


ARTICLE

The 19th-century Slovak National Movement: Ethos of Plebeian Resistance

Vasil Gluchman 

Institute of Philosophy, University of Rzeszów, Poland and Institute of Ethics and Bioethics, University of Prešov, Slovakia
Email: vgluchman@yahoo.com

Abstract

The author studies the 19th-century Slovak National Movement as a manifestation of the ethos of plebeian resistance against the “laws of progress” of the century in question, according to which small ethnic groups and nations were to be assimilated for the sake of the further development of more advanced nations and their cultures. A significant role in the formation of the ethos of plebeian resistance was played by Slovak folk culture, the historical context of Great Moravia, the solidarity and support of other Slavic nations living in the Habsburg monarchy, and, above all, the moral qualities of Slovak patriots. Among the most significant manifestations of this ethos was the codification of Slovak, which contributed to the formation of Slovak national identity and national ideology, the 1848–1849 Slovak Uprising, and the development of the Slovak national movement in the 1860s continuing into the mid-1870s. The aim of the 19th-century Slovak national movement was to achieve an equal position of the Slovak ethnic group among the other nations and ethnic groups living in the Habsburg monarchy, which would give rise to the free development of its creative powers and abilities as well as to the pursuit of ethical, humanistic ideals in the lives of its members.

Keywords: Slovak ethnic group; national movement; nation; ethos of plebeian resistance; 19th century

Introduction

Issues of the nation, nation-building, and development of national movements were among the main political ideas in 19th century Europe, thus giving this century the name Springtime of Nations, being the period when a majority of modern European nations were formed. This is especially true of small nations in Central Europe. This also fully applies to Slovaks as an ethnic group predominantly living in Upper Hungary; like other non-Magyar ethnic groups living in Hungary, Slovaks were heavily affected by the country’s social, political, and cultural environment. The Magyar political elite was mainly striving to create a homogenous Magyar political nation with the Magyar language and national identity taking an exclusive, dominant position at the expense of non-Magyar citizens, particularly Slavic citizens of Hungary.¹ This is one of the reasons that the history of Slovaks from the 19th century to the present has been the subject of intensive research in recent decades, not only by Slovak or Central European researchers but also by the international academic community (Brubaker 2004; Goszczyńska 2015; Hudek 2011; Kirschbaum 2005; Maxwell 2005; 2008; 2009; 2016; 2018; 2019; 2020; Maxwell and Turner 2020; O’Donnell 2019; Paul 1985; Pynsent 1994; Smith 1988; 1991; 1995; 1998; 1999; 2009; Teich, Kováč, and Brown 2011; Jakobson 2013).

Herder’s thoughts regarding the past and future have been highly significant not only in Slovak and Central European scholarship but also among Western academics. In his book *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* (*Ideas on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*, 1784–1791), he characterised Slavs as a gentle, peaceful and hard-working nation, often suffering as a

result of German invasions, injustice, and cruelty. Herder expressed the hope that Slavs would awaken from their lethargy and assume the place that befits them (Herder 1800, 482–484). Slovak Lutherans studying at German universities were the first to familiarize themselves with the above ideas; consequently, on their return home, they passed these ideas on, which became a strong mobilizing element in the formation of the Slovak national movement and the awakening of the Slovak ethnic group (Brock 1976, 21–22; David 2007, 5–6, 13–17; Maxwell 2008, 9–13; Maxwell 2020, 183–201; Pynsent 1994, 73–87).

In works dedicated to studying the 19th-century Slovak national movement, attention is primarily paid to historical, political, social, cultural, ideological, and religious issues and, possibly, social-philosophical aspects. With its mistakes and shortcomings, the Slovak national movement of the 19th century is still an example of the ethos of plebeian resistance against unfavourable external and internal circumstances in which the Slovak ethnic group found itself. The main goal of this article is to study the forms of the Slovak ethos of plebeian resistance in the 19th century.

Miroslav Hroch divided the development of small nations into three phases. Phase A primarily focused on the scientific and cultural interests of intellectuals in studying an ethnic group, including its history, folk culture, customs, and traditions. In his view, a decisive role in the transformation of an ethnic group into a nation was played by Phase B, which included national agitation, the formation of national identity and national ideology. The goal was to form a mass national movement as a prerequisite to finalizing the process of national formation, which would involve all social classes of the ethnic group. This meant preparing a national program that would, apart from requirements regarding the cultural and linguistic rights of an ethnic group, also contain demands for the political and social rights of all social classes – in other words, it had to be a nationwide programme (Hroch 1985). According to him, the Slovak national movement started to develop particularly around the cultural and linguistic issues in the last decades of the 18th century (i.e., approximately in the same period as many other national movements of small nations in Central Europe), thanks largely to intellectuals who revealed its past, proved its ancient heritage, and collected and published Slovak folk songs, poetry, customs and traditions. One of the most significant personalities in this period of the Slovak national movement was Anton Bernolák.² He was the author of the first codified Slovak language called *berňolákovčina*, based on the cultured variety of the Western Slovak dialect (1787), which caused the Slovak Catholic community to abandon the use of Czech or Slovakized Czech. Bernolák was an active member of the Slovak Learned Society (Slovenské učení tovarišstvo), which brought together Catholic priests and scholars primarily from the territory of present-day Slovakia (Hroch 1985, 98). Their activities revolved around spreading enlightenment and education in the Slovak language defined by Bernolák. However,

Bernolák ... never posited the existence of a *natio slovacca*: his prime allegiance went to the *natio hungarica* of the nobility and its *patria*, Hungary. He was certainly a supporter of equal rights and complete respect for the different vernaculars spoken within the kingdom: his whole career witnessed his devotion to the cultivation of his Slovak mother tongue and to his interest in the past of his native ethnic group. But he never denied the obligation incumbent on a multilingual country to select the speech of the majority of the ruling nobility as the state language while preserving the free cultivation of the various vernaculars for all other purposes. (Brock 1976, 14–15)

Among the many of Bernolák's followers, those who were active in literature included the Catholic priests Jozef Ignác Bajza (1755–1836), Juraj Fándly (1750–1811) and, mainly, Ján Hollý (1785–1849), who is considered one of the most significant Slovak poets of all times. The importance of Hollý's body of work for the Slovak national movement lies in his poetic treatment of this significant period in the history of his Slovak ancestors, Great Moravia, to which he dedicated the epic poems

Svätopluk and *Cyrillo-Methodiada* (Hollý [1833] 1985; [1835] 1985). By using Great Moravia as the setting of his national poetry, Hollý established the origins of the Slovak nation in the 8th/9th century, prior to the arrival of Magyar speakers in the territory of Hungary. Other Slovak intellectuals went even further by locating their nation in the ancient past. Ján Kollár³ even inferred a myth of ancientness and, thus, the existence of a Slavic nation that ancient Slovaks from India were part of (Kollár 1838). As far as the collective historical memory goes, this was derived from shared fates in the times of the Duchy of Nitra, Great Moravia, and later, the Hungarian Kingdom whose inhabitants were, from the very start of its existence, descendants of the Nitrians and Moravians (Teich, Kováč, and Brown 2011).

Thus, in Hroch's first phase—Phase A—it was the awakening of the Slovak ethnic group which needed to take place and, following Herder, also shape its ethnic and cultural awareness by, for instance, collecting and publishing Slovak folk poetry or folk songs as Kollár, Šafárik, and Benedicti did in the 1820s and 1830s, or as Pavol Dobšinský did later when he collected and published Slovak folk tales, or as Adolf Peter Zátarecký did with his collection of Slovak sayings and proverbs (Kollár [1823] 1988; Dobšinský [1880–1883] 1958; Zátarecký 1897).

That was the first criterion for the Slovak ethnic group in the 19th century to start recognizing itself as not only a biological but also a cultural entity, which had, over the course of centuries, created a folk culture that had been comparable, at that level, with those of other nations and ethnic groups. Pavol Jozef Šafárik's⁴ research into the history of Slavs, their language, and literature, as well as Slavic antiquities, carried out in parallel, was closely connected to it and significantly enhanced the historical and cultural awakening of the Slovak ethnic group (Šafárik 1826; 1837; [1842] 1955). Equally, Kollár's mythology, despite its pseudoscientific character, had its place in building a romantic image of the Slovak ethnic group and the Slavic nation, including their ancientness (Kollár 1838). Thus, when developing the Slovak national movement, the first phase was mainly concerned with intentional activity, which, originally, also had a certain spontaneous impulse. It took, for instance, the form of Kollár's participation in the celebration of the Reformation at Wartburg (1817) that, in the end, transformed into a demonstration of German nationalism and budding pan-Germanism, which caused Kollár's concerns regarding the future fate of Slavs under the influence of the growing nationalist spirit in Germany (Kollár 1897, 328–336; 2009, 283–288).

