

**DIE WELT DER SLAVEN
SAMMELBÄNDE · СБОРНИКИ**

Herausgegeben von
Peter Rehder (München) und Igor Smirnov (Konstanz)

Band 14



VERLAG OTTO SAGNER
München 2002

Lexical Norm and National Language
Lexicography and Language Policy
in South-Slavic Languages
after 1989

Edited by
Radovan Lučić



VERLAG OTTO SAGNER
München 2002

DIE WELT DER SLAVEN SAMMELBÄNDE · СБОРНИКИ

Herausgegeben von
Peter Rehder (München) und Igor Smirnov (Konstanz)

Band 14



VERLAG OTTO SAGNER
München 2002

Mario Grčević

Some remarks on recent lexical changes in the Croatian language

As is well known, the language policy of the former SFRJ (= *Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*) tried to create a "Serbo-Croatian standard language"¹ 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.² 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 sympathising with the *Ustaša* regime of World War 2, and that the incriminated words were "ustašoid" as well.³ Another method was to punish authors that fought against censorship. Therefore, when M. Šimundić (1971, 238) asking a television newscaster 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"), Blaško Grce, was relegated from his former function and degraded to the function of a corrector in 1976 after he had tried to circumvent that censorship (Selak 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-Moguš (1971) was destroyed in a paper factory just because it had been titled "*Croatian*" *Orthography* instead of "Serbocroatian" or "Croatoserbian" *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 Yugoslav language policy as a unique form of unitarianism that only partly resembled the old *Czechoslovakism* (Brozović 1971, 197-198). According to Brozović, this unitarianism, 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.⁴

Despite all the endeavours 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 being "forced" into journals as well as television, and that nouns ending in *-lac* were increasingly being replaced by those ending in *-telj* (Selak 1992, 106). Only about ten years later, the unmistakable results of this tendency have become apparent: The suffix *-telj* actually has

¹ As to the differentiation between the concepts of "literary language" and "standard language" see Auburger 1991, 23-24.

² Cf. the observation by Auburger (1997, 25) concerning the transformation of the variance relationship from lower linguistic levels to variance relationships on higher levels up to the lectological and general linguistic level with entire language systems such as sociolects, professional languages, dialects, etc. as items of the variance relation.

³ For example, in a report called *Linguistic problems in the function of nationalist ideology in the SR Croatia* (Selak 1992, 53-119; 107) written in 1980/81 for official *internal* use, the Croatists of that time were compared to the politicians concerned with the politics of language during the NDH-State period. (NDH = *Nezavisna država Hrvatska*, 1941 - 1945).

⁴ See also Brozović 1998. In a non-terminological sense Brozović 1971 calls this unitarianism *serbocroatism*. L. Auburger shows that such a *serbocroatism* was developed already in the 19th century. He also gives a detailed description of its nature and its development (Auburger, 1997; 1999).

replaced the suffix *-lac* in many words, although the suffix *-lac* previously was in use too (or in some words even more usually than *-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 Yugoslavia (shown here in italics):

advokat - *odvjetnik, branitelj*; aeroport - *zračna luka*; ambasada - *poslanstvo, poklisarstvo*; artiljerija - *topništvo*; avijacija - *zrakoplovstvo*; aviomehaničar - *zrakoplovni mehaničar*; baterija [milit.] - *bimica*; budžet - *proračun*; daktilografija - *strojopis*; datum - *nadnevak*; deponirati - *pohraniti*; delegacija - *izaslanstvo*; delegat - *izaslanik, zastupnik*; Europa - orth. older and correct beside 'Evropa'; direktan - *izravan*; faktor - *činitelj, čimbenik*; familija - *obitelj*; firma - *tvrtka*; geografija - *zemljopis*; geograf - *zemljopisac*; grupa - *skupina*; hapsiti - *uhićivati, uhićiti*; kancelarija - *ured*; kasarna - *vojarna*; klavir - *glasovir*; muzika - *glazba*; komisija - *poovjerenstvo*; kompozitor - *skladatelj*; kopilot - *supilot*; protest - *prosvjed*; protestirati - *prosvjedovati*; oficir - *časnik*; opozicija - *oporba*; organizirati - *ustrojiti*; original - *izvornik, podrijetlo*; pauza - *stanka*; rezerva - *pričuva*; sekretar - *tajnik*; sekretarijat - *tajništvo*; sistem - *sustav*; telegraf - *brzojav*; telegram - *brzojavka*; etc.

Depending on whether they belong to the active or passive vocabulary of the primary Croatian speakers in former Yugoslavia, not all of these words can be treated equally. *Odvjetnik* (lawyer), *tvrtka* (company), *proračun* (budget), *sustav* (system), *glazba* (music) were examples of active usage while *pričuva* (reserve), *vojarna* (barracks), *časnik* (officer), and *uhićivati* (to arrest) belonged to the passive vocabulary. The number of references of the words *odvjetnik* and *advokat* in the frequency dictionaries by Šojat (1983) and by Moguš – Bratanić- Tadić (in the following: Moguš 1999) shows that the frequency of some of the (partial) doublets mentioned above varied substantially in the language of Croatian journals even before 1991. The corpus on which Moguš' 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 DNPSU represent the different sub-corpora: D= drama, N= newspapers, P= prose, S= poetry, U= textbooks. The newspapers consulted (*Borba*, *Glas Slavonije*, *Novi list*, *Slobodna Dalmacija*, *Večernji list*, *Vjesnik*) were published in 1975 and 1977 and contain 200,000 word units. The corpus on which Šojat's frequency dictionary (1983) is based consists of 130,279 word units taken from the newspapers *Večernji list* and *Vjesnik*, both published in 1980.

