
UDK 929:323.1(=163.6)

Matija Ogrin

Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana

ANTON MARTIN SLOMŠEK IN VPRAŠANJE ENOTNOSTI SLOVENSKEGA KULTURNEGA PROSTORA

Članek predstavi Slomškova prizadevanja za jezikovno ter kulturno integracijo slovenskih dežel v desetletjih med 1821 in 1862. Navzočnost slovenskega kulturnega in zemljepisnega prostora v Slomškovem delu je predstavljena s pomočjo njegove korespondence in poppisov, z gledišč Slomškovega dela za enoten slovenski knjižni jezik in Slomškove literature (pesmi).

Ključne besede: A. M. Slomšek, slovensko slovstvo, slovenski knjižni jezik, slovenski kulturni prostor

1 Uvod

Prispevek Antona Martina Slomška k slovenski kulturi je obsežen in kompleksen, saj je intenzivno deloval na raznolikih področjih, kakor so duhovniško pastoralno delo in pridižna literatura, praktično pedagoško delo in pisanje učbenikov, prevajanje in urednikovanje, kulturno organiziranje, poučevanje slovenščine, intenzivna skrb za poenotenje slovenskega knjižnega jezika ter njegovo uveljavljanje v javni rabi, pisanje pesmi, proze, verske esejistike, vzgojeslovne publicistike itn. Začetki njegove literarne dejavnosti segajo že v gimnazijski čas okrog leta 1816, intenzivno delo na več področjih, povezanih s slovenščino in slovenskim slovstvom, pa se začne z njegovim vstopom v celovško bogoslovje jeseni 1821. Čas teh začetkov je ravno čas po izidu Kopitarjeve slovnice (1809), ki je bila »normativni mejnik« med »preteklim časom obstajanja deželnih knjižnih različic« in »procesom njihovega poenotenja« v skupni jezikovni normi (OROŽEN 2010: 212) sredi 19. stoletja. Proces poenotenja slovenskega knjižnega jezika pa je mogel biti le zunanji izraz, zunanji fenomen bistvenih notranjih premikov v sočasni slovenski kulturi – premikov, ki pomenijo razmah slovenske narodne zavesti ter postopno integracijo pokrajinske, deželne pripadnosti v slovensko narodno pripadnost. Slomškov prispevek k tem integrativnim procesom je bil pomemben zlasti na Koroškem in Štajerskem, kjer je bil v času svojega delovanja tako rekoč osrednja osebnost narodnega preroda. V njegovem delu lahko opazimo številne in močne pobude za povezovanje Koroške, Štajerske, Kranjske in Primorske in s tem povezano zavest o prostoru teh dežel ter njihovi medsebojni pripadnosti v okviru slovenstva kot višje, nadrejene skupnosti. V tem članku nameravamo z izbranimi primeri orisati nekaj tistih področij Slomškovega integrativnega delovanja, kjer izraziteje prihaja do veljave njegova zavest o slovenskem kulturnem in zemljepisnem prostoru.

2 Slomšek je vse od svojega bivanja v ljubljanskem liceju, torej še izpred bogoslovnih let, vzdrževal mrežo pisemskih stikov s prijatelji in sodelavci po vseh sloven-

skih deželah. Čeprav se je ohranil le manjši del Slomškove korespondence, več kot 400 njegovih ohranjenih pisem dobro prikaže gosto mrežo stikov, kulturnih povezav in dejavnosti, ki so segale prek vseh slovenskih dežel in vključevale domala vse vidne kulturne delavce njegovega časa. Ti stiki so bili posebej intenzivni s središči tedanjega kulturnega življenja Slovencev, ki so bili Ljubljana, Celovec, deloma Gradec, in s krogom ožjih sodelavcev na Štajerskem. Verjetno se je Slomšek že v ljubljanskem liceju (1819–1820) spoznal z Metelkom, ki je s predavanji slovenščine pomembno vplival na kvaliteto knjižnega jezika mlajše izobraženske generacije vključno s Čopom in Prešernom (KOLARIČ 2009). Slomšek je izpričano sodeloval z Metelkom že v bogoslovnih letih, saj je Metelko pošiljal Slomšku v Celovec pole svoje slovnice že med tem, ko se je dotiskovala, torej do 1825 (KOVAČIČ 1934: 37). Zanimiva so ohranjena Slomškova pisma Matiji Čopu iz dobe, ko je bil spiritual v Celovcu, ki poleg zaupljivega, prijateljskega odnosa kažejo na intenzivno izmenjavo knjig in na odpiranje jezikoslovnih in literarnih vprašanj. Tako je Slomšek 30. oktobra 1832 iz Celovca poslal Čopu v Ljubljano Megiserjev slovar in nekatera Jarnikova dela, pozneje Svetokriškega, prosil za posredovanje pri cenzuri zbirke t. i. Ahacelnovih pesmi (AZN 1930: 3), se zanimal za delo in izhajanje *Kranjske čbelice*, dne 5. januarja 1833 pa zapisal: »Ich wünschte bald wieder ein Lied unsers genialen Pfehbern zu hören! Profim ga lepo posdraviti, pa tudi druge blage Slovenze.« (AZN 1930: 5) ter pozneje poročal, da je Ahaclova zbirka pošla, v čemer je videl uspeh slovenskih nedeljskih šol na Koroškem in Štajerskem, ki so si prizadevale za rast bralne omike (AZN 1930: 11). Še obsežnejša je bila korespondenca z Bleiweisom, v kateri je iz Št. Andraža in pozneje iz Maribora pisal uredniku *Novic* v Ljubljano; med drugim večkrat o svojih jezikoslovnih stališčih glede t. i. novih oblik. Te je podpiral, toda zagovarjal je postopno uveljavitev ter vzajemnost med slovenskimi deželami: »Meni je prav, da Kranjci zvonec nosite; pa pozabiti ne smejte, de smo tudi mi Slovenci, in ne terjajte, da bi vselj le Vaša veljala; tudi mi vzamemo mnogo Vaših oblik, ktere niso po naše, posnemaje sv. Avguština: In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.« (AZN 1930: 318–321) Iz osebnih stikov je nastalo tudi več Slomškovih življenjepisnih in memoarskih eseev, tako denimo ob smrti goriškega prijatelja Valentina Staniča, ki ga je visoko cenil; ob njem je zapisal: »Naj bi rajnih spodobna pohvala mladim bralcem dobriga duha dala; zakaj mertvi nas živeti vučé.« (*Drobtince* 1848: 81) Na Tržaškem je imel Slomšek stik z Ravnikarjevim naslednikom, škofom Jernejem Legatom. Na Koroškem je bil posebej tesno povezan s šolnikom Matijem Ahacлом in slavistom Urbanom Jarnikom, pa seveda z Mihaelom Andreašem in raznimi »pohorskimimi pevci«. Na Štajerskem in Koroškem je Slomšek ohranil in na novo razvil vrsto povezav s sodelavci svojih publikacij, zlasti proznih prevodov, almanaha *Drobtince* in učbenikov. Med njimi so bili Jožef Hašnik, Mihael Stojan, Valentin Orožen; Jožef Muršec, Anton Murko, Radoslav (Jakob) Razlag, Simon Rudmaš, Mihael Zagajšek idr.¹ Zdi se, da je v dobrih štirih desetletjih svoje aktivnosti, in sicer od približno

¹ Slomšek je sicer odklanjal dajničo, toda po vsem sodeč, je imel neposredne stike tudi s Petrom Dajnikom, čeravno korespondenca z njim doslej ni izpričana. Zgodnejša verzija Slomškove pesmi *Lehko noč*, prvič objavljena v omenjenih Ahacelnovih pesmah (*Pesme po Koroškim ino Štajarskim znane* 1833), je bila namreč poprej v drugačni obliki že natisnjena v neki (doslej neidentificirani) Dajnkovi knjigi. Ker Slomšek te pesmi pred 1833 ni objavil, je mogoče sklepati, da Dajniko te pesmi ni mogel prejeti v obja-

1821 do 1862, Slomšek razvil sodelovanje ali vsaj povezave s skoraj vsemi vitalnimi silnicami kulturnega življenja Slovencev od Koroške in Štajerske do Primorske.

