

THE SOCIAL SITUATION OF THE SLOVENE LITERARY LANGUAGE IN 1584 AND 1984

Jože Toporišič

Four hundred years ago, Jurij Dalmatin and Adam Bohorič pointed out the not so enviable situation of the Slovene language in comparison with German, Dalmatin in his *Vorrede*, the dedication to Hans Khisl in his Bible of 1584, Bohorič in the *Praefatiuncula* to his *Arcticae horulae*.

Both reformers contradicted each other, however, when they contrasted German and Slovene (or whatever they called it) when the concrete choice of language in a given text was at stake, and at the same time German and Slavic when the diffusion and social prestige of both languages was in question. For the former, compare the passage from Dalmatin:

Daher denn auch aus dieser Göttlichen gnad ervolgt / das auff diesen tag in Teutscher Nation / wo das wort Gottes dieser vertolmetschten / teutschen Bibel gemäs / geprädigt wird / allenmeniglich / hoch und nider stands / jung und alt / Man und Weib / Knecht und Dirnen / die Göttliche Schrifft hören / lesen / reden / singen und verstehen können" (Bible of 1584: *Vorrede*, 6). Or: Und wann wir Windischen es auch nur allenthalben danckbarlich erkennen und annemen wolten / so würden wir befinden / das der güttig barmhertzig Gott gleichfals auch uns / in unserer gewöhnlichen Muttersprach / in diesen Landen / eben mit diser wohltat und offenbarung seines worths / nit weniger als anfänglich die Hebreer / und hernach die Griecher und Lateiner / auch nach inen die Teutschen und etliche andere Nationen / mit einer sonderbarn vnuerhofften gnad / für andere Völcker angesehen hat (Bible of 1584: *Vorrede*, 6-7).

Before that, side by side with German he mentions also French, Italian, Hungarian, Polish, Czech, Russian, Danish and "many other languages." For the latter, compare the passage from Bohorič:

Atque, ita non solum extant Ebraea, Chaldea, Graeca et Latina Biblia . . . sed prostant etiam nunc hoc seculo sacra Biblia, Germanica, Hispanica, Gallica, Italica, Vagarica, Boemica, Polonica, Rutenica et Moshovitica lingua. Solis vero nostris hominibus Carniolanis seu Slavis in sua dialecto, hoc tantum beneficium, nondum licuit habere integram. . . . senecta premat viribusque destituat, opus fuit per alios, id quod integris Bibliis adhuc defuit, atque ad traducendum reliquum, pertexere, atque

integra Carniolana vel rectius Slavonica Biblia aedere (Bohorič 1984: 7).

Here the Slovene language is placed side by side with Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, Czech, Russian, etc.

When however, they want to show also the dignity of the speaker of this language, Dalmatin and Bohorič suddenly treat the Slovene only as an offshoot of the gigantic Slavic tree competing with the powerful German oak-tree. Dalmatin:

Auch viel leut vermeint / das dieselbige (i.e., die Windische sprach / besonders / wir die in diesen Landen gebreuchig) / von wegen ihrer besonderer / und in etlichen wörtern / in andern sprachen / ungewöhnlicher schwärer aussprechung / nitwol köndte in die Feder gericht / und mit Lateinischen Buchstaben / zum Druck gebracht / und noch viel weniger / das die ganze Bibel darein köndte transferirt werden. Welches umb desto mehr zubeklagen gewest / das die Windische sprach / nit in ein winckel verborgen: sondern durch gantze mächtige und viel Königreich (gleichwol in etliche Dialectos abgetheilt) heutigstags im schwung gehet (Bible of 1584: *Vorrede*, 7).

And then he states that this language is spoken not only by those who live

in ganzem Creinland / under Steyr un Kärennten / sambt den Angrentzenden Landen / als Crabaten / Dalmatien / und Windischer March / Carst / Metling und Isterreich gesessen / sondern auch Behemen / Polacken / Moscouiten / Reussen / Bosnaken und Wallachen / und auch schier der meiste theil der Völcker / so unsre Erbfeind der Turck / der Christenheit abgedrungen / dieser zeit gebrauchen: Also das auch am Turckischen Hoff / zwischen den andern / in der gantzen Turkey / in gemein / und auch in Cantzleyen gebreuchigen sprachen / die Windische auch ein Heubtsprach ist'' (Bible of 1584: *Vorrede*, 7).

