



UDC 811.163.6"18"
Jasna Honzak Jahić
Faculty of Arts, Prague

NOTIONAL ELEMENTS OF MARKO POHLIN'S *KRAYNSKA GRAMMATIKA* (1768)

The article discusses the notional elements that were the basis of Marko Pohlin's grammar, *Kraynska grammatika* (1768). These elements were the following: the tradition of Slovenian standard language, the author's comparison of the public status of Slovenian with the public status of Czech, which stimulated his culture-forming and consequently nation-forming programs, the context of two Czech grammars, Czech language textbooks at educational institutions in Vienna, *Čechořečnost* by V. J. Rosa (1672) and *Grammatica linguae Bohemicae oder Die böhmische Sprachkunst* by J. V. Pohl (1756, 1764), the understanding of standard language in the 17th and 18th centuries, and the Enlightenment ideas.

Idejne prvine za Pohlinovo Kraynsko grammatiko (1768) so: slovensko knjižnojezikovno izročilo, avtorjeva primerjava javnega položaja slovenskega jezika s položajem češkega, kar je spodbudilo njegov kulturotvorni in posledično narodotvorni program, kontekst dveh čeških slovníc, učbenikov češkega jezika v pedagoških institucijah na Dunaju, *Čechořečnost* V. J. Rose (1672) in *Grammatica linguae Bohemicae oder Die böhmische Sprachkunst* J. V. Pohla (1756, 1764), razumevanje jezika v 17. in 18. stoletju ter ideje razsvetljenstva.

Key words: Revival in the Slovenian lands, Marko Pohlin, *Kraynska grammatika* grammar, Slovenian standard language tradition, public status of Czech and Slovenian, culture-forming and nation-forming programs, grammars by V. J. Rosa (1672) and J. V. Pohl (1756, 1764), understanding of standard language, Enlightenment ideas

Ključne besede: prerod v slovenskem prostoru, Marko Pohlin, slovnica Kraynska grammatika, slovensko knjižnojezikovno izročilo, javni položaj češkega in slovenskega jezika, kulturotvorni in narodotvorni besedilni program, slovnica V. J. Rose (1672) in J. V. Pohla (1756, 1764), misel o knjižnem jeziku, ideje razsvetljenstva

0 In the second half of the 18th century and the first third of the 19th century, the Slovenian cultural space was marked by the culture-forming and national awakening movement of the Revival. During the Revival, the so-called ethnocentric texts, written in Slovenian during the baroque period and mostly religious in purpose,¹ reached programmatically into the secular sphere, where they grew in volume as well as in func-

¹ During the Catholic restoration and baroque periods, Slovenian texts for religious purposes included Jesuit and Capuchin sermons, spiritual lyric poetry, a new prose genre – translated and original meditative prose, and a new literary genre – spiritual drama. Among the first technical texts created during this time are almanacs, e.g., *Nova kranjska pratika na lejtju MDCXXVI*, 1725, which is admittedly modest in content, but whose necessity and popularity are demonstrated by its impression – 30,000 copies (Rupel 1956: 313), the first technical handbooks, such as popular medical books (A. Goličnik, *Arcniške bukve*, 1759) and educational popular science texts (exercises in arithmetic and spelling) in addition to translations (M. Paglavac, *Tobjeve bukve*, 1733, *Zvesti tovariš*, 1742). Foreign-language works of domestic research by polymath empiricists Ž. Popovič, J. L. Schönleben, J. V. Valvasor, as well as scientific, literary and cultural study texts by members of baroque scientific and art societies, particularly of the first such society, *Academia operosorum* (1693–1725), were intended for the educated population. The reformist Catholic action brought to

tional diversity, i.e., they materialized in all functional styles. The reasons for this dynamism with regard to the standard language and functional styles are sociolinguistic: new opportunities for public roles of standard Slovenian were brought about by new civilizational, social, economic, and cultural circumstances of enlightened absolutism together with reform and utilitarian activities of Maria Theresa and Joseph II. The final aim of the »changes in practices in language culture in Slovenian lands, attracting new types of secular literary cultural disciplines, and the regeneration of the standard language« (Kidrič 1930: 42) was – to constitute the nation.² In the Slovenian lands, the Enlightenment philosophical, physiocratic, and political thought was modified³ in accordance with the social development and the status of the Slovenian language, and was therefore focused on the national and linguistic awakening. Its point of departure was the development and cultivation of a fully functional (standard) Slovenian language.

1 In Slovenian culture and literature, the role of a cultivated standard language, well-developed with regard to functional styles, was first highlighted by Matija Čop (1797–1835). In his biographic and bibliographic outline of Slovenian literature, written in 1831 for Šafařík's second, expanded edition of *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten* (hereafter *Geschichte*), he introduced the concept of the »third period« of Slovenian literature. The novelty of this period in literary history, which chronologically followed the periods of Trubar and Hren, lay, in Čop's opinion, in the fact that alongside the most frequent religious texts, technical and popular science texts were written to a greater extent than in the previous period, and »/.../ even something belletristic for the more educated« (Čop, in: Slodnjak 1986: 61), and in the need to cultivate the standard Slovenian language, which was expressed in a greater concern for literary language, as »essays on grammar are even too frequent when compared to other literary fruits« (Čop, *ibid.*). Čop estimated that the initiator and also the creator of the new in the »third period« was Marko Pohlin. This

the forefront the role of the Slovenian language in liturgy and education, which supported the creation and reprinting of linguistic works. Numerous dictionaries were compiled, but remained in manuscript, e.g., the lost *Dictionarium latino-carniolicum* by M. Kastelec (c. 1680), of which only copies are preserved (e.g., copy by Vorenc, 1703–1710), or Hipolit's trilingual dictionary (1711–1712); Bohorič's grammar was reprinted (Hipolit Novomeški, 1715, Carinthian Jesuits in German translation, 1758).

