Gáspár Károli Calvinist University
Faculty of Humanities
Institute of History
Doctoral School of History

PHD DISSERTATION
THESIS BOOKLET

Violetta Veres

German-Hungarian and Hungarian-German dictionary of terms of 19th century Hungarian history

Theoretical and practical issues of dictionary production

Consultants
Prof. Dr. Róbert Hermann DSc
Dr. habil. Ida Dringó-Horváth

2023

Timeliness and justification of the topic choice

There is no doubt that a high level of language skills has become more valuable today. In job advertisements, it is increasingly often stated that language skills are not only an asset but also an expectation. So language skills, and in particular professional language skills, are one of the most demanded non-tangible resources, the intellectual capital of the labour market, one of the most "valuable" parts of a CV.

The lower levels of the education system responded to this demand, with the number of bilingual institutions increasing, and more and more primary schools offering this form of education alongside secondary schools. The 'good' national minority schools were flooded with pupils with no connection at all to the historical nationalities of Hungary because of the target language education. In these institutions, one of the most common subjects taught in the target language is history. Surveys among students clearly show that history is the subject they find the most difficult of all subjects taught in a foreign language because of the many unfamiliar words. In this situation, the dictionary is considered to be the most effective learning aid.

In higher education, foreign-language works appear in the compulsory and recommended literature of history courses, even in the first semesters, and students also read and translate foreign-language sources during their reading practice. Graduate historians often work with various historical sources in foreign languages that are not available in their mother tongue, and they have to interpret, translate and integrate them into their work. Today, high-quality scientific research into the past is unthinkable without knowledge of the work of foreign colleagues, i.e. without reading, understanding, and, where appropriate, citing and referring to large amounts of literature in foreign languages. In addition to comprehension, the production of texts in foreign languages is also an expectation among those working in science. Historians publish in foreign languages, often work in international professional communities, and participate in transnational projects. Their results are often presented at international conferences.

The results of all disciplines are important in the life of a state. However, in the context of history and foreign languages, it should be mentioned that whether and how a nation communicates its own history to other countries is of utmost importance. The past of our country is intertwined with the past of many peoples and nations. Just think of the Turkish rule or the national diversity of the Habsburg Empire! However, the way each nation views its history may differ, just as there are different ways of judging a 'common event' in the past.

Presenting our own scholarly views on international platforms, especially today, is of the highest importance, and a high level of professional language skills is essential. History, as a recognised, exact science, has of course its own specialised language, which differs in certain respects from other specialised languages. However, there are no teaching aids available to support the acquisition of the language of history, although, as we have seen, the problem of this shortage affects three groups: 1) primary and secondary school students who study history in a foreign language, 2) history students and 3) historians. There is a complete lack not only of textbooks and exercise books, but also of modern language dictionaries and even glossaries, although the lack of the latter could be partially compensated by the former. These lexicographical reference works would not only ensure comprehension, but also, where appropriate, correct and historically appropriate (!) professional use of the vocabulary. Nor are there modern dictionaries for periods in which a large part of the sources are written in foreign languages, or on which, because of a common past, publications are regularly produced jointly with researchers from other countries or conferences are organised. The 19th century history of our country is such a period. We can see that by this time the role of Latin had already declined, but despite the strengthening of the Hungarian language, German still occupied a prominent place. In addition, we need knowledge of this language not only to interpret official documents, since the private documents of our best-known Hungarians were often written in German. Historians from the successor states of the Monarchy regularly take part in joint projects, in which, alongside English, the mediating role of German is still strong, of course.

Despite all these important facts, there is no language dictionary on the Hungarian book market that could help the study/work of the three groups mentioned above. Thus, in their case, the learning of the specialised language takes place without a dictionary. Furthermore, the number of students who speak German at a high level is decreasing. For understandable reasons, parents prefer that their children learn English and schools follow suit. English is now the first foreign language for most students, and many primary schools have stopped teaching German. We must therefore also expect that the researchers of the future 19th century will speak English at a higher level than German, and will have a real linguistic routine in the former. This generation will therefore have a particular need for a German-Hungarian-German dictionary, since a large part of the sources of the period are in German. Even today, these are being translated and published in Hungarian, but this is a long, intergenerational process, and if we leave a generation with little knowledge of the language of the sources without any aid, we risk slowing down and interrupting this important work.

In addition to the lack of dictionaries, it should be mentioned that other basic linguistic research, such as the general mapping of the language of historiography or the related meta-lexicographical studies, which are essential for their preparation, is also missing. The results of this scientific research are timely, complementary and could contribute to solving the problem outlined above.

