

Constantin Tonu

The Pan-Slavic Utopian Imaginary

Abstract: Strongly influenced by European Romanticism, the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, the German unification movement and German idealist philosophers, the Pan-Slavic movement (which took shape between 1830 and 1840) had an idealistic, utopian character from the very beginning. The aim of this paper is to analyse the utopian imaginary of the main Pan-Slavic projects, starting with the precursor of the Slavic idea, Juraj Križanić, then moving on to Herder's image of the archetypal Slav, Ján Kollár's plea for Slavic cultural reciprocity, Mikhail Bakunin's proposal to transform the Slavic cause into a revolutionary, anarchic force, Mikhail Pogodin's active campaign for the realisation of Russia's full potential through union with the Balkan and Austrian Slavs, the Russian Pan-Slavism advocated by the Slovak Ľudovít Štúr, and ending with the pseudo-scientific perspective on Slavism of Nikolay Danilevsky.

Keywords: Pan-Slavism; Utopian Imaginary; Pan-Slavic Projects; Slavophilia; Slavic Reciprocity; All-Slavic Union; Slavdom.

CONSTANTIN TONU

Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
costeaunot@yahoo.com

DOI: 10.24193/cechinov.2024.46.22

The Pan-Slavic movement took shape between 1830 and 1840 in the context of European Romanticism, strongly influenced by the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, the German unification movement and the German Romantic philosophers¹ – factors that from the outset gave the Pan-Slavic imagination an idealistic, utopian character. This can be seen even in the way in which the promoters or researchers of Pan-Slavism have tried to articulate and define the Slavic idea over time. For example, in one of the reference books of the field, *The Emergence of Russian Pan-Slavism 1856–1870*, Michael Boro Petrovich says that “by Pan-Slavism is meant the historic tendency of the Slavic peoples to manifest in some tangible way, whether cultural or political, their consciousness of ethnic kinship”². This means that, despite its etymology, the term Pan-Slavism (coined in 1826) was used to refer not only to the all-encompassing Slavic movements or projects, but also to any form of solidarity between two or more Slavic peoples. In other words, regional projects such as Austro-Slavism, Yugoslavism or attempts to unite the Eastern Slavs (Russia, Ukraine and Belarus) also stand under the sign of pan-Slavism.

Like any form of pan-nationalism, Pan-Slavism is difficult to grasp and define, being marked by a conceptual vagueness and low practical feasibility³. This can be seen as a weakness, as a result of which Pan-Slavism lost ground to much better defined and clearly articulated nationalist programmes⁴, but also as an advantage, notes Mikhail Suslov, because “it provides for unprecedented flexibility of the pan-Slavic rhetoric”, allowing it to be combined with other narratives and doctrines (such as Eurasianism, Russian World/ Русский мир, Orthodox Civilization, “Holy Russia”/ Святая Русь, Slavic/Russian/ Polish Messianism, Pan-Orthodoxy, Pan-Russianism etc.) and to capitalize on “on stronger affinities of religion, nation, and territory. As a result, we can speak of many pan-Slavist projects, some of which can be mutually antagonistic, whereas others are complementary or nest within one another like matryoshkas.”⁵

The idealistic, utopian imaginary of the main Pan-Slavic projects will be the subject of the present research – beginning with the precursor of the Slavic idea, Juraj Križanić, then moving on to Herder’s image of the archetypal Slav, Ján Kollár’s plea for Slavic cultural reciprocity, Mikhail Bakunin’s proposal to transform the Slavic cause into a revolutionary, anarchic force, Mikhail Pogodin’s active campaign for the realisation of Russia’s full potential through union with the Balkan and Austrian Slavs, the Russian Pan-Slavism advocated by the Slovak Ľudovít Štúr, and ending with the pseudo-scientific perspective on Slavdom of Nikolay Danilevsky.

The first and probably the most eloquent example of a Pan-Slavic utopian project is that of the Roman Catholic

priest and scholar of Croatian origin, Juraj Križanić (1617-1683), who in 1659 came (under an assumed identity) to the Muscovy of Tsar Alexis with the mission of laying the foundations for the unification of the Slavic Christian world under the patronage of the Tsar and the religious guidance of the Papacy⁶. Since his years as a philosophy student preparing for the Roman Catholic priesthood, he had been interested in the Eastern Church and Slavic languages, and began to express “a fervent desire to be sent to Russia as a missionary”⁷. As Michael B. Petrovich points out, Križanić’s project, which “seems as fantastic today as it probably did then”, was based “on the singularly charitable assumption that the Muscovites were schismatics, not out of malice or unholy pride, but out of ignorance stemming from their isolation”. To rectify this religious identity issue, all that was needed was for “someone to explain to them the root of their error, for which Križanić blamed primarily the Greeks”⁸. In order to understand the extent of Križanić’s idealism, it is relevant to take a look at the concrete steps by which he thought to carry out his plan:

He meant to accomplish his purpose by attaching himself to the person of the Grand Duke of Muscovy as a historian, grammarian, librarian or teacher of his children. He would then persuade the Muscovite ruler to come to the aid of the oppressed Orthodox in the Balkans by waging a crusade against the infidel Turk. As this would require an alliance with the Catholic rulers of the West, K hoped to convince the Muscovite ruler of the necessity as well as of the virtue of returning to the bosom of the First

Rome. Once this was accomplished, the conversion of his subjects would be assured.⁹

The way it all ended highlights even more the contrast between Križanić's utopian project and the state of affairs in the Slavic world at the time. His attempt to convince the Moscow authorities of the need to bring together all the non-Russian Slavic peoples scattered throughout Europe (about whom the Russians knew very little at the time) and to re-establish the unity of the Christendom, headed not by a Pravoslav patriarch but by the Pope, not only did not have the expected results, but was regarded with hostility by the Orthodox priesthood, which in 1661 succeeded in having this "agent of Rome" exiled to Tobolsk in Siberia by means of an imperial decree (*ukaz*)¹⁰.

During his 15-year exile in Siberia, Križanić developed a hybrid Pan-Slavic language based on the vocabulary of Church Slavonic, Serbo-Croatian, Russian and Polish. In this language of his own invention¹¹, written in a modified Latin alphabet, Križanić wrote some nine works on religion, philosophy and politics, which already contain the seeds of many modern Pan-Slavic theories, including the need for Slavic peoples to work together in the face of German oppression. However, these texts had no influence in their time and remained unknown in manuscript until the late 1850s, when they were discovered and published by Russian Pan-Slavists¹² and Križanić was recognised and glorified as the forerunner and father of Pan-Slavism.