² Cf. I. Prijatelj (1935: 1) (»/.../ that cultural, especially literary movement whose intention is to establish the Slovenians as a nation /.../«), J. Koruza (1975/76, 1991: 218) (»/.../ the preliminary stage of the political formation of the Slovenian nation, limited actually to the sphere of culture«), J. Pogačnik (1995: 51) (»/.../ that the Slovenian historical subject was consciously constituted as a project to be attained«), M. Juvan (2000: 133–134) (»/.../ being engaged in the Slovenian national emancipation, the autonomous Slovenian culture /acquired/ a new task – it became an argument and representative of Slovenianhood in the national-cultural relationship to Germanhood«).

³ J. Kos (1979: 33–34) considers a peculiarity of the Slovenian Revival its focus on pragmatic cultural work (promotion of school and general education, compilation of pedagogical and lay technical texts), which was also a unifying factor, as it brought together workers of various ideological orientations (e.g., Catholics, Jansenists, Josephinians, free thinkers), and a noticeable sociological change. The ideas of the European higher and middle bourgeois classes reached the Slovenian, mostly provincial peasant and petit bourgeois classes, as the higher-class, economically developed, intellectually above average or even radical bourgeoisie was only too rare in the Slovenian lands.



assessment is also suggested by the fact that Čop pointed out two characteristics of Pohlin's work: the texts that took into consideration the receptive capacities and needs of socially and educationally heterogeneous addressees, and the grammar.⁴ Čop found Pohlin's codification work (*Kraynska grammatika*, 1768) to have pioneer qualities because it included the request for a cultivated standard language, rather than actually realized the cultivation of standard Slovenian. In a text for Šafařik, Čop referred to Kopitar's assessment (1808/09) of Pohlin's grammar; this indicates implicit support for the previous assessor's judgment; which was heeded by P. J. Šafařik in the first edition of his *Geschichte* (1826, p. 284).⁵

2 The Slovenian lands provided several incentives to the first revivalist, Marko Pohlin (1735–1801), for his national revival work. More specifically:

⁴ Čop's estimate that the creation of functionally differentiated texts for socially and educationally different addressees is a process in which a cultivated and functionally differentiated standard language develops and shapes Slovenian culture has been accepted and defended by the Slovenian literary history (cf., Ivan Prijatelj 1935 (1920/21), France Kidrič 1930, 1929–1938, 1935–1955, Jože Koruza 1975/76, 1985, (1991), Jože Pogačnik 1968, 1995). A comparison between the first modern researchers, Kidrič and Prijatelj, shows certain differences in interpretation. In *preporod* 'rebirth' (expressively reduced to *prerod* 'revival' in contemporary usage), France Kidrič mainly saw new possibilities for standard Slovenian, an opportunity for its (greater) emancipation in public; he (like Čop) placed Marko Pohlin at the beginnings of the new tasks of standard Slovenian. The starting point of Kidrič's thought was the then (1930s) available data about the public status of Slovenian during the Revival. Modern linguistic and cultural study findings (J. Höffler 1973, P. Merku 1980, J. Dular 1989) maintain that in the background of the official, state German there was provincial Slovenian in everyday oral usage, and allow the conclusion that even before the Revival took place in the Slovenian lands, spoken cultural Slovenian must have been more widely spread in the society. – But for Ivan Prijatelj the Revival movement was first and foremost a national awakening movement, and the role of revival acts (social, cultural, linguistic, literary) was assessed based on their nation-forming quality (1935: 32–35). In this light, the final aim of the Revival was the political awakening after March 1848, the *Zedinjena Slovenija* program demanding unification *into one kingdom by the name of Slovenia*, self-determination in state legal systems, and introduction of Slovenian into *schools and offices*. The author moved the chronological beginning of the Revival to the 1870s, the time of Austrian state absolutism, represented by the sovereign Joseph II, Enlightenment social and economic reforms, and the growing power of German centralism. The conceptual introduction to the *Slovenian national renaissance* (Prijatelj 1935: 1) was represented by the poem *Zadovoljni Krajnc* by Valentin Vodnik from the anthology of poetry *Pisanice od lepeh umetnost* and the beginning of Kumerdej's learned society (1779). Vodnik's poem professes the people's active relation towards their own culture. The main goal of (the second) *Academia operosorum* was not the need for fundamental normative linguistic texts and preparation of the standard Slovenian language, but a manifestation of *ratio*, a belief in the power of reason and in the sovereign's Enlightenment reforms, with which A. T. Linhart at the time introduced the society of scholars to the Slovenian lands. In spite of his vast literary production – »/wrote/ more himself than /was written/ in the two centuries before him« (Prijatelj 1935: 34) – and his revival love of homeland, M. Pohlin was not included in the beginnings of the Revival; according to Prijatelj, *Pisanice* represented a Jesuit school baroque classicism work, bringing the previous literary history period to an end.

