

SUPPRESSING THE MEMORY OF SLOVAK PANSLAVISM: THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL MISREPRESENTATION OF KOLLÁR AND ŠTÚR

ALEXANDER M A X W E L L

MAXWELL, Alexander. Suppressing the Memory of Slovak Panslavism: The Historiographical Misrepresentation of Kollár and Štúr. *Historický časopis*, 2023, 71, 2, pp. 249–277, Bratislava.

In the first half of the nineteenth century, intellectuals from northern Hungary usually believed in a single Slavic nation speaking a single language. They imagined Slovaks not as a nation but as a “tribe” of the Slavic nation, and Slovak as a “dialect” or even a “subdialect” of the Slavic language. Modern historians and linguists, however, are so extraordinarily unwilling to acknowledge nineteenth-century Panslavism that many falsify primary source quotations, particularly as concerns the language/dialect dichotomy which features prominently in Panslav linguistic thought: where historical actors refer to a “dialect”, modern scholars substitute the term “language”. The end result is to transform Panslavs into particularist Slovak nationalists. This paper documents the Panslavism of Jan Kollár and Ľudovít Štúr, documents the misrepresentation of their ideas in recent historiography, and speculates why so many scholars refuse to acknowledge past Panslavism.

Keywords: Panslavism. Slovak history. Slavic Languages. Linguistic Classification.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/histcaso.2023.71.2.3>

In the first half of the nineteenth century, many Slavic intellectuals believed in a single “Slavic nation” speaking a single “Slavic language”. They typically characterized Russian, Polish, Czech, and so forth as “dialects” of a greater Slavic whole. Indeed, several engaged in language planning on behalf of that Slavic language, forming literary or scholarly networks with savants in other Slavic countries, founding literary journals that published poetry from all parts of the Slavic world, and writing grammars or other works of language planning in the hopes of bringing the Slavic varieties closer together. Slavs engaged in this sort of activism typically characterized themselves as “Panslavs”.

Panslavism, as practiced in the nineteenth century, no longer attracts much passion: it has been almost wholly supplanted by alternate national concepts. Nevertheless, many of the particularist nationalisms that currently command

popular loyalty in the Slavic world emerged only in surprisingly recent times. Comparing the early twenty-first century map of Europe with the taxonomy of “Slavic tribes [*slavische Volkszweige*]” listed in Jernej Kopitar’s 1810 “patriotic fantasies of a Slav” reveals that five internationally-recognized states (Belarus, Bosnia, Montenegro, North Macedonia, and Ukraine) bear the name of a titular Slavic nationality unknown to one of the greatest Slavists of the early nineteenth century.¹ The great transformations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have changed how Slavs understand themselves, their nationalities, and their language(s). The present, in short, differs from the past.

Nevertheless, a surprising number of scholarly works go to great lengths to efface the difference between the past and the present. Scholars pretend that nineteenth-century actors espoused contemporary ideas by “correcting”, “clarifying”, or otherwise changing the wording of the primary sources they cite, altering the meaning of key passages. These alterations flout one of the most basic scholarly conventions regarding the use of quotations, namely, that text inside quotation marks should not be altered. Scholars have also developed specious theories that basic words have changed their meaning, despite readily available evidence to the contrary.

This paper examines the scholarly depiction of Jan Kollár and Ľudovít Štúr. It begins by documenting their Panslav beliefs at a level of detail that some readers may initially find excessive, reproducing the key words for “language” or “dialect” in the original languages (mostly Slavic or German, but occasionally Latin). The paper then cites secondary literature summarizing or even quoting Kollár and Štúr, showing that translations, summaries and quotations are not accurate. Skeptical readers are urged to consult the original texts for themselves; the original works of Kollár and Štúr are readily available online. The paper concludes with possible explanations for the sorry state of current scholarship. It suggests that nationalist pride plays a secondary role: the main problems are instead anachronistic thinking and the tendency to conflate nationalism with a quest for statehood.

Much of the argument rests on the terminology used to express the language/dialect dichotomy and its translation from Slavic to English or German, so it may be useful to begin with a survey the dichotomy’s history. The word “dialect” ultimately derives from the Ancient Greek word *διάλεκτος* [*diálektos*], which in antiquity referred to both regional varieties of Greek and non-Greek varieties, such as Latin and Egyptian. During the Middle Ages, scholars used the term primarily with reference to regional varieties of Greek. In the 1500s, however,

1 KOPITAR. Patriotische Phantasien eines Slaven. In *Vaterländische Blätter für den österreichischen Kaiserstaat*, 1810, Vol. 3, no. 9, pp. 87-88.

Neo-Latin scholars generalized from “regional variety of Greek” to “regional variety of any language.” During the sixteenth century, furthermore, the term passed into modern European languages. Raf van Rooy dates the Spanish word *dialecto* to 1540, the Italian *dialetto* to 1544, the French *dialecte* to 1550, the English *dialect* to 1566, the Dutch *dialect* to 1614, and the German *Dialect* (later *Dialekt*) to 1634.²

Early modern language purism, however, produced terminological alternatives. The German term *Mundart*, for example, dates back to 1640. Its inventor, language reformer Philipp von Zesen, sought expunge loanwords from the German lexicon, and is today perhaps best known for attempting to replace *Nase* [nose] with the grotesque *Gesichtserker* [face balcony].³ Though the word *Gesichtserker* did not endure, many of his neologisms thrived, including the word *Mundart*.

Purism also inspired a Slavic term that in modern Russian, modern Ukrainian, and modern Bulgarian is written as наречие [*narechie*], in modern Croatian as *narječje*, in modern Czech as *nářečí*, in modern Polish as *narzecze*, in modern Slovak as *nárečie*, and so on. All these variant terms descend from the same proto-Slavonic roots, which Rik Derksen has reconstructed as **na* “on(to), in(to)” and **rěčь* “language; word”.⁴ These compound words, which in all their variant spellings might collectively be described as “descendants of **na* + **rěčь*”, were first associated with the language/dialect dichotomy in Sergej Volchkov’s 1755 French-German-Latin-Russian dictionary, published in Saint Petersburg. Volchkov’s lexicon translated the French word *dialecte* into Russian as both Діалектъ [*Dialektъ*] and нарѣчіе [*narěchie*].⁵ Two other Russian dictionaries followed Volchkov’s lead before the century ended.⁶

In the late eighteenth century, lexicographers from other parts of the Slavic world, following the Russian example, began associating descendants of **na* + **rěčь* with the subordinate half of the language/dialect dichotomy. In 1790, a Serbian dictionary published in Vienna equated Нарѣчіе with German

2 ROOY. Διάλεκτος, *Dialectus*, Dialect: A Word’s Curious Journey from Ancient Greek to (Neo) Latin and Beyond. In *Latomus: Revue d’études latines*, 2019, Vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 749-53; see also ROOY. *Language or Dialect? The History of a Conceptual Pair*. Oxford 2020.

3 PFALZGRAF. Linguistic Purism in the History of German. In HORAN and LANGER, eds. *Landmarks in the History of the German Language*. Oxford 2009, p. 146.

4 DERKSON. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden 2008, 433.

5 VOLCHKOV. *Novoj leksikon na Francusskom, Nemeckom, Latinskom, i na Rossijskom*. St. Petersburg 1755, p. 1:763.

6 HÖLTERHOF. *Rossiiskoi Tsellarius ili poleynoj leksikon / der russische Cellarius*. Moskva: Universitetskaja tipografija, 1771, pp. 429, 610; RODDE. *Deutsch-Russisches Wörterbuch*. Riga 1784, p. 517.

Mundart;⁷ an “Illyrian” dictionary subsequently equated *Narěče* with both German *Mundart* and *Dialekt*.⁸ Lexicographers in Bohemia and Moravia equated the word *nářečj* with the German *Mundart*,⁹ with both Latin *Dialectus* and German *Mundart*,¹⁰ or alternatively equated the word *nářeči* with the German word *Dialekt*.¹¹ Polish scholars translated *narzecz* with French *dialect* and German *Mundart*,¹² or alternatively translated German *Mundart* with Slavic *dyalekt* and *narzecze*.¹³ Savants from Slavic northern Hungary, the territory that would eventually become the Slovak republic, followed the usage of other Slavs. Though Bernolák’s posthumously published dictionary contains no entry for any descendant of **na + *rěčь*,¹⁴ Juraj Palkovič equated *nářečj* with both Latin *dialectus* and German *Mundart*.¹⁵

The language/dialect dichotomy did not, however, satisfy Pavel Josef Šafařík (1795–1861), the most important Slavic savant from northern Hungary, and a key figure in nineteenth-century Slavic studies generally. Šafařík’s name, as Robert Pynsent noted, “is a problem,”¹⁶ since he variously published as “Ssaffarjck”, “Šafařjk”, “Schafarik”, “Schaffarik” and “Šafařík”. Modern Slovak scholars usually refer to him as “Pavol Šafárik,” but Czech scholars prefer Šafařík, a spelling which finds precedent in Šafařík’s own usage. Šafařík’s 1826 *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten* [History of the Slavic Language and Literature in all Dialects], published when Šafařík was around 31 years old, introduced additional classificatory layers for describing the relationships between different Slavic varieties. Šafařík divided the Slavic “*Sprachstamm* [language tree]” into two *Ordnungen* [orders], each *Ordnung* into *Mundarten*, and finally selected *Mundarten* into *Unterarten*. For example, he

7 AVRAMOVIĆ. *Němécij i sérbsij slovár’ na potrebu sérbskago naroda / Deutsch und Illyrisches Wörterbuch zum Gebrauch der illyrischen Nation*. Wien 1790, p. 493.

8 DROBNIĆ. *Ilirsko-němačko-talianski mali rěčnik*. Wien 1849, p. 78.

9 SYCHRA. *Versuch einer böhmischen Phraseologie*. Brno 1821, pp. 1:165, 1:412.

10 CHMELA. *Lateinisch-Böhmisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch / Latinsko-česko-německý slovník*. Hradec Králové 1830, p. 119; JUNGSMANN. *Slovník česko-německý*. Praha 1835, p. 2:608.

11 KONEČNÝ. *Opulný Kapesní slovník čechoslowanského a německého jazyka / Vollständiges Taschen-Wörterbuch der chechoslawischen u. deutschen Sprache*. Wien 1845, p. 211.

12 BANDTKIE. *Nowy słownik kieszonkowy niemiecko-polsko-francuzki*. Wrocław 1839, p. 2:238.

13 TROJAŃSKI. *Ausführliches deutsch-polnisches Handwörterbuch zum Gebrauche für Polen und Deutsche, vol. 1*. Poznań 1844, pp. 109, 917.