And Bohorič about Slovene as the Slavic language:

. . . tamen quid alibi sit vel fiat non multum solliciti, de Slavonica nostra lingua, praeter pietatem etiam iudicant et pronunciant, proindeque me, de Slavis, ut obscuris hominibus, temere quid dicturum opinabuntur. Quare hoc loco altius rem ipsam sed breuissime repetendam duxi. Complector autem Slavico nomine, non aliquam, obscuro loco latitantem et certis illisque perangustis finibus inclusam gentem. Sed appello et complector eo nomine, quotquot regiones et homines, vel Slavice loquuntur vel, ut plurimum verbis conueniunt, sive affinitatem cognationemque aliquam habere cum Slavica lingua manifeste deprehenduntur (Bohorič 1584: 8).

It is therefore clear: for Bohorič — a Slovene when one asserts the particularity and individuality of his language, a Slav when one comes up against the speakers of other languages, concretely of German, for it is from Germany that there radiated the notion of a people closed in the boundaries of numerically small communities, existing in secluded and remote places. As we have seen, we find also in Dalmatin the notion that the Slovene language has been driven into a corner (of course, between Germans and Italians). The justification of linguistic independence of this obviously not large national community is not to be found in the size of its speech territory, but in its transitional position and mission, which provides a bridge allowing the peoples of the West, in particular Germans, to have easy access to the European Southeast and Northeast, to the Southeast into the Ottoman empire (to the *Salvic* jargon used in the Ottoman administration), and the Northeast into the Russian empire (e.g., Sigismund von Herberstein).

Jurij Dalmatin substantiated this notion of the transitional and mediatory suitability of the Slovene language with the idea that all the Slavic peoples, he is addressing in his introduction to the Bible, can understand it, viz.

auch unser Landsprach / wenn sie recht gered und ausgesprochen / oder geschrieben / gar wol / und viel leichter mag vernomen und verstanden werden / als wir gedachte / andere Windische Völcker / in ihrer Sprach / von wegen ihrer schwären und sonderer Pronuntiation und Orthographia / vernemen oder verstehn mügen / wie solches die erfahrenheit gibt (Bible of 1584, Vorrede, 6).

As regards the complicated Czech and Kajkavian Croatian spelling, see also Primož Trubar's opinion.

Dalmatin stresses the structural advantages of Slovene in comparison with other Slavic languages, while Bohorič — implicitly, of course — its administrative and diplomatic value, as proven by the activities of Sigismund von Herberstein and count Francišek Thurn. Bohorič correctly stresses the importance of Slovene as the administrative language in the lands where Slovene is spoken:

Caeterum quantum referat in omni vitae genere et in contratribus omnibus, imo et precipue in recte preponenda de Deo vera doctrina gnotum esse linguae eius gentis, qua cum agendum cuiquam est, id, me tacente, quivis facile intelligit (Bohorič 1584: 16).

In this sense Bohorič quotes the *Golden Bull* of the Emperor Charles IV, which

sanxit, ut posthac Electorum etiam filii, inter praecipuas linguas, Slavicam quoque addiscerent. Peroptimae intellexit

sapientissimus ille Imperator, Electorum filios Slavonicae linguae cognitione difficile carere posse, cum nimirum plerique Principum, eius sermonu populos sibi subditos habeant. Rectius enim fit iudicium et magis iuste saepe pronunciatur, quando Iudex ipse, causam et audit et intelligit, quam qui id facit per interpretes (Bohorič 1584: 17).

Bohorič explicitly stresses the importance of the mother tongue in jurisdictional and administrative usage (not to speak about its importance in religious education), as well for—and let us use here Bohorič's term — “those who are ruling” (Bohorič 1584: 17), although the knowledge of a certain language is important also

tum mediocribus tum etiam plebeis hominibus, qui ad servitutem et non ad dominatum nati sunt. Idque, non solum in uno et eodem et certo, sed prout res et tempora cum fortuna tulerint, etiam in incertis et diversis locis (Bohorič 1584: 17).