⁵ What J. Kopitar critiqued the most severely when assessing Pohlin's grammar was his modernisation of the Slovenian alphabet and his failure to take into consideration the standard language tradition. Kopitar's negative assessment, a young philologist's judgement »about a successful rival« (Toporišič 1983: 95) was adopted by literary historians (e.g., F. Kidrič, A. Gspan, with the exception of A. Slodnjak). Pohlin as a grammarian has been rehabilitated by Slovenian linguists (M. Orožen, 1970, J. Toporišič, 1983).

2.1 The Slovenian tradition of the standard language, created by the continuous work of members of the clergy in pre-Pohlin times. These priests disseminated devotional, general educational texts and textbooks, as well as the first prose texts (J. Svetokriški: *Sveti priročnik*, 1691–1707; M. Paglavc: *Tobijove bukve*, 1733, *Zvesti tovariš*, 1742, *Thomasa Kempezarja bukve*, 1745, *Sveta vojska*, 1747; M. Radeskini: *Spokorjenje ene imenitne grešnice*, 1769), compiled dictionaries (M. Kastelec, G. Vorenc, A. Apostel), and prepared two reprints of Bohorič's grammar (Hipolit Novomeški, 1715, Carinthian Jesuits in German translation, 1758).

2.2 The personal (professional) circumstances of belonging to the Augustinian order initiated Marko Pohlin into a circle which through its compilation of general educational texts and textbooks excellently put into effect the reforms of Maria Theresa and Joseph II concerning the school system and the advancement of general and school education (Pogačnik 1968: 169–233, 1955: 31–33).

2.3 His stays in the monasteries in Maria Brunn (1754–1755) and Vienna (1755–1763), as well as the contacts there with his brethren, the Czech discalceate friars, enabled Pohlin to (a) become aware of the public status of Czech in Vienna and compare it to that of Slovenian, and (b) to gain insight into Czech language textbooks, the grammars *Čechořečnost* by V. J. Rosa (1672) and *Grammatica linguae Bohemicae oder Die böhmische Sprachkunst* by J. V. Pohl (1756, 1764, 1773, 1776, 1783), which were used for studying Czech on secondary and post-secondary levels at Viennese institutions.⁶

2.3.1 Due to physiocratic and Enlightenment ideas, the old conceptions of science and education decreased in value. In reorganizing the studies, the second university reform by Maria Theresa (1774), which was necessary because the Jesuit order had been dissolved (1773), was modelled on more developed foreign universities (Göttingen, Jena), strengthening the role of German at what had been a Latin university and introducing new practical teaching disciplines. The share of science and political science increased and the studies which now lasted for three years instead of the previous two also included living, contemporary languages, e.g., Czech, Spanish, French, and Italian. This fact shows that the public status of Czech in Vienna was the highest of all Slavic languages. Beside German, it was the only language taught at the University of Vienna (1775; first teacher was Josef Valentin Zlobický),⁷ as well as at several other educational institutions (1746, elite Viennese gymnasium Theresianum, 1754, military academy for aristocrats, Jan Václav Pohl; 1752, Theresian military academy in Wiener Neustadt, Antonín Prokop Klobás; 1784, technical academy, Josef Werschauser).

⁶ Other language and linguistic reference books, dictionaries, and Czech textbooks were used for teaching Czech at secondary and post-secondary institutions in Vienna along with the two that have been pointed out. They were written by the then Czech teachers in Vienna, J. V. Zlobický, V. M. Wiedermann, M. V. Šimek, A. J. B. Spurný. Cf. S. M. Newerka (2004: 42–60).

⁷ Cf. Jasna Honzak Jahić, *Delež dunajskih Čehov pri razvoju bohemistike in slavistike: Josef Valentin Zlobický (1743–1810)* (to appear).



The status of Czech in secondary and post-secondary education in Vienna was the result of the loyal relation of the state and was an integral part of the Austrian state policy.⁸ The Austro-Hungarian Empire was facing a military threat in the 1740s; Prussia became its greatest external enemy, especially after losing Silesia, and the monarchy was in pressing need of allies. The Czechs became its most important ally, as most wars for land and legacy were fought on Czech ground. In this way knowledge of the Czech language became a necessity in administration, judiciary, and the army in Czech provinces.

2.3.2 That the comparison of the public status of the two Slavic languages in the Austro-Hungarian Empire influenced the orientation of Pohlin's work and his program is clearly shown in the content range of his early literary production. In his topical cultural, linguistic, and literary program he took into consideration receptively, socially, culturally, and linguistically heterogeneous addressees as he started out with twofold texts. In accordance with the Enlightenment belief in the power of reason and education, Pohlin's general educational texts and textbooks written in Slovenian (*Abecedika*, 1765, *Bukovce za rajtengo*, 1781, *Bukve za brati...slovenskim žovnjirjem*, 1788, *Kmet-am za potrebo inu pomoč*, 1789, *Kratkočasne uganke*, 1799) taught educational and professional skills (and even cultured entertainment) to ordinary, uneducated addressees, educating them to be useful citizens. The texts for the educated, which were to introduce them into the Slovenian cultural circles and thus strengthen the cultural elite, at the time limited to a narrow circle of intellectuals, mostly priests, were in Slovenian and foreign languages. The Slovenian texts ranged in functional styles from literary (almanac of poetry *Pisanice od lepeh umetnost*, 1779–1781), technical (dictionaries, *Tu malu besediše treh jezikov*, 1781, *Glossarium slavicum*, 1792), publicistic (manuscript translation of the Pentateuch), to conversational (manuscript translation of Geller's letters); they showed the structural characteristics (capabilities) of Slovenian and its high culture. Foreign languages also played a role in Pohlin's texts, i.e., as a metalanguage. His bibliography of Slovenian (Carniolan) literary history *Bibliotheka Carnioliae* (1799, published in 1803), written in Latin, surveyed the cultural achievements of the Slovenian lands; in his grammar, *Kraynska grammatika /.../ oder die Kunst die crainerische Sprache regelrichtig zu reden und zu schreiben*, 1763, 1783, the metalanguage was German⁹ in order to teach standard Slovenian to young intellectuals versed in German. This conception of Pohlin's work must have been helpful in the reevaluation of the public status of the standard Slovenian language, preparing it for its social emancipation. One could say that it loosened the social hierarchical Slovenian-German bilingualism, which could not be abolished until the social circumstances changed.