The effort to present Slovak folk culture primarily resulted from Herder's theorem about the force and importance of folk culture for the formation of the nation and its cultural maturity as a condition for its further development. On the one hand, Slovak patriots pointed to Slovak poetry and folk songs; on the other hand, they placed existing Slovak literature in a broader context of rich Slavic literature and traditions. They were associated with the period of Great Moravia, where Cyril and Methodius created Glagolitic, a language into which religious texts were translated, as well as legal documents of the given period for the needs of the inhabitants of Great Moravia and where the foundations of Great Moravian philosophy and ethics were formed (Gluchman 2019; Zozulák 2021). This framework also included the emphasis placed on the ancientness of Slavs within the region of the Carpathian Basin from the times of Samo's Empire and, especially, the period of the Duchy of Nitra and Great Moravia. It was a response to Hungarian political, social and cultural elites, according to whom the old Magyars were the first inhabitants of the Carpathian basin (Kiss 2009, 119; Prelick 1841, 395), which meant the territory of Hungary belonged to them and, according to this interpretation, other ethnicities settled in this territory later – in other words, Magyars are entitled to the dominant position of power in Hungary (Bárándy 1841, 718; Edvi Illés 1838, 92–93; Kiss 2009, 119). This also resulted in an effort to deny the existence of other, comparable cultures and literature in Hungary apart from Magyar (Döbrentei 1828, 1742; Thaisz 1825, 487; Kiss 2009, 122). As László Kiss explains, “[...] Magyar politicians and journalists from the reform era looked down on Slovaks. For self-determination and to form a positive national self-image, it was necessary to disassociate, contrast, and form some kind of (opposing) image” (Kiss 2009, 112). From this viewpoint, all efforts by Slovak patriots to present the existence of Slovak folk

culture and history prior to the arrival of old Magyars in the Carpathian basin formed the “Phase A,” the “national awakening” of the Slovak national movement and part of the Slovak plebeian ethos of resistance against attempts to discredit the Slovak ethnic group, its history, and culture by the Magyar elites. It was based on this that the Slovak national movement called for equal rights and freedoms befitting the so-called historic nations of Hungary.

In Hroch’s view, the Slovak national movement entered Phase B in the 1840s,⁵ characterized by an emphasis on national agitation, the issuing of newspapers, addressing the Slovak ethnic group, and shaping its national identity and national ideology. The 1848–1849 Slovak Uprising was part of this process, and Slovak national activity in this phase culminated in the 1860s and the first half of the 1870s when the cultural association *Matica slovenská* (1863) and three Slovak secondary comprehensive schools were founded, and Slovak national life successfully emerged. However, the same author believes that after the *Matica slovenská* was banned, all of the schools closed down (1874–1875). Magyarization had grown even stronger and the Slovak national movement froze at all levels, which significantly affected and delayed its development in comparison to the national movements of other small European nations at that time. As a result, the Slovak nation did not finalize its development until as late as the first decades of the 20th century (Hroch 1985, 99).⁶

As many as 90% of the 19th-century Slovak ethnic group was made up of peasants, while a higher nobility was almost nonexistent; it had either been Magyarized over the course of time or lacked national awareness, even though their mother tongue was Slovak (Hučko 1974, 42, 55–56). This was consistent with the social composition of the Slovak national intelligentsia, primarily formed by Catholic and Lutheran clergy, teachers, notaries, lawyers, medical doctors, craftsmen, and peasants, among others (Hroch 1985, 101). Almost 75% of the Slovak national intelligentsia in the first half of the 19th century were clergy and teachers, who worked in the vast majority of rural areas, in close contact with Slovak peasants and artisans (Hučko 1974, 44–45). Therefore, the 19th-century Slovak national movement was, with its social origin and place of operation, of a solidly plebeian (meaning nonaristocratic and unprivileged) nature and an example of the resistance against the ruling nation of contemporary society. It also went against the “laws of progress,” according to which small nations or ethnic groups were condemned to assimilation and expiration (Hobsbawm 1990, 35).

Forms of the Slovak Ethos of 19th-Century Plebeian Resistance

According to Anthony D. Smith, there are two ways in which an ethnic community can cease to exist: genocide and ethnocide (sometimes incorrectly named cultural genocide). He posits that genocide is interesting in that, in reality, it rarely achieves its goals, as it hardly ever results in the elimination of an ethnic community or an ethnic category. It could, paradoxically, result in the exact opposite, a revival of ethnic solidarity and awareness or instigation of its crystallization (Smith 1991, 30–31). There is, thus, an interesting differentiation between genocide and ethnocide instead of the term “cultural genocide.” While in the case of genocide, the population, in whole or in part, is physically eliminated, the other case “merely” concerns ethnic elimination by means of voluntary or forced assimilation. This means that members of the ethnic group in question are not physically but “only” ethnically and culturally liquidated, as the characteristic features of their ethnic group are gradually eliminated in various ways over the course of time, including language and, by effect, culture, history and, thus, collective memory and shared fates. It seems to me that the term ethnocide can also be applied to Magyarization, as well as the practices of Magyar political, administrative, social, cultural, and religious elites whose goal was to not only eliminate the Slovak ethnic group but also, more or less, all non-Magyar nations and ethnic groups living in Hungary (Zay 1841; Pulszky 1841; 1842; Grünwald 1878; Seton-Watson 1908; Maxwell 2009). This confirms the existence of ethically and morally unacceptable practices within national politics in Hungary, of the entire Habsburg monarchy in the 19th century and of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, at least until their breakup in 1918 and even though the level of national oppression varied in the Austrian

and Hungarian parts of the Empire especially after 1867 – following the Austro-Hungarian Compromise (Hroch 1999).

According to Smith, religion can significantly contribute to the preservation of awareness in an ethnic community; however, if the new impulses do not awaken a new spirit in the religious system, religious conservatism might numb the ethnic community or turn it into an empty form. An ethnic group can be revived by means of religious reform, provided conservatism does not take over, in which case different forms would have to be searched for in order to revive it, such as cultural borrowing by means of regulated cultural contact with its environment. In this author's view, the third form of ethnic revival might be the participation of the people in the form of a social class movement (Smith 1991, 35–36).

Regarding the role of religion in the preservation of the Slovak ethnic group, it was the Lutheran religion, or Lutheran pastors, in the 19th century who contributed most significantly. Catholic priests also helped considerably, which is evidenced by personalities such as Ján Hollý, Juraj Palkovič, Andrej Radlinský, Ján Palárik, the novice Jonáš Záborský, and many others. However, from the viewpoint of organizational structure, it was primarily the Lutheran church using Biblical Czech as its liturgical language, its traditions and the relatively more democratic organizational structure, which created better conditions for its application in the Slovak national movement than did the Catholic Church. Even though originally Slovak, Alexander Rudnay (1760–1831), for instance, was the Archbishop of Esztergom and the Hungarian primate and later became a cardinal. In the organizational structure of the Catholic Church, with Latin as a liturgical language, the influence of Catholic priests was less significant than that of Lutheran pastors. This is also evidenced by Ján Hučko's findings regarding the social structure of 19th century Slovak patriots, confirming a slight prevalence of Lutheran pastors, especially in the first half of the 19th century (Hučko 1974; Hroch 1985, 100–103). Slovak Lutheran pastors, as well as Catholic priests (similar to the entire Slovak national movement and the Slovak ethnic group), were, in general, subjected to constant Magyar pressure that grew increasingly intense. They had to continuously respond to new stimuli and search for ways to protect themselves from Magyar attacks in politics, religion, culture, language, journalism, science, etc. Slovak national "literary" resistances in the first half of the 19th century are examples of the ethos of plebeian resistance,⁷ which primarily meant resistance to what Slovak patriots perceived as unethical: unjust, inhumane, irresponsible, and intolerant actions by Magyar elites towards Slovaks and other non-Magyar inhabitants of Hungary. They were denied the same rights and freedoms to engage in cultural, linguistic, educational, and religious growth, development, and cultivation by means of their mother tongue. A letter from Slovak nationalist intellectuals to the Habsburg monarch, *Slovenský prestolný prosbopis z roku 1842*, in which the Slovak Lutheran intelligentsia appealed to the ruler in Vienna and complained about Magyarizing oppression, also took place in this framework. The submitters of the letter gave examples of Magyar attacks on Slovaks in ten points and formulated six demands for protection and support from the imperial court in Vienna (Rapant 1943, 116).

The most important thing for us is the restoration of our national honour, so criminally attacked by the abovementioned very severe honours and vicious suspicions, not only before the homeland but even before abroad. Accordingly, in all humility and in the most humble way, we ask Majesty to take us, most loyal subjects, under highest protection, to rebuke these criminal defamations and suspicions and to acknowledge the supreme displeasure in an appropriate way. (Ormis 1973, 554)

Slovak intellectuals were successful to a considerable extent because, under the influence of Vienna, there had been some moderation of Magyarization, even though the methods they used to justify the existence of the Slovak ethnic group—its ancientness, history, language, culture, customs, and traditions—were sometimes less scholarly. Ján Kollár, for instance, managed to respond to external stimuli, as he did not think of religion as an instrument for the conservation of faith and its

eschatological focus but, instead, used it to search for and pass on answers to topical questions in the life of the Slovak ethnic group, the Slavic nation, and problems in the everyday life of the faithful. In his published sermons, he placed almost the same emphasis on religious and moral perfection as he did on the ways to preserve and develop the life of individuals, the entire Slavic nation and the Slovak ethnic group that was part of it (Kollár 1831; 1844).

