

Gabriela Múcsková  
Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava  
Gondova 2, P.O.BOX 32, SK-81499 Bratislava  
*gabriela.mucskova@uniba.sk*

## THE IDEOLOGY OF BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM AND ITS REFLECTIONS ON LANGUAGE PLANNING IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARD SLOVAK<sup>1</sup>

The development of the Slovak standard language in its modern history (the 20<sup>th</sup> century) is accompanied with polemics and alternation of purist and assimilation efforts conditioned by language planning in the range of political ideology. The efforts are primarily focused on Czech language influence on Slovak and they are manifested in an acceptance and support of the Czech influence on one hand and the prescriptive delimitation of the Slovak language on the other hand. The paper focuses on the period of the 1950's and 1960's, which is characterised by two opposite approaches: 1) a conscious and politically supported convergence of Slovak and Czech in the end of the 1950's and beginning of the 1960's and a refusing of any kind of purism in regulation of the language development, and 2) a rise of purist approaches and efforts to protect the Slovak standard language from Czech interferences in the middle of the 1960's. A corpus planning discourse of this period, which is analysed in this article, reflects the interconnection between political ideology and language regulation and it represents an exclusive source for sociolinguistic investigation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The paper is an output of the research project: *The Slovak Language in the Context of Multilingual Communities in Slovakia* (APVV-0689-12).

I want to thank Kathryn Showers-Curtis for proofreading and editing of my text.

## 0. Introduction

It is broadly accepted that political, cultural, and economic circumstances have a direct impact on the development of standard and literary<sup>2</sup> varieties of language as well as on the language itself. The development of sociolinguistics and, recently, also of the theory of language planning<sup>3</sup> has brought a new quality to the investigation of the relationships between the function and structure of language and the function and structure of society, which communicate with it. Moreover, it contributed to knowledge that the political ideology also conditions the theoretical linguistic approach to the standard language and – important for this paper – linguistic interpretation of its historical development.

A concrete example of this interconnection is the period between the end of the 50's and beginning of the 60's in standard Slovak history that was later (since the Warsaw Pact invasion to the democratic changes in 1989) excluded from official historical linguistic descriptions due to the political system and communist ideology. My aim is to reconstruct the actual language planning practice and prescriptive linguistic efforts of this period by means of critical content analyses of the corpus planning discourse of this period, i.e. conference proceedings and linguistic discussions from the first half of the 1960's (for concrete titles, see part 4.). The term “critical” here refers to the fact that the analysed texts do not reflect the actual opinions and views of their authors, because, at that time, they could not openly express their views. The texts also went through a political censorship. So in interpretation of concrete statements we must take into account compulsory demonstrations of convenience with the political ideology as well as earlier and later statements presented in the author's other works. In my reconstruction of these events, I draw mainly from the discussion published in 1964 in the journal *Kultúrny život*, which was – thanks to political release – a platform for open presentation of opinions and attitudes (for details, see the part 4.).

---

<sup>2</sup> We use the term “literary language” for the variety, which was codified in some linguistic prescriptive work and limited in use to written form and/or just to a part of society. On the other hand, the “standard language” is codified variety more widespread throughout society, used in official and public spheres, schools and to some (and growing) extent also in private informal communication. I do not see these two varieties as independent, but as parts of a continuum, in which the real standard language is developed (see Dolník 2010: 20–21).

<sup>3</sup> I draw on B. Weinstein's definition of language planning as “a government authorised, long term, sustained, and conscious effort to alter a language's function in a society for the purpose of solving communication problems” (1980: 56 – cited in Wardhaugh 1992: 346) or J. Dolník: “Language planning is a deliberate, regulatory activity in the sphere of language realised by the state through its institutions and organizations or by other authoritative bodies” (Dolník 2010: 248 – transl. GM).

## 1. Extra-linguistic circumstances of the emergence of literary and standard Slovak

The emergence and development of any literary or standard language are very closely connected with extra-linguistic – cultural and political – circumstances in which the ethnic group using this language lives. Historical extra-linguistic factors have caused that **1)** Slovak – as a literary and standard language – is very young and **2)** this language was developing for a long time in a language situation of wide social multilingualism.

**1)** The first attempt to create a handbook of rules for uniform usage of the Slovak language in writing was *Dissertatio philologico-critica de literis Slavorum* (1787), compiled by a group of Catholic scholars led by Anton Bernolák, which was followed by Bernolák's other grammatical and lexicological works. This form of literary Slovak, prevalingly based on the cultural language of the Southwest variant of Slovak, is today referred to as “Bernolák's codification”, and its usage was limited to literary and popularized educational Catholic works and some periodicals (Pauliny 1983: 160–174). In completely different circumstances – in an atmosphere of political tensions and assimilation efforts (for details see Ďurovič 2007) a second codification attempt (initiated and realised by Ľudovít Štúr and his followers) arose in 1843 and in Evangelical circles (where up to that time Biblical Czech was used as the liturgical and literary language). It was based on a North Central Slovak dialect as a variant least marked by influence of other languages. However, for political reasons, this variety of literary language was not accepted as the official language. On the recommendation of Ján Kollár, Minister Alexander Bach approved a variant of biblical Czech for primary and to some extent also for secondary education. Czech was also partially used in local administration (Pauliny 1983: 193).

