HUMAN AFFAIRS, 7, 1997, 2, 141–158

SLOVAKS AND CZECHS. THE SLOVAK AND CZECH LANGUAGES (THE ETHNO-SIGNIFICATIVE, CULTUROLOGICAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL, AND SOCIOLINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN TWO NATIONS AND THEIR LANGUAGES)

Klára Buzássyová and Slavomír Ondrejovič
Ľudovít Štúr Linguistics Institute, Slovak Academy of Sciences,
Panská 26, 813 64 Bratislava, Slovakia

The aim of this study is to correlate knowledge from the areas of history, art history, and sociology, with related linguistic knowledge and so contribute to understanding of the relations ethnicity – culture – language. The authors would also like to contribute to the understanding of the processes currently taking place in several multinational states, which have also had an impact on the relations between the Slovaks and the Czechs.

The terms ethnos, ethnicity, nationality, nation, national identity and others are probably discussed in scientific and popular-scientific publications, at conferences, symposia, in historical, literary, linguistic, and cultural-political journals more often today than several decades ago. The topicality of the issues associated with the elucidation of the relation between the language and the ethno-social-cultural development of a particular national community has increased at present, when reality itself not only confirms but also denies many theoretical concepts of scientists. Multi-ethnic countries are undergoing disintegration or have already been dissolved, e.g. the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia. The end of the year 1992 witnessed the end of more than seventy-years of coexistence of the Slovaks and Czechs within a common Czechoslovak state; on January 1, 1993 two independent states, the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic, came into existence.

The scope of this contribution does not allow us to deal with terminology in more detail. The terminology is not unified; problems and misunderstandings arise, among other reasons, because the conceptual content of identical or parallel terms is often different (the understanding of the term of the nation in Western countries,

in Central and Eastern Europe, problems concerning the terms nationality, ethnic group, etc.). Therefore we will only briefly remark that the concept and term ethnos, ethnic community is used to indicate a dynamic and developmental understanding of the concept as a specific equivalent of the word nation (also understood on the dynamic-developmental basis) – i.e. common, summary denotation, the naming of such formations as tribe, feudal nationality, nation (in terms of modern nations and the naming of nations living at present in monoethnic (one-nation) and multi-ethnic (multinational) states (cf. Bromlej 1980, p. 35; 1983; Blanár 1986, pp. 196–197; Polakovič 1982; Letz 1991; for elucidating the concept of the nation as understood in Western countries in comparison with the understanding in Central and Eastern Europe, particularly in connection with the issues of national minority rights, see also Minorities in Politics. Cultural and Linguistic Rights, 1992).

From among the defining signs of ethnic community or nation, we shall mainly deal with the signs which are regarded as topical from the point of view of the theme of this contribution; that means in evaluating the relations between the Czechs and Slovaks as two Slavic nations, whose closeness has traditionally been recognized not only in Slavistics but also in the comparison of the inter-ethnic relations of genetic and historical fates of unrelated national communities. The characterizing signs which differentiate one ethnic community from another community or nation are as follows:

1. Culture – i.e. such stable and evident components of culture, as language, religion, folk art, oral tradition, habits, rituals, norms of social and ethnic behaviour;

2. The values of cultural heritage as a whole (the fine arts, architecture, literature: in some conceptions this "higher" culture is not included in the characterizing signs of the concept nation but, as we shall show below, in the Slovak-Czech and Slovak-Hungarian relations which cannot be avoided in our theme, the interpretations of these cultural values are significant;

3. Self-awareness – ethnic (national) consciousness (its outer expression being ethnonym), views of common origin, ancestors, common homeland;

4. Common psyche, national feeling based on interiorized existential experiences and commonly experienced decisive historical events together with acquired cultural values create the "memory of the nation";

5. Relationship between nation and state, non-existence of own state, position of the nation within the state from the political, economic, social and cultural perspective, including mostly useless, sometimes more justified sharpening of relations between the civic and national principles;

6. The otherwise very important sign – a common territory is not considered problematic (particularly not in the material level) in the relations between the Slovaks and Czechs. These relations are, however, significant at the spiritual level and especially in attitudes. The positive and negative manifestations in the relations between the two nations are at present influenced by historical modifications of the relations of the members of the Czech nation to Slovakia as a country, meaning a

certain territory (together with its peculiarities), "appropriation" of Slovakia only by means of its territory. C.f. the quotation from the article of the Czech writer L. Vaculík 1990, 1992, p. 32: "Náš dluh (Slovákům = K.B.) zhruba řečeno je v tom, že my jsme si tělesně i duševně rádi osvojili slovenské území, ale neosvojili jsme si stejně samozřejmě slovenské vnímání, cítění, myšlení. Nepřijali jsme do svého vědomí slovenství." (Our debt (to the Slovaks – K.B.) roughly consists in the fact that we enjoyed appropriation of the Slovak territory both spiritually and physically, but we failed to comprehend the Slovak way of perceiving, feeling and thinking with the same naturalness. We have not admitted Slovakness into our consciousness.)

