Andreja Eržen
(Ljubljana Graduate School of Humanities, Slovenia)

AFFIRMATION OF THE SLOVENIAN LANGUAGE
Slovenian grammars and dictionaries from 16th to 19th century

1. Introduction

One of the main questions, which appear very often in the Slovenian linguistics, is the problem of the construction of the national language and its link with the national consciousness. Must or should this national language be identical to the language of the people? And who this "people" really are: peasants in the village, bourgeoisie in the towns, the clergy or the few intellectuals? The period between 16th and 19th century was the most vivant and important for the development of the dialects, spoken on Slovene territories. Until the middle of the 19th century Slovene philologists succeeded to create the basis for the literary language, based on the central Slovenian dialect. During the history of the language and its development, three questions appeared to be most present:
− The relation between Slovenian language/its dialects and other Slavic languages,
− The relation of the peripheral literary dialects to the central standard,
− The role of the sixteenth-century norm for the modern language.

During the centuries grammars and dictionaries played an important role in the development of the languages. The 16th century presents a turning point in the history of a language; the protestant writers began to write in their native language. Their main aim was to make the ecclesiastical rituals comprehensible to the people. It was also the time of the first grammars, describing vernaculars, although mostly in Latin. The Protestantism gave three main pillars, on which the national language was later on constructed: first grammar (Adam Bohorič, *Arcticae Horulae*, 1584), first dictionary (Hieronimus Megiser, *Dictionairium quatuor linguarum, videlicet germanicae, latinae, illyricae,* 1592) and first translation of the Bible (Jurij Dalmatin, *Biblia, tv ie, vse svetv pismv, stariga inu noviga testamenta, slovenski, tolmazhena,* 1584). The Protestantism developed a literature in the language of the people; it was the process to which the catholic restoration was not favourable. But in spite of all, they could not have been efficient without leaning on the national patriotism.

The development of the Slovenian grammars began with the grammars of the protestant priests who described the dialects they knew and spoke. At this moment, we cannot talk about the connection between the language and the national consciousness. Like in other parts of protestant Europe, the most important thing was that the people understood the language of the church and they could participate in rituals in the language familiar to them. During the centuries that followed, the history of the grammatisation of the Slovenian dialects was an interesting sign of the development of the linguistic thought and the national consciousness.

The lack of the books in the 17th century was a cross European fact and not known only in the Slovenian speaking territories. With baroque and the end of the 17th century new times arrived; the linguistic situation was mainly the same as the situation in the society: Latin was the language the most estimated, used in the church, schools and for science. The upper class spoke Italian and French; the language of the documents and offices was German. The rest of the people spoke the Slovenian dialects.

The beginning of the Slovenian enlightenment is defined with the issue of the grammar of the Augustinian monk p. Marko Pohlin. He published his *Kraynska grammatika* in 1768; it was a grammar of the central Slovenian dialect, written in German.

At the end of the 18th century, mainly because of the French revolution, the national consciousness slowly came into the minds of the intelligentsia. At the beginning of the 19th century the Slovenian national movement had a cultural character, which slowly, towards the middle of the century, turned to the political direction. The idea of the nationality is a modern idea; after quite a lot of turning-points, it entered into the world history at the second half of the 19th century. Language and nation became a theme of eternal debates and since then they present a "popular" point of discussion.

The two main elements of the language policy, grammar and dictionary, show us, in their sociolinguistic aspect, important directions in the development, importance and meaning of the Slovenian language through centuries. That is why a lot of authors would like to show the connection between the use of Slovenian language, or better its dialects, and the national consciousness already in some early linguistics works. The main aim and intention of this work is to present the language development, in relation to the national consciousness.

Grammars and dictionaries are a good material for the study of the relation between the language and national consciousness, the development of the national idea and at the same time give examples of the different language nominations. In the period from the 16th to the 19th century 28 grammars and dictionaries were published. They are an unlimited source, which is not only rich in facts but also often an interesting reading. Almost all grammars, except one of Valentin Vodnik (1811), were written in foreign languages (German, Latin or Italian); this is also a fact, we may not overlook.

An important questions, related to grammars and dictionaries, printed between 16th and 19th century are:

− To whom the writers intended their grammar or dictionary, which is the "target" group of their work,
− Which is the language, dialect of their work,
− How they name the language they describe (*Slovenian*, *Slavic*, *Windisch*, *Carniolien*, …),
− Which is the territory where this language is spoken,
− Why they think it is important to have a grammar or a dictionary of the language described,
− Which was the echo of this work.

The answers to these questions may help us better understand the development of the Slovenian language - from its vernaculars to the stage when it became a literary language - better define the relation between language and nation and characterize its meaning in the context of Slavic and other European languages.

2. One nation, one language, or perhaps not?

The identity of the people (who came to the territory of the Eastern Alps at the end of the 6th century) developed in different cultural, political an economic circumstances. During centuries the word "*narod*" – meaning nation had several different meanings, at finally at the end of the 18th century got its stable significance. Almost in all Slovenian historical school books, literary histories and other similar manuals we can find the same theory:"Beside some ethnological elements which maintain some continuity with old Slavic and late antique

cultural heritage, /…/ the oldest historical prove of Slovenian special identity is language."[1] Language is said to be the source, condition, soul of the nation, its guaranty or the result of its unity: it is the outcome of the battle for the national existence. In the connection language-nation the relation is neither strictly necessary nor arbitrary: we know languages without nations and also such nations without a specific language.[2]

During the centuries the perception of the connection language-nation was submitted to several different interpretations and theories. The strongest influence on the Slovenian linguistic thought had a theory of a German philologist, Johann Gottfired Herder (1744-1803). In his *Fragments about the German literature* he claimed, that the genius of the language is at the same time the genius of the literature of some nation.[3] Together with Fichte, he was the main interpret of the new concept of the nation: for them State was no longer the one who embodies and gives possibility to the nation's existence but the opposite, nation is the only one who has the true legitimacy. The idea of *Kulturnation* (cultural nation) was an excuse for the existence of the nations without states (like German and Italian until the middle of the 19th century). These nations are defined by language and culture. The language was the basis of this national theory which had a great influence on Slovenian intellectuals in the middle of the 19th century. The situation being the same in Slovenian territories, they quickly identified themselves with the Herder's theory.

But the language was not always the main criterion, on which the nations were founded. Until the 19th century the conscience of the several European nations was founded on different basis, among which were religion, feudal tradition, social classes and cultural heritage. Language was only one part of the heritage. At the middle of the 19th century began the huge turning point in the ideology of the nations: it is hard to say if this was positive or negative, but at that time the language became one of the decisive facts and symbols of the nations.[4]

In the reality the language and national borders in most cases don't correspond; one language may be spoken in different countries (neighbouring or not) or has different status in these countries (state language, official language, language of the minority). On the other side the state can be officially more lingual (Switzerland, India) or not (states of emigration). In this aspect the linguistic situation within the two great empires (Austrian and Ottoman), whose border went through Balkans and moved several times between 15th and 19th century, is very interesting. The languages in both empires may on one hand have influenced each other during their rich history of contacts (for example the Balkan languages of the Ottoman Empire – Bulgarian and Macedonian) or on the other hand some of them searched the isolation from others (example of the revolts inside Austrian Empire – Hungarian, Czech, Croatian and Slovene in their relation to German language). For European states, which derived from two empires with political separations, the linguistic borders were basis for the political ones. Mostly in the sense of the romantic German ideology, making the symbol of equality between state, nation, people and language.