3 Slomškova skrb za skupni slovenski knjižni jezik, ki bi presešel pokrajinske razlike in bi postal izrazilo vseh Slovencev skupne omike, se še posebej izraža v njegovi novomašniški zaobljubi, da bo svoj prosti čas posvetil skrbi za materni jezik (KOVACIČ 1934: 45). Splošno znano je, da je takó deloval že kot bogoslovec prvoletnik, ko je jeseni 1821 v celovškem bogoslovju samoiniciativno pripravil tečaj slovenščine za bogoslovce. S tečaji je nadaljeval vsako leto do konca bogoslovja, o čemer pričajo med drugim ohranjeni uvodni govori, v katerih je zavračal tedaj že zakoreninjeno mnenje, da se slovenščine ni potrebno učiti, in poudarjal dostojanstvo materinščine ter njeno pomembnost še zlasti za duhovnika. Že od začetka je prikazoval knjižno slovenščino kot sredstvo združitve pokrajinskih govorov v višjo kulturno celoto. Leta 1829 se je Slomšek po nekaj letih kaplanske službe vrnil v Celovec, tokrat kot spiritual bogoslovnega semenišča. Takrat je svoje tečaje slovenščine obnovil še temeljiteje in deloma dosegel obveznost tega pouka.² Ker je poučeval bogoslovce iz dveh škofij, so bili med učenci tako Korošci kakor Štajerci, nekateri celo s Kranjske. Takšna pokrajinska raznolikost slovenskih govorov, zbranih v njegovem celovškem avditoriju, je Slomšku le potrjevala njegovo vizijo o potrebi po enotnem knjižnem jeziku iz leta 1821. S svojimi tečaji je opravljal podobno prerodno funkcijo kakor Metelko na ljubljanskem liceju, le da njegovo delo ni bilo tako dobro institucionalizirano, čeravno naj bi bil boljši učitelj celo od Metelka (GRAFENAUER 1958: 280). Pri pouku se je lahko opiral na znanstvene slovnice Kopitarja, Metelka in Murka. Toda ker te niso bile najbolj primerne za jezikovni pouk, je Slomšek napisal tudi lastno slovnico *Inbegriff der slowenischen Sprache für Ingeborne*, ki je njegovo razmeroma samostojno jezikoslovno delo (JESENŠEK 2010: 672), nastalo na podlagi pedagoške prakse, zato je posebnost te slovnice, da se končuje s »preverjanji znanja« za tri zahtevnostne stopnje. Slovnico, ki je ostala v rokopisu, je začel Slomšek najverjetneje pisati že ob vstopu v bogoslovje 1821 (prav tam: 679). Ker se je zavedal nasilne germanizacije na Koroškem in Štajerskem, mu je bilo povsem jasno, da z materinščino slovenstvo stoji in pade. Zato je v omikanem knjižnem jeziku videl branik višje duhovne kulture pred procesi raznarodovanja ter izgubo slovenske identitete. Ker je gledal daljnosežno in široko, je kot pot k temu cilju že v bogoslovnih letih odklanjal deželne partikularizme, kakršnega sta razvila Dajnko za štajersko deželno in v manjši meri Metelko (v besedotvorju) za dolensko različico. Čeprav je bil Štajerec, je priznaval vlogo (ne pa prevlade) osrednjeslovenske jezikovne tradicije ter njeno prepletanje z drugimi pokrajinskimi prvinami v postopnem poenotenju knjižnega jezika (JESENŠEK 2003: 673). Tako je vzgajal tudi svoje gojence, kar pri njih ni ostalo brez literarnih in publicističnih sadov. V tem duhu je Slomšek 30. maja 1833 čestital Čopu za »učeno, z vsem pogumom izpeljano črkarsko pravdo« v upanju, da bo končala »pogubonosni

vo drugače, kakor neposredno od Slomška. Prim. natisnjeno stran s Slomškovimi rokopisnimi popravki: UKM, Ms 125/7.

² Krški (celovski) škof Jurij Mayr je to Slomškovo prošnjo potrdil in naložil svojim bogoslovcem Slomškov tečaj slovenščine kot uradno obveznost, medtem ko je lavantinski škof Zimmerman poudaril prostovoljnost za lavantinske bogoslovce (GRAFENAUER 1958: 279–280).

razkol« (AZN 1930: 7), ob poznejših novooblikarskih trenjih po letu 1850 pa potožil Bleiweisu: »vsak piše po svoji trmi [...] Razkolnost je Slovanov bila in bo dedna pregreha.« (prav tam: 316)

4 Slomšek je poleti 1825 odpotoval iz Celovca prek Olimja v Ljubljano »v zadevah slovenskega slovstva«.³ *Kranjska čbelica* je bila sprva tesno oprta na ožji krog sodelavcev na Kranjskem, Slomšek pa kot literat tedaj še neznan, zato ga verjetno niso povabili k sodelovanju. Sam pa je *Kranjsko čbelico* intenzivno spremljal. Zaradi več razlogov je Slomšek med letoma 1829–1838, ko je bil spiritual v Celovcu, med bogoslovci organiziral, mentorsko vodil in sam razvil obširno literarno dejavnost, ki se je kazala v treh glavnih vejah. Najbolj poznana je prva slovenska posvetna pesmarica *Pesme po Koroškim ino Štajarskim znane* (1833, razširjena 1838), ki je hkrati tudi prvi večji literarni dosežek širšega kroga koroških in štajarskih pesnikov. Izmed teh so Jarnik, Slomšek, Valentin Orožen in Josip Hašnik primerljivi s čbeličarji (GRAFENAUER in GSPAN 2009). Celotno gibanje je bilo seveda drugačno, saj ni bilo usmerjeno k romantiki, marveč je stalo na prehodu iz razsvetljenstva v predromantiko in bilo usmerjeno bolj k posnemanju ljudskega pesnjenja, k poetični krščanski refleksiji, vzgoji in razvedrilu. Vendar je vsekakor mogoče govoriti o strnjemem krogu sodelavcev, o Slomškovem krogu, ki je sodeloval pozneje pri skoraj vseh publikacijah, nastalih na njegovo pobudo.

Drugi večji rezultat Slomškovega celovškega kroga je vrsta prevodov Christopha Schmidta, ki so jih pripravljali bogoslovci ob slovenskih tečajih, toda popravljal in za tisk pripravljaj jih je njihov spiritual.⁴ S tem je Slomšek (GRAFENAUER in GSPAN 2009) postal začetnik slovenskega mladinskega slovstva; to se zaradi bolj elitistične usmerjenosti kroga *Kranjske čbelice* ni moglo močneje razviti na Kranjskem, marveč se je, zanimivo, razvilo na Koroškem.

Tretji pomemben rezultat Slomškovega celovškega kroga pa je pesniški almanah, ki je svojevrsten koroški pendant *Kranjske čbelice*, le da ni bil nikdar natisnjen, so Pefme za pokufhno, ohranjene le v enem izvodu iz Slomškove zapuščine. Prvotno je bil morda vsak letnik samostojen almanah, medtem ko so zdaj letniki zbrani v večji rokopisni knjigi (UKM Ms 124). Literarna zgodovina teh pesniških zbornikov, nastalih med letoma 1832 in 1835 in leta 1838, večinoma ni obravnavala obširneje kakor z enovrstičnimi omembami. In vendar so nekatere pesmi teh zvezkov prerasle raven prvih pesniških poskusov ter so v določenem pogledu močno modificirale Vodnikovo pesniško tradicijo, ki jo deklarativno izkazuje njihov naslov, ter ji dale nove, predromantične dimenzije. Videti je, da je Slomšek svojim gojencem predlagal določeno temo – v letniku 1832 je bila to pomlad – in dve od nastalih pesmi sta bili nato objavljeni v Ahacelnovi zbirki. Med izstopajočimi pesniki zbornika so

³ Prim. KOVAČIČ 1934: 48. Grafenauer in Gspan navajata v *SBL* leto 1824 (verjetno pač 1825 poleti, po končanem bogoslovju med čakanjem na namestitveni dekret), ko se je srečal v Ljubljani z Metelkom, Zalokarjem, Strelom in se zanimal za ustanovitev revije Slavinja, do katere pozneje ni prišlo (prim. GRAFENAUER in GSPAN 2009).

⁴ Tako so v Celovcu pod oznako »prevedli mladi duhovni v celovški duhovščini« izšle Schmidove knjige *Perjetne perpovedi za otroke* (1832 in 1836), *Kratkočasne pravlice otrokam v podučenje* (1835), *Sedem novih perpovedi za otroke* (1836) in več drugih.

Janez Arlič, Jožef Hašnik, Valentin Orožen; več pesmi so napisali Andrej Korošec, Jožef Matoh, Matej Pirš, Luka Sevšek. V najboljših pesmih (Arličevih, Hašnikovih in še nekaterih), ki oblikovno ne zaostajajo za Vodnikom, je razsvetljenska poezija tematsko razširjena, prenovljena, celo presežena; poleg naivne vzgojne in razvedrilne tendence se pojavlja bolj introspektivna, duhovno-poetična refleksija na meji med razsvetljenstvom in romantiko, npr. v Arličevi pesmi Mila folsa, ki je že prežeta z romantičnim elegičnim pesimizmom. Temu ustreza tudi opazen oblikovni odkik od kitice alpske poskočnice k bolj kompleksnim metričnim oblikam; Arlič je 1838 napisal celo oblikovno dovršen Sonet. Tako je pod neambicioznim naslovom *Pefme* sa pokufhno začela v Slomškovem celovškem krogu nastajati umetniško bolj ambiciozna duhovna literatura. Ta je v vsebinskem pogledu glede na *Kranjsko čbelico* komplementarna, saj jo večinoma preveva krščanska duhovna vsebina, v literarno-formalnem pogledu pa se na *Kranjsko čbelico* verjetno opira, saj je v pomembnejših lirskih pesmih, zlasti Arličevih in Hašnikovih, zaznati Prešernov vpliv. Tudi v tem je moč videti enega od večznačnih in kompleksnih odnosov med Kranjsko na eni ter Koroško in Štajersko na drugi strani.

5 Na bolj empiričen način izražajo Slomškovo zavest o prostoru slovenskih ter sosednjih dežel potopisi, v katerih je razmeroma podrobno opisal svoja potovanja med počitnicami v spiritualski dobi, zlasti po Koroškem, Štajerskem, Kranjskem in Goriškem. Ohranjeni so potopisi iz let 1833, 1834 (nepopolno) in 1837.⁵ Ohranjeni potopisi pričajo o tehle potovanjih, ki jih je Slomšek poleti večidel opravil na »apostolski način«, tj. peš.

