Peter Hill

Post-1989 Lexical Changes in the Slavonic Languages

1. Language Change

1.1 Introduction

I use the term ‘language change’ even though, according to Andersen, we should avoid the expression: ‘the word “change” has come to be more of a liability than an asset’ (1989, 11). According to Andersen we should instead speak of ‘innovations’. Normally an innovation arises and then exists side-by-side with a traditional form until the latter disappears and only the innovation remains. The language has not actually ‘changed’. James Milroy (2003) reminds us that languages are not organisms and therefore they cannot change as organisms change: what happens is that different speakers use variant forms, and in some cases the same speaker uses variant forms even within the same conversation. There may come a time when no one uses certain forms any more and then we can say that there has been a ‘change’. Language changes not only spontaneously. Language changes can be engineered by language planning. Many linguists have expressed doubts whether it is possible to change people’s speech habits by administrative means but the examples adduced e.g. by Ernst Jahr (1989) show that even radical changes can be effected by language planning.

I will focus here on changes in Russian, which are of the unplanned sort, and in Croatian, where they are planned or at least actively encouraged. I found it difficult to devise a satisfactory title for this paper. I chose 1989 as the emblematic year when the Berlin Wall fell and the Stalinist system came to an end, but changes in language do not happen overnight. The changes that I will be talking about began in Russia with perestroika (from 1985). In Croatia the changes accelerated after independence in 1991, but they reflect developments going back to the 1960s.

1.2 Revolutions and language change

Perestroika in the Soviet Union (from 1985), the collapse of the authoritarian régimes in eastern, central and south-eastern Europe in 1989, the disintegration of Yugoslavia and that of the Soviet Union in 1991 were

ASEES, Vol 20, Nos 1-2 (2006): 173-193.

revolutions and revolutions usually have clear consequences for language. Today I don't think that anyone would dispute this (Panzer 2000; Zemskaja 2000; Zybatow [Hrsg.] 2000). In 1989 (1989, 243) Ureland states: 'Language functions in time, space and the social dimension and changes according to its communicative roles'; further (1989, 251), 'a linguistic change does not come about without social and political causes'. Blount and Sanches (1977, 4) enumerate 'external social forces that may bring about change': 'invasions, conquests, contact, trade, migrations, institutional changes and restructuring, social movements, and revolutions. Essentially any radical social change (...) brings about a restructuring of the communication system(s), thereby producing language change'.

However, this does not mean that I subscribe to the doctrine of Marrism. During the Soviet era, Nikolaj Jakovlevič Marr (1864-1934) propounded the vulgar-Marxist theory that language as part of the social superstructure changed its typological character when the economic base changed, as it did in Russia after the October Revolution. When Stalin finally repudiated the theory in 1950[1], Soviet linguistics was forced into the opposite position, that of denying that social changes affected language at all, and it was some years before sociolinguistics, which had flourished after the October Revolution, could resume (Girke/Jachnow 1974).

Just as it is patently absurd to claim that any language changes its typological character during a revolution, it is equally obvious that revolutions do cause changes in language. One feature of the French language that changed after the French Revolution was the 'change' from [wa] to [we] as in *moi*. Louis XIV is often quoted as having said *L'état, c'est moi*, with the final word pronounced [mwa], but in fact he would have said [mwe], which was then the standard pronunciation. What actually happened during and after the revolution? The diphthong written <oi> had been pronounced [wa] before the revolution, but this pronunciation was considered substandard, while the nobility used [we]. After the revolution, many people that used the [wa]-pronunciation achieved positions of social influence and their pronunciation was now accepted as standard, while the [we]-pronunciation died out with the nobility. Similar things happened in Russia after the October Revolution, for exactly the same reasons.

---

[1]In *Pravda*; later reprinted as Stalin 1951.

1.3 Changes in Russian after the October Revolution

Before the October Revolution, most Russians were illiterate. While members of the educated classes had always learned standard Russian aurally from their parents and their peers, the previously illiterate peasants and workers now acquired this variety through reading and writing, and their pronunciation, which reflected spelling conventions (‘spelling pronunciations’), became dominant in the Soviet Union. Many of the changes in Russian pronunciation during the Soviet era can be seen as a result of this phenomenon. According to the Old Moscow Norm (OMN), which prevailed among the educated throughout Russia before the October Revolution, дождь ‘rain’ was pronounced [doš:’], pl. [daž’d’í], but in contemporary standard Russian we hear predominantly, following the spelling, [došt’] – [dažd’í]. OMN во[ž’:]и ‘reins’ has largely given way to contemporary standard во[ž:][ы], with long non-palatalized [ž:], as in уе[ž:]ать, which has generally replaced уе[ž’:]ать (Ward 1965, 35f.; Comrie/Stone 1978, 30). In the case of the nominative singular masculine form of adjectives with stems ending in velars, the OMN has practically disappeared and given way to the spelling pronunciation [-g^j], [-k^j], [-x^j], with a front vowel in the ending and a palatalized final stem consonant (Comrie/Stone 1978, 37f.). The OMN /platít’: plačú, plótiš’, plót’ut/ ‘pay’ is now unacceptable in standard speech, which has /plačú, plátiš’, plát’at/, following the orthography. In the reflexive/passive particle, which is written -ся, the consonant was not palatalized in OMN pronunciation. In contemporary standard Russian, orthoepic usage varies a great deal, but the spelling pronunciation with a palatalized consonant now predominates (Comrie/Stone 1978, 36ff.).

1.4 An example from Austrian German

Dressler (1997, 114ff.) quotes an interesting example of a phonological change in Austrian German that spread apparently from the speech of children. It is the monophthongization of the diphthong in, for example, *weit* ‘wide’: conservative Austrian pronunciation [vaet], now increasingly [væ:t]. This change spread rapidly, according to Dressler, with the emancipation and upward social mobility of working-class people in the twentieth century and its spread was accelerated after World War II when Austrians strove to dissociate themselves from Germany and its standard pronunciation.