14 BERNOLÁK. *Slovár Slowenski= Česko= Latinsko= Německo= Uherski seu Lexicon Slavicum*. Buda 1825-27.

15 PALKOVIČ. *Böhmisch-deutsch-lateinisches Wörterbuch*. Praha 1820, p. 1036.

16 PYNSENT. *Questions of Identity: Czech and Slovak Ideas of Nationality and Personality*. Budapest 1994, p. 215.

depicted Silesian as an *Unterart* of the Polish *Mundart* of the Slavic language, and “Little Russian” as an *Unterart* of the Russian *Mundart* of Slavic. In his early thirties, Šafařík depicted Slovak as a separate *Mundart* from Bohemian.¹⁷

By the time Šafařík had reached his late 40s, however, his thinking had evolved. In his most influential work, *Slovanský národopis* [Slavic ethnography], he introduced an even more complex taxonomy containing no fewer than seven labeled layers. The mature Šafařík divided *howor lidský*, a phrase that might be glossed as “human speech”, into *jazyky* [languages]. He then divided a *jazyk* into *mluwy*, a *mluwa* into *řečí*, a *řeč* into *nářečí*, a *nářečí* into *podřečí*, and a *podřeč* into *různořečí*. Šafařík specifically imagined the “Slavic language [*jazyk slowanský*]” divided into four *mluvy*, which were in turn divided into seven *řečí*, in turn divided into fourteen *nářečí*. Šafařík concluded that “many of these *nářečí* are subdivided into various *podřečí*, whose number is not yet known”.¹⁸ Šafařík’s seven-layer taxonomy inserts two layers (the *mluwa* and the *řeč*) between the *jazyk* (= language) and the *nářečí* (= dialect). Since to the best of my knowledge no Anglophone scholar has ever devised a layered taxonomy with two levels sandwiched between the “language” and the “dialect”, Šafařík’s terms do not translate into English. Nevertheless, observe that the mature Šafařík subsumed the varieties of each layer within the varieties in the layer above. He specifically classified the Slovak *nářečí* within the broader Czech *řeč*.

Šafařík seven-layer taxonomy proved influential, even if Šafařík’s contemporaries routinely relabeled the various layers. Osip Bodjanskij’s Russian translation, for example, replaced Šafařík’s *mluwa* with the *говор* [*govor*].¹⁹ Piotr Dalhman’s Polish translation changed half of Šafařík’s labels: though he equated Šafařík’s *nářečí*, *podřečí* and *různořečí* with the *narzecze*, *podrzecze* and *różnorzecze*, he divided human speech into *mowy*, a *mowa* into *idiomy*, an *idiom* into *języki*, and a *język* into *narzecza*.²⁰ Other variants were proposed by scholars in Galicia,²¹ or in Carinthia.²² Michal Miloslav Hodža, a scholar who shared Šafařík’s origins in northern Hungary’s Slavic Lutheran intelligentsia, also modified Šafařík’s spelling: Hodža not only used the term *podnářečie* interchangeably with *podřečie*, but replaced Šafařík’s labels *jazyk – mluwa – řeč*

17 ŠAFAŘÍK. *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten*. Buda 1826, p. 26.

18 ŠAFAŘÍK. *Slowanský Národopis*. Praha 1842, pp. 1:3, 1:5-6.

19 ŠAFAŘÍK. *Slavjanskoe narodopisanie*. Translated by Osip Bodjanskij. Moskva 1843, p. 3.

20 ŠAFAŘÍK. *Slowiański narodopis*. Translated by Piotr Dahlmann. Wrocław 1843, p. 4.

21 HOLOVATSKI, Jakov. *Istoricheski ocherk osnovanija Galitsko-Ruskoi Matitsě*. Lviv 1850, pp. 24-25.

22 MAJAR. *Uzajemni pravopis Slavjanski*. Praha 1865, pp. 1-2; MARN. *Pomenki o slovenskem pisaniji*. In *Jezičnik, ali pomenki o slovenskem pisanji*, Vol. 5. Ljubljana 1867, pp. 9-10.

– nářečí – podřečí – různorečí with the variants *jazyk – mluva – řeč – nářečí – podřečí/podnářečí – různorečí*.²³ A subsequent textbook, citing Šafařík via Hodža, replaced Hodža’s *różnorečie* with *rôznorečie*.²⁴ Selected variant spellings are summarized in table 1.

Figure 1: Labels assigned to multi-layer linguistic taxonomies

Šafařík	1842	Jazyk	Mluwa	Řeč	Nářečí	Podřečí	Různořečí
Bodjanskij	1843	Язык	Говор	Рѣчь	Нарѣчіе	Подрѣчіе	Разнорѣчіе
Dahlmann	1843	Mowa	Idiom	Język	Narzecze	Podrzecze	Różnorzecze
Hodža	1848	Jazyk	Mluva	Reč	Nářečie	Podřečie	Różnorečie
Holovatsky	1850	Языка	Мова	Рѣчь	Нарѣчіе	Пôдрѣчіе	Рôзнорѣчіе
Majar	1865	Prostorečje	Mluva	Govor	Nareče	Podreče	Raznoreče
Černý	1865	Jazyk	Mluva	Reč	Nářečie	Podřečie	Różnorečie
Marn	1867	Jezik	Mluva	Reč	Narečie	Podrečie	Różnorečie

The lexical and orthographic diversity visible in Figure 1 should not conceal certain common features. All these taxonomies assigned descendants of **na* + **rěčь* to label the same layer of the taxonomy, namely, the third layer from the bottom. In terms of the language/dialect dichotomy, furthermore, all these scholars treated descendants of **na* + **rěčь* as a subcategory of all other non-compound labels. They variously imagined descendants of **na* + **rěčь* as subcategory of the *Jazyk / Język / Jezik / Языкь*, of the *Mluwa / Mluva / Mowa / Mova*, of the *Řeč / Reč / Рѣчь*, of the *Govor / Говор*, of the *Idiom*, and of the *Prostorečje*.

With this terminological overview in mind, let us turn to the thought of Kollár and Štúr. The discussion below focuses on how these two thinkers understood the Slavic world, and the status assigned Slovak and Slovaks with that broader Slavic context. Though Kollár and Štúr ultimately differed on the precise status of Slovak, both followed Šafařík in positing a “Slavic language”.

Jan Kollár’s Pan Slavism: The Slavic Language and its Dialects

Jan Kollár (1793 – 1852), who in defiance of subsequent convention did not publish as “Ján”, was born in the town of Mošovce, then part of Turóc county in the Kingdom of Hungary. A Protestant pastor and an influential poet, Kollár published several works, including songbooks, collections of sermons, and various pamphlets on patriotic themes. He is best remembered for his epic *Slávy*

23 HODŽA. *Větin o Slovenčině*. Levoča 1848, p. 12, cf p. 76 (*podřečie*), pp. 13, 14 (*podnářečia*).

24 ČERNÝ. *Slovenská čítanka*. Banská Bystrica 1865, p. 2:278.

dcera, first published in 1824 with 150 cantos.²⁵ Kollár substantially expanded the work to 615 cantos in 1832,²⁶ and a posthumously published 1852 edition ultimately included 622 cantos, plus supplementary material.²⁷ The poem's narrator sings of his love for a goddess named Sláva; romantic-sexual feelings symbolize patriotic love for the Slavic nation.

Distinguishing Slovak feeling from Slavic feeling is sometimes difficult because the terms *slovenský* and *slovanský* long served as stylistic alternatives: Jozef Ambruš rightly warned that scholars “have not paid enough attention to the coherent expressions *Slávsky* [Slavic], *slovenský* [Slovak], *Slovensko* [Slovakia], and *Slovenčina* [the Slovak language]”.²⁸ In the expanded 1832 edition of *Slávy dcera*, however, Kollár provided a series of geographic references that unambiguously delineate Panslavic nationalism, rather than Slovak particularism. In verse 257, he described the national homeland “All-Slavia [*Wšeslávia*]” as including the cities of Prague, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kyiv, and Istanbul, as well as the Ural Mountains and the Volga river.²⁹

Kollár also expressed an unambiguously Panslav national concept, rather than Slovak particularist nationalism, in various prose works promoting what he called “literary reciprocity [*wzajemnost, Wechelseitigkeit*]”. His first work on reciprocity was a short essay published in the periodical *Hronka: Podtatranská Zábavnice*.³⁰ Kollár then expanded this essay into a German-language book: the first edition was published in Pest;³¹ a slightly different second edition in Prague.³² Kollár's reciprocity imagined the nation primarily as a literary movement. Kollár advocated reading rooms, book exchanges, libraries, university chairs, and a “pan-dialectical [*wšenářečné / allmundartliche*] literary newspaper”.³³

Kollár's works on reciprocity repeatedly evoked the language/dialect dichotomy. His initial essay in *Hronka* divided the “many-tribed Slavic nation [*mnohokmeného národu slawského*]” into four “main, living, educated and

25 KOLLÁR. *Slávy Dcera: we třech zpěwjch*. Buda 1825.

26 KOLLÁR. *Slávy Dcera: lyricko-epická báseň w pěti zpěwjch*. Praha 1832.

27 KOLLÁR. *Slávy Dcera: lyricko-epická báseň w pěti zpěwjch*. Wien 1852.

28 AMBRUŠ. Die Slawische Idee bei Ján Hollý. In HOLOTÍK, ed. *Ludovít Štúr und die Slawische Wechelseitigkeit*. Bratislava 1969, p. 47.

29 KOLLÁR. *Slávy Dcera*, verse 257. This work has unnumbered pages.

30 KOLLÁR. O literárnég *Wzágemnosti*. In *Hronka: Podtatranská Zábavnice*, 1836, Vol. 1, no. 2, p. 39-53.

31 KOLLÁR. *Über die literarische Wechelseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation*. Pest 1837.

32 KOLLÁR. *Über die Wechelseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation*. Leipzig 1844.

33 KOLLÁR. O literárnég *Wzágemnosti*, p. 50; KOLLÁR. *Über die literarische Wechelseitigkeit* (1837), p. 123; KOLLÁR. *Über die literarische Wechelseitigkeit* (1844), p. 94.

literary dialects, namely, Russian, Illyrian, Polish and Czechoslovak [*nynj žigjcyjch, hlawněgšjch, wzdělaněgšjch a knihy wydawagjcyjch nářečj, totiž: ruské, illyrské, polské a českoslowenské*], which were in turn divided into “smaller dialects or subdialects [*menšjch nářečj a podnářečj*]”. Kollár specifically listed “little Russian [*maloruského*]” inside Russian, Lusatian [*lužického*] inside Polish and “Croatian, Windic [*chorwatského, windického*]” inside Illyrian. His only reference to the Slavic linguistic zone as a whole posited a “Slavic řeč”.³⁴ In the expanded German version of his essay on Slavic reciprocity, Kollár proposed a very similar taxonomy. He still posited a single Slavic nation speaking a single language: “the scattered Slavic tribes [*slawischen Stämme*] see themselves as one great people [*ein grosses Volk*] and their various dialects [*Mundarten*] as one language [*eine Sprache*], awoken to national feeling, and long to bind themselves more closely together”. Kollár also retained the same four “living educated dialects [*jetzt lebenden gebildeteren Dialekte*],” namely Russian, Polish, Bohemianslovak [*böhmischslowakischen*, in the 1844 reprint *böhmisch-slowakischen*], and Illyrian [*Illyrischen*], though at end of the book he posited a “Serbian dialect [*serbische Mundart*]” rather than “Illyrian”. The German volume also added Bulgarian as one of the “smaller dialects and subdialects [*kleinern Mundarten und Untermundarten*]”, subsumed within Illyrian/Serbian.³⁵

Neither of these works explicitly discussed the status of Slovak, though the terms *českoslowenské*, *böhmischslowakischen*, and *böhmisch-slowakischen* suggests a “dialect” extending from Bohemia to northern Hungary and thus encompassing Slovak. In a separate work on orthographic reform, however, Kollár was unambiguous. Specifically addressing a Slovak audience, Kollár called alluded to the “dialectical ties [*nářečnimi swazky*]” uniting “we Slovaks, Bohemians, Moravians, Silesians and in part Lusatians too”, and subordinating this Czechoslovak “national tribe [*národní kmen*] within a broader Slavic nation. In the same tract, he opined that “the Slovak on his own does not have anything in literature, or rather what he has, it is more Czechoslovak than Slovak proper”.³⁶

Kollár’s national feeling, then, attached itself first to a Slavic nation [*národ, Volk, Nation*], then to a Czechoslovak tribe [*kmen / národní kmen / Stamm*], and only then to anything Slovak particularist. His concept of the national language similarly posited a Slavic řeč / Sprache, which encompassed a Czechoslovak *nářečia / Mundart / Dialekt*, which in turn encompassed Slovak as either a

34 KOLLÁR, J. O literárněg Wzágemnosti, pp. 41, 42.

35 KOLLÁR. *Über die literarische Wechselseitigkeit* (1837), pp. 3, 11, 130, 11; Kollár *Über die literarische Wechselseitigkeit* (1844), pp. 3, 9, 99-100, 9.

