Linguistics Faculty Publications   Linguistics

2002

Slovak Standard Language Development in the 15th–18th Centuries: A Diglossia Approach

Mark Richard Lauersdorf
University of Kentucky, lauersdorf@uky.edu

Slovak Standard Language Development in the 15th–18th Centuries: A Diglossia Approach

Twenty

Mark R. Lauersdorf

Slovak Standard Language Development in the 15th–18th Centuries: A Diglossia Approach

1. Introduction

Since Charles Ferguson's initial formal description of "diglossia" in 1959 (Ferguson 1959), research based on this sociolinguistic concept has flourished.[1] The framework of diglossia, in its original, Fergusonian configuration and in various expanded and revised forms, has been applied to languages and linguistic situations around the world, including many of the Slavic languages.[2] Charles Townsend, to whom this Festschrift is dedicated, has himself contributed to the body of literature dealing with questions of diglossia in the Slavic-speaking world (e.g., Townsend 1987).

Much of this work on diglossia, including Ferguson's initial study in 1959, has been devoted to synchronic descriptions of contemporary linguistic situations. Far less common are studies that apply the framework *diachronically* to extended periods of historical language development. Most scholars focusing on contemporary linguistic communities necessarily include an overview of the historical background leading up to the present-day situation, but relatively few investigators actually focus on these historical periods of language development as fertile ground for application of the diglossia framework.[3]

---

[1] The first thirty years between 1960 and 1990 produced sufficient research on the topic to fill a 429 page bibliography of nearly 3000 entries (Fernández 1993). See also the shorter (1092 entries) bibliographic article in the journal *Language in Society* covering roughly the same period (Hudson 1992).

[2] See, e.g., Wexler 1992 (Belorusian), Mladenova 1980 (Bulgarian), Magner 1978 (Croatian), Grygar-Rechziegel 1990 (Czech), Krysin 1987 (Russian), Horecký 1995 (Slovak), Tollefson 1978 (Slovene), to mention only a random sampling of Slavic language studies where the term "diglossia" figures directly in the title. Fernández 1993 lists a total of 176 entries under the Slavic language headings "Bulgarian", "Belorussian", "Czech", "Polish", "Russian", "Servo-Croatian" [sic], "Slavonic, Old Church", "Slovenian", "Ukrainian" (although the actual number of individual studies is somewhat less than 176 due to the cross-listing of certain entries under several individual language headings).

[3] Of the nearly 3000 entries in Fernández 1993, only 331 are listed in the index "Historically Oriented Works" (459–61), and even here the distinction must be drawn between works that treat a single historical period *synchronically* and those that look *diachronically* at a longer period or periods of language development. Interestingly, the

It is my belief that the diglossia framework can effectively be used to reexamine longer periods of historical language development within a given linguistic community in order to shed new light on the complex issues of historical language contact and to elucidate the sociolinguistic factors in historical language change and language standardization.[4] One historical Slavic-language situation that I feel would benefit from such reanalysis is the pre-codification (pre-19th-century) period in the Slovak-speaking territories. In this essay I will sketch out the situation in the Slovak lands during the 15th–18th centuries within the framework of diglossia in order to lay the groundwork for fuller sociolinguistic investigation of early linguistic development and language standardization in the Slovak-speaking territories. I will start with a brief review of the basic concepts of Ferguson's diglossia[5], after which I will examine the 15th century Slovak situation on the basis of these concepts. I will then apply the diglossia framework to Slovak standard language development during the 16th century, and conclude with a short overview of further development in the 17th and 18th centuries.

2. Ferguson's Diglossia

Ferguson defines diglossia as follows:

> "Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often

---

diglossia research involving Slavic languages does not reflect the general emphasis on contemporary synchronic studies. The stronger representation of diachronic/historical studies in Slavic is due in large part (but not exclusively) to the ever-expanding collection of work dealing with the early East Slavic language situation. See, e.g. Alekseev 1986, Comrie 1991, Gippius, Straxov, and Straxova 1988, Kristophson 1989, Šapir 1989, Uspenskij et al. 1987, for recent views of the differing sides of this controversial issue.

[4] Ferguson himself considers such diachronic studies to be of value and lists them among his "favorites" for further "productive research on speech communities" (1991: 230): "A final favorite of mine is the kind of study that follows a given situation diachronically for a relatively long period of time or during a period of rapid social and linguistic change…. research of this kind becomes automatically a contribution also to the whole question of language standardization, and, more generally, the mysterious processes of conventionalization in human language" (231–32). Wexler 1971 is an example of a study in this direction that uses some Slavic (Ukrainian) data. Thomas 1989 presents a starting point for diachronic investigations involving the Slavic languages by providing an overview and classification of diglossic situations in standard language development in the Slavic world.

[5] I will be adhering to Ferguson's original (1959) description of diglossia, with certain refinements by Francis Britto (Britto 1986 and 1991), as the basis for my discussion here.

grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation." [1959: 336]

In his extended discussion of diglossia, Ferguson specifically restricts its scope of application by restricting the degree of linguistic relatedness of the two language varieties involved. He does not intend it to apply to the broader relationship of two separate, genetically unrelated languages, such as "the often-cited case of Spanish and Guaraní in Paraguay" (1991: 223). Nor does he intend it to apply to the narrower relationship of differing styles or registers of a single language as, for example, the "formal-informal styles or registers in English" (1991: 224). He also is not attempting to describe in different terms the "more widespread standard-with-dialects" (1959: 336) relationship. The "defining languages" (1959: 326) that he examines in his original study give a clear idea of the mid-range relatedness that he intends to describe. His objective is to provide an investigative framework for relationships of the type existing between Classical Arabic and regional spoken Arabic forms in the Arabic linguistic community, between Classical-based Greek and modern spoken Greek in the Greek linguistic community, between Standard German and Swiss German dialects in the Swiss German linguistic community, and between French and Haitian Creole in the Haitian Creole linguistic community.

