

ETHNOS AND ETHOS: SLOVAK SLAVIC RECIPROCITY AND GREEK-CYPRIOI ENOSIS¹

Vasil Gluchman

DOI: 10.17846/CL.2022.15.1.139-148

Abstract: GLUCHMAN, Vasil. *Ethnos and Ethos: Slovak Slavic Reciprocity and Greek-Cypriot Enosis*. The author studies similarities and differences in the development of the Slovak and Greek Cypriot national movements in 19th century. He pays main attention to the ideas of 'Slavic reciprocity' and 'enosis', as core factors of these 19th-century national movements. He came to the conclusion that, in spite of geographical distance and cultural dissimilarity, both ethnic groups and their respective national movements shared many features. He considers these national movements a manifestation of the universal ethos of modern times. The ethos of the Slovak as well as Greek-Cypriot national movements between the 19th century and the end of World War I primarily lay in the fight for man's rights and freedoms, humanity, human dignity, and justice not only as individuals, but also members of their own ethnic group. This was an effort to pursue the right to a person's freedom of decision-making in linguistic, cultural, and educational issues, without any external pressure, orders, or prohibitions from the political power. This was a pursuit of the original Enlightenment intention following liberalism which was, however, often deformed when presented by ruling nations and reflected the nationalist ideology and colonial policies towards small ethnic groups living in multi-ethnic empires.

Keywords: *Slavic reciprocity, enosis, Slovaks, Greek Cypriots, national movements, 19th century*

The 19th century became a significant historical period in the development of man and mankind, which could, formally, resemble Hegel's triad 'thesis – antithesis – synthesis', in this case 'man – nation – mankind'. In reality, nation, however, was not the antithesis of man, but rather an inter-stage in his orientation towards mankind, which was, at the close of the 18th century, defined by Johann Gottfried Herder in his philosophy of history (Herder, 1800). In the 19th century, nation also became a way in which human rights were pursued by means of the ethnic community to which a man was born. The aim of my paper is to study the ethos of the 19th-century Spring of Nations, i.e. the effort of nations to pursue humanity, human dignity, equality, freedom, and justice, comparing and contrasting the Slovak and Greek-Cypriot national movements in their historical contexts, in relation to ideas of reciprocity and unity.²

First and foremost is the historical fact that Slovaks, just like Greek Cypriots, were, for centuries, subservient to other nations. Sloviens, living in the Duchy of Nitra, which, following conquest by the Moravians, became part of Great Moravia, can be considered the ancestors of the Slovak ethnic group. When, at the beginning of the 10th century, Great Moravia broke up, Slovaks, following various historical upheavals, were gradually integrated into the Hungarian Kingdom at

¹ The article is the result of ECOST-STSM-Request-CA16211-47343 *Reappraising Intellectual Debates on Civic Rights and Democracy in Europe* and I would like to thank to Prof. Stéphanie Lahlé Shaelou, Head of the School of Law, UCLan Cyprus for helping with my research.

² The paper does not deal with the Turkish-Cypriot national movement in Cyprus in the given period, as it had not been shaped and was not properly developed until the 1920s (Dodd 2010).

the beginning of the 12th century (Steinhübel 2011; Lukačka 2011). Since that time, they were part of Hungary until its 1918 breakup, as a result of Austro-Hungary being conquered in World War I and Czechoslovakia, as a common state of Czechs and Slovaks, being established. Magyars³ played a dominant influential and political role in Hungary. In the 19th-century Spring of Nations, Magyars were, based on the state-political theory of historical law, the ruling nation, while Slovaks were a non-state-forming ethnic group, whose autonomous existence Magyars refused to acknowledge (Kürti 2012; Maxwell 2019). It was a consequence of state-political processes, which took place in the Habsburg monarchy from the beginning of the 1790s, following the death of Emperor Joseph II, produced by the opposition of the Hungarian, mainly Magyar, aristocracy against the Germanising policies of Vienna.

