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Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to analyse how the Serbian and Bulgarian nineteenth-century intellectual elites constructed concepts of national identity in media-discourses on linguistic purity, as well as how these purist discourses were situated within their unique Balkan cultural-historical contexts. The dissertation places itself in the field of historical sociolinguistics which suggests a contextual approach to language change in the past and the discourses shaping them. Nevalainen (2015) has subsumed this approach under the integrationist notion of “layered simultaneity”. This notion implies that the meanings which a specific sociocultural community—the Balkan nineteenth-century intellectuals, in the case of this study—simultaneously produces in discourse, are always the outcome of an infinitely complex interplay of historical, social, political, ideological, and cultural contingencies, relations, and entanglements.

The material examined in this study consists of fifteen Serbian and Bulgarian periodicals, four pamphlets, and one book. These publications were either originally published in the periodical press or constituted a vital part of debates that had been initiated in the periodical press. All were published in the period of the Serbian and Bulgarian ‘National Revivals’ (1804–1878) and represent platforms where the members of the expanding bourgeois public sphere debated the questions of purism, language, and national identity. The primary sources stretch from 1830 to 1874. This period was formative for the construction of complex and interacting sets of cultural practices and symbols which were intended to define the nation externally—in relation to other nations and unite it internally. According to the then prevailing Romanticist cultural ideology, language was the prime definer of cultural difference and the utmost expression of the unicity of a people.

Purist discourses on language and national identity are always embedded in specific historical and cultural contexts and can hardly be understood without taking these dynamic frameworks into consideration. The broad picture that emerges from the results of this thesis shows that the convergences and divergences in the purist discourses of the Serbian and Bulgarian intellectual elites are dependent on several contextual factors. A convergent factor was the common starting point in the Pax Slavia Orthodoxa, where higher cultural meanings were defined by the ideology of the Orthodox churches. Yet, divergent were the historical and cultural contexts in which these elites entered into dialogue with the ideological paradigms of Enlightenment and Romanticism that to such and eminent degree shaped the cultural side of modern European nation-building.
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1. Introduction

The focus of this thesis is on the role of discourse on linguistic purism in the parallel and interplaying construction of Serbian and Bulgarian national identities and standard language codes in the historically specific context of the nineteenth-century Balkans. Within the framework of cultural nation-building and nationalism, linguistic purism can be defined as the belief that certain language forms or structures can be more purely national than others. A corollary to this belief is the conviction that these forms and structures reflect and define the national identity of a specific human community which therefore must be defended against foreign intrusions through acts of targeted linguistic engineering. Even if purism can concern all levels of language, including lexis, syntax, phonology, morphology, orthography, or phraseology, it is most frequently applied to the level of lexis. This is also the aspect that will primarily be highlighted in this thesis.

The period from the late eighteenth and through the late nineteenth century was a time of dramatical transition for the members of the Serbian and Bulgarian intellectuals and societal elites. They were gradually leaving the traditional religious community where cultural values and collective identities had been defined by the discourse of the Orthodox Church(es) and had started to enter modernity where they supplemented the religious centre of collective meaning-making with the discourse of nationalism. Religion remained a point of reference, but for the majority of the elite, culture and language became the predominant site for the discursive construction of a historically new kind of national identity. Religion and religious institutions were, in fact, frequently nationalised and turned into significant symbols and – alongside language and culture – means of articulating national unity and difference (Calic, 2019a).

Nineteenth-century Balkan intellectuals ascribed a quintessential significance to language and linguistic purity in the articulation, homogenisation, and protection of national identity. In the text ‘A letter to the Bulgarian intelligentsia’ („Писмо до българска-та интелигенция“), the Bulgarian philologist Marin Drinov (1838–1906) writes:

Language is the primal moral force, which unites thousands of people into one moral body, into one people. The perfection of the language, its strength and purity depend
first and foremost on the spiritual firmness of a people and the close connection between its scattered parts, a connection which protects those parts from merging with other peoples. ("Narodnost", 1868, 4: 16)

It is such purist policy statements in discussions on language and national identity in Serbian and Bulgarian print media that this thesis examines.

The texts from Bulgarian and Serbian nineteenth-century periodicals that I examine reflect the worldview of the educated middle classes. Social meanings and linguistic change were negotiated and co-constructed through the agency and interaction of the members of this social group. For this class, defining and using the most ‘proper’ or ‘pure’ form of the national language was a matter of signalling their identity as the most ‘proper’ or ‘pure’ members of the nation (Joseph, 2004: 174). In addition, they provided the capital for the construction of the national mediascapes, i.e., the field where the social world was presented, perceived, and communicated by means of printed mass media. Moreover, this educated minority developed, controlled, and consumed these discourses.

These Serbian and Bulgarian “scholarly activists” (Wright, 2004: 8) functioned as a species of cultural intermediaries between the Balkans and Western Europe, rural and urban communities, and traditional and modern value-systems. From the last quarter of the eighteenth century onwards, they became engaged in supplementing the pre-modern religious identity with various concepts of ethnolinguistic identities. These traders-cum-intellectuals often lived in some of the urban centres of the multi-ethnic Ottoman, Habsburg, or Romanov Empires and were engaged in in the exchange of both material commodities (such as books, cloths, or spices) and intangible goods (such as ideas). It was in these urban environments that they were influenced by the belief that the social “world is naturally divided into separate and self-contained nations” (Greenfeld, 2001: 663).

It was also in this social environment that they started to develop their specifically Balkan variety of what Jürgen Habermas (1989) calls a “bourgeois public sphere” (cf. sect. 3.3.2). This public sphere was a social space where value-bearing and value-producing private individuals, beyond traditional social divisions and religious constraints, could come together and engage in critical discourse. An essential precondition for the development of this new environment of public discourse was the emergence of the commodities and markets of what Benedict Anderson (2006) calls “print-capitalism” (cf. sect. 3.3.1). This socioeconomic re-
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1 “Езыкъ-тъ е първа-та нравственна сила, която свързва хиляди человъци въ едно нравствено тѣло, въ едни народъ. Отъ съвършенство-то на езыкъ-тъ, отъ неговата чистота и чистота зависи пръвъ и пръво духовна-та крѣпость на едни народъ и тѣсно-то съединеніе между распрыскъ-ти-негови части, съединеніе, което пази тѣзи части отъ сливанье съ други народи.” Unless otherwise indicated, all translations in this thesis are my own, PLC.
structuration prompted the production of printed media such as periodicals and books. These products of print capitalism would be the carriers of the different imaginations of the nation as defined by language and linguistic purity which would be produced, read, and debated by a growing but still very restricted Balkan intellectual elite. The discourse they developed and controlled reflected and served their ideological interests.

The new species of social intercourse, which was developed in the bourgeois public sphere and facilitated by print capitalism, thus became an infrastructure of imagination, through which these intellectual elites could discuss, practise, and disseminate their beliefs about the link between purism, language, and national identity (cf. Anderson, 2006). The imagery of the somehow organically unified people (through language use, mores, folklore, and a common past etc.), or ‘narod’, became a vision of homeliness, sameness, and comprehension in a period of rapid change from a hitherto religiously defined community. As I will discuss in the following (cf. section 2.1.4), however, both were based on a typologically similar ideal or Neoplatonic conceptualisation of the world, human culture, and language. The first was religious, universal, and deeply embedded in Eastern Orthodox spirituality. The second was secular, particularistic and grounded in the Romanticist system of beliefs about language as the superior expression of what the German cultural philosopher J.G. v. Herder (1744–1803) envisioned as the ‘Soul of the People’ (Volksgeist).

1.1 Aims

The aim of this thesis is to analyse how the Serbian and Bulgarian nineteenth-century intellectual elites constructed concepts of national identity in media-discourses on linguistic purity, as well as how these purist discourses were situated within their unique Balkan cultural-historical contexts. The following three research questions are addressed:

1) How did the Serbian and Bulgarian discourse on purism, language, and national identity emerge and develop?
2) How did the Serbian and Bulgarian nineteenth-century intellectual elites represent national identity in discussions on linguistic purity in print media?
3) In what ways did the Serbian and Bulgarian contexts influence these discussions?

I will discuss how these factors influenced the claims to national identity made by the Balkan intellectual elites, as well as how they influenced the actual form and content of the national standard language codes.

Thus, the object of study is the attitudes, beliefs, and convictions concerning the national meanings which were ascribed to certain language forms and structures on the level of lexis, syntax, phonology, morphology,
orthography, or phraseology. The study represents an investigation into the subjective, relative, and contextual nature of claims to national identity within the framework of language standardisation. The sociolinguist Snježana Kordić (2010: 195) emphasises that national identities are not some kind of objective or essential givens bestowed upon us by birth, but a matter of subjective choices made by individuals. These decisions are almost exclusively taken by intellectuals and societal elites (in the name of the people), who control public discourse and instrumentalise symbolic practices such as language in order to realise certain contingent, ideological, and political objectives (cf. van Dijk, 2001: 354f).

1.2 Primary sources and methodological approach

The material examined in this study consists of fifteen Serbian and Bulgarian periodicals, four pamphlets, and one book. These publications were either originally published in the periodical press or constituted a vital part of debates that had been initiated in the periodical press. All were published in the period of the Serbian and Bulgarian ‘National Revivals’ (1804–1878) and represent platforms where the members of the expanding bourgeois public sphere debated the questions of purism, language, and national identity. The primary sources stretch from 1830 to 1875. This period was formative for the construction of complex and interacting sets of cultural practices and symbols which were intended to define the nation externally – in relation to other nations and unite it internally. According to the then prevailing Romanticist cultural ideology, language was the prime definer of cultural difference and the utmost expression of the unicity of a people.

The primary sources discussed in chapter 4 are the scholarly journal *Serbske lětopisi* (‘The Serbian Chronicles’) and the booklets *Odgovor na Sitnice jezikoslovne G. J. Hadžića = M. Svetića* (‘A Reply to Mister J. Hadžić’s = M. Svetić’s Philological Bagatelles’), *Utuk ili Odgovor na Odgovor na Sitnice jezikoslovne* (‘Counter-attack or A Reply to the Reply to Philological Bagatelles’), *Vukov odgovor na Utuk G. M. Svetića* (‘Vuk’s answer to Mr. Svetić’s Counter-attack’), and *Utuk II. ili odgovor na Vukov Odgovor na laži i opadaně u Srbskome ulaku* (‘Counter-Attack II or a Response to Vuk’s Response, to the Lies and Vilification in the Serbian Herald’). Chapter 5 focuses entirely on texts from the Bulgarian journal *Ljuboslovie* (‘Philology’). Chapter 6 examines texts from the Serbian scholarly journal *Glasnik družstva Serbske slovesnosti* (‘The Gazette of the Serbian Society of Letters’), the literary supplement *Podunavka* (‘The Danubian Woman’), and the literary journals *Javor* (‘The Maple Tree’), *Sedmica* (‘The Week’), and *Danica* (‘The Morningstar’). Chapter 7, finally, focuses on texts from the journal *Mirozrenie* (‘Worldview’), the official gazette *Novine srbske* (‘The Serbian News’), the newspaper *Carigradski věstnik* (‘The Tsargrad Herald’), the
pamphlet *Upūtvane za bŭlgarskyj jazyk* (‘Instruction for the Bulgarian language’), the linguistic journal *Knigovište za pročitane* (‘A library for reading’), the journal *Čitalište* (‘Reading Room’) the scientific-political journal *Znanie* (‘Knowledge,’ Bucharest, 1875–6), the newspaper *Svoboda* (‘Freedom’), and the scientific-political journal *Den* (‘Day’).

The general choice of periodicals and other printed media is based on their role in the spread and construction of the national standard language codes and various imaginaries of the national self, as expressed in and through language in a historically new bourgeois public sphere (cf. 3.3.2). Alongside poetry and novels, periodicals played a pivotal role in what Kordić (2010: 187) calls “the machinery of cultural fiction”, which produced the imaginary of the nation in the nineteenth century, and “at the end even [made] citizens identify with the idea that their nation [and language] had always existed in that form”2 (ibid.).

The selection of texts for analysis has been motivated by an intention to obtain a maximal spread of representative sites within which the national identities and languages were constructed in Serbian and Bulgarian purist discourse. My ambition is to reflect the diversity of the Serbian and Bulgarian media landscape in terms of genres, ideological orientations, power, and the centrality of the studied periodicals throughout the entire period under study. Some of the publications were one-man projects that occupied a rather peripheral and ephemeral position in the nascent Balkan mediascape, and others enjoyed the backing of strong political, social, cultural, and economic interests. Thereby, they also exercised a more enduring impact on the construction of national identity in the public discourse on language and linguistic purity. The limitations of this study concern mainly the choice of media. I have limited myself to study newspapers and magazines as the contents of these can pinpoint the principal tendencies concerning the aim of my thesis. Although, including prefaces to grammars, textbooks, and works of fiction would lead to a more complex picture, such an investigation could be a matter of further studies. A detailed list of all the analysed texts is given in the Appendix.

To sharpen the contours of these ideological shifts and dividing lines, I have chosen to study debates. The focus on the micro-cases of Serbia and Bulgaria is motivated by an opportunity to comparatively study the parallel discursive construction of national identities and standard languages on the basis of two similar but not identical cases within the macro-framework of European cultural and linguistic nationalism. This serves the comparative purpose of this thesis and enables an elucidation of the importance of the specific cultural contexts for the choices made and the paths untreated during
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2 „маšineriji kulturne fikcije […] na kraju se građani čak i uživjeli u predodžbu da je 'njihova' nacija oduvijek postojala u takvom obliku“
the discursive construction of the national languages as the supreme manifestation of the innermost identity of the Serbian and Bulgarian nations.

To obtain a deeper understanding of this complex phenomenon, I take into consideration many unique contexts that were influencing changes in both language and society. Nevalainen (2015: 243) uses the term “layered simultaneity” to describe this multi-contextual approach to purist discourses in the past. Furthermore, in order to understand what the claims made to linguistic purity and its link to national identity meant to the Balkan nineteenth-century intellectuals then and there, and in an effort to circumvent the impending dangers of “ideational anachronism” (Bergs, 2012), I will strive for a kind of informational maximalism. Janda and Joseph (2003: 37) have described this method as “the utilization of all reasonable means to extend our knowledge of what might have been going on in the past, even though it is not directly observable.”

What unites all these early specimens of Balkan printed media is that they became public platforms for a discourse in which a new class of bourgeois intellectuals (re)presented, debated, and disputed various concepts of language and national identity. This discourse also unfolded in other commodities of print capitalism, e.g., in the often-extensive prefaces to textbooks, grammars, dictionaries, novels, and translations, which, in turn, were frequently commented on, reviewed, and debated in the periodicals (cf., Ivanova 1994, 1998; Ivić 2001, 2014; Vǔlčev 2008).

Thus, to analyse the texts studied in this thesis within their unique contextual frameworks, I have chosen to apply a complex of qualitative methods which have been developed in the field historical sociolinguistics since the publication of the pioneering paper “Empirical foundation for a theory of language change” by Weinreich, Labov & Herzog in 1968. Not least important is their emphasis on the incorporation of external factors in all theories of language change (Auer et al., 2015) and their efforts to overcome the dichotomy of synchrony and diachrony. This contextual approach to language change in the past and the discourses shaping them has been developed within the framework of (critical) discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992) and later been discussed and subsumed under the integrationist notion of “layered simultaneity” (Nevalainen, 2015: 43). Blommaert (2005) claims that meanings produced in historic discourses are complex events whose reconstruction are determined by the “layers of historicity to which people can relate and from which they can speak” (ibid., p. 131). Thus, this notion implies that the meanings which a specific sociocultural community – the Balkan nineteenth-century intellectuals, in this case – simultaneously produces in discourse, are always the outcome of an infinitely complex interplay of historical, social, political, ideological, and cultural contingencies, relations, and entanglements. I will also place the analysed representations of purity in language and national identity within the theoretical framework of
language policies and language planning, and, as mentioned above, pay particular attention to the ideological rationales for these purist policies.

1.2.1 Notes on quotation principles
Because of the symbolic charge ascribed to individual letters in the nineteenth-century discourse on language and national identity, I will, whenever possible, use the orthographical form of the primary source that I am quoting. All longer block quotes will be given in the original, with my translation into English in square brackets.

1.3 Previous research
Robert Auty’s article “The Role of Purism in the Development of the Slavonic Literary Languages” (1973) is of pioneering importance for the study of purism and language standardisation in the general Slavic context was. Auty surveys purist attitudes, ideologies, and policies among the intellectual elites of all the Slavic language communities. He draws several clarifying typological and conceptual lines according to which he separates Russian and Polish from all the other Slavic languages due to their historical continuity “from their medieval beginnings to the present day” (Auty, 1973: 336). Thereby they are also less affected by linguistic purism which, according to Auty, typically took place within the ideological framework of nineteenth-century linguistic and cultural nation-building. This is juxtaposed with the historical development of all the other Slavic standard language codes which is described as “fragmented, interrupted, or of recent (and sometimes deliberate) origin” (ibid.). Auty emphasises that the remaining Slavic languages were “strongly marked by the political objectives and cultural beliefs of the national revivals” (ibid.). He distinguishes between “anti-foreign purism and anti-Slavonic purism” (ibid., p. 337) within the Slavic language communities. This distinction seems disputable because the Slavonic-Serbian (as well as Church Slavonic and Russian) cultural and linguistic heritage of the Vojvodina intellectual elite was perceived as foreign and threatening to the linguistically defined national identity of Vuk St. Karadžić and his followers. It was turned into a social foreigner and enemy within in relation to which the national standard language code was constructed.

Peter Herrity’s article “Puristic Attitudes in Serbia in the Second Half of the Nineteenth century” (1978) discusses the purist attitudes during the later phases of the National Revival in Serbian media discourse. While, on the one hand, underlining the relative lack and impact of purist policies in the Serbian context (in relation to the Croats and Slavs of the Habsburg Empire in general), Herrity, at the same time, points at some intriguing instances of post- or late-colonial purist attitudes amongst Serbian intellectuals in Habs-
burg Vojvodina. He shows that these attitudes were to a great extent directed towards the negatively charged Turkish and Greek lexical heritage of the recent past within the Ottoman Empire. They were to a similar extent occupied with defending the national standard code from the syntactic and lexical influence of the dominant German and Hungarian languages within the Habsburg Empire, where many of the period’s influential Serbian intellectuals were living and working. The anti-German purist attitudes also included the then fashionable “Illyrian words”, i.e., Croatianisms, which by many Serbs were regarded as Germanisms in disguise.

In his article “Towards a Typology of Lexical Purism in the Slavic Literary Languages” (1988), George Thomas investigates the role of lexical purism in the process of lexis development of the Slavic national standard language codes. He inscribes the phenomenon within the conceptual framework of “a general theory of purity, purism, and purification in human experience” (Thomas, 1988: 97). Thomas claims that the purist movements in most Slavic language communities reached their apogee during the nineteenth-century national language revivals, also in cases when similar purist policies had existed in earlier stages in the history of the language. A similar point has been made by Nuorluoto (2012). According to Thomas, these purist discourses, politics, and policies were conducted by small elites and in the ideological context of nationalism.

Thomas identifies six types of lexical purism. Identification means identifying non-native words, censorship the prohibition of the usage of impure words, eradication ridding a linguistic code from undesired foreign elements, prevention preventing threatening lexical elements from entering into the language, replacement substituting perceived foreignisms with native lexical items (neologisms or dialecticisms), and reception the decisive acceptance or rejection of the conducted purist policy by the language community at large (Thomas, 1988: 99–101).

He furthermore points at five principle aesthetic incitements for purist interventions (Thomas, 1988: 101–4). The first and foremost is xenophobia (divided into general and targeted xenophobia), which is defined as the “fear of foreign influence and dominance” (ibid., p. 101). The second is archaization which implies taking recourse to older and more prestigious stages of a particular language code in the process of lexical enrichment. The third is modernisation which denotes the efforts to remove lexical elements associated with backwardness. In the context of the current thesis, modernisation was for instance the guiding principle in the Serbian efforts to get rid of Church Slavonicisms and the strife to eradicate Turkisms among many of the Balkan Slavic nineteenth-century language activists. The fourth principle is folkishness which denotes the efforts of Romanticist language renewers to base the lexis of the future national standard language codes on ethnographic sources such as “dialects, folk poetry, proverbs, and popular sayings” (ibid., p. 103). The fifth and last incentive is elitism which describes a general negative attitude to substandard and regional language usages.
Moreover, Thomas (1988: 104–7) divides the objects of purist interventions into five lexical categories that will be further discussed in section 2.2. He concludes his paper on lexical purism in the context of the Slavic languages with stipulating three degrees of purist interventions: mild, moderate, and extreme.

In this thesis, I am applying Thomas’ definition of linguistic purism, as a desire on the part of the speech community […] to preserve a language from, or rid it of, putative foreign elements, or other elements held to be undesirable (including those in dialects, sociolects, and styles of the same language). It may be directed at all foreign elements but primarily the lexicon (Thomas, 1991: 12).

Thomas (1991: 3f) places linguistic purism within the theoretical context of historicism, descriptivism, functionalism, and sociolinguistic descriptivism and suggests studying the subject “in the framework of a general theory of purity and purification in the human experience” (ibid., p. 9). Interventions into naturally evolving linguistic practices on behalf of the ideological interests of a certain social group are seldom about language alone, but virtually always about people writing and talking. Thomas exemplifies this by mentioning that the perceived “Yiddishisms” in the Third Reich on behalf of the Nazi purists were for instance accompanied by the ethnic cleansing of Jews (ibid., p. 45). The study’s (ibid., p. 43) assessment that “purism is sometimes regarded as an epiphenomenon to nationalism” and cultural nationalists’ occupation with defining and protecting what they perceive as ours against the intrusions of what they present as foreign, elucidate the link between the role of purism in the language policies and language planning and the construction of national identities.

Diana Ivanova (1994; 1998; 2008; 2014) analyses linguistic purism within the nineteenth-century Bulgarian context. In The Language Questions in the Bulgarian Periodical Press during the National Revival (‘Езиковите въпроси в българския периодичен печат през Възраждането’, 1998), she argues that it is particularly important to understand Bulgarian purist policies and practices within their specific frameworks of interacting extralinguistic contingencies. Ivanova’s (1998) analyses of materials from the periodical press have also provided a bird’s eye view of the Bulgarian media-scape of the discussed period. She mainly devotes her study to a thorough analysis of the different linguistic and orthographic models which are presented in these media discourses, but she also mentions their role in the formation of the national consciousness.

In her paper ‘The question of linguistic purity in the program of the Bulgarian national language during the National Revival (in comparison to Polish) („Въпросът за чистотата на езика в българската националноезикова програма през Възраждането. (В съпоставка с полски език)“, 2014) Ivanova analyses the question of linguistic purity in the period of the National Revival and puts it in comparison to the contemporary situation in Poland. Ivanova (ibid., p. 304) also analyses purism also
on an ideological level and asserts that it represents an instrumentalisation of language to demonstrate “solidness and unity of the society in moments of national danger or of social and mental crisis.”

Ivanova’s historical-typological overview of the developments of the purist attitudes, ideologies, and policies in Bulgaria in the period of the National Revival forms an essential background to the contextualisation of the subject of the current thesis.

Predrag Piper’s (2010) study Jovan Sterija Popović’s views on the Serbian language in his and our time (‘Погледи Јована Стерије Поповића на српски језик у свом и у нашем времену’) analyses the phenomenon of linguistic purism within the scope of the general corpus-planning policy of Jovan Sterija Popović (1806–56). Piper focuses on a paradigmatic dispute between Sterija Popović and Vuk St. Karadžić on the authority and principles to create a scientific terminology for the Serbian language. Piper’s book also represents an attempt to reclaim the pre- or non-Vukovian discourse on language and national identity. He claims that this discourse has been almost totally marginalised by the hegemonical pro-Vukovian discourse which has been dominant in the Serbian and partly Yugoslav context ever since the decades before the Liberation of 1878 and until our time. Following Piper, this discourse produces and reproduces an imaginary of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić and his followers as the sole creators of the Serbian and subsequently Serbo-Croatian language, and, thus, marginalises virtually all other discourses on language, purism, and national identity. Its most significant consequence, Piper claims, is the almost total downgrading of the Slavonic-Serbian concept of language and national identity.

Nadka Nikolova’s monography Purism during the Bulgarian Revival (‘Пуризъмът в епохата на българското възраждане’, 2015) is one of the most extensive studies of purism in the era of the Bulgarian National Revival. It offers a diachronic overview of the Bulgarian purist attitudes and policies during the National Revival - from the patriotic Slavonic-Bulgarian History by (ca 1762) Paisij Hilendarski (1722–73) to the rather extreme general xenophobic purist policy and politics of Ivan Bogorov (1818–92) in the decades around the Liberation of 1878 (Nikolova, 2015: 47–97). In a declarative and symbolic sense, father Paisij’s admonition to his fellow countrymen to know, use, and take pride in their own language and not “learn to read and think in Greek” could be seen as the beginning of the language-defined anti-Greek discursive construction of national identity. At the same time, it marks the beginning of what Todorova (2018:

---

3 “сплотеност и единство в обществото в момента на национална заплаха или на социална и духовна криза.”

4 A similar criticism was expressed already in the classical Yugoslav writer Meša Selimović’s study Za i protiv Vuka (1967).

5 “се учат четати и думати по грчки”.
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characterises as “the defensive character of the Bulgarian national idea.” It is often articulated in response to a perceived or real external threat. Yet, as Nikolova asserts, Paisij’s admonition could hardly be seen as a purist statement (Nikolova, 2015: 51), neither did it have any direct impact on the discourses which gained momentum from the 1840s on.

Nikolova describes how the culturally dominant Greeks or at least Greek culture and language within the ‘Romaic community’ (cf. p. 65) would be the negatively defining Other for the Bulgarian purists of the 1830s and 1840s who targeted in the first hand Greek and, to a lesser extent, Turkish lexis. The purists of the 1830s, 1840s, and 1850s, such as Konstantin Fotinov (1790–1858), Vasil Aprilov (1789–1847), and Ivan Dobrovski (1812–97), were all educated in Greek schools, and crucially addressed Church Slavonic and Russian lexical items as the positively defining Other (rephrased as the true national ‘Self’) in their efforts to define the nation by means of language.

In the years following the Crimean War (1853–6), Nikolova (2015) states that language of public communication (not least that of a unified orthography) became the focus of the purist discourse (ibid., p. 67) and the “theme of domestic and foreign in language” (ibid., p. 68) gained renewed topicality. The debates of the early 1850s on the pure national identity as manifested in the orthography, morphology, and lexis of the national standard language code between Ivan Dobrovski in Mirozrenie ‘Worldview’ and Nikolaj Palauzov (1776–1853) in Carigradski vestnik ‘The Tsargrad Herald’ are utterly emblematic. They were also revealing for the pro-Austrian and pro-Russian politic interests of the participants in this discourse. The focus on lexical purity and its role in the construction of national specificity were reinforced in the discourses of the 1860s and 1870s. The course of the purist discourse could be clearly tracked in the debates between Petko Račev Slavejkov (1827–95), Christo Botev (1848–76), and Ljuben Karavelov (1834–79) on the one hand, and the ever more quixotic strife of Ivan Bogorov for a language entirely cleansed from foreign lexis. These debates took place within the Romanticist ideological framework and represented a clash between a moderate, “targeted xenophobic purism” and a more extreme, “general xenophobic purism” (Thomas, 1991: 81).

Two monographic studies devoted to nationally motivated purist politics and policies in a contemporary Croatian context are Language and Nationalism (‘Jezik i nacionalizam’, 2010) by Snježana Kordić and Language couldn’t care less (‘Jeziku je svejedno’, 2019) by Andel Starčević, Mate Kapović, and Daliborka Sarić. Although they deal with the specifically Croatian brand of purism in the fascist NDH (‘Independent State of Croatia’, 1941–5) and from the Yugoslav Wars (1991–2001) to the present, the theoretical material is relevant for the discussions analysed in this thesis. Purism

6 „темата за домашно и чуждо в езика".
in these works is seen as the linguistic manifestation of a general nationalist ideology that societal elites are instrumentalising in order to establish, maintain, and perform privileged positions of political, economic, social, and cultural power.

Kordić devotes the first chapter of her study (ibid., pp. 9–68) to a comprehensive, critical analysis of the phenomenon of linguistic purism which she puts in comparative relation to the purist language policy in Nazi Germany from the early 1930s to the mid-1940s. Just like Thomas (1991), she argues that the purist policy and policies targeting undesired linguistic features goes hand in hand with discrimination or even cleansing of undesired human groups in the field of ethnopolitics. In the politically motivated discourses engendered by the societal elites, language is often stereotypically and in a naturalising manner presented as the ‘Soul of the People’ which transmits and preserves its unity and authenticity. Purism is on occasions even presented as an essential and pristine characterising feature of the very language in all its historical stages – a scarlet thread uniting the people and its language (Kordić, 2010: 23).

A similar critical perspective on contemporary Croatian prescriptivism and purist discourse and policies as an instrument of exercising political power and social control is presented in the monographic study Language couldn’t care less (‘Jeziku je svejedno’, 2019) by Andel Starčević, Mate Kapović, and Daliborka Sarić. The section “The ideology of purism (monoglossia and mono-origin)” (‘Ideologija purizma (monoglosije i monooriginije)’, 320–50) is dedicated to purist policies within the context of contemporary Croatian prescriptivism. Starčević, Kapović & Sarić contains several important theoretical perspectives and analytical tools which can be applied to any study of purist ideologies in nationalist contexts – regardless of the stage of language standardisation.

Marija Ilić (2012) dedicates her study Purism in Studies on Serbian as a Minority Language: Serbian-Hungarian Linguistic Contacts (‘Purizam u proučavanju srpskog kao manjinskog jezika: Srpsko-mađarski jezički kontakti’) to the role of purist ideologies and policies, not least the “standard language ideology” (Milroy & Milroy, 2002), in the maintenance and defence of the identity and cultural and linguistic rights of the Serbian minority in Hungary. Ilić discerns three types of purist ideologies: “(1) ethnic or national, (2) dialectological, [and] (3) standard-language purism” (Ilić, 2012: 308). While confirming the general picture that Serbian purism in the past and present is mainly characterised by dialectological and standard-language purism, she at the same time emphasises that “neither Serbian has remained immune to purist tendencies which derive from nationalistic concepts of

7 “etnički ili nacionalni, (2) dijalektološki, (3) standardnojezički purizam.”
language (ibid.). These protective, nationalistic, and xenophobic purist policies are particularly active in bi- or multilingual settings of language and cultural contacts and transfers such as that the Serbian minority in today’s Hungary or of the Serbian minority in nineteenth-century Habsburg Vojvodina.

Although devoted to the contemporary language-situation in Yugoslavia, Croatia, and Serbia, the last three presented studies are applicable to the current thesis while elucidating essential patterns in the interacting dynamics of purism, power, and the construction of group identities which also shaped the nineteenth-century Serbian and Bulgarian media-discourse.

1.4 Chapter overview

Chapter 2 elucidates some central key concepts in the Balkan contexts. The concepts are the identity of national identities, various ideologies of language, linguistic nationalism, the framework of language planning and language policies (LPLP), planning for identity, some definitions of purism, its relation to nationalism, and when and why it occurs.

Chapter 3 describes the historical background for the emergence of the Serbian and Bulgarian discourses on purism, language, and national identity. I delineate the pre-modern language ideologies of the Balkans, as well as the Enlightenment and Romanticist ideologies of language in the West and in the Balkans. In the concluding section (3.3), I analyse the role of print capitalism and the Balkan bourgeois public sphere for the ‘imagination’ of the Serbian and Bulgarian nation in the discourse on language, purism, and national identity.

Chapter 4 introduces the context of the early phases of the Serbian discourse on purism, language, and national identity, and focuses on some significant debates which emerged on the pages of *Serbske lětopisi* (‘The Serbian Chronicles’) in the 1830s. The debates comprise clashes between representatives of what I call the ‘Slavonic-Serbian,’ the ‘civil Serbian’ and the ‘popular Serbian concept of language and national identity,’ which would all be pivotal for the future course of the Serbian discourses.

Chapter 5 deals with the Bulgarian situation and discusses the early phases of the Bulgarian discourses on purism, language, and national identity. It analyses the debates which evolved on the pages of Konstantin Fotinov’s magazine *Ljuboslovie* (‘Philology’) in the mid 1840s. These debates represent an early and paradigmatical conflict between defenders of what I have

---

8 “ni srpski nije ostao imun na purističke tendencije koje proističu iz nacionalističkih shvatanja jezika.”
conceptualised as the ‘Slavonic-Bulgarian’ and the ‘pro-Russian vernacularist concepts of language and nation identity.’

Chapter 6 analyses some emblematic discourses on purity in language and national identity in the period 1844–74. The chapter focuses on materials from the influential scholarly and literary journals Glasnik družstva Serbske slovesnosti (‘The Gazette of the Serbian Society of Letters’), Podunavka (‘The Danubian Woman’), Sedmica (‘The Week’), Javor (‘The Maple Tree’), and Danica (‘The Morningstar’). In this period, the earlier mentioned (cf. p. 23), Slavonic-Serbian, civil-Serbian, and popular-Serbian concepts of language and national identity were supplemented by the Yugoslav concept, which emerged in dialogue with the South-Slavic Illyrian Movement in the Habsburg Empire.

Chapter 7 analyses some important instances of Bulgarian purist media discourse in the period 1850–75. The chapter describes the three overarching language ideological concepts dominant in the period. They are labelled the ‘Russo-Bulgarian,’ the ‘Austro-Bulgarian,’ and finally the ‘pure-Bulgarian concepts of language and national identity.’ Chapter 7 analyses materials from Mirozrenie (‘Worldview’), Novine srbske (‘Serbian News’), Carigradska vestnik (‘The Tsargrad Herald’), Svoboda (‘Freedom’), Znanje (‘Knowledge’), Knigovište za pročitanje (‘A Library for Reading’), Čitalište (‘Reading-Room’), and Den (‘Day’).

Finally, chapter 8 draws comparative conclusions from the cases studied in chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7. It elucidates the similarities and differences in the specifically Serbian and Bulgarian nineteenth-century discourse on purism, language, and national identity.
2. Key concepts

2.1 Theoretical frameworks

I will utilise the sociolinguistic theory called critical constructivism in my thesis. Critical constructivism focuses on language as a social and ideological practice that a particular community of communication is instrumentalises to form the social reality in which it is embedded in, and, in turn, shaped by. Nevalainen (2015) argues for the applicability of this approach on the level of society and politics and that it, while being directly connected to the present, concerns “discussions of how language ideology and standardization make up a particularly strong strand in historical research, including studies on purism, language myths, and hegemony” (ibid., 246). The concept of critical constructivism is also intimately related the interplay of essentialism and constructivism, which will be discussed in the following.

Essentialist approaches to languages and national identities present them as actual givens – as reified entities, which somehow exist beyond and independently of social intercourse. Constructivists in contrast, treat linguistic varieties and social identities as fluid processes, as practices, which are constructed, de- and reconstructed through the ideology-laden negotiations and conflicts between the participants in constantly ongoing and multilayered discourses (Joseph, 2004: 83–4).

Greenfeld (2001: 663) describes the constructivist view of language, purism, and national identity in the following manner

there are [...] [i]n fact, [...] no objective foundations for nationality. Empirical study reveals that all nations – as nations – are artificial constructions. Nationality is not natural. Every social group has an identity, but nationality is not any identity, national identity is an identity of a particular kind and its development in any given society is not socially, biologically, or otherwise imperative. Instead, it is in every case a product of an historically distinctive situation. The only foundation of nationalism as such is an idea, it is a particular perspective, or a style of thought.

A similar approach to nationalism has been expressed by Kedourie (1993: 1) who maintained that “[n]ationalism is a doctrine invented in Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century.” For Kedourie it all boiled down to an idea, an ideology, or a particular perspective of the social world.

At the same time, there are several reasonable provisos and modifications that have been expressed by scholars such as Anthony Smith (2011: 226; 232), who point at the persistent impact of the imaginary of the national communities once they have been constructed. Even if national communities
are originally invented categories, they end up as real and pervasive sociological phenomena, whose cultural contents undergo constant renegotiations, but whose individuality and external outlines persist across the generations. A similar stance is expressed by Fredrik Barth (1969), John R. Edwards (1985), Roger Brubaker (2004), and Peter Mackridge’s (2009), who asserts that essentialism and constructionism are not as mutually exclusive as they are conventionally taken to be.

Language may not be a primordial constituent of nationality, but it is the chief medium through which speakers are acculturated into nationhood and one of the chief means through which they articulate their sense of it” (ibid., 10).

Nationalist ideologies still have a great impact on public and academic discourse in contemporary Balkan societies. Marinov (2013: 10) classifies this, sometimes hegemonic, ideological paradigm of scholarly research as “methodological nationalism.” These ideologies are a means of exercising power and control over social behaviour. The national languages are often naturalised as an object of internal identification and an instrument of external differentiation, not least, because “the essence of every ideologized interpretation [is] to present the distorted reality as an actual given”9 (Škiljan, 2002: 164).

However, the essentialist dogma about the ‘natural’ connectedness between an ethnic group, people or nation and its national standard language code is emphatically discarded by contemporary research. Additionally, it is empirically contradicted by the wide spread of multilingualism – both in and outside Europe.

2.1.1 Bourdieu and Critical Discourse Analysis

The French sociologist and poststructuralist Pierre Bourdieu (1930–2002) studied the interconnectedness of discourse, language, and symbolic (and real) power, and emphasised the situatedness of all meanings constructed in discourse. One of Bourdieu’s central theses is that all social meanings, which he held were are produced through language use in historically, politically, socially, and culturally situated discourses which in turn represent a symbolic battlefield for the establishment and reproduction of positions of privileged power. These discourses are often controlled by those possessing the three capitals – the economic, social, and cultural, and reflects their ‘habitus’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 12), i.e., the ideology, or lived ideological relations and the social practices they give rise to. Bourdieu focuses “on language at the level of practice, parole [in the Saussurean sense] and how this reveals underlying structural relations of symbolic power” (Myles, 2010: 33). Thus, Bourdieu

9 „bit svake ideologizirane interpretacije [je] da iskrivljenu realnost prezentira kao stvarnu datost“
(1991) has a performative perspective on language and sees discourses as a particular way to organise meaning-making or signifying practices that constitute “human beings as social subjects” (Woolard, 1998: 6).

Yet, when it comes to language standardisation and the status planning choice of the linguistic practices of a particular social group as the base for the corpus planning development of a national language, Bourdieu’s perspective seems to be entirely occidental, focusing on what Sue Wright calls “state nations” (Wright, 2004: 19). In these settings (e.g., France, Sweden etc.), national linguistic unification and purification were top-down and established through a discourse which was completely controlled by the societal elites and resulted in giving “the upper classes a de facto monopoly on political power” (Bourdieu, 1991: 6). In the sense of Miroslav Hroch (1985, 2000), the ethnic groups of the Balkans were still stateless, i.e., they had not yet obtained a separate statehood, independent from a dominant nation with which they were coexisting. In these settings, the discursive processes were bottom-up and established as a means of cultural-linguistic self-assertion in relation to the discourses of dominating cultural, political, and social groups (such as the Greek-speaking elite within the Orthodox millet of the Ottoman Empire in the Bulgarian case).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in its British form (Fairclough, 1993; 1995) grew out of Bourdieuan poststructuralist thinking on language as an instrument of action and symbolic power and out of the critical linguistics of the 1970s. It is by now an established autonomous discipline which offers both an interdisciplinary theoretical perspective and a complex methodological approach in relation to its perspective on discourse as social action which has the function of distributing social power (Gorjanc, 2017: 14). Researchers utilising some form of CDA are thus interested in relations of social power, inequalities within discourses, and misuses of social power. Their analyses focus on the states and processes through which social power is established and maintained (Dijk, 2001: 352) and is exclusively applied to social issues, precisely while society and culture are constituted by socially, politically, culturally, and historically situated discourses (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997: 271–80). CDA aims at showing how texts function in specific social and cultural practices and explain how discourse is formed by power relations and contemporaneously used to construct social identities and relations, systems of knowledge and beliefs.

2.1.2 National identity and the role of language in constructing it

The role of various linguistic codes or diversified language behaviour in the discursive construction of ethnic and national identity is thoroughly analysed in the study Language, society, and identity (1985) by the social psychologist John R. Edwards. Following Barth (1969), Edwards claims that ethnicity depends less on sets of shared cultural practices (such as language) than on
group boundaries; the individuality and external outlines of ethnic communi-
ties may persist across the generations even if the cultural contents defining
them undergo constant renegotiations. Language (in its communicative and
symbolic quality) is thus only one of many arbitrary cultural practices that
can be instrumentalised in the construction of nationhood, and far from the
prerequisite or essential and primordial defining feature of the nation which
linguistic nationalists claim it to be.

Edwards’ introductory essay “Foreword: Language, Prescriptivism, Na-
tionalism – and Identity” (2012) thoroughly describes the link between na-
tionalism, purism, and prescriptivism, and its role in the construction of na-
tional identities. Prescriptivism, i.e., the belief that some linguistic varieties
and language forms–often connected to a societal elite–are more correct than
other varieties and should be promoted as normative for the linguistic behav-
ior for the entire community, is closely related to purist attitudes and prac-
tices (Edwards, 2012: 13). Linguistic prescriptivism and purism are for in-
stance both often triggered by external or internal pressure and a purported
need to promote and protect the purity of a linguistic variety which is per-
ceived as threatened by foreign languages or debased social varieties (which
is often an excuse for retaining the privileges of a particular social group).
These antithetical driving-forces turn exactly prescriptivism and purism into
some of the most ideologically charged sites within the discursive construc-
tion of both standard language codes and national identities through which a
certain linguistic variety is promoted, purified, and protected as the represen-
tation of the unity and homogeneity of the entire nation.

In his later book Sociolinguistics: A very short introduction (2013), Ed-
wards nuances this description of purism and prescriptivism, stating that
not all linguistic purism is silly and not all prescriptivism [is] unnecessary, the con-
temporary scholarly distaste for prescriptivism must be acknowledged. The distaste is
partly based upon the entirely fallacious notion that to study something is to endorse
it; if also ignores a mundane prescriptivism to which we all attend (ibid., p. 2013: 46)

Following Edwards, a mundane form of prescriptivism and purism thus form
an inevitable part of the linguistic behaviour of most individuals and collec-
tives – including in constructing and performing the identity of individuals
and groups in relation to others.

John E. Joseph’s Language and Identity. National, Ethnic, Religious
(2004) deals exhaustively with the role of language choice in the discursive
construction of various ideological identities in the entire Western tradition.
The study describes a “constructionist turn” (Joseph, 2004: 93) in the analy-
sis of languages and national identity which occurred around 1990 (cf.
Hobsbawm, 1990) under the influence the radical changes caused by the
reorganisation of the USSR and the Eastern Bloc in 1989–91 and the subse-
quent Yugoslav Wars of 1991–2001. All these geopolitical developments
have “contributed to a strong awareness of the fluidity and arbitrariness of
nationality” (ibid., p. 94). They have led many scholars to treat beliefs in
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“real” national identities as mythical, and to conceptualise identities “as something we construct and negotiate throughout our lives” (ibid.). The chapter “Language in National Identities” (ibid., pp. 92–131) presents various historical and contemporary cases where language varieties have been or are being exploited in the construction of identities in the pursuit of obtaining political, social, or cultural objectives. In this chapter, Joseph shows that people are and have been ethnified, racified or turned into nationals for different reasons and by various means (language, skin colour, religion, clothes, cultural practices), and these processes are often linked to power, inclusion and exclusion (gaining privileges for the ‘in-group’ by denigrating the ‘out-group’). Joseph’s conclusions are throwing a clarifying light on the instrumentality of language in the pursuit of the small nineteenth-century Serbian and Bulgarian intellectual elites to define and homogenise their respective national in-group by means of purist policies.

Ranko Bugarski’s sociolinguistic study Language and Society (‘Jezik u društvu’, 1986) introduces several central themes of contemporary sociolinguistics. He affirms the centrality of the hyphenised Serbo-Croatian language for the construction and maintenance of a communal identity in the Yugoslav ideological context. In the chapter “Language and Nation” (‘Jezik i nacija’, 158–210), Bugarski delves into crucial themes such as ‘Language and ethno-national consciousness’10 (ibid., pp. 165–73), ‘Ethnic characteristics in language’11 (ibid., pp. 173–188) and ‘Language and nation in time and space’12 (ibid., pp. 188–206). The inexorable interrelatedness of language, identity, and ideology is also the main argument of Bugarski’s more recent study Language and Identity (‘Jezik i identitet’, 2010). He starts up with making a thorough analysis of the very concept of identity which he separates into three levels. Bugarski is generally sharing the critical, constructivist stance of Kordić (2010) and Starčević, Kapović & Sarić (2019) on the political misuses or manipulations of the link between language and identity on the collective and individual level of identity. Bugarski writes that the nebulous concept of identity is often subjected to drastic misuses in times of crisis and conflict when it can also provoke tragical consequences. A striking case – among the many which could have been induced – are the recent wars on the territory of former Yugoslavia, where different atrocities, and even war crimes, were perpetrated in the name of the defence of a national, confessional, cultural or some other identity (Bugarski, 2010: 19).13

10 „Jezik i etno-nacionalna svest“
11 „Etnička obeležja u jeziku“
12 „Jezik i nacija u vremenu i prostoru“
13 „podložan je drastičnim zloupotrebam u razdobljima kriza i sukoba, kada ume da izazove i tragične posledice. Upečatljiv slučaj – među mnogima koji bi se mogli navesti – jesu skorašnji ratovi na teritoriji bivše Jugoslavije, gde su razna zlodela, pa i ratni zločini, počinjeni u ime odbrane nacionalnog, konfesionalnog, kulturnog ili kakvog drugog identiteta.“
Bugarski locates the beginning of language as the definer of above all national identity to the late eighteenth century European ideological context of J.J. Rousseau (1712–78) and J.G. v. Herder. The nexus of language and national identity, which this ideological paradigm engendered, also entails a belief that a people without its language is doomed to perish, and that an individual can only truly live and create in her/his sacrosanct mother tongue (ibid., p. 21).

The primal defining feature of national identity in the Era of the National Revivals was language. The term ‘national revival’ (or ‘rebirth’), национално възраждане, in Bulgarian and narodni preporod in Serbian, is itself a strongly nationalist ideologeme. It implicates that the true or essential – but, alas, dormant – national self was brought to life or reborn through the efforts of the cultural activists, and not something they constructed through selecting, standardising and dispersing a choice of pre-existing cultural practices (such as language). As Gellner (1964: 169) puts it “nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist.” In the following sections I will discuss the role of ideology in language standardisation processes.

2.1.3 Ideology of language

Kathryn Woolard’s “Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry” (1998) argues for four conceptual foci on ideology and its application to the social practice of language. According to Woolard, they are stretching from a neutral understanding of ideology as “ideational or conceptual, referring to mental phenomena [according to which] ideology has to do with consciousness, subjective representations, beliefs, ideas” (Woolard, 1998: 5), to a critical understanding of the concept as related to “inhabitable positions of power – social, political, economic” and as a matter of “distortion, illusion, error, mystification, or rationalization” (ibid., p. 7). These four strands mark a gradual transition from rather neutral understandings of ‘ideology’ to explicitly critical uses. I will first make a brief account of the four takes on the concept of ideology and then explain how I am using the concept in this thesis.

The adherents of the first (1) recurring strand understand “ideology as ideational or conceptual, referring to mental phenomena; ideology has to do with consciousness, subjective representations, beliefs, ideas” (Woolard, 1998: 5). Like de Tracy, they focus almost entirely on the ideational aspect of ‘ideology’. Branding something as ‘ideological’ does not imply “any social or critical dimensions” (ibid.) but is just a (neutral) way of referring to “the intellectual constituent of culture” (ibid., p. 6). A subsection of this ample and recurring take on ideology is one that does not see ideology as “necessarily conscious, deliberate, or systematically organized thought, or even thought at all; it is behavioral, practical, prereflective, or structural” (ibid. p.
The French structuralists and poststructuralists could be subsumed under this category. The poststructuralists “cast ideology not as a matter of consciousness or subjective representations but rather of ‘lived relations’” or see it as a particular way of organising the signifying practices constituting “human beings as social subjects” (ibid.). This applies to Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of ‘habitus’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 12), which I refer to on several occasions in this thesis.

The second (2) recurring conceptualisation of ‘ideology’ is one that sees it “as derived from, rooted in, reflective of, or responsive to the experience or interests of a particular social position, even though ideology so often (in some views, always) represents itself as universally true” (Woolard, 1998: 6). According to this view ideology is “dependent on the material and practical aspects of human life” (ibid.) and the ideological and material are regarded as mutually constituting. This seems to be the most widely agreed upon strand.

The third (3) strand is in many senses a corollary of the second and its proponents claim that ‘ideology’ is directly linked “to inhabitable positions of power – social, political, economic” (Woolard, 1998: 7). They cast ideology “as ideas, discourse, or signifying practices in the service of the struggle to acquire or maintain power” (ibid.). Ideology is seen “as the tool, property, or practice of dominant social groups; the cultural conceptions and practices of subordinate groups are by definition nonideological” (ibid.).

The fourth (4) major perspective on ‘ideology’ adds the critical ingredients of “distortion, illusion, error, mystification, or rationalization” (Woolard, 1998: 7) to the third – to which it is, otherwise, closely related. This distortion of reality is often driven by an urge to conceal the private interests of the ideological classes and presents what is actually the outcome of ideological construction of language and national identity as ‘natural’ and ‘universally true.’ All four strands have a strong relevance to my thesis, but as I am focusing on agency and the critical aspect of ideology, the first, neutral definition is the least relevant to it.

How do then ideologies of language relate to ideologies in the generic sense of the concept? A tentative definition, focusing on the activist or agency aspect of ideology, could be ‘language in ideological use’ or ‘the ideological instrumentalization of language’. It would then be more appropriate to rephrase ‘ideology of language’ is ‘ideology in language’ in order to emphasize that language is only one of many cultural practices where it manifests itself.

Katrin Woolard writes that ‘language ideologies’ (or language ideologies) “envision and enact ties of language to identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology” (Woolard, 1998: 2) and defines the phenomenon as “[r]epresentations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (ibid.). Linguistic nationalism would, consequently, “envision and enact ties” of a particular lin-
guistic variety (the standard language code) and national identity, and, thus, constitute human beings as nationals “in the social world” (ibid.). Linguistic nationalisms (or nationalists) also affect language forms and language use – for instance through various purist policies – in deeming certain linguistic forms to be in accordance with what is stereotypically and in a Herderian sense presented as the ‘Soul of the Nation’ (or the national identity) and others to be foreign or even threatening to it.

The article “Language ideology” (2004) by the linguistic anthropologist Paul V. Kroskrity focuses on the conceptual framework of language ideology and provides a clear-cut organisational structure of this phenomenon. Kroskrity (2004: 501) delineates five levels for the organisation of language ideologies: “(1) group or individual interests, (2) multiplicity of ideologies, (3) awareness of speakers, (4) mediating functions of ideologies, and (5) role of language ideology in identity construction”. The first and the fifth seem to be particularly important for the understanding of the ideological driving forces behind the discursive construction of a standard language code and a national identity in the Serbian and Bulgarian nineteenth-century periodicals. The first for its focus on goal-oriented agency and its apprehension of language ideologies as representing “the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group” (ibid.). The fifth for its analysis of how “language ideologies are productively used in the creation and representation of various social and cultural identities (e.g., nationality, ethnicity)”14 (ibid., p 509) and locating the origin of the trope of language as a “nation-nucleating force” (ibid.) in European cultural discourse to the teachings the German philosopher J.G. v. Herder.

2.1.4 Linguistic nationalism

Ever since the seminal writings of the German Romantics, such as J.G. Herder, J.G. Fichte, and W. von Humboldt language has been given “a foundational role in European nationalism” (Ferguson, 2006: 18). Language has, not least in the Balkans, been turned into an object of devotion, “one of the most important cults of nationalism, which is, in turn, a kind of secular, that is, political religion”15 (Kordić, 2010: 174). ‘Linguistic nationalism’ or ‘nationalism in language’ can consequently be defined as the subjective belief in the objective existence of a homogeneous national language and that this language is the defining feature of an equally uniform group of human beings deemed to be or become a nation. The sociolinguists Jan Blommaert &

---

14 Italics are given as in the original.
15 „jedan od najvažnijih kultova nacionalizma, koji je opet jedna vrsta sekularne, odnosna političke religije“
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Jef Verschueren call this implicit ideological assumption of a national (linguistic) uniformity, which is still imbuing many contemporary societies “the dogma of homogeneism” (Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998: 195). It is a (blind) dogma exactly because it presents a reality which is actually characterised by heterogeneity, contrast, and change as being homogeneous, similar, and static. The map is not the territory.

Linguistic nationalism is also a movement aiming at constructing, diffusing, and protecting (through various purist interventions) a standardised linguistic variety and making all those deemed to belong to the nation learn, use, and identify with it. Linguistic nationalists claim that (1) people are defined by a particular linguistic variety and that (2) national standard codes (and the nations they are assumed to define) are not constructed and constantly reconstructed in discourses loaded with power and interests, but essential givens which are existing from times immemorial and bestowed upon us by birth. Thus, given the fact that linguistic nationalism is not about language alone, but about people talking and writing, about identifying a particular linguistic variety with a particular group of people (Kordić, 2010: 181), discourses on languages are frequently cover ups for the achievement of political, social, or cultural objectives, which are far from always made explicit.

In the nineteenth century, cultural nationalists – linguists, poets, writers, and folklorists – emerged as a class of privileged interpreters of this particular fixation with the national languages. Language (especially as manifested in the poetry of the Volk) was revered as the innermost repository of the true and indispensable essence of the nations. It was a perceived essence, which those intellectuals were about to conjure up out of an infinite multitude of localised and diverging cultural and linguistic practices. Their ultimate objective was to construct one unified and homogeneous national culture consisting of and maintained by a set of standardised practices defining that culture. What was actually a process of the discursive construction of a historically new kind of identity and language was often presented (and, perhaps, believed to be) a ‘revival’ or ‘rebirth’ of a something primordial and essential lying dormant in the depths of what they presented as the ‘Soul of the People.’ Human societies were envisioned as essentially uniform organisms existing from times immemorial and bound together by invisible bonds (language, above all) of belonging and solidarity which were imagined as running across and outdoing all other potential social dividing lines (Joseph, 2004).

This vision or narrative of an across time and space linguistically unified nation was also instrumentalised by revolutionaries and freedom fighters. They saw the process of homogenising language and other cultural practices as a means of defending the rights of their subordinate ethnie against the threats posed by politically and culturally dominant groups, and ultimately laying claims to a political statehood of their own. Thus, both the liberating
or revolutionary and the conservative or repressing aspects of nationalism were present already in the nineteenth-century discourses (Smith, 2009; 2011).

In relation to the Yugoslav case of mainly the twentieth century, Svein Mønnesland describes two fundamental symbolic uses of language. The first is the unitarian, which “presents a language as one and the same and even makes them merge” (Mønnesland, 2013: 313). This policy is “linked to political centralism” (ibid.). The second symbolic use of language is the separatist, which “aims at presenting or even making languages as different as possible” (ibid.). According to Mønnesland this policy is linked to “nationalism and decentralism” (ibid.).

How exactly the symbolic function of language is instrumentalised depends largely on the objectives of the language ideologues engaged in changing, planning, or manipulating the form and contents of a specific standard language code, and, in consequence, the beliefs and behaviour of the members of the language community using or supposed to be using it.

There are, in fact, no objective or scientifically attestable criteria for the existence of nations either. They are as constructed as all the cultural practices supposed to unify and symbolise them. It is all together a matter of ideology, identification, and subjective interests. “Every nation is”, as Snježana Kordić puts it, “a lie which time and history – like the old myths and classical legends – have given just the semblance of truth” (Kordić, 2010: 189).

2.1.5 Language planning and language policies

Studies of language policies and language planning (LPLP) (cf. Picchio 1984; Joseph 2004; Wright 2004 et alt.) in the West conventionally take Dante’s De vulgari eloquentia (‘On Eloquence of the Vernacular’, ca 1302–5) as their historical point of departure. John Joseph even calls its author “the granddaddy of all linguistic (proto)nationalists” (Joseph, 2004: 98). Ever since De vulgari eloquentia was written in the first decade of the fourteenth century, la questione della lingua (‘the language question’), has been inextricably mixed up with aspects of identity, politics, and power. The renaissance humanists used the concepts dignitas to describe “the appropriateness of a language to perform religious, social or literary functions [in relation to Latin]” (Picchio, 1984: 2), and norma to describe which features of a classical language or a local linguistic patrimony should be accepted into the national language. Questions of dignitas and norma often arose when the Bible (the Vulgate) was translated into the Western European national languages.

16 „Svaka nacija je laž, kojoj su vrijeme i povijest – kao starim mitovima i klasičnim legendama – dali samo privid istine.“
These two concepts roughly correspond to Kloss’ terms ‘status planning’ and ‘corpus planning.’

Dante’s treatise on language was written on the threshold of paradigmatic political and ideological changes in Western European history. The period witnessed the initiation of a gradual transition from late medieval feudalism, and its theocentric system of social meanings, to the emergence of the first early modern “state nations” (Wright, 2004; 2007). This era was characterised by an avid anthropocentric interest in the individual human being and the infinite complexity of life on earth. According to the medieval cultural ideology, in contrast, ‘Language’ was equal to the three holy, liturgical languages (*tres linguae sacrae*), Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. Yet, the supremacy of the Latin culture was now challenged by a novel species of “would-be absolutist monarchs” (Anderson, 2006: 40) and their need for cultural, linguistic, and political prestige and consolidation. Thus, one cultural means of creating external differentiation (‘Ausbau’) and internal consolidation, was introducing a prestigious variety of the vernaculars as the language of bureaucracy, liturgy, and higher culture. Not least important for promoting the development of a new reading public, that could be “mobilized […] for politico-religious purposes” (Anderson, 2006: 40), was the introduction of print-capitalism, which created a new infrastructure for communal imaginations.

The introduction and standardisation of these “administrative vernaculars” (ibid.) was almost never a matter of outright language planning and explicit policy making. Yet, crucially, “[t]here was no idea of systematically imposing the language on the dynasts’ various subject populations.” (ibid., 42). These administrative vernaculars were rather a result of a gradual process of bureaucratic incorporation within the absolutist state that covered more or less the whole early modern period. During these gradual processes, language inevitably became a marker of cultural difference and an instrument of exercising ideological control. Various purist ideologies and interventions played a crucial role in sharpening the outlines of these markers of cultural difference.

John Edwards utilises the term “prescriptivism” (Edwards, 2012: 13) to describe a central feature in any LPLP-processes – including the ‘implicit’ ones occurring in Western Europe in the early modern period. He characterises it as

an unsurprising consequence of the decline of Latin and the rise of European national languages. With the latter came the association between cultural and linguistic specificity, and from this there inexorably arose the desire to preserve and ‘protect’ what was increasingly seen as an important boundary marker (Edwards, 2012: 13).

Prescriptivism, nationalism, and purist ideologies and interventions are inseparably entangled in the sense that purism is a discourse through which
“cultural and linguistic specificity” is articulated or constructed. Commenting on the ideological aspects of language planning, Edwards writes that

planning is inevitably coloured by ideological imperatives; any ‘theoretical’ pretensions can only remain value-free at the most abstract levels: any application immediately involves opinion and preference. More bluntly, what appears as desirable progress to some may be persecution to others – every linguistic route chosen, after all, means another road not taken (ibid., p. 25).

Purism is ultimately about choice. The linguistic routes chosen by the small cultural, economic, and political elites of the nineteenth-century Balkans played a decisive role in the construction of the contemporary Serbian and Bulgarian ethno-cultural nations. These choices were, thus, made under the ideological imperative of nationalism and served the nation-building interests of those making them.

One of the most classical definitions of language planning involves all conscious efforts to change the linguistic behaviour of a speech community (Haugen, 1966b). Einar Haugen separated the process of “taking the step from ‘dialect’ to ‘language,’ from vernacular to standard” (Haugen, 1966a: 933) into (1) selection of norm, (2) codification of form, (3) elaboration of function, and (4) acceptance by community. A couple of years later, Heinz Kloss (1969) introduced the now classical distinction between ‘status planning’ (corresponding to Haugen’s selection of norm), not very distinctly defined as concerned with “the status of the language whether it should be lowered or raised” (ibid., p. 81), and ‘corpus planning’ (corresponding to Haugen’s codification of form and elaboration of function), meaning “that some agency, person, or persons are trying to change the shape or the corpus of a language by proposing or prescribing the introduction of new technical terms, changes in spelling, or the adoption of a new script” (ibid.). Robert L. Cooper (1989) added ‘acquisition planning’ (roughly corresponding to Haugen’s acceptance by community), described as concerning “the implementation of status and corpus policy. Once it has been decided that a certain language will play a certain role in public life, and once the form of that language has been decided, educationists organise how it will be acquired” (Cooper, 1989: 1). James Tollefson similarly characterises the three operational fields of ‘language planning’ as “efforts to deliberately affect the status, structure, or acquisition of languages” (Tollefson, 2011: 357). Tollefson seems to be focusing less than Haugen on human agency. Purist beliefs and policies have a crucial role to play in all aspects of language planning.

Language policies can be detected in the language behaviour on all levels of the social dynamics of human societies. Implicitly, they can be expressed in the choices of language structures and forms made by individuals, groups, or state institutions. Explicitly, they can manifest themselves in overt value statements regarding good or bad, proper or improper, functional or dysfunctional, pure or impure, ours or theirs in language or policy documents. Examples of these policy documents are language acts or grammars which are
compiled by individuals or issued by official authoritative bodies, such as academies. Language policies can be described as interventions into “a system (namely language) which is naturally evolving” (Halliday, 2001: 177) to obtain a particular goal or stimulate social change (Ferguson, 1989). Language ideologies, on the other hand, are the conscious or unconscious attitudes and beliefs about the social role of language motivating the choices made in the course of LPLP. Bernard Spolsky exhaustively characterises the complex notion of *language policy* in the following manner:

> Language policy is about choice. It may be the choice of a specific sound, or expression, or of a specific variety of language. It may be the choice regularly made by an individual, or a socially defined group of individuals, or a body with authority over a defined group of individuals. It may be discovered in the linguistic behavior (language practices) of the individual or group. It may also be discovered in the ideology or beliefs about language of the individual or group. Finally, it may be made explicit in the formal language management or planning decisions of an authorized body (Spolsky, 2004: 216)

This has a clear bearing on my thesis and its focus on the ideology or beliefs about the language of the individuals or groups taking part in the nineteenth century discourse on the future language and identity of the Serbian and Bulgarian national communities, and the role of purist beliefs and policies in the discursive construction of these communities and languages.

In the first chapter of her monograph *Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalisation* (2004) and the subsequent article “Language Planning and Language Policy” (2007), Sue Wright elucidates the role of language and language standardisation in the historical development of the European national communities from the language continuum of the feudal era to the language mosaic of the age of nationalism. Building on Hroch (1985), she distinguishes between the role of language planning in the early-modern *state nations* and late-modern *nation states* (Wright, 2004: 42–68).

In the state nations, the processes of cultural and linguistic integration take place within the precincts of an already established political entity. Examples of this could be France, Great Britain, Sweden, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, and the Netherlands. Status planning was, in fact, a misnomer in these contexts, while “this was mostly an organic process [starting in the early modern period] that began with the growth of the political and economic supremacy of a group within a particular territory. The language of exchange was inevitably the language of this dominant ruling group and the language of the capital” (Wright, 2004: 43). Through being adopted as the language of national bureaucracies, armies, and educational systems, it became the language of power, which was used by those in power and learnt by those eager to climb up the social ladder. The official language was consequently not the result of an official “planning diktat” (ibid., p. 44), but of a protracted political process. For several centuries this language of power was
the prerogative of the selected few and beyond reach for the great majority of the populations. This changed after the French Revolution and the arrival of the Modern Era which was marked both by an all-encompassing democratisation of culture and the advent of programmatic nationalism. “Democracy and nationalism”, in fact, “appear to be in dialectic relation because nationalism can help create the cohesive community of communication that democracy seems to need” (Wright, 2004: 31).

The processes of LPLP that occurred in Europe after about 1800 were predominantly guided by the ideology of nationalism. The ultimate objectives were the same: “linguistic convergence and minimal variation within the state [or cultural community] and maximal linguistic differentiation from neighbours” (Wright, 2007: 166). In the state nation-settings, which I have been discussing until now, they were organised from above – top-down – by central authorities, as a part of the general invention and standardisation of a national culture. A unified culture – which alongside the language it was written in – was communicated to the broad masses through systems of national education, where the children learnt the state’s intolerance of “optional variability in language [and culture]” (Milroy & Milroy, 2002: 6). Language was both the medium and the message. In the ‘nation states,’ which I will discuss in the following, on the other hand, the LPLP-processes were bottom-up and formed part of stateless ethnic groups’ (such as the Habsburg Serbs and the Bulgarians) claim to recognition as a separate cultural community, and, by extension, their pretensions to political statehood.

In ethnic nation state-settings, LPLP were conducted under the imperative of high nationalism. Intellectual elites were planning for external distinction (form languages on the same dialect continuum) and internal linguistic and cultural identity. Heinz Kloss uses the term “Ausbausprache” or “language by development” (Kloss, 1967: 27) to describe this process of selecting a variety on a dialect continuum and developing it into “a standardized tool of literary expression” (ibid.) – planning for difference, in other words. The acquisition planning-phase could not be put into action prior to the establishment of the state and its national education systems; consequently, it is beyond the scope of this study. Examples of nation state-settings, where the processes of cultural and linguistic consolidation of the nation were initiated prior to the establishment of the political state, are Croatia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Romania – and Bulgaria and Serbia. Status and corpus planning policies in these settings were much more explicit and a matter of proving a cultural community’s separateness and coherence (identity) as a prerequisite for laying claims to political independence.
2.2 Purism and national identities

Purism can within the framework of linguistic nation-building and linguistic nationalism be defined as the attitude, belief, or conviction that certain language forms or structures – on the level of lexis, syntax, phonology, morphology, orthography, or phraseology – can be more purely national than others, that these forms and structures reflect and define the national identity of a specific human community and therefore must be defended against foreign intrusions. Even if purism can concern all levels of language, it is most frequently applied to the level of lexis, and this is also the aspect which will primarily be highlighted in this thesis.

In an article on the role of purism in the development of the Slavic literary languages, Auty defines linguistic purism as “the attempts to remove from a given language elements that are foreign or deemed to be foreign and to replace them by elements of native, national character” (Auty, 1973: 335). This quote corroborates the links between linguistic nationalism, purism, and the formation of national identities. Central to all of them is an antithetical occupation with Us and Them, foreign and native. It is driven by an urge to achieve purity, homogeneity, and sameness, i.e., identity, by removing what is perceived as foreign and/or threatening to a particular linguistic variety and the congregation of people using it. Purging lexical items valorised as foreign also serves “the twin purpose of corpus planning” (Wright, 2004: 57): (a) differentiating a linguistic variety from its neighbours, and (b) reinforcing internal cohesion. Roger Gyllin similarly refers to the “internal determinants [for] the genesis and development of a particular literary language” (Gyllin, 1991: 22) He distinguishes “three symbolic sociolinguistic functions, or forces, i.e., the unifying, the separating and the prestige functions” (ibid.). Purism is an active ingredient in all these functions.

