Nationalities Papers, 2018
Vol. 46, No. 4, 633–653, https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
Check for updates

Effacing Panslavism: linguistic classification and historiographic misrepresentation

Alexander Maxwell*

School of History, Philosophy, Political Science & International Relations, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand

(*Received 6 November 2016; accepted 25 August 2017*)

In the early nineteenth century, several Slavic intellectuals believed in a single Slavic nation speaking a single language, though positing various taxonomies of the nation's component "tribes" and the language's component "dialects." Nevertheless, recent scholars, both historians and linguists, prove so extraordinarily unwilling to acknowledge the existence of Panslavism that several falsify the historical record so as to make historical figures conform to modern national and linguistic thinking. This paper discusses Jan Kollár, Ljudevit Gaj, and Ľudovít Štúr as three sample Panslavs, documents the misrepresentation of their ideas in recent historiography, and explores why so many scholars seek to erase Panslavism from the historical record.

Keywords: Panslavism; Slovak history; Croatian history; Slavic languages; linguistic classification

During the early nineteenth century, several Slavic intellectuals posited a single Slavic nation speaking a single Slavic language, viewing Czechs, Poles, Russians, and so forth as "tribes" speaking "dialects." Belief in Slavic unity, and the desire to promote that unity, has since declined. For more than a century, most scholars have viewed Czechs, Poles, Russians, and so forth as "nations" speaking their own "languages." Nevertheless, historical actors from the early nineteenth century usually thought otherwise.

Recent scholarship on nineteenth-century Slavic thought shows a striking tendency to anachronistically impose modern ideas about the classification of the Slavic world onto the historical actors it purports to describe. For some reason, scholars repeatedly flout the basic scholarly conventions that quotations must faithfully reproduce the text being cited. A review of the literature reveals a sorry record of selective omissions, mistranslations, and specious "clarifications" that conceal or alter the meaning of key passages. The problem particularly concerns the linguistic dimensions of Slavic thinking: several scholars accept that historical actors believed in a Slavic "nation," but fail to acknowledge an equivalent belief in a Slavic "language."

Belief in Slavic unity, and especially the desire to promote it, can be described as "Panslavism." The term is nevertheless problematic because modern scholars assume that advocates of Slavic unity necessarily sought a Slavic state. One historical dictionary, for

*Email: alexander.maxwell@vuw.ac.nz

© 2018 Association for the Study of Nationalities

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

example, defined Panslavism as "the principle or advocacy of political unification for the Slavic peoples" (Atkin, Biddiss, and Tallett 2011, 312), and the Oxford English Dictionary defined it as "the movement of aspiration for the union of all Slavs or Slavonic peoples in one political organization" (Simpson and Weiner 1991, 1265). In fact, nineteenth-century Panslavs rarely had such political ambitions. For example, Jan Herkel, the Slovak lawyer generally credited with having first coined the word "Panslavism" in 1826, made no reference to political structures. Herkel (1826, 4) defined Panslavism as "the *unity in literature* among all Slavs [italics in original]." Herkel's book compared the conjugations of verbs and the declensions of nouns and adjectives, and proposed a universal alphabet for all Slavic dialects. The "unity" Herkel sought to promote was strictly orthographic. Subsequent Slavic intellectuals who devised schemes to promote Slavic unity through orthographic reform or *belles-lettres* often described their efforts as "literary Panslavism," explicitly contrasting with a disavowed "political" Panslavism (Hoitsy 1843, 97, 99, 101; Záborsky 1851, ii; Lichard 1865, 5, 7).

Scholars confronted with such discrepancies often propose typologies of Slavism. A plethora of terms have been suggested. Observers of Russia juxtapose Panslavism and "Slavophilism" (Petrovich 1956; Walicki 1975, 495–505; Tuminez 2000, 63–71). Scholars commenting on Western Slavs have variously distinguished Panslavism not only from Slavophilism but also from "Slavism" (Popowski 1893), "All-Slavism" (Panslavismus 1870), "Austro-Slavism" (Hantsch 1965a, 1965b; Frantsuzova 2005; Gąsior, Karl, and Troebst 2014), "Neo-Slavism" (Hantsch 1965a, 1965b; Makowski and Hadler 2013), and so forth. Since these various taxonomies remain fraught with controversy, some scholars collectively refer to different varieties of Slavic thought as "Panslavism," modified with appropriate adjectives. Kirschbaum (1975, 152) spoke not only of "Austro-Slavism" and "Neo-Slavism," but also of "romantic and literary Pan-Slavism," "scientific Pan-Slavism," and "political Pan-Slavism."

Taxonomies of Panslavism have been contested partly because Slavophobes consistently sought to conflate literary Panslavisms with something more explicitly political. Since Hungarian chauvinists, for example, wanted to assimilate Hungary's Slavs, they saw a treasonous Russophile "Panslavism" in even the most apolitical Slavic literary initiatives (Thomson 1951; Ormis 1973; Varga 1993, 110–132). Therese Robinson (1850, 86, 294), an observer of Hungarian affairs sympathetic to Slavic aspirations, insisted in 1850 that Panslavism had no "political" dimension and promoted only "literary" goals. As particularist Slavic nationalisms gained strength, however, defenders of Panslavism dwindled, and the term "Panslavism" increasingly became associated with meanings devised by its enemies.

Modern scholars, furthermore, tend to study literary activity primarily as the precursor of explicitly political nationalism. Slavic literary revivals, in this view, deserve attention primarily because they foreshadow demands for administrative reform or territorial autonomy. Several nationalism theorists explicitly connect literary activity with political agitation: in an influential model of "national awakening," for example, Hroch (1985, 26) treated "scholarly interest" as the first stage in a process of mobilization ending with a "mass national movement." Much literary activism indeed anticipates political movements, but modern scholars apparently assume a general rule. Hantsch (1965b, 23, 25), to give a particularly dramatic example, conceded that Pan-Slavism originally "had no political, but only a literary, meaning," but subsequently argued 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." Seen in this light, literary Panslavism appears relevant only insofar as it anticipates Romanov intervention in the Balkans or

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Central Europe, or other forms of political activity. Much modern work on Panslavism provides only a cursory treatment of orthographic initiatives, such as Herkel's alphabet, so as to concentrate on high politics (Kohn 1953; Lednicki 1953; Petrovich 1956; Fadner 1962).

Indeed, some scholars so eagerly anticipate the politicization of "Panslavism" that they find the relatively apolitical activity of actual Panslavs disappointing. Batowski (1948, 407) denied the historical existence of "any sort of Panslavism, i.e. of a movement aiming at uniting the Slavs on a racial footing, with a front directed against other nations." Horak (1963, 140) proclaimed that "there is no such thing as Pan-Slavism, i.e. as an organic, racially binding idea," and Jopson (1934, 210) wondered "if there ever had been such a thing as Panslavism, in the sense of an alliance and an equality of the Slav peoples." By defining Panslavism in political terms, such scholars have concluded that the term no longer denotes any actual historical phenomena! Perhaps the term would shed more light on the historical record if understood, at least sometimes, in the more literary and linguistic sense that its original advocates intended.

In any event, the "Panslav" texts analyzed here discussed orthographical reforms, grammatical codification, and literary revival without taking any interest in seizing the reins of government. This paper considers literary activism and linguistic thought not as precursors to subsequent political activity, but as legitimate objects of study in their own right. Even if mass national movements have roots in scholarly interests, not all scholarly interests spark mass movements.

I nevertheless suggest that Panslavic linguistic activism qualifies as a form of "nationalism." If the nation is, as Anderson (1983) influentially suggested, an "imagined community," then human imagination becomes an object of study for nationalism scholars. What national communities have historical actors imagined? At it happens, several imagined the nation as a linguistic community encompassing all Slavs. American sociologist Brubaker (1996, 16) has memorably suggested that scholars examine "appeals and claims made in the name of putative 'nations,'" asking how the nation operates "as a practical category, as classificatory scheme, as cognitive frame." As it happens, several historical actors in practice classified the Slavs into a single category and made literary appeals and linguistic claims in its name. That said, this paper particularly analyzes Panslavism as a classificatory scheme. Brubaker's approach to nationalism applies easily to linguistic activism; in particular, studying the politics of classification sheds light on linguistic activism. Scholars can also study appeals and claims made in the name of putative languages, particularly claims made in the name of national languages. How, then, do languages, or dialects, operate as practical categories, classificatory schemes, and cognitive frames?

This paper specifically considers three Panslav nationalists: Jan Kollár, Ljudevit Gaj, and Ľudovít Štúr; documenting their ideas at a level of detail that may initially appear excessive. All three held similar beliefs, and particularly the basic idea that all Slavs form a single nation speaking a single language. Kollár, Gaj, and Štúr all fought for Slavic unity on the battlefields of orthographic standardization and literary exchange. Though Gaj and Štúr both toyed with Russophile politics in their later careers, only their linguistic thinking is relevant to this analysis. Yet while this paper restricts its attention to the "literary" half of the traditional dichotomy between literary and political Panslavism, it nevertheless treats struggles over language codification and classification as a form of "politics," namely, the politics of classification.

This paper, finally, argues that the scholarly literature has wrongly interpreted Kollár, Gaj, and Štúr in terms of subsequent national categories. The evidence rests primarily on inaccurate translations. Kollár and Gaj published both in German and in variants of Slavic; Štúr published his key text in Slavic, with German and Latin translations of key

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Zum erſtenmale wieder nach vielen Jahrhunderten betrachten ſich die zerſtreuten ſlawiſchen Stämme als Ein großes Volk, und ihre verſchiedenen Mundarten als Eine Sprache,

Považujme se se wšemi Slawobratry jako jeden národ, s Čechy pak jako jeden národní kmen.