The idea of a nation is a modern one. It appeared in the middle of the 19th century and since then language and nation become source of several different debates and discussions.

---

[1] Illustrated Slovenian history, 2000, p. 24.
[2] P. Sériot, 1996, p. II.
[3] G. Hermet, 1996, p. 118.
[4] P. Garde, 2004, p. 42.

3. Some facts about the history of Slovenian language

The earliest surviving written documents from the Proto-Slovene speech territory are the *Freising Folia* known as the *Brižinski spomeniki*[5] in Slovenian, consisting of liturgical formulae in the Western rite and a sermon, composed around 1000 A.D. These constitute the oldest attestation of any Slavic language written in the Latin (Carolingian) alphabet. From this time until the middle of the 16ᵗʰ century there are a few surviving documents in Slovene dialects, these are mostly religious and legal texts.

A thirteenth-century sentence ("*Buga vas primi gralva Venus*" – *Bog vas primi, kraljeva Venus*) contained in a German manuscript reveals that the language was used at that time even by the upper German gentry.

From the mid-sixteenth century on, Slovene Protestants, chiefly under the guidance of the reformer Primož Trubar actively promoted the usage of the national languages and the spread of church literature in vernacular, not only among the Slovenians, but the South Slavs in general, including those under Turkish rule. It was during the Renaissance and Reformation that the supremacy of the Church and of universal Latin gave way to new forms of national and literary expression. The Slavic peoples advanced the rights of their vernaculars in the name of a linguistic and cultural continuity and of a return to the original Slavic source. The work of the Slavic Apostles Cyril and Methodius provided the model and inspiration for the translation of the Gospels into the new national languages, for their admission in secular and sacred affairs, as well as for the creation of new Slavic alphabets. In was in that spirit that Jan Hus and Andam Bohorič created their new Slavic alphabets in Latin letters. The alphabet of Bohorič – *bohoričica* – stayed in use Slovenian territories until the middle of 19ᵗʰ century.

But it was above all the Bible translations, initiated by Protestants and Catholics alike, which fostered the equality of the Slavic languages with the three "holy" languages, and which became the workshop in which the Slavic vernaculars acquired their flexibility and richness, and in which their modern literary norms were forged. Thus, some of the earliest and best Slavic grammars (Bohorič's of Slovene, J. Blahoslav's of Czech, Smotryc'kyj's of Church Slavonic, Chojanus' of Sorbian) made their appearance only in the wake of outstanding Bible translations (Dalmatin's in Slovenian, the Kralice Bible in Bohemia, the Ostrog Bible in the Ukraine, Jakubica's New Testament in Sorbia).

Rather than foster a rupture between the modern Slavic languages and the older literary language of the Slavs, Slavic grammarians, historians and writers kept alive for centuries the memory of their common origin and patrimony, a memory that was confirmed by the identity of their name (*slověnski*) despite the great diversity of local designations (*Wendic, Illyrian, Dalmatian,* etc.).

Just as they were eager to emphasise their continuity with the past, the Slavic writers and grammarians were also keen on pointing their linguistic continuity in space, viewing the individual Slavic languages as mere dialectal varieties of one ideal, supranational language.

---

5 The Freising Manuscripts (also *Freising Folia*, *Freising Fragments*, or *Freising Monuments*; German *Freisinger Denkmäler*, Latin *Monumenta Frisingensia*) are the first Roman-script continuous text in a Slavic language and the oldest document in Slovene language. It is important to note they did not influence its further development. The monuments consisting of three texts in the oldest Slovene dialect were discovered bound into a Latin codex (manuscript book) in Freising (Slovene Brižinje, Brižine or Brižinj), Germany. In 1803 the manuscript came to the Bavarian State Library in Munich and Brižinski spomeniki were discovered there in 1807. Four parchment leaves and a further quarter of a page have been preserved. Linguistic, stylistic and contextual analyses reveal that these are church texts of careful composition and literary form.
The precise date of the origin of the Freising Manuscripts cannot be exactly determined; the original text was probably written in the 9th century. In this liturgic and homiletic manuscript, three Slovene records were found and this miscellany was probably an episcopal manual (pontificals). *Brižinski spomeniki* in it were created between 972 and 1093, most likely before 1000.

This view explains the recurrent comparisons drawn between Slavic and classical Greek (with its diverse literary dialects), which recur in the works of Slavic historians and grammarians beginning with St. Orzechowski and Jan Blahoslav up to Jernej Kopitar and Josef Dobrovský!

First printed book in Slovene is Primož Trubar's (1508-1586) *Catechismus* (1550), which, along with Jurij Dalmatin's (1547-1598) translation of the Bible (1584) presents the beginning of the Slovenian language development. Trubar was aware of the already considerable dialect differentiation of the Slovene speech territory and employed elements of the Central Slovene dialects, particularly the dialect of Ljubljana and his native Lower Carniolan, as the basis for his written language. The success of Trubar's publishing venture was due not only to his own dedication and linguistic skills and to that of his Slovenian followers but also to the vigorous support of German Protestants.

The Protestantism gave us three main pillars, on which the structure of the evolving literary language would solidly rest long after the liquidation of the Reformation and of all other Slovenian books: first grammar (Adam Bohorič, *Arcticae Horulae*, The Winter Hours, 1584), first dictionary (Hieronimus Megiser, *Dictionairium quatuor linguarum, videlicet germanicae, latinae, illyricae,* Dictionary of the four languages /German, Latin, Italian and *Illyrian,* 1592) and first translation of the Bible (Jurij Dalmatin, *Biblia, tv ie, vse svetv pismv, stariga inu noviga testamenta, slovenski, tolmazhena,* 1584). These works were used, published and reprinted for the following two hundred years. Megiser's dictionary was republished in an expanded version by the Carinthian Jesuits in 1744; Bohorič's grammar was anonymously published by Hipolit in 1715, and again by the Jesuits in 1758, and thoroughly mined (without reference to its author) by Marko Pohlin; and Dalmatin's Bible remained the source and model for all new attempts at a Bible translation in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The Protestantism developed a literature in the language of the people; it was the process to which the catholic restoration was not favourable. But also the catholic restoration could not have been efficient without leaning on the national patriotism.

The philologists of the first periods didn't ask to use the Slovenian dialects in all the domains of the public communication: they limited it to the ecclesial use. The first grammars were not meant to all speakers of the language; there are groups for which they wrote. At the beginning it was the clergy which role was to transfer the language to the people.

The Counter-Reformation put an end to the era of the language development, but on the other hand with the permission of the Ljubljana bishop Tomaž Hren the protestant translation of the Bible stayed in use. Only without the introduction which was to protestant, simply meaning to heretic.

