Manufacturing Division: The Bosnian Language Project

By

Kevin N. Kenjar

Submitted to
Central European University
Nationalism Studies Program

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Advisor: Professor Rogers Brubaker

Budapest, Hungary

2007

Introduction

In any study of *a* language, in its popular understanding of a "national language", and nationality, it important to understand that these concepts experienced a parallel development. The notion of a common national language only became important when ordinary citizens became an important component of the state. While national languages initially served, almost exclusively, a communicative function, i.e. it allowed citizens to understand and take part in the government of the state, national language soon took on a key symbolic function as a marker of commonality and solidarity among individuals who perceived themselves as a horizontally stratified society. Apart from being a marker of inclusion, national languages also effectively erected barriers of exclusion, separating the so-called "in-group" from the "out-group". As a common national language soon became the *sine qua non* of a nation, the symbolic function soon overtook the communicative function, as evidenced by the maxim "One language, one nation, one state." However, as languages do not have self-identifying features *per se*, they must be operationally defined. This led to the confluence of linguistic classification and political aspiration, giving intellectuals (primarily philologists and linguists) a key role in nation-building social engineering projects. Through the classification of a dialect, or group of dialects, as a language, as well as through the standardization of said language, peoples were granted the status of "nations" thereby fueling for political aspirations. When these political aspirations were achieved, national languages subsequently served as palladia for nascent national identities and, as such, were promoted through education and media, while often being regulated by regulatory bodies of intellectuals with state patronage. Nationalist movements, however, have not always succeeded in achieving or maintaining

political ambitions. These nationalist movements, understanding the symbolic function of language, have sought to promote classificatory claims rivaling those of the establishment. Clearly, any demand the privileged use of a language/dialect in education or culture other than the established one, when it does not bring any obvious advantages to learners, is a demand for status and power, not for easier learning. When political realties shift, and these rival nationalist movements are empowered, their concomitant rival linguistic classifications are gain official acceptance, new regulatory bodies are established, and new educational corpora are adopted as the old institutional carriers and promulgators prove inadequately flexible or are otherwise eliminated. This intellectual shift is necessarily accompanied by attempts to discredit the previous linguistic classifications, as well linguistic planning aimed at dissimilating the new national language from both the old language and the neighboring dialects included under the classification. Given the authority of the new classifications over the old, these trends are often conducted under the pretext of "protection", "revivalism", "purism", and, among intellectuals, "reversing language shift", despite the fact that this is often performed through the introduction of neologisms, calques, and archaisms of spurious origins.

Perhaps the leading exemplar of such linguistic separatism is the case of collapse of Yugoslavia. As the state succumbed to nationalist movements, the institutional carriers and promulgators of the official language, Serbo-Croatian, were eliminated, while rival institutions were established in Serbia and Croatia, marked by the above-mentioned trends. The case in Bosnia-Herzegovina is of particular interest, as the political realities and competing national claims have left Bosnia-Herzegovina heavily divided. Despite being relatively linguistically homogenous, the citizens of Bosnia-

Herzegovina are heavily divided in their national sentiments, with those identifying as Croat and Serb often adhering to the linguistic classifications of their respective kin-states. However, a third linguistic classification, Bosnian, has been empowered by the state and given international recognition through the Dayton Accord. This has led a new nation-building social engineering project: philologists have become engaged in legitimizing their classificatory claims through the impartation of continuity, linguists have standardized the new national language and established a regulatory body, educators have promulgated the new language, and mass media have reified the language through mass reproduction. However, as the Bosnian-Herzegovinian state and civil society remain divided along national lines, not one, but three mutually intelligible official languages (Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian) are promulgated through their respective educational institutions and nationalist media outlets. This leaves the citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina exposed to competing linguistic authorities, each promoting competing orthographic, grammatical, and lexical variants. The obedience to any of these particular linguistic authorities, as indicated by the use of their particular orthographic, grammatical, and, most importantly, lexical conventions, serves as a shibboleth of nationality, marking the speaker's inclusion to or exclusion from a particular nationality. Furthermore, the variants taught in one's school may differ from those used by the media he or she chooses to follow, as well as those used by his or her neighbors, friends and family, resulting in competing "circles of intimidation". Given that language is not simply used, but contemplated and commented on by its speakers, citizens Bosnians are left to reflexively engage their language.

LANGUAGE AND NATION AS A SINGLE DOMAIN

The title of this paper suggests I will be examining the Bosnian language project as a project on the "Bosnian language", immediately suggesting I aim to study *creation* of the Bosnian. This is not my intention. Rather, I will be looking at a *continuous* "language project" in regard to Bosnia and Herzegovina. The "Bosnian language" is merely one of the most recent developments in the project.

In short, the aim is to focus on a continuous debate, spanning generations (even centuries) regarding the relationship between two conceptual categories, "the nation" and "a language". The linkage between the nation and a language is a topic frequently discussed in the field of nationalism studies, and as my introduction shows, this relationship was characterized by, above all else, change. At one point the function of language was purely communicative for the nation, at another it was symbolic, and yet at another, it was deemed necessary. This shifting suggests that the relationship is not something that can be determined, as such a determination would necessitate treating the phenomena of the nation and a language as fixed, ontologically real entities "in-the-world" with the relationship between them being something that can be measured, discerned, or otherwise definitively described. In my approach, I plan to treat these two phenomena as conceptual categories in a single integrated domain; it is the "categorial relationship" between them that becomes the focus of my study. Of course, for the discussants in this discourse, the categories of "nation" and "language" may in fact be understood as fixed, "real", or otherwise essentialized. My ambiguity as to whether or not these concepts are treated as fixed stems from the fact that this is a discussion is occurring through time, with a wide variety of participants with different conceptions. For some, such as the 19th century Slavists, it is immediately apparent that neither a

nation nor a language were being discussed as fixed entities, with the later being regarded as a classification based on dialects, while the former were treated as being contingent on the latter. Thus, in order to have nations, they had to have languages, which were left for these Slavists to create through their classifications. For other participants, such as several key sociolinguists of the 21st century, language was treated as a classification, a way of looking at a variety of discernable linguistic features grouped together. However, this grouping was not to be made not according to the features themselves, but rather according to the groups (nations, ethnic groups, classes, etc.) from which the data was collected, which were treated as fixed entities. For other participants, such as many (but not all) of the speakers themselves, *both* the nation and the language were regarded as ontological realities. The fact that these participants disagree on the fixedness of these categories in attempting to establish the relationship between the two is not an impediment to this study, but rather its foundation.

The way I plan on examining this "language project" is through the methodology suggested by Brubaker in regard to groups in *Ethnicity without Groups*. In this way, groups are not to be strictly understood as groups of people, but rather as groups of classifications, i.e. categories:

> We can analyze the organizational and discursive careers of categories – the process though which they become institutionalized and entrenched in administrative routines and embedded in culturally powerful and symbolically resonant myths, memories, and narratives**.** We can study the politics of categories, both from above and below. From above, we can focus on the ways in which categories are proposed, propagated, imposed, institutionalized, discursively articulated, organizationally entrenched, and generally embedded in multifarious forms of "governmentality". From below we can study the "micropolitics" of categories, the ways in which

> the categorized appropriate, internalize, subvert, evade, or transform the categories that are imposed on them.[1]

I will thus examine the "language project" not only as an ongoing debate on the relationship between "nation" and "language", but a debate moderated by institutions that accept and entrench one particular conception of either or both categories at one particular time. Furthermore, I will examine the "micropolitics" of such institutional entrenchment of these concepts, the ways in these categories are internalized, subverted, evaded, and transformed by those who are categorized, among whom one almost always finds the categorizers whose conceptions are either accepted or rejected by these institutions.

The institutions I aim to examine here include the state, academia, cultural organizations and the media, but it is important to stress that the entrenchment of a category by even one of these institutions has repercussive effects the rest. While this may seem to extend the scope of this paper beyond that which is manageable, I plan to focus primarily, though not exclusively, on the state (and at times, states). The reason for this is that when a particularly category is entrenched by the state, above all other institutions, the repercussive effects are seen in these institutions, though to various degrees depending on the degree in which the state interacts with these other institutions. One need not be an expert on the bureaucracies of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian Empires, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, the wartime Independent State of Croatia, communist Yugoslavia, and the Office of the High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina to know that the state has typically interacted a great deal with these other institutions, particularly the educational institutions.

[1] Rogers Brubaker, Ethnicity without Groups, (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2004), 13.

The process of reification, i.e. the process in which these categories are made "real", shapes the "micropolitics" of the categories, but fundamentally shapes the discussion itself; reification not only affects the discussants themselves, but also the objective data with which they work. Key to understanding this is the notion that reification takes place over time. For example, the institutional entrenchment of a classification, let us say, the Ministry of Education declaration of "Bosnian" as the language of the schools for a period of 20 years, could (though not necessarily) lead to the publication of orthographic manuals, grammars, dictionaries, etc. as well as influencing a generation in the way they write and speak, evidenced in newspapers, literature, etc. While the institutional carriers, in our case the Ministry of Education, may eventually abandon the classification, the effects of this period have changed the data that will shape future debate. For future philological debates, the extant grammars, dictionaries, newspapers, works of literature, etc. from this 20-year period *can* be used in classification, as can the speech of people (particularly *a* people, e.g. a nation), in which traces of this change in lexicon and grammar *can* be discerned, if sought.

An often repeated, almost axiomatic, phrase regarding the construction of languages is that it is not done from scratch, as linguists had to work with "raw materials". As Safran writes, ""[The language of the elite] is not necessarily that of the peasants, who often speak a semiliterate dialect. The elite must legitimize, upgrade, and restructure that dialect in order to turn it into a proper vehicle for the expression of a national sentiment that is capable of being politicized"[2] Brubaker expounds on these "raw

[2] William Safran, "Identity," Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity, ed. Joshua Fishman, 77-93 (Oxford: Oxford UP,1999), 82.

materials" concerning successful "group-making efforts", of which such language "creation" should be considered a part:

> [Those] that do succeed (more or less) do so in part as a result of the cultural and psychological materials they have to work with…. Yet while such raw materials – themselves the product and precipitate of past struggles and predicaments – constrain and condition the possibilities for group-making in the present, there remains considerable scope for deliberate group-making strategy.[3]

I would argue that Brubaker's observations are nearly dead on, but with one small, but crucial, adjustment. If these materials are the "product and precipitate of past struggles and predicaments", and I believe that are, and they "constrain and condition the possibilities of group-making in the present", and I believe they do, then what about them is "raw"? Though Safran's description of gathering, classifying, and upgrading "semi-literate" dialects may have been true at one point in history (as it was in Bosnia in the 19th century), even then philologists were working with previous classifications, those of "dialects". Philological work done on the South Slavic languages did not stop in the 19th century; in fact, I intend to show that it is continuing to this day in some form. Those who followed these 19th century philologists were left with materials that were far from "raw", but were rather *heavily assembled* and *processed*, including orthographic manuals, dictionaries, scripts, literature, etc. This is only to speak of the physical relics, for all these documents functioned then, as they do now, as reifying elements, turning the linguistic classifications from mere "concepts" on the desk of a Vienna-based Slavist, into languages. That is to say, they had been internalized, to various degrees, by those categorized. Once these had been internalized, they fundamentally reshaped the way people wrote and spoke. Yet, I'm neglecting what is perhaps the most important point. If

[3] Brubaker, 14.

the philological classifications had been internalized, and thus became "languages", then would not the dominant conception of the time, and indeed to sole reason behind these linguistic classifications, have become "real" as well? I'm, of course, speaking about the categorial relation with the "nation". All future projects had to deal with all of these raw materials, including the "nations" created in the wake of these classifications. This brings me back to my original point, namely that we must look at "language" and "nation" in a single integrated domain, analyzing the discursive career of the *conceptual relationship* between the categories of "language" and "nation", as well as the institutions that are capable of delivering them, namely the state, academic and cultural organizations, and educational institutions.

There is yet one more point that needs to be addressed. This is the fact the state, as the key institutional carrier of language also served as the key institutional carrier for the "nation". By treating nations and nationalities as "fundamental units of social accounting", the nation became a highly reified concept. Given that the state institutionalized both "language" and "nation", the relationship between them is of the utmost importance. In the case of Bosnia (both pre- and post-Yugoslavia), what we see, as I intend to show, is the academic discourse regarding the relationship between "language" and "nation" effectively, and continuously, reshapes both these categories through re-conceptualizing them into various "new" divisions and subdivisions, with "nation" becoming "nations", "nationalities", "genetic peoples", "tribes" and so on. "Language" is re-conceptualized into new sociolinguistic units, such as "dialects", "variants", "literary languages", "expressions", etc.

I will proceed by looking at the institutions named above, briefly detailing the roles, played by these institutions in reifying *a language*. To regard the reifying roles of these institutions separately would be in error, for they clearly influence each other in a variety of ways. At times, this is done in concert. Other times, such as current situation in which key institutions have (or have not) embraced the Bosnian language to various degrees, it is much more cacophonous.

The State and Language

The state clearly plays a key role in reifying a language, most directly by granting it legitimacy through enshrining it into law, as well through the usage of the norms that have been ascribed to the language. Of course, such reification through the exercise of political power is to be extended to sub-state levels of political power, however classified (republics, entities, cantons, etc.), as well as to multinational and international political entities. Concerning the role of the state, Safran writes:

> "Language becomes standard, scientific, and national state idioms as a result of compulsory educations and the spread of mass media, which are products of conscious public policy, and it is in that sense that national languages, like modern or "civic" nations, are artifacts of a politicized community. Nevertheless, the "primordial" languages that existed before the development of modern nationalism should not be dismissed out of hand. National languages are not created out of thin air; most of them are, after all, based on idioms spoken by a large amount of people. The national languages of the majority of east-central European states are based on Slavic regional dialects… The foregoing suggests that the relationship between a 'civic' (or political) and an 'ethnic' (or cultural) nation is reciprocal; it is a two-way process in which a preexistent language facilitates the creation of a state, and in which the state, once establish, legitimates and develops a language and a culture laden with state-specific ingredients. There is no doubt that it is the state makes an idiom respectable by politicizing it – by transforming a dialect into a language, as happened in the case of Czech, Slovak, Moldavian, and Afrikaans.[4]

[4] Safran, 83-84.

The state's influence in terms of legitimation and promulgation of language categories and standards can be seen in many instances, most directly through legislation acts and executive decrees. However, the state strongly affects nearly every other institution carrier, sometimes quite directly depending on the politics of the state at the time.

Education

One such institutional carrier of classifications and standards over which the state wields incredible influence is that of the educational institutions, particularly primary and secondary education. Educational materials not only promote the use of a particular standard, but also promote the use of a standard *something*, namely, a language. Thus, the very act of educating students on the standard use of *a language* has tremendous reifying effects for that particular language, as it becomes "real" and capable of being learned, spoken, and written both "correctly" and "incorrectly". As Steinberg writes,

> Culture in the broad sense forms part of the authority which Gramsci understood by the phrase *egemonia culturale*. Correcting a child's grammar or accent enforces the majority or standard expression of culture on him or her. Just as teaching history in schools expresses the prevailing values of society, so does the attitude to language.[5]

It is at these levels where language classifications and standards are disseminated to students who rarely question them. After all, few students demand an explanation when told a word is spelled a particular way, or that a feminine genitive plural declines with a particular ending, or that the future tense is constructed with an infinitive. If students would demand an explanation, they would more than likely be told, "Because it is!" Or perhaps more accurately, "Because, that is the rule." Deborah Cameron clearly links the

[5] Jonathan Steinberg, "The Historian and the *questione della lingua*," in The Social History of Language, ed. Peter Burke and Roy Porter (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987), 206.

linguistic norms and conventions to authority, stating that, "defenders of precedent… have actively invested in a certain kind of authority."[6] Though this may the case, it would be incredibly unlikely that a primary school teacher would provide a student with the explanation, "That is the rule in the particularly orthography selected by the Ministry of Education as being in accordance with the ideology espoused by the ruling politicians claiming to represent our collective will."