In Moguš, the word *odvjetnik* has got only 4 references, none of which come from journals (DP), whereas *advokat* has got 27 references, including journals (DNPU). In Šojat's smaller frequency dictionary (1983) however, *advokat* has not got any references while *odvjetnik* has got five. Older developments of this kind are often ignored in recent research and are ascribed 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 Moguš (1999) and Šojat (1983) show that these words were in use already in the Croatian language of the seventies and early eighties. There is no reason to assume that they generally disappeared in the eighties.

Prior to 1991, the passive Croatian vocabulary contained many banished Croatian words equivalent to the actively used words of the politically approved vocabulary. E.g. the officers of the JNA (= *Jugoslavenska 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. Šreter 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

events. Such suppressive relations changed considerably after the dissolution of the SFRJ and the founding of the Republic of Croatia as a sovereign state (1991) (cf. Auburger 1999, 332f.). The regained freedom to use previously forbidden words in all domains of communication without any restrictions made it possible for the Croatian terminology in the semantic field of administration, army, etc. to be based on and continue existing Croatian naming traditions. So, formerly suppressed words switched from the more or less passive vocabulary of the Croatian literary language to the active one without any special stylistic marking. On the whole, various tendencies can be observed. Although e.g. the Slavic word *uljudba* can be found more often in newspapers since the beginning of the nineties, no competitive relation with its synonym *civilizacija*, which is still common, can be observed. Another development can be seen in the pair of words *klavir* – *glasovir* (piano). The word *glasovir* occurs a little more often in the current newspapers than its synonym *klavir* although before 1991 *glasovir* probably was not used in the newspapers at all or only rarely. Such developments were partly influenced by the war that Serbia started against the Republic of Croatia in the name of Yugoslavia in the early nineties. People began to identify particular lexical elements of the former regime as symbols of the military aggressor. Therefore, in wartime literary language use a word like *oficir* had a pejorative connotation. Nowadays, this word appears in newspapers mostly as a reference to history, in particular when referring to J(N)A officers. Similarly the word *kasarna* has been fully replaced by *vojarna*, and is now being used only as a reference to history (JNA barracks). The word *armija* (compare the self-styled *Yugoslav People's Army* = *Jugoslavenska narodna armija*) is still very frequent, but no in its primary meaning (cf. Šonje, 2000), which is covered by *vojska*: In the newspapers, it mainly occurs within compound terms belonging to the inventory of names: *Jugoslavenska armija*, *Armija BiH*, *Irska republikanska armija*, *Rusku armija*, *Sovjetska armija*, *Crvena armija*, *Ukrajinska ustanička armija*. Less frequently it can be found in syntagms with the metaphorical meaning "a lot of": *navijačka armija*, *omanija armija pomoćnika javnoga tužitelja*. Recently, however, *vojska* is also being used in this sense: *vojska njezinih obožavatelja*, *vojska znanstvenika*.

In the rare case that the word *ambasador* is used in newspapers with the meaning "ambassador", it almost exclusively refers to foreign ambassadors (*američki ambasador*, *francuski ambasador*, *bosanski ambasador*, etc.). It is also used in a new metaphorical sense (*exponent*, *advocate*, *representative*): *ambasador dobre volje*, *umjetnost je najbolji ambasador Hrvatske*, *svaka hrvatska (poštanska) marka je ambasador koji promiče hrvatsku kulturu*, *uspješan ambasador naše zemlje*, *u funkciji ambasadora kampanje "Engleska 2006"*, *svojevrsni ambasadori ugostiteljske struke*, *ambasadori bogate hrvatske glazbene tradicije*, *ambasadori hrvatske znanosti*. The word *veleposlanik* does not occur in this sense, but it has largely replaced the word *ambasador* as a designation for Croatian and foreign ambassadors. This explains why its frequency in the newspapers is considerably higher than that of the word *ambasador*.

Another development can be studied analyzing the recent history of the pair of words *dobrovoljac* – *dragovoljac* and of the word *prvoborac*. In 1991 the average speaker would associate the word *dobrovoljac* (volunteer) and *prvoborac* (earliest partisan/soldier) with the volunteers and the first generation (1941) of Tito's partisans (1941-1945). The word *dragovoljac*, which was not in common usage before 1991 and which did not have this denotation (cf. Brodnjak 1991, *dragovoljnik*), therefore could establish itself as a designation for the volunteers on the Croatian side of the war in the nineties. In the language of Croatian newspapers in the nineties, the distinction is quite clear: *dobrovoljci* (Pl.) stands for the volunteers of World War 2, while *dragovoljci* (Pl.) stands for the Croatian volunteers of the last war. At the same time, it can be observed that the word *dragovoljac* replaces the word *dobrovoljac* in all other contexts as well, except in those cases where Tito's partisans are mentioned. A definitive redefinition of its meaning, however, has not occurred yet. It remains to be seen whether the tendency described here is only a temporary phenomenon or whether the reference in Šonje (2000), according to which there is no

semantic difference between *dobrovoljac* and *dragovoljac*, will still hold true in future dictionaries. Obviously a similar differentiation was not possible for the word *prvoborac* because *prvoborac* did not have a corresponding synonym. Considering the context in which the word *prvoborac* 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 "veterans" (*veterani*). 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 *fronta*, for example, was not used as a description of the fronts in the last war but replaced by Slavic words or syntagms: *bojište*, *bojišnica*, *prva crta bojišta* and *prva crta bojišnice*. In compound names, however, the word *fronta* is still used, often occurring in the non-standard form *front* (cf. Brodnjak 1991, *front*). The use of this word in the quoted functions was obviously not influenced by the previous use in *Narodnooslobodilačka fronta* (1941-1945). Similarly, the word *omladina* (*youth*), which is also marked by socialist usage, was not only largely replaced by the word *mladež* 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 *mladež* because of the Yugoslav language policy. The use of the word *sekretarica*, which has been to 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": *telefonska sekretarica*, *automatska sekretarica*. The corresponding *tajnica* (or *tajnik*) occurs almost exclusively in all other meanings, also when referring to foreign employees, who are called *secretary* in their own language. This does not, however, apply to the ministers of the SFRJ, who are called *sekretar(i)* according to their own inventory of names.

