REVIEWS


This collection of articles on “the Slavic idea” is the fruit of a conference held in July 1992 in Tratten/Pošišče in the Gail valley. Not far from the conference site, in Wittenig/Vitence, the great Slovene proponent of “the Slavic idea,” Matija Majar-Ziljski, was born in 1809. The conference, however, was not commemorating Majar’s birth, but rather the hundredth anniversary of his death (he passed away in the unofficial capital of the Habsburg Slavs, Prague, on 31 July 1892). As Andreas Moritsch notes in his introduction, the conference was also marking another death—that of the multinational Slavic state, since what might be considered the last three political embodiments of the Slavic idea (the USSR, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia) had broken down, or were about to break down, into their constituent components when the conference took place. It was time, Moritsch writes, to take stock.

Judging by the published papers, the conference performed its task scrupulously; in fact, this volume is exceptionally coherent for a collection of conference papers, remarkably comprehensive and surprisingly even in quality (in my judgment, eight out of the ten contributions are solid). The articles focus on ideas of Slavic unity and reciprocity, with special attention to Russophile pan-Slavism and Austro-Slavism, within the context of the history of the national awakenings and national movements of individual Slavic nations. The time frame is the nineteenth century. The nations treated in some depth in this relatively short volume are the Slovaks, Czechs, Poles, Slovenes, Bulgarians, Serbs, Ukrainians (of Galicia) and Belarusians. Given the Majar connection, it is only appropriate that three of the ten articles have special reference to Slovene history.

Antoni Cetnarowicz’s contribution concerns “Polish-Slovene relations from the viewpoint of the Slavic idea.” (Cetnarowicz is the author of a Polish-language monograph, published in 1990, on the Slovene national movement and its positions on Polish
affairs.) In his article Cetnarowicz surveys pan-Slavic currents in Polish political and cultural life from 1795 to 1848 and then concentrates on Polish-Slovene relations from 1848 to the early 1870s. In the latter period, Slovenes and Poles often found themselves on the opposite side of issues. During the revolution of 1848-49 Slovene political activists tended to be pro-Austrian and pro-Habsburg, which led to tensions with the more revolutionary Polish democrats. In 1867, after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise was struck, Poles and Slovenes in the monarchy differed in their attitude towards Russia. The Poles had no love for the great Slavic power that had only a few years earlier crushed the Polish insurrection, and they were also quite satisfied with the new dualist arrangement in the Habsburg realm. Among Slovenes, however, especially those of the Young Slovene camp, anti-Habsburg, pro-Russian, pan-Slavic sentiments grew in strength, and a Slovene delegation participated in the “pilgrimage” to Moscow in 1867. Relations were also complicated by the Slovenes’ sympathies for the Ruthenians (Ukrainians) in their struggle against Polish domination in the crownland of Galicia.

Zoran Konstantinović’s article discusses “Matija Majar and the Slavic idea among the Serbs.” In the first half of the article Konstantinovic examines Majar’s ideas on a common Slavic and especially South-Slavic literary language. He cites passages from Majar’s writings of the 1840s composed in a language that was neither Serbo-Croatian nor Slovene, but an invented compromise between them. Later Majar decided that each individual Slavic nation should use its own language for internal communication, but should use a second Slavic language for wider regional communication (thus Slovenes should use Serbo-Croatian, Slovaks Czech, etc.) and Russian as a vehicle for pan-Slavic communication. Konstantinovic points out that Majar did much to promote knowledge of the Cyrillic alphabet among Catholic Slavs, particularly in his journal Slavjan (published in Prague, 1873-75). The second half of Konstantinović’s article discusses the Slavic idea among the Serbs, particularly their cool reception of Illyrianism and warmer interest in more Orthodox-oriented, Russophile pan-Slavism.

The concluding article in the volume was written by the editor, Andreas Moritsch. It differs thematically from the other contributions, discussing “national differentiation in Carinthia in the era
of Matija Majar-Ziljski.” Although it has relatively little to say about the Slavic idea, it is one of the most interesting pieces in the collection. Methodologically attractive, it uses microhistory to explore larger historical processes. The primary source base consists chiefly of old parish and school chronicles of the Gail valley, including the parish chronicle of Göriach/Gorje where Majar served. The entries quoted shed an interesting and often amusing light on Majar’s views and character (e.g., after being reproved and fined by his bishop for participating in the Moscow pilgrimage of 1867, Majar signed a letter to the same prelate with the words “gehorsamst gefertiger Moskaureisender and glücklich Wiederzurückgekommener,” which might be translated as “the most obediently former Moscow traveller and fortunately returned person,” p. 137). Moritsch also introduces his own grandfather, grandmother and native village into his narrative. All the anecdotal evidence mounts up, however, to construct a larger point: the historical rivalry between the German and Slovene languages and cultures in this region cannot be interpreted simply as a national conflict, since it was often driven by more powerful social and political divisions. German was the language of choice of the petty bourgeoisie, civil servants and upwardly mobile peasants; it was also the language of “progress” (Moritsch’s ironical quotation marks) and Liberalism. Slovene was favoured by the curates and the smaller-holding peasantry; it was the language of tradition and Catholicism.

The volume contains a comprehensive index of persons (including scholars cited in the footnotes) and is graced with a portrait of Majar on the cover.

The Slavic idea may well be, as Moritsch suggests, dead, but this volume does raise a few doubts. These papers of the Majar-Ziljski symposium appear as the first special issue (Beihalt) of Bratislava’s Slovanské štúdie. Also, the Belaruso-Bulgaro-Czecho-Polish-Serbo-Slovako-Slovene-Ukrainian authors’ collective seems to have cooperated very successfully. In any case, all who are interested in the intellectual history of East Central Europe in the nineteenth century should be quite pleased with this volume.
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