

**Research Project: New and Ambiguous Nation-Building Processes
in South-Eastern Europe**

Working Paper Series

**INCONSISTANT LANGUAGE POLICY IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOWINA
DURING THE 1960S AND 1970S**

Iva Lučić

http://www.oei.fu-berlin.de/nation-building/resources/wp/lucic_01

The project is funded by the Volkswagen Foundation and the Austrian Science Fund (FWF).



FWF

Inconsistent Language Policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the 1960s and 1970s

Iva Lučić

“We do not want to be anyone’s linguistic colony!”

This statement, which was energetically exclaimed by Miliwoje Jeftić and continuously cited by Bosnian intellectuals, certainly characterizes, in a condensed but very appropriate way, the paradigm of linguistic policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the 1960s and 1970s. In a time of very intense and often opposed linguistic discussions in the promoted centers of Belgrade and Zagreb, those two decades introduced the *aurea aetas* of language and linguistics for the first time, also in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Baotić 2005). Through claims that in Bosnia and Herzegovina no hybrid language or a combination of Croatian and Serbian is spoken, but its own original language, the so-called Bosnian-Herzegovinian expression (“Bosanko-hercegovački standardnojezički izraz”), characteristically for the whole republic, linguistics became the new political “performatives” for certain political and identity assertions. Thus, in form of a reaction to the new nationalistic aspirations which were embodied *inter alia* in a linguistic debate, originating from the centers in Serbia and Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina gave a “resolute” answer to them by promoting its authentic language. In the beginning this active political voice was raised spontaneously without scientific argumentation. This was only given after the foundation of the Linguistic institute. Head quarters for a national publishing house however remained absent during the whole political era (Jahić 1990). There was an attempt to replace the role of passive observer in the language policy with an active modeling process of a new language policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina on the republican level.

Through the analytical lenses of linguistics, the following paper wants to examine the dynamics of the language policy on the Yugoslav level, which prepared the podium for the Bosnian language policy in particular. Further on, the officially proclaimed attitude will be analyzed in some of the documents which appeared during that time. Regarding its realization, some moments will be shown through the prism of the linguistic research conducted by the newly founded Linguistic Institute in Sarajevo. Further consideration of lexical questions and the manner in which they solved the question of Bosnian Muslims /Bosniaks and their linguistic affirmation within the policy will also be reviewed.

The purpose of the paper is to show the variety and pluralism of (often competing) forms through which linguistic questions were politically utilized. Linguistically formulated claims in the name of the nation, with dissolution aspirations (as in Serbia and Croatia,) were thus opposed by the linguistically formulated policy of cohesion (Bosnian case).

The Provocative Context and Precondition of the Bosnian Language Policy

Although language pluralism was already promised at the first AVNOJ-meeting held on 29 September 1943, its constitutional realization lagged behind by a considerable number of years. The constitution of 1946, therefore still embodied rather unitarian tendencies in its proclamation of official languages, according to which the Serbian language was the official language in Serbia, Montenegro; in Bosnia and Herzegovina it was Serbian or Croatian; in Croatia, Croatian or Serbian; in Slovenia, Slovenian; and in Macedonia, the Macedonian language (Karadža 1984). Linguistic issues, however, remained on the margins of political discourse at that time. Priorities were given to the stabilization of the socialist regime and later on, to the creation of the new worker's self-management model after the break with Stalin in 1948 (Okuka 2007). However, in an ideological costume filled with Leninist-cum-Marxist internationalism, combined with Yugoslav integralism (Karadža 1984), there was still enough space for tensions between centralist and federalist tendencies, which gained new defining points within the political argumentation in the late 1950s.

Thus, the often exclaimed inability to find enough space with the political project of the centre (Belgrade) by representatives from Croatia (and Slovenia) began at that time to be phrased in terms of "language" and "nation", which was realized in the variety of orthographic and lexical versions in Belgrade, Zagreb and Sarajevo. To come to terms with this pluralism, on 10 December 1954, the assembled linguists in Novi Sad signed the "Novosadski dogovor" and interpreted the language with the following formulation:

1. The language spoken by Serbs, Croats and Montenegrins is one language. Thus, the standard language which was developed in the two centres of Zagreb and Belgrade is unique with two expressions: *ekavica* and *ijekavica*.

2. The denomination of the language has to entail both of its integrative parts
3. Both characters, Latin and Cyrillic enjoy the same rights. Therefore it is recommended that Croats and Serbs learn both scripts in the schools (Dokumenti 2001).

The reference of only to Serbs and Croats (and an absence of Montenegrins in the second point) as nations, as well as the fact that this document with its so-called “tolerant” elaboration of one language with dual equal forms, was written only with Cyrillic scripts, using exclusively the ekavian variant, already announced a wide gap between the ideological proclamation of linguistic tolerance and its practical realization.

