

A PARADIGM OF SLAVIC NATIONAL EVOLUTION:
BIBLE — GRAMMAR — POET

Rado L. Lencek

This paper is premised on the observation that in modern Slavic societies, linguistic and cultural boundaries tend to coincide. In this respect, cultural, national and linguistic identities are seen as synonymous. This observation is based on two assumptions: first, that in the absence of stronger ethnocultural integrators such as a historical past, it is language — spoken and written and in particular literary language — which essentially defines and characterizes a national culture; and second, that the evolution of a philological culture and nationality presupposes the interplay of all the inherent and symbolic functions which language performs in a society.

The discussion is limited to one model of this evolution which recurs in the history of Slavic cultures and is not unique in the history of cultures in general. The paradigm consists of what are called the three supreme cultural events in the history of a philological nationality: the translation of the Bible into a language; the creation of the Grammar of this language; and the appearance of a national Poet in the language of this society. The Slovene model has been selected to illustrate this paradigm as perhaps the most typical example of such a Slavic philological nationality. In the Slovene paradigm these three events are: Jurij Dalmatin's Bible and Adam Bohorič's *Grammar* of 1584, and Francè Prešeren's *Poezije* of 1847.

The conceptual frame of our discussion is sociocultural and sociolinguistic. We would like to stress that our correlation of social and cultural factors is based on the same three fundamental mechanisms which a common language, in particular a common written language, plays in societies, be they literate or illiterate: to wit, the unifying, the separating, the prestige, and the referencing functions, serving as symbols of social solidarity in societies (Garvin 1959:28-31). It has been shown that by virtue of at least three of these functions — the unifying, the separating, and the prestige — written-literary language represents a catalyzing force in the evolution of a speech community into a national community, and that the same three functions operate in the evolution of national literatures and national cultures (Lencek 1982). It should be stressed, of course, that languages, literatures and cultures are growth-motivated and growth-oriented models. As such they follow the uni-

versal dictum on the process of life in nature: Life is vitality, and vitality means affirmation of life. The essence of all living is that it cannot negate itself. It is quite apparent that a built-in dynamism and a *sui generis* dialectic within language-culture phenomena that underlie their interaction are anchored in this dictum.

*

Every diversification of the communicative function of languages in primitive societies represents a sociolinguistically relevant fact. Hence, it might be argued that, after their conversion to Christianity, the earliest attempts of the Eastern Alpine Slavs at investing their vernacular with the privilege of being used in religious communication between man and God, was a sociolinguistically significant factor in the evolution of the Slovene language. This elevated its vernacular to a functional level that differed from everyday use, and therefore infused an integrative bond into its speech community. Thus, the "Freising Fragments" by AD 1000, the first written record of such a religious functional dialect, are also the first document of the vernacular's new existence on a slightly higher level than in everyday usage. Assuming that these first surviving texts of Slovene reflect the early ninth century Carolingian practice of allowing "nationes" of the Empire to use basic liturgical and homiletic texts in the vernacular, we may speculate that the "Freising Fragments" already symbolize, as it were, two primary sociolinguistic functions that a written language performs in society: the unifying and the prestige function, however modest they might have been at that time. It is very possible that the "Freising Fragments" thus created a tradition of the written word in Slovene lands. The fact that subsequent centuries produced several other such records of written texts of mass consumption in Slovene society, might corroborate such a proposition. It is therefore plausible that Slovene which was not printed before the mid-sixteenth century, and in speech long continued to function on the lowest level of the sociolinguistic scale, had a written manuscript tradition which must have had superdialectal character by virtue of its religious use.

The earliest printed text in Slovene, from the very first Abecedarium and Catechism of 1550 to a complete translation of the Bible and the first Grammar of the new language in 1584, marked a revolutionary turn in this cultural tradition. The invention of printing extended the distribution and influence of the printed word over the spatial continuum of the Slovene speech area. During the subsequent two hundred years new printed texts helped to broaden the thematic and functional orbit of the written and printed language. A steadily growing participation of men of letters from most of the regions broadened the narrow dialectal basis of the first printed texts. In homiletic literature, in poetry, prose, and in the first scholarly-educational works, the Upper

Carniolan dialect gradually gained an ascendancy over the other dialects. Finally, Francè Prešeren employed it in the poetic function, the highest inherent function of a literary language. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the fusion of central dialects was brought to completion, with the Upper Carniolan dialect in the superior role of an arbiter of taste and correctness for more than half a century. At that moment, three sociolinguistic functions of literary Slovene, the unifying, the separating, and the prestige function, were on their way to becoming part of the linguistic consciousness of most speakers of Slovene (Lencek 1976).