Ferguson's examination of these four linguistic communities leads him to posit a hierarchical relationship in the use of the two language varieties in these communities, noting that one of the two language varieties is "superposed" over the other. He uses the designations **H** (= 'high' – Classical Arabic, Classical-based Greek, Standard German, French) and **L** (= 'low' – regional spoken Arabic, modern spoken Greek, Swiss German dialects, Haitian Creole) to distinguish the two varieties (1959: 327). He then discusses the essential features of a diglossic situation, differentiating the H and L varieties and the respective roles that they play in the typical diglossic linguistic community on the basis of nine specific categories. Ferguson's nine categories and the respective H and L characteristics within each category are summarized in the table on the following page (adapted from Britto 1986: 8–9).

Category	H(igh) Language Variety	L(ow) Language Variety
1. Function	Used for formal speeches, writing and such H functions. Little functional overlap with L.	Used for conversations and such L functions. Little functional overlap with H.
2. Prestige	More prestigious.	Less prestigious.
3. Literary Heritage	Large amount of highly esteemed literature.	Small amount of (or no) less highly esteemed literature.
4. Acquisition	Learned formally at school, in addition to L.	Acquired naturally and informally at home.
5. Standardization	Highly standardized by descriptive and normative studies.	Poorly standardized, though informal standards may exist.
6. Stability	Autonomous and stable, with some interference from L.	Autonomous and stable, with some interference from H.
7. Grammar	More complex (or at least extensively different) in grammatical structure than L.	Less complex (or at least extensively different) in grammatical structure than H.
8. Lexicon	Bulk of vocabulary is shared with L, but some items are exclusive to H or have a matched counterpart in L.	Bulk of vocabulary is shared with H, but some items are exclusive to L or have a matched counterpart in H.
9. Phonology	With L constitutes a single phonological structure. Features divergent from L are a subsystem or a parasystem.	With H constitutes a single phonological structure. L, however, is the basic system.

3. 15th-Century Slovakia[6] in a Diglossia Framework

In the 15th century, primarily three languages were used for the production of most written documents in the Slovak-speaking territories: Latin, German and Czech. Latin was the dominant language of administrative and church affairs from the 10th through the 14th centuries in the Hungarian state of which the Slovak lands were a part, and it continued to be employed throughout the 15th century (and onward), despite the increasing use of other languages in written communication. The influx of German-speaking settlers into Slovakia

---

[6] For convenience I will use the term "Slovakia" (alongside the terms "Slovak-speaking territories" and "Slovak lands") throughout the remainder of this paper to refer to the Central European Slovak-speaking territories in their various historical-political configurations during the 15th–18th centuries. There was, of course, no official political entity called "Slovakia" during those periods.

(as early as the 13th century) and their assumption of positions of power in many towns brought on the use of German alongside Latin as a language of town administration in the writing of law codes, town record books and court protocols. In addition to German, a fairly standardized form of Czech, already in use in most forms of written production in the Czech lands by the beginning of the 15th century, also began to take on an increasingly significant role in the Slovak-speaking territories at this time. Early Czech religious manuscripts had been used and reproduced on a limited basis in Slovakia already in the 14th century, but in the 15th century Czech began to be used to generate administrative and legal documents of all types first in West Slovakia and then gradually throughout the Slovak lands.

The use of German in written matters in 15th-century Slovakia appears to have been largely restricted to specific regions and social contexts dependent upon the presence of German speakers as the dominant players in those specific contexts, and German does not appear to have gained broader currency as a written language of communication in other contexts or between speakers of other languages. Latin, on the other hand, as the long-standing language of administrative and church affairs in the Hungarian state, was widely used as a medium of written, as well as spoken, communication in an extended range of regional and social contexts by speakers of various languages. However, while Latin, as a prestige language, did play a prominent role in formal communication in Slovakia and did exert a certain amount of influence on the development of the Slovak language, it is the use of Czech and the relationship between Czech and Slovak in 15th-century Slovakia that I will focus on in the present analysis.[7]

An examination of this Czech-Slovak relationship in 15th-century Slovakia within the framework of Ferguson's nine categories (as presented in Ferguson 1959 and summarized in tabular form above) yields the following observations:

1) *Function*. In the 15th century the Czech literary language was used in a basically unaltered form in Slovakia primarily as a means of written communi-

---

[7] Removing Latin from the analysis of the 15th-century Slovak situation does not invalidate the investigation of the relationship between Czech and Slovak and whether this Czech-Slovak relationship can be considered a case of diglossia during this period. As stated by Ferguson: "… diglossia is very often part of a larger picture. For example, in Lebanon, there are many who make use of the H variety of Arabic as well as their local Lebanese dialect, and in addition speak French and/or English in their daily lives. These languages fit into different places in the communicative functions of the society, and this complexity is not at all unusual in the various types of speech communities in the world … diglossia can be, and often is, a part of a larger array of distribution of language uses in a general language situation" (1991: 224–25). For more on the role of Latin, German and other languages in the history of the Slovak lands, see Doruľa 1977.

cation. It was used in official letters and documents of an administrative and/or legal nature at all levels of governance—among city officials and landed gentry, military commanders, and even at the royal Hungarian chancery. Czech was also used for religious writings, extent examples of which include primarily prayers and songs. Some scholars further assume that already in the 14th century Czech was also used orally in the Slovak lands by Czech priests serving their Slovak parishioners, i.e., in sermons, prayers, various religious rites.[8] In contrast to this use of literary Czech in many formal domains, the Slovak dialects were the major vehicles of oral communication among the general populace in ordinary day-to-day affairs. Thus, Czech filled the higher functions expected of the H variety, while the individual Slovak dialects filled the lower functions expected of the L variety in a diglossic situation.