⁸ Soon after Joseph II's ascent to power the newly introduced language studies at the Viennese Faculty of Arts were abolished for the lack of funding. The only exception among languages were Czech studies, which were preserved because they »were needed and in many respects indispensable« (Studienhofkommission, 1791) (Reichel 2004: 32).

⁹ The fact that Pohlin's grammar was written in German was not accepted as fully self-evident. In the same year the grammar was published, the language teacher Matija Čop proposed Slovenian as a possible metalanguage for Slovenian grammar in his review of *Kraynska grammatika* (Kidrič 1938: 167).

2.3.2.1 Pohlin's grammar of 1768, chronologically his second work, already included a literary program. It contained Pohlin's plans for several texts belonging to different functional styles, and their purpose was explicitly set as well. Beside setting the norms and codifying the standard Slovenian language in a grammar book, the technical, linguistic ones were also to record the Slovenian vocabulary, which is why the author later became engaged in lexicology and wrote two dictionaries (1781, 1792). The high culture of the living, contemporary standard Slovenian was to be demonstrated by a new translation of the *Bible*. Pohlin partly realized his plans and translated the Pentateuch, which nevertheless remained in manuscript; it was only J. Japelj and his collaborators who produced an integral new translation. The polyfunctionality of Pohlin's literary program was explicitly realized in his grammar through Slovenian technical terminology, the theoretical chapter *Spevorenčnost* with the added examples from poetry (translations of Ovid and Virgil contributed by M. Pohlin and F. A. Dev), and through textual examples, i.e. short dialogues on everyday life topics, intended by the author for German and Italian speakers learning Slovenian.

2.3.2.2 Pohlin's text selection is akin to the works by the poet, grammarian, and lexicographer from the Czech baroque period Václav Jan Rosa (1630/1631–1689): the latter first wrote the allegorical poem *Discursus Lipirona*, 1651, followed by his grammar *Čechořečnost*, 1672, to which he added a chapter on poetics and metrics with literary (poetic) texts; he also compiled the trilingual dictionary *Thesaurus linguae bohemica* (which remained in manuscript).

Rosa's textual examples were important for Pohlin since they (a) realized a full cultural textual program with respect to reception and functional variety, and prepared it for its role in mobilizing the Slovenian cultural space, and (b) developed and cultivated the standard language. Pohlin conceived the texts in J. V. Pohl's grammar *Die böhmische Sprachkunst*, everyday life dialogues in German and Czech, as an interesting didactic supplement; befitting the Slovenian space, Pohlin's grammar comprised trilingual conversational texts (Slovenian, German, Italian).

2.3.2.2.1 The principal motive for the tasks that both authors undertook – Rosa during the baroque period and Pohlin during the Revival – was based on a common idea, i.e., the belief in the value of one's own language and on the desire to fortify its value. The established humanistic attitude that »every language is honorable and honest« (Ž. Herberstein, 1549, 1952), »every language shall meet God« (Bohorič, 1584, 1715), which under the current circumstances meant that one's own language was equal to the classical, i.e. biblical languages, was defended and strengthened by two kinds of arguments, i.e., general, Slavic ones and particular, language-specific ones.

The general argument put emphasis on these languages being members of a powerful Slavic community, where the two authors used a tried and tested strategy known from standard language tradition. In both the Czech and Slovenian cases it is evident that a language defence defined by relatedness, the geographic extent, and famous history of the language within the framework of a wider, more powerful and valuable Slavic space was already established. In the Czech lands its holders were the so-called

vlastenci of humanism (lawyer Viktorin Kornel; grammarian and translator of the Bible, Jan Blahoslav; lexicographer Daniel Adam from Veleslavin; grammarian Matouš Benešovský), and in the Slovenian lands the Protestant Adam Bohorič (*Arcticae horulae succisivae*, 1584) and polymath empiricist Žiga Popovič (*Untersuchungen von Meere*, 1750).

It is no coincidence that in defending their own languages V. Rosa and M. Pohlin affiliated themselves with tradition. V. Rosa was a representative of the second, i.e., Balbin's generation during the Czech baroque period, an intellectual clerical circle and (less numerous) lay intellectuals with a clear awareness of their own language. In the same year that Rosa's grammar was published (1672) his friend, the historian Bohuslav Balbin (1621–1688), wrote *Dissertatio apologetica pro lingua Slavonica, praecipue Bohemica* (*Defence of Slavic Language, particularly Czech*), which was disseminated in manuscript form within the private circle of the author's friends and the like-minded (and was only published a good century later in 1775, editor F. M. Pelcl). M. Pohlin was able to support his opinion that language was the expression of a specific ethnic community (*Let us not be ashamed of our language!*) with arguments from the first and second (Hipolit's) editions of Bohorič's grammar, possibly also from the published essay by Ž. Popovič (1750), which included a Bohorič-like apology of Slovenian,¹⁰ but also from Rosa's *Čechořečnost*, which he was given insight to in Vienna among the Czech discalceate friars.

