

Jelica Stojanović

**THE DEVELOPMENT PATH
OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE
AND SCRIPT**



MATICA SRPSKA – MEMBERS' SOCIETY OF MONTENEGRO
DEPARTMENT OF SERBIAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Title of the original Serbian Edition:
Jelica Stojanović, *Put srpskog jezika i pisma*,
Belgrade, Srpska književna zadruga, 2017,
The Blue Edition series

For the publisher
JELICA STOJANOVIĆ

Editor
DRAGO PEROVIĆ

Translation
NOVICA PETROVIĆ

Jelica Stojanović

**THE DEVELOPMENT PATH
OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE
AND SCRIPT**



Podgorica 2020

THE DEVELOPMENT PATH OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE AND SCRIPT, MADE UP OF STRAY PATHS

Only two years have passed from the two hundredth anniversary of the beginning of Vuk Karadžić's struggle for "introducing the folk language in literature", that is to say, from the introduction of the Serbian folk language in the Serbian literary language, or to put it in the more modern phrasing of today: the standard language. The beginning of that struggle is connected to the year 1814, when, in the royal city of Vienna, Vuk's first grammar book came out: *The Orthography of the Serbian Language Based on the Speech of the Common Folk*, which dealt with resolving the three most important standard-related issues: a) the issue of the Serbian orthography, b) the issue of the morphological structure of the Serbian language, and c) the issue of the name of the language and its national boundaries.

Rare are the languages, if, indeed, there are any, which have had such a turbulent history of two hundred years. The historical development of a language can be followed at two historical levels: that of its internal and that of its external history. The internal history of Vuk's Serbian language had a more or less normal development, one could even say that it developed in a straight line, moving along the paths of the stabilisation of its structure, conditioned by functional-stylistic reasons. As opposed to its internal history, the external history of the Serbian language is entirely made up of "tremors". There are so many of these "tremors" that they are to be found on almost every page of its two-hundred-year history.

These two aspects of the history of the Serbian language were very much intertwined at the time of Vuk's struggle for its standardisation and codification. Anyone who wishes to shed

light on “the development path of the Serbian language” must take both these aspects into consideration. It is precisely how Jelica Stojanović approaches the historical path and the current situation of the Serbian language and the Cyrillic script in this book, published within the framework of the Blue Edition of the Srpska književna zadruga [Serbian Literary Commune] publishing house. Her book is a felicitous combination of internal and external characteristics of the Serbian literary language – in their diachronic and contemporary perspectives. This book is made up of seven studies by Jelica Stojanović: 1) *The Serbian Language and the State-National Projects in the 19th and the 20th Centuries*; 2) *Vuk’s Reform of the Serbian Language in the Context of Two Principles: “Write as You Speak” and “General Regularity”*; 3) *The Language of Dubrovnik in the History of the Serbian Literary Language (As Shed Light Upon by Milan Rešetar)*; 4) *The Continuity, Spreading and Status of the Serbian Cyrillic Script – Through the Centuries and Today*; 5) *The First World War – The Attitude towards the Cyrillic Script and Other Serbian National Symbols*; 6) *The Identity and Status of the Serbian Language in Montenegro (The Historical and the Contemporary Aspect)*, and 7) *The Serbian Language in Montenegro in the Mirror of Linguistics and Politics*. On the evidence of these titles, one can perceive three thematic aspects of Jelica Stojanović’s book. The first thematic whole, comprising the first three studies in this book, is made up of scientific papers dealing with the general linguistic/sociolinguistic diachronous and contemporary status of the Serbian literary language. The second thematic whole is composed of the two central papers, which deal with the historical and the current status of the Serbian Cyrillic script, whereas the third, final thematic whole is made up of two papers dealing with the historical and the current status of the Serbian language in Montenegro.

On the one hand, Jelica Stojanović’s book shows that only historical facts can provide a key to understanding various current problems associated with the Serbian language, and on the other, it shows that only on the basis of the contemporary state of

the Serbian language can one properly understand some barely comprehensible historical acts that directly influenced the development path of the Serbian language. The book, thus, reflects in the best possible way the historical development of the Serbian language and the Cyrillic script in their current state, and she views the current situation of the Serbian language as the necessary result of its historical development. It is no wonder that the author dedicates the greatest amount of space in the book to the current linguistic situation in Montenegro, for it is the one least motivated historically, contrary to all the historical developments and turns, both of the Serbian language and the Serbian national idea. Few scholars, if any, could have provided such a scientifically based description of the current situation of the Serbian language in Montenegro as Jelica Stojanović. As a superb language historian and a scholar to whom only scientific criteria matter, Jelica Stojanović has become a symbol of the defence of Serbian studies and linguistics as a science in Montenegro, a scientist who easily counters political ignorance by means of linguistic facts and criteria, a scholar who wishes to channel linguistic anarchy and direct it along the flows of the laws of linguistics, a scholar who exposes political “Montenegrinist” acts as quasi-linguistic ones and sheds light on political manoeuvring and forgeries, steadfastly hoping that, in the case of Montenegro as well, the old adage that a lie has no legs will prove to be true yet.



Therefore, it is no wonder that Jelica Stojanović begins her book about the development path of the Serbian language and the Cyrillic script with a study of *the Serbian language and state-national projects in the 19th and the 20th centuries*. The focus of her research is on the relationship between the language and the people, or to put it more precisely, on the determination of the people through the language. The interaction between the linguistic and the national necessarily invokes the issue of the

historical and the contemporary mutual relations between the language and the people. The majority of European nations – as many as fifty-six out of a total of fifty-nine – “take language as the foundation of culture” to be the basic identity criterion, along with the compactness of territory (Stojković 2008: 116). The Serbs belong to that vast majority, as their intellectual elite, from the very start, “viewed the nation as ‘a community of language’, where the language constituted a factor of its unification and linking of all the members of society. The concept of a linguistic type of nation was already to be found in the enlightenment-oriented work of Dositej Obradović, which was how it determined the Serbian nation”, whereas “the definitive characteristic of a nation as ‘a community of language’ – specifically in the spirit of German Romanticism – was established through the linguistic-ethnographic research work of Vuk Karadžić” (Pišev 2013: 28–29). That is why, when considering the almost interdependent relationship between the Serbian language and the Serbian people, it is necessary to briefly point out how this relationship was interpreted by Dositej and Vuk.

To Dositej and Vuk, the Serbs are all those who speak the Serbian language. And what Dositej and Vuk understood as Serbs – was almost never acceptable to all Serbs. “The Serbs” – Dositej says – “are *called* differently in different kingdoms and provinces: in Serbia they are called Serbians, in Bosnia Bosniaks, in Dalmatia Dalmatians, in Herzegovina Herzegovinians, and in Montenegro Montenegrins. They *speak the same everywhere, understand one another perfectly and easily*, albeit they differ somewhat in their provincial pronunciation, and have taken some words over from the Turks in Turkey, and in the coastal region they have appropriated some from the Italians. [...] And even *the commonest Serb* from Banat or Bačka, no matter whether he is in Serbia, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in Dalmatia, especially in Croatia, in Slavonia or in Srem, is *surrounded by his own language and people, whether he be of the Eastern or of the Roman Christian faith*” (Obradović 1989: 363). From the “boundaries”

of the Serbs, as viewed by Dositej, it is evident that they are not called Serbs almost anywhere, but use the name of the province (place) where they live to refer to themselves. They have a common language (“They speak the same everywhere”), but they do not share a common religion (“Serb... whether he be of the Eastern or of the Roman Christian faith”). Dositej would say the same thing, perhaps even a little more precisely formulated, at the beginning of his enlightenment-oriented work, in his programmatic text – “A Letter to Haralampije” (1783): “Who does not know that the inhabitants of Montenegro, Dalmatia, Herzegovina, Bosnia, Serbia, Croatia (except for Kajkavian speakers), Slavonia, Srem, Bačka and Banat (except for Wallachians) *speak one and the same language?* Speaking of the peoples living in these kingdoms and provinces, I understand as much those of the Greek Church as those of the Latin faith, without excluding Bosniak Turks and Herzegovinians themselves, in view of the fact that *faith may change, but the folk and the language can never be changed.* A Bosniak or Herzegovinian Turk is called a Turk by law, but according to his kin and language, whatever his great-grandfathers called themselves, so will his grandsons call themselves: Bosniaks and Herzegovinians, as long as God lets this world be. They are called Turks as long as the Turks rule the land, and when the real Turks return to the vilayet where they came from, the Bosniaks will remain Bosniaks and will be what their elders were. Therefore, *for all the Serbian folk*, I shall translate thoughts and words of advice of famous and wise people, wishing that they benefit all of them” (Obradović 1989: 49–50).

The criterion of intelligibility, or as linguists today would say, the communicative criterion, as can be seen, is the fundamental criterion of the identity of a language for Dositej, and the language criterion is the basic criterion of the identity of a people or a nation.

Vuk's views entirely coincide with those of Dositej concerning the national designation and “boundaries” of the Serbs. Some fifty years after Dositej's “A Letter to Haralampije” (1783),

and around twenty years after “The Favourite” (1818), Vuk – in 1836 – wrote the text “All Serbs Everywhere”, intending to have it published that same year, as a foreword of sorts to his book *Montenegro and Boka Kotorska*, but it was only published in *Kovčežić [Small Chest]* in 1849. In that text, Vuk, in much broader terms and relying on clearly formulated criteria, drew up the boundaries between the Serbs and kindred neighbouring peoples, confirming Dositej’s views on who belongs to the Serbian people.

Taking language as the fundamental criterion of the national differentiation of the South Slavic peoples, Vuk claimed “that South Slavs, with the exception of the Bulgarians, are divided, based on their languages, into three groups: the first one is the *Serbs*, who say *što* or *šta* [what] (so that, compared to the *Čakavians* and the *Kajkavians*, they may be called *Štokavians*), at the end of syllables, they say *o* instead of *l*; the second group are the *Croats*, who, instead of saying *što* or *šta*, say *ča* (which is why they are called *Čakavians*) and do not change *l* to *o* at the end of syllables, whereas in other features they differ very little from the Serbs; the third group are the *Slovenes*, whom we also call *Carniolians*, who, instead of saying *što*, say *kaj* (which is why our people also call them *Kajkavians*), and who differ from Serbs and Croats linguistically much more than Serbs differ from Croats, but are still closer to one another than they are to any other Slavic people” (Karadžić 1997: 138). As regards the Serbs, being *Štokavians*, they speak one language, but in terms of religion, they are divided into three groups: the Serbs “of Greek faith”, the Serbs “of Roman faith” and the Serbs “of Turkish faith”. And it is only those of the Greek faith – Vuk continued – “who call themselves *Serbs* today, while the others will not accept this name, those of the Turkish faith consider themselves to be *real Turks*, and that is what they call themselves, whereas those of the Roman faith call *themselves* either by the place where they live, for example, Slavonians, Bosnians (or Bosniaks), Dalmatians, Dubrovnikans etc., or, the way writers especially do, they use the old name *Illyrians*, God knows where that came from; the Serbs

call them the *Bunjevci* in Bačka, in Slavonia and Croatia they call them the *Šokci*, and in the environs of Dubrovnik and in Boka they call them the *Latins*” (Karadžić 1997: 125–126).

Seeing that not all Serbs wanted to call themselves Serbs, and that only those of the Orthodox, that is, the Greek faith, used that name, Vuk pointed to the irrelevance of the religious criterion when it came to the national affiliation of religiously divided but nationally homogeneous peoples. When – Vuk said – “one thinks of the fact that there are Hungarians of both the Roman and the Calvinist faith, and yet they are all called Hungarians; or that there are Germans of the Roman, Lutheran and Calvinist faith, and yet they are all called Germans, one must wonder why at least all Serbs of the Roman faith will not call themselves Serbs” (Karadžić 1997: 126). For – Vuk continued – if they “do not want to be Serbs, they have no folk name. [...] If they were to say that they were *Croats*, I would say that this name, by rights, *belongs to the Čakavians only*” (Karadžić 1997:128). Vuk shows that religious divisions are a reason “why, with us, as opposed to other peoples (especially the Albanians) it came to pass that a people developed a dislike of its own name” (Karadžić 1997: 126).

Responding, some ten years later (in 1861), to a polemical text written by Bogoslav Šulek (dating from 1856), Vuk wrote that, to the question “of who the *Serbs* are and who the *Croats* are, I can only answer like this: by rights, these can be called *Croats*: 1) all Čakavians; 2) Kajkavians in the kingdom of Croatia, who have already got used to that name. By rights, the following can be called *Serbs*: all Štokavians, no matter what faith they are or where they live; apart from minor differences, they differ from the Croats in the following: 1) they do not say *ča* or *kaj*, but *što* or *šta*, and 2) at the end of syllables, they turn *l* into *o*, for instance, instead of saying *kotal* [cauldron], *kazal* [said], *žetelci* [harvesters], they say *kotao*, *kazao*, *žeteoci* etc. If Croatian patriots do not agree to this reasonable division, then, for the time being there is nothing else to do about this but to divide ourselves based on *faith*: whoever is of the Greek or Eastern faith, no matter where

they live, they will not renounce the Serbian name, and as for those who are of the Roman faith, let all those who wish to call themselves *Croats* do so. It is true that foreigners might laugh at these divisions among our people today, but what can we, poor unfortunates, do, there is no other way about it” (Karadžić 1997a: 149). A year before his death (in 1863) Vuk repeated that he was of the opinion “that only those who speak the Serbian language are Serbs, no matter which faith they are or where they live” (Karadžić 1997b: 150). It is, then, their language that is the unifying criterion in the Serbs, for they are in the category of peoples with multiple states – “those are the peoples that live in two or more states” (Stojković 2008: 105). Vuk’s fear that, regardless of the fact that we speak the same Serbian language, it might happen that “we become divided along religious lines”, even though “foreigners might laugh at these divisions among our people today” – came true almost a century and a half after his death. In the final decade of the 20th century, the Serbs “of the Roman faith” renamed the Serbian language as the so-called Croatian language, and the Serbs “of Mohammedan faith”, calling themselves Bosniaks, renamed it as the so-called Bosniak language. The Montenegrins followed in the footsteps of the Croats and the Bosniaks, and renamed the Serbian language as the so-called Montenegrin language in the first decade of the 21st century.

If the Croats and the Muslims (Bosniaks) have separated themselves from the body of the Serbian people, whose boundaries are those of “the community of the Serbian language”, on the basis of the criterion of their religion, which Vuk considered to be a not very likely option and ironically commented on,¹ this

¹ It is interesting to note that Njegoš, just like Vuk, or under the influence of the latter – taking the linguistic criterion as the basic criterion of the national identity – first of all in his poetic texts, excluded the religious criterion as a valid national identity criterion. First and foremost, without any doubt, in his poem “A Serb Thanks the Serbs for the Honour” (dating from 1833), where he says “*I thought of being despised as much as an executioner / for the sake of faith – a world of strife*”, or: “*Be a Serb through deeds, believe what you will; / a man’s stupidity is measured by beliefs, /*

did not apply to the Montenegrins and to their manner of re-naming the language. Namely, according to the European identity criteria of ethnicity, there was no way that the Montenegrins could separate themselves from the Serbian ethnic-linguistic corpus, be it linguistically or nationally. Let us recall Vuk and his almost axiomatic opinion that “whoever is of the Greek or Eastern faith, no matter where they live, they will not renounce the Serbian name”. But the Montenegrins, contrary to any scientific logic, and contrary to the world criteria, have renounced both the Serbian language and the Serbian national name.

It is, therefore, hard not to agree with the observation of the well-known historian Milorad Ekmečić that “the Montenegrin language is not only shameful for a people, the Serbian nation and illiterate intelligentsia, it is shameful for civilization” (Ekmečić 2014: 3). Many pages and arguments have been written dealing with this phenomenon, “shameful for a people” and “shameful for civilization”. But those who decide on everything in Montenegro, including the nation and the language, do not care about them. In Montenegro, in fact, “*inhuman* times” have come, times that have “pushed to the foreground people who have been shaped according to the models created by those very times, and the same amount of wisdom is to be found in all the positions where the fate of the people is decided, and it is no wonder that in the country that used to be ‘the Serbian Sparta’ the awareness of national and any other form of affiliation is changed so effortlessly and agrees to what the ancestors of today’s Montenegrins always refused to accept” (Petrović 2015: 245). Among other things, those times show that Mon-

and seriousness by deeds and virtues!” As can be seen, Njegoš considers faith to be “a world of strife” and a criterion of “stupidity” if it is applied to determine “Serbianhood”, that is, whether one belongs to the Serbian people or not. Njegoš most explicitly excluded the religious criterion from the criteria of national determination in the poem “Saluting My People: From Vienna 1847”, specifically, in the following verses: “*It does not matter how one crosses oneself, / but whose blood warms one’s soul, / whose milk has fed one*” (for more details on this, see Kovačević 2013).

tenegro is a unique linguistic phenomenon (for more details on this, see Kovačević 2013a: 243–271), first of all inasmuch as, in this country, the opinions of linguists are blithely ignored. It is only politicians who get asked to decide on linguistic matters, specifically, the ones in power. They are occasionally helped by opposition members when the ones in power are lacking a quorum, and/or when the latter run out of ideas about how they could turn a linguistic issue into a political one, deeply opposed to all the principles of not only linguistics but science as well. Not only have these politicians renamed the Serbian language as the so-called Montenegrin one, but they have also introduced the constitutional differentiation between “the official language” and “a language in official use”. Is there a living soul who knows in what language the decision on this designation was passed, that is to say, which semantic and syntactic rules are observed when it is stated that, in Montenegro, “*the official language is Montenegrin*”, and that “Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Albanian are languages in *official use*”? Anyone who deals with the Serbian language knows that *the official language is one that is in official use*, and that *a language in official use must necessarily be the official language*. But those who passed the Constitution of Montenegro evidently do not know the Serbian language, so presumably, by inaugurating “Montenegrin” in the Constitution as different from Serbian, they meant to say that the official language is not one in official use, nor will a language that is in official use in Montenegro be considered official. And when they need something to fall back on concerning the language, they start referring to this nonsensical constitutional provision.

The renaming of a language, as astutely observed by V. Matović, “does not necessarily produce systemic or normative destabilisation of that language, but it directly leads to the destruction of everything else: national awareness, the system of values, the cultural model, the model of social conduct, the renaming of the cultural heritage, a revision of history, in a nutshell – it essentially endangers the entire existence of the people. [...] Actually, the re-

naming of the language, as well as imposing an alien script upon a people, regardless of where it comes from, be it from foreigners or from within, from ‘the domestic evil’, is a sure sign of the intention to destroy the people in question, if not physically, then to make it non-existent by denying its identity and through the inevitable alienation of its cultural heritage” (Matović 2013: 167–168).



The basic aspect of the introductory study in Jelica Stojanović’s book, entitled *The Serbian Language and the State-National Projects in the 19th and the 20th Centuries*, is her analysis of the relationship between language and nation, focusing on the example provided by the Serbian language. The author shows how, in the area where Vuk’s Serbian language was spoken, which was subsequently called Serbo-Croatian, “the coming into being and/or the formation of new nations and states (based on old, partially new or almost entirely new foundations) was accompanied by the increasingly complex development of the language policy, which often led to denying and/or neglecting scientific criteria for the sake of political (as well as political mongering-related) projects (for which language served as one of the most important tools)... At the same time, a problem arises – not only that of the new language designation, but also that of justifying the new name for one and the same language.” The author follows the development path of the negation of the ethnic character of the Serbian language, emphasising that the process was initiated in Croatia, was continued by the Muslims, or Bosniaks, in B&H, while its final version, almost a caricature, occurred in Montenegro. In view of the fact that science has least dealt with “the developments in Montenegro (which have intensified over the last few years)”, in the introductory study Jelica Stojanović particularly focused on and accented the description of the processes unfolding in Montenegro, comparing them and linking them to the broader (initiated a long time ago) Croatian

and Bosnian-Herzegovinian processes of de-Serbianising and renaming the Serbian language. Jelica Stojanović provides, in a very detailed manner, a complete picture of the current chaotic linguistic situation in Montenegro, based on facts filtered through strict scientific (socio)linguistic criteria, in the final two papers contained in this book: *The Identity and Status of the Serbian Language in Montenegro (The Historical and the Contemporary Aspects)*, and *The Serbian Language in Montenegro in the Mirror of Linguistics and Politics*.

Jelica Stojanović points out the scientific and non-scientific criteria used in the campaign conducted in Montenegro against the Serbian language and in favour of “the Montenegrin language”, the criteria whose aim was to deny the Serbian language and to establish “the Montenegrin language” as the official language in Montenegro. It is well known that there exist (only) three relevant criteria for determining the identity of a language, two of which are purely linguistic: *structural* (what the grammatic structure of the given language is like) and *genetic* (what the given language developed from, that is, what its foundation is), and one sociolinguistic criterion: *communicative* (to what extent the given language is understandable to speakers of another language). Those criteria unequivocally show that the languages in the newly created states following the break-up of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia – “Croatian”, “Bosnian/Bosniak” and “Montenegrin” – which were linguistically unified by the Serbo-Croatian language, non-existent today, are not different languages but one and the same “linguistic language”. The actual term “linguistic language” is almost pleonastic, in view of the fact that there can be no “non-linguistic language”. Although it is pleonastic in itself, it is certainly necessary in order to be able to determine “political language” through it – by means of a negative definition. The identity of a “linguistic” language, in fact, is based on the aforementioned (socio)linguistic criteria: the structural, genetic and communicative ones. If those three criteria coincide in the case of a number of idioms, then we say

that they do not represent different languages but are subsumed under the same “linguistic” language. On the other hand, a “political” language is one that does not fulfil the said scientific criteria of identifying a “linguistic” language. On account of this, renaming a language does not necessarily mean the existence of another language. Renaming does not result in a separate language, but in a variant of the same language at the most. Such a language is linguistically unified, but is normatively disunited, for in its realisation in different states, one encounters normative differences. Such normative discrepancies do not negate the linguistic unity of such a language, but confer the status of a polycentric language onto it. That is precisely the status of the contemporary Serbian language, of which the so-called “Croatian”, “Bosnian/Bosniak” and Montenegrin languages can be considered to be normative variants.

As they could not justify naming their languages “by their own name” relying on any scientific criteria pertaining to language identity, the Croats, Muslims and Montenegrins, when trying to defend the names of their languages as being different from that of the Serbian language, resorted to the argument of “the right of every people to call their language by their own name”. A complete analysis of the only nine international documents wherein language rights are mentioned (Kovačević 2012) – those passed by European institutions, as well as those passed by the United Nations – showed that, when language rights are mentioned in these documents, they are connected either to the language rights of the individual or to those of national minorities. The language rights of peoples or states are never mentioned in these documents, so that there is no mention in writing of “the right of a people to call their language by their own name”. This pseudo-right was thought up by Croatian philologists in 1967, within the framework of their *Declaration on the Name and the Position of the Croatian Literary Language*. Philologists from other Balkan peoples – either because they never checked the legal foundations of such a claim, or because it suited them

to justify their own acts that were not based on science and law – accepted that “right” and spread it far and wide, so that some linguists even qualified it as a “common law right”, that is, a “Yugoslav tradition”. That pseudo-legal criterion is only one of the unscientific political criteria that were used, as scientific linguistic criteria were lacking, when trying to justify the status of the “Croatian” literary language, and afterwards consequently in the case of the “Bosnian/Bosniak” language and the “Montenegrin” language. No less than eight political criteria were created with a view to defending the linguistic individuality of these so-called languages, namely: 1) *the criterion of the self-assessment made by the speakers of the given language, that is, the evaluation of the language by its own speakers*, 2) *the criterion of the right of every people to call their language by their own name*, 3) *the criterion of the name of the language*, 4) *the criterion of agreement concluded by non-linguistic, that is, political authorities*, 5) *the criterion of the constitutional determination of the language*, 6) *the criterion of identifying the identity of the language with that of the nation*, 7) *the criterion of cultural differences* 8) *the criterion of the existence of an independent state*. The unscientific character and irrelevance of each of the above criteria are shed light upon by Jelica Stojanović in some detail, focusing on their application to the so-called “Montenegrin” language, confirming that all those criteria were, for the most part, thought up in order to justify the renaming of the Serbian language.

This is indirectly confirmed by the “linguist” Igor Lakić, an English language scholar who is among the defenders of “the Montenegrin language”. Shedding light on the position of “the Montenegrin language” within the system of the newly created “languages”, he says: “Bearing in mind the review of national identity, we conclude that the newly created standard languages only differ in a symbolic, value-based sense, whereas in structural and genetic terms, they belong to one and the same language system. This, on the other hand, testifies to the fact that the third aspect – the sociolinguistic one, that is, the value-related one, is a

necessary aspect of a language. In that sense, today we can speak of four sociolinguistic or political languages, come into being on the basis of a common linguistic system, of which Montenegrin is the official language spoken in Montenegro” (Lakić 2013: 141). If one excludes the Serbian language, I. Lakić is absolutely right: the Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin languages are “sociolinguistic or political languages, come into being on the basis of a common linguistic system” – namely, the system of the Serbian language. That is why I. Lakić’s argument explaining why Serbian should be renamed as Montenegrin appears almost comical. I. Lakić – forgetting that science must not bypass logic, or common sense for that matter – wrote that “views were voiced to the effect that the Montenegrin language is the Serbian language, and that there exist no grounds for naming it any other way. What tended to be forgotten are *the similarities between the Montenegrin language and the Bosnian or the Croatian language*” (sic!) (Lakić 2013: 143). If the Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin languages are merely the Serbian or Serbo-Croatian language renamed, the above observation tellingly shows that the author is well and truly at odds with logic, for those are not similarities, then, but “identicalities”. That this is so, I. Lakić could have seen on the basis of the unprecedented shameful act that the Montenegrins allowed themselves: they merely changed the title of a grammar of “the Croatian language”, proclaiming it to be “*A Grammar of the Montenegrin Language*” (for more details on this, see: Kovačević 2013a: 243–271). Also, he could have followed the example of R. Bugarski, who, despite his “love of the Serbian language” and of the Cyrillic script in particular, still wrote that “in linguistic terms, that language [Montenegrin] almost does not differ at all from the Serbian language, except in some minor details. Some Montenegrin experts do insist on certain differences, for instance on those two new letters, but linguistically, one cannot speak of a separate language. The Montenegrin language has been politically proclaimed as a separate language, but it is just a regional variety of the Serbian language” (Bugarski 2012: 23). And those “two

letters” that Bugarski mentions are actually “*faux* phonemes” as “*faux* specific characteristics” of the Montenegrin *faux* language. In point of fact, Montenegrin “linguists” wrote in their orthography that “the phonemes *ć* [Latin: *ś*] and *č*’ [Latin: *ž*] are the main differentiating feature of the Montenegrin language, separating it from the other three standard Štokavian languages (Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian). In view of the fact that they constitute a significant feature of the contemporary Montenegrin language, that they have remained in use as generally accepted Montenegrin sounds despite the orthographic and orthoepic norm of many decades which treated them as dialectal, they are a part of the standard language norm.” However, this is negated by the facts pertaining to the dialectal spread of these sounds, for “the area that they encompass precludes any possibility of the sounds *ć* [Latin: *ś*] and *č*’ [Latin: *ž*] being Montenegrisms. Moreover, the fact of their existence in the sound system points to a strong connection not only between the mutually distinct north-western and south-eastern speech zones in Montenegro, but also between Jekavian speeches in general – both with those in the west and those to the east of the Montenegrin border, in an approximately equal measure” (Jovanović 2011: 196).

This should come as no surprise, since it is indisputable, as Jelica Stojanović’s studies show relying on sound arguments, that “On *the dialectal level* as well, the spoken language area of Montenegro fits in very nicely (and has fitted in throughout history) within the broader continuum of the Serbian language, constituting an inseparable part of it – no speech or dialect ends at the border of Montenegro, none of them is ‘Montenegrin only’ or ‘all-Montenegrin’, as the current unscientific trend is trying to present the linguistic state of affairs in Montenegro.”

No one has ever exposed to view all the scientific forgeries, political shenanigans, denials of a multitude of scientifically grounded arguments, all for the purpose of promoting the arguments of political power used in the process of imposing “the Montenegrin language” and abolishing the Serbian ethnic and

linguistic status of Montenegro in such a detailed manner, so meticulously and in such a scientifically well argued manner as Jelica Stojanović. Her studies dealing with the linguistic circumstances and troubles in Montenegro, first of all those occurring over the past two decades, will remain the best confirmation of Ekmečić's observation quoted above, which, let us remind ourselves, in a slightly paraphrased version, runs as follows: "the Montenegrin language is not shameful for a people only, it is shameful for the entire civilization as well".



Jelica Stojanović's book, to which this introductory essay is dedicated, does not deal only with sociolinguistic issues, but also with purely linguistic, even systemic-linguistic issues pertaining to the Serbian language. The papers in this book, however, are not strictly differentiated on the basis of this, for as a rule, they combine topics from both domains, it is just that in some papers the sociolinguistic aspects of her analysis predominate, whereas in others it is the linguistic aspects that are the dominant ones. Among the purely linguistic ones, the paper that stands out on account of its significance is the one entitled *Vuk's Reform of the Serbian Language in the Context of Two Principles: "Write as You Speak" and "General Regularity"*. Jelica Stojanović presents the development of Vuk's standardological principles through the clarification of four issues: 1) the pronunciation of *yat*, 2) the use of the consonant *h*, and related to it, the use of the consonant *f*, 3) the (un)iotated forms *tj* and *dj*, and 4) the iotated consonants *s'* and *z'*.

Concerning Vuk's standardisation of the Serbian literary language, one could say that it is characterised by two compatible processes: pulling down and building up. Specifically, Vuk built up by pulling down and pulled down by building up. By pulling down the Slavic-Serbian language as it was then and until then, Vuk was building up the Serbian literary language on a folk foundation; by building up the Serbian literary language, Vuk was

pulling down (and eventually did pull down) the Slavic-Serbian language. In the first phase of Vuk's campaign (until 1818), the process at work was Vuk's building up by pulling down, and as the campaign progressed, the process of pulling down by building up came to the foreground. Both when pulling down and building up, Vuk relied on two basic criteria – *the criterion of the substance* and *the criterion of the structure of language*. Even though the criteria of substance and structure are combined in almost all of Vuk's texts, still, in the initial phase and at the beginning of the middle phase of Vuk's reform, the criterion of substance took precedence over the criterion of structure, whereas in the final phase of the reform the criterion of structure pushed the criterion of substance into the background. In other words, in the course of his pulling down campaign, Vuk primarily used the criterion of substance, and in his building up campaign, the criterion of structure was of much greater importance to him.

In the first phase of his campaign, Vuk came up with the claim that the only way to overcome the chaotic situation in the Slavic-Serbian language, which was “a mere mixture of Serbian and Russian-Slavic devoid of any rules”, “is for every Writer to start writing they way people speak in his native region” (Karadžić 1969: 90, 58). Everything that the common people speak belongs to the folk language, and is even equally good. For, “as long as the people do not have a specific literary language, they cannot have *regional* words which *cannot be used in books*. That is the current situation of our literature. Today, every word that is spoken among us, even though it might be in a single village, is a folk language word” (Karadžić 1969: 201).

Insisting on the domestic sources of material for the language of literature, Vuk actually insists on their inherent rules, on their characteristics, for it is only through them that one reaches the literary language. Authentic material presupposes the existence of the implicit rules of its use, and those rules should be made explicit on the path towards developing the literary language. From the very first day of his work, Vuk “ex-

plores and establishes” the rules of the folk language, standardises its grammatical structure.

The path that Vuk took towards the standardisation of the Serbian language is best reflected by his words from the year 1848: “I have made efforts and keep doing so, trying to show what the language of the entire Serbian people *is like*, and to *gather its rules and present them in an orderly manner*” (Karadžić 1896: 276).

The fundamental work which constitutes the actual beginning of the codification of the new literary language and the beginning of the study of our language is Vuk’s Serbian Dictionary from 1818. In the *Serbian Grammar* that Vuk published alongside the *Dictionary*, the implicit norm of the folk language is transposed into the explicit one, is unified and codified. The *Dictionary* and the *Serbian Grammar* are at the same time the first descriptive and prescriptive works of the Serbian literary language. Vuk’s *Dictionary* and *Serbian Grammar* broke the tradition according to which the Serbs “have no book yet with their authentic language”, offering solely material drawn from the pure folk language and describing its grammatical structure. The *Serbian Grammar*, remaining faithful to the material drawn from the folk language, offers everything that is relevant for the given linguistic system.

After the publication of the *Dictionary*, aware of the differences that existed between some Serbian dialects, Vuk changed his attitude towards the language material: not all material was equally valuable any longer, for not all dialects were equally valuable in terms of correctness. That is why Vuk came up with the thesis that writers, “when dealing with grammatical issues that are unresolved among the people, should choose that which is more regular” (Karadžić 1969: 107). Writers can no longer write using the dialect spoken in their native region, as Vuk maintained in the period preceding the publication of the *Dictionary*. For, the literary language differs from the folk language. “Our writer must now make an effort to distinguish between the pure folk language and that which is incorrect” (Karadžić 1969: 210). What is incorrect is everything that does not fit in with the

grammatical structure of the Serbian language presented in the *Serbian Grammar* (1818), in *The Main Differences between the Slavic and the Serbian Language of Today* (1826) and *The Main Endings of Nouns and Adjectives in The Serbian Language* (1828), the three works in which Vuk presented the grammatical structure of the Serbian language, whose foundation was made up of the East Herzegovinian dialect.

Writers are not only not allowed to stick to their individual *tastes*, but are also unable to rely entirely on the folk speech of their native region, for there exist descriptive and prescriptive works that represent the structure of the “uncorrupted” folk language. After the publication of the *Dictionary* in 1818, Vuk explicitly stated what he considered to be the basic standardisation, that is, what every writer must know if he wants to write in the folk language: “our writer of today a) must know how to *decline* all nouns and proper nouns; b) must know how to *conjugate* verbs; c) must know how to form sentences according to the rules of the Serbian *syntax*... i) must be unswervingly *consistent* in writing words” (Karadžić 1969: 210). In other words, a writer writing in the folk language must know the rules of its grammatical structure and must adhere to the Serbian orthography.

It is interesting to note that, when specifying the conditions to be fulfilled by writers in order to know the Serbian language, Vuk does not mention any in connection with the vocabulary. It was precisely the vocabulary that was the greatest bone of contention between Vuk and his opponents. Vuk seems to have been aware of the fact that the battle for the Serbian language was not to be won on the level of the vocabulary, but on the level of grammatical structure. During his entire campaign for the standard language, Vuk adhered to the principle of “general regularity”, even though he formulated that particular principle theoretically rather late – only in 1845. The criterion of structure took priority over the criterion of substance (material), from which it was derived early on, and remained supraordinated to it. In view of the fact that the grammatical structure

of the language is a reflection of the autonomous substance, all the other substance must adhere to the rules of the structure. It cannot structurally deviate from the fundamental folk substance. For Vuk, the essence of the literary language boils to the standardisation of its system; the polyfunctionality of that language is of secondary importance, and is primarily connected with the vocabulary. Since the polyfunctionality of language is dependent on the grammatical structure, the broadening of the basic substance of the language must be carried out in accordance with the rules of that structure. Thus Vuk rarely opposed lexemes as such, that is, their unsuitability because they did not belong to the folk layer of the vocabulary. Lexemes are unsuitable if they do not fit in with the linguistic rules of the structure of the folk language. Vuk evaluates the vocabulary relying on the criterion of structure: a vocabulary is suitable, regardless of its source, if it can “be mixed” with the folk vocabulary based on its sound-grammatical characteristics. Or, as Vuk would put it, only those words are unsuitable which, in terms of their sounds and form, “stand among Serbian words the way calves stand among sheep” (Karadžić 1969: 11). The broadening of the basic (inherited) substance, then, is possible from any source if that vocabulary does not violate the phonological-grammatical structure of the Serbian language, that is, if it fits in with the said structure.

Aware of the fact that “when it comes to writing, we cannot be entirely without Slavic and new words” (Karadžić 1969: 164), Vuk found in the folk language the principle of including them in the lexical corpus of the Serbian language. “I wrote down” – Vuk says – “even foreign words that were used by the people... and the more I saw that a *foreign word was changed and Serbianised*, the more gladly I wrote it down” (Karadžić 1969: 221). Using the popular experience of “Serbianising”, Vuk formulated the principles (which he would explicate in the preface to his translation of the *New Testament*) of enriching the basic lexical corpus of the Serbian language: by taking over vocabulary items structurally in keeping with the folk vocabulary, by Serbianising the structurally

unsuited foreign lexical items and by forming new lexical items in keeping with the structural rules of the basic (folk) substance. Thus Vuk almost painlessly resolved the issue of enriching the lexical corpus of the Serbian language, while at the same time preserving the compactness of its grammatical structure. “Abstract words”, which were not to be found in folk dialects, could be freely taken over from other sources if they did not deviate from the phonological-grammatical structure of the Serbian language. In this way, through the standardisation of the grammatical structure and its supraordination to the substance elements, Vuk resolved the issue of the inherited and the acquired substance of the literary language, that is, the question of broadening the substance foundation: it now included all folk and non-folk material complying with the structural rules of the Serbian language.

What he initiated through the *Orthography* (1814)² Vuk brought to completion through his translation of the *New Testa-*

² In *The Orthography*, Vuk formulated the fundamental orthographic principle as the basis of the reform of the Serbian orthography; as is well known – it runs: *Write as you speak, and read as it is written*. Vuk was aware that his *Orthography* would be most criticised precisely because of that orthographic principle, best evidenced by his following estimate contained in the preface to *The Orthography*: “The first and greatest criticism that will be levelled against this Orthography of mine will have to do with the purpose of the orthographic rules: true, I have had a lot of doubts and thought much about this, but finally, this seemed to me to be the best way of adjusting the Serbian Orthography to the rule: Write as you speak; read as it is written” (Karadžić 1814: XI). Although the said principle, as the orthographic ideal, belongs to the German philosopher Adelung, Vuk evidently took it over from Sava Mrkalj, to whose reform of the Cyrillic script he directly refers in *The Orthography*. Vuk says of the alphabet reform proposed by Sava Mrkalj in his book *The Fat of the Thick Yer of Alphabet-quake*, printed in Buda in 1810 (Mrkalj 1810) that “the solution proposed by Mr Mrkalj (which is so true and so clear that each Serb who has common sense and wants to judge it objectively must approve of it) was not to the liking of some people. But has it ever happened that everyone liked something, or will such a thing ever happen? [...] In the interests of the success of the Principality of Serbia, I cannot use any other alphabet except Mrkalj’s, for there can be no easier or purer one for the Serbian language than this one” (Karadžić 2014: 5).

ment (1847): he completely standardised the lexical-grammatical structure of the Serbian language. All the subsequent structural modifications of the Serbian language were carried out in keeping with the requirements and needs of the functional-stylistic differentiation of the Serbian literary (standard) language; at that stage, Vuk's standardisation and the standardological procedures carried out provided merely the germ of the process.

In the process of the standardisation of the structure of the Serbian language, one of the most decisive roles was played by Vuk's first thirteen-day stay in Dubrovnik (from 31st August to 11th September 1834), during the course of his journey from Trieste to Cetinje. During that journey, Vuk wrote to Kopitar: "Today's language of Dubrovnik is truly the Herzegovinian language; these are the greatest differences between them: 1) in Dubrovnik, they pronounce *x* (not as *h*, but as *ch*), 2) they do not say, for example, *dēca* but *djeca* etc.; and 3) they have many, indeed, too many Italian words" (Kopitar and Vuk 1980: 119).

It is precisely the first two differences between the language of Dubrovnik and the one that Vuk, until then, considered to be Herzegovinian – the sound *x* [*h*] and the Ijekavian iotation of the *dj* and *tj* groups – that had a far-reaching significance for the system and the structure of Vuk's subsequent Serbian literary language. Those two "differences" form the criterial basis of the changes concerning Vuk's theoretical views on the Serbian language and/or its standardisation. Until then, the basic and sole criterion for Vuk was the criterion of substance, which he subsequently replaced by the criterion of structure. It is precisely the structural criterion that would, as we shall see, provide the basic reason for accepting the two linguistic characteristics referred to above, first of all those of the Dubrovnik speech as "all-Serbian", that is, pertaining to the literary language.

Almost from the very beginning of his literary-linguistic work, the sound *x* [*h*] presented problems to Vuk. As early as 1817, he exchanged letters with Mušicki in which they discussed the status of the sound *x*, and Mušicki's negative view

of *x* was perhaps the decisive reason for Vuk not to include *x* in the *Dictionary* of 1818; like *ǰ* [ʃ], he excluded it from “the literary sounds” and left it for foreign words only. Until the time of the publication of *Proverbs*, in 1836, Vuk almost solely used it in foreign words, although, as Jelica Stojanović shows, this letter occasionally slipped into domestic words as well. Whereas in the *Dictionary* of 1818 the sounds *ǰ* and *x* were given the same status, in his text written about the Serbian alphabet, published in “Danica” in 1827, Vuk “operates with 29 units: the table includes *ǰ*, but not *x*!”, whereby “Vuk tacitly recognised ‘all the rights’ of the sound *ǰ*, as opposed to the sound *x*” (Si-mić 1991: 268).

It is clear that Vuk did not introduce *x* in the literary language just because it was pronounced in Dubrovnik. Dubrovnik did provide the motive, but it was not the reason for introducing the sound *x* in the Serbian literary language. The actual reason was the systemic character of that sound. On the one hand, it is a necessary element in the phonological structure of the Serbian language, for, just like all the other phonemes, it has a distinctive function (compare, for example: *храна* [food] – *грана* [branch], *хлад* [shade] – *глад* [hunger], *хранити* [feed] – *бранити* [defend], *захладити* [turn cold] – *загладити* [smooth down], *грах* [beans] – *град* [city] and the like). Earlier, Vuk excluded from “the literary sounds” only those with non-distinctive functions. Thus, in the *Serbian Grammar* accompanying the *Dictionary* of 1818, Vuk says that “in the Serbian language there are 28 individual sounds” (to which, as we have seen, in 1827 he added *ǰ* as the twenty-ninth), and having enumerated them, he refers to a footnote, wherein he adds: “Apart from these general sounds, in the Serbian language some special sounds can be heard as well: 1) the Herzegovinians sometimes pronounce *c* [s] in front of *j* as the Polish sound *ś*, and *z* [z] in the same position as *ź*, for example, *ијекупа* [šekira], *ијупта* [šutra], *ијжео* [ižeo]” (V. Karadžić 1987: XXIX). In his description and codification of the Serbian literary language, then, Vuk did not accept the specific East Herzegovinian softened sounds *и* and *ж* (that is, *ś* and *ź*),

come into being through the iotation of the *cj* [sj] and *zj* [zj] groups as literary ones. The reason for his not accepting those sounds as literary ones was obviously the fact that they do not have the distinctive function, that is, they do not have the role of phonemes. When speaking about the “number of sounds”, Vuk presupposed sounds with the distinctive function in the literary language, that is, phonemes. Even though he was not familiar with the term phoneme, Vuk obviously meant that “literary sounds” were what phonology today considers as phonemes.

The sound *x*, as can be seen, was needed by Vuk first of all for systemic reasons: for the sake of preserving the structure of the phonological and grammatical system of the Serbian literary language. By giving it the status of a “literary sound”, that is, a phoneme, Vuk took the principle of *systemicness* as one of the highest principles of regularity. It would appear that this was the principle that Vuk subsequently (in 1845) referred to as “general regularity”, which, it is true to say, he did not clearly define, but took as the fundamental criterion of the regularity of a linguistic phenomenon (Karadžić 2001: 196–198). Systemicness, that is, “general regularity”, thus became a necessary but not a sufficient criterion of “regularity”, that is to say, the literary-linguistic status of a linguistic phenomenon for Vuk. It was subordinated to the criterion of use in folk dialects, so that Vuk never relinquished the principle “that nothing can be allowed to enter the literary language unless it is to be found in folk dialects” (Ivić 1991: 210). That is why it was so important to Vuk that he found a Serbian, and on top of everything else, East Herzegovinian – Dubrovnikan – dialect wherein “the true sound of this letter is best pronounced”. Vuk, then, did not introduce this sound in the literary language *just because* it was used in Dubrovnik and Montenegro, but due to the fact that it was necessary for the structure of the literary language, and was used in both Dubrovnik and Montenegro. This conclusion is best confirmed by the fact that Vuk also perceived some features that were characteristic of Dubrovnik only, but as they were not systemic, Vuk never seriously considered including them in the literary language.

Introducing the sound *x* in the literary language constitutes a confirmation of Vuk's new understanding of the literary language "as a selective combination of features of various dialects" (Ivić 1991: 210). From then on, what mattered to Vuk was not how widespread a linguistic feature was, but its "regularity", that is, systemicness. Vuk himself would explicitly emphasise this in the year when he introduced *x* in the literary language (in his Reply to Dr Jovan Stejić, dealing with the latter's objections to the language of *Proverbs*): "When some words are pronounced in two different ways by the common folk, then a writer's duty, I think, is to choose the variant that is more regular, not paying any attention to whether more or fewer people use it" (Karadžić 2001: 17).

Such a view, or to put it more precisely, this new understanding of the literary language, would be confirmed in Vuk's next essential intervention in the structure of the literary language – abolishing the consistently used Ijekavian iotation of the consonant groups *tj* and *dj* in his own writing – once again after such non-iotated forms had been confirmed in a folk dialect – that of Dubrovnik. Its systemic character was, once again, the reason for including this feature of the Dubrovnik speech in the literary language. In all likelihood, it was only then that Vuk realised that the Ijekavian non-iotation of *dj* and *tj* in the literary language can be subsumed under a rule that has no exceptions to it, whereas the iotation rule would necessitate a great number of exceptions, for the Ijekavian iotation of the consonant groups *dj* and *tj* does not occur in a large number of lexemes, for example: *djelovanje* [acting], *djelo* [act], *tjesnac* [strait], *tjeme* [pate], *tješnje* [tigher], *utješiti* [console], *zdjela* [dish], *stjenica* [bug], *djelilac* [divider], *razdjeljak* [parting], *tjestenina* [pasta] and the like. Once again, Vuk's solution is in keeping with the principle of "general regularity", that is, the principle of "the stable rules of the unified literary language" (Simić 1991: 364). In this case, as in the case of the sound *x*, it turns out that the linguistic features of the Dubrovnik speech, compared to the rival Herzegovinian

speech, are more systemic, and therefore more suitable for getting the status of literary language features.

As an integral part of the East Herzegovinian dialect, as a city with the most systemic features of the Serbian (Ijekavian) speech – Dubrovnik undoubtedly contributed more than any other city to the standardisation of Vuk's and today's Serbian literary language.

Even though Vuk, as we have seen, when he first got acquainted with the Dubrovnik speech, claimed that “the language of Dubrovnik is a real Herzegovinian language”, for a long time there was a debate about whether the oldest Dubrovnik speech was Čakavian or Štokavian-Ijekavian, which was concluded by the analyses of the greatest Dubrovnikan linguist Milan Rešetar. After Rešetar's analyses, the issue of the dialectal status of the Dubrovnik speech and its being one of the Serbian Štokavian-Ijekavian dialects was no longer brought into question. The range of open questions concerning the Dubrovnik speech that were scientifically “closed” by Milan Rešetar is quite broad, and is unavoidable whenever the history of Vuk's Serbian literary language is reviewed. That is why Jelica Stojanović was quite right in dedicating a sizeable part of her book to a study of the scientific contribution of Milan Rešetar to shedding light on the role of the language of Dubrovnik in the history of the Serbian literary language. The study is entitled: *The Language of Dubrovnik in the History of the Serbian Literary Language (As Shed Light Upon by Milan Rešetar)*. Jelica Stojanović shows that “Milan Rešetar very argumentatively and authoritatively (based on his analysis and study of numerous linguistic monuments) rejects the view of a Čakavian Dubrovnik. Through the linguistic characteristics of the prose he studied and the original Dubrovnikan linguistic monuments, he showed that Dubrovnik had always been (since it became Slavic, based on both its ethnic and linguistic features) Štokavian-Ijekavian (that is, Herzegovinian-Ijekavian), never Čakavian-Ijekavian.” Analysing in a detailed manner the linguistic features of prose and poetic texts written

by authors from Dubrovnik, Rešetar came to the conclusion that “the oldest Dubrovnik speech should be sought in the domain of prose, not poetry – in a word, that those poets wrote differently from the way they spoke”. Through his research, he argumentatively proved the oldest Dubrovnik speech was the Herzegovinian Štokavian I/Jekavian dialect (which he variously refers to as: Herzegovinian Jekavian, Štokavian-Jekavian, Herzegovinian Štokavian-Jekavian and the like). His proof originates, as Jelica Stojanović points out, from Rešetar’s analysis of almost the entire corpus of linguistic monument sources, first of all charters and letters, various notes, the language of prose, the language of poetry, the language of Dubrovnik poets outside their poetic works, bearing in mind that “The prose analysed is an incontrovertible indicator of the way the people of Dubrovnik spoke, which dialect is the basis of the city’s speech from the very beginning of its Slavicisation”. Jelica Stojanović also shows “that Rešetar designated the language of monuments (first of all the Cyrillic ones, but only only those), written in the Slavic language in Dubrovnik and its close surroundings (whether they were intended for the Serbian lands, people from Dubrovnik or foreigners – Turks or Latins), first of all as Serbian”. Which Rešetar, as Jelica Stojanović describes in some detail, explicitly emphasised in the manuscript of his academic maiden speech entitled: *The Oldest Dubrovnik Speech, by Milan Rešetar (paper)* – (preserved in the Archive of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, no. 14456), bearing in mind that, for obviously political or politicising reasons, in all likelihood not to antagonise the Croats, in the printed version dating from 1952, published in *The Herald of the Serbian Academy of Sciences*, one of the key final sentences was left out and falsified; this sentence runs as follows: “From that objective observation [that is, that Čakavian has never been spoken in Dubrovnik, J. S.] I draw no further conclusions now, for to me, Serbs and Croats are one people under two different names, so I will never say that Croatian was not spoken in Dubrovnik and Serbian was, *but one who sees Serbs and Croats*

as two different peoples will have to admit that, in linguistic terms, Dubrovnik has always been Serbian". "The act of leaving out this important part of Milan Rešetar's academic maiden speech" – Jelica Stojanović writes – "in a way, is an indicator of subsequent developments and activities. A decade and a half to two decades after World War Two (first of all, starting with the Novi Sad Agreement), the acts of omitting and separating Dubrovnik from the framework of the Serbian language and literature were increasingly in evidence and ever more frequent, not only on the Croatian side. While, on the Croatian side, the literature of Dubrovnik is regularly included in the corpus of the history of Croatian literature and the Croatian language, on the Serbian side it began to be excluded from the corpus of Serbian literature." That is why she dedicated the final part of her study of the position of Dubrovnik in the history of the Serbian literary language and Serbian philology in general to the attitude of Serbian and Croatian philology towards Dubrovnik, its language and literature, from the time of the Novi Sad Agreement to the present day, supporting her analysis by a great many facts and quotes from the relevant literature and documents, the content of which, viewed from a scientific perspective, sometimes gives the impression of being well and truly unbelievable.

Namely, Serbian politics, and Serbian philology following in its footsteps, as Milo Lompar would put it, "interiorised", that is, accepted as its own the Croatian view – under the designation Yugoslav – that the literature of Dubrovnik belongs solely to the corpus of Croatian literature. The interiorisation of this view, as Milo Lompar observes, occurred immediately after the end of the Second World War. "At the time of the establishment of Titoist Yugoslavia, in the year 1945 [...], there occurred a far-reaching interiorisation of the Yugoslav standpoint in the public consciousness of Serbia: *now* that Yugoslavism was a form of Croatian cultural policy. For, the state policy, *determining* the conditions which the Communist dictatorship prescribed

as the only proper ones for any scientific debate, decreed – in 1949 – that the Ministry of Science and Culture should form a Commission for Preparing Textbooks for History of Literature, which prescribed not only that the literature of Dubrovnik was not to be viewed as a regional and separate literature, but also that it was not to be reviewed outside Croatian literature, and that ‘only literary historians from Croatia should write about this era and individual writers’” (Lompar 2011: 180). What is forgotten here is “that language plays an important part on all the levels of a literary text, including that of reception. There is only one literature that we always experience as our own, to which we relate directly. That is the literature written in our own language, the language of the cultural environment that we live and work in, the language of our community/nation” (Deretić 1997: 87). And if the language in which a literature is written is the decisive criterion of its national/identity determination, then the literature of Dubrovnik is indisputably a part of Serbian literature, especially taking into consideration the fact that Vuk Karadžić proclaimed precisely the literature of Dubrovnik to be one of the fundamental criteria of the Serbian literary language, especially when it came to choosing the “southern dialect” as a literary one: “We unanimously admitted” – says Vuk – “that the best and correct thing to do is to accept the southern dialect as a literary one; taking into account the fact [...] that all of old Dubrovnik literature was written in it” (Karadžić 1969: 229).

After almost one century of attempts at obliterating the awareness of the literature of Dubrovnik as part of Serbian literature, Serbian philology appears to have started disposing of such fallacies at the beginning of the 21st century. The best confirmation of this is to be found in the edition “Ten Centuries of Serbian Literature”, published by the Matica srpska [Matrix Serbica] cultural society, whose editor-in-chief is Miro Vuksanović, a member of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, and which has even been criticised for its anti-Serbian bias towards the literature of Dubrovnik. Book Three in Volume One

of this Edition is made up of “The Poetry of Dubrovnik and Boka kotorska”. The publication of this book initiated an avalanche of protests, not only from Croatia but from Montenegro as well. The first to react were the Ministries of Culture of Croatia and Montenegro, protesting that Matica srpska, in its anthology ‘Ten Centuries of Serbian Literature’, “appropriated Croatian and Montenegrin literary heritage, presenting them as Serbian”; this was followed by reactions coming from the Croatian Writers’ Association and a number of Croatian philologists (cf. Kovačević 2015: 223–224). The basic reason for all the reactions coming from Croatia to the reinclusion – or to put it more precisely, non-exclusion of the literature of Dubrovnik from the corpus of Serbian literature, should be described “as moaning for the intervention of the Central Committee, invoking an arbiter, a reflex of the era of Titoism, when such things did not happen, for the Central Committee prevented them from happening” (Lompar 2013: 104–105).



When discussing the Serbian language, especially its historical development path, it is almost impossible not to include its script in the discussion – the Cyrillic script. That is why Jelica Stojanović dedicated two voluminous studies to the issue of the historical and the current status of the Cyrillic script in this book. One of them (*The Continuity, Spreading and Status of the Serbian Cyrillic Script – Through the Centuries and Today*) – is dedicated in its entirety to the issue of the Cyrillic script, and the other (*The First World War – The Attitude towards the Cyrillic Script and Other Serbian National Symbols*) deals with the same issue for the most part. In Serbian philology, these are undoubtedly the most acribically written scientific studies about the historical and the current status of the Serbian Cyrillic script. In these studies, “saturated” with historical facts and criteria-based analyses, the Cyrillic script is shed light upon

from all the relevant scientific perspectives, such as: a) the historical continuity of the Cyrillic script in the areas of Serbian literacy, b) naming the Cyrillic script and the Serbian language, c) the undermining of the Serbian Cyrillic script in the past, d) the Serbian language in the context of two scripts (the Cyrillic and the Latin one), e) the Cyrillic script and the contemporary technologies, and f) the current circumstances (troubles, that is) and the Cyrillic script. Jelica Stojanović shows through her analysis that essentially (and from time immemorial, and truly) the reasons for suppressing the Cyrillic script do not exist and never have. As regards the situation in Montenegro, which took up most of the space dedicated to reviewing the current status of the Cyrillic script, Jelica Stojanović concludes that “there are probably ‘a lot’ of them if we take into consideration which path (‘the official’) Montenegro is taking and wants to take; what kinds of projects are carried out in Montenegro; what Montenegro wants to separate from at any cost; what traces it wants to erase and darken, and what these traces are like”.

We shall point out here just some of the important historical and contemporary aspects of the Serbian Cyrillic script (and the reader is provided with a detailed overview and analysis in Jelica Stojanović’s book). The contemporary Serbian literary language and the contemporary Serbian Cyrillic script are connected by one and the same reformer – Vuk Stefanović Karadžić. Vuk was of the opinion that “there is but one Serbian language, the one spoken by the Serbian people”, and that the best-suited, if not the only script for that language, of which the great Laza Kostić wrote “that there is not a more beautiful one in the world” (Kostić 1990: 227), was the Cyrillic script – reformed, where a single letter (grapheme) would correspond to each Serbian literary sound. Such a harmonious relationship between a language and its script has never been achieved anywhere in the world – except in the case of the Serbian language and the Serbian Cyrillic script. That is why, whenever the Serbian language is mentioned, it implies the Cyrillic script as the primary Serbian script, and

whenever the Cyrillic script is mentioned, the Serbian language is invoked thereby. That is why the Cyrillic script is the inalienable part of the Serbian language, and that is why the Serbian language is fully Serbian only when it is written in the Cyrillic script. It is only in the Serbian language that those two terms can change places metonymically: when one speaks of the Serbian language, one necessarily refers to the Serbian Cyrillic script, and when one speaks of the Cyrillic script, that simultaneously refers to the Serbian language.

All the literature and culture of Orthodox Serbs, from the time of St Sava to the second decade of the 21st century, have been written in the Cyrillic script. Those who know the history of the use of the Cyrillic script among the Serbs are familiar with the fact that, throughout history, there has existed an unbreakable immanent mutual bond between the Serbs and the Serbian Cyrillic script. It has often happened in history that Serbs got persecuted on account of writing in the Cyrillic script, which they did as it was considered to be the most essential Serbian national characteristic. We shall mention here just a few facts concerning the persecution of the Cyrillic script as a Serbian identity-related national characteristic that are generally known to all educated readers. They have to do with the attitude of Croats and Austria-Hungary towards the Serbs and the Cyrillic script. (Stojanović deals at length with the persecutions of the Cyrillic script in this book. See: Stojanović 2011: 65–101). As the Cyrillic script was an inalienable characteristic of Vuk's Serbian language, it was in the 19th and the 20th century that it came under attack as part of the efforts aimed at the extermination of the Serbs, for it was considered that, by banning its use, the Serbs would be deprived of one of their most essential national characteristics. The first official ban on using the Cyrillic script – as Jelica Stojanović informs us – “is connected to the name of Empress Maria Theresa, and it dates from 1779. Having been talked into it by the Roman high priests, she issued the order to abolish the Cyrillic script outside the church, and that the schools be

obligated to introduce 'the simple Illyrian folk language and the Latin script'. All the Serbs in today's Vojvodina, together with the Metropolitan and the Bishops, raised their voices against such an order, so that it was rescinded. [...] Following the death of Maria Theresa, her son Emperor Franz Joseph II renewed this order on 3rd February 1781." The Cyrillic script was most intensely attacked prior to and during the First World War, again by the Croatian and Austrian authorities. One should, for example, recall the notorious "High Treason Trial", dating from 1908–1909, initiated in Zagreb against 53 Serbs from Croatia, one of their greatest sins being their adherence to the Cyrillic script, in view of the fact, as stated in the bill of indictment, they wanted "to use the 'Serbian' (Cyrillic) script on road signs as an outward sign of Serbianhood". And what can one say about the attitude of the Independent State of Croatia (ISC) towards the Cyrillic script? Only 15 days after it was founded (on 25. 4. 1941), the ISC announced the *Law on Prohibiting the Cyrillic Script*, accompanied by the *Order on Enforcing the Law on Prohibiting the Use of the Cyrillic Script, issued by the Minister of the Interior*, which runs as follows: "Any use of the Cyrillic script on the entire territory of the Independent State of Croatia is prohibited. This particularly refers to the work of all the state and local government organs, public administration offices, commercial records and similar writings, correspondence and all public inscriptions." Although it was only during the ISC that the Cyrillic script was prohibited by law, the attitude of the Croats towards it was not much better either before or after the ISC. The Cyrillic script was considered to be an immanent characteristic of Serbianhood, one of the most essential differentiating characteristics separating the Croats from the Serbs. To put it quite simply, the Croats abhorred the Cyrillic script as one of the most recognisable Serbian characteristics. They manifested this attitude not only at the time of the ISC but also in the current independent state of Croatia, where the abolition of the Cyrillic script in schools and public use was one of the first legal acts passed in the domain of educa-

tion; also, books printed in the Cyrillic script were exiled from almost all Croatian libraries. An even better indicator of the fact that the Cyrillic script is an essential Serbian national characteristic is the attitude manifested towards it by Austria-Hungary during the First World War. Thus, in Croatia the Cyrillic script was abolished on 3rd January 1915; in Bosnia and Herzegovina, its use was banned by an order of the Land Government in Sarajevo issued on 10th November 1915. The ban of the Cyrillic script, however, was not limited to Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Following the occupation of Montenegro in 1916, the Austrian authorities forbade the use of the Cyrillic script on 18th September. In Serbia, on the other hand, the decision on banning the use of the Cyrillic script in public communication was passed by the General Army Gubernatorate for Serbia on 12th June 1916. Having taken power in all the states where the Serbian people lived, first of all, Austria-Hungary abolished the Cyrillic script in all of them, considering it to be an essential Serbian national characteristic. It is highly symptomatic to compare the justification given by Austria-Hungary for abolishing the Cyrillic script in Serbia with the arguments offered by the contemporary anti-Cyrillic lobby. Specifically, Austria-Hungary held the view that, within the Habsburg Monarchy, “all the peoples in it can take a step forward in civilizational terms. For the Serbian people to be able to do it, it had to be ‘helped’ to get rid of its fallacies. When it comes to its culture, the greatest obstacle to the inclusion of the Serbian people in civilization was considered to be – the Cyrillic script (Đorđević 2014: 7).

It would appear that this attitude of Austria-Hungary towards the Serbian Cyrillic script slowly took root in the minds of an influential part of Serbian scholars and politicians. What certainly contributed to this state of affairs was the fact that, within the framework of the Corfu Declaration, the Croats’ request that in the new Yugoslav state national specificities such as the *name of the language, the script, emblems* and religious differences should not be abolished was granted. This shows that, even back then, the

Croats were actually defending not only the name of the Croatian language but also the Latin script, fearing that in a parliamentary monarchy ruled by the Karađorđević dynasty the Cyrillic script, as the only Serbian script with the status of a national identity characteristic, would gain dominance of the Latin script. It was precisely from the moment of the founding of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, subsequently renamed as Yugoslavia, that the downfall of the Cyrillic script began. The most plastic reflection of this is the following comparison, quoted by Vasilis Kleftakis. If a university-educated citizen of Serbia, let us call him Rodoljub [Patriot], “who went to sleep in early 1912 and, by some miracle, woke up 100 years later – in the year 2012, there would be things in Serbia for him to marvel over. As an educated man, in 1912 he knew about cars, trains, airplanes, the telephone and telegraph, he read newspapers and illustrated magazines, went to the cinema, went shopping to the modern, well-stocked shops of the day... All the contemporary, modern versions of these things would not surprise him much. He would soon understand that they were the result of technical improvements, modernisation, progress, and would be glad to see them – but he would find one thing very puzzling and painful to see: how come there is so much Latin script in Serbia, a veritable deluge? Where has the Serbian Cyrillic script disappeared... and why? In Serbia, back in 1912, he could not see a single book, newspaper, magazine or poster printed in the Latin script. Today, in the year 2012, walking along Belgrade’s Knez Mihailova Street, Rodoljub would not see a single Cyrillic script label, and it would take him a lot of effort to find a single Cyrillic script title at newsstands or in bookstore shop windows! Naturally, he would have no way of knowing that Serbia was occupied from the end of 1915 until the end of 1918 by Austria-Hungary, which forbade the use of the Cyrillic script – and if he did know that, he would not be surprised by what he saw in Knez Mihailova Street: he would only sadly conclude that the Austro-Hungarian occupation still continued! In any case, who knows?! A modern counterpart of his in terms of education would not be surprised

at all by the domination of the Latin script in 2012. He would not even notice it. His grandfather and father, having been gradually prepared for this by crafty and smart – and not exactly gentle political, police and linguistic ‘spin doctors’ – got used not only to the appearance but also to the increasingly intense offensive of the Latin script. They persuaded them that the Cyrillic script was obsolete, that it was a characteristic of backwardness and benighted nationalism, that it was good, nice and useful to use the Latin script – for it was allegedly also Serbian, was supposed to facilitate communication with the modern world, reportedly made learning foreign languages easier, supposedly made it easier for foreign tourists to orientate themselves – and what not – all of which was supposed to be well and fine” (Kleftakis 2012).

Over a period of one hundred years, the Cyrillic and the Latin scripts have completely changed places among the Serbs. The Latin script continually suppressed the Cyrillic one until it brought it to the point of extermination, dying out. It would appear that two things were decisive in this process. Firstly, the support of the official policy to the spreading of the Latin script at the expense of the Cyrillic script, the most obvious example of which is provided precisely by V. Kleftakis. Namely, “in 1950, meeting the American Ambassador George V. Allen, the Yugoslav Minister of Education [Rodoljub Čolaković?], answering the Ambassador’s question: “Well, if you want so much to separate [from Stalin/the USSR], why don’t you say that teaching in schools will be conducted using both the Cyrillic and the Latin script, and that you will gradually eliminate the Cyrillic script in order to show that you have broken up with Russia?” said: “We are making sure that all children in Yugoslavia learn the Latin script, and this will gradually lead to it [that is, the elimination of the Cyrillic script] of its own accord” (Kleftakis 2012).³ Sec-

³ V. Kleftakis gives the following source for the above quote: Mehta, Coleman Armstrong: “A Rat Hole to be Watched”? CIA Analyses of the Tito-Stalin Split, 1948–1950. (Under the direction of Dr. Nancy Mitchell.), (<http://repository.lib.ncsu.edu/ir/bitstream/1840.16/1006/1/etd.pdf>).

only, the Novi Sad Agreement, which, through an erroneous understanding of the equality of the two scripts, actually contributed to the dying out of the Serbian Cyrillic script, neglecting the fact that the Cyrillic script is an identity characteristic of the Serbian people, and must be preserved as such. Item three of the concluding part of the Novi Sad Agreement runs as follows: “Both scripts, the Latin and the Cyrillic one, are equal; that is why efforts should be made to ensure that the Serbs and the Croats should master both scripts in an equal measure, which is to be achieved, first of all, by teaching them at school.”

The result of the implementation of the said “equality” is quite obvious – not only in terms of today’s consequences but also in terms of those that ensued immediately after the proclamation of equality. The Croats never accepted the Cyrillic script as equal to the Latin one in everyday use. The Serbs, on the other hand, subordinated the Cyrillic script to the Latin one in terms of everyday use. Among the Serbs, the equality of the Latin and the Cyrillic script meant renouncing the Cyrillic one and suppressing it in favour of the Latin one. As Radmilo Marojević shows (1991: 146, 149–150) a number of methods have been used for the purpose of suppressing the Cyrillic script: the administrative, ideological-repressive, propagandistic, economic and discriminatory one, “which is why, to a large degree, the Cyrillic script stopped being the foundation of the national culture in all the parts of the Stalinist (or to put it more precisely: Titoist) state”. Throughout the 20th century, the Cyrillic script was pushed into the shade of the Latin script in various ways, until it was so deep in shade that it could never return to the light of day.

The bloody end of the joint state, into which the Serbs invested so many lives and illusions, unfortunately, did not sober up the Serbs. True, the Serbs declaratively returned to the proven national values, among them the Cyrillic script. But it appears that this return was declarative only. Even though the Cyrillic script was prescribed by the 2006 Constitution as the only script in official use, even today its position in everyday use is no bet-

ter than it was yesterday compared to the Latin script. The reasons for this are manifold. Firstly, there is the erroneous belief that the globalising English language necessarily entails the use of the Latin script and abandoning the Cyrillic script. However, the “Serbian” Latin script, with its specifically shaped letters, is just as unsuited to the English language as the Cyrillic script (would anyone who is familiar with the English Latin script find it easier to read the Latin version of ČAČAK than the Cyrillic variant ЧАЧАК?). That is why, just as it is no obstacle to learning English or any other language written in the Latin script to Russians or Bulgarians, the Cyrillic script cannot be an obstacle to Serbs. Learning foreign languages has never been the reason for the dying out of the Cyrillic script among the Serbs, nor is it a reason today. And if this reason counts at all, it is certainly not one of primary, but of entirely peripheral importance. The primary reasons should be sought elsewhere. First of all, in the predilection of the Serbian people, or to put it more precisely, its “intellectual elite”, for denying their own national values. Of which the Cyrillic script is undoubtedly one.

The Serbs have been made to believe that both the Cyrillic and the Latin script are equally Serbian scripts. Which they are not. As we concluded long ago (Kovačević 2004), and provided a scientific justification for it, “it is not entirely correct to say that the Latin script is a Serbian one, just like the Cyrillic script. *The Cyrillic script is a Serbian script, whereas Gaj’s Latin script, slightly reworked by Daničić, is not a Serbian script, but a script of the Serbian language.* It is not a Serbian script because it was not created for the Serbian language, but it is a script of the Serbian language, because that language is written in the Latin script not only by the Serbs, but also by the Croats, Muslims and Montenegrins. Even if the Serbian language were only written in the Cyrillic script among the Serbs, the Latin script would still be a script of the Serbian language. For today the Serbian language is not used as the literary language only by the Serbs. It is also used, under a non-Serbian name, by the Croats and the Muslims, and

they only write it in the Latin script. And just as, for example, Krleža is not a Serbian writer but a writer of the Serbian language, so the Latin script is not a Serbian script, but a script of the Serbian language.”

Denying the Cyrillic script the status of “the foundation of the national culture”, the status of a primarily Serbian script, the Serbian intellectual elite, anti-national rather than anational – is afraid of its survival today. For, a return to the Cyrillic script would necessarily mean that the Serbian anational and anti-national pseudo-elite would have to leave the stage, vacating it for the return of the Serbian national elite, whose members will not try to persuade the Serbs “that the past does not matter and that they should turn to the future”, but will present to them the only essential truth that all the peoples with a sense of dignity adhere to, which is why they are highly regarded by all: it will be hard for any people to survive in the future if it renounces its past, especially that part of its past which constitutes one of the fundamental criteria of the national identity. And one of those foundations – undoubtedly – is the Cyrillic script.



This preface to Jelica Stojanović’s book, published in the Blue Edition of the Srpska književna zadruga publishing house, provides an overview of the issues that the book deals with and the problems which the author confronts in her analysis of those issues. Authors who are capable of dealing with issues spanning a period of many centuries, from the beginnings of Serbian literacy to the present day, in a scientifically competent manner, without ever leaving the solid ground of scientific facts and scientific analytical criteria, are very rare indeed. A brilliant historian of the Serbian language, well versed in all the development trends of Serbian philology, an uncompromising fighter for the defence and survival of the Serbian script and the Serbian language, especially in Montenegro today, Jelica

Stojanović has written a very valuable book about the historical development and the current situation of the Serbian language, especially concerning Montenegro through history and today – without bypassing any issues or facts. This book confirms the view, already presented in scientific literature (Babić 2016: 183–184) that “the Serbian linguistic area, as seen from the philological perspective of Jelica Stojanović – is indivisible, unified by the historical continuity dating from the time of old scribes’ schools, the dialectal foundation of the Serbian Štokavian speech, the models of Vuk’s and post-Vuk codification, the Ijekavian and Ekavian pronunciation of *yat*, the Cyrillic and the Latin script, which are characteristics on the basis of which linguistic regional characteristics, promoted to the status of standard languages, are not established but overcome”.

LITERATURE

- Babić 2016: Milanka Babić, “Jelica Stojanović – u zaštiti srpskog jezika i njegovog imena, ne samo u Crnoj Gori [Jelica Stojanović – Defending the Serbian Language and Its Name, Not Only in Montenegro]”, in: *Bosanski problemi srpskog jezika [The Bosnian Problems of the Serbian Language]*, Belgrade: Jasen 2016, 173–184.
- Bugarski 2012: Ranko Bugarski, “Ćirilica nije na samrti [The Cyrillic Script Is Not on Its Deathbed]”, *Press*, Banjaluka, 26. 1. 2012, 22–23.
- Deretić 1997: Jovan Deretić, *Poetika srpske književnosti [The Poetics of Serbian Literature]*, Belgrade: Filip Višnjić, 1997.
- Đorđević 2014: Bojan Đorđević, “Muze nisu učutale: kulturni život Srba tokom Velikog rata u ogledalu tadašnje štampe [The Muses Did Not Go Silent: The Cultural Life of the Serbs in the Mirror of the Press of That Time]”, in: Bojan Đorđević, Dragana Grujić, Gordana Đoković, *Letopis kulturnog života tokom Velikog rata: 1916–1918 [The Annals of Cultural Life during the Great War: 1916–1918]*, Belgrade: Institut za književnost i umetnost, Novi Sad: Ma-tica srpska, 2014.

- Ekmečić 2014: Milorad Ekmečić, “Srbiji bi istorija mogla da se ponovi [History Could Repeat Itself in Serbia]”, *Večernje novosti*, 3. 8. 2014, 3.
- Ivić 1991: Pavle Ivić, *O Vuku Karadžiću [On Vuk Karadžić]*, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, 1991.
- Jovanović 2011: Miodrag Jovanović, “Sekvence sj, zj u crnogorskim i drugim ijekavskim govorima [The Sequences sj, zj in Montenegrin and Other Ijekavian Dialects]”, *Oktoih*, 1–2, Podgorica, 2011, 175–196.
- Karadžić 1814: *Pismenica serbskoga jezika po govoru prostoga naroda, napisana Vukom Stefanovićem Serbancem [The Orthography of the Serbian Language, Based on the Speech of the Common Folk, Written by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, a Serb]*. Vienna, 1814.
- Karadžić 1896: Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, *Skupljeni gramatički i polemički spisi [Collected Grammatical and Polemical Writings]*, III/2, Belgrade, 1896.
- Karadžić 1969: Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, *O jeziku i književnosti [On Language and Literature]*, Belgrade: Prosveta, 1969.
- Karadžić 1987: Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, “Srpska gramatika [Serbian Grammar]”, in: *Srpski rječnik [The Serbian Dictionary, 1818]*, Belgrade: Prosveta, Nolit, 1987, XXIX–LXXI.
- Karadžić 1977: Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, “Srbi svi i svuda [All Serbs Everywhere]”, in: *Srbi i njihov jezik: hrestomatija [The Serbs and Their Language: A Chrestomathy]*, edited by Petar Milosavljević, Priština: Narodna i univerzitetska biblioteka, 1997, 125–141.
- Karadžić 1997a: Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, “Srbi i Hrvati [Serbs and Croats]”, in: *Srbi i njihov jezik: hrestomatija [The Serbs and Their Language: A Chrestomathy]*, edited by Petar Milosavljević, Priština: Narodna i univerzitetska biblioteka, 1997, 146–149.
- Karadžić 1997b: Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, “Očitovanje [Manifesting]”, in: *Srbi i njihov jezik: hrestomatija [The Serbs and Their Language: A Chrestomathy]*, edited by Petar Milosavljević, Priština: Narodna i univerzitetska biblioteka, 1997, 150.
- Karadžić 2001: Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, *O jeziku i književnosti III [On Language and Literature III]*, Belgrade: Prosveta, 2001.

- Kleftakis 2012: Vasilios Kleftakis, "Zatiranje ćirilice – plan ili slučaj [The Suppression of the Cyrillic script – Planned or Accidental]", *Nova srpska politička misao*, 6. 1. 2012.
- <<http://www.nspm.rs/kulturna-politika/zatiranje-srpske-cirilice-%E2%80%93-plan-ili-slucaj.html?alphabet=1> (accessed: 3. 7. 2015)>
- Kovačević 1999: Miloš Kovačević, *U odbranu jezika srpskoga – i dalje [In Defence of the Serbian Language – And Further]*, Belgrade: Trebnik, 1999.
- Kovačević 2003: Miloš Kovačević, *Srpski jezik i srpski jezici [The Serbian Language and Serbian Languages]*, Belgrade: SKZ, BIGZ, 2003.
- Kovačević 2004: Miloš Kovačević, "Status pisma u ustavima i zakonima o jeziku i pismu u srpskim zemljama [The Status of the Script in the Constitutions and Laws on the Language and the Script in Serbian Lands], in: *Kako rešiti pitanje pisma u novom pravopisu srpskog jezika i školstvu [How to Resolve the Issue of the Script in the New Orthography of the Serbian Language and in Education]*, Novi Sad: Ćirilica, 2004, 20–24.
- Kovačević 2011: Miloš Kovačević, "Značaj Dubrovnika za standardizaciju srpskoga književnog jezika [The Importance of Dubrovnik for the Standardisation of the Serbian Literary Language]", in: *Gramatička pitanja srpskoga jezika [The Grammatical Issues of the Serbian Language]*, Belgrade: Jasen, 2011, 9–22.
- Kovačević 2012: Miloš Kovačević, "Postoji li pravo naroda na sopstveno ime imenom tuđeg jezika [Does a People Have the Right to Its Own Name through the Name of Another Language]", in: *Jezik i pismo u Republici Srpskoj [The Language and Script in the Republic of Srpska]*, a collection of papers, edited by Rajko Kuzmanović, Banja Luka: ANURS, Naučni skupovi, vol. XXIV, Odjeljenje književnosti i umjetnosti, vol. 13, 2012, 297–311.
- Kovačević 2013: Miloš Kovačević, "Njegošev odnos prema srpskom jeziku [Njegoš's Attitude towards the Serbian Language]", *Nova Zora*, 40/41, Bileća – Gacko, 2013, 42–51.
- Kovačević 2013a: Miloš Kovačević, "O aktuelnom pravopisu i gramatici 'crnogorskog jezika' [On the Current Orthography and Grammar of the 'Montenegrin' Language]", *Slovo*, X /40, Nikšić, 2013, 15–41.

- Kovačević 2013b: Miloš Kovačević, *U odbranu srpske ćirilice: hrestomatija* [In Defence of the Serbian Cyrillic Script: A Chrestomathy], Pale: SKPD Prosvjeta, 2013.
- Kovačević 2015: Miloš Kovačević, *Srpski jezik između nauke i politike* [The Serbian Language between Science and Politics], Banja Luka: Društvo nastavnika srpskog jezika i književnosti Republike Srpske, 2015.
- Kopitar i Vuk 1980: *Kopitar i Vuk* [Kopitar and Vuk], edited by Golub Dobrašinović, PhD, Belgrade, Tršić: Rad, Vukov sabor, 1980.
- Kostić 1990: Laza Kostić, *O književnosti i jeziku* [On Literature and Language], Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1990.
- Lakić 2013: Igor Lakić, “Jezička slika Crne Gore [The Linguistic Picture of Montenegro]”, in: *Jezik između lingvistike i politike* [Language between Linguistics and Politics], Vesna Požgaj Hadži (ed), Belgrade: Biblioteka XX vek, 2013, 133–158.
- Lompar 2011: Milo Lompar, *Duh samoporicanja* [The Spirit of Self-Denial], Novi Sad: Orpheus, 2011.
- Lompar 2013: Milo Lompar, *Povratak srpskom stanovištu?* [A Return to the Serbian Viewpoint?], Belgrade: Catena mundi, 2013.
- Marojević 1991: Radmilo Marojević, *Ćirilica na raskršću vekova. Ogledi o srpskoj etničkoj i kulturnoj samosvesti* [The Cyrillic Script at the Crossroads of Centuries. Essays on Serbian Ethnic and Cultural Self-Awareness], Gornji Milanovac: Dečje novine, 1991.
- Matović 2013: Veselin Matović, *Ćirilica i latinogorica* [The Cyrillic and Monte-Latin Script], Podgorica-Nikšić: Književna zadruha Srpskog narodnog vijeća, NVU Aktiv profesora srpskog jezika i književnosti, Nikšić, 2013.
- Mrkalj 1810: Sava Mrkalj, *Salo debeloga jera libo azbukopotres* [The Fat of the Thick Yer or an Alphabet-quake], Buda, 1810.
- Obradović 1989: Dositej Obradović, *Izabrani spisi* [Selected Writings], Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1989.
- Petrović 2015: Dragoljub Petrović, “Zatiranje Srba u Crnoj Gori ili crtice o serdarskim i nesojskim vremenima [The Extermination of Serbs in Montenegro or Short Stories about the Times of Serdars and Inhumanity]”, in: *Srpski jezik i ćirilica osnove srpskog identiteta* [The Serbian Language and the Cyrillic Script, the Foundations of the Serbian Identity], a collection of papers, Momčilo Vuksanović

- (ed), Podgorica: Književna zadruga Srpskog narodnog vijeća, 2015, 233–247.
- Pišev 2013: Marko Pišev, *Politička etnografija i srpska intelektualna elita u vreme stvaranja Jugoslavije 1914–1919: Slučaj Jovana Cvijića* [*Political Ethnography and the Serbian Intellectual Elite at the Time of the Establishment of Yugoslavia 1914–1919: The Case of Jovan Cvijić*], Belgrade: Filozofski fakultet, 2013.
- Simić 1991: Radoje Simić, *O našem književnom jeziku* [*On Our Literary Language*], Nikšić: Univerzitetska riječ, 1991.
- Stojanović 2011: Jelica Stojanović, *Putevima srpskog jezika i ćirilice* [*Following the Paths of the Serbian Language and the Cyrillic Script*], Nikšić: Izdavački centar Matice srpske – Društvo članova u Crnoj Gori, 2011.
- Stojković 2008: Branimir Stojković, *Evropski kulturni identitet* [*The European Cultural Identity*], Belgrade: Službeni glasnik, 2008.

**THE DEVELOPMENT PATH
OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE
AND SCRIPT**

THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE AND THE STATE-NATIONAL PROJECTS IN THE 19th AND THE 20th CENTURIES

Apart from many other things that it brought along, the nineteenth century was a period of creating, introducing, complexifying, as well as resolving and realising many state and national issues, problems and projects, some of which pertained to linguistic matters.¹ During the course of that century, in the South Slavic linguistic area (especially in one part of it) there occurred a new linguistic situation (yet again connected with state and national issues and challenges), which,

¹ The debates pertaining to the concept of the national, as well as the relationship between the national and the linguistic, were carried over from the 18th to the 19th century: “The answer to the question of what constitutes a nation was not the same in France, Britain, Austria and Russia. The Serbian revolution (this refers to the uprising against the Turks in 1804, J. S.) began at a time when the world culture was characterised by the general belief that a nation was a linguistic community. Towards the end of the 18th century, the German philosopher Herder wrote that borders between nations would be established by linguists, not generals. When confronted with reality, that idea failed, first of all in his own country, before reaching the Balkans” (Ekmečić 2011: 130). In the area where the German language is spoken, a number of nations have been established, but the name of the language – German, has remained. That has not been the case in the linguistic area of the Serbian language: the religious has predominated over the linguistic: “If Western Europe influenced the Serbian revolution, and subsequently the Serbian national culture, that does not amount to separating the language from the nation. In any case, that situation had existed before as well, during the Byzantine and Osmanic eras. The West did not provide a better alternative for the Balkan peoples, namely, to seek the borders of their sovereign nations along the lines determined by linguists. Not just for the Serbian people, but for all the other Balkan nations as well – except for the Albanian one: to be marked by the borders of the same religion and its church organisation. Albania constitutes a historical exception, for it was in the interests of no great power to divide it...”

The prevention of the application of the principle of a nation being a linguistic community was enforced from the very beginning of the Serbian revolution in 1804.” (Ekmečić 2011: 131).

it would appear, was more than ever out of sync with the inner (natural) flow of language, that is to say, external factors (first of all, state and national ones, connected with religious ones) began to influence linguistic developments in a decisive manner, to direct and create a linguistic policy that was new to a considerable degree.² As a product and a consequence of all that, a new designation for this language was thought up, one that had never existed before: Serbo-Croat, and its use was the subject of a lot of pressure. This study will try to deal with the following issues: what this designation was the product of; what the term covered (or was supposed to cover); what it referred to; what corresponds to it in linguistic, systemic and genetic-historical terms; what functions and scope it attained (or was supposed to attain); what its territorial framework and scope was (or how it was conceived and/or planned); what the linguistic (and also the related non-linguistic) circumstances were like in the 19th century, as well as the processes and developments during the course of the 19th and the 20th centuries, and finally, the consequences and results of all that as they are felt today. As it happens, the 19th and the 20th century are known in history as the centuries of politics: “First of all, there is the specific characteristic of the history of the 19th and 20th centuries. Those are perhaps the first centuries in history that we may designate as the centuries of politics. Napoleon said, as quoted by Hegel: ‘In modern times, politics takes the place of the fatum of the era of Antiquity’” (Kastoriadis 1999: 162),

² The linguistic “disturbances” were preceded in the 19th century by the linking of the national to the religious: “At the beginning of the New Age, after 1492, religion had not yet become the watershed of the nation, as is the case today [...]. The accelerated process of turning religion into the watershed of the nation was carried out only after the conflict of interest between the great powers of Western Europe and the Serbian people following the Serbian revolution of 1804–1815” (Ekmečić 2011: 53). After the Berlin Congress, as we find in Ekmečić, “religion as the watershed of the nation in the South Slavic area blossomed into great political ideologies” (Ekmečić 2011: 295), which (step by step) conditioned the separation of the great Serbian ethnic and linguistic corpus from the historical mainstream.

which was reflected in a special way in these parts, especially concerning the Serbian language.

In the area where the Serbo-Croat language was in official use, the coming into being and/or the formation of different nations and states (based on the old, partially new or almost entirely new foundations) was accompanied by the increasingly complex development of the language policy, which often led to denying and/or neglecting scientific criteria for the sake of political (as well as political mongering-related) projects (for which language served as one of the most important tools). This refers both to the period and the processes that led to the generalisation and broadening of the scope of the designation *Serbo-Croat* in the 19th century and to the processes following the suppression and/or abolition of this designation (mostly over the last few decades). The language system and scientific evaluation are often saddled with imposed and fabricated political, state-national and, in connection with these, religious projects which (as it has transpired) aim to create new “languages”, that is, new language designations. At the same time, a problem arises – not only that of the new language designation, but also that of justifying the new name for one and the same language. In view of the fact that there exist no scientifically and historically clear and well-founded criteria for using different designations to denote one and the same language, the justification for the name of the language is sometimes sought in nation-, other times in state-related reasons (often according to the current needs and set of circumstances), and it is often attempted to project the newly formed and established linguistic situation onto the historical-linguistic level. As we find in Milorad Pupovac, “The linguistic ideologies in post-Yugoslav countries over the last few decades have been transformed into ideologies of linguistic identities, while linguistic policies have been transformed into policies of the vernaculars of states and the discourses of nations” (Pupovac 2014: 131). If linguistic identity is not considered to constitute an obligatory integral part of national identity (as evidenced by the example of a great

many nations in the world that have no languages of their own, not does the name of the language they use coincide with the name of the nation in question), why has that particular issue been imposed as necessary and obligatory in these parts!? In addition to this, attempts at artificially creating and proving the special character and identity of a nation have entailed enormous efforts, not to mention great troubles, which have not abated even today. Regardless of all the omissions and twisting of facts, linguistic criteria and historical facts cannot be denied easily. The newly formed “Balkan state(let)s or nations”, as Miloš Kovačević points out, “are actually seeking the criteria of linguistic autonomy (which presupposes the existence of the awareness that a language is unique and independent of any other language). But this autonomy is always determined in relation to the Serbian language. Viewed from that perspective, the Serbian language has the status of an *Abstand*-autonomy, its status as a separate language is not brought into question, whereas one’s ‘own’ language (through the claim that it is different from the Serbian language) is provided with the status of an *Ausbau*-autonomy, which is based on a social awareness whose foundation is a deliberate stressing of differences and a planned distancing of the structure of an idiom from genetically related or identical idioms” (Kovačević 2015: 67). In this process, the greatest “problem” actually turns out to be the Serbian language and its indubitable identity and historical continuity.

A lot has been written and said about the processes and the situation in the 19th century, and also about the new developments in the final decades of the 20th century, which were initiated in Croatia and continued in the region of Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H). However, the developments in Montenegro (which have intensified over the last few years) have been talked about to a considerably lesser extent. That is why we shall dedicate special attention and particularly stress the presentation of the processes in Montenegro and compare them with the broader projects (initiated long ago) outside Montenegro.

1. In order to be able to understand better what is happening with the Serbian language today, it is necessary to go back in time, to the time of the pre-Illyrian and Illyrian movement, and the acceptance of Vuk's reform of the Serbian language in the area occupied by Croatia today. Croatia, as is well known, encompasses various territories (mutually distant and very much divided), with various types of language and literature: "The problems faced by Catholics in the Serbo-Croat linguistic area were quite different from those faced by Orthodox believers. Their problems stemmed from the territorial divisions of the literary language, as well as those of literature itself. There existed a Kajkavian literature, a Slavonian one, a Bunjevidian one of Bačka, a Dalmatian one, a Dubrovnik one etc. And all of those diminutive literary productions, intended first and foremost for the readership of its home region, had its own type of literary language. The constricted nature of the ambiances that those so-called regional literatures relied on in the second half of the 18th century condemned them to being truly provincial in every sense of the word, including even the worst one of all. All of the above existed in the vicious circles of mutual conditioning, intertwined with the absence of a common folk consciousness... No such divisions were to be found among the Orthodox part of the population..." (Ivić 2001: 188).

The area of today's Croatia, as we find in Pavle Ivić, was for a long time divided by state borders into small administrative units. In different regions, regional literary languages were used, based for the most part on homeland dialects.³ In the

³ "It was quite recently that Dalibor Brozović expressed the view that 'the Croatian linguistic standard' did not originate from the Illyrians or from the Croatian followers of Vuk, but from the Slavonian or Dalmatian writers of the 18th century such as Reljković or Kačić Miošić, whose language is close to today's literary language. Naturally, the word 'Croatian' should be understood in a broad sense here, for the majority of the writers referred to in this context did not feel Croatian, but used that word to refer to the inhabitants of certain other areas who possessed a Croatian consciousness themselves and had their own, different type of literary language. And yet, those who broaden the meaning of the term

early 19th century, the most lively writing activities were those in the Kajkavian variant of the language, used in north-western Croatia, with Zagreb as its cultural centre; Čakavian literature (written in different variants of the dialect) was also abundant; literature was also written in the Ikavian variant of the Štokavian dialect in Slavonia, Lika and Dalmatia (Ivić 2001: 162). At the beginning of the 19th century, the Croatian national consciousness in Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, Slavonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina did not exist (Ekmečić 2011: 178): “The awareness that persisted among the people that ‘the Latin side’ extended to Klis, near Split, confirms the reports of the Dalmatian *Provveditore* (overseer, district governor) Giacomo Foscarini, dating from 1572, that Morlachs, the then inhabitants of Dalmatian Zagora under the Turkish rule, were for the most part ‘di fede serviana’, as well as the insights gained from the investigations of subsequent historians, namely, that in this region there were more Orthodox places of worship than Catholic ones. Only the changes that occurred after the Peace of Požarevac, dating from 1718, namely, the Catholicising of Muslims and a part of the Orthodox population, as faithfully described by the Franciscan Stipan Zlatović in 1888, resulted in the Catholics becoming a majority” (Ekmečić 2011: 179). The Serbian revolution of 1815 resulted in establishing the au-

‘Croatian’ in such a way proceed from the fact the ethnic formations which those writers belonged to subsequently fit in with the Croatian nation, just as the further offshoots of literature in their regions became a part of Croatian literature, which was made all the more simple due to the fact that the regional literatures of Catholics using the Serbo-Croat language were occasionally linked by concrete bonds... However, the weakness of the view expressed by the prominent linguist from Zadar lies in the idea of the linguistic standard, which, moreover (in his own words) has remained the same from the 18th century to the present day... The language of these writers is not ‘standardised’, not only because of the fact that it did not adhere to any written norms, which did not exist at the time, but also on account of the fact that there existed considerable linguistic differences between some writers who belonged to the Dalmatian or the Slavonian group (not to mention the differences between these groups)” (Ivić 2001: 162–163).

tonomy of Serbia in the Osmanic Empire, but on account of the assassination of Karađorđe (its clues, as shown by Ekmečić, point to London and Vienna), the revolution was not completed: “In the Serbian revolution of 1804–1815, the idea of establishing multireligious communities failed. Due to the efforts of Austria to liberate Balkan Catholics on its own, the principle of religion as the watershed of nations won. After the encyclical of Pope Pius VII entitled ‘Nihil Romani Pontifices’, dating from 1817, the Habsburg monarch gained the right to appoint Bishops in the former Venetian Dalmatia and parts of Istria. The Catholics of Dalmatia, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Slavonia were forbidden to use the Serbian Cyrillic script, which caused a tectonic rupture in the culture of the Catholic and the Orthodox believers, in the sense of their separation in all the spheres of social activities... The Croatisation of the Catholics of Dalmatia, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Slavonia began with the revolution of 1848” (Ekmečić 2011: 200–201). According to the statistics of the Austrian Government, in the middle of the 19th century (before and after the revolution of 1848), the Serbs outnumbered the Croats in the Empire by 300,000 (Ekmečić 2011: 205). In the early 19th century, it was considered (according to J. G. Wilkinson) that there were a total of 5.5 million Serbs, of whom 2,594,000 lived in the Habsburg Monarchy, whereas there were 800,000 Croats, “which shows to what extent he (that is, Wilkinson, J. S.) believed that the Serbian language was the Štokavian dialect of the population of all three religious persuasions” (Ekmečić 2011: 210).

The principle of linking and identifying the religious and the national was completed and established in the 20th century. The process of the Croatisation of the Catholic population of Dalmatia in the early 20th century was only a hint and was actually felt, but it hardly appeared that it would reach mass proportions and be brought to a close (Ekmečić 2011: 316).⁴

⁴ “The world-renowned artist Ivan Meštrović said in an interview conducted in 1911 that ‘Serb and Croat are two names for one people, only, that people preserved its national individuality, freedom and

At the beginning of the century, as shown by Ekmečić, elite nationalism was transformed into mass nationalism. Among the Croats, this shift occurred along with the establishment of the common Yugoslav state. It was then that the Croatisation of all the Catholics speaking the Štokavian dialect of the Serbo-Croat language began to be finalised, and this process would be completed only after 1945, when the identification of nation and language definitively triumphed (Ekmečić 2011: 204). Among the Muslim population in Bosnia, the region of Raška, Kosovo, Montenegro and Macedonia, the mass type of nationalism only triumphed after 1960 (Ekmečić: *ibid.*).

1.1. The need for **unification** by means of creating one literary language (based on a mixture of dialects) was first officially proclaimed by Ivan Derkos in the following manner: “I propose, therefore, the unification of these three kingdoms: Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia, in view of their subdialects” (Ivić 2001: 192). The transitional period for these three kingdoms (all three being included in the name of the new one: the Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia) with their three dialects, bearing different designations, was the adoption, insistent use and acceptance (albeit for a brief period of time) of the vague and deliberately made vague **designation of “Illyrian”** (which was formerly used, mainly in Vienna, to refer to the Serbs, and which proved necessary [and very convenient] for the transitional phase, when the linguistic and national unity with the Serbs was very much insisted upon): “Through the Kajkavian literary language, the renewal movement abandoned, albeit temporarily, the designation Croatian, replacing it with Illyrian, one of literary origin and vague content, but broad in scope and broadly acceptable for that very reason... The shift to the Štokavian dialect and the adoption of the designation Illyrian removed the main obstacles that may have stood be-

yearning for freedom better under the Serb name. That is why that name is closer to my heart. The region where I was born preserved all the characteristics of our people to the very last detail, as if it were in the heart of Serbia” (Ekmečić 2011: 316).

tween Zagreb and those Catholics speaking the Serbo-Croat language who had not opted for the Croatian national affiliation. The awareness of the national unity started spreading fast. When the designation Illyrian was subsequently abandoned and the designation Croatian was embraced anew, the area encompassed by it was already considerably larger. The process continued throughout the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th, partly extending into the era between the great wars..." (Ivić 2001:190–194).

A number of scholars with a good reputation and high credibility stood behind this idea: "In Croatia, Štrossmajer, Rački, Jagić came onto the scene: **Vatroslav Jagić**, the well-known Croatian linguist, who was a man of great authority and whose opinion was of great importance, took the view that **Serbs and Croats were one people** that should have **one language**; as early as 1861, Rački used the phrase 'the Croatian or Serbian language', in 1867, **the Croatian Parliament** voted, by a huge majority vote, for a law prescribing that 'the Croatian or Serbian language is pronounced the official language in the tripartite kingdom, and everyone is free to use the Latin or the Cyrillic script. In Serbia and Montenegro, the legal designation for the language spoken there remained 'the Serbian language'... The term Yugoslav, referring to the language as well, was used rather often. The **Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts** was founded; having received an invitation from Zagreb, the greatest Serb philologist **Đuro Daničić** went to work there. It was reiterated from all sides that Serbs and Croats were 'one people' that had or at least should have 'one language'..., (anyhow, as far back as 1861, a diploma of an honorary citizen of Zagreb, written in the Cyrillic script, was presented to Vuk Karadžić)" (Ivić 2001: 195–203).

At the same time, by changing the name (in 1863) of the periodical *Даница Хрватска, Славонска и Далматинска* [*The Croatian, Slavonian and Dalmatian Danica /Morning Star/*] to *Даница Илурска* [*The Illyrian Danica*], the preconditions were created for a gradual unification of the area, with

a view to (over time – as is reflected today), generalising the designation Croatian, after the Illyrian one, to refer to the state, the nation and the language.

As regards **Dubrovnik**, in the beginning it was a Romance city, like the majority of the cities in the coastal region, where the Dalmatian language, a local dialect of the Latin language, was spoken initially. The inhabitants of Dubrovnik also spoke other Romance languages, and numerous written documents testify to the fact that Italian and Latin were the languages of the state administration and were spoken by learned people in Dubrovnik. From the earliest times, Slavs lived in the Republic of Dubrovnik. Written documents show that, as early as the 12th century, the East Herzegovinian type of language was to be heard, which came to be quite dominant during the course of the 14th and the 15th century (Ivić 2001: 298).⁵ In the state office of Dubrovnik, for centuries there was a Serbian Language Chancellor, and it was during that time that an abundant Cyrillic heritage was created and preserved. We find information on the breadth and frequency of the use of the term “lingua serviana” in Dubrovnik in P. Ivić’s study *On the Meaning of the Phrase lingua serviana in Dubrovnik Documents Dating from the 15th to the 18th Century*: “This by no means exhausts the list of Dubrovnik documents wherein the phrase *lingua serviana* is used, most often referring to texts written by Dubrovnikans for Dubrovnikans... So far, around sixty examples have been found of designating this language using the phrase ‘lingua serviana’, most often in official documents... The data on the comparatively early appearance of the phrase *lingua serviana* suggest the idea that this particular designation for the Serbian language had reached Dubrovnik even considerably earlier, parallel with the arrival of the language itself, as far back as the time when Dubrovnik’s hinterland belonged to the Serbian state and while the territory of Dubrovnik gradually expanded at the expense

⁵ “In Vuk’s view, ‘Serbian is spoken in Dubrovnik’ (Pantić 1983:126), and ‘today’s language of Dubrovnik is truly the Herzegovinian language (Kopitar and Vuk 1980: 119)”, (Kovačević 2009/2010: 94).

of that state, while the former Serbian subjects and their descendants kept coming and settling down in the city” (ibid.). The Dubrovnik Republic expanded at the expense of the Serbian hinterland, and as this process unfolded, the Orthodox population of these areas initially maintained their rights: “In 1334, the Dubrovnik government took on the obligation from King Dušan’s Charter of giving over Ston and Pelješac ‘for the Serbian priest to reside there and sing in the churches in Ston and on the Promontory’. After the expansion of the Republic, in the newly acquired areas, first of all those that had previously been a part of King Dušan’s state, which were not homogeneous in religious terms, on Pelješac, in the so-called New Lands, and later on in Konavle as well, the Dubrovnik government insisted for a while on the Slavic church service and on Orthodox priests” (Z. Bojović 2014: 10).⁶ Until the final decades of the 15th century, in the Republic there were, apart from Catholic priests, Orthodox ones as well, and both were referred to as “Slavic priests” (“presbyteri Slavici”), (Z. Bojović 2014: 9). However, this changed

⁶ The continual connections with the Serbian hinterland and lands, the settling down in Dubrovnik of population from the area of East Herzegovina, left a deep trace in the consciousness, culture and literature of Dubrovnik: “The Serbian traces in the culture and literature of Dubrovnik are very old, and their continued presence was felt throughout the centuries of its existence, in the first years of the 19th century. The age-old presence of the Serbian traces is already testified to by the fact that a part of the territory of the Dubrovnik Republic belonged to the Serbian state right until the 1340’s. King Dušan, subsequently Emperor Dušan, as history knows only too well, gave a part of his lands to Dubrovnik – the Pelješac peninsula with the city of Ston (wherein the Serbian eparchy existed for a century), and later on his son Uroš gave a part of the coast named Primorje [Littoral]. Over the ensuing centuries, Dubrovnik remembered this part of its history, and it is already mentioned in the mediaeval Cyrillic documents written in Dubrovnik: ‘Let it be known that Emperor Stiepan gave Dubrovnik the city of Ston as a gift in... the year 1333 of Our Lord.’ The Serbian past was an important part of the oral tradition of Dubrovnik and its folk history: innumerable examples from poetry show that Dubrovnikans possessed an excellent knowledge of Serbian folk epic poetry and its greatest heroes (Bojović 2015: *Vreme*, no. 1266, 9th April 2015. <http://www.vreme.com/cms/view.php?id=1286962>).

over time. The population that settled down in Catholic cities (primarily the coastal ones) was forced to accept Catholicism: “During the Venetian Republic, the Orthodox Church did not have its hierarchy in the region, and the Church was formally tolerated but not supported. The Dubrovnik Republic had 35,000 inhabitants, and Orthodox citizens were not allowed entry or to stay in the city of Dubrovnik after dusk” (Ekmečić 2011: 179). It was noted that, in the 17th century, straw was thrown and burned on a path in Dubrovnik where a priest of a different faith had passed (Ekmečić 2011: 65).⁷

1.2. **The adoption of the Štokavian dialect** was a historical move on the part of Croatia. As we find in Pavle Ivić: “The switch to the Štokavian dialect and the adoption of the Illyrian name removed the main obstacles that could have stood between Zagreb and those Catholics speaking the Serbo-Croat language whose national option was not Croatian” (Ivić 2001: 194).⁸ Or in Snježana Kordić: “The forming of the Croatian na-

⁷ The Croatisation of the Serbian, or non-Croatian, population can be observed in many areas of today’s Croatia: “At the turn of the century, Dubrovnik provided an example of this ethnic transformation. Luka Zore, a Catholic writer from Dubrovnik, wrote in 1903 that everywhere around Dubrovnik the language commonly spoken was referred to as ‘ours’, there was even the saying ‘parlano nostrano’. Among the intellectuals, there was a movement entitled ‘Slavdom’, which was initially a synonym for a pro-Serbian inclination. Dubrovnians were ‘Westerners in terms of faith and Easterners in terms of nationality’. Even the local youth resisted Croatisation (‘Sacred Srđ [a hill near Dubrovnik], stave off the worse’). The villagers of Konavle professed a Serbian origin, and Zore says that all the way to the south to Makarska the people identified the terms ‘our folk’ and ‘Wallachians’ with the Serbs: ‘Ours was Serbian, Wallachian, the coastal region language’. The Catholic population of Dalmatia was not entirely Croatised until 1945” (Ekmečić 2011: 317).

⁸ “It is generally known that the Serbian literary language that we know and possess was created by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, for all the Serbs unified by the linguistic criterion: the Serbs of ‘Greek’, ‘Roman’ and ‘Mohammedan’ faith. But on a wave of Yugoslavianism, and subsequently due to the enthusiasm over brotherhood and unity, Vuk’s Serbian literary language was given, with the agreement of the Serbs, contrary to any linguistic logic, the compound designation of the Ser-

tion was helped along by a skilful political manoeuvre of Zagreb philologists, who elevated the Štokavian dialect to the rank of the standard language, not the Kajkavian one, which was substantially more limited in territorial terms... If Zagreb had opted for the Kajkavian dialect in the 19th century, it is not only questionable whether Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia would have united into a tripartite kingdom... Only the Čakavian base, which is the most limited one in territorial terms, could have served for the purpose of developing an *Ausbau*-language (that is, a separate one, J. S.), but if that dialect had been adopted as the basis of the linguistic standardisation, it is also questionable whether the territories occupied by Croatia today would have united after all” (Kordić 2003: 45).

Thus, in the mid-1830's, it was realised in Zagreb that a union might be achieved by abandoning the Kajkavian dialect, and in 1835, Ljudevit Gaj (a born Kajkavian speaker) switched to the Štokavian dialect. “By adopting the Štokavian dialect, the Illyrians were the first to step out of the narrowly defined boundaries of the Kajkavian variant of ‘Croatianhood’. In this

bo-Croat language, not because it is (ethno-)linguistic and Croatian, but because it was ‘embraced’ by the Croats as their own literary language, as the father of the Illyrian movement Ljudevit Gaj would have put it. The adoption of this compound designation imposed and contributed to the rooting of the deceptive impression that the Serbian and Croatian contribution to that language was equal... Scientifically speaking, the position of the Serbian language is almost identical to that of German or English. Namely, just like these languages, it is not spoken in one state only, nor is it spoken by one people only. Even at the beginning of its standardisation, Serbian was not a language created for Serbia only, but a language that Vuk Stefanović Karadžić standardised for all Serbs ‘irrespective of their faith or where they lived. Its grammatical structure, regardless of all its different national and territorial uses, is the same, so that at the level of structure, it is still one and the same language. Along with the structural identity, the Serbian language is also one and the same language at the level of communication (the understandability of its speakers). But due to its national and territorial ‘lack of compactness’ it is necessarily a layered language in terms of its variants” (Kovačević 2007, *Politika* 2006: 9, <http://www.politika.rs/rubrike/Drust...djelje.sr.html>).

way, they provided a strong impetus for the other Croatian regions to follow suit, but they also influenced the neighbouring peoples. 'Keeping the Kajkavian dialect as the literary language – A. Barac says – would have meant abandoning any idea of uniting with the Čakavian- and Štokavian-speaking Croats, with all the consequences this would have had on Croatian national life and literature'" (Simić 1991: 337). The Illyrians abandoned the Ikavian script, which was the predominant script among the Štokavian Catholics at the time when the Illyrian movement appeared.⁹ In Ljudevit Gaj's work enti-

⁹ "Vuk's language was not warmly received by those Serbian intellectuals who were not prepared to abandon the Slavic-Serbian language... It attracted a lot of attention in the Croatian intellectual circles. The position of Croats was different from that of Serbs when it came to the use of their literary language as a symbol of national identity. Living in the part of the Habsburg Monarchy which was ruled from Budapest, Croats were exposed to considerable pressure after the decree issued by Joseph II in 1790, which proclaimed the German language a privileged subject in all schools.

The Hungarians were also very sensitive to the issue of language as a symbol of national identity, as the Hungarian language was not yet recognised as the official language of their part of the empire... It became clear to many Croatian intellectuals that something had to be done quickly in order to ensure the existence of a literary language that would symbolise their national identity, unless they wished to be assimilated, be it by the Hungarians or by the Austrians.

Their initial idea was 'the Illyrian solution.' All of this was based on theory, and mainly in connection with Johann Herder at that, namely, with his claim that all South Slavs were one people... Ljudevit Gaj initially planned to standardise the Croatian-Slavonian, Kajkavian dialect, with an alphabet based on the Czech one, but he soon gave up on the idea of basing the Croatian literary language on the Kajkavian dialect, and switched to the Štokavian one, accepting the language codified by Vuk, but written in the Latin script. That actually meant the acceptance of Vuk's language by Croatian intellectuals and marked the end of the Illyrian movement.

...The Croatian members of the Illyrian movement did not lose much sleep over the fact that the language was called 'Serbian' and was written in the Cyrillic script – in the final analysis, they believed that it would be one language used by all South Slavs. Their connection with the Serbs, with whom they identified, meant that they would not be

tled *Whose Is Kolo?*, we find: “For example, everybody knows and recognises that we have developed and introduced Illyrian literature; but we would not dream of ever claiming that this is not the Serbian but the Illyrian language; on the contrary, we are proud and thank the Great Lord above that we, Croatians, now have one literary language with our Serbian brothers” (Milosavljević 2000: 169). The opinion of Ljudevit Gaj, Vuk Karadžić and others in the 19th century relied on the German linguistic school: “The idea that the Serbs are a nation of one language was created by German linguists from the middle of the 18th century onwards” (Ekmečić 2011: 130). The first one to use the phrase “South Slavs” was the great linguist Johann Adelung in 1782. Working on a systematisation of Slavic languages, he placed all of the southern ones “under the Serbian umbrella” (Ekmečić 2011: 132). Such a heritage, as well as the view of German linguists, were transposed into the science and culture of South Slavs by the Czech scholar Josef Dobrovský and the Slovene Jernej Kopitar, and later by Franc Miklošič and others: “Corresponding between themselves, they established a systematisation of South Slavic languages. They agreed with the belief that the Kajkavian dialect was Slovenian, the Čakavian one Croatian and the Štokavian one Serbian. They divided the Serbian language into ‘half-Serbian’ and ‘real Serbian’... First Dobrovský said that ‘Dalmatians are half Serbian, and those using the Cyrillic script are real Serbs’. Both Dobrovský and Kopitar were of the opinion that Catholic Dalmatians, Dubrovnikans and the inhabitants of other Catholic provinces had been using the Serbian language ‘for more than three hundred years’. They referred to Catholic Štokavians as ‘Slavo-Serbs’, and to the rest as ‘Serbs’” (Ekmečić 2011: 133).

assimilated and turned into Austrians or Hungarians, and that they would preserve their Slavic ethnic being. (Our emphasis!) During that period, we increasingly often find statements to the effect that Serbs and Croats are one people and that they speak a common language” (Nejlor 1996: 18–19).

Serbs were not prepared to identify with the Illyrian name or to give up the Serbian name of either the people or the language. “Vuk’s view that Štokavians were in fact Serbs [...] relied in the views of the then most prominent Slavic scholar, the Viennese professor Franc Miklošič, a Slovene (and not just on his views, J. S.), who, until the end of his life, made a distinction between ‘the Serbian’ (that is, Štokavian) and ‘the Croatian’ (that is, the Čakavian) language... Vuk’s view was challenged by the Croatian philologist Bogoslav Šulek, who warned him in 1856 that a dialect could not be a criterion for determining nationality, for there was historical evidence that among the Štokavian Catholics the name Croatian was **occasionally** (our emphasis!) used. At the same time, he realistically admitted ‘that Slavonians do not call their language Croatian, but Slavonian or Šokcian’...¹⁰ Miklošič’s views were adopted by his disciple Daničić, who published in 1857 the treatise *Разлике између езика Србскога и Хрватскога* (*The Differences between the Serbian and the Croatian Language*)” (Ivić 195–203: 231). However, many connections were established between the Serbian and the Croatian side, and of particular importance were those between the Illyrians and Vuk, whose reputation among them was exceptional. All of the above resulted in the signing of the *Vienna Literary Agreement* in 1850. This Agreement accepted all of Vuk’s orthographic principles (but there is no mention of the name of the language in the text of the Vienna Agreement)¹¹.

¹⁰ The *Šokci* are a South Slavic ethnic group, mainly identified as Croats, living in eastern Croatia, south-eastern Hungary and northern Serbia, translator’s note.

¹¹ “That document, signed by Vuk and Daničić on the Serbian side, and by Ivan Kukuljević, Dimitrije Demetar, Ivan Mažuranić, Vinko Pacel and Stjepan Pejaković on the Croatian side, and also by the Slovene Franc Miklošič, contains a concise presentation of Vuk’s views. The Agreement allowed both the Ekavian and the Ijekavian dialect, on the condition that their use should not be mixed, but recommended the Ijekavian variant, implicitly rejecting the orthographic sign *ě*. Vuk was entrusted with the task of writing *The Main Rules of the Southern Dialect*...

The next step after opting for the Štokavian dialect was its adoption, as well as the adoption of the name for the language – Serbo-Croat, albeit briefly, but that was sufficient for the next phase, which got under way in the 1970's, when the use of the designation Croatian for the language became increasingly pronounced, as were the attempts at establishing and emphasising its specific characteristics and differences in relation to the Serbian language.

1.3. Not so long after Serbo-Croat (or Croato-Serbian, as it was referred to in Croatia) was given its legal (in the Constitution, including the Republican ones, and in legal acts) and normative/standard-related framework, the first to “break with” it were the Croats, precisely those who had insisted on linguistic “unity” through the use of the designations Illyrian and then Serbo-Croat for the language. The year 1967 marked the appearance of *The Declaration on the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language* (supported by a broad circle of Croatian linguists, writers and cultural figures), wherein it was demanded that the Croatian language be constitutionally pronounced independent, and that “the Croatian literary language be consistently used in the sphere of education, journalism, public and political life whenever the Croatian population is involved”, which, as we find in Pavle Ivić, “means outside Croatia as well – but at the same time ‘that employees, teachers and public figures, regardless of their origin, use the official language of their working surroundings’ – which, apart from legalising linguistic animosity, would obviously include the obligation of Serbs living in Croatia to use the ‘Croatian’ literary language... At the same time, the *Declaration* requested that the ‘Croatian literary language’ should penetrate Bosnia and Herzegovina. In other words, the Croats living outside Croatia would get what was denied to another people in Croatia” (Ivić

The Agreement was not realised immediately either among the Croats or among the Serbs... Still, the text remained effective as a programmatic manifesto of decisive importance for the direction of the developments over the course of the ensuing decades” (Milosavljević 2000: 130–131).

2001: 227–229). Several decades later, similar intentions were manifested in the case of “the Bosnian language” as well (of which more later).

In early 1974, when the new Republican Constitutions were in the process of being passed within the framework of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY), the Croatian Constitution was the only one to specifically designate the official language of the Republic, which was formulated in the following manner: “In the Socialist Republic of Croatia, the language publicly used shall be the Croatian literary language – the standard form of the folk language of Croats and Serbs in Croatia, which shall be called Croatian or Serbian”. After this, over the course of the past decades, this process led to the attempt at artificial separation and proving the specific nature (in linguistic and any other terms) of the Croatian language (which has been written about extensively).

1.4. Following Vuk, the Croats also adopted the **Ijekavian dialect** (that is, the [I/J]ekavian pronunciation of the letter [Slavic long vowel] *yat* /*jam* [ǣ]/), and along with it, all the other specific characteristics of the East-Herzegovinian dialect, even though, as Pavle Ivić observes: “In the territory of Croatia, as it was then, the Ijekavian dialect was spoken by Serbs only, as well as the neighbouring Croats here and there who were influenced by them. The regions where the autochthonous Catholic population predominantly spoke the Ijekavian dialect – the coastal area around Dubrovnik, parts of central and eastern Bosnia etc. – were **far outside the Croatian borders**. Even in the more distant regions, **Catholics who spoke the Ijekavian dialect were not very numerous** (our emphasis!). The proportion of Ijekavian speakers among the Catholics who spoke our language barely exceeded ten percent. Most Štokavian Catholics spoke variants of the Ikavian dialect, and among the Illyrians themselves there were such Ikavian speakers (Vjekoslav Babukić, Ignjat Alojze Brlić), but their speech was not taken as the role model. Obviously, other motives were the dominant

factor” (Ivić 2001: 196).¹² The adoption of the Ijekavian dialect, as a predominantly Serbian one, was not without its opponents. Ante Starčević, a Kajkavian speaker, advocated the Ekavian dialect and spoke Ekavian himself. It was none other than Ante Starčević who referred to “Vuk’s Ijekavian speech as ‘bleating’, tripping over it wherever he went, remaining steadfastly faithful to the Ekavian speech, which would be adopted by the Serbs, as well as by himself, whereas the Ijekavian speech would remain Vuk’s legacy and a noble heritage of the time when Vuk’s influence became so deeply rooted in Croatian cultural life” (Novak 1967: 346, quoted from Kovačević 2009/2010: 94).