36 KOLLÁR. O českoslowenské jednotě w řeči a w literatře. In KOLLÁR, ed. *Hlasowé o potřebě jednoty spisowného jazyka pro Čechy, Morawany a Slowáky*, pp. 101-126. Praha 1846, pp. 124, 108.

smaller *nářečia/Mundart* or a *podnářečia/Untermundart*. These ideas are not compatible with subsequent Slovak particularist nationalism, which vigorously proclaims that Slovaks are a “nation” speaking their own “language”. Twenty-first century Slovak nationalists also insist that Slovak is not a dialect or other subcategory of Czech, but assign both Slovak and Czech the same rank in linguistic taxonomies. Kollár’s linguistic nationalism, therefore, was Panslavic, rather than Slovak particularist.

Many scholars have responded to Kollár’s Panslavism with annoyance or anger. Slovak philosopher Marianna Oravcová rejected Kollár’s Reciprocity as “an unclear, fuzzy and elevated vision of Slavism” and as “a projection of values and goals completely different from the actual needs and possibilities”.³⁷ Ukrainian philologist Solomiya Kost’ not only declared Kollár’s ideas “utopian, detached from political realities, incompatible with the historical imperatives and aspirations of the Slavonic peoples”,³⁸ but suggested that literary reciprocity meant “the rejection of national identity, which was the path to the nation’s disappearance” since it contradicted “the aspirations of many Slavic peoples to either restore statehood, or at least become full-fledged European nations”.³⁹ Slovak linguist Eugen Jóna similarly judged that “restricting Slavic reciprocity to four literatures was just dead theory”.⁴⁰ Canadian-Slovak literary scholar Peter Petro wrote that Kollár “mentally lived in Slavdom, a beautiful but unrealistic fiction”,⁴¹ while Hans Kohn dismissed “the Kollar-inspired phantasy of one great Slav nation and one Slav language”.⁴² Alfred Thomas thought “Kollár’s Panslavism was ... based on a dream of harmonious relations between brother Slavs rather than a reflection of objective political reality”,⁴³ and elsewhere condemned “Kollárian Panslavism” as “a reinvented tradition without authentic origins”.⁴⁴

37 ORAVCOVÁ. The Ethnic and Cultural Dimension of National Emancipation. In PICHLER and GAŠPARÍKOVÁ, eds. *Language, Values, and the Slovak Nation*. Washington 1994, pp. 15, 18.

38 KOST’. *Romantychna koncepcija Nacionalnoyi Identychnosti u Slov’yanskyx Literaturax 30–60-x rokov XIX stolittya (na prykladi Tvorchosti Karela Zapa)*. Ph.D. Thesis. Lviv 2021, p. 9.

39 KOST’. *Movne pytannya u traktati Yana Kollara ‘Dyskusiyi pro slov’yans’ku vzayemnist’ yak predmet polemiky mizh avtorom i Lyudovitom Shturom*. In *Naukovyj visnyk mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu*, 2022, Vol. 55, p. 123.

40 JÓNA. *Postavy slovenskej jazykovedy v dobe Štúrovej*. Bratislava 1956, p. 141.

41 PETRO. *History of Slovak Literature*. Montreal 1997, p. 58.

42 KOHN. Romanticism and Realism among Czechs and Slovaks. In *The Review of Politics*, 1952, Vol. 14, no. 1, p. 40.

43 THOMAS. *The Bohemian Body*. Madison 2007, p. 25.

44 THOMAS. *Forging Czechs: The Reinvention of National Identity in the Bohemian Lands*.

Annoyance and anger perhaps explain why so many scholars refuse to take Kollár's Panslavism seriously. Several depict Kollár as positing multiple Slavic "nations," rather than "tribes" of a single nation. Croatian historian Nikša Stančić, for example, claimed that Kollár "grouped all Slavs in only four literary languages, and, consequently, into four nations".⁴⁵ Kollár actually posited one language with four dialects, spoken by one nation with four tribes. Ludovít Haraksim substituted "nations" for Kollár's *Stämme* when describing the "treatise *On the Literary Reciprocity Between the Slavic Tribes and Dialects* (1836)" as "a programme for co-operation between the Slavic nations".⁴⁶ Haraksim did not explain the discrepancy between Kollár's book title and the ideas he ascribed to it, but elsewhere drew attention to lexical substitutions: he wrote that subsequent intellectuals subordinated their ideals of Slavdom to "the interests of their 'tribe', i.e. nation", or alternatively to "the interests of their own tribe, i.e. nation".⁴⁷

Several scholars are so eager to conceal Kollár's Panslavism that they even misrepresent the title of his book. Paul Radosavljevich translated it as "On the Literary Reciprocity between the Families and Dialects of the Slavic Nations,"⁴⁸ that is, transforming the singular Slavic "nation" into plural "nations." Anna Grigorieva gave "About literary mutuality between the Slavic nations and dialects."⁴⁹ The aforementioned Thomas not only gave plural "nations" but also misrepresented *Mundarten* as "languages": "Concerning the Reciprocity between the Various Tribes and Languages of the Slavic Nations."⁵⁰

Even experts on Panslavism transform Kollár's "living educated dialects" into "languages". Both Hans Kohn and John Erickson described Kollár as believing in multiple Slavic "languages".⁵¹ Petra Svoljšak wrote about the "Pan-Slavic ideas of Ján Kollár, who advocated the concept of four great Slavic languages."⁵² Mikuš acknowledged Kollár's belief in a single Slavic "nation", but thought "that nation would, however, still speak four languages".⁵³ Oravcová, concentrating

In RYAN and THOMAS, eds. *Cultures of Forgery*. London 2003, p. 43.

45 STANČIĆ. *Gajevo "Još Horvatska ni propala" iz 1832-33*. Zagreb 1989, p. 109.

46 HARAKSIM. Slovak Slavism and Panslavism. In TEICH, KOVÁČ and BROWN, eds. *Slovakia in History*. Cambridge 2011, p. 108.

47 HARAKSIM, Slovak Slavism and Panslavism, p. 111.

48 RADOSAVLJEVICH. *Who are the Slavs?* Boston 1919, p. 2:211.

49 GRIGORIEVA. Pan-Slavism in Central and Southeastern Europe. In *Journal of Siberian Federal University, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2013, Vol. 1, p. 20.

50 THOMAS, *The Bohemian Body*, p. 25.

51 KOHN. *Panslavism: Its History and Ideology*. Notre Dame 1953, p. 17; ERIKSON. *Panslavism*. London 1964, p. 8.

52 SVOLJŠAK. The pre-March Era, The Time of non-Freedom. In LUTHAR, ed. *The Land Between: A History of Slovenia*. Frankfurt 2008, p. 277.

53 MIKUŠ. *Slovakia and the Slovaks*. Washington 1977, p. 75.

specifically on Kollár's *československý / böhmischslowakische* tribe speaking its *československý / böhmischslowakische* dialect, claimed that Kollár posited "one united, though non-existent, Slavic tribe" speaking "one common united Czechoslovak language".⁵⁴ Kollár had in fact characterized Czechoslovak as a *nárečia / Mundart / Dialekt*.

Still other scholars pretend that the word "dialect", when it appears in Kollár's text, actually meant "language". Karol Rosenbaum, sought to problematize Kollár's concepts by placing the uncomfortable words in quotation marks and adding specious glosses: he wrote of Kollár's "agitated patriotism" for "his 'tribe', 'dialect', i.e. nation and language [*svoj „kmeň“, „nárečie“, t. j. národ a jazyk*]."⁵⁵ Most scholars, however, prefer parenthetical misinformation. American Slavist David Cooper for example, wrote that "Kollár recognized what the loss of a dialect (that is, a language) would mean."⁵⁶

In a spectacular display of cognitive dissonance, Eugen Jóna acknowledged that Kollár's reciprocity imagined "four tribes with their dialects and literatures (Russian, Polish, Czech [sic] and Illyrian)", yet still ascribed to Kollár the belief that "the Slovak dialect (that is, the Slovak language), is rich, succinct, melodious, clean and well-preserved".⁵⁷ Kollár had actually imagined Slovak as a subdialect of the Czech dialect.

A few Slovak linguists, meanwhile, have engaged in straightforward lexical substitution, using parenthetical comments only as a grudging concession to Kollár's actual text. Vincent Blanár wrote that in the correspondence between Kollár and Šafařík "Slovaks were considered a special branch of the Slavic family and Slovak as a special Slavic language ('dialect') [*osobitný slovanský jazyk („nárečie“)*], but did not accept its literary-linguistic independence."⁵⁸ Ján Doruľa also has Kollár imagining a "Czechoslovak language (Czechoslovak dialect of the Slavic language [*Československý jazyk (československé nárečie slovanského jazyka)*])."⁵⁹ It is not clear why these scholars relegate the accurate

54 ORAVCOVÁ. The Ethnic and Cultural Dimension of National Emancipation. In PICHLER and GAŠPARÍKOVÁ, eds. *Language, Values, and the Slovak Nation*. Washington 1994, p. 15.

55 ROSENBAUM. Dielo Jána Kollára v kontexte českej a slovenskej literatúry v 19. storočí: (náčrt problematiky). In *Slavica slovacca*, 1993, Vol, 28, no. 1-2, p. 123.

56 COOPER. Competing Languages of Czech Nation-Building: Jan Kollár and the Melodiousness of Czech. In *Slavic Review*, 2008, Vol. 67, no. 2, p. 312.

57 JÓNA. Účasť Eudovíta Štúra pri utváraní spisovnej slovenčiny. In *Slovenská reč*, 1956, Vol. 21, no. 2, p. 141.

58 BLANÁR. Cenný príspevok k dejinám spisovnej slovenčiny. In *Slavica Slovacca*, 2002, Vol. 37, no. 2, p. 150.

59 DORUĽA. Slovansko-slovenský vlastenec Ján Kollár. In *Slavica Slovacca*, 2009, Vol. 44, no. 1, p. 60.

description to parenthetical comments. Perhaps they chose to cater to twenty-first century expectations, rather than explain nineteenth century thinking?