2) *Prestige.* It is difficult to judge the prestige attached to either of the two linguistic forms (literary Czech and the Slovak dialects) by the 15th-century Slovaks. It can be assumed, however, that since only a small percentage of the population was literate, literacy as a skill was highly esteemed. Thus the knowledge of Czech, if not also the Czech language itself, would have carried a certain amount of prestige. Since Czech also served certain religious functions, it was undoubtedly accorded the higher prestige that is customarily attached to languages of religion. Eugen Pauliny states: "Thus Czech was perceived in 15th-century Slovakia as the universal form of written language of the developing Slovak nation. Thus a primarily hierarchical relationship existed between Czech and the Slovak dialects: Czech as a universal written language form was perceived as a superior form vis-a-vis the indigenous dialects" (1983: 78).

3) *Literary Heritage.* Already in the 15th century there was an established and growing body of Czech literature (both religious and secular) from the Czech lands available to those Slovaks who commanded the language. There is, on the other hand, no recorded body of literature in Slovak from this period.

4) *Acquisition.* It is clear that those Slovaks who possessed a command of literary Czech in its function as a formal written language in 15th-century Slovakia acquired it only through formal education, whereas they were native speakers of their local Slovak dialects by natural acquisition at home.

5) S*tandardization.* By the start of the 15th century, the Czech literary language had already reached a fairly high degree of informal standardization and, as stated by Robert Auty: "When we consider that the relative uniformity of the phonological and morphological structure of the language remained unimpaired, and that its orthography was in the process of consolidation, we can establish the mid-15th century as the period of origin of the Czech literary lan-

---

[8] For a more comprehensive discussion of the use of Czech in Slovakia at this time, see Pauliny 1983: 59–100.

guage as a normalized, polyvalent, nationally recognized idiom" (1980: 170). Descriptive/normative studies of Czech from this period are present in three Latin-Czech dictionaries in verse from the mid-14th century, a Latin-Czech vocabulary from the early 15th century and Jan Hus's Czech orthography from ca. 1410.[9] The Slovak dialects were, at this time, a relatively non-unified group with no formal or even informal written record of an established interdialectal or superdialectal unifying norm. Some scholars claim, however, that there is indirect evidence of the ongoing natural formation of spoken regional interdialectal language forms in this period, and I will return to this idea of oral interdialectal norms in the section of this study concerning the Czech-Slovak linguistic situation in the 16th century.

6) *Stability.* The 15th-century Slovak situation demonstrates reasonable stability in its division of functions between literary Czech and the Slovak dialects. There was a certain amount of Slovak dialect interference in the written Czech employed in 15th-century Slovakia (L → H interference). This is evident in the form of phonological, morphological and lexical "Slovakisms" in extant 15th-century Czech texts (see section 8 "Lexicon" and section 9 "Phonology" below). Whether there was interference from literary Czech in the spoken Slovak of those who were literate (H → L interference) is virtually impossible to establish.

7) *Grammar.* It is difficult to claim that in the 15th century the grammar of Czech was significantly "more complex" than that of Slovak. It is true that modern standard Slovak lacks some of the grammatical "complexities" seen in the modern Czech literary language, e.g., certain morphophonemic alternations in the nominal declensions, or unmatched sets of endings in hard vs. soft adjectival inflection, however this does not hold for the 15th century. At that time various of the phonological and morphological changes that gave rise to grammatical "complexities" in modern Czech not shared with modern Slovak (e.g., unmatched hard and soft adjectival inflection) had not yet run their course, and certain earlier "complexities" that Slovak shared with Czech (e.g., morphophonemic alternations in nominal declensions) had not yet been leveled out in Slovak (in fact many of these early shared features remain in the individual Slovak dialects today). However, Ferguson does not insist on the grammatical complexity of H vs. L as a necessary feature of diglossia stating that he is formulating the notion for his defining languages "even if it should turn out to be

---

[9] *Bohemarius Major, Glossarius, Vokabulář grammatický* (ca. 1360) and *Vocabularius* (1409), all attributed to Bartoloměj z Chlumce (also known as Claretus de Solentia or Master Klaret) and his school. *De Orthographia Bohemica* (ca. 1410), attributed to Jan Hus. See Stankiewicz 1984: 3 & 16 and Auty 1980: 165–69.

invalid for other instances of diglossia" (1959: 333).[10] He does state quite firmly, however, that: "It is certainly safe to say that in diglossia *there are always extensive differences between the grammatical structures of H and L*" (1959: 333). Based on textual and reconstructed evidence it is safe to say that there were notable differences between the grammatical structures of literary Czech and the Slovak dialects in the 15th century (bearing in mind that these grammatical differences could be greater or lesser depending upon the individual Slovak dialect(s) in question).

8) *Lexicon.* While it is difficult to know exactly to what extent there was shared vocabulary between literary Czech and the Slovak dialects in the 15th century, it can be assumed from their genetic proximity within the Czechoslovak dialect continuum (as well as from the large degree of vocabulary overlap in the modern Czech and Slovak languages) that there was at least a base of shared vocabulary "of course with variations in form and with differences of use and meaning" (Ferguson 1959: 334). The existence of paired lexical items between Czech and Slovak is also to be expected during this period, as is the development of lexical items unique to each language, given the development of the two languages within the different political and social contexts of the Czech and Hungarian states respectively. Evidence of this can be found in the occurrence of specifically Slovak vocabulary in the literary Czech of certain legal documents despite the existence of contemporary Czech legal terms.[11]

9) *Phonology.* It seems forced to assert that the 15th-century Slovak and Czech sound systems constituted for a Slovak speaker a single phonological structure of which the Slovak system was basic (although it is clear from linguistic reconstruction that early Czech and Slovak dialects were phonologically

---

[10] Ferguson even admits that "a full analysis of standard German and Swiss German might show this [complexity of H vs. L] not to be true in that diglossic situation in view of the extensive morphophonemics of Swiss" (1959: 334).