HORVATSKO - SLAVENSKOGA

kroatiſch - ſlaviſchen

Samo takvem načinom smemo se nadeati, da nekda ves veliki slavenski jezik iz vseh svojeh različnostih vu četvera glavna narečja skupztegnul se bude,

ren Ziele. Nur ſo, können wir erſt mit froher Zuverſicht erwarten, daß die ganze große ſlaviſche Sprache aus allen Varietäten in vier Hauptdialekte zuſammenſchmelzen wird, deren Literaturen auf die feſten

NÁREČJA SLOVENSKUO

ALEBO

POTREBA PÍSAŇJA V TOMTO NÁREČÍ

Mi Slováci sme kmen a jako kmen máme vlastnuo nárečja, ktoruo je od Českjeho odchodnuo a rozdjelno.

Figure 1. Passages from Kollár, Gaj, and Štúr.

terms. This paper, written in English, provides quotations in my own English translation with the original terminology in parentheses. Indeed, hoping to put the exact wording of the original documents beyond question, I have provided digital scans of seven passages: two from Kollár, three from Gaj, and two from Štúr (see Figure 1, above). The scans have been resized and cropped, but show the original typography. If any readers are still skeptical, they may examine the relevant texts online: all are easily available. The paper

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

concludes with speculative explanations for scholarly mistranslation, adding some suggestions for future scholarship.

Jan Kollár's literary reciprocity

Jan Kollár (1793–1852), born in what is now central Slovakia, was a Protestant pastor and an influential literary figure. He compiled an important collection of Slovak folk songs (1835), but is best remembered for his epic poem *Sláwy dcera*, first published in 1824 and expanded in 1832, in which the narrator's sexual love for the goddess Sláva symbolizes patriotic love for the Slavic nation. The expanded 1824 edition demonstrates with unambiguous place names the broad geographic extent of Kollár's imagined Slavic homeland "All-Slavia [*Wšesláwia*]:" verse 257 claims the Urals, the Tatras, the Volga, the Sava, and the cities of Prague, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kyiv, Istanbul, and Mt. Athos (in Greece). Kollár also made his classification of the Slavic world explicit in various works on Slavic "literary reciprocity." He first published a short essay in the Banská Bystrica periodical *Hronika: Podtatranská Zábavnice* (1836) (not to be confused with the more prominent Prague journal *Hronika*). This short essay attracted considerable interest, so he published a lengthier German-language first in Pest (1837), and then a slightly amended version in Prague (1844). The German version later inspired Mikhail Pogodin's translation into Russian (Kollár 1840), Dimitrije Teodorović's translation into Serbian (Kollár 1845), Jan Tomíček's translation into Czech (Kollár 1853), and even a modern translation into English (Kollár 2009).

In his initial essay on reciprocity, Kollár (1836, 41, 42) posited a "many-tribed Slavic nation [*mnohokmeného národu slawského*]" divided linguistically into four "main, living, educated and literary dialects, namely, Russian, Illyrian, Polish and Czechoslovak [*nynj žigjcjch, hlawněgšjch, wzdělaněgšjch a knihy wydáwagjcjch nářečj, totiž: ruské, illyrské, polské a československé*]." Kollár then divided several of these "dialects" into "smaller dialects or subdialects [*menšjch nářečj a podnářečj*]," specifically mentioning "little Russian [*maloruského*]" inside Russian, Lusatian [*lužického*] inside Polish and "Croatian, Windic [*chorwatského, windického*]" inside Illyrian. In the only passage where Kollár referred to the Slavic linguistic zone as a whole, he characterized it as the "Slavic *řeč*," a word without any obvious English equivalent. The term may encompass both halves of the "language-dialect" dichotomy, but sometimes denoted a classificatory level intermediate between "language" and "dialect." Pavel Josef Šafařík's 1842 taxonomy, for example, divided the "Slavic language [*jazyk slowanský*]" into four *mluvy*, seven *řeči*, and 14 *nářeči* (1842, 1: 5–6).

For the expanded German version of his essay on Slavic reciprocity, Kollár (1837, 3, 11, 130, 11; 1844, 3, 9, 99–100, 9) slightly modified his taxonomy of the Slavic world. He still spoke unambiguously of the Slavs as a single unit, both nationally and linguistically, rejoicing that "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*], awaken 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, Illyrian [*Illyrischen*], Polish, and Bohemianslovak [*böhmischslowakischen*, in the 1844 reprint *böhmisch-slowakischen*], but in another passage toward the end of the book, he spoke not of "Illyrian" but of the "Serbian dialect [*serbische Mundart*]." However, the book expanded Kollár's list of "smaller dialects and subdialects [*kleinern Mundarten und Untermundarten*]," since he now granted Illyrian three subdialects: Croatian, Windic, and Bulgarian.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In none of these works did Kollár list any subdialects for the *československé / böhmischslowakischen* dialect, but, a subsequent essay on orthographic reform mentioned five. Addressing a Slovak audience, Kollár called for "dialectical" literary unity while simultaneously reiterating his belief in a great Slavic nation:

> Let us consider all Slavo-brothers as one nation [*národ*], one national tribe [*národní kmen*] with the Czechs. We Slovaks, Bohemians, Moravians, Silesians and in part Lusatians too have been united together, as long as we can remember, by multiple corporeal and spiritual, national and dialectical ties. (Kollár 1846, 124)

While Kollár's place of birth qualifies him as a "Slovak," Kollár's own linguistic nationalism accrued first to Slavdom, then to a Czechoslovak [*československé / böhmischslowakische*] tribe [*kmen / Stamm / národní kmen*], and only then to Slovakia. In *Wechselseitigkeit* (1837, 24; 1844, 19) he wrote that "Carpathian Slovaks have had until now nearly nothing of their own in literature, thus they were the first to stretch out their hands to embrace all Slavs." He later wrote that "the Slovak on his own does not have anything in literature, or rather what he has, it is more Czechoslovak than Slovak proper" (1846, 108).

Kollár's linguistic nationalism, therefore, was Panslavic: he extolled the Slavic language, posited multiple literary standardizations, and characterized standardized Czech, Russian, Polish, etc. as "dialects." He thought that Slavic libraries should compile "grammars and dictionaries for each dialect," and encouraged ardent Slavs to study them, recommending several by name (1836, 49; 1837, 14; 1844, 95). He also urged Slavic patriots to read literary works written in other dialects: "The Pole," he argued (1837, 130; 1844, 99) should not be "just a Pole, but Slavo-Pole, and study not just books of his own dialect, but also those of the Russian, Bohemian and Serbian dialect." To those who objected that "the great diversity of Slavic alphabets will frighten many from Slavic reciprocity," Kollár replied (1837, 88; 1844, 68) that a savant "who lacks the desire or energy to face difficulties with alphabets … is no great loss for the Slavic nation." Kollár did, however, hope (1837, 127–128; 1844, 97) that Slavs might reform their spelling by adopting an "orthography resting on the spirit of the Slavic language, or at least, for all those who use the same letters, whether Latin or Cyrillic. Neither Magyar, nor Italian, nor the German language should have any influence on Slavic orthography." Such beliefs, incidentally, quintessentially represent "Panslavism" as defined and discussed in this paper.

A surprising number of scholars seem unable to describe Kollár's Panslavism without disparaging it. Canadian-Slovak literary scholar Petro (1997, 58) wrote that Kollár "mentally lived in Slavdom, a beautiful but unrealistic fiction." Slovak-American scholar Mikuš (1977, 75) wrote that "Kollár was trying the impossible: to stop history." An anonymous reviewer in *The Slavonic Review* (1927, 342) wrote of "the *naïveté* which peeps out in every sentence." Thomas (2003, 43) dismissed "Kollárian Panslavism" first as "a reinvented tradition without authentic origins," later arguing (2007, 25) that "Kollár's Panslavism was […] based on a dream of harmonious relations between brother Slavs rather than a reflection of objective political reality."

Kollár's ideas about orthographic diversity within a single Slavic language have attracted particular disdain. Canadian scholar Black (1975, 15) thought the orthographic reform scheme showed where "the basic confusion of Kollár's plan becomes apparent." The American historian Hans Kohn, born into Prague's Jewish community, mocked "the Kollar-inspired phantasy of one great Slav nation and one Slav language" (Kohn 1952, 40), since "by 1850 it had been generally accepted that the Slavic languages were independent languages" (Kohn 1953, 20, 339).

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Slovak scholars seem particularly upset that Kollár rejected a distinctive Slovak language. Slovak linguist Jóna (1956, 141) thought that "restricting Slavic reciprocity to four literatures was just dead theory," while Pauliny (1948, 70), referring to the notion of a single literature for Czechs and Slovaks, concluded: "Kollár did not understand that such an artificial unification of literary languages is not possible." Oravcová (1994, 15–18) dismissed reciprocity not only as "an unclear, fuzzy and elevated vision of Slavism [...] contradictory to the real historical situation," but as "a projection of values and goals completely different from the actual needs and possibilities" that "operated dysfunctionally and was abandoned in the [18]40s."

Reluctance to treat Kollár's Panslavism seriously might explain why scholars prefer to describe Kollár as positing multiple Slavic "nations," rather than "tribes" of a single nation. For example, Croatian historian Nikša Stančić (1989, 109), claimed that Kollár "grouped all Slavs in only four literary languages, and, consequently, into four nations." Kollár actually posited one language with four dialects, spoken by one nation with four tribes. Haraksim (2011, 108) simply 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." Haraksim did not explain the discrepancy between Kollár's book title and the different content he ascribed to it, but elsewhere drew attention to his lexical substitutions: he claimed (2011, 111) subsequent Slavic 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."

Indeed, some scholars have been so eager to conceal Kollár's Panslavism that they misrepresent the title of his book. Radosavljevich (1919, 2: 211) translated it as "On the Literary Reciprocity between the Families and Dialects of the Slavic Nations." Grigorieva (2013, 20) gave "About literary mutuality between the Slavic nations and dialects." Thomas (2007, 25) not only gave plural "nations" but also misrepresented *Mundarten* as "languages:" "Concerning the Reciprocity between the Various Tribes and Languages of the Slavic Nations."