Thanks to Kollár and many other nationally aware Lutheran pastors and Catholic priests, religion, undoubtedly, played a positive role in the Slovak national movement and 19th-century Slovak national life. For Kollár, religion was a way to engage with a broader public by means of published sermons, communicating his views regarding the needs of the Slovaks as a part of the Czech-Slovak tribe and Slavic nation. Kollár's sermons were an ethical and moral challenge, as well as a message to Slavs and Slovaks, regarding the need to unite in the fight for collective, i.e., national, rights within Hungary and the Habsburg monarchy, not only in the first half of the 19th century. Clergy and teachers, as well as other Slovak national intelligentsia in the 1840s, played a key role by focusing on Slovak people and solving their specific social and cultural issues related to poverty also resulting from alcoholism. They founded "temperance (sobriety) societies," Sunday schools, reading clubs, and farmers' collectives (cooperatives) to, in this way, socially and culturally liven up the Slovak people (Štúr [1844–1855] 1956, 66, 84; [1847] 1986; [1846] 1986b; Hučko 1974, 178). In the mid-1840s, there were approximately 500 "temperance (sobriety) societies" active among the Slovak people (Ambruš 1956, 354–355). In 1847, the *Central Association of Temperance (Sobriety)* was established, uniting these associations in Upper Hungary, and the Catholic priest Štefan Závodník (1813–1885) was elected to head it. Proof of the massiveness of this social, moral, and ethnic movement was a petition to the Hungarian Parliament for the abolition of distilleries in Upper Hungary, organized by Štefan Závodník through the Central Association of Temperance (Sobriety) and signed by 40,000 people in February 1848. Farm cooperatives were a similar example of plebeian resistance to social, cultural, and national oppression. On February 9, 1845, Samuel Jurkovič (1796–1873) founded such a cooperative in Sobotište, which was the first credit union in Europe. The purpose of the cooperative was to provide loans and protect farmers and craftsmen from usurers and executions. Based on this example, similar cooperatives were established in the territory of Upper Hungary. The aim of these activities was to socially and culturally raise up the Slovak ethnic group and increase their ethnic awareness at a time of increasingly aggressive Magyarization in the daily life of Upper Hungary (Franková 2007, 164–166), which included drinking Magyar wine and smoking Magyar tobacco as symbols of Magyar national identity (Maxwell 2019). This is also an example of the interests and activities of the Slovak national intelligentsia being interconnected with those of the Slovak people, as well as evidence of the Slovak ethos of plebeian resistance to the ruling social, cultural, and political situation in Hungary.

Another example of a close relationship between Slovak patriots and the Slovak ethnic group was their decision to codify the Central-Slovak dialect as the standard Slovak language (1843) in an effort to lift up the Slovak people by facilitating and bringing them closer to education, edification, and culture in their mother tongue. This decision was a result of Czech being primarily the language of the Lutheran intelligentsia and, even though it was used by Slovak Lutheran parishes as the liturgical language, Slovak people did not feel close to it (Hroboň [1838] 1981, 38–39). The Slovak Catholic intelligentsia, from Bernolák's times, had been using the abovementioned *berňolákovčina* as their own literary language and mostly refused to accept Czech for communication or as a literary language (Hamuljak [1827] 1969). Ľudovít Štúr⁸ and his closest colleagues (Jozef Miloslav Hurban and Michal Miloslav Hodža), in an effort to unify the Slovak national movement (Catholics and Lutherans), proposed the Central-Slovak dialect as the standard language, which was to be, to a significant extent, a compromise between the supporters of Czech in the Lutheran environment and the supporters of *berňolákovčina* in the Catholic environment (Hudek 2011, 259–260). Their efforts, however, met the resistance of both parties, especially Ján Kollár and his followers among the many Slovak Lutherans, who advocated the use of Biblical Czech (Kollár 1846), and from the

Czech national intelligentsia who, even earlier, categorically rejected Kollár's efforts to Slovakize the Czech language.⁹

A great number of Czech patriots (including František Palacký and Alois Wojtěch Šembera) considered the creation of a distinct, standardized Slovak language, in contrast to biblical Czech, a bad idea (Palacký 1846, 31–33; Šembera 1846, 183–184). Some even thought of it as a betrayal of common interests (Havlíček [1846] 1900, 38–40, 105–106, 265–269, 364–366). Even on the part of other Slavic patriots, there were critical responses towards this move by young Slovak intellectuals (Hodža 1920, 300–301). Despite the resistance from a large number of Slovak, Czech, and other Slavic national intellectuals, Štúr and his followers were deeply convinced of the soundness of this move, expressed by Štúr in a letter to Samo Bohdan Hroboň (February 18, 1846), who stated that “[...] a life-or-death struggle is our motto [...]” mainly against Magyarization (Štúr [1844–1855] 1956, 120). Štúr's generation's fight for the Slovak language did not only concern the fight with Kollár and the advocates of biblical Czech among the Slovak Lutheran intellectuals (Štúr [1846] 1986a; Maxwell 2009, 101–140).¹⁰ This motto also became a leitmotif of the Slovak national movement throughout the 19th century, as it reflected the conception of the entire Slovak national ethnic group as a self-existent historical-political subject within Hungary. After all, it was primarily “a life-or-death struggle” with Magyarization, which was a cardinal threat to the existence of the Slovak ethnic group until the 1918 fall of Austria-Hungary. Vladimír Matula claims that

the historic decision by L. Štúr and his closest colleagues to adopt Slovak as a new nationwide standard language and introduce it in literature and the life of Slovak society, as well as its theoretical justification and defence should be understood as a cornerstone in, and the most significant manifestation of, the entire process of the formation of the modern Slovak nation. The dispute between Kollár and Štúr's followers, which, at first sight, appears to be a fight between Czech and Slovak, is actually a fight for the correct understanding and interpretation of historical development and for a correct estimate of future developments. (Matula 1999, 236)

Thus, the young Slovak intelligentsia, in spite of the resistance by many, parted with tradition and started their own path. Later, Milan Hodža, the Slovak politician and follower of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, wrote both critically and respectfully that external pressure from institutions had caused resistance and anger. According to him, “[...] at the bottom of the Slovak soul, there has always lay a rebellion of the poor vassals against their self-willed masters and a vague desire for freedom and democracy. What else was the legend about Jánošík than a cry of folk vision of a liberator, be it anyone in any form” (Hodža 1920, 387). The language struggle, the Slovak Uprising of 1848–1849, and the expansion of the 1860s Slovak national movement, continuing into the mid-1870s, evidenced the Slovak ethos of plebeian resistance.

The second alternative that Smith presented in the context of preserving an ethnic group, cultural borrowing, took place particularly in the first half of the 19th century. The Czech cultural environment was more developed than its Slovak counterpart. Czechs were, in the given era, under less assimilation pressure from Germans compared to Slovaks oppressed by Magyars (Hroch 1999; Macura 1983). After the language-related quarrel, Kollár's and Štúr's deaths, as well as the influence of Bach's absolutism, these cultural contacts “were temporarily alienated and disharmonious” until the 1880s (Jurčišinová 2010, 15). Contact was revived by Masaryk's trips to Central Slovakia and his contacts with representatives of the Martin center¹¹ (Masaryk [1894] 2017, 125). The 1890s saw a much greater boom, which, however, resulted in a conflict with the Martin center due to its Russophile affiliation. Therefore, Masaryk and many other Czech intellectuals pinned their hopes on cooperation with and support from the young Slovak intelligentsia, who rebelled against the old cadres in Martin and who had usurped the right to represent Slovaks and their national life (Jurčišinová 2010, 19, 37, 64; Podrimavský 1983, 140–141, 183–184).

With regard to the third possibility of reviving an ethnic group, as stated by Smith – broad participation by the social classes in the movement – the Slovak national movement was able to mobilize the Slovak masses on several occasions throughout the 19th century. The first and most significant example of this mobilization and active resistance by Slovaks against the Magyar policies of national oppression was an armed demonstration of Slovak volunteers (called Hurbanists, after the most revolutionary representative of the Slovak National Council Jozef Miloslav Hurban¹²) in 1848–1849. There were three armed campaigns between September 1848 and September 1849 (Rapant 1937; 1950), in which approximately 20,000 men took part in total (Štúr [1844–1855] 1956, 237). Apart from Slovaks, there were also Czechs and members of other nations and ethnicities. Based on this, Štúr stated, “The nation will not die! Our rebellion gave some history to the long-term history-less of the nation, and that is of the greatest moral value. It is the first step towards glory” (Štúr [1844–1855] 1956, 194). While the first expedition in the autumn of 1848 concerned only Western Slovakia, the winter and summer expeditions in 1848–1849 also involved Central and Eastern Slovakia, including the regions of Šariš and Zemplín. Many battles took place in the vicinity of Prešov and Košice. In the vast majority of cases, the Hurbanists met with huge support from the Slovak people, in some cases, from the townspeople and the rural nobility, which manifested itself especially in popular rallies organized by the political representatives of the uprising. Hurban and Štúr used these expeditions and assemblies to mobilize the masses of Slovak people, to increase their social and ethnic awareness, and to support the political, social, cultural and linguistic demands of the Slovak national movement (Jurčišinová 2018, 109–114). However, the Magyar state used all its power to persecute those who directly or indirectly supported the Slovak uprising; many ended up in prison, and some were even executed for participating in the uprising (Rapant 1937; 1950). In addition, they presented the Hurbanists as Antichrists, Communists, murderers, and thieves (Dohnány [1850], 1988, 101). For this reason, many Slovaks voluntarily or forcibly joined the Magyar honveds and fought on the side of the Magyar revolution.