*

One of the theses of this paper is that the production of a printed vernacular text as intellectually important and sizable as the Bible, represents an exceedingly significant sociolinguistic event in the evolution of every written vernacular. This was particularly so in the case of the written Slovene and its literary tradition.

The translation of a corpus of religious-literary texts comprising such diverse "forms" and genres as do the Biblical books, must be conceived of as a most significant investment of the energy and resources available to a relatively small and regionally partitioned ethnic group of Slavic speakers in the sixteenth century Inner Austrian lands. The production and use of this corpus through the centuries definitely manifests the powerful cohesive force of the written language acting as a strong stabilizer of vernacular's inertia for survival. In the case of Slovene, such a cultural effort must be linked with the equilibrium and resistance to change of the written standard under the pressure of dialectal change through the centuries.

In light of this, one can understand Jernej Kopitar's astonishment at the language of Dalmatin's Bible, which he did not find to be antiquated or archaic as had been the case in Martin Luther's German or Montaigne's French in relation to the German and French of his time.

"Immer bleibt es ein schöner Beweis für die glückliche Anlage, analogische Bau, und bereits weit vorgerückte Cultur unsrer Sprache, daß sie innerhalb 30 Jahren von 3 einzelnen Männern so ganz grammatisch geregelt werden konnte, daß die Sprache in Dalmatins Bibel nach 200 Jahre noch gar nicht vealtet ist" (Kopitar 1808:39).

This sense of an unbroken tradition, of a continuity in time, led Kopitar to accept the sixteenth century language structure of the Protestant heritage as a firm historical basis of an all-Slovene kind of literacy. What this means is that the language of Dalmatin's Bible prepared the foundations of the first of the three sociolinguistic functions of a written literary language — the unifying function.

Reading through the prefaces and dedications of Slovene and Croatian sixteenth century Protestant texts one does not find any trace of group identification which would oppose a *Crajski* and *Hervazki* language usus. Tending to unite rather than divide the speakers on either sides of the Sotla River, the terms *Slovenci*, *slovenski* still carried their original ethnic connotation. It appears that there was no room for the separatist function in the sociolinguistic concept of the written language. Thus one would be inclined to assume that Jurij Dalmatin deliberately ignored this aspect of the written language of his translation when he wrote in the "*Samerkanie enih potrebnih shtukov, na katere imajo merkati, ty, kateri bodo leto slovensko Biblio brali*":

Inu h'pusslednimu, de bi leta Slovenska Biblia le tém bujle inu daje mej vsemi Slovenci mogla se sastopiti: tako so ene teshishe inu nikar povsod navadne bessede, nikar le na strani raven texta sdrugimi bessedami sloshene, inu s'Svejsdzami snaminovane: temuzh je tudi sadaj na konzu lete bible s'flissom en regishter, po redi tiga a.b.c. postaulen, de, kar bi kej eden v'textu nemogèl dobru sastopiti tu more ta sadaj v'regishtru yskati. Kakòr, kadar bi en Harvat nemogèl sastopiti, kaj se rezhe Arzat, taku yszhi sadaj v'puhshtabi, A, Arzat, tu je njegov jesik postaulen, slasti, Likar, inu more taku on v'svoim Iesiki Likar sa Arzat, brati. Taku kateri bi nesastopil kaj se reko Buque, ta iszhi v'puhshtabi, B, taku najde de se Buqve reko v'njega jeziki, Knige. Satu more on v'svoim jesiki sa Buqve Knige brati. Inu taku se tudi ima od drusih bessed sastopiti, ker kuli enimu naprej prideo, de jih nemore sastopiti, ta, ali na strani pogledaj, ali pak sadaj v'regishtru.

