

## Pregledni članak

UDK 811.163.42'373.45

81'373.45

811.163.42'271

Pregledni članak

Prihvaćeno za tisak 03. 03. 2008.

*Marija Turk, Maja Opašić,*  
*Faculty of Philosophy, Rijeka*  
*mturk@ffri.hr, mopasic@ffri.hr*

### Linguistic Borrowing and Purism in the Croatian Language

In this paper we present a series of evident and latent as well as direct and indirect influences of foreign languages on Croatian. We consider linguistic borrowing through the prisms of purism in contemporary European languages and of implicit and explicit purism in Croatian. We argue that Croatian linguistic purism is consonant with similar activities taking place in other European languages, addressing the same issues according to the same criteria, and that it has been a constant feature of the language, varying only in the degree of intensity. Croatian, as a traditionally purist language, has not accepted foreign language models passively, but has adapted loanwords according to its rules, at the same time activating its expressive potential by creating calques as substitutes for foreign language models.

---

#### 1. The Croatian language in contact with other languages

All Croatian cultural and scientific tradition has been steeped in, and enriched by, several hundred years of linguistic contact with other cultural and civilizational spheres. Linguistic contact and influence can be seen at all language levels, but most of all at the lexical level. Linguistic borrowing may be both readily apparent and latent (Carstensen 1979: 90–94). Lexical innovation arising from clear borrowing produces various types of loanwords, while latent borrowing results in calque. Exception made for the oldest ones dating back to Proto-Slavic (Matasović 2000: 29–37), the origin of loanwords in Croatian, whatever their degree of adaptation, can be identified more or less easily. Calques, on the other hand, are more difficult to identify, since they are formed from the recipient language's semantic components on complete or partial analogy with the source-language model. Previous descriptions of linguistic borrowing in Croatian have mostly dealt with loanwords, and less frequently with

calques, while works which cover both forms of borrowing are rare and incomplete.

As the language of a small European nation which, in accordance with its potential, engaged with the intellectual movements in whose midst it existed and took an active part in the history of European culture and civilization, Croatian has of necessity in many ways been shaped according to preset models. However, the standardological awareness included an explicit tendency not to accept foreign language models passively, but instead to activate the language's own expressive potential based on these models.

**Classical languages**, particularly Latin, played a very important part in all Croatian cultural and scientific tradition and, consequently, in the Croatian language<sup>1</sup>: *kancelar* 'chancellor' (Lat. *cancellarius*), *kodeks* 'codex' (Lat. *codex*), *lektor* 'foreign-language instructor / language editor' (Lat. *lector*), *perspektiva* 'perspective' (Lat. *perspectiva*), *kanon* 'canon' (Gr. *κανών*), *karakter* 'character' (Gr. *χαρακτήρ*), *paradoks* 'paradox' (Gr. *παράδοξος*), *kateheza* 'catechesis' (Gr. *κατήχησις*). Latin also had an important intermediary role between the Croatian and Greek languages: *karizma* 'charisma' (Lat. *charisma* < Gr. *χάρισμα*), *litanije* 'litanies' (Lat. *litania* < Gr. *λιτανεία*), *tema* 'theme' (Lat. *thema* < Gr. *θέμα*), *paranoja* 'paranoia' (Lat. *paranoia* < Gr. *παράνοια*), *scena* 'scene' (Lat. *scaena* < Gr. *σχηνή*), *teatar* 'theatre' (Lat. *theatrum* < Gr. *θέατρον*). Numerous loanwords in terminology were taken, and some were calqued, from or via Latin, e. g. *kamera opskura – tamna komora* 'dark chamber' (Lat. *camera obscura*), *legitiman – zakonit* 'legitimate' (Lat. *legitimus*); *ortoepija – pravogovor* 'orthoepy' (Gr. *ὀρθοέπεια*), *ortografija – pravopis* 'orthography' (Gr. *ὀρθογραφία*), *per capita – po glavi* 'per head' (Lat. *per capita*), *radikalan – korjenit* 'radical' (Lat. *radicalis*), *singular – jednina* 'singular' (Lat. *singularis*), *unilateralan – jednostran* 'unilateral' (Lat. *unilateralis*) etc.

The influence of classical languages on Croatian was intensive and of long duration, beginning practically at the dawn of Croatian literacy. Nevertheless, despite the fact that Croatian developed in "a sort of symbiosis with classical languages" from the very beginning of its literacy, their influence on Croatian has been the subject of far less research than the influence of living European languages.<sup>2</sup>

Contacts between Croatian and the **Italian language** or its dialects began at the same time as Croatian history on the east coast of the Adriatic, while contacts between standard Croatian and Italian languages intensified from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards. The majority of Italian loanwords in Croatian trace

1 Latin was the language of literature, and for a very long time the language of State administration, education, and science, as well as the language of Catholic liturgy.

2 Ivo Pranjković (2001: 156–163) presents, in a brief article, a complete overview of "the basic principles of word borrowing from classical languages". Given the exceptionally small number of scholarly works on the influences of classical languages on Croatian (Turk 2006: 424), we can justifiably concur with Pranjković when he notes, at the end of the article, the need for a monograph on the contacts between Croatian and the classical languages.

their origin from Venetian, an Italian dialect which was, and still is, spoken in Venice and the regions which were in the past under the jurisdiction of Venice. For the most part, these words are now regionalisms and are mainly used in the south of Croatia: e. g. *poneštra* 'window' (Ital. *finestra*), *lancun* 'sheet' (Ital. *lenzuolo*), *ćakula* 'chatter', 'gossip' (Ital. *ciacola*), *bala* 'ball' (Ital. *balla*), *borša* 'bag' (Ital. *borsa*), *butiga* 'shop' (Ital. *bottega*), *kušin* 'pillow' (Ital. *cuscino*), *šetimana* 'week' (Ital. *settimana*), *bićerin* 'small glass' (Ital. *bicchierino*), *kalceta* 'sock' (Ital. *calzetta*), *botun* 'button' (Ital. *bottone*) (Mujčić 1973: 21–39). Italian influence on standard Croatian can be seen in loanwords: *salata* 'salad' (Ital. *insalata*), *boca* 'bottle' (Ital. *bozza*), *čavao* 'nail' (Ital. *chivo*), *balkon* 'balcony' (Ital. *balcone*), *flota* 'fleet' (Ital. *flotta*), *roba* 'merchandise' (Ital. *roba*), *parmezan* 'Parmesan' (Ital. *parmigiano*), *valuta* 'currency' (Ital. *valuta*), *makaroni* 'macaroni' (Ital. *maccharone*); in loanwords with the status of Europeanisms: *violina* 'violin' (Ital. *violina*), *duet* 'duet' (Ital. *duetto*), *balerina* 'ballerina' (Ital. *ballerina*), *čembalo* 'harpichord' (Ital. *cembalo*), *solfeggio* 'solmization' (Ital. *solfeggio*), *pizza* 'pizza' (Ital. *pizza*); in hybrid loans: *autocesta* 'motorway' (Ital. *autostrada*), *bjanko mjenica* 'blank bill of exchange' (Ital. *cambiale in bianco*), *neto-težina* 'net weight' (Ital. *peso netto*), *žiro-račun* 'transfer account' (Ital. *giro conto*); and in calques: *morski plodovi* 'seafood' (Ital. *frutti di mare*), *visoka moda* 'high fashion' (Ital. *alta moda*). Italian also played the role of intermediary between Latin and Croatian: Lat. *possessio* > Ital. *possessione* > Cro. *posjed* 'possession' etc.

