

## CULTURAL-HISTORICAL PRELIMINARIES TO THE FORMATION OF THE SLOVENIAN NATIONAL LITERARY LANGUAGE. PART II<sup>1</sup>

Károly Gadányi

(Gadányi Károly, Berzsenyi Dániel Főiskola, Szlav Filológiai Intézet  
H–9701 Szombathely, Károlyi Gáspár tér 4.)

### **1. Slovenian ortographic reforms in the nineteenth century**

The formulation of spelling norms and a suitable system of graphic representations was one of the most pressing tasks facing Slovenian philologists at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries. The Slovenian writing system was the subject of a special convention in Vienna in 1820 in which E. Kopitar, M. Ravnikar, F. Metelko, and Dobrovský took part.

It should be noted that there had been a longstanding and rich tradition of cardinal reforms or partial modifications in the graphic systems of the Slavs residing in the Austrian Empire, one which dates to the epoch of Jan Hus's activities (Мойсеєнко 1989). Such attempts had often been undertaken on Slovenian linguistic territory.

During the period of national revival, extralinguistic factors were the primary impetus for orthographic reform. As Jakovlev (Яковлев 35) has remarked, "a graphic system is not only a means for recording a given language, but also a reflection of that language's ideology." Among the Slavs, for instance, the existence from ancient times of various alphabets – Glagolitic, Cyrillic, and Latin – was conditioned by historical-cultural and confessional factors.

From the time of the early middle ages all of the Slavs in the ACQ (Austroslavic Cultural-historical Quasi-area) had been compelled to use the Latin alphabet in a variant close to that of a non-Slavic "command" language (primarily German, but, in some cases, Hungarian). During the nineteenth-century national revival the Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, and Slovenians "reject" these orthographical practices and reorient themselves to a more distinctly Slavic orthography. In the long run this tendency resulted in the adaptation of the reformed Czech diacritical orthography on the part of these languages (albeit with some modifications, depending on the particular language involved), the Czech innovations were regarded as a part of "one's own" Slavic heritage and a departure from the "alien."

The first Southern Slavs to employ elements of the new Czech system were the Croat Ljudevit Gaj, the future leader of the Illyrian Movement, and the

---

<sup>1</sup> Part I has been published in *Diss. Slav.: Ling.* XXIV. Szeged, 1996: 69–85.

Slovenians Stanko Vraz and Matija Majar Ziljskij (Kidrič 1908: 658). Gaj championed the adoption of the new Czech ligatures by appealing to the notion of Slavic mutuality: "the letters 'č,' 'ć,' 'š,' and 'ž' [...] are used by our brothers the Czechs, Poles, Slovaks, and Moravians" (Vince 1978: 208). In the face of strong resistance from various quarters of literate Croatian society, Gaj was compelled to abandon some of the Czech innovations. The resulting system – called the *gajica*, *gajčica*, or *gajevica* – was subsequently taken up by Slovenian national leaders in the 1830s under the direct influence of Gaj and in response to J. Kollár's notion of Slavic mutuality (Kidrič 1908: 657).

However, Slovenian orthography was the subject of other proposals in the 1820s and 1830s. In 1824 the Styrian Peter Dajnko published a grammar which reflected the peculiarities of the Styrian dialect and in which he employed an alphabet of his own invention – the so-called *dajncica*, a modified version of the *bohoričica* into which Dajnko introduced Cyrillic letters.

One year later, Franc Metelko, a student of Kopitar's, published his "Lehrgebäude der slowenischen Sprache," a grammar based on the Krajin dialect. Metelko, like Dajnko, also introduced a new alphabet in his grammar. The *metelčica* featured twenty new letters, including Cyrillic letters to render Slovenian [č], [h], [š], [z], and [ž]. In the description of the phonetic features of norms proposed for the literary-written language, Metelko looked to the Dolenjsko dialect.

Metelko was actively supported by Kopitar, while Dajnko was championed by many Styrian writers. Dajnko's grammatical principles were taken account of in publications by Anton Šerf and Koloman Kvas. Dajnko himself published a large number of books.

The principles of Metelko's graphic system were attended to in the publication of textbooks and religious literature up until 1833, when the use of *metelčica* was officially banned in Slovenian schools.

Thus, at the beginning of the 1830s, books were being published in three different orthographies – *dajncica*, *metelčica*, and the older *bohoričica*. Moreover, the unity of the Slovenian literary language faced a very real danger. Alongside an actively functioning literary model based on the Gorenjsko dialect (established at the beginning of the national revival), models based on the Eastern-Styrian and Dolenjsko dialects began to be used.

The orthographic reforms of Dajnko and Metelko provoked criticism on the part of the majority of Slovenian national leaders. The young philologist Anton Murko (1809–1871) in his grammar of Slovenian written for Germans ("Theoretisch-praktische slawische Sprachlehre für Deutsche," 1832) wrote: "Adam Bohorič's orthography was no worse than that of the other Europeans. Until now we, the Styrian Slovenians, were closely connected to the Krajnians by both language and

orthography. Now between us there stands a wall which threatens the Slovenian language as well as Slovenian culture" (Jezikovni pogovori 30). France Prešeren voiced his objections to Metelko's mixed Latin-Cyrillic orthography in his satiric "Poem about kasha," which was published in 1832 in the literary almanac "Kranjska čbelica."

The "Ilirske novice / Illirische Blatt" published a series of installments devoted to questions of Slovenian orthography. They were written by Matija Čop (1797–1835), a historian of literature and the first Slovenian literary critic in the modern sense of the term. In the "alphabet war" of the 1830s Metelko and Kopitar tried to fend off attacks by Čop and Prešeren, who were also joined by F. Celakovsky, Murko, and Kopitar's associate J. Zupan. The arguments against the use of *metelčica* eventually led in 1833 to an official ban on its use in Slovenian schools.

