



**EIGHT
FRAGMENTS
FROM THE WORLD OF
SERBIAN,
CROATIAN,
BOSNIAN
AND
MONTENEGRIN
LANGUAGES**

Pavel Krejčí

**Masaryk University
Brno 2018**

**EIGHT FRAGMENTS
FROM THE WORLD
OF SERBIAN, CROATIAN, BOSNIAN
AND MONTENEGRIN LANGUAGES**

Selected South Slavonic Studies 1

Pavel Krejčí

Masaryk University
Brno 2018

All rights reserved. No part of this e-book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission of copyright administrator which can be contacted at Masaryk University Press, Žerotínovo náměstí 9, 601 77 Brno.

Scientific reviewers:

Ass. Prof. Boryan Yanev, Ph.D. (Plovdiv University "Paisii Hilendarski")

Roman Madecki, Ph.D. (Masaryk University, Brno)

This book was written at Masaryk University as part of the project "Slavistika mezi generacemi: doktorská dílna" number MUNI/A/0956/2017 with the support of the Specific University Research Grant, as provided by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic in the year 2018.

© 2018 Masarykova univerzita

ISBN 978-80-210-8992-1

ISBN 978-80-210-8991-4 (paperback)

CONTENT

ABBREVIATIONS	5
INTRODUCTION	7
CHAPTER 1	
SOUTH SLAVONIC LANGUAGES (GENERAL OVERVIEW)	9
CHAPTER 2	
SELECTED CZECH HANDBOOKS OF SERBO-CROATIAN FROM 60S, 70S AND 80S (SOCIOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS)	29
CHAPTER 3	
SELECTED MOMENTS FROM THE HISTORY OF SERBO-CROATIAN ("B-C-S" POINT OF VIEW)	43
CHAPTER 4	
SELECTED INTERPRETATIONS OF VUK STEFANOVIĆ KARADŽIĆ'S WORK ("C-S" POINT OF VIEW)	59
CHAPTER 5	
SELECTED SOUTH SLAVONIC LANGUAGES AND THEIR REFLECTION IN THE RELEVANT CONSTITUTIONAL ARTICLES ON LANGUAGE (OVERVIEW OF THE LANGUAGE POLICY IN THE AREA OF SO-CALLED CENTRAL SOUTH SLAVONIC DIASYSTEM)	67
CHAPTER 6	
SOUTH SLAVONIC LANGUAGE PARADOXES, UNIVERSITY TEACHING AND TRANSLATING EXPERIENCE (FRAGMENTS OF THE GROTESQUE SITUATION)	105
CHAPTER 7	
LANGUAGE POLICY IN MONTENEGRO (FRAGMENTS OF THE FARCICAL SITUATION)	117
CHAPTER 8	
LANGUAGE AND NATIONALISM (SNJEŽANA KORDIĆ'S POINT OF VIEW)	133
SUMMARY	141
BIBLIOGRAPHY	145

ABBREVIATIONS

Alb.	Albanian
AP	Autonomous Province
AVNOJ	Antifašističko v(ij)eće narodnog oslobođenja Jugoslavije (Anti-Fascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia)
B&H	Bosnia and Herzegovina
B-C-M-S	Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian (language)
B-C-S	Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian (language)
Bosn.	Bosnian
Bulg.	Bulgarian
Cro.	Croatian
FB&H	Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina
FPRY	Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia
FRY	Federative Republic of Yugoslavia

HAZU	Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti (Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts)
I&R	Imperial & Royal
ISC	Independent State of Croatia
JAZU	Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti (South Slavonic Academy of Sciences and Arts)
Mac.	Macedonian
NKOJ	Nacionalni komitet oslobođenja Jugoslavije (National Committee for the Liberation of Yugoslavia)
NSDAP	Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (National Socialist German Workers' Party, Nazi Party)
Orig.	Original
PK	Pavel Krejčí
RS	Republic of Srpska
S-Cr.	Serbo-Croatian
Serb.	Serbian
SFRY	Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia
Slo.	Slovenian
SR	Socialist Republic

INTRODUCTION

The book *Eight Fragments from the World of Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin Languages: Selected South Slavonic Studies 1* presents a summary of my selected studies and analyses in the field of South Slavonic studies, but above all on questions related to Serbo-Croatian and the languages in which it transformed after 1990 (Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, Montenegrin).

The chapters are mainly sociolinguistically focused. The studies were originally in Czech, Serbian or Bulgarian and were published in Czech, Serbian and Bulgarian scientific periodicals and proceedings. I tried to make organic sequence of the chapters, so I started with general overview of South Slavonic languages, their classification, grammar, but also the graphical systems used in the South Slavonic area. The chapters though can also be read in any order. In the next chapters I pay attention mainly to the problematic elements in the history and the present relations between the particular “Serbo-Croatian” nations and their languages. Sociolinguistic issues are intertwined with language didactics, university philology studies, translatology, constitution and relevant legal norms and, last but not least, politics. The last, eighth chapter is devoted to the book *Language and Nationalism*, which precisely reveals the mechanisms of politicizing language and linguistic research. As is apparent from the title, the book will have a follow-up, but in the second volume I will

focus on questions related mainly to phraseology and phraseography, lexicography and onomastics.

I will be very pleased if the book contributes at least a bit to understanding the complex issues of relations between the Serbs, Croats, Bosniaks and Montenegrins, which I present on language issues.

Pavel Krejčí
Brno, Czechia, May 2018

SOUTH SLAVONIC LANGUAGES (GENERAL OVERVIEW)

I. **Genetic–Typological Classification of Slavonic Languages**

Slavonic languages got their rough form during the disintegration of Proto–Slavonic language, which happened gradually during 8th, 9th and 10th century. They came into existence by divergent evolution and form the language family in narrower sense of the word (microfamily). Their mutual intelligibility testifies about their affinity — at least when it comes to a simple conversation on a basic social topic. Agreements are manifested primarily in the lexical plan (core vocabulary) and also in grammar construction.¹ Except **trichotomic** division of Slavonic languages (East Slavonic, West Slavonic, South Slavonic) in literature there are other views on current Slavonic language area. The reason for this is primarily the effort to make the most exact genetic–typological classification of Slavonic languages.

Dichotomic classification unites into one subgroup Southern and East Slavonic languages and Western into the second subgroup. There are also diachronic and typological reasons for dichotomy of North Slavonic area (East Slavonic + West Slavonic) against Southern Slavonic.

1 For the illustration of Slavonic languages affinity in lexical and grammatical plan see Večerka 2006: 13—17.

Tetrachotomic classification is more precise, because it distinguishes the North–Eastern Slavonic area (Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian /and Rusyn language/), North–Western (Polish with Kashubian, both Sorbian, Czech and Slovak languages), South–Western (Serbo–Croatian and Slovenian) and South–Eastern (Bulgarian and Macedonian). That is essentially a modified trichotomic classification, only South Slavonic group is divided so that a synchronically and typologically considerably different Bulgarian and Macedonian have their own subgroup.

Pentachotomic and hexachotomic classification divides Slavonic area on subgroups: East Slavonic, Polish, Czecho–Slovak, South Slavonic and Bulgarian–Macedonian (pent. class.), or also Sorbian (hex. class.). Both have their meaning, but Slavonic area then become too fragmented (Večerka 2006: 86).

From the typological point of view, Slavonic languages belong to *inflected* languages. Regarding the way of expressing grammatical relations, majority of them has a *synthetic* character, only South–Eastern Slavonic subgroup has predominance of *analytical* form.

II. South Slavonic Languages as Official Languages

On the territory of approximately 356 000 km² (an area comparable to the size of today's Germany)², there are seven Slavonic countries — from north–west to south–east: **Slovenia** (orig. Slovenija, in German: Slowenien, in French: Slovénie, in Russian: СЛОВЕНИЯ, in Czech and Slovak: Slovinsko, in Hungarian: Szlovénia, in Romanian: Slovenia, in Albanian: Sllovenia, in Greek: Σλοβενία, in Turkish: Slovenya), **Croatia** (orig. Hrvatska, in German: Kroatien, in French: Croatie, in Russian: Хорватия, in Czech: Chorvatsko, in Slovak: Chorvátsko, in Hungarian: Horvátország,

2 For comparison: the West Slavonic territory with 54 million of Slavs is situated on an area approximately 445 000 km², far the most extensive is East Slavonic territory — only Ukraine and Belarus (in total 56 million of Slavs) represents a total area of approximately 810 000 km², thus area that is larger than West Slavonic and South Slavonic altogether, and as far as Russia is concerned then we are talking about millions of km² and approximately 114 million of Slavonic inhabitants (estimates are from 2010). About 170 million of East Slavs then inhabit the area of almost 17,9 million km². The total number of Slavs can be rounded to a quarter–billion.

in Romanian: Croația, in Albanian: Kroacia, in Greek: Κροατία, in Turkish: Hırvatistan), **Bosnia and Herzegovina** (orig. Bosna i Hercegovina or Босна и Херцеговина, in German: Bosnien und Herzegowina, in French: Bosnie-et-Herzégovine, in Russian: Босния и Герцеговина, in Czech and Slovak: Bosna a Hercegovina, in Hungarian: Bosznia–Hercegovina, in Romanian: Bosnia și Herțegovina, in Albanian: Bosnja dhe Hercegovina, in Greek: Βοσνία και Ερζεγοβίνη, in Turkish: Bosna–Hersek), **Montenegro** (orig. Crna Gora or Црна Гора, in German: Montenegro, in French: Monténégro, in Russian: Черногория, in Czech: Černá Hora, in Slovak: Čierna Hora, in Hungarian: Montenegró, in Romanian: Muntenegru, in Albanian: Mali i Zi, in Greek: Μαυροβούνιο, in Turkish: Karadağ), **Serbia** (orig. Srbija or Србија, in German: Serbien, in French: Serbie, in Russian: Сербия, in Czech and Slovak: Srbsko, in Hungarian: Szerbia, in Romanian and Albanian: Serbia, in Greek: Σερβία, in Turkish: Srbistan), **Macedonia** (orig. Македонија, in German: Mazedonien, in French: Macédoine, in Russian: Македония, in Czech: Makedonie, in Slovak and Hungarian: Macedónia, in Romanian: Macedonia, in Albanian: Maqedonia, in Greek: Μακεδονία, in Turkish: Makedonya),³ and **Bulgaria** (orig. България, in German: Bulgarien, in French: Bulgarie, in Russian: Болгария, in Czech and Slovak: Bulharsko, in Hungarian: Bulgária, in Romanian: Bulgaria, in Albanian: Bullgaria, in Greek: Βουλγαρία, in Turkish: Bulgaristan). During the period between two World Wars, three official languages were spoken on this territory — in Yugoslavia it was Serbo-Croatian and on its north-west also Slovenian (although the king’s Constitution declared one common language all along — Serbo-Croatian-Slovenian, “srpsko-hrvatsko-slovenački”) and Bulgarian in Bulgaria. Between the years 1944—1945, standard Macedonian was codified in the most southern of the six newly created federal Yugoslavian republics. In the period 1990—1995, it occurred the gradual substitution of glossonym *Serbo-Croatian* to one-component name according to the ethnic key — Croats have completed an almost quarter of century lasting transformation of their variant of Serbo-Croatian to *Croatian*, after that Serbs and Montenegrins

3 The Republic of Macedonia was accepted into the UN as a FYROM “Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, Mac. ПРМ “Поранешна Југословенска Република Македонија”, Serb. БЈРМ “Бивша Југословенска Република Македонија”, Bulg. БЮРМ “Бивша југославска република Македонија”, Greek ΠΓΔΜ “Πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβική Δημοκρατία της Μακεδονίας”, Alb. IRJM “Ish Republika Jugoslave e Maqedonisë”, Czech BJRM “Bývalá jugoslávská republika Makedonie”.

replaced the unifying glossonym by re-establishing the name *Serbian*, as the third, Bosniaks made the new name of their language official and started to call it *Bosnian*. In June 2006, the division of the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro happened and, as a result, so far the last relict of socio-politically undesirable Serbo-Croatian — *Montenegrin* language was constitutionally enshrined. It was the only one from the new post-Serbo-Croatian quartet, which did not delimitate directly from Serbo-Croatian, but it defines itself against Serbian. At present, there are seven official (South) Slavonic languages declared in seven South Slavonic countries: *Serbian* (Republic of Serbia, Montenegro, and Bosnia & Herzegovina; Serbian is also one of the two official languages in the Republic of Kosovo⁴, which is ethnically predominantly Albanian, thus not Slavonic), *Montenegrin* (Montenegro), *Croatian* (Republic of Croatia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Montenegro), *Bosnian* (Bosnia & Herzegovina, Montenegro), *Slovenian* (Republic of Slovenia), *Macedonian* (Republic of Macedonia), and *Bulgarian* (Republic of Bulgaria). The total number of speakers of languages in listed countries is, according to the data from 2011, approximately 24,5 million. For the most speakers, the mother tongue is Serbian (*српски језик* / *srpski jezik*, cca 7,8 million), Bulgarian (*български език*, approximately 6,5 million), and Croatian (*hrvatski jezik*, approximately 4,7 million). 2 million of people declare their language as Bosnian (*bosanski jezik*), Slovenian (*slovenski jezik*) approximately 1,8 million, and Macedonian (*македонски јазик*) then 1,4 million of South Slavonic population. The lowest number of speakers declares their mother tongue as Montenegrin (*црногорски језик* / *crnogorski jezik*, approximately 230 000,⁵ i. e. 37 % residents of Montenegro).

4 **Republic of Kosovo**, whose independence was proclaimed by Kosovar Albanians in February 2008, it was up to the present (April 30, 2018) recognized by 112 countries of the world (incl. the Republic of China /Taiwan/). However, the Republic of Serbia, from which it was separated, naturally does not recognize Kosovo independence and in the Serbian Constitution the territory is still present as **Autonomous Province of Kosovo and Metohija** (Serb. "Autonomna Pokrajina Kosovo i Metohija").

5 Official data from the last census in 2011 — Available at <http://sr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Црна_Гора> [2013-07-14].

III.

Basic Phonetic–Phonological, Grammatical and Lexical Characteristic of Official Contemporary South Slavonic Languages

Historically, the South Slavonic languages have the following features:

- descriptive formation of future tense in both imperfect and perfect verbs — e. g.: Bulg. *az shte pisha/shte napisha*, mak. *yas k'e pisham/k'e napisham*, S–Cr. *ja ću pisati/ću napisati*, Slo. *jaz bom pisal/bom napisal* “I am going to write/I will write”
- formant *-ov-* as an indication of plural forms in single syllable word — e. g.: *most* — Npl. *mostovi* (Slo., S–Cr., Mac.), *mostove* (Bulg.) “bridges”
- preservation of past simple tenses: aorist and imperfect (except Slovenian)
- stating the clauses of purpose by using the conjunction *da* + present indicative — e. g.: Bulg. *az go molya da doyde*, Mac. *yas go molam da doyde*, S–Cr. *ja ga molim da dođe* “I ask him to come”

We will begin an overview of South Slavonic languages with their South–Eastern subgroup, as from this region comes the first literary Slavonic language — *Old Church Slavonic* (in Bulgarian Slavonic Studies it is traditionally called *Old Bulgarian*), which in the 9th century served for spreading and consolidation of Slavonic church service in Great Moravia by the Byzantine scholars St. Constantine–Cyril and his brother St. Methodius and their supporters and followers (St. Clement of Ohrid, St. Naum of Ohrid and Preslav, Gorazd, Sava, Angelarius, and others). After Methodius' death (885) and expulsion of his pupils from Great Moravia, as a result of prince Svatopluk's prohibition of Slavonic church service, many of them were admitted to the Bulgarian court. Slavonic literature continued and was further developed with the support of Tsar Simeon the Great. In 893, this language became official in the Bulgarian empire and the continuous development of literary Slavonic language began on the territory of the Bulgarian state. It gradually began to be called with regard to the place where it is used, as the Bulgarian language (“*ѢЗЫКЪ БЛЪГАРСКЪ*”).

This is also one of the reasons why Bulgarian linguistics in professional discourse refers to it as the Old Bulgarian language. Considering that the Old Church Slavonic is no longer living language, its form and genesis is the subject of professional interest of Paleoslavonic studies, Indo-European studies, etymologist etc. Detailed acquaintances are in competence of other university subjects, we will not at this point discuss its phonic, grammatical and lexical plan. This information is, for example, provided to a sufficient extent in a book *Old Church Slavonic in Context of Slavonic Languages (Staroslověnština v kontextu slovanských jazyků)* by Radoslav Večerka (2006).

We will only mention some basic typological information:

- Old Church Slavonic was inflected and synthetic language
- Old Church Slavonic in its original Cyrillo–Methodian version de facto reflected the structure of the Slavonic language from the area around Byzantine Thessaloniki⁶
- The accent was melodic, free and moving
- Phonetics: distinguishing of yer Ъ/Ь, distinguishing of nasal consonants Ѡ/ѡ or. 'Ѡ'/ѡ, distinguishing soft/hard i/y, presence of phone Ъ (“yat”), l epenthetic, reflection sht, zhd < tj/kti, dj, reflection l < dl, tl, South Slavonic reflection -trat-/tlat-, -trět-/tlět-, rat-/lat- < -tort-/tolt-, -tert-/telt-, ort-/olt-
- Grammatical categories of nouns: seven cases, three numbers (singular, dual and plural), three genders (masculine, feminine, neuter) with subcategories as animacy and personality, category of definiteness expressed by definite forms of adjectives (i. e. compound declination)
- Grammatical categories of verbs: three persons, three numbers

6 **Thessaloniki**, in South Slavonic languages **Solun/Солун**, in Greek Θεσσαλονίκη, in Turkish **Selanik**, is traditional metropolis of **historic Macedonia**. It lies on the coast of the Aegean Sea, more precisely in its Theraic Gulf. It is the second largest city of the Hellenic Republic with more than one million inhabitants, a natural centre of the so-called **Aegean Macedonia** (i. e. the part that passed to Greece after the Balkan wars 1912–1913) and the administrative centre of Central Macedonia Province. The half-million metropolis of **Vardar Macedonia**, i. e. the part that passed to Serbia after the Balkan wars and nowadays it is an independent Republic of Macedonia, is its capital city **Skopje** (in Macedonian: Скопје, in Bulgarian: Скопие, in Serbian: Скопље/Skoplje, in Albanian: Shkup, in Greek: Σκόπια, in Turkish: Üsküp); metropolis of **Pirin Macedonia**, i. e. part that passed to Bulgaria after the Balkan wars, and nowadays an administrative unit called Blagoevgrad Province, is a seventy thousand city **Blagoevgrad** (in Bulgarian, Macedonian and Serbian: Благоевград, in Greek: Μπλαγκόεβγκραντ, in Turkish: Yukarı Cuma), until 1950 had a name Gorna Dzhumaya (in Bulgarian: Горна Джумая, in Macedonian: Горна Цумаја, in Serbian: Горња Цумаја, in Greek: Άνω Τζουμαγιά, in Turkish: Yukarı Cuma).

(singular, dual and plural), rich temporal system — present, future I and II, past tenses synthetic or simple (aorist, imperfect), and analytical or compound (perfect, plusquamperfect /antepreteritum/), voice (active and passive), mood (indicative, imperative, conditional), non-finite verbs (infinitive and supine), gerund (participles from nouns and adjectives)

In the Old Church Slavonic vocabulary, besides the Slavonic vocabulary, stood out the cultural layer of loanword from Greek or words created according to the Greek paradigm (which is particularly evident in the area of religious life).

III.1

BULGARIAN LANGUAGE

From the 12th century, evolution of the grammar structure of Bulgarian started to move in a different direction than the development of other Slavonic languages. The reason was probably in the more intensive contacts with non-Slavonic languages, especially with Greek, that it was with other Slavonic languages.

Introduction of the phonetic-phonological and grammatical characteristic of contemporary Bulgarian

- The accent was melodic, free and moving
- Significantly reduced pronunciation of unaccented vowel
- tj/kti, dj > sht, zhd (e. g. *свещ/нощ, межда* “candle/night, balk”)
- Reflection of yat: ѣ > e/‘a (e. g. *снежен/сняг* “snowy/snow”)?
- Reflection of yer in strong position: ъ, ѣ > e (ə), ə (e. g. *ден/тъмен, сън* “day /dark/, dream”)
- Reflection of nasal consonants: ѣ, ѣ > e, ə (e. g. *пет, ръка* “five, hand”)
- The existence of specific mid central and central vowel ə, which is in Bulgarian written as ѣ, in transliteration to Latin alphabet as *ǎ* or in simplified way *a* (it is also possible to encounter with a transliteration *u* or *y*, especially in English texts)

7 The reflection [‘a] is in Bulgarian accented before non-palatal consonants or before syllable with non-front vowels (Večerka 2006: 67).

- $r, l > \text{ər/rə}, \text{əl/lə}$, i. e. syllabic consonant r, l are always with attendant vowels (e. g. *кървав/сръбски* “bloody/Serbian”, *пълно/пльх* “plenty/rat”)
- Developed soft correlation — all consonants have their palatalized counterpart (with the exception of palatal fricative consonants [zh], [sh] and palatal affricate consonant [ch])
- Loss of epenthetic l (e. g. *земя* “ground”)
- Loss of case endings for expressing case relations and their replacement by analytical, preposition expressing
- Loss of infinitive (the basic form of verb is the form of 1. person, singular, present indicative) in connection with e. g. modal or phase verbs *da*-construction (particle *da* + present indicative) is applied
- Expression of category of definiteness with definite article in postpositive position (forms of nouns — sg.: m. *-ət/-‘at* or *-a/-‘a*, f. *-ta*, n. *-to*; pl.: m.+f. *-te*, n. *-ta*)
- Analytical expression of comparative and superlative in adjectives and adverbs with formants *po-* and *nay-*, not with the affixes.
- Expression of future tense with particle *shte* + present indicative
- Very rich temporal system includes, with exception of present and future, future II (f. exactum), past future tense (f. praeteriti), past future indefinite (f. exactum praeteriti), perfect, plusquamperfect (antepreteritum) and past simple tenses aorist and imperfect
- Duplication of the subject — substantive or stressed form of pronoun + unstressed form of pronoun
- Specific way of expressing of the indirect utterance (“the narrative mood”)

These phonic and grammatical features of Bulgarian distinguish it from other (South) Slavonic languages and draw it nearer to the non-Slavonic, but also mutually genetically different language neighbours: Romanian, Albanian and Greek. Based on the typological matches with genetically different languages in specific geographical area, linguists create *language leagues*. Bulgarian and Macedonian and three other Balkan languages mentioned above are thus included in the so-called *Balkan Sprachbund*, except mentioned languages, Serbian also partially belongs here (not

its official form, but its South–East dialects.) In Bulgarian vocabulary, there is a large amount of Turkish loanwords (area of crafts, household, gastronomy, social functions etc.), but also Greek (religion area inherited from Old Church Slavonic period, newer expressions from daily life), and vulgar (Balkan) Latin ones. Many Turkish words are today stylistically marked. Since the second half of the 18th century, Russian has become more widely used. After the restoration of Bulgarian statehood in 1878, Bulgarian also took words from German and French. After World War II, during communist era, came the second wave of Russian loanwords (logically primarily phrases connected with communist system). The period of the last quarter of century is marked by the high frequency of English loanwords (area of economics, politics, new technologies etc.).

III.2

MACEDONIAN LANGUAGE

In spite of some differences, standard Macedonian is characterised by very similar grammatical phenomena as standard Bulgarian.

- Accent is dynamic and stable — on the third syllable from the end (proparoxytonic — e. g. *Македонија* by contrast *македонски* “Macedonia, Macedonian” — in two- and three-syllable words, accent is logically on the first syllable (initial)
- *tj/kt, dj > k', g'* (e. g. *свеќа/ноќ, меѓа* “candle/night, balk”)
- Reflection of *yat*: *ě > e* (e. g. *снег* “snow”)
- Reflection of *yer* in strong positions: *ь, ъ > e, o* (e. g. *ден, сон* “day, dream”)
- Reflection of nasal consonants: *ę, ɔ > e (a), a* (e. g. *пет/зајак/, рака* “five /rabbit/, hand”)
- Existence of specific palatal affricate consonants *k', g'*,⁸ thus soft *k* and soft *g*, the pronunciation of which is close to [tʃ] and [dʒ]; in Macedonian they are written as *ќ, џ*, in transliteration to Latin alphabet then *k', g'*, eventually by digraph *kj, gj* before the vowel
- *l > ol (o)* (e. g. *волк/сонце/* “wolf /sun/”)
- Loss of epenthetic *l* (e. g. *земја* “ground”)
- Loss of the sound [x] (e. g. *леб* “bread”)

8 Zuzana Topolińska classifies them as implosives (Maldžijeva — Topolinjska — Đukanović — Piper 2009: 243).

- Loss of case endings for expressing case relations and their replacement by analytical, preposition expressing
- Loss of infinitive (the basic form of verb is the form of 3. person, singular, present indicative) in connection with e. g. modal or phase verbs *da*-construction (particle *da* + present indicative) is applied
- Expression of category of definiteness with definite article in postpositive position (unlike official Bulgarian, there are three types — *t*-article, *v*-article and *n*-article; forms of nouns — sg.: m. *-ot, -ov, -on*, f. *-ta, -va, -na*, n. *-to, -vo, -no*; pl.: m.+f. *-te, -ve, -ne*, n. *-ta, -va, -na*)
- Analytical expression of comparative and superlative in adjectives and adverbs with formants *po-* and *nay-*, not with the affixes
- Expression of future tense with particle *k'e* + present indicative
- Very rich temporal system includes, with exception of present and future, future II (f. exactum), past future tense (f. praeteriti), perfect, plusquamperfect (antepreteritum) and past simple tenses aorist and imperfect
- Duplication of the subject — substantive or stressed form of pronoun + unstressed form of pronoun
- Short forms of pronoun are often proclitic (e. g. *му викам* “I am telling him”).

Just as Bulgarian, also Macedonian this phonic and grammatical features distinguish it from other (South) Slavonic languages and draw it nearer to the non-Slavonic, but also mutually genetically different language neighbours: Albanian, Greek and Romanian. Macedonian and Bulgarian and three other Balkan languages mentioned above form the so-called *Balkan Sprachbund*.

In Macedonian vocabulary, there is a layer of Turkish and Greek loanwords essentially identical to the situation in Bulgarian. Many Turkish words are today stylistically marked. The cultural and political situation after 1918 caused the penetration of Serbian words. The period of the last quarter of century is marked by the high frequency of English loanwords (area of economics, politics, new technologies etc.).

III.3

SERBO-CROATIAN LANGUAGE (*Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, Montenegrin*)

In the overview of South Slavonic languages, we will continue with North-Western subgroup. This subgroup contains the most numerous and territorially the most extent South Slavonic language, Serbo-Croatian. Until the first half of the 1990s, common language of Serbs, Croats, Bosniaks and Montenegrins was called by this glossonym, resp. official language of former Yugoslav republics of Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia & Herzegovina and Montenegro. From present-day population, Serbo-Croatian would have around 15 million native speakers, inhabiting the area around 200 000 km². The effort to unify the language of Serbs and Croats is closely related to national integration processes in the Balkans, especially with the activities of Illyrians led by Ljudevit GAJ (1809—1872), and later with Serbo-Croatian conception of Vatroslav JAGIĆ (1838—1923), and Croatian Vukovite led by Tomislav MARETIĆ (1854—1938). Nationally and ideologically aware representatives of both mentioned nations jointly declared this effort on informal meeting in Vienna in 1850 (so-called Vienna Literary Agreement). It was at the time when both Serbs and Croats were searching for modern and united face of their standard language. Serbian standard language had, until then, been a mixture of Church Slavonic language, Russian and Serbian elements. It had very little in common with real, spoken Serbian, although it was slowly getting closer. Until radical reform of Vuk Stefanović KARADŽIĆ (1787—1864) and activities of his successor Đura DANIČIĆ (proper name Đorđe Popović, 1825—1882) changed the situation. Vuk's principle "write as you speak"⁹ had for long encountered the resistance of conservative Serbian Orthodox Church and intelligentsia from South Hungarian Serbs, who saw in his reform efforts an attack on Serbian cultural traditions and vulgarization of the language. He was searching for the support of his reform in folk poetry, because he saw the pure national Serbian that is what should have become — in accordance with romantic ideas of that time — the basis for the modern Serbian standard language, accessible to wide national masses. As a basis for the new Serbian, he chose the dialect that was the most spread: Neo-Shtokavian

9 It was taken from the German linguist Johann Christoph Adelung, who has it in his three-volume work *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde* (Berlin 1806—17).

Ijekavian dialect, originally from the border of East Herzegovina and North–West Montenegro.¹⁰

For standard Serbo–Croatian as pluricentric official language, which today represents three to four national variants, these are the characteristic grammatical phenomena:

- Accent is melodic, restrictively free (it does not occur on the last syllable, i. e. ultima) and moving — combination of the tone and quantitative component, it creates four types of accent: 1. short falling — e. g. *màma* “mother”, 2. short rising — e. g. *nòga* “leg”, 3. long falling — e. g. *dân* “day” and 4. long rising — e. g. *tàma* “darkness”
- Occurrence of vocal quantity even in unstable positions — e. g. *ùzēti* “take”
- *tj/kt, dj > ć, đ* (e. g. *sveća/noć, međa* “candle/night, balk”)
- Reflection of *yat: ě > e* in Serbian Ekavian standard (e. g. *sneg* “snow”); *ě > (i)je* in Ijekavian standard norm of Serbian, Montenegrin, Bosnian and Croatian (e. g. *snijeg/snjegovi* “snow/snows”)
- Reflection of *yer* in strong positions: *ъ, ѣ > a* (e. g. *dan, san* “day, dream”)
- Reflection of nasal consonant: *ę, ǫ > e, u* (e. g. *pet, ruka* “five, hand”)
- *! > u* (e. g. *vuk* “wolf”)
- Epenthetic *l* was preserved (e. g. *zemlja* “ground”)
- Typical vocalic alternation *o/l* (e. g. *orao* (NSg.) — *orla* (GSg.) “eagle”, *kupio* — *kupila* “he/she bought”)

10 **Note on the dialectal situation of so-called Central South Slavonic diasystem, i. e. Serbo–Croatian language area:** The basic dialectal division of Serbo–Croatian language area follows the occurrence of different interrogative pronouns, corresponding with English *what?* — Its form is either *što?/šta?*, or *ča?*, or *kaj?*; we distinguish the dialects accordingly: Shtokavian, Chakavian and Kajkavian. Neo–Shtokavian dialects are the basis for standard Serbian but also standard Croatian, in 1990s officially declared Bosnian and Montenegrin, which was constitutionally anchored in 2007. Their next division is according to reflection of Proto–Slavonic vowel “yat” (ѣ) — we either talk about Ekavian, (I)jekavian or Ikavian form (models: *mleko – dete – pevati* vers. *mlijeko – dijete – pjevati* vers. *mliko – dite – pivati* “milk — child — sing”).

In Shtokavian, spoken by Croats and Bosniaks, Ijekavian or Ikavian (Ekavian only peripherally in North Slavonia) dialects are present. Shtokavian dialects spoken by Serbs are Ekavian or Ijekavian. Montenegrin speak only Ijekavian–Shtokavian. As a result, it cannot be simply said that Ijekavian pronunciation is typical for distinction between Serbian and Croatian. Rather, it could be said, that Ekavian is distinct indication of standard Serbian (so-called Belgrade–Novi Sad norm).

Chakavian dialects also have Ekavian, Jekavian or Ikavian variant and they are exclusively Croatian. Kajkavian dialects are entirely Ekavian, so this is not a determining factor for their further classification and they are also exclusively Croatian even though they organically link the Croatian national language territory with Slovenian. When it comes to the standard variants, then standard Croatian is strictly Ijekavian as well as standard Bosnian and last declared Montenegrin (its Ijekavian is the most consistent of all standardized forms mentioned above — in comparison e. g. pl. case ending of dative, locative and instrumental in adjectives *-ijem* opposite to Cr./Bosn./Serb. *-im*). Standard Serbian can have Ekavian or Ijekavian form, but Ekavian is more prestigious, which is historically related to the fact that this dialect is the most widespread in Serbia proper, including the capital of Belgrade and the culturally and economically most developed part of Serbia, Vojvodina.

- Unequal occurrence of phone [x] (e. i. phoneme /h/) — especially the makers of Bosnian standard are trying to increase the frequency of this phoneme (e. g. *lako*, Bosn. *lahko* “easily” or *kafa*, Cro. *kava*, Bosn. *kahva* “coffee”)
- Widespread syncretism of cases (i. e. one ending indicates two or more cases)
- Infinitive is in some constructions, e. g. with modal or phase verbs, replaced with *da*-construction (particle *da* + present indicative) — towards the east, the occurrence of this phenomenon is more frequent
- Analytical-synthetic expression of comparative and superlative in adjective and adverbs — comparative is formed by suffixes, superlative is formed analytically with formant *naj-* + comparative
- Expression of the future tense using the enclitic forms of the verb *ht(j)eti* + infinitive, sporadically *ht(j)eti* + *da* + present indicative (occur above all in Serbian and Montenegrin standard)
- Temporal system include, with exception of present and future, future II (f. exactum), perfect, plusquamperfect (antepreteritum) and past simple tenses aorist and imperfect, but they are nowadays more used in literature

The specific of the Serbo-Croatian standard is its digraphia — Croatian standard uses only Latin alphabet, Bosnian standard uses essentially only Latin alphabet, although it formally admits Cyrillic, Montenegrin standard has constitutionally anchored equality of Latin and Cyrillic alphabet in the administration, Serbian standard prefers Cyrillic. It allows Latin in the administration only in lawful cases and in unofficial communication is permissible to use both without limitation.¹¹ Graphical system of all four national variants of the Serbo-Croatian are unified in terms of graphemes and their relation to the respective phonemes (certain differences can naturally be observed in orthographical norms).

¹¹ The problematic relation of Cyrillic and Latin, where both graphic systems are in competition, is discussed in Jelica Stojanović (2011: 65–101) — it critically describes the factual protections of Latin at the expense of Cyrillic, especially in Montenegro, after the achievement of state independence. Srđan Jovanović Maldoran (2012: 11–68), on the other hand, criticizes such a protectionist approach to the Serbian Cyrillic as purist and unscientific.

Only a radical group of proponents of the independence of Montenegrin language introduced three new characters into its spelling Š, Ž, 3 (in Cyrillic Ѓ, 3', S) identifying three new standardized phonemes [š], [ž], [ʒ]. In the Serbo-Croatian vocabulary, there are more significant differences between the situation in the traditionally Roman Catholic, Orthodox and Muslim environments. There are a few words taken from Turkish language, but not so much as in Bulgarian or Macedonian. Most active, respectively stylistically neutral Turkish loanwords, as well as other Orientalisms, are naturally displayed in Bosnian standard, which is in line with the language policy of its current creators. Many Turkish words are today stylistically marked. Serbo-Croatian also took words from Greek and Latin, many of the Serbian words show traces of adoption from Greek environment, whereas Croatian took it from Latin (Serb. *Vavilon, Kipar, Vizantija* vers. Cro. *Babilon, Cipar, Bizant* "Babylon, Cyprus, Byzantium"). In Croatian, due to the historical contacts of Croats with the surrounding ethnic groups, there are also many German, Hungarian and Italian, loanwords and to a lesser extent also Czech. Since the first half of the 18th century, many Russian loanwords have penetrated Serbian. The new penetration into the Serbo-Croatian language after the Second World War, during the period of the communist regime, had the character of an input of ideologized communist expressions. The period of the last quarter of century is for the all variants of Serbo-Croatian marked by the high frequency of English loanwords (area of economics, politics, new technologies etc.). More considerable prescriptive up to puristic tendencies which sharply stand up against English loanwords (maybe better said Anglo-Americanisms) are apparent in Croatian environment. The wave of revitalization of often obsolete Orientalisms is characteristic for the language policy of promoters of the Bosnian language.