In the early 1960s, with the debate over economic reforms, the suspicion with which the federalists regarded the government reached its peak. This resulted in a new legislative framework and political direction, which the political discourse at that time, often equated with democratization processes (Lampe 2000). The important turning point, which secondary literature often endows with almost mythic importance, is seen in the Fourth Plenum and the removal of the Vice President, Ranković, in 1966. This event was to inaugurate a new era of federalist self-management and to bring an end to the centralist policy. New economic problems, however, and the accompanying question of resource (re)distribution created new struggles to come up (Lampe 2000). In this context, new constructions and assertions of identity were given space according to which a “new style of imagining” (if we use Anderson’s jargon) of a heterogeneous time and space of lived experience, overmastered the model of shared interests. Within the national narration especially present in Croatia, the language issue again became politically potent, but for the first time to that extent in the Communist era.

The first consideration of the language and its function in a multinational region was presented at the Fifth Congress of Slavists in Sarajevo, in 1965, by linguists from all the republics of Yugoslavia. Definitions of variants, as well as interpretations of the standard Serbo-Croatian language, were given for the first time in an alternative way. In the new given context among the referents, Milka Ivić confirmed that: “the existence of variants is inevitable due to the dynamics of the standard language and the literature with all its differences, which cover the wide multinational territory” (Ivić 1966). In this sense the speakers’ conclusion was that the disjunctive character of the SC/CS language as a language in a nationally heterogeneous context was, therefore, not existent. With this new

argumentation, the objection of the “*Novosadski dogovor*” was marked by claiming that due to the opulence of varieties, there was no unique physiognomy of the language. Additionally, the possibility of the dissolution of the one standard language into more different individual idioms was underlined (Baotić 2005).

With this new discourse entering the linguistic podium, the primary function of language as a communicative medium was added (which was underlined by the advocates of the unique physiognomy of the Serbo-Croatian/Croat-Serbian language), in other words, a new aspect of language - as the locus of national identity’s articulation. In that sense Professor Jonke, during the Congress, said: “I would like to add to the political, cultural and economic attributes of our development, also the national attribute which constitutes a very important factor in the whole problem!” (Jonke 1965). Within this new context the variant’s definition also went through a transformation and modified into an “[...] adaptation of the standard uniform language to satisfy tradition and the contemporary requirements of the nation, which is defined as a socio-ethnic formation” (Brozović 1970). Besides the fact that the congress took place in Sarajevo, the capital of a multinational republic, there were no explicit discussions about the consequences of such a socio-linguistic concept of the Serbo-Croatian/Croat-Serbian language. During that time there was also no active language policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the linguists did not discuss the position of the Montenegrins as a nation “without its own language”. The official recognition of Bosnian Muslims was to follow in February 1968. The podium’s space, thus, was reserved for two participants - the owners of national publishing houses (matica Hrvatska and matica Srpska), and the two main centers of (socio)-linguistic and lexicographic disciplines. The variant’s definition and the new stated principles seemed to be created as a medium for only selected nations’ linguistic affirmations as the rhetoric of political claims. In other words, the policy making was inconsistent.

The official linguistic ideology of Socialist Yugoslavia was, however, based on Lenin’s model of pluralistic language policy, according to which there was no official national language in a multinational state, but a language for inter-national/inter-ethnic communication (Karadža 1984). This ideological concept was to guarantee freedom of linguistic expression for every individual peoples and nationalities (Tošović 1984). According to Lenin, the founder of the proclaimed ideology: “The acknowledgement of the equal status of all nations and languages is one of the Marxists’ features, and not just because they are the most consistent democrats. The interests of the proletarian solidarity, the fellowship unity of the fight for class struggle, require the complete equality of all nations

through which any national suspicion or hate will be eliminated. Full equality presupposes the elimination of any language privilege as well as the nation's right for self-determination." (Marks, Engels, Lenin 1960). This policy was already realized in the case of Yugoslavia's minorities and some nations, like Hungarians, Slovaks, Slovenians, and Macedonians etc. In regard of the nations with Serbo-Croatian/Croat-Serbian as the official language, the same democratic attributes of the ideology were harder to implement, especially in nationally inspired language dissolutions.

In the decentralized political concept and the polycentric administration, language and Herder's Romanticism became the new amalgam of nationalism. Being utilized by the political entrepreneurs as the new determinate of their (ethnically) defined nations, language gained a central place in the political discourse.

Only two years after the inauguration of an alternative language-functioning, in 1967 the new discourse was completed in its "defense" of nations. With the publication of "Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika" (Declaration about the name and condition of the Croatian standard language) and its Serbian answer "Predlog za razmišljanje" (A Suggestion to Think About) the inaugurated re-contextualization and utilization of language in the name of nations reached its most developed nationalistic form. Through those two publications, the Croatian and Serbian linguists triggered (unconsciously) the activation of Bosnian politicians. According to those two documents, which advocated the canceling of the "Novosadski Sporazum", the following language condition in the policy should be established:

"It is therefore necessary to change the formulation in the constitution [...] which should run like this: Federal laws and other general acts of the federal organs are being published in their authentic text in four languages: Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian and Macedonian. [...] In accordance with the mentioned requests and explanations, it is therefore necessary to assert the application of the Croatian language in schools, journals, radio, and television, and in the public and political life whenever it is the case of Croatian people. Furthermore, all officers, teachers and public workers are obliged to use this standard language in the region of their employment (emphasis added)" (Deklaracija).