In criticizing a "mixed" orthography, Čop also rejected the phonetic principle as the basis for orthography. Čop reasoned that the phonetic diversity of the Slovenian dialects necessitated the adoption of an etymologically-based orthography. In his publications, Čop was a consistent and forthright advocate of a literary norm which would accommodate all the dialects rather than use a single one of them as its base.

Čop advocated the use of diacritical marks, in the manner of Czech, in order to represent sibilants. M. Majar, St. Vraz, J. Bleiweis and other leaders in the Slovenian revival were also in favor of such Czech-inspired innovations. Šafařík and Celakovsky openly urged the Slovenians to adopt the Czech orthography. Initially, a few articles in Bleiweis's "Novice" were printed in the *gaica*, but by 1848 *gaica* had become more or less universally accepted as the orthography of literary Slovenian. The acceptance of the *gaica* represents the sole victory of the Illyrian movement with respect to the formation of literary Slovenian.

\* \* \*

The bases of Slovenian national culture were laid at the end of the eighteenth century and in the first third of the nineteenth. The main achievements of this period were the creation of a national Slovenian literary language, the emergence of various individual genres of Slovenian literature, and the development of national elements in other spheres of Slovenian culture such as music, architecture, and painting. The development of Slovenian literature was not uniform; whereas it reached a very high level of poetry in the oeuvre of F. Prešeren, prose and drama were still at a rudimentary stage.

Different views with respect to the development of a Slovenian national culture and literary language were to be found among various nationally minded Slovenian intellectuals, who can be roughly divided into "archaicists" and "pro-

gressives." Sometimes competing conceptions were drawn into persistent struggle. All the same, each of them in one way or another played a role in the formation of Slovenian culture.

In many ways the conceptions of national development displayed the influence of leading figures in European culture like Herder, Adelung, the Schlegels, and the French encyclopedists. They were also shaped by the views of prominent Slavic thinkers: the Czechs Dobrovský and Celakovsky, the Slovak J. Kollár, the Pole Mickiewicz, the Croat L. Gaj, and the Serb O. Utješenić.

At the same time, the notions of cultural development which emerged among the Slovenes influenced the cultures of other Slavic peoples. Of particular significance in this respect were the views of Kopitar – the greatest Slovenian philologist of all times, a brilliant and contradictory personality, and a man of great erudition and critical cast of mind who, as a highly placed official, promoted the development not only of Slovenian culture but that of the other Slavic nations living in the Austrian empire as well. In his grammar Kopitar expressed an important aspect of his cultural philosophy by citing the following idea of Schläzer's: "Not a single people has ever broken out of slavery with the aid of mathematics. Nature does not change its customs: the Greeks and the Romans, the Italians, French, Germans, and English attained civilization with the help of culture and science, writers and poets" (Pogačnik 1977: 131).

## **2. Romantic and utilitarian currents in Slovenian culture and the development of literary Slovenian**

The 1830s and 1840s constitute an important stage in the development of Slovenian language and culture. This period is distinguished by notable social changes in the Slovenian lands. The impoverishment of the peasants and their migration into urban centers fostered their **Slovenization**. This, in turn, induced ever increasing numbers of the newly forming Slovenian national bourgeoisie in the cities to join the national movement. The numbers of the Slovenian secular intelligentsia increase at this time. However, the clergy continued to play an important role in the development of Slovenian culture right up until 1848. The social transformations taking place at this time aggravated contradictions in Slovenian society and led to certain ideological changes.

The culture of the previous stage was imbued with optimism, a belief in rationalism, and the conviction that all contradictions could be surmounted by means of enlightenment. But under the impact of events taking place at the beginning of the nineteenth century, confidence in the inevitability of progress gave way to doubts and a new thoughtfulness permeated with a consciousness of the unavoidability of catastrophes. All this was reflected in the emergence of Roman-

ticism, a distinctive reaction on the part of the bourgeois intelligentsia to the cosmopolitanism of Enlightenment ideology. The most important goals of Romanticism were the creation and affirmation of national culture.

In the Slovenian lands Romanticism was represented by two remarkable men – the critic and historian of literature Matija Čop (1797–1835) and the great Slovenian poet France Prešeren (1800–1849), whose oeuvre was qualitatively comparable to that of the leading poets of Europe. The views of Prešeren and Čop were publicized in the "Kranjska čbelica" ("The Krajna Bee"), an almanac issued four times between 1830 and 1834. Edited and published by Miha Kastelič, librarian of the lycee in Ljubljana, the "Kranjska čbelica" printed the work of Kopitar's student Jakob Zupan, the librarian Jurij Kosmač, and the priests Blaž Potočnik and Ignac Kholcapfel (both of whom were students of Metelko). The almanac criticized the views of Kopitar and the Jansenists with respect to the national-cultural development of the Slovenes, particularly where questions of the Slovenian language and literature were concerned.

The ideology of Slovenian Romanticism held language to be the primary index of national cultural development. As champions of this idea, Čop and Prešeren drew from the Schlegel brothers certain characteristically romantic principals which, in their view, were most conducive to the needs of Slovenian cultural life:

1. the potentialities and talent of a people attains its fullest expression in literature, and poetry places that people on the highest level of cultural development;
2. cultural development necessitates an effort to perfect a system of versification;
3. the successful development of national culture presupposes openness to the influences of all other cultures (Paternu 1976: 97–103).

As early as the 1820s Čop and Prešeren keenly sensed the need for a wider sphere of Slovenian cultural activity which would extend beyond the rural population and the clergy. Čop enunciated his credo in the section devoted to Slovenian literature which he wrote for P. I. Šafařík's "History of Slavic literatures." However, Prešeren was the first to openly attack Kopitar's theory of language. In his article "The new orthography," which appeared in the "Kranjska čbelica" in 1831, he emphatically rejected the idea that unrefined peasant speech could be regarded as a ready-made literary language. Čop fully concurred with Prešeren, and he ridiculed attempts to use peasant forms of speech in books. He recommended the study of literary style as found in writers of those parts of the Slavic world where an abundant literature was already in existence and rejected "labelling as impermissible Germanisms or Gallicisms those words which are merely professional terms accepted in all European languages." Čop openly declared that the development of Slovenian would proceed more successfully if more educated people were to take part in Slovenian culture. In such a case, they would place new

demands upon writers which the latter would have to meet in their works (Čop 1935: 50–51).