Moskov (1976: 11) argues that purist policy processes are inevitably shaped by the ideological predilections of those carrying them out. He (ibid.) defines five “objectives for purism”:

1. to construct a national language and conserve its national character;
2. to resist denationalising and assimilatory aspirations;
3. to diminish the consequences of longstanding influence from another language because of ties of kinship, education and culture;
4. to reduce loanwords from different languages entered into the language by virtue of international cultural, scientific, and technological contacts, [and];
5. out of nationalistic and chauvinistic incentives with the goal that the ‘pure-blooded’ and ‘united’ people should speak ‘the language of the ancestors.’

---

17 „1) за изграждане на националния език и за запазване на неговия национален характер; 2) за противопоставяне на денационализаторски и асимилаторски стремежи; 3) за намаляване последиците от продължително влияние от друг език поради родствени, просветни и културни връзки; 4) за ограничаване на заемките от различни езици, влезли по силата на международното културно, научно и техническо общуване;
Although the last is the most explicitly nationalistic (or “chauvinistic”), all five objectives can be seen as manifestations of linguistic nationalism.

Thomas (1991: 39) lists a number of “aesthetic rationales” for purism, i.e., ideological preferences for some language forms or structures over other forms or structures:

There is one aesthetic principle which dwarfs all others – nationalism. The national aesthetic is principally concerned with defining what are the characteristic features of the national culture. This is accomplished by stressing those elements which distinguish the national culture from other cultures and minimising or ignoring the common features (ibid.)

Thomas argues that an interest in the “genetic relationships [and] what constituted the inherited, native element in a given language […] is at the very heart of purism” (ibid., p. 5). According to him, the objective of linguistic purists is, thus, to define what belongs to the national cultural body (corpus) and purge it from everything that is perceived as foreign to it.

According to Thomas’ (1991: 76–81) “taxonomy of puristic orientations”, there are seven fundamental types of attitudes to linguistic purity.

1. **archaising purism** often manifests itself in “an attempt to resuscitate the linguistic material of a past golden age, an exaggerated respect for past literary models, an excessive conservatism towards innovations or the recognition of the importance of a literary tradition” (ibid., p. 76).

2. **ethnographic purism** is characterised by “the notion that the rural dialects are somehow purer than city speech or the standard [and] is commonly encountered as a form of linguistic nationalism” (ibid., p. 77).

3. **elitist purism** comprises “a negative, prescriptive attitude to substandard and regional use” (ibid., p. 78).

4. **reformist purism**, whereby “purism is an important constituent of the conscious efforts to reform, regenerate, renew or resuscitate a language.” (ibid., p. 79).

5. **playful purism**, an attitude to purity in language where the purist intervention is an end in itself. It is not driven by a concern about the native language, as such, but, rather, by a will to ridicule, provoke or amuse.

6. **xenophobic purism**, which can be regarded as the most archetypical and irrational of the purist attitudes. It can manifest itself in an overall negative attitude to all lexical elements perceived as foreign to the imagined national self (“general xenophobic purism”). More frequently, though, it is addressing some particular external sources of lexical enrichment, while remaining open to others (“targeted xenophobic purism”).

---

5) от националистични и шовинистични подбуди с цел „чистокръвният“ или „обединен“ народ да говори на „езика на предците“.

18 The concept of elitist purism is close to what Diana Ivanova formulates as “social purism” („социален пуризъм“) (Ivanova, 2014: 305), i.e. negative attitudes towards the lower strata of the domestic lexis (dialectisms, vulgarisms, and popular-colloquial neologisms etc.).

19 The concept of xenophobic purism is closely related to what Diana Ivanova classifies as “protective purism” („защитен пуризъм“) (Ivanova, 2014: 305), i.e. a type of purist reaction which emerges in the presence of threat to the national identity (and sovereignty) and is directed towards the protection of the national language against foreign influences.

20 This set of beliefs and attitudes, and the dispositions to act they provoke, often forms part of a more all-encompassing complex of negative attitudes to what is perceived as foreign, unde-
7. **anti-purism**, a sort of equivalent to atheism in the world of religious beliefs. Thomas (1991: 81) characterises it as a “puristic reaction to some manifestations of purism” and “it is often directed at xenophobic purism” (ibid.).

Furthermore, Thomas (1988: 99–101) divides the process of lexical purism into six separate but closely interrelated operational modes.

1. **identification** of words which are native enough to enter the corpus of the national standard language code. This mode is a natural prerequisite for all the following.

2. **censorship** through which individuals or standardising bodies (such as academies) refrain from using certain lexical items which they for some reason consider impure. This mode in the first place affects the written language which is more subject to interventions and control.

3. **eradication** through which undesired elements are cleansed from the corpus of the national standard language code. This mode concerns both well-established lexical items and words which are threatening to inundate it.

4. **prevention** which implies the efforts to safeguard the purity of the national lexical corpus by hindering word considered foreign and thereby impure from entering and contaminating it. This purist practice is typically performed by standardising bodies such as academies or other language-planning groups.

5. **replacement**, through which purists with often conflicting ideologies of linguistic purity suggest the replacement of lexical items considered non-native with words of domestic or otherwise desirable origin. Since there are no objective criteria for linguistic purity, this mode often arouses fierce conflicts between the ideological interests of different social groups.

6. **reception** or **acceptance** by the language community of the proposed purist interventions. This mode is decisive for the impact of organised purism – whether it will be accepted, opposed to, ridiculed, rejected or simply ignored by the language community at large.

Bugarski develops the theme of the link between nationalism, purism and identity formation by differentiating between “‘Ours’ and ‘foreign’ in language”21 (Bugarski, 2010: 43).

Separating what is presumed to be ours from what qualifies as foreign is a very old theme, in addition, traditionally laden with stereotypical simplifications and a strong emotional charge. It emerges as a fundamental manifestation form of ideological constructions on the US/THEM-axis, dissociated from everything that is something else and different. Additionally, this traditional wisdom rests on the proclaimed or at least tacit conviction that a clear-cut categorical difference exists between them, and that nothing foreign can be ours, while nothing ours can be foreign (ibid., p. 43).22

---

21 „Naše” i „strano” u jeziku.
22 „Razgraničenje onoga što se smatra našim i onoga što kvalifikuje kao strano veoma je stara tema, uz to tradicionalno opterećena stereotipnim uprošćenjima i jakim emocionalnim nabojem. Ona se javlja kao temeljna konstrukcija na relaciji MI-ONI, uz ogradijanje od svega drugog i drukčijeg. Pri tome konvencionalna mudrost počiva na proklamovanom ili bar prečutnom uverenju da između našeg i stranog prirodno postoji jasna kategorijalna razlika, te da ništa strano ne može de bude naše, dok nam ništa naše nije strano.“
Emotionally charged simplifications of what is presumed to be ours and what qualifies as foreign are of the essence when dealing with the world of purist interventions into naturally evolving linguistic practices. Lexical items, grammatical structures, or even individual graphemes or/and phonemes are instrumentalised in order to construct and maintain an illusory unified national self and to separate it from what is perceived or represented as foreign or threatening (but which, according to the logics of the paradoxical ‘narcissism of small differences’, is mostly closely related and infinitely alike).

Kordić similarly asserts that “purism emerges as a consequence of a nationalistic conceptualisation of language [and] is the linguistic equivalent of xenophobia and an exaggerated social need for differentiation” (Kordić, 2010: 10). Purist ideologues (in whatever clothing they may appear) are thus exploiting language to construct, maintain, and protect the social category of ethnicity or race. It is, as Kordić (ibid.) emphasises, particularly rampant in periods of wars and socio-political crises (as the collective or national equivalent to crisis on the personal level), such as the fascist regimes of mid-twentieth century Europe (Germany, Italy, and Croatia) or the Yugoslav Wars of 1991–2001. But it is also a characteristic feature of the nineteenth-century processes of discursive construction of the modern and linguistically defined nations studied in this thesis. Thus, Kordić conceptualises purism in a negative key, finding that “linguistic purism is an instrument which serves the racist and nationalist ideology” (ibid.).

A different perspective on purism and purist discourses is offered by Nils Langer & Agnete Nesse (2012: 610–11) who describe four types of often overlapping discourses on linguistic purity:

1. **Structural discourse** assumes that for each language there is a state of purity at which the linguistic system is perfectly balanced. The use of foreign words and constructions represents an interference that damages the system and can lead to a breakdown of the language; adherents of this view suggest replacing foreign with autochthonous elements, using archaic or dialectal forms or creating neologisms based on indigenous morphology.

2. **Ideological discourse** emphasizes the superior quality of one’s language based on its genealogical purity and great age, and foreign elements in the language are thus seen as a corruption of cultural purity.

3. **Pedagogical discourse** argues that the use of foreign words leads to social division within a society, since the less-educated and the elderly might not understand new borrowings introduced into specific domains such as youth language or technical registers.

4. **Metalinguistic discourse** more openly acknowledges that purism has to do with taste and aesthetics, rather than a general ability to communicate. The use of foreign words is scorned as chasing fashionable trends and giving the impression of

---

23 „purizam se javlja kao posljedica nacionalističkog shvaćanja jezika“
24 „je jezični purizam orude koje služi rasističkoj i nacionalističkoj ideologiji“
being intellectual and modern, so is seen as superficial and pretentious behavior which should be rejected.

Of these four purist discourses or modes of discussing linguistic purity, the second *ideological* and partly first *structural* seem to be in quite close correspondence to Kordić’s definition of purism as ideology, discourse, and practice. In fact, both are nationalist, while they serve the purpose of constructing differences between US as a nation and THEM or between foreign and domestic in standard language codes. Yet, they are characterised by some significant differences. The structural discourse is *primarily* language-internal and emphasises the original purity of a particular standard language code. At the same time, it defensively represents foreign words as an external threat to this imaginary state of pristine purity. All four discourses are ideological, though, as they are based on attitudes, beliefs, and ideas about the role of language in the social world. This also includes the *pedagogical* discourse which advocates purist interventions into language based on a democratic and inclusive linguistic ideology.

Starčević, Kapović & Sarić (2019) focus on purism in a nationalist context. They critically claim that “purism is a manifestation of the ideology of monoglossia”\(^{25}\), i.e., the aspiration that different codes must not be mixed on any linguistic level”\(^{26}\) (Starčević, Kapović & Sarić, 2019: 320). They also describe its rather extreme subspecies “the ideology of mono-origin” (ibid.), i.e., the attitude or belief that “even adapted loanwords should be entirely substituted with words of domestic origin” (ibid.).\(^{27}\)

The ideology of monoglossia and the ideology of mono-origin are closely related to what Jan Blommaert & Jef Verschueren call “the dogma of homogeneism” (Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998: 195). This dogma is characterised by an ideological denial of and resistance to the heterogeneity and variability characterising most of the linguistic practices surrounding and involving us. The defenders of the dogma of homogeneism aim at homogenising societies around sets of communal cultural myths. They also come close to what Langer & Nesse (2012: 610–11) define as “structural” and “ideological” discourses. Following Thomas (1991), the ultimate objective of all purist discourses and interventions is “purity [as opposed to impurity or mixture], the condition of being ‘pure’, [which] is an appraisive term of positive valence, which refers to a set of core meanings, including ‘homogeneity’,

\(^{25}\) The term ‘monoglossia’ originally stems from Bakhtin (1981: 431) and is opposed to what the same author calls ‘heteroglossia’ and ‘polyglossia’.

\(^{26}\) “Purizam je odraz ideologije monoglosije, težnje da se razni kodovi ne miješaju , na bilo kojoj jezičnoj razini”.

\(^{27}\) „ideologijom monooriginije [...] da se i prilagođene posuđenice potpuno zamijene riječima s domaćim podrijetlom“. 
‘wholeness’, and ‘oneness’” (ibid., 1991: 31) (‘oneness’ or ‘sameness’ is the etymological meaning of the word ‘identity’).

Focusing on lexical language planning in the contemporary Serbian context, Danko Šipka similarly argues that “the processes of ethnification and nationalisation have a key role in different normative interventions in our country and in other Slavic environments” (2022: 38). This is not least relevant to various puristically motivated interventions. Through purist discourses and individual “macro manoeuvres” (ibid.), such as the publication of prescriptive language manuals, grammars, and textbooks etc., the linguistic elites try to establish social narratives which aim at preserving their authoritative position and securing national unity, i.e., identity (both across space and time).

Two overarching tendencies within the study of linguistic purism in the field of sociolinguistics could roughly be defined as (1) more neutral studies and (2) anti-purist studies. Those embracing the first, more neutral stance describe purism as a constituent part of all language-planning and language-standardisation processes. Following them, it is an essential strategy for the protection of, for instance, endangered minority languages and the rights and identities of the typically subordinate groups using them. The adherents of the second, more critical stance see purism as something predominantly negative. They conceptualise it as a superfluous and politically motivated intrusion into naturally evolving linguistic practices and because of a nationalist perception of language. Language becomes “a tool which serves chauvinistic and xenophobic ideologies” and they envision purism as a fundamentally “unscientific approach to language” (Ilić, 2012: 305). Thomas (1988) refers to xenophobia as the most pivotal “aesthetic foundation” for purist intervention into ‘naturally’ evolving languages. He asserts that “[t]he fear of foreign influence or dominance is without doubt the strongest motive for purism” (ibid., 101). This notwithstanding, the two positions might not be as mutually exclusive as they may at first glance seem – it is rather a question of when, where, why, and by whom purist policies are applied. In both cases, however, the incentives for the purist interventions are ultimately rather political then purely linguistic. The nineteenth-century Balkan Romanticist intellectuals exploited the immense potency of language as a means of defining the cultural specificity of their subordinate communities in the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires, and this in turn served them as an argument to lay claims on a political nation of their own.

---

28 процеси етницизације и ународњавања имају кључну улогу у различитим нормативним захватима код нас и у другим словенским срединама."
29 “како последица националистичког шватања језика, оруђе које служи шовинистичким и ксенофобићним идеологијама, те као антинавућни приступ језику”.
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As all components in language policies, personal as well as institutionalised, purism is ultimately a matter of goal-oriented choices and preferences of those implementing them. The purist policies of standardising languages are always selective. Purists are almost never targeting all sources of lexical enrichment, but just those national, regional, temporal, or social varieties which, at a given point in the life of a community, are perceived as harmful or associated with the negatively defining Other(s). At the same time, they can gladly embrace sources which are associated with the positively defining Other(s). Thomas refers to this as “targeted xenophobia” (Thomas, 1988: 102) and puts it in contrast to “general xenophobia” (ibid.).

When does then purism occur, and what is its role in the construction of national identities? Purism can occur at any time in the history of a language community (and in the language policies of both individuals and institutions), but it appears to be particularly prolific in two interrelated situations. The first typical situation is that of (1) language contacts and the second (2) in processes of linguistic nation-building, i.e., in standardising an ‘ethnic’ linguistic variety which is supposed to perform and symbolise the identity of the nation (Nikolova, 2015: 13).

Thus, purism seems to be particularly prominent in times of crisis and rampant nationalism when the borders and contents of the imagined cultural community must be defined and defended. Linguistic cleansing is sometimes even “regarded as an epiphenomenon of nationalism” (Thomas, 1991: 43). Furthermore, the Russian linguist G.P. Neščimenko writes that “the problem of purism gains a particular sharpness and significance in extreme periods in the life of an ethnos which is applicable to both the period of the National Revival, and to the present era of globalisation” (Neščimenko, 2005: 4).

Accordingly, purist attitudes, ideologies, and policies appear to be provoked by the same complex interplay of historical, cultural, and socio-political contingencies which also bring identity to the fore of interests and policies. This is also corroborated by Jernudd (1989), who states that

purism occurs at particular historical times to defend, demarcate, and protect that which constitutes Self. Such times could be periods of rapid social change, of perceived external pressure on the community, of national authentication and consolidation, of class and ethnic conflict over resource distribution, or of “war cry.” Purism may be more or less explicit and it would take different forms under different conditions of historical time, and social and economic circumstance (ibid., p. 3).

Purist ideologies and policies must, consequently, always be understood in the light of the lifeworld or habitus of the person, group, or institution engaged in purifying the national language. It is a complex process and conse-

---

30 „особую остроту и значимость проблема пуризма приобретает в экстремальные периоды жизни этноса, к числу которых относится и эпоха национального Возрождения, и нынешняя эпоха глобализации.”
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quence of interacting cultural contingencies and social concatenations. Be-
liefs and attitudes about language, i.e., linguistic ideologies, virtually always
arise in close interaction with the political and economic interests of the pur-
ists. They can also, and simultaneously, be a pragmatical response to the
empirically attestable linguistic reality surrounding the language planners as
will be discussed in chaps. 4 and 6. Consequently, interventions into lan-
guage (or any other social practice) and the often emotionally charged dis-
putes they provoke, are utterly seldom about language alone, but, in virtually
all cases, about clashes between colliding social, cultural, and political inter-
est and the conflicting conceptualisations of group identity they give rise to.
3. Historical background

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the historical background in the nineteenth century Balkans and their consequences for the language situation of the Orthodox Slavs. I will focus on the era of Romantic Nationalism” (1804–78) and show how it was forming and framing the discourses of purism and linguistic nation-building studied in this thesis. Among other things, it elucidates how the complex structural changes that the area underwent in this period spurred and contributed to new patterns of national cultural identity.

In the Orthodox Balkans, where the majority of the populations were subjects of the Ottoman Empire, these changes started in the late eighteenth century and regathered more significant momentum around the year 1800. The sacred Church Slavonic language was gradually substituted with the national languages and the old ethno-religious communities successively gave way to new ethno-linguistic ones. The modern nation-states of the Orthodox Balkans were, to a great extent, born out of and shaped by an idea – the romanticist belief in the natural existence of culturally defined nations. For the intellectuals and societal elites of the multiethnic Ottoman and Habsburg Empires, the standardisation and purification of a national vernacular culture and language became a vital way of constructing or articulating their ethno-national specificity. The linguistically and culturally defined nations, which were the outcomes of these nationalist discourses, were later transformed into strong claims to political independence.

Modern democracy and nationalism are, in many respects, ideologically connected – in Western Europe as well as in the Balkans. They were born out of the same circumstances and at roughly the same time – in the encounters and conflicts between Enlightenment France and the Romanticist Germany, around the year 1800 (cf. Kedourie, 1993: 1–11). It is important to emphasise that the changes they brought in their wake in these early phases directly concerned only the upper, educated and ideologised strata of the Balkan societies. The broad, illiterate, rural masses, which constituted most of the Balkan populations, were never invited into the making of the nations. Instead, they were romanticised, essentialised, and objectified as the carriers of the inaccessible ‘Soul of the Peoples’ which were constructed in the subjective interests of small intellectual, economic, and cultural elites.
The whole period, from the late eighteenth century until 1878, was marked by almost constant warfare between the Ottoman Empire and the expanding Habsburg, Russian, and French Empires. Those wars wreaked havoc into the day-to-day life conditions of the broad, peasant masses and caused significant demographic changes, when huge populations fled their homes with the retreating foreign armies. This, in turn, led to the establishment of new contact areas of economic and cultural exchange. Colonies were founded in the commercial ports along the north Black Sea and Mediterranean coasts and in the trading towns of Central and Eastern Europe (Crampton, 2003: 55). Here the more privileged members of the Serbian and Bulgarian societies were exposed to new patterns of often politically motivated cultural identifications. These trading colonies were often turned into spearheads of the wielding of power and influence by the empires.

These merchants and intellectuals were to become the driving force in the nineteenth-century Serbian and Bulgarian national revivals. They financed both the printing of books and periodicals and the development of national educational systems which prompted the need for a standardised national language, and to control the discourse through which both the standard language codes and the national identities were constructed. These merchant colonies functioned as hubs in extensive networks through which beliefs about the role and meaning of the national self could be disseminated and debated. The Greek term for this class “of educated people who were simultaneously practising combinations of teaching, writing, and commerce” (Davidova, 2012a: 32) was ‘εμπορολογιωτατος’ (‘trader-cum-scholar’). The Balkan traders-cum-scholars were also the main contributors to and consumer of this new system of publicly shared beliefs. It was their habitus, i.e., their tastes, cultural preferences, and interests, that formed the ideological backbone of these nascent bourgeois public spheres.

3.1.1 The Serbian context

The Ottomans had been on the retreat ever since the catastrophic Great Turkish War (1683–99), when they had lost all their possessions in Central Europe to the Austrians. A significant consequence of this war was the so called “Great Migration of the Serbs”31 (Velika Seoba Srba) of 1690. In connection to this event, perhaps as many as 30,000–40,000 Serbs, together with their patriarch Arsenije III Čarnojević, were forced to flee their homes in Kosovo and Southern Serbia. They found refuge in the newly established

31 This is one of the most iconic and mythologised episodes in the Serbian popular imagination. It has been depicted by the artist Paja Jovanović (1859–1957) in his large-scale painting “Migration of the Serbs” (Seoba Srba, 1896) and inspired the novel “Migrations” (Seobe, 1929) by the Serbian writer Miloš Crnjanski (1893–1977).
Habsburg Military Frontier on the other side of the rivers Sava and Danube, where they gained far-reaching privileges against serving as defenders of the Austrian border. These privileges guaranteed them a position which reminded them of the status they, according to the *millet*-system, had enjoyed in the Ottoman Empire. They comprised the right of the Serbian Orthodox Church to organise the internal affairs of their followers and set up their own educational system. The Serbs of Vojvodina began to develop this school system from the 1720s onwards with the significant assistance of teachers and teaching materials (printed books) imported from the Petrine Russian Empire. This liaison had an enormous impact on the development of the civil cultural concept (Jovanović, 2002: 78–9) among the Habsburg Serbs and their political, cultural, and linguistic orientation towards Russia (Ivić, 1986: 79–83).

Among the Serbs of Vojvodina, print capitalism emerged towards the end of the 1760s. The printed media commodities, the market, and the reading audience it generated gave completely new prerequisite for the discursive construction of shared imaginations of the nation. The first Serbian magazine was *Slavonic-Serbian Magazine* (*Славено-Сербскiй магазинъ*) and it was published by Zaharije Orfelin (1726–85) in Venice in 1768. This magazine was modelled on the Russian *Monthly Writings* (*Ежемесячные сочинения*, St. Petersburg, 1755–64) and published a wide range of popular-scientific contents. Its language was an early form of Slavonic-Serbian with strong elements of Church Slavonic and Russian. The magazine reflected the Slavic and Serbian patriotism of that time’s enlightened educated elite among the Habsburg Serbs (Pavić, 1986: 196–212). It constructed a hyphenated sense of belonging both to the Serbian and wider Slavic community.

The processes of cultural and political consolidation were, at least partly, running parallel in the Principality of Serbia (1815–82). This entailed having an institutional framework (a political administration, a school system, academies, printing facilities,32 books,33 newspapers and magazines etc.) which facilitated and accelerated the course of these processes. The role of the negative other was initially performed by the Habsburg Serbs, who dominated the cultural and political life in the Principality until at least the 1840s. It was in relation to them that the national identity was constructed in purist discourse. They were often pejoratively called ‘Swabians’ and thereby identified with the foreignness of the German culture characterising their life in the province of Vojvodina in the Habsburg Empire.

---

32 The first modern printing house in the Principality of Serbia was the *Knjaževskо-srbska tipografija*, brought to Belgrade in May 1831 (Arnautović, 1912: 28).

At the onset of the nineteenth century, the day-to-day living conditions of the Serbian *rayah*[^34] in the Sanjak of Smederovo (or Pashaluk of Belgrade) in the north-western corner of the Ottoman Empire did not differ much from those prevailing in the rest of the Ottoman Balkans. However, Serbia was far away from the reach and control of the Sultan and his armies and people locally could eke out their traditional way of living without too many intrusions from state officials. This form of life would not change much during the following century. The illiterate peasants “worked lands or tended livestock under village communal elder supervision, and collective social activities centred on local Orthodox churches and monasteries” (Hupchick, 2002: 215). Yet, the Sanjak was a border-zone between the Austrian and Ottoman Empires which throughout the eighteenth century had been the scene of almost perennial wars resulting in huge and decisive demographic changes. Serbian peasants and their ecclesiastical leaders were fleeing to the other side of the rivers Sava and Donau in the wake of the retreating Austrian armies – joining the already substantial Serbian colonies in the southern Habsburg lands.

The Pashaluk of Belgrade came under direct Austrian control from 1718–39 and from 1788–91[^35], during which the villages enjoyed a high degree of autonomy, persons and goods circulated freely across the border, and they did their military service in the Austrian army (Pavlowitch, 2002: 26). This far-reaching local self-government under the village-elders (*kmetovi*) and districts chiefs (*ober-knezovi*) was nullified by the Sultan. Fearing a Christian uprising, Sultan Selim III executed and imprisoned several Serbian leaders, levied the taxes, abolished the militias, and reinstalled the janissaries’ power over Belgrade. All these events led to the outbreak of the First Serbian Uprising (1804–13) in 1804.

The total population of the semi-urban townships of the entire principality amounted to barely 50,000 in 1830 and consisted of different ethnic groups (Pavlowitch, 2002: 74).[^36] The upper classes of these urban centres now started to enter modernity and initiated two interacting processes of modernisation: a political consolidation within the framework of the Principality of Serbia (1817–82) and a cultural (and linguistic) unification through the centripetal forces of a growing system of national education, the development of print capitalism, and the emergence of a bourgeois public sphere.

[^34]: The *rayah* was the tax-paying lower classes of the Ottoman Empire, amounting to on average 90% of the total population in all religiously defined ethnicities — *millets*.

[^35]: This period is called ‘Koča’s Frontier’ (*Kočina krajina*) in Serbian historiography after the commander of the Serbian free corps, Koča Andelković (1755–88), who, under Austrian supervision, took control over the Serbian lands (cf. Gavrilović, 1986: 364–71). One of the most notorious militia leaders in Koča’s Frontier was Đorđe Petrović – Karadorde.

[^36]: The total population of the semi-urban townships of the entire Principality amounted to barely 50,000 in 1830 and consisted of “a mixed world of Serbs, Turks, Jews, Greeks, Vlachs and Gypsies who was gradually becoming ‘naturalized’” (Pavlowitch, 2002: 74).
The First Serbian Uprising, led by Karađorđe Petrović, and the Second Serbian Uprising (1815–17), headed by Miloš Obrenović, affected the emergence of the tense relationship between two social positions and their respective cultural ideologies: the urban and highly educated Habsburg Serbs, on the one hand, and the rural and illiterate Ottoman Serbs, symbolically represented by Vuk St. Karadžić, on the other. This clash developed into one of the most formative forces in the articulation of the national identity throughout the nineteenth century.

Initially, the uprisings were not driven by ideological motives. They started as a social protest movement with the goal to reinstall the Sultan’s control over the province and put an end to the zulum, i.e., the terrorising, violent, and lawless regime of the janissaries. Ideologisation came later and from the culturally more advanced Serbs of Austria and Hungary (Stoianovich, 1959: 243). These privileged members of the Serbian community were providing Karađorđe’s rebels with both arms, people, and other supplies, and turned the spontaneous uprising into a revolutionary struggle for national independence (1807–12). It was this ideological class of highly educated Austrian Serbs that formed the social basis for the development of a bourgeois public sphere and print capitalism. These changes gathered stronger momentum, when Miloš Obrenović won the Sultan’s recognition as a practically autonomous Ottoman Serbian province (1816) (Hupchick, 2002: 215). Another important factor was the returning commanders of the abortive First Serbian Uprising, including Karađorđe. Many of them had fled to Russian Bessarabia in 1813 and were now influenced by Russian society and culture (Stoianovich, 1959: 244). It was in the tension between the foreign (German, Russian, Hungarian, Croatian, French, and Italian etc.) and domestic that the identity of modern Serbia and the Serbian language was discursively constructed.

In the absence of a domestic educated class, Prince Miloš Obrenović (ruling 1815–38 and 1858–60) called upon the Habsburg Serbs to serve as governmental officials. Serbia under the aegis of Miloš Obrenović was characterised by two seemingly contradictory features. On the one hand, it was marked by an efficient restructuring of the country’s internal economic life and expansion of its foreign trade. On the other hand, it bore the features of a Pasha-like authoritarianism, as Miloš Obrenović limited the power and influence of the governmental officials and circumscribed the traditional freedom and autonomy of the villages and their knezovi.

This policy led to several peasant revolts and an organised opposition to Obrenović’s autocracy by the ‘Defenders of the Constitution’ (Ustavobranitelji) after the Hat-i Sherif of 1830 and the subsequent declaration of Serbia as autonomous hereditary principality under the Obrenović-dynasty.

37 Such as Đak’s Revolt (Đakova buna) of 1824 and Mileta’s Revolt (Miletina buna) of 1835.
This political opposition did not comprise just Serbian military and village leaders but soon became an integral part of the ‘Eastern Question’, and the Great Powers’ ambitions to position themselves for the approaching demise of the Ottoman Empire.

Russia and the Ottoman Empire supported the liberal constitutionalists and Britain and France stood behind the prince to prevent the advance of Russian interests in the Balkans (Pavlowitch, 2002: 36). A new constitution was produced in Istanbul in the second half of 1838. The autonomy of Serbia was less far-reaching than according to that of the Hat-i Sherif of 1830, Russia entrenched its role as the sole protector of the Balkan Orthodox Slavs and the opposition reached their goals of a constitutionally guaranteed separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial powers. The opposition soon forced Miloš Obrenović to abdicate and flee the country and, after a brief sojourn on the throne by Miloš’s son Mihailo (reigning 1839–42 and 1860–8), they appointed Karadorde’s son Aleksandar Karadorđević (1806–85).

During Aleksandar Karadorđević’s time on the throne, Serbia engaged in the ambitious enterprise to become a Western-European state (Hupchick, 2002: 217). This included making (linguistically defined) ethno-nationalism one of the ideological core-doctrines of the national policy of the Defenders of the Constitution (Gavrilović, 1981: 269). This policy was not least embodied in the Načertanije written in 1844 by the influential conservative politician Ilija Garašanin (1812–74), who was to serve as prime and interior minister of various Serbian governments in the period 1840–60. This secret draft was inspired by Ljudevit Gaj’s ‘Illyrian Movement’ (Ilirski pokret). Yet, in contrast to both Gaj’s project, Garašanin’s objective was not South-Slavic but purely Serbian (Gavrilović, 1981: 271). Regardless of religious dividing lines, it defines all speakers of any variety of Štokavian as Serbian and aimed at incorporating them into one political state.

This political re-orientation towards Romanticist ethno-nationalism had its obvious repercussions in the field of culture and language. An almost verbatim equivalent of Garašanin’s Načertanije could be found in Vuk St. Karadžić’s folkloristic study ‘Serbs all and Everywhere’ („Срби сви и свуда“) written in 1836 but not published until 1849 (in Vienna). In this article, Karadžić claims that the Serbs “of the Greek […], Roman […], and

---

38 This constitution was as a matter fact the second Serbian constitution after the radical ‘Sretenje Constitution’ (Уставь Княжества Сербїе) written (in Slavonic-Serbian) by the physician and journalist Dimitrije Davidović (1789–1838) and published in Kragujevac in 1835 as a direct result of the Mileta’s revolt the same year.

39 Different varieties of the overarching “Štokavian” are the predominant dialects of the Central South Slavic speech territory. They are named after the interrogative/relative pronoun “što” (‘What’) and cover all areas except a zone inside and around Zagreb (which in turn is “Kajkavian”) and the Istrian peninsula, many of the islands of the Dalmatian archipelago (such as Korčula, Pelješac, Brač, Hvar, Vis and Šolta) and a narrow strip around the cities of Zadar and Split in today’s Croatia (which in turn are “Čakavian”) (Greenberg, 2004: 33).
Turkish creed” (Ivić, 1981: 362) are only superficially divided by religion. What really unites them and makes up for their identity is language; in conclusion, all speakers of Štokavian, by default, belong to the Serbian cultural family.

The Romanticist ethno-linguistic worldview became ever wider embraced by the members of the growing ideological class in the second half of the nineteenth century and manifested itself in both the public discourse on purism, language, and national identity, and in the foreign and cultural policy of the young principality. The gradual fading away of the “civil cultural concept” (Jovanović, 2002: 78–9) and the literary language used by its promoters was partly due to a shift of generations and a growing number of highly educated persons originating from Ottoman Serbia. It was also accompanied by the gradual transition of the centre of the Serbian cultural and political life from the Habsburg lands to the Principality of Serbia (Ivić, 2001c: 301). Likewise, it was influenced by the dramatic events preceding and following the revolutionary ‘Springtime of Nations’ around the middle of the nineteenth century. Novi Sad in Vojvodina was the most significant centre for the production of a national ideology until the 1870s when the Serbian spiritual hegemony is eventually transferred to Belgrade. Apart from being the residence of Matica srpska (from 1864 on) and an important centre of theatre, education, and literature, a great number of influential periodicals were printed in Novi Sad (ibid.). Among the most important were The Serbian Journal („Србски дневник“), The Southern Bee („Южна пчела“), Vojvodina Woman („Войводанка“), The Week („Седмица“), The Morning Star („Даница“), The Maple („Јавор“) and The Banner („Застава“) (Maticki, 2016).

Education was another institutional framework that expanded from the 1830s onwards. To bridge the gap between his ambitious Westernising vision and the desolate oriental reality surrounding him, Prince Aleksandar Karadordević financed studies for over 200 young men from the principality to be educated in French, Austrian, Russian, German, and Italian universities. The cultural preferences (ideologies) and practices of these men and of those passing through the gradually developing domestic system of higher education, left deep imprints on the evolving standard language. A classical gymnasium had been opened in Kragujevac and Belgrade in 1830 and in 1838 the capital obtained the Lyceum (later renamed Velika škola) that eventually expanded into today’s University of Belgrade. A secondary normal

40 „закона Грчкога […], Римскога […], и Турскога“.
41 Snježana Kordić claims that Karadžić’s identification of all speakers of Štokavian with Serbs in 1836 was not bad-intended but more a result of an “astonishing lack of information” (Kordić, 2010: 212). He would later reject this identification “because that time’s Croats disagreed with it” and “define the Serbian nation by Orthodoxy and the Croatian by Catholicism” (ibid.).
school for girls was eventually opened in 1864 and by 1865 Serbia had six Gymnasia, with a total of 46 teachers and 1,476 students (Stoianovich, 1959: 249).

The system of elementary education also grew exponentially in this period. After 1830, the number of elementary schools multiplied rapidly and “by 1870 there were [as many as] 441 schools with 550 teachers and over 23,000 pupils”. Out of a total population of roughly 2,000,000 in 1884 about 200,000 could, to a greater or lesser extent, read and write, most of them living in the greater cities (Stoianovich, 1959: 249–50). An important role for the creation of a national consciousness was also played by the čitališta (‘reading rooms’). The first was opened in Belgrade in 1846 and had its own short-lived organ in the Belgrade Reading Room News („Новине читалишта београдскогъ“) (1847–8). All these institutions of higher education strongly contributed to the standardisation of the national culture and language and to the socialisation of its students into the standard language culture and ideology forming it (Milroy, 2007).

The ‘Society of Serbian Letters’ („Дружтво србске словесности“) was another institution within the Serbian bourgeois public sphere through which the articulate members of the Serbian society could practice, construct and communicate concepts of the national self. It was founded in 1841 by the playwright and Minister of Education (1842–8) Jovan Sterija Popović, and the professor and first rector of the Lyceum Atanasije Nikolić (1803–82) – both Habsburg Serbs. This forerunner of the current Serbian Academy of Science and Arts (SANU) and its journal The Herald of the Society of Serbian Letters („Гласникъ Дружтва србске словесности“) (1847–91) became one of the last strongholds of the Slavonic-Serbian literary language and “civil cultural concept” (Jovanović, 2002: 78–9) it represented. The debates on the literary language had been fierce in the years following 1830.

Prince Miloš Obrenović had been siding with Habsburg Serbian men of letters against any attempts to reform the language in official usage. The overall tendency, though, was towards a gradual vernacularisation of the whole literary field; the discords concerned, mainly, orthography and the role assigned to the Church Slavonic (and Russian) lexical and morphophonological heritage – and the cultural continuity it represented (Ivić, 2001c: 301).

In many traditional Serbian narratives (cf. Ivić 2001), 1847 is often represented as the year of the ‘victory’ of the Vukovian literary language, i.e. the vernacular-based linguistic concept of Vuk St. Karadžić. This year saw the publication of three works which are seen as instrumental for the entrench-
ment of this concept of language: Karadžić’s translation of the New Testament, Đuro Daničić’s (1825–82) *The War on the Serbian Language and Orthography* (“Rat za srpski jezik i pravopis”), and Petar II Petrović-Njegoš’s (1815–51) epical poem ‘The Mountain Wreath’ (“Gorski vijenac”). An important role for the affirmation of the *dignitas* and *norma* of this linguistic concept was also played by Branko Radičević (1824–53) and other Romanticist writers and poets such as Đura Jakšić (1832–78), Jovan Jovanović Zmaj (1833–1904), and Laza Kostić (1841–1910) (cf. Ivić, 1981: 366). The first newspaper to be printed in the Vukovian orthography was the nationalist *Progress* („Напредакъ”) published in Sremski Karlovci (and later Zemun) by Danilo Medaković (1819–81) in 1848 (cf. Gluvačević, 2010: 233).

Many of these poets were associated with the liberal-nationalist movement that was sweeping through Europe and Serbia at that time and leading to the revolutions of the ‘Springtime of Nations’ in 1848–9 during which the educated youth of the stateless ethnic groups of Europe demanded the right of all culturally defined nations to find their ultimate expression in a political state. On 15 June, St. Vitus Day (*Vidovdan*) 1847, an Association of the Serbian Youth (*Družina Mladeži Srbske*) had been founded by at the Lyceum (Skerlić, 1906: 17). Most of them, such as the future minister of the interior Jevrem Grujić (1827–95), belonged to the first-generation of Serbs born in Serbia and graduating from major European universities: in Vienna, Berlin, Paris, Liege, Halle, Leipzig, and Prague (ibid.). Many of these intellectuals enthusiastically greeted the liberal revolution. The Habsburg border Serbs of Vojvodina and more than 5,000 volunteers from the Principality (Stoianovich, 1959: 253) joined the Croats and fought against the radical Hungarian revolutionaries under the command of the Croatian Ban Jelačić. These experiences prompted many leading border Serbs to embrace Croat-inspired confederative ideas. This cultural identification also led to the influx of many Croatian lexical items into the written practice of the many Serbs in Austria. Like their Croatian contemporaries, they demanded the right to use their own language and in May 1848 they convened an assembly (*Majska skupština*) seeking the recognition of Vojvodina (Jelavich, 1997: 316). The demands also contained the prevision of a future association with the Croatian state.

These efforts gained renewed momentum during the second regency of Prince Mihailo Obrenović (1860–8). He was stubbornly determined to turn Serbia into a protector for all the regional unification movements, organise a pan-Balkan rising against the Turkish Overlord and create a large South-Slavic state under Serbian leadership (Pavlowitch, 2002: 50). While the Serbian territorial goals remained the same as in Garašanin’s *Načertanije*, the Prince entertained close contacts with other Balkan leaders, including the dominating force of the Yugoslav movement, Bishop Juraj Josef Strossmayer (1815–1905). Mihailo Obrenović’s second mandate was also a
time of strong ideological movements. The liberals and conservatives were now supplemented by the liberal, Slavophile and ever more Serbophile movement organised in the ‘United Serbian Youth’ (“Ujedinjena Omladina Srpska”) which was founded in Novi Sad in 1866.

The Omladina (1866–72) was above all a movement of the Romanticist young with the aim to spread Serbian literature (Skerlić, 1955a), dreaming about the restoration of Tsar Dušan’s medieval empire and envisioning a future community centred around the rural extended family, the zadruga. The opposite, or negative Other, against which this identity was silhouetted, was the “rotten West”43 (Skerlić, 1955a). Their heterogeneous imaginations of the national self were constructed in the magazine Young Serbian People („Млада Србадија“) (1870–2) and in literary works, such as those by the Romanticist poets Jakšić, Zmaj, and Kostić (Deretić, 2007: 709–62).

These Romanticists contributed to the entrenchment of the linguistic and cultural concept of Vuk St. Karadžić in the second half of the nineteenth century (Ivić 1981: 354). Karadžić’s “New-Štokavian folkloric koine”44 (Brozović, 1970: 113) was soon wholeheartedly embraced by virtually all the intellectuals of the younger generation. From 1864 on, practically all articles in Letopis Matice srpske (The Chronicle of the Serbian Cultural Society) were published in Karadić’s phonemic orthography, and in 1865 it was given official status at the Velika škola. Finally, in 1868 the remaining restrictions on the use of Karadić’s Cyrillic script and orthography were removed in the principality.

The decade between the assassination of Prince Mihailo Obrenović in 1868 and the end of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–8 witnessed a clash between established and new politico-ideological movements. The old conservative Constitutionalists and liberal still dominated the political scene. Now they were supplemented by an emerging generation of radical propagandists of Pan-Slavic solidarity and narrower Serbian nationalism, and the utopian agrarian socialists and revolutionary underground clubs of the Omladina-movement (abolished in 1872). The “radical realism” (Stoianovich, 1959: 360) and utopian agrarian socialism found its expression in the writings of the young Svetozar Marković (1846–75) (Calic, 2019a: 330–1). Each of these political movements by now possessed their own organs in a diversified public sphere through which they could construct and communicate their vision of the national self to a growing national reading audience in the rather stabilised national language. Marković’s utopian socialist ideas were expressed in the newspapers The Worker (“Radenik”) and The Public Sphere (“Javnost”), while the liberal-nationalist fraction canalised their imaginations

43 „трули Запад“
44 „новоштокavska folklorna koine“.
through the newspaper *Unity* ("Jedinstvo") with the conservatives favouring *St. Vitus Day* ("Vidovdan").

When the ‘Eastern Crisis’ started with the Uprising in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1875, Serbian nationalists had paved the way through ideological discourse in the ever more diversified public sphere and the founding of several academies through which they could disseminate their ‘identity politics’ in Bosnia. In this narrative, virtually all Muslims (regardless of ethno-linguistic affiliation) were lumped together in the essentialising ethnonym “Turks” and went through a process of anonymisation and dehumanisation to justify the murdering of them in what was represented as an imminent, just, and righteous war. In geopolitical and ideological terms, the result of the ensuing Russo-Turkish War of 1877-8 was a strong Russian sphere of influence in the Eastern Balkans and a strong Austrian presence in the Western Balkans; for example, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Sanjak of Novi Pazar (between Serbia and Montenegro) were administered by Austria-Hungary.

These social and geopolitical processes were directly linked to the development and course of the Serbian discourse on language, purism, and national identity. The monograph *Language and Social History* (‘Jezik i društvena istorija’, 2002) by Milorad Jovanović analyses some of the stereotypes, myths, and mythologems which have been used to justify the ‘natural’ or ‘predestined’ victory of the “populist concept of the Serbian culture” (ibid., p. 78), language, and national identity of Vuk St. Karadžić. A logical consequence of this ideologically biased dichotomic narrative is the representation of the equally ‘predestined’ defeat of the linguistic traditions and “civil cultural practice” (ibid.) of the Serbian ecclesiastical and bourgeois intellectual elite of Habsburg Vojvodina.

The discourse on the Serbian (and later, Serbo-Croatian) language and national identity is conceptualised as a ‘war’ („rat“) in which Vuk St. Karadžić is heroised as “the winged Wolf – the spiritual organiser of the awakened Serbianhood”45 (Jovanović, 2002: 132) and the Vojvodina intellectual elite is demonised as “[t]he dragons of the civil thought” (ibid., p. 115) and “[c]omplete idiots, madmen, pseudo-writers”46 (ibid., p. 148). This narrative suited the ideological interests of the constructors of both royalist Serbia and royalist Yugoslavias in the period before World War II, as well as communist Yugoslavia (1945–92). The narrative still holds sway in many quarters of the contemporary Serbian discourse on language and national identity.

---

45 „Крилати Вук – духовни организатор пробуђеног српства.“ The given name of the Serbian language reformer Vuk St. Karadžić means ‘wolf.’
46 „Савршени идиоти, лудаци, надрикњижевници.“
3.1.2 The Bulgarian context

The early modern processes of state formation and the gradual development of the national languages (and cultures) that occurred in some parts of Western Europe were almost totally absent in the Ottoman Balkans. Accordingly, when the processes of the ethno-linguistic formation of the contemporary Bulgarian and Serbian nations started in the beginning of the late modern period, around 1800, the natural point of reference – both in terms of dignitas and norma – was the medieval linguistic models offered by the Church Slavonic language. These models had been passed down by their respective ecclesiastical institutions. Church Slavonic, and the cultural world it represented, was either harshly rejected as a demonised internal Other (Jovanović, 2004) – as in the Serbian case – or seen as a source of communal pride and lexical enrichment – as in the Bulgarian case.47

The protracted political unrest, that characterised the period from 1760s to the 1830s in the Ottoman Empire, is often referred to as kърджалийство („кърджалийство“) or kърджалийско време („кърджалийско време“) in Bulgarian historiography. These conditions also frame the beginning of the national movement among the Bulgarian intellectuals. It was a period when bands of bandits were milling about in the Balkan plains “and made many Bulgarians […] flock to mountainous areas and towns and organise their own militia in self-defence” (Daskalov, 2013: 151), or flee in waves of mass migration with the retreating Russian armies. It has been estimated that about 160,000 Bulgarians emigrated after the Russo-Turkish War of 1768–74 and perhaps as many as a quarter of a million following the war of 1828–9 (Crampton, 2003: 55). They fled to today’s Romania and southern Ukraine, and Russia. Those migrations proved crucial when peace and order returned in the late 1820s (Genčev, 2010: 86). Manufacturing mountain villages, such as Gabrovo, Kotel, Koprivštica, Panajirištė, Elena, and Bansko, grew into bustling urban centres with a network of trading contacts throughout the whole European continent. These transformations of the structure of the Bulgarian society entailed the creation of a bourgeois class comprising the carriers, consumers, and producers of the cultural values of the national revival, including the development of national identity and standard language variety.

An active role in this structural transformation of Bulgarian society was also played by the development of a school system. It evolved from the traditional cell schools at the monasteries, with its medieval cultural orientation, through the Helleno-Bulgarian schools, using both Greek and Bulgarian, to the purely secular primary schools, using some evolving variety of

---

47 Notably, (Old) Church Slavonic still plays a very essential role in the Bulgarian national narrative, where it is called Old Bulgarian (старобългарски).
contemporary Bulgarian. Schooling contributed to the stabilisation of the national language. The production of teaching materials prompted a need for a unified language. Moreover, the generations of pupils graduating from these schools were socialised into the standard language and the ideology shaping it. It was a language and an ideology which they, in turn, reproduced and disseminate in the nascent bourgeois public sphere. The first secular primary school was opened in Gabrovo in 1835 on the initiative of Vasil Aprilov and Nikolaj Palauzov (both from the Gabrovo-region). It was financed with the support of the merchant colony in Bucharest (Genčev, 1999: 374). Towards the end of the National revival, there were about 1600 primary schools in the country (ibid., p. 403).

Equally important for the construction of the Bulgarian cultural nation were the émigré communities founded in multiethnic cities in the Russian, Habsburg, and Ottoman Empires such as Brăila, Brașov, Vienna, Prague, Bucharest, Odesa, Smyrna and Istanbul. By the 1830s, the colonies founded in Walachia and Moldova, Odesa and Istanbul had gathered enough riches to finance their own Bulgarian schools (Genčev, 1999: 374). In addition, they were able to finance the printing, publishing and distribution of both textbooks, books of fiction and the periodicals under scrutiny in this thesis.

The emergence of print capitalism (not least the printing of grammars, textbooks, and periodicals) in the second quarter of the nineteenth century prompted the need for a unified literary idiom. The first printing house in the ‘Bulgarian ethnic territory’ was opened in the thriving commercial city of Ruse on the Danube in the 1860s (Vŭlčev, 2009: 119). These extralinguistic factors are directly connected to the crystallisation of the first overarching directions as to the base for the future national language. These far from homogeneous language-ideological camps have been summed up in the following two ‘schools’ (Georgieva, 1989: 88–94; Todorova 2018: 376–6):

1) The supporters of the ephemeral “Church Slavonic school” („Църковнославянската школа“) aimed at turning Church Slavonic into the base for the national language and was represented by literati such as Christaki Pavlovič, Konstantin Fotinov, and Konstantin Ognjanovič (1798–1858).

2) The disparately opposing “Modern Bulgarian school” („Новобългарската школа“) was represented by prominent intellectuals such as Vasil Aprilov, Petŭr Beron (1799–1871) and Ivan

---

48 Odesa also played an important role in the Serbian national movement, not least through the activity of the secret Greek revolutionary society, Philiki Etaireia (Φιλική Εταιρεία), founded in Odesa in 1814 (Sampimon, 2006: 209). One of its most notable members was the leader of the First Serbian Uprising (1804–1813), Dorđe Petrović (Karađorđe), who had fled to Odesa when the rebellion was put down (Agoston, 2009: 308).

49 Vŭlčev (2009: 102) calls the defenders of this stance “the Slavonic-Bulgarian men of letters” („славяно-българските книжовници“).
Bogorov who maintained that the national language must be based on the structural and lexical features of the contemporary varieties spoken by the Bulgarian people.

In the lack of a firm institutional framework, these men constituted the bourgeois public sphere and were both the financial and the ideological driving force behind the establishment and maintenance of print capitalism. It was the needs and worldviews of those articulate members of the Bulgarian society that were expressed and debated in the purist discourses on language and national identity; a discourse which they both created and controlled. It evolved on the pages of the about 100 periodicals that were issued during the National Revival. The émigré communities also functioned as receivers, interpreters, and transmitters of the dominant European cultural currents. Moreover, they had the economical muscles and political motivation to put their ideological convictions into material practice.

This class of merchants and well-to-do artisans proved vital when the processes of cultural consolidation gathered significant momentum in the second half of the nineteenth century. These developments were spurred by the reluctantly westernising reform-period, known as Tanzimat, which was initiated in the Ottoman Empire in 1839 (Hupchick, 2002: 239). The trend of turning towards Russia for models of cultural and linguistic modernisation, as well as political and financial support, was reinforced during this period. The Russian state study grants made it possible for hundreds of young Bulgarians to study in Russia (Genčev, 1999: 378). Many of the Russian school-graduates, such as Najden Gerov (1823–1900), Dobri Čintulov (1822–86), Todor Burmov (1834–1906), Botyo Petkov (1815–69), Partenij Zografski (1818–76) and Ivan Bogorov set the tone in the Bulgarian language-and-national-identity-debates in the second half of the nineteenth century.

This Ottoman imperial edict aimed at reforming the Millet-system and raising the status of the non-Muslim inhabitants of the empire – mainly Slavs, which deeply touched upon the question of a separate Bulgarian Orthodox church. The reform-focus fell particularly on the inequalities prevailing in the Greek-dominated Orthodox millet (Hupchick, 2002: 242). It entailed the intensification of the struggle for the establishment of an independent Bulgarian church and thereby the official recognition of a separate Bulgarian millet (ethnicity). This struggle in many ways concentrated the hitherto processes of cultural consolidation. Richard J. Crampton claims that it was “[i]n the struggle for the establishment of a separate Bulgarian church [that] the modern Bulgarian nation had been created” (Crampton, 2005: 74). It concerned the whole Bulgarian ethnic territory but was mainly driven by the merchant colony in the Ottoman capital.

A state of political autonomy had been envisioned already by the participants in the struggle for an independent church who advocated an evolution-
ary path of political change. Yet, once ecclesiastical autonomy was approaching, this strife was turned revolutionary by men like G.S. Rakovski, Ljuben Karavelov, Christo Botev and Vasil Levski (1837–73) (Hupchick, 2002: 262–3). All of them were also writers, journalists and/or poets, and many of them participated in the language-and-national-identity debates. Rakovski published the second Bulgarian daily newspaper, *The Danubian Swan* („Дунавски лебед”), in Belgrade in 1860–1 and Karavelov printed the newspapers *Freedom* („Свобода”) and (in co-editorship with Botev) *Independence* („Независимость”) in Bucharest in 1869–74.

With Rakovski, the focus of conspiracy moved from cultural and ecclesiastical issues to political action with the objective to liberate all Balkan Christians with armed force and unite them into a Balkan Christian Federation. To this end, he founded Bulgarian legions in Belgrade and Bucharest and organised small armed bands, *četi*, to harass Ottoman officials and raise national consciousness among the Christian subjects. The journalist and writer Ljuben Karavelov shared Rakovski’s vision of a Balkan federation but he dissented on the means of achieving it. Karavelov had been studying history in Moscow and was inspired by the Russian *narodniki*-movement. Now, he argued that the Balkan Christians had to be thoroughly educated by a group of trained and dedicated ‘apostles’ to stage a successful uprising against the Ottoman authorities One of the most famous of these ‘apostles’ was Vasil Levski. Botev is most renowned and loved for his writing, not least for the poem he wrote about the hanging of Vasil Levski, and for his spectacular death at the head of a *četa* during the April Uprising of 1876 close to the town of Vratsa in Northern Bulgaria.

The brutality with which the April Uprising had been crushed caused strong reactions in Western media. William E. Gladstone famously summed up the opinions in the pamphlet “The Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East” (1876). This pamphlet succeeded in arousing public sympathy for the Bulgarians and other South Slavic peoples fighting for liberty from Ottoman Turkey during the Eastern Crisis of 1875–8. In April 1877, Russia declared war on the Ottoman Empire. The Ottomans were defeated after prolonged and rather fierce battles. The resulting Treaty of San Stefano envisioned an enormous Bulgarian state stretching from the Danube in the north and the Aegean Sea in the South, and from the Black Sea in the east to the river valleys of Morava and Vardar in the west. Fearing that Bulgarian would turn into a wedge of Russian influence in the Balkans, the Great Pow-

---


51 Vasil Levski is popularly called ‘the apostle of freedom’ (Апостола на свободата) in Bulgarian discourse.

52 The poem “The Hanging of Vasil Levski” („Обесването на Васил Левски”) was published in *Calendar for 1876* („Календар за 1876 година”) in 1876.
ers organised a new congress in Berlin in June–July 1878. In the resulting treaty, the Bulgarian territories, as defined in San Stefano, were separated into four parts.

The modern Bulgarian state which emerged through the Treaty of Berlin was reduced to a small territory between the Balkan Mountains and the Danube. It had the form of an autonomous principality under a Christian prince. In contrast to the processes of constructing the nation in ethno-cultural (not least, linguistic) terms and the Church Question, it was the result of external political pressure. This fact, and the appalling contrast between the geopolitical end-results of the Treaties of San Stefano and Berlin, spurred Bulgaria’s political and military elite to enter into a number of irredentist war-campaigns in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

Most of the men who had been taking part in the fight for political liberation were also significant men of letters. They were journalists, writers, and poets. In that quality they had a more direct impact on the confirmation of the capacity of the Bulgarian language to perform higher cultural functions, and steer the course of the language-and-national-identity discourse. Thereby, they were also elevating the Bulgarian nation to the dignifying level of what they saw as the other Kulturvölker of Europe.

In the period following the end of the Crimean War in 1856 and until the establishment of the Principality of Bulgaria in 1878, the movement for the construction and entrenchment of a national education system and a national culture gathered new and more all-encompassing momentum (Genčev, 2010: 273f). The merchant colonies of Istanbul, Vienna, Bucharest and Odesa, and the prospering čorbadžiji and/or artisan-merchant class of the growing Bulgarian towns and villages, had by now gathered enough riches to finance the expansion and diversification of the bourgeois public sphere. It was manifested in the foundation of čitališta, school buildings, teacher salaries, the printing of books and the granting of scholarships to foreign institutions of higher education for young men and women. Some of the Russian university-graduates had a strong impact on the ongoing discourse concerning the national language and identity. Among them were the professor of Slavistics at the University of Kharkiv and co-founder of the Bulgarian Literary Society Marin Drinov (1838–1906); the linguist and lexicographer Najden Gerov; the writers, poets, journalists and revolutionaries Ljuben Karavelov and Christo Botev; and the Metropolitan of Tūrnovo and writer of the first origi-
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53 Karavelov has been called the “Herzen of the Balkans” (Stoianovich, 1959: 262) because of his close intellectual bonds with the Russian Westerniser and pre-Narodnik A.I. Herzen (1812–70). In the period 1867–9, he lived in Novi Sad and Belgrade, where he published a number of articles in Serbian which “caused a ‘furor’” (ibid.) in the capital. He also became closely associated with the pan-Slavic organisation ‘United Serbian Youth’ (Ujedinjena om-ladina srpska).

The dynamics of cultural relations and contacts – and the patterns of identifications they give rise to – were also diversified in the second half of the nineteenth century. This manifested itself in the westernising (anti-Greek and anti-Russian) overall cultural and ‘puristic orientations’ (Thomas, 1991) of some of the graduates from Central and Western European and American institutions of higher education. The activities of French and American Catholic and Protestant missionaries in Istanbul opened the gates for young Bulgarian students to enter prestigious American and French high schools and universities, such as the Robert College in Bebek and the French-Turkish Galatasaray High School (Genčev, 2010: 275). Among the graduates from these schools were the ‘father of Bulgarian theatre’ and co-founder of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (BAN) Dobri Vojnikov (1833–78) and the writer and revolutionary politician Stojan Mihajlovski (1856–1927). Another French university-graduates was the publisher of the first Bulgarian newspaper *The Bulgarian Eagle* („Бѫлгарскый орелъ“, Leipzig, 1846–7) and founder of the influential gazette *The Tsargrad Herald* („Цареградский вѣстникъ“, 1848–61) Ivan Bogorov (Topalov, 2007: 96–99), whose purist policy and practice will be further discussed in chapter 7.

Equally important was the financing of writers and the printing of literary works in the national language (Genčev, 2010: 281–2). Literature played multiple roles in the creation of the literary nation both in terms of constructing a set of canonical representations of the nations’ essential character(s) and myths about the cultural family’s collective past, present and future and generating a centripetal standard language behaviour (Milroy & Milroy, 2002). These phenomena interactively served as an anchorage for a sense of collective identity.

Although less prominent then in the Serbian context, collections of folksongs and reinterpretations of folkloric themes by poets such as P.R. Slavejkov played a vital role both as language ‘samples’ and in the process of antithetical identity formation. Some literary works contributed to the creation of stereotypical narratives and representations of the (Phanariot) “Greek”, the “Turk” or other negatively defining others in a language which was often intentionally purged of Graecisms and Turkisms (cf. Mutafchieva, 1995: 65–6). Prominent poets from the period of the national revivals such as Christo Botev and P.R. Slavejkov reproduced stereotypical images of the ‘Turk’ as the incarnation of evil created in folk poetry, and thus contributed to their perpetuation into the post-liberation era (ibid.). In this sense, the literary language became both the medium and the message. During the period of high Romanticism, language, in its purified form, was *per se* perceived as a representation of the potency of the cultural nation using it (an expression of what they presented as the ‘Soul of the People’). The capacity of writing literary works in the genres created in the Western canon (prose,
poetry, and drama) was seen as a proof of the dignity of the people. It corroborated that they had eventually joined the choir of the cultural nations.

Even if the social pyramid of the late nineteenth-century Bulgarian society was still rather flat (Vůlčev, 2009: 100), the literary language and bourgeois public sphere became the privileged community of those few possessing the economical, the social and the cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1991: 14). They could construct and communicate a shared set of values concerning the contents and character of the cultural nation in the growing public sphere, with the help of the integrating forces of print-capitalism and public schooling. These sets of values and the particular dispositions to act and react they prompted, could, again in the parlance of Bourdieu (1991), be called their ‘habitat.’

Using the standard language code was both a way of symbolically performing one’s belonging to the cultural family and a medium of communicating the set of cultural values uniting it. The total population of the Principality of Bulgaria and the Eastern Rumelia was about 3,000,000 at the time of the liberation in 1878, and the rate of overall literacy amounted to barely 3.3 percent (Vůlčev, 2009: 58). This gives us figures suggesting that this network of privileged intellectuals could not have comprised more than roughly 100,000 persons. The great majority of the rural populations of the Bulgarian lands was socialised into the standard language behaviour and cultural value-system of which it was a carrier until well after the Second World War.

Just like in most other nation states, where the discursive construction of the cultural nation preceded the establishment of the political state, the Bulgarian National Revival was a foundational period for the invention of traditions (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983). This process implied the construction of the most archetypical myths and central narratives about the contents and character(s) of the collective past, present and future of those deemed to belong to the cultural family. “To make a nation”, Snježana Kordić writes, “it was necessary to present this creation as a rebirth, as if something ancient was continued”54 (Kordić, 2010: 200).

3.1.3 The role of the Greek-Bulgarian social, cultural, and linguistic entanglements

Raymond Detrez’ (2013: 13) offers an interpretation of the dominating pre-national(ist) patterns of identification in the Bulgarian and generally Balkan context. He locates the beginning of the pre-nationalist era during the Ottoman conquest in the late fourteenth through the fifteenth century and its end at “the penetration of nationalism as an ideology and sentiment” (ibid.) from

54 „Kako bi se napravila nacija, bilo je nužno predstaviti tu kreaciju kao preporod, kao da se nešto drevno nastavlja.“
the late eighteenth century onwards. Detrez proposes the introduction of the overarching concept of a “Balkan cultural union” as a supplement to the more established concept of a Balkan linguistic union (*Balkansprachbund*).

On the level of majority popular low-culture, linguistic contacts in the pre-national era formed part of a more general scheme of cultural contacts among speakers of varieties along the Slavic, Romance, and Greek dialect continua which resulted in a far-reaching convergence on all levels of cultural practices. Even if the rural populations of the Balkan Peninsula mostly married within their religious community, these hybridisations affected them all – regardless of religious affiliation.

On the level of the minority elitist high-culture, on the other hand, the inhabitants of the Balkans identified themselves with their respective religious community – “religion being the basic organizing principle of their perception of the world, their moral values and their relations with others” (Detrez, 2013: 26). This was the starting point for the development and spread of nationalist ideologies and sentiments in the Balkans from the late eighteenth century onwards. It first affected the members of the high-cultural religious communities. In the Serbian case, it was the educated elite organised around the Metropolitanate of Sremski Karlovci who began the process of nationalising the rural majorities by constructing and diffusing sets of homogenised cultural and linguistic practices (a historical narrative, a standard language code etc.). The corresponding processes of cultural and linguistic nation-building in the Bulgarian case were initiated by the Bulgarian members of the religiously and linguistically defined, high-cultural “Romaic community” (Detrez, 2013: 24; 2015a). This proto-national community comprised Orthodox elites from the entire Balkans who for all higher cultural communicative needs used a Greek cultural language. This high-status variety became the medium of intellectual and commercial exchange within the community and a highway to social promotion or a symbol of an already achieved social status. Notable Bulgarian cultural and linguistic nation-builders who were educated in Greek schools were Konstantin Fotinov, Vasil Aprilov, and Ivan Dobrovski.

The Greek ‘Language Question’ was *per se* crucial for the development of Bulgarian linguistic nationalism within the multiethnic Orthodox Christian community, the *millet-i Rûm*, in the Ottoman Empire (cf. Mackridge, 2012). The Greeks served both as a source of inspiration and imitation and were soon turned into the cardinal arch enemy and negatively defining Other in the discursive processes of national self-construction. The Bulgarian cultural, linguistic, and finally political nationalism was substantially a response to the advancement of Hellenism and the diffusion of the ‘Great Idea’ to re-

---

55 This corresponds the official Ottoman term *millet-i Rûm* ‘Roman Nation’ which defined all the Orthodox Christians of the Empire as a nation in terms of religion.
establish the Byzantine Empire within the Romaic community from the late eighteenth century onwards. It emerged as a reaction to the efforts of hellenizing the members of the Romaic community in terms of culture and language – including the entirely voluntary adoption of the Graecophone high-culture by socially ambitious Bulgarians (Detrez, 2015b). The pre-national and national Bulgarian and Greek elites were interconnected and entangled over a long period of time – not least in terms of fluid, hybrid, and hyphenated identifications and identities (cf. Daskalov, 2013: 150). These entanglements and interconnections were essential throughout the later phases of the ‘National Revival’ – from the debates between the ‘Graecomaniacs’ („Гъркоманите“) and the ‘Russophiles’ („Русофилите“) of the 1840s to the ‘Church Question’ of the period between 1860–1872. Thus, it was not a rebellion against the centripetal pressure of the Sublime Porte.

3.1.4 On the threshold of standardisation: The language situation among the Balkan Orthodox Slavs in the nineteenth century

When the processes of (pre)standardisation started, most of the rural inhabitants of the Balkans were using their local dialect. The rate of literacy amounted to barely 3.3 % towards the end of the Bulgarian National Revival (Vûlčev, 2009: 58). According to Stoianovich (1959: 250), the rate of literacy in Serbia grew from 0.5 % in 1827 to 9.33 % in 1884.

These rural populations conducted their daily face-to-face communication within the family, extended family (zadruga), and villages, in a dialect on the South Slavic dialect continuum that stretched from the Julian Alps in the Northwest to the Black Sea in the Southeast. People were probably aware of differences in linguistic, cultural, and religious practices, but they were still of little importance. “National identities as we now understand them were [still utterly] fluent and remained so into the twentieth century” (Wachtel, 2008: 73) when the broad masses were socialised into the homogenised national culture and the language it was written in through compulsory public schooling.

Because of these cultural and linguistic contacts between speakers of varieties along the Slavic, Romance, Albanian, Greek, and Turkish dialect continua, there was also a significant group among them that was bi- or multilingual (and bi- or multicultural). Another result of these long-standing encounters and intersections is cultural convergence, on all levels of popular culture, and yet another the so-called balkanische Sprachbund. This “Balkan linguistic union” (Detrez, 2013: 12) is the result of long-standing contacts

---

56 The programme of the ‘Great Idea’ was formulated in a speech in the Greek parliament in 1844 by the politician Ioannis Kolettis in which he claimed language and culture as the main definers of the Greek identity and nationhood (Daskalov, 2013: 200).
between speakers of varieties of genetically unrelated languages – a process which has made these languages structurally similar while retaining lexical differences (Garrett, 2004: 56).

The intellectual and commercial elites of the Balkans were either part of what Detrez (2013) calls an orthodox Romaic community in the Ottoman Empire or associated with the cultural centre around the Serbian Metropolitane of Sremski Karlovci in the southern Habsburgian lands. The members of the Romaic community were largely Greek in language and culture and engaged in cosmopolitan trade and/or education in the Ottoman, Russian, and Habsburg Empires. The members of the Serbian political, economic, and cultural elite in Southern Hungary were using Russian Church Slavonic (ruskoslovenski) and the heterogeneous and hybrid Slavonic-Serbian (slavenosrpski) for their liturgical and cultural needs (cf. Mladenović, 1989). Just like their Bulgarian contemporaries, they were often engaged in a combination of trade and various intellectual endeavours.

These communities, the “Romaic” and “Slavonic-Serbian”, also functioned as anchors for their cultural identities, defined by religion and language. They had a huge role to play for the development of the future standard languages. Not least in the quality of representing the negative Other and an enemy within for the generation of Romanticist language activists to come (cf. Jovanović, 2002; 2004).

The organising principle in the management of ethnic groups in the Ottoman Balkans, according to the millet system, was religion and not language. Consequently, across all social dividing lines, Orthodox speakers of varieties of Slavic, Romance, Albanian, or Greek were all principally considered the same religiously defined ethnicity. Apart from that, there seems to have existed a complex system of functional distribution concerning the various linguistic varieties within the Ottoman society. Ottoman Turkish was the prestigious inter-ethnic language of the cities (cf. Friedman, 2005: 26), and the central administration and trade was conducted in Greek, Judaeo-Spanish, Venetian Italian, Armenian etc. In the Habsburg lands, on the other hand, the language of culture and administration was predominantly Latin (until the late eighteenth century) and trade and business were conducted in German. The linguistic ecology in the Balkans at the outset of the period studied in this thesis was, accordingly, extremely diversified.