Before analysing the pair of words *priopćiti* - *saopćiti* (*to inform, to notify*) to show how older normative tendencies still influence the latest language changes, I would like to mention the puristic tendency against Serbisms, 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.⁵ 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.⁶ Therefore, it is not surprising that words like *bezbjednost* (= *sigurnost*) (*security, safety*), *obezbijediti* (= *osigurati*) (*to secure*), *uslov* (= *uvjet*) (*condition*), *osmatranje* (= *promatranje*) (*observe*), *inostranstvo* (= *inozemstvo*) (*foreign countries*) do not occur in Croatian newspapers today (except partly in quotations of Serbian and other texts). 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.

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

⁵ Cf. e.g. Babić (1995, 29-32; first published: 1991).

⁶ Whether the paranormative advices could have a considerable influence on the Croatian language changes still has to be examined.

vocabulary by the mediation of B. Šulek (1860), who probably had taken it from J. Stulli (cf. ARJ) as a Church Slavonic word. Leaving aside the question whether *saopćiti* was as common as *priopćiti* in the 19th century, I would like to point out that this word was not influenced by any purism before the beginning of the 20th century.⁷ It was not until the official, politically supported measures in language standardization of the Croatian "Vukovci" (Croatian philologists following the linguistic doctrine of V. S. Karadžić) that the later Croatian linguistic purism against words originating from Church Slavonic or Russian arose. T. Maretić, the founder of this part of Croatian purism, was not bothered by the fact that these Russianisms, as he called them rather generally, were very frequent in the Serbian language of that time. For those cases where older, "native" equivalents existed he suggested, in his *Jezični savjetnik* (1924), to completely remove "unnecessary Russianisms" from the Croatian and Serbian vocabulary.⁸ Many of his suggestions were fairly broadly accepted in Croatia, among others his the recommendation not to use *saopćiti* instead of *priopćiti*. Therefore, in the article under the headword *saopćiti* in S. Pavešić's influential language advisor (1971) we find the statement that "our words" are (among others) *priopćenje* and *priopćiti*. In the official language of the SFRJ, in accordance with the situation in the Serbian language, only *saopćiti* - *saopćenje* were "allowed". After *saopćiti* and *saopćenje* had been replaced by *priopćiti* and *priopćenje* in official correspondence of the Croatian administration at the beginning of the nineties, there was no reason for the Croatian linguists to try to retain the word *saopćiti* and to declare the previously proscribed "Croatism" *priopćiti* to be "false".⁹

Because there was no semantic difference between *priopćiti*, *priopćenje* and *saopćiti*, *saopćenje*, the latter pair disappeared also from the language of the media. When these words do occur in today's language of the media, these are rare cases of interference or quotations of older texts. Only in some magazines (see *Hrvatska ljevica* and *Feral*) *saopćiti/saopćenje* still occur as the result of a conscious choice. These magazines, or rather their texts, form an exception in the Croatian press and should be therefore discussed separately.

Besides the already mentioned types of changes there are also others, e.g. those resulting from the naming of new objects (see e.g. the reactivated word *domovnica*). The fast spread of the new form *perilica* ((*dish*) *washer*) instead of the older syntagm *stroj za pranje* (*rublja, posuda*) was not caused by normative influences but solely by language economy. In Anić (1998) *perilica* is mentioned, however it is not in Šonje (2000). In the media, similar cases led to the formation and spread of the verb *uazočiti* (*prisustvovati* = *to be present*). First, the frequency of the adjective *nazočan* and of the noun *nazočnost*, equivalent to *prisutan* - *prisutnost* but not used very frequently before, increased strongly. Almost at the same time, journalists considered it possible and necessary to have the corresponding verb *uazočiti*. This happened despite repeated claims by philologists that the new form *nazočiti* is unnecessary. It is still not clear whether this new form will make its way into the vocabulary or will be replaced by e.g. *pribivati* (see Šonje 2000, *prisustvovati*) or *prisustvovati*. Currently, the word *pribivati* is not in common use. Unlike in the case of the verb *nazočiti*, suggested neologisms for *helikopter* (*helicopter*) were completely rejected by the journalists.

⁷ Therefore, it was not a problem for I. Filipović (1870) to include this word in his dictionary. So we find the following entries here: *report*: izvješće; *izviest*, *poviedanje*; *to permit*: dopustiti, dopuštati, dozvoliti, dozvoljavati; *to excuse*: ispričati, izvinjavati; *present*: prisutan, nazočan; *insurance*: osjguravanje, obezbjeda, obezbjednja; *to be part of something*: učestvovati, biti učestnik; *ally*: dionik, učestnik; *to inform*: priobćiti, saobćiti; *care*: obskrbljivanje, obskrba, snabdjenje. In Parčić (1901) among others the following headwords can be found: *bezbjednost*, *izviniti se*, *prisutan*, *saobćiti*, *snabdjevati*, *učestnik*. Except for *saopćiti* these headwords are not used in Broz-Iveković (1901).

⁸ Cf. among others Vidović (1969) as to the question how Maretić's *Jezični savjetnik* influenced the later Croatian normativistics in this respect.

