ROMANTICISM AND BIEDERMEIER IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPEAN LITERATURES

VIRGIL NEMOIANU
Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

I

A modified and quiet romanticism is more evident and significant in Eastern and Central European literatures than anywhere else.[1] However, two main deficiencies of research in this area have until now hampered the correct appreciation of this phenomenon by romantic scholarship. The first is reluctance to seek earnestly for unifying traits in the area east of Germany. The second is the failure to understand correctly the relationship between romantic developments in different areas of Europe. As a consequence the general concept of romanticism was weakened and, repeatedly, uncertainties about the chronological borders of the period arose.

The transmission of literary phenomena inside a culture recognized as unitary has been analyzed *theoretically* even less than the reception of impulses from outside that culture. We know more about Arab influences on the Middle Ages or Chinese motifs flourishing in the eighteenth century than about the delicate mechanism through which Baroque forms spread through Europe or about how romanticism came to travel from one center of initiative to many remote areas. Such omissions result from a failure to understand the peculiar pluralistic organization of Western culture (as opposed to, say, the Chinese or the Egyptian or indeed the Greco-Latin culture). The phases of romanticism and its internal growth can well be discussed as a unified model; how the succession of these phases actually occurred in different areas of Europe varied from case to case.

In his fundamental comparative studies of European industrialization in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Alexander Gershenkron established a number of principles which have methodological interest even for those who do not subscribe to the stricter theories of socioeconomic determination of aesthetic constructs. Among these are the following:

1. The more backward a country's economy, the more likely was its industrialization to start discontinuously as a sudden great spurt proceeding at a relatively high rate of growth of manufacturing output.

2. The more backward the country's economy, the more pronounced was the stress of its industrialization on bigness of both plant and enterprise

3. The more backward the country's economy, the greater was the part played by special institutional factors designed to increase supply of capital to the nascent industries and, in addition, to provide them with less decentralized and better informed entrepreneurial guidance; the more backward the country, the more pronounced was the coerciveness and comprehensiveness of those factors.[2]

Gershenkron also described areas as advanced or backward in terms of the sequence in which they used the following institutions during the stages of their

industrialization as sources for their capital supply: factories from the beginning; banks and later factories; or state capital, then banks, and only last factories. In other words, Gershenkron showed that industrialization in various countries was similar in result, but that the processes of industrialization differed and that where the prerequisites of development (for example, according to the English model) were missing, substitutes occurred. In fact, Gershenkron explained, "the more backward was a country on the eve of its great spurt of industrial development, the more likely [were] the processes of its industrialization to present a rich and complete picture." (p. 358) Once a model of development is chosen, a certain orderly predictability in its occurrence from country to country can be established by posing sets of patterns of substitutions.

II

In what ways is a pattern of substitution homologous to that of Gershenkron applicable to literary realities? We have to start from certain postulates which cannot be demonstrated here, but which are neither unreasonable nor arbitrary. The first is that the carrier for the changes of Romanticism is a "human model", a complex of values and behaviors that is found rather consistently behind the events or developments of a certain age, and which can be encountered (perhaps under different shapes with different degrees of precision) in a cross section of society.

The second is that Western literatures (primarily English and German, and to some extent French) reach their Romantic peak around 1790–1815 by a gradual accumulation of expansionary gestures: inclusions of space and time (continents and historical areas), of sex, age and social condition, inclusions of new stylistic and generic forms, of models of religiosity, and most important of psychological states and mental faculties gaining massive access to literary texts. These expansions lead to a model that is based upon the principle of completeness and totality, almost approximating a recovery of (usually secularized) paradisial perfection, as M. H. Abrams rightly suggested.[3] The postlapsarian antinomies between reason and imagination, consciousness and nature, man and God, let alone social divisions were supposed to disappear in the intense flames of a cosmic comprehensiveness. Blake and Wordsworth, Hölderlin and Novalis, Schelling and Hegel clearly shared this effort, which went in parallel with the absolute claims of the French Revolution at its peak, no less than with mystical and occult endeavors or with the searches of a science enamored of universal magnetisms. This "High-Romanticism" was (and could not but be) explosive and inconstant; its project had to end up in disappointment, relativism, irony and fragmentation. Throughout Europe, in the 1820s and 1830s we witness a "taming" of Romanticism, the emergence of a low Romanticism, most characteristically in the German-speaking areas as "Biedermeier", the silver age of the European bourgeois imagination. Features such as withdrawal in idyllism, a modest sentimentalism, an emphasis on home and hearth, piety, political conformity and provincialism were soon detected as characteristic for the literature (and indeed for the whole culture) of Europe between 1815–1848. It took a slightly longer

time to notice that there were also other ways in which "lower Romanticism" or Biedermeier modes expressed themselves: the reduction of the all-encompassing aspiration to unity to smaller targets, such as national revival, social reform or even individual growth. Irony, relativism and disappointment were also orientations that flourished strongly. The emergence of an intricate dialectic of liberalism and conservatism is characteristic of the Biedermeier age and proved of tremendous importance, setting the terms of the debate in a way that influenced later decades, all the way to our own days. Finally a central characteristic is the substitution and/or entermeshing of idealist and aesthetic values with empirical and didactic pursuits in a way that seems rarely to have been equalled or imitated.

My third postulate is that whereas in Western Europe we have a clearly defined succession of separate phases, in the more peripheral areas, e.g. Southern Europe (Spanish and Italian literatures), in American literature, as well as in Eastern and Central European literatures, the salient feature is the overwhelming strength of the Biedermer or lower Romanticism, which almost comes to subsume the short Enlightenments and the occasional explosions of high Romanticism. Let me now return to the concept of "backwardness" and to the debate on Romantic periodization in Eastern Europe.

III

Clearly neither the concept of backwardness nor that of development can be applied to a cultural situation lightly. Empirically, a case could be made for measuring whether a cultural situation is more or less advanced by the use of indicators such as literary editions, total number of authors, authors declared outstanding (according to some conventional set of criteria), and authors who are in tune with the prevailing trends in comparable countries. Such a sociological undertaking would be legitimate and interesting, but does not seem feasible in the near future. Even the concept of development is less than likely to coincide with some acceptable view of progress, as it does in economic history: in this respect even Marx had serious reservations. In fact, I can hardly think of a modern literary history that conceives of its own theme as linear progress.

