

**PAN-SLAVISM AS A “CULTURAL NATIONALISM”?
TRANSLATION AND ADOPTION OF THE PAN-SLAVIC IDEAS IN THE SERBIAN CONTEXT
IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY
PANSLAVIZMUS AKO „KULTÚRNY NACIONALIZMUS“?**

Dušan J. Ljuboja

Atelier Department of Interdisciplinary History, Eötvös Loránd University

dusan.ljuboja3@gmail.com

Klíčové slová

kultúrny nacionalizmus, panslavizmus, srbský nacionalizmus, Slovanský literárny zväz, Juhoslávia

Key words

cultural nationalism, Pan-Slavism, Serbian nationalism, Slavic literary union, Yugoslavism

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to show how the main ideas of Pan-Slavism of the first half of the nineteenth century influenced the development of the Serbian national movement. By mainly focusing on the issues of language and literary cooperation, as well as on the perceptions of the distant past, I argue that Pan-Slavism had a deep impact on Serbian national development. The idea of Slavic literary reciprocity directly led to the establishment of South Slavic literary cooperation. Furthermore, it revealed the division between the Serbs and the Croats regarding how they perceived this literary union and how it should be named. Another point of influence between Pan-Slavism and emerging Serbian nationalism was the question of the “ancient past,” which had a hidden political agenda.

In this paper, I will analyze the ideological connections between Pan-Slavism and the emerging Serbian national movement. More specifically, I will focus on the Serbs living in the Kingdom of Hungary in the first half of the nineteenth century, when Pest-Buda played the role of the Serbian “cultural center.”¹ My aim is to show the influence of Pan-Slavism on the Serbian national movement, as well as the adaptation and transformation of the ideas promoted by the main Pan-Slavists of this era. I find Joep Leerssen’s “cultural nationalism” to be a useful methodological tool, a lens of a sort, through which both nationalistic and Pan-Slavic movements can be observed.

I start the paper with a discussion of whether Pan-Slavism could be regarded as a national movement, while providing a brief overview of the notion of “cultural nationalism” as proposed by Leerssen. His theory is applicable to an early stage of national development, or Phase A, to use the terminology of Miroslav Hroch. For the sake of brevity, I chose to focus on just two of the cultural fields he proposed. First, I will discuss the issue of language, and I plan to rely mainly on the work of Ján Kollár, to determine whether there was a unified Slavic language, or a plan to create one in the future. Kollár’s idea of Slavic literary reciprocity played a crucial role in the creation of a common South Slavic literature and standardized language. I will show how this idea of reciprocity was initially accepted in

¹ Slavko Gavrilović gave a good summary of the reasons why Pest-Buda acted as the cultural center for the Serbian national movement in this period, including printing activity, the relocation of Buda University, and the creation of Matica Srpska in 1826. See Slavko GAVRILOVIĆ, *Srbi u Habzburškoj Monarhiji (1792–1848)* [Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy 1792–1848] (Novi Sad: Matica Srpska, 1994), 10–19.

and standardized language. I will show how this idea of reciprocity was initially accepted in both the Croatian and Serbian cases, with an emphasis on the latter. The Serbian community in Pest-Buda in the Kingdom of Hungary, gathered around their cultural society *Matica Srpska*, acted as the cultural center for all Serbs in the first half of the nineteenth century. The reason for this was its access to the Buda University press, which led them to print books and periodicals in large quantities. The other cultural field, as proposed by Leerssen, is that of discourse, within which I will focus on writings about history. Mainly, my aim is to show the perceptions of “ancient history,” and how the Serbian adoption of the main Pan-Slavic ideas differed from their original conception.

What is a “cultural nationalism”?

Pan-Slavism in the first half of the nineteenth century was in its “Western phase,” which was dominated by Czech and Slovak scholars like Pavel Jozef Šafárik and Ján Kollár.² When we talk about “movements” today, we tend to do it anachronistically. This “movement” was in a way a *society of letters*, whose aim was to elevate the position of the Slavs in the eyes of European scholars, and then to create and promote the idea of unity and cooperation. Thus, it would be safer to argue that the Pan-Slavism of this period was an ideological concept, which briefly could have been classified as a movement, namely during the events of the Prague Slavic Congress and revolutions of 1848. However, this movement ultimately dissolved.

Miroslav Hroch’s typology, where he differentiates between the phases shared by most of the national movements of the so-called “smaller nations,” is a useful tool for understanding different stages in the development of nationalisms. Hroch’s theory is as fluid as it is rigid. Even though it divides the phases of the development of these national movements into three different parts (Phases A, B, and C), it also allows for differences to appear, reflecting whether they approached the final stage of development or not. Some movements stayed in Phase B, which is according to Hroch the most important one – the so-called period of national agitation.³ Not every nationalism reached the final phase, that of a mass movement. Dutch historian Joep Leerssen provides the most suitable methodology for the issues of this paper by relying on and extending the theories of Miroslav Hroch. Leerssen tries to develop a framework that incorporates various national and proto-national movements of the nineteenth century. Unlike Hroch, Leerssen puts the emphasis on Phase A, the so-called period of scholarly movement.⁴ He separates, in a way, the development of a mass national movement from its cultural component, arguing that every nationalism is a cultural nationalism in its essence. Moreover, the early stage of any national movement

² Hans KOHN, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology* (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), xiv.

³ Miroslav HROCH, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*, trans. Ben Fowkes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 23–24. For more recent, extended, views of Hroch, translated to and published in English, see Miroslav HROCH, *European Nations: Explaining Their Formation*, trans. Karolina Graham (London: Verso, 2015).

⁴ Joep LEERSSEN, “Nationalism and the Cultivation of Culture,” *Nations and Nationalism* 12, no. 4 (2006): 562.

(Phase A) is not characterized by the “cultural agenda of nationalism,” as that aspect never ceases, but remains an integral part of the nationalism, even in its developed mass movement stage.⁵

Leerssen further argues that we should avoid anachronistic views and observe the early stages not only of those national movements that developed into a current national state, but also of those that did not. He provides regionalisms as examples, mentioning why movements in Occitania and Galicia never developed into full-fledged nationalisms that led to separatist movements with aims of establishing national states. Early cultural nationalism, as Leerssen dubs it, and which coincided with Hroch’s Phase A, should be observed separately, on its own, and not only in relation to what it leads to.⁶ Another characteristic of cultural nationalism is its territorial indistinctness. What is meant by this is that many of the so-called national workers who operated within the framework of cultural nationalism were located in big cities, which acted as national cultural centers. It did not matter that, for example, Vienna, Venice, and Budapest were not Serbian cities, or that they were not a part of a broader Serbian ethnic territory.⁷ These workers practiced “extraterritoriality,” as Leerssen notes, and they relied on the existing cultural sphere of various cities, which granted them an opportunity to raise their own cultural production and practice more active exchange of knowledge and information.⁸

Lastly, there is a need to discuss the frameworks of cultural nationalism that Joep Leerssen set. He argues that “cultivation of culture” basically coincides with Hroch’s Phase A of nationalism. This encompasses the interest of “national workers” in various fields concerning their target nation, like language, folklore, national epics, history, antiquity, artifacts from the national past, and so on.⁹ Furthermore, these various cultural fields are narrowed down into four major ones – language, discourse, material culture, and practices performed. The first one deals with language itself and its different usages by national workers, ranging from language purism to language reforms and revivalism. Discursive elements of literature, which includes written production in general, but also its emphasis on history writing and antiquarianism, is another field. Everything outside of the first two categories, produced in the material world (art, antiquities, architecture, and artifacts, among other things) forms “material culture,” which also had major importance for these national scholars. Everything immaterial, like cultural practices, folklore, customs, and so on, is grouped into the last field of Leerssen’s typology.¹⁰ This framework developed by Leerssen does not have any temporal boundaries, which makes it a useful tool for studying national movements over a span of multiple centuries. It does, however, have different stages of development, followed by all four cultural fields, which gives them new and improved

⁵ LEERSSEN, “Nationalism and the Cultivation of Culture,” 563.

