# The (re)nationalization of the Serbo-Croatian standards

The question how many languages are spoken on the language territory of the Neo-Štokavian standards has been a subject of heated debate for a long time. Although many linguists have become reluctant to engage in this topic, the problem is not solved. The two sides still accuse each other of ideologism. But is everybody who deals with this subject actually an ideologist? Or might it be possible that Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin and Serbian are really no "normal" standard languages, just as Serbo-Croatian is not a "normal" pluricentric language? To be able to meet a decision on this, the characteristics of the speech forms in question have to be compared with those of other languages. Therefore, neither the model of the "literary variants" nor the one of the "autonomous languages" can be used, since these models are valid only for those linguistic situations for which they were developed. In this context Ulrich Ammon's model is often quoted, the internationally most widely accepted model permitting a decision on what is an individual language and what is a national variety of a language; however, the details of this model in its entirety have not been cited so far by any of the sides. Therefore, in this paper, I present some less commonly known parallels and differences between our speech forms on the one hand and such languages as German, English or Portuguese on the other. This shows that the Serbo-Croatian speech forms really have much in common with the standard varieties of pluricentric languages but that they also exhibit specificities which are not envisaged in Ammon's model. Above all it can be shown that something really happened around 1991, which on the basis of Ammon's model can be termed "nationalization" (or "renationalization"). This nationalization explains a great deal of the theoretical problems and demonstrates that the linguistic situation in former Yugoslavia is not as unique a case as is frequently assumed.

**Translated from** "Die (Re-)Nationalisierung der serbokroatischen Standards" in Kempgen, Sebastian & Gutschmidt, Karl & Jekutsch, Ulrike & Udolph, Ludger (eds.), *Deutsche Beiträge zum 14. Internationalen Slavistenkongress, Ohrid 2008*, 89–102. München: Sagner 2008. DOI: 10.18716/bun/bkms.

**DOI:** 10.18716/omp.64.4

## 1. Introduction

To date, there is still no agreement in the sometimes heated debate that has been going on for many years about the now proverbial question "How many languages?" (which, for example, Thomas 1994, Bugarski 2000, Alexander 2002/03, and many others already mention in the titles of their articles). This can hardly be attributed to a lack of arguments or proposed solutions. Therefore, this article will not attempt to answer this question directly, but will instead analyze, at a metalevel, why the linguistic situation in Bosnia, Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia is so difficult to grasp linguistically.

It is undisputed that serious linguistic changes took place in (former) Yugoslavia at the beginning of the 1990s, but there is uncertainty about what exactly happened. While some assume that Serbo-Croatian split into several languages (Radovanović 2003, Rehder 1998), others argue that the changes can only be seen in metalinguistic discourse, which either means that there is still only one "linguistic" language (Kordić 2004a, Pranjković 2006), albeit several "political" ones (Thomas 1994, Bugarski 2000, Alexander 2002/03), or that it has now finally been officially recognized that a Serbo-Croatian language never existed (Katičić 1997, Auburger 1999).

A major problem in assessing the situation is that it has so far been described almost exclusively using models developed specifically for this situation, making it difficult to compare these descriptions with those of other languages. For this reason, the situation will be presented here strictly according to a model that has been tested on dozens of languages, namely the model of pluricentric languages developed by Ulrich Ammon.[1]

## 2. Presentation of the model of national varieties

### 2.1 Practical application: using Austrian German as an example

When Austria joined the European Union in 1995, it insisted that Protocol No. 10 be appended to the accession treaty, which contains a list of the following words in the annex:

> 90 *Beiried* 'striploin',[2] *Eierschwammerl* 'chanterelles', *Erdäpfel* 'potatoes', *Faschiertes* 'minced meat', *Fisolen* 'green beans', *Grammeln* 'cracklings', *Hüferl* 'beef hip',[2] *Karfiol* 'cauliflower', *Kohlsprossen* 'Brussels sprouts', *Kren* 'horseradish', *Lungenbraten* 'tenderloin',[2] *Marillen* 'apricots', *Melanzani* 'eggplant', *Nuss* 'sirloin tip',[2] *Obers* 'cream', *Paradeiser* 'tomato', *Powidl* 'plum butter', *Ribisel* 'currant', *Rostbraten* 'forerib',[2] *Schlögel* 'hind leg',[2] *Topfen* 'curd cheese', *Vogerlsalat* 'lamb's lettuce', *Weichseln* 'sour cherries' (European Union 1995: 330)