¹² Opting for the Serbian national affiliation among the Catholics (first of all among Ijekavian speakers) in the 19th and the 20th century was quite common: “The contribution of Catholic intellectuals to this, outside the affiliation of Catholic Serbs, was of such a great extent that they themselves unquestioningly accepted the fact of being ethnic Serbs. Ivo Vojinović in the sphere of literature, Vlaho Bukovac in that of painting and Ivan Meštrović in the realm of sculpture were seen by the public as old Dalmatian Serbs. In early April 1910, the Serbian Ambassador to Vienna informed his government about the affair caused by an exhibition of Ivan Meštrović. The 27-year old artist, little known in the world until then, received great accolades for exhibiting his sculptures of heroes from Serbian history. The Ambassador said in his report that ‘Meštrović, who is a good Serb, took motifs for his works from Serbian folk poetry, especially the epic poetry dealing with the Battle of Kosovo, setting himself the task of commemorating our heroes in his sculptures.’ The Habsburg Ministry of Education made a deal with him, intending to purchase two sculptures of his for the sum of 40,000 crowns. They subsequently apologised and gave up on the deal, ‘because it cannot be allowed in Austria-Hungary to celebrate Serbian history.’ They offered him a one-off grant to continue his training there. Incensed, Meštrović informed the Embassy that, at the exhibition scheduled to be held the following year in Rome, he would not be exhibiting his work in the Habsburg Pavilion but in the Serbian one” (Ekmečić 2011: 333–334). Even according to the data provided by the Independent Republic of Croatia (IRC), before the Second World War the Serbs accounted for a sizeable part of the population of that country: “On 10th April 1941, when the country (that is, the IRC, J. S.) was officially proclaimed, the ideological organ of the Catholic Church, the ‘Hrvatska smotra [Croatian Review]’ periodical, published the information that 3,788,000 Catholics and Muslims, and 1,845,000 Serbs lived in that state” (Ekmečić 2012: 374).

The intellectual circle gathered around the *Zora dalmatinska* [*Dalmatian Dawn*] periodical rejected the Ijekavian pronunciation of the *yat* sound, considering it to be characteristic of the Orthodox part of the Serbian people: “As far back as 1844, there was an ongoing argument with the *Zadar Writers’ Circle*, gathered around *Zora dalmatinska*. Those defenders of the traditional Ikavian literary language of Dalmatia, led by Ante Kuzmanić, rejected the ‘horned ž’, especially the Ijekavian pronunciation, of which they stressed that it was characteristic of ‘the followers of the breakaway Eastern Church’” (Ivić 2001: 196). However, that did not prevent the Croats (at least one part of them) from coming up, one century later on, with a new project, according to which whatever was Ijekavian, in one way or another (openly or in a hidden manner), should be subsumed under the category of “Croatian”, whereas the Serbian language was “left over” with the Ekavian pronunciation of *yat* (that is to say – that only the Ekavian would be treated as Serbian). “As far back as the 1970’s, in Croatia some tried to pass off the thesis that the Ijekavian (‘Herzegovinian’) linguistic type was Croatian, while the Ekavian type was Serbian, which led to divisions even within the Serbian corpus itself, for the Serbian literary language had been developing based on the Ijekavian pronunciation in all the regions except Serbia” (Okuka 2006: 45). Thus, in Munich in 1984, there appeared “A Map of the Croatian Language with the Addition of the Serbian Language”, published by Tomo Matisić, wherein everything that is Ijekavian was subsumed under the designation “Croatian” (see Milosavljević 2007: 93). This was reflected in the Dayton Peace Agreement, which was signed in English and, as it says, three other languages: “The text intended for the Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, who had never been Ekavian speakers, even taking into consideration the post-war forcible introduction of the Ekavian dialect in public use by the authorities at the time, was written in the Serbian language using the Ekavian variant – whereby they were placed in a disadvantageous position compared to the other two peoples in terms of linguistic equality,

or were subsumed under Bosnian, the language in which Alija Izetbegović signed the Peace Agreement on behalf of Bosnia and Herzegovina” (Babić 2016: 20).

In keeping with such a linguistic policy, it can (at least to a certain degree) be understood why Croatia and/or some Croatian linguists and trends support the language designations Bosnian and Croatian. It is not difficult to observe that, by covering these territories by different designations referring to the Serbian language, they leave to Serbian (for the most part) only the territory where *yat* is pronounced the Ekavian way. As it appears, what matters (at least to begin with) is that it is not called Serbian (the language, not the dialect – the Herzegovinian, that is – the East-Herzegovinian one).

1.5. There are also frequent attempts aimed at giving the dialect (which Vuk selected as the literary/standard one) a name different from the established and commonly used one – **Herzegovinian** (alternatively: East-Herzegovinian), so that there occur various designations for it; for example, in Dalibor Brozović and Stjepan Babić we find the following ones: *the new Ikavian system, the standard new Štokavian, the middle South Slavic system...* (Kovačević 2003: 150).

1.6. Parallel with this, there are also attempts at presenting every linguistic variant within the borders of today’s Croatia (both now and **historically** speaking) as the Croatian language and its corpus, but at the same time, those borders are expanded (or in any case, there are attempts at expanding them) beyond the territory of Croatia, wherever there are people who declare themselves as Croats, but not only onto those areas (the same tendency is manifest among the protagonists of the Bosnian/Bosniak language). Projecting the Croatian language in historical terms onto all the writers (and documents) to be found on the territory which Croatia occupies now has been in evidence for a long time, a lot has been written about it, but this tendency has been gaining in intensity of late. Thus, for example, these days we often come across the claim that *Miroslav’s Gospel* is a Croatian cultural monument. In the paper entitled *Whose*

Is Prince Miroslav's Gospel? (Zelić–Bućan, 2/2), we find the following: “A re-examination of the political history of Zahumlje and other areas of the Former Red Croatia in the Middle Ages has produced results on the basis of which it is no longer possible to consider *Miroslav's Gospel* a Serbian cultural monument, either concerning its author, Prince Miroslav, or from the point of view of the ethnic affiliation of his homeland, that is, his place of birth. As regards the author, Prince Miroslav, recent historiographic research (B. Radojković) has disproved the old historiographic fallacy according to which Miroslav, as Nemanja's brother, was politically subordinated to the Serbian Grand Župan [Grand Prince]. It has been established that Zahumlje, until the mid-13th century, was not politically a part of the expanding Serbian state under the Nemanjić dynasty, on the contrary, it has been testified that our Prince Miroslav was a vassal to the Croatian-Hungarian King [...]. Consequently, if *MG* was indeed written in Zahumlje, as many prominent scholars believe, Croatian and Serbian ones alike, then it is beyond doubt that it belongs to the Croatian cultural heritage. If, however, it is proven that it was written in Duklja, which is less likely in view of its author, in such a case only Montenegrins, along with Croats, may lay claim to it as the inheritors of mediaeval Duklja...”¹³ Therefore, judging by such claims, the only thing that matters

¹³ And further on: “By way of conclusion, *MG*, in terms of its script, that is, the ‘Western’, Croatian Cyrillic variety; based on the Croatian linguistic redaction of its Old Church Slavic text; the markedly Western Romance style of its visual artistic presentation, which is entirely in keeping with other contemporary Croatian written documents and those preserved in stone; in terms of its archaic liturgy, which in no way corresponds to the contemporary reformed Constantinople liturgy of the Eastern Church, in a nutshell, neither based on its internal characteristics nor on the place of its creation and the person of its author, can it be considered a Serbian or Orthodox cultural monument [...]. In the current triple issue of the Sarajevo periodical *Hrvatska misao* [Croatian Thought], the Zadar historian Milko Brković claims that *Miroslav's Gospel* belongs to Croatian literature, and not, as has been claimed until now, to Serbian literature” (Zelić–Bućan 2/2).

is: let *Miroslav's Gospel* belong to anyone but to the Serbian cultural and linguistic heritage, which it is indubitably a part of.

In the course of a recently held conference in Croatia, a story of “two Miroslavs” was thought up: “There exist two Miroslavs, a Serbian and a Croatian one. Prince Miroslav of Hum is identified with Nemanja’s brother Miroslav, who was also the Prince of Hum for a while. The father of the Serbian Miroslav was not named Zavida, Zavida was the father of Miroslav of Hum.”¹⁴ As we find in Đorđe Janković: “Cultivating this chaotic state of affairs, of course, they play dumb, deliberately forgetting the donor’s inscription chiselled on the lunette of the Church of St Peter in Bijelo Polje (the very same Prince Miroslav, J. S.), which says: ‘In the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost, I, Zavida’s son, the servant of Our Lord, by the name of Stepan Miroslav, the Prince of Hum, have built this Church of the Holy Apostle Peter.’” On the basis of these brief observations, it is evident how unfounded and unscientific this policy is when it comes to dealing with language and cultural heritage, but at the same time deliberately designed and aggressive.

2. The processes initiated in Croatia were continued **in the area of Bosnia and Herzegovina**, where they assumed new dimensions and different tendencies.

2.1. The Bosnian language project, with the aim of making it the official language of the state on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, was initiated (quite forcefully) during the so-called **time of Kállay**. As a consequence of this, there was a planned development of the language policy in B&H. The political aims that were to be realised in Bosnia and Herzegovina through the designation *the Bosnian language* are revealed in a

¹⁴ Brković published his claim that *Miroslav's Gospel* “is a work of old Croatian, not Serbian literature” in the double issue of the quarterly periodical *Hrvatska misao* (April-September 2004), published by the Sarajevo branch of Matica hrvatska [a Croatian cultural institution] (*Politika*, electronic edition, 18th April 2013).

letter sent by Prime Minister Šeko to “Mr k.k.¹⁵ secret adviser, joint finance minister etc. etc. etc.” Benjamin Kállay (dated 11th February 1884). Among other things, in that letter he stated: “The reasons that have motivated the Government to produce a geography textbook, having first compiled the ABC primer, are not solely didactic but also political, for, on the one hand, a good knowledge of one’s country is conducive to developing one’s love of it, and on the other, in the textbooks Bosnia and Herzegovina will be presented as an integral part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, which will contribute to developing the pupils’ awareness of the fact that their country belongs to the Austro-Hungarian Empire [...]. Concerning the census of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the textbook says that all the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina speak one language (that is to say, the entire domestic population speaks one language); what this was meant to avoid was referring to the language spoken here as either Serbian or Croatian, as it is referred to everywhere outside this country, thereby expressing the Serbian or Croatian national affiliation of our local population, which was to be avoided at any cost in this particular case” (Šipka 2006: 148–149). Soon enough, this was expressed more clearly and specifically: “Soon afterwards, the Austro-Hungarian authorities, after Benjamin Kállay was appointed the ‘Chief Administrator’ of Bosnia and Herzegovina (from 1883 to 1903), established a planned, consistent linguistic policy in their new province: it expressed a strong insistence on cultivating and stimulating Bosnian patriotism, Bosnian consciousness, using the name of Bosnia in all documents, that is, the official inauguration of the new Bosnian nation. In keeping with this, the Austro-Hungarian administration deliberately, according to a plan, developed the linguistic policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina and strove to implement it in practice. Thus, in the year 1890, the term Bosnian language was officially established and approved” (Okuka 2006: 83).

¹⁵ The abbreviation stood for *kaiserlich-königlich*, that is, imperial royal, translator’s note.

A new and different process was initiated, starting as early as the Berlin Congress – that of breaking up the great Serbian state of Herzegovina, whose territories were annexed to various entities, while this process also entailed attempts at suppressing and neutralising the name of Herzegovina and the adjective Herzegovinian. This was pointed out following the publication of *A Grammar of the Bosnian Language* in 1890. In its issue no. 17 of the year 1890, the Serbian periodical *Bosanska vila* [*Bosnian Fairy*] took an ironic view of the publication of this grammar book through the following observation: “In any case, Herzegovinians have the right to protest, why should they learn Bosnian, and not Herzegovinian?” (Okuka 2006: 84).

Support for this project came (not from Miklošič but) from the Croatian linguist **Vatroslav Jagić**, who subsequently, in a way, admitted to having made a mistake. “Exposed to attacks from all sides, Kállay, the wily old politician that he was, made quiet and wise moves... Many things worked in his favour, among them the fact Vatroslav Jagić, a world-renowned scientific authority, succeeded Miklošič at the Viennese Department of Slavic Studies. Kállay’s attempt to draw Miklošič into his policy of Bosnianism and the Bosnian language ended in a fiasco...” (Okuka 2006: 83–87). However, Jagić, even if only for a brief period of time, gave his support to this policy: “I consider it quite justified, for the wise administration of this country to use a term that corresponds to the country’s name...’ There were sharp reactions to Jagić’s statement in both Serbian and Croatian newspapers... However, many years later, in his *Memoirs* (1934), Jagić made a confession, trying to defend himself: ‘What I did, the Devil possess me, I did not to please Kállay but to shed light on all that trouble and misery related to the name [of the language], so I said a few words to the effect that it was not a matter of what he called that language but of what language he used, and as far as that was concerned, that the language of the entire Bosnian administration, its official language, was the very same beautiful and regular language spoken by the government in Belgrade as the Serbian language,

and in Zagreb as the Croatian language... That is how it was, in fact, but Kállay's organs, that is, the entire official correspondence, would not publish everything that I said, but only that which favoured Kállay's intentions, namely, that I defended his 'Bosnian language'" (ibid.). However, **Milan Rešetar** remained faithful to the dialectal structure, which indicated that the area of B&H, in dialectal terms, fit in with the broader Serbian area, that the linguistic isoglosses did not match state borderlines, on the contrary. For that reason, his dialect-related writings were not taken into consideration at all.

Kállay's project lasted until his death: "From 1883 until the death of Baron Kállay in 1902, it was forbidden in Bosnia and Herzegovina to use the existing national names. Instead, 'the Bosnian nation' was officially imposed. Its language was called Bosnian, its entire history was presented as a history of a mythical people separate from the neighbouring Serbs and Croats. The Serbian Cyrillic script was proclaimed to be '*Bosnānčica* [the Bosnian script]', the mediaeval tombstones known as '*stećci* [singular form: *stećak*]' were pronounced to represent a testimony to the existence of a separate 'Bosnian Church' in the Middle Ages, based on the 'Bogomil heresy'. In 1999, the scholar Marien Wenzel came to the historically well-founded conclusion that all this had been done because the occupation powers-that-be 'sought an ideological foundation for separation of Bosnia and Herzegovina from Serbia, which was necessary to them'" (Ekmečić 2011: 315).

After his policy had failed, in 1901 Kállay stated that he would no longer participate "in the old argument over what the language of the state is to be called, whether Serbian, Croatian or Serbo-Croat" (Okuka 2006: 91), so that the term Serbo-Croat was officially established in B&H soon afterwards, in 1907.¹⁶

2.2. The former project introduced by Kállay has become operational again recently in **Bosnia and Herzegovina**: "After

¹⁶ "By another act passed that same year, the Government allowed Muslims to go on calling their language Bosnian in official documents, school certificates etc." (Okuka 2006: 93).

the change of identity from Muslim to Bosniak in 1993, the first Bosnian language manuals were made on the basis of the one introduced by Kállay in 1883” (Ekmečić 2011: 315). Only, this time around the boundaries of Kállay’s project (taken over by the contemporary protagonists) have become even more flexible and adapted to the newly imposed needs and the new circumstances. Now we witness the “crossing” of two parameters and standards, which the protagonists are trying to implement depending on the situation, the way it suits them best: on one occasion, the so-called “reasons of the state” are invoked when it comes to naming the language: – **the name of the language = the name of one part of the state** – Bosnian; on another, what is stressed is the name of the language derived from the name of one part of the state (Bosnia), only now **expanded beyond the boundaries of Bosnia and Herzegovina**, to encompass all the areas where those who declare their national affiliation as Muslim/Bosniak live.

As we find in Miloš Kovačević: “Namely, Bosnian Muslims, during the course of the previous, wartime decade of the 1990’s, changed their previous ethnic name of Muslim by the ethnonym (ethnic name) of Bosniak, while simultaneously choosing the glottonym Bosnian language for the name of their language. In this way, they usurped the right to both essential derivatives (the ethnonym and the ktetic [possessive] form) of the noun Bosnia, forcibly changing their meaning, or subsuming under them the undesirable meanings which not only encroach on the constitutional rights of Serbs (as well as Croats) as the constitutive peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina, but negate them altogether...

The term “the Bosnian language” thus becomes a designation for ‘the language of the state’, that is to say, the language of all Bosnians, of all the inhabitants of B&H... In addition to that, by choosing the ethnonym Bosniaks and the glottonym Bosnian language, Muslims expressly manifested a striving for a unitary B&H” (Kovačević 2007: 152). In this way, by naming the language “Bosnian”, the protagonists of this trend try to impose this name in both territorial and eth-

nic terms (even expanding it compared to the time of Kállay): “The inhabitants, that is, the residents of Bosnia (and the designation *Bosnia* is used as the abbreviated name of Bosnia and Herzegovina in its entirety) are not only Muslims, but also Serbs and Croats in addition to them. Since the Muslims have now ascribed the meaning of the ethnonym (the name of an ethnic group, a people) to the ethnic (the inhabitant of a territory) *Bosniak*, in doing so they have actually, be it deliberately or not, doubly negated the equality of Serbs /and Croats/ in B&H). Firstly, they do so by deliberately imposing, through the linguistic connection between the toponym *Bosnia* and the ethnonym *Bosniak*, the thesis about themselves being the only autochthonous people in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which constitutes a direct threat to the equal status of the Serbs as one of the constitutive peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina. On the other hand, by turning the ethnic (the name of a territory) *Bosniak* into an ethnonym (the name of a people), the Muslims prevent the Serbs (and the Croats) from using the said noun as an ethnic, because that meaning is now mixed with the meaning of the people, so that its use creates a linguistic confusion – whether it refers to an inhabitant of Bosnia or a member of one of the Bosnian peoples. The Muslims have seen to it that the Serbs are denied the possibility of using another synonymous and much more widespread ethnic – *Bosnian*” (Kovačević 2007: 152).

By imposing the name “Bosnian” for the language even outside the territory of B&H (that is, wherever Muslims/Bosniaks – as they declare themselves in national terms – live) they manifest a new and different kind of tendency. In his book *The Bosnian Language* (Sarajevo 1991), Senahid Halilović says that the Bosnian variant (as he calls it) is made up of “the Bosnian-Muslim standard language type, the Bosnian-Serbian and the Bosnian-Croatian standard language type... Bosnian Muslims, therefore, have the inalienable right to call their language by their own name, which also refers to the language spoken by the Muslims of Sandžak, Kosovo and Montenegro, and also

by those of the diaspora (Macedonia and Turkey)” (Halilović 1998). We find the following about this in Miloš Okuka: “What Halilović did here was mix linguistic, geographic and socio-linguistic criteria. Over time, instead of vague statements and some formal degree of consideration shown towards the Serbs and Croats, a clear line was adopted: the Muslim component in the standard language, which is identified with the Bosnian component in general, as if the Serbs and Croats did not exist there. Thus Fahrudin Rizvanbegović said in the *Ljiljan* [*Lily*] periodical of 18th to 25th August 1993 that the Muslims have finally ‘come to their senses’ and seen that the Bosnian language ‘has centuries of tradition, just like Bosnian statehood’, that they have realised that ‘the designation Bosnian language has been narrowed down to the Muslim circle, primarily due to the strengthening of the Serbian and Croatian national awareness as the predominant ones among the Catholic and the Orthodox population in Bosnia” (Okuka 2006: 314).

Until now, a large number of manuals and textbooks have appeared that continue implementing the Bosnian language project as outlined above. On the basis of the content of those manuals, Milanka Babić perceives several basic tendencies: 1) developing an awareness of the most distant past of the Bosnian language, reaching back to the first monuments on the territory of today’s B&H written in the Cyrillic script, which is referred to here as *Bosančica* or *Begovica* [*Bey’s script*]; 2) developing, based on the so-called *Bosnian-Herzegovinian linguistic standard*, an awareness of a special standard (now referred to as the Bosnian language) even during the period of the Serbo-Croat phase, when there was talk of variants – the eastern and the western one; 3) presenting the Bosniaks as the authentic speakers of the state of Bosnia, while linking the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Serbs and Croats linguistically to their own centres – Belgrade and Zagreb (Babić 2016: 57–58). Bosnian-Herzegovinian linguists are striving to proclaim all Serbian speakers the diaspora of “the official Belgrade” (Babić 2016: 135), while claiming, on the other hand, that Vuk “took their language away from the Bos-

niaks, and through the agreement concluded with the Croats (in Vienna in 1850), excluded the Bosnian name for the language (although it remains unclear why Bosnian and not Herzegovinian)” (Babić 2016: 125). As we shall see, identical theses are to be found in the statements given by the representatives of “Montenegrin studies” in Montenegro, in whose opinion Vuk Karadžić “took their language away” from the Montenegrins. What is left unsaid is that Vuk carried out the standardisation, as he pointed out himself, for Serbs of all three faiths, and that he referred to the language which he standardised using no other term but Serbian, and that this designation for the language, in view of the dialectal base, was in keeping with the linguistic and Slavic studies views and designations of that period.

2.3. The intentions, developments and aspirations concerning “the Bosnian language” are testified to, in part openly, in part covertly, by the so-called *Charter on the Bosnian Language* and *Notes on the Charter*. The *Charter* goes one step further – it projects the current aspirations and constructions onto **the level of history**. Thus, in the *Charter* “the Bosnian language” is projected onto “the Bosnian Middle Ages”: in item two, among other things, it says: “By using the term *the Bosnian language*, the Bosniaks are adhering to the naming of their language, whose continuity can be followed from the Bosnian Middle Ages onwards. It is a different matter that there has occurred a hiatus in the Bosniaks’ awareness of being the inheritors of the literary heritage of the Bosnian Middle Ages, which is made up of church books, administrative-legal documents and in particular Bosnian epigraphy... In symbolic terms, that relationship is contained, in a condensed and picturesque manner, in the echoes of the life paths of the children of Katarina, the last Bosnian Queen, and Herceg Stjepan Vukčić Kosača...” (*Notes on the Charter* 2002).

In this way, it is attempted to project onto the level of history the continuity and unity of Bosnia, without any mention of Herzegovina (which would encompass not only today’s B&H but a broader area as well): “We get the first dependable testimony of Bosnia from the Emperor-writer Constantine Porphy-

rogenitus (around 950),¹⁷ through the development of Bosnia during the course of the 11th and 12th centuries, and especially during the reign of Ban¹⁸ Kulin (1180–1204), it gained complete affirmation as a state. Zahumlje (the land of Hum)¹⁹ was acquired by Ban Stjepan II Kotromanić as early as 1322, and as of 1378 (during the rule of King Tvrtko I, that area was an integral part of the BOSNIAN STATE. Therefore, Bosnia also encompasses Hum, which was referred to as Herzegovina by Stjepan Vukčić Kosača...

Since the time when the Kingdom of Bosnia fell into the hands of the Turks in 1463, the name of Bosnia encompassed: Bosnia in the narrow sense of the term, Herzegovina and the Sanjak of Novi Pazar (as units of the former Bosnian Eyalet [Province]). Therefore, the designation of Bosnia and Herze-

¹⁷ However, historical sources, as well as Constantine Porphyrogenitus, testify that the devastated areas were populated by Serbs. In the work of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (*Writing on Peoples, De Administrando Imperio; Byzantine Sources* 1959; Janković 2007), one finds that, after being devastated by the Avars, the land was populated by Serbs: “And since today’s Serbia and Paganía, as well as the lands of Zahumlje, Travunia and Konavle, ruled by the Emperor of the Romans, were devastated by the Avars (who drove Romans out of those lands, who now live in Dalmatia and Dyrrachium [now Durrës, Albania, translator’s note]), the Emperor had these lands populated by the Serbs, and they were the subjects of the Emperor of the Romans; the Emperor had them converted to Christianity, bringing priests from Rome and teaching them to worship in the regular manner, and presenting the Christian faith to them” (Chapter 32, *Byzantine Sources* 1959: 49). As opposed to Serbia, not much information on 12th-century Bosnia has been preserved, but “the well-known Byzantine writer Joannes Kinnamos noted (in the year 1159) that the river Drina separated Bosnia from the rest of Serbia” (Blagojević 2011: 137).

¹⁸ Ban was a noble title used in several states in Central and South-Eastern Europe between the 7th century and the 20th century, primarily in medieval Hungary and Austria and their respective predecessor states, translator’s note.

¹⁹ As can be seen from the text quoted here, regardless of its somewhat distorted perspective, Hum was an old Serbian formation, whereas the borders of the lands of local rulers often changed, as did the rule of the said lands.

govina is not derived from the original tradition, but is more or less connected with the period of the Austrian occupation. That is why in this text the meaning of the syntagms Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian language have a broader meaning: they refer to the Islamicised population of Slavic origin, to Muslims who, in linguistic terms, belong to the standard new Štokavian dialect, that is, to the central Štokavian area, which basically developed within the framework of the former Bosnian Pashaluk” (Munib Maglajić, *Notes on the Charter* 2002). The above quote clearly shows the intentions behind this political-ideological project.

Naturally enough, there is no mention of the Herzegovinian Middle Ages”, nor of the fact that Herzegovinian noblemen bore the title of “Herzeg of St Sava”, and that they considered themselves to be the inheritors of the state tradition of the Serbian Nemanjić dynasty. Stefan Vukčić Kosača took that title in 1449,²⁰ “whereby he was evidently connected to the tradition

²⁰ The attitude towards the Serbian and the Orthodox heritage can be seen from the foundation built by Sandalj Hranić, Stjepan Vukčić Kosača’s predecessor and uncle in Šćepan Polje: “At the foot of Soko grad, in the central part of Šćepan Polje, lie the remains of the once monumental church, **the foundation of Grand Duke Sandalj Hranić**, which is considered to have been dedicated to St Stefan...

The tomb of Grand Duke Sandalj Hranić was located alongside the south wall of the west trave, a place traditionally reserved for burying ktitors [donors]. It was a **custom practised for centuries in the countries of the Byzantine Orthodox world, observed with particular assiduity in the Serbian lands...**

In terms of the shape of its base, that of a single-nave temple divided into three traves, with rectangular-shaped areas for singers, the Church of St Stefan relies on the traditions of **old Rascian building**, which was a significant innovation at the time when it was built. In Serbia, in the final decades of the 14th century and the early 15th century, the dominant shape of a church was that of triconch based of Mt Athos role models. (Our emphases!) The decision of the ktitor, Grand Duke Sandalj, to give his foundation the shape of the older Rascian heritage... indubitably had a deeper significance. By relying on the older traditions, as evidenced by the dedication of the temple to St Stefan, the patron of the state and the Nemanjić dynasty, the ktitor manifested his aspiration towards providing a firmer establishment of his rule in the areas that were formerly a

and heritage of the Nemanjićs, for he possessed the Mileševa monastery, where the tomb of St Sava was located, and also because Rastko Nemanjić had ruled the land of Hum. Stefan was an Orthodox believer, and his spiritual advisor and almost constant confidential companion was Bishop David of the Mileševa Monastery” (Bishop Atanasije Jević 2010: 145, 146).

The Orthodox and the Serbian heritage are visible in both the predecessors and the descendants of Stefan Vukčić Kosača. As we find in historical sources: “**The origin of the Kosača family** is connected to the region of the upper Drina, that is, to an area which was continually a part of the state of the Nemanjićs, where there were no Bogumils, nor could there be any... As the owners of a part of the ancient Serbian lands that belonged to Bosnia, after the unfortunate division agreed upon by Ban Tvrtko and Prince Lazar... the Kosačas very soon managed to establish themselves as independent on that territory, thus forming the special character of the country which was to be called Herzegovina... Significant testimonies have been preserved concerning their manifest Orthodox Christian affiliation... During the reign of Grand Duke Sandalj and his successor Herceg Stefan, which lasted for almost seven decades, a number of Orthodox temples were built. During the first half of the 15th century, that area was the location of a kind of ‘renaissance’ of the Rascian style of building... By building foundations next to the ‘capital’ above Sokol and the temples intended for their burial sites, the Kosačas proved themselves to be the last rulers to con-

part of the Serbian state. By building the foundation and the tomb temple intended for his burial site, Sandalj sided with his predecessors, the Serbian rulers and noblemen. This is also manifested by choosing the traditional burial location next to the south wall of the western trave, as well as the grave site prepared during his lifetime. The Mileševa monastery played an important part and provided a role model for these aspirations; during the first half of the 15th century, until the time of the Turkish conquests, the monastery was in a region ruled by Grand Duke Sandalj and his successor Herceg Stefan. This famous sanctuary, with St Sava’s tomb, was the spiritual centre of the state of the Kosačas, as evidenced by the title borne by Sandalj’s successor – ‘Herceg of St Sava’” (Popović 2010, 21–26).

tinue the Nemanjićs' traditions of the preceding centuries during the period immediately before the final Turkish conquest of the Serbian lands" (Popović 2010: 36–37).²¹ This tradition was also continued by Stjepan's son **Vlatko**: "The yearning for foundations of his own was also what motivated Stjepan's son Herceg Vlatko. In the spring of 1473, he would – apparently with the help of his relative Ivan Crnojević, the Orthodox ruler of Zeta – start building the temple of St Stephen the Protomartyr under the city of Novi. It is interesting to note that, as a ruler, the second 'Herceg of St Sava' took it upon himself to build a church dedicated precisely to the celestial protector of Serbian mediaeval states and rulers. By dedicating the temple to that saint, whose name was borne by his father and his youngest brother, Vlatko followed the example of his ancestor Sandalj Hranić" (Vojvodić 2010: 85). Naturally, within the framework of "the Bosnian Middle Ages" project, there is no mention of the fact that Bosnian rulers bore the title of "the Kings of Serbs" (starting from King Tvrtko), or that King Tvrtko was crowned on the tomb of St Sava, or that throughout these times (even at the Turkish court) the language was predominantly designated as Serbian (sometimes as Bosnian, in a territorial sense, such as, for example, Dubrovnican, Slavonian...). "Bosnianhood", according to the *Notes*, suppressed Serbian and Croatian "na-

²¹ And further on: "It has been established that the tribe of Kosačas originates from the Upper Drina region, where the presence of its heritage has been confirmed. The Podrinje region was the location of the cities where the Kosačas resided the longest, and Stjepan Vukčić always stressed the title *the Prince of Drina* within the framework of the developed Herceg-related intitulation. It is believed, with good reason, that the testimony of the origin of the tribe has also been preserved in the name of the village of Kosače, near Foča. Ever since the earliest times, until 1373, the Upper Podrinje region, together with Foča, was a part of the mediaeval Serbian state, and was under the aegis of the western eparchies of the autocephalous Serbian Church. Therefore, in that particular area Orthodox Christianity had very deep roots, which were occasionally damaged but always renewed... It is highly likely that Herceg Stjepan, as a foundation builder, exceeded the achievements of his uncle, even though the information about Sandalj's and the Herceg's undertakings in the capacity of ktitors is incomplete" (Vojvodić 2010: 83–84).

tional (even nationalist)” activities, and interrupted this “ideal continuity” of the term “Bosnian” from “the time of the Middle Ages”.²²

²² “Namely, concerning the possible meanings of the syntagm *the Bosnian language*, as well as the syntagm *the Bosnian literary Middle Ages*, there is a need to examine the relationship between the heritage and the inheritors, as well as the consequences that this relationship entails. However, while this relationship is rounded off and static in the case of the literary heritage of the Bosnian Middle Ages, the relationship between the heritage and the inheritors in the case of the linguistic heritage is open and dynamic, and the changes of the socio-political framework over time have influenced the linguistic situation in Bosnia from the time of the fall of the Kingdom of Bosnia to the present day. The fundamentally different position of the inheritors of the Bosnian language through the four centuries of Osmanic rule was a watershed when it comes to some tendencies in the development of the language, which, however, did not lead to the disintegration of the essential common core. But the increasing national (even nationalist) propaganda coming from the Serbian and Croatian homeland centres already weakened the power of Bosnianhood in Bosnian Serbs, as well as in Bosnian Croats, towards the end of the Osmanic rule. When, during the Austro-Hungarian era, such developments led to the authorities’ decision that the official name of the language was no longer to be *Bosnian*, but *Serbo-Croat*, as of 1907, there occurred some changes that should be pointed out here. For this debate, it is of fundamental significance that the Austro-Hungarian authorities decided to leave the Bosniaks the option of still calling their language *Bosnian* in the domain of their autonomous activities pertaining to religion, religious education and journalism. **Naturally, this was ruinous for both Bosnia, which could not become a state without the voluntary Bosnianhood of all the three (constitutive) peoples living on its territory, and the Bosniaks, who could not have a state without this** (our emphasis!). Of course, the Bosniaks, even if they were politically more aware and stronger, cannot realise that dream on their own: it must be wished for by the majority of Serbs and Croats, and that is not the case today. Therefore, only with a changed balance of power in Bosnia, which would lead to the realisation of the dream of Bosnia as a normal and functional state, not a Frankenstein-type one, could there be any talk about the broadening and filling the syntagm *the Bosnian language* in a manner different from that of the *Charter*, which is the approach advocated by I. Lovrenović, and indirectly by M. Jeftić, too. Until such wished-for circumstances do occur – whether they can be achieved is a different question – Item One of the *Charter* will suffice: ‘the Bosnian language is the language of Bosniaks and of all those who feel it as their own under that name’..

There are attempts to subsume the entire manuscript linguistic heritage (*The Humac Tablet*, *Miroslav's Gospel* and so on), created from times immemorial on the territory of today's B&H, also comprising the areas that once belonged to Hum/Herzegovina, some of which belong to B&H today, some do not, under the category of the historical heritage of the Bosnian language, and to rename the Serbian cursive Cyrillic script, used in the same area, and call it "*Bosančica*". Thus *The Humac Tablet* (dating from the 10th or the early 11th century), preserved near Humac in Herzegovina, which area was annexed to Bosnia only three centuries later, is classified as part of "the heritage of the Bosnian language" (Samardžić 2015: 77–78). There are also attempts to subsume *Miroslav's Gospel*, written towards the end of the 12th century for Prince Miroslav of Hum (in all likelihood, for the Church of St Peter and Paul in Bijelo Polje), under the category of Bosnian heritage. And so on and so forth. Naturally, the Serbian linguistic character of those manuscripts would not be diminished by the fact that they were created on the territory of the former Bosnian formation.²³

Namely, after a long period during which the language was called *Bosnian*, around the middle of the 19th century the linguistic watershed that had been pointed out in principle began to take shape, in the course of which the national nominations – probably under the influence of the activities of Vuk Karadžić – first appeared among the Serbs, while the Bosnian Croats, after the transient *Illyrian* nomination of the language, turned to the *Croatian* nomination, whereas the Bosniaks embraced the *Bosnian* nomination of the language and firmly and closely linked it to their national affiliation" (*Notes* 2002: concerning *Item One*).

²³ In the charters originating from the area of Bosnia, among the oldest written sources we find data pertaining to referring to the population as the Serbs, to the language as Serbian, which testifies to the general presence of this name on the territory of Bosnia: in a number of his charters, Ban Matej Ninoslav refers to his subjects as Serbs, speaking of a possible conflict and litigation between "Serblyns" and Dubrovnians (who were Wallachians to him, as were all the other Ro-mans) pertaining to trade.

АЗЪ РАБЪ БОЖИ МАТѢН А ОДЛѢЛОЦЬ НИНОСЛАВ. БАНЪ БОСЪНЬСКН... ОПКННѢ ДОУ-
БРОВЪТКОН ТАКОЦЬ С(Ъ)ЦЬ СЕ КЕЛТЪВОЮ КЛАЕЛЪ, КАКОЦЬ СЕ БАНЪ КУАНИНЪ КЛАЕЛЪ. ДА
ХОДЕ ВЛАСН СВОБОДНО НУХЪ ДОБЕНТКЪ ТАКО КАКО СУЪ Ъ БАНА КЪАНИНА ХОДНАН... А СЕ АЩЕ.
АКО ВѢРОУЕ СРЪБЛАННЪ ВЛАХА, ДА СЕ ПРИ ПРѢДЪ КНЕЗЕЦЬ. АКО ВѢРДЕ ВЛАХЪ СРЪБЛАННА

The above serves to point out the absence of any criteria in

да се прн прѣдъ баномъ. (н) нномъ влахъ да не бѣде нзма... [I, God's servant Matej, named Ninoslav, the Ban of Bosnia... swore to the municipality of Dubrovnik by the following oath, also sworn by Ban Kulin, that the Wallachians (that is, the Romanic folk of Dubrovnik) were freely to receive their income, the way they did at the time of Ban Kulin... If a Serb (that is, an inhabitant of Bosnia, a subject of Matej Ninoslav) gave his faith (word, that is made an agreement with...) a Wallachian (that is, an inhabitant of Dubrovnik) that they be judged before the Prince (of Dubrovnik). If a Serb (an inhabitant of Bosnia) gave his faith (word) to a Wallachian (an inhabitant of Dubrovnik) that they be judged before the Ban. And no Wallachian was to be found guilty... (The point here is that the inhabitants of Bosnia were referred to as Serbs by the Ban, whereas the inhabitants of Dubrovnik of Romanic origin were referred to as Wallachians at the time. Later on, the term Wallachian came to mean "nomad", one who moves from one region to another. First the Romanians (Wallachians) moved from the coastal region fleeing the Slavs (and founded Wallachia / Romania), and later still (due to the migrations of the Serbian and Orthodox folk because of the Turks), it was ascribed to the Serbs as well, that is, to the cattle raisers who inhabited the hills. (The name was also given to Welshmen / Wallachians, for they migrated as well.) (The oath taken by Bosnian Ban Matej Ninoslav, dedicated to the Prince and the Municipality of Dubrovnik, 1232–1235, CMCCS 134–135).

We find nominations of this type in other rulers, too:

ТКО ГОДН ГРЕДЕ У СТОЊ НЛИ ДЖЕВРОКТАЊИЊИ НЛИ ВЛАХЪ НЛИ СРЪБЛИЊИ НЛИ ТКО НИИ Н ТАКОЕ Н СТОЊА ДА ПЛАЊА ЦАРЊИЊИ... [Whoever goes to Ston, be it a Wallachian or a Serb, or someone else from Ston, shall pay the customs tax] (Gregory abolishes the customs tax in Ston, 1418, OSCS1/541), in Duke Đurađ Voislavljević: воевода долнихъ краи... ѡ градовнихъ вратаръ... нови... крѣшеваць... н ѡ селъ ѡ тель нхъ застаслю ѡ дръжанью нли сръблннѡ нли влахъ. н к томъ нлѣ придаслю ннхъ плеленнто што нлѣ бнше ѡзео воевода сандалъ... [the Duke of lower regions... in the cities of Vrtar, Novi, Kruševac, as we find them, be it a Serb or a Wallachian, give them back what Duke Sandalj took from them...] (Charter of Duke Đurađ Voislavljević, successor of Herceg Hrvoje Vukčić Hrvatinić, confirming the inherited possessions of the Đurđević brothers, among others, the villages between the Cetina and the Neretva rivers, Potkreševo, 1434).

The language is also referred to as Serbian, of which we have a number of formulations dating from the time of Stefan II Kotromanić:

БАНЪ БОСНИ Н УСО(ОН Н СОЛН) Н ГОЊЪ ХОДСКОН ЗЕМЛАН..., СТАВЛЮ ЈА ГЊЪ БАНЪ СТЕФАНЪ СВОЮ ЗЛАТЪ ПЕЧАТЪ ДА ЈЕ ВЕРОВАНО СВАКИ ДА ЗНАЮТЬ Н ВЪДН ИСТИНЪ А ТОМЪН СЪ .Д. ПОВЕЛЕ ЈЕДАКО ДВНЕ ЛАТННСЦН А ДВН СРЪПСЦН Н СВЕ СЪ ПЕЧАКЕНЕ ЗЛАТНЕДН ПЕЧАТН ДВНЕ СТА ПОВЕЛЕ [The Ban of Bosnia and Usola and Sol and the master of the land of Hum..., I, master Ban, give my golden seal in good

these aspirations to design “the Bosnian language” and its heritage, then expand and stretch it in space and time. The history of the term *Bosančica*, as shown by Biljana Samardžić based on her examination of the relevant literature, begins with the paper published by Ćiro Truhelka in 1889 entitled *Bosančica, a Contribution to Bosnian Palaeography*, which contrasts *Bosančica* to the Serbian Cyrillic script, stating that the only connection between them is their common Greek origin. Such projections, which certainly came into being under the influence of and in connection with Kállay’s policy and the introduction of the Bosnian language, have been revived, especially in recent years, by a circle of linguists from the area of Bosnia and that of Croatia. These linguistic circles manifest one and the same intention – to separate the Cyrillic heritage of B&H from the Serbian script and language. To this end, they modify in various ways the “first-introduced” term “*Bosančica*” (referring to it as “the Bosnian Cyrillic script”, “the Bosnian cursive writing”, “the Bosnian-Croatian Cyrillic script”, “the Croatian Cyrillic script”,

faith, for everyone to know and see the truth, for the purpose of which 4 identical charters, two written in Latin and two in Serbian are herewith confirmed (by the golden seal)] (Ban Stefan cedes Rat, Ston, Prevlaka and the islands around Rat to Dubrovnikans, 1332, copy OSCS1/46); subsequently in Duke Sandalj Hranić (“Duke of Bosnia”), who provides a large number of examples containing the name of the language, “sheet” – “Serbian”. СЛАВНОМЪ И ВЕЛМОЖНОМЪ ВЕЛКОМЪ ВОКЕВАН БОСАНСКОМЪ ГЧНЪ САНДАЛЮ... (in many charters)... ДОННХЪ КНЕЗЪ И ВЛАСТЕЛЕМЪ ДЪБРОВЦНИМЪ ТРИ НИХЪ ЛНСТОВЕ ВПРОВАНЕ И СВЯДОКЪЮ ЕРЕ СОВЪ ЛНСТЪ БАНЪЪ СОВОГАН ЛЮГА ПИСАНЪЪ У СЕМЪ ТЕТРАГЪ И С ДРЪЗНАМЪ ЛНСТОМЪ СРЪПСЦНИМЪ КОН ЗА СОВНИМЪ ЛНСТОМЪ У СЕМЪ ТЕТРАГЪ ПРЪВН... А ЕСТЬ СОВЪ ЛНСТЪ ПИСАНЪ ВЪ ЛНТО РОШЕСТВА ХТВА ТНСЪЩНО И ЧЕТНРА СТА И ШЕСТО ЛНТО ЛНСЕЦА МАЪ ЧЕТВЪРТИ ДАНЪ У ДРЪГН ЛНСТЪ КОН ЗА СОВНЕЕН НДЕ СРПСКИН ЕСТЬ ПИСАНЪ ВЪ ЛНТО РОСТ^а ХРИСТОВА ТНСЪЩНО И ЧЕТНРИ СТА И ШЕСТО ЛНТО... [To the renowned and great Bosnian Duke Mr Sandalj ... Prince of the lower regions, and to the noblemen of Dubrovnik, in three sheets (documents), in good faith and testimony, for this sheet (document) wrote close to mine in this book, and with another sheet in Serbian that immediately follows in this book... and this sheet was written in the year 1460, on 4th May, into another sheet written in Serbian here in 1406...] (Exemption from inheritance and transferring the remainder onto the third sheet, 1407, OCS1/337) etc. There was no different nomination for the language to be found in the period before the arrival of the Turks in these parts.

“the Western Cyrillic script”, “the Bosnian-Dalmatian Cyrillic Script”, etc.), ascribing to it, in keeping with their arbitrary designations, somewhat different contents, but always with one and the same goal – to separate it from its ancient roots, which is the Serbian office cursive writing (developed at the court of King Dragutin, then moved westward). The Cyrillic script in the area of today’s B&H should be viewed as a part of the general set of different varieties of the Serbian cursive Cyrillic script, not as a separate alphabet. The shapes of the letters that are imposed as the specific feature of the so-called Bosnian Cyrillic script neither represent the compactness of this area, nor do they separate it in any way from the wholeness of the richness and variety of the Cyrillic script in the broad area of the Serbian language, but “represent merely partial graphic differences (or rather, variations, J. S.), which cannot constitute proof of the autochthonous nature of a script” (Samardžić 2015: 82). In addition to this, it should be pointed out that a different shape of letters (that is to say, various nuances in the morphology of letters) does not imply the specific nature of a script, especially not of a language. The formal level (the manner of writing letters) is not the same as the essence of the graphic system, that is, the graphic-phonetic connection and realisation within the framework of a linguistic system.

2.4. The attempts at projecting the designation Bosnian language onto the entire area of Bosnia and Herzegovina (and subsequently even beyond its boundaries) are evident in the recent examples of classifying and **subsuming writers** from the entire area of B&H, of all national affiliations, **under the heading “the Bosnian language”**. In 2007, works by the Serbian and Croatian writers living and working in B&H were catalogued by the National and University Library (NUL) of B&H, within the framework of the *Cooperative Online Bibliographic System and Service* (COBISS), as books written in the Bosnian language, and at the same time the content of the old library cards was altered and they were catalogued under the heading “the Bosnian language”. In the library in Sarajevo, the works written by Petar

Kočić were catalogued as written in the Bosnian language, as were 54 books by Ivo Andrić: “At the NUL of B&H, they point out that it is very difficult for them to determine the language of the writers who bring their books to them... ‘It is outrageous that the people at the NUL of B&H, over the past year, in addition to cataloguing Serbian and Croatian writers in the new library cards as writing in the Bosnian language, are altering the old cards as well to the designation of the Bosnian language, which is inappropriate, for those writers write in their own language. The NUL of B&H, in view of what is being done there, can no longer call itself national, it is a proponent of an idea and a policy, and that is the policy of the Bosnian nation and the Bosnian language’, maintains Ranko Risojević, a writer and Director of the National and University Library of the Republic of Srpska. ‘We shall deal with contemporary writers somehow, but what are we to do with the classics? In Sarajevo, Petar Kočić was catalogued under the Bosnian language code, and in his time he was the main opponent of the artificial establishment of the Bosnian language’, Risojević pointed out. As many as 54 books by Ivo Andrić were catalogued as written in the Bosnian language, which is illogical if one takes into consideration the fact that, except for his early poetry, he wrote in the Ekavian dialect’, Risojević stressed, adding that he was acquainted with the existing list” (Basara – Lingo 2007).

The said campaign is carried out without any rules or criteria, that is, each individual feature in the language of a writer is interpreted according to the ideological need and whim of the moment, that is, in keeping with the imposed projection: “To him (that is, Demirović, J. S.), Andrić was a Bosnian-Herzegovinian writer because, in the first place, Andrić’s work was ‘steeped in the Bosnian tradition’, whereas Selimović must be classified among Bosnian-Herzegovinian writers because he wrote in the Ijekavian dialect, moreover, using its “Bosnian” variant. While in the latter case the ‘Bosnian’ Ijekavian dialect was the decisive criterion for categorising writers based

on their national-regional affiliation, in the case of Andrić, his use of the Serbian Ekavian variant was not even mentioned by Demirović” (Sotirović 2009).

3. The language policy in **Montenegro**, in terms of the absurdity of the decisions arising out of it, well and truly outdoes all the others, even though a “common feature” with the policies mentioned above can be observed. The processes in these different territories were initiated in waves, first in the area encompassed by the boundaries of today’s Croatia, then B&H, and more recently Montenegro.

The processes at work in Montenegro today are the least grounded in historical terms (and in any other terms at that). Towards the end of the 18th and in the early 19th century (and even earlier, of which we shall have to say more later on) the designation Serbian was omnipresent in these parts: “In Montenegro, the Metropolitanate of Cetinje laid down the initial foundations of Serbian statehood. The Church was the basic institution for the cultivation of the Serbian language and the traditional culture” (Ekmečić 2011: 114). A gathering of tribal headmen, presided over by Petar I, adopted, on 20th June 1796, “A Decision on the Preservation of Montenegro, ‘which we have defended ever since the time when the Serbian Empire was destroyed, and subsequently until the time of the last principal and headman of ours, Ivan Crnojević. After this, the gathering of headmen passed another document with a similar purpose on 6th August 1796 entitled ‘*cmeza* (oath)’ [...]”. Montenegro was entirely marked by the Serbian tradition: “In May 1798, Petar I sent his envoy Savo Ljubiša of the Paštovići tribe (to Russia, J. S.) with a proposal for establishing an independent Serbian state [...]. He accepted the idea of establishing a Serb-Slavic kingdom, and in 1803 he sent to Russia Arsenije Gagović, the Archimandrite of the Piva monastery. Formally, the initiative came from Metropolitan Stratimirović. It was proposed to the Russian Czar that the Serbian people should unite with Russia”

(ibid., 148–149).²⁴ There are many examples of this kind, and we shall deal with some of them elsewhere in this book (and along with this, we shall deal with the Serbian designation for the language and the script), even though there are so many of them that it is only possible to present a small number of them.

Despite the historical heritage, if fact, in direct opposition to it, what has been unfolding **over the past several years** is an experiment of sorts in connection with the status and identity of the Serbian language in Montenegro. “The Montenegrin language” has been imposed formally (and forcibly), **first of all as a designation** (as a teaching subject within the framework of the educational system, and also in a number of peripheral spheres of activity: on billboards, in ATM’s, menus etc., to get the people to become accustomed to that particular designation to begin with), then through certain **formal legal procedures**, by imposing this designation through the Constitution and various legal acts, and finally, through an entirely misconceived and unsuccessful attempt at standardisation, that is to say, at deviating from the existing standard of the Serbo-Croat/Serbian language.

²⁴ There are plenty of examples dating from this period wherein representatives of state or church powers-that-be are referred to using the designation “Serbian”, for example: даннѣ владника цетинскѣ негошѣ, воеводнѣу сръбьскоѣ землѣ, кѣпнѣ оубо светое евангелѣ [Danilo Njegoš, the Prince-Bishop of Cetinje, the Ruler (Duke) of the Serbian land, bought this Gospel.] (A manuscript note kept in the treasury room in Cetinje, 1732, OSNI 1982: 2/91); They (the Turks, J. S.) were confronted by князь Данило съ нѣговимѣ Сербѣима, и бише се три мѣсеца... [Prince Danilo and his Serbs, and they waged war for three months...] (A note in a printed book in the church in Iliino Brdo, near Pljevlja, 1853, OSNI 1982: 3/131); еписаветь петровна смиренноѣ митрополѣтѣ черногогорскоѣ, скендерѣскоѣ и прѣморскоѣ, трона сербскаѣ езархѣ василѣю петровнѣу..., въ москве, за послуженне службѣнѣ божне рождественскаѣ монастѣра мѣтрополѣи [Yelisaveta Petrovna, to the pacific Metropolitan of Montenegro, Skenderia and the coastal region, the Exarch of the Serbian throne, Vasilije Petrović..., in Moscow, for the Divine Service in the Monastery of the Birth of the Holy Mother of God...] (A note written in Russian in the Church of St John in Krtole, Boka Kotorska, 1753, OSNI 1982: 2/176) etc.

3.1. What links “the Montenegrin language” projects and the Bosnian language projects (and the earlier Croatian language projects) is the **identifying of “language” and the state**. Before the referendum, the basic “justification” for the new designation was that the naming of a language represented a (vaguely defined) democratic right (of the people, nation, a group of individuals – of, for example 20%) “to call their language by their own name”. After the referendum, a new “argument” emerged in Montenegro (in keeping with the newly created situation): “The name of a language is the same (should or must be the same) as the name of the state.”²⁵

3.2. What may also link Montenegro with the Bosnian language project (and, naturally enough, with the situation in Croatia as well) is the **omission of the designations Herzegovina and Herzegovinian**. There are attempts to ignore the fact that it was precisely the **East Herzegovinian dialect** that Vuk took over for the basis of the Serbian language. This is manifested in a number of spheres in Montenegro. (It is well known that the “tradition” of leaving out the name of the dialect is a recent phenomenon – the East Herzegovinian dialect began with Vojislav Nikčević!). Let us give but a few examples. The Council for the Standardisation of “the Montenegrin language”, striving to avoid the designation Herzegovinian, proclaimed “the first principle” of “the model for the Montenegrin standard linguistics-

²⁵ “A language goes together with the state, it shares its name with it, and is given power and affirmation precisely by the state, as Rajka Glušica, PhD, a Professor of General Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy and the Vice-Rector for Social Sciences at the University of Montenegro opined... ‘In a succession of arguments which strongly support the proposal that the Montenegrin language should become a Constitutional category, Professor Glušica singles out two which, in her opinion, are very important ones, namely: the existence of a people that considers its native tongue to be Montenegrin and uses that designation when referring to it, and the reality of the independent and stable state of Montenegro, which will enable the people wishing to do so to call their language using the designation Montenegrin in the state of Montenegro, and which will support and cultivate that language through a mature and wise language policy’” (Glušica 2004: cgdijaspora@cg.yu).

tic norm”, stating that the basis of the “language” was to be “the general linguistic layer that belongs to autochthonous Montenegrin citizens”. Is this not reminiscent of the period when it was expected of Rešetar to present the dialectal uniqueness and autochthonous character of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian space!? However, each of the proposed linguistic features (even those of the nature of doublets) that have been the object of heated arguments conducted by the advocates of “the Montenegrin language” (whether they belong to the standard Serbian language or its dialects), belongs to the East Herzegovinian dialect. Thus, the “proposed” features – the four-accent system, the seven-case system, the Jekavian iotation (of the *ded* [grandfather], *čerati* [chase, fight], *s’esti* [sit down], *iz’esti* [eat] variety...), which are all “autochthonous” forms – first of all, of the East Herzegovinian dialect. The “reformers” did not (that is, did not even try to) take over any linguistic feature that belongs solely to the Zeta-Rascian dialect (and therefore, to old Montenegrin speeches – such as the two-accent system, a reduced number of cases – most often four, etc...), without its being a part of the East-Herzegovinian dialect as well.

On the dialectal level, there are attempts to “formulate” the unity and equality of the dialectal space of Montenegro, which, the way it is presented in Montenegro, is compact and separate from the remainder of the dialectal space of the Serbian language (the area of Montenegro, separated from its surroundings, is divided into two dialects, newly designated as “the South-Eastern Montenegrin” and “the North-Western Montenegrin” dialects). These processes are best reflected by the formulations that one has encountered lately in texts written by the new language reformers (including school textbooks): “the common Montenegrin linguistic layer” (Čirgić), “the Montenegrin linguistic community” (Glušica), (see: Bojović 2015).

A good example of this is *The Mother’s Tongue Textbook for the First Year of General Grammar School* (Rajka Glušica and Dajana Ševaljević, Podgorica 2006). Let us offer two examples from this textbook that provide a good illustration of this process:

1) It is well known that the East Herzegovinian dialect encompasses more than half of the territory of today's Montenegro, that is, the old Herzegovina. But the East Herzegovinian dialect is not to be found in this textbook among the dialects that represent the linguistic space of Montenegro. What we do find in this textbook are the new names of dialects in Montenegro – the area of Montenegro (“separated” from the Štokavian dialect as a whole) is subdivided into two dialectal types (closed within the boundaries of Montenegro): “the speeches of North-Western Montenegro” (these, actually, form a part of the East Herzegovinian dialect – which belongs to today's Montenegro) and “the Zeta-Upper Polimlje” one (a new “dialectal” designation again, within the boundaries of Montenegro); these, judging by the above designations, should be “two autochthonous Montenegrin dialects” (in keeping with the “autochthonous Montenegrin citizens” referred to in “the first principle” formulated by “The Council for the Standardisation of the Montenegrin Language” (we shall have more to say on this in the section entitled *The Serbian Language in Montenegro in the Mirror of Linguistics and Politics*). The aim of this hardly needs to be explained.

2) On page 48, the authors make the following claim: “The speeches of North-Western Montenegro belong to the **southern dialect**, which, according to the Vienna agreement of 1850, was adopted as the basis of the common literary language. Later on, scientists named the southern dialect the **East Herzegovinian dialect**.” This gives rise to the following question – why is it stressed that “[l]ater on, scientists named the southern dialect the East Herzegovinian dialect”? For a very simple reason – because it was not quite like that. The term southern dialect is neither of primary concern, nor does it exclude – “Herzegovinian”. The truth is that both before and after the designation “the southern dialect”, the term “Herzegovinian” was used (and the rules of the southern dialect refer, first of all, to the rules of pronunciation of the Ijekavian *yat*) (see Simić 1991: 345–351). Thus, Vuk Karadžić wrote in *The Grammar of the Serbian Language*, published in 1814 (and the year 1814 presumably

came before 1850 and the Vienna Agreement): “The Serbian language” is divided into three “regional dialects”: the first one being the “**Herzegovinian**” dialect, “used by all the Serbs living in Herzegovina, in Bosnia (of Greek as well as Mohammedan faith), in Montenegro, in Dalmatia, in Croatia and in Serbia, from up north to Mača, to Valjevo and to Karanovci”... The second one is “the Srem dialect”..., the third one is “Slavic” [...]. In addition to the above, in Vuk we often find the designation – “**the Erzegovinian language**”, and he also wrote that “today’s Dubrovnikan language is pure **Erzegovinian**” (Dobrašinović 1980: 119). We also find in Vuk: “I first started writing in this dialect, specifically, according to the **Herzegovinian speech**...” (Karadžić 2001: 37). And also: “I find no dialect lovelier or dearer than the others, all three are equal to me; and I wrote this book (that is, *The Serbian Dictionary*, which came out in 1818, J. S.) in **Herzegovinian**: as it is spoken where I was born,²⁶ and

²⁶ V. S. Karadžić was born in western Serbia, and he learned the language of his ancestors who spoke the East Herzegovinian dialect, the way they did in their home region of Drobñjak, even though the Tršić speech was somewhat different already from that which was used in Petnjica and Drobñjak. “Vuk’s ancestors came to Tršić some eighty years before his first *Dictionary* was published. Even if the immigrants from Drobñjak ‘fell into an empty space’ in Jadar, that is, if they had not mixed with immigrants from other regions (which certainly was not the case here), that period was rather long, and the new circumstances would have left considerable imprint on the vocabulary, for links with the old homeland are maintained with difficulty and on an irregular basis, and many things tend to be forgotten. This becomes particularly important when a person is separated from his/her folklore surroundings, thus severing continual and direct contact with them – which was undoubtedly the case with Vuk. It is, therefore, understandable that Vuk’s lexical sources were limited to the regions that he originated from and to those where he lived for several years before the *Dictionary* was published. Montenegro and Herzegovina were excluded from those regions... It was only in the second edition of the *Dictionary* that lexical material from Montenegro was featured to a considerable degree... Then the Drobñjaks were in Herzegovina, and Vuk expressly pointed out that in Montenegro there was ‘no one he knew’, which was why he entrusted no one with ‘finding subscribers’ for the first edition of the *Dictionary*, which, let me add, contained no words from Montenegro” (Petrović 1995: 38–40).

that was how I first learned to speak from my mother and father” (Karadžić 1818: VI–VII) (Our emphasis!).

3.3. An additional aspect of this phenomenon, which can also be linked to the processes unfolding outside of Montenegro, is **the projection of a fabricated present onto a (distant) history and past**, that is, an attempt at falsifying linguistic and historical facts, the historical continuity of the Serbian language in the area of today’s Montenegro. Just as the name of the Bosnian nation and language (in the *Charter* referred to above) is linked to the name of Herceg Stefan Kosača – the Herceg of St Sava, so in Montenegro, the very same “mother’s tongue” secondary school first-year textbook makes the claim that *Miroslav’s Gospel* belongs to the Zetan redaction (without anything in the way of an explanation of what that term could possibly mean or cover), from which it subsequently derives “the Montenegrin language”, thus attempting to attribute to it the element of “historicity”. However, *Miroslav’s Gospel* represents the oldest preserved monument of the Serb-Slavic language, created (most likely) in the Church of St Peter and Paul, a foundation of the Nemanjićs, the most important foundation of Prince Miroslav, an episcopal church, and as was customary at the time, such churches received magnificent monuments of this kind as gifts (that is to say, their ktitors ordered these gifts for them). It was created in the Lim region, that is, an area which then belonged to Hum (and not Zeta), and after that to Herzegovina until the Berlin Congress. Gligorije the Scribe wrote in his own hand to whom the Gospel was dedicated: it was written for Prince Miroslav of Hum, son of Zavida, brother of Stefan Nemanja (who resided in Blagaj, the capital of the Hum region). In addition to this, the orthography of Gligorije the Scribe belongs to a more recent orthography, with Cyrillic orthographic tendencies (on the basis of which the Rascian orthography was created), and not to the more archaic variety (which is referred to as the Zeta-Hum or the Hum-Bosnian orthography).²⁷ The new “Montenegrin language textbooks” stray

²⁷ For more details on the orthographic tendencies in the Serbian linguistic area, and within its framework, in the region of Zeta, see: Stojanović 2012.

even further into improvisation and lack of scientific foundation: “During the Zeta period, the Zeta (Montenegrin) redaction of the Old Slavic language was developed. The most important representative of that redaction and the most representative work of that period is *Miroslav’s Gospel*, created in Kotor in the 1180’s, and written by two scribes – the Montenegrin Varsameleon of Zeta, who wrote the major part of it, and the Serb Gligorije of Rascia, who wrote the last two pages. The Montenegrin/Zetan redaction is defined as a type of the Old Slavic language whose pronunciation was adjusted to the local language of the copyists from mediaeval Zeta. It is from this redaction that the Bosnian and Serbian redactions of the Old Slavic language subsequently developed” (Čirgić-Šušanj 2011). This is how, retroactively, it is being attempted to subsume everything that is encompassed by Montenegro today under the heading of “Zetan” and “Montenegrin”, irrespective of the fact that the data supplied by history and science are contrary to it. None of this, quite simply, is true, which leads one to assume that what is at work here is either elementary ignorance and lack of knowledge about the historical-linguistic issues dealt with (excluding even the knowledge of the obligatory and simplest educational approach to the matter at hand) or a falsification of the historical and linguistic truth. The “term” “the Zetan redaction” was thought up in order to serve for a forcible subsuming under that category or merely for the purpose of throwing into it whatever is linked to the area of today’s Montenegro. Along with this, the Serbian and the Bosnian redactions are derived from it, no less, but this has nothing in common with the actual linguistic processes and historical facts. To say nothing of confusing the notions of orthography (orthographic tendencies) and language. When you mix all of the above together (and dislocate the said monument territorially on top of everything else), you can make any kind of construction you wish. A lot has been written about the arbitrariness of the terms the Zeta-Hum, the Hum-Bosnian orthography and the like (see: Stojanović 2011), and as for the monument sources, insight into the written heritage easily confirms that the monuments preserved in

the region of Zeta do not have the characteristics of the so-called Zeta-Hum orthography, but those of the more recent Rascian orthography, so that the term the Zeta-Hum orthography (as applied to monuments from the region of Zeta) is inadequate and unfounded (Stojanović 2011).

The textbook forgeries multiply, becoming increasingly absurd and reckless, as evidenced by recent textbooks. In *A First Year Grammar School Reader* (Čogurić et al. 2015), within the segment entitled *Montenegrin Mediaeval Literature* (without providing anything in the way of an explanation of what that is supposed to mean, as if that statement was self-explanatory), among other things, it is written: “A significant monument dating from the end of the 12th century is the Cyrillic monument *Miroslav’s Gospel*, copied in Kotor between 1186 and 1190. It represents a borderline monument to the independent development of **the literature of Zeta** [...]. It was written by two scribes, using two different orthographies, the Zetan and the Rascian one. The main scribe, who wrote using the Zetan orthography, was called Varsameleon, and his assistant, Grigorije the Scribe, wrote using the Rascian orthography... The part written by Varsameleon belongs to Montenegrin literature, whereas the part written by Grigorije the Scribe belongs to Serbian literature. Grigorije was an Ekavian, while Varsameleon was an Ijekavian” (186–187). It was no problem for the Montenegrin educational system (On the contrary!) that none of the above sentences was true, and as regards the data that were given correctly, it is true that *Miroslav’s Gospel* is a monument dating from the end of the 12th century and that one of the scribes was called “Grigorije” (as it was once written in the manuscript), who (we have no way of knowing why this was not written here) also signed his name as Gligorije and Gligor (that is, using the Gl- combination twice). A particularly troublesome issue is the introduction of the “term” “the Zetan orthography”, which, even if it did exist as such (and it does not, especially not in the sense that the science of “Montenegrin studies” is attempting to ascribe to it), it would not have any significance for the language and its structure. The claim that one of the scribes was

Ekavian (Grigorije) and the other Ijekavian (referred to as Varsameleon here, even though that name has been brought into question as such), as formulated here, is entirely nonsensical and untrue. (One only needs to look at the texts of the leading Slavic scholars who have dealt with *Miroslav's Gospel*, or the text of this monument to realise this).²⁸

These are just some of the indicators of this state of affairs, taken from a textbook, which provide a good illustration of the general quality of textbooks and “literature” that *deca*, as well as *djeca* [variant form of the noun *children*, translator's note] in Montenegro learn from.

3.4. The next thing that also links the processes unfolding in Montenegro to the preceding ones (in the area of today's Croatia and B&H) pertains to **categorising writers** (reaching to the furthest historical periods) from the territory of today's Montenegro (who belonged to different areas and formations in historical terms) as belonging to the Montenegrin language and literature (regardless of their opting for the Serbian language, ethnicity, culture and affiliation to it).

Thus, in the *Riječ* [Word] periodical, it is stated that “as far back as the 16th century, and especially in the 17th and 18th centuries, the *Paštrovići documents* from today's (*sic!!!*) coastal region of Montenegro were written in the folk Montenegrin language, that Prince-Bishop Vasilije Petrović wrote in the folk

²⁸ After *Miroslav's Gospel*, all the other monuments from the area of today's Montenegro came to be appropriated: “The following are among the written monuments of old Montenegrin literature: *The Ilovik Nomocanon*, dating from the 13th century, *The Gorica Collection*, dating from the 14th century, *A History of Jerusalem Churches* (this is referred to as a separate written monument, even though it is a part of *The Gorica Collection*, J. S.), *The Ruler's Syntagm*, *Priest Dragolj's Collection*, *Oktoich* (just like that, J. S.), *The Miracles of Blessed Mikula*, *The Statute of Kotor*, *The Statute of Budva*” (187). Consequently, what matters is just to reel off a series of titles and lump them together under the heading “Montenegrin literature”, “the Montenegrin language”..., then think up some bits of information, without offering anything in the way of a justification, and thus create a new history for the new man, who is not supposed to check what is written, just to accept it and blindly believe in it, without any wish to verify the truth of it. And so it goes.

Montenegrin language around the middle of the 18th century, that Petar I Petrović Njegoš was a precursor of Vuk in Montenegro, as he wrote his well-known Epistles in a pure folk language, that the genius author Petar II Petrović Njegoš... wrote his capital works in the Montenegrin language. Apart from Njegoš, two of his most important contemporaries, Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša and Marko Miljanov Popović, also wrote in Montenegrin. Andrija Zmajević of Perast, Voivoda Anto Daković, Vuk Vrčević, Stevan Perović Cuca, Marko Car, Luka Jovović, Novica Kovačević, Savo Vuletić... also wrote in the folk Montenegrin language. I have no wish to go on enumerating all the other writers who wrote their works in the Montenegrin language.

More recently, this has been quite successfully done by Matija Bečković and Miro Vuksanović. These two undoubtedly great writers, a poet and a prose writer, imbued with the spirit of the tiny state of Montenegro, have written their supreme literary achievements in the Montenegrin language... Without this language, a repository of the history of the Montenegrin people, through which a vision of its collective fate is expressed, it is questionable whether Matija and Miro would be what they are” (Radulović 2009: 9–10).

Through these ideas, it is attempted in Montenegro to deny the Serbian language and literature designation to everything created on the territory of today’s Montenegro (and to subsume it forcibly, without any grounding or sense, under the category of the “Montenegrin language” and literature).

4. We believe that the segments referred to above, taken from among the multitude of examples pertaining to the projects of new languages (that is, providing new designations for languages) offer a good illustration of how politics can use science for its purposes, how much effort and forgery is required to try to hide history, linguistic identity and reality – and to what extent the structural, genetic and communicative codes of language resist this – which, in the final analysis, cannot be avoided, after all.

Literature

- Babić 2016: Milanka Babić, *Bosanski problemi srpskog jezika* [*The Bosnian Problems of the Serbian Language*], Jasen, Belgrade.
- Basara-Lingo 2007: Djela srpskih i hrvatskih pisaca zavedena pod bosanski jezik [*The Works of Serbian and Croatian Writers Classified as Written in the Bosnian Language*] (authors: Andrea Basara, Mirsada Lingo), *Nezavisne novine Beta*, 9. 9. 2007.
- Blagojević, 2011: Miloš Blagojević, *Srpska državnost u srednjem veku* [*Serbian Statehood in the Middle Ages*], Srpska književna zadruka, Belgrade.
- Bojović 2014: Draga Bojović, Metode potiskivanja srpskog jezičkog identiteta u Crnoj Gori [*The Methods of Suppressing the Serbian Linguistic Identity in Montenegro*], *Srpski jezik i ćirilica. Osnove srpskog identiteta* [*The Serbian Language and the Cyrillic Script. The Basis of the Serbian Identity*], a collection of papers, Književna zadruga Srpskog narodnog vijeća, 26–32, Podgorica.
- Bojović 2014: Zlata Bojović, *Istorija dubrovačke književnosti* [*A History of the Literature of Dubrovnik*], Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade.
- Byzantine Sources 1959: *Vizantijski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije* [*Byzantine Sources for the History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia*], Vizantološki institut Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti, Posebna izdanja, Knjiga 7, Tom II, Belgrade.
- CMCCS 1/2011: *Zbornik srednjovekovnih ćirilskih povelja i pisama Srbije, Bosne i Dubrovnika* [*A Collection of Mediaeval Cyrillic Charters and Scripts of Serbia, Bosnia and Dubrovnik*]. Knjiga 1. 1186–1321. Istorijski institut Beograd. Izbori za srpsku istoriju knj. 9, Ćirilski izvori knj. 1, Belgrade.
- Vojvodić 2010: Dragan Vojvodić, Ktitorska delatnost Stjepana Vukčića Kosače [*The Activities of Stjepan Vukčić Kosača as a Ktitor*], a collection of papers from the scientific conference *Šćepan Polje i njegove svetinje kroz vjekove* [*Šćepan Polje and Its Sacred Objects through the Centuries*], Svevide-Manastir Zagrađe.
- Glušica 2004: Rajka Glušica, *Država daje snagu jeziku, U žiži* [*The State Strengthens the Language, In Focus*], Crnogorska dijaspora, Centar za iseljenike 2004, Internet address: cgdijaspora@cg.yu.
- Dobrašinović 1980: *Kopitar i Vuk* [*Kopitar and Vuk*], Golub Dobrašinović, PhD (editor), Belgrade, Tršić, Rad, Vukov sabor.

- Ivić 1998: Pavle Ivić, *Pregled istorije srpskog jezika* [An Overview of the History of the Serbian Language], Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci-Noví Sad.
- Ivić 2001: Pavle Ivić, *Srpski narod i njegov jezik* [The Serbian People and Its Language], Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci-Noví Sad.
- Ekmečić 2011: Milorad Ekmečić, *Dugo kretanje između klanja i oranja. Istorija Srba u novom veku (1492–1992)* [A Long Journey between Slaughtering and Ploughing. A History of the Serbs in the New Age], Evro-Đunti, Belgrade.
- Jeftić 2010: Bishop Atanasije Jeftić, O hercegu Stefanu Kosači (1435–1466) i njegovom testamentu [On Herceg Stefan Kosača (1435–1466) and His Testament], a collection of papers from the scientific conference *Šćepan Polje i njegove svetinje kroz vjekove*, Svevide-Manastir Zagrađe.
- Karadžić 2001: Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, *O jeziku i književnosti III* [On Language and Literature III], Prosveta, Belgrade, 2001.
- Karadžić 2001 (2): Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, *Gramatički i polemički spisi, III/1* [Grammatical and Polemical Writings III/1], Prosveta, Belgrade.
- Karadžić 1818: Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, *Srpski rječnik, istolkovan njemačkim i latinskim riječima. Skupio i na svijet izdao Vuk Stefanović. U Beču* [A Dictionary of the Serbian Language Explained by Means of German and Latin Words. Collected and Published by Vuk Stefanović. In Vienna].
- Kastoriadis 1999: Kornelijus Kastoriadis [Cornelius Castoriadis], *Uspon beznačajnosti* [The Rise of Insignificance], Gradac, Čačak.
- Kovačević 2009/2010: Miloš Kovačević, *Zašto je Vuk izabrao baš ijekavicu* [Why Vuk Chose the Ijekavian Dialect], *Časopis za književnost i kulturu Nova Zora*, 24.
- Kovačević 2003: Miloš Kovačević, *Srpski jezik i srpski jezici* [The Serbian Language and Serbian Languages], SKZ-BIGZ, Belgrade.
- Kovačević 2007: Miloš Kovačević, *Srbističke teme* [Serbian Studies Issues], FILUM, Kragujevac.
- Kovačević 2015: Miloš Kovačević, *Jezički kao osnov nacionalnog identiteta u novonastalim balkanskim državama* [The Linguistic Identity as a Basis of the National Identity in the Newly Established Balkan States], *Srpski jezik između nauke i politike* [The Serbian

- Language Between Science and Politics*], Društvo nastavnika srpskog jezika i književnosti Republike Srpske, Banja Luka.
- Kordić 2003: Snježana Kordić: *Mitovi jezičkih ideologa* [*The Myths of Linguistic Ideologues*], Književna republika, Zagreb.
- Milosavljević 2000: Petar Milosavljević, *Srpski filološki program* [*The Serbian Philological Programme*], Trebnik, Beograd.
- Milosavljević 2007: Petar Milosavljević: *Ideja jugoslovenstva i srpska misao* [*The Idea of Yugoslavism and the Serbian Thought*], Knjižotvornica Logos, Valjevo.
- Muratagić-Tuna 2008: Hasnija Muratagić-Tuna: *O rječnicima kao dodacima književnim djelima* [*On Dictionaries as Addenda to Works of Literature*], The Seventh Linguistic Conference “Bošković’s Days”, CANU, Podgorica.
- Nejlor 1996: Kenet Nejlor [Kenneth Naylor], *Sociolingvistički problemi među južnim Slovenima* [*Sociolinguistic Problems among the South Slavs*], Prosveta, Belgrade.
- Notes 2002: Bilješke uz Povelju o bosanskom jeziku (1) [Notes on the Charter of the Bosnian Language (1)], 12th October 2002, Vijeće Kongresa bošnjačkih intelektualaca KBI: Bošnjaci i bošnjački jezik [The Council of the Congress of Bosniak Intellectuals CBI: The Bosniaks and the Bosnian Language], keynote speaker: Munib Maglajić, <http://vkbi.open.net.ba/>.
- Novak 1967: Viktor Novak, *Vuk i Hrvati* [*Vuk and the Croats*], SANU, Belgrade.
- Okuka 2006: Miloš Okuka, *Srpski na kriznom putu* [*The Serbian Language on a Crisis Path*], Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Istočno Sarajevo.
- Pupovac 2014, Milorad Pupovac, *Jezične ideologije, jezične politike i proizvođenje jezične netolerancije u postjugoslavenskim zemljama* [*Linguistic Ideologies, Linguistic Policies and Production of Linguistic Intolerance in Post-Yugoslav Countries*], a collection of papers of the Serbian Language Institute, SANU II, *Srpski jezik u aktuelna pitanja jezičke politike* [*The Serbian Language and the Current Linguistic Policy Issues*], Belgrade.
- Petrović 1995: Dragoljub Petrović, *Škola nemuštog jezika* [*A School of Inarticulate Language*], Novi Sad.
- Popović 2010: Marko Popović, *Soko grad nad Šćepan Poljem* [*Soko City above Šćepan Polje*], a collection of papers from the scientific

- conference *Šćepan Polje i njegove svetinje kroz vjekove*, Sveviđe-Manastir Zagrađe.
- Radulović 2009: Zorica Radulović, *Povodom jednog pitanja: Ima li što na crnogorskom?* [Concerning a Question: Is There Anything in Montenegrin?], *Riječ*, nova serija br. 1, Nikšić.
- Samardžić 2015: Biljana Samardžić, *Stazama srpskog rukopisnog nasljeđa Bosne i Hercegovine* [Following the Paths of the Serbian Manuscript Heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina], Srpsko prosvjetno i kulturno društvo "Prosvjeta", Pale.
- Simić 1991: Radoje Simić: *O našem književnom jeziku* [On Our Literary Language], NIP "Univerzitetska riječ", Nikšić.
- OSCS 1929: Ljubomir Stojanović, *Stare srpske povelje i pisma* [Old Serbian Charters and Scripts], Srpska kraljevska akademija, knj. 1, Belgrade-Sremski Karlovci.
- OSCS 1934: Ljubomir Stojanović, *Stare srpske povelje i pisma*, Srpska kraljevska akademija, knj. 2, Belgrade-Sremski Karlovci.
- OSNI 1982: Ljubomir Stojanović, *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi* [Old Serbian Notes and Inscriptions], Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Matica srpska, Fototipska izdanja, Knj. 1–6, Belgrade.
- Sotirović 2009: Vladislav B. Sotirović, *Sudbina dejtonske BiH i Republika Srpska. Bosanski jezik, Bošnjaci i Bosna i Hercegovina* [The Fate of the Dayton B&H and the Republic of Srpska. The Bosnian Language, Bosniaks and Bosnia and Herzegovina], *Nova srpska politička misao*. Časopis za političku teoriju i društvena istraživanja, Belgrade, 2nd July 2009.
- Stojanović 2011: Jelica Stojanović, *Putevima srpskog jezika i ćirilice* [Following the Paths of the Serbian Language and the Cyrillic Script], Matica srpska-Društvo članova u Crnoj Gori, Nikšić.
- Halilović 1998: Senahid Halilović, *Bosanski jezik* [The Bosnian Language], Sarajevo.
- Čogurić et al. 2015: Čogurić et al. *Čitanka za prvi razred gimnazije* [A First-Year Grammar School Reader] (Aleksandar Čogurić, Milica Vukotić, Andrijana Deletić-Milačić), Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Podgorica.
- Šipka 2006: Milan Šipka, *Jezik i politika* [Language and Politics], Beogradska knjiga, Belgrade.

VUK'S REFORM OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE IN THE CONTEXT OF TWO PRINCIPLES: "WRITE AS YOU SPEAK" AND "GENERAL REGULARITY"

1. Vuk's attitude towards "regularity in language" at the beginning of the reform

Vuk's fruitful work was marked by its symbolic and significant beginning 200 years ago, when his *The Orthography of the Serbian Language, Written on the Basis of the Speech of Simple Folk* was published, and the path of his reform was marked by the famous rule introduced by Adelung: *Write as you speak, read as it is written*. In *The Orthography*, Vuk says: "[...] it seemed to me that this was the easiest way to organise Serbian orthography in accordance with the dictum: *Write as you speak; read as it is written* [...]". For: "A language needs as many letters as there are sounds in its words", Vuk thought, deciding in the course of his reform how many "sounds" and how many "letters" the Serbian language needed.

Speaking about the reform of the Serbian language carried out by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, what is mostly taken as his only principle, or as the primary and predominant one, is Vuk's starting point in the reform, namely, the well-known rule: *Write as you speak, read as it is written*. To a much lesser degree, and insufficiently at that, another important principle of Vuk's reform is discussed: the "general regularity" that Vuk aspired to, which left a considerable mark on his reform and contributed to its development, especially as it moved towards its final phase. From the outset, he was aware of the difficulties that such a starting point (that is, Adelung's rule about the concordance between writing and speaking) would entail: "The first and greatest criticism that will be levelled at my Orthography will have to do with the purpose of the orthography: to tell the truth, I have had my doubts and have thought about this a lot, but in the final analysis, it seemed to me that the easiest

way to organise the Serbian Orthography in accordance with the dictum: Write as you speak; read as it is written... Nor can one expect a man, whoever he may be, **to provide a single path and to set orthography rules that all Serbian writers would apply** (Emphasis by means of bold letters is ours!); it would be necessary for the Serbs to hold an assembly dedicated to this issue, so as to come to an agreement and announce to one and all the adoption of an Orthography approved by all, which would be adhered to by everyone willingly, even though he may write *iy* (ѣ), let alone *ie* (ѣ) and *ia* (ѣ)” (Karadžić 1968, XII/I: 31). Even though in the initial phase he proceeded from the view that each writer should use his own dialect, at the same time he set “the rules of orthography” as a basis, rules on account of which “the Serbs should hold an assembly”, aware of the fact that the Serbian language and its norms cannot be abandoned to chaos. In his reform, thus, Vuk, proceeding from *Write as you speak*, bore in mind “the rules of orthography” (for a start, that every writer should write in his own dialect, and in doing so, “each writer must bear in mind stable rules that he will adhere to”; purity and regularity are to be found in the folk speech,¹ but towards the end of the reform, he arrived at that which was supradialectal and generally acceptable).

Getting to know the situation of Serbian dialects “in the field”, Vuk sought and found that which is systemic and generally acceptable, stable and balanced in the language, all of which can be subsumed under its “general regularity”, which he strove

¹ “In the first years of his work as a writer, from 1814 to 1817, the young Vuk formulated his views of the literary language: ‘writers must abide by the pure and uncorrupted speech of the Serbian people’, ‘we must take our grammar from shepherds and ploughmen, and as for the rest (that is, the lexis) we shall come to an agreement about that’; the speech of the simple folk is not ‘simple’ in itself, ‘only their thoughts are simple, but what is at a high level in Homer’s Iliad cannot be simple in the Serbian language either’; each writer should write in his own dialect, the role model of which is ancient Greece with its mosaic of dialectal literatures; ‘each writer should bear in mind stable rules that he adheres to’” (Ivić 1990: 225).

for and attained to a great degree by the end of his reform. From the very start, he thought about the language rules, proceeding from the assumption that the regularity of the language is to be found in folk dialects. As early as 1817, Vuk said: "All our **people**, especially those living in villages, where there are not many writers to be found, **speak regularly according to Grammar...**" (Karadžić 1966: 97; Simić 1991: 158). In 1820, we come across similar thoughts of his: "**The Serbian language has rules**, just like Latin (there is no language in this world that has no rules), but they [that is, his opponents, J. S.] do not know the language, nor do they know its rules, and they blame the language for this, and it seems easier to them, and less shameful at that, to develop a new language without any rules than to learn the folk language according to the rules!" (Karadžić 1996: 96, 101).²

In the year 1821, Vuk wrote: "If **writers** have any power in the realm of language, I believe, they do so in matters of grammar; when common people are undecided about them, **they select that which is most regular**" (Karadžić 1948: 64). Here he already mentions grammatical regularity and selecting that which is "most regular", thus distancing himself from the requirement that each writer should use his own dialect (Ivić 1990: 229-230).³ All this hints at and leads to what Vuk's reform

² "Starting, in the year 1820, to talk about 'simplicity', that is, 'regularity' in the language in a more detailed manner, contrasting these terms, he pointed out that 'speaking of simplicity, we should not be referring to peasants only, and other people who have had no schooling, but to anyone who does not understand things, even though he may have studied a lot, or if he had ten villages and as many carriages drawn by four horses, and God knows how many servants and thousands in his coffers...'" (Karadžić 1996: 96, 101; Simić 1991: 159).

³ "The basis is to be found among the people: 'The higher class of people should speak their language in a more refined way and with a greater degree of purity, and they should be more learned than the common people, wiser, more civil, more harmonious and patriotic, but all those things are awry in our higher class. It is true that many of our gentlemen have studied a lot and possess knowledge that common people do not have; however, what they have learned most are crafts of sorts, which did more harm than good to the hearts and minds of many; in

would bring in the end, which could be subsumed under (as Vuk called it) “general regularity”.

The reform, thus, went through development phases; Vuk defined the issues, pondered them, resolved the problems taking into consideration the linguistic heritage, confronting the practice in the field, mindful of the need for the norms of the Serbian language to be broadly acceptable and well founded. His reform cannot be viewed in a simplified and superficial manner, for it was complex and deeply thought through. We shall briefly deal with the matters that are most important concerning the processes and phases in Vuk’s reform, which best reflect its character, namely: 1. the pronunciation of *yat*, 2. the consonant *h*, and in connection with this *f* and *dž*, 3. the iotised/non-iotised forms *tj* and *dj*.

2. Selecting the norm and the vowel *yat*

Concerning the pronunciation of *yat*, Vuk was more or less consistent from the beginning of his reform, allowing two pronunciation variants, even though he favoured the Ijekavian, that is, Herzegovinian speech, “the southern dialect”, until the end of his reform, although he occasionally wrote in Ekavian – “to provide an example of this dialect” (as Vuk himself

other matters, they acted like the Germans and Hungarians, thus becoming estranged from their own people and their customs; having studied in foreign languages, which they use when working and conversing in society, they have even forgotten to think in Serbian, as well as the folk language, whose power, joy and riches they no longer know, and which seems unrefined and poor to them because they have spoiled it and keep spoiling it... That is why all of the learned Europe marvels at the creations of our people and praises our people for them, whereas the creations of our learned people are mostly such that everyone who knows them must laugh at them and pity the people, as they do not have more learned individuals worthy of their folk” (according to Kovačević 2005: 24).

said).⁴ Initially, he opted for the Herzegovinian speech, which he felt close to linguistically ("...I first started writing in this dialect, based on the Herzegovinian speech", Karadžić 2001: 38). As early as 1814, in *Serbian Folk Songs*, he wrote: "Some may find it funny that I write: *лиено* (nice), *биело* (white), *свiет* (world), *рiеч* (word), but I ask forgiveness of everyone who does not like this. I know that in Slavic books it says: *лѣно*, *бѣло*, *снѣг* (snow), *рѣч*, *свѣт*; and Serbs in the regions of Srem, Ваџка, Banat, as well as those around the Sava and Danube rivers say: *лепо*, *бело*, *снег*, *свет*; but Serbs in Croatia, Dalmatia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro, as well as those in Serbia to Valjevo and Karanovci, they all say: *лиено*, *биело*, *свiет*, *рiеч*, *лiек* (medicine), *рiека* (river) etc." (V. Karadžić 1965/I: 127). Concerning the three variant pronunciations of "yat", Vuk, as a matter of principle, advocates a freedom of choice (in the *Orthography*): "As to which of the three variants is the nicest and best, that would be difficult to decide; for everyone would claim that it is the form he has been used to since childhood; it may be that all three are of equal worth. I wrote the way I did here for two reasons: for one thing, that was the way I heard it spoken by my mother and was used to it as a child, so that now its sound is more pleasing to my ears; for another, this is the way they speak in the region where I listened to these songs" (Karadžić 1965/I: 127).

In the beginning, Vuk was focused on the differences between two types of language (the relationship between the folk

⁴ "Many of our writers have used the eastern (Ekavian) dialect in their writing, and said that it was to be used when writing; it is, however, possible that there is not yet a book that has been written consistently using it. I tried in the book Miloš Obrenović, Prince of Serbia, or Sources for the Serbian History of Our Time (published in Buda in 1828) to provide an example of this dialect, and I think I did it well, only I did not dare say *несам* [I did not], for I had heard that in Belgrade and Kragujevac they laughed at those who spoke like that; but everyone who knows about this must admit that, in this dialect, the more regular form is *несам* rather than *нисам*, as is the case with *зде* [where] of our time (in Buda in 1828), to be favoured over *зди*..." (Karadžić 1896).

and the “Slavic” language); in the *Orthography*, he already spoke about the differences between folk dialects:⁵ “No people (even though they may speak one and the same language) speaks the same everywhere, but in almost every region there are small or big differences in the manner of speaking. There are regional differences in the Serbian language as well, and on the basis of these differences the Serbian language may be divided into three regional dialects, namely: ...the Herzegovinian, Sremian, Slavonian ones...” Vuk concluded, at the same time pointing out the directions in which they spread (Karadžić 1965: 112). Later on, he somewhat modified and formulated this view more precisely (than in *Folk Songs*), speaking of the Ekavian, Ikavian and Ijekavian types: “The greatest difference between these regions is reflected in how they pronounce the letter y: all Serbs have noticed (as if they had all been told this) that the letter y is composed from i and e: that is why Herzegovinians have split it when pronouncing some words, and they pronounce it ie, e.g. *свет, реч*... Whereas in some words they have taken that i as signifying the softening of pronunciation, like q, e.g. *дјевоица* (girl), *дјед* (grandfather)... And then again, in some words they pronounce it as a whole, blending it into ie, e.g. *вјера* (faith), *вјетар* (wind)... Whereas Sremians have left out y altogether and pronounce only e, e.g. *вера, мера*... And Slavonians, for their part, have left out e, and only pronounce u, e.g. *випа* (faith), *думе* (child)” (V. S. Karadžić 1968:112–113).

We find similar formulations in *The Serbian Dictionary*, where, speaking about the beauty of the folk language,⁶ Vuk has this to say about its dialects: “None of these dialects is

⁵ “Not noticing at first that he was dealing with two different languages here, that is, the ‘Slavic’ and the folk language, Vuk classified two different phenomena as one and the same. In the *Orthography*, however, he modified his view and spoke solely about the differences between the folk dialects of the Ekavian, Ijekavian and Ikavian type” (Simić 1991: 200).

⁶ “I am convinced that my efforts and work will be appreciated by all our writers who are fond of their folk language and cherish it as the greatest treasure of our people, wishing that it should prosper; I had no wish to please those who speak the Serbian language but condemn it,

dearer to me than the others, all three are equal to me; I have written this book in the Herzegovinian dialect: a) because it is spoken in the region where I was born, and that was how I learned to speak from my father; b) so that the inhabitants of Srijem, Bačka and Banat can see how their brothers in these lands speak: why nothing has been written about it until now" (Karadžić 1818: XVII).

In the *Vienna Literary Agreement*, these formulations were developed along the same lines with greater precision, the emphasis being on consistency and "regularity": "And so we: 1. unanimously agreed that it is not good to mix dialects in order to create a new one, which is not spoken by the people; it is better to choose one among the folk dialects to be the language of literature... 2. We unanimously agreed that the correct and best thing to do is to take the southern dialect⁷ and use it as the literary language... If anyone, for any reason whatsoever, does not wish to write using this dialect, we think that, for the sake of the people and literary unity, the most useful thing to do would be to write using one of the other two dialects, as a matter of free choice, but without mixing them and creating a language that is not spoken by the people" (in: Simić-Ostojić 1998: 103).

As regards the vocabulary, from the earliest phase onwards, Vuk allowed the greatest possible freedom, realising that lexical differences were not something that could obstruct the unity and uniformity of a language, on the contrary: "...If some call a girl a lass, while others say *ложница* for *кажика* [synonyms for spoon], that is but a small difference" (Karadžić 1968: 113).

saying that it is no language at all, but a corrupt language of cowhands and pigherds" (Karadžić 1818: IX).

⁷ "As has been pointed out a number of times, the main difference in our language concerns the pronunciation of those sounds written in the Slavic language using the letter *ѣ*; depending on its pronunciation, our language is divided into three main dialects, that is, the eastern, southern and western one", as pointed out in the introductory section of *The Rules of the Southern Dialect*, which Vuk was entrusted with writing (in: Simić-Ostojić 1998: 104).

3. Selecting the norm and writing the consonant *x* (or not)

3.1. Vuk's hesitation and pondering the issue of writing the consonant *x* or not is very interesting and significant. One often gets a simplified impression of this: in Vuk's reform there is no consonant *x* to be found until he heard it in Dubrovnik and in certain Montenegrin dialects (the situation is similar with the *mj* and *đj* forms, in words such as *mjepamu* [chase away], *đjevojka* [girl], of which more later). This issue is both different and much more complex than such a simplified or, to put it more precisely, largely erroneous representation (which can be encountered in various textbooks, manuals and the like). Vuk's reform had several phases: he started from the principle "Write as you speak" (although not in such a reduced form even in the initial phase), re-examining a number of issues from the very start, searching for the right solutions, and he arrived at the formulation of the principle of "general regularity" and its implementation in the process of developing and stabilising the norm of the Serbian language. From the very start of his reform, he pondered the issue of what to do with the consonant *x*.

3.2. Before publishing the *Orthography*, Vuk used *x* (*h*). In an article written for "The Serbian News from the Royal City of Vienna" (*Review of Serbian News*), the issue of 2nd January to 6th February 1814, we find: "...writing them (*ux*) so that everyone... can understand" (1968: 15); *Хенкел* (Henckel), *ухвате* (catch), *хотѣли* (wanted), *Хановер* (Hannover) (16,17).

3.3. In the first phase of his reform, Vuk tended to omit *h* (starting with *Orthography*) rather more often than the other way round, relying on the situation as it was in most Serbian dialects. However, he did not leave it out altogether, and not without thinking about it. Concerning the issue of writing the consonant *h* (or not), Vuk was visibly hesitant from the very start, thinking about how best to resolve it, and he never neglected it in any of the phases of his reform.⁸

⁸ "It was Sava Mrkalj who, in his study *The Fat of the Thick Yer* (*Сало дебелозга јера*), introduced a distinction in the list of Serbian letters that

Both in *Folk Songs* and in *Orthography* (1814) Vuk is hesitant: "Serbs quite simply find it difficult to pronounce the letter *h*; they either omit it altogether, for example, instead of *Христос* [Christ], *хоћу* [I want], *ораш* [walnut], they say: *Пустос*, *оћу*, *ора*; alternatively, they turn it into a different letter, especially *v* (*в*) and *k* (*к*), e.g. instead of *сухи* [dry], they say *суви*, *женик* [bridegroom]. Serbs in Herzegovina and Montenegro, when using verbs in the past simple tense, change it to *g* (*г*), for example, instead of *бух* (was), *видіех* (saw), *наїдох* (found), they say *буг*, *видьег*, *надьог*, *додьог* (came), and so on. That is why the letter *h*, when it is at the beginning of a word, in front of a vowel, or in the middle, between two vowels, can be omitted in the Serbian language, e.g. *хоћу*, *маховина* (moss), *духовник* (priest) can be written as: *оћу*, *маовина*, *дуовник*. **It could be written everywhere, wherever it occurs in the Slavic language, but without pronouncing it more forcefully than the German *h* without *c*; in this way, it could be very useful to us in a number of places**" (Karadžić 1968, XII/I: 39). "At the level of phonology, Vuk establishes two subsystems: the basic one, with 28 phonological units, and the additional one, with two extra units – *h* and *f*..." (Simić: 1996: 13, 34). Vuk included *h* and *f* among those letters that are "appropriate for us", of which he enumerated 24: "Of such letters, appropriate for us... there are 24, namely: б, в, г, д, дь, ж, з, ї, к, л, ль, м, н, нь, п, р, с, т, ѣ, ф, х, ц, ч, ш" (Karadžić 1968 XII/I: 38).

From the beginning, when he decided to omit the consonant *h*, the greatest problem for Vuk were foreign languages, in view of the presence of words of foreign origin in the Serbian language, as were Slavic languages also (and in connection with this etymology as well, whenever he embarked on theoretical-historical pondering, the problem of the consonant *h* arose), but that was not all there was to this problem.

would haunt Vuk for almost two decades before he got over it. Mrkalj writes the following about *f* (*ф*) and *h* (*х*): a) 'f is for foreign words'; б) 'Serbian peasants do not know of *h*; however, people who have some learning always pronounce it, which is why I use it'" (Simić 1991: 260).

In the actual text of *Orthography*, there is no consistency in writing (or omitting) *h*. There are more examples of omitting *h* than of writing it (for example: судити *оће* [want to judge], 35; examples with the initial *ć*- (*ћ*-) instead of *htj*- (*хтј*-) occur regularly, for example: ми ћемо *ћети*...[we shall want], да ја *ћадиах*... [if I wanted] да они *ћадиау*... [if they wanted] (78), etc.; furthermore, we find *оћу-оћеш-оће* [I/you/he want(s)] – *оћемо-оћете-оће* [we/you/they want]; *њиов* [their(s)] (64), etc.

But there are also quite a few examples of written Serbian words containing the letter *h*: “коіе кад би ми све *хотіели* писменима разликовати... [which, even if we wanted to distinguish them by letters]” (36), “*Херцеговини*” (38); *и* [’em], as a contracted form of *их* [them] (41), *Херцеговачко*, *Херцеговини*, *Херцеговци* (112); and when he provides examples for the degrees of comparison of the adjective *brave*, he writes them with the initial *h* (*x*): *храбри*, *храбриу* (58); *храбриу*, *наіхрабриу* (59); “...у којем се лице или ствар *находи* [wherein a person or thing is located]...” (66), “...*предходом* [preceding]...” (69); “present tense: *Хотећи*, *а*, *е*; past tense: *Хотіевиши*, *а*, *е*” (79).

When explaining sound changes, Vuk regularly deals with alternative variants featuring *h* (being aware of their etymological position and historicity): “Proper names ending in *g*, *z*, *k*, *h* (*z*, *з*, *к*, *х*), when used in the vocative case singular, change *z* and *з* to *ж* (*ж*), *к* to *ч* (*ч*), and *х* to *ш* (*ш*); in the dative plural case, they change *z* to *з*, *к* to *с* (*ц*), and *х* to *с* (*с*) [...]; thus *Влах* (Wallach) in the vocative case singular becomes *Влаше*..., while in the dative case plural *Власи* (Wallachs) becomes *Власима*...” (48). Also, when dealing with feminine gender nouns, he gives the example of alternative variants: “...those ending in *ка*, *га*, *ха*, when used in the dative case singular... *снаха* (daughter-in-law)⁹ becomes *снаси*” (49). Then he offers examples of verb forms conjugation where the suffix contains *h*, as opposed to other forms, which contain a different combination of sounds

⁹ In a footnote to this, he adds: “One rarely hears the sound *h* pronounced among Serbs in these words; instead, they say *снаа*, while in the dative case they use both *снаи* and *снаси*...” (49).

("The imperfect tense is formed when the final *m* of the present tense is changed to *h*, as in *чувам* (guard, preserve), *чувах*...; in the second and third person singular, *h* is changed to *še* (*ше*); whereas in the plural *h* is not featured: the first person ends in *smo*, the second in *ste*, and the third in *u* (*y*)..." etc. (86); "The imperfect tense is formed... by changing [the infinitive ending] *ti* (*му*) to *h*, for example *писаму* (write) becomes *писах*, *црпљаму* (grind) becomes *црпљах*" (93)..., etc.; "The pluperfect tense... by changing *h* to *o*...: *црпљах* becomes *црпљао*..." (94). Therefore, the sound *h* is always featured in Vuk's theoretical analyses.

Vuk found it hard to completely "renounce" the use of the consonant *h*, especially in certain positions with morpho-phonological functions, although he provided no justification for this. Thus, in *Orthography*, providing examples for conjugation, he mainly wrote the consonant *h* at the end of a word, in the first person singular of the aorist and imperfect tenses, but it is not to be found in the middle of a word in the third person plural: "the imperfect tense: *да ја бях* (I was)..., but *да они биау* (they were); the aorist tense *да ја бих* (1968: 73); the pluperfect tense *да ја биах* (I had been),¹⁰ also *биах*, *бих* but *биау* (71)..., *бивах*, *бивау* (74)... *ћадиах-ћадиаше-ћадиау* (wanted)...; *ћедох-ћеде*...; *ћео*... (1968: 77); *оћу-оћеш* (I/you want)... (77), but *ћадиах*...; *ћах*...; *ћедох*, *ћеде*... (77); *карах* (I scolded)... -*карау* (they scolded)...; ("the imperfect tense") *орах-ораше* (I/you ploughed; *бивах-биваше*...-*бивау*...; *бих*...; (83)..., *творах* (I created)... -*твориау* (they created); *творих*... (97), "the imperfect tense... *ја говорах* (I spoke)..., *ја лубубих* (I kissed) (70) etc." (Karadžić 1968/I).

In the examples featuring pronouns and adjectives in the plural genitive and accusative cases, however, he does not write *h*: *нитомие* (tame), *ми* (55),¹¹ *врућие* (hot), *врући* (56), *сви*

¹⁰ In a footnote to this: "The letter *h* is not pronounced vigorously here, but like the German *h*" (Karadžić 1965: 71).

¹¹ "In the plural nominative case, all three gender forms have two variants: *нитомие* or *нитоми*, the first form being used by common

(all) (57), *они*, *нѣи* (plural genitive case), *и* (plural accusative case), (63); *моѣе*, *моѣи* (64), *тѣе*, *тѣи* (65). But here, too, he manifested a certain degree of indecision: “in the plural nominative case, all three gender forms have two variants: *нѣтомие* or *нѣтоми...*” (55); “As for the plural genitive case, it was derived from the Slavic form, **but omitting the letter *h***; however, **both forms are acceptable**” (56).

3.3.a. After the publication of *Orthography*, Vuk used the letter *h* (*x*) in his correspondence. In “A Review of Vidaković’s *Lonesome Youngster*” (*Рецензіа о книзи зовомой Усамлений юноша, повѣст нравоучителна од Милована Видаковића, Новине србске /The Serbian Journal, 1815*) we come across: “*храбрыхъ* мужева (brave men), *знаменитыхъ* мѣста, от *коихъ* нека и данас стое (famous places, some of which still exist)”; “*разныхъ* (various), *силныхъ* (powerful), *чистыхъ* (pure)” (125); “ово бы Србљинъ казао: по *врховима* ли-снатыхъ дрвета (as a Serb would say: on top of leafy trees)” (127), “*нѣкихъ* (some)..., а особити ово *поточићахъ* (and especially those brooks)...” (128); “*предходећой* (preceding)... *хоће* (wants)...” (129); “к’ глаголу *хоћу* (for the verb *want*)”, *Херцеговини* (to Herzegovina) (130).

3.3.b. In *Одговору на Палинодію* (A Reply to the Palinode), or *У обрану дебелого ера ѿ* (In Defence of the Thick Yer), we also come across examples of the use of *h* (*x*) (e.g. “писао какве *стихове* /wrote some verses/), although the number of cases where the use of *x* would be possible is small. He also discusses the use of *ѿ* (with *p* before a vowel) as opposed to *x* (“*врѿу*, not *врху*”), but concludes that *x* “**is very much needed**” in the cases where it cannot be replaced by *ѿ* (*мапати машемъ* /to wave, I wave/, *яхати яшемъ* /to ride, I ride/, *оран орана ораси* /walnut, genitive case, walnuts/): “That a Serb says: На *врѿу* (On top), not на *врху*, *врѿови*, not *врхови*, *трѿо* (rubbed), not

folk: each Serb who was born and raised in a village will remember that rural Serbs say: *сувие крушака* (dry pears), *зрелие ябука* (ripe apples) and the like. This is especially so in poems: *Од кундака нашије пушака* (Of the butts of our rifles)” (Karadžić 1968: *Orthography* 55–56).

трео..." (136); "It is possible that in our entire language there are not as many as 10 words where we could write *ѣ* instead of *х* (all of them with *р*), such as *врѣови, скрѣати* (break) etc. If we had a letter like the Latin *h*, then we could write *врh, врhа, врhy, крhати* etc. Such a letter would be very useful to us for many other words as well, where *ѣ* is of no use, for example, *маhати машемъ, яхати яшемъ, орах ораhа ораси*; and especially for foreign proper names (of people and cities), for example, *Hagedorn, Haller, Hamburg* and other names like these, how are we to write them? The Russians write them like this: *Гагедорнъ, Галлер, Гамбургъ*" (139).

3.3.c. In *Review of Books I and II of Vidaković's "Ljubomir in Jerusalem"* (Друга Рецензија Србска. Любомир у Елисиуму, морална повѣст, Сочинена отъ Милована Видаковиѣа, Дѣтвовоспитателя, Новине Србске nos. 57–68, 1817) Vuk uses *х* less often, mostly in words of foreign origin and quotes: *оћели кодъ нѣи преноћити* (will he spend the night at their place) (159), *Ерватској* (Croatian) (177), *оће* (183), and consistently: *Ерцеговина, Ерцеговицы* (143), *Ерцеговине* (146), etc., all without *х*, but: *Харалампіа* (145); *Плахиди Архитектону* (Plachidus Architectonus), *Архи-Епископа* (Archbishop) (147), *Србскогъ характера* (Serbian character) (155), *характеръ* (174).

3.3.d. In *Додатаку къ мнѣнію „О писмены НН у нашимъ причастіама“*, no. 25 of *Нов. Србски*, p. 198. *To the Editorial Board*, when giving examples for 1st person singular verb forms, he always wrote *х* (there are 20–30 examples in all): *собрахъ* (gathered), *собирахъ, куповахъ* (bought); in the text itself, he did not use *х*: *нѣиовомъ* (their) (220).

3.3.e. In *A Reply to Mr – C – Concerning His Opinion of the Serbian Grammar*, nos. 45 and 46 of *Нов. Србски*, p. 80, 1817, Vuk Karadžić expresses the opinion that the consonant *х* should not be retained in "our words": "As he (that is, Sava Mrkalj, J. S.) says, it would be his heartfelt wish to keep the letter *х*, but never to pronounce it in our words. – I was myself of that opinion once, but now I would not agree to that. Why should we

write it if we have no intention of pronouncing it? Who would know then where it is to be written? Then we would write *x* the way the Šokci¹² write *h* (wherever they wish). Here, too, we can learn from the Italians (as in the case of place names, too): they do not pronounce *h*, and therefore they do not write it, even though it is found in hundreds of Latin words (which they feel as their own the way we feel about Slavic words” (Karadžić 1968, XII/I: 223).

Here, too, it is stated that there are 28 “simple sounds” in the Serbian language, and having enumerated the others in their proper order, he adds *x* and *ϕ*, proposing that they should be retained “for foreign words only”: In the Serbian language there are 28 simple sounds, which can be written down as follows: а, б, в, г, д, дь, е, ж, з, и, ј, к, л, ль, м, н, нь, о, п, р, с, т, у, ц, ч, џ, ш. What will Mr – C – do now with 23 letters (*ϕ* and *x* are for foreign words only, and we shall retain *и*) when there are 28 sounds of ours to be written down?” (232).

In the text, there is one example containing *x*: *собрахъ* [gathered] (223). However, further on we find: “на иляду места (in a thousand places)” (224), “кожна альина, по ньиовомъ (leather dress, their will)” (226), *оћу* (I want) (228).

Therefore, regarding the consonant *h*, Vuk was undecided about it in *Orthography* (especially in words of foreign origin and “Slavic” ones); he uses it in certain morphophonological positions, pondering the proper place for *h*; in his theoretical considerations, he looked for a way to justify writing or omitting it, which led to inconsistencies in practice. As the year 1818 approached, he used it increasingly less often in practice.

3.4. At the time when he was working on the *Dictionary*, we also find traces of hesitation in Vuk’s correspondence: “For God’s sake, what shall we do with *x*. The common folk are never heard to use it... In my opinion, we should always write it at the end [of a word], and at the beginning and in the middle before vowels, but some will say... why write it there when people do

¹² A South Slavic ethnic group mainly identified as Croats, translator’s note.

not pronounce it" (*Вукова преписка / Vuk's Correspondence/ II*, Belgrade 1908, in: Simić 1991: 261).

Regarding this problem, he also addressed Mušicki, who added at the end of their debate: "If a word without *x* seems homely and plain, then add it to it. It seems to me that 'вала' [thank you, instead of *хвала*] is one such case (Simić 1991: 261–262). But Vuk resolves this dilemma: "Therefore, are we to omit *x* altogether? The Devil take it! This dictionary should show how the Serbs speak, and for those who do not like it, let it say **how they should speak**" (Simić 1991: 262).

As we can see, many examples pose problems to him, which leads to certain deviations and hesitations.

3.5. In the *Dictionary* of 1818, Vuk is even more consistent when it comes to omitting *x* (both in his theoretical considerations and regarding its omission in specific words).

3.5.1. Often enough, **individual words** pose problems. In his correspondence he says: "Now we shall freely write *Ристосъ* (Christ), *дуовникъ* (clergyman), *о̄ну, ора* (walnut), *кожу* (sheepskin coat) etc., the way our brothers speak [omitting the *h* sound]. In faith, it is not pronounced as the German *h* either. Take any word you like and see for yourself. But what shall we do with *парок* (parson)? Shall we write it as *парокъ* or *паро*? Hey! Wait, that's overdoing things! Why, you write *парохъ*, and my Serbs, Bosniaks and Montenegrins say *понъ* or *свештеникъ*" (*Вукова преписка II*, 160). In the *Dictionary*, he "resolves" the problem posed by *парох* – by **omitting** it altogether. It is not to be found in its alphabetical position, its place in the *Dictionary* is empty, but in his list of subscribers he regularly (and often) writes *парох* with a *x*.

3.5.2. Another problem (to be considered) is the fact that **Slavic languages** do have *x* (which he repeats on a number of occasions), and therefore, in all the cases that presuppose etymology it must be taken into consideration, at least in theoretical discussions; what also posed a problem was the presence of a certain number of Slavic borrowings commonly used in Serbian, where it is difficult to omit this consonant, so that he

often opted for leaving out such words: “the Serbs do not have *x* in any words, while the other Slavic peoples do have it (and how); a Serb, for example, does not say *хлад*, *снаха*, *ходити*, *орак*, *оврхао*, but *лад*, *снаа*, *ора*, *оврѣао* etc.” (*Dictionary* 1818: X). Furthermore: “It is true that in the Serbian language there are no words where *x* would be pronounced, but we must use it for foreign words (including Slavic and Russian ones that we use now, for example, *воздух* /air/; I would not dare write these *возду*, nor *воздуз*, *воздуј* or *воздук*, for then it would not be either our word or Russian), as is also the case with *ѳ*” (Karadžić 1818: XXXIV). In the *Dictionary*, Vuk also omits the word *ваздух* in any form, as well as *узѣах* and *узѣу* [variants of *sigh*], “which means that he carefully avoided all the church-related words that constituted a trap in the form of double-edged solutions” (Simić 1991: 268).

3.5.3. Another problem occurs in connection with **foreign proper names**, and also with onomatopoeic words. In the *Dictionary of the Serbian Language* (1818), we find the following: “Someone may even say that we also need *h*; true, we do not need it in any of our words, but when expressing laughter (ha! ha! ha!) and for [interjections such as] ah! oh! uh!, **but it would not come amiss to have it because of foreign names and surnames** (for example, *Haller*, *Hagerdon*, *Hamburg*, *Haag*; the Russians write these *Галлеръ*, *Гагердонъ*, *Гамбургъ*, *Гага*, and as for us, **for the time being**, we can and must write them *Аллер*, *Агедорн*, *Амбург* etc.), **but for the time being, I have left that to someone else to deal with**” (*Dictionary* 1818: XI).

3.5.4. When he decides to omit *x*, **exclamations** also pose a problem. Thus the exclamations *ax!*, *ox!*, *yx!* are also to be found in the *Dictionary* (but not *ux* and *ex*). Vuk positions these exclamations in alphabetical order, the way he does with *x* (that is, it is placed in-between *ѳ* and *ц*), although in his table of sounds Vuk placed *x* (and *ѳ*) at the end.

As can be seen from Vuk’s correspondence, G. Geršić also suggested to Vuk not to use *x* (or *ѳ* either), except in foreign

and Slavic (Russian-Slavic) words (Вукова преписка II, 751–752, 754, 755; Mladenović 2008: 304).

3.5.5. In the *Dictionary*, he almost entirely omits *x* (in the text) in Serbian words. Thus, in the text we find: *иљада, ришћанским, оће, Омир, Ерцеговина, Ерцеговачки, патријар Чарнојевић, Рист, њиов, Вала Бозу!, њи, оравица*, etc.

But in the words of foreign origin, we find: Њ. *Превасходителство Г. Мојсиј Миоковић* (His Excellence Mr Mojsij Mioković, XVI), *епархија* (eparchy, XVII), *октоих* (octoechos, XIX).

The consonant *x* is most often used in the list of subscribers in the *Foreword*, be it within the framework of a title or a name, but not solely in these cases: *екзарх* (exarch), *архимандрит* (archimandrite), *парох* (a great number of examples, although it is not to be found in the *Dictionary* itself), *Атанасије Влаховић* (XXI), *катихета* (catechist), *јеромонах* (hieromonk), *отац Пахомије* (Father Pahomije, XXII), *верховни кнез* (Supreme Knyaz, but *спаија* /spahi/), *код верховнога кнеза писар* (scribe to the Supreme Knyaz, XXIII), *архивар, Христофор Станковић* (archivist Hristofor Stanković, XXIV), *фелдвах мајстор, Антоније Михановић* (feldmeister Antonije Mihanović, XXV), *Христофор, Хариш* (XXVI), *Сара Михаиловица* (XXVII), *тјелохранитељ* (bodyguard, XXVIII).

There is no word in the *Dictionary* beginning with *x*, so that it does not feature as an entry. Still, he could not quite do without *x*. Apart from the cases referred to above, Ljuba Stojanović observed a number of examples that contain this letter; the list of words containing *x* was expanded by Pavle Ivić and subsequently by Professor Radoje Simić: *архиђакон, архимандрит, архимандритов* and *архимандритски* (in addition to *акриђакон, аркијереј, архијереј* is not positioned alphabetically, *акримандрит, акримандритов* and *акримандритски*), *епархиа, захвалити, захваљивање* and *захваљивати, проход, рахт* (saddlery), *ух, цех* (guild), *цехмајстор* (guild master) and *цехмајсторов* (guild master's)... (Simić 1991: 268–269).

3.5.6. Presenting the Serbian alphabet in the *Serbian Grammar* (accompanying the *Dictionary*), he says: "In the Serbian

language there are 28 simple sounds (that is, of such purity that they can no longer be subdivided), which can best be written using the following letters: а, б, в, г, д, (ђ), е, ж, з, и, ј, к, л, љ, м, н, њ, о, п, р, с, т, (ћ), у, ц, ч, џ, ш“ (*Dictionary* 1818: XXIX). Thus, he left out *x* and *ѣ*. But later on, in the tabular representation of the letters, having listed the letters alphabetically, at the end of the table he added *ѣ* and *x*, outside the established alphabetical order (*Dictionary* 1818: LXIX).

In the *Serbian Grammar*, *x* is omitted in certain morpho-phonological positions where it can be found in the *Orthography*: thus (as in the *Orthography*), we find: in the genitive and accusative plural cases, being the same in the case of the said forms of the adjectival-pronominal declension: *жутије / жути, вруђије / вруђи, свије / сви...* (XLIII, XIV), *они – њи / и* (L), *чијује / чију* (LII). But in this case, Vuk does not even mention the possibility of using the variants containing *x* (as opposed to the *Orthography*). Also, although the consonant *x* is not to be found in declension, Vuk gives precisely an example where *x* belongs in etymological terms: *ора-ораа-орау-ораом-орасу-ораа-* (ibid.: XXXVII).

It is interesting to note that Vuk omits examples containing *x* when dealing with sound changes (whereas in the *Orthography* he regularly mentions sounds that alternate with *x*). In the case of comparison of adjectives, we find examples of sound changes of the following type: *дуг – дужи, јак – јачи, луд – луђи, брз – бржи, сладак – слађи, висок – виши, љут – љуђи, горак – горчи, зрк – зрчи, жив – живљи*, but there are no examples of the alternating pair *x/ш* (of the type *тих – тишии / quiet – quieter*)... (ibid.: XLV).

