

George Thomas

THE IMPACT OF PURISM ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CROATIAN STANDARD LANGUAGE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

dr. George Thomas, Mc Master University, Hamilton, izvorni znanstveni članak, Ur.: 15. travnja 1996.

UDK 800.6 : 808.62"18"

The paper deals with the impact of purism on the development of the Croatian standard language in the 19th century. The impact of the puristic intervention is at the highest level during the period of standardization which is best illustrated in the formation of the modern standard languages of central and east central Europe including the Croatian language.

In theory purism operates on all linguistic levels, but in practice is most often concerned with the lexicon.

The notion that the Croatian written language should be kept relatively free of foreign elements goes back to the time of Renaissance. The author mentions major poets and dramatists of the 16th and 17th century in Dalmatia who used a language free of Romance loan words with a major exception of the comedies of Marin Držić. The author includes dictionaries of Vrančić and Mikalja, the kajkavian and štokavian dictionaries of the 18th century, and the dictionaries of Stulli published in early 19th century. Purism is also evident in all forms of prose writings and dictionaries of the Illyrian Movement. The Zadar School and the Rijeka School opposed and criticized the Illyrian reforms for being too much influenced by German. In author's opinion the paradigm change begins with the arrival of Vuk Karadžić's pupils Djuro Daničić and Tomo Maretić. The author concludes that the heritage of the Illyrian period lives on in the contemporary Croatian standard language.

It is now commonly accepted that **purification**, together with **standardisation** and **enrichment**, is one of important characteristics of that process of renewal

whereby many of the standard languages of Europe and beyond have achieved the form which we recognise today (Tolnai 1929; Becker 1948: 66; Auty 1973: 338). Conversely, it has been observed that for a number of reasons both the scale and the impact of this puristic intervention are at their highest level during the period of standardisation (Thomas 1991a: 118-121, 134). Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the formation of the modern standard languages of central and east central Europe, among them, of course, Croatian, the focus of the present discussion. It is important, therefore, that, in attempting a general characterisation of the impact of purism on the Croatian standard language, one should be guided by two basic principles. Firstly, one should concentrate on the period of standardisation. This extends from about 1830, the date of publication of Gaj's *Kratka osnova* (Gaj 1830), to about 1900, cf. the first publication of Materić's grammar in 1899 (Maretić 1899) and the Broz-Iveković dictionary of 1901 (Broz/Iveković 1901), the two works which - whatever their shortcomings - have set the prescriptive norms for Croatian for much of this century. Secondly, one should locate Croatian purism firmly within a central European framework. This means comparing the situation in Croatian not only with the other languages of the Austro-Slavic cultural historical subarea (Czech, Slovak, Slovene, Serbian and Ukrainian) (Moiseenko 1989; Thomas, forthcoming) together with Serbian, but also with the puristic debate in German and Hungarian (for a comparative history of purism, see Thomas 1991a: 195-214). Both of these demands may be satisfied by identifying the puristic sub-paradigm and its relationship to the overall socio-cultural paradigm (using 'paradigm' in the sense used by Kuhn (1970: 175)), which operates within the intellectual elite of a speech community at a particular time (Thomas 1991a: 147-157). It is then possible to recognise paradigm changes within a single speech community, to compare and contrast puristic attitudes from one speech community to another, and to relate them both to differences in their socio-cultural experiences.

Thus far we have spoken about **purism** without defining the term. A concern about the need for **purification**? Obviously, yes, but purification of what from what exactly? Purism may in theory operate on all linguistic levels but in practice is most often concerned with the lexicon (Thomas 1991a: 62-67). It involves a deliberate or unconscious attempt to identify certain elements in a language as undesirable on the basis of their origin. Purists may be content with censoring their own or others' usage (Thomas 1991a: 88-91) or alternatively they may seek to intervene in the development of the language by eradicating and/or replacing these undesirable elements or forestalling their introduction into the standard corpus of the language (Thomas 1991a: 91-95). Puristic intervention involves, then, the **closure** or **openness** to specific elements (Wexler 1974: 11-15; Thomas 1991a: 74-75). The targets of the intervention may be external (loanwords, internationalisms and calques) or internal (dialectalisms, archaisms, neologisms, bookish elements, urban speech) (Thomas 1991a: 68-74). On the basis of the targets of puristic intervention one can identify five main orientations which may occur either in isolation or, more usually in combination with which other: **xenophobic** (**general** or **targeted** at a particular external source), **elitist**, **ethno-**