In the context of linguistic classification, however, descendants of *na + *rěčь cannot be assumed synonymous with the term *jazyk*. The language/dialect dichotomy treats them as binary opposites, and while the multi-level taxonomy propounded by Šafařík was more complex than a simple dichotomy, it still clearly subsumed descendants of *na + *rěčь within a *řeč*, subsumed within a *mluva*, subsumed within a *jazyk*. When discussing Kollár's thought, scholars cannot simply substitute *jazyk* for a descendant of *na + *rěčь, even with parentheses or other distancing devices.

Some of this confusion, admittedly, derives from the idiosyncrasies of linguistic jargon. Linguists often collectively denote the rules set forth in grammar books as a “standard language”, a “literary language”, or something similar. Indeed, several scholars hypothesize that it is precisely the processes of standardization that transforms uncoded and unwritten “dialects” into written “languages”.⁶⁰ Linguists have variously opined that “a dialect may be defined as an undeveloped language”,⁶¹ theorized how “institutionalisation transforms ... a dialect into a language”,⁶² or contrasted literary standards with “exclusively spoken dialects”.⁶³ A standard or literary “language”, furthermore, does not necessarily evoke the language/dialect dichotomy, because the “literary language” can also be juxtaposed with “spoken language”. When Ivo Sivrić wrote that “Kollár advocated that only four literary languages among the Slav nations should be developed and cherished,”⁶⁴ his usage was technically correct.

Nevertheless, terms such as “standard language” or “literary language” encourage confusion because the modifying adjective is easily omitted. Emil Horák, for example, discussed Kollár's “four-branched theory of Slavonic languages [*slovanských jazykov*], according to which Slavic literary languages [*slovanské spisovné jazyky*] would have four written forms”.⁶⁵ The second clause is correct, and the first would be, had a modifying adjective been included.

60 HAUGEN. Dialect, Language, Nation. In *American Anthropologist*, 1966, Vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 926-27; PICQ. *La plus belle histoire du langage*. Paris 2008, p. 112; MYHILL. *Language, Religion and National Identity in Europe and the Middle East*. Amsterdam 2006, p. 11; HOBSBAWM. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. Cambridge 1992, s 60-61.

61 HAUGEN, Dialect, Language, Nation, p. 927.

62 SAFRAN. Language, Ethnicity and Religion: A Complex and Persistent Linkage. In *Nations and Nationalism*, 2008, Vol. 14, no. 1, p. 172.

63 VAN MARLE. Dialect versus standard Language: Nature versus Culture. In CHESHIRE and STEIN, eds. *Taming the Vernacular: From Dialect to Written Standard Language*. London 2014, p. 29.

64 SIVRIĆ. *Bishop J. G. Strossmayer*. Chicago 1975, p. 275.

65 HORÁK. Slovensko-české filologické paralely z (južno)slavistického aspektu. In *Slavica Slovaca*, 2007, year 42, no. 2, p. 102.

Viewed through the lens of the language/dialect dichotomy, furthermore, the terms “standard language” or the “literary language” misleadingly conceal the possibility of associating the “standard language” with the dichotomy’s subordinate half. Šafařík and Kollár were not the only Panslavs who associated distinct literary traditions with various “dialects” of the “Slavic language”: several Slavic savants wrote grammars and dictionaries of Slavic “dialects”.⁶⁶ Matija Majar’s grammar even explicitly described itself as rules for the “Illyrian dialect [*narečje*] and the Slavic language [*jezik*] generally.”⁶⁷ Given the danger of evoking the language/dialect dichotomy, scholars might do well to avoid the terms “literary languages” and “standard languages”, and refer instead to “literary standards,” “literary codifications”, or something similar.

Ludovít Štúr’s Panslavism: Fighting for the “Slovak Dialect”

Scholars prove equally reluctant to confront the Panslavism of Ludovít Štúr (1815 – 1856), a multifaceted patriot celebrated, among other things, for his 1846 Slovak grammar, remembered as a milestone in the codification of literary Slovak. Štúr was born in a small mountain town in the west of the future Slovak republic. Like Šafařík and Kollár, he had a Protestant education in northern Hungary and attended university in Germany. When he started a teaching career at Lutheran lyceum in Bratislava, Štúr showed his enthusiasm for Kollár’s literary works by assigning *Slávy dcera* to students. His social activism often reflected his enthusiasm for a broader Slavdom: he helped establish a Serbian reading room,⁶⁸ and published articles in Croatian newspapers.⁶⁹ Štúr also showed his zeal for Kollár’s Czechoslovak “national tribe” uniting “we Slovaks with the Bohemians, Moravians, Silesians and in part Lusatians too”⁷⁰ by participating in a “Czecho-Slav” literary society, and, while visiting Bautzen, urging Sorbian intellectuals to “nurture reciprocity” and “unite with us”.⁷¹ In short, the young Štúr’s Panslavism followed Kollár’s example.

66 PAVLOVSKYJ. *Grammatika Malorossiyskago narechiya*. St. Petersburg: Plavil’ščikov, 1818; KRIZTIANOVICH. *Grammatik der Kroatischen Mundart*. Zagreb 1837; AFANSIEV-ČUŽBYNSKY. *Slovar’ malorusskago narěchija*. St. Petersburg 1855; NOSOVIČ. *Slovar’ bělorusskago narěchija*. St. Petersburg 1878.

67 MAJAR. *Pravila kako izobraževati ilirsko narečje i u obče slavenski jezik*. Ljubljana: Lehrer, 1848;

68 MILOJKOVIĆ-DJURIĆ. *Panslavism and National Identity in Russia and the Balkans 1830–1880*. Boulder 1994, pp. 21-26.

69 ŠTÚR. Nitra (Narodna slovačka pësma). In *Danica ilirska*, 3 June 1837, Vol. 3, no. 2, p. 85.

70 KOLLÁR. O českoslowenské jednotě w řeči a w literatře. In KOLLÁR, ed. *Hlasowé o potřebě jednoty spisowného jazyka pro Čechy, Morawany a Slowáky*, 101-126. Praha 1846, p. 124.

71 NOWOTNY. Listy, pisane serbskemu gymnazialnemu towarstwu w Budyšinje z lět 1839-50. In *Lětopis*, 1965, Vol. 12, no. 2, p. 193; cf. KUNZE. The Sorbian National Renaissance and

Hungarian politics, however, ultimately led Štúr to break with Kollár. In the 1840s, Slavophobe Hungarian elites, interpreting Panslavism as Russophile irredentism and promoting assimilatory policies collectively remembered as “Magyarization”,⁷² began investigating schoolteachers. Štúr responded with a tract defending Slavic linguistic rights,⁷³ and was removed from his job in December 1843.⁷⁴ As an attempt to silence an outspoken defender of Slavic interests, this sacking may have proved counterproductive, since Štúr then founded an influential journal, the *Slovenskije národňje novini* [Slovak National News].⁷⁵

Persecution, however, led Štúr to the conclusion that Slavs in northern Hungary would better defend their interests with a literary standard different from literary Czech. A literary tradition indigenous to Slavic northern Hungary would counter Magyar reproaches that Hungarian Slavs “living here [in Hungary], do not act like we live here, in that we deliver our literature to the Czechs, unify with them politically, and even that we may have no rights to liberation for our nationality in Hungary”.⁷⁶ Breaking with literary Czech, Štúr reasoned, would demonstrate the loyalty of Hungary’s Slavs and thus remove the pressure to Magyarize: “We are already, and wish to remain, at home; but we will see that our neighbors, and particularly our Magyars, will welcome us home.”⁷⁷

In 1846, therefore, Štúr published not only a grammar book, the *Nauka reči slovenskej* [Handbook of the Slovak reč], but more importantly a pamphlet entitled *Nárečja slovenskuo alebo potreba pisaňja v tomto nárečí* [The Slovak Dialect, or the Need to Write in this Dialect, hereafter *Nárečja slovenskuo*].⁷⁸

Slavic Reciprocity in the First half of the Nineteenth Century. In *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 1999, Vol. 41, no. 2, p. 193.

- 72 RAPANT. *K počiatkom maďarizácie*. Bratislava 1927, 1931; THOMSON. A Century of a Phantom: Pan-Slavism and the Western Slavs. In *Journal of Central European Affairs*, 1951, Vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 57-77; KISS. A magyarok szlovákokról alkotott képe a reformkorban. In *Acta Academiae Paedagogicae Agriensis, Sectio Historiae*, 2009, year 36, pp. 111-28; PÁL. “In the Grasp of the Pan-Slavic Octopus”: Hungarian Nation Building in the Shadow of Pan-Slavism until the 1848 Revolution. In *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 2022, Vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 40-52.
- 73 ŠTÚR. *Beschwerden und Klagen der Slaven in Ungarn über die gesetzwidrigen Uebergriffe der Magyaren*. Leipzig 1843.
- 74 GOGOLÁK. *Beiträge zur Geschichte des slowakischen Volkes, II, Die slowakische nationale Frage in der Reformepoche Ungarns (1790–1848)*. Munich 1963, no. 141-147.
- 75 See RUTTKAY, ed. *Slovenskije národňje novini*. Bratislava 1956; VYVÍJALOVÁ, ed. *Slovenskije národňje novini; boje o ich povolenie (štúdia a dokumenty)*. Martin 1972.
- 76 ŠTÚR. Pohled na hýbání západních a jižních Slowanů. In *Národní Noviny*, 2 May 1848, Vol. 1, no. 23, p. 90.
- 77 ŠTÚR. Panslavism a naša Krajina. In *Slovenskije Národňje novini*, 14 September 1849, Vol. 1, no. 14, p. 869.
- 78 ŠTÚR. *Nauka reči slovenskej*. Bratislava 1846; ŠTÚR. *Nárečja slovenskuo alebo potreba*

Štúr's codification utterly failed to reconcile Magyarizing Hungarians with the existence of a Slavic intelligentsia promoting Slavic interests, but did much to overcome confessional differences between Lutheran and Catholic literary circles in Slavic northern Hungary.⁷⁹

Kollár, however, thought that Štúr's efforts to cultivate a uniquely Slovak literature contradicted the spirit of Slavic reciprocity. He responded by compiling a collection of essays denouncing Štúr,⁸⁰ prompting an indignant reply from Miroslav Hurban, one of Štúr's collaborators.⁸¹ In many ways, the quarrel between Hurban and Kollár in the 1840s foreshadows the twentieth-century dispute between Czechoslovakism and Slovak nationalism. Interwar scholars debating Czechoslovakism by proxy have powerfully shaped how both Kollár and Štúr have been remembered.⁸²

The conflicts of the first Czechoslovak republic, however, should not obscure the common ground shared by Štúr and Kollár in the 1840s. Both Kollár and Štúr believed in a single Slavic nation divided into "tribes". Kollár imagined a "many-tribed Slavic nation [*mnohokmeného národu slawského*]",⁸³ while Štúr argued that "tribalism [*kmenovitost*] (*die Gliederung in Stämme, divisio in stirpes*)" affected the Slavs more than "any other nation".⁸⁴ Both agreed that the Slavic nation shared a common language, namely, the Slavic language. Both divided that language into several written "dialects", each with its own literary tradition.