Cyprus, as a Mediterranean island, boasts a rich cultural and political history, as it was a place many world powers at the time were interested in and, thus, it was subjected to many invasions, e.g. by Egypt, Persia, Greece, Rome, Byzantium, Venice, and, in 1571, conquered by the Ottoman Empire. Cyprus was under the rule of the Ottoman Empire until 1878, when it fell under the administration of Great Britain, which first annexed it at the beginning of World War I and later, in 1925, declared it part of the British Colonial Empire. This was the case until Cyprus became independent in 1960 (Katsourides 2018). This means that the native Greek population of Cyprus, similarly to Slovaks, was, for centuries and millennia, ruled by foreigners. In this context, one could think about the ways the Slovak and Greek-Cypriot national movements, their national awareness, national identity, and national ideology in the 19th century took shape.

Ideas of reciprocity and unity in the Slovak and Greek-Cypriot national movements

Historically, the rise of the Greek national movement in Cyprus was part of the irredentist concept of the 'Great Idea' (Megali Idea), formulated by the Greek politician Ioannis Kolettis (1773 – 1847) in 1844. "Kolettis, relying on historical arguments, demonstrated the duty of liberated Hellenes to fight for the liberation of all Greek lands. This constituted the 'Great Idea' – *Megali Idea* – of the Hellenic race. Greece was considered to be the centre of Europe. It did not belong either to the West or to the East, which allowed it to be Western and Eastern at the same time, a *topos* which would be the source of many ensuing cultural and political projects. In the past, Greece had enlightened the West, and now it was destined through its rebirth to offer its light to the East. In order to achieve this purpose, the Hellenes had to be united in one state, one religion, one cause and one constitution. The symbolic focus of the nation's permanent mental mobilization should be the city that captured the imagination of all Balkan nations, the capital of two empires, Constantinople. Thus, this discourse, apart from an articulation of territorial irredentism, constituted the political equivalent of a prophecy" (Kechriotis 2007, 246).

Petros Nikolaou claims that the establishment of the Greek consulate in Larnaca (1846) could be considered the first publically declared view of the Greek state indicating the programme in question also spreading in Cyprus. However, what was problematic for the Greek-Cypriot national movement in the given period was the weak social base for the national movement only formed by

³ Even though the term *Hungarian(s)* is used more commonly to refer to the nation living not only in present-day Hungary (as well as the same nation living in pre-1918 Hungary), the term *Magyar(s)* is used throughout the present paper in order to differentiate the nation from *Hungarian(s)*, i.e. all inhabitants of the historical territory of (Austro-) Hungary, while the language spoken by Magyars is referred to as *Magyar*.

a small group of intelligentsia and failing to gain broader social support from the Greek-Cypriot ethnic group before the British took over the administration of the island (Nikolaou 2018). ‘Megali Idea’ gave rise to the notion of ‘enosis’ in the Greek-Cypriot national movement, i.e. uniting Cyprus with Greece, which was, however, banned during the Ottoman rule in Cyprus. In Joseph S. Joseph’s view, it only became topical at the beginning of the British administration of the island, i.e. in 1878. Greek Cypriots considered the establishment of the British administration in Cyprus the first step to achieving their goal, i.e. union with Greece (Joseph 2009). Nevertheless, Clement Dodd claims that the ‘enosis’ notion caught on in the Greek-Cypriot community prior to 1878, which is, in his view, evidenced by the demand of Bishop Kition to Sir Garnet Wolseley (Dodd 2010). On their return to Cyprus, graduates of universities in Greece (especially the University of Athens, est. 1837) became a significant aspect in the birth and spread of ‘enosis’ among Greek Cypriots, enhancing the development of national awareness of Greek Cypriots following their shared historic Cypriot-Greek roots based in Antiquity and Byzantium.