Quite a long time had passed before academic work was undertaken on several centuries' worth of contact between Croatian and Italian. Within the framework of Croatian–Italian interaction, a wide range of individual aspects of Croatian–Italian contact has been analyzed and several articles,<sup>3</sup> along with two major monographs,<sup>4</sup> have been published.

**German** had a major and long-term influence on the Croatian language. Croatian had intensive contacts with German, or its Austrian variant (Žepić 2002: 209–227), during the centuries of territorial contiguity and political association. The majority of Germanisms were borrowed in the 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries along with concepts from the cultural superstructure and artifacts of industrial civilization. Today, a large part of those Germanisms have the status of regionalisms or jargon words characteristic of particular professions: e. g. *bremza* 'brake' (Ger. *Bremse*), *fergazer* 'carburettor' (Ger. *Vergaser*), *rost-fraj* 'stainless' (Ger. *Rostfrei*), *šleper* 1. 'semi(trailer)', 2. 'tug(boat)' (Ger. *Schlepper*), *šteker* 'plug' (Ger. *Stecker*) etc. There has been continued interest

3 See Turk (2006: 425).

4 Jukka Hyrkkänen (1973) published the first major work on the influence of Italian on Croatian. He analyzed Italian loanwords which appeared in Croatian Renaissance literature from the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> to the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century; the section dealing with the role of Italian dialects in the process of borrowing into Croatian is extremely instructive. Lelija Sočanac (2004) gives the most comprehensive overview and analysis of Italian–Croatian linguistic contacts; the book also includes a dictionary of Italianisms in standard Croatian and a dictionary of Italianisms in Dubrovnik's dramatic literature.

in studying the influence of German on Croatian since the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as is apparent from the great number of papers dealing with Germanisms from various points of view<sup>5</sup>. Croatian–German contacts are manifested to the greatest extent in calques,<sup>6</sup> some examples of which are: *svjetonazor* 'world view' (Ger. *Weltanschauung*), *poslodavac* 'employer' (Ger. *Arbeitsgeber*), *ležaj* *tech* 'bearing' (Ger. *Lager*), *štednjak* 'cooker' (Ger. *Sparherd*), *čvoriste* 'node' (Ger. *Knotenpunkt*) etc.

German was also important in the role of mediator in the transfer of both loanwords and calques from other languages: Italian (Ljubičić 2000/01: 137–176), English (Muhvić–Dimanovski 1996: 457–464), French (Franolić 1976), and others (Turk – Pavletić 1999: 359–375). Words which in German were themselves calques served as a model for calquing in Croatian: *cvjetača* 'cauliflower' < Ger. *Blumenkohl* < Ital. *cavol fiore*, *dnevni red* 'agenda' < Ger. *Tagesordnung* < Fr. *ordre du jour*, *klima-uređaj* < Ger. *Klimaanlage* < Eng. *air-conditioning*<sup>7</sup> etc.

Croats and Hungarians were in direct contact for centuries, starting from the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, when the Hungarians settled in the Pannonian plains – and from 1102 they shared the same political association. However, fewer words were borrowed from the **Hungarian language** into the Croatian standard language than could be expected given the duration and intensity of contact. Works dealing with Hungarian–Croatian linguistic contact were published only in the last decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>8</sup> True Hungarianisms are

- 5 Among the works dealing with the influence of German on Croatian, two monographs need to be mentioned here. Hildegard Striedter Temps (1958) provides, along with an extended overview of phonetics, a survey of Croatian–German contacts together with the periods of borrowing. She records about 200 words with exact etymologies. She does not, however, define the standard–language status of the Germanisms included, is inconsistent in noting the origin of words where German served as mediator, and excludes German words whose transfer was mediated by the Hungarian language. Eduard Schneeweis's (1960) monograph is characterized by a more painstaking care for detail and greater academic rigor. He records ca. 3000 Germanisms, but, since he takes the concept of Germanism in its broadest meaning, he includes non–German words if German was the mediating language in their transfer, as he himself explicitly states. Those two monographs could be said to have paved the way for more intensive studies of the influence of German on Croatian, the interest in which has not waned to this day; for more on them see Turk (2006: 426–429).
- 6 In his monograph, Matthias Rammelmeyer (1975) describes the different calque types and gives the conditions which words have to satisfy in order to be considered calques. He pays particular attention to the development of derivational types and points out some new derivational types which are created in the process of calquing from German to Croatian. His book thus provides an important impetus for further study and word formation research (Babić 1980: 91–96; Turk 2001b: 267–280; 2002: 47–66).
- 7 Carstensen (1979: 92) holds the German expression *Klima-anlage* to be a calque of the English expression *air-condition(ing)*. In this type of calque the foreign (source) language provides only the creative impulse, with the receiving language creating its own expression independently from the foreign model. Such calquing is called *loan creation*, *false loans*, or *induced creation* in English, as *Lehnschöpfung* in German, and as *équivalent suggéré* in French.
- 8 László Hadrovics's book "*Ungarische Elemente im Serbokroatischen*" (1985) is the first systematic work on Hungarian loanwords in Croatian. It is, in fact, an etymological dictionary

rare in modern standard Croatian, whether they are real Hungarianisms, such as *čipka* 'lace' (Hun. *csipke*), *lopov* 'thief' (Hun. *lopó*), *lopta* 'ball' (Hun. *labda*), *šaš* 'reed' (Hun. *sás*), *kočija* 'coach' (Hun. *kocsi*), or loanwords with Hungarian as the mediating language: *mužar* 'mortar' < Hun. *mozsár* < Ger. *Mörser*; *šogor* 'brother-in-law' < Hun. *sógor* < Ger. *Schwager* (Dürrikel 1988: 99). They are more frequent in Croatian dialects which had closer contact with Hungarian: *salaš* 'farm' (Hun. *szállás*), *beteg* 'sickness' (Hun. *beteg*), *pajdaš* 'companion' (Hun. *pajtás*).