- 1833: Potovanje iz Celovca čez visoke Ture na Solnograško, v Linz, na Dunaj (kjer je srečal Jakoba Zupana), prek Marijinega Celja v Gradec (iskal, a ne našel, Kolomona Kvasa), Sv. Peter pri Mariboru (med drugim srečanje z Antonom Murkom), Spodnja Polskava, Studence, Sladka Gora (Matija Vodušek), Celje, Nova cerkev (Mihael Stojan), Rečica ob Savinji (Jožef Lipold), Solčava, Celovec.
- 1834: Potovanje iz Celovca na Uršljo goro, prek gore Oljke v Vojnik, Slovenske Konjice, Špitalič; odtod je potopis izgubljen. Kljub izgubljenemu rokopisu pa so z računski dokumentirani izdatki potovanja »v Gorico in v Videm na Furlanskem, torej je ob tej priliki obiskal primorske in najbrž tudi **Rezijanske** Slovence. Njih narečje je Slomšek poznaval in se nanj večkrat oziral v svojih slovenskih predavanjih.« (Kovačič 1934: 110)

Kovačič razume omenjene račune kot dokumente istega potovanja, torej v letu 1834. Toda Slomšek v kar dveh poznejših spisih navaja, da je obiskal prijatelja Valentina Staniča leta 1835 in da ga je ta spremljal v Oglej, torej gre za neko potovanje v letu 1835, o katerem ni nobenega rokopisa: »Ne bom pozabil vse žive dni, kako sva v leti 1835 skuz Palmo novo v Voglej hodila, kako so mi iz visokiga stariga turna

⁵ Prim. NŠAMb, fond Slomšek, fasc. VIII, v nemščini. Prvi je iz njih objavil več daljših odlomkov Fr. Kosar v svoji nemški monografiji o Slomšku (KOSAR 1863: 22–38). Bolj obširno pa je iz njih zajemal, jih prevedel in deloma povzel v svoji slovenski biografiji Frančišek KOVAČIČ (1934: 84–133). Teh potopisov slovenska strokovna literatura o potopisju ni obravnavala; upoštevani so bili le v kontekstu Slomškove biografije.

vse kraje nekdanjiga imenitniga mesta razkazali.« (*Drobtince* 1848: 89–90) Pozneje zapiše, da je v družbi »iskrenega Slovenca Valentina Staniča na častitem oltarju sv. Mohorja in Fortunata sveto mašo služil, na pokopališču toljko svetih mučencov in spoznavcev iz veličanske vere naše.« (*Drobtince* 1851: IX)

- 1837: Zadnji ohranjeni potopis dokumentira potovanje iz Celovca čez Korensko sedlo na Bled in v Ljubljano (5. septembra v gledališču s Prešernom, nato pri Pavšku, Metelku), sledijo Višnja Gora (Janez Cigler), Stična, Novo mesto, Zagreb (iskal Ljudevita Gaja, našel družbo mlajših iliristov), hrvaško Zagorje, Varaždin, Štrigova, Ljutomer, Velika Nedelja (Peter Dajnko), Ptuj (Josip Muršec), Celje, Prevalje, Dobrla ves, Celovec.

Na teh potovanjih je imel Slomšek za glavni cilj, da neposredno in od blizu spozna slovenske dežele in ljudi pa tudi cerkvene ustanove, zlasti semenišča in samostane ter si z njihovimi predstojniki izmenja poglede na splošne razmere naroda, izzive Cerkev in s tem povezano vzgojo duhovnikov v bogoslovju. Vendar je bila Slomškova narava zelo občutljiva tudi za lepote narave, omenjal je zanimiva narodopisna opažanja, denimo o ziljskem štehanju in reju pod lipo, človeške prigode pa je spremljal z globljo refleksijo človekove eksistence in usode. Vse troje (opis narave, narodopisni drobec in refleksija) se posrečeno združuje v tej sliki Bleda in okolice:

To je zelo visok grad na pečini, s katerega uživaš v najlepšem in najzanimivejšem razgledu. Naravnost proti zahodu se s svojo sivo glavo dviga kvišku Triglav kot oče vseh okrog ležečih gora; proti severu so precej oddaljene Karavanke, ob vznožju katerih se vrstijo najlepše cerkve; na vzhodu je širna ravnina proti spodnji Štajerski s številnimi župnimi vasmi in gradovi; proti jugozahodu v vrtoglavi globini jezero v prijetni kotlini obliva pečino, in naprej proti planinam, ki se vlečejo tja do Turčije [tj. Bosne], pozdravlja popotnika Sava, ki vre iz svoje bohinjske zibeli. Ravno zdaj odmevajo kasni zvonovi s prijaznega otoka. Na nasprotnem obrežju zagledamo veliko ladjo s številnimi belo oblečenimi deklamacami. Pogreb na jezeru! Edini sin že priletnega očeta, ki se je v pijanosti peljal ob jezeru, padel vanj in utonil, je jadral v grob. Za počasi drsečo ladjo se vleče bela proga, kaže prevoženo pot in izginja brez sledu. Ladja obstane – in mrtveca odnesejo v grob. *Ecce sortem!* – podoba našega življenja.⁶

6 Na drugačen, mnogo bolj daljnosežen in usoden način se je s slovenskim duhovnim, narodnim in geografskim prostorom ukvarjal Slomšek kot škof, ko je v več let trajajočih pogajanjih dosegel novo razmejitev lavantinske škofije (Kovačič 1934: 84–99), s katero je veliko večino štajerskih Slovencev združil v novo urejeni lavantinski škofiji in jih odtegnil nasilni germanizaciji v popolnoma nemško usmerjeni sekavski (graški) škofiji. Ta obširen ekleziastično-politični proces s pogajanjmi med cesarjem, škofi in papežem, v katerem je Slomšek zmagal, čeravno njegovo glavno načelo, da naj se meje škofije ujemajo z narodnostno mejo, ni bilo docela uresničeno, ne sodi v meje tega sestavka. Toda ob premisleku o slovenskem kulturnem in zemljepisnem prostoru ga je potrebno vsaj omeniti, saj gre predvsem temu Slomškovega

⁶ *Ecce sortem* – Glej, (kakšna) usoda! Nemški izvornik v Kosarjevi knjigi (Kosar 1863: 27–28), tu prevod Jožeta Stabeja (Kosar 2012), v tisku.

delu ob drugem njegovem prizadevanju za slovensko kulturo pogloblitna zasluga, da je Spodnja Štajerska do prve svetovne vojne sploh ostala slovenska dežela (POGAČNIK 1991: 147–148, 157).

7 Vitalna narodna zavest, ki jo je Slomšek poleg vere razumel kot bistveno prvo slovenske krščanske omike, se je izražala tudi v njegovih literarnih delih. Posamezne slovenske dežele, pravzaprav deli slovenskega naroda, so v njegovih tekstih večkrat metonimično predstavljeni s slovenskimi rekami. Že zelo zgodaj (1821) in prav ob začetku svoje bogoslovne poti je imel Slomšek slovesen govor za začetek slovenskega tečaja v družbi bogoslovcev. Ohranil se je rokopis tega govora z naslovom Napeljavni govor k Slovenškemu sboru 1821, ki je za svoj čas ne le prvovrstno prerodno dejanje z zbranimi argumenti v prid učenja slovenščine, ampak tudi sam zase mala retorična umetnina. Ker je to prvi (pol)javni govor o slovenskem jeziku v slovenščini, ki povrh doslej ni bil objavljen, naj navedemo nekaj misli, ki ilustrirajo Slomškovo vizijo o potrebnosti učenja knjižne slovenščine kot višje enote, v kateri se združujejo govori posameznih slovenskih dežel. Govor začenja z iztočnico Jezusovih besed učencem: *Vos estis lux mundi*. – Vi ste luč sveta. V uvodu razvije misel, da duhovnik s tem, ko ljudstvu posreduje krščansko vero, obuja v njem hkrati tudi omiko in njene nasledke. Tako je rasla omika pri Nemcih, tako pri slovenskih prednikih v času Cirila in Metoda. Nato z obžalovanjem postavi primerjavo: »O kako merslo je ferze donafhnih vuzhenikov proti ferzi tih dveh bratov k Slovenfki vuzhenofiti.« (NRSS, Ms 44, 3v) Na očitek, da se slovenščina v vsakem kraju drugače govori in se je zato nima smisla učiti, odgovarja, da je vzrok temu med drugim to, da duhovni pastirji sami ne znajo knjižnega jezika: »[Od] kod pride ta reslozhk, de vľaka fara drugazhi isrekuje? Sato kir njih vuzheniki enako prav govoriti ne snajo, kir se Slovenftva le malo, al fzer nizh ne vuzjijo.« (4r) Zavrne tudi druge ugovore proti učenju slovenščine, češ da slovenščino znamo že od doma, ali da naj bi Slovenci že po enem rodu izumrli ipd. Danes si težko predstavljamo, kako odločni in smeli so bili ti Slomškovi pozivi k učenju slovenščine in prerodnemu delu med ljudstvom, ki so bili izrečeni, ko je bil komaj nekaj mesecev v bogoslovju in le pol leta po cesarjevem absolutističnem govoru učiteljem ob kongresu vladarjev v Ljubljani 1821.⁷ Ne glede na to je svoje videnje kulturnega razmaha uveljavljal naprej skladno z idejo o knjižnem jeziku kot zedinjujočem počelu Slovencev, o čemer je v govoru razvil tole poetično prisposodobu:

„Sestre fo fi v nafhi fofefki ,Sava, Drava ino ,Savina, ena tezhe fkus Kranfko, druga fkus Korofhko, ta treka fkus ,Stajarfko deshelo, dalezh od eden druge vľtanejo, pak vender le prijafno fkupej snidejo, ino v drushbi v morje fvoje shlahte ftekajo.

O ke bi vunder tim potoki mi enaki poftali; ,Slovenz je Kranjez, Korefhez, koker ,Stajarz, bratji fmo eden drugimu, ako se mi v nafhjih jesikah, v nafhim govorjenju, ako fmo fhe tako dalezh narasen, senazhimo koker te vode, eden drusga po potu te vuzhenofiti ,Slovenfkiga na dalej vodimo, tok se bodemo nafhim dalnim bratam priblishvali, ino,

⁷ »Ostanite pri starem redu, ki je še vedno najboljši. [...] Ne potrebujem učenjakov, temveč le pridnih državljanov, in tako mi vzgajajte mladino. Kdor meni služi, mora poučevati, kakor jaz ukazujem. Kdor pa tega ne more ali kdor se ukvarja z novotarijami, naj gre, kamor mu drago, ali pa ga dam odstraniti jaz.« (MODER 1952: 16)

o frezhni zhař, kateri pridefh, de bode v jesiku ,Slovenftva ena hiřha, eden rod, eno ,Slovenftvo, en govor! (NRSS, Ms 44, 4r–4v)

Za leto 1821 pomeni takřna vizija izredno stopnjo artikulacije slovenske narodne in jezikovne ideje. ře dodatno je izjemna zato, ker je ohranjena v slovenřcini, in ře dodatno, ker jo je zapisal komaj enaindvajsetletni bogoslovec. V svojem okolju je delovala kot integralna vizija slovenstva, ki naj se harmoniřno razvija po poti vere in kulture. Slomřek je to videnje izrazil ře enkrat v poeziji. Leta 1822 je – verjetno za slovesnost ob začetku ali koncu jezikovnega tečajja – zložil pesem Slovenstvo, ki jo je v spremni opombi označil kot odo, »ki so si jo gojenci celovřkega semenišča peli v spodbudo, ko so se začeli v letu 1822 iz lastne potrebe medsebojno izobrařevati v materinřcini«; objavljena je bila řele nedavno (SLOMŘEK 2010: 15).⁸ Daljša pripovedna pesem v 19 kiticah, zasnovana ře v Vodnikovem duhu, s prisposodobno govori o »spanju« Slovencev, o njihovi teži zgodovini, naposled pa o nujnosti narodnega prebujenja in aktivnega dela. Ideja narodnega in jezikovnega zedinjenja slovenskih dežel je med drugim izražena v tehle kiticah:

Tam Sava mi 'zvira,
kir beli se sneg,
Savina pogmira
prebistro nje tek;
prduři se Drava,
njih sestra, in glej,
kok tečejo brzno
v druźbi naprej.