Research objectives

This research had four main objectives:

1. **Compiling a German-Hungarian and Hungarian-German glossary of 19th century Hungarian history terms,**
2. **Identifying the needs and expectations of the historical dictionary genre and the linguistic difficulties of the target group,**
3. **Formulating complex methodological guidelines for the production of historical dictionaries,**
4. **Exploring the attributes of the language of historiography.**

To achieve the above objectives, I have formulated and carried out the following activities:

1. Reviewing the printed and electronic literature on the subject, both national and international, to analyse conference proceedings on the subject, to analyse existing dictionaries.
2. Collecting the concepts of the topic, create a mind map, define and clarify the concepts.
3. Examining the relationship between history and linguistics, including lexicography, and between the historian and language and language use.
4. Conducting an empirical research (questionnaire survey) to assess the expectations and needs of the target group of the dictionary.
5. Examination of the characteristics of historical terminology, clarification and comparison of the interpretation of sources in historiography and lexicography, identification of their specificities, general examination of the types of sources of 19th century Hungarian history.

6. Identifying the general challenges of historical dictionary writing from a historiographical perspective, independent of the period, and then to identify concrete, period-specific challenges for writing a 19th century linguistic dictionary. Based on this, develop proposals for solutions.

7. Staging the process of corpus-based historical lexicography and describing the stages, defining the content of the corpus, identifying the specificities of lemma selection, and identifying inefficient procedures.

8. Creating the dictionary in an electronic database, providing targeted information to IT specialists, communicating expectations (from a linguistic and historical point of view), displaying the dictionary online, checking usability from the user side and making corrections.

9. Reviewing and analysing the dictionary, formulating new features of the language of history.

Research process and methods

The research for this dissertation was preceded by a three-phase preliminary research, the first step of which was my MA thesis and my special prize thesis for the Hungarian student research conference (OTDK). The choice of these topics was a conscious one, and they can be seen as the first stage of a larger research project, as I explored the characteristics and challenges of German-language history education in Germany, and I also included a student glossary for 19th century history covering the curriculum of primary and secondary school students. In the thesis I assessed the difficulties, teaching aids and glossary needs of teachers of German history, the results of which I have taken into account in this dissertation. The second step of the preliminary research was to collect and interpret the information left out of the thesis and the OTDK dissertation, due to the principles of restriction, and to answer the questions left open in these theses. The third stage of the preliminary research was actually focused on the present doctoral thesis. I familiarised myself with the main theoretical and empirical findings on the subject, the debates and diverging views on the various topics, and then took stock of the methodological tools available. I focused on the difficulties, challenges and limitations of the topic and planned the necessary interventions when they arise. It was at this stage that I formulated one of the most important of the limitation criteria, that my research does not include historical lexicons, glossaries.

After the formulation of the scientific problem and the scientific questions to be answered, and the preparation of the research plan, I defined the research methods of each sub-research, and then I expanded and updated my knowledge in the field of methods with the help of domestic and modern research methodological publications and workshops. After the methodological elaboration and the above-mentioned research phases, the preparation of the dissertation began.

The main aim of the ***first chapter*** was to develop the conceptual framework (conceptualisation) and theoretical framework of the research. On the one hand, to integrate it into the *scientific knowledge already accumulated*[1] and on the other hand, to clarify the meaning of the main concepts of the topic. It was necessary to start with the rudimentary concepts of the subject, since lexicography is a young science and the most fundamental discussions are only now taking place among specialists. As definitions are controversial, and there is a lack of scientific consensus or convergent interpretations on fundamental issues, this was of particular importance. The first chapter was therefore essentially *a documentary secondary/theoretical study*, in which I summarised existing findings and, in places, added to or refuted them using *analogy* and the *(deductive and inductive) method of logical inference.*

In the ***second chapter*** I conducted a *complex basic research, which is missing* from the aspect of the research aim, in which I investigated the relationship between the historian and language, the historian's use of language and the relationship between history and linguistics, focusing on lexicography. This complex study was necessary because the under-researched nature of the topic meant that the most basic findings were missing. At the same time, without mapping the intersection of the two fields, exploring the interrelationships and characteristics, and stating the elementary facts, I could not have made a scientifically sound, user-focused decision on the criteria for lemma selection, and without some basic data, dictionary writing would not have been feasible. The chapter is therefore a *combination of theoretical and empirical research*, with an emphasis on the former. A part of it is documentary research, in which I obtained new results mostly by *deductive reasoning*. However, at the end of the chapter, when examining the lexicographic activities of historians, the *inductive logical method* led to the results.

To measure the role of foreign languages in historical research, I used a popular qualitative method, in-depth guided interviews. The *modelling method* that has been popular since the early 20th century also played an important role in this phase of the dissertation. I

---

[1]Imre Boncz: Basic knowledge of research methodology/Kutatásmódszertani alapismeretek, Pécs, Pécsi University Health Faculty, 2015, 18.

used it to construct my historian-foreign language use model (TörId-model), based on scientific observation across historical periods, and its validity was verified by the aforementioned series of in-depth interviews. In the analysis of historians' language use, in the construction of the foreign language use model, in the analysis of the relationship between historical research and lexicography, and in the identification of the lexicographic work of historians, the *classification/classification procedure* based on the *method of abstraction* was of paramount importance.