1.5 Post-1989 changes in the Slavonic languages

The post-1989 changes in the Slavonic languages appear to relate almost entirely to the lexicon, although there are some pragmatic changes and in Croatia some morphosyntactic and phonological phenomena have now been codified that were previously considered to be solecisms or dialectalisms. In the reflexive/passive construction, e.g. *Vidi se lijepu kuću* (acc.) 'One can see a fine house', literally 'A fine house is seen', the logical object would be the grammatical subject in classical neoštokavian, i.e. *Vidi se lijepa kuća* (nom.) In the newly codified construction the verb is construed as impersonal and the object is in the accusative (see, e.g., *Hrvatska gramatika* 1995, pp. 453ff.). This development is probably influenced by Italian where, in the substandard, we have constructions such as *Affittasi monolocali* 'One-bedroom flats to rent', *Vendesi appartamenti* 'Apartments for sale', where the verb is also construed as impersonal and therefore does not agree with the logical object.

Quantifying constructions in neoštokavian require that the noun be governed by the numeral and used in the genitive, even following a preposition that would normally govern a different case, as in *ravnopravnost sa ostala tri jezika* (gen.) *SFRJ* 'equality with the other three languages of the SFRY', whereas in contemporary Croatian, as for instance in the kajkavian dialect group, there is a tendency to place the dependent noun in the case required by the preposition: *ravnopravnost s ostalim trima jezicima SFRJ*, cf. also štokavian *ravnopravnost ostala tri jezika* (gen. sg., governed by the numeral) vs. *ravnopravnost ostalih triju jezika* (NP in the gen. pl., including the numeral) 'the equality of the other three languages'.

Zagreb is in the kajkavian-speaking area, but, in the nineteenth century, led by the Illyrian Movement, Croatians accepted neoštokavian as the basis for their standard language. However, the standard Zagreb accentuation of the reflexes of the old jat' has never accorded with that of classical neoštokavian (*dijéte* 'child' for classical neoštokavian *dijète, rijéka* 'river' for classical neoštokavian *rijèka*). The Zagreb (and generally Croatian) accentuation has now been codified and thus recognized as standard: instead of classical neoštokavian *dijète* 'child', orthoepic sources now accept *dijéte* as standard; similarly, for classical neoštokavian *rijèka* 'river' the dictionaries now indicate the Zagreb usage *rijéka* as standard (see, e.g. *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, Zagreb 2000; cf. also Vukušić 1982; 1984).

These are not new phenomena, but they have now been codified and thus officially classified as standard in Croatia. In Russian Zemskaja (2000, 42ff.) notes a rise in analytical and agglutinative characteristics.

2. Post-Perestroika Changes in Russian

In Russian the following phenomena have been noted (cf. also Ryazanova-Clarke/Wade 1999):

(1) There are neologisms to denote features of the *novoe myšlenie*, which Gorbačev introduced, and neologisms, many borrowed from English, to describe the new realities of capitalist Russia, e.g. *konsalting* (консалтинг), *sponsor* (спонсор) 'sponsor', *privatizirovat'* 'to privatize', *autsajder obščestva* 'outsider, social outcast', *deideologizacija* 'depoliticization', *tenevik* 'shady businessman', but also calques like *pravovoe gosudarstvo* (Ger *Rechtsstaat*) 'state based on the rule of law', and original formations such as *prjamoj ėfir* 'direct/live (broadcast)', *belye pjatna istorii* 'blank spots in history', 'skeletons in the historical cupboard'. There are also new stump compounds such as *xozrasčet* 'operation on a self-supporting basis; self-financing' (from *xozjajstvennyj rasčet* 'economic calculation'), also *terakt* 'act of terrorism'.

(2) On the other hand, there are terms that used to refer to aspects of Soviet reality that are now obsolete, such as *partorg* 'local Party boss', *CK partii* 'Central Committee of the Party', and even *partija* 'the Party'. Anderson notes that certain expressions characteristic of Soviet propaganda are now used much less, e.g. *trudjaščiesja* 'the workers', but also *velikij* 'great', *vysokij* 'high, lofty', *vospitanie* 'education', *vospityva'* 'to educate'. On this latter he writes: '*Vospitanie* deliberately casts the person in the role of child, belittling the citizen and the society relative to the Party. Russians were conscious of this meaning. Shown a Brezhnev speech in 1993 as part of an experimental study, a Muscovite spontaneously volunteered the comment that the speech pursues an entirely deliberate goal... of lulling the people to sleep, persuading them of the thought that without the Communist Party they are nowhere, like a little child without its mother.' Some typically Soviet expressions are now used ironically: *Idu vypolnjat' dolg pered rodinoj* 'I'm going to fulfil my duty to our homeland', 'I'm off to work' (Zemskaja 2000, 41). I call this 'de-Sovietization of the lexicon'.

(3) Lexemes that previously referred exclusively to phenomena outside the Soviet Union are now part of everyday life: *častnaja kompanija* 'private company', *menedžer* 'manager', *boss* 'boss', *prem'er-ministr* 'Prime Minister'[2] ('Glava pravitel'stva v nekotoryx kapitalističeskix gosudarstvax' ['Head of Government in certain capitalist countries']: *Slovar' russkogo jazyka* [MAS] III 1981 2nd edn., 379), *kabinet* 'cabinet', *blagotvoritel'nost'* 'charity' ('In bourgeois society: giving of material help to the indigent by private persons': *Slovar' russkogo jazyka* [MAS] I 1981 2nd edn., 96), *mėr* 'mayor'. I call this change 'foreign → domestic' (Ryazanova-Clarke/Wade 1999: 're-oriented words', Eckert/Sternin 2004, 46 'nostrification'). These terms do not all have positive connotations: the new Russian reality also has negative imports from other countries, such as *bezrabotica* 'unemployment', *vorotila* 'tycoon', *mafija* 'mafia', *rėket* 'racket', *rėketir* 'racketeer'. Duličenko (1994, 159ff.) lists *zabastovka* 'strike', *birža* 'stock exchange', *bednjak* 'pauper' and *bogač* 'wealthy person' under his *vozvraščenie zabytogo* 'the return of forgotten items'. In Soviet-era dictionaries, *bezrabotica* is illustrated with examples such as *Socializm ne znaet bezraboticy* 'There is no unemployment under socialism' (Ožegov, *Slovar' russkogo jazyka* 1978, 42) or *My uničtožili bezraboticu – tot strašnyj bič dlja rabočego klassa kapitalističeskix stran* ('We have obliterated unemployment – that dreadful scourge of the working class in the capitalist countries': Kirov, *Stat'i i reči* 1934, cited in *Slovar' russkogo jazyka* [MAS] I 1981, 2nd edn., 75). An interesting case is *vlast'* 'power, authority'. *Vlast'* now often means simply 'the government, the authorities', a usage unthinkable in Soviet times. In Soviet times there were expressions such as *narodnaja vlast'* 'popular power' and *Sovetskaja vlast'* 'the Soviet system', but the government was not referred to simply as *vlast'*.