⁹ As we have seen, this kind of development has nothing in common with a return to the period before 1918. Therefore, the remark in M. Wingender (1997, 375): "The clock has to be turned back to the period before 1918", is not at all correct.

The different effects evident in the changes partially discussed above do 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 figure, the one behind the respective word, gives the number of references in Moguš (1999); the second figure, 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: MCC) contains texts from the daily newspapers *Vjesnik*, *Večernji list*, *Slobodna Dalmacija* and the cultural magazine *Hrvatsko slovo* from the period from 1997 to 1999 and at present covers approximately 14,000,000 tokens. Later, I will give some further information about this corpus and the whole project which lead to its creation. It has to be 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 the 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 differentiations. 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.	ambasada 5 N-16/47	veleposlanstvo 0-0/831 (poslanstvo 2 DS)
3.	ambasador 21 DNU-18/89	veleposlanik 0-0/1712
4.	analiza 100 NPSU-18/934	raščlamba 0-0/97
5.	armija 94 DNPU-9/406	vojska 149 DNPSU-21/3236
6.	artiljerija 4 NU-0/10	topništvo 1 U-0/67
7.	autoput 10 N-0/9	autocesta 3 N-0/903
8.	avijacija 3 NU-0/8	zrakoplovstvo 10 NU-0/269
9.	avijatičar 1 S-0/4	zrakoplovac 5 N-0/21
10.	avion 100 DNPSU-25/726	zrakoplov 5 PSU-2/1964
11.	baterija (milit.) 4 DP-17/0 (no milit.: 69)	bitnica 0-0/7
12.	biblioteka 23 DNPSU-10/159	knjižnica 13 NPSU-4/1135
13.	branilac 0-0/1	branitelj 7 DNU-8/1938
14.	budžet 26 DNSU-3/125	proračun ¹⁰ 29 NSU-5/2994
15.	centar 71 DNPU-73/5758	središte 75 NPSU-16/1754
16.	činilac 37 NU-11/4	činitelj 1 U-0/70 čimbenik 2 U-1/543
17.	čitalac 24 NPSU-7/24sic!	čitatelj 3 N-3/914
18.	civilizacija 24 DNPU-0/324	uljudba 1 P-0/33
19.	daktilografija 0-0/0	strojopis 2 U-0/6
20.	datum 16 DNPU-8/603	nadnevak 0-0/62
21.	davalac 7 N-2/7sic!	davatelj 0-0/75
22.	delegacija 154 NPU-46/324	izaslanstvo 0-0/1344
23.	delegat 91 NPU-52/148	izaslanik 5 N-3/730 zastupnik 14 DNPSU-15/2840
24.	demilitarizacija 0-0/80	razvojačenje 0-0/29

¹⁰ The meaning *state budget* of the word *proračun* probably was not part of the common language until after 1991.

25.	direktor 95 DNP-32/4904 upravitelj 8 DNPS-3/652	ravnatelj 1 S-0/1824
26.	disciplina 21 DNPU-7/448	stega 4 DPS-0/68
27.	dobrovoljac 3 DNP-1/56	dragovoljac 0-0/ (the frequent name of a soccer club included:) 1032
28.	efikasnost 10 NU-2/62	učinkovitost 0-0/145
29.	ekonomija 13 DNU-1/1011 privreda 234 NPU-74/226	gospodarstvo 14 DNPU-0/3548
30.	faktor 125 DNPU-7/307	čimbenik 2 U-1/543
31.	familija 9 DP-0/14 porodica 69 DNPSU-4/53	obitelj 59 DNPSU-26/4442
32.	finale 10 DNU-19/2240	završnica 2 NP-13/673
33.	firma 7 NPU-0/196 poduzeće 157 DNPU-23/4905	tvrtka 9 NPU-5/4862
34.	fronta 49 DNPU-07/137 front 34 DNPU-17/23 (+3 -om)	bojište 5 NSU-0/85 bojišnica 0-0/92
35.	generacija 40 DNPU-17/812	naraštaj 5 DPS-0/347 pokoljenje 8 PS-0/15
36.	geograf 0-0/8	zemljopisac 0-0/7
37.	geografija 6 SU-0/24	zemljopis 9 NPU-0/61
38.	geografski 28 DNPU-0/80	zemljopisni 6 PSU-0/116
39.	glasanje 3 P-8/35 (glasati 24 DNPS-7/inf.:17)	glasovanje 0-0/595 (glasovati 1 P-0/inf.:203)
40.	gledalac 48 DNPU-35/70	gledatelj 0-3/1758
41.		glede 0-0/1045
42.	gradevinar 6 NU-4/71 gradevinac 0-0/7	graditelj 12 DNSU-6/172
43.	gradevinarstvo 24 NU-8/76	graditeljstvo 0-0/236
44.	greška 46 DNU-18/338	pogreška 42 DPSU-5/1000 pogriješka 0-0/35
45.	grupa 200 DNPSU-46/2016	skupina 87 DNPSU-9/5395
46.	hapšenje 6 DNP-10/15	uhićenje 0-0/472
47.	hiljada 50 DNPSU-1/23	tisuća 172 DNPSU-49/4411
48.	historija 43 DNPSU-1/21	povijest 138 DNPSU-19/3097
49.	historijski 45 DNPSU-1/57	povijestan 68 DNSU-24/2065
50.	izvještaj 55 SN-21/769	izvješće 0-0/2297
51.	izvođenje 38 NU-9/274	izvedba 49 NU-16/951
52.	kancelarija 22 DNP-0/73	ured 49 DNPSU-3/3546
53.	kandidat 49 DNPS-17/2090	pristupnik 0-0/6
54.	kasarna 19 DNPS-2/10	vojarna 1 P-0/331
55.	klavir 15 DNPSU-0/95	glasovir 0-0/139
56.	komisija 75 DNPU-60/2031	povjerenstvo 1 P-0/1834
57.	kompozitor 8 NU-4/21	skladatelj 7 NU-4/472
58.	kvaliteta 87 DNU-20/1429 (+ kvalitet: 6 DNP-1/4)	kakvoća 12 U-0/304
59.	kvantiteta 2 U-1(-et)/18	kolikoća 0-0/1 količina 149 NPU-11/1277
60.	muzika 78 DNPSU-13/47	glazba 113 DNPSU-19/3170
61.	naređenje 10 DNPS-1/38	naredba 10 DNP-3/204