In the **third chapter**, I presented a questionnaire survey on language difficulties and vocabulary needs among history students. For this research, I carried out the necessary preliminary investigations in the preliminary research phase. I then formulated the *general aims* of the research, *conceptualised* the topic and selected *attributes that characterised the concepts* related to the topic (e.g. level of language proficiency: basic, intermediate, advanced; field of foreign language use in history: research, academic study, both, etc.), which later provided the general and conceptual basis for the questions. I created a *research design*, the information of which I have tabulated for clarity. After the formulation of the (main and sub-) hypotheses, I divided the study into three blocks according to its purpose: stratification, professional and research. I defined their objectives, formulated the main research questions related to them, then created and assigned to them the specific questions that would appear in the questionnaire, and checked the question-hypothesis matrix. I obtained the results of the survey, which involved more than five hundred participants, *using descriptive and mathematical statistics*. After analysing the results, I presented them in tables for easy transparency, drew conclusions and compared them with the hypotheses, and their relations were tabulated.

The **fourth chapter** is part *exploratory* and part *explanatory* research. In this section of the dissertation, I have explored the challenges of historical dictionary writing. The most glaring of these has been the lack of research on the complexity of the language of history. Through *text analysis*, I have highlighted some of the specificities of historical terminology. To ensure transparency, I *colour-coded* the analysed text. I further *classified* the words of the language under study within the general triple linguistic grouping of terms and illustrated the results with diagrams. I identified further reasons for the 'hybridity' of the historical dictionaries.

Using the method of *document analysis*, I presented the sources of historiography and lexicography, and then conducted a *comparative source analysis* to identify the differences in the interpretation of sources in the two disciplines. In the subsection, I also proposed the

introduction of a new scientific concept (lexicographic source criticism), which I *defined* according to the criteria of *scientific conceptualization*. It is important to note that it is in this chapter that we first observe the dominance of the methods and results of historiography.

At the end of the chapter, I presented the challenges of writing a historical dictionary, which I *classified* and grouped into two broad categories by topic (general and 19th century) and then further *differentiated*. In addition to identifying the difficulties, I have also offered solutions to them, thus creating a methodological collection for future dictionaries. It should also be stressed that the challenges identified could only be addressed by the *methods* and results *of historiography*, and that their knowledge and use were therefore indispensable.

The ***fifth chapter*** describes the creation of a historical dictionary, which is attached to the dissertation and which was also created online. The preparation of the dictionary was based on the *methodology of corpus lexicography, specialised lexicography and historical lexicography*, but the first phase of corpus compilation, the lemma selection and the dictionary article preparation was basically dominated by the *historical approach*. The sites of corpus collection were also mainly sites of historical research (library, archives, databases, museums, etc.) or sections of such research related to history. The sources of the corpus were also document types of historiography. In addition to the written source/technical literature dimension, we must also consider lexicographical source material that is typically closely related to history, such as maps, local directories, noble repositories, fonds and inventories, etc. The collection of corpus texts was assisted by bibliographies prepared by historians. In the selection of lemmas, it was possible to identify a high number of terms common to other disciplines, as well as terms from other disciplines closely related to history (military studies, ethnography, literary history, etc.). While in this section I tended to follow the guiding principles of historiography and its methods, in the source criticism section I was able to rely on *historical source criticism* only for part of the collection of texts in the corpus. In the later phases, *lexicographic source criticism* was more appropriate.

I also had to use basic IT methods to physically represent the dictionary. The most important of these was *database management*, as well as the creation of a platform to house the digital corpus and the *writing of a program* to provide the search principles I formulated. The latter was carried out by professional IT specialists, and the collaboration was based on effective *interdisciplinary communication*. Here, too, *analogy, deductive and inductive reasoning*, and continuous, broad-based *professional consultation* were important methods in the design and creation of the dictionary in terms of content. The presentation of the

compilation of the dictionary was carried out in such a way that it also served as a methodological guide.

Chapter six contains an analytical presentation of the new dictionary. The first steps in the analysis of the finished lexicographic reference work were *data analysis, content analysis and statistical analysis*. On the basis of what was presented in the first chapter, using the *methods of dictionary typology*, I classified the dictionary according to different adequate typologies, thus placing it in the lexicographic system and explaining its main features. This was followed by a further complex *meta-lexicographical study and analysis*. In accordance with the methodology of meta-lexicography, I carried out an analysis of *the structures, the word items and the word elements* (lexicographic and non-typographic elements). Here, in addition to the general statistical methods and the learned *structural analysis*, I was assisted by procedures such as simple *machine dictionary analysis, functional-positional segmentation and word item classification*. The process was concluded by *critical analysis and testing*.