In the Slovak national movement, the idea of ‘Slavic reciprocity’, including Czech-Slovak reciprocity, came into existence in the 1830s, most clearly defined by Ján Kollár (1793 – 1852) in the form of cultural and literary mutuality (Kollár 2008). In the Slovak national movement, Kollár’s conception of reciprocity dominated until the mid-1840s; it, however, gradually turned out to be insufficient to meet the aims connected to the establishment of the Slovak ethnic group as a nation within Hungary, since the Slovak ethnic group was perceived as a mere part of the Czech-Slovak tribe. That was why Kollár’s idea was replaced by a modified version of Slavic reciprocity defined by Ludovít Štúr (1815 – 1856) in the form of the Slovak ethnic group as a self-standing tribe within the Slavic nation (Štúr 1846). This idea, together with the creation of standard Slovak language (1843), led to a straining of Czech-Slovak relationships, as the Czech national movement was considered a betrayal of the common goals and intentions and, in a sense, also giving up shared cultural and literary history. Still, both conceptions of the Slovak ethnic group as part of the Czech-Slovak tribe or a self-standing Slovak tribe, connected to the affiliation of the greater Slavic nation, were primarily a cultural and literary, rather than political, project, as the ideas of their bearers always related to the existing constitutional arrangement, i.e. the Habsburg monarchy and Hungary. Also during the 1848 – 1849 Revolution, a solution was still sought after within the existing Habsburg monarchy. Until World War I, Slovaks did not define their demands regarding their own state (Maxwell – Turner 2020).

In spite of Cyprus being ruled by the Ottoman Empire, Greek Cypriots had a relatively well-developed system of political representation by means of the church and considerable national awareness in their leading groups. They were convinced that the British, famous for their liberalism, would allow them to fulfil their dream of uniting with Greece. Greek Cypriots placed great hopes in the declarations of some British politicians, such as William Gladstone or Winston Churchill (the Secretary of State for the colonies), who made himself heard that ‘enosis’ should be taken and dealt with seriously (Dodd 2010). Under the influence of Greek nationalism growing stronger and spreading to Cyprus, Greek Cypriots realised more and more their historical interconnection with the Hellenic past of Cyprus. Just like continental Greeks, they also considered the annexation of their island to Greece something completely natural. What, at first sight, seemed very simple and natural faced obstacles in the form of the British being unwilling to meet Greek-Cypriot intentions, as they followed their own military, as well as power-related, goals in the region (Kyriakides 2016). Thus, to maintain their position and influence, they alternated between supporting Greece and Turkey and, similarly, they sometimes supported Greek Cypriots, while at other times stood on the side of the Turkish Cypriots.

Regarding the 19th-century Slovak national movement, it was mostly, until the breakup of Austro-Hungary, mainly aimed against Magyar national policies – its Magyarisation or

ethnocide – with the aim of completely Magyarising Slovaks and other non-Magyar inhabitants of Hungary (Zay 1841; Grünwald 1878), which, however, did not mean national animosity or intolerance on the part of Slovaks, as these ethnic groups, or nations, had shared the territory for centuries. All that Slovaks demanded was their natural rights, mainly in the area of language, culture, and education (Gluchmanová 2013). Still, this did not mean that either part did not show any heated nationalist emotions; these were, however, much more intense on the Magyar part, such as what happened in 1828 in Lajos-Komarom, where the Slovak Lutheran faithful demanded that Magyar, which they did not understand, be replaced by their mother tongue during religious services; however, the establishment sentenced them to public stick-beating (Štúr 1843). Alexander Maxwell presented many faces of Magyar nationalism manifested in people's everyday life (Maxwell 2019). Nevertheless, the attitude of the Slovak national movement prior to 1918 was not anti-Magyar, it was strongly anti-Magyarisation, i.e. refusing the ethnocide of the Slovak ethnic group.

Based on the above, some parallels can be seen between the Slovak and Greek-Cypriot national movements, especially at the close of the 19th century when, equally, on both the Slovak and Greek-Cypriot part, the idea of reciprocity, mutuality, or unity started to be enforced. The difference lies in that Greek-Cypriots were to be united with a free, state-forming, and ruling Greek nation, while Slovaks were in a different situation, as Czechs were not a ruling nation either. Even though, regarding cultural and political rights, they were much better off in the Austrian part of the Habsburg monarchy than Slovaks in the Hungarian part (Hroch 2009). Still, their fates were, to a considerable extent, decided by others, i.e. the Vienna administration. For this reason, a significant parallel can be found between the positions of Greek Cypriots and Slovaks, as both ethnic groups were in the position of small inferior non-state forming nations reliant on the good will of the ruling nations who governed, in pursuing their power-related, or colonial, goals in the fashion of the 'divide and rule' policy.

