

LEXICAL GERMANISMS IN TRUBAR'S *CATECHISMUS*

Jože Toporišič*

0. Introduction.

From Neweklowsky's Concordance (1984) of the first part (the first 144 pages) of Trubar's first book, the *Catechismus* (itself the first Slovene book, Trubar 1550) I listed the words that, in my opinion, were borrowed from German into Slovene (and hence not earlier, into Proto-Slavic). By my reckoning there are about 135 such words; if as a basis for calculation we take German roots, bases or stems, then there are 98, viz.:

ajfrer, andaht-, borcahen, brum-, bukv-, cag-, cajhn-, cbivl-, ciganer, col, copr-, erb-, falš, far-, farmošter, ferdam(n)-, fig-, flegar, flinder, fraj, frajdik-, gat-, gažl-, glih-/glih, gmajn-, gmer-, gnad-, grev-, gvant-, gviš-, hajd-, havptman, herperg-, imar, ja, joger, ketina, kralj, krišp-, kunšt-, leben, lon-, lotr-, lušt-, mahtig, mal-, martr-, mas-, menih, merk-, nid, nuc-, obar-, ofr-, ofert-, papež, paradiž, pekel, persona, petler-, pild, pridig-, rajt-, rat-, rev-, šac, šaft, šenk-, šent-, škod-, škof, šula, špiž-, špot, štabl-, štalt, štima, štivra, štra(j)f-, štrik, štuk, šulmaster, tabla, tadel, tavžent, tiht-, truc-, trošt-, unuc, up-, var-, verd-, vur-, žalb-, žebr-, žeg-, žlahn-, žlaht/žleht-, žvepl-

Of these, four units occur in conjunction with a prefix: *-glih-*, *-gviš-*, *-merk-*, *-up-*. The total of 'about 135' includes all the words which have at least the root morpheme taken from German, e.g., *škoditi*, *marternik*, *žegnovati/žegnati*, *zamerki*, *gnadiv*, *frajdikost*; excluded are pure calques such as *zastopiti*, *odstati*, *dopasti* (and perhaps also *zanesti se* for *sich verlassen*).¹

1. Semantic Domains.

Trubar's lexical Germanisms in this (first) Part refer, generally speaking, to two kinds of realities: the first we may call 'common-civilizational', the second 'religio-moral'. The former is material or ecclesiastic-spiritual, the latter something different.

1.1. 'Common-Civilizational' Vocabulary. The designations from this domain may be categorized as material and non-material.

1.1.1. The set of material designations contains the largest group of words for objects ecclesiastic (*far, fara, farmošter, menih, papež, škof*); to some degree, for the period in question, the words *šulmaster, pild* and *gliha* 'statue' belong to this set.²

Another kind of social expression is comprised by the designations *ciganer, col* 'toll', *flegar* 'administrator, housekeeper', *kralj, havptman, petlerski, štivra*; to some extent, *šulmaster* and *herpergovati* belong here too. The word *havptman* is of course from scriptural vocabulary (cf. Rajhman 1977: 123). The following belong to the sphere of practical everyday life: *flinder* ("shenska lipota ne ima byti isuuna vtih krispanih laseih oli vtih slatih ketinah oli flindernih oli na oblazhilu tih plashzheu"), *gvant* (cf. "Te Babe . . . de bodo vtim gvantu, kir se spodobi nashi veri": alongside this word, Trubar also uses *oblačilu*, although in a somewhat complicated connection and sense, and also *sukna*: "sturi Adamu tar Eue kosheve sukne inu ye oblezhe"), *ketina, špiža, štrik, žveplu*.

Belonging, essentially, to general culture are the words *bukve, bukvice, pild* 'picture, image' and *gliha* 'picture, image': "ne sturi sebi kakiga Pylda oli Glihe." Apparently concrete designations, also, such as *ratati, šac, tavžent, varovati (se), verdeti, vura, žveplu* are actually used only in association with religious subjects: "On . . . svoje mess[u] . . . shivi inu verdei"; "kadar je bila ta vura nega martre pryshla." The occurrence of the word *štima* is unusual, for the Slovenes surely also knew the word *glas*: presumably, a figurative

sense of the word *glas* is involved here (cf. “kateri glas pa ti poješ”), and even more likely a scriptural usage as *božji glas*: “stima Gospudi Boga”, “stimo tuye shene”, “tuyo stimo vtim paradishu”.