But standard Slovak is a “young” standard language not because its first codification emerged in the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, but because codified Slovak became a real literary and standard language with a function of official language in administration, diplomacy, sciences, education, etc. only after the year 1918, when the so-called “first” Czechoslovak Republic was established (Pauliny 1983: 224).

The roots of today's standard Slovak are usually attributed to the codification of Ľudovít Štúr (1846) – but, of course, today it is much different in its character. In its further development it went through several reforms and modifications – which were not always motivated by natural language development and changes of communication needs, but which also reflected the polit-

ical ideology, language policy, and cultural circumstances, i.e. the factors that determined the status and prestige (or lack of prestige) of Slovak in the concrete social context. This extra-linguistic impact on the development of standard language regulation was also a source of polemics and discussions accompanying the process of historical development of the Slovak literary and standard language.

2) Slovaks living in Central European territory, which was a part of Old Hungarian Kingdom, were constantly in close contact with many ethnic groups and languages. Having no higher language status in Hungary, the Slovak language was under influence of more developed and prestigious standard languages, mainly official and written languages such as Latin – an official language of the royal administration and language of Catholic Church; German (also widespread due to medieval German colonization) used as an official language since the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> c.; Hungarian – a majority language and also an official language since the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> c.; and Czech, which has, due to its language and also economic, educational and political vicinity, special status among the other contact languages (Jarošová 2016, and others). All those languages were used in the territory of today's Slovakia in administration, the courts, science, education, and, later, also in church and liturgy. They have had an impact on the vocabulary and grammar of Slovak and on the development of its standard variety.

## 2. Special status of Czech in the Slovak historical language situation

The tradition of close language contact between Slovak and Czech (which are, moreover, genetically closely related and intelligible) goes back to the early 15<sup>th</sup> century. Since this period, Czech was used in the territory of today's Slovakia (so called Upper Hungary) at first in lower administration, law, and trade. Contact with Czech intensified after the foundation of Charles University in Prague and later also by the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church, which since the 16<sup>th</sup> century gradually penetrated to Upper Hungary and accepted Czech as the language of its liturgy (Pauliny 1983: 105, Krajčovič and Žigo 2002: 78, recently Jarošová 2016).

The intensive language contact situation changed in 1918 into the coexistence of two standard official languages in one common political union accompanied by social bilingualism, which in various political systems lasted (except during war years) up to 1993. Today – despite the split of the common Czechoslovak state – intensive cultural, political, economic, and also language contact and bilingualism – continue mainly in Slovakia.

Due to the above-mentioned historical and cultural circumstances – it was mainly the Slovak language that was affected by this mutual language contact. There were several reasons of this unidirectional influence: Czech had a longer tradition as a cultural and literary language, so it had a higher degree of standardization and democratization. Since the 15<sup>th</sup> century it was used in the Slovak territory in administration, science, literature, religion, etc. and, for the less-advanced Slovak language, it was a natural source of vocabulary enrichment. Moreover, it had, besides the officially codified variety, also a very productive and widespread colloquial form (Lipowski 2005: 88–94). Codified literary Slovak was not widely spread during the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In everyday communication, regional dialects were usually used. Due to the lower and middle classes' inadequate competence of the codified variety of Slovak, usage was unstable and variant. It was also limited to official communication and written language. Presence of Czech in the media, professional life, culture, policy, science and administration as well as in everyday personal communication gave rise to long-term and widespread social (passive) bilingualism. Beside these extra-linguistic factors, the close-relatedness, similarity in language structures and vocabularies (the so called ethno-linguistic analogy – both formal and semantic – see Dolník 2010: 78) and high degree of mutual intelligibility also played a significant role in this unidirectional influence, because it enabled a smooth borrowing and formal adaptation of new items and quick loss of salience of “foreign borrowings”.

A natural consequence of such coexistence of two languages was a spontaneous convergence tendency and dynamism of the language usage in public spheres and in development of standard Slovak. But the natural dynamic development was, mainly in modern times, often a subject of intentional regulation and contradictory efforts by language policy – the convergence or “approximation” of Slovak towards Czech was followed by intentional and purifying divergence or “delimitation” of Slovak from Czech. Both kinds of intentional regulations reflected in prescriptive activities and codification reforms what subsequently motivated linguistic polemics and discussions.

In the history of Slovak literary and standard language development there were several cases when the natural preconditions of Czech influence were purposely intensified or reduced. I give here only some – the most known and for the development of the Slovak language the most important examples<sup>4</sup>:

---

<sup>4</sup> Some of these cases of intentional divergence tendencies or even purist efforts were compared with the situation in some historical periods of the Croatian language, which is, in many aspects, analogous (see Horák 2007, 1999). The problem of purism in Croatian language planning history is – as far as I know – also the subject of many investigations and discussions (see e.g. Vlašić 2012, Mićanović 2008: 44), but a detailed comparison of both cases should be the subject of separate paper.