After completing the dictionary and presenting it from several aspects, I drew new conclusions about the language by examining the lemma pool from a comprehensive, content-based perspective (*using the method of induction*).

Important elements of the whole process were *study trips* to Spain, Austria and Germany, during which I carried out *collection and control work* in national and university libraries, museums, archives and their libraries, the results of which I have incorporated into the thesis.

Summary

In the **first stage** of my research for the historical dictionary, I examined the literature on lexicography and clarified the concepts related to it, which are essential for the topic. This was supplemented by a study of the basics of dictionary typology, the general characteristics of specialised languages and the foundations of historical terminology.

1. Having analysed the process of creating an online historical dictionary, I have found that such a lexicographic reference work requires expertise in several fields of linguistics and clarification of concepts in many areas. The fact that I had to clarify a total of about 40 primary concepts for the planned dictionary, from which a considerable number of secondary concepts also needed to be clarified, demonstrated the complexity of the subject (Chapter 1).

2. In examining the unresolved issues of lexicography, I have found that new scientific problems arising from the explosive development of technology, the differentiation of science, the changing demands of society and the different needs of globalisation are "superimposed" on long-standing, unsolved old ones. Moreover, theoretical work (scientific research) is slow and difficult to keep pace with rapid change. But to solve new problems, it is necessary to clarify old ones. This, and the need for a consensus among the profession as soon as possible, is not only timely but also essential, because the shortcomings of theoretical lexicography are also a major obstacle to practical lexicographic work. (Chapter 1).

3. Analysing dictionary typology, it can be concluded that the genre classification and thorough analysis of a dictionary requires the simultaneous use of several existing dictionary typologies, previously created by experts, which must be selected specifically for the dictionary to be typed. I have also pointed out that, even with the combined use of several such typologies, it is not possible to avoid adding to them or omitting parts of them in order to adapt them to the dictionary under analysis. (1.2.2., 1.2.5., 1.2.6., 1.2.7.)

4. With regard to the use of dictionary typologies, it can be stated that in the case of the characterisation of a dictionary, emphasis should be placed on typification and justification of the chosen category. This kind of scientific justification is often missing in the relevant literature, although justification would draw attention to the specificity of the dictionary, its content, the linguistic layer covered, or even to the shortcomings of the typologies, as we have seen in the case of historical terminology and specialised dictionaries. In the course of my analysis, I have found that the typologies in the literature do not always make it clear, in the case of specific dictionaries, why and what underpins the typification or characterisation made by the author. (1.2.8.)

5. By examining the specificities of special forms of presentation of specialised dictionaries (online dictionaries), I found that in order for a dictionary to be classified as an "online dictionary", it is not sufficient for it to have a database, a website, a search engine and appropriate dictionary structures. If these criteria are met, the dictionary is "only" separated from the digital database and other lexicographic reference works. To be classified as an online dictionary, it must genuinely and adequately carry the specific features and characteristics of the dictionary typological category to which it belongs. (1.2.6.)

6. I have pointed out that online dictionary typology places less emphasis on typification by author/editor than others. I have also highlighted the need to reflect in the literature that there are sought-after and professionally excellent online dictionaries produced (and extended) by a single competent individual, despite the fact that optimal dictionary production is at least an inter-, but rather a multidisciplinary team effort. This is an indication of the existing "dictionary hunger" and the low number of dictionary projects being launched in relation to demand. At the same time, I have pointed out that the two-pillar author/editorial grouping adopted in most meta-lexicographical work is timely to be reviewed and expanded. By examining domestic and foreign dictionaries, I have identified a total of 6 groups. (1.2.6.)

7. I have found that the historical language is so under-researched that linguistic works focusing on the complexity of this language are only occasionally found in the international literature, and are completely absent in Hungarian. However, these would be indispensable in order to produce lexicographical works collecting the specialised language of historiography with sufficient scientific basis. (1.3.4)

8. I have found that some of the general classifications can be used in the field of history, but there are others which, in the absence of specific research results, we cannot yet decide whether they can be used in history. I have also pointed out that some of the most general features accepted by linguistics as being true for all languages are not appropriate for the language of history. (1.3.4.)

The **second part of the research** examined the relationship between the historian, historiography and language and linguistics, including lexicography, focusing on the main points that linguists assisting historians should take into account when researching historical terminology and writing historical dictionaries. I analysed whether those who use the language of history have the necessary knowledge of the language and the books, literature, glossaries and dictionaries that support it.

1. Looking at the relationship between history/historian's work and language from several angles, it can be concluded that the work of a research historian is based on written and spoken professional and vernacular language as a means of understanding and reception, as well as of creation and transmission of information. Language plays a prominent role in all the processes (6 phases) of the historian's work, yet there is little research available that examines the relationship between the historian and language in all the work processes.