graphic, reformist, archaising (Thomas 1991a: 75-83). In the case of Croatian, there is the added complication as to whether Serbian elements, inasmuch as they originate in the same (Serbo-Croatian) **diasystem** (Brozović 1970: 14) but belong to a different tradition of usage, should be regarded as internal or external. In my view, the negative attitude to Serbian elements constitutes a special type of targeted xenophobic purism akin to British closure to Americanisms or Urdu's rejection of the Sanskrit component of Hindi, for example. According to Brozović (1970: 79), it is also necessary to consider within the typology of purism **anti-purism**, that is to say a puristic reaction to a manifestation of purism (especially of the xenophobic variety). This anti-purism should be carefully distinguished from *laissez-faire*, apuristic attitudes and rational critiques of purism. It should be noted that it is entirely possible (as we shall see in the case of certain figures in the history of Croatian purism) for anti-purism directed against xenophobic purism to co-exist with puristic attitudes of one or more of the other orientations.

The notion that the Croatian written language should be kept relatively free of obtrusive foreign elements goes back at least to the Renaissance. The major Dalmatian poets and dramatists of the sixteenth and seventeenth century used a language which, given the prominence of Italian in the life of cities such as Dubrovnik, Split and Hvar, is surprisingly free of the Romance loanwords, which are so characteristic of spoken Croatian of the littoral right up to the present day (Pavić 1883: 76; Vidović 1958; Deanović 1935, 1936, 1967; Hyrkkänen 1973: 609-615; Potthoff 1973: 22-23). A major exception are the comedies of Marin Držić (1505-1567), especially his *Dundo Maroje* where Italian and Croatian are mixed together for humorous effect (Mahnken 1969; Hyrkkänen 1969; Moguš 1969; Thomas 1991b: 303-304; for further examples of the humorous use of code-mixing, see Novak/Lisac 1984). This self-censoring xenophobic purism continued as a value-feature in the literature of the Baroque period both in Zagreb and Dalmatia. In contrast to this, however, it is noteworthy that in Slavonian writer Reljković there is a clear contradiction between explicitly stated puristic principles and his actual practice, which abounds in Turkish and European loanwords (Vončina 1967: 181). Nowhere is the avoidance of foreign elements more prevalent than in the rich lexicographical tradition whether the early čakavian dictionaries of F. Vrančić and J. Mikalja, the kajkavian and štokavian dictionaries of the eighteenth century (Belostenec, Della Bella, Jambrešić) or the compendious dictionaries of J. Stulli published right at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Thomas 1988: 41-47). An exception here is the lexicographical work of Habelić, who often reproduces actively used loanwords. In many instances, the foreign words in these Croatian dictionaries is simply provided with a circumlocutory gloss but we also encounter frequent calques of Latin, Hungarian and Italian models (especially in Jambrešić and Della Bella) as well as Slavic loanwords (especially in Stulli (Živković 1957-8)). Although unsystematic, the use of these calques and Slavic loanwords reflects a growing puristic consciousness in Croatian literature, apparently derived from similar sentiments in the Florentine Accademia Della Crusca and its imitators

(Deanović 1935: 141). This purism was directed not only against elements from those living languages with which Croatian came into contact (Italian, Hungarian and German) but also the language of international scholarship (Latin) (Thomas 1988: 97).

If we examine the state of the Croatian vocabulary on the eve of the reforms of the Illyrian Movement (Thomas 1988: 41-61), it emerges that a "moderate to strong purism is evident in all forms of prose writing and in the dictionaries" (Thomas 1988: 61). One of the goals of the Illyrian reformers in the 1830's was "to re-affirm the need for lexical purism" (Thomas 1988: 62). When they set about reforming the Croatian written language in the 1830's, it is hardly surprising that they should wish to continue in the tradition of spurning foreign elements. In this connection, we should bear in mind that the Illyrians as a whole were accustomed to use languages other than Croatian (particularly Hungarian, German and Latin) for written purposes (Thomas 1988: 21-23; Šidak 1969: 71; Badalić 1970; Batušić 1968; Batušić 1976: 64-76). Moreover, as the popular comedies of Josip Freudenreich (Frojdenrajh) show, the kajkavian vernacular used in Zagreb was full of lexical and syntactic Germanisms (Batušić 1973: 112). The latter were deemed in Illyrian circles - and here there is a sharp distinction from contemporary Serbian attitudes (Belić 1936: 161-164) - to be totally unacceptable for a newly emerging prestigious and autonomous standard language. However, the Illyrians did not face the problem which confronted many other language revivals of the nineteenth century: eradicating loanwords from written usage and replacing them with native equivalents. Furthermore, the fact that the Croatian standard language had long resorted to calquing provided the Illyrians with a ready model for the creation of new lexical items in imitation of foreign words.