Nonetheless within limited periods of time of say 100 to 150 years, it would be easier to decide that there is a general direction of literary movement and that in terms of this *relative* movement an author or work can be seen as more or less advanced. Let me further qualify this statement by noting that this sense of the term *advanced* or *backward* is strictly limited to time and has little to do with quality or value; indeed, such are the dialectics of literary development that a valuable work that seems "chronologically displaced" is likely to seem after a while more challenging and influential than an equally important one that is fully integrated. I suspect that here some variant of the law of deviances *(écarts)* is functioning, this time from a historical-literary rather than a strictly stylistic point of view.

Thus, assuming that the general European literary development includes a succession of phases such as: Enlightenment (neoclassic), Enlightenment (preromantic, or classicism modified in different directions), high romantic, and later romantic or Biedermeier, it is clear that the full range of phases developed

only in England and, to a lesser extent, in Germany and France. In most other countries one or more stages are missing, or the order seems dislocated, or one stage seems to absorb the others. The last case is most interesting, since it indicates a kind of "telescoping" (to employ a term used in the social sciences), a simultaneous occurrence of several phases over a relatively short period of time.

Eastern European social and literary historians tend to respond in three ways when faced with a Western pattern of development and the demand to apply it to a stubborn local context. The first is simply to proclaim that the literary-historical categories in Eastern Europe differ from those in the West and must be defined in their own way. Thus many historians of Russian literature refer to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century as the "Age of Silver" or "Pushkin's age", or they limit the Russian Enlightenment to the latter half of the eighteenth century. Czech literary historians talk very often about a period of "national renaissance" (1780–1830), and so on. This kind of response tends to emphasize local historical circumstances, for example, the national, sociopolitical, sometimes revolutionary implications of romantic literature in the East, as opposed to the Western stress on imagination and individual completeness, and the reformist and moderate nature of the Enlightenment in East-Central Europe, as opposed to its radical implications in the West. The concept of *Goethezeit* sometimes provides a paradigm for the alternative Eastern European literary development.

The second response seems to be inspired by an epidemic vision of fixed cultural categories. These are seen as traveling from West to East like an infectious disease, changing conditions and contaminating vast populations. Each period or subperiod in the West has to find some kind of equivalent in the East, despite a possible lag of thirty or fifty years. Thus, Czech preromanticism is said by some to flourish between 1815 and 1830, Romanian preromanticism is sometimes pushed to 1848 or later, the Hungarian Enlightenment is generally situated between 1772 and 1820, and so on. This "contagious illness" vision was reinforced by the Marxist preconception that the phases of historical development (slave-owning society, feudalism, capitalism, socialism) must follow each other by necessity and in a complete chain for each separate country.

Only the third group of responses seems to approach Gershenkron's methodology in the social sciences. Authors such as Vera Călin, István Sőtér or Al. Ciorănescu contend that in Eastern Europe, at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, a telescoping of periods takes place. Enlightenment and romanticism, both inspired by the West, overlap and thus create a new kind of cultural mix after 1770 or 1780. Obviously, this theory incorporates a bit of each of the preceding ones: the influence aspect from one, the locally specific aspect from the other. Perhaps the most convincing argument made is that most Eastern European societies (but particularly Czech, Hungarian, and Romanian) were throughout most of the eighteenth century in a state of stagnation and decline. Therefore even moderate proposals of reform could elicit passionate responses, high-flying sentiments of a romantic nature, visions of bliss and regeneration. In other words, Enlightenment produced romanticism, not in

a dialectical succession, by contrast and continuity, but rather in a dialectics of simultaneity, as a contemporary outgrowth, a supplement.

It is this antihistorical side of the theory that I am uneasy with. I believe that a somewhat different explanation is valid for the periods 1780–1800 and 1820–1840 in these literatures. I shall survey very briefly three East-Central European literatures and then outline my proposal and indicate in what way I believe the classification applies to other literatures.

IV

Romanian literature was dormant throughout the eighteenth century. There was a fair amount of cultural assimilation (translations and adaptations from French, or even English and German writers).[4] The technical means of cultural communication (printing presses and private, scholarly, or even public libraries) were dramatically improved; many of the traditional genres (chronicles, moral-religious writings, popular-mythical novels) continued to flourish, but there was little creative writing activity that could be correlated to European developments. Indeed seventeenth-century and very early eighteenth-century Romanian writings (D. Cantemir), seem by contrast to correspond more closely to the prevailing Western trends. Not until the late 1780s was there a significant literary change.

At that point, in Bucharest the Văcărescu brothers, following Greek and Italian models, developed an Anacreontic poetry. They paved the way for a new phase in Romanian literature, because their rococo eroticism was often mixed with heroic and nationalist strains; the influence of folklore themes and forms in their poetry is plain. More significantly, a group of philologists, historians, and critics later dubbed Scoala Ardeleană (the Transylvanian School) discovered, after studies in Rome and Vienna, the Latin roots of Romanian and established the theoretical bases of the debate over national identity that was to rage in the nineteenth and deep into the twentieth century.[5] In the writings of Samuil Micu (1745–1806), Gheorghe Şincai (1754–1816), and Petru Maior (1760–1821) there was a strong radical-romantic component that turned into full romantic theorizing only a few decades later, in the work of their follower, Timotei Cipariu (1805–1887). The obsessions with linguistic and racial purity, return to the roots, history as fable, and the myth of regeneration after fall and decay are clear indications of their general thrust.

Although these movements clearly reflect the Enlightenment, it is difficult to share the opinion of most Romanian literary historians that a Romanian Enlightenment lasted until, say 1830, followed by a preromanticism, 1830–1848, and by a romanticism, whose highest achievements belonged to the 19870s and 1880s.[6] Paul Cornea, in his fundamental work on the origins of Romanian romanticism,[7] shows very clearly by analizing the period 1790–1850 that elements of sentimentalist idyllism, Enlightenment neoclassicism, and didacticism, along with full-fledged romantic features, can be distinguished among the mass of minor poetic production of the time.

The most interesting problems are raised by the 1830–1860 period; its half-romantic nature is easily recognized. The main poets of the time were

influenced by Lamartine, Hugo, and Byron: Grigore Alexandrescu, Dimitrie Bolintineanu, and Cezar Bolliac wrote melancholy meditations, colorful oriental and historical ballads, and rebellious social pamphlets, but usually kept away from the central concerns of romantic imagination and transfiguration. The greatest poet of the period, Vasile Alecsandri, was the soul of moderation: he added an academic or ironic polish to the marginally romantic motifs treated by his contemporaries, affected the serenity of Horace and the ironic sprightliness of Ovid, and touched all romantic themes with a graceful detachment, which indicates a lack of poignant involvement similar to that of the Biedermeier.