⁶ LEERSSEN, “Nationalism and the Cultivation of Culture,” 563–564.

⁷ John Connelly also noted the fact the “important thinking about the nation often took place not in the nation’s ‘own’ territory, but elsewhere: in Vienna, Budapest, and Paris,” providing examples such as Vuk Karadžić, Josef Dobrovský, Ján Kollár, and Ljudevit Gaj, among others. See John CONNELLY, *From Peoples into Nations: A History of Eastern Europe* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020), 104–105.

⁸ LEERSSEN, “Nationalism and the Cultivation of Culture,” 565–566.

⁹ LEERSSEN, “Nationalism and the Cultivation of Culture,” 568.

¹⁰ LEERSSEN, “Nationalism and the Cultivation of Culture,” 568–569.

characteristics. These stages, or “types of cultivation,” as Leerssen refers to them, are salvation, production, and propagation. Lastly, the cultivation of culture could be, on the one hand, propagated “from the bottom up,” through endeavors of the middle class and the emergence of their associations, reading rooms and clubs, and printing production. On the other hand, it could be “top-down” oriented or, simply put, managed by the state authorities, their governmental bodies, and sponsored institutions.¹¹

Pan-Slavism as a form of “cultural nationalism”? The question of Slavic literary reciprocity

Pan-Slavism of the first half of the nineteenth century, as a movement and ideology, falls within the framework set by Joep Leerssen. In the following text, I will focus on the two cultural fields he proposed, on language and discourse, mainly on the perceptions of “ancient history.” Anachronistic perspectives of modern researchers of the Slavic nations’ national histories have either disregarded the Pan-Slavic movement of this time or treated it as just a stage in their subject’s own national development. Alexander Maxwell, a Slavist, recognizes this, and urges us to go back to the original sources and treat them *sine ira et studio*. The aim of Maxwell’s study in question is to prove that, for the leading figures of Pan-Slavism of the first half of the nineteenth century, there was a single Slavic nation, divided into different tribes. Furthermore, that nation had a single language, consisting of various dialects.¹² Maxwell even specifically states that “Panslavic linguistic activism qualifies as a form of ‘nationalism.’” He bases this on the theories of Benedict Anderson and Roger Brubaker, and not Leerssen, but his statement still aligns with everything mentioned in my analysis thus far.¹³

The orientation of the early national workers towards language was greatly inspired by the works of Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803). Iván T. Berend argues that Herder introduced the concept of “cultural-linguistic” nationalism in the region of East-Central Europe, where the emphasis on the vernacular languages was the only means through which the “national spirit” could be fully and freely expressed. This also included folk poetry and songs, which preserved the so-called “soul” of a nation.¹⁴ István Gombocz, in his study on the impact of Herder’s ideas on Central Europe, argues that the German philosopher put an emphasis on language and linguistics because doing so served both national, particular progress, as well as progress in general, that of humanity itself.¹⁵ John Connelly, in his work *From Peoples into Nations*, argues that Herder-influenced “linguistic nationalism” became a force to reckon with, and that governments would resort to censorship in order to

¹¹ LEERSSEN, “Nationalism and the Cultivation of Culture,” 570–571. These stages are clearly influenced by Miroslav Hroch’s typology, and they could be partly identified with his Phases A, B, and C.

¹² Alexander MAXWELL, “Effacing Panslavism: Linguistic Classification and Historiographic Misrepresentation,” *Nationalities Papers* 46, no. 4 (2018): 633.

¹³ MAXWELL, “Effacing Panslavism: Linguistic Classification and Historiographic Misrepresentation,” 635.

¹⁴ Iván T. BEREND, *History Derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 48–49.

¹⁵ István GOMBOCZ, “The Reception of Herder in Central Europe: Idealization and Exaggeration,” *Seminar: A Journal of Germanic Studies* 33, no. 2 (January 1997): 108–109.

suppress potential revolting groups.¹⁶ Herder’s ideas not only spread through his written work among the early Slavists, but also through their direct reception in the settings of German universities. Ján Kollár (1793–1852) and Pavel J. Šafárik (1795–1861) both attended the University of Jena, where Heinrich Luden, who edited Herder’s main work, gave energetic lectures.¹⁷ Tomasz Kamusella, in his study on the interrelation of language and nationalism in Central Europe, sees linguistic nationalism as a step towards “political reality,” which became evident in the events of 1848/49, when revolutions among the Slavs broke out and various movements sought political autonomy within the Austrian Empire; also, in 1848 the Prague Slavic Congress was held, which had limited success in comparison to its proclaimed political goals.¹⁸

Was there a single Slavic language which would serve as one of the national components for so-called “Pan-Slavic cultural nationalism”? Ján Kollár did envision a single Slavic nation with a single language, and he expressed these ideas in his works on literary reciprocity among the Slavs. The idea of a literary union of all the Slavic peoples was not an invention of Ján Kollár’s, as Albert Pražák already argued almost a century ago. However, even though some elements of this idea developed by the famous Slovak pastor and poet could be found in the works of Ján Herkel (1786–1853) and Pavel J. Šafárik, it was Kollár who developed and popularized the entire concept. Due to their close interaction, it is quite possible that the idea itself emerged through mutual exchange, especially between Šafárik and Kollár. Pražák noted that Kollár’s idea of reciprocity matured in the period between 1821 and 1836.¹⁹ The first systematically organized version of the idea appeared in 1836, and it was published by several different outlets. The versions in the literary Czech appeared in late 1836, in the magazine *Hronka: Podtatranská Zábavnice* [Hronka: Podtatranská Entertainment],²⁰ and in the papers *Kwéty. Narodnj zabawnjk pro Čechy, Morawany a Slowáky* [Flowers: National Entertainment for Czechs, Moravians, and Slovaks], in late October of 1836.²¹ Aside from these two, there was also a Serbian version, which actually appeared chronologically first, in Teodor Pavlović’s *Serbski Narodni List* [The Serbian National Papers] in late December of 1835 (early January of 1836 according to the Gregorian calendar),²² while the “Illyrian” version came out in Ljudevit Gaj’s *Danica Ilirska* [The Illyrian Morning Star] in July of 1836.²³ Kollár himself gave drafts of the text to these different outlets, including personally to Ljudevit Gaj and Teodor Pavlović, with whom he had close

¹⁶ CONNELLY, *From Peoples into Nations*, 85.

¹⁷ CONNELLY, *From Peoples into Nations*, 86

¹⁸ Tomasz KAMUSELLA, *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 47–48.

¹⁹ Ján Herkel in his *Elementa universalis linguae Slavicae* (1826) proposed the idea of a common language for all the Slavs. On the other hand, Pavel Jozef Šafárik touched on the concept of literary cooperation among the Slavic peoples in his *Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten* (1826). See Albert PRAŽÁK, “The Slovak Sources of Kollár’s Pan-Slavism,” in *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 6, No. 18 (1928): 581–583.

²⁰ *Hronka, Podtatranská Zábavnice* [Hronka: Podtatranská Entertainment], vol. 1, (1836): 39–51.

²¹ *Kwéty. Narodnj zabawnjk pro Čechy, Morawany a Slowáky* [Flowers: National Entertainment for Czechs, Moravians, and Slovaks], vol. 3 (1836): 85–87.

²² *Serbski Narodni List* [The Serbian National Papers] (1835): 198–200, 203–206.