<b>Intentional efforts of regulation of the Czech influence</b>			
<b>convergence</b>		<b>Divergence</b>	
<b>1840's</b>	<b>Ján Kollár</b> concept of Slavic reciprocity	<b>1846</b>	<b>Eudovít Štúr</b> codification based on the Central Slovak dialect
<b>1852</b>	<b>Martin Hattala</b> codification reform adapting several Czech orthographical and grammatical elements	<b>1902</b>	<b>Samo Czambel</b> codification based on real language usage and folk speech
<b>1931</b>	<b>Václav Vážny</b> new codification reflecting political unification programme of the inter war government	<b>1932</b>	<b>Henrich Bartek</b> extreme purism – elimination of all foreign elements – delimitation from Czech
<b>1950's</b>	intentional convergence of Czech and Slovak in terminology and vocabulary	<b>1960's</b>	new wave of anti-Czech purism – new theory of “language culture”

All here-mentioned cases have in common that the intentionally supported convergent tendencies were subsequently followed by some kind of efforts supporting delimitation or separation of Slovak from Czech. In the following parts of the paper I will focus on the last case of intentional convergence and subsequent divergent language planning focused on status and influence of the Czech language inside the Slovak linguistic situation. As I have mentioned before, this period was, for a prolonged period of time, a taboo theme and many of the circumstances and political motivations are still unknown. For an understanding of some aspects of this period, we can look for some analogous points in the preceding historical period. Therefore, I will compare the description of circumstances, motivations and manifestations of those events with the period of the 1930's, which is more well-known and also analysed and interpreted in historical linguistic works dealing with the development of standard Slovak (e.g. Pauliny 1983, Krajčovič and Žigo 2002, and others).

Both periods are – in spite of the fact that the political historical background was totally different – in many language policy aspects very similar. In both cases it was a post-war period starting in common Czech and Slovak political gestalt and some kind of new beginning of political system. An important fact, which was also reflected in culture and language, is that there were great economic and cultural differences between both parts – the Slovak one was mostly agricultural and economically not very strong. Also, the general status of the Slovak language

was nearly identical: Slovak was approved as an official state language and it was intensively developing in new spheres – administration, policy, diplomacy, trade, economy, terminology, science, etc. Thanks to education the standard variety spread further and started to be used behind the spheres of official communication. As I have already mentioned before, in both cases it was also a period of dynamic development, a higher degree of variation, and intensive Czech influence.

Before analysing events and language policy in the 1950's and 1960's, I will briefly review the similar and in many aspects analogical situation of the inter-war period.

### 3. Situation of the 1930's and a rise of purism

After World War I there arose a new political state – the Czechoslovak Republic (declared on 28<sup>th</sup> October 1918) – which was based on parliamentary democracy and market economy. Historically, it was the first time when Czechs and Slovaks created a common political state. Its language policy was based on unifying ideology – ideology of “Czechoslovakism” – according to which the new state was a state of one “Czechoslovak nation” with a common “Czechoslovak language” consisting of two varieties (according to The Constitution approved in 1920). The conception of a common language for both nations should have been realised by gradual approximation of the Slovak language to the Czech language, which began in 1931 when a new codification handbook of the Slovak language, prepared by Czech linguist Václav Vážný (*Pravidlá slovenského pravopisu*), was published. The prescribed norms and rules to some extent reflected the dynamic language state and variation in usage with an intention to support „natural” convergence of these languages by preferring common (bivalent) lexical and morphological items (Krajčovič and Žigo 2002: 216–220).

Official unification language policy, as well as a high degree of instability and variation in standard language usage, a high number of bohemisms, colloquialisms, and slang in public texts and the media motivated an emergence of puristic attitudes and efforts to eliminate foreign – mainly Czech – items (called by a term “barbarisms”) and to replace them by equivalents from Slovak dialects.<sup>5</sup> The platform of the protection of the Slovak language and its “purity” became

---

<sup>5</sup> Hereafter, I use the term purism in accordance with Thomas George: “Purism is the manifestation of a desire on the part of a speech community (or some section of it) to preserve a language from, or rid it of, putative foreign elements or other elements held to be undesirable (including those originating in dialects, sociolects and styles of the same language). It may be directed at all linguistic levels but primarily the lexicon. Above all, purism is an aspect of the codification, cultivation and planning of standard languages” (1991: 12).

a journal *Slovenská reč* (Slovak Language)<sup>6</sup>, which published many prescriptive and puristic articles. In the prescriptive practice the authors did not use any scientific arguments or analyses of the real language usage (Blanár, Jóna and Ružička 1974: 202). The recommendation of some expressions and forms preferred older and historical equivalents, or they drew inspiration from folk speech.

These efforts resulted in the 1938 proposal of a new *Slovak language codification handbook* prepared by leading representative of the purist movement – Henrich Bartek, but his proposal was not accepted because of its overly-puristic character. In spite of many negative aspects, the puristic (mainly anti-Czech) movement had positive acceptance and respect in the society and it was also – at least to some extent – positively appreciated because it contributed to the stabilization of the high variation in the state of standard language practice (see part of the discussion in “*Pri zelenom stole...*” 2014: 123).

