

## THE LINGUISTIC REVIVAL AMONG THE SLAVS OF THE AUSTRIAN EMPIRE, 1780–1850: THE ROLE OF INDIVIDUALS IN THE CODIFICATION AND ACCEPTANCE OF NEW LITERARY LANGUAGES<sup>1</sup>

### I

It is by now a commonplace that a literary language,<sup>2</sup> though it may be based on a particular dialect, never remains identical with that dialect but develops its own characteristic features in all spheres—in phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicon. Thus the Central Bohemian dialect spoken in and around Prague was the source of literary Czech when it first emerged in the fourteenth century; but this dialect is today distinct in many respects from the standard language accepted as the norm by educated speakers. Even languages that have been consciously established in their written form by scholars and writers in more recent times are distinguished in many ways from the local dialects from which they have sprung. Literary Macedonian, for instance, is based on the Central Macedonian dialects, but is not identical, even in phonology, with any one of them.<sup>3</sup>

The divergence, whether gradual and unconscious or deliberate and imposed, results from the very nature and function of the literary language. It is one of the great merits of the Prague linguistic school of the 1930's that it revealed and defined the functional differences that largely determine the differences of form which exist between standard and dialect, but also between different planes of the standard language itself.<sup>4</sup> Once a community has reached a certain stage of social development it feels the need for a means of communication which will be of general, not merely local validity; and the uses which this national language serves are wider and more varied than those for which local forms of the spoken language are adequate. The most fundamental difference between the 'general' and 'local' forms of the language is that the former exists primarily as a written language, the latter primarily (often exclusively) as a spoken language.

As the two forms of language exist, as it were, on different planes, so does their development proceed on different lines. Modern dialectology has shown that the history of local forms of speech is closely tied up with the political, administrative, social and religious history of the communities concerned.<sup>5</sup> A literary language is

<sup>1</sup> This paper is intended to be presented to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists at Moscow in September 1958. I wish to express my thanks to the Leverhulme Trustees whose generosity allowed me the leisure and resources to collect much of the material that is discussed here.

<sup>2</sup> The term is used here not merely for the language of *belles lettres* but in the sense of German *Schriftsprache*, Czech *spisovný jazyk*. My use of the term is parallel to that of Serbo-Croat (*književni jezik*) or Russian (*литературный язык*).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Bl. Koneski, *Грамматика на македонскиот литературен јазик*, I (Skopje, 1952), 46 f.

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague*, I (1929), Thèse 3 ('Problèmes des recherches sur les langues de diverses fonctions'), especially pp. 15–17; B. Havránek and M. Weingart (ed.), *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura* (Prague, 1932); B. Havránek, 'K funkčnímu rozvrstvení spisovného jazyka', *Časopis pro moderní filologii*, xxviii (1942), 409–16.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. A. Kellner, *Úvod do dialektologie* (Prague, 1954), pp. 29–35.

just as closely bound up with the changing circumstances of a particular community, though a wider one. Here, however, changes in the language may be introduced or proposed by the conscious efforts of individuals or institutions (grammarians, writers, academies, even politicians). But it is the community at large, or a dominant section of it, that has the final say. *A priori* it would be reasonable to expect that such individual influences played a predominant part in the formation of those numerous literary languages that have emerged in the last two hundred years. The systematic study of literary languages is still in its beginnings, however; and it remains to be demonstrated in each separate case how far modern literary languages owe their specific character to the ideas, the prejudices and the authority of particular individuals. The aim of the present paper is to consider the way in which this factor affected a group of closely related languages at a decisive period of their history.

## II

The period between 1780 and 1850 saw the acceptance by the Slavs of the Austrian Empire of four literary languages: Czech, Slovak, Serbo-Croat and Slovene. The new Czech represented a revived form of an old-established literary language; Serbo-Croat and Slovene emerged as languages based in part on the popular speech of the day but in part also on older literary languages; Slovak was alone in that its exclusive source was the living spoken language in contradistinction to all written languages previously used among the Slovaks.

Whereas in 1780 the Slavonic vernaculars of the Habsburg domains were only sporadically used in writing (and even then in an almost chaotic variety of local, unstandardized forms), by 1850 the existence of literary Czech, Slovak, Serbo-Croat<sup>1</sup> and Slovene as clearly defined entities was apparent. The present paper is concerned with the processes by which the three first-named languages came to be accepted in this period. In each of these three cases a particular individual played an authoritative part: Dobrovský, Štúr, Gaj. Slovene will not be considered here, for in the history of that language during the period under discussion no single individual, not even Kopitar, looms as large as the three already mentioned.<sup>2</sup>

## III

Modern literary Czech, resuscitated after long neglect, was codified by the great scholar Josef Dobrovský in his *Ausführliches Lehrgebäude der böhmischen Sprache* (Prague, 1809; a revised edition appeared in 1819 as *Lehrgebäude der böhmischen Sprache*<sup>3</sup>). The central importance of Dobrovský's grammar is generally admitted: with his codification a new period begins in the history of the Czech literary language.<sup>4</sup> The essential features of this codification have been succinctly charac-

<sup>1</sup> Only the formation of the Croatian variety of the unitary Serbo-Croat literary language is to be considered here. Developments among the Serbs outside the Austrian Empire will be considered only in so far as they affected the Croats.

<sup>2</sup> I hope to consider this question on another occasion.

<sup>3</sup> Both editions have been reprinted in Josef Dobrovský, *Podrobná mluvnice jazyka českého v redakcích z roku 1809 a 1819* (= *Spisy a projevy Josefa Dobrovského*, ix), (Prague, 1940).

