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LANGUAGES WE SPEAK
WEST – EAST DIVIDE

- Where do you draw a line and why?

- DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES
  - Geography
  - Civilization
  - Economy
  - Science
  - Culture
PERSPECTIVES

- Geography – world or a specific region
- Civilization - Niall Ferguson, *Civilization: The West and the Rest*, 2011 (monopoly of competition, science, the rule of law, modern medicine, consumerism, and the work ethic)
- Economy - Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, 2014 (wealth and income inequality, distribution and redistribution of wealth in developed countries)
- Science – Peng Tian, *Convergence: Where West meets East*, article in a journal *Nature*, 2011; traditional Asian medicine, concept of health and nature vs. chemicals
GEOGRAPHY
MORE GEOGRAPHY

Balkans – East depends on where you stand:
Slovenia
Croatia
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Serbia
Montenegro etc.
COMPARATIVE HISTORICAL STANDARDOLOGY

SOCIOLINGUISTICS

HISTORY

INTERFACE

SOCIOMETRY
COMPARATIVE HISTORICAL STANDARDOLOGY

- South Slavic lands ➔ Croatian and Serbian lands
- Geographic, political and conceptual spaces
  - Dialectal continuum
  - Croatia is at the cultural and civilizational intersection of Central Europe, Mediterranean Europe, and the Balkans
- Border region between the Roman Catholic Church and Eastern Orthodox Church and Islam
SOUTH SLAVIC LANGUAGE QUESTION

- STATUS AND CORPUS OF LANGUAGES

- Slavia romana and Slavia orthodoxa
  - Latin vs. vernacular languages
  - Old Church Slavic vs. vernacular languages
SLAVIA ROMANA – LATIN

- “no one’s” language (foreign to everyone)
- universal/global language
- religious language
- language of the secular literature and science

THEREFORE:

- ideal model for standardization
- universal medium and an obstacle (role of education)
SLAVIA ORTHODOXA – CHURCH SLAVIC

- “everyone’s” language
  - familiar (South) Slavic base
  - close to vernacular
- local(ized) language
- religious language not used for secular purposes

THEREFORE:
- not suitable model for standardization (hybrid)
- local(ized) medium
STATUS AND CORPUS OF CHOICES
STATUS AND CORPUS OF CHOICES

Status planning – involves decisions regarding the status of one language variety in relation to others

Corpus planning - involves decisions as to the actual form of the language itself (orthography, grammar, and lexicon)

- **BASE**
  - (dialectal) base, i.e., the organic local idiom
  - primarily oral
  - phonology, morphology, basic syntax and basic lexicon
  - ties language to the geography

- **SUPERSTRUCTURE**
  - (cultural-civilizational) superstructure
  - primarily written
  - conceptual ground of a standard language
  - allows for transcending borders (time and space)
HIERARCHY
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BASE AND THE SUPERSTRUCTURE IN SOUTH SLAVIC LANDS

- Standardization processes in Slovene language:
  - started in 16th century (Trubar, Krelj, Dalmatin)
  - abruptly stopped until the end of 18th century

- Standardization processes in Serbian language:
  - started in 19th century
  - prior: Old Church Slavic – Church Slavic (localized and Russian redaction) – Russo-Slavic – Slavo-Serbian

- Standardization processes in Croatian language:
  - three distinct dialects (fragmentation)
  - church and secular literature (grammars, dictionaries, scientific literature)
  - štokavian supremacy (authority of great writers, Bosnian Franciscans)
CROATIAN and SERBIAN

- WHAT WAS CHOSEN IN 19th CENTURY?
  - Seemingly the same language variety
  - but,
  - SAME dialectal base
  - DIFFERENT superstructures

- RELEVANT FOR THE STANDARDIZATION PROCESS
PROMINENT AND INFLUENTIAL INDIVIDUALS

- **Maksimilijan Vrhovec**, the archbishop of Zagreb archdiocese and the central figure of Croatian cultural and political life

- **Jernej Kopitar**, Slovene philologist, Imperial censor in Vienna and the central Slavic administrative intellectual

- **Vuk Stefanović Karadžić**, Serbian folklorist and philologist, reformer of the Serbian language

- DIFFERENT ROLES, DIFFERENT POLITICAL STANDPOINTS, DIFFERENT INFLUENCE
FINAL STAGE OF THE PROCESS

- **Maksimilijan Vrhovec** (1752-1827) - call to the spiritual shepherd of his archdiocese 1837
  - initially written in Latin, republished in Danica Ilirska, translated into Illyrian language
  - guidelines for the evaluation of the predecessors and for the restoration (or fortification) of the models
    - folk/oral poems
    - «collections of special words», ie. dictionaries and published books
    - conventional usage norms and the authority of the great writers

- **MODEL**
  - norm is mediated through the literature and usage
  - folk/peasant language is not a model, but the guardian of the tradition
FINAL STAGE OF THE PROCESS

- **Jernej Kopitar** (1780-1844) - «monstrum scientiarum» and «der Gelehrte, der allen heutigen Slawisten vorangeht» (Jakob Grimm, 1836)

- organized Slavic cultural life in Vienna (reputation and influence), supporter of Austroslavism (unity of Slavic peoples within the Austrian Empire), developed Carantania-Pannonia Theory
  - Croats don’t exist as an ethnic community (Kajkavian is Slovenian, Štokavian is Serbian and only Čakavian can be taken into consideration)

- **MODEL**
  - positivist scientific view: there is a link between the language and the “spirit of the people”
  - organic reality is relevant, every cultural influence should be ignored
FINAL STAGE OF THE PROCESS

- Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787-1864) — the executor following Kopitar’s program
  - Kopitar encouraged him to collect folk poems and stories and to write a grammar of the popular Serbian language, as well as a dictionary
    - established Serbian literary language by distancing it from the Russo-Slavic and Slavo-Serbian, brought it closer to Croatian
    - orthographic reform (simplification of Cyrillic alphabet)

MODEL: (following Kopitar)
- language of uneducated/peasants is the ideal language
COMPARISON OF TWO MODELS

- **Norm is mediated through the literature and usage**
- **There is a link between the language and the "spirit of the people"**

**Folk/Peasant Language**
- Language is not a model, but the guardian of the tradition
- Organic reality is relevant; every cultural influence should be ignored

**Standard Language**
- There is a link between the language and the "spirit of the people"
TENTATIVE CONCLUSION

- COLLISION OF TWO CONCEPTS OF STATUS AND CORPUS PLANNING

- All three players understood the difference between the base and the superstructure

- Their hierarchies substantially differed

- Relativity of the commonality and necessary negotiations were not taken into account
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