Of course, the sort of explanation found above is more likely to be found in a university setting, where the state (generally) has less direct influence over curriculums. Of course, I suspect that for many university students, these categories and standards would already be fairly concrete. After all, a student would not likely make it to the university level of education without knowing how to spell or construct the future tense "properly" in her *own language* (and possibly others), and likely had given up the pursuit of an explanation. However, I would argue that there are clear exceptions, particularly in the field of linguistics and related fields. Demanding explanations is exactly what scholars in these fields are in the business of doing. Importantly, at this level of academia, explanations for categories, classifications and standards are not only demanded, but they are provided as well. Of course, anybody who has attended two university courses on the same topic taught different professors knows that there is far from a consensus in field. Concerning languages, competing classifications are often made and justified with elaborate hierarchies and esoteric or foreign terminology (e.g., "*Ausbausprache*", "literary language", "diasystem", "variants", "inorganic idiom", "*Sprachgefühl*"). While there is some agreement on common terminology, there remains

[6] Deborah Cameron, Verbal Hygeine, (London: Routledge, 1995), 13.

a great deal of disagreement concerning the classifications, the criteria for such classifications, as well as for the appellations under which they come to be known. Where there is a high degree of consensus, it is often gathered under a conceptual "school" of thought (often named after the institution where it developed). The principals of these schools often become the tenets of particular academic and cultural organizations, some of which are quite lasting (e.g. the Yugoslav Academy of Arts and Sciences, or JAZU), others more ephemeral. The espousal of such tenets often serves as criteria for membership in such organizations (e.g., one could hardly become a member of the "Croatian Literary Society" while actively espousing the belief that the entire Croatian literary canon is simply an unfortunate trend in the glorious Serbian literary tradition). It is precisely such academic and cultural societies, organizations, and institutions that are commissioned with the publication of textbooks, grammars, orthographic manuals, and dictionaries to be disseminated to lower levels of education, thus fulfilling a key requirement of the state.

It should be noted that the state not only plays a key role in supporting – often financially – and legitimizing particular societies, organizations, institutions and the publications they produce, but also in discouraging and delegitimizing the same through *not* providing support. This sort of linguistic discouragement can also take the form of an official ban and threat of prosecution. As Safran observes, such situations occur primarily when such materials (or their proponents) are "thought of as positing a value-system that runs counter to the state."[7] Such examples of this would include the refusal of the French government to permit education in Basque and Breton, as this would run counter to the

[7] Safran, 85.

ideology of a unitary and indivisible French nation, the early Israeli state's ban on Yiddish theatrical productions, as such productions would interfere with Israel's promotion of Hebrew as well as its staunch opposition to the Yiddisher nationalism espoused by the Bund, or the Pavelić regime imposing a fine and short prison sentence for butchers advertising lamb under the name *jagnjetina* as opposed to *janjetina* (for reasons to be discussed). The very fact that the organizations and publications are seen as positing an ideology that runs counter to that of state can turn them into rallying points for subaltern ideological movements and parties seeking political influence. Thus, nationalist movements frequently invoke (and thus *evoke*) "national languages" as a means of mobilization, for the "national language" effectively serves as a palladium of a "suppressed nation", with both the nation and its language being perceived as being under attack and in need of "protection" or, as we shall see, empowerment. As Hobsbawm writes, "any demand for the privileged or official use of a linguistic classification or standard in education or culture other than the established one, when it does not bring any obvious advantages to learners, is a demand for status and power, not for easier learning."[8] Thus, what the orthographic manuals, dictionaries, and other publications leave us, among many other things, is a record of the status, a level of embracement and empowerment by the state. Of course, what the "Croatian language" was in the 1860s reflects neither the Croatian language nor the Croat nation of today. But as long as these categories are conceived of as both ontologically real and fixed, such documents play an important role in any further claims, and this record cannot simply be erased (though arguably such an effort was partially successful with the 1992 destruction of the Sarajevo

[8] Eric Hobsbawm, "Language, Culture, and National Identity," Social Research 63:4 (Winter 1996), 1065.

National Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with its extensive collection of documents and manuscripts dating from the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian period).

The Shift in Power

When political realties do shift and subaltern are empowered or appeased, their concomitant rival linguistic classifications gain official acceptance and new educational corpora are adopted as the old institutional carriers and promulgators prove inadequately flexible or are otherwise eliminated. This intellectual shift is necessarily accompanied by attempts to discredit the previous linguistic classifications.

Aside from shifts in status, linguistic planning is often conducted, usually (though not necessarily) aimed at dissimilating the new national language from both the old standard as well neighboring standards that may have been included under the classification. Given the authority of the new classifications over the old, these trends are often conducted under the pretext of "protection", "revivalism", "purism", and, among intellectuals, "reversing language shift", despite the fact that this is often performed through the introduction of neologisms, calques, and archaisms of spurious origins, with the assistance of the academic and cultural organizations which had been condemned by the *régime ancienne*.

Of course, not all movements are successful in mass mobilization, as the success in gaining such mass mobilization for constitutionally enshrining a particular linguistic classification (or something as minor as the defense a particular orthographic rule or the elevation in status of a particular lexical variant) depends largely on various other factors, particularly the degree to which those who are to be mobilized accept such classifications, standards, and lexical variants as their own and in need of defense, and,

most importantly, the degree to which the classifications of the nation (and analogous terminology) have been internalized *and* accepted.

The Beginning of the Bosnian Language Project

Despite the seemingly obligatory calls to the ancient past employed by various philologists (more on this will be discussed in the following sections), the most natural place to begin this brief look at the historical classifications of the spoken idiom in Bosnia-Herzegovina is the mid-19th century, when the eastward diffusion of Romantic nationalism first took hold of the intellectuals in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the surrounding lands. While it is *far* beyond the scope of this paper to detail the political affiliations and national sentiments of the various philologists and their often politically-loaded linguistic classifications from this early period, let alone provide the historical social and political contexts necessary for understanding such classifications, I will nonetheless briefly treat several key figures, movements, and linguistic classifications, appellations, and standards, the impact of which would shape the discourse of "nation" and "language" throughout the 20th century, particularly in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the late 1990's. This admittedly cursory historical background is necessary to understand the context in which the Bosnian language of today developed and the implications it bears, for the story of the Bosnian language is incomplete without the story of the competing nationalist conceptualizations and their concomitant philological classifications. Furthermore, such a background is necessary in order to understand what "raw materials" were available for the construction of the Bosnian language in the 1990's.

Vuk Karadžić and the Illyrian Movement

In order to understand the current linguistic classifications occurring in Bosnia and Herzegovina, it is important to examine the events occurring outside of the country in regard the spread of Romantic nationalism, particularly concerning the conceptual categories of both "nation" and "language", as well as the relationship between the categories. Let us begin by examining the early discourse concerning the relationship between the French language, the French nation, and the French state. For Renan, the fact that many French citizens did not speak chancellery/literary French did not preclude their membership in the French nation, but that is not to say it was of no importance for the French nation. Renan stressed that the French language was seen as *a mode* of inculcating common values, experiences, and the will to share a common fate among undifferentiated French citizens, which was seen as the core of French nationhood.[9] Thus, it can be seen that the concept of a single national language originally had a primarily communicative function. As Eric Hobsbawm writes,

> A single national language only became important when ordinary citizens became an important component of the state; and the written language had to have a relation to the spoken language only when these citizens were supposed to read and write it… The original case for a standard language was entirely democratic, not cultural. How could citizens understand, let alone take part in, the government of their country if it was conducted in an incomprehensible language – for example, in Latin, as in the Hungarian parliament before 1840? Would this not guarantee government by an elite minority? This was the argument of the Abbé Gregoire in 1794. Education in French was, therefore, essential for French citizens…[10]

The French language played a primary role in enabling the population to read, discuss, and otherwise follow, as well as participate in, key debates and discussions occurring in the National Assembly, leading to a better understand of the political processes of the

[9] (Renan 1947: 903-904).
[10] Hobsbawm, 19.

French state. However, in 1789, only 12 to 13 percent of the population could understand the chancellery/literary idiom, most of them concentrated in the center of political power, Île de Paris.[11] Surely such a high level of *illiteracy* would have impeded the diffusion of ideas and values of citizenship and the nation, which was the primary concern. Thus, Renan was even open to possibility that the French language might one day be replaced by some other language if it proved to be a superior means of communication.[12]

While this may have been the argument of Abbé Gregoire and Renan, any talk about the transmission of democratic values (i.e. the "free flow of ideas", "maximum participation in the government", etc.) presupposes a specific relationship between the citizen and the state, where the former have control over the functions of the latter. Thus, this description itself is, necessarily, ideologically loaded. Others, such as the Jacobin movement, and the "Terror" government of Robespierre, had different conceptions concerning the role of the average citizen and the state, and the French language would have served an entirely different purpose. As Robespierre's regime ruthlessly executed those felt to be a threat to the state, the French language surely carried a strong symbolic function, as learning French was how one could demonstrate allegiance to the state and integration into the *nation*. Thus, the local *patois* was stamped out and the French language was forcibly taught. In time, the French Republic became an empire under Corsican-born Napoleon Bonaparte, and one can again see a shift in the conception of the relationship between nation and language. In *Le Mauvais démiurge*, Emil Cioran writes, "At St. Helena, Napoleon sometimes liked to browse the [French] grammar… In this

[11] Tomasz D. Kamusella, "Language as an instrument of nationalism in Central Europe," Nations and Nationalism, 7:2 (2001), 237.
[12] Safran, 88.

manner, perhaps, he proved he was a Frenchman,"[13] Whether or not this was Napoleon's intention, it is likely that he didn't browse them for the French language's communicative value, is if to better understand and communicate with his guards at St. Helena.

Around the same time of the emergence of the French nation-state, one can see a dramatic shift in the understanding of culture, evidenced by the works of Johann Gottlieb Herder. It was Herder who first posited the Romantic theory of *Volksgeist*, being the spirit of a people or nation, wherein the people (*Volk*) would be understood, first and foremost, as a cultural unit demarcated by language (*Sprache*). It is important to note that concept, as espoused by Herder, was not inherently political. As Kamusella writes,

> Herder believed that every [*Volk*] was a manifestation of the Divine, and, therefore, something sacred that should not be destroyed, but cultivated. One the other hand, spirits of nations could be most fully expressed only through mother tongues. Thus, he opposed the Germanization projects of other (especially Slavic) language-speakers in the Holy Roman Empire and in Prussia commenced… His opinions were based on the equality of all languages as coming from God.[14]

While this understanding of culture may not have been inherently political, it soon became so following Napoleon's march across Europe, in which the Holy Roman Empire was leveled, with the Austrian Empire surviving as its rump. It was at this point that Johann Gottlieb Fichte first lauded standard German as superior to all other tongues in his *Address to the German Nation* (1807), soon translated into political action by Ernst Moritz Arndt, who proclaimed that a German nation-state should encompass all lands where standard German could be heard.[15] This meant that the "tribes" – the Saxons, Swabians, and Franks – were re-conceptualized under a new hierarchical classification,

[13] Qtd. in Kamusella, 235.
[14] Ibid, 238.
[15] Joshua Fishman, Language and Nationalism, (Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1973), 127-8.

superior to that of tribe, and defined by a common language.[16] This can be understood as synthesis of Herder's equation of *Volk* and *Sprache,* with the French "civic" nationalism, where the nation is the collective citizenry.

While the Congress of Vienna (1815) largely reestablished the old order, Ernst Moritz's calls fell on all ears, that is, all ears capable of understanding German, being the intellectuals and politicians in the Austrian Empire. The ties between a language and a nation had been firmly established, particularly as the concept was diffused throughout Central and Eastern Europe in the Slavic-speaking regions, leading to the 1848 Pan-Slav Congress, convened in Prague by František Palacký. At the Congress, linguists, folklorist, authors, and other scholars discussed, in German, the relationship between language and nation. Whether these scholars were interested in some form of cultural protection, autonomy, or outright independence for the "suppressed" Slavs they came to represent, it became clear that a common standardized language had become the *sine qua non* of the nation, and thus came to be seen as the key vehicle for attaining such political aims. However, most of these lands lacked a standardized chancellery/literary that was capable of serving as a "national language". Thus, as Hans Kohn notes, the promotion of Romantic nationalism by intellectuals among the Slavic-speaking lands made it necessary to rediscover, legitimate, or restructure a 'primordial' idiom.[17] As to how this can be actualized, different models have been posited.

[16] Hobsbawm, 1065.
[17] (Kohn 1945)

One such model is that of Miroslav Hroch, who argued that the creation of a national language is a multiphase project, comprised of three separate phases.[18] In his description, the project begins with a period of scholarly interest (Phase A), in which antiquarians and folklorists delimit an ethnic group's extent through the collection of oral literature and identification of its material culture. This is followed by Phase B, a period in which a handful of scholars decide what dialects/creoles are to be used as the basis for the standard national language and how its codified form should look. This is followed by a final period (Phase C), summed up by Kamusella as the phase "[marking] the rise of the mass national movement spearheaded by the hard-core activists of Phase B; the ethnic group becomes a nation and the national language gains widespread acceptance among the members of the nation and it is gradually elaborated."[19]

An alternative, though similar, multiphase model is that of Einar Haugen, whose proposed model begins with the "selection of a norm", followed by the "codification of form", then the "elaboration of function", and ultimately the "acceptance by the community".[20] The "selection of a norm" involves selecting a band along the dialectal continuum to serve as the dialectal base for the new standard language, which would be hierarchically superordinate to the selected dialects. The "codification of form" involves the standardization process itself, involving the production of grammars, dictionaries, and key translations, such as holy texts and literary classics. The "elaboration of function" involves the increased use of the new standard in a variety of social contexts. Finally, the

[18] Miroslav Hroch, Social Preconditions of a National Revival in Europe: a Comparative Analysis of the Social Compostition of Patriotic Groups Among the Smaller European Nations, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985), 23-4.
[19] Kamusella, 240-1,
[20] Einar Haugen, "Dialect, Language, Nation," American Anthropologist 68 (1966) 922-35.

"acceptance by the community" involves, clearly, the acceptance of the new language by the community from which it was intended, thus creating becoming a "national language".

While a broad consensus can be seen at the time regarding the "nation" being defined by a common "standardized literary language", the decisions regarding the selection of the dialectal base a new language should encompass (i.e. the speakers who would become the "nation"), as well as what works of literature should be used as the literary base for this literary language, what the orthographic rules should be used and what appellation the new language would take (ideally the same as that to be used for the nation) were left to individual scholars. As particular intellectuals may or may not have been in agreement with others in their field (both then and now), competing classifications were made under different appellations with orthographical rules, despite selecting the same, or substantially overlapping, literary and/or dialectal bases. One such philological dispute is that of between Vuk Stefanofić Karadžić and Ljudevit Gaj. Their classifications, orthographical rules, and selections of literary and dialectal bases had, and continue to have, an enormous impact on the region, particularly in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

It is important to note that the linguistic situation in Ottoman Bosnia prior to any sort of philological classification was more or less one of linguistic homogeneity, in that the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina was composed entirely of speakers of the Štokavian dialect. Literacy (and literature), belonged to the privileged few, who wrote in a variety of scripts, including Glagolitic (predominately used by the Franciscans), Cyrillic (predominately used by the Orthodox churchmen), and a modified Arabic script

(*arebica*), used largely by the dominant Muslim land-owning population. Another script, which had almost entirely fallen out of use by the 19th century, was a unique script with elements of both Glagolitic and Cyrillic, now known largely under the appellation *Bosančica*. Concerning lexical variation, it is important to note that the Muslim population, particularly those in urban centers, tended to pepper their speech with the words and expression of "oriental", i.e. Islamic and Ottoman Turkish, origin. Of course, this was not confined to the Muslim population, or to Ottoman Bosnia, for such "orientalisms" are to be found throughout the former Ottoman lands and beyond.

Vuk Karadžić: Serbs, All and Everywhere!

At the beginning of the 19th century, the dominant philological classifications were those of August L. von Schlözer, Jan Kollár, Jernej Kopitar and Pavel Josef Šafarik, who classified the south Slavic dialects into the "Slovenian", "Bosnian", "Dalmatian", "Illyrian or Serbian" (*Illyrisch oder Serbisch*), and finally "Croatian" (this final classification based on the Čakavian dialect of the Istrian peninsula, with the Kajkavian dialect spoken in the region surrounding Zagreb being a point of contention, as it closely resembles the dialects agreed upon as being "Slovenian").[21] Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, was born in Serbia (then part of the Ottoman Empire), and lived in exile in Vienna following the "First Serbian Uprising" against Ottoman rule, came to challenge the classifications of his fellow Slavists. Karadžić, an avid folklorist who compiled Slavic folk ballads (particular those dealing with historic battles against the Ottoman Empire), came to select these ballads as his literary base for his new literary language, further selecting the Štokavian dialect in which they were written as the dialectal base for his

[21] Ivo Banac, The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics, (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993), 80-81.

new language, which he classified under the appellation "Serbian". Karadžić created further controversy by reforming the Cyrillic alphabet of the Church into a strictly phonetic alphabet by creating several new characters, most controversially, incorporating the Latin (i.e. *Catholic*) letter "j" and dropping the Church Slavonic (i.e. *Orthodox*) letter "*jat*".[22] Concerning the specifics of standardization, he selected Neo-Štokavian-Ijekavian dialect (East Herzegovinian) as the standard for his first grammar (published in 1818) and all subsequent grammars. This was not only his native dialect, but also the dialect used in many epic folk ballads. Karadžić further standardized orthography, an easy task when using a phonetic alphabet. His single orthographical rule: "Write as you speak and read as it is written" (*Piši kao što govoriš i čitaj kako je napisano*).