Ethno-significative aspect. We recognize, in agreement with Bromlej, 1980, Blanár, 1986, p. 197, that stable components of culture play both differentiating and integrating roles in the shaping of ethnic community; however, these cannot be absolutized. None of the stable cultural components is a necessary and differentiating ethnic sign, their selection being dependent on historical conditions. The Slovaks as an ethnic community belong to western Slavs. According to the research findings of the linguists supported by archaeological research, the Slovak language was delimited as a specific Slavic language in the 10th–11th centuries, that is in the period of the disintegration of the internally differentiated Proto-Slavic macrodialects and at the beginning of the independent development of individual Slavic languages (Novák, 1980; Pauliny, 1963; 1983; Krajčovič, 1974; Blanár, 1986). There are some specific features of the Slovaks that are relevant from the perspective of ethno-socio-cultural development as compared to other Slavic and non-Slavic ethnic groups, especially: The ethnonym Slovák (where the suffix *-ák* is the west-Slavic substitute for the older *-ěn* with the variant *-ian*) emerges in the second half of the 15th century; the name Slovak both denoted a member of the particular Slovak ethnic group of the upper part of Hungary and it was equivalent to "Slovan", that is it was used to denote the Slavs in general (a similar situation is also in the case of the ethnonyms of the Slovenes and Croatian Slavons) (Dejiny Slovenska II, 1987, p. 115). The phenomena of linguistic development are very important for the oldest history of the Slovak ethnic group and the Slovak nationality. Proper names and toponyms, in particular, represent the oldest direct evidence of the Slovak language for the oldest history of the Slovak language (from the 11th to 15th centuries). These are the strongest evidence of the developmental continuity (Blanár, 1986, cf. references to other literature therein). There are no continuous linguistic relics of the Slovak language in its oldest history; it is the onomastic material – through naming of the geographic objects and persons from the territory, where the Slovak language was used, by domestic means of expression, documented in Latin writings from that period – that serves as evidence of the continuous development of the Slovak language between the 11th and 15th centuries. Continuous linguistic relics date back to the 15th century. These two different chrono-

logical layers of writings create a source for the first historical dictionary of the Slovak language being edited at present (Historický slovník slovenského jazyka, I. 1991, II. 1992, III. 1995, IV. 1996).

The dialects and the oral form of the Slovak language illustrate the continuous development of Slovak from the oldest times. Its importance was highlighted e.g. by a culturologist D. Likhachov during the Xth Congress of Slavists held in Sofia in 1988.

The perception of the ethnic community of the Slovaks, Slovak culture, and the Slovak language abroad by laymen but also by scientists from various fields studying ethnicity, has largely been influenced by the fact that after the fall of Great Moravia – the first state formation of the ancestors of the modern Slovaks – at the beginning of the tenth century, the Slovaks lived for a thousand years within the old Kingdom of Hungary (Uhorsko) and, after the disintegration of Austria-Hungary in 1918, within a common state with the Czech nation. The creation and development of the Slovak nationality was affected by the conditions of the multinational Kingdom of Hungary. In Hungary, affiliation to the privileged classes, to the nobility, was more important than the affiliation to a particular nationality. Since there were no favourable prerequisites for the formation of a codified standard language (which, however, was not a binding sign of a nationality), the standard Czech language of that time started to be used in the written form in some functions of a standard language in the fifteenth century. Neither in that period nor later, was Czech a spoken language within society (Pauliny, 1983, p. 78). The Czech language was Slovacized to various extent. The other relevant factors of the ethno-socio-cultural development of the Slovaks are: creation of the so-called "cultured Slovak" applied in historical writings in the 15th–17th centuries, at first through the orthographic and phonological filter of the Czech language. From the 2nd half of the 18th century, when in Central Europe modern nations began to constitute themselves, the feudal concept of the "natio hungarica" was reappraised and filled with a new content, a national standard language became one of the important signs of the bourgeois concept of the nation, with the national representative value being assigned to it (Doruľa, 1977). In this new social situation, a Slovak standard language was also codified, first by Anton Bernolák (1787), but his form of the official language was adopted only by Catholics, the Lutheran intelligentsia still using Czech, – then by Ľudovít Štúr (1843). Štúr's codification of the Slovak standard language unified all members of the Slovak nation. The completion of the creation of the modern Slovak nation, as with other non-Magyars, led to a conflict with the interests of the modern Magyar nation then being shaped. The re-interpretation of feudal "natio" into modern nation in Hungary is associated with the identification of the Hungarian national (ethnic) history and the state history of Hungary. There is a place for only one nation there. Also for this reason the period between the Austro-Hungarian Compromise (1867) and 1918 meant a diametrically opposed historical experience for the Slovaks compared to the Magyars. Therefore it is difficult for

Slovak and Hungarian historians to interpret events the same way. The same historical period, when the Slovaks as a nation were driven almost to the brink of destruction due to strong, unscrupulous Magyarization, was for the Hungarian nation the most successful period in its history in all respects. By contrast, the disintegration of Austria-Hungary and the following years meant to Slovaks self-preservation and development in a new state – together with the Czech nation but, it was a deep national trauma for the Hungarians (Zemko, 1990). The state doctrine of the first ČSR (first Czechoslovak Republic) – the doctrine of a single Czechoslovak nation and Czechoslovak language (interpreted as one language functioning in "two variants") mentioned the Slovaks as a branch of one nation – led to problems in the relationship between the Czechs and Slovaks even after its official cancellation in 1945 (after World War II in the renewed Czechoslovakia). As an idea, it has long influenced the consciousness of a considerable part of the members of the Czech nation. This is shown by the results of sociological surveys (*Aktuálne problémy Česko-Slovenska* 1990; 1992).

Culturological aspect. From this point of view, the relationship between Czechs and Slovaks shows points of close contact and closeness as well as significant differences as a result of historical development. The closeness is determined by such factors as the Christian and cultural heritage of Great Moravia professed by both nations, as well as by southern and eastern Slavs (cf. e.g. *Život a dielo Metoda*, 1985) as the beginnings of their civilization; the role of Czech in Slovakia as a standard language and as the liturgical language of Slovak Lutherans already mentioned. The perception of Pavol Jozef Šafárik and Ján Kollár as distinguished personalities of both the Slovak and the Czech national revivals is justified. The Czech J. Dobrovský is also linked to Slovakia through his place of birth, and through the place of his studies also the Czech historian F. Palacký. T. G. Masaryk underscored the importance of the Slovaks for the Czech national revival (1936, 1990, p. 55). In the period of strongest Magyarization pressure on the Slovaks at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, significant voices and particular activities were raised by Czech culture to support and help the Slovaks. The idea of the brotherhood of Czechs and Slovaks transferred in the name of the Czechoslovak idea into a mythicizing relationship to Slovakia, was sometimes manifested in a protector-like way, through emphasizing the topic-myth of the elder and younger brothers, which meant fixation of the relationship between the two nations as unequal (Lorenzová, 1990).