The Serbian answer to this document, "Predlog za razmišljanje" followed very soon with the following statement:

"The group of Serbian authors considers the institutions which proclaimed the "Declaration about the name and condition of the Croatian standard language" as most authoritative and thinks that the Declaration is representative for the question of the Croatian language. Therefore the group suggests the resolution without considering a historical and scientific

view of the problem. Bearing in mind the fact out of which this declaration's claim is deduced, the group considers the Vienna agreement and Novosadski agreement invalid. The Croatian and Serbian language from now on will develop separately" (Borba, 3 April 1967).

In its argument for the usage of the Croatian language "whenever it is the case of Croatian people" "Deklaracija" was to legitimize language not only in Croatia but in all regions where Croats live, i.e. also in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The same argumentative logic was then to be applied for Serbs (in Bosnia and Herzegovina). This advocated inscription of language boundaries along national lines implicated at the same time a division of the public spheres along national boundaries.¹ With the introduction of a new linguistic scheme of national narration, which uses the formula one nation = one language, the language dissolution, therefore, was to go along national lines. Additionally, the suggested dissolution was to serve only a dual model, thus dividing the Serbo-Croatian/Croat-Serbian along two national lines, Serbian and Croats leaving other nations (Montenegrins and Bosnian Muslims), which use the same standard language out of consideration. The concept of the linguistic nature of identity politics, therefore, excluded Montenegrins and Bosnian Muslims. By negating their rights to conceptualize their claims through linguistic rhetoric on the political scene, their national negation was also affected, i.e. the negation of any claims in the name of the linguistically defined nation. The deprivation of the possibility to localize the national particularity of Bosnian Muslims also applied within the field of language, where, according to the documents, they were required in both the national and linguistic sense, to oscillate between the two offered versions. This radical change in human relations with language immediately signaled the question about Bosnia and Herzegovina and its integrity as a republic of all three nations: Serbs, Croats, and Muslims.

In the frame of a still very dominant ideology of brotherhood and unity, combined with the Leninist concept of pluralism, those aspirations very soon triggered the special attention of the Communist party, which very soon designed an antipole to the suggested model. Already on 6 December 1967, at the meeting of the Executive Committees of the Central Committee in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, and Croatia, both documents as well as intellectual's works (especially Babić from Croatia and Moskovljević

¹ The division of the public sphere would have been realized e.g. in schools by teaching Serbs Serbian language and Croats Croatian language.

from Serbia)² were condemned as nationalistic and chauvinistic pieces of work (Strogo povjerljivo 1967). The so-called ‘difficult to swallow’ character of the new aspirations were especially stressed by the representatives of the CK SK BiH, Hamdija Pozderac, and Danilo Bilanović, who defined Bosnia and Herzegovina in the new context as “hunting-ground for Serbian and Croatian nationalisms” (*Ibid*). Later on, Pozderac stated that “no one variant, neither the Serbian nor the Croatian is acceptable for Bosnia and Herzegovina whose national composition is not compact. We have to acknowledge the authenticity of our own way of expressing ourselves.” (*Ibid*) This statement was to symbolize the beginning of a republican affirmation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which through its own language policy, was to oppose the linguistic dissolution along national lines which would have endangered the national cohesion in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In the search for an alternative linguistic concept, which was to serve a political concept of national cohesion within the poly-national Bosnian republic, a new defining function was to be created for the language.

Authenticity Between the two Poles. The Bosnian Autonomous (?)

Answer

In a number of documents that were to follow, from the Central Committee in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as congresses, the alternative linguistic policy first gained its political basis. Very soon after the publication of “Deklaracija” and “Predlog”, the Executive Committee of the Central committee in Bosnia and Herzegovina, formulated its own opinion about the two documents. This was done at a meeting, which took place on 27 March 1967, and where they concluded, in a document with the symbolic name “*Izjava*” (declaration), that the “Deklaracija” and “Predlog” are “[...] not just nationalistic and chauvinistic statements, but also an attempt to articulate political averseness towards brotherhood and unity, as well as the equation in the socialist patriotism of the Yugoslav peoples [...]” With regard to Bosnia and Herzegovina it specifically says: “Nations which live in Bosnia and Herzegovina are particularly sensitive to any attempt to destroy the progresses of brotherhood and unity.” With regard to the use of language in the republic, it gives the following statement: “[...] The Communist party always advocated the non-

² According to Babić, Croatian language was a separate language from the Serbian one. Moskovljević, in contrast, in his dictionary treated Croatian as a provincialism). Archive of Bosnia and Herzegovina, document „Strogo povjerljivo 1967”, p. 2.

deprivable right of all citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina to freely and tolerantly use our language.“ At the end of this document the Communist party explicitly called for intellectual engagement “[...] in all aspects regarding the linguistic theory question and its practical realization in this region. In that sense they can contribute constructively to the settling of them and actively be engaged in giving scientific solutions, which will hinder all revival tendencies of international antagonisms clothed with scientific arguments” (Dokumenti 2001).

