

Six

Czech and Slovak national revival

*What can be more glorious, Than to revere one's ancestors, To honor them,
and the fatherland, and the language, To strive for their improvement?*

Jan Nejedlý, 1801¹

The terms that were originally used to describe the transition to nationhood (resurrection, awakening) portrayed the process as something of a miracle: The nation had been dead and was brought back to life, or it had been asleep and was reawakened. A legacy of this is the continued use of the term "awakeners" (*buditelé*) about the men who initiated the process, albeit hardly in a literal sense. The concept of a national revival (*národní obrození*) that became common in the second half of the 19th century suggests a less dramatic change.

It seems that a pre-national Czech identity existed among the nobility already in the Middle Ages; cf. the chronicles of Kosmas and "Dalimil." The Slovak case is more dubious. An idea of "other-ness" is conveyed in certain texts from the 17th century, but this identity was still diffuse and ill-defined. These pre-national identities provided a point of departure for the transition to nationhood, starting in the second half of the 18th century. The ambiguity of those identities and the close cultural and linguistic affinity between Czechs and Slovaks affected the course of the revivals, and explain how Czechoslovakism was possible.

The aim of this chapter is to give an outline of the national revivals of the Czechs and Slovaks,² following Hroch's three-phase scheme. The changing contents of Czech and Slovak identity will be addressed in Chapter Seven. As noted Chapter Three, the diffusion of national identity from an elite to the masses is a gradual process, and its successful completion depends on the ability of a nationally aware elite to propagate the national message and the willingness of the masses to endorse it. Provided that such an elite exists, the former is a question of having the necessary means available; the latter is a matter of nationally relevant conflicts.

¹ (Slavnější což může byti, Nežli čest svým předkům vzdát, Je i vlast, i jazyk ctíti, O jich zvelebení dbát?). Quoted in Hugh LeCaine Agnew: *Origins of the Czech national renaissance* (1993:163).

² For details, see: J. Kočí: *České národní obrození* (1978), *Počátky českého národního obrození*(1990), Z. Šolle & A. Gajanová: *Po stopě dějin. Češi a Slováci v letech 1848–1938* (1969), J. Novotný: *Češi a Slováci za národního obrození a do vzniku českosloveského státu* (1968), *Slovanství v národním životě Čechů a Slováků* (1968). In English: M. Hroch: *Social preconditions of national revival in Europe* (1985), P. Brock & H. G. Skilling (ed.): *The Czech renaissance of the nineteenth century* (1970); H. L. Agnew: *Origins of the Czech national revival* (1993), A. Klima: *The Czechs in*: M. Teich & R. Porter (eds.): *The National question in Europe* (1993), P. Brock: *The Slovak national awakening* (1976), Jiří Kořalka: *Participation of lower middle and working classes in the Czech national movement during the 19th century* (1993), S.J. Kirschbaum: *A history of Slovakia* (1994), and J. F. Zacek: *Nationalism in Czechoslovakia in Sugar & Lederer* (eds): *Nationalism in Eastern Europe* (1994).

The means available to a national movement are clearly different from the means of a government, especially in terms of coercive power. A government can resort to censorship, police surveillance, harassment, imprisonment, violence, even death in order to silence unwanted messages. A national movement must convince the people that they are a nation through agitation, which in practice requires a certain minimum of freedom of congregation and access to printed mass media. National institutions also require financing, whether they are theaters, journals, museum societies or publishing companies. It is perhaps in terms of means the Slovak case differs most from the Czech, and an important reason for this is the difference in nationality policy after 1867.

As for nationally relevant conflicts, such conflicts definitely existed in both cases. Both the Habsburg empire as a whole and the Czech lands, respectively Hungary, approximated what Horowitz calls ranked systems, with concurrence between cultural features and social and/or political domination/subordination. This concurrence was not perfect, but clear enough to provide a foundation for the idea that "we", the Czechs or Slovaks, are underprivileged compared to the others – the Germans and (increasingly) the Magyars.

The role of enlightened absolutism

Traditionally, German Romanticism in general and Herder's ideas in particular have been blamed for the evolution of nationalist ideas and their subsequent diffusion. More recently, the role of Enlightenment ideas and enlightened absolutism has been emphasized. It is hardly accidental that all the national revivals of the subject peoples of the Habsburg Empire started during the era of enlightened absolutism. Moreover, Herderian Romantic influences *are* quite apparent, especially in the 19th century. However, none of these influences were engraved on a *tabula rasa*: They entered into a complicated interaction with existing ideas and, not least, existing realities, yielding similar and yet unique results in each nation.

