticism of Slovak nation's renegades, the magyarised members of the Slovak nation whom he addressed as "Pseudo-Hungarians".

Čaplovič's defensive activity began after the article in Hungarian language *A hazánkbaní tótosodás ügyében* was published in the magazine *Századunk* (1841, vol. 4, No. 3). The reason for his defensive response was the speech of Count Karol Zay, who delivered it upon his appointment to the position of Inspector General of the Evangelical Church in Hungary on 10 September 1841. Zay's speech was published in the magazine *Társalkodó* in 1841 (vol. 9, No. 75), while its Slovak version was published by Daniel Rapant (Rapant, 1943). Čaplovič was especially provoked by two of Zay's theses: 1) The dominant position of "Hungarianship" and the Hungarian language was the basis of Hungarian constitutionalism, culture, "Protestantism", and freedom; if this does not materialise, Hungary would fall back into the Middle Ages; 2) The development of Slovak and any other Slavic languages in Hungary had no perspective, as only Hungarian language with its political and national background was competitive to the superior Germanic and Roman civilisation. An important role in Čaplovič's defensive response was played by the Hungarian-speaking professor of grammar at the Szatócs Grammar School in Rožňava (formerly Kramarček). In order to please Count Zay, he wrote an article in the magazine *Társalkodó* (1840, vol. 9, No. 92) entitled *A panszlaviszmus cseh-szláv hósei Lócsen. Társalkodó* (more details in: Rapant, 1943), in which he described the Pan-Slavists from the Levoča Grammar School as enemies of Zay's objectives. He specifically mentioned Professor Hlaváček, who, as the founder and supervisor of the student literary society in Levoča, helped to publish student almanacs of literary works entitled *Jitřenka*. Čaplovič's defence found a positive response in the self-educating association of students at the Bratislava Evangelical Lyceum, who were pleased that a Slovak intellectual was also defending national affairs, even if he stood outside the national-linguistic disputes until then. It was probably Ľudovít Štúr who sent Čaplovič's article to the editors of the Czech magazine *Květy* with a request to publish it. The article entitled *Hlas ze Slovenska* (A Voice from Slovakia) was published, albeit belatedly, in the aforementioned magazine in 1841 (vol. 8, No. 7-8). It immediately provoked wide negative publicity in the Hungarian public sphere. Count Zay himself responded to it (Rapant, 1943).

Another of Čaplovič's apology *Rozjímaní o zmaďařovaní země Uherské* (*Contemplations on the Magyarisation of the Hungarian Land*) (Čaplovič,

1842b) is a reflection on a single language State formation (meaning historic Hungary) and on the suitability or unsuitability of ways of promoting the Hungarian language as an official language in this formation. It should be noted here that Čaplovič did not move away from his permissive attitude towards Hungarian as the language of administration. In his defence, he also opened up the terminological issue of the political nation and the State nation, and marginally touched on the aforementioned case of Professor Hlaváček and the *Jitřenka* almanac.

He presented his negative experiences with the Slovaks, who changed their nationality to Hungarian for political and other reasons, and with it their attitudes towards the Slovak ethnic group, in his best-known and most cited national defence aptly called *Slawismus und Pseudomagyarismus. Vom aller Menschen Freunde, nur der Pseudomagyarismus Feinde* (Čaplovič, 1842a). The Slovak translation of this defence was only published as late as in 1973 (Ormis, 1973). For this reason, we will deal with it in more detail in the next section of this paper. The immediate impetus for Čaplovič's text was in Count Karol Zay's "pamphlet" (paperback in a non-periodical publication) *Protestantismus, Magyarismus, Slawismus* published in Leipzig by Otto Wigand in 1841 in response to Ján Chalupka's national defence study. Čaplovič's defence was met with a great response in the Slovak Evangelical milieu, which was also confirmed by Ľudovít Štúr in his letter to J. V. Staňek: "The brochure has a large market share here" (Ambruš, 1954, p. 288). The defence contains an extensive introduction and four appendices - the author's previous articles with anti-Hungarian content. The introductory part provides several examples of Zay's failure as an Inspector General of the Evangelical Church in Hungary. The first failure was a record of his one-year work at the General Convention of the Evangelical Church (8 - 10 September 1841), which he presented to a vote by the members of the Convention. According to Čaplovič, the second failure was his paperback text directed against the aforementioned Chalupka's sharp criticism of his position against Professor Michal Hlaváček and his participation in the above-mentioned work of the student almanac *Jitřenka* in Levoča. Čaplovič extended this topic by Zay's definition of freedom of speech. According to Zay, Slovaks may choose between freedom (speaking Hungarian language) or "force", which means oppression, non-freedom: this would happen if they "invited" Russians among themselves. If that had happened, they would be called "traitors" or "high traitors". According to Čaplovič, Zay's conviction was that "Lutheranism is possible only in the Hungarian language and that it would have to perish if Slovaks were reluctant to become completely

