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As is well known, the language policy of the former SFRJ (= Socialism Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) tried to create a "Serbo-Croatian standard language" under the domination of the Serbian language (cf. Auburger 1997). Important parts of this policy were attempts to eliminate those characteristics of the Croatian literary language by which it distinguishes itself from the Serbian literary language. The methods used were manifold. Even still in the eighties, a common "argument" was to claim that the opponents of the official Yugoslav language policy were sympathizing with the Ustaša regime of World War 2, and that the incriminated words were "Ustasoid" as well. Another method was to punish authors that fought against censorship. Therefore, when M. Šimundić (1971, 238) asking a television newsreader why he avoided the word glazba (music), he got the reply: "Ah, you know, it would not be appropriate." Why it would not have been "appropriate" is illustrated by the fact that the editor of the Croatian edition of the official newspaper of the SFRJ ("Službeni list SFRJ"), Blažko Cece, was relegated from his former function and degraded to the function of a corrector in 1976 after he had tried to circumvent that censorship (Sisak 1992, 28-52). Besides, authors of dictionaries, grammars, etc. were not allowed to write their works freely and according to the best of their professional knowledge and competence. Thus, for example, the whole edition of the Croatian Orthography edited by Babić-Finka-Mosić (1971) was destroyed in a paper factory just because it had been titled "Croatian" Orthography instead of "Serbo-Croatian" or "Croatian-Serbian" Orthography.

Most foreign scholars of "serbocroatistics" in the Western democratic world were not aware of these methods of the Yugoslav language policy and of this way of "standardizing" the Croatian literary language. This is not surprising since the ideas of many foreign serbocroatists about the Croatian language were similar to the concepts of Yugoslav language policy. Therefore, they did not show any interest in this problem when in 1971 D. Brozović described the Yugo-Slav language policy as a unique form of unilateralsm that only partly resembled the old Czechoslovakia (Brozović 1971, 197-198). According to Brozović, this unilateralsm, as a vehicle of Greater Serbian ambitions hiding behind older traditions of south-Slavic solidarity, corresponded with, more or less well-known, tendencies of language policy in expansionist states.

Despite all the endeavors to implement this "serbocroatistic" language policy in Yugoslavia, the intended fusion of the Croatian and Serbian literary languages into one "serbocroatian standard language" failed. Consequently, the report Linguistic problems in the function of nationalist ideology in the SR Croatia, complained about the fact that several "Croatisms" were "forced" into journals as well as television, and that nouns ending in -je were increasingly being replaced by those ending in -ije (Sisak 1992, 106). Only about ten years later, the unmistakable results of this tendency have become apparent: The suffix -ije actually has
replaced the suffix -lac in many words, although the suffix -lac previously was in use too (or in some words even more usually then -telj). If we examine Croatian dictionaries of the eighties, e.g. B. Klaić's dictionary of foreign words, we can find lots of "Croatisms" which were more or less proscribed in former Yugoslav (shown here in italics):

advokat - advokat (lawyer), tvrtka (company), proračun (budget), sustav (system), glazba (music) were examples of active usage while prijava (register), vojarna (barracks), časnik (officer), and uskican (to arrest) belonged to the passive vocabulary. The number of references of words advokat and advokat in the text of the dictionary (1983) and by Mošorlega (1983) and by S. S. Tadić (in the following: Mošorlega 1999)4 shows that the frequency of some of the (partial) doublets mentioned above varied substantially in the language of the Croatian journals even before 1991. The corpus on which Mošorlega's frequency dictionary is based was compiled in the seventies. It contains 952,327 word units (tokens) extracted from texts published in the period between 1935 and the seventies. The abbreviations DNPDU represent the different sub-corpora: D = drama, N = newspaper, P = prose, S = poetry, U = textbooks. The newspaper consulted (Borba, Glas Slavonije, Novi list, Slavonski Dalmac, Vjesniki, list Vjesnici) were published in 1975 and 1977 and contain 200,000 word units. The corpus on which Jošić's frequency dictionary (1983) is based consists of 130,279 word units taken from the newspapers Vjesnici list and Vjesnik, both published in 1980.