Now let us take a look at the evidence of the actual usage of the Illyrians to see to what extent - in both their retention of earlier vocabulary and in their neologising and enrichment activities - they were alive to the needs of creating a native intellectual vocabulary. The figures are based on the representative lexicon (i.e. excluding specialist terminology) used in the prose writings of the years 1835 to 1842, particularly Gaj's *Danica* (for further background to the choice of material and the methodology employed, see Thomas 1988: 34-38). The 200 new words noted in these sources fall into the following categories (for classification, identification and detailed word histories, see Thomas 1988: 63-94, 189-243):

- 1) loanwords - 1
- 2) internationalisms (virtually all Graeco-Latinisms) - 44
- 3) lexical calques (mostly based on German models) - 65

Using the sub-categories of lexical calques developed by Betz (1944), these break down further into:

- (a) *Lehnübersetzungen* - 52

(b) **Lehnbedeutungen** - 8

(c) **Lehnertragungen** - 5

4) Slavic loans - 60

In discussing loans from cognate languages it is important to distinguish those in which a set of regular, predictable sound substitutions have been made for those where there has been no such substitution (Thomas 1985: 322-323):

(a) without sound substitutions (all from Russian) - 4

(b) with sound substitutions - 56

5) Independent neologisms - 9

6) Words from internal resources - 21

These may be further broken down into:

(a) words revived from an earlier written tradition - 4

(b) words with new meanings - 1

(c) words with new forms - 4

(d) words from contemporary Serbian usage - 11

(e) dialectalisms and regionalisms - 1

Let us take each categories in turn and then make some general comments on the figures given.

The virtual absence of foreign loans is indicative of a thoroughgoing xenophobic purism directed against them. Hence the Germanisms of Zagreb, the Italianisms of the Dalmatian coast and the Turkisms of the inland areas (Slavonia and the Military Zone) were all denied entry into literary usage although they continued to flourish in local speech. This xenophobic purism has two important repercussions for standard Croatian and its relationship towards the Serbian standard:

1) Loanwords are conspicuous by their absence in standard Croatian; in this respect Croatian contrasts markedly with Serbian but is closely aligned with Czech, Slovak, Slovene, Hungarian and Serbian.

2) Loanwords are associated with lower styles of speech, whereas in Serbian they may be standard (cf. the functional stylistic distribution of **paradajz** in Croatian and Serbian respectively); as in Czech and Slovene (and less markedly in Slovak) this has led to the rise of pairs of words consisting of a native word used only in the standard language and a loanword used in everyday speech (for a representative list of

such pairs in Zagreb usage, see Magner 1996: 52-81); in Croatian (together with Czech and Slovene) these doublets constitute one of the most visible characteristics of the widespread but little investigated diglossia so typical of urban life in Bohemia, Slovenia and Croatia (for more details, see Thomas 1989; Magner 1966, 1978a, 1978b). Indeed, purism on all linguistic levels has contributed directly to the rise and maintenance of diglossia (for more on the relationship between purism and diglossia in general, see Wexler 1971; Thomas 1991a: 129-131).

In contradistinction to loanwords from individual, identifiable sources, internationalisms are well represented in our sample. This demonstrates considerable tolerance on the part of the Illyrians. Yet only 13,7% of these internationalisms are attested without some corresponding "native" synonym also appearing in *Danica* (incidentally, no adequate "native" replacement has ever become stabilised in Croatian for any of these particular concepts). This means that on the whole internationalisms were tolerated as occasional but not complete alternatives to "native" words. This tolerant attitude to internationalisms in the first phase of the Illyrian Movement contrasts strongly with the practice of Šulek (1860), which frequently omits internationalisms altogether or relegates them to a position behind a native synonym. In Šulek (1874), however, we see a return to the earlier state of affairs. As in Czech, Slovene and Slovak, this situation continues to the present day.

Generally speaking, calques provide the purist with something of a dilemma (Thomas 1991a: 70-72): on the one hand, they may be welcomed as an acceptable alternative to a loanword or a clumsy neologisms; on the other, they represent an intrusion from a foreign source at a much deeper level than a loanword. However, the predominant position of calques among the sources of lexical enrichment clearly shows that they were regarded by the Illyrians as a totally acceptable - indeed in many ways the most convenient - means of nationalising the vocabulary (Thomas 1988: 83-87). Moreover, the preponderance of **Lehnübersetzungen** over the rather freer **Lehnübertragungen** strongly suggests that the Illyrians saw no problem with modeling the word-building of their new standard language on a foreign model. This supposition is further supported by the fact the Illyrians resorted so little to coining independent neologisms.