<sup>4</sup> '...Je to... ještě dnes, po více než 130 letech dílo základní, výchozí a opěrný bod vývoje nové spisovné češtiny.' (František Trávníček, 'Význam Josefa Dobrovského pro český národní jazyk', in *Josef Dobrovský 1753–1953* (Prague, 1953), p. 95.)

terized by B. Havránek.<sup>1</sup> Two other Czech grammars of importance had appeared in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, those of F. J. Tomsa (1782) and F. M. Pelcl (1795). That of Tomsa showed distinct affinities with the usage of the small body of Czech literature that had been appearing in the eighteenth century: it tended to accept a few popular or colloquial elements in phonology and morphology.<sup>2</sup> That of Pelcl, on the other hand, was conservative in the extreme. He accepted and reproduced the literary norm of the sixteenth century, the period of the Kralice Bible and of the humanistic language of Veleslavín.<sup>3</sup> Dobrovský steered a middle course between these two opposing tendencies. While for him too the language of the sixteenth century was the norm, he noted, without recommending, certain popular variants of the traditional phonology (-ej- for -ý-, ý (= i:) for é).<sup>4</sup> In the sphere of vocabulary too it is clear that he wished to remain as close as possible to the language of tradition. He wrote, for instance, on 23 October 1790 to his friend the philologist and historian F. Durich, asking for lists of Czech words not included in Tomsa's dictionary, and added:

Nec volo, ut obsoletorum majorem habeatis rationem, quam eorum, quae in scriptis aureae aetatis occurrunt et etiamnum usurpantur.<sup>5</sup>

He thus envisaged literary Czech as the direct continuation of the language of the sixteenth century. That he was, however, no blind follower of tradition for its own sake is apparent from his recommendations concerning the orthographic representation of the sound *i*. The traditional orthography of the *Unitas fratrum* (exemplified in the Kralice Bible) used *y* after *c*, *s*, *z*, but in other cases *i* or *y* according to etymological principles.<sup>6</sup> Dobrovský here restored the 'etymological' *i* or *y* in all cases. Philological sense here overrode loyalty to tradition.<sup>7</sup>

The prime importance which Dobrovský ascribed to the language of the 'golden age' of the late sixteenth century<sup>8</sup> is apparent from his *Geschichte der böhmischen Sprache* of 1791:

So groß auch das Verzeichniß der böhmischen Bücher, welche seit 12 Jahren in Böhmen, Mähren und Ungarn erschienen sind, ausfallen mag, so häufig auch die böhmischen Schauspiele, die in der Neustadt Prag seit einigen Jahren mehr Malen in der Woche gegeben werden, besucht werden mögen, so nahmhaft auch die Anzahl der Pränumeranten auf die böhmische Zeitung sein mag, so zweifle ich doch sehr, daß die böhmische Sprache im Ganzen zu einem wirklich und merklich größern Grade der

<sup>1</sup> B. Havránek, 'Spisovný jazyk český', in *Československá vlastivěda*, řada II (Prague, 1936), p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> See B. Havránek, op. cit. pp. 83 f.

<sup>3</sup> He retained, for instance, the distinction between hard and soft *l*, long extinct, because it is found in the Kralice Bible.

<sup>4</sup> *Ausführliches Lehrgebäude...*, 3.

<sup>5</sup> A. Patera (ed.), *Korrespondence Josefa Dobrovského*, I (= *Sbírka pramenův ku poznání literárního života v Čechách, na Moravě a v Slezsku*, II, 2), (Prague, 1895), p. 208.

<sup>6</sup> *i* and *y* had designated separate sounds in Old Czech but coalesced as *i* in the early modern period.

<sup>7</sup> A different approach to this question (as to the whole problem of orthography) was made by Anton Bernolák, who in his Slovak grammar (*Grammatica slavica...* (Bratislava, 1790)) dispensed with the letter *y* and represented the phoneme *i* by the single letter *i*. In this he was following a suggestion of the earlier grammarian Pavel Doležal (*Grammatica Slavico-Bohemica* (Bratislava, 1746), pp. 3 f.). It is significant that Dobrovský followed Doležal in the arrangement of his grammar but not in any such radical departure from the norms of the older language.

<sup>8</sup> The term 'golden age' occurs in the heading of chapter 9: 'Fünfte Periode, die man das schöne oder goldene Zeitalter der böhmischen Sprache nennen könnte.'

Vollkommenheit gebracht werden könne, als sie unter K. Rudolphs Regierung d.i. in dem goldenen Zeitalter war, zumal da dieß von so vielen zufälligen äußern Umständen abhängt, die nicht in unsrer Gewalt stehen. Patriotische Wünsche... können in der ganzen Masse der Nation keine Revolution bewirken, wenn sie gleich dazu dienen, manchen zum größern Fleiße anzuapornen. Desto schätzbarer bleiben uns die übrig gebliebenen Denkmale unsrer Sprache aus denjenigen Zeiten, wo sie nicht nur die Redesprache des gemeinen Mannes, sondern zugleich auch die Rede- und Schriftsprache des gesittetsten und aufgeklärtesten Theils der Nation war, und jenen Grad der Vollkommenheit erreichte, dessen sie nach dem damaligen Maße der Kenntnisse und des Geschmackses fähig war.<sup>1</sup>