57 The Slavonic-Serbian poet Lukijan Mušicki writes in the poem “The Voice of a Patriot” (Глас Народолубца) from 1819, that “One are [sic!] the union of the people: faith and language” (“Један су сојуз роду: вера и језик”).

58 The autocephalous Serbian Patriarchate of Peć (until its abolition in 1766), though, seems nevertheless to have been in a stronger position to install a sense of ethnoreligious identity in its flocks through the administration of the churches and monasteries, and the mediation of the elders heading the local village communities (cf. Hupchick, 2002: 215)
What the Serbian and Bulgarian cultural nationalists had to deal with was, thus, opposite to the idea and ideal of a cultural unity and homogeneity that some of them had in their minds – a rather chaotic array of heterogeneous cultural and linguistic practices. A static ideological notion collided with a dynamic cultural reality. It must be underlined, however, that, in many cases, the language activists of the Bulgarian and Serbian national revivals were conscious of the dialectal differentiation characterising the linguistic ecology surrounding them (cf. Vŭlĉev, 2009; Jovanović, 2004). The whole venture of cultural and linguistic standardisation was, as matter of fact, full of paradoxes. Language, that is the language spoken by the people, was seen as matter, something almost physical, a natural force – a Kraft, an immanent energy “operative in the nature and the history of a people” (Fox, 2003: 246), which the nationalist intellectuals set out to realise, and thereby help make people cognisant of what they ‘truly’ are. Yet, the operational field of the self-same intellectuals was the written language. The goal of their efforts to standardise the written language was, thus, in the minds of the cultural nationalists, not to construct a completely new species of linguistically defined ethno-national identity. Instead, they presented it as bringing forth and making people aware of a primordial identity which they already possessed.

Crucial for the achievement of this objective was selecting the linguistic variety or group of varieties which as purely as possibly reflected the inaccessible ‘Soul of the People’ which was somehow believed to unite all its constituent members into one, essentially homogeneous, whole. In the phase of corpus planning, this linguistic raw material is ideally subjected to a process of cleansing and protection against linguistic elements on all levels which are thought to be foreign to the same national self. It is elaborated into a conscious and dignifying instrument of national identification and polyvalent and functional means of communication within the cultural family. This double and interdependent function of a (national) standard language is essential. Any community, small or big, concrete, or imagined, is essentially a “community of communication” (Wright, 2004: 31) – being able to communicate is, after all, a prerequisite for performing and maintaining any sense of social identity.

Language assumed an almost mystical aura as the primary marker of cultural difference in the wave of cultural unification that engaged the South Slavic nationalists in the wake of the Napoleonic Wars (1804–15) and the shadow of the disintegrating Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian Empires. The Herderian emphasis on the national vernaculars as the privileged lifeline to their unique heritage deeply influenced Slavic intellectuals (Hutchinson, 2013: 81), not least because of the role the German philosopher ascribed to them in the revitalisation of European culture (Hupchick, 2002: 252). The ultimate objective of this linguistic nationalism was to define the meaning and identity of their peoples by identifying “the authentic language of the people, purified of foreign borrowings, and to make it the public medium of
modern science and culture” (ibid.). Purifying the national language was, according to this line of thought, equal to reaching in to the unique and innermost core of the ‘soul’ of one’s people – a matter of identity, in other words.

Language forms and language structures were thus invested with a strong *symbolic* value in the discourses that emerged in the nascent Balkan mediascapes. What the Balkan intellectuals discussed was in fact not just individual linguistic features but the forms and contents of the national self. These conflicting sets of beliefs and attitudes (ideologies), alongside the social, financial, and political interests of their proponents, also explain the often-heated debates the various linguistic concepts provoked.

3.1.5 Language and identity in the South Slavic context: Background

The very creation of in the first place the Orthodox Slavic cultural community of communion and communication in the first place (Picchio, 1984) was intimately connected to a linguistic route chosen and another road not taken. The Old Church Slavonic language, that for almost a millennium functioned both as the external marker of cultural difference and an internal means of solidarity and communication of this *Pax Slavia Orthoidea*, was created in the medieval Byzantine commonwealth. This old *lingua sacra* was constructed in the early 860s CE by the two brothers Constantin (Cyril) and Methodius who based it on a selection of the South Slavic dialects spoken in the vicinity of the urban centre of Thessaloniki (status planning) and codified its form after the prestigious linguistic and cultural models provided by Medieval Greek (corpus planning).

Old Church Slavonic and its subsequent Church Slavonic ‘redactions’ performed the role of a linguistic icon in the double sense of being designed to reveal divine truth and render the subtleties of Christian dogma, while also being a dignifying symbol of identification – a rallying point – and a transnational means of communication for all Slavdom, on the other. N.I. Tolstoj writes:

Феномен церковнославянского, или древнеславянского, литературного языка заключается в том, что он с самого начала замышлялся и создавался как язык сакральный, богослужебный, обращенный к Богу, во-первых, и как язык общеславянский, предназначенный для всех славян, во-вторых (Tolstoj, 1998: 32).

The term ‘redaction’ linked to ethnonyms such as Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian is an anachronic misnomer when investigating the pre-national, medieval contexts. It would be more accurate to talk about South- and East-Slavic redactions and link them to the various monastic centres (such as the Resava Monastery) where they were developed.

For a discussion on its instrumentalisation in contemporary Russian nationalist discourse, see Bodin, 2008: 66.
[The phenomenon of the Church Slavonic, or the Old Slavonic, literary language lies in the fact that it from the very beginning was conceived of and created as a sacral, liturgical language, directed towards God, in the first place, and as a common Slavic language, intended for all Slavs, in the second.]

Yet, even if this cultural and linguistic model was to become an integrate part of the state ideologies of the medieval Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian Empires – and often a means of wielding political power and religious authority for its feudal rulers, it is important to once again underline the role of this European lingua sacra61 to define a transnational ethno-religious community – and not an ethno-national one, in the late modern sense. This linguistic concept, in their ‘national’ redactions,’ was to serve the South Slavs as an instrument of higher religious-cultural communication and as a symbol of communal pride and identification for almost a millennium. Firstly, Church Slavonic performed this role within the frameworks of the feudal medieval realms – until the Ottoman Turks finally conquered the Bulgarian and Serbian Empires in 1396 and 1458. Secondly, it was instrumentalised by the autocephalous Serbian Patriarchate of Peć and the autonomous Bulgarian Archbishopric of Ohrid – until they were abolished by the Ottoman authorities in 1766 and 1767 respectively. The role as a political, cultural, and ecclesiastical centre for the Serbs was taken over by the Metropolitanate of Sremski Karlovci which had been established in the south Habsburgian lands in 1703. To appeal to Orthodox Slavic unity and pleading for the political support of the Petrine ‘Empire of all Russias’, the Serbian societal elite adopted the East-Slavic redaction of Church Slavonic (ruskoslovenski) as the language of the Serbian Orthodox Church and all higher cultural communication.

In the South Slavic context, prescriptivism, purism, and LPLP can be seen as an unsurprising consequence of the decline (and/or continuity) of Church Slavonic, in its various ‘national redactions,’ and the rise of the national languages (with the transitional, hybrid linguistic states, such as Slavonic-Serbian and Slavonic-Bulgarian it resulted in). The structural similarities with the transition from the Middle Ages to the early modern period in Western Europe are several. One is the introduction of print capitalism which facilitated the construction and dissemination of an imagined national community. This process entailed a gradual transition from a religious Neoplatonic linguistic (and, more generally, cultural) ideology to a kind of secular Neoplatonic linguistic (and, more generally, cultural) ideology. Purity and purist interventions were pivotal to both. In the first case, it was a matter

61 According to R. Picchio (2003: 276) “Pope Adrian recognised the legitimacy of using the Slavonic language in translating the holy texts, and, probably, also for liturgical purposes” (‘Папа Адриан признал правомерность использования славянского языка для перевода священных текстов, а возможно, и в литургических целях’) – probably in connection to Cyril’s and Methodius’ visit to Rome in 868.
of expressing and protecting a language that was thought to ultimately reflect
the pure ideas in the mind of God which also gave the religious community
its meaning and identity. In the second case, it was a matter of expressing
and protecting a language which was thought to ultimately emanate from the
pure ‘Soul of the People’ which also gave the national community its mean-
ing and identity. Due to the role of ideas, both ideologies can be described as
Neoplatonic: the only ontological foundation for both is an idea and idealisa-
tion which denies or ignores the empirically attestable plurality and variabil-
ity of all the surrounding sociocultural practices surrounding it.

The LPLP-processes studied in this thesis could best be described as a
combination of “pre-standardisation” and “standardisation proper” (Thomas,
1991:117–20) – a phase, during which the language planners “tend to act
alone or in small, loosely organised groups” (ibid., p. 117). The Serbs were
slightly more privileged than the Bulgarians with an established ecclesiasti-
cal and cultural centre in the southern Habsburgian lands and a burgeoning
state apparatus within the (semi-)autonomous tributary Serbian Principality
(Kneževina Srbija). This principality had emerged towards the end of the
Second Serbian Uprising in 1815 and been politically and legally defined in
1830. Moreover, the existence of the Matica Srpska, founded in Budapest in
1826, and the Society of Serbian Letters62 (‘Друштво српске словесности’),
founded in Belgrade in 1841, gave the LPLP efforts an organisational
framework that was almost totally absent in the Bulgarian context. The first
institutionalised stronghold for the promotion of LPLP among the Bulgarians
was The Bulgarian Society of Letters63 (‘Българско книжовно дружество’),
established in Brăila in the Principality of Wallachia as late as 1869.

3.2 Linguistic ideologies in the Balkans and in the West

A factor which deeply influenced the Bulgarian and Serbian intellectual
elites’ perceptions of language, linguistic correctness and purity, and the role
of language in society, was the constant influx of printed books in Russian
Church Slavonic from the seventeenth century onwards (Ivić, 2014: 20–9;
Georgieva, 1989: 22–3). These books left a deep imprint on the attitudes and
the beliefs about language of the generations of school children who were
formed in the Serbian organised educational system that developed in Aus-
trian Vojvodina beginning in the 1720s. The first teachers in the school of

---

62 Although it was abolished by the returning Prince Miloš I in 1864, it is still regarded as the
predecessor of the current Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SANU). This institution
and its members would be almost immediately marginalised in the Serbian discourse on lan-
guage and national identity.

63 Which, in turn, is regarded as the progenitor of the present Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
(BAN).
the ecclesiastical, political, and cultural centre of Sremski Karlovci were Russians. Hence, the models of linguistic emulation they held up to their young disciples were represented by Russian linguistic manuals. Two of the most significant were the primer *The First Teaching for Children* by the Russian bishop and Petrine enlightener Feofan Prokopovič (1681–1736) and the canonical *Slavonic Grammar with Correct Syntax* (1619) by the Uniate bishop and religious activist Meletij Smotrickij (1577–1633). The primer was reprinted for the Serbian community in 1726 and the Meletian grammar in 1755 (Nuorluoto, 2012: 64). The two linguistic manuals formed parts of the politically motivated efforts of the Russian Empire to wield cultural power over the Serbs in the Habsburgian lands. Many of the printed religious books, such as books of psalms, horologions and passionals used in the Orthodox churches and monasteries were also written in Russian Church Slavonic. The Russian redaction of Church Slavonic is still the liturgical language of the Serbian Orthodox Church.

The impact of the Russian printed books on the linguistic ideologies of the thin stratum of Orthodox literati in the Bulgarian lands was less systematic. The Bulgarians lacked the centripetal force of an organisational centre, such as that of the Metropolitanate of Sremski Karlovci, and the conduit of an established system of communal education. These predominantly religious books, printed in the Russian redaction of Church Slavonic, played a crucial role as positive or negative models of identification, when the discursive construction of the literary language and national identity gathered more significant momentum in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Psalters, horologions and passionals were imported from the seventeenth through the eighteenth centuries and be used in the churches and the cell-schools of the local monasteries. The strictly systemised, normative, and elaborate linguistic model presented by these books represented the only domestic point of linguistic reference for many of the early participants in the language-and-national-identity discourse, such as Konstantin Fotinov (cf. ch. 5). This Russian Church Slavonic was widely apprehended as the original “Old-Bulgarian” language of SS Cyril and Methodius until the second half of the nineteenth century. In addition, for many eighteenth-century monks and scribes, such as the founder of the Rila Monastery Literary School Josif Bradati (1714–89), it represented a higher style of the same Slavic language (a system of styles in which the vernacular represented the lowest stylistic level) (Radev, 1997). Yet, the topic of the Bulgarians as the true heirs of the Cyrillo-Methodian patrimony played a central role in the Bulgarian national narrative. Hence it was also pivotal for the construction of the meaning and the identity of the Bulgarian nation as a distinctive moral community.

---

64 Первое ученіе отрокомъ, St. Petersburg, 1720.
65 Грамматики славенския правилное синтагма, 1619.
Cultural ideologies were also circulating within the culturally and linguistically Greek Romaic community within the Ottoman Empire, which comprised members from all Orthodox groups of the Balkans – Greeks, Slavs, Albanians, and Vlachs. Not least Greek scholars and clerics were in close contact with the West and the Venetian Empire and were confronted with both the Protestant and Catholic Reformation and the new scientific teachings – such as those of Galileo Galilei and Copernicus. From the seventeenth century onwards, Greek scholars introduced subjects such as ancient philosophy, natural history, geography, and astronomy into the curricula of Orthodox sites of learning – on Mount Athos, as well as in Edirne, Athens, Ioannina, Chios, Jerusalem, Thessaloniki, Jassy, Bucharest, Moscow, and Kyiv (Calic, 2019a: 96–7). This Greek and Romaic context had a pivotal role as a point of reference and departure for the Bulgarian linguistic and cultural construction of national identity from the late eighteenth century onwards.

In the field of language and linguistic ideologies, the Bulgarian ethnic territories were for instance, influenced by the so-called damaskini. The damaskini or damascene literature were collections of religious texts (Gyllin, 1991: 14) which were originally based on a translation of *Thesauros* (Venice, 1558) by the Greek writer Damaskinos Stouditos (ca. 1500–77) into what was actually a Serbian recension of Church Slavonic made in the Western Bulgarian lands (ibid., pp. 46–7) and Northern Greece. The original *Thesauros* could well have been influenced by the Protestant and Catholic Reformation and their language policies of using the vernaculars to spread their interpretations of God’s word to the broad illiterate masses. The first translations were made around the turn of the seventeenth century in Prilep, Lovech, and Mount Athos, and later went through a process of gradual vernacularisation. The original *Thesauros* was written in an alloy of Byzantine Greek and the vernacular, and the language choice was motivated by the same religious-didactical language ideology as the contemporary Protestant reformation and Catholic counter-reformation, i.e., utilising a variety based on the vernacular(s) made the Christian truth accessible to the broad illiterate masses. These ideological concerns were also applied to the language policy of the second and all following exponents of the *damaskini* literary genre which lingered until the mid-nineteenth century. But in contrast to the absolutist dynastic states of early-modern Western and Northern Europe these new vernacular-based literary languages were never politically instrumentalised for national homogenisation in the Balkans. Nothing indicates any nationalist or proto-nationalist motivations for the *original* language choice of the *damaskini* (cf. Radoslavova, 2020). Yet, the frequent mentioning of the

---

66 The “Life and Sufferings of the Sinful Sophronius” („Житие и страдания грешнаго Софрония“, 1805) by the Bishop Sophronius of Vratsa (1739–1813) could be seen as a late exponent of the damascene linguistic ideology.
ethnonym ‘Bulgarian’ testifies to the continuous consciousness about linguistic and cultural difference among the damascene writers. In the eighteenth century, the voices of patriotic self-articulation became ever more perceptible (Genčev, 1999: 360–1). Furthermore, the often-anonymous writers of the damaskini utilised a hybrid linguistic medium which combined elements from the vernaculars with Church Slavonic lexical items for Christian concepts and abstract notions. This common lexical heritage might well have paved the way for later influence of East Slavic liturgical books (and the identity concept it was a carrier of).

Another ideological tradition that had an enduring impact on the conceptualisation of the language and ethnic identity of both the Serbian and Bulgarian Orthodox intellectuals in the period ending around 1800 CE was that of early-modern pan-Slavic Illyrianism. The Serbian literati were more directly affected and in their case this tradition was revived in the late-modern Ilirski pokret (“Illyrian movement”) of the first half of the nineteenth century. Illyrianism was based on the belief that all the (South) Slavic peoples trace their origin to the antique Illyrians and this was first propagated already in the 16th century by South Slav intellectuals of the city-republic of Dubrovnik and the Dalmatian coast (then under Venetian supremacy), such as Vinko Pribojević (ca. 1450–1532) and Mavro Orbini (1563–1613). Pribojević launched his ethno- and glottogenetic theory in the historiographical De origine successibusque Slavorum (‘On the Origin and Glory of the Slavs’, Venice, 1532) and Orbini in his Il Regno degli Slavi (‘The Kingdom of the Slavs’, Venice, 1601) (cf. Calic, 2019a: 13). Yet, Orbini traced the origin of the Slavs to the Scandinavian Peninsula (Sampimon, 2006: 26).

The construction of a Pan-Slavic identity was influenced by the expansion of the Venetian, Ottoman, and Austrian Empires and was soon embraced by the educated, ideological classes of both the Catholic and the Orthodox Slavs of the Western Balkans. Two historiographical works which were connected to the Serbian cultural ambient in Vojvodina and influenced the national self-imaginations of both the Serbian and Bulgarian intellectual elites of the National Revivals were Stematografija (Vienna, 1741) by Christofor Žefarović (ca. 1650–1754) and the four volume Istorija raznih slovenskih narodov, najpače Bolgar, Horvatov i Serbov (‘The History of Different Slavic Peoples, in Particular the Bulgarians, Croats, and Serbs’, Vienna, 1794–5) by Jovan Rajić.

A Romanticist reformulation of the same ideology motivated the efforts to create a language-defined Illyrian nation of the Croatian Illyrian movement in the mid-1830s to the late 1840s, when the self-designation “Illyrian” was forbidden by the Habsburg authorities in 1843 and the movement began to lose impetus (Sampimon, 2006: 35). It was also one of the driving forces in the attempts of Vuk St. Karadžić and his Serbian, Croatian, and Slovene followers to construct a Serbo-Croatian nation by means of language (cf. Wachtel, 1998).
The linguo- and ethnonym ‘Illyrian’ continued to appear in grammars and dictionaries of the Western South-Slavic Balkans. The first systematic and confessionally motivated attempt to describe and promote a language for all South Slavs was made in *Institutiones Linguae Illyricae* (Rome, 1604) by the Jesuit Bartol Kašić (1575–1650). The linguistic concept they were using was based on both Čakavian and Štokavian varieties of Western South-Slavic (cf. p. 77) and was alternatively called both “Illyrian” and “Slavic” (Fine, 2006). This linguistic concept of the Catholic Christian universalism was politically instrumentalised in the efforts of the Catholic Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide. They aimed at uniting the Western and Eastern Churches, and the South-Slavic peoples in the Ottoman Empire by means of a common language and the instigation of uprisings against the Muslim overlord among the Balkan Christians. The linguistic concept of the Catholic Propaganda was reflected in the first printed book containing New-Bulgarian linguistic features, *Abagar* (Rome, 1651) by the Catholic bishop Filip Stanislawov (1608–74) (cf. Rajkov, 1979; Radev 2020). This text, containing both apocryphal and canonical prayers, was based on the linguistic and ideological tradition of Bartol Kašić. Yet, the Slavic language and identity concept, which these Catholic intellectuals were promoters of, was kept alive throughout the eighteenth century. However, given the fact that most of the literature of the Bulgarian Catholics was written in Latin, the concept of language and identity it contained could hardly have influenced the self-conceptions of the members of the Orthodox Bulgarian educated classes, when they started to enter modernity in the early nineteenth century.

During the Middle Ages and their continuation in the Ottoman Empire, the cultural practices of the broad popular masses were to a very large extent left to their own devices and went through a process of syncretisation on virtually all levels: from eating and drinking, costumes, family patterns, music, dances, rituals, architecture, religion, and, not least, language. Long standing contacts, entanglements and interminglings resulted in what could reasonably be called an all-embracing ‘Balkan Cultural Union’ (as a parallel to ‘Balkan Linguistic Union’, cf. p. 65).

67 Similar confessionally motivated Pan-Slavic ideas were held by Aleksandar Komulović (1548–1608), Ivan Tomko Mrnavić (1579–1637), Juraj Križanić (1618–83), and other West South Slavic early-modern intellectuals related to the Counter-Reformation (cf. Ivanova, 2008: 13). A Bulgarian representative of this ideology of Christian universalism was the Catholic canon Krštu Pejkă (1665–1731). Нис Зарцало истине мед цркве источне и западне (1716) was directly inspired by the grammatical works of Juraj Križanić (Ivanova, 2008: 23).
3.2.1 Enlightenment and Romanticist linguistic ideologies in the West and in the Balkans

The period studied in this thesis encompasses the two ideological paradigms of Enlightenment and Romanticism. “The movements of Enlightenment were” as Maria Todorova puts it, “linked from the outset with the incipient stirrings of modern nationalism in Southeastern Europe” (Todorova, 2009: 166). Such nationalist incipient stirrings were characterising the works of all the harbingers of Enlightenment in the Ottoman Balkans. They were for instance reflected in the appeal of Father Paisij Hilendarski to the Bulgarians to “know their race and language” (1762), in the writings of the “remarkable Serbian writer Dositej Obradović (1742–1811), and in the political and philological oeuvre of the influential Greek enlightener Adamantios Korais (1748–1833). Some of them, like Paisius and the Serb Jovan Rajić, reconciled early-modern speculations about the origin of languages and peoples with the traditional Biblical account, and others, like Obradović or Konstantin Fotinov, were strong adherents of the “sensualist school” of John Locke (1632–1704) and his French follower Étienne Bonnot de Condillac (1714–80) — often called ‘Condillocke’ because of their ideological closeness (Silverstein, 1998: 123).

Locke presented his fundamental ideas about the role of language for human cognition in his epistemological treatise *Essay on Human Understanding* of 1690. He claimed that verbal communication is a matter of tele-mentation, i.e., “in the conveyance of ideas from the mind of one individual to that of another” (Harris & Taylor, 2005: 127). In contrast to much of the previous thinking on epistemology, language, and cognition, which saw ideas as something innately endowed upon us and originating from God, Locke, thus, placed human experience at the centre of epistemology, which, indirectly, paved the way for the linguistic and generally cultural ideologies of the European Enlightenment and Romanticism. Of even greater importance for the Romanticist take on the link between purism, language, and national identity was the misinterpretations or hasty conclusions about the interdependent character of the development of the language and knowledge of a particular community (Harris & Taylor, 2005: 135–6) made by eighteenth-century philosophers such as Condillac. This in turn prompted instrumental Romanticist thinkers, such as W. v. Humboldt and J.G. Herder, to draw the conclusion “that the language spoken by a community somehow reflects,
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68 It is hard to reach any certainty as to exactly which linguistic variety or varieties Paisius implied in his admonition to the Bulgarian *literati* of the late eighteenth century. The only literary language existing at the time (apart from that of the *damascenes*) was Church Slavonic.

69 Cf. Penev (1912; 1946) and Konev (1983) for the role and influence of Dositej Obradović for and in the Bulgarian context.
even determines, the way that the members of that community think” (ibid., p. 137). This is a thought that was to linger in European linguistic thinking until well into the twentieth or even twenty-first century.

Herder’s work was both a continuation of and a reaction to the thinking of Condillac and exercised an enormous influence on the European and not least on Balkan linguistic and cultural thought of the Romanticist nineteenth century. As Svein Mønnesland puts it:

After Herder, for the nationalist thought, at least in Central and Eastern Europe, language assumed an almost mystical aura. As a part of the constitution of a nation, culturally and politically, the language question became paramount (Mønnesland, 2013: 316).

Herder’s theory about language as the determinator of man’s loyalty and central defining feature of nationhood (Harris, 2005: xviii) has a strong impact on the public discourse and self-perception in many Balkan countries. In seminal works such as Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Spraches (1772), Stimmen der Völker in Liedern (‘Voices of Peoples in Folksongs’, 1778–9) and Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit (‘Ideas about the Philosophy of the History of Humanity’, 1784–91) he introduced the concept of cultural relativism into the European intellectual discourse (Sampimon, 2006: 18).

Wilhelm von Humboldt famously claimed that “Die wahre Heimat ist eigentlich die Sprache” (‘The true homeland is really the language’, Humboldt, 1909: 322) and has had a thoroughgoing influence on European linguistic thought. Humboldt deterministically believed that the ‘mentality’ or ‘soul’ of a people defined the structure of its language and that this structure in turn defined the worldview and general mindset of the constituent members of that people (Humboldt, 1999: vii–xxxix). This deterministic line of thought would be handed down to the founder of semiotics Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913) and be synthesised in the linguistic hypothesis of his disciples Edward Sapir (1884–1939) and Benjamin Lee Whorf (1897–1941) “that different languages carve up reality in different ways” (Edwards, 2013: 82).

The German metaphysical idealism of Herder was further developed by thinkers like J.G. Fichte, G.W.F. Hegel, and F.J.W. v. Schelling (1775–1854), and transplanted onto Russian soil through the works of Ivan Kireevskij (1806–56), Aleksey Homjakov (1804–60) and Konstantin Aksakov (1817–60), where it took the form of Slavophilism. This system of beliefs about the unique historical destiny and cultural mission of Russia originally emerged in opposition to ‘Westernisers’ such as Aleksandr Herzen and Vissarion Belinskij (1811–48) and the official nationalism of the post-Petrine culture and institutions of power. Yet, in the years following the disastrous Crimean War (1853–6), Slavophilism transformed into official pan-Slavism and became an integrant part of the Tsar’s foreign policy and efforts to exer-
cise ideological influence and control over the minds and activities of the Orthodox Slavs of the Balkans (cf. Offord, 2010: 243–9).

Among the intellectual elites of the stateless Slavic ethnic groups of the Habsburg Empire, the Herderian ideological heritage influenced the ideology of Austro-Slavism, which was constructed in the works of prominent Romanticist intellectuals originating from or active in the Habsburg Empire, such as Jernej Kopitar (1780–1844), Ján Kollár (1793–1852), Ljudevit Gaj (1809–72), Pavol Jozef Šafárik (1795–1861), and partly Vuk St. Karadžić. The supporters of this ideology believed in the existence of a deeply rooted linguistic and cultural unity between the stateless Slavic ethnic groups of the Habsburg Empire. Accordingly, this Slavic people was only superficially divided into tribes and dialects. These intellectuals were committed to strengthening the peaceful cooperation between these ‘tribes’ with the ultimate objective unify them into one whole under the sceptre the Austrian Emperor.

One of the enduring outcomes of this movement was the creation of the Austro-Slavic cultural societies, the so called maticas (cf. p. 85), which aimed at both cultivating the national cultures and strengthening the bonds with the other Slavic peoples within the empire. The ideological character of the belief in the existence of a common linguistic identity between the Slavic peoples was paradoxically proven by the fact these intellectuals and self-proclaimed representatives of the Slavic peoples were forced to communicate in German or French whenever they convened. Although initiated as a counterweight to both official Habsburg nationalism and, not least, to Russian Slavophilism, the ideology additionally became an important factor within the Habsburg government’s imperial policy vis-à-vis the educated elites of the Empire’s Slavic subjects in the years following in the wake of the revolutionary events of 1848–9. The Habsburg governmental officials hoped to stem the centrifugal tide of particularistic nationalisms preserve the Empire’s geopolitical integrity by appropriating and exploiting a part of the emotional appeal of Austro-Slavism.

Western-European linguistic and cultural thinking thus reached the Balkan intellectual elites through various channels. The ideas of the Enlightenment and Romanticist paradigms reached the Serbian intellectuals of Habsburgian Vojvodina through their studies at German and Central European universities and via the nodes of the Balkan merchant colonies in Continental Europe, Russia, and the Balkans. These networks of merchant colonies were of vital importance for the diffusion of Western European ideological influence as well as the social alloy of merchants and intellectuals who became the adherents of the Bulgarian National Revival. However, in the Bulgarian case, Enlightenment impulses to a significantly larger extent came from the Greek or Romaic world of learning and education (as well as directly from Western Europe), and the impact of German Romanticism was, at least initially, mainly filtered through the Russian nineteenth century dis-
course. The focal points of the Serbian intellectual life (monasteries, urban centres, and institutions of higher education) in Southern Hungary and later in the Serbian Principality also played a role as mediators and producers of intellectual influences and contents (Vůlčev, 2009: 59–60).

3.3 Print capitalism, language, and the imagination of the Balkan nations

3.3.1 Print capitalism in the Balkans

The spread of print capitalism was directly linked to the emergence of the Serbian and Bulgarian mediascapes which, in turn, were the spaces where the national languages could be used and developed, and imaginations of the nation could be shared and debated in discourse on language, purism, and national identity.

In his book *Imagined Community: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (1983), Benedict Anderson focuses on how national communities are ‘imagined’. Anderson underlines the crucial role of “print-capitalism” and “print-languages” in the imagining, construction, and performance of the modern nation. According to Anderson (2006: 6), nations, in contrast to concrete face-to-face communities, such as the family or a group of colleagues or friends, are “imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion”. Anderson argues that the very imagining of the modern nation was made possible when “three fundamental cultural conceptions, all of great antiquity, lost their axiomatic grip on men’s minds” (ibid. 36), and explains those further:

The first of these was the idea that a particular script-language offered privileged access to ontological truth, precisely because it was an inseparable part of that truth. It was this idea that called into being the great transcontinental sodalities of Christendom, the Islamic Ummah, and the rest. Second was the belief that society was naturally organized around and under high centres – monarchs who were persons apart from other human beings and who ruled by some form of cosmological (divine) dispensation. Human loyalties were necessarily hierarchical and centripetal because the ruler, like the sacred script, was a node of access to being and inherent in it. Third was a conception of temporality in which cosmology and history were indistinguishable, the origins of the world and of men essentially identical. Combined, these ideas rooted human lives firmly in the very nature of things, giving certain meaning to the everyday fatalities of existence (above all death, loss, and servitude) and offering, in various ways, redemption from them (Anderson, 2006: 36).

Although Anderson’s perspective on the origin and spread of nationalism is almost exclusively occidental (which inevitably creates blind spots in his analytical model), the first of these conceptions is arguably relevant to the
object of study in this thesis. The sacred “script-language” of the Orthodox Balkan Slavs, Church Slavonic, did offer “privileged access to ontological truth, precisely because it was an inseparable part of that truth” (Anderson, 2006: 36) and it was a medium in and through which “the great transcontinental sodality” of the “Pax Slavia Orthodoxa”70 (Tolstoj, 1997) was imagined. In the case of the South Slavic medieval empires, it was also a matter of “being part of the great peoples”71 (Tolstoj, 1998: 18), i.e., appropriating the prestige of the Byzantine high culture. The discursive construction (or imagination) of both the national print-vernaculars and the national identities among the Orthodox Slavs of the Balkans (and the general vernacularisation of culture) was a consequence of the demise of the “great religiously imagined community” (Anderson, 2006: 16) and “the medium of [the] sacred language” (ibid., p. 13) by means of which it was imagined. This religious universalism was contested by the particularism of Romanticist nationalism.

The second cultural conception is equally applicable to this thesis in the sense that both the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires were formed by “the belief that society was naturally organized around and under high centres” (Anderson, 2006: 36). It could relate to the medieval dynastic ruler, emperor or sultan, and the religious community (the Orthodox millet) or the Serbian autocephalous Patriarchate of Peć and autonomous Bulgarian Archbishopric of Ohrid in the Ottoman Empire, or the Serbian Metropolitanate of Sremski Karlovi in the Habsburg Empire. The emperors, sultans, patriarchs, archbishops, or metropolitans heading these communities all governed “by some form of cosmological (divine) dispensation” (ibid., p. 36) in an ideological climate in which all aspects of high cultural meaning making was dictated by the dogmas of the monotheistic Christian or Muslim religion.

The interrelated and paradigmatic change in the “conception of temporality” (ibid., p. 36) also had a crucial role to play as a precondition for the imagining of the modern nation also in the Balkans. The Christian conception that “the origins of the world and of men [were] essentially identical” (ibid.) was for instance still manifest in the biblical historiographic narratives of the Slavonic-Bulgarian History (Историѧ славѣноболгарскаѧ) written by Paisius of Hilendar around 1760–2 and the History of Different Slavic Peoples, in particular of the Bulgars, Serbs, and Croats (Исторія разныхъ славенскихъ народовъ, напаче Болгарь, Хорватовъ и Сербовъ) written by Jovan Rajić and published in Vienna in 1794–5. This perception of temporality was changed with the arrival of print capitalism and the emergence

70 The concepts of Slavia Orthodoxa and Slavia Latina or Slavia Romana was originally introduced by the Italian Slavicist Riccardo Picchio (1980). It is in in very broad terms a separation of the Slavic speaking world into religiously defined cultural spheres.

71 „прьчатиса величѣхъ языцѣхъ“
of a secular bourgeois public sphere. The articulate members of this public sphere now created narratives about the past, present, and future of their “cultural families” which “located [the future] citizens in the flow of national time” (Kroskrity, 2004: 509).

Nationalism can be treated, not only as an ordinary political ideology, alongside liberalism, conservatism, or socialism, but also as a belief system and an emotionally charged social bond, belonging “with ‘religion’ or ‘kinship’” (Anderson, 2006: 5). Therefore, I find it particularly plausible that “these ideas rooted human lives firmly in the very nature of things, giving certain meaning to the everyday fatalities of existence (above all death, loss, and servitude)” (ibid., p. 36). This could also partly explain the willingness of umpteen millions of people “to die for such limited imaginings” (ibid., p. 7) as the nation over the last couple of centuries. Nationalism, to a great extent, supplemented traditional religion as the epicentre of collective meaning making for the new class of secular Romanticist intellectuals who were the driving forces in the national revivals of the nineteenth century Balkans. As Maria Todorova puts it: “Nationalism in the Balkans in the nineteenth century was constructed primarily around linguistic and religious identities. Language was perceived by all national and cultural leaders as the mightiest agent of unification” (Todorova, 2009: 176).

In the Orthodox Slavic Balkans the processes, through which the national languages replaced the old sacred languages as the medium of communal imaginations and the national community superseded (or complemented) the religious community as the principal anchorage of social identity, which commenced around the year 1800. This partly sets the Balkans apart from the developments affecting Western Europe, where the process of replacing the Latin of the medieval European Christian commonwealth with the administrative print-vernacular of the centralised absolutist state-nations started in the wake of the Renaissance and the religious upheavals marking the beginning of the early modern era. I say partly separating because the print-vernaculars (and other ideologically charged signifying practices) of the Western European dynastic realms were the exclusive privilege of an utterly thin stratum of ecclesiastical and bureaucratic educated elites; just like in the nineteenth century Balkans, the bulk of the rural populations was never invited into this print-language and the high-cultural community using it. These elites made up the ideological classes whose beliefs and attitudes discursively formed and changed the vernacular bureaucratic high codes – not least their function of being a symbol for the glory and extent of the early modern empires (cf. Teleman, 2013). These print-vernaculars were, thus, not democratic in the sense of encompassing the whole population, i.e., those speaking some variety genetically related to the (more or less) standardised print-language variety. The ethno-linguistically defined nation-states, emerging in the late-modern era, were, of course, far from democratic. The national standard languages were constructs of those possessing the three Bour-
dieu-an capitals (the social, the economical, and the cultural) and marginalised all the spoken varieties not entering into their making (whether genetically related or not). The construction of national language codes as well as standardised national cultures have in fact led to an impoverishment of the linguistic and more generally cultural ecology of the pre-national era.

The advent of Romanticism in the decades following the French Revolution of 1789, entailed a change in the attitude towards the countryside, its inhabitants (in the Balkans, the rayah), and their cultural practices – not least language. They “went from being neglected or seen as uncivilized and mongrels to being regarded as the repository of the true national self” (Joseph, 2004: 108). In the minds of (the urban) Romanticist philosophers, language emerged as the principal defining feature of the modern nation. In his *Reden an die deutsche Nation* (1808), Fichte, for instance, claims that

> 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 (Fichte, 1968: 190–1).

This belief manifested itself in a top-down “official nationalism” (Anderson, 2006: 86) in the old state-nations and the multicultural empires through which the dynastic rulers and their families were nationalised and placed at the forefront of the ‘democratisation’ of the national culture into which the popular masses were socialised by means of the language used in a system of socially stratified national education (whose predominant purpose was to create loyal nationals). Among many of the stateless ethnic groups of the European multicultural empires, however, it provoked a wave of bottom-up “popular national [freedom] movements” (Anderson, 2006: 86) and a “philological-lexicographic revolution” (ibid., p. 83) in which

> The study of folklore and the rediscovery and piecing together of popular epic poetry went together with the publication of grammars and dictionaries, and led to the appearance of periodicals which served to standardize [their] literary language, on behalf of which stronger political demands could be advanced (ibid., pp. 74–5).

The Serbs and the Bulgarians were two of these stateless ethnic groups in the multicultural empires of Europe whose educated elites set out to imagine, define or construct the contents and outlines of their national selves in the philological-lexicographic revolution of the nineteenth century. The print languages had multiple roles to play in these processes of national self-imagination. In the first place (1) “they created unified fields of exchange and communication below the sacred languages and above the spoken vernaculars” (Anderson, 2006: 43). In the Serbian case, the old *lingua sacra*, i.e., Church Slavonic, was almost entirely reduced to the function of liturgical language, while a variety of the spoken vernaculars constituted the dialect-base for the elaboration of the national standard language code. In the Bulgarian case, the Church Slavonic heritage played a more prominent role
in the discursive construction of both the standard language code and the national identity. Yet, it was in these unified fields of exchange and communication (i.e., in the bourgeois public sphere) that the Serbian and Bulgarian Romanticist educated elites by means of print media, such as periodicals and novels, dialectically and in tandem constructed both the national identities and the national languages – both in explicit discourse and through implicit usage.

Secondly, print-capitalism created a market of fellow-producers and fellow-consumers of this developing print-language, across time and space, which “in their secular, particular, visible invisibility, [formed] the embryo of the nationally imagined community” (Anderson, 2006: 43). Print-capitalism, in short, made it possible for rapidly growing numbers of people to think of themselves and relate to others as a linguistically defined community. This system of beliefs spread down to the general populace during the late nineteenth and a great part of the twentieth century.

Thirdly, the relative black-on-white fixity of the print-language helped to create one of the main ideological illusions of the “standard language ideology” (Milroy & Milroy, 2002). Namely, the essentialist belief that languages are pre-existing, natural, and readymade entities, from times immemorial appertaining to and defining a particular social group, and not a dynamic cultural practice, constantly constructed, negotiated, and changed in discourse by the members of the language community using it, reflecting their specific beliefs, attitudes, and far from altruistic interests.

This is also intimately connected to the main flaws of Anderson’s (sociological) theories on the role of language in the imagination of national communities. As has already been noted by Joseph (2004: 124), “Anderson uses national languages as though they were a constant – when in fact there are just as many variables, constructs, ‘imagined communities’ as the national identities they are invoked to explain.” In contrast to his overall constructivist take on nationalism, he seems to have an essentialist outlook on national languages, and, thereby, he is also (albeit involuntarily) contributing to essentialising the concept of national identities.

Hobsbawm (1990) puts a much more de-essentialising perspective on the role of standard languages in the construction of national identities. He writes that:

National languages […] are the opposite of what nationalist mythology supposes them to be, namely the primordial foundations of national culture and the matrices of the national mind. They are usually attempts to devise a standardized idiom out of a multiplicity of actually spoken idioms, which are downgraded to dialects (Hobsbawm, 1990: 51).

The standpoint that national standard languages are as much discursive constructs as the national identities which they – according to nationalist system of beliefs – are supposed to define, is fundamental to the current thesis.
Moreover, the arrival of print capitalism facilitated the circulation of ideas within the nascent Balkan bourgeois public sphere. As has been shown by Ignjatović (1980), many Bulgarian books from the period of the national revival were, in fact, printed in Serbia due to the lack of printing facilities in the Bulgarian lands. Bulgarian language ideologues were well acquainted with the periodicals and books being published in the Serbian mediascape. Serbian linguistic thought, from Avram Mrazović to Vuk St. Karadžić, exercised a significant influence on the course of the Bulgarian discourse on language and national identity in the period of the National Revival. Karadžić’s Romanticist ideas on a phonemic orthography had a strong impact on Bulgarian literati such as Ch. Pavlovič, Ivan Dobrovski, Georgi Busilin (1823–45), P.R. Slavejkov, Vasil Nenović (1790–c.1850), and Nikola Pŭrvanov (1837/1845–1872) (Ivanova, 2008: 85). Nevertheless, all attempts to introduce similar orthographical principles into standard Bulgarian language usage were countered by the belief that such a venture distanced or even eradicated the Bulgarian cultural community from the Church Slavonic heritage in which their identity was thought to be rooted.

Finally, the personal contacts between members of the Bulgarian and Serbian intellectual elites were close and frequent. The Bulgarian writer and revolutionary Georgi Sava Rakovski spent many years in the 1850s and 1860s in Novi Sad and Belgrade, where he actively participated in the political life of the Principality of Serbia, published his newspaper The Danubian Swan (1860–1) and formulated his idiosyncratic ideas on a common Slavic literary language based on Church Slavonic as a means of achieving a political union among all the South Slavs of the Balkans (Ivanova, 2008: 33–6). Another language ideologue, political activist, journalist, and writer who passed important formative years in the Serbian ambient was Ljuben Karavelov.

3.3.2 The Balkan bourgeois public sphere

Another precondition for the interacting construction of national languages and identities was the emergence of a new type of sociability which Habermas (1989) calls ‘the bourgeois public sphere’ (which seems to correspond to Anderson’s “unified fields of exchange and communication”, Anderson, 2006: 43). In The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere (1989), as in the case of Anderson, Habermas’ theoretical vantage-point is almost exclusively Western European. He describes how the liberal ‘bourgeois public

---

sphere’ (Bürgerliche Öffentlichkeit) in its proper sense emerged in late-seventeenth-century British, and early eighteenth-century French society. It developed as a zone of social intercourse between the “Private Realm” and the “Sphere of public Authority” within the “civil society’ (bürgerliche Gesellschaft)” (Habermas, 1989: xvii) that had been developing in Western Europe since “the […] High Middle Ages” (ibid.). In the case of the South-Slavs of the Ottoman Balkans, the emergence of this public sphere covered the nineteenth century and ran parallel to the new educated middle classes’ general entrance into late modernity. Habermas (ibid., p. 27) conceives of this realm above all as the sphere of private people come together as a public; they soon claimed the public sphere regulated from above against the public authorities themselves, to engage them in a debate over the general rules governing relations in the basically privatized but publicly relevant sphere of commodity exchange and social labor. It became an arena for “people’s public use of their reason (öffentliches Räsonnement)” (ibid.) and opinion-making which substituted the medieval and early modern negotiations of socio-cultural meanings between the estates (the religious institutions, in the first place) and the feudal lords and dynastic rulers.

In the Orthodox Balkans, the high-cultural meaning making took place, first between the medieval rulers and the ecclesiastic and monastic centres, and then between the leaders of the religiously defined ethnic community (millet-basi) or the heads of the Serbian and Bulgarian Patriarchy and Archbishopric and within the entire “Pax Slavia Orthodoxa” (Tolstoj, 1997). Due to fundamental changes in the socio-economical structures of Ottoman society, such as the emergence of print-capitalism and the commodification of culture, these dynamics of high-cultural meaning-making was superseded by what Habermas denotes as the new “public sphere in the world of letters” (literarische Öffentlichkeit) (Habermas, 1989: 29) between the private realm and the sphere of public authority. Print-commodities, such as books and periodicals, emerged as public arenas where a new secular educated bourgeois middle-class could negotiate different kinds of social meanings (such as the national identity). Another important social institution for public meaning-making within this mediating space was the Balkan reading-rooms (čitališta).

In its basic blueprint-form, Habermas’ theory about the emergence and functioning of the bourgeois public sphere is almost completely based on a purely Western European situation which makes it not fully applicable to sociocultural specifics of the Orthodox South Slavs in the Ottoman Empire. Not least relevant to the current thesis is the fact that this sphere of a “Culture-debating […] public” (Habermas, 1989: 159) virtually emerged directly out of a medieval societal order and without the mediation of the early modern period. The bourgeois public sphere played a crucial role as an arena were the form and contents of the Serbian and Bulgarian cultural nation was discursively constructed in the nineteenth
century. In the Bulgarian case, it emerged within the political-administrative context of the Ottoman Empire and as an essential part of liberal-national intelligentsia’s claim to a political statehood of their own, while in the Serbian case it arose in tandem with the formation of the modern state.
4. Discourses on purism and national identity in *Serbske lětopisi* and in the ‘Philological Bagatelles-debate’

4.1 Purism and national identity in *Serbske lětopisi*: The case of the ‘Philological Bagatelles-debate’

The journal *Serbske lětopisi* (The Serbian Chronicles) was founded in 1824 by the professor at the Serbian Gymnasium of Novi Sad Georgije Magarašević (1793–1830) in close cooperation with such prominent intellectuals as Pavol Jozef Šafárík, Jovan Hadžić-Svetić (1799–1869), and Lukijan Mušicki (1777–1837). Šafárík, the famous pioneer of Slavic studies, was at the time director of the gymnasium where Magarašević was working. As we will see, his pan-Slavic convictions would strongly influence the purist ideological orientation of the journal. In the first three volumes of the journal he published selected parts of his comprehensive *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten* (Pest, 1826) in Serbian translation (Mladenović, 1965: 9–10). Another important contributor was the lawyer, writer, and future cofounder of the *Matica Srpska*, Jovan Hadžić. With his frequent publications and leading position in the publishing board, he also left a deep and decisive imprint on the overall linguistic and cultural ideology, and purist policy of *Serbske lětopisi*.

The role of *Serbske lětopisi* was reinforced from the 4/16\(^{74}\) of February 1826 on, when *Matica srpska* (as the first of the Slavic *maticas*\(^{75}\)) was founded in Pest with the initially virtually sole task of saving and publishing the journal. Jovan Hadžić became its first president and the one to formulate its statutes. These statutes explicitly stated that “the reason for the founding of this Society is the united love and devotion to the common good: and the

\(^{73}\) Hadžić published his literary works under the pseudonym Miloš Svetić.

\(^{74}\) According to the Julian and Gregorian calendar, respectively.

\(^{75}\) “Matica” means ‘queen bee’ and denotes a specific kind of West and South Slavic cultural society (with the metaphorical meaning that these organisations “would act like a queen bee and breed more workers for the [national] cultural hive”, Herrity, 1973: 368). The first *Matica* to be founded was *Matica Srpska* (1826), followed by *Matica česká* (1831), *Matica hrvatska* (1842), *Matica slovenská* (1863), and *Slovenska matica* (1864). The last of these West and South Slavic cultural societies to be founded is *Matica crnogorska* (1993).
purpose is to spread the literature and enlightenment of the Serbian People, i.e., to publish and distribute Serbian Manuscripts, now and from now on ceaselessly and forever.”76 The aging poet, clergyman, and professor at the Gymnasium of Sremski Karlovcı Lukijan Mušicki played the more modest role of a symbolic teacher whose advice and support the younger intellectuals were seeking. He was also one of the most educated men of his generation and, as a high church potentate (archimandrite), a representative of the Slavonic-Serbian cultural continuity of the Vojvodina Serbs. The politico-cultural life of this community was centred around the powerful Metropolitanate of Sremski Karlovcı. Mušicki’s involvement with the influential circles of the Serbian Orthodox Church and its powerful metropolitan bishop Stevan Stratimirović (1757–1836) had a certain impact on the general linguistic, purist and cultural orientation of the journal, where he published several patriotic, lyrical works.

The church did not just harbour a potent cultural capital, which constituted the anchoring in the medieval Church Slavonic high culture, but was also a political body which represented the Serbian People in front of the Habsburgian authorities. The thus religiously defined Serbian community of the Austrian Empire enjoyed a far-reaching internal self-government which is reminiscent of the position of the Orthodox millet-i Rûm in the Ottoman Empire. Among other things, the church organised the limited system of public schooling and as such formed the cultural and linguistic preferences and the habitus, or patterns of acting and reacting they provoked, of generations of Serbian intellectuals.

Serbske lětopisi was a child of the climate of the Vormärz or period of nationalist fervour leading up to the ‘Springtime of the Peoples’ in the revolutions of 1848–49.77 Those were years of political unrest during which the intellectual elites of the stateless ethnicities, mostly Slavs, of the Habsburg Empire started to construct the forms and contents of their specific cultural identity (Hroch, 1985). They did it in potent waves of “vernacular mobilisation[s]” (Smith, 2011) in the expanding bourgeois public sphere and with the help of the media of the emerging print capitalism. The maticas played a pivotal organisational role in these processes of cultural-national ‘rebirth.’ They were instrumental when it came to resolve the impending problem of what kind of literary language was going to be adopted by their respective emerging nation (Herrity, 1973: 368).

76 „Повод к заведенију овога Дружства јест једина љубов и ревност к обштему благу; а намереније јест распространеније књижества и просвещенија народа Србског, то јест, да се Књиге Србске рукописне на свет издају и распрострањавају, и то сад и одсад без престанка за свагда.“: http://www.maticasrpska.org.rs/wordpress/assets/statut_MS.pdf
77 As has been shown by Horel (2023: 64), the period of the Vormärz (1825–48) was also a period of oppression, internal colonialisation, and intense magyarisation in the Hungarian part of the Habsburg Empire.
Georgije Magarašević and Jovan Hadžić were both personally acquainted with Vuk St. Karadžić and the latter had in his early youth, when he studied at the Gymnasium in Sremski Karlovci, been enthusiastic about Vuk’s reform of the literary language. In the years preceding the first issue of *Serbske lětopisi*, Hadžić gradually turned towards the Slavonic-Serbian linguistic concept in a state of vernacularisation. Furthermore, both Magarašević and Hadžić were strongly influenced by the Enlightenment spirit and vernacularist linguistic reform programme of Dositej Obradović and his followers, who for rationalist reasons tried to establish a Serbian written language close to the vernaculars to further a secular education and literature amongst the Vojvodinian Serbs (cf. Herrity, 1973: 369).

Both Magarašević and Hadžić, as well as Jovan Stejić, Jovan Sterija Popović, and Sima Milutinović Sarajlija (1791–1847) are sometimes negatively represented in more ideologised Serbian scholarly discourse (cf. Mladenović, 1965; Popović, 1985; Stojanović, 1987), according to the conventional dynamics of binary othering. Though more ideologically unbiased scholars, such as Aleksandar Mladenović and Pavle Ivić, maintain that they, and other writers who opted for basing the national language on some variety of the popular language, were all parts of larger linguistic and cultural processes, which were only slightly accelerated by publication of the works of Vuk St. Karadžić. Mladenović (2000: 687) characterises this process as follows:

> Ради се о процесу србизирања, понародњавања (највише у духу шумадијско-војвођанског дијалекта) славеносрпског књижевног језика, што се остварило у једном сталном, континуираном току развитка, и то још од времена Захарије Орфелина, Јована Рајића и Василије Дамјановића, почев, дакле, негде од 50-60-их година XVIII-века. Тај процес се наставио у првој половини XIX столећа, и био је убрзан појавом Вука Караџића (од 1814. а поготово од 1818. године), и његових дела.

[It is a question of a process of Serbification, vernacularisation (above all in the spirit of the Šumadija-Vojvodina dialect) of the Slavonic-Serbian literary language, which was realised in a constant, continued course of development, already from the time of Zaharije Orfelin, Jovan Rajić, and Vasilije Damjanović, beginning, thus, somewhere in the 1750s–60s. That process continued in the first half of the nineteenth century and was accelerated by the emergence of Vuk Karadžić (from 1814 and particularly from 1818), and of his works.]

Yet, in contrast to Karadžić and his associates, Hadžić and many other Vojvodinian intellectuals wanted to base the Serbian written language on the linguistic practices of the societal elite in Vojvodina. Furthermore, they assigned a significant role to the Church Slavonic literary patrimony in the elaboration of the national language.

*Serbske lětopisi* is the only one of the periodicals analysed in this thesis which is still being issued (under the name of *Letopis Matice Srpske, LMS*). It is thereby one of the oldest scholarly journals in the world. The journal would become one of the most significant print-capitalist constituents of the
expanding bourgeois public sphere where a new class of secular intellectuals would develop the discourse on language (and other sociocultural practices) through which the Serbian national identity would in part be constructed. It was precisely in the interests of this societal groupings that the nation-states, and all the sociocultural practices supposed to define their identity, were constructed.

The first issue of *Serbske lětopisi* was edited and ready for print in May 1824. Yet, the magazine did not reach the hands of the reading audience until 1825, when it was printed by the Buda University Press. The rather long delay was caused by the interference of the censorship of the Habsburgian authorities who were initially frightened by the political potential of the Serbian publishing venture. The first number, when finally issued, also aroused bad blood – this time in the influential metropolitan bishop of this Serbian Orthodox Church in Vojvodina, Stefan Stratimirović. The bishop reacted against the absence of final jers (<ъ> and <ь>) in its miscellany of articles. He probably perceived this as a symbolic threat to the power, influence, and identity of the politico-ecclesiastical institution he was heading, and quite simply decided to sequestrate all its copies (Herrity, 1973: 370). The old order was restored in the following, second issue of the magazine – the jers were back. *Serbske lětopisi* was thus almost immediately faced with both ideological and financial difficulties. To save it from bankruptcy and warrant its future existence, the lawyer and writer Jovan Hadžić founded in 1826 the cultural society *Matica Srbska* in Pest, where it would be published until its translocation to Novi Sad in 1864.

In the short preface to the first number, its prime editor Georgije Magarašević declares the scope of the magazine:

Све што се год Славенског рода от Адрїятског до Леденог, и от Балтиског до црног мора вообще; а осибито што се нас Сербаля тиче и то у књижевном призръњю; све е то предмет Сербске Лѣтописи.

[Everything that concerns the Slavic race from the Adriatic to the Arctic, from the Baltic to the Black sea in general, but in particular us Serbs and specially in literary respect; all that is the subject of the Serbian Chronicle.

These rows reveal a deep influence from the (Austrian) pan-Slavic ideology of Pavol Jozef Šafárik. It also reflects the transitional identity, and “linguistic state” (Mladenović, 1989: 51), implied by the glossonym Slavonic-Serbian, i.e., a belonging both to the all-encompassing Slavic community and to the Serbian people (ibid., p. 95). Just like Slavonic-Bulgarian, this hyphenated designation also marked a transition from the medieval community of *Pax Slavia Orthodoxa* into the age of the modern nations. The ethno-religious community of this Orthodox Slavic World was defined by its Church Slavonic language (and other religious signifying practices). The modern nation-state, on the other hand, was first and foremost defined by the construction of a national standard language code. In this sense, the Slavonic-Serbian
language also marked a passage from one pure Neoplatonic idea of a unified cultural identity to another. It symbolised a transition from being primarily an ethno-religious community ultimately anchored in God to being an ethno-linguistic nation anchored in the ‘Soul of the People’ (or in both). Purist attitudes, beliefs, and policies had an active role to play in the discursive construction of this new type of communal identity.

Magarašević also expresses his concern about the harm that has been caused to the Serbian world of letters by the desire of some writers to advance the cause of the national literature. He is conscious about колику су распру замели измећ читателя своя, због новости кое у езыку самом, кое пак у ортографїи заведены (LMS, 1825, 1: III).

[how much discord they have brought among their readers, because of the novelty introduced in the very language, or again in the orthography.]

He ends his preface in an effort to steer the broad path of reconciliation in saying that гледајући сваким начином, да Сербска Лѣтопис с већим числом народа нашег у миру и согласно буде, увѣрен будући, да ће само оно временом своими быти, што быти мора! (ibid.)

[I will try in every way, to keep the Serbian Chronicle in peace and concord with the greater part of our people, because I am convinced, that only that will in due time be, which must be!]

The impendent need for consensus concerning the common language would also later take precedence over the linguistic predilections of individual writers in some of the Bulgarian discourses (cf. ch. 7).

In this chapter I will examine a selection of texts in which ties between purist policy-statements and national identity are explicitly or implicitly envisioned and enacted during the roughly first two decades of existence of Serbske lětopisi. This discursive construction of “representations […] that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (Woolard, 1998: 2) largely took place in a particular ideological climate. The period was dominated by the dawn of high Romanticism, but, at the same time, the repercussions of Enlightenment linguistic thinking were still very perceptible.

The two texts that will be analysed in the following section express three different concepts of language and national identity. The first (1) could tentatively be called the Slavonic-Serbian concept of language and national identity. Its proponents opted for basing the Serbian written language on the liturgical language used in the Serbian Orthodox Church (Wachtel, 1998: 25). This line of ethno-religious thought was intimately connected to the powerful politico-religious centre of the Metropolitanate of Sremski Karlovci. The Orthodox Church was the only institution which had survived throughout the centuries under Ottoman sovereignty and thus preserved “a high-cultural tie (however tenuous) with the Serbian kingdoms of the Middle
Ages” (ibid.). It also constructed the political and ethno-linguistic imaginary of the connectedness to the pre-modern Pax Slavia Orthodoxa, which since the Ottoman invasion of the Balkans in the fourteenth to fifteenth centuries had been defended by the ever-mightier Russian Empire. In the 1830s, this concept would already be rather marginalised.

The second was the civil-Serbian concept of language and national identity. The proponents of this concept opted for basing the Serbian written language on the contemporary linguistic practices of the urban educated elites of Vojvodina. At the same time, they ascribed a prominent role to the lexical and word-formation resources of Church Slavonic in the corpus-planning process of elaboration. Just like in the case of the Slavonic-Serbian concept, this implied preserving the symbolic ties with the Serbian Orthodox Church and its cultural practices. This ideological orientation is often overlooked by scholars such as Wachtel (1998), who view it as an extension of the Slavonic-Serbian concept. Yet, due to the sharp differences in relation to the Church and her cultural patrimony, I find it reasonable to regard it as a separate ideological current. This sharp ideological dividing line becomes evident both in Hadžić’s text and in Černački’s critical review. The civil-Serbian concept would have powerful supporters until the mid-nineteenth century and beyond, but in the second half of the nineteenth century it would be overridden by the populist-Serbian and Yugoslav concept of language and national identity.

This third concept – populist-Serbian – was famously advocated by Vuk St. Karadžić, who, in correspondence with the teachings of German Romanticist thinkers such as Herder and Humboldt, wanted to base the Serbian written language on the linguistic practices of the Serbian peasantry. Karadžić and his young romanticist sympathisers originally aimed at defining the Serbian people by means of constructing a supranational language based on the Eastern Herzegovinian subdialect of the new-Štokavian dialect. This dialect was spoken in the area around Karadžić’s own native village of Tršić. Initially it had the form of linguistic irredentism and the Serbian Vukovians (vukovci), as the followers of Karadžić were called, aspired to incorporate all speakers of new-Štokavian into the Serbian people. They embraced the entire scope of the lexical resources in frequent use by the popular masses – regardless of their origin and were in this sense fundamentally anti-purist. Yet, their purist efforts were instead targeting the Church Slavonicisms and Russianisms in frequent use among the representatives of the intellectual elites of Vojvodina. This concept of language and national identity would thus be articulated in antithetical opposition to both the Slavonic-Serbian and the civil-Serbian concept of language and national identity. An underlying motivation was to disidentify the Serbian people, politically and culturally, with the Russian Empire and its Orthodox religion. Later it was transformed in alignment with the Croatian Illyrianists and subsequently the founding figures of the Yugoslav Academy (1866) to be invested in the
discursive making of the Yugoslav people (Wachtel, 1998: 25–6). This fourth Yugoslav concept of language and national identity will be treated in more detail in chapter 6.

The debate between Vasilije Cernački (1781–XXXX) and Jovan Hadžić that I will discuss in the following is, thus, essentially a clash between two conflicting ideological conceptualisations of the Serbian language and national identity – the Slavonic-Serbian and the civil-Serbian. The first is represented by the fictive ‘Slavonic-Serb’ and Cernački and the latter by the fictive ‘Serb’. The ‘Serb’, which represents Hadžić’s own stance, is also constructing his discursive position in opposition to the populist-Serbian concept of language and national identity which he is repeatedly referring to. Purist attitudes and beliefs play a central role in the construction of these conflicting concepts of the linguistically defined collective self. They operate on both the level of status and corpus planning.

4.1.1 “A conversation between a Slavonic-Serb and a Serb” and reactions to it

The first two texts to be analysed in this section are the parable-like “A conversation between a Slavonic-Serb and a Serb”78 (LMS, 1830, 2: 93–7), written (anonymously) by Jovan Hadžić, and an exhaustive review of this text which was published in the following number (LMS, 1830, 3: 39–52) of the magazine. The review is signed by Vasilije Cernački, a traveller, polyglot, and the author of the project for the first Serbian dictionary of foreign words79 (Klajn, 2012). Cernački could thereby be seen as one of the first Serbian cognoscenti or constructors of the foreign and thereby also the domestic in language. It was also in this authoritative quality that he entered the debates on ethno-linguistic purity.

The short parable has the form of an amicable conversation between the identity position of a ‘Slavonic-Serb’ (the disciple) and that of a ‘Serb’ (the teacher). The role-personality of the ‘Serb’ is also represents the discursive position of the author. In this discourse the ‘Slavonic-Serb’ asks several pivotal questions concerning linguistic purity on the level of both status and corpus planning, and the ‘Serb’ gives the answers. The first issue to be addressed is the decisive status-planning choice of the linguistic base for the literary language. The Slavonic-Serb asks whether it is necessary to get as close as possible to the Slavonic language or not, and the Serb somewhat elusively answers:

78 „Разговоръ између Славеносерблъина и Србина“
79 „Примѣчанія на Сербскіи Языкъ съ приложеніемъ“ (LMS, 1830, III: 53–6).
However, here it becomes clear that the identity or role-personality of the ‘Serb’ intends to base the literary language on “our common language” (ibid.), and not on the structural features of Church Slavonic. Furthermore, the ‘Serb’ states that it is the duty of every man or woman of letters to utilise the ecclesiastical language as an abundant source of lexical enrichment. The ‘Serb’ is thus advocating what Thomas (1991: 76) typologises as “archaising purism” (Thomas, 1991: 76). Moreover, these Slavonicisms are to be adapted to the morphophonologic structures (“cut and spirit”) of “our language”, i.e., the modern written and spoken linguistic practices of the Vojvodina Serbs. This would also safeguard the cultural continuity of the privileged social group Hadžić himself belongs to. Consequently, Hadžić ascribes a social meaning to certain language forms, which, following his convictions, are to be transformed into pure or dignifying representations of the nation.

The ‘Slavonic-Serb’ then asks the logical follow-up question: “Why the common, and not the simple?” whereupon the ‘Serb’ replies that he does “not know what the simple language is, [he] only know[s], that both the simple and the non-simple speak the same [language]” (LMS, 1830, 2: 94).

This is the first reference to populist-Serbian concept of Vuk St. Karadžić and his associates. They opted for basing the Serbian language and national identity on the linguistic and cultural practices of the “simple” people. Yet, Hadžić (the ‘Serb’) finds it pointless to put them in opposition to each other. Instead, he claims that it is preferable to call it the “common” and not the “simple language” to avoid ambiguities with respect to the “particular [language], which only some people are talking” (ibid.).

This strategy of obtaining linguistic unity is a manifestation of the purist ideology of monoglossia. Following Hadžić, only one socially defined linguistic variety can form the vantage-point for the construction of a supranational language, and thus also define the moral or cultural contents of the nation. Yet, it is not expressing the ideology of mono-origin, while it is wholesale, i.e., indiscriminately including all the (Serbian, Russian, Church Slavonic, Hungarian, German, Greek etc.) lexical resources it contains. In defence of this argument, Hadžić constructs the ideologised picture that the entire scope of the Serbian people (“both the simple and the non-simple,”

---

80 „Зашто обштегъ, а не простогъ?”
81 „Я не знамъ, шта е простъ езикъ, само знамъ, да онимъ истимъ говори и простъ и непростъ“
82 „одъ особитогъ, коимъ само гдекои говоре“
already speak the same language – regardless of the existence of the empirically observable linguistic practices. These dialects (“the particular [languages]”, ibid.) are discarded as the basis for the common standard language code because of their alleged particularity and impurity. In an expression of elitist purism, Hadžić is thus elevating his own more elaborate social variety to fulfil the double function of a supralocal means of communication and of a unifying symbol of the nation.

After this follows a long reasoning about the glosso- and ethnonym Slavonic-Serbian. It reveals the author’s acquaintance with the findings of comparative linguistics which had emerged in the wake of Sir William Jones’ discovery of Sanskrit in 1786 and was being developed by Hadžić’s contemporaries Rasmus Rask (1787–1832), Jacob Grimm (1785–1863), and Franz Bopp (1791–1867) (Harris, 2005: xviii–xix). “But the Serbian language has developed out of Slavonic, that’s why it should be called Slavonic-Serbian”\(^3\) (\textit{LMS}, 1830, 2: 94), says the ‘Slavonic-Serb,’ expressing a typical Enlightenment scriptocentric etymologism or archaising purism (as if the spoken language had developed out of the written and not vice versa). The ‘Slavonic-Serb’ claims that Serbian people “because of the purity ought to return to it [Church Slavonic] like a child to its mother”\(^4\) (ibid.). He is thus implying that Church Slavonic, because of its original purity, must be chosen as the structural basis for the corpus-planning development of the national language. A similar stance had been expressed already in monumental \textit{Istorija} by the archimandrite Jovan Rajić in the 1790s.\(^5\) Yet, the ‘Serb’s’ answer is negative. No, he says, even if Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and French have developed out of Latin, and German, Dutch, Danish, and Swedish originate from Germanic, “and in all those languages there are remaining words from the root-language until the present”\(^6\) (\textit{LMS}, 1830, 2: 95), these languages are not called ‘Latino-Italian’ or ‘Germanic-Swedish.’ Furthermore

\(^{3}\)“Али Србски е езикъ постао одъ Славенскогъ, дакле треба, да се зове славеносербски”

\(^{4}\)“и да се нѣму збогъ чистоте као дете къ матери враћа.”

\(^{5}\)Rajić had, in his historiographical work \textit{Исторія разныхъ славенскихъ народовъ, наипаче Болгарь, Хорватовъ и Сербовъ} (‘The History of the various Slavic Peoples, especially of Bulgars, Croats, and Serbs’, 1794), written that the Church Slavonic language had preserved its pristine purity in Russia „тако, якоже и вода во Источници своемъ всегда чиста есть“ [“just like the water is always purer in its Source”] (Rajić, 1794: 45).