On the other side, the intentional efforts to protect the Slovak language from Czech influence as well as later activities of some of the purists in the political life of the Slovak State (in 1938-1945) influenced by fascist ideology led to a sharp criticism of the purist movement as a whole. For these reasons the purism of this period came later – after World War II – designated as a manifestation of **bourgeois nationalism** (see below) – what played a significant role in the period of the 1950’s and 1960’s.

#### 4. Situation of the 1950’s and 1960’s

As previously mentioned, the period of the 1950’s and 1960’s – mainly its political and cultural atmosphere – became taboo for more than 30 years, and only after the democratic changes in 1989 was it possible to uncover this blank area in the map of our history. In 1990, professor Ján Horecký, who was an active participant of the linguistic life of that time, published two overview articles (1990a, 1990b) and drew attention to these nearly forgotten events – the politically manipulated linguistic conferences in Liblice (1961) and Bratislava (1962) and very sharp polemics in the journal *Kultúrny život* (1964).<sup>7</sup> Texts in the conference proceedings and journal discussion became, for me, a basic corpus for my critical content analysis with the aim of reconstructing events and interpreting them in connection with political ideologies. The most important

---

<sup>6</sup> The first volume appeared in 1932 and the journal – except war years – has been published through today. But its methodological and scientific orientation has, of course, changed.

<sup>7</sup> The journal *Kultúrny život* [*Cultural Life*] was published during 1946-1968. It was an intellectual platform presenting discussions about recent events or trends in culture, literature, philosophy and also policy. In 1968 it was banned for open protests against the invasion of the Warsaw Pact.



source is the journal discussion, which lasted six months and which was not censored.<sup>8</sup> In the following section, I present a survey of the main historical and linguistic events and their impact on language planning practice and prescriptive linguistic efforts.

After World War II, in accordance with the political programme presented in April 1945 (the so-called Košický vládný program) – it was declared that the reinstated Czechoslovak Republic was a connection of two equal and independent nations. The political and social life of the 1950's was influenced by the ideology of Stalin's "cult of personality" and policies supporting "proletarian internationalism" and "socialistic patriotism". Activities and ideas contradicting the regime were classified as bourgeois nationalism, i.e. the ideology that – according to Marxism-Leninism – prefers one nation to the other, which is negative for international solidarity of the working class and prefers the interests of the bourgeoisie. In practise, it was also purposely misused against people criticizing the regime (Rychlík 1998: 192–194). The economic situation in Slovakia was marked by extensive industrialization.

The previously declared equal economic and political status of both parts of the state was changed by the Constitution in 1960, which led to both a subordinate status of Slovak political administration and so-called "Prague centralism" (Lipták 2003: 310).

These political events were reflected in the development of the Slovak standard language and the language policy. Slovak as an official state language in new political and economic conditions was developing intensively in vocabulary, terminology, and styles. The democratization of standard Slovak brought variability of the norm in the situation of bidialectism<sup>9</sup> and in Czech and Slovak bilingualism in the media as well as in public, administrative, and political life.

The process of elimination of economic differences through the industrialization of Slovakia and the fact that there was a lack of qualified specialists and managers caused many Czechs to come to Slovakia and move into high management or control functions as well as many teachers, journalists, cultural workers etc. who came from Bohemia and, of course, used the Czech language in communication. In accordance with the declaration of the leading role of the working class, people from the working class and with a lower education got into ideological, political, media, and management positions. These people had

---

<sup>8</sup> The whole discussion, consisting of more than 30 articles, which were scattered in several issues of the journal, has been republished in a separate book edition entitled "*Pri zelenom stole: Naša reč*" (Múcsková 2014).

<sup>9</sup> Term referring to presence of two or more varieties (e.g. standard language and dialect) within the repertoires of single speakers (see Trudgill 1986: 1).

a lower competence in standard Slovak, so, due to the bilingual situation, they unconsciously adapted and used Czech items in public communication (Blanár, Jóna and Ružička 1974: 202).

After the 1960 Constitution, the necessity to support natural interference of both languages and their convergence was declared. There was no direct or quick attack against the existence and independence of the Slovak language, but any kind of protection of Slovak against Czech borrowings was supposed as incorrect and undesirable. The conscious support of language convergence was also explained by the practical advantages as elimination of possible problems with linguistic differences and lack of understanding. Sometimes it was (mainly in the 1960's when these efforts were criticized) interpreted as a consequence of Stalin's idea of "gradual convergence of the languages of the socialist world" (e.g. Mihálik 1964), but today it is very difficult to assess the extent to which people actually felt this idea as a real.

Through corpus language planning there was a demand for language prescription to regulate the creation of a common, mainly professional, military and political terminology and new vocabulary and to prefer common (bivalent) lexical and morphological items. On the other side, prescriptively-oriented linguistics shouldn't limit, or eliminate intensive influx of Czech items into Slovak public communication, nor even criticize some expressions like bohemisms.