Karadžić's classification and standardization of the Serbian language went hand in hand with his Serbian nationalist conception. While much has been made (particularly by those not identifying with the Serb nationality) of his infamous statement "Serbs, all and everywhere!" (*Srbi, svi i svugdje!*), it is important to understand that he envisaged the Serbian nation as being comprised of all speakers of the Štokavian dialect, whether under Serbian, Ottoman or Austro-Hungarian rule, and regardless of religious affiliation, for they were united under a single *Volksgeist*. Thus, he would have considered the entire population of Ottoman Bosnia to be Serbs and speakers of Serbian, as evidenced by his 1845 quote: "True, in their towns and cities they use a lot of Turkish words, but one could almost say that in all other aspect those brothers of ours of Turkish faith speak

[22] Pavle Ivić, "Standard Language as an Instrument of Culture and the Product of National History," The History of Serbian Culture, (Edgware, Middlessex, England: Porthill, 1998)

better Serbian than the peasants of Greek or Roman faith."[23] Notice Karadžić uses the term "Greek" to describe the Serbian Orthodox faith. This is indicative of a radical change in the conceptualization of "Serbian", the term having previously been used strictly to describe adherents to the Serbian Orthodox Church, which no longer played a part in the Serbian nation as conceptualized by Karadžić.[24]

Vuk Karadžić was clearly not the only ambitious Slavist in region, for a wide variety of philological circles in the southern Slavic lands of the Austrian Empire, each with a variety of philologists, each with their own philological ideas: the "Zadar philological school" supported the use of the Štokavian-Ikavian dialect (arguing this was the dialect spoken in Western Bosnia, Western Herzegovina, Slavonia, Posavina, and Central Dalmatia); the "Zagreb philological school" advocated the fusing of Štokavian with Čakavian (largely confined to Istria and scattered islands in the northern Adriatic) and Kajkavian (the dialect spoken in Zagreb and the Zagorje region); the "Rijeka (Fiume) philological school" advocated an extremely broad pan-Slavic classification, and thus sought to initiate radical orthographic reforms in the hopes of bringing the dialects in line with the northern Slavic dialects (i.e., the basis for today's Polish, Czech, and Slovak standards).[25] Ultimately, the classifications and standardizations of philologists affiliated with a pan-South Slavic movement, known as the "Illyrian movement" (*ilirski pokret*), were to have the largest impact on the development of language in the region.

[23] Qtd. in Alija Isaković, Dictionary of Characteristic Words of the Bosnian Language, (Svjetlost: Sarajevo, 1992), 17.
[24] Banac, 80.
[25] Robert Greenburg, Language and Identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and its Disintegration, (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004), 28.

The Illyrian movement's chief philologist was Ljudevit Gaj, a firm supporter of pan-South Slavic nationalism, believing it to be a means of attaining the privileged status for the Croat people similar to that held by the Hungarians within the Hapsburg Empire. When it came to creating a standard literary language, Gaj selected opted for 'high' literature rather than folk ballads, and thus selected the "Illyrian classics" of Ragusa (modern-day Dubrovnik). These literary works were written in the Štokavian dialect and had a great influence on the literary works produced in Zagreb. Thus, Gaj sought to standardize a common literary language for all south Slavs based on Štokavian (as opposed to his native Kajkavian dialect). The Illyrian movement later narrowed this scope in the wake of the standardization occurring in what would become the standard Slovenian and Bulgarian languages.[26,27] One of Gaj's major achievements toward this end was the standardization of the Latin alphabet to fit the Illyrian language, accomplished by the creation of several new letters and the adoption of diacritical marks used in the northern Slavic languages. Concerning orthography, Gaj was less interested in producing a 'folkish' highly readable language than in diffusing the high literary classics, and thus advocated the etymological orthography used in the Illyrian classics of Dubrovnik.

The Illyrian movement worked for the promotion of Illyrian culture, setting up two key institutions. The first was *Matica Ilirska*, a cultural organization established to

[26] Marc L. Greenberg, "The Role of Language and the Creation of Identity: Myths in Linguistics among the People of the Former Yugoslavia," (paper presented at Faculty International Studies Seminar, University of Kansas: Reinvention of Tradition, April 1996).

[27] The spoken idiom in Macedonia, where the dialectal continuum undergoes several isoglosses between the dialects of southern Serbia and western Bulgaria were highly controversial, and remain so to this day. For more on this, see Sue Gal and Judith T. Irvine, "The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Difference," Social Research, (Winter 1995).

promote Illyrian culture through the publication and distribution of Illyrian classical literature. The second was the "National Publishing House" (*Narodna Tisakara*) of Ljudevit Gaj, which published newspapers and a literary magazine in the new Illyrian language, which were distributed throughout the Hapsburg lands of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia.

Concerning the Gaj's conception of the Illyrian nation, Gaj differentiated between what he perceived as "genetic peoples" and a common Illyrian nation with a single *Volkgeist*. As Banac writes, "[Gaj] repeatedly stressed that the Illyrian appellation was no more than a neutral South Slavic surname, which could not root out the 'genetic' Serb, Croat, Slovene, and Bulgar names."[28]

One thing should be apparent in looking at the philological classifications of Ljudevit Gaj and Vuk Karadžić is that these classifications substantially overlap, but in no way coincide. These classifications differ not only in their respective literary bases, but also in their substantial differences in standardization, namely orthography (etymological v. phonetic), script (reformed Latin v. reformed Cyrillic), and even the desired lexical base (inclusive of the Kajkavian literary lexis v. simple Štokavian vernacular, excluding "Turkish words").

In order to resolve this situation, a meeting was held in Vienna in 1850 between Vuk Karadžić, his colleague Đuro Daničić, and several representatives of the Illyrian movement (Gaj did not take part), concluding in the signing of the infamous 1850 Literary Agreement. This agreement opens with the following paragraph:

> The signers of this declaration, knowing that one nation should have one literature, and seeing with sorrow how our literature is disunited, not only

[28] Banac, 78.

> in alphabet, but also in language and orthography, have come together these days in order to discuss how we could agree and unite our literature, as much as possible.[29]

Thus, though the representatives differed in their classification, there was nonetheless a consensus that one nation should have only one literature, further recognizing that their separate scripts, orthographies, and classifications (i.e. "languages) were impeding their mutual goal of establishing a common literary language for the nation, as they each perceived it. In the agreement, both the Illyrians and Karadžić made key concessions, with Karadžić accepting the phoneme /x/ and the Illyrians accepting the East Herzegovinian Štokavski-Ijekavski dialect as the standard, despite this dialect being confined to only small parts of the Hapsburg Empire's Slavic possessions, but importantly, no decision was made regarding the appellation of this new literary standard, nor were agreements made concerning the script, lexical base, or orthography.[30]

Let us now turn to the institutions embracing the works of Karadžić and the Illyrians. Concerning Karadžić's Serbian language, it initially opposed by the Society of Serbian Literacy (*Srpsko ućeno društo*), coming into conflict not only with those who favored the previous classifications, but also with those who favored the 'high' literary language of Dositej Obradović, created by grafting elements of the local idiom onto Church Slavonic and Russian. Despite this, Karadžić's 1824 translation of the New Testament into his 'folkish' Serbian with phonetic orthography allowed the Štokavian speaking population to be able read the New Testament in their mother tongue, proving to be a strong institutional carrier for his reforms, as this vernacular translation was widely circulated amongst the Štokavian-speaking Orthodox population, and thus served

[29] Qtd. in Monnesland, 1107.
[30] Greenburg, 28.

to reify Karadžić's classification and appellation of the language as "Serbian". By the 1860s, the Society for Serbian Literary adopted Karadžić's reforms, though opposition continued Austrian possession of Vojvodina, where the Ijekavian pronunciation favored by Karadžić was looked down upon as inferior to the local Ekavian pronunciation.[31] This same decade saw the adoption of Karadžić's Serbian language by a variety of publications, particularly collections of folk ballads and textbooks used in Orthodox schools published by the Sarajevo-based Bosnian Vilayet Press (*bosansko-vilajetska štamparija*).[32]

Concerning the Illyrian language, Gaj's publishing house widely circulated newspapers and literary journals, not only in portions of the Austrian Empire, but in Ottoman Bosnia as well. One of these journals from Gaj's publishing house, "Bosnian Friend" (*Bosanski Prijatelj*), edited by Bosnian-born Franciscan monk I. F. Jukić, can be seen as being aimed specifically at instilling a sense of Illyrian "literary nationalism" in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The introduction to this journal reads, in part:

> Almost every country of the spacious Turkish Empire in Europe has woken up from the deep sleep of ignorance and indolence, only Bosnia still sweetly sleeps! All around us, kin nations are enjoying the pleasantly fragrant flowers of national literature, and we don't want to smell? Already, we are constantly singing: *Dolce far niente*. About us, it can be said that we take laziness for wisdom: *Quod segnities est sapientia vocatur*.[33]

[31] Greenburg, 28.
[32] See Miloš Okuka, "Književni Jezici Bosanskih Srba [Literary Languages of the Bosnian Serbs]," in Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], ed. Svein Mønnesland, (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).
[33] I. F. Jukić, ed., Bosanski Prijatelj, (Bèrzotiskom narodne tiskarnice dra. Ljudevita Gaja: Zagreb, 1850), predgovor.

Furthermore, in Franciscan publishing houses in Bosnia and Herzegovina had adopted Gaj's standard as well, evidenced by Franciscan publications from the 1850s and 1860s.[34]

Thus, Asim Pećo sums up the effects Vuk Karadžić and the Illyrian movement had on the population of Ottoman Bosnia as follows:

> Vuk's reforms of the language, and the Cyrillic alphabet, had a good reception in Bosnia. These reforms, actually, only confirmed the existing written tradition. Naturally, by the adoption of Vuk's views on language and writing in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Ijekavian dialect was accepted as the only literary dialect, and the graphemes, for which the phonemes did not exist in the living speech of the people, were dropped. The same thing happened with the Latin alphabet. The reforms of this alphabet, carried out by Gaj and the "Illyrians" were accepted.

As discussed above, the primary institutional carrier for any classification is the state and its relationship with education. At this time, the region in question was under the control of three different states, being the Austrian Empire, the Ottoman Empire, and the Kingdom of Serbia, none of which enshrined the classifications, appellations, and standards into law at this time. Thus, primary institutional carriers for the Illyrian and Serbian standards and appellations were the educational institutions. In Ottoman Bosnia, where education was far from universal, education was left to religious institutions and thus organized along confessional lines. Thus, the Bosnian Franciscan literary publications and textbooks using the Illyrian standard would have been largely circulated among the Catholic population, while the Serbian textbooks and collections of folk ballads were used in Orthodox schools and thus would have been largely circulated among the Orthodox population. However, as all these publications used the Štokavian-Ijekavian dialect, the only distinguishing features were lexical variants, orthography, and

[34] See Ivo Pranjković, "Jezik Bosanskih Franjevaca [Language of the Bonsian Franciscans]," in Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], ed. Svein Mønnesland, (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).

most importantly script. The Islamic schools and institutions at this point continued to teach and publish in the modified Arabic script.[35]

In time the Illyrian movement eventually dissipated, failing to attract masses South Slavs who had no particular interest in the literary heritage of Dubrovnik or in the defense of Croatia's municipal autonomy within the Austrian Empire.[36] Furthermore, the 1867 *Ausgleich* transformation of the Austrian Empire into the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in which the Illyrian movements ideal autonomous Croatia was divided between Austria and Hungary (with the latter reigning over the majority), effectively spelled an end to the movement for Croatian autonomous status on the level of Hungary, around which the Illyrians had centered their aims. However, in the wake of the dissipation of the Illyrian movement, a successor movement gained steady ground.

The Yugoslav Movement: A Linguistic Nation of Genetic Peoples

The Yugoslav movement of Strossmayer and Rački, which advocated a pan-South Slavic ideology similar to that of the Illyrians, though with different political ambitions. Again, the Serbs and Croats were conceived of as "genetic peoples" and thus separate, though these peoples could be unified through common South Slavic (i.e. Yugoslav) cultural nation, conceived of in terms of a common language and culture, and it was this nation which would form the basis for the ultimate goal of establishing a federal Yugoslav state, built on the ruins of the Hapsburg Monarchy embracing the already

[35] Lejla Nakaš, "Kulturne Prilike Bošnjaka u osmanskom periodu periodu [Cultural Conditions of the Bosniaks in the Ottoman Period," in Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], ed. Svein Mønnesland, (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).
[36] Banac, 78.

independent states of Serbia and Montenegro.[37] In 1867, through the extensive patronage of Strossmayer, the Yugoslav Academy of Arts and Sciences (*Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti*, JAZU) was established.

JAZU, under the leadership of Bogoslav Šuslek (a harsh critic of Vuk Karadžić's reforms), worked closely with *Matica Ilirska* to advance the development of a common language. This occurred the same year the Croatian Sabor, after heated debates, declared that, "Every citizen is allowed to use the 'Croatian or Serbian' language as the official language and can choose freely the Latin or Cyrillic script."[38] However, after Šuslek's death in 1871, the philological work of the institution became dominated by Đuro Daničić, (the colleague of Vuk Karadžić and signatory of the 1850 Literary Agreement), who subsequently incorporated many of Karadžić's linguistic reforms in an effort to bring the standards developing in Zagreb and Belgrade into harmony, into the single classification known as "Croatian or Serbian" (*hrvatski ili srpski*), also known as "Serbian or Croatian" (*srpski ili hrvatski*) when published in Belgrade. At this point, the a rift occurred within the Zagreb philological community, causing *Matica Ilirska* to suspend cooperation with JAZU and, in 1874, changed its name to *Matica Hrvatska*.[39] Each publishing house continued publishing under these different linguistic classifications, with the key differences being the appellations and orthographies. This rift occurred as JAZU's Yugoslav cultural unitarists began a full implementation of Vuk Karadžić's orthographic rule.

[37] Banac, 90
[38] Qtd. in Greenburg, 29
[39] Josip Bratulić, Matica Hrvatska: 1842-1997, (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997).

In this period we see two cultural and scientific institutions, JAZU and *Matica Ilirska*, cooperating in order to promote a common literary language, "Croatian or Serbian", and establish a common Yugoslav "nation", albeit one divided among genetic "peoples". The organizations' cooperation was suspended not due to disagreements involving national conceptions, but rather due to disputes over language. *Matica Ilirska* to promoted the Illyrian classics, adhering to the etymological orthography, while JAZU, now led by Daničić, adopted the orthographical reforms of Vuk Karadžić in order to harmonize the standards with those of Serbian.