1.1.2. Non-material designations are connected above all with the ecclesiastic and spiritual world; here the numbers of nouns, verbs and adjectives (with adverbs and particles) are about equal. In each of these groups the positive and the negative are opposed to each other: *lušt* (“ta Paradysh tiga lushta”; “hude shele inu lushte”), *nid* (“vnezhistosti, vkurbary, golufy, vnidi inu vserti”), *špot* (‘shame’: “spot deilla”) on the one hand, and on the other *masa* (“ne imamo bogu masse inu zhasa postaviti”), *tadel* (“An Scoff oli Far ima byti pres tadla”), vs. *trošt* (“ta Skryuna Suetyna ye suseb kanimu troshtu inu poteryenu dana”) and *vupanje*, if this is indeed an early loan from German. For verbs, cf. *cagati* (see Rajhman 1977:120, 122-23), *cbivlati* (“zbiuulamo na nega besedi”), *tihtati* (“vsa misall inu tihtane”), *trucati* (“spot deilla inu truzha suetiga duha”) vs. *troštati*, *upati*, *zagvišati* (“Tiga vsiga sem iest saguışhan vseh suetih Euangelih”), *zauptati* (“[bogu] vupati inu uerouati”; “suetie shene, kateri so suye vupane vbuga postauile” vs. “de se my sevupamo vsiga dobriga pruti ozhetu nebeskimu”; “prauu sauupane Viesusa”). Finally, for adjectives, cf. *falš*, *kunšten*, *lušten*, *vnucen*, *žleht/žlaht* vs. *fraj*, *gvišen*, *pohleven*, *troštav*, *žlahen* (“od te norske Falsh Vere”; “ta kazha ye billa vezh kunstnishi koker vsa shivina na semli”; “koku vezh ta gnusni, vnuzni zhlovik”; “samuzh vse shlaht inu gar uelikegrehe/sem an greshnik, an shleht sauershen zhlovik” and “nekar ne imate byti taku frai oli sami suy, de bi hoteli hudu giati”; “serze ima an guıshan trosht”; “bodite pohleuni pod to mogozho roko boshyo”; “te lepe troshtave besede vtih Euangelih”; “ana shlahna rezh, kir je veliku vredna”. Among the non-inflected words are the more or less absolute *gar* and *imar* (“Tu so gar lepe sastopne besede”: “vse shlaht inu gar uelike grehe”; “bode vezhnu tar imar shiv”, for which see Rajhman 1977:123-24.) The word *glih* is used in at least four meanings: (1) ‘alike, in the same way’ (“glih koker ta gospud to Cerkou”), (2) ‘exactly, precisely’ (“glih sdai”, “glih taku”), (3) ‘similar’ (“de bo nam glih”) and (4) ‘although’ (“zhe glih”). For the particle *gvişnu* cf. “smo guıshnu v mylhosti boshy.”

A somewhat different group of words, in the non-material sphere, designates societal matters: *erb*, *gmajna*,³ *lon* (especially in its figurative sense, as also *lonati*: “seslushon lon pryeti”; “vnebesih lona obilnu” and “koku se ty Hlapci, Dekle, inu Delouci ob lohn dershati imao”), *martra* (but above all with reference to Christ, only once referring to Man: “de nih ne hozhe sapustiti, vbustui, vbolesni, vmartri, vsmrti inu vobeni nadlugi”), *nuc* (“od Nuza tih Sacramentou”; “kai nam ta kerst inu pridiga nuza”; “tako dobro nuzno pridigo”), *reva* (“Jest hozho tebi dosti reue dati kadar bosh noshezha”; “po le teim reunim lebni vtim vezhnm veselei”), *şac* (“se nam vsi nebeski shazi odpro”), *şkoda* (“de sebi inu drusim ne sturimo şkode”; “nishtar ne nuza, temuzh vezh şkodi”), *ştuk* ‘item’ (“slasti lete stuke nashe praue uere”). Of verbs not mentioned above cf. *erbatı* (“ta greh smo my vsi od Adama erbali”; “goluf tiga krallestua Christusa ne bode erball”; “postanemo ani Erbi tiga vezhzniga lebna”), *martrati* (“Martran pod Pontio Pilatushom”; “nas martra, inu tu tellu vmori”), *merkati* (“na leta Jesuseve besede . . . imamo my vsi dobru merkati”), *obarovati* (“hozhe nas obarouati pred hudimi ludmi”; “nas Bug obari pred slegom”), *rajtati* (“po suy iskasheni sastopnosti sazhe taku misliti tar raitati sam sebo”; “gospudi Bogu . . . dati raitingo od vsiga, kar ye vtim shivoti myslil”), *ratati* (“otroci boshy ratamo inu bomo perlozheni gnebeski drushini”), *şenkati* (“Bug nih grehe pregleda inu nim shenka sa uolo Jesusa Chritusa”; “ta shenkana gnada sa uolo Jesusa”), *ştra(j)fati* (“[otroke] koyti, vuzhiti, inu strafati”; “Shenska tar Moshka strafinga inu krysh sa uolo tiga Greha”). The words *fraj*,

krišpan, nucen, vnucen, reven, glih and the adverbs or particles *mahtig, glih* were already discussed (cf. also “mahtig shlahnim velikim ludem”, “mahtig velik Gospud.”)