Through “Izjava” the Bosnian communists gave a Bosnian answer in form of a requital to the national aspiration, which was to be realized by intellectuals in the neighboring republics as well as within its own territory.

A reaction from the intellectual circles, i.e. teachers and researchers from the Faculty of philosophy in Sarajevo, followed very soon in the form of an open letter published on 1 April 1967 (Prosvjetni list, 1 April 1967). Although it failed to give any scientific elaborations of their statement according to their interpretation of the two documents “Deklaracije” and “Predlog” “[...] as acts regarding all nations and peoples of the Serbo-Croatian (Croat-Serbian) region, especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina, can introduce destroying and separation elements.” Therefore both statements are not acceptable, since “[...] language is (was) the medium that in the past has already connected us mutually”(Ibid.) In contrast to the rhetoric of heterogeneous cultures, utilizing the scope of language, given in “Deklaracija” and “Predlog”, the Bosnian intellectuals used the same medium of narration but utilized it for the affirmation of the concept of cohesive community. This was actually an act of support for the Bosnian political discourse regarding the question of the language. Scientific fundamentals for it were, however, still missing.

One year after the first articulations of the Bosnian viewpoint on linguistics, a document from the Central Committee BiH followed on 15 March 1968, thus already after the official recognition of Bosnian Muslims/Bosniaks at the Seventeenth Conference of CK SKBiH. That a clear concept was still absent, can be seen in the first attempts that were made to specify the nature of the language in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and which the mentioned document marked with the following statement:” [...] Nations of Bosnia and Herzegovina – Serbs, Croats, and Muslims are equal and free in their choice between the two variants of the Serbo-Croatian/Croat-Serbian language, by mixing the features of those two.” (Oslobođenje, 20 March 1968).

The solution to the authenticity of the language question in Bosnia and Herzegovina was thus seen in the coexistence and mixture of the two already nationally defined variants. In

their freely chosen symbiosis, the Central Committee in Bosnia-Herzegovina hoped to deprive the language of its function as national subject. The policy's inability to exceed the two variants' frame, which were prescribed and domiciled in Belgrade and Zagreb, made the autonomous intention even more dependent on the neighboring linguistic concepts. The attempt to create a national linguistic reality in Bosnia and Herzegovina was thus mediated by reference to the linguistic concepts made outside this republic, failing to integrate all three nations. Thus, the tolerance was made up by the choice of two already predetermined variants from Serbia and Croatia. The reality of the two variants seemed to be unsurpassable.

For the case of Bosnian Muslims, this "autonomous" policy offered nothing but the possibility to oscillate between the Croatian and Serbian variant, thus leaving the Bosnian Muslims without the possibility of an affirmation. Thus the freedom was embodied in the choice between two neighboring linguistic layouts. In this duality of variants, for a country with three constitutional nations, the Leninist pluralist concept in regard to Bosnian Muslims again failed to serve in reality!

That implementation of both, instead of the perforation of a single one, was at stake was confirmed by the following statement: "Therefore the Executive Committee regards every form of imposture or unnatural preference for each of the variants as a violation of the individual's right to freely choose the expression and his/her language. [...] Future discussions on this topic should be based on the "Novosadski sporazum."³

It took one more year to design a more decisive and emancipated elaboration of the language policy within Bosnia and Herzegovina. At that time, the official proclamation of language policy went through a transformation into a more unaffiliated approach and language expression. At the "Symposium about linguistic tolerance", which took place from 23 to 25 April 1970, topics revolved around the discussion of new potential tools for the Bosnian language-policy project. Linguistic questions, such as linguistic integrity and its nomenclature, the usage of scripts, ijekavian and ekavian pronunciation, and its application in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the question of linguistic policy implementation in educational institutions, were occupying the speakers' podium (Baotić 2005). Despite the repeated absence of a linguistic scientific elaboration of the speakers' arguments, this time, the dual variants model was repudiated as a solution for Bosnia and Herzegovina. A third variant for Bosnia and Herzegovina however, was also out of consideration! At the Symposium about linguistic tolerance, which took place from 23 to 25 April 1970,

³ Ibid.: p. 170.

linguists and pedagogues concluded that: “[...] the culture of Bosnia and Herzegovina and its nations tolerate tendencies of the standard language towards neither polarization between the two variants nor a third Bosnian variant.” (Simpozij o jezičkoj toleranciji). In its consideration of the poly-national composition of Bosnia and Herzegovina, it was concluded that the republic has to accept “[...] everything that exists on the complete Croat-Serbian area framed by the standard language norms, despite the polarization between the two variants which is evident in some of the regions.” (*Ibid*) Regarding the principle for the tolerance of each individual in Bosnia and Herzegovina, it recorded now that each individual: “[...] has the right to choose between all possibilities offered by our standard Serbo-Croatian/Croat-Serbian linguistic norm, or to choose a pure form of one of the existing standard language norms of the East or West variant” (*Ibid*).