Hungarian Involvement in the Dispute

In the 1878, a key political development reshaped the developing ideologies and languages when the Austro-Hungarian Empire occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina (placed under Austrian jurisdiction). One consequence of this was the Kingdom of Serbia, which had come to see the Štokavian speaking population of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of the Serb nation under occupation, faced a setback in regard to the expansionist plans of Interior Minister Ilija Garašanin, which entailed incorporation of all Serb lands (i.e. all Štokavian lands) into a greater Serbian state.[40] Rather than directly challenge the Austro-Hungarian Empire, attention was shifted to Ottoman Macedonia. This was accompanied by a linguistic shift in both standardization and philological classification, as Karadžić's Štokavian-Ijekavian dialect, embraced less as the standard than a decade before, was abandoned in favor of Šumadija-Vojvodina dialect (the dialect spoken in and around the urban centers of Belgrade and Novi Sad) by the Serbian Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences (the organization into which the Society of Serbian literacy had been forcibly

[40] Banac, 83.

merged).[41] Importantly, this dialect used Ekavian pronunciation (rather than Ijekavian), bringing the Serbian standard phonologically closer to the idiom spoken in Macedonia.[42] This was done, admittedly at that, with the stated aim of classifying the idiom spoken in Macedonia as a dialect of Serbian.[43] The extensive morphological difference in Macedonian speech (e.g. the use of prepositions instead of case declinations), were accounted for in various ways, such as that proposed by Radosavljević in his 1890 publication, "The History of Bulgarism on the Balkan Penninsula: The Nationality and Language of the Macedonians", where he writes, "Macedonian speech is covered with rust and mud… This… rusty sediment is the characteristic Macedonian Volapük,[44] accumulated under foreign influence."[45]

Interestingly enough, the Serbian standard departed from Karadžić's standard at roughly the same time the "Croatian Vukovites" of JAZU made significant developments in harmonizing the standards of Gaj and Karadžić, aided largely by the absolutist regime of Count Károly Khuen-Héderváry (1883-1903). Khuen-Héderváry, fearing the explicit demands for Croatian independence by Ante Starčević and the Party of Right, sought to undermine the movement, largely through the promotion of a variety of social-engineering projects that would hinder the efforts of the *pravaši*. These included the incorporation of the "Military Frontier" (*Vojska Krajina*, an area dominated by Orthodox Štokavian speakers, largely seen as a hotbed of Serbian national sentiment) into the

[41] Greenburg, 28.
[42] For more on this, see Sue Gal and Judith Irvine, "The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Difference"
[43] Banac, 210
[44] This is a reference to the short-lived language of Volapük, constructed single-handedly by German cleric Johann M. Schleyer in 1879 in order to serve as a universal language
[45] Qtd. in Banac, 107

Croatian lands, the teaching of Cyrillic in schools, the fostering of Slavonian national sentiment, and finally extensively funding JAZU in 1883.[46] As it turned out, Khuen-Héderváry attempts to stave off the growing popularity of the *pravaši* were largely successful, as the party fractured in 1885 on the issue of cooperation with Serbian nationalists, with the faction advocating cooperation gathering around the newspaper *Hrvatska Domovina* ("Croatian Homeland") and the faction staunchly opposed to such cooperation forming the Pure Party of Right (*Čista stranka prava*), a movement that came to be known as "Frankism", after its leader Josip Frank.[47]

Béni Kállay: A Bosnian Nation and a Bosnian Language

Thus, in the first few years of Austro-Hungarian administration of Bosnia-Herzegovina (beginning in 1878), we see the idiom spoken in Bosnia and Herzegovina classified a shocking number of competing classifications, each ideologically loaded. In Gerd-Dieter Nehring's analysis of various publication being circulated and published in the early years of Austro-Hungarian administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the idiom was known under different names: Croatian (*hrvatski*), Serbian (*srpski*), Croatian or Serbian (*hrvatski ili srpski*), Serbian or Croatian (*srpski ili hrvatski*), and was further known colloquially under several other names, including simply "the language" (*jezik*), Slavic (*slavenski*), "the literary-school language" (*književno-školski jezik*), and, perhaps most succinctly, "ours" (*naški*).[48] As the above-mentioned classifications each corresponded to a different standards being published and circulated by their respective

[46] Banac, 93.
[47] Banac, 96.
[48] Gerd-Dieter Nehring, "Razvoj standardnog jezika za vrijeme austro-ugarske monarhije [Development of a Standard Language in the Times of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy]," in Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], ed. Svein Mønnesland, (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).

institutions, there was anything but a single standard in Bosnia-Herzegovina (despite being relatively linguistically homogenous), but rather a plethora of classifications and standards.

While initially all formal communications of the Austrian administration were conducted under the appellation "Croatian", in 1880 the language of the administration was simply called "the language of the land" (*zemaljski jezik*).[49] At this point, the administration became involved in the debate, with a rather different approach than that used by Count Khuen-Héderváry in Croatia. Under the administration of Béni (Benjamin) Kállay (1882-1903), the administration sought to isolate Bosnia from the competing Serbian, Croatian, and Yugoslav nationalist movements, all of which where advancing claims to the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina, for he came to believe that the competing irredentist movements would tear the country apart, and away from Austria. Thus, Kállay's administration initiated a social-engineering project of its own, aimed at instilling a sense of Bosnian nationality (*bošnjanstvo*) among the population of Bosnia-Herzegovina as a whole.[50] This was done primarily through the publication of geography textbooks, yet the project soon addressed the issue of language. Concerning this issue, Jovan baron Apel, the Head of the State Government (*poglavar Zemaljskog vlade*) of Bosnia-Herzegovina, sent the following letter to Kállay:

> We would like to avoid the language spoken here being called Serbian or Croatian, as it is everywhere in outside lands, as it expresses affiliation of the population here to the Serb or Croat nationalities, and we would like to prevent this situation at all costs.[51]

[49] Ibid.
[50] Sreto Tanasić, "Jezik štampe do 1918. godine [Language Printing Houses -1918]," in Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], ed. Svein Mønnesland, (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005), 351
[51] Šipka, 102.

Thus, in 1883, Kállay's administration established the Commission for Language (*Komisija za jezik*) with the aim of classifying and standardizing the "Bosnian language" (*bosanski jezik*), culminating in the declaration of Bosnian as the official language of Bosnia and Herzegovina, accompanied by the publication of its first grammar, published by the administration, under the title "Grammar of the Bosnian Language for Secondary Schools" (*Gramatika bosanskog jezika za srednje škole*).[52] A look at this grammar reveals that both the reformed Cyrillic and Latin scripts are used, as is Karadžić's phonetic orthography. Furthermore, continuity of the language is imparted through a section dedicated to Bosnia's unique medieval script (*bosančica*), which contained elements of both Cyrillic and Glagolitic scripts. While a flurry of publications were produced in the Bosnian language during Kállay's administration, the subsequent administration abandoned the project, and in 1907 declared that the official language would henceforth be "Serbo-Croatian" (*srpsko-hrvatski*), though the autonomous Muslim institutions could continue publishing in the Bosnian language.[53] Within a year, the "Grammar of the Bosnian Language" was being reprinted under a new title, "Grammar of the Serbo-Croatian Language". With the Sarajevo assassination of Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand by a militant Serbian nationalist, triggering World War I, the administration again changed policy, declaring the official language as "Croatian", with the use of the appellation "Serbian" becoming an act of high treason.[54]

What we see in this era are a series of ideologically loaded classifications emerging from outside of Bosnia-Herzegovina, yet each one including the idiom spoken

[52] Nehring, 313.
[53] Ibid
[54] Ibid

by the population of Bosnia-Herzegovina as a whole. The Hungarian administration in Croatia, the Austrian administration in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Kingdom of Serbia each played a key role in granting legitimacy to one philological classification over the others as it shifted in its acceptance, or rejection, of the ideology espoused by the movements affiliated with these classifications and standardizations. Each state played a dual role, not only legitimizing a chosen classification, but also reifying it through the publication of educational materials, such as seen in the 1890 grammar and subsequent editions. However, subaltern (or foreign-based) ideologies had other means of reifying rival classifications through institutional carriers, such as the publishing houses of JAZU, the Serbian Royal Academy, *Matica Hrvatska*, *Matica Srpska,* and newspapers produced in a "different" though fully intelligible language. This trend would continue throughout the entire history of Yugoslavia, with competing classifications and standardizations gaining legitimation through changes in the state, as subsequently being strengthened through other institutional means, all while rival classifications continue to be perpetuated despite their lack of legitimation.

The Kingdom of Yugoslavia: One Nation, Three Peoples

In the wake of World War I, the new Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes was established as a federated Yugoslav state (the capital being in Belgrade, headed by a Serbian Orthodox dynasty). In 1918, in the Code of Law and Order for Bosnia and Herzegovina, "Serbian or Croatian" was declared to be the sole official language, along with both the Cyrillic and Latin scripts.[55] However, this changed with the ratification of the 1921 Constitution of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. Article 3 of the

[55] *Zbornik zakona i naredba za Bosnu i Hercegovinu,* Art. 128, § 1-2.

constitution declared the sole official language as "Serbian-Croatian-Slovenian" (*Srpsko-Hrvatsko-Slovenačko*). While no philological society had classified such a language, it reflects the belief that one nation can only have one language, though in this case it is clear that the nation defines the language, not the other way around. This reflects the constitutionally enshrined concept of the kingdom as having one official nation, composed of three constituent peoples, the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, left up to individuals to declare.[56]

While "Serbian-Croatian-Slovenian" may have been official classified in the constitution of 1921 (and again in the 1931 constitution of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia), the language was not standardized, nor did it undergo substantial reification in any state institutions. Furthermore, there was little to no control over the other institutional carriers, with a wide variety of grammars and orthographies published under all of the above names, all while the school system in Bosnia and Herzegovina continued using a 1912 "Serbo-Croatian" textbook from the Austro-Hungarian era.[57] When it came to the key reifying institutions of the state, there was little reification for appellation, but a great deal of reification for the Štokavian-Ekavian dialect (i.e. standard Serbian) of the capital city Belgrade. It is important to keep in mind that Karadžić's phonetic-orthographic rule, "Write as you speak and read as it is written" had been widely embraced throughout Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Thus, when the increasingly centrist government used Štokavian-Ekavian (and Cyrillic) in all state publications and institutions, simply following the standard orthographical rule resulted in one speaking the exact dialect spoken in Belgrade!

[56] Šipka, 412.
[57] Ibid.

What we see in the situation described above is a language "Serbo-Croato-Slovenian" deriving its legitimation solely from the constitution, with no reification coming from the academic community (standards, orthographic manuals, dictionaries, etc.) or any other institutional carriers. It was created by fiat, created solely to meet the needs of the kingdom based on the dominant conception that one nation must have one language (no more, no less). However, the notion of a unified Yugoslav nation was based on inverse categorical relationship of "language" and "nation", where the nation's existence was predicated on a common language! Thus, it is not surprising to that with little to no acceptance of "Serbo-Croato-Slovenian" as a classification, even Pribićević, the leading advocate of the principle of Yugoslav "national unity" (*narodno jedinstvo*) recognized it not as a generally held belief, attributing it to a "low level of unitarist consciousness."[58] The lack of acceptance of the classification of "Serbo-Croato-Slovene" was exacerbated by the fact that standardized "Slovenian" was permitted to be officially used in Slovenia. Furthermore, different scripts, with their highly noticeable graphic differences, would almost certainly have hindered the conception that a single language was in use. Interestingly, the fact that there was a clear contradiction in the categorical relationship between the language and the nation did not lead to a rejection of the equation of the categories, but rather a rejection of the classifications. Various political parties advocated recognition for different reclassifications of the remaining language(s) based on their own ideologies, ranging from the federalists' demands for "Croatian" and

[58] Banac, 178.

"Serbian", to the centralists' demands for "Serbo-Croatian", "Croato-Serbian", "Croatian or Serbian", "Serbian or Croatian".[59]

The fact that there were a growing number of institutional carriers (namely the state) of the Štokavian-Ekavian dialect must be considered in light that the classification of the "Serbian language" was fairly reified, and easily identifiable with the Cyrllic script. It must be kept in mind that despite the fact that Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes were *officially* sub-national classifications, these classifications still were predominant, further reified albeit under a different, somewhat vague, category. When this is combined with the equation between the language and the nation (still the dominant conception, particularly among "top academics" as Stojanović, Belić, Cvijić, et al.),[60] the problems become obvious. In fact, the difference in the scripts was identified as an obstacle to unitarist nation-building effort as early as the 1850 Literary Agreement, and several solutions had since been proposed. One solution, proposed in 1913 by Jovan Skerlić, involved a compromise in which the Ekavian pronunciation would be embraced by all (seen as a concession to Belgrade) on the condition that Cyrillic be abandoned. While this proposal found favor and was embraced by unitarist authors and magazines throughout what would become Yugoslavia (including Slovenia), the attempt to enforce a complete ban on Cyrillic by the Austro-Hungarian authorities following the assassination of Ferdinand caused pro-Cyrillic sentiment to crystallize. In a 1918 statement entitled, "For Literary Unity: The Question of Dialects and Scripts", Ćorović writes that, "the Cyrillic script thereby became our fellow sufferer… and a graphic symbol of [the Serb] struggle for self-preservation and of a [Serb] consciousness and endurance, the Cyrillic

[59] Ibid.
[60] Banac, 117

script will remain one of the emblems that cannot be abandoned, a banner under which we must endure."[61] While Skerlić's proposal had been embraced by a number of writers in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia, including such figures as Miroslav Krleža, there was a mass refusal on the part of writers in Serbia to abandon their own script in favor of Latin, which would be seen as too great a concession. Thus, both the Latin and Cyrillic scripts were declared to hold official status in the Kingdom. However, such equality was ignored in the armed forces, where the use of Latin was seen as evidence of "anti-state sentiment" and failure to use Cyrillic was punished.[62]

Thus, when the dominate conceptions of "Serb", "Croat", the "Serbian language", and the "Croatian language", combined with conceived relationship of between nation and language, it came to be believed, or at least actively espoused by among the leadership of Serbian nationalist parties such as the Serbian Radical Party, that the Kajkavian speaking Croats, once they began speaking Štokavian, would "turn into" Serbs:

> Even the least supremacist Radicals, such as Protić and Momčilo Ivanić (1886-1940) who cooperated with Croat autonomists, had no doubt about the strictly Serbian nature of štokavian dialect. A reconstruction of their views points to a belief that the Croat appellation always excluded the speakers of štokavian. And once the kajkavian Croats adopted the štokavian dialect, or in Protić and Ivanić's terms, once the "Croats accepted the Serbian language as their literary expression," they became Serbs: "Is it not a fact that once a whole language is adopted, moreover adopted voluntarily, and what is more, adopted by the Croats single-mindedly, is it not a fact, then, that this action expresses a purely instinctive will? And is not that will… entirely equal to the Serb national will, even if it be called – Croatian?"[63]

[61] Qtd. in Banac, 212
[62] Ibid, 151.
[63] Ibid

Of course, this was quite problematic, particularly among the portions of the population who did not identify as Serbs, such the Croatian autonomists, many of whom perceived such linguistic centralism as "Serbianization". In a complaint registered by one officer in 1920, he complains:

> We, officers, are upbraided by the "patriots," who claim that we are Frankists, Austrians – that we are unreliable… My service as an active officer in the A-H army should not imply that I am a traitor – though this was said to us at the end of 1918 and the beginning of 1919 – or a thief… I am a Croat, body and soul, and I shall not allow myself to be Serbianized. And when I am ordered, moreover under physical duress, to use Cyrillic, it is plain to me where this is leading. I shall not be deprived of my nationality.[64]

Thus, the Latin script also became symbolic of resistance to "Serbianization". Furthermore, the Ijekavian dialect, once suggested by Vuk Karadžić as the purest "Serbian" and considered a threat to the Kajkavian and Čakavian dialects by Croatian nationalists movements, had now been embraced by Croatian autonomist movements as a front against "Serbianization".[65] It is clear from this quote that it was believed that speaking and writing in Cyrillic Štokavian-Ekavian could *transform* a Croat into a Serb.

At this point, it is important to mention we see a different conception developing among the Muslim community of Bosnia-Herzegovina. As the "Bosnian" nationality (and language) had been completely starved of institutional carriers since 1907, there was increasing pressure on the Muslim community to "declare" a Croat or Serb nationality in what came to be known as the "Muslim question".[66] Concerning the question of nationality and language, in an article entitled "Are We Serbs or Croats?", published in

[64] Qtd in Ibid,, 152.
[65] Ibid, 214.
[66] Ibid, 374.

the organ of the Yugoslav Muslim Organization (*Jugoslavenska muslimanska organizacija*, JMO), one reads:

> The factors that have nowadays acquired the strongest role in nation-forming are no longer religion or language, but economic and social relations – that is, material culture in general… Should the Muslims feel they have had their fair chance at economic development, that they can enjoy the same material culture as the Serbs, they will unconditionally and certainly choose the Serb nationhood. But should they continue to observe, as they have hitherto, that chances at economic development are allotted un equally and that in their inequality that are being equated with Croats, they will as before continue to choose Croat nationality.

However, despite the fact that that Muslims would "declare" nationality as either Serbs or Croats (or wouldn't), Muslim organizations such as the JMO and others effectively served as institutional carriers of their own, promoting the conception of a specific Bosnian Muslim "people", hierarchically lower than a "nation".