\(^{6}\)“у свимъ овимъ езицима има и дань данашњи доста изъ кореногъ езика заостали речи”
The quote brings forth the sharp ideological dividing-line between the Slavonic-Serbian and the civil-Serbian concept of language and national identity. Hadžić is now approaching the harshly contested status-planning question as to which social variety (sociolect) shall form the basis of the common language of the nation about to be constructed. The question is controversial not least because of its link to the privileged cultural, social, and economic positions – and the identity of the group to which the author himself belongs. The common language must be based on the spoken variety of the educated elite of Vojvodina (in the Ekavian spirit of the Šumadija-Vojvodina dialect), and not on “some dialect” which “can seldom be perfectly pure” (LMS, 1830, 2: 95). Purity and purist arguments are thus at the core of the dispute. Furthermore, this seems to be an implicit reaction to the qualities that Romanticist language ideologues, such as Karadžić, ascribed to the rural dialects as somehow purer than city speech and as the true repository of the ‘Soul’ or identity of the People. Hadžić’s attitude to the Church Slavonic linguistic patrimony is expressed in the assertion that Slavonicisms shall be “rejected or refined” (LMS, 1830, 2: 95); they ought to be elaborated and adapted to the word-formation patterns of the contemporary living language practices of the educated elite of the Serbian speech-community.

Consequently, the conversation now gradually bleeds into the purism question as to which lexical resources shall have right of residence in the “common [national] language” (LMS, 1830, 2: 95), i.e., the function as foreign or domestic sources of lexical enrichment in the course of the elaboration of the functions or vocabulary development of the standard language code. The ‘Slavonic-Serb’ asks: “Accordingly, we also have to retain some or another Turkish word?” (LMS, 1830, 2: 95). Yes, of course, the ‘Serb’ answers. Because “who will now from the mouth of the people throw away these words: аманетъ ['pledge'], амбаръ ['barn'], киша ['rain'], љакъ ['sack'], љепъ ['pocket'], дућанъ ['shop'], кантаръ ['scale'], пенџеръ ['window'], ибришимъ ['silk thread’], and many other?” (ibid.). The approach is descriptivist in the sense that the author realises that it is beyond the reach of the language planners to – in a patronising and prescriptivist manner – dictate to people how to speak their own language. On the contrary, he adds,

зная, да е сваки неотесанъ, или, као што ти велишъ, простъ езикъ силніи одъ изображеногъ. А сила е тако езику нуждна, да се са изображенияма успоредити може, као и богатство, ясность, окретность, благогласіе, и друга свойства (LMS, 1830, 2: 96)

[you must know, that every rough, or, as you say, simple language, is stronger than the elaborate. And strength is as necessary for a language to be able to compete with the elaborate [languages], as is wealth, clarity, agility, euphony, and other features.]

Hadžić is thus representing what might be called a purist ideology of pluri-origin and actually an “ethnographic purism” (Thomas 1991: 72) when it
comes to the process of lexical enrichment. This is reminiscent of the later definitions of a standard language made by the Prague School of Linguistics in the 1920s–30s in characterising the “common language” as ideally possessing “agility” (‘flexible stability’) and “wealth” (‘polyvalence’) (Vuković, 2015). The vocabulary of the “rough language” (LMS, 1830, 2: 96) will thus provide the vital saps to the body (corpus) of the elaborate standard language code.

The last corpus-planning issue to be touched upon in the conversation between the Slavonic-Serb and the Serb is that of graphisation, i.e., how the sounds of the common language shall be rendered graphically. It appears to be a direct response to the reforms of the Serbian Cyrillic script that Sava Mrkalj had proposed in his The Fat of the thick Yer, i.e., Alphabet Reshuffling (1810) and Vuk St. Karadžić had later developed in his “A Grammar […]” (1814) and “The Serbian Dictionary […]” (1818) which will be discussed later in this chapter. Yet, here Hadžić’s disdainfully ironic tone seems to reveal a stronger emotional charge. Now that “Turkish word[s]” are to be an integrate part of the literary language, how will they then be rendered graphically? The Slavonic-Serb remarks that “we have not got letters for the foreign words”87 (LMS, 1830, 2: 96). The ‘Serb’s’ answer is categorical (and clearly addressing the reforms of Mrkalj-Karadžić):

Ми ћемосе съ овимъ служити, коя већъ имамо; еръ неможемо ми едни азбуку имати, кою нишко нема, а коя се само по глави гдекои безпослени Азбукопротресателя и писменопремещателя меше (LMS, 1830, 2: 96).

[We will utilise the ones we already have, because we alone cannot have a script that no one else has, and which is just prying in the head of some good-for-nothing Alphabet-reshuffler and letter-dislocator.]

The more implicit rationale is that a reform of the Serbian Cyrillic script would entail an isolation from and communicative obstacle in relation to all other Slavic-Orthodox language-communities using the Cyrillic script (i.e., in the first place the Russians). The more implicit, and unvoiced, rationale is the apprehension that this would imply both a diachronic breach with the cultural traditions of the educated Vojvodina Serbs (and the Orthodox Church representing them) and a synchronic breach with the politically important Russians.

In the following third volume of Serbske lětopisi (LMS, 1830, 3: 39–52), Hadžić takes the bold decision to publish the sharply critical article “A review of ‘A conversation between a Slavonic-Serb and a Serb’”88 by Vasilije Cernački. The article is written in a heavily Slavonicised language which incarnates both Cernački’s linguistic ideology and his sociocultural position.

Cernački rejects virtually all the status-, corpus-, and acquisition-planning propositions made in Hadžić’s parable (apart from the ‘Serb’s’ intention to

---

87 “за туђе рехи немамо писмена”
88 „Разсмотрение ’Разговора измедь Славеносербина и Сербина’”
introduce Slavonicisms into the vernacular). He develops a radically etymologist language policy in which he envisions a return to the pure origin of the Church Slavonic language as the literary model and sole source of lexical enrichment and dismisses any attempts to retain foreign (‘Turkish’) lexical items.

Furthermore, he proves, through exhaustive etymological explanations that many of the words Hadžić calls ‘Turkish’ as matter of fact are of Arabic, Persian, or even Slavonic origin, and accuses him of not even knowing his own Serbian language (a criticism he and his kindred spirits would later also be submitted to by Vuk St. Karadžić, cf. ch. 6).

Cernački’s language ideology reflects to a large extent the Enlightenment elitist, prescriptivist, and diachronic paradigm. In accordance with this paradigm, he is expressing both the ideology of mono-origin and the ideology of monoglossia and an “archaising”, “elitist”, and general “xenophobic purism” (Thomas, 1991: 76–81) on both the structural and lexical level. The standard language code ought to be based on a strongly Slavonicised version of the written language of the educated elite (on the level of status planning) which is to be purged from all foreign influences (on the level of corpus planning) and prescribed to the “simple people” (on the level of acquisition planning). The popular masses must be elevated to the level of the educated elite and not the other way around.

In contrast to the Romanticist language ideologues (such as Karadžić and partly Hadžić) he does not ascribe any role whatsoever to the ‘simple people’ and its language. The true repository of homogeneity, sameness, or identity is, on the contrary, to be found in the unpolluted source of the Church Slavonic language. Cernački’s language ideology is succinctly expressed in the following excerpt:

Ако е сербскии нашъ єзыкъ кромѣ естественаго нужднаго на то измѣненія чужимъ влияніемъ у самомъ свомъ существу примѣтно помаранъ , собственымъ запущеніемъ пренебрежень: церковныи напротивъ чужими преписателми нѣчто измѣненъ; то є онъ іоштъ паче (пояче) свію други славяна наиближіи, и познае себе у нѣму као у своей свойствености, о нѣму може као на единомъ основанію своєго єзыка расуждавати безъ помощи чужи єзыка: будући да церковный чистъ себи самомъ основанъ є и у существу своме неповрежденъ (LMS, 1830, 3: 42).

If our Serbian language, apart from the naturally necessary, is noticeably corrupted by this transformation through foreign influence in its very essence, neglected by its own disregard: the church [language], on the contrary, is by no means corrupted by foreign ascriptions; but it is furthermore (moreover) closest to all other Slavs and [they] recognise [themselves] in it as in their own inherent character, it is possible to
reason about it as the single base of their language without the help of a foreign language, given that the pure church [language] is founded on itself and is undamaged in its essence.]

“[O]ur Serbian language” (ibid.) can thus not provide the base for the literary language because of being “noticeably corrupted by this transformation through foreign influence in its very essence” and “neglected by its own disregard” (ibid.). He is referring to the fact that the unbridled vernaculars are bristling with foreign (Turkish, Arabic, Persian, and German) and thus impure lexical items. The popular language is, according to him, too simple and unelaborate to perform the role of a common literary language.

И того ради ако мы Сербскойъ языкъ и хотѣли би звать общимъ то онъ къ таковой всегда остает простъ будучи € по существу такией, къ ученый языкъ кать бы га свиняръ научио и говорио небы зато быо свинярскіи но учень, слѣдователно сербский языкъ какавъ € садъ ни € само простъ него и грђе нежели простъ (LMS, 1830, 3: 44–5).

[And for that reason, even if we would like to call Serbian the common language, it will as such still always remain simple given that it is such in its essence, as a learned language if a swineherd would learn and speak it would not because of that be swineherdly but learned, consequently the Serbian language, as it is now, is not just simple, it is worse than simple.]

He wants the Serbs to rid themselves of all Turkish word-formation morphemes (i.e., “-luk” as in “bezobrazluk” [‘effrontary’]) and substitute them with Slavonic (i.e., “-ie”, as in “bezobrazic”) and asks the reading audience: “Is it not thus better to remember the forgotten [words], and restore [them], than to coin new ones, and stick to those Turkish, as a token of our former, vile slavery?”

89 (LMS, 1830, 3: 44–5).

For many representatives of the Vojvodina intelligentsia, the period of Ottoman rule over Serbia, from the late 15th to the early nineteenth century, performed the role of negatively defining internal Other in the discursive construction of a modern Serbian national identity. All cultural practices associated with the oriental ‘Turks’ were demonised as foreign, impure, and retrograde in a self-denyng process that could be characterised as auto-Orientalism (Said, 1978). This also formed part of the societal elites’ efforts to extricate the nation from the language and cultural identity of what they to a growing degree perceived as the Ottoman colonial power.90

Cernački, in an expression of targeted anti-Italian purism, also claims that the Serbian vernaculars are corrupted by the influence of foreign models of inflection. He is curiously enough locating the source of the corruption of the

89 „Ни е ли болѣ забвена воспомянути, и востановити, нежели нова ковати, или придержатисе таковы турски, въ знакъ бывшаго подлаго робства."

90 This elitist project of ‘de-orientalisation’ from the nineteenth century and up to the present has been thoroughly described by Friedman (2005). For a discussion on the ‘foreignness’ or ‘ourness’ of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan context, cf. Todorova (1997/2009) and Darke (2022).
Serbian past participles in masculinum singular, ending in “-o” (“видио, стао, зріо”), in the “Italian verb ending in o, o stao, veduo, parlao, guardao, in Tuscan ho stato, veduto, parlato, guardato [which are used] instead of види́ль, ста́ль, зрі́ль, гледа́ль which are characterising their own language” (LMS, 1830, 3: 45). Needless to say, perhaps there are no empirically attestable scientific proofs for his speculations. According to Cernački, these purportedly foreign inflectional models pose a threat to the purity of the Serbian language as it is distancing it from the pure source of the original Church Slavonic language.

In line with the Slavonic-Serbian concept of language and national identity, which Cernački is representing, and the purist ideology of monoglossia, mono-origin, and general xenophobia, the Serbs must return to their Church Slavonic ethno-linguistic origin. This status-planning choice of base for the corpus-planning elaboration of their national standard language code, would, according to Cernački, imply being true to one’s own pure and primordial identity, which has been preserved from all foreign influences in the Church Slavonic language. According to him, with this infinitely rich source of linguistic resuscitation, the Serbs cannot just rediscover their own “inherent character” (LMS, 1830, 3: 42), but also their deep unity (or identity) with all the other Slavs (not least the politically important Russians).

4.1.2 ‘According to the Spirit of Our Language’ or ‘According to the Spirit of Our Simple People’

The last four texts to be analysed in this chapter form part of one of the most dramatic debates on Serbian language and national identity of the entire national revival. It is a clash between the civil-Serbian and the populist-Serbian concept of language and national identity represented by the two discourse participants, Jovan Hadžić and Vuk St. Karadžić. At the heart of the polemic was a complex of heavily contested questions concerning both status and corpus planning, which had a direct bearing on the ideological interests of the two different social groups Hadžić and Karadžić spoke for.

The first question concerned the status-planning choice of exactly which social variety or group of varieties should provide the base for the corpus-planning development of a national standard language code. Was this status to be given to the linguistic practices of the “upper class” or to those of the “the simple class of our people” (Jovanović, 2002: 24)? In contrast to the Slavonic-Serbian concept, Hadžić and Karadžić actually agreed on basing

91 „Италско оконченіе глагола на о, о stao, veduo, parlao, guardao, тошкански ho stato, veduto, parlato, guardato […] мѣсто свомь езыку свойственаго види́ль, ста́ль, зрі́ль, гледа́ль.”
92 „више класе […] просте класе нашег народа“.
the future standard language code on some contemporary spoken and/or written variety or group of varieties.

The second question concerned the corpus-planning process of codifying the normative rules of the supranational language. Was the norm-giving grammar going to be written according to ‘the spirit of the language’ of the educated elite and its etymological rootedness in the Church Slavonic of the past or according to the spirit of our simple people as it manifested itself in synchronic linguistic practices of the popular masses? The conflict concerned not least the role of Church Slavonic phonological, morphological, syntactical, phonetical, and semantical models in the codification of the contemporary standard language code.

The third major question is largely a corollary to the second. It concerned the corpus-planning issues of developing a polyvalent terminology for all the functional domains of a modern society. Which sources of lexical enrichment were going to be addressed in the process of constructing a modern vocabulary for the national language code? Both Hadžić and Karadžić represent a purist ideology of pluri-origin, but disagreed harshly, as above, upon the social base for these multiple lexical resources. Were the linguistic nation-builders going to take recourse to the resources offered by the developed literary language of the urban educated elite or rely entirely on the vocabulary and word-formation resources of the rural varieties of popular language? Not least contested was–again–the role of the Church Slavonic literary patrimony and the social, political, and cultural interests it represented.

The polemic was initiated by Hadžić’s tiny pamphlet “Philological Bagatelles”93 (Novi Sad, 1837) and subsequently republished in Serbske lětopisi (LMS, 1838, 4: 83–96). In response, Karadžić published his pamphlet “A Reply to Mister J. Hadžić’s = M. Svetić’s Philological Bagatelles”94 (Vienna, 1839) which in turn was followed by Hadžić’s “Counter-Attack or A Reply to the Reply to ‘Philological Bagatelles’”95 (Novi Sad, March, 1839), Karadžić’s “Vuk’s Reply to Mr. M. Svetić’s Counter-Attack” (Vienna, 1843), and Hadžić’s “Counter-Attack II or a Response to Vuk’s Response, to the Lies and Vilification in the Serbian Herald”96 (Belgrade, 1844). Finally the last three contributions to the polemic, Karadžić’s and Sava Tekelija’s “Letters to the most reverent Mr. Platon Atanacković”97 (Vienna, 1845),
Hadžić’s “A Philological Counter-Attack III”⁹⁸ (Novi Sad, 1846) and Đuro Daničić’s “The War for Serbian Language and Orthography”, are books in their own right and I will, as the focus of this thesis are periodicals, exclude them from this study.

The debate was, as the headlines reveal, confrontative, sharply affrontive, and filled with low blows, in a way that only reinforces the fact that it did not touch upon language alone but on peoples’ sense of self-esteem and/or identity. It formed a pivotal part in the discursive construction of collective identities which served the social and cultural interests the two protagonists represented. Contemporaneously, it concerned “what they [thought] they [were], and who or what the [aspired] to be” (Mackridge, 2009: 10). Karadžić, as Aleksandar Mladenović laconically puts it, “did not always use just scientific, philological arguments in his struggle for the reform of the literary language”⁹⁹ (Mladenović, 1989: 144). The debate culminated in the mythologised annus mirabilis of 1847, when Karadžić printed his translation of the New Testament, based on his New-Štokavian folkloric koine (cf. Brozović, 1970: 113) and Đuro Daničić published his essay “The War for Serbian Language and Orthography.”

The ‘Philological-Bagatelles Debate’ of 1837–47 constituted an essential part of the last protracted breath of the efforts of Hadžić and his associates to establish the spoken varieties of the Vojvodina cultural elites as the base and arbiter for the evolving literary language, on the one hand, and as the source and symbol of national pride and identification on the other. In 1847, new generations, moulded by the spirit of Romanticism, had been born and the epicentre of Serbian cultural, economic, and social life was with a constantly growing gravitation more and more concentrated in the capital of the principality, Belgrade. Towards the revolutionary middle of the nineteenth century, the populist-Serbian concept of language and national identity had almost entirely taken hold of the minds of the ideological classes of Serbian society. Furthermore, distancing themselves from the Vojvodinian intelligentsia, and their cultural identity, served the ideological interests of the ruling elite in the young principality. As Mladenović (1989: 157) asserts, however, the contemporary Serbian language can be seen as a merger of the Slavonic-Serbian tradition and the linguistic concept of Vuk St. Karadžić. This fact was for ideological reasons made invisible or even demonised already from the mid-nineteenth century in the wake of the establishment of closer relations with the Illyrianists and the beginning of the efforts to construct a language-based Yugoslav nation.

Hadžić’s article “Philological Bagatelles” from 1837 is introduced by the Latin quote Adde parum modico! (‘Add a bit more to the little [that has al-

⁹⁸ „Утукъ ІІІ єзыкословный. О єзыку и правопису Србскомъ“.
⁹⁹ „Вук није увек употребљавао само научне, филолошке аргументе […] у својој борби за књижевнојезичку реформу“.
ready been said]!” and separated into two parts. The first part has the heading “To the Serbian Grammarians” and contains Hadžić’s ‘etymologist’ linguistic ideology concerning, in the first place, the corpus-planning issue of the codification of the form (through the writing of grammars) of the nascent national standard variety. The second part is headlined “Кнезъ, князъ, законъ” (‘Village elder, prince, law’) and has the function of giving firm backing to the linguistic ideology or “philosophy” of the first part in the form of substantial etymological evidence. Hadžić is apparently under the strong influence of the theories and reconstructionist quest for correspondences of the then modern paradigm of comparative-historical linguistics.

Hadžić seems to be mobilising his entire high-cultural capital to render his argumentation trustworthy and initiates “To the Serbian Grammarians” with a quote from “Probe russicher Annalen” (1768) by the German historian August Ludwig von Schlözer (1735–1809) on the importance of a thorough understanding of the true theoretical foundations of historiography before facing the task of writing history. The quote is referring to the lack of these theoretical foundations in the field of Russian history writing and ends with the assertion: “that is why I consider it fortunate, that so little has hitherto been written on older Russian history” (LMS, 1838, 4: 84). Thus, Russian historians have avoided building a historiographic tradition on the weak foundations of fatal misconceptions.

Now Hadžić is directly addressing all potential Serbian grammarians, saying:

[According to this, I would freely dare to say: that it is fortunate for the Serbian language, that the Serbs still have no complete and systematically written Grammar, or rather that they are convinced, that they have not got such; and it will be an even greater fortune, if they will not make systems without a preliminary proper investigation and examination of different subjects of the language and the Grammar, without which [...] it is impossible rationally to conceptualise a Grammar of the Serbian language in its full and total amplitudes.]

Like his elder contemporary Wilhelm von Humboldt, Hadžić seems to be sharing the prescriptivist view that languages have a life of their own – a true and essential nature. This essence can, moreover, be corrupted by erroneous popular usages, i.e., because of people being led astray by misconceived

---

100 I want to express my gratitude to Tuomo Nuorluoto and Axel Hörstedt for their advice in translating this Latin quote.
101 „то и као за срећу неку држимъ, што је досадъ у старой русккой Исторіи тако мало писано“. 
grammar books, which they, being illiterate, alas could not read. Following Hadžić, it is the task of learned societies to stem the tide of rampant linguistic corruption and reinstall the proper order by writing grammars based on the ‘true’ and ‘essential’ nature of that language. In order not to further entrench habitual misconceptions

за времена валя добро мотрити , шта је на природи љезика основан, шта ли не, и тако дуго и основано судити и размисляти, пре, него се правило како у љезику осне и као стаљо и истинито призна. Споро и сь великим натегом и читава ученя дружства успеваю против узаконѣны и уобычаєены погрешака у љезику (LMS, 1838, 4: 85).

[it is useful to thoroughly and in advance observe, what is founded in the nature of the language, and what is not, and thus at length and on good grounds judge and ponder, before one establishes any rule in the language and acknowledges it as constant and true. And slowly and with great effort entire learned societies succeed against established and habitual mistakes in language.]

The German language can, in this respect, count itself fortunate, he adds, that J.C. Gottsched (1700–66) and J.C. Adelung (1732–1806) in due time became members of the Die Berlinische Gesellschaft für deutsche Sprache. Hadžić then highlights the entire grammatical tradition of the “Serbs of the Western Church”102 (LMS, 1838, 4: 85) as a warning example of this reiteration of bad linguistic habits. If it would not have been for the misconceived system handed down through the grammatical tradition of the Dizionario italiano-latino-ilirico (1728) by Ardelio della Bella, the Nova slavonska i nimačka gramatika (1767) by Matija Antun Reljković, the Slawonisches Wörterbuch (1778) by Marijan Lanosović, and the Ričoslovnik iliričkoga, italijanskoga i nimačkoga jezika (1803) by Josip Voltiggi, “so many mistakes of the language of the Serbs of the Western Church would hardly have prowled into their books”103 (ibid.). Yet, then he throws in the firebrand that would provoke the strong reaction of Vuk St. Karadžić and thus kindle the whole polemic.

Although seemingly focused on nominal inflection, it contemporaneously had emotionally charged questions of collective, cultural, and national identity at its heart. ‘On whose linguistic and cultural practices are we going to base our collective Self?’ was the implicit question which comprised a clash between the civil-Serbian and the populist-Serbian concept of language and national identity. It was also in part a conflict between Enlightenment etymologist or diachronic and Romanticist synchronic grammatical and purist thinking. Yet, as has already become evident, the two debaters both principally cherished a predominantly synchronic perspective on the foundations for both status and corpus planning.

102 „Србяля западне цркве“. Hadžić is referring to the Catholic speakers of new-Štokavian, i.e., the Croats.
103 „тежко бы се толико погрешака у љезику Србяля западне цркве у њове књиге увукло“
Hadžić claims that the subsequent link in the grammatical-lexicographic tradition of the “Serbs of the Western Church”, Ignjat Alojzije Brlić (1795–1855), would not have been mistaken concerning a number of inflectional morphemes for masculine nouns in his *Grammatik der Illyrischen Sprache* (‘Grammar of the Illyrian Language’, 1833), if he would not have reiterated what Karadžić had wrongly (and against the ‘nature’ of the Serbian language) stated in his *Grammar of the Serbian Language* (1818). It is, according to Hadžić, an eloquent example of the fact “that grammatical systems without a preliminary thorough investigation of the spirit of the language, brings more harm than benefit” (*LMS*, 1838, 4: 86). The spoken language “in all its aspects of usage” (*LMS*, 1838, 4: 87) will still provide the point of departure of the rulebook for the communal linguistic behaviour (the normative grammar) of the Serbian people. Yet, this step cannot be taken before the wrongs and rights of this language have been painstakingly examined and corrected. Only then, provided with “the key to the general Philosophy of the language” (*LMS*, 1838, 4: 86), will it be possible to construct a stable and enduring grammar. This “key” is according to Hadžić, to a large extent provided by what he represents as the pure grammatical models of the Church Slavonic language.

Vuk St. Karadžić initiates his sixteen-pages long, ironic and emphatically polemic “A Reply to ‘Philological Bagatelles’” by accusing Hadžić of being incapable of telling the difference between person and thing, or, rather, “book and writer” (Karadžić, 1839: 3), and ends it by offensively calling him a “bodger and a charlatan” (ibid., p. 19). His somewhat apologetical response to Hadžić’s accusation of having contributed to the grammatical misconceptions of the dictionary of Brlić, is that “Vuk has in his Grammar from 1818 said as much as he knew then” (Karadžić, 1839: 7) but has thoroughly revised it in his own journal “Danica” (‘Morningstar’) from 1828. ‘Every rose has its thorns,’ he seems to be implying. Karadžić supports his arguments with a mixture of references to authorities such as Kopitar, Šafárik, and Jacob Grimm (concerning Hadžić’s etymological speculations in “Кнезъ, князъ, законъ” ['village elder,' ‘prince,’ ‘law’ or ‘creed’]) and empiric observations of the contemporary language practices in the South Slavic linguistic area. That is exactly what characterises the conflicting ideological concepts which are represented by Hadžić and Karadžić.

---

104 Brlić and Hadžić are probably referring to the edition of 1824 which was printed in Leipzig and furnished with a preface by the famous German grammarian and folklorist Jacob Grimm.
105 „системе Грамматически безъ предварителногъ основаногъ испытана духа єзыка выше штете него ползе приносе“.
106 „у свима отношениямъ употребления сматрати“.
107 „ключь обитый Филосфіе єзыка“.
108 „книге од списатеља“
109 „фушер и шарлатан“
110 „Вук је 1818. год. у својој Грамматици онако казао, као што је онда знао“.
Hadžić bases his purist arguments on continuity and rootedness in the continuous past of both the language and the educated community using it. Karadžić, on the other hand, supports his purist argumentation almost entirely with the synchronically observable linguistic practices of the uneducated Serbian peasantry. They are, in accordance with his Romanticist mindset, the true repository of the pure identity and ‘Soul of the People’ and thereby also the only valid arbiter in questions of language and national identity.

The seemingly harmless self-narrative of Karadžić humbly listening to that ‘which is in the people,’ whom he, on linguistic grounds, defines as Serbs, and compiling his findings in the form of collections of folksongs, grammars, and dictionaries etc. is of course a myth. It is a myth which conceals the fact that he was actually – following his beliefs – by means of language discursively constructing a concept of peoplehood or inventing a nation “where it did not exist” (Gellner, 1964: 169). It is an example of ideology as “distortion, illusion, error, mystification, or rationalization” (Woolard, 1998: 7).

Karadžić concludes that Hadžić causes more harm than benefit to the process of elaborating a normative grammar for the national language code, and that

только погрешек учинил, да му е све дело од них шарено, как говор човека, који бунца, па рекне по коју ријеч паметно, па онда што лудо и наопако (Karadžić, 1839: 9)

[he has done so many mistakes, that his entire work is mottled with them, as the speech of a person who is raving, and he says one or another wise word, and then something foolish and wrong].

To corroborate his thesis, Karadžić turns to the inconsistent literary practice of Hadžić, who gives advice to the future grammarians of the Serbian language. In addition, he was a renowned poet (under the pseudonym of Miloš Svetić). Karadžić analyses the vernacularised, but not yet standardised Slavonic-Serbian language of Hadžić’s short poem “My Muse”, in which, he ironically remarks, “if the muses were on his side, the language ought to be correct, pure, and sweet”111 (Karadžić, 1839: 11–12). Yet, alas, it is not. Thus, Karadžić makes explicit reference to the concept of purity in language. He points at a huge number of orthographical and morphological inconsistencies (“сообщавамъ“ versus “сообщити“, “Немачкой“ versus “Немачкій“ etc.), not least when it comes to the choice of “the main difference [...] in our language in the pronunciation of these syllables, which in the Slavonic languages is written with the letter ‘ѣ’”112 (Karadžić, 1839: 13).

He (ibid.) separates “our language into (1) the Eastern, (2) the Southern, and (3) the Western dialect and is thus pre-empting the still conventionally used

111 „да музе с њиме раде, ваљало би, да је језик правилан, чист и сладак.“
112 „главна је разлика у језику нашему у изговарању онијех слогова, који се у Славенском језику пише са словом ћ.“
separation of the new-Štokavian dialect area into the Ekavian, Ijekavian, and Ikavaian subareas. Karadžić adduces a great number of empirically attested emblematic differences between these dialect areas and concludes

[Now, when we know these differences in our language, we can say, that Mr. Svetić has it wrong, to in these bagatelles write not just, for instance већь according to the Eastern dialect, дѣло according to the Southern, and годи according to the Western, but even one single word in two different ways, for instance, старонѣмачко according to the Southern, and немачкий according to the Eastern!]

Karadžić’s arbiter in questions of pure or impure, right or wrong, correct or incorrect, and good or bad in language is thus exclusively the living linguistic practices of popular masses. In front of this, Hadžić (and the sociocultural and discursive position he represented) was not surprisingly doomed to be bereaved all traces of competence and value. The final judgement is unequivocal:

Hadžić’s reply was virtually instantaneous. The “Counter-Attack or A Reply to the Reply to ‘Philological Bagatelles’” was published in March 1839 and was furnished with the motto “Quoth the owl to the tit: You big-headed good-for-nothing!”113 (Hadžić, 1839: 2) with an obvious address to Vuk St. Karadžić. Hadžić is furious and offended to the bottom of his professional honour and calls Karadžić “a malicious brat”114 (ibid., p. 4). Hadžić repeats that his main purpose is to thoroughly scrutinise and examine the living language before its normative rules become codified in the form an authoritative grammar given that the codified mistakes bring greater harm to the language than the uncodified. He asks whether Karadžić agrees or whether his only errand is to “blaspheme, disparage, and scold” (ibid., p. 5). What he does not seem to fathom is that, according to the Romanticist linguistic ideology of Karadžić, nothing in the uncodified rules of the linguistic practices of the popular masses can per definition be wrong. The ‘Soul of our simple People’, in these views is the embodiment and epitome of the supreme au-

113 “Рекла сова сѣници: Угурсузе главатый!”
114 „пакостно дериште“.
thority in language. Only their linguistic practices can harbour and express the pure identity of the Serbian people.

They are talking past each other. Hadžić’s rigid prescriptivism, according to which the spirit of our language is the utmost arbiter in language, to which people must adapt, collides with Karadžić’s ideologised descriptivism, according to which the ‘Soul of the simple people’ is the supreme dictate, and divine principal, which expresses itself in every single particularity of the linguistic practices of the very same simple people.

Овде га опетъ морамъ опоменути, да не бы по свом ъ обычаю са мыслима зашто и изгубио се, да у горе наведеним’ примѣрям немысли се, да се онако неговори, него да оно правило или изятіе у ономе виду поставлѣно и онако основано, као правило или изятие нашта невали, кој онъ као тобоже Грамматикъ и филологъ вазяло бы да є досадъ научіо. Јеръ каково є то бѣдно Гррамматическое опредѣленіе са „ђекоја, и млога друга, и која се ријетко чују?“, - Види ли и разуме ли онъ то? (Hadžić, 1839: 11)

[Here I have to remind him again, that he would not, as is his wont, be carried away by his thought and get lost, that the above mentioned examples do not refer to [the fact] that people do not talk like that, but to [to the fact] that a rule or an exception put in that form, and thus motivated, as a rule or an exception is totally worthless, which he, as an alleged Grammarian and philologist ought to have learnt by now. Because what kind of a poor Grammatical definition is that: “some, and many others, and which is seldom heard?”; - Does he see and understand that?]

What this quote illustrates is exactly the differences in the language ideologies of Hadžić and Karadžić, i.e., whether the linguistic behaviour of the nation is going to be guided by the principle of the ‘spirit of our language’ or by the supreme authority of the ‘spirit of our simple people.’ For Hadžić the guiding principle must be the rules, which a learned society can etymologically reconstruct out the ‘spirit of our language’, while for Karadžić the sole valid ideological dictate is the empirically observable linguistic behaviour or usage of the simple people, i.e., that which is empirically attestable (the rules synthesised out of the first-hand linguistic material Karadžić had salvaged throughout the South-Slavic language area). “The difference between us in this matter”, Hadžić asserts, is that “he [Karadžić] has only collected and listed; and I have, apart from that, evaluated, discerned, concluded, defined, and differentiated the meanings” (Hadžić, 1839: 13).

Hadžić, in a misogynist key, discards Karadžić’s criticism of his etymological speculations in “Кнезъ, князъ, законъ” as the words of “a person who is dreaming and raving like a feverish gran” (Hadžić, 1839: 16), and by stating that his criticism of the linguistic inadequacies of Hadžić’s poem “My Muses” “has not shown anything else then that he [Vuk] is more weak-

---

115 „разлика је између нас у ономь послу ова: Онь је само скупіо и изброю; а я самь осимь тога судіо, разбираво, доводио, значения опредѣлявао и разликао."
116 „village elder, prince, law [or creed]”
117 „човека, кои саня и бушца као баба у болести.”
minded and ruder the rudest [female] greengrocer in Vienna”\(^{118}\) (ibid., p. 18). The inconsistencies of the language Hadžić’s poem are, furthermore, largely due to errors committed by the typesetters and printers. According to Hadžić, however, Karadžić is just acting like a fault-finding child who receives a penny for each fault he can specify.

The inconsistent and impure usage of forms from the three major dialects of the Neo-Štokavian linguistic area (defined by the differences in the phonetic realisation of the Slavonic letter <ѣ>), Hadžić claims, is a consequence of a language-political choice. His ideological rationales are to a great extent democratic. He does not want (1) to give precedence to any of the dialects of the developing standard language code in his writings: “yet, because of this no dialect is still neither defined, nor has been given precedence over the others”\(^{119}\) (Hadžić, 1839: 19). Furthermore, he (perceptively) (2) states that most dialects, due to the “conflicts and migrations” in the region, have not preserved their alleged original purity, but “that a simple person often interlards his speech with some words from another dialect”\(^{120}\) (ibid., pp. 19–20). This is “heard in the folksongs” and of no “grammatical importance” (ibid., p. 20) for Hadžić. That is exactly what the great Homer did in his immortal “Ulysses” and “The Iliad” and he “did not write less Greek, than the other Greek writers, because he was mixing the Greek dialects”\(^{121}\) (ibid.).

Jovan Hadžić starts to ‘play on Vuk’s half of the pitch and discards Karadžić’s arguments with empirically attested pieces of evidence, adding that “this evidence is referred to for him [Vuk] who is just seeing and hearing, but is incapable of thinking about the matter and evaluating [it]’\(^{122}\) (Hadžić, 1839: 23). Thus, he is once again enhancing the paradigmatic divide in their respective linguistic ideologies and language policies.

Hadžić has the impression that the entire Serbian language is the private domain of Karadžić, it is as if “he [Karadžić] has occupied the whole Serbian language, or he has eaten it with a spoon, and there is nothing more left for the rest of us”\(^{123}\) (ibid., p. 24). Yet, according to Hadžić, he is essentially nothing but a fraud who is adorning himself with borrowed plumes and capitalising on the work of others. Hadžić notes that first part of Karadžić’s “A

\(^{118}\) “ништа друго показао ниє, но да є онъ краткоумніи и безобразніи одь найбезобразніє пиларите Бечке.”

\(^{119}\) “опетъ, юшъ ни єдно нарѣчиє зато нити є одређено, нити є првенсзтво надъ другимъ добило.”

\(^{120}\) “размѣрице и премѣстице […] єданъ простъ човекъ нѣке рѣчи изъ другогъ нарѣчиия чество у разговоръ мѣша”.

\(^{121}\) “нити є Омиръ зато, што є нарѣчія грчка мѣшао, манѣ грчки писао, него остали списателы грчки”.

\(^{122}\) “Ово є доказательство наведено за нѣга, кои само види и чує, и мыслити о ствари и судити неуме.”

\(^{123}\) “да є онъ савъ Србскій єзыкъ закупио, или га є кашикомъ покусао, па за друге ништа ни остало”.
Small Slavonic-Serbian Song-Book in the Vernacular” (1815) consisted of a refrain of the poet Sima Milutinović Sarajlija (1791–1847), while the “Serbian Dictionary” (1818) was predominantly the work of his Viennese mentor Jernej Kopitar. The same goes for the attached extended and commented edition of his “Grammar”, which Karadžić, following Hadžić, in the German translation of Dimitrije Tirol (1793–1857), has succeeded to sell “as his own stock” to Jacob Grimm and the German-American writer, linguist and translator Therese von Jacob, known as Talvij (1797–1870). Hadžić, moreover claims that of the six letters which Karadžić has introduced into what he pretends to be his own Serbian orthography, ⟨ђ⟩ is the invention of Mušicki, ⟨ј⟩ is appropriated from the Latin alphabet and ⟨ћ⟩ is taken from the Slavonic graphemic inventory.

Accordingly, the entire Romanticist foundations of Karadžić’s linguistic ideology and language policy are philologically worthless and rotten to the very core; “in this [matter] he [Karadžić] is nothing but a collector and an ordinary copyist” (Hadžić, 1839: 27) of the folksongs which priceless value really belongs to the Serbian people (and not to Karadžić). Furthermore, he claims, Karadžić does not know any foreign languages and is totally unskilled when it comes to scholarly endeavours.

This, as well as Hadžić’s concluding verdict, only emphasises the great social and ideological divide between two conflicting conceptualisations of purity, language, and national identity: (1) one evolutionary and elitist, based on the (Rococo, Baroque, Enlightenment, and Pre-Romanticist) cultural and linguistic traditions of the educated elite of Habsburgian Vojvodina and (2) one revolutionary (devolutionary) and populist, based on the Romanticist conceptualisation of the cultural and linguistic (ethnographic) patrimony of the Serbian village. Put differently: Were the norms of the linguistic and cultural behaviour of the Serbian people going to be (1) etymologically reconstructed by a learned society out of the living popular dialects and in dialogue with the literary traditions of its most educated portion, or (2) synthesised entirely out of the ethnographic raw material which was humbly collected throughout the Štokavian linguistic area and presented to the world (in the form of a collections of folk poetry, a grammar, a dictionary, a translation of the New Testament etc.) by Karadžić? Hadžić’s concluding answers to those questions are unequivocal:

Г. Вукъ зна србски говорити и слушао є доста како Србльи говоре србски; али као Грамматикъ мыслити и судити о єзыку и његовима основима нити зна, нити ће икада знати (Hadžić, 1839: 28).

124 „Мала простонародна Славено-Сербска песниарца”.
125 Her full name was Therese Albertine Luise von Jacob Robinson. She translated Karadžić’s “The Folksongs of the Serbs” (“Volkslieder der Serben”) into German in 1826.
126 „онъ у томе ништа друго ниє, него скупитель и обычный преписиватель’.
The unity of the Serbian language and national identity must, thus, according to Hadžić, be reconstructed out of its inherent grammatic rules, and not through relentless idolisation of the haphazard linguistic practices of the uneducated masses, as proposed by his opponent.

Vuk St. Karadžić’s reply was a long time coming. The pamphlet “Vuk’s Reply to Mr. M. Svetić’s Counter-Attack” was not published until 1843. Karadžić methodically dismisses all eight charges made in Hadžić’s “Counter-Attack II”, and soon returns to the epicentre of his linguistic ideology.

He would have done much better and wiser, if he himself had ascertained to learn the spoken language (albeit merely how it is, but for him it is just why it is [like that]) and put it into the writing of any rule (if not for others, at the very least for himself), instead of imposing himself on others as a teacher in a matter which he himself does not know.

This is and would remain the core of the matter: the unquestionable sanctity and superior prerogative of the spoken language over any books of reconstructed rules for linguistic and cultural behaviour. A person who does not know how the ‘Soul of the People’ embodies itself in the oral linguistic practices of the people, has no right to express any opinion in the discourse on purity, language, and national identity. Karadžić’s stance is thus confrontative and dogmatic; he is not willing to approach Hadžić on one single point.

He dismisses Hadžić’s assertion that his main ambition has just been “to collect and list the principal endings of the nouns” and that he is like “that [swimmer] who just swims on the surface of the water”, and succinctly explains the rationale for his methodological approach:

Kad су ријечи скупљене и једнаке с једнакима у редове стављене, ласно је онда наћи значење ономе, који језик иоле зна (Karadžić, 1843: 10).

[When the words are collected and put all similar together into rows, it is then easy to find the meaning for the person who anyhow knows the language.]

In Karadžić’s view, the ‘People’ thus, possesses a sacrosanct linguistic wisdom that overtrumps the limited intellectual faculties of any learned grammarian. “Who of us is now swimming deepest?” Vuk rhetorically asks, implying that he, in contrast to Hadžić, has reached down to the pure source of the ‘Soul of the People’ (and made it surface).

127 Hadžić used the pseudonym Miloš Svetić as a writer.
128 „Који пак од нас двојице дубље плива“.
Then he touches upon an aspect which clearly illustrates one of the weaker spots of his ideological adoration of that which he had or had not “heard either in our people, or nowhere else”\textsuperscript{129} (ibid., pp. 14–15). The criticism concerns the (now standardised) word “позориште” (‘theatre’) which “our literati write, but I have neither until today heard this word in the people, nor the root from which it stems”\textsuperscript{130}. Vuk’s radical “ethnographic purism” (cf. Thomas, 1991) and dogmatic vernacularist approach to the elaboration of the functions (‘lexical modernisation’) of the Serbian literary language implied utilising exclusively lexical items or root morphemes that existed in the living contemporary vernaculars. Accordingly, it was, in this social sense, an expression of the “ideology of mono-origin” (Starčević, Kapović & Sarić, 2019: 320). The rural “civilization of the ‘gunj’ and the ‘opanak’” (cf. p. 114) and its spoken village varieties (and oral poetry and folksongs etc.) had naturally never been prompted to develop the functional domains (culture, education, science, administration, technology, law etc.) of the modern, urban life from which the peasants were set apart. Karadžić generally criticises the use of the suffix “-ište” on the grounds that “I have been inquiring and collecting words among our people for already almost thirty years, and I have yet nowhere heard words in -ište”\textsuperscript{131} (Karadžić, 1843: 15).

The same ideologically charged corpus-planning issue would contemporaneously be debated between Karadžić (and his associates) and the co-founder of the Society of Serbian Letters and minister of education Jovan Sterija Popović (and his supporters). The Society had been established in 1841 in Belgrade with the explicit purpose of developing a “Serbian scientific terminology” (Piper, 2010: 284). Popović came from the same social ambient as Hadžić, and his linguistic ideology “reflected […] the urban and intellectual mentality of the Serbian civil society of his time”\textsuperscript{132} (ibid., p. 282). In developing a scientific terminology for the Serbian language, he would exploit the Church Slavonic, Russian, and (popular) Serbian vocabulary and the word-formation resources of the entire literary tradition of the intellectual elite of Vojvodina and, if necessary, take recourse to the terminologies developed in the classical (Greek and Latin) and great European languages.

Karadžić would now (as he had previously denounced Hadžić) criticise Sterija Popović and the old guard of the Society of Serbian Letters of not knowing their own language (implying in the first place the spoken varieties of his own Eastern-Herzegovinian dialect as they had been embodied in

\textsuperscript{129}“чуо или у народу нашему, или нигдје никако“.
\textsuperscript{130}“пишу наши књижевници, али у народу ја до данас нити сам чуо ове ријечи, нити коријена, од којега је он производи“.
\textsuperscript{131}“има већ близу тридесет година, како ја по народу нашему ријечи тражим и купим, и још нигдје сам чуо ријечи на ište“.
\textsuperscript{132}“одржавали […] урбани и интелектуални менталитет српског грађанског друштва његовог времена“.
Karadžić’s grammar, dictionary and collections of folk-poetry) and, with a reference to the Illyrian movement in Croatia, write that “the time will come when the Serbs from Srem, from Bačka and from Serbia will go to Zagreb to learn Serbian”\(^\text{133}\).

Illyrians, such as Antun Mažuranić (1805–88), Ljudevit Gaj (1809–72) and Vjekoslav Babukić (1812–75), aimed at constructing an “Illyrian” literary language based on the “New-Štokavian folkloric koine” (cf. Brozović, 1970) of Karadžić’s *Serbian Dictionary* (1818), the word-formation resources of all the Croatian dialects, and the prestigious Štokavian literary tradition of Dubrovnik. The linguistic outcome of this movement would in its most far-flung visions unite all South Slavs from the Adriatic to the Black Sea\(^\text{134}\) (Moguš, 1993: 138–56). The Illyrian language was largely constructed in purist opposition to the pressure of the then expansive Hungarian nationalism (Greenberg, 2011: 378).

Just as in the case with the Illyrian language, Karadžić asserts, the only valid principle of constructing a scientific terminology for the Serbian language would be basing it exclusively on the word-formation resources of the popular language. In a subsequent vote, a majority of *Society* would support the language policy of Karadžić and his associates (Piper, 2010: 284–5). This was a status- and corpus-planning decision which would leave enduring traces in the vocabulary of the Serbian standard language code (i.e., expressed in the relative absence of Church Slavonicisms and Russianisms).

On the very same ideological grounds, Karadžić, in the following pages, dismisses Hadžić’s accusations of him having appropriated and capitalised on the work of Milutinović-Sarajlija and Kopitar, and of not knowing any foreign languages.

According to Karadžić, his role in the whole matter is not being educated and knowing foreign languages, that is the business of the Vojvodinan intellectual elite, but having his hand on the throbbing heart “of our simple peo-

\(^{133}\) „ће доћи време кад ће Срби из Срема, из Бачке и из Србије ићи у Загреб да уче српски“.

\(^{134}\) Following the teachings of the Slovak ideologist of Pan-Slavism Ján Kollár, the Illyrians believed in the existence of four main languages or dialects within the Slavic world: (a) the Russian dialect, (b) the Polish dialect, (c) the Czechoslovak dialect, and (d) the Illyrian dialect (Moguš, 1993: 146). Similar beliefs were held by influential philological and Slavist authorities such as J.C. Adelung (1732–1806) and Josef Dobrovský (1753–1829).
ple” – a role which he, contrary to Hadžić’s snobbish expectations, alongside his peasant origin, takes great pride in.

When it comes to the question of graphisation, i.e., Vuk’s intention to “for the Serbian Dictionary [of 1818] invent new letters for those sounds, which exist in our spoken language but, notwithstanding all that multitude of Slavonic signs, are written with a patchwork against the nature of the language”135 (Karadžić, 1843: 26), he strongly rejects any allegations of having stolen them from others. On the contrary, he claims, the orthographic reform is the fruit of a collective decision: “I have agreed upon this not just in conversation with Mr. Kopitar, but also through letters with Gligorije Geršić, with Pavle Solarić, and with Lukijan Mušicki”136. He adds that the letter <ђ> does not just exist in the old books, “but also in the newest ones, which the Bosnian Serbs of the Roman faith are printing in Venice and are reading all over Bosnia”137 (ibid., p. 27). Karadžić is referring to the fact that many of the Bosnian Franciscan monks were printing their books in the Bosnian or Western Cyrillic script (the so-called “Bosančica”), and, following his ethno-linguistic line of thought, defines all speakers of Štokavian as Serbs (down-grading religion as a marker of ethnic difference).

Karadžić enumerates the most important of his ethnographic, linguistic, and historical works, for which he claims a well-earned recognition (and through which he has discursively constructed his conceptualisation of the Serbian nation): the collections Serbian folk-songs, the “Serbian Dictionary” (which “is already translated to several European languages”, Karadžić, 1843: 29), the “Serbische Grammatik” (in the 1824 translation by Jacob Grimm), “The Life of our People under the Turks”138, and “Material for the Serbian History of Our Time”139 (which was the primary source of Ludwig von Ranke’s book “Die Serbische Revolution,” 1829). He moreover concludes:

У свима овијем пословима главно је, или управо рећи једино, моје намјерење било корист и слава народа нашега (Karadžić, 1843: 30).

[My main, or, properly said, only objective in all these works have been the benefit and glory of our people.]

Thus, he has, in a single stroke, given both the ideological rationale for his lifework and defended himself against the accusations of being “nothing but

135 „начим за Српски Рјечник нове знакове за оне гласове, који се у говору нашему налазе а поред свега многоштва Славенскијех слова пишу се с крпежом против својства језика.”
136 „договарао сам се о томе не само у разговору с Г. Копитаром, него и преко писама с Глигоријем Гершићем, с Павлом Соларићем и с Лукијаном Мушицкијем”.
137 “него и у најновијима, које Босански Срби закона Римскога у Млецима штампају и по Босни читају”.
138 „Живљење народа нашега под Турцима“ (1827).
139 „Грађа за српску историју нашега времена“ (1828)
a collector and an ordinary copyist,” as presented by Jovan Hadžić, who, he repeats, remains “a bodger and a charlatan.”
5. The Discourse on purism, language, and national identity in *Ljuboslovie* (1844–6)

5.1 Konstantin Fotinov, his *Ljuboslovie*, and their historical context

5.1.1 The Emergence of the Bulgarian Discourse in the 1840s

Contextually decisive for the emergence and development of the uniquely Bulgarian discourse on purism, language, and national identity was the dominant Greek language and culture within the multi-ethnic Orthodox Christian community, the *millet-i Rûm*, or ‘Romaic Community’ (Detrez, 2013), of the Ottoman Empire. This dynamic of antithetical culture identification in relation to the Greeks became particularly accentuated during “the irredentist period” (Mackridge, 2009: 18) of Greek history (1844–1881) with the diffusion of the *Megali Idea* (‘Great Idea’) and the successive ethnification of the Greek language and culture.

Many of the approximately 100 newspapers and magazines (Vûlčev 2008), and, not least importantly, grammars, and textbooks in various subjects, which were published during the Bulgarian National Revival were, in contrast to the Serbian situation of more concerted action, almost entirely one-man projects. Most commodities of the nineteenth-century Balkan print capitalism were the fruit of the painstaking labour of one single and often quite isolated representative of the so typical class of “traders-cum-scholars” (Davidova, 2012a: 32). This social stratum was simultaneously the main supplier and the principal demander of nineteenth-century Balkan national ideologies. The members of the Balkan trading colonies financed the printing of periodicals and books, and it was their demands for and use of the national languages that brought them into existence. Furthermore, and not least important in the context of this thesis, it was their beliefs about the social role of language, as the defining feature of national identity that transformed them. Thus, the discourse on purism, language, and national identity took place in many sites throughout a multi-layered and expanding public sphere. Periodicals were probably the most pivotal of these ideological sites. Yet, conceptualisations of the standard language code, and its role as a unifying communicative tool and the symbolic embodiment of what was viewed as the innate essence of the people, were also explicitly or implicitly articu-
lated in the prefaces\textsuperscript{140} to and the contents of the many textbooks, primers, and grammars,\textsuperscript{141} which were published during the early phase of the Bulgarian National Revival (Vuličev, 2008). An illustration was the “Primer with different lecturings” (‘Букваръ съ различны поучения’) or “Fish Primer” (‘Рибен буквар’) from 1824 by the physician and encyclopaedist Petur Beron. He opted for the status-planning choice of basing the future standard language code on a choice of contemporary spoken varieties as a pragmatic means of removing cognitive obstacles for the education of Bulgarian children (cf. Andrejein, 1977; Wahlström, 2012).

The great ideological divide in the Bulgarian nineteenth-century discourses, ran between the Slavonic-Bulgarian and various vernacularist- or populist-Bulgarian concepts of language and national identity. This ideological division is reminiscent of the Slavonic-Serbian, civil-Serbian and populist-Serbian (both vernacularist) concepts, but it was far more disparate and conditioned by a partly diverging sociocultural context. The first discursive clash was that between the already declining Slavonic-Bulgarian and the successively emerging pro-Russian vernacularist concept of language and national identity which would also leave a decisive imprint on many ideological orientations of the second half of the nineteenth century.

The defenders of the Slavonic-Bulgarian concept of language and national identity were often intellectually shaped in the pre-national, culturally Greek Romaic community and its system of higher education. Consequently, most of its defenders directly related to Greek linguistic models and the contemporary Greek debates between “archaists” and “vernacularists” (Mackridge, 2009) in the process of constructing a specifically Bulgarian language and national identity. Yet, patriotically tuned intellectuals, such as Konstantin Fotinov, Neofit Rilski, Emanuil Vaskidovitch, and Christaki Pavlovitch, initially opted for basing the national standard language code on some contemporary, spoken variety – preferably that of the educated elite.

Thus, they represented an “elitist purist orientation” (Thomas, 1991: 76) when it came to this status-planning choice of basing the standard language code on some variety of the vernacular. In the process of corpus planning,

\textsuperscript{140} The conceptualisations of the standard language code in the prefaces to books published during the National Revival and their role for the imagination of the Bulgarian nation have been studied by Mickova (2012).

\textsuperscript{141} Vuličev (2008) makes a thorough philological analysis of the twenty-nine grammars of Bulgarian published between 1835 and 1875, from the Slavonic-Bulgarian grammars by Neofit Rilski, Emanuil Vaskidovitch and Christaki Pavlovich, which were firmly based in the tradition established by Melitij Smotrickij and his, to the first New-Bulgarian grammar by Ivan Bogorov, and the blossoming of the grammar writing in the second half of the nineteenth century with important grammarians such as Joakim Gruev (1828–1912), Teodor Hrulev (1821–65), Sava Radulov (1817–1887), Ivan Momčilov (1819–69) and Todor Šiškov (1833–96). Many of these men of letters took active part in the language debates in the late nineteenth-century periodicals.
this chosen variety was to be purified from foreign influences on all linguistic levels. This model bore a great deal of likeness both to the “middle-way” (Mackridge, 2010) of the Greek language-reformer Adamantios Korais and to the Slavonic-Serbian and civil-Serbian concepts of language and national identity. The Slavonic-Bulgarian discourse participants did not generally have any explicit political agenda – their aim was the cultural rebirth of the Bulgarian nation by means of language. This pursuit was to a great extent an antithetical response to growing pan-Hellenistic tendencies within the Romaniic community.

The vernacularist opponents of the Slavonic-Bulgarian concept of language and national identity would later evolve into a spearhead of Russian cultural influence, but until around 1850 many of them defended a populist purist policy. Their language policy was radically vernacularist on the level of the status-planning selection of the language base and on the corpus-planning levels of graphisation and codification. The contemporary spoken varieties and the rules governing them were to form the base for the future national standard language code and its codified, uniform grammar, and be reflected in its orthographic conventions. Here these vernacularists were driven by arguments of both “pedagogical” (Nikolova, 2015) and “ethno-graphic” (Thomas, 1991) purism. This meant that only those varieties could instrumentally lead to the enlightenment of the Bulgarian people and symbolically reflect its true inner character. Yet, on the level of the development of modern vocabulary – and in some symbolically charged instances of graphisation, they, instead, took recourse to the lexical resources of the Church Slavonic literary tradition. The language was to be purified from the foreign lexical items which after many centuries of Turkish and Greek political and cultural supremacy had comported and enriched by Church Slavonic and the domestic lexis. This archaist, ethnographic and targeted anti-Turkish, anti-Greek, anti-Serbian, and, actually, anti-Russian purism ultimately served the purpose of laying claims to the prestigious Church Slavonic literary heritage as the foundation of the Bulgarian language and national identity. Yet, the populist-Bulgarians, thus, shared many beliefs and attitudes with their Slavonic-Bulgarian adversaries. Around 1850, this purist policy would take an even more archaist and, in addition, a politically motivated pro-Russian turn on practically all instrumental and symbolic levels of language. These developments will be more thoroughly studied in chapter 7.

5.1.2 Konstantin Fotinov and his Ljuboslovie

The first Bulgarian magazine, Ljuboslovie (1844–6), is an early and illustrative example of the slightly idiosyncratic character of the emergence and development of the early phases of the Bulgarian discourse on language and national identity. The magazine was the fruit of the enthusiasm and hard labour of the teacher, writer, and travelling merchant Konstantin Georgiev
Fotinov (1785–1858). He collected financial support for the printing and distribution of the magazine and singlehandedly wrote, translated, and edited the lion’s share of the materials published in it during its barely two years of existence. *Ljuboslovie* marked the beginning of the Bulgarian discourse on purism, language, and national identity. Thus, this discourse emerged the same year (1844) the ethnonationalist *Megali Idea* (‘Great Idea’) was presented in the Greek Parliament. The Greek cultural and linguistic area or the Romaic community was the main frame of reference in relation to which Fotinov and most of the other members the Bulgarian cultural and political elite constructed the meaning, form, and contents of the Bulgarian national identity as expressed in the pure quality of their national standard language code.

During his studies at the Central Hellenic school of Plovdiv, where Greek was the only language of instruction, Fotinov would, for instance, be thoroughly acquainted with the works of some of the most prominent scholars of the Greek Enlightenment. Not least important for his purist language policy and politics were the language reformers Adamantios Korais and Neofytos Doukas (1760–1845), whom he read in the richly furnished school library (Danova, 1994: 88). The Philological Gymnasium had probably been founded in 1808 and in 1809 the famous Greek Enlightenment scholar Constantin Koumas was invited to become its director. Koumas was “a true follower” (Danova, 1994: 91) of Korais and Fotinov’s years of study under his tutelage were coloured by the influence of the Greek teacher.

Both Korais and Doukas saw language as the utmost expression of a nation’s innermost self and their linguistic ideologies seem to have had a profound influence on the beliefs about language and national identity expressed by Fotinov in *Ljuboslovie*. Just like Fotinov, Korais regarded “the reform of the language [as] an organic part of the more general effort aimed at the cultural rebirth of the nation” (Mackridge, 2010: 103). Korais identified a process of decline, degeneration, or barbarisation of the contemporary...
spoken Greek varieties (and the moral corruption of the community using them), expressed in the loss of grammatical categories such as the infinitive and “the presence of many words borrowed from foreign occupiers” (ibid., p. 106). In a purist response to what Korais saw as a state of general corruption, he wanted to create a language based on contemporary Greek varieties but purified from foreign lexical items and “corrected” through “a process of morphological archaization in keeping with an arbitrary selection of the rules governing the phonology and morphology of the ancient language” (ibid. 25). Consequently, Korais’ purist policy was applied to all levels of language – not just to the level of vocabulary. Expressing both an Enlightenment and Romanticist view of language, he wanted the modern Greek language (and nation) to be linked to Ancient Greek like a daughter to her mother – clearly separated from and by no means identical to her, but still relating to her with love, care and understanding. His attempt to steer a linguistic middle way (μέση οδός) between the extremes of the ‘archaists’ and the ‘vernacularists’ would later be called *katharévousa*.145

Fotinov, on the same theoretical grounds, distanced himself from the unreserved use of some combination of contemporary spoken Bulgarian varieties – stained, as they were, in his opinion, by foreign influences, trying instead to steer his own middle course in the language he put into implicit practice and explicitly argued for in *Ljuboslovie*. Just like Korais, he aimed at reconnecting with the true Slavic roots of the Bulgarian people by constructing a literary language which, though based on contemporary dialects, would be lexically and morphophonologically corrected or purified by its Church Slavonic mother – at least initially. In face of the unruly ecology of the spoken varieties, he gravitated towards a more extreme archaist position in the second year’s issue of the magazine. This change of position could well have been inspired by the Greek archaists, such as Neofytos Doukas, who “saw Classical Attic prose as the model of imitation” (Mackridge, 2010: 128).

Two other authors, whom Fotinov could have read in Greek translation at the library of the Central Hellenic school of Plovdiv or come across during the philosophy classes at the Philological Gymnasium of Smyrna, were John Locke and Étienne Bonnot de Condillac. Their thinking on language, cognition, and morality exercised an enormous influence on the whole Western European and Greek Enlightenment, and another possibility is that it trickled down to Fotinov through the mediation of the works of Korais, Doukas, and perhaps Eugenios Voulgaris (1716–1806). Central to, at least Fotinov’s lin-

145 More circumstantial evidence for Fotinov’s affinity with Korais and his concept of language and national identity is that he chose to use a species of *katharévousa* both in his private correspondence and in the preface to his Greek grammar-book (1838) (Danova, 1994: 115).
guistic ideology, was Locke’s theory that words are the external signs or “outward sensible Perceptions” of the ideas or “internal operations in the […] Minds” (Harris, 2005: 135) of those using them. Pivotal to both Korais’ and Fotinov’s thinking about the link between language and national identity was Condillac’s idea that “the language a person [or community] speaks influences the way that person [or community] thinks” and that “some languages [and communities] are better than others, according to the analysis they impose on thoughts” (Harris, 2005: 151). This is decisively reminiscent of the ‘strong’ version of the (in)famous early nineteenth-century ‘Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis’, which maintains that the structure of one’s native language determines one’s perception of the world (Joseph, 2004: 55). ‘Condillocke’s’ understanding of words as signifiers of ideas and Condillac’s belief that ‘the genius of the language’ expresses the ‘genius’ of a definite people”146 (Danova, 1994: 351) was of crucial significance. European Romanticist thinkers later expanded (or misinterpreted) Locke’s and Condillac’s thoughts about the language, cognition, and morality of the nation and see languages as the utmost expression of a people’s unique moral qualities and collective historical experience147 (Harris, 2005: 136).

In the first half of 1842, Fotinov printed the trial issue of his magazine *Ljuboslovie* at the printing house of the Greek A. Damianos (where he had printed most of his earlier books) in Smyrna. This trial issue functioned as a kind of advertising leaflet, written to attract as many sponsors as possible. Sponsorship from the prosperous merchant colonies was the dominant way of financing the printing and distribution of books and periodicals in the nineteenth-century Balkans; this, once again, underlines the important role of the merchant class for the emergence of what Anderson (2006) calls ‘print-capitalism’ (cf. section 3.3). Due to its cosmopolitan character and, perhaps, the interrelated facilities offered by the many printing houses148 in the town, Smyrna was a virtual hotspot for the publishing of different forms of periodicals. At least twenty magazines and newspapers – in Greek, French, Armenian etc. – were issued in Smyrna during the period Fotinov lived there (Danova, 1994: 102–3). The Greek *Philology* (*Φιλολογία*) was another Smyrniot magazine which was strongly influenced by *Treasury of Useful Knowledge*, and it would, in turn, be the source of many translated articles published in *Ljuboslovie*. *Philology* was printed with the support of “the Danish

146 “че думата е белег на идеята и ‘гений на езика’ изразява ‘гения’ на конкретния народ”
147 Woolard (1998: 16–17) claims that “Johann Herder’s famous characterization of language as the genius of the people […] can be traced to […] Condillac.”
148 Many, if not most, were financed by the numerous Protestant Bible societies and missionaries who were active in Smyrna in the nineteenth century.
Protestant mission" (ibid., p. 102). The title of Fotinov’s magazine is, as a matter of fact, a rather felicitous loan translation (calque) of ‘philology’.

5.2 Purism, language, and national identity in *Ljuboslovie*

The first issue of Konstantin Fotinov’s magazine *Ljuboslovie* was published in April 1844. It was going to have in total twenty-four issues collected in two volumes. Throughout its barely two-year long existence, *Ljuboslovie*’s editor struggled with permanent financial difficulties. It was also due to the lack of support from its financer(s) that he eventually, in December 1846, gave up his ambitious intellectual enterprise.

The language policy applied in the magazine reflected the vicissitudes of the linguistic ideology of its editor and main contributor. It was initially based on a choice of spoken Southwest-Bulgarian varieties (status planning) with characteristic features, such as the post-fixed definite article, and contained a large portion of Church Slavonic lexical items and morphophonological traits (corpus planning). In the last issues, Fotinov distanced himself from the spoken language and evolved towards a more archaic conceptualisation of language and national identity; this ideological shift was immediately manifested in his linguistic practice. The still utterly fluid and unelaborate state of the nascent Bulgarian standard language code is attested by Fotinov’s (and other intellectuals’) practice of giving within brackets the Greek, Turkish, or dialect equivalent (glosses) of the Slav(on)ic word used in the texts. This was partly since he was often forced to coin neologisms and partly a matter of avoiding misunderstandings. This sentence on the first page of the first issue may serve as an eloquent illustration:

Žивописцы-те (зографе-те) вообще изображаватъ тозы месецъ да е като единъ юношъ (младъ) сossъ крила на рамена-та и сossъ широка зелена дреха (облекло) украшенъ сossъ въщи отъ различни цвътове и държи въ раце-те си синь бакалецъ (менексе), кои-то или съди или стои на единъ быкъ и държи го сossъ една рука, показующъ зодиЙскки-а знакъ наричаемый Быкъ […] (*Ljub.*, 1844, 1: 1)

[The painters (artists) generally represent this month in the shape of young man (youngster) with wings on his shoulders and with a wide green robe (vestment) embellished with wreaths of different flowers and holding a blue violet (menekse) in his hands, who is either sitting or standing on a bull and holding him with one hand, demonstrating the zodiac sign called Taurus […]]

In this sentence, the Slavic word “живописецъ” is a calque of the Greek “ζωγράφος”, meaning literally “one who paints from life or from nature”,

149 „с подкрепата на датската протестантска мисия“. 
while the more vernacular “младъ” is given in brackets as an explanation for the more Slavonic “юношъ”. Moreover, the vernacular “дреха” is explained with the Slavic “облекло”, while the Slavic word “бакалецъ” is clarified the Turkish word “menekše”, which is supposed to be better known for the purported reader.

This implicit language use also represents a peculiar kind of ‘interlanguage’ on the road towards a fully-fledged modern standard language code which demonstrates the author’s ideological preference for lexical enrichment from Slavonic sources and his positioning of the Bulgarian people in the narrative of the true heirship of the Church Slavonic legacy of SS. Cyril and Methodius. It also illustrates Fotinov’s affinity with the purist policy of Korais’ *katharevousa* concept.

### 5.2.1 Between Enlightenment and essentialism

In this section I will focus on five articles and groups of articles in which purist language ideologies are productively used in the creation and representation of a Bulgarian national identity.

1. The first is “People and Language” (“Народъ иѧзыкъ”) (vol. 1, issue 1–2, April–May, 1844) and its continuation in the articles “Slavonic-Bulgarian Language and Literature” (“Словесностъ Славено-Болгарска”) (vol. 1, issue 6, September 1844) and “A Review of the Slavonic-Bulgarian Language and Literature” (“Обозрънїе Славено-Болгарскїѧ Словесности”) (vol. 1, issue 7–9, October–December, 1844).

2. The second is the unfinished item “Peoples” (Ꙗзыцы) (vol. 1, issue 1, 1844).

3. The third is “An Excuse for the Unfavorability of Writing” (“Извинениє за неблагопрїятность описанїѧ”) (vol. 1, issue 2, May, 1844).

4. The fourth is the letter to the editor “To the Publisher of the Bulgarian Ljuboslovie” (“Камъ издатель атъ на Бѫлгарско то Любословїе”) (vol. 2, issue 20–1, August-September 1846) written by the Odesa-based merchant and doctor Vasil Aprilov.

5. The fifth (5) and concluding article is “It is Hard to know Thyself” (“Мѫчно е да познае человѣкъ самъ себеси”) (vol. 2, issue 22–24, October–December 1846).

I will, in the first place, analyse the “representations […] that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (Woolard, 1998: 2) which are constructed in explicit purist discourse on national identity. Examples will occasionally be given as to how these linguistic ideologies are made manifest in the choices of the language forms and structures put into practice in the analysed articles. These representations will be placed
within the processes of status and corpus planning. The belief that language and certain language forms were the external expression of the collective cultural experience of a particular people made both the choice of the linguistic variety (or varieties) to represent that innermost essence of the Bulgarian people and the structuring of the ‘body’ of that variety an utterly delicate matter.

The article “People and Language” (Ljub., 1844, 1: 6) constructs an explicit representation of language as the external signifier (“countenance” or “face”) of each people which signifies (“characterises and displays”) the moral DNA (its “mentality and customs”) of both that particular people and of each person belonging to it. It is a kind of ethno-linguistic manifesto in which Fotinov explicitly writes that:

Че азък-о е образъ [лице] на секїй народъ и орудие (сечиво) кое-то изображава и показува прави-те и обичаи-те на человѣка, кой-то живее въ содружество человѣческо (Ljub., 1844, 1: 6).

[Language is the countenance (face) of every people and an instrument (tool) which characterises and displays the mentality and customs of the person, who live in a human community.]