It is obvious that Bohorič has in mind here the supraregional role of the language described in his grammar.

Dalmatin, on the other hand, seems to see only the religious and cultural role of language:

Das in dieser so kurzen zeit / und durch so wenig windischer Bücher / Gott gleichsfals / neben dem Predigambt / so viel gnad geben / das viel leut / hohes und nidres stands / jung und alt / Man und Weib / nit allein zur erkantnis des reinen worts Gottes komen / Sondern auch wie die Teutschen / und vor zeiten die Juden / Griechen / und Lateiner dieselbige verständlich lesen / reden / und singen / und dadurch sälig werden (Bible of 1584: Vorrede, 7).

It is interesting how Bohorič in the same argument stresses that he who does not promote the knowledge of the Slovene language is guilty before God for not doing anything to make the Word of God accessible to the people of the Slovene language:

Sic Vos illustres ingenui iuvenes posteritatis optima pars spesque post deum, optima, nequaquam in vobis desiderari patimini, quin nostra etiam lingua confiteatur Domino (Bohorič 1584: 20).

And then he continues:

Insistatis, per *Deum* immortalem oro, parentum atque maiorum vestrorum laudatissimis vestigiis, quibus nihil prius neque antiquius fuit unquam, quam ut pietatis et liberalium artium studia, patrius honor et gloria, Virtute et sanguine maiorum vestrorum parta, apud vos, charam posteritatem, manerent integra. Hoc tam insigne depositum, agite quaeso vos pari cum laude et emolumento omnium, etiam conservetur (Bohorič 1584: 20).

And as the example, he refers, once again to count Thurn and to Sigismund von Herberstein.

The use of Slovene must unite "those who are ruling" and those *qui ad servitatem et non ad dominatum nati sunt* (Bohorič 1584: 17). The former must be an example, worth imitating, to the latter:

Deinde cum Bulla Aurea Electorum filiis, Slavicam discendi linguam necessitatem imponat, Vos etiam, ut eam illustretis, singulari ornamento vobis futurum id esse, vobis persuadeatis, Vestris vero hominibus . . . hac in re estis calcar addituri, ut posthac in hoc elaborent, ut quam cultissime et rectissime scribant, et scripta ipsa Slavica legant, oblatamque divino nutu, in aeditis tam Bibliis Slavicis, occasionem, non sint neglecturi: Verum plebei etiam homines vestri, brevi tempore, in percipiendis Elementis Slavicis, in sumpto, in tantum sint profecturi, ut, expeditius, sua lingua, sacra Biblia et legere et intelligere facile queant (Bohorič 1584: 20).

Bohorič wanted that even among the simple people there would be a certain knowledge of grammar.

All these problems are real and alive today.

Even today the Slovene language is only a tiny member of a large family of Slavic languages, with a highly elaborated grammatical structure which perhaps really makes it an efficient point of departure for mastering other languages.

Indeed, the Slovene language is shared and possessed by all classes of Slovene society today. From the functional point of view, however, Slovene in fact does not exist in the Federal Assembly, in the federal government, or in federal international diplomacy; Slovene is not used in the army; very often it is absent in written and spoken communication with the members of the Serbo-Croatian (or even Macedonian) speech community; though we are allowed to write in Slovene to federal institutions, the correspondence we receive from them is not in Slovene; there is hardly any Slovene language used in other federal forums, such as the ZKJ (the League of Communists of Yugoslavia), in the SZDLJ (the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia), in the trade unions, in scholarly and professional associations. Why not? The answer is simply this: Because of the absence of favorable conditions for this, because the Slovene speaker is constantly confronted with the rejection "I don't understand you," a consequence of the fact that a non-Slovene person (in Yugoslavia) does not learn (is even unwilling to learn) Slovene, which represents an old colonial method censured and condemned among us in the very beginning of the nineteenth century; it was applied