The Rise of Croatia: A Pure Nation with a Pure Language

In the later years of the kingdom, tensions greatly increased between the rival ideological movements, particularly in 1928 when a key anti-unitarist Croatian political figure, Stjepan Radić, and five other deputies were assassinated in the parliament in Belgrade. Within the next six months, the constitution was abolished, and a unitary Kingdom of Yugoslavia was declared, complete with the effacement of the historical territorial borders and appellations and the establishment of a royal dictatorship. This, with its clear unitarist policies, led to an intense radicalization of the anti-Yugoslav nationalist movements, ultimately leading to the establishment of the Ustaša ("Insurgent") movement, a far-right offshoot of the Frankist Croatian nationalist movement established by Ante Pavelić while in exile. The Ustaša movement was a

radical militant offshoot of the Frankist movement), sharing its national conception, best expressed by Frankist ideologue Milan Šufflay in 1921:

> Those who are privy to a genetic cognition of history are acquainted with national memory. The history of ancestors fills the subconscious awareness of each individual. The sum of individual subconsciousnesses is the consciousness of the collective unit – of the nation. Historicism in politics is not the play of individuals, but the imperative of national *mn□mē* – of national memory.[67]

Following its establishment, Ustaša movement became involved in various militant actions to achieve such a Croatian state, including involvement in the assassination of the Yugoslavia's King Alexander in 1934.[68] When the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was occupied by German and Italian forces in World War II, the Ustaša were granted political power by the Axis forces, and declared the Independent State of Croatia (NDH) in April of 1941, with Ustaša leader Ante Pavelić assuming the title of Leader (*Poglavnik*). Importantly, the NDH included all of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

As mentioned above, Pavelić believed that the Croats were not defined in by their language or religion, but rather by genetics and national collective memory. Concerning the issue of language, Pavelić believed that all Croats spoke Croatian, as was their natural right, and was greatly distressed upon returning from exile to see the degree to which the Croatian language had been "Serbianized". Thus, on August 14, 1941, Pavelić and his Minister of Education, Mile Budak, issued the famous "Legal Decree: On the Croatian Language, Its Purity and Spelling" which included ten articles, including:

> The language spoken by Croats, by its pronunciation, by its historical development, by its prevalence in the Croatian national area, by the style of pronunciation, by spelling rules and by the meaning of certain words, is the primary and peculiar language of the Croatian people, and therefore

[67] Qtd. in Ibid, 260.
[68] Ibid, 269.

> not identical with any other language, nor it is a dialect of any other language, nor related to any other nation's common language. That is why it is called the "Croatian language". (Art. I)
>
> The Croatian language is the public welfare of the Croatian people, and therefore nobody should distort or deform it. That is why it is forbidden in pronunciation and in spelling to use words which do not conform with the spirit of the Croatian language, usually foreign words, borrowed from other, even similar languages. Exceptionally, words with special meanings can be used when it is difficult or impossible to find domestic equivalents. (Art. II)

Concerning the specifics of standardization, the decree established the Ijekavian pronunciation as official (Art. IV), specific syntactic rules involving the future tense (Art. VI), and etymological orthography (Art. VII). Thus, Pavelić and Budak classified and standardized the Croatian language by fiat. The decree further forbid the use of non-Croatian names for all institutions and signs (Art. III), and entrusted the Ministry of Education to oversee the process of linguistic cleansing and determining penalties for those who deviate in pronunciation and spelling (Art. VIII), thus ensuring that all institutional carriers would adhere to the decree (or else face the consequences). However, as Milan Šipka observes, even the NDH commandant for the city of Sarajevo, in an official proclamation, employed phonological orthography and "unclean" non-Croatian words, even dating the proclamation with the month of *april* (not the "pure" *travanj*).[69]

The Post-War Era: Supra-Nation

Of course, under the reign of the Ustaša regime there were dissenting voices, the loudest of which happened to be well-armed: the partisans. The partisans' victory brought

[69] Milan Šipka, "Standardni jezik i jezička politika [Standard Language and Language Politics -1918," in Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], ed. Svein Mønnesland, 161-173. (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).

new conceptions of the nation(s) and languages(s), in line with the ideology espoused by the partisans (namely Tito) concerning the nation, i.e. that each nation (*narod*) was to be equal under one government. Thus, in the second Yugoslavia, the already heavily reified appellations of "Slovene", "Croat" and "Serb", as well as the additional appellations "Montenegrin" and "Macedonian", were now placed in the highest category previously known, parallel to each other. This meant that each was regarded by the state, i.e. institutionalized, as *nation* in its own right. Below was a further category of "nationality" (*narodnosti*), a reflection of the Austro-Hungarian hierarchical organization. Concerning language, the Antifascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia (AVNOJ) issued a proclamation in 1944 declaring equality for "Serbians, Croatian, Slovenian, and Macedonian". The official language for republic was determined by their "specific national and linguistic situation", meaning that the categorial confusion had yet to be resolved. Thus, the 1946 constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina declared the official language "Serbian or Croatian" (*srpski ili hrvatski*), while in Croatia it was "Croatian or Serbian" (*hrvatski ili srpski*) and in Serbia and Montenegro it was simply "Serbian".[70]

However, one can see a state-endorsed re-conceptualization of "national language" occurring at roughly the same time as the state institutionally embraced a re-conceptualization of the "nation" hierarchy itself, with the creation of a supra-national category of "Yugoslav". This shift is evident in the censuses. In the 1948 census, the Muslim population were classified as a sub-national group, still recognized as being a sub-division of either the Serb or Croat nations, under the appellation "indeterminate Muslims" (*neopredeljeni muslimani*). In 1953, the Muslims were re-conceptualized as a

[70] Šipka, 422.

sub-nation classification, yet recognized as a sub-division of the supra-national classification, under the appellation "indeterminate Yugoslavs".

Months later, this was reflected in an adjustment of the language. In 1954, a conference was held in Novi Sad, collection of scholars and intellectuals gathered in Novi Sad, initiated by *Matica Srpska* (and of course the Yugoslav state), and came to an agreement regarding the language question. The Novi Sad Agreement's conclusions dealt primarily with standardization, declaring that the "national language of the Serbs, Croats, and Montenegrins is a single language" that had developed around the centers of Belgrade and Zagreb (Art. I), that the name of the language, when used officially, is to include the names of the its constituent parts, i.e. "Serb" and "Croat" (Art. II), that Latin and Cyrillic have equal status and are to be taught in school to both Serbs and Croats (Art. III), that Ijekavian and Ekavian have equal status in all respects (Art. IV). Further articles stated that care must be given to the Zagreb-centered variant and its natural development, and that texts should no longer be translated from one variant to the other (Art. VIII), and that *Matica Hrvatska* and *Matica Srpska* are to work together to create a joint dictionary (Art. V), common terminology for all spheres of economic, scholarly, and cultural life (Art. VI), and a joint orthographic manual (Art. VII). This cooperation was to overseen by a committee appointed by the Zagreb-based Yugoslav Academy of Arts and Sciences (JAZU), the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences (SANU), *Matica Srpska*, *Matica Hrvatska*, and the Universities of Zagreb, Belgrade, and Sarajevo (Art. IX).

In 1960, the first dual-edition orthographic manual was published by both *Matica Hrvatska* (using Ijekavian pronunciation) and by *Matica Srpska* (using Ekavian

pronunciation) under the single, yet complex, appellation "Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian" (*srpskohrvatski*/*hrvatskosrpski*). With the publication of this joint orthographic manual, schools in Bosnia-Herzegovina initially adopted the compound appellation "Serbo-Croatian" (*srpsko-hrvatski*), though ultimately the unhyphenated version "Serbo-Croatian" (*srpskohrvatski*) was named as the official language in the 1963 Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.[71]

Croatian Spring and 1974 Reforms

Though the Novi Sad Agreement was a major step in achieving linguistic unity in the Republics of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Croatia, the agreement was undermined by competing nationalist trends emerging in Yugoslavia. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to detail the political context of the period, it should suffice to say that this was a time marked by increasing federalist tension, especially in regard to republics' financial responsibilities toward the federal government. It was in this context that in 1967 a variety of linguistic and philological societies and institutions, including *Matica hrvatska*, the Croatian Philological Society, the Croatian Literature Society, and the Department of Language and Literature of both the Universities of Zagreb and Zadar, issued the "Declaration on the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language" (*Deklaricija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika*). This declaration stated that the Novi Sad Agreement had violated the principles of partisans concerning equality among the constituent nations:

> The principle of national sovereignty and full equality includes the right of each of our nations to protect all attributes of its national existence and maximum development of not only its economy, but also its cultural activity. Among those attributes includes the important role played by

[71] Šipka, 425.

> having one's own national name of the language that the Croatian nation uses, because it is an inalienable right of each nation that its language is named using its own name, regardless of work done on philological phenomena showing it to be a form of a separate linguistic variant or even belonging to some other nation in its entirety.[72]

The declaration continued by denouncing the tendencies of "statism, unitarism, and hegemony" in communal and economic life, of which the unified "state language" was a part. The declaration concluded with two demands, the first being that the constitution be amended to include the principle of equality for all national languages of Yugoslavia, identified as the Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, and Macedonian literary languages, and the second being that the first demand be implemented through the use of Croatian in schools, newspapers, public and political life, television and radio, as well as by officials, educators and public workers. Within a year, the declaration had become a rallying point for student organizations and morphed into a general "Croatian rights" movement that came to be known as "Croatian Spring" (*hrvatski proljeće*) or simply "mass movement" (*masovni pokret*). This movement reached its apex in 1971 when mass demonstrations were held in Zagreb after *Matica hrvatska*, under the leadership of Ljudevit Jonke (one of the signers and leading proponents of the Novi Sad Agreement, now claiming to be coerced into the agreement) unilaterally ended the Novi Sad Agreement. In 1971, *Matica hrvatska* published a series of books detailing the differences between the Serbian and Croatian languages, as well as a controversial Croatian *language* orthographic manual, which was subsequently ordered to be sent to the nearest furnace, leading to several

[72] "Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika," Telegram, March 17, 1967, 359.

arrests of the "counter-revolutionary" publishers and the forced closure of *Matica hrvatska*,[73]

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, both the state and the Language and Literature Departments of the various universities publicly condemned the Croatian "Declaration".[74] The implications of this conceptual division between the Croatian and Serbian languages would have left Bosnia linguistically divided, and, more importantly, the Bosnia's Muslim community, would have been left as to "declare a language" as the extension of full language right to each nation would not have applied to the Muslim population. In 1971, we see a re-classification of the Muslims, with the state "upgrading" them to a full sub-national group: "Muslims in the sense of nationality" (*Muslimani u smislu narodnosti*). This is symbolized with the capitalization of the initial letter, when a Muslim in a religious sense is written *musliman*, while a Muslim in the nationality sense was written *Musliman*.[75]

Ultimately, in 1974, the movement achieved a degree of success, as a new federal constitution was ratified giving each republic a higher degree of linguistic autonomy. This resulted in Croatia declaring the "Croatian literary language" (*hrvatski književni jezik*) to be in official usage. The adjective "literary" was necessary, for the "Croatian literary language" was considered by the Yugoslav authorities to be the "western variant" of Serbo-Croatian, and thus not a national language *per se*, as it was subordinate in

[73] Greenburg, 32.
[74] Josip Baotić, "Književnojezička Politka 1970-1990 [Literary Language Politics 1970-1990]," in Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], ed. Svein Mønnesland, (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).
[75] Hugh Poulton, "The Muslim Experience in the Balkan States, 1919-1991," Nationalities Papers 28:1, (2000). pp. 54

status.[76] The standard developed in Belgrade and Novi Sad continued under the appellation "Serbo-Croatian", being known as the "eastern variant". The decision of Bosnia-Herzegovina was to follow the conclusions of the "Symposium on Linguistic Tolerance" and similar symposiums held during the crises, in which yet another sociolinguistic conception was created: the "inter-variant" under the appellation "Serbocroatian-Croatoserbian" (*srpskohrvatski-hrvatosrpski*), referred to in linguistic circles as the "Bosnian-Herzegovinian Expression" (*bosansko-hercegovački standardni izraz*).[77]

THE CONTEMPORARY BOSNIAN LANGUAGE PROJECT

In this section, I will go through the important development of the 1990's, during which "the Bosnian language" was created. It is important to bear in mind that its development parallels the earlier language development of Yugoslavia, in that a "language" is created through reclassification in order to accommodate the previous reclassification of the Muslim population as a full "nation" in 1981. It is clear that from the following that this classification had become significantly reified, as evidenced by the arguments of the scholars.

The final years of Yugoslavia were marked by a sharp shift in linguistic politics. With the secession of Croatia (where the "Croatian literary language" (*hrvatski književni jezik*) had been used since the constitution of 1974), the "Croatian" language became official in the constitution in 1990. In Serbia in 1991, the "Serbian" language was declared to be official by law. In Bosnia, this period was marked by polemics in the

[76] Svein Mønnesland, "Emergining Literary Standards and Nationalism: The Disintegration of Serbo-Croatian," present at the conference *Actas do i Simposio Internacional Sobre o Bilingüismo*, 1109.
[77] Baotić, 459.

media, where proposals and demands were being made for a declaration of the "Bosnian" language.[78] In 1990, Dževad Jahić published an article in the Sarajevo-based magazine *Pregled* entitled "On the Vernacular and Literary Language of the Bosnian Muslims" (*O narodnom i književnom jeziku bosanskih Muslimana*), in which he writes,

> The continuity of literary creations of the Bosnian Muslims in their mother tongue is preserved in the very rich folk lyrical and epic literature, as well as in other forms of oral literary tradition. Muslim folk poetry began and developed as a part of a broader epic-lyrical Neo-Štokavian area, in which, in the course of time, a form of poetic inter-dialect was established, defined in scholarly papers as a Neo-Štokavian folklore koine. The koine played an important role in the initial phase of the formation of the Serbo-Croatian literary language, and the contribution of the language of the Muslim folk poetry is evident, although it has not yet been sufficiently investigated […] The name Bosnian (Bosniak) language was, however, widely used; it has the longest tradition among the Muslims. With it, their distance from the oriental-linguistic tradition was expressed as well as their actual ethnic and linguistic Slavic character. This name was applied to a language area broader than that which the name indicated, to the linguistically imprecise Štokavian dialect.[79]

What Jahić does in this article is established a dialectal and literary base for Bosnian language, as well as accurately observing that continuity had been preserved, for the same dialectal base had been selected by both Vuk Karadžić and the Illyrians when the forerunner to Serbo-Croatian was established, though different literary bases had been selected (the epics of the battle of Kosovo and the Renaissance literature of Dubrovnik, respectively). Jahić further argues that the appellation "Bosnian (Bosniak)" (*bosanski [bošnjački]*) was widely used, and not strictly for the vernacular of the Muslim population of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The ambiguity of the appellation in Jahić's

[78] Svein Mønnesland, "Od zajedničkog standarda do trostandardne stiuacije [From a Single Standard to Three Standard Situation]," Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini, (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005), 482.
[79] Dževad Jahić, "O narodnom i književnom jeziku bosanskih Muslimana [On the National and Literary Language of the Bosnian Muslims]," Pregled, (May-June 1990, 359), 374.

argument, where "Bosnian" and "Bosniak" are seemingly interchangeable, should be noted, for this issue would resurface years later. The following year, 1991, saw the publication of Jahić's complete book on the topic, "The Language of the Bosnian Muslims" (*Jezik bosanskih muslimana*), as well as Senahid Halilović's "The Bosnian Language" (*Bosanski jezik*). In Halilović's book, he states that if Serbs and Croats had come to renounce Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian, "then it would be too much to expect the Muslims to be more vigorous in advocating a name which did not even contain their own name… In such a situation, it is understandable that Muslims will bring the Bosnian language back to usage."[80]

These publications, and the abandonment of "Serbo-Croatian" outside of Bosnia-Herzegovina, surely resonated with Bosnia-Herzegovina's Muslim population, for in the official census, taken in 1991, one can see a dramatic shift in the conceptualization of the language. This census, taken for the first time since the nationally oriented political parties were allowed to participate in the elections, left open the question of language, and thus participants were allowed to fill in a black space regarding their "mother tongue" (*maternji jezik*). Of the Muslim population, roughly 90% selected "Bosnian" as their mother tongue.[81] According the results of the 1991 census, the "nations" and "mother tongues" of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina were represented as follows:

NATIONALITY		**MOTHER TONGUE**	
Muslim…….....	43.7%	*Bosanski…….…….*	37.5%
Serb…….	31.3%	*Srpskohrvatski……*	26.6%
Croat…….....	17.3%	*Srpski…….…….....*	18.8%
Yugoslav…….	5.5%	*Hrvatski…….…….....*	13.5%
Other…….....	>1%	*Hrvatskosrpski……..*	1.4%

[80] Senahid Halilović, The Bosnian Language, (Sarajevo: Bosanski Krug, 1991), 15.
[81] Mønnesland, "Od zajedničkog," 482.