Another name deserves most of the credit for the enormous influence it had on the early period of the Pan-Slavic

movement: Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803), for it was he who gave "the Slavs the consciousness of a unity based upon the community of high morality and glorious destiny"¹³, thus generating the Pan-Slavic utopian imaginary. In a mere two pages devoted to the Slavs in *Ideas for the Philosophy of the History of Mankind* (1784)¹⁴, the German philosopher created the image of the "archetypal" Slav, the model of humanity and pure Christianity, whose characteristics would become a leitmotif in the Pan-Slavists writings. According to him, the Slavs have a predisposition for peace, generosity, hospitality, democracy, freedom and humanitarianism, which contrasts strongly with the bellicose and hegemonic tendencies of the Romano-Germanic (especially Germanic) peoples. As a true disciple of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Herder sees in the predominantly rural (and obviously backward) life of the Slavs a happy pastoral, an idyllic way of life¹⁵, clearly preferable to the high degree of civilisation of Western Europe, which only provides the means to oppress other peoples, emphasises man's alienation from his natural state and heralds his imminent end.

Admiring their folklore, their morality and their communion with the land and nature, Herder predicted a glorious destiny for the Slavs, proclaiming them "the coming leaders of Europe"¹⁶. As researchers note, his belief in the potential of the Slavs to create a new, bright, positive era was idealistic in nature, based more on his philosophical ideas than on the actual state of the various Slavic peoples and their history¹⁷. Herder insisted on the originality and specificity of the Slavic world, to which he attributed a unity of

language and “spirit” (*Volksgeist*), at a time when many of the Slavic peoples had not yet developed a sense of nationality¹⁸, but it was precisely the “prophetic” nature of his reflections that made Herder’s impact so great, says Dušan Ljuboja, because they were forward-looking and opened up the possibility of change and improvement.¹⁹ It is with such a prediction that he ends his chapter on the Slavs: “so you, Slavs, now sunk low but once so assiduous and happy, will one day stir from your long, torpid slumber and, freed from your chains, enjoy possession of your fine lands, from the Adriatic Sea to the Carpathian Mountains, from the Don to the Mulde, and on them celebrate your ancient festivals of tranquil industry and commerce.”²⁰

Among the Slavs most influenced by the ideas of the German philosopher were two young Lutherans of Slovak origin, Ján Kollár (1793-1852) and Pavel Josef Šafárik (1795-1861)²¹, considered to be the fathers of early Pan-Slavism, an eminently cultural movement – Kollár became its first poet and Šafárik its first scholar²². While Šafárik devoted himself to the task of demonstrating the antiquity of the Slavs and their importance in the European area, thus contributing to the spread of Slavic studies in academic and scientific circles, Kollár became famous for an epic poem entitled *Slavic Daughter* (*Slávy dcera*), written in Czech and published in 1824²³. In this poem, written in the enthusiasm of assimilating the “prophecies” of Herder – whom the Slovak author glorifies as “a priest of humanitarianism but even more as the friend of the Slavs”²⁴ – the narrator’s love for his beloved coincides with his patriotic love for the Slavic nation, the subjective, individual aspects naturally dissolving into

the motherland called Slavia²⁵. Kollár idealizes the common past of the Slavic peoples, laments their present miserable situation, and optimistically expresses his belief that “the spiritual union of the Slavs will be a blessing for the whole world”²⁶ – attitudes that have made this book “the national bible of early Pan-Slavism”, according to Hans Kohn²⁷.

The cultural-literary character of the early period of Pan-Slavism is also highlighted by the fact that the term “Pan-Slavism” was first used by the Slovak writer and linguist Ján Herkel (1786-1853) in a treatise on Slavic philology entitled *Elements of the Common Slavic Language*, written in Latin (*Elementa universalis linguae slavicae*) and published in Budapest in 1826²⁸. In Herkel’s view, true Pan-Slavism was defined as the literary unity of all Slavs, the precondition for which was the establishment of a common alphabet, a universal Slavic language²⁹. Following in the footsteps of Herkel (and Joseph Dobrovský, considered the “father of Slavic studies”), Ján Kollár wrote the essay *Reciprocity Between the Various Tribes and Dialects of the Slavic Nation*³⁰, in which he argued that Pan-Slavic unity could only be achieved on the spiritual-cultural level, and that this required the exchange of books, the establishment of bookshops, libraries, periodicals, university departments of Slavic philology, the creation of manuals and dictionaries for learning each Slavic dialect (which had to be purified of all foreign elements), the collection and publication of folklore, the strengthening of relations between members of the intelligentsia of the Slavic peoples etc.³¹ But even this limited, non-political appeal for Slavic literary reciprocity remained rather

“ineffectual, if measured by reality”, states Hans Kohn. For even if the literatures of the Slavic peoples flourished in the next century, this was due more to Western influences and the fact of belonging to the European cultural area than to Slavic solidarity. For example, “at the beginning of the twentieth century, it was easier to buy in the Czech bookshops of Prague, German or French books than Russian books. The educated Croat or Slovak read French and German; few were the individuals who read Russian or Polish.”³²

In Kollár’s view, inherited from Dobrovský and others, there was a single Slavic people divided into several tribes and a single Slavic language split into several dialects (four main ones: Russian, Illyrian/Serbian, Polish and Czech/Bohemian-Slovak) and sub-dialects³³ – a view shared, among others, by the Slovak Ludovít Štúr (1815-1856) and the Croatian Ljudevit Gaj (1809-1872), the latter being the main promoter of the Illyrian movement. Analysing the expanded 1824 edition of *Slavic Daughter*, as well as the essay on *Slavic Reciprocity*, Alexander Maxwell identifies the boundaries of “the broad geographic extent of Kollár’s imagined Slavic homeland ‘All-Slavia [Wšeslăwia]’³⁴. It includes the Urals, the Tatras, the Volga, the Sava, and the cities of Prague, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kyiv and, what’s more interesting, Istanbul, and Mt. Athos (in Greece). In doing so, initiates the practice of including non-Slavic territories in pan-Slavic projects, which we will also find in the texts of Mikhail Pogodin, Nikolay Danilevsky or, more recently, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn.