In the case of conjugation, he omits *x* in the places where he wrote it in the *Orthography* (it is not to be found at the end of verbs in the 1st person singular in the aorist and imperfect tenses: *буја-бујај /was-were/...*, *ћедо-ћеде-ћеде / wanted/... or ктедо-ктеде-ктеде* [a variant of the preceding verb form]...), and also *ћадија-ћадијај...*; *ћећу (ктећу / мећу) – ћећеш (ктећеш / мећеш) – ћеће (ктеће / меће)...*;

би-би-би (LVIII); ...*ћедосмо, ћео..., ћеће* (и *ктеће*)-*ћећемо...*
 "The semi-past tense": 1st p. sing. *бија*, 3rd p. pl. *бијашу* (LIX);
 "the almost-past tense": 1st p. sing. *би*, 2nd p. sing. *би*, 1st p. sing. *ћедо*, etc.

3.6. When writing **names and titles**, Vuk is more consistent in his use of *x* and finds it more difficult to decide to leave it out, especially, as Professor Radoje Simić observes, when speaking of well-respected and influential people: "If we take other Vuk's writings into consideration, we shall notice that, in these, he writes names and titles using *x* (and with some other specific graphic and orthographic characteristics, and not only the latter) when he speaks of people who are well-respected and influential in society. We shall quote here all the examples featuring *x* to be found in the biography of Miloš Obrenović, and it will be evident from these that most of them are of the kind mentioned by Professor Simić: *архимандрит* Rajić, *верховни вожд* 10, *архимандрит* Rušić, (*Хуришид*)-Pasha 18-19, Neyshlot fortress *пјехотни полк* [infantry regiment], *верховнога војда* 21, *архимандриту* 54, *архимандритом*, *архимандриту* 97, *архимандрит* Milentije 103 and 104, *архимандрита*, *архимандрит* 127, *њихова толмача* [their interpreter] 131, *архимандрит* 136, *архимандрита*, *верховнога књаза* 139, *архимандрит* 149, *архимандрит* Samuil, Атанасије *Михаиловић*, *архимандрити* 171, *Михаиловић*, *архимандрит* Milentije 194, both *епархије* (eparchies) 200... The writing of proper names and titles, as we see, imposed certain responsibilities and obligations upon Vuk, which were often contrary to his principles and pushed them into the background...

Words like *епархи(ј)а*, *цех*, *цехмајстор*, then the Russian phrase *пехотни полк* and perhaps the Turkish word *пахт* (next to *пат* alphabetically) – actually represent the first harbingers of the inflow of foreign words into Vuk's literary language, even against the will of our linguistic 'supreme leader' (*врховни вожд*): When writing these, too, Vuk was somewhat lenient, as circumstances necessitated..." (Simić 1991: 270-273).

3.7. In his correspondence, too, Vuk used *x* rather often. “Some investigations show that he was prone to doubts concerning the writing of *x*. Thus Asim Peco observes that Vuk ‘even during that period sometimes used *x* in his correspondence’: a) in domestic words: *Духова, многих, хоћу, хоће, одмах, садашњих* (genitive plural form), *похвалну, својих, захтијевање* etc.; b) in foreign words: *стиховима, стихотворству, архимандрита, разархимандритио, Минхену, октоихе, Кноблех, Хилендару, епархија, ипохондрије, хирург, хирурге, нахије, нахији, архиву* (Peco 1966: 93–103)” (Simić 1991: 270–273).

3.8. In the periodical *Danica*, the 1827, issue, in a text dealing with *Serbian Alphabet*, when he provides a list of letters in a table where “the letters are arranged in the order based on the most convenient way of pronouncing a sound” – Vuk includes 29 units: the table contains *ѣ*, but *x* is nowhere to be found! Later on in the text, speaking of capital letters, he positions *x* and *ѣ* “in the old order, as they go one after the other” – and then he adds *x* to the table (Simić 1991: 268).

The continuity of Vuk’s more or less frequent use of the consonant *x*, under different circumstances, for various reasons, along with theoretical deliberations and various justifications, can be observed throughout Vuk’s reform-oriented work.

3.9. Starting from the 1830’s onwards, Vuk made a great turnabout in his work, striving to attain that which was “more regular” in the Serbian language. Getting acquainted with the state of Serbian dialects “in the field”, and also taking many other elements into consideration (as we have seen above), he sought and attained the systemic and the generally acceptable, a stable and even situation in the language, which can be subsumed under its “general regularity” (a term that he introduced in 1847), which also influenced the (final) decision on and the stabilisation of the use of *x*. The biggest and the earliest shift in that direction was made by introducing the consonant *x*. In the *Foreword to Serbian Folk Proverbs*, in 1836, Vuk decided to introduce the consonant *x* in the norm of the Serbian language, thus shaping

and unifying its structure, on which he had this to say: "For my readers, the greatest novelty in this book will be the letter *x*; that is why a few words should be said about this" (Karadžić 1965/IX, 20). He then goes on to provide data from the field concerning the pronunciation, replacement and omission of the consonant *x*, stating precisely where it is best preserved and pronounced, having previously observed that "in many places it would be very much needed and of great help" (1814). On this occasion, too, Vuk does not aim for anything artificial, which does not exist in everyday speech: "Of all our people that I have seen, I can say that the people of Dubrovnik pronounce the true sound of this letter best: there, it is clearly heard at the beginning and at the end of a word, in the middle and in front of vowels, and in front of semi-voiced letters... Apart from Dubrovnik, the sound of this letter is heard in its surroundings, and also towards the south, throughout the coastal region where our people live and in Montenegro, right down to Skadar; but it is rarely sound, stable and in every position within a word" (Karadžić 1965/IX: 22). Further on, Vuk concludes: "Seeing how differently our people pronounce the letter *x*, in this book I wanted to have it printed wherever its proper place is (etymologically), and let the readers pronounce it as they see fit and convenient."

The proverbs are printed with the consonant *x*, but not without exceptions. There are many examples of words with the letter *x*: **Ако рекох, не посјекох** [If I said so, I did no harm.] (7); **Ако те срећа не причека, на вељега је хата стић' не можеш** [If fortune won't wait for you, you won't catch up with it on a fast horse.] (9); **Ако ти кажем гријех не ћу грјешника** [If I tell you about the sin, I won't tell you about the sinner.] (9); **Боље је и празну врећу под пазухом носити него врага у њој** [Better carry an empty bag under you armpit than the Devil inside it.] (25); **Бог срећу дијели, а Влахиња сурутку** [God dispenses fortune, a Wallachian woman whey.] (21); **Истиха се печеница пече** [A roast is best prepared on a low fire.] (116), etc.

Vuk made an effort to write *x* where it belongs etymologically, and also taking into consideration how a particular prov-

erb was written down (irrespective of etymology): **Боље је и суха крушца појести него се наопако у смок хватати** [Better to eat dry bread than to wrongly eat fatty foods (meat, dairy products...)] (26); **Док змија змију не прождере, не може аждаха постати** [Until one snake devours another, it cannot become a dragon.] (70); **Стреха му мјера а рок Ђурђев дан** [The eaves are its measure, it'll last until St. George's day (said of heavy snowfall).] (332); **Трбух је најбољи сахат** [The stomach is the most punctual clock.] (358); **Тражи кирије на суху путу** [Looking for rent on a dry road (i.e. looking for trouble).] (358); **Или купи халат, ил' остави занат** [Go, buy some tools, or give up on your craft.] (112); **Без халата нема ни заната** [No tools, no craft.] (13); **Бије као хала с берићетом** [Fights like a beast with a good harvest (said of hail threatening the harvest).] (14); **Богатство покрива хорјатство** [A thief passes for a gentleman having got rich.] (18).

However, we have noted down a number of proverbs that do not contain *x*, for the most part omitted in some lexical units: **Ако чоек не може бити лијеп и богат као што би ћео, може бити добар и поштен** [If a man cannot be as handsome and rich as he wishes, he can still be good and honest.] (10); **Боље је знано с маном него незнано с фалом** [Better what you know even if it's faulty, than something you don't know even if highly praised.] (25); **Боље је да те други фали (него да се сам фалиш)** [Better to be praised by others (than to praise yourself).]. Look: **Ко се фали сам се квари** (25); but: **Ко се хвали, сам се квари** [He who praises himself spoils himself.] (170); **Да ти капа фали, купи бих ти, али памет не могу** [If you needed a cap, I'd buy one for you, but I can't buy you wisdom.] (62); **Видим ја мога Бога у трбуу!** (ваља да је казала некаква, која је без мужа била затрудњела, па је неко тешио с Богом) [I see God's will in my belly! (probably said by a woman who got pregnant out of wedlock and was consoled that it was God's will).], (37); **Да је мене ћело добро бити, не би Лазо на Косову (ни) погинуо** [If things had been going well for me, Lazar

wouldn't have been killed in Kosovo.] (55); Држ' се пројо (прохо), на свадби сам била! [Wait for me, cornbread, I've been to a wedding feast (said after being served a disappointingly paltry meal)] (77); Др~~к~~е као прут [Shaking like a leaf.] (77); Др~~к~~е (од страха) као фуруна. [Shaking (with fear) like a furnace.] Кад се хоће да каже да се ко кога не боји ни мало [Meaning to say that one is not afraid at all.] (77); За своје воће докле оће [For his own fruit, as long as he wants.] (96); Ристос се роди [Christ is born], said on Little Christmas (St Vassily's Day)... (304); Христос се роди! From Christmas until Epiphany... (385); Христос Васкрс! [Christ is resurrected!] (385); Богу фала е сам се удала / За будалу како сам и сама [Thank God, I have married / A fool such as I.] (408); Ђе сви Турци ту и Усо мали [Where all the Turks go little Uso /instead of Huso/ follows.] (411); Из (пре-)пуна чанка није греота одсркнути [It is no sin to take a sip from an overflowing bowl.] (That is, where there is plenty, it is no sin /греота/ to steal!). It is recounted how the archimandrite (архимандрит) of a monastery pestered a poor (сиромаш) man, whom he knew to be a skilful thief, to sign over a steed to him. When the man said to him: "How can I sign over a steed to you, sir, when I don't have one myself? Only if I steal it; and I don't dare steal from you, for you are the judge of that"; to which the архимандит said: "True, *it is no sin (грејота) to take a sip from an overflowing bowl*, just don't take from the poor, don't even get close to them, or shame will fall upon us." Then the man went and caught (ухвати) the finest steed from the monastery's own stable and stealthily took it away, then signed it over to the archimandrite, assuring him that it was from an overflowing bowl indeed, so he should not be afraid that anyone would recognise it. The archimandrite, not recognising his own steed, thanked (зафали) the man, gave him a treat and made the gift of a thaler to him. Only after the man had left did he realise that the steed was from the monastery's stable, and that the honest thief had tricked him (413), but as they say: Из препуна чанка није грјехоте одсркнути (110).

There are several cases of words being written as doublets; both forms are printed, in keeping with the way Vuk wrote them down. In doing so, it is explained where the form without *x* originates from or who noted it down, which means that it is marked, so that precedence is given to the form lacking *x*: **Пасји ак море не мути**. [Dog's breath does not ripple the sea.] In Bay of Kotor. Or: **Пасји хак мора не мути** (276); **Опарен кашу хлади** [One who has been scalded blows on gruel.] (426); **Опечен кашу лади**. He who has seen trouble is afraid of getting in trouble (426).

By introducing the consonant *x*, Vuk establishes harmony and systematicness in many grammatic relations, which would be considerably less clear and more disorderly if *x* were omitted: instead of *ора-ораа-орачу* [walnut]... (which did not fit in with any paradigmatic model), we get *орач-орача-орачу* (as in *град-града-граду* /city/); the consonant at the end of the root of the feminine gender noun *снаха-снахе-снахи* [daughter-in-law]... (instead of *снаа-снаје-снаји*...), as in *жена-жене-жени* [woman]...; as in *видјех-видје-* [saw]... (instead of equalised forms), *хтједох* wanted... (instead of the former *ћедо*...) and the like (Simić 1991: 210).¹³ In addition to this, he resolved many problems that troubled him while he worked on his language reform and resulted in inconsistencies (words of Slavic origin, onomatopoeic words, words of foreign origin, proper names, titles...).

To the criticisms levelled at him for including the consonant *x* in the *Proverbs* and in his *Reply* to Dr Jovan Stejić, Vuk responded as follows: "...you wonder how I could accept *x* and accuse me of inconsistency on account of that..."

No writer of ours has been troubled by *x* as much as I have; but when I established that our people did pronounce it like

¹³ "By including the phoneme *x* in the basic phonological system, Vuk establishes harmony in the external and internal relations. Regarding the former, Vuk's language became closer to other Slavic literary languages. At the internal level, he rebuilt a compact system of word bases. Namely, the principle of consonant bases was to a certain degree violated through the evolution of our language: *орач-орача-орачу* [ploughman], in accordance with *ора-ораа-орачу* [walnut]" (Simić 1991: 210).

that, I had to accept it (at least as a different or new element of our language), and I am now of the opinion that the best thing to do will be for us all to accept it when it comes to writing books, and when it comes to reading, let everyone pronounce it as is customary and convenient." Pondering his critics' further objections – how the Serbs in those areas where it is not used will accept it – he concludes: "...if we want to write for all Serbs, I think that it is more correct to write it in such words for the sake of those who do pronounce it, than not to write it for the sake of those who do not" (Karadžić 2001 XIV/III: 15–16). Therefore, Vuk thought very deeply about what is most acceptable and common to all Serbs, and also what is established and common to the Serbian language based on a number of reasons.

3.10. This is further clarified in the *Vienna Literary Agreement*: "We have found that it is good and necessary for writers of the Eastern faith to write *x* everywhere where it belongs etymologically, the way writers of the Western faith write *x*, and the way our people of both faiths speak in the southern regions. 4. We have all agreed *x* should not be written at the end of proper names in the plural forms, for it has no place there either etymologically or according to the **common folk speech**, nor is it in accordance with the **Old Slavic language** or the other Slavic languages spoken today..." It is evident that Vuk takes into account the situation in the other Slavic languages and the relations between Serbian and these languages. By finally establishing the consonant *x*, Vuk brings the Serbian language closer to the other Slavic languages (and where this consonant is lacking in the other Slavic languages, Vuk also rather chooses to omit it), taking into consideration the historical heritage, what would be generally acceptable to the people and whether a form exists in the common language. Also of importance here is Vuk's intention for the reformed language to be acceptable and a connecting factor for "Serbs of all three faiths", as "one people should have one literature" (*The Vienna Literary Agreement*).

4. Selecting the norm and writing the consonant ϕ (or not)

Concerning the use of the consonant ϕ , Vuk also found it difficult to make up his mind, often considering it together with the consonant x . Still, Vuk used ϕ rather more often than x , and as he did so, he justified its use. In the *Serbian Grammar*, which was the introductory part of the *Serbian Dictionary* (1818), Vuk had this to say of ϕ : “It is only for foreign words, and is pronounced a little more vigorously than υ [v]... Common Serbian folk pronounce it either as υ , for example, *Стеван, Стева; Вилип, Вића* etc., or change it to n [p], for example, *Стјепан, Трипуњдан, Трипко* etc. But since there are Turkish words in our language that are pronounced with the ϕ sound (for example, *ћерћех* [embroidery frame], *аферим* [bravo!], *седеф* [mother-of-pearl] etc.), and occasionally we have to include it in Greek and Latin words: therefore, we shall include ϕ among our letters” (*Foreword to the Serbian Dictionary* of 1818, Karadžić 1966/II: 34). Vuk often used the consonant ϕ : “In the dictionary itself, we find a large number of words – be it entries or explanations of entries – that are written with ϕ . Such words are of various kinds: some are classified by Vuk as words of foreign origin; others are classified as regional variants or the like; some (in the form of entries) are given without classification (among those are words used by Vuk himself, that is, he includes them in the corpus of his literary language). In a sense, the latter group of words contradicts Vuk’s explanation that ϕ and x are “for foreign words only”: a) in the section dedicated to the letter ϕ , Vuk arranged a total of 63 words in alphabetical order (for example: *фajда* [benefit], *фес* [Turkish cap], *фитиљ* [fuse], *фалити* [lack], *форма* [form]..., *Француска* [France], *Фрушка гора* [Mt Fruška]...)... A number of those words are given in variant forms with υ and n instead of ϕ , and Vuk often points to those forms... Those words which are not accompanied by references to other combinations of sounds are rather more numerous: *аферим, ефендија* [Mister], *софра* [dinner table], *Јефимија*...” (Simić 1991: 264). In the *Dictionary*, Vuk

also introduced the sound *ɥ* [dž, as in *jar*], which is also not characteristic of the folk Serbian language.

All this testifies to the fact that Vuk thought deeply about the most functional solutions to the problems he faced in his reform of the Serbian language, which often brought him dilemmas – in view of the situation in folk speeches, on the one hand, and taking into consideration etymology and words taken over from foreign languages, on the other.

5. Selecting the norm and the iotation of the dental consonants *m* and *ð* (or lack thereof)

In the initial phase of his reform (1814–1818), Vuk used Jekavian iotated forms (with *mj* [tj] and *ðj* [dj], of the *ћепати* /chase/, *ћевојка* /girl/ type), although at first he wrote using a language with a lot of “Slavic” elements (for example, in the *Orthography*), so that we come across: *тјешитель* [consoler], *утјешиште* [console], *ðјевственик* [virgin]... (Karadžić 2001/III/2: 266–267). In the *Dictionary* (1818), he is more consistent when it comes to using iotated forms (as well as forms without *x*), and forms wherein there is no iotation are rare (for example, *ођећа* [clothes], *ћетлић* [child], *ћечин* [children’s], *ћело* [deed], *ћелѡоница* [workshop], *ћешто* [somewhere], *ћетешце* [small child], *ћешње* [tighter], *ћешити* [console] and the like, as well as *тјеме* [pate], *тјемешице*, *тјешње*, *тјешити*, *тјештан*, *подјела* – “that which is doled out to a beggar”, (Karadžić 1818: 1585).

A few years after finally introducing *x* (in 1836), in 1839 Vuk introduced another significant new element; instead of Jekavian iotation (of the *ћепати*, *ћевојка* type), he opted for the forms *mj* and *ðj*. “The consonant groups *mj* and *ðj* are, as a rule, iotated in some dialects, while other dialects use iotation in some cases, in others not; the dialect of the region where Vuk was born belonged to the latter group. Hence, in the first edition of the *Dictionary*, there are a great many examples of the iotation of the consonant groups *mj* and *ðj*, and also a not

inconsiderable number of examples where these groups remained unchanged... As early as 1823, Vuk wrote that 'Bosniaks in the towns, especially those of Turkish faith, do not change, as is customary in the Herzegovinian dialect, a δ preceding j to h , nor do they change m preceding j to h '. Several years later, he had this to say about this pronunciation: 'Of this, one could also say that it is a townsfolk dialect – the upper class speech of the southern dialect'. This ensures uniform treatment of the consonant groups mj and δj (earlier, Vuk's language contained forms such as *лећети* [fly], *поћера*, *ђевојка* etc., in addition to *тјеме*, *утјеиштити*, *подјела* etc.), and the number of consonant alternations, which made the already complex morphological situation of our language even more complicated, was reduced (for example, the following were eliminated: *дијете* – *ђетема* – *ђеца*, *лећети* – *летим* and the like). Even though Vuk, as early as 1839, stopped using forms with the iotated groups mj and δj , and introduced the new ones in his literary language, he still, in keeping with the principle proclaimed in the Foreword to the *Dictionary*, entered the words containing the mj and δj groups, as well as those wherein they were iotated, mostly as separate entries" (*Afterword* in: Karadžić 1852).¹⁴

6. Vuk's attitude towards the iotated forms c' and z'

Still, there was not a single moment during his reform when Vuk thought of including the dialectal forms c' and z' in the norm of the Serbian language, although he was well acquainted with their use: "Apart from these generally used sounds, there are also some specific sounds that can be heard in the Serbian language: 1) Herzegovinians sometimes pronounce c in front

¹⁴ Njegoš also used many forms of this type: he consistently used *видјети*, as well as Slavic forms such as *благодјеја*, *видјеније*, *дјеву*, *дјевственијем*, *дјеистијија*, *дјејателне*, *дјело*, *дјела*, *дјелима*, *дјелце*, *добродјетељ*, *необдјелан...*, *сновидјенија*, *сновидјења...*; *тјелесним*, *тјелодвиженија*, *тјелохранители* etc. (Stijović 1992).

of *j* in the manner of the Polish *ś*, while they pronounce *z* as *ž*, for example, *cjekupa* [axe], *cjympa* [tomorrow], *uzjeo* [ate]" (Karadžić 1966/II: 29). Thus, although the use of those sounds was quite widespread in the Serbian language (not to a lesser degree than the consonant *x*, to a somewhat lesser degree than the Jekavian iotation of *mj* and *đj* to *ħ* and *h̃*), Vuk, even when he did not stress this decisively, had a strong sense of "general regularity", that is, of elements in the language as a part of the linguistic structure (and *c'* and *z'*, as the contemporary terminology would have it, do not have the status of phonemes, are not systemic in character, that is to say, as Vuk would put it, they do not fit in with the "general regularity"). In addition to that, their use is limited to a small number of lexemes.

7. Towards applying the principle of "general regularity"

At the beginning of his reform, Vuk was against mixing "the Slavic" and "the Serbian".¹⁵ "Regularity" is to be found in folk dialects. In his *Review of Books I and II of Vidaković's "Ljubomir in Jerusalem"* (*Друга рецензија Любомиръ у Елісіму (1814)*, published in *Srpske novine /Serbian Newspaper/* in 1815), Vuk says:

¹⁵ "For Serbian writers, from the beginning to the present day, have not agreed on which language they write in. Some have started writing in a purely Slavic language; others, seeing that the Serbs for whom books are written do not understand the Slavic language, have started writing in simple Serbian, the way that people speak; a third group thought it very ugly and unusual to write in books in simple Serbian; that is why they have started writing in a new language (between Serbian and Slavic).

These three groups of writers belong to our people now; the first group, those writing in Slavic and demanding that this language be used, numbers very few writers; the second and third group are now almost mixed, and would gladly write in their native tongue, just like the other peoples of Europe; but the lack of written rules of the Serbian language acts against their wishes, making things difficult for them and causing them to be disunited. Experiencing this not inconsiderable difficulty, well known to every Serbian writer, I wished to make this easier to do, or merely to get the process started" (Karadžić 1968, XII/1: 273).

“All peoples and writers themselves write their books in accordance with grammar rules; with us, people write following the rules of Grandmother Smiljana” (Karadžić 1968, XII/1: 143). Furthermore: “All our people, especially in the villages, where there are not many writers, speak correctly, according to grammatical rules, just as Schläzer or Lessing write in German. It is only our writers who are pushing to have our language corrected; they know not the folk language, so it seems to them that it is easier to create a new language than to learn their own native tongue. It is true that, to this day, no one has yet created a new language, nor is it possible to create one; but it is really easier for them to develop a new language than to learn their own; why learn a new one: why are they making a new one ‘according to the rules of Grandmother Smiljana’, when they would have to learn their own according to the rules that cannot be changed at will” (Karadžić 1968, XII/1: 183). He concludes: “In grammar, there is no matter of taste, just as there is none in arithmetic; it is to be learned and known” (Karadžić 1968, XII/1: 192).

From the very beginning of his reform, then, Vuk speaks about “regularity” and the rules of language, even though initially it mostly referred to the “irregularity” of the Slavic-Serbian language: “Each writer must take care of what he writes about, and just as much (if not even more) of the purity and quality of the language that he writes in; there is no need to talk about this: readers know this, let alone writers. **Each writer must have stable rules in his language which he will adhere to.** The Serbs do not have such rules yet, that is why their writers, when they write in Serbian, must follow the pure, uncorrupted speech of the Serbian people: for Adelung’s dictionary and all his grammars are nothing else but the German people’s collected rules of the German language. **A Serbian writer who errs against the speech of his people errs against the rules of his language**” (Karadžić 1968, XII/1: 126).

In the *Serbian Dictionary* of 1818, in keeping with the above, Vuk says: “Just as the folk singer-narrator cannot ‘write differently from the way he speaks’ – ‘and precisely the way he should’ – so

people who have learned something and know that a language has some rules cannot write without a grammar (some of them may be grammarians themselves); for that reason (as learned people) they would all like to write better than they speak, and so try to improve that language as they best know how, but they actually spoil it that way" (Karadžić 1818: 156).

Vuk took into consideration what existed in folk dialects and what was "more regular" in the Serbian language (on the basis of folk dialects and the differences that existed between them), which leads to "the common literary language", and after publishing the *Proverbs* and having received the objections of Jovan Stejić, he replied as follows: "Until we get to know the language of all our people, I think, as I have said before, that it would be best for every writer to write the way people of his dialect speak (precisely like that and faithfully to it, so that others could recognise the language of his region in his book); and the common literary language (not for 2,000,000 but for 5,000,000 people) will develop over time according to the rules that made it develop in other peoples...

I do not look down on any dialect of our language, but I think that they should not be mixed, but that one should consistently stick to the language that one starts writing in...

When some words are pronounced among the common folk in different ways, I believe that a writer is obliged to choose that which is more regular, regardless of whether more or fewer people speak like that. Thus, if among the inhabitants of Boka Kotorska a nicer and more regular form is found than the ones used here, in our regions, we shall be obliged to include it in the common Serbian language, irrespective of the fact that only 30,000 people live there" (Karadžić XIV/III 2001: 16–17).

As can be seen from the above, Vuk is opposed to mixing dialects, he is in favour of the pure folk language, a pure "dialect", but not one characterised by "spoiled simplicity"; as for the literary language (and its rules), they will crystallise over time – into that which is most regular in the language, and that which constitutes a "general regularity" should be promot-

ed and accepted. Thus, in *Criticism in Language*, published in Vienna on 16th August 1842 (“This was written in issue 31 of the Belgrade newspaper, for the year 1842, on the occasion of a general session of the Serbian Literacy Society”), Vuk reasons in the following manner: “So, when some words are pronounced among the common folk in two or three different ways, should not writers choose the **most regular form** in their writing... One who is good at writing will find it, in the nature of things, **relying on the characteristics of the language**; one who is not will be bothered by everything and will find nothing helpful” (Karadžić XIV/III 2001: 168, 169). He then goes on to ask¹⁶: “Whether one can write everywhere the way one speaks or not, this has been discussed many times among us, and if something new were to be said about that, all that would have to be said again and quite a few things added, and this could not be ‘in a few words,’ so we leave that for another occasion...” (Karadžić XIV/III 2001: 168, 173).

In the context of the principle of “general regularity”, the folk language is viewed in the following way: “Apart from this general regularity, this language of mine differs from the folk language of some regions in that I write, for example, *đujete, đjeća, lijeno, љепота*, whereas the common folk in some areas say *дете, деца, лепо, лепота*, and in others they say *дите, дица, липо, липота* etc. If anyone were to say that he does not accept this southern dialect as the literary language of all Serbs, I would reply that southern Serbs could say the same thing and would be even more justified in doing so, in not accepting the north-eastern or western dialect as the literary language of all Serbs; this way, we would never reach an agreement on this. If someone cannot accept any of these reasons, let him write in the dialect of his own choice, but without mixing dialects, and as for the rest, **let him observe the general regularity**, and we shall leave it up to time and to what endures to either come to an agreement on dialects or to go on writing in every one

¹⁶ In reply to “The Task of a Serbian Philologist” (in issue 32 of *The Budapest Herald*, 1842).

of them. The ancient Greeks wrote in different dialects during the peak period of their literature, and the differences between them were much greater than they are among us" (Karadžić XIV/III 2001: 197–198).

The principle of "general regularity" was entirely in place towards the end of his reform, even though Vuk had been guided by the principle of "regularity" in language from the very start of looking for the best solutions in his reform; he finally shaped the principle of "general regularity" and introduced the actual term in 1845, aware of the fact that the literary language is superordinate to a dialogue. He relied on "regularity" when thinking about what should be selected as "regular" from among what was "different" in folk dialects, provided that it was to be found in folk speech, that it did not "create a language that did not exist among the common folk" (*The Vienna Literary Agreement*). What is also of importance here is Vuk's intention for the reformed language to be acceptable and a connecting factor for "the Serbs of all three faiths", as "one people should have one literature" (*The Vienna Literary Agreement*). At the end of the reform, there is nothing in Vuk's language that could not be found in everyday speech ("Write the way you speak"), but there is also nothing that is found in everyday speech but lacking a systemic character, that is, nothing that does not fit in with the "general regularity". This testifies to the greatness of his reform (that he aimed for the systemic and attained it, but based it of folk dialects and etymology, without any artificial elements). Therefore, in the course of his reform Vuk Karadžić got acquainted with the Serbian language, built upon it and modernised it, established a stable foundation for it, which constitutes a clear and firm basis for Serbian studies, as a science within the Serbian language and a science of the Serbian language.

Literature

- Ivić 1990: Pavle Ivić, *O jeziku nekadašnjem i sadašnjem* [On the Language of the Past and the Present], BIGZ – Jedinstvo, Belgrade – Priština.
- Ivić 1998: Pavle Ivić, *Pregled istorije srpskog jezika* [An Overview of the History of the Serbian Language], Izdavačka knjižnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
- Karadžić 1818: *Српску рјечник: Истолкован њемачким и латинским ријечима. Сакупио га и на свијет издо Вук Стефановић* [Serbian Dictionary: Explained by means of German and Latin words. Compiled and published by Vuk Stefanović], in Vienna.
- Karadžić 1948: *Iz Vukove borbe za književni jezik i pravopis. Odbrane strane* [From Vuk's Struggle for the Literary Language and Orthography. Selected Pages], Prosveta – Belgrade.
- Karadžić 1852: *Srpski rječnik* [Serbian Dictionary] 1852. Afterword. From the history of the book. The Collected Works of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (Editorial board: Golub Dobrašinić, Pavle Ivić, Vladan Nedić, Berislav Nikolić, Milorad Pavić, Miroslav Pantić, Radovan Samardžić, Živorad Stojković), vol. 11 (2), edited by Jovan Kašić, 1968–1969.
- Karadžić 1852, II: *Srpski rječnik* [Serbian Dictionary] 1852, Afterword. From the history of the book. *The Collected Works of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić* (Editorial board: Golub Dobrašinić, Pavle Ivić, Vladan Nedić, Berislav Nikolić, Milorad Pavić, Miroslav Pantić, Radovan Samardžić, Živorad Stojković), vol. II, edited by Jovan Kašić, 1968–1969.
- Karadžić 1965/IX, *Srpske narodne poslovice i druge različne kao one u običaj uzete riječi* [Serbian Folk Proverbs and Other Various Words from Our Custom], in Vienna 1849. The Collected Works of Vuk Karadžić, IX, Prosveta, Belgrade.
- Karadžić 1966/II: Vuk Karadžić, *Sabrana djela Vuka Karadžića. O jeziku i književnosti* [The Collected Works of Vuk Karadžić. On Language and Literature] II, Prosveta, Belgrade.
- Karadžić 1968, XII/I: *Pismenica serbskoga jezika. Po govoru prostoga naroda. Napisana Vukom Stefanovićem Serbancem* [The Orthography of the Serbian Language. Based on the Speech of the Common Folk. Written by Vuk Stefanović, a Serb], in Vienna, 1814. Foreword, in: Vuk Stef. Karadžić, The Collected Works of

- Vuk Stefanović Karadžić XII, *On Language and Literature I*, Prosveta Belgrade.
- Karadžić 1968/I: Vuk Stef. Karadžić, *Mala prostonarodna slaveno-serbska pesnarica. Primečenie. Izdana Vukom Stefanovićem* [A Common Folk Slavic-Serb Book of Poems. Notes. Published by Vuk Stefanović], in Vienna 1814, in: *The Collected Works of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić I, Book of Poems 1814–1815*, Prosveta, Belgrade.
- Karadžić 2001, XIV/III: Vuk Karadžić, *Sabrana dela Vuka Karadžića XIV. O jeziku i književnosti III* [The Collected Works of Vuk Karadžić XIV. On Language and Literature III], Prosveta, Belgrade.
- Karadžić 2001, III/1: *Sakupljeni gramtički i polemički spisi* [The Collected Grammatical and Polemical Writings], III/1, Reply to the Linguistic Notes of G. J. Hadžić – M. Svetić, in Vienna 1839.
- Karadžić 2001, III/2: *O jeziku i književnosti* [On Language and Literature]. The Collected Works of Vuk Karadžić. Published on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić 1864–1964, Prosveta, Belgrade.
- Kovačević 2005: Miloš Kovačević, *Protiv neistina o srpskom jeziku* [Against the Lies Being Spread about the Serbian Language], Srpsko prosvjetno i kulturno društvo "Prosvjeta", Istočno Sarajevo.
- Mladenović 2008: Aleksandar Mladenović, *Istorija srpskog jezika. Odabrani radovi* [A History of the Serbian Language. Selected Papers], Čigoja štampa.
- Simić 1991: Radoje Simić, *O našem književnom jeziku* [On Our Literary Language], Univerzitetska riječ, Nikšić 1991.
- Simić – Ostojić 1998: Radoje Simić – Branislav Ostojić, *Osnovi fonologije srpskoga književnog jezika* [The Basics of the Phonology of the Serbian Literary Language], Univerzitet Crne Gore, Podgorica 1998.
- Stijović 1992: Svetozar Stijović, *Slavenizmi u Njegoševim pjesničkim djelima* [Slavisms in Njegoš's Poetic Works], Izdavačka književna zajednica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
- Stojanović 1924: Ljubomir Stojanović, *Život i rad Vuka St. Karadžića* [The Life and Work of Vuk St. Karadžić], Belgrade.

THE LANGUAGE OF DUBROVNIK IN THE HISTORY OF THE SERBIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE (AS SHED LIGHT UPON BY MILAN REŠETAR)

1. Milan Rešetar and his scientific interests¹

This year (that is, the year 2010, when this text was written) marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of Milan Rešetar and the 70th anniversary of his becoming a member of the Serbian

¹ Milan Rešetar (Dubrovnik, 1st February 1860 – Florence, 14th January 1942), graduated from the grammar school in his native Dubrovnik, and completed his studies of Slavic and classical philology in Vienna and Graz. On the basis of his study *The Dubrovnik Documents from the 13th to the 15th Century* (*Die ragusanischen Urkunden des XIII–XV Jahrhunderts*), he was appointed senior lecturer in Slavic philology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Vienna. From 1919 onwards, he worked at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb, where he retired in 1928. He spent the last years of his life in Florence, where he continually pursued his scientific interests. He became a member of the Serbian Royal Academy in 1940. His studies on the dialectology and history of the Serbian language are of exceptional importance. Among his dialectological papers, of particular importance are the following studies: *The Štokavian Dialect* (*Der štokavische Dialekt*, Vienna 1907), *The Serbo-Croat Accent of the South-Western Dialects* (*Die serbokroatische Betonung südwestlicher Mundarten*, Vienna 1900). His studies *The Earliest Dubrovnik Dialect* and *The Earliest Dubrovnik Prose* were published posthumously in Belgrade, in 1951 and 1952 respectively. When it comes to the history of the Serbian language, of particular importance are his editions of the old cultural monuments such as: *The Zadar and Ranjina's Lectionary*, published in Zagreb in 1894 (JAZU), *Bernardin's Lectionary and Its Dubrovnik Copies* (SRA, Belgrade 1933), *Two Dubrovnik Linguistic Monuments from the 16th Century* (SRA, Belgrade 1938), *A Book of Many Reasons: A Dubrovnik Cyrillic Collection of 1520*, published in Belgrade in 1926, *The New Dubrovnik Charters of Stojanović's Collection* (SRA, Belgrade 1936), *Nikša Zvijezdić, the Dubrovnik Serbian Chancellor of the 15th Century* (SRA, Belgrade 1936), *Two Dubrovnik Linguistic Monuments from the 16th Century*, published in Belgrade (SRA) in 1938, *Four Dubrovnik Prose Plays from the Late 17th Century* (Belgrade 1922) etc. In addition to the above, he deserves credit for the critical editions of works by the Dubrovnik writers Marin Držić (1930), Šiško Menčetić and Džore Držić (1937), as well as Dživo Gundulić (1938).

Academy of Sciences and Arts.² This is a good reason for us to remember his name and his philological thought. In these times, when the linguistic truth is falsified to such an extent, and when such forgeries are glossed over in a facile or humble manner, it is nice to draw a parallel (and to remember) those people who did not make the scientific truth subservient to the interests of the moment or to political profitability and political projects.

Milan Rešetar has achieved many things in science that are significant, decisive and representative. Rešetar, a Catholic Serb from Dubrovnik (of whom there were many in Dubrovnik at the time), began his work at a time when historical-linguistic issues were of great topical interest and work in this domain flourished, so that the main segment of Rešetar's interests was dedicated to the language and dialect of Dubrovnik and its environs, from the time of its oldest written monuments to the current period. It has been said of Rešetar a number of times that he is **the greatest connoisseur of the linguistic situation in Dubrovnik**. That is not surprising at all, in view of the fact that he dedicated the greatest and very fruitful part of his life to the language and dialect of Dubrovnik, and to comparing it to the situation in its surroundings. He studied and presented to the world of science a great number of documents, monuments, literary works created in Dubrovnik and its closest surroundings. His interests branched off in three directions: poetry, prose, speech – which led to drawing general linguistic and philological conclusions.

On the basis of his detailed and far-reaching investigations, Rešetar achieved insight into the language and speech of the oldest Slavic segment of the population, which started settling in Dubrovnik, a Romance-language area until then, very early on, and took over entirely in the 15th century. As we find out in Rešetar, the Dalmatian dialect persisted in the public life

² “The President of the Academy Mr A. Belić herewith announces: the Serbian Royal Academy elected Mr Milan Rešetar a full member of the Academy on 16th February 1940”, *Year-Book*, L 1940, the Serbian Royal Academy, Belgrade 1941, 187.

of Dubrovnik until the middle of the 15th century (in the city councils and offices), “but in the private life of the city (in the home and outside it)” it was replaced by “our language”, which “even made its way into the meetings held by the highest authority – the Senate” (Rešetar 1951: 2). Therefore, the Senate decided in 1472 “that in all the city councils the only language allowed to be spoken is to be only ‘our old Dubrovnican language’ or Italian, while ‘Slavic’ is not to be spoken – which was at the time when the first poets started singing merrily in the folk language!”. However, the living linguistic processes, which unfolded as a result of the settling of Slavic population in Dubrovnik, could not be stopped, so that its Romanic language was soon replaced by the Slavic language: “Twenty years later, that proscribed ‘Slavic’ language was already referred to as ‘our language’ in official documents, and in the early years of the 16th century, when the old Senate members from 1472 and their coevals were dead, it was only mentioned sometimes that ‘the old Dubrovnican language’ was once used in public life, but in reality no one spoke it any longer, although perhaps a few old noblemen still remembered it” (Rešetar 1951: 2).

According to Rešetar, the linguistic Serbianisation of Dubrovnik unfolded gradually, parallel with the settlement of the population originating from the east-Herzegovinian surroundings of the city, and with the Serbianisation of the “natives”, but the elements of faith and the state borders made it considerably different and separated it from the Serbian surroundings: “In the history of our folk life in general, and especially in the history of literature, Dubrovnik occupies an entirely separate position. Having emerged in the manner of an island, where a certain amount of the Romance element survived the Slavic flood, Dubrovnik never became quite equal with its Serbian surroundings: its political independence was contributed to for a long time by its ethnographic separateness, and when the old Romanic city, partly due to the settling of Serbs arriving from the outside, partly due to the gradual Serbianisation of the natives, turned into a Serbian city, at least linguistically, the in-

habitants of Dubrovnik still preserved their individuality; they did speak Serbian, but did not feel themselves to be Serbs, for to them, primarily that which belonged to the Serbian state was Serbian, and Dubrovnik was never within its borders. However, it was not only political borders that separated the inhabitants of Dubrovnik from other Serbs: faith was also a strong separation factor, as well as its cultural bent in general. Namely, while the newly established state of the Nemanjić dynasty resolutely embraced the Orthodox faith, following Byzantium in almost every respect, Dubrovnik never severed its old ties, which connected it to the West in terms of faith and social life – specifically to Rome and Italy. Those are the reasons why, although it did get Serbianised linguistically, it still remained a non-Serbian locale surrounded by Serbian lands, which lived its own life” (Rešetar 1894: VII–VIII). According to Rešetar, the Serbian language started spreading in Dubrovnik from the end of the 15th century, through the church service and church-related contents, as the service was performed in the Slavic language, and also through literary creations, as well as through secular documents, even considerably earlier in the latter case. Parallel with this, works in Latin and Italian were being created as well.³

³ “In this respect, too, the 14th century was a turning point: the new Italian literature and science, which reached so high with Dante, spread to Dubrovnik as well. In the beginning, this influence was very modest, the occasional teacher was invited over. But until a short while before, young people from Dubrovnik went to Italy to study of their own will, and in the 15th century we already find a host of scientists and writers from Dubrovnik. But all that scientific and literary work was not in Serbian but in Latin, for at that time, throughout Europe, scientific texts were only written in Latin, and as for literature, Latin still occupied the first place there as well [...]. Serbian started being written in Dubrovnik only towards the end of the 15th century. In all likelihood, this was initiated from outside the city, and the process began with church-related matters (songs, the gospels), which were imported in Dubrovnik from Dalmatia, where the church service was performed in the Old Slavic language, which had been customary there from the end of the 9th century; this, no doubt, contributed to the folk language entering Latin churches. In northern Dalmatia – whose relations with Italy were the same as those of Dubrovnik, and where, in the 15th century, consider-

Which variant of the Slavic language came to replace the Romanic one, how that came about, what its linguistic specificities are, its dialectal features, the characteristics of the written language, what the Dubrovnik speech is like, which features are to be found in the linguistic monuments from this era, which type of language constitutes their basis, the manner in which certain linguistic features entered the language of these monuments, all these questions are answered by Rešetar taking into consideration everything of relevance which could be indicative of the linguistic circumstances of Dubrovnik. Through his exhaustive and precise explorations of the Old Slavic linguistic monuments created in Dubrovnik (and in connection with Dubrovnik), as well as documents that (directly and indirectly) testify of the language and script of Dubrovnik, Rešetar arrived at incontrovertible conclusions regarding the oldest Slavic dialect in this city. His scientific investigations can be observed unfolding in three directions, somewhat separate and different, but reducible to a single level: the language of poetry, the language of prose and the speech of Dubrovnik.

2. The language of the poetry of Dubrovnik

The basic question on which Rešetar focused in his research and which he answered by meticulously exploring the linguistic monuments of the city, is whether the language of Dubrovnik is to be sought among the city's **poets** or elsewhere. Guided (that is, inspired) by the linguistic features of the oldest Dubrovnik poets from the 15th century (Šiško Menčetić, Džore Držić, Mavro Vetranović), in whose poetry the Čakavian ele-

able scientific and literary work was done in Latin – a writer was born who is rightly regarded to have been the first among the poets of the coastal region to introduce the folk language in literature. It was Marko Marulić (1450–1524) from Split, who, apart from scientific and religious works in Latin and Italian, wrote many pious and moral poems, as well as two long epic poems (*Judita and Suzana*) in the folk language” (Rešetar 1894: IX–X).

ments predominated (simultaneously with the Ikavian ones), some scientists (Kukuljević, Jagić), having become acquainted with the language of these poets early on, tried to see the speech of Dubrovnik in their language. The language of Ivan Gundulić was quite different from that of the first poets referred to above, which became more widely known after Matica ilirska [Matrix Illyrica, a Croatian cultural institution] published his epic poem *Osman* in its entirety in 1844.⁴ Regardless of a certain number of “unusual, that is, archaic forms and words”, as Rešetar says, “everyone could see the Štokavian-Jekavian dialect in Gundulić’s language” (Rešetar 1951: 3–4). Even though Gundulić’s language opposed such interpretations, some of the scholars who were influenced by certain Čakavian linguistic elements

⁴ “Things changed when the poems of some poets older than Gundulić started being published, first of all in Međo Pucić’s *A Slavic Anthology* (Vienna 1844), and then in the following Zagreb publications: *Poems of Difference* by Dinko Ranjina (1850), *Works* by Dinko Zlatarić (1852–53), *Hecuba and Abraham’s Sacrifice* by Mavro Vetranović (1853), and especially when Kukuljević, in the issue of the *Neven* periodical for the year 1855, started publishing Croatian poets of the 15th and the 16th century. One could not fail to observe that the language of those poets differed quite a lot from the language of Gundulić’s *Osman*, and Kukuljević was the first one to note this in a brief biography of Šiško Menčetić (1454–1527) prefacing a selection of his poems: he wrote in a pure Čakavian dialect, just like all his coevals in Dubrovnik and Dalmatia, but subsequently the copiers of his poems substituted the word *ua* [what, that] with *umo*, while leaving *ua* in other poems of his, as well as all the other forms of the Čakavian dialect, and he said the same of Džore Držić (1461–1501)” (Rešetar 1951: 4). Kukuljević expressed a similar view regarding Mavro Vetranović. Rešetar concludes: “Although Kukuljević is no authority in linguistic matters, I have quoted this opinion of his concerning the language of the Dubrovnik poets of the 15th and the 16th century because it is in connection with his work that the issue of the oldest speech of Dubrovnik has been raised, and it would be quite superfluous to prove that those poets **did not write in a pure Čakavian dialect**, and that it was **not** the subsequent copiers who **mixed** their pure Čakavian dialect with their own Štokavian dialect [...]. Later on, Kukuljević changed his views: ‘we can see from the language of poems that the old inhabitants of Dubrovnik were always guided by the language of Dalmatian poets, whereas new Dalmatian poets followed Dubrovnikans’, that is, ‘they imitated Dalmatian poets’” (Rešetar 1951: 4).

observable in the works of the oldest poets, adhered to the opinion that the oldest speech and language of Slavic Dubrovnik were to be sought in the language of its oldest poets. Following this view, they were prone to proclaiming everything among the older linguistic monuments that was written in the Štokavian-Jekavian dialect non-Dubrovnican, that is, they strove to prove that those Štokavian-Jekavian linguistic monuments were not representative or indicative of the authentic Dubrovnik speech. Therefore, judging by certain Čakavian elements present in those poets' works, they drew conclusions about the oldest Dubrovnik speech and sought it in the Čakavian dialect. As Rešetar concludes, Jagić (as the main proponent of this view) had no evidence to substantiate this claim, nor could he find any. But he found it hard to give up such convictions.

Milan Rešetar very argumentatively and authoritatively (based on his analysis and study of numerous linguistic monuments) rejects the view of a Čakavian Dubrovnik. Through the linguistic characteristics of the prose he studied and the original Dubrovnican linguistic monuments, he showed that Dubrovnik had always been (since it became Slavic, based both on its ethnic and linguistic features) Štokavian-Jekavian (that is, Herzegovinian-Jekavian), never Čakavian-Ikavian. Apart from that, in the language of the younger poets, those who created before Gundulić, and especially in the latter's case, we already find Štokavian-Jekavian features, while the Čakavian features in the older poets were not a reflection of the Dubrovnik speech or in keeping with it, but were a consequence of their imitation of Dalmatian poets, who wrote in Čakavian. Therefore, all those creations were written in the Štokavian-Jekavian dialect, with the exception of the majority of poetic creations (which, according to Rešetar, are an imitation of the Čakavian-Ikavian variant of the Dalmatian language), and even those poets used the Štokavian-Jekavian dialect in their writings outside the boundaries of poetry: "In my study of the Čakavian dialect and its boundaries, I dealt with the issue of the old Dubrovnik speech, and I came to the conclusion that the poets of the 16th

century in no way spoke in the manner in which they wrote their poems, for not only did all the prose written in Dubrovnik at that time deviate from the poems written by those same poets, in their prose prefaces and dedications they also deviated from the language of their poems, just as the Dubrovnik prose in general differed from the Dubrovnik poetry of that time. Namely, the poets of the 16th century accepted the language of two 15th-century poets, Menčetić and Držić, but only for their poems. Regarding these two poets, I proved two things: firstly, they did not write in Čakavian but in Štokavian, featuring only some of the characteristics that they took over from the Čakavian speakers in Dalmatia” (Rešetar 1952: 28–29).

Apart from Marko Marulić, Rešetar also presented other Dubrovnik poets from the period between the 15th and the 17th century who also wrote in the folk language (and in whose work various influences could be observed): Šiško (Sigizmund) Menčetić Vlahović, Džore (Đorđe) Držić, Nikola Vetranić (1482–1576), Nikola Nalješković (1587), Marin Držić (around 1587), Dinko Ranjina (1538–1607), Dinko Zlatarić (1556–1607), Dživo (Jovan) Gundulić (1588–1638), Džono Palmotić (1606–1657) (Rešetar 1894: IX–XX), and came to the following conclusion: “The language of the old Dubrovnik poets differs considerably from the Serbian literary language of today: **on the one hand**, there are many forms and words in their works, as well as sound and syntactic phenomena, which **in earlier times** were more or less **to be found in all the Serbian lands** and were subsequently replaced by new ones, **and on the other**, quite a few features can be observed in their works which **distinguished** the Dubrovnik speech, or generally the dialects of the coastal region **from those of Zagorje**.

Among the sound-related phenomena, it is particularly conspicuous that, in the poets of the 15th and the 16th century, one very often finds, indeed, in the majority of cases, some Ika-vian forms alongside Jekavian ones, for example, *вруме* [time], *лун* [lovely], *вира* [faith], alongside *вријеме*, *лијен*, *вјера*. **These poets, most likely, only wrote like this**, following the exam-

ple of Dalmatian writers using the Ikavian dialect, but **did not speak like that** (our emphasis!), for whatever was written in prose form in Dubrovnik at the time (including the writings of the poets themselves!) was almost solely Jekavian, which was how the Dubrovnik charters from the 14th and the 15th century were written. With Gundulić, the Jekavian dialect entered the poetry of Dubrovnik as well, and the Ikavian pronunciation was regularly preserved only where it was really heard, especially in the prefix *npe* – for example *npucmam* [stop], *npudam* [hand over], instead of *npecmam*, *npedam*...” (Rešetar 1894: XX).

Also, Ikavian features are not characteristic of the Dubrovnik speech, they could only appear there due to the imitation of the language of Dalmatian poets. Ikavian features are not to be found in the oldest original documents of secular content, created in the Serbian state office in Dubrovnik, so those poets could not have acquired those features through them. Therefore, they were a purely poetic device. Rešetar presents and explains the presence of Ikavian forms in a very detailed manner: “As a result of this overview of unusual Ikavian forms in the oldest prose written in Dubrovnik, it transpires that **no Serbian chancellor in Dubrovnik and not a single Dubrovnik literary monument written before the middle of the 16th century is predominantly Ikavian**, as Š. Menčetić writes, let alone almost purely Ikavian, as Dž. Držić writes. The only exception is the Serbian chancellor Džive Parmezan, who changes the vowel *ɤ* or *e* mostly to *u* when writing, which he could not have found in the native Serbian communities, **for the Serbian state office never used *u* instead of *ɤ* in writing...** (our emphasis). Parmezan’s writing [...] is not in conformity with the written language of the Dubrovnik charters of the 13th century, which contain no unusual Ikavian forms, but only mix *jam* and *e*, nor is it in keeping with the writing style of his half-brother, of the same mother (a Dubrovnik woman) [...], and least of all can it be found in the charters of the state office from the middle of the 15th century onwards or in the linguistic monuments independently created in Dubrovnik, not revised or copied from

Dalmatian originals [...], which were all created at the time when Menčetić and Držić lived; as there were almost no unusual Ikavian forms in those charters and linguistic monuments, I think that the claim that the Dubrovnik speech was never predominantly, let alone purely Ikavian, is entirely justified, and that, especially at the time when these two poets lived, the Dubrovnik speech was almost purely Jekavian, so that the Ikavian character of these poets' language was due to the influence of the Dalmatian literary language, which, long before their time, had reached Dubrovnik as the language of the church, its books, prayers and songs" (Rešetar 1952: 29).

The debate about the language and speech of Dubrovnik especially gained momentum after two "newly discovered" Cyrillic Štokavian-Jekavian prose monuments (*The Dubrovnik Collection* and *The Leipzig Lectionary*) were taken into consideration; initially, as Rešetar says, they were dealt with by Jagić, Leskin and Maretić. It was evident that the language of these monuments differed from that of the oldest poets. Speaking about the *Collection* in 1868, and confirming that it considerably deviates "in some characteristic aspects from the language of the oldest Dubrovnik poets", and "at that time it was known (that is, thought, J. S.) that in Dubrovnik the Cyrillic script was used only for the correspondence of the Dubrovnik government with the neighbouring ones" (Rešetar 1951: 5), Jagić, wishing to adhere to his view that the oldest Dubrovnik speech is Čakavian, could not afford to admit that the *Collection* was written by a man from Dubrovnik, regardless of the fact that, as Rešetar says, "on the last page (in the afterword) it is written: 'This book was written in Dubrovnik', and although on sheet 89^b the author wishes the best of luck 'to this city of ours, Dubrovnik'. In any case, Jagić did not provide any reasons or evidence to justify his opinion" (Rešetar 1951: 5). Jagić, thus, neglected everything that did not favour the already established opinion about the language of Dubrovnik, and tried to justify it by offering some other reasons.

Along with the *Collection*, there was *The Leipzig Lectionary*, a Dubrovnik linguistic monument, also written in the Cy-

rillic script, which Leskin presented to the public in 1881. Leskin's opinion of it was that it had been written by a man from Dubrovnik, "even though in linguistic terms it is closer to the *Collection* of 1520 than to both oldest poets" (Rešetar 1951: 5–6). Maretić, having established that the *Lectionary* was copied from the older Bernardin's lectionary, observed that "some forms and sounds were transformed from the Čakavian (Bernardin's) speech to that of Dubrovnik". Thereby, Maretić "concurred with Leskin's opinion that *The Leipzig Lectionary* is a Dubrovnik monument" (Rešetar 1951: 6).

The discrepancies between certain features in the language of poets and these monuments led to conflicting opinions of them. As Rešetar observes, "three excellent Slavic scholars had conflicting opinions concerning the question of which monument could be a Dubrovnik one and which one could not. In Jagić's view, the *Collection* could not have been written in Dubrovnik, and according to Leskin and Maretić, that may have been the case, although these two monuments are, for the most part, in linguistic agreement, and equally differ from the earliest poets. What was at issue was whether it can be recognised that monuments written in the Dubrovnik speech are almost purely Štokavian, as is the case with the *Collection* and the *Lectionary*, both written in the Cyrillic script, when the language of the oldest poets possesses several evident features showing these poets to be in agreement with the Čakavian monuments from Dalmatia, whereas they deviate from the Dubrovnik prose written in the Cyrillic script" (Rešetar 1951: 6).

According to Rešetar, an issue that was essentially philological thus became political, for based on the old theory of Vuk and Miklošič that Čakavian speakers are Croatian and Štokavian speakers are Serbian, this turned into a question of whether old Dubrovnikans were Serbs (if they are Štokavians) or Croats (if they are Čakavians). Rešetar, examining the linguistic features of the oldest Dubrovnik poets, came to the conclusion that their speech did not differ from the language of prose, that is, that both spoke the Dubrovnik variant of the Štokavi-

an-Jekavian dialect, but these **poets**, imitating the language of Dalmatian poets, introduced a number of Čakavian features in their poetry (which are repeated, more or less, as mannerisms); Rešetar refers to them as “poetic Čakavianisms”. Rešetar draws attention to the fact that he was drawn into this debate as he was the first one to point out the difference between the language of poetry and that of prose, and after a detailed investigation, he came to the conclusion that the old scripts of the Republic of Dubrovnik and the oldest prose texts written in Dubrovnik in the mediaeval era of our literature were purely Štokavian, that the earliest Dubrovnik poets also wrote in Štokavian, “except for some Čakavian features, which they used to distinguish their poetic discourse from the speech of the common folk” (Rešetar 1951: 6). They took over these individual Čakavian features from books written in Čakavian, Rešetar says, “which is why I claimed that the people of Dubrovnik had never been Čakavians, for the Serbian language came to this once Romanic city from old Zahumlje and old Travunia, where only Štokavian was spoken” (ibid.). Even though, as he said in his maiden speech, he had made that claim 50 years before, he was increasingly convinced of the correctness of his view, since each new investigation and each new study confirmed his earlier findings and additionally strengthened them.

Rešetar’s fundamental conclusion, concerning the language of poetry, is that the poets of the 16th century adopted the poetic manner of two 15th-century poets, Menčetić and Držić (who were under the influence of the good example provided by the Čakavian Marulić). Rešetar also showed that Menčetić and Držić did not write in Čakavian but in Štokavian, and that their poetic language only had certain elements that they took over from Dalmatian Čakavian speakers, first of all the rare form *ча* [what] and the “very frequently encountered *зач* [why]” (as opposed to the Štokavian forms *што* and *зашто*), then the predominant Ikavian pronunciation, the retention of *л* [l] at the end of a syllable (of the *рекал* [said], *чини́л* [did] type), the form *вазети* [take] (instead of *узети*), and rarely the preposition *ва*

[in] (instead of *y*), as well as “the common contracted forms” *mâ* [mine] and *mêê* [yours] (instead of *moja*, *mvoje* and the like; Rešetar 1951: 7). Rešetar goes on to add that the Ikavian forms and the retained π at the end of a syllable cannot be seen as solely Čakavian. However, these poetic Čakavianisms, as Rešetar would show, are nowhere to be found in prose monuments written in Dubrovnik, which clearly shows what the Dubrovnik speech was like from the time when it became a Slavic city.

3. The language of the prose of Dubrovnik

3.1. The Dubrovnik speech, as Rešetar shows, should not be sought in poetry but in **prose**, even though the poetic creations do not stand in opposition to the Štokavian speech of Dubrovnik, if one takes into consideration the fact that the Čakavian features, individual and established, are merely due to acts of imitation on the part of the poets. It is, in fact, the other way round! Rešetar examined the linguistic monuments and presented them taking into account several types: 1) original monuments, 2) texts directly translated from foreign languages into the Dubrovnik speech, 3) monuments that were edited and adapted to the Dubrovnik speech from Čakavian sources, or rarely from church Slavic sources. He examined this material taking into consideration the origin and the heritage of the scribe: some of the scribes (the vast majority of them, in fact) were born in Dubrovnik, some of them had a foreign parent, and some were foreigners themselves. The monuments were also examined taking into consideration whether they were letters addressed to Serbian lands or letters exchanged between inhabitants of Dubrovnik, sent to the Turkish Court and the like. All of the above could be significant indicators and witnesses of the linguistic circumstances. Examining the language of these various kinds of linguistic monuments, in the case when these documents were written in the “Slavic” language, Rešetar shows that what was spoken (and written) in Dubrovnik was

the Herzegovinian-Jekavian dialect, and everything else was a matter of imitation, fashion or a momentary whim. In addition to that, he showed that the poets, as we have seen before (that is, those poets who “sang” for the most part in the Čakavian-Ikavian variant), in their introductions, prefaces and other prose parts of their books (and even alongside their poetic Čakavian texts) also used the Herzegovinian-Jekavian dialect parallel with what Rešetar refers to as “poetic Čakavianisms”. Another testimony to the presence of the Štokavian-Jekavian dialect is the fact that the government of Dubrovnik and some inhabitants of Dubrovnik, in letters and documents that were intended for Dubrovnik itself, also wrote in Štokavian, not in Čakavian. In accordance with the above, Rešetar concludes: “If, then, the Čakavian *zau* is nowhere to be found in any of the several hundred original documents and copies written over a period of 300 years, that is a certain sign that no one in Dubrovnik spoke like that, so it is impossible to believe so many Dubrovnik scribes and copiers conscientiously hid it for such a long period of time, and that none of them, even by accident, wrote that Čakavian *zau*, although Menčetić and Držić reportedly spoke like that and wrote it so often!” (Rešetar 1951: 8).

3.2. To begin with, Rešetar reviews *linguistic monuments* that are not literary in character, that is, **Cyrillic script charters** that were written or copied in Dubrovnik, taking into consideration the following important facts, namely, whether they are: a) original charters and letters, or b) copies made in Dubrovnik. Both types of documents, in their own way, are indicators of the Dubrovnik speech, for even in copies of documents, Dubrovnik scribes changed many linguistic features from the original that were not characteristic of Dubrovnik, “be it deliberately or not”, in order “to make them appear Dubrovnik-style” (Rešetar 1951: 8). Comparing the original with a copy produced significant information about the language of the scribe and the area he belonged to. Analysing the language of charters written in the period between the 13th and the 15th century (presuming that the scribes were from Dubrovnik, unless proven otherwise), it turns out that

they mostly wrote in Štokavian, “because that is what was spoken in Dubrovnik, not out of consideration for the neighbouring Štokavians to whom Dubrovnik residents wrote” (as some scholars tried to explain it) (Rešetar 1951: 8). The most original linguistic monuments, charters and letters, irrespective of whether they were intended for Serbian lands, the Turks or people from Dubrovnik, show that from the earliest times it was Herzegovinian and Jekavian that was spoken in Dubrovnik: “Only from the beginning of the 13th century did our linguistic monuments written in Dubrovnik appear... those were mostly official documents (charters) about the relations between Dubrovnik and the neighbouring Serbian noblemen, which were regularly written and composed in the state office of Dubrovnik, but there is also a great number of documents that were drafted outside Dubrovnik and were only copied in the city.” Among the oldest monuments preserved in Dubrovnik, there are those from the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th century,⁵ and after that there was “an increasing number of **Dubrovnik letters in Serbian written to Serbian rulers**, noblemen and private persons – until the downfall of the independent Serbian states in the second half of the 15th century. But 100 years before that, Dubrovnik started corresponding with its new neighbours – the Turks, in our language: the oldest letter from the city to a Turkish qadi dates from 1396; ...But from the time of Bayazit II (1481-1512), imperial orders started arriving in Dubrovnik **written in the Turkish language, along with a Serbian translation**, and after Suleyman II, it seems that **Serbian correspondence with Turkish emperors ceased altogether** (our emphasis!) – in any case, none has been preserved” (Rešetar 1951: 3).

⁵ “Thus our oldest linguistic monument, the well-known agreement of 1189, concluded between the Bosnian Ban Kulin and Dubrovnik, is at the same time the oldest Dubrovnik monument, preserved as a copy from the beginning of the 13th century. The first Dubrovnik act of ours is the agreement concluded between Dubrovnik and King Vladislav, dating from 1234–35, but it has been preserved only as a copy made in Dubrovnik, it seems, so that the oldest original Dubrovnik act is a letter to King Vladislav of 1238–40” (Rešetar 1951: 3).

The originals of the charters, Rešetar says, “constitute the firmest guarantee that they were written in the purest Dubrovnik dialect” (Rešetar 1952: 3), and the most certain testimony of this is provided by those charters that were written by **Serbian chancellors** “of whom it is certain or at least highly likely that they were **citizens of Dubrovnik**, and first and foremost among those were Nikša and Paskoje Primojević, then Džive Parmezan, Niko Bijelić and Rusko” (ibid.). Rešetar singles out Rusko and Nikša as being particularly important, first of all, because they wrote a large number of charters, so that on the basis of those documents one can form a clear picture of their language, and secondly, because they lived and worked at the time when the oldest Dubrovnik poets Š. Menčetić and Dž. Držić lived and wrote poetry (Rešetar 1952: 3–4).

Some philologists, adhering to the view that the oldest linguistic layer in Dubrovnik is to be found in the Čakavian dialect, proceeded from the premise that Štokavian and Jekavian were not used by the Dubrovnik **noblemen** in their writing, which, according to them, was proof that the oldest Dubrovnik speech was not Štokavian. In addition to this, they maintained (for example, Jagić) that poets were the noblemen of Dubrovnik, and they were the main indicator of what the oldest Dubrovnik speech was like. Rešetar quite easily brought both claims into question. He showed that among the Dubrovnik poets only Menčetić was a nobleman, and later on Dinko Ranjina as well.⁶ As opposed to this, a large number of those who were not poets (and wrote in Štokavian and Jekavian) were noblemen. As Rešetar shows, two scribes (who were mentioned in the first half of the 16th century) were certainly Dubrovnik noblemen, on the basis of which he draws the conclusion that some scribes

⁶ Rešetar established that the only nobleman “until the middle of the 16th century was Menčetić, whom Jagić presumably referred to the most, but the others were not noblemen – Džore Držić, Menčetić’s poetic companion and perhaps predecessor, certainly was not, nor were Vetranović, Čubranović, Dimitrijević, Buresić, Nalješковиć or Marin Držić, and only in 1563 did another nobleman enter the circle of Dubrovnik poets – Dinko Ranjina” (Rešetar: 1951: 38).

from the first half of the 13th century were also Dubrovnik noblemen, moreover, they were Romanic “and did not know Serbian well”, for their language was “quite wrong”. Dživo Parmezan (1348-1363) and Rusko Hristofanović (1392-1430) had Italian fathers, so it is assumed that they learned Serbian from their mother, who was from Dubrovnik, and Nikša Zvijezdić, Rusko’s successor, was “a real citizen of Dubrovnik and a distant relative of the poet Džore Držić” (Rešetar 1951: 9). According to Rešetar’s investigations, that Nikša spoke Štokavian-Jekavian is testified to by original charters and also by copies of charters, which show that Nikša Zvijezdić “changed forms and words from the original, and he made his copies linguistically close to his original charters and his Štokavian speech, while never entering any Čakavian features in his copies, not even those poetic ones, which the first poets used in writing, and reportedly in their speech as well after his death” (ibid.: 16).⁷

Jiriček speaks of a third nobleman, Niko Bijelić, Parmezan’s half-brother, who is mentioned in the years 1312 and 1319 as a state Serbian scribe, “named after his mother Bijela”. In addition to this, neither Jiriček nor Rešetar bring into question the fact that there were several scribes, Serbian chancellors, who were not native inhabitants of Dubrovnik, among whom there were Čakavian speakers, “but that does not change the fact that, as a rule, scribes and copiers were regularly Dubrovnikans who wrote relying on the Dubrovnik speech”, that is, in Štokavian-Jekavian (Rešetar 1951: 9). Rešetar also established that the last 9 char-

⁷ “Only regarding Ikavian forms, it should be admitted that there are more of them in Nikša’s copies than in his original documents, and this is not only because Nikša often retains the Ikavian form that he encountered at the source – which would not be of much significance, but also due to the fact – and this is much more important – that he changed some clearly Jekavian forms and the occasional letter y with Ikavian forms... But [...] we find those unusual Ikavianisms in Nikša, who is a pure Jekavian speaker, only in some copies of charters that he made which were predominantly Ikavian or at least a mixture of Ikavian and Jekavian, so that one cannot believe that Nikša spoke Jekavian when he wrote his original charters and switched to Jekavian-Ikavian when he copied the charters of others” (Rešetar 1951: 16–17).

ters in Nikša's collection were written by Paskoje Primojević (1482–1527), “who was from a reputable civic family, so he can be a good witness to us of how people spoke in Dubrovnik in Menčetić's era” (Rešetar 1951: 14). There are no original charters written by him, “but only copies of several Turkish edicts (in Serbian translation)”, of which two have been preserved in the original, and “from these copies made by Primojević, it is amply clear that he was a Štokavian-Jekavian speaker, who used no Čakavianisms in his copies, not even poetic ones of the kind used by his coevals Menčetić and Držić” (ibid.: 15).

According to Rešetar, a representative indicator of the nature of the language and script of Dubrovnik are notes made by **young Dubrovnik noblemen in the first half of the 15th century in a book written in Latin** “during their leisure time... in Serbian (not Romanic), using the Cyrillic script (not the Latin one)” (Rešetar 1951: 11–12). As Rešetar concludes, on the basis of both newer and older editions of the charters, the Dubrovnik “speech was Štokavian and regularly Jekavian” (ibid.: 14), which is testified to not only by letters and charters intended for the surrounding countries, but also by letters that Dubrovnikans wrote to one another, as well as by the language of scribes who belonged to Dubrovnik's nobility and by the occasional notes (which are credible witnesses), written in the Cyrillic script and in the Štokavian dialect, made by young Dubrovnik noblemen in a book written in Latin. In all likelihood, Rešetar concludes, “Jagić's hypothesis about the autochthonous character of Čakavianism in Dubrovnik, even a weak form thereof, is not well founded at all” (Rešetar 1951: 38).

3.3. Of particular importance as indicators of the old Dubrovnik speech are **the prose monuments of Dubrovnik**: *Ranjina's Lectionary* (started in 1508), *The Dubrovnik Collection* of 1520, written in the Cyrillic script, and *The Dubrovnik Lectionary*. Rešetar dedicated special attention to these. In all the three sources referred to above, Rešetar finds several essential wholes, all of which, in their special way, speak of Dubrovnik, its language and speech. Specifically, within the framework of

these linguistic monuments, one can more or less single out three segments that represent: 1) copies of old Čakavian-Ikavian sources, 2) translations from Latin and Italian, 3) copies of (old) “Dubrovnik redactions”.

3.3.1. In all three monuments (*Ranjina's Lectionary*, *The Dubrovnik Lectionary* and *The Dubrovnik Collection*, the latter two printed in the Cyrillic script), there are parts that represent **copies of Čakavian-Ikavian sources**. In view of their attitude towards Čakavian sources, these three monuments follow the same path, that is, the Čakavian-Ikavian features are replaced (to a greater or lesser degree) by Štokavian-Jekavian elements, which provides an amply clear and picturesque account of the language and speech of the writers of these monuments, and through them, of the language and speech of Dubrovnik. In *Ranjina's Lectionary* (in the part marked by Rešetar as R², which, as he says, was created sometime after 1495), and in the Cyrillic *Dubrovnik Lectionary* (preserved in the Dominican Library in Dubrovnik, which, according to Rešetar, is a copy of the first edition of *Bernardin's Lectionary* of 1495, copied by “the chief scribe A of the *Collection* of 1520, most likely before 1520 and closer to 1495”), Čakavian features are replaced by Štokavian ones, and “no poetic Čakavianism is ever inserted in the text if it is not to be found in the source” (Rešetar 1951: 29). On the basis of the above, one can clearly conclude that there were no Čakavianisms in the copier's speech. The Cyrillic *Dubrovnik Lectionary*, according to Rešetar's conclusions, follows the part of *Ranjina's Lectionary* designated as R², and “to a much greater degree” confirms the direction of the changes made by the scribe: “As it turns out, whatever was changed was done with a view to replacing Dalmatian Čakavian-Ikavian features with Dubrovnikan Štokavian-Jekavian ones” (ibid.: 21).⁸

⁸ “What is striking about this Cyrillic copy, as well as *Ranjina's* R.¹ and R.², is the very often retained suffix *-m* in the present tense and present perfect forms signifying the future, which shows that the two forms had become established in the reading of Biblical texts in church. But it is not so important to us what remained in the *Lectionary* of the Čakavi-

In the Cyrillic *Dubrovnik Collection*, which was written by the first and chief scribe (A), in the first of the two works (which Rešetar designates as Z.^{1a}), there are various articles which constitute “a redaction of Čakavian-Glagolitic (and perhaps also of some church-Cyrillic texts)”; apart from this, in the part done by the third scribe (C), there are articles that constitute a reworking of Glagolitic sources (Z.³). In the case of these copies, too, the scribes regularly replaced Čakavian-Ikavian forms with Štokavian ones (even though, which was to be expected, “they very rarely left in the odd Čakavian form, just as, be it indirectly, through the Čakavian source, or perhaps even directly, the occasional church form found its way into the text rather more frequently” (ibid.: 20). What is of importance here, which testifies to the language and speech of the scribes (and thereby of Dubrovnik), is that there are no cases of things being the other way round, and also of great significance is the fact that there are **no “poetic Čakavianisms” whatsoever** in any of these works.

3.3.2. Concerning the language and speech of Dubrovnik, also of importance are the parts **copied from the already completed “Dubrovnik redaction”**. These comprise: a part of *Ranjina’s Lectionary* and parts of the *Collection* that were not copied from the Čakavian source. In the part of the *Lectionary* that represents “the old Dubrovnik redaction R.¹ (comprising around 380 lessons)”, where Ranjina was not a redactor “but only copied it from a source wherein the Dubrovnik redaction had already been conducted, which may have been done long before his time, certainly at least in the second half of the 15th century” (ibid.: 17), Ranjina “did not retain or add any poetic Čakavianism, except for, in all likelihood, having merely retained, without adding, a number of unusual Ikavian forms. On the contrary, in R.¹ he often retained two Čakavianisms of which it can be said that they were nowhere to be found in the works of the

an source as what was not retained; no poetic or any other Čakavianism is to be found in the *Lectionary* where it could have been placed” (Rešetar 1951: 21).

earliest poets – the suffix *-m* in 3rd person singular and plural of the present tense and present perfect verb forms indicating the future (in the main clauses), but both are so foreign to Štokavian speech that there can be no doubt that, in those situations, Ranjina faithfully retained what had remained of the Čakavian source in the older Dubrovnik redaction” (Rešetar 1951: 18). Those were, for the most part, **Čakavianisms inherited from the church language** and established as such in the Dubrovnik language. According to Rešetar’s conclusions, the linguistic characteristics of the three scribes of the *Collection* are mutually compatible, and they are also in keeping with the language of the charters that are closest to them temporally, as well as with *Ranjina’s Lectionary*: “The *Collection* scribes, then, write in Štokavian and Jekavian on a regular basis, and it is only in the articles that were reworked from the Čakavian source in Z.^{1a} and Z.³ that the odd Čakavian form crept in” (ibid.: 18). Therefore, the parts that were not copied from Čakavian sources are characterised by the Štokavian Jekavian dialect, there are no poetic Čakavianisms, but two Čakavianisms do occur that were retained in the older Dubrovnik redaction through the church language.

3.3.3. The most important testimony about the language of the scribes are the parts of these linguistic monuments that **were translated from the Latin or the Italian language**, and thus represent a direct translation into the Dubrovnik speech. Those are the segment of *Ranjina’s Lectionary* designated by Rešetar as R.³, the part of the *Collection* marked as Z.^{1b} and certain rubrics in the Cyrillic *Dubrovnik Lectionary*. The part in *Ranjina’s Lectionary* “which was translated in Dubrovnik from Latin straight into the Dubrovnik speech” (Rešetar 1951: 17) and comprises “around 50 lessons” was created after the R.² part, which was copied from *Bernardin’s Lectionary*. This part is not influenced by the church language “the way Cyrillic charters are, nor is it the Dubrovnik redaction of a Dalmatian text”; therefore, according to Rešetar, “in a word, R.³ is the oldest example of Dubrovnik prose written in the pure Dubrovnik speech” (ibid.: 18). In this part of the book, Ranjina writes “in

pure Štokavian and Jekavian, with no poetic or any other Čakavianisms, and without any Ikavian form that would be unusual in Dubrovnik” (ibid.). In the Cyrillic *Collection*, in the second part of the book, which comprises “one half of the entire *Collection*” (Rešetar 1951: 20), there are “articles directly translated from Italian into the Dubrovnik speech”, and they contain “absolutely no Čakavianisms or church Slavic forms” (ibid.), as is also the case with segment R.³, which also represents “pure Dubrovnik urban speech, and if one does not recognise it as urban, then certainly rural”. In the language of that original part of the *Collection* “there is nothing that would make it essentially different from the original part of the *Lectionary*, whereas both these original Dubrovnik works equally differ from the Čakavian-Ikavian writing of the earliest poets” (Rešetar 1951: 20). *The Dubrovnik Lectionary* also has some important rubrics that were translated directly from Latin, and which were printed in Latin in the first edition of *Bernardin’s Lectionary*: “The rubrics were translated directly from Latin, most likely by the scribe himself, into the pure Štokavian-Jekavian speech, without any Čakavianisms, containing only three unusual Ikavian forms, as opposed to several hundred Jekavian ones [...]. These rubrics, then, provide a small example of the oldest purely Dubrovnikan prose, dating from approximately the same time as the original parts of segment R.³ of *Ranjina’s Lectionary* and part Z.^{1b} of the *Collection*, to which they correspond quite well, all deviating from the first poets. This is an excellent confirmation of the fact that the linguistic changes made in the whole of the Cyrillic *Lectionary* and in the copied part of segment R.² of *Ranjina’s Lectionary* correspond precisely to the real Dubrovnik speech of the period around the year 1500” (Rešetar 1951: 21–22). These three segments from three different linguistic monuments provide the clearest illustration of the then Dubrovnik speech: they are written in Štokavian-Jekavian, there are no poetic Čakavianisms in them, no unusual Ikavianisms or church Čakavianisms, so that they are an indicator of the way people spoke in Dubrovnik at the time.

The language of Nikša Ranjina is the best indicators of the way people spoke in Dubrovnik. **Ranjina**, as Rešetar reveals, spoke the way he wrote in R.³ (that is, in the part which he translated directly from Latin into the Dubrovnik speech). Also representative of the way he spoke is part R.², in the segment where he changed Bernardin's Čakavian text to Štokavian, as well as R.¹, the part wherein he changes the Čakavian *Lectionary* "to the Dubrovnik speech", that is, all these parts testify to the fact that Ranjina spoke the Dubrovnican Štokavian-Jekavian dialect (Rešetar: 18-19): "Therefore, I resolutely maintain that **the Dubrovnik nobleman Nikša Ranjina was a pure Štokavian-Jekavian speaker** and that he, a younger coeval of the earliest poets, is the best witness of the fact that, in Dubrovnik in the second part of the 15th century, people spoke the way *he spoke*, not the way the first poets wrote" (ibid.: 19). In keeping with the above, Rešetar concludes that Ranjina is "an excellent and resolute witness of the way people spoke in Dubrovnik at the time of the earliest poets, for although he was born only around 1495, or perhaps somewhat earlier, his parents were coevals of both oldest poets, so it is quite impossible that there was such a linguistic difference between Ranjina and his parents as there was between him and the poets" (Rešetar 1952: 7-8; see also in: Rešetar 1894). In addition to this, Ranjina was a citizen of Dubrovnik and a nobleman, so that one can draw conclusions on the basis of his language about the way that the citizens and noblemen of Dubrovnik spoke ("Jagić was truly convinced that *Ranjina's Lectionary* was copied from a Cyrillic edition, that is, from a source that was not intended for the city of Dubrovnik, or at least not for Dubrovnik noblemen" (Rešetar 1951: 19).

Concerning **all four scribes** of the *Collection*, Rešetar observes that they were **citizens of Dubrovnik**: "True, I admit that they are more likely to have been from the environs than from the city itself, for it is hard for me to believe that a voluminous literary work would be written in the Cyrillic script in the city, but it would be easier to find four skilled Cyrillic scribes in the city to collaborate on it" (ibid.: 19). Still, regarding the use of

the Cyrillic script in the city of Dubrovnik, by its own citizens, there is plenty of evidence: “At least until the 16th century, the Cyrillic script was used in the city: in the first half of the 15th century, young noblemen wrote various notes, even verse, using the Cyrillic script; a citizen of Dubrovnik who, in the year 1455, petitioned the government to allow him to return ‘to the city of his birth’, wrote in the Cyrillic script; in 1512, a wealthy merchant in the city wrote his testament in the Cyrillic script, and in 1517 it was copied in the Cyrillic script by the Latin chancellor. And among those Dubrovnik merchants who, in the 15th century and in the first half of the 16th century, sent the government only Cyrillic letters, to which they received only Cyrillic replies, many of them, perhaps even the majority of them, were citizens, for trading was still more in the hands of urban dwellers than peasants, which is why it is very likely that the new Latin literature did not suppress the use of the Cyrillic script in the city very fast” (Rešetar 1951: 19–20).

3.4. The Cyrillic *Breviary* (which Rešetar refers to as *The Serbian Breviary*) also fits in with the above-mentioned manuscripts. It is also a testimony about the life and use of the Cyrillic script and the Štokavian dialect in Dubrovnik. Rešetar concludes that it was copied by a number of scribes (he distinguishes “at least 7 such parts”), and all these different segments “were at various times changed from the Dalmatian source to the Dubrovnik speech and copied by various citizens of Dubrovnik” (Rešetar 1951: 22). Thereby, the *Breviary* “tells us how many people there must have been in the surroundings of Dubrovnik, and perhaps in the city itself, who copied and read such pious Cyrillic Catholic books” (ibid.). What is common to all the scribes is the Štokavian-Jekavian Dubrovnik speech, irrespective of the Čakavianisms transposed from the Čakavian source.

3.5. An indisputable indicator of the speech of the city of Dubrovnik are its **Latin monuments**. If, as Rešetar says, three Cyrillic books (the *Collection*, *Lectionary* and *Breviary*) can be thought of, with good reason, “as having been intended for the surroundings, not for the city itself”, the Latin monuments

(“which were recently published by Professor Fancev and Dr Giannelli”) cannot be thought of as having been intended for the surroundings of the city, as “in the surroundings of Dubrovnik the Latin script was not used at the time when these monuments were created, that is, before the middle of the 16th century” (Rešetar 1951: 23). The language of these monuments **is identical to the language of the Cyrillic monuments**: if they were copied from a Čakavian source, they are characterised by being adjusted to the Štokavian-Jekavian speech of Dubrovnik, and if they are translated from Latin, they contain the Jekavian speech. As is the case with the Cyrillic monuments, they do not contain “poetic Čakavianisms” (ibid.: 24).

3.6. On the basis of the monuments analysed, Rešetar concludes that “**poetic Čakavianisms**” were “entirely **unusual to the inhabitants of Dubrovnik** who wrote original prose at the time of the earliest poets, whereas the poets used them with ease, and it is such a firmly established regular occurrence that there is no poet until the middle of the 16th century, not even Gundulić, who did not use, to a greater or lesser degree, those poetic Čakavianisms; conversely, there is no original prose creation that contains such Čakavianisms even in the smallest degree [...] – this difference can only be explained by the fact that only **some wrote the way they spoke while others did not**, and I think that there can be no dilemma whatsoever about whether the real Dubrovnik speech of the second half of the 15th century and the first half of the 16th century is represented by its poetry or prose” (Rešetar 1951: 25).

3.7. Rešetar also places **Ikavian forms** and their use in a broader context and reviews them in keeping with other linguistic tendencies in the linguistic monuments of Dubrovnik. Ikavianisms occur in poets as a part of “poetic Čakavianisms”, they are a part of the poetic language of the time, having come into being as a result of imitation of Čakavian poets. In some linguistic monuments and in some poets, there is such an abundance of them that they change the overall form of what is truly a Jekavian dialect. Such poetic Čakavianisms, according to Reše-

tar, include “the predominant Ikavianism of Š. Menčetić and the almost pure Ikavianism of Dž. Držić”, which have no firm basis in the prose of their time (Rešetar 1951: 26). In the revised versions of Čakavian texts, there is also “a lot” of unusual Ikavianisms to be found, some monuments contain more, others fewer such forms (28). Concerning the use (or lack) of “unusual Ikavianisms”, the prose of that time does not correspond to its poetry. Original parts of the literary works in Dubrovnik that were directly translated into the Dubrovnik speech correspond to the language of the state office and the majority of private documents (R.³ of *Ranjina’s Lectionary*, part Z.^{1b} of the *Collection* and rubrics of the Cyrillic *Dubrovnik Lectionary*). These contain few or no unusual Ikavianisms: “there are none in R.³, there are only 3 in the Cyrillic *Lectionary*, compared to several hundred Jekavian forms, and the much more voluminous part of the *Collection* contains no more than 5 or 6 of them” (Rešetar 1951: 27–28). Consequently, “the nobleman Ranjina, using the Latin script, has *no* unusual Ikavianisms, whereas a simple man, probably from the environs of Dubrovnik, not the city itself, using the Cyrillic script, *does have them!* That Ranjina was truly a pure Jekavian speaker is confirmed by the fact that he, while copying part R.² from Bernardin, on 15 occasions took another word, different from Bernardin’s, which contains the vowel *ɚ*; while he could freely have used a Jekavian form from ‘the environs’ or ‘an Ikavian form from the urban speech’, yet he used Jekavian forms for all the 15 words in question” (ibid.: 28). On the basis of this, one can quite clearly conclude that Jekavian was spoken in Dubrovnik and its surroundings.

Also testifying to the Jekavian Dubrovnik speech are parts of the monuments which represent reworkings of Čakavian texts. As Rešetar established, there are only two direct copies of Čakavian sources – a part of *Ranjina’s Lectionary* (R.²) and the Cyrillic *Dubrovnik Lectionary*. In these texts, compared to the Čakavian sources, Jekavian forms are very often used instead of Ikavian ones, “and there was no way it could be the other way round, for there are no Jekavian forms in Bernardin”.

But if there are no Jekavian forms in Bernardin, there are Ekavian forms to be found, such as *седети* [sit], *веран* [faithful] etc. What is “very characteristic of the copiers’ pronunciation is that they regularly turn those Ekavianisms of Bernardin’s into Jekavian pronunciation, never to Ikavian” (Rešetar 1951: 29–30). This, too, truly testifies to the fact that Ikavian was not spoken in Dubrovnik.

3.8. Rešetar, presenting the results of his painstaking and tireless work clearly and concisely, concludes that all the prose texts written at the time of the earliest poets in Dubrovnik did not contain any poetic Čakavianisms and were mostly Jekavian: “That was how all the state chancellors wrote, especially Menčetić’s coeval Paskoje Primojević, a citizen of Dubrovnik, and his sons; that was also the language of private documents, especially a Cyrillic testament dating from 1512 and a Latin one from 1524; that is the language of Ranjina in the original part of his *Lectionary*, and also of the original part of the Cyrillic *Lectionary* and the *Collection* of 1520” (ibid.: 30). In the linguistic monuments and parts of them that represent Dubrovnik reworkings of the originals, Čakavian features and “unusual Ikavian forms” were regularly replaced by Štokavian and Jekavian ones, and in the copies of Bernardin’s text, only new Jekavian forms were inserted. Rešetar shows that Nikša Ranjina is the most dependable witness to the fact that, around the year 1500, the then citizens of Dubrovnik, especially its noblemen, spoke Štokavian and Jekavian (Rešetar 1951: 30–31).

According to all of the above, prose texts show that the language spoken in Dubrovnik was Štokavian-Jekavian, that is to say, that the oldest Dubrovnik speech was Štokavian (Herzegovinian) and Jekavian. The prose parts that were translated into the Dubrovnik speech were in Štokavian and Jekavian, as were the parts copied from three Dubrovnik reworkings of the originals, and the parts that were copied from the Čakavian sources, wherein Čakavian and Ikavian forms were regularly changed to Štokavian and Jekavian ones, retaining (in the process of copying) Čakavian Ikavian features, also testify to the presence of

the Štokavian Jekavian speech. However, no prose text contains “poetic Čakavianisms”, that is to say, these Čakavianisms (*ча, зач, ва, -л, мѧ, мвѧ*) represent (through a limited number of examples that are repeated) a mannerism and were introduced in the poetic language of the time through the imitation of Čakavian poets, and outside of these, the poets’ language is Štokavian Jekavian. In prose works, first of all those that were copied from the existing Dubrovnik redaction, there are no “poetic Čakavianisms”, but there is a certain number of “established Čakavianisms” (different from “poetic Čakavianisms”), which came into being under the influence of the church language (the suffix *-m* in the present tense, the present perfect tense form signifying the future – those two forms had become “established through readings of biblical texts in church”, *ibid.*: 21).

After an overview of the earliest linguistic monuments, and through them, of the language of Dubrovnik, Rešetar concludes that there is no further need to prove that **in the period after Marin Držić** the language spoken in Dubrovnik was Štokavian and Jekavian. According to Rešetar, “this is quite clearly proven by two prose writers from the second half of the 16th century, Bazil Gradić and Arkandeo Gučetić”, so that, “as far as I know”, says Rešetar, “there is no philologist, ours or foreign, who would think that at that time people in Dubrovnik spoke the way old poets wrote until the time of Gundulić, and not in the manner of prose writers who did not publish pretentious works of literature for highly educated people but modest pious books for the common folk” (Rešetar 1951: 33).

3.9. Rešetar also reviews three booklets that were printed **towards the end of the 16th century** (two *Christian Teachings* and one *How to Say Mass*). Those booklets were translated by various people from Dubrovnik without any literary aspirations; one was printed in the Cyrillic script (“in all likelihood, for the environs rather than for the city”), while the other two were printed in the Latin script. However, “between this one Cyrillic ‘rural’ book and the two Latin ‘urban’ books there are no essential differences in linguistic terms” (*ibid.*); they were written in

“pure Štokavian and pure Jekavian, which proves that, at least towards the end of the 16th century, there were no essential differences between the speech of the surrounding area and that of the city, so there is reason to believe that this had been so since Dubrovnik got Slavicised, for the Slavs and the Serbo-Croat language came to the city on a regular basis without any doubt, mostly from its closest surroundings” (Rešetar 1951: 34). Of *How to Say Mass* and the *Cyrillic Teachings* he says that they were translated “into the language of Dubrovnik” (ibid.), and it is evident that *Teachings* was translated by Dubrovnikans for Dubrovnikans. Thus Rešetar provided additional evidence and, reviewing various types of linguistic monuments, he showed what the oldest Dubrovnik Slavic speech was like: it was Štokavian Jekavian, both until the 16th century and afterwards.

4. The Dubrovnik speech. Scientific responses and polemics with colleagues and their various contributions and views, which they presented in connection with the speech and language of Dubrovnik

4.1. Reviewing the relationship between the language of poetry and prose in its entirety, Rešetar concludes that the oldest Dubrovnik speech should be sought in the domain of prose, not poetry – in a word, that **those poets wrote differently from the way they spoke** (Rešetar 1952: 44–45). The oldest Dubrovnik speech is the Herzegovinian Štokavian Jekavian dialect (Rešetar uses the terms: Herzegovinian Jekavian, Štokavian-Jekavian, Herzegovinian Štokavian-Jekavian and the like). He proved this by analysing almost all the linguistic monument sources, first of all charters and letters, various notes, the language of prose, the language of poetry, the language of poets outside their poetic works. The prose analysed is an incontrovertible indicator of the way the people of Dubrovnik spoke, which dialect is the basis of the city’s speech from the very beginning of its Slavicisation: “In my papers dealing with the oldest Dubrovnik speech,

I tried to prove that the same dialect spoken in Dubrovnik even today had always been spoken there, namely, the **Herzegovinian Štokavian-Jekavian** dialect, never in the way that the oldest Dubrovnik poets from the second half of the 15th century wrote, as did the poets of the 16th century **until Gundulić**, following their example, that is, that the people there never spoke Čakavian to a degree or predominantly Ikavian. In order to prove the above, I mostly relied on the fact that whatever was written in prose in Dubrovnik or by Dubrovnikans before the middle of the 16th century deviates from the language of poetry in some of its linguistic aspects, but corresponds to the speech of today. In order to make that comparison, I took the middle of the 16th century as the dividing line, for the prose comedies of **Marin Držić** (who died in 1567) date from that period, and have been preserved in manuscript form from that time; what we see in them quite clearly and certainly is how all people in Dubrovnik spoke at the time – the noblemen and the common folk alike, men as well as women, both the old and the young, so that, as far as I know, nobody doubted that, from the time of M. Držić onward, they did not speak the way all Dubrovnikans in his prose comedies speak, but the way that poets until Gundulić wrote, and partly Gundulić himself as well” (Rešetar 1952: 1). With the appearance of Gundulić on the scene, the Štokavian-Jekavian type became established in poetry as well, and from then onward it entirely predominated.

Concerning the issue of the Dubrovnik speech, as well as the relationship between the speech and the language of poetry, Rešetar conducted scientific and well-grounded debates with some philologists and linguists of his time, first of all with those who wished (without proper study and getting to know the situation “in the field” regarding the Dubrovnik monuments and the speech of that period) to “show”, without anything in the way of detailed insight and work, that in its older linguistic layer (and in the earlier period) Dubrovnik was Čakavian-Ikavian in character, and that the Herzegovinian Štokavian-Jekavian

speech came later, or that the Štokavian-Jekavian dialect was characteristic of the environs of Dubrovnik, not of the city itself.

4.2. Rešetar polemicalised with one of the greatest philologists of that time, **Vatroslav Jagić**, about many of the latter's views and assumptions which Jagić did not support with proper argumentation. Jagić proceeded from the erroneous assumption that the poets Menčetić and Dž. Držić wrote the way they spoke (Čakavian-Ikavian), and that, consequently, they spoke the way the people of Dubrovnik spoke (Čakavian-Ikavian); subsequently, trying to prove this erroneous assumption led him to new errors and unfounded and erroneous conclusions.

Rešetar says that, except for himself, “no one in particular has dealt with this issue, but several of our scholars, **off and on**, have expressed their opinion of this issue, and the first one to do so was Jagić..., who strove to prove that those poets wrote the way they spoke, and **according to him, Čakavian was ‘the aristocratic element of Dalmatian cities, (obtained) through the noblemen of Dubrovnik**, who maintained a closer relationship with them than with the plebeian population of the city's surroundings.” Rešetar responds to this rather unusual assumption by asking himself how it was possible for the noblemen of Dubrovnik to maintain a closer relationship with Dalmatian noblemen, from whom they were territorially separated by a broad Štokavian-Jekavian area, than with their own folk, with whom they lived side by side: “**It is not clear to me why Jagić asks whether the Dubrovnik noblemen had a closer relationship with the Dalmatian noblemen than with their own common folk.** That relationship was so tenuous that the Dalmatian noblemen could not exert any linguistic influence on the Dubrovnik nobility: they could neither slow down nor hasten the Slavicisation of the Romanic Dubrovnik, **nor could they bring to it the Dalmatian Čakavian-Ikavian speech through the broad Štokavian-Jekavian area around it**” (Rešetar 1951: 38).⁹ A good indicator of the fact that the noblemen of

⁹ One can easily believe that members of the nobility could be the guardians of some older language, in view of the fact that they were the

Dubrovnik spoke Štokavian-Jekavian is Nikša Ranjina, a nobleman who wrote in Štokavian-Jekavian.

Jagić attempted to prove that the speech of the city of Dubrovnik differed from that of its environs (which is Štokavian-Jekavian). This claim was brought into question by Rešetar based on a number of arguments. As we find in Rešetar, there exist no well-founded arguments to claim that the city speech was ever in any way different from that of its surroundings, for it is impossible to even imagine that the speech of the environs of Dubrovnik changed radically, and it is even less likely to assume that the Čakavian-Ikavian speech might have arrived in Dubrovnik by “jumping” over its Štokavian-Jekavian surrounding area. According to Rešetar, the view that the Čakavian-Ikavian speech may have been imported through marriages contracted with people from Dalmatia is also groundless, for such marriages did occur, but very rarely, so that the Čakavian-Ikavian dialect can only have come to Dubrovnik as a literary language, not as a “family” one.¹⁰

last ones in Dubrovnik, as far back as the end of the 15th century, to preserve the old Romanic language, but that they (almost simultaneously!) preserved the older Čakavian, or at least the semi-Čakavian speech, protecting it from the more recent Štokavian one, sounds quite unbelievable” (Rešetar 1951: 38).

¹⁰ “Still, those differences between the city and its immediate surroundings are not pronounced to such an extent now, nor have they ever been such that one could say that the city folk at any time spoke a different dialect from the folk in the villages around it. I believe that this is out of the question, for it is without any doubt that the once Romanic Dubrovnik got Slavicised, just like other cities of ours in the coastal region: it, too, was Slavicised by its immediate surroundings, and as we know from the history of the state of Dubrovnik that its population never changed radically, which was the case in many regions of ours that came to be directly run by Turkish authorities, it is impossible to imagine that the speech of the close surroundings of Dubrovnik changed radically during that time. The situation being such, there is no way that any other dialect but Štokavian-Jekavian could enter the city. It is even less likely that the Čakavian-Ikavian speech could reach Dubrovnik jumping over its Štokavian-Jekavian surroundings – the only way it could arrive, and did arrive, in Dubrovnik was as the lan-

Milan Rešetar goes on to show that **the presence of the Čakavian forms *ča*** (used less often) **and *zau*** (used more often) was by no means based on the speech of that time, nor was it taken over from the speech foundation; equally, it did not indicate that these forms were used in Dubrovnik. Firstly, that these forms were not characteristic of the Dubrovnik speech is shown by the fact that, according to Rešetar's research, *ča* and *zau* are not used in original Dubrovnik texts. Secondly, Dubrovnik and its vicinity were territorially very distant from the areas where these forms were known (or had been known), which shows that the said forms were in no way ever characteristic of the city of Dubrovnik or its surroundings (and were only to be found in some poetic creations): "First of all, the earliest poets used the form *ča*, very characteristic of the Čakavian dialect, very rarely indeed, but they used *zau* rather often, and we should go through the coastal region until we reach Poljice, north of the Cetina River, and on the sea until we reach the islands of Hvar and Vis, in order to find *ča* and *zau* in the dialects of today, so that Dubrovnik's *ča-zau* is separated from its Dalmatian counterpart by the entire Makarska coastal region from the Cetina to the Neretva River on one side, and on the other side by the dialects of the Rat peninsula and the islands of Korčula and Lastovo, which are closely related to the Čakavian dialect

guage of literature, but definitely not as the family language. It is thought that brides from Dalmatian noblemen's families might have brought it into the homes of the Dubrovnik noblemen; young noblemen from Dubrovnik could indeed marry them, but that happened so infrequently that those rare Dalmatian marriages certainly could not influence the speech of the Dubrovnik nobility in its entirety. Therefore, it is not possible to believe that the dialect then spoken in northern Dalmatia, which is spoken there even now to a certain extent, was spoken in the city of Dubrovnik in the 15th century, either if one assumed that this old dialect (Čakavian-Ikavian) gradually retreated before the new one (Štokavian-Jekavian), which entirely suppressed it, first from the surroundings, and then from the (conservative) city, or that it crossed over from Northern Dalmatia through marriages, or possibly through the settling down of arrivals from that area, passing by the Štokavian-Jekavian surroundings, to the city of Dubrovnik" (Rešetar 1933: 30).

through some of their characteristics, but they do not use *ča* and *zau* at all. If one might think that, during the period of the *Bosnian* and Turkish rule, Štokavian speakers replaced Čakavian ones in the Makarska coastal region, or at least that the former's *umo-zau* replaced the older *ča-zau*, no such thoughts are possible in the case of Rat, Korčula and Lastovo, where history records no intense movements and mixing of populations. If, then, *ča-zau* is not heard there today, nor is it known to have ever been heard or written there, that means that it has never been used there, for if many other visible Ikavian features have been preserved, especially on Rat and Korčula, *ča-zau* would also have been preserved. **In all likelihood, then, Jagić's hypothesis about the autochthonous character of Čakavianism in Dubrovnik, even in a weak form, lacks grounding altogether**" (Rešetar 1951: 36–38).

4.3. To a lesser degree, Rešetar also polemicised with **Stjepan Ivšić**, with whom he was in agreement concerning the fact that Dubrovnik poets sang under the influence of the Čakavian Dalmatia, but he does not agree with Ivšić's hypothesis that, under the influence of the Čakavian Dalmatia, the process of Slavicising the originally Romanic Dubrovnik **noblemen** was carried out.¹¹ As Rešetar observes, the oldest Dubrovnik poets

¹¹ "Jagić's idea that the noblemen of Dubrovnik preserved the older, partly Čakavian Dubrovnik speech, I would say, has recently gained support from Professor Ivšić – when he says that one Čakavian-Glagolitic poem which, in a Dubrovnik redaction, was included in the Cyrillic *Collection* of 1520, 'proves that the Croatian poetry written in the Glagolitic script came to Dubrovnik from the north; under its influence, if not even earlier under the influence of the Čakavian Dalmatia, the originally Romanic noblemen of Dubrovnik were Slavicised, so that the oldest poetic language of Dubrovnik developed among them'. Ivšić, thus, also assumes that the oldest Dubrovnik poetic language developed under the influence of Dalmatian Čakavian poetry, and that influence can only mean that the earliest poets took over a number of things for their Dubrovnik language from the Dalmatian language, in other words, that those poets sang the way they did not speak; therefore, Ivšić is in complete agreement with me concerning the main issue here, and perhaps he also agrees with me concerning the linguistic features which the earliest poets took over from the Čakavian dialect. But, in the form of

were not noblemen, with the exception of Menčetić, and it is particularly “unclear when and how, in Ivšić’s opinion, the Slavification of the noblemen was carried out under the influence of the Čakavian Dalmatia. Regarding the time, he thinks it would have been before the literary influence, which would mean before the beginning of the 15th century at the latest, but did not the noblemen still speak Romanic in their homes then?... **It is even more difficult to understand how it happened that only the noblemen got Slavified under the influence of the Čakavian Dalmatia...** Therefore, it would take some very strong arguments to convince one the Dubrovnik noblemen were not Slavified solely under the influence of the people among whom and with whom they lived” (Rešetar 1951: 39).

4.4. In an earlier paper, **André Vaillant** presents his opinion that, in the 15th century, Čakavian was spoken in Gruž, even in Dubrovnik itself, under the influence of **the trading connections with Dalmatia**, while Štokavian was spoken in the hinterland (in Ploče). As we find in Vaillant: “the information on this that we have (that is, that Čakavian was spoken there, J. S.) allows us to conclude that Čakavian was used for literary purposes only”.¹² In connection with this, Rešetar presents his

a hypothesis, he also allows the possibility that, even before the influence of Čakavian poetry on the oldest poetic language of Dubrovnik, under the influence of the Čakavian Dalmatia the originally Romanic Dubrovnik **noblemen** were Slavified. As Ivšić himself underlines the word ‘noblemen’, what he certainly meant by this was that, under the influence of the Čakavian Dalmatia, only the noblemen were Slavified, not the entire population of Dubrovnik, which would be understood to mean that noblemen poets used some Čakavian forms (only in their poems or in everyday speech as well?)” (Rešetar 1951: 39).

¹² Rešetar’s response to that was as follows: “Whereas Jagić thought that perhaps the Dubrovnik noblemen preserved the older Čakavian speech, which perhaps at one time reached Dubrovnik, including the city itself, and Ivšić at least allowed the possibility that the formerly Romanic noblemen were Slavified ‘under the influence of the Čakavian Dalmatia’, both of them connected the Dubrovnik ‘Čakavianism’ with the noblemen; the French Slavic scholar Vaillant attempted to explain that in quite a different way. To begin with, in an article of his on the Dubrovnik literary language, he says that Dubrovnik truly got Slavi-

own views and a critique of Vaillant's claim: "It is understandable that he maintains that in the eastern suburb of Ploče they spoke Herzegovinian, for Herzegovinians had always come down and keep coming down to Ploče even now, so it is understandable 'that Herzegovinian was spoken there', and that Vaillant believes that the Slavicisation of Dubrovnik came from Herzegovina. But why would it be likely that 'due to the trading connections with Dalmatian Čakavian cities' Čakavian was spoken in Gruž? Can traders who come to a city individually to spend some time there, and then leave it or some of them settle down there – can they change the language of that city? I am convinced that Vaillant would be hard-pressed to name any country in the world where something like that has happened! (Our emphasis!) That can only happen if the foreign element settles down in such numbers that it overwhelms and assimilates the old settlers... Furthermore, Vaillant's claim that 'Čakavian was spoken in Dubrovnik itself' is not convincing (he does not mention the great suburb of Pile at all!), and he immediately adds that 'Čakavian was only used in poetry' – that is, only in **writing**" (Rešetar 1952: 41). However, later on, speaking about the work of Dominik Zlatarić, Vaillant himself changed his mind entirely: "it is not possible at all to claim that Čakavian was **spoken** in Gruž, or even in Dubrovnik itself; the Dalmatian Čakavian-Ikavian dialect is foreign to Dubrovnik, and it arrived there as a literary language that was accepted by the earliest poets" (ibid.).

4.5. **Aleksandar Belić** also came out with some ungrounded views concerning the language of Dubrovnik. As we find in Rešetar: "Vaillant's initial opinion that Čakavians from Dalma-

cised under the influence of the neighbouring Štokavian Herzegovina, but in the 15th century, under the influence of the Čakavian Dalmatia, semi-folklore Čakavian poetry was created, so that the citizens of Dubrovnik – the Romanics, Slavs, Štokavian or Slavicised – for a long time sang their songs in Čakavian, because, due to the trading connections with the Dalmatian Čakavian dialects, it is highly likely that, if the language of the suburb of Ploče was Herzegovinian, the language of the port (that is, Gruž) was Čakavian" (Rešetar 1952: 40).

tia settled down in Dubrovnik was taken over by Belić.” Rešetar reviews the opinion forwarded by Belić, who says that, even though it has been proven that the language of Dubrovnik in the period from the 13th to the 15th century is of the southern or Herzegovinian type (“that **the character of the spoken language of Dubrovnik was of the Hum or Herzegovinian type**”), it is still beyond doubt “that, in the process of establishing the basic Serbo-Croat settlement of Dubrovnik, seafarers from the distant Čakavian regions also participated”, so that “the part of Dubrovnik facing the sea must have been populated by **fishermen and seafarers from the Čakavian parts of Dalmatia...** In the course of the 14th and the 15th century, the Slavic or the Herzegovinian character of the language became general”. Saying that he knows how significant Belić’s words are, in view of his great scientific authority, Rešetar adds: “unfortunately, I cannot agree with that opinion”; regarding Belić’s hypothesis about Čakavian fishermen and seafarers, Rešetar observes: “I will not emphasise that there is no part of Dubrovnik facing the sea or a suburb that could be convenient for the settling of seafarers and fishermen, but I do want to stress that this hypothesis of Belić’s is not well grounded either” (ibid.: 42–43).

4.6. **Henrik Barić**, while admitting that the Dubrovnik hinterland was Serbian, adds that “there were also **Čakavian elements in Dubrovnik, especially workers and craftsmen**”. Connecting this with the views previously referred to, Rešetar concludes, not without irony: “Barić, then, also thinks that a part of the population of Dubrovnik spoke Čakavian, but while Jagić, and to a degree, Ivšić alongside him, referred to noblemen, Vaillant to traders and Belić to seafarers and fishermen, Barić established that in Dubrovnik workers and craftsmen in particular were Čakavians, but failed to provide a single word to justify that strange opinion of his, or to reveal to us the secret of whether those workers and craftsmen (as Jagić and Ivšić claimed) belonged to the old settlers, or were newcomers from Dalmatia (as Vaillant and Belić claimed). Until we hear about

that from Barić himself, I don't think that we should pay his words any mind" (Rešetar 1951: 44).

Concerning the above hypotheses, he concludes: "I resolutely refuse to believe that, for in such a case, we need to revise the history of Dubrovnik, which records no mass settlements of traders, seafarers or fishermen in Dubrovnik" (Rešetar 1951: 45).

4.7. Rešetar maintained very friendly and scientifically sincere relations with **Ljubomir Stojanović**. They corresponded for years, and their letters contain very interesting observations and exchanges of opinions concerning the important philological issues of that time. Stojanović always adhered to the then widespread opinion that Serbs and Croats are two peoples with two languages (Štokavian and Čakavian), while Rešetar initially shared that opinion, which he subsequently changed (but only to a certain extent), due to, as he said himself, the influence of Jagić (he accepted Jagić's idea that Serbs and Croats are one people with two different names). Still, Rešetar accepted this view, as we shall see later, with some reservations, aware of what belonged to whom if the two were divided over linguistic issues.

Stojanović was highly suspicious concerning the attitude of Austria towards Serbs and Serbianhood, both generally and regarding linguistic and scientific issues. Rešetar speaks of this, and also of his friendly and scientific relations with Stojanović in a text where he says, among other things: "I have corresponded with Stojanović for almost 40 years – from 1891 to 1929 [...].

Thus he (that is, Ljuba Stojanović, J. S.) was fully justified in considering Austria to be the greatest enemy of Serbia and Serbianhood, which was why he believed that nothing coming from Austria could be good for Serbia. Therefore, when **the Academy of Sciences in Vienna established the Balkan Commission** (our emphasis!) with a view to conducting research into Balkan countries, he immediately took up a hostile stance towards that course of action undertaken by the Academy in Vienna and the people whom the Commission started sending

to Serbia for purely scientific purposes [...]. When I informed him that the Commission, which was presided over by Jagić, was sending Professor Hirt from Leipzig to Serbia for the purpose of studying the Ikavian dialect in upper Podrinje (which was certainly inconvenient, for Hirt is an Indo-German scholar, who had never before dealt with any Slavic language in particular), I got the following angry reply from him [...]: ‘Do not, you, too, Mr Rešetar, imagine that pure science can be separated from politics. Just as *l’art pour l’art* is an absurd idea, so there is no science for the sake of science, it is connected with life, with politics. I will not delve into this any further, let me just note that Mr Jagić, as the initiator of this, knows full well the Yugoslav Academy in Zagreb was not established for the sake of science only, but also to pursue other aims, and many naïve Serbs were attracted by this and supported it, but no one from Zagreb supported the Serbian Learned Society (except for S. Ljubić...). Consequently, it is understandable that he did not wish to meet with Hirt when the latter came to Serbia, and after that we did not talk about the Balkan Commission, for he persisted in his view that there was no science without politics whereas I contend that there is [...].’

Our views differed most when it came to the attitude of Serbs towards Croats: the article that Jagić wrote about my treatise on Čakavianism, published in 1891 in volume XVII of his Archive, proclaimed that I – until then a Serb separatist, who (according to Vuk’s and Miklošić’s precepts) was of the opinion that Serbs were one thing and Croats something else – was a Serb-Croat unionist, who was convinced that ‘Serbs’ and ‘Croats’ were *one* people under two different names. He, on the contrary, remained faithful to Vuk’s and Miklošić’s precepts and his own original view, so that he always considered Croats to be separate from Serbs, and not only that, he always saw them as a tool of the politics of Austria, whether they were aware of it or not” (Rešetar 1931: 47–49).

5. The designation of the language and the script

5.1. It is evident from many of the views quoted in this book that Rešetar designated the language of monuments (first of all the Cyrillic ones, but not only those), written in the Slavic language in Dubrovnik and its close surroundings (whether they were intended for Serbian lands, people from Dubrovnik or foreigners – Turks or Latins), first of all as Serbian (when referring to the more recent, he occasionally used the term Serbo-Croat, but that was rare).¹³ For the sake of illustration, we shall quote a few more cases that have not been mentioned before.

¹³ Concerning the designation Serbian for the language, that is, “*lingua seruiana*”, found in Dubrovnik documents from the period between the 15th and the 18th century, we find nearly 60 examples of designating the language of Dubrovnik as Serbian in the work of Pavle Ivić (there are only 2 or 3 examples of the use of the designation Croatian, but these are to be found in documents made for special purposes – see: Pavle Ivić, *О значењу израза lingua seruiana у дубровачким документима XV–XVIII века. Из историје српскохрватског језика. Изабрани огледи II* [On The Meaning of the Term *lingua seruiana* in Dubrovnik Documents from the Period between the 15th and the 18th Century. From the History of the Serbo-Croatian Language. Selected Essays II], Prosveta, Niš, 1991, 207–222), where he adds: “This in no way exhausts the list of Dubrovnik documents containing the term *lingua seruiana*, which was mostly applied to texts written by Dubrovnikans for Dubrovnikans... The information on the comparatively early appearance of the term *lingua seruiana* suggests that this designation for the Serbo-Croat language was to be found much earlier in Dubrovnik, parallel with the penetration of the language itself into its territory, as early as the time when the Dubrovnik hinterland belonged to the Serbian state and the state of Dubrovnik gradually expanded at the expense of the latter, parallel with the continual influx of the former Serbian subjects and their descendants into the city itself...” (ibid.: 220–221).

Also: “The linguistic material in our text, then, refers to two kinds of phenomena: those typical of the Dubrovnik zone and those encompassing a broader area, including Dubrovnik itself. Evidently, the observation made by the earlier authors based on the general impression that it is ‘a pure Dubrovnik dialect’, which only befits the purpose of the text – it was proclaimed to the citizens of Dubrovnik ‘in Serbian so that everyone could understand it’” (212).

In Rešetar's paper entitled *Four Dubrovnik Prose Plays*, we find the following note concerning translation or taking over from the Italian language – that “to the words and sentences spoken in the Italian language [he] added in the actual text a **Serbian translation thereof**”, and he did the same “in the case of words borrowed from the Italian language, which were treated as Serbian ones, and were therefore subject **to the rules of the Serbian language**... Until recently, educated Dubrovnikans, who had attended Italian schools, were prone to Serbianising almost every Italian word which they did not know from their own dialect in this way...”¹⁴

The situation is the same concerning many documents and manuscripts from the 15th and the 16th century published by Rešetar. Among these are two linguistic monuments from the 16th century. One dates from 1512, and according to Rešetar, it is “the oldest **Serbian book printed in the Cyrillic script**. True, before that, in 1494 an octoechos was printed by a printing press in Cetinje built by Đurđe Crnojević, the Duke of Zeta, followed by a psalter book in 1495, so that these two large and ceremonial books are, naturally, of Serbian origin in terms of printing and typesetting (they were typeset by Makarije, a monk ‘from Montenegro’), but the **small breviary** published in 1512 by Francesco (Franjo) Ratković, a man from Dubrovnik, has a big advantage over them in that it is **Serbian in terms of language as well** (that is, it is written in the folk language, J. S.), whereas both Crnojević's books are in the church Slavic

¹⁴ “It is a great problem dealing with Italian words and sentences [...]. This is how I solved it: to the words and sentences spoken the Italian language I added in the actual text a Serbian translation in square brackets; I did the same in the case of words borrowed from the Italian language, which were treated as Serbian ones, and were therefore subject to the rules of the Serbian language, but are encountered very rarely (once or twice), and are used by educated people, not by the common folk; somehow, these cannot be considered a part of the linguistic treasury of the Dubrovnik dialect, for until recently, educated Dubrovnikans, who had attended Italian schools, were prone to Serbianising almost every Italian word which they did not know from their own dialect in this way...” (Rešetar 1922: 16–17).

language (that is, a Serbian redaction of Old Slavic, J. S.)”¹⁵ In the document dealing with the *Breviary*, it is said that this book (that is, the *Breviary*) was printed “in Serbian letters and in the Serbian dialect” (stampadis in littera et idomate serviano), and also that “two Italians” were entrusted with “bringing master printers to Dubrovnik ‘**pro imprimendis nonnullis libris in lingua serviana**’” (Rešetar 1922; *The Serbian Breviary 1512*, Rešetar: 22), (our emphasis!).

5.2. As regards **the alphabet**, often enough documents are quoted wherein the Cyrillic script is referred to as the Serbian script. In *Abraham’s Sacrifice* we find: “The attitude of Divković towards *Sacrifice* is very straightforward, for he quite clearly states it on the title page: ‘Which verses were written in Serbian, with a number of corrections, by the Theologian Friar Matie Divković...?; Divković, thus, quite clearly states that he merely ‘wrote Abraham’s verses in Serbian’, that is, transposed them from the Latin to the Cyrillic script” (Rešetar 1929: 47).