In this lexical group the words *coper(nija), leben, šaft, štabla, štalt, špižati/špižen* have been kept in our language. In Trubar these, too, all serve religious thought: *coper(nija)* means only ‘superstition’ (“neiso sveta, samuzh so en zuper”; “inu take slushbe ye ana zupernia inu malikouane pred bugom”); *šaft* is normally ‘Testament’, once ‘occupation, work’ (“Jnu hozho taku eno shaft nouo gori naredyti”; “ta kelih te noue shafti vmuyei kriy”; and “S teimi ima Jesus . . . dosti shafti”); in Rajhman (1977: 118) ‘zaveza, opravek’. The word *štabla* means ‘grade, place’ (“kateri dobro slushio, ty sebi sadobe ano dobro stablo inu veliko fraidikost vti veri”), and *štalt* ‘image’ (“po Boshy Stalti ga ye sturill”). More examples for *špiž*: “nam Jesus da suye tellu kani spyshi, inu suyo kry kanimu pytiu”; “te verne spishati stellom tar skryo Jesusouo”; “Ta offer inu ta spyshan offer tebi ne dopadeio”.

1.2. Religio-moral Vocabulary. The following lexical units belong to the religious or the moral sphere: *andaht, borcahen, bruma, cajhen, ferdammenje, gnada, hajd, Hans, joger, malikovanje, martra, marternik, ofer, paradiž, pekel, persona, pridiga, prigliha, priglihanje, tabla, žegen, žalbanik; grevati, martrati, ofrati/ofrovati, šentovati, žebrati, žegnati/žegnovati; andahtliv, brumen, ferdamnan, gnadiv, hajdovski, oferten*. The contemporary language has, for these, *zbranost/pobožnost, znanilo, pobožnost, čudež/znamenje, preklet/pogubljen, milost, pogan, Janž/Janež, učenec, trpljenje, mučenik, darovanje, raj, oseba, prilika, primera, blagoslov, maziljenec* (whereas *malikovanje, pekel, pridiga* are still in permanent use); the verbs *kesati se, mučiti, žrtvovati (se), preklinjati, moliti, blagosloviti* and the adjectives *zbran/pobožen, preklet, milosten, poganski, ošaben/nadut*.

In this domain our pagan ancestors did not have sufficient native designations whose use they might have extended (as, presumably, they did *with moliti*) to the abstract concepts of Christianity. Therefore they were, generally speaking, forced to take over non-native expressions along with the new religious notions that these expressed. The native synonyms of today were therefore substituted for designations which were originally lacking.⁴

2. Trubar’s Synonyms and Hren’s Substitutions

As has been known since the time of Kopitar⁵ and especially thorough the work of Breznik,⁶ basically all of the borrowed lexicon was replaced by Slovene designations in the *Evangelia inu listuve* of Bishop Hren and J. Čandek; in this way a second possible solution was presented.

2.1. This possibility was already attested in part in Trubar’s free variants: “Sakramenti oli koker my moremo govoriti te (skriune) suetyne”; “so try persone oli Imena” (cf. Rajhman 1977: 117); “nuz oli pryd”; “frai oli prosti”; “ledig oli sam sui”; “frai oli sam suy”; “sblasniti oli zbiuulati” (these may not be pure synonyms). Here we may however only partially ascribe to Trubar the desire to replace the originally German members of these pairs with Slovene expressions: for him it was surely a question of (greater) clarity.⁷ This fact is demonstrated by the pairs of synonyms in which either both are borrowed or both are native words: e.g., respectively, “gmaina oli fara”, “v taki vishi oli stalti”, “Pydle oli Glihe”, “farmoster oli pridigar”, “Christus oli shalbanik”; and “ohranik oli Isuelizhar”, “v . . . pismi oli listeih”, “kar lasi oli se gible”, “s trudom oli teshku”, “Ta kerst oli tu pogrosene”, “madeshou oli vraskou”.⁸ From the coordinate groups with *inu* cf., in addition, “gnadiu inu Mylhostiu”, “bodo umeili inu prou sastopili” (the second expression here being a calque), “vselei inu Imar”, “strafinga inu Krysh”, “hude shele inu lushte”, “gnade inu mylhosti”, “vstanena tiga shivota inu tiga vezhniga lebna”, “vsa mysall inu tihtane”,