The confluence of projects articulated in the first half of the 19th century took place at the First Pan-Slavic Congress,

convened in Prague on 2 June 1848 on the initiative of Pavel Josef Šafárik and František Palacký (1798-1876), the latter being the leader of the Czech national revival movement who also chaired the congress. Of the 341 participants, the overwhelming majority were Austrian Slavs, but there were also a few delegates from Prussian Poland and two Russians, one of whom was the famous anarchist Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876)³⁵. Hopes were high for this unique event, which began with fiery speeches about the Slavic mission and the glorious destiny that awaited them. The Slavic anthem *Hey, Slavs* (composed in 1834 by the Slovak Samuel Tomasik) and the Slavic tricolour (blue, white and red) were unanimously adopted. But the rhetorical phase and the consensus disappeared quickly, notes Hans Kohn, because on the second day the delegates met in sections to discuss concrete issues, and that’s where the discord arose³⁶.

Of all the ideas put forward, by far the most daring and eccentric were those of Bakunin, who, in the message (with messianic overtones) presented to the Congress entitled *Fundamental Principles of the New Slav Politics*, and even more so in the *Appeal to the Slav Peoples of a Russian Patriot*, written at the end of 1848, proposed transforming the Slavic cause into a revolutionary force directed against the old, ossified world full of inequalities. Their revolutionary impetus must have been all the greater because the Slavic peoples were the most oppressed, but also the youngest and full of vitality, untouched by the alienating burdens of the old nations. As the last to join the march of European civilisation, the Slavs were destined to go furthest along the path of emancipation, setting an

example and providing the impetus for the liberation of all other peoples.³⁷

Bakunin opposed both the proposal to unite the Slavs within the Austrian Empire (which he wanted destroyed) and the temptation of the West and South Slavs to project their hopes onto the Russian Empire³⁸, pointing out the impossibility of building a happy and reconciled pan-Slavic nation under the German-born despot, who would never understand the Russian-Slavic people. A true Russian patriot, Bakunin dreamed of a community of all Slavs under the leadership of Russia, but not the Russia of the mid-19th century, where there was only room for mechanical obedience, but a new, revolutionary Russia. To this end, he advocated either the dissolution of the Russian Empire or the creation of a union of free Slavs who would then liberate Russia from autocracy and form with her a Pan-Slavic federation of equals – which “by its fire of blood would illuminate the whole of Europe” and ultimately bring salvation to the whole world.³⁹

As was to be expected, Bakunin’s utopian revolutionary projects did not find many supporters among the congress delegates. The Slavs gathered in Prague in 1848 looked westwards to Austria, not to Russia. They wanted equal rights, duties and freedoms for individuals and nations alike⁴⁰, but they wanted all this to be achieved peacefully, without revolting against their oppressors and without upsetting the balance of the great European powers⁴¹. In the light of these desires, the proposal of František Palacký and Karel Havlíček Borovský was much more attractive and accommodating: Austro-Slavism, which turned out to be the main direction of the congress and which was to remain the main

project of the Slavs in the Austrian (later Austro-Hungarian) Empire for at least the next two decades⁴².

If Pan-Slavism was stronger among the Western and Southern Slavs in the first half of the 19th century, the Russian Empire took the lead in the second half. During the reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855), the Tsarist attitude towards Pan-Slavic ideas oscillated between hostility, rejection, indifference and restraint. An ardent defender of the legitimate monarchy, the Tsar associated Pan-Slavism with rebellion, liberal nationalism, i.e. a potential danger⁴³. The change of perspective came only as a result of the disastrous experience of the Crimean War (and the change of Tsar in 1855). Despite the efforts of officials to maintain good relations with the European powers, the Russians discovered during this war that they had no reliable allies in Europe. Even the Austrian Empire did not come to Russia’s aid as a gesture of gratitude for the Tsar’s intervention in 1849, preferring instead to remain cautiously neutral. The whole concept of European solidarity on which Nicholas I had based his foreign policy was destroyed. Russia found itself defeated, demoralised and diplomatically isolated, so the main (and desperate) question was: “where are we to look for new allies?”⁴⁴ These allies would turn out to be the smaller Slavic brothers.

The main promoter of the idea that Russia should turn to the other Slavic peoples was the eminent historian Mikhail Petrovich Pogodin (1800-1875), who began actively campaigning for the Slavic cause as early as the 1830s and who, according to Mikhail Boro Petrovich, “deserves the title of modern Russia’s first real Pan Slavist”⁴⁵. This title is due to several

important aspects: firstly, Pogodin did not confine himself to making abstractions about the Slavs and talking about them only on the basis of the writings of others, but decided to get to know them personally, making a series of trips to the lands of the Balkan and Austrian Slavs from 1835 onwards. Thanks to these travels, he “came to know more influential Slavic cultural leaders than any other Russian of his time.”⁴⁶ In addition, as an ardent supporter of the dominant imperial ideological doctrine of Russian Emperor Nicholas I, Nationalism-Orthodoxy-Autocracy (proposed by Minister of Education Sergey Uvarov in 1833), Pogodin was probably the only Pan-Slavist who had the privilege of enjoying the confidence of Nicholas’s government⁴⁷. He used this advantage to write a large number of private memoranda to the government, in which he defended the Slavic cause. On top of that, he was a professor of Russian history at Moscow University of Moscow⁴⁸, and an editor and publisher⁴⁹ – positions that gave him the means to spread his ideas among the Russian population.

In a 1838 letter addressed to Grand Duke Alexander Nikolayevich, the future Alexander II⁵⁰, Pogodin argues, in a Slavophile rhetoric, that, despite its former greatness and power, the West has exhausted its creative potential and no longer has anything of value to offer the world. The individual rights and freedoms existing there, together with the emphasis on bureaucracy, have politically weakened the state and turned Western society into a soulless mechanism, an atomised mass civilisation incapable of decisive action. Moreover, even at the height of their development, the European countries have

“developed only one side of human nature and of social growth.”⁵¹ By contrast, the Russian people (as the highest standard of Slavdom) represented a close organic unity held together not by a more or less artificial political mechanism, but by the deep-rooted popular confidence in the Tsar, the God on earth and the living realization of the political self-consciousness and will of the people. Because of these defining characteristics, Pogodin says, nothing is impossible for Russia, and as the representative and the highest standard of Slavdom, the Russians (about 60 million at the time) have a mission to liberate the Slavs from the Austrian and Turkish yoke and unite with them to realise their full potential.