In the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Hungarian models – along with Latin, German and Czech ones – played an important role, via calquing, in the conscious shaping of literary, colloquial and technical language in the lexical areas connected to state administration, i. e. in the creation of school, civil service, legal, military, railway and postal terminologies: e. g. *povjerenik* 'commissioner' (Hun. *megbízott*), *povjerenstvo* 'commission' (Hun. *bizottság*), *željeznica* 'railway' (Hun. *vasút*), *pristojba* 'charge' (Hun. *illeték*) (Nyomárkay 1989). Many Hungarian calques served as models for the creation of Croatian calques: Ger. *Landwehr* > Hun. *honvéd* > Cro. *domobran mil hist* '(Croatian) home guardsman' (Nyomárkay 1989: 152).

**Turkisms** were taken into the Croatian language from Turkish, or from the Arab and Persian languages via Turkish. In general, Turkisms in South Slavic languages can be said to date back to the Ottoman era, although a few had appeared prior to this. Turkisms were spread largely by Turkish army and administration (Skok 1937/38: 166–190), and to some extent by learned individuals who had been educated in Constantinople, as well as via folk poetry (Škaljić 1965: 12). Turkisms can be classified into two groups according to their status in the language. One comprises adopted words with standard-language status: *bakar* 'copper' (Turk. *bakir*), *šećer* 'sugar' (Turk. *şeker*), *bubreg* 'kidney' (Turk. *böbrek*), *jastuk* 'pillow' (Turk. *yastık*) etc. The other one consists of Turkisms which are regionalisms: *čuprija* 'bridge' (Turk. *köprü*), *komšija* 'neighbor' (Turk. *komşu*), *kavga* 'quarrel' (Turk. *kauga*) etc.

**Russianisms** in the Croatian language belong to the sphere of cultural borrowing. The largest group of Russianisms arrived via Russian literature in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Another group, of what are properly Sovietisms, entered many European languages, Croatian included, in the aftermath of the Second World War (Menac 2004: 274–275). In the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Russianisms were borrowed into Croatian via Serbian (Prpić 1938: 126–128). After 1945, borrowing from Russia was ideologically motivated, when a whole series of Sovietisms were borrowed in Croatian: *boljševik hist* 'Bolshevik' (Russ. *большевик*), *kulak* 'kulak' (Russ. *кулак*), etc. Sovietisms were borrowed as ideologies. After the suspension of political relations with the Soviet Union in 1948, ideologically motivated borrowing from Russian ceased, and the more recent Russianisms (e. g. *perestrojka*) have the status of exonemes (Samardžija 1998: 137). Although Russian studies in Croatia have yielded exceptionally sig-

---

with more than 800 words. However, some of the information given therein should not be accepted without question (Dürrikel 1988: 97 – 99).

nificant results in the area of contrastive linguistics, contact linguistics had almost no involvement during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Russianisms in Croatian language were discussed mainly in the context of the influence of sociopolitical changes on lexis (Samardžija 1997: 177–192). Systematic study of Croatian Russianisms began at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and has continued in this century as part of the research project *Croatian in contact with European languages*. Jovan Ajduković (2004) analyzed the linguistic contact between eight Slavic languages and the Russian language. In the chapter “The Croatian Language” (2004: 148–187) he described the adaptation of Russianisms in Croatian. When the quantity of the Russian loanwords and their linguistic status in Croatian are compared with other Slavic languages, especially with Serbian (2004: 46–147), it becomes obvious that the attitude of the Croatian language to Russianisms differed significantly from the attitude that the Serbian language had to Russian. Croatian language tended to be closed to Russianisms while Serbian was rather open.

The first traces of influence of **Czech** on Croatian date as far back as the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and its influence grew stronger from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards, in three waves. The first, rather minor, wave of Bohemianisms arrived in Croatian during the Illyrian Movement era: **časopis** ‘periodical’ (Cz. *časopis*), **dosljedan** ‘consistent’ (Cz. *dusledné*), **nježan** ‘gentle’ (Cz. *něžné*), **pokus** ‘experiment’ (Cz. *pokus*) etc. survive to this day, while **lučba** ‘chemistry’ (Cz. *arch lučba*), **kiselik** ‘oxygen’ (Cz. *kyslík*) have disappeared. The biggest influx of Bohemianisms in Croatian began with Šulek’s dictionaries. The 1860 *German–Croatian Dictionary* includes new Bohemianisms such as **dotičan** ‘concerned’ (Cz. *dotyčné*), **dostatan** ‘sufficient’ (Cz. *dostatečné*), **opetovati** ‘repeat’ (Cz. *opět*), **naklada** ‘edition’ (Cz. *náklad*), **obrazac** ‘pattern’ (Cz. *vzorec*), **tlak** ‘pressure’ (Cz. *tlak*), **važan** ‘important’ (Cz. *závažné*), **živalj** ‘population’ (Cz. *živel*), **pojam** ‘notion’ (Cz. *pojem*); some of them disappeared in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, e. g. **bilina** ‘plant’ (Cz. *bylina*), **latak** ‘matter’ (Cz. *látka*) etc.

Šulek’s *Rječnik znanstvenoga nazivlja*, which was modelled on Pavel Josef Šafařík’s dictionary of the same type, the *Německo–české slovník vědeckího názvosloví pro gymnasia a reálné školy*, facilitated the greatest influx of Bohemianisms. Lexemes such as: **dojam** ‘impression’ (Cz. *dojem*), **dobrobit** ‘welfare’ (Cz. *dobro*) etc. were thus adopted in Croatian, but even more Bohemianisms which were in use in the 19<sup>th</sup> century have since disappeared, e. g. **dira** ‘hole’ (Cz. *díra*), **hvošt** ‘tail’ (Cz. *chvost*). The Czech language played a significant mediating role between Croatian and German, especially in calquing: Ger. *Lobgesang* > Cz. *chvalozpěv* > Cro. **hvalospjev** ‘hymn’ (Rammelmeyer 1975: 187).