There are at least two possible interpretations of the link between the diffusion of Enlightenment ideas through enlightened absolutism and the start of the national revivals. On the one hand, the early national revivals can be seen as a natural *part* of the greater Enlightenment project, with its emphasis on progress and scholarship. On the other hand, they can be interpreted as a *reaction* to the policies of enlightened absolutism. Especially important were the school reforms, the relaxation of censorship and the Patent of Tolerance. The liquidation of the last of the state-rights institution of Bohemia (the Court Chancellery) and the abolition of serfdom were especially offensive to the Bohemian nobility.

The school reforms were consequential in two ways: they raised the question of providing ordinary people with education, and they were accompanied by a Germanization policy that put non-Germans at a disadvantage. From the very beginning, the revivals took the shape of national and linguistic defense. The relaxation of censorship facilitated the defense reaction, by allowing patriotic literature to be printed, including texts that had been forbidden during the Counter-Reformation, such as Balbín's famous defense of the Czech language (1775).

The Patent of Tolerance brought the Czechs and Slovaks closer together, mainly through its restrictions: Czech Protestants were not allowed to take priests from outside the empire. Since the Slovak Protestant clergy was familiar with the use of Czech in sermons, Slovaks were naturally preferred. According to Jan Novotný, these Slovaks not only contributed to the religious life of the Czechs, they also took part in the Czech revival. Upon their return to Slovakia, they became the foremost spokesmen for Czecho-Slovak reciprocity.³

The Enlightenment imprint on the first scholarly phase of the national revival is unmistakable. Yet, the concern of the early awakeners was clearly national, and their attitudes were unequivocally patriotic on behalf of the nation-to-be. Keeping this in mind, we can say that the transition from a scholarly oriented phase A to a more agitation oriented phase B coincided with a shift in influence, from the Enlightenment to German Romanticism. However, cultural matters continued to dominate, and activities were still directed inwards. During the 1840s, the political emphasis increased, and after the events of 1848–49, the national movements definitely engaged in a political struggle with the government(s). In the Czech case, this coincided with a transition from phase B (agitation) to phase C (the mass phase), to use Hroch's terminology.

The Czech national revival

Many scholars (among them Masaryk), distinguish between two generations of Czech awakeners: An older generation, represented by Josef Dobrovský, who was more influenced by the Enlightenment, and a younger generation, represented by Josef Jungmann, who was more influenced by Romantic currents. This distinction coincides roughly with the distinction between phase A and phase B in Hroch's scheme, but not entirely. Later, after the transition to the mass phase (C), a more critical approach gradually formed.

The scholarly phase

The start of the Czech national revival is usually dated to the period between 1770 and 1790. The efforts of the early awakeners were mostly of a scholarly kind, and they usually wrote in Latin or German. During this early period, the Bohemian nobility played an important part in the Czech revival, especially by financing the scholarly activities of the awakeners. Initial efforts focused on studying history and defending the Czech language as a mark of Czech statehood. It was during this period that efforts to recodify the language also started, and the first national institutions were established. The two most important of these were a chair for the study of Czech language and literature at Charles University of Prague in 1793 (first occupied by František Martin Pelcl), and the Bohemian Society of Sciences in 1784 (the Royal Bohemian Society of Sciences from 1790). The first Czech publishing house, *Česká expedice* (Czech Expedition) was established by Václav Matěj Kramerius in 1790.

³ Novotný (1968:40).

The older works of Czech history were marred with myths, and those that were allowed after 1620 had been written from a Catholic point of view, which rendered suspect the Czech cultural achievements (including the language) of the heretic 15th and 16th centuries. The use of new critical methods in history (basically the same as those employed to today) affected old (pre-Hussite) patriotic works as well as the dogmatic Catholic texts of the Counter-Reformation, by bringing their scientific quality and truthfulness under attack. This paved the way for a new critical attitude to undocumented legends, and a re-evaluation of the Hussite heritage, only to be completed by Palacký more than half a century later.

An early example (first volume appeared in 1761) of the use of critical method is Gelasius Dobner's commentary to Hájek's Czech chronicle (*Kronyka česká*), where he raised doubts about the authenticity of central Czech founding myths, like the legend of forefather Czech (Praotec Čech). For this he was charged with being unpatriotic. Dobner's reply illustrates the Enlightenment spirit of the first generation: "It is the foremost duty of the historian that out of love for his fatherland and for knowledge he should wipe away everything that was invented by later ages, and thus rescue his nation from the ridicule of foreigners."⁴ Two early attempts at rewriting Czech history are Pelcl's *Kurzgefasste Geschichte der Böhmen* (first ed. 1774) and *Nová kronyka česká* (3 vols., 1791–96).