According to Rebecca Bryant, national agitation in Cyprus supporting enosis, i.e. unity with Greece, significantly increased at the turn of the 20th century when economic policies of the British turned out to be catastrophic and the educated Cypriots kept being excluded from higher administrative positions (Bryant 2006). Yiannos Katsourides claims that, at the beginning of the 20th century, the Greek-Cypriot national movement became truly popular. 'Enosis' became part of national awareness, national identity, and national ideology, which was enabled by an increased level of primary education, and the idea being supported by governing political subjects and spread by the press (Katsourides 2018). In Cyprus, the Greek national movement was mainly supported by lawyers, journalists, philologists, university students, priests, and business people. These groups formed a new hegemonic historical bloc, which came to the forefront as a consequence of legal and social changes carried out by the British (Katsiaounis 1996). That, in turn, meant that the traditionally ruling groups, without this emergent bourgeoisie, could no longer control the social or political life of the Greek-Cypriot ethnic group. The commercial bourgeoisie, mainly concentrated in Larnaca, played a key role in the spread of the ideas of the Greek-Cypriot national movement at the close of the 19th century, as it was this group that defined the specific political programme based on the demand of uniting Cyprus with Greece (Katsourides 2018).

For the development of the Greek-Cypriot national movement, Cypriot graduates from Greek universities were also key, as they, under the influence of the 'Megali Idea', became crucial supporters of the annexation of the island to Greece (Katsiaounis 1996). They perceived the notion of 'enosis' as double liberation – from Turks and the British. To support the idea of unity, Greek Cypriots established in Cyprus associations, reading rooms, and clubs, promoting the Greek-Cypriot national movement and the notion of 'enosis' (Katsourides 2018). The Greek-Cypriot national movement and the idea of unity gained the support of the masses – Greek-Cypriot inhabitants

of the island. A majority of the Greek ethnic component allowed for the use of demographic and cultural infrastructure, which enhanced the spread of the Greek-Cypriot national movement. Language, religion, common origin, and Greek archaeological finds in Cyprus provided strong arguments regarding the historical, cultural, and linguistic proximity of Greece and Cyprus. This became a strong and paramount basis of, as well as an argument for, the Greek-Cypriot national movement in spreading the idea of unity with Greece (Katsourides 2018).

In Katsourides' view, in spreading the idea of unity with Greece, following Greek national holidays was significant, supported the spread of the Greek-Cypriot national movement and enhanced its mass character. Great emphasis was also placed on close and regular contact with the press, whose engagement was decisive for spreading nationalist views. "The idea that the Greek nation was defined by a unique cultural individuality made manifest in its language, customs, religion, institutions and history, constituted the (Greek) nation as the new subject of history and subsumed the notion of individual and political freedoms beneath the superior ideal of national self-realization. This powerful tradition coexisted uneasily with ideals of liberal self-government" (Katsourides 2018, 42-43).

The notion of 'enosis', thus, successfully spread among the Greek-Cypriot inhabitants of the island, in a, generally, moderate form and without any more serious anti-British incidents, as the representatives of the Greek-Cypriot national movement were convinced of the British affection for Hellenism and the previous support of the Greek liberating struggle against Ottoman rule. This was also supported by the fact that Greece and Britain were on good terms, so it was in the interest of the Greek-Cypriot national movement to maintain good relationships, although they expected the British to be more helpful in making their dreams of uniting Cyprus with Greece come true. As time passed and they did not succeed in getting the British to agree with the annexation, the Greek-Cypriot national movement also gave rise to differing opinions on the ways and the timeframe within which the goal, in the form of 'enosis', should be achieved. On the one hand, there were representatives of the hard line (*adiallakti*), who demanded immediate unification; on the other hand, there were the 'compromisers', traditionalists (*diallaktiki*), who suggested gradual changes, emphasising the need for reform (Panayiotou 2012).