“ta martra inu tiga vezhiga lebna,” “imar inu vselei”. A peculiarity, without the conjunction, is “po le teim lebni ta vezhni.” Coordinate groups with *tar*: “vselei tar Imar”, “vselei tar vedan”, “Rastyta tar gmerait se”, “vezhnu tar imar”, “ohraneni tar isuelizhani”, “lonati tar plazhati”, “misliti tar raitati”. It does not seem that there was any need for synonyms in this group synonyms, especially not for *gnada/milost*, *život/leben*, *vselej/imar/vedan*, *večnu/imar*, *lonati/plačati*, *misliti/rajtati*.⁹ For Trubar it was a matter of a kind of emphatic pleonasticity; Rajhman (1977) is however of the opinion that Trubar adduced these pairs because they were actually in use and he wished to be understood by all.

2.2. Jakob Rigler (1968: 213-214), in a chapter headed “Vključitev jezika protestantov v začetno obdobje protireformacije,” quoted the following replacements for Dalmatin’s originally-German vocabulary that were made by Hren (here, I give forms from Trubar’s *Catechismus* in italics):

NOUNS: *cajhen* - čudež, znamenje; *eksempel* - pokazajne; *erbič* - dedič; *erbščina* - de dinja; *erbat* - po de dīni posesti, dediščino obdržati; folk - ljudje, množica, ljudstvu, množina; izraelski folk - i. gardellu; *gerab* - oskrbnik; *gnada* - milost; *grunt* - stan; *gvant* - oblačilo, obud; *kapitan* - stujni poglavitnik; *korb* - spletenic, jerbes; *kreg* - prepirajne, zuperstvu; *nid* - kujajne, nevoščenje; *leben* - živ(l)ejne, život, živitik; *leščerba* - svetilu; *lon* - plačilo, plača; *luš* - žejla; *nežihrost* - nevarnost; *ohcet* - ženitovajne; *prigliha* - pripouvist; *punt* - hrup; *rajtinga* - čislu; *šac* - obilnu blagu; *šafnar* - hišnik; *šarnogel* - žebelj; *špeceria* - dobrodušeče mazilu; *špegel* - zgledalnik; *špiža* - jejd; *žmaganja* - oponosa; *šraŋga* - ograja; *štalt* - podoba, obraz; *štima* - glas(nost); *trošt* - (po)taženje, *troštar* - odžalnik; *vahta* - straža; *žlahta* - rod, narod.

ADJECTIVES: *brumen* - pravičen; *fals* - nepravi; *glih* - enelik; *glih* eni misli - enumisleči; *ohcetni* - ženitni; *zašpotovan* - zasramovan; *tavžent* - jezeru, milar; *potroštan* - potažen; *vragljiv* - len; *žleht* niše - hujše.

VERBS: *erpergovati* - prenočiti; *feratati* - izročiti, izdati; *ferdamovati* - pogubljevati; *flikati* - popravljati; *gajžlati* - bičovati; *gmerati* - pomnožiti; *imeti* na sebi *gvant* - biti oblečen; *gvantati* - oblačiti; *lebat* - se gostiti; *se masati* - se zdržati; *petlati* - Vbuga ime prositi; *rajtati* - čislovati; *za špot* imeti - k smehu imeti.

ADVERBIALS: *s flisom* - skerbnu; *glih* - enaku; *gvišnu* - rejs; *v luft* - v vejter; *k eni priglihi* - enak.

Only once did Hren replace a native word with a borrowed one, namely *mlajši* with *joger* (now *učenec*). Unchanged in Hren were the following: *los* (žreb), *marter*, *ofer*, *pokaštigan*, *permasnu* (= *zmasnu*), *žegnati*, *žlak*.¹⁰

2.3. With this precise survey of the replacements of German borrowings by Slovene and Slavic elements (Kajkavic, according to Breznik), Rigler confirmed Breznik’s above-mentioned position (which he does not quote). The question therefore now arises: did not Trubar Germanize more than was reasonable? I.e., might his language have been ‘over-Germanized’, more than the Slovene language itself? Rigler believed that Trubar took the speech of Ljubljana into consideration (and was thus different from Krelj), and Rajhman (1977: 124) too views Trubar’s language in more or less the same sense:

“Vprašanje tujk v Trubarjevem slovarju je bilo doslej enostransko obdelano. Očitati so mu, da je tujke nekritično prevzemal, vendar je Trubar tujke iz nemščine občutil povsem drugače, kot jih občutimo danes, ali kot jih je v svojem času občutil Kopitar.¹¹ Po načelu razumljivosti je Trubar pač moral govoriti v jeziku svojih bralcev, imel pa je predvsem pred očmi bralčevo ukaželjnost. Hotel je pojasniti verske resnice, a nikoli drugače, kot je to storil v pridigi in katehezi. Zato tudi sedaj ni mogel skonstruirati povsem drugačnega jezika, ki bi bil umetelen, zato pa daleč od bralca in uporabnika. Pa kljub temu moramo priznati, da si je prizadeval prevesti v slovenščino strokovne termine, predvsem tako, da je ob tuji strokovni termin postavil slovenskega, bodisi da je to bila slovenska

različica (le v enim primeru je nadomestil tuj strokovni termin z nemško sposojenko, ki pa jo rabi tam, kjer ima nemški original tujko), bodisi da je bila to lastna besedna tvorba.”