Among the main authors of fiction, Costache Negruzzi and Alexandru Odobescu wrote historical tableaux that can only be described as Biedermeier in their careful historicist manner, while Nicolae Filimon's novel *Ciocoii vechi si noi* (Old and New Landowners, 1863) evinces a post-Balzacian mixture of sensationalism and social realism–very far from the visionary intensities of core Romanticism. Bălcescu wrote history in the manner of Jules Michelet and Edgar Quinet; Ion Ghica's letters and Odobescu's *Pseudokynegetikos* are only the foremost among a vast body of conversational essays, strikingly close in manner, tone, and elegance to Lamb's and Xavier de Maistre's productions–with which they were hardly acquainted.[8]

The visionary romanticism of Mihai Eminescu in the 1870s is an anachronic but logical reconstruction of an aspect all but missing in the early nineteenth century;[9] the important qualification is that this phenomenon took place "underground", in unpublished projects and manuscripts. Titu Maiorescu, the sternly Victorian mentor of Romania in matters aesthetic, encouraged or even dictated their suppression, while promoting the realistic, serious, Biedermeier, and Victorian aspects of Eminescu's work. Eminescu's philosophy, a combination of Schopenhauer, J. F. Herbart, H. T. Buckle, Herbert Spencer, and Hegel, is largely responsible for the schizophrenic aspect of the poet's work: the "Neptunian", diurnal, discursive, and rational-social side ever opposed to the "Uranian", nocturnal, visionary, fiercely subjective, and mythical side.[10]

V

Somewhat similar processes occurred in the richer neighboring Hungarian literature. The eighteenth century was a period of literary decline after the flowering of Renaissance and even baroque writing in the previous two centuries; Hungarian Enlightenment is usually said to begin after 1772 and to go deep into the 1820s, while the "Reform Age" or "Vormärz" (roughly 1820–1844 or 1820–1850) is said to represent Hungarian romanticism.[11]

But what kind of Enlightenment do we discover when we look closely at the facts? There is no question that the ideas of Locke, Voltaire, and Montesquieu were introduced in Hungary, particularly by György Bessenyei and by his followers, who thought of themselves as representatives of Josephinism. But from the very beginning, there were mingled with these a stress on national sentiment, an admiration of the past, indeed of rugged conservatism, that seem to be, if anything, in *advance* of their time; at the very least they give a decisive

preromantic coloring to the Hungarian Enlightenment. The prevalence of the extended topos of a societal idyll (often, but not always transposed into the historical past) is also a typical feature. Benedek Virág (1754–1830) and the circle of his admirers, Sándor Kisfaludy (whose most influential work appeared around 1800), and Dániel Berzsenyi (who, it is true, became known only after 1813) provide illustrations of this characteristic aspect. In all of them we encounter a peculiar mixture of the romance tradition (Horatian or Petrarchan) with a more nativist melancholy or exaltation of a dark golden age.[12] Among other examples are Mihály Csokonai Vitéz, who did most of his writing in the 1790s, and Mihály Fazekas, who wrote his one important work, *Ludas Matyi* (Mátyás the Gooseboy), in 1804. The former displays a peculiar mixture of belated rococo and sentimentalism *(Dorottya* was clearly influenced by Pope's *Rape of the Lock)* with an intense quasi-romantic awareness of folk themes and folk-stylistic devices;[13] and his drama *Tempefői* is a good presentation of the myth of the *poète damné,* in spite of its amiable form and lack of bitterness. A similar mixture is easily recognized in *Ludas Matyi.*

In other words, it would seem that these preromantic writers slide imperceptibly into a kind of early Biedermeier while still preparing the romantic explosion. We may apply here the views of Alexandru Cioránescu regarding Romanian literature: namely, that compared to the stagnating cultural (and, I should like to add, social) situation in East-Central Europe, both Enlightenment and romantic features could be regarded as revolutionary departures, and thus used interchangeably.[14] There is no organic connection between a developing Enlightenment model and its romantic outcome and negation. Rather, what we encounter is a combination, a kind of hasty averaging of features. In this early stage the quasi- Biedermeier features are perhaps not more than a coincidence; the retreating Western romanticism of the 1820s and 1830s tried to occupy a middle ground between romanticism and a recuperated Enlightenment similar to that the Eastern Europeans were seeking in the 1780s and 1790s. But we must also take into account the sociocultural situation in which the decision that conservative-nostalgic and radical-didactic impulses are not imcompatible was made even before the French Revolution.[15] In this respect Eastern Europe was more similar to England than to France and Germany.

Therefore it is not strange that the Hungarian "romantics" after 1820 differ from the preceding generation in value more than is substance. Mihály Vörösmarty's main works, the hexameter epic *Zalán futása* (The Flight of Zalan, 1825) and the historical tragedies, followed fairly closely the tradition of Csokonai and Berzsenyi. His historical plays of blood and revenge are in the manner of Victor Hugo. His political and philosophizing shorter poems have the ring of Jung Deutschland; they offer individual pessimism and doubt mixed with social and national hopefulness, which throughout Europe is indicative of the breakdown of the core-romantic paradigm.[16]

A number of minor figures could be termed purely Biedermeier: János Garay, whose *feuilletons,* short descriptive pieces, and humorous poems are in the spirit of Lamb and Hunt; Ferenc Toldy, a typical late-romantic historian and critic; Miklós Jósika, whose historical novels of the 1830s and 1840s adapted Scott's approach to Transylvanian history; Pál Vasvári, who philosophized in the manner

of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Michelet; or Mihály Tompa, whose assimilation of folk versification and themes was controlled by a Biedermeier seriousness and respect for industriousness.