Even scholars of Panslavism depict Kollár's four "living educated dialects" [*nynj žigjcjch ... nářečj / jetzt lebenden gebildeteren Dialekte*] as a taxonomy of "languages." Kohn (1953, 17) and Erickson (1964, 8) have Kollár posit multiple Slavic "languages," rather than dialects of a single Slavic language. Svoljšak (2008, 277) similarly spoke of the "Pan-Slavic ideas of Ján Kollár, who advocated the concept of four great Slavic languages." Mikuš (1977, 75) acknowledged Kollár's belief in a single Slavic "nation," claiming that Kollár sought "to integrate all Slavs into one nation, but that nation would, however, still speak four languages." Oravcová (1994, 15), concentrating specifically on Kollár's *českoslowenský / böhmischslowakische* tribe speaking its *českoslowenský / böhmischslowakische* dialect, similarly wrote that Kollár posited "one united, though non-existent, Slavic tribe" speaking "one common united Czechoslovak language." Kollár actually associated the Czechoslovak tribe with a "dialect."

Some of this confusion arises from linguistic jargon. Many scholars describe literary standardization, that is, the rules and conventions defined in grammars and dictionaries, with the term "literary language." The "literary language" exists in implicit juxtaposition with "spoken language" and does not necessarily imply any classificatory status in a linguistic taxonomy. Under this definition, Sivrić (1975, 275) gave an accurate description: "Kollár advocated that only four literary languages among the Slav nations should be developed and cherished." Horák (2007, 102) similarly described Kollár proposing four "written languages," elsewhere described as "literary forms."

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Nevertheless, terms such as "literary languages" and "written languages" invite misunderstanding, since if the modifying adjective is omitted the "literary language" transforms into a "language," and thus something grander than a mere "dialect." Horák (2004, 109), for example, had explicitly collapsed "literary languages" into "languages" in a previous work: he listed Kollár's "four Slavic literary languages" as "the Russian, Polish, Czech [sic] and Illyrian languages." A "standardization" or "codification" would more unambigiously differentiate its referent from the imagined dichotomy between "languages" and "dialects." Alternatively, since Kollár associated the "literary forms" with the "dialects" of the Slavic "language," perhaps one might usefully characterize them as "literary dialects" (Maxwell 2003).

The terms "literary language" and "standard language" (implicitly juxtaposed with spoken language) so strongly connote the classificatory status of a "language" (implicitly juxtaposed to a "dialect") that the semantic conflation runs in both directions. Moguš (1995, 167) treated Kollár's normative proposal for four literary standardizations as a linguistic taxonomy: he wrote that for Kollár "there were four literary idioms in the Slavic world." Herrity (1992, 164) also spoke about Kollár's "four Slavonic literary languages." Kollár in fact recognized that more than four standardizations existed, and believed their profusion problematic. Kollár wrote not that there *were* four standardizations, but rather that their number *ought to be* reduced to four.

Many scholars concede that Kollár used the term "dialect," yet impose their own terminology in explanatory parentheses. In a 1956 article, Slovak linguist Jóna (1956, 141) ascribed to Kollár the belief that "the Slovak dialect (that is, the Slovak language), is rich, succinct, melodious, clean and well-preserved," even after acknowledging in the previous paragraph on the same page that Kollár's reciprocity posited "four tribes with their dialects and literatures (Russian, Polish, Czech [sic] and Illyrian)." In 2008, American Slavist Cooper (2008, 312) followed Jóna in acknowledging Kollár's belief in a "Slovak dialect," but also followed Jóna by inserting parenthetical misinformation: "Kollár recognized what the loss of a dialect (that is, a language) would mean." Jóna and Cooper's terminological clarifications find their mirror reflection in the work of Slovak linguist Blanár (2002, 150), who in 1993 preferred to describe Kollár's belief in "a distinct Slavic language ('dialect')." Meanwhile, Rosenbaum (1993, 123) substituted both linguistic and ethnographic terminology when describing Kollár's "agitated patriotism" for "his 'tribe,' 'dialect,' i.e. nation and language" [*svoj kmeň, nárečie, t. j. národ a jazyk*]. In the context of a linguistic classification, the pairs "dialect/language" are not stylistic alternatives, but categories loaded with such different social significance that they approach binary opposites. Scholars who substitute one for the other do not clarify, they mislead.

In addition to substituting "language" and "nation" for Kollár's "dialect" and "tribe," scholars also substitute Kollár's ethnonyms. Kollár, recall, had posited Polish, Illyrian, Russian, and Czechoslovak dialects. Russian and Polish do not cause problems. Nor, surprisingly, does the adjective "Illyrian [*illyrské / Illyrischen*]," even if scholars sometimes add supplementary explanations. Baer (2014, 20), for example, characterized Kollár's taxonomy as a single Slavic nation divided "into four branches or groups according to the linguistic differences between Polish, Russian, Czecho-Slovak and Illyrian (South Slavic);" and Auty (1952, 88) listed "Russian, Illyrian (no doubt *štokavic* Serbo-Croatian is meant), Polish and Czechoslovak (i.e. literary Czech)." The aforementioned Sivrić (1975, 275) listed Kollár's "literary languages" as "Russian, Czech, Polish, and Illyrian or Yugoslav." Gasten Dorren's popular guide to European languages (2014, 134), somewhat more problematically, characterized Kollár's taxonomy as "Russian, Polish, Czechoslovak and, lastly, what you might call Yugoslav or South Slavic."

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kollár's belief in a "Czechoslovak dialect," however, evidently disturbs scholars not only because of the word "dialect," but also because of the word "Czechoslovak." Several have simply replaced the offending ethnonym with "Czech." Horák (2004, 109) translated Kollár's *československé / böhmischslowakischen* as "Czech." So did the historians Hill (1951, 18), Jelavich and Jelavich (1977, 271), Sutherland (1981, 146), Ference (1995, 49), Magocsi (2004, 25), Tafra (2006, 45), and Ivetić (2012, 100). Even if Czechoslovakism ultimately failed, scholars ought to acknowledge its existence in historical documents: if Kollár posited a "Czechoslovak" linguistic unit, it should not be described as "Czech."

Ljudevit Gaj as Kollár's faithful disciple

Kollár's disciples suffer a similar misrepresentation in the historiography. Ljudevit Gaj (1809–1872) was born to non-Croatian parents living on the Croatian side of the modern Slovene–Croatian frontier. He studied law in Graz, Budapest, and Leipzig. After graduating, he settled in Zagreb. He is best remembered for an influential Croatian newspaper he founded in 1835. Known initially as the *Novine Horvatzke* [Croatian News], it was renamed *Ilirske novine* [Illyrian News] in 1836, and *Narodne novine* [National News] in 1843. The paper boasted an important literary supplement, variously known as the *Danicza Horvatzka, Slavonzka y Dalmatinzka* [Croatian, Slavonian and Dalmatian Morning Star], the *Danica Horvatska, Slavonska i Dalmatinska*, and the *Danica Ilirska* [Illyrian Morning Star] (Živančević and Frangeš 1975; Coha 2009). For simplicity's sake, the text will throughout refer to the literary supplement as *Danica*. References provide exact titles.

Gaj borrowed much of his Panslavism from Kollár, whom he met in Budapest as an impressionable student. Gaj's national and linguistic ideas reflected his mentor's influence throughout his active life. Gaj also tirelessly promoted Kollár's literary works to Croatian audiences. He praised Kollár as a "highly-educated Slav" and reproduced his four-fold taxonomy of the Slavic dialects (Gaj 1835b). His journal also published a translated summary of Slavic Reciprocity ("Ivan Kolar" 1836), and translations of Kollár's poetry (Zdenčanin 1837; see also Horvat 1975, 84–88; Jankovič 1997, 72–74).

Gaj clearly showed his debt to Kollár when discussing orthographic questions. Gaj (1830) began his career as a spelling reformer with his influential primer of 1830, published bilingually in Slavic and German as the *Kratka osnova Horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisaňa / Kurzer Entwurf einer kroatisch-slavischen Orthographie* ["Brief Outline of a Croatian-Slavic Orthography]," hereafter the *Kratka osnova*. He also discussed orthographic questions in a German-language manuscript dated to 1830/1831, recently transcribed by Stančić (2005) and published by the Croatian Academy of Sciences under the Croatian title "Spis o hrvatskom jeziku i književnosti," hereafter Gaj's "Manuscript." A few years later, Gaj (1835a) returned to such questions with his essay "Pravopisz [Orthography]," published over three issues of *Danica*. The following year, he indirectly authorized yet another orthography by publishing Babukić's (1836a, 1836b) "Basic grammar for the Illyrian Dialect of Slavic," over six issues of *Danica*. Gaj endorsed different conventions in these various texts, and an exhaustive treatment of his orthographic ideas lies beyond the scope of this investigation. In all his linguistic works, however, Gaj remained consistent about his Panslavism.

The *Kratka osnova* echoing Kollár's call for Slavs to read books in other dialects, proposed an orthography that would resemble those used elsewhere in the Slavic world:

> The educated Bohemian and Pole feels Pan-Slavism (i.e. the inner desire to bring all Slavic brothers to linguistic-literary unity) too deeply for us to abandon hope that a Croatian book,

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> written with this rational orthography, can be read in Bohemia and Poland, etc. [originally printed in italics for emphasis] (*Kratka osnova* 1830, 22/23)

Gaj (1830, 10/11) also followed Kollár in rejecting the influence of "Magyar or any other foreign orthography," invoking instead the example of "educated Slavic brothers of the Latin script." After a brief survey of Czech, Polish, and Lusatian orthography, he proposed adopting diacritical marks "already used by the Poles, Bohemians, and with them the Moravians and Slovaks, who have already erected a very admirable literature" (20/21). The *Kratka Osnova* specifically advocated the letters Č and Š, today used in Croatian, Slovenian, Czech, and Slovak, as well as Ď and Ň where contemporary Croats use Đ/Dj and Nj. In "Pravopisz" (1835a, 48) Gaj similarly called for spelling that showed "the kinship of our dialect with other Slavic dialects [*rodbinztva nashega narechja z drugimi Szlovenzkoga narechji*]," specifically discussing Polish, Czech, and Lusatian usage, and rejecting the influence of Hungarian orthography. If Gaj thought Polish and Czech were "dialects," his understanding of the "language" can be presumed Slavic.