III.4

SLOVENIAN LANGUAGE

For standard Slovenian these are the characteristic grammatical phenomena:

- Double accent — melodic, characterized by different tone pitch or dynamic characterized by stress. Both melodic and dynamic accent can be short or long. In the terms of stability, it is free and moving. There are three types of Slovenian accent: 1. *akut*, which indicates long *a/i/u* and long narrow *e/o* (melodic *akut* also represents a low tone) — e. g. *tújka* “stranger” 2. *Circumflex*, which indicates long wide *e/o* (melodic *circumflex* also represents high tone) — e. g. *môst* “bridge”, and 3. *Brevis*, which indicates short *a/i/u* and short wide *e/o* (melodic *brevis* also represents low tone) — e. g. *meglà* “fog”. The pronunciation of semivowel [ə] is always short. The melodic accent is considered to be more prestigious, because it is more common in the area around the capital city of Ljubljana, the social–political and cultural centre of today’s Slovenia.
- Reduced pronunciation of unaccented vowel
- *tj/kt, dj > č, j* (e. g. *sveča/noč, meja* “candle/night, balk”)
- Reflection of *yat*: *ě > e* (e. g. *sneg* “snow”)
- Reflection of *yer* in long stressed syllable: *ь, ѣ > a* (e. g. *dan* “day”), in short syllable *ь, ѣ > reduced vowel [ə]* written as *e* (e. g. *pes, sen* “dog, dream”)
- Reflection of nasal consonant: *ę, ǫ > e, o* (e. g. *pet, roka* “five, hand”)
- *ř > (e)r [ər]* (e. g. *krv, koper* “blood, dill”)
- *! > ol [oŭ]* (e. g. *volk* “wolf”)
- Epenthetic *l* was preserved (e. g. *zemlja* “ground”)
- Rich system of vowels — except [a], [i], [u] and semivowel [ə], standard Slovenian also has a double *e* (narrow [e̝] and wide [ê]) and double *o* (narrow [o̝] and wide [ô])
- Rhotacism (e. g. *kdor, kar, morem, moram* “that, which, can, have to”)
- System of three numbers — singular, dual, plural
- Preservation of supine form in constructions with modal or motion verbs — e. g. *gremo kupit, moram pogledat* “we are going to buy, I have to look”
- Analytical–synthetic expression of comparative and superlative

in adjective and adverbs — comparative is formed by suffixes, superlative is formed analytically with formant *naj-* + comparative

- Expression of future tenses is made, unlike in other South Slavonic languages, by using enclitical future form of verb *biti* + past participle (1-ending), which draws Slovenia closer to the West Slavonic languages
- Temporal system is significantly simplified, expressing only two basic forms: present, future and perfect, which also typologically classifies Slovenian into West Slavonic languages

In Slovenian vocabulary, the German influence is particularly noticeable, which distinguishes it from other South Slavonic languages. The period of the last quarter of century is marked by the high frequency of English loanwords (area of economics, politics, new technologies etc.).

IV. Glagolitic, Cyrillic and Other Scripts

In the past, Slavonic language was written in several scripts. In the beginning with **GLAGOLITIC**,¹² Slavonic script, which was created by **Constantine-Cyril** for the purpose of his mission in Great Moravia in the middle of the 9th century (862). Glagolitic is a unique script, but there is still no consensus about inspiration in Paleo-Slavonic today — according to Damjanović (2003: 30—35), there are three interpretations: *exogenous*, *endogenous* and *exogenously-endogenous*. Supporters of *exogenous* origins are trying to prove that for each Glagolitic graph some inspiration can be found in another script (for example, a number of older generations of Slavists: I. Taylor, V. Jagić, V. Vondrák, J. Vajs, R. Nahtigal, F. Fortunatov, N. S. Trubetzkoy, L. Geitler etc.). On the contrary, supporters of *endogenous*

¹² The term *Glagolitic* does not come from the Cyrillo-Methodian period. This script was in the past called *Cyrillic* (*kurilovitsa* at Novgorod's pop Upyr Likhoy from year 1047, *čirilica* in Dubrovnik documents from 14th and 15th century; The Script of St. Jerome, *Hieronymian* (littera Hieronymiana) or *Slavonic script* (pismena slověnskaya). The name *Glagolitic* (Serbo-Croatian *glagoljica*) comes from Croatian environment. According to Croatian researcher and expert on Glagolitic script Mateo Žagar (2009: 149, quote as per Blažević Krezić 2012: 476), this term was first used by **Franjo GLAVINIĆ** in 1626 in the letter to the Roman Congregation.

interpretation are trying to prove that the Glagolitic is a completely new script with a certain internal logic of characters (G. Tschernochvostoff, P. Ilchev, married couple V. and O. Jonchevs, S. Sambunjak). Supporters of exogenously–endogenous origins tend to explanation that the Glagolitic is definitely an original and distinctive graphical system that at first does not resemble any other script. This originality cannot be perceived in such a way that the Glagolitic has no connection to the graphic systems that Constantine knew, and that it would remain without any external inspiration (this attitude is evident at T. Eckhardt, J. Hamm or K. Horálek).

The Glagolitic had two basic forms — older *round* (Bulgarian) that existed around the 12th century, and later *squared* (Croatian) the beginning of which can be found in the half of the 13th century, probably under the influence of Latin beneventana font (Oczkova 2010: 126). Sometimes transitional form of *round–squared* or *semi–round* Glagolitic is mentioned, and it is appropriated by Bosniaks, when they attach the attribute “Bosnian” in the context of nationalization of literature on the territory of today’s Bosnia & Herzegovina (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 22). They do not see it as the transitional type, but as the distinctive third type. In the Croatian environment, Glagolitic literature survived continuously until 1857 (Damjanović 2003: 26).

Soon after, at the end of the 9th century, on the court of Bulgarian Tsar in Preslav, simpler Cyrillic was gradually profiled on the basis of the Old Greek uncial majuscule script. The **CYRILLIC** undergo several modification during its existence — one of them is *Bosnian Cyrillic* (“bosanchitsa”)¹³, adopted Cyrillic, which was used mainly in Bosnia (and later on in Dalmatia, Dubrovnik /Ragusa/ and Coastal Croatia) in some modification from 13th century (Milanović 2004: 42)¹⁴ to the beginning of 20th century (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 49); *The Civil Script* (“grazhdanka”) simplified “civil” form of Cyrillic from the times of the Russian Tsar Peter the Great (1708), which was gradually accepted by other

13 The Western variant of Cyrillic got the name *bosanchitsa* in 1889. It was first used by Croatian archaeologist and art historian **Čiro TRUHELKA**.

14 According to Stjepan Damjanović, we can speak about significant specificities of Bosnian Cyrillic only from 15th century (Damjanović 2004: 296). However, the proponents of the Bosnian language autonomy see, somewhat controversially, beginnings of Bosnian in the 10th century (Dževad Jahić in Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 49). The motivation for such a claim is obviously non-linguistic. In their opinion, 13th century is the time when “the second type of Bosnian Cyrillic” — the italic manuscript appeared.

Slavonic nations which use Cyrillic and it is also known as *azbuka*.¹⁵ As for the origin of Cyrillic, the experts are not united in this case — previously authorship was attributed to St. Clement of Ohrid, St. Naum of Ohrid or Constantine of Preslav. However, considering the overall cultural, religious, political and social situation of the Bulgarian Empire at the end of the 9th century, and its relation to the Byzantium and Byzantine culture as such, closer to the truth would be the opinion that Cyrillic evolved at the princely and later Tsar's court of Simeon the Great in Preslav by gradual adaptation of Greek script to Slavonic language. In 893, when Simeon came to the Bulgarian throne, it was decided at the Great Assembly in Preslav that the Slavonic language written with Cyrillic alphabet became the official language of the realm, which was preceded the further development of Cyrillic not only as a script of religious literature, but also as a script for common secular purposes.

In Bosnia, as a result of Islamization, from the mid-17th to the end of the 19th century, *literatura alhamijado* was cultivated. It was written in Slavonic language (Serbo-Croatian, Bosniaks would today say it was Bosnian language), but with Arabic script (so-called **AREBICA**), which was also used in Turkish language, official language of Ottoman Empire, to which Bosnia belonged from the second half of the 15th century till 1878.

The **GREEK script** for the recording of Slavonic language was used in Bosnia and Hum according to Dževad Jahić at the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th century, about what allegedly testifies only a small amount of preserved documents from that time (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 44). From the 19th century Aegean Macedonia come some Bulgarian monuments written in Greek; they were written in the relevant regional dialect. Some well-known are *Konikovo Gospel* (Кониково евангелие, 1852, author Pavel Bozhigrobski), *Kulakiya Gospel* (Кулакийско евангелие, 1863, author Evstatiy Kipriadi) or *Greek-Bulgarian dictionary* (гръцко-български речник, completed 1893, author Gyosho Kolev), even Bulgarian part is written in Greek script.

Finally, we must mention the Latin script — the oldest written document of the Slavonic language, written by the **LATIN** script dates

15 The terms *Cyrillic* and *Azbuka* cannot be simply seen as synonyms, both terms are based on different aspect: the first one is naming which was historically given (in our case it is derived from anthroponym *Cyri*l, Bulg. *Кирил*, Serb. *Кирило*), the second is based on naming the first two letters of the system — а, б, в, г, д... : азъ, buky, vědě, glagolyo, dobro...

back to the turn of the 10th and 11th century from the Alpine (Pannonian) Slavs (future Slovenes). The Latin script had naturally, albeit at different speeds, spread among the Slavs of the Roman Catholic confession. For the needs of Slavonic languages, it had to be adjusted, either with compounds (digraphs and trigraphs) or diacritics (dots, commas, carons, etc.), because its system of signs did not reflect all existing Slavonic phonemes. Finally, it should be remembered that both Latin and Greek scripts were known to Slavs and they used them before the Cyrillo–Methodian mission, but unsystematically, as monk (Chernorizets) Hrabar writes about it in his treatise *On the letters*, from the period of the Preslav Literary School¹⁶.

The contemporary Slavonic world (*Pax Slavia*) writes in Cyrillic and/or Latin script. *The Cyrillic script* (*azbuka*) is used in Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian and Rusyn (in these languages the term “azbuka” is more used), then Bulgarian, Macedonian (кирилица), Serbian, Montenegrin and formally in Bosnian (ћирилица), that means except Bosnian, in all Orthodox Slavonic nations (*Pax Slavia Orthodoxa*). Each of these languages has, in addition to a basic common fund of graphs, a certain number of separate, specific characters.¹⁷ This does not necessarily mean they mark any specific phonemes which cannot be found in other Slavonic languages — e. g. Belarusian *ŷ* /w/, Ukrainian *ʀ* /g/, Serbian *њ* /ń/ or Macedonian *ќ* /k’/.

The Latin script is used in Polish, Kashubian, Upper and Lower Sorbian, Czech, Slovak, Slovenian, Croatian and Bosnian, primarily nations of the West Christian world (*Pax Slavia Romana*). Officially, the Latin script is used in Montenegrin (constitutionality is Cyrillic and Latin equality guaranteed in the Montenegrin administration) and Serbian (in Serbia is its use restricted in favour of Cyrillic). Here too, each of these languages has its own alphabet adjusted to its needs. Basically, Slavonic Latin for specific Slavonic phonemes favours diacritics; the more pronounced presence of compounds is evident mainly in Polish and Kashubian.

16 “Being still pagans, the Slavs did not have their own letters, but read and communicated by means of tallies and sketches. After their baptism they tried to write Slavonic language with Roman and Greek letters without adjustment.” (orig.: “Slované dřive, pokud ještě byli pohané, neměli zajisté knihy ani písmo, nýbrž počítali a hádali s pomocí črt a vrubů. Když však byli pokřtěni, snažili se psát slovanskou řeč římskými a řeckými písmeny bez úpravy.” — Mnich Chrabr: *O písmenech*, quote as per Večerka 2006: 94; underlined PK).

17 These specific characters may be shared by more Slavonic languages — see, for example, Serbian and Macedonian Cyrillic.

CHAPTER 2

SELECTED CZECH HANDBOOKS OF SERBO-CROATIAN FROM 60S, 70S AND 80S (SOCIOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS)

I.

From a social perspective the period from 1950 to 1990 was when the communists held power in both the former Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. In Czechoslovakia the demise of communism came at the end of 1989, although the modern-era democratic Czechoslovakia continued to exist for another three years — on 1st January 1993 it disappeared from the map of Europe and since then two new states can be found in its place — Czechia and Slovakia. The demise of Yugoslavia was a far longer, more difficult and bloodier process — it lasted from June 1991, when Slovenia and Croatia declared independence, until April 1992, when Serbia and Montenegro concluded a new union agreement and created the so-called third, Serbian–Montenegrin Yugoslavia (Federative Republic of Yugoslavia). In terms of our analysis, these turning points are important because they mean:

1. the common language of the Serbs, Croats, Bosniaks and Montenegrins, which for decades had been traditionally referred to as Serbo–Croatian, was replaced by a language whose name was taken from the national name of each national community, which at the symbolic level resulted in a constitutional article explicitly describing the official language of each country

(Croatian in Croatia in 1990, but in its own way also in 1974, or 1972, Serbian in Serbia and Montenegro in 1992, Bosnian in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1993, and Montenegrin in Montenegro in 2007);

2. the gradual end to the controlled publication of linguistic handbooks in Czechia — during this period practically all key textbooks, dictionaries, grammar and conversation books were published by the State Pedagogical Publishing House, or the Czechoslovak Academy of Science “Academia” publishers.

As a consequence of the events described in point 1), after 1990 just one handbook was published in Czechia (in two parts — although it began to be published back in the 1980s), whose name contained the glossonym *srbochorvatština* (Serbo-Croatian) — dictionaries and conversation books then particularly describe Croatian, and to a far lesser extent Serbian.

As a consequence of the events described in point 2), the creation and publication of linguistic handbooks became more a matter of will and available finances rather than the result of methodologically sophisticated and carefully planned professional work — this has meant that the quality of linguistic publications and handbooks available to customers vary greatly.

That is the situation as it is now. However, let's return to the years between the issue of the first and last modern-era Serbo-Croatian linguistic handbook, i. e. from 1958 to 1992. Our aim is both to present a summary of the Serbo-Croatian linguistic handbooks published in Czechia at the time, and also particularly to explore how they reflected the complex language situation in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia. We will be focusing on:

1. an explicit commentary of the choice of variant(s) represented in the handbook material,
2. the actual content of handbooks in the light of the variations of Serbo-Croatian as declared by the so-called Novi Sad Agreement from 1954,
3. the choice between the Latin and Cyrillic scripts,
4. the explicit attitude towards the sociolinguistic situation of Serbo-Croatian as propagated to the user of the relevant handbook.

II.

During the period in question five textbooks were published on various themes (one of which was in two parts and one three-part work), three types of dictionaries, three conversation handbooks and one grammar guide. After a pause of more than ten years following the end of the Second World War handbooks of the Serbo-Croatian language once again started to be published at the end of the nineteen fifties.¹⁸ The first were textbooks (1959) and a conversation handbook (1958) by Mirko **Wirth**. It was not until the 1960s that modern language aids began to be published on a systematic basis — a textbook by Vladimír **Togner** (1963), Miloš **Noha**'s pocket dictionary (1963, 1965, 1967, 1969) and a conversation handbook by Anna **Jeníková** (1966, 1969); at the turn of the 60s and 70s these were followed by a new, truly contemporary and systematic textbook for language schools (in two parts) by Vida **Ljacká** and Lida **Malá**, with the modest subtitle *Prozatímní učební text* (“Provisional Textbook”) and in 1972 this was followed by *Srbocharvátština pro samouky* (“Teach Yourself Serbo-Croatian”), prepared by Anna **Jeníková** together with Vratislav **Cikhart**. Only re-editions of handbooks for self-taught language students appeared on the market in the 1970s. There was another publishing boom in the 1980s — with the issue of a new conversation handbook (1980, 1984, 1989), where Anna **Jeníková** was one of just three authors; the same author, together with Jarmila **Gleichová**, also prepared a small tourist dictionary (1982, 1987), and Anna **Jeníková** was one of the three creators of the academic *Srbocharvátsko-český slovník* (“Serbo-Croatian-Czech Dictionary”) (1982). This time saw the last editions of **Jeníková**'s textbook for self-taught language students (1982, 1987), **Noha**'s pocket dictionary (1984) and the second part of *Srbocharvátština pro jazykové školy* (“Serbo-Croatian for Language Schools”) (**Ljacká** — **Malá**, 1985). The second half of the nineteen eighties saw the publication of the first two parts of the *Učebnice srbocharvátštiny* (“Serbo-Croatian Textbook”) (the third was published in 1992) by Milica **Tondlová** and Jan **Sedláček**'s *Stručná*

18 The causes of this pause are described by Hana Jirásková: “In the fifties didn't exist any cultural contacts, no language handbooks were published. The last textbook was issued in 1946 and the next ten years there were no mutual official cultural contacts. The situation got a bit better in the beginning of the sixties, when language handbooks again were published.” (orig.: “U 50. godinama nisu postojali nikakvi kulturni kontakti, nisu bili izdani nikakvi jezični priručnici. Zadnji je udžbenik izašao 1946. i sljedećih 10 godina nije dolazilo do uzajamnih službenih kontakata. Situacija se malo poboljšala početkom 60. godina kada su se opet počeli tiskati jezični priručnici.” — Jirásková 2006: 7–8).

mluvnice srbocharvátštiny (“A Short Serbo–Croatian Grammar”) (1989). Sedláček’s detailed and erudite overview of grammar was thus the symbolic end to the era of linguistic handbooks dedicated to Serbo–Croatian as the common language of the “three” Yugoslavian nations (the Bosniaks were not mentioned as a separate nation in handbooks during that period, nor as Muslims).

III.

In the second part of this study we will be focusing on three textbooks from the publications mentioned above: Tognier’s *Cvičebnice srbocharvátštiny* (“Serbo–Croatian Workbook”) from 1963, Jeníková’s *Srbocharvátština pro samouky* (“Teach Yourself Serbo–Croatian”) from 1972, in our case on the last edition from 1987, and Ljacká — Malá’s *Srbocharvátština pro jazykové školy* (“Serbo–Croatian for Language Schools”) from 1969 (I.), or 1970 (II.) — here on the last edition from 1973 (I.), or 1985 (II.), as well as on Jeníková’s conversation handbook, or *Česko–srbocharvátská konverzace* (“Czech–Serbo–Croatian Conversation Handbook”) by Jeníková — Janešová — Prokopová — here on the first edition from 1966 and the last edition from 1989, one dictionary — Noha’s *Srbocharvátsko–český a česko–srbocharvátský kapesní slovník* (“Serbo–Croatian–Czech and Czech–Serbo–Croatian Pocket Dictionary”) — last published in 1984 — and one grammar handbook — Sedláček’s *Stručná mluvnice srbocharvátštiny* (“A Short Serbo–Croatian Grammar”) from 1989.

III.1

Comments on the Choice of Variant(s) Represented by the Handbook Material

First it must be said that all the textbooks analysed entirely deliberately omit the Ijekavian variant of Serbo–Croatian and also Cyrillic. Teaching texts were mostly or exclusively Ekavian and were written in the Latin script. The conversation dialogues and vocabulary of the pocket dictionary were also exclusively Ekavian and written in the Latin script. The authors always tried to explain this in the foreword to their handbooks:

“For practical reasons the textbook is based on the Shtokavian dialect with Ekavian pronunciation, although, where necessary, also

includes Shtokavian Ijekavian pronunciation” (Togner 1963: 4, cf. also 9);¹⁹

“In this textbook we present texts in the Ekavian dialect, as it is easier and simpler; we will later also be working on texts in the Ijekavian dialect” (Ljacká — Malá 1973: 5);²⁰

“For pedagogical reasons we have taken Ekavian as our basis, but where appropriate we have pointed out the most typical phonological, morphological and dictionary features of the Jekavian variant” (Jeníková 1987: 5),²¹ cf. also “For methodical reasons our textbooks are written in Ekavian Shtokavian” (ibid.: 12);²²

“For the sake of simplicity the Serbo-Croatian text is written in the Ekavian variant of Serbo-Croatian, with the Latin script above it” (Jeníková 1966: 6);²³

“Our handbook is written in the eastern, Ekavian (Serbian) variant of literary Serbo-Croatian. However, it is — for the sake of simplicity — written using the Latin script, and not Cyrillic” (Jeníková — Janešová — Prokopová 1989: 17);²⁴

“For simplicity’s sake Ekavian has been used in this dictionary. It is only in exceptional cases that we present the Jekavian variant with the relevant reference (e. g. with the word *biljeg*, in Ekavian *beleg*)” (Noha 1984: 41);²⁵

“In the grammar book this double word form is characterised for each word or word form partly by means of slashes with the Ekavian-Ijekavian doublet, e. g. *dete/dijete*, and partly by the use of brackets with the Ekavian-Jekavian doublet, e. g. *d(j)eca* (= *deca/djeca*). However, this means of indicating the double pronunciation is not used when whole

19 Orig.: “**Z důvodů praktických** je učebnice založena na štokavštině ekavské výslovnosti, přihlíží však, kde je to nutné, i k štokavštině ijekavské výslovnosti.”

20 Orig.: “V této učebnici uvádíme texty v nářečí ekavském, protože je **snadnější a jednodušší**, později přejdeme i k textům v ijekavském nářečí.”

21 Orig.: “**Z důvodů pedagogických** jsme vzali za základ ekavštinu, ale na vhodných místech upozorňujeme na nejtypičtější hláskoslovné, tvaroslovné a slovníkové rysy jekavské varianty.”

22 Orig.: “Naše učebnice je **z metodických důvodů** psaná ekavskou štokavštinou.”

23 Orig.: “**Pro snazší použitelnost** je srbocharvátský text psán ekavskou variantou srbocharváštiny a nadto latinkou.”

24 Orig.: “Naše příručka je napsána ve východní, ekavské (srbské) variantě spisovné srbocharváštiny. Na rozdíl od ní však je — pro zjednodušení — psána latinkou, a nikoli cyrilicí.”

25 Orig.: “**Pro jednoduchoost** vycházíme v tomto slovníku z podoby ekavské. Jen výjimečně uvádíme v hesle podobu jekavskou s příslušným odkazem (např. u slova *biljeg*, ekavsky *beleg*).”

sentences are given, especially in the syntax in the cited documents, as it would be distracting. In such cases generally just one form of Ekavian or Ijekavian (Jekavian) is given” (Sedláček 1989: 5).²⁶

These citations make it clear that the Ekavian dialect was more acceptable for the writers of Czech teaching, conversation and vocabulary handbooks, particularly as it was simpler, or more practical for teaching purposes — students or lay users did not have to concern themselves with where to use *je* and where to use *i je*. It was not until newer conversation handbooks that the reasons for this step were explained in all the other handbooks. The only exception in this article is Sedláček’s grammar guide, whose linguistic material maintains a thorough balance between the Ekavian and Ijekavian variants.

III.2

Content of Handbooks in the Light of the Variations of Serbo-Croatian

With perhaps just one exception all the handbooks favour — as we have shown above — the Ekavian, or Serbian variant, although this is not down to any political or other extralinguistic preferences; they do mention the existence of the western (Croatian) variant to a varying extent. So, a certain percentage of texts in teaching handbooks is also in Ijekavian. The practically exclusively Ekavian *Srbocharvátština pro samouky* (Anna Jeníková, Vratislav Cikhart; Prague, SPN, “Učebnice pro samouky” edition, 1987 — 5th edition /1st: 1972, 2nd: 1974, 3rd: 1978, 4th: 1982/) has just one lesson, lesson 29, entitled *Srb v Charvátsku*, specially dedicated to the western variant of Serbo-Croatian, including a small two-page section on the most common different expressions (eastern versus western region). There is an examples of both variants of Serbo-Croatian in the introductions of the handbook — in the Belgrade and Zagreb editions of one short newspaper article from April 1967 *Mala uzbuna oko pšenice* the author wanted to illustrate the differences between the two variants (Jeníková 1987: 17n.).

Moreover, there are not many more Ijekavian texts in any of the parts of *Srbocharvátština pro jazykové školy* (Vida Ljacká, Lida Malá; Prague, SPN,

26 Orig.: “V mluvnici se tato dvojí hlásková podoba vyznačuje u jednotlivých slov nebo tvarů slov jednak pomocí lomítek u ekavsko-ijekavských dublet, např. *dete/dijete*, jednak pomocí závorek u ekavsko-ijekavských dublet, např. *d(j)eca* (= *deca/djeca*). Tento způsob označování dvojí výslovnosti se však neuzívá při uvádění celých vět, zvl. v citátových dokladech v syntaxi, protože by zde působil rušivě. V takových případech se ponechává zprav. jen jedna podoba ekavská nebo ijekavská (jekavská).”

“Učebnice pro jazykové školy” edition, vol. I: 1973 — 3rd amended edition /1st: 1969, 2nd: 1971/, vol. II: 1985 — 2nd amended edition /1st: 1970/). For didactic reasons Ijekavian does not appear in the first part at all, while in the second Ijekavian is the dialect used for the introductory articles to lesson 7 (*Sutjeska*) and lesson 11 (*Dalmacija pod snijegom*), where this could be described as the Croatian variant.

There is much greater equality between the two variants in Vladimír Togner’s *Cvičebnice srbocharvátštiny* (Prague, SPN, 1963 — 1st edition). Each lesson includes a section entitled *Continuous Reading*, containing a number of texts written in the western, i. e. Croatian variant. The text on Zagreb, however, which is the introductory article in lesson 29 (*Zagreb*) is written in the eastern variant.

The only author who thought to inform students of the Turkisms in Serbo-Croatian was again Togner — he did so in his introductory article in lesson 34 (*Sarajevo*), although the rest of the lesson is also written in Ekavian. Neither Jeníková nor Ljacká — Malá present any oriental lexical aspects in any special lessons.

In her *Česko-srbocharvátská konverzace* (Prague, SPN, 1966 — 1st edition /2nd: 1969/) Anna Jeníková explains: “For the sake of simplicity the Serbo-Croatian text is written in the Ekavian variant of Serbo-Croatian, with the Latin script above it. As certain different words are used in the western part of Yugoslavia and on the on the northern Adriatic coast, these cases are given and indicated” (Jeníková 1966: 6).²⁷ However, Jeníková did not see this essentially rational choice through to the end, as she is not consistent in presenting the western variant, when she overlooks phonetics (see e. g. *Chtěl jsem vás něčím potěšit* “I wanted to do something to please you” has the equivalent *Hteo sam nečim da vas obradujem* marked as eastern and *Hteo sam vas nečim obradovati* as western /*ibid.*: 122/; however, in the west the verb *hteti* has the form *htjeti* and the form of the so-called l-ending participle is not *hteo*, but *htio*). The explanation of this variance does not give the Ijekavian variants, i. e. a phonetic explanation, but tends to focus more on the grammatical and lexical aspects. An explanation of the variation is given on pp. 11—12.

27 Orig.: “Pro snazší použitelnost je srbocharvátský text psán ekavskou variantou srbocharvátštiny a nadto latinkou. Protože pro některé skutečnosti je jiné pojmenování v západní části Jugoslávie a na severním pobřeží Jadrana, jsou tyto případy uvedeny a označeny.”

In the newer *Česko-srbocharvátská konverzace* (Prague, SPN, 1989 — 3rd edition /1st: 1980, 2nd: 1984/) there is one page devoted to explaining the variance of Serbo-Croatian (Jeníková — Janešová — Prokopová 1989: 17), although unlike the previous conversation handbook this presents the Ekavian phonetic and eastern lexical and grammatical variants — this is basically Serbian language conversation handbook.

One highly non-traditional work in this respect is *Srbocharvátsko-český a česko-srbocharvátský kapesní slovník* (Prague, SPN, “Kapesní slovníky” edition, 1984 — 5th edition /1st: 1963, 2nd: 1965, 3rd: 1967, 4th: 1969/), by Miloš Noha. The Serbo-Croatian material presented by the author in the first part of the dictionary is both Serbian and Croatian (with the eastern/Serbian root *opšt-* it even refers to the western/Croatian *opć-*, so in the dictionary there is the Croatian *općina* “municipality”, but not the Serbian *opština*; we have to imply that for ourselves /Noha 1984: 262, 260/). However, in phonetic terms this material is exclusively Ekavian. In contrast, in the second part of the dictionary, wherever there is a difference Serbo-Croatian phraseology is presented by placing the Croatian variant first, followed by the Serbian variant, marked with an asterisk (e. g. *spolupráce* “cooperation” — *suradnja*, **saradnja* /*ibid.*: 529/, *divadlo* “theatre” — *kazalište*, **pozorište* /*ibid.*: 445/ etc.). However, if the term is the same and differs only in its phonetic variant, once again — in accordance with the preference stated in the introductory chapters — only the Ekavian form is given (e. g. *děvče* “girl” — *devojka* /*ibid.*: 444/ or *dítě* “child” — *dete* /*ibid.*: 445/). The author himself only touches upon this in instructions no. 6 (*ibid.*: 10), where he explains the purpose of the asterisk, and in section 81, where he mentions the lexical differences between the Serbian and Croatian variants of Serbo-Croatian. He does, however, — in line with the prevailing conviction at the time — add: “It must be pointed out that all these and other similar differences are now considered doublets, the choice of which is at one’s own discretion” (*ibid.*: 43).²⁸

The variation of this language is also cited by Jan Sedláček, author of *Stručná mluvnice srbocharváštiny* (Prague, Academia, 1989 — 1st edition): “This grammar guide also takes account of certain differences between the Serbian and Croatian variant of the standard language. (...) These

28 Orig.: “Je třeba znovu upozornit, že všechny tyto a jiné podobné rozdíly mají nyní povahu dublet, mezi nimiž je každému ponechána volba.”

differences are always laid out and illustrated at the appropriate place in the grammatical description. However, the rest of the text of the grammar guide, especially in the cited documents, generally gives just one alternative form — Serbian or Croatian. (...) The Short Serbo-Croatian Grammar does not consciously emphasise the variations and partial differences and its main aim is to portray the grammatical structure of Serbo-Croatian in its basic features, which are common to both variants of the literary language” (Sedláček 1989: 5—6).²⁹ Given the focus of his grammar guide, this approach is understandable.

In teaching handbooks adequate attention is given to Ijekavian only by V. Togner. In terms of teaching Serbo-Croatian in the Czech environment, newer handbooks such as both Ljacká — Malá’s and that of Jeníková see Ijekavian as being entirely marginal (2 lessons in Ljacká — Malá’s book and 1 lesson in Jeníková’s). A similar ratio, although far smaller, can be seen in the approach to the specific lexicon on the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Muslims — where Togner shows a didactic that is at least comparable to the interest devoted to Ijekavian by other such textbooks, it does not appear at all in these textbooks. As regards conversation handbooks, while the content of the older handbooks (Jeníková 1966) do in certain justified cases offer the western variant together with the eastern (albeit in a somewhat confused Ekavian version where a phonetic choice is given), the newer handbook (Jeníková — Janešová — Prokopová 1989) has completely given up on the variation and is exclusively Serbian from today’s perspective. Unless the other handbooks mentioned here, Noha’s dictionary contains a far greater proportion of Croatian terms (in the Czech-Serbo-Croatian part these are even given preference, if there are equivalents of so-called doublets), although as regards the phonetic variant Noha gives only the Ekavian form. In his grammar guide Sedláček provides a balance in the phonetic variants and grammatical differences and maintains this balance as far as the lexical aspects are concerned (in illustrative examples).

29 Orig.: “V mluvnici se přihlíží také k některým rozdílům mezi srbskou a charvátskou variantou spisovného jazyka. (...) Tyto rozdíly jsou vyloženy a ilustrovány vždy na příslušném místě mluvnického popisu. V ostatním textu mluvnice, zvl. v citátových dokladech, se však uvádí zprav. jen jedna variantní podoba — srbská nebo charvátská. (...) Stručná mluvnice srbocharvátstiny se vědomě neorientuje na zdůrazňování variantnosti a dílčích rozdílů a klade si za svůj hlavní úkol zachytit mluvnickou stavbu srbocharvátstiny v jejích základních rysech, jež jsou společné oběma variantám spisovného jazyka.”

III.3

Choice Between the Latin and Cyrillic Scripts

Although the authors of the handbooks mentioned here tend to favour Ekavian, i. e. exclusively the Serbian variant (we should bear in mind that the literary norm for the Croats, Bosniaks and Montenegrins is Ijekavian and was even when Serbo-Croatian was supposedly the officially preferred version), they demonstrate the completely opposite attitude to another highly Serbian attribute of this language — Cyrillic. In Togner's book quite a lot of the texts are written in Cyrillic in the parts entitled *Continuous Reading*, together with the articles at the beginning of lessons 15 (*Šumadija*), 21 (*Hajduci*), 25 (*Polražajnik*), 28 (*Vojvodina*) and 33 (*Reči*). In Ljacká — Malá's two-part textbook Cyrillic appears in the first work merely as an illustrative text to present the two alphabets (Ljacká — Malá 1973: 148), although in the second volume there are many more articles written in Cyrillic script. Jeníková deliberately does not bother with Cyrillic, even in her conversation handbooks (cf. "Our handbook (...) — for the sake of simplicity — is written using the Latin script, and not Cyrillic" /Jeníková — Janešová — Prokopová 1989: 17/),³⁰ and the case is the same with Noha. Sedláček extensively focuses on Serbian Cyrillic and its comparison with the Serbo-Croatian Latin script in section 20 Alphabet and Spelling (pp. 35—37), although in his handbook Serbo-Croatian is written entirely in the Latin script.

Cyrillic is mentioned relatively frequently by Togner and Ljacká — Malá; for instance, the frequency of articles written in Cyrillic clearly shows that this alphabet is not important for a pragmatic understanding of the language. This factor was then probably one reason why Jeníková completely gave up on trying to "force" Cyrillic on self-taught language learners, i. e. the target group for her handbook. This was a crucial factor in the case of the conversation handbook, the dictionary and the grammar guide.

III.4

Attitude to the Sociolinguistic Situation of Serbo-Croatian

In this last point we want to explore how the authors of these handbooks define Serbo-Croatian, its variants and other sociolinguistic aspects. To

30 Orig.: "Naše příručka je (...) — pro zjednodušení — psána latinkou, a nikoli cyrilicí."

quote Vladimír Togner: “The term Serbo–Croatian literary language (...) is used to refer to the only literary language with two pronunciations, Ekavian (Serbian) and Ijekavian (Croatian) and with two alphabets, Latin and Cyrillic.” (Togner 1963: 9).³¹ A very similar view of the situation is taken by Anna Jeníková, although she attempts to provide a more thorough clarification (again, with her target group in mind): “We take the viewpoint that Serbo–Croatian is one language with two literary variants: eastern Ekavian Shtokavian and western Jekavian Shtokavian.” (Jeníková 1987: 5),³² and also: “Despite certain (overall slight) differences in morphology and composition, and especially in phonetics and vocabulary, Serbo–Croatian is one language, as these differences do not make it harder for people to understand one another and in most cases are considered admissible literary variants. It is therefore mostly irrelevant whether someone refers to the theatre using the word *pozorište*, which is commonly used in the east, or with the word *kazalište*, which is used in the west. The same applies with the words *vazduh* – *zrak* (“air”), *železnička stanica* – *kolodvor* (“railway station”), etc. It is also irrelevant whether we refer to a child as *dete* or *dijete*, etc.” (ibid.: 11).³³ In her conversation handbook Jeníková focuses on giving a basic description of the dialects of Serbo–Croatian (stating Shtokavian, Chakavian and Kajkavian, or Ekavian, Ijekavian and the Ikavian dialect) and the differences between Serbian and Croatian, although these passages do not contain any declaratory examples (Jeníková 1966: 11–13). A highly similar, albeit more detailed, approach is taken to these questions by Miloš Noha — he describes two “literary dialects” (Serbian Ekavian and Croatian Ijekavian) and particularly highlights the differences between the two variants (Noha 1984: 40–43). Jan Sedláček merely mentions a “considerable variation, which is particularly apparent in vocabulary and, to a certain extent, also

31 Orig.: “Pod výrazem srbocharvátský spisovný jazyk (...) rozumíme tedy jediný spisovný jazyk s dvojí výslovností ekavskou (srbskou) a ijekavskou (charvátskou) a s dvojitým písmem, latinkou a cyrilicí.”

32 Orig.: “Vycházíme z hlediska, že srbocharváština je jeden jazyk s dvěma spisovnými variantami: východní ekavskou štokavštinou a západní jekavskou štokavštinou.”

33 Orig.: “Srbocharváština je přes některé (celkem malé) rozdíly v tvarosloví a skladbě, zvláště však v hláskosloví a slovní zásobě, jazyk jeden, protože zmíněné rozdíly neztěžují vzájemné dorozumění a označují se ve většině případů za přípustné spisovné varianty. Je tedy vcelku lhostejné, nazve-li někdo divadlo slovem *pozorište*, které je běžné na východě, nebo slovem *kazalište*, kterého se užívá na západě. Obdobně je tomu u slov *vazduh* – *zrak* (vzduch), *železnička stanica* – *kolodvor* (nádraží) atd. Právě tak je lhostejné, nazveme-li dítě *dete* nebo *dijete* apod.”

in grammar” (1989: 5).³⁴ His introduction essentially implies that these variants are particularly understood to mean phonetic variation (Ekavian–Ijekavian), but also mentions ethnic (Serbian–Croatian) variation (*ibid.*). The newer conversation handbook by Jeníková et al. States that “the literary Serbo–Croatian language is not entirely consistent. It has two variants: “Serbian” (eastern), which is used in Serbia and Montenegro, i. e. roughly the eastern part of Yugoslavia, and “Croatian” (western), which is spoken by Croats, i. e. the inhabitants of what is roughly the western part of the region” (Jeníková — Janešová — Prokopová 1989: 17).³⁵ We also learn that “people in the east speak so-called Ekavian (saying *mleko, dete, pesma, delo*), while in the west these words are *mlijeko, dijete, pjesma, djelo* (so-called Ijekavian). In the western part of Yugoslavia the Latin script is used for writing and in printed texts, while Cyrillic is used in the eastern part” (*ibid.*).³⁶ The textbooks by Vida Ljacká and Lida Malá do not comment in any detail on the sociolinguistic situation, merely stating that “Serbo–Croatian is the language of the Serbs and the Croats, whose dialects form a single whole — Serbo–Croatian with shared grammar, spelling and basic vocabulary; this is why lessons speak of just one language” (Ljacká — Malá 1973: 5).³⁷

The quotations cited show what was essentially a consensus with the opinion that prevailed in Yugoslavia itself after the so-called Novi Sad Agreement (1954). When speaking of the variance of Serbo–Croatian, there is the phonetic variation (the Ekavian vs. the Ijekavian variant) as well as the geographic variation (the eastern vs. western variant), or ethnic variation (the Serbian vs. Croatian variant). In this respect it is worth noting how the authors of the relevant handbooks treat the individual variants: Togner (1963) and Noha (1984) unify the phonetic and ethnic criterion (Ekavian = Serbian, Ijekavian = Croatian), while Jeníková

34 Orig.: “(...) značné variantnosti, jež se projevuje zvláště v slovní zásobě a do jisté míry také v mluvnici.”

35 Orig.: “[S]rbocharvátský spisovný jazyk není zcela jednotný. Má dvě varianty: “srbskou” (východní), která se používá v Srbsku a v Černé Hoře, tedy přibližně ve východní části Jugoslávie, a “charvátskou” (západní), jíž mluví Charváti, tedy obyvatelé zhruba západní části území.”

