WORKING PAPERS
EUROPEAN STUDIES
AMSTERDAM

2

Joep Leerssen

The Cultivation of Culture

Towards a Definition of Romantic Nationalism in Europe

Opleiding Europese Studies, Universiteit van Amsterdam
2005

Joep Leerssen in Professor of Modern European Literature at the University of Amsterdam.

ISSN 1871-1693

Working Papers European Studies Amsterdam is a series of incidental publications by staff members, associates and collaborators of the Department of European Studies at the University of Amsterdam.
Printed texts in brochure format can be obtained (free of charge for individuals) from the Secretariat, European Studies, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Spuistraat 134, 1012 VB Amsterdam, Netherlands; e-mail secr.es-fgw@uva.nl
The texts can be downloaded in PDF format from http://www.europesestudies.nl

The Cultivation of Culture
Towards a Definition of Romantic Nationalism in Europe

Joep Leerssen

Nationalism as an ideology has attracted an enormous body of historical analysis and critical/theoretical reflection. Any new contribution or initiative must face an ever-more cumbersome task if it wants to situate itself with regard to the enormous mass and variety of existing research. The risk is also that one loses oneself (and one's readers) in the familiar rehearsal of competing approaches and viewpoints: primordialist (those who hold that national feeling has been a persistent mobilizing force throughout history), modernist (those who hold that national feeling is an ideological by-product of modernization processes) or ethno-symbolist (those who hold that modernity has invested old ethnic identity-patterns with fresh ideological mobilizing power).[1]

The present article offers a programmatic initiative from the position of cultural history, focusing on the culturally-oriented commitment of nationalist movements as a historical topic. The cultural agenda of nationalist movements has hitherto often been dealt with either in the context of nationally-framed cultural

---

[1] The standard survey is Smith 1998; also: Lawrence 2005.

history, or else in the margin of socio-political analyses; that is to say: marginally, piecemeal, or anecdotally. Our understanding of the ideology as a whole may profit, however, from bringing its cultural concerns into focus, and aligning them towards a comparative analysis and typology. I want to argue this point by successively addressing the following tenets:

1. All nationalism is cultural nationalism;
2. Cultural nationalism is a topic for cultural history;
3. Cultural nationalism requires a cross-national comparative approach;
4. Nationalism begins as a 'cultivation of culture';
5. The 'cultivation of culture' can be mapped as a specific array of concerns.

Let me point out, by way of preliminary, that the context taken here is specifically European. The obervations in the following pages can claim little or no applicability to nation-building processes in the Americas, Asia, or Africa; the focus is on nineteenth-century nationalism as it develops in Europe in the long nineteenth century. To compound that development, hugely complex as it is in itself, with other phenomena, anticolonial movements and modernization processes elsewhere in the world (in other words, to aim for a theory of nationalism of unlimited, global applicability) would add an unworkable overload of variables to one's working data. Even so, the synthetic framework presented here is already enormously broad in scope: to account for trends and patterns that would embrace Iceland and Greece, Catalonia and Finland, France and Estonia, Germany and Albania, Scotland and Slovakia, is, I am aware, almost fatuously ambitious. I offer it only as a working model for colleagues in the field to test and verify/falsify; but I do so on the firm belief, based on a good deal of source research in a fairly wide sample of national cases, that a firmly-delineated typology of European-style cultural nationalism is feasible, and, what is more, heuristically useful – not only as a frame of reference in order to sort out the enormous mass of historical evidence from diverse backgrounds, but also as a basis on which to envisage thematic-comparative research. I shall argue this in more detail towards the end of this article.

All nationalism is cultural nationalism

We do not easily speak of 'cultural liberalism' or 'cultural socialism'; but the phrase 'cultural nationalism' seems plausible and straightforward enough. It stands to reason because the very concept at the heart of nationalism, that of the *nation,* refers to an aggregate of people whose 'peculiar character' referred to in the famous definitions of both Smith and Breuilly[2] is at least in part constituted by cultural factors such as language or historical awareness – factors that belong to the realm of reflection, discourse, arts and scholarship, rather than to that of political decision-making or social action. Most scholars see a seamless osmosis between the social and political emergence of national movements and simultaneous flanking involvements in the cultural sphere. To be sure, many political movements, from Fascism to Christian Democracy and from Socialism to Feminism, will spawn cultural activities and will use cultural practices and symbols to mobilize their activists and their constituency; but in none of these ideologies or movements is the mutual embrace between self-defining cultural consciousness-raising and social-political demands so intensely intertwined as in nationalism. To proclaim the need for an Estonian or German nation-state, or to assert the rights of Catalan or Welsh within the Spanish or British state, involves and invokes culture not only as a bond between adherents, or as a mobilizing instrument (like a party anthem or an election poster), but as a legitimation, and an end in itself. The right to national self-determination, to cultural survival and cultural self-expression, counts as a self-evident and ethically autonomous principle, alongside (not derived from) equality, justice and political stability. If anything, nationalism sees the state as a means to an end (the state should embody

---

[2] Smith's five-fold typology of nationalism opens with "The world is naturally divided into nations, each of which has its peculiar character and destiny" (Smith 1998: 187); Breuilly's three-part definition opens with "There exists a nation with an explicit and peculiar character" (Breuilly 1993: 2).

its constituent nationality, and derives its right to exist in part from that function[3]).

Nationalism studies have so far not followed a clear line of approach in dealing with the cultural dimension of nationalism. Mid-twentieth-century studies (one thinks with special admiration of the work of Hans Kohn and Isaiah Berlin) approached nationalism as a topic in Europe's History of Ideas, concentrating on the texts, the thinkers, the rhetoric and viewpoints that brought nationalism into circulation, and 'articulated' the nation as a focus of political loyalty. While scholars like Kohn and Berlin charted, with great learning and acumen, the discourse of nationalism, their analyses and typologies have since then been open to criticism. Their analysis seemed often to move in the rarefied atmosphere of elite thinkers and writers, with little obvious connection to the mass movement that nationalism had become. Kohn's work, moreover, was overshadowed by his loaded and now-abandoned opposition between a Western-style, civic-rational type of nationalism and an Eastern-style ethnic-mystic type.

Since the days of Elie Kedourie and Ernest Gellner, the emphasis has become more sociological and politological in nature. The focus has shifted to the stage of societal development that could give rise to a nationalist movement, and on the role of nationalist movements in modern state formation. The famous

---

[3] The last point was borne out in a famous incident in the Netherlands. A social-democrat party leader, Thijs Wöltgens, playfully pointed out in the mid-1990s that Dutch sovereignty was not necessarily coterminous with the advancement of Dutch interests in the European context. He pointed out that powerful German *Länder* such as Bavaria or Northrhine-Westphalia, owing to their leverage in the German Federal Republic, could exert greater (albeit indirect) influence in European affairs than could a small, though sovereign, state like The Netherlands. Paradoxically, Dutch power would increase if the Netherlands were to become a German *Land*. Reactions to the provocative thought experiment made a telling point: the Dutch public felt that the prime importance of Dutch sovereignty (and hence the fundamental *raison d'être* of an independent Kingdom of the Netherlands) lay, not so much, pragmatically, in the advancement of Dutch interests internationally, as, emotively, in the safeguarding and maintaining of a 'Dutch identity'. The concept of a 'Dutch identity' was, and is, ill-defined, but clearly involved cultural factors such as lifestyle, mentality, traditions and language. Cf. Bolkestein 2003.

'modernism wars'[4] compounded this. Gellner (1983) had been at pains to argue that the scholarly analysis of nationalism should keep aloof from nationalist dogmas and tenets (especially the belief in an extrahistorical, categorical and aprioristical existence of nationality). He therefore stressed the cleavage between the recent (nineteenth-century) emergence of nationalism as a constitutional ideology, and the primordial existence of 'the nation' that this ideology invoked, promulgated, and in some cases arguably invented. 'Culture' for Gellner was mainly the mere ammunition of nationalism. For Gellner, nationalism as an ideology only *invoked* the nation and its culture, but was not generated by it. What it *was* generated by, involved modernization processes such as exo-education (vocational and professional training by publicly appointed specialists rather than within the local community), and similar patterns in the distribution of intellectual capital and socio-economic scale enlargement. Thus, the cultural-identitarian agenda of nationalists was taken out of the analysis and treated in general-formulaic terms such as 'Ruritanian' vs. 'Megalomanian'.