From among culturological phenomena, we shall mention as pars pro toto, the interpretation of the history of art as a contrast to the dependence of the structure of the history of art on the structure of the state-political history as presented by J. Bakoš (1988). Before the first Czechoslovak Republic came into existence, the theoretical concepts of Hungarian art historians had interpreted the history of art so that the artistic heritage of Slovakia was an organic part of that of the old Kingdom

of Hungary. In the 19th century, with the identification of the historic Hungarian state with the ethnic Hungarian or Magyar nation, this meant that it was regarded as part of Magyar art. After 1918, the theory of a single Czechoslovak nation within the new Czechoslovak Republic authorized the Czech scientists to perceive the relics of Slovakia as their cultural heritage. (There was no account of the Slovak history of art because there were no Slovak art historians at that time; J. Bakoš, 1988, p. 9.) In view of the understanding of the history of art within the context of Czecho-Slovak cultural relations it is important that in contrast to the etatistic concept of the Hungarian history of art, the Czech art historians understood the history of art in Slovakia as a whole where two levels meet – art in Slovakia and Slovak art. This whole is an outcome of the two determinants – of the external influences and state-historical bonds as well as the specific features and traditions of the territory and its ethnic group. Since the history of art in Slovakia cannot only be interpreted from the ethnic point of view, the territory of Slovakia started to be regarded as a spiritual subject gifted with a "genius loci". This concept should have overcome the contradiction between the art imported into Slovakia and the creatively adopted sovereign Slovak art. J. Bakoš (1988) postulates the category of the "crossroads of cultures" for the interpretation of the history of art in Slovakia, stating thus clearly that the historical routes of art in Slovakia are the results of meetings, touching, crossing, penetrating and mixing of several cultural circuits. What appears as a periphery, a sort of marginality, from the point of view of cultural and artistic currents flowing from the West, is the productive "periphery"; the wealth of artistic heritage in Slovakia and its almost startling stylistic variety illustrate not only the high level of economic development and social diversity but primarily the rich artistic life of Slovakia in the culture of which art played a significant role. Let us recall that the contrast centre – periphery is also productive in linguistics and that the concept "crossroads" is often used in relation to Slovak as a Slavic language whose place is, on the basis of ancient settlement connections and comparison of old isoglosses, on the border between the West Slavic, East Slavic, and South Slavic worlds (Blanár, 1986; several studies of Habovštiak).

If in self-awareness, ethnic and/or national consciousness and national feeling historical continuity plays an important role in the development of the gained values of material but especially spiritual culture including national history, the history of literature, art, language, it should be clarified why the Slovaks are often characterized as a nation with a weak national consciousness. There are objective reasons for a much more difficult shaping of the national consciousness of the Slovaks compared to neighbouring nations, which is based on the knowledge of own history and on interiorizing of the continuity of history.

The roots of this situation are in the history of 20th century, especially in the way education was implemented through history in Slovakia. If we take into account that history became a "state" science as early as in the 19th century (Novosád, 1993, p. 9), national history did not offer the Slovaks enough objective sup-

ports for shaping their consciousness of historicity if compared to other nations. A phenomenon, which played a negative role, was adequately named the "year zero syndrome" by the Slovak historian Ľ. Lipták (1992a, 1992b). The syndrome consists in the fact that after each coup, after each revolution, everything starts again from the zero point, such being at least the official version. The comparison of political changes in the history of Slovakia in 1918, 1939, 1944–1945, 1948, and in 1989 proves the existence of this syndrome both in the propaganda and in the political practice of the winners. The accentuation of real or apparent aspects of the new regime "the end of one-thousand-years of slavery", "the first independent Slovak state", "the end of totalitarianism" helps the victorious group to cope with the first reluctant moments of a not-yet-rooted power. Through emphasizing the dark past, the harsh present is veiled. Political coups interrupt historical bonds for some time but the continuity of history cannot be liquidated for ever. This is why that in spite the five-fold beginning in the twentieth century the fundamental streams of Slovak history were enforced in each epoch – the process of the nation's emancipation continued, sometimes thanks to, sometimes, in spite of, the coup (Lipták, 1992a, p. 25).

However, in the system of education, the history where rather the discontinuity of phenomena, events and personalities was presented, must have led to negative consequences. Such a discontinuous history afflicted the national consciousness of generations of Slovaks. And thus from the perspective of present fifty-year-olds, there are families where grandparents were taught the (national) history according to the Hungarian-state history, parents learned the Czechoslovak history according to the state doctrine of the first ČSR, some having more positive, some more negative experiences from the period of the moderately authoritarian Slovak state (1939–1945); children who attended elementary and middle schools or studied at colleges or universities after 1945, were taught history with whole sections of Slovak national history presented unilaterally, distorted, or simply left out, tabooed. The personalities were "erased". The first concise, yet synthetic history of Slovakia and the Slovaks understood as real Slovak history, i.e. giving an account of national history from the Slovak point of view and struggling for the impartial outlook on the past of Slovakia and of the Slovaks could only be created in the conditions of the present democratic society. It appeared as *Slovenské dejiny* (Slovak History – Marsina–Čičaj–Kováč–Lipták, 1992). The situation in the last two decades during which the August 1968 occupation and all accompanying events were taboo, was no different either and afflicted equally both Czechs and Slovaks. It should be noted that as early as in 1935, in his work *Jazykovedné glosy k československej otázke*, Ľ. Novák, as a young 28-years-old gifted linguist, argued on the scientific basis that the Czechoslovak nation and language was fictitious; he also pointed to the legislative inconsistency when the subject "československočina" (Czechoslovak language) was taught in Slovak as the language of instruction, while, in Bohemia – which seemed to be normal – it was Czech (Novák, 1936, pp. 301–318). Ľ. Novák almost

foresaw all the negatives in the national consciousness of the Slovaks caused by the fact that within the mentioned subject, the proportions of phenomena and the outlook were significantly detrimental to the Slovak national language and literature: the significance of outstanding national representatives, Ľ. Štúr, in particular, was artificially concealed, the history of Slovak literature was pictured superficially, in torsos, even with a sort of disrespect. Looking at the Slovak-Czech relations from the psychological angle (cf. below), it would be useful to take the mentioned shortcomings in education through history into account. These, together with other facts not mentioned here, play a role in the fact that there are a number of Slovaks whose national consciousness is balanced having been acquired on the basis of the knowledge of the continuity in history and who do not feel any need to declare it, but, on the other hand, there are individuals who have recourse to non-balance in both directions – to either exaggeration of declared national pride or self-depreciation.

