

THE CONCEPT AND ROLE OF LANGUAGE IN THE FORMATION OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENTSIA IN SLAVIC SOCIETIES IN THE 18TH AND 19TH CENTURIES

Rado L. Lencek*

1. Introduction

This paper is premised on the observation that the processes leading to the emergence of the Slavic national systems and their subsequent institutionalization fit rather well into general models in which the sociocultural system is viewed from an evolutionary perspective. According to Max Weber, an initial interplay of the material interest and charismatic inspirations of the few becomes the 'life-style' of a distinct status group, and in turn eventually becomes the dominant orientation, the 'common value system' of a whole nation or civilization.¹ It is easy to think of the ethnic intelligentsia in Slavic societies, at the time of their National Revivals, in a charismatic role, transferring their values to the masses and thus pervading them with a common national consciousness. While the linguistic and social gulf between the masses and the status-competing non-Slavic groups explains the failure of the latter to impose its system, the linguistic and social bond between the masses and their own intellectual élites, who were engaged in the building of a new vernacular educational system (wherever such a bond existed²), explains and justifies the success and ultimate victory of this value system in Slavic societies. Hence the role of language in the formation of national intelligentsia in Slavic societies in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The conceptual frame of our discussion is sociocultural and linguistic, more precisely sociolinguistic, i.e., stipulated in terms of an interdependence and interaction between language and society. The time axis of our discussion is represented by the historical movement of the Slavic National revival, somewhat arbitrarily dated between the mid-eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries, and intellectually representing a Slavic Enlightenment and Romanticism where these literary and philosophical movements took root in Slavic society. The model to be presented, a single model from a universe of differentiating variables of the role of language, is that of the evolution of national intelligentsia in Slavic societies. What we propose to show is that from the nexus of sociolinguistic functions of literary languages, i.e., modern standard languages, at least one, the *prestige function*, should be added to the parameter of factors predicating the historical role of Slavic intelligentsia during their National Revivals.

2. Attitudes to Slavic Languages

2.0. The intellectual climate in Slavic societies at the beginning of their National Revivals, and the attitudes among their élites toward their native languages, may perhaps be best understood against a typology of general conceptions of the time about Slavic languages, their written traditions and their prospects for the future. There are three types of mental image of this kind which influenced the development of the Slavic written traditions during this period:³

First: the old Humanist-Slavic and later Baroque-Slavic truism, empirical if trivial, that all the Slavic peoples spoke (in the words of Bohorič 1584) *unam et eandem linguam*, implying that the written versions of this one language represented a mutually intelligible

linguistic continuum with no significant boundaries between the versions;

Second: the similarly old Humanist-Slavic cliché, that a common all-Slavic written language could be created to facilitate intellectual communication among the Slavic peoples (cf. Križanić 1666); such a *lingua communis* could be modeled on the grammar of Old Church Slavonic, or could be artificially constructed on the basis of the living Slavic dialects; and

Third: the pre-Romantic, German-made proposition that any uncorrupted speech of any illiterate society might at any time be developed into a written language and start its own literary tradition. According to a home-made Slavic, although initially also Humanist, sequel to this theory, in a group of dialect-type languages (like Greek or Slavic) an 'organic' evolution of the written dialects through coexistence and a process of mutual rapprochement would ultimately lead to one single written language which would supersede all its written dialectal varieties (cf. Kopitar 1808). The emphasis here was that literary languages were not to be created by decree by legal authorities, and that their creation did not require history, continuity and stability, or the elegance, taste and refinement of a sophisticated tradition.

It is easy to understand that the generations of Slavic élites who debated their *questione della lingua* ultimately resolved this gamut of designs in favor of the Romantic plan of an 'organic' evolution of the written dialects into independent literary languages. It is not however so easy to understand that they could not see the inconsistency that their proposition was built on a most obvious contradiction—namely, that the promotion of individuality cannot mean anything other than a retreat from what is shared; the more a particular Slavic written dialect affirmed its existence and the more it developed its own literature, the less it could be expected some day to renounce its specificity in favor of universality.