Those scholars who, like Armstrong (1982), took issue with Gellnerian modernism sought, not so much to quarrel with the ideology's nineteenth-century rise to prominence, as with Gellner's dismissal of a pre-existing and underlying 'nation'. Adrian Hastings (1997) controverted the modernist constructivism of Gellner (and Hobsbawm) by concentrating, not on the nineteenth-century cultivation of Englishness, but on the culture of medieval and early-modern England. If the issue of 'culture' was raised in the modernism wars, it was not so much as part of the agenda of nineteenth-century nationalists, as in the contested issue as to whether there was such a thing as an ontologically autonomous national culture at work in history-at-large. Hobsbawm (1990), for his part, saw culture only as a side product of wider societal developments and often as an intellectualist tool fashioned with a political agenda. He accordingly locates

---

[4] For a sense of the various ongoing debates: Smith 1971, 1998 and Lawrence 2005, but also Hall 1998 and the special issue of *Nations and Nationalism* (Guibernau and Hutchinson 2004).

'ethno-linguistic' nationalism at a quite late period. Likewise, an excellent study such as Michael Billig's *Banal nationalism* (1995) implicitly sees cultural aspects of nationalist thought as ramifications, reflections or otherwise secondary side-effects and side-products of what is primarily a political movement and ideology.

Thus, neither for modernists nor for their opponents does the culture-oriented agenda of nineteenth-century nationalism seem to be very important. For modernists, the cultural rhetoric of nationalists is either a legitimizing smokescreen or a sort of extra-political fallout; for anti-modernists it merely reflects the persistence of a pre-existing fact. All parties concerned tend to locate 'culture' outside the nationalist ideology, as the general, external ambience which was invoked or influenced; rather than analysing cultural rhetoric as an intrinsic part of, and commitment within, the nationalist project.

This is perhaps best seen in John Hutchinson's classic study *The dynamics of cultural nationalism* (1987). This is rightly considered one of the seminal works in the field of nationalism studies, and one which does focus on activism in the cultural sphere. Just how promising that approach is, can be gathered from Hutchinson's outstanding introduction, which opens a wide European panorama, situates Ireland in a wider context of cultural initiatives and cross-currents, and indeed gives us one of the best outlines of the concerns of cultural nationalism to date. Yet even in this book, the actual research questions raised by Hutchinson focus on the sociology of cultural activism, analysing cohorts of actors by background etc., and situating their concerns in a socio-political context. In the course of the analysis, the 'dynamics of cultural nationalism' is turned into a sociography of cultural nationalists. Although Hutchinson amply and interestingly demonstrates that such activism developed quite early on in nineteenth-century Ireland, and indeed antedated the rise of political nationalism in its parliamentary and separatist variants, the actual discourse of cultural nationalism is indicated, referred to, rather than analysed in its tenets and preoccupations, its themes,

fixations and rhetoric.[5]

Among nationalism scholars, then, culture and nationalism have been like oil and water. Although literary scholars and historians have continued to study the intellectual and rhetorical history of nationalist discourse and assumptions,[6] this has usually taken the form of small-scale, article-length case studies of individual sample cases, at best gathered into thematic collections; the implications for our understanding of the typology of nationalism as a whole were somehow lost in the great debate between modernists (who argued on the whole from societal modernization-models) and anti-modernists (who, if they were interested in cultural activities, studied them as manifestations of the *nation* rather than as preoccupations of *nationalism*). Likewise, in the many valuable concrete case studies of developing national movements in nineteenth-century Europe (most of them oriented towards single countries, others adopting a more regionally-comparative approach[7]) cultural activism will be referred to as a mere accessory to politics. The primacy is clear: politics explains culture and culture illustrates or reflects politics.

Individual, specific instances of cultural activism are of course mentioned in the course of most analyses of nationalism, and often very interestingly so. We read of a newspaper being founded here, or a choral society there; or we see mention of an edition of folksongs or of a certain historical novel. But such references are usually given by way of illustration, as background information to

---

5 I can illustrate this no better than to point out the difference in modus operandi between Hutchinson's work and my own, later *Remembrance and imagination* (Leerssen 1996), which studies the self-representing discourse which articulated the idea of Irish nationality proclaimed by these cultural (and political) nationalists.

6 Teich & Porter 1993, Cubitt 1998, Giesen 1991, Berding 1994, 1996, Řežník & Slevákova 1997. Alongside such essay collections, there are also thematic volumes such as Flacke 1998 and White & Murphy 2001. Monograph studies are scarcer; particularly inspiring are Thiesse 1999 and Geary 2002.

7 Examples of such regionally-comparative studies are Loit 1985, Reiter 1983, Mitchison 1980, Michel 1995, Hettne, Sörlin, & Østergård 1998.

social or political events and developments. They are often cited mainly to invoke something as vague as an intellectual climate such as 'the spread of the ideas of Herder' or 'romantic medievalism in the style of Sir Walter Scott'. A single occurrence will serve as a telling, exemplary and representative ensample standing in for a number of unspecified other, similar ones. Only rarely are events and developments in the cultural sphere dealt with exhaustively, or subjected to quantitative or typological analysis. What the reader gets are one or two anecdotes from the field of culture, *à titre d'exemple*, evoking the sort of historical *couleur locale* or mentality in which socio-political developments can be situated. Culture is described, referred to; almost never does it get analysed.

This tendency is all the more unsatisfactory in the light of the important insights emerging from the work of Miroslav Hroch on the various phases in the gestation of national movements.[8] Hroch has demonstrated that cultural preoccupations are usually ahead of political events, and not just a passive reflection of them. The cultural preoccupations of what Hroch terms 'Phase A' nationalism makes the nation thinkable as a focus of political loyalty. The social demands of Phase B nationalism and the mass appeal of Phase C follow, and indeed seem to presuppose, a cultural consciousness-raising.

To be sure, Hroch's 'three phases' model has its own inner complexities, and in some cases has elicited questions; it could hardly be otherwise, since it involves specific identifications of various 'phases' in various national cases, which may from case to case lead to debate. Yet on the whole the model has gained widespread acceptance to the extent that most scholars now accept that separatist movements often begin in the study, that the schoolmasters and poets who collect proverbs and folktales are the unwitting avant-garde for the social and

---

[8] Hroch 1968, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998. Hroch's model is aptly summarized by A.D. Smith (1988: 56): "First, an original small circle of intellectuals rediscovers the national culture and past and formulates the idea of the nation (phase A). There follows the crucial process of dissemination of the idea of the national by agitator-professionals who politicise cultural nationalism in the growing towns (phase B). Finally the state of popular involvement in nationalism creates a mass movement (phase C)."

political activists, and that, while the precise nature of A-, or B-, or C-phase nationalism may vary from country to country, cultural preoccupations stand at the beginning of the alphabet. Hroch's phase model sidesteps and fits the competing schools of nationalism studies. For Gellnerians it describes precisely how 'nationalism invents nations'; for ethno-symbolists it describes how ethnic traditions are retrieved and made available for a nineteenth-century political-ideological investment. In placing cultural fieldwork and consciousness-raising (something I shall here call *the cultivation of culture*) at the beginning of developing nationalist/separatist movements, Hroch singles out the specificity of nationalism among other ideologies. Following Hroch, we may point out that in its historical gestation, too, nationalism is always, in its incipience at least, cultural nationalism.

Cultural nationalism is a topic for cultural history.

Hroch's model leaves some desiderata. Some four of these may be listed as follows:

[1] Phase A cultural nationalism is treated in terms of what it leads to, not in terms of what it sets out to do. In its actual application, Hroch's model may lead us to see Phase A nationalism as the overture to Phase B; the incubation period, as it were; a warming-up exercise before the real action starts. There is nothing in Hroch's model *per se* that imposes this view, but one sees it in operation nevertheless: Phase A seems to get a mention in nationalism studies largely because of the Bs and Cs for which it prepared the ground.

[2] By the same token, once social/political activism gets going, the role of Phase A cultural nationalism seems to have played itself out; it is the match that lit the fuse, and in the greater conflagration ceases to be of particular importance. That view is, again, facilitated by the succession of letters in the alphabet to denote

phases that are thereby all too easily seen as 'succeeding' phases. However, the historical record shows that cultural concerns are not restricted to the early stages of national movements. Culture remains on the agenda even when national movements have obtained a full-fledged social and political activist presence (witness figures like Botev and Rakovski in Bulgaria, or Pearse in Ireland); indeed, even after the achievement of a nationalist objective in the establishment of sovereign statehood, one can see an undiminished concern for the cultivation of the national culture in the set-up of the new state. Huchinson (1987: 40-46) has rightly drawn attention to the iterative, recurring nature of cultural nationalism, its tendency to return again and again to its preoccupations; one may perhaps go further see this as a sign of non-transient persistence, a concern that maintains itself in the shifting circumstances of a developing social and political context. Certainly the succeeding activists in the filiation of cultural nationalism see themselves as part of something almost like an apostolic succession or, in the root sense of the term, a tradition. The two in-depth studies of Gaelic language revivalism in Ireland by Philip O'Leary (1994, 2004) bear this out: one covers the pre-independence period 1881-1921, the other covers the years after the establishment of the Irish Free State, 1922-1939; the sources cited in great detail by O'Leary show a remarkable thematic, ideological and functional consistency.[9] In contrast, then, to what the neat succession of letters A, B and C would suggest in Hroch's phase model, the cultural agenda of nationalism does not cease when subsequent, more activist phases swing into action, but continues to feed and inform these.