²³ *Danica Ilirska* [The Illyrian Morning Star] (1836): 114–120, 122–123.

connections.²⁴ Peter Podolan noted that Kollár sent a draft of the text to Gaj via Vjekoslav Babukić, a member of the Illyrian movement who was staying in Pest at the time. The text was translated by Fran Kurelac and adapted by Ljudevit Gaj.²⁵ Teodor Pavlović resided in Pest at the same time as Kollár, so it is safe to assume that he was given a draft of the text personally, which is also the reason why it appeared chronologically first among all the versions of the text. In the following year, Ján Kollár would publish the extended version of the work, in German.²⁶ The work was translated into Serbian in 1845, when it was published in the Principality of Serbia, which was still a part of the Ottoman Empire.²⁷

In the Gaj’s version from 1836, it is stated that the “Illyrian” was one of the main Slavic dialects, but unlike Kollár’s original text, in the section about subdialects, the editor included Serbian, alongside Croatian, Slovenian, and Bulgarian.²⁸ The Serbian version, on the other hand, added Serbian as one of the main dialects, but did not replace “Illyrian,” which was kept as one of the main ones as well. The following text from the original, concerning the subdialects, was left unchanged, stating that “Illyrian” included Croatian, Slovenian, and Bulgarian.²⁹ This utter confusion shows how Kollár’s original idea about the language of the South Slavs and its subdialects was adapted to serve different purposes, in both the “Illyrian” and Serbian context. Without any intentions of delving deeper here into the evolution of the text and its alterations in various translations, I would restrict myself for now to presenting some of the basic ideas of Slavic literary reciprocity. For this, I will rely on the text published in *Hronka* in 1836, as it was the closest to the original. The original text was organized in successive points, discussing what the meaning of reciprocity was, what it was not, which dialects were included, which territory was to be included, and so on. In a brief introduction, the text states that the idea of reciprocity or literary cooperation was a “new, unique and original” idea in Europe, which had a great significance for the “Slavic people.” Therefore, it “deserves dutiful attention and all-around interest from every educated Slavic man.”³⁰ The text explicitly states that Slavic reciprocity did “not consist of the political union of all the Slavs,” further clarifying that its purpose was not to assist “demagogic upheavals against the

²⁴ One of these drafts was the one sent to the editor of *Hronka*. The text of the document ends with “Z väčšej úvahy v ‘Hronke’ 1836.” If the Serbian version came out at the turn of 1835 and 1836, this proves that Teodor Pavlović had a draft as well, like the one sent to *Hronka*. Therefore, we can assume that Kollár had multiple copies of the same draft, which he gave out to others. For the draft that Ján Kollár sent to *Hronka*, which is stored in the Literárny archív of Slovenská národná knižnica in Martin, Slovakia, see SNK Literárny archív 39 E 6.

²⁵ Peter PODOLAN, “Croatian Elements in the Life and Work of Ján Kollár,” in *Croatia and Slovakia: Historical Parallels and Connections (from 1780 to the Present Day)*, ed. Holjevac Željko et al. (Zagreb: University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Science, 2017), 43.

²⁶ Johann KOLLÁR, *Ueber die literarische Wechselseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation* [About the literary reciprocity between the different tribes and dialects of the Slavic nation] (Pesth: Trattner-Károlyischen Schriften, 1837).

²⁷ A notable feature of this 1845 Serbian translation was that the translator replaced “Illyrian” from the original text with “Serbian,” which he openly admitted. See Jovan KOLLAR, *O književnoj uzajmnosti između različni plemena i narečja slavenskoga naroda* [About the literary reciprocity between the different tribes and dialects of the Slavic nation], transl. Dimitrije Teodorović (Knaž. Serb. Knjigopečatnja: Belgrade, 1845), 9.

²⁸ *Danica Ilirska* [The Illyrian Morning Star] (1836): 115.

²⁹ *Serbski Narodni List* [The Serbian National Papers] (1835): 199.

³⁰ *Hronka*, Podtatranská Zábavnice, vol. 1, (1836): 39. All quotations translated into English in this paper, unless otherwise noted, were translated by Dušan J. Ljuboja.

earthly rulers and their decrees, from which only discord and misery arises.” The text continues to state that this literary cooperation could easily be possible “where one people exists under various scepters,” regardless of the differences in religious denominations, customs, or even orthographies.³¹ Therefore, it was very important to show that the idea of literary cooperation had no ultimate political goals, to avoid the watchful eyes of state censorship.

Kollár imagined one Slavic language divided into four dialects [nářečí]: Russian, Illyrian, Polish, and Czechoslovakian. Each of these dialects had different subdialects [podnářečí] within them – Russian had Little Russian, Illyrian had Croatian and Wendish (i.e., Slovenian), and Polish had Lusatian. Slavic reciprocity, as perceived by Kollár, did not constitute a forced mixing of the existing Slavic dialects; since they were already noticeably grammatically distant from one another, such an endeavor would not even have been possible. Therefore, it would have been unreasonable to think that a people belonging to one of the main Slavic branches would give away their existing linguistic independence and uniqueness, and “forget all the accumulated treasure” in it.³² Kollár did not envision that every Slav needed to be able to write or speak in every Slavic dialect, but that they should at least be able to read it, and understand the spoken word of those which were not their native ones. Also, it would not be realistic to buy every single book in every dialect. Therefore, Kollár proposed that it would suffice to possess mainly those selected, classic, works that embodied Slavdom in its entirety.³³ Evidently, Kollár tried his best to present various Slavic languages of that time, which were themselves in a process of language purification and development, as dialects of a unified Slavic language. The fact that they were not completely mutually intelligible did not bother him. He could not compare this heterogeneous “language” with any living one, so he sought examples in the past, comparing the Slavic language of his time with the Greek spoken in antiquity, and its four dialects (Ionic, Aeolic, Doric, Attic).³⁴

Kollár saw a benefit in the mutual language exchange between the related “dialects.” It would lead to language purification on all sides in two different ways. First, it would create more harmony in the language, because all the “coarse” words and sounds would either weaken and transform or disappear entirely. Secondly, it would do away with all foreign words and expressions, borrowed over time from different languages (Latin, German, Hungarian, French and so on).³⁵ This language purism would serve toward the effort of “approaching the ideal of Pan-Slavic [wšeslawskég] language [řeči], i.e., the language that a Slav from any tribe easily understands.” Furthermore, foreign words, Kollár argued, alienated Slavs one from another, tribe from tribe, and dialect from dialect – and this could be solved only with a linguistic “great cleansing.”³⁶

³¹ *Hronka*, Podtatranská Zábavnice, vol. 1, (1836): 40.

³² *Hronka*, Podtatranská Zábavnice, vol. 1, (1836): 41.

³³ *Hronka*, Podtatranská Zábavnice, vol. 1, (1836): 42.

³⁴ *Hronka*, Podtatranská Zábavnice, vol. 1, (1836): 42–43.

³⁵ *Hronka*, Podtatranská Zábavnice, vol. 1, (1836): 48.

³⁶ *Hronka*, Podtatranská Zábavnice, vol. 1, (1836): 51.