What gave Hren the incentive to replace almost all the borrowed lexicon with native (or at least Slavic) words? Did he know of Krelj's criticism of Trubar (“do polu nembški”), and perhaps follow him in his attention to those “kir so okuli nas”, those who almost “povsod čisteši govore” (as Krelj put it)? Was there assistance also from the Croatian *glagoljaški* priests with whom Hren came into contact?

With respect to Hren it might in our opinion be actually proved that Kopitar was right in his opinion that the language of individuals, above all, had become ‘foreignized’ but not the Slovene language itself—at least, not as much. Here it is interesting to note to what extent Hren had corrected some of the words which Kopitar (1808: 54) enumerated as a rebuke to Trubar (here, the words replaced by Hren are italicized): *leben*, *lebat*, *špiža*, mordane, štritanje, (hudobo) tribati, (biti) šacan, feržamati, punt (Bund), *cajhen*, šenkinga, *gvant*, flegar, rihtar, špendia, folk.

3. Adaptation of Borrowings

In the case of borrowed words, it is first of all necessary to note that indeclinable words may be borrowed unchanged; e.g., *gar*, *glj*, *falš*, *fraj*, *imar*, *mahtig*, *žleht/žlaht*, *ja*. In this instance this means adverbs and (in German) the indeclinable predicative forms of adjectives, some of which in Slovene are used, with zero declension, as adjectives: thus we have shown that *glj* may be one of three parts of speech, and these words are all similar: *falš* is actually attested only as an adjective (“s falsh pridigo”, “falsh prizhanje”, “falsh vere”); *fraj* is only used predicatively (“so frai oli prosti”, “biti taku frai oli sami suy”); *žleht/žlaht* is again only an attributive adjective (“vse shlaht inu gar velike grehe”, “vsem shlaht ludem, kir bodo v nega verovali”, or “an shlaht savershen zhlovik”; “nasha shlaht, mahina, nezhistia inu petlerska deila”).

The adoption of nouns into the Slovene linguistic system does not present problems either: German nouns ending in consonants go into the first masculine declension (*borcahen*, *cajhen*, *ciganer*, *col*, *coper*, *erb*, *leben*, *lušt* etc.), while those ending in vowels go into the first feminine declension (*bruma*, *bukve*, *fara*, *gliha* etc.), although early ones at that time also went into the second feminine declension (*andaht*, *štalt*, *šaft*). The only neuter noun is *žveplo*, and in this regard is a curiosity.

Verbs could not be taken over in this kind of way, but had to be given a verbal affix followed by a desinence: *cagati*, *cbivlati*, *erbat*, *gažlati*, *grevati*, *lonati*, *martrati*, *merkati*, *ofrati*, *prigliha(ti)*, *rajtati*, *ratati*, *šenkati*, *špižati*, *štra(j)fati*, *tihtati*, *trucati*, *troštati (se)*, *vupa(ti)*, *žalbat*, *žebati*, *žegnati*; *herpergovati*, *lotrovati*, *malikovati*, *ofertovat*, *šentovati*, *žegnovati*, *zašpotovati*; *škoditi*; *verde(ti)*; and cf. also *zagvišati*, *zamerkat*. The chief verbal affix is *-a-*, and *-ova-* is also frequent. In the case of *žegnati/žegnovati* an aspectual opposition is presumably involved. In examples like *zagvišati*, *zašpotovati* we may be dealing with derivations from prepositional phrases (*za gvišno*, *za špot*), but cf. German *vergewissern*, *verspotten*.

Similarly, borrowed adjectives (apart from those mentioned above with zero declension) had to have a Slovene affix: *brumen*, *gvišen*, *kunštn-*, *lušten*, *nucen*, *oferten*, *reven*, *špižen*, *unucen*, *žlahen*; *ferdam(n)an*, *krišpan*; *gnadiv*, *troštav*; *petlerski*, *hajdovski*; *figov*. The frequency of the affixal types may be gauged from this list.

As for nouns, they are rarely formed from borrowed bases: *cuprnija*, *frajdikost*, *predi-ga*, *prigliha*, *marternik*, *žalbanik*; participles in *-n* and verbal nouns are to be excluded.