And if we add to this number another 30 million of our brothers, siblings and cousins, Slavs scattered all over Europe, from Constantinople to Venice and from the seas to the Baltic and German seas, Slavs who have the same blood as ours, who speak the same language and therefore, by the law of nature, sympathise with us, who, in spite of geographical and political separation, form one moral whole with us, by origin and language! Let us subtract this number from neighbouring Austria and Turkey, and then from the whole of Europe, and add it to ours.⁵²

Pogodin specified the composition of the Slavic Union in another letter, written in 1854. Predictably, Russia must become the head of the Union, but “not at will, not arbitrarily, not out of ambition and lust for power, but out of necessity, according to the nature of things, just as the Russian

language must over time become a common, literary language for all Slavic tribes, not under the compulsion of the Russian government, but according to the laws of philology⁵³. The capital should not be in Saint Petersburg or Moscow, but in Constantinople, because of its historical significance, and at the head of the union – none other than the Tsar. The interesting part about his project, however, comes after a few lines, when he says that, in addition to all the peoples of Slavic origin, there are a few other peoples which, because of their geographical location (being between the Slavic lands), *must* join the union: Greece, Hungary, Moldavia, Wallachia and Transylvania. The ease with which the Russian historian tries to justify this decision reaches idealistic heights, as he confesses that he sees no reason why these peoples would not want to be part of the Slavic union since they would be granted full autonomy in internal affairs, and only in general matters would they depend on the authorities in Constantinople and the Tsar.⁵⁴

Behind this reasoning lies Pogodin's conviction that Russia did not seek outward conquest or power. It sought its "glory in the moral and social perfection of man and humanity" – "a wisdom repeated for the next 120 years by all Russian imperialists, Slavophile or Bolshevik"⁵⁵, as Hans Kohn notes. Following in Jan Kollár's footsteps, Pogodin passionately declares that the future belongs to the Slavs. The other great nations have already had their heyday. Now it's the Slavs' turn: "Therefore, they must now enter the field, begin the highest work for humanity, and demonstrate their noblest powers."⁵⁶

Pogodin's call for Slavic solidarity had more resonance during the reign of

Alexander II, a period that coincides with the peak years of Russian pan-Slavism: between the Crimean War (1853-1856) and the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878). The confluence of Pan-Slavic projects from this period took place at the Moscow Slavic Congress organised in 1867. As Zdenko Zlatar notes, this event was perfectly timed, coming immediately after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867 "which rendered the Habsburg Empire into a Dual Monarchy dominated by Germans and the Magyars at the expense of the Slavs"⁵⁷. As a result, František Palacký's Austro-Slavic project, which pinned the hopes of the Slavs on the restructuring of the Austrian Empire into a federation in which they would enjoy the same rights and freedoms as other peoples, suffered a severe blow. The members of the Moscow Slavic Benevolent Committee (founded by Pogodin in 1858) "used this opportunity to reinforce their message that Western and Southern Slavs had only one, but very powerful, backer: Russia"⁵⁸.

To be more convincing, they made the strategic decision to publish a book that advocates the unification of the Slavic world under Russian rule, but written by a non-Russian Slav, namely: Ľudovít Štúr's essay *Slavdom and the World of the Future*, originally written in German in 1851 and translated into Russian by Vladimir I. Lammanskii in 1867⁵⁹. Ľudovít Štúr (1815-1856) wrote this text in the aftermath of the revolutionary events of 1848, the outcome of which deeply disappointed him (1815-1856) and caused him to rethink his Pan-Slavic conception (until then influenced by Jan Kollár's idea of Slavic reciprocity). Criticising the idea of literary/cultural solidarity as insufficient and rejecting "the

whole Western concept of civilisation as a set of impersonally defined norms and institutions⁶⁰ which only leads to decadence, spiritual stagnation, disunity and eventually chaos, Štúr turned his gaze eastwards, to the idealized image of the Russian Empire. Proclaiming “the superiority of the Slavs over the other nations”⁶¹ and advocating their spiritual union in Orthodoxy and their linguistic union through the establishment of Russian as the official language of Slavdom, he “called upon his Slavic brethren to realize that without the Russian Empire they had no future”⁶². His essentializing view of the Slavs and his admiration for the figure of the Tsar, autocracy, the communal life of Russian peasants and Russian Empire in general (which he never visited) led Hans Kohn to affirm that “Štúr is a good illustration of S. Harrison Thomson’s assertion that «there was always an element of the unreal and the naive in Pan-Slavism»”⁶³.

The entire tradition of Russian Pan-Slavism culminated, shortly after the Moscow Slavic Congress, in the publication of Nikolay Danilevsky’s book *Russia and Europe: The Slavic World’s Political and Cultural Relations with the Germanic-Roman West* (1969). As the most coherent and comprehensive synthesis of Slavophile thought, this book “achieved both fame and notoriety as the Bible of Russian Pan-Slavism”⁶⁴, and Danilevsky as its patriarch. Drawing on the ideas of Ivan Kireevsky in his seminal essay *On the Nature of Education in Europe and its Relation to Russian Education*, Danilevsky (1822-1885) states that the Romano-Germanic world (synonymous with modern Europe) and Russia (as the best representative of Slavdom) differ not only in degree, not only in circumstances, but also in essence, because they belong to

different civilizations or historical-cultural types – which “correspond to the great linguistic-ethnographic families or tribes of humanity”⁶⁵. Every historical-cultural type, he says, manifests itself like a living organism, passing through a period of youth, followed by maturity and senescence. According to this logic, European civilisation, which has already passed the peak of its development and is currently in decline, will be replaced, by historical necessity itself, by the much younger Slavs, who are already on the verge of coming to the fore on the international stage. A scientist by training and outlook, Danilevsky used the language and metaphors of biology and zoology to describe and compare cultures and civilisations, thus attempting to give Pan-Slavism a scientific character.⁶⁶

This “scientific” reasoning, however, does not undermine the utopian dimension of his Pan-Slavic project. On the contrary, it seeks to legitimise it. To a certain extent, Danilevsky’s unionist proposal resembles Pogodin’s: aware of the necessary requirements of their historical calling, the Slavs must form a federation that embraces all the lands and peoples from the Adriatic to the Pacific, from the Arctic to the Aegean. Under the leadership and hegemony of Russia, they would establish Tsargrad as their capital (he prefers this name, not Constantinople) and Russian as the common Pan-Slavic language. They differ, however, in the justifications they offer for including non-Slavic peoples in their imagined Pan-Slavic communities. After praising the innate qualities of the Slavs, such as kindness, peacefulness, discipline, the gift of obedience or the infinite readiness for self-sacrifice⁶⁷, Danilevsky goes on to say that

into this All-Slavic federation must enter, willingly or unwillingly, all those non-Slavic nationalities (Greeks, Romanians, and Magyars) crammed into the Slavic body, whose historical fate has been inseparably connected, for better or for worse, with ours. But this foreign ethnographic admixture losing itself, so to speak, in the mass of the Slavs, cannot have the same harmful disintegrative influence for an All-Slavic union that it has had for individual Slavic unions. Not only that, but the main non-Slavic members of the Slavic federation – the Greeks and Romanians – cannot even be considered a foreign admixture within it, because whatever they lack in similarity of the blood is made up for by their similarity of spirit: though not Slavs, they are Orthodox. But even that is not all. These people are not so foreign to Slavs, even by blood, as some think and as many would like. They are saturated, so to speak, with Slavic elements, and as a link in the system of Slavic peoples are analogous to the Romanic peoples within the European system who, like the French, are saturated with Germanic elements. What is strictly non-Slavic in them is only the vain pretence of isolation, exaggerated within their intelligentsia by the temptations, instigations, and incitements of our Western ill-wishers.⁶⁸