Čop and Prešeren advocated the creation of a Slovenian literary language which would be comparable to the languages of the developed European peoples. Their activities in this respect signified a new stage in the growth of Slovenian national consciousness. Rejecting the notion of the Slovenian language's limited potentialities, the Romantics began to contemplate the development of Slovenian literature from other directions. The confinement of Slovenian literature to books for the peasantry they regarded as inexpedient, the more so as the city dwellers and intelligentsia began to display increasing interest in the national movement at the end of the 1820s. According to Čop, Slovenian literature had to stimulate interest among the educated circles of Slovenian society, a conception which was realized in the "Kranjska čbelica," whose readership was composed primarily of students and officials.

As an opponent of the "restrictive" aspects in the program of Kopitar and the Jansenists, Čop thought highly of "Pisanice," an almanac which he considered a forerunner of "Kranjska čbelica" and the comedies of Linhart. He regretfully noted that save for the poetry of Vodnik and Jarnik and some translations of the Gorica enlightener Stanič, nothing which did not pursue narrow didactic ends had appeared in print in Slovenia after 1790.

Despite his thorough familiarity with and love for the poetry of Goethe, Byron, Lamartine, Mickiewicz and other Romantics, Čop repudiated such Romantic features as mysticism, fantasy, and demonism, which were also alien to Prešeren (Paternu 1963: 153–154). The Romantic poet who most influenced Prešeren was Uhland, whose poetry was distinguished by ingenuousness, gaiety, and earthly love (Priatelj 1931: 129). Prešeren had a high regard for the German Romantics and was enormously fond of Dante, Byron, and Goethe. Čop acquainted Prešeren with Mickiewicz's work, and the Polish poet's patriotism and aspiration to realize the role of poet in the life of his people inspired his Slovenian counterpart. Mickiewicz's epic poem "Konrad Wallenrod," a fragment of which Prešeren translated into Slovenian, influenced Prešeren's "Baptism in the Savica" (Štefan 1963: 184–191). Prešeren was also influenced by Jan Kollár, another Slavic Romantic poet, and he took an interest in "Slovo o polku Igoreve," the anonymous Old Russian epic (Nartnik 1982: 263).

Prešeren devoted some attention to the notion of Slavic mutuality. Some of his ideas in this area can be found in his poem "Zdravica," where he connects love of the native land (Slovenia) with love for Slavdom ("God preserve our land and the entire Slavic world which surrounds it!"). Mutual cooperation of all free peoples in a world from which national enmity is exiled also figures as a motif in this

poem. Prešeren's work furthers the democratic traditions of the Slovenian national movement which were laid down by Linhart. On the whole, Prešeren's attitude to Slavic mutuality was two-sided; in spite of his love and sympathy for Slavdom, he made sober assessments of the lifelessness and naivete of such cultural-ideological movements as Illyrism. Prešeren regarded Illyrianism as a harmful theory which lacked vitality. If the hopes of the Illyrianism were realized, he wrote, then the Slavs would deprive themselves of the cultures of four living Slavic peoples – the Kajkavian Croats, the Rusins, the Slovaks, and the Slovenes – and those peoples, in turn, would be deprived of an autonomous literary language. The creation of a single literary language for all the Slavs Prešeren regarded as an impossibility. In a letter of 1837 to Stanko Vraz he wrote that "the union of all the Slavs in a single literary language will in all likelihood remain no more than a good intention" (Pri-jatelj 1931: 151).

Prešeren and Čop did much to enrich Slovenian poetry. Like the brothers Schelling, Čop believed that a mastery of the forms of Italian Renaissance poetry could raise the people's cultural level. Prešeren was alien to purism and the fear of influences from other languages.

Thanks to Prešeren's efforts, Slovenian poetry liberated itself from didacticism and utilitarianism and became a truly national poetry. After Prešeren one could with complete justification speak of an established Slovenian literary language.

Prešeren's poetry met with earnest sympathy on the part of leading cultural activists in both Slovenia and other parts of the Austrian Empire. However, he also provoked sharp criticism, particularly on the part of Kopitar and the Jansenists, who considered his love lyrics improper and amoral. In both German and Slovenian publications Čop ardently championed Prešeren's poetry, praising him for the introduction of new verse forms and the elevation of Slovenian style to the level of artistically developed literatures. Supporters of Prešeren appeared in other Slavic lands; among them, for instance, was the Czech poet F. Celakovsky. In Prešeren's genius Slovenian Romantic poetry attained a very high level.

\* \* \*

In the 1840s the movement headed by Janez Bleiweis (1808–1881) vanquished the Jansenists. Bleiweis published and edited the "Kmetijske in rokodelske novice," a popular newspaper whose diverse contents included articles on medicine and economics as well as critical reviews. Although Bleiweis's activities were conducted on a lower cultural level than those of Prešeren and Čop, they succeeded in provoking interest in Slovenian culture in a wider sphere of the population which included the peasantry.

Compared with that of the Jansenists, Bleiweis's literary program was a step forward. Both Bleiweis and the Jansenists were conservative in their views; however, whereas the Jansenist center of gravity was occupied by religious-moralistic concerns, the primary direction of Bleiweis's activities was instructive and patriotic in character. Bleiweis was no theoretician. His efforts were primarily aimed at the "education and ennoblement" of the mass reader. He advocated the publication of books for the common people which would provide information about trade and agriculture, history, geography, ethnography, and law.