Wartime Linguistic Publications and Shifts in Status

In 1992, following Bosnia-Herzegovina's declaration of independence, war broke out. During the Bosnian war, the official status of the language was shifted when separatists declared the founding of Republika Srpska, which later evolved into one of two official entities of the state following the Dayton Agreement. In 1992, when the Constitution of Republika Srpska was drafted, Serbian was established as the official language:

> In the Republic, in official usage is the Serbian language of the Ijekavian and Ekavian pronunciations and the Cyrillic script, and the Latin script in the manner established by law.[82]
> (Službeni glasnik Republike Srpske broj 3/92)

Clearly, the Cyrillic script had been given priority, as the Latin script was to be regulated through future legislation. It is important to note that the pronunciations deemed official in this article, Ijekavian and Ekavian, each have a clear regional usage. Though Ekavian pronunciation was declared as an official pronunciation in the territory of Republika Srpska, this pronunciation has not historically been native east of Drina, as it has historically been confined to eastern regions of Serbia proper. This would indicate the choice of official pronunciation had less to do with empowering the spoken idiom of the citizens that it did with establishing links to Serbia proper. In fact, the wording of the amendment is reflected in the constitution of Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (at the time a loose union between Serbia and Montenegro), ratified less than a month later, which reads:

> In the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in official usage is the Serbian language of the Ekavian and Ijekavian pronunciations and the Cyrillic

[82] "*U Republici je u službenoj upotrebi srpski jezik ijekavskog i ekavskog izgovora i ćirilično pismo, a latinično pismo na način određen zakonom.*"

> script, while the Latin script is in official use in accordance with the Constitution and law.[83]
> (Article 15, FRY Constitution, 1992)

In the territory controlled by the government of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbo-Croatian (*bh. izraz*) continued to be in official usage. However, a growing movement was demanding the recognition of the appellation Bosnian.

In 1992, the linguist, author and folklorist Alija Isaković published his "Dictionary of Characteristic Words of the Bosnian Language" (*Rječnik krarkterističnе leksike u bosanskom jeziku*). The dictionary, drawing from wide body of literary works published by Bosnian Muslims in the past four centuries (regardless of how they expressed their national affiliation), includes an exhaustive number of entries, primarily those of Ottoman Turkish (and thus Arabic and Persian) origin, extensively colored by Islamic terminology. In his introduction, Isaković clearly espouses his ideological position toward the issue of language, beginning with a quote by sociolinguist Joshua Fishman:

> Our language is our morality, and it does not require any special effort to explain the concept of *the Bosnian language*. "The fact itself that an objective, unemotional, scientific term is *necessary* in relation to 'one kind of language', is in itself an indication that the term 'language' often carries a value judgment, that it is a term indicative of a certain emotion or opinion, and that at the same time it is a term that *generates* emotion and opinion." The Bosnian language was not created within the framework of either the Serbian or the Croatian language, it is not derived from them, but it is an objective parallel language. The Bosnian language had its own course of development until the beginning of the 20th century, when political circumstances changed its public status. The Bosnian Muslims, as a separate cultural group in the centuries-old Bosnian society, acquired with time different experiences from their neighbors. Thus, when the natural right to their mother tongue and its name is in question, the degree

[83] "*U Saveznoj Republici Jugoslaviji u službenoj je upotrebi srpski jezik ekavskog I ijekavskog izgovora i ćiriličko pismo, a latiničko pismo je u službenoj upotrebi u skladu sa ustavom i zakonom.*"

> of difference is not essential […] Namely, if Serbs, Croats, Bosnian Muslims and Montenegrins speak, basically, the same language, then the Bosnian language is explained sociolinguistically by the analogous terms: the Serbian language, the Croatian language, the Montenegrin language. For, the disappearance of the Bosnian language from the linguistic terminology of the 20th century did not occur for linguistic reasons, just as the disappearance of the Bosnian Muslims from Yugoslav 20th century sociology was not a biological process, but the consequence of political games. Of course, with time, everything finds its proper place. […] A people which in its original geopolitical community has named its language spontaneously, as all independent peoples do – both the greatest and smallest, at any historical moment will not die out, emigrate, or be assimilated by other peoples. Descendants of ancient Bosnians are still using the Bosnian language…[84]

Thus, Isaković believes that languages, as opposed to dialects, are to be classified not by linguistic criteria (though he does note the Muslim population makes characteristic use of the velar-fricative phoneme /x/), but by the *natural right* of a nation to use the appellation of its choice as a matter of national-preservation. This echoes the arguments used in the 1967 "Declaration" concerning the right to use the "Croatian" language, in that the language does not define the nation, but rather the nation defines the language. The nation, in this case the Bosnian Muslim nation, is conceived of as a non-negotiable ontological reality, dating back to ancient times. However, Isaković makes a key point regarding the relationship between nation and language that radically differs from the arguments and other previous arguments. Isaković recognizes conceives of the nation as having a *right*, not so much as to a language, but to a history. Isaković views the relationship of language and the nation in a constructivist mindset, where acknowledging that the conceptual category of his nation is marked by lack of continuity. The negation of the nation, consequently language to the negation of the *national* language, a

[84] Alija Isaković, Dictionary of Characteristic Words of the Bosnian Language, (Svjetlost: Sarajevo, 1992), 7-9.

consequence of political manipulation and something to be that can be set right. Thus, Isaković places himself in a position where he must show that the classification "Serbo-Croatian" is in some way an *unjust* consequence of political manipulation:

> Although at the Literary Conference (of Vienna, 1850) nobody represented Bosnian language interests, Vuk (Karadžić) practically legalized that which, in purified form, had been given by the… Bosnian and Herzegovinian oral tradition […] The social situation in Yugoslavia, the correlation between national and linguistic excommunication, was the reason why not a single Muslim participated in the Novi Sad Agreement, or in the making of the orthographic manual of 1960, or in any subsequent orthographic manuals. Thus it is not strange that the joint orthographic manual of *Matica srpska* and *Matica hrvatska* completely ignores the basic characteristics of the Bosnian language, that is – the place of the Bosnian language in our common language. At that time, there already existed good and trained linguists among the Muslims. Also, when the six-volume Dictionary of Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian Literary Language was published by both *Maticas* (1967-1976), Muslim literary sources were almost entirely omitted (only 1.8% were included), and their characteristic lexis was marked only here and there, and was proclaimed unliterary, provincial, odd. Thus Vuk Karadžić himself was betrayed and, on this occasion, was reduced to a declarative model only. In this way numerous generations of Muslims, especially in the past fifty years, have been brought up linguistically in the unitarian conception of a common standard language (Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian, Serbian or Croatian), brought up in contradiction of their own literary heritage, in considerable contradiction of their mother tongue, its warmth, softness and refinement.[85]

Isaković thus discredits "Serbo-Croatian" by pointing out that even though the selected dialectal base had been that of the Bosnian Muslims (Štokavian-Ijekavian), Bosnian Muslims themselves were denied participation in the key planning and standardization agreements, thus the literary heritage of the Bosnian Muslims had been neglected, evidenced by the disparagement of the characteristic *lexis* of such works. Following his critique of Serbo-Croatian, Isaković ends his introduction with the following statement:

[85] Alija Isaković, Dictionary of Characteristic Words of the Bosnian Language, (Svjetlost: Sarajevo, 1992), 15, 25-27.

> The present Dictionary is the first attempt to put things right and to enrich our common language – which everybody names according to his own tradition, with the wealth that the Bosnian language had to offer. If, however, in time, these national languages become greatly separated, abandoning the agreed standard, the Bosnian language – both vernacular and literary – will remain what it has always been to the Bosnian Muslim nation: their morality, their spirituality and their refuge.[86]

Thus, Isaković is essentially asserting that there exists is a common language, in a purely linguistic and communicative sense. Elsewhere, he states this quite explicitly: "It goes without saying that the language, regardless of what it is called today, has been the language of all Bosnians and Herzegovinians of all religions and nationalities."[87] However, Isaković argues that within this single language are found different "national languages", defined in a purely sociolinguistic sense. It is the common language that Isaković calls for to be enriched by the lexical wealth of the Bosnian Muslim tradition. However, Isaković implies that any further divergence of the "national languages" of which this common language is comprised will naturally result in the *linguistic* independence of the Bosnian language, for the Bosnian Muslim nation will continue to embrace these lexical variants in both their vernacular and literary language under the appellation "Bosnian".

In December of 1992, another key development emerged when over one hundred Bosnian Muslim intellectuals issued an open letter to President Alija Izetbegović entitled "For Equality of the Bosnian Muslims in Language" (*Za ravnopravnost Bosanskih Muslimana u jeziku*), published in the newspaper *Oslobođenje*. In this letter, the demand was made for the constitution to be amended to read, "In the Republic of Bosnia-

[86] Alija Isaković, Dictionary of Characteristic Words of the Bosnian Language, (Svjetlost: Sarajevo, 1992), 27.
[87] Ibid, 19.

Herzegovina in official usage is the Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian language of Ijekavian pronunciation."[88] While the publication of Isaković's dictionary may have done much to reify the classification of "Bosnian" as a language with a distinct oriental-flavored lexicon drawn from centuries of documents, publications and books, I feel that the simple publishing of this dictionary would be an insufficient explanation for the high degree of consensus generated among Bosnian Muslim intellectuals as reflected in this letter. Though Isaković's dictionary does detail a list of *historical* injustices, it does not leave the impression that the Bosnian Muslim language and literary tradition, as he conceives it, is presently under direct attack and in need of protection. Perhaps a better explanation can be found in the context of the war. On August 25th through 27th, Bosnian Serb paramilitary units fired incendiary shells on the Sarajevo National Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina (which also housed much of the University of Sarajevo's Oriental collection), destroying several million books, publications, documents, and manuscripts, many dating from the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian era as well as destroying the building itself, built in the Moorish revivalist style during the Kállay administration (1896). Thus, the political and cultural artifacts thought to embody the Bosnian Muslim language and literary tradition *were* under direct attack The open letter to Izetbegović was published around three months after this attack.

Despite the increasing pressure from intellectuals and the media, the presidency of Bosnia-Herzegovina, led by Izetbegović, reaffirmed the stance of the government toward Serbo-Croatian and Ijekavian pronunciation with a ruling on February 24, 1993. This ruling stated that the text of the constitution should be written as follows:

[88] "Za ravnopravnost Bosanskih Muslimana u jeziku [For Equality of the Bosnian Muslims in Language]," Oslobođenje (Sarajevo), Dec. 13, 1992.

> In the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in official usage is the Serbo-Croatian language, otherwise known as Croato-Serbian, of the Ijekavian pronunciation.[89]
> (Službeni list, 14.4.93)

Thus, as Serbo-Croatian's status as an official language throughout the former Yugoslavia succumbed to the empowerment of rival nationalist political parties and the philological classifications promoted by them, only in the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina did the language survive as the sole official language. However, this position advocating the name Serbo-Croatian was short-lived. Half a year after the government had reaffirmed its stance, the presidency gave a new ruling concerning the official language in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The new ruling reads as follows:

> In the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in official usage is the standard literary language of the Ijekavian pronunciation of its constitutive nations, which is named using one of three names: Bosnian, Serbian, and Croatian.[90]
> (Službeni list, 1.9.93)

This rejection of the name "Serbo-Croatian" may be interpreted in several ways. One possibility is that the presidency, under Alija Izetbegović, had come to accept that institutional carriers of "Serbo-Croatian" had collapsed outside of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and though a common literary standard remained, the conceptualization of that standard as a single language had been discredited due to the increasing tide of nationalist rhetoric. When asked about this, many people in Bosnia-Herzegovina have speculated that Izetbegović's Party of Democratic Action (SDA), or even Izetbegović himself, simply no longer wanted Bosnia-Herzegovina to be the sole country using the name "Serbo-

[89] *"U Republici Bosni i Hercegovini u službenoj upotrebi je srpskohrvatski odnosno hrvatosrpski jezik ijekavskog izgovora."*
[90] *"U Republici Bosni i Hercegovini u službenoj upotrebi je standardni književni jezik ijekavskog izgovora njenih konstitutivnih naroda koji se imenuje jednim od tri naziva: bosanski, srpski, hrvatski."*

Croatian" as there was no reference to Bosnian Muslim, in the appellation (this interpretation is in line with Halilović's 1991 statement, quoted above). Whatever the reasons, the proposal clearly states that the there is in fact a single language, though it is called by a variety of names, thus roughly meeting the demands of the open letter sent by the Bosniak intellectuals in December of 1992.

Within weeks of the constitutional change, the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports issued a proclamation to all schools to change all school documents from "Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian Language and Literature", also called "Mother Tongue Language and Literature" (*Maternji jezik i književnost*), to "Bosnian, Serbian, Croatian Language and Literature", and further provided the following example for educators: "Today we will study an educational unit from our language, which is called the 'Bosnian, Serbian, Croatian language.'"[91]

In 1993, there was a very important development that would have key repercussions for the conceptualization of the relationship between the nation and language. A constitutional amendment was ratified that officially changed the appellation of the Muslim nation, which was henceforth to be known as the "Bosniak" (*bošnjak*) nation. This was again changes Isaković had argued on behalf of the Bosnian language on sociolinguistic grounds, stating the "Bosnian language" is explained sociolinguistically by the analogous terms. However, this argument, if maintained, would lead to the sociolinguistic explanation justifying not Bosnian language (*bosanski jezik*), but rather the Bosniak language (*bošnjački jezik*).

[91] Mønnesland, "Od zajedničkog," 486.

The Federation and Pseudo-Separation of the Standard

Less than a year later, when the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina effectively ceased to exist as a functional state, a new constitution was created in the areas under control of the newly created Federation of Bosnia and Herzegvonia, a political entity created under the Washington Agreement in the spring of 1994, which effectively ended fighting between the Izetbegović government and the Croat paramilitary organizations (namely the *HVO*) and abolished the separatist Croatian Republic of Herzeg-Bosnia. Concerning the issue of official languages in this new political entity, the 1994 Constitution of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina reads as follows:

> The official languages of the Federation are Bosnian and the Croatian language. The official alphabet is the Latin alphabet. Other languages may be used as means of communication and teaching.[92]
> (Službene novine Federacije BiH, 21.07.1994)

While a casual reading may suggest that there were in fact two official languages, being called Bosnian and Croatian, a closer reading reveals that it is not so straightforward. While the constitution refers to "official languages" (*službeni jezici*) in the plural, the noun "language" (*jezik*) is in the singular and follows the adjective "Croatian", while it is missing from the adjective "Bosnian". This ambiguity is augmented by the fact that definite articles are not used in the language(s), thus two possible translation are possible: that the "official languages" as either "Bosnian and the Croatian language" or "the Bosnian and Croatian language". This ambiguity is not confined to non-native speakers; I consulted several native speakers who suggested various possible interpretations. Some suggested that the amendment contained a grammatical error, being the use of singular form of "language" (in which case the "correct" version would state that the official

[92] *"Službeni jezici Federacije su bosanski i hrvatski jezik. Službeno pismo je latinica. Ostali jezici se mogu koristiti kao sredstva komunikacije i nastave."*

languages are "the Bosnian and Croatian languages"). Others interpreted the constitution as recognizing "Bosnian" as one of the official languages, being completely split from Croatian (and Serbian), though it did not explicitly recognize Bosnian as a "language" *per se*. A third and final interpretation was suggested when I was told, "It is almost as if the official *languages* are treated as *a single language* called 'Bosnian and Croatian'." It is important to note that this change in classification and status accompanies the formation of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and thus one must look at the position of Izetbegović's government vis-à-vis that of Tuđman in Croatia, which rejected any connection between the Croatian and Serbian. While only Alija Izetbegović may know for sure, I suspect that wording of such a key amendment dealing with a potentially explosive issue was not haphazardly, but rather fashioned to be deliberately ambiguous, and thus subject to the various interpretations, in an attempt to appease various ideological positions without completely capitulating to one particular view. As we shall see, this sort of semantic wriggling would reappear in the post-war constitutions.