This passage is a significant illustration of Dobrovský's views on the Czech language: on the one hand he praises the exemplary character of the language of the 'golden age' while on the other he views with sceptical reserve the possibilities of a linguistic revival. In the expanded second edition of the same work, published in the following year,<sup>2</sup> Dobrovský was even more doubtful of the value for the Czech language of the vernacular theatrical performances that had been given in Prague since 1786:

Ich gönne vom Herzen diese Unterhaltung derjenigen Klasse von meinen Landsleuten, die das deutsche Theater nicht besuchen können, zweifle aber sehr, daß dadurch die böhmische Sprache im Ganzen gewinnen werde...<sup>3</sup>

The language of these performances was no doubt rough and popular; and Dobrovský was concerned to preserve and study a language of refinement and culture. He was still pessimistic as to the possibility of the Czech language ever again reaching its former heights.<sup>4</sup>

Thus Dobrovský's codification of literary Czech is firmly based on his respect for the language of the 'golden age' which he regarded as the classical form of his native tongue. Where he modified sixteenth-century usage it was in order to remove what was arbitrary or unsystematic.<sup>5</sup> Dobrovský's grammar, therefore, like that of Pelcl marks a certain reaction against the Czech grammatical tradition of the past hundred and fifty years. Rosa, Doležal and Tomsa<sup>6</sup> had all made some concessions to the changes that had affected the spoken language since the sixteenth century: Dobrovský did not accept these any more than he did the ridiculous neologisms of Pohl.<sup>7</sup> He was by training and instinct a scholar, not a reformer. His attitude to language is well characterized in words used by his disciple, the Slovene scholar Kopitar, in another connexion:

... Wir sind nur Historiker, und sollen so berichten, wie wir es gefundenen.<sup>8</sup>

With the spread of rationalist ideas over Europe the scholarly study of history had come into being, and had brought in its train the systematic and historical approach to the study of language. Dobrovský came to Slavonic philology by way of Biblical

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 363.

<sup>2</sup> *Geschichte der böhmischen Sprache und Literatur* (Prague, 1792). All three editions of this work (1791, 1792 and 1818) are reprinted in *Spisy a projevy Josefa Dobrovského*, VII, ed. B. Jedlička (Prague, 1936).

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit. p. 215.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. pp. 216 f.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. in his ruling on the use of *i* and *y* (see above p. 394).

<sup>6</sup> Václav Rosa, *Čechořečnost seu Grammatica linguae Bohemicae* (Prague, 1672); Pavel Doležal, *Grammatica Slavico-Bohemica* (Bratislava, 1746); F. J. Tomsa, *Böhmische Sprachlehre* (Prague, 1782).

<sup>7</sup> J. W. Pohl, *Grammatica linguae bohemicae oder die böhmische Sprachkunst* (Vienna, 1756).

<sup>8</sup> In a letter to Ignac Kristianović of 4 May 1838 (*Arhiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku*, XII (1875), 98).

textual criticism;<sup>1</sup> and his work on literary Czech was just as much a fruit of philological interest as of patriotism.<sup>2</sup>

Dobrovský's doubts about the future of the Czech language were not confirmed. Within a few decades of the appearance of his grammar more Czech books had been printed than during the whole of the 'golden age'. A new literary language was coming into being; and its use was gradually being extended to all fields of writing and to all levels of social intercourse. The causes of this development will not be considered here.<sup>3</sup> It is, however, necessary to consider how far the new literary language followed the pattern laid down by Dobrovský.

Modern literary Czech, as it emerged in the 1850's in the works of, say, Erben, Havlíček and Němcová, was essentially identical in phonology and morphology with the language recorded in Dobrovský's grammar. In vocabulary, of course, there had been an immense expansion, to meet new needs of expression;<sup>4</sup> and in orthography the Gothic letters had been superseded by Roman with some small modifications of the traditional system. In a few details the new language appears even more archaic than that of Dobrovský.<sup>5</sup> Earlier the situation had been rather more fluid. Certain characteristic features of colloquial Prague speech (based on the Central Bohemian dialect) can still be found in the works of Mácha.<sup>6</sup> Even in the 1840's the language of Tyl's plays showed many characteristics that later came to be regarded as popular or even vulgar;<sup>7</sup> and this is also true of the early work of Havlíček.<sup>8</sup>

Nor had attempts been lacking to initiate a more radical departure from the norm laid down by Dobrovský. Jan Kollár, the first notable poet to write in the new Czech, had advocated, and to some extent introduced, arbitrary modifications of the literary language with the aim of making it more melodious.<sup>9</sup> These ideas were taken up by F. D. Trnka and V. P. Žák (Žiak): both these writers wished to make Czech more euphonious by introducing Moravian dialectal elements.<sup>10</sup> All such aberrations from the traditional norm were rejected, however. This rejection was due in no small measure to the authority of František Palacký who as editor of the influential journal *Časopis českého musea* upheld the forms of the older language and specifically attacked Trnka's neologisms in an important article: 'O českém jazyku spisovném.'<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. his correspondence with Durich *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> Only during attacks of mental illness did he indulge in visions about the future of the Slav race such as we associate with the later, romantic generation of the Czech revival. Cf. his letter to Durich of 24 November 1795 (Patera, p. 355). The contrast between such fantasies and his normal sober scepticism is striking and no doubt psychologically revealing.

<sup>3</sup> They are outlined in the article by the present writer on 'Language and Society in the Czech National Revival', *Slavonic and East European Rev.* xxxv (1956), 241–8.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Havránek, *op. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> Initially *ú-* always appears, not *ou-*; medial *-ej-* (recorded by Dobrovský as an alternative to *-ý-*) has been practically abandoned.