Hungarian" ("Lutheran Slovaks [...] must become Hungarians"); [...] to immerse the Slavic family into a strong Hungarian body") (Ormis, 1973, pp. 378, 387). Interestingly, Zay omitted Slovak Catholics when considering the freedom of speech, which was understandable, as he could expect strong opposition from Catholic bishops. In connection with the freedom of speech within the monarchy, Čaplovič argued logically and factually that Slovaks, especially young people studying at Hungarian or Austrian or German schools, were learning Hungarian and German. Civil servants did the same. However, he questioned whether common sense could be followed on language issues rather than in Zay's "philological fanaticism," which could only awaken "dormant" ethnic nationalism and complicate the political situation in the monarchy, especially in historic Hungary.

The leitmotif of Čaplovič's defence is a criticism of Zay's defence of the "Pseudo-Hungarians", i.e. Slovak natives, among whom Zay (the Inspector General of the Evangelical Church in Hungary) himself was in the first place. Under the county law, almost a million Protestant Slovaks were entrusted with Zay's "father's" care and protection. Čaplovič aptly described the Slovak renegades: "*They are so free from all human wisdom that they want to make Slovak youth fall in love with the Hungarians*" (Ormis, 1973, p. 105). He rebuked Zay for spreading the thesis of Pan-Slavism, that is, of an ideological "ghost" that would create "two great Slavic empires." This was probably Zay's response to contemporaneous economic political visions of the "great power of pan-Slavism," which were brought in and disseminated by Hungarian Government-controlled newspapers and magazines. In this connection, Zay argued that "*Hungary would only be great and happy if all of it was Hungarian*" (Ormis, 1973, pp. 380-388). At the end of this part of Čaplovič' defence, he presented three pieces of evidence of "pseudo-Hungarian" fanaticism, which was published in the Budapest liberal daily *Pesti Hírlap*. The first evidence related to the aforementioned attack against Professor Hlaváček when the District Convent of the Evangelical Church (held between 17 and 18 August 1841) proposed to launch an investigation due to his pan-Slavic activities in Levoča. The second evidence was directed against Zay's pretend attempt at a peaceful and natural spread of the Hungarian language among Slovaks. Čaplovič's third evidence aimed at abolishing the "society of Slovak students" as ordered by the General Convention of the Evangelical Church, which, according to Čaplovič, was its "reckless", "despotising", "bizarre" act (Ormis, 1973, pp. 389-391).

The first appendix (entitled *On Slavicism in Hungary*) was Čaplovič's response to Zay's letter to professors at the Levoča Lyceum. It aimed at

documenting the dispute between Count Karol Zay and Professor Hlaváček. Here, Čaplovič commented on the statement of the Inspector General of the Evangelical Church in Hungary that the Hungarians were not dependent on Slovaks, but on Germans, in terms of crafts and way of life. To Zay's other radical view of the rapid Magyarisation of Evangelical Slovaks, Čaplovič replied in another way, saying that Slovaks would remain Slovaks even with Hungarian as the official language; they were and would be Hungarian patriots, whilst at the same time defending their mother tongue.