2. I identified the ways in which the historian encounters and engages with language at each stage. I have highlighted that in the first three phases of the historian's research process (i.e. from the acquisition of prior knowledge to the critical analysis of historical data), language use is complicated by a number of factors. I have pointed out that linguists assisting historians in their work should therefore examine the language used by the historian from (at least) three angles. These are the language layers, the period/language specificity of the language history, and the mother tongue/foreign language issue. The three aspects can be summarised as follows:

a) the historian is working with several linguistic layers, with the linguistic conditions of several linguistic historical periods, which he or she must understand in almost the same way in order to achieve a successful result. Depending on the subject of his research, he or she must be able to deal correctly not only with the linguistic state of his or her own time and the time being researched, but in some cases also with the linguistic state of the in-between. The more distant your period is from the present, the more difficult it will be for your research to deal with these 'intermediate linguistic states'. (If there has been a paradigm shift in the historiography of a nation, territory or state, you must also be able to deal with the vocabulary that preceded it.)

b) analysing the relationship between historical research and foreign language use, I found that no (higher level) historical research can be carried out without foreign language use/knowledge, and that although the period of research strongly influences the appearance of languages in individual works, a general model of language use can be established (*Historian's foreign language use/Törld model*). On this basis, we can distinguish, in the case of historical research, *between a primary research foreign language, a secondary research foreign language, a mediating/diplomatic foreign language, a publication foreign language*. Although their importance and role for research varies, none is negligible. It can also be shown that, although the number of foreign languages used depends on the age and the subject, more than one, and sometimes 8-10 different foreign languages may be needed. The importance of foreign languages in the work of historians is further indicated by the fact that the need for a high number of foreign languages is independent of whether the subject of the research is Hungarian or universal history. Its importance is also indicated by the fact that, even for those working on

purely Hungarian history, the use of mother tongue sources and literature is very low. (2.1.)

3. I have found that, despite the fact that history has its own language and that foreign languages are of great importance in historical research, there are no auxiliary materials and courses available for students and professionals wishing to learn them, which have long been available in other languages (e.g. law, economics, military science). In this situation, those interested could benefit greatly from high-quality foreign language dictionaries, but these are also completely missing. (2.1.)

4. In examining the interface between history and linguistics, I have found that although linguistics is a recognised auxiliary science of history, there is an unspoken "research tradition": historical research primarily draws on historical comparative linguistics, sometimes on historical semantics. The other branches of linguistics are often ignored, despite the fact that they could be a useful aid, either in terms of providing new results or supporting research findings. It would be advisable to break with this 'tradition' and examine in more detail which branches of linguistics could be useful for research into which historical periods, and then integrate the results into the subject of the auxiliary sciences of history. (2.2.)

5. Analysing the relationship between historiography and lexicography, it can be concluded that
   a. the two sciences can mutually help each other to establish new scientific results, to verify them or to support the process leading to them;
   b. lexicography can play a *supportive and productive* role in the work of historians;
   c. historians also carry out practical lexicographic work (of a lexicographical nature), from which lexicography can also benefit. I have identified and illustrated six types of lexicographic work by historians,
   d. interfaces between the two sciences, the directions and methods of cooperation and the possibilities of integrating their results into education are not scientifically defined and developed, and I have proposed to research them. (2.2.)

In the **third stage of the research**, I conducted a questionnaire survey among history students to create a dictionary and to determine the expectations of dictionary users, including the lack of dictionaries and the difficulties of dictionary use. I summarise the results of the questionnaire survey on language difficulties and dictionary needs as follows:

1. The main foreign language used by respondents for their work is English, followed by German and the dead languages.

2. The majority of respondents use both literature and sources in a foreign language,

3. The respondents use a foreign language for both their studies and research, whether they are researching/studying Hungarian or universal history.

4. Respondents' knowledge of the foreign language used is intermediate or advanced, but they still have difficulties in understanding and expressing historical terms in a foreign language. For some, so much so that it impeded the progress of their work. This is particularly true in the case of the foreign language equivalents of Hungarian terms.

5. The vast majority of respondents use a dictionary frequently in their work and often need to use several dictionaries at the same time. Sometimes they still fail to find the term they are looking for.

6. Respondents cited the lack of dictionaries, difficult searches, lack of appropriate equivalents and, in such cases, the need to explain the term as a major difficulty in finding the right word..

7. In particular, those who use historical terms in a foreign language are uncertain whether the term found in the dictionary is correct from the point of view of historiography and whether it is appropriate for the period in question. The problem is compounded by the fact that, if they find several equivalents for a term, they are unable to judge which of these should be used in the period in question.