Štúr and Kollár disagreed most visibly about the number of Slavic tribes and dialects. Štúr rejected Kollár's four-fold division of Slavic tribes/dialects, positing instead eleven different Slavic tribes, each with a distinct dialect, notably "we Slovaks with our own Slovak dialect [*mi Slováci s našim vlastním*

písaňja v tomto nářečí. Bratislava 1846.

79 LOCHER. *Die Nationale Differenzierung und Integrierung der Slovaken und Tschechen in ihrem Geschichtlichen Verlauf bis 1848*. Haarlem 1931, pp. 139-208; MAXWELL. *Choosing Slovakia*. London 2009, pp. 117-140.

80 KOLLÁR, ed. *Hlasové o potřebě jednoty spisovného jazyka pro Čechy, Morawany a Slowáky*. Praha 1846.

81 HURBAN. *Českje hlasi proti Slovenčiňe*. Skalice 1846.

82 HODŽA. *Československý rozkol*. Martin. vlastním, 1920; PRAŽÁK. *Češi a Slováci*. Praha 1929; PRAŽÁK. *Dějiny spisovné slovenštiny po dobu Štúrovu*. Svazek třetí. Praha 1922; *Slovenská otázka v době J. M. Hurbana*. Bratislava 1923; MAXWELL. The Legacy of Slavic Reciprocity in the First Czechoslovak Republic. In GAŠIOR, KARL and TROEBST, eds. *Post-Panslavismus: Slavizität, Slavische Idee und Antislavismus im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen 2014, pp. 69-78; BAKKE. Conceptions of Czechoslovakism among Czech Politicians in Government Inauguration Debates 1918–1938. In HUDEK, KOPEČEK and MERVART, eds. *Czechoslovakism*. London 2022, pp. 149-171.

83 KOLLÁR, O literárnég Wzágemnosti, p. 39.

84 ŠTÚR, *Nářečja slovenskuo*, p. 10.

Slovenským nárečím].⁸⁵ Štúr was explicit and unambiguous about his belief in a Slovak “tribe” speaking a Slovak “dialect”, writing: “We Slovaks are a tribe and as a tribe, we have our own dialect, which is different and distinct from Czech [*Mi Slováci sme kmen a jako kmen máme vlastnuo nářečja, ktoruo je od českjeho odchodnuo a rozd'jelno*].”⁸⁶

The modern Slovak republic claims Štúr as a national hero. Štúr certainly made important contributions to Slovak history: he played a striking role during the 1848 revolution, and his linguistic ideas influenced the work of Martin Hattala,⁸⁷ which ultimately served as the basis for literary Slovak. The Slovak Academy of Sciences *Institute of Linguistics* bears his name, as does the town of Štúrovo. Štúr’s face has graced several banknotes. Bratislava even boasts a “Štúr café”. Štúr’s status as a Slovak national hero, however, perhaps explains why so many scholars seek to suppress his Pan Slavism.

Scholarly accounts of Štúr, like those of Kollár, seek to conceal his use of the language/dialect dichotomy. The effect is particularly dramatic when scholars discuss the pamphlet in which Štúr advocated a distinctively Slovak literary standard, *Nářečja slovenskuo alebo potreba písan'je v tomto nářečí*. The word *nářečja* appears in the title not once but twice, a fact which subsequent scholars apparently find inconvenient. Scholars are aware of Štúr’s status as the “father of the Slovak language”. Scholars have, perhaps, also grown accustomed to thinking about a literary standard as a “literary language”, and thus expect Štúr to use the word *jazyk*, not a descendant of **na* + **rěčь*.

When writing in English, therefore, scholars simply engage in lexical substitution, replacing the word *nářečja* with something more palatable. The word *nářečja* has been glossed as “orthography”,⁸⁸ as “idiom”,⁸⁹ and as “speech”.⁹⁰ At least four scholarly works have mistranslated Štúr’s title as “The Slovak Tongue or the Necessity of Writing in this Tongue”.⁹¹ Many scholars, finally, have rendered *nářečje* as “language”. The title of Štúr’s pamphlet has

85 ŠTÚR, *Nářečja slovenskuo*, p. 13.

86 ŠTÚR, *Nářečja slovenskuo*, p. 51.

87 HATTALA. *Grammatica linguae slovenicae, collatae com proxime cognata bohemica*. Banská Štiavnica: Lorber, 1851; HATTALA. *Krátka Mluvnica slovenská*. Bratislava 1852.

88 SETON-WATSON. *Racial Problems in Hungary*. London 1908, p. 80.

89 PECH. Nationalism in Eastern Europe (Review). In *Slavic Review*, 1970, year 29, no. 4, p. 720.

90 DE BRAY. *Guide to the West Slavonic Languages*. Bloomington 1980, p. 132.

91 BROCK. *The Slovak National Awakening: An Essay in the Intellectual History of East Central Europe*. Toronto 1976, p. 48; FELAK. At the Price of the Republic: Hlinka’s Slovak People’s Party, 1929–1938. Pittsburgh 1994, p. 7; BURKE. *The Social History of Language*. Cambridge 1987, p. 203; SUSSEX and CUBBERLY. *The Slavic Languages*. Cambridge 2006, p. 103.

been given “the Slovak Language or the Need to Write in this Language”,⁹² as “the Slovak Language or the Necessity of Writing in this Language”,⁹³ and as “The Slovak language and the need to write in it.”⁹⁴ Štúr’s word *nárečje* is also routinely mistranslated when scholars cite a key passage from Štúr’s argument “*Mi Slováci sme kmen a jako kmen máme vlastnuo nárečja.*” Iván Berend, using quotation marks, translated the passage: “we have our own language, which is quite separate from the Czech”, adducing it as evidence that Štúr “argued that Slovaks constituted a nation” and “advocated a separate Slovak language”.⁹⁵

Scholars writing in Slovak lack the option of hiding behind inaccurate translations, but justify lexical substitution with parenthetical “clarifications”. Eugen Jóna claimed that “the main argument according to Štúr is that the Slovaks are a tribe (i.e. a nation) and as a tribe they have their own dialect (i.e. language), which is different and distinct from Czech [*Hlavným dôvodom pre Štúra je to, že Slováci sú kmeň (t. j. národ) a ako kmeň majú vlastné nárečie (t. j. jazyk), ktoré je od českého odchodné a rozdielne*].”⁹⁶ An article by Slovak linguist Ján Kačala similarly cited passages in which Štúr used a descendant of *na + *rěčь, inserting each time the bracketed comment “[read: language]”. Lexical substitution thus enabled Kačala to speak about Štúr’s “understanding of Slovak as a national language”.⁹⁷

A few scholars putting words into Štúr’s mouth have tried to justify their lexical substitutions. Even after acknowledging that “Slavophiles considered Slavdom a nation and the Slavic languages dialects”, Peter Petro insisted of Štúr that “the word ‘dialect’, as he used it, meant ‘language’”.⁹⁸ American historian Hugh Agnew claimed that Štúr “insisted that Czech and Slovak were two separate distinct languages (though he still used the word ‘*nárečie*’ [sic])”.⁹⁹ Samuel Cambel wrote of Štúr that “the main idea of his work” was that “Slovaks

92 TEICH. *Bohemia in History*. Cambridge 1998, p. 379; KIRSCHBAUM. *A History of Slovakia: The Struggle for Survival*. London 1995, p. 100; KIRSCHBAUM. *Historical Dictionary of Slovakia*. Lanham 2014, p. xxxvi.

93 MIKUŠ. *Slovakia and the Slovaks*. Washington 1977, p. 76; BARTL. *Slovak History: Chronology and Lexicon*. Bratislava 2002, p. 96.

94 KOVÁČ. The Slovak Political Programme: From Hungarian Patriotism to the Czechoslovak State. In TEICH, KOVÁČ and BROWN, eds. *Slovakia in History*. Cambridge 2011, p. 125.

95 BEREND. *History Derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley 2003, p. 57.

96 JÓNA, *Postavy slovenskej jazykovedy*, p. 86.

97 KAČALA. Jazykovedné dielo Ludovíta Štúra a súčasná slovakistika. In *Reč*, 1986, Vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 131, 132.

98 PETRO, *History of Slovak Literature*, p. 67.

99 AGNEW. LeCaine. Czechs, Slovaks and the Slovak Linguistic Separatism of the Mid-Nineteenth Century. In MORISON, ed. *The Czech and Slovak Experience*. London 1992, p. 28.

are a distinct nation and as a nation have their own language (in the terminology of the day ‘tribe’ and ‘dialect’) [*Slováci sú osobitný národ a ako národ majú svoj vlastný jazyk (v dobovej terminológii „kmen“ a „nárečie“*)].¹⁰⁰ Czech scholar Ivan Dorovský discussed Štúr’s thoughts about “Slavic dialects (i.e. languages) [*slovanských nářečí (t. j. jazyků)*].”¹⁰¹ Peter Brock cited Štúr as writing, “We Slovaks are a tribe and as a tribe we have our own language,” but admitted in a footnote that “dialect” would have been a “more exact” translation.¹⁰² None of these scholars, however, provided any explanation why Štúr would use a descendant of *na + *rěčь to insist upon, or understand, a distinct Slovak “language”.

Nevertheless, at least one Slovak scholar has formally proposed a theory of lexical shift. Writing in the *Československý terminologický časopis* [Czechoslovak Journal of Terminology], Vincent Blanár argued that during the 1860s and 1870s

the semantic meaning of the word nárečie was simplified. While in Štúr’s era the meaning “language [*jazyk, Sprache*]” dominated, in the 1860s and 1870s this meaning decreased to an archaism. The basic meaning of the word became “dialect [*Dialekt, Mundart*], which corresponds to the present state of affairs.¹⁰³

Rather than espousing the Panslav theory of a single Slavic language so common among other nineteenth-century Slavic intellectuals, Blanár argued, Štúr actually espoused the Slovak linguistic particularism familiar to twentieth- or twenty-first-century readers, but he did so using archaic nineteenth-century terminology. According to Blanár, national concepts have not changed since the nineteenth century: Slovaks have always espoused Slovak particularist nationalism. Štúr invoked a descendant of *na + *rěčь because Slovak words have changed their meanings.

Blanár’s hypothesis of lexical shift has the virtue of falsifiability. Had the meaning of the word *nárečja* had actually changed relative to the German terms *Sprache*, *Dialekt*, and *Mundart*, that change would leave traces in dictionary definitions. Slavic lexicography, however, does not support Blanár’s hypothesis. As noted above, numerous Slavic lexicographers, including Juraj Palkovič, Štúr’s teacher and mentor at the Lutheran school in Bratislava, defined descendants of *na + *rěčь as *Mundart*, *Dialekt*, or *dialectus*. Šafařík’s usage also contradicts

100 CAMEL. *Dejiny Slovenska II (1526–1848)*. Bratislava 1982, p. 721.

101 DOROVSKÝ. *Postavy slovenskej jazykovedy v dobe Štúrovej*. Bratislava 2004, p. 36.

102 BROCK. *The Slovak National Awakening: An Essay in the Intellectual History of East Central Europe*. Toronto 1976, p. 47.

103 BLANÁR. K terminológii v matičných rokoch. In *Československý terminologický časopis*, 1963, Vol. 2, no. 5, p. 265.

Blanár's hypothesis: Šafařík, and the many Slavic savants influenced by him, consistently treated descendants of *na + *rěčь as a subcategory of the *jazyk*, not as a synonym or stylistic alternative.