36 Orig.: “[N]a východě se mluví tzv. ekavštinou (vyslovuje se *mleko, dete, pesma, delo*), zatímco na západě znějí tato slova *mlijeko, dijete, pjesma, djelo* (tzv. ijekavština). V západní části Jugoslávie se píše a tiskne latinkou, ve východní části cyrilicí.”

37 Orig.: “[S]rbocharvátsština je jazyk Srbů a Charvátů, jejichž nářečí tvoří jeden celek — srbocharvátsštinu se společnou mluvnicí, pravopisem a základním slovním fondem; proto se ve vyučování mluví o jediném jazyce.”

(1987) unifies the phonetic and geographic criterion (Ekavian = eastern, Ijekavian = western), Jeníková — Janešová — Prokopová (1989) unify, with a certain degree of reserve, the ethnic, geographic and phonetic criterion (“Serbian” = eastern = Ekavian, “Croatian” = western = Ijekavian). Sedláček (1989) successfully avoids simplifying matters with such a unification and separately describes the phonetic and ethnic criteria and how they are manifested. Many of these handbooks are therefore evidently inaccurate in that they identify the Ijekavian variant with the Croatian element and the west of the former Yugoslavia, and Ekavian with the Serbian element and the west of the former Yugoslavia. However, such simplified schemes cannot reflect the complexities of reality — there is a problem assigning dialects into such a binary system particularly in the case of the language of Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina. According to the systems mentioned above, people in Montenegro would speak the Ekavian variant while the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina would use the “Croatian” variant, which are highly inaccurate, if not false claims (in phonetic terms Montenegro is exclusively Ijekavian, while from a geographic perspective it is not western nor ethnically Croatian; Bosnia and Herzegovina is phonetically Ijekavian (although at the substandard level also Ikavian), while in geographic terms it is more western, but is only around one fifth ethnically Croatian — half of the population is Bosniak and almost a third Serbian).

IV.

Most of the handbooks described here deliberately present mostly the Ekavian variant, although the reasons for this are entirely didactic, not political or on other extralinguistic grounds; it has been very difficult for later generations of students to learn about Ijekavian, and especially the western variant, as newer textbooks (Ljacká — Malá, Jeníková) mentioned it very little. Western, i. e. essentially Croatian lexical elements were more noticeably present particularly in the Czech–Serbo–Croatian part of Noha’s pocket dictionary. The only work to offer a balance between both phonetic variants was Sedláček’s concise grammar. The graphic Cyrillic variant fared somewhat better than the

phonetic Ijekavian variant in textbooks, being purposefully included not only in Togner's texts, but also particularly in the textbook for language schools. In non-didactic handbooks the Latin script was clearly favoured over the Cyrillic, though these publications did explain the letters of the Cyrillic alphabet. As regards the sociolinguistic characteristics of Serbo-Croatian, there was a good effort to provide a more detailed interpretation by Jeníková (1987) or Jeníková — Janešová — Prokopová (1989), while no deeper analysis is given by Ljacká — Malá. However, the effort to simply explain the complex reality of the variations of Serbo-Croatian often resulted in inaccurate and misleading claims (in the conversation handbook by Jeníková — Janešová — Prokopová, for instance). In any case, none of the interpretations in these three handbooks was contradictory to the conclusions of the Novi Sad Agreement on Serbo-Croatian as the common language of the Serbs, Croats and Montenegrins from 1954. From the modern-day perspective interfering with the content of teaching texts in particular may be seen as the marginalization or even disregard for the Montenegrins and Bosniaks (at that time Muslims), who are practically not mentioned in the introductory chapters, or the in the actual texts that follow. The only didactical interest that we saw in the specific lexicon present in the language of the Yugoslavian Muslims, no matter how slight, was in Togner's relatively comprehensive handbook.

**SELECTED MOMENTS FROM THE HISTORY
OF SERBO-CROATIAN
("B-C-S" POINT OF VIEW)**

The study programs of South Slavonic philologies at the Masaryk University in Brno contain not only synchronous language learning, but also lectures directed at diachronic language learning. This means that apart from the usually expected subjects such as phonetics and phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicology in master's programs, students are offered also courses that are focused on the past — dialectology and language history. In this paper, we will focus our attention on the history of language. What we like to point out is: as the history of language we can study historical phonetics, phonology and grammar of a particular standard language, as well as the process of standardization of such a language. We can study the first and the second option alike if we talk only about one particular language, but apart from that, we can talk about them by comparing them. We can compare, for example, the Serbian language with the mother tongue of our students, i. e. with the Czech language, or Serbian with other South Slavonic or Slavonic languages. In our study programs of South Slavonic languages we pay attention to the comparison of the process of historical development of these languages in order to enable students to become familiar with and adopt a broad spectrum of different ways of standardization of modern standard languages, to identify similarities and differences in them. At the same time, it is our aim to show the essence of problematic

relations within the Serbian-speaking linguistic area on one hand (or the area of the Central South Slavonic diasystem — how this area is called in Croatia and B&H) and the Bulgarian-Macedonian linguistic area on the other hand. If we would only talk about the history of the Serbian language within the Serbian philology, students of the Serbian language would not have the opportunity to learn more about the specifics of the standardization process in Croatia, and vice versa — for students of the Croatian language, it would always remain unrevealed what happened, for example, with the Old Church Slavonic language and Serbs. Questions related to the Bosniak (which the Bosniaks themselves call Bosnian) or the Montenegrin linguistic standard, i. e. the views and positions of the propagators of the Bosnian or the Montenegrin standard language, would also not be brought to the attention of our students of Serbian, Croatian or Balkan studies. We consider that such a limited approach is not sufficient enough as it leads to a limited view, the result of which is the inability of being objective, or at least attempting to be objective, when different facts are not being concerned, but actually different interpretations of the same facts.

It is never easy to discuss historical events, given the different national sources. This is why we want, using several examples, to show the interpretation of the history of the standardization of literary languages on the territory of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Croatia. We will look at the introductory chapters of three grammar books, containing information about the history of the standardization of literary language: Serbian (*Gramatika srpskog književnog jezika* [GSKJ] — written by Živojin STANOJČIĆ, Belgrade 2010 /1st ed./, and its older version *Gramatika srpskoga jezika* [GSJ] — written by Živojin STANOJČIĆ and Ljubomir POPOVIĆ, Belgrade 2004 /9th ed./), Croatian (*Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* [GHJ] — written by Stjepko TEŽAK and Stjepan BABIĆ, Zagreb 2009 /17th ed./, 1996 /11th ed./, and 1994 /10th rev. ed./), and Bosnian (*Gramatika bosanskoga jezika* [GBJ] — written by Dževad JAHIĆ, Senahid HALILOVIĆ and Ismail PALIĆ, Zenica 2000 /1st ed./). The introductory information includes, first of all, data about languages in general, classification of Slavonic languages, history of the language whose grammatical structure is discussed, and the dialects of this language. In Stanojčić's grammar book 18 pages (p. 17—34.) are dedicated to this information, in Težak

and Babić's grammar book — 21 pages (p. 11—31), in Jahić, Halilović and Palić's grammar book — 48 pages (p. 21—68).

I. Classification of South Slavonic Languages

Our analysis begins with the classification of South Slavonic languages. Based on the citations mentioned below, it is obvious that the most instances for explaining the oldest period of South Slavonic languages and the modern state in that area are determined by Ž. Stanojčić and author of the introduction to Bosnian grammar Dž. Jahić. They both try, at least in a few words, to explain and determine the sociolinguistic situation in the area of the former Serbo-Croatian language (1B, i. e. 1K), Stanojčić and Popović in the older edition (GSJ, 1E):³⁸

SERBIAN:

1A/ "U toku istorijskog razvitka u krugu *južnoslovenske zajednice* formirale su se dve jezičke zajednice. Prvo, formirala se — *zapadna jezička zajednica*, iz koje su se razvili, kao posebni narodni jezici — *jezici Srba i Crnogoraca, Hrvata i Slovenaca* i, na osnovama jezika prva tri navedena naroda, mnogo kasnije, *jezik Bošnjaka*, koji su, i kao književni jezici, danas određeni nacionalnim predznakom (na primer, *srpski jezik, hrvatski jezik, slovenački jezik* itd.). Drugo, formirala se — *istočna jezička zajednica*, iz koje se razvio jezik hrišćanske crkve svih slovenskih naroda, poznat u lingvistici kao *staroslovenski jezik* (koji se naziva u nauci i terminom *starocrkvenoslovenski jezik*), kao što su se razvili i jezici *Makedonaca i Bugara* (tj. *makedonski jezik i bugarski jezik*)." (Stanojčić 2010: 18)

1B/ "[U] drugoj polovini XX veka, taj (lingvistički isti) **[srpskohrvatski] jezik** prvo se deli na **dve varijante**, odnosno sada — od poslednje decenije XX veka — na **dva standardna (književna) jezika** — *srpski i hrvatski*, kojim govore i pišu pripadnici ta dva naroda bez obzira na to u kojim državama žive — Srbiji, Crnoj Gori, Hrvatskoj ili u Bosni i Hercegovini. **Zatim se kao književni jezici kodifikuju i varijante koje nose nazive bosanski jezik (odnosno bošnjački jezik) i crnogorski jezik**, koji su i službeni jezici u jednom od dva entiteta u BiH, odnosno u Crnoj Gori." (Stanojčić 2010: 34)

³⁸ In all quoted paragraphs **bold** and underlined are the author's statements, in *italics* is the original language text.

1C/ “U nauci o slovenskim jezicima, pa i u gramatikama, lingvistička zajednica u kojoj su se nalazila ova tri narečja, (...) označava(la) se terminom *srpskohrvatski jezik* (...).” (Stanojčić 2010: 18)

1D/ “U toku istorijskog razvitka u krugu južnoslovenske zajednice formirala se *zapadna jezička zajednica*, iz koje su se razvili *slovenački* i *srpskohrvatski jezik*, i istočna jezička zajednica, iz koje su se razvili *makedonski*, *bugarski* i nekadašnji *staroslovenski jezik*.” (Stanojčić — Popović 2004: 6)

1E/ “S obzirom na to (na posebne društveno-političke, verske, nacionalne i druge uslove, na jezička okruženja drugih naroda), *srpskohrvatski književni jezik* deli se na **dve varijante ili vida**, odn. na **dva standardna (književna) jezika — srpski i hrvatski**. U nekim delovima Bosne i Hercegovine (onima sa južnoslovenskim muslimanskim stanovništvom) neguje se **varijanta s nazivom bosanski ili — sa više opravdanja — bošnjački jezik**.” (Stanojčić — Popović 2004: 21)³⁹

1F/ “U južnoslovenskim zemljama, *srpskohrvatskim jezikom*, koji, zavisno od sredine, **ima vidove i nazive: srpski jezik, hrvatski jezik, kao i bošnjački jezik**, narodnim i književnim (= standardnim) danas se govori u državnoj zajednici Srbija i Crna Gora, u Bosni i Hercegovini i u Hrvatskoj.” (Stanojčić — Popović 2004: 6)

In the Croatian grammar we find an interesting development of the understanding of the relationship between the Croatian and Serbian languages — comp. 1994 edit. (1I) and later (1H, 1G):

CROATIAN:

1G/ “(...) južnoslavenski su *slovenski*, *hrvatski*, *srpski*, *makedonski*, *bugarski* i *staroslavenski*. **U novije vrijeme počinje se oblikovati i bošnjački (bosanski, jezik bosanskih muslimana)**, a **prve priručnike dobiva i crnogorski**.” (Težak — Babić 2009: 9)

1H/ “(...) južnoslavenski su *slovenski*, *hrvatski*, *srpski*, *makedonski*, *bugarski* i *staroslavenski*.” (Težak — Babić 1996: 9)

1I/ “(...) južnoslavenski su *slovenski*, *hrvatski* i *srpski*, *makedonski*, *bugarski* i *staroslavenski*.” (Težak — Babić 1994: 9)

BOSNIAN:

1J/ “*Južnoslavenski jezici* nastaju iz južnoslavenskoga prajezika, odnosno iz dva njegova ogranka. Ovim prajezikom preci Južnih Slavena govorili su prije nego što

39 Next Ž. Stanojčić in footnote gives definition of Serbo-Croatian from the Encyclopaedy of Serbian Nation (Enciklopedija 2008: 1076).

su se doselili na Balkan. Taj južnoslavenski prajezik razdvaja se na zapadni i istočni prajezik. Iz **zapadnog južnoslavenskoga prajezika** nastali su **slovenski jezik** i **srednjojužnoslavenski dijasistem**, a iz istočnoga južnoslavenskoga prajezika nastali su makedonski, bugarski i staroslavenski jezik." (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 21)

1K/ "Srednjojužnoslavenski dijasistem sadržavao je pet širih dijalekatskih cjelina: kajkavsku, čakavsku, zapadnoštokavsku, istočnoštokavsku i torlačku. Iz tih pet srednjovjekovnih narječja kasnijim razvojem nastaju: *zapadna srednjojužnoslavenska grupa*, a to su *hrvatski i bosanski jezik* i *istočna srednjojužnoslavenska grupa*, a to su *srpski i crnogorski jezik*. **Srednjojužnoslavenski dijasistem** (odnosno nazivi za sve četiri nacionalno-jezičke tradicije) više od jednog stoljeća (od sredine XIX sve do kraja XX vijeka) **razvijao se u sklopu zajedničkog naziva *srpskohrvatski/hrvatskosrpski jezik***. **Danas se upotrebljavaju nazivi *srpski, hrvatski i bosanski jezik*, s tim što naziv *crnogorski jezik* još nije zvanično priznat.**" (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 21)

Regarding the youngest post Serbo-Croatian standard language — Montenegrin, it is mentioned only in recent editions of Serbian and Croatian grammar (1B and 1G), but the Bosnian grammar mentions it even before the breakup of the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro due to the separation of Montenegro, along with noting that its name "has not been officially recognized yet" ("još nije zvanično priznat", 1K).

If we compare the data from the analyzed different grammars, we could see that the current state is basically being described in the same way in each of them — four standard languages can be distinguished (Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin), which are essentially a variant of one language ("Serbo-Croatian" /GSKJ/, respectively, the "Central South Slavonic diasystem" /GBJ/). The fact that there are two possibilities of calling the language of Bosniaks is explicitly stated only by the Serbian grammar ("*Bosnian language* [respectively, *Bosniak language*]" — 1B; "*Bosnian* or — more justified — *Bosniak language*" — 1E) and Croatian grammar ("*Bosniak* [Bosnian, language of Bosnian Muslims]" — 1G), but there is no denial of one or the other glossonyms in them. Bosnian grammar lists only one option ("*Bosnian language*" — 1K). Different ways in which information is given about the language of Bosniaks are completely in line with Serbian, that is, Croatian, or Bosniak language policy.

II. Versions of Old Church Slavonic Language, Glagolitic Alphabet (Glagolitsa)

In this part we are interested in the versions of Old Church Slavonic language, mentioned by the authors of the studied grammar books, and in what they say about the Glagolitic alphabet (Glagolitsa). In Živojin Stanojčić's GSKJ (as well as in Ž. Stanojčić and Lj. Popović's GSJ) only the Serbian version is mentioned, and the author presents the Glagolitic alphabet only as the first graphic system of Old Church Slavonic, i. e. he neither discusses a more detailed division of Old Church Slavonic versions, nor does he mention the different types of Glagolitic alphabet. Stjepan Babić (GHJ) mentions all versions (2A), divides the Glagolitic alphabet into an old type (rounded, i. e. *obla*) and a new type (squared, i. e. *uglata*, Croatian, 2B). In this context, it is notable that he designates the new type using a national attribute (*Croatian*), however there is no such attribute (*Bulgarian*), for the old type, even though it is used just as often.

CROATIAN:

2A/ “(...) taj se modificirani, živom govoru donekle prilagođeni tip naziva redakcijama: *hrvatska, srpska, ruska, češka, bugarska, makedonska, panonskoslavenska.*” (Težak — Babić 2009: 10)

2B/ “Stari je tip glagoljice tzv. *obla glagoljica*, a u Hrvatskoj se razvio novi tip — *uglata ili hrvatska glagoljica.*” (Težak — Babić 2009: 10)

The authors of the Bosnian grammar book have a different view of the oldest period. In their opinion, three versions of Old Church Slavonic language exist within the Serbo-Croatian language territory: in addition to the generally recognised Serbian and Croatian versions, there is also a “Bosnia-Hum” (2C) one, which however is traditionally designated by Serbian linguists as Zeta-Bosnia or Zeta-Hum orthographic type of the Serbian version of Old Church Slavonic (See, e. g. Milanović 2004: 43). This division is immediately followed by the conclusion that the modern Bosnian language actually originated from this very version (2C). They also explain the Glagolitic alphabet (Glagolitsa) in the same way — in addition to the rounded and the squared form, they also mention a “transitional

form" between them — the so-called semirounded (*poluobla*) one, which is immediately given the necessary regional attribute — "Bosnian Glagolitsa" ("bosanska glagoljica", 2D):

BOSNIAN:

2C/ "Postoje različite redakcije staroslavenskog jezika: **hrvatska, srpska, bosansko-humska**, bugarska, makedonska, češka i ruska redakcija. Tako je bosanski jezik potekao iz svoje bosansko-humske redakcije, odnosno verzije prvotnoga staroslavenskog ili općeslavenskog jezika." (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 22)

2D/ "Postojala su **tri tipa glagoljice**. (...) U Bosni se u srednjem vijeku upotrebljavala **prijelazna forma između oble i uglaste glagoljice**, koja se naziva *poluobla*, odnosno *bosanska glagoljica*." (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 22)

III.

Bosnian Alphabet (Bosanchitsa)

So called "bosančica" (bosanchitsa, Bosnian alphabet) as a specific type of Cyrillic alphabet is mentioned only in Croatian and Bosnian grammar, while Stanojčić does not provide any information about it. S. Babić understands the term "bosančica" as a variant of Western Cyrillic (3A). It is completely understandable that Dž. Jahić dedicates much more space to bosančica. However, unlike Babić, Jahić refers to it as a Bosnian Cyrillic (3B), i. e. again uses the regional definition, as we have already noticed in the Glagolitic case (2D). In addition, we could notice that the authors feels a strong need to prescribe to the users of his grammar which terms are correct, and which are not (3B). On the other hand, we leave a debatable piece of information about the fact that the bosančica was formed (or was in use) in the 10th century.

CROATIAN:

3A/ "Uz glagoljicu vrlo se rano javlja i **zapadna ćirilica, tzv. bosančica** (Bosna, južna Dalmacija, *Povaljska listina* iz 1184./1250.) i latinica (...)." (Težak — Babić 2009: 12)

BOSNIAN:

3B/ “U najstarije vrijeme (X vijek) u Dubrovniku i srednjoj Dalmaciji pa i u Bosni formirana je **bosanska ćirilica ili bosančica**. (...) Za tu ćirilicu upotrebljavaju se različiti nazivi: najčešće *bosančica*, zatim *bosanska ćirilica*, *bosanica*, *bukvica*, *bosansko pismo*, a tendenciozno i nenaučno upotrebljavali su se i nazivi *hrvatska ćirilica*, *hrvatsko pismo*, *bosansko-hrvatska ćirilica*, pa čak i naziv *srpsko pismo*. (...) ustavna bosančica bila je u upotrebi od X do XV vijeka.” (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 49)

IV. Illyrian Movement

As regards the interpretation of the Croats’ Illyrian movement, we can notice various emphases: Serbian linguist Ž. Stanojčić talks about these people “having worked on creating of the united standard language and orthography, which is common both for the Serbs and the Croats” (“rad na stvaranju jedinstvenog književnog jezika i pravopisa, zajedničkog za Srbe i Hrvate”, 4A), and in his opinion Lj. Gaj’s Neo-Shtokavian language is “a literary language of Vukovian type” (“književni jezik vukovskog tipa”, 4A); however this attribute is missing in the earlier edition of his grammar book (4B).

SERBIAN:

4A/ “(...) u prvoj polovini XIX veka najvažniji deo ilirskog književno-kulturnog programa bio je rad na stvaranju jedinstvenog književnog jezika i pravopisa, **zajedničkog za Srbe i Hrvate**. (...) Otuda su oni 1836. godine za književni jezik uzeli najrasprostranjenije, *novoshtokavsko narečje ijekavskog izgovora*, koje je kao književni jezik, uostalom, već bilo potvrđeno u bogatoj dubrovačkoj književnosti, i time se našli na istoj opštoj liniji sa našim velikim reformatorom Vukom Stef. Karadžićem. (...) Ljudevit Gaj (...) učinio da se **novi, književni jezik vukovskog tipa** spoji sa tradicijom i tako postane opšti književni jezik Hrvata. (...) Iako se književni jezik razvijao na *istoj osnovi*, hrvatski ilirci bili su za to da osnova za njegovo bogaćenje, osim narodnog, bude i jezik iz prošlosti, pre svega jezik dubrovačke književnosti XV—XVIII veka. Vuk Karadžić je, s druge strane, tu osnovu video samo u aktualnom narodnom jeziku i u jeziku narodnih umotvorina. Ove razlike u pristupu zajedničkom književnom jeziku, međutim, ne menjaju strukturu toga jezika.” (Stanojčić 2010: 31)

4B/ "(...) da se novi književni jezik spoji sa tradicijom i tako postane opšti književni jezik Hrvata, (...)." (Stanojčić — Popović 2004: 18)

Unlike Stanojčić, S. Babić puts the emphasis on the fact that the Shtokavian version was spread among Croats even before the Illyrian movement, and that the members of the movement wanted to unite linguistically all southern Slavs (4C), but were not successful. When we compare all three used issues of the Težak and Babić's grammar, we can notice the process of substitution of internationalism *grafija* — only the word *grafija* (4E), then presence of Croatian word *slovopis* along with *grafija* (4D), and finally only *slovopis* (4C). Such approach in specialized text we can characterize as typical example of language purism.

CROATIAN:

4C/ "Sve je Hrvate u jednom jeziku i u jednom slovopisu, tipu slova za pisanje glasova, ujedinio tek Ljudevit Gaj. (...) Gaj je naišao na neznatan otpor jer je postupao vrlo taktično, a s druge strane jer je i prije njega na kajkavskom području bilo shvaćanja da treba uzeti štokavski književni jezik i pokušaja da se tako piše (Draškovićeva *Disertacija*), kajkavci su smatrali da preuzimaju svoje, a ne nešto tuđe. Zato Gaj zapravo i nije prekinuo jezičnu tradiciju, nego je nastavlja, u prvom redu dubrovačku i slavonsku. On je dakle jedan od hrvatskih književnih jezika, koji je u Hrvata već bio izgrađen i prije preporoda, proširio i na kajkavsko područje. (...) **[Gaj i ilirci] nastojali su da u književnom jeziku ujedine sve Južne Slavene.** Zato su hrvatski jezik nazvali ilirskim i zato su neke pojedinosti prilagođavali tomu cilju. **No to je bilo više deklarativno, praktički su to ostvarili samo kod Hrvata štokavaca, čakavaca i kajkavaca.** (...) [Š]iroka se ilirska ideja pokazala neostvarljivom. Svi su južnoslavenski narodi krenuli svojim putovima." (Težak — Babić 2009: 14)

4D/ "Sve je Hrvate u jednom jeziku i u jednom slovopisu (grafiji), tipu slova za pisanje glasova, ujedinio tek Ljudevit Gaj." (Težak — Babić 1996: 13)

4E/ "Sve je Hrvate u jednom jeziku i u jednoj grafiji, tipu slova za pisanje glasova, ujedinio tek Ljudevit Gaj." (Težak — Babić 1994: 13)

Bosniak Dž. Jahić's interest in the Illyrian movement is guided only by the role of this movement as regards Bosnian language, as seen in example 4F.

BOSNIAN:

4F/ “Ilirski preporoditelji **bosansko jezičko naslijeđe uključuju u sastav ilirskog jezika**, sve dok pojam “ilirizam” nije potisnut pojmom “kroatizam”, pri čemu je **bosanski jezik nazivan i smatran dijelom hrvatskog jezika**. S druge strane, **Vuk Karadžić** je smatrao da su Bošnjaci, kao i svi narodi štokavskog narječja, u stvari Srbi, te stoga **njihov jezik također naziva srpskim.**” (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 55)

V. The Vienna Literary Agreement

The so-called Vienna Literary Agreement (“Bečki književni dogovor”) of 1850 is closely related to the Illyrian movement. In the Serbian grammar book this agreement is traditionally presented as a starting point for the common linguistic and literary path of Serbs and Croats. In GSKJ (unlike in the earlier GSJ) it is also emphasized that this is Vukovian type of the literary language (5A, 5B).

SERBIAN:

5A/ “Gotovo istovremeno sa Vukovom delatnošću, pristalice ilirskog pokreta u Hrvatskoj, predvođeni *Ljudevitom Gajem*, napuštaju kajkavsko narečje u funkciji hrvatskog književnog jezika i uzimaju štokavsko narečje ijekavskog izgovora. Na taj su način **ilirci i Vuk utrli put budućem zajedničkom književnom jeziku. Književnim dogovorom** u Beču 1850. godine, ilirci D. Demeter, I. Kukuljević, I. Mažuranić i drugi, zajedno sa Vukom, Đ. Daničićem i F. Miklošičem, **pozvali su srpske i hrvatske pisce da pišu novim, vukovskim tipom književnog jezika**. Mladi naraštaji ljudi koji su delovali u kulturi prihvatili su ovaj poziv, pa se tokom celog preostalog dela XIX veka zajednički književni jezik razvijao na idejama Vuka i iliraca.” (Stanojčić 2010: 28)

5B/ “(...) pozvali su hrvatske i srpske pisce da pišu **novim tipom književnog jezika**.” (Stanojčić — Popović 2004: 16)

In the Croatian grammar book information about the Vienna Agreement can be found only in GHJ94. The Agreement’s description made by Babić can be characterized as the typical Croatian view of this event. The sentences “coming from mistaken assumption” (“polazeći od krive

pretpostavke”) and “mainly under Karadžić’s influence” (“najviše pod Karadžićevim utjecajem”, 5C) illustrate an attempt to explain why during this period the Croats are seeking some kind of a language union with the Serbs. In the grammar book’s next edition (GHJ96) paragraph 14. has been changed entirely to provide a conclusion about the period of the Illyrian movement as a kind of Croatian revival. In this edition (Težak — Babić 1996: 14) the Vienna Agreement is not mentioned at all. The same applies to the 2009 edition (Težak — Babić 2009: 14). That is, even though in the oldest of the editions analysed the Agreement is mentioned in at least one paragraph, its significance is strongly marginalized and it is interpreted as a mistake, which has remained “without immediate influence on the later development of Croatian and Serbian standard language” (“bez neposrednog utjecaja na kasniji razvoj hrvatskoga i srpskoga književnog jezika”, 5C). Removing the information about the Vienna Agreement from the later editions can be seen as the endpoint of this marginalization.

CROATIAN:

5C/ “Polazeći od krive pretpostavke da su Hrvati i Srbi jedan narod i da prema tome trebaju imati jednu književnost i jedan književni jezik, 1850. godine sastaju se u Beču Hrvati I. Kukuljević, D. Demeter, I. Mažuranić, V. Pacel i S. Pejaković, Srbi V. S. Karadžić, Đ. Daničić i Slovenac F. Miklošič i zaključuju, najviše pod Karadžićevim utjecajem, da je najbolje od narodnih narječja izabrati jedno da bude književni jezik, da je najbolje da to bude ijekavski govor i da pisanje treba biti što bliže izgovoru. Taj dogovor, nazvan Bečkim književnim dogovorom, ostao je bez neposrednog utjecaja na kasniji razvoj hrvatskoga i srpskoga književnog jezika.” (Težak — Babić 1994: 14, paragraph 14)

As regards the Vienna Literary Agreement, the authors of the Bosnian grammar book are once again interested only in the Agreement’s impact on Bosnian language, or how Bosnian language benefited from the Agreement. Jahić, of course, concludes that there was no benefit at all (5D); on the contrary — he sees in it “a strictly political form of agreement between the Serbs and the Croats” (“uska politička forma sporazuma između Srba i Hrvata”, 5D). In Jahić’s opinion, “the Bosnian tradition is not explicitly named, is non-scientifically negated and is not

spoken about” (“Bosanska tradicija se ne imenuje, nenaučno se negira i prešutkuje”, 5D).

BOSNIAN:

5D/ “U zaključku Dogovora stoji kako za temelj zajedničkog jezika treba uzeti “južno narječje”, tj. Vukov hercegovački i Gajev štokavsko-ijekavski dijalekt kao književni. Tu, međutim, nije ni spomenuta Bosna kao matica toga govora i te dijalekatske baze. **Nije uvažavana pisana bogomilska, bosanskomuslimanska i franjevačka tradicija, a bosanski jezik također nije ni spomenut. Dogovor je u stvari bio jednostrana i uska politička forma sporazuma između Srba i Hrvata.** Tu je ispoljena izrazita unitaristička koncepcija zajedničkog jezika na račun središnje bosanske i crnogorske tradicije. Bosanska tradicija se ne imenuje, nenaučno se negira i prešutkuje. Takav pristup nasljeđuje se (oko sto godina kasnije) i u koncepciji samog Novosadskoga dogovora iz 1954. godine. Time je postavljen temelj za naimenovanje jezika: srpskohrvatski-hrvatskosrpski, a historijski naslijeđeni naziv *bosanski jezik* istisnut je iz lingvističke upotrebe.” (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 55—56)

VI. Language Policy in Yugoslavia

As the sixth topic, we selected language policy in Yugoslavia and its reflection in analyzed grammars. An excerpt from the Serbian grammar serves as a testimony that its author views the period of common literary language almost idyllic:

SERBIAN:

6A/ “Sociolingvistički gledano, kraj XIX i početak XX veka doneli su pojačane veze među srpskim i hrvatskim piscima i javnim radnicima, pa tako i među njihovim kulturama u celini, čime se **zajednički književni jezik**, koji je tokom većeg dela XX veka imao naziv srpskohrvatski (...), **bogatio iz raznovrsnih izvora sa cele teritorije na kojoj se govorio. Tome je doprineo i život u zajedničkoj državi Jugoslaviji (...), kao i zajednički život i kulturni razvoj (...) u federalnoj državi, koja je ustavno i tome jeziku, i svim drugim jezicima (...) koji su se u toj državi govorili — garantovala upotrebu u kulturi, kao i uopšte u javnoj i službenoj upotrebi.**” (Stanojčić 2010: 32)

A totally different interpretation is found in the Croatian grammar. The period of the first Yugoslavia was not idyllic at all (6B); in the second Yugoslavia, however, the position of the language was better, although at the same time the Croatian language "experienced second decroatianisation" ("doživio drugo rashrvaćivanje", 6B). Babić describes the period of the Novi Sad Agreement (1954) and the *Declaration* (1967). (6D). The years after the breakup of SFRY for Croatian language mean liberation and return to old positions (6D), which should automatically be accepted positively. The direction of the Croatian language policy is well seen in the correction of one sentence (6C) from GHJ94, which also speaks of "language expressions" ("jezični izrazi"). GHJ96 and GHJ09 already speak of "languages" ("jezici", 6B).

CROATIAN:

6B/ "Stvaranjem prve Jugoslavije 1918. godine silom srpske vlasti, zakona, odluka i propisa koji su protegnuti na Hrvatsku ili koji su donošeni u Beogradu samo na srpskome jeziku, srpski se književni jezik znatno proširio na štetu hrvatskoga i tako je na mnogim područjima (...) naglo prekinuta hrvatska jezična tradicija, ali ni takvim nasilnim postupcima nije postignuto jezično jedinstvo. (...) U početku je u drugoj Jugoslaviji u načelu priznato svakomu narodu da se služi svojim jezikom pa su zakonski priznata četiri ravnopravna jezika: hrvatski, srpski, slovenski i makedonski, ali je tada hrvatski jezik doživio drugo rashrvaćivanje." (Težak — Babić 2009: 16)

6C/ "U socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji u početku je prepušteno svakom narodu da se služi svojim jezičnim izrazom." (Težak — Babić 1994: 15)

6D/ "Budući da je **Novosadski dogovor iskorištavan za dokazivanje da hrvatski književni jezik ne postoji** i da je unifikacija političkom i upravnom prevlasti imala težnju da prevladaju srpske književnojezične osobine, kako se to dogodilo u BiH, u ožujku 1967. osamnaest hrvatskih kulturnih ustanova potpisuje *Deklaraciju o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika* tražeći da se u Ustav SFRJ unese odredba kojom će se jasno i nedvojbeno utvrditi ravnopravnost četiriju književnih jezika: slovenskoga, hrvatskoga, srpskoga i makedonskoga. Taj zahtjev nije prihvaćen, nego je *Deklaracija* doživjela žestoku političku osudu. (...) **Sa stvaranjem slobodne Hrvatske hrvatski se književni jezik počinje snažnije pohrvaćivati u onome dijelu u kojem je bio rashrvaćen.** U jednome smislu vraća se na 1918. (...), a u drugome na 1945. (...)." (Težak — Babić 2009: 17)

Bosnian grammar suggests a view that once again resonates Serbo-Croatian language is something in which the Bosnian language “flows into like an undercurrent” (“*utanja poput ponornice*”) and that is the reason why it “disappears” (“*nestaje*”, 6E). Jahić interprets the Novi Sad Agreement as the period of Illyrian movement or the Vienna Literary Agreement, as an agreement between Serbs and Croats in which there is no place for the language of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian and even Montenegrin areas (6E). The term *Bosnian language* “returns to use” (“*vraća se u upotrebu*”, 6G) during the war in the 1990s.

BOSNIAN:

6E/ **“Bosanski jezik u vrijeme između dva svjetska rata svoje pisane forme razvija u sklopu srpskohrvatskog jezika. Više nema nikakvog spomena o tome jeziku. U vrijeme kad naziv bosanski jezik ponovo utanja poput ponornice, nestajući iz zvanične upotrebe, svijest o njemu i njegovoj historičnosti ne zamire. (...) *Novosadski književni dogovor* iz 1954. godine i *Pravopis srpskohrvatskog jezika* iz 1960. godine, mada polaze od principa jezičkog zajedništva, nastavljaju tradiciju dvovarijantnosti srpskohrvatskog jezika sa njegovim centrima u Beogradu i Zagrebu. Oni zanemaruju središnji jezički prostor, ne samo bosanskohercegovački već i crnogorski.”** (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 61)

6F/ “U vremenu između 1970. i 1980. godine u Bosni i Hercegovini dolazi do pojačane aktivnosti u raspravama o bosanskoj jeziku, o jezičkom zajedništvu, toleranciji i književnojezičkoj politici.” (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 62)

6G/ “U toku rata na svim nivoima upotrebe vraća se naziv *bosanski jezik*. Oko toga su u početku bila lutanja i nedoumice; da li se njime imenuje jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini ili samo jezik Bošnjaka, da bi ubrzo prevladala teza značenja toga jezika kao maternjeg jezika Bošnjaka.” (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 63)

VII. Summary

As regards the language classification (i. e. standard languages on the former Serbo-Croatian area), data in the Serbian grammar (Živojin Stanojčić), the Croatian grammar (Stjepan Babić) and the Bosnian grammar (Dževad Jahić) are more or less the same, i. e. SERBIAN \approx CROATIAN \approx BOSNIAN.

As regards the interpretation of the versions of Old Church Slavonic language, the Glagolitic alphabet (Glagolitsa) and the Bosnian alphabet (Bosanchitsa), the Serbian grammar book does not contain enough data for this period, and the data in the Croatian grammar book differs from that in the Bosnian one. This can be illustrated schematically as follows: SERBIAN (\approx) CROATIAN \neq BOSNIAN.