A certain parallel can also be found in the 19th-century Slovak national movement, in which there were conservatives around Ján Kollár, focusing on Czech-Slovak cultural and literary reciprocity as part of the conception of Slavic reciprocity causing serious problems to the national movement due to accusations of pan-Slavism (Zay 1841; Pulszky 1842; Grünwald 1878). On the other hand, there were radicals around Ludovít Štúr, who came up with an innovative idea of Slovakness, in which the Slovak ethnic group was presented as a self-standing tribe of the Slavic nation, while preserving the idea of cultural and literary reciprocity or, rather, the proximity of Slavs, while placing the political and social demands of the Slovak ethnic group to the forefront. These, by far, exceeded the framework of the previously defined cultural, linguistic, and educational demands of the Slovak ethnic group, be it in relation to Vienna or Pest. They even went as far as an armed campaign in 1848 – 1849 against the Magyar Revolution to express loyalty to the emperor, but mainly hoped that Vienna would appreciate their loyalty to the royal court in those hard times and would grant them equal status and rights, which had been, until that point within the monarchy and Hungary, withheld from them. As many times before, the demands of Slovaks were left unfulfilled once the revolution was defeated.

Comparison of Slavic reciprocity and enosis

Based on the existing research, great similarities as well as differences have been observed in the 19th-century position of Slovaks and Greek Cypriots. On the one hand, their similarity lay in them both being non-state-forming ethnic groups that were part of multi-ethnic empires, where the ruling political power was in the hands of the elites of other nations. Slovaks were part of the Habsburg monarchy and Hungary; Greek Cypriots were part of the Ottoman Empire. In 1867, the Habsburg monarchy became dual as Austro-Hungary, while the ruling elites of Hungary were, *de facto*, almost exclusively Magyar, which resulted in Slovaks, similarly to other non-Magyar nations and ethnic groups living in Hungary losing any protection on the part of Vienna from the Magyar assimilating policies. When Cyprus fell under the administration of Britain in 1878, the Greek-Cypriot community gained relatively greater authority in managing their own matters in comparison to the times when it was ruled by the Turks; still, it was in a position inferior to the ruling Brits.

Even when ruled by the Turks, Greek Cypriots participated, albeit to a restricted extent, in managing the life of their own ethnic group, especially by means of the Greek Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Cyprus. Unlike Greek Cypriots, Slovaks had very little chance to participate in the management of the political and public life of their ethnic group, which also only lasted a limited time when, following the defeat of the Magyar Revolution, several representatives of the Slovak ethnic group were granted positions in state or public administration as a reward for fighting alongside Vienna. The 1867 Austro-Hungarian Settlement ended this minimal participation of Slovaks in the management of their own matters. This means that, while in the case of the Greek-Cypriot ethnic group whose level of participation in the political, cultural, edifying, and educational life of their community slightly increased post 1878, as, of 1867, Slovaks lost the little chance they had to directly influence the political and power-related administration of their own matters within Hungary.

This can be claimed in the context of the unity efforts by Greek Cypriots and Slovaks alike. The hopes the Greek-Cypriot community placed in being united with Greece grew when Cyprus fell under British administration. It was aided by the statements of some British politicians and, especially the support and spread of this idea from Greece's political representatives, who lived their 'Megali Idea' dream, i.e. great unification of all Greeks. The pan-Hellenic idea won the hearts and minds of many Greek-Cypriot students who came home after graduation from the University of Athens and spread it among the Greek-Cypriot community. On the other hand, it was true that the Brits were in no hurry to fulfil the wishes of the Greek-Cypriot ethnic group and its representatives in their uniting with Greece, as Cyprus fulfilled a key strategic regional role in their foreign policies. Instead of allowing Greek Cypriots to fulfil their dreams of 'enosis', the British governed Cyprus in the spirit of their colonial approach, i.e. followed the 'divide and rule' policy. This meant that, according to their own needs and interests, they sometimes supported Greek Cypriots, at other times the Turkish-Cypriot community and, in this way, maintained tense relationships and justified their prolonged stay in Cyprus.