The prestige factor of the printed language in a work such as Dalmatin's Bible must be considered in terms of the values particular to the space and time coordinates of the work's appearance. Obviously, the very concept of the prestige function of a language differed from the present tendency to evaluate standard languages by their usefulness as means for social advancement. It is important to note, however, that linguistic prestige symbols exist in all societies at all levels of their development. In the early written languages of prenational stages, for instance in the oldest Slavic literary tradition, words and notions such as *slovo*, Greek *logos* 'word,' *buky*, *gramma* 'letter,' *kъnigy*, *biblión* 'books,' *slovo bukъvъnoe* 'written word,' 'the word of the Scriptures,' assumed an idealizing prestige value characteristic of sociolinguistic attitudes toward language in a society recently introduced to literacy. Similarly, in a spiritual heritage which was at a great remove from any Church Slavonic tradition, the terms *besseda* 'word,' *Boshja besseda* 'God's word,' *buqve* 'book,' *pissmo* 'scripture,' that were introduced by Protestant Reformers, must have been saturated with prestige attitudes

toward the written word and the book in which their indigenous language was made "as good as the language of others." Dalmatin's German introduction to the Bible most typically expressed the sentiments which must have been inspired in the members of the "true God's Church" *tiga slovenskega jesika* (Trubar 1555):

"Und wann wir Windischen es auch nur allenthalben dankbarlich erkennen und annemen wolten, so würden wir befinden, das der güttig barmherzig Gott gleichsfals auch uns, in unserer gewöhnlichen Muttersprach, in diesen Landen, eben mit dieser wolthat und offenbarung seines worts, mit weniger als anfänglich die Hebreer, und hernach die Griechen und Lateiner, auch nach inen die Teutschen und etliche andere Nationen, mit einer sonderbarn unuerhofften gnad für andere Völcker angesehen hat" (Biblia 1584: Vorrede, 6-7).

This awareness of the privilege derived from possession of the Scriptures translated into the common mother tongue of the lands, offers the first manifest sociocultural evaluation of a linguistic prestige that rests on cognizance of an achievement already essentially sociolinguistic.

*

The second thesis of this paper runs as follows: While the unification and stabilization of the written word through time is a prerequisite for the development of a written language, contact between languages in the process of translation is itself a factor of primary importance in this development. The modern vernacular written languages — including English, German and Slavic — growing out of spoken dialects, were geographically limited and were used largely for practical and seldom for intellectual purposes. Their contact with the classical languages of Latin and Greek enriched them lexically, intellectualized their grammatical and word-formational expressive means, expanded their stylistic patterns, verbal devices and the universe of images that were needed to fully develop their intellectual and artistic potentialities. Moreover, the Protestant Reformation invested the translation of the "word of God" into new vernacular languages with a new intellectual challenge which linked the act of translation of the Bible with the act of its interpretation. And what we have primarily in mind here is the simplest form of textual interpretation of the originally Hebrew, Greek, Latin, or German Biblical text in idiomatic translation which would bring out the meaning of the original in the spirit of the individual nature of a vernacular. Other forms of this *sacerdotal function* of new literary vernaculars consisting in their liturgical and homiletic usage which involves translation, paraphrase and interpretation of the sacred word, could not but pave the way for greater artistic freedom in translation and in cre-

ative writing. Here lies the historical role and influence of a translator of the Bible in the evolution of modern languages. The translation of the Holy Scriptures was one of the best training grounds for the growth of written dialects into literary languages.

It is not surprising to find that early translators were acutely aware of the problems of translation from Latin. Primož Trubar, for example, reflected on these difficulties with particular sincerity: "I would like to see and hear somebody — he writes in his Introduction to the *Ta prvi dejl tige Noviga Testamenta* of 1557 — who would be able to render in Slovene such usual Latin words as *salutatio, exultatio, iubilatio, laetitia, hilaritas, iucunditas, persecutio, afflictio, patientia, contumelia, contentio, seditio* .. and many others for which no equivalents in our language exist" (Rupel 1966:79). Only thus can one fully appreciate Dalmatin's efforts to render concisely and idiomatically into the new written vernacular such Latin phrases and constructions as: *Ut quid perditio haec?* (Matthew 26:8) by "H'zhemu je le-ta potrata?"; or: "Zhessar je sèrže polnu, tu usta govore" for Latin *Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur* (Matthew 12:34). Similarly, one does justice to hundreds of biblical phrases and idioms which in the Trubar-Dalmatin translation became part and parcel of the everyday language, e.g.: *dobri pastir* 'the good shepherd,' *v puti tvoiga oblizhja, oku sa oku, sob sa sob*; or in full sentence as this one which could be as taken from a folk-song: "*Inu on je nym sapovedal, de so vsi doli sedli, enu omisje per drugim, na seleni trati*" (Mark 6:9).