It is worth noting from the perspective of the sphere of language that the significance of the continuity was in Slovak transferred to the lexical meaning of the word 'dejinnosť' (=historical continuity; awareness of the continuity of history; relationship of the nation to its history). The implicit semé "continuity" became a relevant distinctive component of the lexical meaning of the word 'dejinnosť' because the linguistic community of the Slovaks feels this property as vital. And this certainly also, or just because of the fact, that in everyday life the Slovaks often offend against historical continuity (Buzássyová, 1990, pp. 175–176).

Psychological aspect. It was said several times that the Slovaks defined themselves in their history especially in relation to two nations and cultures: Hungarian and Czech. The arguments of M. Kusý (1990) that the relation to the former nation was characterized by the power and political dominance of the Hungarians as the ruling nation and thus the Slovaks's position was not so much in relation to, but rather against the Hungarians, the relationship to the Czech nation and its culture "was and still is in principle the history of exemplary cooperation" can be accepted to a certain extent as justified. Although this "exemplariness" might raise doubts by pointing to several events and aspects of the coexistence of the Slovaks and Czechs, it definitely is not by coincidence that K. Lorenz used in his book *8 smrtelných hříchů* (Czech translation; originally published in German: *Die acht Todsünden der zivilisierten Menschheit*) "Hungarian regions where Hungarian and Slovak villages are very close" as an example of adversary and competing ethnic groups, provoking one another also through emphasizing the difference between national costumes (Lorenz, 1990, p. 62).

It should be noted that Slovaks and Czechs entered the common state in 1918 not only with different historical experiences and different levels of economic and cultural development but also with different expectations. Czechoslovak statehood meant for the Czech nation merely a continuation of the Czech statehood from older history or its extension, for most Slovaks a common state was, however, an

act of agreement between two subjects. This difference also came to the fore when, after the split of ČSFR (Czech and Slovak Federal Republic), the Czech Republic confirmed, in spite of protests from the Slovak side, that they would keep the Czechoslovak flag as a symbol of their statehood (even the keeping of the name Československo – Czechoslovakia for the Czech Republic was considered), raising arguments, also adopted by President Havel, that it was primarily the citizens of the Czech Republic who identified themselves with Czechoslovakia from the very beginning.

It should be kept in mind that there were also pragmatic reasons for the alliance of Czechs and Slovaks. In 1921 there lived 51% Czechs, 23% Germans, 15% Slovaks, 6% Hungarians and 4% Carpathian Rusyns in the multinational Czechoslovak Republic. The basis of pre-war Czechoslovakia was the doctrine of a single Czechoslovak nation, one tribe, whose branches the Slovaks and Czechs were supposed to be. The political and pragmatic reason for the doctrine was that it was the only way how Slovaks and Czechs could have reached the significant two-thirds majority within the new state (which was strongly emphasized particularly by President Wilson) to satisfy the demand of national self-determination without problems.

The new state's home politics were democratic and liberal, which had both positive (development of national schools and culture, cultural help to Slovakia) and negative features (deepening differences between Czechia and Slovakia). The number of Czechs in Slovakia doubled during the years between 1921 and 1937. The mission of the Czechs arriving to Slovakia was to promote its culture; but they took functions in the state administration and in state-supported areas. In the last year of the first ČSR, 60% of the inhabitants (Slovaks and Hungarians) lived on agricultural production (Bunčák, 1991).

There is a connection between this mission of the Czech intelligentsia in Slovakia and the attitudes which were reflected in the research results: "Česi o Slovákoch a Slovensku" (Czechs about Slovaks and Slovakia) carried out in 1946 by the "Ústav výskumu verejnej mienky" (Institute of Public Opinion Research), functioning in 1946–1950 (see also Timorácky, 1992; Frič–Bútorová–Rosová, 1992) which was remarkable from the perspective of both the answers of the respondents and the questions asked by interviewers. One of the questions, answered positively by 80% of respondents, was: Do you like Slovaks? Do you enjoy singing or listening to Slovak songs? However, 66% of respondents were convinced that the Slovaks differ significantly from the Czechs in their nature and only 14% supported the strengthening of the independence of Slovakia.

Questions of this type were and still are not very acceptable to Slovaks as M. Timorácky shows. They raise astonishment or rather indignation. Why are the feelings to Slovaks examined and why is it on the basis of songs? Some Slovaks were allergic to the older and more experienced brother from the very beginning. On the other hand, however, the number of Czechs exasperated by the ungratefulness of the Slovaks with respect to them was increasing at that time. Not much has changed

even after 40 years in this matter as another sociological research conducted in the Centrum pre výskum spoločenských problémov (Centre for research on social problems) (1990) and Centrum pre sociálnu analýzu (Centre for social analysis) (1991, 1992) shows. The idea of a single Czechoslovak nation was supported by 50% of respondents from the Czech republic and 60% of its citizens did not agree with any amendments of the federation because they felt it as extortion from the side of Slovaks. Moreover, it has also been shown that for many Czechs Slovakia still remains an exotic country with the Tatra mountains, with traditional foods and drinks, like *bryndzové halušky* (pasta with Liptauer cheese) and *slivovica* (plum brandy).