These 23 Austriacisms therefore have "the same status and may be used with the same legal effect as the corresponding expressions used in Germany" ("den glei-

[1] This article addresses the fact that the written languages of Bosniaks, Croats, Montenegrins, and Serbs are clearly distinguishable from one another by using the terms *Bosnian*, *Croatian*, *Montenegrin*, and *Serbian*, while the fact that the members of the four peoples can communicate better with each other than, for example, with Slovenes or Macedonians, is referred to by the traditional term *Serbo-Croatian*. This is done in a completely neutral manner, simply because none of the proposed alternatives (*Central South Slavic*, *Standard Neo-Štokavian*, *BCS*, *SerBoCroatian*, *naški*, etc.) is entirely convincing.

[2] Apparently, Austrian, German, American, and British butchers all cut up cows, pigs, lambs, and chickens differently, so that the pieces they sell (and name) only partially overlap but never coincide. This is a terminological nightmare for a translator (not only for a vegetarian one).—D. B. 2026.

chen Status und dürfen mit der gleichen Rechtswirkung verwendet werden wie die in Deutschland verwendeten entsprechenden Ausdrücke", i.e. *Roastbeef* 'striploin', *Pfifferlinge* 'chanterelles', *Kartoffeln* 'potatoes', *Hackfleisch* 'minced meat', *grüne Bohnen* 'green beans', etc.; ibid.; for the background and impact of this protocol, see Markhardt 2006).

In 2003, however, a product labeled as *Marillenmarmelade* 'apricot jam' was nevertheless rejected by the food inspection authority, as *Marmelade* must, according to an EU directive, contain citrus fruits, whereas jam must be labeled as *Konfitüre*. While this regulation, which is based on the English model and contradicts common German usage, had been tacitly accepted in Germany, it led to the "Apricot Jam War" ("Marillenmarmeladekrieg") in Austria (Markhardt 2006: 22)—especially since it was mistakenly considered to be linguistic paternalism from Germany (ibid. 23)—and ultimately resulted in the adoption of an exemption by the European Council.

As early as 1949, in order to avoid any hint of linguistic affinity with Germany, the name of the school subject *Deutsch* 'German' was abolished in Austrian schools and replaced by the term *Unterrichtssprache* 'language of instruction'; however, the glottonym was reintroduced in 1952 (cf. Ammon 1995: 126f.). The *Österreichisches Wörterbuch* 'Austrian Dictionary' (Back & Fussy 2006), published in Vienna since 1951, does not contain the word *Deutsch* even in a subtitle. And the manifesto "Österreichisch als eigene Sprache!" ("Austrian as a language in its own right!"), signed in 2004, called on the government to amend the article on language of the federal constitution to read "Die Staatssprache ist Österreichisch in einem europäischen Kontext" ("The official language is Austrian in a European context"), "Die Staatssprachen sind Deutsch und Österreichisch" ("The official languages are German and Austrian"), or something similar, and to advocate for the recognition of Austrian as a separate EU language (cf. Manifest 2004).

These brief snapshots should demonstrate how closely national identity can be linked to a speech form that, despite its high symbolic and identificatory value, is classified by all serious linguists as 'only' a *national variety* and not as a separate language.

### 2.2 The theory: Ammon (1995)

On the question of how to objectively decide whether two linguistic expressions belong to different languages or to the same language, Kloss (1952) already provided some answers, which Ammon (1995) further refined and, particularly for pluricentric languages, developed into a comprehensive model with a clearly defined algorithm. This will be briefly presented here.

According to Ammon, two criteria are decisive for answering this question: first, roofing, which correlates with standardization (or Kloss's *ausbau*), because "standard varieties cannot be roofed, and non-standard varieties cannot roof other