The second annex contains three parts. The first part (*O maďarčení Uhorska*) (*On the Magyarisation of Historic Hungary*) had one dominant theme: it was Čaplovič' challenging a monolingual State, not in the sense of Joseph II's solution (Emperor Joseph II introduced German as the official language in Historic Hungary), but as the Slovak "pseudo-Hungarians" wanted to do - they suggested that all "non-Hungarians" in the historic Hungary speak Hungarian. Another fact is that immediately after introducing German as the official language in Hungary, national- language based nationalisms arose in this territory. In this context, Čaplovič suggested that after the possible implementation of one more violent language unification in Hungary, the ethnic-emanicipation process of non-Hungarian nationalities in Hungary would intensify. In the second part (*Need and usefulness*), Čaplovič emphasised his previous position on the nature of a monolingual State: speech unity is useful, for example, in education, in economic life, in communication in public and State administration, and so on. On the other hand, it is important for a State, especially for a multinational one (as was the case with the Austrian monarchy), to develop language and cultural diversity, as this internally enriches it in cultural and other ways and, at the same time, it strengthens patriotic and State-political cohesion.

Although Čaplovič was well oriented in the cultural and political atmosphere of the time, he did not fully understand that the issue of the national revival should be connected with the existence of the Slovak literary language and with the established orthography. In his opinion "*language is nothing more than a means of communicating one's thoughts*" (Ormis, 1973, p. 399). As an Evangelical, he did not identify with Bernolák's "prescriptive" codification of standard Slovak, he held onto the position of the Slovak language ("Hungarian Slovak") cultivated by several generations of Slovak scholars. He did not understand that this form of Slovak fulfilled the basic function of communication, but its public (administrative) function was limited. For this reason, it was necessary to choose a cultural prescriptive form of language that would be able not just to transcend the boundaries of the original

dialects, but also to perform other functions in public, including the integration function (more details in: Kačala, 1994; 2002). It was not until Štúr's codification initiative that united the nation, its ecclesiastical, political, estate, and cultural authorities, and the new codified Slovak began to fulfil all dominant functions: communicative, cognitive, aesthetic, and representative. In this respect, Čaplovič lacked the theoretical linguistic knowledge, as well as the penetrating political-cultural thinking about the constitutive elements of the Slovak nation, which would enable him to substantively justify the historical right of Slovaks to an equal position with other nations in the historic Hungary. He argued that "*a nation only exists until it exchanges its own language for another one*" (Jankovič, 1945, p. 115), but at the same time - paradoxically - he emphasised that unlike Hungarian (he often called it "historic Hungarian language") Slovak language did not need any "further improvements" (Ormis, 1973, p. 400).

His position was reflected in the third part of the annex (*Scope and Difficulties*), in which he considered only the ways and means of spreading Hungarian as an official language throughout Hungary. In this context, the characteristics of two important natiological concepts – *nation* and *people* – are worth noting "*A nation is,*" according to him, "*a part of humanity, differing from others in its origin, speech, and numbers,*" and "*the people are the sum total of all the inhabitants of any State, which may consist of different nations, as in this country of Hungary*" (Ormis, 1973, p. 405). In contrast to the theoretically developed definitions of the nation, in this issue Čaplovič referred to the well-known authorities of philosophy and politics (Aristotle, Plato, Cicero, Montesquieu, and Filandieri), criticising them for "*leaving no precise definition*". We assume that the authorship of the above definition of a nation that lacks other ethnic factors such as history, territory, culture, and religion may be from Čaplovič. From the point of view of the above definition of the nation, not only Hungarians but also "Slavs" were a nation in Hungary, all of whom form the "*people of the Kingdom of Hungary*" (Ormis, 1973, p. 405). As for the definition of the term *people*, Čaplovič only expanded the content of the Latin term of "*regnicolae*" (inhabitants of a country); he did not consider that the people at this time were perceived as the broadest layer of society not belonging to the privileged, ruling, or wealthy layer of the population of the State, or of the nation. A substantial part of the text consists of Čaplovič's criticism of examples from the Hungarian press, which indiscriminately and "hoaxely" questioned Slovaks as members of the nation and their language as "*the language of blacksmiths and workers.*" Hungarians, on the other hand, were regarded as members of the "ruling" nation" (Ormis, 1973, p. 408).