(4) Lexemes referring to phenomena that were part of Russian life and administration before the October Revolution have been revived, e.g. *duma* (the Russian parliament), *gubernator* 'governor (of a Russian province)', *departament* '(government) department', *rossijanin* 'Russian citizen', *gimnazija* 'grammar school' and *licej* 'lycée', *kupečestvo* 'the merchants', but also religious terminology such as *duxovnik* 'confessor' and Church-Slavonic lexemes such as *blagočinie* 'decorum'. I call these 'revived' or 'reactivated

---

[2]His official title is actually *predsedatel' soveta ministrov* 'Chairman of the Council of Ministers'

lexemes'. Duličenko (1994, 159ff.) includes this phenomenon within his category of 'the return of forgotten items'.

(5) Certain lexemes that previously had a negative connotation are now considered to be neutral, e.g. *biznes* 'business', *sdelka* 'business deal', *konkurencija* 'competition', *lobbizm* 'lobbying' (cf. Bojcov 1991, 24ff.). The word 'soviet' has acquired a negative connotation, as in the contemporary quotation *Servis tut byl vpolne sovetskim* 'The service [in the hotel] was totally soviet', i.e. very bad. These are 'stylistic shifts' (Ryazanova-Clarke/Wade 1999: 're-connotation').

As Zybatow (1995, 81ff.) points out under the heading *Stereotypen im Wandel* ('changing stereotypes'), some traditional lexemes are used differently by different groups of people, e.g. the 'Democrats' use *svoboda* in a collocation such as *svoboda slova* 'freedom of speech', or they use the plural *svobody* 'freedoms characteristic of civil society'. When 'Democrats' talk of *svoboda*, meaning the freedom of the individual, 'Conservatives' stress *bratstvo* 'fraternity', i.e. *ravenstvo* 'equality'.

(6) There are also neologisms that have been coined to refer to the Soviet era. Such expressions have a negative connotation, e.g. *komandno-administrativnyj socializm* 'command socialism' (also *kazarmennyj socializm* 'parade-ground socialism': Duličenko 1994, 147), *totalitarnyj stil' rukovodstva* 'totalitarian administrative style' (Bojcov 1991, 23) or *sovok* (slang) 'person with Soviet mentality'[3]. I call these 'negative neologisms'.

(7) Some lexemes have been reinterpreted: during perestroika *levyj* 'left' came to designate the radicals, i.e. economic liberals, while *pravyj* 'right' referred to the conservative, anti-reformist communists (Ryazanova-Clarke/Wade 1999, 72). These are 'denotational shifts'.

(8) Lexemes that previously never appeared in print – vulgarisms, 'four-letter words' or in Russian *necenzurnye slova* 'words that would not pass the censorship', *mat* 'vulgar language', *molodežnyj žargon* 'youth slang' and *obščij žargon* general slang – are now used both in newspapers and in artistic

[3] Homonymous with *sovok* 'trowel'; here it is a suffixal formation from the stump *sov* as in *sovxoz*. According to Eckert/Sternin (2004, 107) *sovok* in this sense is now already obsolete.

literature[4], and there is now an excellent dictionary of them, *Bol'šoj slovar' russkogo žargona* 'Large dictionary of Russian slang' (St Petersburg 2000), with copious quotations from contemporary newspapers, especially newspapers aimed at young people, such as *Komsomol'skaja pravda* and *Moskovskij komsomolec*, and artistic literature. I call this 'resurfacing of the substandard', although it is rather the 'appearance in print' of the substandard. Zybatow (1995, 185) takes Duličenko to task for calling this phenomenon *leksičeskaja vul'garizacija* 'lexical vulgarization': it is, he argues, rather *vul'garizacija pragmatičeskaja* 'pragmatic vulgarization', the lexemes in question not being new, but now appearing in written styles, where they were previously practically unknown. For Zybatow (1995, 233ff.), the Russian language is undergoing a radical reorganization of its functional styles. In newspaper reports journalists flout former conventions, whether lexical or syntactic. The political joke, formerly restricted to the intimate oral sphere, is now established as a text type in the written media, with a rich vein of intertextual parody on Soviet 'newspeak'. And Zybatow (1995, 242ff.) points to other sources of innovation in Russian journalism, such as 'Odessa Russian' and *magnitofonnaja kul'tura* 'oral samizdat'.

Some 'jargonisms' refer to phenomena that did not officially exist in the Soviet Union, such as *alkaš* 'alkie', *abortmaxer* 'back-yard abortionist' (Honselaar 2002). Some expressions have moved from the substandard or even from thieves' cant to being merely colloquial, often used in the media or in political invective, sometimes acquiring a metaphorical meaning: *černucha* 'muck-raking, negative writing', *bespredel* 'lawlessness, crime', now colloquial, 'chaos, mess', *močit'* 'to bump off', now 'to lay into, savage', or *tusovka* 'gathering of thieves to plan a crime', now simply 'get-together', *postavit' na sčetčik, vključit' sčetčik* 'to threaten to bump someone off if he fails to cough up', now simply 'to put on notice', e.g. *Rossiju stavjat na sčetčik* 'Russia has been put on notice' (newspaper headline) (Zemskaja 2000).