We sometimes face the opinion that the river Morava separating Bohemia and Moravia from Slovakia is a border dividing the European perception of the world into two paradigms: 1. the paradigm of Western rationalism and 2. the paradigm of Eastern emotionality. On the other hand, the Slovak historian A. Spiesz (1992) but also others, defend the assessment of the Slovaks as people with a Western mentality and European way of thinking. Slovakia is a country situated on the eastern border of Western civilization where part of the citizens does not profess Western but Eastern type of Christian religion. According to the 1991 population census, out of the total number of 5,268,935 inhabitants, only 34,244 are members of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

But is there indeed something like a cultural-historical genotype of thought and behaviour of nations? For instance, M. Kaľavský (1991, p. 357) shows that no previous ethnological research had found or abstracted any specifics which would be valid for Slovaks throughout the Slovak territory or outside it and would not be valid elsewhere. However, it cannot be ruled out, since no such research has been carried out in Slovakia so far.

Public opinion polls concerning the self-evaluation of the Czechs and Slovaks and relations between them are instructive. All researches carried out by sociologists in 1990, 1991, and 1992 confirmed that the Slovaks value themselves very high, they are very indulgent towards themselves, whereas the Czechs are too critical of themselves. It is reflected on various characterologies in historicizing journalism and in literature. While among Slovaks the self-critical images are rather rare (A. Matuška, L. Kováč, Ľ. Lipták), on the Czech side, a rather sharp evaluation of their own mentality and history predominates. It is assumed to be associated with a sort of lead of the Czechs in civilization manifested in their higher standard of development. The idea of the peculiarity of the Slovaks is to some extent also cultivated by Slovak journalists since a number of journal articles describe the Slovak nation as one that does not lag behind any, even "more visible" ethnic group. It is not the nation to be blamed for not being known in the world. It was concealed and blackened by pro-Czech political representation and the Hungarian lobby, and by home renegades (so-called "janičiari", i.e. janizaries). By and large, the Slovak press does not make any particular attacks on or denunciations of the Czech part

even in cases of strong national exaltation. Much sharper was the reaction to the activities of the Slovak 'janičiar' or the so-called federal Slovaks (pejorative name of Slovak politicians who allegedly represent the interests of the whole federation but in fact represent the Czech interests; the resulting effect of their activities is harmful to the Slovak part of federation).

In self-evaluation, the Slovaks primarily ascribe to themselves the characteristic hard working (42%), followed by amiability (15%) and sincerity (19%), which are supposed to be typical features of Slovak nature. From among negative properties they admit alcoholism and low national pride (in 1992 this property was not reported any more). As much as half of the respondents abstained from the assessment; some arguing that in their opinion there was nothing like a typical Slovak nature and people should be evaluated individually, some not knowing what is characteristic of the Slovaks.

The Czechs' perception of Slovaks is different from the way the Slovaks see themselves. They do not see them as hard-working, sincere, honest people but quite the opposite: more as assertive, nationalistically-oriented, haughty, and at the same time – although in a lesser degree – as having an inferiority complex. By and large, the Czechs see the Slovaks more in a negative light.

It is also important how the Hungarians living in Slovakia see the Slovaks. In some points they agree with the Czechs, but in some they agree with the Slovaks. From among positive properties they report hard work, modesty and unpretentiousness, among the negative there are nationalism and alcoholism.

The dominant conviction among Slovaks is that they are a hard-working nation. This property is ascribed to them by the Hungarians, but the Czechs deny it. Interestingly, *Slovník české frazeologie a idiomatiky* (1983, p. 427) explains the comparison *dřít/dělat jako otrok/Slovák/galejník/na galejích* (work hard like a slave/ Slovak/galley slave ... to work physically or spiritually hard, a lot, intensively until tired out, diligently, and eagerly. Some reports from Lower Austria also bring evidence that Slovaks were always preferred by rich landlords in their selection of workers for particular seasons over all ethnic groups settled there (Serbs, Croats, Czechs, Slovaks) (Schultz, 1963).

Nationalism is assigned to the Slovaks by both the Czechs and the Hungarians, while the Slovaks have so far reproached themselves for their small nation pride. How do the Slovaks see the Czechs? Rather – similarly as the Czechs see the Slovaks – in an unfavourable light. Their typical features were: astuteness (19%), superiority (10%), less often egoism (5%), laziness (4%) and talkativeness (4%), prattling (4%). From the positive properties they appreciate their cultivation (4%), skill (2.5%) and humour (2%). Almost one third of the Slovaks said that there was nothing like a typical Czech nature.

In journalist and essayist texts Slovaks often recall their plebeianism. In his book *Dúchanie do pahrieb (Rekindling the Embers)*, the Slovak writer V. Mináč said: "If history is the history of kings and emperors, dukes and princes, victories and con-

quered territories, if history is the history of violence, robbery and exploitation, then we have no history, at least, we are not its subject. But if the history of civilization is the history of labour, the history of interrupted but again and again winning construction, then it is also our history ...we are a plebeian nation, no other nation is so plebeian in such a pure form as we are." Particularly since 1989, new interpretations of Slovak history have emerged, uncovering a higher degree of national self-consciousness. According to them, the history of Slovakia and of Slovaks confirm that we are a nation with our own roots reaching back to Great Moravia, tested and verified in struggles for national being, sovereignty, future, the Slovak nation, which experienced and carried on its shoulders the plundering of Tartars, invasions of Turks (and, within the European context, protected the border of the Christian world against Islam), anti-Habsburg revolts, never capitulating. It did not surrender even under the increased pressure in the second half of the 19th century, when the ruling strata of the old Kingdom of Hungary tried to assimilate its members and integrate them into the Magyar nation. It proved its capability to survive as an ethnic community by relying on its vivid language, reviving traditions and Christian worldview.

The results of the above-mentioned sociological survey into the history of the relations between Czechs and Slovaks are instructive for evaluating these relations. According to this research, the first ČSR was for the Czechs the paradigm of democracy and for 70% of the Czech citizens its establishment was an important precondition for the survival of Slovaks as a nation. The Slovak state between 1939 and 1945 was unequivocally fascist, it was treachery with respect to the Czechs (not the only alternative). The Slovak National Uprising, which is one of the most significant events for Slovaks, is recognized by Czechs as a convincing gesture of the resistance of the Slovak nation to fascism. This event is, however, uselessly exaggerated in their opinion. In 1968, in the period of the Prague Spring, the Slovaks did not support the process of revival and cared more for their identity and after 1968 they adapted more to the communist regime (Timorackỳ, 1992).

