Herder, Kollár, and the Origins of Slavic Ethnography

Alexander Maxwell

Philosophy of Johann Gottfried von Herder thoroughly informed ideas of a poet Ján Kollár. Nevertheless, Kollár was more than merely a conduit for transmitting Herder’s ideas: he selected, interpreted and transformed Herder’s philosophy in the service of his literary Pan-Slavism.
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Ethnography and anthropology have contributed the history of East-Central Europe, since ethnographic ideas helped form ideas of national community, and thus nationalism. Specifically, the philosophy of Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803) shaped the proto-ethnographic imagination of several patriots who later laid the foundations of ethnography and anthropology as scholarly disciplines. The Pan-Slav poet Ján Kollár (1793–1852), one of Herder’s most influential disciples, has not attracted as much scholarly attention from historians of ethnography, but his ideas also shaped the ethnographic agenda of Slavic scholars. Subsequent contributors will consider in detail the development of ethnography and anthropology in various national contexts. This chapter, however, shows how late German Enlightenment philosophy and Romantic Pan-Slav nationalism helped lay the foundations of ethnography in East-Central Europe.

While John Zammito ranks Herder among “the earliest and most radical advocates of supplanting philosophy with anthropology,” (Zammito 2002: 3) few modern academics would classify him as either anthropologist or ethnographer. He never left Europe, and spent most of his life working as a pastor. One recent biography speaks instead of his “historical-philosophical approach” (Alder and Koepke 2009: 1). His earliest works often had philological themes, but eventually his ruminations on the philosophy of language culminated in a four-volume study Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit (1784–1791). This theological and historical work proved
enormously influential among German-speaking scholars, and won Herder a European reputation. It also appeared in English translation as *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man* as early as 1800 (reprinted in 1803), and in French as *Idées sur la philosophie de l'histoire de l'humanité* in 1828 (Herder 1827–28).\(^1\)

Herder’s theory of history rested on theological foundations, but nevertheless remains a characteristic product of the Enlightenment. Sharing the Enlightenment’s quintessential confidence that human reason could reveal all mysteries and solve all problems, Herder set himself the goal of creating “a philosophy and science of what concerns us most nearly, of the history of mankind at large” (Herder 1803a: x).\(^2\) He began with the assumption that human history developed in accordance with a divine plan:

> Many steps and events in the history of the human race are to me incomprehensible, without the operation of superior influence. For instance, that man should have brought himself into the road of improvement, and invented language and the first science, without a superior guidance, appears to me inexplicable. (Herder 1803a: 230, Book 5)

Herder believed that human reason could reveal the laws of human history, much as Isaac Newton had discovered celestial mechanics: “Man is also a part of the creation, and in his wildest extravagances and passions must obey laws, not less beautiful and excellent than those, by which all the celestial bodies move” (Herder 1803b: 269, Book 15). Indeed, in what a sarcastic British critic dubbed “a kind of mystic pythagoreanism,” (The British Critic 1803a: 155) Herder consciously evoked Newton’s methods by discussing the virtues of the world’s various civilizations with a curious metaphor from differential calculus:

> Through all the polished nations ... a chain of cultivation may be drawn, flying off in extremely divergent curves. In each it designates increasing and decreasing greatness, and has maximums of every kind. Many of these exclude or limit one another, till at length a certain symmetry takes place in the whole. (Herder 1803b: 295, Book 15, Ch. 3)

Herder proposed no equations and the calculation of such maxima remained entirely metaphorical. Such mathematical imagery nevertheless illustrates the general Enlightenment fascination with Newton’s achievements.

Herder foreshadowed ethnography by taking an interest in peoples living in all parts of the globe. Like many contemporary clergymen, he emphasized the unity of the human race, and specifically rejected the idea of multiple human races (Herder 1803a: 298, Book 7, Ch. 1). Admittedly, Herder’s discussion of negro physiognomy, obsessed

---


\(^2\) Churchill’s preface in Herder (1803a) gives this passage in italics.
as it is with lip size and skin color, makes painful reading today: “the lips, breasts, and private parts, are proportionate to each other: and as Nature ... must have conferred on these people, to whom she was obliged to deny nobler gifts, an ampler measure of sensual enjoyment” (Herder 1803a: 269, Book 4, Ch. 4). Nevertheless, Herder also emphasized European ignorance of African life, and condemned European exploitation of African societies: “how many happy and peaceful nations may dwell at the feet of the Mountains of the Moon! Europeans are unworthy to behold their happiness; for they have unpardonably sinned, and still continue to sin, against this quarter of the globe” (Herder 1803a: 266, Book 4, Ch. 4).

Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit repeatedly urged further study of peoples that had previously aroused little curiosity among Herder’s contemporaries. Herder discussed the Winnebago and Ojibwe (Chippewa) of North America (Herder 1803a: 278, Book 4, Ch. 6) and the Chukchi and Kurile Islanders in east Siberia (Herder 1803a: 250, Book 4, Ch. 2), lamenting that “of the inhabitants of Nubia and the interior regions of Africa beyond it, we know but little” (Herder 1803a: 261, Book 4, Ch. 4). While Herder took a disproportionate (and Eurocentric) interest in the Ancient Greeks and Romans, his work stimulated scholarly interest in non-European peoples among scholarly circles in central Europe. A scholarly journal in Göttingen, for example, recommended “the fruitful and erudite genius of the immortal Herder” as a guide to ancient Persian culture.3 In 1804, a Bavarian periodical similarly reported that Herder’s philosophy provided “a new perspective on the mysterious ruins at Tschelminhor [probably the Mayan temple at Chichen Itza] or Persepolis,” and had inspired contemporary efforts “to decipher the cuneiform and hieroglyphs there.”4

Herder analyzed nations primarily in terms of their contribution to human progress. Herder’s comments on the world’s major civilizations strike a decidedly triumphal tone: “Nations modify themselves, according to time, place, and their internal character: each bears in itself the standard of its perfection, totally independent of all comparison with that of others.” ((Herder 1803b: 293–294, Book 15, Ch. 5) Significantly, however, Herder also emphasized the positive when discussing “rude” peoples, though he sometimes struggled to find something positive to say.

Modern ethnographers and anthropologists might not fully recognize their discipline in Herder’s thinking. Modern scholars might object, for example, to ranking civilizations along any measures of “perfection,” though Swiss theologian Alexandre-César Chavannes, frequently if incorrectly credited with having coined the word “ethnology” in 1787, defined the subject as “the history of peoples progressing toward civilization.”5

---

3 Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen, vol. 131 (16 August 1806), 1297, [1297-1310].
Yet most modern ethnographers would probably applaud Herder’s insistence that non-European civilizations have their own validity, and contribute to humanity’s betterment. In a discussion of northern Asia, for example, Herder opined that “the people of China may boast, that they have contributed more to soften the rude nations of this vast region, than the Europeans probably in all the four quarters of the globe” (Herder 1803b: 20, Book 11, Ch. 2). He consciously downplayed European achievements in arts and sciences, observing that Europeans stood on the shoulders of other civilizations: “vain is the boast of so many Europeans, when they set themselves above the people of all the other quarters of the globe ... for no other reason, but because they were born amid the confluence of these inventions and traditions” (Herder 1803a: 434, Book 9, Ch. 3).

Perhaps Herder’s most important contribution to ethnographic thought in East-Central Europe, however, came from in his conviction that God steered history through the vehicle of nations and cultures. If each human culture had some unique contribution to make to humanity, then each individual culture merited careful study. Herder particularly emphasized the importance of language: “By speech alone we attain to reason” (Herder 1803a: 426, Book 9, Ch. 2). Since knowledge of foreign civilizations, particularly vanished civilizations, depended on understanding their language, Herder insisted on linguistic particularism in literature: every nation should cultivate its own language and literature. Consequently, Herder’s thought implicitly justified political struggles against linguistic assimilation.

Many scholars interpret Herder’s celebration of linguistic diversity as a German response to French cultural hegemony, thus as a manifestation of German nationalism, and therefore of the “cultural nationalism” supposedly characteristic in Germany (Hayes 1927; Penrose and May 1991; Lyon 1994; Spencer 1997; Fox 2003). Herder’s linguistic chauvinism, however, should not be overstated. John Edwards noted in his recent study Language and Identity, Herder “was certainly less strident than some of his followers” (Edwards 2009: 209). Like most moralists of his age, Herder simply urged Germans to show fidelity to traditional culture, and so condemned the then-popular tendency to adopt the French language as a sign of sophistication, along with the equally popular French fashions, furniture and philosophy.