Indeed, Jurij Dalmatin's non-biblical vernacular texts in the *Biblia*, such as his "*Gmain Predgovor zhes vso sveto Biblio*," and his introductory passages to individual Biblical books, often attest to a conscious effort at writing in a poetic language and style. By all the evidence we possess, these may be claimed as the very first poetic prose in Slovene. Perhaps imitating a foreign pattern, though more likely, new, independent and original, the figurative style of this prose appears in Dalmatin's writing with all the charm of novelty. The fresh and vivid images are not drawn from classics but from life, from the experiences of the people for whom the Bible was intended.

Satu je tudi le-ta vuk S. Evangelia v'svetim pismi [we read in Dalmatin's *Gmain Predgovor*] nikar nespodobnu pèrglihan enimu rosnimu oblaku s'jutra, inu eni rossi katera s'jutra sguda pade: timu Sonzu kir s'jutra pres oblakou gori gre: Deshju po vrozhusti, kateri vse ohladi inu s'frisha, kar je u'venilu: inu Sonzu po dolgim deshju kateru vse spet gori srouná kar je od deshja doli pobyenu: timu lepimu vesselimu polejtnimu zhassu: Eni veliki zhastiti vezherji: enimu shlahtnimu dragimu Perlinu: enimu skrivnimu Shazu inu drugim lubesnivim, sdravim, veliku vrejdnim rizhem sa kateriga volo ima slejdni Kàrszhenik pèr-

nareden biti, nikar le vse svoje blagu, temuzh tudi svoj leben, inu kar kuli lubiga ima na tém Svejti, rad inu volnu sapustiti'' (Biblia 1584: VII. Od evangelia).

Figurative language unfolds in the new written vernacular from simple ingenuous parallels that are drawn with objects and situations from familiar world and experience. We can sense that this language is decidedly no longer the language of the Bible. Its images, realistic, concrete and plain as they are, are derived from the mundane sphere of practical life; brought into the written vernacular, they represent the very first testing and experimenting with creative writing in Slovene letters.

*

Our third argument here deals with the role and function of a linguistic text such as the Bible, as a socializing and uniformizing force in the development of a national culture. The case is obvious: for a timespan of more than three hundred years Dalmatin's Bible dominated the religious use of the language and was the only form of a functional-stylistic specialization of its written expression, open, understandable and accessible to literate and illiterate speakers of their parish communities. At this level of Slovene cultural development — before Prešeren — the language of the Bible, of the Gospels and of ritual, the language of the pulpit and the confessional, was the most important formative factor in the evolution of a common psychic system underlying the concept of Slovene nationality. Through generations, this language carried a message, a philosophy on language and its people, that consisted, as it were, of two precepts. One spoke of the existence of a Sunday and Holiday prestigious form of the Slovene language raised above the everyday vernacular and its dialectal varieties. The other affirmed the charisma of the mother tongue and preached the *Christian* duty of the faithful to preserve it and to pass it to next generations. Precepts such as these ran among the numberless threads which bind the language and its people in the history of the Slovene nation.

* * *

The second cultural event in the evolution of national identity in a Slavic linguistic community is the appearance of the first grammarbook of its vernacular. In our paradigm this event is synchronized with the creation of the first major text in the vernacular — in most instances, the text of the Holy Scriptures. In the context of this discussion, the first Grammar of a literary vernacular will again be considered in terms of sociolinguistic functions. Specifically, the phenomenon will be viewed in the light of any language planning and systematization of linguistic facts which a vernacular grammar of a newly written language may perform in the evolution of the cultural identity of a linguistic community.

Among the sociolinguistic functions which grammar may assume in the evolution of language as a vehicle for national identity, several would seem to be pertinent to this discussion. One concerns the selection of a dialectal platform to lend its structure to the systematized norm of the written language; another refers to the grammarian's attitude to usage or usages in language tradition; a third relates to the operation of a grammar as a frame-of-reference for speech usage and its unification in a speech community.

By the middle of the sixteenth century when the first texts in the newly printed vernacular began to enter the Slovene lands, *the Windische Sprache — slouenſki jesik* simply meant an abstract entity, the sum of the various, by then well individualized dialectal bases that had evolved from the Eastern Alpine Slavic. Prior to this time boundary, the development of this vernacular is characterized by structural changes which established the historical grooves of the evolution of Slovene as we know it today. Its development after this point is marked by a self-propelled splintering and diversification process which extended all the way to the level of parish and village communities. Its first systematization and codification in a Grammar appears, as it were, at a fictitious standstill immediately before the outburst of linguistic pressures responsible for the momentous dialectalization thrust.