Ta potok veseli
me pejtı vuči,
Slovence na beli
dan gori budi,
de b' hotli en druž'ga
za brate spoznat,
prjazno po potu
modrine pelat.

Topos slovenskih rek, ki Slomřku simbolno predstavlja ideje kulturnega sodelovanja, jezikovnega zbliževanja in narodne zedinjenosti posameznih slovenskih dežel, je bil globoko vrařčen v njegovo duřevnost. Ko je v približno istem času, tj. med letoma 1821 in 1824, napisal daljšo epsko-lirsko pesem, posveřeno Urbanu Jarniku,⁹ jo je zasnoval s tematiko povezanosti med »Savinjsko ravnino« in pokrajino ob korořki reki; o sebi govori pesnik alegoriřno kot o majhnem grozdu, ki ga je s řtajerske prinesel v dar Korořki (tj. Jarniku), pesem pa je seveda naslovil Drava (Drava! ti slo-

⁸ Vprařanje o tořnem začetku jezikovnih tečajev v letih 1821 ali 1822 ostaja odprto. Po Slomřkovi dataciji je mogoče sklepati, da je bil Napeljavni govor s konca leta 1821 ali je bil morda uvod v tečaj, ki se je praktiřno začel řele v letu 1822.

⁹ Jarnik je bil v letu 1824 star 40 let, zato je moźno, da mu je Slomřek kot prijatelj in obřudovalec to pesem napisal prav ob jubileju oz. godu tega leta.

venska mati, SLOMŠEK 2011: 20–23). Simbolika slovenskih rek in pokrajin se je nato v Slomšku vzbudila še potem, ko je ob koncu življenja kot škof poslednjič obiskal Solčavo in v župnijsko knjigo zapisal pesem Slovo Žolcpaškim planinam ter jo tudi podpisal »Pri svoji tretji in poslednji obiskavi 21. rožnega cveta 1861«. V petkitični pesmi se prepletata motiv strmih solčavskih planin in dolinskih slovenskih rek:

Z Bogom, hčere stare matere, mogočne Slave:

košata Radoha, visoka Ojstrica,
gorjata Rinka in zobata Olšova!
Povzdigajte Slovencom bistré glave,
naj bojo vrli sini Slave!

[...]

Deroča Drava, svetla Sava in Savinja,
mogočne vode in slovenske sestre tri,
vsaka po svoji stezi neprenehoma hiti
in te uči, slovenska rodovina!

kako se zadobi modrina. (SLOMŠEK 2007: 63–64)

Solčavske planine v pesmi alegorično konotirajo moralno neomajnost, premočrtnost, narodno zavednost; ta »vertikalni« element se dopolnjuje s »horizontalnim«, ki ga uvajajo slovenske reke, predstavnice slovenskih dežel, ki so hkrati simbol vztrajnosti, zagnanosti, dinamičnosti. Pesnik je snov pretanjeno komponiral tako, da vertikalni element zavzema prvo in četrto kitico, vmes med njima kakor v dolini tečejo reke v drugi in tretji kitici. Zadnja, peta, poveže obe prvini v prizadevanju za resnico in dobro med Slovenci s projekcijo v odprto prihodnost.

8 Slomšek se je le predobro in preveč realistično zavedal resničnega položaja Slovencev na Štajerskem in Koroškem, da bi ga ne boleli učinki germanizacije: notranja vdaja nekaterih Slovencev nemštvu, zatajevanje lastnega, slovenskega izvora ter jezika, postopen odpad družine in ponemčenje lastnih otrok. O tem je Slomšek večkrat z bolečino pisal; krivdo je videl predvsem v Slovencih samih; v premajhnem spoštovanju maternega jezika in lastnega izvora. Za to večidel ni obtoževal Nemcev, ampak rojene Slovence, ki so se pripravljali za nekaj socialnih ugodnosti odtujiti svojemu rodu. Tem je namenil oster, zelo jasen članek Graja nemškutarjev, objavljen še v zadnjih *Drobtinica*h njegovega življenja leta 1862. To antologijsko besedilo se začinja tako:

»Kaj mi hočete dati, in jaz vam ga izdam?« tako je govoril Judež Iškarjot kervoželjnim sovražnikom Kristusovim. [...] Kaj nam hočete dati, in vam hočemo prodati svoj narod, svoj materni jezik in vso narodno blago? tako govorijo naši nemškutarji, svojega naroda zatajevavci, po nemški strani Nemcom, po vogerski strani madjaroni Magjarom, lahoni po laški strani pa Italijanom. Trideset srebrnikov ravno ne iščejo; zadosti jim je nekoliko pohvale, nekaj posvetne časti. [...] Ni se potemtakem čuditi, da vbogo slovenščino od vsih krajev pokončavna povodenj zaliva ... (*Drobtince* 1862: 59)

Ti in takšni stavki so izhajali iz prejasne zavesti, kaj se dogaja po štajerskih ter koroških mestih, trgih in vaseh, še zlasti med tistimi Slovenci, ki so po novi razmeji-

tvi škofij ostali »prepuščeni na milost in nemilost« krški (celovski) oz. sekavski (graški) škofiji (Kovačič 1935: 92–94). Slomšek se je zavedal, da se skokovito nadaljuje proces, ki je v počasnejših in manj nasilnih korakih spreminjal narodnostno podobo Koroške že stoletja. Iz te zavesti je nastala svojstvena, prav za Slomška značilna vizija potujčenega, izgubljenega slovenskega prostora, ki jo je s svojim poetičnim slogom opisal takole:

Kdo je ponemčil Gorotana visoke planine in doline zelene častite Koroške dežele, v koji so svoje dni mogočni Gorotanski knezi gospodovali, kakor nam priča jezer let stari kamniti prestol na starodavni ravnini poleg Gospe svete? Na grobu stare slave knezov prestol v zemljo leze na meji nemčije [tj. nemštva], in na bližnem homu častita stolica Gospa sveta že v nemčiji medli; alj visoke gore Grebenca in Kačji verh, Golovica in Svinja ste v nebo kipeče priče, da so svoje dni Slovenci po njih košatih livadah svoje čede pasli, in z njih višin v sosedno Tirolsko, Solnogradško in Avstrijansko gledali in popevali gorske popevke, kder sedaj ni slovenskega glasu več čuti. Bistrice po vsih krajih nemčije po slovensko rožljajo, se v Dravo, Muro in Murco odmevajo, pa po njih bregih ni več Slovincov, ki bi razumili, kaj jim velijo potoki in reke u starodavnih časih po slovensko keršene. Koroško Brezje in štajarski nemški Gradec nam pripovedata v množini veliko varožev, tergov in vesi po nemških krajih, da so jih nekdanji Slovenci stavili in v njih prebivali, v kojih so zdaj le Nemci doma. – Kaj so očitni sovražniki nekdanje Slovence po vsih tih krajih pobili in po kervavem boju si osvojili vse te slovenske lastnine? – Nemškutarji so jih po malem Nemcom prodali, ter so sebe in svojo deco ponemčili.« (*Drobtince* 1862: 59–60)

Značilno je, da so tudi v teh žalobnih, elegičnih stavkih omenjene tri slovenske reke; toda te tečejo skozi potujčeni prostor, ki je za slovenstvo izgubljen. V tipologiji slovenskih »literarnih prostorov« ne bi smel manjkati tudi ta prostor, iztrgan iz organske in jezikovne zveze s preostalim slovenskim kulturnim prostorom, za katerega enotnost in omiko si je Slomšek prizadeval in katerega zgodovinsko odtujitev je zato boleče občutil ter izrazil. Takšno odtujitev – tako prostora nasploh kakor tudi posamezne osebe – svojemu rodu je razumel Slomšek kot kršitev od Boga danega naravnega reda, naravnega prava. Slovenska kultura, po Slomškovo omika, je bila v njegovem pojmovanju del celostne krščanske omike in vitalno odvisna od krščanstva, ki ji je po njegovem prepričanju omogočilo nastanek ter razvoj. Zato je Slomšek tudi avtor prve teološke utemeljitve slovenske narodne individualnosti, izražene v znani pridigi na binškoštni ponedeljek 1838 (SLOMŠEK 2004) in v drugih spisih.