varieties" ("Standardvarietäten können nicht überdacht werden, und Nonstandardvarietäten können nicht überdachen", Ammon 1995: 2); and second, the similarity of the varieties being compared, for which Ammon (1995: 6) suggests measuring "the number of matching words in texts that are identical in meaning and translated as literally as possible" ("in sinngleichen, möglichst wörtlich übersetzten Texten […] die Zahl der übereinstimmenden Wörter") as an approximation. The interaction of the two criteria is illustrated in the following table: 🗋91 Starting from a given standard variety, a variety compared with it belongs to the same language or not, depending on its standardization and its similarity to the initial variety, as shown in the table.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>high similarity</th><th>medium similarity</th><th>low similarity</th></tr>
<tr><td>identical words</td><td rowspan="2">> 50 %</td><td>< 50 %</td><td rowspan="2">< 50 %</td></tr>
<tr><td>recognizable cognates</td><td>> 50 %</td></tr>
<tr><td>standard variety (roofing)</td><td>same language<br>(pluricentric)</td><td colspan="2">other language<br>(ausbau language) | (abstand language)[3]</td></tr>
<tr><td>nonstandard variety (roofed or roofless)</td><td colspan="2">same language<br>(dialect, sociolect, etc.)</td><td>other language<br>(foreign dialect etc.)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ammon's example:<br>German<br>Standard German</td><td>Austrian Standard German, Swiss Standard German</td><td>Standard Luxembourgish, Standard Dutch, Standard Afrikaans, Standard Yiddish<br>Swabian dialect</td><td>Standard French</td></tr>
</table>

If, according to these criteria, several standard varieties belong to one language, that language is *pluricentric* (e.g. Arabic, Armenian, Chinese [Mandarin!], German, English, French, Hindi-Urdu, and many other languages; cf. Clyne 1992). In this case, according to Ammon (1995: 96), a further distinction can be made as to whether a center in which one of the standard varieties applies has its own internal codification (as e.g. for German in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland) and is thus a *full center*—or whether it has specific standard variants but has not codified them independently in normative dictionaries, making it a *semi-center* (such as, for German, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, South Tyrol, and East Belgium).

[3] Ammon (1995: 1–11) does not use these two internationally accepted terms coined by Kloss (1952: 16–20) here, but this is precisely what is meant; Kloss (1952: 19f.) already speaks of a "minimum distance" ("Mindestabstand") that must be given in order to speak of different (ausbau) languages, and of a "maximum distance" ("Höchstabstand") that requires the existence of different (abstand) languages even without ausbau.

Furthermore, Ammon (1995: 84f., 92, 95) distinguishes between "national", "state", and "regional" standard varieties (the latter two of which can be further specified as "subnational" or "substate"). Abstracting somewhat from Ammon's explicit wording, one could say that *state* varieties are distinguished by an area of validity that is clearly defined by state borders, while *regional* standard varieties usually have an area of validity with fuzzy borders, with a center and a periphery; one example would be the south(east)ern German regional standard with its center in Munich, whose individual variants (*Semmel* 'bread roll', *Brotzeit* 'lunch snack', apical [r], *ich bin gesessen* vs. *ich habe gesessen* 'I have sat', etc., cf. König 2005: 232–245) are spread across areas of varying sizes. *National* varieties, on the other hand, can also be state varieties in the case of a nation state, but they are primarily linked to the members of the nation, regardless of how many countries the nation lives in. (At the time of the division of Germany, for example, the German nation lived in two states, the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, while the Kurdish nation is currently spread across several 'foreign' countries.) From this, it can be concluded that although a national variety is generally (cf. Ammon 1995: 77) dependent on state institutions for the codification and enforcement 92 of norms, its scope encompasses "all individuals of the nation or the language community within the nation" ("alle Individuen der Nation bzw. der Sprachgemeinschaft in der Nation", ibid.), i.e. it is ultimately defined by individuals and not primarily by territory.

## 3. Attempt to apply Ammon's model

### 3.1 Similarity tests

In the following, we will now apply this model to Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian, while naturally retaining Ammon's terminology, even though it differs in part from the terms commonly used in former Yugoslavia. In particular, it should be noted that a) a linguistic system[4] is referred to here exclusively as a *variety*, while *variant* always refers to a linguistic unit, e.g. a word, a phoneme, a syntactic structure, etc.; that b) *standard variety* is synonymous with *književni jezik* (i.e. it is also used when a language has only one standard variety);[5] and that

[4] Since Brozović (1970: 38) and Silić (1996) claim that a single variety is only a question of Saussure's *parole* (or Coseriu's *habla*), while the *langue* (or *systema*) encompasses all standard and non-standard varieties of the (Serbo-)Croatian language as a whole, it should be clearly stated here that every dialect, sociolect, idiolect, and of course every standard variety has its own *langue* and *parole* (and also Coseriu's *norma*), while a language as a whole is merely a 'system of systems' (cf. Ammon 1995: 1).

[5] In order to avoid the misunderstanding that the term *standard varieties* must *a priori* refer to several varieties of *one and the same* language, I have chosen the term *standards* for the title of this article.

c) Ammon simply calls *language* what Brozović (1970: 66) introduced the term *jezik-dijasistem* 'language-diasystem' for.