The idea of literary reciprocity in the South Slavic context

The idea of Slavic reciprocity and its views on the Slavic language and dialects had a profound impact on the Serbian and Croatian national developments. The Illyrian movement created by Ljudevit Gaj (1809–1872) in 1835, and the idea of “Yugoslavism” that arose as a reaction to it, both had different perceptions of South Slavic cultural and literary unity. Ljudevit Gaj gained prominence in the Slavic scholarly circles with his *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisanija* [A Short Outline of Croatian-Slavonian Grammar] published in 1830 in Buda. In it, he proposed a reform of the Latin orthography used in the Kingdom of Croatia and Slavonia.³⁷ Also, this work accepted the Shtokavian dialect, instead of the Kajkavian, which was used (and still is) in Zagreb and its surrounding area.³⁸ *Kratka osnova* was the igniting spark for the movement which gradually rose around Gaj in the following years, and which became the basis of the future Illyrian movement.³⁹ Ljudevit Gaj developed his ideas of Slavic unity after he came to Pest-Buda to study at the Faculty of Law. There, he met and befriended Ján Kollár, who became his tutor. The idea of Slavic literary cooperation greatly influenced the views of the young student. Kollár, who was a Slovak, accepted and wrote in biblical Czech, which he saw as a basis for the common literary language of Czechs and Slovaks.⁴⁰ Thus, Gaj also looked for a common name which would encompass all the South Slavs who lived in the Habsburg Monarchy and spoke in similar dialects.⁴¹

This was the time of ongoing debates about language and the political nation in the Kingdom of Hungary, which started in the late eighteenth century. In 1827, the Hungarian Diet made it obligatory for all Croatian academic institutions to teach the Hungarian language to everyone, including non-Hungarians, who were the majority in the kingdoms of Croatia and Slavonia.⁴² However, in 1832 during his speech at the Hungarian Diet, Count Janko Drašković (1770–1856) used the Shtokavian form of the language he called *naški* [our

³⁷ Nikša STANČIĆ, “Grafija i ideologija: hrvatski narod, hrvatski jezik i hrvatska latinica Ljudevita Gaja 1830. i 1835. godine” [Orthography and ideology: The Croatian people, Croatian language and the Croatian Latin of Ljudevit Gaj in 1830 and 1835], in *Rad Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti. Razred za književnost* 492 (2005): 261–262.

³⁸ Introducing the Shtokavian dialect, used predominantly by Serbs, instead of Kajkavian or Chakavian in the Illyrian and Croatian works ultimately led to unity between the Croats and the Serbs in the literary language, which was crowned by the Vienna Literary Agreement in 1852. Until then, Kajkavian was seen by Jernej Kopitar and Vuk St. Karadžić as a mainly Slovenian dialect that included some Kajkavian-speaking Croats, and Shtokavian was perceived as Serbian, which included Shtokavian-speaking Croats. See Marcela BEDNÁROVÁ, *Symboly a Myty Chorvatskeho Narodneho Hnutia: Fenomen Ilyrizmu* [Symbols and Myths of the Croatian National Movement: The Phenomenon of Illyrism] (Bratislava: VEDA, Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akademie vied, 2012), 27.

³⁹ Maria Rita LETO, “Danica ilirska i pitanje hrvatskog književnog jezika,” [The Illyrian Danica and the question of the Croatian literary language] in *Slavica tergestina* 11/12 (2004): 164–165.

⁴⁰ This language was called by a variety of names by its contemporaries: “Czech,” “Slavo-Bohemian,” “Bibličtina,” “Biblical Slovak,” “Czechoslovak.” See KAMUSELLA, *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe*, 533.

⁴¹ CONNELLY, *From Peoples into Nations*, 116–117.

⁴² Michal KOPEČEK and Balázs TRENCSÉNYI, eds., *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770–1945); Texts and Commentaries*, vol. 2 (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007), 340–341.

language]. This act hid a political agenda, with Drašković trying to portray all the people who used the same language as him as belonging to one nation. In addition to the *Slavo-Croats*, as he referred to them, the vast majority of the inhabitants of Slavonia, Bosnia, Montenegro, and the Military Frontier used it as well. Furthermore, he called for Dalmatia and even Bosnia and Slovenia to politically “rejoin” their cradle, which in his eyes was the Kingdom of Croatia and Slavonia.⁴³

Drašković’s political speech fitted perfectly with the ideas of Gaj, and they became the leading figures of the movement which tried to gather all the South Slavs living in the Monarchy under a single name. Ljudevit Gaj obtained a royal privilege to publish a political periodical, *Novine Horvatske* [The Croatian Newspaper], in 1834 in Zagreb, with a literary supplement called *Danica Horvatska, Slavonska i Dalmatinska* [The Croatian, Slavonian, and Dalmatian Morning Star].⁴⁴ In order to attract the other South Slavs, particularly the Serbs, Gaj needed to “find” their common name.⁴⁵ Later, in 1835, he chose “Illyrian”, and renamed his papers to *Danica Ilirska* [The Illyrian Morning Star], thus opting for a name of the ancient population which lived in the western part of the Balkan Peninsula in antiquity.⁴⁶ While reading Gaj’s 1834 *Announcement* for his upcoming newspapers and literary magazine, a researcher will notice how tangled and underdeveloped the Croatian author’s national and supra-national notions still were. By connecting them with the political aspirations of the Croatian and Slavonian Sabor⁴⁷ for unification with Austrian Dalmatia and other Slav-dominated parts of the Habsburg Monarchy, Gaj introduced these notions into the contemporary political narrative. He mentioned both “Slavic nation of the Southern parts” and “Illyrians,” both designating a larger group of people in which Croats also had their place as a separate entity, and he declared what his publications’ scope of interest would be: “In short, everything about the Croats and their Illyrian brothers, from the ancient to the current state of all Slavic people, that is worth studying and knowing.”⁴⁸

During the years of Gaj’s proclamations and the emergence of the Illyrian movement, the Serbian press from Pest-Buda did not have an immediate reaction. One of the reasons might be the temporary ban of the Serbian cultural society Matica Srpska by the censorial authorities in the period 1835–1836, along with its literary magazine *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle].⁴⁹ Also, the periodical *Serbski narodni List* [The Serbian National Papers], owned by Teodor Pavlović (1804–1854), who was also the editor of Matica’s periodical *Serbski Letopis* at this time, was not published in 1836 due to supposed financial reasons. However, from 1837 onwards, in the main Serbian publications from Pest-Buda, there was a visible discontent towards the name chosen for the South Slavs by the Zagreb-based movement. The two most prominent figures who emerged with their criticisms in the late

⁴³ KOPEČEK and TRENCSENYI, *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe*, 344–345.

⁴⁴ KOPEČEK and TRENCSENYI, *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe*, 231.

⁴⁵ CONNELLY, *From Peoples into Nations*, 11.

⁴⁶ KOPEČEK and TRENCSENYI, *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe*, 234.

⁴⁷ This was the Croatian feudal assembly, similar to the Hungarian Diet.

⁴⁸ Cited per KOPEČEK and TRENCSENYI, *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe*, 235.

⁴⁹ For an overview of the censorship episode, see Živan MILISAVAC, *Istorija Matice Srpske I Deo 1826–1864* [History of Matica Srpska Part I 1826–1864] (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1986), 284–294.

1830s were Teodor Pavlović, aforementioned editor of several important Serbian publications, and Jovan Subotić (1817–1886), a young writer and poet who later became the next editor of the periodical *Serbski Letopis* (1841–1851).

In his commentary, casually made in a few footnotes to one article, Pavlović directly asked his readership what the “Illyrian language” was, while at the same time acknowledging the necessity for a literary cooperation between all the Slavic peoples. He saw it as essential to the progress of the “Yugo-Slavs,” as he called them, who were of the same blood, language, and roots, but with different orthographies.⁵⁰ However, among all the South Slavs, according to Pavlović, no one had done more to further the language and literary progress than the Serbs had, especially with their *Serbski Letopis*. He argued that the term “Illyrian,” as a common name for the people and their language, would never be accepted in the Kingdom of Hungary, the Principality of Serbia, Bosnia, Montenegro, Herzegovina, Slavonia, Dalmatia, and Croatia, where “people of our kin lived.” This people’s name was the Serbs, in accordance with their language and origin, and they only differed among themselves by their regional and territorial names, like Bosniaks, Montenegrins, and Slavonians, among others.⁵¹ He recognized that the Serbs of the Roman Catholic faith living in Bosnia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Croatia, and parts of Southern Hungary “do not want to call themselves Serbs, though they speak the Serbian language, and yet they admit their Serbian origin and descent, and their desire for unity and harmony in the literature!”⁵²