[11] "Although these oldest Czech texts were written by Czechs or by Slovaks who had studied at Prague University and had thus learned Czech well we still find Slovakisms in them…. These include Slovak personal and, in general, proper names and certain designations or terms that are connected with the Slovaks' Hungarian surroundings…. This is especially noticeable in the Žilina Townbook from the 15th century—a translation of the Magdeburg law code from German into Czech. The translation was prepared in Slovakia (Žilina) and that reality is readily visible in the translation. For example Slovak legal terminology is used there. The translator didn't use Czech legal terms because the text was translated for the use of Slovak citizens of Žilina and it was therefore natural to use known and customary Slovak legal terminology" (Doruľa 1977: 35). It should be noted here that such use of specifically L (Slovak) members of H-L lexical pairs in a distinctly H (literary Czech) context/domain is uncharacteristic for a diglossic situation. Ferguson states that "*the use of one or the other [member of an H-L lexical pair] immediately stamps the utterance or written sequence as H or L*" (1959: 334).

closely related within the West Slavic language group). It is also difficult to ascertain for the 15th-century Slovak situation whether the Slovak speakers had "a single inventory of distinctive oppositions for the whole H-L complex and that there [was] extensive interference in both directions in terms of the distribution of phonemes in specific lexical items" (Ferguson 1959: 335–36). The evidence of phonological Slovakisms in the Czech texts produced in 15th-century Slovakia seems to indicate phonological interference at least in the direction L → H,[12] but it is essentially impossible to produce evidence for H → L (Czech → Slovak) phonological interference during this period.

For the 15th-century Slovak linguistic situation under investigation (as for any historical language period), it is difficult to make concrete statements about the final three categories of "grammar", "lexicon" and "phonology", primarily because of the obvious lack of direct evidence concerning the spoken forms of Czech and Slovak in Slovakia at the time. However, as stated by Francis Britto, the three categories, "grammar", "lexicon" and "phonology", "actually focus on the *single* issue of *linguistic relatedness* between H and L [emphasis added]" (1986: 9). If categories 7, 8 and 9 are considered together here as measures of the linguistic relatedness of literary Czech and the Slovak dialects in the 15th century, the textual and reconstructed linguistic evidence, cited in part under 7), 8) and 9) above, would appear to indicate that the genetic relationship between these two language varieties falls within the range presented by Ferguson's defining situations of Arabic, Greek, Swiss German and Haitian Creole.[13] The issues of linguistic relatedness, or linguistic distance, between the two language varieties in a proposed diglossic situation, and how best to

---

[12] "In the Žilina Townbook (in the translation of the Magdeburg law code from German and in later entries from sessions of the city council) we also find phonological and morphological Slovakisms. Such Slovakisms can also be found in another well-known written monument from the 15th century, the *Modlitby pri kázni zo Spišskej kapituly* ['Prayers connected with a sermon from Spišska Kapitula'] (from 1480)" (Doruľa 1977: 35).

[13] Purists may still point out that the Czech-Slovak situation could not be considered a true case of diglossia because, regardless of the degree of genetic relatedness between Czech and the Slovak dialects, the two language varieties represent *two different languages*. It can be argued, however, that the linguistic relationship between the Slovak dialects and literary Czech in the periods under consideration here (particularly the earlier 15th–16th century periods), was no more distant than the contemporary relationship between the Swiss German dialects and Standard German, and therefore is valid within Ferguson's framework. Heinz Kloss even goes so far as to make the following statement concerning the relatedness of the modern Czech and Slovak dialects (in a discussion of the relationship between the modern Czech and Slovak standard languages): "We are dealing with dialects whose speakers would certainly be reported by linguists as constituting a single linguistic community if they were at a preliterate stage" (1967: 31).

measure this relatedness/distance have been areas of contention for as long as scholars have been studying diglossia[14], and Ferguson attempts to clarify his original conception of how far apart the two varieties should be for a situation to be considered diglossic by refocusing the issue as follows:

> "Though I did not make it clear in the [original 1959] article why I felt the term should apply only to situations in which the varieties were closely related, it was because I was interested in looking at the sources and outcomes of different language situations. Where does a diglossic situation come from? What will happen to it over time? My feeling was that if you have two varieties in this H-L relationship that are fairly closely related to one another, one kind of outcome will result (e.g., certain kinds of lexical borrowings will take place, certain forms of phonological and syntactic convergence will be likely, and so forth). However, if the H and L varieties are unrelated languages, then the outcomes will ultimately be quite different; different kinds of borrowing will take place and different types of intermediate forms will result, and the overall history of the language situation will be different." [1991: 223]

On the basis of the arguments summarized in this section, I consider the Czech-Slovak linguistic situation in 15th century Slovakia to present a case of diglossia, and turn now to the "overall history of the language situation"—the developmental tendencies and the outcome of the pre-codification Czech-Slovak situation—as the focus of the remaining sections of this study.[15]

---

[14] A detailed review of the issues involved would go beyond the bounds of the present discussion and the reader is referred to Britto 1986 for a full discussion of linguistic distance in diglossia and a proposed set of terms within which to analyze it more concretely.

[15] Even before Ferguson's initial formulation of the concept of diglossia, Pauliny made the following statement that seems to confirm the validity of applying the diglossia concept to the early relationship between literary Czech and the Slovak dialects: "Thus between Czech and Slovak existed not only the hierarchical relationship of literary language and dialects, which we mentioned earlier, but there was also a relationship of dissimilarity, a relationship between two languages, a bilingual relationship between them. This bilingual relationship was, to be sure, of a particular character, on the one hand because of the great closeness of Czech and Slovak, on the other hand because of that hierarchical relationship that existed between Czech and Slovak…. This bilingual relationship was also particular because Czech functioned as the written language against Slovak as the spoken language" (1958: 43).