The idea of reciprocity among Slovaks took several forms; unlike the Greek-Cypriot community where it was not only regarded as cultural and literary, but also political, mutuality and unity with Greece. The Slovak ethnic group, especially its intelligentsia, saw their future through the idea of Slavic reciprocity, authored and promoted by Ján Kollár, which was, however, an apolitical idea, limited to cultural and literary reciprocity of all Slavs while maintaining the existing constitutional organisation of all countries where Slavic nations or ethnic groups lived. In this respect, the idea of Czech-Slovak reciprocity was developed; however, still merely following cultural and literary reciprocity, without any political aspirations or ideas regarding a change in the constitutional

status quo of the Habsburg monarchy. Nevertheless, leaning towards this idea subsided, mainly on the Czech part, after standard Slovak was codified, which many Czechs saw as a betrayal of their mutual interests on the part of Slovaks. In reality, Czechs mainly minded that Slovaks started to identify themselves as a self-standing ethnic group, distinct from the Czech ethnic group, which weakened the position of the Czech national movement in relation to Vienna in enforcing their intentions of achieving the autonomous position of Czechs, or historical Czech territories within the Habsburg monarchy.

When the 1848 – 1849 revolution was defeated and during Bach's absolutism (also after 1867), Slavianophile and Russophile ideas came to the forefront in a more forceful way, especially in conservative representatives of the Turčiansky Svätý Martin centre, who believed the Slovak ethnic group could only be saved by means of external help and dreamt of the Russian Tsar liberating Slovaks and other Slavs from servitude of Magyars and Vienna. While, in the Greek-Cypriot community, the idea of unity with Greece gained greater and greater attraction, ideas of any unity or reciprocity in the Slovak ethnic group were merely found in the daydreaming or illusions of some intellectuals, as the Slovak national movement was ruled by passivity and expectations of external salvation. The Slovak ethnic group was actually helped from the outside; however, not in the way the representatives of the conservative wing of the Slovak national movement had been hoping for, as, among the Czech bourgeoisie and intelligentsia, the Czech national movement grew stronger and stronger with the aim of pursuing the idea of autonomy, albeit as part of the monarchy. To achieve this, they placed hope in the Slovak ethnic group, culturally and linguistically closest thanks to the centuries-long tradition of using Biblical Czech as a liturgical language by Slovak Lutherans, but mainly the idea of Czech-Slovak reciprocity.

This idea was mainly born in Masaryk, who spread it within the Czech intellectual environment, trying to also find support among Slovak conservatives who, however, maintained their Slavophile and Russophile orientation until almost the breakup of Austro-Hungary; thus, his efforts were crowned with neither understanding nor success. For this reason, he focused on the young Slovak intelligentsia studying in Prague, winning them over to these ideas. This led to the development of cooperation between the Czech and Slovak intelligentsia as representatives of national movements inclined to the idea of reciprocity, cooperation, as well as alliance (Jurčišinová 2010). These ideas did not meet with understanding on the part of the ruling nations and kept being presented by the Austrian, and even more so by the Hungarian, government as anti-state, jeopardising the country's integrity and, mainly, the political and assimilating intentions of the ruling Magyar elites.

In spite of the disaster caused by World War I, for which Austro-Hungary was also responsible, it resulted in an opportunity for Czechs and Slovaks to make a great number of important decisions and take steps to pursue the idea of a shared state. Representatives of Czech and Slovak political emigration, as well as representatives of American Czechs and Slovaks, signed agreements in Cleveland (1915) and Pittsburgh (1918) on forming a unified state of Czechs and Slovaks. It was declared independently in two places – in Prague on October 28th, 1918 and in Turčiansky Svätý Martin on October 30th, 1918. At the turn of the 20th century, the Greek-Cypriot ethnic group was in a better position thanks to participating in the political administration of their community's life, hoping for 'enosis' to materialise. In the end, it was pursued neither at that time (even though it came quite close thanks to the British offering Cyprus to Greece in exchange for support in World War I), nor at the close of World War I, nor at any point in the future.