Kollár's linguistic taxonomy of the Slavic world informed Gaj's. In the *Kratka osnova*, Gaj (1830, 22/23) refers to "the Slavic language [*slavenski jezik / slavischen Sprache*]," divided into "four main dialects [*četvera glavna narečja / vier Hauptdialekte*]." While one paragraph in *Kratka osnova* inconsistently posited the "Croatian language [*kroatische Sprache*]" in the German text but the "Croatian dialect [*horvatskem narečju*]" in the Slavic text, Gaj elsewhere (1830, 14/15, 8/9) not only invoked "the Croatian dialect [*horvatskem narečju / kroatischen Mundart*]," but contrasted "our dialect [*našem narečju / unserem Dialekte*]" with "other Slavic dialects" [*drugih narečjih slavenskeh / andern slavischen Mundarten*]. Much as Kollár saw Slovaks as part of a greater Czechoslovak "national tribe" within Slavdom, Gaj also imagined Croatia as part of a larger tribe, itself subsumed within a Slavic whole. In the *Kratka osnova*, Gaj (1830, 22/23) specifically appealed to "our brave brothers in Styria and Carniola" to put aside the "false patriotism" of Slovene particularism: "only in this way can we with happy confidence expect that the great Slavic language with all its varieties will coalesce." In the Manuscript, furthermore, Gaj (1830/1831, 290) proclaimed the existence of "only one south-Slav dialect [*südslavischen Dialekt*] which divides into three subdialects [*Unterdialekte*], namely, Wendish, Serbian, and Croatian."

Gaj hoped to reduce the diversity of literary codifications, but expected each "dialect" to have its own literary standard. In "Pravopisz," for example, Gaj (1835a, 39) called for "one orthography for our dialect" [*jeden pravopisz nashim narechjam*]. In the Manuscript, Gaj (1830/1831, 291) posited a "subdialect" with its own "written language," lamented "the division of the Croatian written language [*kroatische Schriftsprache*] into three varieties," and called for a "Pan-Croatian written language [*pankroatische Schriftsprache*]" because "the Croatian subdialect [*kroatische Unterdialekt*] could only reach its perfection from a literary perspective" by adopting a single standard.

Gaj's ethnographic thinking also proved rigorously Panslavic: he consistently spoke of a single Slavic nation. The *Kratka osnova* posited "our Slavic nation [*narod naš slavenski / Slaven Nazion, unsere slavische Nazion*]," never a "Croatian nation" (Gaj 1830, 20/21, 3). The Manuscript spoke of the "Croatian branch of Slavic [*kroatische Slawenzweige*]," later specifying "two Slavic subtribes [*slawische Unterstämme*], namely the subtribe of the Croats and of the Serbs" (Gaj 1830/1831, 48). The "Pravopisz," posited "our Slavic nation [*nashega Szlavskoga naroda*]" (Gaj 1835a, 48).

Documenting Gaj's taxonomy of "tribes" proves more challenging. Gaj generally avoided the word "koléni," the word *Danica* used to translate Kollár's *kmen / Stamm* (Kolar 1836; Danica 1837). The 1845 Serbian translation of Kollár, however, used the

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

word *plemena* (Kollár 1845), and Gaj (1835c, 88) also described the Illyrians as "a great tribe" [*jedno veliko pleme*], and, in a historical essay (1839, 46, 47), as "a Slavic tribe" [*pleme slavjanske*] subsumed within "the Slavic nation" [*narod Slavjanski*]. The *Kratka osnova*, however, enumerated no subdivisions of the Slavic nation; it merely mentioned non-Croatian Slavic "brothers" (Gaj 1835a, 2/3, 7, 21). In "Pravopisz" Gaj (1835a, 48, 39) not only spoke of "brothers," but proposed a vague metaphor about "four great Slavic streams which flow into the common Slavic sea." Such formulae are less explicit than Kollár's, but articulate the same basic idea of a single Slavic nation with four main tribes.

Scholars prove as reluctant to acknowledge Gaj's Panslavism as Kollár's. Stančić, discussing Kollár's influence on the *Kratka osnova*, placed Gaj's words in parentheses but substituted his own words for his analysis:

> Gaj showed that he again accepted the four-fold structure of Kollár's classification of the Slavic languages and Peoples. He divided the Slavs into four nations ("tribes") and thought they could be united into four literary languages ("dialects"). (Stančić 1990, 59)

Stallaerts (2010, 195) wrote that "Ljudevit Gaj believed the national Croatian identity could only be preserved through the creation of a common language." A multi-author *History of Yugoslavia* (Dedijer 1974, 304, 301) declared that "Illyrism's historical message was the creation, under its standard, of modern Croatian national ideology," concluding that Gaj composed a "reformed Croatian orthography." While Gaj indeed reformed Croatian orthography, he did so for an ideology nationally "Slavic" and tribally "Illyrian," not "Croatian."

Several scholars obscure Gaj's Panslavism by misrepresenting the title of his book. In Gaj's work, the titular adjectives *Horvatsko-slavenskoga* / *kroatisch-slavischen* clearly mean "Croatian-Slavic:" just as Gaj's thought generally drew on Kollár's, his dual ethnonym evoked those Kollár had advocated. Many scholars translate it correctly, but several, apparently uncomfortable with Gaj's unfamiliar ethnonym, dispense with the inconvenient second half. Goldstein (1999, 60) claimed that "in 1830 Gaj wrote *Kratka osnova hrvatskog pravopisa* (Foundations of Croatian Orthography)," and Moguš (1995, 162) discussed the "Kratka osnova horvatskog pravopisaňa" (A Short Outline of Croatian [i.e. Kaikavian] orthography). Other scholars, either exploiting or confused by the resemblance between "Slavic" [*slavenski* / *slavisch*] and "Slavonian" [*slavonski* / *slawonisch*], have Gaj articulate not Croatian-Slavic but "Croatian-Slavonian" sentiment. Croatian-Australian scholar Zlatar (1995, 390) gave the title of Gaj's pamphlet as "A Brief Outline of Croatian-Slavonian Orthography," and Croatian ethnographer Žmegač (2004, 36) as "Brief Basics of Croatian-Slavonian Grammar." British Slavist Hawkesworth (2007, 45) gave "A Short Basis of Croato-Slavonian Orthography," and Serbian historian and public intellectual Dedijer (1974, 301), "A Short Basis of Croato-Slavonian Orthography." Eccentrically, Kohn (1953, 60) treated *slavenskoga* / *slavischen* as "Slovene" yielding a "Short Outline of Croat-Slovene Orthography."

Note that Gaj's usage of the word *slavenski* to mean "Slavic" rather than "Slavonian" conforms to the definitions given in both Giuseppe Voltiggi's *Ricsoslovnik* (1803, 492, 494) and Šulek's *Deutsch-Kroatisches Wörterbuch* (1860, 3: 1685). No entries for "Slavonian" or "Slovene" appear in Karadžić's *Rječnik* (1818, 770), Mažuranić and Užarević's *Wörterbuch* (1842, 334, 482), or Veselić's *Rěčnik* (1854, 3: 773). Nevertheless, all contemporary dictionaries with relevant entries render Gaj's *slavenski* as "Slavic."

Scholars more readily acknowledge Gaj's Slavism in a national context. Gaj's nationalism was not Croatian-particularist; indeed, Gaj's national concepts are often seen, with considerable justification, as proto-Yugoslav. Nevertheless, most scholars fail to see the

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Panslavism in Gaj's linguistic ideas. Though Gaj (1830, 22/23), like Kollár, unambiguously posited "four main dialects, whose literatures [...] will be the common property of all Slavs," American linguist Robert Greenberg (2004, 25) acknowledged that Gaj "accepted the notions of Pan-Slavism," yet claimed nevertheless that "for Gaj, four main Slavic languages existed." Jonke (1976, 66), simultaneously misrepresenting both Kollár and Gaj, wrote that "under the influence of the Slovak Jan Kollár, Ljudevit Gaj adopted the thesis that there are four Slavic languages." Zlatar (1997, 1: 170), meanwhile, explained Gaj's ideas correctly, but felt the urge to denigrate them: "Gaj regarded all the Slavs as a single people," according to Zlatar, because he was "basing himself on Kollár's erroneous belief that there is only a single Slavic language with four main dialects." Gaj's espousal of Slavic unity, both ethnographic and linguistic, put him at odds with contemporary ideas about Croatia, and modern scholars evidently do not like it.

Ľudovít Štúr as Kollár's renegade disciple

Historiography proves no more capable of reproducing the Panslavism of Ľudovít Štúr (1815–1856). Štúr was born in a small mountain town in the west of today's Slovakia. Like Kollár and Gaj, he attended university in Germany, and, in his youth, articulated a similar Panslavism. Visiting Saxony, he urged Sorbian intellectuals to "nurture reciprocity, [...] unite with us so that you become powerful through this bond" (Nowotny 1965, 186; Kunze 1999, 193). Teaching at the Lutheran lyceum in Bratislava (Pozsony/Pressburg), he assigned Kollár's *Sláwy dcera* to students, participated in a "Czecho-Slav" literary society, and helped establish a Serbian reading room (Milojković-Djurić 1994, 21–26; Slovenský biografický slovník 1987, 5: 532). Štúr (1837) also wrote about Slovak folksongs for Gaj's *Danica*. Indeed, two years later *Danica* (1839, 91) vividly illustrated the cosmopolitan literary Panslavism of the era by publishing a series of Lusatian-Sorbian letters thanking Štúr for introducing them to Kollár's poetry.