Explicitly, this convergent regulation was "discussed" at a linguistics conference in Liblice in 1961 (see proceedings *Problémy marxistické jazykovědy*, 1962). In the two main presentations – (Bělič 1962, Peciar 1962) – and following commentaries the mutual interference of both languages was interpreted as a natural result of the coexistence of two languages in the common socialist state. The expression "discussed" should here be put into quotation marks, as the conference and linguists' presentations were monitored by representatives of Communist Party (Horecký 1990). The acceptance of convergent tendencies and the "approximation" of the Slovak language to Czech was a focus of the next linguistics conference in 1962 in Bratislava (see *Jazykovedné štúdie*, 1963) and it also influenced a conception of an actually prepared *Slovník slovenského jazyka* [*Dictionary of Slovak Language*] (1959-1968), which started to include among its entries also some Czech borrowings and marked them as "literary" or "archaic" expressions.

The argument supporting convergent tendencies as "a natural development of language" (Peciar 1964) utilized, and to some extent also "misused" the theory of the Prague Linguistic Circle and the functional approach to language cultivation.

The sharp criticism of interwar purism, denounced as a mark of bourgeois nationalism in the political atmosphere of the 1950's, gave rise to "fear of pur-

ism”, i.e. fear of criticizing Czech borrowings or interferences in linguistic journals (Mihálik 1964). This also played an important role in approaches to the language regulations in this period.

Open criticism of the state of language in the media, public communication, and administration came in the journal *Kultúrny život* in 1964, i.e. in a time when political liberalization and release as well as pro-reform and decentralization efforts appeared. In May 1964 a well-known translator and editor Ján Ferencík published an article: *Na obranu starých materií* [*In defence of grandmothers*] – where he criticized a “bad language culture” in official and public communication, bad standard language competence of the intelligentsia, and excessive borrowing of Czech expressions and phrases. Critique was also addressed to the authors of the *Slovník slovenského jazyka* [*Dictionary of Slovak Language*] and also linguists for readily accepting these innovations. For illustration I put here at least a short part of this very emotive and provocative article:

*“Chcem, brániac staré matere, brojiť proti tým, čo si nepokladajú za povinnosť rodný jazyk dokonale poznať, zveľaďovať ho v duchu jeho zákonov a tradícií, čo svoj lajdácky, odronský a v dôsledkoch nepriateľský postoj k jazyku zakrývajú frázami o posvätnosti živého hovorového úzu, ktorý však nepoznajú, z ktorého vylučujú práve staré matere a obmedzujú ho na jazyk svojho najbližšieho okolia – poväčšine na jazykovú miešanicu Bratislavy; chcem brojiť proti tým, čo teoreticky zdôvodňujú potrebu “obohacovať” jazyk cudzími prvkami, na ktoré údajne nemáme potrebné výrazy, proti tým, čo v mene zblížovania slovenčiny s češtinou znetvorujú české slová a vytvárajú zo slovenčiny odpadkový kôš na jazykové nepodarky; proti tým, čo vlastnú neznalosť jazyka povyšujú na zásadu a každého, kto sa usiluje jazyk chrániť, biľagujú ako nepriateľa.”*

*[“I want – defending grandmothers – to inveigh against those who do not feel it is an obligation to have perfect knowledge of their native language and to cultivate it in accordance with its laws and traditions; those who their sloppy, caddish and hostile attitude towards language conceal by phrases about sacred nature of a living colloquial usage, which in fact they don’t know; those people are excluding grandmothers from the language usage and decreasing it to a language of their nearest neighbourhood – mainly to a language mix of Bratislava; I want to inveigh against those who theoretically justify the need to “enrich” the language with foreign elements, because we allegedly don’t have equivalents, against those who are – in the name of approximation of Slovak to the Czech – disfiguring Czech words and making Slovak to be a waste bin for language rejects; I am speaking against those who exalt own ignorance of language to principle and mark as enemy everyone who seeks to protect language.”]* (transl. GM).

For today's reader, the article might seem to be not very much different from other articles focused on "language criticism", but historically – it was the first manifestation of these opinions that appeared after years of silence. This was probably one of the reasons why the article motivated a wide discussion in which not only linguists, writers, editors, and translators, but also teachers and common readers discussed the question of language regulation and language culture in the beginning of the 1960's. This is also confirmed by Zora Jesenská's<sup>10</sup> later comment (see "*Pri zelenom stole...*" 2014: 119):

*"... v atmosfére bolo a dlho zostávalo čosi nezdravé, situácia nebola normálna. A keď Ferenčík prehovoril, ľudia pocítili úľavu a vybuchlo z nich to, čo ich páliło, ale čo pre spomínané atmosférické okolnosti desať rokov v sebe tultali"*

[*"... for a long time, something unhealthy remained in the atmosphere. The situation was not normal. And when Ferenčík spoke, people felt a relief and what burnt in them and what they – because of the atmospheric circumstances – were hiding for ten years exploded from them"*] (transl. GM).

The discussion lasted until October 1964 and includes more than 30 published articles (more than 40 other articles stayed unpublished) and a final panel discussion organized by the editorial management of the journal in 21<sup>st</sup> October and which was published under the title – *Pri zelenom stole: Naša reč* [*Behind the green table: Our speech*].