In Mošorlega, the word advokat has got only 4 references, none of which come from journals (DP), whereas advokat has got 27 references, including journals (DNPDU). In Jošić's quantity of frequency dictionary (1983) however, advokat has got no references while advokat has got five. The development of this kind is often seen in regional research and are described to the period after the proclamation of the Republic of Croatia in 1991.

For instance, the fact that the words glazba, skladatelj (composer) and sustav probably did not occur in certain types of texts before 1991 does not imply that these words can now be considered "reactivated" (cf. Samardžija 1998, 149). The references in Mošorlega (1999) and Jošić (1983) show that these words were in use already in the Croatian language of the seventies at least. There is no reason to assume that they generally disappeared in the eighties. Prior to 1991, the passive Croatian vocabulary contained many banned Croatian words equivalent to the actively used words of the politically approved vocabulary. E.g. the officers of the JNA ("Yugoslavenska narodna armija, Yugoslav People's Army") publicly only could be called oficir (Sg.) - oficiri (Pl.) and not časnik - časnici. (For using the word časnik (officer) instead of oficir the physician I. Streter was sentenced to 50 days in jail in 1987 (Vuković 1996, 78-79).) Accordingly, the possibility of using the previously frequent word časnik was already reduced in such a way that before 1991 it could only occur in special contexts, e.g. in relation to historical...
semantic difference between dobravoljac and dragavoljac, will still hold true in future dictionaries. Obviously a similar differentiation was not possible for the word prvohorac because prvohorac did not have a corresponding synonym. Considering the context in which the word prvohorac still appears in the modern Croatian language of the newspapers, one would conclude that it does not describe the Croatian volunteers of the last war. The term is avoided in two ways: 1) originally by calling them dragovoljci; and 2) later on by referring to them as "veteranac" (veteran). Consequently, the frequency of the word veterani increased significantly, despite the fact that the puristic tendency against internationalisms had become stronger in the nineties (cf. Samardžija, 2000a). Under the influence of this tendency the internationalism frontha, for example, was not used as a description of the fronts in the last war but replaced by Slavic words or syntagms: bojištje, bojišnica, prva cesta bojištka and prva cesta bojišnica. In compound nouns, however, the word frontha is still used, often occurring in the non-standard form fron (cf. Brodnjak, 1991, front). The use of this word in the quote was obviously not influenced by the previous use in Narodnooslobodilačka frontha (1941-1945). Similarly, the word omladina (youth), which is also marked by socialist usage, was not only largely replaced by the word mladet but is in Šonje (2000) even limited to its first meaning as a description of the former Yugoslav Youth Organisation. It should be noted that before 1991 the word omladina could replace mladet because of the Yugoslav language policy. The use of the word sektarica, which has been in a great degree replaced by tajnica (or masc. tajnik) in the meaning "secretary," shows a similar development. Surprisingly, however, it occurs quite often in the meaning of "answering machine," tajništva sektarica, autonotska sektarica. The corresponding tajnica (or tajnik) almost exclusively in all other meanings, also when referring to foreign employees, who are called sekretari in their own language. This does not, however, apply to the ministers of the SFRJ, who are called sekretari according to their own inventory of names.

Before analyzing the pair of words priopći - saopći (to inform, to notify) to show how older normative tendencies still influence the recent language change, I would like to mention the fact that this word, which increased in the first half of the nineties. On the one hand, the most influential normativists had already pointed out in the early nineties that necessary future codifications of the Croatian literary language must take place independently of the relationship between Croatian and Serbian. 3 On the other hand, the results of linguistic contact with the Serbian language, which had been dominant in the process of language standardisation during the "Yugoslav era," could not be denied. The war that Serbia started against Croatia at the beginning of the nineties strengthened puristic tendencies against serbisms: Amateur linguists became involved in language politics, writing Serbian-Croatian contrastive dictionaries of their own. The old Croatian purism, which had worked against Serbisms in earlier times, was continued with renewed zeal during the war in the nineties. 4 Therefore, it is not surprising that words like bezbijednost (=sagustom) (security, safety), osebšebijedati (=sagrustati) (to secure), uslov (=uvjet) (condition), osmatranje (=pomiranje) (observe), inostranstvo (=inozemstvo) (foreign countries) do not occur in Croatian newspapers today except partly in quotations of Serbian and other tests.