8. Researchers of Hungarian history primarily use German, followed by Latin. This group felt that their work was most hindered when they did not understand a technical term or an expression, and they were the most likely to have to use several dictionaries to find a technical term.

9. Most doctoral students research Hungarian history and chose German as their research language. The majority of doctoral students have an advanced level of German, but even so, there were some who were not always sure whether they were using the correct expression in a foreign language, and this is the group that most often had to use several dictionaries to find a specific term.

10. The overwhelming majority of respondents would benefit from a period-specific linguistic dictionary, both in paper and digital format.

11. With regard to the dictionary, it was found that the most requested terms are military history, social history, religious history, economic history and political history, but over 10% would like to have terms from other fields of history in addition to these.

12. The majority of respondents mentioned the criteria of accuracy, authenticity, sophistication, ease of search, but also the need for period indication, example sentences, pictures, diagrams, source indication and the possibility of interactivity (Chapter 3)

In the **fourth phase** of the research, I examined the challenges of producing a bilingual historical dictionary in order to provide methodological suggestions for the problems encountered in the dictionary production process. This involved further research on historical terminology and the identification of the challenges and possible solutions to the dictionary production process. In this chapter, I examined the challenges that arise from the specific characteristics of historiography, or which are lexicographic in nature but which can be addressed by historiography. On this basis, I have made the following observations and suggestions:

1. After a statistical analysis of the texts of historians' publications, I found that both modern language and contemporary language (source citations) are present in them, the weight of the latter was confirmed by statistical results, so it can be concluded that a corpus for a historical dictionary should include contemporary source texts in addition to modern literature, and therefore I based the dictionary on this. (3.1.)

2. A review of the technical terms and vocabulary shows that

    a) here we can also identify 1) general colloquial words, 2) common specialised words and 3) specialised words. However, a further analysis of the terms shows that the three groups can be further differentiated from a word-historical point of view, i.e. they can be further subdivided into modern and contemporary terms.

    b) there is a set of common, colloquial words in the discipline of historiography, in which the common words have already had an underlying meaning in the period, or have been given an underlying meaning by historiography. Within these, we can distinguish between simple and compound words and phrasemes according to their structure.

    c) there is a group of specialised languages of history, distinct from other specialised languages. It is a set of words that are inherently common in the vernacular, which

have been forgotten or have even died out in modern language (archaisms), but which are essential for historiography to describe a phenomenon. It is therefore because of their extinction from the vernacular that general words have become specialised terms, understood only by specialists in the study of the past.

d) it is an open question whether historiography has a workshop language, i.e. a professional public language; this could not be detected from the corpus texts, so further research is needed to answer this question. (4.1.)

3. When creating a historical dictionary, it should be taken into account that historical dictionary writing is a "hybrid" phenomenon, since it requires knowledge of at least two disciplines (historiography and lexicography), knowledge of not only the language of the historical period but also of modern terminology, as well as the historical sources and literature. Historical lexicography is thus both a lexicographic and a historical lexicographic work, and the associated meta-lexicographic research must also branch out in both directions.. (4.2.)

4. It should be noted that the interpretation and typology of the two sciences differ. Therefore, when communicating or using scientific results, it is necessary to specify and distinguish whether we are talking about lexicographical or historical sources. (4.3.)

5. When comparing historical and lexicographical sources, it can be concluded that the two disciplines may treat the same document as a source of a different level, and therefore the source type must be specified by the dictionary producer. (4.3.)

6. In order to assemble the lexicographic sources of a historical dictionary according to the criteria of science, we need to examine the historical source results for a given period, which determine the most common types of historical sources for that period. (4.3.2.)

7. It can be concluded that historical source criticism is a widespread concept and method, on the basis of which I have investigated whether there is a justification for such a method in lexicography. As a result, I have proposed a concept of lexicographic source criticism and its application. (4.3.4.)

8. In analysing the difficulties of compiling a historical dictionary, I identified general and period-specific (19th century) difficulties. These are found in all dictionary structures. I have also proposed solutions to the difficulties identified. (4.4.)

9. I identified and examined ten difficulty variables in writing a dictionary of historical terms related to the 19th century. I have identified the points where the historical

aspects override the lexicographical aspects. This may serve as a methodological aid to others in writing future historical dictionaries. (4.5.)

After that, in the **fifth stage**, I defined the process of creating a German-Hungarian and Hungarian-German dictionary of 19th century Hungarian history terms, its stages and the contents of the stages. The chapter shows the linguistic and lexicographical solutions of the dictionary production, referring to the results of the previous chapter where necessary. All this is intended as a methodological guide and can be used by those who undertake to write historical dictionaries.

1. Dictionary preparation, lemma selection, dictionary article creation and computer presentation can be divided into phases. The main stages are further subdivided into tasks which are logically interrelated and interdependent. (5.1.)