By contrast, the Slovaks cast doubt on whether the first ČSR was really democratic. For them, it embodied economic oppression and the high unemployment pushed them to go abroad almost as much as before 1918. The concept of a single Czechoslovak nation was completely mistaken. The assessment of the Slovak state was rather ambiguous; in any case it was a period of fulfilling the desire of the Slovaks for independence.

It is noteworthy that because of the collaboration with the regime of the Slovak state, but ultimately because of the satisfaction of the desire for national sovereignty some famous representatives of Slovak literature – poets of the so-called Catholic modern, and writers as well as organizers of cultural life had to emigrate after 1945. Their departure clearly afflicted Slovak culture.

Sociological researches carried out so far (1946, 1990, 1991, 1992) confirmed the lively feelings of belongingness of the Czechs and Slovaks but, on the other hand, they also corroborated the growing feelings of injustice and misunderstand-

ings on both sides. The majority of Slovaks had nothing against the Czech nation, their "anti-Czechism" was mostly directed against "Pragocentrism" and the unitary state. Some of the Czechs were also against Pragocentrism (40%) and since Slovaks (so-called federal Slovaks) also played rather a significant role in that centre, paradoxically enough, it also included expressed disgust towards the Slovaks (Timoracký, 1992).

Sociolinguistic aspect. Relations between the Czech and Slovak languages shows that some tension between Slovak and Czech dates from as early as the 15th century and has not ended even with the split of Czechoslovakia. Words taken from Czech were one of the characteristic features of Štúr's codification of standard Slovak in 1843. In terms of the Hegelian philosophy and Humboldt's philosophy of language, Ľ. Štúr saw the spirit of the nation primarily in the grammatical construction of the language. Therefore he did not see the taking of the lexical units from Czech to standard Slovak as inappropriate, particularly those from the language of special purpose, which was already well elaborated in Czech at that time.

There was a certain balance in the interpenetration of Czech and Slovak. This natural balance was broken particularly when Slovak and Czech artificially approached or distanced one from the other (also under political pressure). For instance, during the first ČSR, *Pravidlá slovenského pravopisu* (The Rules of Slovak Orthography) (1931) were prepared under the guidance of the Czech linguist V. Vážný on the principle that the Slovak and Czech languages should be brought closer together. It was the main reason for the anti-Czech purism in Slovakia that followed. Feeling the threat to Slovak, the purists did not lean on the functional aspect but on the aspect of linguistic purity. However, many their interventions, particularly at the levels of sound and grammar, removal of unnecessary oscillations and duplications, were useful for Slovak. The convergent development was then again emphasized in the 1950s and 1960s.

The Czechoslovak federation (in October 1968) – also as a consequence of the unfavourable internal and external situation in the period immediately after the occupation of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 – was an external form for a centralized state where the leading political power – the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia – deformed and pulled down the original principles of federation from as early as 1970 with the active participation of Slovaks (Žatkuliak, 1992). In spite of this, the establishment of the federation brought a qualitative change into the relation between Czech and Slovak. The position of Slovak changed as compared with the linguistic situation in the previous two decades. For instance the Czech and the Slovak languages were used alternatively in mass media (TV and radio broadcasting) in a settled proportion, which meant a higher degree of equalization. This was also reflected for example in linguistics in about the mid 1970s, when the concepts-terms started to be worked out and used: contact variant, contact synonym (cf. Budovičová, 1979, p. 56; Jedlička, 1985, p. 16). The results of confrontation studies of

Czech and Slovak implemented so far, concerning not only the issue of language but also the wider context of the national literary heritage and cultures, have been included in several collections of works of Charles University Slavica Pragensia. Particular attention was devoted to the issues of the linguistic situation. The linguistic situation in the ČSFR with its specific features different from those in other multinational states was characterized by J. Horecký's term "dvojjazykovosť" (= parallel bilingualism, i.e. each participant of communication speaks his/her own language understanding one another without translation) in contrast to "classical" bilingualism. Sociolinguistically oriented Slovak linguists do not judge some linguistic means as bohemisms any more (only on the basis of the criterion of origin), several such means are qualified as a result of interaction, parallel development or bridging the gaps in one language. Sociolinguistic methods (especially questionnaires) have recently started to be applied with the aim of finding the real image of the use and evaluation of contact means and non-contact variants by language users themselves. M. Sokolová (1991) showed how the sociolinguistic method can be used for determining the measure of communicative efficiency of the means of language of various linguistic levels on the basis of the frequency and their evaluation by users as common, artificial, inappropriate. The research carried out by the author showed that the high communicative efficiency of contact variants is associated with their communicative functionality following from semantic differentiation of contact and non-contact variants, from the differentiation of these variants at the level of styles and from the overlap of bohemisms and dialectisms. Contact lexical synonyms enlarge synonymous rows, increase the possibilities of stylistically more differentiated forms of expression, fulfilling also some pragmatic functions in the language (e.g. melioration of expressions) (Buzássyová, 1993). For example the adjective 'záludný' is a contact lexical synonym in Slovak. In connection with a noun: "záludná otázka"– tricky question, it is a more neutral, more meliorative – expression versus "sharper" stylizing of the same denotation using treacherous (zákerná) question; the reality being named is indicated and stylized also in a slightly different way than in other synonymous connections unpleasant, uneasy, delicate (háklivá) question.

Some contact means function only on the level of the individual text use, not in social communication. For instance, the ethnographically significant name "oberačky" (= season of gathering grapes for wine-making) is also the name of this reality in the standard Slovak language. The contact variant 'vinobranie' (vintage) can occur within the text as an expression of higher style with shades of bookishness in the figurative meaning as it is in the titles of the journalist text: "Zeljenkovo vinobranie" (the article deals with the composer Ilja Zeljenka who gathered the fruits of his creative work, when three new works were premiéred during several weeks.