The first grammar of Slovene, Adam Bohorič's *Arcticae horulae . . . de latino Carniolana Orthographia* (1584), was produced in the course of preparation of Dalmatin's *Biblia* for print. It was originally planned to be a most unassuming document on spelling rules for printing texts in the newly printed vernacular of the Slovene lands. What came out of this modest design, however, was — as Adam Bohorič defined his work between the lines — the *Grammatica de Lingua Carniolana*, a grammarbook of a language spoken, as explicitly stated, *per totam Carniolam, Styriae et Carinthiae maiorem partem*, and patterned on the tradition of Humanist grammarianship of the time. The model on which it was based was no less a grammar than *Grammatica Latina*, the work of the leading German Latinist, Philip Melanchthon.¹

For a long time Bohorič's *Arcticae horulae* was known only for those parts of its culturological "Praefatiuncula" which characterize the ideol-

¹Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560), a German Latinist, a theologian and a Reformer, one of the most learned scholars of his days, ranking with Erasmus, an associate of Luther, from 1518 Professor of Greek at the University of Wittenberg, author of the *Grammatica Latina*, of which the *Orthographia* and the *Etymologia* appeared in 1515, and the *Syntaxis* and *Prosodia* in 1526, in a final edition in 1550 (*Grammatica Philippi Melanchthonis Latina*, Paris 1550). In the fall of 1548 Adam Bohorič registered at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Wittenberg where he attended Melanchthon's lectures. Cf. France Kidrič, "Bohorič Adam," *Slovenski biografski leksikon*, I (1. zvezek) (Ljubljana, 1925-1932), 49-52.

ogy of the so-called humanist and baroque Slavism. The value of Adam Bohorič's contribution to the sociolinguistic history of literary Slovene, however, lies in the grammar itself, in the treatment of the language and in particular in the premises on which the treatment is based.

Adam Bohorič makes no secret of the fact that the inspiration and the ideal leading his interest for language was Philip Melanchthon's *Grammatica Latina*. Using its format, style and language, he must have viewed it as the model for a grammar of a vernacular literary language in the making. While not embarrassed to admit that he indeed tried to fit the linguistic facts of the new vernacular to the grammatical molds of his Latin model, Bohorič also tried to identify the differences between his native Slavic and adopted Latin and German. It is very likely, however, that the intellectual vision of the structure of a future literary language, rather than the style of contemporary grammarianship had prompted him to define his goal and methodology thus: *ex communi usu rectissime loquendi, regulis depromptis, atque in certam quandam methodum coactis, totam rem Grammaticam Carniolanam ... comprehendere*" (Bohorič 1584: "Praefatio," 18-19).

This suggests — and this is our first thesis here — that in writing his grammar, Adam Bohorič followed the philological criterion for measuring correctness and excellence that had been used by the Ancients and had subsequently been revived by the Humanists: to learn in the pages of the best writers. In the case of the young Slovene Protestant tradition in which in a span of thirty-four years *Arcticae horulae* represents its forty-fifth title, this criterion could not but point to the usage of its best *published* texts, Trubar's, Krelj's, Dalmatin's original or translated.² And secondly, in writing his grammar, Adam Bohorič did not try to base the structure of his language on any individual dialect used either by Trubar or Krelj or Dalmatin. Rather, he attempted to integrate the usage of the texts of all three dialectal varieties, Trubar's Central, Krelj's Western, and Dalmatin's Eastern Carniolan. Theoretically, this last principle defined a literary language with a *supradialectal norm*. Contradictory as this may sound, this norm based on all its dialects, was still free from everything local; not representing one dialect more than any other, yet still representing all the dialects of this language as a whole.

²Jernej Kopitar, the codifier of the modern Slovene, perfectly understood this aspect of Adam Bohorič's contribution to the evolution of literary Slovene when he put it in his *Grammatik der Slawischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyermark* (1808): "O ja! biederer Bohoritsch! dir und deinen Fraunden hat es unsere Sprache zu danken, dass sie gleich bey ihrer ersten Erscheinung jene grammatische Correctheit und Consequenz mitbrachte, welche andere Sprachen erst nach und nach, nach vielem Modeln und Aendern nicht erreichen. Auffallend ist es, dass die Krainische Sprache seit Bohoritsch's Zeiten . . . sich gar nichts verändert hat!" (Kopitar 1808:XL).