Josef Dobrovský (1753–1829) is generally regarded as the major figure in the first generation of Czech awakers, mainly because of his central role in the recodification of the Czech language. In 1792 Dobrovský published *Geschichte der Böhmischen Sprache und Litteratur*. A more detailed version, only leading up to 1526 because of censorship, came in 1818. He compiled a dictionary, formulated a grammar (published 1809) and set out the guidelines for the creation of new words. Part One of his Czech–German dictionary came in 1802; Part Two was finished by Puchmajer and Hanka in 1821. Dobrovský is also counted among the founders of Czech Slavonic studies. Despite his efforts, he had little faith in the future of the Czech language. He wrote most of his texts in German; like many of his contemporaries, he did not believe that Czech could be used in the fine arts and in science. It is rather ironic that he laid the foundations for the development that was eventually to prove him wrong.

Works of agitation were not entirely lacking during the first phase, but much of this was written in German or Latin, which excluded a majority of the people; besides, the patriotic message was generally directed at the nobility rather than the average commoner. However, some attempts were made at diffusing a sense of national pride and awareness to the broader masses through publication of newspapers and journals and patriotic theatrical performances in Czech. The Royal Theater of the Estates, a German-language theater in Prague founded in 1781, allowed Czech performances in 1785–86. Then a Czech theater, *Bouda* (The Lodge), was temporarily set up in the Horse Market (today's *Václavské náměstí*), while the *Vlastenské Divadlo* (Patriotic Theater, founded 1789) lasted for about ten years.

⁴ Quoted in Agnew (1993:29).

The first newspaper in Czech, *Pražské poštovské noviny* (Prague Post News) appeared as early as in 1719. *Krameriусovy císařské královské pražské poštovské noviny* (Kramerius' Royal Prague Post News, founded 1789), was the first truly patriotic newspaper in the Czech language, while Jan Nejedlý's *Hlasatel český* (Czech Herald) was the first successful Czech literary journal, appearing from 1806.⁵ Others were to follow, but around the turn of the century they were still few in number, as were their subscribers.

The phase of agitation

The start of phase B of the Czech revival may be dated to around 1810–20. According to Hroch, the Czech national movement was well on its way to becoming a mass movement by the mid-1840s, and was helped by the revolution of 1848–49.⁶ The phase of agitation in the Czech case thus covered a time-span of around forty years.

This was in many ways a transitional phase, when a national ideology was formed, while the scope of activities expanded and changed direction. Two trends are discernible: On the one hand, the line between scholarship and agitation became more blurred. It was no longer scholarship for its own sake, but scholarship aimed at improving the situation of the nation. At the same time, important national institutions were founded. On the other hand, the activities of the awakeners expanded gradually, from scholarship to poetry, journalism and the collection of national songs, fairytales and legends. Scholars were often also translators of plays and poetry, or they wrote poetry themselves. To write in Czech became a patriotic act in itself.

Josef Jungmann (1773–1847) is generally regarded as the second great Czech awakener. He was a transitional figure – on the one hand he was influenced by Enlightenment rationalism, and was a great admirer of Voltaire,⁷ but at the same time he was influenced by Romantic currents. Among his major academic contributions are *Slovesnost* (1820), which was the first Czech reader and textbook in literary theory, a history of Czech literature (1825), and a five-volume Czech–German dictionary (1834–39). He was also among the founders of the first scientific journal in Czech, *Krok* ("Step", 1821).

In his *Dvojí rozmlouvání o jazyku českém* (Two Conversations on the Czech Language – 1806), Jungmann formulated the first Czech national cultural program. To him, the hallmark of nationhood was language. He accordingly set out to shape a sophisticated scientific literature as well as belles-lettres in Czech. He wrote poems himself and translated a number of European authors into Czech. (Milton's *Paradise Lost* is counted as the most important work). Jungmann discovered that Czech lacked a broad range of words for more sophisticated purposes, and set out to remedy this, often using Polish or Russian models. Some of the resulting (odd) new words soon went out of use, but the legacy of his efforts is visible even today.

⁵ See Agnew (1993: pp. 129 ff. and 148) for details on theater and journals.

⁶ Hroch (1985:44.)

⁷ Šolle & Gajanová (1969:16).

Apart from Jungmann, three other names stand out in the second phase of the Czech revival; a Moravian – František Palacký (1798–1876), and two men born in "Upper Hungary" – Jan Kollár (1793–1852) and Pavel Josef Šafařík (1795–1861).⁸ They belonged roughly to the same generation and were well acquainted. As Protestants they attended the Lyceum in Bratislava, and Kollár and Šafařík had both attended the German University of Jena, a hotbed of German nationalism at the time. Unlike the others, Palacký went beyond the cultural orbit, advocating political autonomy for the Czechs in a federalized Austria after 1848.

As a scholar Palacký was able to combine national enthusiasm with a high academic level. He is seen as the founder of modern Czech historiography, and is still counted among the greatest Czech historians of all times. His monumental work on Czech history started to appear in German in 1836 under the title *Geschichte von Böhmen* (two volumes). After 1848 he began writing in Czech. Expanded versions of these and three more volumes later were published under the title *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě* (History of the Czech Nation in Bohemia and Moravia). Here Czech history is followed up to 1526.