Herder’s reputation as a philosopher perhaps encourages historians to give him the whole credit (blame?) for all subsequent manifestations of linguistic nationalism in throughout Central Europe. Linguistic nationalists drew inspiration from Herder’s philosophy, but they first needed to radicalize and politicize Herder’s ruminations. The “idealization and exaggeration” (Gombocz 1997) of Herder’s ideas among subsequent nationalist circles has, in fact, attracted considerable attention among scholars of

---

6 For a good historiographic overview, see Löchte 2005: 75–99; see also Ergang 1931; Knoll 1996; Springer 1994; Kamenetsky 1973.
East-Central Europe. Most studies of Slavic intellectual history discuss Herder at least in passing, and at least six scholars have published scholarly works with the phrase “Herder and the Slavs” in the title (Janeff 1939; Birke 1950; Sydoruk 1956; Lehmann 1978; Drews 1990; Caussat 1996). Many Slavs, however, experienced Herder’s influence through the mediation of Slavic intellectuals who re-interpreted Herder in light of their own experiences and concerns.

Ján Kollár, not to be confused with Viennese historian and early ethnographer Adam Kollár (1718–1783), proved Herder’s most influential Slavic disciple. He was born in a small town in Hungary’s Túrócz county, now part of Slovakia’s Žilina county. Like Herder, Kollár worked most of his life as a pastor. He came from a Slovak family, studied Lutheran theology in Jena, but spent most of his career in Budapest. He is best remembered as a Pan-Slav poet, but also spent much of his career promoting Slavic studies, including ethnography.

Kollár’s Pan-Slavism drew on the example of German nationalism, which Kollár experienced first-hand while studying in Jena. In 1817, he attended the Wartburg festivities with his fellow students (Rosenbaum 1968: 535–540; Murko 1897). He subsequently described the experience as a fall from grace: “I had savored the fruit from the tree of nationality, bitter and painful to the soul” (Ďurčanský 1965: 119). Returning to Hungary, he applied the German model of nationalism to Slavdom, a nation which in Kollár’s mind stretched over “half of Europe, a third of Asia, and a significant section of America” (Kollár 1844: 57; 2009: 108). Though Slavic unity has subsequently proved elusive, contemporary skepticism about Pan-Slavism’s viability must not distract scholarly attention away from the passion that the Slavic ideal aroused during the nineteenth century.

As a form of “nationalism,” Slovak Pan-Slavism stands out for its lack of a political agenda. Ján Herkel, the Slovak lawyer who first coined the term “Panslavism,” defined it in 1826 as “unity in literature” (Herkel 1826: 4; for a full description of Herkel’s proposals, see Maxwell 2003: 129–149). In 1830, Ljudevít Gaj characterized it as “the inner desire to bring all Slavic brothers to linguistic-literary unity” (Gaj 1830: 25). After fear of Russian expansionism transformed “Panslavism” into a bogey, one self-professed “Pan-Slav” distinguished between “political” and “literary” Panslavism, concluding in 1843 “the political Pan-Slavism has no friends among us, but the literary has many, and wins
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7 For Herder’s impact on Czechs, Hungarians, Serbs, Croats, Slovenians, and the Baltic Countries, see Andraschke and Loos 2002; for Herder’s impact on Slovaks and Armenians, see Otto 1996; on the Czechs, see David 2007 and Loužil (2005); on the Slavs generally, see Bittner 1929. See also Ziegengeist, Grasshof and Lehmann 1978; Wilson 1973; Ergang 1966; Domdey 1995; Namowicz 1994; Adler 1966; Sundhaussen 1973.
9 Consider three biographies: Ginsberg 1942; Nečásek 1952; Kirschbaum 1966.
10 This passage was originally printed in italics for emphasis.
ever more” (Hojč 1843: 99). Political Pan-Slavism circulated among some Russian patriot circles (Fadner 1862; Petrovich 1956; Kohn 1960),11 which in turn encouraged certain South-Slavs (MacKenzie 1967; Milojković-Djurić 1994; Zlatar 2007; Teržić 2006), a few Poles also developed a non-literary Panslavism (Lednicki 1928; Maxwell 2008), but political Panslavism existed most forcefully in Russophobic Non-Slavic imaginations (on the “bogey” of Panslavism, see Thomson 1951; Varga 1993).