Loans from other Slavic languages (mostly from Czech and Russian) are the second most important source of new vocabulary. This is not surprising when we consider that the Illyrian Movement was closely tied to the idea of Slavic reciprocity as advocated by Ján Kollár (cf. *Danica* 1837, Nos. 29, 30, 31). For the Illyrians, Slavic loans did not constitute an external source but were a testimony of the potential of Croatian for internal renewal. Nevertheless, the Illyrians did not accept such loans uncritically but - with very few exceptions - made sure that they were fully integrated into the sound-system by a series of regular sound-substitutions (Thomas 1988: 73-83).

Compared with many language revivals, there is surprisingly little use made of internal resources in the enrichment of standard Croatian, whether we are speaking of dialectalisms, revivals from previous usage or resemanticisation of old words. Only in the introduction of loans from Serbian did the Illyrians make appreciable use of resources within the Serbo-Croatian diasystem. Even then, significantly, the bulk of the words came not from Vuk's contemporary reformed Serbian standard but from the earlier Slaveno-Serbian with its important (Russian) Church Slavic component (Thomas 1988: 69-70).

On the basis of the evidence presented above, purism of the Illyrian period can be identified as reformist and xenophobic in orientation and confined to the lexical level. In order to characterise in further, we need to develop a profile of intensity of the puristic activity involved. In an earlier work (Thomas 1991a: 170-175) I identified five criteria for assessing puristic intensity from a synchronic perspective and drew up a check-list of features characteristic of three levels of intensity (mild, moderate and extreme) for each of them. On the formal criteria (the weighting of non-puristic factors, the configuration of the puristic orientation and completion of purificational process) Illyrian purism may be described as moderate while with respect to substantial criteria (the targets of purism and the nature of the preferred replacements) it conforms to a mild level of intensity. Taken together, Illyrian puristic activities are situated mid-way between profiles typical of mild and moderate purism.

The Illyrian movement was essentially Zagreb-based. How did the other Croatian philological schools react to these reforms and what effects did this reaction have on the development of Croatian purism? The philologists of the Zadar School (Šime Starčević, Ignjat Alojzije Brlić, Ante Kuzmanić and Božidar Petranović) criticised the Illyrian reforms for being too much influenced by German and insufficiently folk-based (for a detailed treatment of this school, see Vince 1978: 317-402). Starčević in particular was opposed to the linguistic novelties introduced by the Illyrians, chiefly on the ground that they were out of tune with peasant speech. He described the Illyrian language as "smies iz Ilirskoga, Pemsckoga, Poljsckoga, Ruskoga i Staroslovjenskoga jezika kao da pravi Ilirski iliti Hrvatski jezik u živućim govorim Štajerskom, Kranjskom i čistom Hrvatskom, iliti Bosanskom i Dalmatinskom neima potribnoga građiva za pravi nauk i književnost" (*Glasnik Dalmatinski*, 24 October, 1849). Kuzmanić too rejected the Slavization of the Croatian vocabulary, which he referred to as "rusško-česko-slavenosrbski". This radical criticism of the introduction of Slavic loanwords smacked of an extreme, xenophobic purism, aroused - at least in the attitude to Russian and Slaveno-Serbian material - by sincerely held Catholic beliefs. Moreover, as Vince (1978: 397-401) points out, Starčević and others were mistaken in their belief that their ethnographic approach could solve the problems facing a rapidly expanding standard Croatian. But then, their interventions, sought only to criticise the Illyrian reforms not to suggest any viable alternatives. Indeed, in practice these philologists used many words favoured by the Illyrians without comment. For example, Brlić in

the 1850 edition of his grammar uses many of the same words as Babukić (*glagolj, predlog, padež, pričastje, prislov*) but in the first three of these instances it is probable that both Babukić and Brlić have each taken the words directly from Vuk's *Pismenica* (Karadžić 1965: 23-121) (Thomas 1988: 118, 139, 195, 212, 218). Similarly, Petranović found the dialects to be an inadequate source when searching for native legal terms for his *Pravdonoša* (published in Zadar in 1851-1852) and therefore made use of the Illyrian coinings *dvoboj, okolnost, prednost, tajnik* (Vince 1978: 386-388). Moreover, Petranović was largely responsible for introducing several Illyrian terms in the Serbian component of the *Juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slavischen Sprachen Österreichs: Deutsch-kroatische, serbische und slovenische Ausgabe* (Vienna 1853). It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the attitudes of the Zadar school had little if any impact on the general direction of Croatian puristic development.