[3] Going by the logic of Hroch's phase model, there is reason, therefore, to bring cultural nationalism, or the cultural concerns of nationalism, out from under the

---

[9] Nationalist histories of Ireland usually tended to focus on a tradition or transgenerational filiation of anti-English assertions, following this from generation to generation like the baton in a relay race. The term for this national 'baton' thus handed on down the centuries was the *claidheamh soluis* or 'sword of light'. *An claidheamh soluis* was the title of a nationalist periodical in the years 1899-1930; *The sword of light* was also the title of a nationalist history of Irish cultural nationalism: Ryan 1939.

shadow of the social and political movements which have been hitched to its train. There is more to 'Phase A' than what we see in the rearview mirror of social and political movements. There may be historical things, phenomena, that are not so easily identifiable *postquam* as forerunners of something else. The concerns and agendas of regionalism (such as it has been studied in France by scholars like Anne-Marie Thiesse (1991), or in the Netherlands in the cases of the Frisian movement (Jensma 1998) and Limburg regionalism) are typologically and structurally quite close to Phase A nationalism; they may even have imbricated and interacted with national movements elsewhere. A case in point is the nineteenth-century revival of medieval *jeux floraux* literary festivals, first in Toulouse and Occitanian France, then in Barcelona and Catalonia, and thence in Galicia; these were inspired by each other, and tapped into a shared remembrance of the great days of courtly poetry in Romance languages antedating the hegemony of Castilian and the Langue d'Oïl.[10] While, however, the renaissance of the *jocs florals* in Barcelona formed part of a salient and well-defined cultural-nationalist movement, its impact in Toulouse never went beyond asseretions of Occitan regionalism – the Galician *xogos froraes* taking up an intermediary position between the two. There is, in other words, a sliding scale of particularist investment in such cultural revivals, some of which will spawn a more activist phase B or C, while others will not; this differentiation should not hide the Phase-A-movements-without-further-issue from our analysis as being of no import. Surely in the history of nationalism in Europe it is not altogether unimportant that Vasile Alecsandri, the Romanian statesman, folksong-collector and nation-builder, was a cherished guest at *Félibrige* gatherings in Provence.[11] What is more, the dynamics whereby the cultivation of culture may, for longer or shorter periods, maintain a mild regionalist aspect before inspiring a more separatist agenda, needs closer scrutiny. The Welsh *eisteddfod* was, and is, a cultural festival with little or no separatist

---

[10] Ripert 1917: 58-60 discusses the revival in Toulouse from the mid-1840s onwards, inspiring similar revivals in Barcelona and Galicia in 1859-61. For the Catalan case, see Miracle 1960; for Galicia: Máiz Suarez 1984, Barreiro Fernández 1982-83.

[11] On the *Félibrige*, see Martel 1997; Pasquini 1997; Ripert 1917.

radicalism in its rhetoric; but its centuries-long presence since its revival in the 1820s has been a long, slow, subtle galvanising element in the assertion of Welsh difference from England.[12] Again, the cultivation of a national culture in Italy and Spain for a long time works on a regionalist basis: folktales, folksongs etc. are initially collected as specimens of Sicilian, or Piedmontese, of Neapolitan culture, or of Valencian, Andalusian or Aragonese culture, and only gradually obtain a symbolical significance and status as somehow belonging to, and exemplifying, the 'national' Spanish or Italian cultural heritage.[13] Again, in a good many cases, the infrastructure of sociability which provided a platform for early cultural nationalism starts in city cultures (civic academies, reading societies, newspapers) and only later obtains a more generalized national import.

[4] In other words, early cultural nationalism does not yet work within the national categories that would later result from its activities. There is a danger of anachronistic distortion if we contextualize Phase A nationalism in a national context which only crystallized later, as a result of subsequent developments (phases B and C). To begin with, this tends to screen 'failed nationalisms' from our view. In all too many cases, nationalism studies are conducted as a sort of archeology of the modern state: only those national movements and antecedents are singled out which have actually managed to constitute themselves into the states with which we are familiar nowadays. In the process, it becomes a self-fulfilling circular reasoning to argue that the ethnic roots of the modern nation go back further than the emergence of the nationalist ideology. Of course they do. We all have neolithic ancestors. Surely the problematical point is (and here perhaps the views of Gellner and Smith as argued out in their Warwick Debate can be

---

[12] Cf. Edwards 2000 and, more generally, Williams 1985; Williams 1980.

[13] The interaction between regionalism and nationalism is complex (Storm 2005). In the Basque country, the regionalism of Antonio de Trueba (1881-1829) stands alongside the nationalism of Sabino de Arana (1865-1903; on whom, cf. Juaristi 2000 and Watson 1996). In many established states, regional icons and stereotypes can obtain national-symbolical status; cf. van Borgt, Hermans & Jacobs 1996 for the Dutch case.

reconciled[14]) that prior to the emergence of nationalism these ethnicities were a mangrove swamp of inchoate and competing identitarian patterns, which were not only given a fresh symbolical function in nationalist terms, but also filtered, selected, realigned and reconfigured in the process, sometimes to the point of transmutation or invention.

Cultural nationalism requires a cross-national comparative approach

The 'rearview mirror perspective' of looking at Phase A nationalism in terms of what it subsequently gave rise to, must tend to project a twentieth-century mental map of Europe back onto an early-to-mid-nineteenth-century ethnocultural landscape. That landscape, however, was in many cases initially divided along different classifications from the ones which emerged from historical events. Why and how did Baltic nationalism come up with nation-states like Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania – and how did these categories take over from original regional units like Livland, Courland and Samogitia? How did the Morlacks disappear, the notion of 'Illyrianism' briefly appear and then dispappear again, as a separate ethnic category in the Balkans?[15] Through what processes did the Albanians and Macedonians manage, and the Vlachs fail, to crystallize into a territorially established nation? That these things happened as they did is the outcome of a turbulent century where contingency jostles with circumstance and leader-personalities with geography. But the point remains that the grammars, dictionaries and poems of the early phases situated themselves in a geo-ethnically different landscape from ours. It also means that many of their activities took place in contexts that now fall outside the states which emerged subsequently. The

---

[14] famously, in *Nations and Nationalism* 2 (1996): 357-370.

[15] On the idea of a 'Morlack' nation/culture inhabiting the uplands of Dalmatia, see Wolff 2001. On Slavic nationalities more generally, Wolff 1994; Kohn 1960.

Albanian Naum Vexilharqi lived and worked in what is now Romania. The beginnings of Serbian literary culture lie in the printing presses of Venice and Budapest. After 1830, Polish and Lithuanian intellectuals looked to Kiev as much as to Warsaw or Wilno/Vilnius; Finnish nationalism tapped into ethnically Finnish areas which then, and now, formed part of Russia. One of the first Bulgarian newspapers was printed in Smyrna.[16] One could go on; but the reader will have noticed my drift. Such situations strike us as extraterritorial and therefore slightly anomalous, part of an ethnic primal soup which only later slotted into its proper geographical matrix; and that is an anachronistic post-hoc distortion.

In the realm of culture, Vienna can be a Bulgarian or Greek centre of learning even though geographically and politically it is far removed from the Rodopi mountains or the Peloponnese. Heinrich Heine, based in Paris, famously called the German language his 'portable fatherland' (*mein portatives Vaterland*). The extraterritorial (or rather: territorially a-specific) location of many early concerns and workers in the field of cultural nationalism is not an anomaly, but a fact of life. Whereas nationalism as a social and political movement takes place in a geographical space, cultural processes take shape in a mental ambience which is not tethered to any specific location.