Numerous loanwords from **French** were integrated into the Croatian language.<sup>9</sup> The vast majority of these either have the status of Europeanisms: **šarm** ‘charm’ (Fr. *charme*), **emocija** ‘emotion’ (Fr. *émotion*), **loža** ‘lodge’ (Fr. *loge*), **maketa** ‘scale model’ (Fr. *maquette*), **marioneta** ‘marionette’ (Fr. *ma-*

9 For a monographic description of Croatian–French language contacts see Dabo–Denegri (2007).

*rionnette*), **memoari** 'memoirs' (Fr. *mémoires*), **medalja** 'medal' (Fr. *médaille*), **pejzaž** 'landscape' (Fr. *paysage*), **garaža** 'garage' (Fr. *garage*), **šampion** 'champion' (Fr. *champion*), **marš** 'march' (Fr. *marche*), **masakr** 'massacre' (Fr. *Massacre*); or arrived via German as an important mediator: **parket** 'parquet' (Ger. *Parkett* < Fr. *parquet*), **parlament** 'parliament' (Ger. *Parlament* < Fr. *parlement*), **menuet** 'minuet' (Ger. *Menuette* < Fr. *menuet*), **komoda** 'commode' (Ger. *Kommode* < Fr. *commode*), **manira** 'manner' (Ger. *Manier* < Fr. *manière*), **kontrola** 'control' (Ger. *Kontrolle* < Fr. *contrôle*), **limuzina** 'limousine' (Ger. *Limousine* < Fr. *limousine*) (Franolić, 1976); or are calques: **polusvijet** 'demi-monde' (Fr. *demi-monde*), **državni udar** (Fr. *coup d'état*), **mrtva priroda** 'still life' (Fr. *nature morte*), **dnevni boravak** 'living room' (Fr. *salle de séjour*), **ključ u ruke** 'turn-key' (Fr. *clef en main*), **crni film** 'black film' (Fr. *film noir*), **fatalna žena** 'femme fatale' (Fr. *femme fatale*) etc.

In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Croatian, along with the majority of European languages, was swamped with loanwords from the English language. Anglicisms, in fact Americanisms, have been the largest single group of loanwords over the last few decades. They cover all areas of human activity, e. g. sport: **bejzbol** (Eng. *baseball*), **meč** (Eng. *match*), **ragbi** (Eng. *rugby*), **tenis** (Eng. *tennis*), **trener** (Eng. *trainer*); music: **džez** (Eng. *jazz*), **rok** (Eng. *rock*), **plejбек** (Eng. *playback*), **hit** (Eng. *hit*); social and political phenomena: **mobing** (Eng. *mobbing*), **buling** (Eng. *bullying*), **aparthejd** (Eng. *apartheid*), **Amnesty International**, all areas of science and technology: **menadžment** (Eng. *management*), **hardver** (Eng. *hardware*), **displej** (Eng. *display*), **klaster** (Eng. *cluster*), **tender** (Eng. *tender*) etc. It was precisely because of English loanwords that contact linguistics was articulated at a scientific level in Croatian linguistics.<sup>10</sup>

As well as on the level of loanwords, English language influence can be seen at the level of calques, e. g. **banka podataka** (Eng. *data bank*), **kritična masa** (Eng. *critical mass*), **krstareća raketa** (Eng. *cruise missile*), **mikrovalna pećnica** (Eng. *microwave oven*), **nogomet** (Eng. *football*), **operativni sustav** (Eng. *operating system*), **staklenički efekt** (Eng. *greenhouse effect*), **dilersko tržište** (Eng. *dealer market*), **odljev mozgova** (Eng. *brain drain*), **hladni rat** (Eng. *cold war*), **neboder** (Eng. *skyscraper*), **šutljiva većina** (Eng. *silent majority*), **visoka tehnologija** (Eng. *high technology*), **zračni jastuk** (Eng. *air bag*), **ljudska prava** (Eng. *human rights*), **održivi razvoj** (Eng. *sustainable development*), **sukob interesa** (Eng. *conflict of interest*), **kvaliteta života** (Eng. *quality of life*).

10 After more than 25 years of working on various aspects of Anglicisms in Croatian, in 1971 Rudolf Filipović published the book *Kontakti jezika u teoriji i praksi*, in 1986 *Teorija jezika u kontaktu: Uvod u lingvistiku jezičnih dodira*, which synthesized the results of his research. that had previously been published in a series of articles in Croatian and English. Starting from the theoretical propositions presented in that book, in 1990 he published the book *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom: podrijetlo – razvoj – značenje*. These two works together form a complete whole and became indispensable manuals in Croatian linguistics for all language contact research, regardless of the languages concerned.

Due to the complexity of the problems, language contact research tends to focus on the unidirectional influence of one, “prestigious,” language on another language. Of course, linguistic influences are much more complex than that; they are intertwined and interdependent, and the relationship of one culture to another and their interactions are always part of the equation. Linguistic borrowing has, to a limited extent, taken place in the opposite direction as well – from Croatian towards another language. Croatian loanwords in the Venetian dialect (Ljubičić 1993: 143–153) are an example of this, as is – at the adstratum level – the influence of Croatian on Romance idioms in the region of Istria.

## 2. Lexical borrowing between purism and the language’s needs

In principle, the process of lexical borrowing is characterised by two opposing tendencies: the need to name a new concept, and resistance towards the borrowed foreign word. This latter tendency is known as linguistic purism.<sup>11</sup> Daneš (1988: 1701) places purism in the context of “dialectal contradictions” between “isolationism (nationalism) and universalism (internationalism)”. Purism is often considered as “little more than an epiphenomenon of nationalism” (Thomas 1991: 43) or “an expression of national conviction (Gesinntheit)” (Bartsch 1985: 252–253). Purism directed against external influence is based on the assumption that the “national culture is unique and irreplaceable” i. e. that the national language can serve as a symbol of “self-identification with the national culture” (Thomas 1991: 43). Purist activity is particularly noticeable in the process of linguistic standardization, and therefore purism is largely considered to be a universal feature of standard languages (Brozović 1970; Thomas 1991).