The prime piece of evidence will be provided by Sándor Petőfi himself. Of his main poetic epics, *A helység kalapácsa* (The Hammer of the Village, 1844) was immediately recognized as antiromantic, deflatig conventions and masterfully playing with the lower register halfway between Heine and Puskin, and certainly not far from the manner of Mickiewiecz's *Pan Tadeusz. János Vitéz* (Childe John, 1845), on the other hand, uses the fantastic in the playful, deliberate manner of the later romantics, and certainly kept clear of the prophetic intensity of imagination of the first romantic generation. Naturally, one may debate whether in some of his shorter lyrics, in the short novel *A hóhér kötele* (Hangman's Rope), and some other writings of the years 1845–1846, Petőfi does not identify himself with a purer romanticism. It seems to me that, even after possibly answering this question in the affirmative, we shall find this high- romantic episode engulfed in a mass of idyllic, descriptive, and moody genre poetry, which includes *Az Alföld* (The Plain, 1844), *Téli esték* (Winter Evenings), and *A vén zászlótartó* (The Standard-Bearer, after 1847) and, indeed, his travel diaries and occasional prose pieces for *Pesti Divatlap*.[17] In *A Tisza* (1847) and the related genre and descriptive poems, we find Petőfi at his most characteristic: idyllic and tempestuous scenes alternate rather than organize themselves along a past versus future (alienation versus redemption) pattern of intelligible progress. What is more, Petőfi's characters show an awareness of Dickens' eccentrics and misfits, and close analysis of his treatment of structures borrowed from folk poetry shows how thoroughly he had "out-run" the romantics.[18] In a word, the progress from Csokonai to Petőfi is one of mastery or, perhaps, of aesthetic information, not a deeper one involving the self-shaping of human existentiality.

VI

A few brief comments on the periodization of Czech literature will, I hope, further clarify the specific romantic pattern of development in Eastern Europe. As William Harkins has shown, there has been a very serious debate on this subject and the conclusion rather generally accepted would have it that the Czech Enlightenment lasted well into the nineteenth century, followed by fairly short preromantic and romantic periods between roughly 1815 and 1860.[19] This view fits the second category of theories described above, the one which holds that all phases of the Western pattern must be rediscovered in identical sequence in the East, vith an average lag of half a century. A closer look easily reveals a different situation.

The Czech Enlightenment had an explosively radical quality that makes it close kin to romanticism. That is why so many literary historians refer to it as the period of renaissance.[20] It would be impossible to overlook the many features pointing to romanticism even in the work of a rationalist like Josef Dobrovský, who was influenced by Herder, who admired the Schlegels, who thought that Indian and Slavic mythology had a common basis, and who tried to localize universal reason in the specific Slavic way.[21] On the other hand, A. J. Puchmajer thought he could

encourage or develop romanticism through poetry in the manner of the *Göttinger Hain* and rococo stylistics. The same type of mixture is evident in the work and approach of the more nationalistic representatives of the literature of the time, such as Josef Jungmann or Ján Kollár. Jungmann disliked romantic poets and promoted the works of Voltaire and Wieland, Pope, Goldsmith, and Goethe (from among the latter's works he translated, significantly, *Hermann und Dorothea*). But at the same time he rhapsodized about a fantastically modified past of the Slavs and displayed intense nationalism. I shall not discuss the typical transitional ("preromantic") play of the fabricated manuscript collections of Králóve Dvur and Zelená Hora (the imaginative work of Václáv Hanka with the help of Josef Linda and others)–certainly prime examples of the imagination working with mixed theoretical and literary material.

But Ján Kollár and F. L. Čelakovský express even better the highly ambivalent attitude toward romanticism of writers belonging to the Czech "renaissance". These are people who were well aware of the main romantic figures in Europe (sometimes through personal contact) and who nevertheless were trying to find a middle road, specifically different from that of Western European core romanticism. During his German studies Kollár admired Goethe, Arndt, and Jahn; the ideas of Lorenz Oken, J. F. Fries, and Heinrich Luden were digested as suggestions for a patriotic-national vision of Slavic grandeur and mythical potential; better even than in Jungmann, we can observe the mechanics of structure transfer from the cosmic to the mundane in Kollár's poetic output or theoretical ramblings.[22] His courses and published or posthumous manuscripts on the identity of the Slavic zodiac with the Indian–Egyptian one or the fantastic-philosophical etymologies of the concept of *Slav* parallel similar attempts to structure poetically large areas of intellectual discourse throughout Europe in the early nineteenth century. Such features of Biedermeier metamorphosis make even Kollár's later conservatism and admiration for A. S. Khomyakov irrelevant. Earlier, and perhaps more drastically than others, Kollár expressed the culture-civilization tension which from Herder on obsessed German and Eastern European intellectuals until well into the twentieth century.

Josef Mühlberger contends, correctly I believe, that the common, old Slavic concept of *Mir* with its implications of both peace and cosmos and its foundation in the matriarchal village-state with common ownership based on moderation and quiet growth was important to the shaping of the traditional perceptual assumptions of Czech literature.[23] It certainly provided, when rediscovered, a convenient historical and even religious legitimacy for a variety of holistic visions. It is easy to see how Puchmajer or others might in turn have related their rococo idyllism to this more vigorous and weightier construct. But it was left for Čelakovský to spell out the opposition in his two series of poems of 1829 and 1839: *Ohlas písní ruských* and *Ohlas písní českých.* Čelakovský himself claimed that he was pointing to differences between ethnic-psychological morphologies in opposing the deep forests, rugged cliffs, and tumultuous waves of the Russian spirit to the open lawns, friendly bushes, and murmuring creeks of the Czech song.[24] I submit that Čelakovský was observing the transition from high romanticism to the lower but consistent harmonies that the Biedermeier was seeking.

The literary atmosphere of the 1830s and 1840s in Bohemia could never be thoroughly understood without the concept of Biedermeier. The main figures of the period certainly display Biedermeier features, and it seems surprising that almost none of the major literary historians (not even Wellek) were willing to tackle this fact. It is true that, for example, Josef Kajetán Tyl's musical plays, full of fairytale fantasy, black humor, and fiddling obsessions have always been compared to those of Nestroy and even Raimund. A brilliant, recent article by Milorada Součková has disclosed the wealth of implications in Tyl's famous poem, which later became the national anthem of the Czechoslovak republic *Kde domov můj?*[25] Although Součková's account is illuminating, I believe that her exclusive reliance on Cosmas's *Chronicon* is confining; whatever Tyl's sources, the responses to his poem were part of an intellectual climate in which a more modern idyllic model was shaping the perception of imaginative and empiric realities. The best evidence is provided by some of Tyl's contemporaries, such as František Jaromir Rubeš–the first important representative of the easy, humorous, miniature, descriptive genre dealing with the ordinary life of ordinary people that was to inaugurate in Czech literature a tradition lasting from Karolina Světlá (d. 1899) all the way to Marie Pujmanová, Alois Jirásek (d. 1930), Jarmila Glazarová, František Táborský (d. 1940), Ignát Herrmann (d. 1935), Karel Polácek (d. 1944) and indeed to Jaroslav Hašek himself.