The geographical indistinctness of early cultural nationalism is a factor of central, cardinal importance in our historical analysis of nationalism at large, for two reasons. To begin with, it accounts for all the geopolitical and territorial quarrels which emerge once the cultivation of culture is translated from the realm of learning and letters into that of social and political action. Cultural consciousness-raising addresses traditions and ethnic groups; political activism will stake territorial claims for the autonomous rights of those traditions and groups, leading to competing and conflicting territorially-autonomist demands on

---

[16] On Albania: Faensen 1980, Iancovici 1971, Islami 1969; particularly valuable for understanding the Albanian case is a literary history: Elsie 1996. On early Serbian print culture: Holton & Mihailovitch 1988; also Király 1993. On Ukraine: Lindheim & Luckyj 1996; Luckyj 1983; Prymak 1996. On Finnish: Klinge 1980; Rubulis 1970. On Fotinovs Bulgarian newspaper *Ljuboslovie*: Lord 1963: 264.

mixed regions such as Ulster (cf. Heslinga 1962), the Greek-Albanian or Greek-Macedonian frontier, and indeed most Balkan frontiers and ethnically mixed areas, including Vojvodina, Bukovina and Transylvania.

More importantly, this means that in cultural consciousness-raising, all nations of Europe are each others' immediate neighbours, and therefore are open to dense patterns of mutual influence and exchenage. Literary and philological actors are in close contact although the ethnicities they work on are situated at distant parts on the European map. The Lithuanian Jonas Basanavičius and the Ukrainian Yurij Venelin work in, and on, Bulgaria; the Slovene Jernej Kopitar is approached by the Portuguese Royal Academy concerning the edition of a medieval *cancioneiro*. Jacob Grimm mediates between the Finn Lönnrot and the Breton La Villemarqué, and makes the Irish grammarian John O'Donovan a member of the Prussian Academy.[17] In other words, the intellectual and cultural history of European nationalism need not tether a given national movement to its 'proper' country, or to the socio-economic circumstances and conditions of that place, but must also situate developments in a dense and tight network of mutual contact and inspiration. Nationalism, certainly in its 'Phase A' cultural manifestation, is a truly international European pandemic.

Accordingly, cultural nationalism needs another explanatory context beyond the sociopolitical infrastructure of its home country (however that may have been configured or constituted at the time); and one of the central concerns I hope to bring across is that the various 'phase A-style' manifestations of cultural nationalism in Europe need to be studied in their mutual contacts, as part of a comparative cultural history. The analogy I have in mind is that of Romanticism: another European pandemic which was almost contemporary with cultural nationalism and which has many points of overlap with it. Where would literary and cultural historians be if we studied Romanticism piecemeal, country by

---

[17] On Basanavičius: Senn 1980, Krapauskas 2000. On Venelin: Kohn 1960: 66-67. On Kopitar and the *Cancioneiro da Ajuda*: Michaëlis de Vasconcellos 1904. On Grimm's Celtological correspondence and contacts: Lauer Plötner & Laurent 1991.

country, in each case pondering the stage of modernization of that country, the position of its middle classes, its educational system and economic scale? While such factors establish the background for a Romantic movement in a given context, the main understanding of Romanticism works on the basis of charting the spread of a certain poetical programme in the realm of letters: authors influencing other authors, ideas and attitudes concerning literary beauty and literary inspiration being communicated much like a rumour or a fashion, across networks and in a dynamics which the cultural sociologist Dan Sperber has aptly described as a *contagion des idées*, or 'epidemiology of beliefs' (Sperber 1990, 1996). In sum, we understand Romanticism not as something sociologically generated by a political or economic infrastructure, but as something triggered by the cultural communication and dissemination of ideas. Human actors are, in such an approach, the carriers, enunciators and disseminators of notions, ideas and attitudes.What matters is not just the social situatedness of these actors, but also their function in the dissemination of ideas, as relay stations in a spreading cultural movement.

Comparative Literature has done much to trace and typify European Romanticism in this way.[18] A similar approach may be useful for the tracing and typology of cultural nationalism.

Nationalism, philology and the 'cultivation of culture'

Over the past ten years or so, the project *Philologists and National Learning* (http://www.hum.uva.nl/philology) has collected a database on Phase A nationalism in Europe. The database now contains some 3000 records itemizing activities termed 'cultural' in the critical literature, and spans a bewildering variety

[18] Classic studies that come to mind are Van Tieghem 1969, Praz 1930, Béguin 1946, de Deugd 1966, Gusdorf 1993.

of practices and endeavours: the compiling of dictionaries and grammars, the erection of commemorative monuments, the establishment of newspapers and university chairs, the edition of ancient documents (legal, historical or literary), the writing of historical novels or patriotic verse, the composition of national music, the organization of sporting events and the opening of museums and reading rooms. Clearly, the notion of what 'culture' means in cultural nationalism covers a wide spectrum of manings; even so, a certain consistency between these diverse endeavours can be discerned.[19]

– For one thing, all these pursuits are carried by an overlapping network of actors, who in very many cases undertake initiatives in various of these fields. Sir Walter Scott, notorously, was a creative writer, an antiquary and historian, and staged George IV's visit to Edinburgh; Jacob Grimm was a lexicographer, grammarian, legal historian, folktale collector and editor of old literary texts; the list of such 'multitaskers' could be extended indefinitely. Clearly, for the literati concerned, there was some intellectual continuity between these various initiatives.

– There was also a shared institutional and social framework. The actors involved seem to be situated, almost all of them, at the interstice between *belles lettres*, private erudition, and a professionalization that involved appointments as librarians, archivists, and professorships, both at universities and at *lycées* or *Gymnasia*. Across Europe, archives and libraries came under direct or indirect state control, as did universities, where new chairs in language, literature or philology were established. Appointments in these institutions created career opportunities and a publically-established working environment for literati and scholars who until then would have worked in private networks or through semi-private associations like the Percy Society or the Bannatyne Club. Conversely, these appointments formed part of a reorganization and reinventory drive in the libraries and archives of Europe that brought many forgotten or neglected texts, codices and documents to light. The rediscovery and publication of 'national

---

[19] I have set out the patterns summarized here in greater detail in Leerssen 2004.

classics' such as *Beowulf*, the *Chanson de Roland,* the *Nibelungenlied* and *Reinhart Fuchs* all follow this pattern,[20] as does the initiative to publish national documents in large-scale endeavours such as the *Monumenta Historica Germaniae* or the *Rolls Series*.

– Besides the institutional framework, there was also an underlying intellectual template that linked the various manifestations of early cultural nationalism. That template may be described as *philological*, not in the limited sense familiar to us nowadays ('lang.-and-lit. studies'), but in the sense as originally enunciated by Giambattista Vico in his *La scienza nuova* of 1724. For Vico, philology was the counterpart to philosophy. In this opposition, philosophy is concerned with arriving at *truth* in our understanding of the world (e.g., questions of moral or natural philosophy such as: what is gravity, are humans inherently good or sinful, what happens when something is combusted, what is the ontological status of a colour?); philology, by contrast, is concerned with arriving at *certainty* in our understanding of the world. In Vico's view, the only certain knowledge that humans can achieve has to concern things which are themselves products of the human mind – much as a watchmaker may never be certain about the existence of God, but can fully comprehend the workings of the watch he has constructed. Philology, in Vico's scheme, was the scholarly investigation of the certainty and truth which humans had made for themselves, the *verum factum* (which may be translated either as 'true fact' or as 'constructed truth'). Thereby, Vico's *Scienza Nuova* defined and opened up a field of scholarship which nowadays we would broadly call the Cultural Sciences. Vicoesque philology addressed all man-made certainties and world-views that are articulated through language, poetry, history, law and institutions, and mythology. What is more, in Vico's view these fields were in the original, primitive state a single, undifferentiated whole: poets, law-makers, historians and priest were indistinguishable and had a sole shared function in articulating a nation's culture and world-view.

---

[20] On which, cf. Leerssen & Mathijsen 2002.

Strikingly, the cultural spheres here grouped together by Vico as the investigative field of *philological* learning are fairly precisely the fields where we can place the activities of a generation of early-nationalist intellectuals.[21] While their debt to Vico is often unstated or perhaps not even conscious, we see that romantic-nationalist intellectuals naturally combine legal history and the study of language, literature, manners and customs, and mythology. They did so in a dense network with a lively exchange of ideas across specialisms and national frontiers.[22] Once again, Jacob Grimm is a paradigmatic case in that he was an outstanding scholar in all these fields.[23] Also as a 'networker' and institutional inspiration his name may be mentioned: in 1846 he brought together a conference of *Germanisten* (the first of its kind). Under the 'philological' appellation of *Germanisten*, Grimm united (and proclaimed the unity of) the three sister sciences of literary/linguistic study, history, and legal jurisprudence. These three disciplines he saw united in their shared method (historicism, *i.e.* the tendency to understand the world in terms of its diachronic growth processes) and their shared object (to understand the anthropological roots and mainspring of German culture and a German identity). Grimm's *Germanistenversammlung* is in itself of exemplary value in that both in its personnel, in its venue and in its ideological outlook it foreshadowed the Frankfurt *Nationalversammlung* of 1848. 1846 conveners like Grimm and Arndt had a prominent position in 1848; a number of attending 'Germanisten' in 1846 were delegates in the 1848 *Nationalversammlung*; both meetings were held in the Paulskirche in Frankfurt, a symbolical location given Frankfurt status as an erstwhile Free Imperial mini-republic, and neutral *omphalos* for all German lands; both meetings were suffused by a *Vormärz* enthusiasm which (oddly to present-

---

[21] As Hummel 2003 shows, there is a widespread semantic/conceptual shift in the notion of philology, from general 'erudition' and 'love of letters' to the investigation of the field of *historia rerum* and *historia verborum* (32-33); Vico may be considered a linchpin in this wider trend.