The excerpt also reveals Fotinov’s ideological positioning in the Enlightenment sensual tradition of such thinkers as Condillac and Destutt de Tracy (the inventor of the very term idéologie) which had been so instrumental for the emergence of the Greek discourse on language and national identity. In this discourse, language is, thus, represented as the immediate reflection of a people’s cultural contents. The sensualists believed “that any ideas more developed than physiological sensations are dependent on such ideas’ being clothed in signs; and the organization of signs by some systematic grammar enables the discursive expression of a logical faculty of mind” (Silverstein, 1998: 123). A curious corollary or expansion of the belief that language is the marker of ethno-cultural difference would then be that grammar writing (or systematic language planning) is a matter of enabling “the discursive expression of a logical faculty of a [national] mind.” The grammarians (or those engaged in the construction of the national language) were, following this line of thought, systemising the signs which were the external expression of the ‘Soul of the People.’

This article does certainly express the core dogma of all linguistic nationalism, i.e., the identification of a particular linguistic variety with a specific people, but it does it in the spirit of Enlightenment rationalism and in the language of an eighteenth-century natural scientist. There is for instance, generally, no traces of demonising othering in the discourse on language and national identity on the pages of Ljuboslovice. The text produces a peculiar theory on the genesis of both peoples and languages. The circumstances to
which human beings are naturally subject, Fotinov writes, “forced them to assemble and live together in order to help each other”\textsuperscript{150} (\textit{Ljub.}, 1844, 1: 6). To help each other they had to develop “a means with which they could communicate their needs to each other, as well as the orders and inclination of their soul”\textsuperscript{151} (ibid.). This, in turn, gives rise to, first, “incomprehensible sounds,” and, then, to “different bodily movements (head-nodding or hand-waving).” Eventually, it culminates in the use of “the words […]”, which is an undefined interpreter of the thought, of the concept, and the spiritual will, and this interpreter is called LANGUAGE\textsuperscript{152} (ibid.). Consequently, it was the need for mutual assistance against the relentless forces of nature that made people originally come together and develop into nations (or ethnicities). Language arose as a tool of furthering this assistance which, in the course of time, became the irreducible mark of ethnocultural difference of that people. It was, thus, not originally a matter of blood and belonging, but of rational choice.

The rationalist approach of characterising the discourse is further emphasised in the following block quote defining the role of language to connect a class (or a proper species) of human beings into a proper and particular people and separate them from all other possible kinds of similar classes.

[Furthermore, as the language thus connects a class (a proper species) of human beings into a proper and particular people and distinguishes (divides) them from all other possible kinds of similar classes, it is a differentiator, or characterising sign (mark) of every people.]
tion of the innermost essence of that people and a prestigious mark of its ethnocultural difference.

The German Romanticist language-philosopher J.G. Fichte had similarly expressed the belief that “[t]hose who speak the same language are joined to each other by a multitude of invisible bonds” in *Reden an die Deutsche Nation* (1808) (cf., p. 29; 80; 87). Yet, whereas it is a consequence of a series of adventitious factors and rational choice for Fotinov, for the German out-and-out Romanticist, language is an endowment bestowed upon a people “by nature herself, long before any human art begins” (Joseph, 2004: 191). The text utilises the parlance of an Enlightenment natural scientist in defining a proper and particular people as a class (or a proper species) which is internally connected by its linguistic practice(s) and externally distinguished from all other possible similar classes by means of the *characterising sign* of language.

Yet, the core dogma of all linguistic nationalism, that every nation (or people) is defined (or characterised) by the language its members are using, is reiterated in the short (total sixteen lines) and unfinished item “Peoples”. It states that

Секъй ъзыкъ (народъ) има свойствений языкъ по крайней мѣрѣ богатъ, или недостачченъ; благогласенъ или не (*Ljub.*, 1844, 1: 6).

[Every people (folk) has its characteristic language at least, rich, or insufficient; euphonious or not.]

This short text is written on the very threshold of the discursive processes through which the modern Bulgarian literary language would emerge as a standardised and polyvalent tool of supralocal communication, i.e., the pass from dialect to language, by (1) selection of norm, (2) codification of form, (3) elaboration of function, and (4) acceptance by community. The steps (2) and (3) in these processes are suggested by the value-charged adjectives “rich”, “insufficient”, and “euphonious” in the brief block quote above. The concepts of “euphonicity” or “eloquence” are closely related to the prestige function of literary languages and occupy a central position in the purist policy promoted on the pages of *Ljuboslovie*. The second guiding principle for its purist policy could be understood in light of the ideology of mono-origin or what Thomas (1991: 76) terms “archaising purism.” The ideology of mono-origin refers to the belief that purity in language can only be obtained by taking recourse to linguistic models of exclusively domestic origin. Archaising purism typically aims at revitalising linguistic materials from a past ‘golden era’ and venerates tradition, while, at the same time, its adherents demonstrate an exorbitant conservatism when it comes to innovations.
The article “An excuse for the Unfavorability of Writing”\(^{153}\) (Ljub., 1844, 2: 21–2) is a manifesto-like text which highlights central themes in the purist discourse in Fotinov’s Ljuboslopvie. It constructs the binary opposition between “eloquence” (or ‘eloquent language’) and “vernacular” (or ‘simple language’) stating that Fotinov is “struggling very much with two opposite things when [he is] writing: i.e., the eloquence and the vernacular”\(^{154}\) (Ljub., 1844, 2: 21–2). Deploiring the current state of the contemporary Bulgarian literary language Fotinov asserts that

Като смыдлимъ, че секїй списатель особный же и общей неотбджа

должность по возможности да описува списанїе-то му сладкорѣчно и сось

собственное значенїе, кое не само че има сладость, но и сила приключава ве-

сма голема на онова щото говори человѣкъ, наслаждавамсе некако и драго ми

е да послѣдъвамъ и да предпочитамъ онова, кое-то е праведно, правио и и

коренина-а ни язъкъ свойственно и природно, и най паче на теплъ-те му

рачители, представители же и защитницы любословны благопрїятно и и

угодно, отъ конъ-то, ако да бы былъ достоеятъ, можехъ да прїимамъ и любовъ и

почесть (Ljub., 1844, 2: 21).

[As I am thinking that every writer, privately as well as publicly, has the indispensa-

ble duty to, if possible, write his works eloquently and with the proper meaning,

which does not just have eloquence, but gives a great strength to what you say, I

somehow rejoice and it is a pleasure for me to follow and prefer, that which is right-

eous, right, and which is in accordance with the roots of the language and natural to it,

and above all favourite and pleasant for those who warmly cares about it, its lan-

guage-loving representatives and defenders, from which I, if found worthy, could re-

ceive love and respect.]

The position expressed in the block quote might be interpreted as an expres-

sion of the elitist “prescriptivism of the rationalist linguists of the eighteenth
century” (Harris, 2005: 177) and what Thomas (1991: 76) calls “elitist pur-

ism”. Regardless of earlier rationalist arguments, Fotinov (Ljub., 1844, 2:

21) here expresses the view that language has an objective life of its own and

moreover that aesthetically value-charged qualities, such as “righteous [and]

right”, are applicable to it, and not a matter of subjective human evaluation

of certain language forms. Furthermore, he claims that “eloquence and […]

the proper meaning”, and the “great strength” they entail, are achieved by

sticking to its “roots”, i.e., its etymologically reconstructable origins. Biolog-

ical or organic metaphors such as “roots” formed an intrinsic part of the im-

agery of Enlightenment linguistic thinking and could also be explained by

the development of historical-comparative linguistics in the wake of William

Jones’ ‘discovery’ of Sanskrit in the late eighteenth century.

At the same time, concerns are expressed in the article that the “common

people” will not be able to understand the eloquent language of the educated

\(^{153}\) “Извинение за неблагопрїятность описанїа”

\(^{154}\) “Двѣ противоположни вещи (едни отъ други несогласни неща) твърде мѣ борать, като описувахъ: Благорѣчіе-то сир. и просторѣчіе-то.”
elite and thereby will neither “benefit” nor gain any “pleasure” (Ljub., 1844, 2: 21) from it. Fotinov advises the members of the educated elite to, at least temporarily, approach the vernacular uses of the broad, uneducated masses, and, as far as possible, refrain from foreignisms and use synonyms. Using synonyms is thus a means of avoiding ambiguities during the initial phases of “common peoples” socialisation into the national language. “If the reader does not understand one word”, Fotinov puts forward, “he will know from the second”\(^{155}\) (ibid.).

Yet, the text emphasises, to attain the objective of purity, “‘homogeneity’, ‘wholeness’, and ‘oneness’” (Thomas, 1991: 31) the Bulgarian intellectuals must return to the Church Slavonic sources and refrain from using

рѣчи испорченны и совсѣмъ отъ матери-а языкъ отдаленны и да послѣдува въ особны-те и помѣстны злообыкновенны рѣчи, кои-то са испорченны и разваленны отъ небрежѣніе (немаренѣ) и отъ неученѣ, и кои-то совсѣмъ щото са обыкновенны по нѣкои мѣста, но въ нѣкои други не са разваленны, но учувани чисто въ свой-атъ источнокъ (Ljub., 1844, 2: 21).

[words which are depraved and totally distanced from the mother tongue and follow the peculiar and locally misused words, which are depraved and ruined by negligence (neglect) and by ignorance, and which are quite common in some places, but in some others they are not ruined, but preserved purely in their source.]

In this short excerpt, “the mother tongue” and the “source”, where the words are “preserved purely”, is identified with Church Slavonic.\(^{156}\) This is also, in the author’s view, the corpus planning choice of preference for the processes of lexical enrichment which the Bulgarian men of letters are about to initiate. The article constructs a picture of the linguistic reality based on value-laden binary oppositions between the positive purity of the “source” and the negative “peculiarly and locally misused words, which are depraved and ruined by negligence (neglect) and by ignorance” (my italics, PLC). The only possible way of superseding the centrifugal array of local linguistic practices (“misuses”) and homogenise the Bulgarian language, and unite the Bulgarian people with their true origin, is by returning ad fontes. In an earlier text (“Peoples”, Ljub., 1844, 1: 6), it had been stated that “Slavonic”, alongside “Hebrew, Arabic, Assyrian, […] Latin, and Greek”,\(^{157}\) is one of the six oldest languages in the world. Following Fotinov, embracing this antique pedigree would be an efficient way of obtaining the third, symbolic sociolinguistic prestige-function of standard language codes. Thus, the Bulgarian language would be separated from other varieties and peoples and the Bulgarians would attain the objective of ethno-linguistic unity across time and space.

\(^{155}\) “ако да не разумева читател-о перва-та речь […] отъ втора-та да познае“

\(^{156}\) In the 1840s virtually all references to ‘Church Slavonic’ still implied its Russian ‘redaction’.

\(^{157}\) „Славенскїй […] Еврейскїй, Арабскїй, Ассурѣйскїй […] Латинскїй и Еллинскїй“.
The extensive text “To the Publisher of the Bulgarian Ljuboslovie” (vol. 2, issue 20–2 August-October 1846), written by the Odesa-based Bulgarian merchant and physician Vasil Aprilov, marks a species of the paradigm shift of language ideologies. It is a transcendence from the vanishing Enlightenment conceptualisation of language and national identity, supported by Fotinov and other representatives of the “Church Slavonic School”, and the Romanticist vision of the disparate “Modern Bulgarian School”. The text marks a discursive clash between what I have called the Slavonic-Bulgarian and the emerging vernacularist and Russo-Bulgarian concepts of language and national identity. These predominantly Romanticist concepts would from now on exercise a strong influence on the discourse concerning the Bulgarian language, purism, and national identity. Many of its representatives, such as Aprilov and N.S. Palauzov (1776–1853), would as merchants spend many years in Russia and have close contacts with Slavists such as Jurij Ivanovič Venelin (b. Georgiy Hutsa, 1802–39) (Arnaudov, 1971: 461f).

Aprilov’s conceptualisation of language and national identity and language policy are paradigmatically Romanticist in several ways. Firstly, on the level of status planning he proposes a shift from what could be called an Enlightenment elitist, prescriptivist, and diachronic paradigm to a Romanticist, populist, descriptivist, and synchronic paradigm. This Romanticist paradigm gives precedence to the contemporary spoken varieties (or an ideologised vision of them) as the basis for the national language and its arbiter in questions of rights and wrongs in language. Secondly, on the level of graphisation, Aprilov pleas to the Bulgarian literati to, like the Russians before them, as he sees it, reject several superfluous letters and introduce a phonemic orthography in which every individual grapheme (letter) corresponds to one specific phoneme (sound). Romanticist is also, thirdly, the belief that language is the primordial and essential defining feature of each people (in contrast to Fotinov’s belief that language becomes the defining feature of peoplehood because of rational choice). At the same time, it reflects the rationalist Enlightenment representation of the vernaculars as the most efficient way of spreading the light of knowledge to the broad masses. Aprilov’s ethno-linguistic concept is in many respects strongly reminiscent of the “populist concept of the Serbian culture” (Jovanović, 2002: 78) held by his Serbian contemporary Vuk St. Karadžić. Yet, this Romanticist shift would in turn provoke a radicalisation of the archaist position of Fotinov’s discourse in the article “It is hard to recognise yourself”, published in the last three issues of Ljuboslovie.

The text begins by warning the Bulgarian intellectuals against “that discord into which the Serbian [language and literature] has fallen”158 (Ljub., 1846, 20: 127). The author refers to the conflicts between the defenders of the Slaveno-Serbian and civil-Serbian linguistic concept and the populist-

---

158 “той раздоръ, въ кой то падна сербска та /словесность/”
Serbian concept of language and national identity of Vuk St. Karadžić and his associates (cf. ch. 4). Aprilov urges “our grammatical-teachers and writers to agree on some grammatical rules, which will provide the basis for our language” (Ljub., 1846, 20: 127). In order not to raise unnecessary cognitive obstacles on the road towards the enlightenment of the people, these grammatical rules must be written “according to the popular language, with the addition of new letters” (ibid.). Every attempt, the text argues, of “renewing the old Bulgarian language” (ibid.) is totally counterproductive and futile. This would only make Bulgarian school children waste time on learning the abstruse grammatical rules and letters of the (dead) Church Slavonic language (“orthography”). It is stated that a sharp line must be drawn between the new and the ‘old language’. The latter ought to be reduced to the functional domains of liturgy and science. To strengthen his vernacularist arguments, the text relies firmly on the authority of Greek ‘demoticists’ such as Athanasios Christopoulos (1772–1847) and Constantinos Vardalachos (1755–1830) and refers to the example of a number of European peoples. Aprilov asserts that

примѣръ атъ на Италіанци тѣ, Грѣцы тѣ, Русси тѣ, и други тѣ словенски народи, показа ни чи суетно мѣщо щеше да е, ако ищяхме да са дѣржимы съ онова мнѣнїе, чи требува да са грыжимы да возобновимъ старый атъ Бѣлггарскїй языкъ, дѣто го имамы въ священо то Писанїе, и въ другы тѣ стары рукописы (Ljub., 1846, 20: 127).

In contrast to the ‘old language’, the Bulgarian grammarians and writers have to follow humbly in the footsteps of the popular language and throw out the superfluous Church Slavonic letters “and write everything with one letter; so that we will facilitate the learning, and make the language smoother and plainer” (Ljub., 1846, 20: 127). As examples of those working in this direction, he mentions the Moscow university alumnus Georgi Busilin (1823–45) and the graduate of the Richelieu Lyceum in Odesa Najden Gerov.

In the second part of the letter to the editor of Ljuboslovie (vol. 2, issue 21 September 1846), Aprilov brandishes virtually all the efforts to compose grammars based on what he regards as the useless orthography of the old

---

159 “наши тѣ грамматико-учители и писателы, да са согласхъ на едны грамматическы редове, кои то да станахъ основа на азыкъ атъ ни”
160 “по народно, съ притурванїе на нови слова”
161 “возобновимъ старый атъ Бѣлггарскїй азыкъ”.
162 да пишемъ съ една буква сичко то; дѣто така да улеснимъ ученїето, и да направимы азыкъ атъ по ровенъ и по гладкъ.
Bulgarian Language in the decade following 1836. He mentions grammarians like Emanuil Vaskidovič, Neofit Rilski, and Christaki Pavlovič. As represented in the text, all these loosely associated members of the Church Slavonic or Slavonic-Bulgarian school falsely believe that the language in the old printed liturgical books (which are bristling with Russicisms and Serbianisms) contain the old Bulgarian dialect. And because of this delusion тѣи грамматико-составители, и да обратиха тѣколко внимание на говорннѣт аѣзѣк, опредѣлително прѣѣха печатный аѣ церковный аѣзѣк за толкоже правилень, колко то е свѧто и истинно само то Писанїе (Ljub., 1846, 21: 138).

[these grammar-compilers, even if they had paid some attention to the spoken language, definitely accepted the ecclesiastical language as equally proper as the very Scripture is holy and true.]

This is a misconception created by those who have “been studying according to the printed books, and according to the Slavonic-Serbian-Russian grammars”163 (Ljub., 1846, 21: 139). Following the text, these grammars represent phonetically Russified and Serbified versions of the old-Bulgarian spoken language into which the Holy writ was translated a thousand years ago. It is claimed that this has deluded these bookworms into denying the empirically attestable fact that people across almost the entire Bulgarian language area, apart from in the regions confining to Serbia and in “the villages of Černa gora, around Skopje”,164 are still speaking with yuses. Namely, recent findings in old manuscripts by European scholars has proven that the first translation of the Bible contains the phoneme /ɤ̞/ or /ə/ (which was graphically rendered as <ѫ>). This ‘schwa’ “was”, according to Aprilov, literally най много, отличителна та черта на Бѫлгарскїй аѣзѣк, то ё, юсъ аѣ (ѧ).

The ъ и сега са произноса по Бѫлгарїѧ тѫ, както са произнесше преди тысѧта (1000) години, кога то са преведи св. Писанїе (Ljub., 1846, 21: 138).

[the most distinguishing feature of the Bulgarian language, i.e., the yus (ѧ). This <ѫ> is still pronounced all over Bulgaria in the same way as it was pronounced a thousand (1000) years ago, when the Holy writ was translated.]

Consequently, the text represents the direct bloodline of the Bulgarian language and national identity as concentrated in one single phoneme. This phoneme is conceptualised as the marker of ethno-linguistic difference in relation to the other Slavic peoples – the Serbs and the Russians, in the first

163 „учихъ са по печатаныѣ тѣ книги, и по словено-сербско-Руссѣ тѣ грамматики.“ Aprilov is probably referring to the grammatical tradition of Meletij Smotrickij and the works of the Serbian grammarian Avram Mrazovič (1756–1826). The grammars and textbooks of the latter inspired both the Serbian Vuk St. Karadžić and the Bulgarian Neofit Rilski.

164 „Черногоскѣ тѣ села, около Скопѣѧ“. Aprilov is referring to the mountain Černa gora (‘Black Mountain’) in today’s western Bulgaria.

165 This phoneme was graphically rendered as <ѫ> (the ‘big yus’) until 1945 when the new communist regime introduced the grapheme <ъ> in the same function. This corpus-planning measure was probably a symbolic way of marking the end of the old ‘bourgeois’ era.
place. Additionally, it is represented as a claim to the Bulgarian privileged ownership of the Church Slavonic patrimony. It is an example of the Romanticist organic vision of language and national identity. The external forms in the world of phenomena might be seemingly radically altered and in the flow of relentless change, but the innermost core and the true essence of the ‘Soul of the People’ will always – like a quietly flowing underground river – remain substantially the same.

Това требува да не загубимъ, защо то това е бисеръ на наше то бытъ и на наше то сегашно и бъдещо просветъніе (Ljub., 1846, 21: 142).

[This we do not have to lose, because it is the pearl of our existence, and of our present and future enlightenment.]

This single phoneme is, according to Aprilov, the primordial marker of ethno-linguistic difference, in which the true essence of the ‘Soul’ of the Bulgarian people has been preserved in its original purity.

The second significant stumbling stone and shibboleth of the new-Bulgarian language and the speech-community using it, is, as claimed in the text, the post-fixed definite article. “The rejection of the articles”, it is stated, “has provoked disagreement among the writers, who think that they are thus getting closer to the old dialect”166 (Ljub., 1846, 21: 141). In an anti-prescriptivist key, Aprilov asserts that it would be foolish of the teachers to “teach the children to write and speak without [definite] articles, the children will only listen to them at school, but when they go home, they will speak with articles with their relatives, and with the rest of the people”167 (ibid.). The grammarians must follow the people and not the other way around, because the people have preserved the pure markers of ethnic difference in its linguistic practices.

As a case in point, he refers to The First Bulgarian Grammar (Пѫрвичка бѫлгарска грамматика) by Ivan Bogorov which had been published in Bucharest in 1844. This grammar embraces both the post-fixed article and the yuses, and is, following Aprilov, “compiled according to the grammatical rules of Vostokov, attached to the Ostromir Gospels”168 (Ljub., 1846, 21: 141). This is taken as hard evidence “that the first [grammar by Bogorov] is based on the primordial Bulgarian pronunciation and hence it should become the basis for the new Bulgarian language”169 (ibid.). The case is substantiated

166 Изфарленіе то на членъ атъ роди разногласіе помежду писатели тѣ, кои то мыслать, чи уже съ това са приближавать камъ старо то нарѣчіе.

167 да учатъ дѣца та да не говорать и пишкть съ членове, дѣца та ще ги слушать толко во училище то, но като отидатъ у дома си, съ родинни тѣ си, и съ другиѣ атъ народъ ще говорать съ членове.

168 Aprilov is referring to the famous Russian philologist Aleksandr Ch. Vostokov (1781–1864) who discovered and dated the Ostromir Gospels (1056/57) in 1815. The Ostromir Gospels are still the oldest dated Slavonic book.

169 „чи пѫрвичка та е основана на старобитно то Бѫлгарско произношеніе, и за това требува да стане основа на новый атъ Бѫлгарскій языкъ."
by reference to the weighty authority of Jernej Kopitar whose grammar “is written with yuses” and who “as a foreigner is writing without prejudice about the Bulgarians” (ibid.). In the last part of the letter, the author is, however, critical of Bogorov’s grammar on several grounds – not least for his prolific use of neologisms which do not exist in the popular dialects. Following Aprilov, this grammar is still to be preferred because of its widespread use of the main contents of our ‘primordial’ language.

In the third and concluding part of his letter to the editor of Ljuboslovie (vol. 2, issue 22 October 1846, pp. 154–7), Aprilov harshly criticises all those who – like Christaki Pavlovič and Fotinov himself – have “thrown out the articles” (Ljub., 1846, 22: 155) The criticism is based on two fundamental arguments. The first could be seen as an expression of Thomas’ (1991: 76) “ethnographic purism”: the post-fixed definite is a characteristic feature of the Bulgarian rural dialects which have preserved the primordial purity of the ‘Soul’ of the Bulgarian people (and rejecting it is equal to annihilating your own true self). This is one of the most typical beliefs of the Romanticist linguistic nationalists. An idealised picture of the pure essence of the contemporary spoken varieties is to be the sole arbiter in questions of binary opposed rights and wrongs (domestic/foreign, pure/impure etc.) in language. The text does not refer to the actual spoken varieties – bristling with Turkish and Greek loanwords as they were. Only in this utterly restricted sense is he a descriptivist. The second argument is rationalistic. Aprilov writes that “the people are by nature striving for the short sentences” and he, in contrast to Pavlovič, claims that “‘the pen’ [“перо то”] is easier and smoother to pronounce than, for instance: ‘that pen’ [“това перо“]” (Ljub. 1846, 2: 156).

Aprilov ends his letter by urging all teachers throughout Bulgaria
dа бългайскъ съ слово и съко изръченѣ нарно, и тѣ замѣтки да ги
изложатъ въ нѣко книжка, или да ги обавляватъ презъ дневникъ атъ. Така
сось време ще стане пѣло грамматика на говорный атъ языкъ, когото
требува да очистимъ отъ чуждѣ слова, защото имамы наши старо или ново
бѣлгарскы
[Ljub. 1846, 2: 157].

[to annotate every word and every expression of the popular speech, and to expose those notes in some pamphlet, or publish them through the journal. In that way the grammar of the spoken language will with time become complete, which we must purify from foreign words, because we have our own old- or new-Bulgarian.]

Accordingly, Aprilov’s letter ends its rather exhaustive Romanticist manifesto by admonishing teachers all over the yet imagined Bulgarian linguistic

---

170 “е писана съ юсове […] като иноземецъ, пише за Българе тѣ безъ съко пристрастїе.”
171 “изфѣрили членове-те”
172 “человѣци тѣ оть природѣ са стремѣхъ вѣ крѣтокъ тѣ изрѣченѣа […] перо то е по
лесно и гладко, отъ, да речемъ, това перо.”
and cultural area to engage in the almost sacrosanct mission of sounding the depths of the ‘Soul’ of the Bulgarian nation. The ultimate objective is to bring up the pure and priceless pearls “of our existence, and of our present and future enlightenment”173 (Ljub., 1846, 21: 142). Thus, the grammar will only reach its supreme completion when it is entirely based on the words and expressions of the popular speech – purified from foreign words and, additionally, enriched by lexical items from ‘old-Bulgarian’, i.e., Church Slavonic. Only then will what he saw as the ‘Soul of the People’ finally resurrect from the abyss of historical oblivion and embody itself in the homogenised linguistic practices of the nation. This eloquently elicits the ideological aspect of language standardisation and standard languages. They are always “an idea in the mind rather than a reality – a set of abstract norms to which actual usage may conform to a greater or lesser extent” (Milroy & Milroy, 2002: 19).

In line with this Romanticist discourse, Aprilov’s status planning choice of the basis for the future norm falls upon the contemporary spoken varieties (or rather upon an idealised form of these vernaculars(s) – existing only in his own mind). These varieties will be turned into “a standardized tool of literary expression” (Kloss, 1967: 27) for the Bulgarian nation through an Ausbau- or corpus planning process in which the body of the language is purged from what is deemed to be foreign lexis and enriched, elaborated, or modernised by means of what is perceived as domestic lexis. This might be interpreted as an illustrative example of Thomas’ “xenophobic” and “ethnographic purism” (Thomas, 1991: 76; 80). In its ideological fervour, though, Aprilov’s text seems to turn a blind eye to the fact that the linguistic practices of the Bulgarian villages are totally lacking the whole range of the lexis characterising all the functional domains of modern life. The purist policy presented in the letter also corresponds to the ideology of monoglossia and the ideology of mono-origin. This is particularly apparent in its aspiration on absolute linguistic uniformity and ambition to elaborate, enrich, and modernise the language using exclusively what it presents as domestic resources.

According to Aprilov, and following the “three symbolic sociolinguistic functions” (Gyllin, 1991: 22) of a literary language, this Ausbau process will eventually transform the nation into a unified community of communication. This will be obtained by separating it from other varieties on primarily the South Slavic dialect continuum – not least through the ‘shibboleth-function’ of the big yus174 and the postfixed definite article.175 Thus, it will eventually
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173 на наше то бытие и на наше то сегашно и бъдещо просветление
174 The ‘little’ and ‘big yus’ (<ке> and <ѫе>) graphically represented nasal vowel phonemes ([ɛ̃] and [ɔ̃]) in the Church Slavonic script.
175 The postfixed definite article is a characteristic feature of the contemporary Bulgarian language which implies that the gender specific definite articles (masc. fem. and neut.) are postfixed to a noun or to the first word (an adjective or a possessive pronoun) in a noun
become a prestigious symbol for the cultural family ideally using it and evoke pride and loyalty in all its members.

The extensive response to Aprilov’s letter in the tripartite article “It is Hard to know Thyself” (vol. 2, issue 22–4 October–December 1846) once again underlines the fact that language debates are seldom about language alone, but about conflicting conceptualisations of group identity. Fotinov’s article starts with an anecdote about the antique Greek philosopher Thales of Miletus (620–546 BCE) in which they ask the illustrious wiseman “what is hard? [and] he answered: ‘For you to know thyself.’ And what is easy? ‘To advise others’, he said”\(^{176}\) (Ljub. 22: 159).

The parable forms the prelude to a rather downcast retrospect of the whole venture of publishing Ljuboslovie and a defiant apology for the Slavonic-Bulgarian discourse on language, purism, and national identity. The story about Thales is obviously about group identity – it is about knowing your true national self. Following the Slavonic-Bulgarian line of thought, the only way of superseding the dialectal fragmentation of the contemporary spoken varieties and uniting the Bulgarians linguistically is to return to the old-Bulgarian ‘spoken’ language into which the Holy Writ was translated a thousand years ago, as it is still the true and prestigious marker of ethnocultural difference of the Bulgarian people in the world of nations.

This policy is elitist and archaist in the sense that it eventually opts for basing the literary language on Church Slavonic in the phase of status planning. In the phase of corpus planning, the form of the language must be codified, and its functions elaborated in accordance with the resources of the Church Slavonic high-status code. Fotinov’s language policy is, finally, prescriptive in the sense that it, in the acquisition planning phase, must be prescribed to the popular masses. As a rationale for his policy, Fotinov reinforces the belief that the Bulgarians are the only rightful heirs of the prestigious Church Slavonic patrimony. It is the pure and pristine source of their national identity.

The defence of the Slavonic-Bulgarian concept of language, purism, and national identity is written in a language which is also a practical embodiment of its language ideology. The post-fixed definite articles are, as Aprilov had noted, totally absent, but Fotinov is using several other characteristic features of the contemporary Bulgarian language. He asserts that

\[
\text{Съ перво начало като прияхъ перо да писувамъ на Болгарскїй языкъ, друго немахъ предъ очи освень говорный языкъ, който по большей части между}
\]

\(^{176}\) "що е мъчно? отговори „Да познае человѣкъ самъ себеси.“ А що е лесно? „Да созвѣтува другиго“ рече."
[From the very beginning, when I grabbed the pen to write in the Bulgarian language, I did not have anything else on my mind than the spoken language, which for the most part is used among the people, and I followed like an unbridled horse [follows] his head.]

Yet, the author gets lost and finds himself on roads without any regularity and “light to go on”\(^{177}\) (\textit{Ljub.}, 1846, 22: 160), and concludes that a popular language without a grammar is like a horse without a bridle. A grammar is, according to Fotinov, nothing but an art, which urges and teaches a person to speak his language in the right way and to write it correctly. To avoid the hawthorns and pitfalls of the wrong paths of the vernaculars, this grammar must be based on that of Church Slavonic. According to this discursive positioning, this is tantamount to the spoken Bulgarian language into which the holy brothers translated the Bible a millennium ago.

When the intention of following grammatical rules filled him, Fotinov continues

[I could not find any more blessed and decent grammar than that which is contained by and governing the Holy Writ, which is the unflinching foundation of both the liturgical and spoken Bulgarian language and which is its whole substance and whole confirmation and reinforcement even up to this day from so many centuries.]

The Bulgarian language and the people which is defined by it should consequently be rooted in and dignified by the grammatical example governing the Bible. If the yus was the “pearl of our existence”\(^ {178}\) (\textit{Ljub.}, 1846, 21: 142) for Aprilov, Church Slavonic is by Fotinov represented as the “whole substance”\(^ {179}\) (\textit{Ljub.}, 1846, 22: 160) of the Bulgarian language and national identity. He makes explicit reference to the grammar of Avram Mrazović as the pattern he has been following. He is probably referring to the “Handbook to the Slavic grammar: to be used by the Slavonic-Serbian popular schools”\(^ {180}\) (ibid.), which was published in Buda in 1800. He motivates his choice by writing that he prefers Mrazović’s grammar to the grammars based on the contemporary spoken varieties and which “have taken such by ignorance ruined words as the basis for its rules”, in order not to suffer from the dialec-

\(^{177}\) “никакво святило за наставление”.

\(^{178}\) “бисеръ на наше то бытіе”.

\(^{179}\) “всичко вещество”.

\(^{180}\) Руководство къ славенския грамматицѣ и оправленіѣ во опотребленіѣ славено-сербскихъ народныхъ оучилищъ
Fotinov mentions Adamantios Korais as the one who has taken the Greeks out of this conundrum by steering a linguistic middle way between the ‘archaists’ and the ‘vernacularists’. Furthermore, Korais had created a language based on contemporary Greek varieties but purified from foreign lexical items and “corrected” it through “a process of morphological archaization in keeping with an arbitrary selection of the rules governing the phonology and morphology of the ancient language” (Mackridge, 2010: 25). Korais’ language policy and ideology function as a blueprint for what Fotinov initially intended to do with the Bulgarian language. Just as for Korais, in the Greek context, this language policy at the same time implies a moral regeneration of the Bulgarian people.

In the second part of “It is Hard to know Thyself” (vol. 2, issue 23 November 1846, pp. 171–6) Fotinov rhetorically asks

[To whom of all the Slavic peoples does this liturgical, or Slavonic most belong, from which peoples it has naturally arisen, in which countries of the Slavic world is this liturgical language written, who has invented it, for what reason is it written, in what times, in whose lifeworld and cooperation, and from whom has it shined forth into the world.]

On the following pages he exhaustively proves that “Constantine, as a monk called Cyril, and his elder brother Methodius were native Slavonic-Bulgarians” (Ljub., 1846, 23: 172) living in lands inhabited by Slavs, and that they invented the Cyrillic script and translated the Holy Writ from Greek into Slavonic-Bulgarian in the nineth century in order to Christianise “Boris, the Tsar of the Bulgarians” and his subjects. “Could they with such perfection have translated the Holy Writ into the Slavonic-Bulgarian tongue, if they were not naturally Slavonic-Bulgarians?” (ibid.) he ponders. By so doing, Fotinov corroborates his own thesis about the exclusive rootedness of the Bulgarian language and national identity in the Cyrillo-Methodian linguistic and cultural patrimony.

In the third and concluding part of his long text (vol. 2, issue 24 November 1846, pp. 183–91), Fotinov invokes a whole host of contemporary slavi-
cist authorities – “Schlözer, Pogodin, Šafárik, Šefyrjov, Venelin, Aprilov [...] as well as Bodjanskij, [and] Konstantin Zelenickij”\(^{184}\) (Ljub., 1846, 24: 184) – in support of his thesis that the entire Cyrillo-Methodian heritage in the first place belongs to the Bulgarians. Hereby he finds it duly proven that the Holy Scripture “is [...] in pure-Bulgarian”\(^{185}\) (ibid.). According to Fotinov, it is the pure and pristine source of Bulgarian glotto- and ethnogenesis to which the Bulgarians ought to return to be wholly realised as a national community.

Following the elitist example of these highly educated holy brothers, the Bulgarians must now base their literary language on the linguistic practices of their sociocultural elite

Accepting the vernacularist concept of Aprilov and rejecting the elitist linguistic example of the two holy brothers, was, in Fotinov’s eyes, tantamount to betraying the true self of the Bulgarian people.

Moreover, the absence of the < ѵ> (“this foreign sound”\(^{186}\), Ljub. 1846, 24: 190) in the Cyrillo-Methodian texts, and its presence in the contemporary spoken varieties, is by no means a reason to deviate into the vernacularist jungle of Vasil Aprilov. Why should the Bulgarians prefer the millet of the vernacular to the wheat of the classical language? Fotinov rhetorically asks. No, the true differentiator, or characterising sign (mark) of the Bulgarian people is not the yuses (and the post-fixed definite article), which are the result of later foreign influences,\(^{187}\) but the ‘pure-Bulgarian’ Ecclesiastical dialect of the holy brothers from Thessaloniki, which, in Ivanova’s words, according to Fotinov (and Neofit Rilski) “shall serve as source for enrichment of mainly the word-stock and which will solve the lexical inconsistencies which has emerged because of the dialectal variegation, and fulfil the role of arbiter”\(^{188}\) (Ivanova, 1998: 23). Church Slavonic is the ‘roots’ and the
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184 Шлецеръ, Погодинъ, Шафарикъ, Шевьрежъ, Венелинъ, Априловъ [...] , каквото и Боданский [...] Константинъ Зеленецкий
185 святое Писание [...] е на чистоболгарския язикъ
186 това непознато звученъ
187 Fotinov claims that the vowel /ъ/ or /о/ is a result of Tatar influence (Nikolova, 2015: 64).
188 „че църковнославянският език ще служи като източник за обогатяване главно на словарния фонд и ще разрешава възникнали поради диалектната пъстрота лексикален разнобой, изпълнявайки ролята на арбитър“.
‘mother’ which the Bulgarians as loving children and lawful heirs like no other Slavic people have the obligation
da go uchiva i da proslyduva [...] da go predpochita i chuva. Tova nar’che, kakvoto vidohme, Bolgarsko e, ot’ Bolgari i za Bolgari preveden, i s’kii Bolgarin’ kakto naslydnik’, dolgenn e da go sogranii vo ucheniyz axuy pismennyi. To e istina che nyne ne mogemee nito da govorime, nito da pisemee spered’ Cerkovnoe nar’che; po krajnii mbr obache dl’ki sme da sl’yduvame po negovi pravila i nastavlenii takav kakvoto pravat’ uchenii lud’i na dnebnii den’, za koto takto nemam’ m’sto da govorim’y, prestavam (Ljub., 1846, 24: 191).

[to protect and follow [and] to preserve and prefer. This dialect is, as we have seen, Bulgarian, translated by Bulgarians and for Bulgarians, and every Bulgarian is as an heir obliged to preserve it in the written language of education. It is true that we can neither speak nor write according to the Church dialect; but we are at least obliged to follow its rules and instructions as do these days educated people, but as I have not got room to speak thereof, I cease.]

And there he ceases with, at least in part, a concession to Aprilov’s opinion that the Bulgarian school children cannot be forced to use the ‘Church dialect’ in either their spoken or in their written linguistic practices. However, at the same time he maintains that Church Slavonic shall be given the role of lawgiver in the elaboration of the form and function of the contemporary Bulgarian language. For him, and the etymologist Slavonic-Bulgarian line of thought, the Church Slavonic roots will always have the final say in questions of the rights and wrongs in the discourse on language, purism, and national identity.
6. Discourses on linguistic purity and national identity in Serbian periodicals (1844–74)

In this chapter I will examine some examples of the Serbian discourse on language, purism, and national identity in the second half of the nineteenth century. The main scope is to investigate what role purist ideologies, and the policies they engendered, played in the interconnected construction of both the modern standard Serbian language code and the national identity it represented for many participants in the discourse.

The young Principality of Serbia underwent intense modernisation in the period from the 1840s to the late 1870s. These radical changes presented the societal elites with several impending challenges. New technical inventions changed the patterns of communication and discourse, and new ways of organising society required a radical expansion and unification of a written language which was primarily based on an idealised version of the linguistic practices of the peasantry. This language was in many ways inapt to fulfil the needs of a modern, urbanised society with its public institutions of political governance, legislation, administration, and, not least, its expanding system of national education.

The roughly three decades studied in this chapter, were also a period of intensified international contacts and entanglements, not least with the neighbouring Croats. The drastic turns within Serbian society, and public discourse, actualised questions of national identity as expressed in and through language. Given the central role ascribed to language in defining the modern nation, linguists, writers, and philologists of that time were given the prerogative of interpretation in the public debates of the era (cf. Joseph, 2004). Additionally, many of them contemporaneously held central positions both within the scholarly and political life of the young principality.

The complex processes of the preceding centuries had led to several decisive results. One was the gradual suppression of the situation of Church Slavonic–vernacular diglossia. Under the sociolinguistic conditions of the preceding period, from the Late Middle Ages up to the mid-eighteenth century, the high-prestige variety of the sacred Church Slavonic language had fulfilled virtually all higher cultural purposes (Mladenović, 1989: 45). At the same time, the vernacular low-prestige varieties had been reduced to the functions of oral, face-to-face communication within the local communities – as well as being the medium of the traditional epic poetry. The status-
planning issue as to which variety or group of varieties was going to form the basis for the building out (Ausbau) of a polyfunctional modern language, had by the mid-nineteenth century been resolved in favour of some version of the vernacular. Yet, it was still not completely clear which societal group was to be given the prerogative of defining the exact nature of this vernacular dialect base. Was the standard Serbian language code, and the identity it was seen as a conveyer of, going to be based exclusively on the linguistic practices of the rural masses or was some weight also to be given to the traditions and practices of the educated urban elites?

One of the most impending challenges in the field of corpus planning was the construction of a scientific terminology, which could fulfil the communicative needs of the modernising Serbian society. This challenge was directly related to the “destiny of the terminological accomplishments of the Church Slavonic lexis”\(^{189}\) (Ivić, 2001: 190) in this functional expansion of the standard Serbian language code. Church Slavonic and the Russian lexis formed a central part of the prestigious high-language code and identity of the educated Serbian elites of Habsburg Vojvodina. For many members of these elites, this lexis conveyed several symbolic contents. It marked their alignment with the Serbian Orthodox Church and thereby also a rootedness in the continuous tradition of the prestigious Serbian medieval realms (Ivić, 2001). Moreover, the Slavonic and Russian vocabulary epitomised the societal elites’ strong alliance with the Russian Empire and its Orthodox tsar. Giving up this lexis would imply breaking the bonds with a system of sociocultural meaning making, which engendered both their sense of collective identity and their position of privileged power.

The Serbian Society of Letters ‘Дружтво српске словесности’ (in the following DSS) had been founded by J.S. Popović and Atanasije Popović in Belgrade in 1841 as part of a general shift of political and cultural life to the capital of the young Principality of Serbia. It was organised to solve the corpus-planning issue of creating scientific terminology in Serbian and to expand the functional domains of the written language.\(^{190}\) This task almost immediately caused fierce disputes between, chiefly, Jovan Sterija Popović and Vuk St. Karadžić. The dispute culminated during a series of sessions of the Society at the end of May 1845. Karadžić vehemently protested against Sterija Popović’s proposal that the DSS should be authorised to continue their work on a dictionary of scientific terms, arguing that its members “do not know the Serbian popular language good enough to be able to create scientific terms in the spirit of the popular language”\(^{191}\) (Piper, 2010: 284).

\(^{189}\) “судбине терминолошких тековина црквенословенске лексике.”
\(^{190}\) The language policy and purist ideology of the DSS have been thoroughly studied the various papers collected in Bojović (2017).
\(^{191}\) „не знају довољно добро српски народни језик да би могли правити научне термине у духу народног језика.”
On the very last of DSS’s three May-sessions in 1845, Karadžić (1894: 160) prophetically uttered that there will “come a time, when the Serbs from Srem, Bačka, and Serbia will go to Zagreb to learn Serbian.” Karadžić was hereby, *inter alia*, referring to the purist policy of the Croatian and Slovene Illyrianists, who in part approached the question of lexical modernisation by coining neologisms based on the word-formation resources of the vernaculars. They aimed at cleansing the language from, primarily, the many Germanisms and Magyarisms, at the same time freeing themselves from the colonial oppression of the Habsburg Empire that they represented. In addition, Karadžić wrote a letter to the minister of education and president of the DSS Paun Janković (1808–65) in which he repeated his verdict about the incompetence of the DSS in occupying itself with the corpus-planning task of constructing a scientific terminology in Serbian. In this letter, he paraphrased his own prophecy that the illustrious members of the DSS would soon have to learn Serbian from their Croatian neighbours (cf. Karadžić, 1894: 149–57).

The contacts between Serbian, Croatian, and Slovene linguistic activists were many and intense in the period from the 1840s to the 1870s. Zagreb was expanding as a centre of the cultural, economic, and political life of the region. Growing in importance was also the idea of constructing a Yugoslav people by means of a common language – Serbo-Croatian, which also gained momentum in the second half of the nineteenth century under the pressure of “Hungary’s aggressive assimilationist policies” (Calic, 2019a: 297). The Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts (‘Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti’) was founded in Zagreb in 1866 with the explicit intention to construct an all-encompassing, language-based unity of all the South-Slavs (including the Bulgarians). The first phase of these discursive processes was crowned with the publications of the corpus-planning manuals of the Croatian Vukovians Ivan Broz (1852–93), Tomislav Maretić (1854–1938), and Franje Ivecović (1834–1914) around the year 1900 (Wachtel, 1998: 24–31; Ivić, 2001: 200–1). These grammars and dictionaries
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192 “доћи вријеме, кад ће Срби из Сријема, Бачке и Србије ићи у Загреб да уче српски.”
193 The corpus-planning responsibility of constructing and codifying a scientific terminology for Croatian was to a large extent given to the philologist and lexicographer of Slovak origin Bogoslav Šulek (1816–95). He did certainly exploit the word-stocks of the Štokavian, Čakavian, and Kajkavian dialects in coining neologisms, but he also borrowed and constructed calques or loantranslations from other Slavic languages – not least from his maternal Slovak and Czech. This strategy of lexical enrichment would later draw him into conflict with the Croatian Vukovians. Šulek was also one of the main ideologues of Illyrianism. In 1844 he published the programmatic *What do the Illyrians want? (Šta namėravaju Iliri?)*. In Croatia this idea was supported by such significant intellectuals as the philologist Adolfo Veber Tkalečević (1825–89), the bishop and politician Juraj Josip Štroumsma (1815–1905), the historian, writer, and clergyman Franjo Rački (1828–94), and the philologist and pioneer of Slavic studies Vatroslav Jagić (1838–1923).
defined the rules of linguistic behaviours and the language vocabulary of the hyphenised Serbo-Croat nation.

On the Serbian side the idea was propagated by Vuk St. Karadžić and his followers – above all his prime disciple Đuro Daničić. Daničić and Karadžić were two of the signatories of the Vienna Literary Agreement (‘Bečki književni dogovor’) of 1850. The Agreement was a symbolically important declaration of intent which was signed by several influential Serbian, Croatian, and Slovene intellectuals in the Austrian capital in 1850. It contained a five-point program which envisioned the construction of a common language based on the *southern dialect* ‘južno narječe’, i.e., the “New-Štokavian folkloric koine” (Brozović, 1970: 113) which constituted the base for Karadžić’s concept of language and national identity.

In the three decades studied in this chapter, it became fashionable to use so called *Illyrian words* ‘ilirske riječi’ among a significant portion of the Serbian intellectuals. Thereby, they demonstrated their loyalty to the Yugoslav idea of Karadžić and the signatories of the Vienna Literary Agreement. This linguistic expression of political sympathies and public performance of cultural identities, in turn, provoked ridicule and a kind of anti-Croatian purism among other Serbian intellectuals. One of them was Jovan Sterija Popović. The criticism launched by Sterija Popović and many other influential Serbian intellectuals concerned virtually all levels of language – lexicon, syntax, morphology, and phonology – but it was particularly harsh in the field of lexis. These critics characterised the Croatian neologisms and calques as *monstrosities* ‘nakaze’ (Herrity, 1978: 208) and they were conceptualised as an ominous threat to the beauty and expressivity of the Serbian language.

In contrast to the systematic policy of moderate to extreme ethnographic and general xenophobic purism of their Croatian neighbours, the Serbian situation after 1847 was generally characterised by an attitude of *laissez-faire*, although there were frequent individual and significant expressions of ethnographic, reformist, playful, and, above all, targeted xenophobic purism (Thomas, 1991). The main targets for the interventions of the Serbian purist seems to have been lexical, phraseological, and syntactic Germanisms and Croatisms which by many “were seen as an intermediary for Germanisms” (Herrity, 1978: 203). The urban dialect of Zagreb, ‘purgerski’, was, and still is, thoroughly influenced by German. Non-Slavic loanwords and sources of lexical enrichment were also frequently addressed – Turkisms, Magyarisms, Graecisms, and even Italianisms, and some intellectuals expressed purist concerns about internationalisms of Graeco-Latin provenance. Although the general picture is one of mild purism, these expressions of linguistic xenophobia were significant for the articulation of the construction of the “Serbi-
an national individuality”195 (Ivić, 2001: 189). As in virtually all cases of general or targeted xenophobic purism, regardless of its intensity, it was a matter of contrastive “self-silhouetting against [a foreign] Outside” (Leersen, 2006: 17).

6.1 Coming to terms with terminology: Purist discourse in Podunavka and Glasnik Družstva srbske slovesnosti, 1844–47

This section will be dedicated to a thorough analysis of the purist discourse of the civil-Serbian concept of language and national identity as, mainly, represented by Jovan Sterija Popović and the circles associated with his socio-cultural standing and the Society of Serbian Letters (DSS). Sterija Popović and his associates stand or a mild elitist, archaist, ethnographic, and even playful purist discourse and policy, which tries to steer a middle way between the more extreme expressions of archaist and vernacularist attitudes to purity in language and national identity.

The texts I will analyse were all published in the period 1844–47. They were printed in the official organ of the Society of Serbian Letters, Гласникъ Дружства србске словесности (GDSS), and in Podunavka which was the literary supplement of the official newspaper, Србске новине. These articles developed into a debate when both the defenders of Sterija Popović’s positions and the young romanticist advocates of the Vuk St. Karadžić responded in a series of articles in Podunavka. These texts constitute a vital part of the Serbian mid-nineteenth century discourse on language, purism, and national identity.

The minister of education and classicist writer Jovan Sterija Popović had been turned into a public laughingstock by young critics for what they saw as hopelessly retrograde stances on language and national identity ever since the May-sessions of the DSS. Then Vuk St. Karadžić convinced its president Paun Janković to disqualify the DSS as a competent body for the construction of a terminological dictionary. The debates that preceded and followed this status- and corpus-planning decision were charged with strong emotions and therefore also sharply polarised.

At the epicentre of the clash and conflict between the discourses of the two generations were the purist principles for the functional extension of the Serbian language. On 11 November 1844, the members of the DSS published the text “News from the Society of Serbian Letters”196 (Podunavka, 1844, 46: 181–2). The short text has the character of an ideological manifesto for the identity and general language policy of the DSS. It also functions as a theoretical introduction to the “Preparation, for a nomenclatural (terminological)

195 "српска национална индивидуалност."
196 “Извѣстіе Дружства с’рбске словесности”. 
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dictionary” (Podunavka, 1844, 46: 182–3). This list of proposed scientific terms, in which the lemmas are given in Latin, was going to be irregularly published in Podunavka until the 14th of April 1845, when the work was interrupted in connection with the May-sessions of DSS. It stretches from “A posteriori, чувствоизворно” (Podunavka, 1844, 46: 182) to “Curatela, старательство” (Podunavka, 1845, 14: 59).

In “News from the Serbian Society of Letters” the members declare that the main concern of the DSS is the “the cultivation and perfection of the Serbian language” (Podunavka, 1844, 46: 181–2). The cultivation of the purity of national language had been the rationale for the foundation of most European academies ever since the foundation of the Italian Academia della Crusca in Florence in 1582 (Edwards, 2009: 217). The members of the DSS explicitly state that they intend “the cultivation of the popular [my ital., PLC] language” and that they find this Ausbau task “by all means most current and necessary” (ibid., p. 182). To obtain the objective of turning the Serbian language into a polyfunctional written language code which can serve the national speech community in all the domains of a modern society, the DSS will have to situate all their upcoming sessions “in the field of a Serbian Terminology” (ibid.). The members of the DSS identify themselves with the civil-Serbian discourse, asserting that “so many Serbian writers from the time of the eminent Dositej Obradović” (ibid.) have given their contributions to this vital cause. The core of the task consists in

da србскомъ народномъ езыку оно богатство р ѣчій и израза сакупи и начини, кое му имати валя, да бы се оно њово благородство књижевности утв'рдило и уздигло, и да бы с ньмъ не само Списательи, него и Професори на катедрама у отечественъмъ, особито вишимъ школама и правительствени Званичници у разнимъ земальскимъ, особито већимъ Надлежательствама у напредакъ лакше и равнообразне могли послужити (Podunavka, 1844, 46: 182)

[to collect and produce that richness of words and expressions for the Serbian language, which it ought to have, in order to ascertain and elevate the dignity of its Literature, and so that not only the Writers, but also the Professors at the departments in the national, particularly higher schools and the governmental Functionaries in different national, particularly larger Authorities henceforth can use it with greater ease and more uniformly.]

In this short quote, the members of the DSS address many of the status- and corpus-planning challenges facing any modernising society. Without explicitly specifying the sources (though they have earlier mentioned “the popular language”), they must compile and coin an extensive and homogeneous corpus of scientific terms to elevate the Serbian language to the status of a polyvalent national code. The ultimate objective is to satisfy the impending

---

197 „Припрема, за називословный (терминологический) Рѣчникъ“.
198 „образованѣ и усавршенствованѣ езыка србскога“.
199 „образовавацъ народногъ езыка […] свакоји найпречији и найнуждіји“.
200 „у поло србске Терминологи“.
needs for efficient communication within the domains of education and governance in any modern nation-state.

These declarations did not per se provoke any strong reactions among the young romanticist followers of Karadžić. What provoked bad discursive blood was rather the purist ideology and policy which the DSS intended to apply in the lexical modernisation of Serbian society. Both the young romanticist philologists and writers, and the older classicist generation of intellectuals referred to the word-formation resources of the popular language as the prime and primal source of lexical enrichment. Yet, for the young Vukovians this syntagma meant exclusively the new-Štokavian folkloric koine which had been collected and codified in the works of their great master. For the members of the DSS, on the other hand, it meant the gradually Serbified Slavonic-Serbian language of the towns and villages of Vojvodina which was still in close contact with the lexical resources of Church Slavonic and Russian. Consequently, they have created a list of words

po kojoj ne se uvidi da e ono jedne odakuplje niym i za termiologiske oprdeljene rčij iz staro-slavenskoga jezika, iz onog predragog i ekstvenog izvora uzelo, drugu od jih su novi spisatelji nasili i upotrebljavali, zadrzalo a za srbiskije jezike slojki posvoilo, a druge opet iznova za istajr nachinilo (Podunavka, 1844, 46: 182).

[according to which you will comprehend that it is some of the words which it [the DSS] has compiled and terminologically defined words from the Old Slavonic language, which it has taken from this beloved and unique source, others [have been taken] from the order of those [words], which the new writers have found and utilised, it has retained them and adopted them according to the Serbian language, others, yet, have been created anew.]

According to this explicit elitist and archaising purist policy, they were addressing three principal sources and strategies of lexical enrichment: 1) Church Slavonic (which would probably include several Russian lexical items), 2) the literary practice of contemporary writers, and 3) the coinage of neologisms based on the morphological resources of the same word-stock. This was the very same language ideology that was implicitly manifested in their own literary practice. It was exactly these purist principles for the lexical modernisation of the Serbian language which would be at the heart of the conflict which broke out on the pages of Podunavka almost exactly a year later.

On 20 October and 10 November 1845, Jovan Sterija Popović published his ironic bipartite “Letter in the new Serbian language” (Podunavka, 1845, 42: 175; 45: 191–2). This fictive letter provoked a group of young Vukovian philologists. The text was written in the wake of the May-sessions of the DSS when the interference of Vuk St. Karadžić had concretely led to

---

201 They referred to a vernacularist literary tradition which had been initiated by the Enlightenment philosophical writer and language reformer Dositej Obradović.

202 „Писмо новымъ србскимъ језикомъ“
the interruption of the work terminological dictionary. Moreover, Karadžić’s venture implicitly entailed the general disqualification of the DSS as an authoritative body in matters of philology and status- and corpus planning. This was a step which caused a significant embitterment among the members of the DSS. Sterija Popović’s text is also a humoristic comment and general response to the fashion of using the so-called Illyrian words among the young romanticist writers and Vukovians. It is an implicit an expression of Sterija Popović’s language policy and is written in an ‘Illyrianised’ language which is supposed to illustrate the absurdity of the Croatian neologisms, and, in consequence, the illogicality of appropriating the strategies of Croat neighbours lexical enrichment. In a footnote he mockingly explains that

[This is a letter of a young Serb, who is endeavouring to break with the hitherto way of writing and introduce a new, which some of the contemporary writers are utilising. Given that many are supporting this opinion, I therefore think that appropriating the very same writing will be of great benefit; because, on the one hand, such a bounty of new words can be found in it, yet, on the other, let the Serbs see how much beauty there is in such a language, and let them accordingly decide, whether we shall accept the new way of writing of some of our young Writers, or whether we shall reject it. Besides, everyone is wrong who would think that this letter is referring to the Croats.]

In this letter he ironically imitates the style and language of the younger generation and implicitly sums up virtually all the core issues of the then current and future debates on the principles of modernisation concerning the Serbian language. Above all, they involve the communicatively and symbolically important corpus-planning issues of constructing unified graphical conventions and elaborating the functions of the Serbian vocabulary. The quote also brings forth the central point of the clash between the romanticist ideological paradigm of the “young Serb” and the interests and conceptualisations of the world, language, and national identity of Sterija Popović and his generation. Are the articulate members of the Serbian speech-community going to make a clear break with the existing literary tradition and its Russian and Church Slavonic lexical resources and embrace the corpus-planning strategies of the Croatian Illyrianists and Vukovians? These questions were also intimately related to questions of political interests and the patterns of cultural identifications they give rise to. Sterija Popović’s negative attitude to the total denial of the tradition he is representing becomes obvious.

In this letter he ironically imitates the style and language of the younger generation and implicitly sums up virtually all the core issues of the then current and future debates on the principles of modernisation concerning the Serbian language. Above all, they involve the communicatively and symbolically important corpus-planning issues of constructing unified graphical conventions and elaborating the functions of the Serbian vocabulary. The quote also brings forth the central point of the clash between the romanticist ideological paradigm of the “young Serb” and the interests and conceptualisations of the world, language, and national identity of Sterija Popović and his generation. Are the articulate members of the Serbian speech-community going to make a clear break with the existing literary tradition and its Russian and Church Slavonic lexical resources and embrace the corpus-planning strategies of the Croatian Illyrianists and Vukovians? These questions were also intimately related to questions of political interests and the patterns of cultural identifications they give rise to. Sterija Popović’s negative attitude to the total denial of the tradition he is representing becomes obvious.

The second part of the fictive “Letter in the new Serbian language” (Podunavka, 1845, 45: 191–2) constitutes an answer from an imaginary friend,
written in the same mocking spirit and using the same ‘Illyrianised’ language. The anonymous correspondent begins with thanking the writer for the merriment his “love letter in a new costume”\textsuperscript{203} (ibid., p. 191) has caused and immediately addresses the vital question of ethno-linguistic purity. He writes:

Найпрво мніемъ быти потребито, да ти пріобћимъ мое пазке гледе езыка нашег, кои е юшт незгоданъ, и потребитъ врстны радіоник, да га одь старославянскога одцише и новима, чисто србскима материискима накрме. Не могу ти се, дакле, доста захвалити, што си наканіо таковыми богаштинама указати се, и стару славянштину као Гордіевъ узао мачемъ великога Скендеръ пресчи […] (ibid.).

[Firstly, I find it necessary to communicate my opinions regarding our language, which is still unsuited, and in exigency of distinguished professionals, to separate it from Old Slavonic and to feed it with new purely Serbian maternal [words]. I cannot, thus, thank You enough that You have decided to make such bounties appear, and to cut off the old Slavonic culture like the Gordian knot with the sword of the great Alexander […].]

The main crux in the making of the Serbian nation is thus parodically conceptualised as the Church Slavonic cultural and linguistic patrimony and the identity concepts and political alliances it represents – with Pax Slavia Orthodoxa and Russia, primarily. The correspondent proposes to resolve this corpus-planning conundrum by resolutely cutting off the Old Slavonic language and take recourse exclusively to purely domestic word-formation resources in the process of lexical enrichment. Implicitly, this would also pave the way for engaging in the construction of a communal language and national identity with the Croats by underemphasising or eliminating the confessional marker of ethnocultural difference.

The anonymous narrator also touches upon the question of acquisition planning – i.e., the acquisition of the new language and the system of cultural norms and identities itcomports through the system of higher education. He expresses satisfaction over the perspective that a younger generation of teachers could have taken over the Lyceum (the predecessor of the University of Belgrade) and even the seminary. It gives hope, he writes, that “they [the students] will acquire the new language, and not as they, deplorably enough, would have until now”\textsuperscript{204} (Podunavka, 1845, 45: 191). Consequently, getting rid of the old Slavonic language is ironically represented as universal solution to the language-and-national-identity conundrums in which the Serbs are trapped.

The sharpness of the reactions to Sterija Popović’s letter can be explained by the humour with which the subject is treated. It was probably also caused by the strong questions of emotionally charged cultural identifications and political interests it was related to. The first critical response came

\textsuperscript{203} "у новой одори любавно писмо"

\textsuperscript{204} "да ће си они намакнути езыкъ новый, а не као што жалибоже до сада бы."
in the article “An epistle to a friend on the letters written in the new Serbian language”\(^{205}\) (*Podunavka*, 1845, 47: 195–6) signed with the initials B.G.J.Č. and published on 23 November.\(^{206}\) Piper (2010: 288) identifies the persons behind the initials as Ban, Golub, Josimović and Čavlović. Ban would be the poet and playwright Matija B. (1818–1903), from Dubrovnik, and Čavlović is probably the politician and publicist Pavao (Paja) Č. (1821–77) from Zagreb. The text is an emblematic clash between two generations and their respective cultural codes and overall patterns of self-understanding. The four young radical romanticist language-ideologues are totally lacking the suave sense of humour of their more mature adversary. The article accuses Sterija Popović of coveting “to become a literary dictator”\(^{207}\) (*Podunavka*, 1845, 47: 195) in a time that does not condone dictators, by which the four critics are underlying their Romanticist, democratic, and populist attitude to purism, language policy, and standard language development. They claim that:

> неможе ни мало да трпи, но мрзи и гони све списатељ, који неће да пишу како онь пише, или како се говори у буџаку, где се онь родио. Онь неће да зна за различите дијалекте, него хоће да се све србство одрекне свое умне слободе, па из неговы дъла научи, како да говори и пише (ibid.).

[he cannot at all tolerate, but hates and persecutes all writers, who refuse to write as he writes, or as people talk in the nook where he is born. He does not want to know about different dialects but wants the entire Serbian people to give up its intellectual freedom and learn how to speak and write from his works.]

This marks a continuation of the debates between Vuk St. Karadžić and Jovan Hadžić a decade earlier (cf. 98–113). Using the discursive strategy of focusing on the person (*ad hominem*) rather than on the core of the matter (*ad rem*), would be recurrent in the late nineteenth century Serbian debates on language and identity. The opponents of the linguistic nation-building project of Karadžić and his followers would routinely be subjects of the discursive strategy of classical othering, i.e., it would be represented as essentially different from and fundamentally inferior to the ‘Vukovians.’ They were personally denigrated and demonised, and their arguments would either not be listened to or undergo a gross bipolar simplification (‘You are either with Us or against Us’). The four writers, thus, claim that Sterija Popović is autocratically trying to turn his own dialect, sociolect, and chronolect into the sole monoglottic base for the modernisation and functional extension of the Serbian language.

B.G.J.Č. claim that, Sterija Popović, instead of rationally criticising the modes in which the Serbian intellectuals actually are writing, has merely

\(^{205}\)“Посланица другу о писмама [sic!], писанима новымъ србскимь езыкомъ.”

\(^{206}\)The “Epistle” was, according to Piper (2010: 288), published without the knowledge of the stately censorship by the editor-in-chief Miloš Popović. Popović was the brother of Đuro Daničić. Piper claims that this reveals a consciousness about the offensive nature of the published text (ibid.).

\(^{207}\)“књижевнимъ диктаторомъ постати.”
collected all the useless words that “sometimes some student or unexperienced youngster has been using in [his] writing”208 (Podunavka, 1845, 47: 195) and with them composed a letter which has no equivalent in real life. The explicit message is “Look, brothers, how our young Serbs are writing, laugh at them!”209 (ibid.). To illustrate the absurdity of the criticism in the “Letter in the new Serbian language” the young intellectuals make a long list of Russian and Church Slavonic words, e.g., „работнъйшій, нелзя, убо […], каждый […], понеже […], опятъ […], любопремудствовавъ”210 (ibid.). According to them, it would have been as absurd composing an article with this selection of words, and send the message “Look, brothers, how our fathers were writing.”211 (ibid., p. 196). In their view, these extreme, constructed examples do not tell anything about the actual written language practices of the two conflicting generations.

Moreover, they accuse Sterija Popović of misrepresenting, misunderstanding, and misusing the purported Illyrian lexis of his indecently parodical letter. In order to illustrate their own stance on lexical enrichment, they quote a longer passage from the collection of poetry Gusle i tambura (‘Gusle and tambura’, Prague, 1845) by the poet and “true Illyrian”212 (Podunavka, 1845, 47: 196) Stanko Vraz (1810–51). In this passage, Vraz declares that he has been inspired by Karadžić’s Narodne srpske poslovice (‘Serbian Popular Sayings’, Cetinje, 1836). He is in the first hand focusing on the great amount of historically inherited Turkisms and presents his purist ideology concerning the lexical enrichment of naš jezik (which is virtually verbatim corresponding to that of Karadžić and his followers):

Ima kod nas gospode, što vrlo viču na rěči inostrane a najpače na turske, kažući da one grde krasan naš jezik. I ja rado priznajem, da bi vrlo dobro bilo, te bude jezik naš prost od tih rěčih kao i od svake druge priměši inostrane; i svagda ću nastojati, da jim se pišući ně kako uklonim. Nu za veliku nevolju volim opet metnuti tudju a narodu poznatu rěč, nego kovati novu kakvu ili grliti m ěsto nje od drugih skovanu, koja se neslaže ni s duhom ni s licem jezika našega. […] U slogu […] budimo puriste strogi a ne u golih rěčih (Vraz, 1845: 101–2).

[There are gentlemen among us, who yell a lot at the foreign words and above all the Turkish, saying that they are uglifying our wonderful language. I also gladly admit that it would be very good, if our language should be free from these words as well as from all foreign involvements; and I will always endeavour to remove them in some way in writing. Yet, to my great distress, I anyhow prefer to insert a foreign [word which is] familiar to the people, than to coin some new one or in its place embrace some [word] coined by someone else, which does not correspond to the spirit and face of our language. […] Let us be severe purists in the style […] but not in the naked words.]

208 „некадъ гдъкои ђакъ или неизкусанъ младићъ у писаню употребио.“
209 „Ево, браћо, како млади наши Срби пишу, те съмьйте се.“
210 ‘working, you must not, therefore […], each, because […], again […], gladly philosophise’
211 „Ево, браћо, како су наши отци писали.“
212 „правый Илирь.“
This quote is explicitly about purism – about how specific stylistic and lexical features of a certain linguistic code in a binary mode are believed to be foreign or “correspond to the spirit and face of our language” (ibid.), and to what was perceived as the ‘Soul,’ character, or identity of the community using it. “[O]ur language” (ibid.), in this case, is the language of all the South Slavs, or Illyrians.

This language successively came to be identified with the southern dialect or New-Štokavian folkloric koine which would be instrumentalised in the construction of the Yugoslav people in the second half of the nineteenth century (Wachtel, 1998: 24–31). The Vukovians identified two main threats to their populist-Serbian project of linguistic nation-building, which were posed by the particularism of

1) the Church Slavonic and Russian lexis of the old Vojvodina intellectual elite, represented by Jovan Sterija Popović, and
2) the corpus-planning strategy of calquing and coining neologisms, represented by Bogoslav Šulek and his Croatian associates.

Consequently, the representatives and practitioners of these two threatening purist ideologies, i.e., the defenders of the civil-Serbian concept of language and national identity, would have to be discursively marginalised and incapacitated. This was often obtained through the strategy of othering, demonisation, and denigration. For the Vukovians, planning the corpus of the language became tantamount to constructing the body of the nation. Even though the goal for Vraz and the Vukovians was a language completely cleansed from foreign intrusions, they preferred using general foreignisms, and in particular Turkisms, which were familiar to the people, over coining abstruse neologisms or embracing neologisms coined by others. The vital point was not as much in the choice of individual lexical items but in using an overall language. This language was equal to a style, which, according to the Romanticist language ideologues, expressed the ‘Soul’ and form of our people. “Let us be severe purists in the style […] but not in the naked words”213 (Vraz, 1845: 102). Vraz, thus, represents an anti-neologist purist policy.