As regards the Illyrian movement, the Vienna Literary Agreement, and the period of Yugoslavia, the Serbian grammar book presents these periods in a rather idyllic way — the emphasis is put on the cooperation between Serbs and Croats, which reached its peak in the Yugoslav state. In the Croatian grammar book these periods are presented as a wrong attempt for cooperation or a kind of closer connection with the Serbs on the Croats' part, or (mainly in later periods) like a faith of the Croats for language independence, against Serbian language hegemony and language unitarism. In the Bosnian grammar book those three periods are presented as periods of various agreements between Serbs and Croats, which however leaves no room for the language views of Bosnia and Herzegovina's Muslim population. This can be illustrated schematically as follows: SERBIAN \neq CROATIAN \neq BOSNIAN.

SELECTED INTERPRETATIONS OF VUK STEFANOVIĆ KARADŽIĆ'S WORK ("C-S" POINT OF VIEW)

I.

Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (*1787 in Tršić, Ottoman Empire /now in Serbia/, †1864 in Vienna, Austria) is till these days a personality whose work and thoughts induce amusement, as well as critique and condemnation. During his life, Vuk was supported mainly by the prominent Slavonic Studies scholar of the first half of 19th century, **Jernej Kopitar** (1780—1844), that significantly redounded to creation of "Karadžić the philologist". It was Kopitar who found Karadžić and incited him to start collecting oral tradition works, who supported him in the ambition to reform back-then design of Serbian standard language (so-called Slavonic-Serbian language) in both the grammar and graphic form, based on vivid common speech on which most of the oral tradition was based. Vuk's reform of standard Serbian was a breaking point that diversified it from the more unrestrained conception of hybrid Slavonic-Serbian language with elements of Russian redaction of Church Slavonic, and in firm enforcement of modern face of standard Serbian as a language close to people, based on one of the vivid dialects. As the most spread and suitable dialect Karadžić saw the "South" one, now known as Neo-Shtokavian subdialect of Ijekavian pronunciation (Eastern Herzegovinian dialect

or Eastern Herzegovinian–Krajinian), that came from the area of his origin and that he knew very well.

Karadžić's linguistic work soon bore fruit by publishing a first small grammar book (*Pismenica srpskoga jezika, po govoru prostoga naroda napisana*, 1814), written in not yet reformed standard language, and little later by well-known Serbian Dictionary (*Srpski rječnik*, 1818, second extended edition 1852) that included actualized version of Vuk's Serbian Grammar (*Srpska gramatika*) as well.

During his life, he experienced disagreement from very important positions: except of Serbian prince **Miloš Obrenović** (in reign 1815—1839 and 1858—1860) there were also main protagonists of Serbian Orthodox Church, led by metropolitan of Karlovci and Belgrade **Stefan Stratimirović** (in office 1790—1836) that preferred to distinguish between high-style language one can use for science as well, and language of common people with different expressive means. Among the others that disagreed with V. Karadžić there was **Jovan Hadžić** (pseudonym **Miloš Svetić**, 1799—1869), one of the founders and first chairman of the Matrix Serbica (*Matica srpska*), that insisted on Slavonic-Serbian standard language and that was the main opponent of Vuk's reforms. Another strong opponent of Vuk's reforms was Serbian writer from the back-then South-Hungarian Vojvodina, **Milovan Vidaković** (1780—1841), that promoted conservative attitude to language and script, and saw any interventions to Serbian Cyrillic script as impervious. Another writer and public agent from Vojvodina **Evstatije-Eta Mihajlović** (1802—1888) criticized Karadžić in 1862 for the reform of Cyrillic script, that was harmful for Serbian language and Serbian nation, and was — according to him — supported by the “enemies of the Cyrillic script”. Literary historian **Jovan Skerlić** (1877—1914) said in 1907 about Karadžić's language reform that one cannot dogmatically stick to purity of original, “the only true” standard language (that means Karadžić's language), he knew that even standard language succumbs to dynamic processes and therefore changes.

On the other hand, against Hadžić and supportive of Vuk Karadžić stood — with his publication called *The War for Serbian Language and Orthography* (*Rat za srpski jezik i pravopis*, 1847) — Đura Daničić (by his own name Đorđe Popović, 1825—1882). With this publication he stepped into the polemique between Karadžić and Hadžić after the publication of

Hadžić/Svetić article *Utuk III jezikoslovni. O jeziku i pravopisu srbskom* (1847), and extensively contributed to enforcement of Karadžić's reforms. Clear support was given to Karadžić's work during the existence of Yugoslavia, in the era most sympathetic to concept of common Serbian and Croatian language (and later Montenegrin and Muslim/Bosniak as well), the so-called Serbo-Croatian concept. Support for this concept as polycentric language with two equal variants of standard language was declared in December 1954 in Novi Sad in the house of the Matrix Serbica at the meeting of leading specialists in linguistic and cultural authorities from important Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian scientific and cultural institutions. Vuk Karadžić, and the main protagonist of Illyrian movement, **Ljudevit Gaj** (1809—1872), became proponents of this conception, even though that real impact on bringing Serbian and Croatian standard language together had the following generation of linguists — Đura Daničić, **Vatroslav Jagić** (1838—1923) and Croatian members of the so-called Vukovite movement lead by **Tomislav Maretić** (1854—1938). Compliments were raised to Vuk's language and his Serbian Dictionary (*Srpski rječnik*, 1818) by f. e. **Meša Selimović** (1910—1982) in his publication *Za i protiv Vuka* (1987), from where also the article *Vukov srpski jezik*, lately published in compilation *Srpski pisci o srpskom jeziku* (Kovačević 2003b: 95—98) came from.

But how is Vuk's opus viewed after 1990? We will pay most attention to radical positions — so-called **Neo-Vukovian**, also called "retrolinguistic" (Jovanović Maldoran 2012) on one side, and — let's say — **radical Croatistic** on the other.

II. Serbian Neo-Vukovite movement

Part of Serbian linguists that finds basis for their Serbian philological program (paradigm) in thought of Vuk Karadžić and foremost Slavonic Studies scholars from the first half of 19th century, are being called *Neo-Vukovites* by American Slavonic Studies scholar Robert Greenberg (2000/2005). According to him, they are "linguists (...) who advocate the return to the pure principles of the 19th century Serbian reformers

Vuk Karadžić and Đura Daničić” (Greenberg 2005: 77).⁴⁰ Prominent Neo-Vukovite linguists are already mentioned Miloš Kovačević and f. e. Petar Milosavljević, Radoje Simić and others. This group criticized strictly promoters of Serbo-Croatian paradigm (f. e. Pavle Ivić) that — according to them — “collaborated with the Croats, and by working together on a common Serbo-Croatian language, made a disservice to the Serbian people” (Greenberg 2005: 79).⁴¹

Miloš Kovačević (2003a: 48) see Karadžić’s division of dialects, as it was presented in the well-known article *Srbi svi i svuda* (written in 1836 already, but issued only in 1849), as still valid. He notes, that Karadžić’s classification was not different from those advocated by main authorities in Slavonic Studies of that era (J. Dobrovský, J. Kopitar, P. J. Šafařík, F. Miklošič, J. Grimm and others). He contrasts — quoting **Petar Milosavljević** — Karadžić’s philological paradigm, that steams (in simple terms) from the view “all the Serbs are viewed as Shtokavians, and all Shtokavian literature is viewed as Serbian” (Kovačević 2003a: 79)⁴² and Jagić’s philological paradigm, that stands on the ideas of Illyrian and South-Slavonic movement (Kovačević 2003a: 77). Karadžić’s Serbian orientation is put in contrast with Jagić’s Serbo-Croatian orientation, that was at last accepted by the Serbs themselves, so since the end of 19th century is Karadžić’s philological program put aside: “Jagić’s philological program (...), even though in basis purely Croatian, is being showed as Vukovite, so step-by-step it is being accepted by Serbians as well, not seeing anything dangerous in it, as it was at start presented not as Croatian, but as Croatian and Serbian. (...) Jagić’s philological program of Serbo-Croatian fully replaced Vuk’s philological program of Serbian.”⁴³

Kovačević (following on Milosavljević; Kovačević 2003a: 78—79) states basic differences between Karadžić’s and Jagić’s program (the two above mentioned paradigms) and sums them in four points:

40 Orig.: “jezikoslovci (...), koji se zalažu za povratak čistim načelima devetnaestostoljetnih reformatora srpskog jezika Vuka Karadžića i Đure Daničića.”

41 Orig.: “suradivali s Hrvatima radeći na zajedničkom srpsko-hrvatskom jeziku učinili medvjedu uslugu srpskom narodu.”

42 Orig.: “svi Srbi su smatrani štokavcima, a sva štokavska književnost smatrana je srpskom.”

43 Orig.: “Jagićev filološki program (...) iako u osnovi čisto hrvatski, prikazivan je kao vukovski, pa su ga postepeno usvajali i Srbi, ne videći u njemu nikakve opasnosti, jer je on, najprije, prezentiran ne kao hrvatski, nego i kao hrvatski i kao srpski. (...) Jagićev filološki program serbokroatistike potpuno je potisnuo Vukov(ski) filološki program srbistike.”

1. KARADŽIĆ: Serbs and Croats speak different languages (Shtokavian and Chakavian), however JAGIĆ: Serbs and Croats speak the same language (Croatian or Serbian);
2. KARADŽIĆ: Shtokavian language is in fact Serbian language, however JAGIĆ: Shtokavian language is in fact Serbo-Croatian, or put differently, Croatian or Serbian;
3. KARADŽIĆ: Serbian language has only one main dialect — Shtokavian, however JAGIĆ: Serbo-Croatian has three main dialects: Shtokavian, Chakavian and Kajkavian;
4. KARADŽIĆ: Only Shtokavians speak Serbian, irrespective of religion — Orthodox, Catholics and Muslims, however JAGIĆ: Serbo-Croatian, that differs from Vuk's Serbian in name only, is spoken by Serbs as well as Croats, and these differ from one another in confession only, where Serbs are exclusively Orthodox and Croats exclusively Catholics.

From what has been said till now we can conclude that Đ. Daničić was Karadžić's follower only till his departure for Zagreb and that as Vuk's real followers we can name **Laza Kostić** or **Ljubomir Stojanović**, where among supporters of Jagić's Serbo-Croatian program there were Daničić (since his arrival to Zagreb), **Tomislav Maretić** and **Aleksandar Belić** (1876—1960). Predecessors of this program were supporters of Illyrian movement (Kovačević 2003a: 79—80). According to Neo-Vukovite linguists, Serbian philology of 20th century stepped aside from Vuk's Serbian-oriented positions and chose Serbo-Croatian orientation of Jagić instead, defending it even more than Croats themselves (because of whom this program was promoted) during some periods of 20th century (the Second World War, the turn of 60s and 70s or during the dissolution of Yugoslavia; Kovačević 2003a: 81).

III. Radical Croatists

Serbo-Croatism, at the beginning of which stands Vuk Karadžić, is being criticized from totally opposite positions by f. e. **Stjepan Babić**,

typical proponent of Croatian nationalistically-oriented philology. In the prologue to Croatian issue of monography *Hrvatski jezik i serbokroatizam* by **Leopold Auburger** (2009: 7) he states: “The book that lies in front of us is not only an overview of external history of Croatian language, but also a representation of linguistic and political program that aims at unifying Croatian and Serbian and under the domination of Serbian at creating a Serbo-Croatian as a separate language. This program was defined and named Serbo-Croatian, what complemented Slavonic and Croatian terms.”⁴⁴ Auburger goes on in his text on this topic: “After the transfer, the long-term strategic goal of Serbo-Croatism was to shift the Croatian language into the Serbian developmental path, and eventually replace it with the new Serbian. In that way, Croatian as a separate language had been exhausted” (Auburger 2009: 61).⁴⁵

While Neo-Vukovite linguists Kovačević and Milosavljević see Karadžić with his opinions on typology similar to Dobrovský, Šafařík, Kopitar and Miklosich, advocating Serbistic paradigm, Auburger and Babić blame the very same group for spreading Serbo-Croatism, in fact something what is in opposition to Serbism: “Cooperation of Josef Dobrovský, Jernej Kopitar, Josef Pavel Šafařík and Vuk Karadžić in the conceptual and terminological foundation of South Slavonic typology and classification has already in the very beginning impacted the typology of South Slavonic languages in favour of Serbo-Croatism and is doing so till today” (Auburger 2009: 63).⁴⁶ Vuk Karadžić is therefore for nationalistic oriented Croatian linguists unambiguously blamable person, as he is “All-Serbian and Great-Serbian oriented” (Auburger 2009: 65 and many other places).⁴⁷

In a soberer way are Karadžić’s views being reviewed by Polish Slavonic scholar **Barbara Oczkova**, that in her extensive and hermeneutically very

44 Orig.: “Knjiga koja je pred nama, nije samo pregled vanjske povijesti hrvatskoga jezika, već upravo i prikaz jezično-političkoga programa koji je imao cilj unificirati hrvatski i srpski i pod dominacijom srpskoga stvoriti “srpskohrvatski” kao zaseban jezik. Taj je program Auburger definirao i nazvao serbokroatizmom, čime je bitno upotpunio slavističko i kroatističko pojmovlje.”

45 Orig.: “Dugoročni strateški cilj serbokroatizma bio je nakon transfera hrvatski jezik općenito preumjeriti na srpsku razvojnu putanju te ga na kraju konačno zamijeniti novim srpskim. Na taj bi način hrvatski kao zaseban jezik bio dokinut.”

46 Orig.: “Sudjelovanje Josefa Dobrovškoga, Jerneja Kopitara, Josefa Pavla Šafařika i Vuka Karadžića u pojmovnom i terminološkom utemeljenju južnoslavističke tipologije i klasifikacije već je u samim početcima usmjerila tipologiju južnoslavenskih jezika u korist serbokroatizma te ju je sve do današnjih dana gurala na njegov kolosijek.”

47 Orig.: “svesrpski i velikosrpski nastrojen.”

precise monography *Hrvati i njihov jezik* (2010) did not forget to remark later Karadžić's revision of positions on relation *ethnos — language* from the article *Srbi svi i svuda* (in fact talk "about the Serbs everywhere, though they lived",⁴⁸ as Vuk specified in one letter from 1861 to the redaction of Zagreb article *Pozor —* see Milosavljević 2002: 155) issued in new article *Srbi i Hrvati* (1861). In this article he confirms his original classification ("Serbians = Shtokavians, Croats = Chakavians and Kekavians in Kingdom of Croatia used to that name"),⁴⁹ as he views it as scientifically and ethnolinguistically objective, however adds: "If Croatian patriots will not agree on this rational division, we cannot do anything else but divide ourselves by law or confession: who is under Greek or Oriental law, regardless where he lives, he cannot reject Serbian name, and from those under Roman law, anybody can say he is Croat if he wants" (Oczkova 2010: 272, see also Milosavljević 2002: 154).⁵⁰

IV. Serbian Ultrationalists

From totally different positions is Karadžić being criticized by the most extreme Serbian nationalists, that blamed him after 1991 for being "the spy of the Austrian government"⁵¹ and that his real ambition was to help Croats to "steal" Serbian Shtokavian dialect (Greenberg 2005: 81 is quoting Miroslav Samardžić [*Tajne Vukove reforme*. Kragujevac 1995]). Refusing Karadžić's reforms by Serbian ultrationalists (in whose world-view Orthodoxy plays — at least at verbal level — a significant role) can be seen also in the name of one of such oriented organizations — *Srbska Akcija* ("Serbian Action"). Adjective in this name is intentionally written in morphonological script (it should be *Srpska Akcija* according to valid standard norm), that was standard in Slavonic-Serbian language, that

48 Orig.: "o Srbima svima, makar gdje stanovali."

49 Orig.: "Srbi = štokavci, Hrvati = čakavci i kekavci u Kraljevini Hrvatskoj na to ime naviknuti."

50 Orig.: "Ako Hrvatski rodoljupci ne pristaju na ovu na razumu osnovanu diobu, onda se za sad u ovome ništa drugo ne može učiniti nego da se podijelimo po zakonu ili vjeri: ko je god zakona Grčkoga ili istočnoga onaj se makar gdje stanovao neće odreći Srpskoga imena, a od onih koji su zakona Rimskoga neka kaže da je Hrvat koji god hoće."

51 Orig.: "Špijun austrijskih vlasti."

means in that form of standard Serbian that Vuk criticized and replaced by his standard language based on widely-spoken Serbian.

If all the above mentioned statements were valid at the same time, Vuk Karadžić would have been careless and cynical Great-Serbian nationalist, moderately said active Serbian patriot — typical “product” of his era, that — however — worked against Serbia and Orthodoxy in service of Vienna and Vatican, and further even liquidator and Croatizator of Serbian Shtokavian and at the same time liquidator and Serbizator of Croatian language — all this covered by the idea of Serbo-Croatism, while working his whole life on creation and establishment of modern Serbian language based on Neo-Shtokavian dialect...

V.

At the end of this short excursion among current Vuk’s followers and opponents, we would like to quote foremost Serbian philologist **Predrag Piper** that basically stated that Vuk Karadžić (but not him only) should not be viewed strictly as a positive actor (glorification) or on the other hand strictly as a negative actor, and advised to look at his legacy in sober way, if possible objectively, not to refuse positive aspects of his work and not to be afraid to point out the discrepancies and weak sides of him as a scientist (Piper 2004: 195).

**SELECTED SOUTH SLAVONIC LANGUAGES
AND THEIR REFLECTION
IN THE RELEVANT CONSTITUTIONAL ARTICLES
ON LANGUAGE
(OVERVIEW OF THE LANGUAGE POLICY
IN THE AREA OF SO-CALLED
CENTRAL SOUTH SLAVONIC DIASYSTEM)**

I.

Introduction — a Brief Summary of the Situation Before 1918

Whereas the official status of the **Croatian** language in the Croatian lands of the Habsburg monarchy passed through the 19th century with various twists and turns (alternation of prohibitions and permits, the search for optimal denominations) and the language of the Croats reached a final enactment in the framework of the Croatian–Hungarian settlement in 1868 (under the name of the Croatian language),⁵² in the constitutions at that time of the already existing **Serbian** state, questions of the official language and its name were not addressed in any way whatsoever. Similarly, there is no mention of the official language in the first Constitution of the Principality of **Montenegro** in December 1905 (see Vujošević 2005). The constitution for **Bosnia and Herzegovina** of 1910, i. e. two years after its annexation by Austria–Hungary, in Article 11, merely states general features of the right to preserve national identity and the language, but in the Instructions for Parliamentary Activity, in Article 33, the Serbo–Croatian language (“srpsko–hrvatski”) is mandated as the

52 See ŠARINIĆ, J. *Nagodbeno Hrvatska*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 1972, p. 288–289, quote as per *Hrvatsko-ugarska nagodba 1868*. [online] Available at: *Hrvatski jezični portal* <http://hjp.novi-liber.hr/index.php?show=povijest&chapter=20-hrv_ugar_nagodba>.

official language of the provincial parliament, and it is also mandated that all parliamentary papers must be written in both Latin and Cyrillic.⁵³

II. The Period from 1918 to 1944

From the point of view of the development of the concept of a common language of **Croats and Serbs** — other modern-day South Slavonic nations could not participate because either they simply did not exist in this sense (Bosniaks) or they were not sufficiently mature or recognized enough (Montenegrins, Macedonians), or they spoke an entirely different language (Slovenes, Bulgarians) — in the first half of the 20th century, it is important to note that this unitarist stream was prepared prior to the establishment of a common South Slavonic state thanks to the activities of Serbian linguists Vuk S. Karadžić and Đura Daničić, Croatian philologist Vatroslav Jagić, and especially the scientific and publishing activities of Croatian followers of Karadžić's language concepts, i. e. Tomislav Maretić, Ivan Broz, Franjo Iveković, etc. Therefore, the creation of a common South Slavonic state in December 1918 appeared to be a logical national and political outcome of previous cultural, social and language efforts. The constitution of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes of June 1921 (the so-called *Vidovdanski ustav*, i. e. Constitution of the Day of St. Vitus), valid until January 1929, and the subsequent Constitution of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia of September 1931, state (in Article 3) that the official language is “srpsko-hrvatsko-slovenački”, i. e. Serbo-Croatian-Slovenian. Although the name of the language was consistent with the idea of a unified nation of three names, the intention was rather the father of the idea — the linguistic reality was different: the Slovenes cultivated their Slovenian language and the proclaimed Croatian-Serbian unity was also very shaky, if it existed at any. That is why the three-member

53 Orig.: “Zemaljski ustav (štatut) za Bosnu i Hercegovinu — § 11. Svim zemaljskim pripadnicima ujemčeno je čuvanje narodne osobine i jezika.” “Saborski poslovni red — § 33. Raspravni jezik u saboru jest srpsko-hrvatski. Zvanični zapisnik, stenografske sjedničke izvještaje kao i sve ostale spise saborske pisarnice namijenjene saboru treba sastaviti u oba pisma (latinici i ćirilici).” See *Zemaljski ustav (štatut) za Bosnu i Hercegovinu*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/117687515/Bosanski-ustav-1910#scribd>>.

construct of the unified state or political language of Yugoslavia belongs to the same category of empty idealistic, but pragmatic proclamations as the “Czechoslovak language” known from interwar Czechoslovakia.

Probably the most significant departure from the **Croats’** attempts at unitarization was brought upon by the Second World War and, in particular, the short existence of the Independent State of Croatia (ISC). The ultranationalist views of the Ustaša regime of Ante Pavelić were also reflected in the language, particularly in the subsequent application of new linguistic laws, cf. *Zakonska odredba o zabrani ćirilice*, i. e. the Decree on Cyrillic Prohibition, 1941, or the *Zakonska odredba o hrvatskom jeziku, o njegovoj čistoći i o pravopisu*, i. e. the Act on the Law of the Croatian Language, on its Purity and Spelling, 1941, which stated that, among other things, “The language spoken by the Croatian is by its origin, its historical development, its dissemination in the Croatian national territory, in way of pronunciation, grammatical rules and meaning of individual words, the original and unique language of the Croatian nation, and is not identical to any other language, nor is not a dialect of any other language or common language shared with any other nation. That is why it is called the Croatian language” (Article 1); “The Croatian official and literary language is the Shtokavian dialect of Jekavian or Iekavian pronunciation. (...)” (Article 4); “The Croatian language uses morphological, not phonetic spelling” (Article 7).⁵⁴ **Bosnia and Herzegovina** were essentially a part of the ISC at that time, so the laws of the Croatian language naturally applied to them.

The name of the language of the **Montenegrins** as Montenegrin language first appeared in the 1941 draft of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Montenegro, which was prepared by the Italian occupying

54 Article 1: “Jezik, što ga govore Hrvati, jest po svom izvoru, po poviestnom razvitku, po svojoj razprostranjenosti na hrvatskom narodnom području, po načinu izgovora, po slovničkim pravilima i po značenju pojedinih riječi izvorni i osebujni jezik hrvatskog naroda, te nije istovjetan ni s jednim drugim jezikom, niti je narječje bilo kojega drugog jezika, ili bilo s kojim drugim narodom zajedničkog jezika. Zato se zove “hrvatski jezik”.”

Article 4: “Hrvatski službeni i književni jezik jest štokavsko narječje jekavskoga odnosno iekavskoga govora. Gdje je u ikavskom govoru kratko “i”, ima se pisati i izgovarati “je”, a gdje je u ikavskom govoru dugo “i”, ima se izgovarati i pisati “ie”.”

Article 7: “Na hrvatskom se jeziku ima pisati po korienskom, a ne po zvučnom pravopisu.” See *Zakonska odredba o hrvatskom jeziku, o njegovoj čistoći i o pravopisu*. [online] Available at: [http://hjp.novi-liber.hr/?show=povijest&chapter=26-zakonska_odredba](http://hrvatski.jezicni.portal<http://hjp.novi-liber.hr/?show=povijest&chapter=26-zakonska_odredba>). Only the comment see also *Zakonska odredba o hrvatskom jeziku, o njegovoj čistoći i o pravopisu*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. [online] Available at: <<http://ihj.hr/iz-povijesti/zakonska-odredba-o-hrvatskom-jeziku-o-njegovoj-cistoci-i-o-pravopisu/44/>>.

power. Article 3 states that the official languages of the Montenegrin state are Montenegrin and Italian (“Službeni jezici Države su crnogorski i italijanski” — see Burzanović 2010). However, this constitution never entered into force. This incriminating formulation is more of a reflection of the rejective attitudes towards Serbia and all things Serbian maintained at the time than a result of natural sociolinguistic development or scientific linguistic research.

III. The Period from 1944 to 1954

The resistance led by Tito communists created the Anti-Fascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia (*Antifašističko veće narodnog oslobođenja Jugoslavije*, AVNOJ) in the autumn of 1942, which began coordinating military operations throughout the territory of Yugoslavia. In Decision No. 18 of 15 January 1944, the AVNOJ ordered that all its decisions and declarations, as well as all documents of the National Committee for the Liberation of Yugoslavia (*Nacionalni komitet oslobođenja Jugoslavije*, NKOJ), should be officially published in Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian and Macedonian languages and that all these languages shall be equal throughout the territory of Yugoslavia (Greenberg 2005: 124). Yugoslavia was restored after the Second World War, but not as a monarchy: the new state now represented a federation of six people’s republics (Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia and Montenegro — in this respect, Article 2 of the Constitution of the Federative People’s Republic of Yugoslavia). It was also declared the home of five equal peoples: Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians and Montenegrins (each of which was represented on the new state emblem with a torch), ruled by the Yugoslav communists headed by Josip Broz Tito. The new Constitution of the Federative People’s Republic of **Yugoslavia** in January 1946 was written in four language versions, in line with the regulation of the AVNOJ. However, the official language of the FPRY was not clearly specified, and the same can be said of the constitutions of its federal republics. Article 65 on the publication of laws and other official texts only vaguely refers to the languages of the individual republics, and Article 120 expresses the language of legal proceedings in a similar way.

However, the Croatian and Serbian constitutions are specific in aspects of linguistic policy: the Constitution of the People's Republic of **Croatia** (1947) states that the judicial proceedings are conducted “na hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku” (i. e. in the Croatian or Serbian language, Article 112), whereas the Constitution of the People's Republic of **Serbia** (1947) states that judicial proceedings are conducted in Serbian and in autonomous units also in Croatian, as well as in the languages of national minorities (which are, of course, precisely stated in the Constitution, note PK) in which the jurisdiction of the court is located (Article 141). There is, therefore, a certain mismatch, but it has its own explanation, since in Croatia both Croats and Serbs were constitutive, i. e. equal peoples, while in Serbia, Croats were mainly in the newly established Autonomous Province of Vojvodina. The combination of “hrvatski ili srpski” in the Croatian constitution could be interpreted either as a real possibility of choice (Croatian *or* Serbian), or rather as the use of the established (terminologized) Croatian dual-component labeling of the common language (i. e. Croatian *and/or* Serbian) used before 1945, or 1918, but almost exclusively by Croats — cf. the names of the grammar of Maretić or spelling of Boranić.⁵⁵ Also, in the Constitution of the People's Republic of **Montenegro** of December 1946, the language is not explicitly stated, but — as in the Serbian Constitution — Article 113 states that the proceedings are conducted in the Serbian language. For the Constitution of the People's Republic of **Bosnia and Herzegovina** of December 1946, the same is true in principle, only Article 63 states that laws and other regulations are published “na srpskom ili hrvatskom jeziku”. This faithfully reflects the ethnic and linguistic situation in this central Yugoslav republic.

III.1

The Novi Sad Agreement (1954)

The question of whether Serbs, Croats, Montenegrins, and the Slavonic Muslim population, mainly from Bosnia and Herzegovina, speak two or more different languages, or if they speak only variants of one common literary language — Serbo-Croatian, was once again opened by a survey

55 MARETIĆ, T. *Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb 1899; BORANIĆ, D. *Pravopis hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Zagreb 1921.

in the journal *Letopis Matice srpske*, whose results stimulated a meeting of Serbian and Croatian linguists in December 1954. The meeting took place in Novi Sad and was organized by the Matrix Serbica (Matica srpska), which is headquartered there. Today, Croatian linguists, in particular, agree in their assessments that the real objective was to state the need to unify Serbian and Croatian orthography as well as professional terminology, i. e. the factual need to create one functional literary language for the people of the then People's Republic of Serbia, the People's Republic of Croatia, the People's Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the People's Republic of Montenegro. In the *Letopis* survey, which preceded the meeting, there were, among other things, proposals for the Croats to renounce the Ijekavian pronunciations and in turn for the Serbs to renounce the Cyrillic script. However, they were not accepted by any of the parties concerned (the Serbian literary critic Jovan Skerlić came up with the same idea in his similar survey in 1914). Finally, the need for unity was confirmed — Croatian linguists, however, claim that it was under the pressure of political circumstances. The agreed conclusions of the meeting (the *Novosadski dogovor*) could be loosely interpreted as follows: 1) The language of the Croats, Serbs and Montenegrins is one language, so even the standard language that evolved around two centers, Belgrade and Zagreb, is unified, but with two pronunciation variants: Ekavian and Ijekavian; 2) In the case of the naming of this language on official occasions, it is always necessary to express both components (Serbian and Croatian) and thus to use the names *Serbo-Croatian*, or *Croato-Serbian*, or *Serbian or Croatian*, or *Croatian or Serbian* (“srpskohrvatski”, “hrvatskosrpski”, “srpski ili hrvatski”, “hrvatski ili srpski”); 3) Both pronunciation variants are equal; 4) Both graphical systems used — Latin and Cyrillic — are equal; 5) In this spirit, it is necessary to create a dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian language, terminological dictionaries and common orthography.⁵⁶ The agreement, although at first glance fair, still contained the seeds of future tensions and friction. Firstly, it did not address the status of the language standard in Bosnia and Herzegovina or Montenegro and, on the other hand, allowed the creation and spread of mistakes, that the Ijekavian variant of Serbo-Croatian is

56 The whole text see *Novosadski dogovor (1954)*. [online] Available at: <http://govori.tripod.com/novosadski_dogovor.htm>.

exclusively western, i. e. *de facto* Croatian, and that the Serbian variant, i. e. eastern, is only Ekavian. This, in turn, influenced both the language of the Croats, to which began to flow through the Ijekavian “channel” several Ijekavian as well as Serbian expressions (e. g. Serbian *bezbednost* (ek.)/*bezbijednost* (ijek.), “security”, but in Croatian it is *sigurnost*), and the language of Serbs outside Serbia (and perhaps also Montenegrins), who, in turn, feared that their language would be considered a “western variant” in view of the Ijekavian pronunciation, and would thus be exposed to Zagreb’s normative superiority, i. e. Croatian influence. Both consequences were naturally perceived by the nationalists on both sides as being significantly negative. On the other hand, the Novi Sad agreement actually acknowledged the pluricentric character of the language, which could be either western, i. e. the Croatian variant (exclusively Ijekavian), or eastern, i. e. the Serbian variant (mainly Ekavian).

IV. The 1960s

The new Constitution of the Socialist Federative Republic of **Yugoslavia** of April 1963, in Article 42, generally formulates the equality of the languages and scripts of the peoples of Yugoslavia, but with the exception of communication in the army where commands, teaching and administration are performed in the Serbo-Croatian language. In the Constitution of the (renamed) Socialist Republic of **Serbia** in April 1963, in addition to the universal declarations of equality of languages and scripts of nations and ethnics, we only find clarification of language in Article 164 regarding laws and other official texts to be published in the Serbo-Croatian language and in Article 169 whereby public authorities with a public mandate shall conduct proceedings in the Serbo-Croatian language. The term Serbo-Croatian (“srpskohrvatski jezik”) also appears in two statutes, i. e. the Statute of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina and the Statute of the Autonomous Province of Kosovo and Metohija (here together with Albanian), which are part of the Serbian Constitution of 1963. In the **Croatian** constitution of the same period, Article 247 reads that the proceedings in the courts and other authorities are conducted

in “Croato–Serbian” (“na hrvatskosrpskom jeziku”). The Constitution of the Socialist Republic of **Bosnia and Herzegovina** of April 1963 speaks in Article 216 of the publication of the Republic’s laws and other official texts in the Serbo–Croatian language. Elsewhere, it declares the equality of languages and scripts of all the peoples of B&H. In the 1963 Constitution of the Socialist Republic of **Montenegro**, the official language in the chapter on proceedings before state authorities is stated as being Serbo–Croatian (Article 217), again in line with the official language of Serbia.

IV.1

Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language (1967)

The political disintegration in the second half of the 1960s as well as the dissatisfaction of a significant proportion of the Croatian professional and cultural public with the status of the Croatian language in Yugoslavia, resulted in the writing and publication of the Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language (*Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika*, 1967).⁵⁷ Its main objective was to achieve an amendment to the Constitution of the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) in the sense that it is clear that there are four constitutive languages in Yugoslavia: Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian and Macedonian. The declaration was signed by many Croatian cultural and scientific institutions (universities, the Matrix Croatica, the association of writers, the Croatian Philological Society, etc.). The immediate reaction from the central authorities was to reject it. One can say that the declaration was one of the impulses of the outbreak of the so-called Croatian Spring (1971), which meant an upsurge in Croatian national consciousness (or nationalism — depending on the point of view) against its stigmatization and the forced Yugoslav unity, for which Croats often saw Serbian assimilation policies. However, the process of unraveling mainly from the political causes of the maintained unity of Serbo–Croatian had already begun. The theoretical underpinning of the articulation of Croatian law on its own existence was primarily prepared by linguist Dalibor Brozović (1970). Important cultural and political support for the path of the Croatian language towards politically declared independence

57 The original text with comments e. g. *Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika: grada za povijest Deklaracije*. J. Hekman (ed.). 3. izm. 1 dop. izd. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1997.

was, among other things, the withdrawal of the signature under the Novi Sad Agreement by the Matrix Croatica, the Croatian Philological Society, the Institute for Linguistic of the South-Slavonic Academy of Sciences and Arts (JAZU) and the Society of Writers of Croatia, which occurred in 1971.

V. The 1970s

The year 1974 marked a significant change in constitutional order at a federal level, as well as in the individual republics and autonomous regions. Significant changes mainly concerned the very nature of the Federation, but they also included language issues. In the 1971 Supplement to the Constitution of the **SFRY**, the issue of the official language is unambiguously transferred to the individual republics. In the new wording of the Constitution of the SFRY of February 1974, apparent decentralization is evident in passages about the language used in the army, where in the administration and training structures it is possible to use “one of the languages of the peoples of Yugoslavia”, and in its parts the languages of nations and ethnics (Article 243). In addition, the article states the equivalence of the languages and scripts of the nations *and ethnics* of Yugoslavia.

The relevant articles of the new **Serbian** constitution of February 1974 do not differ substantially from the original version of 1963. Language is mentioned only in Article 233 on laws and other official texts to be published in the Serbo-Croatian language and in Article 240 that public authorities with public authority shall conduct proceedings in the Serbo-Croatian language. In a generally formulated chapter on socialist autonomous regions, language is not mentioned. The 1972 supplement to the **Croatian** constitution, and subsequently the new Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Croatia of 1974, states that in public relations (“u javnoj upotrebi”) “Croatian literary language — the standard form of the national language of Croats and Serbs in Croatia, which is called Croatian or Serbian” shall be used.⁵⁸ Article 293 further

58 Article 138: “U Socijalističkoj Republici Hrvatskoj u javnoj je upotrebi hrvatski književni jezik — standardni oblik narodnog jezika Hrvata i Srba u Hrvatskoj, koji se naziva hrvatski ili srpski”. It is probably one of the most complicated definitions of an official language that we could encounter in the given context. The spasmodic effort to “feed the wolf, but at the same time save the goat” is by definition more than obvious.

specifies that authentic federal texts of laws and other regulations shall be published in the Official Journal of the SFRY in Croatian literary language, in Latin alphabet (“na hrvatskom književnom jeziku, latinicom”). The new constitution of the SR of **B&H** of February 1974 contains a separate article about language (Article 3). It is written that the official language of Bosnia and Herzegovina is Serbo–Croatian, respectively Croato–Serbian language with Ijekavian pronunciation (“srpskohrvatski, odnosno hrvatskosrpski jezik ijekavskog izgovora”). It also states the equality between Cyrillic and Latin. A similar modification was also made to the new constitution of the Socialist Republic of **Montenegro**. According to which, the official language in Montenegro is Serbo–Croatian language with Ijekavian pronunciation (“srpskohrvatski jezik ijekavskog izgovora”) and again an equality in the scripts is declared (Article 172).

VI. Yugoslavia on the Eve of Collapse

Testament to the fact that even the Serbs felt threatened by questions of the free use of the mother tongue at the end of the existence of the Yugoslav Federation is included in the Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts of 1986 (this was in fact a draft version of the prepared text that escaped to press — for more see Štěpánek 2011: 344—350), which states in point 5(b), among other things, “The parts of the Serb nation that live in a significant number in other republics, do not have the right, in contrast to national minorities, to use their language and script, to be politically and culturally organized, to develop the unique culture of their nation together”.⁵⁹ This is a clear indication of the status of the Serbian language in Croatia — the 1974 constitution, seemingly justly formulated to accommodate all, in the opinion of the Memorandum, in fact disadvantaged the Serbs over the Croats. The reinforced political position of Serbia in the Federation was reflected in the new Constitution of the

59 Orig.: “Delovi srpskog naroda, koji u znatnom broju žive u drugim republikama, nemaju prava, za razliku od nacionalnih manjina da se služe svojim jezikom i pismom, da se politički i kulturno organizuju, da zajednički razvijaju jedinstvenu kulturu svog naroda.” See Memorandum Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti (nact). Jesen 1986. [online] Available at: *Peščanik.net* <https://peščanik.net/wp-content/PDF/memorandum_sanu.pdf>.