In Annex No. 3 (*Čo sa naučili jeden od druhého Slovania a Maďari?*) (*What did Slavs and Hungarians Learn from Each Other?*) Čaplovič, on the basis of his own observations of Slovak, German, and Hungarian lexicon in various areas of economic, social, and cultural life, arrived at a realisation that refutes the conclusions in an article written by his classmate Jób Zmeškal (Ormis, 1973). Zmeškal, a Slovak renegade, stated many inaccuracies and untruths about the Slovaks and their relationship to the Hungarians in his article, which Čaplovič gradually questioned by the power of his own arguments. However, it must be stated that these arguments were more or less of an empirical-rational and historical nature. As he was not an expert in the field of philology, he did not argue with the views of the Slavists (especially of the Hungarian ones) and did not correct some of their misinterpretations about the relations between the old Hungarians and Slovaks in the Danube Basin. Nevertheless, later several well-founded linguistic-historical analyses of Slovak scientists such as Ján Stanislav, Eugen Paulíny, Rudolf Krajčovič, and others confirmed his interpretation of certain contexts of history on the Slovak-Hungarian border. Particular attention should be paid to two books by Ján Stanislav (Stanislav, 1999; 2004), in which he proved that before the old Hungarians arrived in the Danube basins, the border of today's Slovaks reached much further south.

The leitmotif of the eight “wonders” in Appendix No. 4 (*Mirabilia*), which Čaplovič found in several Hungarian printed periodicals (*Pesti Hírlap, Hirnök, Jelenkor, Társaldokó, Tudományos, Gyűjtemény*), is the evidence of various “*mirabilia*” that devalued the lives of the population. He focused especially on the special “wonders” in the Slovak setting: the voting of the Slovak nobility without knowing the content of the law codified in the Hungarian language; issuing diplomas in Hungarian instead of universal Latin; cooperation between the peoples of historic Hungary, lack of national pride, diligence and sensible governance, no loud demonstration of the slogans of the French Revolution in historic Hungary.

The last Annex No. 5 (*Odpoveď jedného Chorváta na súkromnú mienku istého kozmopolitu.*) (*A Croatian's Response to the Private Opinion of a Cosmopolitan*) contains both Čaplovič's critical response to an article by a “certain cosmopolitan” published in the Zagreb political German newspaper *Luna* on 11 June 1841 (Ormis, 1973) and his presumption that the Austrian Empire able to form a “fraternal community of happy nations” (Ormis, 1973, p. 429) assumes the role of the “front protective wall” for Hungarians, Hungarian Slavs, Germans, and Italians. Čaplovič's wish to turn to the Viennese imperial court with Slovak demands was not incidental. He perceived it,

like other Slovak patriots, as the rescue of Slovaks from Hungarian politics and the spread of the Hungarian language even where it was not necessary (Evangelical divine services, etc.). For this reason, he significantly assisted Ľudovít Štúr in modifying the proposal (more details in: Rapant, 1943) of the first public political appearance of the Slovak national movement and its requirements – the famous Slovak Petition handed over to Emperor Ferdinand V on 5 June 1842 in Vienna.

## CONCLUSION

During his relatively short life, Ján Čaplovič (who died in 1847, a year before a series of revolutions against the monarchies broke out in most of Europe) conducted meaningful journalistic, national, political, and edifying work appreciated by prominent personalities and editorial offices of Slovak political and nation-forming movement. By way of example, Jozef Miloslav Hurban is to be mentioned here, as he dedicated the first year of the *Nitra Almanac* to Čaplovič as his thanks for protecting Slovaks and Slavs (1842). Juraj Palkovič also devoted the second volume of the literary magazine *Tatránka* (1842) to him. The editors of *Slovenské národné noviny* and the *Tatrín* cultural association also expressed their admiration and thanks for his work for the benefit of the Slovak nation (Jankovič, 1945). Čaplovič, with his enlightenment attitudes, fearless formulation of national defence reflections, factual arguments in sharp discussion, polemics with non-partisans of Slovak identity, questioning of the efforts of Hungarian politicians wishing to change a multinational historic Hungary into a unified Hungarian political nation, with his prompt evaluation of current social and political situation and a search for political and diplomatic ways of addressing the unfavourable situation of the Slovak ethnic group within the Austrian monarchy, especially within the historic Hungary, indirectly accelerated the need for codification of the Slovak language in 1843, helped the Slovak national revival movement in the process of forming national awareness of Slovaks and inspired Slovak political thinking in the early decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century to a self-conscious presentation of rationally justified political projects of national independence.