The works of Štúr himself also contradict Blanár's hypothesis. Blanár's hypothesis predicts, for example, that Štúr would describe French, Italian, and Spanish as Romance *nárečja*. In *Nárečja slovenskuo*, however, Štúr insisted that the Romance languages are "proper *reči* and not *nárečja*, just as e.g. the French, Spanish and Italian nations are proper nations [*národí*]"¹⁰⁴ Indeed, Štúr elsewhere referred to the *rozličnorečja* of Genoa, Padua, and Bologna.¹⁰⁵ In the introduction to his grammar, furthermore, he insisted that Slovaks have "their own *nárečja*, which is not just a *rozličnorečja* of Czech, which we call Slovak, the Slovak *nárečja* [*mi skutočne máme vlastnuo nárečja, či je to ňje len rozličnorečja Česťini, čo mi Slovenčinou, nárečím Slovenským volávame*]"¹⁰⁶ Štúr's use of these classificatory categories clearly evokes Šafařík's taxonomy. Perhaps most damagingly for Blanár's hypothesis, however, Štúr himself explicitly translated *nárečja* into Latin and German as "*dialectus, Mundart*".¹⁰⁷

Štúr, in short, espoused Panslavism. He did not give familiar words unfamiliar meanings while professing modern Slovak particularist nationalism, he used familiar words with familiar meanings to express a national concept that has since become unfashionable. Štúr articulated the literary Panslavic nationalism that thrived in the early nineteenth century.

Even if Štúr's Panslavism creates difficulties for later generations seeking to depict him as a Slovak particularist national hero, Štúr cannot be blamed. Scholars, however, seem unwilling to face the ramifications of Štúr's Panslavism, and so have resorted to mistranslations and misquotations. Lexical substitutions transform Štúr's Panslavism into the comfortingly familiar Slovak particularism scholars evidently expected to find. Nevertheless, such terminological substitutions remain dishonest scholarship.

Who's Afraid of Panslavism?

Why have scholars been so reluctant to acknowledge Panslavism? This conclusion can offer only speculations, but some speculation seems worthwhile. Perhaps future scholars can learn to better perceive Panslavism in the historical record if they become more aware of the reasons why past scholars have sought to suppress it.

104 ŠTÚR, *Nárečja slovenskuo*, p. 44.

105 ŠTÚR, *Nárečja slovenskuo*, p. 43.

106 ŠTÚR, *Nárečja slovenskuo*, p. vii.

107 ŠTÚR, *Nárečja slovenskuo*, p. 10.

Slovak particularist nationalism is the most obvious suspect, particularly as concerns the misrepresentation of Štúr. Tomasz Kamusella employed the “handy algebraic-like equation language = nation = state” to summarize the broader Central European tendency to equate and conflate language and nation,¹⁰⁸ and linguistic loyalties have indeed played an unusually important role in Slovak nationalism, even by central European standards. Hugh Seton-Watson once wrote that “there is no more striking example than the Slovak case of the role of language in nation-forming”,¹⁰⁹ while Tibor Pichler argued that “the Slovak nation was entirely language based”.¹¹⁰ Slovak patriots seeking to glorify Štúr as a national hero thus have a motive to suppress his Panslavism, since it is difficult for them to acknowledge that the Slovak historical record deviates from the Slovak national myth.

Slovak nationalism, however, cannot provide the whole explanation for these poor citation practices. Not all of the Slovak scholars discussed in this article are propagandists. Several of the scholars cited above, furthermore, are not Slovaks at all. The Hungarian historian Iván Berend, the Austro-German-born American historian Hans Kohn and the English-born Canadian scholar Peter Brock all expunged Panslavism from their accounts of Kollár and Štúr. Whatever their motives, Slovak nationalism seems an unlikely candidate.

Anachronistic thinking provides a broader explanation. Historians seeking to understand the past sometimes appropriately impose twentieth or twenty-first century analytical categories on the nineteenth century. The notion of a “Slovak language”, however controversial in the past, has enjoyed widespread scholarly recognition since the Second World War.¹¹¹ If scholars mistake current fashions about how to classify the Slavic linguistic zone for a “scientific fact”, if they mistake the Slovak language and/or nation for an objectively verifiable truth rather than a consensus belief, then they will struggle to understand historical actors who believed in other languages and/or nations.

Even anachronism, however, cannot fully explain why so many historians find Panslavism so difficult to acknowledge. Ideological change lies at the heart of the historical discipline, historians are usually comfortable with the idea that historical actors once thought differently. What makes Panslavism so uniquely

108 KAMUSELLA. *Words in Space and Time: Historical Atlas of Language Politics in Modern Central Europe*. Budapest 2022, p. xvi.

109 SETON-WATSON. *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. London 1977, p. 169.

110 PICHLER. “The Idea of Slovak Language-based Nationalism.” In PICHLER and GAŠPARÍKOVÁ, eds. *Language, Values, and the Slovak Nation*. Washington 1994, p. 37.

111 MAXWELL. Taxonomies of the Slavic World since the Enlightenment: Schematizing Perceptions of Slavic Ethnonyms in a Chart. In *Language and History*, 2015 Vol. 58, no. 1, p. 37.

hard to perceive? Perhaps a full explanation lies in the curious history of how scholars have understood the definition of the word “Panslavism”.

Panslavism as manifested in nineteenth-century Hungary mostly concerned literary and linguistic questions. The Slovak lawyer who originally coined the term, Jan Herkel (who in defiance of subsequent convention did not publish as either Ján or Herkel) defined Panslavism in his 1826 comparative grammar as “the *unity in literature* among all Slavs [italics in original]”. He compared things like noun declensions and verb conjugations, seeking compromise forms to bring the different varieties together. He also thought all Slavs should use a common alphabet, since “all Slavic dialects are but one single language”.¹¹² Kollár’s reciprocity, as noted above, analogously focused on libraries, bookstores, literary journals, and the like. Nevertheless, hostile Magyarizers repeatedly attacked Panslavism for its alleged Russophile irredentism, equated with treason.¹¹³ The journal *Pesti Hirlap*, for instance, called on the government to investigate the “Panslav element”,¹¹⁴ which supposedly opposed “the unity of the Magyar homeland”.¹¹⁵ Both Kollár and Štúr attracted personal condemnation from leading ethnic Hungarian politicians. Ferenc Pulszky, reviewing Kollár’s reciprocity, found it “hard to believe that all Slavs are interested and concerned only with literature”,¹¹⁶ while András Sörös attacked one of Štúr’s tracts as “brazen suspicion, false slander, and unfounded lies”.¹¹⁷ Such vehement hostility led numerous Panslavs in northern Hungary to contrast the literary or linguistic Panslavism they supported with a “political Panslavism”, which they condemned.¹¹⁸

Much contemporary scholarship, however, assumes that all Panslavs pursued the “political” objectives imagined by the enemies of the Slavs, rather than the literary/linguistic goals that actually interested north Hungarian Slavs during the nineteenth-century. Reference works variously define Panslavism as “the

112 HERKEL. *Elementa Universalis Linguae Slavicae*. Buda 1926, pp. 4, 17.

113 THOMSON. A Century of a Phantom: Pan-Slavism and the Western Slavs. In *Journal of Central European Affairs*, 1951, Vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 57-77; ORMIS, ed. *O reč a národ*. Bratislava 1973; VARGA. Fear of Pan-Slavism. In *A Hungarian Quo Vadis: Political Trends and Theories of the Early 1840s*. Budapest 1993, pp. 110-132.

114 *Pesti Hirlap*. Magyarország és Erdély. *Pesti Hirlap*, (29 September 1842), p. 689.

115 *Pesti Hirlap*. Magyar önálló kereskedelem megalapításáról. *Pesti Hirlap* (15 January 1843), p. 38.

116 PULSZKY. A’ Szlávok literariai viszonságáról. In *Pesti Hirlap* (2 October 1842), pp. 702-03.

117 SÖRÉS. Ismét egy adat az Allgem. Zeitung költeményeiről. In *Pesti Hirlap* (8 February 1844), pp. 88-89.

118 HOITSY. *Apologie des ungrischen Slawismus*. Leipzig 1843, pp. 97, 99, 101; ZÁBORSKÝ. *Predmluva. Žehry: Básně a dvě řeči*. Wien 1851, p. ii; LICHARD. *Rozhovory o matici slovenskej*. Banská Bystrica 1865, pp. 5, 7.

movement of aspiration for the union of all Slavs or Slavonic peoples in one political organization”,¹¹⁹ or as “the principle or advocacy of political unification for the Slavic peoples”.¹²⁰ Even specialist studies of Panslavism prefer a “political” definition: John Erickson thought that “in very general terms, Panslavism has been identified with the movement of the Slavs for a political union”,¹²¹ while Hans Kohn spoke of “the Pan-Slav program of a union of all Slavs into a powerful whole, shaping the political and cultural destinies of mankind”.¹²² The persistence of such definitions is curious. To understand Ukrainian anarchism, scholars study Ukrainian anarchists; to understand German social democracy, scholars study German social democrats. Why then do scholars invoke Hungarian or German Slavophobe definitions to understand Slovak Panslavism?

Perhaps modern scholars prefer the political definition because they tend to equate “pan-nationalism”, and indeed “nationalism” itself, with a quest for statehood.¹²³ Since Panslavs repeatedly discussed invoked the “nation”, scholars apparently assume that Panslavs secretly or ultimately cherished the desire for a Panslav state. Hugo Hantsch, to give one particularly vivid example, admitted that Habsburg Panslavism originally “had no political, but only a literary, meaning”, but still concluded that since “Pan-Slavism could reach its goal only if the Austro-Hungarian monarchy fell to pieces ... the actions of Pan-Slavs, therefore, had to be hostile to the monarchy”.¹²⁴

Theories of nationalism, however, must always be checked against the historical record. While many theories of pan-nationalism assume that literary activism inevitably implies a longing for statehood, such theories shed little light on the national thinking of Kollár, Štúr and their contemporaries. Habsburg Panslavism did not imply Russian irredentism, and indeed is better analyzed as a form of language planning.¹²⁵

119 SIMPSON and WEINER, eds. *The Compact Oxford English Dictionary*. Second edition. Oxford 1991, 1265.

120 ATKIN, BIDDISS and TALLETT. *The Wiley-Blackwell Dictionary of Modern European History Since 1789*. Oxford 2011, 312.

121 ERIKSON, *Panslavism*, p. 3.

122 KOHN, *Panslavism*, p. 325.

123 MAXWELL. Pan-Nationalism as a Category in Theory and Practice. In *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 2021, Vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 8-11; MAXWELL and TURNER. Nationalists Rejecting Statehood: Three Case Studies from Wales, Catalonia, and Slovakia. In *Nations and Nationalism*, 2022, Vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 692-707

124 HANTSCH. Pan-Slavism, Austro-Slavism, Neo-Slavism: The All-Slav Congresses and the Nationality Problems of Austria-Hungary. In *Austrian History Yearbook*, 1965, Vol. 1, pp. 23, 25.

125 MAXWELL. Greece and Germany as Models for Habsburg Pan-Slavs. In *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 2021, Vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 20-39.