2.3.2.2.2 As a special characteristic, peculiarity of the language, Rosa pointed out its structural properties: (a) the capability of inflection, made possible in Czech by patterns of forming and changing word forms, described together with noun declinations, tense formation and comparison of adjectives, (b) a wealth of word-formation means, affix morphemes proven by verbal compounds, i.e. by word-forming prefixes added in an orderly way to verb bases thus changing the meaning of the base verbs, and by the capability of Czech to form modification derivatives, i.e., diminutives, (c) a developed phonologically expressive word image, functioning as a good didactic aid to mastering other languages.

Pohlin pointed out (a) that Slovenian was recognizable to its speakers as it was a language with its own fixed structure – *a well-founded language*,¹¹ (b) that the current language practice was in need of transformation, since the uneducated, uncultivated users spoke any way they *wished*,¹² and that the task of his grammar was therefore to prove that the language was characterized and, what is more, distinguished by its *regularity*,¹³ (c) the argument of utility. In the communication between socially non-

¹⁰ That Pohlin was familiar with the work of Ž. Popovič is testified by Pohlin's lexicographic work. A. Breznik (1927: 91–99) ascertained that in his etymological dictionary *Glossarium slavicum*, 1792, Pohlin used all the data from Popovič's manuscript dictionary *Specimen vocabularii vindocarnioli* from his legacy and from his essay *Untersuchungen von Meere*.

¹¹ Cf. M. Pohlin, Predgovor v Kraynsko grammatiko (2003: 202).

¹² Cf. M. Pohlin, Predgovor v Kraynsko grammatiko (2003: 207).

homogeneous speakers, mastering Slovenian was useful for higher social classes: that way it was easier to make the peasant *listen to the Church and the state*.¹⁴ Concluding his thoughts about the usefulness of knowing Slovenian with his position that language was a natural right of the majority class despite its being socially subordinate, Pohlin supplemented the Enlightenment utilitarian motive with a humanistic element.¹⁵ Rosa too wrote about the usefulness of knowing Czech, but within a didactic framework: the wide repertoire of phonemes in Czech represented a good starting point for learning foreign languages.

The evident differences between the highlighted peculiarities of Czech and Slovenian in the two authors can be traced to the different intentions they envisaged for their grammars. In his grammar, written in Latin, V. Rosa pointed out the particular structural properties of Czech, because he used them to defend and corroborate the value of Czech in relation to other languages (although nowhere explicitly to a specific language). But since he intended his grammar for foreigners as a foreign language textbook,¹⁶ he had to point out those characteristics of Czech which were to prove it equal to the languages which enjoyed a better social status in the Czech lands during the Counter-Reformation.¹⁷ M. Pohlin on the other hand pointed out those properties of Slovenian which were to support the author's intention – to write a grammar of Slovenian which would codify and set the norms for a better and more regular language.

Pohlin's decision to disregard the tradition and thus choose for his grammatical description the contemporary colloquial language of the Carniolan center Ljubljana was dictated by several reasons. It was certainly a decision made by an enlightened person: the language spoken in the center of the province was primarily chosen because it was the one with the highest social value, because it was prestigious (*»V/il-lagers were educated in the language of the city intellectuals. After all, that was the very idea of Enlightenment«*) (Slodnjak, quoted in J. Toporišič 1983: 97), but it should

¹³ Cf. M. Pohlin, *Predgovor v Kraynsko grammatiko* (2003: 204). – For Pohlin, the basic ordering criterion for setting the norms of the standard language was language regularity, which was not a new criterion, but part of the cultural tradition (going back to antiquity, humanism). The position that language was ordered on the basis of rules and that rules were to be given priority over exceptions and particularities, which were but vestiges from older periods of development, meant that the fundamental method was to find the linking rules and thus the systematic order in language description. In his description Pohlin made use of one of the basic criteria of language regularity – the analogy, e.g., when choosing his sample words for noun declinations, when classifying verb conjugations into thematic, -am, -em, -im, and athematic, when classifying adverbs according to the typical question word...).

¹⁴ Cf. M. Pohlin, *Predgovor v Kraynsko grammatiko* (2003: 204).

¹⁵ Cf. Trubar's view of the Slovenian language in his prefaces, e.g., in the Slovenian preface to *Katekizem* (1550).

¹⁶ Cf. V. J. Rosa, introduction to *Čechořečnost*, in: O. Koupil (1996: 121–122).

¹⁷ After the White Mountain events, changes in extralinguistic factors (with regard to the 15th and 16th centuries) affected the social status of Czech, because the social range of its speakers was narrowed and its functional differentiation was limited. Hence the Czech language was limited in usage in the sense that (a) Czech was not the general language of conversation, because its usage was limited with respect to social classes, (b) during that period the languages of science were primarily Latin, German, and French, and (c) in administration German was used alongside Czech. Cf. B. Havránek (1936), A. Stich (1991, 1995), Z. Starý (1995).