Of course it is not always possible to date the appearance of a lexical change. While words from the economic sphere, such as *konsalting*, clearly date from perestroika, others, such as *seks*, while they may well now be more

[4] There was a similar development immediately after the October Revolution, until Stalin re-introduced 'law and order' in the language, as in other areas of life (Panzer 2000, 3; Bierich 2000).

frequent than before perestroika, have been around at least since the 1960s. The word *seks* – referring to sex in Japan (not in the Soviet Union!) – was first recorded in *Izvestija* of 31 May 1964 (*Novye slova i značenija* 1973). Anglicisms are by no means exclusively a post-perestroika phenomenon. Post-World-War-II Soviet youth slang was full of anglicisms. The heady sixties and seventies resonated in the Soviet Union as well with terms such as *xippi, bitnik, xipster, daun, polis, isteblišment*. Youth-speak was an anti-language with its own anti-lexicon. 'If it's Western, its hip' was the motto then as it is now (Davie 1997; Eckert/Sternin 2004, 43ff.). English penetrated above all via western pop music, which young people listened to, via short-wave radio and black-market recordings. While this youth slang did not normally appear in print, there was some research, mainly by non-Soviet scholars, and during the brief liberalization of the early 1960s known as the 'Third Thaw' more realism, including immediacy in language, was possible in artistic literature, as in Vasilij Aksenov's *Na polputi k lune* 'Half-way to the moon' (1962).

Some lexemes fit into more than one category, e.g. *predprinimatel'stvo* 'the entrepreneurs; entrepreneurial spirit; entrepreneurial activity' was used in Russia before the October Revolution. During the Soviet era it could be applied, if it was used at all, only to phenomena outside the Soviet Union.

3. Post-1989 Lexical Changes in Other Slavonic Languages

3.1 Changes as in Russian

All these changes are more or less characteristic of all the post-Stalinist languages (cf. various articles in Panzer 2000), including even German in Eastern Germany (Clyne 1993), but there are some interesting developments in individual Slavonic languages.

3.2 Bulgarian

An interesting phenomenon in Bulgaria is the use of Turkish lexemes for stylistic purposes, especially in the press. Bulgaria was part of the Ottoman Empire for almost 500 years and naturally many Turkish lexemes entered everyday Bulgarian speech. When Bulgarian was codified towards the end of the nineteenth century, the fate of these so-called Turkisms was threefold:

(1) Turkisms for everyday realia survived, because there were no replacements or because replacing them would have been too difficult.

(2) Historicisms naturally became obsolete.

(3) Most Turkisms, however, were deliberately replaced with borrowings from Russian or western languages. These Turkisms were then relegated to the substandard sphere, whence they have now resurfaced as an extremely effective stylistic device.

When the Bulgarian Prime Minister Kostov presented his economic plans to the IMF, the headline in one Bulgarian newspaper read: *Aškolsun* (Tk. *Aşkolsun!*) 'Good on you!' Or in a leading article deriding the Bulgarian attitude to tall poppies: *Kato sa tolkova* ***akălii****, da se opravjat sami!* 'If they're so **clever**, let them take care of themselves!' (Tk. *akıllı*)[5].

3.3 The Purification/ Restoration/ De-X-ification of the National Language (Croatian, Bosnian, Macedonian, Slovakian, Ukrainian)

Croatian, Bosnian and Macedonian nationalists resent what they see as the Yugoslavianization or Serbianization of the national language during the Yugoslavian era while Slovaks and Ukrainians resent the 'Bohemianization' or 'Russification' respectively of the Slovakian or Ukrainian lexicon during the Czechoslovakian or Soviet era. In Croatia, Bosnia/Hercegovina and Macedonia nationalist governments have promoted the de-Serbianization of the national language and the 'restoration' of its 'purity'. Croatian language planning in the post-Yugoslavian era has been explicitly referred to by Croatian nationalists as the 're-Croatization' of the national language. Similarly, Bosnian nationalists say that their language-planning efforts aim to restore the Bosnian character of their language. Bosnian linguists claim that Bosnian literary sources were neglected in 'Serbo-Croatian' lexicography and hence Bosnian lexical items were not registered (Völkl 2002).

In Bosnian today, Islamic expressions (Orientalisms) are now much in evidence: *avaz* 'voice, sound, clamour', today 'newspaper' (*Dnevni avaz* 'daily newspaper'), *džehenem* 'hell', *šejtan* 'Satan', *dženaza* '(muslim) funeral', *ahiret* 'heaven', *dunjaluk* 'this world'. Greetings are now *selam alejkum* (on meeting) and *alahemanet* (on taking one's leave) rather than the traditional Sr Cro *dobar dan!* 'Good morning'. Even in everyday vocabulary, Orientalisms are preferred to Slavonic lexemes, as in *hasta* 'ill' (Sr Cro *bolestan*), *pendžer* 'window' (Sr Cro *prozor*), *adet* 'custom' (Sr Cro *običaj*), *fajda* 'profit, use' (Sr

[5] On Turkisms in Bulgarian cf. Grannes/Hauge /Süleymanoğlu 2002.

Cro *korist, dobit*), *haber* 'news' (Sr Cro *vijest, obavijest*), *hajirli* (adj.) 'favourable' (also as an interjection: 'good luck!'). In many words the historic velar fricative /x/, orthographic <h>, which was lost in neoštokavian, the historical basis of the standard language, and which used to be considered a colloquial feature, has been restored, e.g. in *kahva* 'coffee' (Sr *kafa*, Cro *kava*), *lahko* 'easy' (Sr Cro *lako*), and there are even 'hyper-Bosnianisms', where a non-historical /x/ has been inserted, as in *hudovica* 'widow' (Sr Cro *udovica*). These forms have an 'ethnic label'. But there are also neologisms of Slavonic origin, such as *okomica* 'heritage'. Where there is no distinctive Bosnian lexeme, marked Croatian items appear to be preferred to Serbian ones (Šipka 2002; Völkl 2002).