Kollár’s Pan-Slavism, in any event, took the form of “scholarly interest,” to borrow Miroslav Hroch’s influential description of nationalism’s initial phase in East-Central Europe (Hroch 1985: 23; on Hroch’s impact see Maxwell 2010). He made his reputation with an epic poem conflating his love for the Slavic nation with his love for a beautiful allegorical goddess (Kollár 1825; later expanded to Kollár 1832).12 He then helped compile the Národiné zpiewanky, a two-volume collection of folk songs (Kollár 1835), illustrating Tibor Berend’s dictum that “the national movement of Central and Eastern Europe began with romantic folklorizing by a handful of intellectuals” (Berend 2003: 49) Kollár also participated in orthographic debates, a topic which aroused so much passion in the Habsburg Empire that some of his contemporaries spoke of an “alphabet war” or “language war.”13 In 1846, when Lutheran patriot Ľudovít Štúr wrote a distinct Slovak orthography and a pamphlet advocating its use (Štur 1846a, 1846b), Kollár rallied the defenders of biblìctina (“Biblical Czech”) (Kollár 1846).14 Most importantly, Kollár wrote a book on “Slavic Reciprocity,” Über die Wechselseitigkeit zwischen die verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation [hereafter, Wechselseitigkeit], which advocated a Pan-Slavic literature.15

Kollár’s activism rested on a Herderian cosmology. Herder had briefly mentioned the Slavs, urging them to cultivate themselves:

it is to be wished that ... the continually decaying remains of their customs, songs and traditions [be] collected; and such a global history of this race ultimately completed, as the picture of mankind requires.

(Herder 1803b: 484, Book 16)

11 Though Ludovít Štúr was a Slovak, his Slawenthum und die Welt der Zukunft might also count as Russian Pan-Slavism, since it was published first in Russian as Slavjanstvo i mir budushchego (Štúr 1867), later from the original German manuscript the benefit of scholars as Das Slawenthum und die Welt der Zukunft (Štúr 1931), but only appeared in Slovak after the collapse of Communism as Slovanstvo a svet budúcnosti (Štúr 1993).

12 The volume has frequently been reprinted; see also Wiesner (1924).

13 The Slovene case is canonical; see Čop 1833. Several other commentators used the martial metaphor to discuss linguistic struggles generally, see Világosváry 1841 add Roth 1845.

14 For diverging views of this work and its impact, see Horák 2007; Short 1996; Maxwell 2009.

15 A Czech version of this essay appeared in the journal Hronika in 1836; it attracted enough interest for Kollár to prepare a German version in 1837. I cite the definitive 1844 version, which differs from the 1837 version mostly in pagination. Russian, Serbian and Czech translations appeared in 1840, 1845, and 1853, respectively. For a Slovak translation, finally, see Rosenbaum 1954. Citations below give page numbers first from the German original and then from my own English translation (Kollár 2009).
The study of Slavic culture, for Herder, furthered the understanding of humanity. When Kollár devoted himself to collecting Slavic folk songs, therefore, he was, in a way, carrying out the ethnographic research agenda that Herder set forth in *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*.

Kollár’s self-image as a Slav also owed something to Herder’s comments. Herder’s brief discussion of the Slavic peoples had emphasized the positive, but Herder apparently struggled to find something to praise. In the end, he characterized Slavs as “liberal, hospitable to excess, lovers of pastoral freedom, but submissive and obedient, enemies to spoil and rapine” (Herder n.d.: 483, Book 16). He also ended with an optimistic prediction for the future:

> These now deeply sunk, but once industrious and happy people will at length awake from their long and heavy slumber, shake off the chaos of slavery, enjoy the possession of their delightful lands from the Adriatic sea to the Carpathian mountains, from the Don to the Vltava, and celebrate their ancient festivals of peaceful trade and industry. (Herder 1803b: 484)

Kollár, it seems, took sincere pride in Herder’s description, boasting in *Wechselseitigkeit* that Slavic nation was “exceptional for its mild habits and love of freedom, its hard work and industriousness, its trade, agriculture and mining,” and elsewhere that Slavs prefer “a pure, quiet, and peaceful way to earn a living, such as agriculture, not noisy and bloody professions” (Kollár 1844: 48, 67; 2009: 102, 115). Kollár was most entranced, however, by Herder’s vision of a glorious Slavic future. Kollár proposed a theological explanation why Slavs had heretofore played but a modest role in world history: “The Lord of the World assigns each people and each century a role in the great drama, and some peoples must wait longer than others to appear on stage” (Kollár 1844: 66; 2009: 114). Kollár’s Slavic activism thus sought to lay the groundwork for the Slavs’ future splendor; which would, in the end, enrich all of humanity.