And this is what happened between 1750 and 1850: to the seven living written forms of Slavic, as they appear in the oldest scholarly classification, that by Schläözer (1771),—namely: Russian, Polish, Czecho-Moravian, Illyrian (today's Serbo-Croatian), Bulgarian, Windisch (Slovene) and Wendisch (Lusatian or Sorbian)⁴—the century-long promotion of coexistence and rapprochement resulted in the addition of six written varieties of language, each claiming to be literary. Five of them—Ukrainian, Slovak, Upper Sorbian and Lower Sorbian, and Kashubian—appeared on the agenda of the Prague Slavic Congress of 1848 and once again on that of the Moscow Slavic Congress of 1867; the sixth, Belorussian, was also acknowledged; all in all, with the one exception of Macedonian, just as they are today, nearly a century and a half later.⁵

2.1. Against this background the evolution of the Slavic literary languages proceeds through dilemmas and compromises, the resolutions of internal and external antinomies, the choices between the alternatives and adjustments of opposing principles, all of which are part of the development of every literary language. The external and internal integrational processes of this evolution are essentially sociolinguistic, in the sense that they concern the relations between language and society. Every step and aspect of the languages' growth, from the first choice of dialectal basis, of model of development, through the search for authenticity, the process of territorial expansion, the shaping of the norm and the promotion of stability, to the process of intellectualization—all represent sociolinguistic alternatives and their resolutions. When resolved, the choices begin to cluster behind the sociolinguistic *functions* of new languages: the unifying, the separating, the prestige functions; and behind the *attitudes* generated by them: language loyalty and language pride.⁶ Our discussion here will be limited to the prestige function and the attitude of pride, which represent the pivotal and integral function and attitude played by the new

Slavic literary languages in the charismatic mission of the Slavic native intelligentsia during their National Revivals.

2.2. Let me hasten to add that these dilemmas, as all matters concerning language, were in the Slavic societies of the time much more a part of a general concern with language than they are today. Prior to the nineteenth century it is safe to say that all manipulation of the native tongue—what today we call ‘language planning’—even though pre-scientific, was in the public domain of the national (better: pre-national, even ethnic) intelligentsia at large. And if what Meillet so aptly wrote in his *Les langues dans l'Europe nouvelle* of the late 1910s is true, that the European standard languages in general were simply the languages of ‘intellectual élites, created by and for élites,’⁷ then the case of the Slavic literary languages fits this judgment better than any other European languages; for they were created by an ethnic, pre-national or even national Slavic intelligentsia for its own self, for its own ethnic, pre-national or even national Slavic intelligentsia; in short, they were created by and for the Slavic élites of the time. In a sense, the story of dilemmas faced and of compromises conceded in the evolution of the literary languages which the Slavic intelligentsia helped to build cannot but mirror the story of this intelligentsia’s own dilemmas and compromises made during its quest for its linguistic and national identity.

3.0. Language Prestige

There are of course enormous differences between the sociolinguistic concept of the prestige attached to the possession of a vernacular, and that attached to the possession of an early written literary language of the pre-national period, and that attached to the possession of a modern standard language of a nationality.⁸ The value judgments that underlie prestige at these stages may simply be: the social solidarization of the individual speaker within the group; the idealization of or the almost academic estimation of the literary and cultural ideal of a society; or (as today in modern societies) an entirely pragmatic judgment, the assessment of the value and usefulness of a standard as a means for social advance. These varieties of language prestige can be found in societies in the pre-national and national evolution of their literary standards.

Thus, for instance, inside a closed regional dialect a particular linguistic feature may become an overt prestige symbol, the social solidarization of the speaker of that dialect. And contrarily, speakers of such a dialect who enter a different linguistic environment will make a serious effort to get rid of an idiosyncrasy of their regional dialect. Quoting an (abbreviated) observation from the Serbo-Croatian speech area:

Zašto Slavonac, Ličanin, Banijac, kada dodje u Zagreb počne govoriti zagrebačkom kajkavštinom, iako je njegov materinski govor gotovo identičan s književnim jezikom? . . . I zašto hercegovački seljak počinje u Dubrovniku govoriti dubrovačkim žargonom? . . . Uzrok je prestiž ljudi u čiji se govor ugleda,” (Peruško 1965: 35-36)

The ultimate reason lies in the prestige of the language pattern of the environment one wants to imitate.