The acknowledged masters of this tradition came at its very beginning; contemporaries of Tyl and Rubeš, though younger, Božena Němcová and Jan Neruda provided classical examples of Biedermeier writing by any standards. Němcová's *Babička* (Granny, 1855) with its static choices and multitude of vivid details illustrates the main strategy of this literary approach. The examples of minute and credible harmony in the life surrounding us are multiplied to surfeit. They have to convince us that their mere accumulation suggests an all-encompassing harmony. Leslie Stephen and others have spoken of circumstantial realism in the writings of Defoe; I suggest that Němcová similarly fuses the idyllism of the late eighteenth century with the hope that at least a fleeting outline of the primeval Slavic *mir* can be recaptured. But the cumulative effect proves stronger: the reception is one of atmosphere, not of comprehensive structure. The charge that this is sentimentalism–a mere mixture of sadness and humor–is, coming from a modern reader, neither more or less justified than when applied to other contemporary writers: it only points to the deeper contradictions of any Biedermeier formula. Similarly, Jan Neruda in his *Malostránskí povídkí* (Small Side Stories, 1878) or in his earlier collections of stories insisted on the capacity of the smallest structures to reflect the complexity and diversity of the universe as a whole. Neruda has sometimes been compared to Gottfried Keller. There is no question that in any periodization scheme their function in their respective literatures would be quite similar. They both abandoned the confining schemes of later romanticism in favor of the nonpurposive description of realism. But although the schemes were abandoned, the thematic material remained the same–the life and habits of the small rural or urban bourgeois environment–and the range of possible combinations of events did not become broader. However, a better suggestion, in my opinion, is that Neruda paralleled Wilhelm Raabe, with whom he shares a slightly nervous use of humor and a rather bashful

sentimentality. Many of Neruda's short stories relate psychologically sophisticated, almost "modernist" experiences, but they are placed in frameworks of hard stone: students at night smoking quietly on the Gothic roofs, surrounded by gables and gargoyles, or a teenager deciding to spend the night in St. Venceslas Cathedral, while other stories begin with lavish descriptions of the fat, smelly darkness of little houses. Thus the events are smothered and miniaturized by their own environment, not a rural, but an urban one. Layers of heavy civilization flatten out the would-be dramatic contours of events.

Czech literature certainly displays striking parallels to German literature; the two have probably the most orthodox and richly developed Biedermeier system. Czech literature has its equivalent of Heine or *Jung Deutschland* in the person of Karel Havlíček-Borovsky–who founded the epigrammatic-skeptical pole of Czech Biedermeier, just as Rubeš had founded the idyllic one. Another stock character of the Biedermeier cast is also present–the leisurely, erudite, imaginative essayist. Indeed, Frantisek Palacky can be seen in the best of European company, with Michelet, Carlyle, and Quinet, as one of the greatest belletristic historians, whose ideological-polemical vision is informed by a dominant myth–the pragmatic version of the romantic paradigm of immanent transcendence. Palacky's stylistic olympianism combined with his later-romantic visionary brilliance make him an eminent representative of the European Biedermeier.

Karel Hynek Mácha is such an important figure that he has been discussed from a comparatist angle more often than others. René Wellek has been quite concerned with Mácha's status: in a famous article he shows that the parallel between Byron and Mácha is limiting and has to be replaced by categories of similarities to different authors (most of whom I would characterize as Biedermeier).[26] Let us note among the parallels enumerated by Wellek those with Bulwer-Lytton and with Scott. Although Mácha's lyrical intensity is much more impressive than that of his English colleagues, he did share some basic concerns with them. Chief among these seems to me realistic concealment. Like all later romantics, he shied away from the absolute hero, from the typical figure embodying the experience of mankind as a whole, but tried nevertheless to maintain the general abstract stages of this experience.

Even though he and his contemporaries would not have resorted to stark myth, and even though they did not have the courage to proclaim that they were writing on "the poet's mind" or the "world's soul", they were eager to tackle the subject somehow. Much as he differed from his conventional contemporaries, Mácha did strive for typical experiential stages in highly individualized circumstances. The abstract and symbolic scheme is hiding in realistic or melodramatic garb. It is not exaggerated to call this procedure a mimetic concealment, a deliberate attempt to throw the doubters off track and to illustrate the same general points with individual cases. This attempt required the increasing use of external "romantic" elements, that is, the spectacular romantic machinery that one finds in *Eugene Aram* or *The Last Days of Pompeii,* no less than *Cikáni* (The Gypsies) or *Máj.*

A different process is at work in Mácha's reception of Scott. The structure of Scott's historical novels is deformed in a high-romantic direction. This is a phenomenon that can be recognized in many literatures with a weak or even a

missing high-romantic phase (French, Polish, Romanian, and others): the emergence of a substitute intensified romanticism at the tail end of the whole phase. *Křivoklat* or *Cikáni* are dense, fast-paced stories, in which suggestion and allusion come into their own as central devices, and energetic melodrama gradually acquires the shades of hermetism.

VII

In spite of Mácha's apparently ambiguous position, Czech literature, like Hungarian and Romanian, can essentially be divided into two phases: preromanticism and late romanticism (Biedermeier). The transition between the two is smooth. The more uniform character of the Eastern European romantic periods and movements prevents the sharp differences seen elsewhere, for example, between Goldsmith, Wordsworth, and Landor. Petőfi and Csokonai, Puchmajer and Rubeš, are close in style and matter, and the work of one continues smoothly from the work of the others.

This is not to say that such literatures lack pure Enlightenment features. Rather, a curious stratification takes place, perhaps as a consequence of the more elitist and stratified nature of Eastern European societies as opposed to Western ones: Enlightenment activities are bestowed from above, Enlightenment doctrines are designed to help the rising social groups. Not Dobrovský, but rather his humbler colleagues in the learned societies of Prague and Olomouc are true representatives of the Enlightenment. Václav Matěj Kramerius, with his journalistic and editorial production, is also such a representative. Echoes of the Enlightenment can be heard very late, in the statues and work of the *Matice Česká* (after 1831).[27] For Eastern European literatures the Enlightenment is not a flourishing of the neoclassicist human paradigm, or the bold intellectual consequence of the structural tensions between elitism and egalitarianism, as it is for Diderot and Hume. Rather, it is a purely *practical* background of educational reform, importation of intellectual information, careful dismantling of religious absolutes by the addition of scientific or rationalist elements, renewal of social usage and intercourse. Most of these features had been rather secondary aspects of Western Enlightenment.