Kollár differed significantly from Herder, however, in his vision of humanity’s future perfection. Herder, recall, had taken an interest in all types of human achievement:

> among the Chinese it was refined political morality; with the Hindus a kind of refined purity, quiet assiduity in labour, and endurance; with the Phoenicians, the spirit of navigation, and commercial industry. The culture of the Greeks, particularly at Athens, proceeded on the maximum of sensual beauty, both in arts and manners, in science and political institutions (Herder 1803b: 293–294, Book 15, Ch. 3)

---

16 Churchill refers to the Vltava river as the “Muldaw,” an awkward attempt to render the German “Moldau” with English spelling.

17 I have taken the liberty of replacing Churchill’s “hindoos” with “Hindus.”
Where Herder dreamed of humanity’s future progress in science, morality, industry, arts and political institutions, Kollár’s passion, by contrast, only extended to literature and linguistics. Politics, government, commerce, and industry held little interest for Kollár; he showed particular contempt for military glory, which he dismissed as “battles, campaigns, the spilling of blood, conquests and enslavement,” though he also claimed that Slavs were “brave in war” (Kollár 1844: 45, 48; 2009: 100, 102). Wechselseitigkeit discussed by name Byron, Cervantes, Goethe, Homer, Horace, Klopstock, Lessing, Mickiewicz, Pushkin, Schiller, Shakespeare, Virgil, Voltaire, and Wieland. It also mentioned at least twenty grammarians or lexicographers. Kollár referred to Alexander the Great because of his supposed inability to overcome Greek dialectical differences: how many authors could mention Alexander only in a dialectological context (Kollár 1844: 14; 2009: 80)?

Both Kollár and Herder saw nations as historical actors with roles in the unfolding drama of human progress, and both judged various nations in terms of caricatured personalities. Since Kollár saw the primary function of the nation as the production of belles lettres, he imagined the glorious Slavic future in literary terms. To help future Slavic literary geniuses produce their masterpieces, Kollár specifically proposed that literati from all four “tribes” of the Slavic nation (i.e., Russians, Poles, Illyrians, and Czechs) should read literature written in other “dialects” of the Slavic language. This would boost the potential market for Slavic literature and enrich each Slavic “dialect,” and help the dialects to “stamp out foreign words and expressions, reject Latinisms, Germanisms, Tatarisms, Magyarisms, and so on, and be able to enrich itself from true Slavic sources” (Kollár 1844: 73; 2009: 119).

Take away the nuisance of tribes and the barriers of dialects, and all this jealousy directed against the great men and merits of other tribes will cease. Slavic history is the common property of all Slavs, and in the light of Reciprocity Slavic literature will become a shimmering diamond, with many rays and only one focus, and its concentrated bejeweled light will play in all colors. (Kollár 1844: 36; 2009: 94)

So would language planning contribute to Slavdom’s future glory.

Modern scholars may find the idea of a single Slavic literature hard to understand, since Russian and Polish could boast established literary traditions using different alphabets even in Kollár’s day. While the idea of a single “language” encompassing multiple literary traditions has lost its currency for modern Slavic patriots, modern scholars must acknowledge that it appealed to many Habsburg Slavs during the nineteenth century, and particularly to Slovaks (Maxwell 2003). Kollár himself insisted that a national literature could arise despite the different scripts: “who lacks the desire or energy to face difficulties with alphabets ... is no great loss for the Slavic nation” (Kollár 1844: 68; 2009: 115). Nevertheless, Kollár also hoped to reduce the number of Slavic alphabets, and as mentioned above, opposed Štúr’s attempt to codify a new literary Slovak.
In his enthusiasm for “literary dialects” of the Slavic language, Kollár broke with Herder. Herder had greatly prized literacy: “All nations who have been destitute of this artificial tradition have remained, according to our ideas, uncultivated” (Herder 1803a: 429). He had nevertheless assumed that written language would decrease linguistic diversity, and acknowledged that the loss of diversity implied certain disadvantages:

Not only are the living accents and gestures, which formerly gave language such power to penetrate the heart, gradually extinguished by writing; not only are dialects, and consequently the characteristic idioms of particular tribes and nations, rendered less numerous; but the memories of men, and the spirit of their mental powers, are enfeebled by this artificial assistance of prescribed forms of thought.