[22] A good idea of the 'cultural transfer' across Europe through nineteenth-century philological networks is given by the collections Espagne & Werner 1990, 1994.

[23] On Grimm and his position in emerging *Germanistik*, see Bluhm 1997, Janota 1980, Wyss 1979.

day observers) combined a left-leaning anti-monarchist liberalism with aggessive, chauvinist German patriotism and expansionism (e.g, regarding Schleswig-Holstein).[24] All this once again illustrates the active-anticipatory (rather than passive-reflective) nature of cultural pursuits in the development of nationalism.

Vico's 'philological' programme was aimed at understanding national characters (the *natura delle nazioni* that features in the subtitle of the *Scienza Nuova*). This investment, with an added historicist approach, underpins all cultural-national pursuits of the subsequent century. The prominent classicist August Boeckh defined philology in a phrase that Vico would have appreciated: he called it *die Erkenntis des Erkannten*, the 'understanding of how/what we understand'.[25] In a similarly recursive phraseology, I suggest that the underlying, unifying concern of early cultural nationalism and romantic historicism lies in the *cultivation of culture*. By that phrase I understand specifically the new interest in demotic, vernacular, non-classical culture, and the intellectual investment that takes such vernacular culture, not merely as a set of trivial or banal pastimes, or as picturesque 'manners and customs', but as something which is worthy of scholarly attention because it represents the very identity of the nation, its specificity amidst other nations.[26]

This *cultivation of culture* underpins, I contend, nationalists' scholarly, creative and political-propagandist concern with language, with folktales, history, myths and legends, proverbs, ancient tribal/legal antiquity, mythology, antique heirlooms, etc. All of these are, at a specific historical juncture, lifted from their context of origin by a professionalizing philological elite; they are

---

[24] See *Verhandlungen* 1847 and Fürbeth et al. 1999, especially Habermas's contribution (Habermas 1999); also my forthcoming book (Leerssen 2006).

[25] Boeckh repeatedly phrased the idea of philology in these terms, notably in his *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften* of 1877, and often also in a more extensive phraseological working-through. See the text samples collected and commented in Hummel 2003: 218-220.

[26] I argue the point in greater detail in my Leerssen 1999, 2004.

recontextualized and instrumentalized for modern needs and values; and they are invested with a fresh national symbolism and status. Complex as these processes are, they can nonetheless be mapped as a specific arra of concerns, allowing us to address the agenda of cultural nationalism in analytic rather than merely descriptive terms.

The 'cultivation of culture' can be mapped as a specific array of concerns

The idea that early 'Phase A' style nationalism essentially involves a cultivation of culture would be no more than a phraseological pirouette if it did not allow us to gain a more specific analytical understanding of what that actually involved. What exactly do we mean by 'culture' and by 'cultivation'?

It would be quixotic to try and impose a definition of the notoriously protean concept of culture. Most readers will have a commonsense, albeit unspecific understanding of the term. Rather than fitting historical evidence into *a priori* definitions, it seems preferable to inventorize current, commonsense aspects of what is commonly considered a cultural endeavour, and to attempt some pragmatic systematization on that basis. This would at least have the heuristic value of being able to 'place' a given cultural endeavour vis-à-vis others, to situate a given activity against at least a more systematically diversified and specified template of the notion of 'culture' in nationalist activism.

The model I want to present here does not, therefore, claim to reflect the inner structure or capture the true essence of 'cultural' nationalism; it is merely a grid, a heuristic device, to sort out and situate various aspects and practices. It is as uncongenial, as artificial and arbitrary, as the system of meridians and parallels of longitude and latitude is to the outline of the earth's continents: it does not describe the earth as it is, but allows us to fix a position on its surface.

So what is culture, and how is it cultivated? A first line of systematization involves the type of cultural *field* in question; four of these seems to cover most of the data in a meaningfully differentiated fashion.

[1] Foremost among these four is clearly that of language. From Herder to the generation of the Humboldts, Schlegels and Grimms, language comes to be seen as the essential soul of a nation's identity and position in the world.[27] An extraordinary number of cultural-nationalist initiatives are concerned with language: from grammar-writing to purism,[28] from language revivalism to language planning.

[2] Closely attendant on this is language's twin sister in the mind-set of emerging philology: literature. One thinks primarily of novels, theatre and verse, but this should not exclude the more referential genres of disquisition, such as history-writing, antiquarianism, cultural criticism. Most writers at the time moved easily between the genres of learned argument and poetic creation, and what was called *literature* in the early nineteenth century is closer to what we now call *discourse*: culture in its written manifestation, the textual output and inheritance of a given society.

[3] Outside the fields of language and discourse we can identify a category of 'material culture': artefacts and objects in space such as painting, sculpture ancient and modern, antiquities, monuments, traditional dress and architecture, symbols such as flags and heraldry, public buildings.[29]

[4] Finally, that leaves the performative field of non-verbal, immaterial culture:

---

[27] Cf. Caussat Adamski & Crépon 1996.

[28] On purism, see van der Sijs 1999. Also, on language standardization, the great survey Fodor & Hagège 1983-94.

[29] Much of this (but also other fields of culture: textual and performative) has become popular among cultural historians under the heading of *lieux de mémoire*, following the seminal collection by Pierre Nora (1997), which has had spin-off projects in various European countries: Feldbæk 1991-92, François & Schulze 2001, Isnenghi 1996-97. Aspects of historicist culture in nation-formation have in Britain been studied by Samuel 1989 and Hobsbawm & Ranger 1983.

cultural practices, involving folkdances, pastimes and sports, manners and customs, and (last but not least) music.

There are, of course, overlaps between these fields. For instance: The establishment of national theatres not only involved the writing of plays, but sometimes also the establishment of a public purpose-built theatre building, and included performances of 'national' or nationally-inspired ballet and music alongside, or within, the dramatic programme. On the whole, however, the division along the lines suggested here provides a workable sorting-grid.

And what about the idea of 'cultivation'? This aspect involves the agenda on the part of cultural-nationalist actors and activists, their intended instrumentalization of the national culture. Here, the data suggest a division into some three types of endeavour, which we might call *salvage*, *fresh productivity*, and *propagandist proclamation*, respectively[30]

[A] The first of these (possibly also the earliest in time, with an appreciable pre-romantic run-up in the eighteenth century) is content with mere inventorization (of language, discourse, artefacts or practices, as per the fours fields listed above). It has been pointed out before that cultural studies in the Romantic period, often follow a 'salvage paradigm'; particularly so if the cultural topic involved is not part of the timeless-classicist canon (more durable than bronze, *aere perennius*, in Horace's phrase), but of a more informal, popular and vernacular provenance. It is part of a romantic mindset to celebrate surviving specimens of ancient tradition as 'the last of their kind', final remaining samples of a vanishing, almost vanished inheritance.[31] Manuscripts are seen the surviving vestiges of a pre-Gutenberg

---

[30] These are, very roughly, separate in intensity of ideological/political instrumentalization. The moment when they get under way is also staggered in time, almost like Hroch's three phases; but all three persist concurrently, without any obvious cut-off point or tipping point.