In the context of the Slovak national movement, the years 1848–1849 posed a dilemma that could be called “Who to join? Magyars, Austrians, of Slavs?” Austria, led by General Windischgrätz, suppressed the Slavic Congress as well as the 1848 Prague Uprising. The Magyars categorically rejected the national demands of Slovaks and other Slavs (Kürti 2012, 100; Maxwell 2019, 49). The Slavs themselves lacked Kollarian reciprocity, as each group wanted something different: some a federal Austria, others autonomy. All of them ended up on the side of Vienna, seemingly fighting for their own rights and freedoms. In reality, they fought to preserve the imperial, or royal, throne, which was mainly successful thanks to intervention by the Russian czar. Nevertheless, this did not bring about new rights or freedoms for Slovaks. On the contrary, every national group within the Habsburg Empire was just as rightless and unfree in Bach’s absolutism. Despite this, Slovaks converted their pre-existing ethos of literary and linguistic resistance into an armed campaign for their own rights and freedoms, even though the result was, in comparison to the expectations, more than bewildering. However, it still showed both the abilities and flaws, as well as faults, of the representatives of the Slovak national movement. Above all, Slovaks, in this way, entered the political history of 19th-century Central Europe, albeit, mistakenly, on the side of the Habsburgs. It was, however, the only way to achieve anything for the Slovak ethnic group in the given political situation (Dohnány [1850] 1988, 17–18; Mináč [1965] 2014, 18; Štefanovič [1886] 1988, 205).

Even though the 1850s were, in the Habsburg monarchy, negatively marked by Bach’s absolutism (which more or less equally affected the “victorious” Slovaks and the defeated Magyars), the Slovak national movement manifested its ethos of resistance, power, and capabilities mainly in the 1860s and the first half of the 1870s when the political situation in the monarchy relaxed somewhat. This was exemplified by the Declaration of the Slovak Nation (Memorandum slovenského národa, 1861), in which, at a mass gathering of Slovaks in Martin, political demands were formulated with regard to the Vienna government, including the requirement of territorial and administrative autonomy, the establishment of *Matica slovenská* (1863) and its cultural edifying as well as scientific activities, and, equally, the existence of three Slovak grammar schools and their educational

programs.¹³ Nevertheless, after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise (1867), and especially with the start of Kalmán Tisza's administration in 1875, the conditions of non-Magyar nationalities in Hungary greatly worsened. This was mainly true for the Slovak ethnic group, as the Magyar political, cultural, and social elites considered them to be the main target of Magyarization and assimilation, which, in the decades to come, led to national policies that could be considered ethnocides. This is exemplified not only by closing down the abovementioned Slovak grammar schools and banning all activities of *Matica slovenská* but also by the liquidation of Slovak primary education, the support of the mass emigration of Slovaks to the U.S., and transferring children from Slovak counties to the Magyar environment with the intention of Magyarizing them.

This led to a flawed move by representatives of the Slovak national movement. They opted for voluntary passivity by the Slovak National Party in elections, through which they wished to point to the practices of the ruling Magyar political power in disabling political parties of non-Magyar nations and ethnic groups in Hungary to actually represent their ethnic groups in the Hungarian parliament and fight for their rights or present their needs (Podrimavský 1983, 74–163). The above tactic of the Slovak political representatives was advantageous for Magyar political intentions, as it helped their efforts to stop Slovak candidates and voters from exercising their active or passive right to vote to the full extent. This was one of the main reasons why a great number of Czech politicians and, consequently, young Slovak intelligentsia, gave up at the Martin center. They realized that the politics of passive resistance were harmful to the Slovak ethnic group and its interests while helping the Magyars.

On the other hand, journalism was a principal ethos of Slovak national resistance in this period. Slovak patriots turned to journalism in times of electoral passivity to a much greater extent than before. By pointing out the misdemeanours of Magyarization, Slovak journalists were in violation of national law No. 44/1868. In accordance with the laws adopted to protect the interests and privileged position of the Magyar nation, its language, culture, and literature, they were put on trial and punished by prison sentences of months to years. Even though Slovak patriots were aware that their personal freedom was endangered, they still joined the struggle against Magyarization and the institution of the Hungarian government, which was fully under the yoke of Magyar national interests (Seton-Watson 1908, 305–309, 328–330, 463–466).

Another example of the ethos of resistance of the Slovak ethnic group was organising people's assemblies at the turn of the 20th century to mobilize the Slovak population. In the vast majority of cases, these assemblies met with bans and all kinds of obstacles from the state, including the involvement of the army and the police, as well as consequent persecution of the organizers (Podrimavský 1983, 122–137; Seton-Watson 1908, 249–273).¹⁴ People's assemblies were organized by the Slovak National Party in response to criticisms of its political passivity by the young generation of the Slovak intelligentsia. The first assemblies were held in Modra and Tisovec in February 1893, and the next assemblies were held in Mošovce in March 1893. They discussed political requirements concerning language rights and the self-governing autonomy of the Slovak ethnic group, as well as demands for a general voting law. The largest assembly was in Mošovce, which was attended by more than 800 people. Following these successful events, there were attempts to organize meetings in other cities. The local authorities, however, prohibited them, as was the case in Martin, Stará Turá, and Pezinok (Podrimavský 1983, 122–123). An example of Magyar state power inhibiting Slovak people's assemblies is the celebration of the 100th anniversary of Ján Kollár's birth in 1893. Originally, celebrations were supposed to take place in Martin and Mošovce on August 1–2, 1893, which, however, was banned by the Magyar authorities (Jakubec 1893, 111). Therefore, on August 6, a private event was held in Mošovce, which was also attended by the then member of the Austrian Parliament Thomas Garrigue Masaryk; nevertheless, the gendarmes intervened against this private assembly. Masaryk was not even allowed to visit Kollár's birthplace, driven away with bayonets. Masaryk was outraged that such injustice was happening in his father's homeland and that the gendarmes, even for innocent, nonviolent acts, threatened people with bayonets (Horváthová [1893] 1972, 65–66).

The most significant manifestation of the ethos of plebeian resistance was the aversion and indefatigability of the Slovak ethnic group and its representatives against the determined, long-term efforts of the Magyar ruling and political elites to Magyarize and assimilate them. The process of Magyarization followed the abolishment of the reforms implemented by Emperor Joseph II at the close of the 18th century and, in various degrees of intensity, continued until the breakup of Austria-Hungary. It reached its peak at the turn of the 20th century, an example being Magyar gendarmes shooting at protesting Catholic faithful in the Slovak village of Černová (1907). There were 15 deaths, 70 injuries, and 38 people sentenced to more than 36 years in prison (Maxwell 2009, 30; Mésároš 1978, 613–614; Seton-Watson 1908, 339–351). Although Austria-Hungary was in an almost permanent state of constitutional political, economic, and social crisis in the early 20th century, there were also a great number of international political problems affecting the monarchy (Janos 1982, 149–200; Péter 2012, 357; Taylor 1948, 185, 194, 205–206). Even so, shooting at its own citizens in Černová was primarily the result of Magyar chauvinist policies against Slovaks, which penetrated all spheres of political, social, cultural, religious, educational, and everyday life in Upper Hungary.

There is a large body of evidence in books and press reports of that period of belittlement, mockery, and humiliation of the Slovak ethnic group (Čapek 1906, 191–209; Grünwald 1878, 18–19, 29–30, 32, 40, 53, 55, 70–71, 112; Hurban-Vajanský [1882] 1973, 203–204; Irmei [1879] 1973, 188–189; Paul 1985, 128–146),¹⁵ which also penetrated the consciousness of the broad mass of the population. This includes the local authorities and individuals who adjudicated the Černová shooting and the consequent trials of its citizens. In this context, Anton Štefánek claimed that only a few people had realized that the Magyar race was doomed for destruction by its own national and social policies. In his view, the gentry had deteriorated both culturally and materially, and the moral dullness of prominent people could be observed. He asked whether Magyars could revive Hungary and return it to a culture aimed at general education and humanity (Štefánek [1910] 1973, 275). The author aptly characterized the issue of Hungary and its Magyar ruling circles, which shut themselves away in their own social, political, and cultural bubble created by the ideological fetish of Magyarization, where they could not see the catastrophic consequences that would be caused by their chauvinist national policies. This resulted in the fall of Hungary in 1918.