Since writing alone enabled a culture to pass its ideas to subsequent generations, however, Herder thought the price of literacy worth paying: writing, he concluded, was the most durable, quiet, efficacious institution of God, by means of which nation acts upon nation, age upon age, and through which the whole human species will in time find itself encircled in one chain of fraternal tradition. (Herder 1803a: 430)

Kollár, by contrast, thought Slavs could avoid the drawbacks of literacy. Literary dialects would, he believed, combine the benefits of literacy without any loss of dialectical diversity. Indeed, he went further: “It is a great fortune for a language that wishes to elevate itself to education and literature that it has many dialects,” (Kollár 1844: 73; 2009: 119) since the possibility of borrowing vocabulary from other dialects eliminated the need for foreign loan words.

Kollár ended Reciprocity with contained a nine-point plan to promote the Pan-Slavic literature. The first six points concerned belles lettres: Kollár called for Slavic bookstores, book exchanges, university chairs for the study of Slavic literature, a pandialectical literary magazine, Slavic libraries, and language-learning textbooks. Points eight and nine concerned linguistics: Kollár demanded that foreign loan words be purged and called for a Pan-Slavic orthography “which all Slavs can use, at least for those that use the same letters” (Kollár 1844: 97; 2009: 134). Point six, finally, called for “collections and publication of folk songs and proverbs,” (Kollár 1844: 96; 2009: 133) thus foreshadowing subsequent ethnographic research. Kollár urged Slavic patriot-scholars to study folk culture, and several took his advice.

Kollár’s ideas enjoyed great popularity in the early nineteenth century, when Slavic ethnography first emerged as a scholarly discipline. Kollár’s ideas informed the research agenda of several early Slavic ethnographers. Indeed, in 1849 Kollár personally contributed to Slavic ethnography in the Habsburg lands by lecturing on Slavic antiquities at the Alma Mater Rudolfina, today’s University of Vienna. One recent history of Austrian ethnology has suggested that Fran Miklošič, the first professor of Slavic philology in Vienna, “continued the agenda developed by Kollár” by offering
“proto-folkloric courses” on subjects such as “Slavic ‘Folk Poetry,’ ‘Sources of Slavic Mythology,’ and ‘Slavic Ethnography’” (Dow and Bockhom 2004: 18). Additionally, Pavol Šafárik, a Prague-based Slovak scholar whose 1842 Slovanský národopis marks the formal birth of Slavic ethnography, had personally collaborated with Kollár: aforementioned Národiné zpiewánky had been a joint project between the two enthusiasts. Nor was Kollár’s influence restricted to Slovaks, to Lutherans, or to individuals who fell under the spell of his personal charisma. Slovene priest Anton Kreml, receiving Kollár’s Wechselseitikeit from Stanko Vraz, exclaimed he was “very happy to receive so precious a present as Kollár’s golden book … Kollár’s perspective is fantastic, and give us enough work” (Anton Kreml to Jožef Muršec on 22 June 1838, cited from Ilešič 1905: 28).

Given how thoroughly Herder’s philosophy informed Kollár’s ideas, any influence Kollár had on Slavic ethnography implies a proportionate Herderian influence as well. Nevertheless, Kollár was more than a conduit for transmitting Herder’s ideas: Kollár selected, interpreted and transformed Herder’s philosophy in the service of his literary Pan-Slavism. Where Herder had shown a global curiosity, Kollár concentrated his attention on a single people: Kollár shows little evidence of extra-European cosmopolitanism, though he openly admired various non-Slavic poets and authors. Kollár also stressed literary and linguistic issues much more forcefully than Herder, a thinker remembered for his emphasis on language. Perhaps historical accounts of “Herderian linguistic nationalism” in East-Central Europe should be revised in light of Kollár’s interpretation.

Kollár, finally, combined his scholarship with cultural activism. Herder had expressed various liberal opinions, but overall, his research agenda called for descriptive and analytical studies primarily of interest to other scholars. Consider the following lament:

Why can I yet quote no work, that has even in a slight degree fulfilled with wish of Bacon, Leibniz, Sulzer, and others, for a general physiognomy of nations from their languages? Numerous materials for such a work are extant … [yet] The laurel is not yet gathered; it waits for the appearance in due time of another Leibnitz. (Herder 1803a: 428, Book 9, Ch. 2)

Kollár presumably shared Herder’s scholarly curiosity, and his Reciprocity proposed various research projects for future Slavists: comparative dictionaries, translations, and folkloric studies. Yet Kollár concerned himself not only with reaching, but with teaching and outreach. Kollár’s disinterest in high politics did not distract from his social engagement. His proposed bookstores, libraries and university chairs addressed not merely an audience of scholars, but the public at large. In 1849, Kollár even drew up

---

On Kollár and Šafárik’s collaboration, see Caussat, Adamski and Crépon 1996: 183–188.
a school curriculum.\textsuperscript{19} Both Herder and Kollár offered a philosophy of history and a view of the world, but Kollár, in Pynsent’s words, also “provided a programme of action” (Pynsent 1994: 53).

