

## SUMMARY

**Andrej Kmeť and Slovak National Movement  
Fragments of his life and formation of his historical  
memory by 1914**

The monograph follows up the selected activities and attitudes of Andrej Kmeť (1841-1908) in context of the Slovak National Movement. It also traces up the formation of his historical memory before 1914 (e.g. the funeral, obituaries, art work). The first three chapters analyse life of A. Kmeť and their fundamental sources are his publicistic writings and correspondence. The first one deals with his “national awakening” – as a matter of fact A. Kmeť identified with the ideology of the Slovak National Movement during his theological studies in Esztergom. Within this chapter the author briefly describes history of the Slovak clerical-literary school on the Seminary in Esztergom and Kmeť’s significant participation in its activities.

After A. Kmeť had taken orders he mostly engaged in edification activities, such as establishing libraries and associations, writing edifying booklets etc. These educational and edification activities were dominative during his chaplaincy service in Senohrad and Krnišov. The chapter two reflects on this period of his life and therefore its title is Edification. At that time Kmeť had cooperated with the New Slovak School but after his quarrel with Ján Nepomuk Bobula his political orientation was directed more towards the Slovak National Party, resident in Turčiansky sv. Martin. He wrote an extensive work *Hospodár na Slovensku* (Farmer in Slovakia) for Matica Slovenská, which suggests his active participation in the activities of this institution.

Although he continued on edification activities after Matica Slovenská had been closed down, natural sciences became a subject of his dominant interest, and that was in terms of his scientific activities (mainly botany) as well as in terms of his efforts to institutionalise scientific work within the Slovak

National Movement. Therefore the third chapter is called Science and introduces selected activities and attitudes of A. Kmeť during his chaplaincy service in Preňčov (and partly in Krnišov, too). The author describes reactions of A. Kmeť on an atmosphere of disappointment and apathy in the Slovak National Movement after 1875. Kmeť appealed for action, primarily and in particular for study of natural sciences. He wished for establishing of natural sciences journal and association. Most of the leaders of the National Movement did not share his ideas and opinions. Further on the author deals with a genesis of Slovak Museum Society in context of the previously mentioned efforts of A. Kmeť. The genesis of the museum institution shows a clear evidence of failure of Kmeť's effort to establish an academic institution. Furthermore A. Kmeť, as a chairman of the Slovak Museum Society, was forced to fight against misconstruction of its purpose as ethnographical museum. In this chapter the author also outlines some attitudes of A. Kmeť towards selected fractions in the Slovak National Movement. He was critical towards the Slovak National Party as well as towards their ideological rival – Hlasist Movement. While he reproached the former their apathy and passivity, his negative attitude toward the latter was of ideological character, when on the beginning of the 20th century he objected strongly against published articles of Hlasists, and especially of their Czech colleagues. On the other side, as the author implies, in the early period of his life A. Kmeť worked with Czech slovakophils (Rudolf Pokorný, Karel Kálal). A group of Catholics associated around František Richard Osvald was the current of the Slovak National Movement which Kmeť mostly related to.

Title of the last chapter is Memory and the author analyses different formations of posthumous legacy of A. Kmeť within the Slovak National Movement by 1914. The fact that a whole spectrum of Slovak nationalists endeavour to heroize A. Kmeť is interesting. On the other side the author observed some efforts to change the conception of the Slovak Museum Society, to focus on collection of explicitly Slovak artefacts and written relics . These efforts were not consistent with the original concept of A. Kmeť.