4. The Evolution of the Czech-Slovak Situation in the 16th Century

As was mentioned above in the brief discussion of category (5) "standardization", some scholars claim that there is evidence for the formation and informal standardization of spoken interdialectal Slovak koinés at least as early as the 15th century (some place the beginnings of these developments as early as the 11th century). It is generally claimed that there were three such spoken koinés, based on the three major Slovak dialect divisions: West Slovak, Central Slovak and East Slovak.[16] The possible existence of such informal *spoken* Slovak norms would not, however, jeopardize the classifying of the 15th-century Slovak situation as diglossic. In discussing "standardization", Ferguson readily allows that "a kind of standard L may arise which speakers of other dialects imitate and which tends to spread like any standard variety except that it remains limited to the functions for which L is appropriate. In speech communities which have no single most important center of communication a number of regional L's may arise" (1959: 332).

In addition to the claims that spoken interdialectal forms of Slovak were in use by the 16th century, there are also arguments that the extant corpus of 16th-century administrative and legal texts provides evidence of the gradual formation of *written* interdialectal varieties of Slovak. Despite the potential existence of such nascent written interdialectal varieties, it might still be possible to apply the concept of diglossia to 16th century Slovakia, since Ferguson in discussing diglossic "stability" states that: "The communicative tensions which arise in the diglossia situation may be resolved by the use of relatively uncodified, *unstable*, intermediate forms of the language … [emphasis added]" (1959: 332). However, those scholars proposing 16th century varieties of written interdialectal Slovak generally state that these written interdialectal formations exhibit a relatively *stable* norm. This might indicate a moving away from the diglossia situation in Slovakia already in the 16th century. In addition, these stable interdialectal L forms are said to be found in administrative and legal texts, and such texts were part of the functional domain of the H variety, i.e., literary Czech. This too would seem to indicate the breakdown of diglossia in 16th-century Slovakia.

There has long been discussion in the Slovak linguistic community concerning the formation of stable, written interdialectal forms of Slovak in the 16th century and the evidence for the existence of such interdialectal forms in 16th-century texts. Most of the studies focusing on this question have concentrated on single texts or small groups of texts from specific regions, investigating in

---

[16] See, for example, Kotulič 1968, Krajčovič and Žigo 1994: 87–89.

detail the nature of the language of these isolated texts.[17] Habovštiaková 1968 deals with the phonology, morphology and lexicon of a more extensive sample of data, however, the data is drawn from the card catalogs of the *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka* (*Historical Dictionary of Slovak*, Majtán 1991-) and not from the direct investigation of a textual corpus. Text-based studies that have been larger in scope have focused chiefly on the lexicon, less on phonology, morphology and syntax.[18] The cumulative evidence from these earlier studies is sufficiently convincing to encourage more comprehensive investigation of the issue in the form of large-scale text-based studies of all structural aspects of the language of 16th-century Slovak texts. I recently completed a detailed investigation of the phonology of an extensive corpus of 16th-century administrative-legal texts from all major dialect areas of Slovakia (Lauersdorf 1996), and the phonological evidence gathered in that study appears to support the claims concerning the rise of fairly stable, written interdialectal forms of Slovak in the 16th century (albeit only in texts from the West and Central Slovak regions). The more extensive lexical studies mentioned above have gathered compelling evidence in this direction as well. Unfortunately, sufficient information from the areas of morphology and syntax has not yet been assembled to determine whether the morphological and syntactic structures of the textual language confirm or refute the interpretation suggested by the phonological and lexical evidence.

Based on the phonological and lexical evidence assembled to this point, it appears that 16th-century administrative-legal texts from the Slovak-speaking territories are written largely in an interdialectal language form that exhibits a mixed structure combining both Czech and Slovak linguistic elements. Although this textual interdialect appears patterned on established Czech models and contains significant Czech phonological and lexical material, there are strong and consistent Slovak elements in both the phonology and lexicon of the texts. The Slovak elements in the texts are generally of an interdialectal nature and not characteristic of micro-dialectal variation. Individual micro-dialectal forms do occur, but these are the exception rather than the rule. There is some regional variation which has caused scholars to propose a West Slovak, a Central Slovak, and an East Slovak written interdialect along the lines of the spoken interdialects proposed for each of the three major Slovak dialect divisions. What is important for the present discussion of the 16th-century situa-

---

[17] See Lauersdorf 1996: 30–31 for a listing of such studies of single texts and small groups of texts.

[18] Many of these lexical investigations were conducted in connection with the immense data-gathering project for the production of the *Historical Dictionary of Slovak*. References to such lexical studies can be found in Lauersdorf 1996: 31.

tion, however, is the existence of *any* such stable, interdialectal Slovak linguistic form functioning not only in the usual, informal spoken domains of a "low language variety", but also in the more formal, written domains of a "high language variety".

Ferguson (1959), and later Paul Wexler in his article on diglossia and language standardization (1971), include four possible scenarios for the breakdown or resolution of a state of diglossia:

1) The range of use of H is extended to include the functions formerly reserved for L. In the Czech-Slovak situation under investigation, Czech would become not only the written but also the spoken means of communication among the Slovaks.

2) A single variant of L extends its range of use to include the functions formerly reserved for H. In the Czech-Slovak situation (choosing one variant at random), spoken interdialectal West Slovak centered around an important center like Bratislava or Trnava would become used in the entire Slovak-speaking territory for spoken and written communication.

3) (as a modified version of #2) Several L variants achieve an extended range of use, supplanting H in their respective regions. In the Czech-Slovak situation of this study, spoken interdialectal West Slovak, Central Slovak and East Slovak would each become used as the spoken and written language for their respective environments/regions.

4) H assimilates some of the linguistic features of L and this "simplified" H is used for all H and L functions. In the Czech-Slovak diglossia situation, Czech would take on Slovak linguistic features and this Czech-Slovak hybrid would serve as the spoken and written language of the Slovaks.

As stated above, the written interdialects discernible in 16th-century Slovak administrative-legal texts exhibit a mixed structure combining both Czech and Slovak linguistic elements. This mixed linguistic form appears to have a Czech base with significant Czech phonological and lexical material into which consistent Slovak elements (both phonological and lexical) have been incorporated. Thus the Czech-Slovak diglossia situation established for the 15th century appears to have begun a process in the 16th century toward resolution according to the fourth scenario just described—that of the "simplification" of H by incorporation of features of L and the use of this "simplified" H in all functional domains.