The Rijeka philological school was dominated by the complex and often contradictory figure of Fran Kurelac (Vince 1978: 405-470). His linguistic attitudes reflect a predilection for native archaisms and unusual (and often outmoded) Slavic loanwords. Like the Zadar school before him, Kurelac was opposed to the words introduced by the Illyrians as reflecting German models or as being loans from the contemporary Slavic languages. His purism was an extreme, archaising nature, although, contradictorily, he did favour certain of his own neologisms, e.g. *prvice* 'elements', *vatrenik* 'enthusiast', *gvozdenica* 'railway', *kolostaj* 'station' (Vince 1978: 428-429). His private papers (retained in the Arhiv JAZU, XV, 8/F-7, p.9) contain a list of 'Schlechte Barbarismen', including words, introduced according to Illyrian puristic principles: *čitaonica, dogodovština* 'history', *dvorana, igrokaz, kazalište, načelo, okolnost, poljodjelac, ustav* 'institute', *zbirka*. (Vince 1978: 453). He also disapproved of *parobrod* and *značaj*. On the other hand, he approves of *samoslovac* and *samo-stan*. Despite being ably countered in Zagreb by Adolf Veber Tkalčević, Kurelac's ideas were accepted not only by other Rijeka writers but also by later critics of 'barbarisms' Rožić, Andrić and (most influential of all) Tomo Maretić (Vince 1978: 439-443). Moreover, Kurelac's disapproval of certain words (including some of those listed above) led to their exclusion from the Broz-Iveković dictionary of 1901. Kurelac's intervention differs from the earlier Zadar critique in several important ways. Firstly, he is not content with blanket condemnation but deals with specific lexical items. Secondly, he attempts to replace these items with words of his own creation. Finally, he had considerable influence on the attitudes of those who came after him. Nevertheless, it is significant that most of the Illyrian words subjected to criticism by Kurelac have survived to the modern day (of the words listed above *dogodovština* in the meaning of 'history' is the sole exception), while virtually none of Kurelac's puristically inspired alternatives has found subsequent favour in standard Croatian.

Meanwhile in Zagreb no major shift in orientation can be discerned in the 1850's, 1860's and 1870's although a slight decline in puristic intensity is discernible in Šulek (1874) (Thomas 1988: 143). However, the last two decades of the century see a sharp

change in puristic attitudes in the Croatian capital resulting from a reassessment (if not repudiation) of the achievements of the Illyrian reformers and the introduction of a totally new paradigm for establishing the norms of the Croatian standard language. This paradigm change begins with the arrival of Vuk Karadžić's pupil Đuro Dančić in Zagreb to play a leading role in the newly established Yugoslav Academy of Science and Arts. In particular, the Academy Dictionary which began to be published in 1880 totally ignored the Illyrian lexicographical contributions (at least until Volume 5 (published 1898-1903) when words from Šulek (1860) was included for the first time). Although not conceived as a prescriptive dictionary of the contemporary language, the immense prestige of his new undertaking could have provided a boost to the puristically-inspired lexicon of the Illyrian era. Nor were matters helped by the publication in Zagreb of Broz/Iveković 1901, the first large-format modern dictionary, which was supposed to reflect Croatian (as well as Serbian) usage. The introduction to this dictionary states that it is based primarily on Vuk and Daničić, the most recent Croatian lexicographical source being Stulli. It represents, therefore, a total break with the Illyrian tradition. Not only is it orientated towards Serbian usage but it is based on a narrowly ethnographic conception of the standard language. As a result, less than half of the vocabulary introduced in the early Illyrian period is absent from BI. However, despite this absence, much of this material continues in use to this day, e.g. *bak-rorez, blagostanje, časopis, čitaonica, dvoboj, gospodarstvo, igrokaz, iznimka, izraz, jezikoslovlje, kazalište, olovka, parobrod, podmet, podneblje, poduzeće, prednost, predstava, protivorječje, rastresen, rodoslovlje, suglasnik, sustav, sveopći, sveučilište, tjednik, točan, upliv, usklik, uzor, vodopad, vodovod, životopis* (Thomas 1988: 143-145). Ironically a large number of these words is recorded in a contemporary Serbian source (Popović 1895) even though in the introduction to the latter work the author states unequivocally "izostavio sam dosta i od reči, koje su skovane u zagrebačkoj školi i uvukle su se u književnost". Indeed, he goes as far as to say "one, sa većinom svojih druga, moraće iščeznuti iz književnog jezika, kao što uvidavniji hrvatski pisci i nastoje, da u duh srpskog jezika što bolje proniknu". It would appear from this comparison that the Croatian dictionary is being more "Vukovian" than its Serbian contemporary. Indeed, a contemporary critic of Broz/Iveković 1901, Vatroslav Jagić, sees a too rigid interpretation of the Vukovian viewpoint as the crux of the problem. By limiting itself to words that have the Vuk or Daničić *imprimatur* the dictionary presents in his view "den Eindruck eines veralteten, den gegenwärtigen Bedürfnissen wenig entsprechenden Unternehmens" (Jagić 1902-3: 529). This Vukovianism, as has been pointed out before (Brozović 1970: 79; Thomas 1992: 179-180), was a form of ethnographic (and anti-puristic) purism. All that distinguishes Broz/Iveković from Popović is that the greater tolerance of the latter. Moreover, to use Vukovian principles to bar the way to Croatian words in a Serbian dictionary is a far cry from using them to remove Croatian words from the Croatian language. Furthermore, while the Popović dictionary was superseded by Ristić/Kangrga in 1928, Broz/Iveković remained the sole Croatian-German dictionary for the first half of the twentieth century. In the