A sudden thematic and functional broadening of the printed language took place in the second half of the eighteenth century (after 1768), during the Enlightenment. The beginning of the Slovenian *enlightenment* is defined with the issue of the grammar of the Augustinian monk p. Marko Pohlin. He published his *Kraynska grammatika* in 1768; it was a grammar of the central Slovenian dialect, written in German. Another turning-point caused by a grammar. The slogan of Marko Pohlin "*zakaj nek ne po krajnsku*?" (Why not in the language of Carniola?) reflects the new expectations vested in Slovenian and the belief in its literary potential with respect to German and a declining Latin. Pohlin produced a huge body of work, a total of sixty books ranging from astronomy, agriculture, history and ethnography to versification and grammar.

Although some important contributions were made to Slovene literacy by Catholic intellectuals (notably, the monk and grammarian, Marko Pohlin), the Slovene language remained secondary to the state language, German and, in the western and northeastern peripheries, Italian and Hungarian. The beginning of the modern Slovene standard language

can be dated to the work of Jernej Kopitar (1780-1844), whose *Grammatik der slawischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyermark* (1808) marks the beginning of a language constructed from selected dialect elements and based on historically-supported spelling. The literary language was raised in prestige by the literary efforts of the Romantic poet France Prešeren (1800-1849) and the literary circle around Baron Sigismund Zois (1747-1819).

Illyrian Provinces (French *Provinces illyriennes*) were formed in 1809 when Austria ceded with the Treaty of Schönbrunn its lands Carinthia, Carniola, Croatia southwest of the river Sava, Gorizia and Trieste to France after the defeat at the Battle of Wagram. These territories lying north and east of the Adriatic Sea were joined into the Illyrian Provinces, technically part of France, the capital of which was established at Ljubljana. The French administration, headed by a Governor-General, introduced civil law (*Code civil*) across the provinces.

In the time of Illyrian Provinces proclamations were published in the provinces' official journal, *Télégraphe officiel*, simultaneously in French, German and "Slavonian"; this elevation of a Slavic language to an official language had a great impact on the development of the modern Slovenian language. Between 1811 and 1813, the French author Charles Nodier was working in Ljubljana as the editor of the journal. In August 1813, Austria declared war to France. And we all know how the famous Waterloo ended; the Congress of Vienna confirmed Austria in the possession of the former Illyrian Provinces. The Austrians cancelled all French reforms, including language rights.

At the beginning of the *19th century* the Slovenian national movement had a cultural character, which slowly, towards the middle of the century, turned to the political direction.

4. Several names for one language

The very name of the language and of its speakers bears witness to the conflicting forces that were at work: political, ideological and historical. Until the 19th the name for Slovenian people and their language vacillated between the generic name *Slovenci* and regional names, related to different territories: *Kranjci*, *Štajerci*, *Korošci* and also *Winden* or *Vendi*. While *Kranjski* was used also outside the territory of Kranjska (*Carniola*), *Windisch* meant only Slovenian people living in Carinthia and Styria. It was only through the efforts of the champions of linguistic unity (Valentin Vodnik, Jernej Kopitar, Urban Jarnik) that the regional terms were gradually given up in favour of the generic name and that *windisch* (which is still used by Germans) acquired a pejorative connotation.

When Trubar in the middle of the 16th century writes "*lubi Slovenci*" (dear Slovenes) we have to be aware these are not the same *Slovenci* as meant by Kopitar in the middle of the 19th century. Until the 19th century people of the Slovenian territories identified themselves with the dialects they spoke: they were Carniolians, Caritnhians and Styrians. The similar situation was with the philologists; most of them wrote in Latin or German. When they wrote in "Slovenian" they used the dialect they knew. Usually that was the dialect of their native environment. The authority named the language with different nominations which more or less showed the territory of their rule.

The names of the languages are arbitrary; like the names of the countries they are a result of historical circumstances, invented and changed according to different interventions.

A table with the nominations found in the grammars and dictionaries is very interesting and gives us a lot of useful information:

16th century	17th century	18th century	19th century
Bohorič *slavonicae, carniolana* **Dalmatin** *Windiſch, Crajnſki, Coroſhki, Slovénſki ali Besjázhki* **Megiser** *illyricae, Sclavonica seu Illyrica lingua*	**Sommaripa** *Schiavo* **Kastelec** *carniolicum*	**Hipolit** - *Slavonica* **Pohlin** - *Kraynska slavicum, carniolicum* **Gutsman** - *Windische* **Kumerdej** - *slavo-carniolicum, Krainisch-slawische* **Zagajšek** - *Slovennska, Wendische*	**Japelj** - *Slawische* **Kopitar** - *slavischen* **Vodnik** - *ſlovénſki* **Weissenthurn** - *cragnolino* **Šmigoc** - *windische* **Dajnko** - *windischen* **Metelko** - *Slowenischen* **Murko** - *Slowenischen, Slovensko* **Potočnik** - *ſloweniſchen* **Janežič** - *slovenska* **Cigale** – *slovenski*

Analysing the information we can conclude, that the name *Slovenski* does not appear before the 19th century. Several different names can be found in the grammars and dictionaries of the Slovenian dialects. The authors of grammars and dictionaries used different names to describe the language and people for who they were writing: *Illyrians, Slave, Slovenian, Sclavi, Vindi* and *Veneti*.

This fact shows us a great problem of translation of these nominations, better said the trouble of correctness of the today's translations. It is difficult to know what Bohorič meant when he wrote *slavonicae* and Sommaripa when he named his dictionary *Vocabolario Italiano e Schiavo*.

Because the term Slovene and Slovenian were the only term also for Slave the terminological mixture stayed until the beginning of the 19th century; partly they also used the name *Kranjci*, *kranjski* language in generic meaning Slovene. Between the inhabitants of Carniola Slovenes were in majority that is why for them these terms were not ambiguous. At the beginning of the 19th century the term Slave was "imported" from other Slavic languages (Czech). With this the terminology became more stable: the basis *sloven-* was meant to designate what was our own and *slovan-* was used for all other Slavic nations. In this time the term *Slovenija* was created and writers who wrote in foreign languages started to use names like *Slowenen*, *slowenisch* and *Slovenica*.

The time before the revolution 1848 made end to several different nominations. Interesting is the one part of the introduction which Jernej Kopitar wrote in his grammar *Grammatik der slavischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steiermark (1808):" Nur die Steyriſchen und Kärntniſchen Slaven werden zum U n t e r ſ c h i e d e von ihren d e u t ſ c h e n Mittbürgern W i n d e n, d. i. Slaven genannt; (denn W e n d e, W i n d e iſt das deutſche Synonymon für S l a v e ſo wie Unger für Madjar, u. m. a.) Eben deßwegen nennen ſie ſich auch ſelbſt S l o v é n z i, d.i. Leute vom S l a v i ſ c h e n Volkſtamme, nicht vom Deutſchen. In Krain hingegen, wo das ganze Land von Slaven bebaut wird, fiel dieſer Anlaß weg, und der Spezial=Nahme Krainer, (K r a j n z i) gilt ausſchließend ſeit Mannsgedenken. - Sprache, Kleidung, lebensart iſt die nähmliche bey den Winden, wie bey den Krainer, aber nie wird der Krainer Slovénz im ſpecialen Sinne, und umgekehrt der Slovénz nie Krajnz genannt."*[6] This

---

[6] J. Kopitar, 1808, p. VI.

passage is a good example of different nominations (Vendi, Krajnzi, Krainer,…) of the nation and language which we nowadays call *slovenski, Slovenci* (Slovenian).

