

Aleksander Pavkovič. *Tschechisch und Slovenisch im Vergleich ihrer schrift- und standardsprachlichen Entwicklung*. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2011. 265 pp.

The aim of this book is to explore the development of a standard variant normalized in grammars and adopted script in Czech and Slovene. Aleksander Pavkovič (hereafter P) restricts himself to the brief period from the second half of the eighteenth century to the early years of the nineteenth century, i.e., from late Baroque period until the Enlightenment and Pre-Romanticism period. The author tries to trace Enlightenment ideas reflected in the period grammars. P postulates two preliminary questions: (1) Did the linguistic ideas of J. Ch. Gottsched (a literary theorist and critic who helped to regularize German as a standard language) influence both Czech and Slovene grammarians? (2) Were the ideas of Enlightenment and nationalism accompanied by concrete language policies?

The book is divided into six chapters, a final summary, and a list of references. The first chapter introduces the reader to the necessary terminology and shows how the terms were understood in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The predominant influence of German in the Austro-Hungarian Empire is also illustrated by German terminology as well as German equivalents of proper names used by grammarians of the time. The rise of language standardization is also put into the context of a three-phase model of national development postulated by the Czech scholar M. Hroch (from scholarly interest to national campaigning and finally to mass movement).

The second chapter discusses the language situation in both Czech and Slovene territory during the late Baroque period. The works of Baroque grammarians are briefly described, e.g., Rosa's *Čechořečnost* (1672) as well as the work of Jesuit authors like Konstanc and Drachovský. More discussion of these Jesuit authors would have been desirable because their grammars were mostly practically oriented and were considered useful for instruction in keeping a certain standard, e.g., *Žáček* by Šteyer.

The third chapter of P's book is devoted to the comparative description of the important late Baroque grammarians: J.V. Pohl and his prestigious grammar of Czech in 1756, and Marko Pohlin, author of the Carniolan grammar in 1768. Both grammars are compared step by step in P's book, which includes a discussion of terminology. Such an approach tends to be too descriptive. The most interesting part of the chapter is the insight into German as a metalanguage for both authors in the context of their predecessor Gottsched. The book also discusses the public reaction to both grammars, a theme which opens the fourth chapter of P's work. In the fourth chapter, the second generation of both Czech and Slovene grammarians is presented, e.g., Pelcl and Kumerdej, accompanied again by brief descriptions of their grammars. The structure of the chapter is basically the same. German as a metalanguage of these grammarians is again discussed.

The fifth chapter is devoted to the third generation of grammarians, Dobrovský and Kopitar, the great Slavists of the Czech and Slovene nations. Again, the structure of the chapter remains the same—grammars of both authors are described and compared. Ultimately P attempts to define a system in all the grammars discussed. According to this approach, Pohl and Pohlin are still rooted in late Baroque purism even if they have innovations in their grammars. The second generation is even more innovative and “enlightened.” The third generation exhibits more rapprochement between the scholars of both nations, especially due to the influence of Dobrovský and his grammar, including its layout and methodology. The grammarians are also put into Hroch's phases of national development mentioned earlier. It is worth asking whether all the grammarians ought to be systematized in such a way and whether they actually belong to the different periods or generations defined by P, e.g., Dobrovský was almost 40 when Pohl died. Pohl can be considered a purist and his scientific erudition cannot be compared with that of Dobrovský. It might be better to consider these authors as representatives of a different *modus operandi* rather than successors. The same could be said for the Slovene grammarians. Such a conclusion is also hinted at by P in the final summary. The final chapter of the book also briefly adduces Czech and Slovene protagonists of “Alltagssprache,” both writers and poets who used and popularized the new standard variants in their works.

Concerning the formal aspects of P's book, the layout is very clear and systematic, although P's characterizations of grammars could have been less descriptive and more illustrative. The reader tends to get lost in the text. I would add the monumental *Kapitoly z dějin české jazykovědné bohemistiky*, published in Prague in 2007, to the list of references. Also, I would be careful about quoting Wikipedia (p. 142) which might be considered a popular encyclopedia rather than a scholarly work. Concerning internet sources, I would refrain from quoting the detailed path from the root address (p. 263) because nobody will meticulously write all abbreviations and numbers into the browser. It would be advisable to quote just a basic address. A scholar should also avoid using brief student handouts as a source of information, e.g., the 3-page

presentation of Baroque grammarians by Pleskalová (p. 257), as it may not be considered a scholarly source.

Generally, P's work represents another contribution to the history of linguistics and might be considered as an attempt to incorporate the development of grammars in a broader historical context of Enlightenment ideas. Let us hope that the author will continue with further research on the development of Czech and Slovene lexicography in his area of specialization.

Prispelo marca 2013
Received March 2013

Roman Sukač
Slezská univerzita v Opavě