Linguistic theories, furthermore, must also be checked against the historical record. The contrast between codified “literary languages” and uncoded “spoken dialects” may shed light in other contexts, but proves misleading when applied to Panslavs in Hungary. Kollár and Štúr associated Slavic literary traditions with the status of “dialect” [*nářečí, nářečja, Mundart, dialectus*]. They disagreed both about the overall number of these various dialects, and specifically about the status of Slovak. However, they agreed on the essential unity of the “Slavic language”, and thus that literary Russian, literary Polish, literary Czech, and so forth, were “literary dialects”.¹²⁶

Nineteenth-century Panslavism thus encourages a new look at the history of “Slovakia”. During the nineteenth century, belief in a “Slovak nation” and a “Slovak language” evidently held little appeal to influential figures from what would eventually become the “Slovak” ethnoterritory. That individuals subsequently claimed as Slovak national heroes failed to articulate basic tenets of Slovak nationalism problematizes narratives of Slovakia’s “quest for statehood”.¹²⁷ Scholars may be forgiven if they find the ubiquity of Panslavism surprising, but the aforementioned annoyance and anger directed at Kollár suggests that some scholars are not merely surprised, but threatened. I suggest, however, that scholars should not feel threatened, but intrigued. The lack of Slovak particularist nationalism among nineteenth century “Slovaks” provides historians with an opportunity to investigate contingency in so-called “national awakening,” one of the fundamental questions about the origins of nationalism. The contingencies of Slovak nationalism are interesting, and remain surprisingly unexplored.

The misrepresentation of Kollár and Štúr offers one final lesson of particular importance to emerging scholars, or to scholars new to nineteenth-century “Slovak” national thought. For whatever reason, the secondary literature has gone to great lengths to suppress the memory of Panslavism. The basic principle that primary source quotations must be transcribed without lexical substitution is not being followed. Indeed, the extent to which book titles have been mistranslated and key passages from important documents falsified amounts to scholarly misconduct. Until such practices cease, scholars taking an interest in this period must stick closely to the primary sources, ideally in their original editions. The secondary literature is demonstrably untrustworthy.

126 MAXWELL. Literary Dialects in China and Slovakia: Imagining Unitary Nationality with Multiple Orthographies. In *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2003, Vol. 164, pp. 129-149

127 UČNÍK. *European Discourses on Rights: The Quest for Statehood in Slovakia*. Brussels 2003.

About the author

Associate Professor Alexander Maxwell, Ph.D.

Victoria University of Wellington, History Programme

PO Box 600

Wellington, New Zealand

e-mail: alexander.maxwell@vuw.ac.nz

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5332-5795>

<https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=12807400700>

<https://www.webofscience.com/wos/author/record/15551041,26183258>

List of references and literature

Primary Sources

ČERNÝ, Emil. *Slovenská čítanka, vol. 2*. Banská Bystrica: Krčméry, 1865.

HATTALA, Martin. *Grammatica linguae slovenicae, collatae com proxime cognata bohémica*. Banská Štiavnica: Lorber, 1851.

HATTALA, Martin. *Krátka Mluvnica slovenská*. Bratislava: Schmidovy, 1852.

HERKEL, Ján. *Elementa Universalis Linguae Slavicae*. Buda: Typis regiae universitatis Hungaricae, 1826.

HODŽA, Michal Miroslav. *Větin o Slovenčině*. Levoča: Werthmüller, 1848.

HOITSY, Samuel. *Apologie des ungrischen Slawismus*. Leipzig: Vlockmar, 1843.

HOLOVATSKI, Yakov. *Istoricheski ocherk osnovanija Galitsko-Ruskoj Matitsě*. Lviv: Cherenkami Institute Stavropihijanskogo, 1850.

HURBAN, Miroslav. *Českje hlasi proti Slovenčine*. Skalice: Skarniel, 1846.

KOLLÁR, Jan. *Národní zpiewanky čili pjsně swětské Slowákow w Uhrách*. Buda: Typis regiae universitatis Hungaricae, 1835.

KOLLÁR, Jan. *Sláwy Dcera: we třech zpěwjch*. Buda: Typis regiae universitatis Hungaricae, 1824.

KOLLÁR, Jan. *Sláwy Dcera: lyricko-epická báseň w pěti zpěwjch*. Praha: Trattner a Károly, 1832.

KOLLÁR, Jan. *Über die literarische Wechselseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation*. Pest: Trattner a Károly, 1837.

KOLLÁR, Jan. *Über die Wechselseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation*. Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1844.

KOLLÁR, Jan. "O českoslowenské jednotě w řeči a w literatře." In KOLLÁR, Jan, ed. *Hlasowé o potřebě jednoty spisowného jazyka pro Čechy, Morawany a Slowáky*, 101-126. Praha: Kronberg a Řiwnák, 1846.

KOLLÁR, Jan. *Sláwy Dcera: lyricko-epická báseň w pěti zpěwjch*. Wien: Mechitarist, 1852.

KOLLÁR, Jan. *Reciprocity Between the Tribes and Dialects of the Slavic Language*. Bloomington: Slavica, 2009.

LICHARD, Daniel. *Rozhovory o matici slovenksej*. Banská Bystrica: Matičných spisov č. 4, 1865.

MAJAR, Matija. *Uzajemni pravopis Slavjanski*. Praha: Kober, 1865.

MARN, Josip. *Pomenki o slovenskem pisaniji. Jezičnik, ali pomenki o slovenskem pisanji, Vol. 5*. Ljubljana: Rudolf Milic, 1867.

- ŠAFARÍK, Pavel Josef. *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten*. Buda: Typis regiae universitatis Hungaricae, 1826.
- ŠAFARÍK, Pavel Josef. *Slowanský Národopis*. Praha: n.p., 1842.
- ŠAFARÍK, Pavel Josef. *Slavianskoe narodopisanie*. Translated by Osip Bodjanskij. Moskva: Universitetskaja tipografija, 1843.
- ŠAFARÍK, Pavel Josef. *Slowiański narodopis*. Translated by Piotr Dahlmann. Wrocław: Schletter, 1843.
- ŠTÚR, Ľudovít. *Beschwerden und Klagen der Slaven in Ungarn über die gesetzwidrigen Uebergrieffe der Magyaren*. Leipzig: Robert Binder, 1843.
- ŠTÚR, Ľudovít. *Nauka reči slovenskej*. Bratislava: Tatrin, 1846.
- ŠTÚR, Ľudovít. *Nárečja slovenskuo alebo potreba písanja v tomto nárečí*. Bratislava: Wigand, 1846.
- SYCHRA, Mathias. *Versuch einer böhmischen Phraseologie, vol. 1*. Brno: Traßler, 1821.

Source editions, published editions

- ORMIS, Ján. *O reč a národ*. Bratislava: SAV, 1973.
- RUTTKAY, Fráňo, ed. *Slovenskje národňje novini*. Bratislava: Slovenské vydavateľstvo politickej literatury, 1956.
- VYVÍJALOVÁ, Mária, ed. *Slovenskje národňje novini; boje o ich povolenie (štúdia a dokumenty)*. Martin: Osveta, 1972.

Press

- KOLLÁR, Jan. O literarnég Wzágemnosti. In *Hronka: Podtatranská Zábavnice*, 1836, Vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 39-53.
- KOPITAR, Jernej. Patriotische Phantasien eines Slaven. In *Vaterländische Blätter für den österreichischen Kaiserstaat*, 1810, Vol. 3, no. 9, pp. 87-88.
- Magyarország és Erdély. In *Pesti Hirlap* (29 September 1842), pp. 689-690.
- Magyar önálló kereskedés megalapításáról. In *Pesti Hirlap* (15 January 1843), p. 38.
- PULSZKY, Ferenc. A' Szlávok literariai viszonságáról. In *Pesti Hirlap* (2 October 1842), pp. 702-03.
- SÖRÉS, András. Ismét egy adat az Allgem. Zeitung költeményeiről. In *Pesti Hirlap* (8 February 1844), pp. 88-89.
- ŠTÚR, Ľudovít. Nitra (Narodna slovačka pësma). In *Danica ilirska* (3 June 1837), Vol. 3, no. 3, p. 85.
- ŠTÚR, Ľudovít. Panslavism a naša Krajina. In *Slovenskje Národňje novini*, Vol. 1, nos. 215-218 (3, 7, 10, 14 September 1847), pp. 857-58, 861-63, 865-66, 869-70.
- ŠTÚR, Ľudovít. Pohled na hýbání západních a jižních Slowanů. In *Národní Noviny* (2 May 1848), no. 23, pp. 89-90.

Secondary sources

Monographs

- BARTL, Július. *Slovak History: Chronology and Lexicon*. Bratislava: SAV, 2002.
- BEREND, Ivan. *History Derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California, 2003.
- BROCK, Peter. *The Slovak National Awakening: An Essay in the Intellectual History of East Central Europe*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1976.
- BURKE, Peter. *The Social History of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

- CAMBEL, Samuel. *Dejiny Slovenská II (1526–1848)*. Bratislava: SAV, 1987.
- DE BRAY, R. G. A. *Guide to the West Slavonic Languages*. Bloomington: Slavica, 1980.
- DERKSEN, Rick. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- DOLANSKÝ, Julius. *Stopami buditeľů*. Praha: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury a umění, 1963.
- DOROVSKÝ, Ivan. *Slovenské meziliterární shody a rozdíly*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2004.
- ERIKSON, John. *Panslavism*. London: Historical Association, 1964.
- FELAK, James. *At the Price of the Republic: Hlinka's Slovak People's Party, 1929–1938*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1994.
- HROCH, Miroslav. *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- JÓNA, Eugen. *Postavy slovenskej jazykovedy v dobe Štúrovej*. Bratislava: SAV, 1985.
- KAMUSELLA, Tomasz. *Words in Space and Time: Historical Atlas of Language Politics in Modern Central Europe*. Budapest: CEU Press, 2022.
- KIRSCHBAUM, Stanislav. *A History of Slovakia: The Struggle for Survival*. London: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- KIRSCHBAUM, Stanislav. *Historical Dictionary of Slovakia*. Lanham: Scarecrow, 2014.
- KOHN, Hans. *Panslavism: Its History and Ideology*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1953.
- KOŠŤ, Solomiya. *Romantychna koncepcija Nacionalnoyi Identychnosti u Slov'yanskyx Literaturax 30–60-x rokov XIX stolittya (na prykladi Tvorchosti Karela Zapa)*. Lviv: Ivan Frankiv National University, Ph.D. Thesis, 2021.
- LOCHER, Theodore. *Die Nationale Differenzierung und Integrierung der Slovaken und Tschechen in ihrem Geschichtlichen Verlauf bis 1848*. Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk Willink & Zoon, 1931.
- MAXWELL, Alexander. *Choosing Slovakia*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2009.
- MIKUŠ, Joseph. *Slovakia and the Slovaks*. Washington: Three Continents Press, 1977.
- MILOJKOVIĆ-DJURIĆ, Jelena. *Panslavism and National Identity in Russia and the Balkans 1830–1880*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1994.
- PETRO, Peter. *History of Slovak Literature*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1997.
- PYNSSENT, Robert. *Questions of Identity: Czech and Slovak Ideas of Nationality and Personality*. Budapest: CEU Press, 1994.
- RADOSAVLJEVIĆ, Paul. *Who are the Slavs?* Boston: Richard Badger, 1919.
- ROOY, Raf Van. *Language or Dialect? The History of a Conceptual Pair*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- SETON-WATSON, Hugh. *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. London: Methuen, 1977.
- SETON-WATSON, R. W. *Racial Problems in Hungary*. London: Archibald Constable, 1908.
- SIVRIĆ, Ivo. *Bishop J. G. Strossmayer*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1975.
- STANČIĆ, Nikša. *Gajeva "Još Horvatska ni propala" iz 1832-33*. Zagreb: Globus, 1989.
- SUSSEX, Roland and CUBBERLY, Paul. *The Slavic Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- TEICH, Mikuláš. *Bohemia in History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- THOMAS, Alfred. *The Bohemian Body*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 2007.
- UČNÍK, Lubica. *European Discourses on Rights: The Quest for Statehood in Slovakia*. Brussels: Peter Lang, 2003.
- VARGA, János. "Fear of Pan-Slavism." *A Hungarian Quo Vadis: Political Trends and Theories of the Early 1840s*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1993, pp. 110-132.