[31] The trope of 'the last of...', which peaks as a cultural concern in the mid-1820s, has been analysed in an excellent study: Stafford 1994. The notion of the 'salvage paradigm' in

world implicated in a long process of attrition, dispersal and loss; oral poetry is stereotypically snatched from the lips of aging folk who have long memories but little remaining life expectancy; folktales and folk music are invariably part of a lifestyle which is threatened by modernization. (Ironically, this modernization process is seen as a threatening, eroding force by the very scholars whose work it enables and facilitates.) A similar worried stance, surveying a receding antiquity from a modernizing vantage-point, concerns ancient buildings, monuments, historical sites or symbolically invested landscapes; or superstitions, pastimes and performative traditions. (Generally, the link between the emergence of folklore and of nationalism is well established.) A primal urge, therefore in the cultivation of culture is that of *salvage* on the basis of *registration* and *description.*

[B] A second type of cultivating culture involves the inspiration of fresh cultural *productivity*, the emergence of contemporary initiatives inspired by these historicist inventories and remembrances. Linguists no longer just inventorize language by means of grammar and dictionaries, they argue about orthography, standardization, the status of dialects vs. a central norm, and the need for linguistic purity from foreign contamination. Often the vernacular's claim to prestige is signalled by initiatives to translate the Bible (or other 'world classics'). In the field of textual production, we see the writing of patriotic or historical verse, or narrative, or drama; the emergence of a new type of national history-writing, taking 'the nation' for its collective protagonist rather than the deeds of monarchs and generals;[32] literary criticism and literary history-writing, formulating a canon and an agenda for a literature now understood as a national pursuit (cf. Spiering 1999). In the field of material culture, we encounter canonization processes by means of the establishment of national museums and the restoration of ancient buildings. In music culture, there is the rise of schools of 'national composition'

---

anthropological studies was coined by Clifford, Dominguez & Minh-Ha 1987.

[32] A comparative project on such national history-writing (*Representations of the past: The writing of national histories in Europe*) is now being conducted under the auspices of the European Science Foundation: http://www.uni-leipzig.de/zhs/esf-nhist/index.htm.

– which, tellingly, means two things: [a] nationally distinctive, in that it makes the nation stands out amidst others, and [b] drawing for that purpose on the idiom of demotic, non-classical musical traditions (folk music and folk dances). The lifestyle of the peasantry inspires the genre of rustic-'realist' narrative, full of local and folkloric colour, which almost everywhere in Europe takes over after the Romantic historical novel has played itself out. Traditional sports and pastimes, or even traditional dress, may be revived or cultivated by clubs and associations.

[C] Thirdly, the national culture thus salvaged and perpetuated may be used for the purpose of propagandist proclamation: it is drawn upon to suffuse the public sphere with a sense of collective national identity. First and foremost that happens in the field of education: the vernacular language is taught, or used in education; university theses are no longer in Latin. The national history becomes a school subject, as does the nation's literature. Pageants, school posters, historical monuments and pantheons are used to proclaim the nation's history and to give it a firm presence in the here and now. Historicist architecture (neo-Gothic or otherwise) is used; newly-built streets are given dedicatory names taken from historical memories and great names from the past. Festivals, awards and other public manifestations are held involving linguistic, literary, historical or folkloristic agendas.

This, then, gives at last a differentiated idea of how one can position various aspects of culture, and aspects of its cultivation. If we juxtapose the two dimensions, 'culture' and 'cultivation' into a matrix, the 'cultivation of culture' takes on the following shape:

		TYPES OF CULTIVATION		
		salvage	**productivity**	**propagation**
CULTURAL FIELDS	**language**	language description	language maintenance	language activism, language planning
	discourse	text editions	translations, literature, history, criticism	education, festivals commemorations
	material culture	archeography	monument protection, musealization, architecture	dedicatory investment of public space
	practices performed	folklore studies	folklore revival, national music, rustic literature	folk pageantry

To further accommodate this model to the available data, two other categories must be identified, which are not specific to any given pursuit/field set out here, but which rather function as a facilitating framework to all of them. One is the social ambience (sociability and the public organization of cultural pusuits), the other the institutional infrastructure created by the modern (post-French Revolution) state. One is 'bottom-up', generated by initiatives on the ground, often as part of an urban middle-class sociability most strongly represented among the professional classes, and involves the establishment of associations, city academies, book rooms, reading societies and clubs, and the establishment of newspapers or periodicals. The other is 'top-down', initiated, funded and/or overseen by the authorities, and involves the establishment and management of state-controlled institutions such as archives, libraries, universities or university institutes (cf. Rüegg 2004), and national academies, museums or galleries; or else, government-sponsored surveys of the national culture or of the documentary sources of the nation's history.

Once these two institutional/social frameworks are factored in, the result is a matrix which looks as follows:

	SALVAGE, RETRIEVAL, INVENTORY	FRESH CULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY	PROPAGATION, PROCLAMATION IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE
LANGUAGE	dictionaries grammars	orthography debates standardization / dialect debates language purism	language activism, language planning, language education
DISCOURSE	editions of older - literary texts - historical documents - legal sources	translations / adaptations (Bible, classics) national / historical drama, novel, poetry national history-writing literary history, criticism	history education historical pageants commemorations events / festivals / awards
MATERIAL CULTURE, ARTEFACTS	archeography monumental remains symbolically invested sites	monument protection policy historicist architecture, design restorations, museums	monuments dedication of public spaces
CULTURAL PERFORMANCES, PRACTICES	editions of oral literature proverbs, superstitions, pastimes, folklore manners and customs folk dances, folk music	rustic-realist literature, traditional sports / pastimes revived, national music composed	revived or invented traditions events / festivals / awards: (folklore, sports, music)
SOCIAL AMBIENCE	associations, congresses, academies; publishing ventures, reading societies, book clubs, periodicals		
INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE	universities/chairs, libraries, archives, museums, academies, government agencies		

Once again: this model does not describe or characterize cultural nationalism. It is merely an accessory in order to locate, in a set of coordinates, a given pursuit or practice in the cultivation of culture. The model's main use is heuristic. In nationalism studies, the field of culture, and the traditions of cultural nationalism, have too often been referred to in unspecified ways, by means of one or two sample instances meant to betoken an entire, unspecified further realm of 'all that cultural stuff', indicated rather than described, let alone analysed. By at least diversifying and specifying how we can place 'all that cultural stuff', a precondition may be created for a more detailed comparative study.

Future research will have to take at least two other dimensions into account: the various nationalities involved,[33] and the chronology. What happened in Iceland in 1820, what in Slovenia in 1850? Which came first where? Is it possible to see certain pursuits more heavily represented in established nation-states like Denmark, others in marginal minority cultures such as Estonia? Only on that basis will it be possible to get a firm and concrete sense of which ideas and initiatives spread where, and along which networks and in what chronology.

---

[33] This involves further problems – complex, but not intractable. Leaving aside the question which linguistic or political 'units' were the carriers of separate national movements, there is a major pragmatic problem in the fact that the history of these movements, in all the many different languages of Europe, has often been best written in those languages themselves. It is a major obstacle to cross-national comparative research that the existing documentation is spread over sources in many different languages. This is only very gradually being alleviated by newer publications in English, French or German.

Conclusion

Cultural nationalism is an international movement, not just the cultural fall-out of separate political-nationalist movements. It is as international a movement, or intellectual fashion, as Romanticism, with ideas and initiatives from one country picked up, imitated or applied elsewhere, in a swirl of cross-border intellectual traffic. The actors who carried it were concerned, not just with a single nationality or cultural tradition to the exclusion of all others, but with a philology and taxonomy of Europe's diversified cultural landscape, involving a reassessment and revalorization of the various individual, vernacular cultures. They were deeply interested in contacts, comparisons and larger patterns, and in the process bequeathed to their political fellow-travellers a discourse, rhetoric and mental template concerning their nations' roots, specificity and autonomous cultural status.

The 'cultivation of culture' configures and articulates cultural traditions in the diverse European landscape as 'national'; it transmutes them from informal vernacular/demotic practices to discrete elements in the structural systematics of a European continent considered as a set of nations. In this respect, cultural nationalism is a central, fundamental and persistent aspect of nationalism across Europe throughout the last two centuries.[34] It pursues concerns of its own, which

---

[34] As stated at the outset of this article, the type of cultural nationalism inventorized here is specifically European in scope. Its various underlying factors affected all of Europe, and hardly any non-European areas. This applies to the establishment of universities and libraries, and to the historicist re-inventory of old textual records in the climate of romantic medievalism. (On romantic and nineteenth-century medievalism, see Ridoux 2001, Bloch & Nichols 1996, van Kesteren 2004.) It applies even more strongly to the impact that Vico's notion of philology had on a new branch of the human sciences institutionalized in a network of scholars transforming themselves from a Republic of Letters into a new professional class of academic civil servants. All of this affects all of Europe – earlier in some countries, later in others, but leading eventually to manifestatons and repercussions from Reykjavik to Odessa and from Santiago de Compostela

should not be seen merely as a side issue in the margin of political nationalism. While its chronological development is connected with known factors of nation-building and state formation (such as the rise of middle-class sociability, the spread of literacy, the penetration of mass print and the centralized organization of universities, libraries and institutions of learning) it also follows a chronology and dynamics of its own, influenced by intellectual factors such as the rise of the philologies and of literary historicism (Leerssen 2004).