Concerning the copies of *Bernardin’s Lectionary*, we also find: “As far as we know, *Bernardin’s Lectionary* was copied three times in Dubrovnik and its environs – once in the Latin script, only partially, and twice in the Cyrillic script, in its entirety... (Rešetar 1933: 7). The second complete Cyrillic copy of *Bernardin’s Lectionary*, that is, D (*The Dubrovnik Lectionary*), has only

¹⁵ And further on: “Ratković’s book is, in fact, not an unknown work, for Professor Fancev, in his edition of *The Vatican Croatian Breviary* and *The Dubrovnik Psalter* (Zagreb 1934), presents two similar Dubrovnik breviaries printed in the Latin script, both found in the Vatican Library – one in manuscript form, perhaps dating from the end of the 14th century, the other (also preserved in one copy only) from the end of the 15th century, but the differences between the two Vatican breviaries and Ratković’s book in terms of the text and the language is so great, and all the three monuments are important to us primarily because of their language – that it would be worth the effort to publish **Ratković’s breviary even if it were not the oldest purely Serbian book printed in the Cyrillic script**. That is why we should be truly grateful to the Serbian Royal Academy, which immediately and enthusiastically accepted my proposal to have this book published again [...]” (M. Rešetar – C. Giannelli 1938, VII–VIII. 7–8).

become known recently, one may say. It is kept in the library of the Dominican Monastery in Dubrovnik, where it arrived before 1582, as S. Crijević claims in the library catalogue, which he compiled in 1751; in the section comprising *Libri rituales*, on page 57, at number XIII, he has this to say about D: *Epistole, Evangelia... leguntur Ilirica lingua, et seruiano caractere exarate...* Milas presented Crijević's note on D and expressed his opinion that the book was written towards the end of the 15th century or in the early 16th century in the southern coastal region, and that it would appear that the writer was 'from somewhere on the Dubrovnik side...' (Rešetar 1933: 16–17).

In the paper entitled *Two Dubrovnik Monuments from the 16th Century*, we find the following: "The priest Luka Radovanović, in his will dating from the year 1502, left to another priest, Pavle Vukašinović, who had dealt with printing before, the machines required for printing in 'Slavic letters' (*de littera schiava*), but it is not known whether either of them ever actually printed anything... Based on that contract, Micalović and Šušić formed an association, for an indefinite period of time, wherein the former invested his work..., according to which he was to print *The Office of St Mary*, the Gospels, apostles and monologues of St Augustine 'in littera et idiomate serviano', whereas Šušić invested 108 golden ducats. Micalović was to go get the books to be printed by Soncino, and then to sell them in Dubrovnik and in Serbia (in *partibus Servie*), and for that purpose he was to open and maintain a shop in Dubrovnik [...].

'Master' Francesco, thus, intended as early as 1510 to publish Cyrillic books, so perhaps he went to Italy for that purpose (the contract with Soncino was concluded in Recanati [south of Iacchino])... What is important is that from the contract with Soncino we see that Micalović was already planning to publish 'in littera et idiomate serviano' and *Officium s. Mariae*, for that is undoubtedly the very same thing as our own *The Office of the Blessed* (or holy) *Virgin Mary*" (Rešetar 1938: pp. XVIII–XX).

In Milan Rešetar we also find, in connection with the designation "Bosančica", which appeared in the 19th century, referring

to the Cyrillic script of the western Serbian lands, that he has this to say in his paper *A Book of Many Reasons (A Dubrovnik Cyrillic Monument)*: “The manuscript was written in the so-called Bosnian Cyrillic script, which is actually no special Bosnian script, but an older Cyrillic minuscule, which in times of old was the usual script in all our lands where the Cyrillic script was used, among Orthodox, Catholic and Muslim believers alike”.¹⁶

Rešetar also classifies the monuments written **in the Latin script** (Štokavian-Jekavian) in the area of Dubrovnik (“in the Dubrovnik dialect”) among the Serbian ones and criticises Ljuba Stojanović for not including them in his collection: “Stojanović never says expressly what scope he intended for S (abbreviation for *Stojanović’s Collection*, J. S.), but everything indicates that he only included in it those charters which were written by Serbs or to Serbs [...]. But Stojanović narrowed the boundaries of Serbian charters in yet another way: those charters which – even though they were written in Serbian and to Serbs – were not written

¹⁶ Furthermore: “It is of particular importance to us that on the basis of D we know when and where our collection was written. That is, regarding the place where it was written, the text in sheet 84b (see page 119), points to Dubrovnik through the words ‘to this city of ours Dubrovnik... God preserve it...’ The manuscript, then, was written in Dubrovnik in its entirety, and there is no doubt, again, that it was written by Dubrovnikans; I said that in Jagić’s Archive XIII, 368, already based on the part published by Jagić, while Jagić was inclined to think that the manuscript was written by some Bosnian-Dalmatian Franciscan. Now that I know the entire manuscript, and that I have seen that from beginning to end it is full of all kinds of specifically Dubrovnik linguistic features, I resolutely maintain that all three scribes were Dubrovnikans (A, B and C), as I will prove in a separate study. And as they wrote in the Cyrillic script as far back as the early 16th century, I do not believe that they were from the city of Dubrovnik itself, but from its surroundings, where the Cyrillic script was used much longer than in the city; of the main scribe A, moreover, I think, based on some of his linguistic features, that we can say with certainty that he was from the island of Mljet, and it is possible, therefore, that the entire manuscript was created in the Dubrovnik Benedictines’ monastery on Mljet, which the common folk called ‘monks’ as late as the 19th century, as opposed to other catholic monks (Franciscans and Dominicans) (Rešetar 1926, p. XII 1926: XIV–XV).

in the Cyrillic script he did not include in S; that was why he did not take over nos. 97–100, just because they were written in the Latin script; he took testaments written in Dubrovnik in the Cyrillic script in the 15th and the 16th century, but he omitted a testament written in Dubrovnik in Latin, dating from 1524, which is the oldest document written in the Latin script of that kind.¹⁷ But if that is what Stojanović considers to be the most important factor when deciding on the Serbian character of a monument, why did he still omit nos. 938, 1005 and the charter in the ‘addendum’, which were preserved only in late copies in Latin, and only now have they been brought back to the Cyrillic script by the publisher?” (Rešetar 1936: 125–127).

6. The dialects in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Just how perspicacious Rešetar was and how true and sincere his attitude to science was can be seen from his response to Kallay’s policy concerning the situation with the dialects in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Those who issued orders received support for the project of Kallay’s language policy not from Miklošič but from the Croatian linguist Vatroslav Jagić, who subsequently admitted, after a fashion, that he had made a mistake. As a junior colleague of Jagić’s at the Vienna University department, Milan Rešetar remained faithful to the scientific truth. In point of fact, Rešetar was sent to gather dialect-related material in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but he was not allowed to present and use the material gathered, “because he did not agree with the opinion of the Government counsellor Horowitz that the dialect in that particular area differs from the dialects in other areas” (Ivić 2001: 274–275). Rešetar had this to say about that incident

¹⁷ In his paper *The Oldest Dubrovnik Speech*, we find again: “Jiriček had published another document a little earlier – the oldest Serbian testament written in the Latin script, dating from 1524, this in an article in which he published some minor Cyrillic notes from the first half of the 15th century [...]” (Rešetar 1951: 11).

(having been denied material for a scientific defence of his thesis): “I think that the cause of it all was this: when I returned from Bosnia to Vienna, my superior Horowitz, in his peremptory manner, talked to me about my trip, and he asked me if I had seen for myself that in Bosnia and Herzegovina they spoke a dialect which differed from those in all the neighbouring areas, and I replied, clearly enough, that, on the contrary, I had seen that the situation was what we philologists thought and knew it was, that is, that not only one dialect was spoken in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but dialects from various parts of B&H spilled over and mixed with the dialects of the neighbouring countries (Jagić, *Spomenici*: 241)”, (quoted in: Okuka 2006: 91).

7. The relationship between the Serbian and the Croatian language

As can be seen from this presentation of his very rich opus, Rešetar considered Štokavian (in this particular case, the Herzegovinian “Štokavian-Jekavian” variant) to be, first of all, Serbian, and that was how he designated it. Later, under the influence of the new ideas of that time, and also of the opinion of his father-in-law Vatroslav Jagić, Rešetar spoke of the Serbian-Croatian unity: “And yet again, I still held on to Miklošič’s claim that Serbs were one and Croats something else, and I defended that view in several articles published in the Split periodical *Narod* [*People*] and in my doctoral dissertation, which was published by Jagić in volume XIII of his *Archive*. This prompted Jagić to talk about my views and to try to prove how wrong were all those who were of the opinion that Serbs and Croats were linguistically divided, insisting on two dialects only, the Čakavian and the Štokavian one, proclaiming the former to be Croatian and the latter to be Serbian. Jagić was even more adamant about my fallacy in his private letters, so it is him that I should be grateful to for crossing over to the side of those who do not split one and the same people on account of its two dif-

ferent names, but on the contrary, seek to testify, in words and deeds, to the unity of our people by not making any distinctions between ‘Serbian’ and ‘Croatian’, recognising that both names are justified to designate the entirety of our people” (quoted in: Milosavljević 2002: 402).

Still, Milan Rešetar did not use the term “Croatian” in any of his papers dealing with linguistic monuments connected with the original Dubrovnik speech. He expressed his attitude towards the language of Dubrovnik and its script at the very end of his maiden speech at the Academy, delivered on 16th February 1940, when he was elected a full member of the Serbian Royal Academy. As he was not present at the ceremony, his maiden speech was presented by Belić, who said that “he was asked, as his scientific work was closest [to Rešetar’s], to present its main content”, and also “to read a few excerpts” (*Yearbook* L, 1940, SRA, Belgrade 1941). In the 1940 *Yearbook* (published in 1941, before the war), at the beginning of his presentation of Rešetar’s maiden speech, Belić paraphrases an important view of Rešetar’s: “He (that is, Rešetar, J. S.) follows the development of the language of Dubrovnik from the beginning of the 13th century to the present day, and his conclusion is that the spoken language of Dubrovnik has always been Herzegovinian. **It is – a folk Serbian dialect**, if one separates the Serbian from the Croatian language, or a Serbo-Croat dialect for everyone who sees Serbs and Croats as one people with two different names” (*Yearbook* 1941: 188). In the manuscript that Rešetar handed in as his academic maiden speech entitled: *The Oldest Dubrovnik Speech, by Milan Rešetar (paper)* – (kept at the archive of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, no. 14456), he sublimates his exposé in the final paragraph, which runs as follows: “From that objective observation [that is, that Čakavian has never been spoken in Dubrovnik, J. S.] I draw no further conclusions now, for to me, Serbs and Croats are one people under two different names, so I will never say that Croatian was not spoken in Dubrovnik and that Serbian was, **but one who sees Serbs and Croats as two peoples will have to admit that, in linguistic terms, Dubrovnik has always been Serbian** (our emphasis!)”

(Rešetar 1940: from the manuscript, p. 52)¹⁸ (Addendum no. 1). However, when the academic maiden speech was published after the war in 1952 in the *Herald of the Serbian Academy of Sciences* under the title of *The Oldest Dubrovnik Speech* (Rešetar 1951: 1–54), this closing paragraph was quite simply left out (by whom and how is a separate issue) (Addendum no. 2).

On the back of the last sheet of paper (empty, unwritten on) of the manuscript of Rešetar's maiden academic speech, there is an added note at the bottom of the page (written in green ink, crossed out with an ordinary pencil), written in a handwriting that is different from Rešetar's, containing a somewhat modified final observation by Rešetar, which runs as follows: "I go no further than this scientific result, and I will most certainly not enter the unfortunately renewed argument about the Serbianhood and the Croatianhood of Dubrovnik, for to me, Serbs and Croats are one people under two different names, which is why Dubrovnik is both Serbian and Croatian to me. But one who separates the Serbian from the Croatian must admit that, in linguistic terms, Dubrovnik has always been Serbian" (the following was added subsequently: "This was written by Dr Aleksandar Belić, but neither his nor Rešetar's conclusion is to be found in the printed text of this treatise. B. Kovačević"), (Addendum no. 3).

8. Later developments and the attitude towards the language and literature of Dubrovnik

The act of leaving out this important part of Milan Rešetar's academic maiden speech, in a way, is an indicator of sub-

¹⁸ In front of this quote in the manuscript, we find a sentence that was crossed out, but which can easily be read: "Now I will not connect this claim (that is, that Čakavian has never been spoken in Dubrovnik, J. S.) to any other tendencies, for now Belgrade is to me a Croatian city just as much as Zagreb is a Serbian one, but to those who separate the Serbian from the Croatian I will always maintain that, **in linguistic terms, Dubrovnik has always been Serbian** (our emphasis!)" (Rešetar 1940: 52).

sequent developments and activities. A decade and a half to two decades **after World War Two** (first of all, starting with the Novi Sad Agreement), the acts of omitting and separating Dubrovnik from the framework of the Serbian language and literature were increasingly in evidence and ever more frequent, not only on the Croatian side. While, on the Croatian side, the literature of Dubrovnik is regularly included in the corpus of the history of Croatian literature and the Croatian language, on the Serbian side it began to be excluded from the corpus of Serbian literature. The literature of Dubrovnik was excluded from Serbian literature in *The Encyclopaedia of Yugoslavia* (Lompar 2014: 121), and this exclusion had its own development trend. As we find in Milo Lompar, this process can be followed starting from “the cultural-political fate of *An Overview of Serbian Literature* (1909) by Pavle Popović”. In this textbook, in keeping with the philological-historical tradition, within the framework of the periodisation of Serbian literature, three areas are outlined: old, folk and Dubrovnik literature (Lompar 2014: 121). A short while later (1913), Pavle Popović, in the preface to the second edition (1913) stresses “that Dubrovnik literature can be called *Serbian* at least as much as *Croatian*”, thereby opting for the Yugoslav programme, thus sacrificing the Serbian for the sake of the Yugoslav programme, in order to appease the Croats: “This is an important moment, for it shows how the process of suppressing the *personal* Serbian standpoint in favour of the *general* Yugoslav standpoint got under way in Serbian public consciousness, *despite* numerous personal dilemmas concerning historical developments” (Lompar 2014: 121–122). The abandoning of the Serbian and the acceptance of the Yugoslav standpoint, according to Lompar, is also visible in the period between the great wars in Pavle Popović’s acceptance to write *Yugoslav Literature* instead of a history of Serbian literature. For a while, the Serbian standpoint existed parallel with the Yugoslav one, so that *An Overview of Serbian Literature* was published alongside the Yugoslav one in 1919, 1921, 1923, 1925, 1926 and 1927, and the last edition of this textbook appeared

in 1931, which coincides with the time of the official proclamation of unitary Yugoslavianism (Lompar 2014: 123): “There is, however, an important detail: despite the state’s imposition of unitary Yugoslavianism, the Ministry of Education approved, on 31st May 1934 – ‘further use of this textbook (that is, *An Overview of Serbian Literature*, J. S.) in secondary schools.’ That the Croatian standpoint continued to exist directly and continually, is testified to by *The Croatian Encyclopaedia*, wherein Dubrovnik literature is understood as exclusively and solely Croatian: entirely in keeping with the criticism of *An Overview of Serbian Literature* of long ago. This shows the uninterrupted continuity of the Croatian cultural policy” (Lompar 2014: 123).

After World War Two, in 1949, the Ministry of Culture formed the Commission for Preparing History of Literature Textbooks, which prescribed that “the literature of Dubrovnik *must not be* viewed as a regional and separate literature, or outside of *Croatian* literature, and also that ‘this period, the era and individual writers should be dealt with by literary historians from Croatia’ (Vice Zaninović)” (Lompar 2014: 124). Thus *An Overview of Serbian Literature* was never published in Titoist Yugoslavia. At the same time, around 1965, Miodrag Popović, while revising his texts for *The Encyclopaedia of Yugoslavia*, for which he wrote some of the entries, noticed that a part of one sentence of his was left out, the part in which he wrote that the literature of Dubrovnik constituted a common Serbo-Croatian heritage (Lompar 2014: 126): “*Despite* Miodrag Popović’s categorical insistence that the erased part of the sentence about a common Serbo-Croatian heritage be reinstated in *his* text, ‘the Belgrade editorial office was rather surprised when they received a printed copy of Volume V’, for Miodrag Popović ‘established that the part of the sentence on which he had insisted was not reinstated’” (Lompar 2014: 127). The removal and prohibition of everything which did not treat the literature of Dubrovnik as Croatian only went on with great intensity. An ideological witch-hunt was initiated only because, in 1967, *An Overview of Serbian Literature* was included in a selection of

reading matter for students, and within the framework of this witch-hunt, it was stressed that “in the name of ‘our socialist Yugoslavia,’ the cultural-political accent was placed ‘on the chauvinist orientation, which is reflected in placing the literature of Dubrovnik, in the second chapter of the book, within the boundaries of Serbian literature.’ The actual witch-hunt was initiated due to a proposal that Pavle Popović’s book, parallel with those written by Branko Vodnik (*A History of Croatian Literature*, Zagreb, 1913) and Mihovil Kombol (*A History of Croatian Literature*, Zagreb 1945), should be offered to the students of the Faculty of Philology in Belgrade as part of their reading list for Dubrovnik literature” (Lompar 2014: 127). The very mention of Pavle Popović’s book led to accusations on the title page of the *Borba* [*Struggle*] daily, claiming that Pavle Popović’s textbook is “outdated and chauvinistically intoned”, whereas Mihovil Kombol’s textbook, which was written “based on the so-called ‘root orthography [korienski pravopis]’, which was the norm during Pavelić’s Independent State of Croatia, was not subjected to this kind of treatment; during the entire period of the existence of that ‘state’, in a somewhat abridged version printed earlier, the book was the *official* textbook prescribed by the Ustashi Ministry of Education for Croatian secondary school pupils (Miroslav Pantić)” (Lompar 2014: 127–128): “If it was controversial to offer Pavle Popović’s book to students, how it is possible – from a *Communist standpoint* – that a textbook prescribed by the Independent State of Croatia was not controversial? If that textbook was not controversial, then it means that it was to be made *the only* source of knowledge about Dubrovnik literature in Belgrade. Does that not mean that – through the mechanism of Communist coercion – it was meant to interiorise the Croatian standpoint within the Serbian academic community, that is to say, to impose that which was obligatory in Zagreb as obligatory in Belgrade as well? In accordance with such efforts, the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Serbia forwarded to Mirko Tepavac – on 8th May 1968 – information on the work being done on a history of literature of

the peoples and national minorities of Yugoslavia, wherein it is said that Dubrovnik literature 'is treated as part of Croatian literature'. The interiorisation of the Croatian standpoint, therefore, shaped the cultural basis of Serbian public consciousness" (Lompar 2014: 128).

As we find in Petar Milosavljević: "In all the histories of Serbian literature published until the beginning of World War Two, Serbian literature was divided into these four parts: folk literature, old literature, middle (Dubrovnik) literature and new literature [...]. Soon after the Novi Sad Agreement, Matica srpska [The Serbian Matrix cultural society], together with Srpska književna zadruga [The Serbian Literary Commune], started publishing the edition *Serbian Literature in One Hundred Books*. Within the framework of this edition, Serbian literature was diminished. Without a word of explanation, the literature of Dubrovnik was left out of it, whereas folk literature, having been created in the so-called Serbo-Croat language, was presented as the common good of Serbs and Croats" (Milosavljević 2007: 209). This practice continued in other editions as well: "Those editions included *Serbian Drama* (Nolit) and *A History of the Serbian People* (Srpska književna zadruga), *Serbian Literary Criticism* (Matica srpska, the Institute for Literature and Art..." (ibid.: 222). The literature of Dubrovnik was left out of the corpus of Serbian literature in university-level curricula, in various textbooks etc.

This placed the Serbian linguistic policy in the service of the linguistic policy of the Croats, which attempted to retroactively subsume everything that is within the boundaries of Croatia today under the designation "Croatian", and thereby under the Croatian language and Croatian literature, projecting the results of the ideological-political activities of today onto the historical-linguistic and the historical-literary level. This policy is carried out in all areas. Thus an international scientific conference was held in 2004, resulting in *A Collection of Papers on Milan Rešetar*, whose contributors attempted to polemicise with Milan Rešetar's scientific thought and the results

that he achieved. The aim was, above all, to “bring into question” his investigations of the language of Dubrovnik as Serbian and the results that he achieved. However, it is not easy to polemicise with the precise, well-founded results based on meticulously conducted research, which Rešetar achieved owing to diligent and honest scientific work (based on thorough philological knowledge and education, a representative corpus and work on original linguistic monuments), and to dispute his crucial results is virtually impossible. That is why such efforts often boiled down to *a priori* evaluations and conclusions, determined in advance. Thus, in Katičić we find: “When Milan Rešetar and the Croatian language are mentioned in a single breath, as is the case with the title of this paper, it almost sounds like an oxymoron. As if incompatible phenomena are joined through a single phrase into a contradictory whole. To speak of the Croatian language is in no way characteristic of Rešetar (This refers to the language of Dubrovnik, J. S.). Especially if that language is supposed to be his own. He was thoroughly imbued with the linguistic views of his time, which only allowed determining linguistic identity on the basis of a genetic classification of organic languages, that is to say, on the basis of their classification based on origin. Cultural features were entirely excluded from this” (Katičić 2005: 9). Katičić rightly observes that Rešetar (as a citizen of Dubrovnik and a Catholic) considers his language to be Serbian, and also that he designates the language and speech of Dubrovnik as Serbian. He also correctly states that this was the view (and scientific opinion) of the time wherein Rešetar lived and worked, a time that relied on structural-genetic linguistic recognisability, on historicity, on “classification based on origin”, without which language does not have its recognisability and specificity. Therefore, that is the starting point where the relevant scientific and linguistic criteria are taken into consideration. That era, as Katičić says, determined linguistic identity on the basis of “a genetic classification of organic languages” and “classification by origin”, and it is based on the above that Rešetar came to his conclusions on the

identity and the designation of the language of Dubrovnik – as Serbian. For that language to be “Croatian”, as can be seen from Katičić’s paper, “cultural features” are to be involved, according to which, excluding “the origin” and “genetic classification”, the language of Dubrovnik would get the “designation” – Croatian. It would not be amiss here to raise the question of what kind of “a cultural feature” it is that excludes “the origin” and “genetic classification”. For sure, some special and unknown feature, and Katičić himself does not reveal to us what kind it would be, so we ought to take his word for it that such a feature exists (and that it is relevant). It should be noted that, in accordance with the circumstances in Dubrovnik at the time, the era of Milan Rešetar, the notion of its language as Serbian did not exclude “cultural features”. On the contrary! According to Katičić, the structural-typological criterion is not essential either when it comes to determining the linguistic identity and the status of a language: “The borders of the Croatian language in space, geographical and historical space alike, cannot be drawn based on sound-related and other grammatical isoglosses, but most of all based on stylistic ones” (Katičić 2004: 11). However, Katičić fails to state clearly what “stylistic isoglosses” give a special character to the Croatian language, nor does he provide an example of any language, at a broader level, where “stylistic isoglosses” are an indicator of the specific character of a language (irrespective of genetic, structural, “sound-related”, “grammatical” features, irrespective of “the origin”), a language that earned its specificity on the basis of indeterminate stylistic isoglosses. That is all in the way of “arguments” that are supposed to prove that the language of Dubrovnik is Croatian. It would appear that, in doing so, Katičić himself confirmed Rešetar’s findings and evidence concerning the language of Dubrovnik. We find equally “logical” reasoning in the paper contributed by Josip Lisac. Despite his own observation that Rešetar “for the most part refers to the Slavic idiom of Dubrovnik as the Serbian language” (Lisac 2005: 70), that is, that Rešetar calls the language which he spoke Serbian, Lisac unexpectedly concludes: “Rešetar’s pa-

pers are written in standard new-Štokavian with a(n) I/Jekavian physiognomy, which he almost regularly used when he wrote in Croatian” (Lisac 2005: 73).

It is only recently that in the publications (as well as lectures) of some Serbian literary theorists and historians, and also institutions, the literature of Dubrovnik has come to be included in the corpus of Serbian literature, or at least has not been excluded from it. As we are not in a position here to deal with this problem in a more detailed manner, we only mention this in the context of Rešetar’s scientific, professional presentation of the literature and language of Dubrovnik, grounded in deep and systematic investigations of them.

The abundance of Serbian monuments, both those written in the Serb-Slavic language and those written in the Old Serbian language, preserved from the end of the 12th century onwards, testifies to the fact that these documents were preceded by a long period of widespread literacy in the Serbian language. Starting from this period, monuments written in the Cyrillic script have been preserved from all Serbian lands, and despite having been destroyed for centuries, they constitute a very rich written heritage of the kind that many areas and peoples cannot boast of.

Literature

- Belić 1941: Aleksandar Belić, *Saopštenje* [Presentation], Godišnjak [Yearbook], L 1940, Srpska kraljevska akademija, Belgrade.
- Ivić 1991: Pavle Ivić, *Označenju izraza lingua seruiana u dubrovačkim dokumentima XV–XVIII veka. Iz istorije srpskohrvatskog jezika. Izabrani ogleđi II* [On the Meaning of the Term *lingua seruiana* in Dubrovnik Documents from the Period between the 15th and the 18th Century. From the History of the Serbo-Croat Language Selected Essays II], Prosveta, Niš.
- Ivić 2001: Pavle Ivić, *Srpski narod i njegov jezik* [The Serbian People and Its Language], Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
- Katičić 2005: Radoslav Katičić, *Milan Rešetar i hrvatski književni jezik* [Milan Rešetar and the Croatian Literary Language], a collection of papers on Milan Rešetar, a literary critic and philologist, presented at the international scientific conference held in Vienna, 25th September 2004, Dubrovnik, 1st and 2nd October 2004, Hrvatski studiji Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb, 9–21.
- Lisac 2005: Josip Lisac, “Najstariji dubrovački govor [The Oldest Dubrovnik Speech]” and “Najstarija dubrovačka proza [The Oldest Dubrovnik Prose]” by Milan Rešetar, *Zbornik o Milanu Rešetaru, književnom kritičaru i filologu*, Zbornik radova s Međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa, Beč, 25. rujna 2004, Dubrovnik, 1.2. listopada 2004, [a collection of papers on Milan Rešetar, a literary critic and philologist, presented at the international scientific conference held in Vienna, 25th September 2004, Dubrovnik, 1st and 2nd October 2004], Hrvatski studiji Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb, 69–77.
- Lompar 2014: Milo Lompar, *Duh samoporicanja. Prilog kritici srpske kulturne politike* [The Spirit of Self-Denial. A Contribution to Criticism of the Serbian Cultural Policy], Evro-Đunti, Belgrade.
- Milosavljević 2002: Petar Milosavljević, *Srbi i njihov jezik* [Serbs and Their Language], Trebnik, Belgrade.
- Milosavljević 2007: Petar Milosavljević, *Ideja jugoslovenstva i srpska misao* [The Idea of Yugoslavianism and the Serbian Thought], Knjižotvornica Logos, Valjevo.

- Okuka 2006: Miloš Okuka, *Srpski na kriznom putu* [The Serbian Language on a Crisis Path], Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Istočno Sarajevo.
- Rešetar 1894: Milan Rešetar, *Antologija dubrovačke lirike* [An Anthology of Dubrovnik Lyrical Poetry], SKZ 15, Biograd, printed in the state printing press of the Kingdom of Serbia.
- Rešetar 1894: Milan Rešetar, *Zadarski i Ranjinin Lekcionar* [The Zadar and Ranjina's Lectionary], JAZU, Zagreb.
- Rešetar 1922: Milan Rešetar, *Četiri dubrovačke drame u prozi. Iz kraja XVII vijeka* [Four Dubrovnik Prose Plays. From the end of the 17th century], Srpska kraljevska akademija, Belgrade.
- Rešetar 1926: Milan Rešetar: *Libro od mnozijek razloga. Dubrovački ćirilski spomenik od g. 1520* [A Book of Many Reasons. A Dubrovnik Cyrillic Monument Dating from 1520], Srpska kraljevska akademija, Sremski Karlovci.
- Rešetar 1929: Milan Rešetar, *Redakcije i izvori Vetranovićevo Posvetilišta Avramova* [Redactions and Sources of Vetranović's Abraham's Sacrifice], "Rad", JAZU, Zagreb.
- Rešetar 1931: Milan Rešetar, *Iz pisama pokojnog Ljub. Stojanovića* [From the Letters of the Late Ljub. Stojanović], Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor. Book XI. Vol. 1–2.
- Rešetar 1931(2): Milan Rešetar, *Dubrovački zbornik od god. 1520* [The Dubrovnik Collection of 1520], SKA, special editions, book C, philosophical and philological writings, book 24, Belgrade.
- Rešetar 1933: Milan Rešetar, *Bernardinov leksionar i njegovi dubrovački prepisi* [Bernardin's Lectionary and Its Copies Made in Dubrovnik], Srpska kraljevska akademija, book XCIX, philosophical and philological writings, book 23, Belgrade.
- Rešetar 1936: Milan Rešetar, *Nove dubrovačke povelje Stojanovićevo zbornika* [The New Dubrovnik Charters in Stojanović's Collection], SKA, Glas CLXIX, Belgrade.
- Rešetar 1936 (2): Milan Rešetar, *Nikša Zvijezdić, dubrovački srpski kancelar XV vijeka* [Nikša Zvijezdić, A Serbian Chancellor of Dubrovnik from the 15th Century], SKA, Glas CLXIX, Drugi razred, Filozofsko-filološke, društvene i istorijske nauke 87, Belgrade.
- Rešetar – Đaneli 1938: M. Rešetar – Đ. Đaneli, *Dva dubrovačka jezička spomenika iz XVI. vijeka. Srpski molitvenik od g. 1512. Novo izdanje priredio Milan Rešetar* [Two Dubrovnik Linguistic

Monuments from the 16th Century. Serbian Breviary of 1512. New edition edited by Milan Rešetar, SKA, special editions, book CXXII, philosophical and philological writings, book 32, Belgrade.

Rešetar 1938: Milan Rešetar, *Rječnik i dikcija Ranjinina zbornika* [*The Vocabulary and Diction of Ranjina's Collection*], JAZU, Historičko-filologički i filozofičko-juridički razred. Book 260 (117), Tisak Nadbiskupske tiskare, Zagreb.

Rešetar 1940: Milan Rešetar, *Najstariji dubrovački govor* [*The Oldest Dubrovnik Speech*], manuscript of his academic maiden speech, Yearbook L, 1940, SKA, Belgrade.

Rešetar 1951: Milan Rešetar, *Najstariji dubrovački govor*, Glas Srpske akademije nauka CCI, Odeljenje literature i jezika, Nova serija 1, Belgrade.

Rešetar 1952: Milan Rešetar, *Najstarija dubrovačka proza* [*The Oldest Dubrovnik Prose*], Srpska akademija nauka, special editions, Book CXCII. Odeljenje literature i jezika. Book 4, Belgrade.

THE CONTINUITY, SPREADING AND STATUS OF THE SERBIAN CYRILLIC SCRIPT – THROUGH THE CENTURIES AND TODAY

In order to gain a more complete picture concerning the Serbian Cyrillic script and its use, it is necessary to take into consideration a number of aspects. *Firstly*, its historical continuity, presence and spread across a broad area where the Serbian language has been and is being used. *Secondly*, what the attitude of state and other institutions towards the Cyrillic script is like in the area where Serbian is spoken; what its position, presence and status are like today. *Thirdly*, what the attitude of the scientific and professional public towards the Cyrillic script and their view of it are like, in view of the status and the presence (or lack) of it. *Fourthly*, what the Cyrillic script represents and carries with it. *Fifthly*, the cultural-historical and the traditional-spiritual value of the Cyrillic script, and the emotional-symbolic attitude towards it in the Serbian linguistic area. We shall try to take into account and review all these aspects. We shall lay special emphasis on the use of the Cyrillic script in the area of Montenegro today – first of all, because relatively little has been written about it, and then, because we naturally gravitate towards this area and are best acquainted with it.

1. The historical continuity of the Cyrillic script in the area of Serbian literacy

1.1. The year 2013 marked the 1150th anniversary of the beginning of the mission of St Cyril and St Methodius, which is why UNESCO has proclaimed this year to be the year of the brothers from Thessaloniki, St Cyril and St Methodius, a year of importance for all Slavic peoples. The Slavs, the most numerous and the most widespread Indo-European people, have received their literary language, which possesses continuity today in various Slavic literary languages as its extension. From the mission

of St Cyril and Methodius, there began and still develops a great, continual, recognisable and deified, Christianised Slavic literacy.

For the most part, parallel with the spreading of Old Slavic literacy (sometimes even immediately before it), the Slavs accepted the Cristian faith as well. We draw conclusions on **the creation and development path of the Old Slavic language** on the basis of a small number of sources: Old Slavic, Latin and Greek ones. As not many sources have been preserved, many questions remain open even today: “Of all the mediaeval eastern Christian literacies, the Slavic literacy is the youngest one in temporal terms, but it is also one of the most mysterious ones (Stanišić 2014: 152). Particularly mysterious is the relationship between and the origin of Old Slavic alphabets: “one could hardly find another area of Slavic studies whose mystery would be so hopelessly unsolvable as in this particular case” (Stanišić 2014: 152).

Original manuscripts containing Cyril and Methodius’s translations have not been preserved; what has been preserved are Old Slavic monuments from the end of the 10th century and from the first half of the 11th century (16 monuments in all), which make up the Old Slavic canon (Old Slavic monuments in the narrow sense of the term). Old Slavic monuments were written in two alphabets: the Glagolitic and the Cyrillic script. Some of the very important issues that Slavic scholars have been arguing about are these: which alphabet did Cyril create, and which of the two alphabets is the older one? Concerning the latter dilemma, it has for the most part been resolved: the Glagolitic script is considered to be older than the Cyrillic one. The Cyrillic script, as the younger of the two, according to many, was created in Preslav, Bulgaria; as for its creators, Constantine of Preslav is the most often mentioned name, followed by Clement of Ohrid. However, despite the general and for the most part accepted opinion, it has not been dependably proven that Cyril did not create the Cyrillic script. In old Russian manuscripts we usually find the information that the Glagolitic script is called Cyrillic (Kirilik), after its creator Cyril. (In a Cyrillic manuscript from Novgorod dating from the

end of the 15th century, which is a copy created based on the original from 1074, the writer, Upir Lihoj, informs the reader that he copied the book, as he puts it, is kourilovicy, whereas it was actually – from the Glagolitic script). There are opinions that the Cyrillic script was named in honour of the teacher by his disciples. In any case, apart from the term the Slavic script, the Glagolitic script was also called Cyrillic (probably during the entire era of Cyril and Methodius), and subsequently the younger script came to be called the Cyrillic one. The designation Glagolitic actually appeared later (towards the end of the Middle Ages, among the Croats). The root of this term is the verb *глаголати* (“speak”, “say”), often used in the Gospels.

As we find in Vanja Stanišić, “the creation of all the eastern Christian alphabets essentially followed the Greek model of creating a national script”, but among them all, “Slavic literacy occupies a special place owing to its digraphic character. It is only the Old Slavic corpus that is characterised by two graphically entirely different scripts” (Stanišić 2014: 152). The issue of the origin of Old Slavic alphabets has not been entirely resolved either. The origin of the Cyrillic script is for the most part clear, it was created in accordance with the Greek Uncial script (angular, majuscule), and at the level of expression it is identical to the Coptic and the Gothic script (Stanišić: *ibid.*). The Cyrillic script, graphically mysterious, is identical in terms of expression “to the also mysterious Georgian and Armenian script, which are connected to the Greek script only through their internal structure” (Stanišić: 152). As regards the origin of the Glagolitic script, first of all its letter design, different opinions exist. Most scholars are prone to seeing its origin in the Greek minuscule form (Leskin, Jagić, Belyaev), whereas others found the origin of the Glagolitic script, that is, its individual letters, in various Eastern scripts, which were known to Cyril and Methodius: Old Jewish, Samaritan (Šafarik, Vondrak), Coptic (Fortunatov), Avestian (Vs. Miller), Armenian, Georgian (Gaster), which themselves represent, in a sense, a stylised Greek alphabet. We would say that the dominant opinion today

the basis of which the origin of the Slavs is derived, that is, from “слово” (from Christ), seeing in the Slavic people “a new chosen God’s people” (see: Turčanji 2004).

Through the mission of Cyril and Methodius, the Slavic language became the fourth sacral language, along with Hebrew, Greek and Latin. The entire mission of Cyril and Methodius (until the death of Methodius) was marked by a struggle for gaining the right for the Slavic language to be used in church service, which is known as the struggle with “three-language proponents”. In Moravia, as we find in *The Hagiography of Cyril*, “Latin and Frankish archpriests, together with priests and disciples”, tried to deny the Slavic language the right to be used for liturgical purposes, in view of the three chosen languages, “for that was what Pilate wrote on the Lord’s grave”, so Cyril and Methodius called them “three-language proponents” of the three-language heresy, Pilatians.¹

The struggle with the “three-language proponents” also marked the brothers’ journey to Rome: in Venice, “bishops, priests and black-robe wearers” attacked Constantine “the way rooks at-

¹ *The Hagiography of Cyril* speaks of this: “As God’s science was spreading, the ancient malicious envier, the cursed Devil, could not stand that beneficial process, so he entered his courts and started inciting many to evildoing by telling them: –God is not praised through this. That is, if He found this pleasing, could He not have made it so that they, writing their sermons in letters anew, praised the Lord? He chose only three languages: Hebrew, Greek and Latin, in which to strive to praise the glory of God.

[...] Entering into a struggle with them, the way David did with foreigners, conquering them with the words from the Scriptures, he called them three-language proponents, for that was what Pilate wrote on the Lord’s grave.”

The Hagiography of Cyril has this to say about it: “There were, however, more of those other people who cursed Slavic books, saying that it did not befit any people to have its own letters except for Jews, Greeks and Latins, as Pilate’s inscription of the Lord’s cross said – so the apostolic vicar, calling them Pilatians and three-language proponents, cursed them and ordered a bishop who suffered from the same illness to sanctify three priests and two readers from among the disciples.”

tack a hawk” (*The Hagiography of Cyril*).² On this occasion, too, the philosopher successfully responded to the three-language proponents: “Does not rain that God gave us fall on each and every one equally? And does not the sun shine equally on everyone as well? Do not all of us breathe the air equally? How come, then, that you are not ashamed to recognise only three languages, and wish for all the other peoples and tribes to be blind and deaf? Tell me this, do you consider God to be so powerless that He cannot allow that, or so jealous that He won’t do it?” (*The Hagiography of Cyril*). The philosopher then referred to the holy books, quoting a number of excerpts that did not favour the three-language proponents: “Namely, David cried: ‘Praise the Lord, all you peoples, and praise him all you men. And let everything that breathes praise the Lord’”, and he also quoted from the Gospel According to St Mark: “Go to the whole world and preach the Gospel to each and every creature. He who believes and makes the sign of the cross will be saved, and he who does not believe will be judged. The signs for those who believe will be as follows: using my name, they will drive out demons, they will speak in new tongues”, and from St Paul’s address to Corinthians: “Now I wish that you all spoke in tongues, but even more that you would prophesy; and greater is one who prophesies than one who speaks in tongues, unless he interprets, so that the church may receive edifying. But now, brethren, if I come to you speaking in tongues, what will I profit you unless I speak to you either by way of revelation or of knowledge or of prophecy or of teaching? Yet even lifeless things, either flute or harp, in producing a sound, if they do not produce a distinction in the tones, how will it be known what is played on the flute or on the harp? For if the bugle produces an indistinct

² “When he was in Venice, bishops, priests and black-robe wearers gathered and attacked him the way rooks attack a hawk, and they spoke the three-language heresy, saying: –Man, tell us, how is it that you have made books for the Slavs and are now teaching them from those books, which no one has thought of until now, not the apostles, nor the Pope of Rome, nor Gregory the Theologian, nor Hieronymus, nor Augustine? As for ourselves, we know only three languages, in which it is befitting to praise God from books – Hebrew, Hellenic and Latin” (*The Hagiography of Cyril*).

sound, who will prepare himself for battle? So also you, unless you utter by the tongue speech that is clear, how will it be known what is spoken? For you will be speaking into the air. [...] If then I do not know the meaning of the language, I will be a barbarian to the one who speaks, and the one who speaks will be a barbarian to me. [...] For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my mind is unfruitful. What is the outcome then? I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the mind also; I will sing with the spirit and I will sing with the mind also. [...] Therefore if the whole church assembles together and all speak in tongues, and ungifted men or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are mad? [...] Each tongue is to preach that the Lord Jesus Christ serves the glory of God the Father. Amen.’ He shamed them with these words and many others, and then left” (*The Hagiography of Cyril*).

St Cyril, who died in 869, left it to Methodius to continue their work and to “dispose of the three-language heresy”. Pope Hadrian II, and then Pope John VIII as well, recognised the Slavic language as fitting for the church service, even though the Bavarian archbishop continually exerted pressure against it and there was constant indecisiveness concerning church service in the Slavic language, until the final ban, which ensued after the death of Methodius in 885 and the banishment and incarceration of Cyril and Methodius’s disciples. In this region, Slavic Glagolitic literacy was probably never completely abolished, as evidenced by *The Kiev Folios* (Missal), dating from the second half of the 10th century, of which seven parchment folios have been preserved.³

Thus, after staying in Moravia for more than three years, going to Rome and establishing the Pannonian and Pannonian-Moravian Archbishopric headed by Archbishop Methodius,

³ The area of Serbian dialects, that is, the Serbian lands, have been mentioned among philologists more than once in connection with the creation of *The Kiev Folios*. Although some of those assumptions have been brought into question, “Serbian dialects, as well as south Slavic dialects in general, would remain as one of the possibilities when it comes to interpreting and studying *The Kiev Folios*” (Trifunović 2001: 175-176).

the centre of Slavic literacy shifted to the south Slavic area, and the best-known and most fruitful centres of literacy turned out to be Ohrid and Preslav. After Svatopluk had banned the Slavic liturgy and banished the disciples (in 885-886), those disciples who managed to avoid slavery, among them the famous Clement, Naum, Sava, Angelar and Gorazd, found shelter in Macedonia, Bulgaria, Serbia and the coastal region, where they continued the work of their teachers.

What can one say about the Serbian lands and **Serbian literacy at the time of the Old Slavic mission**? There are a number of indicators showing that the Serbian language has a significant place within the framework of the Old Slavic period of literacy.

1.2. To begin with, there is a possibility that, going to Moravia, Cyril and Methodius passed through the Serbian lands. They probably travelled to Moravia via Venice, stopping in the coastal towns of Byzantine Dalmatia (Privatirić 2014: 106).

Furthermore, the Serbian redaction “may have originated from the Old Slavic variant adopted at the time of the establishment of Methodius’s Pannonian Archbishopric, following the invitation of Pope John VIII sent to the Serbian Prince Mutimir” (Savić 2014: 298). Actually, Pope John VIII wrote to the Serbian Prince Mutimir in 873: “We support you and follow the customs of our ancestors; go back to the diocese of the Pannonians as much as possible. As, by the grace of God, the See of the Blessed Apostle Peter has already sent a bishop there, seek his pastoral protection” (P. Duthilleul), (Kont 1989: 458). It is not known what the Serbian Prince replied to the Pope. Therefore, this would point to “the efforts of the Roman Pontifex to spread the jurisdiction of the Pannonian Archbishopric to the territory of the Serbian Principality” (Komatina 2015: 713-716; quoted from Penktovski 2014: 58). The Serbian Principality only partly spread across the territory of the former diocese of Pannonia; at the same time, other parts of it were located in the territories of the former Roman dioceses Moesia and Dalmatia (Penktovski 2014: 59). Judging by these moments, Slavic Glagolitic literacy

and the Slavic liturgy may have spread to include Serbian areas (that is, a part of the Serbian lands) at the time when Methodius was the Pannonian Bishop. Whether Slavic Glagolitic literacy originally appeared in the Serbian lands coming precisely from the Pannonian Archbishopric remains an open question (Pirivatrić 2014: 104-105).

A special aspect of this problem are the ties between the Serbian lands and the coastal region church centres and the Roman jurisdiction (Pirivatrić 2014: 108),⁴ which may have been of more or less importance for Slavic literacy after the abolition of the Pannonian Archbishopric. After the abolition of the Pannonian (Moravian) Archbishopric, the Slavic liturgy and literacy continued, in all likelihood, in the Salonitan (Split) Archbishopric, which was established by Pope John VIII in 879. To prove that the Slavic language was used for church service, Penktovski (2014: 85) refers to Pope John X's epistle to the Salonitan Archbishop Jovan and the bishops subordinated to him, and also to his epistle sent to the Croatian King Tomislav (around the year 925, on the occasion of the Split Council), in connection with the preparations for the Council and the reorganisation of the regional church province, wherein the mention of Archbishop Methodius is of particular importance, and he also mentions the preserved fragments of Glagolitic Missal-sacraments, and Glagolitic inscriptions from the 11th century on the Dalmatian coast. During the reorganisation of the Salonitan Archbishopric in 925, the use of the Slavic language for liturgical purposes was officially forbidden (Penktovski 2014: 86), which was confirmed during the Councils of 1054 and 1060–1061.

⁴ “Its activities pertained to the Pannonian Archbishopric in the context of work on the territory of Central Europe, populated by Slavs, which became a complex church-political project. Rome advocated a return of Illyricum, initiated the establishment of church organisations that spread on the territories of the former Roman provinces Dalmatia and Pannonia, where, along the line Split (Salona) – Blatenski grad [Blatania City] – Morava, Slavic principalities were located: Croatian, Serbian, Blatenian and Moravian” (Penktovski 2014: 65).

The next important centre of Glagolitic literacy may have been the Dubrovnik Archbishopric, which (according to Pirivatrić 2014: 108), in all likelihood, had already been founded around the middle of the 10th century, but certainly before the year 1000, in view of the fact that it was mentioned in a Venetian chronicle of that time: “While it is known that the Archonty of Croatia had its Bishop in Nin, it can be assumed of Serbia (including the region of Bosnia) and Travunia that they were under the jurisdiction of the Latinophone Bishop of Dubrovnik. The Bishop of Zahumlje had his seat in Ston, whereas Duklja and Pagania, which remained for a long time outside the Christianisation trends, did not have their own bishop at the time, towards the end of the 9th and at the beginning of the 10th century. The renewal of Serbia under Prince Časlav, with the help of the Byzantine Emperor, probably included renewed activities of the Bishop of Dubrovnik” (Pirivatrić 2014: 108). According to documentary sources, the scope of its jurisdiction spread onto the Slavic hinterland, that is, onto the then Serbian areas Zahumlje, Serbia and Travunia (Pirivatrić: *ibid.*); the existence and subsequent banning of Slavic literacy would be connected to this region: “That unknown region, perhaps, is precisely the territory encompassed by the well-known Porphyrogenitus’s description of Serbia dating from the middle of the 10th century. The recent discoveries of Glagolitic monuments in Konavle (in 1997, J. S.) and Dubrovnik Župa (in 2006, J. S.), dating from the 11th century, pertain to the then Serbian state and ethnic area in territorial terms” (Pirivatrić 2014: 108), and *ipso facto* to the linguistic area, too.⁵

Another line of influence and spreading of Slavic literacy and the Cyrillic script onto the areas of Serbia can be connected

⁵ The Dubrovnik Republic spread at the expense of the Serbian hinterland; one part of its territory belonged to the Serbian state until the 1340’s: Ston and Pelješac were a part of the state of King, later Emperor Dušan, who ceded control of them to the Dubrovnik Republic, and later on his son Uroš did so with the part of the coast referred to as Primorje [Seaboard] (Z. Bojović 2014: 10).

to the region of Bulgaria, that is, to the connection between the Bishopric of Ras and the Bulgarian Bishopric, later Patriarchate in Preslav (Pirivatrić: *ibid.*). Towards the end of the 10th and in the early 11th century, this kind of influence could also pertain to Duklja. The earliest testimony of the existence of the Ras Bishopric dates from the time of the reign of Emperor Petar (927–969), that is, the time of Prince Časlav. After Byzantium conquered Bulgaria in 971, a Byzantine military garrison was established in Ras (971–976), so that during that short period the Ras Bishopric was probably under the jurisdiction of the Byzantine Metropolitan Drač, which at that time also encompassed Duklja until the moment when Prince Vladimir of Duklja clashed with Bulgarian Emperor Samuil in 998. After that, Vladimir, in all likelihood, as Samuil's son-in-law, continued to rule his region within the renewed Bulgarian Empire, which encompassed the region of Raška (Pirivatrić 2014: 108-109). On the basis of these church and state connections, it may be assumed that the influence of Slavic literacy and liturgical practice spread.⁶

⁶ An event mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in his well-known text *On the Governance of the Empire*, where it says that the Serbian Archon Petar and the Bulgarian Archon Simeon concluded a peace agreement around 897-8 and established a relationship of godparenthood, may be assumed to represent indirect evidence of the presence of Slavic literacy in the Serbian area. Concerning this event, Pirivatrić poses several important questions: where was the rite of christening performed, who officiated – a priest or a bishop, under whose jurisdiction and, which is of particular importance, according to what prayer book: Slavic, Greek or Latin? He concludes: “One of the possible assumptions is that the godparenthood arrangement was made in the Church of St Peter, in the region of Ras, using a Slavic prayer book. The church is located in today's Raška District in Serbia, on the outskirts of Novi Pazar. At the time, the region of Ras was a border area, a zone of contact between Serbia and Bulgaria. The godparenthood of Petar and Simeon meant the establishment of spiritual kinship between them, which may have influenced the spreading of Slavic liturgical texts and literacy from the Bulgarian literary centres in Preslav and Ohrid. Hence the early Serbian redaction of the Old Slavic language, of which we have no linguistic monument, could be hypothetically tied to this period of Serbian history. The appearance of a Bulgarian church calendar in Serbia, written at the time of Prince Boris Mihail, sometime between 866

In the Serbian regions, during the course of the 11th century, there existed alternating influences of various church centres and secular authorities: the hegemony of Duklja, the supreme power of Byzantium, then the influence of the church coastal region Latinophone and Roman Catholic centres, namely, Dubrovnik, Bar, Kotor, Ston and Split. In the year 1019, the Bishopric in Ras was included in the domain of the Archbishop of Ohrid and, as such, represented the westernmost point of the reach of the Greek-Slavic liturgical practice (Pirivatrić 2014: 113).⁷ Towards the end of the 11th century and in the 12th century, the power of Duklja declined and Serbia was in the ascendant, then the Byzantine rule in the region of Ras was renewed, “which spelled the final supremacy of the Byzantine influence in Serbia over that of Hungary, starting from the final third of the 12th century. The weakening of Serbia’s ties with Duklja, on the one hand, and its hostility with Byzantium, on the other, are circumstances that may have favoured the Slavic liturgy and literacy in the Ras Bishopric, countering the Latin and Greek influence” (Pirivatrić 2014: 116). Very strong influences came from Ohrid, whence, ever since the beginning of the 10th century, the paths of the spreading of the Glagolitic script, and subsequently the Cyrillic one, originated. “Recently, the manuscript known as *The Ohrid Palimpsest* was identified as a part of the literary connections between the Ohrid Archbishopric and the Serbian space” (Trifunović 2001: 66, accord-

and 877 (Turilov), could be tied precisely to the time when the spiritual kinship of Petar and Simeon was established” (Pirivatrić 2014: 106-107).

⁷ “According to three imperial charters issued in 1019 and 1020, the Ohrid Archbishopric was divided into thirty-one bishoprics, located mostly in the central part of the Balkan peninsula and on its western side, not counting Albania and Primorje. Among them are six bishoprics that would later on become a part of the Serbian Bishopric of St Sava (their seats being in Prizren, Lipljan, Niš, Braničevo, Belgrade, Trimon – Sremska Mitrovica). On the basis of another charter, to these was added the Ras Bishopric [...]. Western influence in the region of Raška was thoroughly suppressed owing to the activities of priests from Ohrid, and almost entirely disappeared later on” (Trifunović 2001: 118-119).

the redaction of the initial translation in accordance with the Greek original, as evidenced, for example, by the Greek borrowing “jektenija” in the text of *Mary’s Gospel*, a form that has a stable liturgical meaning in the Byzantine tradition (Penktovski 2014: 69). In *Mary’s Gospel* (as is the case with the Glagolitic *Zograph Gospel*), there is a lectionary-type arrangement in accordance with the Byzantine tradition, which testifies to the influence exerted on those texts by the Slavic liturgical Four Gospels, used in the church service conducted according to the Byzantine rite (Penktovski 2014: 87-88).

According to recent studies, the Serbian redaction is evident in the scribe work of **Dimitri of Sinai** (Savić 2014a: 3). According to Viktor Savić, the first page of *The Kiev Folios* was written at some later date (the 11th or the 12th century). A palaeographic analysis showed that this page was written by “Dimitri the Sinner”, “along with the Paschal table and a prayer book in *The Sinai Liturgiaron*, literary notes in *The Siani Psalter* which carries his name – the so-called *Dimitri’s Psalter* (both monuments are of the Eastern rite tradition), as well as a section of *The Sinai Missal*” (Savić 2014a: 3). On the first empty page of *The Kiev Folios*, there is a hand-written segment of *St Paul’s Epistle to the Romans* and a special prayer to the Holy Virgin, added at a later date by, as scholars have observed, “Dimitri the Sinner”, “who also made his mark in

ways be Serbian, even when it enters dialects of Bulgarian origin, which are under Serbian influence” (according to Trifunović 2001: 19–20). As an important indicator of the Serbian character of *Mary’s Gospel* within the framework of philological details, Trifunović points to the presence of hapax (that is, a word used only once within a certain circle of texts). Radoslav Večerka quotes the following such examples from *Mary’s Gospel*: ВЪЗГЛАВЪННИЦА, ЖАЛЪ, ЗАСЪДЪННИКЪ, КОКОТЪ, МНСА, ПОМЪРЪКЪЖЪН, РАСЪЯНИЕ, ПРНПЛОДНЪН, ТОКЪ, ЧРЪВЪН. Jagić pointed out the lexeme *кокотъ*, as opposed to the widespread *коуръ*, as a Serbian characteristic, and a similar example is *чрѣвнн*, from which Daničić later derives “црѣвѣа”, then the hapax form *расъяниѣ*, confirmed by Theodore of Chilandar, and the form *расъятн*, which was used by Stefan the First-Crowned, etc. (according to Trifunović 2001: 20). This does not exhaust the characteristics that testify to the Serbian character of *Mary’s Gospel* (Trifunović 20–24).

other manuscript books from Sinai created towards the end of the 11th century and in the early 12th century (especially according to Miklas's findings, and as previously identified by J. Tarnanidis)" (Savić 2014b: 277).

According to the findings of Heinz Miklas, the head of the Vienna team that is currently doing most of the work on studying the newly found Sinai Glagolitic manuscripts, the linguistic characteristics of Dimitri of Sinai can be connected to "the area of the Western Balkans" (Savić 2014a: 3). "In the recently published phototype editions of Dimitri's *The Sinai Psalter*, due to the interference of different scribe traditions, as well as the Štokavian speech basis of this scribe, it is concluded that he is from somewhere in the region of Duklja – Zeta, from where he moved to the Holy Land 'for church-political reasons' in the 11th century (Miklas et al. 2012: 133)" (Savić 2014: 295).⁹ The creation of *Kiev₂* and the Sinai manuscript treasury (first of all, owing to the work of H. Miklas) is connected, as V. Savić points out, with the area that was under the jurisdiction of the Church of Dubrovnik (approximately, from the Dubrovnik hinterland towards Pelješac and Zahumlje), Dimitri of Sinai was formed, in literary terms, in the part where Duklja and Travunia touch.¹⁰

⁹ Dimitri of Sinai, according to indirect evidence from manuscripts, was from a mountainous area: "It has also been assumed of Dimitri that, apart from living in an area of high mountains, he also comes from such an area, on account of some concrete realia that occur in his notes within the framework of *The Sinai Psalter* – because of a prayer asking that wolves not enter stables, that is, a prayer in which he addresses his protector St Dimitri of Salonica, where he mentions bears, wolves and foxes" (Savić 2014: 294).

¹⁰ As regards the origin of Dimitri of Sinai, "it could be the area of the Dubrovnik Archbishopric, not the Bishopric (a narrower part), specifically the part where the jurisdiction of two churches subsequently overlapped", the area "where the Cyrillic script spread early (even though the Glagolitic script was quite vital) and which was directly influenced by the heritage of St Clement (of Ohrid). Until the end of the 11th century, that could refer to both Duklja and Serbia, but it appears that in the said period only the former came to directly depend on the Church of Dubrovnik. The cult of St Patronella (in *Sinai₃* the name Petrunia appears, a variant of the name of the early Christian martyr Patronilla, a

“In Dimitri’s work, we see very archaic texts of the Serbian redaction. The layers of archaic orthography, which persisted for a long time in the Serbian environment, first of all in church texts, confused scholars when it came to analysing and recognising monuments from the Serbophone area” (Savić 2014b: 285).¹¹

Therefore, some of the early Old Slavic monuments testify to the early beginnings of the Serbian redaction, the widespread presence of the Slavic language in church services performed in the Serbian lands: “A clear insight into Dimitri’s written heritage, as well as a correct interpretation of the redaction features of *Mary’s Gospel* (which was recently shown to be the first representative of the Serbian redaction after all, not ‘only’ an Old Slavic monument written on Serbian soil), enable us to identify the oldest Serb-Slavic monuments with certainty” (Savić 2014a: 3). V. Savić, taking into consideration both older and recent scientific investigations, concludes: “What emerges before us, previously

fragment of whose mortal remains is kept in Dubrovnik, where her cult was widespread, J. S.), being of local character, limited in scope, could not reach all parts of the Archbishopric with equal intensity, especially not the more distant ones and those that had only recently been added to it. Hence, in the final analysis, based on the current level of our knowledge, we must assume that it was a relatively narrow north-western segment of this province towards Travunia (where the church influence of Dubrovnik was stabilised), above the Bay of Kotor and Risan, towards the so-called ‘Podgorje [an area at the foot of a mountain]’: therefore, a mountainous area at the tripoint, or possibly a little more to the south” (Savić 2014: 298–300).

¹¹ According to Viktor Savić, the first sheet of *The Kiev Missal* (*Kiev*₂), apart from the fact that it is generally concluded that it belongs to “the South Slavic redaction”, contains a number of linguistic features which “correspond to the early Štokavian speech”, whereas the once only used *l epentikum* may point to the western South Slavic area: “*Kiev*₂ has a conservative ‘Old Slavic’ (etymological) orthography, which, as is well known, persisted for a long time in mediaeval Slavic manuscripts, for example, in the Serbian territory it was a regular feature until the 12th century, with occasional relapses long into the 13th century.” V. Savić mentions a number of linguistic features which, viewed together, point to the Štokavian area, that is, “cumulatively, they correspond to the early Štokavian development” (Savić 2014b: 285–290).

muddled and impossible to see in its entirety, is the literary-linguistic continuity from the end of the 10th century to the close of the 12th century. It is certain, then, that Serb-Slavic literacy possesses a documented and uninterrupted duration from the early Middle Ages to the New Age (from the end of the 10th century to the middle of the 18th century). The written Serbian word in the first two centuries is primarily Glagolitic, and over the course of the remaining six – Cyrillic” (Savić 2014a: 3).

Cyrillic literacy left an early trace in the Serbian lands, as evidenced by the *Temnić inscription*, the oldest Cyrillic monument with features found in Serbian dialects, which dates from the 10th or the 11th century (Pirivatrić 2014: 110). The ktitor-funded *Humac Tablet*, located in today’s Herzegovina (near Ljubuški), which is written in the Cyrillic script but contains remnants of the Glagolitic script, that is, individual Glagolitic letters inserted in the Cyrillic text, which illustrates the trend of replacing the Glagolitic script with the Cyrillic one, but also testifies to the living presence and knowledge of the Glagolitic script. Many old monuments indicate that in the preceding period transliteration of monuments originally written in the Glagolitic script into the Cyrillic script was a trend very much in evidence, which resulted in retaining the Glagolitic orthographic tradition for a long time and its coexistence and interweaving with the Cyrillic orthographic tradition (see: Stojanović 2011). The Glagolitic script lived on and survived sporadically in the Serbian lands for a century or two, as evidenced by *Gršković’s and Mihanović’s Fragments* (probably dating from the early 12th century, possibly from the end of the 11th century) from the Serbophone area, and also by *Mary’s Gospel*, which contains notes on the margins written in the Serbian language and in the Cyrillic script, dating from the 14th century, which would indicate that during this period the Glagolitic script was well known and that this Gospel was used in the Serbian church.

The abundance of Serbian monuments, both those written in the Serb-Slavic language and those written in the Old Serbian language, preserved from the end of the 12th century onwards,

testifies to the fact that these documents were preceded by a long period of widespread literacy in the Serbian language. Starting from this period, monuments written in the Cyrillic script have been preserved from all Serbian lands, and despite having been destroyed for centuries, they constitute a very rich written heritage of the kind that many areas and peoples cannot boast of.

1.4. The Cyrillic script, as the heritage of Old Slavic and of Serbian and other Slavic languages, which have been and have remained the inheritors of the Cyrillic script, has remained the connecting thread of the Serbian language through the centuries across the broad area of its reach. The Serbian Cyrillic script, created on the basis of the Old Slavic Cyrillic script, was finally shaped and completed by **Vuk Stefanović Karadžić**, relying on a thousand years of tradition; through the centuries, it has been (and for the most part has remained to the present day) the script of the Serbian language and literacy, whether in the case of the church Slavic language (Serb-Slavic, the Serbian redaction of Old Slavic; Slavic-Serbian), or in the case of the Serbian folk linguistic expression.

The area of the spread and presence of the Cyrillic script encompassed all the lands that were ever a part of the Serbian state (and Serbian literacy) in the early Middle Ages. The Cyrillic script was used in Raška, Zeta, Hum, in the whole of Bosnia, in the coastal region (to a great degree), all the way to the lower stretch of the Cetina River: "In any case, the use of the Cyrillic script crossed that boundary early on, encompassing temporarily, in the 12th and the 13th century, the island of Brač. The Bosnian conquest of the greater part of Dalmatian land towards the end of the 14th century provided a fresh impetus to the expansion of the Cyrillic script on that side. The Cyrillic document of the Split cathedral chapter dates from the year 1410.

At the time of Stefan Nemanja and King Vladislav, the border of the Serbian state was near Split, on the Cetina River, and documents speak of friendship and alliance... In the first half of the 15th century, the statute of the autonomous principality of Poljica, near Split, was drawn up and written in the Cyrillic

script; this script was used there until the 18th century by the local administration in its correspondence. The spread of the Cyrillic script to the northern areas in the 15th and the 16th century was short-lived, but it did manage to include some of the highest-ranked Croatian noblemen among its users, among them Nikola Zrinski and several members of the Kelenović family...” (Ivić 2001: 135, 139).

The Cyrillic script was used in Dubrovnik (along with the Latin script); after it was Slavicised, its speech was east Herzegovinian: “In the surroundings of Dubrovnik, it was mostly Catholic priests who used the Cyrillic script, naturally enough, writing in the local Štokavian Jekavian variant of the east Herzegovinian dialect. Apart from letters and notaries’ acts, several large texts from this period have been preserved, such as gospel lectionaries, a breviary printed in 1512 ‘in the Serbian script and language’, a collection of pious texts entitled *A Book for Many Reasons* dating from 1520. In the territory of the Republic of Dubrovnik, the Cyrillic script was inherited from earlier times. The entire surroundings of Dubrovnik, except for a narrow strip of land around the city, belonged to the state of the Nemanjić dynasty all the time... The Cyrillic script began to be used in Dubrovnik two centuries before the Latin script... In the 16th century, the Latin script made a leap, so to speak, spreading beyond the Adriatic coast...” (Ivić 2001: 131, 147, 165).

The Cyrillic script spread to encompass Dalmatia and Slavonia. As we find in R. Grujić: “...anyone can see that among the Serbs in Croatia and Slavonia the Cyrillic script had always and solely been used... For example, I found in the library of the Belovar protopresbyter alone 123 old Serbian manuscripts and printed books, and an even greater number of more recent Russian-Slavic ones, and I copied from them around 655 various notes written in the Cyrillic script dating from the period between the 14th and the 19th century; I found almost as many inscriptions on iconostases, crosses and other church equipment. Moreover, in the cathedral Uniate church in Križevci, on the Holy Throne, I found a cross from the first half of the

18th century with a Cyrillic inscription” (Grujić, in: Milosavljević 2002: 419–420). We find a confirmation of this in L. Kostić: “That each Serb living there, regardless of his faith, felt it his duty to write in the Cyrillic script, to present it to the world, is clearly proven by a letter written by Petar Preradović to Vuk Karadžić in 1846 (Preradović was a Catholic)... Serbs did not want to read books printed in the Latin script, let alone write using that alphabet... Austria and Hungary published their laws in the Cyrillic script” (Grujić, in: Milosavljević 2002: 419–420).

The Cyrillic script was the diplomatic script of the Turkish, Hungarian and Romanian courts. “All the historical monuments written in the Serbian language were almost solely written in the Cyrillic script, and only a few from the earliest times were written in the Latin script. Along with the Serbian language, the Cyrillic script reigned in Dubrovnik, Dalmatia, Primorje, Bosnia and Herzegovina. It was always held in high esteem, throughout the Balkan Peninsula and far beyond its borders, and its reputation was at its highest from the 15th century to the 17th century, and from that period there are many historical monuments written in Cyrillic in southern and eastern parts of Croatia. Thus it was that the following noblemen wrote in the Cyrillic script: the Nelepićs, the Talovacs, Ivan (Ange) Frankopan, the Keglevićs; it was recently scientifically established that Nikola Jurišić always signed his name in the Cyrillic script, including official state acts, which makes it very likely that he knew no other script. However, in the north-western parts of Croatia, which the Serbian influence could not reach, the Cyrillic script was never used before the arrival of Serbs in those parts, and when Serbs eventually settled there, they still used the Cyrillic script as their folk and church script – the way they had done in their ancestral homes. The Cyrillic script was also highly respected and used for a very long time by Slavic and Bosnian-Herzegovinian Catholics and Mohammedans. The latter used it on a regular basis when corresponding amongst themselves and with the Krajina [borderland region in-between the Ottoman and the Austrian empires, translator’s

note] Austrian and other commanders – so that we find it on Mohammedan tombstones. And Catholic priests began printing their books for Roman Catholics in Herzegovina, Bosnia and Slavonia in the Serbian language, using the Cyrillic script, which they referred to expressly as the Serbian script, as early as the 16th century” (Grujić, in: Milosavljević 2002: 417–418).

The presence and the reputation of the Cyrillic script were at a high level, not only in the Balkan peninsula but throughout Europe as well, especially from the 15th to the 17th century, and one could even say until the 19th century. The 19th century represents the beginning of particularly unfavourable and clearly manifested influences concerning the status, suppression and banishment of the Serbian Cyrillic script. “In Slavonia, among Roman Catholics, the Latin script started to suppress the Cyrillic script only during the second decade of the 18th century, when lay priests and Roman Catholic monks from Croatia started coming there, but we have data confirming that Franciscans resisted this trend as late as the 1730’s. Thus, for example, the Franciscan provincial [abbot] Luka Karagić sent, on 1st July 1736, a circular letter to all the monasteries and priests subordinated to him, wherein he forbade, in item 6, all Franciscans to use the Latin script when writing letters in the folk language, threatening severe punishment to anyone who failed to comply; they were to use ‘solely the Cyrillic script, for this script is God’s gift, specially given to peoples and languages, and it is not given to many’” (Grujić, in: Milosavljević 2002: 417–418).

1.5. Today’s Montenegro contains territories or parts of territories of various formations, and for the most part, except for the coastal areas, to a degree, they brought with them the Cyrillic script as their spiritual heritage and as an expression, a statement and the substance of literacy and tradition.

The continuity of the Cyrillic script can be followed in the area of today’s Montenegro through the centuries. This alphabet is an indicator of and a testimony to the fact that these areas have generally possessed literacy. It is not possible to mention a single literacy monument of any importance

from the area of today's Montenegro (regardless of whether it was created in Zeta, old Hum, Herzegovina, Raška, Old Serbia or the coastal regions) which was not written in the Cyrillic script. These include *Miroslav's Gospel*, charters and letters of Zeta's rulers, *St Sava's Ilovik Nomocanon*, the rich treasury of the Holy Trinity monastery near Pljevlja, the Nikoljac monastery from Bijelo Polje, the Piva monastery, the Cetinje monastery, *The Vranje Charter*, the printed books of the *Obod printing press*... Among those writing in the Cyrillic script were St Petar of Cetinje, Petar II Petrović Njegoš, King Nikola, Marko Miljanov, Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša...

The Cyrillic script is the bearer and the cradle of spirituality, history, tradition, culture, the written and the literary heritage, whose riches is carried over into the 20th century, but also plummets into it, especially towards the end of the 20th century, which leads to a deep cut as the 20th century turns into the 21st, when an almost total Latinisation of Montenegro occurs, which is all too clearly visible, or possibly even its extra-Latinisation as regards its literacy and script.

2. Naming the Cyrillic script and the Serbian language

What are these reasons (so strong) for the suppression of the Cyrillic script and what are they like!? Essentially (and truly, since time immemorial), they do not exist and never have. As far as Montenegro is concerned, there are probably "a lot" of them if we take into consideration which path ("the official") Montenegro is taking and wants to take; what kinds of projects are carried out in Montenegro; what Montenegro wants to separate from at any cost; what traces it wants to erase and darken, and what these traces are like.

2.1. Through history, in the areas where the influence of the Serbian language was felt, and through it of its script as well, the Cyrillic script was often referred to as **the Serbian script**. That is the usual designation in the Štokavian area, and also in its

surroundings, if the script was actually named (thereby making its designation more precise in relation to, for example, the Russian or Bulgarian Cyrillic script, that is to say, the Cyrillic script of some other language). There are close to one hundred examples of this, collected and published (from the areas of Raška, Zeta, Boka, Hum, Bosnia, Dubrovnik, Slavonia, Cavtat, Zadar, at the Venetian, Austrian, Turkish... court; the Vatican, in notes made by Englishmen, Frenchmen...).

Thus, for example, Franjo Ratkov Micalović signed a contract in 1510 with Girolamo Soncino, a publisher from Pesaro, on the basis of which the latter was to print *The Office of the Holy Virgin*, the Gospels and *Conversations with Oneself*, about the attitude of the soul to God (*Soliloquia*) by St Augustine, all of which were to be printed “in the Serbian letters and language” (“in littera et idiomate serviano”), (Z. Bojović 2014: 10). The Jesuit Marin Temparica from Cavtat wrote in 1582 to the General of the Jesuit Order Cl. Aquaviva that it was necessary to cast letters “in the Slavonian alphabet, letters of the kind they call Serbian here”. Herzegovinian Catholics in Popovo and Zažablje, on the Neretva River, state in a petition dated 1st August 1629 that they sign using “Illyrian or Serbian letters”, that is, the Cyrillic script. Giovanni Pasquali (1645) proposes to the Congregation of Kotor that, for the sake of proselytism “they should send to the Serbian Seaboard area 4 to 5 St Athanasius monks from Rome” (Kostić 1999: 13), but these should first learn to speak Serbian and to write “the Serbian letters of St Cyril” (ibid.: 20)... In *The Illyrian Newspaper* for the year 1840, Gaj speaks about the Cyrillic script... “which the Illyrians of the Eastern Church have preserved under the famous special Serbian name” (ibid.: 83). Particularly well known are the verses of the Slavonian poet Matija A. Reljković from his famous poem *The Satyr*, which was printed for the first time in 1762. In the poem, he states that a Slavonian says to him that his parents had no education, and yet they lived well. Reljković says this in his verses: *Oh, Slavonian! You are very much mistaken, / Whenever*

*you respond to me like that; / Your parents could read, / They could read and write Serbian!...*¹²

¹² The greatest amount of information of this type is to be found in Laza M. Kostić, and there is also interesting information in Miloš Okuka. We quote only some of it.

In Laza M. Kostić, among other things, it says: “In 1530, a traveller through Turkey, a Slovenian by the name of B. Kuripešić, found an inscription near Rogatica “in the Serbian language and letters”..

The Zadar prelate Simeon Budineo (‘Šime Budinić’), who lived in the 16th century (he was born around 1535 and died in 1600), had a book printed in Italian in Venice in 1597, entitled *A Brief Guide to Learning the Serbian Alphabet*. He called our Cyrillic script nothing but the Serbian alphabet...

In August 1637, Franja Mrkanić from Čiprovac wrote to the Roman Congregation for religious propaganda about the books used by priests and monks in Serbia, Raška, Herzegovina etc.: ‘which are written in the Serbian alphabet called *Sr Cyril’s*, in the old Illyrian language’..

The (Catholic) Archbishop of Bar Vićentije Zmajević..., states that he is particularly deserving for ‘being trained to use Serbian letters’..

The language in which Truber published his translation of the Scriptures was called by Friar Matija Divković, who had a book printed in Venice in 1565 ‘Christian teachings’, ‘the Slavic language’, while he referred to Cyrillic letters as ‘Serbian letters’[...].

In 1903, the Karlovac Bishop Petar Jovanović wrote that in Plaško, among other things, ‘reading and writing in Serbian were being taught’ [...].

During the well-known ‘High Treason trial’ held in Zagreb in 1908–1909, when 53 most prominent Serbs were accused [...] of advocating the use of the Cyrillic script not only in official acts and primary schools, but also [...] for trying ‘to even set up the Serbian script on road signs as an external indicator of Serbianhood’ [...].

In 1924, one of the greatest contemporary Slavic scholars, the Frenchman André Vaillant, wrote about the old Dubrovnik language, saying on that occasion: ‘The Diplomatic language is Štokavian, written in the Serbian Cyrillic alphabet’” (Kostić 1999: 61–73).

In Miloš Okuka, concerning Franciscans in Bosnia, we find: “Stjepan Marijanović published in Buda in 1836 the first *The Alphabet Book or the Beginners’ Course in Illyrian and Latin Letters Made for Bosnian Classrooms*, wherein, apart from ‘the Illyrian alphabet’, ‘the Serbian alphabet is also dealt with’ [...] Antun Knežević Varcarin and Mihovil Marijanović Livnjak published in Zagreb... in their own classroom an alphabet book for the first year of school, a primer intended for Catholic schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which contains a special chapter

As we find in Ekmečić, the language and the Cyrillic script of the Dalmatian Catholics all the way to Omiš and on the islands was also called “*letera serbiana*” in 1458, or “*lingua e lettera cirrilica, illirica, detto serbski*” in 1684. “Educated writers who correctly marked the Serbian territory were rare; one such was the poet Ivan Gundulić, who says in ‘Osman’ (1621) that the term Serbia means ‘a large part of the Hungarian Crown, Herzegovina and all the land around Dubrovnik” (Ekmečić 2011: 56).

Naturally, that was also the situation in **the regions of Montenegro**: in this respect, of particular importance is a bibliography of papers about Dalmatia and Montenegro published in Latin in Venice in 1842. In it, it says that books were printed in Cetinje [...] using Serbian letters (“characters”) [...]. In the year 1517, the Venetian Doge L. Loredan confirms the testament of Đurđe Crnojević, acting upon a request submitted by the latter’s wife Jelisaveta (the testament was translated into Latin). In a number of places, it is written that the testament was written in Serbian, translated from the Serbian language etc. At one point it is stated that “*it was written and signed in the Serbian language and letters*” (Milošević 1994).

The Archbishop of Bar Andrija Zmajević, who originated from Perast, wrote as early as 1675 a treatise wherein he says that he wishes “to teach only reading and writing the Illyrian Serbian letters, and to abandon the Latin ones” (Kostić 1999: 61–73).

Everyone knows **Njegoš’s verses** (to be found in the dedication on the book *Vuk’s Danica*, dating from 1826): “Serbian I write and speak, / I say it loud to everyone: / my nationality is Serbian, / my mind and soul are Slavic.” The following examples are also of interest: “In 1838 and 1839, the Montenegrin Prince-Bishop Petar II (Njegoš) received several letters from the Bosnian Vizier Vejid-Mehmed Pasha. In the first one, the latter says: ‘I wrote one Turkish and one Serbian message, they are the same’... (There are a number of examples of this type, J. S.). Andrija Stojaković from Trieste announced the printing of

entitled: The Cyrillic ‘Serbian’ Alphabet, containing texts written in the Cyrillic script” (our emphasis!), (Okuka 2006: 72, 73).

Njegoš's *Šćepan the Little* in *The Yugoslav Newspaper*, which was then, in 1850, published in Zagreb. He says that the book is to be printed 'in Serbian letters, with a self-teaching alphabet...' (Kostić 1999: 61–73). **Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša** (in 1870) calls the Cyrillic script "the Serbian heritage" (Kostić 1999: 61–73)...

As we can see from numerous testimonies, this Serbian language script of many centuries was referred to as Serbian across a wide area by various authors. The designation "Bosančica" was formed in the 19th century for political reasons, with a view to hiding and darkening a sizeable corpus of the Serbian linguistic heritage, separating it from its source and subsuming it under some other category.¹³

¹³ As we find in Biljana Samardžić: "The term 'Bosančica' was introduced in scientific terminology and literature by Ćiro Truhelka (towards the end of the 19th century, J. S.) in his paper *Bosančica, a Contribution to Bosnian Palaeography*, which created a veritable revolution among the public and in the linguistic circles. Namely, opposing the *Bosančica* script to the Cyrillic one, Ć. Truhelka holds the view that those are two independent scripts and that the only thing which connects them is their common Greek origin. However, it is evident that Truhelka was not well acquainted with this subject matter and the actual development of that particular script. Stressing that it was a typical example of an independent Bosnian script, Truhelka sparked off a wide-ranging polemic in the scientific circles. "The end result of this polemic is that Truhelka's thesis about Bosančica as a separate Cyrillic script was not scientifically based but had political connotations, in keeping with the Austro-Hungarian policy of that time – whose aim was to separate the language and script of Bosnia of that time from the wholeness of the Serbian linguistic area." Specifically, Truhelka tried to justify his claim that 'Bosančica' was an independent script, but failed to provide any arguments and evidence to support that claim, which was why it was rejected by Rešetar, Nedeljković, Mladenović, Čremošnik and many others. Truhelka based his view on the ideas of E. Kurelec, who was guided by political, not scientific reasons, as D. Dragojlović concludes, and who evidently wanted to present this script as a unique, independent and special Bosnian alphabet.. Serbian scholars are of the opinion that Truhelka's characterisation of the so-called *Bosančica* was aided and abetted to a great extent by the policy of the then Prime Minister of the B&H Government Benjamin Kállay (1883–1903)... B. M. Nedeljković, in his paper *On Bosančica*, opposed Ć. Truhelka's opinion, emphasising that there were no differences or material evidence that would make it possible to separate *Bosančica* from the

2.2. Very early on, there appeared the **Serbian Cyrillic print set** (“**Serbian characters**”, as it is often called, if something is printed in the Serbian language). The oldest Serbian book printed in the Cyrillic script, *Octoechos of the First Tone* (1494/1495), is predated by only two or three years by the oldest Cyrillic book, printed in Krakow, at a printing establishment which worked forty years after Gutenberg’s, and where, starting in 1491, Mr Schweipolt Fiol, a German by birth, printed Russian-Slavic books. **Đurđe Crnojević** had this to say of his undertaking: “Seeing that churches were left without holy books [...], inspired by the Holy Spirit [...], I put together the printing set” with the help of “a humble priest, a monk called Makarije from Montenegro” (the first Cyrillic printer in the South Slavic area). The printing establishment worked between 1493 and 1496, and five books came out of it. After this one, other printing establishments were founded in various places where books were printed in the Serbian language and the Cyrillic script. Through the centuries, there existed a number of Serbian printing centres, the Serbian print moved from one place to another, seeking and finding places where, in changeable and difficult times, it could go on printing and maintain the continuity of books, first of all to fulfil the needs of the church, but these undertakings also had a broader cultural-historical and linguistic significance. Of great importance for Serbian printing is the continuation of the work of the Vuković printing press in Venice. **Božidar Vuković Podgoričanin**, “born in the city called Podgorica”, was the founder and owner of the most important Serbian printing establishment in the 16th century (“the most important one and the main printing press for the Serbian language”, as his son Vincenzo described it), which worked in Venice, managed by him, over a period of 20 years (1519–1521,

corpus of the Serbian Cyrillic script, that is, ‘there is nothing to separate the Bosnian script from other Cyrillic scripts’; therefore, the thesis about *Bosančica* as a separate script on the basis of its specific way of writing certain letters (namely, ‘Ǧ’, ‘к’, ‘т’, ‘в’, and ‘ж’) ‘has no palaeographic, let alone cultural-historical justification’” (Samardžić 2009: 229).

1536–1539). Božidar also used the Latin name *Dionixio*, identifying himself on a number of occasions as “*Dionixio the Serb*” (“*Dionixio servo*”), “of the Serbian nation” and the like (Pešikan 1994: 80). In the year 1521, he noted that, seeing how other peoples printed their “writings,” he wished to print “our Serbian, as well as Bulgarian” letters (Jovanović 1994: 53).¹⁴

Vicenzo Vuković was the son and successor of the famous printer Božidar Vuković. Continuing and inheriting the introductory parts in his father’s books, he repeats the latter’s wish that “in the parts of Serbia and Raška, as well as other areas subjugated by the evil Turks, he could make up for everything that the Ismailis have destroyed and looted” (Pešikan 1994: 85). Vincenzo Vuković, together with a partner, “asks for exclusive permission to print books in the Serbian language and letters (in *lingua et caractere serviano*) for the general welfare of the people and the Serbian language (*della nation et lingua serviana*)” (Jovanović 1994: 53). He was granted the right to print Serbian books for a period of 25 years; in 1542, he concluded a contract of sale for 32 books of “Serbian print” (*stampe serviane*) in Šibenik (Pešikan 1994: 84). In the text of the petition on the basis of which the Venetians gave him and his partner permission and privilege for printing, it is emphasised “that the Serbian nation was destroyed in a flood of infidels”, that the books are to be printed “for the general welfare of the Serbian nation and language, and for the sake of spreading the Christian faith”, and it is also said that the books should “help Serb Christians

¹⁴ All of Božidar’s printed prefaces, apart from manifesting spiritual motives, were imbued with the awareness of the great evil that had befallen the Serbian people and its church under the Turkish rule, and he strove to improve this state of affairs. He often said that he was “overwhelmed with great pain and sorrow” “in a foreign land”, wishing to be buried on Zeta’s Holy Mount, Starčeva gorica [Old Man’s Mount], expressing a wish in his first testament that the printing establishment be given “to the monasteries on Lake Skadar”. He also wrote in the first testament that, if he and his brother had no male children, in the Greek church of St George in Venice there should be a Serb priest, and “if a Serb priest could not be found, let a Greek one be there” to perform the funeral rite (Pešikan 1994: 80–81).

to preserve their faith”, not convert them (Pešikan 1994: 85). In the notes of Cardinal Guglielmo Sirleto (and also in those made by other high-ranking Catholic clerics), he is mentioned as “a protector of the Serbian language” and “a protector of Serbs”; “Vicenzo is referred to as ‘Giovanni Vicenzo Serb’ or ‘the aforementioned Serb’” (Pešikan 1994: 83).¹⁵

Also of great importance is the printing establishment of **Jerolim Zagurović** from Kotor (a printer of Serb-Slavic books in Venice in 1569–1570). The Zagurovićs were a prominent Catholic family from Kotor. The *Psalter*, printed in 1569, is the first book published by Jerolim Zagurović of Kotor; in the afterword, it says: “A humble sinner of a man, Jerolim Zagurović, a nobleman of the city of Kotor... prints this book... Psalter in Greek, and Psalms in Serbian, written in the year 7070 (Jakov, printer)” (Stojanović 1982: 210–211).

The first Serbian Alphabet Book was printed on 25th May 1597 in Venice (“as the first book for learning to read Serbian”), and the writer of *The first Serbian Alphabet Book* in the Serb-Slavic language is Inok Sava, a monk from the Dečani monastery, born in Paštrovići (it says in the book that the man “making the effort to publish it is the humblest among the inoks [monks]”, “with the blessing of Abbot Hieromonk Stefan”), (Alphabet Book 2009: 7).

The Treasury of the Serbian Orthodox Church in **Kotor** also preserves many valuable, interesting and rare old books, which are still not sufficiently well known, or are entirely unknown to the broader public, or even to the scientific public. Recently, a hitherto unknown copy of *Abraham’s Sacrifice* by

¹⁵ “Vicenzo felt close ties to the Serbs and the Serbian space due to a special, slightly bizarre motive: he obsessively tied his origin to Serbian Despots. True, he does not mention this in his petition for the licence, which he submitted together with De Schio in 1546, but in a prefatory epistle written that same year, he refers to his father Božidar as a descendant of ‘the famed Vuk Despot and Branko Vuković and Stefan Despot’... This line of ‘pious rulers of the Serbian land’ leads all the way back to Constantine the Great, for that is what it says ‘in a letter from the time of the birth of Serbian kings and emperors’” (Pešikan 1994: 85).

Vikentije Rakić, a book printed in the Cyrillic script at a printing establishment in Kotor in 1799, was discovered in the Treasury. Namely, in 1951 the National Library in Belgrade obtained a copy of this important book, through which it was revealed that there had existed a Cyrillic Serbian printing establishment in Kotor unknown until then (as confirmed by this one book).¹⁶ At the time it was thought that this was the only copy of this edition, very important for linguistics, culture, literature and history. However, an additional copy was discovered in Kotor. The book *Abraham's Sacrifice*, printed in Kotor in 1799, at a time of great hardships for the people and books alike, represents a fine and significant link in the continuity of the Cyrillic script and Serbian printing (*Abraham's Sacrifice* 2013). It is the first printed book on the territory of today's Montenegro after the Crnojević printing establishment ("towards the end of the 15th century, Montenegro encompassed only the mountainous area between the Bay of Kotor and Lake Skadar", *Abraham's Sacrifice* 2013: 27). In the title of this book, it says: "Abraham's sacrifice and the sinner's conversation with the Mother of God. Translated from the Greek into the Serbian language by Vikentije Rakić, in Kotor 1799..., printed by Fran Andreolo of Venice, the Royal Printer. He dedicates it to the Highly Respected Mrs Jelisaveta Palikuća, née Muškatirović (a Serbian Daughter, who treated him with great kindness), in loving memory of her husband Mr Jovan Palikuća, a wonderful Serb" (*Abraham's Sacrifice* 2013: 2nd sheet in the phototype edition of the book).

Also, the first book "which was published by a man from Dubrovnik in the folk language was printed in the Cyrillic script, not the Latin one" (Čurčić 1994: 20). It was printed at the Venetian printing establishment of Giorgio Rusconi (it was completed on 1st and 2nd August 1512), by Franjo Ratkov Micalović of

¹⁶ Vikentije Rakić printed three editions of *Abraham's Sacrifice* in Buda and one edition in Kotor in 1779. In the Slavic Adriatic region, after Dubrovnik (1782) and Zadar (1789), the first printing establishment in Kotor was founded in 1799, and after that in Split in 1813 (*Abraham's Sacrifice* 2013: 11).

Dubrovnik, and was entitled *The Breviary of the Blessed Lady*. It was also referred to by the shorter title **Breviary** (Čurčić 1994: 20). Milan Rešetar published it under the title of *The Serbian Breviary*, and he said of it that “it has the great advantage of being printed in the Serbian (that is, folk) language, whereas both Crnojević’s books are in pure Church Slavic (Rešetar – Gianelli 1938: 7–8). In a document related to the *Breviary*, it says that it is printed “in the Serbian dialect and letters” (stampadis in littera et idomate serviano), in the Štokavian-Ijekavian Dubrovnik dialect, and two “Italians were entrusted with the task of bringing to Dubrovnik master printers specialised in the Serbian language and letters (pro imprimendes nonnullis libris in lingua serviana)” (Čurčić 1994: 20).

As can be seen from a variety of documents, the script and the language of these printed editions are qualified as being in the Serbian language and the Serbian script.

3. The undermining of the Serbian Cyrillic script in the past

What the Serbian Cyrillic script represented to the Serbs and Serbian history through the centuries, and what it should mean today (if we understand its significance) is testified to by both the words of those who made efforts to suppress it and/or to destroy it, as a symbol of Serbianhood and an indicator of a rich historical heritage, and by the words of those who defended and protected it. We shall try to illustrate this by means of two examples.

General Sarkotić, as a representative of the military authorities in B&H during World War One, understood and expressed the significance of the Cyrillic script for Serbian history, culture, and identity better than the Serbs themselves. In Sarkotić’s own words: “the Cyrillic script should be made useless to the Serbs as a weapon”, that is to say, it is necessary “to eliminate the Cyrillic script from public life and divest it of the Serbian national character”. “And since ‘in the understanding of South Slavic peoples the

Cyrillic script is an expression of the Serbian language, then the use of the Cyrillic script is an act of high treason, which is why it must be banished'. Korbatin proposed that a person caught disregarding the ban on the use of the Cyrillic script should be fined in the amount of 50 to 1000 kunas" (Okuka 2006: 96, 97).

On the other hand, also during World War One, the use of the Cyrillic script was banned in Montenegro in 1916. At the army headquarters in Danilovgrad, on 19th October 1916, 14 teachers handed in their resignations on account of the abolition of the Cyrillic script in schools and the introduction of the Latin script, which was imposed parallel with the Croatian curricula, textbooks, even teachers, who were brought over from Croatia and B&H. The teachers were arrested soon after their rebellious act and brought before a military tribunal. One of the justifications that they gave for refusing to teach without the Cyrillic script was: "The Cyrillic script is Serbian history – the artery, aorta of Serbian nationalism, and we are prepared to be Serbian teachers and refuse to be anational ones... All the cultural heritage of our people has been written in the Cyrillic script, and not presenting our national history would mean renouncing the past, present and future" (Radonjić 2000: 9; in: Matović 2011: 34).

3.1. According to some writings and testimonies (of a Russian¹⁷ and a Pole), immediately after the great church schism in the course of the so-called Council of Split (or Solin), the Slavic script and church service in the Slavic language were proclaimed *non grata*, "a demonic invention" (according to the Pole).¹⁸

¹⁷ "L. V. Berezin was the first one to say, in his book *Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia and the Military Border*, 1, published in Petersburg in 1879, on page 42, that 'during the Council of Split in 1059, Slavic church service was rejected in the following words (in Latin). I would translate it thus: 'Indeed, they said (the church fathers participating in the work of the Council) that Gothic letters had been found with some man called Metodije, a heretic, who had lied and written many things against the rules of the Catholic faith in that same Slavic language'" (Kostić 1999: 30).

¹⁸ "A certain Count called Valerian Krasinsky, who wrote the following in a book published in French around the middle of the previous

Many of the high and mighty understood the significance of the Cyrillic script for the Serbs, so that, striving to realise their aims, they either prohibited it or, realising its significance for the Orthodox folk, tried to use the Cyrillic script (and books printed in it) to win over the church and the people for Uniate purposes. The printing establishment founded by Schweipolt Fiol, a German by origin, was the first one to be orientated towards the Orthodox world (Čurčić 1994: 14). Books printed in Krakow were made after the Russian model, with Yugoslav traces. Most of those books ended up in Russia, but some were distributed among the Serbs. The Catholic Inquisition accused Fiol of printing books in the Cyrillic script, and he was arrested in November 1491. At the same time, it was not allowed to sell Cyrillic books in Krakow (which was just one of many bans of the Cyrillic script) (Čurčić 1994: 15). “Catholic Cyrillic books represent important monuments for the history of the Štokavian dialect in areas where their writers originate from, and also for the history of the use of the Cyrillic script [...]. Naturally, this observation changes when the Cyrillic script is used for the purpose of expansion, Uniating and Catholicisation of Orthodox believers” (Čurčić 1994: 23). As opposed to Catholic Cyrillic printing, “Protestant Cyrillic printing only had an episodic role”. Primož Trubar tried to find collaborators among the Serbs who would translate Protestant books printed in the Cyrillic script for Serbs and Bulgarians. “Not having found any collaborators among the Serbs, Trubar left it to Stefan Konzul and Anton Dalmata, translators of Glagolitic books, to prepare Cyrillic books as well...” (Čurčić 1994: 23).

century (*A Religious History of the Slavic Peoples*): “The Slavic letters discovered by Cyril are nothing but a modification of the Greek alphabet, enriched by the occasional Eastern letter in order to express sounds that are unknown in the Greek language. In the year 1060, in Solin (Dalmatia), the Synod proclaimed that this Slavic alphabet was a demonic creation and that Metodije was a heretic. However, it is still being used today [...] by the Slavs who have been attached to the Greek church, even by those who recognise the supremacy of the Pope” (Kostić 1999: 30).

However, the Cyrillic script, as we have shown before, was used until the 19th century, mostly without any obstacles, and it spread along with the expansion of the Serbian language (and not among Orthodox believers only). In the 19th century, there appeared the tendency and the process of suppressing and narrowing down the use of the Cyrillic script. In this respect, two closely connected processes stand out and are recognisable, which, however, are differently manifested in formal terms; these processes marked “the abolition and narrowing down of the use” of the Cyrillic script: one is related to public, official and clearly manifested attempts at banning its use, while the other was carried out under the cloak and the false pretext of the equality of the Cyrillic and the Latin Script.

3.2. The 19th century and the early 20th century were marked, to a greater extent than all the centuries before, by many **attempts at banning the use** “of the Serbian Cyrillic script”. Public bans most often resulted in producing completely the opposite effects from those expected and given as a task to perform. They actually awakened the awareness of the significance and the value of the Cyrillic script and adherence to it, so that they resulted in strong resistance with a view to preserving and defending this script; consequently, they did not bring any results, except for a short while. On the contrary!

3.2.1. The first official ban of the use of the Cyrillic script is connected to the name of Empress **Maria Theresa**, and it **dates from 1779**. Having been talked into it by the Roman high priests, she issued the order to abolish the Cyrillic script outside the church, and that the schools be obligated to introduce “the simple Illyrian folk language and the Latin script”. All the Serbs in Today’s Vojvodina, together with the Metropolitan and the Bishops, raised their voices against such an order, so that it was rescinded. “At first they respected the love of our people for their Serbian script – the Cyrillic script, as did the Austrian state authorities, so that Empress Theresa herself ordered in 1769 to found a Serbian printing establishment in Vienna – which was to use Cyrillic letters and print all the books that the Serbian

people needed for the church, school and education in general. In early 1771, they already printed several thousand alphabet books, collections and psalters, at the Empress's expense, and distributed them for free to Serbian children in all our regions under the Austrian rule. But before her death, Empress Maria Theresa initiated, in 1779, the attempt of the state authorities, having been persuaded to do so by Roman high priests, to dissuade Orthodox Serbs from using the Cyrillic script, so that they should gradually get used to the Latin script, like the Croats and like the by-then Uniated and Catholicised Serbs. They thought that this would pave the way more easily to uniting the entire Serbian people with the Church of Rome under the Austro-Hungarian rule – but it proved to be a miscalculation on their part” (Grujić, in: Milosavljević 2006: 420–424).

3.2.2. Following the death of Maria Theresa, her son **Emperor Franz Joseph II** renewed this order on 3rd February 1781: “Soon afterwards Maria Theresa died, and her son Joseph II was opposed to religious proselytism, so he did not pursue this matter for a while. But Emperor Joseph had other centralistic and Germanising tendencies, so those advocating a union used this attitude of his to achieve their goal; as the Cyrillic script was an important obstacle to a successful realisation of the Emperor's tendencies among the Serbian people, the opponents of Orthodox Christianity had an easy task persuading the Emperor to renew the order of 1779 on 3rd February 1781, whereupon he invited the administrator of the Serbian Metropolitanate of Karlovci, **Bishop Mojsije Putnik**, to warn all Serbian bishops and the clergy **not to dare by any means to obstruct the introduction of the Latin script in Serbian folk primary schools...**” (Grujić, in: Milosavljević 2006: 420–424).

This was met by a vigorous resistance of the bishops, the school administration and the people, on account of which the Emperor was forced to rescind the order: “Regarding the conclusion of the School Commission (that the Cyrillic script must not and cannot be abolished, for ‘the Serbian people... has exceptional respect for its Slav-Serbian letters’) no specific order has

been issued by the Emperor, and our people has most vigorously resisted any attempt at abolishing the Cyrillic script and introducing the Latin one; school inspectors throughout the country reported this to Vienna, so that on 26th July 1784, there came a new order from the Emperor for Metropolitan Putnik, referring to the order of 1779, stating **that the Cyrillic script, along with the Church Slavic language, could only be used in liturgical and religious books, and all the other secular Serbian school books are to be, as of now, written and printed in the simple folk language and in the Latin script.** The Emperor's decision was announced to the inspectors of Serbian folk schools, who were told to implement it right away. But as soon as our people, especially those living in Croatia and Slavonia, found out about this, they immediately realised that this posed a danger to their faith and nationality, so they rose in protest everywhere and strongly resisted the introduction of the Latin script, ...very energetically they argued the cause of the Cyrillic script and said that the people would never renounce it, *for they are convinced that 'losing their script leads to threatening the very basis of the determination of the national character'*. At the same time, they addressed all the other important actors in the state, so that Emperor Joseph entrusted the School Commission attached to the Court with the task of dealing with this issue, discussing it and submitting a proposal to him. The Commission met on 26th January 1785, and having received the necessary information from J. Kurzbeck, the owner of the Serbian printing establishment in Vienna, stated that they considered it inappropriate to abolish the Cyrillic script in the Monarchy so abruptly for two reasons: firstly, in such a case, the printer Kurzbeck would have to receive a compensation in the amount of 20,442 forints for having invested as much in the printing of Serbian books using those letters, and secondly, because this could easily lead to dangerous unrest among the Serbs. Therefore, the Commission proposed to postpone dealing with that issue indefinitely, which the Emperor adopted and, on 29th March 1785, through the Metropolitan, **informed all the Serbian Bishops and the people**

that the Cyrillic letters could still be used freely among the Serbian people and in Serbian schools (our emphasis!)” (Grujić, in: Milosavljević 2006: 420–424).

The process of banning the Cyrillic script continued¹⁹ and intensified, as far as the use of force is concerned. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, starting from the occupation of 1877, many cases of persecution of the Cyrillic script were noted (Zbiljić 2005: 11). In formal and public terms, the Cyrillic script was never prohibited, but the authorities strove in various ways to limit it to the Orthodox Serbian population, and to suppress it and make it undesirable. We shall have to say more about this later on!

3.2.3. In **World War One**, the Austrian authorities continued their policy of persecuting the Cyrillic script, only now, from the areas that were formerly under the Austro-Hungarian rule (Croatia and Slavonia), the persecution spread to all the regions where Serbs lived.

3.2.4. Even after **World War One**, the times were not quite peaceful when it came to the attitude towards the Cyrillic script. In the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, there appeared the idea of adopting the Latin script and “sacrificing” the Cyrillic one (Skerlić, King Aleksandar) as a compromise of sorts (through which the Serbs would have lost their script of many centuries: the Cyrillic one, and the dialect which had been spoken by the Serbs only until the advent of the Illyrian movement: the Ijekavian one).

3.2.5. In **World War Two**, only ten days or so after taking power, on 21st April 1941, the Independent State of Croatia proclaimed *The Law on Prohibiting the Cyrillic Script*, which came into effect on 25th April 1941, signed by Ante Pavelić. It was published in Zagreb in *Narodne novine* [*The People’s Newspaper*]:

¹⁹ This phenomenon “started receiving intense impulses from the middle of the previous century, especially after Austria was driven out of Italy and led to compensate for the losses it sustained there in the Balkans” (Petrović 2005: 11).

THE INDEPENDENT STATE OF CROATIA –
CLERICAL-NAZIFASCIST

2. THE BASIC LAWS OF THE ISC

a) **THE LAW ON PROHIBITING THE CYRILLIC SCRIPT**

1. On the territory of the Independent State of Croatia, the use of the Cyrillic script shall be prohibited.

2. This Law shall come into effect on the day it is proclaimed in “Narodne novine”, and its enforcement shall be entrusted to the Ministry of the Interior.

Done in Zagreb, 25th April 1941.

Headman: Dr. Ante Pavelić, in his own hand

No. XXV-33-Z.p. – 1941.

The Chairman of the Headman’s Legal Committee Dr. Milovan Žarić, in his own hand

The Law on Prohibiting the Use of the Cyrillic Script shall be accompanied by the Order on Enforcing the Law on Prohibiting the Use of the Cyrillic Script, which runs as follows:

b) **ORDER ON ENFORCING THE LAW ON PROHIBITING THE USE OF THE CYRILLIC SCRIPT, ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR**

1. Any use of the Cyrillic script on the entire territory of the Independent State of Croatia is prohibited. This particularly refers to the work of all the state and local government organs, public administration offices, commercial records and similar writings, correspondence and all public inscriptions.

Consequently, I herewith order:

that all use of the Cyrillic script be stopped forthwith on the entire territory of the Independent State of Croatia in public and private life alike. All printing of any books in the Cyrillic script shall be prohibited.

All Cyrillic public inscriptions shall be immediately removed, within three days at the latest.

2. Those who violate this order shall be fined in the amount of 10,000 dinars and imprisoned for up to one month.

Done in Zagreb, 25th April 1941.

No. 34-Z. – p – 1941. Minister of the Interior

Dr. Andrija Artuković, in his own hand

(Narodne novine, 25th April 1941)

In the region of **Montenegro**, the Italian occupying forces, at the very beginning of the Second World War, introduced the language designation: *lingua montenegrina*. On the pages of *Zeta*, there is an advertisement for an Italian-Montenegrin dictionary, which says: “The newly created circumstances necessarily impose the need to know the Italian language, and also for Italians to learn our language. For that purpose, as of today, we start publishing an Italian-Montenegrin dictionary in instalments, which will be of use to both sides. Each one of our readers, if they regularly follow this dictionary, will be able to learn, over a very short period of time, how to speak, read and write Italian and Montenegrin” (*Zeta* 12th May 1941, issue no. 20, p. 2).²⁰

3.3. In spite of all the bans, the time when the Cyrillic script was suppressed the most and forgotten was starting from the period of “creating, proclaiming and making legal” “**the equal position**” of the Cyrillic and the Latin script.

“The equal position” of the two scripts was made official and adopted by the Novi Sad Agreement: – Item three of the conclusions contained in the Novi Sad Agreement runs as follows: “Both scripts, the Latin and the Cyrillic one, are in a position of equality; that is why efforts should be made for Serbs and Croats to learn both scripts in an equal measure, which is to be achieved first of all through teaching at school.”²¹

²⁰ The change of the name of the language was accompanied by changes in the names of streets. In an article entitled “Bringing Old Names Back” (Cetinje, 17th May 1941, *Zeta* issue no. 23, p. 2) it says: “The streets of Cetinje whose names have been changed were given back their old names today. Kralja Aleksandra [King Aleksandar’s] Street was renamed Kralja Nikole [King Nikola’s] I Street; Njegoševa [Njegoš’s] Street was renamed Katunska Street; and Vilsonova [Wilson’s] Street was renamed Zetska [Zeta] Street.” Still, the Cyrillic script was not publicly banned.

²¹ “Those conclusions were formulated in Novi Sad on 10th December 1954, in a text written in the Latin script under the Cyrillic heading of *Matica srpska*, wherein the Latin script was mentioned as the first of the two scripts of that language; the names of the signatories were arranged based on the Latin alphabet, all of the Croats signed their names in the Latin script, as did some of the Serbs (Radovan Lalić and Miloš

In formal terms, the Cyrillic script was (that is, “became”) equal with the Latin script, but essentially, everything was done with a view to entirely suppressing it and pushing it into oblivion. On the Croatian side, the notion of equality was “interpreted”, treated and implemented differently from the way things were on the Serbian side. For the Croats, what equality meant (in practice) was completely ignoring the Cyrillic script; that which did not exist was virtually unknown: it regularly happened that post offices returned letters written in the Cyrillic script, with a note saying: incomprehensible, illegible, unknown – on the pretext that they did not know the Cyrillic script.²² The Cyrillic script was not used among Catholics in Croatia, and gradually went out of use among Orthodox believers there, too.²³

Moskovljević, for example). In addition to this, it should also be said that Matica srpska had a Cyrillic typewriter at the time, and it was using this typewriter that the text of the Agreement was prepared, which was signed by prominent writers, scientists, cultural workers, the occasional representative of the authorities; of a total of 63 of them, only 23 signed their name in – the Cyrillic script (according to the facsimile copies of these documents published in *The Orthography of the Serbo-Croat Literary Language*, Novi Sad – Zagreb, Matica srpska – Matica hrvatska)” (Petrović 2005: 53).

²² Here are some examples: “There were many violations of the rights of those citizens who considered the Cyrillic script their alphabet of choice. Bank clerks in branch offices of banks in the coastal region often returned cheques filled out in the Cyrillic script (because they did not know it or did not want to know it). In Serbia, identification cards are printed in the Cyrillic script, but personal data are entered using a Latin typewriter... A citizen who wished to have his identity card written in the Cyrillic script in its entirety only managed to exercise that right having brought his own Cyrillic typewriter to the police station!... Also, Orthodox Serbs could find no place in Zagreb to have a death notice printed in the Cyrillic script” (Marojević 1991: 28, 163). “A letter addressed to Metropolitan Jovan was returned from Zagreb to the Belgrade Singing Society, marked with a note saying ‘forbidden’. The Croatian Post Office thereby forbade the use of the Cyrillic script” (According to: *Cyrillic Script Forbidden?!*, source – *Pravda*, 6. 12. 2008).

²³ We have witnessed personally that some Orthodox Serbs who, after the last war, found refuge in Montenegro, and who were our students at the Faculty of Philosophy in Nikšić, did not know the Cyrillic script.

As opposed to the situation in Croatia, the equality of the Cyrillic and the Latin script was differently “interpreted” and implemented in practice in Serbia and Montenegro. Various mechanisms were slowly applied that contributed to an increasing suppression of the Cyrillic script. First it was pronounced to be an “outdated”, “peasant-style” and “crude” script. Next came the elimination of Cyrillic typewriters from everyday use (alternatively, they were very difficult to obtain), and manufacturers stopped producing them. From Bugojno (where typewriters were produced), only Latin typewriters could be obtained for decades, whereas Cyrillic ones became available only when they started being imported from Germany (the *Politika* daily, *The Forbidden Cyrillic Script*, 7th December 2008).

3.4. On the territory of **today’s Croatia**, as we have seen from the above, the Cyrillic script was often banned and destroyed. However, now there are some new tendencies appearing in Croatia. On the one hand, the old attitude towards the Cyrillic script persists, as a consequence of animosity (for it remains the Serbian national script in the minds of Croats). This is evident from the recent resistance to the introduction of the Cyrillic script in **Vukovar**.²⁴ At the same time, in November 2012, a **scientific conference was held at the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts** in Zagreb, where “the Croatian Cyrillic script” was given a special place. Academicians from Croatia spoke for two days about the Croatian Cyrillic heritage from the period between the 11th and the 18th century as “a treasury of Croatian historical variety” (<http://www.matica.hr/vijenac/488>). Evidently, without the old Serbian heritage there

²⁴ “A rally entitled ‘No to the Cyrillic Script in Croatia’, held in the central Zagreb square, which, according to police estimates, gathered thousands of protesters, was brought to a close some time before 2 p.m., ending with a request addressed the Government, demanding that it urgently amend the constitutional law on the rights of national minorities, and that Vukovar, by 18th November at the latest, be proclaimed a city of permanent piety where the Cyrillic script is never to be introduced”, the Croatian media reported. (“Around 20,000 People Attend the Rally ‘No to the Cyrillic Script in Croatia’”).

is no “projected” foundation relying on deep history and abundant historical heritage. In keeping with this, the Croats have placed a monument to the Cyrillic script – “the Croatian script” on the fence of the primary school in Kočerín, near Široki brijeg (12 Cyrillic letters chiselled in stone, 1.4 m tall, one metre long and 25 cm wide).

3.5. The “equality” referred to above resulted in an incredible event occurring during **the last war**. The Croats carried out the “ethnic cleansing” of all their libraries, divesting them of Serbian books: this act of “**biblioclasty**”, as it was referred to in Croatia, resulted in the removal of millions of books by means of “technically disposing” of them (*Prosvjeta*, vol. 10/35, issue no. 59/660, November 2003: 5), that is, incinerating them and treating them as waste matter fit for the garbage container, which was the result of following “two guidelines” prescribing a write-off of books in Croatia: “The cleansing of libraries by removing undesirable titles and authors – [the periodical] ‘Feral’ discovered cases of this in Korčula, Velika Gorica, Slatina and Split – which unfolded in the early 1990’s according to the official guidelines regularly received from the highest ranks of Tuđman’s regime... As early as 1992, all the heads of school libraries received ‘Obligatory guidelines on the use of the library holdings’, signed by the then Minister of Culture and Education Vesna Girardi-Jurkić... (Ministarstvo prosvjete, kulture i športa, 7). The other set of guidelines, much worse in terms of its content, was signed by a certain Veronika Čelić-Tica, from the National and University Library in Zagreb” (Lasić 2002: 25-26).²⁵ In these documents, this “process” is re-

²⁵ Among other things, these “guidelines” “state that primary schools ‘must’ or ‘should’ have in their libraries ‘only works written by Croatian authors and translated by Croatian translators (as an exception, they may keep books by authors of other nations if they are included in the students’ reading lists)’. What is striking about this is that Croatian writers, then, can only be Croat nationals... It is explicitly prescribed that ‘school library holdings must not include ideologically marked literature, [...] that linguistically improper books have no place in a school library... These guidelines finally advise the library staff to act swiftly and with dedication, and allows them to dispose of such books as old paper, this being a

ferred to by terms such as: “extraction”, “shelf cleansing”, “removal”, “write-off”; “improper books, ideological in character, Serbian, written in the federal language, written in the Cyrillic script (printed)”, then: “outdated”, “books inherited from institutions of the previous regime”, “unnecessary books”,²⁶ “removal of books in the Serbian language” (Livada 2002: 13). Whole “cubic metres” of books were proclaimed to be a surplus (*Prosvjeta*, vol. 10/35, issue no. 59/660, November 2003: 7).²⁷ “The overall number of the books destroyed cannot be established. In Zagreb libraries alone, the annual write-off of books in the 1990’s exceeded 10

measure of last resort” (Lasić 2002: 7). The following report is very much in keeping with the above: “Some ten days ago, during a Parliament session, Mr Borislav Škegro, Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, stated that the Government would provide incentives for those publishers who put out books that the state of Croatia needs [...]. Public libraries will get money for getting rid of ‘books in Serbian and similar languages’, and also of inappropriate and outdated translations” (*Prosvjeta*, vol. 10/35, issue no. 59/660, November 2003: 22).

²⁶ “This was done based on various forms of justification: extraction, removal, write-off... , improper books, ideological in character, Serbian, written in the federal language, written in the Cyrillic script (printed), then: outdated, books inherited from the institutions of the previous regime... books, that is, literary sources. More recently, the phrase unnecessary books entered circulation. No additional justification of the designations referred to above has ever been provided, but any review of our reality in the context of the event as a whole clearly indicates its origin, function and aim (Lešaja 2003: 18).

²⁷ “The City Library in Split announced that as much as 15 cubic metres of books constituted a surplus. From 1991 onwards, they were in a hurry in Croatia to carry out a general cleaning up of public libraries, so that in 1992, a total of 54,956 books were written off in Zagreb alone, whereas the City Library wrote off 23,000 volumes in 1994 alone, that is, ten per cent of its holdings (according to the world standards, a 5 per cent write-off is only allowed under exceptional circumstances such as earthquakes or floods). In 1996, in the libraries of the city of Zagreb, a further 55,332 books were written off, of which the Bogdan Ogrizović Library alone wrote off 17,293 volumes, but even a few years later, the libraries of the city of Zagreb still had to receive a report on which books were written off, based on what criteria and where they ended up eventually, so that there were speculations to the effect that they ended up as waste paper” (Vukov-Colić 2003: 32–34).

per cent of the overall library holdings” (Lasić 2003: 42). Books were taken out onto city squares and incinerated, thrown into garbage containers, onto rubbish dumps, in places, only heaps of charred remains of books were left: “The write-off order was as follows: all books written in the Cyrillic script; editions printed in Serbia in the Cyrillic script, Latin script, Ekavian or Ijekavian dialect; all the titles written by leftists and anti-fascists; all the books and titles dealing with the National Liberation Struggle; many titles by Jews and Muslims; a great many Russian authors; a great number of philosophers and their writings” (Livada 2003: 14).²⁸ There exist, unfortunately, many testimonies of this act: “Bookicide, a term which state-building ‘kulturtraegers [culture carriers]’ used for years to refer solely to ‘Serb-Četniks’ and ‘Yugo-Communists’, found its real-life counterpart in Split. To put it more precisely, in the City Library, where, around the middle of 1997, **some fifteen cubic metres of unloved books** were stacked up in the corridors of Bishop’s Palace, only to be devoured by the garbage dump later on” (Lasić 2002: 7).

²⁸ “It seems appropriate to us to bring this epilogue to a close with the words of Slobodan Šnajder (‘Administration of Justice – A Foolish Undertaking’, ‘Novi list’, 29. 7. 2002.): ‘A terrible bookicide happened in Korčula, what happened in Korčula was something quite the opposite of any culture and civilisation, in the final analysis, it was something punishable according to the legal regulations which state that inciting hatred, be it religious, racial, nationalist or ideological, is punishable by law – in Croatia, hatred is a coat of many colours. If someone rejoices so much when books are burned, if someone, moreover, organises their – cremation, that person must be reminded of that laconic observation of old: after burning books, it is always people who are burned next!...

Concerning the decision of the Zagreb Municipal Court, no one even thinks about which specific legal provisions it is in violation of – what matters is that the silent majority approves of all those burnt offerings. Why, there are no more Serbs left in Croatia anyhow, so why should we preserve their Asiatic letters when they are gone anyway?

Why, we are not Armenians, Asians, we are courteous, polite people, we are Apollo, we are the West, we are the Pope’s, we are culture and civilisation. We are the Latin script, brothers. And those who are not all of that shall burn. And as long as there are people who light bonfires the way they do on Korčula, there will be a Croatia” (Lešaja 2012: 566–567).

4. The Serbian language in the context of two scripts (the Cyrillic and the Latin one)

Even among Serbian linguists, there are different opinions regarding the status, presence (or lack thereof) and protection (or lack thereof) of the Cyrillic script. Some scholars adhere, to a great degree, to the view of “the equality of the two scripts”, that is, the opinion that both scripts should be preserved as an expression of the richness of our language, an indicator of tolerance and a recognition of the newly created situation, while they give precedence to the Latin script.

4.1. For example, Ranko Bugarski (in: Zbiljić 2005: 248) advocated the following viewpoint: “As far as I am concerned, I am one of those who consider parallel use of both scripts to be an enrichment, for both paths open up access to a great civilizational circle.”

In Ivan Klajn (*Politika*, 22nd August 2009) we find: “The legal formulation about ‘the equality of the Cyrillic and the Latin script’, as we know, is not a new one. We had it for half a century, and we saw that in practice it meant that the Cyrillic script retreated before the Latin one. It was not because of Communists, mondialists or some ‘Vatican-Comintern conspiracy’, but quite simply because the Latin and the Cyrillic script are not in the same position, they are not symmetrical. We need the Latin script for English, Latin, for most foreign languages being learnt with us, for writing formulas in mathematics, physics, chemistry, for pharmacy prescriptions, for car registration plates, for maintaining correspondence with foreign countries, for Internet addresses and e-mail, for SMS messages and so on. The Cyrillic script is not used for any of those functions. We can only use it for writing Serbian, and we should do so. But we can also write Serbian using the Latin script, and many (most) people do so. There’s the rub. If we wanted to abolish the equality of the two scripts at any cost, to retain only one of them – it would have to be the Latin script.”