Sterija Popović’s purist ideology was defended by the mathematician, writer, and secretary of the Society of Serbian Letters Atanasije Nikolić (1803–82) in the article “A notice to the authors of the epistle on the letters written in the new Serbian language”214 (Podunavka, 1845, 48: 199–200). Nikolić immediately addresses the core of the matter. He commences in a confrontative tone.

Кои сте вы безь фенѣра, и изъ кое сте воденице вас четити млађана воздухопловца? куда сте се данась залетили и тако напели духомъ злобе и пако-

213 “У слогу [… ] будимо puriste strogi a ne u golih rěčih.”
214 „Опомена сачинительима посланице другу писама писанима новымъ србскимъ езъкомъ.“
Nikolić is concerned about defending the identity of a social group whose interests and honour are viciously assaulted by the neologisms and Croatianisms (“concoctions and commodities”) of the four young writers. It is the Orthodox Church and its cultural and linguistic practices which has defended “the faith, name, and existence of the Serbian people” (ibid.). Now, Nikolić claims, these true Serbs are threatened by the purist policy, and language and identity project of the upcoming generation of romanticist writers and philologists. It was a generation which was turning to Zagreb for inspiration and guidance in the creation of a Yugoslav people defined by a common language. While confessing that “it would be more beneficial to use the popular language today,” Nikolić (ibid.), contemporaneously, describes the lexis and word-formation strategy of this common language as “perverted and fabricated.” In an equally religiously moralising tone, he discards the whole Yugoslav language and identity-project with the Biblical word “fornication” to which B.G.J.Č. are subjecting “the language which is a sanctity for the Serb” (ibid., p. 200). The project is compared to the act of raping.

Another defendant of Sterija Popović’s person and alleged cause was a certain Jovan Đ. Jevtimijević, who in “A Response. On the Epistle by Messrs. B.G. J. and Č. printed in nr 47 of Podunavka” rebukes the four critiques for having “dared […] to touch upon the honour of our people.” Jevtimijević is sharing the discursive position of Atanasije Nikolić and the old intellectual elite of Vojvodina with its deep rootedness in the cultural traditions and practices of the Serbian Orthodox Church. They both defend an identity concept in which religion – and not language – is the prime and superordinate marker of Serbian ethno-cultural
difference. For the new romanticist generation of intellectuals, on the contrary, language is the superordinate cultural practice which they form and instrumentalise to define and communicate what would be seen as an expanded Yugoslav national identity.

The merely twenty years old Đuro Daničić was in 1845 an ardent advocate of the pan-Serbian linguistic nationalism, according to which all speakers of new-Štokavian – regardless of creed or cultural traditions – were to be defined as Serbs. As late as 1857, Daničić identified the Croats exclusively with the Čakavian dialects. Yet, in the second half of the century, he cooperated closely with the Croatian Yugoslavists in the construction of an extended, linguistically defined South-Slavic national identity. He was not just be one of the signatories of the symbolic Vienna Literary Agreement (1850), but also twice served as the secretary general of the Yugoslav Academy of Science and Arts (Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti). This academy was founded under the patronage of Josip Juraj Štrosmajer (1815–1905) in Zagreb in 1867. One of its main objectives was to further the cause of far-reaching Yugoslavism (Wachtel, 1998), which also encompassed the Bulgarians (and Macedonians).

On 14 December 1845, Daničić turns to Sterija Popović in the short confrontative article “To the Tease” (Podunavka, 1845, 50: 207–8). He calls Sterija Popović a “buffoon” and the whole letter is a dazzling effort to repay with evil for his “Letter in the new Serbian language.” Consequently, Daničić is applying a language which is paraphrasing the literary style of older writers. To emphasise what he saw as the ridiculous absurdity of the scientific terms proposed in the “Preparation for a nomenclatural (terminological) dictionary,” he interlards the text with some of the terms and explains them in Latin, Serbian, or German in the numbered footnotes. Some of them are “покретаня, сгомиляй, езыковкама, школскима ручняцима” (Podunavka, 1845, 50: 207). Thus, he is also mockingly imitating the modus operandi of the compilers of the provisional dictionary. Daničić apologises to the reader for having wasted so much paper with this nonsense and claims that it would take the students of the Highschool of Belgrade 6–7 years to learn the abstruse terms of the “Preparation for a nomenclatural dictionary of the Society of Serbian letters.” Then they could as well study Latin, he adds, underlining the foreign, abstruse, constructed, and unnatural character of language of the DSS. Hereby Daničić is also juxtaposing this linguistic concept with what he saw as the spontaneous and natural directness of the popular language of the Vukovians.

These bipolar simplifications (natural–unnatural etc.) is an expression of the linguistic populism which is generally characterising the Serbian mid-

224 "Задиркивалу"
225 "лакрдіяшъ.
226 'starting up', 'collect', 'grammars', and 'school-handbooks.'
nineteenth century discourse on language and national identity. Daničić’s rabid defence of the Vukovian language is for instance hiding the fact that the new-Štokavian folkloric koine of Vuk St. Karadžić reflected the pre-modern life-worlds of the Serbian peasantry. Naturally, it did not comprise the linguistic domains of science, technology, schooling, administration, and governance, which are characterising a modern society. In some way or another, they had to be elaborated. The purist choice could be to use loan-translations and coin neologisms based on the vernaculars, as Bogoslav Šulek and the Croatian Illyrianists were doing (not least, inspired by the Czech example), or to take recourse to the word-formation resources of the sociolects and literary traditions of the Vojvodina intellectual elite. However, none of these options were viable for Daničić and the young Vukovians. Consequently, both had to be marginalised in the discursive making of first the Serbian and then the Yugoslav people.

Daničić ends his text with quoting exactly the same proverb, which Jovan Hadžić had been using as a motto for his “Counter-Attack or A Reply to the Reply to ‘Philological Bagatelles’” in the debate with Vuk St. Karadžić about six years earlier: „Рекла сова сеници“ ‘Quoth the owl to the tit’ (Podunavka, 1845, 50: 208). He signs the text with the symbolic “A young Serb from Austria”227 (Podunavka, 1845, 50: 208). The signature indicates both his generational belonging and the fact that Daničić at the time of writing was studying law in Vienna, where he also closely cooperated with both Karadžić and the Austro-Slavic ideologue Franc Miklošić (1813–91).

An answer to both Daničić’s fictive letter and the article by the pseudonym B.G.J.Č was published already in the subsequent number of Podunavka (1845, 51: 210–12). “To Mr. B.G.J.Č. and the young Serb from Austria”228 was written by the pedagogue, poet, and teacher at the Gymnasium of Belgrade Ilija Zaharijević (1820–53). Zaharijević criticises “Mr. B.G.J.Č.”229 (Podunavka, 1845, 51: 210) on several grounds. He finds it both unfair and paradoxical to offend Sterija Popović just because he “доказуе, да речи оне нису за Србљ, кое по самомъ речамъ ньовыми нису ни за Хрвата.”230 B.G.J. and Č. had, by quoting Stanko Vraz, themselves expressed a hostile attitude to the use of neologisms in the functional extension of the national language based on the southern dialect of Vuk St. Karadžić. Sterija Popović’s “Letter in the new Serbian language” did certainly represent a warning wrapped in ridicule, but his sole purpose had been

227 „Младъ Србинъ изъ Аустрие“.
228 „Господину Б.Г.І.Ч. и младомъ Србину изъ Аустрие“.
229 „Господина Б.Г.І.Ч.“
230 „доказуе, да речи оне нису за Србљ, кое по самомъ речамъ ньовыми нису ни за Хрвата.“
For Zaharijević it is thus about defending the Serbian language from the threat posed by what he represents as “indecent” (ibid.) or foreign to its pure and pristine spirit. Moreover, the defence of this language is constructed as a sacred task. Zaharijević maintains that the members of the DSS do not deserve to be called “pig-heads”[231] (ibid.) just because they are proudly persevering in this holy defence of the Serbian character of the national language. If the Serbs do not in time refrain from “such a coining and writing”[232] (ibid.), he apprehends that they in 10–15 years risk becoming an accepted characteristic of the Serbian language. In his view, the tide of Illyrian words must be stemmed before it floods and corrupts its true national essence.

Furthermore, Zaharijević continues, it is a horrendous fallacy claiming that these words are invented by students and children, when “we find them in a book written by their teacher: ‘What the Illyrians want’, and we find plenty of them also in the Danicas and in the Dalmatian C. and S. News”[233] (Podunavka, 1845, 51: 211). Zaharijević is referring to two central publications of the Croatian Illyrian movement. The first was the manifesto-like pamphlet Šta naměravaju Iliri (‘What the Illyrians intend’, 1844) by Bogoslav Šulek in which he formulates a cultural and linguistic ideology of the Illyrian movement. The second was Ljudevit Gaj’s newspaper Novine Horvatske-Slavonske-Dalmatinske (‘The Croatian-Slavonian-Dalmatian News’) and its weekly literary supplement Danica horvatska, slavonska i dalmatinska (‘The Croatian, Slavonian and Dalmatian Morningstar’), which was published in 1844–6. The Illyrians believed in the existence of one single Illyrian people defined and united by one common South-Slavic language. As I have mentioned earlier (cf. p. 76), this belief was also held by important Pan-Slavic ideologies such as Ján Kollár and Pavol Jozef Šafárik. Šulek (1844: 1) ambitiously describes the homeland of these Illyrians as comprising

one dàržave, koje medju Jadranskim i Càrnim morem leže, najme današnju: Horvatsku, Slavoniu, Dalmaciu Istriu, Korošku, Krajnsku, Štirsku, južnu stranu

[231] The original wording is „тиквама“, i.e. ‘the pumpkins.’ The word тиква ‘pumpkin’ is sometimes used to denote the head in Serbian and could, in certain contexts, have the connotation of ‘pig-head.’ Jovan Sterija Popović, for instance, published a comedy with the title Pokondirena tikva in 1838.

[232] „таквог кованя и писаня“

[233] „а мы те речи налазимо у књиги од овы учителя писаной: ‘Шта намґра ва Илири,’ и има ий сињет по Даницама и Новинама Х.С. Далматинским.“
Ugarske, Sàrbiu, Bosnu, Càrnu goru, Bugarsku i Albaniu. – Stanovnici […] ovieh zemaljah zvahu se Iliri.

[those states which are situated between the Adriatic and the Black See, namely today's: Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia Istriя, Carinthia, Carniola, Styria, the lower Hungary, Serbia, Bosnia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, and Albania. – The inhabitants of these countries […] called themselves Illyrians.]

Merged with Vuk St. Karadžić’s vision of one single people united by the new-Štokavian folkloric koine, this ideology would in the second half of the nineteenth century transform into Yugoslavism. It contrasted with this identity concept that the Zaharijević and the Slavonic- and Civil-Serbian camp now antithetically tried to articulate as a ‘Serbianness’ rooted in the Orthodox Church and the cultural traditions of the Vojvodina intellectual elite. A primarily confessional understanding of national identity clashed with a cultural and linguistic one.234

The tone is significantly sharpened, when Zaharijević, in the second part of the article, turns to Đuro Daničić. With seeming rationality, Zaharijević exclaims that the corpus-planning issue of creating a scientific terminology must be approached from many angles. The DSS has created a list of proposed terms for the domains of modern life which by necessity do not exist in the language of the Serbian peasantry. The DSS

некаже да су найболѣ и духу Србскогъ езыка найприличніе, него ий предлаже суду учены Срба, па ако нико ништа непримѣти, и болѣ некаже, Срби ће се служить ньима, докле имъ нужда и волѣ буде (Podunavka, 1845, 51: 211).

[does not say that they are the best and most adapted to the spirit of the Serbian language, but it suggests them to the court of the educated Serbs, and if no one has nothing to remark, and says something better, the Serbs will use them, as long as they need and desire.]

Zaharijević claims that there is a significant discrepancy between using words which are unfamiliar to our people out of vanity, as in the case of the Illyrianisms of the young intellectuals, and using uncommon words out of necessity – “when there are no others in the people”235 (Podunavka, 1845, 51: 211). Without further problematisation, both are referring to a hypothetical ‘people.’ Zaharijević claims that the terms the DSS proposes are at any rate more intelligible to the Serbian people than words such as “потребштина [‘commodity, necessity, supply’], опачина [‘atrocite, perverseness’], догодовштина [‘experience, event, adventure’], одлука [‘decision’], дражба [‘auction, vendue’], уветъ” [‘condition, requirement’] (ibid.), etc., with which they are garnishing their language. Yet, the choice of using these words is not just a matter of preferences and intelligibility. It is tanta-

234 This conflict between the Herderian Kulturnation, defined by language and culture, and the religiously defined Konfessionsnation, which in part was an Ottoman heritage, has left an enduring imprint in the Balkans (Calic, 2019b: 12).

235 „кадъ други у народу нема.“
mount to nothing less than betraying the Serbian people. Just like Atanasije Nikolić before him (cf. p. 149), Ilija Zaharijević now uses a religiously connotated imagery to brandish all those who are posing a threat to their conceptualisation of the national identity. He ends the section with a curse. “[H]ere is an answer in your own language: You Serbian infidel!”

According to the defenders of the civil-Serbian concept of language and national identity, such as Nikolić and Zaharijević, the pure essence of the Serbian language and people must be preserved and protected against the assaults by the westwards looking Vukovians. Zaharijević advises Daničić to employ his talent in supporting the Serbian language and furthering the progress of the Serbian people, and not make it merge with a foreign language. Mixing, hybridising, and merging with what is presented as foreign is the most archetypical fear of all brands of xenophobic purism (and xenophobia in general). It is often equalised to losing one’s true and essential national self, or, in other words, to dying as a nation (Thomas, 1991: 80). Zaharijević concludes the letter exactly in this key:

Я предвежно очитуемъ, да ћешъ убоица рода Србског быти, ако и наконъ у томъ болявомъ повѣтарцу уточишъ узтражишъ (Podunavka, 1845, 51: 211–2).

[I beforehand pronounce that You will be the murderer of the Serbian nation, if You also after this seek refuge in this unsane breeze.]

The Zagreb Wind, i.e., the influx of Illyrian words, would often be conceptualised as the most impending threat to the purity of the Serbian language in late nineteenth-century purist discourse. In this discourse, lexical items and other linguistic features were frequently reified and presented as an almost physical threat to the Serbian nation. The Illyrian words were by some commentators represented as ‘monstrosities’ or наказе, (Javor, 1863: 13) which stigmatised the language and offended the dignity and identity of the Serbian nation.

Zaharijević signs the text with the anonymous “А Serb from Austria” (Podunavka, 1845, 51: 212) and immediately makes an addition in his own name. In this addition he moralistically calls the new Serbian language of the young Vukovians “а sin and a shame” and assures

да ће свакій правый Србинъ чувати прадедски езыкъ, у коме благо и сва срећа Србска лежи и блиста (Podunavka, 1845, 51: 212).

[that every true Serb will protect the ancestral language, in which the wealth and whole fortune of the Serbs lies and shines.]

---

236 „ево ти одговоръ твоимъ езыкомъ: Србска невѣро!“.
237 A similar attitude to the lexis characterising the Croatian usus would be expressed in the Belgrade-based linguistic journal Naš jezik under the editorship of Aleksandar Belić (1876–1960) in the 1930s (cf. Baraban & Jozić, 2019).
238 „греота и срамота“
The stronghold of the pure language and true identity of the Serbian people was according to Zaharijević located “in [Sremski] Karlović and Novi Sad, the Serbian falcons’ nests”\(^{239}\) (ibid.). Consequently, he saw the Serbian Orthodox Church, whose see was located at Sremski Karlović, as the guarantee for the religious cultural practices – not least language, which, according to him, defined the Serbs as a separate national community.

Zaharijević’s article would in effect conclude the dispute and succinctly sum up what it was really about, namely – purism and national identity. It was about the efforts of two societal groups to propagate and defend their respective conceptualisations of the Serbian nation as symbolically conveyed by language forms. In the case of the older generation of Jovan Sterija Popović, one of the main threats to the purely Serbian character of the language was posed by the influx of abstruse Croatisms. The younger generation, headed by Daničić, on the other hand, identified the main threats to their particular vision of the Serbian nation with the Slavonic-Serb tradition. Consequently, they set out to finally cleanse the language from all remaining Slavonicisms and Russianisms.

Early in 1847, Sterija Popović published his “Reasons for the nomenclatural dictionary”\(^{240}\) (GDSS, 1847, 1: 9–16). In this 6–7 pages long text, Sterija Popović sums up the debate around the abortive terminological dictionary and responds to Vuk St. Karadžić’s decisive criticism in his own words. “Reasons for the nomenclatural dictionary” is a manifesto for the language ideology and corpus-planning policy of Sterija Popović and DSS and the cultural, social, and political interests they represented. It also contains their particular vision of the Serbian nation. In this sense, Sterija Popović’s purist ideology and policy is certainly nationalistic, xenophobic, and protectionist, when it comes to its objectives. Furthermore, surely, it is predominantly archaic and elitist, but it also contains elements of ethnographic purism, when it comes the species of the proposed replacements of perceived foreignisms. Nonetheless, it is somewhat more pragmatic, tolerant, democratic, and language-oriented than the purist ideology and policy of both his self-appointed defenders and his Vukovian adversaries. Sterija Popović in some respects tries to steer a middle way between the more extreme expressions of all these attitudes to purity in language. He sometimes exposes a perceptive understanding for the complex dynamics and diversified ecology of the linguistic reality surrounding and involving him. This concern, not least, the restrictions it poses to any attempts to interfere into “naturally evolving” (Halliday, 2001: 177) linguistic practices.

“Reasons for the nomenclatural dictionary” is printed in direct connection to a list from ‘A’ to ‘S’ of proposed scientific terms in Serbian in which the

\(^{239}\) у Карловцима и Новомъ Саду, гнѣздама соколова Србски“.

\(^{240}\) „Разлози о назывословнымъ рѣчма“.
lemmas are given in Latin. The text is centred around two fundamental questions:

1) Are the scientific terms going to be ‘Serbified’ at all or should the dictionary be created through the acceptance of loanwords, foreignisms, and internationalisms, and through the practice of calquing?

2) Is the construction of a terminology of scientific terms going to be the responsibility of an authoritative linguistic body, such as the DSS, or is it going to be the prerogative of a multitude of linguistically engaged individuals?

However, he begins by addressing the fatal criticism Karadžić had presented in connection to the May-session of the DSS.

Г. Вукъ Карадзичъ изрази се и устмено и писмено, да дружство, занимаюћи се овымъ посломъ ништа друго не чини, него само квари и грду нашъ езыкъ (GDSS, 1847, 1: 9)

[Mr. Vuk Karadžić expressed himself both orally and in writing, that the society, in occupying itself with this work, does not do anything else, than deprave and abuse our language.]

The criticism led to the interruption of the DSS’s work on the dictionary, and, more importantly still, de facto implied its marginalisation in the process of linguistic nation-building. Symbolically enough, the text was published on the eve of 1847 – the year that, in later days’ research would be called the Anno mirabilis for the ‘victory’ of the Vukovian concept of the linguistically defined Serbian (and, later, Yugoslav) nation (Ivić, 2001). Why would it be more correct, Sterija Popović asks, when a simple person from the Bačka-region, using a phonological adaption, says đamчићъ instead of дампфшифъ (Germ. Dampfschiff ‘steamship’), compared to an educated person who uses the domestic паробродъ (GDSS, 1847, 1: 10). He is referring to one of the core tenets of the radically ethnographic purist policy of the Vukovians. According to this tenet, everything existing in the usus of the Serbian peasantry (including ‘deformed’ foreignisms) is going to be accepted as an integrate part of the language of the nation. At the same time, the linguistic traditions and resources of the educated elite are to be marginalised and totally denied any role in the construction of the Serbian nation and its language.

Дакле прости имаю право богатити езыкъ новыма рѣчма; ученъ, поне Србинъ, то не смѣ, зашто онъ по рѣчма Г. Вука не уме мыслити у свомъ езыку (GDSS, 1847, 1: 10)

[Thus, simple people have the right to enrich the language with new words; an educated, at least Serb, cannot do it, because, according to the words of Mr. Vuk, he cannot think in his own language.]

The DSS had in fact been born immediately out of an importunate need to create a homogeneous terminology for the Lyceum of Belgrade and the con-
fusion created by the diversity of individual usages. That is also why the task ought to be entrusted to a norm-giving authoritative body of professionals such as the DSS and not be left to the discretion of linguistically engaged individuals (linguists or not).

According to Sterija Popović, peoples can be educated and formed along two principal paths: “either by themselves, or with the help of others” (GDSS, 1847, 1: 11). While principally recommending the first, autochthonous path to nation-building and linguistic modernisation, Sterija Popović, at the same time, makes several pragmatic concessions to the social dynamics of linguistic practices. For instance, he welcomes longstanding calques, such as Богородица ‘Virgin Mary’ into the language of the nation. These types of words have “gain[ed] citizenship” (ibid., p. 12) and have been accepted by the speech-community as soon as they entered common usage. They are formed according to the spirit of the language and there is a firm link between signifier (word) and signified (concept). The last assertion contains an implicit criticism of the purist practice of calquing which was employed by contemporary Illyrian language-builders, such as Bogoslav Šulek, where the link between word and concept spontaneously seemed less obvious. Sterija Popović describes the first, autochthonous word-formation strategy in the following manner:

У првом случаю како се тко понятія каковогъ учини свѣстнымъ, онако му и дае име, у матернѣмъ, коимъ мысли и говори, езыку; нити му пада на паметъ тражити рѣчи туђе, да понятіе свое роду своме, за кога умствуе и ради, яснымъ и ра-зумльивымъ учини (GDSS, 1847, 1: 11–2).

[In the first case, as soon as someone becomes aware of some concept, then he also gives it a name in the mother tongue in which he thinks and speaks; it does not even cross his mind to look for foreign words in order to make the concept clear and understandable for his people for which he thinks and works.]

According to Sterija Popović’s criteria, this purist strategy is a way of avoiding both the excessive and thoughtless use of all kinds of foreignisms and refraining from the practice of calquing. The “he” implied in this quote denotes an educated (male) member of the Serbian speech-community upon which the task to modernise the language ought to be entrusted – on behalf of the people. To reflect both the ‘Spirit of the language’ and the ‘Soul of the People,’ they must seek out the domestic root and inflectional morphemes for new concepts which inevitably enter the modernising Serbian speech-community. The foreignisms дампфишъ ‘steamboat’, архіва ‘archive’, канцеллария ‘office’, and експедиторъ ‘expediter’, can, thus, successfully

241 Yet, almost none of the members of the DSS was specialised in philology or linguistics. Sterija Popović himself was a lawyer.
242 „или сами собомъ, или помочу други“.
243 Богородица is a Church Slavonic calque of the Byzantine Greek Ἐὐαγγέλιον (Eng. ‘God-Mother’ or ‘God-Bearer’) which is a sacred title given to Virgin Mary.
244 „добие графанство“
be replaced with the domestic парняча, чуварница, писарница, and од-правлячъ (GDSS, 1847, 1: 12). Even though he had earlier expressed an implicit criticism of the programme of systematic, concerted purism of the Croats, this, if realised, would in fact have led to a similar purist policy among the Serbs.

Sterija Popović also implicitly touches upon matters of contact linguistics. No nation can be formed and develop in total isolation – cultural and linguistic contacts and transfers are indispensable. Every nation, Sterija Popović claims, “borrows enlightenment from others”245 (GDSS, 1847, 1: 12–3). These linguistic contacts can be brought about along two socially divided paths. The first, less desirable path is when ordinary people indiscriminately mix up with members of other ethno-linguistic community. These chaotic language contacts produce words such as шилбокъ ‘guard’ and боктеръ246 ‘night watchman’, which represent folk etymologies or morphophonotactic adaptations of the German words Schildwache and Wächter (GDSS, 1847, 1: 13). No speech-community can protect itself completely from this category of words. Moreover,

тежко е ий е сасвимъ прогнати из обичногъ говора, еръ се народъ не занима езикословиемъ, и чишћенѣмъ рѣчій (GDSS, 1847, 1: 13).

[it is hard to dispel them [foreign words] totally from the common speech, while the people are not dealing with linguistics, and the purification of words.]

This is also an indirect concession to the fact that the operational field of language planning and purist politics is in the first hand the written and not the less controllable spoken language.

A more desirable realisation of cultural and linguistic contacts and transfers, is, according to Sterija Popović (GDSS, 1847, 1: 13), when

поедини люди кодъ изображены народа воспитаваю, и поцрпивши знаня и вѣштине распространявю ий међъ своима снародницъ.

individual persons are educated among more developed peoples and diffuse the knowledges and artifices which they have acquired among their fellow countrymen.

When these individuals during their studies abroad come across a hitherto unknown modern phenomenon and introduce it into the Serbian speech-community, they will, at the same time, give it a name, which ideally reflects the spirit of the Serbian language. Sterija Popović exemplifies the replacement of the foreign типографія ‘typography’ with the domestic књигопечатна и инспекторъ ‘inspector’ with надзиратель (GDSS, 1847, 1: 13).

The introduction of a modern school system, an administration, and an army entails an even more alarming flood of Graeco-Latin internationalisms,

245 “позаймлюе просвѣщеніе одъ други”.
246 Both шилбок and боктер are included in the comprehensive, six-volume Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика (1976). Both are designated as ‘barbarisms.’
Germanisms, and Turkisms, which urgently must be replaced with domestic equivalents. Instances of these linguistic threats are 

ексхортаторъ – ‘exhortator’,

dиректоръ – ‘director’,

цензоръ – ‘censor’,

факторъ – ‘factor’,

секретаръ – ‘secretary’,

директоръ – ‘clerk’,

архіваръ – ‘archivist’,

факторъ – ‘factor’,

секретаръ – ‘clerk’,

архіваръ – ‘archivist’,

реплика – ‘replica’,

пост-стacion’ (GDSS, 1847, 1: 14).

Sterija Popović pathetically exclaims:

Не мора ли овдѣ искренномъ родолюбцу срдце заплакати се, гледаю ћи такву имарность, да се ръчи странне бель свакогъ обзыра не само увлаче, него имъ се суштествобанѣ уредбено утврђуе? (ibid.)

[Must not the heart of any true patriot burst into tears here, observing such a negligence, when foreign words not just enter indiscriminately, but their existence is consolidated through regulations?]

This is one example of one of the most essential of all features characterising purist policies in contexts of nationalist homogenisation – xenophobia or fear of what is perceived and presented as foreign in language. Horror of heterogeneity is another principal driving force. Sterija Popović urges the government to urgently take due measures to stem the tide of foreign words which are threatening to flood the core of the nation – its language. Nevertheless, he also emphasises that the Serbs are in a more favourable seat then Russia which had been enlightened above all with the help of the Germans. This has resulted in undesirable results such as лейбварцтъ – ‘royal physician’,

штатъ – ‘staff, establishment, state’,

кунсткамера – ‘cabinet of curiosities’ (GDSS, 1847, 1: 14). Yet, the Serbs are lucky enough to be shaped or constructed by Serbs who can give “a new concept a Serbian, or at least a Slavic name” (ibid.). By the Slavic language, Sterija Popović implies “all other [Slavic] dialects” 247 (ibid., p. 15) which are to be preferred to Greek, Latin, German, and Turkish words as sources of lexical enrichment. Thus, they can preserve and protect the purely Serbian or at least Slavic spirit of the national language from intrusions of foreign elements.

Towards the end of his programmatic text, Sterija Popović illustrates the peril of the negligent use of foreignisms in a scene, which could have been excerpted from one of his many comedies.

Кадъ е одвешный житель Хб. имао ићи у Крагуевацъ съ писмомъ вышегъ едногъ надлежатства, у комъ сае явля, да е онъ кураторъ добара И. и кадъ му се то предписание прочита, у комъ е ова рѣчь више пута повторавана была, рекне Хб. неповолно: „Господо, я самъ быо увѣкъ поштенъ човекъ; зашто да ме сада подъ старость срамотите, называюћи ме кураторомъ?” – Треба ли више о овомъ говорити? (GDSS, 1847, 1: 15).

[When the local resident Hb. had to go to Kragujevac with a letter from a higher authority, in which it is communicated that he is the dickspector of the assets of I. and when the transcript, in which this word was repeated several times, was read aloud, 247 „сва остала нарѣчiя“.
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Hb. resentfully said: “Sir, I have always been an honest person; why do You dishonour me now in my old age by calling me a dickspector? – Is it necessary to discuss this anything further?]

Sterija Popović seems to be telling us that language use and individual words can be perceived as offensive and threatening to the perception of both individual and national dignity and identity. Just as the negligent use of the sexually connotated ‘dickspector’ hurts the self-esteem of the poor civil servant in the quote, so can the thoughtless introduction and usage of various foreignisms harm the dignity of an entire people. Purging the Serbian language from these species of offensive foreignisms and replacing them with more national equivalents is therefore a matter of protecting and empowering the individuality and dignity of the Serbian people.

In conclusion, the debates analysed in this section essentially represent a confrontation between two generations and their respective conceptualisations of the national identity as conveyed by the communal language which was in the process of being discursively constructed. On the one hand, there was the evolutionary discourse of the older generation of classicist writers and intellectuals, such as Sterija Popović. They were ideologically anchored in the tradition of the Vojvodina intellectual elite and the linguistic reforms initiated by the ex-monk Dositej Obradović. This was a tradition through which the written language went through a process of gradual vernacularisation. These writers identified with a wider Slavonic-Serbian ethno-cultural context and some of them saw the Orthodox Church and religion as the main marker of Serbian national unicity. In the field of language policy and language planning, this symbolically important bond was embodied in taking recourse to the word-formation resources of Russian and Church Slavonic in the construction of the modern standard Serbian language code based on some variety or varieties of the vernacular.

For the young romanticist followers of the revolutionary model of Vuk St. Karadžić, these word-formation resources represented one of the principal obstacles for the construction of a language based exclusively on the varieties spoken by the Serbian peasantry as manifested in the works published by Karadžić. To construct a Serbian national identity based on the Vukovian linguistic concept alone, young philologists, such as Đuro Daničić, had to marginalise the Church Slavonic and Russian lexis, and the identity it represented, through a targeted ethnographic purist policy. Initially, this linguistic concept was instrumentalised in the discursive construction of a pan-Serbian national identity. Yet, in the second half of the nineteenth century, it would be invested in the making of the extended Yugoslav nation, which in some versions included even the Bulgarians.

The dispute also touched upon the more general question as to who or which social group was to have the prerogative of interpretation in matters of language and philology. Was it what they saw as the pure spirit of the popular language as mediated and claimed by romanticist philologists such as
Karadžić and his associates? Or was it the collective prerogative of an authoritative, academic grouping such as the DSS? At the last session, a majority of the DSS’s members voted in favour of Karadžić’s proposal to turn the uneducated rural masses into the sole arbiter in questions of rights and wrongs in language. Thereby they also disqualified their own competence in matters of language politics and language planning. It practically entailed a discursive retreat of the social group they belonged to.

This step contributed to the reinforcement of the already strong discursive momentum of the populist-Serbian concept of language and national identity. In the long run, it led to several vital consequences. One was the further marginalisation of the Slavonic and civil-Serbian concept of language and national identity held by writers such as Jovan Hadžić, Lukijan Mušicki, Milovan Vidaković (1780–1841), and Jovan Sterija Popović. The authority to decide in matters of language, culture, and, thus, national identity, would be completely handed over to the younger generation of romanticist writers and philologists such as Branko Radičević and Đuro Daničić. This pivotal turn in the discourse on language and national identity was symbolically entrenched in 1847 by the publication of Karadžić’s translation of the New Testament (Нови завјет), Daničić’s A War for the Serbian Language and Orthography (Рат за српски језик и правопис), Radičević’s Songs I (Песме I) and The Mountain Wreath (Горски вијенац) by Petar Petrović Njegoš. The stylistic resources of the transitory Slavonic-Serbian written language were thus almost entirely refuted in favour of those of the New-Štokavian folkloric koine (Brozović, 1970: 113) in the corpus-planning process of lexical enrichment.

Purifying the national language from most Church Slavonicisms and Russianisms was also a step with far-reaching political implications. Intentionally or not, the populist discursive turn of Vuk St. Karadžić did comport a realisation of long-standing efforts by the Habsburg authorities to allow the Serbs to acquire education exclusively in the popular language (and in the Latin alphabet). By distancing the Serbian community from a linguistic code which potentially could unite them with the Russians, they intended to draw them into the Austrian sphere of political interests. Similar political intentions would in the wake of the revolutionary 1848–9 serve as a justification for the ideology of Austro-Slavism, by which some prominent Slavic intellectuals aspired to culturally unite the Slavic peoples within the Habsburg Empire.

One of the most prominent architects of this ideology was Karadžić’s mentor and close associate Jernej Kopitar, who envisioned a South-Slavic unity under Croatian leadership (Resic, 2006: 125). Marginalising the Church Slavonic heritage in the making of the national language through a goal-oriented purist policy also implied denying the Vojvodina intellectual elite any role in the construction of the linguistically defined national identity. It served the political interests of these Austro-Slavic intellectuals to em-
power patterns of cultural identifications which averted the Serbs from the Orthodox Church and Russia. More importantly still, it paved the way for the process of constructing the Serbo-Croat language in the second half of the nineteenth century. This language (or these languages) would be formed by and instrumentalised in the construction of the national identities of all the Yugoslavias of the twentieth century – from the kingdoms of the inter-war period (1918–41) to the republics of the post-war era (1945–2006).

6.2 Resisting or embracing the “Zagreb wind” and other purist themes in the discourses up until 1874

In contrast to their Croatian contemporaries, the members of the privileged, educated elites of the Serbian speech-community did not pursue any concerted, conscious, and goal-oriented purist policy in the second half of the nineteenth century. Continuing until today, this is an overall characteristic difference between the language policy and planning in Serbia and Croatia. The general picture was instead one of *laissez faire*. Yet, at the same time, many influential intellectuals expressed purist or even anti-purist concerns, attitudes, and stances on the development of the common language – not least in relation to its role as a symbolic representation of the nation. This evolved into many micro-discourses in the growing Serbian mediascape within which many of the discursive themes of the debates of the 1840s would be reiterated and expanded. The intensified relations between the Serbian Vukovians and Croat Illyrianists and Vukovians was an extra-linguistic factor which would leave a decisive imprint on the course of these discourses. The corpus-planning works of Croatian linguists such as Fran Kurelac (1811–74), Bogoslav Šulek, Vinko Pacel (1825–69), and Adolf Veber Tkalčević, and not least Franje Iveković, Ivan Broz, Tomislav Maretić, and Vatroslav Rožić (1857–1937) would be symbolically instrumentalised in the then ongoing linguistic construction of the Yugoslav nation (cf. Novak, 1967; Samardžija, 2001).

The articles I will analyse in this section were published in the influential literary journals *Sedmica* (‘The Week’), *Javor* (‘The Maple Tree’) and *Dan-

---

248 The first Yugoslavia was founded as the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (*Kraljevina Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca*) in 1918. In 1929 it was renamed into the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (*Kraljevina Jugoslavija*). Yugoslavia was re-established as the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia (*Federativna narodna republika Jugoslavija*) in 1945. In 1962 it was renamed as the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia (*Socialistička federativna republika Jugoslavija*). After the wars of the 1990s, Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) continued in the internationally never recognised shape of the Federative Republic of Yugoslavia (*Federativna republika Jugoslavija*) until Montenegro declared its independence in 2006.
ica (‘The Morningstar’) in the period 1856–74. *Sedmica* was published in Novi Sad as the weekly literary supplement of the daily newspaper *Srbski dnevnik* in the period 1852–8, when it was abolished by the Habsburg authorities. Its first editor (until 1857) was the publicist and historian Danilo Medaković, who had earlier been responsible for the radical journal *Napredak* (‘Progress,’ 1848–63) which was the first periodical printed in the Vukovian orthography. Its second editor-in-chief was the journalist and writer Đorđe Popović ‘Daničar’ (1832–1914), who also founded *Danica* in 1860 (hence the nickname ‘Daničar’). The literary journal *Javor* (1862–3 and 1874–95) was also published in Novi Sad under the editorship of the Vukovian romanticist poet Jovan Jovanović Zmaj. *Danica* was published until 1872 and was already from the beginning printed in the new morphophonologic orthography of Vuk St. Karadžić.

The article “Some words about Turkish and generally foreign words in the Serbian speech”249 by the Vukovian philologist, professor, and Minister of Education Jovan Bošković (1834–93) was published in number 30, 31, and 32 of *Sedmica* in August 1856. According to Ivanović (2018: 2), it “represents one of the first more serious scientific descriptions of loanwords in Serbian linguistics.”250 The primal purpose of the article is to list a vast number of foreignisms which are “to be expelled”251 (*Sedmica*, 1856, 30: 234) from predominantly the spoken language and propose more suitable domestic replacements. The intent to expel foreign words forms part of the overall efforts to give the language a more national character. As evident from the title, Bošković is in the first place targeting Turkisms, but he also lists many other foreignisms which are routinely used in the colloquial, spoken language of the towns of Vojvodina. Many of them are Germanisms. These words

> су намъ истинъ сваки данъ на езику, али се србскогъ езика ни мало не тичу, еръ имамо већиномъ место ньихъ свое изразе (кадшто и по два), кои туђима ни у чемь не уступаю (*Sedmica*, 1856, 30: 234).

[are truly every day on our tongue, but they have nothing at all to do with the Serbian language, because in most cases we have our own expressions (sometimes even a couple of them) instead of them, which by no means are inferior to the foreign.]

Yet, Bošković pragmatically excepts several longstanding commonplace foreignisms “which have become Serbian a long time ago”252 (ibid.) and for which the domestic equivalents have sunk into oblivion. Many of them are of Greek, Latin, or Turkish origin, e.g., *друм* (Gr. δρόμος, ‘road’), хиљада

---

249 „Неколико речи о турскимъ и у обште странимъ речима у србскомъ говору“.
250 „један од првих озбиљнијих научних описа позајмљених речи у српској лингвистици.“
251 „за избававањ“
252 „кое су одавна србскима постала.“
(Gr. χιλιάς, ‘thousand’), талас (Gr. θάλασσα, ‘wave’), круна (Lat. corona, ‘crown’) and тетфер (Tu. tefier, ‘notebook’) (ibid.). Some of them have also been semantically differentiated throughout the centuries and gained a precise connotation which cannot easily be replaced by a domestic lexical item. Moreover, the frequent Turkisms must be separated into those which have obtained citizenship and thus become what Bugarski (1996: 19) calls “domestic words of foreign origin,”253 and those which are to be expelled from the language. The discursive anthropomorphisation of lexical items signalled by the wording “expel” is striking. Words that cannot be expelled are those “which have struck root in our language a long time ago, and out of which new ones have sprung”254 (Sedmica, 1856, 30: 234). These longstanding Turkish loanwords and their derivates and compounds often denote plants, animals, food, illnesses, and objects which have been brought to the speech-community from distant countries and for which there are no domestic equivalents. Bošković (ibid.) lists words like мајмун ‘monkey’, зумбул ‘hyacinth’, кajsija ‘apricot’, памук ‘cotton’, кафа ‘coffee’, ишеће ‘sugar’, суџук ‘sujuk’,255 and халва ‘halva.’256 He also excepts words like дућан ‘store’, кавез ‘cage’, љула ‘pipe’, тенсија ‘casserole’, and ишерп ‘apprentice.’ They are the lexical results of sociocultural transfer and denote phenomena which are intimately related to the everyday lifeworld of the members of the speech-community. Other words which have obtained right of residence within the precincts of the Serbian language are those where “we have two expressions: one Turkish and some other foreign”257 (Sedmica, 1856, 30: 235) and where a domestic equivalent is lacking. Instances of this category of words are lexical doublets such as боја-фарба ‘colour’ and кадифа-сомот ‘suede’ (ibid.).

Having done all these pragmatic concessions to the social dynamics of the linguistic ecology surrounding him, Bošković arrives at the crucial point of his article – the symbolic construction of national identity in relation to negatively defining Others in language. It takes the form of a long list of foreign words, divided into “Turkish words” and “Other foreign words”258 (Sedmica, 1856, 30: 235; 31: 242), which are to be cleansed from the language of the nation and replaced with more suitable domestic equivalents. It is here that the red line between Us and Them in and beyond language is going to be drawn. Yet, as the predominant attitude to foreignisms in lan-
guage among the leading members of the Serbian speech-community was one of laissez faire, Bošković would in most cases be proven wrong in his purist efforts.

The vast majority of the Turkisms he wanted to reject are retained alongside their proposed replacement in contemporary Serbian or Croatian usage. Examples of such words are лепеза (махач) ‘fan’, зејтин (уље) ‘oil’, кајмак (скоруп, милерам) ‘kajmak’, сирће (оцат) ‘vinegar’, јастук (узглавље) ‘pillow’, авлија (двориште) ‘yard’, пенџер (прозор) ‘window’, сандук (ковчег) ‘box’, јак (врећа) ‘bag’, ада (острво) ‘island’, синџир (верига) ‘chain’, инат (свађа, пркос) ‘spite, obstinacy’, and јок (не, није) ‘no’ (Sedmica, 1856, 30: 235–6; 31: 241–2). The linguistically defining other in this first section was, thus, associated with the negatively connotated, often discursively demonised, recent past—that of the former Ottoman overlord. The language of the Oriental Turks was often conceptualised as ‘regressive’, ‘uncivilised’ or ‘barbaric’—words which were contrasted to the ‘progressive’, ‘civilised’ or ‘cultured’ languages of the Occident, with which some of the influential Serbs were identifying. For them, disidentifying themselves from the linguistic heritage of the former coloniser through a targeted anti-Turkish purist policy formed an essential part of the process of post-colonial, linguistic nation-building.

The second part of Bošković’s list was indeed devoted to other unnecessary foreignisms in general, but it was by far dominated by lexical, morphological, and syntactic Germanisms (and, to a certain extent, Magyarisms), i.e., the dominant language of the current Habsburg imperial power. The members of the Serbian minority of Austrian Vojvodina, were, indeed, subjected to what Phillipson (1992) has called ‘linguistic imperialism.’ This is a process whereby the language of a politically, economically, and culturally dominating (majority) group is exercising pressure on a dominated (minority) group and its language(s). For Bošković and many of his contemporaries, the transfer of Germanisms represented an impending threat to the integrity and identity of the Serbian language and its speakers.

“An unpleasant feeling is engulfing you, when you see so many ‘unnecessary’ foreign words” (Sedmica, 1856, 32: 250), Bošković comments his long list of other foreignisms which are to be cleansed (or expelled) from the Serbian language and replaced by more suitable domestic equivalents. He is concerned with the beauty and purity of the Serbian language, and asks ironically:

---

259 *Kajmak* is a type of creamy dairy food popular all over the Balkans.

260 Some of these words are rather archaic, literary, regional, and rare, or have a more restricted semantic or stylistic value in contemporary Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, or Montenegrin usage.

261 „Непрятно осећан је подузима човека смatraоћи толике ‘непотребе’ стране речи.“
Or would anyone really be pleased, if the Serbian speech was generally so pure and beautiful, as for instance this sentence: I walked along the corridor, a curtain was raised and a window open, I got caught in a draught and got rheumatism?

Bošković is in the first place accusing the influential male members of the Serbian speech-community for acting as spearheads for this undesired linguistic and cultural transfer. German was the dominant cultural language of the era – comparable to English in our time. As writers, readers, and translators of German literature, they opened the gates for this “deluge of foreign words, which are threatening to flood everything”\(^\text{262}\) (\textit{Sedmica}, 1856, 32: 250).\(^\text{263}\) Furthermore, as officials, teachers, and merchants in Habsburg Vojvodina, where German was the official language, they were in constant, day-to-day contact with representatives of this negatively defining other. He mentions the productive use of German verbs with the Serbian suffix -ovati as particularly offensive, e.g., бесшетеловати (Germ. bestellen ‘order’) or ундерхалтовати (Germ. unterhalten ‘support, entertain’) etc. (ibid.).

Moreover, Bošković assigns a special role to women in the protection and preservation of the purely Serbian character of the language, while they, being more restricted to the home, are less contaminated by the language in official usage. He urges all educated Serbian men and women to take pride in their popular language and to publicly “speak Serbian more beautifully and purer”\(^\text{264}\) (\textit{Sedmica}, 1856, 32: 251). Thus, they will become more acquainted with the linguistic resources of their own language and get hold of richer and more suitable domestic expressions. With a reference to the language codified by Vuk St. Karadžić, he gives an important role to the written, literary language in the process of purifying the spoken language of the Vojvodina Serbs.

And given that the popular language for us – also is the literary language, this is far easier to accomplish; that the literature is using the word-stock of the entire Serbian

---

\(^{262}\) " потопу од туђих речи, кои прети све да поплави".

\(^{263}\) Linguisitic transfer of this kind is occurring all the time (also) in contemporary sociolinguistic settings, when (articulate) members of a relatively small speech-community relate to the language of a political, economic, and cultural super-power. My native Swedish is for instance sprinkled with lexical, syntactic phraseological direct loans, loanwords, and calques from English. Moreover, it is often provoking purist reactions in various quarters of the speech-community (calling for their replacement with more suitable domestic equivalents).

\(^{264}\) "лепше и чисте србски говоре".
people, and various other provincialisms (i.e., words which are only spoken in a particular region), and chooses all the “most beautiful – most common and suitable – expressions.”

The words that cannot be found in Karadžić’s dictionary (a new, extended edition had been published in 1852) are to be retrieved from the so-called srbulja,\textsuperscript{265} i.e., handwritten or printed books in the ‘Serbian’ recension of Church Slavonic.

This quite succinctly sums up the purist policy of Bošković, a policy which in its essence is deeply Vukovian – nationalistic, xenophobic, and protectionist in its objectives and radically ethnographic when it comes to the proposed lexical replacements. In the \textit{Srpski rječnik} (“Serbian Dictionary”) of 1852 Karadžić and his right hand Daničić had lexically identified the Serbian people with the linguistic practices of the illiterate New-Štokavian speaking rural masses. This included a great number of Turkisms and some Germanisms\textsuperscript{266} in frequent use among the people but excluded the Russian and Church Slavonic lexis of the educated elite of Vojvodina.

Furthermore, he shared the scepticism towards the coining of abstruse neologisms practiced by the Illyrian lexicographer Bogoslav Šulek. “It is better to take a foreign word, which is familiar to the people, then topsy-turvy construct a new one”\textsuperscript{267} (Stojanović, 1924: 127), as Karadžić had put it. Bošković expressed the same purist approach towards the end of his text. The newly coined expressions are not just incomprehensible, but they are also hard to remember. “[T]hey are just moving around in some books and newspapers, which harm themselves with redundant novelties”\textsuperscript{268} (\textit{Sedmica}, 1856, 32: 251). Neither was the archaist purist strategy of taking recourse to the lexical resources of the old srbulja significantly deviating from the policy of Karadžić and his associates. Karadžić had practically applied the same strategy in his translation of the \textit{New Testament} (1847). Yet, Bošković’s purist policy goes a step further and sharpens the lines between \textit{Us} and \textit{Them}, \textit{Domestic} and \textit{Foreign} in language. Bošković wants to ‘expel’ many of the Turkisms, Germanisms, and other foreignisms embraced by Karadžić-Daničić.

A similar attitude to ethno-linguistic purity was espoused by the Romanticist poet Jovan Jovanović Zmaj in the first instalment of his tripartite article “Let us begin to cleanse are language!”\textsuperscript{269} published in \textit{Javor} on 10 January

\textsuperscript{265} The very term \textit{srbulja} had been uses for the first time in Vuk St. Karadžić’s \textit{Srpski rječnik} (1818) to differentiate Church Slavonic handwritten and printed books in the Serbian recension of Church Slavonic from those in the Russian recension of the same language, which had come to dominate among the Serbs in early nineteenth century.

\textsuperscript{266} According to Peco (1986: 271), Karadžić’s and Daničić’s \textit{Srpski rječnik} (1852) contains about 3700 Turkisms and some 280 Germanisms.

\textsuperscript{267} „Боље је узети туђу ријеч, него ли наопако нову градити."

\textsuperscript{268} „они се врзу само по некимъ књигама и новинама, кое саме себу излишнимъ новостима штету чине."

\textsuperscript{269} „Почимо пречишћавати језик!“
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According to Ivanović (2018: 2), the article is ideologically and methodologically directly inspired by Bošković’s text. The first of the three articles is a theoretical preface to the draft to the purist dictionary comprising 292 words that follow in the final two instalments. This dictionary had been initiated by the “Novi Sad women’s movement” (ibid.). The Novi Sad women also played an active role in the development of the dictionary. Jovanović Zmaj begins his article by praising the women of Novi Sad for their efforts to “speak Serbian as purely as possible” (Javor, 1863, 1: 13). Jovanović Zmaj (ibid.) is quite explicit when it comes to the link between purism, language, and national identity (and gender). He states with satisfaction

"шта су Србкиње наше саме собом, без поджизања сватиле, како је нужно чишћење језика, како је скопчано чисто унутрање обећање, са чистом спољашњом одећом – чисто србско срце са чисто србским збором."

[that our Serbian women by themselves, without being urged, have understood how decisive it is to purify the language, how linked the pure interior promise is to the pure exterior apparel – the pure Serbian heart to the pure Serbian speech.]

According to this line of thought, the pure essence of the Serbian language is directly linked to the pure essence of the Serbian people – the spirit of the language is identified with the ‘Soul of the People.’ In a dated and emphatically patronising manner, typical for the period, he presents the virtues of women in a stereotypical way and reduces them to the de facto subordinate role of inspiring the men in their efforts to purify the language “with their tender weapon” (Javor, 1863, 1: 13). Being constrained to play the part of the virtuous muses, who are excluded from the world of professional and academic life, women do not discuss science and avoid falling for the fallacy of using superfluous foreign words. Following him, the uncontaminated female language ought to serve as an example for men in this “era of nationalities” (ibid.). Such idolisation of the pure, i.e., monolingual, quality of women’s language has been stressed in the works of male representatives of the Western tradition from antiquity to modern times; one of its earliest proponents seems to be Plato (Todorova, 2018: 381).

Then Jovanović Zmaj comes to the central theme of coinages. Like Karadžić-Daničić and Bošković, he prefers retaining some well-established foreignisms to “replacing them with some incorrectly coined or badly used [words]” (Javor, 1863, 1: 13). Addressing the Serbian women, he emphasises that “there are [enough] pure words among our people” to express everything the Serbian speech-community needs and desires. These words must just be compiled and codified in corpus-planning manuals such as dictionar-

270 „покрета новосадских Српкиња.“
271 „шта чистије србски говоре“.
272 „својим нежним оружјем“.
273 „добра националности“.
274 „са неправилно скованим или рђаво употребљеним замене“.
ies and grammars; manuals, which, by defining the boarders and use of a
named language, also described the outlines and conduct of a named nation.
The superior threat to the purity of the Serbian nation and its language was
posed by the coinages sweeping in from the Illyrian west. Jovanović Zmaj
warns the Serbian women:

нарочито чувајте се сковани речи, који вам загребачким ветром долазиле буду,
јер ту има наказа, које би нам језик грдно жигосале и са који ће се и само
ковачи, кад до свести дођу грдно кајати (Javor, 1863, 1: 13).

[particularly beware of the forged words, which will be brought to you by the Zagreb
wind, because there are monstrosities, which would terribly stigmatise our language
and for which the forgers will only awfully repent when they become aware of it.]

He and many of his compatriot intellectuals saw the Illyrian neolo-
gisms, which indeed often were calques of German models, as coverups for
the exercise of German cultural and political influence. He exemplifies
word-formation principles of such ‘monstrosities’ with the Croatian verb
zdvojiti ‘despair’, which is a calque of the German verzweifeln (Javor, 1863,
1: 14). According to Jovanović Zmaj, the ‘forger’ has neither rooted this
neologism in the word-formation resources of the Croatian nor in those of
the Serbian language. Instead, he has created an abstract monstrosity based
on an inaccurate morphological analysis.

Jovanović Zmaj is not generally negative to Croatisms or Illyrian words.
On the contrary, he finds that there are many words “in the books and maga-
zines, which are written in the Latin script” (Javor, 1863, 1: 14) which are
less frequent but potentially of great use to the Serbian speech-community. It
as a case of targeted purism where only those calques of German models
were addressed as threats to the identity and integrity of the Serbian people
and its language.

Another article which is mainly targeting syntactic and phraseological
Germanisms as the principal negatively defining Other in language, is
“Something about our language.”275 The short text was published in Danica
on 11 August 1863 and was written by the Vukovian litterateur Atanasije
Popović. As Bošković and Jovanović Zmaj before him, Popović is focusing
on the results of longstanding Serbian-German language contacts. It aims at
replacing these Germanisms with more suitable domestic equivalents. He
begins by pledging alliance to the language- and national identity-
programme of Vuk St. Karadžić:

Г. Вук Ст. Карадžић својим радом на пољу наше књижевности највише је
учинио, те се опште признало, да ваља чистим народним језику писати све оно,
што се пише за народ. За г. Вуком дођоше многи наши наученици и писци, те
нас туђеници, који су од нас напреднији, неће већ толико корети да неумемо да
пишемо својим, иначе красним језиком (Danica, 1863, 32: 509).

275 „Нешто о нашем језику“. 
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[Mr. Vuk S. Karadžić has with his work done most in the field of our literature, and it is generally acknowledged, that everything which is written for the people, ought to be written in the pure popular language. Many of our scientists and writers has joined Mr. Vuk, so the foreigners, who are more advanced than us, will no longer criticise us for being uncapable of writing in our own, otherwise beautiful language.]

The main threat to the hegemonic position of the Vukovian discourse on language and national identity is posed by the many phraseological and syntactic Germanisms which are sneaking into the language through translations of German literature. Just like Karadžić had blamed the members of the DSS for not knowing their own language, Popović now accuses the Vojvodinian clerks and officials of negligently serving as vectors for the influx of undesired foreignisms. He claims that “these kinds of expressions can mostly be found in our clerk’s offices or bureaus” (Danica, 1863, 32: 509) and gives some examples of harmful Germanisms. Some of them are 'fall in love’ instead of заволети (Germ. ‘sich verlieben’), to je moguće ‘it is possible’ instead of то се може (Germ. ‘es ist möglich’), and он зависи од ‘he depends on’ instead of он је под влашћу (Germ. ‘er ist abhängig von’). According to Popović, these expressions do not correspond to the ‘Spirit of the Serbian language’ and must be urgently eradicated. At the end of his article, Popović (Danica, 1863, 32: 510) urges his compatriots to stem the tide of harmful Germanisms before it is too late:

Оваквих ђерманизма имаће у нашем језику још доста; па зато баш и ваља да се што више старамо, да нам језик буде чистијег, ако желимо, да се цел, или намера писања непромаши.

[There will be still many such Germanisms in our language; and exactly because of this we must care as much as possible to make our language purer, if we do not want to miss the aim, or purpose of writing.]

A basically anti-purist, pragmatic, and cosmopolitan response to Bošković’s, Jovanović Zmaj’s, and Popović’s articles came in “Once again ‘Something about our language’.” This text was written by the professor of classical philology at the Serbian Great Orthodox Gymnasium of Novi Sad, Jovan Turoman (1840–1915), and was published in Danica on 1 September 1863. According to Turoman, the three authors had gone to the extremes in their efforts to cleanse the language from perceived lexical, syntactic, and phraseological foreignisms. The Turkisms зејтин ‘oil’ and сирће ‘vinegar’ are for instance far more frequent throughout the entire Serbian speech-area than the proposed replacements уље and оцам which are far more commonplace among the Croats. They have become “domestic words of foreign origin” (Bugarski, 1996: 16) which now serve the Serbian com-

---

276 „Оваквих се израза највише налази по нашим писарницама или канцеларијама“.  
277 Thomas (1991: 81) sees anti-purism as a “puristic reaction to some [often xenophobic] manifestation of purism” and compares it to atheism in the field of religious beliefs.  
278 „Опет „Нешто о нашем језику““.  
279 This gymnasium still exists and now carries the name of Jovan Jovanović Zmaj.
munity as efficient means of trans-local communication. Neither do broadly accepted and widely used phraseological Germanisms, such as *то је могуће* ‘it is possible’ and *он зависи од* ‘he depends on’, cause any conundrum. Symbolically expelling them from the language would only create communicative obstacles.

Turoman also addresses the frequent internationalisms and scientific terms of Graeco-Latin origin which had been so vehemently criticised by Popović. According to Turoman they do not pose any threat to the identity and integrity of the Serbian people and their language. German, he states, is ripe with words of Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Sanskrit, Arabic, Slavic, Romance, Turkish, Hungarian etc. origin, and this does by no means make it less German. It is, on the contrary, a communicative asset which allows the Germans “to express everything with four to five and more expressions” (*Danica*, 1863: 35: 59). As warning examples, he highlights the Hungarians and the Croats, who “go in the footsteps of the Hungarians” (ibid.). They have Magyarised all the terminological concepts within the fields of philosophy, law, medicine, and technology to such an extent that they themselves cannot any longer understand them, Turoman states. Concerning the Croats, he does not even find it worthwhile mentioning any of all the “monstrosities in the translation of technical terms [and] different Greek and Latin words” (ibid.). There is no need to pursue any policy of forced purism among the Serbs, states Turoman. Instead, they must await the arrival of “some young Vuk,” (ibid.) who will scour the depths of the Serbian people for new words, which have been formed by the spirit of the people, and with them put together a dictionary twice as comprehensive as the already existing *Srpski rječnik* (1852).

In a period, which was characterised by a strife for national particularity and homogeneity, Turoman reformulates the Serbian national identity and language as one characterised by plurality and heterogeneity. He ends his text in an emphatically anti-purist key:


---

280 “свашта са четири до и више израза изразити”.
281 “[з]а Мађарима иду узастопне”.
282 “напака у преводу технички израза [и] различити грчки и латински речи”.
283 „как млади Вук“. *Vuk* means 'wolf' and this animal is sometimes presented as a personification of the Serb (cf. Ivošević, 2006: 7).
284 The concept of ‘Winkelnation’ is rarely met in the corpora. One of the few times it is used is in the antisemitic text *Ahasver und die Winkelnation* by the German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer (1788–1860). It seems to be connected to social or/and national marginalisation. I am expressing my gratitude to Simon Bergqvist for the valuable help with contextualising and grasping the semantic load of this concept.
It is said: Just provincial nations are purists, and this is the very truth. If we are purists, then we are a marginal nation. Yet, our devise is: Even if one Serb will remain in the world, he is a people – and not a provincial nation. If we do not want one single Serb to be a marginal nation, how are the five million of us then going to be it! Are we then going to be purists?

The same Turoman would in 1874 publish the article “The literary union of Serbs and Croats”\textsuperscript{285} (\textit{Javor}, 1874, 15: 471–4) in which he enthusiastically praises the literary unification of the two South-Slavic peoples.

Колико нас има, који нисмо уверени, од како благотворног би утицаја по просвету народа српског и хрватског било то, да се однегује она биљка, што би на широко и на далеко просипала најугоднији мирис, – да се однегује биљка, која има оно лепо име: књижевна заједница Срба и Хрвата (\textit{Јавор}, 1874, 15: 471)

[There are so many of us, who are not convinced of the beneficent effect that it would have on the education of the Serbian and Croatian people to cultivate that plant, which would spread its most pleasant perfume far and wide, – to cultivate the plant, which has that beautiful name: \textit{the literary union of Serbs and Croats}.

This vision of a literary and/or linguistic union between the Serbs and the Croats in many respects foreshadowed the processes of creating a synthetic Yugoslav culture which gained renewed momentum around the turn of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century and materialised in the hyphenised Serbo-Croatian language (Wachtel, 1998).

\textsuperscript{285} "Књижевна заједница Срба и Хрвата".
When the Bulgarian intellectuals entered into the period 1850–75, they had principally resolved the question as to which linguistic variety should form the structural basis for the elaboration of the national standard language code. This status-planning choice had fallen upon some vernacular variety or group of vernacular varieties. However, the Bulgarian intellectuals were still deeply engaged in debates as to exactly which this variety or group of varieties would be.

Thus, in the discourse that evolved on the pages of the periodicals, two major viewpoints were crystallised concerning the development of the modern Bulgarian standard language code. One advocated a polydialectal basis while the other advocated a monodialectal one (Todorova, 2018: 377). Many of the participants in the public debate argued for giving precedence to the group of spoken varieties which had preserved what they perceived as the purest form of the Bulgarian language, suggesting thereby that it was most apt to express the national identity. Consequently, the dichotomic topics of domestic and foreign and pure and impure in language became a central theme in the discourses which accompanied these processes of linguistic standardisation and cultural self-assertion.

Significant energies were also devoted to several crucial corpus-planning issues. One such issue was the principles for the extension, modernisation, and functional development of the vocabulary of the national standard language code. Another was the construction and codification of a complex of unified literary norms (mainly phonological and morphological) for all Bulgarians based on the vernacular (Nikolova, 2015: 67). The discovery of the differences between the various so called ‘national redactions’ (the Russian, Bulgarian, and Serbian etc.) of Church Slavonic in the 1850s, also prompted many intellectuals to ascribe a privileged role to the Church Slavonic word-stock in the development of the vocabulary of the modern Bulgarian language. In an essentialist manner, it was constructed as a direct link to the mediaeval Bulgarian Empire and a way of rooting the modern nation in its true self.

The different stances in relation to the development of the national standard language code have in later times traditionally been synthesised by Bulgarian scholars into four ‘language schools’ or language ideological group-
ings. These ‘schools’ all developed in the period 1850–1875 and are either named after their respective leading figures – Ljuben Karavelov and Marin Drinov, or the politico-cultural centres which functioned as their organisational hubs – the town of Tŭrnovo in today’s north-central Bulgaria and the town of Plovdiv in today’s south-central Bulgaria (Andrejčin, 1977; Georgieva, 1989: 177–82).

The subdivision into these four ‘language schools’ highlights the differences in the diverging status- and corpus-planning choices of language varieties and linguistic forms and does not take into consideration ideology and the role of language in the construction of national identities. Consequently, as the scope of my thesis is to analyse the role of purism in the interactive discursive constructing of language and national identity, I have chosen to separate the conflicting stances of the second half of the nineteenth century instead into three vernacularist conceptualisations of language and national identity. These three conceptualisations, the Russo-Bulgarian, the Austro-Bulgarian, and the pure-Bulgarian concept of language and national identity elucidate the ideological driving forces behind the discourses on purity in language and ethnicity of the period.

The Bulgarian language ideologues did not focus exclusively on questions of lexical purism. The purist policies of the three conceptualisations of the Bulgarian language and national identity operated on virtually all linguistic levels. Matters of morphology, orthography, and/or graphisation were also turned into central productive sites for national self-construction within the language and national identity discourse of the late nineteenth century. The argument that Bulgarians were direct heirs of the Cyrillo-Methodian linguistic patrimony would, for instance, play a significant role for the choice of a set of etymological spelling norms. This nation-nucleating narrative, which reconnected the contemporary Bulgarians with an idealised medieval past, functioned as an arbiter in evaluating the domestic or foreign character of certain graphemes/phonemes.

Various aspects of status and corpus planning became ideologically charged tools for drawing a sharp dividing-line between different viewpoints. For most intellectuals participating in the discourse, it was vital to defend the national standard language code from foreign lexical items, which they perceived as impure. Therefore, they constructed these foreignisms as a threat to both language and the identity they considered it to represent. These discourses on language and national identity were inscribed in a set of entangled political, social, and cultural contexts which crucially influenced their courses and outcomes.

---

286 The Bulgarian nineteenth-century literati used the word „буквa“ (‘letters’) to denote both graphemes and phonemes.
The period 1850–75 witnessed a growing diversification of the vernacularist or populist-Bulgarian concepts of language and national identity which in most cases reflected different politico-cultural ideologies. The participants in the discourses on language and national identity instrumentalised various purist policies to construct their imagination of the Bulgarian people. One general ideological dividing line ran between pro-Russian and pro-Austrian pan-Slavic conceptualisations of language and national identity. The pro-Russian orientations were far more dominant and decisive than the pro-Austrian. These ideological orientations were expressed in conflicting targeted xenophobic purist policies operating on virtually all levels of language. The various purist policies were often conditioned by concrete socio-political situations and emerged as a response to the other concepts of language and national identity. Another issue concerned the role and exclusivity of domestic lexis in the corpus-planning process of lexical enrichment which in some extreme cases reflected xenophobic tendencies. A contested question within this pure-Bulgarian concept, in turn, was exactly which dialect or group of dialects were to define the form and contents of the national standard language code. This inevitably involved the crucial question of the symbolic representation and differentiation of the nation. The populist-Bulgarian concepts could tentatively be divided into the Russo-Bulgarian, the Austro-Bulgarian and the pure-Bulgarian concept of language and national identity.

As discussed in Chapter 5, the Russo-Bulgarian concept had been initiated already in the first half of the nineteenth century. It gained a broader momentum in the second half of the century – particularly after the Crimean War 1853–6, when Slavophilism became a part of the Russian tsar’s foreign policy. Aware of the political impact of the public spheres on the development of the nascent nations of the Balkans, emissaries of the tsar invested significant resources into wielding soft power in culture and education. Russian Pan-Slavism promulgated the idea of a spiritual unity among the Orthodox Slavs and constructed a communality bound together by Orthodox Christianity, language, and culture. In the field of purist language policing, it entailed strengthening the archaist tendencies towards a positive identification with Russian and Church Slavonic lexis. A corollary to this position was the targeted xenophobic attitude to Greek, Turkish, and general Western lexis which was to be purged as foreign to the corpus of the national lan-

---

287 Slavophilism was a transplantation of the theories of German metaphysical idealism – as formulated by philosophers such as Schelling (1775–1854), Fichte and Hegel – to Russian soil through which thinkers like Ivan Kireevskij (1806–56), Aleksej Chomjakov (1804–60) and Konstantin Aksakov (1817–60) formulated the unique historical destiny and cultural mission of Russia in the geopolitical dynamics of Europe and the world (cf. Leatherbarrow, 2010: 243–6). Initially it was opposed to the official nationalism of the westernised post-Petrine culture and institutions of power, but, after the disastrous Crimean War, it was appropriated and instrumentalised to wield power and influence among the Balkan Orthodox Slavs.
guage. Ultimately, the purpose was to construct the Bulgarian national identity in positive relation to Russia. In some crucial respects this drew the Russophiles close to the Slavonic-Bulgarians which they had so sharply criticised in the 1840s, not least concerning the emphasis on the common Church Slavonic lexis in the process of lexical enrichment.

This tendency would be reinforced by the Church Question of the 1860s and early 1870s, when the Church Slavonic linguistic patrimony was appropriated in an eventually successful effort to separate the Bulgarian Orthodox Church from the sovereignty of the Greek Patriarch. This strife was nation-nucleating in many respects and in conflict with the Russian politico-cultural ambitions in the Balkans. Yet, Bulgaria would be liberated by the Russians in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–8. This contributed to the Russo-Bulgarian cultural and political rapprochements and led to a reinforced influx of Russian lexical items in the decades to come.

Russian-financed periodicals and other publishing ventures became spearheads for the struggle to establish channels of influence and control and they were to a growing extent financed by Russia. Examples of periodicals – directly or indirectly by imperial Russia – were Carigradski vestnik (1848–62), Bŭlgarski knižici (1858–62), and Sŭvetnik (1863–70) (Genčev, 2002: 265–7). In the field of language, these intensified relations became evident in the steady influx of Russian lexical items. This marked an empowerment of what I have earlier (cf. p. 176) called the Russo-Bulgarian concept of language and national identity.