Many of the best scholars of this time were also translators, poets, journalists and writers. Mention has already been made of the translation activities of Jungmann. One of Jungmann's disciples, František Ladislav Čelakovský (1799–1852), was a poet, a translator and a philologist. In his two *Ohlasy* (Echoes – 1829 and 1839), he mixed folk songs with his own poetry. Božena Němcová (1820–1862) collected folk tales and wrote her own tales (best known is "Grandmother"), where she used elements from popular tradition to develop a new genre.

The Romantic currents of the time inspired the panegyric praise of national character and the exclamations of love for anything that could be defined as "national" so characteristic of the first half of the 19th century, in art, in literature, in journalism and poetry. "Kde domov můj", the present Czech national anthem, is a good illustration of the kind of poetry written at the time. The original text by Josef Kajetán Tyl (1808–56), written to the musical *Fidlovačka* (1834), runs like this: "Where is my home? Water murmurs in the meadows, pine trees whisper in the mountains, spring flowers sway in the orchard, the land of Paradise is in sight! And that is the beautiful land, the Czech land – my home!"⁹

It is in light of this Romanticism we must see the infamous pseudo-medieval manuscripts (a cycle of false Old Czech poems) which "proved" that the Czechs were at a culturally advanced stage at a time when the German archenemies were still barbarians. These writings were "discovered" in 1817 and 1818, and exerted great influence on nationally minded Czechs because of their elegant style and the myths they created about the Czech past. Dobrovský doubted their authenticity, but they were generally believed to be genuine until the 1880s. Today, it is generally believed that students of Jungmann's (Hanka was one) manufactured them.

⁸ Kollár and Šafařík also played a central role in the Slovak national revival. I will return to them in greater detail in that context.

⁹ (Kde domov můj? Hučí voda po lučinách, bory šumí po skalínách, v sadě skví se jara květ, zemský ráj to na pohled! A to je ta krásná země, země česká – domov můj!). The text is e.g. quoted by Milada Součková in Brock & Skilling (1970:26).

The bulk of Czech national institutions were established during the 19th century. A Czech National Museum was founded in 1820, after two years of bureaucratic wrangling. The Museum was established by members of the Bohemian nobility, who were influenced more by *Landespatriotismus* than by Czech national ideas. Beginning in 1827, they published two journals, one in German (which expired in 1832 for lack of subscribers) and one in Czech. Palacký became the first editor of both. In 1831 Palacký, Jungmann and Jan Svatopluk Presl founded the *Malice česká*, modeled on the five years older Serbian *Matica*.

The *Malice česká* was, in the words of Stanley B. Kimball, "the first institution to promote successfully the revival of Czech. It was also the first independent Czech cultural institution to advance nationalism, the first modern institution of a purely Czech character, one of the first and strongest supporters of the modern Czech nation, and the most important legal centre of the Czech national movement to 1848."¹⁰ The goal of the *Malice* was to support Czech language and literature. Under Bach absolutism, however, it reverted to publishing neutral and practical books, and was after 1861 superseded by other institutions.

Karel Havlíček (1821–56) was the forerunner of a new, critical brand of Czech patriots. He is regarded as the founder of Czech political journalism, but he was also a poet and politician. When Czech was first starting to gain foothold in the scientific and literary community, the status of the language was still precarious, and, in the eyes of the patriots, everything written in Czech was by definition good – no matter what the literary quality.

Havlíček rebelled against this notion. He found much of the Romantic super-patriotic Czech literature of his time shallow and theatrical. As a first object of his criticism he chose Josef Kajetán Tyl's novel *Poslední Čech* (The Last Czech). In his review, he remarked rather caustically that it was easier to die for one's country than to torture oneself by reading some of the patriotic literature being produced (!).¹¹ This brought him to Palacký's attention, on whose recommendation he in 1846 became the editor of *Pražské noviny* (*Národní noviny* from 1848) and its literary magazine *Česká včela*. Despite his critical attitude, Havlíček managed to become a national symbol, due to his brave opposition to Vienna after 1849.

Unlike most of his contemporaries, Havlíček laid the blame for the nation's weak position on the Czechs themselves. "Who is the greatest enemy of our nationality?" he asked. "We are ourselves! The government cannot wipe us out, it cannot stamp out our language if we use it. In time, it will even have to protect it. Who can keep us from learning Czech? And yet only a few hundred know it well enough so that they can use it in discussion and professional writing!"¹² His critical attitude also extended to the Pan-Slav ideas that had dominated the Czech national movement after the Napoleonic Wars. In his eyes, the different Slav peoples were separate nations – not one nation with several tribes.

¹⁰ Stanley B. Kimball: *The Malice česká, 1831–1861*, in Brock & Skilling (1970:54).