Republic of **Serbia** of September 1990, in a special article on language, according to which the official language in Serbia is Serbo-Croatian written in Cyrillic, with the official use of Latin regulated by a special law (Article 8). Special laws also regulated the official languages of ethnics that have the constitutional right to use them in the territories where they live.⁶⁰ The naming *Serbian language* was first mentioned in the 1991 Act on Language and Script, which states that Serbian is the official Serbo-Croatian language, whereby a Serbian language expression (“izraz”), be it Ekavian or Ijekavian, shall also be called Serbian language.⁶¹ Therefore, there was a clear shift towards the status that the Croats achieved at a constitutional level in 1972, and the explicit application of the Ijekavian pronunciation. Article 12 of the new Constitution of the Republic of **Croatia** of December 1990 defined the official language as being Croatian, with an official Latin alphabet. It further adds that, in individual municipalities (Cro. *općina*) other languages and Cyrillic or any other script may be used in official language besides Croatian and Latin, under the conditions laid down by law.⁶² Hence the Croats through this new constitution, finally and completely rejected Serbo-Croatian language, as the first Yugoslav nation “bound” by the Novi Sad Agreement. Bosnia & Herzegovina and Montenegro adopted their new constitutions only after the fall of SFRY. Yugoslavia, as we have known it since its inception, ceases to exist *de jure* in 1992, when the post-Yugoslav republics that gradually left Yugoslavia in 1991, i. e. Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia & Herzegovina and Macedonia were internationally recognized. Serbia and Montenegro formed the so-called third (Serbian-Montenegrin) Yugoslavia (officially the Federative Republic of Yugoslavia) in spring 1992, and then the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro (2003—2006). This unequal bound lasted until 2006, when Montenegro declared independence.

60 Article 8: “U Republici Srbiji u službenoj je upotrebi srpskohrvatski jezik i ćirilčko pismo, a latiničko pismo je u službenoj upotrebi na način utvrđen zakonom. Na područjima Republike Srbije gde žive narodnosti u službenoj upotrebi su istovremeno i njihovi jezici i pisma, na način utvrđen zakonom.”

61 Orig.: “U Republici Srbiji u službenoj je upotrebi srpskohrvatski jezik, koji se, kada predstavlja srpski jezički izraz, ekavski ili ijekavski, naziva i srpskim jezikom” — see Greenberg (2005: 74).

62 Article 12: “U Republici Hrvatskoj u službenoj je uporabi hrvatski jezik i latinično pismo. U pojedinim lokalnim jedinicama uz hrvatski jezik i latinično pismo u službenu se uporabu može uvesti i drugi jezik te ćirilčno ili koje drugo pismo pod uvjetima propisanim zakonom.”

VII. Summary of the Period Until 1990

The years of the first Yugoslavia and the Second World War can be characterized as a period of extreme linguistic unitarism on the one hand (one official language — “Serbo-Croatian-Slovenian” was officially proclaimed not only in the Central South Slavonic diasystem,⁶³ but the whole of the Yugoslav state) and extreme linguistic nationalism on the other hand (after the break-up of Yugoslavia by the Axis states, Croatian is introduced as the official language in Ustaša’s Croatia, Cyrillic is forbidden, and this process was accompanied by pronounced purism and archaic spelling); both poles are supplemented by a rarity of language separatism (the unrealized draft of the constitution of Montenegro under Italian tutelage took into account “Montenegrin” in addition to Italian).

The period of the first post-war constitutions can be summarized as follows: in the territory of the Central South Slavonic diasystem, i. e. the four “Serbo-Croatian” republics, two official languages — Serbian and Croatian — were officially recognized, whereby Serbian was in the constitutions of all of these republics, while Croatian was recognized only in Croatia and in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in Serbia only in the AP of Vojvodina. The question of the phonetic variants of the official languages (whatever they are called) is not explicitly addressed.

The period of the first socialist constitutions of 1963 is characterized by the fact that only one language is officially recognized in the territory of the Central South Slavonic diasystem, but in two variants: western, Ijekavian Serbo-Croatian (“hrvatskosrpski jezik”, i. e. Croato-Serbian — this term is only found in the Croatian constitution); eastern, Ekavian Serbo-Croatian (“srpskohrvatski jezik”). The question of phonetic variants is not explicitly solved in the constitutions because the naming

63 In Croatian: “srednjojužnoslavenski dijasistem”; language-diasystem is a term used by Dalibor Brozović to name the genetically linguistic aspect of languages — it indicates “isključivo genetskolingvističke zajednice, npr. bliskosrodnih dijalekata” (Brozović 2008: 18). The preference for the term “Central South Slavonic diasystem” over the common Serbo-Croatian language for indicating the language of the Serbs, Croats, Bosniaks and Montenegrins, is advocated by Brozović as follows: “Za taj jezik-dijasistem nema zadovoljavajućega naziva i zato se u slavistici i uopće u komparativnoj lingvistici služimo složenim terminom “hrvatskosrpski” ili “srpskohrvatski” — usprkos višestrukim slabim stranama toga dvočlanog i na dva načina izricanog naziva — jer nam je ipak potrebna nekakva nomenklaturna jedinica za taj pojam, npr. kada nabrajamo slavenske jezike-dijasisteme” (ibid.).

of the languages and the universal approach to it at the official level are based on the conclusions of the Novi Sad Agreement (1954).

The period of the 1974 revised socialist constitution is perceived by the fact that only one national language was still formally recognized in the territory of the Central South Slavonic diasystem, but its denominations were no longer in line with the Novi Sad Agreement — the Croatian constitution returns to the earlier denominations of a common language (“hrvatski ili srpski”, i. e. Croatian or Serbian), but its standard variant was already inadvertently referred to as the Croatian literary language (“hrvatski književni jezik”); the Serbian and Montenegrin constitutions remained in Serbo-Croatian, while the Bosnian-Herzegovinian constitutions used both the Serbian and Croatian Serbo-Croatian denominations (“srpskohrvatski/hrvatskosrpski”) and explicitly refer to both variants. The phonetic variant was specified in the constitutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro — each time as Ijekavian.

The period of the new constitutions of Serbia and Croatia of 1990, adopted at the end of the existence of the SFRY, is characterized by a sharp shift in the territory of the Central South Slavonic diasystem — in the two federal republics, Serbo-Croatian remained exclusively valid (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro), in one Serbo-Croatian, which under certain circumstances can be called Serbian (Serbia), and in the other exclusively Croatian (Croatia). The position of the language of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Croats was unclear (the Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina did not yet formally recognize the Croatian language). The Novi Sad structure of a pluricentric Serbo-Croatian language, which was disturbed by the 1974 constitutions (especially the Croatian one) began to collapse definitively.

VIII. Republic of Croatia

The official status of the language in Croatia, as defined in the 1990 constitution, was also confirmed in the revised constitution of April 2001. During the era of President Franjo Tuđman (1922—1999, head of Croatia from 1990 until his death), there was a politicization of language issues

and inappropriate purist interventions, especially in the lexical plan. For example, it can be seen in the violent revival of archaism or the often insensitive creation of neologisms to replace “Serbian” words, for which expressions of international (Latin-Greek) origin were often considered. This noticeably purist effort was somewhat mitigated after the death of President Tuđman, but above all, at the level of professional debate, where there is still an ongoing dispute between supporters of greater or absolute control over the language emphasizing the significance of the symbolic level of the function of the literary language (so-called prescriptivists or purists, which may include Sanda Ham, Stjepan Babić or Mario Grčević, cf. e. g. the focus of papers in the journal of the Croatian Philological Society *Jezik* /“Language”/) and supporters of greater freedom of language emphasizing above all the communication level of the function of the literary language (so-called descriptivists, in rare cases holding theses of the pluricentric character of Serbo-Croatian, thus not recognizing the existence of more standard languages in its space, as these so-called languages are considered as standard Serbo-Croatian variants — this approach is represented in particular by Snježana Kordić). Heightened exchanges of views are full of invective and ironic notes on both sides.

VIII.1

Memorandum of the Matrix Croatica on the Croatian Language (1995)

In addition to intra-Croatian disputes and exchanges of opinion, particularly in the 1990s, Croatian linguists, writers and other culturally active persons strongly demonstrated the desire to defend their own newly-acquired independent language from attacks from their Serbian counterparts. Evidence of these political clashes taking place in linguistics can be found in the Memorandum of the Matrix Croatica on the Croatian Language (*Promemorija o hrvatskome jeziku Matice hrvatske*), written in December 1995 (i. e. during the peace talks in Dayton and Paris on the end of the war in the territory of the former Yugoslavia, but mainly in Bosnia and Herzegovina). The Memorandum as a whole advocates in particular the right of the Croatian language to independence; it attempts to prove that the Croatian language is different from Serbian in all directions, although both languages are very close, and the analogy of Croatian vers. Serbian can be seen in such pairs as Dutch vers. German, Norwegian

vers. Danish, Slovak vers. Czech. The text is divided into three chapters and does not have a specific author. According to the Memorandum, the Croatian language has included Shtokavian, Chakavian and Kajkavian dialects since the 14th — 15th century. Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, during his work on the contemporary Serbian literary language, was inspired by the Croatian literary language, its dictionaries and grammar manuals, which, according to the authors of the Memorandum, “Facilitated the expansionist efforts of the young Serbian state”. Unlike the approach of Serbian nationalist statements (see below), whose authors seemingly try to approach the whole issue scientifically, Croatian authors, on the contrary, rely on the views of “modern sociolinguistics”, and emphasize the important, if not fateful, role of cultural, historical, social, political, economic and psychological factors, and most of all the will of the speakers of the given language. Similar to the Serbian Neo-Vukovites (see below), even these Croatian nationalists do not positively favor the glossonym *Serbo-Croatian*, because they represent a unit on which “the Great-Serbian administration and diplomacy of the first and second Yugoslavia persisted”. The Croatian nation defied such a name for its language and finally rejected it in 1967 with a well-known Declaration (see above). Part of the resistance against the real and presumed demands of the Serbs is often the repeated assertion that the Serbs have their current literary language on the basis of the Shtokavian dialects since the 19th century thanks to Vuk S. Karadžić (previously they expressed themselves with various variants of the Church Slavonic language), whereas Croats have “for almost a thousand years, documented writings and literature in their native language”.

VIII.2

Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts on the Croatian Language (2007)

In January 2007, the Department of Philological Sciences at the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts (Razred za filološke znanosti HAZU) prepared a text with the lapidary name Croatian Language (*Hrvatski jezik*), which was published in the second issue of *Jezič* in April of the same year. Compared to the Memorandum, it is much more extensive and more detailed, in its own way it could be understood as a more comprehensive encyclopedia providing information on the history of the Croatian

language. Attitudes and opinions are not fundamentally different to the Memorandum, and there are no obvious shifts in argumentation either. The period of narrow Croatian–Serbian language contacts is portrayed as permanent pressure by the Serbian authorities on the serbization of the Croatian language and thus the constant need to defend Croatian linguistic independence. The Novi Sad Agreement about common language (1954) is perceived in the text as a “dictate” (p. 47). Only the Declaration of 1967 is perceived as a turn in a positive direction for the Croats. The conclusion includes a chapter on the standard language and the claim that the relationship between Croatian and Serbian cannot be perceived in the same way as the relationship between different variants of English or German, since Croatian and Serbian were never unified, there was never a common Neo–Shtokavian basis for all South Slavonic languages, nor any initial common standard language on a Neo–Shtokavian basis, which would later develop independently in different territories.

IX.

Federative Republic of Yugoslavia; Republic of Serbia; Republic of Kosovo; Republic of Montenegro (up to 2006)

The constitution of the newly constituted Federative Republic of Yugoslavia⁶⁴ of April 1992 only mentions the Serbian language and Ekavian and Ijekavian pronunciations in Article 15 (“U Saveznoj Republici Jugoslaviji u službenoj upotrebi je srpski jezik ekavskog i ijekavskog izgovora i ćirilično pismo, a latiničko pismo je u službenoj upotrebi u skladu sa ustavom i zakonom”). However, the *Serbian language* was already included in the Serbian or Serbia intervening constitution, in July 1991 (again after 44 years) by the amendment of the wording of Article 8

64 This is a state institution that was formed out of the ruins of the SFRY and was founded by representatives of Serbia and Montenegro. Under this name (Serb. Savezna Republika Jugoslavija) it existed as a so-called third or also Serbian–Montenegrin Yugoslavia until 2003, after which it was renamed to State Union of Serbia and Montenegro (Serb. Državna Zajednica Srbija i Crna Gora). The secession of Montenegro in May 2006 based on the very close result of the Montenegrin referendum (55.5 % for independence, whereby the EU set a threshold of 55 % for the result to be recognized — see https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Referendum_o_nezávislosti_Černé_Hory) meant the definitive end of the last remnants of Tito’s Yugoslav federation. The epilogue of the whole process was Kosovo’s separation from the framework of the Serbian state by it proclaiming independence in February 2008.

of the 1990 Serbian constitution, “u službenoj je upotrebi srpski jezik i ćirilčko pismo” — the adjective *srpski* “Serbian” replaced the previous *srpskohrvatski* “Serbo-Croatian” (Grčević 2011: 148). In accordance with both constitutions, the Constitution of the Republic of Montenegro was amended in October 1992 (for the first time in the 1990s), and after 46 years it again only mentions the Serbian language, of course with the Ijekavian pronunciation (this specification of the Montenegrin constitution has accompanied it since 1963). Unlike the Yugoslav and Serbian constitutions, however, it states the equality of the Cyrillic and Latin alphabets (Article 9: “U Crnoj Gori u službenoj upotrebi je srpski jezik ijekavskog izgovora. Ravnopravno je ćirilčno i latinično pismo”).

In June 1996, a new law on the official language was prepared in Serbia, which entered into force in 1997. According to this new law the official language is Serbian, with Ekavian variant of pronunciation and is written in Cyrillic. Accordingly, Ijekavian Serbian lost its official position in the territory of the Republic of Serbia and the so-called Novi Sad era was finally ended. The law was also in contraction to the wording of the Constitution of the FRY (see above).

IX.1

Declaration on the Serbian Language (1998)

In August 1998, several Serbs and other similarly-minded linguists (a total of 15 people), grouped together as the so-called World Congress of Serbs, published the Declaration on the Serbian Language (*Slovo o srpskom jeziku*) in a Serbian national newspaper “Politika”, and also in the form of a brochure in the same year. The publication represents a wider text advocating the attitudes of a part of the Serbian philological and intellectual community, whose essence lies both in the understanding of the Serbo-Croatian linguistic area as essentially exclusively Serbian, and in the fact that the existence of other nations is not factually recognized in the area of the Shtokavian dialects (Croats and Bosniaks are referred to as “Serbs with Catholic or Muslim religion” (e. g. pp. 7, 10, 11), respectively, the Croatian language is considered to be a Zagreb variant of the Serbian literary language, and according to the Declaration true Croats are merely Chakavian). These attitudes are often sharpened by the views of V. S. Karadžić and other important Slavists of his time, which are now

naturally obsolete. The Declaration returns to the widespread conviction among several Slavists in the 19th century (J. Dobrovský, P. J. Šafařík, J. Kopitar, F. Miklosich, V. S. Karadžić), for example, in the opinion that the Shtokavian dialects are Serbian dialects; therefore, today's Shtokavian based standard language (i. e. the language of the Serbs, Croats, Bosniaks⁶⁵ and Montenegrins) is also objectively Serbian, regardless of whether someone likes it or not, since it is *de facto* Karadžić's Serbian. The Declaration also declares the equivalence of the Ekavian and Ijekavian variants of Serbian as well as Cyrillic and Latin alphabets. The text of the Declaration is critical to glossonym *Serbo-Croatian* (and the other two-component names of common language), which, according to the Declaration, was forced upon Serbs by the Croats in order to gradually "appropriate" this Karadžić standardized modern Serbian literary language by making this composite — and its content — in order to subsequently split the separation of the Croatian language, and create the impression that something was divided that was previously united — according to the Croats against their will. Similarly, the Declaration criticizes attempts made to separate the languages of the Bosniaks and Montenegrins. The document was universally rejected by the professional Slavist public as being radically nationalistic, and also by Decision No. 2 of the Board for Standardization of the Serbian Language (*U odbranu dostojanstva srpske jezičke nauke*) in the same month that the text was published (Brborić — Vuksanović — Gačević 2006: 72—76). In response to criticism of this decision published by one of the signatories, M. Kovačević, their position was reiterated by the members of the Board in September 1998 (Decision No. 4 — *Spoj neznanja, izmišljanja i arogancije* — *ibid.*: 79—81). Nevertheless, the argumentative substance of the Declaration is still shared by a relatively large number of Serbian professional and lay public.

IX.2

Conclusions of the Novi Sad Scientific Conference "The Serbian Question and Serbian Studies" (2007)

Further proof of this is given by the declarative text of the Conclusions of the Novi Sad Scientific Conference on the Serbian Question and Serbian

65 For more on the naming of *Bosniak* as the English equivalent orig. *Bošnjak* see below XI.1.

Studies (*Zaključci Novosadskog naučnog skupa "Srpsko pitanje i srbistika"*) of November 2007. The conclusions are divided into six chapters and their opinions are essentially identical to the spirit of the Declaration. The conference was organized by the Movement for the Restoration of Serbian Studies (*Pokret za obnovu srbistike*) with the support of the "Government of the Republic of Serbian Krajina in Exile" (*Vlada Republike Srpske Krajine u progonstvu*). There are 60 names below the Conclusions, but it is not clear whether all of the participants in the conference can be considered to be the intellectual kindred spirit of the Conclusions, although at the beginning of the first section of the Conclusions it is stated quite clearly that: "... the participants of the conference accepted this conclusion" (Milosavljević — Subotić 2008: 139). The text is primarily concerned with the tasks of Serbian studies as a new, post-Serbo-Croatian science. This science should deal with the Serbian area both synchronously and diachronically, in the intentions of the Neo-Vukovite point of view. It is emphasized that the Shtokavian dialects are Serbian, refuting any other names used for the Serbian language, especially the term Serbo-Croatian language. According to the Conclusions, Croats surrendered their language in the 19th century and adopted the "Ijekavian variant of the Serbian language", which is not unnatural from the point of view of world practice, but it is unnatural and unscientific to rename the adopted language of another nation. Glagolitic and Cyrillic are the origins of Serbian script, which other Slavonic nations also adopted, etc. (ibid.: 139—142).

The protectionist approach of several Serbs to their own language, which would be analogous to the strong Croatian prescriptivism and purism, is expressed primarily in relation to Cyrillic — its mystical nature, the connection of the spirit and the language of the nation and of course its threat, which is metaphorically depicted as a threat to the existence of the Serbian nation itself. A picture of the battle between Cyrillic and Latin, which, in similar circles, is seen as one of the manifestations of the heroic struggle of the Orthodox Slavonic world against the collapsing Western civilization, is presented to the public (for more details see Jovanović Maldoran 2012).

Returning to the constitutional articles, the Constitutional Charter of the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro of March 2002 does not address the issue of language at all, but articles on languages in the constitutions

of both confederated republics remain in force (see also Grčević 2011: 148). Article 10 of the new constitution of the independent Republic of Serbia of November 2006 states Serbian in Cyrillic as the official language and graphic system (“U Republici Srbiji u službenoj upotrebi su srpski jezik i ćirilčko pismo. Službena upotreba drugih jezika i pisama uređuje se zakonom, na osnovu Ustava”). The form of the phonetic variant is therefore not explicitly declared. The official use of Latin alphabet (and other languages) is traditionally regulated by law in accordance with the constitution.

Most recently, Serbian — in addition to Albanian — is recognized as the official language of the independent Kosovo (Article 5 (1) of the Constitution of the Republic of Kosovo of June 2008 states: “Službeni jezici u Republici Kosovo su albanski i srpski jezik”).

X. Montenegro (after 2006)⁶⁶

The preparatory phase of the separation and composition of the Montenegrin standard language took place in the 1990s and is linked to the extensive, often somewhat amateurish, publishing activity of Vojislav Nikčević (1935—2007). In 1994 a group of Montenegrins led by the Montenegrin PEN Center adopted a Declaration on the Constitutional Status of the Montenegrin Language, which title is *Language as a Homeland (Jezik kao domovina. Deklaracija Crnogorskog PEN centra o ustavnom položaju crnogorskog jezika* — see <<http://www.montenet.org/language/pen-decl.htm>>), because the Montenegrins were the only nation on the territory of the former Serbo-Croatian language whose mother tongue bore the name of a foreign nation (see Neweklowsky 2010: 122). The declarers’ objective was that in the Montenegrin constitution the glossonym *Serbian* be replaced with *Montenegrin*. At that time, in 1995, there was also remarkable international support in the form of the Resolution of the International PEN Center on the Montenegrin Language (*Rezolucija Međunarodnoga PEN centra o crnogorskom jeziku*), which was prepared during the 62nd Congress of the International PEN Club held

66 More about the language situation in Montenegro see Chapter 7.

in Perth, Australia (see https://hr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crnogorski_jezik, unfortunately we did not get the text of the resolution — note PK). The final stage of Montenegrin language separation can only be seen under the conditions of an independent Montenegro, i. e. after 2006. Apart from organizing various expert debates and conferences on the topic, this phase can be characterized by five major events: 1) the constitutional anchoring of the Montenegrin language (first realized in 2007) 2) the death of the “father of the Montenegrin language” Vojislav Nikčević (2007), 3) publication of the orthography (2009), 4) publication of the grammar (2010), and 5) the introduction of the Montenegrin language as the main language as well as the language of primary and secondary schools (as of the 2011/12 school year). Article 13 of the new Constitution of Montenegro of October 2007⁶⁷, states that the official language is Montenegrin, but at the same time it adds that Serbian, Bosnian, Albanian and Croatian can be used in official relations (“Službeni jezik u Crnoj Gori je crnogorski jezik. Ćirilčno i latinično pismo su ravnopravni. U službenoj upotrebi su i srpski, bosanski, albanski i hrvatski jezik”). Traditionally, it declares the equality of the two scripts, the pronunciation variant is no longer mentioned, in Montenegro only Ijekavian is spoken, and the potential risk of enforcing the Ekavian variant from Belgrade at the expense of the Ijekavian in view of the new political reality has ceased. For example, the Serbian linguist M. Kovačević points out the nonsense in the wording of the constitutional article on the language of Montenegro, and criticizes, in this sense, the apparent differences in the expressions of official language (“službeni jezik”) and language, which can be used in official relations (“jezik u službenoj upotrebi”) (Kovačević 2015: 90).

The specifics of the Montenegrin standardization discourse are as follows:

1. In addition to the deceased literary scientist V. Nikčević, his young follower linguist Adnan Ćirgić, linguist Rajka Glušica and the philosopher from Novi Sad Milenko Perović, a significant number of foreign linguists were involved in the codification

67 In accordance with the new constitution, Montenegro surrendered its official (political) name the Republic of Montenegro and officially left only the geographical name, which became the only universal identifier of that state. It has extended the number of European countries that have done the same in the long off and not so long off past (Ireland, Georgia, Ukraine, Romania, Hungary, Bosnia and Herzegovina).

of the original Montenegrin language. The Croat Josip Silić and Ukrainian Lyudmila Vasileva were involved in the orthography, and Milenko Perović led the committee. The authors of the most recent grammar were the Croats Josip Silić and Ivo Pranjković, and to a lesser extent Adnan Čirgić (who “montenegrized” the original Croatian grammar of Silić and Pranjković,⁶⁸ particularly in the area of illustrative language material). Support of the Montenegrin language was also expressed by a number of other foreign Slavists;

2. The existence of at least three linguistic centers (radical Montenegrists — followers of the V. Nikčević legacy, associated around A. Čirgić at the Institute of Montenegrin Language and Literature, which became the Faculty of Montenegrin Language and Literature in Cetinje in 2014, moderate Montenegrists, associated around R. Glušica and the program of Montenegrin language and South Slavonic literatures at the Faculty of Arts in Nikšić, and the more or less Neo-Vukovite focus of the Serbists, associated around Jelica Stojanović and the Serbian language and South Slavonic literatures program at the Faculty of Arts in Nikšić), all three streams are linked by relatively intensive mutual hostility;
3. The Montenegrin language or its literary standard enforced by radical Montenegrists and codified in the above-mentioned orthography (2009) and grammar (2010) textbooks, as one of the “survivors” of Serbo-Croatian it contains new phonemes and the corresponding letters in its standardized form (their entry in Latin alphabet is Š, Ž and 3 /3/).

68 SILIĆ, J. — PRANJKOVIĆ, I. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*. Zagreb 2005.

XI. Bosnia and Herzegovina

Article 4 of the first Constitution of the independent Bosnia and Herzegovina of 1992, revised in March 1993, states that the official language of the Republic of B&H is Serbo-Croatian, respectively Croato-Serbian language with Ijekavian pronunciation. It also states the equality between Latin and Cyrillic.⁶⁹ The official language is redefined by regulatory legislation of August 1993, whereby it continues to be “the literary language with Ijekavian pronunciation, which is called one of the three names: Bosnian, Serbian, or Croatian”. International recognition of the Bosnian language came during the Dayton and Paris peace agreements in 1995, although in the new Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which came into force with the signature of the Framework Peace Agreement in Paris in December 1995, does not explicitly speak of the languages of the state, it is left to the constitutions of the individual entities, i. e. the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FB&H) and the Republic of Srpska (RS). Article 6 of the Constitution of the FB&H approved by the Parliament of the FB&H in March 1994 states, among others, that the official languages of the Federation are Bosnian and Croatian and the official alphabet is Latin.⁷⁰ Paragraph 1 is important as it states Bosnian and Croatian as the official languages, with Bosnian being constitutionally anchored for the first time.

Article 7 of the Constitution of the RS adopted by the Parliament of the RS in December 1992, modified and supplemented in accordance with the new post-war terms of December 1995, is formulated as follows: the official language of the Republic is Serbian with Ijekavian and Ekavian pronunciations, and Cyrillic alphabet; the official use of Latin is regulated by a special law.⁷¹ Its similarity to the constitution of

69 Article 4: “U Republici Bosni i Hercegovini u službenoj upotrebi je srpskohrvatski, odnosno hrvatskosrpski jezik ijekavskog izgovora. Oba pisma, latinica i ćirilica su ravnopravna”.

70 Article 6: “(1) Službeni jezici Federacije su bosanski jezik i hrvatski jezik. Službeno pismo je latinica. (2) Ostali jezici se mogu koristiti kao sredstva komunikacije i nastave. (3) Dodatni jezici mogu se odrediti kao službeni većinom glasova svakog doma Parlamenta Federacije, uključujući većinu glasova bošnjačkih delegata i većinu glasova hrvatskih delegata u Domu naroda”.

71 Article 7: “U Republici je u službenoj upotrebi srpski jezik ijekavskog i ekavskog izgovora i ćirilično pismo, a latinično pismo na način određen zakonom. Na područjima gdje žive druge jezičke grupe u službenoj upotrebi su i njihovi jezici i pisma, na način određen zakonom”. The first constitution of the Serbian state formation within Bosnia and Herzegovina was the Constitution of the Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina of February 1992, whose Article 7 was identical to that of the later Constitution of the Republic of Srpska.

the FRY is more than obvious, with only the Ijekavian variant being in first place, which is understandable given the character of the Bosnian Serb language. Nevertheless, in the autumn of 1993, the ruling RS was already attempting to eliminate the phonetic dualism from the standard language of the Bosnian Serbs. The initiator was the Chairman of the RS Parliament Momčilo Krajišnik, who attempted to formalize only the Ekavian variant, on the grounds that every ethnic that wants to be a nation must have united standard language (“svaki narod koji hoće da bude nacija mora imati jedinstven jezički standard” — see Brborić — Vuksanović — Gačević 2006: 217; Ijekavian could continue to be used in artistic style and simple communication — *ibid.*: 114, 216). This legal step was not enacted until 1996 by the Act on the Official use of Language and Script (*Zakon o službenoj upotrebi jezika i pisma*, for more details see Board Decision No. 38 — *ibid.*: 216—221). However, apart from exceptions (e. g. Pavle Ivić, was reluctantly positive about proposal), this step did not find support even in Serbia itself, e. g. the Board for Standardization of the Serbian Language clearly expressed in 1997 that both phonetic variants of pronunciation are equally Serbian. In 1998, the Parliament of the RS again formalized Ijekavian. The question of phonetic dualism is always topical. If we remember, Ekavian pronunciation only occurs in Serbia (although not throughout the territory). Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and all of Montenegro (no matter how they call their language) speak Ijekavian.

The constitutional articles on language were amended as a result of an Order of the Constitutional Court of B&H of 2000, supported by the opinion of the Office of the High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina, who was the Austrian Wolfgang Petritsch at the time (1999—2002), that the Constitution shall ensure the equality of all three languages throughout the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina (i. e. Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian). The Constitution of the FB&H included this amendment (replacing the previous version) of April 2002: “(1) Službeni jezici Federacije Bosne i Hercegovine su: bosanski jezik, hrvatski jezik i srpski jezik. Službena pisma su latinica i ćirilica. (2) Ostali jezici mogu se koristiti kao sredstvo komunikacije i nastave”. The proposal to amend the Constitution of the RS was as follows: “Srpski, hrvatski i bošnjački jezik, ćirilčno i latinično pismo, ravnopravno se upotrebljavaju

u Republici Srpskoj. Način takve službene upotrebe jezika i pisma uređuje se zakonom”. However, the text was not accepted by Petritsch, the problem was the Serbian designation of the Bosnian language as *bošnjački* “Bosniak” compared to *bosanski* “Bosnian”, which was preferred by the Bosniaks. Thus, the amended legislation of April 2002 finally took the following form: the official languages of the Republic of Srpska are: the language of Serbian nation, the language of Bosniak nation, and the language of Croatian nation. The official alphabets are Cyrillic and Latin.⁷² For the sake of interest, in the draft of the new Constitution of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was created by the four-member expert group of the Social Democratic Party of B&H in March 2009, Article 10 of the Rules of Procedure states that the official languages of the Republic of B&H are Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian, and the Latin and Cyrillic alphabet.⁷³

Bosnian was therefore constitutionally anchored in the constitutions of the Federation of B&H and Montenegro, and also in the constitution of the independent Kosovo (Article 5(2) of the Kosovo’s Constitution states: Turkish, Bosnian and Roma languages have the status of official languages at the municipal level or will be in official use at all levels as provided by law).⁷⁴ The Constitution of the Republic of Srpska deliberately avoids the adjective *bosanski* “Bosnian” as a linguistic function with the paraphrase *jezik bošnjačkog naroda* “language of Bosniak nation”.

XI.1

The terms “Bosnian” and “Bosniak”

The process of separating the Bosnian language began at the time of the political agony of the SFRY (for more about the historical context of the revitalization of the term *Bosnian language* see Hladký 2005: 280—281). It is clear that the leaders of Bosnian language separatism sought inspiration and support in particular from Croatian linguists. The specificity of Bosnia–

72 Orig.: “Službeni jezici Republike Srpske su: jezik srpskog naroda, jezik bošnjačkog naroda i jezik hrvatskog naroda. Službena pisma su ćirilica i latinica”.

73 Article 10: “(1) U Republici su u službenoj upotrebi bosanski, hrvatski i srpski jezik te latinično i ćirilično pismo. (2) Ostali jezici se mogu koristiti kao sredstvo komunikacije i nastave u skladu s ovim ustavom”.

74 Article 5: “(2) Turski, bosanski i romski imaju status službenih jezika na opštinskom nivou ili će biti korišćeni kao službeni na svim nivoima, u skladu sa zakonom”.

–Herzegovina standardization discourse can be found in the different views of the naming of the language of Bosniaks: there is competition between the adjective forms of *bosanski* “Bosnian” (derived from the toponym *Bosna* “Bosnia”) and *bošnjački* “Bosniak” (derived from the ethnonym *Bošnjak* “Bosniak”). The Bosniaks⁷⁵ are clear about this — they prefer the first option. Proof of this can be found, among other things, in the names of their basic language and linguistic handbooks, and it is also mentioned in the 2002 Declaration on the Bosnian Language (see below). The Serbs and the Croats (or many of their linguists), on the contrary, tend towards the name *bošnjački*, because from a word formation point of view this adjective clearly refers to the Bosniaks, the only nation of Bosnia and Herzegovina that calls its language so. Their arguments are explained in detail in the First Decision of the Board for Standardization of the Serbian Language of February 1998 (*Bošnjački ili bosanski jezik; sat ili čas; jevrejski, hebrejski (jezik) ili ivrit* — see Brborić — Vuksanović — Gačević 2006: 61—71). The original idea was that the glossonym *bosanski* would cover the language of all the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina, irrespective of their nationality. The motivation of such a designation was thus a shared space, “bosanski jezik” was to be a continuation of what was called Bosnian–Herzegovinian standard language expression of Serbo–Croatian, respectively Croato–Serbian literary language (“bosanskohercegovački standardni jezični izraz srpskohrvatskog, odnosno hrvatskosrpskog književnog jezika”) in the times of the SFRY and especially after the constitutional changes in 1974, i. e., in fact the Bosnian–Herzegovinian regional variant of Serbo–Croatian (see Greenberg 2005: 52—54). But this idea was already condemned to failure. At the time of tense nationalism on all sides, it was inconceivable that the Croatian and Serbian inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina would renounce the national naming of their languages, and accepted the “Bosnian language” without justification,

75 In the days of Socialist Yugoslavia, Bosniaks were called Muslims, S–Cr. *Muslimani* (sg. *Musliman*), for which the unusual orthographic designation (with a capital letter M in Serbo–Croatian) is first encountered in the writings of the Yugoslav communists of the Second World War, for example in the Resolution founding to AVNOJ of November 1942 and later AVNOJ documents. Their final recognition as the sixth constitutive Yugoslav nation (in addition to the Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Montenegrins and Macedonians) did not take place until the second half of the 1960s. The attempt to change this ethnonym rarity for a more common expression led political representatives of Bosnian–Herzegovinian Muslims to revitalize the name *Bošnjak* (in English: *Bosniak*), whereas the commonly used *Bosaniac* (in English: *Bosnian*) was to remain primarily to describe the inhabitants of Bosnia in the regional sense, regardless of national or religious preferences, but also to fulfill the function of naming the citizen of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

which was promoted by the Muslim part of the B&H population (and this attitude still holds true today). In addition, in Muslim views of the Bosnian language, they saw nationalist attempts to impose their own concept of language on the non-Muslim population of B&H. Hence, the name *Bosnian* refers, in essence, only to the standard language of the Bosniaks.

The syntagma “bosanski jezik” is first mentioned in the work of Konstantin Kostenečki *Skazanie izjavljeno o pismenah* from the turn of 15th century (Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000: 49). The first modern attempt to name the collective language of the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina as Bosnian was made by the Austro-Hungarian administration — the name *bosanski zemaljski jezik* (i. e. the Bosnian provincial language) was used in practice from 1 January 1879, but also *srpsko-hrvatski* or *hrvatsko-srpski jezik*. A major supporter of Bosnian regionalism as a tool against Serbian and Croatian nationalism, and therefore also a supporter of the regionally understood language for B&H — Bosnian, was the I&R Minister of Finance Benjamin Kállay, an ethnic Hungarian who was in charge of Bosnia and Herzegovina between 1882 and 1903, for most its occupation by the Austro-Hungarian Empire (1878 — 1908, then B&H was annexed and became an official part of the Habsburg monarchy). On his initiative, the first “Bosnian” grammar (*Gramatika bosanskoga jezika za srednje škole*) was developed by the Croat Fran Vuletić in 1890. The grammar is actually Croatian, the name is only politically motivated and the author himself was not too happy about the name of this language, which is why the first edition did not even bear his name. Vuletić’s grammar has been published several times, but since 1911 under the name *Gramatika srpsko-hrvatskoga jezika*. Kállay also encouraged the excellent Viennese Slavonic studies scholar, the Croat Vatroslav Jagić, to express his support for the Bosnian language, who, however, did not forget to point out that the language spoken in Bosnia is “the same language as the Serbs call Serbian and the Croats call Croatian” (Kraljačić 1974: 293—294, based on Hladký 2005: 91). By the Order of the Provincial Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina of October 1907, the official name of the so-called provincial language (in German *Landessprache*) in Bosnia and Herzegovina was finally changed to *srpsko-hrvatski* or *hrvatsko-srpski*, but due to the certain stability of the name *bosanski*, the government issued a new regulation in late November

1907, according to which it allowed autonomous institutions to continue to use this attribute for naming the official language.