In other words, Danilevsky lists not only ties of blood or spirit, or geographical and strategic reasons, as arguments in favour of these lands joining the pan-Slavic union, but also the fact that “they constitute

mere ethnographic material, which is to say, a sort of inorganic substance entering into the makeup of historical organisms or historical-cultural types”. According to his theory, only groups of people that comprise these cultural-historical types can be positive agents in human history. All other peoples or tribes have no creative or destructive greatness (either because their distinctiveness was lost very early in their development, or for some other reason), and so play neither a positive nor a negative role.⁶⁹ In the light of these ideas, it is only natural that they would want to be part of the great Slavic federation.

A few years after the publication of Danilevsky's book, thanks to Bosnia and Herzegovina's uprising against the Ottoman Empire in 1875, Slavic solidarity took on unprecedented proportions, giving its followers hope that the Pan-Slav dream would finally be realised. “This event sparked a wave of Pan-Slavic sympathies among the Russians, several thousands of whom went to the Balkans as volunteers, while many more participated in Slavonic benevolent committees, gathering help for the insurgents and promoting the Pan-Slavic cause in the media and among the political elite.”⁷⁰ Under the growing pressure of public opinion, the Russian Empire decided to go to war against the Turks. Despite the victory, however, the Berlin Congress of 1878 was a fiasco for the Russians, and the whole Pan-Slavic momentum fizzled out. Which does not mean that it disappeared altogether. The Slavic idea resurfaced at the outbreak of the First World War, during which Pan-Slavic propaganda was widely used to mobilise Russian troops, and then, after lying dormant for the next two decades, was revived

in 1941 by Stalin's decision, who wanted to mobilise the Slavic allies in the war against Germany. With the Tito-Stalin split in the late 1940s, Pan-Slavism went into exile again for the next 50 years, only to return in the post-Soviet period, with Alexander Solzhenitsyn among its proponents, who, in good Pan-Slav tradition, envisioned a Slavic union to which, in addition to Russia, Ukraine and Belarus, he wants to add Kazakhstan, leaving the door open for Moldova as well⁷¹.

This research work was supported by Moldovan Ministry of Education and Research within the project „Perspective interdisciplinare asupra fenomenelor de confluență și de confruntare în domeniile lingvistic, literar și folcloric în spațiul basarabean ca limes civilizațional și frontieră geopolitică” [Interdisciplinary perspectives on the phenomena of confluence and confrontation in the linguistic, literary and folkloric fields in the Bessarabian space as a civilizational boundary and geopolitical frontier] (code 010301).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angaut, Jean-Christophe, “Revolution and the Slav Question: 1848 and Mikhail Bakunin”, in *The 1848 Revolutions and European Political Thought*, edited by Douglas Moggach & Gareth Stedman Jones, Cambridge University Press, 2018, p. 412-413.
- Buleu, Constantina Raveca, *Paradigma puterii în secolul al XIX-lea [The Paradigm of Power in the 19th Century]*, Bucharest, Ideea Europeană, 2011.
- Danilevskii, Nikolai Iakovlevich, *Russia and Europe: The Slavic World's Political and Cultural Relations with the Germanic-Roman West*, translated and annotated by Stephen M. Woodburn, Bloomington, Slavica Pub, 2013.
- Dorđević, Vladimir et al., “Revisiting Pan-Slavism in the Contemporary Perspective”, in *Nationalities Papers*, 51: 1, 2023, p. 1-13.
- Grigorieva, A. A., *Pan-Slavism: Ideology and Politics (40s of the XIX – early XX centuries)* [A.A. Григорьева, Панславизм: идеология и политика (40-е годы XIX – начало XX вв.)], Irkutsk, Asprint, 2013.
- Guins, George C., “The Degeneration of Pan-Slavism”, in *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Oct.), 1948, p. 50-59.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried, *Ideas for the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*, Princeton University Press, 2024.
- Kohn, Hans, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, Second edition, revised, New York, Vintage Books, 1960.
- Kohn, Hans, “The Impact of Pan-Slavism on Central Europe”, in *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Jul.), 1961, p. 323-333.
- Kostya, Sándor, *Pan-Slavism*, edited by Anne Fay Atzel, Danubian Press, Inc., 1981.
- Krištof, Pavol, “Responsibility and idea of Slavism in Kollár's and Štúr's thinking”, in *Ethics & Bioethics (in Central Europe)*, 12 (3-4), 2022, p. 145-153.
- Ljuboja, Dušan, “Herder's Ideas and the Pan-Slavism: A Conceptual-Historical Approach”, in *Pro&Contra*, 2. (2.), 2018, p. 67-85.
- Macůrek, Josef, “The Achievements of the Slavonic Congress”, in *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 26, No. 67 (Apr.) 1948, p. 329-340.
- Marušiak, Juraj, “Slovakia: Emergence of an Old-New Pseudo-Pan-Slavism in the Context of the Conflict Between Russia and Ukraine After 2014”, in Mikhail Suslov, Marek Čejka, Vladimir Dorđević (eds.), *Pan-Slavism and Slavophilia in Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe: Origins, Manifestations and Functions*, Palgrave Macmillan, Palgrave Springer International Publishing, 2023, p. 329-355.
- Maxwell, Alexander, “Herder, Kollár, and the Origins of Slavic Ethnography”, in *Traditiones*, 40 (2), 2011, p. 79-95.