62.	obaveza 78 NPU-37/162	obaveza 33 NPU-0/2524
63.	obrazovanje 50 NU-62/662	naobrazba 5 NU-0/162 izobrazba 1 N-0/116
64.	oficir 68 DNPS-5/103	časnik 7 DPS-0/533
65.	omladina 71 DNU-27/36	mladež 8 DPSU-1/1429
66.	opozicija 26 DNPU-9/218	oporba 2 S-0/1752
67.	organizirati 82 DNPU-36/2054	ustrojiti 0-0/85
68.	parada 9 DNPS-1/155	mimohod 4 PSU-0/132
69.	patrola 11 NP-0/43	ophodnja 4 DPS-0/154
70.	pauza 72 DNPU-3/89	stanka 0-1/250
71.	porijeklo 20 DNSU-11/230	podrijetlo 10 DPSU-0 ¹¹ /575
72.	posjetilac 24 DNPU-3/42	posjetitelj 0-1/775
73.	potpredsjednik 45 DN-16/1630	dopredsjednik 0-0/449 dopredsjedatelj /3
74.	poznavalac 6 DNU-3/20	poznavatelj 0-0/200
75.	pratilac 12 DNSU-2/28	pratitelj 0-0/40
76.	predsjednik 450 DNPU-178/18463	predsjedatelj 0-0/131
77.	princip 57 DNSU-13/406	načelo 98 DNPU-16/1178
78.	prisustvovati 90 DNPSU-18/331	nazočiti 0-0/42 pribivati 0-0/27
79.	prisutan 104 DNPSU-27/720	nazočan 2 P-1/1376
80.	prisutnost 49 DNPSU-2/268 prisustvo 16 DNPSU-3/43	nazočnost 1 P-2/731
81.	propaganda 19 DNSU-6/148	promidžba (č) 1 P-0/č: 61; dž: 361
82.	protest 11 DNPS-8/150	prosvjed 2 P-1/1867
83.	protestirati 13 DNPU-1/83	prosvjedovati 0-0/430
84.	provođenje 44 NPSU-27/458	provedba 6 NU-6(provadb?) /1339
85.	prvoborac 7 DN-0/16	
86.		pučanstvo 7 DU-1/491
87.	pumpa 6 NPU-0/34	crpka 2 U-0/201
88.	raskršće 43 DNPSU-2/3	križanje (raskrižje) 8 NU-6/237 raskrižje 1U-0/228
89.	rezerva 30 DNU-11/440	pričuva 0-0/239
90.	saopćenje 31 N-13/1	priopćenje 0-0/2382
91.	saopćiti 25 DNS-13/5	priopćiti 1 D-0/1589
92.	saradnja 20 N-0/3	suradnja 155 DNPU-79/4656
93.	sekretarica 2 DN-0/23	tajnica 0-0(tajnik6)/737
94.	sekretarijat 49 N-12/29	tajništvo 3 D-1/228
95.	sistem 303 DNPSU-84/306	sustav 140 DPU-1/4540
96.	spot 15 DNPU-19/4622	šport 2 D-0/1143
97.	štab 28 DNPSU-13/117 general- 12 DN-0/44	stožer 3 DPS-1/960
98.	štampa 53 DNU-24/36	tisak 4 DNS-0/1697 (excluded "Tisak" as the name of a company)
99.	štampati 7 DNPS-1/16	tiskati 7 DPU-3/278
100.	staratelj 1 P-0/4	skrbnik 0-0/27
101.	stroj za pranje -?/?	perilica 0-0/30

¹¹ Z. Šojat uses the word *podrijetlo* in his introduction (Šojat, 1983, IV).

102.	talas 63 NPS-0/5	val 146 DNPSU-7/725
103.	teatar 42 DNPSU-18/886	kazalište 128 DNPSU-49/2697
104.	telegram 10 DNP-2/20 telegraf 1 N-0/90	brzjav 24 DNP-4/85 brzjavka 2 PU-0/1
105.	tokom 25 DNPU/53	tijekom 7 SU/4787
106.	učesnik 7 NPU-1/11	sudionik 38 NPU-32/921
107.	uniforma 49 DNPS-1/120	odora 14 DPS-0/239
108.	upotreba 128 DNPU-9/331	poraba 0-0/8 uporaba 0-0 ¹² /695
109.	uputstvo 5 NPU-2/14	uputa 33 DNPSU-4/348
110.	utisak 17 DNPU-2/23	dojam 46 DNPU-17/1056
111.	veteran 2 N-0/398	
112.	vezi (92) -/u vezi 938	svezi (3) -/u svezi 648
113.	zakletva 9 DS-0/45	prisega 4 D-0/99
114.	zloupotreba 6 NU-6/89	zluporaba 0-0/175 zloporeba 0-0/206