Undoubtedly, it is true that definitions of a nation often serve political goals. In this case, they were instrumental, as Marek Waldenberg points out. In some cases, they were used to deny the national existence of certain ethnic groups. There are also contrary examples where the definition of a nation was adjusted to define a community as a nation with the aim of acquiring certain authority (Waldenberg 2000, 20). The theme of “nation” was often in the hands of politicians and authorities, depending on what was convenient at a particular time. The relationship of Vienna with the non-Magyar nations and ethnic groups within Hungary is an example, as the imperial court was able to maintain dependency and loyalty through various vague promises, which were believed on a long-term basis by, among others, the Slovak political representation. Only a few of their promises were actually met. Only as late as the 1860s, part of the young generation, led by Ján Palárik,¹⁶ realized that the ruler would not appreciate the loyalty of the Slovak ethnic group. Therefore, they suggested shifting the focus to Magyars and trying to find common ground with them, even though they did not find much agreement with other members of the Slovak national representation (Palárik [1860] 2010; Martinkovič 2020).¹⁷ In the end, this path was also unpassable. At the 1867 Austro-Hungarian Compromise, Vienna “donated” the non-Magyar nations and ethnic groups in Hungary to Magyars. They considered this an opportunity to arrange national issues in Hungary the way they saw fit – by means of forced Magyarization (Grünwald 1878, 81–82; Auer 2004, 41), which could be called ethnocide, as termed by A. D. Smith. The goal was the creation of a united Magyar political nation that would exclusively use the Magyar language in state and public spheres, in schools, and in churches. The Magyar language and affiliation with the Magyar nation was a fundamental precondition of any social growth.

Conclusion

The Slovak ethos of plebeian resistance was an example of a social battle fought mostly by nonaristocratic and politically and culturally nonprivileged classes of the Slovak ethnic group. This group was represented by Slovak national intelligentsia over and against the social, political, and cultural conditions of the 19th century. It was resistant to the “law of progress,” in this case, resistance against Magyarization, which could have resulted in the ethnocide of the Slovak ethnic group. One of the forms of this resistance was the effort to raise the self-confidence of the Slovak ethnic group by publishing collections of folk songs, folk tales, and proverbs that disseminated both the folk culture and the folk wisdom of the Slovak ethnic group. All are manifestations of the ethos of plebeian resistance. Equally, the effort to strengthen the self-confidence of the Slovak ethnic group by a return to the history of Great Moravia and a reminder of the fame and importance of the ancestors of the Slovaks can also be considered part of the ethos. In the same framework is the cultural message of Great Moravia, which had an impact on contemporary European culture. It placed the ancestors of the Slovaks among the cultural nations of Europe, thanks to the Old Slavonic language and Old Slavonic translations of religious books, as well as its recognition as a liturgical language, alongside other classical Christian liturgical languages (Kollár 1824 [1974]; Šafárik 1837, 793–822; Sasinek 1878; Spiesz and Caplovic 2006, ix–x; Teich, Kováč, and Brown 2011, 95–97). Slovak “literary” national defensive treatises against Magyarization written in the first half of the 19th century as well as the 1842 *Slovenský prestolný prosbopis* are similar examples of the Slovak ethos of plebeian resistance, which advocated for the rights, freedoms, and dignity of the Slovak ethnic group.

A significant moment in the 19th-century Slovak national movement and an example of the ethos of plebeian resistance of its young generation (concentrated around Ludovít Štúr) and the Slovak ethnic group as a whole, was the abandonment of the common Czech-Slovak language (biblical Czech) used by the former generations of Slovaks, primarily Lutheran scholars, and the codification of Slovak as a literary and common language. On the one hand, this caused complications in Czech-Slovak relations, as the vast majority of Czech intellectuals of the period in question, as well as a considerable number of Slovak and Slavic patriots led by Ján Kollár, believed it weakened Czech-Slovak ties as well as Slavic reciprocity. On the other hand, it brought about unification with the majority of Slovak Catholics, which strengthened the Slovak national movement in Hungary. Even though this process was not simple and faced a great number of challenges, over time, it turned out to be justified from the viewpoint of the linguistic, cultural, and political establishment of the Slovak ethnic group in Hungary and the enforcement of its demands for an equal position among the other nations and ethnic groups living in Hungary. It was a key point in the transition to Phase B (of Hroch’s typology) in the development of the Slovak national movement.¹⁸

The solidarity and support of other Slavic nations living in the Habsburg monarchy, especially Czechs, but also Croats and Serbs, played a great role in the strengthening of the ethos of plebeian resistance of the Slovak ethnic group. This support took the form of cultural and literary reciprocity, mainly on the part of Czechs and Croats, and of political support for Slovak demands in the Hungarian Senate, manifested as a direct endorsement of the 1848–1849 Slovak Uprising. Slovaks fought for their rights and freedoms in an armed conflict against Magyars, albeit without sufficient political or military experience or enough political support on the part of the Imperial Court. This was especially the case in 1848, when the Court played both sides regarding national minorities living in the monarchy. It was a mistake for Slovaks to join in the armed conflict of Vienna against Pest. It was, however, a consequence of the Magyars unwillingness to meet the national demands of other nations and ethnic groups living in Hungary that caused the representatives of the Slovak national movement to fight for their demands on the side of Vienna. Despite Vienna failing to meet any of the essential Slovak national demands, the Slovak national movement, as well as the Slovak ethnic group, through armed demonstrations strengthened their self-confidence and showed the

world their determination and resistance by reaching for their weapons in the hope of achieving their goals of the growth, development, and cultivation of the powers and abilities of members of the Slovak ethnic group. In the end, the fight for these goals was successful on the battlefields of World War I, when many Slovaks fought alongside Czechs for the Allies (Entente), which contributed to the Allied Forces agreeing to the establishment of Czechoslovakia as a common state of Czechs and Slovaks at the close of World War I.

Another example of the ethos of plebeian resistance of the Slovak national movement was its first revival in the 1860s (until the mid 1870s). This was connected to the activities of *Matica slovenská* and Slovak secondary schools. The second revival came after years of strong Magyarization and the political passivity of the Slovak National Party. This occurred between the second half of the 1870s and the end of the 1880s and was marked by a significant decay of the Slovak national movement compared to the previous decade. The young generation of students and graduates of universities in Prague, Vienna, and Budapest assumed the ethos of plebeian resistance despite the adversity of the old generation of patriots concentrated around *Svetozár Hurban Vajanský* in *Turčiansky Svätý Martin*. With the support of Czech political circles, especially Masaryk, they invigorated the Slovak national movement. They followed and developed the ethical messages and ideals of the Slovak national movement of the 1840s on the way to equality for the Slovak ethnic group with other nations and ethnic groups living in the monarchy that also sought freedom and humanity.

The 19th-century Slovak national movement, through its ethos of plebeian resistance, played a positive role in shaping the ethnic and national awareness of the Slovak ethnic group, forming an ethnic and national identity and constituting a national ideology. This was primarily based on the humanist ideals of the Enlightenment expressed by Herder regarding Slavs and their future, as well as by following his thoughts of mankind's humanistic direction. It was these ethical and moral ideals that became the basis of Kollár's conception of the nation and Slavic reciprocity, which were then, with some necessary era-related modifications, followed by Štúr's adherents and other Slovak patriots. They strove to enforce these ideals not only in the cultural, linguistic, and religious but also in the political and social lives of the Slovak ethnic group in the second half of the 19th century. With regard to objective external circumstances, as well as subjective drawbacks, they did not always succeed. What they achieved, however, was to preserve the Slovak ethnic group and, albeit with significant problems, establish it politically in the first decades of the 20th century as a modern European nation through the shared country of Czechs and Slovaks. However, the Slovak national movement and Slovak nationalism of the first half of the 20th century, especially during World War II, cannot be associated with the ethical message of Kollár and Štúr's generation, which called for equal rights and freedoms for all nations striving to realize the ideals of humanity.

Financial Support. Author has received research grant from KEGA. Funding was provided by KEGA (Grant No. 013PU-4/2022).

Disclosures. None.

Notes

- 1 In the article it is differentiated between the residents of the Hungarian Kingdom (The Kingdom of Hungary), called Hungarian(s) and members of individual ethnic groups living in the same territory prior to 1918, for whom there are used individual terms, such as Slovaks, Magyars, Croats, Serbs, etc.
- 2 Anton Bernolák (born on October 3, 1762, Slanica; died on January 15, 1813, Nové Zámky) – a Catholic priest and linguist. He studied in Ružomberok, Bratislava, Trnava and Vienna and worked as a chaplain or a priest in Čeklís, Trnava, and Nové Zámky. He authored the following

linguistic works: *Dissertatio philologico-critica de literis Slavorum* (1787), *Linguae Slavonicae ... compendiosa simul et facilis Orthographia* (1787), *Grammatica Slavica* (1790), *Etymologia vocum slavicarum* (1791) and the posthumously issued six-part *Slowár Slowenský Češko-Lafínsko-Ňemecko-Uherský seu Lexicon Slavicum Bohemico-Latino-Germanico-Ungaricum auctore Antonio Bernolák Nobili Pannonio Szlaniczensi* (1825–1827). Apart from these, he also published many other linguistic and religious treatises.