5. Grammars and dictionaries of the Slovenian language
From the 16th to 19th century

Grammars are not just a simple description of the natural language; they are a linguistic tool which becomes political through the time. Together with dictionaries they form instruments which help us understand linguistical procedures, and sometimes even more, developments in the society.

In the period from the 16th to the 19th century 16 grammars and 13 dictionaries were published:

Grammars:
1584 Adam Bohorič / *Arcticae horulae*
1715 Hipolit Novomeški / *Grammatica Latino-Germanico-Slavonica*
1768 Marko Pohlin / *Kraynska Grammatika*
1777 Ožbalt Gutsman / *Windische Sprachlehre*
1793 Blaž Kumerdej / *Krainisch-slawische Grammatik*
1791 Mihael Zelenko / *Slovennska Grammatika oder Georg Sellenko's Windische sprachlehre*
1807 Jurij Japelj / *Slawische Sprachlehre* (manuscript)
1818/09 Jernej Kopitar / *Grammatik der slavischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steiermark*
1811 Valentin Vodnik / *Pismenost ali gramatika se perve shole*
1811 Vincenc Franul Weissenthurn / *Saggio grammaticale italiano-cragnolino*
1812 Janez Krstnik Leopold Šmigoc / *Theoretisch-practische Windische Sprachlehre*
1824 Peter Danjko / *Lehrbuch der windischen Sprache*
1825 Franc Metelko / *Lehrgebäude der Slowenischen sprache im Königreich Illyrien und in dem benachbarten provinzen*
1832 Anton Murko / *Theoretisch-praktische Grammatik der Slowenischen Sprache in Steiermark, Kärnten, Krain und dem illyrischen Küstenlande*
1849 Blaž Potočnik */ Grammatik der flowenifchen Sprache*
1854 Anton Janežič / *Slovenska slovnica*

Dictionaries:
1580 Adam Bohorič / *Elementale Labacense cum Nomenclatura trium linguarum* (not preserved)
1584 Jurij Dalmatin / *Register* (dans la traduction de la Bible)
1592 Hieronim Megiser/*Dictionarium quatuor linguarum, videlicet, germanicae, latinae illyricae*
1603 Hieronim Megiser / *Thesaurus polyglottus*
1607 Alessandro Alasio da Sommaripa / *Vocabolario Italiano e Schiavo*
1680/88 Matija Kastelec / *Dictionarium latino-carniolicum*
1781 Marko Pohlin / *Tu besediše treh jezikov*
1787/98 Blaž Kumerdej / *Dictionarium slavo-carniolicum* (manuscript)
1789 Ožbalt Gutsman / *Deutsch-windisches Wörterbuch*
1806/17 Valentin Vodnik / *Slovar nemško-slovenski-latinski* (manuscript)
1833 Anton Murko / *Slovensko-Nemshki in Nemshko-Slovenski rozhni besednik*
1850 Anton Janežič / *Popolni ročni slovar slovenskega in nemškega jezika*
1860 Matej Cigale, Anton Alojzij Wolf / *Deutsch-slowenisches Wörterbuch*

All the works listed above contain a great amount of interesting and valuable facts for the understanding of the progress of the Slovenian language. Describing all of them would take too much space that is why I chose to present only some of them briefly, mostly the ones which had a great influence on other works.

5.1 Protestantism

Grammars:
1584 Adam Bohorič / *Arcticae horulae*
1715 Hipolit Novomeški / *Grammatica Latino-Germanico-Slavonica*
Dictionaries:
1580 Adam Bohorič / *Elementale Labacense cum Nomenclatura trium linguarum* (not preserved)
1584 Jurij Dalmatin / *Register* (dans la traduction de la Bible)
1592 Hieronim Megiser/*Dictionarium quatuor linguarum, videlicet, germanicae, latinae illyricae*
1603 Hieronim Megiser / *Thesaurus polyglottus*
1607 Alessandro Alasio da Sommaripa / *Vocabolario Italiano e Schiavo*

Initially, the term *protestant* meant, "to be a witness" rather than, "to be against" as the current popular interpretation of the word seems to imply in the sense of *one demonstrating against something*. As an intellectual movement, Protestantism grew out of the Renaissance and West European universities, attracting some learned intellectuals, as well as politicians, professionals, skilled tradesmen, and artisans. The new technology of the printing press allowed Protestant ideas to spread rapidly, as well as aiding in the dissemination of translations of the Christian Bible in native tongues.

The motivation of the protestant writers was that everyone could accept the religion in his own language. A phrase, often written in their works was – *young and simple reader* – as also seen in the work of *Primož Trubar (Abecedarium* and *Cateshismus, 1550) "Mladi inu preprosti Slovenci"*. It was believed that the young people were the best pupils and the ones the most suitable for learning languages. This idea of simplicity, meant in a most positive way, was strongly present in the romantic theories of Johann G. Herder who two centuries later emphasised and glorified the importance of simple countryside people and their pure and simple language. Trubar's aim was to reach the average reader and to obtain comprehension rather than beauty.

For the basis of his language Trubar took the central dialect which already included the elements of other dialects and was the language of the administrative centre of Carniola (Ljubljana). Trubar's work present the starting point of the way the Slovenian language took in its development from different local variants to literary language.

Trubar's work would have been incomplete had it not been bolstered by that of his collaborators who complemented him in many aspects;
the year 1584 was important for the growth of the Slovenian language; it was marked by the edition of two books – translation of the Bible and publication of the first grammar of Slovenian dialects. Register of words (*Register besed*) published at the end of the Jurij Dalmatin's translation of the Bible (*Biblia, tv ie, vse svetv pismv, stariga inu noviga testamenta, slovenski, tolmazhena,* 1584) represents a good basis for the study of the language. The list of words contains words from several south-Slavic dialects; Dalmatin put this Register at the end of his translation because he wanted all the South Slavic people to be

able to read his translation of the Bible. The title of the Register is very interesting and shows us the content and its purpose:

R E G I S T E R

Nekatérih beſed, katére, Crajnſki, Coroſhki, Slovénſki ali Besjázhki, Hervázki, Dalmatinſki, Istrianſki, ali Craſhki ſe drugázhi govoré.[7]

(Register of some words which are differently pronounced in Carniola, Carinthia, Slovenian or Besjak, Croatian, Dalmatian, in Istria or in Karst).

In the same year and also in the same town, in Wittemberg, the first grammar of the Slovenian language was published. Adam Bohorič was the member of the group which was in charge to give comments on Dalmatin's translation of the Bible. Doing that he decided to try to write a grammar of his native language. For him the grammar was essential for the language acquisition. It was written upon the model of Latin grammar of his tutor Melanchthon. *Arcticae horulae* (Winter hours, 1584) is the first grammar of one of the Slovenian dialects. Written in Latin, the work describes the dialect of central territory of Slovenia. For Bohorič the knowledge of Slovenian language was one of the most important parts of the education and that is why his grammar was written as a manual for teachers. His well known sentence is *Plures novisse linguas et iucundam est et utile*.[8]

The desire to go beyond the confines of one's language is apparent in the earliest works of the Protestants, like in Dalmatin's Register and in Bohorič's Slovene grammar (both as we know printed in 1584), which were destined for all Southern Slavs. This tendency in the all-Slavic orientation of grammatical and lexicographic works goes as far to the eighteenth and nineteenth century.