From the table it can be inferred that words like *avion* (plane), *direktor* (direktor, manager), *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. Pranjković claims (cf. Pranjković 2000, 71). Equally, the supposedly new productivity of the type of nouns ending in *-(id)ba* like *odmoridba*, *zagladba*, *gladidba* and *odželjezidba* which according to I. Pranjković is "particularly frequent" (Pranjković 2000, 70), is not supported by the MCC. On the word *koštvnik* (price list) Pranjković notes the following:

Out of fear to use a Serbism 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 (*koštvnik*). Besides, judging by its form, *koštvnik* could easily be taken for a Serbism, cf. the Serbian *cenovnik*. (Pranjković 2000, 72)

The word *koštvnik* does not occur even once in the MCC (neither do its derivatives). *Cjenik*, on the other hand, has got 238 references. Unfortunately Pranjković 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. Katičić'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 (Katičić 1997, 28). The searches in the *Croatian national corpus*, which is accessible to everyone on the internet (<http://www.hnk.ffzg.hr/>), also show that the specifications supplied by Pranjković 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 monolithic institutionalised political forces. This "institutionalisation" is judged to have a negative influence, often without any consideration for scientific objectivity.

For example, S. Kirfel (2000, 120) reduces the current "discussion about the Croatian language (not only the standard language)" to the following: "Its principal aim doubtlessly 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 purism, she determines in which cases the Croatian purism is "irrational and extreme" (134).

¹² Z. Šojat uses the word *uporaba* in his introduction (Šojat 1983, IV). In my opinion before 1991 words like *uporaba* and *podrijetlo* mostly occurred in an elevated style of expression.

The word *komisija* (commission, committee) was still used as a term in the nineties, although for terminological reasons it was replaced by *povjerenstvo* in certain meanings. Kirfel 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 *prosvjed* (protest) is "formed even more unfortunately" (128). S. Kirfel also thinks that the word *obitelj* still had to "become a common word" in 1978 (Kirfel 2000, 125). From this point of view it remains entirely unclear why Šojat (1983) has 26 references for this word and Mogaš (1999) 59 (DNPSU).

M. Wingender 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]" (Wingender 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" (Wingender 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 Wingender 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. (Wingender 2000, 260-261; 1997, 382)

M. Wingender 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. Wingender 2000, 265). As an example she quotes the dictionary by Brodnjak (1991) which was supposedly written in the nineties. However, Brodnjak's dictionary was not written in the nineties, under the rule of the new Croatian "rigorous language policy" (Wingender 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 Croatists in Croatia. Unfortunately M. Wingender has not taken into account that Croatian-Serbian differences were first registered by a Serbian linguist, namely by R. Bošković (1935) (cf. Brodnjak 1991; Wingender 1997, 376) and that, still in the political era of communist Yugoslavia, a Serbian author published a Croatian-Serbian dictionary (Ćirilov 1989).

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 led, 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 largely 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 again 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 circumstantiate 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 **suraditi* (50), quoted as an "old derivative from *su-*", 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 *suautor*, *sufinancirati*, *suigrač*, *suosnivač*, *suvlasnik* or *međuvrijeme*, *poluvrijeme*, *polumjer*, 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 *zamolili smo ga da doći* are used instead of the correct *zamolili smo ga da dođe* 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 *zamolili smo ga da doći* is not mentioned even once in the MCC. 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, 308-351). 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 as "something ridiculous" without offering any linguistic arguments? Such positions can perhaps be explained by the basic postulates of Slavic philology in the 19th century.¹³ This historical "problem" in the development of slavistics can be explained only in connection with the theoretical, methodological and philosophical presuppositions and "apories" of serbocroatism (Auburger 1997, 1999, here especially: 351-406). On the basis of these presuppositions "serbocroatistics" 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 single languages" needs "a type of linguistic personalism as a general theoretical basis" and must not ignore "in an individualist and reductionist way the reality of existing groups of speakers and 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

¹³ Cf. Grčević 1997a, 85-126, 1997b, 1997c.

in which the previous and the contemporary lexical structures currently co-exist,¹⁴ 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 Slavic 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. Gazdiková and M. Dragičević 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
	January, February, March, October, November, December 1998
Slobodna Dalmacija	June 1999
Hrvatsko slovo	numbers 150-200, 1998

At present, the corpus is being supplemented by texts from *Feral* and from the latest editions (2000/01) 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 a second corpus is planned. It will contain texts from Croatian newspapers and magazines of the period before 1991.

Bibliography

- Anić, Vladimir. (1998). *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb, 1991; 3rd edition: 1998.
 Arj. (1880-1976). *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 23 vol. Zagreb.
 Auburger, Leopold. (1991). "Entwicklungsprobleme der kroatischen Standardsprache", *Natalicia Johanni Schröpfer octogenario a discipulis amicisque oblata - Festschrift für Johannes Schröpfer zum 80. Geburtstag*, Ed.: Auburger, L.; Hill, P. München, 1-31.
 Auburger, Leopold. (1993). *Sprachvarianten und ihr Status in den Sprachsystemen*. Philosophische Texte und Studien 36. Hildesheim; Zürich; New York.
 Auburger, Leopold. (1997). "Der Status des Kroatischen als Einzelsprache und der

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.