Indeed, the development of such mixed Czech-Slovak language forms was fostered in Slovakia in the mid to late 16th century by the linguistic practices accompanying the Lutheran Reformation. In their desire to use the indigenous language in the work of the church as espoused by the ideals of the

Reformation, the Slovak Protestants adopted Czech for use in their worship, a natural decision since literary Czech had until now functioned as the "high language variety" in Slovakia. This adoption of Czech as the language of the Lutheran church also caused the practice of using literary Czech for *spoken* purposes to increase among the Slovak Protestants during this period. This increased use of Czech in Protestant religious affairs and the increasing expansion of literacy brought on by newly founded Protestant schools brought about greater contact of the general Slovak-speaking population with the Czech language through the course of the 16th century. This in turn led to increased conscious and unconscious "Slovakization" of the form of literary Czech in use among the Slovak Protestants, i.e., further "simplification" of H through incorporation of features of L.[19]

Concerning possible social factors leading to the breakdown of a diglossic situation Ferguson states that: "Diglossia seems to be accepted and not regarded as a 'problem' by the community in which it is in force, until certain trends appear in the community. These include trends toward (a) more widespread literacy (whether for economic, ideological or other reasons), (b) broader communication among different regional and social segments of the community (e.g., for economic, administrative, military, or ideological reasons), (c) desire for a full-fledged standard 'national' language as an attribute of autonomy or of sovereignty" (1959: 338). Interestingly, precisely these trends are present to differing degrees by the end of the 16th century in the Slovak lands:

a) Literacy becomes more widespread—as mentioned above, the growth in the number of schools in Slovakia during the Reformation causes an increase in literacy particularly among the middle classes of society.[20]

b) Broader communication/integration arises regionally—the constant Turkish military threat to the south during the 16th century causes an increase in cooperation and communication among the various administrative districts

---

[19] It should be emphasized that the actual situation was not as homogeneous as the somewhat simplified picture presented here. The degree to which any given Czech text was "Slovakized" depended on a number of variables, and any such text must be considered to exist somewhere on a fluid continuum between "pure Czech" and "heavily Slovakized Czech".

[20] "But in the 16th century, in the period of the Reformation, the number of those who knew how to read and write greatly increased, and there are many extant documents from the 16th century written in Czech which were already written not only by scribes but also by simple city gentry and landed gentry, indeed such documents even arise in the villages" (Varsik 1956: 85).

in Central Slovakia. Scholars also maintain that West and Central Slovakia show stronger integration with each other during this time.[21]

c) The Slovaks continue to assert themselves among the other ethnic groups in the Hungarian state—Slovaks rise to administrative positions in an increasing number of cities during the 16th century. Along with the arrival of Slovaks into city administration comes an increased use of the indigenous language in city affairs. While this does not constitute "desire for a full-fledged standard 'national' language as an attribute of autonomy or of sovereignty", it does demonstrate ethnic awareness among the 16th-century Slovaks and the manifestation of this awareness in language use.[22] Thus, not only the linguistic but also the social conditions conducive to the dissolution of a diglossic situation appear to have been in place in late 16th-century Slovakia.

5. Overview of Further Development in the 17th and 18th Centuries

In light of the continued development into the early 17th century of mixed Czech-Slovak language varieties fostered by the Slovak Protestants, Pauliny comments that: "It is possible perhaps to conclude that the Slovak Protestants would have unequivocally worked their way through to a Slovak literary language if recatholicization had not arrived" (1983: 111). The recatholicization efforts of the late 16th to early 18th centuries resulted in a reversal in linguistic practice among the Slovak Protestants. Whereas the Reformation period had

---

[21] "The unfavorable social conditions in the 16th and 17th centuries did not prevent the further integration of the Slovak people. This integration occurs chiefly in West and Central Slovakia…. Central Slovakia (that is the districts that were not under Turkish control, thus not Gemer, Novohrad, and part of Hont) had intensive cohesion during the times of the anti-Turkish battles…. This region participated very actively as a unit in defending the mining cities in the battles against the Turks…. This unity is striking especially in the Zvolen, Tekov, and Hont districts…. The integration of West and Central Slovakia as a unified whole is clear and relatively strong at this time" (Pauliny 1983: 103–04).

[22] Take, for example, the case of the city of Trnava: "We have already referred in more detail to the development of relations in Trnava in the 15th century and how the Slovaks there, represented above all by the tradesmen, asserted themselves in city governance already in the 1480s as a result of their large numbers…. Just as earlier the German patriciate had used German in the city as an outward manifestation of their power, so also the Slovaks after gaining representation in city governance began to use their language, i.e., written Czech [*písomná čeština*], which for them was the written manifestation of their own Slovak speech. The Trnava Slovaks wrote using written Czech, but they called it Slovak, just as they called their preachers Slovak preachers, even though they preached to them using written Czech. From this it is already clear what function the Czech language had among the Slovaks: the same function that written German had among the Trnava Germans. For the Trnava Slovaks, Czech was also the outward manifestation of their power in city governance" (Varsik 1956: 57).

witnessed increasing Slovakization of the Czech language in use among the Slovak Protestants, the recatholicization period resulted in their turning to a more "pure" Czech as exemplified in the recent Czech Bible translation, the *Kralická bible* (1579–93), for use in their religious practice. Thus the fading diglossic situation in Slovakia was somewhat reinforced through the deliberate reinstating of literary Czech in certain portions of the functional domain of H among certain sectors of the population.[23]