The Serbian editor stated that “Illyr is not our word, but a foreign one,” used in Latin for the Serbs and Croats who lived in the former Roman province of Illyricum. Again, he stated how “we have called ourselves Serbs in our language since the beginning” and how certain foreign authors sometimes used regional names for them, like Slavonians or Dalmatians. Furthermore, Pavlović drew parallels with the current situation as well, where those living in the Austrian crown land of the Kingdom of Illyria might have called themselves “Illyrian.” However, there was no chance for all the South Slavs to unite under this name, as it was artificial:

The name Illyr could never take root in the hearts of Serbs and Croats. Ask (excluding more recent writers) a Serb and a Croat living in Dalmatia, Slavonia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Hungary, or from anywhere, and no one will ever say that he is an Illyrian. Therefore, it would be possible for us to, with and through writings, insert [the name] Illyrian into the heads of the people, but it will never settle in their hearts; the reason is that [the phrase] the Illyrian language is not present in our language or the Croatian language, nor is the word Illyr, and the Illyrian origin of Slavs is not present anywhere in the world, and it never has been.⁵³

This side commentary made in the 1837 issue of *Serbski Letopis* was later reprinted in the 1839 issue of *Serbski Narodni List*. Being an editor of both printed publications at the time, Pavlović decided to make his initial remarks more visible and accessible to his readers.

⁵⁰ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 41 (1837): 28.

⁵¹ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 41 (1837): 29.

⁵² *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 41 (1837): 29–30.

⁵³ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 41 (1837): 30.

However, in this new article titled *Ime Roda* [The Name of the People], he expanded on his initial thoughts about the issue. Pavlović reminded his Serbian readers about their “true” origin, passed down through generations. Their Serbian name was under pressure by certain Croats who “wish to forcefully change our faith by imposing the foreign Illyrian name.”⁵⁴ He repeated the claim that the name “Illyrian” was not rooted in the hearts of the people, and that, aside from a few Serbs who succumbed to the pressure,⁵⁵ most of them resisted, in spite of the constant pressure from Zagreb and *Danica Ilirska*. Teodor Pavlović went as far as to state the following:

Whoever steals our language from us, both they and we consider each other as a blood enemy, because without language we barely stay alive: He who exterminates our name strikes for the head and erases us from the list of nations forever; is that, therefore, a friend? Is that a brother? The desire is, I think, for all the South Slavs to take one name. This is all well and good, and undoubtedly useful for all those Slavs. [...] but it is not possible to destroy one’s personal name, and just take the general one.⁵⁶

Teodor Pavlović ends this text with a plea to his “brothers” to let go of their intentions to “Illyrize” others, which will only produce the opposite effect. Instead of a union between the people of the “same tribe,” there will only be strife and disharmony. He continued thus:

Everybody cherishes their own the most; therefore, to each their own, that is a right and a necessity: let us each call ourselves by our birth name; Carniolans [Slovenians] should be Carniolans, Croats should also be Croats, and Serbs should be Serbs individually, but when we are referring to all of them together, let us call ourselves as we are naturally called and as we must be called: the closest, one-tribed, and dearest brothers Yugoslavs, Yugoslav.⁵⁷

Jovan Subotić, in his text titled *Neke misli o sojuzu Književnom Slavena na jugu i toga sojuzna imenu* [Some thoughts about the literary union of Slavs in the South and its name], which appeared in *Serbski Letopis* in 1839, systematically presented his arguments against the name “Illyrian”. Subotić was asking why “Illyrian” had suddenly become a designation for all the South Slavs, both from the past and the present. He argued that “the name ‘Illyr’ has only now started to be introduced, but the name “Yugo-Slav” is as old as the presence of the Slavs in the South.” Here, he meant that the Slavic common name was “natural” and “ancient,” as opposed to the artificial one proposed by the Illyrian movement.⁵⁸ Were they, as Subotić noted, members of the people living in the Kingdom of Illyria, which was an Austrian crown land in his time? Or were they members of the people recognized

⁵⁴ *Serbski Narodni List* [The Serbian National Papers] (1839): 172.

⁵⁵ Pavlović is referring here to the magazine *Bačka Vila* [The Bačka Fairy] and its editor Petar Jovanović, who openly promoted the Illyrian idea in his publication, and even called himself “an Illyr-Serb from Bačka.” Pavlović referred to Jovanović as a “killer of the Serbian name.” See Vasilije Đ. KRESTIĆ, *Istorija Srpske štampe u Ugarskoj: 1791–1914* [History of the Serbian Press in Hungary: 1791/1914] (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1980), 47.

⁵⁶ Pavlović here identified Serbian as a “personal name” and Illyrian as a “general” one. See *Serbski Narodni List* [The Serbian National Papers] (1839): 172.

⁵⁷ *Serbski Narodni List* [The Serbian National Papers] (1839): 174.

⁵⁸ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 96–7.

diplomatically as *natio Illyrica*, who were in fact Orthodox Christian Serbs living in the Austrian Empire?⁵⁹ Could they also represent all the various peoples living in the territories which were once a part of the ancient Roman province of Illyricum? Jovan Subotić clearly showed the limitations of the usage of a name which had varying historical, territorial, and political connotations, aside from the fact that as such it was unknown to the broader population.⁶⁰

Subotić was perplexed by the Illyrian movement’s idea that all the South Slavs would just accept the name they chose as a general one, without any objections. For him, the name “Yugo-Slav” was superior to “Illyrian”.⁶¹ If the latter was to be accepted, it would lead to the disappearance of the “national names” of the Serbs, Croats, Bulgarians, and other South Slavs. This would not be the case if the “natural” name, that of “Yugo-Slav,” was accepted.⁶² However, when it came to the name of the literary union of the South Slavs, Subotić’s argument was more nuanced. He argued that any literary union should bear the name of the language in which it writes. Immediately, this removed the “Illyrian” option from the discussion, as there was no existing language with such a name, and any other suggestion was perceived as laughable by the Serbian author.⁶³ Continuing, Subotić wrote: “But that union does not need any foreign name; it already has its natural, own name: the name of the main language, the name of the people which speak the main language, whose members are all the other smaller nations who speak with this and that dialect.”⁶⁴ That main language and main nation was Serbian. Relying on the equation of the Shtokavian dialect with Serbian, Subotić saw all the other accents and dialects as parts of the broader language. He concluded that “All these dialects can produce one literature, which would be the literature of the Serbian language. The unity of those various peoples would be named after the people which speak their main language, ‘Serbian.’”⁶⁵ Pushing this argument further, Subotić argued:

The Croats used to have the same alphabet as we did, and in the composition of the language, where are they different from us? This becomes clearer because Croats changed their language on the basis of the [writings] of wise Gaj and, having the nature of the language in their minds, went so far [with their changes] that if Croatian Danica was written with the Cyrillic alphabet, no one would recognize that it was not written in genuine Serbian. If the books written in one language belong to one literature, then Croatian books would eventually enter into Serbian literature.⁶⁶

The term “Illyrian” initially had different meaning for Kollár and Šafárik, designating most often Serbs and the Serbian people as a whole. Peter Podolan noted that Jernej

⁵⁹ Subotić was referring here to the term used by the Habsburg authorities in official documents related to the period of Serbian migrations to the north and settlement within the Habsburg Empire in the Early Modern period.

⁶⁰ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 98–99.

⁶¹ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 103.

⁶² *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 111–112.

⁶³ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 112–113.

⁶⁴ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 114.

⁶⁵ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 114.

⁶⁶ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 116.