What is more, cultural nationalism is territorially much more free-floating than are social movements and their political demands. It offers a standing reminder that 'German nationalism' or 'Greek nationalism' is not the same thing as 'nationalism in present-day Germany' or 'nationalism in present-day Greece'. The cultivation of culture was initiated and pursued in multi-ethnic metropolitan centres and imperial capitals as well as rural borderlands, by scholars on the cusp of a professionalization process, with careers that took them to different places, and who maintained a dense transnational network where influences and debates could pass freely from one corner of Europe to another; it addressed cultural traditions which are at the time were often imprecisely located or demarcated in people's minds or in the real world.

Political and sociological analyses of nationalism have tended to focus on modernization processes and public-sphere activism rather than on the rarefied and often nostalgic realms of philology, folklore, literature and traditionalism. What is more, studies of nationalism concentrating on single-country cases will tend to marginalize the radically trans-national dynamics of ideas that came from elsewhere, that were expressed in different languages, or that were undertaken in

---

to St. Petersburg. While there may have been some parallel aspects or reverberations of these processes outside Europe (in the United States, Argentina, post-Tanzimat Turkey or colonial India), on the whole the data indicate that nationalism resting on the agenda of a cultivation of culture may indeed be particular to Europe, and constitute a specifically European sub-type of nationalism at large.

places outside the borders of the present-day state. The early-nationalist cultivation of culture was a pervasive and hugely important concern, but its data have seeped into the footnotes and *obiter dicta* of political and literary histories. Nonetheless, it poses a rich field of study with its own profile, its own problems and perspectives, and it is indispensible for our proper understanding of nationalism at large.

References:

Armstrong, John A. 1982. *Nations before nationalism*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Barreiro Fernández, Xosé Ramón. 1982-83. *Historia contemporánea de Galicia*. 3 vols. La Coruña: Gamma.

Béguin, Albert. 1946. *L'âme romantique et le rêve: Essai sur le Romantisme Allemand et la poésie française*. Paris: Corti.

Berding, Helmut, ed. 1994. *Nationales Bewußtsein und kollektive Identität. Studien zur Entwicklung des kollektiven Bewußtseins in der Neuzeit, 2*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

———, ed. 1996. *Mythos und Nation. Studien zur Entwicklung des kollektiven Bewußtseins in der Neuzeit, 3.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Billig, Michael. 1995. *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage.

Bloch, R. Howard, and Stephen G. Nichols, eds. 1996. *Medievalism and the modernist temper*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bluhm, Lothar. 1997. *Die Brüder Grimm und der Beginn der Deutschen Philologie: Eine Studie zu Kommunikation und Wissenschaftsbildung im frühen 19. Jahrhundert*. Hildesheim: Weidmann.

Bolkestein, Frits. 2003. "Nederlandse identiteit in Europa", *Ons erfdeel* 47 (4):485-497.

van Borgt, Carlo, Amanda Hermans, and Hugo Jacobs, eds. 1996. *Constructie van het eigene. Culturele vormen van regionale identiteit in Nederland*. Amsterdam: P.J. Meertens-Instituut.

Breuilly, John. 1993. *Nationalism and the state*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. Original edition, 1982.

Caussat, Pierre, Dariusz Adamski, and Marc Crépon, eds. 1996. *La langue source de la nation. Messianismes séculiers en Europe centrale et orientale (du XVIIIe au XXe siècle)*. Edited by S. Auroux, C. Normand and I. Rosier, *Philosophie et langage*. Sprimont: Mardaga.

Clifford, James, Virginia Dominguez, & Trinh T. Minh-Ha. 1987. "The politics of representation; of other peoples: Beyond the «Salvage Paradigm»", in *Discussions in Contemporary Culture 1*, ed. H. Foster (Seattle: Bay Press): 131-137.

Cubitt, Geoffrey, ed. 1998. *Imagining nations*, *York Studies in Cultural History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

de Deugd, Cornelis. 1966. *Het metafysisch grondpatroon van het romantische literaire denken: de fenomenologie van een geestesgesteldheid*. Groningen: Wolters.

Edwards, Hywel Teifi. 2000. "The eisteddfod poet: An embattled figure", in *A guide to Welsh literature, c. 1800-1900*, ed. H. T. Edwards (Cardiff: University of Wales Press): 24-27.

Elsie, Robert. 1996. *History of Albanian literature*. 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press.

Espagne, Michel, and Michael Werner, eds. 1990. *Philologiques I: Contribution à l'histoire des disciplines littéraires en France et en Allemagne au XIXe siècle*. Vol. 3, *Philologiques*. Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme.

———, eds. 1994. *Philologiques III: Qu'est-ce qu'une littérature nationale? Approches pour une théorie interculturelle du champ littéraire*. Vol. 3, *Philologiques*. Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme.

Faensen, Johannes. 1980. *Die albanische Nationalbewegung*. Edited by N. Reiter. Vol. 4, *Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen*. Berlin / Wiesbaden: Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität Berlin / Harassowitz.

Feldbæk, Ole, ed. 1991-92. *Dansk identitetshistorie*. 4 vols. København: C.A. Reitzel.

Flacke, Monika, ed. 1998. *Mythen der Nationen: Ein europäisches Panorama*. München & Berlin: Koehler & Amelang.

Fodor, István, and Claude Hagège, eds. 1983-94. *Language reform: History and future*. 6 vols. Hamburg: Buske.

François, Etienne, and Hagen Schulze, eds. 2001. *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte*. 3 vols. München: Beck.

Fürbeth, Frank, Pierre Krügel, Ernst E. Metzner, & Olaf Müller, eds. 1999. *Zur Geschichte und Problematik der Nationalphilologien in Europa. 150 Jahre Erste Germanistenversammlung in Frankfurt am Main (1846-1996)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Geary, Patrick J. 2002. *The myth of nations. The medieval origins of Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and nationalisms*, *New perspectives on the past*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Giesen, Bernhard, ed. 1991. *Nationale und kulturelle Identität. Studien zur Entwicklung des kollektiven Bewußtseins in der Neuzeit, 1*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Guibernau, Montserrat, & John Hutchinson, eds. 2004. *History and national destiny: Ethno-symbolism and its critics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gusdorf, Georges. 1993. *Le romantisme*. 2 vols. Paris: Payot. Original edition, 1984-85.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1999. "Was ist ein Volk?", in Fürbeth et al. 1999: 23-39.

Hall, John A., ed. 1998. *The state of the nation. Ernest Gellner and the theory of nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hastings, Adrian. 1997. *The construction of nationhood. Ethnicity, religion and nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heslinga, M.W. 1962. *The Irish border as a cultural divide. A contribution to the study of regionalism in the British Isles*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Hettne, Björn, Sverker Sörlin, & Uffe Østergård. 1998. *Den globala nationalismen*. Stockholm: SNS.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1990. *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric J., & Terence Ranger, eds. 1983. *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holton, Milne, & Vasa D. Mihailovitch. 1988. *Serbian poetry from the beginnings to the present*. New Haven: Yale Center for International and Area Studies.

Hroch, Miroslav. 1968. *Die Vorkämpfer der nationalen Bewegung bei den kleinen Völkern Europas. Eine vergleichende Analyse zur gesellschaftlichen Schichtung der patriotischen Gruppen*. Praha: Universita Karlova.

———. 1994. *The social interpretation of linguistic demands in European national movements*. Florence: European University Institute.

———. 1995. "National self-determination from a historical perspective", *Canadian Slavonic papers / Revue canadienne des slavistes* 37 (3-4): 283-299.

———. 1996. *In the national interest*. Prague: Charles University.

———. 1998. "Programme und Forderungen nationaler Bewegungen. Ein europäischer Vergleich", in *Entwicklung der Nationalbewegungen in Europa 1850-1914*, ed. H. Timmermann (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot): 17-29.

Hummel, Pascale. 2003. *Philologus auctor. Le philologue et son oeuvre*. Bern: Lang.

Hutchinson, John. 1987. *The dynamics of cultural nationalism: The Gaelic Revival and the creation of the Irish nation state*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Iancovici, Sava. 1971. "Relations roumano-albanaises à l'époque de la renaissance et de l'émancipation du peuple albanais" *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 9: 5-48, 225-248.

Islami, Myslim. 1969. *Naum P. Veqilharxhi*. Prishtinë: Rilindja.

Isnenghi, Mario, ed. 1996-97. *I luoghi della memoria*. 3 vols, *Storia e società*. Roma / Bari: Laterza.