Namely, purification aims to preserve the standard language, as a “symbol of national identity” (Bartsch 1985), from foreign influence. To purism in this sense, exclusivity and intolerance are usually ascribed, and so purism is commonly spoken of as a negative phenomenon. However, instances of purism should not be judged *a priori*; instead, each should be evaluated on the basis of its own characteristics, taking into consideration the sociocultural context and sociolinguistic situation in which it appears (Thomas 1991: 187). Purist activity can also be explained by the need for the language, as part of a nation’s culture, to be preserved from external threat and from disintegration; Thomas (1991: 48) calls this need “unrational motivation”. Daneš (1988b: 1701) warns that seeking a rational functionally established balance between the indigenous basis of a language on one side and foreign influence on the other is among the hardest tasks of linguistic culture, “perhaps in all contemporary standard languages”. Purism is, above all, a form of codification, culti-

---

11 Actions aiming to free a language of its own elements originating in dialects and sociolects come under the heading of linguistic purism as well; however, these forms of purism will not be addressed here.



vating and planning of standard languages (Thomas 1991: 12). Purism is part of linguistic culture, which is defined as the “set of behaviours, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language and religio–historical circumstances associated with a particular language” (Schiffman 1996: 5). In any case, the standardisation process, which is often interpreted as “language management” (Downes 1998: 32) is carried out in “certain sociohistorical conditions” without which standardisation cannot be understood. Elementary purism – introducing order and accepting systematic limitations – is an attendant phenomenon of all languages.<sup>12</sup>

However, languages differ in the degree and intensity of their purist tendencies, and the attitudes to purism within a single language differ from one period to another. Cultural history confirms that higher–intensity purism does not appear at random, but is always a reaction to adverse circumstances determined by cultural, civilisational and, in particular, political factors. Generally speaking, we can agree with the Czech theoretician Bohuslav Havránek, who says: “It is understandable (...) that national languages whose independence has never been endangered are always more in favour of international lexical elements than are languages of those nations which found obliged to fight for their existence, and for their independent language” (Havránek 1977: 11) The “understandability” of Havránek’s claim rests on recognising language as an integral component of national identity, and thereby recognising purism as activities which “protect and preserve” the language from external influence. It is thus “understandable” in the specific context of nation–shaping, which is accompanied by the standardisation process.

### 2.1. *Purism in European languages*

In European languages, purism has been directed against a number of different dominant languages and varied in intensity over time. In the national languages which were exposed to strong foreign influence during certain periods of their history, the specific historical–political situation gave rise to puristic reactions, aimed at preserving the linguistic identity and recognizability as a form of national identity. The relationships of the so–called “small languages such as Croatian, Slovenian and Czech towards prestigious languages with which they were in historical contact, can, given their historical circumstances and genetic closeness, be shown to be similar” (Turk–Sesar 2003). On the other hand, “English which imported thousands of words from French and Latin (mainly after 1066) is now by far the world’s biggest lexical exporter” (Görlach 2002); however, purism has not endured in it precisely because there has been no threat to the national language, and no fear of foreign domination – linguis-

---

12 Edwards (1985: 27) points out that “international purism” began with the foundation of the Florentine Accademia della Crusca in 1582 and states that the desire for language purity had existed for hundreds of years before the appearance of “linguistic nationalism” around 1800. On the purist role of “language academies” compare also Thomas (1991: 108–112).

tic, cultural, political or religious (Thomas 1991: 48). Slavic languages belonging to the Eastern or Western cultural–civilizational spheres exhibit different attitudes towards purism. East Slavic languages, and those South Slavic languages that belong to the same historical–linguistic and civilisational grouping, were, generally speaking, freer from puristic tendencies and more open to loanwords during their standardisation.<sup>13</sup> Languages which belong to the Western cultural–civilisational spheres have diverse attitudes to calquing. Polish had the most consistent development and the least need for intentional calquing, while Czech was completely open to calquing, as were Slovenian, which was within a strong German and Czech sphere of influence, and Slovak, which was in a Hungarian and Czech sphere of influence. These inherited attitudes are still observable in Slavic languages today, especially towards English loanwords, as the largest group.

In the past, non–Slavic European languages too manifested purism in their attitudes to loanwords, which ranged from strictness to complete tolerance. Today, English loanwords excite strikingly purist tendencies (in French and Hungarian); moderately puristic tendencies, even in languages which used to be were unmistakably puristic (such as German, Italian, Swedish); and relative indifference (in Portuguese). In languages with pronounced purist tendencies, outright lexical borrowing gives way to calquing.

## 2.2. Purism in the Croatian language

Purism has had a long tradition in the Croatian language. Concern for linguistic purity has marked its history, either implicitly or explicitly. Always a concomitant of the standard language, purism has appeared in varying degrees of intensity and in diverse forms over different periods. Adverse social conditions facing the Croatian language have always resulted in higher levels of purism. The purist tradition is rooted in two considerations:

1. For most of its history, the Croatian language was, to a great extent, in an unfavourable sociolinguistic situation in relation to other languages – Turkish, Italian, German, Hungarian, then Serbian for the best part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and finally English from the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

2. Historically, in its puristic endeavours Croatian largely modelled itself on other purist languages – German, Hungarian and Czech. In following their experience, it was itself puristic, in particularly towards German and Hungarian, in an effort to mitigate their influence.

Throughout the history of Croatian, its purism has had a dual nature: one form of purism aimed at halting or, in its milder form, minimising direct foreign influence, i. e. the influx of loanwords; the other, meanwhile aimed at moderating indirect foreign influence, i. e. the creation of calques. This is a classic form of purism, such as exists in other languages as well. Croatian pur-

13 This is confirmed by e. g. many Russian Germanisms and semi–calques: Ger. *Schrift* > Russ. *урифт*, Ger. *Platzkarte* > Russ. *плацкарта*, Ger. *Wacht* > Russ. *вахта*, Ger. *Leibwache* > Russ. *лейб-гвардия* etc. (Turk–Sesar 2003).

ism is in no way exceptional: it corresponds completely to similar tendencies in other European languages, addresses the same issues that they do (Thomas 1991: 62–83; Muhvić–Dimanovski 1992: 109–114, Turk 1996: 63–79) according to the same criteria (Pranjković 1996: 5–12), and has been a constant feature of the language, varying in degree of intensity.

### 2.2.1. Loanwords and purism

Croatian purists have offered the longest and the most tenacious resistance to the excessive use of loanwords. A critical attitude towards loanwords has been a feature of Croatian since the dawn of its literacy and has marked its whole history. Most philologists and writers have tended to moderation. Adherents of strictness and advocates of moderate approaches all agree that, if there is a choice between a foreign word and its native synonym, the native word should be preferred (Jonke 1953: 2; Klaić 1953/54: 108). Loanwords can be tolerated when they have a role to play in a standard language style (Filipović 1977/78: 139–141). Anglicisms, which are, as a global phenomenon, making inroads into the majority of world languages, are today one of the most topical issues in loanword studies. Since the 1970s, the *Jezik* journal has constantly been publishing articles on Anglicisms and their status in the Croatian lexis: words like *computer*, *show*, *marketing*, *leasing*, *grapefruit*, *hovercraft*, *space shuttle*, *hardware*, *play-off*, *time-out* etc. for which successful or less successful substitutes were suggested, with only a handful having caught on in colloquial speech.