There is another major difference between the Western European and the Eastern European Enlightenment. In Hungarian, Romanian, and Czech literatures, the earlier phases of the Enlightenment were ignored and a strong late phase, already distorted in a preromantic direction, flourished. *Scoala Ardeleaná,* Kollár and Dobrovský, Csokonai and Fazekas are prime examples. However, many scholars would agree that the possibility of a strong romantic revolution depends on a fully developed Enlightenment base. It is indeed the complete implementation and dialectic *Aufhebung* (suspension–denial preservation) of the Enlightenment program. The romantic human model does not emerge out of nothing; total expansion must proceed from gradual extensions. The absence of high romanticism in these Eastern European countries is not a quirk of fate, nor is it a matter of arbitrary choice. The cluster of values (Enlightenment plus preromantic) that appeared there in 1770–1790 had

to develop its own momentum; it was simply not spacious enough, not comprehensive enough, not organic enough to lead to a spasm of transuniversal harmony. On the other hand, the same construction was well able to adapt itself to late-romantic (Biedermeier) configurations. In France, Lamartine and Musset represented a retreat from the temerities of Saint-Just and Sade; in England, Scott and Lamb moderated the absolute claims of Wordsworth's conscience; in Germany, Mörike and Heine reduced to scale the mytical intensities of Hölderlin and Novalis; but in Eastern Europe the entrance to the Biedermeier was effected smoothly, with merely a passing frown at the excesses of Western romantics. Indeed, in Mácha or Eminescu or Petőfi, the genuine intensities of romanticism were repressed or hidden.

The practicality of the Biedermeier–national and social bodies as agents of development–appealed to the historical forces at work there, while the idyllic and domestic side of the Biedermeier could well compensate for the agonies of historical change. To put it more forcefully, precisely because the Biedermeier was dualistic in nature. It had a wider appeal in Eastern Europe than the absolute unity postulated by core romanticism. The inherent conservatism of Eastern European political development that seemed so puzzling to outside observers was not "genetic" or "inevitable"; it just represented the unfolding of the specific model of their entrance into the modern age. This dualism explains how the smooth surface of continuous moderation is punctured by occasional outbursts, how social cohesion is challenged but not disrupted by harsh stratification, and finally how selfish materialism and social idealism coexist so placidly in this part of the world.

Thus, Gershenkron's suggestions can prove useful in many ways. The human model (the carrier of literature) develops in several phases; it is quite possible for a community to identify with a late phase and not with an earlier one. I believe that this is precisely what happened in Eastern Europe: there was no full-fledged Enlightenment, only a catching up with its *last* phase (preromantic warts and all). Analogously, we can conclude that there was no high romanticism–merely a powerful and complex Biedermeier (1820–1850), fully synchronized with the corresponding Western phase.

VIII

It is interesting to look at these three literatures in comparison to the powerful and highly developed Polish and Russian literatures of the same period. (It would not be absurd to argue that in the 1820s and 1830s a politically inexistent Poland produced the most valuable "low-Romantic" literature in Europe). These two cultures did not suffer, like neighboring literatures, from the relative sterility of two centuries (1550–1750). In fact they both displayed a well-sketched (if not fully colored) Enlightenment phase and at least Poland was from the Middle Ages on fully synchronized with Western literatures. They had, as the literary historian Chizhevsky observed, royal courts and state organizations that could support Enlightenment efforts and experiments.[28] Nevertheless it is easy to note that in Russia neoclassicism was tinged by sentimentalism and all the other traits that we associate with the preromantic cluster of features (the Rousseauism of

Karamzin for instance). In turn Polish Enlightenment was largely shaped by Baroque momentum, Western echoes and a preference for the picturesque, the eccentric and fantasy. As in Central European literatures, 1820 did not mark a major change in literary structure, but simply in the quality of the output which rose considerably, not in style or themes, but rather in attitude or literary conscience. What changed rather radically around 1815–1820 is self-perception, and ultimately an awareness of the (Western) high-romantic paradigm in literature and philosophy. Central and Eastern European literatures caught up with Western European trends at their most advanced point. They skipped high romanticism and "became Biedermeier" somehow pretending that they had experienced the upheaval of an effort toward human regeneration by revolution and of the Romantic cosmic embrace by totalizing consciousness. Pushkin and Gogol were immediately synchronized with their late-Romantic colleagues in Vienna or Paris. Scott and Byron were understood with the same enthusiasm all over Eastern Europe. Garay or Odobescu were synchronic with the Spanish *costumbristas* or the likes of Lamb, Hunt and Hazlitt. Mickiewicz and Slowacki explored more deeply than their Western counterparts the relationship between dream, relativity, rebellion, hopelessness and *Geborgenheit.*

At this point certain common Central European features became salient. They have to do with a kind of institutionalization of Biedermeier attitudes, with their integration in the perception of national identity. This is true about Austria, Hungary, and Bohemia, to a good extent about Romanian culture, and even about some South Slav literatures, that I am imperfectly familiar with. (Thus the Serbian Jovan Steria Popović, 1806–1856, has been roundly declared a Biedermeier writer by some critics and in the twin Croatian literature the founders of realism, August Senoa and Ante Kovačić built on a strong pastoral-idyllic basis.)[29] The types of sensibility expressed in the Biedermeier age, the intellectual debates unfolding at that time, the great names produced then shaped the community consciousness of Hungarians, Romanians, Czechs and others and channeled their modes of thinking until at least the middle of the twentieth century, and this despite further progress in literature and science, as well as in sociohistorical levels. In Polish and Russian cultures cultural and historical events prior to the Biedermeier age, as well as others soon following it had equal importance or more in organizing the future course of the community. In this respect Poland and Russia resemble more England or France, while the Central European experience resembles (up to a point) the one in German language areas.