Kopitar, Pavel J. Šafárik, and Ján Kollár all understood the term in this way.⁶⁷ In Kollár’s case, this was evident in his German edition of his discourse on Slavic reciprocity, where in one part he clearly equated “Serbian” with “Illyrian.”⁶⁸ Šafárik, however, noted how ambiguous the term was in his earlier writings. In his *Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten* [History of the Slavic Language and Literature in All Dialects], published in Buda in 1826, he noted that “Illyrian” could refer to Slavonians, Serbs, Slavo-Serbs, or all the Slavs in the South. He even claimed that it was not possible to find any sensible use of the “Illyrian” name, which was variously used and misused, thus losing any particular meaning, leading him to prefer to avoid it in general.⁶⁹ This section of the text was translated to Serbian and published in the magazine *Serbski letopis* in 1825 (before the German version was published in 1826), which made Šafárik’s views about this issue known to the Serbian readership.⁷⁰ Therefore, when in the following years Šafárik changed his mind, as in his *Slowanské starožitosti* (1837) and *Slowanský národopis* (1842), where he would completely accept the name “Illyrian” for the South Slavs and their common literary language, this was seen as a betrayal by the Serbian side. Jovan Subotić wrote that Šafárik “had spoken completely differently” about these issues only a few years before, but that now he had “suddenly, and without any cause given, changed his opinion, and betrayed himself.”⁷¹

It is important to emphasize that Subotić wrote his entire argument about naming the literary unity among the South Slavs because he wanted to fit it into Kollár’s idea of literary reciprocity. He wrote: “I am also a Slav, and I am also excited for the unity of the Slavs in the South” and that he “always thought that [...] the Slavs in the South could also make a literary union without the name Illyr, as well as along with it.” Therefore, he rejected the idea that only one designation, that of “Illyrian,” would be possible, and he criticized anyone who fervently defended that name and those who thought that “whoever opposes the name ‘Illyrian’, opposes the Goddess Slava.”⁷² Therefore, we can conclude here that Subotić, like Pavlović before him, proposed various alternatives (“Yugo-Slav,” “Serbian”) for the name of the literary language of the South Slavs, and rejected “Illyrian.” Still, they made those arguments in order to align themselves as close as possible to Kollár’s idea of Slavic literary reciprocity, without rejecting its true meaning or purpose.

⁶⁷ PODOLAN, “Croatian Elements in the Life and Work of Ján Kollár,” 44.

⁶⁸ I am referring to a part of the text where he suggested that a Russian, a Pole, or a Czech would not only be referred to by those names, but also as a Slavo-Russian, a Slavo-Pole, and a Slavo-Czech. Here, Kollár mentioned that “der Serbe oder Illyrier sei nicht bloss ein Serbe, sondern ein Slawo-Serb,” clearly equating “Serbian” with “Illyrian.” See KOLLÁR, *Ueber die literarische Wechselseitigkeit*, 130–131.

⁶⁹ Paul Joseph SCHAFFARIK, *Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten* [History of the Slavic language and Literature in All Dialects] (Ofen: Kon. Ung. Universitäts-Schriften, 1826), 23.

⁷⁰ *Serbskij Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 1 (1825): 56.

⁷¹ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 99.

⁷² *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 102.

The notion of “Slavic antiquity” and its adaptations in the Serbian context

Another key point of the Pan-Slavic influence on Serbian national development was the notion of the “ancient past.” Here, the work of Pavel Jozef Šafárik is the most well-known and influential. In his 1828 book *Über die Abkunft der Slawen nach Lorenz Surowiecki* [On the Origin of the Slavs According to Lorenz Surowiecki], he systematically approached the question of “Slavic antiquity” for the first time. Initially meant to be a commentary on the book of another Slavist, Polish historian and economist Wawrzyniec Surowiecki (1769–1827), the book developed into an original work with Šafárik’s unique remarks.⁷³ He was more explicit about the goal of his research on the antiquity of the Slavs in his article called *Myšlenky o starobylosti Slowanq w Europě* [An opinion about the ancientness of the Slavs in Europe], which appeared in *Časopis Českého Museum* in 1834. There, he wrote: “The purpose of this public observation is thus: to prove that the origin of the Slavs should be sought in the surroundings of the European peoples, and not that of the Asian ones, least of all in the areas of the Scythians or Mongolians, to whom we were kindheartedly added by some of our neighbors.”⁷⁴ In essence, his arguments could be summed up as follows: Slavs were living in Europe, alongside other European peoples, long before the invasions of the “Asiatic hordes” in late antiquity; moreover, they were living in their current homeland before the arrival of the Germans or Hungarians. His best-known work and a culmination of this line of research of his was *Slovanské Starožitnosti*, published in Prague in 1837.⁷⁵

As a professor and director of the Serbian Gymnasium in Novi Sad (1819–1833), Šafárik was well connected with the Serbian cultural circles. One of his colleagues, Georgije Magarašević (1793–1830), established, with his help, first the periodical *Serbian Chronicle* in 1824, then the society Matica Srpska two years later. Šafárik’s works and translations appeared from the very first issue of *Serbski Letopis*. Furthermore, the work *Über die Abkunft der Slawen* was translated into Serbian when it was subsequently published in the Pest-based periodical, in all the issues from 1829.⁷⁶ Šafárik’s article about the ancientness of the Slavs in Europe, from *Časopis Českého Museum*, was translated into Serbian in 1834.⁷⁷ Lastly, excerpts of his *Slovanské Starožitnosti* were translated and published in issues of the *Serbian Chronicle* in 1839 and 1841.⁷⁸

In the Serbian context, there were several attempts to write about Serbian antiquity, inspired by the works of Šafárik and other Slavists. One of the most influential ideas was that all the Slavs were once called Serbs, and that this could be proven by linguistical analysis of

⁷³ For more information on Surowiecki, see Aleksander GELLA, “Wawrzyniec Surowiecki: Polish Pioneer in Anthropological Studies,” *Current Anthropology* 11, no. 1 (1970): 59–60.

⁷⁴ These “neighbors” being contemporary German historians whom Šafárik cites. See *Časopis českého Museum* [The Magazine of the Czech Museum], vol. 1 (1834): 25.

⁷⁵ Pawel Josef ŠAFÁŘIK, *Slovanské Starožitnosti* (W Praze: Tiskem Jana Spurného, 1837).

⁷⁶ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 16 (1829): 5–34; *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 17 (1829): 21–50; *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 18 (1829): 33–60; *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 19 (1829): 11–32.

⁷⁷ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 38 (1834): 1–50.

⁷⁸ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 46 (1839): 1–15; *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 55 (1841): 1–14.

sources from antiquity, such as the writings of Procopius. This was initially proposed by Josef Dobrovský (1753–1829), who was a renowned Slavist of his time, in his *Institutiones Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris* (1822), and accepted by Šafárik in his *Über die Abkunft der Slawen* in 1828.⁷⁹ Ján Kollár argued against this theory in his *Rozprawy o gmenách počatkách i starožitnostech národu slawského a geho kmenů* [Discussions about the Origin and Ancientness of Names of the Slavic Nation and Its Tribes], published in Buda in 1830, stating that the names Serb and Slav were both old, but that there is no reason to believe that the latter became the new common name, replacing the former.⁸⁰ Translated excerpts from this book of Kollár’s, with a focus on the parts regarding the origin of the names Serb and Slav, appeared in a series of articles in *Serbski Letopis*, in issues from 1831 and 1832. They were translated by Pavle Stamatović (1805–1864), who was an editor of this Serbian magazine at the time.⁸¹

One of the first original contributions to the topic of the Serbian antiquity was *Sveslavije ili panteon. Sv. 1* [Pan-Slavism or Pantheon, Vol. 1], written by Jevto Popović in Trieste, and published by Josif Milovuk in Buda, in 1831. In this text, designed as an introduction to the biography of the medieval Serbian emperor Stefan Uroš IV Dušan (1306–1355), Popović tried to add his contribution to the issue of the most ancient origin of the Slavs. He mentioned the works of Surowiecki and Šafárik, whom he appreciated as those who had done so much in this field. However, he argued that neither had “dared to dig for the sources of the origin of the Slavs in their primordially from the ancient fog,” at least not as deeply as he intended to. Popović, through astonishing mental and linguistic gymnastics, tried to prove that the ancient Phoenicians, Paeonians, and Slavs were one and the same. According to his theory, the Serbs were just a Balkanian branch of this ancient people, but Popović did not argue that they predated all the peoples he mentioned, nor the Slavs themselves.⁸²

Pavle Stamatović, who was a Serbian Orthodox priest and a prominent cultural worker operating mainly in Buda and Szeged, took the argument about Slavic and Serbian ancientness even further. In his own periodical, *Serbska pčela* [The Serbian Bee], he published an article called *Serblji, starodrevni žitelji Evropejski, i najstariji sedeoci u Mađarskoj* [The Serbs, ancient inhabitants of Europe, and the oldest dwellers of Hungary].