- Serbokroatismus: ein Lehrstück aus der kontaktlinguistischen Begriffsgeschichte", *Neue Forschungsarbeiten zur Kontaktlinguistik. Plurilingua*, 19, Ed.: Moelleken, W. W.; Weber, P. J. Bonn, 21-29.
 Auburger, Leopold. (1999). *Die kroatische Sprache und der Serbokroatismus*. Ulm/Donau.
 Babić, Stjepan. (1990). *Hrvatski jezik u političkom vrtlogu*. Zagreb.
 Babić, Stjepan. (1995). *Hrvatski jezik jučer i danas*. Zagreb.
 Barth, Gregor. (1999). "Veränderungsprozesse und -tendenzen im kroatischen Wortschatz", *Beiträge der Europäischen Slavistischen Linguistik (Polyslav)* 2, Ed.: Böttger, K.; Giger, M.; Wiemer, B. München, 25-32.
 Bašić, Nataša. (1994). "'Nasilna kroatizacija'", *Jezik*, 41, 5, 157-160.
 Brodnjak, Vladimir. (1991). *Razlikovni rječnik srpskoga i hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb.
 Broz, I; Iveković, F. (1901). *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb.
 Brozović, Dalibor. (1971). "O sadanjem času na kružnici jezičnoga sata", *Kritika*, 17, 190-210.
 Brozović, Dalibor. (1997). "Stanje i zadatci jezikoslovne kroatistike", *Prvi hrvatski slavistički kongres*, 2 vol., Ed.: Damjanović, Stjepan. Zagreb, 1st vol., 9-13.
 Brozović, Dalibor. (1998). "Povijesna podloga i jezičnopolitičke i sociolingvističke okolnosti", *Hrvatski jezik*, Ed.: Lončarić, Mijo. Opole, 3-34.
 Croatian National Corpus. <http://www.hnk.ffzg.hr/>.
 Čirilov, Jovan. (1989). *Hrvatsko-srpski rječnik inačica. Srpsko-hrvatski rečnik varijanti*. Beograd.
 Filipović, Ivan. (1870). *Neues Wörterbuch der kroatischen und deutschen Sprache*. Zagreb.
 Gnjidić, Maja. (2000). "Stav govornika hrvatskog standardnog jezika prema oživljenicama", *Govor*, XVII, 2, 155-162.
 Grčević, Mario. (1997a). *Die Entstehung der kroatischen Literatursprache*. Köln; et al.
 Grčević, Mario. (1997b). "Zašto slavistika 19. stoljeća nije priznavala postojanje hrvatskoga jezika? Uzroci i posljedice", *Jezik*, 45, 1, 3-28.
 Grčević, Mario. (1997c). "Karadžićeva gledišta o hrvatskome jeziku u slavističkome okružju", *Jezik*, 45, 2, 41-58.
 Grubišić, Vinko. (1985). "Hrvatski jezik nakon II. svjetskog rata", *Hrvatska revija*, 35, 2, 272-286.
 Gvozdanović, Jadranka. (1985). *Language System and its Change*. Berlin.
 Gvozdanović, Jadranka (Ed.). (1997). *Language Change and functional Explanations*. Berlin; New York.
 Katičić, Radoslav. (1994). "Hrvatski jezik kao pojava određena svojom poviješću", *Jezik*, 41, 5, 129-134.
 Katičić, Radoslav. (1997). "Hrvatski jezik u svijetu", *Prvi hrvatski slavistički kongres*, 2 vol., Ed.: Damjanović, Stjepan. Zagreb, 1st vol., 23-30.
 Kirfel, Sabine. (2000). "Die kroatische Sprache des Rechts - Kontinuität in der Diskontinuität", *Die Sprachen Südosteuropas heute. Umbrüche und Aufbruch*, Ed.: Kunzmann-Müller, Barbara. Frankfurt am Main; et al., 118-136.
 Klaić, Bratoljub. (1985). *Rječnik stranih riječi*. Zagreb.
 Kunzmann-Müller, Barbara (2000a). "Sprachliche Wende und Sprachwandel im Kroatischen/Serbischen", *Die Sprachen Südosteuropas heute. Umbrüche und Aufbruch*, Ed.: Kunzmann-Müller, Barbara. Frankfurt am Main; et al., 42-65.
 Kunzmann-Müller, Barbara (2000b). "Sprachlicher Wandel im modernen Kroatischen", *Sprachwandel in der Slavia*, 2 vol., Ed.: Zybatow, Lew N. Frankfurt am Main; et al., 1st vol., 129-140.
 Mamić, Mile. (1999). *Temelji hrvatskoga pravnog nazivlja*. Zagreb.