absence of any dictionary of the Croatian standard language the words omitted from Broz/Iveković were consigned to a state of limbo.

The new Vukovian principles were also embodied in the writings of Tomo Maretić, the dominant Croatian grammarian of the turn of the century. In his grammar, Maretić approved of several of the words introduced by the Illyrians into Croatian usage, e.g. *književnost*, *pjesništvo*, *sveučilište* especially since they replace foreign words (Maretić 1899: 682). However, he noted that some words loaned from Czech and Russian were not well formed. He insisted that all Slavic loans should be adapted to the sound pattern of Serbo-Croatian. He also approved of several Illyrian neologism (e.g. *dvoboj*, *umjetnost*, *značaj* (though in the last instance by Maretić (1924) he had changed his mind!) but he suggested replacing *iznimka*, *poduzeće* and *upliv* by the more recent words *izuzetak* (taken from the Serbian usage - G.T.), *pothvat* (though not registered in any nineteenth-century dictionary, cf. ARJ XI:131) and *utjecaj* respectively (Maretić 1899: 686,693). He rejected several words because they were too slavish imitations of foreign models, e.g. *sveopći* calqued on German *allgemeine* or Czech *všeobecný*, to which, significantly he preferred *opći*, *općeni* "jer narod to veli" (Maretić 1899: 696). On the same grounds he rejected the calques, e.g. *vodopad* and *samostan*. In similar fashion, he dismissed the calque *poljodjelstvo* as unnecessary in view of the fact the common people used *ratarstvo*. Faced, however, with the absence of popular usage for *predstava*, Maretić was content to observe that at least Vuk himself used the corresponding verb *predstaviti* (Maretić 1899: 687). He disapproved of a number of Illyrian coinings including *časopis* and *bajoslovan* (Maretić 1924). In the same work he also took exception to *blagostanje*, *igrokaz*, *protuslovlje*, *rudokop*, *slovnica*, and *vidokrug*. In all these observations, the impact of which the reader may judge for himself, Maretić employs the typical double-standard of ethnographic (anti-reformist) purism: what is allowed in the way of neologising to the rural peasant is forbidden to the educated, urban citizen.

Many Croats remained sceptical of this critique of the Illyrian reforms. For Miroslav Krleža, for example, the Illyrian word-stock represented "neposredne plastičke žive slike, sastavni dio našeg jezičkog urbaniranog načina izražavanja" (quoted in Kalenić 1980: 6). Indeed the overzealous espousal of Vukovianism may have played a role in fuelling the excessive xenophobic purism directed at Serbian elements, which characterises certain periods in the history of standard Croatian in the twentieth century (for more detailed treatment of this issue, see Magner 1967, Thomas 1978). In any case, what remains, I believe, the deepest impact of Illyrian puristic activity is that "after several generations of speakers have been taught to be wary of foreign words, a *moderate purism* [italics in the original - G.T.] has become a value feature in Croatian consciousness" (Kalogjera 1978: 391). The effects of this consciousness are to be seen in word selection where the standard language provides a native and non-native pair of synonyms: *povijest* not *historija*, *glazba* not *muzika*,

rajčica not *paradajz*. In this, as is in so many other ways, the heritage of the Illyrian period lives on in the contemporary Croatian standard language.