In the case of the constitutional alliance of Czechs and Slovaks, the attitude of the Entente Powers turned out to be decisive, which was why the efforts of the representatives of the Czech and Slovak foreign resistance, led by T. G. Masaryk and Milan Rastislav Štefánik (1880 – 1919), to win over top representatives of France, Great Britain, and the USA for the idea of Czech-Slovak

reciprocity and the establishment of Czechoslovakia were understandable. They realised the pursuit of this intention was only possible following the victory of the Entente in World War I, which was why they organised Czech and Slovak military units and made them part of the Entente Forces, in order to contribute to gaining the support of the Entente for an independent state of Czechs and Slovaks.

Both national movements can be characterised mainly with regard to their culture and language, which is why they can be considered ethno-cultural national movements. It applies for both the Slovak and Greek-Cypriot national movements that they developed and achieved a level of national agitation before the arrival of capitalism and, in both cases, it was a form of anti-colonial national movement, as written by Joanna Goszczyńska about the Slovak national movement regarding the Magyarisation efforts of the Hungarian political elites (Goszczyńska 2015). It is, undoubtedly, true that the Slovak national movement was, to a significant extent, influenced by the Magyarising efforts of the Magyar political elites; its development, however, cannot merely be connected to external pressure, as the ideas of liberties and rights of man started spreading throughout Europe under the influence of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. These, in combination with Romanticism, and mainly Herder's and Hegel's philosophy of history transformed in defining nations' historical or natural rights. As a result, ideas of ethnic and national awareness and, later, national identity and national ideology started to spread among small European nations. It was these colonisation efforts on the part of ruling nations that made the development of national movements a significant means of protecting ethnic groups from ethnocide, i.e. assimilation and extinction.

Conclusion

The ethos of the Slovak as well as Greek-Cypriot national movements between the 19th century and the end of World War I primarily lay in the fight for man's rights and freedoms, humanity, human dignity, and justice not only as individuals, but also members of their own ethnic group. This was, first of all, an effort to pursue the right to a person's freedom of decision-making in linguistic, cultural, and educational issues, without any external pressure, orders, or prohibitions from the political power. All in all, this was a pursuit of the original Enlightenment intention following liberalism which was, however, often deformed when presented by ruling nations and reflected the nationalist ideology and colonial policies towards small ethnic groups living in multi-ethnic empires.

REFERENCES

- Bryant, Rebecca.* 2006. On the Condition of Postcoloniality in Cyprus. In Papadakis, Yiannis, Peristianis, Nicos & Welz, Gisela (eds.). *Divided Cyprus: Modernity, History, and Island in Conflict*. Bloomington & Indianapolis, 47-65.
- Dodd, Clement.* 2010. *The History and Politics of the Cyprus Conflict*. Basingstoke.
- Gluchmanová, Marta.* 2013. *Vývoj učiteľskej etiky na Slovensku*. Prešov.
- Goszczyńska, Joanna.* 2015. *Wielkie spory małego narodu*. Warszawa.
- Grünwald, Béla.* 1878. *A Felvidék*. Budapest.
- Herder, Johann G.* 1784/1800. *Outlines of a philosophy of the history of man*, trans. T. Churchill. London.