2. In order to be able to collect the primary sources of the dictionary with scientific rigour, I had to define the boundaries of the basic vocabulary of 19th century historical terminology, and give criteria for its definition (narrowing). In doing so, it was necessary to take into account, among other things, the needs of the target group and the achievements and traditions of historiography in this period. (5.2.2.)

3. It can be concluded that the most different and decisive phase of historical dictionary writing from the production of other types of (corpus-based) dictionaries is the definition of the principles of compilation of the corpus, its compilation and use, and their complexity. This is a special task because it must include documents from both the present and the period in question (historical sources and specialised literature), select documents appropriate to all target groups and, in addition, include documents in both Hungarian and German (hybridity). (5.2.3.)

4. Examining the problem of the volume of lexicographic resources involved, I have found that the first step is to create an "aggregated" corpus, in which categories by level of need, genre and language are created and on which a program is written that allows the categories to be associated according to need, i.e. to create appropriate "sub-corpus" from the aggregated corpus. (5.2.3.)

5. I also confirmed that in the writing of a historical dictionary, although there are possibilities to reduce subjectivity at the lemma selection stage, it is not completely impossible, and therefore it is necessary that the participants in the specific dictionary writing include a person who is sufficiently well trained in the history of the period in question, and that regular professional consultation is not neglected.

6. As a by-product of the study, one of the most common methods of selecting lemmata, the frequency test, is not an appropriate method for a historical dictionary covering a large period of time, because the result will not be satisfactory from the point of view of historiography. However, the method can be used for narrowing down on smaller topics, as well as to help in the retention or deletion decision on a lemma. (5.2.4.)

7. Practice has shown that the preparation of a dictionary covering a whole century with scientific ambition, in the course of which the results of both historiography and lexicography are properly reflected, is a long process, spanning several years and requiring continuous professional consultation.

In the **sixth phase** of the research, a general presentation of the completed German-Hungarian-German Historical Dictionary (MNTSZ), its genre and type classification, an analysis of its features, and a presentation of the website serving as a publication platform were presented. The chapter is thus a dictionary-analytical, meta-lexicographical, dictionary-critical work. On this basis, we can conclude that

1. I have created a bilingual, non-profit, (yet) limited-scale, non-alphabetic dictionary for direct use, electronic, including online, covering a field of the profession, which can be extended by the Community. (6.1.)

2. The dictionary has a three-level lemma collection: It covers the entire period-related vocabulary of elementary and secondary school students studying history in German, contains the basic vocabulary of the era (students) and in addition, provides a higher level of history-knowledge (researchers) vocabulary in several areas.

3. The dictionary can be accessed from a web page. The final database is stored on a dedicated server, the words are stored in the MySQL database. The online dictionary works with search optimization. I also emphasized that although the users' knowledge and tools are different, they have the same chance of using the dictionary.

4. The dictionary has mega-, macro- and microstructure. In its megastructure, special texts related to history education and research are available. (6.2., 6.3.)

5. It contains a total of 15,383 lemmas, of which 7,606 are Hungarian and 7,777 are German. These include nouns, adjectives, verbs, and constant phrases. (6.3.)

6. The dictionary can be extended by the Community, but the approval is the author's authority, which guarantees the extension according to scientific criteria. (6.2.1.)

7. The dictionary's entries contain useful, clarifying and helpful information for historiography, which I have grouped into 12 categories. (6.3.)

8. The dictionary has been designed to provide users with a proper base for presenting the various fields of Hungarian history of the 19th century (history of events, history of law, economic history, history of costumes, history of science and technology, history of religion, political history, social history, history of women, history of culture, history of nationalities and military history) in a foreign language (if they have a sound knowledge of the language), so it does not only support comprehension. In addition, it helps to place events in context.

After the dictionary was completed, I examined its lemma inventory in order to make new findings, to obtain new results or to confirm existing ones in relation to the **language of historiography.** On this basis, I found that

1. MNTSZ and the corpus compiled for its preparation have demonstrated that the discipline of historiography can be divided into two large sets, the modern and the contemporary. It is only by understanding and using these two sets together that the events of the past can be interpreted and described in a scientific way,

2. the lemma pool showed that the language of history has a high proportion of vocabulary in common with other disciplines, and that these disciplines are very diverse. The link is not limited to a few disciplines, or even to a single discipline.

3. by looking at the numerical data of the lemmata of the dictionary I have compiled, we can say that nouns and stative nouns dominate. Among other things, this shows that phraseologisms play a prominent role in this language, which lexicography must not only take into account but also respond to in an appropriate way.

4. the vocabulary is not dominated by English. Although there are still some terms that are taken over from a foreign language, while in the case of modern terminology they are mostly derived from the dominant English language (e.g. manager), the vocabulary of the language of history is not dominated by English foreign words. The lingua franca of the period and field (e.g. lex) and the influences on the speakers of the language (historical processes, e.g. odbor) are the determining factors in the language. The modern vocabulary set is not as dominated by English as other specialised languages.