<sup>6</sup> *ou-* is regularly found, *-ej-* frequently, *vo-* for *o-* occasionally.

<sup>7</sup> See A. Jedlička, 'K jazykové a slohové stránce Tylových divadelních her', *Naše řeč*, xxxvii (1954), 73–86.

<sup>8</sup> See J. Bělič, 'Jazyk v Havlíčkových Obrazech z Rus' (1954), *Naše řeč*, xxxvii (1954), 92–103.

<sup>9</sup> Jan Kollár, 'Myšlenky o libozvučnosti řeči vůbec, obzvláště československé', *Krok* i, part iii (1823), 32–47; see also *Slávy dcera*, sonnets 503 and 504.

<sup>10</sup> Incidentally neither was by birth a Moravian.

<sup>11</sup> *Časopis českého musea* (1832). The controversy between Palacký and the 'Moravian' group is well summarized by J. Bělič, 'Zásady Palackého v otázkách jazykové kultury' (= *Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis*, i (Olomouc, 1949), 166–237), especially pp. 184–95.

J. Bělič<sup>1</sup> has convincingly shown how Palacký was originally inclined to share Kollár's desire to modify the norm of literary Czech according to current romantic notions, and how it was his acquaintance with Dobrovský (and Dobrovský's writings) from 1820 onwards that caused him to abandon such ideas and return to the 'classical' norm of sixteenth-century Czech. The seed sown by Dobrovský fell on fertile soil: for Palacký came from a family that had never abandoned its allegiance to the Church of the Bohemian Brethren, and he had been educated in the Protestant schools of Slovakia, at Trenčín and Prešpurk (Bratislava).<sup>2</sup> The language of the Kralice Bible had been familiar to him from his earliest years. It was therefore not surprising that he came to uphold the view that the revival of literary Czech implied a return to the phonology and morphology of the 'golden age'.<sup>3</sup>

This phonology and morphology are essentially those of present-day standard Czech. From the point of view of most Bohemian dialects they are archaic and were indeed archaic in the sixteenth century. All speakers of Central Bohemian dialects naturally say *ou-*, *-ej(-)*, *-ý(-)* where the standard language has *ú-*, *-ý(-)*, *-ě(-)*.<sup>4</sup> But seen from Moravia these features are less archaic and to many speakers they are natural and familiar.<sup>5</sup> It is therefore arguable that the present standard is more of a compromise than has sometimes been admitted.

It remains to assess the significance of individual scholars and writers in the processes which led to the acceptance of the new norm. If Dobrovský had gone to the East as a Jesuit missionary (as he originally intended),<sup>6</sup> would literary Czech have developed on lines that brought it closer to the spoken language of Prague? Such questions are perhaps unprofitable as they can only be answered by further speculation. Nevertheless the following facts would seem to be established beyond doubt:

(1) Dobrovský considered that he was recording and analysing a particular literary language which had fallen out of use but which represented an essential element in the national heritage of the Czechs.

(2) Those who re-established the use of literary Czech in no way imagined that they were creating or re-creating a language. Their attitude is summarized in the words which the characters in Jirásek's novel of the national revival *F. L. Věk* more than once apply to the Czech language: 'Neumřela, ale spí.'

The Czech literary language as it had existed before the Battle of the White Mountain was an essential factor in any consideration of the nature and destiny of Czech as a written medium. In the event it was the decisive factor. Dobrovský was no doubt the main instrument in bringing about this development; and it may be that his genius and the authority that derived from it expedited the victory of tradition. But it seems likely that tradition was in any case stronger than the unsystematic and sporadic attempts to introduce new 'popular' or 'euphonious' elements into the phonology and morphology of the literary language.

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. pp. 175–84.

<sup>2</sup> See J. Jakubec in *Literatura česká devatenáctého století*, II<sup>2</sup> (Prague 1917), 51 ff.

<sup>3</sup> In syntax too Palacký strictly followed the involved Latinizing style of the sixteenth-century humanists. Havránek describes his language as 'the climax and conclusion of... humanistic Czech' (op. cit. p. 97).

<sup>4</sup> See B. Havránek, 'Nářečí česká', in *Československá vlastivěda*, III. *Jazyk*, pp. 128, 135–8.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. pp. 159 etc.

<sup>6</sup> J. Jakubec, op. cit. I (1911), 162.

## IV

Among the Croats the linguistic revival did not make its full impact until the 1830's. Constitutional conflicts with the Magyars from 1790 onwards had, it is true, brought to the fore the conception of language as the principal attribute of nationality;<sup>1</sup> and in the period 1810–35 there was among the younger Croatian intellectuals a widespread desire to write in the vernacular as opposed to German, Hungarian and Latin, the languages hitherto favoured by officialdom and polite society in Croatia and Slavonia.<sup>2</sup> There was, however, no certainty as to the form of the national language that ought to be cultivated. The dialectal divisions of the Croats were marked, owing to the complex vicissitudes of their history. While in civil Croatia (*banska Hrvatska*), including Zagreb, the kajkavic dialect was more or less universal, in Slavonia and most parts of the Military Frontier štokavic dialects were spoken; finally, in maritime Croatia and in Dalmatia most areas still spoke čakavic dialects.