It should be noted that this same year saw the publication of the first contemporary Bosnian language textbook, "Grammar of the Bosnian Language" (*Gramatika bosanskog jezika*). The authors of this grammar, Hanka Vajzović and Husein Zvrko from the University of Sarajevo's Faculty of Political Science, admit that it was a slapdash effort, having been published in the midst of the war in order to meet the requirement of the government in Sarajevo (in fact, due to the wartime conditions, Vajzović and Zvrko were unable to meet one another while writing the grammar).[93] Interestingly enough, 1994 also saw the republication of the 1890 "Grammar of the

[93] Mønnesland, "Od zajedničkog", 487.

Bosnian Language", published under Kállay's administration. As Mønnesland points out, "A minority of less-informed readers thought that this was the Bosnian standard of the day, not an (important) source for the history of language standardization in Bosnia and Herzegovina."[94] While Mønnesland is right to point out that it is an important historical document, I believe it is more important to focus on its timing. Through the republication of this 1890 grammar, continuity is imparted onto the conceptualization of an independent "Bosnian" language. Thus, rather than the Bosnian language simply being seen as a "new language" created out of wartime necessity, it could be seen as a restoration of the language (or at least the appellation) used before the Yugoslav period (or more accurately, before the 1907 shift in the Austro-Hungarian administration's policy). Thus, an antique is pulled from the attic, and dusted off for all to see.

Post-Dayton Linguistic Planning and Shifts in Status

On December 14, 1995 the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina ended with the signing of the "General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina", commonly referred to as the Dayton Accord, which was signed by the president of Croatia (Franjo Tuđman), the president of Bosnia-Herzegovina (Alija Izetbegović), the president of Serbia (Slobodan Milošević), as well as by United States Secretary of State Warren Christopher. The signatories of the Dayton Accord thereby gave official (and consequently international) recognition to the document and everything contained therein. Importantly, Article XI of the General Framework Agreement states that it was drafted in "Bosnian, Croatian, English, and Serbian languages, each text being equally authentic." The placement of the languages in English alphabetical order extinguishes

[94] Ibid.

the notion that the document recognizes "Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian" as a single language. Thus, the signatories conferred the Bosnian language with full status and recognition for the first time. Shortly afterwards, a scholarly committee was formed in order to discuss the publication of an orthographic manual for the "new" Bosnian language. The committee nominated Senahid Halilović, who published his "Orthographic Manual of the Bosnian Language" (*Pravopis bosanskog jezika*) the following year. Importantly, this orthographic manual provided a list of words considered a part of the new Bosnian standard. Some words were the same as Croatian, yet different from Serbian. Others were the same as Serbian, yet different from Croatian. Some words had two possible variants, one being the standard in Croatian, and the other being the standard in Serbian. Others were nearly identical to one or the other, yet with the inclusion of the phoneme /x/ (e.g. not *istorija* but *historija*). This pronunciation trait, identified as characteristic by Isaković was inserted in words in which it was actually by portions of the population, as well as some words where it had gradually disappear, though historical evidence suggests it was once in use, *sahat*, not *sat* ("hour").

Ironically, while the Bosnian language had received formal international recognition in 1995 and the standardization had begun, it had yet to receive recognition within the entire territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina. This changed in 1998 when the new constitutions were drafted for both entities. The new constitution of the Federation was identical to the 1994 version in regard to language, with the sole exception of adding the word "language" after "Bosnian":

> The official languages of the Federation are the Bosnian language and the Croatian language. The Latin script is official. Other languages may be used as a means of communication and teaching.[95]
> (1998 Constitution of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Art. I.6)

Before looking at the constitutional change for the entity of Republika Srpska, let us first look at a decision by the Belgrade-based Committee for the Standardization of the Serbian Language (*Odbor za standardizaciju srpskoh jezika*). On February 16, 1998, citing sociolinguistic arguments that each nation has a language of the same appellation, in addition to citing the 1993 legal change in the appellation of the Muslim nation to the Bosniak nation, the Committee ruled that in standard, proper Serbian, the name of the language of the Bosniak nation would be the "Bosniak language". Furthermore, the decision specifically stated that the decision applied retroactively to the Dayton Agreement.[96] Thus, the official recognition of Bosnians language, both internationally and within the Federation, was not to apply to all "Serbian" speaking areas, including Republika Srpska. With this in mind, it is no surprise that the amendment to the Constitution of Republika Srpska was worded in such a way as to deny this change in the Bosnian language status. The drafters of the 1998 Constitution of Republika Srpska largely maintained the text of their wartime constitution, keeping the word "language" in the singular, yet removed the adjective "Serbian":

> In Republika Srpska, in official usage is the language of Ijekavian and Ekavian pronunciation and the Cyrillic script, and the Latin script in the manner established by law.[97]
> (1998 Constitution of Republika Srpska, Art. 7)

[95] *"Službeni su jezici Federacije bosanski jezik i hrvatski jezik. Službeno je pismo latinica. Ostali se jezici mogu koristiti kao sredstva komunikacije i nastave."*
[96] Odbor za standardazija srpskog jezika. Decision 1 (16.2.1998)
[97] *"U Republici Srpskoj je u službenoj upotrebi jezik ijekavskog i ekavskog izgovora i ćirilično pismo, a latinično pismo na način određen zakonom."*

Thus, through the removal of the appellation, the constitution of Republika Srpska reasserted linguistic unitarity through the proclamation of a single language with both Ijekavian and Ekavian pronuncation. This unnamed language may or may not be understood as being "Serbian" or "Serbo-Croatian", but it could not be conceived of as "Bosnian", as it does not fit the dialectal base of the Bosnian language (i.e., strictly Ijekavian).

In September 1998, a key linguistic planning conference, the "Symposium on the Bosnian Language" (*Simpozij o bosanskom jeziku*), was held in the city of Bihać, jointly by the Sarajevo-based Institute for Language and Literature (*Institut za jezik i književnost*), the government of the canton of Una-Sana (the canton in which Bihać is located), and by the Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture, and Sports.[98] This symposium brought together scholars from throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina to discuss the development of the Bosnian language. Importantly, the participants of this conference included the top linguists from every university in the Federation (not all of whom are Bosniaks). The papers delivered in this conference approached the language from a wide variety of perspectives. In particular several papers explicity covered the relationship between language and the nation, including such papers as Džemaludin Latić's "How to Avoid Linguistic Nationalism" and Marina Katnić-Bakaršić's "Linguistic Rights Between Theory and Practice in Multi-national Communities – Analysis of More Recent Documents of the Council of Europe and UNESCO".[99]

[98] Ibrahim Čedić, ed. Simpozij o bosanskom jeziku: Zabornik radova, (Sarajevo, Institut za jezik u Sarajevu, 1999), 7.
[99] Ibrahim Čedić, ed, Simposium on the Bosnian Language, (Sarajevo: Institut za jezik, 2000).

Aftermath of the 1998 Constitutional Status Change

On August 19, 2000, the Constitutional court of Bosnia-Herzegovina ruled, after a protracted debate, that the above-mentioned articles in the constitutions of both entities were unconstitutional on the grounds that all languages needed to have official status throughout both entities in order to avoid ethnic discrimination.[100] Furthermore, the Office of the High Representative, presided by Wolfgang Petritsch, issued a declaration in 2002 stating that the constitutions of both entities needed to be amended in order to ensure linguistic equality among the citizens of all three constituent nations. These factors ultimately led to the amending of both entities' constitutions on April 19, 2002.

Less than a month before the constitutions for the two entities were to be decided upon, more than sixty leading Bosniak intellectuals (including leading Bosniak linguists, poets, authors, and directors) issued a public declaration, published in various newspapers, publicly declaring support for the Bosnian language. The seven points of the declaration included the following:

1. The Bosnian language is the language of Bosniaks and of all those who, with that appellation, take it as theirs.

2. By way of usage of the term Bosnian language, Bosniaks trace the identity of their language, the continuity of which can be traced all the way back to the medieval times in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the existence of which has, on innumerable occasions, been confirmed within various files of governance and legal documents, public speeches, Bosniak oral and written literature and in literature published in Slavonic and other languages.

3. Regardless of similar or different opinions about the common or the specific within the standardized languages originated on the grounds of the Central South Slavic Diasystem – which forms the majority of the South Slavic linguistic community – we take it that all national currents are speaking of the language Serbs have always called Serbian, Croats Croatian and Bosniaks Bosnian.

[100] Ibid, 489

4. Manipulations of the term the Bosnian language for political purposes – which was the case in certain periods in the past, along with manipulating the name of the Bosniak nation – as well as the usage of the syntagm within the regional context do not challenge the authenticity of the usage of the term among the Bosniaks in the national/folk context.

5. By persisting on the usage of the historical name of their language, the Bosniaks in Bosnia and Herzegovina and abroad do not jeopardize rights of anybody, nor do they adopt something that doesn't belong to them. In that context, using the name the Bosnian language does not include any tendency toward the unification or unitarization in the area of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

6. The attempts to impose the Bosniak appellation on the language upon the Bosniaks, instead of the historically confirmed and in practice accepted term of the Bosnian language, represent politicizing, which is the consequence of Serbian and Croatian paternalism, which has survived but hasn't prevailed, as has the denial the Bosniak national identity.

7. While emphasizing the legitimate right to call their language by its historical, and among the nation, 'rooted' name, the Bosniaks encourage equal rights of other nations in Bosnia and Herzegovina and abroad, and welcome linguistic research and cultural intercessions which will enable better understanding and mutual respect.

We see in this declaration a combination of complex sociolinguistic and linguistic arguments, each one regarding the relationship between "nation", "language" *and* "appellation". Specifically outlined is the right of the nation the use the appellation it chooses, and the right to not have an appellation imposed on it.

When the constitutions were amended weeks later, the constitution of the Federation was officially changed to read:

> The official languages of the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina are: the Bosnian language, the Croatian language and the Serbian language.[101]
> (Amendment XXIX, April 19, 2002)

[101] *"Službeni jezici Federacije Bosne i Hercergovine su: bosanski jezik, hrvatski jezik i srpski jezik."*

In Republika Srpska, the constitution was amended in such a way as to ensure linguistic equality to all citizens of all three constituent nations while simultaneously continuing to withhold recognition of the status of the Bosnian language, once again by skirting the appellations. The skillfully crafted amendment reads as follows:

> The official languages of Republika Srpska are: the language of the Serb nation, the language of the Bosniak nation and the language of the Croat nation.[102]
> (Amendment LXXI, April 19, 2002)

Interestingly enough, it is the constitution of Republika Srpska that is accordance with the demands made by the Bosniak intellectuals not to impose an appellation.

Review of Institutional Carriers

In this next section, I will briefly go over several key institutional carriers of the language. Some of them are rather straightforward, while others, particularly the highest levels of education (most important for this study) require more elaboration.

Concerning mass media, the standards and appellations are fairly straightforward, Various newspapers clearly demonstrate ideological leanings, and the standards correspond. In her assessment of publishing in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Janet Crayne identifies the standards used in various newspapers as adhering, or not adhering, to various orthographic rules. [103] Concerning Bosnian, the daily newspaper *Dnevni Avaz* and weeklies *Dani*, Liljan, *Azra*, and *Bošnjak* adhere closely to Halilović's orthographic manual. Croatian, in both standard and appellation, is found in the weeklies *Hrvatska Riječ* and *Horizont*. Serbian, following the Evakian standard and Cyrillic script, is found

[102] *"Službeni jezici Republike Srpske su: jezik srpskog naroda, jezik bošnjačkog naroda i jezik hrvatskog naroda."*
[103] Janet Crayne, "Publishing in Bosnia and Hercegovina," in Publishing in Yugoslavia's Successor States, eds. Michael Biggins and Janet Crayne (New York: Haworth Press, 2000), 41-82.

in the daily *Glas Srpske* and the weekly *Reporter*. The "non-nationalist" papers *Oslobođenje* and *Večernje Novine*, which are aimed at the population as a whole, do not adhere to any particular orthographic manual, essentially following the pre-war "inter-variant linguistic tolerance", using the appellation "BHS", an abbreviation of "Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian". Concerning television, various independent and local channels exist, but the primary three are based along the political divisions. The station for the Republika Srpska broadcasts in Serbian, using Ekavian pronunciation. The station for the Federation broadcasts in the pre-war "inter-variant", as does the station for the Republic as a whole. However, while the Federation station uses only Latin script, the Republic station alternates scripts daily, so one day the script are solely Latin and the following day Cyrillic. Concerning the education at the lowest levels, they are organized by the individual cantons with each nation allowed to have education in its own language. The effect of this has largely been the segregation of the schools along "ethnic lines". The choice of orthographic manuals and grammars is left up to the cantons. Clearly, not every town has schools for all three languages, and students are often mixed in schools under a dominant label.

A survey of the higher educational institutions of Bosnia-Herzegovina yields fascinating results. The University of Tuzla (*Universitet u Tuzli*) has a Department of "Bosnian Language and Literature", offering a degree by the same name. Republika Srpska's University of Banja Luka (*Universitet u Banjoj Luci*) is equally straightforward, with its Department of "Serbian Language and Literature", again offering a degree in the same. The University of Mostar (*Sveučilišta u Mostaru*), with the name of the university itself being the standard Croatian word (*Sveučilišta*, not *Universitet*) clearly follows the

same pattern, offering courses on Croatian language and literature within the Department of "Croatistics" (*kroatistika*).[104] The University of Zenica (*Universitet u Zenici*) does not have a Faculty of Philosophy, though the Faculty of Pedagogy does have a Department of "BHS Language and Literature" (*BHS Jezik i Književnost*), in which course offerings include language courses, covering various Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbo-Croatian grammars and orthographic manuals (no modern Serbian grammars are included), and literature courses, covering Bosnia-Herzegovinian literature from both the modern era as well as Ottoman, Hapsburg, and Yugoslav eras, including literature identified as Yugoslav, Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, Muslim, Franciscan, and Jewish.

The curricula at the University of Sarajevo (*Universitet u Sarajevu*) are perhaps the most interesting. The Faculty of Philosophy has a Department of "Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian Language" (*Bosanski, Hrvatski, Srpski Jezik*), offering a degree in "Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian Language and Literature of the Nation(s)[105] of Bosnia and Herzegovina" (*bosanski, hrvatski, srpski jezik i književnost naroda BiH*).[106] The department offers, according to its course list, four levels of "Contemporary Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian Language" (*Savremeni bosanski, hrvatski, srpski jezik*), respectively dealing with phonetics and phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, and further

[104] While elevating the study of Croatian language and literature to a field of its own may seem extreme, it is important to bear in mind that Zagreb's School of Croatian Studies (*Hrvatski Studiji*), founded by fiat under war-time Croatian president Franjo Tuđman, has gone further, elevating it to a fell-fledged science under the name "Croatology" (*kroatologija*).

[105] The word *naroda* could is the genitive of "nation" (*narod*) in both the singular and the plural, and thus translating the word as "nation" or "nations" depends on the context. So as not to endorse or subvert the concept of a common Bosnian-Herzegovinian "nation", I have provided both translations.

[106] *Nastavni plan i program: škola 2004/2005*, Universtitet u Sarajevu, Filozoski Fakultet Sarajevo, Odsjek za bosanski, hrvatski, srpski jezik, (2004), 4.

offers courses in the "Standard and Culture of the Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian Language" (*Norma i kultura bosanskog, hrvatskog, srpskog jezika*).[107] However, in the course descriptions themselves, found in the same publication, the third and fourth level courses are simply named "Contemporary Bosnian Language" (*savremeni bosanski jezik*).[108] Concerning the literature courses, they are divided into separate courses (or, in some cases, separate sections of a single course) under the names "Bosniak Literature" (*Bošnjačka književnost*), "Croatian Literature" (*Hrvatska Književnost*), and "Serbian Literature" (*Srpska književnost*).[109] A look at the course descriptions reveals that students enrolled in the course "Croatian Literature" are to study works from Croatia and those by Bosnian Franciscans, as well as studying "Bartol Kašić and his enthusiasm for the 'Bosnian' (Štokavian) language" (*Bartol Kašić i njegovo oduševljenlje za 'bosanski' (štokavski) jezik).*[110] The course description for "Bosniak Literature" reveals that it includes literature from the Middle Ages in addition to works by Bosniak authors.[111] Included among these 'Bosniaks' are Safvet-beg Bašagić (who identified himself as being a Croat of Muslim faith)[112] and Meša Selimović (who, though born to a Muslim family, declared himself to be both a Serb and an atheist).[113] The works of Nobel Prize winning author Ivo Andrić (who was born in Bosnia and baptized as a Roman Catholic,

[107] Ibid, 2-4.
[108] Ibid, 58, 75.
[109] Ibid, 2.
[110] Ibid, 50.
[111] Ibid, 46.
[112] Banac, 365.
[113] Meša Selimović, Death and the Dervish, trans. Bogdan Rakić and Stephan M. Dickey, (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern UP, 1998), xiii.

and nonetheless adopted the Štokavian-Ekavian dialect and is thus hailed as one of Serbia's greatest writers)[114] are taught in a course entitled "Serbian Literature II".[115]

Conclusion

Is the Project Still Going?