In contrast to this Protestant return to Czech, the Catholic church during this period attempted to reconvert the Slovak Protestants by reaching them in their native language. The Slovak Catholics began developing religious materials based on the West Slovak variety of the interdialectal Czech-Slovak hybrid already at hand since the 16th century in Slovak administrative-legal writings, and they further Slovakized this linguistic base. Thus, despite the return of the Slovak Protestants to the use of a more "pure" H, the process of "simplifying" H through inclusion of elements of L and the use of this "simplified" H in ever broader functional domains continued throughout the 17th century, largely through the efforts of the Slovak Catholics. The continuation of these developments into the 18th century leads Pauliny to claim that: "The advantageous use of Cultural West Slovak [a term used for the West Slovak interdialectal language variety] in Catholic writings at the end of the first half of the 18th century was expressed in the appearance of an already rather firmly normalized national literary language" (1983: 144). In the second half of the 18th century, the Camaldolite monks began a process of codifying this language of Catholic writings, producing a Latin-Slovak dictionary and the first Slovak translation of the Bible.[24] This language form was also cultivated at this time as a spoken language among the educated. Thus it would appear that by the second half of the 18th century the diglossic period in Slovakia was approaching an end.[25]

At this point the more or less natural progression toward resolution of the diglossia situation and development of a standard language in Slovakia was interrupted, and the calculated interventions of first Anton Bernolák and then Ľudovít Štúr transformed the standardization process into one of overt language planning and codification. Initially, the West Slovak interdialectal variety

---

[23] For a more extensive discussion of the language use of the Slovak Protestants during this period, see Pauliny 1983: 104–17.

[24] *Syllabus dictionarij latino-slavonicus … cum brevi quoque methodo parvulorum, rite videlicet: scribendi, formandi, et pronunciandi nonnullas voces in Ortographo-Slavonico Idiomate* (1763) and *Swaté Biblia Slowénské aneb Pjsma Swatého částka I, II* (ca. 1750). See Stankiewicz 1984: 29 and Pauliny 1983: 146.

[25] For a lengthier treatment of the language use of the Slovak Catholics at this time, see Pauliny 1983: 139–49.

that had developed by the late 18th century out of a mixed Czech-Slovak base continued to play a role even in the planned codification efforts. Bernolák's codification at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries is generally considered to have been based on the West Slovak interdialectal variety found in the spoken and written use of the educated[26], and thus it could be seen as continuing the resolution of the diglossic situation according to scenario 4: the "simplification" of H into an H-L hybrid used in all functional domains. However, Bernolák's codification did not gain widespread support, and his proposed standardization of Slovak was supplanted by the work of Štúr and his followers in the mid-19th century. Štúr based his codification on 19th-century *Central* Slovak interdialectal language use (considered to have developed out of an earlier spoken Central Slovak interdialect) and consciously directed it away from overtly Czech elements in phonology and morphology.[27] These decisions and their successful implementation in Štúr's codification of the modern Slovak standard language caused an abrupt change in the path that standard language development in Slovakia had been following. With Štúr's codification, the definitive resolution of the Czech-Slovak diglossic situation occurred according to the second scenario discussed above—a single variant of L was extended in its range of use to include the functions formerly reserved for H. The Central Slovak interdialectal language variety was extended in its range of use to include the functions formerly reserved for literary Czech.

6. Conclusion

As stated at the outset, my intent with this study was to provide a sketch of the linguistic situation in Slovakia during the 15th–18th centuries within a diglossia framework, to serve as a starting point for more in-depth sociolinguistic investigation of early linguistic development and language standardization in the Slovak lands. In this attempt to establish a baseline for further investigation, I have necessarily focused on the earlier periods of the 15th and 16th centuries— the earliest time from which there is significant direct documentation of patterns of indigenous language use in Slovakia in the form of a larger corpus of texts written in a Slavic language (be it Czech or mixed Czech-Slovak). The conclusions I have drawn here—postulating a 15th–16th century situation of Czech-Slovak diglossia gradually resolved in the course of the 17th–18th

---

[26] See, e.g., Kotulič 1992, Krajčovič and Žigo 1994: 71–72, Pauliny 1983: 160–74.

[27] See, for example, Krajčovič and Žigo 1994: 102–04, Pauliny 1983: 175–99. There were, of course, numerous linguistic, social and ideological reasons for the abrupt and calculated redirecting of the standardization process away from a (Czech-)West Slovak base toward a Central Slovak base. Unfortunately, the scope of this paper does not allow for further investigation or consideration of these issues here.

centuries through increasing development and use of a mixed Czech-Slovak interdialect—will require further evaluation. Detailed sociolinguistic studies of the individual periods in question, especially of the later periods of the 17th and 18th centuries, will be needed in order to fully test the validity of these conclusions, and it is hoped that such future investigations will build on and will study in more detail the issues that I have presented here.

Works Cited

Alekseev, Anatolij A. 1986. "Počemu v Drevnej Rusi ne bylo diglossii." *Literaturnyj jazyk Drevnej Rusi: Mežvuzovskij sbornik*. Eds. Vladimir V. Kolesov, et al. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo Universiteta, 3–11. [*Problemy istoričeskogo jazykoznanija*, 3.]

Auty, Robert. 1980. "Czech." *The Slavic Literary Languages: Formation and Development*. Eds. Alexander M. Schenker and Edward Stankiewicz. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, 163–82. [*Yale Russian and East European Publications*, 1.]

Britto, Francis. 1986. *Diglossia: A study of the theory with application to Tamil*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

———. 1991. "Tamil Diglossia: An Interpretation." *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10.1: 60–84. [special edition of *SJL*: *Studies in Diglossia*. Ed. Alan Hudson.]

Comrie, Bernard. 1991. "Diglossia in the Old Russian Period." *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10.1: 160–72. [special edition of *SJL*: *Studies in Diglossia*. Ed. Alan Hudson]

Doruľa, Ján. 1977. *Slováci v dejinách jazykových vzťahov*. Bratislava: Veda.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. "Diglossia." *Word* 15.2: 325–40.

———. 1991. "Epilogue: Diglossia Revisited." *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10.1: 214–34. [special edition of *SJL*: *Studies in Diglossia*. Ed. Alan Hudson.]

Fernández, Mauro. 1993. *Diglossia: A Comprehensive Bibliography 1960–1990 and Supplements*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [*Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series V: Library & Information Sources in Linguistics*, 23.]