REFERENCES

- Auty, R. "The Role of Purism in the Development of the Slavonic Literary Languages" (*Slavonic and European Review*, 61 (1973), 335-343)
- Badalić, J. "O bilingvizmu u književnosti hrvatskoga preporoda" (*Umjetnost riječi*, 14 (1970), 15-24)
- Batušić, N. "Uloga njemačkog kazališta u Zagrebu u hrvatskom kulturnom životu od 1840 do 1860" (*Rad JAZU*, 353 (1968), 395-582)
- Batušić, N. (ured.) *Pučki igrokazi XIX. stoljeća* (Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti, 36) (Zagreb 1973)
- Batušić, N. *Hrvatska drama od Demetra do Šenoe* (Zagreb 1973)
- Becker, H. *Zwei Sprachanschlüsse* (Berlin/Leipzig 1948)
- Belić, A. "O građenju novih reči" (*Naš jezik*, 4 (1936), 129 - 131, 161 - 165, 193 - 197, 225 - 232, 256 - 264)
- Betz, W. "Die Lehnbildungen und der abendländische Sprachenausgleich" (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 67 (1944), 275-302)
- Broz, I., Iveković, F. *Riječnik hrvatskoga jezika* (Zagreb 1901)
- Brozović, D. *Standardni jezik* (Zagreb 1970)
- Deanović, M. "Osservazioni sulle origini dei calchi linguistici", (*Archivum Romanicum*, 18 (1935), 129 - 142).
"Zašto dubrovački književnici nisu pisali kako su govorili?" (*Hrvatsko kolò* (1936), 62-77)
"O urbanom karakteru dubrovačkog leksikala" (*Forum*, 14 (1967), 397-403)
- Gaj, Lj. *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisa na poleg mudrolubnih narodnih i prigospodarnih temelov i zrokov* (Budim 1830)
- Hyrkkänen, J. "Neke pojedinosti o Držićevu vokabularu" in: *Zbornik radova o Marinu Držiću* (Zagreb 1969), 318 - 332
Der lexikalische Einfluss des Italienischen auf das Kroatische des 16. Jahrhunderts (*Die italienischen Lehnwörter im Sprachgebrauch der*

- dalmatischen Kroaten im Licht der kroatischen Renaissance-Literatur* (Helsinki 1973)
- Jagić, V. "Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika" (*Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 23 (1902), 522 - 529), 24 (1903), 230 - 242)
- Kalogjera, D. "On Serbo-Croatian prescriptivism" (*Folia Slavica* 1 (1978), 388 - 399)
- Karadžić, V. *Sabrana dela*, Vol. 12 (Belgrade 1965), 23-121)
- Kalenić, V. "Jezični koncept ilirizma" (*Književnost i jezik* 27 1980), 1-12)
- Kuhn, O. *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed., Chicago 1970)
- Magner, T.F. *A Zagreb kajkavian dialect* (University Park, Pennsylvania 1966)
- "Language and nationalism in Yugoslavia" (*Canadian Slavic Studies* 1 (1967), 333 - 347)
- "Diglossia in Split" (*Folia Slavica*, 1 (1978), 400 - 436)
- "City dialects in Yugoslavia" in: *American Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists*, Volume 1 (Columbus, Ohio 1978), 465 - 482
- Mahnken, I. "Uloga jezika u Držićevim komedijama" in: *Zbornik radova o Marinu Držiću* (Zagreb 1969), 311 - 317
- Maretić, T. "Ruske i češke riječi u književnom hrvatskom jeziku" (*Rad JAZU*, 108 (1892), 68 - 98)
- Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnoga jezika* (Zagreb 1899)
- Hrvatski ili srpski savjetnik za sve koji žele dobro govoriti i pisati književnim jezikom našim* (Zagreb 1924)
- Moguš, M. "Jezični elementi Drževića 'Dunde Maroja'" in: *Zbornik radova o Marinu Držiću* (Zagreb 1969), 269 - 281
- Moiseenko, V. E. *Češko-igoslavjanske jazykovye svjazi èpochi nacional'nogo vozroždenija (30 - 80e gody XIX veka)* (Avtoreferat doktorskoj dissertaciji LGU, Leningrad 1989)
- Novak, S. P. and Lisac, J. (eds.) *Hrvatska drama do narodnog preporoda*, 2 vols. (Split 1984)
- Pavić, A. "Junije Palmotić" (*Rad JAZU* 68 (1883, 69-176, 70 (1884), 1-88)
- Popović, D. *Rečnik srpskoga i nemačkoga jezika* (Pančevo 1895)
- Potthoff, W. *Die Dramen des Junije Palmotić: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Theaters in Dubrovnik im 17. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden 1973)
- Ristić, S., Kangrga, J. *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog i njemačkog jezika* (Belgrade 1928)
- Šidak, J. "Der Illyrismus - Ideen und probleme" in: L' Holotik (ed.), *L'Udovít Štur und die slawische Wechelseitigkeit* (Bratislava 1969), 61 - 89
- Šulek, B. *Němačko-hrvatski rečnik* (Zagreb 1854 - 1860)
- Hrvatsko-njemačko-talijanski rječnik znanstvenog nazivlja* (Zagreb 1874)
- Thomas, G. "The origin and nature of lexical purism in the Croatian variant of Serbo-Croatian" (*Canadian Slavonic Papers* 20 (1978), 405 - 420)
- "Problems in the study of migratory loanwords in the Slavonic languages" (*Canadian Slavonic Papers* 27 (1985), 307 - 325)
- The impact of the Illyrian Movement on the Croatian lexicon* (Munich 1988)