Bleiweis was firmly convinced that popular literature should inspire loyalty to and love for homeland and emperor, rather than amuse. He called for the creation of libraries for the common people and envisioned the appearance of inexpensive books in mass editions, whose publication would be undertaken by wealthy patrons and various national societies (Kmetijske in rokodelske novice VI). Bleiweis advocated a simplicity of style which bordered on the primitive: a writer ought to write in such a way that children could understand him. The esthetic merits of a given work did not interest Bleiweis; he evaluated literature on practical, material, or moral grounds. The Illyrian Matija Majar propagated views similar to those of Bleiweis in the latter's newspaper. He urged writers to create "noble and useful" works which would instill in their readers honesty, a sober way of life, love of peace, and industriousness. Furthermore, Majar actively promoted the literatures of the other Slavic peoples.

The territory of Krajna was the principal center of both the Romantic current (Čop and Prešeren) and the utilitarian current (Kopitar, followed by Bleiweis) in Slovenian culture at this time.

### **3. Slavic mutuality, Illyrianism, and the Slovenian literary language**

A third national-cultural movement – so-called "Illyrianism" – appeared among the Slovenes at the end of the 1830s. The city of Graz served as something of a center for Slovenian Illyrianism, which was for the most part confined to Styria and Carinthia, areas in which the Slovenian populace was particularly threatened by Germanization and a local literary-written tradition was absent.

In the central areas of Slovenia, where normalization of the national literary language was proceeding more actively and an artistic literature in that language was developing successfully, Illyrianism had practically no support.

The history of Illyrianism among the Slovenians and the Southern Slavs as a whole left a deep imprint on the lexical composition of the Slovenian literary language.

As Kulakovsky (Кулаковский 1885) noted more than 100 years ago, the Austrian Empire was the birthplace of all initiatives with respect to the linguistic



unification of the Western and Southern Slavs, although such initiatives often drew their inspiration from elsewhere.

The notion of Slavic mutuality often took root in the educated layers of Slovenian society. Its history in Slovenia must be viewed in the context of the development of Slovenian national consciousness.

One ought first to note that the Slovenes became a nation in the absence of a state of their own or even of a single Slovenian administrative-political territory. The lands of the Slovenes spread over several provinces of the Habsburg monarchy – Carinthia, Styria, Gorica, Primorje, Krajna – and the lands of the Hungarian crown. In the predominantly Austrian German provinces of Carinthia and Styria the Slovenes comprised a third of the population. In Primorje there was a large population of Romance language speakers, and in Hungary the Slovenians resided in only two counties. As a result of such administrative splintering, at the beginning of the nineteenth century most Slovenians regarded themselves as Krajnians, Styrians, Carinthians etc. rather than as members of a single Slovenian nation.

The Austrian ascendancy, established in the Slovenian lands during the institution of feudalism, retarded the political and cultural development of the Slovenes. Unable to develop their own class of feudal lords, the Slovenes could not look back to a tradition of statehood and political struggle, in contrast to other peoples wholly or partially included in the Austrian Empire such as the Hungarians, the Croats, and the Poles. In the absence of such traditions, Slovenian culture somewhat lagged behind the cultures of its Slavic neighbors. Although the activities of the Slovenian Protestants in the sixteenth century led to the appearance of a Slovenian alphabet and grammar as well as a few books in Slovenian, the traditions of written language were still very weak. In many cases the results of Slovenian Protestant activities were nullified by the Counterreformation; moreover, their achievements were too modest to justify speaking of a full-fledged Slovenian written language and book printing industry. For instance, they did not put out any Slovenian texts of a geographical, historical, or literary nature.

Unlike its Polish, Hungarian, and Croatian counterparts, Slovenian national consciousness did not bear the stamp of an aristocratic tradition. Democratic tendencies were quite prominent in its development from the very beginning. In the closed territory of the Austrian monarchy the thrust of Slovenian national consciousness was primarily directed against Austro-German cultural-linguistic expansion. The most farsighted Slovenian cultural nationalists, such as F. Levstik, stressed that the "civilizing" mission of the Germans with respect to the Slavs culture had always aimed at annihilation of Slavic culture in the conquered territories in order to facilitate the transformation of a "conquered people into an illiterate herd at the service of the German lords" (Levstik 1961: 35–37). In contrast, "our Slovenian mission is thoroughly democratic" (Ibid.: 320).

The absence of political traditions and of a firmly established written culture account for two characteristic features in the formation of Slovenian national consciousness: the significant role of the folk tradition and, for a brief period, the importance attached to the notion of Slavic mutuality. With respect to the latter feature, development of Slovenian national consciousness mirrored the experience of other Slavic peoples within the Habsburg monarchy, such as the Czechs, Croats, and Galician Ukrainians, among others. Like the Slovenes, they regarded themselves as both individual peoples and representatives of Slavdom as a whole. To justify their national development, the young nations in formation drew upon aspects of the history, traditions, and cultural achievements of their respective peoples. Among the majority of the smaller Slavic peoples such traditions were weak. In such cases they affirmed their right to national existence on the basis of history and the cultural achievements of all the Slavic peoples. The national leaders of the Slovenes endeavored to instill in their people a feeling of Slavic mutuality – according to their credo, "national pride is essential to the Slovenes, but above all else they can take pride in the Slavic world in general" (Slovanski svet 1895, № 29, 271).

Pan-Slavic ideas developed among the Slovenes in the guise of **Yugoslavism**, **Austro-Slavism**, and **Russophilism**, which in their Slovenian manifestations were cultural-ethnic, rather than political, in character prior to 1848.

Whereas Austro-Slavism and Russophilism influenced the formation of Slovenian national consciousness in its initial stages, the appearance of Yugoslavism a few decades later was directly connected to that social-political and cultural movement known as Illyrianism, which had originated in Croatia in the 1830s.

Ljudevit Gaj, the founder of Illyrianism, regarded the Southern Slavs as a single people and actively campaigned for their cultural-linguistic unification. Illyrianism met with a warm response among many Slovenian cultural nationalists. In the overwhelming majority of Slovenian Illyrians Illyrian ideas were interwoven with a notion of Slovenian national consciousness.