The idealization and estimation of the literary and cultural values of a literary language in a pre-national period of its development deserves special attention in many Slavic societies. Thus, for instance, after their conversion to Christianity, the earliest attempts of Slavic communities to invest their vernacular with the privilege of being used in communication between man and God represented a sociolinguistically most significant event; it elevated the vernacular to a functional level, however restricted socially, which differed

from everyday usage and raised it to a new existence on a slightly higher level than that usage. The very first records of these texts in the Slavic languages already symbolize two primary sociolinguistic functions—the unifying and the prestige functions—however modest they may have been at the time. We should add that in the early written languages of pre-national stages, for instance in the oldest Slavic literary tradition, words and ideas like *slovo* (Greek *logos*), *buky* (Greek *gramma*), *künigy* (Greek *biblion*), and *slovo buküvinoe* assumed an idealizational prestige value characteristic of sociolinguistic attitudes toward language in a society recently introduced to literacy. Thus the tongue of the Scriptures, the tongue of the Gospel and of the ritual, the tongue of the pulpit and of the confessional, became a most important formative factor in the evolution of a common psychic system underlying the concept of Slavic ethnic solidarity first, and of Slavic nationality later. From generation to generation the tongue of the Gospel and of ritual carried a philosophy about language and its speakers that consisted of two precepts. One spoke of the existence of a Sunday or Holiday form of the language, raised to a level above the everyday vernacular and its dialectal varieties. The second affirmed the *charisma* of the mother tongue and preached the Christian duty of the faithful to preserve it and to pass it on to following generations. Precepts like these ran through innumerable threads which bound the language and its speakers in the histories of the Slavic nationalities. What this ancient philosophy tells us about language, however, is linked less to the social prestige of its speaker along the Addresser-Addressee axis of the speech act, than with the *dignitas* of the Context-Message-Code axis of the speech act in the linguistic situation (Jakobson 1960: 353).

And we should take particular note of the fact that at this stage of the evolution of ethnic solidarity the bearer of this message was the priest whose position in the communities was *charismatic* by definition—even when his activity and leadership went beyond pastoral care into educational and cultural missions among his people.

Then, at a point in time (in this evolutionary model), the secular native intelligentsia began to emerge in Slavic societies. At first there appeared individual scholars and poets, who by virtue of their talents were educated and inducted into the status groups of the dominant language. At a point of their careers they (for some specific reason) switched their allegiance from the language in which they were educated to the vernacular of their native culture. New written languages were created; religious texts, new translations of the Bible, and original poetic texts gave them *dignitas* which now meant *cultural prestige*; these were similar to, but not yet the same as, the *dignitas* and prestige of the dominant language.

With the growth of educational opportunities for the non-privileged classes of society, and with the opening of new professional channels and tasks into which the educated native intelligentsia could be drawn, the need for intellectuals increased. A new class of educated and semi-educated individuals—teachers, journalists, publicists, all kinds of literati, lawyers, priests and prelates, public officials—grew into a *new status group of native intellectual élites* which took upon themselves (as Max Weber would say) the leadership in their cultural *Gemeinschaft*. This new class now began to invoke the idea that they were to be the custodians of the development of their national literary language, the caretakers of its cultural prestige, and that they were specifically predestined to cultivate it as the most privileged peculiarity of their ethnic group, set off from others as a *nationality* or *nation*.

It is at this point that the value system of the ethnic intelligentsia, built on the recognition of the linkage of the common language of a community and nationality or nation, and of the linkage of a prestigious national literary language and the social prestige of its bearers in a society, began to enter the consciousness of members of Slavic societies. The native

intellectual élites whose position in society was *charismatic by social class* or *charismatic by the mission professed* declared their charismatic mission and assumed a charismatic authority in their movement. It is the recognition of this authority on the part of society, consisting of respect, loyalty, devotion and absolute trust in the leaders, which is decisive for the validity of *charisma* of intellectual élites of this kind.

4.0 The Language Question in the Mid-19th Century

And this is where we stand by the mid-nineteenth century. There were four theoretical possibilities for the solution of the language question which occupied Slavic philologists and intelligentsia at large during their National Revivals, viz., (a) to adopt *one* of the existing literary languages for *all* the Slavic communities; (b) to design a *lingua communis*, an artificial or a spontaneously developed written language for *all* the Slavic communities; (c) to promote the growth of *new written languages* and new literary traditions for a *pluralistic solution*; and (d) to develop a common written language *through an organic evolution* of the written dialects by means of coexistence and mutual rapprochement. Of these four possibilities, two practical solutions clashed in the final competition: either the Slavic communities could select and adopt *one single Slavic language to be shared by all, there and then*, or they could accept a rapprochement-type solution with several written languages and literatures which would be exposed to a process aimed at bringing them together in *one single language in the future*. The resolution of this practical dilemma was in the hands of the Slavic intelligentsias.