The Austro-Bulgarian concept of language and national identity was a rather marginal and ephemeral phenomenon in the context of the puristically motivated Bulgarian discourse on language and national identity. This concept was above all defended by the Vienna-based intellectual Ivan Dobrovski (and to some extent his financial sponsor Ivan Cankov). In many respects it represented the Austro-Slavic ideology applied to the field of the Bulgarian language (Ivanova, 1998: 31–8). It aimed at constructing the Bulgarians in positive relation to the Slavs of the Habsburg Empire and negative relation to the Russian Empire and the Russians. This is expressed in a positive attitude to lexical borrowings from South- and West-Slavic languages and a negative attitude to borrowings from Russian and the Church Slavonic language. This targeted anti-Church Slavonic and anti-Russian xenophobic purist policy aimed at distancing or disidentifying the Bulgarians with the

---

288 It was, for instance, sharply criticised by the conservative, tsarist thinker, and Byzantinist-ideologue Konstantin Leontiev (1831–91). He saw both nationalism and the national movements among, not least, the Orthodox South-Slavs and [liberal] democracy in general as a threat to the cultural-spiritual unity of the Orthodox-Slavic world (Todorova, 2009: 86).

289 After a brief decline in the interwar period, the pro-Russian (or -Soviet) hegemonical discourse would gain new momentum in the years following the establishment of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria in 1946 (Danova, 2008: 477–92; Genčev, 2002).
cultural heritage of the Orthodox Church and, not least importantly, with the political influence of the Russians. In line with Dobrovski’s overall Austro-Slavic patterns of cultural identification was also his corpus-planning choice of basing the spelling conventions on the phonemic principles close to those of the progenitor of the populist-Serbian concept of language and national identity – Vuk St. Karadžić. Just as in the case of the Serbian language reformer, this choice was based both on Enlightenment theories on learning and cognition and formed part of an effort to disentangle the Bulgarian speech-community from any symbolic ties with the Orthodox Church and the identity-concept it represented.

The defenders of the various pure-Bulgarian concepts of language and national identity all shared an overall commitment to basing the linguistic making of the Bulgarian people on purely domestic language resources – a purist commitment which operated on virtually all levels of corpus-planning. They all expressed general xenophobic attitudes to lexical borrowings but differed radically in the practical implementation of these principles. The internal conflicts concerned primarily the extent and radicalism of this general xenophobic purism. They differed when it came to the degree of targeted openness/closure to lexical enrichment from particular non-domestic sources. Thus, it was also a clash between moderately pragmatic and more extreme, ideologically die-hard purist policies.

P.R. Slavejkov represented a rather pragmatic and liberal attitude to Russian, Church Slavonic, and generally Slav lexical items in the interdependent construction of the Bulgarian standard language code and national identity. On the other hand, Ljuben Karavelov, true to his agrarian populist and overall romanticist ideological convictions, emphasised the priority of what he perceived as the spirit of the language of the people as a guiding principle in all aspects of status and corpus planning (Ivanova, 1998: 110–20).

Slavejkov and Karavelov were adamantly anti-Greek. Both were also deeply engaged in the Church Question which aimed at disentangling the Bulgarians from the religiously defined Greek Orthodox community of the Ottoman Empire. The Church Slavonic or Old-Bulgarian linguistic heritage was instrumentalised in this claim to Bulgarian ethno-religious and ethno-linguistic separateness and the Bulgarians’ rootedness in the medieval Bulgarian empires (Daskalov, 2013: 223). To emphasise this ethno- and glotto-genetic continuity, this literary tradition was already in the nineteenth century often referred to as Old-Bulgarian (Nuorluoto, 2012: 36). Slavejkov, in a Romanticist key, even referred to the continuity of the Bulgarian spoken language since the days of Cyril and Methodius to construct a privileged, direct bloodline to the Old-Bulgarian literary heritage (Ivanova, 1998: 56–7). Making the status-planning choice of basing the standard Bulgarian language code on the spoken varieties would thus imply reconnecting to this prestigious past in the linguistic making of the Bulgarian people. In this strife to
appropriate the Church Slavonic tradition they joined ideological hands with the defenders of the Russo-Bulgarian populist concept.

A more extreme purist policy was rabidly espoused by the most quintessential of all purists of the Bulgarian National Revival – the cosmopolite, physician, and enlightener Ivan Bogorov. Bogorov evolves towards a radical purist position according to which all foreign influences are threatening to annihilate the purity of the Bulgarian language and ethnicity (Nikolova, 2015: 108). He embraces an uncompromising ethnographic purist orientation that above all targets the strong influence from the contemporary Russian language which for him also included Church Slavonic. A central point of criticism in his targeted anti-Russian purism is the impurity of the Russian language itself. According to Bogorov it is bristling with “German, French, and Tatar words” (ibid.). To develop and express the essential, primordial, pure, and unique identity of the Bulgarian people and free it from foreign cultural and political influences, the Bulgarians, according to Bogorov, must take recourse exclusively to domestic resources during their linguistic self-construction. For him this pure and pristine linguistic material could solely be found in the spoken practices, past and present, of the Bulgarian peasantry – not least in the dialects of the region of Sliven, where he himself grew up. Bogorov’s pure-Bulgarian concept of language and national identity thus represents an extreme purist ideology of ethno-linguistic mono-origin (Starčević, Kapović & Sarić, 2019: 320). This bears a great deal of likeness to the Serbian and Croatian Vukovians’ mono-dialect status-planning choice of the dialect of Vuk St. Karadžić’s region of origin as the exclusive base for the construction of the Serbian and later Serbo-Croatian language and national identity. Yet, in contrast to the rather uncompromising mono-originist purist ideology of Bogorov, Karadžić and the advocates of the populist-Serbian concept of language and national identity tolerated well-established lexical items of all origins which were in frequent use in the linguistic practices of the Serbian peasantry.

Thus, the processes of cultural and linguistic homogenisation of the preceding decades were politically instrumentalised in the 1860s and early 1870s in the struggles to liberate themselves from the supremacy of the Greek Orthodox Church and establish an independent Bulgarian Church. They formed the backbone of the intellectual and political elites’ claim to national self-determination (cf. Kedourie, 1993; Hroch, 1985; 2000). This struggle was to a significant extent centred around the question of the status and function of the national language within the Bulgarian community (Nikolova, 2015: 68). The three symbolic functions of literary languages (Gylllin, 1991: 22), i.e., those of differentiation, integration, and representation – and their close link to concepts of purity – came to the fore within the scope

---

290 „немски, френски и татарски речи“.
of these politico-religious pursuits. In the wake of the Herderian cultural relativism, language now became an instrument of articulating cultural difference in relation to often demonised defining Others. Language was also instrumentalised to integrate the purported nationals into a set of homogenised linguistic practices and create a representation which would reflect the pure essence of the national self. Crampton (2005: 74) even claims that it was “[i]n the struggle for the establishment of a separate Bulgarian church [that] the modern Bulgarian nation had been created.” One of the extralinguistic factors separating the Bulgarian late-nineteenth century case from the situation in Serbia, is, precisely, the central position of the Church Question in the discourse on national distinction. The Serbs already had a well-established politico-ecclesiastical centre in the form of the Metropolitanate of Sremski Karlovci, which represented a significant continuation of the Serbian Orthodox Church that had been founded by Saint Sava in 1219.

Another extralinguistic factor which prompted the intensification of the processes of linguistic codification was the upsurge in the publication of periodicals and books in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Of great importance was also the entailing diversification and expansion of the market and growth of the reading audience. These print capitalist developments gave rise to new needs and patterns of communication which accelerated the homogenisation of the literary code in use among the members of the upper, ideological strata of the nascent Bulgarian ethno-linguistic community. International contacts, through trade, travels abroad, and studies at Russian and Western European universities, also contributed strongly to the almost contagious spread of beliefs about the specificity of one’s own cultural family. They spurred an urgent need to assert these cultural characteristics and to instrumentalise them in the pursuit of political objectives.

In the following section, I will analyse a couple of central discourses on linguistic purity and conceptualise them within the framework of the construction of a Bulgarian national identity. These discourses represent clashes between the Russo-Bulgarian, the Austro-Bulgarian and various brands of populist-Bulgarian concepts of language and national identity. Even if I will
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291 The Bulgarian enlightener Emanuil Vaskidovič (1795–1875), for instance, metaphorically and in a derogatory tone writes that the Bulgarians ought to refrain from drinking the “Serbian muddle” („Сербския подлив”) and from the “Russian tub” („Российската каца”) — i.e., address them as sources of lexical enrichment, but stick to the living grammar of the popular spoken varieties, in the preface to the textbook “Дѣтинско прибавленіе” (1852) (Nikolova, 2015: 68)

292 When the Serbian Patriarchate in Peć was abolished by the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople in 1767, the Metropolitanate of Sremski Karlovci gained the role of epicentre for the Serbian ethnoreligious community. It also inherited the claims to continuity with the medieval Serbian kingdoms. The Bulgarian Archbishopric of Ohrid suffered the same fate in 1766 but was never substituted by an alternative centre. The continuous bonds with the medieval Bulgarian kingdoms and its ecclesiastical organisation were thereby broken.
primarily focus on discourses concerning the level of lexis and orthography, I will as well take into consideration other aspects of, in the first place, corpus planning. This is also in accordance with my own definition of the act of purifying as any choice between two or several lexical, syntactical, phonological, morphological, orthographical, word-formational, or phraseological alternatives where one or several are perceived as ideologically foreign, impure, or harmful to the ‘body’ of the national standard language code.

7.1 From “Yer-heresy” to “A new Tower of Babylon”: a Bulgarian debate on orthographic purism

Orthographic purism within the context of linguistic nation building can be defined as the choice between two or several principles for the development or alteration of orthographic norms of a standardising or standardised language in which one or several alternatives are envisioned as foreign or threatening to pollute the true or pure character of the language and ethnicity in question. In the era of National Romanticism language was seen as the supreme expression of the character and identity of national communities (often metaphorically rephrased as the ‘Soul of the People’) and the development and defence of national standard language codes therefore became a question of almost ontological gravity. In many cases the national language also became instrumentalised to lay claims to the political self-governance of the thus linguistically defined national community (cf. Kedourie, 1993; Hroch, 1985; 2000) In the following section, I will analyse a discourse on orthographic purism which developed in the Bulgarian cultural context in the early years of the 1850s and which contained significant elements of often politically conditioned identity construction.

This discourse is interesting in many respects. It represents the three or four politico-cultural centres and defining Others in relation to which the Bulgarian national identity was constructed: (1) Western Europe, in the guise of Vienna, where Ivan Dobrovski published his magazine; (2) the Greek and Oriental, in the guise of Istanbul, where Carigradski vestnik was issued; (3) Russia, in the guise of Odesa, where Nikolaj Palauzov lived and worked; and finally (4) the Balkan context, in the guise of Belgrade, where the Serbian official newspaper Novine srbske (‘Serbian News’) was printed. Another peculiar circumstance is that Dobrovski and Palauzov were both living in multicultural urban centres: the bustling capital of the Habsburg Empire, Vienna and the relatively recently founded Russian Black-Sea free port of Odesa. These socio-cultural environments were detached from the yet imagined homeland onto which they were projecting their conceptions of the purest essence of the Bulgarian national spirit as expressed in their language.
The threat of alienating the Bulgarians from what was perceived as the source of their true identity was launched by a proposition to introduce an orthography based on radically phonemic principles close to and inspired by those of their Serbian contemporary Vuk St. Karadžić. In fact, there had been several attempts to introduce more or less far-reaching phonemic spelling norms ever since the 1830s, when, for instance, Neofit Bozveli almost verbatim quoted the slogan of Karadžić’s orthography “write as you speak” („пиши както говориш“, as it is voiced in Bulgarian) in his Slavonic-Bulgarian Guide for Children („Славеноболгарское детеводство“, 1835) (Danova, 2008: 432). When Ivan Dobrovski reintroduced the theme of the “Natural Spelling” in the anonymous and fictive letter “An opinion on the Bulgarian Spelling” in the first issue of his magazine Mirozrenie (‘Worldview’) in 1850, “that claim had the sense of a proper rebellion” (ibid.). By then, the lion’s share of the most influential Bulgarian intellectuals opted for an etymological orthography as a means of anchoring the Bulgarians in their Church Slavonic roots and often strengthening the political bonds with the Russian Empire.

Just like Ljuboslovie (cf. Ch. 5,) Dobrovski’s magazine Mirozrenie was much an ephemeral achievement of one single deeply engaged individual. Consequently, the contents of this periodical explicitly reflected the – in the Bulgarian context – idiosyncratic cultural ideology of its publisher and virtually sole contributor. Its short lifespan comprised merely five issues which were published in Vienna from September 1850 to June 1851 and printed at the printing house of the Armenian Mekhitarists (which was one of the few in disposal of Cyrillic types).

In the years following the revolutionary 1848–9, when the national movements of stateless ethnic groups of the multinational Empire had taken up arms and threatened its integrity, the Habsburg capital became the epicen-
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293 Karadžić was one of the many sponsors of Dobrovski’s magazine and he printed his books in the same printing house as his Bulgarian contemporary – that of the Armenian Mekhitarist monastic order. However, even if they moved in the same social circles, nothing indicates that they were personally acquainted (Lindgren, 2012: 68).

294 The principle “Schreib, wie du sprichst” was originally formulated by the German Enlightenment philologist and ‘phonologist’ Johann Christof Adelung (1732–1806) in a dispute with the ‘etymologist’ Jacob Grimm (Ewald, 1992: 65).

295 The language policy of Ivan Dobrovski in Mirozrenie has been studied by Šišmanov (1965), Penev (1977a), Rusinov (1980), Ivanova (1998; 2008), Danova (2008), and Lindgren (2012) and others.

296 “Естественно то Правописание“.

297 “Мнение за Правописание то българско“.

298 The title of the magazine is probably a calque of the name of the Czech magazine Světozor which had been founded by P.J. Šafárik in 1834 (Danova, 2008: 444).

299 “това искане е имало смисъла на истиински бунт“.

300 Dobrovski made an attempt to revitalise the magazine under the heading „Мирозрение или български инвалид“ (‘Worldview or the Bulgarian invalid’) in 1870 (Ivanova, 1998: 32).
tre of Slavic studies. In response to these developments, the Austrian authorities established a chair of Slavic philology at the University of Vienna in 1849. In part, it was a means of appeasing the Slavic revolutionaries and their demands for cultural rights and internal autonomy, and partly it aimed at controlling the Slavic national movements. Its first titular was the Slovene Franc Miklošič with whom Dobrovski would be in close contact during his stay in Vienna (cf. Šišmanov, 1965). Danova (2008: 458) claims that Miklošič’s influence was pivotal for Dobrovski’s choice of applying phonemic spelling principles in his magazine.

Dobrovski would also socialise with the person responsible for Miklošič’s nomination, Pavol Jozef Šafárik (Surman, 2020: 76), Josef Jireček (1825–88), and other prominent supporters of the ideology of Austro-Slavism (cf. p. 78). Moreover, Miklošič was closely related to the Austro-Slavic ideologue behind many of the linguistic reforms of Vuk St. Karadžić – Jernej Kopitar (Kropej, 2013: 221). The many similarities between the populist purist policy pursued on the level of orthography by Karadžić and Dobrovski are hardly coincidental. Mirozrenie would be financed by the Viennese Catholic merchant of Bulgarian origin Anton Cankov (1818–91). Cankov was one of the most vociferous advocates of the Austro-Slavic ideology among the articulate member of the Bulgarian community. The Austro-Slavic system of cultural beliefs would leave a deep imprint on virtually the entire scope of the variegated materials which would be published in the periodical.

Dobrovski’s main adversary, the Odesa-based Russian state official and intellectual Nikolaj (or Nikola) Palauzov, in contrast, ultimately rooted the Bulgarian people in the language of the Orthodox Church and Russia. It was a language-ideological stance that concealed a strong commitment to strengthen the political bonds with the Russian Empire. Palauzov published his defence of the purity of the Bulgarian language in two articles under the heading “Some thoughts about the Bulgarian orthography” in issues 80 and 81 of the newspaper Carigradski vestnik (‘The Tsargrad Herald’) in April 1852. Palauzov was not just a Russian citizen, but also deeply involved with the ideological interests of the tsar. He saw everything that could potentially distance the Bulgarian people and language from the Russians – and

---

301 Anton Tsankov was the elder brother of the more famous Dragan Tsankov (1828–1911) who would be one of the most energetic propagators of the creation of a Bulgarian Uniate Church, i.e. of resolving the question of the independence of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church by establishing a full union with the Roman Catholic Pope. He would also twice serve as prime minister of the independent Principality of Bulgaria. The two brothers would also write the first grammar of contemporary Bulgarian in German – Grammatik der bulgarischen Sprache (Vienna, 1852).

302 „Нѣколко мысли заради болгарско-то правописаніе“. 
thereby from the other members of the pan-Slavic family – as a demonic apostasy to their own true and pristine self.

Carigradski vestnik reflected the pro-Russian ideological predilections and furthered the interests of the mercantile and intellectual elite of the vast Bulgarian colony of Istanbul – especially under the guidance of its second editor-in-chief. “The birth and lengthy existence of the first big Bulgarian newspaper [...] is both directly and indirectly related to Russian influence and Russian politics”303 as asserted by Genčev (2002: 265). This archetypical social vanguard in the creation of the modern Bulgarian nation also provided the economic capital that made the publishing venture possible – with, importantly, direct financial support from the Russian Empire. Carigradski vestnik had been founded in 1848 by Ivan Bogorov. Bogorov was also its first editor-in-chief (1848–50). The weekly newspaper’s second editor-in-chief (1850–62) was Aleksandŭr Exarch (1810–91),304 who deepened the newspaper’s alignments with Russian politico-cultural interests. Additionally, he turned it into an active instrument in the struggle for an independent Bulgarian Orthodox Church. This struggle was, at least in the field of politics, in strong opposition to the Russian efforts to establish political hegemony.

With its about fourteen year long lifespan, Carigradski Vestnik was the most long-lived Bulgarian periodical of the whole pre-Liberation era.305 The questione della lingua occupied a prominent place in its publishing materials. Important corpus-planning issues from the 1850s onwards were the affixation of strict orthographical norms and the creation of a unified grammar and vocabulary for the imagined Bulgarian national community. This, in turn, entailed the status-planning choice of exactly which spoken variety or group of spoken varieties it was going to be based on (Ivanova, 1998: 44–53). Purist attitudes, beliefs, and policies operated on all these linguistic levels. They played a crucial role for many of the individual choices made during the Bulgarian process of linguistic nation-building.

A peculiar intermezzo in the discussion is also represented by a short open letter to the editor-in-chief of Mirozrenie published in the Serbian newspaper Novine srbske on 12 May 1851. In this text, the anonymous critic declares that “the Bulgarians have to preserve the old orthography, which is

---

303 „Раждането и продължителното съществуване на първия български голям вестник […] е свързано и пряко, и косвено с руското влияние и руската политика.“

304 Just like Bogorov, Exarch was one of the most highly educated Bulgarians of his era. He had been studying in Bucharest, Budapest, Munich, and Paris, and he would twice candidate for the post of Prince of the post-Liberation Principality of Bulgaria.

305 The future pro-Russian first prime minister of independent Bulgaria, Todor Burmov, also held the post of editor-in-chief for a very brief period; practically he edited just one issue. In 1860–2 he would be the editor-in-chief of another of the more influential of the Bulgarian periodicals of the pre-Liberation period - Bŭlgarski kniţici, which was equally pro-Russian.
the orthography of the Orthodox Church and Russia” (Danova, 2008: 463) to resist the threat of Western propaganda (represented by the phonemic orthography) and protect their national character. The letter and the response it provoked (in June 1851) are perhaps the two texts in this section where the link between linguistic purism and antithetical identity formation – and its binary dynamics of mutual demonisation – becomes most obvious. It also illustrates the close and intense cultural contacts which the Balkan social elites entertained in the period.

In the following section, I will, thus, analyse a discourse on, in the first hand, orthographic purism. In this discourse, the participants constructed opposing conceptualisations of the Bulgarian language and national identity to defend the ideological interests of the social groups they represented. Both these identity concepts were ultimately anchored in and relating to the two, then current brands of pan-Slavism – Austro-Slavism and Slavophilism. In the second half of the nineteenth century, these cultural ideologies were politically instrumentalised by the Habsburg and Romanov Empires. The empires’ objective was to expand their sphere of power and influence and preserve the integrity of their realms by curbing the ravishing national ambitions of their Slavic subjects.

7.1.2 The Confessions of a ‘Yer heretic’

In the fictitious anonymous letter “An opinion on the Bulgarian Spelling” (Mir, 1850, 1: 1–2), probably written by Ivan Dobrovski himself (Ivanova, 1998: 33; Danova, 2008: 451), radically phonemic orthographical concepts are introduced. The concepts were developed in the subsequent “On the same, A Response” (Mir, 1850, 1: 2–4).

The letter is in fact an apology for the incongruence between Dobrovski’s phonological beliefs and his own written practice. The phonemic spelling is theoretically and ideologically anchored in the extensive article “On the Alphabet. Or on pronunciation in general” on the following pages, with a continuation in the magazine’s third issue from November (Mir, 1850, 3: 41–4). Dobrovski also treats the crucial corpus-planning issues of the elaboration of a scientific terminology in the article “Nomenclature (Terminology)” (Mir, 1850, 3: 44–5) and the creation of a common grammar in the article “A Bulgarian grammar” (Mir, 1850, 3, 45–7). The first of these two articles are revealing when it comes to Dobrovski’s pro-

306 че българите трябва да спазват стария правопис, който е правопис на православната църква и Русия”.
307 "За исто то, Ответ“.
308 “За Азбука тъ. Или за произношение то вообще [sic!]“.
309 "Пределоречие (Терминология)“.
310 "Българска Язична“.
Slavic and targeted anti-Greek and anti-Turkish attitude to lexical purism. Yet, the two texts both deviate from the focus on orthographic purism in this section and will therefore not be analysed here.

Dobrovski’s own literary practice is an eloquent embodiment of his general vernacularist conceptualisation of the standard Bulgarian language code. His written linguistic practice even reflects the reductions characterising the dialect of his native town of Sliven on the southern slopes of the Balkan Range in today’s Eastern Bulgaria. Moreover, the texts in Mirozrenie are loaded with lexical neologism and calques of Slavic origin by which Dobrovski substituted Graecisms or Turkisms to create a functionally polyvalent standard Bulgarian language code out of domestic lexical resources. These neologisms and calques were either of the author’s own device or borrowed from other Slavic languages – not least Serbian.

The anonymous author of “An opinion on the Bulgarian Spelling” criticises Dobrovski for not being consequent in implementing his phonemic spelling principles (“the natural spelling”). He puts these spelling conventions in antithetical contrast to the etymological “orthography.” Worth noting is that he is using a Greek loanword for the negatively loaded “orthography” and a Slavic syntagma for the praised “natural spelling.” The ‘naturalness’ of the “естественно то правописание” (‘natural spelling’) is put in contrast to the abstruse artificiality of the etymological “orthography.” He expresses his disappointment with the “Orthography or Horrorgraphy” (Mir, 1850, 1: 1) used in the magazine. It is at loggerheads, he claims, with the editor’s declared intention to write naturally. This would potentially be a set of spelling principles which would to such a degree harmonise with pronunciation that even a child, whose “head is not yet prevailed by Grammatical corruptions” (ibid.), easily could understand. The author refers to the whole tradition of Bulgarian writers defending the principles of phonemic spelling – from Vasil Aprilov to Christaki Pavlović and Anastas Stojanović Kipilovski (1802–70). These reforms had been motivated by “pedagogical purism” (Nikolova, 2015: 115) and made to remove any superfluous cognitive obstacles for the education of the rising generations (such as a multitude of letters denoting the same phoneme). He also supports his Enlightenment rationalist argumentation for the “natural spelling” (Mir, 1850, 1: 2) by quoting a Polish-French grammar written by a Slav (ibid.).

---

311 A functionally polyvalent standard language code is a written language which is fully suitable for use in all the domains characterising a modern society.
312 „орфография иди Стравография [sic!]“
313 Глава ть му не е още преобладана от Граматически разрращения“.
314 „естественно то правописание“.
315 He is most probably referring to the “Essai de grammaire polonaise, pratique e raisonnée. Pour François” (Warsaw, 1807) by Onufry Kopczyński (1735–1817) (cf. Stammerjohann, 2009: 826–7).
316 „един Славенин“.
sage contains an almost verbatim quotation of the same principle that Vuk St. Karadžić had turned into the slogan of his reforms of the Serbian orthogrophy (‘Write as you speak and read as it is written’).

От там произхожда това въобще правило, което излиза от природа тъ на говоренето то и от желание то на съчния мудрец: пишети както произносяш, и произносяй както пишеш (Mir, 1850, 1: 2).

[Therefrom origins that universal rule, which emerges out of the nature of speech and out of the desire of all wise men: write as you pronounce, and pronounce as you write.]

The fictive critic finds the discrepancy between Dobrovski’s phonological ideology and less radical spelling policy in the magazine appalling. He reiterates that Dobrovski is applying “another Horrorgraphy, or in soft words (euphemism) Orthography”317 (ibid.) despite his own convincing argumentation for the doubtless superiority of the “natural spelling.” It is superior, not least, due to “the priceless benefits, which a People can have from it according to the convenience of learning [it]”318 (ibid.), and because it is advocated by weighty intellectuals – living and dead.

Under the cloak of his constructed anonymous antagonist, Dobrovski does not with a single word reveal any overt traces of Romanticist ethno-linguistic identity-policy, but is, on the contrary, basing his reasonings entirely on rationalist arguments. He uses arguments which are firmly anchored in the Enlightenment sensualist school of ‘Condillocke’ (cf. p. 74; 119). His aim is to remove all cognitive obstacles (above all the unnatural ‘orthography’) for the education of the Bulgarian people, which per se could be seen as a patriotic statement. Many of the counterarguments, which he is enumerating towards the end of the letter, would, in fact, be reiterated by his ideological adversaries – the etymologists.

He is thus anticipating all potential criticism against the introduction of phonemic spelling norms for the nascent modern Bulgarian standard language code by listing several central objections to it. The first, he claims, is that it would be easier to reach an agreement on the conventions for spelling by using etymological spelling norms. ‘Orthography’ would, moreover, entail reconnecting to the prestigious tradition of the Old-Slavonic literary patrimony. The third possible counterargument would be that other peoples are observing a state of incongruence between writing and pronunciation, i.e., “they see one thing in the book and read another”319 (Mir, 1850, 1: 2). Yet, Dobrovski immediately objects to this argument by stating that such an order would force both grownups and children to waste precious time on learning

317 “друга Стравография, і з благословіє (евфімізм) Орθграграфія.”
318 “неуценна тъ полза която може един Народ да има от него според улеснене то на поучене то.”
319 “друго гледът в жнiга тъ [sic!] а друго прочиът.”
the arcane rules of the “grammatico-artificial Orthography”\textsuperscript{320} (ibid.). Otherwise, Dobrovski implies, it would not be possible to bridge the gap between graphical signifiers and the sound-images they are supposed to signify. Furthermore, as the fourth argument, applying etymological spelling conventions would create an understanding for the etymological origins of the words, and thus make the older strata of the language accessible for the contemporary readers. It would, finally, as the fifth argument, imply following the example of prestigious nations, such as the French and English. Dobrovski emphasises that “all these excuses for the astonishing Horrорgraphic (Orthographic) depravation of their languages are groundless and totally futile”\textsuperscript{321} (Mir, 1850, 1: 2). Yet, in a conciliatory tone, he immediately adds that this anomaly is balanced by the impending need for a common literary language. For the sake of consensus, the minority must adapt to the will of the majority, Dobrovski concludes.

In his “On the same, A Response” (Mir, 1850, 1: 2–4) Dobrovski reveals a naiveness concerning the complexity of the linguistic ecology in the imagined Bulgarian speech area. This is a blind spot which is often characterises the unreflect ed advocates of the standard language ideology (cf. Milroy, 2007) and their scriptocentric worldview. He answers that he has no intention whatsoever “not to write according to my, to You known opinion on the natural Spelling, that is according to the living pronunciation of the language”\textsuperscript{322} (Mir, 1850, 1: 2). Yet, in a manner which is strongly reminiscent of the defenders of the civil-Serbian concept of language and national identity, he is immediately adding that he is thereby not implying the linguistic practices of the uneducated rural masses, but those of the educated urban elites. He explains

\begin{quote}
[that I with natural spelling do not understand pronouncing according to the pronunciation of a completely vulgar language without any constant Grammatic rules. But, on the contrary, it is most well-grounded to assume that this literary Bulgarian language should be as easily comprehensible as possible for the People for which their Learned persons will speak, that language can be subjected to pretty good Grammatic rules, and be rather well-embellished and expressive, not less than any other elaborated lan-
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{320} „граматико-ізміслена Орθграграфiя“ развращенiе на язiцi те нiм неоснователнi сa i сьвєем суетнi."

\textsuperscript{321} „удiвiтелно то Стравографiческо (Орθграграфiческо)"

\textsuperscript{322} „да не пiша, според iзвестно то вi мое мненiе, по естественно то Правопiсанiе, то ест по жiвото произносенiе язiчно.“
The pronunciation of the social group Dobrovski himself represents will thus be reflected in the spelling conventions of the standard Bulgarian language code. According to Dobrovski, making the status-planning choice of this social variety the norm-giving base for the entailed corpus-planning, or Ausbau process, comports several significant benefits. It would inevitably give it a fixity (“constant Grammatical rules”) which all the other, thus marginalised, spoken varieties (and the social groups using them) – vulgar or not – would not have. Yet, Dobrovski does not seem to comprehend that the transformation from oral to written, “from dialect to language” (Haugen, 1967), would give any chosen variety or set of varieties a stability and controllability which it had previously been lacking. What separates the spoken varieties of the urban educated elites from those of the rural masses, in this respect, is merely the level of modernisation or elaboration of their vocabularies (“rather well-embellished and expressive”). The oral practices of the peasant majority are by no means less rulebound than those of the upper echelons of society. It often boils down to overt or covert attempts of establishing or preserving a position of power and domination (suggested by the formulation “the People for which their Learned persons will speak”).

Furthermore, Dobrovski explains, if he would have commenced to write in Bulgarian three decades ago “when the learned Compatriots for the first time began writing and translating in Bulgarian”323 (Mir, 1850, 1: 3), he would doubtlessly have begun to write according to the contemporary “natural” pronunciation. Now, alas, the intellectuals seem to be more inclined to agree on some kind of “Orthography” and he and all other minority dissenters must simply obey the will of the majority. Indeed, Dobrovski declares, “orthography” is based on “longstanding habits, or prejudices, self-interest […], or simply ignorance, or, to a greater or lesser degree, a compound of these circumstances”324 (ibid.). Yet, the objective of reaching an agreement on the principles for the construction of a unified literary language is of superior importance and so crucial for the future of the entire nation that “nothing could be more harmful than the continuous unsettlement”325 (ibid.). Furthermore, it is a question of a social contract – negotiated and agreed-upon conventions among the members of the speech-community – which can be subjected to revisions and renegotiations. This is a discourse in which the phonologist minority can convince the etymologist majority that it is “more

323 “когато първо зафанихъ ученi те Соотечественици спѣвът [sic!] илi да превождът на Български”. Dobrovski is perhaps thinking of for instance the “Fish-Primer” by Petur Beron, which was published in 1825.
324 “многовременнi навiкновенiа, iлi предразсужденiа […], iлi просто невежество, iлi соедiненi по малко то iлi по мало то от тiя абщоятелства [sic!]”.
325 “нищо друго не можи да е по вредително освен скокогищно то нерешение".
just and more beneficial”326 (ibid.) to concede to the principles of “natural spelling.” Consequently, he expresses his understanding “for Aprilov and the other of our Bulgarian writers”327 (ibid.) who, regardless of their support for “the natural spelling,” continue to write according to “Orthography.” In this way “they were hoping more easily to reach an agreement with the rest”328 (Mir, 1850, 1: 3). Towards the end of the response, Dobrovski mentions that “the Serbs as well have begun to abandon their old Orthography and to write according to the Natural Spelling that is according to their pronunciation, as far as it is possible with their still wicked alphabet”329 (ibid.). This is an explicit reference to the ever-broader impact of the orthographical reforms of Vuk St. Karadžić and his associates. Yet, the Bulgarian literati have still not succeeded in agreeing on a common orthography and “Bulgarian has been written with as many different orthographies, as there have been writers appearing” (Mir, 1850, 1: 4). Dobrovski has therefore decided to “write according to our Slavonic-Bulgarian pronunciation, that is according to Spelling and to the Orthography (euphemistically speaking)”330 (ibid.). The linguonym “Slavonic-Bulgarian” reflects the writer’s pan-Slavic belief in the existence of one single Slavic language (and people) of which Bulgarian was just one of many dialects.

In the bipartite article “On the Alphabet. Or about the pronunciation in general” Dobrovski gives backing to his defence of the “natural spelling.” He does it by anchoring his orthographic ideology in the conceptual framework of the Lockean sensualist theories on cognition, signified and signifiers – perhaps mediated by the writings of Locke’s French disciple Condillac (Danova, 2008: 433). Locke famously claimed that words indicate or reveal ideas in the mind of the speaker and that they primarily serve the purpose of disclosing human beings’ minds to others through the act of speaking. They are, thus, external and perceptible signs, which are signifying and communicating otherwise unattainable ideas in the minds of the speakers (Ott, 2003: 4; 24; 33). Dobrovski, in a conventionally religious key, rephrases this thought, claiming that this “heavenly gift” (i.e., language) bestows upon man

326 “по право, и по полезно”.
327 “за Апрілов и другі те наші білгарські писателі”.
328 “съ съ надявал по лесно да съ съгласъ съ другі те”.
329 “чі і Сърбі те започніли съ да изоставіть стара та Орфографія і да пішть по Естественно Правописаніе сіреч по проізносеніе то сі, колкото им е възможно с порочна ть им още азбука.”
330 “да піша по Естественно то-ни Славено-Българско проізносеніе, сиреч по Правописаніе а не по Орфографія (по евфімізм).”
[vocal, i.e., pronounceable signs for his concepts, and these pronounceable signs for the human concepts (ideas) are called words, those words give him an easy way of representing vocally also the different mental connections and approximations of the simple concepts which he originally receives according to his sensations.]

Exactly for the rationalistic sake of facilitating the vocal representation of “different mental connections and approximations” (ibid.), he was advocating the phonemic spelling principles (‘natural spelling’). These principles would facilitate cognition and render the transition from thought to words – signified to signifier, in Saussurean terms – as smooth and transparent as possible. Applying etymological spelling principles (‘orthography’) would, in contrast, render the link between concept and word – signified and signifier – less immediate and clear. Thereby they would also erect a barrier for the process of human cognition and the education of the broad popular masses.

Equally rationalist (and Eurocentric) are Dobrovski’s motives for introducing “one universal perfect Alphabet”331 (Mir, 1850, 1: 7) for all the human languages based on the Cyrillic script which is “far more perfect than the Latin”332 (ibid.), he asserts, because

During the period of the National Revivals, there were several pan-Slavically motivated attempts to create one universal script for all Slavic languages (Ivanova, 2008: 50–7). The famous Russian Slavist Aleksandr Hilferding (1831–72) and his less well-known Slovene colleague Matija Majar (1809–92) both launched ideologically driven graphisation projects based on the Cyrillic script. Hilferding was closely linked to the Russian tsar’s ambitions to exercise soft cultural power throughout the Slavic world and Majar was inspired by the Illyrian movement among his countrymen and the neighbouring Croats. This elucidates the ideological nature and political implications of the orthographical aspect of language planning and linguistic nation-building.

The material published in Mirozrenie reflected a general Austro-Slavic cultural ideology and Dobrovski’s ambitions to tear down any cognitive obstacles on the road towards the education and enlightenment of the Bulgarian people. It was a policy which was guided by an overall pedagogical purist orientation (Nikolova, 2015: 115). Consequently, there are utterly few – if any – explicit signs of Romanticist ethno-nationalistic identity politics in his linguistic ideology and practice. Dobrovski seems to be entirely guided

331 "една всеобща совершенна Азбука”.
332 "Млого по совершенна от Латинска тъ"
by rationalist motives and he endeavoured to draw a sharp dividing line between the instrumental and the symbolic functions of language. For him language was primarily an instrument of furthering education and progress and not a symbolic practice which – linked to religion or not – could be politically exploited to construct ethno-national differences. Nonetheless, this was exactly what some of his adversaries were accusing him of. They saw his “natural spelling” as a cover-up for the diffusion of Western propaganda among the Bulgarians.

This ideological position was radically expressed in the short open letter “To Mr. Jovan Dobrović, the editor of Mirozrenie”333 published in the Serbian daily newspaper Serbian News on 12 May 1851. The anonymous letter covers barely one column and is written in a language which, lexically, morphologically, and orthographically could be characterised as moderately conservative Slavonic-Serbian. The letter is signed by a certain “L. a man from Vidin”334 – a town on the Danube in today’s north-western Bulgaria. Both the form and substance of the text have a clear bearing on the theme of antithetical identity articulation by means of puristically motivated language choices. They are choices in which one or several alternatives are envisioned as impure, foreign, or posing a threat to the true, real, primordial, or essential character of the nation.

The language choice of the anonymous correspondent is, thus, by no means coincidental or ideologically neutral. Using Church Slavonic and Russian lexical items and orthographical features symbolised a political and cultural link to the Russian Empire.335 It was seen as an external expression of the internal substance of the Bulgarian people. “L. a man from Vidin” was in other words sharing the overarching civil-Serbian ideology of the Serbian intellectual elite of Vojvodina whose literary language he was using. He only transplanted it to the Bulgarian context. Thereby he also contributed to the construction of what I have called a Slavonic-Bulgarian and Russo-Bulgarian concept of language and national identity.

The anonymous critic in a haughty tone declares that he as well as everyone who is interested in philology and the literature of the educated peoples is very well acquainted with the orthography of Sanskrit which is “‘natural’, i.e., simple, and therefore perfect”336 (SN, 1851, 54: 211). In line with the conceptual framework of comparative-historical linguistics, he locates the purest model of imitation to Sanskrit, which had been discovered for Western Europe by Sir William Jones in the 1780s. This served him as an indirect scientific support for his etymologist position and envisioning Church Slav-
vonic as the true origin and substance of the Bulgarian national identity. He continues by asserting that he has also familiarised himself with the “orthographical system of the Serbian writer Mr. Vuk St. Karadžić, which could be said to be good”337 (SN, 1851, 54: 211). He claims that Karadžić and a handful of other writers are presently trying to force this orthography upon the Serbian people. Yet, this transgression, he claims, will never pass among the Bulgarians.

А зашто? — — То свакиј онай, кои в'руе, да халъина човька преобразуе и развраћуе, лако погодити може. Правописъ е као и споляшн ъ одѣло; па зашто бы мы у томе моду увели, да бы се назови савршенштъ одѣло; па зашто народности и цркви нашъ уштрбъ нанело, преузносили, а тимъ съ правога се пута одвратили. (SN, 1851, 54: 211)

[And why? — — That can everyone, who believes that the dress transforms and debases a person, easily guess. The orthography is like an external clothing; but why would we enter into this fashion in order to elevate this so-called perfection which would certainly cause harm to our national character and church, and thereby turn us away from the true path.]

In this metaphorical manner the anonymous writer means that the external form of the language – its graphical representation, in this case – reflects the inner, moral character, identity, or ‘Soul of the Nation.’ Consequently, the introduction of phonemic spelling principles would pose nothing less than a threat to this character and to the Orthodox Church which is its bullwork and true source. The underlying pro-Russian anti-West political motives for the identity politics regarding spelling principles for the standard Bulgarian language code is just a cover-up for the defence and promotion of the interests of a particular socio-economical group. This becomes obvious in the continuation of the letter. What the article is really aiming at is defending the ideological interests of a particular socioeconomical group. “L. a man from Vidin” writes that

Мы живимо іоштъ у порабоштенію и стенѣмо подъ агарянскимъ игомъ; а наша е литература текъ садъ проникла, или болѣ рећи возродила се, па кадъ іоштъ и то у разсуђенѣ узмемо, да насъ благотворно сунце текъ са сѣвера огрѣяти и благощестіе наше сачувати намъ може, ако Богъ да и хоће; онда несм ѣмо наше народно одѣло са себе збацити, него га дотле съ поносомъ носити морамо, док се неослободимо и тако неоснажимо, да кадри будемо устремлѣнію запада одпоръ давати и одбіяти стрѣле, кое садъ западъ подъ видомъ просвѣте и сяйне будућности и на нас ъ бацато започе: па онда текъ, будући, да осуђени нисмо шпри староме крпежу остати, моћимо и „естественнымъ” правописомъ писати. (SN, 1851, 54: 211–2)

[We are still living in slavery and are groaning under the Turkish yoke; and our literature has only now emerged, or, better put, has been reborn, and when we also take into account that the beneficial sun, God willing, can warm us and protect our piety only from the north, then we cannot thus throw of our folk costume, but we must still wear

337 „система правописа србскога списателя г. Вука Ст. Караџића, коя бы се могла наречи да е добра“.
it with pride until we liberate ourselves and become strong enough to be capable to offer the aspiration of the West resistance and repel the arrows which the West now, in the form of education and a bright future, begins to throw also upon us: and only then, given that we are not deemed to stick to the old patchwork, we will be able to write with the “natural” spelling.]

The strong metaphors reveal the emotional charge of the letter. Language and creed are represented as the two strongholds of the Bulgarian national identity, and they are now under attack “from the plague of the West”338 (ibid.) or “the western propaganda”339 on the pretext of introducing phonemic spelling principles. The only way of protecting the Bulgarian national character, piety, and freedom is to hold on to the orthography of the Orthodox Church and seek the support and protection from Russia (“the beneficial Orthodox Church and seek the support and protection from Russia (“the beneficial sun […] from the north”340, ibid.).

According to the anonymous critique, the Church Slavonic orthography thus represents a provisional shield against the poisonous arrows of the West in this precarious time of Turkish slavery. It forms part of the already initiated process of post-colonial, national self-articulation in the field of language. Yet, Russia and the Church Slavonic orthography is not per se a defining feature of the Bulgarian nation, as it is an “old patchwork” which can be abandoned as soon as the Bulgarian intellectuals stand on firmer ground and are “capable of offering the aspiration of the West resistance” on their own. What we have here is thus a kind of instrumental, xenophobic, elitist, and archaising purism. It represents a compound of purist attitudes in which the Church Slavonic orthography is presented as a means of defence against the assaults of the demonised Other – the West, which is represented by the attempts to introduce phonemic spelling principles.

The anonymous critic ends his open letter with the hope that he will not need to read any more ruminations about the introduction of the “natural spelling” in Mirozrenie. He urges his fellow countrymen to be on their guard, because:

Лукавога лиза вали се чувати, и пазити, да небы кою обчицу изъ стада нашега езыка и благочестия заразіо (SN, 1851, 54: 212).

[One has to protect oneself against and beware of the cunning fox so that it will not infect some little sheep in the herd of our language and piety.]

Dobrovski’s response is almost immediate. Towards the end of the fifth and very last issue of Mirozrenie of June 1851 he published the ironically titled article “A Brahmin in Vidin”341 (Mir, 1851, 5: 75–80). The article has the perhaps even more mocking subtitle “My amiable Anonymous Friend

---

338 “одъ западне куге”.
339 “Западна пропаганда”.
340 “благотворно сунце […] са сѣвера“
341 “Един Брахманъ въ Видинъ“.
(where shall I look for Thee?!)." Sarcastic humour and theatrical indignation characterise the tone of the response. From his rationalistic point of view, Dobrovski obviously did not find the criticism worthy of being taken seriously. Yet, exactly this kind of targeted pro-Russian and pro-Church Slavonic purist attitudes – albeit not so extreme – would leave deep and enduring traces in the vocabulary and morphology of the contemporary standard Bulgarian language code.

Just like Jovan Hadžić in the Serbian context (cf. ch. 4), Dobrovski is focusing on the alleged role of the big or back Yer as the principal symbol for the national identity’s rootedness in Orthodox Christianity and its prestigious Church Slavonic literary tradition. Moreover, exactly like Hadžić, Dobrovski’s adversaries saw it as a guarantee for the political and cultural alliance with the Russian Empire. True to his overall rationalist position, Dobrovski asserts that language-planning must not be mixed up with issues of politics, religion, or national identity. This is another of the blind spots of the declaratively rationalist language-policy of Dobrovski. Planning the linguistic behaviour of a named national community is or inevitably becomes mixed up with politics. As a whole, his idealistic stance strongly smells of the lamp. In line with the principle “write as you speak,” he uses the Yer “just like [his] Co-religionists and co-tribal Compatriots, Orthodox Christian Bulgarians speak and pronounce” (Mir, 1851, 5: 75), and not in its etymological positions. Implicitly, he denies any direct influence from Vuk St. Karadžić and frees the Serbian language reformer from all accusations of having thrown him down into the “Abyss of Yer-propaganda” (ibid.). With unconcealed irony he thanks his “furious friend” for saving him from this abyss, and continues:

Ах! добря ми наумяваш, благоговейнейшiй Господiне, онi голям блазнитель Враг-Дявул, който е прiкарал в тос крiв пъть православнi ъ Пiсатель Сърбскi Г. Вука Стефановiча и неговi те православнi Последователi, той тряба да мъ е изблазнiл и меня. Й като нiкога нiтi последнi те нiтi самсi Г. Вук не мi е продумвал нищo за Ерове те, то съ вiдi как непосредственно iстi ъ онi Дявул-Враг е iзлъгал i меня; покрайнiмeре нощя насъня пришепнал на ухо то, iзблазнiл мъ е, та мъ е вкарал до колени в Ероеретичество то! (Mir, 1851, 5: 76)

[Ah! good that You are reminding me, most venerated Sir, of that big tempter Foe-Devil, who has led the Orthodox Serbian writer Mr. Vuk Stefanović and his Orthodox Followers into the wrong track, he must have been tempting me as well. Yet, as neither the latter, nor Mr. Vuk himself have said a word to me about the Yers, it is obvious that this very same Devil-Foe directly has deceived me as well; he has leastwise at

---

342 „Лiубезнiй мой Прiятелю Безiменнiй (де да Тъ търса?!)
343 Graphically it is represented by the letter “ъ” and its phonetic value in contemporary Bulgarian is /ɤ/.
344 „както […] Едноверци и едноплемени Сьотечественници, Православнi Христенi Българi говорът и произносiцът“.
345 „Еропропагандистa Бездна“.
night while asleep whispered in my ear, he has tempted me, and driven me to my knees in the Yer-heresy!]

Dobrovski does not imply that the Bulgarians and the Serbs would not be good Orthodox Christians. He just wants to underline that this does not depend on language, in general, or on using the Yer in its etymologically correct positions in particular. Exactly this was the apple of discord in the debates between Jovan Hadžić and Vuk St. Karadžić during the final phase of the debates on the Serbian standard language code. Furthermore, Hadžić and Dobrovski’s anonymous critic utilises almost identical extralinguistic arguments for the retention or introduction of etymological spelling principles. Yet, while Karadžić represents an explicit Romanticist “ethnographic purism” (Thomas, 1991: 76), Dobrovski’s attitude to linguistic purity, in its orthographic aspect, could tentatively be labelled Enlightenment “rationalist purism.” For him language per se is exclusively an instrument of communication, cognition, and learning, and not linked to the national identity and the Orthodox Religion or Russia as its cultural definer and political defender.

All this proves that this “Indo-Brahmin […] in his insane and useless blind fanaticism […] is nothing but a ridiculous and pathetic Charlatan” (Mir, 1851, 5: 78). The wording of this verdict bears a striking resemblance to Vuk St. Karadžić’s characterisation of one of his main adversaries, Jovan Hadžić, as a “bodger and charlatan” (cf. p. 105). Moreover, in both cases the discourses circled around the decisive role of one single exponent of graphisation – the letter Yer, in the construction, maintenance and defence of the form and contents of the national identity.

The reactions to Dobrovski’s attempts to introduce the “natural spelling”, i.e., a phonemic orthography, were thus numerous and fierce in the periodicals financed with Russian money and aligned with the Tsar’s pan-Slavic policy. One of the most prominent tribunes for the furthering of Russian cultural and political interests among the Bulgarians in the 1850s was Cari-
gradski vestnik. This newspaper was financed by the Russian Embassy and the Patriarchate in Istanbul (Danova, 2008: 464). Jordan Hadžikonstantinov-Džinot (1818–82) for instance writes that “Mr. Joann Dobrev, instead of being the general embellisher of the Bulgarian orthography, is killing all Bulgarian philology and writing”\(^{346}\) (CV, 1850, 13). One of the strongest

\(^{346}\) “Г. Йоанъ Добревъ мѣсто да е общи украсител на правописний Болгарскомъ, онъ убива всичко языковсловие и писание Болгарское.”
critics of Dobrovski’s “natural spelling” and general language policy would be the Russian official and pro-Bulgarian cultural activist of Bulgarian origin Nikolaj Christoforovič Palauzov. Palauzov was deeply entangled in the pro-Russian interests of the Bulgarian colony of Odesa. In a letter to the famous Russian Slavist Viktor Ivanovič Grigorovič (1815–76) (Danova, 2008: 464–5), he, in a derogatory tone, characterises the complete uselessness of the “natural spelling.” He writes that “the Bulgarian language with the new orthography is exactly the same as a frock-coat without arms.”

The same Palauzov publishes the bipartite article “Some thoughts about the Bulgarian orthography” in number 80 and 81 of Carigradski vestnik on 29 March and 12 April 1852. The article is written in a strongly Russified Bulgarian and with all the Yers in their etymological positions. This is both due to the author’s language ideological convictions and probably to the fact that he was educated and living in Russia. Palauzov’s pro-Russian, archaising, and elitist purist policy is targeting several aspects language planning. In the first hand, it addresses Dobrovski’s proposition to introduce phonemic spelling principles, alongside similar attempts among the other South-Slavic peoples. He also turns to one of the other hot corpus-planning issues of the Bulgarian linguistic debates in the second half – that concerning the role, forms, and position of the post-fixed definite article.

Palauzov supports his argumentation with comprehensive references to the Rusyn historian and Slavist Jurij Ivanovič Venelin. Venelin has been accredited for opening the eyes of the Russian and European academic communities to the existence and cultural specifics of the Bulgarians. Thereby, he strongly contributed to the pro-Russian – and anti-Greek – purist turn in the Bulgarian linguistic debates (Daskalov, 2013: 154). Venelin accomplished it through works such as the three-volume The old and today’s Bulgarians in their political, ethnographic, historical and religious relations to the Russians (Moscow, 1829–41), A grammar of today’s Bulgarian dialect, On the formation of new Bulgarian literature (Moscow, 1838), and Critical studies on the history of the Bulgarians (Moscow, 1849). Venelin’s descriptions, or narrative constructions, of the Bulgarians’ glorious historical past and pitiful political present, and their ethnographic, cultural, and linguistic specifics, were warmly embraced by the influential members of the Bulgarian merchant colony in Russia. Not least significant

---

347 “българският език с новия правопис е точно това, което е сюртук без ръкави.”
348 „Древние и нынешние Болгаре в политическомъ, народописномъ, историческомъ и религиозномъ ихъ отношения къ Россиянамъ.“
349 „Грамматика нынешнего болгарского наречия.“
350 „О зародышъ новой болгарской литературы.“
351 This historiographical work was posthumously published on the initiative of the Russian historian Spiridon Nikolaevič Palauzov (1818–72), who was a close relative of N.Ch. Palauzov. Its original title is „Критическая изслѣдованія объ истории Болгаръ.”
was the fact that he constructed the Bulgarians as originally Slavs and in a positively defining relation to the other Slavs, in general, and the Russians, in particular.

Palauzov begins his article by accurately presenting Dobrovski’s spelling system as based on the phonemic principle “write as you pronounce and pronounce as you write” (CV, 1852, 80: 117) and reveals his own position by rhetorically asking

на що ны е това, кога имаме своя азбука, на коя до нын пишятъ Бѫлгаре и наши единородны Братія Россіане, и коя е освѣщена отъ вѣковете и сроднилася е съ славянскіатъ языкъ? (CV, 1852, 80: 117)

[what use do we have of it, when we have our script, in which the Bulgarians and our only begotten brethren the Russians are writing until today, and which is sanctified by the centuries and is related to the Slavonic language?]

Following Palauzov, the introduction of Dobrovski’s “natural spelling” would provoke several harmful consequences. It would not just imply a breach with the prestigious and centuries-old literary tradition of the Church Slavonic language, but also comport a separation from the “only begotten brethren the Russians” (ibid.).

In the same spirit, he criticises Dobrovski’s substitution of big Yus (<ѫ>) with the big Yer (<ъ>) to represent the phoneme /ɤ̞/ or /ə/ graphically. Just as for Vasil Aprilov in the debates with Konstantin Fotinov six years earlier, the big Yus and the Yers did not just have an instrumental function reflecting a unique Bulgarian phoneme and mark the hardness of individual consonant. The big Yus did not exist in medieval Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic manuscripts; thus, it represented a mark of unique Bulgarian national distinction and the deep rootedness of the Bulgarian people in the Church Slavonic patrimony. Palauzov extols the congeniality of the Slavic azbuka which – in contrast to the Latin alphabet – has “one individual letter for each sound.”

The introduction of the “natural spelling” would imply disowning oneself of this priceless asset and losing “this our property, which constitutes a distinctive feature of the Slavonic language.”

Palauzov makes several references to the linguistic developments in the other South-Slavic contexts – among the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, which show that he is well informed about the debates among his closely related neighbours. He uses them as deterrent examples of the negative consequences of having several scripts and principles of spelling within the scope of the

---

352 Paradoxically, Venelin developed his theory on the purely Slavic origin of the Bulgarians in his so-called “Hun-theory.” He meant that not only the conquered Slavs of the mediaeval Bulgarian realm but also the proto-Bulgarian conquerors were of purely Slavic origin. According to his rather opaque logic, the proto-Bulgarians were actually Huns, but the Huns, in turn – even Attila – were Slavs. This ethnogenetic idea was widely espoused and propagated by the Odesa-based Bulgarian merchants-cum-intellectuals (Daskalov, 2013: 229).

353 “за секи звукъ особна буква.”

354 “това наше достояние, кое составлява отличително свойство Славянского языка.”
same language. “Unfortunately,” he writes, “the Slavic person’s innate ‘evil genius to correct’ the letters, has introduced several alphabets into ‘the very same language!’”\(^{355}\) (CV, 1852, 80: 117). Dobrovski’s attempt to introduce a new orthography for the Bulgarian language threatens to lead to nothing less than “a new Tower of Babylon”\(^{356}\) he writes.

Palauzov exemplifies this “evil genius” and the confusion of tongues (or rather scripts) it creates with the situation among the Slovenes where “Kopitar for the sound Ж used two Latin letters, Metelko something like Ж. Danjko X etc.: Thus, the Slovenes now have three different alphabets!”\(^357\) (CV, 1852, 80: 117). He ascribes this deplorable fact to the innate, simple passion of the Slavs to tear apart the forms of the letters.

As another case in point, Palauzov refers to the reforms of Vuk St. Karadžić. “The Serbs and Croats of the Greek creed” (CV, 1852, 80: 117) have indeed accepted the Russian Cyrillic script, he writes, but now Karadžić out of sheer vanity has rejected graphemes \(<я>, <ѣ>, <ъ>\), and \(<ѣ>\) and replaced the congenially Slavic letter \(<ѣ>\) with no less than three graphemic representations. Palauzov refers to the Ekavian, Ijekavian, and Ikavian realisation of the Slavonic grapheme \(<ѣ>\), e.g., \(река\), \(ријека\), and \(рика\) ‘river.’ He cannot see any other reasons for this than the personal objective of “attaining the fame of a Reformer” (ibid.). These reforms have fortunately not been accepted by the Serbian government and only led to a confusion of scripts within the Serbian speech-community, he points out. The same bad fate will befall the Bulgarians, Palauzov warns, if they would accept the “natural spelling” of Dobrovski.

According to Palauzov, the situation among the “Serbs and Croats of the Latin Creed” (CV, 1852, 80: 117) is even worse. They use the Latin script and represent the uniquely Slavic phonemes in an array of confused and disparate ways. Palauzov is referring to the different Latin spelling conventions (Italian and Hungarian) which were used among the Catholic Southern-Slavs before the orthographic reforms of Ljudevit Gaj (Badurina, 2012). These reforms were initiated in the 1830s and completed by Đuro Daničić in the second half of the nineteenth century. This orthographical confusion
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\(^{355}\) „По несчастію, врожденъ Славянскому человѣку ‘злой геній да исправля ‘ писмена, введе нѣколко алфавиты въ ‘единъ и тотъ же языкъ!’“

\(^{356}\) „ново Бавилонско столпотворенiе“

\(^{357}\) „Для звука Ж, Копитар употрѣбѣлъ двѣ Латински букви, Метелко нѣщо като Ж. Данико Х и проч.: Така, сега Словенцы-те три различны алфавити!“: Palauzov is referring to the attempts to substitute the traditional \(bohoričica\), which had been created in the sixteenth century by Adam Bohorič (1520–98), with a new, more phonemic alphabet. The attempts by Peter Danjko 1787–1873) to introduce the so called \(danjčica\) (‘Danjko-alphabet’) and of Franc Serafin Meteljko (1789–1860) to introduce the \(meteljčica\) (‘Meteljko-alphabet’), were both inspired by the Illyrianist ideologue Jernej Kopitar. The Slovene orthographical disputes ended with the acceptance of a modified version of Ljudevit Ga’s \(gajica\) (Gaj-alphabet’). As mentioned before (cf. p. 185), Kopitar played a decisive role also in the reform of the Serbian orthography.
cannot provoke anything but tears, Palauzov exclaims. He exemplifies with the Ragusan baroque poet Ivan Gundulić’s (1589–1638) epic poem *Osman* from 1621 which was printed for the first time in 1826. According to the publisher, the inhabitants of Croatia and Slavonia can take as much pride in “this epopee […] as the Greeks in Homer, the Romans in Virgil, and Italy in Tasso”[^358] (*CV*, 1852, 80: 118). Yet, the inhabitants of Croatia and Slavonia can neither take pride in nor enjoy it, because the publisher has printed it in a Latin alphabet of his own design, and they, alas, cannot even read it. This piece of epical mastery is equally inaccessible to “the inhabitants of Serbia, Bosnia, Montenegro, and the Hungarian Serbs”[^359] (ibid.) because they use the Russian Cyrillic script.

Another deterrent example from the world of the South Slavs is the *Grammatik der Illyrischen Sprache*[^360] (‘Grammar of the Illyrian Language’) by Ignjat Alojzije Brlić, which was published in Vienna in 1833. Despite initially deploiring the confusing existence of as many as twenty different Slavic alphabets and extolling the pristine superiority of the Cyrillo-Methodian script, Brlić introduces another composed of Latin, Vukovian, and other letters. This is already the twenty-first Slavic script and Dobrovski’s system of “natural spelling” is threatening to become the twenty-second. “The Slavic tribes are entangling their literacy into nets, which they have prepared for themselves”[^361] (*CV*, 1852, 80: 118), Palauzov concludes with a quote from the authoritative Slavist J.I. Venelin.

To avoid erecting a “new Slavic Tower of Babylon”[^362] (*CV*, 1852, 80: 118) the Bulgarians must turn to the Russians, whose language “is more refined, purer, and richer than the Bulgarian [language]”[^363] (ibid.). Palauzov makes explicit reference to purity, purism, and the corpus-planning process of modernisation and lexical elaboration. The Bulgarians can be saved from the bad fate of the other South Slavic peoples only by holding tight to the etymological spelling norms of the Russian and “Church Slavonic (Bulgarian)”[^364] language. Otherwise, their descendants risk losing their ability to read “today’s Bulgarian books and even the Holy Writ”[^365] (ibid.). Following Palauzov, this fatal step would also imply losing one’s sense of national identity, which is rooted in the language and narrative of this literary tradition. Palauzov adds that

[^358]: тѫзе Епопея [….] като и Грецы сосъ Гомера, Римляне сосъ Виргилія, Италія сосъ Тасса”.
[^359]: „жители те на Сербія, Боснія, Чернігірія и Серби венгерски”.
[^360]: The full title is *Grammatik der Illyrischen Sprache: wie folche in Bosnien, Dalmazien, Slawonien, Serbien, Ragusa, & dann von den Illyriern in Banat und Ungarn gesprochen wird, für Deutsche*.
[^361]: Славянски племена завѫрзватъ своя писменность въ мрежи, кои сами си ги готвятъ”.
[^362]: "нове Словенское столптовореные."
[^363]: „е по изящень, по чисть и по богать отъ Бѫлгарскі атъ.”
[^364]: „Церковно-Славянскій (Бѫлварсій) [sic!]“
[^365]: „сегаши [sic!] Бѫлгарски книги и даже Св: Писаніе“.
Orthography, and, implicitly, the strife to preserve the bonds with the uniquely Bulgarian Church Slavonic heritage and Russia, is a “holy matter [which we cannot] toss around like some toy” (ibid.), Palauzov continues with reference to Venelin. Following the example of the frivolous Vukovian Serbs would only lead to an “orthographic discord” (ibid.) among the Bulgarians. Instead, they must seek advice from the professional philologists of the other Slavic peoples, “for instance [from] the Russians” (ibid.). In contrast to the phonemic principles of Ivan Dobrovski and Vuk St. Karadžić, Palauzov claims the etymological axiom that orthography and pronunciation are two completely different and even conflicting matters.

Nikolaj Palauzov opens the next instalment of his bipartite article with a new purist statement aiming at drawing the Bulgarians closer to the Russians and the other Slavic tribes.

Palauzov claims that the only way to supersede the dialectal variegation which is characterising the Bulgarian speech area and create a superregional standard language code is, thus, to obey the etymological spelling norms of the Church Slavonic tradition and Russia. Moreover, the Bulgarians must abandon the anti-Slavic “barbarism” of the post-fixed definite articles. These articles are not just transmogrifying throughout the language area, but also separating them from the Russians, obstructing case declension, and making the writing of poetry virtually impossible. The bad linguistic habits of the simple people to substitute the cases with prepositions and the postfixed definite article, are, according to Palauzov (CV, 1852, 81: 122), “such a galimatias, Babylon, which, however, unfortunately [is] in wide use.”

---

366 “предметъ священъ […] да го вартимъ като нѣкоя игрушка.“
367 “орфографически раздоръ“.
368 “каква галиматия, Вавилонія! която однако по несчастіе въ голѣмо употребленіе“.
articles as “similar to ungreased wheels which are passing on over cobblestones and permanently emitting the sounds ta.. ta.. ta!”369

This discussion gradually bleeds into the general corpus-planning issue of creating a grammar which can “preserve the literate unity of the people”370 (CV, 1852, 81: 122). Grammars are indeed sets of implicit or explicit rules which regulate the language behaviour of a socially or geographically defined speech-community. In non-ideologised settings, these rules of linguistic conduct are negotiated, defined, and changed among the constituent members of the face-to-face-community. Yet, the ideologically biased Palauzov aimed at preserving the unity or constructing the identity of the Bulgarian people by defining the rules of their linguistic conduct as closely as possible to those governing the language behaviour of the Russian ethnolinguistic community. All features which threatened to distance the Bulgarians from the Russians (and the other Slavic peoples) were thus demonised as ‘barbarisms.’ The post-fixed definite article was represented as one of the most fatal (morphological) menaces to this grammatical unity of the Bulgarian people with themselves, the Russians, and the other Slavic peoples. To solve this conundrum, Palauzov calls for the convocation of a grammatical court. This language-planning court would evaluate the already existing grammars by Emanuil Vaskidovič, Neofit Rilski, Christaki Pavlovič, and Ivan Bororov, as well as grammars in other dialects within the Bulgarian speech-area. In this manner, they could efficiently “choose what is best, and compile something correct, which is based on laws and adequate principles”371 (CV, 1852, 81: 122). These “laws and adequate principles” would by no means be ideologically neutral. Otherwise, the Bulgarian people risk being thrown into the grammatical turmoil which is dismembering the neighbouring South-Slavic peoples:

Това требува будущност на Бѫлгаска писменность и безпеченіе народа отъ Грамматически раздоръ, отъ кой и до сеги страдаятъ наши сосѣды: Сербы, Кръяты, Босняки, Славуны и рагузинцы (CV, 1852, 81: 122)

[That is what is needed for the future of the Bulgarian letters and to save the people from the Grammatical discord, from which even today are suffering our neighbours: the Serbs, Croats, Bosnians, Slavonians, and Ragusans.372]

N.Ch. Palauzov ends his article hoping that the Bulgarian grammar which the deceased J.I. Venelin, on the commission of the Imperial Russian Academy, wrote during his scientific journey to Bulgaria in 1829, will soon be printed. This grammar “must be utterly interesting and contains many ingen-

369 „подобно на ненамазаны кола, които заминуватъ презъ каманы и издаватъ въчно звукове та.. та.. та!”
370 „сохрани грамотно единство въ народать.”
371 „да избере най доброто, и да составя едно правилно нщо основано на законы и на достаточны принципи.”
372 The Ragusans were the inhabitants of Ragusa, which is the historical name of today’s Croatian town of Dubrovnik.
ious Grammatical observations [which are] very useful for our language, which has an urgent need of a critical Grammar, for a correct perspective on our language”\textsuperscript{373} (CV, 1852, 81: 122). Venelin’s book was the first scholarly description of the grammar(s) of the contemporary spoken Bulgarian varieties, but it would remain unprinted until as late as 1997 (Venediktov, 1997: V–XXII).

This corpus-planning manual would certainly have given ample support for Palauzov’s identification of the Bulgarians with Slavdom, Russia, and Church Slavonic patrimony, and for the pro-Russian, elitist, and archaising purist policies it gave rise to. This ideology was also shared and promoted by most of the members of the resourceful Bulgarian merchant colony in Russia. These merchants-cum-scholars possessed not only the economical, but also the social and cultural capital necessary to gain the upper hand in the politically motivated late-nineteenth century Bulgarian debates on language and national identity.

7.2 Bogorov and the Bulgarian purist discourses up until 1878

In this section, I will analyse the purist ideology Ivan Bogorov. One of the most pivotal language planning issues of the decades around the Liberation of 1878 was the intellectualisation and modernisation of the Bulgarian word-stock. Many influential Bulgarian intellectuals of the time cherished moderately pragmatic purist attitudes and turned to Russian, pan-Slavic, and western sources of cultural dialogue, identification, and lexical enrichment. Contemporaneously, Bogorov evolved into targeting all allegedly non-domestic sources of lexical enrichment as foreign and threatening to the Bulgarian character (българщината) of the national written language. This extreme, xenophobic, and ethnographic purism has been evaluated as “eccentric [and] groundless”\textsuperscript{374} (Nikolova, 2015: 98) by both his contemporaries and many modern scholars.\textsuperscript{375} This purist policy and the many reactions it provoked in the Bulgarian public sphere will be the object of study of the following pages.

The enlightener, polyglot, publisher, and physician Ivan Bogorov was doubtlessly one of the most highly educated Bulgarians of his era. Bogorov studied at the Phanar Greek Orthodox College in Istanbul, the Richelieu

\textsuperscript{373} “треба да е весма любопытна и содержава многи остроумны правилны зам ѣчанія Грамматически, твѫрдѣ полезны за нашіатъ языкъ, който има таквази голѣма нужда за критическа Грамматика, за правиленъ взглядъ на нашій языкъ“.