In Ukrainian the attempt to de-Russify the national language is having some bizarre results. Russian has two different words for two different shades of 'blue': *sinij* and *goluboj*, while Ukrainian has three: *synij*, *holubyj* and *blakytnyj*. They are not interchangeable. Ukrainian and Russian are here clearly not semantically isomorphic. However, many Ukrainian nationalists see *holubyj* as a Russianism and avoid it. If this continues, Ukrainian will end up with only two words for 'blue', *synij* and *blakytnyj*, and will thus be semantically isomorphic with Russian or at least much closer to it; but, as has been variously pointed out (e.g. in Ross 2003) the external form of the lexicon is felt to be emblematic, whereas semantic isomorphy is not visible and is therefore not noticed by nationalists. To add to this bizarre story, *blakytnyj* is a Polonism, and so, if the Ukrainian nationalists were consistent, they would eliminate this lexeme as well; but Russianisms are seen as a threat to the linguistic autonomy of Ukrainian, while Polonisms are not. On the contrary, Polonisms are seen as an excellent method of de-Russifying Ukrainian. Another example is *potjah* (Pol *pociąg*) for *pojizd* (Ru *poezd*) 'train' (Mokienko 2000; Javorska 2000; on language policy in the former Soviet republics cf. Dietrich 2005).

4. ‘New Croatian’ (*novogovor* ‘newspeak’, *novohrvatski* ‘new Croatian’, *hadezeovština* ‘HDZ-Speak’ [HDZ – *Hrvatska demokratska zajednica* ‘Croatian Democratic Union’]

4.1 Introduction

There are three dialect groups in the central South-Slavonic area: štokavian, kajkavian and čakavian. The largest is štokavian, but the Croatian capital, Zagreb, is in the kajkavian area. All three dialect groups produced a considerable body of literature. In the nineteenth century Croatian nationalists took the decision that štokavian should be the basis of the Croatian national language and towards the end of the nineteenth century the official policy was to create a common standard language with the Serbs, hence the term ‘Serbo-Croatian’ (although this term was coined in German[6] and never became popular in either Croatia or Serbia). This was the policy of the the so-called *hrvatski vukovci*, that is, the Croatian followers of the Serbian language reformer Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787-1864).

From about 1960 onwards a group of influential Croatian linguists, especially Ljudevit Jonke and, later, Dalibor Brozović, put forward the view that the codification of Croatian had been too exclusively focussed on štokavian and had neglected the kajkavian heritage. In Yugoslavia this view was seen as separatist and in the 1970s its proponents were persecuted (Brozović, for instance, was sent to a provincial university).

After Croatia became independent Croatian newspapers were full of new words. They were normally immediately comprehensible, partly from the context, partly because they were formed from indigenous morphemes according to productive derivational patterns. The sources of these neologisms were many and varied, but they included the Croatian Academy of Sciences and the Croatian government, which also sought to influence linguistic developments: Dalibor Brozović was one of President Tudjman's closest political advisers. Both Tudjman and Brozović made statements in favour of an active purist language policy in Croatia. Croatian nationalists see the Yugoslavian phase in their history as an attempt to obliterate their cultural

[6] Apparently by Jacob Grimm in 1818 (*serbisch-kroatisch*). It was used by the highly influential Slovenian writer and Austrian *Zensor* Jernej (Bartholomaeus) Kopitar in 1836 (*dialecto illyrica, rectius Serbochrovatica, sive Chrovatoserbica* ‘the Illyrian dialect, more correctly Serbocroatian or Croatoserbian’): Lencek 1976.

identity, including their linguistic distinctiveness. It is therefore axiomatic for them that Croatian independence entails a reassertion of Croatian linguistic distinctiveness. They see this policy essentially as one of restoring the Croatian character of the language by ridding it of Yugoslavian or Serbian elements.

The media in the Republic of Croatia employ proof-readers, who examine all texts before they are printed or broadcast: the proof-readers correct the texts with regard to style and they also 'Croatize' them if necessary. Questions of language are discussed in the journal *Jezik*, which is devoted to the cultivation of the language (Ger *Redekultur*, E also 'linguistic ecology'). This journal conducts an annual competition for the 'best' and 'worst' word of the year ('najbolja i najgora riječ godine'). There is an institution called the *Odjel za kulturu hrvatskoga jezika* 'Language Culture Section' where Croats can ring and ask for advice on questions of language. There are also various works on usage, such as *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik*, a sort of Croatian style manual, published by the Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje in Zagreb in 1999, cf. also Mamić 1997. Vladimir Brodnjak's extensive 'Differential Serbian-Croatian Dictionary' (*Razlikovni rječnik srpskog i hrvatskog jezika*) saw a number of editions in the 1990s, becoming something of a 'bible' for Croatian purists anxious to avoid any lexeme considered to be a 'Serbism'. An oft quoted instance of semantic differentiation is *odojče* Cro 'piglet' but Sr 'infant' (Mamić 1997, 14ff.). A less emotive example is *obitelj* Cro 'family', Sr only 'monastic community', as also in Cro, vs. Sr *porodica* 'family', Cro 'extended family' or 'family' in the metaphorical sense (Mamić 1997, 139ff.).

The first such differential dictionary was apparently Petar Guberina's and Kruno Krstić's comparatively modest *Razlike između hrvatskoga i srpskoga književnog jezika* ('Differences between the Croatian and Serbian Standard Languages', Zagreb 1940). This project was tainted by its association with the Ustaša régime. Understandably, it vanished from sight after World War II, though it was reprinted by Croatian émigrés in Mainz in 1977. Jovan Ćirilov's *Hrvatsko-srpski rječnik inačica* ('Croatian-Serbian Dictionary of Variants', Beograd 1989) reflected a very different aim, practical rather than ideological: Ćirilov, a Serb, recognized differences in usage between Belgrade and Zagreb and wished, so he explains, to catalogue them so as to facilitate communication between Yugoslavia's two leading republics.