Hungarian political circumstances eventually led Štúr to propose a new codification of Slovak. In 1840, after Kramárcsik (1840) attacked the "Czech-Slav Heroes of Panslavism" in the influential Hungarian newspaper *Társalkodó*, Count Károlyi Zay, a particularly vigorous advocate of Magyarization (1841), led a committee to expunge Panslavism from Hungarian schools (Gogolák 1969, 2: 142). Štúr's outspoken defense of Slavic linguistic rights (1843), published under the pen-name "*ein Ungarische Slawe* [A Hungarian Slav]," contributed to his sacking in December 1843. Štúr decided that Slovaks needed a distinctively Hungarian literary standard to appease the Magyars. As Štúr wrote to a Czech journalist, Slovaks had to counter Magyar reproaches that:

> we, 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, because it is foreign. (Štúr 1848, 89)

Štúr hoped a consciously Hungarian literary standard would calm Magyar fears. As Štúr subsequently argued (1847, 869)

> from the point of view of our written language we are domesticated in our homeland. [...] We are already, and wish to remain, at home; but we will see that our neighbors, and particularly our Magyars, will welcome us home.

Štúr also hoped that Slovak Catholics and Slovak Protestants might better resist the pressure to Magyarize if they would combine their literary efforts. While hopes of reconciliation with Magyarizing patriots went unfulfilled, Štúr's initiative helped bridge the confessional gap between Slovak Lutherans and Catholics (Locher 1931, 139–208; Maxwell 2009, 117–140).

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

After consulting with various Catholic and Lutheran literati, Štúr and his colleagues introduced a new literary Slovak in 1843. Štúr promoted the new standardization in his newspaper, the *Slovenskje národňje novini* [Slovak National News]. A few years later, Štúr further supported the new codification by publishing a grammar book, *Nauka reči slovenskej* [Handbook of the Slovak *reč*] (1846a) and a pamphlet (1846b) *Nárečja slovenskuo alebo potreba písaňje v tomto nárečje* [The Slovak Dialect, or the Need to Write in this Dialect, hereafter *Nárečja slovenskuo*]. Štúr's codification estranged him from Kollár (1846), who published a collection of essays denouncing Štúr's initiative, prompting an angry rebuttal from one of Štúr's collaborators (Hurban 1846). The bitter polemic cast a long shadow on Slovak–Czech relations.

Štúr's argument with Kollár has obscured their extensive common ground. Just as Kollár (1836, 39) posited a "many-tribed Slavic nation [*mnohokmeného národu slawského*]," Štúr's *Nárečja slovenskuo* (1846b, 10) argued that "tribalism [*kmenovitot*] (*die Gliederung in Stämme*, *divisio in stirpes*)" affected the Slavs more than "any other nation." Štúr also described his work as "a book about Slavic reciprocity" (Ambruš 1953, 1: 108).

Yet where Kollár classified Slovaks as a sub-category of the Czechoslovak "national tribe" of the Slavic nation, Štúr characterized Slovaks as a distinct Slavic tribe, speaking its own distinct dialect. As Štúr put it (1846b, 51), "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 nárečja, ktoruo je od českjeho odchodnuo a rozdjelno*]." More generally, Štúr (1846b, 13) rejected Kollár's four-fold division of Slavic tribes/dialects, positing 11 different Slavic tribes, each with a distinct dialect, including "we Slovaks with our own Slovak dialect" [*mi Slováci s naším vlastním Slovenským nárečím*]. Both Štúr and Kollár thus believed in a single Slavic nation divided into tribes, and a single Slavic language divided into dialects. Štúr broke with Kollár only about the number of dialects.

Štúr proved central to Slovakia's national politics. He played an important role during the 1848 revolution, participating actively in the Prague Panslav congress and helping organize the so-called Slovak volunteers, who fought Kossuth's short-lived regime (Danilák 1997). His grammatical ideas also influenced the influential Slovak linguist Martin Hattala, the oft-neglected definitive codifier of literary Slovak. Štúr is a national hero in the Slovak Republic. The town of Štúrovo is named after him; so is the department of linguistics at Comenius University in Bratislava. His face adorns the 10 crown banknote from the first Slovak republic, the 50 crown banknote from Communist Czechoslovakia, and the 500 crown banknote from the second Slovak republic. Štúr's status as a Slovak national hero, however, probably encourages scholars to ignore his Panslavism.

Štúr has most baffled scholars by using the word *nárečja* to describe what scholars now prefer to call the Slovak "language." Scholars have often responded by simply pretending that Štúr's text conforms to their expectations. For example, Slovak linguist Doruľa (2011, 3, 5) wrote that Štúr had "scientifically formulized the essential relationship between Slovak and Czech as two similar, yet distinct Slavic languages," treating as factual "Štúr's scientific finding that Slovak is a separate Slavic language." When citing Štúr, Slovak linguist Kačala (1986, 131, 132) repeatedly inserted the bracketed comment "[read: language]" whenever Štúr used the word "dialect." Czech scholars Dorovský (2004, 36) and Dolanský (1963, 128) preferred to add the comment "i.e. language," Dorovský with and Dolanský without parentheses. In a commentary on Štúr's grammar, Slovak linguists Jóna and Ďurovič (2006, 12) equated Štúr's phrase "distinct dialect [*zvlášno nárečja*]" with "language." Petro (1997, 67) acknowledged that "Slavophiles considered Slavdom a

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nation and the Slavic languages dialects," but, when discussing Štúr, opined nevertheless that: "the word 'dialect,' as he used it, meant 'language'." American historian Agnew (1992, 28), finally, wrote that Štúr "insisted that Czech and Slovak were two separate distinct languages (though he still used the word 'nárečie' [sic])." Agnew offered no explanation why Štúr would use the word "dialect" if he intended a different meaning: he simply proclaimed Štúr's belief in Slovak language-hood while citing textual evidence to the contrary.

Several scholars conceal Štúr's Slavism by mistranslating the title of Štúr's polemical pamphlet, *Nárečja slovenskuo alebo potreba písaňje v tomto nárečje*. Scholars have variously rendered the word *nárečja* as "speech" (De Bray 1980, 132), "idiom" (Pech 1970, 720), or "orthography" (Seton-Watson 1908, 80). At least four works, two from linguists (Burke 1987, 203; Sussex and Cubberly 2006, 103) and two from historians (Brock 1976, 48; Felak 1994, 7), have translated the title as "The Slovak Tongue or the Necessity of Writing in this Tongue," and it is worth pointing out that the Slavic words for "tongue," Czech/Slovak *jazyk* and Croatian/Serbian/Slovene *jezik*, also mean "language." Other scholars have straightforwardly mistranslated *nárečje* as "language." Slovak-Canadian scholar Kirschbaum (1995, 100, 2014, xxxvi) and Slovak-British historian Teich (1998, 379) both translated the title of Štúr's work as "the Slovak Language or the Need to Write in this Language." Slovak historian Kováč (2011, 125) gave "The Slovak language and the need to write in it," and Slovak historians Mikuš (1977, 76) and Bartl (2002, 96) "the Slovak Language or the Necessity of Writing in this Language."

Scholars have also repeatedly mistranslated the word *nárečje* when quoting the aforementioned key passage in Štúr's argument "*Mi Slováci sme kmen a jako kmen máme vlastnuo nárečja*." To support the contention that Štúr "advocated a separate Slovak language" and "argued that Slovaks constituted a nation," Berend (2003, 57), using quotation marks (!), cited Štúr as saying: "we have our own language, which is quite separate from the Czech." Brock (1976, 48, 80) cited the same passage as: "We Slovaks are a tribe and as a tribe we have our own language," admitting in a footnote that "dialect" would be a "more exact" translation. Why would any scholar consciously choose a less exact translation? I suggest that "dialect" is not a "more exact" translation of *nárečja*, but rather the "correct" translation (Šimko 1991, 277; Trnka 1992, 215).

Scholars writing in Slovak cannot easily hide behind inaccurate translations, so they insert specious "clarifications" or "corrections" into the passages they cite. Jóna (1985, 86) 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." When Blanár (1993) summarized Stur's belief that "the spiritual form of a nation is its dialect (which means language in Štúr's terminology)," he justified only his linguistic terminological substitution, not his ethnographic substitution. Cambel (1987, 2: 721) claimed that Štúr tried "to emphasize the main idea of his work, that Slovaks 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")]. How can contemporary scholars analyze Štúr's Panslavism if contemporary "terminology" prevents the concept from being articulated?

Even scholars who cite the passage accurately seem unable to digest its contents. Tibor Pichler's chapter on "the idea of Slovak language-based nationalism" (1994, 40) cited correctly, then commented that Štúr, "the theoretician of language and nation," argued from "one fundamental motive, namely, the will to be a nation." Why, then, did Štúr describe Slovaks as a "tribe"? Horák (2003, 102) cited the key passage from Štúr's book without

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

any lexical substitution, though he did modernize the orthography. In the immediately following sentence, however, Horák described Štúr's passage as a "declaration of an independent Slovak language." Horák offers no explanation why Štúr would have chosen to declare the independent Slovak language as a "dialect." Perhaps Pichler and Horák implicitly accepted Cambel's theory of terminological transformation?

Surprisingly, the theory of terminological transformation has attracted serious scholarly attention. Slovak linguist Vincent Blanár, in a specialist study for the "Czechoslovak Journal of Terminology," proposed a chronology for this supposed semantic shift, at least in linguistic contexts. In the 1860s and 1870s, Blanár declared:

> 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. (Blanár 1963, 265)

Rather than use modern terminology to express an archaic Panslav nationalism, Blanár argued, Štúr used archaic terminology to express modern Slovak nationalism. Štúr's beliefs supposedly conform to twentieth and twenty-first century notions, only his vocabulary was unfamiliar.