As shown elsewhere, the most popular solution of the language question among the Slavic intelligentsias of the time was the proposition that was sanctioned by a tenet which derived from the Age of Enlightenment: namely, all that is good should follow a natural course of evolution, should grow organically, without any interference from outside (Lencek 1971: 244-256). An *ad hoc* example of a literary standard with such an evolution was derived from the interpretation of the development of Ancient Greek, as supplied by contemporary classical philology. The literary koine of the pre-imperial period of classical Greece was a multiform literary language, based on four literary dialects: Eolic, Doric, Ionic and Attic, used side by side in the literature. In the course of literary development these dialects came to be characteristic of certain genres, and once their role was established the choice of one or another depended upon this factor rather than upon the native dialect of the author. A uniform graphic standard minimized the structural and lexical variation and concealed the differences in the pronunciation.

A Slavic version of the Greek-dialects model, as formulated for the first time by Kopitar (1808)—the principle of coexisting languages, calling for an immediate graphic standardization and a gradual integration in the course of evolution—remained for more than fifty years one of the most important ingredients of a Slavic linguistic ideology. While it was originally developed in the framework of an essentially integrative postulate, its ideas served more as a catalyst which accelerated the processes of differentiation among the Slavic literary standard languages. They molded the pluralistic concept of the Slavic literary languages (Šafárik 1826) and helped Karadžić and Gaj in engineering their great scheme (1850) for South Slavic linguistic integration. As Jan Ludvíkovský points out, these same ideas must have helped to shape the ideology of Kollár's "Greek Chapter" in his treatise on Slavic Reciprocities (1837) to a much higher degree than we are usually willing to recognize.

On the other hand, however, there is no doubt that a theory arguing in favor of a common language created by an 'organic' evolution of all individual written dialects, and therefore

proposing a deferment of its creation into the distant future, involves a most paradoxical contradiction. It is obvious that to promote individuality cannot mean anything other than to retreat from what is shared. By building stability and self-centredness in the individual, one weakens the possibility of subsequent integration. The more a particular written Slavic language affirmed its existence and the more it developed its own literature, the less it could be expected to some day renounce its specificity in favor of universality. Here lies the fundamental inconsistency in Kopitar's design. Only a decade later Šafárik, working with the same premises and still aiming at an ultimate integration, already spoke of an interim Slavic pluralism.

It was under the aegis of this concept—we have called it the Slavic version of the Greek-dialects model, an aesthetically and intellectually highly gratifying design of a national literary language—that a pluralistic evolution of the literary languages took root in the Slavic societies. The classical model and the enlightenment philosophy which lay behind it created a prestigious image and a culturological program shared by several generations of Slavic intelligentsia. Already in Adelung's time, the eighteenth century, this model was echoed in the Vienna, Prague and Kraków circles of the Slavic intelligentsia, and during the 1820s, 1830s and 1840s it echoed again in Pest, Novi Sad, Zagreb, and minor Slavic centers. Its practical implementation, i.e., the promotion of new written languages and literatures, meant the activation of the system of sociolinguistic functional machinery by means of which national literary standard languages operate: the *unifying*, the *separatist* and the *prestige* functions. At the very moment that these three standard-language functions are activated in a society, the *aesthetic concept* of a literary language must yield to the pressure of the sociolinguistic forces promoting the evolution of the language question in society. Thus, the idealistic *aesthetic concept* of a literary language above all of its dialects changed to the *pragmatic concept* of a national literary standard for each and every written dialect, with its contradictory premise resolved into an affirmation of the plurality of the Slavic languages and cultures.

5.0. The Moscow Congress of 1867

As is well known, the final dilemma—one single Slavic language to be shared by all, immediately, *versus* a plurality of Slavic languages and cultures, for the distant future—was put on the agenda of the Slavic Congress, the *Slavjanskij s'ezd*, in Moscow in May 1867, where it was stated clearly and explicitly by two spokesmen for the non-Russian Slavic intelligentsia in attendance. It may be worth noting that there were gathered at the 1867 Congress about a hundred non-Russian Slavic delegates: writers and poets, professors and teachers, priests and prelates, lawyers, economists, scholars and publicists; representatives of new charismatic Slavic institutions, scholarly societies, museums and libraries; architects, doctors, industrialists, merchants and noblemen.⁹ The two spokesmen of this most representative body of the Slavic intelligentsia of the time publicly articulated their own predisposition about the Slavic language question, by infusing into their statements their own personal and collective charismatic vision.