These differences were not invented by Ustaša sympathizers, as has sometimes been alleged. There is a long-standing, rich, distinctively Croatian

lexical tradition, reflected in such lexicographic works as, e.g., Ivan Mažuranić and Jakov Užarević's *Deutsch-illirisches Wörterbuch* ('German-Illyrian Dictionary': Zagreb 1842), Bogoslav Šulek's *Deutsch-kroatisches Wörterbuch* ('German-Croatian Dictionary' Zagreb 1860) and his *Hrvatsko-njemačko-talijanski rječnik znanstvenog nazivlja* ('Dictionary of Scientific Terminology' Zagreb 1874-1875). Mažuranić and Užarević sought to expand the vocabulary for the standard language by borrowing from sister-languages such as Czech and Russian. Šulek and the Zagreb School borrowed from these sources, too, as well as from the kajkavian and čakavian dialects, but they also created new words from native lexical resources. These lexicographers have left their mark on the standard, even if many of their lexemes proved stillborn (Jonke 1965 [1971, 185]; Ivić 1984 [1990, 124]). This tradition continued even after the official adoption of the Vukovian principles at the end of the nineteenth century (cf. Ivić 1984 [1990,128]) and was not obliterated by the 'translation' into Vukovian neoštokavian of the works of Croatian classical writers such as August Šenoa (cf. also Brozović 1978; Auburger 1991,16-17). Since the 1970s Croatian linguists have been researching their national lexicographical traditions. Today the earliest dictionaries serve as a source of Croatian lexemes, e.g. the dictionary of Juraj Habdelić 1670 or those published in the nineteenth or early twentiethth centuries, such as Parčić 1901. The result of such research is published in the journal *Jezik*, or other journals, e.g. in 1991 in *Rasprave Zavoda za hrvatski jezik* there is an article on Croatian electoral terminology 'Hrvatsko izborno nazivlje' by Marko Lukenda and Mile Mamić. They examined the history of Croatian electoral terminology, beginning with the *Juridisch-politische Terminologie: Deutsch-kroatische, serbische und slowenische Separatausgabe* (Wien 1853). Such research always leads to suggestions for appropriate terms for use in the Republic of Croatia, which were taken seriously by state authorities under HDZ governments.

Brozović gave a programmatic lecture on 15 October 1993 in which he put forward the view that the indigenous Croatian language traditions had been suppressed since the formation of the first Yugoslavian state in 1918. Brozović admitted that there was resistance to the language reforms promoted by the HDZ. Resistance came from three different groups. Firstly, there were the so-called *jugonostalgičari*, those that regret the passing of Yugoslavia, a group destined to die out, according to Brozović. The second group were young people, who did not see why they should abandon expressions that they had

been using all their life. Brozović gave as an example the historical expression *pričuvni časnik* 'officer of the reserve', instead of the Yugoslavian expression *rezervni oficir*. Brozović stressed that these were not neologisms but old Croatian expressions that had now been revived (often they were part of the terminology used in Austria-Hungary). The third recalcitrant group named by Brozović were certain intellectuals, who were familiar with international terminology and saw no reason to adopt indigenous Croatian terms.

4.2 The language of the Croatian press

The features of Contemporary Standard Croatian, as reflected in the language of the Croatian press, are the following:

(a) an increase in the proportion of typically Croatian, especially native (Slavonic) formations (Cro *kovanice* 'newly coined words') where Sr often prefers borrowed words: *bojišnica* 'front (in war)' (Sr *fronta*), *putovnica* 'passport' (Sr *pasoš* < Hungarian †*passzus*), *domovnica* 'identity card' (Sr *lična karta*), *zemljovid* 'map' (Sr *mapa, geografska karta*), *oporba* 'opposition' (Sr *opozicija*), *vatrodojavni sustav* 'fire-alarm system' (Sr would use an expression such as *alarmni požarni sistem*), *tiskovna konferencija* 'press conference' (Sr *konferencija za štampu*), *svjetonazor* (Ger *Weltanschauung*) 'world view' (Sr. *pogled na svet*), *velezgoditnjak* 'person who hit the jackpot (*zgoditak*)' (here Serbian apparently has no equivalent).

(b) revived/reactivated lexemes (*oživljenice*): *župan* 'district prefect', *satnik* 'captain (mil.)', *djelatnik* 'employee' (cf. Kalogjera 2002, 117), *vjerodajnica* 'credentials' (Tafra/Bratanić 2002, 138)

(c) an increase in the proportion of kajkavian forms. The increase in kajkavian elements leads to greater proximity to Contemporary Standard Slovenian because of their common lexicological heritage. Thus words such as *učinkovit* (Sln *učinkovit*) 'effective' (replacing Serbian/štokavian *efikasan, d(j)elotvoran*) are now shared by Croatian and Sln, but not by Sr. Other examples: *veleposlanik* 'ambassador' (Sr *ambasador*, Sln *veleposlanik*), *nazočan* 'present' (Sr *prisutan*, Sln *navzoč, prisoten*); *pozornost* 'attention' (Sr *pažnja*, Sln *pozornost*); *zahtjevan* 'demanding' (Sln *zahteven,* Sr no equivalent); *glede* (Sln *glede*) 'as regards, regarding'; *opskrbiti* (Sr *snabdeti*, Sln *oskrbovati, preskrbeti*) 'to provide'; *rabiti* 'to use' (Sln *rabiti*, Sr *upotrebljavati*). Note that in some cases Croatian has achieved an additional

stylistic synonymy, e.g. *ambasador* remains in the metaphorical sense, as in *ambasadori hrvatske znanosti* 'ambassadors of Croatian science' (Grčević 2002, 152)