¹¹ Referred by Barbara Kohák Himmel: *Karel Havlíček and the Czech press*, in Brock & Skilling (1970:116).

¹² Quoted by Himmel in Brock & Skilling (1970:120).

The mass phase

The transition from the phase of agitation to the mass phase can be dated to the period between 1848 and 1861. Before 1848, the nation did not yet include all strata of the population. After 1861, national awareness had reached the masses and a fully-fledged mass national movement existed, politically institutionalized in the National Party (Old Czechs). This transition coincided with the rapid industrialization of the Czech lands, creating new nationally relevant conflicts, and it was completed after serfdom was abolished in 1848.

The latter half of the 19th century was also a period during which the Czechs got many of their important national institutions. Apart from the many newspapers, journals and reading societies that were established, a nationally oriented gymnastics society, *Sokol* (Falcon) was founded in 1862, followed in 1881 by a national theater (which burned down right after the opening and was reopened two years later). The theater was built entirely on voluntary contributions from Czech patriots, and is in itself evidence of the strength of the national movement. The many rallies during the period of passive resistance (1863–79) testify to its mass character.

The Czech part of Charles University became after 1882 the center of a new generation of patriots, who took up the critical heritage of Havlíček. These are called the Realist school for their critical attitude to the old ways of presenting Czech history and the Romanticism of the preceding period. Leading figures in the Realist school were Jan Gebauer in linguistics, Tomáš G. Masaryk in philosophy, and Jaroslav Goll in history. In the struggle over the authenticity of the "old medieval" writings in 1886–87, they all stood together, arguing that the nation could not live on a lie. For this, they were charged with being anti-national.

Now scholarship and agitation again parted company: The aim became to tell history the way it actually was (cf. Ranke). At the same time, the leadership of the national movement passed to writers, journalists and politicians, who generally subscribed to a romantic national interpretation of history. The break between the scholars and the national movement was, however, not complete. Scholars remained important in defining the contents of national identity: what it really meant to be Czech. An illustration of this is the debate on the meaning of Czech history, which started after the turn of the century and is still not quite over.¹³

In this debate the former Realist alliance broke up, with Goll and especially his disciples (who remained faithful to the positivist ideal) on one side, and Masaryk and his supporters on the other. It was Masaryk who triggered the debate through a series of books he wrote on the national question in the years 1895–98, where he set out to present a new philosophy of Czech history. I will return to this debate in the next chapter.

¹³ A collection of contributions until 1945 may be found in Miloš Havelka (ed.): *Spor o smysl českých dějin* (1995). On the contemporary debate, see e.g. Jan Patočka: *Náš národní program* (1990), Jan Křen: *Historické proměny češství* (1992), Jaroslav Krejčí: *O češství a evropanství* (1983, 1995), Petr Pithart: *Dějiny a politika* (1990), František Kautman: *Naděje a úskalí českého nacionalismu. Viktor Dyk v českém politickém životě* (1992).

The Slovak national revival

The Slovak revival deviates from the Czech in at least three respects. First, the pre-national foundations were much weaker. Using two terms coined by Anthony D. Smith we might say that while the Czechs could *rediscover* their history, the Slovaks had to *reconstruct* theirs.¹⁴ A literary language had to be codified for the first time; Slovaks lacked state traditions, and national awareness was not very widespread. Second, two competing currents coexisted during the national revival: One Slovak-Catholic, the other Czechoslovak-Protestant, and this additionally impeded the revival – especially after the linguistically-based concept of the nation gained ground. Third, the Slovak awakeners lacked a native nobility who could help finance their activities.

The scholarly phase

The Slovak national revival started in roughly the same period as the Czech, the final two decades of the 18th century. Activities were also roughly of the same kind and the awakeners wrote in a foreign language, mostly Latin or Czech. Incidentally, two of the Slovak "firsts" were initiated by Slovak Catholics. In 1780 the first Slovak history, *Historia gentis Slavae. De regno regisbuque Slavorum*, was published in Latin. The author was Juraj Papánek, a Catholic priest. By name this was a Slavic history, but it was meant for a Slovak audience, and the focus was on the Slovak tribe of the Slav nation. Papánek invented a line of Slovak kings that never existed,¹⁵ and presented Great Moravia as the first Slovak state.

The idea of codifying the Slovak language was conceived in the Society for the Fostering of the Slovak Language under the General Seminary in Bratislava during the 1780s. The driving force was another Catholic clergyman, Anton Bernolák (1762–1813). In *Dissertatio philologico-critica de litteris Slavorum* (1787), he criticized the idea of a national unity between Czechs and Slovaks on the basis of a common literary language. He saw a literary language as a means of expressing national character and distinguishing the Slovaks from the neighboring Slav nations. The resemblance to Jungmann's ideas twenty years later is obvious.