⁷⁹ When discussing why Procopius used the name “Sporoi” for the ancestors of the Slavs and the Antes, Šafárik writes: War sie bei den Slowenen, wie kamen diese dazu, sich selbst mit einem griechischen Namen zu belegen? Das Wahre, dass der Name Spori durch Prokop aus dem Worte Srb, Srbi ge drechselt worden, und dass Srb, noch heutzutage als Specialname zweier entfernter, verschiedenen Sprachordnungen angehörender Stämme vorhanden, ehemals ein eben so allgeineiner einheimischer Völckernamen der Slowenen, wie im Deutschen Wenden, Winden, war, hat schon Dobrowský angedeutet, und jede spätere Prüfung wird nothwendig darauf zurückkommen müssen. See Paul Joseph SCHAFFARIK, *Über die Abkunft der Slawen nach Lorenz Surowiecki* [On the Origin of Slavs According to Lorenz Surowiecki] (Ofen: Kon. Ung. Universitäts-Schriften, 1828), 65.

⁸⁰ Ján KOLLÁR, *Rozprawy o gmenách počatkách i starožitnostech národu slawského a geho kmenů* [Discussions about the Origin and Ancientness of Names of the Slavic Nation and Its Tribes] (W Budjné: W Král. Universické Tiskárně, 1830), 150–151.

⁸¹ For the specific translation of Kollár’s rejection of the theory of the Serbian origin of all the Slavs, see *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 28 (1832): 23.

⁸² Jevto POPOVIĆ, *Sveslavije ili Panteon. Sv. 1* [Pan-Slavism or Pantheon, Vol. 1] (Budim: Pečatnja Univerziteta Peštanskog, 1831), iv–xx.

Essentially, he adopted Dobrovský’s proposal, arguing that all the Slavs were once called Serbs. Starting his analysis from the Biblical flood, he continued with equating the Serbs with the Vends, Medians, Scythians, Sarmatians, and Slavs.⁸³ The purpose of this article was to prove the presence of the Serbs in the Kingdom of Hungary since the most ancient times, and that they had arrived there long before the times of the kings Sigismund I (1387–1437) and Matthias I (1458–1490). The writer also subsumed the rest of the Slavs into the “large Serbian people,” thus incorporating the histories of the Slovaks and Czechs. Stamatović, after presenting his arguments to the reader, hoped that they would “be easily convinced that the Serbs are the oldest inhabitants, and that the Hungarians are newcomers to the land later named ‘Hungary.’”⁸⁴ He concluded the article thus: “From all of the aforementioned an irrevocable historical truth is born [...] that the Serbs were the oldest inhabitants of Hungary, and that they deserve the most basic respect and acknowledgment from all the other newly arrived peoples.”⁸⁵ This echoed similar words of Šafárik, who feared that “the Slavs again in the nineteenth century are experiencing the same old and horrible acts which occurred during the time of Heinrich the Fowler, Albrecht the Bear, Álmos, Árpád, Zoltán, and others.”⁸⁶ Thus, the arguments about the ancient history of the Slavs and the Serbs came full circle, ending in the present from which they were written. The 1830s and 1840s was a period when the Hungarian political elites used “the chimera of Pan-Slavism,” as Laszló Kontler phrases it, as a scarecrow, to crack down on the Slavic national movements on the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary. They created a concept of a political nation which guaranteed on paper individual liberties for all. In reality, it promoted Magyarization and the adoption of Hungarian as the only political language in the Kingdom of Hungary. As a consequence, this added even more fuel to the fire of the rising national movements among the ethnic minorities living there.⁸⁷

Further proof of the importance of the “antiquity” argument was its inclusion in the discussion about the name for the literary union of the South Slavs. In his previously discussed article, Jovan Subotić focused on Count Janko Drašković and his writings about this topic.⁸⁸ What Subotić keenly noticed, unlike his counterparts from the Illyrian movement, was that there was no hard evidence of Slavs being autochthonous in the Balkans in antiquity, as the people connected to the Zagreb-based movement claimed. Furthermore, he argued that historians’ various views on the matter differed in such ways that “it will never be known who was right.” He also uses the term “historical certainty,” which meant that there should be enough sources and evidence from which researchers could extract

⁸³ *Serbska Pčela* [The Serbian Bee], vol. 1 (1833): 63–89.

⁸⁴ *Serbska Pčela* [The Serbian Bee], vol. 1 (1833): 87.

⁸⁵ *Serbska Pčela* [The Serbian Bee], vol. 1 (1833): 89.

⁸⁶ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 1 (1825): 66.

⁸⁷ Laszló KONTLER, *A History of Hungary* (Budapest: Atlantisz, 2009), 251–254. For an overview of the Hungarian reaction to the threat of Pan-Slavism, see Judit PÁL, “‘In the Grasp of the Pan-Slavic Octopus’*: Hungarian Nation Building in the Shadow of Pan-Slavism until the 1848 Revolution,” *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 28, no. 1 (2021): 40–52.

⁸⁸ See Janko DRAŠKOVIĆ, *Ein Wort an Iliriens hochherzige Töchter über die ältere Geschichte und neueste literarische Regeneration ihres Vaterlandes* [A word to generous Illyrian daughters about the older history and the latest literary regeneration of their homeland] (Agram: Druck der k.p. ilir. Nat. Typographie von Dr. Ljudevit Gaj, 1838).

information and reconstruct the past.⁸⁹ This view was in stark contrast not only to the views of the Illyrian movement, but to those of “Slavic antiquity” as well. The following words summed up Subotić’s attitude:

We do not know when those Slavs who lived in Illyricum Minor [Iliriku malom], came to those areas; it could easily be that that land was called Illyria even before their arrival there! We do not know that they used the name “Illyr” to refer to each other, as it could easily be that they were given that name by the Romans or other peoples.⁹⁰

Jovan Subotić even tried to argue that, even if it was true that, at some point in the past, there was a Slavic people named the Illyrians, there would not be any reason to take that name for all the South Slavs in modern times. In his view, that name disappeared with the passage of time, as did the names of the Alans, Goths, Vandals, and others like them.⁹¹

Concluding remarks

The aim of this paper was to analyze how the Pan-Slavism of the first half of the nineteenth century influenced the Serbian national movement. To this aim, following the methodology of Joep Leerssen, I chose two different cultural fields, those of language and discourse, and tried to present how they were perceived by some of the most prominent Pan-Slavic figures of this era. Then, I continued to analyze the translation and transformation of these fields in the context of the Serbian national movement, which was dominated by the Pest-Buda Serbs and their cultural production in this period.

First, the idea of a common Slavic language divided into four main dialects, as envisioned by Kollár, assumed that these different (and yet similar) linguistic branches would develop until a point when their own internal evolutions would bring them closer to an “ideal” of the common Slavic language. In the South Slavic context, there was a disagreement about the name of this dialect and its common future literature. The Zagreb-based movement, led by Ljudevit Gaj, imagined this common name to be “Illyrian,” which was rejected by the Pest-based Serbs, mainly by Teodor Pavlović and Jovan Subotić. This rejection of Gaj’s idea led to two different things. One was the rise of “Yugoslavism,” which ultimately prevailed as the name for South Slavic unity. The other was the notion that, because the main dialect of the South Slavs was Shtokavian, the entire literary union and language could (or should) be named “Serbian.” These different notions would continue well into the following centuries, and they were a direct consequence of Kollár’s ideas of Slavic literary cooperation.