5. Conclusion

The changes in Russia are clearly of the unplanned type (Keller calls them 'invisible-hand processes', cf. also Zybatow 1995 *passim*). Purists such as Duličenko decry the 'vulgarization' of the Russian language, which he calls (1994, 221ff.) *gruboslovie* 'course language' and *sramoslovie* 'vulgar language', and he even uses the expression *agressija sramoslovija* 'the vulgar-language assault'. Politicians inveigh against the *vesternizacija russkogo jazyka* 'the westernization of the Russian language'. Duličenko (1994, 315ff.) derides the language of the media alternately as *rusangl* 'Anglo-Russian', as *interrusskij jazyk* 'inter-Russian' and as *germano-romano-russkij sleng* 'Germanic-Romance-Russian slang'. Politicians have attempted to stem the flood of anglicisms and vulgarisms and generally halt the 'decline of the Russian language' by introducing a 'Law on the State Language of the Russian Federation' (5 February 2003), which appears to have had no effect at all. In Macedonia and Croatia, by contrast, nationalist governments have promoted the de-Serbianization of the national language and the 'restoration' of its 'purity'. Croatian language planning in the post-Yugoslavian era has been explicitly referred to by Croatian nationalists as the 're-Croatization' of the national language.

To what extent have these lexical innovations become part of everyday Russian speech? Bojcov claimed in 1991 that expressions such as *predprinimatel'stvo* 'the entrepreneurs; entrepreneurial spirit/activity' were now widely used and had become part of everyday speech. Some lexemes have different connotations or even different content in the speech of different social groups. The expression *demokraty* 'democrats', in particular, has negative connotations for many Russians, especially less educated ones, who blame those calling themselves *demokraty* for the widespread pauperization in post-perestroika Russia (cf. Eckert/Sternin 2004, 54); hence the variant form *der'mokraty* from the vulgarism *der'mo* 'dung, muck' (Ryazanova-Clarke/Wade 1999, 328). Similarly *patriot, patriotizm, patriotičeskij* have

negative connotations for liberals but positive ones for reactionary Russians (Eckert/Sternin 2004, 55; Ryazanova-Clarke/Wade 1999, 97: ‘enantiosemy’).

In Croatia and, to a lesser extent, Macedonia, Slovakia and Ukraine, we have a case of language planning, but the question is: who is planning the language and who is following the policy? There is no doubt that these developments reflect a conscious attitude to the use of language, which was noticeable before independence, but has since increased. There are, of course, both ‘wild’ and ‘cultivated’ varieties of language, i.e., dialects and urban substandards on the one hand and standard languages on the other, although the two are, of course, in a dialectical relationship with each other. The ‘cultivated’ varieties can be more easily planned than the ‘wild’ varieties. The latter - dialects and urban vernaculars - tend to change under the influence of the former - i.e., the standard language, but only very slowly. At present these developments are probably restricted to the media and to certain branches of scholarship, especially philology, but we can hypothesize that the development will spread to the colloquial standard and to other functional styles. Have people in Croatia started speaking the way the journalists write? Anecdotal evidence suggests that everyday speech is indeed changing.

References

Andersen, Henning. 1989. ‘Understanding linguistic innovations’ in Breivik, L.E., Jahr, E.H. (eds.): *Language Change: Contributions to the Study of its Causes*. Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter, 5-28.

Anderson, Richard D. Jr. ‘Metaphors of dictatorship and democracy: Change in the Russian political lexicon and the transformation of Russian politics’ http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/anderson/Metaphor13.htm

Auburger, Leopold. 1991. ‘Entwicklungsprobleme der kroatischen Standardsprache’ in: Auburger, Leopold, Hill, Peter (eds.): *Natalicia Johanni Schröpfer octogenario a discipulis amicisque oblata*. München: Kovač, 1-32

Bierich, Alexander. 2000. ‘Zur gegenwärtigen Situation der substandardlichen Varietäten im Russischen’ in Panzer, Baldur (Hrsg.): *Die sprachliche Situation in der Slavia zehn Jahre nach der Wende*. Frankfurt a.M: Lang, 13-29.

Blount, Ben G. and Sanches, Mary 1977: 'Introduction' in Blount, Ben G., Sanches, Mary (eds.): *Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Change*. N.Y., London: Academic Press, 1-20.

Bojcov, Ivan. 1991. 'Novacii v russkoj obščestvenno-političeskoj leksike' *Fremdsprachen* 1, 22-26.

Brozović, Dalibor. 1978. 'Hrvatski jezik, njegovo mjesto unutar južno-slavenskih i drugih slavenskih jezika, njegove provijesne mijene kao jezika hrvatske književnosti' in: Flaker, Aleksandar and Pranjić, Krunoslav (eds.): *Hrvatska književnost u evropskom kontekstu*. Zagreb: Zavod za znanost o knjizevnosti Filozofskog fakulteta Sveucilista, 9-83.

Clyne, Michael. 1993. 'The German language after unification: adapting assumptions and methodologies to the new world order' *IJSL*. 100/101, 11-27.

Comrie, Bernard and Stone, Gerald. 1978. *The Russian Language since the Revolution*. Oxford: OUP.

Davie, James. 1997. '*Texno, trans* and *džank*: New Waves of Anglicizmy in Russian Youth Slang' *Australian Slavonic and East-European Studies* 11, 1/2, 1-18.

Dietrich, Ayşe Pamir. 2005. 'Language Policy and the Status of Russian in the Soviet Union and the Successor States outside the Russian Federation' *ASEES* 19, Nos. 1-2, 1-28.

Dressler, Wolfgang. 1997. '"Scenario" as a concept for the functional explanation of language change' in: Gvozdanović, (ed.), 109-142.

Duličenko, A.D. 1994. *Russkij jazyk konca XX veka*. München: Sagner.

Eckert, H. and Sternin, I.A. 2004. *Die russische Sprache im Umbruch. Lexikalische und funktionale Veränderungen im Russischen an der Schwelle zum 21. Jh.* Hamburg: Kovač.

Girke, Wolfgang and Jachnow, Helmut 1974: *Sowjetische Soziolinguistik.* Kronberg: Ts Scriptor.