by no means be disregarded that Pohlin was a native speaker of the Carniolan city centre, Ljubljana, which must have been helpful in his grammatical description. The second reason for Pohlin's decision was the current European linguistic thought. It was characterized by a tension created through striving for the polyfunctionality of language and realizing at the same time that the standard language was not perfect. The imperfection of the standard language was supposedly reflected in the differences between the standard language (tradition of written texts) and the contemporary spoken language. The authors were well aware of these differences, and mostly acted, by and large, on the basis of two linguistic principles, the tolerant (preserving) and the active (changing) one. J. L. Schönleben's (1618–1681) view *Let us write according to the people's habit, let us speak according to the local habit* was adopted by the most visible and productive authors in the Slovenian cultural space (M. Kastelec, J. Svetokriški), and Hipolit Novomeški's reprint of Bohorič's grammar (1715) confirmed the aspirations to preserve the Protestant standard language tradition. Contrary to this was the view (held, for example, by G. W. Leibnitz, J. Ch. Gottsched) that the linguist should be actively involved in the theory and practice of the standard language; contemporary language research was the method based on which it was possible to overcome the differences between the standard language tradition and the contemporary stage of language development, and thus attain a cultivated contemporary language. The view indicated here can be seen in Pohlin's relation to the standard Slovenian language. The differences between the contemporary spoken and traditional written forms of the language – created by modern vowel reduction, consequent consonantal changes and the transition of *l* to bilabial *u* – would be smaller if the colloquial natural contemporary language of educated citizens of the provincial center of Carniola were accepted as the norm. – Pohlin's disregard of the standard language tradition includes his interventions in the material (spoken and written) word forms (e.g., introducing *s* because of the replacement of *f*, notation of accents, introducing *ě*), which were partially retained and heeded.¹⁸

Pohlin's Czech contemporary J. V. Pohl also decided in his grammar *Grammatica linguae Bohemicae oder Die böhmische Sprachkunst* (1756, 1764, 1773, 1776, 1783), which was intended for teaching Czech as a foreign language at the Vienna military academy and at the Viennese court, to disregard the standard language tradition. In the introduction to his grammar (p. 2), he argued for his decision by taking the view that the contemporary language was superior to the language of earlier periods because it was natural, and made his claim concrete by including in his language description some phonological and morphological elements of contemporary spoken Czech, e.g. diphthong *-ej* and narrowed *-ý* in adjective declination, substitution of diphthong *ou* for initial short *u*, *-(a)ma*, *-(a)mi* endings in the plural instrumental of masculine nouns, examples of colloquial forms of the comparative and imperative. The author's explicit opposition to tradition was exceptional for Czech grammarian work as a different procedure was customary: in their descriptions, authors did not explicitly disavow the

¹⁸ More details on Pohlin's description of the Slovenian language in his grammar in: Jasna Honzak Jahić (2003: 331–350).

humanistic standard language tradition, but at the same time they also acknowledged the elements of contemporary spoken Czech.¹⁹

Pohl's interventions in the Czech alphabet and orthographic rules also meant disregarding the tradition. The author's efforts can be characterized as adjusting the Czech orthography and orthoepy to the foreign language addressee. Pohl's method of simplification (e.g., not distinguishing vowel length in *i*, *í*, substituting for the etymological long *ů*, discarding diacritics for shibilants preceding *i*, disregarding *i*, *y* distribution rules) actually decreased the differences between the source language, which was also the metalanguage of the grammar, i.e., German, and the target language, i.e., Czech.²⁰

2.3.3 Pohlin's grammar was a novelty among Slovenian grammar texts also because its author was the first to systematically compile Slovenian linguistic terminology. A comparison of the arguments used by Pohlin to defend and advocate his right to new terms with Rosa's arguments shows that they are in agreement; Pohlin only partly paraphrased and shortened the original text. Rosa's (and Pohlin's) arguments are (a) sociolinguistic – the formation of new terms is dictated by the need for such terms, which is why this possibility is present in all languages and is not a privilege of classical languages; and (b) linguistic, especially with regard to the right and professional duty of a competent individual – linguist. The process of terminology formation is governed by its own laws, which are derived from the ordering linguistic method, i.e., the analogy, and (standard) language word-formation tradition – which is explicit in the case of forming derivatives from indigenous word bases.

If both authors' terminology formation is examined against the circumstances in which they worked, certain differences can be seen in their motives. Rosa worked in Counter-Reformation and baroque periods when standard Czech was lexically very open. Part of the extension of standard lexicon due to the needs for new terms because of general development and changes in extralinguistic reality was through borrowing words, namely technical language from Latin (education), military and commercial terms from Romance languages, general lexical items and technical terms for various crafts from German, especially its spoken variety (Havránek 1943: 1075). For this reason Rosa's motive for creating technical terms could be his (puristic) response to the intensive endorsement of loanwords in contemporary Czech. This conclusion is supported by the fact that Rosa was so acutely aware of his own language that he used Czech as the administrative language in his legal practice and as the language of his professional and private correspondence. (Petráčková 1987: 140–141).

During the Revival, when M. Pohlin was active, he was motivated to form new terms by the current new Enlightenment and physiocratic principles, which brought about a new understanding of economy, science, and technical fields, the reformation of university studies, the creation of new schools, specialities and professions, the publication of pedagogical, technical and general educational tests, and consequent-

¹⁹ Cf. Czech grammars, e.g., J. Konstanc (1667), V. M. Šteyer (1668), J. V. Rosa (1672).

²⁰ More details in: Jasna Honzak Jahić (2003: 335–336).



ly the creation of new technical terms and terminological collections. The lexicon included in Pohlin's grammar provides a fair reflection of the time of its creation. The expression of conceptual world of rationalism and physiocratism are general and technical terms, e.g., names for nationalities, numerous professions, various kinds of money, pragmatic world of objects, abstract and concrete qualities, and actions.²¹

V angleščino prevedla
Monika Kavalir.