XI.2

Declaration on the Bosnian Language (2002)

The Declaration on the Bosnian language (*Povelja o bosanskom jeziku*) of March 2002 was an attempt by Bosniak intellectuals to explain and defend the right of the Bosnian language to exist and to the chosen name. The Declaration was made at the Institute of Bosniak Studies at the BCS “Revival” in Sarajevo (*Institut za bošnjačke studije BZK “Preporod”*), and justification was given immediately in the prologue: “Due to the increasingly frequent questioning of the Bosniaks’ right to name their language by its historical name, we, assembling at the Institute of Bosniak Studies in the Executive Committee of the Bosniak Cultural Society “Revival” in Sarajevo, hereby convey to the public that our common position on this issue — which we confirm with our signatures — is expressed in this Declaration on the Bosnian language”. The Declaration is made up of 59 signatories and is not extensive, having only seven brief points. The authors of the Declaration see the Bosnian language as a manifestation of the common language of the Serbs, Croats, Bosniaks and Montenegrins, which is called by its name by each of these peoples. Serbian or Croatian non-recognition of the term *Bosnian* is seen as politically motivated and as a consequence of “surviving but not yet overwhelmed Serbian and Croatian paternalism and the negation of Bosniak national identity”. According to the Declaration, the preference of the term *Bosnian* does not in any way constitute efforts of unification or unitarization in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Codifiers of the Bosnian language are mainly concerned with the exceptional nature of its rich oriental vocabulary (words of Arabic, Persian and Turkish origin) and with the higher frequency of the phoneme *h* [x] (which is largely related to Islamic cultural traditions and orientations) than in the languages of the Croats, Serbs or Montenegrins. However, the non-oriental vocabulary is actually Serbian, Croatian or common to the entire Serbo-Croatian area. Critics of separation, of course, perceive the above arguments as inadequate and scientifically (socio-linguistically) worthless. The dialect basis of the standard language of

Bosniaks is the same as the dialect basis of the languages of the other mentioned nations — Neo-Shtokavian with Ijekavian pronunciations built on Eastern Herzegovinian dialects. Uncertainty in this case also leads to a prescriptivist or purist approach to the language standard (its exaggerated orientalization, i. e., factual archaization), which is intended to ensure that the Bosnian language is as different as possible from the languages of the Serbs and Croats. The leading codifiers of Bosnian literary language are or were Alija Isaković, Senahid Halilović, Dževad Jahić and Hasnija Muratagić-Tuna.

XI.3

Declaration on the Common Language (2017)

Symbolically, the most recent declaration was made in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which, unlike all previous memoranda, declarations or conclusions, appeals to linguistic unity understood in an antinationalistic way. At the end of March 2017, the text of the Declaration on the Common Language (*Deklaracija o zajedničkom jeziku*) was published as a spontaneous conclusion to a series of expert lectures on Languages and Nationalisms (*Jezici i nacionalizmi*), which took place in Serbia, Croatia, Montenegro and Bosnia & Herzegovina during 2016. Inspiration from the book by Snježana Kordić *Jezik i nacionalizam* (2010) is more than obvious. The basic idea of the Declaration is that the four post-Yugoslav nations previously speaking Serbo-Croatian speak one common language, but with four standard variants that are equal, and that the existence of these variants does not mean that they are four different languages. At the same time, this fact does not question the very existence of four nations or their statehood, religion or other identifying elements, nor does it block the possibility of naming these variants by various different terms. Each nation has the full right to codify its variant “freely and independently”. The authors of the Declaration then ask, among other things, to stop “unnecessary, absurd and expensive ‘translations’ of judicial and administrative practice” and to remove “all forms of language segregation and language discrimination from educational and public institutions”.

XII. Summary of the Period After 1990

The period of the post-1992 Constitution of post-Yugoslav countries can be summarized as follows:

1. The glossonym *Serbo-Croatian* disappears from all constitutions, it is kept the longest in B&H; is replaced by the name derived from the name of the nation of the given spoken language: *Serbian* (Serbs, and Montenegrins up to 2007), *Croatian* (Croats), *Bosnian* (Bosniaks), *Montenegrin* (Montenegrins since 2007).
2. Nationalism prevails in relation to language on all sides, which has somewhat different manifestations (and may not naturally dominate the whole of the relevant national community): a return to Vuk Karadžić's view of Shtokavian as solely a Serbian dialect of the Serbs (ideological model "the Serbo-Croatian was actually Serbian and its three "non-Serbian" clones are only variants of Serbian"). On the other hand there is the linguistic prescriptionism and purism of the Croats (archaisms, neologisms, emphasizing the "purity" of the Croatian language, "Neo-Croatian"), the Bosniaks (revitalization of unused orientalisms) and the Montenegrins (introducing new phonemes and graphemes, considering dialectal elements as part of the literary/standard language).
3. For Croats, Montenegrins and Bosniaks in particular, the symbolic function of the language is often openly preferred to its primary, communicative function (whereas with Serbs this occurs to a much lesser extent and is typical of a protectionist's approach to Serbian Cyrillic).
4. Attempts at some form of social retention of Serbo-Croatian, i. e. anti-separatist but also anti-expansionist opinions, arguably supported by sociolinguistic theory (polycentric/pluricentric languages, including Serbo-Croatian according to objective indicators), are in the minority (e. g. P. Ivić, I. Klajn, M. Šipka, R. Bugarški, B. Ostojić, M. Riđanović, S. Jovanović Maldoran, D. Škiljan, I. Pranjković, S. Kordić, L. Lashkova, B. Gröschel, etc.) and beyond linguistic research have no chance in prospering

under the socio-political conditions (see contemporary post-Yugoslav language and linguistic productions). However, a hope for change may be the latest initiative, whose name is Declaration on a Common Language (2017), which has been signed by hundreds of people from Croatia, Serbia, Montenegro and Bosnia & Herzegovina, and which combines resistance to the hate speech and the sustained image of the enemy. This image is firmly established at the core of both separatist and expansionist movements in the former Yugoslavia, and the concepts of language are often a significant part of their rhetoric.

XIII. Instead of Conclusion

To conclude, let us add a few of our own observations: above all, we must not lose sight of the simple fact that there a language is stated in the constitution and that no conclusions can be drawn from its existence. It is still necessary to bear in mind that constitutional anchoring of a language is primarily a political act that does not have to be, and often is not, consistent with the professional linguistic view of the legitimacy of such a language or its status. Furthermore, it is necessary to realize, especially in the Croatian-Serbian dispute, that Croatistic, Serbistic, and Serbo-Croatistic positions are held by leading Serbian or Croatian linguists, professors, academics and internationally renowned experts. Yet, their opinions are very often contradictory, even if they are expertly argued (at least at first glance). All three of these sides have a sufficiently strong and well-informed support from foreign colleagues. These facts must at least surprise the perceived observer of the standardization processes in the former Yugoslavia.

At the heart of the issue and mutual unrest is a fairly simple question, which was already raised in the national revival processes of the 19th century, i. e. whether our current four nations speak a) one standard language (in more variants), or b) two/three/four different standard languages. If we think a) is right, then we only have to solve the seemingly trivial additional question: what do we call this language?

What is its character? Serbo-Croatian because it serves as a form of trans-regional communication of the population living between the banks of the Danube of eastern Serbia and the Adriatic coast of western Croatia, as S. Kordić pragmatically advocates? Or Serbian, because it is genetically and historically the language of the Serbs, and Shtokavian is the exclusive dialect of the Serbs, as a significant part of the Serbian linguists claim? No realistic third option is likely to be offered, and from the first two the Serbian opinion has little or no hope of acceptance beyond the Serbian “Lebensraum”. However, if we say that b) is correct, then there are many more additional questions, which can only be answered in a further study.

XIV. Sources

ARHIV Jugoslavije: *Rezolucija o osnivanju Antifašističkog veća narodnog oslobođenja Jugoslavije*. [online] Available at: <http://www.arhivyu.gov.rs/index.php?st_location=home&st_version=active&structure__template_-_type=zoom&lang=en&image_id=5144&w=500&h=796> [2017-11-29].

ARHIV Jugoslavije: *Ustav Federativne Narodne Republike Jugoslavije, 31. januar 1946*. [online] Available at: <http://www.arhivyu.gov.rs/active/sr-latin/home/glavna_navigacija/leksikon_jugoslavije/konstitutivni_akti_jugoslavije/ustav_fnrj.html> [2015-12-21].

BURZANOVIĆ, S. Crnogorski ustav iz 1941. godine. — *Matica*, XI, 44, Cetinje — Podgorica: Matica crnogorska, 2010, 261—278. [online] Available at: <<http://www.maticacrnogorska.me/files/44/12%20crnogorski%20ustav%20iz%201941.%20%28priredio%20slavko%20burzanovic%29.pdf>> [2012-03-08].

DEKLARACIJA o zajedničkom jeziku. [online] Available at: <<http://jezicinacionalizmi.com/deklaracija/>> [2017-11-29].

HEKMAN, J. (ed.) *Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika: građa za povijest Deklaracije*. 3. izm. i dop. izd. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1997.

HRVATSKI jezik. — *Jezik*, LIV/2, 2007, 41—50.

HRVATSKO–ugarska nagodba 1868. [online] Available at: *Hrvatski jezični portal* <http://hjp.novi-liber.hr/index.php?show=povijest&chapter=20-hrv_ugar_nagodba> [2015-10-20].

JEZIK kao domovina. *Deklaracija Crnogorskog PEN centra o ustavnom položaju crnogorskog jezika*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.montenet.org/language/pen-decl.htm>> [2018-05-08].

MEMORANDUM Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti (nacrt). Jesen 1986. [online] Available at: *Peščanik.net* <https://pescanik.net/wp-content/PDF/memorandum_sanu.pdf> [2015-12-22].

NARODNE novine br. 8/74: *Ustav Socijalističke Republike Hrvatske*. Zagreb, 1974. [online] Available at: <https://www.pravo.unizg.hr/_download/repository/Ustav_Socijalisticke_RH_1974.pdf> [2015-12-22].

NOVOSADSKI dogovor (1954). [online] Available at: <http://govori.tripod.com/novosadski_dogovor.htm> [2015-12-22].

ODLUKA o proglašenju Ustava Socijalističke Republike Hrvatske. — *Narodne novine: Službeni list Socijalističke Republike Hrvatske*. [online] Available at: <https://www.pravo.unizg.hr/_download/repository/Ustav_SRH_1963.pdf> [2015-12-22].

ODLUKA ustavotvornog Sabora Narodne Republike Hrvatske o proglašenju Ustava Narodne Republike Hrvatske. — *Narodne novine: Službeni list Narodne Republike Hrvatske*. [online] Available at: <https://www.pravo.unizg.hr/_download/repository/Ustav_NRH_1947.pdf> [2015-12-21].

POVELJA o bosanskom jeziku. [online] Available at: <http://govori.tripod.com/povelja_o_bosanskom.htm> [2017-11-29].

PROMEMORIJA o hrvatskome jeziku Matice hrvatske. [online] Available at: <<http://ihjj.hr/iz-povijesti/promemorija-o-hrvatskome-jeziku-matice-hrvatske/51/>> [2017-11-29].

SLOVO o srpskom jeziku. Beograd: Foundation for Truth, 1998.

SLUŽBENI list NR Bosne i Hercegovine, god. 2, br. 1: Ustav Narodne Republike Bosne i Hercegovine. Sarajevo, 31. decembar 1946.

SLUŽBENI list NR Crne Gore, 2/1947: Ustav Narodne Republike Crne Gore. Titograd, 1947.

SLUŽBENI list SR Crne Gore, 14/63: Ustav Socijalističke Republike Crne Gore. Titograd, 1963.

SLUŽBENI list SR Crne Gore, 5/74: Ustav Socijalističke Republike Crne Gore. Titograd, 1974.

USTAV Crne Gore. [online] Available at: <<http://www.skupstina.me/images/dokumenti/ustav-crne-gore.pdf>> [2017-11-29].

USTAV Federacije Bosne i Hercegovine. [online] Available at: <<http://skupstinabd.ba/images/dokumenti/ba/ustav-federacije-bih.pdf>> [2017-11-29].

USTAV Federacije Bosne i Hercegovine. [online] Available at: <http://www.sogfbih.ba/uploaded/pravni_okvir/osnovni/Ustav%20-FBiH%20sa%20amandmanima.pdf> [2017-11-29].

USTAV Kraljevine Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca, 1921. [online] Available at: <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/243114662/aj-10-02-02-txt-ustav1921-pdf#scribd>> [2015-12-21].

USTAV Narodne Republike Srbije. Beograd, 1947. [online] Available at: <http://digitalna.nb.rs/wb/NBS/Razno/Srpski_ustavi/RA-ustav-1947#page/0/mode/1up> [2015-12-22].

USTAV Republike Bosne i Hercegovine. — *Službeni list Republike Bosne i Hercegovine*, godina II, broj 5, 14. mart 1993. [online] Available at: <http://www.fcjp.ba/templates/ja_avian_ii_d/images/green/Ustav%20RBiH.pdf> [2017-11-29].

USTAV Republike Hrvatske. Zagreb: Narodne novine, 1990. [online] Available at: <http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/1990_12_56_1092.html> [2015-12-22].

USTAV Republike Kosovo. [online] Available at: <<http://www.kryeministri-ks.net/repository/docs/Ustav1.pdf>> [2017-11-29].

USTAV Republike Srbije. Beograd: Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, 1990. [online] Available at: <http://digitalna.nb.rs/wb/NBS/Razno/Srpski_ustavi/RA-ustav-1990#page/1/mode/1up> [2015-12-22].

USTAV Republike Srbije. [online] Available at: <<http://www.ustavni.sud.rs/page/view/sr-Latn-CS/70-100028/ustav-republike-srbije>> [2017-11-29].

USTAV Republike Srpske. [online] Available at: <<http://ndcsarajevo.org/Dokumenti/Ustav%20Republike%20Srpske.pdf>> [2017-11-29].

USTAV Republike Srpske. [online] Available at: <<http://skupstinabd.ba/images/dokumenti/hr/ustav-republike-srpske.pdf>> [2017-11-29].

USTAV Savezne Republike Jugoslavije. — *Službeni list SRJ*, br. 1/92 od 05.01. [online] Available at: <<http://eudo-citizenship.eu/NationalDB/docs/MON%20FRY%20ustav%20srj%201992.pdf>> [2017-11-29].

USTAV SFRJ iz 1963. [online] Available at: <<http://mojustav.rs/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Ustav-SFRJ-iz-1963.pdf>> [2015-12-22].

USTAV Socijalističke Federativne Republike Jugoslavije (1974). [online] Available at: <[https://sr.wikisource.org/wiki/Устав_Социјалистичке_Федеративне_Републике_Југославије_\(1974\)](https://sr.wikisource.org/wiki/Устав_Социјалистичке_Федеративне_Републике_Југославије_(1974))> [2015-12-22].

USTAV Socijalističke Republike Bosne i Hercegovine i Ustavni zakon o sprovođenju Ustava SR BiH. Sarajevo: Službeni list SR BiH, 1963.

USTAV Socijalističke Republike Bosne i Hercegovine: Ustavni zakon za sprovođenje Ustava SR BiH. Beograd: Savremena administracija, 1974.

USTAV Srpske Republike Bosne i Hercegovine. [online] Available at: <https://sr.wikisource.org/sr-el/Устав_Српске_Републике_Босне_и_Херцеговине> [2017-11-29].

USTAV SR Srbije; Ustav SAP Vojvodine; Ustav SAP Kosova sa ustavnim zakonima za sprovođenje Ustava. Beograd: Službeni list SFRJ, 1974. [online] Available at: <http://digitalna.nb.rs/wb/NBS/Razno/Srpski_ustavi/RA-ustav-1974#page/0/mode/1up> [2015-12-22].

VUJOŠEVIĆ, M. (ed.) *Crnogorski ustavi 1905—2005*. Knjiga 2. Podgorica: NIU Službeni list Republike Crne Gore, 2005. [online] Available at: *Portal Montenegrina.net* <http://www.montenegrina.net/pages/pages1/istorija/dokumenti/ustav_crne_gore_iz_1905.html> [2015-10-19].

ZAKONSKA odredba o hrvatskom jeziku, o njegovoj čistoći i o pravopisu. [online] Available at: *Hrvatski jezični portal* <http://hjp.novi-liber.hr/?show=povijest&chapter=26-zakonska_odredba> [2015-12-21].

ZAKONSKA odredba o hrvatskom jeziku, o njegovoj čistoći i o pravopisu. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. [online] Available at: <<http://ihjj.hr/iz-povijesti/zakonska-odredba-o-hrvatskom-jeziku-o-njegovoj-cistoci-i-o-pravopisu/44/>> [2015-12-21].

ZAKONSKA odredba o zabrani ćirilice. In: [R. I.]. Vratimo se u 2015. godinu. 20.08.2015. [online] Available at: *Index.hr* <<http://www.index.hr/vijesti/clanak/vratimo-se-u-2015-godinu-/837243.aspx>> [2015-12-21].

ZBIRKA zakona SR Srbije: *Ustav Socijalističke Republike Srbije sa ustavnim zakonom osprovođenju Ustava*. Beograd: Savremena administracija, 1963. [online] Available at: <http://digitalna.nb.rs/wb/NBS/Razno/Srpski_ustavi/RA-ustav-1963--#page/0/mode/1up> [2015-12-22].

ZEMALJSKI ustav (štatut) za Bosnu i Hercegovinu. [online] Available at: <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/117687515/Bosanski-ustav-1910#scribd>> [2015-12-22].

**SOUTH SLAVONIC LANGUAGE PARADOXES,
UNIVERSITY TEACHING
AND TRANSLATING EXPERIENCE**
(FRAGMENTS OF THE GROTESQUE SITUATION)

I.
Introduction with a Glossonymical “Mishmash”

From the very founding of the Masaryk University, i. e. from the very beginning of the scientific interest in the language(s) of Serbs, Croats, Bosniaks and Montenegrins, university teaching of this language/these languages has been oriented in line with the idea of the linguistic unity of these peoples. The name of the common language, however, has gone through different stages, mainly in the Croatian language, as throughout the nineteenth century the Serbs called their language with their national name, i. e. they called it “Serbian” (*српски језик*). The Croats’ problems with the name of the language are evidenced, for example, by the sitting of the Croatian Parliament (*Sabor*) on the official and the national language in the so-called Triune Kingdom of 1861, when the name “South-Slavonic language” (*jugoslavenski jezik*) was finally chosen among numerous more or less suitable proposals, but the then chancellor Ivan Mažuranić corrected it into “Croatian” (*hrvatski jezik* — but the proposal was never accepted by Emperor Franz Josef I — see Samardžija 2004: 12). Daničić in the South-Slavonic Academy of Sciences and Arts (JAZU) and the Croatian supporters of the Karadžić’s reform (the so-called Croatian Vukovites) used most often the two-component term “Croatian or Serbian” (*hrvatski ili*

srpski jezik), but not consistently (Ivan Broz's *Pravopis* /"Spelling"/ of 1892, and Iveković and Broz's dictionary of 1901 only used the attribute *hrvatski*, although this did not change the "Vukovian" orientation of these crucial texts.) The language of the first (Royal) Yugoslavia as per the constitution was referred to as "Serbo-Croatian-Slovenian" (*српско-хрватско-словеначки*), but in fact the Slovenians developed their Slovenian language separately from the language of the two other constituent nations — the Serbs and the Croats: on the Serbian part the name "Serbo-Croatian" (*српскохрватски*) was established (propagated as early as the first half of the 19th century mainly by Slovenian Slavonic scholar Jernej Kopitar), while among the Croats the original, now relatively stable name *hrvatski ili srpski* prevailed, as well as to a lesser degree *hrvatskosrpski* ("Croato-Serbian" — compare, for example, the spelling titles by Croatian Dragutin Boranić and Serbian Aleksandar Belić).

As regards the name, Czech dictionaries of this period were not unanimous: we come across the forms *srbský neboli chorvatský* (1906), *srbocharvatský* (1910), *srbochorvatský* and *srbo-chorvatský* (1916), *jihoslovanský* (1920), *srbsko-chorvatský* (1926), *jugoslávský* (1937) and again, but now only *srbochorvatský* (1939).⁷⁶ It is a telling sign that we do not practically come across even two publications, which use the same name for the language discussed. Jaroslav Merhaut's dictionary of 1940 was, for example, named *česko-chorvatský*,⁷⁷ this time in accordance with the new socio-political situation, which was also reflected in the attitude towards the language. After 1945 significant dictionaries as well as other linguistic works were written only after the so-called Novi Sad Agreement (1954), so the name of the language in the Czech environment was established as a single form, namely *srbocharvatský* (it is interesting to note that during this period the Czech Slavonic scholars unambiguously preferred the second option of the dual forms (*srbo*)*chorvatský* and (*srbo*)*charvatský*). Only one case of a calque of the Croatian version of this two-component name is registered, namely *chorvatosrbský* (1973) — in a dictionary published by the Croatian Czechs in the town of Daruvar.⁷⁸ The situation remained like that until the collapse of the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia.

76 More about it see Krejčí 2017: 145—146.

77 MERHAUT, J. *Veliki češko-hrvatski rječnik*. Zagreb 1940.

78 SOBOTKA, O. *Slovník chorvatosrbsko-český*. Daruvar 1973.

This relatively large introduction is necessary in order to clarify the circumstances of teaching the language of the four nations mentioned above. These circumstances can be summarized as follows: during the entire first (royal) and second (socialist) Yugoslavia, in the Yugoslav as well as in the Czech, respectively the Czechoslovak, environment the assertion was maintained that the studied language was at first one for two nations (the Serbs and the Croats), then after 1945 — for three nations (the Montenegrins too), and from the 1960s on — for four nations (the Bosnian Muslims as well). However, the Novi Sad Agreement itself assumed that this language did not have only one version but two. The distinctive element was, on the one hand, the alphabet used, but also the phonetic view of the literary language. However, none of the distinctive features was applied without exceptions: in addition to the Cyrillic alphabet, the Serbs and the Montenegrins started using the Latin alphabet more and more often, the Ijekavian Serbo-Croatian was used not only by the Croats, but also by a part of the Serbs and by all Montenegrins and Bosnian Muslims (nowadays called Bosniaks). Thus the designation “Western” version was not accurate and enabled the penetration of Serbian language elements in Ijekavian “packaging” in the Croatian language standard (which, incidentally, led to the famous *Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language* of 1967), and, on the other hand, gave rise to the assertion that the Croatian Serbs who spoke Ijekavian phonetic version and lived on Croatian territory de facto spoke or should speak using the Western version of Serbo-Croatian, i. e. using the Croatian language standard (which was in its turn criticized by the *Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts Memorandum* of 1986).

The Czech linguistic publications, which were unanimous as regards the use of the name *srbocharvátský*, also acted quite identically in the description of that language. They only used the Latin alphabet and chose the Eastern, Ekavian version. The Ijekavian version was presented in greater detail only in the academic Serbo-Croatian-Czech Dictionary of 1982 and in the Short Serbo-Croatian Grammar of 1989.⁷⁹ So if somebody wanted to learn from Czech textbooks and phrase-books the language of the people they met during an Adriatic coast vacation, unknowingly

79 *Srbocharvátsko-český slovník*. Praha 1982; SEDLÁČEK, J. *Stručná mluvnice srbocharváštiny*. Praha 1989. More about see Chapter 2.

they would have learned the version which was not used in their favourite resort. And if they wanted to learn the Western variant, it was simply impossible.

II. South Slavonic Language Paradoxes and Related Questions

The last year students were accepted in universities to study the academic discipline of Yugoslavian Studies was the fateful 1991. The language core of the subject was the Serbo-Croatian. The students spent five years learning a language which was virtually disintegrating on its own territory, and after graduation they became specialists in a language which formally, *de jure* no longer existed...

There is also another way to describe their education — they became specialists in all the languages which formally replaced the Serbo-Croatian on the territory where it had been used in the past... Is that so or not?

Thus, we arrive at some quite “thin ice” questions, which everyone dealing professionally with the area of present-day Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, and Montenegro, and in broader terms every Balkan and Slavonic scholar, asks sooner or later.

1. Has Serbo-Croatian been, and is it still an actually existing language, which has been “quarterdrawn” only under the influence of unfavourable socio-political, i. e. extra-linguistic circumstances? If so, then anyone who has ever learned Serbo-Croatian can now boldly declare they know Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin. If not, which language of the hereditary languages do they know? And do they know only one, two or three, if not all four languages? If we come from the textbooks from this period, that were almost exclusively Ekavian, such a graduate should boldly proclaim today to know Serbian, and only Serbian, because the other three national language standards are not Ekavian.⁸⁰ However, if he considers

80 Here I find it necessary to explain that it is easier for a person who speaks Ijekavian to express himself in written language in Ekavian, not the opposite — Ekavian speaker who tries to speak in

himself to be a graduate of Serbian, he should automatically have a command of both Serbian types of graphic systems, not only Latin, but also Serbian Cyrillic. However, according to the preferences of the old textbooks of Serbo-Croatian, we can doubt about it.

2. If Serbo-Croatian was one objectively existing language, which from political perspective doesn't exist nowadays (the constitutions of the newly-founded states do not mention "Serbo-Croatian" and, with only some exceptions abroad, no publications come out in this language), but it objectively exists from a genetic linguistic perspective,⁸¹ however its name is called into question (alternative solutions are proposed such as "Standard Neo-Shtokavian" as a standardized version of the "national" language which has no name and is technically referred to as "Central South Slavonic diasystem" /*srednjojužnoslavenski dijasistem*/ — see Brozović 2008),⁸² which of the languages should be offered for studying at universities after Serbo-Croatian? All four languages? Or just some of them? And which ones exactly? What criteria should we use in making this choice?
3. In case that a university offers more than one of the post-Serbo-Croatian languages, there comes another practical question: is it possible to study those languages in parallel? Or should the student choose only one of them? If it was really a matter of separate, individual languages, the answer would undoubtedly be "Yes, simultaneously," just like Spanish and Italian, German and Danish can be studied simultaneously, as well as very easily mutually intelligible languages such as Czech and Slovak, or Bulgarian and Macedonian. If we are rather talking about national versions (realizations) of one and the same linguistic system with practically identical grammar and more significant but still marginal differences only in lexical terms and in prosody (and of course in the dichotomy of Ekavian/Ijekavian pronunciation),

Ijekavian way should apply rules of reflections of yat into *-ije-* or just *-je-*.

81 According to many scientists, from a socio-linguistic perspective as well, see for example B. Gröschel (2009) or S. Kordić (2010).

82 A very similar approach is also applied by R. Bugarski (2002).

I suppose that the answer should be “No, they have to choose only one language.”

4. The other option is to study something, which terminologically resembles Serbo-Croatian language (for example B-C-S = *Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian*, or B/K/S, i. e. *Bosnisch-Kroatisch-Serbisch* — this is how the language is often designated in some Austrian and German universities, but now *Montenegrinisch* should also be included, and the abbreviation should be B/K/M/S, or B-C-M-S in English), as one language, with one lecturer. But what will these students actually be studying when neither standard “B-C-S” nor “B-C-M-S” language exists? They will most probably be studying the standard used by the specific lecturer, i. e. not “B-C-(M-)S” but either Bosnian or Croatian or Montenegrin or Serbian (if we assume that these languages objectively do exist from a linguistic perspective). We can argue that even such a lecturer is able to point out certain differences between the different standards. But is this actually true? And what will this training result in? My personal opinion is that it would result mainly in chaos in the heads of the “B-C-(M-)S” students. Why not say openly that the language taught is Croatian or Serbian? I personally do not see in “B-C-(M-)S” any Solomonic decision, nor cutting any Gordian knot, but rather public political hypocrisy and scientific alibism.
5. There is one more question related to teaching the so-called B-C-(M-)S language, or several of the languages of the post-Serbo-Croatian area — to what extent would students be able to master actively, at a communication level, the detailed, often very difficult to distinguish lexical and stylistic differences between two, or even more languages? One more thing: should the students study the specific language with the existing differences constantly being pointed out (which is potentially embedded in the B-C-(M-)S model), or should they study two languages (for example Croatian and Bosnian) in parallel, and find the differences between the languages by themselves? And how can they deal by themselves with the possible Croatian-Bosnian interference? And can this even be called “linguistic interference” in the true sense of the word, if we compare

the Croatian–Bosnian “interference”, for example, with the Croatian–Czech one? The same question applies even more in the case of B–C–(M–)S model.

6. A certain defense of B–C–(M–)S concept could be the fact, that the language is taught not for active usage on a certain level of communication, but rather to gain some insight into it, on a very basic level of knowledge, such as in our courses of South Slavonic languages for beginners. It means that no emphasis is placed on its active usage (or to a very limited extent), but rather on passive comprehension. Under such circumstances, however, it is not absolutely necessary to engage the teacher — native speaker and the teaching is then characterized by a more significant presence of the meta-lingual aspect. The particular language standard and its form is receding in the background and the emphasis is on the grammatical structure and the basic vocabulary.

III.

South Slavonic Language Paradoxes and the Experience of the Slavonic and Balkan Studies in Brno, Czechia

What is the practice at the Department of Slavonic Studies at the Masaryk University in Brno? While the war in former Yugoslavia was still in full swing, two new academic programs were accredited: Slovenian Studies and Macedonian Studies, i. e. disciplines studying the language and literature of the respective nations. Yugoslavian Studies as an academic program oriented towards the country in general, but with its core in the Serbo–Croatian Studies, was not transformed into a terminologically updated version; the break-up of Yugoslavia was used to create independent, so-called “national philological academic studies” centred around the study of the respective national language and literature. Thus, independent Serbian Studies and Croatian Studies were accredited as the philologies of the two most important post-Yugoslav nations in terms of politics, culture and history, as well as population numbers.

Our academic disciplines were not defined by the (genetic) linguistic aspect but by the *national factor*, as we assume that indeed the language

of the Croats cannot be taught from textbooks written in Serbian (or in the Serbian version of the common language, whatever we call it). Also, the living language of the Serbs cannot be taught to students by any other than a Serb or a lecturer from a Serbian environment. If in the future we offer Bosnian language courses, they will not be taught by the current Serbian or Croatian lecturer, but by a Bosniak one, for whom this language is their mother tongue and who knows its standard norm.

The preference of the *linguistic aspect* in building the university programs could provide many interesting opportunities for studying the Serbo-Croatian language area as a linguistic whole (an area of one literary/standard language with four versions). Probably the students will study one of the versions of the Serbo-Croatian language (depending on the origin of the lecturer), all the national literatures written in this language but with a stronger emphasis on the themes and the place of the studied works within the Balkan, European, or world literature, and with pushing its function and role of the particular people into the background. Historical events will be viewed and interpreted not from a national perspective but from a “supranational” one with the highest possible degree of scientific objectivity. But here come the questions of what would be the name of an academic program designed in this way, and whether it would be more attractive than the current, nationally-oriented Croatian and Serbian philologies, which are clearly defined in terms of content.

The question of why Bosnian and Montenegrin languages are not yet offered in our department can be answered relatively easily: as far as Bosnian language is concerned, it is not taught separately even in Sarajevo, in the local university, where the department of Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian languages actually offers in its curricula⁸³ a traditional study of the Serbo-Croatian language, but called *bosanski, hrvatski, srpski jezik* (I pay special attention here to the technocratic name of the academic discipline, whose individual components are arranged in alphabetical order, the name does not even contain the expected conjunction “and” between the penultimate and the final item of the list, and that this listing is still missing Montenegrin if we want to be consistent —

83 These curricula are available at:
<http://www.ff.unsa.ba/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogcategory&id=28&Itemid=8>.

probably because the Montenegrin is not the official language in B&H). So if Bosnian language is not studied independently in the very heart of Bosniak ideology, we can hardly expect it to be given such a standing in foreign universities. By the way, studying exclusively Bosnian language within B&H is possible only at the University of Tuzla.⁸⁴ And what about the Montenegrin language? This youngest post-Serbo-Croatian literary language, politically formalized only in the Montenegrin constitution in 2007, may be the only language from the “quartet of heirs” with three new phonemes and the corresponding graphemes, but so far it doesn’t even have its own specialists who are able to describe it exhaustively and in detail. The main language phrase books in the Montenegrin language are compiled by its foreign “patrons”. The undoubtedly pioneering work of essentially the first Montenegrinist Vojislav Nikčević was questioned very often and successfully especially with regard to the objectivity of his linguistic research. Montenegrin Studies, even in Montenegro itself, is an academic discipline still in its infancy, so it is not to be expected that anywhere else in the world the time has come for this science to be accredited as an independent university discipline.⁸⁵

In the end of this part, full of questions but scarce of answers, I will permit myself to present my opinion, which is as follows (and the practice of teaching at the Masaryk University confirms it): in designing the curriculum, the Slavonic or Balkan specialists should not have to hide behind the alibistic decision to please everyone (and in fact no one), which for some people may be politically correct, therefore the automatic and correct decision (see the B-C-(M-)S model). They should rather open their eyes and look at the reality, which, at least as far as independent Serbian studies and independent Croatian studies are concerned, is indisputable and historically grounded if we start from the position of preferences of *national philologies*. In the case of an academic discipline, which is primarily linguistic (or why not even primarily literary), we should take into account the linguistic reality, and the Serbo-Croatian

84 And for the sake of completeness, let us say that the University of Mostar offers only study program Croatian philology, while universities in Banjaluka and East Sarajevo only study program Serbian philology.

85 The study program Montenegrin language and South Slavonic literatures, which is politically strongly preferred, can be studied in the few last years at the University of Montenegro (Faculty of Arts in Nikšić). In the past that university had only program Serbian language and South Slavonic literatures.

language area should be the only subject of training, regardless of the current national preferences of its population.

IV. South Slavonic Language Paradoxes and Translating Experience

To provide an example of the absurdity of the described situation, I chose one certified translation of Czech extract from the police records that I received thanks to my translational praxis. Translation should have been done to Bosnian language. Bosnian norm was never taught in the past and was not identical with Serbo-Croatian norm that books were focused on — at least in one aspect: it always was Ijekavian. During the analysis we found following aberrances against Bosnian language norm:

- *ispis iz evidencije kaznenog registra* < collision of terms *kaznena evidencija* (Serbian, Bosnian) and *kazneni registar* (Croatian), correct *ispis iz kaznene evidencije*
- *broj beleški* — Serbian, correct *broj bilješki*
- *mesto rođenja* — Serbian, correct *mjesto rođenja*
- *istovetnost, istovetan* — Serbian, correct *istovjetnost, istovjetan*
- *overavam, overavajuća osoba* — Serbian, correct *ovjeravam, ovjeravajuća osoba*
- *predsednik* — Serbian, correct *predsjednik*
- *prevod* — Serbian, correct *prijevod*

It is evident from the analysis that most prevailing mistake of the translator was not respecting Ijekavian base of Bosnian, while the Ekavian forms used by translator can be seen as Serbian only. This finding is surprising, as it is more frequent to see that translator, skilled in Ekavian language norm (that is obviously in this case) and aware of Ijekavian base of non-Serbian (Croatian and Bosnian) norm, is putting all the Ekavian forms carefully into Ijekavian and most probably neglecting lexical level or terminology. In our case translator paid attention to lexical part (correctly noting Serbian verbal form *saopštiti* and using Western form *saopćiti*) — what is, due to this the resignation on careful Ijekavization of text, even more surprising.

By analyzing the translation, we can conclude that translator most probably was a person that studied Serbo-Croatian, more specifically its Eastern form (that was frequently prioritized in Czech learning books), or studied in new socio-political situation Serbian, rather its most prestigious Ekavian form. On an official stamp we would expect to see “Translator for Serbo-Croatian language” or “Translator for Serbian language”, eventually even braver “for Serbian, Bosnian and Croatian language”. I was very surprised to see that official stamp of translator states “Translator for Bosnian and Montenegrin language” (see picture), that means languages (or language variations) that are both strictly Ijekavian. Moreover, back in times, when this translator got his official stamp (2003), Montenegrin language did not even officially exist (official recognition of Montenegrin related to the new constitution of Montenegro in 2007), and only was a subject of emotional debates of its advocates and opponents (and still is).



From the above stated we can conclude, that translation to Bosnian was done by translator with Ekavian, that means strictly Serbian language competence, that however, for the reasons unknown to me, did not include the only language that he (from the posthumous legacy of Serbo-Croatian) really knew. Still, he has a status of court translator of Bosnian and Montenegrin granted by Czech court authority, both the languages he — as we have seen — does not master... To put it differently, text was translated to language that was not part of the assignment and that

even is not present on the official stamp of the translator. Translator masters the language he translated to only (Serbian), but does not master languages he has on the official stamp (Bosnian and Montenegrin); topped by the fact that nobody minds now, but might — if it is needed for some reason — what can result in disallowance of translation... This situation reminds us of “Cimrman”⁸⁶ mystification and is grotesque evidence of abnormality of current state, that we wanted to point at in this chapter.

86 Jára Cimrman is Czech fictional polymath created in the 60ies of the 20th century by Zdeněk Svěrák (*1936), Jiří Šebánek (1930—2007) and Karel Velebný (1931—1989) and became famous due to the Theatre of Jára Cimrman. The performance of the mentioned theatre with the protagonist Jára Cimrman and its fictional work was created by Zdeněk Svěrák and Ladislav Smoljak (1931—2010).

LANGUAGE POLICY IN MONTENEGRO (FRAGMENTS OF THE FARCICAL SITUATION)

I.