## REFERENCES

AMBRUŠ, J. (1954). *Listy Ľudovíta Štúra I*. Bratislava, 1954.



- Apologetika. (2021). Available at: <https://sk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apologetika>. [Accessed 4. September 2021].
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1811). *Nucleus Plani tabularis sive synopticus decisionum curialium extractus*. Bratislava: Weber 1811.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1814a). *Novum facilem et utilem apes in duplicatis alvearibus colendi rationem omnibus apicolis commendat*. Wien 1814.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1814b). *Die Bienezucht in Doppelstöcken... I*. Wien, 1814.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1814c). *Die Bienezucht in Doppelstöcken... II*. Wien, 1814.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1817). *Zpráva včelárska o opatrovaní včel v dvojitych ulech s zvláštnym ohledem na magazýní, kláty a koše*. Vienna: Anton Dolla, 1817.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1818). Slowaken in Ungarn (podtitul Beweis dass die Slowaken in Ungarn Engländer sind. Halb, Ernst, halb Scherz.). In: *Hespereus*. No. 49, 55, 57, 59.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1819). *Slawonien und zum Theil Croatien. Ein Beytrag zur Völker und Länderkunde. Theils aus eigener Ansicht und Erfahrung (1809 – 1812), theils auch aus späteren zuverlässigen Mittheilungen der Insassen*. Vol. 2. Pešť: Hartleben, 1819.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1820). Slowaken in Ungarn (podtitul Beweis dass die Slowaken in Ungarn Engländer sind. Halb, Ernst, halb Scherz.). In: *Hespereus*. No. 19, 21, 22, 23.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1837). *Manuale legum urbarialium anni, 1836*. Viedeň: Mösle-Braumüller, 1837.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1838). O prirodzenom práve. In: *Századunk I*. No. 8, 17, 18.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1841a). *Synopsis legum de annis 1836 et 1840*. 14. Viedeň: Braumüller-Seidel, 1841.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1841b). Hlas zo Slovenska. In: *Květy*. No. 7-8.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1842a). *Slawismus und pseudomagyarismus. Vom aller Menschen Freunde, nur der Pseudomagyarismus Feinde*. Lipsko: Wigand, 1842.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1842b). *Rozjímaní o zmaďarování země Uherské*. Praha: Pospíšil, 1842.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1975). *O Slovensku a Slovákoch*. (Preložila, doslov a poznámky napísala Viera Urbancová). Bratislava: Tatran, 1975.
- ČAPLOVIČ, J. (1997). *Etnografia Slovákov v Uhorsku*. (Z rukopisu preložil, poznámky a doslov napísal Rudo Brtáň). Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 1997.
- ČAPLOVIČ, V. (2012). O djelu Jána Čaploviča. In: *Scrinia slavonica*. No. 12, pp. 497-519. Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/19759516.pdf> [Accessed 2. September 2021].