Examples such as *borcahen* and *unucen* (cf. *Vorzeichen*, *Unmütze*) must be understood as non-derived.

4. Urban and Rural Usage

The question remains: to what extent were the words which Trubar borrowed from German spoken among the provincial population, as opposed to the city (where there must have been rather more of them). Of course we have no way of knowing the situation in the 16th century, but it may not have been very different from the state of affairs in the countryside today; for example, in Mostec. For this village we may attest the following for Trubar's Germanisms (in some case, of course, only the root):¹²

ājfrat, būkvíce, cōgat, cōjhen, cēgan [in a song: cigājner], cōla, cúper, cupnija, jērb, jērbat, fōvš, fōr, fōra, fōjmušter, frđaman, figuv-, frēj, gōžla, glih (zdě/bít), glih(at se), gmějna, gnōda, grévnga, gvànt, gvíšn, gvíšnu, zagvišat, hāvptman, júger, kėtna, král, kújštn, ùn, ùnat, lěšt, lúšn, lúšnu, malík, malikuvàje, mōrtra, mrtrót, nezmōsn, mērkat, zamērkat, nēc, ubvōrvat, úfer, pōpež, paradíž, pēku, pēkler, pildik, prédgva, pr glihi, prglihaže, rōjtat, rōtat se, rēva, révn, šōcl, šōcka, šénkat, škúda, škúdit, škōf škófa, šùla, špējza, špōt špóta, šputat se, štíma, štíbra, štrōjfat, štrōjfga, štrēk štrika, štōek štúka, tōbla, tōdu tōdla, tōvžnt, túhtat, trēc, trūšt, trúštat se, vūpat se, zavūpat, vūpaje, vōrvat, vōera, ždōvba, žēgn, žēgnat, žlēhn, žlēht, žvēplu.

Altogether this is more than a good two-thirds of the words listed in **0**. above. It would not be difficult to find, in some other dialect, many more equally suitable words, to the extent that the ideas they represent are also used in a rural setting.

Of course the meaning of these words has in part changed: thus, *cōjhen* means 'notice, note' (cf. *zacōjhnat*); *cōla* is a region on the former boundary between Styria and Carniola; *fōvš* means 'envious'; *gmějna* is the name for community ground (and *gmějně* is 'a community piece of land near the church' in Mostec); *júger* is 'a grown boy who should know how to behave like one'; *kújštn* 'particularly capable, difficult to get the better of'; *lěšt* 'will', as in *ni me lěšt*; *lúšn* 'nice, clean'; *nezmōsn* 'too ample, too fat'; *úfer* 'offertory perambulation of the altar'; *pildik* 'small picture'; *rōjtat* 'to intend and *purōjfat* 'to notice'; *šōcl/šōcka* 'darling, sweetheart'; *špējza* 'store-house'; for *štrōjfat* cf. *še štrōf plōčat*; *na trec* is 'in spite of'; *šputat* 'to rebuke', *šputat se* 'to be scandalized, shocked about something'. Of course, many of these items have stylistic markings that we pay no attention to here.

In the dialect, too, literary variants are intruding for those listed above: *bit lūbusúmn*, *znōmeje*, *cēgan*, *dēdič*, *dēdvat*, *nevušlěv-*, *žūpnik*, *duhóvnik*, *župnija*, *preklět*, *prōst*, *jidnōk*, *pugōjfat se*, *mišust*, *kesōje*, *ublěka*, *kapētan*, *gulějenk*, *zōver* (a special chain for braking), *plōčca*, *puplōčat*, *vūla*, *mūčt (se)*, *prevělki*, *daruvōje*, *rāj*, *pudūbca*, *prbliznu*, *lūbica*, *dōt*, *glōs*, *dāvka*, *kaznuvōt*, *nadstrōpje*, *tuō žba*, *viudažit se*, *mōžca*, *blaguslōv*, *blaguslūvit*. Many of these expressions have remained constantly in use alongside the borrowed ones in the dialect.

5. Conclusion

Comparatively speaking, Trubar has many lexical Germanisms, in the same way as he has many syntactic ones, cf. Toporišič 1987. Especially for his first book these Germanisms are understandable, for with this book Trubar was, at least originally, addressing above all the urban populace; and the urban speech was to a considerable degree a

Germanizing one—especially so, surely, in Carniola, and even more especially in Ljubljana, the city which Trubar must have had in the forefront of his thoughts.