- Maxwell, Alexander, "Effacing Pan Slavism: linguistic classification and historiographic misrepresentation", in *The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity: Nationalities Papers*, Vol. 46, Issue 8, 2018, p. 633-653.
- Nedashkovskaya N.I., Myagkov, G.P., "Polemics around L. Štúr's essay 'Slavdom and the World of the Future': Romanticism and nihilism in the discourse of projects for the Slavic national revival in the 19th century", in *Uchenye Zapiski Kazanskogo Universiteta. Seriya Gumanitarnye Nauki*, 2017, vol. 159, no. 4, p. 856-871.
- Orton, Lawrence D., "Did the Slavs Speak German at Their First Congress?", in *Slavic Review*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (Sept.) 1974, p. 515-52.
- Petrovich, Michael B., "Juraj Krizanic: A Precursor of Pan-Slavism (CA. 1618-83)", in *The American Slavic and East European Review*, Vol. 6, No. 3/4 (Dec.) 1947, p. 75-92.
- Petrovich, Michael Boro, *The Emergence of Russian Pan Slavism 1856-1870*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1956.
- Pogodin, Mikhail Petrovici, "Pis'mo k Gosudaryu Tsesarevichu, Velikomu Knyazyu, Aleksandru Nikolayevichu (nyne tsarstvuyushchemu Gosudaryu Imperatoru) v 1838 godu", in *Izbrannyye Trudy*, compilers, authors of the introductory article and comments: A. A. Shirinyants and K. V. Ryasentsev, Moscow, ROSSPEN, Russian Political Encyclopedia, 2010, p. 178-188.
- Pogodin, Mikhail Petrovici, "Opasnosti Rossii. O diversiyakh i soyuznikakh. Znachenie voyny. Sostoyaniye narodnogo dukha", in *Pogodin Mikhail Petrovici. Izbrannyye Trudy*, compilers, authors of the introductory article and comments: A. A. Shirinyants and K. V. Ryasentsev, Moscow, ROSSPEN, Russian Political Encyclopedia, 2010, p.p 274-288.
- Pražák, Albert, "The Slovak Sources of Kollár's Pan-Slavism", in *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 6, No. 18 (Mar.) 1928, p.p 579-592.
- Serebrian, Oleg, *Rusia la răsăritie. Geositorie, geocultură, geopolitică [Russia at a Crossroads. Geohistory, geoculture, geopolitics]*, Second Edition, Chisinau, Cartier, 2019.
- Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr Isaevich, *Rebuilding Russia: reflections and tentative proposals*, translated by Alexis Klimoff, New York, Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1991.
- Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr Isaevich, *"The Russian question" at the end of the twentieth century*, translated by Yermolai Solzhenitsyn, New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1995.
- Štúr, Ludovít, *Slavyanstvo i mir budushchego: poslaniye slavyanam s beregov Dunaya*, translated by V.I. Lamanskii, St. Petersburg, Izdaniye Obshchestva revniteley russkogo istoricheskogo prosveshcheniya v pamyat' imperatora Aleksandra, 1909.
- Suslov, Mikhail, "Geographical Metanarratives in Russia and the European East: Contemporary Pan-Slavism", in *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 53:5, 2012, p. 575-595.
- Suslov, Mikhail, Marek Čejka, Vladimir Đorđević (eds.), *Pan-Slavism and Slavophilia in Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe: Origins, Manifestations and Functions*, Palgrave Macmillan, Palgrave Springer International Publishing, 2023.
- Sydooruk, P. John, "Herder and the Slavs", in *AATSEEL Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Sept. 15), 1955, p. 71-75.
- Thomas, George, "Ján Kollár's Thesis of Slavic Reciprocity and the Convergence of the Intellectual Vocabularies of the Czech, Slovak, Slovene, Croatian and Serbian Standard Languages", in *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (September 1992), p. 279-299.
- Tonu, Constantin, "Contemporary Pan Slavism – between Imperialism and Modernity", in *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Philologica*, no. 22, 2021, p. 277-290.
- Trencényi, Balázs & Michal Kopeček (eds.), *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)*, vol. 2, Budapest, CEU Press, 2007.
- Zlatar, Zdenko, "For the sake of Slavdom' II. M. P. Pogodin and the Moscow Slavic Benevolent Committee: a collective portrait of 1870", in *East European Quarterly*, XL, No. 3 September 2006, p. 255-291.

NOTES

1. Sándor Kostya, *Pan-Slavism*, edited by Anne Fay Atzel, Danubian Press, Inc., 1981, p. 5; Hans Kohn, "The Impact of Pan-Slavism on Central Europe", in *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Jul.),

- 1961, p. 325; Susan Baker, "Pan-Slavism in the Balkans: A Historical View", in Suslov, Mikhail, Marek Čejka, Vladimir Đorđević (eds.), *Pan-Slavism and Slavophilia in Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe: Origins, Manifestations and Functions*, Palgrave Macmillan, Springer International Publishing, 2023, p. 60; Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, Second edition, revised, New York, Vintage Books, 1960, p. ix.
2. Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Panslavism 1856-1870*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1956, p. ix.
 3. Dejana Vukasović & Miša Stojadinović, "On Pan-Slavism, Brotherhood, and Mythology: The Imagery of Contemporary Geopolitical Discourse in Serbia", in Suslov, Mikhail, Marek Čejka, Vladimir Đorđević (eds.), *Pan-Slavism and Slavophilia in Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe: Origins, Manifestations and Functions*, p. 123; Vladimir Đorđević et al., "Revisiting Pan-Slavism in the Contemporary Perspective", in *Nationalities Papers*, 51: 1, 2023, p. 5-6.
 4. *Ibidem*, p. 6.
 5. Mikhail Suslov, "Geographical Metanarratives in Russia and the European East: Contemporary Pan-Slavism", in *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 53:5, 2012, p. 577.
 6. Michael B. Petrovich, "Juraj Krizanic: A Precursor of Pan-Slavism (CA. 1618-83)", in *The American Slavic and East European Review*, Vol. 6, No. 3/4 (Dec.) 1947, p. 75; Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. xiii.
 7. Michael B. Petrovich, "Juraj Krizanic: A Precursor of Pan-Slavism (CA. 1618-83)", in *op. cit.*, p. 78.
 8. *Ibidem*.
 9. *Ibidem*.
 10. Oleg Serebrian, *op. cit.*, p. 41; Michael B. Petrovich, "Juraj Krizanic: A Precursor of Pan-Slavism (CA. 1618-83)", in *op. cit.*, p. 81.
 11. He calls this language "Russian" because he considers Russian to be the purest of the Slavic languages, the others having developed from it as a result of the Slavic migrations in the early Middle Ages. See Oleg Serebrian, *op. cit.*, p. 41.
 12. The Russian folclorist P. A. Bezsonov (1827-1898) was the first to rediscover Juraj Krizanić, publishing in 1859 his treatise on politics (*Razgovory ob vladatelstvu* Discourses on Government), which was to become his most famous and influential work. See: Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Panslavism 1856-1870*, p. 247.
 13. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. ix.
 14. Johann Gottfried Herder, *Ideas for the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*, Princeton University Press, 2024, p. 470-472.
 15. He calls them "lovers of pastoral liberty". *Ibidem*, p. 471.
 16. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. ix-x, 10.
 17. Dušan Ljuboja, "Herder's Ideas and the Pan-Slavism: A Conceptual-Historical Approach", in *Pro&Contra*, 2. (2.), 2018, p. 69, 75-76, 83; Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. x; P. John Sydoruk, "Herder and the Slavs", in *AATSEEL Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Sept. 15), 1955, p. 71-75.
 18. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. x.
 19. Dušan Ljuboja, *op. cit.*, p. 81.
 20. Johann Gottfried Herder, *op. cit.*, p. 472.
 21. Both studied at the University of Jena, where Herder taught.
 22. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 3-4.
 23. Balázs Trencsényi & Michal Kopeček (ed.), *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)*, vol. 2, Budapest, CEU Press, 2007, p. 206.
 24. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 9.
 25. Alexander Maxwell, "Effacing Panslavism: linguistic classification and historiographic misrepresentation", in *The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity: Nationalities Papers*, Vol. 46, Issue 8, 2018, p. 637; Balázs Trencsényi & Michal Kopeček (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 207.