5. from the lemma pool, I found that there are also differences in the area of standardisation compared to other languages. A significant number of historical terms are not suitable for international standardisation, since, as we have seen, the different

interpretations of history in different nations and the underlying meaning, emotion, etc., of the terms make this impossible for certain important terms.

6. no modern workshop jargon was identified in the corpus. However, based on an examination of the corpus texts and the MNTSZ, it can be said that there is a workshop language within the contemporary vocabulary of historiography, which was used interchangeably by the linguists of the period. An example of this is the term 'fat Berta'/'dicke Bertha', which had an official name in both periods, e.g. bombarda, mortar 42, etc. However, in today's historical literature, these are considered equivalent vocabulary.

7. titles of the famous press products and written works of the period (e.g. Hitel/Világ/Stadium by István Széchenyi) are part of the historical language, since without them the period cannot be described and they have often become terms that go beyond themselves in historiography,

8. names of the most important clubs, associations, institutions, honours and awards are part of the historical language, because without them, an era cannot be described, no biographies can be written. Consequently, the proportion of proper nouns is high in this language, especially in comparison with scientific languages.

Usefulness, recommendation

I recommend the use of the dictionary attached to my thesis mainly to the following groups:

1. for primary and secondary school pupils studying history in German,

2. for primary and secondary school teachers of history in German,

3. for primary and secondary school teachers of German target language civilisation,

4. for primary and secondary school pupils learning German target language civilisation,

5. for history and history teacher students,

6. for university lecturers teaching history and history teacher students,

7. for research historians,

8. for other groups whose work is in some way related to the period: translators, ethnographers, archivists and librarians, museologists, museum educators, minority researchers, linguists, researchers into the history of the various professions.

I recommend the results of this thesis to the following groups:

1. for linguists working in theoretical and practical lexicography, specialised lexicography and historical lexicography,

2. for historians,

3. for professionals working in and teaching the auxiliary sciences of history,

4. for language teachers,

5. for researchers of language teaching and specialised language training,

6. for staff and researchers from national minority and bilingual institutions,

7. for education policy makers.

The author's main publications on the subject

1. Violetta Veres: Teaching history in bilingual schools, Gáspár Károli Calvinist University, OTDK thesis, 33rd OTDK, Learning and Teaching Methodology - Knowledge Technology Section, Győr, 2017.

2. Violetta Veres: The situation of bilingual schools in Hungary, in Paszkál Kiss– Dóra Tóth (ed.): Ubi dubium, ibi libertas, L'Harmattan, Budapest, 2017.

3. Violetta Veres: Universal dictionary history overview, KRE-DIt, 2021/1. Source: http://www.kre-dit.hu/tanulmanyok/veres-violetta-egyetemes-szotartorteneti-attekinto/

4. Violetta Veres: Questionnaire survey on professional difficulties and vocabulary needs among teachers of history in German, in Viktor Csanádi– György Tamás Farkas– Gyopárka Jakab – Köves– Gabriella Jeki– Gergő Segesdi– Dániel Tóth-Gyóllai (ed.): Studia Iuris Historiae et Theologiae, Gáspár Károli Calvinist University Doctoral Student Self-government, Budapest, 62-80. Source: http://www.kre-dit.hu/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Studia-Iuris-Historiae-et-Theologiae-2021.pdf

5. Vivien Rapali– Violetta Veres: „Progress was my slogan too, but I was never a friend of extremes." memories of Mihály Perlaky (1814–1889), Lymbus – Magyarságtudományi Forrásközlemények, 2021, 59–90.

Key presentations on the subject by the author

1. Violetta Veres: History and lexicography, History and inter-disciplinarity conference, Gáspár Károli Calvinist University, Budapest, 2017.

2. Violetta Veres: History, linguistics, military science, Inter-disciplinarity is the hidden resource of science conference, National University of Public Service, Budapest, 2018.

3. Violetta Veres: The main 19th century sources of research on Hungarian military terminology, Challenges, Opportunities, Solutions conference, National University of Public Service, Budapest, 2018.

4. Violetta Veres: Do we need a historical dictionary? Horizons and Dialogues 4th International Conference, Pécs, 2018.

5. Violetta Veres: Publishing scientific results using modern pedagogical methods, See and be seen 2nd conference, National University of Public Service,, 2018.

6. Violetta Veres: Questionnaire survey on language difficulties and vocabulary needs among history students, 24th Spring Wind Conference, Miskolc, 2021.

7. Violetta Veres: Questionnaire survey on professional difficulties and vocabulary needs among teachers of history in German, Multidisciplinary Conference, Gáspár Károli Calvinist University, Budapest, 2021.