Whatever one might think of Illyrianism from a social-political or cultural point of view, it cannot be disputed that it left a deep imprint on the development of the Slovenian national literary language, especially in the area of its vocabulary.

The Slovenian Illyrians championed the cause of the *Gajica*. The chief points in its favor, they argued, were its simplicity and its status as the Latin-based orthography most widely used among the Slavs. According to Majar, one of the most fervent Slovenian Illyrians, this latter feature would enable the Slovenes together with the other Slavs who employed the *Gajica* to read books written in each other's language (Kmetijske in rokodelske novice 1845, № 1). Majar advised

Slovenian writers to study the vocabularies of all the Slavic languages with the goal of creating neologisms which were both Slovenian and Slavic in sound (Kmetijske in rokodelske novice 1847, № 2, 7–8).

1848 was a turning point in the development of Slovenian national consciousness. Whereas it had previously evolved along primarily cultural-ethnic lines, it now began to take on a more and more active political cast.

The Revolution of 1848 marks both the heyday and, to a certain degree, the downfall of Austro-Slavism in the consciousness of the Slovenian cultural nationalists. Although Slovenian political agendas include elements of Austro-Slavism in the 1860s and even later, its influence on Slovenian national thinking greatly declined after 1848. Yugoslavism played a clearly subordinate role to that of Austro-Slavism during the revolutionary period; the influence of Russophilism had considerably weakened by the turn of the century, as the Slovenian liberals were opponents of serfdom.

In the area of language development, after 1848 a number of Slovenians pursued more ambitious goals, attempting to bring Slovenian into greater conformity not only with Serbian and Croatian, but with the other Slavic languages as well. Leading Slovenian cultural nationalists devoted great attention to the traditions of general – Slavic culture as found in Old Church Slavonic and the culture of the Cyrillian – Methodian epoch. Their efforts to use Old Church Slavonic as a model for the construction of modern Slovenian as well as a general Slavic literary language were based to a great extent on Kopitar's and F. Miklošič's "Pannonian" hypothesis with respect to the origin of Old Church Slavonic.<sup>2</sup> This hypothesis, which enjoyed great prestige throughout the nineteenth century, identifies Old Church Slavic with **Old Slovenian** (*altslovenisch*) and refers to modern Slovenian as **New Slovenian** (*neuslovenisch*).

In connection with the matters mentioned above, we now turn our attention to extralinguistic factors which influenced the evolution of the Slovenian literary language. We concur with I. V. Churkina (Чуркина 1977: 250), the noted Slovenist and cultural historian, when she remarks that "the 'Pannonian' hypothesis [...] **played an enormous role in the formation of the Slovenian literary language, especially in its vocabulary**" (our emphasis). By the mid-nineteenth century Slovenian society had produced a pleiade of highly educated philologists, representing two generations, who were in a position to pursue a single-minded

---

<sup>2</sup> Data assembled in the last few decades by Slavists and Indo-Europeanists has led leading Slavists to take a new look at the dispersal of the ancient Slavs in the light of the Pannonian and Danubian theories. See in this connection the work of O. N. Trubachev (Трубачёв 1993), who discusses early Slavic ethnolinguistic groupings on the Middle Danube.

linguistic politics. Furthermore, many words and expressions which had entered the conversational language from German and Italian were eradicated and **replaced by words and expressions from Old Church Slavic or other Slavic languages**. Among the fervent advocates of such a practice was the well-known Slovenian philologist F. Levstik. Levstik, a staunch adherent of Slavic cultural mutuality, regarded Old Church Slavic as the language from which the modern Slavic languages had evolved; for this reason, he argued, its syntax, morphology, and lexicon should serve as the basis for the linguistic convergence of the Slavic peoples. In addition to Kopitar and his student Miklošič, M. Pleteršnik, author of the celebrated "Slovenian-German dictionary," stood close to Levstik's view.

In the second half of the nineteenth century another movement arose among Slovenian philologists and cultural nationalists. According to its representatives, the Slovenian language had not yet attained a high enough level of development to function as an independent literary language. They envisioned the creation of a general Slavic literary language using elements from all the Slavic languages. This utopian goal fell on fertile soil in the Slovenian lands inasmuch as the Slovenian literary language itself was formed to a great extent as a **koine**, i.e. as an alloy of all the Slovenian dialects wherein no single dialect served as its base. Such a pattern of development induced many Slovenian philologists to envision the creation of an artificial general Slavic language along the lines of literary Slovenian; however, socioeconomic and political factors constituted an insurmountable barrier to the success of such a project.

\* \* \*

In summing up the contents of this section, we will attempt to look at the problem against a broader general-Slavic "typologized" background.

In the mid-nineteenth century the situation of the South Slavic literary languages – their structural design and mutual relations – significantly differed from the situations of such West and East Slavic literary languages as Polish, Czech, and Russian. The mid-nineteenth century was a period in which the structures and basic features characterizing the contemporary Polish, Czech, and Russian literary languages were established. This process included the institution of norms which allowed for a limited range of variation and the settling of questions regarding relations with the dialects and traditional models – Church Slavonic for Russian, the language of the "Golden Age" for Polish, and the language of the Hussite era (the *bibličtina*) for Czech.

It is important to remember that the position of these three languages was the result of a rather long period of development. It should also be noted that in the

first half of the nineteenth century relations with these languages exerted an impact on the formation of other East and West Slavic literary languages – Russian and Polish in the case of Byelorussian and Ukrainian, and Czech in the case of Slovak. Here the principle of "rejection" was not the only factor at work; a general, fairly abstract structural base was maintained, and attempts were made to bring the relevant two languages closer to each other and to formulate the younger literary language as a "local" variant of the more "universal" one.

As a result of their very rapid development, the situation of the South Slavic literary languages in the middle of the nineteenth century was qualitatively different.