9 Sklep

V štirih desetletjih slovstvenega in kulturnega delovanja Antona Martina Slomška od 1821 do 1862 je slovenski narodnostni prostor nastopal kot ena osrednjih preokupacij njegove misli in pisanja. Implicitno se to kaže že v obširni mreži pisemskih stikov s sodelavci, ki je segala s Koroške in Štajerske na Kranjsko, Tržaško in Goriško. Eksplicitno se Slomškova misel o slovenskem narodnostnem prostoru izraža v njegovih prizadevanjih za pouk slovenskega jezika, s katerim je na Koroškem in Štajerskem sredi 19. stoletja pomembno pripomogel k uveljavitvi skupne norme knjižnega jezika, v katerega se stekajo posamezne pokrajinske inačice ter narečja. Zanimiva

je tudi Slomškova percepcija prostora v potopisih, nastalih na njegovih potovanjih po slovenskih deželah v letih 1833, 1834 in 1837. Kot literarni simboli pa nastopajo elementi slovenskega prostora v Slomškovih literarnih delih, zlasti pesmih. Osrednja podoba, ki je pojavlja večkrat, je podoba slovenskih rek, ki prihajajo iz raznih slovenskih dežel, a se stekajo v enoten tok in v njegovih pesmih s tem predstavljajo vsem Slovincem skupno jezikovno ter narodnostno kulturo. Temelje tako integriranega slovenskega jezika ter slovenskega kulturnega prostora je Slomšek videl v naravnem pravu, danem od Boga, iz česar je razvil prvo teološko utemeljitev slovenske narodne individualnosti.

VIRI IN LITERATURA

- AZN: *Arhiv za zgodovino in narodopisje, 1930–1932*. Ur. Frančišek Kovačič. Maribor: Zgodovinsko društvo.
- Drobtince za novo leto 1848: Učitelam ino učencam, starišam ino otrokam v podvujenju ino za kratek čas*. Celje: Matija Vodušek.
- Drobtince za novo leto 1851: Učitelam ino učencam, starišam ino otrokam v podvujenju ino za kratek čas*. Celovec: Jožef Rožman.
- Janko MODER, 1952: *Iz zdravih korenin močno drevo: Iz zgodovine Družbe sv. Mohorja*. Celje: Družba sv. Mohorja.
- NRSS, Ms 44: Register slovenskih rokopisov 17. in 18. stoletja. Ms 044. Anton Martin Slomšek: Napeljavni nagovor k'Slovenfkimu sboru 1821. Tudi na spletu.
- Anton Martin SLOMŠEK, 2004: *Tri pridige o jeziku: Elektronska znanstvenokritična izdaja*. Ur. Matija Ogrin in Jože Faganel. eZISS – Elektronske znanstvenokritične izdaje slovenskega slovstva. Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede ZRC SAZU. Tudi na spletu.
- , 2007: *Poezija: Objavljene pesmi*. Ur. Matija Ogrin. Celje: Celjska Mohorjeva družba, Društvo Mohorjeva družba (Zbrano delo, 1).
- , 2011: *Poezija: Neobjavljene pesmi*. Ur. Matija Ogrin. Celje: Društvo Mohorjeva družba, Celjska Mohorjeva družba (Zbrano delo, 2).
- UKM, Ms 124: *Pefme sa pokuŕhno 1832–1838*.
- UKM, Ms 125/7: *Lehko noč* (pesem v dajničiči, tisk).
- Ivan GRAFENAUER, 1958: *Stolica za slovenski jezik na ljubljanskem liceju in Slomškovi tečajji v celovškem semenišču*. *Zgodovinski časopis* XII. 272–285.
- Ivan GRAFENAUER in Alfonz GSPAN, 2009: *Slomšek Anton. Slovenski Biografski Leksikon*. Ljubljana: Zadružna gospodarska banka. Tudi na spletu.
- Marko JESENŠEK, 2003: *Slomškovi jezikovni nazor in slog. Slovenski knjižni jezik – aktualna vprašanja in zgodovinske izkušnje*. Ur. Ada Vidovič Muha. Ljubljana: FF (Obdobja, 21). 669–682.

- , 2010: Slomškova rokopisna slovnica – Inbegriff der slowenischen Sprache für Ingeborene. *Studia Historica Slovenica* 10 (2/3). 667–681.
- Rudolf KOLARIČ, 2009: Metelko Franc Seraf. *Slovenski Biografski Leksikon*. Ljubljana: Zadrúžna gospodarska banka. Tudi na spletu.
- Franz KOSAR, 1863: *Anton Martin Slomšek, Fürst-Bischof von Lavant*. Maribor: E. Janschitz.
- Franz KOSAR, 2012: *Anton Martin Slomšek, knezoškof lavantinski. Njegovo življenje in delovanje*. Prev. Jože Stabej. Celje: Celjska Mohorjeva družba. V tisku.
- Fran KOVAČIČ, 1934, 1935: *Služabnik božji Anton Martin Slomšek, knezoškof lavantinski I, II*. Celje: Družba sv. Mohorja.
- Martina OROŽEN, 2010: *Kulturološki pogled na razvoj slovenskega knjižnega jezika: Od sistema k besedilu*. Maribor: Zora (Zora, 74).
- Jože POGAČNIK, 1991: *Kulturni pomen Slomškovega dela*. Maribor: Obzorja.

UDK 929:323.1(=163.6)

Matija Ogrin

ZRC SAZU Institute of Slovene Literature and Literary Studies, Ljubljana

ANTON MARTIN SLOMŠEK AND THE QUESTION OF THE UNITY OF THE SLOVENE CULTURAL SPACE

This article presents Slomšek's efforts towards linguistic and cultural integration of the Slovene lands between 1821 and 1862. The prominence of the Slovene cultural and geographic space in Slomšek's works is presented by using his correspondence and travel writings, with a special view to his works on a unified Slovene literary language and his creative writing, in particular his poems.

Key words: A. M. Slomšek, Slovene literature, Slovene literary language, space of Slovenian culture

1 Introduction

Anton Martin Slomšek's work for Slovene culture is exceptionally broad and complex because he labored intensively in very different fields, such as clerical pastoral work and sermon composition, applied pedagogical work and textbook writing, translating and editing, cultural organizing, teaching Slovene, intensive advocacy for standardization of the Slovene literary language and its assertion in public life; writing poetry, prose, religious essays, and moral tracts. He became active in literature already in high school, around 1816, and his intensive involvement in all fields connected with Slovene language and literature began when he entered on theological studies in Celovec (Klagenfurt) in the fall of 1821. These beginnings correspond to the time after the publication of Jernej Kopitar's grammar (1809), which was a »normative signpost« between »the past of language variants in the different lands« and »the process of their unification« into a common linguistic norm (OROŽEN 2010: 212) in the middle of the nineteenth century. The process of unifying the Slovene literary language was surely but an external expression, an external appearance of essential internal shifts in Slovene culture of the time—shifts that meant the spread of Slovene national consciousness and gradual transformation of regional, provincial affiliation into Slovene national affiliation. Slomšek's contribution to these integrative processes was significant, especially in Carinthia and Styria, where he was, during the time he was active, the central figure in the national awakening. We can observe numerous instances of strong insistence on linkages between Carinthia, Styria, Carniola, and Primorsko in his works, which display a consciousness of these lands' spaces and their mutual belonging within the framework of Slovendom as a higher, superior community. In this article, I will outline some of the areas of Slomšek's work for integration with select examples that most clearly exhibit his consciousness of the Slovene cultural and geographic space.

2 Starting with his time at the Ljubljana lycée, even before his seminary years, Slomšek carried on correspondence with a wide network of friends and colleagues in all of the Slovene provinces. Although only a small portion of Slomšek's correspondence survives, the over 400 letters that have show very well his network of cultural connections, and activities throughout the Slovene provinces and including just about all of the cultural activists of his time. It is understandable that these contacts were especially intensive in the then centers of Slovenes' cultural life—Ljubljana, Celovec, and to some extent Gradec (Graz)—and with a narrow circle of colleagues in Styria. It is probable that already at the lycée in Ljubljana (1819–1820) Slomšek met Franc Metelko, whose lectures on Slovene were an important influence on the quality of the literary languages used by the younger generation of intellectuals, among them Matija Čop and France Prešeren (KOLARIČ 2009). Slomšek is confirmed to have collaborated with Metelko during his seminary years, when Metelko would send to him in Celovec the drafts of his grammar even as it was being printed—that is, in 1825 (KOVAČIČ 1934: 37). Of interest are Slomšek's letters to Čop that have been preserved from the time he was a seminary mentor in Celovec. Besides a trusting, friendly relation, they attest to an intensive exchange of books on linguistic and literary matters. Thus on 30 October 1832 he sent to Čop in Ljubljana Megiser's dictionary and some of Jarnik's works. Later he sent Svetokriški and asked him to intercede with the censor for collections of the so-called Ahacel poems (AZN 1930: 3), inquired about the work on publication of *Kranjska čbelica*, and on 5 January 1833 wrote: »Ich wünschte bald wieder ein Lied unsers genialen Pfehern zu hören! Profim ga lepo posdraviti, pa tudi druge blage Slovenze.« (AZN 1930: 5) Then later he reported that the Ahacel collection has been well received, which he saw as evidence of the success of Slovene Sunday schools in Carinthia and Styria in their efforts to encourage progress in reading (AZN 1930: 11). His correspondence with Bleiweis was even larger. He wrote to the editor of *Novice* in Ljubljana from Št. Andraž and later Maribor many times, including about his linguistic positions on the so-called new forms—he supported them but advocated gradual introduction and reciprocity between Slovene lands: »I think it is right that the Carniolans are seated at the head of the table, but you must not forget that we, too, are Slovenes, and do not demand that yours is always the rule; and we take many of your forms, which are unlike ours, copying Št. Augustine: In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.« (AZN: 318–321) Many of Slomšek's biographical writings and memoirs came from his personal connections. Thus, for instance, he wrote about his friend Valentin Stanič from Goriško, whom he highly admired: »May the fitting praise of the deceased give young readers inspiration for the dead teach us to live.« (*Drobtince* 1848: 81) In Trst (Trieste), Slomšek was in contact with Ravnikar's successor, Bishop Jernej Legat. In Carinthia, he was especially closely connected with the teacher Matija Ahacel and the Slavist Urban Jarnik, and of course with Mihael Andreaš and various »Pohorje poets«. Slomšek maintained and refreshed multiple connections with colleagues on his publications, especially prose translations, the almanac *Drobtince*, and textbooks. Among them were Jožef Hašnik, Mihael Stojan, Valentin Orožen, Jožef Muršec, Anton Murko, Radoslav (Jakob) Razlag, Simon

Rudmaš, Mihael Zagajšek, and others.¹ It appears that during the good four decades of his activities, from approximately 1821 to 1862, Slomšek developed cooperation or at least contacts with almost all of the vital trends of the Slovenes' cultural life, from Carinthia and Styria to Primorsko.