then to German practices in relation to the Slavs and other East European peoples, of course. The so-called 'majors,' i.e. those who are 'greater in size,' simply do not recognize the thought formulated by Adam Bohorič in the very first sentence of his *Praefatiuncula: Plures novisse linguas et iucundum est, et utile, addo et pernecessarium esse, in confesso est* (Bohorič 1584: 1). It is frankly admitted today that this does not apply to the so-called *S*-languages (*S* stands here for small, smaller, less important languages with a small number of speakers), as in the case of Slovene. Slowly and painfully the realization is entering our consciousness that by pressing us to accept another language, they are pressing us also into intellectual and cultural inferiority. In trying to express ourselves in a non-native tongue, we are inevitably more primitive in expression than we would be otherwise, therefore linguistic barbarians, not sufficiently equipped with the ability for flawless expression of our innermost feelings and thoughts.

And so you hear the speaker of our language stutter in a foreign parlance instead of rejoicing at the lively flow of his mother tongue, painfully searching for more or less suitable approximations in a foreign language instead of choosing from the riches of his own vocabulary. Such a situation suggests a human being with healthy limbs but destitute of the sense of equilibrium. The 'leading,' i.e. those who lead, are with such behavior giving a bad example to those who are led, who in no way could fancy that they would be in any position to lead. Thus, it would be prudent and wise that we turn around the thought of Holy Scripture: "Do not do to your brother what you would not do to yourself!" and say: "Do not do to yourself what you fend off from your brother"! As long as in the assemblies where Slovene is treated with disdain and ignored, their multi-lingual participants would not consider it unusual if somebody, representing his community, did not use his mother tongue (or the tongue of the community he represents), the principle of the equality of rights of nations and nationalities will not be a living reality but an empty word on paper. No apologizing in this respect can offer an excuse, every apologizing represents disloyalty to oneself, is a caricature of oneself. The equality of rights namely must represent an indivisible principle, a whole, — or it simply is not equality of rights. In his time, Ivan Cankar ironically characterized the situation of the Slovene nation with the tautology: "*Položaj slovenskega naroda je v slabem položaju*" — The situation of the Slovene nation is in a bad situation! Speaking of the Slovene language, we can paraphrase Cankar with a slightly better variant: "The situation of the Slovene language is not in the best situation."

Totally functional is Slovene today for instance in the Church (though here it is still partially limited in the means of its diffusion); it is used in jurisprudence (though in a quite unenviable state on the lowest

echelons of its usage, e.g. in written verdicts and contracts), and in the *artes liberales*, as Adam Bohorič would say, either in the arts as such or in professional practice; but in professional practice it is often very frail again. And it is used in publicity journalism, as in Dalmatin-Bohorič's time, if we are allowed to designate with this term the prefaces and dedications of the Protestant preachers and writers who tried to disseminate what in the main science and philosophy discovered as new. Yet, also here, in scholarship, it happens again and again that an original Slovene discovery is not always revealed in Slovene, but in a foreign language, as it practically used to be over the centuries.

One more association can be derived from the passages quoted from Dalmatin and Bohorič. 'Those who are ruling,' are not exactly real masters of the Slovene language and by that not a very good example to other speakers. Their word is strongly contaminated with the language of the Center of the State and of its branch-offices throughout the land. Sometimes it was said (Jernej Kopitar) that such speakers, to be sure, weave garlands (i.e. sentences) with domestic flowers (i.e. words), yet they weave them in foreign language patterns; today, a critical observer, of course, can find among the flowers for the garland once again quite frequently also foreign "flowers" of a special fragrance; the same is true of the words woven with morphemic elements: among them too many foreign, though related elements, have entered with practically the same effect: they replace the native elements—though easier than German or Italian once upon the time. There is no real difference with regard to the originality of the Slovene language, if these or other such elements are Slavic or West European, or international, which means Greco-Roman, for that matter.