Articles in Journals, Book Chapters

- AGNEW, Hugh LeCaine. Czechs, Slovaks and the Slovak Linguistic Separatism of the Mid-Nineteenth Century. In MORISON, John, ed. *The Czech and Slovak Experience*. London: St. Martin's Press, 1992, pp. 21-37.
- AMBRUŠ, Jozef. Die Slawische Idee bei Ján Hollý. In HOLOTÍK, Ľudovít, ed. *Ľudovít Štúr und die Slawische Wechselseitigkeit*. Bratislava: SAV, 1969, pp. 46-49.
- BAKKE, Elisabeth. Conceptions of Czechoslovakism among Czech Politicians in Government Inauguration Debates 1918–1938. In HUDEK, Adam, KOPEČEK, Michal and MERVART, Jan, eds. *Czechoslovakism*. London: Routledge, 2022, pp. 149-171.
- BLANÁR, Vincent. K terminológii v matičných rokoch. In *Československý terminologický časopis*, 1963, Vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 257-74.
- BLANÁR, Vincent. Cenný príspevok k dejinám spisovnej slovenčiny. In *Slavica Slovaca*, 2002, Vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 148-154.
- COOPER, David. Competing Languages of Czech Nation-Building: Jan Kollár and the Melodiousness of Czech. In *Slavic Review*, 2008, Vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 301-320. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0037677900023548>
- DORULA, Ján. Slovenčina a bibličtina v evanjelickej cirkvi na Slovensku. In *Slavica Slovaca*, 2011, Vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 3-9.
- GRIGORIEVA, Anna. Pan-Slavism in Central and Southeastern Europe. In *Journal of Siberian Federal University, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2013, vol. 1, pp. 13-21.
- HANTSCH, Hugo. Pan-Slavism, Austro-Slavism, Neo-Slavism: The All-Slav Congresses and the Nationality Problems of Austria-Hungary. In *Austrian History Yearbook*, 1965, vol. 1, pp. 23-37. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237800008481>
- HARAKSIM, Ľudovít. Slovak Slavism and Panslavism. In TEICH, Mikuláš, KOVÁČ, Dušan and BROWN Martin, eds. *Slovakia in History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, pp. 101-119.
- HAUGEN, Einar. Dialect, Language, Nation. In *American Anthropologist*, 1966, Vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 922-935. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1966.68.4.02a00040>
- HODŽA, Milan. *Československý rozkol*. Martin: vlastným, 1920.
- HORÁK, Emil. Slovensko-české filologické paralely z (južno)slavistického aspektu. In *Slavica Slovaca*, 2007, Vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 102-110.
- JÓNA, Eugen. Účasť Ľudovíta Štúra pri utváraní spisovnej slovenčiny. In *Slovenská reč*, 1956, Vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 131-146.
- KAČALA, Ján. Jazykovedné dielo Ľudovíta Štúra a súčasná slovakistika. In *Reč*, 1986, Vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 129-135.
- KOHN, Hans. Romanticism and Realism among Czechs and Slovaks. In *The Review of Politics*, 1952, Vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 25-46. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1404717>
- KOŠŤ, Solomiya. Movne pytannya u traktatí Yana Kollara 'Dyskusiyyi pro slov'yans'ku vzayemnist' yak predmet polemiky mizh avtorom i Lyudovitom Shturom. In *Naukovyy visnyk mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu*, 2022, Vol. 55, pp. 120-123.
- KOVÁČ, Dušan. The Slovak Political Programme: From Hungarian Patriotism to the Czechoslovak State. In TEICH, Mikuláš, KOVÁČ, Dušan and BROWN Martin, eds. *Slovakia in History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, pp. 120-136.
- MAXWELL, Alexander. Literary Dialects in China and Slovakia: Imagining Unitary Nationality with Multiple Orthographies. In *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2003, Vol. 164, pp. 129-149. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2003.051>
- MAXWELL, Alexander. Taxonomies of the Slavic World since the Enlightenment: Schematizing Perceptions of Slavic Ethnonyms in a Chart. In *Language and History*, 2015, Vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 24-54. <https://doi.org/10.1179/1759753615Z.000000000037>

- MAXWELL, Alexander. Pan-Nationalism as a Category in Theory and Practice. In *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 2021. Vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537113.2021.2004767>
- MAXWELL, Alexander. The Legacy of Slavic Reciprocity in the First Czechoslovak Republic. In GAŠIOR, Agnieszka, KARL, Lars and TROEBST, Stefan, eds. *Post-Panslavismus: Slavizität, Slavische Idee und Antislavismus im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2014, pp. 69-78.
- NOWOTNY, Pawol. Listy, pisane serbskemu gymnazialnemu towarstwu w Budyšinje z lět 1839-50. In *Lětopis*, 1965, Vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 184-245.
- ORAVCOVÁ, Marianna. The Ethnic and Cultural Dimension of National Emancipation. In PICHLER, Tibor and GAŠPARIKOVÁ, Jana, eds. *Language, Values, and the Slovak Nation*. Washington: Paideia, 1994, pp. 9-24.
- PÁL, Judit. "In the Grasp of the Pan-Slavic Octopus": Hungarian Nation Building in the Shadow of Pan-Slavism Until the 1848 Revolution. In *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 2002, Vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 40-52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537113.2021.2004764>
- PECH, Stanley. Nationalism in Eastern Europe (Review). In *Slavic Review*, 1970, Vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 719-721. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2493299>
- PFALZGRAF, Falco. Linguistic Purism in the History of German. In HORAN, Geraldine and LANGER, Nils, eds. *Landmarks in the History of the German Language*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2009, pp. 137-168.
- PICHLER, Tibor. The Idea of Slovak Language-based Nationalism. In PICHLER, Tibor and GAŠPARIKOVÁ, Jana, eds. *Language, Values and the Slovak Nation*. Washington: Paideia, 1994, pp. 35-46.
- PRAŽÁK, Albert. *Češi a Slováci*. Praha: Státní nakladatelství, 1929.
- PRAŽÁK, Albert. *Dějiny spisovné slovenštiny po dobu Štúrova*. Praha: Gustav Voleský, 1922.
- PRAŽÁK, Albert. *Slovenská otázka v době J. M. Hurbana*. Bratislava: Filozofická fakulta University Komenského, 1923.
- ROOY, Raf Van. Διάλεκτος, Dialectus, Dialect: A Word's Curious Journey from Ancient Greek to (Neo-) Latin and Beyond. In *Latomus: Revue d'études latines*, 2019, Vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 733-70. <https://doi.org/10.2143/LAT.78.3.3287369>
- ROSENBAUM, Karol. Dielo Jána Kollára v kontexte českej a slovenskej literatúry v 19. storočí: (náčrt problematiky). In *Slavica slovacca*, 1993, vol. 28, no. 1-2, pp. 121-127.
- SAFRAN, William. Language, Ethnicity and Religion: A Complex and Persistent Linkage. In *Nations and Nationalism*, 2008, Vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 171-190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8129.2008.00323.x>
- SVOLJŠAK, Petra. The pre-March Era, The Time of non-Freedom. In LUTHAR, Oto, ed. *The Land Between: A History of Slovenia*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2008, pp. 264-279.
- THOMAS, Alfred. Forging Czechs: The Reinvention of National Identity in the Bohemian Lands. In RYAN, Judith and THOMAS, Alfred, eds. *Cultures of Forgery*. London: Routledge, 2003, pp. 29-52.
- THOMSON, Harrison. A Century of a Phantom: Pan-Slavism and the Western Slavs. In *Journal of Central European Affairs*, 1951, Vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 57-77.
- VAN MARLE, Jaap. Dialect versus standard Language: Nature versus Culture. In CHESHIRE, Jenny and STEIN, Dieter, eds. *Taming the Vernacular: From Dialect to Written Standard Language*. London: Routledge, 2014, pp. 13-34.

Dictionaries

- ATKIN, Nicholas, BIDDISS, Michael and TALLETT, Frank, eds. *The Wiley-Blackwell Dictionary of Modern European History Since 1789*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

- AVRAMOVIĆ, Teodor. *Němécij i sérbsij slovár' na potrebu sérbskago naroda / Deutsch und Illyrisches Wörterbuch zum Gebrauch der illyrischen Nation*. Wien: Edlen von Kurzbeck, 1790.
- BANDTKIE, Jerzy. *Nowy słownik kieszonkowy niemiecko-polsko-francuzki, vol. 2*. Wrocław: Korn, 1839.
- BERNOLÁK, Anton. *Slovár Slowenski= Česko= Lat'insko= Německo= Uherski seu Lexicon Slavicum*. Buda: University Press, 1825-27.
- CHMELA, Josef. *Lateinisch-Böhmisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch / Latinsko-česko-německý slovník*. Hradec Králové: Pospíšil, 1830.
- DROBNÍČ, Josip. *Ilirsko-němačko-talianski mali řečník*. Wien: Jermen, 1849.
- HÖLTERHOF, Franz. *Rossiiskoi Tsellarius ili poleynoj leksikon / der russische Cellarius*. Moskva: Universitetskaja Tipografija, 1771.
- JUNGMANN, Josef Jakub. *Slovník česko-německý, vol. 2*. Praha: Špinka, 1835.
- KONEČNÝ, Johan Nepomouk. *Ouplný Kapesní slovník čechoslowanského a německého jazyka / Vollständiges Taschen-Wörterbuch der čechoslawischen u. deutschen Sprache*. Wien: Wenedikt, 1845.
- PALKOVIĆ, Juraj. *Böhmisch-deutsch-lateinisches Wörterbuch*. Praha: Thomas Kubelka, 1820.
- RODDE, Jacob. *Deutsch-Russisches Wörterbuch*. Riga: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch, 1784.
- SIMPSON, John and WEINER, Edmund, eds. *The Compact Oxford English Dictionary*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- TROJAŃSKI, Józef Kajetan. *Ausführliches deutsch-polnisches Handwörterbuch zum Gebrauche für Polen und Deutsche, vol. 1*. Poznań: Mittler, 1844.
- VOLCHKOV, Sergej. *Novoj leksikon na Francusskom, Nemeckom, Latinskom, i na Rossijskom, vol. 1*. St. Petersburg: Academy of Sciences, 1755.