One very important way in which the Biedermeier shaped the future was the emergence of what I would call a "Central European learning ethos" by contrast to (Max Weber's) "Protestant work ethos". Unfortunately there is no room here for more than a short definition. The Central European learning ethos grew out of a combination of Enlightenment and Romantic features. It postulated the liberation and advance of the human individual or group by an increasing access to science, information, and humanistic values. The immersion in the values of high culture and professional competence were supposed to be rewarded (indeed, as often as not, in the Danubian area, they *were* rewarded) by access to a higher level of humanity, by integrative acceptance, ultimately by a kind of liberation. This *ethos,* of Biedermeier origin, was truly comprehensive and inclusive. It

applied to the peasantry: ceaseless toiling, a deliberate limitation of living standards, stinting and hoarding were justified by the hope that a younger generation would pass the barrier separating it from full liberated humanity. It applied to the middle classes, and perhaps in particular to the Jewish middle classes in their effort at social integration and cultural acceptance.[30] It applied to the working class and to the large bureaucratic apparatus of the Double Monarchy and of the successor states in inculcating the values of duty, order, honesty and legality, punctuality and responsible behavior (the symbolic embodiment of which became for a while Emperor Franz Josef I). It informed even the aristocratic layers, casting about for an existential rationale and for some positional legitimation in a gradually modernizing world. It is interesting to note that the "Central European ethos" (and I am not saying that somewhat related meritocratic and enlightening concepts did not exist in other parts of Europe, notably in England, but they were less generalized, and did not comprise all ethnic groups and social classes as in the Danubian basin) exerts even now an influence on people's consciousness. Thus in North America, where it was brought by Central European immigrants and particularly by Jewish middle-class communities, this Biedermeier artifact continues to persist even at the end of the twentieth century.

The other group of examples to be adduced briefly here is more institutional in nature. The purposes of national revival were defined in all these cultures in the moderate mode of Biedermeier reformism and traditionalism. Hence the emergence of "liberal-conservative" political doctrines.[31] Hence the preference for written media and pamphletary challenges to the existing order (rather than violent means). Hence the cultivation of sentimental myths about the "golden ages" of national origins (particularly in Hungarian and Romanian literatures, to some extent in others also). Hence the proliferation of associations of all kinds (as intermediary structures between state and individual).[32] Hence in particular (as mentioned above) the founding of organizations that defined national identity and cultural-scientific concerns: *Matice Česká, Astra, Matice Srpska* and many others. All these developments can be connected with cognitive and sensitivity categories born in the crucible of the Biedermeier age.

Hov can we *evaluate* these features and developments? The first conclusion must be that it is not *necessary* for one national literature to repeat all the phases of another or of the "general" European development, nor must we postulate the need for a time lag in more marginal literatures.

Eastern European literatures were not able to overcome by themselves the pressure of the Enlightenment and of neoclassical momentum. On the contrary, in Central Europe the Enlightenment mentality usually managed to absorb the incipient modifications of its own *figura*. Of course that meant that it was enriched and provided a richer intellectual and psychological environment, one capable of satisfying the needs of local intellectual elites. At the same time it meant that, after 1815 or 1820 when disappointment, Restoration and a general lowering of sights set in in the West, Eastern and Central European literatures found it easy and natural to synchronize with the prevailing European Romantic model. A broader late Enlightenment found the newest (and limper) Romanticism accommodating and indeed exciting. Some of the interesting and, I believe,

creative consequences for Eastern and Central Europe were just mentioned. But they should not blind us as to the massive sociohistorical disadvantages of this "counterpoint" type of progress.

Admittedly any kind of Romanticism has at its center an absence: the impossibility of achieving the kind of rebirth of human nature and the kind of integrality of the social, the natural, and the divine that were the supreme goals of Romanticism. However, the attempt itself–whether as revolutionary break, violent consciousness raising, supreme fantasy, Napoleonic continental upheaval, or otherwise–became in large parts of Western Europe a kind of presence and accelerated the movement towards modernization. Wherever a "high-romantic" phase was skipped a double absence installed itself at the background of further historical advances. Beyond the inbuilt certainty of failure of Romanticism, owing to its absolute claims, there was East of the Elbe the failure to take advantage of the accelerating energies of sociocultural experiments and of their organic assimilation. In Central Europe the assimilation was there, but its object was absent. Many of the best and most endearing aspects of the region, and many of its most discouraging and backward features were caused or generated by it. (Deficiencies in the relationship to reality, slothful modernization, excessive nostalgia, the chronic addiction to retrograde populisms of all kinds are just some of the latter historical handicaps.)

For a polycentric culture, such as the European one, the East and Central European experience was and is valuable and enriching. Its version of the Biedermeier provided–precisely because it was synthetic, telescoped and substitutive–many suggestions for the future. In retrospect, Gogol appears as Kafkian and surrealist; Mácha was claimed by many modern groups; Krasiński pointed to expressionism and avantgarde and so forth. The sociohistorical consequences of a specifically Biedermeier emphasis in the Danubian area were however, at best, mixed in their historical merits.

Notes

1. A full treatment of this topic is in my book *The Taming of Romanticism. European Literature and the Age of Biedermeier* (Cambridge, MA: Harward University Press, 1984), and particularly in Chapter 4, from which several sections of this paper are adapted or taken literally, as well as in "Ostmitteleuropäisches Biedermeier. Versuch einer Periodisierung (1780–1850)," in Herbert Zeman, ed., *Österreichische Literatur. Ihr Profil im 19. Jahrh. (1830–1880)* (Graz: Akademische Druck u. Verlagsanstalt, 1982), 125–139.
2. Alexander Gershenkron, *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective* (1952; rpt. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 353–4, 5–30, 354–64.
3. M. H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism* (New York: Norton, 1971).
4. Alexandru Duţu, *Coordonate ale culturii românesti in secolul al XVIII-lea* (Bucharest: Editura pentru Literătura, 1968).
5. Ion Lungu, *Şcoala ardeleană* (Bucharest: Minerva, 1978). The one significant literary work associated with the group is *Ţiganiada* by I. Budai-Deleanu, a Voltairean mock-heroic poem in which some preromantic notes can be detected.
6. Typically, Alexandru Dima et al., eds., *Istoria literaturii române* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei R. S. R., 1968), II. 9–229.
7. Paul Cornea, *Originile, romantismului românesc* (Bucharest: Minerva, 1972). See Vera Călin, "Aspects de la superposition des courants littéraires dans la litterature roumaine au cours de la

premiere moitié du XIXe siècle," in *Actes du We congrès de l'Association Internationale de Littérature Comparée* (Belgrade: Mouton, 1969), pp. 225–230. Călin speaks mostly about the simultaneous reception of classicism, Enlightenment, preromanticism, and romanticism in Romanian poetry.