Most of the protestant writers who described Slovenian language had this language or its vernaculars for their mother tongue. Hieronim Megiser was German who met the sons of Trubar and Dalmatin in Wittemberg. With their help he got acquainted with Slovenian language and described it in the first multilingual dictionary *Dictionarium quadrum linguarum, videlicet, germanicae, latinae, & illyricae (que vulgo Sclavonica appellatur),* The dictionary of four languages, 1592). This work was of a great importance; the Illyrian language, as Megiser names it, was described beside other "important" European languages: German, Latin and Italian. What we also may not overlook is his nomination of the described language: he didn't use the term "Slovenian" but "*Illyricae*" and beside that also "*que vulgo Sclavonica appellatur*".

Megiser was a great erudite and the vocabulary of his multilingual dictionary was used by several other authors during the periods that followed.

5.2 Enlightenment

Grammars:
1768 Marko Pohlin / *Kraynska Grammatika*
1777 Ožbalt Gutsman / *Windische Sprachlehre*
1793 Blaž Kumerdej / *Krainisch-slawische Grammatik*
1791 Mihael Zelenko / *Slovennska Grammatika oder Georg Sellenko's Windische sprachlehre*
1807 Jurij Japelj / *Slawische Sprachlehre* (manuscript)

---

[7] Jurij Dalmatin, *Biblia, tv ie, vse svetv pismv, stariga inu noviga testamenta, slovenski, tolmazhena, 1584,* Wittemberg. Register is printed at the end of the book.
[8] A. Bohorič, *Arcticae Horulae*, 1584, p. 3 (introduction to the grammar) "It is good to know several languages."

1818/09 Jernej Kopitar / *Grammatik der slavischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steiermark*
1811 Valentin Vodnik / *Pismenost ali gramatika se perve shole*
1811 Vincenc Franul Weissenthurn / *Saggio grammaticale italiano-cragnolino*
1812 Janez Krstnik Leopold Šmigoc / *Theoretisch-practische Windische Sprachlehre*
1824 Peter Danjko / *Lehrbuch der windischen Sprache*
1825 Franc Metelko / *Lehrgebäude der Slowenischen sprache im Königreich Illyrien und in*
     Enlightenment presents an important period in the history, cultural and political.
Dictionaries:
1680/88 Matija Kastelec / *Dictionarium latino-carniolicum*
1781 Marko Pohlin / *Tu besediše treh jezikov*
1787/98 Blaž Kumerdej / *Dictionarium slavo-carniolicum* (manuscript)
1789 Ožbalt Gutsman / *Deutsch-windisches Wörterbuch*
1806/17 Valentin Vodnik / *Slovar nemško-slovenski-latinski* (manuscript)

     The Age of Enlightenment refers to either the eighteenth century in European philosophy, or the longer period including the seventeenth century and the Age of Reason. It can more narrowly refer to the historical intellectual movement *The Enlightenment*, which advocated Reason as a means to establishing an authoritative system of aesthetics, ethics, and logic. The intellectual leaders regarded themselves as courageous elite who would purposely lead the world into progress from a long period of doubtful tradition, irrationality, superstition, and tyranny, which they imputed to the *Dark Ages*. The movement helped create the intellectual framework for the American and French Revolutions.

     Thinkers of this age advocated the idea that nationality had a basis beyond mere preference. Philosophers, such as Johann Gottfried von Herder whom we already mentioned, reasserted the idea from Greek antiquity that language had a decisive influence on cognition and thought, and that the meaning of a particular book or text was open to deeper exploration based on deeper connections, an idea now called hermeneutics. The original focus of his scholarship was to delve into the meaning in the Bible and in order to gain a deeper understanding of it.

     As we may see above, during this time, several grammars and dictionaries have been published. It was the most productive period in the development of the Slovenian language.

     The work of a linguist Jernej Kopitar was of a great importance for the development of the language. Even though he wrote only in Latin and German he represents the founder of the study of the language among the Slavs, together with others founders of the Slavic philology (such as Dobrovský, Šafařík, Vostokov and Karadžić).

     He consecrated all his work to the development of the Slovenian language and its grammar. He worked as a librarian in a state library in Vienna[9] where he met and exchanged experiences and opinions with several linguists from other Slavic countries: he was a good friend of Josef Dobrovský, Ljudevit Gaj and Vuk Karadžić. Together with Gaj and Karadžić he "created"[10] the Serbo-Croatian language 1850. Kopitar's most important work is his grammar: *Grammatik der slavischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyermark*, 1808. The grammar was written in German and destined to specialists who would with the help of this

---

[9] Almost all of Kopitar's activities were held in the capital of the empire which was at that time also the most important cultural centre of Slovene students who came there to study and where they could meet other Slavic intellectuals.

[10] This "creation" was an official act, signed by Kopitar, Gaj and Karadžić and some other Serbian and Croatian philologists. It artificially created Serbo-Croatian language, based on Serbian dialect, known as "*štokavien*". It was a "successful unifying" of Croats and Serbs under a common literary language.

work acquire a clear idea of the Slavic languages, spoken on Slovenian territories; their structure, history and limits. The title itself is interesting because it limits the speech area of the Slovenian dialects and at the same time connects them to other Slavic languages.

Kopitar was also a great partisan of the Panslavic theory; he finds evidences for the theory of Slavic parent in the philology. This proof will encourage intellectuals from several Slavic countries to pose questions of cultural and at the end also political unity of all Slaves. But eventually at the later period of his work Kopitar abandoned the theory of panslavism; the reason was mostly because Dobrovský and other important Slavists suggested that Slovenian should be only one dialect of Croatian language and that Slovenes are just Croatian colony. The quest for interdependence and unity, which shaped also the early works of Kopitar, and which was particularly intense among the minor Slavic nations, was at the same time counteracted by the opposite tendency – towards individuation and differentiation.

In his grammar Kopitar cites Herder a lot; he knew the ideas of European rationalism and Slovenian enlightenment. He emphasises the importance of the language of the people for the creation of the literary language; he was against any foreign words in Slovenian language. In the introduction to his grammar he gives the Dobrovský's classification of Slavic languages:

Die Hauptdialekte des Slaviſchen Sprache, die ſich noch bis auf unſre Zeiten herrſchend erhaletn haben, ſind, nebſt der Alt=Slavoniſchen Kirchen= oder Bibelſprache, nach Herrn Dobrowſky's Claſſification:[11]

1. *Die Ruſſiſche Sprache*
2. *Die Polniſche, mit dem Schleſiſchen im Fürſtenthume Teſchen*
3. *Die Illyriſche nach verſchiedenen Mundarten, als der Bulgariſchen, Serviſchen, Bosniſchen, Slavoniſchen, Dalmatiniſchen, Raguſäiſchen*
4. *Die Kroatiſche mit dem Windiſchen im Krain, Steyermark und Kärnten[12]*
5. *Die Böhmiſche, mit dem Mähriſchen, Schleſiſchen um Troppau, und Slovakiſchen in Ober=Ungern*

Kopitar's encouragement of dialectal diversity and his call for a new Slavic alphabet found an immediate echo in the activities of Peter Dajnko from Styria and Franc Metelko from Lower Carniola. Both of them wrote a grammar in which they tried to introduce new orthography. In 1824 Dajnko published *Lehrbuch der windischen Sprache* and a year later (1825) Metelko also published his grammar *Lehrgebäude der Slowenischen sprache im Königreich Illyrien und in dem benachbarten Provinzen*. They both tried to introduce their form of new orthograpy for which they were persuaded to be more suitable for the slovenian dialects.