Blanár's theory of terminological transformation has the virtue of falsifiability. If the meaning of the word *nárečja* had actually changed relative to the Latin and German, that change would have left traces in the historical record. Blanár's hypothesis implies, for example, that Štúr would have described French, Italian, and Spanish as *nárečja*. In *Nárečja slovenskuo*, however, Štúr (1846b, 44) insisted that the Romance languages are "proper languages and not dialects [*nárečja*], just as e.g. the French, Spanish and Italian nations are proper nations [*národi*]." Discussing Italian, he spoke of "Genoan, Paduan, and Bolonan dialects [*genuézko, Paduánko, Boloňézko nárečja*]" (1846b, 43). Štúr used similar terminology discussing Germanic languages: "The Scandinavians and the English [...] are not Germanic tribes [*germanskje kmeni*], but Germanic nations [*germanskje národi*]" (1846b, 37) Štúr claimed, "therefore, a Germanic nation [*národ Germanskí*] neither is nor will be developed into tribes, since it has not divided itself into dialects" (1846b, 39). When discussing England, France, Germany, and Italy, therefore, Štúr used the words *nareče* and *kmen* in conformity with modern usage.

Dictionary definitions also suggest Štúr's contemporaries used the term *nárečje* with its familiar modern meaning. Blanár argued that the meaning "Dialekt, Mundart" appeared only in the 1860s, but a multilingual dictionary by Juraj Palkovič, Štúr's teacher and mentor at the Lutheran school in Bratislava, defined *Nářečj* as "Mundart" and "dialectus" (1820, 1: 1036). Kollár's works, appearing in both Slavic and German, also spectacularly contradict Blanár's hypothesis of semantic change. Most damagingly, however, Štúr himself (1846b, 10) translated *nárečja* into Latin and German as "dialectus, Mundart." Štúr, therefore, did not use familiar words with archaic meanings, he used familiar words with familiar meanings to express a Panslavic nationalism that, however archaic, however unfamiliar or unpalatable to contemporary scholars, enjoyed great currency among nineteenth-century Slavic intellectuals.

In short, scholars of Slovak history and language, even those familiar with nineteenth-century Panslavism, appear unwilling to acknowledge Štúr's Slavism. Scholars prepared to substitute key words in a direct quotation, of course, can attribute any opinion to any historical figure. Conceptual and lexical substitution has thus let scholars attribute to Štúr a more recognizable Slovak particularist nationalism, concealing his Panslavism.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Explaining consistent mistranslations

What does this shameful parade of scholarly mistranslations signify? Scholars are human, and make mistakes. Several readers, both friendly and hostile, have pointed out errors in my own published works. Nevertheless, the mistranslations discussed above follow a pattern. Scholars use the word "language" to translate Kollár's *nářečj / Dialekt / Mundart*, Gaj's *narečje / narechje / Dialekt / Mundart*, and Štúr's *nárečja / dialectus / Mundart*, but do not use the word "dialect" in place of *jazyk / jezik / Sprache*. Scholars use the word "nation" to translate Kollár's *kmen / národní kmen / Stamm*, Gaj's *plemen*, and Štúr's *kmen / Stamm*, but do not use the word "tribe" in place of *národ / narod / Volk / Nation*. Scholars are evidently unwilling to acknowledge that historical actors believed in a single Slavic nation, or in a single Slavic language. In short, scholarly mistranslations, both ethnographic and linguistic, efface Panslavism.

Significantly, scholars demonstrably impose contemporary national categories not merely to describe the putative ethnographic or linguistic reality, but when summarizing the beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions of historical actors. Stančić and Haraksim, for example, replaced "tribes" with "nations" when discussing Kollár's "ideas" and "programme," Jonke and Greenberg replaced "dialect" with "language" when discussing Gaj's "notions" and "thesis," and Cambel and Pichler replaced "dialect" with "language" when discussing Štúr's "main idea" and "fundamental motive." Even scholars persuaded about the objective reality of the Croatian language and Slovak languages must, I suggest, acknowledge that Kollár, Gaj, and Štúr articulated other ideas.

Why has recent scholarship been so reluctant to acknowledge Panslavism? Part of the problem may lie in the habit of modernizing texts for contemporary readers. Central European scholars routinely "correct" or "modernize" archaic spellings; the style guide of at least one Central European journal advises "lexical change" if old texts use "inappropriate words" (Klimeš 1954). Some changes indeed seem relatively harmless. Kollár's epic poem *Sláwy dcera*, for example, is routinely reprinted and described in the secondary literature as *Slávy dcera* (with v). Goldstein, as noted above, transformed Gaj's *pravopisaňa* into *pravopisa*, and Horák changed Štúr's *vlastnuo nárečj* to *vlastné nárečie*. Perhaps the habit of "correcting" or "modernizing" archaic orthography trains scholars to take similar liberties with archaic ideas? Thus scholars "correct" or "modernize" *Horvatsko-slavenskoga* into *hrvatskog*, *nárečj* into *jazyk*, and *kmen* into *národ*.

Modern nationalism presumably plays a role as well. Rewriting documents to make historical figures anachronistically conform to modern national concepts obviously helps legitimize contemporary political structures. Štúr's Panslavism, for example, may embarrass Slovak patriots who wish to claim him as a national hero. How can the linguistic division of the Slovak Academy of Sciences bear the name of a man who did not believe in a Slovak language? Slovak nationalists thus have obvious motives for replacing Štúr's Panslavism with Slovak particularism. Croatian nationalists have similar motives for replacing Gaj's Panslavism with Croatian particularism.

Nevertheless, nationalist agendas provide only a partial explanation for the parade of mistranslations. Modern nationalists, in central Europe or in a diaspora, might wish to ignore nineteenth-century Panslavism, and ascribe other national ideologies to Panslav authors. Neither consideration, however, explains mistranslations in the work of Ivan Berend, a Hungarian scholar who moved to Los Angeles after the collapse of Communism, or Peter Brock, an English-Canadian scholar who studied in Poland before settling in Toronto. Scholars based in Central Europe, furthermore, might find it professionally

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expedient to leave institutional nationalism unchallenged without espousing that nationalism themselves.

Anachronism provides a more general explanation for mistranslations: scholars are retroactively imposing contemporary national categories onto historical figures. Modern scholars no longer see Slovaks and Croats as tribes of a Slavic nation, nor Slovak and Croat as dialects of a single Slavic language. Historical figures born in what is now Slovakia or Croatia are retroactively ascribed to Slovak or Croatian history, thus their linguistic nationalism, even if Panslav in content, retroactively becomes "Slovak" or "Croatian" linguistic nationalism. Unproblematized belief in modern taxonomies of nationhood and languagehood thus apparently prevents scholars from acknowledging contrary taxonomies, even as reported speech. A similar tendency toward anachronistic classification perhaps also explains why scholars transformed Kollár's adjective *československé / böhmischslowakische* into the significantly different ethnonym "Czech."

A new look at nineteenth-century Slavic thought is necessary. Scholars must restore Panslavism to its proper place in the history of Slavic nationalisms. Rethinking the history of Slavic linguistic thought offers particularly rich possibilities for intellectual history, if only because social scientists and historians have until now mostly abandoned the field to linguists. Linguists are trained to evaluate linguistic ideas in terms of correctness, an irrelevant yardstick for studying ideologies of linguistic nationalism. Historians, I suggest, are better suited to analyze Panslavism as an instance of unsuccessful nationalist mobilization. Nevertheless, both linguists and historians apparently have difficulty analyzing failed linguistic concepts, which has harmed the scholarly literature. Scholars re-examining Panslavism should, therefore, base their accounts on primary sources as much as possible. The extant literature, prone to interpret Panslav scholars in light of subsequent national categories, has misrepresented their thought, routinely falsifying quotations from primary sources. The scholarly literature on Panslavism, and particularly the linguistic aspects of Panslavism, is demonstrably unreliable.

References

Agnew, Hugh LeCaine. 1992. "Czechs, Slovaks and the Slovak Linguistic Separatism of the Mid-Nineteenth Century." In *The Czech and Slovak Experience*, edited by John Morison, 21–37. London: St. Martin's Press.

Ambruš, Jozef, ed. 1953. *Listy Ľudovíta Štúra*. Bratislava: SAV.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.

Anon. 1927. "Jan Kollár and Literary Panslavism." *Slavonic Review* 6 (17): 336–343.

Atkin, Nicholas, Michael Biddiss, and Frank Tallett. 2011. *The Wiley-Blackwell Dictionary of Modern European History Since 1789*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Auty, Robert. 1952. "Jan Kollár, 1793–1852." *Slavonic and East European Review* 31 (76): 74–91.

Babukić, Vjekoslav. 1836a. "Osnova slovnica slavjanske naréčja ilirskoga." *Danica Ilirska* 2 (10–15), 5, 12, 19, 26, March; 2, 9 April, pp. 37–40, 41–44, 45–58, 49–52, 53–56, 57–60.

Babukić, Vjekoslav. 1836b. *Osnova slovnice slavjanske naréčja Ilirskoga*. Zagreb: Milan Hiršfeld.

Baer, Josette. 2014. *A Life Dedicated to the Republic: Vavro Srobár's Slovak Czechoslovakism*. Stuttgart: Ibidem.

Bartl, Július. 2002. *Slovak History: Chronology and Lexicon*. Bratislava: SAV.

Batowski, Henryk. 1948. "The Poles and Their Fellow Slavs in 1848." *Slavonic and East European Review* 27 (69): 404–413.