- Hroch, Miroslav.* 2009. *Národy nejsou dílem náhody. Příčiny a předpoklady utváření moderních evropských národů.* Praha.
- Joseph, Joseph S.* 2009. Cyprus: Domestic Ethnopolitical Conflict and International Politics. In *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 15/3-4, 376-397.
- Jurčišinová, Nadežda.* 2010. *Československá jednota a Slováci. Kultúrno-spoločenské aktivity spolku.* Prešov.
- Katsiaounis, Rolandos.* 1996. *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century.* Nicosia.
- Katsourides, Yiannos.* 2018. The Rise of Greek Cypriot Nationalism to Hegemony: Agency, Particularities, and Popularization. In Kyritsi, Thekla – Christofis, Nikos (eds.). *Cypriot Nationalisms in Context: History, Identity and Politics.* Cham, 25-46.
- Kechriotis, Vangelis.* 2007. Context. Ioannis Kolettis: On this Great Idea. In Trencsényi, Balász – Kopeček, Michal (eds.). *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770 – 1945). Texts and commentaries, vol. II. National Romanticism: Formation of National Movements.* Budapest, 245-247.
- Kollár, Ján.* 1837/2008. *Reciprocity between the Various Tribes and Dialects of the Slavic Nation,* trans. & ed. Alexander Maxwell. Bloomington.
- Kürti, László.* 2012. Liberty, Equality, and Nationality: National Liberalism, Modernization, and Empire in Hungary in the Nineteenth Century. In Fitzpatrick, Matthew P. (ed.). *Liberal Imperialism in Europe.* New York, 91-114.
- Kyriakides, Klearchos A.* 2016. Disraeli, 'the key of Western Asia' and the Echoes of History in the Levant. In Yiangou, Anastasia, Kazamias, Goerge, Holland, Robert (eds.). *The Greeks and the British in the Levant, 1800 – 1960s: Between Empires and Nations.* London, 97-110.
- Lukačka, Ján.* 2011. The beginnings of the nobility in Slovakia. In Teich, Mikuláš, Kováč, Dušan & Brown, Martin D. (eds.). *Slovakia in history.* Cambridge, 30-37.
- Maxwell, Alexander.* 2019. *Everyday Nationalism in Hungary, 1789 – 1867.* Berlin.
- Maxwell, Alexander & Turner, Molly.* 2020. Nationalists rejecting statehood: Three case studies from Wales, Catalonia, and Slovakia. In *Nations and Nationalism* 26/3, 692-707.
- Nikolaou, Petros.* 2018. National Identity, Otherness, and Bi-communal Relations Through the Cypriot Greek-Speaking Press Between 1878 and 1912. In Kyritsi, Thekla – Christofis, Nikos (eds.). *Cypriot Nationalisms in Context: History, Identity and Politics.* Cham, 47-73.
- Panayiotou, Andreas.* 2012. Hegemony, Permissible Public Discourse and Lower Class Political Culture. In Papadakis, Yiannis – Bryant, Rebecca (eds.). *Cyprus and Politics of Memory: History, Community and Conflict.* London, 71-93.
- Pulszky, Ferenc.* 1842. A szlávok literariai viszonzosságáról. *Pesti Hírlap*, 183, 2 October 1842, 702-703. In Rapant, Daniel (ed.). *Slovenský prestolný prosbopis z roku 1842, II. diel. Dokumenty. Liptovský Mikuláš*, 410-413.
- Steinhübel, Ján.* 2011. Duchy of Nitra. In Teich, Mikuláš, Kováč, Dušan & Brown, Martin D. (eds.). *Slovakia in history.* Cambridge, 15-29.
- Štúr, Ludovít.* 1843. Die Beschwerden und Klagen der Slaven in Ungarn. Leipzig.
- Štúr, Ludovít.* 1846. Nárečja slovenskuo alebo potreba písania v tomto nárečí. Prešporok.
- Zay, Carl.* 1841. Protestantismus, Magyarismus, Slawismus. Leipzig.

VASIL GLUCHMAN

prof. dr hab. Vasil Gluchman
Institute of Philosophy
University of Rzeszów
Aleja Rejtana 16c
35-959 Rzeszów
Poland
vgluchman@ur.edu.pl

Institute of Ethics and Bioethics
University of Prešov
17. novembra 1
08001 Prešov
Slovakia
vasil.gluchman@unipo.sk
ORCID: 0000-0002-5778-8447
WoS ID: AAB-4081-2020