First, there was František Rieger, a forty-nine year old representative of the Czech intelligentsia, a prestigious status group with a definite charismatic mission, fighting for the recognition of the principle of a plurality of Slavic languages and cultures. In his speech before the distinguished audience at the University of Moscow Rieger recaptured the intellectual essence of the Western and Southern Slavs' view about the language problem of Slavic societies at the culmination of their National Revivals by reiterating the traditional Czech position on this question:

“The Slavic dialects are so close to one another that, were it the will of God, we would now be one nation in literature and language. But God, the fortunes of our thousand-year history, and our adversities did not wish it so. . . [Therefore] in this respect, gentlemen, two paths lie before us: we must choose either complete unity, or diversity in harmony. For all of us this question has especial significance, gentlemen; we must subject it to mature discussion. The fate of the whole of Slavdom will be decided by the solution to this question. In this question I always recall the example of the Greeks who, in spite of all the differences among their dialects, nevertheless advanced the excellent flower of enlightenment. These blooms of Ancient Greek civilization developed in all their heterogeneity . . . This, gentlemen, is the path which Slavdom must now follow. Many would perhaps prefer a confluence into a single whole, body and soul, but a thousand years of history cannot disappear without a trace. I think that the example of the Greeks, who by this path reached a level of enlightenment never before attained, can serve as a consolation for us and ensure for us a great future. . . I hold this view, gentlemen, that diversity of parts does not exclude unity; [but] the unity must be sought in the harmony of the parts. An indivisible unity can lead to uniformity and lifelessness, just as simple fragmentation without a leading spirit can lead to weakness and destruction,” (*Vserossijskaja vystavka 299-303*).

Second, there was a young Serbian university student, the twenty-three year old Vladan Djordjević, then known as the founder of the patriotic organization *Omladina* and one day to become prime minister of Serbia; at the Moscow Congress he represented Slavic intellectuals who were a full generation younger than Rieger. Speaking at the banquet at Sokolniki, he most eloquently acted as a spokesman of a new Slavic “status group” which claimed its own charismatic social esteem, status interest and status monopoly, linked with the sociolinguistic evolution of the new national literary languages of the non-Russian Slavic societies of the time. He argued that:

“A thousand years of separation has endowed each branch of the Slavic family with an individuality of its own, which not only does not permit each of them to become a member of one enormous whole, but also makes such a step dangerous for the whole of Slavdom. What would men of letters gain by adopting a common literary language such as Russian? They would create among the Slavic nations a single caste of litterateurs, and the nations themselves would not understand their own literature.” (*Vserossijskaja vystavka 365-366*).

6.0. Conclusion

It is here that we come to what is probably the central focus of the analysis of the relation between language and intelligentsia in Slavic societies during their National Revivals. In terms of the historical uniqueness of each separate Slavic society, at different yet similar stages of their evolution, over a period of three generations, a new social group of educated individuals were raised to a prestige status in their societies. With time this new group of Slavic intellectuals, with a more or less strong sense of personal identity and collective responsibility for the community of their cultural and linguistic order, assumed a *charismatic mission* in their societies. They became the bearers of cultural and social innovations, such as (among the most elementary kinds of charismatic innovation) the institutionalization of literary, pre-national and national languages, and the creation of perhaps the very

first prestigious institutions and symbols for the development of social and cultural life in their societies.

And it stands to reason that charismatic innovations, including spoken and written literary languages, once implemented and institutionalized, tended to maintain the legitimacy of their own existence, of their values, symbols and norms. Once new ethnic, national languages (in particular) became part of the personal charisma of the educated members of society, they assumed the social prestige of charismatic intelligentsia; when institutionalized, the new status groups and their national languages began to share in the dynamic qualities of charisma which have been directing the destiny of Slavic societies ever since.