The dynamic language situation on the territory of former Yugoslavia, and especially where literary Serbo-Croatian language has been spoken (Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro), has been observed with great scientific interest for more than twenty years now. In the first half of the 1990s Serbo-Croatian disappeared as a literary language — the Croats completed their language emancipation within the independent Croatian state (1991) and have since then uncompromisingly been calling their language *Croatian*. At the same time, but a bit later, the Serbs also returned to the old glossonym *Serbian*. The Bosnian Muslims, i.e. the Bosniaks, in response to what had happened to the Serbo-Croatian language with the Croats and the Serbs, renamed their language to *Bosnian* (in Bosnian *bosanski*), but Serbian and Croatian linguists called it *Bosniak* (бошњачки/*bošnjački*). At the time Montenegro was following the path of Serbia, as well as the Serbian part of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Republic of Srpska). These are the only three states where Serbian language has a leading role, which is only logical. Serbian literary language has two phonetic versions, resulting from the reflection of the old phoneme “yat”: *Ekavian* (in Serbia and to a limited extent also in Srpska), and *Ijekavian* (in Montenegro and Srpska). It appears from the foregoing that at the level

of standard language the main difference between Serbia and Montenegro (i.e. the states which had formed the federation and later the confederation in the period 1992—2006) is exactly the Ekavian, respectively the Ijekavian pronunciation of the old Yat vowel. This is why we shouldn't be surprised that in the Montenegrin institutions, from 1974 on, it has always been added to the name of the language (Serbo-Croatian, respectively Serbian) that the official language of that state is with Ijekavian pronunciation (see Krejčí 2012), which, at the same time, is the most significant difference between the standard languages of Serbia and Montenegro. And this also became the first “bone of contention” among Serbian linguists.

II.

This dispute was well described by **Robert D. Greenberg** (2005: 77—98). As regards the opinions in view of the new situation in the sphere of planning the status, in his study Greenberg observed three main groups of Serbian linguists: “1. Linguists supporting the *status quo*, who see the contemporary Serbian language as a variant of Serbo-Croatian, and who believe that this language should be naturally formed on the former Eastern variant of the common language; 2. Neo-Vukovite linguists, who advocate the return to the pure principles of 19th century Serbian reformers Vuk Karadžić and Đura Daničić; 3. Orthodox linguists, who adopt the ideology of extreme nationalism and require an ‘orthodox Serbian language’ and spelling” (Greenberg 2005: 77).⁸⁷ Greenberg pointed out prominent Serbian linguist, Academician **Pavle Ivić** (1924—1999) as a typical representative of the first group; he considered, for example, Prof. **Miloš Kovačević**, Prof. **Radoje Simić**, or the linguists from the Serbian Studies Section at the Faculty of Arts in Nikšić (University of Montenegro) as “Neo-Vukovites”. According to Greenberg, a typical representative of the orthodox Serbian linguists from the third group was Prof. **Radmilo Marojević**.

87 Orig.: “1. Jezikoslovcima zagovarateljima *statusa quo*, koji smatraju da je suvremeni srpski jezik izdanak srpsko-hrvatskoga i koji vjeruju da taj jezik treba nastajati prirodno iz bivše istočne varijante zajedničkog jezika; 2. Jezikoslovcima neovukovcima, koji se zalažu za povratak čistim načelima devetnaestostoljetnih reformatora srpskog jezika Vuka Karadžića i Đure Daničića; 3. Ortodoksni jezikoslovcima, koji usvajaju ideologiju ekstremnog nacionalizma i zahtijevaju ‘ortodoksni srpski jezik’ i pravopis.”

III.

As regards the language situation in Montenegro, and more specifically the rivalry between the Ekavian and the Ijekavian pronunciation in the Serbian national space, it is interesting that according to the author the representatives of the first group supported the Ekavian norm not only within the Republic of Serbia, but also anywhere else where Serbian was the official language (“[...] this group of linguists always lobbied for abandoning the Ijekavian variant and advocated the unification of the Serbian language under one sole official pronunciation” — *ibid.*: 78).⁸⁸ It is understandable that such a view of the language situation posed a certain danger to the traditional language standard in Montenegro, which was purely Ijekavian — moreover the government of the Republic of Srpska of the time (mainly **Radovan Karadžić** and **Momčilo Krajišnik**) insisted on introducing a Belgrade, i.e. Ekavian language standard as the official one for all the Bosnia and Herzegovina territories, which were then under Serbian control. This demand was put forward in 1993, it was legislatively processed in 1996, however in the beginning of 1998 the then leaders of the Bosnian Serbs repealed the controversial law and returned to the Ijekavian standard at the official level.

The later Decisions No. 13 (2000), 37 and 38 (2003) of the Board for Standardization of the Serbian Language (*Одбор за стандардизацију српског језика*), which discussed from various perspectives the equality between the Ijekavian and the Ekavian norms of Serbian literary language, played a significant role in the perception of the existence of two phonetic variations of Serbian literary language. Decision No. 38, among other things, contained the first nine articles of the Law on the Official Use of Languages and Scripts (in the Republic of Srpska) of 1996, in which the first eight articles delineated the public space (educational system, radio and television, legislation, etc.), where Ekavian Serbian was imposed as an official norm. However, actually nowhere an explicit intention was expressed for a broader ban on Ijekavian and artificial imposition of Ekavian, and we can back this up by citing Article 9: “Serbian language of Ijekavian pronunciation, outside of use defined by this law, may be

88 Orig.: “[...] ta skupina jezikoslovaca uvijek iznova lobirala za napuštanje ijekavskog izgovora i zalagala se za ujedinjenje srpskoga jezika pod jednim jedinim službenim izgovorom.”

used without restriction” (Brborić — Vuksanović — Gačević 2006: 218—219).⁸⁹ Among the fierce defenders of the equality of the Ijekavian norm, the largest number of linguists were from the second group (the so-called Neo-Vukovites). A Montenegrin representative of this group was for example **Branislav Ostojić**. At first glance, it could be assumed that the defenders of the Ijekavian norm in Montenegro would turn into fighters for the independence of the Montenegrin language standard. All the more so because they did not have a strong position in the Board, “ideologically” the Board was led by the linguists from the first group. However, this did not happen, on the contrary — the Neo-Vukovites remained radical fighters for Serbian linguistic unity and for its two phonetic versions having equal rights. **Greenberg** (2005: 109) commented on this as follows: “After this defeat of Montenegrin Neo-Vukovites there was no transition to the side of those who advocated a separate Montenegrin language. Instead, it separated them from the mainstream of linguistic circles and made them even more vulnerable to attacks by the fraction of the advocates of independence.”⁹⁰ But, in the academic circles of Montenegro the so-called Neo-Vukovites remained the strongest (pro)Serbian group. One of the results of their (socio)linguistic activity, a direct reaction to the demands and the linguistic (mis)interpretations made by the Montenegrin linguistic separatists (Montenegrists), was the book *Serbian Language Between Truth and Deception* (*Српски језик између истине и обмане*, 2006) by **Jelica Stojanović** and **Draga Bojović**. The authors looked at, and criticized the actions and the language policy of the Montenegrin nationalistically oriented authorities, the so-called “right” of every nation to call its language as it wishes, referring to the fact that no such right exists, and that the claim for this “right” also appeared first within the Serbo-Croatian space — in a well-known Croatian Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language (1967),⁹¹ as it had been proven by German linguist **B. Gröschel** in one of his studies (Stojanović — Bojović 2006: 29—31).⁹²

89 Orig.: “Српски језик ијекавског изговора изван употребе утврђене овим законом може се користити без ограничења.”

90 Orig.: “Nakon tog poraza crnogorskih neovukovaca nije došlo do njihova prelaska na stranu onih koji zagovaraju odvojeni crnogorski jezik. Umjesto toga, to ih je odvojilo od glavne struje jezikoslovnih krugova i učinilo ih još ranjivijima za napade frakcije zagovaratelja nezavisnosti.”

91 For more see above Chapter 5.

92 See also: “In its program Montenegro in Front of the Challenges of Future, the Matrix [Montenegrina] concludes: Montenegro and the Montenegrins have right and obligation to call their mother tongue

IV.

Several times **Miloš Kovačević** reacted to Montenegrin language claims. He perceived Serbian language as multinational and pluricentric, and looked for analogies with the sociolinguistic position of English or German language (Kovačević 2003a: 7–8). He talked of the so-called Montenegrin language in a separate chapter in the above quoted publication, called So that's the "Montenegrin" one (*Такав ли је тај "црногорски језик"* — *ibid.*: 163—199). This chapter is actually a harsh criticism of the Montenegrin Grammar by **Vojislav Nikčević**,⁹³ which in Kovačević's opinion was non-scientific, in many parts it shamelessly copied older Croatian, Serbian and Serbo-Croatian grammars, and was full of errors and fabrications. In the beginning of this chapter, **Kovačević** says: "If anyone in the linguistics is known for persisting in writing about what he knows almost nothing about — then, without a doubt, it is Vojislav Nikčević. He is one of those to who one cannot explain his ignorance, because an ignorant is ignorant precisely because he thinks he knows what he does not know" (*ibid.*: 163).⁹⁴ The very words of **Nikčević** about the equality between the vernacular and the standard (or literary) language, which was, in his opinion, specific namely and only for the Montenegrin language,⁹⁵ indicated the lack of knowledge about linguistic patterns, criticized by **Kovačević**. The same words were later repeated by poet **Branko Banjević**, chair of

by Montenegrin name and this needs to be a part of state politics" (orig.: "У својој програму Црна Гора пред изазовима будућности Матица [црногорска] је закључила: Црна Гора и Црногорци имају право и обавезу да свој матерњи језик назову црногорским именом и то треба да постане дио државне политике" — Samarđžić 2011: 20) or "In sociolinguistic way, we can talk about a right of every nation to call their language by the name they want, based on values that speakers of this language follow in defining its name. In this sense, there was nothing surprising about the will of Montenegrin nation to call their language Montenegrin" (orig.: "У социолингвистичком смислу, можемо говорити о праву сваког народа да свој језик назове именом којим жели, на основу вриједносних ставова које говорници једног језика слиједе у дефинисању његовог назива. У том смислу није било ништа чудно у жељи црногорског народа да свој језик назове црногорски" — Lakić 2013: 143)

93 НИКЧЕВИЋ, В. *Црногорска граматика*. Подгорица: Дукљанска академија наука и умјетности, 2001.

94 Orig.: "Ако је ико у лингвистици познат по томе што истрајава у писанији о ономе о чему готово ништа не зна — онда је то, без сумње, Војислав Никчевић. Он спада у оне којима је немогуће објаснити незнање, јер незналица и јест незналица управо по томе што мисли да зна оно што не зна."

95 "(...) one can put a symbol of equality between Montenegrin vernacular and Montenegrin literary language, what cannot be done with any of the European languages" (orig.: "[...] између црногорског народног и црногорског књижевног језика може [се] ставити знак једнакости, што у Европи није случај ни са једним језиком" — Nikčević 2000: 19).

the Committee for Standardization of the Montenegrin Language.⁹⁶ In another of his articles, **Kovačević** (2012: 303—323) also denounced the non-scientific approach to creating a new Montenegrin grammar⁹⁷ and Montenegrin spelling⁹⁸, i.e. reference books, which should form the basis of the desired Montenegrin standard language norm. **Kovačević** criticized the political support for the so-called Montenegrin language in another article, quoting, among other things, the words of Montenegrin politician **Miodrag Vuković**⁹⁹ and using them to prove the exclusively political, i.e. non-linguistic reasons for creating the so-called Montenegrin language (Kovačević — Šćepanović 2011: 116). Danish linguist **Per Jakobsen** also saw a political role in these social-political rather than linguistic processes, saying: “The confusion around the name of language has been created by political elites of individual countries who were trying, ‘from above’, to influence the change of language. (...) The key term in all of this is nation building” (Jakobsen 2010: 94).¹⁰⁰

V.

The activities of the Montenegrin language separatists, among which most prominent and most fruitful in terms of number of publications was the already mentioned literary scholar **Vojislav Nikčević**, began in the 1990s. In 1994 a group of Montenegrins led by the Montenegrin PEN Center

96 “Spelling of Montenegrin language is not a thing of agreement as in other areas. Literary language and vernacular of the Montenegrins is the same, what is and exceptional case in the world. Because of this cannot our Spelling be controversial, as it preserves natural characteristics of Montenegrin language” (orig.: “Правопис црногорског језика није ствар договора као у другим срединама. Књижевни и народни језик код Црногораца је идентичан, што је јединствен случај у свијету. Због тога наш Правопис не може бити споран јер чува природне особине црногорског језика” — Vanjević 2008: III — quote as per Kovačević 2012: 303).

97 ЧИРИЋ, А. — ПРАЊКОВИЋ, И. — СИЛИЋ, Ј. *Граматика црногорскога језика*. Подгорица: Министарство просвјете и науке, 2010.

98 *Правопис црногорскога језика и рјечник црногорскога језика (правописни рјечник)*. Приредили Миленко Перовић, Јосип Силић и Људмила Васиљева. Подгорица: Министарство просвјете и науке, 2009.

99 “Calling a language by any name is not a linguistic, but exclusively political question and official language must be defined by dominant nation. It is logical that official language will be Montenegrin” (orig.: “Именовање језика није лингвистичко већ искључиво политичко питање и службени језик се мора утврдити по доминантној нацији. Логично је да службени језик буде црногорски” — quoted by Nikolić 2007: 56).

100 Orig.: “Конфузију око назива језика су створиле политичке елите појединих земаља које су настојале ‘одозго’ да утичу на промену језика. (...) Кључни појам у свему томе је nation building.”

adopted a Declaration on the Constitutional Status of the Montenegrin Language (*Jezik kao domovina. Deklaracija Crnogorskog PEN centra o ustavnom položaju crnogorskog jezika* — see <<http://www.montenet.org/language/pen-decl.htm>>), because the Montenegrins were the only nation on the territory of the former Serbo–Croatian language whose mother tongue bore the name of a foreign nation (see Neweklowsky 2010: 122 or Perović 2011: 23). The declarers’ objective was that in the Montenegrin constitution the glossonym *Serbian* be replaced with *Montenegrin*. In 1995, there was also remarkable international support in the form of the Resolution of the International PEN Center on the Montenegrin Language (*Rezolucija Međunarodnoga PEN centra o crnogorskom jeziku*), which was prepared during the 62nd Congress of the International PEN Club held in Perth, Australia (see <https://hr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crnogorski_jezik>). At that time, in 1995, at the initiative of the abovementioned PEN Center, a Committee for Codification of the Montenegrin Language was established, and in 1997 **Nikčević** published a “fundamental work” (in the words of the quoted S. Perović) — *Spelling of the Montenegrin Language* (see Perović 2011: 23).¹⁰¹ Even before the Spelling came out, **Nikčević** had already published a large two-volume publication *Montenegrin Language*,¹⁰² in the first volume of which he dealt primarily with the ethnogenesis of the Montenegrin nation (Neweklowsky 2010: 123). However, **Nikčević**’s abundant propaganda activity and numerous published books also had their dark side — his critics criticized the non-scientific and, euphemistically put, “specific” approach to the scientific facts and topics he worked with and interpreted in his own way in his articles and books (in which he dealt mainly with the genesis of the Montenegrin nation and language). His main idea was to prove that the Montenegrins were an entirely different ethnicity from the Serbs, respectively that from a historical perspective their language had nothing in common with Serbian language (**Nikčević** linked genetically the Montenegrin language to Polabian)¹⁰³, etc. After **Nikčević**’s death (2007),

101 НИКЧЕВИЋ, В. *Правопис црногорскога језика*. Подгорица: Црногорски ПЕН центар, 1997.

102 НИКЧЕВИЋ, В. *Црногорски језик. Генеа, типологија, развој, структурне особине, функције*. Цетиње: Матица црногорска, том I. 1993, том II. 1997.

103 In a radio program of 1998 V. Nikčević said: “Serbian language is originally Ekavian only and Serbs did not have Ijekavian variant till migrations. Ijekavian was brought from the old homeland, from today’s Eastern Germany. Prototype of Montenegrin language is Polabian language that died out in 18th century. Ancestors of Serbs brought only Ekavian from the South-Eastern Poland, that is in touch with Belorussian Ekavism” (orig.: “Српски језик је изворно само екавски и до миграција Срби

as the leading philologist–propagandist of full Montenegrin language separatism can be considered **Adnan Čirgić**, Head of the Institute for Montenegrin Language and Linguistics (Podgorica) and “the first doctor of Montenegrin language” (Perović 2011: 24). This institution can be seen as the centre of radical language Montenegrism. Radical in the sense that its propagandists were aiming to create a language standard different from the currently existing in Montenegro standard language, regardless of whether we call it Serbian, Montenegrin, or even Serbo–Croatian. In this respect, it is emblematic that three new phonemes and the respective graphemes were introduced into the Montenegrin standard because they were part of the Montenegrin vernaculars.¹⁰⁴ However these consonants are specific to some vernaculars not only in Montenegro but also in the Serbian areas. In addition to the application of these controversial phonological phenomena Nikčević and his followers were aspiring to a certain archaization of the language standard in Montenegro. It can be summarized that the goal of this group of Montenegrists was exactly the change of the existing standard language in Montenegro (this change could also be called “literary” — see Lakić 2013: 144).¹⁰⁵

нису имали ијекавицу. Ијекавица је донесена из праотаџбине, из данашње источне Њемачке. Прототип црногорског језика је полабски језик који је изумро у 18. вијеку. Преци Срба су донијели само екавицу из југоисточне Пољске, која је у вези са белоруским екавизмом” — Interview 1998).

104. These are the palatal consonants [ç], [ʒ] and afrikata [ʒ] and their graphic equivalents Š, Ž, ʒ in Latin, respectively Ć, 3', S in Cyrillic (Compare Serbian Ekavian standard *секира, зеница*, similarly also *тепату, где* (in Latin *sekira, zenica, terati, gde*), Serbian Ijekavian standard *сјекира, зјеница*, similarly also *тјепату, здје* (in Latin *sjekira, zjenica, tjerati, gdje*), and Montenegrin /Nikčević—Čirgić/s/ standard *џекира, з'еница*, similarly also *ћепату, ље* (in Latin *šekira, ženica, ćerati, de* — “axe”, “pupil”, “urge, drive”, “where”), where however the already existing phonemes are utilized [h], respectively [h]).
105. In this respect, Adnan Čirgić unequivocally said in an interview: “The name of Montenegrin language does not cover Serbian content, this does not mean renaming the existing standard, but that it implies a special standard and standardization. Politically speaking, in an independent state of Montenegro, similarly to independent Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia, and simply by the same principle, the official language should be Montenegrin by the name of the state of Montenegro, and would be at the same time language of all its citizens” (orig.: “Име црногорског језика не покрива српске садржаје, то не значи преименовање постојећег стандарда, него да то подразумевијева и посебну норму и стандардизацију. Политички гледано, у независној држави Црној Гори, попут независне Хрватске, Босне и Херцеговине и Србије, једноставно истим принципом требало би да службени језик буде црногорски по имену државе Црне Горе који би био подједнако језик свих њених грађана” — Interview 2007).

VI.

This approach was criticized not only by those denying the existence of a Montenegrin language but also by some prominent Montenegrin, Serbian, and European linguists. In relation to the newly emerged language situation **Rajka Glušica**, Head of the study program in Montenegrin Language and South Slavonic Literatures in the Faculty of Arts in Nikšić, accepted the term “restandardization” of the literary language, proposed by Serbian linguist **Ranko Bugarski** (2009). According to Bugarski, the process leading to creation of the new standard languages had three phases: standardization, emergence of variants and restandardization (Glušica 2009: 23). More specifically, this means that: “The first phase would correspond to the beginning of the monocentric standard language on dialect base within the process of standardization (Serbo–Croatian in the 19th century), the second phase corresponds to the emergence of variants within the process of variant establishment, and through this process the language becomes pluricentric standard language (Serbo–Croatian in the 20th century with two variants: Serbian and Croatian, and two literary language expressions: Montenegrin and Bosnian–Herzegovinian); and the third phase is a transformation of variants into standard languages through restandardization (contemporary standard languages: Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin)” (ibid.).¹⁰⁶ The quoted text clearly shows that R. Glušica supported the existence of Montenegrin standard language but did not agree with the ideas of **Nikčević** and **Čirgić** about the very process of standardization and its result, a final “product”, i.e. the form of the Montenegrin standard language, because to **Čirgić** standardization meant “not necessarily renaming the existing standard, but a specific norm and standardization” (see Note 105).

This view reveals the main methodological disagreement between the representatives of the Montenegrists’ *radical wing* (closely linked to the Montenegrin nationalistically oriented authorities and represented by

106 Orig.: “Prva faza bi odgovarala nastanku monocentričnog standardnog jezika od dialekatске базе процесом стандардизације (српскохрватски у XIX вијеку), друга одговара развијању варијаната процесом варијантације, чиме тај језик постаје полицентричан стандардни језик (српскохрватски језик у XX вијеку са двије варијанте: српском и хрватском и два књижевнојезичка израза: црногорским и босанскохерцеговачким); и трећа фаза представља преобликовање варијаната у стандардне језике путем рестандардизације (данашњи стандардни језици: српски, хрватски, босански и црногорски).”

the Institute for Montenegrin Language and Linguistics in Podgorica) and the Montenegrists' *moderate* or rather *pragmatic wing* (represented by the Montenegrin Studies section at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Montenegro in Nikšić, in other words a "linguistic" group). Even though both groups had the same goal (standardization of the language of the Montenegrin nation under the name *Montenegrin language*, and taking care about its development), the methods and the personal preferences were so different that they led to mutual hostility. This was made obvious, for example, by the following words of **R. Glušica**: "Nationalism produces myths that are being uncritically accepted and that strengthen the national identity, and the most favourite myth is the one about the dissimilarity with the neighbours, division from them and independent existence from the ancient times. This myth is basis for building the Montenegrin language in the minds of Montenegrin language nationalists. The Montenegrin language is an independent language idiom, as a special one brought from the legacy of Polabian-Pomeranian area (today's Eastern Germany), created from the extinct Polabian language, has not a common origin with other South Slavonic languages, and that is why it is different from the neighbouring languages. All this is far from scientific truth and very dangerous" (Glušica 2011: 116).¹⁰⁷ After having read the words of Prof. Glušica, we won't be surprised by the fact that she was also the author of one of the many positive reviews of the book *Language and Nationalism (Jezik i nacionalizam)* by **Snježana Kordić**,¹⁰⁸ and that similarly she criticized the manifestations of Serbian nationalism. On the other part, she was not of the same opinion as **S. Kordić** when talking about the relation between state (or nation) and language — **R. Glušica** said that "in sociolinguistic and political view it would be natural that Montenegrin state has Montenegrin name of its language, under condition that it has speakers that see their language as Montenegrin. Language goes with

107 Orig.: "Национализам производи митове који се некритички прихватају и којима се јача национални идентитет, а најомиљенији мит јесте онај о несродности са сусједима, одвојености од њих и аутохтоно постојање од давних времена. Управо на овом миту гради се црногорски језик у изведби црногорских језичких националиста. Црногорски језик је аутохтон језички идиом, као посебан донијет је из прапостојбине из Полабља-Поморја (данашња источна Њемачка), настао је из изумрлог полапског, нема заједничко поријекло са другим јужнословенским језицима, па се због тога и разликује од других сусједних језика. Све је то далеко од научне истине и веома опасно."

108 KORDIĆ, S. *Jezik i nacionalizam*. Zagreb: Durieux, 2010. Review by R. Glušica see Glušica 2011b, review by the author of this book see Chapter 8.

the state, shares a name with it and is given a strength and affirmation of a stable and strong state” (Glušica 2009: 144, see also 145),¹⁰⁹ S. Kordić in turn unequivocally supported the opinion that “national identity of speakers is not a criterium for naming the language, f. e. a Swiss does not speak Swiss, a Belgian does not speak Belgian, a Canadian does not speak Canadian, an Austrian does not speak Austrian, an Argentinian does not speak Argentinian and so on” (Kordić 2010: 127).¹¹⁰ We wouldn’t be surprised either by the words of A. Čirgić, at a conference organized by the Montenegrists’ radical wing, about R. Glušica: “There might be those among you that ask why there are for example no representatives of the Department of Montenegrin Language in Nikšić at this round table, and why there are no linguists from this department? When we were preparing this round table, they all were informed about it in advance and received an official invitation. However, we were said that there is nobody interested among them. It is beyond question to ask why Montenegro have such a department for the Montenegrin language at all” (Čirgić 2011: 16).¹¹¹

VII.

Roughly the same position as R. Glušica’s was maintained, for example, by Norwegian Slavonic and Serbo–Croatian scholar Svein Mønnesland. He said the following about the ideas of radical Montenegrists: “(...) I don’t believe that future standard language in Montenegro will be the same as the one that was offered by professor Nikčević, but that it will be based on language that is nowadays in media, literature and so

109 Orig.: “Социолингвистички и политички било би природно да црногорска држава има црногорско име свог језика, под условом да има говорнике који свој језик сматрају црногорским. Језик иде са државом, дијели име са њом, по чему му снагу и афирмацију даје стабилна и јака држава.”

110 Orig.: “nacionalna pripadnost govornika nije kriterij za nazivanje jezika, npr. Švicarac ne govori švicarski, Belgijanac ne govori belgijski, Kanadanin ne govori kanadski, Austrijanac ne govori austrijski, Argentinac ne govori argentinski itd.”

111 Orig.: “Можда има данас међу вама оних који се питају зашто на овоме округлом столу нема на примјер ниједнога представника Катедре за црногорски језик у Никшићу и зашто нема лингвиста с те катедре? Кад смо припремали овај округли сто, сви су они благовремено обавијештени о њему и упућен им је званичан позив за учешће. Но речено нам је да међу њима нема заинтересованих. Излишно је после тога постављати питање што ће Црној Гори уопште таква катедра за црногорски језик.”

on, what does not diminish its historical role” (Interview 2006),¹¹² and just like **M. Kovačević**, **S. Mønnesland** also criticized (only a little more moderately) the non-scientific views of **V. Nikčević**, saying about him that “[since] the beginning of 90s, he published a series of papers about history and grammar of Montenegrin language, often with polemical tones, and not always on the most scientific bases” (Mønnesland 2009: 127).¹¹³ About Prof. **Glušica**’s view the Norwegian Slavonic scholar said: “In my opinion, prof. Glušica gave a very realistic picture of the current situation. (...) It was quite wise to point out the need to include Ijekavian pronunciation into norm in Montenegro, and that the valid spelling of 1960 was out of date. She pointed to a negative tendency in other areas, thinking, probably, of the Croatian and Bosnian standard, to make as many differences as possible among the new standard languages, hoping that the Montenegrin linguists would not make this mistake, but would standardize the actual state. In the standardization, ‘it is necessary to rely on forms that are of national origin and generally accepted. To consider only those solutions that are validated widely in literature and other functional styles.’ I agree with that” (Interview 2006).¹¹⁴ **Mønnesland** characterized the Montenegrin standard language of the 1990s as one of the two Ijekavian versions of Serbian language (the second was the Serbian Ijekavian standard in Bosnia and Herzegovina) (Mønnesland 2009: 125). As regards the Montenegrin language situation later he also observed three “schools” — 1. **Nikčević**’s Montenegrin, 2. **Glušica**’s Montenegrin, and 3. Serbian. According to **Mønnesland** (2009: 128), the “most well-known linguist in Montenegro” Prof. **Branislav Ostojić**, co-author of *Ijekavian Serbian Spelling* (1993)¹¹⁵ and *History of*

112 Orig.: “(...) не вјерујем да ће будући стандардни језик у Црној Гори бити једнак књижевном језику који је предложио професор Никчевић, већ да ће се базирати на језику какав је данас у медијама, литератури итд., што не умањује историјску улогу његову.”

113 Orig.: “Od početka 90-ih objavio je niz radova o povijesti i gramatici crnogorskog jezika, često s polemičnim tonovima, a ne uvijek na najstručnijoj osnovi.”

114 Orig.: “По мом схватању проф. Глушица је дала сасвим реалну слику садашње ситуације. (...) Сасвим умјесно је указала на потребу да се ијекавица нормира у Црној Гори, те да је важећи правопис из 1960. године застарио. Указала је на негативну тенденцију у другим срединама, мислећи ваљда на хрватски и босански стандард, да се направи што више разлика међу новим стандардним језицима, надајући се да црногорски лингвисти не би направили ту грешку, већ ће нормирати стварно савремено стање. При нормирању ‘треба се ослонити на облике који су општенародни и општеприхваћени. Узимати у обзир само она рјешења која су потврђена у широкој употреби у литератури и другим функционалним стиливима’. С тим се слажем.”

115 СИМИЋ, Р. — ЋОРИЋ, Б. — КОВАЧЕВИЋ, М. — ОСТОЈИЋ, Б. — СТАНОЈЧИЋ, Ж. *Правопис српског језика са рјечником*. Београд — Никшић: Унирекс, 1993.

the Montenegrin Expression of Literary Language (2006),¹¹⁶ was outside the three listed schools. Ostojić's views were by no means Montenegrinistic, i.e. he did not mean to create a new Montenegrin standard with his book, but rather wanted to pay attention to the significant differences between the Ijekavian versions within the Serbian language territory (ibid.: 130).

VIII.

So far, we have made a basic juxtaposition of the views: 1. of two strongly nationally oriented groups — the Serbian “Neo-Vukovites” and the radical Montenegrists, and 2. of two Montenegrinistic trends — pragmatic, or “linguistic”, and radical, or “literary”. However, how do the Neo-Vukovites and the pragmatic Montenegrists perceive each other? Judging from R. Glušica's anti-nationalistic statements, given above, it could be expected that the familiar proverb “The enemy of my enemy is my friend” would not apply to this situation. M. Kovačević said about R. Glušica, that she was “one of the few linguists that had stood behind the political project of Montenegrin language” (Kovačević — Šćepanović 2011: 87),¹¹⁷ and for example the constitutional definition of the Montenegrin language,¹¹⁸ accepted by R. Glušica without any remarks,¹¹⁹ was commented on by M. Kovačević in his typical ironic way.¹²⁰

116 ОСТОЈИЋ, Б. *Историја црногорског књижевнојезичког израза*. Подгорица: ЦИД, 2006.

117 Orig.: “један од ријетких лингвиста који је стао иза политичког пројекта црногорског језика.”

118 Article 13 of the new Montenegrin constitution (October 2007): the official language in Montenegro is Montenegrin. Cyrillic and Latin script has equal status. Serbian, Bosnian, Albanian and Croatian can be used in official relations. (orig.: “Службени језик у Црној Гори је црногорски језик. Вирилично и латинично писмо су равноправни. У службеној употреби су и српски, босански, албански и хрватски језик” — see Chapter 5 or Krejčić 2012: 158).

119 “Article 13 says that the official language is Montenegrin, that Cyrillic and Latin script has equal status, and that Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Albanian are used in official relations. Such a constitutional definition of official language and languages in official use steamed from the need to solve this problem on democratic bases in multinational, multi-lingual, and, first of all, in politically divided Montenegro. Obviously, the policy of language pluralism, which supports linguistic diversity, is in effect, but Montenegrin language is primarily promoted and legally protected as an expression of national identity” (orig.: “У Чл. 13 стоји да је службени језик црногорски, да су равноправне хирилица и латиница, те да су у службеној употреби српски, хрватски, босански и албански. Овакво уставно дефинисање службеног језика и језика у службеној употреби настало је из потребе да се у вишенационалној и вишејезичкој, а прије свега политички подијељеној Црној Гори, на демократски начин ријеша ова проблематика. Очигледно да је на снази политика језичког плурализма којом се подржава језичка разноликост, али се прије свега промовише и правно штити црногорски језик као израз националног идентитета” — Glušica 2009: 27).

120 “That ‘uniqueness of Montenegrin language’ was confirmed by constitutional regulation (definition), that for sure is ‘unique in the world’, as Montenegrin is certainly the only one from the languages

IX.

In conclusion we can say the following: there are currently three main trends in Montenegro, which are active in the polemics about the language policy in Montenegro itself: 1. Radical Montenegrin wing, related to the views of the “father” of the Montenegrin language **Vojislav Nikčević**, and united around the ideologically close institutions such as Matrix Montenegrina (*Matica crnogorska*) in Cetinje, the Montenegrin PEN Center, or the Institute for Montenegrin Language and Linguistics in Podgorica, headed by **Adnan Čirgić**. This wing can be described as led by moderate to radical nationalism and, using “language engineering” methods, imposing its romantic views of the Montenegrin standard language as an entirely specific South Slavonic language. Outside Montenegro they are supported, for example, by several Croatian linguists, who participate even personally in the realization of their language intentions. The involvement of foreign specialists in their favour (for example, Croats **Josip Silić** /Grammar and Spelling/ and **Ivo Pranjković** /Grammar/, or Ukrainian **Lyudmila Vasileva** /Spelling/) is typical of this wing; 2. Pragmatic (realistic) Montenegrin wing, primarily related to linguists **Rajka Glušica**, **Igor Lakić**, and the study program Montenegrin Language and South Slavonic Literatures in the Faculty of Arts in Nikšić. This wing can be described as led by objective (socio)linguistic criteria, linguistic (pragmatic) opportunism to moderate nationalism, and sociolinguistic realism, based on scientific theories which justify the views supporting the independence of the Montenegrin language as one of the four “political” languages built on the so-called Central South Slavonic diasystem (i.e. the former Serbo-Croatian language). Outside Montenegro their views somewhat coincide, for example, with the views of Serbian

of the world mentioned in constitution that is ‘official language’, but not ‘language used in official relations’. Constitution of Montenegro sees ‘Montenegrin’ as an ‘official language’, but does not include it in the ‘languages used in official relations’, as it enumerates there: Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Albanian. Thus, ‘the Montenegrin language’ is constitutionally unique language in the world because it is ‘the official language’, which is not ‘the language used in official relations’” (orig.: “Та ‘јединственост црногорског језика’ своју је потврду добила и у уставној одредби (дефиницији), која заиста јесте ‘јединствена на свијету’, јер је ‘црногорски’ вјероватно једини од свих у уставу записаних језика у свијету ‘службени језик’, али не и ‘језик у службеној употреби’. Устав Црне Горе, наиме, сматра да је ‘црногорски’ ‘службени језик’, али га не подводи под ‘језике у службеној употреби’, него тамо набраја: српски, хрватски, босански и албански. Тако је ето ‘црногорски језик’ уставно уникатан језик у свијету, јер је ‘службени језик’, који није ‘језик у службеној употреби’” — Kovačević 2012: 303—304).

linguist **Ranko Bugarski**, or Norwegian linguist **Svein Mønnesland**; 3. (Pro)Serbian wing, with partially “Neo-Vukovite” orientation, primarily related to the study program Serbian Language and South Slavonic Literatures in the Faculty of Arts in Nikšić, to Matrix Serbica — Association of the members in Montenegro (Matica srpska — Društvo članova u Crnoj Gori), and to linguists such as **Branislav Ostojić**, **Jelica Stojanović** or **Draga Bojović**. This wing can be described as led by objective (socio)linguistic criteria and moderate to radical language nationalism, based on scientific theories which justify the views supporting the thesis that the language of Serbs and Montenegrins spoken in Montenegro is Serbian or, more precisely, Montenegrin expression of Serbian literary language. Outside Montenegro, they are supported by many Serbian linguists who often participate personally in the polemics against the propagandists of Montenegrin language separatism. Their views coincide, for example, with those of Serbian linguist **Miloš Kovačević**.

X.

In the near future, it will be interesting to follow the development of the rivalry between the two Montenegrin wings, and to what extent will the Serbian wing succeed in achieving constitutionally equal status for Serbian language alongside Montenegrin. We have to add that the Serbian claims are totally reasonable, because we have to take into account the fact that, according to the latest census (2011), Serbian is still the most common language in Montenegro, as it was indicated by 43 % of the population, while Montenegrin — by only 37 %.¹²¹ And even though it may be expected that as a result of the focused anti-Serbian state propaganda the number of Montenegrins declaring their language as Montenegrin will increase, the number of citizens indicating Serbian as their language shouldn't fall below 30 %, given the ethnic structure of the Montenegrin population, so its significance from the perspective of Montenegro's entire territory shouldn't be reduced radically nor marginalized.

121 See http://sr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Црна_Гора.

CHAPTER 8

LANGUAGE AND NATIONALISM (SNJEŽANA KORDIĆ'S POINT OF VIEW)

Snježana KORDIĆ: *Jezik i nacionalizam*. Zagreb: Durieux, 2010, 430 p., ISBN 978-953-188-311-5.

Short, but appropriate name of the book, written by Croatian linguist Snježana Kordić, promises answers to many questions anybody who is aware of (or is in process of getting know) the South-Slavonic language area must ask. Themes this book is discussing are not connected to language development of former Yugoslavia after 1990 only, even though the main aim of author is to analyze language and national relations between the Croats, Bosniaks, Serbs and Montenegrins. Attentive and (in Slavonic Studies) specialized reader will experience many flashes of current and past or already faded problematic relations, sometimes mainly national, sometimes more about language, affecting ordinary and political decision making in other Slavonic countries. Book brings more light into many language-connected steps of professional linguists mainly in Croatia and denudes their political or even politicking calculations that stands behind such decisions and on that Kordić mercilessly points at, and judges them based on richly quoted specialized (socio)linguistic literature as academically disputable, unscientific and quasi-scientific. Book is divided to three main parts: *Language purism* (p. 9—68), *Pluricentric standard language* (p. 69—168) and *Nation, identity, culture, history* (p. 169—379).