\textsuperscript{374} “чудат, необоснован”.

\textsuperscript{375} The language policy of Ivan Bogorov has been thoroughly studied by researchers such as Mladenov (1927) and Andrejčin (1977), Ivanova (1998), and Nikolova (2015).
Lyceum of Odesa, chemistry at the University of Leipzig, and medicine at the University of Paris. In the polymath manner characterising many literati of the period the National Revivals, he left significant contributions to a great many fields of Bulgarian letters and learning. He collected and published folk-songs, translated textbooks and novels into modern Bulgarian, wrote the first Bulgarian grammar based on vernacular varieties („Първичка българска грамматика“, Bucharest, 1844), and compiled the first Bulgarian-French dictionary („Българско-Френски ръчникъ“, Vienna, 1869–71) etc.

Yet, most decisive for the current study is Bogorov’s pathbreaking role in the development of the Bulgarian press of the period of the National Revival. By founding and editing several central periodicals from the 1840s to the 1880s, he contributed greatly to the development of the bourgeois public sphere and the infrastructure of collective discourse it represented. Bogorov founded and single-handedly edited the first Bulgarian newspaper ‘The Bulgarian Eagle’ (Бѫлгарскый Орелъ, Leipzig, 1846–7), cofounded and coedited ‘The Tsargrad Herald’ (Цариградский вѣстникъ, 1848–62), created the first Bulgarian philological journal ‘A Library for Reading’ (Книговище за прочитане, Vienna, 1874–5), and the first post-Liberation journal ‘Pure-Bulgarian anvil for eloquence’ (Чистобългарска наковалня за сладкодумство, Plovdiv, Vienna, and Sofia, 1878–9).

The last periodical had the motto ‘As long as language lives, a people will not perish.’ Defending the existence of the Bulgarian people by means of safeguarding the pure Bulgarian character of their written language constituted the scarlet thread running through his entire linguistically orientated opus. Yet, the first two decades of his activity bore few traces of the uncompromisingly extreme, xenophobic, and ethnographic purism of Bogorov’s later years. In contrast, the purist ideology of the period 1844–68 could be characterised as moderate, pragmatic, and democratic. Certainly, Bogorov did embrace pan-Slavism, in both its Habsburg Austro-Slavic and Russian Slavophile form. Paradoxically, his democratic attitudes towards language could even be seen as forebearer to his later, more extreme ethnographic purism. According to Nikolova (2015), the great watershed in his language ideology was the Second Pan-Slavic Congress in Moscow in the summer of 1867. Bogorov participated and even met the Russian Emperor, Aleksandr II. Yet, his overall impressions were harshly negative. Just like his German contemporary Friedrich Engels (1820–95) before him, Bogorov began to

376 “Докле е жив езика, един народ няма да загине.“
377 Engels had already in 1849 (in the article “Der magyarische Kampf” in Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Nr 194 of 13 January) denounced the Russian pan-Slavic ambitions writing that “The Pan-Slavic unity is thus either a pure pipe dream, or just – the Russian knout.” (“Die panslawistische Einheit ist also entweder eine reine Schwärmerei oder aber - die russische Knute.”).
see the Russian attempts to create unity among the Slavs as a sly cover-up for the Tsar’s ambitions to expand his sphere of political power. As he had earlier turned away from Greek, Turkish, and Church Slavonic sources of lexical modernisation, and the political and cultural power and identities they represented, he now targeted perceived Russicisms as foreign and threatening to the true essence of the Bulgarian language.

7.2.1 ‘A Passion to be a Purist’

Ivan Bogorov amplified his purist policy of the period 1869–78 in two principle printed sources. The first are the three, all sixteen pages long pamphlets Upŭtvane za bŭlgarskyj jazyk (‘Instruction for the Bulgarian language’) published in Vienna 1869–71. An early version of the third pamphlet was previously published in the magazine Čitalište (‘Reading Room’) on 1 August 1871. The second is the magazine Knigovište za pročitane (‘A library for reading’) which Bogorov published in six issues in 1874–5. It was also printed in Vienna, where he had, almost symbolically, moved immediately after the Second Pan-Slavic Congress in Moscow in the summer of 1867. I will base my analysis on materials from these sources. In addition, I will include texts discourse participants from a wide range of periodicals, such as Čitalište (‘Reading Room,’ Istanbul, 1870–5/6), Znanie (‘Knowledge,’ Bucharest, 1875–6), and Den (‘Day’). These publications became discursive platforms from which the authors criticised the purist ideology and policy of Ivan Bogorov.

Čitalište was the organ of the Istanbul Reading Room and had the general educational and literary orientation of many of the Bulgarian periodicals of the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Its editors-in-chief were all eminent intellectuals of the era of the National Revival such as Marko Balabanov (1837–1921), Lazar Jovčev (1840–1915), Todor Ikonomov (1835–92), Petko Račov Slavejkov, and Stefan Bobčev (1853–1940). Many of them would also play a significant role in the political, cultural, and ecclesiastical life of post-Liberation Principality of Bulgaria. Čitalište had an overall conservative and pro-Russian ideological orientation and entertained close relations with the Slavophiles of the Moscow Slavophile Committee (Genčev, 2002: 269–70).

The early and slightly abbreviated version of the “Third instruction for the Bulgarian language” („Трето упѫтване за българскъ езъкъ“, in the following referred to as TUZBE, Čitalište, 1871, 21: 641–54) has the form of a kind of discursive antiphon. The dialogue is created by the comprehensive footnotes, in which one of the editors-in-chief of Čitalište, P.R. Slavejkov, directly comments on the contents of the article. Slavejkov is perhaps most famous as one of the first new-Bulgarian original poets with the collection of poems A mixed bunch of flowers (Смѣсена китка, 1852) and the poem “The Spring of the White-Legged” („Изворът на белоногата“, 1871). Both these works were, in the romanticist vein, inspired
by Bulgarian folk-poetry. Generally, Slavejkov is one of the most typically romanticist figures of the entire period. He started his career by collecting folksongs, sayings, and proverbs, and created many canonical literary works of the Bulgarian national canon. Prototypically romanticist were also Slavejkov’s attitudes and beliefs about language. He saw it as “a mirror of the spirit and genius of the people” (Ivanova, 1998: 53), which had to be protected against foreign encroachments. He was not least focusing on the borderer-zones of Macedonia and Aegean Thrace, where the Serbian and Greek influences and expansionist politics were particularly strongly felt. Both Greece and Serbia had presented their respective masterplans of national expansion in 1844 – the Megali Idea (‘Great Idea’) and Načertanije (‘The Sketch’). Slavejkov was also one of the most prolific publishers of the National Revival. He published and edited newspapers and magazines such as Gajda (‘The Bagpipe,’ 1863–7), Makedonija (‘Macedonia,’ 1866–72), Ružica (‘Ružica,’ 1871), Pčelica (‘The Little Bee,’ 1871), and, finally, Čitalište.

An explicit purist policy permeated the linguistic theory and practice of in the first place Makedonija and Čitalište. Slavejkov’s language cleansing policy could be characterised as democratic or “ethnographic” (Thomas, 1991: 77). It was democratic in the sense that he saw the linguistic practices of the Bulgarian village as the primal source of lexical enrichment, and “xenophobic” (ibid., p. 80) in the sense that he targeted particular external sources of enrichment as foreign and threatening to his specific vision of the national self. Yet, Slavejkov’s lexical purist policy was moderate and pragmatic both in comparison to the xenophobic fervour of Bogorov and the radical folklorism of Vuk St. Karadžić in the Serbian context. Like Karadžić, Slavejkov cherished a tolerant attitude to many of the Turkisms in wide use among the rural populations of the Bulgarian speech-area (something he would be severely criticised for by Bogorov). However, in pragmatic contrast to both Karadžić and Bogorov, he did not “deny the role of Russian [as well as Church Slavonic, and other Slavic languages] as a source of the entrance of international cultural vocabulary, scientific terminology and other means of intellectualisation of the language” (Ivanova, 2014: 309–10). Furthermore, on the level of graphisation, Slavejkov supported an archaising, etymologist or historical ideology which anchored the Bulgarian popular unity or national identity in the prestigious Old-Bulgarian literary tradition (cf. Vŭlčev, 2008).

378 “огледало на духа и гения на народа.”
379 Ružica was the first Bulgarian magazine addressing a female reading audience.
380 Pčelica was the first Bulgarian magazine for children.
381 „отричат ролята на руския език като източник за навлизане на международна културна лексика, научна терминология и други средства за интелектуализация на езика.“
Bogorov’s approach to the modernisation and intellectualisation of the standard Bulgarian language code was instead to coin neologisms exclusively out of the lexical and morphological resources of what he saw as the purest of the Bulgarian dialects. This approach is in many ways reminiscent of the purist policy of some of Bogorov’s Croatian contemporaries. According to Bogorov, the ethnically and linguistically purest Bulgarian villages were in the Balkan Mountains (Ivanova, 1998: 86). It was these two conceptualisations of language and national identity, and the politico-ideological interests they served, which would clash in the discourse on lexical purism in the “Third instruction for the Bulgarian language” that was published in Čitalište on 1 August 1871.

The only truly democratic way to intellectualise a standard language code and avoid a situation of diglossia is to base the common language exclusively on words already existing in the dialects or to coin neologism out of the morphological resources they dispose of. This is the prescriptivist point which Bogorov is trying to make throughout the entire article. To emphasise this point, he begins his text with a historical overview of some deterring examples from the Judeo-Christian historical context where various written language codes have been used to exclude and manipulate the popular masses. Among the ancient Egyptians the written language, and learning in general, was the exclusive prerogative of a closed caste of priests and sorcerers. These privileged members of society would “by means of the sciences [make] miracles in front of the people, which the world thought to be supernatural phenomena and called them magic.”

Yet, in the Western world, Latin was the language of learning because the sciences could not be taught to the people in the living language. This exclusive hegemony was first challenged “in Germany [by] a German, who attempted to print a book in the German language, then he committed a great sin, but now a huge good for his tribe” (Čitalište, 1871, 21: 642). From the time of Martin Luther on, the peoples of Europe have commenced to advance learning and education in their own languages, he states.

What he depicts as the desolate Bulgarians, though, did not have any other choice than to turn to the more advanced Greek neighbours. For the sake of social promotion, they began to study in the “Hellenic language”, i.e., the classicised linguistic concept of katharevousa of Adamantios Korais, a written-language variety which was based on the vernaculars but adapted to the ancient system of inflection and cleansed from foreign, above all Turkish, lexical items. According to the romanticist ethnolinguistic logic of Bogorov, however, this was a sheer luck for the Bulgarian ethnicity. Because, if the

382 „посредствомъ наукъ правяха чуда прѣдъ хората, които свътъ мышлѣше за извѣстственны работи и ги нарѣчава маги.”
383 „[въ] Германии пѣрвый Нѣмецъ, който посѣгна да напечета книга на Нѣмскій языкъ, тогда направи голѣмъ грѣхъ, а нынѣ прѣголѣмо добро на своя родъ”
Bulgarian intellectuals had been studying in “the popular language,” they would have run the risk of language shift and thereby the loss of their linguistically defined national self.

In one fell swoop, Bogorov discards both the Slavic ethnicity and the role of the Church Slavonic literary tradition as a source of linguistic enrichment.

А пакъ нiи, прѣди да се наречемъ Българи, отъ нашытѣ прѣдѣды Славяны нѣмаше нищо, освѣнъ, че тѣ сѫ са наричали Хунни, Авари и Печенѣги. Колко-то за черковнославянский езыкъ Българитѣ никогажъ не сѫ го говорили, нито сѫ го имали за тѣхенъ политически: той е излѣенъ натѫкмо споредь гръцкий

[Yet we, before we called ourselves Bulgarians, did not have anything from our ancestors the Slavs, apart from that they called themselves Huns, Avarians, and Pechenegs. As far as the Church Slavonic language is concerned, the Bulgarians have never spoken it, neither did they have it as their political [language]: it is cast exactly according to the Greek [language].]

Entangled ethnogenetic and etymological speculations were a speciality of romanticist philology, and Bogorov was perhaps influenced by the writings of Venelin, or just reflecting sets of general beliefs among that time’s philologists, when he claims that the Slavs were or at least “called themselves Huns, Avarians, and Pechenegs” (ibid.). Based on the finding he had access to then, Bogorov furthermore makes the general statement that the Church Slavonic language was a written medium which to a great extent consists of lexical, morphological, and syntactic calques of Byzantine Greek. 384 The Bulgarian medieval realm did gain much if its cultural-political prestige through appropriating and transforming the cultural practices of the Byzantine Empire – its religion, arts, and language. According to the dualistic worldview of Eastern Christianity, the Church Slavonic language was never supposed the reflect the dynamics of earthly social intercourse and relentless change but was rather conceived of as something of a linguistic icon. It was a static idea that original purity was to be defended in various reforms throughout the centuries, e.g., those implemented by the last Bulgarian Patriarch Euthymius (ca 1325–1404) in the second half of the fourteenth century (Haralampiev, 1990). 385

Bogorov therefore claims that most of the populations inhabiting the areas controlled by the Bulgarian medieval tsars never spoke this religious high-language code. Yet, he strongly simplifies the dynamic nature of spoken

384 Although being partly true that the Church Slavonic language is ripe with lexical, morphological, and syntactic calques of Byzantine Greek, researchers such as Ihor Ševčenko (1991) and Henrik Birnbaum (1992) et al. have also shown that this influence was not as far-reaching as has previously been believed.

385 In Muscovite Russia, this early example of religiously motivated purism would lead to the so-called ‘Second South-Slavic Influence’ (второе южнославянское влияние) and the ‘correction of books’ (исправление книг). These reforms were to a large extent effectuated on the command of the Bulgarian priest Kiprian, who had been appointed Metropolite of Kyiv and Russia in the late fourteenth century (Nuorluoto, 2012: 52).
linguistic practices, when he suggests that the Bulgarians, in various regions, have spoken the same language from the arrival of the Ottomans to the present day (at the time of writing). To corroborate this assertion, he refers to the two folksongs, “Tsar Murad said to Mara” and “Načo speaks quietly [and] beautifully to Dimka.”386 Bogorov claims that these folksongs are from 1389 and 1835, and their linguistic closeness serves him to prove the constancy of the spoken, popular Bulgarian language practices.

The popular language has, thus, following Bogorov, preserved a pre-colonial, pristine purity, which has been lost in the language of the societal elites. He claims that the contemporary Bulgarian literati, alas, do not write as their people speak, and has been speaking since time immemorial, but use a written language polluted by foreign lexical elements. This does not just pose a threat to the pure Bulgarian character of this language, but also raises obstacles for the communication and education of the Bulgarian people. Nikolova (2015: 115) has called the last language-cleansing preoccupation “pedagogical purism.”387 Bogorov maintains that

Да се просвети единъ народъ, нѣма друг по-кѫ съ пѫть освѣнь неговый бащинъ езыкъ; защо дѣтето, щомъ влѣзе въ школото, разумѣва най-добрѣ даскалътъ и запомнева всичко щото е учило на башинъ си езыкъ доклѣ свѣтъ свѣти. ([Citatište, 1871, 21: 644])

[There is no shorter road for a people to be educated than in its father tongue; because as soon as a child enters the school, it understands the teacher best and remembers everything that it has been studying in its father tongue forever and ever after.]

This was also the reason why the Bulgarians once and for all threw off the Greek cultural and linguistic yoke. Per se, this assertion seems rather reasonable; the crucial role of the first language in process of learning is rather undisputed in contemporary research. Yet, according to Bogorov, the intellectuals are not just to be blamed for causing this situation of diglossia, but also for creating the misconception that “there is no living Bulgarian language in the world”388 (ibid.). Following him, this fallacy has been engendered by the fact that the language used in the printed books has “a foreign appearance”389 (ibid.). He gives several examples of words (or morphemes) with a foreign appearance from the domain of education and learning or of general Russianisms in the language of P.R. Slavejkov (ibid.). Bogorov opts for replacing them with words based exclusively on purportedly domestic

---

386 The original titles are „Цар Мурад Мари думаше“ and „Наочно Димки тих лепо говори“. At least the first of these folksongs has been and is still used to prove that Bulgarian women stubbornly and with great sacrifices resisted the temptations of male representatives of the Turkish overlord, and thereby superseded the threat of miscegenation. The mixture of ‘races’ considered to be different is one of the archetypical fears of all ethnic nationalism.
387 „педагогически пуризъм.“
388 „да нѣма на сѣвѣтъ Български живъ езыкъ.“
389 „едиъ чуждъ изглѣдъ.“
root and inflectional morphemes or with loanwords with a long-standing existence in the Bulgarian popular *usus*.

Slavejkov’s pragmatically Russo-Bulgarian, moderately radical, and ethnographic purism, and conceptualisation of the Bulgarian national identity clashes with Bogorov’s uncompromisingly pure-Bulgarian hostile attitude to any real or perceived foreign elements in the intellectualisation of the standard Bulgarian language code. In the eyes of Bogorov, using non-Bulgarian words implies an apostacy of one’s true national self. Slavejkov objects to Bogorov’s attempts to coin neologisms out of purely domestic resources on several grounds. While, on the one hand, he is sympathetic to using the resources of the Bulgarian vernaculars, he, on the other hand, finds it unrealistically extreme to coin completely new words using the word-formation resources of the Bulgarian dialects alone.

**Ний мыслимъ че твърдѣ на кѫсо гледатъ и твърдѣ ограниченъ искатъ языкътъ онѣи които възбраняватъ разнообразното производство и сложение на разны думы отъ едн ѫ думѫ коіѫто іѫ има вече въ языкътъ. А освѣнъ това и не възможно да ся ограничимъ само въ с ѫществующитѣ въ живый языкъ думы и съ тѣхъ да искамы да изразимъ не сѫществовавшитѣ въ народътъ понятія (Čitalište, 1871, 21: 645–6)**

> We think that those who forbid the multifarious production and formation of different words out of a word that already exists in the language, regard the language too short-sightedly and want it to be too restricted. Apart from that, it is impossible to limit ourselves solely to the words which exist in the living language and wishing with them to express concepts which do not exist among the people.

If the root of a particular concept exists in the living Bulgarian language, the Bulgarian intellectuals can feel free to adopt all the derivative words existing in the other “Slavic dialects” (ibid., p. 646). According to Slavejkov, they must, in the first hand, address Church Slavonic or the closely related Russian, and, in the second hand, adopt words “from Serbian and Czech, and Polish, when it is more comprehensible and closer to the character of the Bulgarian language” (ibid.).

In the extended version of the article published in Vienna a year later, Bogorov (*TUZBE*, 1872: 15) compares Slavejkov’s Bulgarian language to “a gipsy bag with Russian, Serbian, Czech, Polish, and Moravian words, allegedly accepted into it according to Bulgarian roots!” Slavejkov, on his hand, responds that it would be better not to write anything at all than “to coin new words according to the narrow and rough moulds of Mr. Bogorov” (Čitalište, 1871, 21: 646). Exactly this had also formed the core of the

---

390 “Славенскы нарѣчія.”
391 “отъ срьбскый и чехскый и полскый, когато e po вразумителна и по блиска до свойството на Българскый языкъ.”
392 “циганска вулия с Русски, Сръбски, Чехски, Лехски и Моравски думи, приети в него уж според български корени!”
393 “да ся лѣіѫтъ новы думы по тѣснытѣ и бугравы калѫпы на Г-на Богорова.”
criticism of linguistic concept of Vuk St. Karadžić in the Serbian context. The restricted code of the rural populations of the Balkans could naturally not fulfil the complex communicative needs of an urban-based, modern nation-state.

According to Slavejkov, it would be more expedient to import a common modern lexis with already established connotations from closely related Slavic languages than to create neologisms out of the coarse word-formation resources of the local dialects. This would pave the way for a modern language which could easily be accepted by the entire speech-community and tear down communicative barriers with in the first hand the other Slavic brethren. If every writer, in contrast, coined words out of the resources of his local dialect, the Bulgarians would not just be unable to create a national, super-dialectal community of communication, but it would also imply “withdraw[ing] into the narrow bounds of one’s own entity”\textsuperscript{394} (\textit{Čitalište}, 1871, 21: 646). In other words, it would impede the communication in the world of learning and modernity within the wider Slavic community. Slavejkov concludes, that Bulgarian children, at any rate, would have to acquire this intellectualised word-stock, or school-language, through education.

Bogorov (\textit{Čitalište}, 1871, 21: 647) ironically states that Slavejkov “with Mr. Miklošič’s dictionary under his arm”\textsuperscript{395} has corrected the Bulgarian dialects. He is referring to the \textit{Lexicon linguae slovenicae veteris dialecti} (1850) by Miklošič and alluding to Slavejkov’s purist practice of addressing Church Slavonic sources in intellectualising the Bulgarian vocabulary. For Bogorov, just as for Karadžić, the idealised people’s knowledge of “the natural rules of their Grammar”\textsuperscript{396} (ibid.) had the almost sacrosanct status of sole arbiter when it came to rights and wrongs in language. The role of the grammarians was to listen carefully to the throbbing heart of this living language and to register all the movements they could perceive in codifying language manuals, such as grammars and vocabularies. Bogorov sarcastically continues to voice the opinion of a fictive people:

Хората казватъ още, че Г. Славейков е постигнал да пише тѣй Българский, щото го разумъвъ всичкътъ Славенски народи. Тѣй Българский народь трѣбова да са голъми, че е добилъ такъвъ синъ, който е направилъ това, което до сега всичкътъ Славенски учени не сѫ могли да изврѫшатъ. А какъ го разумъвъ ти, то насѫ не е грыжа, защото тѣхъ не е грыжа за насѫ, нѣ само идемъ да забѣлѫжимъ, че нѣ билгаритѣ не разбираемъ Г. Славейковъ писмовѣнъ езыкъ (\textit{Čitalište}, 1871, 21: 645–6)

[Furthermore, people say that Mr. Slavejkov has succeeded to write Bulgarian so that all Slavic peoples understand it. Thus, the Bulgarian people must be great, as it has produced such a son, who has done what all the Slavic learned men have hitherto

\textsuperscript{394} “ся затвори въ тѣснѣтѣ прѣдѣлы на своѣтѣ цѣлинѣ.”
\textsuperscript{395} “съ Г. Миклошичевый Лексиконъ под мышница.”
\textsuperscript{396} “естественьтѣ правила на своята Грамматика.”
failed to accomplish. Yet, it does not bother us how they [the Slavs] understand it, because they do not care about us, we just want to remark that we, the Bulgarians, do not understand the language of Mr. Slavejkov."

In this quote Bogorov reveals his anti-Slavic and above all anti-Russian purist attitude and he emphasises the negative Others in relation to which he articulates the Bulgarian national identity. For ideological reasons, he seems to be unable to see the linguistic reality that is surrounding him, and he refutes to comprehending words which he considers to be foreign or hostile. This is a psychological phenomenon which is rather common in language-conflict settings.

Bogorov accuses Slavejkov, Christo Danov (1828–1911), Ljuben Karavelov, Najden Gerov, Sava Radulov, and other Bulgarian intellectuals of forcing the natural Bulgarian language into the grammatical and lexical straitjacket of Church Slavonic and Russian. He criticises them both for coining neologisms out of non-Bulgarian roots and inflectional morphemes and for their careless use of pure Russianisms. When it comes to the literary language practice of these intellectuals, Bogorov’s criticism was largely accurate. Their language was bristling with, not least lexical and syntactical Russianisms. According to Bogorov, these are words and grammatical categories that are foreign to the character of the Bulgarian people and their language. His language is emotionally charged and expressively vitriolic. Those who try to introduce the allegedly foreign grammatical element of participles into the pure Bulgarian language, are, for instance, dismissed as “sly brutes” (Čitalište, 1871, 21: 653). According to Bogorov, many years in Russia have alienated these intellectuals from their true linguistic and ethnic roots and they are no longer capable of discerning the differences between Russian, and Russified Church Slavonic words and purely Bulgarian ones.

Защото Българскытѣ и Русскытѣ рѣчи си иматъ лика и прилика както два стръка аглика, та умътъ въ бързостта си не може да различи едно както окото не може да разпознае спицытѣ на едно колело, кога то са върти бържѣ (Čitalište, 1871, 21: 654)

[Because the Bulgarian and Russian words have the likeness of two stalks of primrose, so that the mind in the haste cannot separate them, just as the eye cannot discern the spokes of a wheel, when it is spinning faster.]

---

397 The frequent usage of Slavonicisms and Russianisms among the Bulgarian nineteenth-century intellectuals was probably not only a consequence of ideological choices and patterns of cultural identifications. Many Church Slavonic abstract nouns had been established in the Bulgarian literary usus both through the Bulgarian Orthodox Church and its monastic educational system, and by the damascini-writers of the late sixteenth century on. It was also a contact-linguistic phenomenon in the sense that many Bulgarian intellectuals of the period of the National Revival studied and/or lived in Russia.

398 “хътры гадины.”
To eradicate the well-known words with which a people of six million are communicating and to substitute them with foreign lexical items is the work of an academy – and not of laymen. This cannot be done until the Bulgarians have an intellectual vocabulary of at least six thousand words, Bogorov claims. He hereby denies the fact that most of the Bulgarian villagers of the period did not communicate outside a very restricted local context. They were caught up in the “local dialectical idiosyncrasy” (Gellner, 1964: 55) and probably had a very vague notion of their ethno-national belonging. However, it was onto them that Bogorov was projecting his ideological conceptualisations of the Bulgarian language and national identity.

Bogorov is using the antithetical buzzwords of “ours” (in contrast to theirs) and “protect” (presupposing a threat) in accordance with the framework of an extreme, xenophobic purism, writing that:

Намъ нынѣ не остава друго, освѣнь да събираме онова щото имаме, щото е наше и да го вардимь както единъ безцѣнъ камыкъ (Čitalište, 1871, 21: 654)

[For us today nothing else remains than to collect what we have, because it is ours and to protect it as a precious stone.]

Language is thus “a precious stone” – the innermost core of the national identity, which must be protected against the impending threat of foreign intrusions.

Bogorov’s targeted, Russophobic purist policy was further accentuated in A Library for Reading (KZP, 1874–5) which was published in period (after 1873) when his linguistic concerns were almost exclusively dedicated to matters of language cleansing. The political aspect of this fear of the foreign becomes obvious in the article “One Common Bulgarian Language”399 (KZP, 1874, 4: 1–4).

Руси-тѣ ся крият под булото на Славяни да распростират Рускиат език, между сичитѣ славянски народи уж с име панелавизи, а по-добрѣ е да са нарече панрусизи, че днес с име Славяниски език са разбира Рускиат, когато тии иститѣ никак не приемат да са заличи тѣхното бащинско име Росия и да се нарече Славяниа. А най-злото е, че тии ако и да неналитат толкова на нас, ний сами, без да са осѣтим слугуваме на панруската им мисъл, а са затичаме да правим писмовният език Руско-Бѫлгарски“ (KZP, 1874, 4: 1).

[The Russians are hiding under the veil of Slavs in order to diffuse the Russian language among all the Slavic peoples under the pretence of pan-Slavism, but it would be better to call it pan-Russianism, because by the Slavic language one today understands Russian, [and] those [the Russians] by no way concede to obliterate their patronym Russia and call themselves Slavia. Yet, the worst is, that even if those do not jump so much upon us, we ourselves, without noticing, are skivvying for the pan-Russian thought, and are hurrying to make our written language Russo-Bulgarian.]

Bogorov’s alternative was, as stated earlier, to address purely Bulgarian sources of intellectualisation of the domestic word-stock. This extreme eth-
nographical purism, not least as it was expressed in the sixth pamphlet of *A Library for Reading* (1875), was harshly criticised in a short review (*Znanie*, 1875, 17: 271) under the heading “Literature” („Книжевности“) by Ljuben Karavelov. In a scornfully sarcastic tone, he responds to Bogorov’s intolerant attitude to the language of virtually everything written by contemporary Bulgarian philologists and writers.

Г. Богорововъ [sic!] са е завзъл да оправи българскиятъ езикъ, когото е той изучавъл и разглъдъвалъ, слъдователно той анатомира съкъ новопоявивше са литературно дъло, премята различни думи, превожда ги на български и съвъртува писателите да ги приъматъ български, защото той, г. Богорововъ, са е родилъ въ Калоферъ, дъто българете съ свъти и безгрѣшни и въ этимологическо и синтаксическо [sic!] отношение. (*Znanie*, 1875, 17: 271)

[Mr. Bogorovov [sic!] has engaged in putting in order the Bulgarian language, which he has studied and examined, consequently he anatomises every recently emerged literary work, flings in different words, translates them into Bulgarian and advises the writers to accept them just because he, Mr. Bogorovov, is born in Kaloferr\(^{400}\), where the Bulgarians are holy and immaculate both in etymological and syntactic respect.]

The many medical metaphors refer to the fact that Bogorov was a practising physician, and the vitriolic tone conceals a serious criticism which was shared by many late nineteenth-century Bulgarian intellectuals. This criticism asserted that the vocabulary of the language of the Bulgarians must reflect the dialects of the entire speech-area and not be restricted to one local dialect-base.

Karavelov, otherwise, just like Bogorov, shared the ethnographic and general xenophobic purist ideology of a fullblood romanticist. In the article “On the Language” („За езикът“, *Svoboda*, 1870, 16), Karavelov had urged the Bulgarians to study all the dialects, compile a dictionary, and only then engage in cleaning away the foreign rubbish, i.e., the Turkish, Greek, Russian, and Church Slavonic words, and to substitute them with Bulgarian, as the people has preserved them for such a long time”\(^{401}\) (ibid., p. 18). Furthermore, just like Bogorov, he targeted all foreign sources of lexical enrichment. What he objected to was Bogorov’s narrow, partisan localism.

Many Bulgarian late nineteenth-century intellectuals criticised Bogorov for forming neologisms exclusively out of the linguistic material of his own local dialect. Curiously enough, both Vuk St. Karadžić and Ivan Bogorov located the purest and most pristine varieties of their respective language concepts to the area where they themselves grew up. It was the dialect, which, in his eyes, was least polluted by foreign lexical items. The abstruseness of these coinages provoked different reactions among the critics – rang-

\(^{400}\) Here Karavelov is mistaken. Bogorov was not born in Kalofe, but in the nearby town of Karlovo on the southern slopes of the Balkan range in today’s south-eastern Bulgaria.

\(^{401}\) „па после да завземеме да си чистим чуждите боклуци, т.е. турските, гръцките, руските и църковнославянските думи и да ги заменяме съ български, както ги учувал народът от толкова години.“
ing from profound indignation over the communicative obstacles they raised to sheer ridicule of their absurd otherworldliness. The revolutionary poet and journalist Christo Botev (Nezavisimost, 1874) reproaches Bogorov for “destroying” the language and making it “good for nothing.” A more conciliatory and pragmatic approach to Bogorov’s purist policy was expressed in an anonymous announcement of the publication of his book The Village Doctor (Селскiат лѣкарь, 1875) in the magazine Day (Den, 1875, 7: 4). The anonymous author states that

Тъзи книжка щѣла да съдържа много добри съвѣти и наставления за пазенето на здравьето, ноще тя била написана по едни друг чистонароден езикъ, щото цѣлъ да може да я разбира всѣки Българинъ, който умѣе да прочита.

[This pamphlet would contain many good advice and instructions for the protection of one’s health, if it, in addition, would have been written in a simple, purely popular language, because then every literate Bulgarian could understand it.]

However, Bogorov must abstain from his “passion to be a purist [in order to make the book] more available for villagers and townspeople – that is all readers” (Nikolova, 2015: 112).

Bogorov’s anti-Russian purist attitude would be even more accentuated after 1878, when the Russians, by virtue of having liberated the country, could strengthen their influence on the political and cultural life of the young principality. His alternative was to go to the Bulgarian villages and use the lexical and morphological resources of the vernaculars in modernising the Bulgarian vocabulary. Still, Bogorov’s purist policy is more based on a quixotic etymological quest to fixate the true meaning and purely Bulgarian character of the language. He completely ignores the fact that language and meaning are a matter of social conventions and dynamic negotiations among the members of the speech-community, and the sociocultural context in which they are living.

In this ethnographic enthusiasm Bogorov was reminiscent of his Serbian near-contemporary Vuk St. Karadžić. Yet, in contrast to Karadžić, who had accepted everything existing in the vernacular usus, including Turkisms and Graecisms, Bogorov’s radical purism did not tolerate anything other than lexical items emanating directly from purely domestic sources. It evolved into a blatant example of what Thomas calls “general xenophobic purism” (Thomas, 1991: 81). Nevertheless, when it comes to the functional diversification, intellectualisation, and modernisation of the standard Serbian and Bulgarian language varieties, both Karadžić’s and Bogorov’s purist policies would – to different extents – eventually show unrealistic. In the end, most

402 “разваля […] непособен за нищо.”
403 “севда и да бъде пурист […] по-достъпна за селяни и граждани, сиреч за всички читатели.” The review of the The Village Doctor seems to be the first time when the word “purist” was used in Bulgarian. It was also the only time it was used during the entire National Revival (Nikolova, 2015: 7).
Serbian and many Bulgarian language planners of the late nineteenth century, would pragmatically address the lexical resources of the culturally, economically, and technically more advanced and prestigious Russian and Western European languages for patterns of lexical enrichment.

In the contemporary Bulgarian public discourse, Ivan Bogorov is best known as an awkward figure who coined several rather ridiculous neologisms such as драснитазниклечка ‘strikefirestick’ (as a domestic replacement for Turkish loanword кибрит ‘match’). His name has come to symbolise “any inappropriate neologism in the Bulgarian language” (Koleva, 2019: 50). Most of his status- and corpus-planning propositions were indeed at loggerheads with the dominant linguistic and cultural ideology of his time and few of his neologisms gained foothold in the language. They were perceived as too odd and unfeasible to be accepted by the speech-community at large during the phase of nascent acquisition planning in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Purist policies and discourses of national identifications are in the constant, dynamic flow of social change – they are culturally and historically contingent. There are no fixed or essential givens as to their directions and results. If Bogorov’s rather quixotical purist policy had been in concordance with the then hegemonical or dominant discourses of cultural identification, many of his abstruse coinages could well have formed an integrate part of today’s modern Bulgarian vocabulary. Moreover, they would probably have been perceived as perfectly normal, neutrally charged words. Yet, Bogorov did have the audacity to challenge the economically, politically, and culturally dominant social groups, who were possessing the prerogative of interpreting what was normal, right, and desirable when it came to language and national identity – and he lost.

404 „всеки неуместен неологизъм в българския език.“
8. Summary and conclusions

In the ideological transition between Enlightenment and Romanticism, which gave birth to both modern European democracy and modern nationalism, the idea of a “language of the people” came to define national identity. The language of the broad popular masses was regarded as a symbolic and communicative practice with the potency of regenerating a lost communal understanding and restoring a blurred homogeneity. In this climate of conflict and thoroughgoing and rapid change, the intellectual elites of the Serbian and Bulgarian ethnic minorities in the south-eastern parts of the Slavic world began their quest for what they envisioned as the pure quality, the identity, and the origin of their language and ethnicity.

The mid-1820s to the mid-1870s mark a period of uprooting social change in the southern parts of the Habsburg Empire, in the semi-autonomous Principality of Serbia, and in the Ottoman Empire, where most of the Serbs and Bulgarians were living. It was not just a period of devastating wars between the great powers, which brought waves of migrations in their wake, but also one of profound structural changes of the living conditions in the Balkans. Urbanisation, expanding international trade and contacts, early forms of industrialisation and technological inventions created new preconditions for discourses in which national identities were collectively imagined.

These processes of modernisation were to a large extent driven by an emerging middle-class of merchant-intellectuals who in their quality as Orthodox merchants had established a network of trading colonies in ports and urban centres throughout Western Europe, and the Habsburg, the Ottoman, and the Russian Empires. From their base in these multicultural spaces, they were gradually included in expanding networks of a cultural dialogues. These intellectuals now progressively started to leave their almost exclusive membership in the Pax Slavia Orthodoxa, where higher cultural meanings had been defined by the dualistic worldview of Orthodox Christianity. Instead, they commenced to develop a unique ideological amalgamate, which merged elements of the older traditions with aspects of Enlightenment rationalism and Romanticist idealism. They began to envision a social world divided into culturally and linguistically defined nations.

This paradigmatical shift towards a cultural and linguistic conceptualisation of the world spurred an upsurge of vernacular mobilisations in the Balkans. From the vantage point of their predominantly urban spaces, a new
generation of highly educated Serbian and Bulgarian intellectuals started to focus on the countryside as the true repository of their vision of the pure and pristine character of their respective cultural families. Many of them found its utmost expression in the linguistic and oral literary practices of the rural populations of their purported ethnic territories. Yet, this concept of a national identity, based on the linguistic practices of the rural majority masses, soon provoked a conflict with interests of the hitherto dominant social group and its conceptualisation of language and national identity. This older generation of bourgeois intellectuals anchored their identity in the literary traditions of the Orthodox Churches and/or the linguistic practices developed within their own minority ranks.

These conflicts provoked intense and protracted public debates as to exactly which social variety was to be given the privilege of forming the base for the elaboration of a standard language code which according to the worldview of the South-Slavic intellectuals symbolically and communicatively was to unite the nation. A crucial factor for this collective national self-imagination was the emergence of a Balkan bourgeois public sphere and the expansion of print capitalism. Books, educational materials, and, not least, newspapers and magazines did not just provoke a need for a standardised tool of written communication, but also became the principal medium through which the Serbian and Bulgarian intellectuals could present, debate, and practice various concepts of national identity as manifested in language. Purist discourses on language and national identity became one of the most charged fields in these emerging public spaces through which the differences between the ingroup of our nation and the outgroups of other nations was articulated.

The purist discourses on language and national identity that the Serbian and Bulgarian intellectuals developed in printed media in the period 1830–1875 are the focus of study of this thesis. These discourse participants ascribed a national meaning to certain language forms – on all linguistic levels (lexis, syntax, phonology, morphology, orthography, and phraseology), i.e., they saw these forms as the paramount markers of difference for the identity of their cultural families. The conflicting purist ideologies and policies that these intellectuals defended were often directly related to their overall ideological affiliations and social interests – as expressed both in the field of culture and politics.

The two texts studied in the first part of chapter 4 were both published in Letopis Matice Srpske (LMS) in 1830. The discourse these texts reflect emerged in dialogue with the historical context of the Habsburg province of Vojvodina. Here an older generation of intellectuals linked to the Serbian Orthodox Church and its system of cultural values were beginning to lose
their positions of privileged cultural and political power to younger generation of more liberally tuned men educated in the spirit of central European Aufgeklärter Absolutismus (‘Enlightened Absolutism’) and German Romanticism at secular universities.

Although agreeing on several central issues of status and corpus planning, they disagreed on some crucial issues directly related to lexical purism. Firstly, they agreed on giving the privileged role of base for the elaboration of the national language code to the contemporary Slavonic-Serbian spoken and written variety developed within their own social ranks and aligned with the Enlightenment elitist traditions developed by writers such as Dositej Obradović. Secondly, both indented to preserve the Church Slavonic graphemic system as a symbolic link to the continuity of the Serbian medieval reign and its Slavonic-Byzantine system of higher cultural meanings, the cultural-religious commonwealth of Pax Slavia Orthodoxa and the politically mighty Russian Empire. What they disagreed on was the role of the Church Slavonic literary heritage in the lexical purification and enrichment of the standard language code, and in defining the Serbian national identity.

For Cernački and his like-minded contemporaries, Church Slavonic represented the pure source of the unification of the Serbian people. He therefore defended the eradication of all foreign lexical and word-formation resources that had entered the language via a centuries-long situation of social, linguistic, and cultural contacts. Even if Hadžić’s purist policy in many respects represents a typically elitist, etymologist, and scriptocentric worldview, at the same time he makes some concessions to the results of these long-standing linguistic and cultural contacts. While aiming at retaining some vital bonds to the literary tradition of the Church by ascribing a significant role to it in the process of lexical enrichment and symbolically retaining its orthography, at the same time he embraces many of the well-established foreign lone words used by his own social group and the entire Serbian speech community.

This discursive turn towards a gradual secularisation of language and the general system of cultural values gains further momentum in the cases studied in the second part of chapter 4. The five analysed texts were written by Jovan Hadžić and Vuk St. Karadžić in 1837–43 and emerged in dialogue with several pivotal historical alterations of the Serbian society. One was the gradual shift of the centre of cultural and political power from Vojvodina to Belgrade – the capital of the semi-autonomous Principality of Serbia, which gradually paved the way for a dominant position of a young Romanticist generation in public discourse.

This public discussion gradually transforms into a confrontation between the urban, prescriptive, and elitist Civil-Serbian and the rural, descriptive, and democratic populist-Serbian concepts of language and national identity. The defenders of the Civil-Serbian concept meant that both the standard language code and the national identity in all respects must be
anchored in the continuity of the cultural and linguistic traditions of the educated Serbian elite in Habsburg Vojvodina. This position of privileged social, political, and cultural power was now challenged by Karadžić who anchored the national identity in the language of the rural popular majority of Serbia proper as manifested in his own collections of oral literature. Following him, this language would ideally be entirely purified from all traces of Russian and Church Slavonic linguistic superstructures. This purist approach posed a serious threat to the privileged prerogative of interpretation of the Vojvodina elite concerning the contents and outlines of the linguistically defined national identity.

The early Bulgarian discourse on purism, language, and national identity studied in chapter 5 emerged out the cultural and political context of the culturally and linguistically Greek Orthodox Christian community, the millet-i Rûm, or Romaic Community, in the Ottoman Empire. Most early Bulgarian men of letters (such as Fotinov and Aprilov) were intellectually socialised into this Greek system of higher education and its Enlightenment approach to language and national identity. In the 1840s, this ideological take on language and national identity was challenged by several Bulgarian intellectuals framed by the Russian cultural and political context and its Romanticist approach. The purist discourses this engendered strengthened the tendency from a Slavonic-Bulgarian towards a vernacularist and Russo-Bulgarian conceptualisation of language and national identity.

Under the direct influence of contemporary Greek purist discourses on language and national identity by writers such as Adamantios Korais, Fotinov is initially defending a position close to that of his Serbian contemporaries Jovan Hadžić and Vasilije Cernački. In this elitist, archaist, and etymologist Enlightenment discourse, the true mother tongue and original, pure, and pristine source of the ethno-linguistic unification of the Bulgarian people is identified with the Church Slavonic literary tradition. To supersede the centrifugal array of local linguistic practices (‘misuses’), the Bulgarians must, on the level of status planning, base their national standard language code on the spoken and written practices of the educated elite. On the level of corpus planning, this base-variety would, then, gradually be purified from foreign words by being their replacement with Church-Slavic lexical items. This symbolic bond is also enacted by retaining the Church Slavonic graphemic system.

This discursive position becomes even more radicalised in reaction to the criticism it receives from the defenders of a Romanticist-vernacularist or Russo-Bulgarian concept of purism, language, and national identity. In the last issues of the magazine, its editor proposes an uncompromising return to the literary traditions and ethnic origins of the holy brothers Cyril and Methodius and the Bulgarian medieval kingdoms. This should be obtained by purifying it from all foreign features that – through linguistic contacts – have
polluted the language, and the ethnicity it represents, throughout the many
centuries of Ottoman and not least Greek political and cultural dominance.

The Romanticist-vernacularist turn in the Bulgarian purist discourse was
launched in the open tripartite letter “To the Editor of the Bulgarian
Ljuboslovie” by Aprilov. In emerged out of an overt dialogue with the con-
temporary Russian, new-Bulgarian, Greek demoticist, and generally Slavic
and particularly Serbian purist discourses on language and national identity.
It reinforces the gradual shift from an Enlightenment elitist, prescriptivist,
and diachronic paradigm to an essentially Romanticist, populist, descripti-
vist, and synchronic paradigm. Although bearing a great deal of likeness to
the populist-Serbian concept of Vuk St. Karadžić, it also draws close to the
civil-Serbian concept of Jovan Hadžić in its Romanticist appeal to the
Church Slavonic (“Old-Bulgarian”) literary tradition as both a source of
lexical enrichment and a linguistically defined ethnicity.

Following this line of thought, the standard language code should on all
linguistic levels be based on the contemporary varieties spoken by the Bul-
garian peasantry. These varieties should gradually be cleansed from all for-
eign lexical items through their gradual replacement with domestic words
found in the vernaculars or in what is represented as the “old-Bulgarian spo-
ken language” as codified in the Cyrillo-Methodian literary tradition. The
most essential marker of Bulgarian ethno-linguistic difference in relation to
the other Slavic peoples is located in one single phoneme – the big yus
(<ѫ>). This phoneme is not just still used throughout the entire Bulgarian
speech-area, it is also found in the, then, recently analysed “Ostromir Gosp-
pels”. Aprilov interprets this as hard evidence for the Bulgarians’ unique
rootedness in and privileged ownership of the Church Slavonic literary pat-
trimony.

The Serbian purist discourse on language and national identity of the pe-
riod 1844–74 emerged in dialogue with a complex interplay of a number
extralinguistic factors. One such factor was the further affirmation of Bel-
grade as the centre of Serbian intellectual and political life. The growing
bureaucracy and expanding system of (higher) education of the semi-
autonomous Principality of Serbia provoked a need for the elaboration of
specific terminologies for all the linguistic domains of a modern society.
Another institutional framework that played a central role in the debates was
the Društvo serbske slovesnosti which had been founded by the two Vojvo-
dina intellectuals Jovan Sterija Popović and Atanasije Nikolić in 1841. It
would soon be fiercely criticised by Vuk St. Karadžić and a new generation
of Romanticist and highly educated intellectuals which sided with the
Vukovian concept of language and national identity. In the second half of the
nineteenth century, these intellectuals initiated a cultural dialogue with the
illyrian movement aimed at constructing a linguistically defined cultural
community of all South-Slavs in the Western Balkans – the Yugoslav con-
cept of language and national identity.
The debates of the mid-late 1840s were broadly speaking divided into two overarching fractions. On the one hand there was the waning evolutionary discourse of the older generation of classicist writers and intellectuals, such as Sterija Popović. They were ideologically anchored in the tradition of the Vojvodina intellectual elite and the linguistic reforms initiated by the ex-monk Dositej Obradović. This was a tradition through which the written language went through a process of gradual vernacularisation. These writers identified with a wider Slavonic-Serbian ethno-cultural context and some of them saw the Orthodox Church and religion as the main marker of Serbian national unicity. In the field of language policy and language planning, this symbolically important bond was embodied in taking recourse to the word-formation resources of Russian and Church Slavonic in the construction of the modern standard Serbian language code based on some variety or varieties of the vernacular.

On the other hand, there was the revolutionary discourse of the young romanticist followers of Vuk St. Karadžić. According to them, the Slavonic-Serbian word-formation resources represented one of the principal obstacles for the construction of a language based exclusively on the varieties spoken by the Serbian peasantry as manifested in the works published by Karadžić. To construct a Serbian national identity based on the Vukovian linguistic concept alone, young philologists, such as Đuro Daničić, had to marginalise the Church Slavonic and Russian lexis, and the identity it represented, through a targeted ethnographic purist policy. Initially, this linguistic concept was instrumentalised in the discursive construction of a pan-Serbian national identity, but in the second half of the nineteenth century it would be invested in the making of the extended Yugoslav nation which in some versions included even the Bulgarians. In addition to Church Slavonic and Russian lexis of the old Vojvodina intellectual elite, they would puristically target the calques and neologisms of Bogoslav Šulek and his Croatian associates as an undesired obstacle for the construction of a Yugoslav unity.

The period 1856–74 was characterised by a constantly more diversified public sphere in which the popular-Serbian and Yugoslav concept of purism, language, and national gained ever more discursive momentum – marginalising almost entirely the civil-Serbian concept of the aging generation of Vojvodina intellectuals. Instead, the threat against a Serbian and/or Yugoslav concept of language and national identity was now constructed as posed by some Orientalisms, Germanisms, and Magyarisms. The Serbian minority of Habsburg Vojvodina had been particularly subdued to this contact-linguistic process, whereby the language of a politically, economically, and culturally dominant majority group is exercised pressure on a dominated minority group and its language(s). While not being hostile to Croatian lexis in general, they also targeted Croatian Šulekisms, i.e., coinages by or in the spirit of Bogoslav Šulek, which they saw as either abstruse localisms or Germanisms in disguise. Purifying themselves from these undesired results of linguistic
contacts and transfers formed part of a late-colonial strife for cultural self-affirmation. For some, these purist policies also implied constructing a cultural and linguistic union with the Croats, based on the Vukovian New-Štokavian folkloric koine, which, eventually, would form the basis for later claims of political unification in the state of Yugoslavia.

The Bulgarian purist discourses on language and national identity of the period 1850–75 were shaped in a complex interplay with several extralinguistic factors. One such was the politically orchestrated intensified cultural dialogue with the Russians within the framework of Slavophilism (particularly in the years following the Crimean War 1853–6). Tsarist interests financed many pivotal Bulgarian periodical ventures and the purist discourse on language and national identity published on their pages often reflected these general Russo-Bulgarian patterns of cultural and political identification. Another framework that shaped the discourse throughout the 1860s and the early 1870s was the so-called ‘Church Question’ wherein the then strife for cultural-linguistic affirmation of the Bulgarian people was politicised in an endeavour to create an autocephalous national church. In the field of purist discourse and language planning this manifested itself in an identification with the Church Slavonic or ‘Old-Bulgarian’ as the true source of a linguistically based national unification – sometimes with an explicit anti-Russian tendency.

The debates analysed in the first half of chapter 7 covers the years 1850–2 and focus mainly on the corpus-planning issues of graphisation, central morphological issues, such as the post-fixed definite article, and grammaticalisation. These issues now became charged fields for the symbolic articulation of national identities. The controversy was provoked by a proposition to introduce phonemic spelling principles published in Mirozrenie in 1850. In this discourse, the Austro-Bulgarian rationalistic attempts to introduce some new graphemes and a phonemic orthography reflecting the pronunciation of the urban educated elite was constructed as a threat to the Bulgarian national character by the representatives of the Russo-Bulgarian concept of language and national identity. For both the anonymous “L., a man from Vidin”, who published his response in Novine srbske, and N.Ch. Palauzov, who responded in Carigradski vestnik, this proposition represented an identification with the West and the Catholic Habsburgs, which was constructed as threat to the pure character of the Bulgarian people. Hence, they instead aimed at anchoring the national identity in a positive relation to the religious Pax Slavia Orthodoxa and the politically strong Russian Empire by retaining graphemes and morphology shared with the Russians, as well as a morphophonemic orthography. Addressing the Church Slavonic roots would not just function as a shield against Western propaganda, but also be an efficient way of over-riding the dialectal variegation prevailing in the Bulgarian speech area and orthographically, morphologically, and grammatically unite the entire nation.
The Bulgarian discourses of the years 1869–75 were performed by representatives of different pure-Bulgarian concepts of language and identity on the purist principles of intellectualising the Bulgarian word-stock. All discourse-participants shared a general populist-Bulgarian orientation when it came to the status planning, but they disagreed on the principles and sources of lexical enrichment and on other corpus-planning issues such as graphisation. The debates were embedded in the politico-religious struggle for the establishment of an independent Bulgarian Orthodox Church of the 1860s and 1870s, which contributed to the accentuation of the Cyrillo-Methodian patrimony in the construction of the Bulgarian national identity. This had an impact on the recourse to Church Slavonic as a source of lexical enrichment for the development of the moderately etymological spelling-norms of the contemporary Bulgarian standard language code.

In this extra-linguistic context, Ivan Bogorov launched his radically purist pure-Bulgarian concept of language and national identity. According to this concept, the popular language should be purged from all foreign influences and intellectualised exclusively through neologisms coined out of the linguistic raw material of the purest of the Bulgarian dialects. Moreover, he claimed that Church Slavonic had never been a spoken language but is a liturgic written medium ripe with Byzantine Greek calques on all levels. Thus, it was also foreign to what was constructed as the soul of the Bulgarian people as preserved and expressed in its language. While Bogorov was, i.a., guided by strong anti-Russian sentiments in his purist policies, some of his more pragmatically opposed, such as P.R. Slavejkov targeted the influx of lexical items from dominant languages of contact and conflict – above all the Greek language of the Romaic community and its Church. In the spirit of Cyrillo-Methodianism and Romanticist pan-Slavism, he instead advocated Church Slavonic and Russian, but also other Slavic languages, as resources for the intellectualisation of the Bulgarian word-stock. Just like Slavejkov, most of Bogorov’s critics shared his overall populist-Bulgarian convictions, some, like the liberal revolutionary Ljuben Karavelov, even embraced a similar general xenophobic purist policy. Their criticism was rather pragmatic. They reacted to his biased and narrow choice of dialect base and to the cognitive hindrances potentially created by his abstuse and otherworldly neologisms.

* *

To sum up, the convergences in the Serbian and Bulgarian purist discourses on language and national identity were partly conditioned by their communal point of departure in the Church Slavonic literary and cultural tradition – the Pax Slavia Orthodoxa. Partly divergent, however are the ways and pace in which they entered into modernity – both in terms of the reception and reformulation of the Enlightenment and Romanticist cultural ideologies that formed it and in terms of the structural changes that radically reshaped their
living conditions. When the privileged portion of the Serbian community entered modernity in the climate of Aufgeklärter Absolutismus in Habsburg Vojvodina in the second half of the eighteenth century, they already possessed the organisational politico-religious framework of the Metropolitanate of Sremski Karlovci. The Habsburg manifestation of European Enlightenment would also be decisive for their initial steps of elitist vernacularisation. When, on the other hand, the educated stratum of the Bulgarian speech-community entered modernity in the cultural climate of the Greek millet-i Rûm or Romaic Community in the beginning of the nineteenth century, they totally lacked the organisational framework of an established politico-religious centre. The discourses did not just emerge later, they were also far more haphazard and predominately based on personal contacts and networks. These early contacts with the Greek questione della lingua (‘language question’) and the Enlightenment spirit that initially formed it, in part also explains both the elitist approach to vernacularisation of language and culture and the enduring centrality of the theme of the Cyrillo-Methodian heritage in the Bulgarian discourses – across the entire period of the National Revival.

The discourses from the 1840s to the 1870s emerged in a context of growing diversification and increasing politicisation of both the Serbian and the Bulgarian public sphere. Just as in the preceding period, in the Serbian case it had the support of the centripetal forces of an established state structure, while, in the Bulgarian case, these processes occurred as a result of the efforts of local merchant colonies and often the financial support of Russia. The Romanticist movement in Serbia was also shaped in dialogue with Vienna and the events of the Vormärz or Springtime of Peoples (1815–1848), when all the stateless ethnic groups of the Habsburg Empire – mostly Slavs – extolled in their cultural unicity. After the abortive revolutions of 1848, this brief period of liberal-nationalistic enthusiasm soon transitioned into a climate of political oppression, when the assimilatory pressure from the German and Hungarian elites fell hard on both the Croatian and Serbian ethno-linguistic minorities of the Habsburg Empire. This external pressure fuelled the efforts to construct a language-defined Yugoslav communality in the second half of the nineteenth century even more, which in the beginning of the 20th century transitioned into a bid for a South-Slavic state.

The Bulgarian intellectuals, on the other hand, entered into dialogue with German Romanticist currents in both Central and Western Europe, as well as in the Balkan context. Yet, of still more vital importance was the relation to the Russian politico-cultural context, in which pan-Slavicism, after the Crimean War (1853–6), transformed into an integrative part of the Tsar’s efforts to wield soft political power over the Orthodox Slavs of the Balkans. The centrality of the Cyrillo-Methodian topos in the Bulgarian discourses was even more accentuated after the introduction of the Megali Idea or Great Idea in 1844 as the core dogma of the Greek majority within the millet-i
Rûm. The Russian foreign policy and Greek efforts to Hellenise the Bulgarians resulted in some instances of anti-Russian and a more targeted anti-Greek purist policy in the construction of a separate cultural identity. Within the scope of the “Church Question (1860–72), these processes of linguistic and cultural nation-building transformed into the politico-religious strife to create a separate Bulgarian Orthodox Church, which ultimately lead to the establishment of the semi-autonomous Principality of Bulgaria in 1878.

Purist discourses on language and national identity are always embedded in specific historical and cultural contexts and can hardly be understood without taking these dynamic frameworks into consideration. The broad picture that emerges from the results of this thesis shows that the convergences and divergences in the purist discourses of the Serbian and Bulgarian intellectual elites are dependent on several contextual factors. A convergent factor was the common starting point in the Pax Slavia Orthodoxa, where higher cultural meanings were defined by the ideology of the Orthodox churches. Yet, divergent were the historical and cultural contexts in which these elites entered into dialogue with the ideological paradigms of Enlightenment and Romanticism that to such and eminent degree shaped the cultural side of modern European nation-building.
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Sammanfattning

Avhandling *Purism och nationell identitet: Konstruktionen av språk och nationell identitet i serbisk och bulgarisk artonhundratalsdiskurs* studerar puristiska mediediskursers roll för den samverkande konstruktionen av standardspråkskoder och nationella identiteter bland serber och bulgarer under åren 1830–1875. Avhandlingen sällar sig till de studier som med avstamp i historisk sociolingvistik analyserar hur språkliga förändringar formas i dialog med unika historiska, kulturella, sociala och politiska förutsättningar.

Perioden 1830–1875 kännetecknades av uppslitande social förändring i det Habsburgska rikets sydligaste delar, i det halvautonoma förstendömet Serbien och i det Osmanska riket, där de flesta serberna och bulgarerna då levde. Det knappa halvseklet härjades inte bara av ödeläggande stormaktskrig, som framtvingade vågor av migrationer, utan präglades också ett av djupgående sociala förändringar av levnadsomständigheterna på Balkan. Urbanisering, växande internationell handel och kontakter, tidiga former av industrialisering och teknologiska landvinningar skapade nya förutsättningar för de puristiska diskurser i vilka de nationella identiteterna kollektivt föreställdes.

Dessa moderniseringsprocesser drevs i hög grad av en framväxande klass av ortodoxa köpmän och intellektuella vars medlemmar hade etablerat ett närverk av handelskolonier i hamnstäder och andra urbana centra i såväl Västeuropa, som i det Habsburgska, Osmanska och Ryska imperiet. Med utgångspunkt i dessa mångkulturella miljöer inkluderades de gradvis i expanderande närverk av kulturella dialoger. De började successivt att lämna sitt närmast uteslutande medlemskap i det religiöst definierade *Pax Slavia Orthodoxa*, där högre kulturella meningar hade definierats av den ortodoxa kristenhetens dualistiska världsbild. I stället utvecklade de en unik ideologisk legering, som förenade element av den äldre inhemska traditionen med aspekter av upplysningsrationalism och romantisk idealism. De började föreställa sig en social verklighet indelad i kulturellt och språkligt definierade nationer.

Analyismalet omfattar perioden 1830 till 1875 och utgörs i huvudsak av texter hämtade från tidningar och tidskrifter, men också i något fall från broschyrer och andra trycksaker. Den gemensamma nämnaren för de analyserade texterna är att de på ett eller annat sätt debatterar språkets och den språkliga renhetens roll som uttryck och gränsmarkör för olika nationella identitetskoncept. Valet av just periodika har dikterats av dess centrala bety-
delse för att både konstruera och sprida de nationella standardspråkskröden och de olika föreställningar om nationella identiteter, som uttrycktes på, i och genom språket i en historiskt ny borgerlig offentlighet.

Kapitel ett ger en allmän inledning till ämnet, presenterar studiens mål och gör en överblick över de primärkällor som analyseras i kapitel 4–7. Dessutom tecknas en bild av avhandlingens metodologiska utgångspunkter, som är grundade i historisk sociolingvistik och principen att all språklig förändring i det förflutna måste läsas i sitt unika kulturella sammanhang. Språkliga förändringar sker i samspel med och betingas av de omgivande historiska, sociala och kulturella strukturerna, och en fullständig förståelse av dem förutsätter ett beaktande av en stor mängd, komplext samverkan faktorer.

Avhandlingens andra kapitel bär titeln Nyckelbegrepp och lyfter just fram ett antal centrale begrepp för att förstå den unika balkanska artonhundratalts-contexten. I kapitlet fokuseras särskilt på företeelser som de nationella identiteternas identiteter, olika språkideologier, språklig nationalism och språkplanering och språkpolitiker, samt några definitioner av purism, dess relation till nationalism och när och varför den uppkommer.

Kapitel tre, Historisk bakgrund, beskriver det historiska ramverket för de serbiska och bulgariska puristiska diskurserna om språk och nationella identiteter. Det tecknar en bild av såväl de förmodna språkideologierna på Balkan, som av upplysningens och romantikens språkideologier i Väst och på Balkan. I dess avslutande del analyseras den tryckkapitalismens och den balkanska borgerliga offentlighetens avgörande roll för att skapa och sprida föreställningar om den serbiska och bulgariska nationen i puristiska diskurser om språk och nationell identitet.


I kapitel 5, Diskursen om purism, språk och nationell identitet i Ljuboslovie (1844–1846), introduceras den innehåll av avhandlingen för de tidiga faserna av de bulgariska puristiska språk- och identitetsdiskurserna framträdde. Det analyserar de debatter som utvecklade sig i Konstantin Fotinovs tidskrift Ljuboslovie under ett par år i mitten på 1840-talet. Dessa debatter representerar en tidig och paradigmatisk konflikt mellan det som i avhandlingen kallas det slaviska bulgariska och ett ryskt bulgariskt vernikularistiskt språk- och identitetskoncept.

Kapitel 7, *Diskurser om språklig renhet och nationell identitet i bulgarisk periodika (1850–1875)*, analyserar några viktiga fall av bulgarisk puristisk mediediskurs under perioden 1850–1875. I kapitlet beskrivs de tre övergripande språkideologiska koncept som satte sin prägel på periodens debatter. De betecknas som de ryskt bulgariska, austrobulgariska och rent bulgariska språk- och identitetskoncepten. I kapitel 7 analyseras material från tidskrifterna och tidningarna *Mirozrenie, Novine srbske, Carigradski vestnik, Svoboda, Znanje, Knigovište za pročitane, Čitalište och Den*.

I det avslutande åttonde kapitlet dras jämförande slutsatser mellan de fall som studerats i kapitel 4, 5, 6 och 7. Det lyfter särskilt fram konvergenser och divergenser i de specifika serbiska och bulgariska puristiska diskurserna om språk och nationella identiteter under de drygt fyra årtionden som studerats i avhandlingen. Perioden var på många sätt formativa för de båda gruppers språkliga och kulturella nationsbyggen, och flera av de föreställningar som skapades då är fortfarande livskraftiga i samtida identitetsdiskurser.

Konvergenserna i de serbiska och bulgariska puristiska diskurserna kan sammanfattningsvis till dels förklaras av deras gemensamma utgångspunkt i den kyrsklaviska litteratur- och kulturtraditionen – i *Pax Slavia Orthodoxa*. Det finns dock stora divergenser i när och hur dessa moderniseringsprocesser försiggick – både vad gäller mottagande och omformulering av upplysningens och romantikens formativa kulturella ideologier och vad gäller de strukturella förändringar som omgestaltade deras livsvillkor.

När den priviligierade delen av den serbiska gemenskapen började träd in i moderniteten under 1700-talets andra hälft, gjorde de det i ett ideologiskt klimat som präglades av den upplysta absolutismen i det Habsburgska riket. De hade dessutom stöd i en redan etablerad politisk-religiös organisatorisk struktur i form av metropolitsätet i Sremski Karlovci. Den habsburgska manifestationen av den europeiska upplysningen skulle också vara avgörande för deras första steg mot en elitistisk vernakularisering av språket.

Den högst utbildade delen av den bulgariska språkgemenskapen saknade däremot organisatoriskt stöd i ett etablerat religiöst-politiskt centrum när de påbörjade sina moderniseringsprocesser i det kulturella klimat som genomsyrade den grekiskdominerade *millet-i Rûm* eller ortodoxa romerska nationen i det Osmanska riket i början av 1800-talet. Diskurserna framträdde inte bara senare, utan de var också långt mer slumpmässiga och baserades i hu-

Diskurserna från 1840–tallet växte fram under omständigheter av en växande diversifiering och tilltagande politisering av den serbiska och bulgariska offentligheten. Ideologiskt utmärktes den av en syn på språk och identitet som ytterst hade sitt ursprung i den tyska romantiken. Precis som under den föregående perioden hade dessa processer i det serbiska fallet ett avgörande stöd i den centripetala kraft som en etablerad statsstruktur medför. I det bulgariska fallet framträdde de däremot som ett resultat av ansträngningar från lokala handelskolonier som många gånger hade finansiellt stöd från Ryssland.

Den romantiska rörelsen bland serberna formades i dialog med Wien och händelserna under *Vormärz* eller nationernas vår (1815–1848), när alla de statslösa etniska grupperna i det Habsburgska riket – mestadels slaver – lovsjöng just sin kulturella unicitet. Efter de misslyckade revolutionerna 1848 övergick snart denna korta period av liberalnationalistisk entusiasm i ett klimat av politiskt förtryck. Då föll assimilationstrycket från de tyska och ungerska eliterna tungt på både serbiska och kroatiska etnolingvistiska minoriteterna i det Habsburgska riket. Detta yttre tryck gav ytterligare bränsle åt ansträngningarna att konstruera den språkdefinierade jugoslaviska gemenskap under 1800-talets andra hälft, som i början på 1900-talet skulle omvandlas till politiska krav på bildanden av en sydslavisk stat.

De bulgariska intellektuella trädde å sin sida i dialog med de tyska romantiska strömningarna såväl i den central- och västeuropeiska, som i den balkanska kontexten. Av än större betydelse var dock relationen till den ryska politiskt-kulturella kontexten, där panslavismen efter Krimkriget (1853–1856) hade förvandlades till en integrerad del av tsarens ansträngningar att utöva mjuk politisk makt över Balkans ortodoxa slaver. Det kyrillo-methodianska toposets betydelse blev ytterligare accentuerat efter att *Megali Idea* eller den stora idén 1844 hade upphöjts till kärndogm för den grekiska majoriteten inom *millet-i Rûm*. Den ryska utrikespolitiken och de grekiska ansträngningarna att hellenisera bulgarerna resulterade i några fall av antityrsk och en mer målinriktad antigrekisk puristisk politik i konstruerandet av en separat kulturell identitet. Inom ramen för den s.k. kyrkofrågan (1860–1872) förvandlades dess processer av språkligt och kulturellt nationsbygge till den politisk-religiösa strävan att bilda en separat bulgarkortodox kyrka, som i slutändan skulle leda till att det halvautonoma Furstendömet Bulgarien etablerades 1878.
Puristiska diskurser om språk och nationell identitet är alltid inskrivna i specifika historiska och kulturella kontexter och kan knappast förstås utan att dessa dynamiska ramverk tas i beaktande. Den breda bild som framträder ur resultatena av denna avhandling visar att konvergenserna och divergenserna i de serbiska och bulgariska intellektuella eliternas diskurser beror på en mängd kontextuella faktorer. En konvergent faktor var det den gansamma utgångspunkten i Pax Slavia Orthodoxa där högre kulturella meningar definerades av de ortodoxa kyrkornas ideologi. Divergenta var dock de historiska och kulturella kontexter i vilka dessa eliter trädde i dialog med de upplysningens och romantikens ideologiska paradigm som till en så eminent grad formade den kulturella sidan av modernt europeiskt nationsbyggande.
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