The orthographies contained new characters, imported mostly from Cyrillic. Dajnko for example used new signs for č, ž and š. He wrote: *Keliko jezîkov zná8, tęliko lýdi valá8[13]*. In today's orthography this would be: *Koliko jezikov znaš, toliko ljudi veljaš*. (It is good to know several languages).

Argue about the different orthographies finally brought to a huge quarrel which is in Slovenian linguistic history known as the "quarrel of alphabets". It was one of the developments which finally brought to the unification of the language and its orthography. The question of the diverse alphabets which the peripheral regions adopted from their neighbours (Hungarian in Prekmurje, Italian in Primorska) was a serious one. The diversity gave rise to new local varieties (*dajnčica* in Styria, *metelčica* in Carniola) and this set of the

---

[11] J. Kopitar, *Grammatik*, 1808, p. XX.
[12] Here Kopitar gives a remark that one day perhaps we should change this point, but surely after some researches.
[13] P. Dajnko, *Vorrede* of grammar.

war of alphabets which reflected the deeper tensions between the forces of particularism and the forces of unification.

Finally, the two orthographies *dajnčica* (from Dajnko) and *metelčica* (from Metelko) were banned in the middle of the 19th century.

Another discussion was happening at the same time and was mostly between Kopitar (and his supporters Dajnko and Metelko) on one side and Prešeren (with Čop): the main point of the dispute was the basis for the language: the contrary between the language of the country (meaning the simple people in the villages, like the ideal of Herder's philosophy) and the language of the intellectuals, preferred by France Prešeren (1800-1849). The demand to purge Slovenian of German words and constructions was a great part of Kopitar's program. His idealization of the language of the "people" was inspired as much by this demand as by his cultural Pan-Slavism and his romantic belief in the popular language as the repository of the national spirit.

The conflict resulted in a public dispute, where Prešeren with his sonnets argues against poverty of the simple language and aimed for higher purposes. He wanted to give a higher status to the Slovenian language, elevating it to the literary language. Although France Prešeren is acknowledged to be the greatest of the Slovene poets, the important role he played in the formation of the Slovene literary language is usually not fully appreciated. His vigorous independent ideas about the cultivation and development of the literary language are to be found in his letters as well in his poetry, often expressed in the biting wit and probing satire of verse epigrams. The influence of his creative writing and his opposition to the leading philologist of his time were particularly important, coming as they did at a time when the Slovene literary language had reached a watershed in its development. Prešeren, however, wanted the literary language to act as an instrument of great refinement and versatility, able to satisfy the needs of the Slovene intellectual and the cultural needs of the Slovene nation. Prešeren, unlike Kopitar and his followers, saw the need to build on the foundation that already existed. Prešeren's attitude to Germanisms is in fact that of a pragmatic and practical realist: their complete eradication would cause more harm than good, while excessive use of them was undesirable. He also points out that excessive borrowing from all areas of Slavdom will make the Slovenes like magpies, and their language like that spoken in the tower of Babel! Prešeren's efforts to cultivate an independent Slovene literary language and a literature of European dimensions have ensured him a worthy place in Slovene cultural history.

5.3 Romanticism and the second half of the 19th century

Grammars:
1832 Anton Murko / *Theoretisch-praktische Grammatik der Slowenischen Sprache in Steiermark, Kärnten, Krain und dem illyrischen Küstenlande*
1849 Blaž Potočnik / *Grammatik der ſloweniſchen Sprache*
1854 Anton Janežič / *Slovenska slovnica*
Dictionaries:
1833 Anton Murko / *Slovensko-Nemshki in Nemshko-Slovenski rozhni besednik*
1850 Anton Janežič / *Popolni ročni slovar slovenskega in nemškega jezika*
1860 Matej Cigale, Anton Alojzij Wolf / *Deutsch-slowenisches Wörterbuch*

Romanticism was an artistic and intellectual movement that originated in late 18th century Western Europe. In part a revolt against aristocratic social and political norms of the

Enlightenment period and a reaction against the rationalization of nature. It elevated folk art, language and custom, as well as arguing for an epistemology based on usage and custom. It was influenced by ideas of the Enlightenment, particularly evolution and uniformitarianism, which argued that "the past is the key to the present", and elevated medievalism and elements of art and narrative perceived to be from the medieval period. The name "romantic" itself comes from the term "romance" which is a prose or poetic heroic narrative originating in the medieval.

Movement is typically characterized by its reaction against the Enlightenment; whereas the Enlightenment emphasized the primacy of reason, Romanticism emphasized imagination and feeling. One of Romanticism's key ideas and most enduring legacies is the assertion of nationalism, which became a central theme of Romantic art and political philosophy. From the earliest parts of the movement, with their focus on development of national languages and folklore, and the importance of local customs and traditions, to the movements which would redraw the map of Europe and lead to calls for self-determination of nationalities, nationalism was one of the key vehicles of Romanticism, its role, expression and meaning. Early Romantic nationalism was strongly inspired by Rousseau, and by the ideas of Johann Gottfried von Herder, who in 1784 argued that the geography formed the natural economy of a people, and shaped their customs and society.

Fichte expressed the unity of language and nation in his address "To the German Nation" in 1806: *Those who speak the same language are joined to each other by a multitude of invisible bonds by nature herself, long before any human art begins; they understand each other and have the power of continuing to make themselves understood more and more clearly; they belong together and are by nature one and an inseparable whole. ...Only when each people, left to itself, develops and forms itself in accordance with its own peculiar quality, and only when in every people each individual develops himself in accordance with that common quality, as well as in accordance with his own peculiar quality—then, and then only, does the manifestation of divinity appear in its true mirror as it ought to be.*[14]

The period was very vivid also in the Slovenian territories. The production of books grew and with them also the amount of grammars and dictionaries. The language slowly gained the basis to become a literary language; grammars and dictionaries started to unite different Slovenian dialects into the literary language. The basic contours of the contemporary literary language were drawn in the 1850's when the Slovenes succeeded in solving the three interconnected problems which have accompanied the entire history of the language, the three questions we mentioned at the beginning of this work (- the relation between Slovenian language/its dialects and other Slavic languages, - the relation of the peripheral literary dialects to the central standard, - the role of the sixteenth-century norm for the modern language).

The question of the relation of Slovenian to other Slavic languages emerged again in 1848 when Matija Majar proposed a gradual dissolution of Slovenian within the common "Illyrian" language. In practice this program proposed the adoption of two coexistent systems: a "lower" language for everyday purposes to be used by uneducated speakers and a "higher" language which would strive to assimilate its forms to those of other Slavic languages with which it would in this fashion gradually merge. This program was no less utopian than that of its predecessors for it both demanded that the Slovenes renounce their national identity and expected that every Slovenian writer become a Slavic philologist.