Furthermore: “If we wanted to introduce one script at any cost, that could only be the Latin one,’ Ivan Klajn emphasises. He stresses that he and his fellow linguists do not agree that the Latin script is a Croatian script. ‘It is as much Serbian as it is Croatian; however, it is not a traditional Serbian script, but a more recent one, but we did not have to learn the Latin script from the Croatians, for there is a widespread tradition of using it in Serbia from 1918 at the very least,’ he says, ‘the Latin script is as much Serbian as is the Cyrillic one.’ The linguist Ivan Klajn says that the Cyrillic script is a cultural good which should be preserved, but there is no way we can become a ‘Cyrillic’ country” (30th October 2006, 14:54, 18:55, source: B92).

4.2. A considerable number of experts in the domain of linguistics believe that the Cyrillic script should be given priority, that it should be protected by means of various legal and constitutional acts, that it should be given a place and status worthy of it today, in view of its historical, traditional, cultural and any other role in the Serbian language and culture, but that the Serbian language, bearing in mind its cultural-historical and written heritage, cannot afford to renounce the Latin script. Miloš Kovačević is of the following opinion: “The Serbian literary language has two scripts – the Cyrillic and the Latin one. Even though the Serbs have long used both the Cyrillic and the Latin script, they are not in a completely equal position among the Serbs. The Cyrillic script constitutes the vertical support of the Serbian spiritual, cultural and historical identity, and was created by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić as the national phonetic script on the basis of the thousand-year long Serbian and Slavic literacy. Hence, the Cyrillic script is the first Serbian national script. The Latin script stands on an equal footing to it only in terms of use, for the Serbs have long used the Latin script as well, and have written an enormous number of literary, scientific and cultural works in it. By renouncing the Latin script, we would have to indirectly renounce everything that the Serbs have created in it, which is not and cannot ever be in accordance with the Serbian national interest. By excluding these works from the corpus of

Serbian literature, which has long been the programmatic aim of the Croatian philological programme, the Serbs would probably be the only European people lacking two centuries of literature, that is, bereft of the entire literature of the middle period (Renaissance and Baroque). For those reasons, the Latin script, alongside the Cyrillic one, must remain the script of the Serbian people, and perhaps even more due to the fact that, by renouncing the Latin script, Croats and Muslims would be provided with an argument for extracting the part of the Serbian language that carries their name, its script being the differential feature in relation to the Serbian language” (Kovačević 2003: 18–20).

Predrag Piper holds a similar view: “In Serbia (and in Montenegro as well – J. S.), the Latin script was practically not used until 1918, when the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was founded. Consequently, the Cyrillic script is the primary Serbian script, which, apart from its functional significance, also has a symbolic significance as one of the most recognisable features of the national culture of Serbia over the course of a period of almost a millennium. The Latin script is a secondary script in Serbian culture, which, during the course of the 20th century, came to occupy a position in it by gradually suppressing the Cyrillic script from many areas of use” (Piper 2004: 141).

According to Petar Milosavljević: “There exists the Serbian Latin script as well, which was presented by Vuk Karadžić in the Serbian Dictionary as early as 1818, alongside the Serbian Cyrillic and the Croatian Latin script. The Latin script of today (coming from Gaj) represents the continuity of the Serbian Latin script” (Milosavljević 2006: 281).

Radmilo Marojević proceeds from the following assumption: “The script belongs to those to whom the language belongs”; he views the Latin Script as the alternative Serbian script. “The Latin script (naturally: the Serbian Latin script) is viewed in this book as the alternative Serbian script, which means, as a script for special and additional purposes and for a special (Catholic) population... The establishment of the Cyrillic script as the national script of Serbia, the one in official and

public use... in no way means banishing the Latin script either from culture or from the everyday communication of the Serbs and citizens of their state” (Marojević 2001: 17, 92).

4.3. Furthermore, it is not a rare view that the Serbian language is the only one (in the world) possessing a dual script, and that script duality is not possible without threatening the survival of one of the scripts, in the case of the Serbian language – the Cyrillic one, in favour of the “dominant and more aggressive” Latin script.²⁹

4.4. At the same time, an unusual (as well as absurd) process has started unfolding recently: “In the international information system for cultural and scientific development, whose standards are adhered to by all the members of UNESCO, there is no entry **the Serbian language – the Latin script**, and whatever has been written using that variant of the Latin script is classified as Croatian cultural heritage in library holdings throughout the world” (Petrović 2005: 79), even though a great number of works in the domain of Serbian literature, science and culture have been written in the Latin script, first of all works by Catholic Serbs, the entire literature of the late Middle Ages; the literatures of Dubrovnik and the Bay of Kotor are written in the Latin script in their entirety, and they constituted and still constitute “an integral part of Serbian literature”.

A particularly large corpus in the Serbian heritage is the one written in the Latin script starting from the beginning of the “period of equality” of the two scripts. Naturally, this is no reason at all for the Serbian language to renounce its Latin script heritage, but efforts should be made towards bringing back to the Cyrillic script its proper, adequate and deserved place in the areas where Serbian is spoken.

²⁹ According to the view of the “Cyrillic” Association from Novi Sad: “Since there are no more Catholic Serbs, the Latin script cannot be a Serbian one.” By way of justification, it is stated, among other things, “that in international classification and records, that which is printed in the Serbian language (using the Latin script) is classified as Croatian cultural heritage”, the “Cyrillic” Association (cirilica@EUnet.yu).

Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, in his *Serbian Dictionary* of 1818, provided an overview of scripts: in the first place, he put, as he called it, **the Serbian Cyrillic script**, in the second place was **the Serbian Latin script**, and **the Croatian Latin script** came third, along with an inventory of the letters used in these written heritage scripts. What can be seen from this overview is that the Latin script, which came to be fully established later (and further developed), represents the main continuity of what Vuk designated as “the Serbian Latin script”. This pertains, for example, to the symbols for: *ѣ* (according to the data provided by Vuk: Serbian *lj*, Croatian *ly*); *ѧ* (Serbian *nj*, Croatian *ny*); also to *ћ* (Vuk gives the combination *ch* for the Serbian Latin script, whereas in the Croatian variant there is no equivalent of *ћ*...). The “design” for the letter *đ* [the Cyrillic *ђ*], as used in the Latin script today, was provided by Đuro Daničić.

4.5. **The truth about the Cyrillic script** is entirely different, after all – both concerning its aesthetic aspect and its functionality. **George Bernard Shaw** said of the Serbian Cyrillic script that it was “the most perfect and the simplest” script (which it really is). The Cyrillic script (especially its Serbian variety), as can often be heard, in terms of its visual effect, is a sight for sore eyes: “In 1937, **W. Weber** defended his doctoral thesis on *The Alphabets of the World* at Leipzig University. He was an ophthalmologist. For a long time he studied all the alphabets of the world from various aspects. After long study, Dr Weber established that the Serbian Cyrillic script was the best and the least tiring for the eyes. In honour of the best alphabet in the world, Dr Weber had Serbian Cyrillic letters written in large print on the first page of his dissertation...” (Stojčić 2008: 105). In addition to that, over three hundred million people the world over write using – the Cyrillic script.

4.6. What is indisputable, in our opinion, is that the Cyrillic script should be given back its proper and adequate place, which belongs to it in the domain of the Serbian language, this by engaging the efforts of all the relevant social actors; however, it is also indisputable that such engagement should not be lacking

when it comes to protecting the cultural and written heritage that was created and is still being created in the Serbian language using the Latin script – and thus forms an integral part of it. There is a particularly large corpus in the Serbian heritage written in the Latin script starting from the “period of equality” of the two scripts. On account of this, the Serbian language most certainly cannot give up on its Latin script heritage, but efforts should still be made to give back the Cyrillic script its proper, adequate and deserved place in the areas where Serbian is spoken.

5. The Cyrillic script and the contemporary technologies

In recent times, what is offered by way of “justification” for the suppression of the Cyrillic script is the thesis that it is a “non-global”, “non-international” script, one which is “inconvenient for the contemporary technologies”.³⁰ However, two international scientific conferences were held recently, one entitled *The Internet and the Cyrillic Script*, at the National Library in Belgrade (11th and 12th February 2002), the other, entitled *The Contemporary Information Technologies – The Internet and the Cyrillic Script* (in Bijeljina, the Republic of Srpska/B&H, 25th November 2003), in the course of which it was pointed out which possibilities the contemporary information technology carried with itself, and also concerning the equal possibilities of using the Cyrillic script, naturally, based on the engagement of the state and society, which is often lacking (in

³⁰ “There are no technical problems pertaining to the use of the Cyrillic script in the contemporary information technologies, which is due to years of dedicated work of both our own experts and the world’s top companies, for all international organisations gave their support to respecting cultural and linguistic diversity in the contemporary informatics society”, *The Cyrillic Script and the Contemporary Information Technologies*, a round table discussion of the Informaticians’ Society of Serbia, 7th September 2008 (<http://www.dis.org.yu/>).

the areas where the Serbian language is spoken, especially in some of them).³¹

In addition to this, many countries use and retain their (non-Latin) scripts and function quite adequately, without any problems in the contemporary world, while at the same time taking care of their cultural heritage. Let us mention, by way of example, just Orthodox peoples close to us: Greece, Russia, Bulgaria, and there are many others besides these...

Bulgaria is the first country to have requested (in June 2008) registering Internet addresses written in the Cyrillic script (according to the claim made by Bulgarian high-ranking officials): “After Bulgaria’s entry in the European Union, **the Cyrillic script became the third official script**, after the Latin and Greek scripts. Bulgaria considers its script a part of its national identity... Sofia wishes to have its Internet domain designated *бр* – in the Cyrillic script... Bulgaria is also planning on holding a conference in the near future, with a view to gathering all countries that use the Cyrillic script (Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia, Mongolia, Russia, Tajikistan, Serbia and Ukraine), to discuss designations of Internet domains” (the *Blic* daily, 23rd June 2008: 5).

³¹ Some of the conclusions adopted at the conference in Belgrade are as follows: “1. It is necessary to make certain that all the state and societal actors adhere to the constitutional, legal and cultural-historical norms that ensure for the Serbian language and the Cyrillic script, its only original script, those advantages that the Cyrillic script has as the root and the only original script of the Serbian language, that is, to ensure their full implementation in public life in the manner that guarantees all of the above for the Greek language and its script on Cyprus and in Greece, which has long been a member of the European Union. 3. It is necessary to ensure that the importers and suppliers of computer equipment and other contemporary information technologies are legally obligated to have them adjusted – as regards the working language and script, the keyboard layout with the English Latin script and the Serbian Cyrillic script, the requisite fonts and the code layout, which would contain the pre-Vuk era Cyrillic letters – to the needs of the broadest circle of the speakers of our language and its original script, which would presuppose professional translation of requisite programs into the Serbian language”, from the scientific conference *The Internet and the Cyrillic Script*, held at the National Library of Serbia on 11th and 12th February 2002.

The President of Russia Dmitry Medvedev, speaking at the *World Congress of the Russian Press*, held in Moscow (also in June 2008), stated that, for its new domain, Russia would request that it be written in the Cyrillic script – *пф*. “As of next year, Russia should start using the Cyrillic script for Internet site addresses; this was stated a few days ago by Vladimir Vasilyev, a high-ranking official of the Russian Ministry of Communication. In a statement given to the Interfax agency he said that Russia would use its own script based on the recent decision of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), which runs the Internet globally, to allow the use of non-Latin scripts such as the Cyrillic, Arabic and Chinese Mandarin alphabet for website addresses” (the *Glas javnosti* daily, 14th June 2008: 14).

6. The current circumstances (troubles, that is) and the Cyrillic script

The Cyrillic script (especially after it was “officially” recognised as “equal” to the Latin one) has been suppressed and is on the way out in Serbia, whereas its situation in Montenegro was better until around twenty years ago.

6.1. A number of papers have been produced dealing with the topic of the presence of the Cyrillic script (or a lack thereof) **on the territory of Serbia**. According to the available data (of about a decade ago), in the cities of Serbia the use of the Cyrillic script was reduced (in public inscriptions) to the level ranging from approximately fifteen per cent in the cities of Vojvodina to around thirty per cent in Belgrade and throughout Šumadija.³²

On the basis of the recent provisions of the Constitution, Serbia has, to a great extent, brought back the special status of

³² There are a number of papers attesting to this, e.g. D. Petrović (2005: 39–57).

the Cyrillic script as a national one.³³ In both recently adopted Constitutions (of 1990 and 2006), it is stated that in the Republic of Serbia the Cyrillic script shall be in official use, whereas the official use of other scripts shall be regulated by the law, based on the Constitution.³⁴ As a result of this, there has been a

³³ The Constitution of 1990 states in Article 8: “In the Republic of Serbia, the Serbo-Croat language and the Cyrillic script shall be in official use, whereas the Latin script shall be in official use in the manner prescribed by the law. In the regions of the Republic of Serbia inhabited by national minorities, the language and the script of the said minorities shall be in official use in the manner prescribed by the law.”

The Constitution of 2006 states in Article 10: “In the Republic of Serbia, the Serbo-Croat language and the Cyrillic script shall be in official use. The official use of other languages and scripts shall be prescribed by the law, based on the Constitution.”

³⁴ Concerning this Constitutional provision on the use of the Cyrillic script in Serbia, **certain objections have been raised by the Venice Commission.** In Miloš Kovačević (who is referring to Slobodan Antonić’s reaction to these objections) we find: “Thus, as Slobodan Antonić informs us, the Venice Commission has criticised Article 10 of the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia, already quoted before, which prescribes the official use of the Serbian language and the Cyrillic script, in the following manner: ‘It is striking that, compared to the Constitution of 1990, the right to protect the languages of national minorities has been diminished, for Article 8 of that Constitution expressly states that the Latin script shall also be in official use in the manner prescribed by the law.’ As a corollary of Articles 14 and 18.2, as well as Articles 75 to 81 of the Constitution, the legislator clearly intended to protect the rights of minorities at the level of the Constitution. Hence, it is not clear to the Venice Commission why the legally protected use of the Latin script, which most minorities prefer to use, is no longer explicitly mentioned in the Constitution. It is all the more puzzling in view of the fact that, according to Article 20.2 of the Constitution ‘the achieved level of human and minority rights cannot be lowered’ (Antonić 2007: 18). S. Antonić analysed this objection raised by the Venice Commission in some detail and from a number of aspects, so that there is virtually nothing left to add to his analysis. That is why we shall only briefly refer to its fundamental theses. Condensing the criticism addressed to the makers of the Serbian Constitution to the observation that ‘the Venice Commission knows that national minorities in Serbia prefer writing or reading Serbian in the Latin script, rather than the Cyrillic one’, S. Antonić observes that ‘paradoxically enough, they are referring to a provision regulating

return of the Cyrillic script in public use in Serbia (although it is still insufficient in view of the status granted to it by the Constitution, or at least should be granted based on it). This state of affairs is not difficult to observe – in every place the presence (and “return”) of the Cyrillic script are visible, compared to the situation from the preceding period, especially taking into account the current situation in Montenegro.

As regards the presence of the Cyrillic script in the Republic of Srpska, one can gladly observe, even at first glance, that it has begun to “return” and to “repossess” this area.

6.2. Regarding Montenegro – today, its Constitutional provisions persist in maintaining the (Communist era) “equal-

the official use of the Serbian language.’ Article 10 does not state that, from now on, the Hungarian language in official use in Serbia is to be written in the Cyrillic script, or that the Bulgarian language in official use in Serbia is to be written in the Latin script. No, it merely regulates the official use of the Serbian language. The simplest question that this gives rise to is – what have national minorities got to do with the decision on which script the Serbs are to use officially in the state of Serbia? Moreover, how does this violate any right of theirs previously attained in any way whatsoever? And whatever kind of a minority right is this new, latest minority right, proclaimed only using Serbia as an example, ‘that national minorities in Serbia prefer writing or reading Serbian in the Latin script?’ Perhaps we should propose that the Venice Commission be given some sort of award, having discovered a new right, in truth, never demanded or exercised – the right of an ethnic minority to demand not only that the state should communicate with its members in their own language, but also that the state should communicate with its citizens who are a part of the ethnic majority in a script which is more convenient for ethnic minorities!’ (Antonić 2007: 18). “Is this – AntoniĆ continues posing relevant questions – some kind of a joke or is it intended to be taken seriously? Does the Venice Commission really think that this is a valid argument? **Do they really believe that the Serbs should switch to the Latin script lest they should violate the right of ethnic minorities to write in Serbian using the Latin script?**” (our emphasis!), Miloš Kovačević, *The Relations between the Serbian Language and Its Script and Minority Languages and Their Scripts*, A Symposium of the Cyrillic Script 2007: The Obligations in Education, Professional Practice and Orthography in Connection with the Serbian Language and Its Script Following the Passing of the New Constitution of the Republic of Serbia (Philology and Linguistics), (*Politika* 2006: 9).

ity”, attained, proclaimed and adopted after World War Two, but this “equality” has been brought to a state of almost utter inequality in Montenegro today, resulting in the almost total disappearance of the Cyrillic script, especially in those domains that are closely controlled by the authorities, their outposts and individuals in their service. In both Constitutions, it is stated: The Cyrillic and the Latin script shall be equal.³⁵ However, in practice, the process of the (increasingly manifest) disappearance of the Cyrillic script is nearing completion.

Here are a few examples to illustrate this.

In Montenegro, the Latin script has “occupied” all public spaces, including the names of **companies, cafés, restaurants, shops**. It is almost impossible to find advertisements written in the Cyrillic script. There is not almost a single billboard written in the Cyrillic script (except during political campaigns, often enough conducted by the very same parties engaged in the process of making the Cyrillic script disappear, but prepared, for the sake of getting a few votes more, to [ab]use the Cyrillic script for their own gain). However, the situation in the south and the north of Montenegro is somewhat different: the Cyrillic script is holding its own in the north to a greater degree. According to the data gathered in 2011 in various Montenegrin cities by students attending the *Serbian Language and Literature Programme of Studies*, around 95% of various kinds of inscriptions are written in the Latin script (less than 80% in Berane, around 90% in Pljevlja, up to 98% in the coastal region...). In the cities on the coast, to a certain degree, the Cyrillic script fared best in Herceg Novi, but even there close on 90% of various inscriptions are written in the Latin script (in Herceg Novi, one can observe the tendency to write inscriptions using both

³⁵ In the previous Constitution, Article 9 (*The Language and the Script*) stated: *In Montenegro, the Serbian language of the Ijekavian dialects shall be in official use.* In the new Constitution, it is stated: *The official language shall be Montenegrin... The Serbian, Bosniak, Croatian and Albanian languages shall also be in official use.* In both Constitutions it is stated: *The Cyrillic and the Latin script shall be equal.*

scripts). In Nikšić, there are over 95% Latin script inscriptions to be seen; it is not difficult to observe that in Nikšić (and the situation is actually no different in the other cities) there are more Chinese than Cyrillic letters to be seen.

Public institutions have, up to a point, retained the old Cyrillic inscriptions, but one can observe a recent tendency of replacing them with Latin script letters (or, at best, parallel inscriptions in both scripts). Almost no recent inscriptions are to be seen in the Cyrillic script only (examples of this, albeit rare ones, are only to be found in Berane), while, as a rule, they are written in the Latin script only. Only a few old (leftover) Cyrillic inscriptions remain, awaiting to be rewritten in the near future. There is no TV station in Montenegro with a Cyrillic logo. Before our very eyes, the Cyrillic logo РТЦГ [The Radio Television of Montenegro] 1 and 2 (in a combination of blue, white and red) was replaced by the Latin script equivalent – RTCG (in a red-yellow colour combination); there is no official Cyrillic script site of the Government or ministries of Montenegro; all signposts are written in the Latin script (without any exceptions, be it in the cities or in-between them); boards with the names of cities (with the exception of some in the north, where Cyrillic and Latin inscriptions are to be found side by side, for example, in the case of Mojkovac, Kolašin, Berane and Plužine, are also written in the Latin script.

We have conducted an opinion poll of sorts, asking – **our fourth-year secondary school students which script they primarily used** (which script they preferred using). The situation differs as one moves from the south towards the north: in the coastal cities, with the exception of Herceg Novi, the Latin script predominates entirely (in Bar, Budva and Tivat, 90% and more students use it, in Kotor – close on 90%); in Cetinje, over 90%; in Podgorica, 70% of the students surveyed use the Latin script, in Bijelo Polje 68%; in Herceg Novi, between 50 and 60% of the students prefer the Latin script. In Nikšić, an approximately equal number of students use both scripts, whereas in Pljevlja more than 60% of the students use the Cyrillic script;

in Mojkovac, around 70%, in Berane, over 85%... (Later on, the percentage of those who use the Latin script mostly increases, or comes to predominate among those who use both scripts).

How this process is unfolding is evident from the names of streets. **The names of streets** in Montenegrin cities used to be written solely in the Cyrillic script. However, there is a process of replacing the Cyrillic script by the Latin one at work. Even now, the names of streets in the coastal cities are written in the Latin script (Bar, Budva, Tivat, Kotor... In Herceg Novi, the names of streets are also written in the Latin script, except for Zelenika, where they are written in both scripts), and also in Bijelo Polje. As it would probably be too conspicuous to abruptly take down all the Cyrillic inscriptions and replace them with Latin script ones (as was done during the occupation of Montenegro in World Wars One and Two), this process (for the time being) is unfolding gradually: whichever street has been renovated recently, it gets a new inscription, invariably (!?) in the Latin script; each newly built street gets a Latin script inscription; if the name of a street is changed, the new name must be written – in the Latin script.³⁶ Thus, for example, in Pljevlja, a negligible number of streets still have the old Cyrillic script inscriptions (e.g., *улица Саве Ковачевића* [*Save Kovačevića Street*]), but most inscriptions have been changed with Latin ones (for instance, *ulica Kralja Petra*, *ulica Nikole Pašića*, *Drvarska ulica* – these were formerly written in the Cyrillic script). In Berane, the old street names are in the Cyrillic script, but in one district there are four new boards, written, naturally enough, in the Latin script, for example, *ulica Osme crnogorske*). In Nikšić, the old street names

³⁶ Unfortunately, that year, 2011, when we were gathering the above data, we were proven wrong: the gradual replacement of street names written in the Cyrillic script by Latin ones took a sharp turnabout. In the year 2015, all the Cyrillic script boards with street names in Nikšić were taken down and replaced with Latin script ones, just like during World War One, when the occupying force did this. At this moment in time, we have no information on the situation in the other Montenegrin cities, but it is not too difficult to assume what has happened or what will happen to Cyrillic script street names in Montenegro as it is now.

are also written in the Cyrillic script, but new ones are written in the Latin script) – we already have new Latin inscriptions for *Šetalište* [Promenade] Vito Nikolić, *ulica Petra Lubarde*. In Podgorica, the new street names are also written in the Latin script: *ulica Njegoševa*, *ulica Kralja Nikole*, *ulica Vojislavljevića*... In Cetinje, the earlier Cyrillic script inscriptions have been retained, but last year, when *Бука Караџића* changed its name to *Islandska*, the new name was written in new Latin script letters...

The “replacement” of the Cyrillic script by the Latin one is evident in many (in truth, almost all) spheres: thus, all the bus companies and taxi services have their names written in... the Latin script; almost all the old labels written in the Cyrillic script – such as *самоуслуга* [self-service shop], have been replaced by new designations: *market* and *supermarket*, *самопослуга* – all written in the Latin script. In Podgorica, one encounters the following sight: two vans stand parked side by side; the smaller, older one, bears the inscription *Фудбалски клуб „Будућност“* [The “*Budućnost*” /Future/ Football Club], written in the Cyrillic script; the larger, newer one bears the same inscription, only written in the Latin script (*Fudbalski klub „Budućnost“*). Some ten years ago, the logo *Универзитет Црне Горе – Подгорица* ([The University of Montenegro – Podgorica] written in the Cyrillic script on blue student booklets), was changed to the Latin script (*Univerzitet Crne Gore*) on green student booklet. Recently (towards the end of 2015), the Cyrillic inscription *Филозофски факултет* [The Faculty of Philosophy] was replaced with *Filozofski fakultet*, *Filološki fakultet* [The Faculty of Philology]. The Serbian Language Institute initiated, some 10–15 years ago, the periodical *Ријеч* [Word], which had a Cyrillic script logo. The new Editor-in-Chief, not without the support of the new editorial board (since the Cyrillic and the Latin script are “equal” in Montenegro), came up with the proposal for a new logo (naturally enough, in the Latin script), so that the latest issue (that is to say – the first renewed one) bears the inscription *Riječ*.

Within the framework of the overall attitude towards the Cyrillic script, it was no surprise that, on 20th May 2010, the

last issue of the *Побједа* [*Victory*] daily printed in the Cyrillic script came out, after almost sixty-six years of being published in this script (the first issue of *Побједа* came out on 24th October 1944), and on 21st/22nd May (the “Montenegrin Independence Day”), the first Latin script issue of *Pobjeda* came out, whereby, in the words of its Editor, they “načinili prvi veliki korak [made the first great step]”.³⁷ It remains an open question – “the first great step” towards what!? A great step it may well be, but it most certainly is not a right or true one, nor is it in the direction of some good cause.

It would appear that, at least for the time being, we find the Cyrillic script the preferred companion when we set off for the next world, for the names of funeral service companies, as far

³⁷ The “justification” is provided in “A Word from the Editor”, and the title of the text in question (*Pobjeda in the Latin Script – Pragmatism or Heresy*) better reveals the essence of switching to the Latin script than the said “justification”, which runs as follows:

“Dear Readers,

I announced in my first editorial, seven and a half months ago, that *Pobjeda* would be redesigned. **Today we have made the first great step in that direction.**

A survey that we have conducted over the past few months indicates that **the majority of our potential readers, especially the young, that is, the segment of the population where the presence of *Pobjeda* is still not sufficiently felt,** favour the Latin script. We have moved to meet their expectations in terms of form as well.

We have not neglected the fact that, in this guise, *Pobjeda* will be more readily accessible to those citizens of Montenegro whose native tongue is not Montenegrin, and also to foreigners interested in getting information about our country.

Economic-technical arguments also favour this change. Analyses have proven that **through this change of script we shall accomplish considerable savings in terms of time, human resources and material,** and also that this enables automatic archiving of the contents, makes it easier for the readers to search the contents and ensures complete compatibility with other platforms and with potential future collaborators and partners abroad.

We are certain that this is the right step. Srđan Kusovac” (Our emphasis!) (*Pobjeda* 21st and 22nd May 2010: 2).

as we have been able to ascertain (for example, in Nikšić: *Bop* [*Pine*], *Cyza* [*Tear*], *Hapučuc* [*Daffodil*]), are written in the Cyrillic script; obituary notices (with minor exceptions that have been observed lately) are printed in the Cyrillic script; the same goes for inscriptions on tombstones.

These are just some of the indicators concerning the unfolding of the process of the “Latinisation” of Montenegro – in our time and before our very eyes.

7. Through the centuries, in the broad areas of the Serbian language, the Cyrillic script has testified to the continuity and identity of the Serbian language and literature, as well as Serbian culture and history; it has been a recognisable sign and symbol; an indicator of the abundance of the foundations of the Serbian heritage (without neglecting the Glagolitic script from the beginnings of the era of literacy introduced by Cyril and Methodius, or the Latin script heritage in the Serbian language of a more recent date). It is in accordance with the above that the Serbian linguistic and cultural policy should be developed.

Literature

Bukvar 2009: *Prvi srpski bukvar inoka Save* [*The First Serbian Alphabet Book of Inok Sava*], Venice 1597, edited by Mihailo Blečić, Službeni glasnik – Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade.

Vrhobreznički 2000: *Vrhobreznički ljetopis* [*The Vrhobreznik Annals*] (phototype edition), Istorijски institut Crne Gore, Podgorica.

Vukov–Colić 2003: Davorka Vukov–Colić, Strah i pepeo [Fear and Ashes], *Zarez*, I/16, 15th October 1998, *Prosvjeta*, vol. 10 (35), issue 59 (669), November 2003, Issue topic: Books on the Bonfire of Biblioclasty, Srpsko kulturno društvo Prosvjeta, Zagreb, 32–35.

Grković–Mejdžor 2011: Jasmina Grković–Mejdžor, O formiranju srpske redakcije staroslovenskog jezika [On the Formation of the Serbian Redaction of the Old Slavic Language], *Đurđevi stupovi i Budimljanska eparhija* [*The Đurđevi stupovi Monastery and the Budimlje Bishopric*], collection of papers, Berane – Belgrade, 43–51.

- Ekmečić 2011: Milorad Ekmečić, *Dugo kretanje između klanja i oranja. Istorija Srba u novom veku* [A Long Journey between Slaughtering and Ploughing. A History of the Serbs in the New Age] (1492–1992), Evro–Đunti, Belgrade.
- Zbiljić 2005: Dragoljub Zbiljić, *Izdaja srpskog pisma* [The Betrayal of the Serbian Script], Ćirilica, Novi Sad.
- Zelić–Bućan 2012: Benedikta Zelić–Bućan, *Čiji je evanđelistar kneza Miroslava* [Whose Is Prince Miroslav's Evangelistary], Hrvati Bosne: Hercegovina, 2/2 <https://croatianscript.wordpress.com>.
- Žertva Avramova 2013: *Žertva Avramova. Drama Vikentija Rakića* [Abraham's Sacrifice. A Play by Vikentije Rakić], edited by, prefaced by, phototype edition: Ivana Marić – Darko Antović, published by Matica Boke, Kotor.
- Žitije Metodijevo 1964: *Ćirilo i Metodije – žitija, službe, kanoni, pohvale* [Cyril and Methodius – Hagiographies, Services, Canons, Canticles], Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade.
- Žitije Ćirilovo 1964: *Ćirilo i Metodije – žitija, službe, kanoni, pohvale* [Cyril and Methodius – Hagiographies, Services, Canons, Canticles], Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade.
- Ivić 2001: Pavle Ivić, *Srpski narod i njegov jezik* [The Serbian People and Its Language], Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
- Internet i ćirilica 2002: from the scientific conference *The Internet and the Cyrillic Script*, held at the National Library of Serbia, 11th and 12th February 2002.
- Jovanović 1989: Batrić Jovanović, *Crnogorci o sebi (od vladike Danila do 1941)* [Montenegrins on Themselves (From Bishop Danilo until 1941)], Belgrade, Sloboda.
- Jovanović 1994: Gordana Jovanović, *O jeziku starih srpskih knjiga* [On the Language of Old Serbian Books], *Pet vekova srpskog štamparstva* [Five Centuries of Serbian Printing], 1494–1994, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Matica srpska, Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Belgrade, 53–60.
- Klajn 2009: Ivan Klajn, *Dnevni list Politika* [the *Politika* daily], 22nd August 2009.
- Kovačević 2003: Miloš Kovačević, *Srpski jezik i srpski jezici* [The Serbian Language and Serbian Languages], Belgrade.

- Kovačević 2006: Miloš Kovačević, *Odnos srpskoga jezika i njegovog pisma prema manjinskim jezicima i njihovim pismima* [The Relations between the Serbian Language and Its Script and Minority Languages and Their Scripts], Simpozijum o ćirilici [A Symposium on the Cyrillic Script] 2007: The Obligations in Education, Professional Practice and Orthography in Connection with the Serbian Language and Its Script Following the Passing of the New Constitution of the Republic of Serbia (Philology and Linguistics), (in: the *Politika* daily, no. 33195, 5th March 2006, p. 9).
- Kont 1989: Fransijski Kont [Francis Conte], *Sloveni. Nastanak i razvoj slovenskih civilizacija u Evropi (VI–XIII vek)* [The Slavs. On the Origins and Development of Slavic Civilisations in Europe (6th – 13th century)], vol. II, “Filip Višnjić”, Belgrade.
- Kostić 1999: Lazo M. Kostić, *O srpskom jeziku. Vuk i Nemci* [On the Serbian Language. Vuk and the Germans], Novi Sad.
- Lasić 2002: Igor Lasić, Orlovi rano lete u smeće [Eagles Fly Early into Garbage], *Prosvjeta*, vol. 10 (35), issue 59 (669), November 2003, Issue topic: Books on the Bonfire of Biblioclasy, Srpsko kulturno društvo Prosvjeta, Zagreb, 24–26.
- Lasić 2002: Igor Lasić, Knjižarnice su uništavane sagorijevanjem [Libraries were Destroyed by Incineration], *Prosvjeta*, vol. 10 (35), issue 59 (669), November 2003, Issue topic: Books on the Bonfire of Biblioclasy, Srpsko kulturno društvo Prosvjeta, Zagreb, 40–42.
- Lasić 2002: Igor Lasić, Pravorijek na kraju [Verdict at the End], *Prosvjeta*, vol. 10 (35), issue 59 (669), November 2003, Issue topic: Books on the Bonfire of Biblioclasy, Srpsko kulturno društvo Prosvjeta, Zagreb, 5–7.
- Letić 2012: Branko Letić, Atribut srpski za jezik i prismo u starim dokumentima i književnim djelima [The Attribute Serbian, as Used for the Language and Script in Old Documents and Works of Literature]. *Jezik i pismo u Republici Srpskoj* [The Language and Script in the Republic of Srpska], Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Republike Srpske, Naučni skupovi, odjeljenje književnosti i umjetnosti, vol. 13, 135–151.
- Lešaja 2012: Ante Lešaja, *Knjigocid. Uništavanje knjiga u Hrvatskoj 1990-ih* [Bookicide. Destroying Books in Croatia in the 1990's], Profil knjiga d.o.o., Kaptol 25, Zagreb, Srpsko narodno vijeće, Ilica 16, Zagreb.

- Lešaja 2003: Ante Lešaja, Uništavanje književne građe – zločin koji se zanemaruje. Izdaja intelektualaca [Destroying Books – A Neglected Crime. Betrayal of Intellectuals], *Prosvjeta*, vol. 10 (35), issue 59 (669), November 2003, Issue topic: Books on the Bonfire of Biblioclasty, Srpsko kulturno društvo Prosvjeta, Zagreb, 18–23.
- Livada 2003: Svetozar Livada, Lepe knjige lepo gore [Nice Books Burn Nicely], *Prosvjeta*, vol. 10 (35), issue 59 (669), November 2003, Issue topic: Books on the Bonfire of Biblioclasty, Srpsko kulturno društvo Prosvjeta, Zagreb, 8–18.
- Marojević 1991: Radmilo Marojević, *Ćirilica na raskršću vekova. Ogledi o srpskoj etničkoj i kulturnoj samosvesti* [*The Cyrillic Script at the Crossroads of Centuries. Essays on the Serbian Ethnic and Cultural Self-Awareness*], Dečje novine, Gornji Milanovac.
- Matović 2013: Veselin Matović, *Ćirilica i latinogorica* [*The Cyrillic and Monte-Latin Script*], Književna zadruga Srpskog narodnog vijeća, Podgorica – Nikšić.
- Milosavljević 2002: Petar Milosavljević, *Srbi i njihov jezik* [*The Serbs and Their Language*], Beograd.
- Milosavljević 2006: Petar Milosavljević, *Srpska pisma* [*The Serbian Scripts*], Besjeda, Banja Luka.
- Milošević 1994: Miloš Milošević, *Testament Đurđa Crnojevića* [*The Testament of Đurđe Crnojević*], Podgorica – Cetinje.
- Okuka 2006: Miloš Okuka, *Srpski na kriznom putu* [*The Serbian Language on the Crisis Path*], Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Istočno Sarajevo.
- Ondruš 2004: Šimon Ondruš, Nastanak slovenskog pisma u IX veku [The Creation of the Slavic Script in the 9th Century]. Segments of the book *Proglas Konstantina-Ćirila* [*The Proclamation of Constantine-Cyril*], Bratislava: Perfekt, 2004. (accessed 2016: Filozofski fakultet, Novi Sad, www.ff.uns.ac.rs).
- Пенктовски 2014: Алексей М. Пенктовский, Славянское богослужение в архиепископии святителя Мефодия, *Sveti Ćirilo i Metodije i slovensko pisano nasleđe 863–2013* [*St Cyril and Methodius and the Slavic Written Heritage 863-2013*], Institut za srpski jezik. Staroslovensko i srpsko nasleđe I, Belgrade, 25–103.
- Petrović 2005: Dragoljub Petrović, *Sumrak srpske ćirilice* [*The Twilight of the Serbian Cyrillic Script*], Ćirilica, Novi Sad.

- Pešikan 1994: Mitar Pešikan, Leksikon srpskoslovenskog štamparstva [A Lexicon of Old Slavic Printing], *Pet vekova srpskog štamparstva* [Five Centuries of Serbian Printing], 1494–1994, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Matica srpska, Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Belgrade, 71–218.
- Piper 2004: Predrag Piper: *Srpski jezik između velikih i malih* [The Serbian Language between the Big and The Small], Belgrade.
- Pirivatrić 2014: Srđan Pirivartić, Ćirilometodijevske tradicije i srpske oblasti pre postanka autokefalne crkve u kraljevstvu Nemanjića 1219. godine [The Cyril-Methodian Traditions and the Serbian Areas before the Establishment of the Autocephalous Church in the Nemanjićs' Kingdom in 1219], *Sveti Ćirilo i Metodije i slovensko pisano nasleđe 863–2013*, Institut za srpski jezik. Staroslovensko i srpsko nasleđe I, Belgrade 2014, 103–125.
- Rešetar – Đaneli 1938: M. Rešetar – Đ. Đaneli, *Dva dubrovačka jezička spomenika iz XVI. vijeka. Srpski molitvenik od g. 1512.* [Two Dubrovnikan Linguistic Monuments from the 16th Century. The Serbian Breviary of 1512]. A new edition, edited by Milan Rešetar, SKA. Special editions, vol. CXXII. Philosophical and philological writings, book 32, Beograd 1938, VII–VIII.
- Savić 2014a: Viktor Savić, Dimitrije Sinaï je najstariji srpski književnik [Dimitri of Sinai is the Oldest Serbian Writer], in: Sačuvajmo srpski jezik [Let Us Preserve the Serbian Language], *Politika* 18. 10. 2015.
- Savić 2014b: Viktor Savić, Redakcijske odlike prve stranice Kijevskih listića [The Redaction Characteristics of the First Page of the Kiev Folios], *Sveti Ćirilo i Metodije i slovensko pisano nasleđe 863–2013*, Institut za srpski jezik. Staroslovensko i srpsko nasleđe I, Beograd, 277–309.
- Samardžić 2009: Biljana Samardžić, Termin bosančica kao zablude u istorijskom razvoju srpskog jezika [The term Bosančica as a Fallacy in the Historical Development of the Serbian Language], collection of papers from the conference *Nauka i nastava na univerzitetu* [Science and Teaching at the University], Pale.
- Stanišić 2014: Vanja Stanišić, Slovenska pismenost i srednjovekovni alfabeti grčkog kruga [Slavic Literacy and the Mediaeval Alphabets of the Greek Circle], *Sveti Ćirilo i Metodije i slovensko pisano nasleđe 863–2013*, Institut za srpski jezik. Staroslovensko i srpsko nasleđe I, Beograd, 151–169.

- Stojanović 2011: Jelica Stojanović, *Putevima srpskog jezika i ćirilice* [Following the Paths of the Serbian Language and the Cyrillic Script], Matica srpska – Društvo članova u Crnoj Gori, Nikšić.
- Stojanović 1982: Ljubomir Stojanović, *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi* [Old Serbian Notes and Inscriptions], Knjiga I, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Matica srpska, phototype edition, book 4, Belgrade.
- Stojčić 2008: Đoko Stojčić (interview with Saša Važić), *Mons Aureus*, 20, Smederevo.
- Trifunović 2001: Đorđe Trifunović, *Ka počecima srpske pismenosti* [Towards the Beginnings of Serbian Literacy], Čigoja štampa, Belgrade.
- Turčanji 2004: Vilijam Turčanji, O Proglasu [On the Proclamation], segments of the book *Proglas Konstantina-Ćirila*, Bratislava: Perfekt, 2004 (accessed 2016: Filozofski fakultet, Novi Sad www.ff.uns.ac.rs).
- Ćirilica 2009: The “Ćirilica” Society (cirilica@EUnet.yu).
- Ćirilica 2008: *Ćirilica i savremene informacione tehnologije* [The Cyrillic Script and Contemporary Information technologies], a round table discussion held by the Informatics Society of Serbia, 7th September 2008 (<http://www.dis.org.yu/>).
- Čurčić 1994: Laza Čurčić, Vidovi i ogranci ranog slovenskog štamparstva [The Forms and Branches of Early Slavic Printing], *Pet vekova srpskog štamparstva, 1494–1994*, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Matica srpska, Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Belgrade, 9–24.

THE FIRST WORLD WAR – THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CYRILLIC SCRIPT AND OTHER SERBIAN NATIONAL SYMBOLS

It is known for a fact, albeit only partially and in principle (for it has never been the subject of sufficient attention), what the attitude of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (as well as Austria, and their allies, as part of one and the same policy) in the First World War was towards many Serbian cultural and national features, towards the Serbian ethnos and spirituality, which was especially manifested in their attitude towards the Serbian Cyrillic script and language. However, these manifestations gained in intensity during World War One, and were initiated (and proclaimed when and as much as possible, and as much as it suited various political projections) much earlier than that. What happened during World War One was merely a more open manifestation of the already initiated (and, thus, planned) processes, which had the same aim – suppression and/or narrowing of the Serbian ethnic space, and also of the national, historically established characteristics and symbols; the historical cultural heritage.

1. The attitude towards the Serbs and their national characteristics (in the area of Austria and Hungary) until the First World War

1.1. All that happened during the First World War in terms of the attitude towards the Serbian people had its deep causes, which had been manifested, more or less openly, for centuries before World War One. We shall try to briefly present the attitude towards the Serbs in these (various) areas (where the influence and rule of Austria and Hungary alternated) before the First World War, so that we could more clearly comprehend the disastrous attitude manifested during World War One and its consequences.

1.2. In the fringe areas that were under the Austro-Hungarian rule, the Serbs were made to settle down as part of a plan to preserve the borders against the Turks; being necessary for this purpose, they were granted privileges and promised rights when it came to preserving their faith, language and script.¹ The privileges also encompassed the Serbs who were included in the **Military Borderline** system. The inhabitants of the Krajina region, Orthodox and Catholic believers alike, who were included in the Military Borderline system and entrusted with the task of preventing a further onslaught of the Turks towards Central and Western Europe, gained certain privileges, as well as considerable military and other obligations (Krestić 1994: 229). The court and military authorities of Austria gladly accepted the Serbs, for they provided them with cheap military force. They were directed to settle down in thinly populated or depopulated areas that were gradually made exempt from the jurisdiction of the Croatian Parliament and the Croatian Ban and turned into a special territory known under the name of Military Borderline or *Vojna krajina*.

1.3. The autonomy that **the Serbs gained in Hungary** is known as the **church-people's autonomy and the people's-church autonomy**, which guaranteed them religious and personal safety, as well as the safety of their property. The royal privilege was proclaimed by Leopold I **towards the end of**

¹ "The Royal Privilege granted to the Serbs settled there, the Statuta Villachorum, dating from the year 1630, through which the Austrian Emperor Ferdinand II **guaranteed the Serbs all their religious and other rights**, represents the first legal act of this kind, which guaranteed the new ethnic elements in Austrian 'nether lands' – the Serbian population, all religious and national rights, also stipulating their obligations to the Austrian court as border guards [...] The border guards settled in the Krajina region were obligated to defend the state frontier of the Habsburg Monarchy (they procured uniforms, weapons and food at their own expense); in return, they had the right to settle there and work the land without having to pay taxes and other state duties, were freed from all feudal obligations towards the (mainly Croat-Hungarian) noblemen, and were free to pursue their Orthodox faith, which they particularly insisted on" (Garonja–Radovanac 2008: 20).

the 17th century, and the Serbs received it at the time of “the so-called **Great Turkish War (1683–1699)** [also known as the War of the Holy League], when Austria, under the Habsburg dynasty, was at times in a great crisis and danger” (Krestić 1994: 88). Looking for support, it turned to the Serbs, and in return for the help that it got from them, Austria gave them privileges (Krestić 1994: 88–89). As these privileges were contrary to “the Hungarian historical and state law”, granted outside the aegis of the Hungarian Parliament, “due to the pressure of the Hungarian estates and the Catholic Church, in the course of the 18th century, when Austria was not faced with any external or internal threats, Austrian rulers” narrowed down the Serbs’ privileges. “On the contrary, at times of internal turmoil (during the Rákóczi Uprising of 1703–1711) and wars, the privileges were confirmed anew” (Krestić 1994: 89). These privileges were conferred upon the Serbs as a military people by the ruler himself. However, the Hungarian estates and the Catholic Church fought resolutely against the Serbs’ privileges. Due to their pressure, during the course of the 18th century, when Austria was not exposed to any military threats and thus did not need the Serbs as soldiers, the rights previously promised to the Serbs were suppressed and narrowed down (Krestić 1995: 89). It went like that all the time: when Hungary and Austria needed the Serbs for military operations, they made concessions to them, but when the danger diminished, “the Hungarian authorities and the Catholic clergy exerted pressure against the Serbs, trying to subject them to Uniatism and Hungarianisation, first of all in the areas where the Serb population did not make up a compact whole and were located on the periphery” (ibid.).²

² “When the military services of the frontiersmen were not of particular importance, especially after the Ottoman Empire had been decisively driven out of Central Europe, unpopular measures were taken, namely, separating civil rule from military rule (which automatically meant being lowered to the status of serfdom), and during the 18th century this often led to mass rebellions of the inhabitants of the Krajina region that were suppressed in blood” (Garonja–Radovanac 2008: 20).

1.4. In addition to the rights granted to them by the royal privilege, as well as the numerous and difficult obligations stemming from their borderline service, the frontier Serbs enjoyed a special status, which was due, among other things, to the fact that for a long time they managed to preserve their local self-government (Krestić 1995: 90). The abolition of the Serbs' rights was manifested early on in the *Vojna krajina* region. The Serbs, who had been directed to settle down as a living shield, "constituted the absolute majority of the *Krajina* population by the middle of the 18th century".³ The Habsburg Monarchy and the Banovina of Croatia, which were faced with a real threat of "the expansion of the Serbian ethnic space (parallel with a relatively fast development of the newly independent state of Serbia), exerted pressure, especially in the case of some previously guaranteed rights. Thus, it was forbidden to use the Orthodox Church (Julian) calendar, and also to use the Cyrillic script in liturgical and religious books, educational programmes for Serbian children and the like. The fundamental 'borderline' laws, adopted between August 1807 and May 1850, completed the reorganisation of the *Vojna krajina* region, which eventually led to its abolition in 1881 and annexation by Civil Croatia" (Garonja–Radovanac 2008: 239).

1.5. The privileges referred to above (the church-people's autonomy) "and the self-governing and autonomous rights derived from them were exercised by all the Serbs living on the Austrian and the Hungarian territory, and quite understandably, also those Serbs who lived on the territory of Croatia and Slavonia" (Krestić 1994: 90). However, in 1723 the Croatian estates passed a decision according to which "no one in Civil Croatia and Slavonia could own real estate unless that per-

³ In the Military Borderline area, over a period of only two years, the number of inhabitants increased from 474,000 to 618,000. In the year 1843, of the 572,000 inhabitants, 246,000 were Serbs, and in the Slavonian part, out of a total of 162,000 inhabitants, 92,000 were Serbs. As opposed to other areas, the population of the Military Borderline suffered the greatest losses during wars (Ekmečić 2011: 212).

son was a Catholic. Those very estates, known for their bigotry and excessive Catholicism, submitted a petition to the Hungarian Parliament in 1741, wherein they stated that the Roman Catholic faith in Croatia and Slavonia was threatened by 'schismatism'. They petitioned the Empress (Maria Theresa, J. S.) to banish from Croatia and Slavonia all 'schismatic' bishops and to place 'the Greek-non-Uniates' (that is, the Serbs) under the jurisdiction of the Uniate Bishop in Svidnica. They also asked that the 'schismatic' Metropolitan be prohibited from exercising the church authority in Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia" (Krestić 1995: 90–91). As Austria was engaged in a great war at the time and, therefore, needed the Serbs for military operations, the Court Wartime Alliance (favourably disposed towards the Serbs) interceded for the Serbs, so the Empress relented and, on 23rd April 1743, **confirmed the Serbs' privileges**. But the struggle for abolishing the privileges, on the one hand, and for preserving them, on the other, never ceased. Also, "in 1751 and 1764, the Župa [administrative district] of Virovitica and the Hungarian Parliament brutally rose against the Serbs. The Croatian authorities in the Župa of Virovitica demanded the following: that the Eastern Orthodox faith be banned, that all Serb schools be closed, that the building of Serb churches using hard materials be banned, that the Serb clergy, even the metropolitans and bishops, be tried by the Župa, and that they be brought before a court of law like 'any other riff-raff'..." (Krestić 1995: 92).

During the course of the 18th century, the Serbs strove to gain and to preserve the guaranteed rights and privileges from both the Hungarian Parliament and the Catholic Church, whereas the latter strove "to annul or diminish the privileges. Such tendencies on the part of the Hungarian estates and the Catholic Church coincided with the absolutist and centrist leanings of the Court, which, through special decrees passed in 1729, 1732 and 1734, regulated the Serbian issue. These royal decrees well and truly destroyed the Serbs' privileges" (Krestić 1994: 90). In the year 1770, the Court issued a **Reglament** that diminished certain religious rights (the Metropolitan was di-

vested of secular authority and could no longer appoint bishops [the appointment could be approved by the Emperor]; the number of church holidays was diminished, reforms were made concerning the old calendar, the Serbs were obligated to pay a tithe to the Roman Catholic Church, etc.).

The abolition and suppression of some privileges (political, religious, educational ones) led to the abolition and prohibition of other features that were a part of the Serbian national identity: the script and the language.⁴ **The School Constitution of 1777** reformed the Serb schools, thereby depriving them “of the influence of the clergy and turning them into state institutions [...]. A radical and final subordination of the autonomy of the Serbian Orthodox Church and the Serbian people to the central authorities was effected in 1779 through the passing of the so-called **Declaratoria** [...]. Instead of the political autonomy that the people continually demanded, the Declaratoria and the School Constitution only gave the Serbs a church-educational autonomy” (Krestić 1995: 93). At the same time, all the while there were efforts aimed at not recognising the Serbs’ national name; in the Parliament, the Hungarian estates passed a law on 1791 that recognised “the Greek non-Uniates” as citizens of Hungary, but thereby abolished their national designation and name.⁵ Thus, as can be seen, the Serbs were not recognised as a separate nation, nor as Serbs, but only as members of a confession, as “the Greek non-Uniates” (Krestić 1995: 95–96).

⁴ “When they had their own church, the Serbs were considered a people, and when they lost it from 1767 onwards, they were officially classified as Greeks, while their language was termed provincial or referred to by the common Slavic name” (Ekmečić 2011: 23).

⁵ “They were allowed to freely exercise their religious beliefs, to have their own churches, funds and schools, to work as civil servants etc. The final provision of this law has an added clause wherein the following is stated: unless all of the above is in contravention of the existing state laws.

[...] Based on the aforementioned article of that law, the Serbs were not recognised as a separate nation, nor as Serbs, but only as members of a confession, as ‘the Greek non-Uniates’, together with the Greeks and the Wallachians, who belonged to the same faith” (Krestić 1995: 95).

As a recognisable sign of the Serbian national identity, referred to by its Serbian designation as such, **the Cyrillic script** was always the first to suffer blows. Many rulers in various epochs attempted to prohibit the Serbs from using the Cyrillic script. As has already been mentioned, the Serbian Cyrillic script was banned by Maria Therese, Franz Joseph, Benjamin Kállay, Ante Pavelić and others. The first official ban of the use of the Cyrillic script was passed by Empress **Maria Therese** in 1779 (even though examples and intentions of this kind had not been lacking before). After the death of Maria Therese, her son Emperor **Franz Joseph II** issued this order anew on 3rd February 1781.

1.6. A period when the Serbian autonomy in Hungary flourished is the one starting with the **revolution of 1848/9** (the breakdown of Bach's absolutism) and lasting until the end of the Eastern Crisis in 1878, following which the Serbian power and role began to wane: "As they had done in the Timisoara Council of 1790, the Serbs demanded a separate autonomous territory at the May Convention of 1848 [...]; the establishment of Vojvodina [Voivodeship, a type of duchy] was proclaimed at the **May Convention of 1848**, but it was short-lived [...], recognised by the Croatian Parliament but not by Vienna [...]; when Austria was defeated in the war against Italy and France in 1859, the Serbian Voivodeship came to an end, the decision on its abolition being passed in 1860 [...]. In 1868, the Hungarians passed a law which gave the Serbs the right to have their Serbian autonomy in church, funds-related and educational matters, and the national character of the Serbian Church in Hungary was recognised [...]. The events unfolding in the Balkans (the Herzegovinian Uprising, the Serbian-Turkish War and the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina) contributed to a an even greater pressure on the Serbs in Hungary exerted by the Hungarian government, which carried out "a state supervision" of the Serbian autonomy (Krestić 1994: 102–105).

In the early 20th century, the Court in Vienna and the Hungarian governments considerably narrowed down the scope of the Serbian autonomy, which was reduced to self-gov-

ernment in religious and educational matters. Even such a reduced level of autonomy was a thorn in the side of Vienna and Budapest, so that Franz Joseph, acting on a proposal submitted by the Hungarian government, altogether abolished and suspended the autonomy in 1912 (Krestić 1994: 105). Thereby, he abolished the people's-church autonomy, even though it was not formally done, and the autonomy was entirely abolished on the eve of the Balkan Wars and before the breaking out of the First World War, when preparations for a final showdown with Serbia were well under way in Vienna (*ibid.*).

1.7. Concerning the **disputes between the Serbs and the Croats**, what was of decisive influence was the policy based on Croatian state and historical law, which proceeds from the assumption that, on the state territory of Croatia, there exists only one people – the Croatian “political”, that is, “diplomatic” or, as they would say today, constitutive people: **“the Croatian state and historical law** has always been, and still is, the starting point of every “Greater Croatia” policy, the purpose of which is to establish a greater, ethnically pure and, in terms of faith – Catholic unified Croatia [...]. Croatian politicians and political parties recognised the physical existence of the Serbs in Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia, but refused to recognise their political individuality, their constitutive character, treating them as ‘Orthodox Croats’. Intending to assimilate them..., they erased their Serbian name, not only when designating their nation and their language, but also when designating their institutions, particularly their Serbian Orthodox Church” (Krestić 1995:231). The situation was similar when it came to designating the language or the people, the adjective Serbian was invariably avoided. “That adjective was not used **in the name of the Serbian Orthodox Church** either: the official designation was the ‘Greek-Eastern’, ‘Greek non-Uniate’ and ‘Croatian Orthodox Church’” (Krestić 1995:231–232).⁶ The basis of all the mis-

⁶ “In view of the fact that, according to this principle (that is, the right of ‘a political people’, J. S.), there were no Serbs in Croatia, for they were a part of the Croatian ‘political people’, which made them Croats in political

understandings and conflicts between the Serbs and the Croats in the party-political relations of the second half of the 19th and the early 20th century were due to the negation of the Serbian national identity in Croatia.

1.8. In Croatia, the issue of the language and its name has always been closely connected with the issue of recognising or not recognising the national identity of the Serbs living there. “Only exceptionally, at moments of political crises, when the Croatian statehood and national future were at stake, was the existence of the Serbian people and the Serbian language officially recognised in Croatia” (Krestić 1995: 227).⁷

Concerning the designation of the language, apart from the official designation “the native language”, the designations

terms, many administrative-political, cultural-educational and quasi-scientific measures were taken with a view to realising a political goal – to make Croatia free from Serbs – in practice. This was the task and such were the intentions behind the catalogue of *The First Dalmatian-Croatian-Slavonian Exhibition*, held in 1864; in it, the Serbs were not referred to in terms of their national affiliation, as was the case with the far less numerous Tsintsars and Armenians. The Serbs were referred to in terms of their religious affiliation as Croats of the Greek-Eastern, that is, Orthodox faith. As the aim was to create a homogeneous Croatian ‘political’ people, which presupposed an ethnically clean Croatia, the Serbian name was systematically omitted wherever it could be omitted” (Krestić 1995: 204).

⁷ The continuity of this trend was manifested during World War One as well: in the birth certificates issued at the time there is no information about the language and nationality of the new-born, only about faith, and these rubrics only state – istočno pravoslavna [Eastern Orthodox]; all the data are entered in the Latin script, the form is printed in German and Serbian (in the Cyrillic script), (the Archive of Serbia: <http://velikirat.nb.rs/kolekcije>).

In *The Serbian Herald* we find: “The Zagreb daily ‘News’ reports that the Croatian Ban, officiously performing his duties, forbade the sale of volumes 3, 5, 7 and 8 of ‘The Christian Library’ published in 1900 by the Serbian printing house in Zagreb.

The reason for this ban is the fact that in their contents he found ‘statements suitable for Greater Serbia propaganda.’

If only that could save them from the Serbian menace, which they keep fantasising about, even when they have arrested, banished and destroyed whatever bears the Serbian name” (*Srpski glasnik* no. 256, p. 3, 25. 9. 1916).

“Croatian-Illyric”⁸ and “Croatian”, referring to Latin script texts, and “Serbian-Illyric”, that is, “Serbian”, referring to Cyrillic script texts were used (Krestić 1994: 196).⁹ Among a number of proposals for the name of the language that were submitted in 1861 and 1866, the name that was adopted was – Yugoslav: “The Serbs were not satisfied with the decision to call the official language of the tripartite kingdom *Yugoslav*. They were prepared to accept the proposal submitted by Ivan Kukuljević, that the language should be called ‘Croatian-Serbian’ or ‘Croatian or Serbian’. They saw unerringly that the Yugoslavism which was imposed upon them was a kind of Greater Croatia campaign that was meant to erase the Serbian name, the Serbian national feeling and the very Serbian national being” (Krestić 1995: 198). Within the framework of the linguistic policy, it is evident that there was a tendency to avoid mentioning the designation “Serbian” whenever possible.

The Cyrillic script, as a Serbian script, would be suppressed in various ways, and the Serbian flag and coat-of-arms, as national symbols, would be forbidden (Krestić 1995: 204).¹⁰

⁸ “It is well known that the Parliament decided in 1861 that the official language in Croatia was to be called *Yugoslav*, and that there were proposals to call it ‘Croatian-Slavonian-Serbian’, ‘Croatian-Slavonian’, ‘Croatian-Serbian’, ‘Croatian or Serbian’, ‘Croatian’, ‘Serbian’ and ‘the language of the people of the tripartite kingdom’” (Krestić 1995: 198).

⁹ “At the Banovina conference held in Zagreb in 1860, in a petition submitted to the ruler by Ivan Mažuranić, it was demanded ‘that the people’s Croatian-Slavonian language, as recognised by the patent of 7th March 1850, be used when dealing with all public matters’. In a letter written in his own hand, dated 5th December that same year, Franz Joseph fulfilled the conference demand and ordered that the official language in Croatia and Slavonia be *Croatian-Slavonian*” (Krestić 1995: 198).

¹⁰ “This entire policy towards the Serbs in Croatia was succinctly formulated in an article written by the Croatian historian and university professor Vjekoslav Klaić, published in *Vienac [Wreath]* in 1893. In it, he says ‘that the right national name for people from Istria to the Balkans is Croats, and the tribal name is Serbs, that is, the Serbs are a species of the Croatian genus. Each Serb is a Croat, but a Croat is not a Serb’” (Krestić 1995: 204).

While the Croats continually strove to fulfil their interests while exploiting the Serbs in difficult (and fateful) times, granting them concessions and privileges, meeting their national demands, but at the same time taking those rights away from them when they did not need the Serbs, “the Serbs never betrayed the Croats, and they were often in the first ranks in battles. That is what happened at the time of the revolution and the war with the Hungarians in 1848/49, when an agreement and dualism were forcibly imposed in 1867/68, the deposition of the compromise Ban Levin Rauch and the struggles concerning a revision of the agreement in 1869/1873, at the time of the national movements in 1883 and 1903, and a number of times later on, until recent times” (Krestić 1995: 234). After the Austrian-Prussian War of 1866, when the hopes about reforming Austria along federalist lines fell through and it became clear that the leading role was won by the Germans and the Hungarians, not the Slavs, when the Serbs became necessary because of the threat of Hungarisation and Germanisation, **the Croatian Parliament** solemnly declared on 11th May 1867 “*that the tripartite kingdom recognises the Serbian people living in it as a people that is the same as and on an equal footing with the Croatian people*”, and concerning the issue of the language, at the beginning of January 1867, the Parliament passed a decision proclaiming that “***the Croatian or Serbian language***” was the official language. “Those were the first clear signs of a more relaxed attitude towards the Serbs” (Krestić 1995: 207).¹¹ However, **the Assembly** did not adhere

¹¹ “When one reviews critically all the misunderstandings and conflicts that broke out concerning the name of the language and the issue of the recognition of the Serbian national identity before the breakdown of absolutism, between 1860 and 1867, the conclusion that imposes itself unequivocally is that the basis of all the mutually harmful confrontations was the Croatian state and historical law, which gave rise to Greater Croatia-related ambitions and assimilatory tendencies, whose aim was an ethnically pure Croatian state... Jovan Ristić, who was well informed on these matters, wrote about this as follows on 11th November 1868: ‘The Croats did not want to admit that there existed Serbs in Croatia, and when the Hungarians exerted a strong pressure on them, then they went soft on the Serbs. They wanted to drag us into their struggle with the Hun-

to the decision passed by the Croatian Parliament in 1867, but concluded: "All the teaching in people's schools is to be conducted solely **in the language of the Croatian people**, and no other language is to be learned in people's schools but the Croatian language..." (Krestić 1995: 211).

The **Uniate Parliament of Levin Rauch** also voted, in **1868**, for the agreement "on the basis of which in Croatia and Slavonia 'the Croatian language' was proclaimed the official one". After that came the abolition of the right to use the Cyrillic script in official documents issued by the state institutions in the region of the **Župa of Srem**: "Even though a number of Croatian deputies declared themselves in favour of preserving the Cyrillic script, the Uniate majority outvoted them, so the Parliament decided that the national government should 'issue an administrative decision to the effect that in the Župa of Srem *the Croatian language, as written in the Latin script, is to be used for all official matters*'" (ibid.). This decision did not deprive the Serbs of their right to submit their petitions, complaints, suits and other documents of that kind to the authorised organs in the script of their choice: be it the Latin or the Cyrillic one.

In *Cetinjski vjesnik* [*The Cetinje Herald*] of 27th February 1910, there is a report on this event in an article entitled "The Cyrillic Script": "At the time of Ban Rauch, in Croatia and Slavonia the Serbs were subjected to great pressure, and among other things, **the Cyrillic script** was exposed to persecution. It was thrown out of school and no one was allowed to use it in official communication". In 1869, Rauch contributed to the Croatian Parliament's vote in favour of banning the use of the Cyrillic script as the official one in Srem.¹² When Dr N.

garians, so that, after they got rid of them with our help, they could go on denying the national being of the Serbs" (Krestić 1995: 209).

¹² "When, on account of that (i.e. the adoption of the law against the use of the Cyrillic script as the official one in Srem, J. S.), Miletić wrote in his periodical *Zastava* [*Flag*] a sharp, derisory and insulting text directed against Rauh and his Parliament, he was condemned to a

Tomašević took over the Ban's chair, the Cyrillic script became fully equal to the Latin one again. "From now on, everyone will be able to use it freely in correspondence with the authorities. It will be reintroduced in schools as well. The Cyrillic script will be taught parallel with the Latin one, so that school textbooks will be printed in it, the way they are now printed in the Latin script" (Jovanović 1989: 45). But, as was also the case in other segments pertaining to the Serbian ethno-cultural and spiritual milieu, this decision, too, would only last for a while. As soon as the situation became favourable, the prohibitions and persecution would continue.

Events and legal acts (recognition and non-recognition of the Serbs' rights) succeeded one another year after year, various types of legal acts were passed, often enough mutually conflictual, as was the case with the decision passed by the Parliament ("*the Croatian or Serbian language*" is the official one) and the Assembly ("All the teaching in people's schools is to be conducted solely in the language of the Croatian people"). In Zagreb, from 23rd to 25th August 1871, *The First General Croatian Teachers' Convention* was held. To commemorate the event *A Statistical Overview of the Tripartite Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia* was published, wherein (as was also the case with the catalogue of *The First Dalmatian-Croatian-Slavonian Exhibition*) there was no mention of the Serbs, they were only referred to as a certain number of Orthodox Croats (Krestić 1994: 211). And so on and so forth. After the Serbs from Croatia (together with Croatian political parties), with the support and whole-hearted help of the Serbs from Hungary, deposed the compromise Ban Levin Rauch and in **the election in May 1871** defeated the Unionists convinc-

prison sentence of several months. Even after this ban, the Cyrillic script was exposed to constant attacks coming from the Croatian authorities. Therefore, not at all accidentally, all the national-political programmes of the Serbs repeated, like a chant of sorts, the demand to legalise the equal position of the Cyrillic script in official communications with all the national authorities" (Krestić 2013: 29, in: Kovačević 2014).

ly, the promises made earlier were reneged on. After winning the election, the People's Party (headed by Ivan Mažuranić) forgot about the Serbs' help and the promises it had made to them, its members "forgot their parliamentary decision from the beginning of 1867, on the basis of which the Croatian or Serbian language was proclaimed the official one. They also forgot about the statement they had made in the Parliament on 11th May that same year, namely, 'that the tripartite kingdom recognises the Serbian people, living in it together with the Croatian people, as being the same as and equal to the latter'" (Krestić 1995: 212). This was manifested with particular clarity in the name of the language, in the law "on the Organisation of People's Schools and Academies for Teacher Training in the Kingdom of Croatia and Slavonia", wherein "the Croatian language", not "the Croatian or Serbian language", was proclaimed to be the one that should be used for teaching purposes. The Serbs were deeply dissatisfied with it and demanded that the law be changed, but the Croatian Parliament and Government turned a deaf ear to the Serbs' demands until the passing of the new **Law on Schools in 1888**; before that time, in all the schools of the Tripartite Kingdom, the only language used was Croatian (Krestić 1995: 2012–2013). After a great struggle and turmoil, "the Club of Serbian Deputies in the Croatian Parliament addressed a memorandum to the highest authorities of Croatia on 5th December 1887, demanding, among other things, that Paragraph 11 of the Law on Schools from 1874 'be amended, adding the provision that *the teaching language in people's schools be Croatian or Serbian*'. This demand of theirs was granted by Ban Khuen Héderváry and **the Croatian Parliament in 1888**, so that 'Croatian or Serbian' was proclaimed the teaching language in the schools of the Tripartite Kingdom" (Krestić 1995: 216).

The Serbs persistently strove for equality and for the recognition of their national identity, and in 1888 they were close to reaching an agreement, which was proposed by certain

Croatian political circles.¹³ However, this agreement did not bear fruit.¹⁴

The agreement between the Croats and the Serbs, which was concluded on the basis of complete equality through the **Croatian-Serbian Coalition of 1905**, resulted in a text adopted in the course of the **Dalmatian Council of 1905**, wherein it is stated that “our common language is to be called Croatian or Serbian” (Krestić 1995: 219). However, the said Coalition and agreement were irreconcilably opposed by Josip Frank and Frankovites. After the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in Vienna and Budapest, striving to break up the Croatian-Ser-

¹³ When well-known Croatian politicians offered the Serbs an agreement in 1888, the Serbs accepted it, and in their reply, appealing for two national names pertaining to the designations for the people and the language, it is stated, among other things: “we gladly accept your view regarding this: that the Croats and the Serbs have one and the same Slavic root, and as you say, *are two tribes of one people*; that both tribes, over time and during the course of historical events, have had their own *special*, ‘popular-political’ development, and that, on account of that, these two national names, ‘Serbian’ as well as ‘Croatian’, having been recognised on the basis of many years of development, are equally justified, and having been adopted by both sides, are *consequently* to be used to designate our *unified people* with those *two names*...”, and in accordance with the above, the Serbian population “can cultivate their own national language, ‘the Serbian language’ alongside ‘Croatian’, being one and the same, using the people’s ‘Slavic Cyrillic script’ alongside ‘the Latin script’ on a completely equal footing”. Subsequently, however, the agreement failed to bear fruit (Krestić 1995: 216).

¹⁴ In their animosity and aggressiveness towards the Serbs, the **Party of Rights** members were the most prominent in expressing such sentiments; in their press, we find the following: “*In Croatian lands, we recognise only one political people: the Croatian people, only one national flag: the Croatian one, only one official language: the Croatian one*’. The Frankovite [Frankovites were the followers of Josip Frank, a leader of the Party of Rights, characterised by their consistently anti-Serb position, *translator’s note*] organ *Croatia* had the following message for the Serbs: there could be no agreement with them unless they admitted that in Croatian lands there was only one Croatian flag, one Croatian language, that is to say, ‘one political people: the Croatian one’” (Krestić 1995: 218). Such a policy, albeit not so clearly manifested, has been visible on the Croatian political scene and has been implemented virtually to the present day.

bian coalition, while at the same time relying on Josip Frank's Pure Party of Rights, the so-called **High Treason Trial against the Serbs was initiated** in 1908: "In order to break up the Coalition and the unity of Serbs and Croats, their opponents decided to strike at the Serbs with all their might, no matter what means they used. Accusing them of spreading Serbianhood, putting up Serbian flags, using the Cyrillic script, establishing branches of the Serbian Independent Party, founding Sokol associations [gymnastics societies], building financial institutions, adorning various objects with the Serbian coat-of-arms and the like, they started arresting prominent Serbian citizens on a mass scale. In early January 1909, a bill of indictment was brought against 53 arrested Serbs, accusing them of high treason. *One of the incriminations contained therein was that 'the Greek-Eastern people', as the Serbs were referred to in the text of the indictment, was spreading the belief that the said people's language was Serbian...*

Ignoring historical facts and blindly adhering to Croatian historical law, according to which there were no Serbs in Croatia, so that there could be no Serbian language either, it was claimed in the indictment that Greater Serbia-oriented propaganda, initiated from Serbia, brought the Serbian name, the Cyrillic script, the Serbian flag, coat-of-arms and other national symbols to Croatia" (Krestić: 223). The Cyrillic script was then designated as "a means of propaganda imported from Serbia, used for the purpose of spreading Serbian state and political thought. On account of this, it was demanded by a number of interested parties that it be banned. This demand was granted by the Croatian Ban Baron Pavao Rauch, the aforementioned Levin Rauch's son. On 8th December 1908, his government 'declared people's school publications printed in the Cyrillic script invalid' and issued an order stating that, in the future, in all the schools in Croatia, including those of the Serbian faith, 'only publications printed in the Latin script' were to be used. In accordance with this, official seals were not to contain Cyrillic letters. According to the government order issued on 5th January 1909, the Cyrillic script was not to be used in public com-

munication. It could only be used by the parents of children when communicating with religious and school bodies for the purpose of submitting private petitions, applications, excuses and similar submissions” (Krestić 2013: 29). The Croatian and Serbian press of Yugoslav orientation contributed a great deal to unmasking the participants of behind-the-scenes activities directed against the Serbs in the course of the high treason trial conducted in Zagreb (226).¹⁵ This trial fell through eventually (Krestić 1995: 226).

1.9. The Austro-Hungarian policy of de-Serbianisation was transferred onto the area of Bosnia and Herzegovina. At the beginning of the Serbian uprisings from the 1875-1878 period, the Austrian army sent its cunning spy Alfred Bojić to the Bosnian border and to Serbia. His reports are of exceptional importance as an indicator of the development of the national awareness in the Serbs and the Croats. Those reports show that the process of the Croatisation of Catholics in **Bosnia and Herzegovina** had not got under way by 1876, that east of Slavon-ski Brod the Serbian national idea was the dominant one both among Catholic and among Orthodox believers, whereas to the west of that border people were divided along religious lines (Ekmečić 2011: 286).

After the Congress of Berlin and the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the aims of the Habsburg Monarchy policy did not favour the Serbian national interests or the Orthodox faith: “In the instructions given to General Joseph Filipović, the commander of the occupying forces, in 1878, even before crossing the border and entering Bosnia, it was stated that ‘the warmly recommended course of action for him in religious matters was to steadfastly protect the Catholic segment of the

¹⁵ Ivan Ribar, a coeval of these events, characterised Josip Frank in the following manner: “His closest avant-garde, made up of the majority of people’s deputies and the most unscrupulous elements from the ranks of the bourgeoisie and farmers, and unfortunately, those of working and peasant youth, were representatives of Frankovite riff-raff, prepared to carry out the extermination of the Serbs if it served the interests of the holy Croatian cause, for the glory of the Habsburg dynasty” (Krestić 1995: 224).

population, for they would mostly opt for the preservation of the monarchy. Apart from Catholics, he was to dedicate special attention to Muslim landowners, who had the largest estates in their possession and were traditionally the most progressive part of the Bosnian people. He was to strictly oversee the establishment of separate connections between the Muslims and the Serbs. This would prevent any hostile aspirations on the part of the Orthodox population opposing the occupation” (Ekmečić 2011: 293).

The **annexation crisis** changed the status quo in the Balkans when Austria-Hungary, in October 1908, “violating the provisions of the Congress of Berlin and the balance of power in Europe, proclaimed the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina” (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 57). The de-Serbianisation policy gained momentum. An opportune moment for embarking on a policy of destruction was awaited impatiently: “Vienna’s need for conducting a rational policy is testified to by a letter sent by the heir to the throne Franz Ferdinand to Major Brosch von Aarenau... wherein it is stated: ‘Hold Conrad in check, please.¹⁶ He should desist from his war fever. It would be wonderful and very pleasant to crush those Serbs and Montenegrins. But what is the use of cheaply acquired laurels if we have to pay for them through a European crisis..., wage battles on two or three fronts” (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 60). Following the occupation of B&H, Austria did everything in its power to prevent the Serbian people from uniting. The territorial separation of Serbia and Montenegro served that purpose: “the region of Raška, officially referred to as ‘the Novi Pazar Sanjak’, first received Habsburg garrisons and later fell under the

¹⁶ “The Minister of the Armed Forces General Conrad von Hötzendorf pointed out in the memoranda of December 1907 that only ‘an aggressive policy’ could save Austria-Hungary and bring it success. This presupposed the annexation of the occupied regions and ‘the annexation of Serbia, including its central area of Niš...’ In other words, the annihilation of the Serbian state was a precondition for taking over the central parts of the Balkans and establishing a hegemony in that area” (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 54–55).

Sultan's administration. Through this wedge, Austria-Hungary strove to prevent the territorial union of Serbia and Montenegro" (Ekmečić 2011: 293).

1.10. Starting from the occupation in 1877, numerous cases of the persecution of the Cyrillic script were observed in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Zbiljić 2005: 11). "Right from the start of their rule, the Austrians' course of action was pro-Croatian: on 6th January 1879, it was decreed that *the Croatian language* be the official language in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Thereby, they abolished the designation *the Bosnian language*, which the Turkish authorities strictly adhered to, but which the Serbs and the Croats did not accept, continuing to call their language by its national name, *Serbian* and *Croatian*" (Okuka 2006: 83). This decision did not remain in force for a long time, only a few months, so that the designation in official use was generalised to Serbo-Croatian or Croato-Serbian, while in some domains other designations were encountered.¹⁷

¹⁷ "However, the first decision of the Austro-Hungarian authorities on the language was short-lived. In the order issued on 26th August that same year in Sarajevo, the language was called that of *the land* in the case of two courses, and *the language of the Bosnian land* in the newly established *Realschule*-type grammar school. The list of subjects studied therein, however, contains a different designation: *the language of the land (Croatian, Serbian)*. In the provisional Rules of Procedure for the authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, dated 16th August 1879, the designation *Serbo-Croat language* is used, and in the order of the Land Government dated 17th July 1879, the language is referred to simultaneously as *Serbo-Croat* and *Croato-Serbian*. In 1880, Minister Slavi declared to the Austrian delegation that the teaching language in the schools of Bosnia and Herzegovina was '*the Bosnian or Serbo-Croat language of the land*', and the official language used by the lower-rank communal authorities when communicating with the citizens was '*solely Croatian*'. The provisional Rules of Procedure for the authorities of 16. 2. 1879 determined that official correspondence from the level of the district downward and between the Land Government and county authorities and city magistrates was to be conducted in *the Serbo-Croatian language*, whereas communication from the district level upward was to be in the German language. The registry books of government and administrative offices – with the exception of the Praesidial Bureau – were to be kept in *the Serbo-Croat language*" (Okuka 2006: 83).

The designation Serbo-Croatian in the annexed B&H was short-lived. The Austro-Hungarian authorities initiated the project of the Bosnian language as the “language of the land” (that is, the official state language) on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina very forcefully at the time of Kállay. Still, the Cyrillic script fared worse than the language name: “The Cyrillic script was particularly exposed to attacks in B&H following the Austrian occupation. Namely, immediately after the occupation, at the time of the pro-Croatian regime of Josip Filipović, in an order dating from 1879, pertaining to introducing ‘two educational courses for the purpose of learning to read and write the Croatian language using the Latin script’, the sole use of the Latin script was prescribed” (Stančić 1991:122). The Cyrillic script was also banned during the annexation crisis of 1908 and 1909, when this Serbian script was entirely banished from public use.

On the eve of World War One, in the B&H Parliament a debate was conducted anew about adopting the Law on Regulating the Official and Teaching Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which stipulated the use of Serbo-Croatian as the official language (Okuka 2006: 95). “A particular bone of contention was the draft version of the Government’s Decree accompanying the Law, wherein it was stipulated that ‘the official language of the land railways ... was to be German’, and which also contained provisions pertaining to the script” (Okuka 2006: 95). The Law officially proclaimed the equal status of the Cyrillic and the Latin script, but in practice every effort was made to suppress the Cyrillic script. In addition to this, whatever had any connection with the Serb national being was banned (Serbian organisations, periodicals and the like were banned).

1.11. A suitable time for anti-Serb activities ensued **after the assassination of Franz Ferdinand**: a draft was proclaimed, all Serbian societies in **Bosnia and Herzegovina** were disbanded, or in the case of a more lenient treatment, they ceased all their activities. The printing establishments of opposition papers were destroyed, so that Serbian papers stopped being published. Immediately after the beginning of the conscription pro-

cess, all the Serbian schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Slavonia were closed, “and Serbian teachers were thrown into the street... Teaching in Serbian was forbidden. Based on an order of 26th July, traditional Patron Saint’s Day celebrations were expressly abolished from then on. It was even forbidden, by way of an announcement issued by the Government appointee in Sarajevo on 6th August 1915, to wear ‘a Serbian-style’ fur cap, the motivation of which was ‘undoubtedly political in character’” (Ćorović 1996: 151–152).¹⁸

1.12. **The plans for dealing with the Serbs**, and with Serbia as well, are testified to by the attitude of the German Emperor Wilhelm II, expressed in the autumn of 1913, during his meeting with Franz Ferdinand and the Foreign Affairs Minister Leopold von Berchtold: “‘The Slavs are not born to rule but to serve’; he concluded that ‘the relations of Austria-Hungary and Serbia can only be those of the dependence of the weaker side on the stronger one, the way it is with planets.’ If Serbia refuses to obey, he was of the opinion that it should be made to do so.

¹⁸ As regards the attitudes towards the Serbs in B&H, in the article *Persecutions in Bosnia* we find the following: “The ‘Rusko slovo [Russian Letter]’ correspondent in Odessa recently had the opportunity to talk to a reputable Serb from Bosnia who had managed to escape, and who gave him a lot of interesting details about the terrible Austrian regime that our people in this region is subjected to.

The Austrian Government has decided to banish the entire Serbian population from Bosnia and Herzegovina. This order is carried out in such a terrible way that it cannot even be compared to what the worst barbarians from the previous centuries had done. The authorities are doing this so fast that soon there will not be a single Serb left in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The prisons are full and army barracks and schools have been turned into detention centres. Everything in these detention centres has been arranged in such a way as to contribute to the detainees’ death as soon as possible.

An order was issued recently, stating that the Serbian soldiers in the Austrian army were turning themselves in to the enemy en masse as soon as they had the chance. From now on, whoever was caught intent on desertion was to be hanged, and their families, especially wives and children, were to pay large fines” (28. 8. 1916; no. 227. p. 3).

His message to Vienna was condensed in the following words: 'When His Majesty Emperor Franz Joseph demands something, the Serbian Government must obey; should they fail to do so, Belgrade is to be bombarded and kept under siege until the will of His Majesty is done...' (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 46–47). Also, in the days of victory, Wilhelm II stressed that Serbia "must disappear completely": "The circles close to Franz Joseph resolutely adhered to the view that it was not to be allowed 'that anything should remain in the way of a sovereign Serbia'" (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 199), and the functioning of the occupation authority was based on the principle that Serbia was to be destroyed. "According to the wartime proclamation of Franz Joseph, the propaganda accompanying his proclamation was characterised by the slogan: 'Serbia must die!'" (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 106). As it turns out, "...the war was not waged only against Serbia as a state but also against the entire Serbian people" (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 128).

On the occupied territory, all the national institutions were immediately abolished: "Official correspondence with the occupation authorities was solely conducted in the Latin script, and in official acts, orders, decisions, regulations, announcements and correspondence the Serbian language was Croatised. The administrative staff were instructed to act harshly 'so as to break Serbianhood and to destroy its power for as long as possible'... At the same time, there were efforts to incorporate Montenegro in the Monarchy" (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 202). The Bosnian Governor Potiorek was particularly insistent and vocal in this respect, "demanding from the Government in Vienna to close all the Serbs' banking and educational institutions, as well as all their cultural societies, and to abolish the church-school autonomy" (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 81). Austria-Hungary sought the Serbs' greatest and proven enemies to entrust them with the task of implementing its policy: "The position of Governor General was intended for the notorious nobleman General Stjepan Sarkotić, well known for his hostility towards the Serbs" (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 125).

Vienna identified “the destruction of Serbia” with its “vital interests” (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 66), while at the same time “adhering to the view that the independent Serbian state posed a threat to the Monarchy” (ibid.: 67). The only dilemma was what to do with the vanquished adversary: to forcibly destroy and “swallow” the country, make it a part of the Monarchy; or to have it divided by the neighbouring countries among themselves (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 70).

1.13. As can be seen from these examples, the Austro-Hungarian intentions towards Serbia and the Serbian people, as well as their banning of the symbols of the national identity of the Serbs, preceded the First World War and the assassination of Franz Ferdinand by almost 150 years. Immediately before and during the First World War, they only gained in intensity and unscrupulousness.

2. The First World War – the continuation and intensification of activities on the anti-Serb project

2.1. The roots of whatever was manifested during World War One reached much further back into the past, having been manifested, with greater or lesser intensity, throughout the 18th, and especially the 19th century. This policy was directed against the Serbian name, against the law of the people, the language and the church; it was manifested through the prohibition of the Cyrillic script and other symbols of the Serbian identity (names, flags, the coat-of-arms, folk costumes...). All of the above only gained in intensity and exclusionary tendencies at the moment when new (un)favourable conditions prevailed, following the occupation of various territories during the First World War.

2.2. At the time of **the First World War, the Cyrillic script** was officially banned in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia. On the territory of **Croatia**, starting from October 1914, it could only be used in religious education, whereas it was banned in public life (Radojević – Dimić

2014: 135).¹⁹ The Croatian Parliament, on 13th October 1914, passed a decision on banning the Cyrillic script in Croatia: “Thus, as early as 3rd October 1914, the Land Government in Croatia abolished the designation *Croatian or Serbian language* and changed it to *Croatian*. The designation *Croatian or Serbian language*, all of a sudden, became a danger, from the Government’s perspective, to ‘the state-legal significance of the Croatian language’. Based on a new order issued by the Government, dating from 3rd January 1915, the Cyrillic script was abolished in Croatia when it came to the work of the administration” (Okuka 2006: 95).²⁰ In 1914, on 3rd October, through its order no. 25826 the Croatian Government forbade the Cyrillic script in primary schools, and on 13th October it was abolished in secondary schools as well (Ćorović 1996: 152).

2.3. The ban on using the Cyrillic script was transferred onto **Bosnia and Herzegovina** as well. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the relevant order was only issued on 11th November 1915; it completely excluded the Cyrillic script from official communication (Ćorović 1996: 152). The Governor of Bosnia and Herzegovina General Oskar Potiorek demanded of Vienna, in October 1914, a removal of Serbian confessional schools, which was done soon afterwards, following which it was the turn of the Cyrillic script to be removed (Okuka 2006:

¹⁹ “Before the passing of these measures in Croatia, the anti-Serb sentiments assumed increasingly official contours not only in the activities of the authorities in practice but also in the tendencies to sanction it through the language and the provisions regulating the language. The activities of the authorities branched off in three directions: a) banning the work of and abolishing Serbian confessional schools; b) banning the Cyrillic script; c) demands for abolishing the designation Serbo-Croatian language” (Okuka 2006: 95–96).

²⁰ We find similar observations in Ćorović as well: “Based on the order of the Croatian Government of 5th November 1914 no. 28428, the designation ‘Croatian or Serbian’, used until then to refer to the native tongue was reduced to ‘Croatian’. Finally, on 3rd January 1915, based on the Ban’s order no. 8422, the Cyrillic script was abolished in all land offices and administrations” (Ćorović 1996: 152).

96).²¹ The demand for eliminating the designation Serbo-Croatian was unsuccessful, but the Cyrillic script was banned and banished from Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1915. That same year, on 10th November, the Land Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina issued an order on the use of the Cyrillic script in all domains: in written communication and in school (*Glasnik zakona i naredba za Bosnu i Hercegovinu* [*The Laws and Orders Gazette of Bosnia and Herzegovina*], XLIX, 11th November 1915),²² and the Bosnian Parliament passed a decision on

²¹ This undertaking was continued by General Stjepan Sarkotić and his deputy Nikola Mandić: “Mandić was of the opinion that the Serbs should be assimilated into ‘those layers of society faithful to the state’ [...]. He (that is, Sarkotić, J. S.) viewed the Cyrillic script ‘as an important means of combat’ [...]: ‘If we make an effort now to prevent that connection and render that means of combat useless, I think that it can be done in such a way that complete success is likely if we remove the Cyrillic script from public life and divest it of the Serbian national character’ [...]. ‘If, within the framework of our administration, the Cyrillic script as the Serbian national script disappears, it must be thrown out of school as well’ [...].”

General Sarkotić and War Minister Krobotin were insistent in their efforts to persuade Vienna of the need to ban the Cyrillic script in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In September 1915, Krobotin demanded that that not only the Cyrillic script be banned, but also further use of the term *Serbo-Croatian*, and that the former designation *the language of the land* be reintroduced. To him, the designation *Serbian*, if used in any combination whatsoever, constituted an act of *high treason*. And since ‘in the view of South Slavic peoples, the Cyrillic script is an expression of the Serbian language’, then use of the Cyrillic script is an act of high treason, which is why it must be banished. Krobotin proposed that those violating the ban on the use of the Cyrillic script should be fined in the amount of 50 to 1000 kunas” (Okuka 2006: 96–97).

²² “Among other things, the following was stated in it:

- a) ‘All the authorities of Bosnia and Herzegovina, administrative offices and institutes shall solely use the Latin script in written Serbo-Croatian communication.’
- b) ‘In all the teaching institutes of the land where Serbo-Croatian is the teaching language, only the Latin script shall be used.’
- c) ‘The books used in the people’s primary schools that are printed in the Cyrillic script are to be immediately replaced with ones printed in the Latin script.’

banning the Cyrillic script. On that occasion, Stjepan Sarkotić said to the Parliament that “the Serbs in B&H with their Cyrillic script represent a hostile body of the East in the combat zone of the West” (Okuka 2006: 98).

Everything else went alongside the banning of the Cyrillic script. Immediately after the assassination in Sarajevo, there began the persecution of the Serbs in Austria-Hungary, the demolition and looting of their property, the imprisonment of prominent figures, murders, executions by the firing squad and hangings.²³ Based on the Land Government order of 13th/26th October 1914, all the Serbian schools in B&H were closed, whereas the teachers were arrested or banished to their native towns. All the Serbian national associations, political and religious institutions were prohibited from working, Patron Saint’s Day celebrations were abolished, it was even forbidden to wear “Serbian-style” fur caps, the families who “joined the enemy” had their property confiscated. The authorities especially targeted the intelligentsia, particularly priests and teachers (Radić – Isić 2014: 14–15). The Land Government in B&H introduced the right of supervising the church authorities, and on 8th June 1916, forbade “pilgrimages” and any gatherings with large numbers of people (Radić – Isić 2014: 16).²⁴

d) The first year pupils of the Serbian Orthodox faith ‘must immediately stop learning the Cyrillic script’. They may ‘only use that script in religious teaching, and the teaching of that script shall be left over to religious studies teachers’ (Okuka 2006: 98).

²³ During the First World War, a number of “high treason” trials were held in Bosnia and Herzegovina, their basic aim being to destroy all the political, cultural, educational and religious organisations that the Serbian national movement relied on: “In a trial held in Banja Luka, a total of 21 priests were indicted. Lacking evidence, the authorities even indicted some priests of membership in Serbian cultural-educational societies or on account of travelling to Serbia” (Milošević 2015: 163).

²⁴ “The Governor of the country Stjepan Sarkotić said in a public speech of 12th February 1915, addressing the Banja Luka Metropolitan Vasilije Popović: “The clergy, whose vocation it is to cultivate the soul of the people, has poisoned the said soul, and the teaching staff, who have been entrusted with the task of cultivating the spirit, have poisoned that

2.4. Austria-Hungary attacked Serbia with particular vehemence and aggressiveness, then Montenegro as well, indeed, it attacked everything in these parts that bore a Serbian designation. This matter has been written about, be it superficially or in a systematic manner, especially in recent years – at the time of the one hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the First World War. Apart from the data we have found in the relevant literature, for the purposes of this research we have examined a large number of papers, periodical and books that were published during the course of World War One, both those edited and printed by the occupying force and those edited and published by the Serbs, with a view to gaining as accurate an insight into the situation from the direct sources dating from that period as possible. This material is interesting and certainly suitable for gaining a more thorough insight into the situation in the occupied territories, as it contains a wealth of information, data and a memorable picture of the overall atmosphere and many essential details, along with direct testimonies of witnesses. Access to this material has been considerably facilitated in Serbia, as the voluminous World War One sources have been digitalised at the National Li-

spirit. I salute the people, and if it is true that the people has now come to share the responsibility for what has happened, still, the main culprits are those who have led the people astray, priests and teachers' (Bosn. Post, no. 40)" (Ćorović 1996: 154). In the Banja Luka indictment, on pp. 163–4, it is stated: "Through various poems and articles, characterised by tendentiousness, the Serbian population of these parts (Bosnia and Herzegovina) got acquainted with Serbian history, particularly the events pertaining to the former Serbian Empire, Emperor Dušan, Lazar, Serbian heroes, Kraljević Marko, the Battle of Kosovo and prominent figures known for their efforts aimed at establishing Greater Serbia [...]. The court in Bosnia and Herzegovina is entirely in the service of the anti-Serbian policy, as clearly evidenced by a long series of trials [...]. What is of interest in this respect are verdicts against some printed works by certain Serbian and Slovene writers. Vojislav Ilić's *Poems* have been seized for high treason, for 'in these poems the writer points out Serbia's glorious past and its ruin, as well as the fact that parts of the Serbian people under the rule of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy are in servitude [...]" (Ćorović 1996: 156).

brary, thus making them more readily accessible for research purposes. In Montenegro, the material about World War One of this type is mostly to be found in the library “Đurđe Crnojević” in Cetinje, whose staff has kindly placed it at our disposal for research purposes. We have examined both papers published by the occupying force (*Cetinjske novine* [*The Cetinje News*] and *Vjesnik naredaba/Vjesnik naredaba* [*The Orders Gazette*]), as well as *Глас Црногорца* [*The Montenegrin's Voice*], which was published clandestinely. As these newspaper reports are very interesting, significant, representative and illustrative, we have decided to present as many of them as possible in their original form. We are of the opinion that, in this way, the intentions of the occupying force can best be presented, as well as the manner in which the enemy dealt with everything that had a Serbian designation. In addition to this, the material that we present here has not been published up to now, which is why it is of particular importance to present it to the readers, so that it can serve for gaining a deeper and more thorough insight into wartime events, which were accompanied or preceded by political and ideological passions, especially directed at the language, script, education and other national symbols.

2.4.1. After Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the persecution and prohibition of the Cyrillic script were transferred into **Serbia and Montenegro**. In Serbia, the Cyrillic script was banned in public use immediately following the occupation, in early 1916, and that same year it was banned in Montenegro as well. Among other things, boards with Cyrillic inscriptions were removed from public places. The ban on the use of the Cyrillic script lasted until the liberation in 1918.

Along with the banishment of the Cyrillic script, thousands of people from Serbia and Montenegro were interned in camps on the territory of Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria. The Cyrillic script was abolished in public use, as were school textbooks in Serbian, which were replaced by Croatian textbooks, and teachers were also brought over from Croatia. Bulgaria initiated the

killing or internment of Serbian priests and introduced its own school (Ilić–Marković 2014: 80). “Schools were opened for ‘children of obligatory school age’ wherein they were taught by Croatian teachers who were freed from the obligation of doing their military service”, as it says in *The Serbian Herald* (no. 78: 2).

On the territory of Serbia, the occupying authorities were engaged in the harshest reprisals: both in terms of their attitude towards the people and their lives, and also concerning the script and the language, educational-cultural activities, as well as national characteristics overall.

“In order to frighten the people, the Germans killed a lot of people to begin with. As if even that was not enough for them, they exiled all men aged 15-50 to Austria and Germany. I’m telling you, sir: today, Serbia is a land of women and small children. There are no adult males here!

Lest the land should remain untilled, the German brought Russian prisoners over to Serbia to work the land. It is not known precisely how many of them there are, but I think the actual number is not below 70,000.

All priests were interned in Bulgaria or Austria. The essential rites, if anyone cares about them, are performed by the army priests of Austrian Serbs...” (*The Serbian Herald*, 5th May 1916: 3).²⁵

A “Journal de Genève” correspondent describes the situation in Serbia in the following manner:

“The little news we get from Serbia is very discouraging. In Belgrade, there is one paper being published in the Latin script, three times a week, informing the population about the victories of the German and Turkish armies. Through its articles, the paper tries to convince the population, suffering the hell of the darkest slavery imaginable, that they have nothing left to hope for...

The victors are opening schools, but they are banning all Serbian books, the way they have banned all the holy Serbian traditions.

²⁵ In an article published in *The Serbian Herald* (28. 8. 1916; no. 227. p. 3) entitled *The Persecution of Serbs*, it says: “The Novi Sad paper ‘Ujvidéki Hírlap’ reports from Zagreb that the office and the estate of Giga Aranicki, a wealthy lawyer from Sremska Mitrovica, have been confiscated after it was found out that the Serbs had set him free after capturing him, so that he did not suffer the way other captured Austro-Hungarian officers did...”

To this moral suffering one should add the physical misery of the population dying of hunger: they have taken all foodstuffs from them, driven them out of their homes, from which they have taken pieces of furniture, beds, blankets etc.” (*The Serbian News*, no. 126, 1916: 2).²⁶

2.4.2. To begin with, all the **papers and periodicals** that were published in Serbia were banned²⁷ (some continued to be published abroad), and the Austro-Hungarian authorities started publishing *The Belgrade News*, the aim of which was to publish Austro-Hungarian propaganda in Serbia. The first issue came out on 15th December 1915 (the editorial board, management and printing press being located at no. 26, Vuka Karadžića Street, Belgrade), was written using the Ijekavian dialect and vocabulary, and the hyper-Ijekavian dialect, which was dominant on the territory of Croatia.²⁸

²⁶ In *The Serbian Herald* (no. 202, Thessaloniki, Wednesday 8th August 1916, vol. 1), in the article entitled *The Hungarian Language in Serbia*, we find: “Things are not going well for the Habsburg Monarchy [...]

Its generals and ministers are rushing in all directions, and the whole world awaits with interest to find out what fateful decisions they will pass for the salvation of this ruined country, or at least to minimise the damage.

The report is as follows: it has been decided to introduce the Hungarian language as the official one in Serbia, currently occupied by the Austro-Hungarian forces.

Such a decision, comical as it is, on the verge of death, is truly worthy of Austro-Hungarian statesmen.”

²⁷ The Serbian army in Skadar tried to continue publishing papers for the purpose of publishing wartime reports (after being in Skadar for a month). Thus an issue of *Vesnik [Herald]* came out on 17th December 1915 (announcing that it would come out every second day), wherein it is said that Skadar is very poorly stocked when it comes to technical equipment, as evidenced by the letters used for printing: “The lack of Cyrillic and Latin letters forces us to print ‘Vesnik’ using the letters that the only printing establishment in Skadar has at its disposal. Our readers will find this tiresome while reading...” (*Vesnik*, vol. I, no. 1, p. 1).

²⁸ Just as *Cetinjske novine* was published in Cetinje, *Beogradske novine* was published in Serbia under occupation, both being treated as Austro-Hungarian publications.

In the article entitled *The Situation in Belgrade*, it says: “Most citizens find employment in administration: some as interpreters, others

The Serbian Herald writes about a pretentious manner of reporting, a false representation of the situation in Serbia and on the battlefield, on media torture perpetrated through *The Belgrade News*, about “the terrible language” that the paper is written in:

“The Belgrade News’ is the only paper being published in Belgrade. It is printed in the Croatian and the German language. It is full of invective directed against the Serbian Government and filled with lies and slanderous claims... This paper has managed to misinform the people, in co-operation with other agents, planting the news that King Petar has died, the Government members have all been killed, that the entire army has been captured, that no soldiers have managed to save themselves [...]. In order to prove that people are satisfied with the new situation in Serbia, the military and civil authorities have been ordered to organise rallies in the countryside and to send gratitude statements to the civil Governor in Belgrade. All those statements, put together following a formula, praise the new social order in Serbia, manifest their satisfaction, pray to God for the Emperor’s health and curse the Government of the Kingdom of Serbia, which has brought all that evil upon them [...].

Written in a horrible ‘Croatian language’, impossible and incomprehensible to the local readers, the paper is printed in the official ‘Belgrade News’, and is subsequently translated and reprinted using the German print, to be presented to foreign readers in order to show the Kulturträger role of the new regime. [...] All newspapers, all printed matter must be seized at the border crossing. Thus, no news can reach Serbia from anywhere in the world [...]”, (*The Serbian Herald* 1916/114: 2).

2.4.3. That was also how things unfolded in **Montenegro**, which capitulated in early January 1916 and was forced to sign an unconditional peace treaty (as offered by Austria-Hungary). All the papers there stopped being published (formerly printed in the Cyrillic script, with the exception of *The Montenegrin’s Voice*, which continued being printed in the Cyrillic script clandestinely in Neuilly, near Paris, and after that in Rome). Instead of the former local papers, there appeared occupation

as clerks, municipal staff members, workers in the electrical equipment factory, streetcar attendants, in printing establishments as translators, and finally in taverns and kitchens, where the patrons usually drink coffee and read Croatian, Hungarian and German newspapers” (*The Serbian Herald*, no. 78, p. 2).

ones: *Cetinjske novine* (started coming out on 7th September 1916, ceased on 19th October 1918), *Ilustrovane cetinjske novine* ([*The Illustrated Cetinje News*] a literary supplement to *Cetinjske novine*), *Vijesnik naredaba* [*The Orders Gazette*], *Najnovije vijesti* [*The Latest News*], all printed, from the first issue to the last one, to the very last letter, in the Latin script (in Cetinje, in the printing establishment of the Army General Gubernatorial Office for Montenegro).²⁹ *Vijestnik naredaba* / *Вижестник наредоба* was the only one to be printed, in 1916, using both scripts (the Latin one on the left-hand page, the Cyrillic one on the right-hand page), but as of January 1917, it was printed using the Latin script only. As regards the vocabulary, it was generally of the kind which is dominant in the region of Croatia (*zaklad* [foundation], *šport* [sport], *športne zabave* [sports entertainment], *obznana* [announcement], *vijećnik* [councilor]...), until “siječanj [January]” 1917. In *Cetinjske novine*, they also used the Croatian names for the months of the year: *rujan* [September], *listopad* [October] etc. Many Serbian schools were closed, while Albanian ones were opened (*The Montenegrin's Voice* 1917/16: 3).³⁰

2.4.4. After a short **occupation of Belgrade** (which lasted fifteen days), the occupying forces clearly manifested their intentions right from the start. They immediately issued the order to replace Cyrillic street names with Latin ones. In J. Miodragović's diary (printed in 1915), it is stated:

“One day, the following order arrived at the municipal office: all street names were to be written in the Latin script. The reason they gave was that their soldiers could not read the Cyrillic

²⁹ “The Army Gubernatorial Office never entrusted anyone outside the armed forces with the task of editing these papers” (Martinović 1965: 207).

³⁰ In an article entitled *Newspapers in Cetinje*, in *Greater Serbia* we read: “In Cetinje, the Austrian authorities also publish ‘Crnogorski Glasnik [The Montenegrin Herald]; which was printed half in the Cyrillic script, half in the Latin one six months ago, and is now printed in the Latin script only. The editor-in-chief is a Croat, Dr. Juraj Kumičić” (*Greater Serbia*, no. 29: 2).

script. When we read this, we looked at one another and communicated with our eyes, and decided *not to obey that order*.

However, it was easy to make that decision, but how do we maintain it and how do we defend ourselves; what reason shall we give?

And this group of 15-20 people of very diverse professions found one in no time: there is no craftsman capable of doing that, and we have no money to pay him anyway, so this cannot be done [...].

And so, as this was near the end of their rule, this is how things remained. They did not insist anyway. And so no trace of their rule was left in Belgrade. Otherwise, it would seem to everyone that they were returning to a foreign, desecrated Belgrade” (Miodragović 1915: 70–71).

Consequently, the Austrian authorities, even during this very brief occupation of Belgrade, immediately attempted to banish the Cyrillic script. During the occupation, their conduct was increasingly brutal and far-reaching. Right after the beginning of the occupation, the Austro-Hungarian authorities issued an order on banning the Cyrillic script. In this document (written in German, we present a translation of it into Serbian) on **abolishing the Cyrillic script** on the territory of Serbia after the occupation, it is stated:

K. u. k. (Kaiserlich und königlich) Army General Governorate in Serbia

Department 8 no. 597 sector 1916

Re:

The abolition of the Cyrillic script

For:

Belgrade, 12th June 1916

The AHC (Army High Command) herewith intends to abolish entirely the use of the modern Cyrillic script in official communication and in public life within the Army General Governorate in Serbia, possibly as early as 1st January 1917.

Therefore, from the beginning of the new school year, only the Latin script will be taught in all schools.

As opposed to the above, the Old Slavic script used by the Orthodox Church and Orthodox Catechism shall be retained.

The district commands and the bridgehead command in Belgrade shall submit a report by 15th October this year on whether the abolition of the modern Cyrillic script is practically feasible by the deadline referred to above in view of the situation in the

country, and whether it would be appropriate from a political perspective in view of the attitude of the population.

This is addressed to all district commands, the bridgehead command in Belgrade and the district command of the city of Belgrade. On behalf of the Governorate: Signed...

(This document on the abolition of the Cyrillic script is kept at the Archive of Serbia as part of the holdings on the Army General Governorate in Serbia 1915–1918, the Political Department – 8, volume II, document 38, abridged format: the Archive of Serbia, AGG 1915–1918 holdings, PD – 8, vol. II, 38).

The order on abolishing the Cyrillic script was implemented in the field, of which we find testimony in many periodicals and newspapers. In *The Serbian Herald*, we find the following in connection with the banning of the Cyrillic script: “From Viennese papers we find out that Austrians have banned the use of the Cyrillic script in Serbia. Also, it is forbidden to send by post any printed matter written in Cyrillic letters. Violation of this order is punishable by 1 to 5 years of imprisonment, based on a law passed on 5th May 1869” (*The Serbian Herald* 1916/54: 3).

Beogradske novine reports on 7th March 1916 on the introduction of private **postal communication**, noting that the use of the Cyrillic script is strictly forbidden: “Yesterday, on Monday, an important event took place. As we have reported elsewhere, the empire and royal military post office of the 1st class in the occupied territories is now open to private communication... The address must be written in the German, Croato-Serbian or Hungarian language. *The use of the Cyrillic script is forbidden*” (*Beogradske novine* 1916/29: 3).³¹

³¹ Intimidation, as well as propaganda to the effect that no letters written in the Serbian language will be delivered led many Serbs to start writing letters in the Bulgarian and the German language, which was exposed to vigorous criticism from the Serbian side: “It has been observed lately among our people, and this is something that can be exploited to a great degree by our enemies, and to an even greater degree, it can offend the national sensitivity of our far-off and generous allies, who, not knowing the cause of this phenomenon, could be very easily led to conclude: despite all the misery that has befallen us, we still cultivate some affection for those wrongdoers who are enjoying themselves in our beautiful Serbia in the role of conquerors.

2.4.5. In the territories occupied by Bulgaria, the treatment of the local population was the same, only, it would appear, even more merciless and vehement:

“The areas occupied by the Bulgarians were headed by the Military Governor, and the power was solely in the hands of the Bulgarians. The people making up the clerical staff were all brought over from Bulgaria [...] and Bulgarian teachers were brought over and entrusted with the task of carrying out Bulgarisation. In the schools that were obligatory for Serbian children, the teaching was conducted solely in the Bulgarian language. The teaching of history and geography was subjugated to Bulgarian propaganda. Scientists were entrusted with the task of ‘proving’ the ethnic, linguistic, historical and geographical affiliation of ‘the Bulgarian Morava Basin’ and that Macedonia belonged to Bulgaria. What was exposed to pressure was the national consciousness and identity of the Serbian people. In order to destroy the Serbian intelligentsia, many teachers, professors, priests, clerks and politicians were arrested [...].

The use of Serbian first names, as well as inscriptions in the Serbian language and the language itself, were forbidden,

This has to do with the fact that our people write to one another in Serbia in the Bulgarian, and especially in the German language. Since some sort of connection with Serbia was established, someone has skillfully persuaded our people that we should correspond in German and Bulgarian, and that will do. We have all seen that this is not so, but the habit to light a candle for the Devil has remained, that is, to correspond amongst ourselves in Bulgarian and German. Even though, due to the fact that the Jerries are our close neighbours, the German language is taught in our schools and a great many lessons are dedicated to this, still, not very many of our people can write in German, so they ask a friend or an acquaintance to write a postcard for them with a view to getting whatever information they can about those close to them that they left behind in the Homeland. It is clear to each and every Serb why he corresponds like this, but it is not so widely known that this lenient attitude of ours makes our enemies laugh, while it inspires a feeling of resignation in our friends. At first glance, this seems a trivial matter, but this is not really so, for even in the most cultured man, at certain moments, some feelings overpower all the others, and when it comes to patriotism, there are no trivial matters under such circumstances.

Therefore, let us write in Serbian only, be it in the Cyrillic or in the Latin script, for a great many of our people have adopted the latter alphabet (The Serbian Herald, 1/172: 3, Monday, 4th July 1916).

and textbooks in the Serbian language were systematically destroyed. Serbs were given new surnames, while new-born babies were given Bulgarian names. Serbian churches were first desecrated, following which Bulgarian priests were brought to them. The celebration of Patron Saint's Day was forbidden" (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 205).³²

In *Srbobran* ([literally: *Serbianhood Defender*] a popular Serbian periodical and an organ of the Serbian Association Slo-ga [Unity], New York), in May 1916, there is a testimony of the great suffering of Serbs at the hands of Bulgarians, who were intent on ethnically cleansing Macedonia of Serbs. Priests and

³² However, **Bulgaria** was also divested of its historical heritage, regardless of the fact that it was an ally, which clearly shows the aims of the Austro-Hungarian, first of all Austrian policy. In an article entitled *Street Names in Sofia*, we find: "The city administration of Sofia passed a decision, in the course of its last session, to call one of the city's streets Vienna Street and another Berlin Street" (*Beogradske novine*, 20th February 1916, no. 22, p. 3). In an article entitled *The Germanisation of Bulgarians*, we read: "What the Bulgarians achieved through their alliance with the Germans is that the latter Germanise them in the speediest way possible, and this German flood can only be driven out of Bulgaria with the help of an allied army" (*The Serbian Herald*, no. 214, p. 3).

A correspondent of the Hungarian paper "Az Újság" published his notes on the Germanisation of Bulgarians, which show, in his own words, to what extent the Bulgarian officials managed to subject their country to the influence of Vienna and Berlin: "Wherever you go in Sofia, you encounter a German. In Marie Louise Street and in Commerce Street, the majority of apprentices are German, many German traders have opened shops in the centre of the city, and in all shops you see a notice saying: 'German spoken here', 'Everything here is German' and 'German school for children'.

Newspapers are full of advertisements for German or Austro-Hungarian shops. In the streets, you only hear German spoken. German flags flutter everywhere, and German soldiers guard the German headquarters, located opposite the royal court.

The description published in 'Az Újság' finishes in the following manner: 'It seems as if a German Niagara has flooded Bulgaria' (*The Serbian Herald*, no. 214, p. 3).

Greater Serbia had this to say on the above phenomenon: "All Bulgarians look suspicious to Germans. All public meetings, political discussions in bars and restaurants are strictly forbidden..." (*Greater Serbia*, Solin, 14th April 1916, no. 5, vol. I, p. 1).

teachers were the first to suffer the consequences of their intent: they were “symbolically” sent off on trips in order to be killed under the slogan “gone to Sofia”, which meant “on the way to his death”, “liquidation”:

“Refugees from Bitolj and its environs say that the Bulgarian authorities ordered the population to report themselves for the purpose of conducting a census. Immediately afterwards, an order was issued to send all Serbs who had come there from the old Kingdom of Serbia to Sofia. This meant that all priests and teachers were to go there. It is believed that none of them ever reached Sofia, they were all slaughtered on the way there. The Bulgarians themselves boasted that this order to send Serbs to Sofia was a hint that they were to be slaughtered. So, now when they say of someone who is absent that ‘he is on his way to Sofia’, that means that the Bulgarians have liquidated him [...]. In this way, the Bulgarians are paving the way for the final settling of Balkan affairs. They wish to completely annihilate the Serbian name in those parts of Serbia that they intend to take over, so that, whatever happens at the end of the war, they will go to the European Congress and say: ‘Just take a look and see! There are no Serbs in these parts, only Bulgarians!’ After all this, we must say that we feel some regret for so bitterly accusing the Turks on account of their harsh rule over Serbia during the course of five hundred years” (*Srbobran* 1916; Dr Nikolaj Velimirović: 1916).

2.4.6. The new authorities also changed Cyrillic inscriptions and street names (and even the names of some cities):³³ “The ‘Berliner Tageblatt’ reports that the streets of Smederevo have been given different names, German ones, such as Goethe Street, Stettin Street, Brandenburg Street, etc.” (*The Serbian*

³³ We find information on this in *The Serbian Herald* (30th July 1916, no. 197: 2) in the article entitled *The Situation in Serbia*: “The Bucharest correspondent of the English paper ‘The Near East’ describes the situation in occupied Serbia according to the account of a Romanian who has recently arrived in Bucharest from Serbia: ‘Belgrade has regained its former appearance to a degree even though enemy troops are stationed in it. The Austrians have seen to it that it gets a certain new colour and spared themselves the inconvenience of encountering Serbian features at every step. That is why they ordered that shop labels be changed, that hotels get different names, etc. Thus, for example, the restaurant ‘The Russian Emperor’ is now called ‘The Emperor Franz Joseph Hall’, and so forth.”

Herald 1916/2: 2); the “Pošta [Post Office]” hotel was formerly called “Serbia” (*Greater Serbia*, no. 29: 2); “on the basis of a decree, Kriva Palanka [literally: Crooked Small Town] was renamed Krivorečna [River bend] Palanka” (*The Serbian Herald*, no. 35, 2). The Solun [Thessaloniki] Hotel, in the immediate vicinity of the railway station, was renamed “Hotel Wien” (*The Belgrade News*, 23rd January 1917, no. 41: 4).

There are many deeply disturbing testimonies about the abolition of the Cyrillic script to be found. The notes of Luka Lazarević³⁴ offer a striking representation of the sheer amount of intolerance and aggression manifested by the occupying forces towards the Cyrillic script:

“The Cyrillic script is no more. Hatred towards the Serbs and everything that bears a Serbian name led the Austrians to erase the Cyrillic script the moment they entered Belgrade. No Cyrillic inscription or label was tolerated anywhere. An order was issued to break all the boards bearing the name of city streets. The inscription ‘Miša Anastasijević to his Fatherland’ was taken off the University building’. All the Cyrillic shop labels had to be replaced by Latin ones [...]. Whoever had a Cyrillic inscription on his house facing the street had to destroy it. They climbed to the top of the Rossia building in order to destroy the inscription on it..

The Latin script is in offices, schools, the post office and telegraph – everywhere. No Cyrillic script writing is accepted anywhere. Obituary notices are printed in the Latin script...” (Lazarević 2010: 127).

No less intolerance was shown by the occupying forces towards Serbian and Russian **street names**, of which Luka Lazarević also provides testimony in his *Notes*, in a section entitled *Street Names*:

“With a lot of confidence in their ability to keep what they have conquered, convinced that Belgrade would certainly remain in their hands, and possibly a part of Serbia as well –

³⁴ Luka Lazarević (1857–1936), historian and philologist, teacher and principal in Serbian grammar schools, Chairman of the Serbian Teachers’ Association, author of a number of books, published these writings in 1919, immediately after the war (according to: Gordana Ilić-Marković).

the Austro-Hungarians managed to di-vest even the streets of Belgrade of their names... If only they had given that task to a smart man, but no, they gave it to a nincompoop. The selection of street names is highly indicative of their godfather's level of intelligence. Karadorđeva Street was renamed *Donja* [Lower] Street. Kralja Petra Street was renamed *Saborna* [Council] Street. Vase Čarapića Street was renamed *Vatrogasna* [Fire Brigade] Street. Vaznesenska [Ascension] Street was rena-med *Old Church Street*.

The flat Lomina Street was renamed – God only knows why – Bregovita [Hill] Street. Molerova Street became – *Vrtljanska* [Gardening] Street (whatever is this supposed to mean?). Aleksandar Square, named after the heir to the throne, was given back the name *Terazije* [Scales].

One street came to be called *Šljivarska* [Plum-Growers'] Street (and there is not a single plum-tree in it). Another one was called *Slepa* [Cul-de-sac] Street. And there is one called *Tamna* [Dark] Street.

The names of streets are written on street corners (naturally, in the Latin script), on the walls, using black colour, and in places a blue builder's pencil. How ugly many street names are! The Hungarian or German who wrote those names did it the wrong way, the way they mistakenly pronounce them" (Lazarević 2010: 117).

The attempt to ban the Cyrillic script did not bypass **the church** either: "The official language in the occupied regions was German... The army High Command did not issue any special orders concerning the use of the script for church purposes. Analogously to the orders on banning the Cyrillic script, some clerks in the military administration maintained that **the Latin script had to be used in church**, but the clergy did not adhere to this... The church administration had to use the Latin script at first (for correspondence, keeping the protocols and accounting books). In April 1917, the use of the Cyrillic script was allowed, both for the internal and external church administration..." (Radić – Isić 2014: 94).