On the other hand, some words that are labelled as "Serbisms" and are commonly known to be such occur rather often (see e.g. the already mentioned word front). Their usage, however, should be discussed in a separate contribution.

Tuning to the above mentioned pair saopći - priopći and the influence of older normative tendencies, first of all we have to note that the verb saopći and the verbal noun saopćenje were completely replaced by priopći and priopćenje at the beginning of the nineties, both in administrative and media language. The word priopći seems to have entered the Croatian

1 Therefore, it was not a problem for J. Filipović (1870) to include this word in his dictionary. So we find the following entries here: report: izvjeće, izvjesti, povijest, to permit: dopustiti, dopustiti, dopustiti, dopustiti, to occur: iscjeljen, izvijestiti, present: pristati, načistiti, instance: nepravilni, nezbijediti, osebšebijedati, be part of something: učestrovati, bo sebeležiti, sv: biti, čitati, u izvor: prodotti, saopći, care: obziru, obziru, obziru, obziru, obziru, obziru, make: učestrovati, načistiti, present: pristati, načistiti, načistiti, načistiti, wordlist: učestrovati, wordlist: učestrovati, wordlist: učestrovati. Except for saopćenje these headwords are also used in Broz (1991).

2 This is one of the factors that influenced the later Croatian normativisms in this respect.

3 As we have seen, this kind of development has nothing in common with a return to the period before 1958. Therefore, the remark in M. Wingenstor (1997, 379): "The clock has to be turned back to the period before 1958," is not at all correct.

4 Cf. J. Filipović (1870) as to the question here Marinčić's (1931) sayings influenced the later Croatian normativisms in this respect.
The different effects evident in the changes partially discussed above also occur in various combinations. In the following paragraphs I will list the words discussed so far and others which have undergone a change in frequency in newspaper language. The first word, the one behind the respective word, gives the number of references in Mosgul (1999); the second word, the one behind the hyphen, gives its number in Šojat (1983); the third figure, the one behind the slash, indicates the number of references in the Mannheim Croatian Corpus. The Mannheim Croatian Corpus (further: MG) contains texts from the daily newspapers Vjesnik, Vjesnik list, Hrvatska list, and the cultural magazine Hrvatsko slovo from the period from 1979 to 1999 and at present covers approximately 1,400,000 tokens. Later, I will give some further information about this corpus and the whole project which led to its creation. It has been pointed out that the underlying corpora are not ideally suited for a comparison like the following one. More appropriate linguistic material for such a comparison, however, is not available to me at present.

The aforementioned numerical ratios can be regarded only as indicators of the fact that in newspaper language some changes (probably) occurred. To answer the question how and why these changes took place, it would be necessary to describe the problems of the previous and recently appearing semantic distributions. In some cases one would also have to consider further (partial) synonyms and derivatives:

| 1. advokat 27 DNPU-0/16 | odvjetnik 4 DP-5/1318 |
| 2. ambasadör 21 DUH-18/39 | veleposlanstvo 0-0/831 (poslanstvo 2/DS) |
| 3. ambasador 21 DNPU-18/38 | veleposlanstvo 0-0/712 |
| 4. analiza 100 NPSU-8/934 | raščlambja 0-0/97 |
| 5. arhiva 94 DNPSU-9/246 | vojska 149 DNPSU-21/3236 |
| 6. artillerija 4 NPSU-1010 | topstvito 1-U/0-67 |
| 7. autokar 10 NPSU-79 | autocesta 3-3/80/3 |
| 8. avtovoz 3 NPSU-3/8 | zrakoplovito 0-0/22 |
| 9. avtobus 3 NPSU-106 | zrakoplovito 6-6/04 |
| 10. avion 100 DNPSU-25/276 | zrakoplovito 5 PSLV-2/1964 |
| 11. baterija (milit.) 4 DP-170 (no milt.: 69) | bitnica 0-0/7 |
| 13. branački 0-0/91 | branitelj 7 DNPSU-0/938 |
| 14. budžet 26 DNPSU-3/125 | proračun 29 NSU-5/994 |
| 15. cezar 71 DNPSU-73/578 | srednja 2/5/1754 |
| 16. čimba 37 NPSU-111 | čimbenik 1 U-U/0-78 |
| 17. čitalica 24 DNPSU-7/234 | čitatelj 3 NPSU-3/14 |
| 18. civilizacija 24 DNPSU-314 | tijedna 1 P-U/0-32 |
| 19. doktorat (milit.) 0-0/0 | strojstvo 2 U-U/0-06 |
| 20. datum 16 DNPSU-3/603 | nadnevjak 0-0/62 |
| 21. davca 7 N-U/75 | davatelj 0-0/75 |
| 22. delegacija 154 NPSU-3/14 | izaslanje 0-1/344 |
| 23. delegat 91 NPSU-52/148 | izaslanje 5 N-3/370 zastupnik 14 DNPSU-15/2840 |
| 24. demilitarizacija 0-0/80 | razvojčenje 0-0/29 |

The meaning state of the word proračun probably was not part of the common language until after 1991.
From the table it can be inferred that words like *avion* (plane), *direktor* (director), *centar* (centre), *generacija* (generation), *kvaliteta* (quality) or *komisija* did not disappear almost completely from today's "publishing style of the Croatian standard language" as e.g. I Prančić claims (cf. Prančić 2000, 71). Similarly, the supposedly new productivity of the type of nouns ending in -(i)da like *admiralija, zaglavila, gladijat, oscarf* and *ofis* and which according to I. Prančić is "particularly frequent" (Prančić 2000, 70), is not supported by the MCC. On the word *kolač* (price list) Prančić notes the following:

"Out of fear to use a Serbian and/or only to abolish the old word, the Croatian word (cjenik), unsuspecting in every way, was replaced by a foreign word of German origin (kolač). Besides, judging by its form, *kolač* could easily be taken for a Serbian, cf. the Serbian cognate." (Prančić 2000, 72)  

The word *kolač* does not occur even once in the MCC (neither do its derivatives). *Cjenik*, on the other hand, has got 238 references. Unfortunately Prančić does not give any proof for his statements and makes all the "changes" that are discussed by him appear to be commonly "well known". With such misrepresentations frequent in recent works, R. Katlic's account of a foreign colleague who came to Croatia after a long time wondering at the fact that everyone was actually still speaking "like in former times" is not surprising (Katlic 1997, 28). The searches in the Croatian national corpus, which is accessible to everyone on the internet (http://www.hsk.ffgr.hr), also show that the specifications supplied by Prančić are to a large extent wrong. Under the influence of such disinformation about the changes in the Croatian language, these are generally explained by individual authors as the result of monopolistic institutionalised political forces. This "institutionalisation" is judged to have a negative influence, often without any consideration for scientific objectivity.

For example, S. Kieft (2000, 120) reduces the current "discussion about the Croatian language (not only the standard language)" to the following: "its principal aim doubtless is to define the Croatian language in opposition to the Serbian one". Therefore, she opposes Croatian and Serbian texts not for reasons of scientific research, but because "the Croatian standard language defines itself first of all by its separation from the Serbian standard" (132). Without further investigating Croatian patriotism, she determines in which cases the Croatian patriotism is "irrational and extreme" (134).

---

1. Z. Šojat uses the word *pojedinač* in his introduction (Šojat 1983, IV).
The word *domnina* (commission, committee) was still used as a term in the nineties, although for terminological reasons it was replaced by *povjerenstvo* in certain meanings. Kofkel declares the word *povjerenstvo* to be a “doubtful neologism” from the 19th century “which poses the question whether historical evidence of a word is sufficient legitimisation for its renaissance” (128). The word *protest* (protest) is “formed even more unfortunately” (128). S. Kofkel also thinks that the word *obitelj* still had to become a common word in 1978 (Kofkel 2000, 125). From this point of view it remains entirely unclear why *Soja* (1983) has 36 references for this word and *Mogu* (1999) 59 (DNPSU).