8. Mention could also be made of Nicolae Filimon's *Escursiuni in Germania meridională* (1860), or his many artistic, musical, and economic reviews. Mihai Kogalniceanu published in the 1840s a large number of delightful observations (ironic and objective) on Moldavian social customs; see *Scrisori: Note de calatorie,* ed. Augustin Z. N. Pop and Dan Simonescu (Bucharest: Eminescu, 1967). Vasile Alecsandri's fragmentary memoirs and some of his prose *(Istoria unui galbăn şi a unei parale)* belong to the same category.
9. A conceivable exception is Alecu Russo, *Cîntare României* (1850). But even Russo was influenced by Xavier de Maistre an author greatly appreciated by Romanian literati of the time in his minor writings.
10. Ion Negoiţescu, *Poezia lui Eminescu* (Bucharest: EPL, 1967).
11. Tibor Klaniczay, József Szauder, and Miklós Szabolcsi, *History of Hungarian Literature* (London: Collet's, 1964) is Marxist. Julius von Farkas, *Die ungarische Romantik* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyer, 1931) is Nadlerian. A typical position (widely shared by traditional Eastern European Marxists) is that the problem of periodization should be subordinated to a belated nation-forming process, which drew from different sources simultaneously. It is put forward by László Sziklay, "La Formation de la consience nationale moderne dans les littératures de l'Est de l'Europe Centrale," in *Les Lumières en Hongrie, en Europe Centrale et en Europe Orientale,* ed. Béla Köpeczi (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971), p. 56. Interesting and sophisticated is István Sőtér, *The Dilemma of Literary Science* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973), pp. 101–240–both on the theory of periodization in European literature, and on the way this can be applied to Hungarian literature. He applies the *Goethezeit* model and relies a lot on expanded *Sturm und Drang;* ultimately he takes 1817 as the starting date.
12. One of the many parallel examples in neighboring literatures is provided by the Slovak J. I. Bajza's René (1783–1785). Usually characterized as an Enlightenment novel, it might well be understood as showing romantic features. See Jan Tibensky, "Les Traits fondamentaux et les principaux représentants slovaques de l'époques des lumières," in Köpeczi, *Les Lumières en Hongrie,* p. 66.
13. It should be noted that Csokonai's *Dorottya* has often been compared to *Pan Tadeusz* and *Onegin.* See, e.g., F. Szilágyi, "Les Changements du léxique de la langue littéraire et courante hongroise à l'époque des lumières, en rapport avec les changements de la conscience (collective) linguistique (stylistique)," in Köpeczi, *Les Lumières en Hongrie,* p. 86.
14. Alexandru Cioranescu says: "le romantisme ne peut être conçu comme renversement ou comme réaction que là où il y a eu préalablement un classicisme" (*Revue de littérature comparée,* 48, no. 1 [1974], 160–161). This opinion is shared by many Eastern European specialists. Besides Vera Călin (n. 7), see the opinions of K. Horvath and L. Sziklay in Köpeczi, *Les Lumières en Hongrie,* pp. 59 and 101, on simultaneous reception
15. Both in Hungary and in Romania. See Andrew Janos, "Modernization and Decay in Historical Perspective: The Case of Romania," in *Social Change in Romania 1860–1940,* ed. K. Jowith (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, 1978), pp. 72–117. See also Janos, *The Politics of Backwardness in Modern Hungary, 1825–1945* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).
16. A possible exception is his philosophic fairy play in verse *Csongor és Tünde* (1831), much indebted to the atmosphere of *A Midsummer Night's Dream.*
17. Parallel examples are Mácha, Eminescu, Hugo, and, in another sense, Norwid and Nerval.
18. Sőtér, pp. 196–197.
19. William Harkins, "The Periodization of Czech Literary History, 1774–1879," in *The Czech Renascence of the 19th Century: Essays Presented* to *Otakar Odlozilik,* ed. Peter H. Brock and H. Gordon Skilling (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), pp. 3–13.
20. Vaclav Flajšhans, *Pisemnictví české slovem i obrazem od nejdávnějších dob az po naše časy* (Prague: Grosman a Svodoba, 1901), Arne Novák, *Die tschechische Literatur,* Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, 18, ed. Oskar Walzel (Potsdam: Athenaion, 1931), pp. 1–114. (Novák later changed his mind.) See Arne Novák, *Dějiny české literatury,* 3 vols. (Prague: Práce Československé Akademie Ved, 1959–1967).

21. Matthias Murko, *Deutsche Einflüsse auf die Anfänge der Böhmischen Romantik* (Graz: Styria, 1897), p. 23.
22. See ibid., pp. 197–216, 234; see also the interesting sonnet analysis of the way in which a new "wholeness" is created out of separate parts by a mimetic process, pp. 213–214.
23. Josef Mühlberger, *Tschechische Literaturgeschichte* (Munich: Ackermann–Gemeinde, 1970), pp. 4–5.
24. Novák, *Die tschechische Literatur,* p. 46.
25. Milorada Součková, "*Locus Amoenus:* An Aspect of National Tradition," in Brock and Skilling, *Czech Renascence,* pp. 26–32.
26. René Wellek, *Essays on Czech Literature* (The Hague: Mouton, 1963), pp. 148–179. Parts of the essay were published in 1937 and 1938. Milorada Součková, *The Czech Romantics* (The Hague: Mouton, 1958), pp. 39–86.
27. Stanley Kimball, "The 'Matice Česká," 1831–1861: The First Thirty Years of Literary Foundation," in Brock and Skilling, *Czech Renascence*, pp. 53–73. Similar organizations were created by the Transylvanian Romanians (in fact, Archbishop Saguna was directly inspired by his Uniate philologist predecessors–Micu and Sincai) and the Serbians: *Astra* and *Matica Srpska.* For a more general Czech background, see Arne Novák, *Die tschechische Literatur,* pp. 35–37.
28. Dimitrij Chizhevsky, *Comparative History of Slavic Literatures,* trans. Richard Noel Porter and Martin P. Rice (1968; reprint, Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Press, 1971), pp. 119–149.
29. See the studies of Aleksander Flaker and Dragysha Zhivkovich.
30. Viktor Karady, "Les Juifs, l'Etat et la société dans la monarchie bicéphale," in: ed. A. Deszles, M. Molnár; *Le genic de l'Autriche–Hungrie* (Paris, P. U. F. 1989), pp. 83—98.
31. Cf. J. C. Nyiri, *Am Rande Europas. Studien zur österreichisch–ungarischen Philosophiegeschichte* (Vienna: Böhlan, 1988).
32. Miklós Molnár, "Société civile et vie associative" (in: *Le génie,* pp. 53—64.).