A respectable list of literature (p. 381—407) and registers of names and terms (p. 409—428) follow. Monography is concluded with a two-page introduction of author, where we (among other things) get to know that author is from Osijek in Slavonia, and that she left for Germany after absolving her PhD. studies (1993) and gave lectures for fifteen years at universities in Bochum, Münster, Berlin and Frankfurt/Main.

In part devoted to language purism author describes in detail what is language purism, how it is being expressed, what are the arguments of puristically-oriented linguists and how they promote their thoughts in particular national community. At many places she compares situation in Croatia after 1990 with situation in Germany at times, when this country was controlled by the ideology of Hitler's NSDAP, and she finds many interesting parallels. Already in this first part of the book it is obvious that her view of standard language, its place in a national community and roles linguists should play in such community, is based on principle of minimal intervention, so she could be seeing (and criticizing) many signs and approaches she criticizes when talking about Croatian purists, even when talking about other, more prescriptive-oriented advocates of greater or lesser control of language. Many arguments, that Snježana Kordić provides against Croatian purists, are very similar to those of Václav Cvrček, that in his monography *Regulation of Language and The Concept of Minimal Intervention* (*Regulace jazyka a Koncept minimální intervence*, 2008) opposes views of Czech linguists that look at question of standard language from the point of theory of language culture, according to Cvrček imperfect and in some parts dangerously close to purist views, even though the theory of language culture set itself against purism at the beginning. Typical signs that author blames her colleagues for are f. e. creating and affirming the feeling of endangerment of Croatian language, aspiration to clean it from foreign elements, aspiration to protect its purity via regulation (support of function of the so-called lectors, de facto censors of language, that f. e. patrol in media so no unwilling words will be used), widening and fostering of a false feeling that the Croats in fact does not master their standard language or master it incorrectly, what leads in effect to communication frustration of speakers, that come under this impression because of the lack of information, further the impression that (some) linguists are the "chosen ones" and the only ones that perfectly master the correct Croatian standard norm, giving

priority to symbolic function of language instead of communication, or applying subjective esthetic criteria in evaluation of language signs (see f. e. contests for a most beautiful newly-created Croatian word).

Second part of the book is dealing with at first sight more difficult question — how to name the language that is being spoken in Croatia, and what is its relation to language or languages of the Serbs, Montenegrins and Bosniaks, that means languages that are the closest to Croatian in this sense. Based on solid socio-linguistic analysis, Kordić concludes (or we should say: advocates the opinion she has had for a long time) that the four named nations are speaking one standard language and this standard language has four national variants: Serbian, Croatian, Bosniak and Montenegrin. Character of this language is in line with socio-linguistic classification polycentric (or pluricentric) and author of this book blames linguists, that are — from different reasons — opposing or keeping this fact back, for unscientific approach, no regards to the reason being ignorance (lack of specialized background) or intention (politics). According to author, the question of naming this language in specialized linguistic discourse cannot be understood as a complex problem, because a name Serbo-Croatian (Serbo-Croatian *sprskohrvatski/hrvatskosrpski jezik*; Russian *сербохорватский язык*; German *serbokroatische Sprache*; French *langue serbo-croate*) is in practice being used for 150 years already, and therefore there is no reason for stepping aside from this fixed term. Kordić, of course, states more arguments for this name, answering her opponents at the same time. For example she replies to the blame that the name Serbo-Croatian is not taking into consideration two nations that are speaking this language, with claim that names of languages almost never reflects names of all the nations that are speaking them, and speaking about Serbo-Croatian, she interprets this composite term — quoting Dalibor Brozović (1988) — as two components determining geographical area where this language is spoken, that means Serbia in the East, Croatia in the West (and Bosnia and Montenegro in the middle) — p. 129. She compares situation of Serbo-Croatian almost exclusively with situation of English, German, Spanish, Portuguese, French, but as well Hindi, where she also arguments with a fact, that these are pluricentric standard languages that are being spoken in more states, without anybody calling for specific name for his national or state variant.

At this place we would like to argue that states where the above-mentioned languages are spoken outside of the mother country (outside of Great Britain, Germany, Spain, Portugal, France), did not apply in history that type of nationalism that we know from the Slavonic countries (so-called Eastern, cultural, ethnical nationalism). Societies there are, on the other hand, typical example of so-called Western nationalism, aiming at creation of the so-called political, territorial nation (the Americans, Australians, Austrians, Swiss, Argentinians, Brazilians...). According to our opinion, it is important for understanding why nobody there is disputing the principle that “national identity of speakers is not a criterium for naming the language, f. e. a Swiss does not speak Swiss, a Belgian does not speak Belgian, a Canadian does not speak Canadian, an Austrian does not speak Austrian, an Argentinian does not speak Argentinian and so on” (p. 127). This is, among other things, reason why there are practically no ambitions for formulation of nationally-oriented claims and “rights” to name one’s own language in this countries, what is so different from Slavonic world, where the “holy trinity” of ethnic nationalism is being practically unexceptionally applied: one independent state (let’s say Montenegro), one independent nation (the Montenegrins), one independent language (Montenegrin) — preferably even one unique national belief (Montenegrin Orthodox Church) — all terminologically allied; fulfilling of this trinity (tetrad) is then a goal of every real nationalist, no matter where he comes from. However, from not so far history we know that Slavonic attempts to create one political nation with more ethnical nations based only on sharing common state area were not successful (Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia). Comparison of post-Serbo-Croatian situation with the above mentioned Western European examples is accurate in terms of typology of studied area (characteristic of studied languages, their classification), however, according to our opinion, ethno-psychological, socio-political and historical background cannot be compared, so the final analogy is deformed. From the point of view of the so-called national psychology would deeper probes to other Slavonic nations be more beneficial — either to their mutual relations or to their inner problems with separatism (f. e. the Bulgarians and Macedonians, Czechs and Slovaks, Ukrainians and Rusyns, Ukrainians and Russians, Moravian expressions in Czechia, Silesian in Poland). The

question of language plays important role there as well and opinions like “if I consider myself ethnically different, then I need to speak different language, no matter if this is linguistically correct or not. If not, then I will argue with *law* to speak differently or at least to call my language in any way, if I consider myself to be ethnically someone else.” From the non-Slavonic Balkan probes of analogical problematic areas, we might consider including language situation of the Romanians, Moldovans, Aromanians or look more closely at it in the Albanian national scope (mainly Albania, Kosovo and North-Western Macedonia). We are, however, aware that author was following mainly those analogical or illustrational examples that she had a deep knowledge of thanks to her studies.

Snježana Kordić, thanks to her consistency, could not omit the question why are (not only) Croatian linguists committing such an extensive falsification in their area of specialization. Answer is simple here, too: nationalism. And if nationalism stands behind the unscientific attitude to language study, Kordić is rightfully asking if, or eventually how is nationalism as a predominant binding social idea impacting other areas of the society, how it forms it and influences. That is why is the third and largest part of the book aimed at questions of national and cultural identity (and the role of language in these questions), both in synchronic and diachronic way. Author broadens linguistic orientation of this book in many chapters and starts with a wide critique of nationalism from the point of history, political science, sociology or philosophy. And even though she — as in other chapters of her book — backs her arguments from more than a half in the opinions of specialists in this area, we cannot resist the feeling that Kordić is in her quotations only repeating parlour philosophizing of civilization-malady critiques.

What I have in mind: to criticize nationalism and mainly its extreme forms is, naturally, correct and we can hardly oppose this Croatian linguist here. Experience from war conflicts in former Yugoslavia in the first half of 90s is saying for itself. But Kordić is, with a typical consistency, starting a critique of the so-called unarmful forms of nationalism — patriotism, love of homeland, national proudness... Nationalism (no regards if in “soft” or extreme form) is being criticized by Kordić mainly with regards to lies, myths and fabrications that accompanied creation of today’s nations chiefly in 19th century, but that people believe in till today, what is caused

by nationalistic-oriented educational system of criticized countries that is created and cherished by nationalistic-oriented governments (author contrasts criticized Croatia or other post-Yugoslav countries with primarily Germany and other Western-European countries). And Kordić essentially hates a lie as a platform of solidarity of a particular national society as she is aware that this lie is not caused by ignorance of laics (and therefore excusable in some way) but was and is politically-calculated by intellectual elites, including scientists (and therefore contemptible). This is, according to her, contrary to the role of intellectual in the society. However, to attack — among other things — even *sport* (p. 362—363) as an environment where the lowest, and by quoted authorities mainly men chauvinistic instincts and passions are being shown, seems distant from otherwise sober and precisely-constructed argumentation of author. And it is not important that these attacks are being almost in full taken over from other literature by Kordić. The very two-page subchapter about sport set within complexly-concepted chapter *Nationalism* is, according to our opinion, the weakest point of this book and suggests that author should cautiously think the wideness of applied multidisciplinary approach over, as high specialized standard from the linguistic or cultural-historical parts might be in chapters devoted to more distant disciplines regrettably lowered, no regards to the fact, that Kordić is anxiously sticking to quotes of authorities in these disciplines — expert in those fields would surely be able to find other authorities that could question opinions of the quoted ones. Human's desire to unite, create interest groups is natural, it is not important if the common element is religion, nationalism, football, collection of marks or even possession of a special model of automobile. Our examples are disparate and incomparable in content, but the basis is the same — these are the platforms that enable a group of human beings to unite, create a fellowship based on a common shared idea or interest. This is connected to an ambition to prove oneself, to do something others will remember, to be better, cleverer, faster, stronger, richer, more powerful, successful or popular (and so on) than somebody else. And all these natural human ambitions (that can be caricature very easily as their manifestations are indeed often ridiculous) are being in fact rejected by Kordić's critique of sport, according to her nationalized, even though the very same sport offers a range of options how to

eliminate these natural instincts without the losing side being hurt in any way, or even endangered on life (about the role of sport as a kind of a “valve” of soft, unharmed forms of nationalism is being discussed by for example Serbian linguist Ranko Bugarski in publication *Nova lica jezika* /2009: 82—83/). It would be probably unrealistic to expect that the international representational sport matches would be cancelled only to eliminate all sorts of potential manifestations of patriotism, nationalism, chauvinism, or also racism. Sport, after all, is carried out at club level as well, including international competition, and disproportional national or club fanaticism, accompanying some sport matches (even within one national community!) is still one and the same coin, but from the other side. Every country has its own laws and police to oppress, judge and punish socially improper manifestations of support.

We cannot omit this Croatian linguist's style of work with secondary literature. Many chapters are being created by Kordić in fact by taking others' quotes over, thus a reader has a feeling that author works as some kind of “manager of others' thoughts” only. Although intertextuality is typical for specialized works, we cannot avoid a feeling of some disproportion while reading the book *Language and Nationalism*. Is it possible to advocate this attitude in any way? Despite the mixed feelings we have in this regard, we think yes. To understand this, we need to get familiar in basic features with disputes that Snježana Kordić has for more a decade with protagonists of official Croatian language and linguist strategy, and mainly with diction of mutual critical remarks. In light of this cannot the disproportionately frequent and excessive quoting of author be viewed as inability of author to write her own text on this topic (that would, after all, be a very audacious claim, as Kordić's rich publication activity, mainly in magazine *Književna republika* is suggesting something different — continuous interest in the topic and her long-term and systematic study), but more like a form of defense, protected by unquestionable foreign authorities (let's mention Gröschel, Kloss, Glück, Ammon, Haarmann, Friedman, Hobsbawm, Thomas, Sundhaussen and others). It is defense of experienced linguist “chess master”, that knows from her own experience that her opponents could easily attack herself (as they do it in their reaction after all), not needing to pay attention to specific denial of her claims, while it is more difficult to attack verbally

and without counterargument the biggest world authorities in the field. One author's remark by the register of terms is indicative and eloquent for the whole heated dispute: "Based on experience, we can expect that in reactions to the book there will be inaccurate quotations without stating pages these claims should be on. That is why was this detailed register of terms prepared, so a reader could easily verify all the places, where a term is occurring. It is possible that this register of terms will work as a prevention to fabrications of non-existing claims" (p. 417).

Book *Jezik i nacionalizam* is specific, and in terms of content and bold polemic tone a unique South-Slavonic contribution to discussion about language situation in former Yugoslavia. Snježana Kordić brings in it — what exactly? In one of many reactions to the book, that author of these lines read, was mentioned a statement, that Kordić is "discovering America", when she from the beginning to the very end assiduously states, that Croats, Bosniaks, Montenegrins and Serbs speak four national variants of *one* standard language. But, is it not enough? In the mirror of what was done about language in former Yugoslavia in the past two decades and what is still being done there, her book is more than discovering America a loud shout that "the king is naked" — Kordić publicly, non-ambiguously and unscrupulously states what was widely accepted before 1990 and what a great part of Yugoslav society more or less sensed and still sense, but was afraid to say and advocate publicly in the new socio-political circumstances formed by nationalists (there are some exceptions, of course). After all, even that America was not *discovered* by Columbus, but from the point of view of European discovery-path history just *re-discovered*, not speaking about the fact, that its real existence was arbitrary to such discovery cruises. And, similarly, according to Kordić and based on scientific arguments that author patiently tolerates on 400 pages, Serbo-Croatian objectively and truly exists, no regards to how eagerly are nationalistically thinking linguists on the Slavonic South trying to prove otherwise. Whatever is our opinion on this issue, book is undoubtedly one of the most important and useful publications that are discussing the analyzed topic. At least it forces us to think, and that is something.

SUMMARY

The first chapter **South Slavonic Languages (General Overview)** is general overview of South Slavonic languages, their classification, phonetics and phonology, grammar, but also the graphical systems used in the South Slavonic area.

The second chapter **Selected Czech Handbooks of Serbo-Croatian from 60s, 70s and 80s (Sociolinguistic Analysis)** is dedicated to didactical topic. This text analyzes the attitudes towards Serbo-Croatian language and the reflection of the sociolinguistic reality in socialist Yugoslavia based on material from some Czech handbooks of Serbo-Croatian (textbooks, conversations, dictionary, grammar). The chapter follows the explicitly expressed attitude to the sociolinguistic situation of Serbo-Croatian and its pluricentric character, then selection of that option as a primary for educational purposes, the actual content of the handbooks in the light of the variability Serbo-Croatian, which was declared the Novi Sad Agreement of 1954, and the ratio of the Latin alphabet and Cyrillic again with regard to the needs of education and practical usage. All eight publications are based on the Latin alphabet, i. e. a Western official graphic system, mainly Ekavian pronunciation, i. e. an Eastern phonetic form (the only work to offer a balance between both phonetic variants — Ekavian and Ijekavian — was Sedláček's short grammar), and do not confront the Serbo-Croatian as one standard language, though pluricentric. From the

modern-day perspective interfering with the content of teaching texts in particular may be seen as the marginalization or even disregard for the Montenegrins and Bosniaks (at that time Muslims), who are practically not mentioned in the introductory chapters, or the in the actual texts that follow.

The third chapter **Selected Moments from the History of Serbo-Croatian (“B-C-S” Point of View)** compares different ways of description of the language history of the Serbs, Croats, Bosniaks and Montenegrins, and sociolinguistic issues in this regard, as shown in the introduction of some grammars of Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian languages. In the analyzed grammars we can be observe the following: more or less the same view on the classification of South Slavonic languages; as far as the pre-standardization period, views differ mainly in the Bosniak grammar; most disagreements in all grammars appear in connection with interpreting the events of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. These findings illustrate the difficulties faced by the teachers and students of the history of South Slavonic languages at Masaryk University in Brno, Czechia.

The fourth chapter **Selected Interpretations of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić’s Work (“C-S” Point of View)** focuses on Vuk Karadžić personality in terms of how it is currently his philological work accepted or on the contrary rejected. Even dogmatic adoration of its work can be seen in the views of some contemporary Serbian linguists that R. D. Greenberg (2005) described as “Neo-Vukovites”. Extremely reluctant approach to him have mainly the Croatian nationalist-minded linguists.

The next chapter **Selected South Slavonic Languages and Their Reflection in the Relevant Constitutional Articles on Language (Overview of the Language Policy in the Area of so-called Central South Slavonic Diasystem)** analyzes the constitutional articles of the Yugoslav state (1918—1992) and its four “Serbo-Croatian” federal republics (1946—1990), that in some way allude to the language, and in the second part the constitutional articles about languages of post-Yugoslavian countries (after 1992), former “Serbo-Croatian” federal republics: Croatia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro. During the monarchy the constitutional article declared the official language idealistically as Serbo-Croatian-Slovenian. Statutory regulation of the Independent State

of Croatia (1941—1945) very precisely defined the Croatian language and prohibited the Cyrillic alphabet. At that time, in occupied Montenegro, there was the first attempt to constitutionally enshrine the glossonym Montenegrin language. AVNOJ documents and constitutional articles of FPRY and of every of the Yugoslav people's republics immediately after the war provided the free glossonym presence of Serbian or Croatian. After the so-called Novi Sad Agreement (1954) the literary forms of the language of Serbs, Croats and Montenegrins were unified in the framework of one pluricentric standard language with a name mandatory consisting of two parts (Serbo-Croatian) with two variants (Ekavian written in Cyrillic and Ijekavian written in Latin), which is reflected in the respective constitutional articles. After the Croatian Declaration (1967), the Novi Sad arrangement began to be disturbed, which culminated in the language article in the Croatian Constitution of 1990. In Croatia after 1990 the glossonym in the constitution was no longer altered, the linguistic and media discourse showed of the struggle to purify the Croatian from Serbian language elements (whether real or supposed), which often had a purist character. In Serbia and Montenegro in 1991—1992 the glossonym Serbo-Croatian was changed for Serbian; in 1996 by the law in official contacts was only allowed the Ekavian version of Serbian, the new Serbian constitution of 2006 does not specify the phonetic variant. The new Montenegrin constitution from 2007, on the other hand, for the first time officializes the glossonym "Montenegrin language". The most complex national and language situation was in Bosnia & Herzegovina, and this situation naturally also affected the problems connected with the constitutional articles about language(s) in the constitutions of Bosnia & Herzegovina, but mainly in the constitutions of its parts — the Federation of Bosnia & Herzegovina and the Republic of Srpska. In the defense or support of the languages that replaced the Serbo-Croatian language in the monitored nations, various declarative texts were issued (1994 in Montenegro and 1995 in Australia about Montenegrin, 1995 and 2007 in Croatia, 1998 and 2007 in Serbia, 2002 and 2017 in Bosnia & Herzegovina, and the only one in favor of an antinationalist approach was the second one).

South Slavonic Language Paradoxes, University Teaching and Translating Experience (Fragments of the Grotesque Situation) is a chapter again dedicated to didactics, but also to the problems of translation

and translatology. The collapse of the Yugoslav state (1991—92) also affected national and linguistic issues. Serbo-Croatian language, which was until then, linguistically and politically, the only common language of the Serbs, Croats, Montenegrins and Muslims (Bosniaks later), was replaced in the successor republics by language with the corresponding ethnic glossonym (Croatian, Serbian and later Bosnian and Montenegrin language). Political support for the autonomy and uniqueness of these languages in their respective countries, however, faces an ambiguous acceptance by professionals-linguists. This ambiguity is reflected in the long-term problems with the concept of teaching of the so-called national philologies. Finally, we try to illustrate abnormal character and the grotesqueness of the contemporary situation on a concrete example from the translological practice.

The seventh, penultimate chapter **Language Policy in Montenegro (Fragments of the Farcical Situation)** presents an analysis of disputes for the standard language in Montenegro with regard to the planning of its status and its name. We observe the existence of three major trends that influence the standardization process and language codification in Montenegro or who want to manage them: 1. Radical Montenegrists, 2. Pragmatic Montenegrists and 3. Serbian “Neo-Vukovites”. All three groups are based on the certain scientific facts, greater objectivity and scientific maturity, however, is observed only in the second and third group. The first group is under the strong influence of too romantic and nationalist myths.

The last chapter **Language and Nationalism (Snježana Kordić’s Point of View)** is a review of the controversial book by the Croatian linguist Snježana Kordić *Jezik i nacionalizam* (Zagreb 2010), that on examples of Croatian, respectively post-Yugoslavian space she criticizes problematic approaches primarily serving Croatian linguists often their (un) professional manifestations of state nationalism, as well as politically motivated attempts to regulate language at any cost and to intervene in its development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auburger 2009 — AUBURGER, L. *Hrvatski jezik i serbokroatizam*. Preveli N. Palašić i L. Auburger. Rijeka: Maveda; Hrvatsko filološko društvo Rijeka, 2009.

Banjević 2008 — BANJEVIĆ, B. Nijesmo jezik prilagođavali tuđim pravopisima. — *Pobjeda*, 30.08.2008, Kultura, p. III.

Blažević Krezić 2012 — Blažević Krezić, V. (rev.) Riječki glagoljaški krug. Darko Deković, Istraživanja o riječkome glagoljaškom krugu. Matica hrvatska: Zagreb, 2011., 523 str. — In: *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest*, 44, 2012, 473—479.

Brborić — Vuksanović — Gačević 2006 — БРБОРИЋ, Б. — ВУКСАНОВИЋ, Ј. — ГАЧЕВИЋ, Р. (eds.) *Српски језик у нормативном огледалу. 50 одлука Одбора за стандардизацију српског језика*. Београд: Београдска књига, 2006.

Brozović 1970 — BROZOVIĆ, D. *Standardni jezik. Teorija, usporedbe, geneza, povijest, suvremena zbilja*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1970.

Brozović 2008 — BROZOVIĆ, D. *Povijest hrvatskoga književnog i standardnoga jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2008.

Bugarški 2002 — BUGARSKI, R. *Lica jezika. Sociolingvističke teme*. 2. izd. Beograd: Knjižara Krug; Biblioteka XX vek, 2002.

Bugarški 2009 — BUGARSKI, R. *Nova lica jezika. Sociolingvističke teme*. 2. izd. Beograd: Knjižara Krug; Biblioteka XX vek, 2009.

CRNA Gora. [online] Available at:

<http://sr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Црна_Гора> [2013-07-14].

CRNOGORSKI jezik. [online] Available at:

<https://hr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crnogorski_jezik> [2017-11-29].

Cvrček 2008 — CVRČEK, V. *Regulace jazyka a Koncept minimální intervence*. Praha: NLN; Ústav Českého národního korpusu, 2008.

Čirgić 2011 — ČIRGIĆ, A. Crnogorski jezik nakon standardizacije. — In: *Crnogorski jezik u javnoj upotrebi. Zbornik saopštenja*. Podgorica: Institut za crnogorski jezik i književnost, 15—17.

Damjanović 2003 — DAMJANOVIĆ, S. *Staroslavenski jezik. Četvrto, popravljeno i dopunjeno izdanje*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 2003.

Damjanović 2004 — DAMJANOVIĆ, S. *Slovo iskona. Staroslavenska/starohrvatska čitanka*. Drugo, dopunjeno izdanje. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2004.

Enciklopedija 2008 — *Енциклопедија српског народа*. Београд: Завод за уџбенике, 2008.

Glušica 2009 — GLUŠICA, R. Jezička politika u Crnoj Gori. — *Riječ. Časopis za nauku o jeziku i književnosti*, nova serija, br. 1, Nikšić, 15—30.

Glušica 2011a — GLUŠICA, R. Sila i zastrašivanje umjesto argumenata. — In: *Crnogorski jezik u javnoj upotrebi. Zbornik saopštenja*. Podgorica: Institut za crnogorski jezik i književnost, 114—117 (reprint of the original newspaper text: Stav: Profesorica Rajka Glušica o crnogorskom jeziku i nacionalizmu. Sila i zastrašivanje umjesto argumenata. — *ND Vijesti*, Kultura, 23.02.2011).

- Glušica 2011b — GLUŠICA, R. (rev.) O nacionalizmu i jeziku (Snježana Kordić, *Jezik i nacionalizam*, Durieux, Zagreb, 2010). — *Riječ. Časopis za nauku o jeziku i književnosti*, nova serija, br. 5, Nikšić, 185—191.
- Grčević 2011 — GRČEVIĆ, M. Suvremena jezična situacija u slavenskim zemljama. — In: *Slavenski jezici u usporedbi s hrvatskim II*. D. Sesar (ed.). Zagreb: FF-press, 2011, 143—159.
- Greenberg 2005 — GREENBERG, R. D. *Jezik i identitet na Balkanu. Raspad srpsko-hrvatskoga*. Prevela A. Peti-Stantić. Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2005.
- Gröschel 2009 — GRÖSCHEL, B. *Das Serbokroatische zwischen Linguistik und Politik. Mit einer Bibliographie zum postjugoslawischen Sprachenstreit*. München: Lincom Europa, 2009.
- Hladký 2005 — HLADKÝ, L. *Bosenská otázka v 19. a 20. století*. Ediční řada Monografie, sv. 12. Brno: Masarykova univerzita v Brně; Mezinárodní politologický ústav, 2005.
- INTERVIEW 1998 — Да ли постоји црногорски језик? Интервју с В. Никчевићем и М. Шћепановићем. — *Радио-Мост*, модератор Омер Карабег, 05.04.1998.
- INTERVIEW 2006 — Свен Менесланд, норвешки слависта и учесник недавног скупа о језику у ЦАНУ говори за Вијести. Интервју са С. Менесландом. [online] Available at: *Вијести*, септембар 2006 <<http://forum.cafemontenegro.com/showthread.php?22992-Nacija--nacionalizam-nacionalista-.../page2>> [2014-01-31].
- INTERVIEW 2007 — Црногорске језичне дилеме. Интервју с А. Чиргићем. [online] Available at: *Europa Magazine*, 2007 <<http://www.europamagazine.info/cgjezik.htm>> [2014-01-31].
- Jahić — Halilović — Palić 2000 — ЈАHIĆ, DŽ. — HALILOVIĆ, S. — PALIĆ, I. *Gramatika bosanskoga jezika*. Zenica: Dom štampe, 2000.

- Jakobsen 2010 — JAKOBSEN, P. *Južnoslovenske teme*. Beograd: SlovoSlavia, 2010.
- Jeníková 1966 — JENÍKOVÁ, A. *Česko-srbocharvátská konverzace*. Praha: SPN, 1966.
- Jeníková 1987 — Jeníková, A. *Srbocharváština pro samouky*. Edice Učebnice pro samouky. 5. vyd. Praha: SPN, 1987.
- Jeníková — Janešová — Prokopová 1989 — JENÍKOVÁ, A. — JANEŠOVÁ, J. — PROKOPOVÁ, L. *Česko-srbocharvátská konverzace*. 3. vyd. Praha: SPN, 1989.
- JEZIK kao domovina. Deklaracija Crnogorskog PEN centra o ustavnom položaju crnogorskog jezika*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.montenet.org/language/pen-decl.htm>> [2018-05-08].
- Jirásková 2013 — JIRÁSKOVÁ, H. *Nastava hrvatskog jezika u Češkoj*. [online] Available at: kroatistika.cz <http://kroatistika.cz/clanky/vyuka/vyuka_hrv.pdf>, 1—13 [2013-05-29].
- Jovanović Maldoran 2012 — JOVANOVIĆ MALDORAN, S. *Retrolingvistika. Istraživanje lingvističkog atavizma u Srbiji*. Beograd: Medijska knjižara Krug, 2012.
- Kordić 2010 — KORDIĆ, S. *Jezik i nacionalizam*. Zagreb: Durieux, 2010.
- Kovačević 2003a — КОВАЧЕВИЋ, М. *Српски језик и српски језици*. Београд: Српска књижевна задруга — БИГЗ, 2003.
- Kovačević 2003b — КОВАЧЕВИЋ, М. (ed.) *Српски писци о српском језику*. Београд: Источник, 2003.
- Kovačević 2012 — КОВАЧЕВИЋ, М. О актуелном правопису и граматичи “црногорског језика”. — In: *Српско језичко наслеђе на простору данашње Црне Горе и српски језик данас*. Зборник радова са међународног научног скупа одржаног у Херцег Новом 20—23. априла 2012. Ј. Стојановић et al. (eds.). Никшић: Матица

- српска — Друштво чланова у Црној Гори; Матица српска у Новом Саду, 2012, 303—323.
- Kovačević 2015 — КОВАЧЕВИЋ, М. *Српски језик између науке и политике*. Бања Лука: Друштво наставника српског језика и књижевности Републике Српске, 2015.
- Kovačević — Šćerpanović 2011 — КОВАЧЕВИЋ, М. — ШЋЕПАНОВИЋ, М. *Српски језику вртлогу политике*. Никшић: Матица српска — Друштво чланова у Црној Гори, 2011.
- Kraljačić 1974 — KRALJAČIĆ, T. *Kalajeva nacionalna politika u Bosni i Hercegovini*. — In: *Problémy národního hnutí v dějinách Československa a Jugoslávie od roku 1867 do konce 19. století*. Sborník prací z vědeckého zasedání československo-jugoslávské historické komise v Banské Bystrici 10. — 11. 9. 1973. Praha, 1974, 293—294.
- Krejčí 2012 — КРЕЙЧИ, П. Конституција и език (шрихи към езиковата политика на Сърбия и другите постсърбохърватски републики). — In: *Българската езикова политика в условията на европейска интеграция и глобализация*. Д. Иванова (ed.). Пловдив: Университетско издателство “Паисий Хилендарски”, 2012, 150—162.
- Krejčí 2017 — KREJČÍ, P. *Česko-jihoslovanská lexikografická produkce v letech 1900 až 2016*. — In: *Quo vadis, philologia?* E. Krejčová, P. Krejčí (eds.). Brno: Česká asociace slavistů; Tribun EU, 2017, 145—167.
- Lakić 2013 — LAKIĆ, I. *Jezička slika Crne Gore*. — In: *Jezik između lingvistike i politike*. V. Požgaj Hadži (ed.). Beograd: Knjižara Krug; Biblioteka XX vek, 2013, 133—158.
- Ljacká — Malá 1973 — Ljacká, V. — Malá, L. *Srbocharvátština pro jazykové školy I*. Edice Učebnice pro jazykové školy. 3. vyd. Praha: SPN, 1973.
- Ljacká — Malá 1985 — Ljacká, V. — Malá, L. *Srbocharvátština pro jazykové školy II*. Edice Učebnice pro jazykové školy. 2. vyd. Praha: SPN, 1985.

- Maldžijeva — Topolinjska — Đukanović — Piper 2009 — МАЛЦИЈЕВА, В. — ТОПОЛИЊСКА, З. — ЂУКАНОВИЋ, М. — ПИПЕР, П. *Јужнословенски језици: граматичке структуре и функције*. Београд: Београдска књига, 2009.
- Milanović 2004 — МИЛАНОВИЋ, А. *Кратка историја српског књижевног језика*. Београд: ЗУНС, 2004.
- Milosavljević 2002 — МИЛОСАВЉЕВИЋ, П. (ed.) *Срби и њихов језик. Хрестоматија*. Београд: Требник, 2002.
- Milosavljević — Subotić 2008 — МИЛОСАВЉЕВИЋ, П. — СУБОТИЋ, М. (eds.) *Србистика/Serbica: Српско питање и србистика — излагања, закључци и прилози. Зборник радова 3*. Бачка Паланка — Ваљево: Логос, 2008.
- Mønnesland 2009 — MØNNESLAND, S. Sociolingvistička situacija u Crnoj Gori. — In: *Jezični varijeteti i nacionalni identiteti. Prilozi proučavanju standardnih jezika utemeljenih na štokavštini*. L. Badurina, I. Pranjković, J. Silić (eds.). Zagreb: Disput, 125—136.
- Neweklowsky 2010 — НЕВЕКЛОВСКИ, Г. *Српске и јужнословенске теме*. Нови Сад — Београд: Матица српска; Вукова задужбина; Завод за уџбенике, 2010.
- Nikčević 2000 — НИКЉЕВИЋ, В. Crnogorski kao maternji. Budućnost naroda čuva se jezikom. — *Pobjeda*, 19.02.2000, p. 19.
- Nikolić 2007 — НИКОЛИЋ, Т. Извориште будућих сукоба. — *НИН*, 2923, 04.01.2007, 56—57.
- Noha 1984 — НОНА, М. *Srbocharvátsko-český a česko-srbocharvátský kapesní slovník*. Edice Kapesní slovníky. 5. vyd. Praha: SPN, 1984.
- Oczkowa 2010 — ОЦЗКОВА, В. *Hrvati i njihov jezik. Iz povijesti kodificiranja književnojezične norme. Prijevod s poljskoga jezika N. Pintarić*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2010.

- Perović 2011 — PEROVIĆ, S. Ipak se kreće. Crnogorski jezik kao lajtmotiv međunarodne aktivnosti Crnogorskoga PEN centra. — In: *Crnogorski jezik u javnoj upotrebi. Zbornik saopštenja*. Podgorica: Institut za crnogorski jezik i književnost, 2011, 23—25.
- Piper 2004 — ПИПЕР, П. *Српски између великих и малих језика*. Друго, допуњено издање. Београд: Београдска књига, 2004.
- REFERENDUM o nezávislosti Černé Hory. [online] Available at: <https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Referendum_o_nezávislosti_Černé_Hory> [2017-11-30].
- Samardžić 2011 — SAMARDŽIĆ, N. Jezik i samosvijest. — In: *Crnogorski jezik u javnoj upotrebi. Zbornik saopštenja*. Podgorica: Institut za crnogorski jezik i književnost, 2011, 19—22.
- Sedláček 1989 — SEDLÁČEK, J. *Stručná mluvnice srbocharvátštiny*. Praha: Academia, 1989.
- Stanojčić 2010 — СТАНОЈЧИЋ, Ж. *Граматика српског књижевног језика*. Београд: Креативни центар, 2010.
- Stanojčić — Popović 2004 — СТАНОЈЧИЋ, Ж. — ПОПОВИЋ, Љ. *Граматика српскога језика*. 9. изд. Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, 2004.
- Stojanović 2011 — СТОЈАНОВИЋ, Ј. *Путевима српског језика и ћирилице*. Никшић: Матица српска — Друштво чланова у Црној Гори, Одјељење за српски језик и књижевност, 2011.
- Stojanović — Voјović 2006 — СТОЈАНОВИЋ, Ј. — ВОЈОВИЋ, Д. *Српски језик између истине и обмане. (Социо)лингвистичка анализа стања у Црној Гори*. Београд: ЈАСЕН, 2006.
- Štěpánek 2011 — ŠTĚPÁNEK, V. *Jugoslávie — Srbsko — Kosovo: Kosovská otázka ve 20. století*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2011.

- Težak — Babić 1994 — TEŽAK, S. — BABIĆ, S. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. 10. poprav. izd. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1994.
- Težak — Babić 1996 — TEŽAK, S. — BABIĆ, S. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. 11. izd. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1996.
- Težak — Babić 2009 — TEŽAK, S. — BABIĆ, S. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. 17. izd. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2009.
- Togner 1963 — TOGNER, V. *Cvičebnice srbocharvátštiny*. Praha: SPN, 1963.
- Večerka 2006 — VEČERKA, R. *Staroslověština v kontextu slovanských jazyků*. Olomouc — Praha: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci; Euroslavica, 2006.
- Žagar 2009 — ŽAGAR, M. *Hrvatska pisma u srednjem vijeku*. — In: *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika — 1. knjiga: Srednji vijek*. J. Bratulić et al. (eds.). Zagreb: Društvo za promicanje hrvatske kulture i znanosti Croatica, 2009.

Scientific Editorial Board of Masaryk University

prof. Ing. Petr Dvořák, CSc.

PhDr. Jan Cacek, Ph.D.

Mgr. Tereza Fojtová

Mgr. Michaela Hanousková

prof. MUDr. Lydie Izakovičová Hollá, Ph.D.

doc. RNDr. Petr Holub, Ph.D.

doc. Mgr. Jana Horáková, Ph.D.

doc. PhDr. Mgr. Tomáš Janík, Ph.D.

doc. JUDr. Josef Kotásek, Ph.D.

prof. PhDr. Tomáš Kubíček, Ph.D.

doc. RNDr. Jaromír Leichmann, Dr.

PhDr. Alena Mizerová

doc. Ing. Petr Pirožek, Ph.D.

doc. RNDr. Lubomír Popelínský, Ph.D.

Mgr. Kateřina Sedláčková, Ph.D.

doc. RNDr. Ondřej Slabý, Ph.D.

prof. PhDr. Jiří Trávníček, M.A.

doc. PhDr. Martin Vaculík, Ph.D.

Pavel Krejčí

EIGHT FRAGMENTS FROM THE WORLD OF SERBIAN, CROATIAN, BOSNIAN AND MONTENEGRIN LANGUAGES

Selected South Slavonic Studies 1

Cover design and prepress by Pavel Pilch

Published by Masaryk University, Žerotínovo nám. 617/9, 601 77 Brno, CZ

1st electronic edition / 2018

ISBN 978-80-210-8992-1

The background of the page is filled with a complex, abstract pattern of thin, light blue lines. These lines are mostly curved and wavy, creating a sense of movement and fluidity. Some lines are straight, while others form loops or spirals. The overall effect is a modern, minimalist aesthetic.

muni
PRESS