Columbia University

NOTES

- * To explain the emergence of the Slovene national system and its institutionalization, Toussaint Hočevar in one of his most unassuming footnotes (1975: 27-28) very perceptibly pointed to the possibility of applying Max Weber's sociological analyses of the processes of institution-building and cultural creativity in societies to the evolution of the socioeconomic and sociocultural system of the Slovene National revival. In my contribution to this posthumous Festschrift in his honor, I am attempting to show how Max Weber's concepts of charisma and its institutional implications bring a linguist to the consideration of the place of the charismatic in the process of national language-building in Slavic societies. This paper was prepared for and delivered at the Symposium "The Formation of the Slavic and Balkan Cultures in the 18th and 19th Centuries" which was held at the Institut slavanovedenija i balkanistiki AN SSSR, Moscow, November 24-25, 1987, and organized under the aegis of the American Council of Learned Societies/Soviet Academy of Sciences Commission on the Humanities and Social Sciences.
1. Max Weber (1864-1920), German sociologist, historian and economist; the principal challenge to his theory was the Marxist idea of economic determinism. In his theory of the sociological factors that shape history he tried to show that religious and ethical ideas were of overwhelming significance and that the principal instigators of historical change are special status groups, endowed with social esteem and prestige, their own style of life and status monopolies in society. See in particular Weber 1904-05, 1921, and 1922; and also Eisenstadt 1968, Bendix 1962, Shils 1965, and Osipov 1980.
 2. The historiographic division of Slavic societies into a *Slavia orthodoxa* and a *Slavia romana* (Picchio 1984), with zones of overlapping influence, e.g., Ukraine and Belorussia, only partially represents the variety of culturological evolutions of Slavic societies during the National Revival period. In fact, in a systematic study of Slavic societies every single linguistic community represents a differentiating variable relevant to the problem under discussion. Until they are fully and explicitly stated and separately and distinctively analyzed, no general pattern or trend can be assumed to have existed in Slavic societies.
 3. On this subject, see Weingart 1928 and Lencek 1983, 1985.
 4. See Schlözer 1771.
 5. See Kohn 1960, Vserossijskaja vystavka 1867.
 6. As is well-known, there are three sociolinguistic functions that characterize literary languages—the unifying, the separating, and the prestige functions—that are essentially symbolic, and a fourth, the so-called frame-of-reference function, which is not. The first three are paralleled by three sociolinguistic attitudes: language loyalty, pride, and awareness of norm. As defined by the Prague School of Linguists (Havránek 1932, Mathesius 1932) by the unifying function we designate the function of a standard language with which (by unifying several areas into a single standard-language community) it prompts the identification of the individual speaker with the standard-language community; by the separating function, we mean its function to demarcate a speech community as separate from its neighbors. The other two functions refer to the prestige which results from the possession of a standard language, and to the function of the standard language as a system that serves to orient the speaker in matters of correctness and of the