2.4.7. After the occupation of **Montenegro** in 1916, the Austrian authorities, based on the order of Governor General Victor Weber (no. E 1873 ex 16. Ž. K.) of 18th September 1916 (according to: Brajović 2005: 171), **forbade the use of the Cyrillic script** in schools, institutions and postal communica-

tions; they also excluded folk epic poems, patriotic poems and the subject Serbian History from the school curricula (Matović 2014: 26). School documentation and public correspondence, with negligible exceptions, had to be in the Latin script: school certificates were written in it, as were school curricula, various lists, acts; even church correspondence was conducted in the Latin script; some high priests (Bishop Kiril, for example) wrote (and signed) their letters in the Latin script (the Archive of the Budimlje-Nikšić Bishopric, to which we were kindly allowed access by Professor Veselin Matović).³⁵

Regarding the education and the alphabet to be used in Montenegro, in *The Belgrade News*, which was published in the Serbian language in Vienna, it says that **the name of the language** in Montenegro is – **Croatian**: “As early as the spring, new textbooks and curricula were prepared, following the Austrian role model, and in September all primary schools could start teaching using them. In Old Montenegro, Montenegrin teachers were appointed to teach the Croatian language, and in New Montenegro Austrian and Hungarian teachers were to do so (our emphasis!). [...] The Cyrillic script will only be retained in religious education, while the Latin script will be used in the

³⁵ The school curricula were adapted to those from Croatia or taken over from Croatia; literary events were held in Cetinje, mostly to do with Croatian writers. The theatrical and musical repertoire of the time was mostly made up of contents from Austria-Hungary and its allies. *Cetinjske novine* published cultural programmes on a daily basis, and we could not find any Serbian contents (or Montenegrin ones, for that matter) there: there were no *gusle* [a folk string instrument used to accompany epic poetry recitals, *translator’s note*] recitals to be found (we can only imagine how much the inhabitants of Cetinje enjoyed such cultural programmes). We find evidence of this in *Cetinjske novine*, which published information on cultural-artistic programmes and repertoire.

An official ID (that of Petar Radović, the Municipality of Cetinje, for example) dating from the time of the Austro-Hungarian occupation, issued in 1916 by the military gubernatorate in Montenegro, contains the following information: nationality and faith – Serbian, Orthodox (a Serb of the Orthodox faith), all written in the Latin script (*The Montenegrin* 38: 5).

other subjects” (in: Reichpost, Wien, 8. 11. 1916, p. 15; Pester Lloyd, Budapest, 5. 11. 1916, p. 8.).³⁶

The Belgrade News, in an article entitled *Newspapers in Cetinje*, reports on the occupiers’ intention to publish a newspaper in the Croatian language, whose aim it will be to teach the people of Montenegro the Latin script, which, as they say, is little known here. For the first six months, the paper will be published using both the Latin and the Cyrillic script, in two columns, and after this period it will contain the Latin script only (presumably they envisaged that the people would need that long to get used to the Latin script and learn it):

“The following report comes from the seat of the wartime press: in a few days, a paper will start being published in Cetinje; its aim will be to inform the local population about the actual situation in all battlefields and to gradually explain the order established in Austria-Hungary and in the occupied territories; another aim will be to inform the public in the Monarchy and in neutral states about the relations in Montenegro. At the same time, this paper will serve the purpose of teaching the Latin script, which is little known in this country. The editor-in-chief is Dr Juraj Kumičić. The paper will be printed **in the Latin script** (our emphasis!), at first using a two-column page; one column will be printed in the Latin script, the other using Cyrillic letters. After six months, the paper will be printed in the Latin script only, which the readership is warned about in the sample issue. The paper will be publishing advertisements as well” (*Beogradske novine*, 12. 03. 1916: 2).

However, as we have seen, from the very first issue (7th rujan [September] 2016) *Cetinjske novine* was published in the Latin script only, whereas *Vjesnik naredaba/Vjesnik naredaba* entirely switched to the Latin script in January 1917.

The attitude towards the Serbian language and the Cyrillic script was particularly manifest in **the educational system**. The Cyrillic script was banned in schools. In addition to the use of the Latin script, learning the German and the Hungarian lan-

³⁶ This information, quoted from a newspaper article, was sent to us by our colleague Gordana Ilić-Marković, who had gained insight into *Beogradske novine*, which was published in German in Vienna. We are also grateful to her for translating this quote from German into Serbian.

guage also became obligatory. The teaching staff was replaced, in some cases even by Austro-Hungarian non-commissioned officers (corporals), (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 199).

The Governor justified the order about the compulsory use of the Latin script by the need to facilitate the communication between the occupiers and the enslaved people to the benefit of both. Reportedly, “not knowing the local script made the work of the Austrian organs more difficult, and thereby resolving the citizens’ petitions and other issues was more difficult as well” (Rakočević 1997: 1250).

Postal communications also had to be conducted in the Latin script. We find the following about that in *The Orders Gazette*: “First of all, it is ordered that, in communication with Germany and the general Governorate in Warsaw – until further notice – only the German language may be used. K. und K. military high command” (*Vjesnik naredaba*, 8th January 1917). Later on, we find: “For postal dispatches sent from Montenegro to a foreign country, the Hungarian language may also be used as of now. K. und K. military high command” (*Vjesnik naredaba*, 13th March 1917)... And finally: “Only the use of German, Hungarian, Bulgarian Turkish and French is allowed. The German or the Latin alphabet must be used for writing letters (*Vjesnik naredaba* of May 1917, regarding postal communication. Item 6, p. 14). The same policy was pursued in Serbia, the conclusion being: the use of the Cyrillic script is banned (*Beogradske novine* 1916: 3).

2.4.8. When opening **schools** and organising the educational system in **Serbia**, the occupying forces also strove to leave nothing to chance and to place everything in the service of the Austro-Hungarian policy.

As we find in *The Serbian Herald*, “the opening of **schools** has started. An order has been issued stating that all primary-school-age children must attend school. The teachers in these schools are Croatians who have been discharged from the army and sent to teach the Croatian language, using Croatian textbooks. Schools have also been opened in some towns

in the countryside. The Croatian language is replacing the Serbian language everywhere. Apart from Croatian, German is also taught as an obligatory subject. It has been ordered that Hungarian be introduced in grammar schools in addition to the two languages referred to above as an obligatory subject” (*Srpski glasnik*, no 114, Thessaloniki, Thursday 5th May 1916).

The educational system that existed in the Governorate was developed in the document *The Basic Principles for Establishing Primary and Secondary Schools in the Occupied Region of Serbia*, precisely detailing the curriculum, the make-up of the teaching staff and the teaching language: “Serbian teachers and professors could not get employed in such schools. Only catechism, ethics and church singing were taught by Serbian priests, and the supervisory organ was made up of Austro-Hungarian army priests. In mid-January 1916, the occupation authorities prepared a plan for opening primary and secondary schools in Serbia. The curriculum forbade the use of the Cyrillic script, which caused a shortage of textbooks, for even Serbian textbooks from Vojvodina, written in the Cyrillic script and approved on the territory of the Monarchy, were not allowed in Serbia” (Radić – Isić 2014: 87).

Schools were opened with a view to re-educating Serbian children, and also distancing them from the Serbian national symbols, even though the authorities strove to present the situation differently. According to these reports, Serbian schools had taught children the wrong history and culture, placing school in the service of politics, poisoning young souls, so that the occupying forces’ school would give them the right knowledge and culture. *The Belgrade News* reports on the on the enthusiasm and joy of the Serbian people on account of the opening of schools (complete with the Austrian national symbols), on tears of joy shed by Serbian mothers, which really sounds too unconvincing, false and malicious. This is best evidenced by the justification of the occupation authorities, published in *The Belgrade News*, as part of an article entitled *The First Primary Schools Open in Belgrade*:

“We had nice spring weather on Thursday, 10th February, at ten o'clock in the morning, on the occasion of a ceremonial opening of the first primary school in Belgrade, in the presence of Honourable Army Governor General, Field Lieutenant Marshal Count Salis-Seewis. Many people had gathered in front of the school, as did many, many children. On the school building there hung two great black-and-yellow imperial flags, and in front of the school gates there was a military band of the Vienna Infantry Regiment... When Mr Governor General arrived in a car, the band played the *imperial anthem*, which all those present listened to with their heads uncovered. This was a very impressive moment, and many a mother barely hid her tears [...].

The tenth of February will be written in gold letters in the cultural history of Belgrade. On that day, in the presence of Honourable Army Governor General, Count Salis-Seewis, the first primary school was ceremonially opened in Belgrade.

That day is not so important because, after a long break, the first primary school was opened in Belgrade after the occupation, but because the school that was opened was entrusted with the task of giving children real knowledge, real culture. Serbian schools, especially during the reign of Petar Karađorđević, did not properly understand this task.

Everything in Serbia, even schools, has been placed in the service of politics. Teachers were not educators of children, but political agitators who poisoned immature and impressionable young souls entrusted to them, just as Petar Karađorđević and his ministers poisoned the whole people and led it onto the path of ruin for the whole country. In the introductory section we already spoke about this agitation, we mention it here only because of this connection.

No one can deny the effective knowledge of Serbian teachers, but their activities have been limited from the very start, for they only pursued certain political aims. Let us give but one example: children in Serbian schools were taught a mercilessly deformed history, as a result of which children received a completely wrong notion of their country's mission and various possibilities that could arise out of this. The only ones who were successful in this domain were the friends of a Princip or a Čubrilović. Naturally, things being the way they are, there was little time left for real cultural work. As the high and mighty of Serbia had money for anything but schools, Serbian education was left far, far behind the education in the neighbouring Monarchy” (*Beogradske novine*, 13th February 1916, no. 19: 1).

Striving to win over the people, the occupiers blame the Serbian authorities for the “illiteracy” and “wrong education” of children, as well as personal gain and failing to provide funds for education:

“We would not even think of blaming the Serbian people, misled by its leaders and very much pressed upon, for the deplorable cultural situation, reflected in the figures referred to above. The responsibility for that falls upon those whose coterie-oriented politics and coterie-based management of the country hid the fact that in this small country the pensions of former ministers and high-ranking state officials amounted to more than what was provided for education overall. But precisely because of the fact that a conscientious ruler takes responsibility for the fate of the people, as well as its education, one of the first and greatest concerns of the imperial and royal military general Governorate was to provide the Serbian youth, the foundation of the future of the Serbian people, after wartime years, during which cultural efforts had to falter out of necessity, with the benefits of regular education at school as soon and as abundantly as possible” (*Beogradske novine*, no. 24, 24th February 1916, vol. II, pp. 1–2).

At the same time, in *The Belgrade News*, the occupying authorities hypocritically attempted to justify and praise their crimes to high heaven, presenting themselves as the saviours of the people, full of love and care:

“The thousands of children, to whom their putative ‘enemy’ opens the door of a temple of knowledge and skills, caring for them lovingly and having honest, conscientious and self-sacrificing teachers lead them through their first steps in life in their native tongue, will, according to the intentions of Honourable Army Governor General, Count Salis-Seewis so succinctly stated on the occasion of the opening of the first primary school in Belgrade – **become fully educated people one day**. They should learn to look at life with a clear gaze, to understand it with an enlightened mind and to respect and cherish the blessings of serious and reasonable work aimed at the true benefit of the people, and then the Serbian people will be able to look forward to a better and happier future with calm confidence” (*Beogradske novine* 1916/19: 1).³⁷

³⁷ From to a threatening and compulsory invitation for enrolment in schools published in *The Belgrade News*, it is evident how important it was to the occupiers to educate (that is to say, to re-educate) Serbian children: “All the pupils attending secondary schools (Realschules,

The real picture, however, of the opening of schools in Serbia is to be found in *The Serbian Herald*. Throughout the country, Serbian children were forced to attend schools, which were opened in order to spread the regime propaganda: "...and schools started being opened. An order was issued stating that all primary-school-age children had to attend school. **Croatian teachers** who were discharged from the army teach in those schools were used to teach **the Croatian language, using Croatian textbooks**. Schools have also been opened in some cities in the countryside. The Croatian language is replacing the Serbian language everywhere. Alongside Croatian, **German is also taught as an obligatory subject**. As regards grammar schools, an order was issued to introduce, in addition to the two languages mentioned above, **the Hungarian language** as an obligatory one" (*Srpski glasnik*, 1916/114: 2). We find similar information in Luka Lazarević's notes: "Primary schools. No former Belgrade teacher has been engaged to teach, even though there were quite a few to be found in Belgrade, both older and younger ones, more than twenty in all... They brought in some teacher rejects – and who knows if they were teachers at all! – from various cities in Croatia and Hungary" (Lazarević 2010: 114).

As is confirmed by the texts published in *The Serbian Herald*, children were sent to schools under great pressure and threats, and they were taken to Belgrade by train from various Serbian cities so that the schools could be filled, if only partially:

"Towards the end of December, the Austrian authorities in Belgrade issued strict orders, threatening big fines, inviting

grammar schools, commercial schools, as well as those attending teacher training schools, vocational and craftsmanship schools) from Belgrade should immediately report, submitting their school certificates, to the city council, Makenzijeva Street no. 40. The pupils who are outside Belgrade at the moment are to be reported by their relatives, who should submit their school certificates if possible. Those who fail to do so within three days of the publication of this announcement shall be punished. Belgrade, 4th March 1916, K. und K. district commander Major Franz, in his own hand" (*Beogradske novine*, 5th March 1916, no. 28, p. 2).

the population to report all children of school age and those who had attended primary school for enrolment, as they were to continue attending school, or so they claimed. In the issue of the Zagreb periodical 'Obzor [Horizon]' of 8th February, however, we read that on that day only 380 children were reported for all the grades of primary school.

What does this mean? Aren't there more children in Bel-grade, as Austrian papers are trumpeting the fact that, for weeks, trains full of the inhabitants of Belgrade have been arriving in the capital city? We know that there were around one hundred and twenty teachers working in Belgrade's primary schools, how can it be that there are not enough primary school pupils even for five teachers? Keep your hands off our children, otherwise, your great-grandchildren will tremble when they hear the Serbian name!⁸ (*Srpski glasnik*, 1916/42: 2).

The Austrian authorities behaved in other Serbian cities the way they behaved in Belgrade. We find information on education in the service of Austria-Hungary, elimination of all national characteristics, abuse of schools and children, torture against the people and Serbian children, in the book *Education in Serbia* (the municipal "Realschul Grammar School" in Kragujevac), where, among other things, the following is stated:

"From the time of the entry of the enemy forces in Kragujevac, between 18th and 31st October 1915, a terrible and dark era has descended on our city [...]. The Serbian intelligentsia, Serbian youth, after losing their freedom, after the finest and most exalted moment of popular heroism, have remained, due to a set of circumstances, in a country where the enemy has begun to judge, rule and run things according to their plan, system, beliefs and convictions [...]. The enemy [...] considered the youth of Serbia to be rebellious, its teachers and educators the main propagators of Serbian ideals, and hence they always strove to oppress the young as much as possible, to alienate them from their teachers, who had stayed in their homes, and to forbid educators any contact, any meeting with them. In a number of cities in Serbia, **they exerted horrible pressure on the souls of our children**. Kragujevac was among those cities [...].

There remains only the lovely Cyrillic inscription 'Гимназија [Grammar School]', which the much hated enemy could not erase, to remind us of our beloved school lessons, when we happily and freely educated our youth, whose parents and brothers are still constantly fighting for the freedom of the Fatherland" (*Education in Serbia* 1916: 167, 168).

At the same time, Serbs in Austria were forbidden from enrolling in schools, and those already enrolled were forbidden from attending school lessons any longer. In an article entitled *Serbs from Abroad Forbidden from Enrolling at the University of Vienna*, it is said: “At the University of Vienna, there is an ongoing campaign aimed at preventing Serbs from abroad from enrolling. Yesterday, a petition signed by numerous professors was submitted at the Rectorate” (*Deutsches Volksblatt*, 12th July 1914, 4)...

“One crazy thing, Vienna, 29th June. At the University of Vienna, a campaign has been initiated with a view to excluding Serbian students from lectures at this University from now on. As ‘*Deutsches Volksblatt*’ claims, a number of University professors have signed a petition towards this end and submitted it at the Rectorate (*Politika*, 4/14 July, 2)”, (Ilić-Marković 2014: 112).

The occupiers’ attitude towards Serbian schools was also manifested towards **Serbian books**. In the article *Serbian Books*, Luka Lazarević writes that Serbian books, especially due to the fact that they were printed in the Cyrillic script, were seen as firearms:

“Serbian books. To the occupying forces, Serbian books were as dangerous as firearms. During the first days after their entry in Belgrade, all bookshops were closed. After they were granted concessions, a bookshop owner could reopen the shop, but had to immediately submit a precise list of the books in stock. Specially appointed commissions examined the books one after another. All Serbian books printed in the Cyrillic script were taken away. Presumably, they were considered the spoils of war. Bookshop owners were strictly forbidden from displaying any book printed in the Cyrillic script in the shop window...

Our textbooks were taken away. It was not allowed to sell dictionaries for Serbian schools.

Regulations, practice notebooks – these were all taken out of bookshops and destroyed. In the Serbian bookshops in Belgrade, you could buy German and Hungarian books, Croatian textbooks, publications of various Croatian societies and institutions, the only thing you could not get was a Serbian book...” (Lazarević 2010: 74).³⁸

³⁸ “A list of textbooks used in Belgrade grammar schools during the occupation – for the subjects The Serbian Language and History – Ma-

Printing establishments suffered the same treatment: “All printing establishments were immediately closed down. The state printing establishment was looted down to the last inventory item...”

All the Cyrillic print letters in all the Cyrillic print establishments were destroyed” (Lazarević 2010: 75).

2.4.9. A similar situation was to be found in Montenegro. The educational system was strictly subordinated to the political-ideological aims of Austria-Hungary, regulated and guided by strict regulations and measures: “For the relevant Austro-Hungarian factors with an interest in Montenegro, the educational system was not only a cultural educational issue but primarily a political one [...].

Schools in Montenegro stopped working in October 1915, when, due to the fact that the country was at war, teachers were also conscripted and sent to military units. Based on the order of the General Governorate, primary schools were reopened in March 1916, but only in the Cetinje and Bar districts [...]. Normal work in all the schools on the territory of Montenegro was resumed in September 1916.”³⁹

retić: Hrvatska gramatika [A Croatian Grammar], Divković: Rečenica [The Sentence]; Bogdanović: Pregled hrvatske književnosti [An Overview of Croatian Literature]; Klajić: Atlas za hrvatsku istoriju [An Atlas of Croatian History]; Petračić: Hrvatska čitanka [A Croatian Reader]; Broz – Boranić: Hrvatski pravopis [Croatian Orthography]; Šurmin – Bosanac: Čitanka [A Reader]; Drehsler: Hrvatska čitanka za više razrede [A Croatian Reader for Higher Grades]; Šišić: Povjest Hrvatske [A History of Croatia]; Srkulj: Izvori za hrvatsku povjesnicu [Sources of Croatian History] (Kangrga, Jovan / M. Kostić (eds.): Nastavnik [Teacher], 150 f.)” (Ilić–Marković 2014: 183).

³⁹ Furthermore: “The General Governorate issued an announcement on 29th May 1916, stating that all the teaching posts in the country were to be considered vacant as of 15th June, and that school and kindergarten teachers were to be considered out of work. The teachers who intended to go on working were warned that they were given a deadline: they were to submit an application to the relevant district high command by 15th June, stating which city they wanted to work in. Failing this, those who did not observe this deadline would be considered to have given up on their teaching posts...” (Rakočević 1997: 248).

In *The Serbian Herald* (5. 8. 1916), in the article *Schools in Montenegro*, we find information on how schools in Montenegro were opened and what the authorities wanted to achieve through this act. The manner and the purpose of doing so largely coincide with those in Serbia: “Narodni list [The People’s Paper]’ of 18th July reports primary schools in Montenegro are to be opened. The organisation and management of these schools were entrusted to the Dubrovnik school principal Posedel.

The Austrians, even though their situation is precarious, are trying to create the impression that they have occupied Serbian lands for good.”

Everything was very strictly controlled, nothing was left to chance, suitable teachers were selected and, as was the case in Serbia, they were mostly brought over from Croatia: “The teachers who accepted the work on offer had to sign a solemn statement first, stating that they would obey all orders issued by the military administration, that they would not engage in political activities in or outside school, that they would not inspire hatred against the military authorities or allow such intentions, and that they would not do anything to spread hatred against the Austro-Hungarian military force, but undertook to educate the young ‘to become honest, hard-working people, dedicated to their duties’ (the Archive of Montenegro, file: occupation, the district of Cetinje, school acts of 1916 and 1918)” (Rakočević 1997: 248). As we can see, the employees undertook to work in keeping with the occupiers’ orders, otherwise, teachers were brought in from the outside who were prepared to comply with these requirements: “The General Governorate tried to bring in a certain number of teachers from the remainder of the territory where Serbo-Croatian is spoken, especially from Croatia” (Rakočević 1997: 249).

A new curriculum was prescribed for primary schools, and it came into effect in 1916/17.⁴⁰ According to this curriculum,

⁴⁰ “The following subjects were taught in primary schools: Christian Science, Reading, The Native Tongue, Mathematics, Geography, History, Biology (combined with the Economy, Chemistry, Botany, Hygiene and Agriculture)” (Rakočević 1997: 250).

the Latin script was introduced in schools, and everything that pertained to Serbia, its history, heroic and other patriotic poems was removed from the curriculum. “The primary school curriculum was, to a certain degree, adjusted to the primary school curriculum in Croatia” (Rakočević 1997: 251).

The Austro-Hungarian authorities paid special attention to the education of Muslim and Albanian children.⁴¹ Albanian schools were opened even in places where there were no Albanian children to be found: “From Cetinje, there are reports that the military authorities have started opening Albanian schools in Montenegro! Apart from several schools opened in new areas, in Plav, Pljevlja etc., Albanian schools have been opened in old areas, in Podgorica, Bar and Kolašin, even though there is not a single secondary school for the many Serbian children living here in the entire country, just as there is not a single Albanian family in all those places” (*The Montenegrin's Voice*, 1917: 4).

The Cetinje News, in the article *The Opening of an Albanian school in Plav*, reported on this event, providing another testimony to the pro-Albanian policy of Austria-Hungary:

“Our editorial office has received the following report: ‘Finally, the long-awaited moment has arrived. Owing to the intercession of the K. und K. General Governorate, we have been sent the young Albanian teacher S. Krstić, who ceremonially opened our school on 30th April. The joy and merriment felt in our small Plav was best evidence that morning, when many overjoyed children gathered in the classroom in order to embark on the holy act of receiving education in the school. We felt all the more overjoyed hearing the teacher speak the Albanian language, so dear to our hearts, and teaching our

⁴¹ “Albanian schools were opened in a number of places in Metohija, and also in Plav, Gusinje and Ulcinj. The Albanian school in Plav was opened on 30. 4. 1917. In those schools, teaching was conducted in the Albanian language, but in view of the situation, it was not possible to do that immediately..”

Apart from Albanian schools, there existed Catholic, religious ones, which, according to the head of the Austro-Hungarian High Command, had a propagandistic mission in addition to the cultural-educational one...” (Rakočević 1997:252, 253).

children in it. Children, as well as adults, gladly come to school, even though at this time of the year they are most needed at home for domestic chores.

For our school, that holy blessing, we should put everything else aside and help in any way we can, and we should send our children to school, for no greater blessing could have befallen us, that our children can be educated in their mother tongue, Albanian – the people of Plav.” (*Cetinjske novine*, no. 82, Cetinje, vol. II, September 1917, p. 2).⁴²

⁴² Parallel with the processes unfolding in Montenegro, efforts were made to ensure the autonomy of Albania. In the article *The Autonomy of Albania*, we read: “The Chief Commander for the territory of Albania issued a proclamation on 23rd January, the anniversary of the entry of Austrian-Hungarian troops in the country, wherein he says that the Albanian people is likely to be granted home rule soon. In this way, the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy, which has always endeavoured to preserve the unity of that people and the integrity of the Albanian territory, starts to effectively manifest its benevolence towards this people. This is where we essentially differ from our enemies. While they have been “liberating” small peoples for God knows how long, who long for nothing else but to remain liberated, we speak of liberation when it is in our power to keep our word. That is how it was in Poland, and that is how it is in Albania.

The Austrian-Hungarian troops, which are in this country as friends today, have come here in the name of the Monarchy, which, as this proclamation states, strives to give the people an orderly administration, respecting their faith, language and national specificity, the old rights and customs of that people, so that, guaranteeing the personal integrity, honour and property of the individual, it can heal the wounds caused by the past upheavals and wars, and pave the way for a better development of the people. This administration will prepare and educate the Albanian people, which, unfortunately, lags behind in terms of cultural and economic development on account of long-lasting chaotic circumstances, so that it will be able, as much as possible, to exercise its right to home rule without going astray, as was the case in the past. As soon as the preconditions are created for the country’s autonomy, Austria-Hungary will immediately establish Albanian home rule, and will not withdraw its effective protection from this country later on.

Knowing that the supreme war commander of the troops stationed in Albania is at the same time the protector of all the just aspirations of the Albanian people, this people will be in a position, relying on the Monarchy and its defensive power, to calmly look forward to its future” (*Cetinjske novine*, no. 49, Cetinje, 1st February 1917, vol. II. p. 1).

Austria-Hungary did not open secondary schools in Montenegro.⁴³ “As regards secondary schools, before the war Montenegro had six grammar schools and a teacher training/theology school. During the occupation, no secondary school was opened” (Rakočević 1997: 255). Among the children who had finished primary school, a selection was made based on political and ideological suitability, and they were sent to Austria to be “educated”: “The High Command has agreed that Montenegrin students and secondary school pupils may continue their education at the faculties and in the secondary schools of Austria-Hungary, but only those against whom ‘there are no political objections’ (the Archive of Montenegro, to [Minister] Burian, 31. 10. 1916)..”

The scholarships were granted by the by the General Governatorate, based on proposals submitted by district commands and personal marks. Priority was given to the candidates who, according to the assessment of the authorities, were not objectionable in political terms, as well as the children of parents who worked for the occupation authorities or who were considered loyal to the Monarchy in the opinion of district commands” (Rakočević 1997: 259).

Scrupulous attention was paid to who would be educated and where, with a precisely planned political-ideological profiling of pupils (especially those educated in Serbia, who needed to be “re-educated”) and schools (those selected mostly continued

43 “In early summer 1916, the General Governatorate intended to open three grammar schools, specifically, in Cetinje, Nikšić and Podgorica... The enrolment of pupils in grammar schools, and also in craftsmanship and commercial schools, was to be conducted by a special inspectorate made up of persons from Austria-Hungary. The children selected for vocational schools were to be sent to schools in the Monarchy’s countryside. The Governatorate reviewed this issue, primarily as a political one, and took the view that secondary schools could not be entrusted to the politically untrustworthy Montenegrin teaching staff, and many Montenegrin teachers had been interned anyway. The only solution was to bring teachers over from the Monarchy, which the Governatorate counted on in any case” (Rakočević 1997: 256).

their education in Austria-Hungary): “As early as April 1916, the Commander of Bosnia, General Sarkotić, informed the High Command that there were several hundred students-pupils in Montenegro who had mostly attended school in Serbia, and were forced to interrupt their education because of the war. In his opinion, these pupils/students should be allowed to continue their education in the Monarchy, for that would be the best way to influence their education, leading to freeing them from the Greater Serbia-influenced ideas. The funds for their education should not be a problem, in Sarkotić’s, opinion, for that would serve the interests of the Monarchy (STAW, Sarkotić to the Head of the High Command, no. 1185, 27. IV 1916)” (Rakočević 1997: 256).

2.4.10. Other national features were banned as well.

2.4.10.a) The Serbian (and Montenegrin) blue-red-white flag was banned in Montenegro, but it was allowed, probably to distance Montenegro from Serbia as much as possible, to put up the old Montenegrin flag alongside the obligatory black-yellow Austrian flag and the Croatian and Hungarian flags, even the Albanian flag:

“The allowed flags in **Montenegro**. On the territory governed by the K. und K. General Military Governorate in Montenegro, the flags bearing Austrian and Hungarian (Croatian) state and land colours may be put up on ceremonial occasions.

It is allowed to put up flags of states that are our allies, namely, Albanian ones (black-red); on the contrary, the flags of all the countries that are at war with the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy or its allies are unconditionally forbidden.

Consequently, the Serbian national colours are forbidden (red-blue-white); on the contrary, there is no reason to ban old Montenegrin flags (red, with white edges and a white cross in the middle).

The loyal Montenegrin population will certainly appreciate this sign of consideration of their own historical flag, and will gladly use it to express their loyalty” (*Cetinjske novine*, 1917: 2).

2.4.10.b) That is how it was in **Serbia** as well. During a brief occupation of Belgrade in 1915, the authorities immediately replaced the Serbian flag:

“A black-yellow flag. On the day when the Austrian-Hungarian army marched into the abandoned Belgrade, on a Wednesday in November 1914, the first thing on their minds was to take over the Court and to put up their own flag there [...].

[...] Therefore, they had to find a craftsman as soon as possible and to make an Austrian flag and put it up on the Court building before dark. And so, a Serb craftsman climbed through the attic of the Serbian Court to take down the Serbian flag and put up the Austrian one! That was the first sign of the capital city's submission and the population's subordination to the new master.

The flag, the holy symbol of the unity of the people, now tore us apart from Mother Serbia, adding us to those who have made our folk across the Sava and the Danube cry on account of the pain they suffered, who have made millions of other Slavs cry! Are we, too, to go there?! God forbid [...].

And how we, common folk, felt watching that can never be put in words [...]

A Serbian craftsman, then, had to take down the Serbian flag from the Court building and put up the Austrian one. And all of us had to watch and suffer that. Before the dark, the Austrians put up two more flags: the Hungarian one and some sort of a Croatian flag. (Signifying, presumably, that those three nations: the Austrian, Hungarian and Croatian one have come to rule Serbia?). The next day, the General put up these same flags on the City as well, with all the military pomp they could muster [...]

And so it came to pass that we ourselves put up and watched, for all of thirteen days, those symbols of our servitude and subordination...” (Miodragović 1915: 95-101).

The first occupation and the removal of the flag did not last long, to the satisfaction of the entire population:

“And on that significant day, the happiest day in the lives of the people of Belgrade, in Tuesday, 2nd December, when our brave army, headed by our heroic King, entered Belgrade [...] the citizens saw to it that that rag was removed from the Serbian court, the one which offended and humiliated them for so many days, and that the Serbian King should not enter the Serbian Court under a foreign flag [...] And this morning [...] the Serbian foot freely stepped into the Court, climbed to the attic and took down that ‘black-yellow rag’ and put up the tricolour Serbian one. And there was no telling who was happier: the man who actually did it, or those of us who were watching from below [...]. It seemed to everyone not only that they were rising from the dead, that they were living, but also

that they were building a common house, for a happy common life of all Serbs.

In no time at all, the black-yellow flag lay down on the ground, and when the automobile bringing back the King arrived from the church and entered the Court, the citizens of Belgrade who were there spread that flag at the very gates, so the car drove right across it, and as it entered the yard and turned, the Belgraders picked it up from there and took it to the stairs that the King was to climb up when entering then Court, and put it down there. And so the King walked right across it. That symbolised very nicely what had happened: the Imperial army that had so proudly moved through the city the day before, now lay at the feet of His Majesty, begging for mercy [...] And so this 'rag', which had humiliated us for all of thirteen days, was eventually humiliated itself. And the Serbian King entered the Court under the Serbian flag again..."⁴⁴ (J. Miodragović 1915: 95–101).

During a new occupation, lasting for a longer period of time, Serbian flags, naturally enough, were taken down and replaced again.

2.4.11. **The burning of Serbian books** that occurred during the latest war in these parts was not an entirely new phenomenon: Serbian books had been burned during the First World War as well: "In Veles, while older and more serious people were reserved and showed little enthusiasm when the Bulgarians came, the young, especially children, were rather more enthusiastic."⁴⁵

⁴⁴ The symbolism and the significance of the flag are testified to by a note in *A Wartime Diary* (THE FLAG – Gilles Clarty): "The flag, that is – mark these words – in a nutshell, as represented by a single object, everything which has made and makes the life of everyone of us: the hearth, where we were born; a patch of the land that we grew up on; a mother, rocking us in the cradle, and a father chiding us; the first years of life; the first tear of hope; dreams; fantasy; memories. The flag – those are all the joys put together, all gathered in a single, most beautiful word in the world: Fatherland" (*A Wartime Diary*, no. 202, p. 807).

⁴⁵ The words we find in *The Serbian Herald* from the difficult year of 1916 testify to the national and every other form of suffering on the part of the Serbs: "Both the Bulgarians and the Austrians did whatever they could to prevent the leaking out of any information on what was really going on in Serbia. Striving to completely separate Serbia from the rest of the world, they hid even things that had nothing to do with the war. However,

Based on the initiative of children, at the instigation of the

judging by the news that reach us from time to time, some things about the situation in Serbia are known. But the greatest amount of information became public knowledge when, through the liberation of Bitolj, the veil folded over our entire country was unfolded for a little bit.

[...] It is known for a fact, for example, that the Bulgarian authorities sold off all the belongings of our clerks, that in all of Serbia real estate was sold off as ownerless, that entire garrisons were dined and wined on food and drink that were seized from the population. Many Bulgarian prisoners of war were seen with items of our national clothes on [...].

The administration of the whole country is mostly military in character. The civic authorities are subordinate to it everywhere. It is easy to imagine what the military regime of a merciless enemy might look like [...].

The main aim of both the Austrian and the Bulgarian regime was not only to obliterate all traces of the life of our state, but also to destroy us as a nation. The Austrians did it with the intention of turning our people into a shapeless anational mass, while the Bulgarians were intent on turning our people into Bulgarians – no less! Through an artificial administrative division, they wish to weaken the resistance of our people to begin with. Tearing Serbia apart serves as the basis for this. In the part occupied by Austria, it went even further in doing so: in the new parts of Serbia, they established an administration different from that in the old parts. Montenegro was also slit into New and Old Montenegro [...]. Through administrative division and obstructing all communication between individual segments of our people, the Bulgarians wish to isolate some parts of our people from one another. For that reason, they banished from the new parts all the families that originate from the old parts of Serbia.

Whatever reminds the people of its community is destroyed. **The Bulgarians have destroyed every Serbian book** that they could lay their hands on, they have destroyed all schools and established schools of their own, where pupils are taught in the Bulgarian language and in the Bulgarian spirit, and they have destroyed our church organisation. The Austrians have proved no more cultured in that respect. They have banned the use of the Cyrillic script and the old calendar. All the cultural institutions in the country have been destroyed, all the antique objects have been ruined or taken away. The people are forced to celebrate Austrian and Bulgarian patriotic ceremonial occasions, and children as well. All the means at their disposal are used to convince the people that the situation established by the invasion is permanent. False rumours are spread about the Serbian army, on the victories of the central powers, on slow peace. Special papers have been established with a view to leading the people astray. They want to make the desperate situation of our people even more desperate by destroying all hope. Our entire homeland has been turned into a prison on whose walls the enemy has written the words of a great poet who saw

Bulgarian authorities, a rally was held in front of the building of the district administration in Veles. Everyone brought to the rally whatever Serbian textbooks they had, and after several enthusiastic speeches against Serbia and the Serbian regime in Macedonia, they started setting fire to Serbian books. As they say, it was the 'head of the district' who gave the order to start doing so; the man had opened the rally by delivering a long speech. In the whole of Veles that day, people were carrying Serbian books around and setting fire to them, shouting insults directed against the Serbs" (*Srpski glasnik* 1916/24: 1).

2.4.12. **The cultural and artistic treasures of the Serbs** were looted and taken away: museums, libraries and galleries were looted by various occupiers:

"We have been informed that 140,000 volumes have been looted from 'the National Library' and taken from Serbia to Sofia" (*Srpski glasnik* 1916/90: 2). The National Museum suffered a similar fate: "As we find out, the Austrians, when they decided to appropriate the National Museum in Belgrade, also decided to steal all the other museums and archives. This honourable task was entrusted to a commission headed by Kršnjavi, of whom they say that he is a well-known Austrian military historian, unless it is the notorious Iso Kršnjavi, the 6th Croatian Minister of Education. Another commission member was the former Consul Vladislav Đerđej, who now represents the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs within the framework of the military authorities in Belgrade. The commission first made an inventory of the items that were to be looted, classifying them on the basis of their origin and they meant to Austria, Hungary, Croatia and Bosnia" (*Srpski glasnik* 1916/26: 2). And that was not all: "'Obzor' reports that the Austro-Hungarian authorities in occupied Serbia have ordered that all Serbian coats-of-arms and seals be seized" (*Srpske novine* 1916/87: 2).⁴⁶

them on the gates of hell in his imagination: 'Abandon hope ye who enter here'" (*Srpski glasnik*, no. 325, 4th December 1916, vol. I, p. 1).

⁴⁶ "The Bulgarians pride themselves on what they have stolen from Serbia. "Berževija Vjedomesta" of 4th November contains this report from Bucharest: In Sofia these days, a ceremony has been held to celebrate the opening of the Ethnographic and the Geographic-Historical Museum. Almost all the objects exhibited in these museums have been looted from Serbia" (*Srpski glasnik*: 6. 1. 1917, no. 358: 2).

Archibald Reiss drew particular attention to the bombardment of the University, museums and hospitals, “pointing out that scientific, artistic and cultural institutions were protected by the Hague Convention. University libraries were looted, and University teaching aids were also taken away, as were all the leftover official archives of government institutions, ministries and political parties [...]. The treasuries of the Dečani, Ravanica and Manasija monasteries were looted. *Emperor Dušan’s Code* was taken away from Prizren. A part of this treasury has disappeared without trace, for all the efforts made after the war with a view to returning the looted items to their lawful owners proved fruitless” (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 190, 199).

In *Greater Serbia*, in the article entitled *The German Atrocities and Peace*, it is said that Germany “destroyed, without any military reasons, historical monuments and art works, even though the ancient and savage conquerors such as the Avars, Huns, Turks, Tatars and others paid the necessary attention to suchlike objects [...]. The Bulgarians subjected our people to exarchy, whose canonisation was not recognised by our ecumenical church. Also, they forbade the use of our Serbian language in the cradle of our Serbian homeland” (*Velika Srbija*, no. 256, 22nd December 1916, p. 1, vol. I; 4, 10).

2.4.13. **The Gregorian calendar** was introduced: “On 20th May 1916, the Military General Governorate published the order of 5th May on introducing the Gregorian calendar on the Serbian territory under the Austro-Hungarian occupation” (Radić – Isić 2014; 91).⁴⁷ We also find information on this in *The Belgrade News*: “Proclamation. Introducing the Gregorian calendar. From the day of the proclamation of this order, in all official and public communications time is to be calculated solely according to the Gregorian calendar. Failure to comply with this order shall constitute a criminal offence. Count Salis-Seewis, Field Lieutenant Marshal” (1916/21: 1).

⁴⁷ A Code of the Laws and Orders issued by the K. und K. Military Administration in Serbia, Belgrade, 1916–1918, 1916, 1–11 (in: Radić – Isić 2014: 91).

The Belgrade News also reports on this in the article *A Cultural and Communication Issue*: “Based on the order of the K. und K. Military Governor General, from now on in all official and public communications time shall be calculated solely according to the Gregorian calendar. In the public communications of municipalities, corporations and parties, in the year 1916 the Gregorian calendar designation may be accompanied by one in accordance with the old calendar, which is to be placed underneath. In the case of the church year, the Julian calendar shall apply, as has been the case up to now...” (*Beogradske novine* no. 22, Belgrade, Sunday 20th February 1916, vol. II).

The Gregorian calendar was “willingly” introduced in Bulgaria as well. In the article *The Gregorian Calendar in Bulgaria*, we read: “The Bulgarian Ministerial Council has recently decided to introduce the Gregorian calculation of time in Bulgaria. The manner of doing so shall be decided later” (*Beogradske novine*, 20th January 1916, no. 9).⁴⁸

2.4.14. **Churches and monasteries** were burned down, destroyed, looted, desecrated. “Apart from destroying and setting fire to some churches, church and monastery buildings..., the enemy turned some churches into stables, billets and warehouses” (Radić – Isić 2014: 28). During the course of the First World War, 51% of priests and monks suffered directly the consequences of the war (they were killed, interned, imprisoned, used as hostages), that is, of a total of 3,326 of them, 1,702 suffered in one of the ways referred to above (Radić – Isić 2014: 149).⁴⁹

⁴⁸ *Greater Serbia* also reports on this in the article *A New Calendar*: “Since Bulgaria, out of hatred towards Russia, has abandoned its own calendar and adopted the Gregorian one, and as even Turkey has adopted that same calendar for the basis of calculating time, it is no wonder that, in Serbia as well, the Gregorian calendar has been proclaimed to be the only one in effect” (*Velika Srbija*, no. 13, p. 2).

⁴⁹ “Looted churches. From all the churches in Belgrade, they took away all the valuables (altars, bishops’ mitres, silver candle holders, chalices etc.); they took down all the bells from the belfries and took them away. Only one church bell remained in Belgrade (in the Church of Ascension).

They took down the copper roof from the Orthodox Cathedral...” (Lazarević 2010: 45).

The Bulgarians behaved the way the Catholic occupiers did: “The St Naum Monastery [...] Sad but true, the Bulgarians took everything away, the icons, candle holders, even the shroud from the coffin containing the mortal remains of St Naum. Looted as it is, the monastery looks devastated [...]. While the Serbian army abundantly donated to the monastery, and while even the Turks sent their contributions, the Bulgarians totally ruined it...” (*Velika Srbija*, Solin, 14th April 1916, no. 5, vol. I, p. 1).

However, *The Belgrade News* regularly reports on the Catholic church service being performed in the languages of the occupiers. In the article *Catholic Church Service*, we find: “On Christmas Day, 25th December, Mass will be served at the Roman Catholic church at no. 23, Krunska Street at 8 o/c a.m., in Croatian and Hungarian, and at 9 o/c in German. At 10:30 a.m. there will be a sermon in German and the Great Mass. At 2:30 p.m. the Vespers will be held [...]” And further on: “The Hungarian church service. On Christmas Day, it will be held at the church on the corner of Miloša Vellikog Street and Bosanska Street, at 9 o/c a.m., for those of the Protestant persuasion (Evangelists and Reformists)” (*Beogradske novine*, no. 4, 23rd December 1915, p. 3).

Church services were also under control. The main military Governorate prescribed the obligations of priests, and under item 3 it is stated: “Each priest shall be obligated to **erase the usual prayers for the King and his dynasty** from all the church and prayer books that he uses, and the same applies to **the Russian Emperor** as the putative protector of the Eastern Church” (in: Radić – Isić 2014: 92)... Luka Lazarević also mentions this in his notes: “The liturgy. During the liturgy, it is forbidden to pray for the life and health of the Serbian King, and it is forbidden to mention any Serbian archpriest. They also forbade any mention of our ‘**servicemen**’” (Lazarević 2010: 116).

The church, its heritage and rights received a treatment that was a part of the overall pattern of anti-Serbian activities: “General Potiorek demanded that the use of the Serbian flag and coat-of-arms be banned in public life, and that the designation

Serbian Orthodox Church be changed to 'Bosnian'. In the entire area under occupation the Serbian name was abolished, the use of the Cyrillic script and the work of cultural institutions were banned, civic rights were denied, whole families were exiled, concentration camps were formed, the ethnic and religious structure of entire regions were changed..., churches were desecrated and pulled down, the publication of Serbian papers was brought to a halt, the holdings of a number of Serbian reading rooms were burnt down [...]. Cyrillic labels over private firms were removed" (Radojević – Dimić 2014: 134–135).

Serbian forests were destroyed: in *The Serbian Herald*, in the article *The Destruction of Serbian Forests*, we find: "There are reports from Belgrade that the Austrian authorities, acting upon orders received from Vienna, have embarked on a very hurried campaign of cutting down all Serbian forests. Great quantities of wood are transported to Austria via the Danube and by trains on a daily basis" (*Srpski glasnik*, no. 197, 30th July 1916, p. 3).

2.4.15. Lovćen and all its symbolic significance were given a special treatment by the enemy. The conquest of Lovćen was presented as the most important objective. The attack on Lovćen was given a great deal of attention, there were reports on the weather conditions not being favourable for the occupying troops. The reporter even saw a symbolic aspect of "the hellish thunderstorm" and the fog that covered, describing them as "the heavens' resistance" to the occupier. In the article *Details Concerning the Offensive against Lovćen. An Eyewitness's Description*, published by *The Belgrade News*, this event is described in some detail:

"In the 'Bosnische Post', an eyewitness describes his impressions of the first day of the attack of the K. und K. forces against Lovćen, that is, the very beginning of the offensive. The said eyewitness writes: The first battle for Lovćen unfolded before the eyes of the commander of the attacking army, General of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Infantry General Sarkotić, who, together with the Head of the General Staff Colonel Münich and their retinue, was positioned on the deck of the naval yacht 'Dalmat'. The General was in a confident mood while he watched the beginning of the terrible struggle from Krtule Bay.

The weather was superb. From the Bay of Krtule, wherein the yacht was anchored for a while in the vicinity of the monastery, the General sailed into the first bay of Boka Kotorska to observe the artillery in action near Orahovac, where the enemy had found shelter in the steep rocks of Gomolica. From the previous observation points, too, one could hear the continual thunder of gunfire as a veritable hellish concert, but the **horrific thunder** was even more resounding when we entered the Bay of Kotor, where each bullet echoed several times rebounding from the high rocks.

The attack progressed favourably for us when the weather changed all of a sudden. The sky became overcast, **the top of Lovćen was increasingly hidden by the clouds**, and thick fog soon descended onto the battlefield. **In vain did General Sarkotić turn his eagle-sharp eyes towards the bare rocks, they were mercilessly hidden by thick fog, as if it wished to protect them from our guns.**

The Commander was just preparing to order the Captain of the ship to return to Zelenika [...] when the information came that everything would turn out all right [...].

And so it did, for in the evening we received the news that our infantry had penetrated the enemy lines on Solar (height: 1308 m). Indeed, had the weather not turned bad around noon, our exceptionally brave troops would have taken Lovćen on Saturday, the second day of the attack; the weather was the only reason why the attainment of our goal was postponed for 24 hours.

The Bosnian-Herzegovinian units were particularly deserving for the taking of Lovćen, for they were the first ones to penetrate the main enemy lines. **‘They’ll find out what a Bosniak is’**, was what a strapping young Bosnian soldier told me when he headed towards the enemy lines with his unit. And they were given the opportunity to see what a Bosniak was like” (*Beogradske novine*, 2–1, 1916).

In another issue, *The Belgrade News* reports on impressions to be found in other foreign papers. It is evident how much importance the enemy attached to the taking of Lovćen, speaking of this victory as “the major part of this war”, a success that is incomparable and more important than all previous conquests. In the article *The Fall of Lovćen. The Impressions in Vienna*, we find, among other things, the following:

“It is with joyful pleasure that local papers speak of the political and military significance of the taking of Lovćen, which they refer

to as **the major part of this war**. They point out the exceptional joint work of our infantry units, artillery and fleet, and go on to stress that the taking of Lovćen does not mean only a defeat for Montenegro, but also a hard blow to Italy, which had demanded, as a precondition for its permanent neutrality, that Austria-Hungary should not take Lovćen” (13. 1. 2016, no. 6: 2). In addition to this. “The ‘Fremdenblatt’ writes: The three-day persistent fighting, which showed the exceptional achievement of our infantry, in cooperation with our artillery and navy most clearly, delivered into our hands the Montenegrins’ main stronghold. Our troops **conquered a bastion** which, in the view of any tactician and engineer, seemed impossible to conquer [...]. The Montenegrins put up a desperate resistance. In hand-to-hand combat, our infantry took the very peak of Lovćen. The ‘Neues Wiener Tagblatt’ reports: Our troops have done a heroic deed, perhaps comparable in its magnitude to what has been achieved on other fronts, but definitely *not surpassed yet*. If any defensive position could fittingly be described as ‘**unconquerable**’, a word often abused by our adversaries, it was truly appropriate in the case of Lovćen, and yet, **on top of it there flutters the Habsburg flag in the cold Montenegrin wind today**. The ‘Reichspost’ reports: The conquest of Lovćen, the stony bastion of Montenegro, represented **the supreme military achievement so far. The fall of Lovćen bares the very heart of Montenegro...**” (*Beogradske novine*, 16th January 1916, no. 7. vol. II, 1: 1).

In a euphoric mood, the conquest of Lovćen is even given precedence over the penetration of the Russian front and also over “the total annihilation of the rule of Petar Karagjorgjević”. In the article *Lovćen*, this is expressed in the following manner:

“No event in the course of this war – victorious for the central authorities so far – has filled us with such joy as this truly rare one in historical terms. **Not even the penetration of the Russian front** on the Dunajec River, which led to Russian defeats and their retreat from Galicia, nor the fall of all Russian fortresses, into which so many billions of French money had been poured, **nor even the total annihilation of the rule of Petar Karagjorgjević** has proved to be such a source of **pleasure to us** as the fall of Lovćen.

Our General Staff reports on this **superhuman feat** in brief lapidary sentences. Who does not know these steep, impassable, almost entirely dormant rocks [...]. This great victory, which will be written in the history books, the victory of our Austro-Hungarian army, so dear to our hearts, did

not only deal a deserved blow to the master of Montenegro, who had forgotten about the gratitude owed to the effective benevolence of the neighbouring Monarchy, but also hit hard the treacherous, contemptible Italy” (*Beogradske novine*, 16th January 1916, no. 7. vol. II).

The conquest of Lovćen did not fulfil a strategic goal only, the primary goal was the pulling down and destruction of the most profound Serbian and Montenegrin national symbol, the chapel on Lovćen, and through it the literary-artistic heritage of the great Njegoš, and placing everything within different frameworks. *The Serbian Herald*, in an article entitled *Barbarians*, reports on this as follows:

“The Austro-Hungarian barbarians were not satisfied that they had robbed us of our country like bandits, but have now resorted to desecrating saints.

There are reports from Cetinje that the Austrian authorities have moved the mortal remains of Prince-Bishop Rade, the author of ‘The Mountain Wreath’ from Lovćen to the Cetinje Monastery, and it is well known that the poet’s last wish was to be buried on Lovćen. They say they did it for military reasons, so that Montenegrins should not come to Lovćen.

This really matters to them very much, as they have started waging war with the dead” (*Srpski glasnik*, no. 256, p. 3, 25. 9. 1916).

3. As specific events unequivocally show, the goal of the Austro-Hungarian policy was to destroy, suppress and/or narrow down the Serb ethnos and all the national-identity characteristics of the Serbian people, as well as its historical-cultural heritage. These processes, initiated long before World War One, very much increased in intensity (under the pretext of revenge for the assassination [of Franz Ferdinand]) during the course of World War One. During approximately two years of occupation, Austria-Hungary managed to create the formal conditions for an almost total change of identity, which was carried out in all the segments in formal terms, the aim being to effect essential changes.

Literature

- Brajiović 2005: Milan-Mišo Brajiović, *Pleme Bjelopavlići* [*The Bjelopavlići Tribe*], Podgorica, Kulturno prosvjetna zajednica.
- Garonja-Radovanac 2008: Slavica Garonja-Radovanac, *Srpsko usmeno poetsko nasleđe Vojne krajine. U zapisima 18, 19. i 20. vijeka* [*The Serbian Oral Poetic Heritage of Vojna Krajina. As Written Down in the 18th, 19th and 20th Centuries*], Čigoja štampa, Belgrade.
- Ekmečić 2011: Milorad Ekmečić, *Dugo kretanje između klanja i oranja. Istorija Srba u novom veku (1492–1992)* [*A Long Journey between Slaughter and Ploughing. A History of the Serbs in the New Age*], Evro –Đunti, Belgrade.
- Ilić Marković 2014: Gordana Ilić Marković, *Dnevnik Velikog rata. Prvi svetski rat u ogledalu srpske književnosti i štampe* [*A Diary of the Great War. The First World War in the Mirror of Serbian Literature and Press*], Samizdat B92, Belgrade.
- Jovanović 1989: Batrić Jovanović, *Crnogorci o sebi (od vladike Danila do 1941)* [*Montenegrins about Themselves (from Prince-Bishop Danilo to 1941)*], Sloboda, Belgrade.
- Kovačević 2014: Miloš Kovačević, *Austrougarske zabrane srpskog jezika i ćirilice kao posljedica Sarajevskog atentata* [*Austro-Hungarian Bans of the Serbian Language and The Cyrillic Script as a Consequence of the Sarajevo Assassination*], in: *Ćorovićeви susreti 2013. godine. Međunarodni naučni skup istoričara: Sarajevski atentat 1914* [*Ćorović's Meetings 2013. An International Scientific Gathering of Historians: The Sarajevo Assassination of 1914*], Vojislav Maksimović and Draga Mastilović (eds.), Gacko: SPKD „Prosvjeta“, 247–264.
- Krestić 1994: Vasilije Đ. Krestić, *Iz istorije Srba i srpsko-hrvatskih odnosa* [*From the History of the Serbs and Serbo-Croat Relations*], Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod. Volume I (1848–1883).
- Krestić 1995: Vasilije Đ. Krestić, *Grada o Srbima u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji (1848–1914)* [*Sources about the Serbs in Croatia and Slavonia*], Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod. Volume I (1848–1883).
- Krestić 2013: Vasilije Krestić, *Istorija se nemilosrdno poigrava sa Srbima* [*History Mercilessly Plays with the Serbs*], *Pečat*, Interview with Ljiljana Bogdanović, 27th December.

- Lazarević 2010: Luka Lazarević, *Beleške iz okupiranog Beograda (1915–1918)* [*Notes from Occupied Belgrade (1915-1918)*], (First edition: 1919, Belgrade), Jasen, Belgrade.
- Martinović 1965: Niko Martinović, *Razvitak štampe i štamparstva u Crnoj Gori 1934–1945* [*The Development of Print and Printing Establishments in Montenegro 1934–1945*], Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo, Belgrade.
- Milošević 2015: Borivoje Milošević, *Austrougarski zločini nad Srpskom pravoslavnom crkvom i sveštenstvom u Bosni i Hercegovini tokom Prvog svjetskog rata* [Austro-Hungarian Crimes against the Serbian Orthodox Church and Clergy in Bosnia and Herzegovina during World War One], *Ćorovićevi susreti, Međunarodni skup istoričara „Bosna i Hercegovina u Prvom svjetskom ratu* [*Bosnia and Herzegovina in World War One*], SPKD Prosvjeta, Gacko, 153–167.
- Miodragović 1915: Jovan Miodragović, *Tragični dani Beograda. Beleške iz trinaestodnevne vladavine austrijske u Beogradu* [*The Tragic Days of Belgrade. Notes Made during the 13-day Austrian Rule in Belgrade*], J. Miodragović, S. B. Cvijanović, „Pravda“ Drag. Petrovića i komp., Belgrade.
- Matović 2013: Veselin Matović, *Ćirilica i latinogorica* [*The Cyrillic and Monte-Latin Script*], Književna zadruga Srpskog narodnog vijeća, Podgorica – Nikšić.
- Okuka 2006: Miloš Okuka, *Srpski na kriznom putu* [*The Serbian Language on a Crisis Path*], Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Istočno Sarajevo.
- Radić – Isić 2014: Radmila Radić – Momčilo Isić, *Srpska crkva u Velikom ratu 1914–1918. Prva sveobuhvatna istoriografska studija o stradanju srpske crkve u Prvom svetskom ratu* [*The Serbian Church in the Great War 1914–1918. The First All-encompassing Historical Study on the Suffering of the Serbian Church in the First World War*], Filip Višnjić, SPKD Prosvjeta, Belgrade – Gacko.
- Radojević – Dimić 2014: Mira Radojević, Ljubodrag Dimić, *Srbija u Velikom ratu 1914–1918. Kratka istorija* [*Serbia in the Great War 1914–1918. A Short History*], Srpska književna zadruga, Beogradski forum za svet ravnopravnih, Belgrade.
- Rakočević 1997: Dr Novica Rakočević, *Crna Gora u Prvom svjetskom ratu 1914–1918* [*Montenegro in the First World War 1914–1918*], phototype edition, ITP „UNIREKS“, Podgorica.

- Stančić 1991: Ljiljana Stančić, Nominacija grafija u Bosni i Hercegovini u vrijeme austrougarske uprave [The Denomination of Scripts in Bosnia and Herzegovina at the Time of the Austro-Hungarian Rule], in: *Književni jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini od Vuka Karadžića do kraja austrougarske vladavine* [The Literary Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Time of Vuk Karadžić to the end of the Austro-Hungarian Rule], Miloš Okuka and Ljiljana Stančić (eds.), München: Slavica Verlag Dr. Anton Kovač, 1991, 120–132.
- Stojanović 2011: Jelica Stojanović, *Putevima srpskog jezika i cirilice* [Following the Development Paths of the Serbian Language and Script], Izdavački centar Matice srpske Društva članova u Crnoj Gori, Nikšić.
- Ćorović 1996: Vladimir Ćorović, *Crna knjiga. Patnje Srba Bosne i Hercegovine za vreme Svetskog rata 1914–1918* [The Black Book. The Suffering of Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the World War 1914–1918], Udruženje ratnih dobrovoljaca 1912–1918. godine, njihovih potomaka i poštovalaca, Belgrade (the book was first published in 1920).
- Šipka 2006: Milan Šipka, *Jezik i politika* [Language and Politics], Beogradska knjiga, Belgrade.

Sources:

- Beogradske novine* [The Belgrade News].
- Reichpost*, Wien, 8. 11. 1916, p. 15; *Pester Lloyd*, Budapest, 5. 11. 1916, p. 8.
- Velika Srbija* [Greater Serbia] (<http://velikirat.nb.rs/collections/show/>).
- Vjesnik naredaba* 1917/1: *The Orders Gazette* of the K. und K. military administration in Montenegro. Vol. I (new edition; published and sent out on 8th January 1917. I. Official section. 41.
- Vjesnik naredaba* 1917/2: *The Orders Gazette* of the K. und K. military administration in Montenegro. Vol. III. Published and sent out on 13th March 1917. I. Official section. 7.
- Glas Crnogorca* 1917: *The Montenegrin's Voice*. Neuilly, near Paris, 10th June 1917. vol. 45 – no. 16.

Srpski glasnik [*The Serbian Herald*], <http://velikirat.nb.rs/collections/show>.

Srpske novine [*The Serbian News*].

Srbobran 2016: *Srbobran* [*Serbianhood Defender*], a popular Serbian periodical and an organ of the Serbian Association Sloga [Unity], New York, Thursday, 12th May 1916, no. 144 vol. VI. Dr Nikolaj Velimirović 2016, Dr Nikolaj Velimirović, *Srbija u okovima* [*Serbia in Chains*], London “New Witness”, April 1916.

Cetinjske novine [*The Cetinje News*].

Školovanje u Srbiji [*Education in Serbia*] 1916.

<http://velikirat.nb.rs/kolekcije>

THE IDENTITY AND STATUS OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE IN MONTENEGRO (THE HISTORICAL AND THE CONTEMPORARY ASPECT)

The issues implied by the above formulation are very broad and complex. It presupposes a genetic, typological and value-related aspect of observing linguistic phenomena – that is, what language is, what it originates from, the traditional-cultural linguistic heritage, what the contemporary linguistic processes and language policy are and what they are like (including the attitude of the social collective towards language). A stable linguistic situation can only be achieved if one takes into consideration and recognises the majority (or almost all) of the parameters referred to above. We shall try to point out all these aspects concisely and clearly with a view to presenting as coherently as possible the linguistic reality of Montenegro.

1. A brief historical-linguistic sketch of Montenegro

The Serbian language has a continuity of development that is measured in centuries, which is reflected in its long and recognisable history and structural-typological recognisability. However, the political-ideological background exerted a crucial influence, especially in the 18th and the 20th century, on the external history of the Serbian language, that is, on the creation, opening, complexifying, resolving and realising many state, national and, in connection with these, linguistic issues, problems and projects in these parts, which led to numerous changes and disruptions that were reflected on the Serbian language.

The area that forms a part of Montenegro today is made up of regions that, for the most part, belonged to various for-

mations of Serbian lands through history.¹ However, through history, as evidenced by the monument sources (and based on philological studies), those areas were connected through literature and language, and unified to a large degree, with negligible variations that most often depended not so much on formal divisions or borders, but rather on certain copying and scribe centres and seats of literacy. This is testified to by old monument sources (both those written in the folk language and those written in the literary language,² of the Church Slavic – and the Serbo-Slavic and the Slavic-Serb type). As we find in Professor Radoje Simić and Branislav Ostojić: “The Old Slavic language of the Serbian redaction, then Slavic-Serb and in the 19th century Vuk’s literary language were considered to be the common language from Kotor and Cetinje to Belgrade and Szentendre (Simić – Ostojić 1966: 29). It was not just that they were consid-

¹ “True – not only Serbs lived in old Zeta (which reached deep into Albania, all the way to Lesh), but also Wallachians, Albanians and the so-called Latins in coastal towns. In the Hum and Raška parts of today’s Montenegro, in addition to Serbs there also lived Wallachians, and in the mines of Brskovo there were probably other new settlers, starting with the Saxons, but the Brskovo names found in the first Turkish census lists show that they had already been assimilated by, blended with the surrounding Serbian population [...].

As opposed old Zeta, old Montenegro did not have such ethnic and ethno-social diversity, but was reduced to the Serbian base (after the assimilation of Wallachians). It was out of that Serbian base and within the framework of the Serbian people that Montenegrinhood came into being and developed its self-awareness. That was from the moment that the Montenegrin name appeared on the stage of history, which we discern at the time of the Crnojevićs that my generation remembers. The Montenegrin popular or ethnic self-awareness has always had a broader Serbian and a narrower Montenegrin determination, which branched off onto tribal lines. The name Montenegrins meant the same as Montenegrin Serbs” (Pešikan 2009: 124; – *The Montenegrin Name and Our Age*. The text was written in 1989 as the maiden speech on the occasion of admission into the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts).

² We use the term literary language in a broad sense here (both connected to the language of literature and the language of church service in the Serbian Orthodox Church, even the language of written communication in broad terms).

ered to be, the linguistic picture that represents this situation is a reflection of the linguistic connections and mutual influences of these areas. In addition to this, today's Montenegro is made up of more than half the territory that used to belong to Hum (and to Herzegovina), then a part that used to belong to Raška, a part that belonged to old Montenegro, Brda [the Hills]... All of the above to a considerable degree influenced the dialectal differentiations that used to divide and still divide, in dialectal terms, the area of Montenegro, while at the same time connecting it to linguistic areas outside its current territory.

1.1. Comparing various **Serbo-Slavic** manuscripts from different and distant areas, and diachronically at that (over a broad span of time), it can be observed that the Serbian linguistic space (in view of the application of linguistic and orthographic models) is to a considerable degree unified and interconnected (be it the Raška, Resava or post-Resava orthographic model). This tells us to what extent the copying centres and scribe schools maintained intense communication amongst themselves, as much as the actual circumstances allowed it (among other things, by changing the place of residence of scribes, exchanging books and the like). It is not possible to draw very strict borderlines between different schools of orthography (either in space or in time), there are no stark contrasts, just gradual and partial shifts (Đorđić 1971: 204–206; Mošin 1972; Jerković 1983: 15).

As the Latin script was also used in the Serbian linguistic space (in the earlier period) alongside the Cyrillic script (which soon expanded and became entirely dominant later), both orthographic traditions were present and inherited, the older Glagolitic and the younger Cyrillic one (some of its solutions differing from the Glagolitic orthography). Apart from the shifts in the domain of scripts, there were also shifts in the domain of orthographic schools and the tendencies within the framework of the said schools.

As far as orthography is concerned, in the Church Slavic language (and in the folk language, which relied upon it), there were

no significant changes after the 12th century, but there did occur variations and slight reforms (and modifications). Innovative features (in the domain of orthography), which most often came into being in the East, spread and were adopted all the way to the westernmost parts of the Serbian linguistic space. What we refer to here are the customs and innovations connected with the advent of the so-called **Raška orthography** (towards the end of the 12th and in the early 13th century), as well as those connected with the **Resava copying school** (towards the end of the 14th century) – with the orthographic innovations of this school.

1.1.1. Concerning the **Raška orthography**, it is well known that its orthographic principles favour the inherited Cyrillic orthographic tradition, that the **Raška orthography** was first established in the eastern part of the Serbian linguistic space (in Raška), and that over time it spread westward (where a more archaic orthography was dominant at the time, the basis of which contained a number of orthographic principles closer to the Glagolitic orthographic tradition). At the very beginning of the 13th century, the orthography was reformed. In fact, it was made orderly and codified, so that it should correspond better to the Serbian redaction of the Old Slavic language (relying to a greater extent to the Cyrillic orthographic tradition). The work on language reforms is connected with the name of St Sava, and is referred to in science as the **Raška orthography**. The specific characteristics of the **Raška orthography**, as opposed to the preceding eastern and western traditions that remained for a longer period of time are as follows:

The earliest specificity and the most consistently applied rule – differentiating between a so-called “uncovered” vowel (one at the beginning of a word or a syllable) and a so-called “covered” one (positioned behind a consonant), as reflected in the use of the following pairs for the covered/uncovered position: оу – ю, а – ѡ, е – ѳ, о – ѱ, ы – нѣ дслын, дко, дѣтн, пось...; ктеро, кланіѣ, оубнєнє...; южє., люю...; око, огнєнє, завєдєова, бєзоумнє...; 2) the differentiation between the position soft consonant + vowel and the position hard consonant + vowel,

that is, the writing of the ligatures ю – ѣ – ѣ behind palatal consonants. This violates the first of the above-mentioned principles (pertaining to the covered/uncovered position), and the former principle contributes, to a certain degree, to making the spreading of the latter orthographic rule more difficult: ЛЮ ВЛЮЕНЪ, ВЪЗВРАНИШЕ, ЛЮБЛШЕ (ю is almost consistently written in this position,] is written often, ѣ less frequently: ЗЕМЛЕ, ВЛНЖ ННН). This rule (compared to the first one), especially in the beginning, was applied with considerably less consistency, and its application became established during the course of the 14th century in the far east, and over time, it was applied more often and more consistently in the west as well. 3) The absence of “ђерва [đerva, the letter Ѓ, ѣ, the 6th letter of the Cyrillic script (referred to as **ђерва** in the Church Slavic language); đ, dj, the 8th letter of the Latin alphabet, *translator’s note*],” and the use of various graphic solutions for the sounds ħ [č] and ħ [đ] (for example, *тисука* [tisuća], *Крусик* [Krusić], *помоту* [помоћи]...; *освобога* [osvobađa], *оутврѣние* [utvrđenje], *медоу* [među]...), (according to: Rodić – Jovanović 1986: 9–12).

We can say that these orthographic solutions constitute tendencies, but not that they are limited in space and time. On the contrary! As regards the monuments written in the Serbian redaction of the Church Slavic language towards the end of the 12th century, *Vukan’s Gospel* contains considerably more features that are characteristic of the Raška orthography (the absence of *ђерва*, the writing of ligatures...), and *Miroslav’s Gospel* contains both orthographic models (the main scribe’s orthography contains mainly the features of the more archaic, western orthography, whereas in the case of Gligorije the Scribe there are features of the Cyrillic orthographic tradition that later on became established in “the Raška orthography”).³ But the *Bjelopolje Four Gospels*, dating from the end of the 13th century (preserved in the treasury of the Nikoljac Monastery in Bijelo Polje) is a monument that contains the most consistent application of the Raška orthographic model compared to all the Serbo-Slavic

³ For more details on this, see: Stojanović 2011.

manuscripts described so far.⁴ Thus, the *Čajniče Gospel* (dating from the end of the 14th century), from the so-called Bosnian group, is inconsistent when it comes to applying the orthographic models: in some segments of it there are features of the Raška orthography, while in others the more archaic orthographic model (often referred to as the Bosnian-Hum model) is applied almost consistently.⁵ *Prince Miroslav's Inscription* in Bijelo Polje (Hum) is characterised by the presence of the Glagolitic orthographic tradition, and the oldest preserved inscriptions from the region of Zeta (the *Morača Inscription* and the *Inscription of the Bishop of Zeta Neophyte*) are characterised by the Cyrillic orthographic tradition (that is, the Raška orthography).

That is also the case with monuments written in the **folk-type Serbian language**. What can be concluded from the described and analysed monuments from the Serbian linguistic area (of which there are more than a few) is that there never existed “pure” schools of orthography, especially if any of the centres of literacy are viewed diachronically, but that there was a tendency of gradually replacing the older orthographies (which were present for a long period of time, being retained and applied in the western parts of the area) with the newer

⁴ “*The Bjelopolje Four Gospels* is a typical example of the Raška orthography, with an orthographic system that strives to be firmly established and clear, with a great degree of certainty when it comes to the application of principles, which is a consequence of a more liberal and consistent application of the already established rules of the Raška orthography.

In the uncovered position of the sounds *ju, ja, je*, the ligatures ю, ја, је are almost consistently written: for example, юден, обою, ютроу, главою; яци, ясти, яниа, праваја; јелюу, једного, оубнѣши, подаеть... Also, the ligatures ю, ја, је are also written behind consonants (although not as consistently, with the exception of the ligature ю, compared to the previously mentioned rule), for example: людни, поустиню, вола, вниши го, землик, влнжнѣ...” (Stojanović 2002: 120–121).

⁵ Thus in the *Čajniče Four Gospels* (wherein, by the way, ligatures are used less often) we find examples containing ligatures: ясти Mt 2:26, явѣ б/14, велниа Mt 24:24, нїѣ Mk 6:25, недѣжнѣ Mk 6:56, нскушенѣ Lk 4/13 подмолю се Mt 26:36 (Jerković 1975).

(eastern) Raška orthography. In the early period, one can observe inconsistency and unevenness in the central part of the area (Hum), which later spread to the region of Bosnia. To put it more precisely, it was not so much a matter of replacement as of introducing new, more practical and clearer solutions from the Raška orthography in the west (there were no processes unfolding in the opposite direction to be observed), and their increasing stabilisation and more consistent application in the east in diachronic terms.

1.1.2. The situation is similar in the case of the **Resava** school of orthography. The changes and corrections of the orthography in the South Slavic area occurred in the course of the 14th century, which resulted, in the final quarter of the 14th century, in the orthography reform in Bulgaria carried out by Patriarch Euthymius (Mošin 1972: 257–258). At that time, towards the end of the 14th century, a new orthography was created in Serbia, which came to be known as “the Resava orthography” after the then centre of translation and copying activities. Most likely, the establishment of this orthography is connected to the Serbian Patriarch Jefrem, born in Bulgaria, which leaves open the possibility that the orthography of the Bulgarian Patriarch Euthymius influenced that of Resava. “The exceptionally successful Resava School, which worked within the framework of the Resava Monastery (today’s Manasija), was the greatest and best organised scriptorium of the Serbian Middle Ages, and was certainly one of the most prominent scriptoria in Europe at the time” (Nedeljković 1972: 484). It was established during the reign of Despot Stefan Lazarević, gathered learned people from the country and from abroad, who contributed to the creation of the third type of the mediaeval Serbian orthography.

The Resava orthography is easily recognisable owing to a considerable number of unified and proclaimed orthographic features, which represent a turnabout and an innovation compared to the former Raška orthography.⁶ The copies originat-

⁶ “Many Serbian manuscripts from the 15th and the 16th century enable us to clearly perceive their basic characteristics. Compared to the

ing from “the Resava School” are characterised by a normative orthography and a high degree of general orderliness and dependability. “The earlier planned changes in the texts of church books, which, as a rule, were carried out in the course of copying, had one of the following aims:

to establish the original authenticity of the text through lexical corrections, so as not to violate the purity of faith, based on religious writings, through deviations from the original,

or to adjust the graphic aspect and the orthography to the changed pronunciation reality, rationalising the latter thereby (the so-called Raška orthography originated from that particular need; Aleksandar Belić saw the powerful influence of St Sava behind the said orthography)”, (Ivić 1994: 67). According to Pavle Ivić, the ideal was a return to the old ways, which did not contribute to the practicality of the orthography, quite the contrary. This reform brought Serbian books closer to Bulgarian and Greek ones, and it was guided by the ideals of humanism and the spirit of the epoch (Ivić 1994: 67). The principles of the Resava orthography strove for a return to the old role models, for getting closer to the Greek orthographic and linguistic elements.⁷ “The process of getting the South Slavic script and

texts from the previous period, these manuscripts are characterised by the use of the Greek letters T, psi, xi, ižica [the last letter in the Old Slavic alphabet (y), *translator’s note*], as well as a more consistent differentiation between the use of the ordinary *o* letter and *omega* [Ω, ω]; a more regular use of the letter ‘zelo’ as a function of the Bulgarian pronunciation of that letter is some words, such as *звезда* [*zvezda* – *star*] and the like; the use of *x*, which had not existed in the Raška redaction, moreover, in the sense of the Bulgarian orthographic rule concerning its use in its phonetic place, first of all in prepositions and prefixes, as opposed to *q*, which is put in the place of a reduced half-sound at the end of a word; a regular use of *spiritus* and accents, and a fixed system of punctuation. On the one hand, this orthography shows that it was created on the basis of an organic evolution of the Serbian script of the Raška redaction, but on the other, it also contains some important elements that were taken over from the then Bulgarian orthography, and in that respect, they give the Resava reform the character of an orthographic revolution” (Mošin 1972: 258).

⁷ “Whatever originated from it (that is, from the Resava School, J. S.) is marked by the same concept, the same vision of how a Serbian

orthography closer to the Greek role model unfolded throughout the 14th century. Towards the middle of the century, letters borrowed from the then Greek italic script occurred in Slavic texts with increasing frequency” (Mošin 1972: 257–258).

This orthographic model spread from the east towards the south and the west of the Serbian language area, so that its orthographic solutions soon came to be applied in the region of Zeta, Hum...

The Raška orthography represented a deep-rooted and strong heritage, so that the Resava orthography did not suppress it completely. First of all, in the case of some orthographic details many features of the Raška orthography are still present, having been retained and used parallel with the Resava orthography norm, with more characteristics of one or the other, often differing from one monument to another, from one scribe to another.⁸

1.1.3. The Serbian orthography of the 16th century (judging by various manuscripts dating from that period) is characterised by the presence of books based on both the Raška orthography and the Resava one. This state of affairs resulted (judging by the manuscripts reviewed) in inconsistent application of the features of the Resava orthography and hesitant implementation of the Resava norm, and also in the interweaving and alternation of the Raška and the Resava orthographic models. This period is often referred to as the **post-Resava orthography period**. The most frequent deviations compared

book should look. Obviously, their work was guided by people who had very clear notions of how this should be done” (Mošin 1972: 258).

⁸ “With considerable inconsistency and a certain amount of evolution, that orthography was the dominant one in Serbian texts until the 18th century. It was named ‘the Resava orthography’ after the region of Resava, where, during the reign of Despot Stefan Lazarević, the Manasija Monastery became the living centre of translation activities, and in terms of regular orthography, it became a part of the tradition of our literacy for centuries, ‘copied from a good source, by experienced Resava translators’ – as it says, for example, in a note contained in a manuscript dating from 1660” (Nedeljković 1994: 485).

to the preceding models are as follows: the ligatures] and F are used inconsistently, the *thick yer* is used inconsistently (or almost not at all), compared to the preceding orthographic models. Both schools of orthography (the Raška and the Resava one) were preserved and recognisable through a rich heritage. That is why the **post-Resava** period is characterised by the interweaving of these orthographic traditions. The scribes were familiar with both orthographic models, so that the monuments dating from that period are marked by a somewhat lenient (and flexible) attitude towards the norm (some monuments are more faithful to the Raška orthographic model, while others adhere more closely to the newer, Resava one, the latter being the more frequent trend), but deviations from the Resava orthographic principles are frequent as well (Đorđić 1990: 204–206; Mošin 1972; Jerković 1983: 15).

All the orthographic-linguistic types referred to above are characteristic of a broad area where the Serbian language is spoken, including the regions that are a part of Montenegro today (judging by the preserved and studied monuments). Serbo-Slavic monuments from various periods testify to this, documents that have been researched and dealt with linguistically (both those dating from the pre-Resava period: *Miroslav's Gospel*, *Divoš's Gospel*, *The Bjelopolje Four Gospels*, and those dating from the Resava and the post-Resava period: the "*Psalters*" from the *Crnojević printing establishment* [the end of the 15th century], *The Gorica Collection* [dating from 1441/42] *The Vrhobreznik Manuscript* [from the Holy Trinity Monastery near Pljevlja, dating from the middle of the 17th century], *Sinners' Salvation* [dedicated to the Tušimlja Monastery in Drobnijak, also dating from the middle of the 17th century], and many others).⁹

1.2. Similar tendencies characterise the **Russian-Slavic language** (which was accepted in the Serbian Church across a broad area) and the **Slavic-Serbian** orthographic-linguistic and

⁹ Kuljbakin 1925; Grickat 1961; Stojanović 2000; Grković–Major 1993; Stojanović 2013: 303–522; Stojanović 2005; Stojanović 2006; Stojanović 2010.

literary model. We find features of the Slavic-Serbian language not only in writers from the far north (in South Hungary), where this type was first accepted and established, but also in the southernmost parts of the Serbian linguistic space.

The Slavic-Serbian language came into being through a gradual adjustment of Russian linguistic features (which were not readily understandable to readers, especially those who were not very well educated) by introducing elements of the Serbian language. This presupposed approaching the folk language, that is, Serbianising the Church Slavic language, adapting Russian-Slavic linguistic features to the Serbian linguistic situation. That is how the Slavic-Serbian language was created: by mixing Russian-Slavic and Serbian linguistic elements. This linguistic type, in its turn, survived, while undergoing significant changes, until the final great modification – Vuk's reform.

In the pre-Vuk period, language was manifested and realised in three somewhat different ways: as **the Church language** (dominated by the Russian-Slavic elements), **the civic language** (Slavic-Serbian) and **the folk language**: "The Serbs entered the 18th century with two linguistic manifestations of literacy, the Serbo-Slavic and the folk language. Around the year 1700, this duality already had a tradition of five centuries... The adoption of the Russian-Slavic language did not interrupt the practice of writing in the folk Serbian language" (Ivić 1998: 105 and 136). During this period Zaharije Orfelin (Mladenović 1969: 153, 174; Stijović 1970: 19–30), Jovan Rajić¹⁰ and Vasilije Dimitrije-

¹⁰ "Even though the history of the contemporary literary language, as is well known, belongs to the period from Vuk's era onwards, one still cannot ignore what had happened before Vuk, at least not writers from Vojvodina (without diminishing the importance of others), who wrote to a great degree using the folk language, many features of which are reflected in our literary language of today... Viewed in that light, the investigation of the folk language of the well-known writer from Vojvodina Jovan Rajić (1726–1801) is undoubtedly of importance. What should be viewed as his Serbo-Croat language, on the one hand, is his, for the most part, folk language – from today's aspect, dialectal features – which was referred to 'the common folk language' at the time. On the other hand, this designation should presuppose many linguistic features that are to

vić all wrote some of their works in the folk language. “Dositej Obradović boldly introduced the folk language in Serbian literature. His book *Life and Adventures* was not only written in that language, but also contained a clearly formulated programmatic view that ‘learned people should write in the common language,’ ‘for in this way, little by little, all the people will come to think and judge the purpose of each and every thing’” (Ivić 1998: 139). Thus, the folk language has its unbroken duration, from the oldest Serbian language monuments onwards, and in all Serbian language areas there simultaneously exist and survive two linguistic types, which is characteristic of other great cultures as well: “The system of the genre-based arrangement of linguistic types was particularly disrupted by writers who always wrote in the folk language, such as Dositej, Muškatirović and Emanuil Janković. The works and writings of Vasilije Petrović are also characterised by the interweaving of Russian and Church Slavic elements” (Ivić, 1998: 167). In the works of St Petar of Cetinje and Njegoš, apart from elements of the folk language, there are lots of Church Slavic elements. “Vuk was not the first one to advocate the promotion of the folk language in literature. From the very beginnings of Serbian literacy, the folk language was often used to complement, and occasionally to replace a Church Slavic word. When, in the early 18th century, the Serbs in South Hungary started working on the renewal of their culture, their old Serbo-Slavic language began to revive as well, but the new folk manner of linguistic expression was used alongside it” (Simić 1995: 3).

1.3. **Vuk’s language reform** meant, to a certain degree, deviating from the existing literary-linguistic situation, for the most part in relation to Slavic-Serbian as the dominant linguistic model, first of all in books of religious content, and to a considerable degree also in texts with literary-artistic content (some literary works were written in Serbo-Slavic, but a large

be found in his works written in the folk language, which are identical to the corresponding features in our contemporary literary language...” (Mladenović 1964: 9).

number of them were written in the folk language, both in the region of Serbia and in the areas that are a part of Montenegro today). Therefore, the pre-Vuk period linked these areas through the parallel existence of two linguistic (functionally layered) types. Vuk's language reform constituted favouring the second linguistic type, which was characteristic of texts with secular content, written in the Serbian folk language, with a (greater or lesser) predominance of features originating from folk dialects. At the same time, Vuk used, to a large degree, Church Slavic forms when corresponding forms were lacking in the folk dialect (he relied on the linguistic treasury of the Church Slavic language, substituting for and complementing the "insufficiencies" of the folk language). Vuk's reform and the folk language (as the standard and literary language), based on the East-Herzegovinian dialect (which Vuk selected as the basis of the Serbian literary language), were accepted both in Serbia and Montenegro (and also far beyond these areas).

This brief overview of the situations and tendencies, representing, in a nutshell, the areas of today's Serbia and Montenegro (and beyond) through history, provides an illustrative testimony of the unity of the Serbian literary language, the unity of linguistic processes and developments. Thus, the Serbian language was characterised by diglossia, which accounts for the presence of monuments written in the folk language and those written in the Church Slavic language (be it the Serbo-Slavic or the Slavic-Serbian period) within the framework of the rich and recognisable history of Serbian literacy. And, naturally: "Vuk was not the first one to advocate the promotion of the folk language in literature. From the very beginnings of Serbian literacy, the folk language was often used to complement, and occasionally to replace a Church Slavic word. When, in the early 18th century, the Serbs in South Hungary started working on the renewal of their culture, their old Serbo-Slavic language began to revive as well, but the new folk manner of linguistic expression was used alongside it" (Simić 1995: 3).

1.4. The unity of the literary language is testified to by **the continuity of the old vowel *yat* in Serbo-Slavic monuments**. It is well known that the vowel *yat* turned into its reflections very early on, in Ekavian and Ikavian from the 13th century (although individual examples of this occurred earlier as well, and in I/Jekavian from the 15th century onwards. All of the above was reflected (and present) in numerous written monuments, first of all those written in the folk language. Monuments written in the folk language (that is, those of secular content: charters, letters, correspondence of rulers, agreements, negotiations, some legal acts, codes and the like) most often approximately reflect the situation in the dialects, both concerning other linguistic features and concerning the reflection of *yat*, so that, in view of the area where they originated, they could have the Ekavian, Ikavian, Ijekavian or mixed reflection of *yat*.

The other group of monuments, that is, those written in the so-called Serbo-Slavic type, adhered to the norm rather more firmly, deviated from it less often, were less susceptible to the influx of linguistic features characteristic of a particular language area. This variant was used mostly for writing books needed by the Church; naturally, every detail had to be taken into consideration, including the correct linguistic transposition of the holy word (as faithfully to the original as possible), which implied establishing and maintaining a firmer and more stable norm (and orthographic models).

Regarding the issue of the writing of *yat*, that is, the replacements of this vowel in the I/Jekavian dialect area in monuments written in the Serbian redaction of the Old Slavic language this was mostly discussed as a side issue in papers dealing with some of the monuments of this type.

Analysing monuments of the Serbo-Slavic type from the I/Jekavian area, first of all those from the area of today's Montenegro (ipso facto, that also partly includes monuments from the areas of the former Zeta, Hum and Raška),¹¹ we came to the

¹¹ For more details on these problems, see Stojanović 2005: 263–273.

following conclusion: in these monuments, the most frequent tendency is to write *yat* in the positions where it belongs etymologically, and if there are deviations from this rule, instead of *yat* we have *e* as a continuant of *yat*, which was, as it transpires, closer to the Serbo-Slavic norm (a reflection of *yat* under the influence of the spoken language practice occurs rarely).

1.4.1. That is the situation starting from the *Bjelopolje Four Gospels*. This manuscript is characterised by a great degree of consistency in the application of the Raška orthography. It dates from a period when there already occurred examples of replacing the vowel *y* with *e* (but not with *ije*). The *BFG* adheres rather a lot to the Serbo-Slavic tradition, the vowel *yat* is most often written in the old etymological positions. There are only a few examples of deviating from this practice, where *e* is written instead of *yat*: телеѣ Лк пѣ; телеѣн Мк ѡз, добръ несть, and there are also opposite examples to be found, writing *yat* instead of the etymological *e* in the word *зред-*: грѣдоуцтнхъ, грѣдн.¹²

1.4.2. In the language of the “Psalter”, printed by the Crnojević printing establishment, according to J. G. Major, we find forms with *e*, as opposed to the old *yat* “The material reviewed confirmed the Ekavian replacement of *yat* in the ‘Psalter’, a monument created in the field, containing the Ijekavian replacement of this phoneme... The same situation was also observed, for instance, in books from Mrkša’s Church, which were printed in the Ijekavian territory, too, and in books from Skadar and Goražde as well” (Major 1987: 48).

1.4.3. In the text of *The Gorica Collection*, Ekaviansim is also to be found, as evidenced by the writing of *e* in the place of the etymological ѣ (недра 266a/3, коупель 267a/7, обнтелн 268a/16), as well as by the writing of ѣ in the place of the etymological е (всенѣрѣднын 266b/4–5, нзрѣдно 271a/7–8), (Dragin 2013: 74). Also, *e* is most often also written in places where, in the Old

¹² The *Bjelopolje Four Gospels* is a manuscript preserved in the Nikoljac Monastery in Bijelo Polje; it was written towards the end of the 13th or in the early 14th century in the region of Raška (for more details, see: Stojanović 2002).

Slavic language, doublet forms are used, as well as in words of Greek origin (Stojanović 2013: 512–515).

1.4.4. In connection with this issue, we have collected and analysed a corpus from *Old Serbian Notes and Inscriptions* (Stojanović 1986), limiting our research to monuments from the Ijekavian area). Frequent replacements of *yat* with *e* are also observed in notes accompanying Serbo-Slavic manuscripts and in inscriptions from various parts of today's Montenegro, as well as from a broader I/Jekavian area. In the *Notes*, which is of particular significance, we find examples from different areas and from all periods (we are interested here in the period starting from the 15th century, since when we have had the replacement of *yat* with (*i*)*je* in the spoken language basis). What can be concluded on the evidence of this is as follows: in the material published in the *Notes*, if *yat* is not written in the etymological positions, we find the vowel *e* as its continuant almost on a regular basis. For the purpose of illustration, we provide a small number of excerpted examples (from different areas and from different periods), for example: the 15th century – где (Pljevlja, the Holy Trinity Monastery, 1476/109); телесно, делом, телесн, смерьнаго (Cetinje, written in the home of I. Crnojević, 1489/112); последн, роукоделнсах, целолоудрню, смеренн (Makarije, 1493–1494, 116–118); теле, смернын (1495/119); месеца, летъ, преставн се (inscription on a tombstone in a monastery in the Župa of Nikšić); пресветне (Čajniče, 1492/115); the 16th century – смернн (Savina, 1510/126); последнн, ѿ реке, вндетн, погребень, погрешно (Cetinje, B. Vuković, 1519, 136–138); смернын, местѣ (Sarajevo, 1510/126); вехоу, рекѣ, бешѣ (Jerolim Zagurović, Kotor); препнсоуціннмь, селмь, белегъ, внде, всехъ, вехъ, дело, место (1562/198); лето, преставн, лѣтѣх (Morača, inscription on a door, 1574/219); смерному, лето, места, побездень (Šudikova, near Berane, 1582/231); лето (Podmaine, Praskavica, 1594/249); смерьннн, през, неделѣх (Paštrovići); всехъ, место, новемь, телажѣ, погрешено, веком, бешѣ, чловек, меромъ, хтеах (Piva, 1571/215–216); the 17th century – места, пресвета (Cetinje, inscription on a mitre, 1682/428); лета (Nikšić, 1695/466); лета (Drobnjak, 1700/579); летѣ, васен, градовехъ, местехъ, време,

лето (Kotor/Perast, 1682/437); the 18th century – ценаѡ, цена (Cetinje, 1732/91); лето, грешни (Morača, inscription on a wall, y1714/32); лето, степевъ, степац (the Nahya of Rijeka, 1722/59); рѣцѣ, белога поля, беломъ полю (Bijelo Polje, Nikoljac, 1726/72); всѣхъ, лето (Duga, Bratonožići, 1755/186)...

1.4.5. The tendency of writing *e* instead of *yat*, if *yat* was not used, is characteristic of *The Vrhobreznik Annals*, too. This, certainly, was not a characteristic of the spoken language base where the scribe Gavriilo Trojičanin originated from (Šćepan Polje), nor of the area where the manuscript was created (Pljevlja). The dialectal base of both areas is characterised by the I/Jekavian reflection of *yat*. That means that the form featuring *e* originated from the literary Church Slavic (Serbo-Slavic) norm. We excerpted the corpus connected to the vowel *yat* from the phototype edition of this manuscript.¹³ Even though it was not our intention to excerpt very precisely and thoroughly all the examples from the *Vrhobreznik Annals*, we noted over 300 examples where, in place of the former vowel *yat*, we find the vowel *e*, often repeated in the same lexeme, even though in most of the examples *yat* is written in the etymological positions (*The Vrhobreznik Annals* 2004).

1.4.6. From the same period as *The Vrhobreznik Manuscript* (the middle of the 17th century), we have the manuscript *Sinners' Salvation*.¹⁴ It is noticeable that it fits in with the general picture and corresponds to the situation in other Church Slavic

¹³ For example: дедъ 44b/2, мѣсецн 68a/22, бѣседовати 68b/4, завеса 75b/16, плевкы 84a/29, верникѣн 86b/16, беснѣю 91b/20, двѣма 156b/20, мѣднѣн 176a/4, целн 192a/14, искоренн 194b/13, оукрепнше се 197a/22, посекоше 210a/10, северъ 216a/11, мѣра 216a/7, девкамъ 290b/20, 291b/3, белнградѣ 297b/21, 296b/21, порекломи 303b/24, престолннкъ 202b/15, прѣвпрестолннкъ 203a/27, преломаъ 306a/18, прешгланнкъ 325b/23, прѣдалъ 262b/26; видѣти 81b/4, оуспе 71a/7, зрѣ 106b/10, прнспѣлъ 103a/18, сѣдѣти 175b/2, жнкеше 211a/10, нзвръгѣти 213a/22, тръпетн 242a/22 (*The Vrhobreznik Annals* 2004).

¹⁴ According to the note accompanying this manuscript, it was written (that is, translated from the Greek language) by two monks (a monk named Vasilije, a Drobniak from the village of Zagulje, with his brother Stefan), for the Tušimlja Monastery. It is kept at the National Library in

manuscripts. Concerning this linguistic feature, scribes adhered rather firmly to the Serbo-Slavic norm. Even more often than in the manuscripts presented so far, they adhered to the rule that the vowel *yat* was to be written in the positions where it etymologically belonged, but there are examples of *e* used instead of old *yat*, for instance: внде 4a/3, вредные 3b/5, плевелы 5a/3, коренїи 5a/5, тревобѣсїи 7a/25, тревобогаденїе 7a/29, въ средѣ 9a/4, медведа 10b/11, въ времѣ 11b/24, оумреше 14b/25, вѣчень 26b/17, бледослове 34b/9, времѣ 35a/4, брегъ 38a/5, гдѣ 39a/5, вндели 72b/24, оумрехъ 72b/25. More consistent would have been: оумре, трѣпехъ.

Therefore, a general characteristic of the Serbo-Slavic language, on the one hand, is the preservation of etymology and the writing of *yat*, and on the other, deviation from this etymological principle, the writing of *e*, as opposed to the former vowel *yat*, regardless of the reflection of this phoneme in the dialect base (or its possible pronunciation). Within the framework of our corpus, the insertion of the reflection of *yat*, in accordance with the dialectal base, is very rare. This orthographic-linguistic feature also testifies to the overall interlinking of the Serbian literary-linguistic space (in diachronic terms) and of the adjustment of the norm to different (territorial) formations, reflected in the considerably unified practice of writing *yat* (or its continuant), without significant deviations, taking into consideration the pronunciation in the region where the monument in question was created.

1.4.7. Approximately around the year 1730, there occurred a change of redactions of the Church Slavic language among the Serbs, which constitutes one of the greatest turnabouts in the history of the Serbian literary and church language. New social and historical reasons influenced this change and the adoption of the Russian-Slavic language, which introduced a shift concerning the pronunciation of the vowel *yat* in the preceding tradition. It is believed that the Russian-Slavic pronunciation

St Petersburg, where we obtained a microfilm of this manuscript courtesy of Vyacheslav Zagrebin.

was characterised by Jekavianism (according to the research carried out by the Soviet scientist B. A. Ouspensky, until the 18th century, in the Russian Orthodox Church there existed a pronunciation of the Church Slavic language wherein the consonants positioned before *e* were not softened, whereas those positioned before *yat* were softened. Ouspensky even showed that such a pronunciation has been preserved in liturgy to this day among the members of the “Old Rite” sect). The Serbian pronunciation of the Russian-Slavic language in church is of that type: before *e*, a consonant is treated as a hard one, and when combined with *yat* as a soft one, so that the sound *j* is introduced (Ivić 2001: 176).

This opened up more space and further broadened the possibilities of different continuants for *yat*: 1) the pronunciation of *yat* characteristic of the language of the Church: a) the writing of “yat”, b) the writing of *e* as a continuant of “yat”, c) the “Jekavianism” of the Russian-Slavic period; 2) unevenness in view of the continuant of *yat*, which reflects the influence of various layers, and alongside this, conditioning by the dialectal base (in connection with literary texts); 3) the reflection of *yat* stemming from the dialectal base. On account of this, in the pre-Vuk period there is the greatest amount of unevenness when it comes to the writing and pronouncing continuants for the vowel *yat*. Such a diversity in the Serbian literary language could produce a foundation for the future acceptance of Vuk’s I/Jekavian, and somewhat later the Ekavian reflection of *yat*, which were present in literature and in many other written texts, and also in folk dialects.

1.4.8. Opting for the East-Herzegovinian dialect as the basis of the Serbian language,¹⁵ Vuk ipso facto opted for the I/Jekavian reflection of *yat* as well. Vuk introduced the I/Jekavian reflection for *yat* in texts of religious content with his translation of the *New Testament*, which was given in the I/Jekavian form.

¹⁵ A number of reasons have been given for such a decision on his part: the fact that this dialect was quite widespread, liking the Serbs of all three faiths, progressiveness...

Vuk's reform and the folk language (as the literary language) were accepted both in Serbia and Montenegro (and across a much broader area). As we find in Pavle Ivić: "The act of adopting the folk language as the literary language actualised the issue of the dialectal base of the language among the Serbs. The explicitness of the issue was sharpened by Vuk's abandonment of the old Cyrillic sign for *yat*, which had, until then, blurred the difference between the Ekavian and the Ijekavian pronunciation in writing. Vuk's solution in practice was simple: he never renounced writing in his beloved Ijekavian dialect. True, in theory Vuk showed more open-mindedness, recognising everyone's right to choose his own dialect, even though he always gladly found reasons to favour the Ijekavian variant" (Ivić 2001: 197). Vuk had a number of reasons for choosing the East-Herzegovinian dialect: "The local dialects of Vojvodina markedly differ amongst themselves; it would appear that in the literary language those features that were closer to the Serbian average were easier to adopt, which, in any case, suited the adoption of that language in the principality of Serbia. Thus, a milder form of the Herzegovinian speech and a milder form of the Vojvodinian speech found themselves alongside each other... In the Ekavian area, Vuk's victory was, in fact, a compromise. Ekavian speakers replaced the literary language they had used until then with Vuk's language, but they introduced the Ekavian variant in it..." (Ivić 1990: 236–237; Ivić 1991: 242–243; Ivić 1998: 197).

In 1894, Stojan Novaković, the great Serbian philologist, published *A Grammar of the Serbian Language* (written in the Ekavian dialect, codifying the Ekavian variant of the literary language and marking its affirmation in the literary language on an equal footing with the Ijekavian variant. As we find in Professor Radoje Simić: "Novaković gives arguments in favour of the Ekavian variant, which are almost entirely adapted from Vuk's arguments in favour of the Ijekavian variant, and thus they do not appear convincing enough" (Simić 1991: 386). Novaković also, referring to Vuk as well, advocated the equality of the two variants: "I think it should be said here that, no obsta-

cles should be imposed concerning the differences between the two dialects, that they should be kept entirely equal. As Vuk St. Karadžić said of them as far back as 1818, in the first edition of his Dictionary, ‘that neither was lovelier or dearer to him than the other, but that he considered them equal’, we are of that opinion today as well” (Novaković 1888).

Within the framework of the Serbian linguistic standard, which had mostly been established by 1870 or thereabouts, there was a freedom of choice between the Ekavian and Ijekavian reflection of *yat*. This in no way impeded its unity. On the contrary, it unified the historical heritage (concerning the entire monument treasury – of both the Church Slavic and the Serbian folk language) and the reality of the period, in view of the situation within the dialects (both pronunciations were quite widespread). Therefore, **the cultivation and preservation of the dual pronunciation of *yat* in the Serbian literary language** constitutes its richness, preserving it from possible dissolution or giving some people the opportunity (which has been observed lately) of appropriating the Ijekavian dialect, which had been Serbian since time immemorial. In addition to that, the Ekavian and the Ijekavian heritage (both in the literary/standard language and in the dialects) cannot be identified with today’s state-building formations, nor should they be confined within territorial boundaries, favouring one or the other. As we find in Pavle Ivić: “...we should respect **the right of Jekavian speakers in our midst to use their own pronunciation – in the workplace, in publications and in schools**. Let us go on cultivating the tradition of the picturesque Jekavian expression. In terms of the sheer richness of the language, other Serbs will always have something to learn from the folk poems noted down by Vuk, from Njegoš, Ljubiša and Matavulj, from the writers of Mostar and from Kočić, but they will learn no less from our contemporaries, whose presence is so strongly felt in the current Serbian literature. **The fresh breath of Jekavian eloquence must be preserved in our pupils’ textbooks, on the pages of our periodicals and in the editions of Serbian**

publishers...” (Ivić 2011: 241). We find similar reasoning today in Ivan Negrišorac: “The Serbian language policy would have to encompass both the Ekavian and the Ijekavian pronunciation, as two dialects of the Serbian language that should be cultivated within the framework of the same standard solutions. Both dialects are Serbian, primarily Serbian” (Negrišorac 2014: 20). In connection with this, we should ask ourselves how much effort is invested today in the preservation of the Ijekavian dialect as Serbian linguistic heritage and treasury, first of all in Serbia (where it is being omitted altogether and replaced in every sphere of public life), and also elsewhere. The Ijekavian dialect, which the Serbs had spoken in historical continuity until the Croats “embraced” it by accepting Vuk’s standard (who, as Ivić showed, had never spoken Ijekavian) should be given special attention and its well-earned place, thoroughly deserved, in the broad area of the Serbian language.

2. The dialectal picture of Montenegro

On the dialectal level as well, the spoken language area of Montenegro fits in very nicely (and has fitted in throughout history) within the broader continuum of the Serbian language, constituting an inseparable part of it – no speech or dialect ends at the border of Montenegro, none of them is “Montenegrin only” or “all-Montenegrin”, as the current unscientific trend is trying to present the linguistic state of affairs in Montenegro.¹⁶ There are areas that are a part of Montenegro today which, through history, have belonged to various formations; Montenegro is made up of a large part of the territory that once belonged to Hum (and Herzegovina), a part that encompasses more than half of Montenegro (in addition to which there are broad areas of south-western Serbia, broad areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, which lies at the base of the normative,

¹⁶ For a more detailed account of this, see: *The Serbian Language and the State-National Projects of the 19th and the 20th Century*.

standard language); there is a part which formerly belonged to Raška, Old Serbia, and a part that belonged to old Montenegro, Zeta, Brda... All of this has exerted a considerable influence on the dialectal differentiations which divide the area of Montenegro today, while at the same time linking it to the linguistic areas outside its current territory.¹⁷

The most striking differentiation is the one dividing Montenegro into two different dialectal types, the more archaic one (the dialects of the Zeta-Raška type) and the more progressive, East-Herzegovinian type (which Vuk took over at the basis of the Serbian language). These two dialect types differ in many linguistic features, and are linked to other spoken language areas outside the boundaries of Montenegro on the dialectal level. There is no linguistic feature that would be characteristic of Montenegrin dialects only, but the scope of each feature reaches far beyond its boundaries. That is the case with the so-called Jekavian iotation (such as *hepamu* [instead of *tjerati* – chase, drive], *hevojka* [instead of *djevojka* – girl]), and mostly with the pronunciation of *c'* [s'] and *z'* [z'], which is a feature of Ijekavian speeches from Banja Luka, Dalmatia, Kordun, Banija, Lika, Bosnia and the entire western Serbia; *s* is to be found more of-

¹⁷ This spilling over the boundaries is not characteristic of the dialectal level only, but is manifested on other levels as well. As we find in Mitar Pešikan: “Science, however, as well as education, which is always connected to it, has the obligation not to neglect any side of the objective truth. While remaining in the service of that all-encompassing truth, we shall still have to admit that any serious expert investigation of the life of the Serbian people is artificial and unnaturally fragmented if it omits the Montenegrin part, for example, if it deals with the Serbian linguistic material from Herzegovina, Sandžak and Toplica – but leaves out Montenegro. This also holds true when dealing with history, ethnology and linguistic culture – and the written heritage within it, and also with folk dialects, folk poems and proverbs, and a number of other components, including an inventory of names, that is, human and geographic names. In all of this, naturally, there will be elements that are specific of Montenegro or of certain parts of it, but there will also be a lot of things that do not end at the Montenegrin border, but link the historical and cultural life of Montenegro to the life of the other Serbs, and in some of their aspects to the lives of other peoples” (Pešikan 2009: 133).

ten in the Kosovo-Resava dialect than in the Zeta-Raška one (and it is precisely these features that are emphatically presented as specifically Montenegrin ones).

3. The naming of the language on the territory of today's Montenegro

3.1. As regards the traditional cultural identification and naming, the language of the territory of today's Montenegro, ever since it was first named, has been solely referred to as Serbian (for a certain period of time, as the official language – also as Serbo-Croatian, even though it never became established in popular usage). We have many testimonies of this: from Crnojević, the Obod printing establishment and its staff; it was also called Serbian during the reign of the Petrović dynasty, etc.¹⁸

For the purpose of providing an illustration of the above, we offer but a few examples:

– Thus, for instance, relating to the testament of **Đurđe Crnojević** (dating from the 15th century), his widow had the following to say: “...realised through a dependable translator, from the aforementioned Serbian language into the Latin language, for that testamentary note was and is written in the aforementioned Serbian language, in his own hand, by the late Đurđe Crnojević, Esquire...” (Milošević 1994).

– **Božidar Vuković Podgoričanin** (of the Obod printing establishment and the founder of a printing establishment in Venice) had this to say in the *Afterword to the Prayer Book* from 1520: “I have come to desire making our Serbian letters [...] for the print set” (Stojanović 1986). We find the same desire in his son Vincenzo (as we have noted before).

¹⁸ On the mentions of the Serbian name and the name of the Serbian language in history (in connection with Montenegro), see also in: Petrović 1995: 48. и 64.

– Jerolim Zagurović of Kotor wrote in the *Afterword to the Psalter* from 1569: “I have completed this work, which is called the Psalter in Greek, and in Serbian – Psalm Tunes” (Stojanović 1, 1986).

– **The Petrovićs (Njegoš, Prince and King Nikola...).** Everyone is familiar with Njegoš’s verses: *I write and speak Serbian...* In 1836, *A Serbian Alphabet Book for Teaching the Young to Read Church and Civic Texts* by Dimitrije Milaković was published by the Metropolitan printing establishment. In 1838, Dimitrije Milaković’s *A Serbian Grammar for the Serbian Youth* was published in Montenegro by the Government printing establishment.

In the year 1867, a new educational programme was introduced, including a subject entitled “Reading, Serbian and Slavic”. In 1868, a book entitled *The First Knowledge for Serbian Primary Schools* (an official school textbook) was published in Cetinje; in it, we read: “Montenegro is now a principality [...] the Montenegrins are a Serbian people...” (p. 33).

In 1869, a new educational programme was prepared for the four-year primary school, and in all the four grades Serbian was to be taught as a separate subject. In 1876, the timetable of the subjects being taught at the Women’s Institute in Cetinje contained the designation – *the Serbian Language*. In 1897, *A Serbian Alphabet Book for the First Year of Primary School* was published, written by Đuro Popović and Jovan Roganović. In *The Orthodox Catechism Book* (Parts 1, 2 and 3), dating from 1899, written by Đuro Popović and Pero Martinović, the subject being taught is the Serbian language.

In *The Geography of the Principality of Montenegro for the Third Year of Primary School* (written by Đuro Popović and Jovan Roganović, published by the State Printing Establishment in Cetinje in 1895), we find: “The people living in Montenegro are pure Serbs who speak the Serbian language, and there are 300,000 inhabitants. They are mostly of the Orthodox faith, and some are Roman Catholics and Mohammedans, but it should be known that we are all of Serbian origin and Serbian nationality” (33).

In 1900, *A Serbian Grammar for the Third and Fourth Year*, compiled by Đuro Špadijer, was printed by the State Printing Establishment of the Principality of Montenegro.

In *The Law on the People's Schools in the Principality of Montenegro* (Cetinje, the State Printing Establishment of the Principality of Montenegro, 1907), it is stated: "Article 1. It is the duty of the people's schools to educate children in the national and religious spirit, to prepare them for civic life, and especially to disseminate education and Serbian literacy among the people..." In "The Study of Sounds", in the section entitled "The sounds and letters of the Serbian language", it says: "In the Serbian language there are 30 sounds...", and in the section "What is Serbian grammar", among other things, we find: "Serbian grammar is a science that teaches us to speak, write and read Serbian correctly..."

In *The Geography of the Kingdom of Montenegro for the Third Year of Primary School* (written by Đuro Popović and Jovan Roganović, Cetinje, the Royal Montenegrin State Printing Establishment, 1911), it is stated: "Montenegro is ruled by King Nikola of the famous Serbian family Petrović-Njegoš... In primary school, the pupils learn... Serbian history, the Serbian language..."

In all the school certificates issued until the Second World War (and also for some twenty years after the Second World War) the name of the subject is *the Serbian language*, etc.

3.2. Serbian was the official language and the language of public and private communication in Montenegro at the time of the Principality and the Kingdom of Montenegro. "As opposed to Croatia and Slavonia, where there were ongoing struggles in the second half of the 19th century over the name of the language, so that different designations were in public and official use (Croatian or Serbian, Croatian), and Dalmatia, where, apart from Italian, the official acts increasingly often mentioned the designations Serbian or Croatian, that is, Serbo-Croatian – in Serbia and Montenegro the language was only referred to by the designation Serbian, and thus named, it performed all the

functions of the literary and the official language” (Okuka 2006: 44). From the beginning of the 20th century, a greater diversity could be observed: “In the period of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and subsequently of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1918-1941), on the territory of Montenegro the provisions of the centralised constitutional system of the Yugoslav state community were applied (Serbo-Croatian, Serbo-Croatian-Slovenian, Yugoslav)” (Vukić 2006: 25).

During the First World War, the occupying authorities favoured “Croatian” as the designation for the language spoken in Montenegro (for more details on this, see the chapter *The First World War – The Attitude towards the Cyrillic script and Other Serbian National Symbols*).

It was only during the Italian occupation in the Second World War that the term *lingua Montenegrina* was introduced by the Italian authorities and came into public use. Therefore, “the designation Serbian has a linguistic, as well as extra-linguistic and ethno-linguistic grounding in terms of argumentation” (Kovačević 2007: 24). As we find in Mitar Pešikan: “Especially concerning the language, the folk language of the Montenegrins has always been Serbian, as part of the Serbo-Croatian linguistic whole. In Montenegro, Serbian has always been spoken as ‘our Serbian language’, as it is written in the *Cetinje Annals* by an old Montenegrin scribe. Even after the war, we called the language that we were being taught at the Cetinje grammar school *the Serbian language*... All of the above are incontrovertible truths, which we should all acknowledge, irrespective of how we look upon the desirable future development, the issue of where the Montenegrin ship of state should sail on the troubled seas of our time... But the historical Montenegro would never even dream of isolation and separation. From Bishop Danilo, ‘the leader of the Serbian land’, to King Nikola, whose soul would only find peace ‘when the Serb was no longer a slave’, it always wanted to be a spark and vanguard of the renewal of the Serbian state, was always prepared to expand its programme towards South

Slavism, the liberation of the Balkans, the all-Slavic renewal” (Pešikan 2009: 124).

3.3. **The constitutional definition of the language** (its official and public use in Montenegro) was not precisely and uniformly determined for a number of years after World War Two: “Towards the end of 1945, the Constitutional Assembly in Cetinje adopted the Constitution of the People’s Republic of Montenegro. The name of the official language is not defined in formal-legal terms by any of the provisions of the said Constitution. However, in Chapter Ten, **The National Courts**, in Article 113 it is stated, literally: ‘The proceedings before courts of law shall be conducted in the Serbian language...’ Based on insight into **school certificates** issued by primary, secondary and vocational schools in Montenegro in the post-World War Two period, it is evident that the school subject Serbian Language and Literature is referred to in school certificates without the designation: Croatian” (Vukić 2006: 27). That was the state of affairs until **The Novi Sad Agreement** (1954), when the official language also began to be designated as Serbo-Croat. “The name and the status of the official language in the Republic is not standardised by any specific provision in the **Constitution of Montenegro dating from 1963** either. Still, the official language is mentioned marginally in Chapter Ten, Constitutionality and Legality; in Article 217 of the said Constitution, among other things, it is stated: ‘State organs and organisations that deal with matters of public interest shall conduct their work in the Serbo-Croatian language’” (Vukić 2006: 27).

In the next Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Montenegro (SRM), dating from 1974, the name of the official language is explicitly defined in Article 172: in the SRM, the language in official use is the Serbo-Croat language of the Ijekavian pronunciation (that is, after the adoption of *The Declaration on the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language*, dating from 1967, in the same year when the Croatian Constitution adopted the formulation about the language “in

public use” in the Socialist Republic of Croatia: “the Croatian literary language”, “which is called Croatian or Serbian”). In the year 1975, language sections were formed in the Yugoslav Assembly: 1) Serbo-Croatian (Serbia and Montenegro), Croatian (Croatia), Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian (Bosnia and Herzegovina). For the first time, the principle of two scripts was promoted: the Cyrillic and the Latin one (for more details on this, see Okuka 2006: 227). The essential change in the name of the official language in Montenegro occurred after the break-up of the Yugoslav federation in 1991: *The language in official use is the Serbian language of Ijekavian pronunciation*. Thus, the official language named in the Constitution of Montenegro after the Second World War was called Serbo-Croatian and Serbian for approximately the same number of years. Regardless of the constitutional designation, the popular designation was the Serbian language. However, the new Constitution of 2007 introduced the entirely unfounded and ungrounded formulation: *The language in official use is Montenegrin... Also in official use are Serbian, Bosniak, Croatian and Albanian*. (For more details on this, see: *The Serbian Language in Montenegro in the Mirror of Linguistics and Politics*).

4. The decision of the social collective

The language policy that is conducted in Montenegro is not favoured even by that loosest of criteria (never sufficient in itself [in stable societies and societies that strive for linguistic stability]), the sociolinguistic one, usually referred to as general social acceptability, or “the self-determination of speakers”. General social acceptability, but only as one of the elements that a language policy takes into consideration, presupposes that a language is to be named in accordance with the decision of the majority of the given social collective. This is evidenced, in a way, on the sociolinguistic level by the latest censuses in Montenegro (in 2002, 64% of the citizens opted for the desig-

nation – Serbian. This means that the naming of the language was carried out even contrary to the will of the citizens who had opted precisely for the national designation which is emphasised and imposed as the name of the language). And despite the language itself!

Naturally, in serious societies, where the language policy is conducted in a serious manner, the option of the so-called folk linguistics is not sufficient in itself: "...it is well known in linguistics that the speakers' perception (and evaluation) of the linguistic situation need not coincide with the real situation: considering an idiom language because its speakers perceive it thus would be the same as, for example, considering a political system democratic because that is how its population perceives it. Politicologists, as a rule, would not be happy with such a solution. In natural sciences, it is even more obvious than in social ones that it is not much use following the opinion of a population of laymen. No serious biologist, for example, would consider an eel to be a snake because people think so" (Ammon 1989: 35).

The censuses also testify to how, through a political-ideological projection (and pressure), in the second half of the 20th century (during the Communist rule), the identity of the population of Montenegro, both the national (after the Second World War) and the linguistic one (in the final decade of the 20th and in the early 21st century): according to the census carried out in the Kingdom of Montenegro (in 1909) 95% of the population spoke Serbian; according to the census carried out in 2003, with the intention of favouring the designation "Montenegrin" as the name of the language (it included a rubric containing the options: Serbian, Montenegrin..., so that all a respondent had to do was encircle one of the language options), but despite great pressures, 63.49% of the respondents opted for the Serbian language; 21.96% opted for Montenegrin (of the overall number of those declaring themselves to be Montenegrin nationals, 156,374,

that is, 58.42% of them stated that Serbian was their mother's tongue).¹⁹ According to the 2011 census, 42.88% of the respondents opted for Serbian (this time, too, a not inconsiderable number of those who declared themselves to be of Montenegrin and Bosniak nationality opted for Serbian as their mother's tongue), 36.97% opted for Montenegrin (5.33% for Bosnian; 5.27% for Albanian; 0.59% for Bosniak; 0.45% for Croatian).²⁰ Despite these figures, after the constitutional and legal changes in Montenegro, the Serbian language (which the majority of the respondents opted for) became "equal" to Croatian (0.45%), but was unequal compared to "Montenegrin", which fewer speakers opted for.

¹⁹ According to the 2003 census: national affiliation (Montenegrins 43.16%; Serbs 31.99 %; Bosniaks 7.77 %; Albanians 5.03 %; Croats 1.10 %...); language (Serbian 63.49%; Montenegrin 21.96%; Albanian 5.26; Bosniak 3.21; Bosnian 2.22%; Croatian 0.45; undeclared 2.24%...). Of the overall number of those who declared themselves to be Montenegrin, 156,374 (58.42%) stated that Serbian was their mother's tongue, whereas 106,214 respondents opted for Montenegrin; of the overall number of Serbs, 197,684 (99.63%) stated that Serbian was their mother's tongue; of the overall number of Yugoslavs, 1,705 (91.67%) stated that Serbian was their mother's tongue; of the overall number of Albanians, 30,382 (97.49%) stated that Albanian was their mother's tongue; of the overall number of Bosniaks, 18,662 (38.73%) stated that Bosniak was their mother's tongue, 13,718 (28.47%) stated *Bosnian* as their mother's tongue, 12,549 (26.04%) opted for Montenegrin, and 2,723 (5.65%) opted for Serbian as their mother's tongue; of the overall number of Muslims, 13,627 (55.34%) stated that Montenegrin was their mother's tongue, 8,696 (35.31%) stated that Serbian was their mother's tongue, 1,094 (4.44%) opted for Bosniak, 414 for Albanian, and only 282 respondents opted for *Bosnian* as their mother's tongue; of the overall number of Croats, 2,529 (37.13%) stated that Serbian was their mother's tongue, 2,438 (35.80%) opted for Croatian and 1,375 (20.19%) for Montenegrin.

²⁰ The 2011 census: national affiliation (Montenegrins 44.98%; Serbs 28.72%; Bosniaks 8.56%; Albanians 4.91%; Roma 1.01%; Croats 0.97%); language (Serbian 42.88%; Montenegrin 36.97%; Bosnian 5.33%; Albanian 5.27%; Bosniak 0.59%; Croatian 0.45%).