The question of an integrated literary language that would level the differences between the periphery and the central areas was confronted with even greater éclat. The formulation of a

---

[14] Kelly, 1968, p. 197-98.

supradialectal, abstract norm attracted a great attention. The reconstructive, historical treatment of the literary language was superseded only at the turn of the century with the advent of a new generation of linguists (Stanislav Škrabec, Matija Valjavec, …).

These three aspects of linguistic interference in the evolution of the Slovene literary language stimulated and consolidated the integration of regional traditions. The processes involve the three different courses of Slovene evolution proposed by grammarians and may be labelled the *Slavization*, *Archaization* and *Vernacularization* of the Slovene literary language.

Some interesting works from this period:

Anton Murko - *Theoretisch-praktische Grammatik der Slowenischen Sprache in Steiermark, Kärnten, Krain und dem illyrischen Küstenlande (1832)*
- His grammar delivered the final blow to Slovene linguistic regionalism by opting for synthesis of the major Slovene dialects. He rejected the various orthographic reforms by returning to the *bohoričica* (the later editions of the grammar adopted the *gajica*). Murko's grammar served as an authoritative model for several decades.

Anton Janežič – *Slovenska slovnica s kratkim pregledom slovenskega slovstva ter z malim cirilskim in glagoliškim berilom za Slovence* (1854)
- One of the most influential grammars of Slovene, based on the works of Metelko (1825) and Miklošič (1852). It was often revised by the author and by later grammarians. The examples are drawn from older Slovene texts and from popular usage.

Anton Janežič – *Popolni ročni slovar slovenskega in nemškega jezika. Vollständiges Taschen-Wörterbuch der slovenischen und deutschen Sprache* (1850-51)
- The original edition relied heavily on the dictionaries of Pohlin (1781), Murko (1833) and Gutsman (1789) and included many Serbo-Croatian words. The second revised and augmented edition of the German-Slovene part did away with many of the Slavic loan-words and neologisms and became one of the most authoritative dictionaries of its time.

6. Conclusion

One of the characteristic traits of the debates on the language question in those Slavic cultures which, like the Slovene, developed without an ethnically conscious aristocracy or middle class was that for a long time the evolution of their literary standard did not affect the level of their narrower social communicative functions. Thus in the Slovene lands the dilemma "German vs. Slovene" stood for social and cultural differentiation, and, in the given social structure, there was very little need for the development of a Slovene administrative and cultural language. The *communicative function* of Slovene, except for the vernacular in dialects, was limited to its use in books. Primož Trubar's *Schriftsprache* (1550) remained for centuries a Slovene *Büchersprache*, that is, a book language. In this respect the Slovene situation differs from the Florentine "Language Question" model of Dante's time.

In the 16th century the development of vernacular grammars was under a huge influence of Protestants. Their main aim was to make the ecclesiastical rituals comprehensible to the people. During the centuries the character of the movement changed – through cultural in the 18th century into a political movement at the middle of the 19th century. It is here that the dilemma "Slovene or something else" found its final compromise: the integration of the

Slovene dialects into an acceptable form to be codified in the grammar of the Slovene literary language.[15]

Until our time 25 different grammars and 15 dictionaries of Slovenian dialects have been published. Every one of them is different from others; they bring new knowledge and show us the development of the language which depends from social and historical context.

All the authors had the same goal: publish a grammar to give rules to the language and publish a dictionary to enlarge to language's vocabulary. They felt the wish and need to know and describe the language, to give rules and take notice of the differences their mother tongue had with German, Italian or Latin. And beside that also to call attention to differences between several local variants, dialects the language had.

Another important aspect of the grammatical and lexicographical tradition of Slovenian, and also other Slavic languages, is its relation to the linguistic thought of the West. Western linguistic influences on the Slavs can be traced back to the fifteenth century. The Slavic authors were keenly aware of the linguistic controversies in the West, while some of their grammarians were in personal contact with most outstanding Humanists of Europe (like Bohorič's apprenticeship to Melanchthon). What we may not ignore is the fact that the study of the Slavic languages owes a special dept also to the foreign scholars who settled in the Slavic countries and acquired first-hand knowledge of their languages and cultures. Thus the great polyglot Megiser placed Slovene in the company of the most prestigious languages of Europe (in his quadrilingual dictionary of 1592).

Regarding their contents the grammars and dictionaries are strongly alike, but when we read the introductions they differ a lot. On one side, it was impossible to obtain all the information one would want wont, but on the other hand some introductions are rich with examples and illustrations. Some authors give a lot of information, regarding the position of the language in the society, their point of view, the history and development of the language.

Every of these works shows the spirit of the time in which it was published and also the philosophy of the period. That is why it is interesting to see the oppositions the authors gained from their contemporaries.

In the history of the Slovenian language the grammars and dictionaries played an important role. Their authors occupy different places in the literary history of our language and their influences on future works differed a lot. But what they all had in common was that they all tried to:

- Describe on the best possible way the characteristics of the regional languages,
- To gather the vocabulary for the dictionary of the vernacular they wanted to describe.

They worked on school manuals, printed necessary abecedaries and books of lecture for countryside schools and Sunday schools. Their contribution to the development of the language was immense.

A linguistically relevant characteristic of the Slovene language question was that it helped resolve two "existential" problems of the literary language:
1) in principle, the relation of a literary language to its dialects, that is, the problem of the theoretical basis of a literary language of the integrational type;
2) from a practical point of view, the unification of the literary traditions of different dialectal bases, notably the unity among central and eastern, Carniolan and Styrian dialects.

---

[15] Lencek, 1982, p. 266.

7. Bibliography

AHAČIČ 2003 = K. Ahačič, *Od naslovnikov knjig do rabe slovenščine v cerkvi: nekaj vprašanj slovenske sociolingvistike 16. stoletja*, in: Jezik in slovstvo, Letn 48, št. 6. Ljubljana: Slavistično društvo Slovenije, 3-24.

ANDERSON 1983 = B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* London-New York: Verso.

ARCHAIMBAULT 1992 = S. Archaimbault, *Les premières grammaires du slavon*, in: S. Auroux (ed.), Histoire des idées linguistiques. Tome2. Liège: Pierre Mardaga, 239-250.

AUROUX 1985 = S. Auroux, *La linguistique fantastique.* Paris: Éditions Denoël.

AUROUX 1992 = S. Auroux, *Le processus de grammatisation et ses enjeux*, in:S. Auroux (ed.), Histoire des idées linguistiques. Tome2. Liège: Pierre Mardaga, 11-64.

AUROUX 1994 = S. Auroux, *La révolution technologique de la grammatisation.* Liège: Pierre Mardaga.

AUROUX 1996 = S. Auroux, *Langue, État, Nation: le modèle politique*, in: P. Sériot, Language et nation en Europe centrale et orientale du XVIIIème siècle à nos jours. Lausanne: Cahiers de l'ILSL 8, 1-19.

BAGGIONI 1997 = D. Baggioni, *Languages et nations es Europe.* Paris : Payot.

CALVET 1987 = L. J. Calvet, *La guerre des langues et les politiques linguistiques.* Paris : Payot.

CALVET 1993 = L. J. Calvet, *Histoire des mots.* Paris: Éditions Payot.

CALVET 1993 = L. J. Calvet, *L'Europe et ses langues.* Paris : Plon.