Second, I approached the idea of “Slavic antiquity” as a part of Leerssen’s cultural field of discourse. In essence, Pan-Slavists of this time argued that Slavs were not only living in their homelands prior to the Great Migrations of late antiquity, but that they predated Germans and Hungarians there. This argument had a political connotation, due to the reality of the decades prior to 1848. In the Serbian context, there were attempts to either equate

⁸⁹ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 104–105.

⁹⁰ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 105.

⁹¹ *Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839): 107.

the Serbs with ancient peoples, in order to emulate the theories proposed by Šafárik and others, or to show that the Serbs were, in fact, the oldest European population. The latter argument was used by Pavle Stamatović to show that the Serbs had lived in the Kingdom of Hungary long before the Hungarians came there, and that they deserved “respect” because of it.

In conclusion, further research would be appreciated on not only the two cultural fields I chose for this study, but also on the remaining ones. Moreover, a comparative approach, juxtaposing the different translations and adaptations of the main Pan-Slavic ideas among the different Slavic peoples, would lead to a more extensive study on these topics.

Literatúra

Secondary literature

- BEDNÁROVÁ, Marcela. *Symboly a Myty Chorvatskeho Narodneho Hnutia: Fenomen Ilyrizmu* [Symbols and Myths of the Croatian National Movement: The Phenomenon of Illyrism]. Bratislava: VEDA, Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied, 2012.
- BEREND T. Iván. *History Derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- CONNELLY, John. *From Peoples into Nations: A History of Eastern Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020.
- GAVRILOVIĆ, Slavko. *Srbi u Habzburškoj Monarhiji (1792–1848)* [Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy 1792–1848]. Novi Sad: Matica Srpska, 1994.
- GELLA, Aleksander. “Wawrzyniec Surowiecki: Polish Pioneer in Anthropological Studies.” *Current Anthropology* 11, no. 1 (1970): 59–60. <https://doi.org/10.1086/201094>.
- GOMBOCZ, István. “The Reception of Herder in Central Europe: Idealization and Exaggeration.” *Seminar: A Journal of Germanic Studies* 33, no. 2 (1997): 107–18. <https://doi.org/10.3138/sem.v33.2.107>.
- HROCH, Miroslav. *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*. Translated by Ben Fowkes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- HROCH, Miroslav. *European Nations: Explaining Their Formation*. Translated by Karolina Graham. London: Verso, 2015.
- KAMUSELLA, Tomasz. *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- KOHN, Hans. *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.
- KONTLER László. *A History of Hungary*. Budapest: Atlantis, 2016.
- KOPEČEK, Michal, and TRENCSENYI Balázs, eds. *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770–1945); Texts and Commentaries*. 2. Vol. 2. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007.
- KRESTIĆ, Vasilije Đ. *Istorija Srpske štampe u Ugarskoj: 1791–1914* [History of the Serbian press in Hungary: 1791/1914]. Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1980.

- LEERSSEN, Joep. “Nationalism and the Cultivation of Culture.” *Nations and Nationalism* 12, no. 4 (2006): 559–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8129.2006.00253.x>.
- LETO, Maria Rita. “Danica ilirska i pitanje hrvatskog književnog jezika,” [The Illyrian Danica and the question of the Croatian literary language]. *Slavica tergestina* 11/12 (2004): 163–188.
- MAXWELL, Alexander. “Effacing Panslavism: Linguistic Classification and Historiographic Misrepresentation.” *Nationalities Papers* 46, no. 4 (2018): 633–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1374360>.
- MILISAVAC Živan. *Istorija Matice Srpske I Deo 1826–1864* [History of Matica Srpska Part I 1826–1864]. Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1986.
- PÁL, Judit. “In the Grasp of the Pan-Slavic Octopus’*: Hungarian Nation Building in the Shadow of Pan-Slavism until the 1848 Revolution.” *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 28, no. 1 (2021): 40–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537113.2021.2004764>.
- PODOLAN, Peter. “Croatian Elements in the Life and Work of Ján Kollár.” In *Croatia and Slovakia: Historical Parallels and Connections (from 1780 to the Present Day)*, edited by Holjevac Željko et al, 32–46. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Science, 2017.
- PRAŽÁK, Albert. “The Slovak Sources of Kollár’s Pan-Slavism.” *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 6, No. 18 (1928): 579–572.
- STANČIĆ, Nikša. “Grafija i ideologija: hrvatski narod, hrvatski jezik i hrvatska latinica Ljudevita Gaja 1830. i 1835. godine” [Orthography and ideology: The Croatian people, Croatian language and the Croatian Latin of Ljudevit Gaj in 1830 and 1835]. *Rad Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti. Razred za književnost* 492 (2005): 261–296.

Sources

Printed periodicals

- Časopis českého Museum* [The Magazine of the Czech Museum], vol. 1 (1834).
- Danica ilirska* [The Illyrian Morning Star] (1836).
- Serbska Pčela* [The Serbian Bee] 4 (1833).
- Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 1 (1825).
- Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 16 (1829).
- Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 17 (1829).
- Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 18 (1829).
- Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 19 (1829).
- Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 28 (1832).
- Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 38 (1834).
- Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 41 (1837).
- Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 46 (1839).
- Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 48 (1839).
- Serbski Letopis* [The Serbian Chronicle] 55 (1841).
- Serbski Narodni List* [The Serbian National Papers] (1835).

Serbski Narodni List [The Serbian National Papers] (1839).

Printed monographs

DRAŠKOVIĆ, Janko. Ein Wort an Iliriens hochherzige Töchter über die ältere Geschichte und neueste literarische Regeneration ihres Vaterlandes [A word to Illyrian generous daughters about the older history and the latest literary regeneration of their homeland]. Agram: Druck der k.p. ilir. Nat. Typographie von Dr. Ljudevit Gaj, 1838.

KOLLÁR, JÁN. *Rozprawy o gmenách počatkách i starožitnostech národu slawského a geho kmenů* [Discussions about the Origin and Ancientness of Names of the Slavic Nation and its Tribes]. W Budjné: W Král. Universické Tiskárně, 1830.

KOLLÁR, Johann. *Ueber die literarische Wechselseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation* [About the literary reciprocity between the different tribes and dialects of the Slavic nation]. Pesth: Trattner-Károlyischen Schriften, 1837.

KOLLAR, Jovan. *O književnoj uzajmnosti između različni plemena i narečja slavenskoga Naroda* [About the literary reciprocity between the different tribes and dialects of the Slavic nation]. Transl. Dimitrije Teodorović. Knaž. Serb. Knjigopečatnja: Belgrade, 1845.

POPOVIĆ, Jevto. *Sveslavije ili Panteon. Sv. 1.* [Pan-Slavism or Pantheon, Vol. 1]. Budim: Pečatnja Univerziteta Peštanskog, 1831.

SCHAFFARIK, Paul Joseph. *Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten* [History of the Slavic Language and Literature in All Dialects]. Ofen: Kon. Ung. Universitäts-Schriften, 1826.

SCHAFFARIK, Paul Joseph. *Über die Abkunft der Slawen nach Lorenz Surowiecki* [On the Origin of Slavs According to Lorenz Surowiecki]. Ofen: Kon. Ung. Universitäts-Schriften, 1828.

ŠAFAŘIK, Paul Joseph. *Slovanské Starožitnosti*. W Praze: Tiskem Jana Spurného, 1837.

Archive sources

Slovenská Národná Knižnica (SNK) in Martin. Literárny archív, sign. 39 E 6.