Formation of modern literary Slovenian, Croatian, and Serbian<sup>3</sup> necessitated the resolution of two fundamental questions:

1. the relation to tradition (to Church Slavonic and to other varieties of written language dating to previous epochs);
2. the relation to the dialectal base (choice of a primary dialectal base, attempts to create a mixed dialectal base).

These interrelated questions were complicated by a number of other important factors, such as the presence of "regional" literatures, the competition between different cultural centers (in the case of Slovenian, between Ljubljana, Celovec (Klagenfurt), Graz, and, to some extent, Vienna), the presence or absence of urban koines, and **the influence of other Slavic and non-Slavic literary languages**. Finally, extralinguistic factors – and national consciousness above all – played a very significant role.

The western part of the South Slavic dialectal continuum is distinguished by a great degree of fragmentation and differentiation of dialectal features. The well-known dialectal diversity of Slovenian and the relative isolation of many of its dialects prompted I. A. Boudouain de Courtenay to regard the Režjanski and Terski dialects as separate languages. In general, the phonetic, morphological, and lexical distinctions between the Kajkavian, Čakavian, and Štokavian dialects is equal to (or even greater than) the distinctions between the Russian, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian languages.

The eastern Štokavian dialect spreads over a wider expanse of territory but is more uniform than the Slovenian dialects or Čakavian and Kajkavian considered as a whole. With respect to the selection of a dialectal base for the Southern Slavic languages, it was important that the number of Croats, Serbs, Bosnians, and Chernogorians who spoke Štokavian was substantially greater than that of Croats who spoke Kajkavian or Čakavian.

---

<sup>3</sup> As the Bulgarian and Macedonian linguistic territories were not formally part of the ACQ, we do not treat them here.

On the entire territory of the eastern part or, to be more precise, the Orthodox zone of Eastern Slavdom, Church Slavonic was the unifying element in the literary language.

In the western zone of Southern Slavdom, there was no single Slavic language suitable for supradialectal use and capable of serving as a base and model for the unification of the dialects. The use of Church Slavonic by the Croats was an extremely local phenomenon and restricted in large measure to the clergy. A number of "local" literary varieties were to be found among the Croats in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries – Kajkavian, Slavonian-Štokavian, Bosnian-Štokavian, Čakavian.

A similar situation prevailed in Slovenia, where at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century Dolenjsko (F. Metelko et al.) competed with Gorenjsko (M. Pohlin et al.) and attempts were made to introduce Styrian (P. Danko), Carinthian, and Prekmurian literary norms.

The language of writers who represented the various "regional" literatures was generally close to the popular, dialectical speech of their respective territories. Making the written word comprehensible and accessible for the wider populace did not constitute a particularly complicated problem as it did in the eastern Southern Slavic zone at that time. However, the western zone was confronted with the problem of creating a unified oral literary standard, and alongside this task there soon arose another – the sphere of the literary language's dispersal, a problem called forth by the need to facilitate communication over a large territorial expanse, free cultural exchange, and the liquidation of local isolation.

It became necessary to unite the various local literary languages, to choose a wider dialectical base, and to determine the relation to tradition – for the Slovenes this meant the language of Trubar and Dalmatin, for the Croats the language of Dubrovnik literature, and for the Orthodox Balkan Slavs Church Slavonic. The need for linguistic and literary unification was dictated in part by such essentially extralinguistic factors as the yearning for national-ethnic solidarity in the face of Ottoman expansion and Habsburg policies of Germanization.

The task of unification involved more than the selection of a dialectical base; on the practical level it resulted among the Slovenians in the **elaboration of a number of possible models**, distinguished from each other by degree of closeness to one or another dialect as well as by the extent to which the traditions of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries had been taken into account. These two variables were interconnected, since the language of preceding epochs was related in various degrees to one dialect or another.

With regard to the scope of the abovementioned models at one end were those like the Slovenian *metelčica*, which fixed in almost phonetic transcription

the Dolensko dialect as spoken in F. Metelko's time, while at the other were St. Vraz's project for the creation of a general Slovenian-Croatian-Serbian literary language and even projects which outlined the creation of a general Slavic language capable of serving all the Slavs. But as we now know, middle-of-the-road solutions prevailed in the establishment of the structures of the modern Slovenian and Croatian literary languages. Slovenian did not merge with Croatian; instead a "general Slovenian" language was elaborated by employing, in part, the general fund of other Slavic languages. The literary norms of Croatian and Serbian were formally united in 1850 on the basis of a general neo-Štokavian dialect in the spirit of Karadžić and Gaj.

It is important to note that, on the whole the more ambitious of the above-mentioned projects were more than abstract attempts to create something on the lines of a "Slavic Esperanto" – as vital responses to the problems of creating national literary languages, they represent attempts to find an optimal model for uniting the largest number and widest range of dialects within a single literary language (Толстой 1988: 205).

There was little, if any, practical demand for the unification of all Slavic languages, and the "general-Slavic" projects were ultimately rejected. Nonetheless, their emergence is a very important landmark in the history of the Slovenian language – they exerted an influence on literary Slovenian both before and after 1848, the year in which, according to widespread scholarly convention, the norms of national literary Slovenian were established.

We will discuss the character of these "general-Slavic" projects below. For the moment it is important to stress once more that from the seventeenth century onward in the Slavic world as a whole, such projects arose primarily in present-day Slovenian and Croatian linguistic territory. No such projects were entertained among the Poles. "General-Slavic" projects among the Eastern Slavs were exclusively directed at bringing the other Slavic languages closer to Church Slavonic or Russian (Пыпин 1892). Among the Czechs and the Slovaks, attempts were made to draw Slovak closer to Czech. Serbian and Bulgarian efforts in this respect mirrored those of the Eastern Slavs. On the other hand the variety and number of Slovenian and Croatian "general-Slavic" projects was quite extensive (Кулаковский 1885).