All these dialects had at one time or another formed the basis of a literary language. The remarkable literature of the Ragusan Republic (Dubrovnik) in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was composed in a štokavic language based on local speech;<sup>3</sup> and this tradition was far from being extinct when the Ragusan Republic was abolished by Napoleon's armies in 1808. In Slavonia the eighteenth century had seen a modest flourishing of didactic literature in the local ikavic-štokavic dialect.<sup>4</sup> In Zagreb too a local kajkavic literature had grown up since the sixteenth century, and especially from the late eighteenth century.<sup>5</sup> No literature of any note had been composed in čakavic since the seventeenth century, though in the Middle Ages and the sixteenth century dialects of this type had formed the basis of the literary language in many coastal areas.

None of these literary dialects were of more than local significance at the beginning of the nineteenth century; and it soon became a matter of some importance to decide on a form of the vernacular that should be acceptable throughout the Triune Kingdom.<sup>6</sup> Ultimately agreement was reached, though not without keen and polemical discussions which extended throughout the 1830's and 1840's. The new literary Croatian that then emerged was štokavic in character, and thus of wider validity than the new kajkavic literature, with its purely local appeal, or čakavic, moribund or extinct as a literary medium. Moreover the new literary Croatian was in most essentials identical with the new literary Serbian that had come into being in the same period owing primarily to the work of Vuk Karadžić. Thus, with the Vienna agreement of 1850 between Serbian and Croatian writers (*Književni dogovor*) the formal seal was set on a new literary language which was

<sup>1</sup> These conflicts have been described by Pl. Kulakovskij, *Иллиризмъ* (Warsaw, 1894), ch. 1, and by Đ. Šurmin, *Hrvatski preporod*, 1 (Zagreb, 1903). The principal documents that illustrate the reawakening of linguistic consciousness among the Croats before 1835 were assembled by Fr. Fancev in *Dokumenti za naše podrijetlo hrvatskoga preporoda (1790–1832)* (= *Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske*, XII (1933)).

<sup>2</sup> Dalmatia, where Italian was the language of cultivated society, was slow to join in this movement; cf. Šurmin, op. cit. II (1904), 67 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Though not without čakavic elements drawn from the earlier Dalmatian literary tradition represented notably by Marko Marulić.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. T. Matić (ed.), *Iz hrvatske književnosti u Slavoniji prije Preporoda* (Zagreb, 1942).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Vl. Dukat, *Sladki naš kaj* (Zagreb, 1944).

<sup>6</sup> Croatia-Slavonia-Dalmatia.

the joint possession of Serbs and Croats, deriving as it did from the traditions and linguistic practice of both these peoples.

The acceptance of the new literary language was a great sacrifice on the part of the kajkavic speakers who predominated in Zagreb, the chief Croatian cultural and administrative centre, and in its hinterland, the Zagorje. The abandonment of literary kajkavic was one result of the work of the Illyrian movement, which led the Croatian revival in the 1830's and 1840's; and the chief credit for it has usually been accorded to the leader of that movement, Ljudevit Gaj. Our task here is to examine briefly the part played by Gaj in this major linguistic decision.

Gaj, as a native of Krapina, was himself a kajkavic speaker; and it was in this form of the vernacular that he wrote until 1836. Even when he returned to Croatia from his studies in Budapest, full of the ideas of co-operation and solidarity among the Slavs that had been inspired in him by the Slovak poet Jan Kollár,<sup>1</sup> it was merely in a reform of orthography, not of language, that he expressed them.<sup>2</sup> It soon became clear, however, that a new orthography, based on the Czech adaptation of the Latin alphabet, was to be but a step towards the linguistic unification of all the Southern Slavs—the 'Illyrians', who in Kollár's and Gaj's conception formed one of the four great branches of the Slavonic nation.<sup>3</sup>

From its second volume (1836) Gaj's journal *Danica ilirska* was consistently written in the new Czech-style orthography and in the štokavic dialect. He had rejected<sup>4</sup> the extremist views of those who wished to adopt a single dialect exclusively, and of those who would have forged a composite dialect out of all the existing ones. At this stage Gaj saw the new unified orthography as a factor that would naturally cause the meandering brooks of southern Slavonic speech to converge again into a single mighty stream.<sup>5</sup> He did not in so many words advocate štokavic as the basis of phonology and morphology: but he used it from 1836 and gave it theoretical backing by serializing, in six issues of *Danica*, the štokavic grammar by Vjekoslav Babukić.<sup>6</sup>

Other Croats before Gaj had called for the establishment of a literary language that would serve the whole nation and supplant local dialects. Thus Ivan Derkos in 1832 advocated the amalgamation of the dialects of the three kingdoms;<sup>7</sup> and in the same year Count Janko Drašković had written his 'Dissertation' to the Croatian deputies in the Hungarian Diet in a somewhat hybrid štokavic.<sup>8</sup> In 1833

<sup>1</sup> Kollár's famous essay *Über die literarische Wechselseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation* appeared in 1837; and a Croatian version of it had appeared in *Danica ilirska* in the preceding year: but the ideas of Slavonic co-operation contained in it were already present in the second edition of *Slávy dcera* (1832) and undoubtedly informed Kollár's conversations with Gaj.

<sup>2</sup> Lj. Gaj, *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisanja*... (Buda, 1830); reprinted by Fancev, op. cit. no. 32.

<sup>3</sup> See Lj. Gaj in *Danica Horvatzka, Slavonzka y Dalmatinzka*, I (1835), no. 10, pp. 38 f.

<sup>4</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>5</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>6</sup> *Osnova slovnice slavjanske narječja ilirskoga uredjena Vjekoslavem Babukićem* (= *Danica ilirska*, II (1836), nos. 10–15).