- 3 Ján Kollár was a Slovak Lutheran pastor, philosopher, theologian, philologist, poet, and supporter of Slavic literary and cultural reciprocity, based on which he is also often considered the founder of cultural and literary Pan-Slavism. He was born on July 29, 1793 in Mošovce (present-day Slovakia), studied in Kremnica, Banská Bystrica, Bratislava, and Jena (1817–1819) where he completed his study of theology. Between 1819–1849, he worked as a Lutheran pastor in Pest (now part of Budapest, Hungary), then as a university professor of archaeology in Vienna (1849–1852). He died in Vienna on January 24, 1852. His best-known literary work is the collection of poems *Slávy dcéra* [*The Daughter of Sláva*, 1824] and, in philosophical literature, his work *O literárnej vzájomnosti medzi rozličnými kmeňmi a nárečiami slovanského národa* [*Reciprocity between the Various Tribes and Dialects of the Slavic Nation*, 1836–1837, English edition 2008].
- 4 Pavol Jozef Šafárik (born on May 13, 1795 in Kobeliarovo and died June 26, 1861 in Prague), a Slovak living in Prague on a long-term basis, was a poet, historian, ethnographer, and Slavist. He studied in Rožňava, Dobšiná, Kežmarok, and Jena (1815–1817) and worked in Novi Sad (1819–1833) and Prague (1833–1861). Among his most significant works are *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten* (1826), *Slovanské starožitnosti* (1837; 1865) and *Slovanský národopis* (1842). He also published a collection of poems *Tatranská múza s lyrou slovanskou* (1814) and many other historic and linguistic works.
- 5 A key moment in the transition to phase B was the linguistic split in which Slovak Protestants renounced (biblical) Czech as a common literary language with the Czechs and in 1843 codified the Slovak language as a literary and communicative tool of the Slovak ethnic group. This step also had a very important political dimension, because there was a linguistic unification of Slovak Catholics and Lutherans and Slovaks defined themselves as a separate tribe within the Slavs (Brock 1976, 33–46; Hroch 1985, 98; Kirschbaum 2005, 100–101, Teich, Kováč, and Brown 2011, 124–125).
- 6 The history of Slovaks from the end of the 18th century to the present, their transformation from an ethnic group to a nation are, in my opinion, an example of the historical development of the nation, and, thus, Brubaker's "eventful perspectives" cannot be applied to it (Brubaker 1996, 19–21). Although some events in the history of the Slovak nation can be said to have taken place, as a whole they are examples of historical development, albeit complex and sometimes controversial, especially in the 20th century.
- 7 These are 15 treatises authored by Ján Kollár, Samuel Hoič, Ján Chalupka, Ľudovít M. Šuhajda, Ján Pavel Tomášek, Ján Čaplovič, Ľudovít Štúr, Michal Miloslav Hodža, and others. The treatises were published between 1821 and 1848 in Hungarian and German in defence of the linguistic, cultural, and educational rights of Slovaks (Ormis 1973).
- 8 Ľudovít Štúr (born on October 28, 1815 in Uhrovec, died on January 12, 1856 in Modra) was a Slovak politician, journalist, linguist, philosopher, historian, pedagogue, and a leading representative of the Slovak national movement in the 1840s. He studied in Győr, Bratislava, and Halle (1838–1840) and worked as an assistant to Professor Palkovič at the Lutheran Lyceum (preparatory high school and college) in Bratislava (1840–1843), the editor-in-chief of *Slovenské národné noviny* (*Slovak National Newspaper*, 1845–1848), and was a member of the Hungarian Parliament for the Royal town of Zvolen (1847–1848). Alongside Hurban and Hodža, he was the head of the Slovak National Council during the armed uprising against the Hungarian government (1848–1849) and later worked as a tutor. Among his most significant works are *Starý a nový vek Slovákov* (1841), *Die Beschwerden und Klagen der Slaven in Ungarn über die gesetzwidrigen Uebergriffe der Magyaren* über die gesetzwidrigen Uebergriffe der Magyaren

- (1843), *Das neunzehnte Jahrhundert und der Magyarismus* (1845), *Nárečie slovenské alebo potreba písania v tomto nárečí* (1846), and *Das Slawenthum und die Welt der Zukunft* (not issued until 1867 in Russian entitled *Slavjanstvo i mir buduščego*).
- 9 In a letter dated November 17, 1829, František Palacký asked Kollár to wait with his Slovak novelties of the Czech language, because it would do much damage in Bohemia (Palacký [1829] 1879, 393–394). Josef Jungmann rebuked Kollár even more strongly in a letter dated April 26, 1836, accusing him, with his linguistic innovations, of building a Chinese wall between Czechs and Slovaks, which he considered dangerous for both literatures, and urged him to return to the biblical Czech as written by Comenius. He considered Kollár's Slovakised Czech a creation of fantasy, which has no support in Bohemia. "It will never be written in Bohemia as you write, we will reluctantly turn away from such a way" (Jungmann [1836] 1880, 210–211).
 - 10 Kollár, when considering his defence of Biblical Czech in an argument with Štúr about standard Slovak, clung too fiercely to his own work, which was the idea of Slavic reciprocity, including Czech-Slovak unity and its expression in the form of Slovakised Czech (Kollár 1846). He was not prepared to admit that the idea of a shared language was unacceptable for Czechs for many reasons. It became equally unacceptable for the young Slovak Lutheran intelligentsia. Moreover, a majority of the Slovak Catholic intelligentsia rejected Czech. Many people did not understand it (Kollár [1830] 1991, 100). In the name of this reciprocity, Kollár, however, overlooked the opposing views and stubbornly defended his conception of Czech-Slovak linguistic and cultural unity.
 - 11 It was the headquarters of the Slovak National Party in Turčiansky Svätý Martin, represented by the conservative wing of the Slovak political scene centered around the *Národné noviny* (National Newspaper), headed by Svetozár Hurban Vajanský (1847–1916).
 - 12 Jozef Miloslav Hurban (born on March 19, 1817 in Beckov and died on February 21, 1888 in Hlboké) was a representative of the 19th-century Slovak national movement, a Lutheran pastor, theologian, writer, and publicist. He studied in Trenčín and Bratislava and worked as a pastor in Brezová and in Hlboké (1843–1888). He published the almanac *Nitra* and the journal *Slovenské pohľady*. During the 1848–1849 revolution, he was the chair of the Slovak National Council, the executive political body of the Slovak national movement. He was engaged in the struggle for the standard language, as well as the clerical-religious disputes regarding the Magyarizing intentions of Lutherans and Calvinists to be united in one Protestant Church, in which Magyar Calvinists would dominate, leading to the Magyarization of Slovak Lutheran parishes. In the context of the language-related conflict, he wrote a polemic treatise against Ján Kollár–*Hlasové o potrebe jednoty spisovného jazyka pro Čechy, Moravany a Slováky* (1846) – and, with regard to the previously mentioned clerical-religious disputes, the work *Unia čili spojení lutheranů s kalviny v Uhrách* (1846). Apart from these, he also authored a voluminous book dedicated to the history of Slovak literature titled *Slovensko a jeho život literárny* (1846–1851). Additionally, he wrote several literary works, such as *Svätoplukovci* (1844), *Olejkár* (1846), *Od Silvestra do Troch kráľov* (1847), *Gottšalk* (1861) and many others.
 - 13 During its 12-year existence, Matica slovenská published 40 issues of the academic almanac *Letopis Matice slovenskej*, in which the authors published papers on history, ethnography, philosophy, and ethics, as well as the natural sciences, such as geology, botany, etc. Three Slovak grammar schools educated 1,900 graduates who significantly influenced the further development of the Slovak national movement at the turn of the 20th century. Even though Matica slovenská was not allowed to establish local branches, it had a member base in those counties of Upper Hungary inhabited by the Slovak ethnic group. In 1867, it had 1,112 members mainly representing the countryside's intelligentsia, merchants, craftsmen, and some farmers. Interesting was the collective membership of 78 villages in these counties and 46 foreign members (Eliáš 2003, 71–73). The data regarding membership of Matica slovenská evidence a strong bond of the Slovak national movement with the Slovak ethnic group in the given period.

- 14 In 1898–1908, 503 Slovaks were tried by Hungarian courts in 81 political trials, resulting in total prison sentences of 79 years and 17 days, as well as fines totalling 30,881 crowns (Seton-Watson 1908, 454–462).
- 15 In his book *Racial Problems in Hungary* (1908), Robert Seton-Watson provides a great amount of evidence regarding the brutality of Magyarisation policies against Slovaks and other non-Magyar nations and ethnic groups in Hungary.
- 16 Ján Palárik (born on April 27, 1822 in Beckov and died on December 7, 1870 in Majcichov) was a Slovak Catholic priest, one of the most significant 19th-century Slovak dramatists, and a leading representative of the New School in the Slovak national movement in the second half of the 19th century, who strove for cooperation with opposing Magyar political parties. He studied in Esztergom, Bratislava, and Trnava and worked in Starý Tekov, Banská Štiavnica, Pest (1851–1862), and Majcichov (1862–1870). He published the journal *Cyrrill a Method*, which resulted in his conflict with the clerical hierarchy. In his journalism, he reacted to the topical political situation in the country; he wrote several contributions dedicated to possible solutions to national issues in Hungary, among the most significant being *Otázka národnosti a nasledovne i literatúry pri novom politickom preporodení Uhorska* (1860), *O vzájomnosti slovanskej* (1864), and *Účel Austrie pod centralizmom i dualizmom* (1868). Among his dramatic works are the stage plays *Inkognito* (1858), *Drotár* (1860), and *Dobrodružstvo pri obžinkoch* (1862), and he also wrote some minor works based on the needs of the religious life and education of common people.
- 17 The first significant attempt at cooperating with Magyar political elites was the book by Štěpán Launer *Povaha Slovanstva, se zvláštním ohledem na spisovní řeč Čechů, Moravanů, Slezáků a Slováků* (1847) which, however, met with a widely dismissive attitude from Slovak political representation and led to Launer being accused of harming Slovak national interests (Pichler 2011, 15–30).
- 18 This is despite the fact that from the end of the 19th century, especially under the influence of T. G. Masaryk in the Czech and Slovak intellectual environment, Kollár's idea of Czech-Slovak reciprocity began to grow stronger (Masaryk [1895] 1990), transformed at the end of the First World War into a common state of Czechs and Slovaks as a politically united Czechoslovak nation. However, Štúr's Slovak language significantly helped the Slovak ethnic group to overcome the pitfalls of Magyarization and become, alongside the Czech nation, a state-law nation within Czechoslovakia (and to reach phase C of the Hroch's typology).