An interesting feature of the discussion is that a majority of linguists in their contributions vindicated the high variability of norm, incorrect usage of standard language and plenty of bohemisms and slang expressions in public texts by natural and spontaneous consequences of the dynamic development of the society in the new conditions. They explained the convergence policy as an "unhindered development of the language" (Peciar 1964). On the other hand, litterateurs (translators, writers, poets), editors and also some non-philologists criticised the current state of standard Slovak in public discourse, which they evaluated as bad and endangering the identity of the Slovak language. They also reproached the linguists for the lack of language regulation and protection of its "purity". They stressed the necessity of regulation and purification of the language from the side of linguistic authorities and expressed a demand of a new theory of language cultivation and prescriptive linguistics (e.g. Mihálik 1964, Chorváth 1964, "*Pri zelenom stole...*" 2014: 116).

---

<sup>10</sup> Zora Jesenská – was famous Slovak translator and she was several times persecuted by totalitarian regime in 1950's and 1960's.

The discussion also opened the theme of interwar purism and its (later) negative evaluation from the linguistic point of view (expressed mainly at the Liblice conference) as well as the political (communist) point of view as it was connected with the generally criticized interwar period as a period of bourgeois nationalism. All participants of the discussion had personal experience with the events of the interwar period, so these parts of the discussion are valuable as an oral history testimony enhancing the knowledge presented in historical and linguistic scientific works.

Besides negative evaluation and consequences of the interwar purism, some authors reminded its positive effects on language norm stabilisation. In the political context of the 1960's when the purism was refused and unacceptable – they argued that the protection of language and language prescription is not purism (see a part of the discussion in “*Pri zelenom stole...*” 2014: 117). That is why we today – in interpretation of this period – characterise this demand of new prescription as “hidden” or “moderate” form of purism (see Múcsková 2015).

The further development of Slovak language planning, especially corpus planning, really built a new theory of language culture, which was presented in the linguistics conference in 1966. The main representative of this approach was Jozef Ružička, who presented the so called *Tézy o slovenčine* [*Theses about the Slovak language*], which stressed the independence of the Slovak language with its unique character and development and “kritériá spisovnosti” [“criteria of standard correctness”] (Ružička 1967a, 1967b) according to which the new language items should be assessed as “correct” or “incorrect” – i.e. suitable or bad for official codification. Ružička is also an author of the first proposal of *Language law* published in 1968 focused on protection of Slovak as an independent and original language. This turn in language policy reinforced the authority of prescriptive linguistics and revived the purist, mainly anti-Czech, approaches to the language regulation.

## 5. Conclusion

The development of Slovak literary and standard language, and its intentional regulation, consists of an alternation of divergent and convergent tendencies which are conditioned by extra-linguistic political background. The period of the 1960's is a typical example of such alternation. In the sphere of language planning, we see a fundamental change from the intentional and supported convergence of Slovak and Czech to intentional and supported delimi-

tation of Slovak as an original and independent language. The rejection of any kind of purist regulation (as a sign of bourgeois nationalism) had been changed into the requirement of protection of the standard language from “nonfunctional” borrowings and of necessity to care about it in the intentions of its “internal rules”. But this “care” and “protection” of the language was not viewed as purism – this term had, and still has, a negative connotation in the Slovak prescriptive linguistics.

From the point of view of historical linguistics, I do not want to assess any approach to language regulation as good or bad, useful or detrimental for language. Language itself always exists in some social and political circumstances and it is determined by them. Language, as it is, keeps its functions and fulfils the needs of its users. And in its actual state and structure, it preserves traces of older intentional approaches, social attitudes, regulations, and conflicts.

#### Bibliography:

- AUTY, ROBERT. 1973. The Role of Purism in the Development of the Slavonic Literary Languages. *The Slavonic and East European Review* 51/124. 335–343.
- BĚLIČ, JAROMÍR. 1962. Poměr mezi češtinou a slovenštinou v období socializmu. *Problémy marxistické jazykovědy*. Ed. Bělič, Jaromír; Doležel, Lubomír; Peciar, Štefan. Nakladatelství ČSAV. Praha. 387–402.
- BLANÁR, VINCENT; JÓNA, EUGEN; RUŽIČKA, JOZEF. 1974. *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny II*. SPN. Bratislava.
- BUZÁSSYOVÁ, KLÁRA. 1977. Slovenčina ako stredoeurópsky jazyk. (Na okraj protikladu domáce/cudzie.) *Sociolinguistica Slovaca*. 3. *Slovenčina na konci 20. storočia, jej normy a perspektívy*. Ed. Ondrejovič, Slavomír. Veda. Bratislava. 69–78.
- DOLNÍK, JURAJ. 2010. *Teória spisovného jazyka so zreteľom na spisovnú slovenčinu*. VEDA. Bratislava.
- ĎUROVIČ, ĽUBOMÍR. 2007. Kodifikácia novej spisovnej slovenčiny – predpoklady a kompromisy. *Ludovít Štúr a reč slovenská*. Ed. Ondrejovič, Slavomír. Veda. Bratislava. 21–34.
- FERENČÍK, JÁN. 1964. Na obranu starých materií. *Kultúrny život* 18/1. 8.
- HORÁK, EMIL. 1999. Povaha a genéza slovenského a chorvátskeho jazykového purizmu. *Slovensko-chorvátske jazykové a literárne vzťahy*. Ed. Horák, Emil. T.R.I. Médium. Bratislava. 89–95.
- HORÁK, EMIL. 2007. Slovensko-české filologické paralely z (južno)slavistického aspektu. (Slovanská vzájomnosť a slovanské jazykové konflikty.) *Slavica Slovaca* 42/2. 102–110.