Bernolák was well acquainted with Czech literature and cultural traditions, and partly used them as a point of departure for his own work. He was thus not anti-Czech in a cultural or historical sense. In the introduction to his dictionary he emphasized that he did not hate the Czech language, which he besides Polish and Russian considered as the most educated of the Slav tongues. He published a grammar in 1790 and a handbook on etymology in 1791 (both in Latin) while his dictionary *Slowár Slowenský*, completed in 1796, was published post mortem in the years 1825 to 1827. Bernolák based his codification of Slovak on a Western Slovak dialect; he discarded Czech letters that represented sounds not found in Slovak (ř, ě, ů) and created new ones for sounds not common in Czech (ľ). The literary language he created is known as *Bernoláčtina*.

¹⁴ On the concepts, see A.D. Smith: *The ethnic origin of nations* (1986:178).

¹⁵ See *Slovanství v národním životě Čechů a Slováků* (1968:102).

During the 1790s, a few books were published in this language, mainly religious literature, some works of Enlightenment and some patriotic books, but also some translations and poems. In order to facilitate the diffusion of the language, Bernolák and Juraj Fandlý, another renown Slovak patriot and writer, founded *Slovenské učené tovarišstvo* (The Slovak Learned Society) in 1792. This was one of the very first Slovak national institutions, was important also because its 581 members formed a tight network all over Slovakia.

While Bernoláčtina spread among the Catholic majority population, the nationally minded Slovak Protestant intelligentsia remained faithful to the Kralice Bible and the Czech *Bibličtina* (Bible language). This intelligentsia played a role far out of proportion to the number of Protestants in the population. They sought out their Czech counterparts for support, and through these contacts, the concept of a Czecho-Slovak tribe of the Slav nation gradually arose. The language-religious split thus played a major part in the crystallization of the two currents in the Slovak national revival.

An early example of a contribution from the Protestant current is Ján Hrdlička's *Vznešenost řeči české neb vůbec slovenské* (The Sublimity of the Czech tongue or actually the Slovak, 1786). This was a defense of the Czech Bible language, and it echoed Karel Hynek Thám's *Obranu jazyka českého proti zlobivým jeho utrhačům* (Defense of the Czech language against the mischief of its offenders, 1783). The Protestant Lyceum in Bratislava was the center of this current. Important figures outside the Lyceum were initially Juraj Ribay and Štefan Leška. Ribay had close links with Dobrovský from 1785 to his death in 1812, and for Dobrovský's dictionary he collected 14,700 Slovak words and 3,850 expressions that differed from Czech.

In the beginning of the 19th century the Protestant awakeners, led by Bohuslav Tablic and Juraj Palkovič, increased the efforts to strengthen the Czecho-Slovak linguistic and cultural community. They established bookstores, tried to spread Czech literature, worked to found a Czecho-Slovak society (accomplished only in the 1830s for lack of funding), and the establishment of a Czechoslovak chair at the Protestant Lyceum in Bratislava. The latter was achieved in 1803 with support from Czech patriots, and Palkovič filled the professor post until 1848. Between 1812 and 1818 he also published a patriotic weekly, *Týdeník aneb Císařské královské Národní noviny* (Weekly or Royal National News).

The phase of agitation

According to Hroch, the Slovak phase of agitation started in the 1820s, only slightly later than the Czech. But material conditions were more difficult, and Slovak agitation did not begin to bear fruit until the 1830s. A certain degree of success can be noted around the mid-1840s, and some notable results were achieved in the cultural and educational fields during the 1860s, but because of increased Magyarization after the *Ausgleich* of 1867, the transition to the mass phase was postponed to the 20th century.¹⁶

¹⁶ See Hroch (1985:98–99).

While the phase of agitation was a time of national flowering among the Czechs in terms of national institutions, journals and newspapers, the Slovak situation was far more precarious. First, Magyarization pressures were much stronger. Assimilation into the ruling Magyar nation was openly advocated already in 1817, and anti-Slovak attacks were accompanied by arguments to the effect that the Slovaks did not comprise their own nation within the Hungarian framework, and thus had no right to a national life. The Magyar language was made compulsory in the higher school system and the administration system; eventually also the primary schools were increasingly Magyarized, culminating after 1867.