References

- Ambruš, Jozef. 1956. "Komentáre." In Ludovít Štúr, *Listy II (1844–1855)*, edited by Jozef Ambruš, 323–547. Bratislava: VSAV.
- Auer, Stefan. 2004. *Liberal Nationalism in Central Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Bárányi [pseudonym]. 1841. "Magyarismus többféle maniák elleni harcában." *Századunk* 4 (92): 716–720.
- Brock, Peter. 1976. *The Slovak National Awakening: An Essay in the Intellectual History of East Central Europe*. Toronto & Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 2004. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1996. *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Čapek, Thomas. 1906. *The Slovaks of Hungary: Slavs and Pan Slavism*. New York: The Knickerbocker Press.
- David, Zdeněk V. 2007. "Johann Gottfried Herder and the Czech National Awakening: A Reassessment." *Carl Beck Papers in Russian & East European Studies* 1807: 1–53.
- Dobšinský, Pavol. (1880–1883) 1958. *Prostonárodné slovenské povesti, I.–III*, edited by Eugen Pauliny. Bratislava: SVKL.
- Döbrentei, Gábor. 1828. "A' Magyar-nyelv." *Felső-Magyarországi Minerva* 4 (4): 1736–1742.
- Dohnány, Mikuláš. (1850) 1988. "História povstania slovenského z roku 1848." In *Slovenské povstanie 1848–1849*, edited by Cyril Kraus, 8–180. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Edvi Illés, Pál. 1838. *Első oktatásra szolgáló kézikönyv vagyis a legszükségesebb tudományok összessége*, 2nd edition. Budán: A Magyar Királyi Egyetem Betüivel.
- Eliáš, Michal. 2003. "Matica slovenská v rokoch 1863–1875." In *Matica slovenská. Dejiny a prítomnosť*, edited by Tomáš Winkler and Michal Eliáš, 31–96. Martin: Matica slovenská.

- Franková, Libuša. 2007. "Osvetové a ľudovýchovné snahy slovenských vzdelancov v období národného obrodzenia (1780–1848)." *Dejiny* 2 (2): 148–168.
- Gluchman, Vasil. 2019. "The Literary Works as a Code of Ethics in Great Moravia." *Ethics & Bioethics (in Central Europe)* 9 (3–4): 106–118.
- Goszczyńska, Joanna. 2015. *Wielkie spory małego narodu*. Warszawa: Elipsa.
- Grünwald, Béla. 1878. *A Felvidék*. Budapest: Ráth Mór.
- Hamuljak, Martin. (1827) 1969. "Pavlovi Jozefovi Šafárikovi." In *Listy Martina Hamuljaka I. (1924–1833)*, edited by Augustín Matovčík, 93–96. Martin: Matica slovenská.
- Havlíček Borovský, Karel. (1846) 1900. *Politické spisy*, díl I., edited by Zdeněk V. Tobolka. Prague: Jan Laichter.
- Herder, Johann G. (1784) 1800. *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man*, translated by T. Churchill. London: St. Paul's Church-Yard.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hodža, Milan. 1920. *Československý rozkol*. Turčiansky Svätý Martin: náklad vlastný.
- Hollý, Ján. (1833) 1985. "Svätopluk." In *Dielo II*, 178–553. Edited by Ján Štibraný. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Hollý, Ján. (1835) 1985. "Cyrilometodiáda." In *Dielo II*, 10–175. Edited by Ján Štibraný. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Horváthová, Marína Oľga. (1893) 1972. "S. H. Vajanskému 6.8.1893 (list č. 44)." In *Korešpondencia Svetozára Hurbana Vajanského II. (Výber listov z rokov 1890–1916)*, edited by Pavol Petrus, 65–67. Bratislava: SAV.
- Hroboň, Samo Bohdan. (1838) 1981. "Bratislavskej spoločnosti." In *Dotyky s múzou. Levočské rukopisné básne a listy Sama Bohdana Hroboňa*, edited by Edmund Hleba, 38–39. Prešov: Štátna vedecká knižnica.
- 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*, translated by Ben Fowkes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hroch, Miroslav. 1999. *Na prahu národní existence. Touha a skutečnost*. Prague: Mladá fronta.
- Hučko, Ján. 1974. *Sociálne zloženie a pôvod slovenskej obrodeneckej inteligencie*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Hudek, Adam. 2011. "Between Czechs and Hungarians: Constructing the Slovak National Identity from 19th Century to the Present." *History Compass* 9 (4): 257–268.
- Hurban-Vajanský, Svetozár. (1882) 1973. "A tót leány." In *Literárne vzťahy slovensko-maďarské*, edited by Rudolf Chmel, 203–207. Martin: Osveta.
- Irmei, Ferenc. (1879) 1973. "Slovenský ľud našej vlasti." In *Literárne vzťahy slovensko-maďarské*, edited by Rudolf Chmel, 188–191. Martin: Osveta.
- Jakubec, Jan. 1893. "Jak jsme oslavili Kollárovo stoleté jubileum." *Naše doba* 1 (1): 109–120.
- Janos, Andrew C. 1982. *The Politics of Backwardness in Hungary 1825–1945*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jungmann, Josef. (1836) 1880. "Dopisy Josefa Jungmanna k Janu Kollárovi." *Časopis Musea Království českého* 54 (2): 196–218.
- Jurčišinová, Nadežda. 2018. "Slováci v revolučných rokoch 1848–1849 a východné Slovensko." *Dejiny* 13 (2): 92–115.
- Jurčišinová, Nadežda. 2010. *Československá jednota a Slováci. Kultúrno-spoločenské aktivity spolku*. Prešov: FF PU.
- Kirschbaum, Stanislav J. 2005. *A History of Slovakia: The Struggle for Survival*, 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kiss, László. 2009. "A magyarok szlovákokról alkotott képe a reformkorban." In *A közös történelem vitás kérdései. Sporné otázky spoločných dejín. Acta Academiae Paedagogicae Agriensis, Nova series, tom XXXVI, Sectio Historiae*, edited by László Kiss and Imrich Nagy, 111–128. Eger: EKF.
- Kollár, Ján. 1831. *Nedělnj, Swátečné i přiležitostné Kázne a Řeči*. Pess: Trattner & Karoli.
- Kollár, Ján. 1838. *Sláva Bohyně a původ gména Slawůw čili Slawjanův*. Pešť: J. M. Trattner-Károlyi.
- Kollár, Ján. 1844. *Nedělnj, Swátečné i přiležitostné Kázne a Řeči, díl druhý*. Budjn: Jan Gyurian & Martin Bagó.
- Kollár, Ján, ed. 1846. *Hlasové o potřebě jednoty spisowného jazyka pro Čechy, Morawany a Slowáky*. Prague: Kronberger & Řivnác.
- Kollár, Ján. 1897. "Leben auf den deutschen Hochschulen." In *Deutsche Einflüsse auf die Anfänge der Böhmisches Romantik*, edited by Matthias Murko, 293–362. Graz: Styria.
- Kollár, Ján. (1824) 1974. *Slávy dcera*. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Kollár, Ján. (1823) 1988. "Předmluva." In *Piesne svetské ľudu slovenského v Uhorsku, 1. diel*, edited by Ján Kollár and Pavol J. Šafárik, 11–42. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Kollár, Ján. (1830) 1991. "Ján Kollár Františkovi Palackému 29.5.1830." In *Listy Ján Kollára I, 1816–1839*, edited by Jozef Ambruš, 99–100. Martin: Matica slovenská.
- Kollár, Ján. (1837) 2008. *Reciprocity between the Various Tribes and Dialects of the Slavic Nation*, translated and edited by Alexander Maxwell. Bloomington: Slavica.
- Kollár, Ján. 2009. "Pamäti z mladších rokov života." In *Dielo*, 141–307. Edited by Miroslav Vojtech. Bratislava: Kalligram.
- Kürti, László. 2012. "Liberty, Equality, and Nationality: National Liberalism, Modernization, and Empire in Hungary in the Nineteenth Century." In *Liberal Imperialism in Europe*, edited by Matthew P. Fitzpatrick, 91–114. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Launer, Štěpan. 1847. *Povaha Slovanstva, se zvláštním ohledem na spisovní řeč Čechů, Moravanů, Slezáků a Slováků*. Lipsko: Slovanské knihkupectví.