### 2.2.2. Calques and purism

Purist activity directed against accepting foreign words results in the creation of calques which are based on foreign models and more less faithfully copy them. Consequently, linguistic purism is at the same time “an indispensable precondition for the creation of calques in the widest possible meaning of that term” (Muhvić–Dimanovski 1992: 109). Purist activity which aims for calques as more suitable solutions to language problems than loanwords, is also subject to critical reappraisal. In the quest after better solutions, several calques are often created for the same concept. Since their supply substantially exceeds the communicational demand of the Croatian language, the majority of them have become a part of the passive lexis. Thus, for example, **železnica** ‘railway’ (Ger. *Eisenbahn* or Hun. *vaspálya*) substituted *gvozdénica*, *gvozdeni put*, *železni put*, and the calque **kolodvor** ‘railway station’ (Hun. *pályaudvar*)<sup>14</sup> supplanted synonymous calques such as *kolnica*, *istrkalište* and *dvor koloteka* despite strong opposition from Croatian purists. Although they were assessed according to the purist value system, and judged as incorrect and un-

---

14 Compare Nyormárcay (1989: 194–195).

suitable, many calques have been proved necessary, and survive in standard Croatian – e. g. *kolodvor*, *brzjav*,<sup>15</sup> *prosjud*<sup>16</sup> etc.

Purist interventions in favour of calques can have three different outcomes, as follows:

1. The calque is accepted in colloquial practice: *samoposluživanje/samoposluga* (Eng. *self-service*), *perilica* 'washing machine' (and, with relatively great frequency, *stroj za pranje rublja*) substitutes the loanword *vešmašina/vašmašina* (< Ger. *Waschmaschine*) etc.

2. Both the loanword and the calque are used, in parallel: *kompjutor – računalo*, *play off – doigravanje* (the suggestions *završnica* and *razigravanje* for the latter have not gained acceptance), *bypass – premosnica* etc.

3. The Croatian equivalent is not accepted in practice: “*full contact*” (sport) – *puni kontakt*, “*jackpot*” – *glavnjak/velezgoditnjak*, *broker* – *izvikačač/pretragač*, *AIDS* – *kopnica*, *grejpfрут (grapefruit)* – *limunika*, “*jumbojet*” – *mamutnjak*, *tajm-aut (time out)* – *predah*, *marketing* – *tržništvo*, *leasing* – *zakupništvo*, *hardver (hardware)* – *željezarija* etc.

## Conclusion

The main body of the Croatian standardological tradition steers a middle course – keeping a distance from rigid purism whatever its form, respecting the individuality and authenticity of its own language as well as its functional and stylistic stratification; what is marked as undesirable in one functional style does not necessarily have to be so in another, or in standard language generally. Loanwords and calques do not need to supplant each other. In its own context each enables a more precise manner of expression, and a functional and stylistic stratification of the standard language. In these lexical parallels, various types of relations obtain:

1. Members of a lexical pair have corresponding meanings: the loanword appears in one context while the Croatian equivalent appears in another – i. e. they become functionally and stylistically stratified: the Europeanism *atmosfera* has a role in terminology, while the calque *ozračje* lost its role in terminology.

2. Members of a lexical pair have corresponding meanings, appear in the same context and have a similar stylistic status, but both are necessary since they form derivatives that have different meanings, e. g. *muzika – glazba*:

*muzika* → *muzicirati* 'play/make music'

*glazba* → *uglazbiti* 'set to music'.

15 Rammelmeyer (1975: 155) explains the word *brzjav* 'telegram' as a loan creation based on German *Telegramm*, while Nyomárkay (1993: 121) says that the model for first part of the compound (*brzo-*) should be sought in the Hungarian expression *sürgös*, and the model for the second (*-jav*) in the German compound *Drahtmeldung*.

16 Rammelmeyer (1975: 267) thinks that this is a calque of German *Protest*.

3. The loanword can be unmarked for style, less frequent in official communication, common in professional jargon, and more frequent than the Croatian equivalent in colloquial style (e. g. *advokat* – *odvjetnik* 'lawyer', *telegram* – *brzjav* 'telegram' etc.).

4. If the Croatian equivalent has substituted the loanword, then the loanword is marked for style: *veleposlanstvo* – *ambasada* 'embassy', *povijest* – *historija* 'history', *povjerenstvo* – *komisija* 'commission', *tajnik* – *sekretar* 'secretary' etc.

5. The loanword and the Croatian equivalent are not identical on the entire scale of meaning: *literatura* – *književnost* 'literature', *nacionalni* – *narodni* 'national', *kompozicija* – *skladba* 'composition, piece of music'. In such lexeme sets, the internationalism is usually the hyperonym.

In the scientific style, internationalisms are not only possible and permitted, but are necessary, for several reasons. Due to international connections in science, they exist in all languages. Very often, no functional Croatian equivalent exists (*anoda* 'anode', *ekologija* 'ecology', *elektroda* 'electrode', *teorija* 'theory', *vena* 'vein'), or the internationalism and the Croatian equivalent do not correspond semantically (*šou* / *show* – *priredba*, *lider* / *leader* – *vođa*, *pravak*).

If we approach the linguistic facts from a functional point of view, the positive side of linguistic purism become apparent, and the negative connotations – which traditionally come to the fore and colour the view of linguistic purism as an undesirable phenomenon – seem inappropriate. As resistance to insensitivity to stylistic stratification, purism is synonymous with linguistic culture.

Croatian, as a traditionally moderately purist language, has not accepted foreign language models passively, and has instead developed an active relationship with them. It has adapted the necessary loanwords according to its phonological and grammatical rules, and created calques based on foreign models. In this manner it enriched its lexical and semantic levels, preserved its expressive self-identity and took its place in the European linguistic convergence.