This time, therefore, tolerance towards the horde of synonyms within the Serbo-Croatian/Croat-Serbian language, which constituted the cornerstone of the Bosnian new policy, was embodied in its elasticity within the frame of the standardized language. However, to what extent all nations in Bosnia and Herzegovina could participate and contribute with their linguistic specifics in the standardized language, will follow later. The conclusive and complete version of the Bosnian language policy was delineated at the conference of the Central Committee, in co-operation with the commission for ideological questions, held on 17 February 1971, in Sarajevo, which exteriorized its content in the document called “Književni jezik i književnojezička politika u Bosni i Hercegovini” (Standard language and literature in Bosnia and Herzegovina) (Dokumenti 2001).

Regarding its argumentative logic, it was determined by two points, i.e. linguistic facts, and the sociopolitical constellation and interests of all nations that live in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Regarding the first point it was appointed that: “It must be taken into consideration that Serbo-Croatian / Croatia-Serbian - independently from its differences and even variants within it - is the language of Serbs, Croats, Muslims and Montenegrins in all four republics.”⁴ Regarding the second aspect, the following statement was made: “All questions, which are related to our standard language, cannot be resolved unilaterally without the agreement and democratic examination of all problems in the atmosphere of reciprocal respect and understanding” (*Ibid*).

The language question in Bosnia, however, was to be resolved according to four main principles:

⁴ *Ibid*.: p. 174.

1. Acceptance of the Serbo-Croatian and Croatia-Serbian language respectively as one language with all its varieties and variants.
2. Openness towards positive cultural and linguistic influences from all republics and all cultural environments from our linguistic territory.
3. Maintenance of the autochthonous linguistic standards and cultural values, which are the common hoard of all nations of Bosnia and Herzegovina and which connect them mutually, i. e. insistence on all those things that connect and approach.
4. Complete freedom of the individual's choice of his linguistic expressions, independent from their variants' designation (*Ibid*).

The realization of the linguistic policy in elementary and secondary schools was specified in detail at the Symposium about linguistic tolerance. There, teachers from different schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as linguists and employed people in cultural associations, concluded: “[...] every pupil in elementary and secondary school, as well as students in Bosnia and Herzegovina, has the freedom to choose their own language of expression. The teachers’ freedom is, however, restricted since they are not allowed to impose any of their personal persuasions, but to teach the standard language norm.” In fact, that meant that “[...] the school lessons in SR Bosnia and Herzegovina have to be held in ijekavian form. [...] The school books must be printed in ijekavian form. [...] the pupil is free to choose its form of expression, but he is also obliged to learn the rules of the ijekavian standard language” (Simpozij o toleranciji).

The same statements were underlined in “Književnojezička politika”, with the argumentation that ijekavian embodies the linguistic feeling (jezički osjećaj) which prevails in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This interpretation of the standard language form was mainly realized in the schools. Cyrillic and Roman scripts were taught and in weekly intervals, teachers and pupils used the Cyrillic and Roman form, however always with the ijekavian form.

During the inauguration phase of this policy, reactions came from Belgrade, which in “Politika” and “Nin”, interpreted the tolerance policy as the prohibition of ekavian. A fierce opponent to the policy was Egon Feteke, a linguist at the institute for Serbo-Croatian language in Belgrade, who, especially in the beginning of the 1980s, characterized the Bosnian language policy as anti-ekavian (Politika, 8.5.1982).

The embodiment of the Bosnian authenticity was made in the coining of the term “Bosankso-hercegovački standardnojezički izraz” (Bosnian standard-language expression). The replacement of the term “variant” with “izraz” should symbolize the countervailing power against the polarization policy (Ibid.). According to this document, contrast had to be given to “Deklaracija” and “Predlog” in which language served as a commodity for national development, since in Bosnia it presented the commodity of the whole territory, a republic in which three nations lived in a cohesive community.

Instead of defining the nation, as proclaimed in “Deklaracija” and “Predlog”, the new nature of the language policy was to define the territory of the whole republic, Bosnia and Herzegovina. By defining the substance of the language with the reference of territory instead of the nation, a new qualitatively different point of linguistic approach was offered. Such elaboration evidently served a political concept of national cohesion within one poly-national republic. In addition, it was to consolidate its republican equalization with Croatia and Serbia using the same medium of policy, language, but giving it an alternative mark. Through the engineering of its own language policy, Bosnia in fact tried to assert its own political trajectory within the political space and projects, led by Serbia and Croatia. It was an attempt to emancipate itself by solving linguistic questions in its own way, which, up until then, had been done by the two centers in Belgrade and Zagreb.