Janota, Johannes, ed. 1980. *Eine Wissenschaft etabliert sich, 1810-1870*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Jensma, Goffe. 1998. *Het rode tasje van Salverda. Burgerlijk bewustzijn en Friese identiteit in de negentiende eeuw*. Ljouwert: Fryske Akademy.

Juaristi, Jon. 2000. *El linaje de Aitor*, *Pensamiento*. Madrid: Taurus.

van Kesteren, Ronald. 2004. *Het verlangen naar de Middeleeuwen. De verbeelding van een historische passie*. Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek.

Király, Péter. 1993. *National endeavours in Cnetral and Eastern Europe as reflected in the publications of the University Press of Buda*. Budapest: Magyar Felsöoktatás.

Klinge, Matti. 1980. "«Let us be Finns»: The birth of Finland's national culture", in Mitchison 1980: 67-75.

Kohn, Hans. 1960. *Pan-Slavism, its history and ideology*, *Vintage Russian library*. New York: Vintage.

Krapauskas, Virgil. 2000. *Nationalism and historiography: The case of nineteenth-century Lithuanian historicism*. New York: Columbia Univerity Press.

Lauer, Bernhard, Bärbel Plötner, & Donatien Laurent. 1991. "Jacob Grimm und Th. Hersart de La Villemarqué: Ein Briefwechsel aus der Frühzeit der modernen Keltologie", *Jahrbuch der Brüder Grimm-Gesellschaft* 1:17-83.

Lawrence, Paul. 2005. *Nationalism: History and theory*. London: Pearson.

Leerssen, Joep. 1996. *Remembrance and imagination. Patterns in the historical and literary representation of Ireland in the nineteenth century*. Edited by S. Deane. Vol. 4, *Critical conditions*. Cork: Cork University Press.

———. 1999. *Nationaal denken in Europa: een cultuurhistorische schets*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

———. 2004a. "Literary historicism: Romanticism, philologists, and the presence of the past", *Modern language quarterly* 65 (2):221-243.

———. 2004b. "Ossian and the rise of literary historicism", in *The Reception of Ossian in Europe*, ed. H. Gaskill (London: Continuum): 109-125.

———. 2006. *Betwist erfgoed, omstreden grenzen: Taal, literatuur en de afbakening van Nederland, 1806-1890*. Nijmegen: Vantilt.

Leerssen, Joep, & Marita Mathijsen, eds. 2002. *Oerteksten: Nationalisme, edities en canonvorming*. Amsterdam: Instituut voor Cultuur en Geschiedenis.

Lindheim, Ralph, and Georges S.N. Luckyj, eds. 1996. *Towards an intellectual history of the Ukraine: An anthology of Ukrainian thought from 1710 to 1995*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Loit, Aleksander, ed. 1985. *National movements in the Baltic countries during the nineteenth century*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Lord, Albert B. 1963. “Nationalism and the Muses in the Balkan Slavic literature in the modern period”, in *The Balkans in transition. Essays on the development of Balkan life and politics since the eighteenth century*, ed. C. & B. Jelavich (Berkeley: University of California Press): 258-296.

Luckyj, Georges S.N. 1983. *Panteleimon Kulish. A sketch of his life and times*. Vol. 127, *East European Monographs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Máiz Suarez, Ramón. 1984. *O rexionalismo galego: Organización e ideoloxía (1886-1907)*. A Coruña: Castro.

Martel, Philippe. 1997. “Le Félibrige”, in Nora 1997: 3: 3515-3553..

Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, Carolina. 1904. “Resenha bibliographica”, in *Cancioneiro da Ajuda. Edição critica e commentada* (Halle/S: Niemeyer): 1-53.

Michel, Bernard. 1995. *Nations et nationalismes en Europe centrale*. Paris: Aubier.

Miracle, Josep. 1960. *La restauració dels Jocs Florals*. Barcelona: Aymà.

Mitchison, Rosalind, ed. 1980. *The roots of nationalism: Studies in Northern Europe*. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Nora, Pierre, ed. 1997. *Les lieux de mémoire*. Quarto ed. ed. 3 vols. Paris: Gallimard. Original edition, 1984-1992.

O'Leary, Philip. 1994. *The prose literature of the Gaelic revival, 1881-1921. Ideology and innovation*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

———. 2004. *Gaelic prose in the Irish Free State 1922-1939*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Pasquini, Pierre. 1997. “Une sociabilité en représentation: Les félibréjades”, *Provence historique* 187: 231-243.

Praz, Mario. 1930. *La carne, la morte e il diavolo nella letteratura romantica*. Milano.

Prymak, Thomas M. 1996. *Mykola Kostomarov: A biography*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Reiter, Norbert, ed. 1983. *Nationalbewegungen auf dem Balkan*. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz.

Řežník, Miloš, and Ivana Slevákova, eds. 1997. *Nations, identities, historical consciousness. Volume dedicated to Prof. Miroslav Hroch.* Prague: Faculty of Philosophy, Charles University.

Ridoux. 2001. *Évolution des études médiévales en France de 1860 à 1914*. Paris: Champion.

Ripert, Emile. 1917. *La renaissance provençale (1800-1860)*. Paris / Aix-en-Provence: Champion / Dragon.

Rubulis, Aleksis. 1970. *Baltic literature. A survey of Finnish, Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian literature*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Rüegg, Walter, ed. 2004. *A history of the university in Europe 3: Universities in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (1800-1945)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ryan, Desmond. 1939. *The sword of light: From the Four Masters to Douglas Hyde, 1636-1938*. London: Barker.

Samuel, Raphael, ed. 1989. *Patriotism: The making and unmaking of British national identity*. 3 vols. London: Routledge.

Senn, Alfred Erich. 1980. *Jonas Basanavičius. The patriarch of the Lithuanian national renaissance*. Newtonville, MA: Oriental Research Partners.

van der Sijs, Nicoline, ed. 1999. *Taaltrots. Purisme in een veertigtal talen*. Amsterdam/ Antwerpen: Contact.

Smith, Anthony D. 1971. *Theories of nationalism*. New York: Harper & Row.

———. 1998. *Nationalism and modernism. A critical survey of recent theories of nations and nationalism*. London: Routledge.

Sperber, Dan. 1990. "The epidemiology of beliefs", in *The social psychological study of widespread beliefs*, ed. C. Fraser & G. Gaskell (Oxford: Clarendon Press): 25-44.

———. 1996. *La contagion des idées*. Paris: Odile Jacob.

Spiering, Menno, ed. 1999. *Nation building and writing literary history*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Stafford, Fiona. 1994. *The last of the race. The growth of a myth from Milton to Darwin*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Storm, Eric. 2005. "De eerste bloeiperiode van het regionalisme (1890-1945). Een internationale historiografische verkenning", *Cultuur: Tijdschrift voor etnologie*, 1: 35-47.

Teich, Mikuláš, and Roy Porter, eds. 1993. *The national question in Europe in historical context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thiesse, Anne-Marie. 1991. *Ecrire la France. Le mouvement littéraire régionaliste de langue française entre la Belle Epoque et la Libération*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

———. 1999. *La création des identités nationales. Europe XVIIIe-XXe siècle*. Paris: Seuil.

Van Tieghem, Paul. 1969. *Le romantisme dans la littérature européenne*. 2nd ed. ed. Paris: Michel. Original edition, 1948.

Verhandlungen. 1847. *Verhandlungen der Germanisten zu Frankfurt am Main, am 24., 25. und 26. September 1846*. Frankfurt: Sauerländer.

Watson, Cameron. 1996. "Folklore and Basque nationalism: Language, myth, reality", *Nations and nationalism* 2 (1): 17-34.

White, Harry, and Michael Murphy, eds. 2001. *Musical constructions of nationalism. Essays on the history and ideology of European musical culture 1800-1945*. Cork: Cork University Press.

Williams, Glanmor. 1980. “Wales: The cultural bases of nineteenth and twentieth century nationalism”, in Mitchison 1980: 119-129.

Williams, Gwyn A. 1985. *When was Wales? A history of the Welsh*. London: Penguin.

Wolff, Larry. 1994. *Inventing Eastern Europe. The map of civilization on the mind of the Enlightenment.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

———. 2001. *Venice and the Slavs. The discovery of Dalmatia in the age of Enlightenment.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Wyss, Ulrich. 1979. *Die wilde Philologie: Jacob Grimm und der Historismus*. München: Beck.

published titles:

1. P.J.G. Kapteijn, *Over de Europese Grondwet* (May 2005)
2. Joep Leerssen, *The Cultivation of Culture* (September 2005)