Although the "general-Slavic" projects did not involve the reintroduction of Old Church Slavonic or its graphics, an Old Church Slavonic element was reflected in all of them to some extent. In their efforts to reduce the various Slavic forms to a common denominator, the authors of these projects produced something akin to a "reconstruction" of Late Common Slavic, which, as A. Meillet pointed out, is nearly identical to Old Church Slavonic both structurally and formally. Furthermore, the creation of a "unified" norm necessitated a graphic system capa-

ble of various phonetic realizations – e.g. **а** could be read as [u], [o], and [a] depending on the reader's native Slavic tongue.

Beginning with that of J. Križanić, Cyrillic served as the alphabet for almost all the Slovenian and Croatian "general-Slavic" projects (Экман 1963). Križanić hailed from Ribnik, a village near the juncture of the Čakavian, Kajkavian, and Slovenian linguistic territories. The vocabulary of his "inter-Slavic" language was up to ten percent Croatian and from five to ten percent Russian in composition. Words common to all the Slavic languages comprised fifty to sixty percent of the vocabulary (Ibid.: 76).

The bases of other "mutual" Slavic language projects which followed were roughly the same, though they contained a somewhat smaller portion of Russianisms and Church Slavonicisms. Of particular interest in this regard are the previously mentioned scholastic efforts of Matija Majar Zilskij, the "Illyrian" – Slovene from Carinthia who published the book "Pravila kako izobraževati ilirsko narečje i u obče slovenski jezik" in 1848 in Ljubljana. Under the influence of the Slovak Jan Kollár's ideas, Majar called for the linguistic unification of the Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, and Bulgarians and envisioned the existence of a single unified Slavic language with four dialects – Czech, Polish, Russian, and Illyrian (Lenček 1968).

In the abovementioned work Majar (1848: 12) issues the following recommendation: "When writing in your native Illyrian dialect do so in conformity with the other Illyrian dialects and do not wander to far from the practice of the other Slavic languages [...] Slovenian, Croatian, Serbian, Bulgarian, [...] Old Church Slavonic – none of these can serve us as a literary language."

In 1863–1865 Majar publishes "Узаємні правопіс славянські, то је: Uzajemna slovnica ali mluvnica slavjanska" in Prague. This book included a rather detailed survey of the phonetic, morphological, and word-formational features of Church Slavonic, Russian, Croatian, Czech, and Polish together with examples from Bulgarian, Lusatian, "Carinthian-Slovenian," and "Ugorsk-Slovenian"; at the end of each section "mutual-Slavic" forms and lexemes were proposed. Most of Majar's suggestions leaned in the direction of Russian and Church Slavonic. He also considered Cyrillic (in its "civic" form) to be the only alphabet appropriate for pan-Slavic usage (Majar 1865: 30).

I. Navratil and J. Drobnič also supported the introduction of Cyrillic into Slovenian schools (Prijatelj 1937: 39–41). Other Slovenian projects envisioned the use of one or another existing Slavic language as the basis for a general-Slavic language. In 1849 I. Pokljukar proposed that Serbian be used, while P. Hicinger advanced the candidacy of Old Church Slavic (but three years later transferred his support to Russian). Among the supporters of Church Slavic were Oroslav Caf,



who believed that Russian was the existing Slavic literary language which stood closest to Church Slavic; in Caf's opinion, replacing the Russian pleophonic forms (e.g. *болото*) with their Old Church Slavic equivalents would render Russian and Old Church Slavonic formally identical.

R. Razlag, editor of the journal "Zor," advocated a mixed "all-Slavic" language which would include a sizable number of Russian, Czech, and Serbian words. Such a language, according to Razlag, should serve as the basis for the "rectification" of the Slovenian literary language itself.

These are just some of the many Slovenian writers, philologists, and other cultural nationalists who promoted the creation of a general-Slavic language. However, the line of Prešeren, Čop, and Zupan, all of whom opposed such projects, was developed and strengthened in the second half of the nineteenth century by cultural and social activists like J. Trdina, F. Levstik, L. Svetec, M. Cigale, and F. Cegnar, among others. Toward the end of the 1860s most Slovenian philologists recognized the impossibility of inventing a general-Slavic language, inasmuch as the entire course of historical development had been leading to the creation of independent Slavic nations.

\* \* \*

**Summary:** By the 1870s the basic norms of the Slovenian literary language were almost finalized, in a form close to their contemporary equivalents. The Slovenes rejected "general-Slavic" projects, just as a few decades earlier they had ultimately rejected St. Vraz's attempt to introduce the "Illyrian" language into their midst. However the notion of a general-Slavic language exerted a definite influence on the **general structure** of the Slovenian literary language. For instance, according to J. Toporišić, the very same F. Levstik who "did much to create a beautiful, vital, popular, and general Slovenian literary language in the 1850s undertook its rectification on the basis of Old Church Slavic in 1868" (*Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*. Vol. IV: 449).

Our observations indicate that the abovementioned currents in Slovenian intellectual and cultural life of the nineteenth century exerted a significant influence on the formation of the vocabulary of literary Slovenian, a view which conforms to that of other scholars (Чуркина 1977: 252). As an indirect result of the notion of Slavic mutuality in its various guises, various elements from other Slavic languages were drawn into the process of formation – they left a visible imprint on the literary language both in orthography (the introduction of the *Gaica*) and in the lexicon where an enormous number of other-Slavic borrowings entered the language.

The period from 1848 until the end of the nineteenth century was crucial in the development of the modern Slovenian literary language.

At a time when Illyrianism had begun its decline, Majar represented the most extreme Illyrian position vis a vis the literary language of the Slovenians. His ideas with respect to an artificial literary language ("Pravila, kako izobraževati ilirsko narečje i u obče slovenski jezik," 1848) left no heritage. However, the polemics surrounding Majar's program induced the Slovenian intelligentsia to take an ever-increasing interest in those problems connected with the formation and perfection of the national literary language.