- HORECKÝ, JÁN. 1990a. Jazyková politika v r. 1948 – 1988. *Kultúra slova*. 24/8. 259–265.
- HORECKÝ, JÁN. 1990b. O jazykovej politike v r. 1948 až 1988. *Studia Academica Slovaca*. 19. Prednášky XXVI. letného seminára slovenského jazyka a kultúry. Ed. Mistrík, Jozef. Alfa. Bratislava. 139–150.
- CHORVÁTH, MICHAL. 1964. Jazyk, literatúra, kultúra. *Kultúrny život* 39/1. 7, 10.
- JAROŠOVÁ, ALEXANDRA. 2016. Prítomnosť češtiny na Slovensku a aspekt spisovnosti. *Jazykovedný časopis* 67/1. 5–30.
- Jazykovedné štúdie* 7. *Spisovný jazyk*. 1963. Ed. Ružička, Jozef. Vydavateľstvo slovenskej akadémie vied. Bratislava.
- KRAJČOVIČ, RUDOLF; ŽIGO, PAVOL. 2002. *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny*. Univerzita Komenského. Bratislava.
- LANSTYÁK, ISTVÁN. 2016. Jazykové ideológie (všeobecné otázky a glosár) [http://fphil.uniba.sk/uploads/media/lanstyak\\_2016\\_jazykove-deologie\\_27.01.2016.pdf](http://fphil.uniba.sk/uploads/media/lanstyak_2016_jazykove-deologie_27.01.2016.pdf) (accessed 15<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2016).
- LIPOWSKI, JAROSLAV. 2005. *Konvergence a divergence češtiny a slovenštiny v československém státe*. Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis No 2727. *Slavica Wratislaviensia* CXXXII. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego. Wrocław.
- LIPTÁK, ĽUBOMÍR. 2003. Slovensko v 20. storočí. *Krátke dejiny Slovenska*. Academic Electronic Press. Bratislava. 265–330.
- MÍČANOVIČ, KREŠIMIR. 2008. Hrvatski s naglaskom: standard i jezični varijeteti. Disput. Zagreb.
- MIHÁLIK, VOJTECH. 1964. Staré matere a umývanie murínov. *Kultúrny život*. 27/1. 1, 9.
- MÚCSKOVÁ, GABRIELA. 2013. “Nehatený rozvoj” spisovného jazyka v kultúrnom a politickom kontexte 60. rokov 20. storočia. *Sociolinguistica Slovaca*. 7. *Jazyk a diskurz v kultúrnom a politickom kontexte*. Ed. Ondrejovič, Slavomír; Vrábl'ová, Júlia; Krausová, Anežka. Veda. Bratislava. 91–102.
- MÚCSKOVÁ, GABRIELA. 2015. Polemika o jazyku ako prameň poznávania dejín spisovného jazyka v kontexte jazykovej politiky alebo O purizme v jednej “zabudnutej” diskusii. *Jazykovedné štúdie XXXII. Prirodzený vývin jazyka a jazykové kontakty*. Ed. Balleková, Katarína; Králik, Ľubor; Múcsková, Gabriela. Veda. Bratislava. 567–576.
- PAULINY, EUGEN. 1983. *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny od začiatkov po súčasnosť*. Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo. Bratislava.
- PECIAR, ŠTEFAN. 1962. O vzťahu spisovnej slovenčiny k spisovnej češtine. *Problémy marxistické jazykovedy*. Ed. Bělič, Jaromír; Doležel, Lubomír; Peciar, Štefan. Nakladatelství ČSAV. Praha. 403–416.