In that sense a new way of utilizing linguistics began to flourish on the podium of the language policy which now accommodated a pluralism of (socio-)linguistic conceptions and national affirmations.

Scientific Legitimacy - the Foundation of the Institute for Language and Literature

Soon after the Symposium, the foundation of the Institute for Language and Literature in Sarajevo followed in 1972. With socio-linguistics as its main field of agency, its main task was to create scientific justification for the Bosnian political positioning in regards with the language. The inauguration and confirmation of the institute’s operational field took place at the “Mostarsko savjetovanje”, where the affirmation of Serbo-Croatian/Croat-Serbian language, with both its scripts in the equal sense as well as the realization of the Bosnian language policy, were considered as the central tasks.

Regarding the thematic fields of the initial projects, they were strongly dedicated to sociological aspects of language. Some of the main projects analyzed the orthography in

Bosnia and Herzegovina (Pravopisna problematika u Bosni i Hercegovini), its dialects, and their territorial distribution within the republic “Dialectical complex of Bosnia and Herzegovina-synchronic description, and the relation with the contemporary standard language (Bosanskohercegovački dijalekatski kompleks – sinhronija, deskripcija i odnos prema standardnojezičkom izrazu), as well as the concept of the school books⁵.”

The project about dialects, domiciled by the institute, symptomatically shows to what extent the ideological concept of the language policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina was determining the linguistic science and the institute’s work.

For instance, as part of the mentioned project, Dževad Jahić, (nowadays the main advocate of Bosnian language) conducted research about the state of affairs on dialectical basis, and the standard language in the southern region of Praca and Lima. In respect of the national composition, those regions are dominantly inhabited by Bosnian Muslims mixed with Serbs. This region, as stated in the project’s results, is linguistically characterized by the special sonant gemianic pronunciation (glanna instead of gladna [=hungry]), as well as frequent interpolation of the letter “h” in some words (kahva instead of kafa/kava [=coffee], lahko instead of lako [light, simple]) (Jahić 1990). Those dialectical peculiarities, however, have often been regarded as the result of the influence of oriental languages on most Muslim inhabitants, in Bosnia and Herzegovina. As they could be found in the regions inhabited by Bosnian Muslims, they were perceived as an ethnic dialect feature, which was often also used in the historic works about the ethno-genesis of Bosnian Muslims (e. g. in Hadžijahić, Čerić, Suljević)⁶.

With his main task to legitimize the language policy through its “scientific” work, the author, however, concludes in his study that: “[...] the territorial factor is primary in the lexico-semantic layer of the dialects, while the ethnic factor can be treated only as a secondary one” (Jahić 1990). By neglecting the reality of the ethnic moment in the dialects and in order to legitimize the language policy based on territorial definition of the language, the author made those characteristics specific only to the studied region. In that way, any national connotation, even within the (non-standardized) dialects, which was to serve the “denationalization project” of the language as propagated in the policy, was eliminated. For us, as this example shows, the institute’s works continuously were generated in political spheres and had the function of a scientifically prolonging the Commu-

⁵ Stated in the interview with Professor Baotić, on 20 July 2007.

⁶ A detailed elaboration regarding the letter “h” and its interpolation is given in Smailović’s article “Glas h i njegove zamjene u savremenom srpskohrvatskom standardnom jeziku”, in *Radovi*, no. 5.

nist party's arm. Thus, the scientific autonomy was circumscribed by the political discourse.

In pursuing the realization of the authenticity and potency of Bosnian language, policy as well as its institutes in relation to the field of lexicographic questions the conclusion, however, leads, beyond Bosnian boundaries and widens the specter of analysis. As already stated, the authentic character of “Bosanskohercegovački standardnojezički izraz” was embodied in the principle of tolerance and freedom of choice, within the standardized language. Following the argument on which the principle of tolerance was based, and according to which the emphasis of freedom of choice was set within the frame of the standardized form of language, the crucial question about tolerance, then, leads to the standardization processes of the in Bosnia and Herzegovina used language. Additionally, point three of “Književna politika” guaranteed the “maintenance of the autochthonous linguistic standards and cultural values, which are the common heritage of all nations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and which connect them mutually, i.e. insistence on all those things that connect and approach” (emphasis added).

That the proclaimed common heritage of all nations of Bosnia and Herzegovina was not integrated in the standard language, was shown by Alija Isaković, in his meticulous comparative study of the Pravopis dictionaries from 1960, and published by Matica hrvatska and Matica srpska. With the leading question of to what extent the linguistic specifics of Bosnian Muslims in particular constituted the standard language, he concludes bitterly that the proportion of the lexis characteristic was the biggest in Vuk Karadžić's dictionary, while in the 1960 Pravopis dictionary, it was the smallest (Isaković 1984).