3 Slomšek's advocacy for a common Slovene literary language that would overcome regional differences and become an indicator to all Slovenes of their collective progress is especially pronounced in his first Mass promise to devote his free time to the mother tongue (Kovačič 1934: 45). It is well known that he had already been doing this as a first-year seminarian. In the fall of 1821 he took the initiative to prepare a Slovene language course for seminarians. He continued the course every year until he graduated, as his introductory speeches, which have been preserved, attest. In them, he refutes the established opinion that it was not necessary to study Slovene, and he highlighted the language's qualities and its importance, in particular for priests. From the start he held that literary Slovene was a means of combining regional dialects into a superior cultural unit. In 1829, after several years of service as an associate pastor, Slomšek returned to Celovec as a seminary mentor. It was then that he revamped his Slovene language course and partially achieved that it be required.² Since he was teaching seminarians from two dioceses, there were both Carinthians and Styrians, and even some Carniolans. Such a variety of regional dialects gathered in his Celovec classroom only convinced Slomšek, from 1821, of his vision of a unified literary language. His course performed a revival function similar to Metelko's at the Ljubljana lycée, only his work was not institutionalized, even though he was a better teacher than even Metelko (Grafenauer 1958: 280). In his teaching he could rely on the scholarly grammars by Kopitar, Metelko, and Murko. However, since these were not suitable for language teaching, Slomšek wrote his own grammar *Inbegriff der slowenischen Sprache für Ingeborene*, which was substantively his own linguistic work (Jesenšek 2010: 672). It flowed from his teaching experience and therefore a feature of the grammar is that it ends with »a test of knowledge« on three levels. Slomšek most likely began writing the grammar, which remains in manuscript form, already when he started his theological studies in 1821 (ibid.: 679). Since he was aware of the forced Germanization in Carinthia and Styria, it was clear to him that Slovendom would stand or fall with the language. Therefore, he saw in a cultivated, literary language a defense of higher spiritual culture against loss of national and ethnic identity. Since he took a long, broad view, already in his seminary years he rejected regional particularisms as a path to the goal, unlike Dan-

¹ Slomšek rejected Peter Danjko's alphabet but everything indicates he had direct contacts with Danjko as well, although the correspondence has not yet been attested. A very early version of Slomšek's poem »Lehko noč«, first published among the so-called Ahacel poems (*Pesme po Koroškim ino Štajarskim znanje*, 1833), was before that, in a different form printed in one of Danjko's (not yet identified) books. Since Slomšek did not publish the poem before 1833, we can conclude that Danjko could not have obtained it for publication except directly from Slomšek. The printed version can be compared with Slomšek's manuscript (UKM, Ms 125/7).

² The Celovec/Klagenfurt bishop, Georg Mayr, confirmed Slomšek's request and assigned his theology students to Slomšek's Slovene course, while the Lavanttal bishop, Zimmerman, underlined that it was optional for his students of theology (Grafenauer 1958: 279–80).

jko and the Styrian dialect and to a lesser degree Metelko (in word formation) and the Dolenjska dialect. Moreover, although himself a Styrian, he insisted that central Slovene linguistic traditions together with elements from other regions take the lead in the gradual formation of the literary language (JESENŠEK 2003: 673). That is how he taught his students, and it bore literary and journalistic fruits. In this spirit Slomšek congratulated Čop on 30 May 1833 for his »scholarly, courageous spelling rules« in the hope that they would put an end to the »devastating schism« (AZN 1930: 7). During later reform arguments after 1850 he complained to Bleiweis »Each stubbornly writes his own way. The proclivity to schism was and will continue to be an inherited sin of the Slavs. (ibid.: 316).

4 The summer of 1825 Slomšek left Celovec and went to Ljubljana via Olimje in »Slovene literary matters«.³ The almanac *Kranjska čbelica* was at first closely focused on a narrow circle of collaborators in Carniola. As an unknown writer at the time, Slomšek had not been invited to cooperate, but he followed the publication intensely. For a variety of reasons, from 1829–1838, while a seminary mentor in Celovec, Slomšek developed and led wide ranging literary activities among the seminarians. There were three main branches of activities, the most well known of which was the first Slovene secular songbook, *Pesme po Koroških ino Štajarskim znane* (1833, expanded in 1838), which was at the same time the first large literary achievement of a wide circle of Carinthian and Styrian poets. Among them, Jarnik, Slomšek, Valentin Orožen, and Josip Hašnik were comparable to the *Kranjska čbelica* contributors (GRAFENAUER and GSPAN 2009). Of course, the group was different; they were not oriented towards Romanticism, but were part of the transition from Enlightenment to pre-Romantic literature, and thus more oriented to imitating folk poetry, to poetic Christian reflection, education, and entertainment. Nonetheless, it is still possible to speak of a tight circle of collaborators, about a Slomšek circle that cooperated on almost all later publications that he initiated.

Another significant accomplishment of the Slomšek Celovec circle was a series of translations of Christoph Schmid, which the seminarians in the Slovene course prepared, though their mentor corrected them and prepared them for print.⁴ Gspan and Grafenauer believe that Slomšek was the founder of Slovene literature for youth, which could not become well developed in Carniola because of the elitist complexion of *Kranjska čbelica*. It did, however, develop in Carinthia. (GSPAN and GRAFENAUER 2009)

The third important achievement of the Slomšek Celovec circle was an almanac of poetry, which was a kind of Carinthian offshoot of *Kranjska čbelica*, only it was not printed and remained in manuscript. It was entitled »Pefme za pokuhno« and is preserved in only one copy, in Slomšek's archive. At first, each issue was probably

³ See KOVAČIČ (1934: 48). GSPAN and GRAFENAUER (2009) refer to 1824 as the year he met Metelko, Zalokar, and Strel in Ljubljana and inquired about the founding of the journal *Slavinja*, which never took place, but it was likely the summer of 1825, after the parting blessing and while waiting for the placement decree

⁴ Schmid's books *Perjetne perpovedi za otroke* (1832; 1836), *Kratkočasne pravlice otrokam v podučenje* (1835), *Sedem novih perpovedi za otroke* (1836), and many others came out in Celovec/Klagenfurt with the subtitle »translated by young seminarians in the Celovec seminary«.

prepared as a separate almanac, but now they are sewn together in one large, bound manuscript (UKM Ms 124). Literary historians have, for the most part, not treated these poetry collections, which were assembled in 1832–1835 and 1838, giving them only passing note. However, some of the poems rise about the level of beginners' attempts and in some respects modified Vodnik's poetic tradition, which the collection cites in its title, and gave it new, pre-Romantic dimensions. It appears that Slomšek gave his students a certain theme—in 1832 it was spring—and then some of the resulting poems were published in the so-called Ahacel collection. Among the notable poets in the collection are Janez Arlič, Jožef Hašnik, and Valentin Orožen; Andrej Korošec, Jožef Matoh, Matej Pirš, and Luka Sevšek wrote many poems. In the best poems, which not formally inferior to Vodnik's—those by Arlič, Hašnik, and a few others—Enlightenment themes are significantly expanded, refreshed, and even superseded: Besides naïve moral and entertaining tendencies, there is a more introspective, spiritual reflectiveness that is on the border between the Enlightenment and Romanticism. Certain poems, like Arlič's »Mila folsa«, are filled with Romantic elegiac pessimism. The move from the stanzas of Alpine melodies to more complex metrical forms accords with this. In 1838 Arlič even wrote a formally finished »Sonet«. Thus under the modest title »Pefme za pokufhno« Slomšek's Celovec circle began to write artistically more ambitious spiritual literature. This Christian spiritual content complemented the contents of *Kranjska čbelica*. From a formal standpoint, it probably relies on *Kranjska čbelica*, because the most significant lyrics, especially those of Arlič and Hašnik, display Prešeren's influence. Here, too, it is possible to see one of the most indicative and complex relations between Carniola on the one hand and Carinthia and Styria on the other.

5 His travel writings express Slomšek's awareness of the space of Slovene and neighboring lands in a more empirical way. In them, he quite precisely described his holiday travels during his time as a seminary mentor, especially in Carinthia, Styria, Carniola, and Goriško. The travel writings from 1833, 1834 (incomplete), and 1837 have been preserved.⁵ The travel writings that have been preserved tell about the trips that Slomšek made, for the most part in an »apostolic manner«—that is, on foot.