- PECIAR, ŠTEFAN. 1964. O nehatený rozvoj. *Kultúrny život* 24/1. 8.
- “Pri zelenom stole – naša reč.” *Návraty k takmer zabudnutej diskusii*. 2014. Ed. Múcsková, Gabriela; Vrábľová, Júlia. Univerzita Komenského. Bratislava.
- RUŽIČKA, JOZEF. 1967a. Problémy jazykovej kultúry. *Kultúra spisovnej slovenčiny*. Ed. Ružička, Jozef. Vydavateľstvo SAV. Bratislava. 9–22.
- RUŽIČKA, JOZEF. 1967b. Tézy o slovenčine. *Kultúra spisovnej slovenčiny*. Ed. Ružička, Jozef. Vydavateľstvo SAV. Bratislava. 283–290.
- RUŽIČKA, JOZEF. 1968. Zákon o slovenčine. *Kultúra slova*. 2/7. 225–228.
- RYCHLÍK, JAN. 1998. *Češi a Slováci ve 20. století: Československé vztahy 1945 – 1992*. Academic Electronic Press – Ústav T. G. Masaryka. Bratislava – Praha.
- THOMAS, GEORGE. 1991. *Linguistic Purism*. Longman. London.
- TRUDGILL, PETER. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Basil Blackwell. Oxford.
- VLAŠIĆ, MARIJA. 2012. *Tradicija purizma u hrvatskom jezikoslovlju*. Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy. Praha.
- WARDHAUGH, RONALD. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Blackwell Publishers. Oxford.
- WEINSTEIN, BRIAN. 1980. Language Planning in Francophone Africa. *Language Problems and Language Planning*. 4/1. 55–77.

## Ideologija buržoazijskoga nacionalizma i njen utjecaj na jezično planiranje u razvoju slovačkoga književnog jezika

### Sažetak<sup>11</sup>

Tema odnosa između slovačkoga i češkoga jezika tema je koja usprkos velikom broju objavljenih radova još uvijek nije dostatno obrađena i iscrpljena. S razvojem sociolingvističkih i pragmalingvističkih pristupa otvara mogućnosti za nove spoznaje o razvoju jezika i njegovoj uvjetovanosti izvanjezičnim čimbenicima.

Razvoj slovačkoga književnog jezika od njegova je nastanka popraćen diskusijama, polemikama i smjenjivanjem delimitacijskih odnosno asimilacijskih nastojanja. Svjesne regulacijske težnje proizlaze iz aktualnih strategija jezičnoga planiranja i iz politički uvjetovane jezične ideologije, a usmjerene su ponajprije na utjecaj češkoga jezika na slovački. S jedne strane bilo je razdoblja svjesnoga zbližavanja obaju jezika i potpore češkim posuđenicama u slovačkom

---

<sup>11</sup> I want to thank dr. sc. Siniša Habijanec, PhD., for translation the text of the Summary into Croatian.



(početak 30-ih i 60-ih godina 20. stoljeća), s druge strane, te su politički motivirane tendencije izazivale purističke i delimitacijske tendencije (puristički pokret međuratnoga razdoblja, te razdoblje tzv. „prikrivenoga purizma” druge polovice 60-ih godina).

U radu se detaljnije bavimo razdobljem 50-ih i 60-ih godina 20. stoljeća, koje je omeđeno velikim političkim promjenama – od razdoblja staljinskoga kulta ličnosti i, često namjenski zloupotrebjavane, borbe protiv buržoazijskoga nacionalizma, preko razdoblja jačanja praškoga političkog centralizma sve do političkoga i društvenoga otvaranja u drugoj polovici 60-ih godina. Politička se atmosfera neposredno odražavala i u pristupima književnom jeziku. Na kraju 50-ih i početku 60-ih godina promicano je svjesno i politički poduprto nastojanje za približavanjem češkoga i slovačkoga jezika u ime stvaranja zajedničke terminologije i leksičkoga fonda dvaju bratskih socijalističkih naroda. Niži stupanj usvojenosti književnoga jezika i jak utjecaj češkoga jezika u Slovačkoj uzrokovali su veliku nedosljednost i varijantnost u standardnoj jezičnoj praksi. U skladu s politički motiviranom težnjom k približavanju dvaju jezika prodor čeških elemenata u slovački standardni diskurs jezična je preskripcija smatrala prirodnim. I obratno: nastojanja za očuvanjem jezične „čistoće” te ograničavanje prodora bohemizama bila su vrednovana kao nešto neželjeno i često su se povezivala s purističkim pokretom međuratnoga razdoblja koji se u novim političkim okolnostima poimao kao iskaz buržoazijskoga nacionalizma.

Godine 1964. na stranicama časopisa *Kultúrny život* rasplamsala se oštra diskusija u kojoj su ponajprije literarno aktivne ličnosti (književnici, prevoditelji i urednici) uputili kritiku jezičnoj kulturi književnoga jezika u medijima i službenoj komunikaciji, pretjeranom preuzimanju čeških elemenata, kao i kritiku jezikoslovcima koji nedovoljno štite čistoću književnoga jezika. Čuo se i zahtjev za stvaranjem nove teorije jezične kulture koja je konačno implementirana nakon 1966. godine prihvaćanjem tzv. književnojezičnih kriterija te Teza o slovačkom jeziku.

U dosadašnjim radovima o povijesti slovačkoga književnog jezika razdoblje 50-ih i 60-ih godina nije relevantno vrednovano, pri čemu ide o razmjerno kratak period u kojem je nastupio temeljni obrat u pristupu slovačkomu književnom jeziku i reguliranju njegova razvoja. Te promjene proizlaze ponajprije iz izvanjezičnih – političkih i ideoloških događaja.

Ključne riječi: slovački jezik, češki jezik, jezični kontakt, jezično planiranje, purizam

Keywords: Slovak language, Czech language, language contact, language planning, purism