In fact, besides the intensive research conducted on the dialectal semantic and lexical specifics based in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was conducted by the institute, its contribution to the standard language was minimal, not to say invisible! This reality also mirrored the impotency of the Bosnian policy to exercise influence on that field of linguistics.

In 1981 “Oslobođenje” initiated a campaign to publish the so-called linguistic informatory, with a collection of new, still not standardized, words from Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the same sense, as with the Muslim lexis, it remained a project without broader influence on the centers. Interesting to note is that at that time, the “tolerance principle” was realized visually in “Oslobodjenje”, by printing the pages by turns in Cyrillic and Roman scripts. That the linguistic (and not just visual) tolerance was again just oscillating between Zagreb and Belgrade, ignoring Sarajevo, was proved by “Oslobođenje”.

With linguistic issues entering the political scene, Oslobođenje introduced a linguistic column for the purpose of serving as a linguistic orientation for Bosnian inhabitants. Under the pretense of being of an educational nature, its main writers were professors and researchers from the linguistic institute (Milan Šipka, Miloš Okuka, Josip Baotić etc.). Questions about spelling, foreign words, and other linguistic obscurities were discussed, and potential solutions were offered. One of the central fields of this educational mission was *inter alia* the correct usage of (standard) words in the language. A recurrent topic within this field, constituted especially the usage of words, “which are common in our daily language.” (Okuka 1983). For answering the questions about the “correct and pure” standard language, the main consultants, however, were the dictionaries published in Serbia and Croatia. The answers provided by the linguists, were determined by the Serbian or Croatian variants.

Therefore, without having its own “matica”, which could have published its own dictionaries for Bosnia and Herzegovina, the institute’s main scientific occupation was, thus, reduced to observing and documenting the (dialectal) specifics of the Bosnian territory. As the question of standardization was still the privilege of Zagreb and Belgrade, none of the linguistic particularities of that region were taken into consideration. A result of that was the discrepancy between the standard language and the linguistic reality in Bosnia.

Conclusions

Bosnia and Herzegovina, with its different sense of urgency and complacency, started to develop an alternative lens through which language was not to be seen as an instrument for national pride, serving for national consolidation. In contrast, a new concept was to be created, which illuminated the language as a warrantor of territorial integrity in a multinational republic - Bosnia and Herzegovina. Since the affirmation of this - in Bosnia domiciled - concept developed after the exteriorization of “Deklaracija” and “Predlog”, its employment has more of an epiphenomenon character. The new concept was a reaction to the “parental” aspiration of the neighboring countries, rather than a presentation of a self-initiated draft. Just how much the Bosnian political discourse was actually captured within the Croatian and Serbian discourse, is revealed by the nomenclature of the language. Thus, with the enforcement of both combinations - Serbo-Croatian and Croato-Serbian - in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as stated in point 1 of the “Književna politika”, the authenticity of the denomination of the language was realized with the inte-

gration of two variants, leaving the creation of one Bosnian autonomous variant – as advocated by Isaković, out of consideration. .

Although Bosnia and Herzegovina presented a nationally tolerant/ignorant linguistic concept, it designed its model by using elements (name, lexicographic model, standard language) which were offered by Serbia and Croatia, i.e. the centers which were propagating language as a nation's defining loci. In its inability to break the discourse which it was opposing, it created a policy of balancing between the two poles without any really authentic alternatives. The insistence on a non-national linguistic concept was, to that extent, also scientifically propagated, so that even ethnical linguistic marks, like dialects, were denied their ethnic characteristics, and were to be defined in a territorial sense.

As a consequence of this, the tripartite national composition of Bosnia and Herzegovina was to be solved linguistically with the tolerance principle (stated in point four, in "Književna politika"), which tried to find a balance in the dual linguistic model. Consequently, in an a-national concept, using the nationally defined variants of two nations - Serbian and Croatian, the linguistic affirmation of Bosnian Muslims experienced absolute marginalization and remained officially unnoticed, suppressed, and inconsistent in its pluralistic principle and tolerance. Thus the horizon of tolerance, limited by the two variants, was not wide-reaching enough to incorporate all three - by then acknowledged nations, in their linguistic particularities.

In an interview, Josip Baotić characterized the policy as the following: "The language policy and the institute were to embody a policy of republican emancipation, a policy of integrity advocated by Pozderac, Bijedić, and Mikulić." It is questionable to what extent a real integration of the republic really took place. And even if it was a republican integration on the political broader scene of Yugoslavia, it was built on the inconsistent emancipation of all three nations within the republic.

References

Primary Sources

Deklaracija o hrvatskom jeziku, MH Zagreb, 1991, pp. 7-11.

Feteke, E. 1982, "Zabrana ekavice", in *Politika* 8.5.1982.