- In 1833 he traveled from Celovec over the Visoke Ture/HoheTauern mountains to Salzburg, Linz, Vienna (where he meets Jakob Zupan), via Marijino Celje/Mariazell to Graz (he searched for but did not find Kolomon Kvas), to Sv. Peter near Maribor for among other things a meeting with Anton Murko, to Spodnja Polskava, Studenice Sladka Gora (to see Matija Vodušek), Celje, Nova cerkev (Mihael Stojan), Rečica ob Savinji (Jožef Lipold), Solčava, and back to Celovec.
- In 1834 his trip was from Celovec to Uršlja gora over the mountains Oljka to Vojnik, Slovenske Konjice, and Špitalič; from there the account is lost. Despite the lost manuscript,

⁵ NŠAMb, fond Slomšek, fasc. VIII, in German. Fr. Kosar was the first to publish many longer excerpts from them, in his German-language monograph about Slomšek (KOSAR 1863: 22–38). Frančišek KOVAČIČ (1934: 84–133) took more liberally from them, translated them, and summarized some of them in his Slovene-language biography. Slovene scholarship on travel writing has not treated them; they have only been taken into account in the context of Slomšek's biography.

bills document travel expenditures »to Gorica and Videm in Friuli, so that on this occasion he probably visited the Rezija/Resia Slovenes as well. Slomšek became acquainted with their dialect and cited it many times in his lectures.« (Kovačič 1934: 110)

Kovačič understands these bills as documents from the same trip, in 1834. However, in two later accounts Slomšek states that he visited his friend Valentin Stanič in 1835, and that the latter accompanied him to Aquileia, meaning some trip in 1835, for which there is no manuscript: »To the end of my days I will never forget how in 1835 the two of us went via Palma nova to Aquileia, how I was shown all of the lands of the once great city from a high, old tower.« (*Drobtince* 1848: 89–90). Later he wrote that in the company of the »true Slovene Valentin Stanič he served mass on the high altar in St. Hermagoras and Fortunatus, on the grave of so many holy martyrs and witnesses to our salvific faith.« (*Drobtince* 1851: IX)

- 1837: The last travel account that is preserved is of a trip from Celovec over the Korensko sedlo to Bled and Ljubljana (on 5 September he was at the theater with Prešeren, then at Pavšek and Metelko's), then to Višnja Gora (Janez Cigler), Stična, Novo mesto, Zagreb (he searched for Ljudevit Gaj and found a company of young Illyrianists), Croatian Zagorje, Varaždin, Štrigova, Ljutomer, Velika Nedelja (P. Dajnko), Ptuj (Josip Muršec), Celje, Prevalje, Dobrla ves, and back to Celovec.

During these trips, Slomšek's main goal was to learn about the Slovene lands and people directly and close up, and also about the church institutions, especially the seminaries and monasteries, where he would exchange views with their directors on the general condition of the people, the Church's challenges, and the related theological education of priests. However, Slomšek's nature was also very open to the beauties of nature, and he frequently added interesting observations about the people; for instance, about the Ziljska equestrian sport known as *štehvanje* and dance called *rej*, beneath the linden. He added deep reflections on human existence and fate to his stories of human events. All three—natural description, anecdotes about the people, and reflections—are happily married in this picture of Bled and surroundings:

The castle is very high on a cliff from which you can enjoy the most beautiful and interesting view. Due west Triglav raises its gray head like the father of all the mountains around it; to the north are the fairly distant Karavanke, at the foot of which is a string of pretty churches; in the east is a broad plain towards Lower Styria with its many village churches and castles; to the southwest, dizzyingly far down in a pleasant ravine a lake washes on the rocks; and further towards the mountains that extend all the way to Turkey (i.e., Bosnia), the Sava greets the traveler, rushing from its Bohinj cradle. It is just now that the late bells resound from the welcoming island. We catch sight of a large boat on the opposite bank with many maidens dressed in white. A burial on the lake! The only son of an already elderly father was boating on the lake while drunk, fell in, and drowned. He sailed into his grave. A white line extends behind the slowly gliding boat, marking its course, and disappears without a trace. The boat stops, and they carry the dead man to his grave. *Ecce sortem!*—the image of our life.⁶

⁶ *Ecce sortem* 'Look, (such) a fate!' In Kosar's book (KOSAR 1863: 27–28), is the German original; Jože Stabej's Slovene translation (KOSAR 2012) is forthcoming.

6 As a bishop, Slomšek was involved in another, more far reaching, and fateful way with the Slovene spiritual, national, and geographic space. During long years of negotiating he obtained a new division of the Lavanttal, later Maribor diocese (KOVACIČ 1934: 84–99), uniting the vast majority of Styrian Slovenes in a newly organized Lavantinska diocese, saving them from forced Germanization in a completely German-oriented Graz-Seckau diocese. This article cannot cover how Slomšek won in this extensive ecclesiastical-political process with negotiations between the emperor, bishops, and pope, although he did not fully realize his main goal, that the diocesan and ethnic borders correspond. Nonetheless, in considering the Slovene cultural and geographic space it is at least necessary to mention it, because it is thanks to Slomšek's work, besides his other efforts for Slovene culture, that Lower Styria remained a Slovene province at all until WW I (POGAČNIK 1991: 147–148, 157).

7 The vital national consciousness, which besides faith Slomšek saw as the essential ingredient of Slovene Christian progress, was also expressed in his literary works. In his texts, individual Slovene provinces, actually pieces of the Slovene people, are often metonymically represented as Slovene rivers. Quite early—I have repeatedly cited 1821—at the very beginning of his religious path, Slomšek gave a celebratory speech in the company of seminarians for the start of the Slovene-language course. The manuscript of the speech has been preserved. It is entitled »Napelvavni govor k'Slovenf'kimu sboru 1821« [A commencement speech to the Slovene assembly in 1821] and is not only a top rate revival act with arguments aligned to support the study of Slovene, but also a minor piece of rhetorical art. Since this is the first (semi-) public speech about the Slovene language in Slovene, which has yet to be published, I will adduce some of the thoughts that illustrate Slomšek's vision of the need for learning literary Slovene, a higher form of the language in which the dialects of the individual Slovene provinces are joined.

The speech begins with the opening of Jesus's words to his disciples: *Vos estis lux mundi* 'You are the light of the world'. In the introduction he develops the thought that when conveying the Christian faith to the people a priest simultaneously inspires in them progress and its fruits. That is how progress took place among the Germans, and how it took place among the Slovene ancestors in the time of Sts. Cyril and Methodius. Then he makes a disappointed comparison: »And yet how cold the hearts of today's teachers compared to the hearts of these two brothers towards Slovene learning.« (NRSS, Ms 44, 3v) To the objection that Slovene is spoken differently in each place and therefore it is senseless to study it, he answers that the reason, among others, is that the spiritual pastors themselves do not know the literary language: »what is the reason for each parish to speak differently? Because their teachers do not know how to speak correctly either, for there is to little Sloveness, or they do not study it at all.« (4r) He likewise rejects other objections to learning Slovene, such as knowledge of Slovene from home or that Slovenes will die out in another generation. Today it is difficult for us to imagine how decisive and brave Slomšek's calls for the study of Slovene and revival work among the people were, having been spoken when he was at the seminary but a few months and only a half year after the emperor's absolutist speech to the teachers at the congress of rulers in Ljubljana in

1821.⁷ Despite this, he continued to state his view of cultural growth together with the idea of the literary language as uniting principle for Slovenes, one that he poetically depicted in his speech:

They are sisters in our neighborhood »Sava«, »Drava«, and »Savinja«, one flowing through Carniola, the other through Carinthia, the third through the Styrian land, staying far from one another yet warmly joining with each other and together entering the sea as a family.

Would that we become like these streams: Carniolan, Carinthian, as well as Styrian are Slovenes, we are brothers to one another; would that in our language, in our speech, even though far apart, we would unite as these waters, on this path of learning we Slovenes would recognize one another from a distance, draw closer to our distant brothers, and, oh happy time to come, when Slovenedom will have one home, one people, one speech. (NRSS Ms 44, 4r–4v)

For the year 1821, this vision was an exceptional advance in articulating Slovene national and linguistic ideas. It is the more exceptional because it has been preserved in Slovene, and moreover, because a barely twenty-one year old seminarian wrote it. In its context—and effectively—it acted as an integrating vision of Slovenedom, which was to develop harmoniously along the path of faith and culture. Slomšek expressed this view once more, in poetry. In 1822, probably for a ceremony at the start or end of the language course, he composed the poem »Slovenstvo«, in an accompanying note calling it an ode »which the students of the Celovec seminary sang for inspiration when they began, in 1822, of their own accord to educate themselves in the mother tongue«. It was published only recently (SLOMŠEK 2010: 15).⁸ A longer, nineteen-stanza narrative poem composed in Vodnik's style, contains a simile of Slovenes' »sleep«, tells of their difficult history, and then of the necessity of a national awakening and active work. The idea of national and linguistic unity of the Slovene lands is one of the themes expressed in the stanzas:

There my Sava springs,
Where the snow lies white,
The Savinja slows
its racing flow;
the Drava joins,
their sister, and look,
how they race speedily
together along.

The merry river
teaches me to sing,

⁷ »You will remain with the old order, which is still the best. [...] We do not need students but dutiful citizens, and that is how you will educate the youth for me. Whoever serves me must teach as I command. Whoever cannot or is engaged in novelties may go where he pleases, or I will have him removed.« (MODER 1952: 16).

⁸ The question of the exact beginning of the language course, in 1821 or 1822, remains open. By Slomšek's dating it to 1822 it is possible to conclude that the commencement speech from the end of 1821 was an introduction to the course, which only began in 1822.

raises the Slovenes
 to a new morn,
 with a desire to
 call each other brother,
 and happily sail
 a path to wisdom.

The topos of Slovene rivers, with which Slomšek symbolizes the idea of cultural cooperation, linguistic approximation, and separate Slovene lands unifying into a nation, was deeply embedded in his consciousness. When at approximately the same time, between 1821 and 1824, he wrote a longer epic-lyric poem dedicated to Urban Jarnik,⁹ he based it on the theme of linkage between the »Savinja Valley« and the area along the Carinthian river. The poet speaks allegorically about himself as a small grape brought from Styria as a gift to Carinthia (i.e., Jarnik). Of course, he called the poem “Drava” (»Drava! Slovene mother«; SLOMŠEK 2011: 20–23). The symbolism of Slovene rivers and lands appeared again later, when at the end of his life, as a bishop, he visited Solčava for the last time and wrote down in the parish book the poem »Slovo Žolcpaškim planinam«, signing it »On my third and last visit 21 June 1861«:

Farewell, daughters of the old mother, mighty Slava:
 verdant Radoha, high Ojstrica,
 towering Rinka and sharp Olšova!
 Make the Slovenes raise their keen heads,
 that they be brave sons of Slava!
 [...]

 The rushing Drava, clear Sava and Savinja,
 Mighty waters and Slovene sisters three,
 each without respite running its course
 and teaching you, Slovene family!
 how wisdom is gotten. (SLOMŠEK 2007: 63–64).