26. George C. Guins, "The Degeneration of Pan-Slavism", in *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Oct.), 1948, p. 57.
27. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 9; Constantin Tonu, "Contemporary Pan Slavism – between Imperialism and Modernity", in *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Philologica*. no. 22, 2021, p. 279-280.
28. Oleg Serebrian, *Rusia la răspântie. Geositorie, geocultură, geopolitică* [*Russia at a Crossroads. Geohistory, geoculture, geopolitics*], Second Edition, Chisinau, Cartier, 2019, p. 42. As Michael Boro Petrovich states, it is paradoxical, but symptomatic of the pan-Slavic movement (especially in its early period), which relies on the specificity of the Slavic world and the absolute difference towards Latin-Germanic (especially Germanic) culture and civilization, the fact that this treatise was written in a non-Slavic language and was published in a non-Slavic city. See: Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Pan Slavism 1856- 1870*, p. 3, 19. There is, moreover, a whole polemic, numerous anecdotes and caricatures about the language spoken by the Slavs at their first congress, in 1848. See, on this point, Lawrence D. Orton, "Did the Slavs Speak German at Their First Congress?", in *Slavic Review*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (Sept.) 1974, p. 515-52.
29. A.A. Grigorieva, *Pan-Slavism: Ideology and Politics (40s of the XIX – early XX centuries)* [A.A. Григорьева, *Панславизм: идеология и политика (40-е годы XIX – начало XX вв.)*], Irkutsk, Asprint, 2013, p. 37-38; Alexander Maxwell, "Effacing Pan Slavism: linguistic classification and historiographic misrepresentation", in *op. cit.*, p. 633-634.
30. Ján Kollár, *Reciprocity between the Various Tribes and Dialects of the Slavic Nation*, translated by Alexander Maxwell, Slavica Pub, 2009. See also: A.A. Grigorieva, *op. cit.*, p. 38. In this essay, published in German, Serbian, Croatian and Czech in 1936-1938, Kollár replaced the term "Pan-Slavism", invented by Herkel, with "Slavic reciprocity", by which he meant mainly a literary reciprocity. As Albert Pražák points out, the idea of Slavic reciprocity did not originate with Kollár: "Actually, however, all he did was to bring the idea to a theoretical culmination and in a skilful and suggestive manner to synthesise the formula of Slav reciprocity which had already been indicated in numerous verbal variations both at home and abroad." See Albert Pražák, "The Slovak Sources of Kollár's Pan-Slavism", in *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 6, No. 18 (Mar.) 1928, p. 579-592.
31. Alexander Maxwell, "Herder, Kollár, and the Origins of Slavic Ethnography", in *Traditiones*, 40 (2), 2011, p. 87; A.A. Grigorieva, *op. cit.*, p. 48, 101-102. See also: George Thomas, "Ján Kollár's Thesis of Slavic Reciprocity and the Convergence of the Intellectual Vocabularies of the Czech, Slovak, Slovene, Croatian and Serbian Standard Languages", in *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Sept.), 1992, p. 279-299.
32. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 12.
33. Alexander Maxwell, "Effacing Pan Slavism: linguistic classification and historiographic misrepresentation", in *op. cit.*, p. 637-641; George Thomas, "Ján Kollár's Thesis of Slavic Reciprocity and the Convergence of the Intellectual Vocabularies of the Czech, Slovak, Slovene, Croatian and Serbian Standard Languages", in *op. cit.*, p. 282; Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 12.
34. Alexander Maxwell, "Effacing Pan Slavism: linguistic classification and historiographic misrepresentation", in *op. cit.*, p. 637.
35. Of all the Slavic nationalities, only the Bulgarians were not represented at the congress. See Josef Macůrek, "The Achievements of the Slavonic Congress", in *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 26, No. 67 (Apr.) 1948, p. 329.
36. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 82-83.
37. Jean-Christophe Angaut, "Revolution and the Slav Question: 1848 and Mikhail Bakunin", in *The 1848 Revolutions and European Political Thought*, edited de Douglas Moggach & Gareth Stedman Jones, Cambridge University Press, 2018, p. 412-413.
38. *Ibidem*, p. 415-416.

39. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 90-92; Constantina Raveca Buleu, *Paradigma puterii in secolul al XIX-lea* [*The Paradigm of Power in the 19th Century*], Bucharest, Ideea Europeană, 2011, p. 237-238.
40. At the time, only Hungarians and Austrians in the Habsburg Monarchy enjoyed these rights.
41. The choice of the peaceful, liberal, non-confrontational path is also due to the desire to counter the attempts of the Germans and Hungarians to “demonise” the Congress and the Pan-Slavist movement in general. See, in this regard, Josef Macůrek, “The Achievements of the Slavonic Congress”, in *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 26, No. 67 (Apr.) 1948, p. 334.
42. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 87; Constantin Tonu, “Contemporary Pan-Slavism – between Imperialism and Modernity”, in *op. cit.*, p. 283-284.
43. Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Pan-Slavism 1856- 1870*, p. 22-23.
44. *Ibidem*, p. 29.
45. *Ibidem*, p. 61.
46. *Ibidem*, p. 26-27; See also: Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 140-141.
47. Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Pan-Slavism 1856- 1870*, p. 26.
48. In Walicki’s words, Pogodin’s views of Russia and Russian history reflect a conservative Utopianism based on the patriarchal nature of Russian society. See: Zdenko Zlatar, “For the sake of Slavdom’ II. M. P. Pogodin and the Moscow Slavic Benevolent Committee: a collective portrait of 1870”, in *East European Quarterly*, XL, No. 3 September 2006, p. 265.
49. In 1841 Pogodin founded a newspaper called *Moskvitianin* (*Muscovite*), which had a section devoted to the non-Russian Slavs. See Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Pan-Slavism 1856- 1870*, p. 61, 105-107.
50. Mikhail Petrovici Pogodin, “Pis’mo k Gosudaryu Tsesarevichu, Velikomu Knyazyu, Aleksandru Nikolayevichu (nyne tsarstvuyushchemu Gosudaryu Imperatoru) v 1838 godu”, in *Pogodin Mikhail Petrovici. Izbrannyye Trudy*, compilers, authors of the introductory article and comments: A. A. Shirinyants and K. V. Ryasentsev, Moscow, ROSSPEN, Russian Political Encyclopedia, 2010, p. 178-188. Hans Kohn called this letter, which never reached its destination, “the earliest concise formulation of Russian Pan-Slavism”. See Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 141.
51. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 144-145.
52. Mikhail Petrovici Pogodin, “Pis’mo k Gosudaryu Tsesarevichu, Velikomu Knyazyu, Aleksandru Nikolayevichu (nyne tsarstvuyushchemu Gosudaryu Imperatoru) v 1838 godu”, in *op. cit.*, p. 178-179: “А если мы прибавим к этому количеству еще 30 миллионов своих братьев, родных и двоюродных, Славян, рассыпанных по всей Европе — от Константинополя до Венеции и от морей до Балтийского и Немецкого морей, Славян, в которых течет одна кровь с нашею, которые говорят одним языком и, следовательно, по закону природы нам сочувствуют, которые, несмотря на географическое и политическое разлучение, составляют одно нравственное целое с нами, по происхождению и языку! Вычтем это количество из соседней Австрии и Турции, а потом из всей Европы и приложим к нашему.” (author’s transl.)
53. Idem, “Opasnosti Rossii. O diversiyakh i soyuznikakh. Znachenije voyny. Sostoyaniye narodnogo dukha”, in *Pogodin Mikhail Petrovici. Izbrannyye Trudy*, compilers, authors of the introductory article and comments: A. A. Shirinyants and K. V. Ryasentsev, Moscow, ROSSPEN, Russian Political Encyclopedia, 2010, p. 284: “Россия должна сделаться главою Славянского союза, не по своему желанию, не по произволу, не из честолюбия и властолюбия, а по необходимости, по естеству вещей, точно как Русский язык должен со временем сделаться общим, литературным языком для всех Славянских племен, не по принуждению Русского правительства, а по законам филологии.” (author’s transl.)
54. *Ibidem*, p. 284.
55. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 144-145
56. Mikhail Petrovici Pogodin, “Pis’mo k Gosudaryu Tsesarevichu, Velikomu Knyazyu, Aleksandru Nikolayevichu (nyne tsarstvuyushchemu Gosudaryu Imperatoru) v 1838 godu”, in *op. cit.*, p.

- 186: “Следовательно, они должны выступить теперь на поприще, начать высшую работу для человечества, и проявить благороднейшие его силы.” (author’s transl.)
57. Zdenko Zlatar, “For the sake of Slavdom”, II. M. P. Pogodin and the Moscow Slavic Benevolent Committee: a collective portrait of 1870”, in *op. cit.*, p. 272.
58. *Ibidem*.
59. N.I. Nedashkovskaya & G.P. Myagkov, “Polemics around L. Štúr’s essay ‘Slavdom and the World of the Future’: Romanticism and nihilism in the discourse of projects for the Slavic national revival in the 19th century”, in *Uchenye Zapiski Kazanskogo Universiteta. Seriya Gumanitarnye Nauki*, 2017, vol. 159, no. 4, p. 858.
60. Juraj Marušiak, “Slovakia: Emergence of an Old-New Pseudo-Pan-Slavism in the Context of the Conflict Between Russia and Ukraine After 2014”, in Suslov, Mikhail, Marek Čejka, Vladimir Đorđević (eds.), *Pan-Slavism and Slavophilia in Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe: Origins, Manifestations and Functions*, p. 331; Pavol Krištof, “Responsibility and idea of Slavism in Kollár’s and Štúr’s thinking”, in *Ethics & Bioethics (in Central Europe)*, 12 (3–4), 2022, p. 149–151.
61. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 18–19.
62. Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Panlavism 1856– 1870*, p. 248; Ludovít Štúr, *Slavyanstvo i mir budushchego: poslaniye slavyanam s beregov Dunaya*, translated by V.I. Lamanskii, St. Petersburg, Izdaniye Obschestva revniteley russkogo istoricheskogo prosveshcheniya v pamyat’ imperatora Aleksandra, 1909, p. 141–159.
63. Hans Kohn, “The Impact of Pan-Slavism on Central Europe”, in *op. cit.*, p. 324.
64. Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Panlavism 1856– 1870*, p. 66.
65. Nikolai Iakovlevich Danilevskii, *Russia and Europe: The Slavic World’s Political and Cultural Relations with the Germanic-Roman West*, translated and annotated by Stephen M. Woodburn, Bloomington, Slavica Pub, 2013, p. 103.
66. Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, p. 190–192; Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Panlavism 1856– 1870*, p. 73.
67. Nikolai Iakovlevich Danilevskii, *op. cit.*, p. 168; 393.
68. *Ibidem*, p. 314–315.
69. *Ibidem*, p. 73–74. According to him, the cultural-historical types or distinct civilisations, in chronological order, are as follows 1) Egyptian; 2) Chinese; 3) Assyrian–Babylonian–Phoenician, Chaldean or ancient Semitic; 4) Indian; 5) Iranian; 6) Jewish; 7) Greek; 8) Roman; 9) Neo-Semitic or Arabic; 10) Germanic-Roman or European; and the 11th will be the Slavs.
70. Mikhail Suslov, “Russian Pan-Slavism: A Historical Perspective”, in Mikhail Suslov, Marek Čejka, Vladimir Đorđević (eds.), *Pan-Slavism and Slavophilia in Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe: Origins, Manifestations and Functions*, Palgrave Macmillan, Springer International Publishing, 2023, p. 36.
71. Solzhenitsyn Aleksandr Isaevich, “*The Russian question*” at the end of the twentieth century, translated by Yermolai Solzhenitsyn, New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1995, p. 93; Aleksandr Isaevich Solzhenitsyn, *Rebuilding Russia: reflections and tentative proposals*, translated by Alexis Klimoff, New York, Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1991, p. 7.