Therefore, the similarity test described above must first be applied to the standard varieties (which serve as official languages) in the four (five if Kosovo is included) Serbo-Croatian-speaking countries. All differences are underlined and then counted:[6]

> *Bosnian:* Već u slavenskoj prapostojbini dolazi do uočljivih razlika između pojedinih jezičkih grupa. Tako se formiraju buduće etničko-jezičke zajednice: južnoslavenska, zapadnoslavenska i istočnoslavenska. Prije doseljenja Južnih Slavena na Balkan postojala je i unutrašnja raslojenost ove grane na njen istočni i zapadni dio, te se u nauci govori o istočnojužnoslavenskome i zapadnojužnoslavenskome prajeziku. Iz zapadnojužnoslavenskoga prajezika na zapadnijem dijelu Balkanskoga poluotoka razvijaju se tri dijalekatske cjeline: štokavska, kajkavska i čakavska. (Halilović 1998: 13)

> D 93 *Croatian of Croatia:* Već u slavenskoj prapostojbini dolazi do uočljivih razlika između pojedinih jezičnih grupa. Tako se formiraju buduće etničko-jezične zajednice: južnoslavenska, zapadnoslavenska i istočnoslavenska. Prije doseljenja Južnih Slavena na Balkan postojala je i unutrašnja raslojenost ove grane na njezin istočni i zapadni dio, te se u znanosti govori o istočnojužnoslavenskome i zapadnojužnoslavenskome prajeziku. Iz zapadnojužnoslavenskoga prajezika na zapadnijem dijelu Balkanskoga poluotoka razvijaju se tri dijalekatske cjeline: štokavska, kajkavska i čakavska. (translated by Amir Kapetanović)

> *Serbian of Serbia:* Već u slovenskoj prapostojbini dolazi do uočljivih razlika između pojedinih jezičkih grupa. Tako se formiraju buduće etničko-jezičke zajednice: južnoslovenska, zapadnoslovenska i istočnoslovenska. Pre doseljenja Južnih Slovena na Balkan postojala je i unutrašnja raslojenost ove grane na njen istočni i zapadni deo, te se u nauci govori o istočnojužnoslovenskom_ i zapadnojužnoslovenskom_ prajeziku. Iz zapadnojužnoslovenskog_ prajezika na zapadnijem delu Balkanskoga poluostrva razvijaju se tri dijalekatske celine: štokavska, kajkavska i čakavska. (translated by Biljana Golubović)

Of these 68 words from the Bosnian original, which are not intended as 'evidence' but merely as an illustration of the method, 94% are identical in the Croatian translation and 81% in the Serbian translation;[7] the Croatian and Serbian transla-

[6] One problem not specifically addressed by Ammon (1995) is that of writing. He himself also takes into account purely orthographic differences such as Swiss ⟨ss⟩ versus German/Austrian ⟨ß⟩. However, the Serbian example makes it clear that purely graphic differences can only be included to a limited extent, because otherwise they would lead to the obviously false statement that the inhabitants of Belgrade *speak* a common standard variety, but *write* two different languages that are completely foreign to each other, since the Cyrillic and Latin versions of a text differ from each other by almost 100%. Therefore, I have only counted those differences that are also audible when the text is read aloud.

[7] Bosnian texts that are less similar to Croatian are closer to Serbian. Lehfeldt (1999: 88) notes the rarity of specific Bosniakisms even in the newspaper *Ljiljan*.

tions are 75% identical with each other.[8] Bosnian Serbian or Montenegrin—Ijekavian—translations, which cannot be analyzed in this paper, would be even closer to Croatian and Bosnian than the Ekavian Serbian of Serbia, while Bosnian Croatian texts generally differ little from the Croatian of Croatia.[9]

This clearly fulfills Ammon's condition for treating the standard varieties mentioned as a pluricentric language, namely an identity of over 50% of the words. (Tests with slightly larger and fictional text excerpts always yield slightly different numerical values, but overall the same result.) Burgenland Croatian, however, is a special case, as its standardization took place outside Yugoslavia and it has integrated Čakavian and Ikavian elements into the standard. Therefore, this will be dealt with separately here:

> *Burgenland Croatian:* Širom svita haraju i dandanas nemiri i krize, na peldu u Iraku, Afganistanu, Pakistanu, Bliskom istoku itd. itd., kot da se čovičanstvo i u tisućljetnoj prošlosti u tom pogledu ništ_ nije naučilo. A i uzroki nemirov uvijek su isti: siromašni 🗋94 protiv bogatih, borba za vlast, za moć, vjerska nepodnošljivost ali i uskraćivanje ljudskih prav_. Vrlo rijetko kroz ljeto čuju se riči državnikov, ki pozivaju narode i pojedince na pravično podiljene zemaljskih dobar_, na ispunjenje zakonov, na toleranciju – ali božićno vrime zaistinu je pravo vrime za takovo opomenjivanje i razmišljavanje. (Sučić 2007: 1)

> *Croatian of Croatia:* Širom svijeta haraju i dandanas nemiri i krize, na primjer[10] u Iraku, Afganistanu, Pakistanu, na Bliskom istoku itd. itd., kao da čovječanstvo i u tisućljetnoj povijesti u tom pogledu ništa nije naučilo. A i uzroci nemira uvijek su isti: siromašni protiv bogatih, borba za vlast, za moć, vjerska nesnošljivost, ali i uskraćivanje ljudskih prava. Vrlo rijetko tijekom godine čuju se riječi državnika, koji pozivaju narode i pojedince na pravično _dijeljenje zemaljskih dobara, na ispunjenje zakona, na toleranciju – ali božićno vrijeme doista je pravo vrijeme za takovu opomenu i razmišljanje. (translated by Amir Kapetanović)

Of the 91 word forms in this text excerpt, 74% are retained in the Croatian translation. This means that Burgenland Croatian differs from Croatian at least as much

[8] Compare the (admittedly constructed) texts of 160 words given by Ammon (1995: 9–11), in which the German German and Swiss German versions are 85% identical (not counting orthographic differences). In the versions in Yiddish, Luxembourgish, and Dutch, the languages most closely related to German, respectively only 16%, 6%, and 5% of the words are identical with the German versions.

[9] Okuka (2000: 72) considers Bosnian Croatian to be "identical to Croatian in Croatia, in some cases even more 'Croatianized' than in Croatia itself" ("идентичан хрватском језику у Хрватској, у неким случајевима чак и више 'похрваћен' него у самој Хрватској"), with the last clause, however, suggesting a certain independence of the Bosnian Croatian variety.

[10] Although Amir Kapetanović translated this correctly, the German paper published in 2008 contained a mistake here, for which I alone am responsible. (D. B. 2026.)

as Ekavian Serbian.[11] In Ammon's model, however, these subtleties are not relevant, as all texts coincide by well over 50%, meaning that their similarity is *high* and they must therefore be classified as varieties of a pluricentric language.[12]

It is often claimed that it was the 'Croatian Vukovites' ('hrvatski vukovci') who forcibly 'united' the Croatian and Serbian languages, which are actually foreign to each other, into one language. Unfortunately, no native speakers from the time of the National Renaissance period are alive who could be asked 95 to produce 'equivalent texts translated as literally as possible' in order to verify this. But even a glance at actual translations is revealing. For this purpose, we will use the beginning of the translations of Herder's (1791) chapter on the Slavs, which is available in an "Illyrian" version from Ljudevit Gaj's *Danica* (1835: 231) and two Serbian versions, of which the one by Stamatović (1832: 27) is quoted here, which, as Keipert (2000) has shown, served as a basis for the *Danica* translation alongside the German original. Where the older Serbian version by Davidović (1816: 248) is closer to the *Danica* text, it is added in parentheses:[13]

*Serbian:* Славенски народи обузымаю на земльи, већій просторъ, нежели (негол') _у повѣстницы, између прочи причина и збогъ тога, што су подалеко отъ Римляна живили. Мы и[x] познаємо найпре на Дону, а доцніе (потомъ) на Дунаву,

[11] The fact that many Croatian Croats find Burgenland Croatian much more difficult to understand than Serbian has nothing to do with linguistic similarity but rather with their limited contact with Burgenland, as a result of which Burgenlandisms such as *pelda* 'example' (= *primjer*) are largely unknown in Croatia, while Serbianisms such as *ostrvo* 'island' (= *otok*) are well known. However, for a variety of reasons, comprehensibility is not a criterion for determining linguistic status (cf. Ammon 1995: 5f.).