Currently, in the former Yugoslav countries, particularly in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the choice of lexicon, perhaps above all, appellation, involves a high degree of reflexive engagement due to the diverging official classification and standards. Importantly, each language (as well as its associated standard and lexicon) is conceptually linked with a particular nation. Thus, when one identifies with, or is identified with, one of these nations, there is tremendous pressure to *perform* in the manner. This is no different than the social intimidation seen elsewhere. For example, I am expected to write a certain way in an academic paper, properly obeying orthographical rules and employing a specific lexicon, thus performing as a scholar. However, I certainly wouldn't feel pressure to use words like "reflexive engagement" in a private conversation with my mother, nor would I use Chicago style citation on a note left on the refrigerator. In fact, I would feel pressure to *not* do such things, for I would likely be chastised, or at least teased, in this case for *performing* the wrong role. In other words, it is a highly contextualized performance.

One example of this sort of contextual performance can be seen in a 2006 interview with Željko Komšić, the current Croat president of Bosnia-Herzegovina's three-person rotating presidency. Komšić, when asked which language he speaks, replied:

[114] Ibid.
[115] *Nastavni plan*, 69.

> I speak the way my mother and father taught me, and I am absolutely understood by all. I know the words *siječanj*, *veljača*, *ožujak*[116]… I even know what that means, but I speak the way my parents taught me.[117]

Clearly unsatisfied with this answer, the interviewer further prodded Komšić, asking, "How do you call the language that you speak?" When faced with this direct question, Komšić replied, "I preferably call it Bosnian." It is clear from this interview is that Komšić is well aware that he is being interviewed, that the interview would be published, and that the interviewer would not neglect the fact that he is the "Croat" president of Bosnia and Herzegovina. When asked which language he speaks, we see that Komšić explains that he speaks his mother tongue and that this doesn't impair the communicative value of his speech. Without further prompting, begins to list the names of the months, using the "Croatian" lexical variant. He then states that he even knows what *that* means, adding "but, I speak the way my parents taught me." In other words, he is aware of the meta-semantic meaning, i.e. the social baggage the words carry. He is aware of the expectations placed on him, as the "Croat" president, to speak with words deemed to be "Croatian". He concludes this long answer by reiterating that he speaks his mother tongue, as if to *justify* the way he speaks. It is clear at this point that Komšić does not consider Croatian as his mother tongue, for if he did he could have simply answered "Croatian" and avoided this seemingly tense situation, as so much would have been expected of him. Despite it being clear from his answer, and the way he dodged the appellation, the interview persists, directly asking him to name his language, as if he

[116] These standard Croatian names for "January", "February", and "March", as opposed to the Latin-based "*Januar*", "*Februar*" and "*Mart*", which are widely used in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

[117] Pincom.info: BH Internet Dnevnik, "Komšić: Nisam vjernik, govorim bosanski jezik," 3.10.2006, <http://www.pincom.info/bih/opsirnije.asp?ID=42237>

needs the quote for a scandalous headline. Komšić answers, saying he *preferably* calls it Bosnian, indicating that though that he finds that to be the ideal appellation, it isn't always possible. One gets the feeling from reading the interview that Komšić fears being labeled as a "bad" Croat, as if his choice of words and appellation were a way of measuring of "Croat-ness". If in fact they are used that way by the interviewer, they aren't to sole measure: the interview was published under the title "*Komšić: I'm not a believer, I speak the Bosnian language*".

In order to look at this reflexive engagement, I decided to conduct a series of short interviews with friends from Bosnia and Herzegovina and one from Slovenia. Importantly, prior to interviewing them, I first asked, "Can I interview you for my thesis on the Bosnian language and nationalism?" After getting their acceptance, I asked, "Can I conduct the interview now?" I followed this by taking out a notepad and paper, while assuring them that I would not use their real names. While I have no background in cognitive science, I clearly presented a variety of cultural primers that would result in the situation being perceived as formal. I am contrasting this with other observations I have made, regarding various levels of formality.

In the first interview, conducted with Ante from the town of Kakanj (in central Bosnia), yielded interesting results concerning this reflexive engagement. Ante frequently refers to his language using the appellation "Bosnian" throughout the interview, but when asked directly what language he speaks, Ante states that he speaks "Serbo-Croatian". Asked to explain this inconsistency, Ante replies:

> I think I speak the Serbo-Croatian language because I speak the way I learned before the war. For example, I say *opština*, not *opšćina*. Its weird for me, nobody used to say that in Kakanj, but now everybody seems to say it. I say *istorija*, which is supposedly 'Serbian' now, but my younger

> brother (born in 1991) says *historija*. I give him a hard time for it sometimes. To me, it's such a peasant way to pronounce it. I guess he must have learned it in school.

When asked why he refers to his language as "Bosnian" if he believes he is speaking pre-war Serbo-Croatian, he replied, "Well, what else am I going to call it? I speak Bosnian. What choice do I have? Serbo-Croatian doesn't exist anymore." I then asked him "If the language were called 'Bosniak' (*bošnjački*), would you still claim to speak it?" He answered, "No, I wouldn't. I can say I speak Bosnian because I'm a Bosnian, which supposedly doesn't exist, but I'm not a Bosniak". Concerning his lexicon, Ante stated that while in everyday speech he uses the word *sedmica* ("week"), the standard word in Serbian (and widely considered to be a "Serbian word" in Croatia), when speaking with the local parish priest, he uses the standard Croatian equivalent, *tjedan* (widely considered to by a "Croatian word" in both Bosnia and Serbia). Both *sedmica* and *tjedan* are considered standard Bosnian. When asked why he makes such a lexical change, Ante responded:

> I attended a Catholic school in Sarajevo, where everything was conducted in Croatian. They taught us how to speak proper Croatian. I didn't receive good grades in my Croatian class. I simply don't speak or spell that way. But when speaking with my priest, I known I should be speaking in Croatian, so I say *tjedan*. He is an authority figure… I wouldn't say *sedmica* in front of him. But I never use Croatian at home, never!

Even non-native speakers are subject to this controversy, for they are exposed to completely different "circles of intimidation", with different preferences for one particular word or appellation. One interesting example is the case of Pavla, a Slovenian who speaks what she refers to as "BHS", an abbreviation of *Bosanski/Hrvatski/Srpski*. When posed with the question as to why she uses this appellation, Pavla replied,

> I began calling it "BHS", after finding out this is the name used in the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslav. I used to say "Croatian", "Serbian" or "Bosnian", trying to use the name I thought was preferred by whomever I was speaking with. But I would often use the wrong name, and occasionally be scolded. Sometimes I would get screamed at! They would yell, "Why do you call it Serbian?" You never know what to call it when talking with multiple other people from throughout ex-Yugoslavia. Like when talking with a Bosnian and Serb. What do you call it? So now I am consistent, I only use BHS."

Notice, first of all, that Pavla classifies the various languages under a single classification, under a "neutral" appellation. This appellation is neutral not in the sense of being *anational*, such as "Central South Slavic diasystem", but rather in the sense of being neutral between Bosnian, Serbian, and Croatian nations and the right of each nation to have its own appellation used. Thus, while the separate classifications of the Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian languages are rejected, the nations are accepted as parallel groups with an equal right to the appellation of its choice, despite the fact that none of the associated appellations are actually used, but rather combined into an acronym.

Evading the Categories: The Naš *Phenomenon*

At this point, I will turn away from the interviews I conducted, and instead turn to direct observations I have made. As mentioned above, the sort of reflexive engagement is contextual. Appellations and orthographic rules are generally not considered in day-to-day conversion.. As clear from the above interviews, when directly posed with the question "What language do you speak?" or "How do you call your language?" the answer is pondered over, justified, even dodged. This speaks of a great deal of social pressures and circles of intimidation, where the answer could be "correct" or "incorrect", depending entirely on who is asking and the context.

In less formal settings, one particular phenomenon stands out: the evasion of the appellation. This is done through its replacement with "Ours" (*naš*). For example, I would frequently hear, "How do you say [something] in ours?" (*Kako se kaže [nešto] na našem*?) While this may appear to be an awkward expression in English, it is quite natural in the original. Indeed, this is quite an easy way to avoid the subject of the appellation, and I have heard it many times in Bosnia (and rarely heard the appellations for the language), both in the Federation and Republika Srpska. Perhaps most interesting is the use of *naš* by Pavla, for though she is fluent, she is not a native speaker. This raises the question that has been asked throughout this paper by so-called nation-builders and elite manipulators: if the language if "ours", then who are "we"? Of the six people I asked, I received six different answers, each after noticeable bafflement: "Yugoslavs", "Ex-Yugoslavs", "South Slavs", "Bosnians", "Bosnians, Croats, and Serbs" and finally "I don't know, I never thought about it".

Final Remarks

As can be seen in the previous chapter, the institutionalized categories of "nation" and "language" are shifting, even today. The steady reification of these categories, through both the state and the intellectuals empowered by the state as "authorities", shapes our understanding of language and nation. With the fairly constant shuffling of linguistic authorities and state conceptions of nationalism, the vestiges of previous harmonizing classifications (at least intended to be) remain imbedded in the educational system and academic discourse. As we have seen, this conceptual shuffle has made significant progress in its reification in Bosnia. Changes in the last fifteen years have clearly made their mark. This is not to suggest that conflict is somehow inherent in our

conceptions. As seen above, these classifications aren't at the forefront of our thoughts, for people don't ponder day and night about the congruency of nations and languages, much as the "contextual schizophrenia" does not plague Bosnians in day-to-day life. Rather, the incongruence between these overlapping, but in no way coinciding, categories and classifications is strictly contextual. However, when "authorities" issue a public demand stating that the incongruence needs to be addressed, as every "nation" *deserves* a "language" and "our language has been manipulated", the categories are evoked at the same time. The old classifications of the Yugoslav supra-nation and Serbo-Croatian may be absent from the discourse, but they can be evoked easily with questions about "the language" in context. As my final remark, I would like to reiterate my belief that scholars of nationalism studies could benefit from treating "language" and "nation" in a single elastic domain, for they were treated as such by early scholars of nationalism (the Slavists), and this has left its vestiges. As seen with the people(s) discussed above, the conceptual divorce of "language' and "nation" has left many scholars confused in attempting to determine the relationship between them, despite the fact that they truly have experienced a parallel, and often intertwining, development.

Works Cited

Brubaker, Rogers. Ethnicity without Groups. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2004.

Banac, Ivo. The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993.

Baotić, Josip. "Književnojezička Politka 1970-1990." In Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], edited by Svein Mønnesland. (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).

Bratulić, Josip. Matica Hrvatska: 1842-1997. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997.

Cameron, Deborah. Verbal Hygeine. London: Routledge, 1995.

Crayne, Janet. "Publishing in Bosnia and Hercegovina." In Publishing in Yugoslavia's Successor States, edited by Michael Biggins and Janet Crayne, 41-82. New York: Haworth Press, 2000.

Einar Haugen, "Dialect, Language, Nation," American Anthropologist, 68: 922-35.

Gal, Sue and Judith T. Irvine. "The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Difference." Social Research. 1995.

Greenberg, Marc L. "The Role of Language and the Creation of Identity: Myths in Linguistics among the People of the Former Yugoslavia." Paper presented at 'Reinvention of ' Faculty International Studies Seminar, University of Kansas, April 1996.

Greenburg, Robert. Language and Identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and its Disintegration. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004.

Jahić, Dževad. "O narodnom i književnom jeziku bosanskih Muslimana [On the National and Literary Language of the Bosnian Muslims]." Pregled (Sarajevo). (May-June, 1990).

Jukić, I. F. ed. Bosanski Prijatelj [Bosnian Friend]. Sv.1. (Bèrzotiskom narodne tiskarnice: Zagreb, 1850).

Halilović, Senahid. The Bosnian Language, (Sarajevo: Bosanski Krug, 1991), 15.

Hobsbawm, Eric. "Language, Culture, and National Identity." Social Research. 63:4 (Winter 1996).

Hroch, Miroslav. Social Preconditions of a National Revival in Europe: a Comparative Analysis of the Social Compostition of Patriotic Groups Among the Smaller European Nations. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.

Ibrahim Čedić, ed, Simposium on the Bosnian Language. Sarajevo: Institut za jezik, 2000.

Isaković, Alija. Dictionary of Characteristic Words of the Bosnian Language. Svjetlost: Sarajevo, 1992.

Ivić, Pavle. "Standard Language as an Instrument of Culture and the Product of National History," The History of Serbian Culture. Edgware, Middlessex, England: Porthill, 1998.

Kamusella, Tomasz D. "Language as an instrument of nationalism in Central Europe." Nations and Nationalism. 7:2 (2001).

Mønnesland, Svein. "Emerging Literary Standards and Nationalism: The Disintegration of Serbo-Croatian." Paper presented at the conference *Actas do i Simposio Internacional Sobre o Bilingüismo,* Universidade de Vigo, Galacia, Spain, October 23-26, 1997.

---. "Od zajedničkog standarda do trostandardne stiuacije [From a Single Standard to a Three Standard Situation]." In Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], edited by Svein Mønnesland, (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).

Nakaš, Lejla. "Kulturne Prilike Bošnjaka u osmanskom periodu [Cultural Conditions of the Bosniaks in the Ottoman Period]." In Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language i n Bosnia and Herzegovina], edited by Svein Mønnesland, 161-173. (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).

Nehring, Gerd-Dieter. "Razvoj standardnog jezika za vrijeme austro-ugarske monarhije [Development of a Standard Language in the Times of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy]." In Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], edited by Svein Mønnesland. (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).

Okuka, Miloš. "Književni Jezici Bosanskih Srba [Literary Language of the Bosnian Serbs]." In Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], edited by Svein Mønnesland, (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).

Poulton, Hugh. "The Muslim Experience in the Balkan States, 1919-1991." Nationalities Papers 28:1 (2000).

Pranjković, Ivo. "Jezik Bosanskih Franjevaca [Language of the Bosnian Franciscans]." In

Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], edited by Svein Mønnesland, 227-258 (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).

Safran, William. "Identity." In Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity, edited by Joshua Fishman, 77-93. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.

Selimović, Meša. Death and the Dervish, Bogdan Rakić and Stephan M. Dickey, trans. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern UP, 1998.

Steinberg, Jonathan. "The Historian and the *questione della lingua*." In The Social History of Language, edited by Peter Burke and Roy Porter, 198-209. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

Tanasić, Sreto "Jezik štampe do 1918. godine [Language Printing Press -1918." In Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], edited by Svein Mønnesland, 161-173. (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).

Šipka, Milan. "Standardni jezik i jezička politika [Standard Language and Language Politics -1918." In Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini [Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina], edited by Svein Mønnesland, 161-173. (Institut za Jezik: Sarajevo, 2005).

Primary Sources

BH Internet Dnevnik. "Komšić: Nisam vjernik, govorim bosanski jezik." <http://www.pincom.info/bih/opsirnije.asp?ID=42237> (Accessed May 31, 2007).

"Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika [Declaration on the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language." Telegram. (March 17, 1967).

"Povelja o bosanskom jeziku [Charter on the Bosnian Language]." Institut za bošnjačke studije, et al. Sarajevo, March 21, 2002.

Nastavni plan i program: škola 2004/2005 Universtitet u Sarajevu, Filozoski Fakultet Sarajevo, Odsjek za bosanski, hrvatski, srpski jezik, (2004).

Odbor za standardazija srpskog jezika. Decision 1. (16.2.1998).

"Za ravnopravnost Bosanskih Muslimana u jeziku [For the Equality of the Bosnian Muslims in Language." Oslobođenje. (13.12.1992).