*

Our second thesis in reference to Adam Bohorič's grammar is narrowly sociolinguistic. The teaching on standard languages has it that every written language serves as a frame-of-reference for speech usage in general by providing a codified norm that constitutes a yardstick for correctness. Individual speakers and groups of speakers are then judged by their associates and fellows according to their observance of this yardstick. In as much as this frame-of-reference function of written languages is part and parcel of a grammar, acquaintance with the grammarbook governs the frame-of-reference function of the standard.

This is the way the sociolinguistic frame-of-reference function operates in modern societies and their standards; its functioning presupposes a uniform education and language learning in the schools. There is, however, a vast difference between the consciousness of the norm among speakers of modern standards and among speakers of vernaculars in pre-literary societies. Yet even in this latter condition some form of the sociolinguistic frame-of-reference function is present. The existence of grammarbooks, schools and books in a society is necessarily bound to breed this function even among the speakers of vernaculars of written languages.

While in Slovene society such an influence of the frame-of-reference function was first observed by Lucien Tesnière in the early twenties of this century, it must have been operating at least since the introduction of obligatory general education in 1774. Speaking as a dialectologist encountering fieldwork difficulties in avoiding the interference of the written language in the recorded data, Tesnière pointed to the powerful impact which an elementary education in language can have in language change in a Slavic society. What this means in fact is that acquaintance with the written language and the grammarbook activates the frame-of-reference reaction in speakers of a vernacular, and that this phenomenon can occur long before the creation of a standard language. In the Slovene lands this process might have started in the oldest known educational practice, regulated by Trubar's *Cerkovna Ordninga* of 1564, where he wrote:

“V slednim Meistu, v tergu inu per sledni Farri se imajo shulmoshtri inu shularji dershati, v meistih inu terjih de se Latinsku inu Nemshku, per tih Farrah od farmoshtrou, podrushnikou inu meshnariu tu Slovensku Pismu, brane inu pisane vuzhi,” and “Vssaki Pridigar inu Farmoshter ima per suie Farry eniga Shulmoshtra oli Meshnaria imeiti inu dershati, de te mlade Hlapshyzhe inu Deklyze, Purgarske inu kmetishke Otroke vuzhi Slouenski brati inu pissati” (Trofenik 1973:79).

Adam Bohorič was the superintendent of such an educational system in Ljubljana and his Grammar very probably represents the first

yardstick used in measuring, comparing and judging the language usage in Slovene society.³

* * *

The third most influential event in the evolution of Slavic philological nationalities is the appearance of a national Poet-Genius in their cultural tradition.

It is easy to understand why sociologically oriented students of literature link the appearance of a national Poet with the development of broader group-solidarities in society. While literature is the medium of a culture and language is its *materia prima*, the relation between both is usually expressed as follows: Literature does not exist unless expressed in language; language itself, however, in particular when used in poetry, is by far more than the "marble, bronze or clay" used in sculptor's craft (Sapir 1921:211). Language in poetry is a symbolic system of reference that communicates experience of our present, of our past, and more importantly, of our future. Hence, a literary artist, optimally a great Poet in a society, develops "new forms of expression, which allow us to act in a present; preserves linguistic conventions and traditions, which allow us to commemorate individual and communal aspects of our past; and envisions future, wherein actions, now painful or terrible, become beautiful and sublime. All this is possible because the artist experiments with symbols to discover their ultimate possibilities in expression. This is the basis of the power of men of letters" (Duncan 1953:73). This would seem to be a possible socio-philological explanation of the basis of the power of a national Poet-Genius in a society.

In Slovene cultural history Francè Prešeren is the national poet of such a rank and mission. "Prešeren has become the embodiment of Slovene culture to the outside world," wrote Henry Cooper in his monograph on the great Slovene. "His poetry has come to stand as the highest achievement in the Slovene tongue. Wherever anything is known about the Slavic literatures, Prešeren is invariably included in the

³The importance of the sociolinguistic frame-of-reference function of a grammar-book is not necessarily measured by its grammatical-normative influence on a written language, but rather by the extent of its influence in the grammatical tradition of a speech community. From this point of view, Adam Bohorič's *Arcticae horulae* (1584) must have had a much greater impact in Slovene sociolinguistic grammatical tradition than this is usually admitted by Slovene grammarians. It has been shown that the paradigms of the *Arcticae horulae* were imitated in the paradigmatic tables of Hieronymus Megiser's *Dictionarium quattuor linguarum* (Graz 1592), and in the modest grammatical sketch in Alasia de Sommaripa's *Vocabolario Italiano e Schiavo* (Udine 1607). In a second edition, anonymously, *Arcticae horulae* appeared in Father Hipolit's *Grammatica Latino-Germanico-Slavonica* . . . (Labaci 1715), and a third time in a German translation, again anonymously, in *Grammatica oder Windisches Sprach-Buch* . . . (Klagenfurt 1744). Cf. Fran Ramovš, "Zgodovina slovenske slovnice," in *Zbrano delo*, I (Ljubljana 1971). 213-250.