M. Wingerder seems to believe that the entire Croatian purism, which has been existing for several centuries, is solely concerned with the increasing of Croatian-Serbian differences. Because the Serbian language traditionally shows a larger readiness to accept foreign words, it is necessary to avoid these words [in the Croatian language] (Wingerder 2000, 262). It remains to be shown, she announced in 1997, “that the majority of articles published on the Croatian standard language are based on the concern for the separation of the Croatian from the Serbian language” (Wingerder 1997, 372-373). It is strange, however, that she does not mention the results of the announced research (“It remains to be shown...”) by any word. In Wingerder 2000 (260) she declares that it remains to be shown, that most of the language advice from the series in Vjesnik “is based on the concern about the stabilisation of Croatian and on the strict separation from the Serbian language.”

The realisation of this new, now reduced “project”, however, does not lead to the announced results:

A large part of the analysed articles serves actual language maintenance; besides, articles concerning Croatian - Serbian language relations and the relations of Croatian to other Slavic or non-Slavic languages (so-called internationalisms) are quantitatively strongly represented. Furthermore some articles are concerned with (especially legal) terminology (Wingerder 2000, 260-261; 1997, 382).

M. Wingerder repeatedly stresses that “pointing out the differences between Serbian and Croatian” is a distinguishing trait of the Croatian side and especially of “the guidelines of the Croatian “new language policy” (cf. Wingerder 2000, 265). As an example she quotes the dictionary by Brodjnik (1991) which was supposedly written in the nineties. However, Brodjnik’s dictionary was not written in the nineties, under the rule of the new Croatian “rigorous language policy” (Wingerder 2000, 251), but could not be published earlier for political reasons. Under the conditions of the political era in which it was written, it would have been simply “forbidden”, like many other works of Croats in Croatia. Unfortunately M. Wingerder has not taken into account that Croatian-Serbian differences were first registered by a Serbian linguist, namely by R. Bokčki (1935) (cf. Brodjnik 1991; Wingerder 1997, 376) and that, still in the political era of communist Yugoslavia, a Serbian author published a Croatian-Serbian dictionary (Cirilov 1988).

According to a remark by B. Kunzmann-Müller, the establishment of the Croatian literary language as state language (“official own standard language”) has led to the situation that in Croatia linguistics “only in the most favourable of cases” shows a concern for objectivity.

Unfortunately, in Croatia that has, among other things, to a situation where linguistics is almost exclusively concerned with questions in connection with the elaboration of the Croatian standard, aiming for objectivity only in the most favourable of cases. The dominant premise of maximum divergence from the typically identical Serbian has been accepted everywhere (Kunzmann Müller 2000a, 61).

Despite the fact that B. Kunzmann-Müller at first states that “different factors” are responsible for “the changes in the derivational morphology”, she explains them primarily in the context of maximisation of differences between Croatian and Serbian:

On the one hand, in the process of elaborating the Croatian standard language, they aim at a maximisation of the difference to Serbian. The formal means used for this purpose are of an archaising nature. On the other hand, a set of affixes attains productivity, making up designative deficits in modern Croatian. Distinction in relation to the Serbian language is a desired side effect here. (Kunzmann Müller, 2000a, 51)

However, the examples with which B. Kunzmann-Müller tries to contextualise the “changes in the derivational morphology” are misinterpreted and thus the just quoted conclusion concerning the “distinction in relation to Serbian” is wrong too. While the verb *saturiti* (50), quoted as an “old derivative from *zut*”, does not exist in the Croatian language, almost all of her aforementioned “innovations” were already in common use before 1991 (cf. the words mentioned together with *supredsjedatelj* in the same series of “new forms” like *vamctor, suphmaceni, supgroc, woxwain, sololvskit or medenvrie, polvriev, poljem, poljam* etc.). With such “innovations” the changes in the derivational morphology and the purpose “of a maximisation of the difference to the Serbian language” can surely not be supported. B. Kunzmann-Müller does not prove her thesis convincingly, not even by repeatedly referring to the article by I. Pranjković mentioned above, which she obviously considers a “favourable case” in which Croatian linguistics is aiming for objectivity.