Second, the Slovak awakeners were few, their composition was socially narrow, and they were usually not well off. The nobility was Magyarized and has been accused of being more bent on Magyarization than were the native Magyars, while the bourgeoisie was largely German. According to Novotný, this is one of the reasons why the available funding for Slovak journals with educational and patriotic contents was inadequate in the 1820s and 1830s. Not until the 1840s were the Slovaks able to finance regular newspapers and journals. In the meantime, they relied on Czech patriotic journals to some extent, like *Květy* (Flowers) under the editorship of Josef Kajetán Tyl from 1834. Czech journals played a role in the Slovak revival chiefly by bringing articles addressing Slovak problems, and by publishing pieces written by Slovak patriots, Protestants *and* Catholics. Czech books were also widely sold.¹⁷

The transition from phase A to phase B coincided with an greater emphasis on Pan-Slavic ideas. At the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1815) Russia stood out as the great emancipator in the eyes of the Slavic subject peoples of Eastern Europe, and a general pro-Russian and Pan-Slavic wave ensued. The Slovaks were no exception; the Pan-Slavic tone of the Slovak national revival was, if anything, stronger than elsewhere. The Polish uprising (1830) changed the direction of Slovak Pan-Slavism from pro-Russian to pro-Polish, with a few exceptions.

The Romantic currents that influenced the generations of Jungmann and Palacký in the Czech national revival are no less visible in the Slovak case. Panegyric praise of everything national can be found among representatives of both currents. The literary form of Bernoláčtina peaked during the 1820s and 1830s through the poetry of Ján Hollý, who surprised even the Czech awakeners by his well-turned verse. (Not that it made them any better disposed towards Bernoláčtina, however.) His poems were even published in Czech translation in the Czech scientific journal *Krok* in 1823. He also translated classical poetry into Bernoláčtina, such as Virgil's *Aeneid*, and thereby helped prove its utility.¹⁸

Slávy dcera (the daughter of Slava) written by Jan Kollár (1793–1852) is probably the best example of Romantic influences among the other current of Slovak awakeners, those adhering to the Czech literary language. This monumental collection of poetic songs, first published in 1824 and expanded in later editions, praised the Slavs and predicated their great future.

¹⁷ See Novotný (1968: pp. 77 ff.).

¹⁸ Novotný (1968:73–74).

Slávy dcera is also a clear expression of Kollár's ideas of Slav reciprocity, which he spelled out in his theoretical works *Rozprava o jménách* (Discussion of Names, 1830) and *O literárnej vzájemnosti medzi kmeny a nárečiami slavskými* (Concerning the Literary Reciprocity between Slav Tribes and Tongues, 1836). His means of ensuring Slav reciprocity were of a cultural nature: bookstores, libraries, comparative grammars and dictionaries, publication of folksongs and proverbs, translation of books, chairs of Slav dialects at the universities, literary periodicals and intensive travel among scholars.

Kollár wrote his own texts mainly in archaic Czech, and he also tried to expand the use of Czech in Slovakia. He was opposed not only to Bernoláčtina, but also to the new Slovak literary language formed by Štúr in the 1840s, and to Jungmann's modern Czech.

While Kollár channeled his enthusiasm for the Slav cause into poetry and romancing about the noble Slavs, Pavel Josef Šafařík focused on scholarship. Among Šafařík's greatest contributions are *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach alle Mundarten* (1826), which was the first attempt at a comprehensive history of the Slav languages and alphabets, and *Slovanské starožitnosti* (Slav Antiques, 1836–37), devoted to the oldest Slav history. *Slovanský národopis* (Slav Ethnography, 1842) gave a contemporary picture of the Slavic nations, their settlements and numbers, their languages and literature, and is seen as one of the first expressions of Czech political Austro-Slavism.

The 1830s saw the beginning of a rapprochement between the Catholic and the Protestant current in the Slovak revival under the umbrella of Slav reciprocity. The defenders of Bernoláčtina, with Martin Hajmuljak at the helm, emphasized the cultural kinship with the Czechs, and the followers of Kollár started to see the need for linguistic reform. In 1834, a joint body, *Spolek milovníkov reči a literatury Slovenskej* (The Association of Lovers of the Slovak Tongue and Literature) was founded, with Kollár as the first chairman. The increased Magyarization drive of the 1840s only strengthened this rapprochement, and also served as a pretext for the first Slovak petition to the emperor against Magyarization (1842).

A decisive event in the rapprochement process was the second (and ultimately successful) attempt at codifying a Slovak literary language, by the third great Slovak awakener of this phase, the Lutheran clergyman Ľudovít Štúr. The decision to form a new Slovak literary language based on a central Slovak dialect was made in February 1843. The foundations for his codification of a new Slovak literary language were set out in two books, *Nárečja slovenskuo* (The Slovak Tongue) and *Náuka reči slovenskej* (Theory of the Slovak Language), a Slovak grammar. The first book written in this new "code" was the yearbook *Nitra* (1844), published by Jozef Miloslav Hurban (1817–88), one of Štúr's close compatriots. Like Štúr and the third co-worker, Michal Miloslav Hodža, Hurban was a clergyman of Protestant stock educated at the Lyceum in Bratislava and active in the Czecho-Slovak society. He was the first of the "Štúr circle" who abandoned Kollár's concept of a Czecho-Slovak nation and adopted the notion of Slovak individuality, around 1837.