- Macura, Vladimír. 1983. *Znamení zrodu. České obrození jako kulturní typ*. Prague: Československý spisovatel.
- Martinkovič, Marcel. 2020. "The Ethics of Responsibility in Ján Palárik's Civic Liberalism." *Ethics & Bioethics (in Central Europe)* 10 (3–4): 133–145.
- Masaryk, Tomáš Garrigue. (1895) 1990. *Česká otázka. Naše nynější krize*. Prague: Svoboda.
- Masaryk, Tomáš Garrigue. (1894) 2017. "List J. S. Macharovi z Bystričky 26.8.1894 (list č. 30)." In *Korespondence. T. G. Masaryk – Josef Vatropluk Machar, sv. 1 (1893–1895)*, edited by Helena Kokešová, Petr Kotyk, and Irena Kraitlová, 124–126. Prague: Masarykův ústav a Archiv AV ČR.
- Matula, Vladimír. 1999. "Komentáre II." In *Ludovít Štúr, Listy IV. Dodatky*, edited by Vladimír Matula, 201–265. Bratislava: Národné literárne centrum.
- Maxwell, Alexander. 2005. "Multiple Nationalism: National Concepts in Nineteenth-Century Hungary and Benedict Anderson's 'Imagined Communities.'" *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 11 (3): 385–414.
- Maxwell, Alexander. 2008. "Ján Kollár's Literary Nationalism." In *Reciprocity between the Various Tribes and Dialects of the Slavic Nation* by Ján Kollár, 1–67. Translated and edited by Alexander Maxwell. Bloomington: Slavica.
- Maxwell, Alexander. 2009. *Choosing Slovakia: Slavic Hungary, the Czechoslovak Language and Accidental Nationalism*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Maxwell, Alexander. 2016. "Hungaro-German Dual Nationality: Germans, Slavs, and Magyars during the 1848 Revolution." *German Studies Review* 39 (1): 17–39.
- Maxwell, Alexander. 2018. "'Suppliant Nationalism' in Slovakia and Wales: Polyethnic Rights during the Nineteenth Century." *Central Europe* 16 (1): 29–50.
- Maxwell, Alexander. 2019. *Everyday Nationalism in Hungary, 1789–1867*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Maxwell, Alexander. 2020. "Contingency and 'National Awakening.'" *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 26 (2): 183–201.
- Maxwell, Alexander & Turner, Molly. 2020. "Nationalists Rejecting Statehood: Three Case Studies from Wales, Catalonia, and Slovakia." *Nations and Nationalism* 26 (3): 692–707.
- Mésároš, Július. 1978. "Na prahu nového storočia." In *Slovensko: Dejiny I.*, edited by Ján Tibenský, 591–651. Bratislava: Obzor.
- Mináč, Vladimír. (1965) 2014. "Tu žije národ." In *Dúchanie do pahrieb. Návraty k prevratu*, 15–41. Bratislava: Matica slovenská.
- O'Donnell, Stephen. 2019. "The 'Slovakization' of 19th-Century Migrants from Upper Hungary to the United States: A Case Study in the Politics of Language Use." *Nationalities Papers* 47 (5): 840–852.
- Ormis, Ján V., ed. 1973. *O reč a národ. Slovenské národné obrany z rokov 1832–1848*. Bratislava: SAV.
- Palacký, František. 1846. "O národech uherských, zvláště Slovanech." In *Hlasové o potřebě jednoty spisovného jazyka pro Čechy, Morawany a Slowáky*, edited by Ján Kollár, 25–33. Prague: Kronberger & Řivnáč.
- Palacký, František. (1829) 1879. "Dopisy Františka Palackého k Janu Kollárovi." *Časopis Musea království českého* 53 (25): 378–397.
- Palárik, Ján. (1860) 2010. "What Should We Expect from the Hungarian Constitution for Our Nationality and What Do We Need Most Now?" In *Modernism: The Creation of Nation-States*, edited by Ahmet Ersoy, Maciej Górny, and Vangelis Kechriotis, 46–49. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Paul, David W. 1985. "Slovak Nationalism and the Hungarian State 1870–1910." In *Ethnic Groups and the State*, edited by Paul Brass, 115–159. London: Croom Helm.
- Péter, László. 2012. *Hungary's Long Nineteenth Century: Constitutional and Democratic Traditions in a European Perspective*, edited by Miklós Lójkó. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Pichler, Tibor. 2011. *Etнос a polis. Zo slovenského a uhorského politického myslenia*. Bratislava: Kalligram.
- Prelick, István. 1841. "Pillantás Magyarország állapotjára." *Századunk* 4 (51–52): 394–397.
- Podrimavský, Milan. 1983. *Slovenská národná strana v druhej polovici XIX. storočia*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Pulszky, Ferenc. (1842) 1943. "A szlávok literariai viszonyosságáról." In *Slovenský prestolný prosbopis z roku 1842, II. diel. Dokumenty*, edited by Daniel Rapant, 410–413. Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš: Transcius.
- Pulszky, Ferenc. (1841) 1943. "Ungarische Zustände. Aus Ungarn. Anfang März." In *Slovenský prestolný prosbopis z roku 1842, II. diel. Dokumenty*, edited by Daniel Rapant, 139–140. Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš: Transcius.
- Pynsent, Robert B. 1994. *Questions of Identity: Czech and Slovak Ideas of Nationality and Personality*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Rapant, Daniel. 1950. *Slovenské povstanie roku 1848–49, diel druhý*. Turčiansky Svätý Martin: Matica slovenská.
- Rapant, Daniel. 1943. *Slovenský prestolný prosbopis z roku 1842, diel prvý. Úvod*. Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš: Transcius.
- Rapant, Daniel. 1937. *Slovenské povstanie roku 1848–49, diel prvý*. Turčiansky Svätý Martin: Matica slovenská.
- Sasinek, Franko V. 1878. *Dejiny drevnych národov na území terajšieho Uhorska*, 2nd ed. Turčiansky Svätý Martin: Kníhtlačiarsky účastinársky spolok.
- Seton-Watson, Robert. 1908. *Racial Problems in Hungary*. London: Archibald Constable.
- Smith, Anthony D. 2009. *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: A Cultural Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Anthony D. 1999. *Myths and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Anthony D. 1998. *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Anthony D. 1995. *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Smith, Anthony D. 1991. *National Identity*. London: Penguin Books.
- Smith, Anthony D. 1988. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, 2nd ed. Malden: Blackwell.
- Spiesz, Anton, and Dusan Caplovic. 2006. *Illustrated Slovak History*, edited by Ladislav J. Bolchazy. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers.
- Šafárik, Pavol Jozef. (1842) 1955. *Slovanský národopis*. Prague: ČSAV.
- Šafárik, Pavol Jozef. 1837. *Slowanské starožitnosti*. Prague: Pomocj Českého museum.
- Šafárik, Pavol Jozef. 1826. *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten*. Ofen: Kön. Ung. Universitäts.
- Šembera, Alois Wojtěch. 1846. "Z dopisu J. Kollárovi." In *Hlasové o potřebě jednoty spisovného jazyka pro Čechy, Morawany a Slowáky*, edited by Ján Kollár, 183–184. Prague: Kronberger & Řiwnáč.
- Štefánek, Anton. (1910) 1973. "Mladé Maďarstvo." In *Literárne vzťahy slovensko-maďarské*, edited by Rudolf Chmel, 273–275. Martin: Osveta.
- Štefanovič, Samuel D. (1886) 1988. "Slovenské povstanie z roku 1848/49. Na základe pravdy a skutočnosti..." In *Slovenské povstanie 1848–1849*, edited by Cyril Kraus, 183–223. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Štúr, Ludovít. (1844–1855) 1956. *Listy II (1844–1855)*. Edited by Jozef Ambruš. Bratislava: VSAV.
- Štúr, Ludovít. (1847) 1986. "Naše nádeje a žiadosti k nastávajúcemu snemu." In *Dielo II*, 128–149. Edited by Jozef Ambruš. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Štúr, Ludovít. (1846) 1986a. "Jánovi Kollárovi." In *Dielo I*, 323–324. Edited by Jozef Ambruš. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Štúr, Ludovít. (1846) 1986b. "Naše polozenie vo vlasti." In *Dielo I*, 541–554. Edited by Jozef Ambruš. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Štúr, Ludovít. 1843. *Die Beschwerden und Klagen der Slaven in Ungarn*. Leipzig: Robert Binder.
- Taylor, Alan John Percivale. 1948. *The Habsburg Monarchy 1809–1918*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Teich, Mikuláš, Dušan Kováč, and Martin D. Brown. 2011. *Slovakia in History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thaisz, Endre. 1825. "Elme-futtatás a' Magyar Nyelv' becsüléséről." *Felső-Magyarországi Minerva* 1 (4): 483–488.
- Waldenberg, Marek. 2000. *Narody zależne i mniejszości narodowe w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej. Dzieje konfliktów i idei*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Yakobson, Alexander. 2013. "State, National Identity, Ethnicity: Normative and Constitutional Aspects." In *Nations: The Long History and Deep Roots of Political Ethnicity and Nationalism* by Azar Gat, 328–379. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zay, Carl. 1841. *Protestantismus, Magyarismus, Slawismus*. Leipzig: Georg Wigand.
- Zátúrecký, Adolf Peter. 1897. *Slovenská príslovia, pořekadla a úslovia*. Prague: Česká akademie.
- Zozulak, Ján. 2021. "Philosophical, Anthropological and Axiological Aspects of Constantine's Definition of Philosophy." *Ethics & Bioethics (in Central Europe)* 11 (1–2): 14–22.