Even in cases when constructions like *zamoliti* smo ga da doci are used instead of the correct *zamoliti* smo ga da dode B. Kunzmann-Müller identifies a connection to the Croatian “official side”. This “official side” does “little or nothing at all” against the penetration of the infinitive constructions from the spoken language into the language of the Croatian press, and thereby promotes “the distinction from Serbian” (Kunzmann-Müller 2000a, 52; 53). The construction *zamoliti* smo ga da doci is not mentioned even once in the MCM. In spoken language, it is not familiar to me and other Croatian speakers whom I know. Significantly, contemporary Croatian normativists agree with each other on the fact that unfortunately there has been no centrally led Croatian language policy since 1991 (cf. Samardžija 1999, 308-315) Kunzmann-Müller in no way indicates who, in her opinion, might have established the said Croatian “official side”.

How can we explain that even in the most recent period interest in the Croatian language and its development in many works on Croatian language changes is still reduced to the relation between Croatian and Serbian, and that the autonomy of the Croatian language is readily treated “something ridiculous” without offering any linguistic arguments? Such positions can perhaps be explained by the basic postulates of Slavic philology in the 19th century. "This historical problem in the development of slavistics can be explained only in connection with the theoretical, methodological and philosophical presuppositions and "aries of" serbocroatian" (Auburger 1997, 1999, here especially: 351-406). On the basis of these presuppositions "serbocroatian" was thought of primarily as a prescriptive discipline of language planning, which did not understand that a "satisfying solution to the theoretical problem of the existence of a diversity of autonomous" languages needs "a type of linguistic personism as a general theoretical basis" and must not "language communities ..." (Auburger 1993, 272). Methodically appropriate philological research on the recent Croatian language changes therefore requires a professional, objective procedure, which does not ignore or distort realities, trying to model the linguistic realities along concepts in favour of an outdated linguistic policy.

The lexical developments which have been briefly described here have led to changes in the previous system of lexical variants. Apparently this process is far from being completed. The way
in which the previous and the contemporary lexical structures currently co-exist, their functional and quantitative relations to each other, the situational patterns of their usage, and the semantic consequences of these developments, all these aspects are at the centre of research in a project on "Institutionalising Processes" based at the Slavonic Seminar at the University of Mannheim. Director of the project is Professor Dr. Jadranka Gvozdanović. Researchers are Dr. S. Rittgasser and the author of this article. The project is financed by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) as a subproject of the project "Language Variation as Communicative Practice."

The central part of the investigation is dedicated to the study of the language of contemporary Croatian newspapers and magazines. In addition, the spoken and written Croatian language of native speakers from Croatia and abroad is to be examined. In order to be able to analyse the language of the newspapers systematically J. Gvozdanović assigned me to compile a corpus of newspaper texts which can be searched by computer. This was done before the approval of the project by the German Research Foundation. Thanks to the additional assistance of M. Gudžiková and M. Dražičević during the preparation of the texts it was possible to enlarge the corpus to its present size of approx. 14,000,000 word units. It contains texts from the following publications:

| Večernji list | February, March, April, May 1999 |
| Vjesnik | May, June, December 1997 |
| Slobodna Dalmacija | January, February, March, October, November, December 1998 |
| Hrvatsko slovo | June 1999 |
| | numbers 150-200, 1998 |

At present, the corpus is being supplemented by texts from Feral and from the latest editions (2006/01) of Večernji list, Vjesnik and Slobodna Dalmacija. In order to empirically determine the units that are relevant as indicators for language changes in the newspapers and in order to be able to make comparisons beyond the word level the compilation of the newspaper corpus is planned. It will contain texts from Croatian newspapers and magazines of the period before 1991.
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14 Cf. e.g. the results of the research done by Gnjidić (2000, 161) on the acceptance of the "reactivated" words among Croatian speakers. Her inquiry shows that the "reactivated" words mentioned by her are known, used and perceived positively by the speakers.
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