However, problematic or negative consequences of Czecho-Slovak "dvojjazykovosť" (parallel bilingualism) should not be avoided either. Increased demands were placed on the linguistic culture and cultivation of both Slovak and Czech by

the linguistic situation within the common state; from a quantitative point of view (the proportion of inhabitants was 2:1), the pressure of Czech, which had a stronger position, on Slovak was more significant than the other way round. Due to excessive centralization of terminological normalization activities, the one-sided conformation of the Slovak terms to the Czech basis, although it would often have been more suitable to base the creation of a Slovak term on a different naming motif, pressing out the native phraseology with a newer Czech phraseology, are considered negative in Slovakia. It was an anomaly and hypocrisy of pre-November 1989 "normalization" that politicians did not forbid the Slovak linguists to study the relations between Slovak and Czech but the research results could only be published in specific journals and could not be popularized among the wider public. Through the years, in practice focused on linguistic culture, it could not be said that an expression was not Slovak but Czech. The bilingual practice in the mass media wiped off the borders between the two close languages and therefore, such an argument was often necessary.

Conclusions:

1. At least two tendencies are applied at present in Slovak linguistics concerning the issues of the contact between Czech and Slovak. The first, doing away with damage which led in the preceding regime to deformations in national consciousness as well as in the linguistic consciousness of individuals, places emphasis on the opposition home/foreign in cultivating the standard language. The second approach, with a more significantly sociolinguistic orientation respects more the attitudes of language users towards language. This respect is based on the assumption that the axiological value of contact phenomena is different in individuals; the psychological, national representative factor, the factor of cultural and historical tradition and communicative effectiveness can have a different position in the hierarchy of values of individual language users; strategies of cultivating linguistic manifestations have to reckon with it.

2. So far, confrontation analyses of Slovak and Czech have not applied the concept of the linguistic image of the world characteristic of every national language and which, through the way of its presentation in expressions, meanings of expressions and their mode of connection, contains encoded ethnolinguistic and culturological information. It helps monitor how a particular language community classifies and interprets the world (Grzegorczykowa, 1990). The productivity of this concept in the research of one language but also in confrontation research of Slovak and Czech and in the research into the contact between these languages will have to be shown in future research.

3. Good relations between the Czechs and Slovaks in independent states are based on the hope that both nations will be able to get rid of the surviving stereotypes after some time. The stereotypes of Czechs in the most open form were expressed by P. Příhoda (1992) – who puts them as: a) the stereotype of Slovak inferi-

ority and Czech superiority, b) stereotype of Slovak complementariness (effort at enlarging the Czech nation with the Slovaks as a foundation for the theory of a Czechoslovak nation) and c) stereotype of the Slovak betrayal and the Czech victim (incapability of understanding the Slovaks' struggles for sovereignty and independence rather than seeing them as perfidy and betrayal). On the Slovak part, correct relations with the partner nation are based on the hope that the Slovaks will be able to get rid of the inferiority complex or of the stereotype of blaming somebody else for everything what happens to them. In a new independent state they could prove themselves to be a really mature nation fully responsible for the conditions of their existence and their re-creation in a better form.

4. There is asymmetry in the reception of cultural values in Czech-Slovak relations. The Slovaks' relationship to Czech culture, literature, music, etc. is positive, having been cultivated "on the macrolevel" at least from the times of Ľ. Štúr. On the Czech part, reception of Slovak culture is rather a matter of individuals. The capability of Slovaks "to acquire" the cultural values of the Czech nation, ability to have aesthetic experiences, does not mean, however, either manifesting proprietary relations to them or showing the need to adopt the national spirit of the other nation but actually the ability to perceive Czech culture also for its Czechness, not only for what is universal in it. It is probably the reason for the non-acceptance of L. Vaculík's formulation in the cited contemplation about "the non-adoption of the Slovak way of perceiving, feeling and thinking by Czechs" in Slovakia but quite the opposite, it increased misunderstanding (of course, particularly for the author's other accusations laid against Slovaks). Therefore, after the split into two independent states it appears more appropriate to denote the relation between Slovak and Czech culture as "Nelúčenie" (No farewell) rather than saying goodbye by L. Vaculík and other Czech writers. It is a symbolic expression (referring to the poem with the same title by L. Novomeský of 1939), through which the literary theoretician and editor-in-chief of the journal Literárny týždenník P. Števček (1992) expressed his hope that after the split both Czechs and Slovaks would realize more intensively the relationships of their belonging together and that the relations between Slovak and Czech culture would survive.

REFERENCES

Bakoš, J.: *Periféria alebo križovatka kultúr.* Slovenské pohľady, 104, 1988, pp. 5–19.

Blanár, V.: *Kontinuitný alebo diskontinuitný vývin slovenského jazyka.* Slovenská reč, 51, 1986, pp. 196–206.

Bromlej, J. V.: *Etnos a etnografia.* Translated from Russian *Etnos i etnografija,* 1973, by A. Pranda. Bratislava, Veda 1980.

Budovičová, V.: *K teórii spisovného jazyka najmä z hľadiska medzijazykových vzťahov.* In: *Z teórie spisovného jazyka.* Ed. J. Ružička. Bratislava, Veda 1979, pp. 52–59.

BUNČÁK, J.: *Sociálna diferenciácia a národná identita v Československu od roku 1919*, manuscript 1991.

BUZÁSSYOVÁ, K.: *Dejinnosť*. Kultúra slova, 24, 1990, pp. 175–176.

BUZÁSSYOVÁ, K.: *Kontaktové varianty a synonymá v slovenčine a v češtine*. Jazykovedný časopis, 44, 1993, pp. 92–107.

BUZÁSSYOVÁ, K. /review/ – Jana PLICHTOVÁ, editor: *Minorities in Politics. Cultural and Language Rights*. Bratislava: Czechoslovak Committee of the European Cultural Foundation, 1992. In: International Journal of the Sociology of Language. 120. Minority Languages in Central Europe. Ed. S. Gustavsson and Z. Starý. Berlin – New York, Mouton de Gruyter 1996, pp. 135–139.