Berend, Ivan. 2003. *History Derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Black, Peter. 1975. *Kollár and Štúr, Romantic and Post-Romantic Visions of a Slavic Future*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Blanár, Vincent. 1963. "K terminalógii v matičných rokoch." *Československý terminologický časopis* 2 (5): 257–274.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Blanár, Vincent. 1993. "Jazkovendé dielo Ľudovíta Štúra v slovenskom a slovanskom kontexte." *Slavica Slovaca* 28 (1–2): 4–14.
Blanár, Vincent. 2002. "Cenný Príspevok k Dejinám Spisovnej Slovenčiny." *Slavica Slovaca* 37 (2): 148–154.
Brock, Peter. 1976. *The Slovak National Awakening: An Essay in the Intellectual History of East Central Europe*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Brubaker, Rogers. 1996. *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Burke, Peter. 1987. *The Social History of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
Cambel, Samuel, ed. 1987. *Dejiny Slovenská*. Bratislava: SAV.
Coha, Suzan. 2009. "*Poetika i politika Gajeve Danice*." (*Ph.D. Thesis*). University of Zagreb.
Cooper, David. 2008. "Competing Languages of Czech Nation-Building: Jan Kollár and the Melodiousness of Czech." *Slavic Review* 67 (2): 301–320.
Danica horvatska, slavonska i dalmatinska. 1839. "Dopis iz Serbie Lužička u Saskoj." 5 (22), June 8: 91–92 .
Danica. 1837. "Slovstvo." 3 (26), July 1: 108.
Danilák, Michal. 1997. "Ľudovít Štúr a Slovanský zjazd v Prahe roku 1848." In *Ľudovít Štúr v súradniciach minulosti a súčasnosti*, edited by Imrich Sedlák, 84–112. Martin: Matica slovenská.
De Bray, R. G. A. 1980. *Guide to the West Slavonic Languages*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
Dedijer, Vladimir, ed. 1974. *History of Yugoslavia*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Dolanský, Julius. 1963. *Stopami buditelů*. Prague: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury a umění.
Dorovský, Ivan. 2004. *Slovanské meziliterární shody a rozdíly*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
Dorren, Gasten. 2014. *Lingo: A Language Spotter's Guide to Europe*. London: Profile.
Doruľa, Ján. 2011. "Slovenčina a bibličtina v evanjelickej cirkvi na Slovensku." *Slavica Slovaca* 46 (1): 3–9.
Erickson, John. 1964. *Panslavism*. London: Historical Association.
Fadner, Frank. 1962. *Seventy Years of Pan-Slavism in Russia: Karamzin to Danilevskiĭ, 1800–1870*. Enschede: Haarlem.
Felak, James. 1994. *At the Price of the Republic: Hlinka's Slovak People's Party, 1929–1938*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.
Ference, Gregory Curtis. 1995. *Sixteen Months of Indecision: Slovak American Viewpoints Toward Compatriots and the Homeland from 1914 to 1915*. Selinsgrove, PA: Associated University Press.
Frantsuzova, Olga. 2005. "Politicheskii panslavizm i idei vseslavianstva v Chekhii v pervoi polovine XIX g." (*Ph.D. Thesis*). Department of General History, Moscow State University.
Gaj, Ljudevit. 1830. *Kratka osnova Horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisaňa / Kurzer Entwurf einer kroatisch-slavischen Orthographie*. Buda: Royal University Library.
Gaj, Ljudevit. 1830/31. Manuscript transcribed by Nikša Stančić, 2005.
Gaj, Ljudevit (as "Lyudevit Gay"). 1835a. "Pravopisz." Danicza Horvatzka, Slavonzka y Dalmatinzka March 1(10–12), 14, 21, 28: 38–40, 41–42, 46–48.
Gaj, Ljudovit. 1835b. "Odgovor." *Danica Horvatska, Slavonska i Dalmatinska* 1 (31): 122–124.
Gaj, Ljudovit. 1835c. "Oglas." *Danicza Horvatzka, Slavonzka y Dalmatinzka* June 6, 1 (22): 88.
Gaj, Ljudevit. 1839. "Tko su bili stari Iliri?" Danica Ilirska March 5 (10–13, 15), 9, 16, 23, April 6: 37–39, 41–43, 46–46, 49–51, 58–59.
Gąsior, Agnieszka, Lars Karl, and Stefan Troebst, eds. 2014. *Post-Panslavismus: Slavizität, Slavische Idee und Antislavismus im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Wallenstein.
Gogolák, Ludwig. 1969. *Beiträge zur Geschichte des slowakischen Volkes*. Munich: Oldenbourg.
Goldstein, Ivo. 1999. *Croatia: A History*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
Greenberg, Robert. 2004. *Language and Identity in the Balkans*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Grigorieva, Anna. 2013. "Pan-Slavism in Central and Southeastern Europe." *Journal of Siberian Federal University, Humanities and Social Sciences* 1: 13–21.
Hantsch, Hugo. 1965a. "Panslawismus, Neoslawismus und Austro-Slawismus." *Der Donauraum* 10: 94–104.
Hantsch, Hugo. 1965b. "Pan-Slavism, Austro-Slavism, Neo-Slavism: The All-Slav Congresses and the Nationality Problems of Austria-Hungary." *Austrian History Yearbook* 1: 23–37.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Haraksim, Ľudovít. 2011. "Slovak Slavism and Panslavism." In *Slovakia in History*, edited by Mikuláš Teich, Dušan Kováč and Martin Brown, 101–119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hawkesworth, Celia. 2007. *Zagreb: A Cultural and Literary History*. Oxford: Signal.
Herkel, Ján. 1826. *Elementa Universalis Linguae Slavicae*. Buda: Royal University Press.
Herrity, Peter. 1992. "The Problematic Nature of the Standardization of the Serbo-Croatian Literary Language in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century." In *Language Planning in Yugoslavia*, edited by Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth, 162–175. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
Hill, Elizabeth. 1951. *Why Need We Study the Slavs?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hoitsy, Samuel. 1843. *Apologie des ungrischen Slawismus*. Leipzig: Vlockmar.
Horak, Stephen. 1963. "Heritage of Lenin's Coexistence." *The Ukrainian Quarterly* 19–20: 133–143.
Horák, Emil. 2003. "Štúrov spis Nárečia slovenskuo alebo potrebe písaňja v tomto náreční v aktuálnom slovanskom kontexte." *Slavica Slovaca* 38 (2): 97–103.
Horák, Emil. 2004. "Slovensko-makedónske jayzkové paralely." *Slovaca Slovaca* 39 (2): 107–114.
Horák, Emil. 2007. "Slovensko-české filologické paralely z (južno)slavistického aspektu." *Slavica Slovaca* 42 (2): 102–110.
Horvat, Josip. 1975. *Ljudevit Gaj: Njegov život, njegovo doba*. Zagreb: Liber.
Hroch, Miroslav. 1985. *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.
Hurban, Miroslav. 1846. *Českje hlasi proti Slovenčiňe*. Skalice: Skarniel.
Ivetić, Egido. 2012. *Jugoslavia sognata: lo jugoslavismo delle origini*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
Jankovič, Ján. 1997. *Chorvátska literatúra v slovenskej kultúre*. Veda: Bratislava.
Jelavich, Charles, and Barbara Jelavich. 1977. *The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804–1920*. Seattle: University of Washington.
Jonke, Ljudevit. 1976. "Ljudevit Gaj zum 100. Todestag." *Die Welt der Slaven* 21 (2): 62–69.
Jopson, Norman. 1934. "Introduction to G. Bozhovitch's Story 'The Lair.' *The European Quarterly* 1 (2): 208–120.
Jóna, Eugen. 1956. "Účasť Ľudovíta Štúra pri utváraní spisovnej slovenčiny." *Slovenská reč* 21 (2): 131–146.
Jóna, Eugen. 1985. *Postavy slovenskej jazykovedy v dobe Štúrovej*. Bratislava: SAV.
Jóna, Eugen, and Ľubomír Ďurovič, eds. 2006. *Nauka rečí slovenskej: Komentáre, bibliografia*. Bratislava: SAV.
Kačala, Ján. 1986. "Jazykovedné dielo Ľudovíta Štúra a súčasná slovakistika." *Reč* 51 (3): 129–135.
Karadžić, Vuk. 1818. *Srpski rječnik*. Vienna: P. P. Armeniern.
Kirschbaum, Joseph. 1975. "Slovak Émigré Literature." In *Slovak Language and Literature: Essays*, edited by Jaroslav Rudnyckyj, 235–267. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, Department of Slavic Studies.
Kirschbaum, Stanislav. 1995. *A History of Slovakia: The Struggle for Survival*. London: St. Martin's Press.
Kirschbaum, Stanislav. 2014. *Historical Dictionary of Slovakia*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.
Klimeš, Lumír. 1954. "Jak vydávati staročeské texty?" *Slovo a slovesnost* 15 (3): 136–140.
Kohn, Hans. 1952. "Romanticism and Realism among Czechs and Slovaks." *The Review of Politics* 14 (1): 25–46.
Kohn, Hans. 1953. *Panslavism: Its History and Ideology*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
"Kolar, Ivan". 1836. "O slovstvenoj vzajemnosti medju koleni i naréčji slovenskimi." *Danica Ilirska* 2 (29–31): 114–116. 117–120, 122–123.
Kollár, Jan. 1824. *Sláwy Dcera: we třech zpěwjch*. Buda: Royal University Library.
Kollár, Jan. 1832. *Sláwy Dcera: lyricko-epická báseň w pěti zpěwjch*. Prague: Trattner and and Károly.
Kollár, Jan. 1835. *Národnié zpiewanky čili pjsně swětské Slowákow w Uhrách*. Buda: Royal University Library.
Kollár, Jan. 1836. "O literarnég Wzágemnosti." *Hronka: Podtatranská Zábavnice* 1 (2): 39–53.
Kollár, Jan. 1837. *Über die literarische Wechselseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation*. Pest: Trattner and Károly.