<sup>7</sup> 'Propono ego conjunctionem trium horum Regnorum; Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae, quoad Subdialectos suas... Per conjunctionem hanc intelligo ego unionem trium Dialectorum, quas loquuntur tria haec Regna, in unam linguam, non popularem, sed eruditam, literariam, qua scientiae et artes, scripta periodica, et rhapsodica ab eruditis legerentur et scriberentur' (Joannes Derkooosz, *Genius patriae super dormientibus suis filiis*... (Zagreb, 1832), pp. 38 f.; reprinted by Fancev, op. cit. p. 290).

<sup>8</sup> 'Dijalekta pako ovoga kao običnoga u pismoznanju starinskomu i kao punijega izvolio jesam' (Count Janko Drašković, *Disertacija iliti razgovor darovan gospodi poklisarom zakonskim*... (Karlovac, 1832), p. 3; reprinted by Fancev, op. cit. (p. 297)).



there appeared the scholarly 'Illyrian' grammar<sup>1</sup> of I. A. Brlić, merchant of Brod in Slavonia. As a Slavonian Brlić naturally chose štokavic as the basis of his grammar; but his attitude was by no means narrowly provincial as is apparent from the title of his book. Although not an enthusiast for Gaj's new orthography he accepted it<sup>2</sup> in the second edition<sup>3</sup> for the sake of unity.<sup>4</sup> His real preference would have been for the Cyrillic alphabet in the reformed version devised for Serbian by Vuk Karadžić;<sup>5</sup> but his advocacy of this concession to the Serbs seems to have called forth little or no echo in the Triune Kingdom.

The authority of štokavic must indeed have been reinforced by the work of Vuk in the 1820's and 1830's. His grammar<sup>6</sup> and, perhaps more important, his collection of Serbian ballads<sup>7</sup> had pointed the way to a new literary Serbian, based essentially (though not exclusively) on the language of Vuk's native Herzegovina.<sup>8</sup> Brlić had become an admirer of Vuk's work when a copy of Jakob Grimm's translation of the latter's grammar<sup>9</sup> fell into his hands shortly after its publication. In it he found 'eine kräftige, schöne Nationalsprache wie sie im Munde des Volkes lebt. . .',<sup>10</sup> and so it must have appeared to other readers.

Although Brlić reluctantly accepted Gaj's new orthography<sup>11</sup> he remained aloof from the Illyrian group in Zagreb. There his fellow-Slavonian, Babukić, as the effective editor of *Danica*,<sup>12</sup> for some years exercised considerable authority in directing the course of the new literary Croatian. Apart from his native štokavic speech-habits he was profoundly influenced by the old literary language of Dubrovnik.<sup>13</sup> This influence became very apparent in the language of the articles in *Danica* and gave rise to a number of protests.<sup>14</sup> The language of Dubrovnik, moreover, strongly affected the two foremost poets of the Illyrian movement, Ivan Mažuranić and Stanko Vraz,<sup>15</sup> for all the latter's criticisms of the Ragusan writers. A. Belić has shown how Vuk Karadžić too, though rejecting the Ragusan archaisms introduced into their language by the 'Illyrians', himself accepted those Ragusan elements which still lived on in the popular vernacular. Thus, Belić concludes, there was found in the language of Dubrovnik the 'golden bridge' which was able to unite the new literary language of the Serbs with that of the Croats.<sup>16</sup>

The conflicts and compromises which led to the stabilization of the new Croatian

<sup>1</sup> *Grammatik der illyrischen Sprache wie solche in Bosnien, Dalmazien, Slawonien, Serbien, Ragusa &c. dann von den Illyriern in Banat und Ungarn gesprochen wird* (Buda, 1833).

<sup>2</sup> Except for *ě* which he replaced by *je*.

<sup>3</sup> (Zagreb, 1842.)

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. pp. xvi f.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit. pp. x-xii, xvii-xviii.

<sup>6</sup> *Писменица сербскога језика, по говору простог народа написана* (Vienna, 1814).

<sup>7</sup> *Српске народне пјесме*, vols. i-iii (Leipzig, 1823-4); vol. iv (Vienna, 1833).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. A. Belić, *Вукова борба за народни и књижевни језик* (Belgrade, 1948).

<sup>9</sup> *Wuk's Stephanowitsch kleine Serbische Grammatik verdeutscht und mit einer Vorrede von Jacob Grimm* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1824).

<sup>10</sup> Brlić, op. cit. pp. vii f.

<sup>11</sup> He even defended it against the antiquated Dalmatian orthography: *Zora dalmatinska*, i (1844), no. 10, pp. 73-5.

<sup>12</sup> See A. Barac, *Hrvatska književnost I. Književnost ilirizma* (Zagreb 1954), p. 276.

<sup>13</sup> It is noteworthy that during the 1840's he produced editions of the works of Gundulić, the greatest Ragusan poet: *Osman* (1844); *Različne pjesni* (1847).

<sup>14</sup> Notably by another Slavonian, Kajo Adžić. Cf. *Danica ilirska*, iv (1838), no. 15, 59, and Adžić's letter to Gaj of 15 May 1838 (printed in *Grada za povijest književnosti hrvatske*, vi, p. 9).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Vraz' letter to Mažuranić of 15 December 1836 (in *Grada* . . . i, letter no. 1 of those by Vraz there printed), and A. Barac, op. cit. p. 106.