The tension between Herder’s relatively detached observation and Kollár’s engagement thus anticipated an issue that has since proved central to ethnography and anthropology as scholarly disciplines: the tension between impartial observation and social engagement. Many scholars believe that responsible anthropologists should use their knowledge and relative privilege to engage critically with the societies they study (see e.g. Sanford and Angel-Ajani 2006; Ambruster and Lærke 2009); some have even advocated “action anthropology” (Stull and Schensul 1989). Other anthropologists, however, emphasize critical distance and scholarly neutrality. While nineteenth-century positivism has fallen from popularity, some anthropologists still see their discipline as a “science” (Kuznar 1997; Lett 1997; Channa 1998; Edwards, Harvey and Wade 2007). Johannes Fabian has even discussed the possibility of anthropological “objectivity” (see e.g. Fabian 2001). Neither Herder nor Kollár theorized their research philosophy in such terms, but their differences nevertheless remain suggestive: Patricia Caplan may have begun her overview of “anthropology and ethics” (Caplan 2003) in the 1960s, but the tension she describes dates back to the earliest foundations of ethnography as a discipline.
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ZlataL, Zdenko
Herder, Kollár in izviri slovanske etnografije

V članku avtor pojasni, kako sta pozna razsvetljenska filozofija in romantični panslavistični nacionalizem postavile temelje etnografije v Vzhodni in Srednji Evropi. V prispevku je najprej na kratko predstavljena filozofija Johanna Gottfrieda von Herderja (1744–1803), ki je bila podlaga za proto- etnografsko delo številnih raziskovalcev, ki so utemeljili etnografijo in antropologijo kot znanstveni disciplini. Morda Herderjev najpomembnejši prispevek k etnografski misli, ki so ga upoštevali njegovi idejni nasledniki, verjetno izvira iz njegovega prepričanja, da bog usmerja zgodovino skozi posamezne narode in kulture. Če vsaka kultura prispeva enkraten delček v mozaik človeštva, potem si vsaka od njih zasluži tudi natančno preučevanje. Herder je v svojih delih poudarjal še pomen jezika. Ker je razumevanje tujih civilizacij, in sicer predvsem tistih, ki so izginile, odvisno od poznavanja njihovega jezika, je vztrajal pri lingvističnem partikularizmu: vsak narod bi po njegovem moral kultivirati svoj jezik in književost. Takšne ideje so bile v prid tistim posameznikom, ki so nasprotovali jezikovni asimilaciji; močno pa so vplivale tudi na panslovanskega pesnika Jána Kollárja (1793–1852). Bil je eden izmed najvplivnejših Herderjevih učencev, njegov koncept pa so pomembno prispevali k oblikovanju dolgoročnega raziskovalnega načra slovanskih etnografov. Kollárjev panslavizem je bil prežet s primeri iz nemškega nacionalizma, njegov aktivizem pa je temeljil na Herderjevem razumevanju sveta in pogledu na raziskave slovanskih kultur, ki naj bi širile spoznanja o človeštvu. Kollár je torej prevzel Herderjevo raziskovalno radovednost in predlagal različne raziskovalne projekte za bodoče slaviste: primerjalne slovarje, prevode in folkloristične raziskave. (Kljub temu Kollárjevo del doslej v zgodovini etnografije ni bilo deležno opaznejših analiz.) Ni pa se ukvarjal le z raziskavami, temveč tudi s (pre)vzgojo javnosti. Čeprav se ni posebej zanimal za visoko politiko, ga to ni odvrnilo od družbene angažiranosti.

Članek tako predstavi ambivalentnost med Herderjevim relativno oddaljenim in neprizadetim opazovanjem ter Kollárjevo družbeno angažiranostjo. Sprehovorii torej o temi, ki ima še vedno osrednji pomen v etnografiji in antropologiji.
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