- "Towards a typology of lexical purism in the Slavic literary languages" (*Canadian Slavonic Papers* 30 (1988), 95 - 111)
- "The role of diglossia in the development of the Slavonic literary languages" (*Slavistična revija* 37 (1989), 273 - 282)
- Linguistic purism* (London/new York 1991)
- "The dramatist's tongues: a survey of language choice in Slavic drama" in: *Slavic drama* (Ottawa 1991), 300 - 317
- "Lexical purism as an aspect of language cultivation in Yugoslavia" in: R. Bugarski/C. Hawkesworth, *Language planning in Yugoslavia* (Columbus, Ohio 1992), 176 - 188)
- "Neskol'ko zamečanj o roli purizma v literaturnyx jazykax gabsburgskoj imperii v devjatnadcatom stoletii" (forthcoming)
- Tolnai, V. *A nyelvéjitas: a nyelvéjitas elmelete es tortenete* (Budapest 1929)
- Vidović, R. "Kako se splitski govor oslobađao utjecaja talijanskoga leksika" (*Mogućnosti* 5 (1958), 386 - 390)
- Vince, Z. "Kurelčeva puristička nastojanja" (*Revija za književnost, kulturu i društvena pitanja* 12 (1968), pp.?)
- "Filološke škole 19. stoljeća u razvoju hrvatskoga književnog jezika" (*Jezik* 16 (1968-69), 33-41, 65 - 70)
- "O nekim pitanjima hrvatskoga književnoga jezika u doba ilirizma" *Forum* 28 (1974), 261 - 300)
- Putovima hrvatskog književnog jezika* (Zagreb 1978)
- Vončina, J. "O tuđicima u Reljkovićevu 'Satiru'" (*Filologija* 5 (1967), 175 - 83)
- Wexler, P. "Diglossia, language standardization and purism: parameters for a typology of literary languages" (*Lingua* 27 (1971), 300 - 354)
- Purism and language: a study of a modern Ukrainian and Belorussian mantionalism (1840-1967)* (Bloomington, Indiana 1974)
- Živković, S. "Ruske riječi u Stullijevu riječniku" (*Južnoslovenski filolog* 22 (1957-58), 241 - 264)

SAŽETAK

George Thomas

UTJECAJ PURIZMA NA RAZVITAK HRVATSKOGA STANDARDNOGA JEZIKA U DEVETNAESTOM STOLJEĆU

U članku se govori o utjecaju purizma na razvitak hrvatskoga standardnoga jezika u 19. stoljeću. Učinak purističke intervencije je najveći u periodu standardizacije koja je najbolje ilustrirana u oblikovanju modernih standardnih jezika središnje i istočnoga dijela središnje Europe uključujući tu i hrvatski jezik.

U teoriji, purizam djeluje na svim lingvističkim razinama, ali je u praksi najizraženiji u leksiku. Mišljenje da hrvatski književni jezik treba biti relativno slobodan u odnosu na strane elemente potječe još od vremena renesanse. Autor spominje glavnije pjesnike i dramatičare 16. i 17. stoljeća u Dalmaciji koji su se služili jezikom bez romanskih posuđenica s iznimkom komedija Marina Držića. U svoju raspravu autor uključuje rječnike F. Vrančića i J. Mikalje, štokavske i kajkavske rječnike iz 18. stoljeća, kao i rječnike J. Stullija, tiskane početkom 19. stoljeća. Purizam je također evidentan u svim oblicima proze i rječnicima ilirskog preporoda. Zadarska i Riječka filološka škola kritički su se odnosile prema ilirskim reformama zbog prejakog njemačkog utjecaja. Po autorovu mišljenju promjene započinju djelatnošću Đure Daničića i Tome Maretića. Autor zaključuje da baština ilirskog preporoda živi i danas u suvremenom hrvatskom književnom jeziku.