pantheon as the Slovene equivalent of the Russian Puškin, the Pole Mickiewicz, or the Czech Mácha" (Cooper 1981:139). We might add that within Slovene culture, Prešeren stands today as the catalyst and symbol of Slovene national and linguistic-cultural integration, and his poetry as an icon *sui generis*, that evokes unity and faith in the future. In his own time, when the dilemma provoked by Stanko Vraz necessitated a choice between Slovene or Illyrian, it was Prešeren's Genius which resolved the identity crisis of literary Slovene. The small *Poezije* of 1847, based on a lexicon of not more than two thousand seven hundred words of the basic vocabulary of Slovene, created a poetic language qualitatively on a par with the European poetry of the time.

It is well known that the linguistic premises of the evolution of modern Slovene were laid by Jernej Kopitar and that the course of its subsequent cultural development was defined and induced by Matija Čop and Francè Prešeren. In his *Grammatik der Slawischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyermark* (1808), Kopitar accepted the sixteenth-century Protestant heritage as a firm historical basis of literacy and redirected the search for its linguistic authenticity, in particular in the syntax and lexicon, into the dialects and their linguistic forms and usages. Paradoxical as it may sound, it was Kopitar and his pupil Matevž Ravnikar who paved the way for the language of Prešeren's poetry. By 1847, when *Poezije Dóktorja Francéta Prešérna* was published, the written language tradition once again dipped into the source first time tapped by Primož Trubar and his associates.

On the other hand, there was a hiatus between Jernej Kopitar and Čop-Prešeren's generation. This gap was reflected by their differing attitudes towards defining the role and function of a written, viz. literary language in society. Kopitar's insistence on the role of dialects, peasant speech and of the Church Slavonic model in building the norm, was linguistically warranted and positive. When transferred to the sphere of society, its culture and prospects of its progress, however, his principles became objectionable and unacceptable. It was this dimension of his program, rather than the question of language as such, that led to the confrontation between Kopitar and the younger elite dedicated to a more sophisticated literacy for a prospective urban culture, and opened up the Slovene *Questione della lingua*. Though, in sociolinguistic terms, Kopitar — who is for all practical purposes responsible for the creation of modern Slovene — must have been conscious of the unifying and the separatist functions of its written form, he still looked at the prestige function of the written language with the eyes of a sixteenth-century linguistic codifier. There was no room for Dante's concept of the *dignitas* of the *volgare illustre* in Kopitar's understanding of a literary language. On the other hand, Čop and Prešeren were already part of a new Slovene middle-class generation that subscribed to the Schlegelian vision

of the linguistic identity of a nation, of the role of a cultivated urban language in society, and the mission of urban society in the development of modern nations. Aiming at a Slovene *high culture* of the *future*, this was a visionary generation; it was preoccupied with the poetic function of Slovene, with the questions of the elegance and refinement of language to be used by a Slovene middle class of tomorrow. Sociolinguistically, the case made by the Čop-Prešeren generation for a Slovene poetic language meant a conscious effort to implement the highest *prestige function* of literary Slovene that went far beyond Primož Trubar and Jurij Dalmatin's understanding of their decision to elevate their native dialects onto the pedestal of a written language, or Adam Bohorič's codification of the best usage of Slovene texts in his Grammar. Čop the Theoretician stipulated this dignity in the name of Romantic tenets on the highest functional nobility of poetic language in national societies, Prešeren the artistic Genius brought about its realization to the fulfilment of the culturological program of the time, so fittingly formulated by Frederick Schlegel:

“Every free and independent nation should claim the right to a native literature—that is—an idiomatic literary development of language. Without a native literature, the national genius will never be self-possessed, or enjoy an immunity from barbaric associations...” (Schlegel F. 1889:225-226).

It is astonishing how well Francè Prešeren, the Poet-Genius understood this challenge.