REFERENCES

- BREZNIK, A., 1926: *Slovenski slovarji*. Razprave. Ljubljana: Znanstveno društvo za humanistične vede. 143–165.
- BRŤAŇ, R., 1939: *Barokový slavizmus*, Praha.
- HAVRÁNEK, B., 1936: *Spisovný jazyk český a slovenský*. Praha: Československá vlastivěda.
- – 1943: Heslo Terminologie. *Ottův slovník naučný nové doby. Dodatky*. Dílo šesté, svazek druhý. 1074–1078.
- HONZAK JAHÍČ, J., 2002: Marko Pohlin in Václav Rosa, *Slavistična revija 50/1*, Ljubljana: Slavistično društvo Slovenije, 9–28.
- – 2003: Pohlinov in Metelkov opis slovenskega knjižnega jezika v luči časa njunega zastanka. *Slavistična revija*. Letnik 51. Posebna številka. Zbornik referatov za trinajsti mednarodni slavistični kongres. Ljubljana, 15.–21. avgusta 2003. Ljubljana: Slavistično društvo Slovenije, 331–350.
- JUVAN, M., 2000: *Vezi besedila*. Ljubljana: Literarno-umetniško društvo Literatura.
- KORUZA, J., 1991: *Slovstvene študije*. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.
- KIDRIČ, F., 1929–1938: *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva od začetkov do marčne revolucije*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica.
- – 1930: Razvojna linija slovenskega preporeda v prvih razdobjih. *RDHV V–VI*. 42–48.
- KOS, J., 1979: Tipološke značilnosti slovenskega razsvetljenstva v evropskem kontekstu. *Obdobja 1*. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut. 27–36.
- KOUPIL, O., 1996: Václav Jan Rosa: Předmluva k Čechořečnosti. *Listy filologické CXIX/1–4*. 101–161.
- OROŽEN, M., 1970/71: Pohlinovo jezikoslovno delo. *Jezik in slovstvo* 16. 250–254.
- PETRAČKOVÁ, V., 1987: Příspěvek k životopisu V. J. Rosy. *AUC Philologica* 2–3. *Slavica Pragensia XXIX*. 131–141.
- POGAČNIK, J., 1995: *Slovensko slovstvo v obdobju razsvetljenstva*. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.
- POHL, J. V., 1756: *Grammatica linguae Bohemicae oder Die böhmische Sprachkunst*.
- POHLIN, M., 2003 (1768): *Kraynska Gramatika, das ist Die Crainerische Gramatik*.
- PRAŽEK, A., 1946: *Národ se brnil. Obrany národa a jazyka českého*. Praha: Sfinx.
- PRIJATELJ, I., 1935: *Duševni profili slovenskih preporediteljev*. Ljubljana: Merkur.
- ROSA, W. J., 1991 (1672): *Czech grammar (Čechořečnost)*. Prague: Porta.
- RUPEL, M., 1956: *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva*. Ljubljana: SM.
- SLODNJAK, A., 1968: *Slovensko slovstvo*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- STARY, Z., 1995: *Ve jménu funkce a intervence*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova.

²¹ Cf. J. Honzak Jahić (2003: 339–340).

- STICH, A., 1987, 1991: On the beginning of modern standard Czech. *Explicite Beschreibung Der Sprache und automatische Textbearbeitung*. Praha: Matematicko-Fyzikální fakulta Univerzity Karlovy. 121–128. *Naše řeč* 7. 57–62.
- STICH, A., 1995: Česká spisovnost a nespisovnost – kořeny a přítomnost. *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura. Sborník z olomoucké konference*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova. 49–56.
- TOPORIŠIČ, J., 1984: Pohlinova slovnica. *Slavistična revija* 32/3. 427–479.
- TRUBAR, P., 1550: *Katechismus*.
- VIDOVIČ MUHA, A., 1998: Slovnice slovenskega jezika. *Enciklopedija Slovenije* 12. 79–81.

POVZETEK

Slovenski kulturni prostor je v drugi polovici 18. stoletja in prvi tretini 19. stoletja zaznamovalo kulturooblikovalno in narodnoprebujevalno gibanje prerod (preporod). Slovenska besedila, v baroku namembno večinoma verska, so v času preroda programsko posegla na posvetno področje, se tam množila in uresničevala v vseh funkcijskih zvrsteh. Razlogi te knjižnojezikovne in funkcijskozvrstne dinamike so bili sociolingvistični; sprožile so jih nove civilizacijske, družbene, kulturne in gospodarske okoliščine razsvetljenega absolutizma in terezijansko-jožefinskega reformnega in utilitarnega delovanja. Na Slovenskem je bila razsvetljenska misel v skladu z družbenim razvojem in s položajem slovenskega jezika osredotočena na narodno in jezikovno prebujanje z izhodiščem v polnofunkcijskem razvijanju in kultiviranju slovenskega (knjižnega) jezika. Že Matija Čop (1831) je zato izpostavil Marka Pohlina (1735–1801) in njegovo *Kraynsko grammatiko*, 1768; za Čopa je bila Pohlinova slovnica pobudna zaradi izražene zahteve po kultiviranem knjižnem jeziku, zaradi Kopitarjeve kritike (1808/09) pa vse do strokovne rehabilitacije (v sedemdesetih, predvsem v osemdesetih letih 20. stoletja) ni bila sprejeta kot kodifikacijsko delo, ki bi knjižno slovenščino dejansko kultiviralo.