Grannes, Alf; Kjetil Rå Hauge and Hayriye Süleymanoğlu. 2002. *A Dictionary of Turkisms in Bulgarian*. Oslo: Novus forlag (Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, Serie B: Skrifter Vol. CVIII)

Grčević, Mario. 2002. 'Some remarks on recent lexical changes in the Croatian language' in: Lučić, Radovan (ed.): *Lexical Norm and National Language: Lexicography and Language Policy in South-Slavic Languages after 1989.* München: Sagner, 150-163.

Gvozdanović, Jadranka (ed.). 1997. *Language Change and Functional Explanations*. Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton, de Gruyter (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 98)

Honselaar, Wim. 2002. 'Newspeak, lexicography and computers' in: Lučić, (ed.): *Lexical Norm and National Language. Lexicography and Language Policy in South-Slavic Languages after 1989*. 102-108

Ivić, Pavle. 1984 [1990]. 'L'évolution de la langue littéraire sur le territoire linguistique serbo-croate' *Revue des études slaves* 56, 313-344. Serbian version: *Književnost* 1986, 875-881, 1145-1151, 1499-1507, 1743-1751; and in Ivić, Pavle. *O jeziku nekadašnjem i sadašnjem*. Beograd: BIGZ-Jedinstvo (1990) 87-140.

Jahr, Ernst Håkon. 1989. 'Language planning and language change' in: Breivik and Jahr, (eds.): *Language Change: Contributions to the Study of its Causes*. 99-114.

Javorska, Galina. 2000. 'O podstawowych nazwach barw w języku ukraińskim' in: Gregorczykowa, R. and Waszakowa, K. (eds.). *Studia z semantyki porównawczej* I. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawkiego, 29-38.

Jonke, Ljudevit. 1965. 'Postanak novijega književnog jezika u Hrvata i Srba'. *Jezik* Repr. in: *Hrvatski književni jezik 19. i 20. stoljeća*. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska 1971, 179-191.

Kalogjera, Damir. 2002. 'Misunderstandings about the role of the monolingual dictionary' in Lučić, Radovan (ed.). *Lexical Norm and National Language: Lexicography and Language Policy in South-Slavic Languages after 1989.* 111-119.

Keller, Rudi. 1990. *Sprachwandel. Von der unsichtbaren Hand in der Sprache*. Tübingen: Francke. English translation: *On language change. The invisible hand in language*. London, N.Y.: Routledge, 1994.

Lenček, Rado L. 1976. 'A few remarks for the history of the term "Serbocroatian language"' *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* XIX/1. 45-54.

Lüdtke, Helmut. 1989. 'Invisible-hand processes and the universal laws of language change' in: Breivik and Jahr, (eds.). *Language Change: Contributions to the Study of its Causes*. 131-136.

Mamić, Mile. 1997. *Jezični savjeti*. Zadar: Hrvatsko filološko društvo.

Milroy, James. 2003. ‘On the role of the speaker in language change’ in Hickey, Raymond (ed.). *Motives for Language Change*. Cambridge: CUP, 143-160.

Mokienko, V.M. 2000. ‘Zur aktuellen Sprachsituation in der Ukraine’ in Panzer, Baldur (Hrsg.). *Die sprachliche Situation in der Slavia zehn Jahre nach der Wende*. Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 85-98.

Panzer, Baldur. 2000. ‘Politische und sprachliche Veränderungsprozesse’ in: Panzer, Baldur (Hrsg.). *Die sprachliche Situation in der Slavia zehn Jahre nach der Wende*. 1-12.

Ross, Malcolm. 2003. ‘Diagnosing prehistoric language contact’ in Hickey, Raymond (ed.). *Motives for Language Change*. 174-198

Ryazanova-Clarke, L. and Wade, T. 1999. *The Russian Language Today*. London, N.Y.: Routledge.

Šipka, Danko. 2002. ‘Internal and External Lexical Dynamics: A Case Study of Serbo-Croatian’ in: Lučić, Radovan (ed.). *Lexical Norm and National Language. Lexicography and Language Policy in South-Slavic Languages after 1989.* 96-101

Stalin, I. 1951. *Marksizm i voprosy jazykoznanija*. Moskva: Gos. izdatel’stvo političeskoj literatury.

Tafra, Branka and Bratanić, Maja. 2002. ‘Croatian lexicography between politics and linguistics’ in: Lučić, Radovan (ed.). *Lexical Norm and National Language. Lexicography and Language Policy in South-Slavic Languages after 1989.* 134-141

Ureland, P. Sture. 1989. ‘Some contact structures in Scandinavian, Dutch, and Rhaeto-Romansh: inner-linguistic and/or contact causes of language change’ in: Breivik and Jahr (eds.). *Language Change: Contributions to the Study of its Causes*. 239-276.

Völkl, Sigrid Darinka. 2002. ‘Bosnian language: Language between ethnic/national identification and communication’ in: Lučić, (ed.): *Lexical Norm and National Language. Lexicography and Language Policy in South-Slavic Languages after 1989.* 28-37.

Vukušić, Stjepan. 1982. ‘Usporedbe dvaju novoštokavskih naglašavanja – stiničkog i Daničićeva. Prilog za uporabnu normu hrvatskog književnog jezika’ *Senjski zbornik* IX, 279-362.

Vukušić, Stjepan. 1984. *Nacrt hrvatske naglasne norme na osnovi zapadnog dijalekta.* Pula: Istarska naklada.

Ward, Dennis. 1965. *The Russian Language Today: System and Anomaly.* London: Hutchinson.

Zemskaja, Elena. 2000. 'Aktivnye processy v russkom jazyke poslednego desjatiletija 20-go veka' in Panzer, Baldur (Hrsg.): *Die sprachliche Situation in der Slavia zehn Jahre nach der Wende*. 31-48.

Zybatow, Lew N. 1995. *Russisch im Wandel. Die russische Sprache seit der Perestrojka.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Zybatow, Lew N. (Hrsg.). 2000. *Sprachwandel in der Slavia*. Frankfurt a.M.: Lang.