The Solčava mountains in the poem allegorically connote moral fortitude, principledness, and national consciousness. The »vertical« component is complemented by the »horizontal«, which the Slovene rivers introduce, the representatives of the Slovene lands, which are at the same time symbols of continuity, enthusiasm, and dynamism. The poet delicately arranged the contents so that the vertical component takes the first and fourth stanzas, between which the rivers run as if in a valley in the second and third stanzas. The final, fifth stanza ties both elements together in support of truth and good between Slovenes, projecting them into an open future.

8 Slomšek was only too realistically aware of the true condition of Slovenes in Styria and Carinthia for him not to be pained by the effects of Germanization: some Slovenes’ inner surrender to German; concealment of their own, Slovene origins

⁹ In 1824 Jarnik was forty, so it is possible that Slomšek wrote this as a friend and admirer for his birthday.

and language; and finally, the breakdown of the family with the Germanization of children. Slomšek wrote about this with hurt many times. He blamed the Slovenes for this most of all—for their insufficient respect for their language and origins. For the most part he accused the Slovene born, not the Germans, because the former were prepared to distance themselves from their people for some social advantages. To them he addressed a sharp, very pointed article, »Graja nemškutarjev«, which was published in the last, 1862 issue of *Drobtince* in his lifetime. The anthologized text begins:

»What will you give me that I hand him over to you?« is what Judas Iscariot said to the bloodthirsty enemies of Jesus Christ. [...] What will you give us that we sell our people, our mother tongue, and all the nation's possessions? That is how our German sympathizers talk, betraying their people; on the German side to the Germans; on the Hungarian side the *madjaroni* to the Hungarians; and on the Italian side, the *lahoni* to the Italians. They are not exactly looking for thirty pieces of silver; they are satisfied with a little praise, some worldly honor. [...] There is no reason, then, to be surprised that a mortal flood is drowning Slovene from all sides ... (*Drobtince* 1862: 59)

These and similar statements derived from the lucid awareness of what was happening in Styrian and Carinthian towns, squares, and villages, especially among the Slovenes who were »left to fend for themselves« in the Celovec and Gradec dioceses after the diocesan reform (Kovačič 1935: 92–94). Slomšek was aware that the process was proceeding apace and that it had more slowly and with less oppressive steps changed the ethnic make up of Carinthia in preceding centuries. Based on this awareness, Slomšek developed a vision of an alienated, lost Slovene space, which he poetically described:

Who Germanized Gorotan, the high mountains and green valleys of the dear Carinthian land in which in their days the might Gorotan princes reigned, as every year the old stone throne on the ancient plain by Gospa sveta attests? The throne on the grave of the princes' ancient glory is sinking into the ground on the German (i. e., German people's) border, and on a nearby hill the honored capital Gospa sveta wanes, already in Germany; but the high peaks of Grebenec, Kačji verh, Golovica, and Svinja, you vibrantly testify that in their time the Slovenes tended their flocks on your verdant slopes, looking from your heights at neighboring Tyrolean, Salzburg, and Austria and singing mountain melodies, where today not a Slovene voice is heard. Through all the German lands flow streams that bubble in Slovene, bringing their sounds into the Drava, Mura, and Murica rivers, yet there are no more Slovenes on their banks anymore to grasp what the streams and rivers once christened with Slovene names are saying. Carinthian Brezje and Styrian German Gradec and the many towns, squares, and villages in German lands tell us that olden day Slovenes built and lived in them, where now there are only German houses. –Did obvious enemies kill all the Slovenes in all of these lands and in bloody battle conquer all of these Slovene properties? –German sympathizers little by little sold them to the Germans and made themselves and their children Germans. (*Drobtince* 1862: 59–60)

It is significant that even in these sad, eloquent sentences the three Slovene rivers are named: however, they flow through an alienated space that has been lost to

Slovenedom. In the typology of Slovene »literary space«, even the space that has been wrenched from its organic, linguistic connection with the rest of the Slovene cultural space must be present. Slomšek advocated for Slovene unity and therefore historical alienation pained him, and he expressed this. Slomšek understood such alienation—of space in general and likewise of an individual from the people—as a violation of God given natural law. Slovene culture— Slomšek used the term »cultivation«—was to him a part of Christian culture as a whole and closely dependent on Christianity, which he was convinced enabled its origin and development. For this reason Slomšek is also the author of the first theological justification for national individuality, which he voiced in a well known Monday after Pentecost sermon in 1838 (SLOMŠEK 2004) and in other writings.

9 Conclusion

The Slovene cultural space was one of the central preoccupations of Anton Slomšek's thought and writings during his four-decade literary, cultural, and ecclesiastic career (1821–1862). This is implicitly evident in the broad network of his correspondence with collaborators, which spread from Carinthia and Styria to Carniola, the Trst area, and Goriško. Slomšek's thinking on the Slovene national space is explicitly expressed in his efforts on behalf of Slovene language teaching in Carinthia and Styria in the middle of the nineteenth century, by which he significantly advanced the establishment of common norms for the literary language, which would include regional variants and dialects. Slomšek's perception of space, as expressed in his travel accounts, is also of interest. They stemmed from his travels through the Slovene lands in 1833, 1834, and 1837. Elements of the Slovene space appear as symbols in Slomšek's literary works, especially his poems. The central, repeated allegory is the image of Slovene rivers coming out of the different Slovene lands and joining in a single flow. In his poems, they represent to all Slovenes a common linguistic and national culture. Slomšek saw the foundations of such an integrated Slovene language and Slovene cultural space in God given natural law, from which he derived the first theological justification for Slovene national individuality.

WORKS CITED

- AZN: *Arhiv za zgodovino in narodopisje* [*The historical and ethnographic archive*]. Ed. Frančišek Kovačič, Maribor 1930–1932.
- Drobtince za novo leto 1848*. Učitelam ino učencam, starišam ino otrokam v podvujenje ino za kratek čas. Celje: Matija Vodušek.
- Drobtince za novo leto 1851: Učitelam ino učencam, starišam ino otrokam v podvujenje ino za kratek čas*. Celovec: Jožef Rožman.
- Janko MODER, 1952: *Iz zdravih korenin močno drevo: Iz zgodovine Družbe sv. Mohorja* [*A mighty tree from good roots: On the history of the St. Mohor Society*]. Celje: Družba sv. Mohorja.

- NRSS, Ms 44: Register slovenskih rokopisov 17. in 18. stoletja [The register of Slovene manuscripts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. Ms 044. Anton Martin Slomšek: Napeljavni nagovor k Slovencekimu sboru 1821. Web.
- Anton Martin SLOMŠEK, 2004: *Tri pridige o jeziku: Elektronska znanstvenokritična izdaja* [Three sermons on language: An electronic scholarly edition]. Ed. Matija Ogrin and Jože Faganel. eZISS – Elektronske znanstvenokritične izdaje slovenskega slovstva. Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede ZRC SAZU. Web.
- , 2007: *Poezija: objavljene pesmi* [Poetry: Published poems]. Ed. Matija Ogrin. Zbrano delo, 1. Celje: Celjska Mohorjeva družba, Društvo Mohorjeva družba.
- , 2011: *Poezija: Neobjavljene pesmi* [Poetry: Unpublished poems]. Ed. Matija Ogrin. Zbrano delo, 2. Celje: Društvo Mohorjeva družba; Celjska Mohorjeva družba.
- UKM, Ms 124: Pešme sa pokušhno 1832–1838 [Poetic attempts 1832–1838].
- UKM, Ms 125/7: Lehko noč (pesem v dajničiči, tisk) [Good night (a poem printed in dajničica)].
- Ivan GRAFENAUER, 1958: Stolica za slovenski jezik na ljubljanskem liceju in Slomškovi tečajji v celovškem semenišču [The capital of the Slovene language at the Ljubljana lycée and in Slomšek's course at the Celovec seminary]. *Zgodovinski časopis* XII. 272–285.
- Ivan GRAFENAUER and Alfonz GSPAN, 2009: Slomšek Anton. *Slovenski Biografski Leksikon 1925–1991. Elektronska izdaja* [Slovene biographical dictionary 1925–1991. Electronic edition]. SAZU, ZRC SAZU. <http://nl.ijs.si:8080/fedora/get/sbl:3074/VIEW/>.
- Marko JESENŠEK, 2003: Slomškov jezikovni nazor in slog [Slomšek's view of language and his style]. *Slovenski knjižni jezik – aktualna vprašanja in zgodovinske izkušnje*. Ur. Ada Vidovič-Muha. Ljubljana: FF (Obdobja, 20). 669–682.
- , 2010: Slomškova rokopisna slovnica – Inbegriff der slowenischen Sprache für Ingeborene [Slomšek's grammar in manuscript – A model of the Slovene language for foreigners]. *Studia Historica Slovenica* 10 (2/3). 667–681.
- Rudolf KOLARIČ, 2009: Metelko Franc Seraf. *Slovenski Biografski Leksikon*. Ljubljana: Zadružna gospodarska banka. Web.
- Franz KOSAR, 1863: *Anton Martin Slomšek, Fürst-Bischof von Lavant*. Maribor: E. Janschitz.
- Franz KOSAR, 2012: *Anton Martin Slomšek, knezoškof lavantinski. Njegovo življenje in delovanje* [Anton Martin Slomšek, Lavantinska archbishop]. Trans. Jože Stabej. Celje: Celjska Mohorjeva družba. In press.
- Fran KOVAČIČ, 1934, 1935: *Služabnik božji Anton Martin Slomšek, knezoškof lavantinski I, II* [God's servant Anton Martin Slomšek, Lavantinska archbishop I, II]. Celje: Družba sv. Mohorja.

Martina OROŽEN, 2010: *Kulturološki pogled na razvoj slovenskega knjižnega jezika: od sistema k besedilu* [A culturalogical view of the Slovene language's development: from system to text]. Maribor: Zora.

Jože POGAČNIK, 1991: *Kulturni pomen Slomškovega dela* [The cultural significance of Slomšek's work]. Maribor: Obzorja.