Za Pohlinovo narodnoprerdno delo so bili pobudni: slovensko knjižnojezikovno izročilo, pripadnost k redu diskalceatov, ki so odlično uresničevali terezijanske in jožefinske reforme na področju šolstva in napredka šolske in splošne izobrazbe, ter stiki s sobraty, češkimi diskalceaty, ki so Pohlinu omogočily (a) spoznati javni položaj češčine na Dunaju in ga primerjati s slovenskim, in (b) dobiti v razvid učbenika češkega jezika, slovnici, *Čechořečnost* V. J. Rose (1672) in *Grammatica linguae Bohemicae oder Die böhmische Sprachkunst* J. V. Pohla (1756, 1764, 1773, 1776, 1783), ki sta se uporabljala pri visoko- in srednješolskem študiju češkega jezika na dunajskih inštitucijah.

Kronološko drugo Pohlinovo besedilo *Kraynska grammatika /.../ oder die Kunst die crainerische Sprache regelrichtig zu reden und zu schreiben*, 1763, 1783, je vsebovalo knjižni program (slovnica sodobnega slovenskega deželnega jezika, načrtovanje evidentiranja slovenskega besedišča in novega prevoda svetega pisma) ter je bilo hkrati polnofunkcijsko besedilo (strokovno, umetnostno, praktičnosporazumevalno). Pohlinov program je soroden delom jezikoslovca in pesnika iz češkega baroka Václavu Janu Rosi (1630/1631–1689). Rosovi besedilni zgledi so Pohlinu aktualni, ker (a) so uresničevali recepcijsko in funkcijskozvrstno polnejši kulturni besedilni program in ga pripravljali na njegovo mobilizatorsko nalogo v slovenskem kulturnem prostoru, (b) so razvijali in kultivirali knjižni jezik. Osnovno gibalno nalogo, ki sta si jih zadala oba ustvarjalca, Rosa v baroku in Pohlin v prerodu, je imel skupno idejno podlago – vero vanje v veljavnost lastnega jezika in hkrati njeno utrditev. V humanizmu uveljavljeno stališče *Vsak jezik je časten in pošten* (Ž. Herberstein, 1549, 1952) so branili in utrjevali argumenti dveh vrst, splošni, slovanski, in posebni, lastni posameznemu jeziku. Splošni argument, članstvo jezikov v jezikovno sorodni, številčno močni, zemljepisno razširjeni in slavni slovanski skupnosti, je bil preizkušena strategija, znana iz slovenskega in češkega knjižnojezikovnega izročila. Različne posebne lastnosti češčine in slovenščine so rezultat različnih namenov, ki sta



ju imela pisca s svojima slovničnima besediloma. V. Rosa je v svoji latinsko pisani slovnici, namenjeni tujcem kot učbenik tujega jezika, izpostavljala posebne strukturne lastnosti češčine (sposobnost pregibanja s oblikospreminjevalnimi in – tvornimi vzorci; bogastvo besedotvornih sredstev, zlasti pred- in priponskih obrazil; razvita glasovna izrazna podoba jezika), ker je z njimi branil in potrjeval veljavnost češčine v razmerju do drugih jezikov (čeprav nikjer eksplicitno proti kateremu) in z njimi dokazoval, da je češčina enakovredna jezikom, ki so imeli v češkem prostoru v protireformacijskem času ugodnejši družbeni položaj. M. Pohlín pa je zaradi namere, napisati slovnico, ki bo zaradi slabe jezikovne prakse normirala in kodificirala boljši jezik, izpostavil temeljne lastnosti svojega jezika (lastno, za nosilce slovenskega jezika prepoznavno strukturo; pravilnost jezika), dodal času aktualni argument utilitarnosti (koristnost obvladanja slovenščine pri sporazumevanju socialno nehomogenih govorcev) ter humanistično prvino (jezik kot naravna pravica večinskega, sicer družbeno podrejenega sloja ljudi). Da je Pohlín izbral za svoj slovnični opis sočasni živi jezik kranjskega središča Ljubljane, je vplivala razsvetljenska misel o vplivanski vlogi jezika z največjo družbeno veljavo, in aktualna misel o knjižnem jeziku (proučevanje in urejanje sodobnega jezika kot možnost premoščanja razlik med knjižnojezikovnim izročilom in njegovim sodobnim razvojnim stanjem).

Pohlín je svojo novotvorbo (prvi tvorec slovenskega slovničnega izrazja!) zagovarjal z argumenti obrambe in pravice do novotvorbe, prekrivnimi z Rosovimi (1. sociolingvistični – novotvorbo narekuje poimenovalna potreba, zato je dana vsem jezikom, in 2. jezikoslovni sploh – pravica in delovna dolžnost kompetentnega posameznika – jezikoslovca). Posebne okoliščine, v katerih sta avtorja delovala, so pokazale tudi razlike v motivih. Pri Rosi, pri katerem je bila zavest o lastnem jeziku izpričano zelo živa, je bila lastna novotvorba lahko tudi odziv na veliko leksikalno odprtost knjižne češčine v njegovem času. V prerednem času pa so Pohlínovo novotvorbo motivirala tudi načela razsvetljenstva in fiziokratizma, kar je lepo razvidno v splošnopoimenovalni in strokovni leksiki, zajeti v Pohlínovi slovnici.