5. The current developments in connection with the language and the language policy

5.1. What has been at work in recent years is an experiment of sorts regarding the status and identity of the language of Montenegro. Decisions (at various levels) pertaining to the (re)naming and “additional naming” of the Serbian language in public and official use have been passed abruptly, without arguments or grounding, from certain (political and state) power centres (supported by certain non-governmental organisations and institutions). There have been attempts to jeopardize the status of the Serbian language in Montenegro without any reason or grounding, through a mere institutional and parainstitutional impositions of “solutions”, despite its historical horizontal and vertical underpinning, despite scientific arguments (linguistic and sociolinguistic ones alike), the linguistic essence and social reality. And the protagonists of all this are **those to whom language is not a profession but a “political option”** and those who, worst of all, promote their political fervour through “linguistic” activities. Linguists have discarded linguistics in order to fit in with the realisation of political projects and to serve political ideologies, which have no connection with linguistics whatsoever, but are a product of very extreme nationalist phenomena, movements and activities.

The relationship between scientific and political parameters is very complex and intertwined, and viewed from the perspective of linguistic criteria, the status and development of a language or languages are much clearer than in the context of linguistic-political or almost bared political ones.²¹ The “justifications” that were offered for such processes were not scientifically grounded, they did not even come close to science and did not have any criteria as such. Linguistic criteria are stable and clear, which is why they are far fewer than political ones; those are: the structural, that is, systemic-typological criterion

²¹ On the relationship of and the demarcation line separating the linguistic and the political criteria, see: Kovačević – Šćepanović 2011.

(i.e. what language is in view of its grammatical structure); the genetic criterion (which is where the historical continuity of language originates from); the communicative criterion (comprehensibility). Non-linguistic “criteria”, which, in these parts, have served as a “justification” for creating new languages, that is to say, new names for one and the same language, are incomparably more numerous, and new ones are created and added all the time – in view of the newly created situation, projects and needs, namely: 1. the right of each and every people to call their language by its own name, 2. the right of a nation to call its language by its own name, 3. self-evaluation (and self-determination, often enough – fabricated and imposed) of the given language’s speakers, 4. the criterion of agreement concluded by non-linguistic, that is, political authorities; 5. the “criterion” of compromise, 6. the criterion of independent state; 7. the criterion of culture, 8. the constitutional determination of the name of a language, 9. the norm and standardisation as a criterion... And that is not all...!? (See: Kovačević – Šćepanović 2011).

5.1.1. The processes of suppressing the designation Serbian for the language first started **in the educational system**. In March 2004, the state and educational authorities in Montenegro passed the decision that in Montenegrin schools, instead of the subject *Serbian Language and Literature*, the subject *Mother’s Tongue and Literature* should be taught, and that at the end of the school year (or schooling!?), the pupils and their parents could opt for the name of the language as they wished – in keeping with the justification of the Assistant Minister (Radovan Damjanović) that “the time has come for the name of the language not to be prescribed” and that “the citizens may call it what they like”, “that it is the personal right of a pupil to call that language as he/she likes”, that “the naming of the language constitutes the free will of the citizens” (the daily *Dan [Day]*, 13th March 2004: 11). As we find in Miloš Kovačević: “From a linguistic point of view, we cannot speak of a ‘mother’s’ or a ‘Montenegrin’ language, let alone of a ‘mother’s Montenegrin’ language... That is not at all a term (that is, mother’s, J. S.) one

would use to name a language, that is a term for a language adopted with ‘mother’s milk’. Therefore, the general term is the parents’ tongue. That is why not all peoples necessarily call that language ‘mother’s’, for it can also be, as is the case with the Poles, the ‘father’s’ language. But each ‘mother’s’ or ‘father’s’ language has its name: it is Russian, English, Spanish or Serbian, for example. The term ‘mother’s’ cannot replace any lingvonym (name of a language). Along with mother’s, one must state the name of a language... The term ‘mother’s’, for instance, is equivalent to the term ‘river’ or ‘mountain’” (Kovačević 2005: 112).

5.1.2. After a short while, when the summer holiday had begun, the same ministry and the same council passed a new decision (no less absurd): that the subject in question was to be called *Mother’s*, followed by a designation in brackets (*Serbian, Montenegrin, Croatian, Bosniak*), that is, four “language names”, so that at the end of the school year, depending on the wish of the parents or the pupils, one of the four “names” was to be entered (that is to say, “a designation for the name of the subject” – according to the Ministry’s formulation). From the above, one can discern the “project” of the Montenegrin authorities: first divest the language of its name (instead of Serbian, introduce the term *mother’s* as a substitute for the name of the language), and then, within the framework of the designation “mother’s” add a name to it (initially, using a four-name designation where “Montenegrin” was to be inserted), and subsequently rename it, calling it the Montenegrin language (or the like). During the initial period, make a quick succession of moves in various domains introducing the designation “Montenegrin” for the language.

5.1.3. In addition to the above, the designation Montenegrin for the “language” was introduced and imposed in many other areas and segments of life, all for the purpose of getting Montenegro used to the designation Montenegrin for the “language”. The aim of this is to create, by any means and method available, the “ambience” for (self-induced) oblivion. That is why this process is carried out outside expert and scientific circles, in spite of them, in fact, misrepresenting the linguistic

circumstances, deceiving Montenegro, bringing it into conflict with reality, with its own people, its language, its cultural and linguistic needs... In this way, the authorities are trying to create a “new language” – “Montenegrin”, relying on a new science – “Montenegrin studies” (or whatever it may be called?!), or to create a new science, “Montenegrin studies”, “Montenegrology” (?!), the fruit of which is to be a new language – “Montenegrin”.

5.1.4. The tenacity manifested in carrying out the unhealthy, erroneous and unrealistic language policy in Montenegro shows no signs of abatement, but only gains in intensity. The next move is **preparing amendments to the Constitution** – especially in the section dealing with the designation for the language. From the very start, two highly tendentious issues in connection with this were introduced: 1) What should the “language”, “linguistic standard” (provisionally speaking) be? 2) What should the language be called?

1) When the language designation “Montenegrin” is proclaimed, various “options and views” concerning what it should be are in circulation: 1. Introducing “novelties” in the Serbian language standard along with the change of name; 1.1. “Realising” the specific character of the language through the introduction of some dialectal forms of the Serbian language, that is to say, through the promotion of new letter signs for sound values (the “phonemes”, that is, allophones) *c*, *z*, *s*; 1.2. Introducing doublet-type solutions (of which one is dialectal and the other in keeping with the Serbian language norm), iotised and non-iotised forms (*ћепаму*, *ђевојка* and *мјепаму*, *дјевојка*, *цјџпа* [tomorrow], *ц’џпа...*); 2) The Serbian language (and its linguistic standard) are simply to be renamed Montenegrin (for a while, there was a proposal to use the term Montenegrin-Serbian), that is, the established name for the language is to be changed illegitimately and ungroundedly: “The Montenegrins are to call that Serbian language of yours, which you speak, Montenegrin... end of story.”²²

²² The Minister of Education and Science Slobodan Backović, as quoted in the daily *Dan*, 31st August 2004, and according to the au-

Thus, even though the designation Montenegrin for the language is bandied about, there is no success when it comes to determining (or agreeing on) what it should be, what should be “proclaimed” and normativised, how that distinction (!) is to be implemented in practice in relation to the existing Serbian language (and its linguistic standard), how, if all that should come to pass (for the “benefit” of Montenegro), the speakers opting for one or the other are to be divided.

5.1.5. Before the referendum, the basic “justification” for **changing the language and/or the name of the language** was that the naming of a language is (some vaguely defined) “right” (of a people, nation, group of individuals – for instance, 20%), which is a politically manipulative projection. Such views, imposing politics onto science and putting language in the chains of politics originating from the centres of power, are recognisable in Stalinist-Leninist practices. As the linguist Milorad Pupovac points out: “As the scientificness of politics did not emanate from itself, or from any particular science, but from the ideologemes of the scientised philosophy of Marxism, and since politics wanted to eliminate the difference between itself and science, it is understandable that the knife was in the politician’s hand” (Pupovac 1986: 94). In the words of Dragoljub Petrović: “It is a well-known truth that, when science and politics clash, it is politics that should be changed” (Petrović 1996: 62). But that is something that Montenegrin politicians never seem to realise!

What is misguidedly emphasised is the erroneous and/or imaginary “right”, that is, the right of an individual, a vaguely defined social group, the right of every people (that is, nation) to “its own language”.²³ What tends to get forgotten in doing so

dio recording of a press conference the Minister gave, available from the website of the Ministry of Education and Science of Montenegro.

²³ “It is possible that the word ‘right’ has become a fashionable one in the South Slavic area, for there is no other way to explain why South Slavic philologists invoke ‘the right of a people to its own language’ when no one is requesting of the said people to switch to a foreign language...” (Kordić 2010: 120).

is the right of a language to have its own name, which should not be taken away from it, nor should another name be imposed – totally ungrounded. “In political terms, the issue of the name of a language is most often referred to as ‘the inalienable right of every people to call its language by its own name’, a demand voiced in *The Declaration on the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language* (1967). In some cases, this right is expanded, and as was the case with *The Declaration on the Bosnian Language* (1992), that results in claims about ‘the elementary right to freely name one’s own language’. This, then, is not about the right to name a language in accordance with the name of a people, but about ‘*freely nam[ing] one’s own language*’” (Šipka 2001: 144).

As Miloš Kovačević observes, the “fundamental argument” for the “specific character” of the Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin languages is “the right of each and every people to name its language after its own name”. That “right”, as Kovačević shows, was thought up in Croatia by referring to non-existent international laws: “Without any doubt, the Croats were the first ones to resort to that particular argument in *The Declaration on the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language* (1967): they claimed that ‘*it is the inalienable right of each and every people to call its language by its own name, regardless of whether it is a philological phenomenon which, in the form of a separate linguistic variant, or even in its entirety, also belongs to some other people*’ (The Declaration 1967: 164). The proponents of renaming the Serbian language anew also use this argument as the crucial one. Thus, for example, Dž. Jahić, defending the designation Bosnian language, says that ‘*the right of a people to its own name for its language, to the national name of its language, is indisputable and beyond any scientific doubts, or even political ones*’ (Jahić 1999: 25). This right ‘to the national name of [one’s] language’, in view of the fact that the Bosniaks have opted to name their language Bosnian, not Bosniak, all of a sudden turns into ‘everyone’s right to name their language any way they want to’. Thus, I. Čedić says that “there are objections to the effect

that the term *Bosnian language* is not appropriate, for it has not been adjusted to the name of the people using it. The criterion of naming a language in accordance with the name of the people using it is opposed to *everyone's right to name their language any way they want to* (Čedić 2009: 41, footnote 1). The proponents of 'the Montenegrin language' often refer to that particular right. Thus, for example, S. Perović says that 'each citizen of Montenegro has the right to name their language by their national name' (Perović 2006)" (Kovačević 2015: 46–47).

Miloš Kovačević has proven that such a "right" has no grounding in any international acts, that is to say, that it does not exist as such, having examined all the documents and views pertaining to language among the legal documents of international organisations such as the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the Organization for Co-operation and Security in Europe (OSCE) and the European Union. Referring to specific documents, he showed which particular "rights" are mentioned and prescribed in them, and that among these rights there is no right of a people to give its language its own name. He also dealt with the question of the actual meaning of "the international recognition of a language", "which is also often mentioned as one of the key arguments proving the existence of the said newly named languages" (Kovačević 2015: 47). That no such "right" exists, as Kovačević observes, had already been pointed out by some linguists, for instance by [the German linguist Bernhard] Gröschel (2003: 164), "who sees this 'right' as a Croatian 'invention', and also by [the Norwegian linguist Svein] Mønnesland, 'according to whom it is a Yugoslav tradition';²⁴ similarly, P. Jakobsen observes that "there are no rational explanations for ascribing the said significance to the name of a language. The

²⁴ The fact that this "right" has become the property of the post-Yugoslav space is testified to by the words of Snježana Kordić, in whose opinion "It is possible that the word 'right' has become a fashionable one in the South Slavic area, for there is no other way to explain why South Slavic philologists invoke 'the right of a people to its own language' when no one is requesting of the said people to switch to a foreign language..." (Kordić 2010: 120).

opinion that ‘each country has the right to its own language’ represents an excessively simplistic view of the relationship between a people and its language. There are so many peoples that do not have their own language that there is no need whatsoever to enumerate them, and consequently, there are no reasons why the Croats and the Bosnians, for instance, should get ‘the right to their own language’ all of a sudden” (Jakobsen 2010: 93–94, quoted in: Kovačević 2015: 48).

Kovačević has also checked all the international documents pertaining to language rights and presented the views on this issue contained in them. Analysing and providing insight into nine documents that represent the most relevant international documents wherein language rights are mentioned, he came to the conclusion that “almost all of the provisions and views on language contained in these documents are quoted, relying on a tendentious and erroneous interpretation, in a Statement issued by the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts [CASA] (2005)”²⁵ (Kovačević 2015: 49). Following a detailed examination, he came to the conclusion that “none of the said documents deal with the language rights of peoples, but solely with the language rights of either individuals or members of national minorities.”²⁶ Only one document, namely, *The Universal Dec-*

²⁵ Statement by the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts 2005: “A Statement of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts on the Position of the Croatian Language, the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, the Department of Philological Sciences”, *Jezik [Language]*, vol. 52, no. 2, Zagreb, 2005, 41–80.

²⁶ In four documents dealing with language, only *the language rights of minorities* are mentioned: *The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (adopted in Strasbourg in 1992); *The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (passed by the Council of Europe in 1995); *The Hague Recommendation Regarding the Education Rights of National Minorities* (passed by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe – OSCE); *The Draft Treaty establishing a constitution for Europe* (adopted by the European Union on 18th June 2004), (Kovačević 2015: 50–52).

In four documents, as Kovačević observes, this time not only those originating from European organisations and institutions, but also

laration of Linguistic Rights (Barcelona, 1996), deals with the rights of language communities,²⁷ without including the criterion of states and the criterion of peoples” (Kovačević 2015: 52). In all of those documents, with the exception of the one adopted in Barcelona, the sole issues dealt with are the linguistic rights of individuals and members of national minorities: “Nowhere, nowhere at all, are the linguistic rights of peoples or states mentioned, let alone prescribing *the right of a people to call its language by its own name*. It is all the more strange that in the Statement issued by the CASA, where most of the views on language referred to here are quoted, those views are interpreted as a confirmation of ‘*the right of peoples or national minorities to their cultural identity and language*’ (the Statement of the CASA 2005: 43), that is to say, of the conclusion originating from these documents that ‘*in the case of a people living in its own state, or of one of the sovereign and constitutive peoples in the common*

those coming from the United Nations, what is emphasised is *the right of the individual to his/her own language*: *The European Social Charter* (with amendments 1961, 1966, 1996); *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (passed by the United Nations in 1948); *The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (passed by the United Nations); *The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (1966, 1976 – this United Nations document also stresses the linguistic non-discrimination of the individual).

²⁷ According to this Declaration, Kovačević explains, “a language community presupposes ‘any human society historically located on a particular territory, irrespective of whether that space is recognised or not, which is identified as a people and has developed a common language as a natural means of communication and cultural cohesion among its members’ (Katnić–Bakaršić 1999:48). In view of the fact that this document does not proceed from the notion of states but from that of language communities, irrespective of the political status of their languages, there is no mention whatsoever in it of the right of a people to its own name for its language, but Article 33 prescribes the right of a people, that is, a language community, to name itself: ‘All language communities shall have the right to name themselves using the name which is used in their own language. Any translation into other languages must avoid ambiguous or pejorative denominations’ (Katnić–Bakaršić 1999: 49),” (Kovačević 2015: 52).

state of more than one peoples, language-based discrimination cannot even be thought of, let alone allowed' (the Statement of the CASA 2005:45). Thus, 'the Statement quotes sentences from a United Nations document speaking of the right of every person to freely use his/her language, but those sentences are presented in the CASA Statement as meaning that each people must have a different language. In this way, the authors of the Statement misrepresent the right of every *person* as the right of a *collective*' (Kordić 2010:122). Is it any wonder, then, that it was precisely the Croats who thought up 'the right of a people to its own language name', while others – either because they did not check the legal basis of this 'right' or because it suited them for the purpose of justifying their own acts not grounded in science or the law – accepted and disseminated this view, so that this fictitious right, as we have seen, has been described by some linguists as 'a common law right',²⁸ that is, as 'a Yugoslav tradition', Kovačević concludes (Kovačević 2015: 52-53).

Neither "the international recognition of a language", nor the recognition of a language under a particular name, which certain interest groups from the South Slavic space refer to, is grounded in any provisions of international law, "it is not to be found in the rights of peoples. The subjects of international recognition are states only" (Kordić 2010: 119).²⁹ "But in spite of

²⁸ "To R. Bugarski, the given 'right' has the status of a 'common law' one, in view of the fact that, according to him, 'the usual argument that each people has the right to name its language by its national name is indisputable, but with two essential reservations. Firstly, what is at work here is merely *some common law right*, that is, a practice that has existed in the world for a long time, not a right that would be guaranteed in international institutions and codified in their documents, for it is quite simply nowhere to be found' (Bugarski 2006). Let us ask, then, wondering at the logic of this, how something can be subsumed under 'common law rights', how we can accept the argument of 'a practice that has existed in the world for a long time', if such a 'right' has never been confirmed except in the Balkans?!" (Kovačević 2015: 48).

²⁹ Concerning the international recognition of the newly established Balkan languages, Per Jakobsen has this to say: "There has been talk (and there is still talk) about the internationally recognised newly

that”, Kovačević writes, “linguists, especially those from Croatia, often speak of the international recognition of the Croatian language, presenting various reasons for the said recognition” (Kovačević 2015: 53).³⁰

In Montenegro – that “right” was initially, as we have seen, “based” on the expressed wish of an individual (parent, pupil and the like), and later on – in accordance with the current set of circumstances: on the “right” “of a certain number of speakers” who opted for the designation Montenegrin when asked to name their language during the census, then on the constitutional right, the right of the nation, that state right, all in all, boiling down to the “right” dictated by the authorities and various centres of power.³¹

established national languages, even though it gives rise to the question of who has officially recognised the Croatian or the Bosnian language and how this recognition has come about. Evidently, the recognition has been limited to a certain number of world universities that have introduced the Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian language, or have even divided what was formerly known as Serbo-Croatian studies into Croatian and Serbian studies respectively” (Jakobsen 2010: 93-94, quoted in: Kovačević 2015: 53).

³⁰ To the Croats, the main “argument” and criterion of international recognition, as Kovačević observes, “is the criterion of the special library code established by the Library of Congress in Washington”. Kovačević concludes: “That recognition pertains to a change of the code in the ISO library norms that applied to the Serbo-Croatian language. [...] The said ‘recognition’ is actually of the librarianship variety, and has nothing whatsoever to do with the linguistic criteria pertaining to the identity of a language. This recognition, then, is not based on any scientific criterion that would enable ‘the Croatian language’ to gain the status of a linguistic language” (Kovačević 2015: 57–58).

³¹ This trumped-up and strained “right”, as we have seen, is presented as “guaranteed”, “universal”, “undeniable”, “self-explanatory”, the intention being for it to become an axiom through constant repetition, and it is as such that it is used in Montenegro today: “This rationalisation strives for a political grounding of the Montenegrin language, and thus suggests that the political *origin* of the Montenegrin language is connected to universal human rights. That is a classic example of untruth. For, the political origin of the Montenegrin language lie in the Ti-

5.1.6. After the referendum, a new “argument” was put forward (and is still in circulation) in Montenegro: “**The name of the language equals (should or must equal) the name of the state**” – even though it is well known that the name of a language is not derived (in formational-semantic terms) from the name of a state, nor is it often that a language is territorially equated with a state; also, not every state has only one official language, and not every state has an official language precisely defined in its Constitution.

5.2. Those are all the “arguments” that are in circulation and that are proclaimed by the protagonists of the latest language policy in Montenegro. That is where any further debate, explanations, justifications come to a close... Quasi-arguments are proclaimed and repeated as axioms, as truths that are self-explanatory and self-sufficient. Just like any ideological cliché, it is supposed to become lodged in people’s minds through constant repetition, to become a substitute for everything else and to provide the basis for the implementation and imposition of a vacuous and ungrounded language policy.

5.2.1. Emphasising such (non-linguistic, even anti-linguistic) criteria and pushing them into the foreground is quite outside the rules and customs in the civilizational practices of the world: “In addition to this, what needs to be said is that such requests are made mostly in these parts, what is more, they are made as an argument in favour of the dissolution of the common Serbo-Croatian standard language and the formation of separate national linguistic standards (of the Croatian, Serbian and Bosniak languages). Elsewhere in the world, in similar situations, when a number of nations share one standard language (such as English, German, Spanish and others), there is no debate on the name and the status of the language in question... The relations are such in this regard that the rule that each people (that is, nation) should have its own (standard) language, and that the language in question must be called by its name

toist state of public consciousness, as representatively announced by the supreme Croatian Communist Vladimir Bakarić” (Lompar 2014: 207).

or a name of its own choosing, cannot be taken as a universally applicable one. That is our specific characteristic: it is an expression of national-political relations and the development of the standard language in these parts... However, in debates on these issues, one cannot resort to arguments that do not correspond to the scientific truth... General concern for language is often manifested – seemingly paradoxically – in the actually chaotic state of the standard linguistic norm..., often enough with strong nationalist ideological designations and with the tendency to contain, despite the proclaimed democratic aims, various kinds of inequalities at both collective and individual levels in their very foundation” (Šipka 2006: 181).

Still, compared to all the known cases, the decisions made and the steps taken in Montenegro today in connection with its language constitute a precedent. Even the Croatian, that is, the “New Croatian” and the Bosniak (!?) languages, even though linguistics has mostly characterised them as “political languages”,³² have passed (or are attempting to pass) some sort of procedure (even though the manner of the “creation” of these “languages” [leaving aside the question of to what extent, in linguistic terms, they cannot be considered separate languages], that is, “standard variants” [if, in some cases, one can even speak of standard variants]).³³ They were, in a way, accepted by a certain group of speakers and had a group of experts (albeit

³² In connection with this issue, one needs to pose the question of what the “term” “political language” has meant at all since it first appeared, what area it realistically (!?) covers, what it refers to, what it actually means (that is to say, should or can mean). However, when it comes to the linguistic processes coming into being in the area where the Serbo-Croatian language functioned, this term has proven to be necessary in order to explain the nature of the “new languages” and the circumstances from which they originated.

³³ Concerning the issue of “Bosnian”/“Bosniak”, see in: Ćorić 2005: 21–29. (Here we find, among other things, the following: “The *standard*, that is, *the standard language*, is attained through a laborious and often long process of standardisation. And just precisely when it was, and how, that the Bosnians created a *standard*, remains unclear”, 25). See also: Radovanović 2004: 153–167; Ćupić 2002: 26–27, etc.

politicised) who attempted (or are attempting) to create something in the way of a “new language”. If, then, we compare the situation in Montenegro with one of the most chaotic regions in the civilized world, pertaining to the attitude towards language and the proclamation of “languages”, namely, the area covered by the (formerly!?) official Serbo-Croatian language, which, as R. Bugarski points out, “represents an interesting case at the international level from a sociolinguistic perspective” (Bugarski 1995: 45), we can conclude that what is happening in Montenegro is unparalleled even in this context. After the “suppression” of the name – the Serbo-Croatian language – and the promotion of “new languages”, that is, “variants”, their normativisation and standardisation were carried out (or were attempted), which was followed by their being promoted, or attempts at promoting them into official languages (or variants thereof). What was introduced in Montenegro was (only?!) the name – Montenegrin (without determining its content in any way). But the protagonists of the language policy behaved as if everything was self-explanatory and God-given.

5.2.2. Thus, a language (not even the standard variant of a language) cannot be imagined without linguistic planning, normativisation, standardisation, as the product of a serious, scientifically founded, expertly thought through language policy appropriate to the situation of the given language (in linguistic and sociolinguistic terms). That is a long-lasting, laborious, large-scale undertaking which, according to sociolinguistic parameters, mainly unfolds through ten phases; it requires the engagement of a great number of linguistic experts from various domains, first of all for working on *the linguistic norm*, and also on the implementation and adoption of all that in practice (which is out of the question in Montenegro). According to Radovanović (whose elaboration of the above process we shall rely on, with a view to showing how serious, large-scale and difficult an undertaking language planning and work on it is, and similar views can be found in other linguistic and sociolinguistic papers as well): “According to our traditional

views, it (that is, the language norm, J. S.) encompasses *the orthographic norm* (the rules of writing), *the orthoepic norm* (the rules of pronunciation), *the morphological norm* (the rules of building words and grammatical forms), *the syntactic-semantic norm* (the rules of forming sentences), *the lexical norm* (the rules of using words)...³⁴

Concerning standardisation, we also find in Radovanović: “The steps that must be taken in order to attain the language norm and the standard language can be classified as ten basic phases, whose chronological order is changeable sometimes, while at times it is such that certain phases unfold simultane-

³⁴ “The norm, therefore, encompasses all the levels of a language, including both the spoken and the written form of language manifestation, reaching into all the domains of its grammar. In that sense, the orthographic norm is realised through *normative orthography*, whereas the other norms referred to are prescribed through *normative grammars* and *normative dictionaries*... It is not difficult to conclude that, understood in the manner referred to above, an explicit, unified, codified and institutionalised linguistic convention that we call the language norm, as a result of the process of normativisation of a language at all the levels of its existence, manifestation and analysis, would have to encompass a few more, usually neglected segments, or recognised only in principle. Those are *the textual norm* (the rules of the formation of a text, a discourse, a speech event), *the stylistic (genre) norm* (the rules of establishing stylistically and genre-marked linguistic formations), *the pragmatic (contextual) norm* (the rules of conforming the linguistic means to the non-linguistic components of the context – when it comes to the selection and use, production and interaction of pronouncements). Only a language norm thus understood and realised could encompass the overall linguistic knowledge (and competence of the code [the language system], as well as the communication competence [language use])... The product of the process of the normativisation of a language is a *normativised language*. The latter functions as the *standard language* of the collective to which it belongs, which means the society and the culture that have normativised it or have accepted the finished norm as their own. The standard language primarily has the role of a communication, as well as a creative instrument for the speech representatives and the speech community whose possession it is... That is why the discipline dealing with theoretical and practical issues connected with issues related to the problems of the language norm and the standard language is most often referred to as *language planning*” (Radovanović 1986: 187).

ously, some phases get left out and the like. The systematisation that is proposed here is inspired by the solutions and the **well-known discussion of 'sociolinguists'** on these problems: A. Hong, J. V. Neustupni, J. Fishman, V. Tauli, P. Gavrin, C. Ferguson and others: 1) *selection* (= *choosing*), 2) *description* (= *describing*, which should be particularly emphasised, is the only phase of language planning that can be solely entrusted to linguists and their jurisdiction, so that, from beginning to end, it is a purely linguistic task, however the study of language is understood and divided), 3) *codification* (= *prescribing*), 4) *elaboration* (= *development*) 5) *acceptance* (= *adoption*), 6) *implementation* (= *application*), 7) *expansion* (= *broadening*), 8) *cultivation* (= *preserving*), 9) *evaluation* (= *assessing the worth of*), 10) *reconstruction* (= *amendment*) of the *norm*...

After the functions referred to above have been fulfilled, a language can take over the function of the standard language and be given the role of a general communication and creative instrument within the society to which it belongs only if the said society starts using it in its interactive, communication and creative practice (in education, the mass information media, science, art, administration, the judicature, etc.), and **then, through appropriate legal acts, officially gives it the status of the standard language...**, the 'description' precedes 'prescription' (our emphasis!)" (Radovanović 1986: 188–189, 192–194). Whereas in Montenegro, first of all, and the only thing we have – is the regulation, followed by one unsuccessful attempt after another to provide a description of it, on the one hand, or the imposition of another name for the Serbian language, on the other!

5.2.4. Regarding the lack of a scientific, expert, historical, traditional-cultural and symbolic (in the real sense of the term) grounding of the project entitled the Montenegrin language, and its sheer senselessness and pointlessness, we have spoken about it many times, as have relevant experts entitled to doing so. Concerning the **pronouncement of science on the matter** (apart from the numberless linguistic papers published in recent years) it will suffice to mention the international scientific

conference *The Linguistic Situation in Montenegro – The Norm and Standardisation*, held at the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts (MASA) in May 2007. All the linguists from Montenegro (those who live and work in Montenegro) were invited to the conference, as well as all the linguists originating from Montenegro (those who have spent large parts of their life and working years in Montenegro), all the linguists who worked in Montenegro for a number of years, linguists from Croatian (only one accepted the invitation), linguists from B&H (only one attended the conference), and linguists from Slavic Studies departments at foreign universities. Among almost forty conference participants, only one (Rajka Glušica) emphasised and advocated the idea of “the standardisation of the Montenegrin language” in her paper. The numerous reactions from other conference participants showed that the said paper and such an idea were scientifically ungrounded. The only participant to show a degree of “understanding” for such a view was the Norwegian linguist Svein Mønnesland. In all the other papers and discussions (dealing with the linguistic situation in Montenegro), it was clearly stated that there was no (scientific, traditional-historical, socio-political...) reason to experiment with the Serbian language and its name. It is precisely on account of this that this conference was not mentioned or was wrongly interpreted by the media in Montenegro.³⁵

5.3. The current linguistic situation in Montenegro is unnecessarily forced and problematised. The country used to have a stable linguistic situation. The standard and norm in use in Montenegro do not differ from the Ijekavian variant of Serbian outside its territory.³⁶ The norm and standard of the Serbian

³⁵ The papers were published in the *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference The Linguistic Situation in Montenegro – The Norm and Standardisation*, MASA, Podgorica 2008.

³⁶ Often enough, examples of peripheral significance are offered as differences, which, as optional variants or doublet-type variants are to be found in orthography textbooks and orthographic dictionaries in connection with the Ijekavian pronunciation: for instance, the variant *cjympa* [tomorrow] in Montenegro, *cympa* in the remainder of the re-

language used in Montenegro, as we find in Pavle Ivić, is firmly established in historical terms (Ivić 1990: 6), based on a rich cultural-historical heritage, scientific elaboration and development, general social acceptability, on account of which it is the only guarantee of stability and durability. Any other solution in terms of a change of name, whether it has to do with a change (that is, attempting to change) the standard or not, is a product of an extremely ill-founded politicisation of linguistic issues and, as evidenced by the development in recent years, only leads to the disintegration and falsifying of the spiritual being of Montenegro, creates instability and misunderstanding, conflicts and divisions pertaining to something as essential as – language. Merely and nakedly political solutions in the sphere of language (inevitably) lead to the state of affairs in which (every) political change in society results in a change of the language policy (and linguistic reality). This does not occur if it is understood that the language policy is not merely politics but linguistics, too, as well as tradition, culture, language – and also includes the man speaking that language.

5.4. As can be concluded from the above, the “Montenegrin language” project is a product of political manipulation; it was initiated under the tutelage of a political oligarchy, it came into being as its by-product, and that is the only way it can be sustained. That is why it was necessary for the state to get so unnaturally engaged with a view to obstructing and turning the historical flow of the Serbian language in Montenegro. The ac-

tion (however, there are areas in Montenegro where *супта* is used as well, and *сјупта* is also used outside Montenegro); the situation is the same with *нијесам* [I am not] in Montenegro, *нисам* in other Ijekavian areas (in this case in particular, there is no unified practice: in a considerable part of Montenegro, *нисам* is used as well), and matters stand similarly with other optional (or doublet-type) forms that are characteristic of the Serbian Ijekavian standard, for example: *предлог* [proposal], *пренис* [copy], *прелом* [break], *пресјек* [cross-section], *преступ* [violation], *речник* [dictionary], which are in circulation both in Montenegro and in the Republic of Srpska... The Serbian I/Jekavian standard and its realisation in Montenegro is not polarised in relation to the Serbian Ijekavian standard outside Montenegro.

tivities undertaken in connection with the language in Montenegro have no grounding in what they call the softest borderline linguistic discipline (sociolinguistics) or in the loosest of language policies (relying least of all on linguistics), or in healthy politics; they constitute a precedent in (socio)linguistic and linguistic-political activities. Sociolinguistics (to which some erroneously refer) is not and must not be under the influence of politics. By definition, sociolinguistics is determined first of all by its linguistic, not political component. "Actually, the current sociolinguistic production, unfortunately, boils down to providing a 'scientific' justification of the political views of one social group or another, of one ideology or another, and especially to explaining the official language policy. We are of the opinion that scientific sociolinguistics cannot be based on such foundations. On the contrary, as a science, sociolinguistics is possible only if its research meets the strictest linguistic criteria, while observing the methodologies of linguistic and sociological sciences" (Marojević 1991: 6).

Literature

- Ammon 1989: U. Ammon, Towards a Descriptive Framework for the Status/Function (Social Position) of a Language within a Country", U. Ammon (ed.), *Status and Function of Languages and Language Varieties*, Berlin/New York.
- Backović 2004: the Minister of Education and Science Slobodan Backović, the daily *Dan*, 31st August 2004.
- Božović 2009: Ratko R. Božović, Govor i jezik [Speech and Language], in: *Život kulture [The Life of Culture]*, Filip Višnjić, Belgrade.
- Bugarski 1995: Ranko Bugarski, *Jezik od mira do rata [Language from Peace to War]*, Belgrade.
- Vrhobreznički 2004: *Vrhobreznički rukopis [The Vrhobreznik Manuscript]*, phototype edition, Istorijski institut Crne Gore, Podgorica.
- Vujadinović 2012: Željko Vujadinović, "Jezik i nacionalni identitet [Language and the National Identity]", *Jezik i pismo u Republici*

- Srpskoj* [Language and Script in the Republic of Srpska], Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Republike Srpske, odjeljenje književnosti i umjetnosti, 151–163.
- Vukić 2006: Predrag Vukić, “Srpski jezik u ustavnom poretku Crne Gore [The Serbian Language in the Constitutional System of Montenegro]”, *Slovo*, vol. IV, no. 12, Nikšić.
- Grickat 1961: Irena Grickat, *Divoševo jevanđelje* [Divoš's Gospel], Južnoslovenski filolog XXV, Belgrade.
- Dragin 2013: Nataša Dragin, *Spomenici srpskoslovenske pismenosti. Jezik i tekstologija* [Monuments of Serbo-Slavic Literacy. Language and Textology], Tiski cvet, Novi Sad.
- Đorđić 1990: Petar Đorđić, *Istorija srpske ćirilice. Paleografsko-filološki prilozi* [A History of the Serbian Cyrillic Script. Palaeographic-philological Contributions], Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade.
- Ivić 1998: Pavle Ivić, *Pregled istorije srpskog jezika* [An Overview of the History of the Serbian Language], Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
- Ivić 1990: Pavle Ivić, *O jeziku nekadašnjem i sadašnjem* [On the Former and the Current Language], Belgrade – Priština.
- Ivić 1990 (2): Pavle Ivić, *Jezičko planiranje u Srbiji danas* [Language Planning in Serbia Today], Jezik danas III /9, Novi Sad.
- Ivić 1991: Pavle Ivić, *Iz istorije srpskohrvatskog jezika* [From the History of the Serbo-Croatian Language], Prosveta, Niš.
- Ivić 2001: Pavle Ivić, *Srpski narod i njegov jezik* [The Serbian People and Its Language], Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
- Izjava HAZU 2005: “Izjava Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti o položaju hrvatskoga jezika, Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Razred za filološke znanosti” [The Statement of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts on the Position of the Croatian Language, the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, the Department of Philological Sciences], *Jezik*, vol. 52, no. 2, Zagreb, 41–80.
- Jezička situacija 2009: *The international scientific conference “Jezička situacija u Crnoj Gori – norma i standardizacija”* [The Linguistic Situation in Montenegro – The Norm and Standardisation], the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts, Podgorica.

- Jerković 1975: Vera Jerković, *Paleografska i jezička ispitivanja o Čajničkom jevanđelju* [*Palaeographic and Linguistic Investigations into the Čajniče Gospel*], Novi Sad.
- Jerković 1983: Vera Jerković, *Srpska Aleksandrida, Paleografska, ortografska i jezička istraživanja* [*The Serbian Alexandride. Palaeographic, Orthographic and Linguistic Investigations*], Belgrade.
- Kovačević 2002: Miloš Kovačević, O pravu naroda na sopstveno ime jezika [On the Right of a People to Its Own Language Name], in: *Srpski jezik između nauke i politike* [*The Serbian Language between Science and Politics*], Društvo nastavnika srpskog jezika i književnosti Republike Srpske, Banja Luka, 46–62.
- Kovačević 2005: Miloš Kovačević, *Protiv neistina o srpskome jeziku* [*Against Untruths about the Serbian Language*], collection of papers from an international scientific conference, Pale.
- Kovačević 2007: Miloš Kovačević, “Srpski jezik između lingvistike i politike”, *Slovo* [*Letter*], a periodical for the Serbian language, literature and culture, vol. IV, no. 11, Nikšić.
- Kovačević – Šćepanović 2011: Miloš Kovačević – Mihailo Šćepanović, *Srpski jezik u vrtlogu politike* [*The Serbian Language in the Whirlpool of Politics*], Matica srpska – Društvo članova u Crnoj Gori, Nikšić.
- Kordić 2005: Snježana Kordić, “U službi politike (odgovor I. Pranj-koviću) [In the Service of Politics (A reply to I. Pranj-ković)]”, *Književna republika*, vol. III/7–8, Zagreb.
- Kordić 2010: Snježana Kordić, *Jezik i nacionalizam* [*Language and Nationalism*], Durieux, Zagreb.
- Kristal 1987: Dejvid Kristal [David Crystal], *Kembrička enciklopedija jezika* [*The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language*], Nolit, Belgrade.
- Kuljbakin 1925: St. Kuljbakin, *Paleografska i jezička ispitivanja o Miroslavljevom jevanđelju* [*Palaeographic and Linguistic Investigations of Miroslav's Gospel*], special editions of the Serbian Royal Academy, vol. LII, Sremski Karlovci.
- Lompar 2014: Milo Lompar, *Duh samoporicanja* [*The Spirit of Self-Denial*], Evro-Đunti, Belgrade.
- Marojević 1991: Radmilo Marojević, *Ćirilica na raskršću vekova. Ogledi o srpskoj etničkoj i kulturnoj samosvesti* [*The Cyrillic Script*

- at the Crossroads of Centuries. Essays on the Serbian Ethnic and Cultural Self-awareness], Dečje novine, Gornji Milanovac.
- Major 1993: Jasmina Grković-Major, *Jezik „Psaltira“ iz štamparije Crnojevića* [The Language of the “Psalter” from the Crnojević Printing Establishment], MASA, Podgorica.
- Milošević 1994: Miloš Milošević, *Testament Đurđa Crnojevića* [The Testament of Đurđe Crnojević], Podgorica – Cetinje.
- Mladenović 1964: Aleksandar Mladenović: *O narodnom jeziku Jovana Rajića* [On the Folk Language of Jovan Rajić], Novi Sad.
- Mladenović 1969: Aleksandar Mladenović, *Prilog proučavanju Orfelinovog jezika* [A Contribution to the Study of Orfelin’s Language], A Matica srpska collection of papers on philology and linguistics III.
- Mošin 1972: Vladimir Mošin, „Revolucije“ u istoriji srpskog pravopisa [“Revolutions” in the History of Serbian Orthography], in: *Stara književnost*, Nolit, Belgrade.
- Negrišorac 2014: Ivan Negrišorac, *Srpska jezička politika: osnovni preduslovi i važnost konsenzusa* [The Serbian Language Policy: The Basic Preconditions and the Importance of a Consensus], a collection of papers of the Institute for the Serbian Language of the SASA II, *Srpski jezik i aktuelna pitanja jezičke politike* [The Serbian Language and the Topical Issues of the Language Policy], Belgrade, 9–25.
- Nedeljković 1972: Olga Nedeljković, *Pravopis „Resavske škole“ i Konstantin Filozof* [The Orthography of “the Resava School” and Constantine the Philosopher], in: *Stara književnost*, Nolit, Belgrade, 484–492.
- Novaković 1888: Stojan Novaković, *Srpska kraljevska akademija i negovanje jezika srpskog* [The Serbian Royal Academy and the Cultivation of the Serbian Language], Glas SKA [The Voice of the SRA] X.
- Okuka 2006: Miloš Okuka, *Srpski na kriznom putu* [The Serbian Language on a Crisis Path], Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Istočno Sarajevo.
- Petrović 1995: Dragoljub Petrović, *Škola nemuštog jezika* [A School of Inarticulate Language], Novi Sad.
- Pešikan 2009: Mitar Pešikan, “Crnogorsko ime i naše doba [The Montenegrin Name and Our Age]” (written in 1989 as a maiden

- speech on the occasion of being proclaimed a member of the MASA), *Slovo*, a periodical for the Serbian language and culture, VI/24, Nikšić.
- Pupovac 1986: Milorad Pupovac, *Lingvistika i ideologija* [*Linguistics and Ideology*], Književna zajednica Novog Sada, Novi Sad.
- Radovanović 1986: Milorad Radovanović, *Sociolingvistika* [*Sociolinguistics*], Književna zajednica Novog Sada, Novi Sad.
- Radovanović 2004: Milorad Radovanović, “Jezičke prilike u Bosni i Hercegovini [The Linguistic Circumstances in Bosnia and Herzegovina]“ (in: *Planiranje jezika* [*Language Planning*]), Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
- Rodić – Jovanović: Nikola Rodić – Gordana Jovanović, *Miroslavljevo jevanđelje. Kritičko izdanje* [*Miroslav’s Gospel. A Critical Edition*], the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, a collection of papers on the history, language and literature of the Serbian people, Department I – vol. XXXIII, Belgrade.
- Simić – Ostojić: Radoje Simić – Branislav Ostojić, *Osnovi fonologije srpskoga književnog jezika* [*The Basics of the Phonology of the Serbian Literary Language*], Univerzitet u Beogradu, Belgrade.
- Simić 1995: Radoje Simić, *Pravopis srpskoga jezika. Između pada i uspona* [*The Orthography of the Serbian Language. Between Downs and Ups*], Nikšić.
- Simić 1991: Radoje Simić, *O našem književnom jeziku* [*On Our Literary Language*], NIP „Univerzitetska riječ“, Nikšić.
- Stijović 1970: Svetozar Stijović, *O međusobnom odnosu nekih rusko-slovenskih i srpskoslovenskih osobina u Orfelinovima pesmama* [*On the Mutual Relations of Some Russian-Slavic and Serbo-Slavic Features in Orfelin’s Poems*], Prilozi PJ 6.
- Stojanović 2002: Jelica Stojanović, *Ortografija i jezik Bjelopoljskog četvororjevanđelja (13/14. vijek)* [*The Orthography and Language of the Bjelopolje Four Gospels (13th/14th century)*], Univerzitet Crne Gore, Podgorica.
- Stojanović 2005: Jelica Stojanović, “Obilježavanje starog vokala ‘jat’ i njegovih kontinuanata u spomenicima pisanim srpskoslovenskim jezikom na (i)jekavskom govornom području [Marking the Old Vowel ‘yat’ and Its Continuants in Monuments Written in the Serbo-Slavic Language in the Area of the I/Jekavian Spoken Language]“, *Srbistički prilozi* [*Serbian Studies Contributions*], a

- collection of papers in honour of Professor Slavko Vukomanović, Belgrade.
- Stojanović 2006: Jelica Stojanović, *Neke jezičke odlike rukopisa Grešnih spasenije (manastir Tušimlja u Drobnjaku, 17. vijek)* [Some Linguistic Features of the Manuscript Sinners' Salvation (The Tušimlja Monastery in Drobnjak, the 17th Century)], the scientific conference At the Source of Vuk's Language, Žabljak.
- Stojanović 2010: Jelica Stojanović, *Pisar Gavrilo Trojičanin i pravopisno-jezičke osobnosti Vrhobrezničkog ljetopisa* [The Scribe Gavrilo Trojičanin and the Orthographic-Linguistic Specific Features of the Vrhobreznik Annals], a collection of papers from the scientific conference *Šćepan Polje and Its Sacred Objects through the Centuries*, Svevide – the Monastery Zagrade.
- Stojanović 2011: Jelica Stojanović, *Putevima srpskog jezika i ćirilice* [Following the Paths of the Serbian Language and the Cyrillic Script], Matica srpska – Društvo članova u Crnoj Gori, Nikšić.
- Stojanović 2013: Jelica Stojanović, *Pravopisne odlike Goričkog zbornika* [The Orthographic Features of the Gorica Collection], Teolingvistička proučavanja slovenskih jezika [Theolinguistic Studies of the Slavic Languages], Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti. Odeljenje jezika i književnosti. Srpski jezik u svetlu savremenih lingvističkih teorija [The Serbian Language in the Light of Contemporary Linguistic Theories], Belgrade, 303-522.
- Stojanović 1986: Ljubomir Stojanović, *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi* [Old Serbian Notes and Inscriptions], Vols. I–VI, SANU/MS, phototype editions izdanja, Belgrade.
- Čorić 2005: Božo Čorić, *Zloupotreba jednog lingvističkog termina* [On the Abuse of a Linguistic Term], the sixth linguists' conference "Bošković's Days", Podgorica.
- Čupić 2002: Drago Čupić, *O tzv. bošnjačkom jeziku (Slovo o jeziku)* [On the So-called Bosniak Language (A Word on Language)], Belgrade.
- Šipka 2001: Milan Šipka, *Naziv jezika kao ustavnopravna kategorija* [The name of a Language as a Constitutional-Legal Category], the international scientific conference *Language and Democratisation*, Sarajevo.

THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE IN MONTENEGRO IN THE MIRROR OF LINGUISTICS AND POLITICS

The tendency towards the disintegration of the Serbian language and/or its name has never been manifested with such violence and lack of grounding as in Montenegro, a cradle of great and significant achievements through the Serbian language and in the Serbian language. When we look back at the last ten years or so, it seems incredible that, as far as the linguistic circumstances are concerned, in formal terms and looking from the outside, so much has happened, so many acts, regulations, laws and provisions have been passed, as a result of which one may get the impression of living in some other linguistic and social reality. But since a language does not change overnight, the essence of the language has remained the same, stable and unchanged.

The scenes and developments surrounding the formal “inauguration” and building in of the “Montenegrin language” project unfolded in succession, very fast, in a superficial and forced manner, despite all the valid scientific, expert, cultural-historical, well-known and recognised requirements and needs of the language and society, at odds with both the contemporary civilizational trends and good customs pertaining to the language policy, from which the language, the people (and the state) would benefit.¹ Whatever happened was under the dictate of a set task – something ought to and must be done, ignoring linguistic facts and science. In Montenegro, **the name of the language** – Montenegrin, was imposed, following which

¹ The changes and cuts in Montenegro are performed against the totality of being, as our great linguist Mitar Pešikan says: “The Montenegrins and other Serbs are connected by much more than their origin. To put it in a picturesque manner – they are connected by commemorations, both those that are a cause for rejoicing and sad ones, from St Sava’s Day to St Vitus’ Day...; to put it more specifically – they are connected by all their history, ethnology, linguistic and spiritual culture” (Pešikan 2009: 131).

the creation of the “language” (that is to say, “standardisation”) was promised. But without being based on any linguistic criterion, or even one from the sphere of sociolinguistics – neglecting the language needs and reality, the standard language tradition and practice, turning everything into a mere politicisation of language, a product of politics laid bare. A healthy and stable language policy should be adjusted to linguistic facts, should be based on scientific, expert, historical-culturological and general social principles. Contrary to this, in recent years politics started directly regulating the issue of the language in Montenegro, that is to say, it attacked the linguistic reality. On account of this, such a politicisation of language, as a product of aggression and quasi-science, instead of bringing stability, spiritual and scientific order and progress, only led (and will lead) to disorderliness and chaos in language and society. “Politics, however, often steps outside the defined boundaries, where political interventions are natural, necessary, justified and desirable, and ipso facto indisputable, and arbitrates on language issues that are purely expert, linguistic in character, or does so with a view to realising this or that political aim, ignoring linguistic facts, that is, the objectively established linguistic reality, and neglecting its obligations when it comes to ensuring the conditions for the development of the particular science dealing with it – linguistics and its disciplines. In such cases, political interventions are unjustified, imposed, undesirable, and in any case – harmful” (Šipka 2006: 40).

1. The name of the language – the general principles and processes in Montenegro

1. The notion of **linguistic individuality** and specificity, and that of the name and naming a language, are viewed somewhat differently, but in linguistic literature, and for the most part in practice as well, certain general principles are accepted and in effect. For the purpose of determining what is a language and

what is not, various criteria may be taken into consideration (or at least some of them): the most important ones are **linguistic** criteria (systemic-linguistic, genetic, typological, communication ones – that is, the degree of understandability conditioned by the similarities and differences between language systems), then the **sociolinguistic** criterion (language viewed in the context of society, language planning and the language policy, where [in some cases] an important segment is the ideological-political concept applied to language and the linguistic practice – which should originate from, or coincide with, be in agreement with or “in cahoots” with the linguistic ones). Where is “the Montenegrin language” to be found amidst all this? What does that designation represent, presuppose and cover? In the contemporary civilizational practice, a language (even the standard variant of a language) cannot be thought of without language planning, normativisation, standardisation, as the product of a serious, scientifically based, expertly thought through linguistic policy, adequate to the linguistic situation (the linguistic, as well as the sociolinguistic one).

The name of a language is primarily a linguistic (terminological) issue, but it can also be a political problem, as in our case, or even a constitutional-legal category. As can be seen from numerous sociolinguistic studies, the name of a language (as is customary in civilizational practice if one wants a stable linguistic situation) should be in keeping with the structural-genetic code, that is, the linguistic essence, with the traditional-cultural identification and naming, with scientific-professional expertise, with the general social acceptability – and it is only out of all this that the language policy should arise. (But in linguistic terms only!) As we shall see, “the language-related policy” in Montenegro is not grounded in any of these factors (for more on this, see: Stojanović – Bojović 2006). These aspects are presented in more detail in the preceding text (*The Identity and Status of the Serbian Language in Montenegro [The Historical and the Contemporary Aspect]*), so that on this occasion we just present the main theses. Firstly: in structural-genetic and

typological terms, the spoken-language area of Montenegro fits in quite nicely with the broader spoken-language area of the Serbian language, constituting an integral part of it – based on the origin and structure of the language. Secondly: at the level of the language, nothing ends on the borders of today's Montenegro. As far as the area of Montenegro is concerned, it is made up of various dialects (and speeches), and none of them is “Montenegrin only” or “all-Montenegrin”, as some quasi-scientific representations would have us believe. Thirdly: traditionally, the language spoken on the territory of today's Montenegro has always been called Serbian (in the capacity of the official language – Serbo-Croatian as well, though not for long, and without any grounding in the popular naming of it). Fourthly: the general social acceptability (which is not considered to be one of the more important criteria when it comes to language planning) presupposes that a language should be called the way the majority of the social collective decides to call it. In a way, the social collective option is testified to at the sociolinguistic level by the latest censuses conducted in Montenegro, even though the question must be raised of whether a census is a valid and (especially whether it is a sufficient) indicator – first of all in view of the general atmosphere and pressures, in the media and of all other sorts, within the framework of which the language issue was “promoted”. But even the censuses do not seem to favour the current language policy, for the latest ones were indicative of a majority option in favour of the designation Serbian referring to the name of the language spoken in Montenegro. In view of the fact that there exist no scientifically and historically clear and well-grounded criteria for naming one (and the same) language differently, it is attempted to justify the name of the language based on the right to call it so in itself, sometimes using the national, other times the state designation (often enough according to the current needs and set of circumstances), following which it is attempted to project the newly formed and created linguistic situation onto the historical-linguistic level.

The best indicator of the kind of language policy conducted in Montenegro are the processes having unfolded (decisions made and steps taken) so far. We shall present them in the order in which they occurred and were implemented, while at the same time trying to analyse them in relation to linguistic and sociolinguistic parameters.

2.1. The designation Montenegrin for the name of the language (as has been observed before), was first imposed **onto the school and educational system** in 2004, through the so-called mother's tongue as the designation of the main subject (while the pupils and parents were given the opportunity to opt for and write the "name of the language as they wished", one of the options being "Montenegrin"), then the name Montenegrin for the "language" was introduced within the framework of quadruple naming options (*Serbian, Montenegrin, Croatian, Bosniak*), pertaining to one and the same school subject – "Mother's Tongue", which could be named as one of the above. There were no other changes to speak of, either in the Constitution or as regards the attempts at creating some new form of standard.

The "justifications" for **changing the name of the language** in Montenegro have been (and still remain) entirely ungrounded and unconnected to the primary (and fundamental) postulates upon which a healthy, scientifically and culturologically founded language policy and language study are based. Most often, the justification for renaming (or additionally naming) the language, was that **"everyone has the right to call his/her language by his/her own name"**, which is a "right" unknown in the world practice outside these parts. Specifically, the so-called right of a people to call its language by its own name was first thought up in Croatia, within the framework of the well-known *Declaration on the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language* (1967). As we find in Snježana Kordić: "They are referring to the fact that the naming of the language by the designation Croatian is in accordance with 'the right of the Croatian people. The people has the right to name its own language by its own name.' Commenting on this claim, which has been in

circulation ever since the *Declaration*, Gröschel (2003: 164) points out: 'It is all the more imperative to maintain resolutely that, even at the time of the *Declaration* of 1967, it was an ad hoc trumped-up right. No declaration of rights adopted by the UNO or UNESCO, no regional convention on the protection of human rights or minority rights (the Conference of Security and Co-operation in Europe/OSCE or the Council of Europe) contains such a right to the self-determination of the name of a language'" (Kordić 2010: 121). In keeping with this, a language "has the right" to its own name, that is, one cannot forcibly, without any grounding in any criterion whatsoever, change the established name of a language – that is why the Americans have failed to change the name of the English language and the Australians the name of the German language, even though such attempts have been made before courts of law.

Also, it was pointed out that each nation ha[d] the right to call its language "by the name of the nation". "Jacobsen (2006: 319) points out that the opinion that there exists the right of a people to determine the name of its language derives from an erroneous view of the relationship between nation and language. Namely, there are so many peoples that speak the same language as some other people, 'that they hardly need mentioning, and consequently, there are no reasons for the Croats' to refer to some non-existent right of a nation (*ibid*). If a language were to be named according to the name of a nation, and several nations spoke the same language, then there would exist several designations for one and the same language, which is scientifically unacceptable, as it suggests that there exist a number of different languages (Gröschel 2001: 175)" (Kordić 2010: 121). The best testimony of the above is the situation in other countries and among many (small as well as big) nations in the world that do not call the language that they use by the name of their nation but retain the common and inherited name for the language (hence, there is no Austrian, American, Australian, Brazilian, Cuban, Mexican, Argentinian, Canadian language...).

Leaving aside the areas once “serviced” by the Serbo-Croatian language and the manner of establishing nations in these parts, we shall take a general look (in broad terms) at the relations between nation and language and the name/naming of a language. The “argument” that “each nation has the right to call its language by its own name” (and to foreground it, even to the point of exclusivity) and a forcible imposition of such a solution are regarded as “language apartheid” today. In doing so, the nation is interpreted as something natural and God-given, and its language as being inherent to it as such. However: “Research has shown that nations ‘are not created of their own accord but are established by states and nationalists’ (Gellner 1999: 10). The popular view that ‘nations are a natural, God-given form of classifying people... – is a myth’ (Gellner 1991: 77). Due to this particular myth being so widespread ‘attention should be focused on the fact that nations are not created naturally, but come into being through the activities of their members. Sometimes, it is precisely the persons or groups that are very much engaged in this process who do not wish to admit this’ (Ammon 2000: 522), and whose duty is to ‘create a nation within an independent state by spreading the belief in its existence onto the entire population’ (Seton-Watson 1977: 3)... Nations are not just given by history: ‘nations – and it seems that recent investigations agree on this point – are not simply ‘here’ as historical entities, but are created where there is a wish to create them, they are... thought up’ (Gardt 2000a: 2). They are not given by language either: ‘The connection between nation and language is equally little given by nature as is the view of a large group of people that they are a nation’” (Kordić 2010: 184–185). The nations that exist today have come into being in different ways and on different foundations, some are based more on the historical, ethnic or linguistic principle, others on the state principle, while some are based on the religious, cultural or linguistic principle or the like. Some nations base their name on distant historical past, which is evidenced by the inherited, old name for their language, while other nations are of a more

recent date (“synthetic nations”),² and in the case of the latter, often enough, the name of their language does not coincide with the name of the nation or, as is the case in these parts, it is artificially (even forcibly) connected with the national. Naturally, in practice there are mutual relations of different types. The creation of new synthetic nations, and accordingly, of new languages, is mostly connected with “thinking up tradition” (Vujadinović 2012: 151), which (as we have previously shown) has been particularly manifested in the area that used to be covered by the language named – Serbo-Croatian.

The relations between a people, language and nation are complex (and they differ when viewed in a historical and a contemporary framework), but in that context, a language should be based on healthy, realistic and non-artificial relations, relations that are not created and imposed forcibly and unnaturally. In fact, sometimes the word *language* could be used to mean both a people and a language, nations were formed and created in more recent, or even “the most recent” times (resting upon different, often enough artificial foundations): “Some might think that making a nation merely means raising the awareness of an already existing people, and that the said people has always made up a nation, only being unaware of the fact. Therefore, it is necessary to point out that studies of peoples in the past show ‘that between those peoples and contemporary nations there exist no direct or even deterministic connections’ (Breuilly 1999, 242). It is erroneous ‘to link the popular and the national from a historical point of view’” (Kordić 2005: 185). A similar view of such linguistic tendencies is found in David Crystal’s well-known *Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language*, where he says: “In the 18th and the 19th centuries, in particular, language nationalism was the predominant European movement, language being the primary external sign of group identity. Today,

² “The creation of synthetic nations and modern regionalism are complementary processes... The creation of a new nation as an artificial construct, as a rule, is paralleled by an attempt to erase all connections with the one that it originated from” (Vujadinović 2012: 158).

similar tendencies can be observed in many parts of the world, as part of separatist political movements” (Kristal 1987: 34).

What is characteristic of the contemporary views of the relationship between nation and language is that they need not coincide (and should not, if there is discordance between them, especially in the case of new “artificial nations”). The contemporary picture of the world provides the best testimony to this. In today’s determinations, those relations diverge and intertwine in various ways: often enough, one language is used by several societies, nations or states (for example, English, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Arabian... are official languages [each one of them individually] for a large number of societies); one society (nation or state) can have a number of languages (as it the case with Switzerland). English is, thus, the only official language or one of the official languages in around 45 states and in a great number of nations today. What would happen if our own “golden rule” were applied in this case, and if each state or nation “gave” English their own state or national designation?! Linking mere politics and a stripped-down national designation to language is a characteristic of the Marxist and Communist milieu: “*Otto Bauer* and *Karl Renner*, Marxists from the era of the Second International, saw language only in its constitutive-political function; to them, it was one of the fundamental constituents of the national being... Such a way of thinking about language was inherited by Marxists in Russia, that is, the Soviet Union, from the Second International Marxists. Just as it was to Bauer and Renner, language is the essential component of the national being to *Lenin* as well” (Pupovac 1986: 94). This view of language, then, is the same as that manifested by the state-forming “power men” in Montenegro, but it is overshadowed by the latter in sheer absurdity and the depth of its failures – in view of their way of “pondering” language and the decisions resulting out of it.

2.2. After the referendum, a new “argument” was introduced in Montenegro (and is still in circulation): “The name of the language is equal (should or must be equal) to the name of

the state.” The promotion of such mutually conditioned factors was most often accompanied by the following kind of “explanation”: that it is logical, that it is normal; that all the surrounding states have named their languages after the name of the state (even though we know that Serbian was not derived from Serbia [the name of the state] but from the ethnonym Serb; there is no such thing, for instance, as the Bosnian-Herzegovinian language, while there does exist the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina...). In addition to that, it is well known that the name of a language is not derived from the name of a state but from the name of a people, so that the name of the Russians’ language is Russian, not Russianic, the Italians’ language is Italian...); furthermore, there is no Austrian, Swiss, Belgian, American, Brazilian, Algerian language..., although there exist states bearing those names; there was no Montenegrin language during the existence of the state of Montenegro at the time of King Nikola I Petrović... In any case, debates in Montenegro are usually decided through the use of such “arguments”.

2.3. Following the above, the language issue (first of all, the matter of its name) was put up for **debate in the Montenegrin Parliament**, quite at variance with the (usual and appropriate) order of things and priorities: linguistics, politics (based on linguistic and sociolinguistic criteria), and law in the end. Not in the reverse order, in view of the way the language policy is implemented in Montenegro! The issue of language in Montenegro was, thus, placed upside down, was put up for debate in the Parliament (without any expert or social verification), thus paving the way for parliamentary (that is, political) solutions to be imposed upon the professional domain, science, the people of Montenegro, the language, as a product of – not even a political agreement but a political swindle and/or coercion. As we find in Milan Šipka: “Prescribing the name of a language should not be a matter for the Constitution, it should determine the official use of a language by entering its already existing name in the text of the Constitution” (Šipka 2001: 144). What happened in Montenegro was that, by formally winning the parliamentary

majority vote, the will of a (small) part of the speakers received the political seal of approval for a constitutional renaming of the language, thus overpowering the will and the rights of the majority. Science was altogether ignored for the sake of political/power-holders' dictate and "gain"! As we find in Snježana Kordić: "The only reason for forming new languages is to create conflicts within the same state, another one being a demonstration of power on the part of the powers-that-be. Nationalism constitutes the background of both reasons" (*Dan*, 12th September 2010, 24).

2.4. In October 2007 the designation "Montenegrin" for the language was entered in the Constitution of Montenegro. In the previous version of the Constitution, in Article 9 (*The Language and Script*) it was stated: *The language in official use in Montenegro is the Serbian language of the Ijekavian pronunciation.* In the new Constitution, it says: *The language in official use is Montenegrin... Also in official use are Serbian, Bosniak, Croatian and Albanian.* Therefore, another purely formal decision was taken, for which it was only necessary to have a certain number of voters (a show of hands) in the Montenegrin Parliament, and in view of the "democratic circumstances", it has not been a problem for the Montenegrin authorities for quite a while now. The language designation entered in the Constitution does not exist and has never existed, it has no grounding in the will (and choice) of the people, it is not really known what it is supposed to represent, but that particular solution in the Constitution was voted for based on a political decision (or verdict). As is well known from the practice in this domain throughout the world, the name of a language need not be entered in the Constitution, which is the case in many countries of the world (as we shall see later), but the act of entering the language name (first of all, an accepted and established one) presupposes that the language is standardised, normativised, as well as socially verified (all of which contributes to linguistic and social stability): "A Constitution may be changed overnight, but nothing of the kind can happen to the existence of a standard language"

(Kordić 2010: 112). A **Constitution**, as is well known, **does not create a language**, nor is the mere act of entering a language name proof of its existence. Clear evidence of this is precisely the manner in which the name for the language/languages in official use was entered in the Montenegrin Constitution. “The uninitiated think that the constitutional proclamation of the official language means that there exists the language that they speak. They need, therefore, to be reminded that proclaiming the official language of a state is no criterion for determining the existence or non-existence of a standard language (Matusch 1999: 78–79)”, (Kordić 2010: 111).

The name of a language is primarily a linguistic (terminological) issue, not a political one (that is, a matter of politicisation), as is the case in Montenegro. Linguistics should precede politics and the law, whereas in Montenegro it was the other way round, so that nothing valid could come out of it. The designation “Montenegrin” for the language, without any specific content, without trying, even very loosely, to define what that language should represent, without attempting even ever so slightly to deviate from the already existing norm of the Serbian language (or from the previous norm, covered by the term Serbo-Croatian), was entered in the Constitution. However, as we find in Šipka, what is entered in the Constitution, if anything is to be entered at all, is the name of a language that is an established and “indisputable” one (and the name that was entered in Montenegro not only is not indisputable, but is not based on anything valid either): “The name of a language is also a constitutional-legal category that is of topical interest in our sociolinguistic and political circumstances. The constitutional-legal regulation of the name of a language does not occur on a regular basis in the world, for in the majority of cases the official use of a language is determined **under an already established and indisputable name** (our emphasis!), and there are constitutions that do not even regulate the official use of a language at all. That is why this issue should be reviewed under our specific socio-political and sociolinguistic circumstances, and the most

favourable solutions are to be sought in that particular context” (Šipka 2006: 163–166).

In a large number of world countries (Germany, the United States of Americas, Great Britain, Hungary, Denmark, Norway, Sweden...), **the name of their language** (the official language, the language in official use, the state language...) **is not entered in the Constitution** (nor is it defined by the Constitution). A language, that is, its name, is presupposed if the issue of the language policy is based on established, customary, well-founded and clear principles: “More than 98% languages in the world have no official status (Gröschel 2009: 341). If the Constitution were a criterion for the existence of a language, then the 98% of languages that have not been proclaimed as official by the Constitution would not exist” (Kordić 2010: 112). The circumstances in Montenegro itself testify to this, for in its Constitutions up to 1974 the name of the language is not specified. However, as we see (and as we shall see later), in Montenegro, the entry of the name of the “language” – Montenegrin in the Constitution, has become the basic and the only criterion and proof of the existence of that language; all the preconditions are neglected, scientific criteria, the linguistic reality and needs are ignored and disdained. A constitution that has not acknowledged reality or the scientific truth does not have to (even must not) impose obligations on science (and not only science): “Cooper (1989: 101) observes that even constitutionally proclaimed official languages are sometimes ignored. As an example of such ignorance, he gives the example of some states in which as many as 14 ministries out of 16 do not observe the constitutional provisions on the official language, using another language, so that decades after the constitutional determination of the official language it is not necessary to observe the established provision if it was passed” (Kordić 2010: 113).

Consequently, entering the name of a language in the Constitution (presumably, the sad example of Montenegro provides ample testimony to this) is no proof that the language in question does exist. However, as a rule, that is, in accordance with

the customary and expected order of things (to which Montenegro and the dictatorial powers-that-be did not adhere), the name of a language should be entered in the Constitution (if it is to be entered) provided that the said language does exist, has been standardised and normativised, is linguistically recognisable, differs from other languages, possesses a historical continuity in the building and development of the language system and its standard: "It should be said that the Constitution does not prescribe the name of a language directly (it does not normativise the official name of the language in question, but the official use of that language designated by the name that is customary, or has been specifically selected based on the will of a particular social collective). That means that establishing the actual name of a language is not primarily a constitutional-legal category" (Šipka 2006: 150). As regards Montenegro, the "customary" name of its language, "selected by a particular social collective" is (and has been) the Serbian language, so that the designation in the preceding Constitution was correct, based on tradition, history, science, the will of the social collective, and ipso facto, such a name contributed to stability and harmony. This new solution had to, as we have been witnessing to the present day, result in destabilisation, chaos, confusion... That is not a scientific (even in the loosest sense of the term), but a political decision, even a matter of politicising, so that it should have no significance for science or influence it in any way: "For, **a simple decision does not yet make a language.** By the same token, a name cannot turn several languages into one or one language into several languages" (Blumm 2002: 153)... in addition to this, the constitutional proclamation of an idiom as the official language and the constitutional fixing of that naming are not sociolinguistic but political in character (Gröschel 2007: 149)... **As the constitutional proclamation of the official language is guided by non-scientific motives, it has no influence on sociolinguistics** (Gröschel 2007: 206)" (Kordić 2010: 110). That is why the constitutional proclamation, especially in the manner that it was brought about in Montenegro,

does not work in favour of the constitutional regulation. On the contrary, it served as the “alibi” and “proof” of the existence of the language: “There is another reason against the constitutional proclamation: the euphoria that is artificially created, and this proclamation as such can lead people to view the language and/or the particular name for it as a totem, as a quasi-sacral emotionally charged group symbol with which they identify, something like the national anthem, flag, coat-of-arms (Tabouret-Keller 1997: 318–319). The phenomenon referred to above has been observed in the newly established Yugoslav states (Friedman 1999: Gröschel 10). The leading elites stir up a false panic through the media, leading people to believe that the nation and the state will perish if the official language is not proclaimed by the Constitution as having the name of the nation and the state in question; **the policy of linguistic panic usually occurs in the form of a seemingly attractive inflow of funds, supposed to occur very soon** (our emphasis!), which, as a rule, causes problems rather than solving them (Gonzalez 2001: 260)” (Kordić 2010: 114).

2.5. Since the designation “Montenegrin”, the name of a language devoid of content, was entered in the Constitution, there have been attempts at justifying this constitutional provision. The Government of Montenegro, quite irrespective of the relevant (professional and scientific) institutions, passes decisions on linguistic matters. Thus it came about that the Government appointed the **Council for the Normativisation of the Montenegrin Language**. Namely, on 23rd November 2007, a note coming from the Ministry of Education and Science of Montenegro (signed by Minister Backović) was delivered to the Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy Bojka Đukanović (addressed to: The University of Montenegro, The Faculty of Philosophy, Professor Bojka Đukanović, PhD, Dean), wherein it was stated: “Dear Ms Đukanović, In view of the fact that the Constitution of Montenegro proclaimed Montenegrin to be the official language of the country, it is necessary to carry out its standardisation. In the light of this, the Ministry of Education and Sci-

ence is planning to submit to the Government of Montenegro the initiative for establishing the Council for the Standardisation of the Montenegrin Language. The Council's task will be to prepare proposals for: the orthography of the Montenegrin language, the grammar of the Montenegrin language and a dictionary of the Montenegrin language. Being of the opinion that members of this body should be prominent scientists and experts on particular areas of language, competent to undertake this task, one of importance for every state, we kindly ask you to propose, on behalf of the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts, prominent scientists and experts who could be members of the future Council. Yours, respectfully, Minister, Professor Slobodan Backović, PhD.³ What is there to say about this!? Anyone knowing anything about the structure of institutions in any state certainly knows that a faculty which is a part of a university (as an autonomous institution) cannot pass decisions on behalf of the official academy of that state (nor can it be the other way round). Just as the state should not pass decisions on behalf of the University if it respects its autonomy (which has certainly not been the case in Montenegro for a long time). The Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy reacted in a more logical manner: she "instructed" the Study Programme for the Serbian Language and South Slavic Literatures to appoint a commission, but (illogically and absurdly) – one for the normativisation of "the Montenegrin language" (!?). This attempt at fraud did not work, for the Study Programme for the Serbian Language did not appoint a commission "as instructed", after all (that is, the vote on that failed at the session convened for that purpose). The MASA did not appoint the commission either.

2.6. As was confirmed in *The Official Gazette* of 22nd February 2007, the decision passed by the Government of Montenegro (already announced previously) "...on forming the Council for the Standardisation of the Montenegrin Language",

³ Montenegro, the Ministry of Education and Science, no.: 01-6432/8, 23rd November 2007, Podgorica, signed: Minister Slobodan Backović.

“which was obligated” “to prepare: a proposal for the Orthography of the Montenegrin Language, a proposal for the Grammar of the Montenegrin Language, a proposal for A Dictionary of the Montenegrin Language” came into effect on that day. The Council members (a total of 13 of them: Branko Banjević – Chairperson, Rajka Glušica – Deputy Chairperson, Milorad Stojović, Mirko Kovač, Mladen Lompar, Rajko Cerović, Čedo Vuković, Zuvdija Hodžić, Milenko Perović, Zorica Radulović, Tatjana Bečanović, Igor Lakić, Adnan Čirgić) were appointed based on criteria that were unknown – the only thing that was certain was that the said criteria were not in accordance with professional and scientific references. Namely, for a very modest amount of additional expert work on an already existing language and its standard, the services of entire teams and commissions made up of many linguists, and also of the relevant institutions, are engaged under normal circumstances. In this particular Council, apart from the occasional politically engaged linguist (or one whose services were engaged by politicians), there were practically no linguists (basically, all the linguists who had accepted to be a part of this “undertaking” were appointed as members of this working body).

2.7. The Constitution only provided additional fuel for ongoing political projects! The name for the language (“Montenegrin”) was also imposed through a great many regulations and laws, which is manifested in the condition that “is to be fulfilled” for the purpose of obtaining Montenegrin citizenship and being issued personal identity documents.

In *The Law on Citizenship*, which the Government submitted to the Parliament for adoption, among the preconditions for obtaining Montenegrin citizenship was – knowledge of the official language (which already marked the abuse of the forced “distinction” between the official language and the language in official use!?). However, in an amendment submitted by the Democratic Party of Socialists (DPS) it was proposed to replace the designation knowledge of the official language with – knowledge of the Montenegrin language. The proposed

amendment was adopted by a majority vote, thus becoming an integral part of the text of the Law. In September, the farce about passing a “Montenegrin language” exam as a precondition for obtaining Montenegrin citizenship was initiated (and brought to a close). The said exam was taken (after the payment of a 100 euros fee) by university graduates who were “applicants” for the citizenship, people who had been learning the Serbian language throughout their schooling and speaking it all their lives.⁴

However, in order to obtain Montenegrin citizenship somewhat later (for example, in 2010/2011), one had first to obtain (as we were in a position to verify from the experiences of those who applied for Montenegrin citizenship) the following certificate – heading: “Examination Centre” (we

⁴ “Young men who took their Montenegrin language exam yesterday in order to be able to obtain Montenegrin citizenship burst out laughing when we asked them: Was it difficult? They said they had to write a picture postcard in Montenegrin. To anyone whatsoever. Furthermore, they had to read a text and answer questions about it. Later on, in the oral part of the exam, they were engaged in a dialogue with their examiners – in Montenegrin... ‘They told us we were taking the exam based on the existing orthography, for a new, Montenegrin one had not been adopted yet. There were no new phonemes, that language is the very same one we have been speaking all our lives,’ said Bojana... Bojana added with a smile – she was examined in Montenegrin... by her literature teacher from the Podgorica grammar school...” (*Večernje novosti* [Evening News], 9th September 2008, 12).

“As of yesterday the admission to Montenegrin citizenship for citizens of the former Yugoslav republics is no longer conditioned by their taking a Montenegrin language exam... He adds that, until the process of the standardisation of the Montenegrin language is completed, the citizenship applicants who have completed their primary, secondary or advanced school education, or university studies in any of the republics of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or the Union of Serbia and Montenegro, will not have to take a Montenegrin language exam. That means that Montenegrin citizenship applicants who have diplomas from Serbia, for example, after the codification and adoption of the orthography of the Montenegrin language, will have to take that exam even though they have obtained their diplomas in the same state and in the same official language as those whose diplomas have been certified in Montenegro” (*Večernje novosti*, 24th September 2008, 5).

do not know for certain where this centre is located, what it represents, who does the examining and what precisely is examined), and further on there is the following text: “having examined the documentation submitted, we herewith certify that (name and surname) possesses knowledge of the Montenegrin language to the extent that enables basic communication. This certificate is issued based on personal request, and the person named above shall use it for the purpose of admission to Montenegrin citizenship.” Also, such “certificates” issued by the “Examination Centre” had to be requested even by those who had lived almost all their lives in Montenegro (and were of an advanced age), having completed their schooling and university education there, having learned the same language as the staff of the “Examination Centre”, perhaps even having shared a desk with them and, for the most part, having been rather better students than the anonymous “examiners” from the “Examination Centre”.

Furthermore, in Article 7 of *The Law on Personal Identity Documents* it is stated that the information contained in personal identity documents is to be given: firstly – in the official (that is, “Montenegrin”) language, secondly – in the English language, and thirdly, in another part of that law it is written: “*In the case of a citizen who is a member of a less numerous autochthonous people or an ethnic minority, hereinafter referred to as: minority, the contents of the identity card form and the data referred to in Article... of this Law shall be entered in the language and the script of the minority that the said citizen belongs to*”. It feels logical to ask, is it for this reason (among other things) that the distinction between the official language and the language in official use has been thought up? Also, it should be observed that, according to the latest censuses, there is no majority people in Montenegro, that is, no population group with a specific national affiliation accounts for 50% of the overall population, and the only actual majority is that of citizens who opted for the Serbian language (who are beginning to be treated as a minor-

ity in Montenegro, because the Serbian language has not been entered among those “in official use”).

2.8. After the constitutional proclamation of the “Montenegrin” designation for the language, which, as we have seen, remains in the sphere of mere and pure politics, Adnan Čirgić was “promoted” to the title of **the first doctor of “the Montenegrin language”**. Having defended the doctoral dissertation entitled *The Speech of Podgorica Muslims (a Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective)* in 2007 in Croatia, at the University Juraj Štrosmajer in Osijek, he became “the first doctor of the Montenegrin language”. Approximately half a year before this, he tried to submit the same (or a similar) topic for a Master’s Degree thesis at the Faculty of Philosophy in Nikšić – without success (he was requested to expand the topic). He obtained a PhD, bypassing the academic degree of a Master (which was not possible in Montenegro), before an examination board made up of: Milan Moguš, Ljiljana Kolinić, Lorean Despot and Rajka Glušica (*Novosti*, 4th November 2007). On top of everything else, the event received so much media publicity in Montenegro that it was even reported on in the main news programme on state TV, and the newly promoted doctor received congratulations from the Parliament Speaker “in person”. That was, then, how the promotion of “the Montenegrin language” began, naturally enough, **without the language as such, but with “the first doctor of the Montenegrin language”**. All of the above inspired the Montenegrin authorities, empowered by the entry of the language designation “Montenegrin” in the Constitution and the promotion of “the first doctor of the Montenegrin language”, to embark on new activities and campaigns.

2.9. The Department of the Serbian Language and Literature at the Faculty of Philosophy was the first to come under attack. The constitutional provision (passed based entirely on a political decision) was to be implemented in all domains! There is a telling testimony to this to be found in a statement given by the then Vice Rector of the University of Montenegro Rajka Glušica, a member of the Commission for Standardisation: “If

the official language in Montenegro is Montenegrin, it is entirely natural for the Department to be named after it, and I hope that this will soon be done.”⁵

2.9.1. From the very start, it was announced through the media (and in other ways) that the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language would be abolished, or that it would be, as they said, transformed (which boiled down to the same thing). In connection with this, one could hear very different and unclear (mis)information. Vice Rector Rajka Glušica “expects” that the designation the Serbian Language and South Slavic Literatures will be changed, and that the Department should be named after the official language – “Montenegrin”. Dean Bojka Đukanović stated that it was being considered what would be the most efficient way of “transforming”, “expecting” that the programme of studies would bear the designation – “Montenegrin”, in accordance with the Constitution.⁶

⁵ The daily *Dan*, 31st October 2007, 12. Furthermore: “She (that is, Rajka Glušica) said that ‘she considered it entirely natural for the programme of the Serbian language and literature’ to be renamed in accordance with the new Constitution of Montenegro, which prescribes the official language is Montenegrin. ‘I do not wish to start a polemic, for I am not authorised to pass any decisions on this matter. The authorised Ministry is the only institution that can pass such a decision, in view of the fact that this pertains to a programme of studies at the state University’”. That is what Rajka Glušica, a Professor at the state University, thought about this matter at the time (*Dan*, 30th October 2007, 11).

“Glušica is of the opinion that the only good solution is that only one programme of studies should exist, namely, the Montenegrin Language and South Slavic Literatures. She justified her view in the course of a Senate meeting, as she stated for *Republika*, by referring to the historical circumstances, saying that, each time when the historical circumstances changed, so did the name of the programme of studies.

When asked whether the programme of studies for the Montenegrin Language and South Slavic Literatures could get under way without first completing work on the Orthography and Grammar of the language, Glušica replied that these two important books for the Montenegrin language would be finished by September”, *Republika*, 30th May 2008, 7. (Our emphasis!)

⁶ “When asked about this particular dilemma and similar ones, Bojka Đukanović, the Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, replied that

From March 2008 onward, at the various instances and institutions of the Faculty of Philosophy (according to the instructions of Minister Backović and Vice Rector R. Glušica) various proposals and instructions concerning the **renaming of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language “in accordance with the Constitution”** were included in the agenda. This was done not in accordance with any scientific (or at least any other relevant) criteria, but in accordance with the Constitution, which (at least the section dealing with language) was the product of a political manipulation and lack of freedom, of the “victory” and violence of politics over science. “There are many examples (as can be seen, the example of Montenegro is illustrative in this segment, and also in many others, J. S.) that show how politics interferes even with those purely expert, linguistic matters, and in the interests of realising its aims, it manipulates scientifically established linguistic facts or interprets them to suit the current political course” (Šipka 2006: 40). The Vice Rector also tried to enlist support within the framework of the Senate of the University. However, both instances took the view that such a decision should be first reviewed within the framework of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language, as the only expert and scientific body at the University, following which it would be discussed on the basis of the working material from that session.

2.9.2. On account of the above, a session of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language was convened, and it was

the Department of the Serbian Language would be renamed ‘in order to observe the provisions of the Constitution’ [...]. ‘The Faculty of Philosophy is a part of the state University, which is why we must strictly observe decisions passed by the state, as well as the new Constitution. By introducing the Montenegrin language in official use, conditions have been established for renaming the Department of the Serbian Language and South Slavic Literatures, that is, its transformation in accordance with acts passed by the state. It is the collective, however, that will decide on the name of the Department, and I am certain that it will soon bear the designation – Montenegrin’” (*Večernje novosti*, 19th November 2007, p. 17).

held on 16th April 2008. One of the items on the agenda was the “renaming” of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language. Among the items reviewed was a letter from the former Minister Slobodan Backović (who had left the ministerial post three months before the session), in which he demanded of the Faculty of Philosophy to change the name of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language to the Programme of Studies for the Montenegrin Language, and that, as of autumn 2008, the students be enrolled in the “newly named” programme of studies; the students who had been enrolled in the Serbian Language Programme of Studies were to be allowed to complete their programme of studies under the old name and with the old programme. After a discussion and justifications, this proposal was rejected by a majority vote.

2.9.3. As those “authorised” (headed by Dean Bojka Đukanović) were not satisfied with the decision of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language, during the next session of the Faculty Council there was no discussion on the item on the agenda which was formulated (and put up on the notice board) as: *Renaming the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language in Accordance with the Constitution* (nor was the material from the preceding session forwarded, that is to say, it was put aside!). At the same time, the Dean’s statements such as: “the Department did not manage to forward to us their official view on renaming”, “I saw that they had discussed it, but no consensus was reached”, and that “the Serbian Department did not forward any proposals” were circulated in the media (*Dan*, 24th April 2008, 13).

In the meantime (before the next session of the Faculty Council), it was attempted to change and/or “modify” the attitude of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language. On account of this, new sessions of the Programme of Studies were convened (and attempts were made to do so) in order “to discuss new proposals”, that is, to change the existing “attitude”, seeking to adopt a decision that would be to the taste of the “authorised” instances and would suit them. The proposal (that is,

the new “offer”) given by the Faculty management to the Head of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language, of which the Programme was to voice its view (in the course of a session scheduled for 14th May), was to establish the Programme of Studies for “Montenegrin”, as well as a parallel Programme of Studies for South Slavic Languages and Literatures (of the Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian type). The majority of the members of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language refused to discuss the same issue again (that is, to alter the Programme’s decision and thus give legitimacy, as an expert and scientific body, to such projects undertaken by the authorities), as a result of which there was no quorum for the said session and this issue could not be discussed. As the next session of the Faculty Council was scheduled for 19th May, that same day a new session of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language was convened (to be held before the Council session and to provide support “at least” to the proposal for establishing the Programme of Studies for Montenegrin alongside the Serbian one).⁷ As the majority of members of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language did not wish to give legitimacy

⁷ “The Dean of the Faculty, Professor Bojka Đukanović, PhD, stated for ‘Dan’ that the said session would most likely be postponed, for the Council had not received the decision of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language and Literature. When asked to comment on the information that the Department had already made its decision, and that the majority of eight members of the Council of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language had voted against the proposal, she said that she had no knowledge of their having passed an official decision. She went on to add that ‘all options are open when it comes to the question of whether the existing department is to be renamed, or the Serbian Language Department will go on working, in which case a new programme of studies for Montenegrin would be established.’ ‘We cannot say anything more precisely at the moment,’ Đukanović stated. Otherwise, according to the claims made by members of the Faculty Council, this question was raised at the previous session by Professor Rajka Glušica, PhD, a member of the Commission for the Normativisation of the Montenegrin Language, formed for the purpose of preparing a proposal for the orthography of the Montenegrin language. It was she who proposed that the renaming of the Serbian Language Department

to political decisions through their acquiescence, there was no agreement (that is, quorum) to hold that session either.

2.9.4. At the same time, trying to garner any kind of support for this “project”, R. Glušica convened a session of the Institute for Language and Literature for 7th May 2008 (the legitimacy and the legal status of the Institute at the Faculty was debatable), for which the first two items on the agenda were: 1. *Adjusting the name of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language and South Slavic Literatures to the Constitution of Montenegro*; 2. *Adjusting the name of the subjects Serbian Language I and II in non-linguistic study groups to the Constitution of Montenegro*. The session was held, and it gave “support” to what had been imposed from above⁸ (which was, in any case, not in effect and illegal), without a quorum (it is stated in the record that eleven members

be included in the agenda of the session convened for Wednesday, 23rd April” (*Blic online*, 23. 04. 2008 – 11:48).

⁸ In the record, the following is stated, among other things: “1. ...The current situation imposes the taking of a new step towards a further change of the name of this programme of studies, in view of the fact that Montenegro is an independent and autonomous state (even though some members of the Programme of Studies and the Faculty Council cannot accept this fact and are making concerted efforts with the aim of making this state a temporary category of as short a duration as possible), especially in relation to the supreme legal act of the state – the Constitution, which prescribes that the Montenegrin language is the official language. It is entirely **natural** that a state which finances the organisation of teaching should initiate the process of **renaming the existing programme of studies and establishing a programme of studies for the Montenegrin language at the state University (as evidenced by the letters sent to the Faculty of Philosophy by the authorised Ministry)**, and especially that it is precisely the state organs (the Ministry of Education and Science and the Government) who decide on the enrolment policy, on establishing or abolishing programmes of studies... (Our emphasis!)

The Council for the Standardisation of the Montenegrin Language, established by the Government of Montenegro, has prepared **The Orthography of the Montenegrin Language** and **The Grammar of the Montenegrin Language** for publication; they are soon to be published by the Institute for Textbooks and Teaching Aids in Podgorica (This was in May 2008, and it is amply clear from the above that neither the orthography nor the grammar were “prepared for publication”, indeed,

were present; four members had announced their absence, five members refused to attend the session, of which they submitted written notice, which equals – fourteen absent members).⁹

2.9.5. This “document” was forwarded to the Faculty Council in order to support the campaign for abolishing the Serbian Language Department. In the course of the session of the Council of the Faculty of Philosophy held on 19th May

they were not even “started”, so that this is yet another attempt at deceit, among a number of others, J. S.).

Following a very well argued discussion of this issue, all those present (with one abstention) voted in favour of: **renaming the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language and South Slavic Literatures as the Programme of Studies for the Montenegrin Language and South Slavic Literatures**. The Professors who announced that they would be absent from the session gave their support to this proposal...

The Institute members supported the proposal and suggested to the Council of the Faculty of Philosophy **adopting the curriculum of the Programme of Studies for the Montenegrin Language and South Slavic Literatures**. (The curriculum is enclosed in the Appendix).

2. All the Institute members who were present gave their support to the initiative that the subjects Serbian Language I and II in non-linguistic programmes of studies be **renamed as Montenegrin Language I and II**, and adopted the programmes for those subjects (the programmes for the subjects Montenegrin Language I and II are enclosed in the Appendix); Nikšić, 7th May 2008 (signed: Director of the Institute for Language and Literature, Professor Rajka Glušica, PhD). This “material” (it is obvious how “truthfully” it was based) was forwarded to the Council of the Faculty of Philosophy.

⁹ Many found the survival of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language bothersome: “The decision of the Council of the Faculty of Philosophy and the Senate of the University was commented on by Senior Lecturer Tatjana Bečanović, PhD, who teaches Montenegrin literature; she said that it was an unacceptable solution, which meant the marginalisation and underestimation of everything Montenegrin... Responding to the request of the Ministry of Education and Science (which, as we have seen from the demand sent by Minister Backović, presupposed renaming the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language as “Montenegrin”, J. S.) pertaining to adjusting the Programme of Studies for the Serbian language and South Slavic Literatures to the Constitution of Montenegro, the Faculty of Philosophy said a resolute, historic No!, proclaiming violation of the Constitution a pure scientific discipline” (*Vijesti*, 3rd June 2008, 14).

2008, it was decided that the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language should remain and to establish the Programme of Studies for “Montenegrin”. This proposal was subsequently supported by the Senate of the University.

All in all, one absurdity, a product of irresponsible politics (such as entering the language designation Montenegrin in the Constitution), led to another one, which was imposed upon science, which thereby (in that segment) stopped being science (establishing a programme of studies for a language whose name was politically imposed within the framework of a fundamentally scientific institution – a state university), without the existence (not even in principle) of any norm or standard for the newly named language. The University, as a scientific institution, was supposed to justify and cover up that which came from the sphere of politics laid absolutely bare, as a consequence of misguided political moves.¹⁰

¹⁰ The functioning and survival of the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language and Literature is a thorn in the side of many, as in Montenegro everything should bear the designation “Montenegrin” only: “The Council of the Faculty of Philosophy in Nikšić passed a pointless decision, on the basis of which the Programme of Studies for the Montenegrin Language and South Slavic Literatures is to be founded, but the Department of the Serbian Language and South Slavic Literatures is to be retained as the basic department. This is stated in the joint announcement of the Montenegrin PEN Centre and the Montenegrin Association of Independent Writers (MAIW). ‘This not only ignores the Constitution of the sovereign state of Montenegro, but also serves to deceive the future students of the Department of the Serbian Literature and South Slavic Literatures, who, upon completing their studies in Montenegro, will find themselves in a dilemma over where they should be employed.’ It is stated that in Serbia, that is, at Serbian universities, there exist 16 departments for the Serbian language and literature, and as is the case in Montenegro, there is a hyperinflation of this kind of experts. The task of renaming the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language and South Slavic literatures as the Programme of Studies for the Montenegrin Language and South Slavic Literatures should have been completed much earlier, at the express request of the authorised Minister” (*Pobjeda*, 1st June 2008).

“It is customary, but not obligatory, to adopt a plan and programme first, and then to start the procedure of establishing a programme of

2.9.6. The authorities' assurances and guarantees that, before the establishment of a new "programme of studies", the process of normativising and standardisation would be completed (the orthography, grammar books, even dictionaries) came to nothing. But regardless of this, students were enrolled and the teaching got under way. By "the promised date", the Council did not manage to adjust any of the proclaimed norms, but there was (as ever) the Serbian language and its standard, and its abuse (again and again). In connection with this, on TV Montena, on the day of the Feast of the Dormition of the Mother of God in August 2008, the Head of the newly formed programme of studies stated: "**In order to be able to function for this enrolment period** (our emphasis!), we have adopted the programme for the Serbian language and south Slavic literatures, identical to the plan for the Serbian language and south Slavic literatures."

2.9.7. In view of all the previous announcements, a new one coming from the Minister of Education, stating that "the Montenegrin language", until "expert staff" arrived from the newly established department in Nikšić, would be taught by Serbian lecturers, that is, by Serbo-Croatian lecturers, but that they would have to take some kind of "differential" exam prior to this...¹¹ Following the same kind of logic, those who com-

studies. However, Glušica pointed out that there had been cases before when the Senate gave the green light for establishing a programme of studies, and only then was the process of preparing plans and programmes initiated... After the Senate of the University of Montenegro, ten days ago, gave the green light for establishing a new programme of studies, Glušica opined that **it would have been better to rename the existing one**. She then pointed out that **the Montenegrin language should have priority at the University**, in view of the political reality and the fact that the Constitution prescribes that the official language in use shall be – Montenegrin" (*Vijesti*, 10th June 2008, 10).

¹¹ "Assistant Education Minister Marko Jokić expects that a model will be found which will make it possible for Serbian language lecturers to teach the Montenegrin language, until, as he said, the first generation of students graduates from the Faculty of Philosophy... Minister Sreten Škuletić announced the day before yesterday that, as of the next school

plete their studies of “the Montenegrin language”, in view of the fact that they “have mastered the programme for the Serbian language and south Slavic literatures, identical to the plan for the Serbian language and south Slavic literatures” should take a “differential” exam (when, and if, it is known – what kind of “differential”, in relation to what!?).

3. In August 2011, as there was still no graduate with a “Montenegrin language” university certificate, the Ministry of Education and Science (parallel with the adoption of plans for the teaching subject that they called the Montenegrin Language and the printing of a textbook on whose cover it also said the Montenegrin Language) organised a Montenegrin language training course, which lasted two days (that is, all of 180 minutes), and the “attendees” were issued a certificate of having attended the seminar entitled “Teaching the Montenegrin Language”, on the basis of which they were entitled to teach the said language. The seminar was attended by more than 2,000 Serbian language teachers. At the same time, those who did not attend the “seminar” received invitations from the Employment Bureau (or from their schools) to just come and collect their “new diplomas”, which awaited them (without any “additional vocational training”).

year, primary and secondary school pupils would be learning the Montenegrin language based on a new programme and textbooks... He (that is, Assistant Minister Jokić, J. S.) states that he cannot provide any precise information on the way in which, perhaps, **teachers who have completed studies of the Serbian or Serbo-Croatian language could receive additional education so that they could teach the Montenegrin language until the Council completes the work it has undertaken...** Regardless of all that, the differences between the languages are not excessive, so that these issues will be regulated as we go along. The difference lies in the normativisation of language, and I suppose that the Ministry will find a way of resolving this problem. One of the options is to **take some kind of a differential exam** when it comes to the domain of language... **For the students attending the Montenegrin language programme of studies, the textbooks will be expanded and more comprehensive,** Tatjana Bečanović says” (*Dan*, 28th October 2008, 11).

4. In order to empower “the Montenegrin language” all the more after all, the authorities tried to completely ignore the linguistic reality and to impose it unconditionally as the only one in the educational system (by adopting *The Law on General Education* in July 2010), justifying this by means of the designation “the official language”, which was most certainly deliberately entered in the Constitution (even though the Constitution did not matter to them in 2004 when it came to naming the subject, now this particular segment of the Constitution, the designation “the official language”, gained the status of an axiom).

There are many examples on the Montenegrin political scene illustrative of a lack of resourcefulness, misguided conduct, unprincipled behaviour on the part of the language policy creators. That, however, did not prevent them from blindly implementing the projects that were laid down despite any healthy and reasonable language policy. What has been of topical interest lately are the efforts of the opposition in Montenegro aimed at entering the Serbian language in the Constitution in the capacity of the official language (In view of the fact that the distinction between the official language and the language in official use had already been imposed in Montenegro. It is well known that a language in official use is, in fact, the official language, and that an official language, even though it is official, need not be in official use. However, the protagonists of power claimed that there could not be two official languages, regardless of the fact that such practices do exist in the world: for example, in Switzerland, where there are a number of official languages – and not just in Switzerland; subsequently, they also claimed that “Montenegrin” was not “just the official” language but “the state language as well”, even though the formulation “the state language” is not to be found in any act). According to the statements given by President Filip Vujanović: “In Montenegro, **there cannot exist two official languages, and we must know that Montenegrin is the state language.**”¹² In that same

¹² Statement given by Filip Vujanović, President of Montenegro, *Dan*, 2nd March 2012, 3.

interview, President of the Republic Filip Vujanović, speaking for the Radio Television of Montenegro 1 on 1st March 2012, said that there existed “two Montenegrin languages”: “Ranko Krivokapić and I speak two different Montenegrin languages. There exist two Montenegrin languages, one with 30 letters, the other with 32.” Indeed, fifteen minutes later, an interview with “President [predsjednik] of the Assembly of Montenegro” Ranko Krivokapić began on the RT Vijesti channel, and the latter did speak “a different Montenegrin language”, the one “with 32 letters.” Naturally, to state the obvious truth, President [predsjednik] Vujanović spoke the standard/literary Serbian language, while predsjednik Krivokapić spoke, albeit rather chaotically and unfortunately, taking into consideration the context of the beauty of dialects, using dialectal forms of the Serbian language. We would all understand one another easily if it were not for the great misunderstanding arising from the attempt of both the “predsjednik” and the “predsjednik” to cover the truth with a veil of untruth, that is, to veil the Serbian language (the standard language and the dialectal forms alike) under the guise of a different name.

5. At the beginning of the school year 2010, after a lot on negotiations between the authorities and the opposition, **the name of the teaching subject – Montenegrin-Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian** was accepted in the teaching practice,¹³ the

¹³ According to various statements that were to be found in the media, this contributed to achieving “the equal status for Montenegrin and Serbian”. The powers-that-be and the opposition concluded, in Podgorica on 08. 09. 2011, “A political agreement on certain issues pertaining to the European integrations of Montenegro”, and the said “agreement” for the most part concerned **the amendments to Article 11 of the General Law on Education**, in the part pertaining to language, so that in Article 3 it is stated: “The teaching in this institution shall be conducted in the Montenegrin language; bearing in mind the same linguistic foundation, the teaching in this institution shall also be conducted in the Serbian language as the language in official use; observing the rights of minority peoples, the teaching in this institution shall also be conducted in Bosnian, Albanian and Croatian as languages in official use; the Ministry authorised to deal with educational matters shall regulate more

justification being that the dash between Montenegrin and Serbian presupposed “equal status”, as was explained after the “agreement” was reached.¹⁴ How this “equality” was to be implemented in practice we shall show in the text that follows. The very name of the subject is debatable, both formally and essentially. As far as we know, based on orthography textbooks we have examined, no orthography knows of such a semi-compound designation – with a dash in-between two equal parts,

_____ closely the unified teaching process... Article 4. Based on the Constitution of Montenegro, the concept of the civic state, and **bearing in mind the same linguistic foundation of the Montenegrin and the Serbian language, the teaching plan and programme ensures that teaching is to be conducted in the subjects named: the Montenegrin-Serbian, Bosnian and Croatian language**, and that marks are to be given in the subjects thus named. During the school year 2011–2012, the teaching will predominantly rely on the teaching plan and programme of the subject known heretofore as the Mother’s Tongue and Literature, with additional content that will ensure **studying the specific characteristics of mother tongues**. The Ministry of Education, with a view to preparing a permanent teaching plan and programme of this subject, for the purpose of applying it as of the school year 2012–2013, **will form a special commission made up of experts in all four languages**. If need be, the Ministry will turn to the European Commission for help. In case of different administrative needs in Montenegro and abroad, the pupils will be able to obtain, based on submitting a personal request, a certificate confirming their knowledge of the official language, that is, the mother’s tongue, if these do not coincide” (The daily *Dan*, 9th September, 3).

¹⁴ However, for years now, the official policy in Montenegro has been the dissolution of the essential and renouncing true values, and on top of everything else, the authorities have been trying, using all the mechanisms at their disposal, to preclude even formal “equality” in practice. We are in a position to witness this process in all the spheres of life. In the case of a number of documents that they have to fill in or sign, the citizens can choose between the options “Montenegrin” and, for example, English (which, unfortunately, often turns out to be the “saving” option for those who do not “know” Montenegrin) – while there is no possibility of opting for the Serbian language.

Naturally, it is not possible to speak of any essential equality, for the Serbian language possesses a historical foundation, continuity and recognisability, a rich spiritual and cultural heritage; according to all linguistic and historical criteria, it is a language with a recognisable and stable standard and norm – and it is not a political-ideological projection.

of which both the first and the second part of the semi-compound are changeable in terms of declension. In orthography textbooks there is a variant with a dash where both parts are subject to change (for example, *асистент-приправник*, *асистента-приправника* [assistant-trainee, the nominative and the genitive case]), but these two parts are not equal – the latter determines the former; there also exists a variant where both parts are equal in status (two surnames as part of female names, *Anica Savić-Rebac*), but in this case there is no change of surname (*od Anice Savić-Rebac* [from Anica Savić-Rebac]). In addition to this, when the dash is followed by commas, it is not clear what should be the orthographic sign of equal status, what is equal to what, and we cannot rely on orthography textbooks because from this formulation one cannot see whether that which is separated by commas is supposed to be “equal” (in which case Serbian, which nearly 50% of the respondents in the latest census opted for, is equal to Croatian, which 0.4% respondents opted for), or that which is separated by the dash.

After all of the above, before adopting the new law on general education, the Institute for Textbooks (not without agreement with certain power structures) **hurriedly printed textbooks with the inscription “The Montenegrin Language” on the covers**. According to the political agreement concluded between the authorities and the opposition, these textbooks were to remain out of circulation after the adoption of the new Law on General Education, but contrary to the agreement, these textbooks were not withdrawn, gradually they started being imposed in schools (and are slowly becoming established these days). The textbooks with the inscription “The Montenegrin Language” on the covers have mostly remained in use, and unofficially, within the framework of this subject, the pupils are getting acquainted with “two new sounds”, which, in effect, constitutes an attempt to slowly impose the “new Montenegrin norm” (that is, quasi-norm) upon everyone (Thus, we find the following examples in these textbooks, separated by a stroke: *ђеца/дјеца* [children], *ђевојка/дјевојка* [girl], *с’еду/сједу* [sit],

коз'у/козју [goat], *прис'етити/присјетити* [remember], *виђети/видјети* [see]... The latest textbooks go even further: (from 2015 onward, in the 6th-grade textbook, for example) only the forms *ђеца, ћепати* [chase] have been used.¹⁵

6. This was not the end of it. What also came to the fore in the new textbooks was the campaign of **leaving out** (or more precisely, kicking out) **Serbian writers** (and also of any Serbian designation in front of the names of the Serbian writers who remained in the curricula), who were adequately represented before, from St Sava onwards, and were replaced by writers of whom graduate philologists had never heard (not that they

¹⁵ It is certainly difficult, if not impossible, to find textbooks with as many doublet-type forms as there are to be found in these textbooks, which are filled with strokes to the point of bursting, which only additionally confuses and burdens the pupils (the educational system being as complicated as it is). “Gender-sensitive forms” are consequentially included (separated by strokes): *примијетио/примијетила си...* [you noticed], *учио/учила си...* [you studied]; *одредити са другом/другарицом из клупе* [decide together with the boy/girl sitting next to you]; *сам/сама разврстај гласове* [classify the sounds yourself]; *корисник/корисница националне банке* [national bank client]... In addition to this, the principle of “the broadest doubletisation possible” (as they called it) is fully implemented (that is, for those wishing to stay literate, and also for those who do not!? – even though the latter forms are placed first), and the textbooks are bursting with doublets and new letters...: *Those children [ђеца/дјеца] (with speech defects) do not pronounce a great many sounds; where [ђе/дје] the representative work The Hagiography of Prince Vladimir of Zeta was created; A conversation between grandfather [ђеда/дједа] and grandson was included; the children [ђеца/дјеца] and foreigners learning Montenegrin; it is mentioned here [овђе/овдје]...*; *Those languages are to be found everywhere [свѷђе/свѷдје]; the name given to a child [ћемему/дјемему] may determine the child's fate; children [ђеца/дјеца] will star in it, children's [ћечује/дјечује] songs will be heard; there is the north-western [с'еверозападна/сјеверозападна] group of Montenegrin dialects; the Glagolitic script is reminiscent [подс'ећа/подсјећа] of no other script...; remember [с'ету/сјему] what you learned last year...; put together a reminder [подс'етник/подсјетник]...; If a sound is so-norous, you feel [ос'етити/осјетити] a strong vibration; beside Senica [С'еницу/уз Сеницу]; Old Slavic texts were written on skins, be it calf or goat [коз'ој/козјој]. And it is from textbooks like these that Montenegrin children (ђеца!!!) are learning today!?*

are at a loss, because almost invariably these writers' artistic achievements are very modest indeed).¹⁶ In pursuing this practice, efforts are made to avoid referring to Serbian writers by the national designation, not just in the case of those from the area of Montenegro but also in the case of those from Serbia proper, while in the case of Croatian writers, for instance, the national designation is expressly stated.

7. In November 2011, the Commission for Preparing the Programme for the Teaching Subject Montenegrin-Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian Language and Literature was established, made up of "representatives of all four sides", but as it turned out in practice, and as can be seen from the reactions of Serbian language representatives (see: *Analitika* 2012), the protagonists of the powers-that-be in the Commission were entrusted with a specific task, and they tried to impose "the norm of the Montenegrin language", while at the same time marginalising the Serbian language and its speakers, both in the teaching practice and in broader terms. The debate did not progress "beyond ABC". The work of this Commission has been suspended for a long time, and the textbooks bearing the inscription The Montenegrin Language still remain in schools. Thus, the project directed against the Serbian language is thoughtfully, systematically and steadily being implemented, orchestrated by the central mechanism of the Montenegrin authorities.

¹⁶ The following examples will suffice to illustrate this – all one needs to do is compare names, for example: St Sava, Domentijan, Theodosius, folk poems of the Kosovo cycle, King Nikola Petrović, Miodrag Pavlović, Matija Bečković, Momčilo Nastasijević, Milorad Pavić, Branimir Šćepanović, Žarko Komanin and others, who are no longer to be found in school programmes; Njegoš, Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša, Branko Radičević, Branko Ćopić, Vasko Popa, Desanka Maksimović and others are still there, but to a lesser degree..., and there are some new names to be found, for example, Slobodan Vukanović, Spasoje Labudović, Dragan Kršenočić-Brković, Čedo Vulević, Ljubomir Đurković, Jovo Knežević, Blaga Žurić, Đordina Radivojević, Šukrija Pandžo, Sunčana Škrinjarić, Šimo Ešić, Ratko Zvrko, Enisa Osmančević Ćurić, Nazmi Rahmani, Veljko Radović and others, who are now in the textbooks (for more details and arguments, see: Veselin Matović 2012).

8. In July 2013, there was another attack pertaining the use of the Serbian language. Namely, Matica crnogorska [the Montenegrin Matrix] had submitted an objection to the Constitutional Court concerning a previously adopted decision (through the aforementioned Law on General Education, arising out of the agreement concluded between the authorities and the opposition), on the basis of which teaching is conducted in all the “languages” mentioned in the Constitution, **demanding that teaching be conducted in the “official”** (that is, “the Montenegrin language”). The Constitutional Court decided in their favour (according to this decision, teaching is to be conducted in “the official language” only).¹⁷

In addition to all of the above, in 2014 the Faculty of the Montenegrin Language was opened in Cetinje (certainly the first of its kind, there is no faculty of the Russian/Serbian language or the like in the case of native languages, these are studied within the framework of broader philological programmes), which “joined” the previously established Programme of Studies for the Montenegrin Language and South Slavic Literatures at the Faculty of Philosophy in Nikšić. What is being attempted in this way is to force and broaden the scope of the Montenegrin designation for the language as much as possible everywhere,

¹⁷ In the verdict it is stated: “From the provisions of Article 13 of the Constitution, which prescribes that the official language in Montenegro shall be the Montenegrin language, that the Cyrillic and the Latin script shall have equal status, and that Serbian, Bosnian, Albanian and Croatian shall be languages in official use, it does not follow that the Constitution allows the legislator to establish a different legal position of the official language and the other languages in official use in any domain, including the process of general education in state institutions, that is, the specific arrangements concerning the process of teaching in those languages.” Furthermore: “The Constitutional Court has established that the legislator has exceeded the boundaries of constitutional authorisation, for in addition to the obligation of conducting the teaching process in the Montenegrin language, the said legislator established the obligation of conducting the teaching process in one of the languages in official use – Serbian”, thereby “derogating from the constitutional principle of the Montenegrin language as the only official language in Montenegro”, etc. (Matović 2014: 144).

and to create the impression of scientific seriousness by means of its increased formal presence in institutions, preferably those of scientific-educational and scientific character.

9. When this formal-legal violence came to an end (or was brought to a close), there came a period of seeming quiet in Montenegro, but in fact, work on the same project continued, in a somewhat more clandestine manner, with fewer sharp cuts; quietly (or just a little more quietly) and systematically (more systematically), **the Serbian language and its speakers continued being divested of their rights.** There remained the tendency to diminish and destroy, keep silent about and ignore what the Serbian language retained in formal-legal terms (“language in official use”; “fitted in with” and crammed within the four-term designation of the teaching subject) in practice on a daily basis. The powers-that-be and their system behave as if the Serbian language does not exist and never has existed in Montenegro. The aim of this is to get all of Montenegro used to another name for the language, even indirectly, in a roundabout fashion, by eliminating the formal need and opportunity for encountering the name of the Serbian language and its functioning in the system of Montenegro. Not only will they lack this formal need, they will also be deprived of the opportunity to exercise this essential right of theirs.

It is impossible to mention each and every detail here, but we shall remind the reader of some. As we have mentioned earlier, before the new Law on General Education was adopted (the one which contains the name for the teaching subject Montenegrin-Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian), the Institute for Textbooks (in agreement with certain power structures) hurriedly printed textbooks whose covers bore the inscription “The Montenegrin Language” (immediately before the beginning of the school year), and these, contrary to the agreement between the authorities and the opposition, remained in use. In this way, children who declared themselves to be Serbian language speakers on the occasion of the census learned from textbooks bearing the inscription “The Montenegrin Language”,

thus getting acquainted with “two new letters” (c’ and z’ [s’ and z’]). Only a child who plucked up the courage to say that he/she did not want to learn these “new letters”, as they were not part of the Serbian language standard would be spared this (but there were few of those, and their number is diminishing). In keeping with the above and with this policy, it was stated in an announcement published by the Mayor of Podgorica Migo Stijepović (on 24th July 2015) that the capital city would provide free textbooks for the first-grade pupils of Podgorica, and in the very first sentence it says: “The budget of the capital city for the year 2015 envisages the procurement of a set of textbooks for all the children [đecu!] enrolled in the first grade of primary school on the territory of Podgorica who are to be taught in the Montenegrin and the Albanian language” (PR Office, *Dan* 24. 7. 2015, p. I). When reactions ensued (in view of the evident discrimination), the Podgorica PR Office issued an announcement stating “that all first-grade pupils on the territory of Podgorica, without exception, will be getting free textbooks, for in terms of form and content, these textbooks are the same for all the first-grade pupils in Montenegro” (*Dan* 25. 7. 2015, p. I). Why, if it is all the same, does it not say that free textbooks will be provided for children being taught “in the Serbian language?! At least in some Montenegrin city where textbooks were distributed “to all children being taught in the Montenegrin language”! It is quite clear that, in this way, it is attempted to deprive Serbian language speakers of any right due to them, and most terribly of all, it is imposed upon children “to be taught in the Montenegrin language”. To say nothing of the fact that in these announcements “being taught in a particular language” is confused with “the form and the content of the textbooks”, that is to say, the name of the language in connection with these two domains of official use.

The Serbian language is also discriminated (in fact, eliminated) in the new Statute of the University of Montenegro. The new Statute, adopted in February 2005, contains the Rulebook of Doctoral Studies (Article 11), characterised by a forced use of

the term “official language” (which is another indicator of why the artificial distinction between “official language” and “language in official use” was made in the Constitution – precisely for the purpose of divesting a “language in official use” of official use in reality). The following is stated in the Statute:

“On the basis of Article 87 paragraph 5 of the Law on Higher Education (“The Official Gazette of Montenegro”, no 44/2014) and Article 140 of the Statute of the University of Montenegro, the Senate of the University of Montenegro, in the course of a session held on 26th February 2015,

passes

THE REGULATIONS OF DOCTORAL STUDIES [...]

Article 11

A doctoral dissertation, or a doctoral art project, shall be prepared and defended in the language in which the programme of doctoral studies is realised.

A doctoral dissertation may be written and defended in the English language even if doctoral studies are not realised in the English language, on the condition that the programme of studies enables this and that members of the examination board possess knowledge of that language, in which case an expanded abstract is to be written in the official language...

Reports, the dissertation mark and other documentation, as well as the doctoral dissertation itself, or a doctoral art project, shall be written in the official language and in the English language if a person who does not possess knowledge of the official language is a member of the examination board and participates in the procedure of applying for, working on or defending a doctoral dissertation as the final part of a programme of studies being realised in the official language...”

When one enters the website of the Government of Montenegro, the Ministry of Education and Science, the University of Montenegro, the Faculty of Philosophy, and so on, for the option “contact” on the menu one can choose between the Montenegrin language and the English language. As it transpires, one can formally establish contact with official institutions in Montenegro only in Montenegrin or English, but not in the majority language – Serbian (regardless of the fact that, essentially, one is doing so precisely in the Serbian language). Therefore, in formal-legal terms, one cannot conduct any official communica-

tion (which is presumably what a language in official use should serve for) in Montenegro in the Serbian language.

10. Concerning the status of the Serbian language in Montenegro and that of its speakers, a lot has been said in scientific circles, at scientific conferences, symposia, round table discussions; this issue has been noted as a major problem that should not be neglected. **The actors in the domains of science, profession, institutions** who are most directly affected by this have drawn attention to this state of affairs and observed that a solution should and must be sought. In the course of a conference held two years ago at the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, the President of Matica srpska Dragan Stanić pointed out a number of the most important aspects in connection with the Serbian language policy. Firstly: **“The Serbian language policy should by no means be Serbian only, but pan-Serbian** (our emphasis!). This means that it should cover the entire Serbian language area, not only in the states which explicitly declare themselves to belong to the Serbian language area (the Republic of Serbia and the Republic of Srpska) but also all the other areas where Serbs live (in the Republic of Montenegro, the Republic of Croatia, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and elsewhere)” (Negrišorac 2014: 17). Furthermore, drawing particular attention to the area of Montenegro (which was quite justified in view of the precipitous developments aimed at threatening the very survival of the Serbian language and its historical continuity), he observed that it was “of exceptional importance” that “the Serbian language policy” should manifest “a special attitude” and “dedicate particular attention” to those who endeavour to preserve the traditional name of the language in these parts, of whom there are 42.88% according to the latest census (Negrišorac 2014: 17). Another important issue that he drew attention to concerned the act of the mere renaming of the Serbian language: “The Serbian language policy should manifest a clearly defined attitude towards the phenomenon, unknown so far, of simply renaming the language and developing artificial linguistic-standard systems, in the course of which addi-

tional elements are brought in, superfluous in communication terms, but serving as difference factors, while entirely omitting the initial, Serbian name of that language” (Negrišorac 2014: 19), most obviously and absurdly carried out in Montenegro. Another unavoidable problem is the falsifying of the Serbian literary-linguistic heritage by subsuming it under non-Serbian continuity and heritage. All of the above has been mentioned many times outside the context of this conference.

The conclusions reached at a conference held in 2013 were also unequivocal. In *The Concluding Announcement*, among other things, it is stated that **these problems can best be resolved “through full cooperation of the authorised ministries and national councils, on the one hand, and scientific and expert institutions, on the other”**, and that problems are also manifested, among other things, “in the insufficient and inadequate protection of the linguistic and identity rights of Serbs (and also of Serbian language speakers, we would add, J. S.) outside the Republic of Serbia, etc.” Furthermore: “The Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Serbia should establish a **language policy programme** (within the framework of the programme of the identity, cultural, educational and overall state policy), to be implemented in a coordinated manner, bearing in mind the need to preserve a unified Serbian language area, and also to protect the Serbian written heritage against appropriation” (Zaključci 2014: 227). Unfortunately, neither the conclusions reached at this conference nor the words of scientists uttered during the conference resulted in improving or attempting to improve the situation in Montenegro, it all remained at the level of words. The institutions and organisations whose task and obligation that should be did not respond or make any efforts in that direction.