- perception and evaluation of speech. Of the corresponding attitudes, language loyalty is linked to the unifying and the separating functions, and with them to the broader attitudes of nationalism; pride is linked to the prestige function; and awareness of norm is linked to the frame-of-reference function. It is these sociolinguistic elements, functions, and attitudes that we conceive as determinants in the evolution of language.
7. "Comme le français, et en partie presque autant, l'anglais, l'italien, l'espagnol, le portugais, l'allemand, le polonais sont les langues traditionnelles, créées par des élites pour des élites, qu'on ne peut parler et écrire qu'au prix d'un sérieux apprentissage et dont la pratique suppose une forte culture." Meillet 1928: 175.
 8. It may be useful here to define the sociolinguistic attributes of the concepts *prestige*, *dignity* and *charisma* as used in our discussion, on the axis of the speech act in a linguistic situation (Jakobson 1960: 353). *Prestige* and *dignity* relate to language, but differ in their referents: in the main the latter, *dignitas*, implies the addressee, while the former, *prestige*, refers to the addresser. Hence the basic meaning of prestige, as defined, e.g., in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary of 1977: "the power to command admiration or esteem," or, in Weinreich's (1953: 79) sociolinguistic definition, the "usefulness of a language as a means for social advance." The concepts *charisma*, *personal charisma*, *charismatic mission*, on the other hand, are attributed to the addresser and are inherently and intrinsically correlated with an addresser's positions of authority and social prestige. Thus the sociolinguistic prestige attached to the possession of a language may be conceived as a marker of status emanating from the charismatic mission of an élite social group of this kind—as the intelligentsia always was in Slavic societies.
 9. The number of official non-Russian delegates at the *Moscow Congress* of 1867 included: 28 Serbs (16 from the Austro-Hungarian lands and 12 from the Principality of Serbia), 2 delegates from the Principality of Montenegro, 27 Czechs and Moravians, 10 Croats, 4 Ukrainians, 3 Slovaks, 3 Slovenes, 2 Lusatian Sorbs and 1 Bulgarian from the Ottoman Empire.—A professional breakdown of these delegates is as follows: 12 university professors and high-school teachers, 11 high-ranking ecclesiastics and priests, 10 lawyers, 10 scholars and publicists, 4 journalists, several writers and poets, 4 higher public officials, 2 vojvodas, 3 secular landowners, 2 medical doctors, 1 librarian, 1 architect, and 4 representatives of leading Slavic scholarly and cultural institutions. The latter included representatives from the *Srpsko učeno društvo*, *Društvo za jugoslavensku povijest i starine* and the Czech Museum. See *Vserossijskaja vystavka* 111-15, passim.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bendix, R. 1962. *Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait*. Garden City NY: Doubleday.
- Bohorič, A. 1584. *Arcticae horulae succissive de latino Carniolana literatura . . .* Wittenberg.
- Eisenstadt, S.N. 1968. "Introduction: Charisma and institution building: Max Weber and modern sociology," ix-lvi in S.N. Eisenstadt, ed., *Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building. Selected Papers*. London & Chicago: U Chicago P.
- Fishman, A.J. 1971. *Language and Nationalism. Two Integrative Essays*. Rowley MA: Newbury House.
- Garvin, P.L. 1959. "The standard language problem: concepts and methods," *Anthropological Linguistics* 1/2: 28-31.
- Havránek, B. 1932. "Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura," 32-48 in B. Havránek & M. Weingart, eds., *Pražský Linguistický Kroužek: Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura*. Prague: Melantrich [= *Vyhledy* 14].
- Hočevar, T. 1975. "Economic determinants in the development of the Slovene national system," 27-78 in R.L. Lencek, ed., *Papers in Slovene Studies 1975*. New York: Society for Slovene Studies.
- Jakobson, R. 1960. "Closing statement: Linguistics and Poetics," 350-377 in T.A. Sebeok, ed., *Style in Language*. Cambridge MS, New York & London: MIT Technology Press & Wiley.
- Kohn, H. 1960. *Pan-Slavism, Its History and Ideology*, 2nd. rev. ed.. New York NY: Knopf and Random House [Vintage Books].
- Kollár, J. 1837. *Über die literarische Wechselseitigkeit zwischen der verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slavischen Nation. Aus dem Slavischen, in der Zeitschrift Hronka gedruckten, ins Deutsche übertragen und verm. vom Verfasser*. Pest: Trattner-Karolyschen Schriften.