Kollár, Jan. 1840. "O literaturnoy vzaimnosti mezhdu plemenami i narechiyami slavyanskimi." *Otechestvennyya zapiski* 8 (1–2): 1–24, 65–94.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kollár, Jan. 1844. *Über die Wechselseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation*. Leipzig: Otto Wigand.
Kollár, Jan. 1845. *O književnoj uzajamnosti izmedju različni plemena i narečja Slavjanskoga naroda*. Belgrade: Serbian Royal Library.
Kollár, Jan. 1846. "O československé jednotě w řeči a w literatře." In *Hlasowé o potřebě jednoty spisowného jazyka pro Čechy, Morawany a Slowáky*, edited by Jan Kollár, 101–126. Prague: Kronberg and Řiwnák.
Kollár, Jan. 2009. *Reciprocity Between the Tribes and Dialects of the Slavic Language*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
Kováč, Dušan. 2011. "The Slovak Political Programme: From Hungarian Patriotism to the Czechoslovak State." In *Slovakia in History*, edited by Mikuláš Teich, Dušan Kováč, and Martin D. Brown, 120–136. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kramárcsik, Karl (as Károly Szatócs). 1840. "A Panszlavizmus cseh-szláv hősei Lőcsén." *Társalkodó* 9 (92): 365–366.
Kunze, Peter. 1999. "The Sorbian National Renaissance and Slavic Reciprocity in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 41 (2): 189–206.
Lednicki, Wacław. 1953. "Panslavism." In *European Ideologies: A Survey of 20th Century Political Ideas*, edited by Feliks Gross, 808–912. New York: Philosophical Library.
Lichard, Daniel. 1865. *Rozhovory o matiči slovenksej*. Banská Bystrica: Matičnych spisov.
Locher, Theodore. 1931. *Die Nationale Differenzierung und Integrierung der Slovaken und Tschechen in ihrem Geschichtlichen Verlauf bis 1848*. Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk Willink & Zoon.
Magocsi, Paul Robert. 2004. "Geography and Borders." In *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe*, edited by Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer, 19–29. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
Makowski, Krzysztof, and Frank Hadler, eds. 2013. *Approaches to Slavic Unity: Austro-Slavism, Pan-Slavism, Neo-Slavism, and Solidarity among the Slavs Today*. Poznań: Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
Maxwell, Alexander. 2003. "Literary Dialects in China and Slovakia: Imagining Unitary Nationality with Multiple Orthographies." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 164: 129–149.
Maxwell, Alexander. 2009. *Choosing Slovakia*. London: I.B. Tauris.
Mažuranić, Ivan, and Jakov Užarević. 1842. *Deutsch-ilirisches Wörterbuch*. Zagreb: Ljudevit Gaj.
Mikuš, Joseph. 1977. *Slovakia and the Slovaks*. Washington, DC: Three Continents Press.
Milojković-Djurić, Jelena. 1994. *Panslavism and National Identity in Russia and the Balkans 1830–1880*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs.
Moguš, Milan. 1995. *A History of the Croatian Language: Towards a Common Standard*. Zagreb: Globus.
Nowotny, Pawol. 1965. "Listy, pisane serbskemu gymnazialnemu towarstwu w Budyšinje z lět 1839–50." *Lětopis* 12 (2): 184–245.
Oravcová, Marianna. 1994. "The Ethnic and Cultural Dimension of National Emancipation." In *Language, Values, and the Slovak Nation*, edited by Tibor Pichler and Jana Gašparíková, 9–24. Washington, DC: Paideia.
Ormis, Ján, ed. 1973. *O reč a národ*. Bratislava: SAV.
Palkovič, Juraj. 1820. *Böhmisch-deutsch-lateinisches Wörterbuch*. Prague: Thomas Kubelka.
Panslavismus im Gegensatz zum Allslaventhum, Der. 1870. Strausbourg: Köhler.
Pauliny, Eugen. 1948. *Dejiny spisovney slovenčiny*. Bratislava: SAV.
Pech, Stanley. 1970. "Nationalism in Eastern Europe (Review)." *Slavic Review* 29 (4): 719–721.
Petro, Peter. 1997. *History of Slovak Literature*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
Petrovich, Michael. 1956. *The Emergence of Russian Panslavism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Pichler, Tibor. 1994. "The Idea of Slovak Language-based Nationalism." In *Language, Values and the Slovak Nation*, edited by Tibor Pichler and Jana Gašpariková, 35–46. Washington, DC: Paideia.
Popowski, Józef. 1893. *Nationalität-Race* (Slavismus-Panslavismus). Vienna: Frick.
Radosavljevich, Paul. 1919. *Who Are the Slavs?* Boston: Richard Badger.
Robinson, Therese (as Talvi). 1850. *Historical View of the Languages and Literature of the Slavic Nations; With a Sketch of Their Popular Poetry*. New York: Putnam.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rosenbaum, Karol. 1993. "Dielo Jána Kollára v kontexte českej a slovenskej literatúry v 19. storočí: (náčrt problematiky)." *Slavica slovaca* 28 (1–2): 121–127.
Šafařík, Pavel Josef. 1842. *Slowanský Národopis*. Prague: n.p.
Seton-Watson, R. W. 1908. *Racial Problems in Hungary*. London: Archibald Constable.
Šimko, Ján. 1991. *English-Slovak Dictionary*. Bratislava: Komenský.
Simpson, John, and Edmund Weiner, eds. 1991. *The Compact Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Sivrić, Ivo. 1975. *Bishop J. G. Strossmayer*. Chicago, IL: Franciscan Herald Press.
Slovenský biografický slovník (od roku 833 do r. 1990). 1987. Martin: Matica Slovenská.
Stallaerts, Robert. 2010. *Historical Dictionary of Croatia*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.
Stančić, Nikša. 1989. *Gajeva "Još Horvatska ni propala" iz 1832–33*. Zagreb: Globus.
Stančić, Nikša. 1990. "'Naš narod,' Ljudevita Gaja iz 1835. Godine." *Radovi zavoda za hrvatsku povijest* 23: 53–80.
Stančić, Nikša. 2005. "Prilog: Grafija i ideologija: hrvatski narod, hrvatski jezik i hrvatska latinica Ljudevita Gaja 1830. i 1835. Godina." *Razred za društvene znanosti* 492 (43): 288–294.
Štúr, Ľudovít (as Ljudevit Štur). 1837. "Nitra: Narodna slovačka pěsma." *Danica ilirska*, June 3 3 (2): 85.
Štúr, Ľudovít. 1843. *Beschwerden und Klagen der Slaven in Ungarn über die gesetzwidrigen Uebergriffe der Magyaren*. Leipzig: Robert Binder.
Štúr, Ľudovít. 1846a. *Nauka reči slovenskej*. Bratislava: Tatrín.
Štúr, Ľudovít. 1846b. *Nárečja slovenskuo alebo potreba písaňje v tomto nárečje*. Bratislava: Wigand.
Štúr, Ľudovít. 1847. "Panslavism a naša Krajina," Slovenskje Národňje novini September 1 (215–218): 3, 7, 10, 14: 857–58, 861–63, 865–66, 869–70.
Štúr, Ľudovít. 1848. "Pohled na hýbání západních a jižních Slowanů." *Národní Noviny* 23: 2 May, 89–90.
Šulek, Bogoslav. 1860. *Deutsch-Kroatisches Wörterbuch*. Zagreb: Franz Suppan.
Sussex, Roland, and Paul Cubberly. 2006. *The Slavic Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sutherland, Anthony. 1981. "The Fathers of the Slovak Nation: From Juraj Tranovsky to Karol Salva or from the Reformation to the Rise of the Populists (1500s–1890s)." *Slovak Studies* 21: 5–187.
Svoljšak, Petra. 2008. "The Pre-March Era, The Time of Non-Freedom." In *The Land Between: A History of Slovenia*, edited by Oto Luthar, 264–279. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
Tafra, Branka. 2006. "Značenje narodnoga preporoda za hrvatski jezik." *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina* 2 (2): 43–55.
Teich, Mikuláš. 1998. *Bohemia in History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Thomas, Alfred. 2003. "Forging Czechs: The Reinvention of National Identity in the Bohemian Lands." In *Cultures of Forgery*, edited by Judith Ryan and Alfred Thomas, 29–52. London: Routledge.
Thomas, Alfred. 2007. *The Bohemian Body*. Madison: University of Wisconsin.
Thomson, Harrison. 1951. "A Century of a Phantom: Pan-Slavism and the Western Slavs." *Journal of Central European Affairs* 11 (1): 57–77.
Trnka, Nina. 1992. *Slovak-English, English-Slovak Dictionary*. New York: Hippocrene.
Tuminez, Astrid. 2000. *Russian Nationalism Since 1856: Ideology and the Making of Foreign Policy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
Varga, János. 1993. "Fear of Pan-Slavism." In *A Hungarian Quo Vadis: Political Trends and Theories of the Early 1840s*, 110–132. Budapest: Akadémiai.
Veselić, Rudolf. 1854. *Rěčnik ilirskoga i němačkoga jezika*. Vienna: Venedikt.
Voltiggi, Giuseppe. 1803. *Ricsoslovnik*. Vienna: Kurtzbeck.
Walicki, Andrzej. 1975. *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-century Russian Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Záborsky, Jonáš. 1851. "Predmluva." In *Žehry: Básně a dvě řeči*, iii–vi. Vienna: Mechitaristů. Introduction with unnumbered pages.
Zay, Carl. 1841. *Protestantismus, Magyarismus, Slawismus*. Leipzig: Wigand.
Zdenčanin, Rodoljub (psuedonym). 1837. "Slovak i Tatra." *Danica Ilirska* 3 (10), March 11: 37.
Živančević, Milorad, and Ivo Frangeš. 1975. *Ilirizam, Realizam*. Zagreb: Liber.
Zlatar, Zdenko. 1995. *The Slavic Epic: Gundulić's Osman*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
Zlatar, Zdenko. 1997. *The Poetics of Slavdom*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
Žmegač, Jasna Čapo. 2004. "Anton Radić, Peasants into Croats." In *Ethnology, Myth and Politics*, edited by Dunja Rihtman-Augustin, 35–46. Farnham: Ashgate.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360 Published online by Cambridge University Press