Another analogy of Bohorič's, having to do with our linguistically and nationally exemplary ancestors, is also still valid, be it in reference to the highest leadership, governmental, as it were, or simply to the narrower, national leaders (Charles IV with his *Golden Bull* to the sons and daughters of his nobility on one side, on the other a list of our men of letters, reduced to simplify, with Trubar, Krelj, Dalmatin, Bohorič, Hren, Kastelic, Svetokriški, Hipolit, Pohlin, Japelj, Kumerdej, Kopitar, Prešeren, Bleiweis, Levstik, Stritar, Škrabec, Cankar and others). Will the "noble young men," "sons of illustrious magnates of Styria, Carinthia and Carniola and sons of the entire knightly rank" (Bohorič 1584: 19) keep burning the flame of the torch, passed to us by the sixteenth century tradition, to keep it shining, and not lastly, to pass it on, still brighter, to those who are coming after us? Or: are we going to pass the torch to posterity at all, or will its flame go out before we will be able to hand it over to them alive? More often than ever before the parable comes back to us about the man who sold his inheritance for a mess of pottage to appease his momentary hunger . . . And the scene with "the

entire world" for the one who is willing to fall on his knees before somebody and pray to him . . . This is the fear of our leaders of yesterday, among them of Oton Župančič who in the moments of his deepest anguish queried in his distress: "*Boš rod, ki bivaš tod, boš v duši čvrst?*" ('Are you, tribe, living here, going to be tough enough in your soul?'—along the four "milestones" of the Slovene lands—Celovec, Maribor, Gorica, Trst, of which only one still stands today?). Not to challenge the reality to become worse—as it is unavoidable—every Slovene of whatever state and position should ask himself whether he would be able to say about himself as it is written under Primož Trubar's portrait: "*Jest ſim enu dobru voſkovanje voſkoval, jeſt ſim ta tek dopernessel, jeſt ſim vero ohranil*"—if the value 'religion' be exchanged with the value 'language': I kept and preserved the Slovene language; I kept it everywhere where I spoke, and preserved it in such a way that I am able to pass it still richer to others.

And still further, there is the analogy of the Provincial States, of the "illustrious magnates of Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola and of their entire knightly rank." Four hundred years ago, the Provincial States contributed a wealth of money for a unique cultural act with which they authenticated the cultural unity of the three Inner Austrian lands and areas incorporated with them where the majority of Slovenes lived. Bohorič engages them for the Slovene cause in spite of the fact that they were only German by origin (or language). He credited them with the fact *quin nostra etiam lingua confiteatur Domino* (Bohorič 1584: 20), and implores their descendants

"per Deum immortalem"—parentum atque maiorum / eorum / laudatissimis vestigiis, quibus nihil prius neque antiquius fuit unquam, quam ut pietatis et liberalium artium studia, patrius honos et gloria, Virtute et sanguine maiorum parta, apud . . . charam posteritatem manerent integra (Bohorič 1584:20).

And he continues with the thought:

Hoc tam insigne depositum, agite quaeso apud vos pari cum laude et emolumento omnium, etiam conservetur (Bohorič 1584:20).

What Bohorič had in mind here is best expressed in the first passage of this eulogy, where he said:

Sic illi Magnanimi viri, vobis, quoque exemplo esse possunt, ut pro se quisque et certatim in id incumbatis, quo pietas, literarum studia, tum etia Gloria autta maiorum vestrorum, ad posteros pervenit, etiam vestro exemplo commendabilior (Bohorič 1584:22).

Let us transpose these words in the present-day situation! The leaders, "those who are ruling" society, are obligated to support adequately the Slovene cultural action; in fact, their support is nothing but the reimbursement to the Slovene community of that part of its riches which they are taking away from it for an expedient investment in all-national affairs, including the affairs concerning the State.

If we now pass to more concrete and specific linguistic aspects, we must say that Bohorič clearly understood that the 'leading,' i.e. 'the one who is ruling', must "learn the Slavic language"; he must consider it his "special honor" if he promotes it and stimulates his own people to strive

ut quam cultissime et rectissime scribant, et scripta ipsa Slavica legant, oblatumque divino nutu, in aeditis, iam Bibliis Slavicis, occasionem, non sint neglecturi, *but that* plebie etiam homines . . . brevi tempore, in percipiendis Elementis Slavicis, in sumpto, in tantum sint profecturi, ut, expeditius, sua lingua, sacra Biblia et legere et intelligere, facile queant (Bohorič 1584:20).