In 1845, the Štúr circle published the first issue of *Slovenské Narodní Noviny* (Slovak National News) with the literary magazine *Orol tatranský* (The Tatra Eagle), which was forbidden after Bach absolutism set in. After a period when three Slovak literary languages (*Bernoláčtina*, *Štúrština* and *Czech Bibličtina*) coexisted, a final compromise was reached in 1852, incorporating some elements of *Bernoláčtina*. The result was published in Martin Hattala's *Kratká mluvnica slovenská* (A Concise Slovak Grammar). This also marked the end of the Czechoslovak current in the Slovak revival, at least for the time being.

The 1840s also saw the first successful attempts at forming patriotic associations for the general public, like the cooperative movement, the Sunday school movement (under the slogan education of the nation) and amateur theaters. In the brief period between the end of Bach absolutism (1859) and the *Ausgleich* of 1867, Slovak agitation made clear progress, not least institutionally. *Matica slovenská* (The Slovak Matica) was founded in Turčianský Svätý Martin in 1863. The aim was moral and scholarly education of the Slovaks, cultivating Slovak literature and art, and increased material welfare of the Slovak nation. The three Slovak *gymnasia* that were founded strengthened the Slovak intelligentsia, at least for a while. The *Ausgleich* meant a setback for the Slovak national movement. Magyarization impeded the diffusion of Slovak identity as well as the development of Slovak political parties.

Towards a mass phase

Prior to the revolution of 1848, the Slovak national movement had been confined to a small intelligentsia, largely made up of the clergy. Towards the end of the century, it was gaining a foothold also among the middle classes in the cities, well-off peasants and professionals. It has been suggested that the "opposition and radical press had a special capacity to replace the banned or unauthorized Slovak secondary schools, associations and political forums."¹⁹ Slovak journals and newspapers thus represented an institutional base through which the Slovak national movement could grow in spite of the harsh conditions. In addition, Slovak students who did not want to assimilate often left Slovak territory for places where the atmosphere was freer and more encouraging. Slovak national circles were developing outside Slovak territory, as was the case among students in Prague, Vienna and Budapest, and close political cooperation developed with the other subject nations of Hungary as well as with the Czechs. The Czechophile current again grew stronger as the First World War approached.

The Slovak problem was also brought to the attention of the world through the writings of R.W. Seton-Watson (*Racial Problems in Hungary*, 1906) and the Norwegian author Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, especially after the Černová incident in 1907. The pretext was that Andrej Hlinka, a Ružomberok priest, was deprived of his office and jailed on charges of Pan-Slav agitation. When a new church in Černová was to be consecrated by a Magyar priest, a large crowd protested. The Hungarian Gendarmerie fired into the crowd, killing 16 people.

¹⁹ László Szarka: *The Slovak national question and Hungarian nationality policy before 1918*, in: *The Hungarian Quarterly*, vol. 35 (1994:106).

To what extent a Slovak national identity was a mass phenomenon at the beginning of the First World War is hard to say, since the census was based on language, not on subjective identity. Considering the number of Slovaks that were still peasants and the totally dominant Magyar propaganda, it is likely that the Slovaks had not yet completed the mass phase by 1918. Moreover, a comparison of census figures from the last Hungarian and the first Czechoslovak census suggests that there existed a large bilingual group with dual or situational national identity (I will return to this question in Chapter Ten).

Concluding remarks

There were some major differences between the Czech and Slovak national revivals. The pre-national foundations for nationhood were clearer, the period of agitation started earlier, and the transition to a fully fledged mass national movement was made much earlier in the Czech case than the Slovak. Hroch terms the Czech development "integration heightened by revolution" and the Slovak "belated under the influence of external oppression."²⁰

The Czechs were able to make the transition to the mass phase right after the middle of the 19th century, and had plenty of time before the First World War to develop their political and cultural life. In 1918, the Czechs were thus a fully formed nation with well-developed national institutions, a national identity that encompassed the entire population and a sophisticated political system, where all major social classes were represented.

Slovak patriotic agitation started in the 1840s, but it did not take off during the revolution of 1848–49, and was thwarted, first by Bach absolutism (1852–59), later by the Magyarization drive after 1867. The Slovaks did not manage the transition to the mass phase until the days of the First Republic. An important legacy of the Slovak national revival was the division of the national movement into two currents, one Slovak oriented and one Czechoslovak oriented, roughly corresponding to the division between Catholics and Protestants. No such division occurred in the Czech movement.

In addition to the differing economic, political and cultural conditions, there were thus differences between the Czechs and Slovaks in terms of national awareness as well. There were still regions in Slovakia where people did not relate to the national message; moreover, a great many people were on the verge of being assimilated into the Magyar nation. The stage was now set for a struggle over the Slovak "soul."

²⁰ Hroch (1985: pp. 98 ff.).