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Introduction

Several of the articles listed below originated at a conference on language policies and cultivation of the language held at Smolenice in April 1985. A number of writers reflect a general unease about the quality of public and professional language practice in certain areas. Here, and elsewhere, one also detects the usual tension between stout upholding of the established norms and pressures to adopt a somewhat more elastic approach. A good deal of the published work on offer relates to the further codification and systematization of standard usage or to lexicographical projects under way. Under the latter heading we may include a considerable interest in analysis of contemporary trends in terminology and phraseology. Certain elements in the recent official recodification of standard pronunciation have begun to meet with a critical response in one or two quarters (see section 7 below).

1. Bibliographies


2. History of the Language

F. Uličný, SR, 51: 101–04, argues for the oldest occurrence of the word slovensky in a document of 1294 containing the phrase ‘ad parvam arborem nystra slovenski breza’: although only surviving in an 18th-c. copy the error of ‘nystra’ for Hungarian ‘nyirfa’ (birch-tree,
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‘breza’) suggests its genuine origin. V. Blanár, ib., 196–206, defends the continuity of Slovak in early medieval times, rejecting the Hungarian writer G. Győrffy’s suggestion that the place name Dravce indicates Bulgarian settlement. P. Žigo, ib., 266–33, examines tense and aspect in subordinate clauses of time, using material from the 16th to 18th cs. P. Šima, RLB, 8:107–11, finds some curious lexical parallels to Slovak (or Czech) in two Russian MSS of the 15th–16th cs and tries to use these as evidence about early cultural Slovak. J. Doruľa, ib., 102–06, discusses some Hungarian loanwords, including chotár. R. Krajčovič, ib., 185–91, looks at stylistic elements in 17th–18th c. wills and inventories. Š. Švagrovský, ib., 112–20, summarizes research to date on the five 18th-c. East Slovak Calvinist books from Zemplín, and, SISl, 21:273–77, describes an 18th-c. Ruthenian Cyrillic MS from Michalovce containing Slovak and other elements. He also gives us an interesting account of Slovak scholars, including the lexicographer of Greek Emil Černý, who taught classics in Tsarist Russia, ib., 62–70 (also in SAS, 14, 1985:515–33). J. Skladaná, SISl, 21:257–63, describes further work on a Polish source for the 18th-c. Camaldolite dictionary MS, while B. Ricziová, ib., 264–72, examines its use of the apostrophe to denote soft dentals. For the 19th c. the major publication is Eugen Jóna’s Postavy slovenskej jazykovedy v dobe Štúrovej, Bratislava, SfPN, 1985, 170 pp., which gives a useful informed account of Slovak language developments from Anton Bernolák to Ludovít Štúr and Martin Hattala (including a personal bibliography for the latter). Note also the general study by Vladimír Forst, Ludovít Štúr, Prague, Melantrich, 285 pp. E. Jóna, SR, 65–72, 281–87, reminisces on the linguistic disputes of the 1920s to 1940s, while A. Gladrow, ZSI, 31:552–55, outlines the general evolution of Slovak between the wars.

3. Lexicology