<sup>16</sup> A. Belić, 'Место Дубровника у духовном развиту нашег народа', in *Око нашег књижевног језика* (Belgrade, 1951), pp. 199 f.

language by the 1850's cannot be discussed here in detail. The language that emerged employed Gaj's orthography and was based, like the Serbian of Vuk Karadžić, on a south-western form of štokavic. Of the Ragusan archaisms only a few were retained.<sup>1</sup> Thus it was possible for a group of representative Croatian and Serbian scholars and writers unanimously to approve the 'Literary Agreement' (*Književni dogovor*) which they signed in Vienna in March 1850.<sup>2</sup> This document asserted the existence of a single Serbo-Croat literary language based on the 'southern'<sup>3</sup> dialect.

It cannot be said that the Croatian form of the new language owed its character primarily to the influence of any single individual. Its orthography, indeed, was in essentials that of Ljudevit Gaj; but neither he nor Babukić<sup>4</sup> determined the details of its phonology and morphology. The influence of the old literary language of Dubrovnik was a factor of primary importance; and the work of Vuk Karadžić also played an indirect part. The unifying and guiding force in the whole process came from the Illyrian movement, whose most lasting creation was the new Croatian literary language.

## V

The last of the new Slavonic literary languages to be formed in the Habsburg Empire during the period under discussion was Slovak.<sup>5</sup> Until the 1780's no systematic attempt had been made to establish a literary language among the Slavs of Upper Hungary.<sup>6</sup> In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries political and religious circumstances in Slovakia diverged in many ways from those of Bohemia and Moravia; so that in 1780 the western Slovak priest Anton Bernolák could write a Slovak grammar which was firmly based on the concept of a separate Slovak nation.<sup>7</sup>

By the 1840's, however, neither the (largely western Slovak) language codified by Bernolák nor the revived Czech literary language had been fully accepted by the Slovak intellectuals. In the decade 1842–51 a new form of literary Slovak, based on the dialects of central Slovakia and entirely independent of any existing literary language, was devised by L'udevit Štúr and found swift and wide acceptance. Here, more than in either of the cases already considered, it would be reasonable to suppose that the language that emerged would bear the unmistakable stamp of the prejudices, interests and speech-habits of a single individual. It would

<sup>1</sup> Notably the separate case-endings for the dative, locative and instrumental plural of certain nominal declensions.

<sup>2</sup> The text was published in the Zagreb newspaper *Narodne novine* (1850), no. 76, and has been reprinted by V. Novak, *Antologija jugoslovenske misli i narodnog jedinstva (1390–1930)* (Belgrade, 1930), pp. 183–6.

<sup>3</sup> *Scil.* štokavic-jekavic.

<sup>4</sup> Babukić took up an eccentric position in his linguistic controversy with Vuk. See Lj. Stojanović, *Žusom u pad Byka Cmegf. Kapayuka* (Belgrade, 1924), pp. 683–4.

<sup>5</sup> The main facts of the development are summarized by V. Vážný, 'Spisovný jazyk slovenský', in *Československá vlastivěda, řada II* (Prague, 1936), 145–215, E. Pauliny, *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny* (Bratislava, 1948), and more briefly by the present writer in 'The evolution of literary Slovak', *Trans. Phil. Soc.* (1953), pp. 143–60.

<sup>6</sup> The name 'Slovak' (*Slovák*) itself means 'Slav' in general; and the modern use of it dates from the eighteenth century. See A. Pražák, *Dějiny spisovné slovenštiny po dobu Štúrovu* (Prague, 1922), and the summary of the evidence by the present writer, loc. cit. p. 147.

<sup>7</sup> See *Trans. Phil. Soc.* (1953), p. 150.

of course be foolish to suggest that without Štúr's action there would have been no separate Slovak language. Here we may agree with J. Dolanský that the new language was clear evidence of the existence of a new nation and arose naturally from the historical conditions of the *Vormärz* period.<sup>1</sup> The actual structure of the language was, however, fashioned by Štúr according to his own ideas—linguistic, aesthetic and practical. In this work, moreover, he lacked the guidance of some existing literary form of the vernacular—a factor which had, as we have seen, been decisive in the case of the Czechs and influential in that of the Croats. On the contrary, Štúr's language set itself up in conscious opposition to the Czech literary language which had been exclusively used (with or without modification) by the Slovaks until the middle of the eighteenth century and was the medium in which all Štúr's own works were written until 1844.

It was Štúr's personal decision that the new language should be based on the dialects of central Slovakia and not, like the language of Bernolák and his followers, on western Slovak. For this decision there were a variety of reasons. Štúr himself justified his choice by the statement that the 'purest and most beautiful' Slovak was spoken in the Tatras.<sup>2</sup> This subjective judgment must be considered in connexion with the fact that Štúr himself was born and bred in the village of Uhrovec on the edge of the central Slovak area. It must, however, be remembered that Štúr was by no means alone among his contemporaries in imagining that the Tatras were the original home of the Slavs and that the Slovak dialects were still close to Old Church Slavonic, the most ancient preserved Slavonic language.<sup>3</sup> It is also noteworthy that the language codified in Štúr's grammar is not based on the dialect of Uhrovec, but represents a selection of phonological and morphological features that are characteristic of the central Slovak dialect group as a whole.<sup>4</sup>

It has often been noted that this selection made by Štúr from among the complex possibilities of the Slovak dialects was in no way eccentric or haphazard but included those central Slovak features that were most characteristic and widespread.<sup>5</sup> This is a tribute to Štúr's linguistic acumen; but it seems that he was helped by another, external factor. Recent research, notably by E. Pauliny,<sup>6</sup> has shown that by the 1840's the influence of central Slovak was affecting Slovaks of all areas. This influence can be found very strongly in the popular songs of the time (for example those collected by Jan Kollár in his *Národné zpěvanky* (1834)), and to a lesser extent in vernacular documents from west and east Slovakia which show marked central Slovak features.<sup>7</sup> It is reasonable to suppose that the Slovak youths, many from central Slovakia, who came to Bratislava for their schooling,

<sup>1</sup> 'Boj o spisovnou slovenštinu a konečně vítězství štúrovců v otázce jazyka manifestovaly před celým světem, že slovenský národ dozrál právě jako národ už před rokem 1848 do plné národní svébytnosti' (J. Dolanský, 'Česko-slovenská spolupráce v období národního obrození', in *O vzájomných vzťahoch Čechov a Slovákov* (Bratislava 1956), p. 135).