The fact that Trubar was somehow aware of this 'foreignization' is perhaps shown by the coordinate syntagmatic strings with the conjunctions *oli*, *in*, *tar*, and even more the native Slovene correspondences for the borrowings from German in other parts of the book; here and there Trubar took the trouble to provide the Slovene for an important notion that was expressed with a borrowing; e.g., *skrivna svetina* for *zakrament*. No real search on his part can be discerned, however, for a purely Slovene word to replace a Germanism; Trubar was more aware of this problem with respect to borrowings from Croatian. It was Sebastijan Krelj who introduced this note into Slovene writing, and Trubar did not follow him (or else this has not been fully researched.) Krelj's idea was triumphant in the viewpoint of the chief counter-reformer(s), Bishop Hren (or Janez Čandek), whether or not he/they knew Krelj's criticism of "gospod Trubarjeva kranjščina". In the organization of *Evangelia inu listuve* of 1612 it was apparent that already then the Slovene language could work efficiently, on the whole, without any words borrowed from German (but yet with some words from the neighbouring Slavic Croatian).

This de-Germanization (this general dis-alienation) of the Slovene literary language was a significant act with respect to nationalistic consciousness-raising, and, probably, not just a re-Catholicizing critical zeal directed toward correcting the Protestant literary language: in the end it showed the Slovene to be a person whom German linguistic colonization had simply robbed of his linguistic originality and hence his linguistic consciousness, i.e., precisely that property which was so very necessary to the Slovene if he wished to maintain himself as an ethnic or national individual. With this de-Germanization, however, there occurred to some extent a widening of the distinction between everyday speech and the literary language that was potentially at the disposal of the whole of Slovenia, and which in turn, after almost a thousand years, had again come into contact with that part of the Slavic world nearest to it, the Croatian part. In a certain sense it was only in connection with that element that in the given circumstances linguistic Slovene-ness itself (and all other kinds of Slovene-ness) were able to survive.

Of course in future developments it will be necessary to know how to use a tested model of defense for Slovene originality in the literary language against the language of the State environment—in new circumstances also—if there is a wish to survive, to be independent, and not to go over to something admittedly larger and kindred, yet at the same time no longer identical with us.

University of Ljubljana

REFERENCES

*Translated by Tom M.S. Priestly.

1. As is apparent, the data are given here in contemporary morphophonemic transcription. Quotations below from Trubar are spelled as in the original (or in Neweklowsky 1984), except that the 'long s' is replaced by the letter 's'. Personal names are omitted, except in section 1.2.
2. Cf. Rajhman (1977: 119): "*Far* je Trubarju duhovnik, tudi Kristus, navadno v dobrem pomenu, kadar je v peyorativnem, zaznamo iz sobesedila. Vedno pa je izraz *farmašter* izraz za protestantskega pastolja. Razlika med *farmaštrom* in *pridigarjem* je bila podobna kot danes med župnikom in kaplanom."
3. According to Rajhman (1977: 118), "*Gmajna* in *cerkev* sta si po vsebini blizu," whereby the latter meant 'a group of believers' and the former "naj bi predstavljala cerkev v nekem kraju."