- Maretić, Tomislav. (1924). *Hrvatski ili srpski jezični savjetnik*. Zagreb.
- Moguš, M; Bratanić, M; Tadić, M. (1999). *Hrvatski čestotni rječnik*. Zagreb.
- Parčić, Dragutin. (1901). *Rječnik hrvatsko-talijanski*. Zadar.
- Pavešić, Slavko, et al. (1971). *Jezični savjetnik s gramatikom*. Zagreb.
- Pederin, Marko. (1991). "Neopravdano potisnute riječi", *Jezik*, 38, 4, 128.
- Peti, Mirko. (1994). "Nerazlikovnost razlika", *Rasprave Zavoda za jezik*, 20, 245-272.
- Pranjković, Ivo (2000). "Normative und paranormative Neuerungen in der kroatischen Sprache", *Die Sprachen Südosteuropas heute. Umbrüche und Aufbruch*, Ed.: Kunzmann-Müller, Barbara. Frankfurt am Main; et al., 66-74.
- Samardžija, Marko (Ed.). (1993). *Jezični purizam u NDH*. Zagreb.
- Samardžija, Marko. (1998). "Leksik", *Hrvatski jezik*, Ed.: Lončarić, Mijo. Opole, 133-152.
- Samardžija, Marko (Ed.) (1999). *Norme i normiranje hrvatskoga standardnoga jezika*. Zagreb.
- Samardžija, Marko. (2000a). "Internationalismen in der kroatischen Sprache - Vergangenheit und aktueller Stand", *Die Sprachen Südosteuropas heute. Umbrüche und Aufbruch*, Ed.: Kunzmann-Müller, Barbara. Frankfurt am Main; et al., 75-93.
- Samardžija, Marko. (2000b). "Normierung und Standardisierung des Kroatischen", *Sprachwandel in der Slavia*, 2 vol., Ed.: Zybatow, Lew. N. Frankfurt am Main; et al., 1st vol., 583-597.
- Selak, Ante (Ed.). (1992). *Taj hrvatski*. Zagreb.
- Sesar, D; Vidović, I. (2000). "Što je novogovor učinio hrvatskomu jeziku?", *Jezik*, 47, 3, 81-94.
- Silić, Josip. (1997). "Novinarski stil hrvatskoga standardnog jezika", *Kolo*, 3, 495-513.
- Silić, Josip. (1999). "Leksik i norma", *Norme i normiranja hrvatskoga standardnoga jezika*, Ed.: Samardžija, Marko. Zagreb, 282-292.
- Šimundić, Mate. (1971). "O kulturi jezika i govora na zagrebačkom radiju i televiziji", *Kritika*, 17, 225-240.
- Šojat, Zorislav. (1983). *Čestotni rječnik Večernjeg lista i Vjesnika*. Zagreb.
- Šonje, Jure; et al. (2000). *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb.
- Šulek, Bogoslav. (1860). *Deutsch-kroatisches Wörterbuch*. Agram.
- Tadić, Marko (1997). "Računalna obradba hrvatskih korpusa: povijest, stanje i perspektive", *Suvremena lingvistika*, 43-44, 387-394 (<http://www.hnk.ffzg.hr/mt/>).
- Tadić, Marko (1998). "Raspon, opseg i sastav korpusa suvremenoga hrvatskoga jezika", *Filologija*, 30-31, 337-347 (<http://www.hnk.ffzg.hr/mt/>).
- Tafta, Branka. (1999). "Povijesna načela normiranja leksika", *Norme i normiranja hrvatskoga standardnoga jezika*, Ed.: Samardžija, Marko. Zagreb, 260-281.
- Težak, Stjepko. (1999). *Hrvatski naš (ne)zaboravljeni*. Zagreb.
- Vidović, Radovan. (1969). *Kako ne valja - kako valja pisati*. Zagreb.
- Vuković, Milan. (1996). "Hrvatski jezik u kaznenim progonima", *Jezik*, 44, 2, 77-80.
- Wingender, Monika. (1997). "Sprachpolitik in Kroatien. Eine exemplarische Analyse der Sprachratgeber im Vjesnik", *Linguistische Beiträge zur Slavistik* 58, Ed.: Schulze, Jana; Werner, Eduard. München, 372-392.
- Wingender, Monika. (2000). "Aktuelle Entwicklungen in der kroatischen Standardsprache", *Die Sprachen Südosteuropas heute. Umbrüche und Aufbruch*, Ed.: Kunzmann-Müller, Barbara. Frankfurt am Main; et al., 251-270.

Preface	7 ¹
Introduction	11
Raymond Detrez: <i>Language or nation: what came first?</i>	
Language Policy	19
Olga Mišeska-Tomić: <i>Contentious issues in the relationship of Macedonian to the neighbouring Slavonic languages</i>	21
Sigrid Darinka Völkl: <i>Bosnian language: Language between ethnic/national identification and communication</i>	28
Miloš Okuka: <i>Montenegrin vs. Serbian or: is there a separate Montenegrin language at all?</i>	38
Maja Draženović-Carrieri: <i>BCS - A Practical Approach</i>	49
Lexicography and Language Variants	53
Biljana Šljivić-Šimšić: <i>On My Collaboration with Morton Benson on the SerboCroatian-English Dictionary: Decisions Concerning the Variants</i>	55
Radovan Lučić: <i>Infeasibility of a lexicographic amalgamation of Croatian and Serbian in a bilingual dictionary</i>	60
Jelica Novaković-Lopušina: <i>Two in one or one in two</i>	71
Vlado Đukanović: <i>How to do arithmetics with language: the nature of lexical variations in 'the language traditionally referred to as Serbo-Croatian'</i>	77
Case-Studies in Lexicography	85
René Genis: <i>Grammatical Information in the New "Bi-directional" Polish-Dutch Dictionary: Some Problems and a Few (Im)practical Solutions</i>	87
Danko Šipka: <i>Internal and External Lexical Dynamics: A Case Study of Serbo-Croatian</i>	96
Wim Honselaar: <i>Newspeak, lexicography and computers</i>	102

The Politics of Lexicography	109
Damir Kalogjera: <i>Misunderstandings about the role of the monolingual dictionary</i>	111
Mira Načeva-Marvanová: <i>Before and after 1989: The Case of Great Bulgarian Dictionary of Foreign Words</i>	120
Dubravko Škiljan: <i>"Differential" dictionaries: their motivations and goals</i>	126
Branka Tafra, Maja Bratanić: <i>Croatian lexicography between politics and linguistics</i>	134
Standardology	143
Ranko Bugarski: <i>Serbo-Croatian and its descendant: a case of Umbau?</i>	145
Mario Grčević: <i>Some remarks on recent lexical changes in the Croatian language</i>	150
Milorad Radovanović, Nataša Bugarski: <i>Serbian Language at the End of the Century</i>	164
Nikola Rašić: <i>What happened to Serbo-Croatian? Sociolinguistic changes on territories of Former Yugoslavia</i>	173
Afterword	183
Jiří Marvan: <i>National Languages in Post-Socialist Countries – Just Means of Communication or Tools of Revival?</i>	