<sup>2</sup> L. Štúr, *Nauka reči slovenskej* (Bratislava, 1846), p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. P. J. Šafařík, *Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten* (Buda, 1826), p. 370.

<sup>4</sup> See Vážný, op. cit. p. 165. A careful analysis of the dialectal basis of Štúr's language has been made by A. Habovštiak, 'L'udovít Štúr a slovenské nárečia', *Slovenská reč*, XXI (1956), 218–32. It is clear that the influence of the dialect of Uhrovec played a part, though a minor one, in influencing Štúr's decisions.

<sup>5</sup> Habovštiak, op. cit.

<sup>6</sup> E. Pauliny, 'Spoločenské funkcie strednej slovenčiny pred Štúrom', *Slovenská reč*, XXI (1956), 174–86.

<sup>7</sup> E. Pauliny, loc. cit. pp. 180–4.

used a rough *κωνή* of this kind. It is in this sense that we may understand Štúr's words on p. 9 of his *Nauka reči slovenskej* (1846):

Krem toho Slovenčina, ktorá za spisovnú reč prijímame, je od všetkých Slovákom za najpravdivejšiu reč Slovenskú uznaná i obľúbená, tak že sa dačo inakšie hovoriaci Slováci, keď príležitosť majú, veľmi radi tejto reči podučia i ju prijímajú.<sup>1</sup>

It would seem therefore that the new language was not simply the personal creation of a patriotic and gifted philologist. Štúr gave force and direction to tendencies that were already in existence.

The Slovak that was finally codified in the 1850's was not in all respects the language of Štúr.<sup>2</sup> The modifications were largely the work of M. M. Hodža and M. Hattala.<sup>3</sup> Štúr's largely phonemic orthography was replaced by the more familiar but less precise Czech system. One or two rather local features of Štúr's morphology were replaced by more generally accepted forms; but in two cases phonemes of particularly local currency (those represented by the letters *ä* and *ľ*) were introduced into the language. Štúr had omitted these sounds which he found unattractive.<sup>4</sup> For Hattala they were characteristically Slovak, and his view found acceptance. The whole discussion concerning the codification concentrated on finding what was characteristic and at the same time acceptable.

Thus literary Slovak, like Croatian, emerged from discussion and polemics; it was in some respects a compromise between the views of Štúr and those of Hattala. Yet it cannot be said that the final result was very far from the language of Štúr. In this case the influence of an individual appears to have been decisive in the process of codifying a new literary language. But we cannot doubt that Štúr's language would have been abandoned like that of Bernolák if it had not been built on a broad foundation of usage. This foundation was provided, not by the precise and tangible structure of an older literary language, but by a general consensus of educated speakers. Only thus can we explain the swift victory of the new language over all its rivals. It is in most essentials identical with the standard Slovak of today.

## VI

It has been shown that all the three languages under discussion owed much to the views and practice of individuals; but the importance of these factors and the manner in which they found expression varied in each case. Dobrovský, the *Aufklärung* scholar, revealed the half-forgotten treasures of the older Czech language to a younger generation eager to exploit them; Gaj, the romantic politician and patriot, inspired his contemporaries to forge from traditional and popular elements a language that would enable the Croats to join in linguistic unity with their Serbian kinsmen; Štúr gave conscious form to a latent consensus of educated usage and produced a new literary medium that won the acceptance of his countrymen as the visible mark of Slovak nationality.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Pauliny, loc. cit. p. 175.

<sup>2</sup> Agreement on the essentials of the language was reached in 1851 at a meeting in Bratislava of Catholic and Protestant scholars and writers. The authoritative codification was that of M. Hattala, *Krátká mluvnica slovenská* (Bratislava, 1852).

<sup>3</sup> For analysis of these modifications cf. L'. Novák, 'K vnitřním dějinám spisovné slovenštiny', *Slavia*, XI (1932), 73–99, 295–322. Hattala is viewed in a more favourable light by E. Jóna, 'Martin Hattala', *Jazykovedný časopis*, VII (1953), 15–33.

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted, moreover, that they do not occur in the dialect of Uhrovec. Cf. Habovštiak, loc. cit. p. 211.

In no case was the codifier of the new or revived language working in a vacuum. All stood between the sometimes conflicting realities of linguistic tradition and everyday speech. Where the authority of the traditional language was strong fewer concessions could be made to colloquial usage: this was the case with Czech. Where, as with Slovak, no traditional language served as a model, usage provided the framework which was filled out by detailed discussion. Croatian stood half-way between these two positions, and ended with a compromise: later still it was to move further in the direction of popular usage.

All those who engaged in these processes of linguistic history were concerned to combine what was characteristic with what was acceptable. The ultimate solutions were indeed the work of individuals; but they owed their character to factors that lay outside the will of individuals—in the history and needs of the communities which the new languages were to serve.

R. AUTY

CAMBRIDGE