4. See Rajhman (1977: 106-12) for several synonyms in this domain, including *gnada/milost* (earlier treated by Ivan Grafenauer) and *leben/život*.
5. Kopitar 1808: xlii, "V tem delcu se strogo sledi Bohoričevi slovnici in celo nekaj *nemških* besed iz Jurija Dalmatina besedila je bilo zamenjanih s sprejemljivimi pristno kranjskimi."
6. Breznik 1917/1983: 33-35, first citing Oblak (1895) to the effect that Hren replaced many German words with authentic Slovene ones, continues: "Druga Hrenova zasluga je, da je odpravil iz Dalmatinovega besedila nemške tujke in jih nadomestil s slovenskimi in nekaterimi kajkavskimi izrazi. . . Hren je bil prvi, ki se je postavil na strogo slovensko stališče in je načelno zavračal vse, kar je v jeziku tujega. V tem oziru se ne more meriti z njim noben protestantski pisatelj, tudi Krelj in Juričič ne, dasi sta pisala med vsemi najčistejšo slovenščino. . . V . . . skoraj dvestoletni dobi so bile edino izdaje Evangelijev inu listov, ki so z neznatnimi izjemami skrbno hranile Hrenovo besedilo, proste najnavadnejših tujk, vse druge so jih bile polne. Tako je cerkev po Hrenovi zaslugi veliko storila za čistočo božje besede."
7. Cf. Rajhman 1977: 117, "Trubar je rabil tujko tedaj, če zanjo ni bilo ustreznega domačega izraza."
8. The meaning of this last word is unclear to me. Rajhman (1977) treats the following sets of native synonyms: *telo/meso*, *kraljestvo/bogastvo*, *zlodej/hudič/vrag*, *spravlavic/ohranenik/besednik/odvetnik*, *tri imena/sveta Trojica/ime božje*.
9. Cf. Rajhman 1977: 123-24 with respect to the following 'synonymic doubles' (or whatever they may be termed): *izrajtati inu izgruntati*, *ana šenkiga oli dar božji*, *cbivlamo inu cagamo*, *imar tar vselej*, *zastopnost inu modrost*.
10. Note the modern forms in the Mostec dialect: *puŕšat* 'to guess', *mŕtrra*, *úfer*, *kaštigan*, *nezŕŕŕsen*, *žŕgnat*, *žlák*. (Note: [ę e ę] and [o ɔ ɔ] are raised, middle and lowered mid vowels; the acute and grave accents denote long and short stress, respectively; cf. Toporišič 1961/1978).
11. Rajhman here quotes pages 390, 393 and 399, each time in a note.
12. See note 10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Breznik, Anton. 1917. "Literarna tradicija v Evangelijih in listih," *Dom in svet* 30: 170-74, 225-30, 279-84, 333-47; reprinted in Jože Toporišič, ed., *A. Breznik. Jezikoslovne razprave* (Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, [1982] 1983) 27-54.
- Kopitar, Jernej. 1808. *Grammatik der Slavischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyemark* (Ljubljana: Korn).
- Neweklowsky, Gerhard. 1984. *Trubarjev Katekizem 1550. Konkordanca, Index besed, pogostnostni spiski* (Ljubljana: Državna založba).
- Rajhman, J. 1977. *Prva slovenska knjiga v luči teoloških, literarno-zgodovinskih, jezikoslovnih in zgodovinskih raziskav* (Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga).
- Rigler, Jakob. 1968. *Začetki slovenskega knjižnega jezika* (Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti).
- Toporišič, Jože. 1961. "Vokalizem moščanskega govora v Brežiškem Posavju," *Dolenjski zbornik* (Novo mesto, 1961); reprinted in J. Toporišič, *Glasovna in naglasna podoba slovenskega jezika* (Ljubljana: Obzorja, 1978, 141-63).
- , 1987. "Zgodovinske perspektive Trubarjevega nemčevanja," *XXIII seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture* (Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta Univerze Edvarda Kardelja) 5-18.
- Trubar, Primož. 1550. *Catechismus In der Windischenn Sprach, sambt einer kürtzen Auszlegung in gesang weiss . . .* (Tübingen: Ulrich Morhart).

POVZETEK

BESEDNI GERMANIZMI V TRUBARJEVEM CATECHISMUSU

Trubar je na splošno pisal veliko besednih nemčizmov. V Katekizmu 1550 (kolikor ga je konkordančno izdal G. Neweklowsky) je nad 135 takih besed z okrog 100 koren/osnovami. Te besede so splošnocivilizacijskega in versko-nravnega področja (a tudi prve nastopajo v okviru versko-nravnega

tematike). Osnovna pomenska polja so družbene ustanove, modni artefakti, sicer pa predvsem vera in nравnost krščanstva, za kar je Slovanom prvotno manjkalo poimenovanj, a so jih, kakor kažeta starocerkvenoslovanščina in staroslovenščina znali ustvariti iz svojega. Pri Trubarju tako še živi v obliki dvojnic, tudi sam je katero ohranjal, če ne tudi prispeval, zlasti za protestantsko predmetnost (tudi pojmovno) pa je (pre)rad uporabljal iz nemščine prevzete besede. Očitek glede tega je bil že takrat s strani Krelja in kajkavskega kritika njegovega jezika, doslednega purističnega uresničevalca pa so take kritike besed (ki so sicer bile primerno prilagojene strukturi slovenskega jezika) dobile v protireformatorju T. Hrenu. Ker se trdi, da je Trubar toliko nemčeval iz ozirov do (ljubljskih) meščanov, je postavljeno vprašanje, koliko nemčevanja bi bilo tedaj na deželi. Za primer je govor vasi Mostec: kolikor gre za identično predmetnost (tudi pojmovno seveda) bistvene razlike ni, saj sta na Mostecu še pri starejši generaciji (bili) v rabi dobri dve tretjini teh besed (korenov, osnov), čeprav deloma tudi s premaknjenimi pomeni. Na raznemčevanje so opazovali od Kopitarja sem zlasti V. Oblak, A. Breznik, izčrpno pa je podal pregled te prakse pri Hrenu J. Rigler. Hrenovo dosledno raznemčevanje je pomembno, ker je tako očiščena slovenska beseda še 200 let prihajala na ušesa slovenskemu verniku, krepila pa je poleg jezikovne tudi rodovno in narodnostno zavest slovenske jezikovne skupnosti.