Columbia University

REFERENCES

- Biblia 1584. Biblia, tv ie, vse svetv pismv, stariga inu Noviga Testamenta Slovenski tolmažena, Skusi Ivria Dalmatina. Wittenberg.
- Bohorič, A. 1584. Arcticae horulae succissive de latino Carniolana literatura Wittenberg.
- Breznik, A. 1917. Literarna tradicija v “Evangelijih in listih”. Dom in svet, 30, 170-174, 225-230, 270-284, 333-347.
- Brower, R.A. (ed.) 1959. On Translation. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Cooper, H.R. 1981. Francè Prešeren. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Duncan, H.D. 1953. Language and Literature in Society. A Sociological Essay on Theory and Method in the Interpretation of Linguistic Symbols. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fishman, A.J. 1972. Language and Nationalism. Two Interpretative Essays. Rowley. Mass.: Newburry House Publishers.

- Garvin, P.L. 1959. The Standard Language Problem: Concepts and Methods. *Anthropological Linguistics* 1 (2), 28-31.
- Hankamer, P. 1927. *Die Sprache, ihre Begriff und ihre Deutung im sechzehnten und siebzehnten Jahrhundert*. Bonn: Verlag von Friedrich Cohen.
- Hightet, G. 1949. *The Classical Tradition. Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*. New York and London: Oxford University Press.
- Kissling, H.J. 1971. Aussenseitiger-Betrachtungen zu A. Bohoričs *Arcticae Horulae*. Adam Bohorič, *Arcticae Horulae*. Die erste Grammatik der slowenischen Sprache. Wittenberg 1584. II. Teil: Untersuchungen. Ed. B. Berčič. Munich: Rudolf Trofenik, 83-87.
- Kopitar, J. 1808. *Grammatik der Slawischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyermark*. Laibach: W.H. Korn.
- Kristeller, P.O. 1955. *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strains*. New York: Harper and Row (Harper Torchbooks).
- Lencek, R.L. 1976. On Dilemmas and Compromises in the Evolution of Modern Slovene. *Slavic Linguistics and Language Teaching*. Ed. Thomas F. Magner. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 112-152.
- 1982. Language and Literature. *Slovene Studies: Journal of the Society for Slovene Studies* 4:178-179.
- 1984. The Modern Slovene Language Question: An Essay in Sociolinguistic Interpretation. *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question. I. Church Slavonic-South Slavic-West Slavic*. Ed. Riccardo Picchio and Harvey Goldblat. New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, 297-317.
- Lentner, L. 1964. *Volkssprache und Sakralsprache. Geschichte einer Lebensfrage bis zum Ende des Konzils von Trient*. Vienna: Verlag Herder.
- Murko, M. 1927. *Die Bedeutung der Reformation und Gegenreformation für das geistige Leben der Südslaven*. Prague and Heidelberg.
- Otwinowska, B. 1974. *Język-naród-kultura. Antecedencje i motywy renesansowej myśli o języku*. Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow-Gdańsk: Polska Akademia Nauk.
- Padley, G.A. 1976. *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500-1700. The Latin Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pogačnik, J. 1976. Jurij Dalmatin im Lichte stilistischer Untersuchungen. *Jurij Dalmatin, Biblia 1584. II. Teil. Abhandlungen*. Ed. A. Slodnjak and B. Berčič. Munich: Rudolf Trofenik, 63-85.
- Rigler, J. 1986. *Začetki slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana: SAZU, Razred za filološke in literarne vede, 22.
- Rupel, M. (ed.) 1966. *Slovenski protestantski pisci. Druga, dopolnjena izdaja*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.

- Sapir, E. 1921. *Language. An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Schlegel, F. 1889. *Lectures on the History of Literature, Ancient and Modern, now first completely translated by H.G. Bohn*. London: G. Bell and Sons.
- Slodnjak, A. 1968. Über die nationbildende Kraft der Reformation bei den Slowenen. *Abhandlungen über die slowenische Reformation*. Ed. B. Berčič (Munich: Rudolf Trofenik), 11-22.
- 1971. Die Wirkung der *Arcticae Horulae* von Adam Bohorič auf das Schrifttum in den slowenischen Ländern von 1584 bis 1809. *Adam Bohorič, Arcticae Horulae. Die erste Grammatik der slowenischen Sprache. Wittenberg 1584. II. Teil: Untersuchungen*. Ed. B. Berčič (Munich: Rudolf Trofenik), 122-134.
- Trofenik, R. (ed.) 1973. *Primož Trubar/Primus Truber. Cerkovna ordninga/Slowenische Kirchenordnung. Tübingen 1564. I. Teil: Text*. Munich: Rudolf Trofenik.