CAUSSAT 1996 = P. Caussat, D. Adamski et M. Crepon, *La langue source de la nation, Messianismes séculiers en europe centrale et orientale (du XVIIIe au XXe siècle).* Bruxelles : Pierre Mardaga Editeur.

COLOMBAT 1998 =B. Colombat, *Corpus représentative des grammaires et des traditions linguistiques.* Paris: Histoire, Épistemologie, Langage, Hors-Série n°2. Tome I.

COLOMBAT 2000 = B. Colombat, *Corpus représentative des grammaires et des traditions linguistiques.* Paris: Histoire, Épistemologie, Langage, Hors-Série n°2. Tome II.

COSERIU 2003 = E. Coseriu, *Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie, Von Anfängen bis Rousseau.* Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag Tübingen und Basel.

ČOP 1973 = M. Čop, *Iz gradiva za zgodovino slovenskega slovstva*, Izbrano delo, Jernej Kopitar, Matija Čop. Ljubljana: Naša beseda.

DOMINICY 1985 = M. Domincy, *La naissance de la grammaire moderne, Langage, logique et philosophie à Port-Royal.* Bruxelles : Pierre Mardaga Editeur.

ECO 1994 = U. Eco, *La recherche de la langue parfaite dans la culture européenne.* Paris : Éditions du Seuil.

GARDE 1996 = P. Garde, *Langue et nation : le cas serbe, croate et bosniaque*, in : Langue et nation en Europe centrale et orientale du XVIIIème siècle à nos jours. Lausanne : Cahiers de l'ILSL, n^{0}8, 123 – 148.

GARDE 2004 = P. Garde, *Le discours balkanique. Des mots et des hommes.* Librarie Arthème Fayard.

GRDINA 1996 = I. Grdina, *Konstituiranje slovenske narodne identitete in slovenska književnost (v trikotniku Avstrija – Jugoslavija – Slovenija*, in Avstrija. Jugoslavija. Slovenija. Slovenska narodna identiteta skozi čas. Ljubljana: Oddelek z zgodovino Filozofske fakultete, 90-111.

GRDINA 1997 = I. Grdina, *Starejša slovenska nabožna književnost.* Ljubljana: DZS.

HÉRAUD 1966 = G. Héraud, *Peuples et langues d'Europe.* Paris : Éditions Denoël.

HERDER 1985 = J. G. Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit.* Wiesbaden: Fourier.

HERMET 1996 = G. Hermet, *Histoire des nations et du nationalisme en Europe*. Éditions du Seuil.

ILUSTRIRANA ZGODOVINA SLOVENCEV 2000 = Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.

KUDORFER 2003 = D. Kudorfer, *Lebendiges Büchererbe, Säkularisation, Mediatisierung und die Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*. München: Bayerische StaatsBibliothek.

LAPIERRE 1988 = J. W. Lapierre, *Le pouvoir politique et les langues*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

LENCEK 1982 = R. L. Lencek, *The Structure and History of the Slovene Language Question*. Ohio, Slavica Publishers.

LENCEK 1984 = R. L. Lencek, *The Modern Slovene Language Question: An Essay in Sociolinguistic Interpretation*, in: Riccardo Picchio and Harvey Goldblatt, Aspects of the Slavic Language Question. New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, 297-317.

MELIK 1997 = V. Melik, *Problemi v razvoju slovenske narodne identitete (do 1941)*, in Avstrija. Jugoslavija. Slovenija. Slovenska narodna identiteta skozi čas. Ljubljana: Oddelek z zgodovino Filozofske fakultete, 41-53.

OROŽEN 1996 = M. Orožen, *Oblikovanje enotnega slovenskega knjižnega jezika v 19. stoletju*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.

OROŽEN 1996 = M. Orožen, *Poglavja iz zgodovine slovenskega knjižnega jezika* (od brižinskih spomenikov do Kopitarja). Ljubljana: Oddelek za slovanske jezike in književnosti Filozofske fakultete.

OROŽEN 2003 = M. Orožen, *Razvoj slovenske jezikoslovne misli*. Maribor: Zora 26.

PICHIO 1984 = R. Picchio, *Guidelines for a Comparative study of the Language Question among the Slavs*, in: R. Picchio and Harvey Goldblatt, Aspects of the Slavic Language Question. New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, 1-42.

PORTAL 1965 = R. Portal, *Les Slaves, Peuples et nations*. Librairie Armand Colin.

RIGLER 1968 = J. Rigler, *Začetki slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana: SAZU.

SAUSSURE 2001 = F. de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Éditions Payot.

SCAGLIONE 1984 = A. Scaglione (ed), *The Emergence of National Languages*. Ravenne: Longo Editore.

SÉRIOT 1996 = P. Sériot, *Langue et nation : une relation problématique (Europe centrale et orientale du 18ème siècle à nos jours)*, in : Langue et nation en Europe centrale et orientale du XVIIIème siècle à nos jours. Lausanne : Cahiers de l'ILSL 8, I-VI.

SÉRIOT 1997 = P. Sériot, *Faut-il que les langues aient un nom ? Le cas du macédonien*, in : Andrée Tabouret-Keller (ed.), Le nom des langues I, Les enjeux de la nomination des langues. Louvain : Peeters.

SIGUAN 1996 = M. Siguan, *L'Europe des langues*. Mardaga.

STANKIEWICZ 1980 = E. Stankiewicz, *Slovenian*, in: A. M. Schenker and E. Stankiewicz, The Slavic Literary Languages: Formation and Development. New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, 85-102.

STANKIEWICZ 1984 = E. Stankiewicz, *Grammars and Dictionnaries of the Slavic Languages from the Middle Ages up to 1850. An Annotated Bibliography*. Berlin: New-York, Amsterdam.

STEFANINI 1994 = J. Stefanini, *Histoire de la grammaire*, Textes réunis par Véronique Xatard. Paris : CNRS Éditions.

ŠKILJAN 1988 = D. Škiljan, *Jezična politika*. Zagreb: Biblioteka Naprijed.

ŠKILJAN 1999 = D. Škiljan, *Javni jezik. K lingvistiki javne komunikacije*. Ljubljana: Studia Humanitatis.

ŠKILJAN 2002 = D. Škiljan, *Govor nacije. Jezik, nacija, Hrvati*. Zagreb: Golden marketing.

TABOURET-KELLER 1997 = A. Tabouret-Keller, *Les enjeux de la nomination des langues, Presentation,* in : Andrée Tabouret-Keller (ed.), Le nom des langues I, Les enjeux de la nomination des langues. Louvain : Peeters.

THIESSE 2001 = A. M. Thiesse, *Le création des identités nationales, Europe XVIIIe-XXe siècle*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

THOMAS 1999 = P.-L. Thomas, *Frontières linguistiques, frontières politiques*, in Histoire, Epistemiologie, Langage, t. XXI/1, 63-82.

TRUBETZKOY 1924 = N. S. Trubetzkoy, *La Tour de Babel et la confusion des languages*, in La langue source de la nation. Bruxelles : Pierre Mardaga Editeur, 503-519.

WEILL 1938 = G. Weill, *L'Europe du XIXème siècle et l'idée de nationalité*. Paris : Albin Michel.