- GAŠPERÍK, J. (1927). *Pamätnosti včelárstva Slovenského, Memorabilia apiaria slovenica I.* (Literatúra z doby národného prebudenia Slovákov. Sosbieral Dr. Ján Gašperík). Bratislava: Zemské ústredie spolkov včelárskych pre Slovensko 1927.
- GBÚROVÁ, M. (2019). *Štefan Launer (1821-1851)*. Bratislava: Veda, 2019.
- HODŽA, M. (1920). *Československý rozkol*. Turčiansky sv. Martin, 1920.
- HRNKO, A. (2021). Spoluzitie Slovákov s Maďarmi v Uhorsku a maďarizácia. In: *Blog Antona Hrnka*. Available at: <https://www.hrnko.sk/2010/04/18/spoluzitie-slovakov-s-madarmi-v-uhorsku-a-madarizacia/> [Accessed 20. October 2021].
- JANKOVIČ, V. (1945). *Ján Čaplovič – život, osobnosť, dielo.* (Edícia Spisy historického odboru Matice slovenskej v Turčianskom Sv. Martine). Vol. 8. Martin: Matica slovenská, 1945.
- KABELÍK, J. (1926). Juraj Rohonyi a jeho obrany Slovanů, zvláště Slováků. In: *Sborník filosofický*. Vol. VIII, pp. 104-138.
- KAČALA, J. (1994). *Slovenčina – vec politická*. Martin: Matica slovenská, 1994.
- KAČALA, J. (2002). *Slovenčina pri mílnikoch slovenských dejín*. Trnava: Univerzita sv. Cyrila a Metoda 2002.
- KAČÍREK, Ľ. (2011). Modernizácia Uhorska v 19. storočí a slovenské národné hnutie. In: Martinkovič, M. ed. *Idey a vývoj Slovenského národovtorného myslenia*. Trnava-Krakov: Filozofická fakulta Trnavskej univerzity v Trnave, Spolok Slovákov v Poľsku, 2011.
- LAUNER, Š. (1847). *Povaha Slovanstva*. Lipsko. 1847.
- MESZÁROS, O. (2006). Paradoxy Jána Čaploviča alebo o jednom spôsobe marginalizácie. In: *Filozofia*. Vol. 61, No. 10. pp. 827-837.
- ORMIS, J. V. (1943). Dve vydania Šuhajdovej brošúry Der Magyairsmus in Ungaren. In: *Literárnohistorický sborník I.* pp. 36-37.
- ORMIS, J. V. (1967). Neznáma brožúra Pavla Senického. In: *Historický časopis*. Vol. XV, No. 1, pp. 46-62.
- ORMIS, J. V. (1973). *O reč a národ (Slovenské národné obrany z rokov 1832-1848)*. Bratislava: VEDA, 1973.
- PRAŽÁK, A. (1926). *Slovenské studie. Samuel Hojč*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, 1926.
- RAPANT, D. (1927). *K počiatkom maďarizácie I.* Bratislava, 1927.
- RAPANT, D. (1937). *Slovenské povstanie 1848-49. I.* Martin: Matica slovenská, 1937.
- RAPANT, D. (1943). *Slovenský prestolný prosbopis z roku 1842*. Vol. 2. Liptovský sv. Mikuláš: Tranoscius, pp. 49-55.

- RAPANT, D. (1947). *Ideálna maďarizácia 1790-1840*. Martin: Matica slovenská, 1947.
- REICHEL, D. (2009). *Kapitoly metodologie sociálných výzkumů*. Praha: Grand Publishing, 2009.
- SCRUTON, R. (1991). *Krátke dejiny novovekej filozofie*. Bratislava: Archa, 1991.
- SCHULZE, H. (2003). *Stát a národ v evropských dějinách*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lirové noviny, 2003, pp. 136-159.
- STANISLAV, J. (1999). *Slovenský juh v stredoveku*. Vol. 1. 2nd edition. Bratislava: Národné literárne centrum – Dom slovenskej literatúry, 1999.
- STANISLAV, J. (2004). *Slovenský juh v stredoveku. Slovník mien s mapovými prílohami*. Vol. 2. 2nd edition. Bratislava: Literárne informačné centrum, 2004.
- ŠTÚR, L. (1986). *Dielo I*. Bratislava: Tatran, 1986.
- TIBENSKÝ, J. (1964). Historická podmienenosť a spoločenská báza vzniku bernolákovského hnutia. In: Tibenský, J. ed. *K počiatkom slovenského národného obrodzenia. Zborník štúdií Historického ústavu SAV pri príležitosti 200. výročia jubilea narodenia Antona Bernoláka*. Bratislava: Veda, pp. 55-96.
- URBANCOVÁ, V. (1970). *Počiatky slovenskej etnografie*. Bratislava: Veda, 1970.
- ZURIAŇOVÁ, Ž. (1930). O brožúre Michala Miloslava Hodžu, „Der Slowak!“. In: *Prúdy*. Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 246-253.