## References

- Ajduković 2004: Ajduković, Jovan: *Kontaktološki rečnik adaptacije rusizama u osam slovenskih jezika*. Foto Futura, Beograd.
- Babić 1990a: Babić, Stjepan: "Njemačke posuđenice u hrvatskom književnom jeziku", *Hrvatska jezikoslovna čitanka*. Globus, Zagreb, 214–224.
- Babić 1990b: Babić, Stjepan: "Njemačke prevedenice u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku". *Hrvatska jezikoslovna čitanka*. Globus, Zagreb, 225–230.
- Babić 2004: Babić, Stjepan: *Hrvanja hrvatskoga*. Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- Bartsch 1985: Bartsch, Renate: *Sprachnormen: Theorie und Praxis*. Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen.
- Brozović 1970: Brozović, Dalibor: *Standardni jezik. Teorija, usporedbe, geneza, povijest, suvremena zbilja*. Matica hrvatska, Zagreb.
- Carstensen 1979: Carstensen, Broder: "Evidente und latente Einflüsse des Englischen auf das Deutsche". *Fremdwort – Diskussion*, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, München, 90 – 94.

- Dabo–Denegri 2007: Dabo–Denegri, Ljuba: *Hrvatsko–francuski jezični dodiri*. Nakladni zavod Globus, Zagreb.
- Daneš 1988: Daneš, František: “Sprachkultur”. In: Ulrich Ammon, Nobert Dittma & Klaus J. Mattheier (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, II. Vol. Walter de Gruyter Berlin, New York, 1697–1703.
- Downes 1998: Downes, William: *Language and Society*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Dürrić 1988: Dürrić, Marija Ana: “Hungarizmi u hrvatskom književnom jeziku”. *Jezik*, XXXV, 4, Zagreb, 97–99.
- Edwards 1985: Edwards, John: *Language, Society and Identity*. Basil Blackwell, André Deutsch, London.
- Filipović 1971: Filipović, Rudolf: *Kontakti jezika u teoriji i praksi*. Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- Filipović 1977/78: Filipović, Rudolf: “Tudice i jezična kultura”. *Jezik*, XXV, 5, Zagreb, 138–142.
- Filipović 1986: Filipović, Rudolf: *Teorija jezika u kontaktu. Uvod u lingvistiku jezičnih dodira*. JAZU – Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- Filipović 1990: Filipović, Rudolf: *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo – razvoj – značenje*. JAZU – Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- Franolić 1976c: Franolić, Branko: *Les mots d'emprunt français en Croatie*. Nouvelles Éditions Latines, Paris.
- Görlach 1996: Görlach, Manfred: “Purism and the UDASEL”. *Suvremena lingvistika*, 41/42, Zagreb, 163–182.
- Görlach 2002: Görlach, Manfred: *English in Europe*. Oxford University Press.
- Hadrovics 1985: Hadrovics, László: *Ungarische Elemente im Serbokroatischen*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Havráněk 1977: Havráněk, Bohuslav: “Teorija književnog jezika”. *Književni jezik*, VI 1, Sarajevo, 7–16.
- Hyrkkänen 1973: Hyrkkänen, Jukka: *Der Lexikalische Einfluß des Italienischen auf das Kroatische des 16. Jahrhunderts. Die italienische Lehnwörter im Sprachgebrauch der dalmatinischen Kroaten im Licht der kroatischen Renaissance–Literatur*. Helsingin yliopiston monistuspalvelu, Helsinki.
- Jonke 1953: Jonke, Ljudevit: “O upotrebi tudih riječi”. *Jezik*, II, 1, Zagreb, 2.
- Katičić 1973/74: Katičić, Radoslav: “O purizmu”. *Jezik*, XXI, 3–4, Zagreb, 84–90.
- Katičić 1992: Katičić, Radoslav: *Novi jezikoslovni ogledi* (dopunjeno izdanje), Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- Klaić 1953: Klaić, Bratoljub: “O zamjenjivanju tudica našim riječima”. *Jezik*, I, 4, Zagreb, 107–113.
- Ljubičić 1993: Ljubičić, Maslina: “O semantičkim promjenama hrvatskih posudenica u mletačkom dijalektu”. *Suvremena lingvistika*, 19, 1–2, (35/36), Zagreb, 143–153.
- Ljubičić 2000/01: Ljubičić, Maslina: “Sul ruolo del tedesco come lingua donatrice nella formazione dei falsi amici croato–italiani”. *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia*, 45–46, Zagreb, 137–176.
- Matasović 2000: Matasović, Ranko: “Germanske posudenice u praslavenskome i pitanje relativne kronologije”. *Filologija*, XXXIV, Zagreb, 29–37.
- Menac 2004: Menac, Antica: “Ruske posudenice u hrvatskome jeziku”. *ZRC SAZU* (Zbornik povzetkov, 2. del, XIII međunarodni slavistički kongres), München, 274–275.
- Muhvić–Dimanovski (1992): Muhvić–Dimanovski, Vesna: *Prevedenice – jedan oblik neologizama*. Rad HAZU, knj. 446, Zagreb.
- Muhvić–Dimanovski 1996: Muhvić–Dimanovski, Vesna: “Njemački kao jezik posrednik pri posuđivanju iz engleskoga u hrvatski”. *Suvremena lingvistika*, 41–42, Zagreb, 457–464.
- Muljačić 1973: Muljačić, Žarko: “Problemi della simbiosi slavo–romanza nell’Adriatico”. *Miscellanea II*. Facolta di lingue e letterature straniere dell’Università di Trieste, Udine, 21–39.