Isaković, A. 1970, "Varijante na popravnom ispitu", in *Život*, no. 11-12, Sarajevo, pp. 54-71.

Ivić, M. 1966, „Problem norme u književnom jeziku“, in *Jezik*, vol. 2, no. 13, pp.2-8. Jezički informator, Oslobođenje 1981.

„Izjava Izvršnog komiteta Centralnog komiteta Saveza komunista Bosne i Hercegovine povodom Deklaracije o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika i Predloga za razmišljanje grupe članova Udruženja književnika Srbije“, in *Standardni jezik i nacionalni odnosi u Bosni i Hercegovini (1850-2000)- dokumenti*, Institut za Jezik u Sarajevu, pp. 165-167.

Jonke, Lj. 1965, „Problem norme u hrvatsko-srpskom književnom jeziku“, in *Jezik*, vol.1, no. 13, pp. 1-6.

Književni jezik i književnojezička politika u Bosni i Hercegovini – Dokumenti društveno-političkih organizacija, 1971, in *Oslobođenje* 24.3.1971. pp. 8-11.

Mostarsko savjetovanje o književnom jeziku (referati, diskusija, zaključci), Institut za jezik i književnost u Sarajevu and Oslobođenje.

Ocjene Izvršnog komiteta u CK SKBiH stanja u oblasti jezika u Bosni i Hercegovini, in *Oslobođenje*, 20.3.1968, pp. 15-16.

Otvoreno pismo nastavnika i saradnika Filozofskog fakulteta u Sarajevu, in *Prosvjetni list*, 01.04.1967, p. 3.

Pravopisna problematika u Bosni i Hercegovini-Radovi, Institut za jezik i književnost u Sarajevu, 1976.

„Predlog za ramzišljanje“, in *Borba*, Beograd 3. April 1967, p. 5.

„Simpozijum o jezičkoj toleranciji“, in *Prilozi nastavi srpskohrvatskog jezika i književnosti* 1969/70, vol 4, Banja Luka.

Smailović, I. “Glas h i njegove zamjene u savremenom srpskohrvatskom standardnom jeziku”, in *Radovi*, no. 5, pp. 117-218.

Zaključci simpozijuma o jezičkoj toleranciji 1970, in *Standardni jezik i nacionalni odnosi u Bosni i Hercegovini (1850-2000), Dokumenti*, 2001, Institut za jezik i književnost, Sarajevo, pp. 170-174.

Zaključci Novosadskog dogovora, in: *Standardni jezik i nacionalni odnosi u Bosni i Hercegovini (1850-2000), Dokumenti*, 2001, Institut za jezik i književnost, Sarajevo, pp. 149-151.

Mostarsko savjetovanje o književnom jeziku, Sarajevo, 1973.

Secondary literature

Baotić, J. 1984, "Standardni srpskohrvatski jezik, norma i varijante", *Književni jezik*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 122-141.

Baotić, J. 2005, "Književnojezička politika 1970-1990", in *Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini*, ed. Svein Monnesland, Institut za jezik u Sarajevu, Institut za istočnoevropske i orijentalne studije Oslo, pp. 435-477.

Brozović, D. 1970, *Standardni jezik*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb.

Borozović, D. 1984, "O nazivu jezika Srba, Hrvata, Muslimana i Crnogoraca", in *Sveske Instituta za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa*, no. 5-6, Sarajevo, pp. 315-357.

Bugarski, R. 1984, *Jezik i nacija*, in *Sveske Instituta za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa*, no. 5-6, Sarajevo, pp. 23-27.

Dizdar, M. 1970, "Marginalije o jeziku i oko njega", in *Život*, no. 11-12, Sarajevo, pp. 109-112.

Isaković, A. 1984, "Leksika u muslimanskih pisaca i nasi pravopisi", in *Sveske Instituta za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa*, no. 5-6, Sarajevo, pp. 329-341.

Jahić, Dž. 1990, "Dijalekt i međuetnički odnosi" in *Jezik, nacija, nacionalizam*, Jahić, Dž., Oslobođenje, Sarajevo, pp. 173-184.

Jahić, Dž. 1990, „Jezik između nacionalnog i nacioanlističkog“, in *Jezik, nacija i nacionalizam*, Oslobođenje, Sarajevo, pp. 13-31.

Karadža, M. 1984, "Ustavna načela o ravnopravnosti jezika naroda i narodnosti i njihovo ostvarivanje u praksi saveznih organa i organizicija," in *Sveske Instituta za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa*, no. 5-6, Sarajevo, pp. 139-150.

Lampe, J. 2000, *Yugoslavia as History. Twice There was a Country*, 2nd edn, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Marks, Engels, Lenin, 1970, *O jeziku*, Kultura, Beograd, 1970

Tošović, B. 1984, „Rješavanje jezičkog pitanja u SSSR-u“, in *Sveske Instituta za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa*, no. 5-6, Sarajevo, pp. 73-109.