11. What are, and what could be the tasks of Serbian studies and the institutions interested in the Serbian language (its rights and the rights of Serbian language speakers in Montenegro), in the context of everything that we have managed to say on the subject here, can be concluded on the basis of the

facts that we have presented. And that which we have not presented can be surmised and filled in. To begin with, at least to the extent necessary (as much as possible), one should not forget that in Montenegro the Serbian language has its historical vertical (and that the entire linguistic heritage is written in the Serbian language and should be gathered, described and cultivated); one should not forget Serbian language speakers in Montenegro (which tends to happen these days); one should not forget all the institutions and organisations that are dedicated to the Serbian language, to studying, preserving and cultivating it (the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language and Literature in Nikšić; Matica srpska – the members' association in Montenegro; the Association of Serbian Language Teachers, writers; associations and the like) – which is not the case for the time being. Too much has been left to chance and to a small number of those who are dedicated to the Serbian language and culture (whether they are actors in the domain of science, literature, culture in a broad sense, and to Serbian language speakers who, despite everything, are trying to preserve the Serbian language and to preserve themselves within the Serbian language in Montenegro). We believe that it is an obligation, as well as the right and honour of all Serbian (and generally scientific) institutions to care about their nation, and first of all about Serbian studies as a scientific discipline, as well as about Serbian language speakers, wherever they may be, and about the rights of the Serbian language and its heritage everywhere, and that (much more) effort and dedication should be put in towards that end.

2. The standardisation (and normativisation) of language – the general principles and processes in Montenegro

2.1. Some failures led to others. On 22nd February 2008 (through the publication in *The Official Gazette*), the previously announced decision of the Government of Montenegro "...on

establishing the Council for the Standardisation of the Montenegrin Language” came into effect; its “*obligation*” was to “*prepare a proposal for the Orthography of the Montenegrin Language, a proposal for the Grammar of the Montenegrin Language and a proposal for a Dictionary of the Montenegrin Language*”. The Council was made up of actors of various profiles and interests, very few linguists, the latter being those who subordinated science to political and ideological engagement. It was announced that, by the beginning of the school year (2008/2009), the orthography, grammar, “Montenegrin language” textbooks would be finished;¹⁸ this remained a mere announcement. In view of the fact that the entire “project” relied on politics and a demonstration of power, as can be seen from what we have presented before, it could not go beyond those boundaries. Standardisation and normativisation should be guided by scientific principles (those of linguistics, sociolinguistics and even language policy) if they are to produce any results: “codification does not mean thinking up and imposing norms..., ‘under normal circumstances, codification of linguistic norms means noting down the sum total of what has already been accepted’ (Hundt 2005: 22)” (Kordić 2010: 73).

¹⁸ “Assistant Minister of Education and Science Ćazim Fetahović said yesterday for ‘Dan’ that ‘it is expected that, by the time of the beginning of the next school year, that is, in eight months, the orthography and the grammar of the Montenegrin language will be finished, and that they will become an integral part of the educational programmes in effect in educational institutions’. He explained that ‘the Ministry of Education, after communicating with the University and some other institutions, submitted to the Government a proposal for establishing the Council for the Standardisation of the Montenegrin Language’, whose members were nominated in the course of the session held the day before yesterday...”

Doctor Rajka Glušica, a Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy and Deputy Chairperson of the newly formed Council, said that ‘the only important thing is to perform that task honestly, in a quality manner and scientifically. We shall standardise what we already have, without looking at others. I expect that we shall start working very soon, because this is urgent. I would like people to leave us in peace to do our job’, said Glušica briefly” (*Dan*, 26th January 2008, 11).

2.2. By the time of the beginning of the new school year (in August 2008), the orthography and the grammar that had been announced were not yet to be seen, but “**a proposal for the orthography**” did appear;¹⁹ according to the information given, the Council applied the previously adopted **7 orthographic principles**. Towards the end of August 2008, the media reported that the Ministry of Education had received the orthography, wherein the previously adopted “7 principles” were “observed” and applied. Those “7 principles” were supported by 10 of the 13 members of the “Council”, and they are as follows: “For the purpose of making the work of the Orthography and the Grammar as efficient as possible, the members of the Council, to begin with, adopted the following Orthographic Principles: 1. the model for the standard Montenegrin linguistic norm shall be the common, general linguistic layer that belongs to all autochthonous Montenegrin citizens. 2. This Orthography will observe the following rule in Montenegrin: Write as you speak, and read as it is written. 3. The Ijekavian variant shall be the normative one, in keeping with the Montenegrin tradition and the contemporary usage. 4. The all-Montenegrin phonemes *ć, đ, š* and *ž*, come into being through Jekavian iotising, are part of the standard Montenegrin linguistic norm. The sounds *š* and *ž* shall have their own graphemes (in both the Cyrillic and the Latin alphabet). 5. The standard Montenegrin four-accent system with vowel lengths

¹⁹ “The Government’s Council for General Education, presided over by Professor and new Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy in Nikšić Blagoje Cerović, will review the Proposal for the Orthography of the Contemporary Montenegrin Language with an Orthographic Dictionary... The MINA news agency reports that the Chairperson of the Council of the Standardisation of the Montenegrin Language Branko Banjević submitted the said Proposal to the Minister of Education yesterday, but there was no information on who would review that document, the Council for General Education or a special Commission, following which it would be forwarded to the Government... Adnan Čirgić, a member of the Council for Standardisation, said that the **Proposal contained seven orthographic principles**, which three members of that body had refused to sign, namely, Igor Lakić, Zorica Radulović and Tatjana Bečanović...” (*Dan*, 29th August 2008, 11).

shall be codified. 6. The orthography of the Montenegrin language shall not implement the archaisation of the language, nor can it be used to normativise localisms, dialectisms and provincialisms that are not part of the general contemporary usage in Montenegro. 7. In all other respects, unless the contemporary Montenegrin linguistic practice prescribes otherwise, the Montenegrin orthography shall not deviate from the Orthography of the Serbo-Croatian literary language.”²⁰

How the language policy is implemented in Montenegro is clearly seen from the above adopted “principles”. Thus, for instance, “the first principle” states that “the model for the standard Montenegrin linguistic norm shall be **the common, general linguistic layer that belongs to all autochthonous Montenegrin citizens**” (our emphasis!). Each segment of this “principle” is formulated in such a way that it does not mean anything. That, however, is the best foundation for manipulation. This gives rise to the question of what (and who) these “autochthonous Montenegrin citizens” are – how one proves or disproves their autochthonous character (whether by their being the bearers of “the common, general linguistic layer”, or whether possessing “the common, general linguistic layer” proves that a person is “an autochthonous Montenegrin citizen”). Are the Serbian language speakers who opted for the language that they truly speak (of whom there were 64% according to the next-to-last census, and close to 50% according to the latest census) “autochthonous Montenegrin citizens”?! If so, are they, too, the bearers of “the standard Montenegrin linguistic norm”?! And is anyone planning to impose upon them “the model of the standard Montenegrin linguistic norm”? Or, perhaps, they are not “autochthonous Montenegrin citizens”?! What if “autochthonous Serbian citizens” (and many other “autochthonous citizens” as well) possess that same “general linguistic layer”, and what if some “autochthonous Montenegrin citizens” are not the

²⁰ Concerning the “7 principles” adopted by the “Council for Standardisation”, one could get information through the media (see, for example, the dailies: *Dan*, *Vijesti*, *Politika*, 29. 08. 2008).

bearers of this “general linguistic layer”?²¹ In point of fact, the borders of today’s Montenegro are not the borders of dialectal isoglosses, nor is the dialectal area of Montenegro unified. It is actually very fragmented, and in addition to this, Montenegro is divided into two parts by a strong and very important cluster of dialectal isoglosses (in historical and area dialectology).

Presumably in keeping with the “neo-scientific” above “principle”, the so-called “fourth principle” is formulated as follows: “The all-Montenegrin phonemes *ć*, *đ*, *š* and *ž*, come into being **through the Ijekavian iotising** (our emphasis!) of the sounds *s* and *z*, are part of the standard Montenegrin linguistic norm... In accordance with the above, those two phonemes shall have their own graphemes in the Cyrillic and the Latin alphabet.” However, **those are neither general nor all-Montenegrin phonemes; likewise, neither are *s*’ and *z*’ phonemes, nor are they Montenegrin only.** The sounds *s*’ and *z*’ (as in *šesti*, *iz’esti*), as well as the iotised forms of the *ćerati* and *đevojka* type, belong to the dialectal corpus of the Serbian language, and are spread across the broad area of the Serbian language. Defining precisely the area of the spread of the sounds *s*’ and *z*’, Miodrag Jovanović concludes that these spirants cannot be considered “Montenegrinisms”: “The area that they encompass, which we have tried to present at least in basic terms in this paper, precludes any thought that the sounds *s*’ and *z*’ may be Montenegrinisms. Moreover, their existence in the sound

²¹ After precise analyses carried out based on scientific parameters, comparing the situation in folk dialects (in view of the spread of linguistic isoglosses) and what the new Orthography of the Montenegrin Language “brings” (in keeping with the proclaimed principle of “autochthonousness”), Ana Janjušević concludes: “A reader who is in any way knowledgeable will observe that Montenegro is sharply divided into a younger, Štokavian zone (the East-Herzegovinian dialect), characterised by the four-accent system, and a zone of older Štokavian dialects, where in two accents are most often to be found. Does that mean, then, that the inhabitants of the southern and the north-eastern part of Montenegro, who use the old two-accent or three-accent system in official communication, are not ‘autochthonous Montenegrin citizens’”? (Janjušević–Oliveri 2011: 110).

system constitutes a strong bond not only between the mutually differing spoken language zones of north-western and south-eastern Montenegro, but also between Jekavian dialects in general – with both those in the west and those to the east of the borders of Montenegro, in an approximately equal measure. The fact that the reach of certain phenomena is not the same everywhere, that some significant limitations have, to a degree, created differences between Montenegrin dialects themselves, cannot alter the basic conclusions: based on the manner of their coming into being and the degree of the use of the palatal sounds *s'* and *z'*, the area of Montenegro shares the fate of the other Ijekavian dialects (Jovanović 2011: 196).²² In addition to this, in many cases these sounds (*s'* and *z'*) could never have come into being through Jekavian iotation (for instance, in *koz'i, s'utra, pas'i, pros'ak...*), even though it is said in the “prin-

²² The dialectal picture of the spread of these sounds is presented precisely and clearly in M. Jovanović's study: “Following the formation of the sounds *s'* and *z'* from the groups *sj* and *zj* – according to the new and most recent iotising – in the spacious belt of Ijekavian dialects that our investigation has encompassed (from the dialects of Banija and Kordun, through those of Bosanska krajina, in the western part of our linguistic territory, to the dialect of the village of Gorobilje near Užička Požega, in the central part of western Serbia), we have come across many coincidences, which are rather more noticeable than differences” (Jovanović 2011: 193). Therefore, as it transpires, these sounds are no “autochthonous Montenegrin specificity”, they encompass a much broader area, and in addition to that, they encompass, in unequal measure, the dialects of today's Montenegro (“the groups *sje* and *zje* [especially *sje*] in the coastal dialects are rather more stable than one might expect judging by the situation in the dialects of the surrounding area. On the other hand, in the dialects of Dubrovnik and Cavtat, as opposed to the neighbouring dialect of Konavle, the iotation of the spirants *s* and *z* is entirely unknown. Other Montenegrin dialects, together with those of Eastern Herzegovina, and to an almost equal degree with the dialects of the Serbian Lim basin area, are part of a belt in which iotation is more markedly in evidence. In the dialects of Novi Pazar and Sjenica, the increasingly frequent occurrence of the Ekavian reflex of *yat* has largely contributed to reworking its basic Ijekavian structure, so that one could say that the use of the sounds *s'* and *z'* there can be considered an occasional phenomenon” (Jovanović 2011: 192).

ciples” – “and two more, come into being through the Ijekavian **iotation** of the sounds *s* and *z*”, while it is precisely to *koz’i* and *s’utra* that they refer the most, calling them a part of “the common, general linguistic layer”. These softened sounds are characteristic of hypocoristic and onomatopoeic words, included in the *Orthography* by the advocates of normativism without any criteria, “substantiated” by examples in the dictionary, while hypocoristic and onomatopoeic words “can be a part of the folk lexis, but in view of the fact that they are on the periphery of the lexical system and that they have their ‘regular’ doublet pairs, no serious standard linguistic norm includes them in its dictionary corpus” (Janjušević 2011: 117). Also, in some dialects there is no consistency when it comes to the results of the iotation of the sequence *zj*, where a switch to *đ* has been noted, as in: *iđela, iđes, iđede; uđašati, uđati, uđa...* (Jovanović 2011: 191, 188). So much for being conversant with linguistic processes and about the solid foundation and justification of the given “normativistic” principles!

The sound *s*, which was the subject of a debate over whether to include it in the “standard”, in addition to being heard in a narrow area of Montenegro (to a rather limited degree), is quite widespread in the Kosovo-Resava dialect. None of the linguistic isoglosses ends on the borders of Montenegro, none of these linguistic features is Montenegrin only (or “general” and “autochthonous”), as the authorities wish to present it.

2.3. In the course of the year 2008 (at the time of the beginning of the school year), after the 13th session of the 13 members of the Council for the Standardisation of “the Montenegrin Language”, immediately after the submission and announcement of the “Proposal for the Orthography” (which task the Council had entrusted to Adnan Čirgić), there occurred a **division and a schism** (which led to the emergence of a “double Council”), with **two proposals for the “Orthography”**,²³ which were duly submitted to the Ministry. It remained

²³ “He (that is, Banjević, J. S.) says that the Council members Rajka Glušica and Zorica Radulović gave up at the last moment on the orthog-

unclear to the very end what the difference between the two orthographies was: it would appear that it was a struggle for the (in)glorious supremacy in the matter of some (im)possible “Montenegrin language”. In principle, both “orthographies” contain so-called “doublet forms”: that is to say, the Montenegrin language should include **dialectal forms of the Serbian language and forms of the standard Serbian language**, and there should be a parallel coexistence of these. That would mean, for example, that the pairs *tjerati – ćerati*, *djevojka – đevojka*, *sjekira – s’jekira...* should have equal status, and in a way, these are two (sub)systems in this domain. One side (headed by Rajka Glušica) “envisages” the existence of doublet forms “for a long time”²⁴ – while the other, headed by Adnan

raphy that had already been agreed upon and said that they would offer their own version of this textbook. ‘However, it is not their own version of the Orthography at all, it is the existing one, wherein they made some changes that are contrary to the prescribed principles’, Banjević claims. He opined that it was obvious that some Council members ‘are of the opinion that the normativisation of the Montenegrin language means copying the Orthography of the Serbo-Croatian or Serbian Language’. ‘I ask them, who could authorise the codifiers of a language to appropriate the heritage of another language as their own’, said Banjević’ (*Danas*, Podgorica, 30th August 2008).

“Two days ago, the Council Chairperson Mirko Banjević, who is also the President of Matica crnogorska, submitted to the Ministry of Education a proposal for a new orthography of the Montenegrin language, which, among other things, envisages consequentially observing Jekavian iotation, which presupposes expanding the alphabet by adding two new graphemes ‘š’ and ‘ž’, come into being by blending the consonants ‘sj’ and ‘zj’... “There is no official version of the orthography of the Montenegrin language, and the document which Banjević submitted without the Council’s consent represents the version that the Council had not voted on, which, as such, cannot be considered by those in the Ministry who are authorised to do so’, claims Lakić (a Council member, J. S.) in a press release” (The daily *Politika*, 31st August 2008).

²⁴ ““The orthography Principles are very deftly mixed with the actual text of the Orthography. The Principles were signed by ten Council members, myself among them, on the condition that the most contentious part, Item 4 (the normativisation of Ijekavian iotation: ć, đ, š, ž) was to be resolved by means of doublets. Essentially, the remaining six

Čirgić, holds the view that “the doublet state of affairs” is merely a transitional solution, and that dialectal forms (of the *ćerati*, *s’esti*, *đevojka*, *iz’esti* type) should suppress the standard ones (of the *tjerati*, *djevojka*, *sjesti* type).

2.4. The year 2009 (instead of, as had been announced previously, with the easily and quickly compiled “Montenegrin language”) began with “a copious amount of material” submitted by the two groups within the previously divided, now rearranged and disbanded Council. According to the announcement made by the Minister of Education and Science Sreten Škuletić: “After the formation of the commissions that will be reviewing the texts that have been submitted, the public will be informed about the Ministry’s moves that are to follow... **How many new letters, phonemes, words and grammatical rules pupils and students will be studying may remain unknown until the school year 2010/2011...** Only when we see what the Council has done will we be able to act. It all depends on the

orthographic principles are not subject to dispute... The manner of their inclusion in the text of the Orthography is another matter. The most bothersome thing of all was that the products of Ijekavian iotation were in most cases prescribed as the only correct forms (*s’utra*, *s’ever*, *veleposjed*, *predsjednik*, *predsjedništvo*, *predosećaj*, *seta*, *setiti se*, *setnost*, *osećajan*, *osjetljiv*, *osenčiti*, *detinjast*, *počernica*, *ponedeljak*, *ovđe*, *onđe*, *učerivač* and a number of others), and naturally, the sound *ž*, says Glušica, Professor of General Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy in Nikšić...

Glušica is of the opinion that today’s speaker of the Montenegrin language is ‘an educated person who will not easily renounce the orthographic habits learned through the educational system of many years. It should be understood that the Montenegrin language is: *sjutra* and *s’utra*, *đevojka* and *djevojka*, *sednica* and *sjednica*, *predsjednik* and *predsednik*. One form came into being in folk dialects, whereas the other came with the standard, **both are ours, Montenegrin, for they are equally used by Montenegrin speakers.** Which form will prevail in the future – remains to be seen. **Let us recognise that both have the right to life.** We must not exclude either of them. In the situation that the Montenegrin language is in today, doublets are the best solution. **They encompass all the speakers and none can be threatened**’(our emphasis!)” (ELEKTRONSKE NOVINE, published: 01. 09. 2008. 15:09, THE ORTHOGRAPHY AND GRAMMAR ALREADY EXIST. Source: www.politika.rs).

material that they will submit...” (*Dan*, 14th February 2009, 11). The following day, we read: “For the time being, we are trying to review what the Council has delivered. As soon as we see what texts pertaining to the orthography, grammar and dictionary we have received, we shall know what our next steps will be, **so that we could have a completely standardised language as soon as possible**’ (our emphasis!), Škuletić explained, adding that it depended on the quality of the material submitted by the Council when Montenegrin language textbooks would be printed” (*Dan*, 21st February 2009, 11).

2.5. As the two groups could not reach an agreement, the Ministry of Education of Montenegro formed the so-called **foreign expert commission** (group), which “decided” to adopt the “orthography proposal” based on the “principle”: “**Write as you speak, speak as it is written!**” (*The Official Gazette of Montenegro*, no. 49, vol. LXV, 5), taken over from the “principle” forwarded by Vojislav Nikčević – wherein he changed “govoriš [you speak]” with “zboriš”, so as to “Montenegrinise” the said “principle”. The “expert group” was made up of the Croat Josip Silić (a retired linguist, a regular reviewer of “Montenegrin orthographies, grammars and histories written by Vojislav Nikčević), the Ukrainian Lyudmila Vasilyevna (of whom, concerning her achievements in linguistics, we know precisely – nothing, but we do know that she had been pronounced by the aforementioned Vojislav Nikčević to be his collaborator and a holder of PhD in the Montenegrin language in Ukraine) and the philosopher/sociologist from Novi Sad (originating from Montenegro) Milenko Perović.

On 9th July 2009, the Minister of Education and Science Sreten Škuletić approved “the orthography of the Montenegrin language with a dictionary proposed by ‘the expert commission’” (*Dan*, 10th July 2009: 10). As Minister Sreten Škuletić points out in his announcement, the services of “foreign experts” were engaged because “we did not have any usable domestic ones”, due to the fact that all the “usable domestic ones” were “Council members” (*Dan*, 11th July 2009: 11). In view of

the fact that, as had been suggested earlier, two versions of the orthography were submitted, the one adopted, obviously, was the version submitted by Adnan Čirgić, and according to the justification given, the “orthographic dictionary” submitted by Rajka Glušica was adopted. However, judging by all the indicators available, there were no significant differences between the two “versions”.²⁵ To what extent these “orthography proposals” were rather identical is testified to by the fact that “the expert group” declaratively adopted the “orthography” submitted by Adnan Čirgić and the “orthographic dictionary” submitted by Rajka Glušica. Presumably, an orthographic dictionary would have to be in agreement with the corresponding orthography (although, if the truth must be told, in the “orthography proposal” nothing is in agreement with anything, and therefore, need not be in agreement with the “proposal for the orthographic dictionary” either – in which nothing is in agreement with anything either).

In the text of “the reaction of five Council members”, it is stated: “That commission passed the third version, which, according to the statements issued by them, is not a compromise one, but proceeds from **‘philosophical and neostructuralist principles’** (our emphasis!), so that, from the existing versions, it could ‘use the material which, through appropriate additions and interventions, could be brought to the final form’” (*Dan*, 30th July 2009, 11). The only thing that remains for us to do is see what this standardisation, proceeding from “philosophical and neostructuralist principles” looks like!? The basic “motto”

²⁵ “The Council for the Standardisation of the Montenegrin Language, headed by Professor Branko Banjević (established in January 2008), submitted the first proposal for the orthography to the Ministry on 30th August. This version was proposed with seven principles and three new sounds. Three Council members did not agree with this proposal... on account of which, five months later, two proposals were submitted, one with 31 letters, the other with 32 letters. The former proposal envisaged the possibility of using doublets (our emphasis!), so that, according to this version, for example, it would be correct to say both *đevojka* and *djevojka*” (*Dan*, 11th July 2009: 11).

of all these decisions and developments is based on the following “principle” (that is, the ultimatum): **the Montenegrin language must exist**, in keeping with the “justification” given at the press conference by the “expert group” member Milenko Perović – “**if we have aimed a spear** (our emphasis!), we must hit our target, lest our enemies should take revenge and gloat” (The News Programme of the Radio Television of Montenegro 1, 10th July 2009). And Silić (in the words of Milenko Perović) “intervened on the orthography” aiming “**radically for the Montenegrification of the Montenegrin language**”, which Perović himself “would not dare to do even as a Montenegrin”. What this should mean is preposterous to even ask. Moreover – “the Croatian Professor Silić knows the Montenegrin language better than any native Montenegrin” (!?!), (*Dan*, 11th July 2009, 11). It would appear, on the basis of the above, that anyone who “prefers” expert “orthography” will have to procure the teaching services of a Croat.

And the language would be spoken [“збориће се”], according to the justification given by “the expert group”, following the “rules” – “**of the broadest doubletisation possible**” (!?!), so that everyone can speak the way they like, that is, the way they have spoken until now”, in the words of the “expert team” member Milenko Perović (July 2009, 17:17 pm, MINA), therefore, “according to the rules of Grandmother Smiljana”, as Vuk Stefanović Karadžić would have put it. That is to say, “the orthography thus presented”, declaratively and formally, proclaims standard forms of the Serbian language (of the *djevojka*, *tjerati*, *sjesti*, *izjesti* type), as well as dialectal forms of the Serbian language (of the *đevojka*, *ćerati*, *sěsti*, *izěsti* type) to be “the Montenegrin language”, so that various “expert groups” will be entrusted with the task of finding a way – to implement the use of “the broadest doubletisation possible” in practice.

The first variant was adopted, as M. Perović informed us, so that “those who have been linguistically literate so far should remain literate”, and the other (judging by the first “justification”), presumably, so that those illiterate should turn “liter-

ate” (or remain illiterate, or...). And as the “protagonist” of the so-called Montenegrin orthography Adnan Čirgić explained: “The existence of doublets (*ded* – *djed*, *devojka* – *djevojka*, *tjerati* – *čerati*) should only be a transitional solution until the establishment of a new orthography, which would codify only the autochthonous forms (that is, *ded*, *čerati*, as well as *sednica*, *izvesti* – J. S.)” (*Večernje novosti*, 11th July 2009), presumably, so that “the former” (“those who have been linguistically literate so far”) should become illiterate (!?) – again, in keeping with the justification of “the expert team”.

2.6. The conflict between two groups of “normativists”, members of a once unified Council, led to a total schism, personal conflicts and a struggle for “domination” over some “future” “Montenegrin language”.²⁶

2.7. As a product of all these “linguistic” developments (in fact, political projections), there ensued a **chaos of “standardological literature” on “the Montenegrin language”**, which only added to the general nonsense of it all. In September 2010, there appeared “A Grammar of the Montenegrin Language”, written by Adnan Čirgić and two Croatian linguists: Ivo Pranjković and Josip Silić, which had been adopted and verified by the Council for General Education in Montenegro on 21st June.²⁷ Several days later, there appeared “The Orthography of the Montene-

²⁶ “The teaching assistant at the Faculty of Philosophy in Nikšić, and one of the authors of the orthography of the Montenegrin language, Adnan Čirgić, cancelled his engagement at this university unit... In a letter, Čirgić claims that one of the reasons for his departure is the fact Rajka Glušica, Head of the Programme of Studies for the Montenegrin Language and Literatures, ‘was allowed to conduct the staffing policy herself, instead of it being based on the law, and that she did so based on her personal likes and her ideological concept... My fault consisted in preparing the working version of the Orthography of the Montenegrin Language, which the expert team accepted as the first official orthography following the redaction process” (*Dan*, 16th September 2009, 11).

²⁷ *A Grammar of The Montenegrin Language* (authors: Adnan Čirgić, Ivo Pranjković, Josip Silić), the Ministry of Education and Science of Montenegro, Podgorica 2010. “A *Grammar of the Montenegrin Language* was adopted by the official Decision of the Ministry of Education

grin Language”²⁸ (the editorial board was made up of the previously appointed “expert team”: Milenko Perović, Josip Silić again, Lyudmila Vasilyevna – together with Adnan Čirgić).

Several days before the *Grammar*, to pave the way for it, so to speak, there appeared a freely distributed booklet entitled: “The Montenegrin Language. **The Scientific-methodological Foundations** (!?!, our emphasis!) of the Standardisation of the Montenegrin Language”, whose author, yet again, is the aforementioned Croat Josip Silić.²⁹ Within these methodological foundations, for example, we find prescribed as the only correct variant: “*Kamo ideš?* [Where are you going?]” and “*Kamo*

and Science of Montenegro, no. 01-2571/4 of 5th July 2010”, as it says in the accompanying note.

²⁸ *The Orthography of the Montenegrin Language* (Editorial Board: Milenko A. Perović, PhD, Chairperson of the Expert Commission, Josip Silić, PhD, member of the Expert Commission, Lyudmila Vasilyevna, PhD, member of the Expert Commission, Adnan Čirgić, PhD, Jelena Šušanj), the Ministry of Education and Science of Montenegro, Podgorica 2010. In the accompanying note, it says: “*The Orthography of the Montenegrin Language* was adopted by the official Decision of the Ministry of Education and Science of Montenegro, no. 01-2884 of 30th June 2010”.

²⁹ On Tuesday, 24th August 2010 (p. 13), the daily *Pobjeda* published the following advertisement (illustrated by colour photos): “FOR FREE. To all the readers of the daily ‘Pobjeda’, on 27th August, a free gift: THE MONTENEGRIN LANGUAGE. A book by Josip Silić. Published by the Ministry of Education and Science of Montenegro, the book presents the scientific-methodological foundations of the standardisation of the Montenegrin language. ‘We must remind the public of the fact that the norm, just like the standard language that it belongs to, is a social institution. It is established by society, not the individual. The norm selects and evaluates. It decides which organic speech and which part(s) of it will be taken as the foundation of the standard language...’ (Author). On 3rd September, you will be able to buy ‘A Grammar of the Montenegrin Language’ at the newsstands for 4.99 euros. On 10th and 17th September, at the same price, ‘The Orthography of the Montenegrin Language’ will be on sale, too.” We believe that it is not necessary to comment on this. It seems that only “the principle of commercialisation” (and banalisation) was observed (and newsstands were, indeed, an appropriate point of sale)!

da idem? [Where am I to go?])” (and the correct answer to this question is: “*Onamo* [There]”, “*Ovamo* [This way]”...); also: “*Đe se to događa* [Where is this happening?]” (to which the answer is: “*Ovđe* [Here]”, “*Onđe* [There]”...). According to this manual, it is not at all correct to say: “*Đe ideš?* [Where are you going?]”, “*Đe si krenuo?* [Where are you headed?]” or: “*Gdje ideš?*” (for more details on this, see p. 24).³⁰ Is this distinction really supposed to be accessible to Montenegrin speakers?!? The distinction between the adverbs *gdje* and *kamo* has all but disappeared in the speech practice of even the most educated Montenegrin speakers, and the leading linguists in Montenegro also speak about the loss of this distinction: “In the Serbian language, where less care is taken about the rules of grammar, and more reliance is placed on the nature of the language and the feeling for the language, that distinction (between place and direction, J. S.) is increasingly lost, especially between the adverbs *gdje* and *kamo*, to the detriment of the latter” (Ostojić 1996: 18). But that is why the dialectal forms of the Serbian language (*đe*, *ovđe*) are forced, so that the “foundations” should resemble Croatian to a lesser degree.

The “Grammar” textbook was for the most part copied from *A Grammar of the Croatian Language for Grammar Schools and Higher Education Institutions* by Josip Silić and Ivo Pranjković (Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 2005), with the addition of forms, some taken from dialects, some thought up relying on who knows what principle, all of which should contribute to the “special

³⁰ “The morpheme *-amo* designates ‘the direction of movement’, the morpheme *-uda* refers to ‘the space of movement’, while the morpheme *-đe* (as well as the morphemes *-u* and *-tu*) refer to ‘place’.. To the question *Kamo?* the reply in the case of I is *Ovamo*, in the case of you *Tamo*, and in the case of he *Onamo*. To the question of *Kuda?* [Where?] the reply alongside I is *Ovuda*, alongside you *Tuda* [That way] and alongside he *Onuda* [That way]. To the question *Đe?* the reply alongside I is *Ovđe*, alongside you *Tu* [Here] and alongside he *Onđe* [There]... With specific questions and answers, it goes as follows: (I asks you) *Kamo ideš?* – (You answers) *Tamo*... (You asks I) *Kamo da idem?* (I answers) *Ovamo*... To the question posed by I *Đe se to događa?* you answers *Ovđe* or *Onđe*...”, is how this is explained in *The Methodological Foundations* (Silić 2010: 24).

character” of “the Montenegrin language”. And is it not surprising to see so many Croatian linguists putting in so much effort to contribute to the domain of “Montenegrin studies”!? And let us note here that, not so long ago, there appeared a map drawn by the Croat Tomo Matisić according to which the entire Ijekavian area (including Montenegro and south-western Serbia) is the area of – the Croatian language. To begin with – in is enough for the language (in Montenegro as well) not to be called by the Serbian name. Comparing the new “Montenegrin language handbooks”, the *Orthography* and *Grammar*, with the former Serbian/Serbo-Croatian Orthography dating from 1960, Ana Janjušević shows that they are identical in almost every respect (that is, that work on the new handbooks consisted of copying the old solutions), except for the chapter which, in the old Orthography, was entitled “The Ijekavian and Ekavian Pronunciation”, whereas in the new Orthography it is entitled “The Montenegrin Ijekavian Pronunciation”: “The determinant ‘Montenegrin’ should probably serve to differentiate that Ijekavian speech from some ‘non-Montenegrin’ variant – probably the Croatian, Bosnian or possibly Serbian Ijekavian speech, that is, if the authors allow the possibility of the existence of such an Ijekavian variant” (Janjušević–Oliveri 2011: 110). A. Janjušević, relying on a detailed analysis, goes on to compare these two orthographies, also considering “the new phonemes thought up by the Montenegrin normativists”, and shows that “an overview of the solutions pertaining to the repartition of *yat* indicates that ‘the Montenegrin Ijekavian speech’ is the same as the Serbian one, that is, as the Serbo-Croatian Ijekavian speech, with the exception of some solutions that pertain to a negligible number of lexemes” (which, more often than not, are forced in order to create a seeming difference, J. S.), so that, consequently, “the proposed pretentious determinant ‘Montenegrin’ does not at all match the Ijekavian speech, which is more or less normatively unified on the entire Štokavian territory” (Janjušević–Oliveri 2011: 119).

The most appropriate and dependable analysis of these normative handbooks has been provided by Miloš Kovačević,

who, after a detailed analysis, concludes: “The analysis of the three normative handbooks of ‘the Montenegrin language’ – the *Orthography*, *Grammar* and *The Scientific-methodological Foundations of Standardisation* – points to two almost imminent characteristics. Whatever is new in these three handbooks in theoretical-methodological terms, as a rule, can be qualified as scientifically unfounded, and can only be justified by the ‘uniqueness of the Montenegrin language’ among all the languages in Europe and the world, which is so ostentatiously emphasised by its inaugurators and main ‘flag-bearers’. If the principles that form the foundation of the orthographic and grammatological description are erroneous, then the said description cannot be at a scientifically satisfactory level. This is best confirmed by the handbooks themselves. They are full of failings, large-scale ones, which often have the status of material errors” (Kovačević 2012: 320).

The grammar, as well as the orthography, introduce “two new letters” for “two new sounds” in “the new norm” – *s’* and *z’*, which are proclaimed to be phonemes here. As *s’* and *z’* do not have the status of phonemes in the language (“Those East-Herzegovinian sounds, in view of the fact that one can barely draw individual distinct pairs for them, remain at the level of dialectal sounds”, Kovačević – Šćepanović 2001: 627), Vojislav Nikčević started constructing words wherein he “accommodated” *s’* and *z’*, whose status and frequency of occurrence in dialects were debatable, especially taking into consideration “the general linguistic layer that belongs to all autochthonous Montenegrin citizens”. In order to obtain the palatal fricatives *s’* and *z’* (sound units that constitute allophones, that is, contextually conditioned realisations of the phonemes *s* and *ʒ*) the status of phonemes, words from everyday speech are taken at random or forms sporadically noted down in very narrow areas are thought up (thus, despite great efforts, one can barely produce a minimal pair: *z’ènica* [the pupil of the eye], as opposed to *ženica* [little woman]; *s’ènica*, as opposed to *šenica* [contracted form of *wheat*] even though the only accepted literary form is

pšenica).³¹ Apart from serving to try to ensure the status of a phoneme to the sound *z'*, the form *ženica* was supposed to perform another function for the “normativists”. Since there are no lexemes (except for hypocoristics) starting with *z'*, and as it is customary to illustrate letters (for example, in alphabet books) by providing words that begin with a given letter, the form *ženica* was included in the “norm” and gained a wide “use” even though, as shown by Miodrag Jovanović, “this permanent and typical Ekavian form, whose spread reaches far beyond the area of Montenegro, is only known in the form of *e < ž*. The Jekavian parallel *ženica* has been confirmed only by the researcher Mato Pižurica (70), dealing with the speech in the environs of Kolašin, and that is a lexeme which has a parallel use, solely as a non-iotised form, its synonym *zjena* (we have no confirmation of the existence of *z'ena*)” (Jovanović 2008: 154). Be that as it may, today we find it in alphabet books written as *ženica*, even though children cannot recognise the meaning of this lexeme in its new form, with *z'*, until it is additionally explained to them. Still, in *The Orthography of the Montenegrin Language*, regardless of the research carried out by dialectologists, we find both *z'ena* and *ženica* (p. 212). As A. Janjušević observes, in *The Orthography of the Montenegrin Language* and in the dictionary enclosed with it, “the iotised spirants *s'* and *z'* are to be found only in several root morphemes, and also in hypocoristics and onomatopoeic words, which are at the periphery of the lexical corpus of every language” (Janjušević–Oliveri 2011: 119). In the

³¹ “Two new ‘phonemes’ are introduced as a trademark of sorts – *s'* and *z'* – in blissful ignorance of the fact that those are no phonemes at all, but dialectal variants of the existing phonemes in the Serbian literary language (*sj, zj*). If we followed their logic, then the Montenegrin language would be spoken by all of Herzegovina and a considerable part of Bosnia, almost the whole of western Serbia, as well as the entire area of the Zeta-Raška speech type, from Bar to Studenica” (Ščepanović, *Večernje novosti*, 16. 7. 2009). Furthermore: “That is the only language where it is unknown what a sound is and what a phoneme is. How, then, can one make an orthography for such a language?”, Miloš Kovačević (*Večernje novosti*, 16. 7. 2009).

Dictionary, there are a great many words (mostly hypocoristics and onomatopoeic words, but not only these) whose meaning cannot easily be understood by (more or less informed) speakers, such as: *z'ato*, *s'ekutić*, *s'erepica*, *s'erepičan*... (often without any explanation of their meaning [in some cases the meaning is given, in others it is not, no principle being discernible], that is, without anything in the way of lexical analysis within the framework of the dictionary). Thus, the meaning of many of these words is certainly not known to “autochthonous Montenegrin citizens”; and the meaning of some of these words is not known to any “autochthonous Montenegrin citizen”. But this was supposed to increase the frequency of occurrence of *s'* and *z'*. In keeping with this, in the *Grammar* we find that “a sound possesses three elements”, “exclamations express states, emotions”, the pronunciation of a syllable that follows a short falling accent “is noticeably lower”, that is, the basic text of the *Grammar* is mostly written using dialectal forms of the Serbian language, which sounds funny is a text that is supposed to be scientific (calling it unscientific would be putting it rather mildly), and on top of everything else, there is the forced, overemphatic use of *s'* and *z'* (again, wishing to disperse the “new letters” throughout the books, so that these “phonemes” should sound “scientific”). Thus, the authors thought of [*dos'ećali*] a lot of things in order to make the new language as “specific and special” as possible. In any case, “If one could say of the ‘Bosniak/Bosnian language that it is based on the principle ‘Wherever you think it is convenient, throw in the *H* sound’; then the fundamental principle of ‘the Montenegrin language’ would undoubtedly be: ‘Wherever you can [*Ђе год можеш*], use words containing *c'* [Latin: *ś*] and *s'* [Latin *ž*]” (Kovačević 2012: 320).³²

³² “The innovation introduced in the Montenegrin alphabet is linguistically unjustified, as the sounds *s'* and *z'*, which occur not only in Montenegrin speech but also in all the other Štokavian speeches with Ijekavian pronunciation, cannot have the status of phonemes, both on account of the difficulty in finding distinct pairs and due to the very small number of lexemes in which they occur” (Janjušević–Oliveri 2011: 119).

As had been announced previously, the consonants *ć*, *đ*, *s'* and *z'*, come into being through Jekavian iotation (that is, in front of *je* from the old short vowel *yat*), were added to the norm. In view of the rule, if we intend to observe the rules, this would presuppose forms such as: *đevojka*, derived from *djevojka*, *đed* from *djed*..., as well as *đevica* [virgin], from *djevica*, *đelo* [deed], from *djelo*, *pođela* [division], from *podjela*, *pređeli* [landscapes], from *predjeli*, *đelovanje* [acting], from *djelovanje*, *đelimičan* [partial], from *djelimičan*, and further iotation in *dječak*, *djetski*, *djelić* [small part], *dječkić* [small boy], *djeva*, *djevica*, *odjenuti* [clothe], *nadjenući* [give (a name)], *dještvo* [effect], *djelanje*, *razdjeljiv* [divisible], *dodjela* [awarding], *zdjela* [dish], *podjela*, *djelotvoran* [effective], *djelatelj* [actor], *djelitelj* [divider], *djeljiv*, *djelimičan*, *djelić*..., for in all these cases the *je* derived from short *yat* was behind *d*. Thus *ćerati* was derived from *tjerati*, but the *je* derived from *yat* was behind *t* in *tjelesni* [corporeal] (= *ćelesni*?!), *tjelohranitelj* [bodyguard] (= *ćelohranitelj*?!), *tjeskoba* [anxiety], *tjestenina* [pastry] (= *ćestenina*?!), *tjesnac* [narrow passage] (= *ćesnac*?!), *tjeme* [pate], *tjemeni* (= *ćemeni*?!), *tješiti* [console], *otjelotvoriti* [embody] (= *oćelotvoriti*?!), *otjelotvorenje* [embodiment] (= *oćelotvorenje*?!)... Would iotation be applied in such cases?! Apart from *sěsti*, derived from *sjesti*, and *izěsti*, derived from *izjesti*, the *je* derived from *yat* behind *s* and *y* is also to be found in *sjenka* [shadow] (= *sěnka*?!), *sjetan* [melancholy], *sjetnost* (= *sětnost*?!), *podsjetnik* [reminder], *zacsjěnyjyžu* [dazzling]..., *odsjek* [department] (= *odsěk*?!), *razjesti*, *razjeden* (= *razěden*?!)... Or does this rule apply to a small percentage of cases (who knows on the basis of what criterion they were selected!), and not to the rest, which would presuppose, in accordance with the function and purpose of orthography (to prescribe the rules and exceptions from the rules) presenting all the exceptions from the rule, of which there would be many more than those which fit in with the “rule”. It would be a sign of scientific honesty to at least observe that today Jekavian iotation and *ć* and *đ* (in front of a reflex of short *yat*) constitutes an exception even

in “autochthonous Montenegrin citizens” rather than a rule, in view of the number of lexemes where it is to be found.³³

In this “Orthography”, however, the exceptions to the rule are not listed (which, in view of their sheer number, would seem to become the rule!?), nor is it clear when only the orthographically recognised form is to be used, or when doublet forms may be used (based on what criterion, except when it seems appropriate to the “orthographers”) – as a result of which, in this “Orthography” and “orthographic dictionary” in some cases we find one form (*tješnji* [narrower], p. 368, *boy*, p. 181), in other cases both forms (*tješitelj/ćešitelj* [consoler], p. 368, *dječiji/đečiji*, *djetlić/đetlić* [woodpecker], p. 181), **without reference to any specific rule.**³⁴ The lack of criteria and principles has led

³³ Such exceptions were incomparably far less numerous at the time of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, but he did opt for the forms *djevojka*, *tjerati*, after all... which, irrespective of the fact that he heard them in some regions, fit in with the system much better (but he never advocated the view that the sounds *s'* and *z'* could and should be a part of the language system). Although it was often observed that Vuk opted for these forms because he had heard them in one segment of the folk speech, still (as was the case with the use of *h*), the adoption of these forms was also influenced by the criterion of “general regularity”, as we find in Vuk. (For more details on this, see the segment on Vuk Karadžić.)

³⁴ The rules pertaining to the so-called “doublet forms” are no rules, but factors of chaos and confusion in the language, and are therefore inapplicable in practice. We can assume what the application of this “rule” would look like in the teaching process. In the case of doublets, it is the obligation of the speaker (teacher, pupil) to decide on one form and to consistently use it in a particular situation. (That is so in spoken language, and it is particularly so in the case of written language.) Therefore, if one opted for one variant, one should say consistently: *sjutra*, *tjerati*, *djevojka*, *izjesti*, *cjelokupan*, *tjesni*, *djelovi*, *djelić*, *tjeme*, *sjenka...*; alternatively, one should adhere to the pronunciation: *čerati*, *đevojka*, *izěsti s'utra* (but whether that should extend to include *ćelokupan*, *ćelesni*, *đelovi*, *đelić*, *ćeme*, *ćelohranitelj*, *šenka*, *ošćaj* is a moot point...?!). So, imagine a classroom in which one child consistently sticks to one variant (*istjerati*, *sjutra*, *djelić*), another child opts for a different variant (*iščerati*, *s'utra*, *đelić*), one (say, a biology) teacher speaks one way, another (say, a history teacher) – speaks otherwise. How is a pupil (especially one attending the first or the second grade) to understand what is supposed

to, as A. Janjušević–Oliveri observes, to orthographic anarchy: “The striving of orthographic innovators to include Jekavian iotation in the norm almost in its entirety has led to orthographic anarchy, so that forms which do not exist in any Montenegrin speech (*ćelishodno*, *ćelina*, *ćeme*) have been proclaimed to be normative, while others (*trpljeti*, *življjeti*), otherwise frequently encountered in folk dialects, have been excluded from the norm, the explanation offered being that iotation does not occur in those positions” (Janjušević–Oliveri 2011: 119). This state of affairs is correctly reflected in the following observation made by Ivan Klajn: “The Montenegrin language is an artificial creation, while Montenegrin grammar is a political decision” (Klajn 2010).

2.8. Now the other, neglected side of the once unified “Council for the Standardisation of the Montenegrin Language” has raised its voice, intent on “creating” the Montenegrin language, partly (and “abruptly”) renouncing the two “new letters”. Even though, not so long ago, we were in a position to read the following statement of the author of a possible future “orthography”: “It should be understood that the Montenegrin language is: *sjutra* and *s’utra*, *đevojka* and *djevojka*, *s’ednica* and *sjednica*, *predsjednik* and *preds’ednik*. Which form will prevail in the future – remains to be seen. Let us recognise that both have the right to life!” (Glušica, *ibid.*: 01. 09. 2008). Did not “the expert team”, half a year before this, along with Adnan Čirgić’s “proposal for the orthography”, adopt “the orthographic dictionary” submitted by Rajka Glušica (which, for the most part, fits in with the “proposal for the orthography” submitted by Adnan Čirgić), and that “dictionary” contained the “two new letters” as well!? Or is this Montenegrin language changing so

to be correct, how is a teacher to maintain concentration and follow the “correct” pronunciation of a pupil?! If we pay attention to all those who are trying to “speak” the new “language” through the media, we shall see that they are unable to “fathom” what is supposed to be “correct”: on one occasion they say *s’utra*, on another *predsjednik*; once they say *đevojka*, another time *djecca*...

fast that even the printing of books cannot keep up with it!? Both attempts at “normativising” are equally misguided and unfounded, and are, thus, unacceptable.

3. Laws, regulations and orders as the “methodological foundations” of “the Montenegrin language”

In July 2010, another new legal act, tantamount to an order, was passed in Montenegro – the parliament adopted *The Law on General Education*, which prescribed that in schools **the teaching was to be conducted in “the Montenegrin language”**, and that “the Montenegrin language” was to become a compulsory teaching subject – all of which was a continuation of improvisational-ideological processes and attacks: the Montenegrin language just had to exist (which is testified to by: the formal introduction of the name for the “language” in schools, then its inclusion in the Constitution, only then followed by an attempt at normativisation and standardisation, the printing [that is, the mass-producing] of the “Grammar” and the “Orthography”), and subsequently by the attempt **to impose it upon all and sundry**. Although it was announced that this law would be applied in schools (and in other spheres) starting as early as September 2010, it was given up on abruptly (as far as that particular school year was concerned), through a statement issued by Minister Slavoljub Stijepović. However, towards the end of December 2010, the Council for General Education adopted the “Programmes for the Teaching Subject of the Montenegrin Language and Literature for Primary and Secondary Schools, Grammar Schools and Adult Education” based on a new “democratic” regulation (*Dan*, 3rd January 2011, 11).³⁵

³⁵ Inspired by the events pertaining to the language so far, at the Faculty of Philosophy in Nikšić, soon afterwards, they tried to change the name of the teaching subject the Serbian Language to “the Montenegrin Language” as part of the programmes of studies for foreign language, but the proposal failed to win the majority vote in the course of the Faculty Council session: “The Administration of the Faculty of Philosophy in

So much about “democracy” in Montenegro and about what political meddling and imposition of linguistic solutions can lead to – which, step by step, has led to a total **alienation of the language policy from science and linguistic essence**, and especially to a **violation on the part of the legislature against the linguistic reality and needs**. Before the referendum in Montenegro, the basic “justification” for changing the language and/or the name of the language was that the naming of a language was (some vaguely defined) democratic right of a group of individuals – say, 20% of the population, that it was (everyone’s) democratic right (without anything in the way of an explanation of what that meant and without taking into consideration what a mature and healthy language policy presupposed). But according to the “2011 version” of democracy, as opposed to the preceding version of “democracy”, not only was “everyone not allowed to call their language by their own name”, nor did a nation (or a people) have the right to call their language by their own name, but a language that had its own name (Serbian) and those who called that language by its real name (Serbian), that is, those whose mother’s tongue was Serbian, **were deprived of**

Nikšić intends to change the name of the subject the Serbian language to the Montenegrin Language within the framework of almost all departments, including the programmes of studies for foreign languages and the Teacher Training Studies. If the proposal submitted by the Dean’s Office is accepted during the August session of the Faculty Council, when a decision on this should be passed after three unsuccessful attempts, which failed due to a lack of quorum, the subject the Serbian Language would be studied, as of September this year, only within the framework of the eponymous programme of studies. A group of professors from the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language and South Slavic Literatures has addressed the Senate of the University and Rector Predrag Miranović, warning them that such a solution would ‘represent an act of discrimination of the students who call their mother’s tongue Serbian’ whereby ‘their basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution would be violated and withheld from them...’ ‘We shall settle this matter at the Faculty first, and only then inform the public about it. It is an ongoing process, and therefore we cannot make any public statements in connection with it’, said the Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy Blagoje Cerović for ‘Dan’ yesterday...“ (*Dan*, 13th and 14th July 2010, 11).

all rights. The only right in effect now was the one stemming from the inadequately adopted Constitution (which, in spite of that, is violated, interpreted as the authorities see fit and in accordance with the newly imposed projections).

Such a “democratic” act, embodied by the new law, in addition to not being founded on science, professional expertise, the language, the will of the people, historical continuity, or even on the Constitution (irrespective of the fact that it was adopted without relying on the linguistic reality, and that entering the name of the language in the Constitution is no indicator that the said language does exist, as we have seen from the above). Namely, as we have pointed out earlier, in the preceding Constitution it said: *In Montenegro, the Serbian language of Ijekavian pronunciation is **in official use*** (our emphasis!). In the new Constitution of Montenegro, it says: *The official language shall be Montenegrin... Serbian, Bosniak, Croatian and Albanian shall also be in official use*. In the new Constitution, an unusual and forced “distinction” was introduced, suitable for (or suited to) political manipulation: the official language – language in official use, this construction being used to give priority to something which has been subsumed under the formulation – the official language. The term is supposed to mean what the democratic powers-that-be decree that it should mean! However, “**the language in official use**” is the same as “**the official language**”, a language is official because it is in official use. But an official language need not be in official use, it can have a symbolic function. A good example of this is provided by the Vatican, where (except for Italian) Latin is also the official language (even though it is not, and cannot be, in official use). A not very good example is provided by Montenegro and its authorities, who have entered “Montenegrin” as the official language, a language that has never existed (nor did it exist, naturally enough, when it was entered in the Constitution); on top of everything else, to the present day (and very likely, not until tomorrow either) have they managed or will they manage to

agree on just precisely what they would proclaim as the Montenegrin language.

Various forms of manipulation and pressures pertaining to the alleged “compulsory nature of the Montenegrin language” would constitute acts of violence in every respect (scientific, professional, political, social), so that this **proposal of the law is unacceptable** for those inhabitants of Montenegro who call their language Serbian and want to be educated in it, study it and contribute to its advancement. As we have seen, from the slogan – **the Montenegrin language must exist**, they have now switched to a new one – **the Montenegrin language must be imposed upon everyone** (the product of violence now becomes a means of violence). And after everything that has been said, we can conclude that it is absurd and unjust to demand of Serbian language speakers to call their standard Serbian language by another name and to proclaim dialectal forms of the Serbian language, which they gladly use in informal communication (of the *đevojka*, *ćerati* type) as standard (literary) ones, and especially to spoil and degrade their literacy by using caricature-like forms. Consequently, they should be enabled to **use the Serbian language in all domains and spheres – in state acts and administration, and also in the educational system (including teaching in the Serbian language)** on the entire territory of Montenegro. No one in Montenegro (who considers Serbian to be his/her language) should be forced to adhere to linguistic solutions that threaten and violate his/her basic (linguistic and non-linguistic) rights, nor should anyone be deprived of the official use of the Serbian language.

Despite all the misguided language policy steps and the catastrophic consequences that they have produced, the only “culprits” for just about everything in Montenegro and the only problem are those whose opinions do not coincide with the authorities’ views; in other words, the most important thing now is to discriminate against, problematise, blame and marginalise those who are trying, while relying on proper argumentation, to point out the unprofessional, unscientific attitude manifest-

ed in the misguided implementation of the language policy: “South Slavic linguistic circles take things so far that they, as Ressel observes (2000: 231–232), criminalise those who advocate different opinions: ‘Naturally enough, language cannot be changed overnight merely by changing laws and issuing administrative orders. What can be done, however, is launch or massively support another way of looking at phenomena, favour it, and marginalise or even criminalise alternative ways of looking at things, that is, see to it that they are no longer heard or disseminated, and that they are branded as politically obsolete” (Kordić 2010: 176–177).

4. The world tendencies pertaining to the naming of languages from the “post-Serbo-Croatian” area

Concerning the world stage and the attitudes towards the naming of languages from the “post-Serbo-Croatian language area” (if one can call it that), as well as the study of this phenomenon, no matter how much effort some put in trying to prove (especially in Croatia) that those are different languages, scholars mostly adhere to the view that it is one language system – resting on the foundations established by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, with different variants in some regions: “The common Štokavian dialect as the standard language ‘leaves little room for creating major differences and contributing to further distancing, regardless of what politicians are wishing for’ (Laškova 1999: 81)... The fact that the Štokavian dialect became the standard language in the region of today’s Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro does not fit in with the wish of Croatian scholars to prove that there are four standard languages there. In order to cover up that fact, in their publications about the standard language in Croatia they emphasise the otherwise negligible contribution of Kajkavian and Čakavian elements, misrepresenting their significance, while at the same time pushing into the background the fact that the stand-

ard language in Croatia is Štokavian in character (Kordić 2010: 100)... If different standard languages are to develop within a dialectal continuum, it is necessary to take different dialects for the standard” (Cooper 1989: 139, quoted in: Kordić 2010:139), which was certainly not the case in this area.

The attempt at artificially creating and proving the specific character of a language was particularly in evidence in Croatia. As we find in Per Jakobsen: “Since the break-up of Yugoslavia and Croatian independence in 1990, the official Croatian policy has been to maintain that the former common language, Serbo-Croatian, no longer exists and that Croatian is a separate language. From the moment of proclaiming Croatian independence, through a well-prepared campaign, they have been trying to convince foreign states that Serbian and Croatian are two different languages, almost incomprehensible to their respective speakers. That the campaign has been successful is perhaps best evidenced by the fact that many people abroad have felt qualified to confirm, without possessing any knowledge of the subject matter but very resolutely all the same, that the Communist regime in Yugoslavia forbade the Croatian language and obstructed its free development... One great project aimed to distance the language as much as possible from the common norm, which, very ironically, provided the foundation for Croatian nation-building in the first half of the 19th century. In the 1830’s, patriotically-minded Croats chose the common dialect for their literary language; that dialect was standardised and described in grammars and dictionaries, in both Croatia and Serbia. From then until the disintegration of Yugoslavia, Serbo-Croatian was recognised as the common standard of Serbs, Croats, Bosnians and Montenegrins. But along with the establishment of new independent states, an integral part of the nation-building in the new countries was the view that their languages were new and independent as well. **Naturally, one cannot change a language just like that, following the dictate from above, turning it into something different from what it is and has always been**” (Jakobsen, 27. 01. 2011, <http://www.h-alter.org/vijesti/>

kultura/knjiga-koja-ugrozava). Through its structure, derived from its historical continuity, and also through its standardo-logical processes, a language resists such attempts: "A language has its make-up, with phonological, morphological and syntactic structures that change slowly. The only open category is the vocabulary, which is subject to constant changes. That is why the vocabulary and orthography are the only domains where Croatian language innovators can actually change something, and over the years they have launched in Croatia an Orwellian Newspeak with very strict rules about what the correct and incorrect use of the language is. Serbian words and phrases that have become customary in Croatia are definitely incorrect. The major media and publishing houses employ so-called language editors, who, in fact, function in the capacity of censors, their task being to stop 'wrong' words, to prevent Serbianisms from reaching the public. At a more popular level, newspapers ran competitions inviting readers to think up the best Croatian word. There have even been serious attempts at criminalising the use of non-Croatian words, almost following the example of Italy at the time of Mussolini, and those of Nazi Germany and Fascist Croatia during the Second World War. And that was all on account of the illusion that the national and language boundaries were identical, and that Croatia does not have its own identity without a separate language..." (Jakobsen, 27. 01. 2011, <http://www.h-alter.org/vijesti/kultura/knjiga-koja-ugrozava>).

Even though the situation concerning the naming of languages in the world (first of all in the domain of Slavic Studies) is not quite balanced, it is still rather more stable and balanced compared to the area of the former Yugoslavia. Although we do not have complete insight into the situation, we shall present some information that we have found in the relevant literature or obtained through our own research. According to the data we find in Milan Šipka (2006: 57–60), "in the 1970's and the 1980's, Serbo-Croatian Studies, within the framework of Slavic Studies, was a very popular discipline", occupying the top spot (in terms of interest in research and academic studies) among

South Slavic languages. “The latest data available in America for the years 1983/84 and 1984/85 show that, among Slavic languages, apart from Russian, the most popular one at American universities, in terms of the number of students and courses, is the Serbo-Croatian language” (Lenček 1987, 240; quoted in: Šipka 2006: 59). The name for this language mostly remained Serbo-Croatian, Serbian or Croatian (in the major study centres); in rare cases (first of all in Austria) one can find the tripartite name B/C/S, but in practice, for the most part it is Croatian or Serbian: “According to the information received from our colleague Wayles Browne – for the region of the United States of America and Canada, Gerhard Neweklowsky – for Austrian Slavic Studies centres, and D. Šipka – concerning the situation in the main university centres in Poland, the current situation in these countries is as follows: ...*Serbo-Croatian*, as the name for the language and the teaching subject, has been retained at all American and Canadian universities... The designations *Serbian*, *Croatian* or *Bosnian* have not been found at any university there. However, in summer schools of Eastern European and Slavic languages, the situation is different...

...In Austrian Slavic Studies centres, the attitude towards Serbo-Croatian Studies has changed inasmuch as, instead of the name previously used – the Serbo-Croatian language, a new tripartite designation has been introduced – *Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian*, and it most often depends on the lecturer whose services are engaged which name for the language will be used in practice (Šipka 2006: 64–65). As the lecturers engaged are most often from Croatia, the designation Croatian is the one most often used for the language in practice... In Poland, the process of the dissolution of Serbo-Croatian Studies is also under way, for the time being mainly at the level of lecturers (for Serbian and Croatian). The situation varies from one university to another. In Warsaw and Kraków, for example, there are lecturers for both languages, in Katowice and Toruń only for Croatian, in Łódź only for Serbian. In Poznań, the name of the course is Serbian and Croatian Philology, and the main linguistic subject

is *A Descriptive Grammar of the Serbo-Croatian Language. Bosnian* is not mentioned anywhere, at least it is not to be found in the names of any subjects... (According to the information we have obtained, in Wrocław the course designation is: Philology – Serbian and Croatian, J. S.)

All in all, one could say based on insight into the current situation at universities in the United States, Canada, Austria and Poland (which is a large enough sample) that Serbo-Croatian Studies are in better shape abroad than domestically” (Šipka 2006: 66).

Based on the information we have received, until recently, the name Serbo-Croatian survived in Russia (but priority was given to Serbian), and there is a tendency, initiated in some centres not long ago, of establishing separate Serbian and Croatian Studies. The situation in Bulgaria is similar to that in Russia,³⁶ and in the Czech Republic, for instance in Brno, one year they enrol students in Serbian Studies, the next year in Croatian Studies. The situation is somewhat different in Belarus.³⁷ Evidently, the domestic turmoil is reflected internationally in the form of fewer changes: “From the (socio)linguistic point of view, these are ‘variants of one and the same language. It is,

³⁶ According to the information forwarded to us by our colleague Slavka Velichkova, the situation is as follows: “As regards the status of the language at the Department in Plovdiv, there exist three sections (sectors): 1. Slavic Philology with Polish; 2. Slavic Philology with Czech; 3. Slavic Philology with Serbian and Croatian (formerly – with Serbo-Croatian), as is the case at the University of Sofia. The teaching is conducted on the basis of the Ekavian variant of Serbian, and our lecturer, who is from Banjaluka, helps us when it comes to getting our students acquainted with the I/Jekavian pronunciation. We mostly get our advanced (3rd, 4th and 5th year) students acquainted, as before, with the existing lexical and terminological Croatisms, mainly dealing with specific texts”.

³⁷ According to the information we received from our colleague Mikita Suprunchuk, until 1999 or thereabouts, the Serbo-Croatian language was taught at his Faculty, following which the name was changed to Serbian, taking into consideration that there was an additional Croatian language course for Serbian students (lasting approximately one semester, comprising around 40-50 lessons). All of the above disciplines are taught at the Department of Theoretic and Slavic Linguistics.

thus, quite understandable that even today linguists, especially abroad, use the designation *the Serbo-Croatian language* as a linguistic term' (Laškova 2001:20). 'In the foreseeable future, one cannot count on the fixed terms for the Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin language disappearing from the provisions on language in post-Yugoslav constitutions. This should not irritate Slavic scholars, especially not foreign ones, German scholars among others, who are always ascribed some sort of a leadership position. Changing the designation Serbo-Croatian language would mean capitulating under political pressures in the countries that have succeeded Yugoslavia' (Gröschel 2009: 35)" (Kordić 2010: 135–136).

5. The term "standard language" – the general principles and the Montenegrin circumstances

Based on all of the above, it is clear that the new political activities undertaken and the moves made by the authorities in Montenegro contribute to creating an arbitrary, untrue and misguided picture of standardisation (the illusion of a standard), which has no connection with the fundamental requirements and principles of standardisation. In the paper **On the Attribute "Standard Language"**, D. Nehring provides an overview of "standard language" features that "does not aspire to be the final word on the subject" (nor is there any agreement on "the necessary number of features"). On the basis of these features, a standard language/variant: 1) is autonomous, independent, 2) manifests democratisation tendencies, 3) is expansive, 4) represents a form of communication, 5) has identity and integrity, 6) is developed, 7) most often is codified, 8) is supraregional, supradialectal, 9) has been normativised, 10) is (generally) recognised as suitable, 11) is selective, 12) is historical and independently determined, 13) is differentiated in functional-semantic terms, 14) is elastically stable, 15) refers to the upper layer, 16) is invariant, 17) is unique, 18) is cultivated, 19)

is formed, regulated, 20) has a written form, is used in writing, 21) fulfils new communication needs, 22) is polyvalent, functional, 23) has a symbolic character, 24) has a tradition (history), 25) has a high social status (prestige), 26) has a leading role (compared to other variants), 27) is used on the territories of one language space, 28) is used in oral communication, 29) is vital (Nehring 2003: 29–30).

If we take a closer look at the above overview of “standard language” features (which, according to the author, was compiled on the basis of papers presented by V. A. Serebrinnikov [1973] and K. Gutschmidt [1977, 1933]), we shall see that what has been happening in Montenegro has nothing to do with standardisation, and fulfils almost none of the above criteria. The features “is historically and independently determined” and “has a tradition (history)”, as ones that contribute to stability and consistency, are those that “the Montenegrin language” does not have, nor can it ever have or achieve them. Also, it does not fulfil the criteria of “independence” / “autonomy”,³⁸ “identity” / “integrity”, not is it “supraregional”/ “supradialectal”³⁹ (in Montenegro, no distinction is made between a dialectal base and superstructure – the dialectal is confused with the supradialectal without any rules). It also lacks the feature of “normativeness” / “being codified” (we have seen all too well what the writing of a Montenegrin “grammar” and “orthography” boiled down to), nor is it “developed” and “used

³⁸ “This once again explicitly states the aim of Rohde’s standard language model, namely, its function to confirm the independence and differentiation of (very) similar standard idioms” (Nehring 2003: 33).

³⁹ “Croatian and other South Slavic philologists often refer to the term standard language misinterpreting its meaning. As it is one of the key notions in their argumentation, and they present it by hiding its main characteristics and ascribing to it precisely the opposite ones, it is necessary to show how it is to be defined in the domain of (socio) linguistics.

A standard language is a supraregional language of all the layers of society (Stedje 2001: 222). In definitions of a standard language, it is stated that it overarches a dialect and a sociolect (Lewandowski 1990: 1069)” (Kordić 2010: 69).

in writing”, and it is not “generally recognised”, does not have “a leading role”, “a high social status” or “a symbolic character”. What is singled out as an important feature is “stability”, and the Montenegrin language project neither contributes to stability (that of the social, political, educational system or the administration), nor is that which is presupposed by the term the Montenegrin language (if, indeed, anything whatsoever is presupposed by it) stable in any usual sense of the term. It is a product of short-lived and inconsequential moves, the result of political intention and coercion, even though “a standard language represents a specific ‘sociolect’ (with an explicit norm), which is adjusted to various forms of public communication; is used primarily in the state administration, in schools, in the mass communication media and partly in literary ‘production’. **The sole authority of the state-political domain when it comes to passing decisions on the standard language has never been confirmed** (our emphasis!)” (Nehring 2003: 34). It would appear that “the sole authority of the state-political domain when it comes to passing decisions on the standard language” has been confirmed – in Montenegro (a laid bare, representative example)... “What is also of importance, we believe, is the fact that recognising the state as the highest authority on the matter does not necessarily mean that the standard variant in question represents or must represent the official language of a state. The latter influences its use in a broader sense of the term (Ammon 1987, p. 329, quoting Kloss 1977)” (Nehring 2003: 39).

6. A general overview

Regarding the official state policy in Montenegro and the processes unfolding over the past few years, “language”, as we have shown, has become the object of political passions and fervour, the means and instrument of diverse political manipulations, it has become “merely” a political option, one that is supposed to be developing in the direction imposed by the

party giving orders – not the object of scientific studies, expert assessments, not a continuer of historical, civilizationally established and proven linguistic processes and parameters. Montenegro has become one of the most representative (if not the most representative) example(s) of a misguided language policy that neglects, disdains and ignores science, the existing linguistic reality, historical continuity, and manipulates linguistic facts, as well as social and linguistic needs.

Literature

- Analitika 2012: the Analitika portal, 28th January.
- Banjević 2008: “Interview with Mirko Banjević”, *Pobjeda*, 30th August 2008.
- Glušica 2008: Rajka Glušica (statement), the daily *Dan*, 26th January 2008.
- Glušica 2008: Rajka Glušica (statement), “Pravopis i gramatika već postoje [The Orthography and Grammar Already Exist]”, *Elektronske novine*, published: 01. 09. 2008. 15:09.
- Glušica – Ševaljević 2006: *Udžbenik maternjeg jezika za prvi razred opšte gimnazije* [A Textbook of the Mother’s Tongue for the First Grade of General Grammar School] (Rajka Glušica, Dejana Ševaljević), Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Podgorica.
- Glušica – Ševaljević 2008: *Udžbenik maternjeg jezika za drugi razred opšte gimnazije* [A Textbook of the Mother’s Tongue for the Second Grade of General Grammar School] (Rajka Glušica, Dejana Ševaljević), Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Podgorica.
- Gramatika 2010: *Gramatika crnogorskoga jezika* [A Grammar of the Montenegrin Language] (Authors: Adnan Čirgić, Ivo Pranjković, Josip Silić), Ministarstvo prosvjete i nauke Crne Gore, Podgorica.
- Dobrašinović 1980: *Kopitar i Vuk* [Kopitar and Vuk], Golub Dobrašinović, PhD (ed.) Beograd – Tršić, Rad, Vukov sabor.
- Zaključci. Zaključno saopštenje [Conclusions. Final Announcement], *Zbornik Instituta za srpski jezik SANU* [Collection of Papers of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts] II, *Srpski jezik i aktuelna pitanja jezičke politike* [The Serbian Language and the Current

- Language Policy Issues*], Institut za srpski jezik SANU, Belgrade, 227–228, 2014.
- Ivić 2001: Pavle Ivić, *Srpski narod i njegov jezik* [*The Serbian Language and Its Language*], Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
- Jakobsen 2011: Per Jakobsen, *Knjiga koja ugrožava* [A Book That Threatens], 27. 01. 2011, <http://www.h-alter.org/vijesti/kultura/knjiga-koja-ugrozava>.
- Janjušević–Oliveri 2011: Ana Janjušević–Oliveri, “Crnogorske inovacije srpskog/srpskohrvatskog pravopisa [The Montenegrin Innovations of the Serbian/Serbo-Croatian Orthography]”, *Oktoih*, Časopis Odjeljenja za srpski jezik i književnost Matice srpske – Društva članova u Crnoj Gori, Nikšić, 109–120.
- Jovanović 2011: Miodrag Jovanović, “Sekvence sj, zj u crnogorskim i drugim ijekavskim govorima [The Sequences sj, zj in Montenegrin and Other Ijekavian Dialects]”, *Oktoih*, Časopis Odjeljenja za srpski jezik i književnost Matice srpske – Društva članova u Crnoj Gori, Nikšić, 175–196.
- Jovanović 2008, Miodrag Jovanović, “Pravci prostiranja nekih jezičkih pojava u Crnoj Gori [The Directions of the Spread of Some Linguistic Phenomena in Montenegro]”, *Jezička situacija u Crnoj Gori. Norma i standardizacija* [*The Linguistic Situation in Montenegro. The Norm and Standardisation*], CANU, Radovi sa međunarodnog naučnog skupa, Naučni skupovi, knjiga 87, Odjeljenje umjetnosti, knjiga 29, Podgorica, 131–161.
- Klajn 2010: Ivan Klajn for the *Blic* daily, Crnogorski jezik je veštačka kreacija [The Montenegrin Language Is an Artificial Creation] (M. Keranović – M. Leskovac 04. 09. 2010).
- Karadžić 2001: Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, *O jeziku i književnosti* [*On Language and Literature*] III, Prosveta, Belgrade 2001.
- Kastoriadis 1999: Kornelijus Kastoriadis [Cornelius Castoriadis], *Uspon beznačajnosti* [*The Rise of Insignificance*], Gradac, Čačak.
- Kovačević 2009/2010: Miloš Kovačević, “Zašto je Vuk izabrao baš ijekavicu [Why Vuk Opted for the Ijekavian Dialect]”, časopis za književnost i kulturu *Nova Zora* 24.
- Kovačević – Šćepanović 2011: Miloš Kovačević – Mihailo Šćepanović, *Srpski jezik u vrtlogu politike* [*The Serbian Language in the*

- Whirlpool of Politics*], Izdavački centar Matica srpska – Društvo članova u Crnoj Gori, Nikšić.
- Kovačević – Šćepanović: Miloš Kovačević – Mihailo Šćepanović, “Tovari lingvističkih nesuvislosti [Loads of Linguistic Nonsense]”, *Srpski jezik* VI, 1–2, 621–649, Beograd.
- Kovačević 2010. Miloš Kovačević, “Nauka ne poznaje politiku [Science Knows No Politics]”, *Srpske novine*, no. 16, 26th August.
- Kovačević 2012: Miloš Kovačević, “O aktuelnom pravopisu i gramatici „crnogorskog jezika“ [On the Current Orthography and Grammar of “the Montenegrin Language”]”, *Srpsko jezičko nasljeđe na prostoru današnje Crne Gore i srpski jezik danas [The Serbian Linguistic Heritage in the Area of Today’s Montenegro and the Serbian Language Today]*, Zbornik radova sa međunarodnog naučnog skupa održanog u Herceg Novom 20–23 april 2012, Matica srpska – Društvo članova u Crnoj Gori, Matica srpska u Novom Sadu, Nikšić, 303–323.
- Kordić 2010: Snježana Kordić, *Jezik i nacionalizam [Language and Nationalism]*, Durieux, Zagreb.
- Negrišorac 2014: Ivan Negrišorac, “Srpska jezička politika: osnovni preduslovi i važnost konsenzusa [The Serbian Language Policy: The Basic Preconditions and the Importance of a Consensus]”, Zbornik Instituta za srpski jezik SANU II, *Srpski jezik i aktuelna pitanja jezičke politike*, Institut za srpski jezik SANU, Beograd, 9–25, 2014.
- Matović 2012: Veselin Matović, *Noć dugih makaza [The Night of Long Scissors]*, Matica srpska – Društvo članova u Crnoj Gori, Odbor za prosvjetu i medije, Aktiv profesora srpskog jezika i književnosti – Nikšić, Oktoih.
- Matović 2013: Veselin Matović, *Ćirilica i latinogorica [The Cyrillic and Monte-Latin Script]*, Književna zadruga Srpskog narodnog vijeća, Podgorica – Nikšić.
- Nehring 2003: D. Nehring, O atributu „standardnojezički“ [On the Attribute “Standard Language”], *Riječ*, Časopis za nauku o jeziku i književnosti, IX/1–2, Nikšić.
- Oktoih. Matica srpska – Društvo članova u Crnoj Gori, Nikšić 2014.
- Ostojić 1996: Branislav Ostojić, *Kolebanja u normi srpskog jezika [Hesitation in the Norm of the Serbian Language]*, UNIREKS, Podgorica.

- Perović 2009 (a): Milenko Perović (interview), The Montenegrin Radio Television News Programme, 10th July 2009.
- Perović 2009 (b): the *Dan* daily, 11th July 2009, 11.
- Pešikan 2009: Mitar Pešikan, “Crnogorsko ime i naše doba [The Montenegrin Name and Our Time]” (written in 1989 as a maiden speech on the occasion of being proclaimed a member of the MASA), *Slovo*, Časopis za srpski jezik, književnost i kulturu, VI/24, Nikšić.
- Pravopis 2010: *Pravopis crnogorskoga jezika [The Orthography of the Montenegrin Language]*, Ministarstvo prosvjete i nauke Crne Gore, Podgorica.
- Radulović 2009: Zorica Radulović, Povodom jednog pitanja: Ima li što na crnogorskom? [Concerning the Question: Is There Anything in Montenegrin?], *Riječ*, new series, no. 1, Nikšić.
- Silić 2010: Josip Silić, *Crnogorski jezik. Naučno-metodološke osnove standardizacije crnogorskoga jezika [The Montenegrin Language. The Scientific-Methodological Foundations of the Standardisation of the Montenegrin Language]*, Ministarstvo prosvjete i nauke Crne Gore, Podgorica.
- Službeni 2009: *Službeni list Crne Gore [The Official Gazette of Montenegro]*, no. 49, vol. LXV.
- Stojanović – Bojović 2006: Jelica Stojanović – Draga Bojović, *Srpski jezik između istine i obmane (sociolingvistička analiza stanja u Crnoj Gori) [The Serbian Language between Truth and Deceit (A Socio-linguistic Analysis of the Situation in Montenegro)]*, Jasen, Belgrade.
- Stojanović 2014: Jelica Stojanović, “Aktuelni procesi u vezi sa pismom i jezikom u Crnoj Gori – zadaci nauke i jezičke politike [The Current Processes Concerning the Script and the Language in Montenegro]”, *Zbornik Instituta za srpski jezik SANU II, Srpski jezik i aktuelna pitanja jezičke politike*, Institut za srpski jezik SANU, Beograd, 151–167.
- Čirgić 2009: Adnan Čirgić (statement), *Večernje novosti*, 11th July 2009.
- Čirgić – Šušanj 2011: *Crnogorski jezik, Udžbenik za drugi razred gimnazije [The Montenegrin Language, A Textbook for the Second Year of Grammar School]* (Adnan Čirgić, Jelena Šušanj), Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Podgorica.

Čirgić – Šušanj 2011/2: *Crnogorski jezik, Udžbenik za četvrti razred gimnazije* [*The Montenegrin Language, A Textbook for the Fourth Year of Grammar School*] (Adnan Čirgić, Jelena Šušanj), Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Podgorica.

Šipka 2006: Milan Šipka, *Jezik i politika* [*Language and Politics*], Beogradska knjiga, Belgrade.

Šćepanović – Kovačević 2009: Mihailo Šćepanović, Miloš Kovačević (statements), *Večernje novosti*, 16. 7. 2009.

REGISTERS

REGISTER OF TERMINOLOGY

- Language of Dubrovnik 149, 229, 238, 242, 244, 246, 247, 255, 153, 201, 202
356–358, 364, 365, 371
- Dubrovnik speech 153–156, – language in official use 372, 158–159, 161–162, 164–165, 373, 411, 413, 417, 419, 430, 437, 169–182, 195–196 439, 440, 466
 - city speech 180 – language planning 389–391, 403, 404
 - Cyrillic charters 169 403, 404
 - Čakavian-Ikavian 155, 162, – language policy 59, 79, 97, 193, 167, 168, 178–181, 184 345, 366, 373, 374, 376, 379, 387, 389, 393, 394, 401–405, 410, 413, – Dalmatian speech 66, 155 430, 440, 441, 443, 443, 465, 467, – Dubrovnik literature 157, 468, 476
 - 197–200 – linguistic criteria 60, 85, 201, 239 376, 394, 402, 403, 410
 - “poetic Čakavianisms” 160– – linguistic identity 59, 107, 201, 162, 168–170, 173, 175, 176 202
 - Serbian letters of Dubrovnik – literary language 61, 64, 68–71, 163 73, 74, 76, 101, 119, 131, 138, 140, 143–145, 149, 156, 158, 180, – Slavic language 151–153, 184, 209, 221, 254, 346, 355–358, 187–190, 213, 215, 217, 224 363–365, 372, 373, 445, 469
 - speech of the environs 180 – non-linguistic criteria 377, 387, 390, 425, 467
 - Štokavian-Jekavian 153, 155, – norm 391
 - 158–160, 162, 165–167, 170– – selection 391
 - 173, 175, 177–180, 192, 194 – description 391
 - language of Dubrovnik – codification 391
 - poetry 150, 153, 156, 157, – elaboration 391
 - 160, 161, 173–174, 177–178, 184 – acceptance 391
 - language of Dubrovnik prose – implementation 391
 - 149, 150, 153, 155–161, 166, – expansion 391
 - 169, 173–178, 189 – cultivation 391
 - Linguistics 92, 376, 377, 387– – evaluation 391
 - 389, 393, 401, 402, 410, 412, – reconstruction 391
 - 422, 443
 - folk language 74, 107, 115, 118, 142–144, 151, 156, 189,

- official language 65, 73, 74, 79, 81, 284, 285, 293, 294, 313, 368, 370–373, 387, 389, 394, 404, 409, 412, 415, 417–419, 421, 430, 436, 439, 466, 475
 - sociolinguistics 394, 402–405, 414, 443
 - speech 64, 101, 116–119, 140, 143–145
 - Ijekavian 72, 74–76, 96, 101, 105, 106, 116, 118, 245, 252, 304, 358–360, 364–367, 372, 393, 411, 444, 446–448, 457, 466
 - Ekavian 75–77, 96, 97, 105, 106, 116, 118, 175, 252, 358, 359, 363–366, 459
 - Ikavian 8, 20, 22, 23, 64, 100, 103, 104, 107, 111, 114, 116, 120, 121, 124, 128, 133, 304
 - standard 7, 8, 15, 19, 23, 29, 31, 32, 34, 44–47, 149, 202, 303, 311, 312, 323, 324, 326, 333–336, 338, 339, 349, 351, 358, 360, 361–363, 366 371, 373, 374, 377, 384, 387–392, 394–401, 404, 409, 410, 413–415, 419–421
 - standard language 15, 30, 31, 311, 313, 333, 334, 336, 337, 348, 357, 377, 414, 415, 419–421
 - state-national projects 3–5
 - state projects
 - national projects
- Cyrillic script 9, 11, 28, 38, 40, 41, 104, 105, 108, 112, 113, 117, 118, 120, 135, 136, 138, 139, 149, 155–157, 167, 171–177, 179–181, 184–197, 199–201, 203–213, 223, 224, 227, 230, 232, 233, 236, 239, 241, 243, 244–246, 248, 242, 253, 258–263, 269, 277, 282, 293, 295, 317
 - banning the Cyrillic script 191, 243, 246, 253, 259
 - “biblioclasy” 196
 - “Bosančica” 31, 38, 30, 137, 180, 181
 - “Croatian Cyrillic script” 40
 - naming the Cyrillic script
 - “western Cyrillic script” 41
 - Glagolitic script 128, 156–158, 166, 167, 171, 214
 - Latin script 16, 119, 120, 122, 136, 138, 139, 173–175, 186, 188–191, 193–195, 198–214, 230, 232, 233, 235, 236, 240, 242, 245, 250, 252, 253, 258–262, 271, 293
- Vuk’s reform 7, 59–62, 66, 78, 301, 303, 310
 - consonant *ǣ* (*f*) 62, 67, 71, 74, 75, 78, 84
 - consonant *x* (*h*) 62, 64–83
 - “general regularity” 59, 60, 62, 66, 78, 87, 89–91, 408
 - iotation of consonants *m* (*t*) and *ǎ* (*d*) 62, 66, 85–86
 - regularity 59–62, 65, 66, 78, 87–91, 408
 - sounds *c’* (*s’*) and *z’* (*z’*) 86, 87, 390, 392–394, 404, 406, 408
 - southern dialect 47, 62, 65, 86, 90
 - “write as you speak” 59, 60, 66, 390, 397
- World War One 185, 186, 191, 221–285, 317
 - civic language 301

- folk language 20, 53, 61, 64, 88–90, 97–99, 102, 135, 184, 188, 190, 292, 293, 301–304, 311, 311, 317
 - Serbian national symbols 221–285
 - abolishing the Cyrillic script 190, 253, 254
 - burning books 198
 - calendar 165, 24, 226, 277, 279, 280
 - churches and monasteries 259, 280
 - conquest of Mt Lovćen 282–285
 - cultural and artistic treasury 278, 279
 - education 24, 225, 227, 229, 240, 242, 248, 260, 261, 263–265, 269, 271, 273, 274, 278, 323
 - flag 230, 235, 236, 243, 264, 274–276, 282, 361
 - name of the language 230, 234
 - names of streets 193, 211, 259
 - schools 186, 188–191, 225, 226, 232–234, 241, 244–246, 249, 252, 253, 255, 258–273, 293, 296, 300, 311, 316, 318, 323, 375, 381, 417, 421
- Serbian language
- Bosniak language 23, 333, 334, 357, 406, 412
 - Bosnian language 23, 25, 27–34, 36–42, 45, 49, 239, 240, 327, 328, 332, 333, 356, 378, 406, 419
 - Church Slavic 24, 107, 116, 135, 172, 185, 190, 292, 295, 301–303, 307–309, 311
 - Croatian language 18–20, 22, 23, 28, 140–143, 146–148, 232, 239, 244, 251, 260–263, 266, 329, 332, 334, 378, 381, 402, 403, 415
 - Čakavian 8, 15–18, 99–102, 104–108, 110–122, 124–133, 140–142
 - Herzegovinian language 12, 23, 26, 31
 - Illyrian language 11–13, 15–17, 19, 178, 188
 - Kajkavian 7, 8, 15–17, 21, 414
 - Montenegrin language 44–46, 49, 52, 53, 323, 328, 332, 337, 338, 347, 349, 356, 361–377, 379, 382–384, 389, 390, 392, 395–397, 399, 401, 403–406, 409–411, 413, 419–421
 - Old Slavic 50, 83, 98, 99, 136, 156–158, 162, 165, 167, 170, 172, 253, 292, 294, 298, 304, 380
 - Serbo-Croatian language 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 19, 28, 31, 36, 44, 131, 134, 141, 144, 146, 194, 207, 239, 240, 244, 245, 314, 316–319, 332, 333, 335, 350, 353, 354, 358, 374, 375, 391, 395, 403, 414–419
 - Serbian language in Montenegro 44, 47, 291–340
 - redaction 24, 49, 50, 113–115, 122, 128, 136, 162, 167, 168, 170, 172, 292, 294, 295, 298, 304, 308, 400
 - the Raška orthography 49–50, 294–299, 305,
 - the Resava orthography 297–299
 - the post-Resava orthography 293, 299, 300

- the Zeta-Hum orthography 51
- the Hum-Bosnian orthography 50
- "the Zeta orthography" 50
- Russian-Slavic 75, 172, 300, 301, 308, 309
- Serbo-Slavic 49, 171, 172, 182, 183, 291, 302–308
- Štokavian 8–10, 14–20, 23, 34, 47, 100–102, 104–119, 121–130, 132, 140, 169, 170, 173, 176, 178, 403, 414, 415

REGISTER OF NAMES

- Aarenau, von Brosch 238
- Adelung, Johann 16, 59, 88
- Andrić, Ivo 41, 42
- Antonić, Slobodan 207, 208
- Antović, Darko 215
- Ammon, U. 320, 340, 353, 421
- Artuković, Andrija 192

- Babić, Milanka 22, 30, 31
- Babić, Stjepan 22
- Babukić, Vjekoslav 19
- Banjević, Branko 363, 390, 394, 395, 398
- Barac, Antun 15
- Barić, Henrik 131, 132
- Basara, Andrea 42
- Bauer, Otto 355
- Backović, Slobodan 325, 361, 362, 368, 369, 372
- Bečković, Matija 52, 381
- Bečanović, Tatjana 363, 372, 375, 390
- Belić, Aleksandar 96, 130, 131, 141, 142, 151, 298
- Belyaev, Ivan D. 157
- Berthold, Leopold von 241
- Bijelić, Niko 110, 111
- Blagojević, Miloš 32, 53
- Blečić, Mihailo 214
- Blumm, D. 360
- Bogdanović, David 269, 286

- Božović, Ratko 340
 Bojić, Alfred 237
 Bojović, Draga 46, 54, 100, 349, 425, 440
 Bojović, Zlata 13, 54, 67, 164, 177
 Bonaparte, Napoleon 4
 Boranić, Dragutin 269
 Boris Mihail, Emperor 165
 Bosanac, Stjepan 269
 Brajović, Mišo 259, 286
 Breuilly, J. 354
 Brković, Milko 24, 25
 Brlić, Ignjat Alojze 20
 Broz, Ivan 269
 Brozović, Dalibor 7, 22
 Budinić, Šime 178
 Bugarski Ranko 199, 331, 335, 340
 Bukovac, Vlaho 21
 Buresić, Marin 110
- Car**, Marko 53
 Cerović, Blagoje 390, 411
 Cerović, Rajko 363
 Clement of Ohrid 156, 162
 Conrad, von Hözendorf 238
 Constantine, the Great 183
 Cooper, R. L. 359, 415
 Crnojević, Đurađ 135, 179, 181, 184, 185, 217, 292,
 Crnojević, Ivan 36, 43, 306, 314
 Crnojević, Jelisaveta 179
 Crystal, David 342, 354
 Cuca, Stefan Perović 52
- Časlav, Prince 164, 165
 Čelić-Tica, Veronika 196
 Čirgić, Adnan 46, 50, 363, 366, 390, 394, 396, 398, 400, 401, 409, 422, 425, 426
 Čogurić, Aleksandar 51, 57
 Čremošnik, Gregor 180
 Čubranović, Andrija 110
 Čurčić, Laza 184, 185, 187, 219
- Ćirilo, Konstantin 155–162, 167, 178, 187, 214, 215, 216, 218
 Ćorić, Božo 334
 Ćorović, Vladimir 241, 244, 247, 288
 Ćopić, Branko 381
 Ćupić, Drago 334, 345
- David, Bishop 35
 Daković, Anto 53
 Dalmata, Anton 187
 Daničić, Đuro 11, 18, 168, 203
 Demetar, Dimitrije 18
 Demirović, Hamdija 42, 43
 Derkos, Ivan 10
 Divković, Matija 136, 178, 269
 Dimitrije, Sinaït 168, 169, 218
 Dimitrijević, Vasilije 301, 302
 Dimitrović, Nikola 110
 Dimić, Ljubodrag 238, 242, 243, 256, 262, 279, 282, 287
 Dobrašinović, Golub 48, 54, 92, 422

- Dobrovský, Jozef 17
 Domentijan 381
 Dragin, Nataša 305, 341
 Dragojlović, D. 180
 Drehsler, Branko 269
 Držić, Marin 95, 102, 110, 122, 124
 Držić, Džore 95, 99, 100, 102–104, 106, 108, 110–112, 125
 Duthilleul, Pierre 162
- Đorđić, Petar 293, 300, 341
 Đukanović, Bojka 361, 367, 369, 370
 Đurđević, brothers 39
 Đurković, Ljubomir 381
- Ekmečić, Milorad 3, 4, 8–10, 14, 17, 21, 28, 29, 43, 55, 179, 215, 224, 226, 237–239, 286
 Ešić, Šimo 381
- Ferdinand, Franz 238, 240, 241, 243, 285
 Fetahović, Ćazim 389
 Filipović, Jozef (Josif) 237, 240
 Fiol, Schweipolt 181, 187
 Fortunatov, Filip F. 157
 Foscari, Giacomo 8
 Frank, Josif 235–237
 Frankopan, Ivan 174
 Frank, Joseph 230
 Friedman, V. A. 361
 Gaj, Ljudevit 15–17, 177, 201
- Garonja–Radovanac, Slavica 222, 224, 286,
 Gardt, A. 353
 Gellner, E. 353
 Giannelli, G. 119
 Girardi–Jurkić, Vesna 196
 Gligorije, Scribe 49, 51
 Glušica, Rajka 45, 46, 54, 338, 363, 366–368, 370, 372, 374, 394, 396, 398, 400, 409, 422
 Gonzalez, R. D. 361
 Gradić, Bazil 122
 Grković–Major, Jasmina 167, 214, 300, 305, 342
 Grickat, Irena 300
 Gröschel, B. 328, 352, 359–361, 419
 Grujić, Radoslav 172–175, 189, 191
 Gundulić, Ivan 100, 101, 179
 Gundulić, Dživo 95, 102, 103, 119, 122, 124
 Gučetić, Arkandeo 122
- Halilović, Senahid 30, 31, 57
 Hegel, Friedrich 4
 Herder, Johann 3, 16
 Hirt, Peter 133
 Horowitz, head of team 139, 140
 Hodžić, Zuvdija 363
 Hranić, Sandalj 34, 36, 40
 Hrvatinović, Hrvoje Vukčić 39
 Hristofanović, Rusko 111
 Hundt, M. 389

- Ilić, Vojislav 247
- Ilić–Marković, Gordana 249, 261, 268, 269, 286
- Isić, Momčilo 246, 259, 263, 279–281, 286
- Ivić, Pavle 7, 8, 10–12, 14, 18–22, 55, 60, 61, 75, 92, 134, 139, 151, 173, 215, 298, 301, 302, 309–312, 339, 341, 423
- Ivšić, Stjepan 128, 129, 131
- Izetbegović, Alija 22
- Jagić, Vatroslav 11, 27, 100, 101, 104, 105, 110, 112, 117, 125, 126, 128, 129, 131–133, 138–140, 157, 168
- Jakobsen, Per 328, 329, 331, 332, 415, 416, 423
- Janković, Đorđe 25, 33
- Janković, Emanuil 302
- Janjušević–Oliveri, Ana 392, 394, 403, 405, 406, 409, 423
- Jahić, Dževad 327
- Jeftić, Bishop Atanasije 35, 55
- Jeftić, M. 37
- Jerković, Vera 293, 296, 300, 342
- Jiriček, Konstantin 111, 139
- Joseph, Franz II 189, 227, 228, 230, 242, 257
- Jovan, Archbishop 163
- Jovanović, Batrić 215, 233, 286
- Jovanović, Gordana 182, 215, 295, 344
- Jovanović, Miodrag 392–394, 405, 423
- Jovanović, Petar 178
- Jovović, Luka 53
- Jurišić, Nikola 174
- Kállay, Benjamin 25–29, 40, 178, 227, 240
- Karagić, Luka 175
- Karađorđević, Aleksandar 191
- Karađorđević, Petar 264, 284
- Karadžić, Vuk Stefanović 11, 14, 15, 17, 32, 38, 47–49, 55, 59–61, 63–65, 67, 69–72, 74, 79, 83–93, 172, 174, 200, 201, 203, 250, 288, 311, 399, 408, 414, 423
- Kastoriadis, Kornelijus 4, 55, 423
- Katarina, Queen 32
- Katičić, Radoslav 147, 148, 151
- Katnić–Bakaršić, Marina 330
- Kačić Miošić, Andrija 7
- Kašić, Jovan 92
- Keglević, family 174
- Kelenović, family 173
- Keranović, M. 423
- Kinnamos, Joannes 33
- Kiparsky, V. 158
- Klaić, Vjekoslav 230, 269
- Klajn, Ivan 199, 200, 215, 409, 423
- Kloss 421
- Knežević, Jovo 381
- Kovač, Mirko 363
- Kovačević, B. 142

- Kovačević, Miloš 5, 12, 15, 21, 23, 29, 30, 55, 62, 93, 200, 201, 207, 208, 215, 233, 286, 317, 322–324, 327–332, 342, 403–406, 423, 424, 426
- Kovačević, Novica 53
- Kolinić, Ljiljana 366
- Komanin, Žarko 381
- Komatina, Nikola 162
- Kombol, Mihovil 145
- Konzul, Stefan 187
- Kont, Fransis 162, 216
- Kopitar, Jernej 12, 17, 54, 422
- Kordić, Snježana 14, 15, 56, 326, 328, 331, 342, 351–354, 357–361, 389, 414, 415, 419, 420, 424
- Kosača, Vlatko 35
- Kosača, Stefan Vukčić 32–34, 49, 54, 55
- Kostić, Laza M. 174, 177–180, 186, 187, 216
- Kotromanić, Stefan II 33, 39
- Kotromanić, Tvrtko 33, 36
- Kočić, Petar 42, 311
- Kraljević, Marko 247
- Krestić, Vasilije 222–237, 286
- Krivokapić, Ranko 377
- Krobatin, Alexander von 245
- Kršenović–Brković, Dragana 381
- Kršnjavi, Iso 278
- Kuzmanić, Ante 22
- Kukuljević, Ivan 18, 100, 230
- Kulin, Ban 33, 38, 379, 109
- Kumičić, Juraj 252, 261
- Kulybakin, Stjepan 167
- Kurelec, E. 180
- Kuripešić, B. 178
- Kurzbek, J. 190
- Labudović, Spasoje 381
- Lakić, Igor 363, 390, 395
- Lalić, Radovan 193
- Lasić, Igor 196–198, 216
- Laškova, Lili 419
- Lazarević, Luka 258, 259, 266, 268, 269, 2781, 286
- Lazarević, Despot Vuk 183
- Lazarević, Despot Stefan 297, 299
- Lenček 407
- Leskin, Avgust 104, 105, 157,
- Leskovac, M. 423
- Lešaja, Ante
- Lessing 88
- Letić, Branko 216
- Lewandowski, T. 420
- Livada, Svetozar 197, 198, 217
- Lingo, Mirsada 42, 54
- Lisac, Josip 148, 149, 151
- Lihoj, Upir 157
- Lompar, Milo 143–146, 151, 333, 342
- Lompar, Mladen 363
- Loredan, L. 179
- Ljubić, S. 133
- Ljubiša, Sava 43
- Ljubiša, Stefan Mitrov 53, 176, 180, 311, 381

- Maglajić, Munib 33
Mažuranić, Ivan 18, 230, 234
Maksimović, Vojislav 286
Maksimović, Desanka 381
Mandić, Nikola 245
Maretić, Tomo 104, 105
Marijanović, Stjepan 178
Marjanović, Mihailo Livnjak 178
Marić, Ivana 215
Marojević, Radmilo 194, 201, 202, 217, 340, 342
Martinović, Niko 252, 287
Martinović, Pero 315
Marulić, Marko 99, 102, 106
Matavulj, Simo 311
Matišić, Tomo 22, 403
Matović, Veselin 186, 217, 260, 287, 381, 382, 424
Mattusch, K. 358
Medvedev, Dmitry 206
Menčetić, Šiško 95, 99, 100, 102–104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 120, 121, 125, 129
Methodius 155–159, 161–163, 167, 187, 214, 215, 217, 218
Meštrović, Ivan 9, 21
Miklas, Heinz 169
Miklošič, Franc 17, 18, 27, 105, 139, 140
Milaković, Dimitrije 315
Miller, Vsevolod F. 157
Milosavljević, Petar 17, 19, 22, 56, 1341, 146, 151, 174, 175, 189, 191, 201, 217
Milošević, Miloš 179, 217, 314, 343
Milošević, Borivoje 246, 287
Miljanov, Marko 53, 176
Miodragović, Jovan 253, 275, 276, 287
Miroslav, Prince Stepan 23–25, 38, 49–52
Micalović, Franjo Ratkov 137, 177, 184
Mladenović, Aleksandar 75, 93, 180, 301, 302, 343
Moguš, Milan 366
Moskovljević, Miloš 194
Mošin, Vladimir 293, 297–300, 343
Mønnesland, Svein 328, 338
Mrkalj, Savo 66, 67, 71
Mrkanić, Franjo 178
Muratagić–Tuna, Hasnija 56
Mutimir, Prince 162
Muškatirović, Jovan 302
Nalješković, Nikola 102, 110
Nastasijević, Momčilo 381
Naylor, Kenneth 17, 56
Negrišorac, Ivan 312, 343, 386, 387, 424
Nedeljković, B. M. 180
Nedeljković, Olga 297, 299, 343
Nedić, Vladan 92
Nehring, D. 419–421, 424
Nelepić, Princes 174
Nemanjić, Dynasty 24, 34

- Nemanja, Stefan 25, 49, 172
 Nemanjić, Rastko 35
 Nemanjić, Emperor Dušan 13, 164
 Nemanjić, Uroš 13, 164
 Neweklowsky, Gerhard 417
 Nikčević, Vojislav 45, 397, 404
 Ninoslav, Matej 38, 39
 Novak, Viktor 21, 56
 Novaković, Stojan 310, 310, 343

Obradović, Dositej 302
Obrenović, Miloš 63, 77
 Okuka, Miloš 26, 27, 31, 56, 152, 178, 179, 186, 217, 239, 240, 244–246, 287, 288, 317, 319, 343
 Ondruš, Šimon 158, 217
 Orfelin, Zaharije 301
 Osmančević–Čurić, Enisa 381
 Ostojić, Branislav 65, 93, 292, 344, 402, 424

Pavelić, Ante 145, 191, 193, 227
 Pavić, Milorad 92, 381
 Pavlović, Miodrag 381
 Palikuća, Jelisaveta 184
 Palikuća, Jovan 184
 Palmotić, Džono 102
 Pantić, Miroslav 12, 92, 145
 Pandžo, Šukrija 381
 Parmezan, Dživo 102, 110, 111
 Pasquali, Giovanni 177
 Pacel, Vinko 18
 Peco, Asim 78
 Pejaković, Stjepan 18
 Penktovski, Aleksei M. 162, 162, 168, 217
 Perović, Milenko 362, 397, 399, 401, 425
 Perović, Sreten 328
 Petar, Archont 165
 Petračić, Franjo 269
 Petrović, Vasilije 44, 52, 302
 Petrović, Danilo 44, 317
 Petrović, Dragoljub 48, 56, 191, 194, 202, 206, 217, 314, 326, 343
 Petrović, Nikola I 176, 193, 315–317, 356, 381
 Petrović, Petar II Njegoš 53, 86, 176, 179, 285, 302, 315, 316, 381
 Petrović, St Petar Cetinjski 53, 176, 302
 Pešikan, Mitar 182, 183, 218, 292, 313, 317, 318, 343, 347, 425
 Piper, Predrag 201, 218
 Pirivatrić, Srđan 162–167, 171, 218
 Popa, Vasko 381
 Pope Handrian II 161
 Pope John VIII 161–163
 Pope John X 163
 Popović, Đuro 315, 316
 Popović, Marko 35, 36, 56
 Popović, Miodrag 142
 Popović, Pavle 143, 145

- Porphyrogenitus, Constantine VII 33, 164, 165
- Potiorek, Oskar 242, 244, 282
- Pranjković, Ivo 342, 400, 402, 422
- Preradović, Petar 174
- Primojević, Nikša 110
- Primojević, Paskoje 110, 112, 121
- Pucić, Medo 100
- Pupovac, Milorad 5, 56, 326, 355
- Putnik, Mojsije 189, 190
- Radivojević, Đurđina 381**
- Radić, Radmila 246, 259, 263, 279–281, 287
- Radičević, Branko 381
- Radovanović, Luka 137
- Radovanović, Milorad 334–337, 344
- Radović, Veljko 381
- Radović, Petar 260
- Radojević, Mira 238, 242, 243, 256, 262, 279, 282, 287
- Radojković, B. 25
- Radonjić, Pero 186
- Radulović, Zorica 53, 57, 363, 390, 394, 425
- Rajić, Jovan 77, 301
- Rakić, Vićentije 184
- Rakočević, Novica 262, 269–271, 273, 274, 287
- Ranjina, Dinko 95, 100, 102, 110, 113–116
- Ranjina, Dinko 117, 120, 121, 126
- Ratković, Francesco 135, 136
- Rauch, Levin 231–233, 236
- Rački, Franjo 11
- Rahmani, Nazmi 381
- Reljković, Matija Antun 7, 177
- Reiss, Archibald 279
- Ressel, G. 414
- Rešetar, Milan 28, 46, 95–142, 146–149, 151–153, 180, 185, 218
- Ribar, Ivan 237
- Rizvanbegović, Fahrudin 31
- Risojević, Ranko 41
- Ristić, Jovan 231
- Rodić, Nikola 291, 344
- Roganović, Jovan 315, 316
- Rusconi, Giorgio 184
- Rušić, Archimandrite 77
- Sava, Inok 183
- Savić, Viktor 118, 168–171, 218
- Savić–Rebac, Anica 379
- Salis–Seewis, Count 264, 265, 279
- Samardžić, Biljana 38, 40, 41, 57, 180, 181, 218
- Samuil, Emperor 165
- Sarkotić, Stjepan 185, 242, 245, 246, 274, 282, 283
- Seton–Watson, H. 353
- Shaw, George Bernard 203
- Silić, Josip 397, 399–402, 422, 425
- Simeon, Emperor 165, 166

- Simić, Radoje 16, 47, 57, 61, 64,
 65, 67, 73–75, 77, 78, 82, 84,
 93, 292, 302, 303, 310, 344
 Sirlet, Guillermo 183
 Skerlić, Jovan 191
 Sončina, Ćirolam 137, 177
 Sotirović, Vladislav B. 43, 57
 Srkulj, Stjepan 269
 St Sava 35, 36, 166, 294, 298,
 347, 380, 381
 Stančić, Ljiljana 240, 288
 Stanišić, Vanja 156–158, 218
 Starčević, Ante 21
 Stejić, Jovan 82, 89
 Stedje, A. 420
 Stefan, Hieromonk 183
 Stijepović, Slavoljub Migo 384,
 410
 Stijović, Svetozar 86, 93, 301,
 344, 345,
 Stojaković, Andrija 179
 Stojanović, Jelica 49–51, 55,
 171, 219, 288, 295, 296, 300,
 304, 305, 344, 345, 349, 425,
 Stojanović, Ljubomir 57, 75, 93,
 132, 138, 139, 152, 183, 219,
 305, 314, 315, 345,
 Stojović, Milorad 363
 Stojčić, Đoko 203, 219
 Suleyman II 109
 Suprunchuk, Mikita 418

 Šafarik, Jozef 157
 Šipka, Danko 417
 Šipka, Milan 26, 57, 288, 327,
 334, 345, 348, 356, 358–360,
 368, 416–418, 426
 Šišić, Ferdo 269
 Ševaljević, Dijana 46, 422,
 Škegro, Borislav 197
 Škrinjarić, Sunčana 381
 Škuletić, Sreten 374, 396, 397
 Špadijer, Đuro 316
 Štrosmajer, Juraj 11, 366
 Šćepanović, Branimir 381
 Šćepanović, Mihailo 322, 323,
 342, 404, 405, 423, 424, 426
 Šulek, Bogoslav 18
 Šušanj, Jelena 50, 401, 425, 426
 Šušić, Petar Jurjev 137

 Tabouret–Keller, A. 361
 Tarnanidis, J. 169
 Talovci, Princes 174
 Temparica, Marin 177
 Theodosius 381
 Theresa, Maria 188, 189, 225
 Tomašević, Nikola 232, 233
 Tomislav, ruler 163
 Trifunović, Đorđe 161, 166,
 168, 219
 Trubar, Primož 187
 Truhelka, Ćiro 40, 1780
 Tuđman, Franjo 196
 Turilov, Anatoly A. 166
 Turčanji, Vilijam 158, 159, 219

 Vaillant, André 129–131, 178

- Varsameleon 50, 51
Vasilyevna, Lyudmila 397, 401
Vasilyev, Vladimir 206
Vejid–Mehmed, Pasha 179
Velimirović, Nikolaj 257, 289
Velichkova, Slavka 418
Vetranić, Nikola 102
Vetranović, Mavro 99, 100
Vidaković, Milovan 71, 87
Vladimir, Prince 165, 380
Vladislav, King 109, 172
Vlahović, Atanasije 75
Vlatko, Herceg 36
Vodnik, Branko 145
Voisavljević, Đurađ 39
Vojvodić, Dragan 36, 54
Vojinović, Ivo 21
Vondrak, Vaclav 157
Vrčević, Vuk 53
Vujadinović, Željko 340, 354
Vujanović, Filip 376, 377
Vukanović, Slobodan 381
Vukašinović, Pavle 137
Vukić, Predrag 317, 318, 341
Vuković, Božidar Podgoričanin
181, 182, 314
Vuković, Branko 183, 306
Vuković, Vincenzo 181–183, 314
Vuković, Čedo 363
Vukov–Colić, Davorka 214
Vuksanović, Miro 53
Vuletić, Savo 53
Vulević, Čedo 381
Weber, W. 203, 259
Wenzel, Merien 28
Wilhelm II 241, 242
Wilkinson, J. G. 9
Zavida 25, 49
Zagrebin, Vyacheslav 308
Zagurović, Jerolim 183, 306,
315
Zaninović, Vice 144
Zbiljić, Dragoljub 191, 199, 215,
239
Zelić–Bućan, Benedikta 24, 215
Zlatarić, Dominko 100, 102, 130
Zlatović, Stipan 8
Zmajević, Andrija 53, 179
Zmajević, Vićentije 177
Zore, Luka 14
Zrinski, Nikola 173
Zvijezdić, Nikša 95, 111, 152
Zvrko, Ratko 381
Žarić, Milovan 192
Žurić, Blaga 381

ABOUT THIS BOOK

The papers collected in this book have been written from 2006 to the present day. They have come into being in the most difficult period in history for the heritage of many centuries of the Serbian language and the Cyrillic script, especially in Montenegro – during the years when politics laid bare is imposed upon science, and forgeries are imposed upon the truth. The papers have been published in periodicals, presented at international scientific conferences. However, as these papers are of great topical interest at the moment, they have all been revised to a greater or lesser degree, in view of the recent findings that we have come across or some new developments in connection with the Serbian language. The papers are thematically linked, presenting the relationship between the historical and the contemporary, that is – the Serbian language and script, their heritage of many centuries, in the context of today's developments and circumstances. In some of the papers, the attention is focused on the processes unfolding in the history of the Serbian language and script, while in others the focus is on the situation as it is today. The book consists of six thematic wholes: *The Serbian Language and the State-National Projects in the 19th and the 20th Centuries*; *Vuk's Reform of the Serbian Language in the Context of Two Principles: "Write as You Speak" and "General Regularity"*; *The Language of Dubrovnik in the History of the Serbian Literary Language (As Shed Light Upon by Milan Rešetar)*; *The Continuity, Spreading and Status of the Serbian Cyrillic Script – Through the Centuries and Today*; *The First World War – The Attitude towards the Cyrillic Script and Other Serbian National Symbols*; *The Identity and Status of the Serbian Language in Montenegro (The Historical and the Contemporary Aspect)*; *The Serbian Language in Montenegro in the Mirror of Linguistics and Politics*.

The papers connected to historical-linguistic issues mainly deal with the external history of the Serbian language, with the complex relationship between the language and the external

factors influencing the historical processes, which have lately, more than ever before, diverted the issue of language from the domain of linguistics to that of politics, especially in Montenegro. Special attention is paid to the developments occurring in the 19th and the 20th centuries, that is, to the place and significance of science (in this particular case, the study of language) and to the attitude of politics towards science, for these centuries are referred to as “political centuries”. A lot of what is happening to the Serbian language and the Cyrillic script today is a consequence of processes initiated a century or two before (especially manifest in the 19th and the 20th century), which sheds light on and explains today’s situation, hinting at which steps can be taken in order to move on.

The focus of our interest is, first of all, the language situation in Montenegro today, but as the processes unfolding in Montenegro today cannot be properly understood without being linked to other spaces and times, we expanded the domain of our interest to cover this broader level as well. A series of ideologically-politically defined moves, unparalleled in the world linguistic civilizational theory and practice, which are at odds with linguistics, with communication and social needs, with the cultural-historical duration of the language, with what the structural-genetic code of the language contains, were manifested in this period, especially in the last few decades. As we witness all of the above on a daily basis in our work, our aim was to note down, present and document the reality of it, the actors and events, and to review them in the context of linguistics and language policy, on the one hand, and the history of the language, on the other.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Jelica Stojanović was born in Dubrava (Šipačno), Nikšić, Montenegro, in 1966. She commenced her studies of the Serbo-Croatian language and Yugoslav literatures in 1984, completing them in 1988 at the Faculty of Philosophy in Nikšić. In 1989, she entered postgraduate studies at the Faculty of Philology in Belgrade, completing them by defending her Master's Degree thesis in 1993. She defended her doctoral dissertation, entitled *The Orthographic and Linguistic Characteristics of the Four Gospels from the Nikoljac Monastery in Bijelo Polje (Dating from the 13th/14th Century)*, in the year 2000 at the Faculty of Philology in Belgrade.

Since 1991, she has been working at the Faculty of Philosophy (Philology) in Nikšić, the Department of Serbian Language and Literature (later renamed as the Programme of Studies for the Serbian Language and South Slavic Literatures). She was elected Assistant Professor in 2001, Associate Professor in 2006, and Full Professor in 2012. She spent two academic years (1996–1998) working as a lecturer in the Serbian language in Russia, at the State University in St Petersburg, the Department of Slavic Studies. Since 2004, she has been working as a visiting lecturer in Kosovska Mitrovica, and since 2010 in Foča, the Republic of Srpska. She lectures in *The History of the Serbian Language*, *The Old Slavic Language*, as well as *The Church Slavic Language* and *A Comparative Grammar of Slavic Languages*. She has been a collaborator of the Institute for the Serbian Language of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts since 2000, and has been a member of the Matica srpska cultural society since 2004; she has been the Secretary of the Department of Serbian Language and Literature of Matica srpska – Members' society in Montenegro since 2010, and has been a member of the Scientific Society for Cultivating and Studying the Serbian Language – Belgrade since 2001, and a member of the Language Committee of the Srpska književna zadruga [Serbian Literary Cooperative] publishing company since 2013; she is also a member of the

Committee for the Normativisation and Standardisation of the Serbian Language and the Department of Language and Literature of the Montenegrin Academy of Science and Arts.

She has published three books: *The Orthography and the Language of the Bjelopolje Four Gospels (Dating from the 13th/14th Century)*, the University of Montenegro, Podgorica 2002; *The Serbian Language between Truth and Deceit. A (Socio) linguistic Analysis of the Situation in Montenegro* (co-authored with Draga Bojović), Jasen, Belgrade 2006; *Following the Paths of the Serbian Language and the Cyrillic Script*, published by Matica srpska – Društvo članova u Crnoj Gori, Nikšić, 2011. She has also published over one hundred scientific papers, over fifty professional and popular science papers and presentations, and has been a participant of sixty international and around thirty domestic scientific conferences. Her scientific preoccupations lie in the sphere of the history of the Serbian language. The political projects in connection with the status and the identity of the Serbian language that have been unfolding lately, especially in Montenegro, have led to her broadening her sphere of interest to include issues related to this (with a view to reviewing and presenting contemporary processes from a linguistic and sociolinguistic perspective, and also from that of the language policy – through the historical and the contemporary aspect) – this book being a result of it.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD - THE DEVELOPMENT PATH OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE AND SCRIPT, MADE UP OF STRAY PATHS

Miloš Kovačević I

THE DEVELOPMENT PATH OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE AND SCRIPT 1

THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE AND THE STATE-NATIONAL PROJECTS IN THE 19th AND 20th CENTURIES 3

VUK'S REFORM OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE IN THE CONTEXT OF TWO PRINCIPLES: "WRITE AS YOU SPEAK" AND "GENERAL REGULARITY" 59

Vuk's attitude towards "regularity in language" at the beginning of the reform 59

Selecting the norm and the vowel *yat* 62

Selecting the norm and writing the consonant *h* (or not) 66

Selecting the norm and writing the consonant *f* (or not) 84

Selecting the norm and the iotation of the dental consonants *m* and *đ* (or lack thereof) 85

Vuk's attitude towards the iotated forms *c'* and *z'* 86

Towards applying the principle of "general regularity" 87

THE LANGUAGE OF DUBROVNIK IN THE HISTORY OF THE SERBIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE (AS SHED LIGHT UPON BY MILAN REŠETAR) 95

Milan Rešetar and his scientific interests 95

The language of the poetry of Dubrovnik 97

The language of the prose of Dubrovnik 107

The Dubrovnik speech. Scientific responses and polemics with colleagues and their various contributions and views, which they presented in connection with the speech and language of Dubrovnik 123

The designation of the language and the script 134

The dialects in Bosnia and Herzegovina 139

The relationship between the Serbian and the Croatian language 140

Later developments and the attitude towards the language and literature of Dubrovnik	142
THE CONTINUITY, SPREADING AND STATUS OF THE SERBIAN CYRILLIC SCRIPT – THROUGH THE CENTURIES AND TODAY	155
The historical continuity of the Cyrillic script in the area of Serbian literacy	155
Naming the Cyrillic script and the Serbian language	176
The undermining of the Serbian Cyrillic script in the past ..	185
The Serbian language in the context of two scripts (the Cyrillic and the Latin one)	197
The Cyrillic script and the contemporary technologies	204
The current circumstances (troubles, that is) and the Cyrillic script	206
THE FIRST WORLD WAR – THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CYRILLIC SCRIPT AND OTHER SERBIAN NATIONAL SYMBOLS	221
The attitude towards the Serbs and their national characteristics (in the area of Austria and Hungary) until the First World War	221
The First World War – the continuation and intensification of activities on the anti-Serb project	243
THE IDENTITY AND STATUS OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE IN MONTENEGRO (THE HISTORICAL AND THE CONTEMPORARY ASPECT)	291
A brief historical-linguistic sketch of Montenegro	291
The dialectal picture of Montenegro	312
The naming of the language on the territory of today's Montenegro	314
The decision of the social collective	319
The current developments in connection with the language and the language policy	322
THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE IN MONTENEGRO IN THE MIRROR OF LINGUISTICS AND POLITICS	347
The name of the language – the general principles and processes in Montenegro	348
The standardisation (and normativisation) of language – the	

general principles and processes in Montenegro	388
Laws, regulations and orders as the “methodological foundations” of “the Montenegrin language”	410
The world tendencies pertaining to the naming of languages from the “post-Serbo-Croatian” area	414
The term “standard language” – the general principles and the Montenegrin circumstances	419
A general overview	421
REGISTERS	427
Register of terminology	427
Register of names	429
About this book	437
About the author	439

Jelica Stojanović
THE DEVELOPMENT PATH OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE
AND SCRIPT

Published by
Matica srpska – Members' Society of Montenegro
Department of Serbian Language and Literature
Podgorica, Rimski trg 50/1
<https://maticasrpskacg.org/>
maticasrpska.cg@gmail.com

For the publisher
Jelica Stojanović

Editor
Drago Perović

Translation
Novica Petrović

Technical preparation
Nikola Kadović

Cover design
Milovan Kadović

Printed by
Birograf - Beograd

Print run
500

The translation of this book into English was enabled by the Ministry of Culture
and Information of the Republic of Serbia

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији
Национална библиотека Црне Горе, Цетиње

ISBN 978-9940-580-80-3
COBISS.CG-ID 14961924