Unfortunately today, the language of the average educated Slovene (not to speak about a politician or an activist) cannot serve as an example of the educated Slovene language to be imitated by those who in fact imitate him, either formally or in the usage of the language. We have seen that this average Slovene intellectual is all too eager to treat his own language with disdain and to express himself poorly in a foreign language.

As for our "Provincial States" who are supposed to take care of the implementation of the highest cultural achievements, similar to the sixteenth century translation and printing of the Bible, one should say this: It is they who in the given circumstances should make it publicly crystal clear that the language of such a minor community as represented by the Slovenes, exists today in underprivileged conditions, and that it is indispensable to provide for its cultural needs with financial support of a larger percentage of the national income than in numerically stronger language communities. Only thus would the equality of rights of the *S*-languages be sufficiently protected in relation to *M*—(i.e., majority)—languages; only in such way would the books of an *S*-language cost the same as the books in the *M*-language. Analogically, this holds also for other cultural (and scholarly) areas, for instance for the theater, opera-houses, film production, and for all *S*-languages of national minorities elsewhere, in other states, as well. Otherwise we shall become an army of highly rarefied generals, with no soldiers, to be sure, i.e. without consumers of cultural goods, in particular of the so-called "simple people," underprivileged by their income and financial means. Every community, national included, is like a chain: it holds together only as much as it is strong in its weakest, numerically most fre-

quent link. It would be really bad if we had to think that our "Provincial States" believed that it would be possible to cultivate the larger strata of our nation in another, even though related language. The practice of our educational authorities is occasionally again forcing Slovene students to accept textbooks in foreign languages instead of providing them all in the native tongue. It is still worse with so-called TV and Radio school-programs which in fact are to a large extent denationalized, non-Slovene, while nobody would even try to change this harmful practice. This certainly cannot be positive and cannot be justified with excuses, such as the weak material basis of our society, while at the same time this same community is giving away to others its shares disproportional to its numbers which is the criterion for division of goods from above downwards.

Still more tragic would it be for Slovenes if they suddenly discovered that their "Provincial States" had accepted the idea that the entire "Slovene affair" could become incomparably less expensive if it were completely done away with, integrated into a larger element, as it were. In fact we are already doing this when we do not affirm and assert the Slovene language in all its functions in life, when we are undercutting its roots by consenting to the idea of "common-core-programs" in Slovene literature. Any such abnegation of our wholeness is to a high degree dangerous and is destroying the national, psychic and spiritual power of Slovene literature, including some other arts and all aspects of national life. That is to say: who is not firm in what concerns the nation, cannot be firm in what concerns the State. And yet, in fact, our State has been created to preserve the existence and independence of each of its linguistic national entities. That is why the struggle to overcome the national could be so harmful and dangerous.

Thus we are coming to the last theme of our discussion: the relation between brothers in language and between neighbors. Our two Protestant Reformers, Dalmatin and Bohorič, may serve as patterns for our time as well.

Dalmatin in the first paragraph of his *Vorrede* dedicates his Bible to:

den Wolgebornen, Edlen, Ehrneuesten, Fürsichtigen, Ehrsammen und weysen Herrn, Frauen, Freyherren, Rittern, denen vom Adel, Bürgern und allen Gottseligen Christen, in Fürstenthumen, Steyr, Kernten, und Crein, sampt den Incorporirten Herrschafften Windischer March, Metling, Ystereich, und Carst desessen (Bible of 1584: *Vorrede*, 1),

that is to the Inner Austrian Slavic community in whose adjacent dominions the Croatian language was also spoken. For the same reason some other South Slavic Reformers, including Pietro Paolo Vergerio, entertained the idea that the sixteenth-century Slovene literary language

might have been constituted in such a way that it would have included also the non-Slovene speakers of the entire area between the Eastern Alps and the Adriatic. This was in no way any longer possible, however, because on this territory there already existed two different languages. That is why Dalmatin wrote:

Und wiewol unser Creinerische sprach, auff die ich hierinn, als ein Creiner, fürnemlich gesehen, sich mit einer sonderbaren eigenschafft, etwas von den andern Windischen *Dialectis* abzeucht: So hab ich doch mit der *Orthographia*, und Schreibung der wörter, in ander weg, besonders, mit zusetzung etlicher wörter am rand, mit *asteriscis* verzeichnet, und hinten in ein Register, auch dahin mich bevlissen, das nit allein in Crein, Untersteyr und Kärnten, sondern auch in andern obgedachten Windischen Landen, diese meine vertolmetschung, so wol zu auffnehmung der sprachen selber, als zur befürderung reiner Lehr, fruchtbarlich, wie ich verhoff, mag gelesen und gebraucht werden (Bible of 1584: *Vorrede*, 8).