Gippius, A. A., A. B. Straxov, and O. B. Straxova. 1988. "Teorija cerkovno-slavjansko-russkoj diglossii i ee kritiki." *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Serija 9: Filologija*. 43.5: 34–49.

Grygar-Rechziegel, Adela. 1990. "On Czech Diglossia." *Czech Studies: Literature, Language, Culture / České studie: Literatura, Jazyk, Kultura*. Ed. Mojmír Grygar. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 9–29.

Habovštiaková, Katarína. 1968. "O vzťahu slovenčiny a češtiny v slovenských písomnostiach zo XVI.–XVIII. storočia." *Slavia (Časopis pro slovanskou filologii)* XXXVII.2: 235–52. [special issue of *Slavia*: *VI. mezinárodní sjezd slavistů*.]

Horecký, Ján. 1995. "Slovensko-česká diglosná komunikácia." *Sociolingvistické aspekty výskumu súčasnej slovenčiny.* Eds. Slavo Ondrejovič and Mária Šimková. Bratislava: Veda, 183–87. [*Socioliguistica Slovaca*, 1.]

Hudson, Alan. 1992. "Diglossia: A bibliographic review." *Language in Society* 21.4: 611–74.

Kloss, Heinz. 1967. "'Abstand Languages' and 'Ausbau Languages'." *Anthropological Linguistics* 9.7: 29–41.

Kotulič, Izidor. 1968. "O formovaní kultúrneho jazyka slovenskej národnosti." *Jazykovedný časopis* XIX.1–2: 134–49. [special issue of *Jč*: *Venované VI. medzinárodnému zjazdu slavistov v Prahe 1968*.]

———. 1992. "Bernolákovčina a predbernolákovská kultúrna slovenčina." *Pamätnica Antona Bernoláka*. Ed. Juraj Chovan. Martin: Matica slovenská, 79–90.

Krajčovič, Rudolf and Pavol Žigo. 1994. *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny: Študijná príručka a texty*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského. [*Vysokoškolské skriptá. Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Komenského*.]

Kristophson, J. 1989. "Taugt der Terminus 'Diglossie' zur Beschreibung der Sprachsituation in der alten Rus'?." *Die Slawischen Sprachen* 19: 63–72.

Krysin, Leonid P. 1987. "Bilingvism, diglossija i regional'noe var'irovanie russkogo jazyka." *Jazyk velikogo bratstva narodov*. Ashjabad: n.p.

Lauersdorf, Mark Richard. 1996. *The Question of 'Cultural Language' and Interdialectal Norm in 16th Century Slovakia: A Phonological Analysis of 16th Century Slovak Administrative-Legal Texts*. München: Verlag Otto Sagner. [*Slavistische Beiträge*, 335.]

Magner, Thomas F. 1978. "Diglossia in Split." *Folia Slavica* 1.3: 400–36 (+ maps, 436a-d). [special edition of *FS*: *Sociolinguistic Problems in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Yugoslavia*. Eds. William R. Schmalstieg and Thomas F. Magner.]

Majtán, Milan, ed. 1991– . *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka*. Bratislava: Veda. [5 volumes to date: I: A–J (1991), II: K–N (1992), III: O–pochytka (1994), IV: poihraťsa–pytlovať (1995), V: R–Š (2000).]

Mladenova, Olga. 1980. "Diglossie et interférence structuro-sémantique entre le moyen-bulgare littéraire et le roumain." *Balkansko Ezikoznanie / Linguistique Balkanique* 23.4: 27–40.

Pauliny, Eugen. 1958. "Kultúrnohistorické podmienky a spoločenské funkcie bilingvizmu v dejinách spisovnej slovenčiny." *Československé přednášky pro IV. mezinárodní sjezd slavistů v Moskvě*. Prague: Academia, 37–45.

Pauliny, Eugen. 1983. *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny od začiatkov po súčasnosť*. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.

Šapir, Maksim Il′ič. 1989. "Teorija 'cerkovnoslavjansko-russkoj diglossii' i ee storonniki: Po povodu knigi B. A. Uspenskogo *Istorija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka*." *Russian Linguistics: International journal for the study of the Russian language* 13.3: 271–309.

Stankiewicz, Edward. 1984. *Grammars and Dictionaries of the Slavic Languages from the Middle Ages up to 1850: An Annotated Bibliography*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton.

Thomas, George. 1989. "The Role of Diglossia in the Development of the Slavonic Literary Languages." *Slavistična revija* 37.1–3: 273–82.

Tollefson, James W. 1978. *Diglossia and Language Policy, with Special Reference to Slovenia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Townsend, Charles E. 1987. "Czech Diglossia and Interlinguistic Influence." *Geolinguistic Perspectives (Proceedings of the International Conference Celebrating the Twentieth Anniversary of the American Society of Geolinguistics)*. Eds. Jesse Levitt, Leonard R. N. Ashley, and Kenneth H. Rogers. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 353–59.

Uspenskij, Boris Andreevič et al. 1987. *Istorija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (XI-XVII vv)*. München: Verlag Otto Sagner. [*Sagners slavistische Sammlung*, 12.]

Varsik, Branislav. 1956. *Slovenské listy a listiny z XV. a XVI. storočia*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.

Wexler, Paul. 1971. "Diglossia, Language Standardization and Purism: Parameters for a Typology of Literary Languages." *Lingua* 27.4: 330–54.

———. 1992. "*Diglossia et schizoglossia perpetua*—the fate of the Belorussian language." *Sociolinguistica* 6: 42–51. [individual volume title: *Nationalsprachenentstehung in Osteuropa / The Rise of National Languages in Eastern Europe / L'origine des langues nationales en Europe de l'Est*. Eds. Klaus J. Mattheier and Baldur Panzer.]

Department of Modern Languages
Luther College
700 College Drive
Decorah, IA 52101-1045 USA
<lauersma@luther.edu>