Dejiny Slovenska. II. Ed. S. Cambel. Bratislava, Veda 1987.

DORULA, J.: *Slováci v dejinách jazykových vzťahov*. Bratislava, Veda 1977.

FRIČ, P. – BÚTOROVÁ, Z. – ROSOVÁ, T.: *Česko-slovenské vzťahy v zrkadle empirického výskumu*. Sociológia, 24, 1992, pp. 43–84.

GRZEGORCZYKOWA, R.: *Pojęcie językowego obrazu świata*. In: *Językowy obraz świata*. Ed. J. Bartmiński. Lublin, 1990, pp. 41–49.

Historický slovník slovenského jazyka. I. A – J. Ed. M. Majtán. Bratislava, Veda 1991.

Historický slovník slovenského jazyka. II. K -N. Ed. M. Majtán. Bratislava, Veda 1992.

JEDLIČKA, A.: *Kořeny a rozvoj konfrontačního studia češtiny a slovenštiny*. In: Slavica Pragensia XXV, 19, 1985, pp. 11–24.

KAĽAVSKÝ, M.: *Etnicita a etnické vedomie?* Slovenský národopis, 39, 1991, pp. 354–357.

KUSÝ, M.: *Slovenský fenomén*. Fragment K, 1990, No. 2.

KRAJČOVIČ, R.: *Slovenčina a slovanské jazyky. I. Praslovanská genéza slovenčiny*. Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo 1974.

LETZ, J.: *Národná suverenita a jej význam pre Slovensko*. Bratislavské listy. Kultúrno-politický mesačník IV, 1991, No. 6, pp. 4–5.

LIPTÁK, Ľ.: (1992 a) *Výšky a pády Slovenska*. Historická revue, III, 1993, No. 7, pp. 24–25.

LIPTÁK, Ľ.: (1992 b) *Pripravenosť Slovenska na demokraciu* (paper read at the international symposium Slovakia in the Political System of Czechoslovakia in 1918–1939 held from 11 to 13 November 1991). Slovenské pohľady, 108, 1992, No. 4, pp. 40–45.

LORENZ, K.: *8 smrtelných hříchů*. Praha, Panorama 1990.

LORENZOVÁ, H.: *Mýtus Slovenska v české kultuře na přelomu 19. a 20. století*. In: *Kontexty českého a slovenského umenia*. Ed. J. Bakoš, I. Mojžišová. Bratislava, Správa kultúrnych zariadení Ministerstva kultúry Slovenskej republiky 1990, pp. 232–239.

MASARYK, T. G.: *Česká otázka. Naše nynější krize*. Praha, Nakladatelství Svoboda 1990.

Minority v politike. Kultúrne a jazykové práva. Ed. J. Plichtová. Česko-slovenský výbor Európskej kultúrnej nadácie 1992.

NOVÁK, Ľ.: *Jazykovedné glosy k československej otázke*. 2nd ed. Turčiansky Svätý Martin, Matica slovenská 1936.

NOVÁK, Ľ.: *K najstarším dejinám slovenského jazyka*. Bratislava, Vydavateľstvo SAV 1980.

NOVOSÁD, F.: *Otázky k štátnosti*. Slovenské pohľady, 109, 1993, No. 1, pp. 6–10.

PAULINY, E.: *Fonologický vývin slovenčiny*. Bratislava, Vydavateľstvo SAV 1963.

PAULINY, E.: *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny od začiatkov po súčasnosť*. Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo 1983.

POLAKOVIČ, Š.: *Čo je národné bytie?* Zahraničná Matica slovenská, Hamilton, Ontario, Kanada 1982.

PŘÍHODA, P.: *Slováci českýma očima (o slovenském heterostereotypu české mysli)*. Katolický týdeník, 48/1992, supplement *Perspektivy*, reissued under the title *O troch českých stereo-*

typoch in Slovenské národné noviny 4, 1993, No. 5, p. 3. Also read as a paper at the international conference Federations and National Autonomies in Broader Europe held in October 1991.

SCHULTZ, A.: *Beiträge zur Heimatkunde von Hohenau.* Hohenau 1963.

Slovník české frazeologie a idiomatiky. – Přirovnání. Ed. F. Čermák, J. Hronek, J. Machač. Praha, Academia 1983.

SOKOLOVÁ, M.: *Komunikatívna efektívnosť českých kontaktových javov v súčasnej slovenčine.* In: *Všeobecné a špecifické otázky jazykovej komunikácie. 2. diel.* Ed. J. Findra. Banská Bystrica, Pedagogická fakulta 1991, pp. 232–242.

SPIESZ, A.: *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebauvedomeniu.* Bratislava, Perfekt 1992.

ŠIMEČKA, M.: *Príbeh o jazyku.* Slovenské pohľady, 108, 1992, No. 9, pp. 2–5.

ŠTEVČEK, P.: *Nelúčenie II.* Literárny týždenník, 6, 1993, No. 1, p. 1.

TIMORACKÝ, M.: *Verejná mienka o česko-slovenských vzťahoch.* In: GÁL, F. et al.: *Dnešní krize česko-slovenských vztahů.* Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství 1992, pp. 68–90.

VACULÍK, L.: *Naše slovenská otázka.* Literární noviny No. 5/1990, reissued in Nos. 51–52/ 1992, p. 32.

ZEMKO, M.: *Maďarská história ponúknutá svetu. (Marginálie Nemaďara k Stručným dejinám Maďarska v angličtine).* Slovenské pohľady, 106, 1990, pp. 43–50.

ŽATKULIAK, J.: *Deformácia Ústavného zákona o československej federácii po októbri 1968.* Historický časopis, 40, 1992, pp. 473–486.

Život a dielo Metoda prvoučiteľa národa slovienskeho. Editors and translation E. Pauliny, Š. Ondruš. Bratislava, Tatran 1985.