- Nyomárkay 1989: Nyomárkay, István: *Ungarische Vorbilder der kroatischen Spracherneuerungen*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Nyomárkay 1993: Nyomárkay, István: “Le cas du calque... est plus complex. “ (B. Unbegaun) (Über die Lehnübersetzungen mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Kroatisch[serbisch]e). *Studia Slavica Hung.* 38/1–2, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 113–124.
- Pranjković 1996: Pranjković, Ivo: “Temeljna načela pravilnosti”. *Kolo*, 5, Zagreb, 5–12.
- Pranjković 2001: Pranjković, Ivo: “Hrvatski i klasični jezici”. *Zbornik Zagrebačke slavističke škole*, Zagreb, 156–163.
- Prpić 1938: Prpić, Tomislav: “Rusizmi u jednoj knjizi”. *Hrvatski jezik*, I, Zagreb, 126–128.
- Rammelmeyer 1975: Rammelmeyer, Matthias: *Die deutschen Lehnübersetzungen im Serbokroatischen. Beiträge zur Lexikologie und Wortbildung*. Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden.
- Samardžija 1997: Samardžija, Marko: “Utjecaj sociopolitičkih mijena na leksik hrvatskoga jezika u XX. stoljeću”. *Croatica*, 45–46, Zagreb, 177–192.
- Samardžija 1998: Samardžija, Marko: “Leksik”. *Hrvatski jezik* (eds. Mijo Lončarić),. Univerzitet Opolski – Institut Filologii Polskiej, Opole, 133–152.
- Samardžija 2002: Samardžija, Marko: “Hrvatski jezik u vrijeme globalizacije”. *Riječki filološki dani*, Rijeka, 435–438.
- Schiffman 1996: Schiffman, Herald F.: *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. Routledge, London, New York.
- Schneeweis 1960: Schneeweis, Edmund: *Die deutschen Lehnwörter im Serbokroatischen in kulturgeschichtlicher Sicht*. Walter de Gruyter–Co., Berlin.
- Skok 1937/38, Skok, Petar: “Prilozi proučavanju turcizama u srpskohrvatskom jeziku”. *Slavia*, XV, Praha, 166–190.
- Sočanac 2004: Sočanac, Lelija: *Hrvatsko–talijanski jezični dodiri (s rječnikom talijanizama u standardnome hrvatskom jeziku i dubrovačkoj dramskoj književnosti)*. Nakladni zavod Globus, Zagreb.
- Sočanac 2005: Sočanac, Lelija (ed.), Žagar–Szentesi, Orsolya – Dragičević, Dragica – Dabo–Denegri, Ljuba – Menac, Antica – Nikolić–Hoyt, Anja: *Hrvatski jezik u dodiru s europskim jezicima: prilagodba posuđenica*. Nakladni zavod Globus, Zagreb.
- Striedter–Temps 1958: Striedter–Temps, Hildegard: *Deutsche Lehnwörter im Serbokroatischen*. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Škaljić 1966: Škaljić, Abdulah: *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku*. Svjetlost, Sarajevo.
- Thomas 1991: Thomas, George: *Linguistic purism*. Longman, London, New York.
- Thomas 1996: Thomas, George: “The impact of purism on the development of the Croatian standard language in the nineteenth century”. *Fluminensia*, VIII, 1–2, Rijeka, 49–62.
- Turk 1996: Turk, Marija: “Jezični purizam”. *Fluminensia*, VIII, 1–2, Rijeka, 63–79.
- Turk 2006: Marija Turk: “Hrvatski u kontaktu tijekom 20. stoljeća”. *Hrvatski jezik u XX. stoljeću, Zbornik radova, Matica hrvatska*, Zagreb, 423–447.
- Turk–Pavletić 1999: Turk, Marija – Pavletić, Helena: “Posrednički jezici u kalkiranju”. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 25, Zagreb, 359–375.
- Turk–Sesar 2003: Turk, Marija – Sesar, Dubravka: “Kalkovi njemačkog podrijetla u hrvatskome i u nekim slavenskim jezicima”. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 29, Zagreb, 325–338.
- Žepić 2002: Žepić, Stanko: “Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache in Kroatien”. *Zagreber germanistische Beiträge*, 11, Zagreb, 209–227.

### *Jezično posuđivanje i purizam u hrvatskome jeziku*

Hrvatski je jezik sukladno svojim snagama živio u duhovnim kretanjima koja su ga okruživala i živo se uključivao u europske kulturne i civilizacijske tokove. U prilogu se daje sintetski prikaz hrvatskih jezičnih dodira s drugim kulturnim, civilizacijskim i jezičnim krugovima. Iz tih je dodira izraslo evidentno (posuđenice) i latentno (prevedenice) posuđivanje i neprekidno zamjetan jezični purizam. Puristička se djelatnost osobito očituje u procesu standardizacije jezika, stoga se umjereni purizam smatra univerzalnom značajkom standardnih jezika. Hrvatski je purizam u suglasju sa sličnim nastojanjima u europskim jezicima: bavi se istim pitanjima, ima jednake kriterije i neprekidno traje s različitim intenzitetom. U jezicima s izrazitijom purističkom tendencijom izravno jezično leksičko posuđivanje uzmiče pred kalkiranjem. Hrvatski je jezik oblikovao aktivni odnos prema stranojezičnim činjenicama. To je skrb za jezičnu pravilnost koja ne prihvaća svaku stranu riječ pasivno, proizvoljno i bez prosudbe, ali je prihvaća ako mu je potrebna i pri tom je usklađuje sa svojim jezičnim zakonitostima. Hrvatski se purizam očituje ne samo u otporu prema pasivnom preuzimanju stranih riječi, već prije svega u njegovu poticajnu djelovanju da se pokrenu vlastite mogućnosti u stvaranju izraza za izvanjezične inovacije: on je nuždan uvjet za stvaranje prevedenica u najširem smislu toga naziva. Puristička djelatnost koja za cilj odabire prevedenice kao prikladnija jezična rješenja od posuđenica također je podložna kritičkom preispitivanju. U hrvatskome je jeziku u normativnoj ocjeni posuđenica i prevedenica bilo zastranjivanja, i to u rasponu od potpunog proskribiranja ili jednih ili drugih, do nekritičnog prihvaćanja i jednih i drugih. Glavnina standardološke prakse priklanja se umjerenom stavu. Kao što je cjelokupna povijest hrvatskoga standardnoga jezika obilježena nastojanjem da se u prihvaćanju stranojezičnih činjenica poštuje načelo reda i funkcionalnosti, tako su i danas aktualna normativna pitanja posuđenica i prevedenica. Imajući u vidu leksičko raslojavanje i polifunkcionalni karakter standardnoga jezika u procjeni posuđenica i prevedenica, potreban je diferenciran pristup: jedan sinonimski parnjak u neutralnoj, drugi u obilježenoj ulozi. Pristupa li se jezičnim činjenicama funkcionalno, u prvi će plan doći pozitivne strane purizma i neće biti mjesta negativnim konotacijama koje se obično stavljaju u prvi plan pa se jezični purizam smatra nepoželjnom pojavom. Purizam kao opiranje neosjetljivosti za stilističko raslojavanje sinonim je za jezičnu kulturu. Zahvaljujući njemu, hrvatski se jezik leksički obogatio, posuđenice prilagodio fonološki, morfološki i semantički, a u prevedenicama očuvao izraznu samosvojnost i uključio u širu jezičnu konvergenciju.

**Keywords:** linguistic borrowing, linguistic purism, Croatian

**Ključne riječi:** jezično posuđivanje, jezični purizam, hrvatski jezik