The other extreme was represented by the conservative position of Janez Bleiweis, editor of the newspaper "Rokodelske in kmetijske novice." Extremely jealous of his status as the "father of the Slovenian people," Bleiweis rejected all innovations in the literary language and its lexicon.

The mid-nineteenth century witnessed the formation of a group of young Slovenian intellectuals at the University of Vienna. Under the leadership of Matij Cigal and Luka Svetec, they elaborated a strategy which occupied a position midway between the diametrically opposed views of Majar and Bleiweis.

At the close of the nineteenth century the entirety of the Slovenian lexicon which had been employed in the bookish-written language of the previous epoch (especially from the 1830s on) was consolidated by Maksim Pleteršnik on the pages of the two-volume "Slovensko-nemški slovar" (Ljubljana, 1894–1895), the largest bilingual Slovenian dictionary ever published.

During the last decades of the nineteenth century Slovenian literary usage incorporated certain Styrian (*stajerske*) and Carinthian (*koruske*) phonetic and morphological features. In declension the adjectival endings *-iga* and *-imu* gave way to *-ega* and *-egu* (*lepiga* and *lepigu* vs. *lepega* and *lepegu*). Differentiation of gender in the comparative degree of adjectives was established (*lepši dan*, *lepša njiva*, *lepše polje* in place of the former *lepši dan*, *lepši njiva*, *lepši polje*). The superlative prefix *-naj* was adopted (*najlepši* in place of *narlepši*), the dative plural endings of masculine nouns *-om/-em* were introduced (*bratom*, *krajem*, *Slovencem*), the cluster *šč* replaced the Gorenško *š* (*kleščje* in place of *kleše*), etc.

In many respects Slovenian literary usage realized the proposals which A. Murko had made in his Slovenian grammar in the 1830s. After the 1830s Murko's proposals were supplemented by, among others, those of a younger generation of Slovenian philologists. They based their recommendations on a detailed comparative study of Old Church Slavic, Common Slavic, and Slovenian. They introduced the substitution of *videti*, *videl* for *viditi*, *vidil*; use of *e* in case endings which followed palatal consonants: *licem*, *stricem*, *lovcem*, *beračev*, etc.; use of the letter "r" by itself to represent syllabic *lʀ*: *smrt*, *srce* in place of *smèrt*, *sèrce*

(an innovation drawn from the Eastern-Styrian dialect); institution of the prefix *pro-*: *prodreti* in place of *predreti*; use of the formant *-lec* instead of *-vec*: *brelec*, *poslušalec* instead of *bravec*, *poslušavec*; etc.

Certain specialists refer to the second half of the nineteenth century as the "Epoch of Slavization" in the history of literary Slovenian (Jurančič 1981: 12). During this time Slovenian took in an enormous amount of lexical material, both in the form of calques and direct borrowings, from Old Church Slavic, Croatian, Serbian, Czech, Russian, and Polish.

The considerable cultural-literary and political activity of Slovenian society in the second half of the nineteenth century furthered the dissemination and gradual fixing of these new features and elements in the lexicon throughout the territory embraced by the Slovenian literary language.

#### REFERENCES

- Čop, M. 1935, *Izbrano delo*. Celje.
- Jurančič, I. 1981, *Slovensko-srbskohrvatski slovar. Predgovor*. Ljubljana, 3–14.
- Kidrič, F. 1908, Česko-ilirski pravopis na Štajerskem do "Novic". In: *Zbornik u slavu Vatroslava Jagića*. Berlin, 656–662.
- Lenček, R. L. 1968, The Theme of the Greek Koine in the Concept of a Slavic Common Language and Matija Majar's Model. In: *American Contributions to the Sixth International Congress of Slavists. Prague. Vol. I*.
- Levstik, F. 1961, *Zbrano delo*. Ljubljana.
- Majar, M. 1848, *Pravila kako izobraževati ilirsko narečje i u obće slovenski jezik*. Ljubljana.
- Majar, M. 1863–1865, *Uzajemni pravopis slavjanski, to je: Uzajemna slovnica ali mlvni-ca slavjanska*. Prague.
- Nartnik, V. 1982, Ob prvem prevodu "Slova o polku Igoreve" v slovenščino. In: *Obdobje realizma v slovenskem jeziku...* Ljubljana.
- Paternu, B. 1963, Nastanek teorije realizma v slovenski književnosti. *Slavistična revija* № 1–4, 153–154.
- Paternu, B. 1976, *France Prešeren in njegovo pesniško delo*. Ljubljana.
- Pogačnik, J. 1977, *Jernej Kopitar (Znameniti Slovenci)*. Ljubljana.
- Prijatelj, I. 1937, *Borba za individualnost slovenskega knjižnega jezika 1848-1857*. Ljubljana.
- Vince, Z. 1978, *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb.
- Кулаковский, П.А. 1885, Очерк истории попыток решения вопроса об едином литературном языке у славян. В кн.: *Мефодиевский юбилейный сборник*. Варшава, 127–136.

- Мойсеєнко, В.Ю. 1989, Чеський діакритичний правопис і розвиток слов'янських графічних систем на базі латиниці в ХІХ ст. *Проблеми слов'янознавства*. Львів. № 39, 34–41.
- Пыпин, А.Н. 1892, Теория общеславянского языка. *Вестник Европы*. Кн. 4–5.
- Толстой, Н.И. 1988, *История и структура славянских литературных языков*. М.
- Чуркина, И.В. 1977, Идея славянской взаимности в словенском национальном самосознании. В кн.: *Формирование национальных культур в странах Центральной и Юго-Восточной Европы*. М., 245–251.
- Трубачёв, О.Н. 1993, Древние славяне на Дунае (южный фланг): Лингвистические наблюдения. В кн.: *Славянское языкознание: XI Международный съезд славистов, Братислава, сентябрь 1993 г. Доклады российской делегации*. М., 3–23.
- Экман, Т. 1963, Грамматический и лексический состав языка Юрия Крижанича. В кн.: *Dutch Contributions to the V. International Congress of Slavists*. The Hague.