- Kopitar, J. 1808. *Grammatik der slavischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyermark*. Ljubljana: Korn.
- Križanić, J. 1666. *Gramatično izkázanje ob rúskom jezíku*. Ms. published in *Čteníja v Imperatorskom Obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskix pri Moskovskom universitete, Moscow, 1868*.
- Lencek, R.L. 1968. "The theme of the Greek koine in the concept of a Slavic common language and Matija Majar's model," 258-285 in *American Contributions to the Sixth International Congress of Slavists. Prague, 1968, August 7-13. Vol. I: Linguistic Contributions*. The Hague: Mouton.
- , 1971. "Kopitar's Slavic versions of the Greek dialects theme," 269-301 in W.E. Harkins, O. Horbatsch & J.P. Hursky, eds., *Symbolae in Honorem Georgii Y. Shevelov*. München: Ukrainian Free U. [= Universitas Libera Ucrainensis, Facultas Philosophica, Studia 7].
- , 1983. "The enlightenment's interest in language and national revival of the South Slavs," *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* 10: 111-134.
- , 1985a. "A paradigm of Slavic national evolution: Bible - Grammar - Poet," *Slovene Studies* 6: 57-71.
- , 1985b. "On sociolinguistic determinants in the evolution of Slavic literary languages," 39-51 in G. Stone & D. Worth, eds., *The Formation of the Slavonic Literary Languages. Proceedings of a Conference Held in memory of Robert Auty and Anne Pennington at Oxford 6-11 July 1981*. Columbus OH: Slavica.
- Ludvíkovský, J. 1947. "Slovanský humanismus obrozenský (Kollárova anticko-křesťanská syntéza)," 93-119 in J. Macůrek, ed., *Slovanství v českém národním životě: sborník úvah profesorů Masarykovy university*. Brno: Rovnost.
- Mathesius, V. 1932. "O požadavku stability ve spisovném jazyku," 14-31 in B. Havránek & M. Weingart, eds., *Pražský Linguistický Kroužek: Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura*. Prague: Melantrich [= Vyhledy 14].
- Meillet, A. 1928. *Les langues dans l'Europe nouvelle*. 2nd ed.. Paris: Payot.
- Osipov, G.V., ed. 1980. *Neomarksizm i problemy sociologii kul'tury*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Peruško, T. 1965. *Razgovori o jeziku u Istri*. Pula: "Glas Istre".
- Picchio, R. 1984. "Guidelines for a comparative study of the language question among the Slavs," 1-42 in R. Picchio & H. Goldblatt, eds., *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*. New Haven CN: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies.
- Schlözer, A.L. von. 1771. *Allgemeine nordische Geschichte. I-II. Aus den neusten und besten nordischen schriftstellern und nach eigenen untersuchungen beschrieben*. . . . Halle: Gebauer.
- Shils, E.A. 1965. "Charisma, order and status," *American Sociological Review* 30: 199-213.
- Šafárik, J. 1826. *Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten*. Ofen: Mit. Kön. Ung. Universitäts-Schriften.
- Vserossijskaja vystavka 1867 = Vserossijskaja ètnografičeskaja vystavka i Slavjanskij s"ezd v mae 1867 goda*. Moscow: Universitetskaja tipografija.
- Weber, M. 1904-05. *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus*, trans. T. Parsons, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1930.
- , 1921. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, trans. *Economy and Society, an Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, eds. G. Roth and C. Wittich. New York NY: Bedminster Press, 1968.
- , 1922. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1924 ed.)
- Weingart, M. 1928. "O politických a sociálních složkách v starších dějinách spisovných jazyků slovanských, zvláště církevněslovanského," 157-187 in M. Weingart & alii, eds., *Z dějin východní Evropy a Slovanstva. Sborník věnovaný Jaroslavu Bidlovi*. Prague: Bečková.
- Weinreich, M. 1953. *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*. New York NY: Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York, 1.
- Zlydnev, V.I. & alii, eds. 1985. *Koncepcii nacional'noj xudožestvennoj kul'tury narodov central'noj i jugo-vostočnoj Evropy XVIII-XIX vekov*. Moscow: Nauka.

POVZETEK

**JEZIK IN NJEGOVA VLOGA V OBLIKOVANJU SLOJA
NARODNEGA IZOBRAŽENSTVA V SLOVANSKIH DRUŽBAH
18-TEGA IN 19-TEGA STOLETJA**

Prispevek sloni na dveh teoretskih izhodiščih: sociolingvističnem, slonečem na razvojni soodvisnosti in medsebojnem vplivanju jezika in družbe v vsakem obdobju razvoja knjižnih standardov; in sociološkem, ki ta razvoj vključuje v funkcijsko soodvisnost med novim etničnim-nacionalnim jezikom in njegovim glavnim nosilcem in pokroviteljem v družbi - slojem prednacionalno orientiranega izobraženstva v obdobju njegovega nacionalnega prebujanja. Analiza se predvsem ustavlja ob sociolingvistični prestižni funkciji novih knjižnih jezikov in na sociološki prestižni poziciji njihovih nosilcev in pokroviteljev v družbi, na katerih sloni njihovo karizmatično poslanstvo.

V obdobju prednacionalnega razvoja posameznih slovanskih družbenih skupnosti so si prve generacije njihovih izobražencev v več ali manj tesnem jezikovnem stiku s svojimi etničnimi sredinami pridobile prestižni položaj v svojih skupnostih. S časom so si novi etnično-nacionalni izobraženci, z močnejšim ali šibkejšim občutkom za lastno identiteto in za kolektivno odgovornost do svoje kulturne in jezikovne skupnosti, pridobili sloves karizmatičnih voditeljev svojih skupnosti. Ti izobraženci so bili nosilci kulturnih in družbenih inovacij, institucionaliziranja novih prednacionalnih in nacionalnih jezikov, ustvarjanja prvih prestižnih institucij in etnično-nacionalnih ikon in simbolov, na katerih je rastlo kulturno in socialno življenje v njihovih družbah. Institucionalizacija teh inovacij in njih legitimizacija, ki je slonela na osebni karizmi izobražencev v družbi, je tako postala deležna socialnega prestiža karizmatičnega izobraženstva. Tako sta novo nacionalno izobraženstvo in njegov narodni jezik pričela participirati na 'dinamiki karizme', ki je odslej vodila usodo slovanskih narodov.