Therefore no mixing of linguistic elements in a kind of artificial, unrealistic literary language, nor any fusion of dialects; Dalmatin's language is the "*Creinerische Sprach*," all the rest is a matter of dictionaries. He applied this solution already in the first volume of his *Biblie, tv ie vsiqa svetiqa pisma pervi deil* of 1578, when he compiled "*Register v katerim so nekotere krajnske besede za Hrvatov ino drugih Slovincov volo v nih jezik stolmačene, de bodo le-te inu druge naše bukve bule zastopili*" (RUPEL 1966: 331), and once again in the Bible of 1584 with the "*Register Nekatérih besed, katére Crajnski, Coroshki, Slovénski ali Bezjázhki, Hervázki, Dalmatinski, Istrianski, ali Crashki, se drugázhi, govoré*" (RUPEL 1966:341). The Register of 1584, as we now know, was very probably compiled by Adam Bohorič. On the other hand, Bohorič in his "*Praefatiuncula*" consistently refers only to Styrians, Carinthians and Carniolans, while in the first part of his grammar, in the synoptic tables, reestablishes the relation between Cyrillic and Glagolitic graphic systems in comparison with Slovene writing.

Dalmatin's and Bohorič's views are, of course, inherited from Primož Trubar, who already in 1557 directed his *Ta pervi deil tiga noviga Testamenta* to Slovenes in a narrower sense, i.e. "to all pious Christians in Carniola, Lower Styria, Carinthia, Kras, Istria and in the Windisch Mark" (Rupel 1966: 71); and a little farther in the Preface in the same book he emphatically stresses: There is a Croatian language; it is written with two sorts of Croatian letters and is spoken not only in Croatia and Dalmatia, but also by many Turks, and in Constantinople in the court of the Ottoman rulers. "If needed, we Carniolans and Slovenes understand it even much better than the Czech, Polish or Lusatian language, and similarly the Croats do our Slovene" (Rupel 1966: 72-73).

Each language, Slovene and Croatian, must therefore have its own Bible. And not once Trubar tells us how much effort he invested in building his language: "I have made an effort to use words and phrases which can be easily understood by every Slovene, ones from Carniola, Lower Styria, Carinthia, Kras, Lower Carniola, or our Bezjaki. That is why I selected the Slovene peasants' speech as spoken in Raščica where I was born" (Rupel 1966: 80). In 1560, in *Ta drugi deil tige noviga Testamenta*, Trubar mentions a Croatian Bible which clearly speaks of the literary linguistic separation of Slovenes from Croats and of other peoples east of them. He drew in the Slovene cultural orbit the speakers of the dialects in the regions south of the Sava River and up to the Adriatic in Istria where Slovene dialects met with the Croatian language. In this way, except for Prekmurje, a region which joined the Slovene literary tradition much later, the boundary between the Slovene and Croatian literary languages was on the whole drawn by the sixteenth century. Let us keep it intact for ever.

The social situation of literary Slovene in 1584 did not differ substantially from where we stand in 1984. Neither in the matter of substance, concerning the existence of a literary language called Slovene, nor in questions of its geographic extent, and in particular not in the basic premises and propositions concerning the policies and dialectics of its social implementation and affirmation.

University of Ljubljana

REFERENCES

- Bible of 1584. *Biblia, tv ie, vse svetv pismv, stariga inu Noviga Testamenta Slouenski tolmazhena*, Skusi Ivria Dalmatina. Wittenberg.
- Bohorič, A., 1584. *Arcticae horulae succissive de latino Carniolana literatura* . . . Wittenberg.
- Rupel, M. (ed.) 1966. *Slovenski protestantski pisci*. Druga, dopolnjena izdaja. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.