[12] Another variety that might be considered missing here is Molise Slavic ("Molise Croatian"). In the Standard Croatian and Molise Slavic parallel translations from the *Decameron* that are printed in Duličenko (2003: 155f.) and, although not strictly prepared according to Ammon's criteria, can serve as a guide, a total of 10% of the words match. However, the clear majority of Molise Slavic words can be recognized as cognates to their Croatian parallels, so that the similarity of the texts can be classified as *medium*. (These figures would probably not change significantly even with a translation "as literal as possible", as there are too many phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexico-semantic differences, cf. Breu 1998.) Thus, what is decisive for the classification of this variety is standardization. Breu (1998: 275) notes: "Das Moliseslav. ist keine Schriftsprache. Gelegentlich wird es von Intellektuellen dennoch schriftlich gebraucht […]" ("Molise Slavic is not a standard language. Occasionally, however, intellectuals use it it in writing […]"). This would make it a dialect (a roofless external dialect) of Serbo-Croatian. For Duličenko (2003: 32), the enthusiast of microlanguages, however, a grammar book printed in Canada in 1968 is reason enough to describe Molise Slavic as a "functionally weak literary microlanguage" ("функционально слабый литературный микроязык"), i.e. as an ausbau language. However, Molise Slavic is by no means a standard variety of Serbo-Croatian, as this would require it to be *highly* similar to the other standard varieties.

[13] My sincere thanks go to Helmut Keipert, who was kind enough to give me copies of the poorly accessible Serbian translations.

ондѣ мѣђь Гоѳима (Готы), а овдѣ мѣђь Хуннима (Хунны) и Булгарима (Бугары), съ коима су често Римско Царство яко узнемиривали, по већой части само као сопутни, помагаюћи или служећи народи […].

*'Illyrian':* Slavenski puki obstiraju veći prostor na zemlîi, nego vu dogodovšćini, a to med ostalim takajše zato, jer su od Rimlîanov daleko živeli. Mi ih poznamo najpervo na Donu, zatim na Dunaju, onde med *Goti*, a ovde med *Huni* i *Bulgari*, s koimi su rimsko carstvo jako uznemiravali, ali vekšinum kakti skupputujući, pomagajući ili služeći puki. [Kursiv im Original]

Of the 55 words in this section, 55% are identical, so that the similarity of the texts according to Ammon can still be described as *high*.[14] Thus, according to Ammon's model and contrary to Brozović (1970: 124), the standard varieties of Serbian and Croatian can already be classified as a common pluricentric language in 1835 due to their high similarity, even though their standardization at that time was still almost completely independent of each other.

Between 1835 and today, there have been phases of convergence and divergence between the standard varieties discussed here, but it can be assumed that the similarity never became less than it was in 1835 and that the differences were never completely eliminated. Thus, at least since 1835, we have been dealing with standard varieties of high similarity—the basic prerequisite for the application of Ammon's model of national varieties is therefore met.

### 3.2 Development of the variety structure over time

Unfortunately, the development of the variety structure prior to 1945 must be excluded here, but it is clear that political terms such as *Illyrian*, *Yugoslav* (cf. 🗋96 Okuka 1998: 19f.), *Serbo-Croato-Slovene* (*srpsko-hrvatsko-slovenački*, cf. Okuka 2000: 66–67), the *Bosnian language* of the Austro-Hungarian administration (cf. Okuka 1998: 54–59) or even Vuk's (1849) *Serbian* for everything Štokavian did not refer to uniform standard varieties.

Yugoslavia's language policy only received a linguistic foundation in socialist Yugoslavia. The 1954 Novi Sad Agreement established that there were two *varijante* (i.e. standard varieties), a western one centered in Zagreb and an eastern one centered in Belgrade. While the agreement only addresses the differences in the representation of **ě* and the two alphabets (cf. its text in Greenberg 2004: 172–174),

[14] By comparing other passages, the texts could be brought closer to the requirement of a translation "as literal as possible", which would certainly increase their similarity even more. For example, the 'Illyrian' translation in other places also uses *narod* instead of *puk* (Danica 1835: 231, 232), *jer* is also found in the Serbian text (Stamatović 1832: 29), etc. Incidentally, it should be noted that some of the differences can be attributed to Kajkavian elements in the 'Illyrian' text, which can hardly be described as Croatian-Serbian differences (e.g. 'Croatian' *živeli* vs. 'Serbian' *živili*), since these isoglosses run differently from the boundary between Serbian and Croatian.

other linguistic literature also and above all deals with lexical differences (cf. Ivić in Brozović & Ivić 1988: 47 [1990: 65]). The term *književni jezik* later came into use as a synonym for *varijanta*, especially in Croatia (cf. Brozović in Brozović & Ivić 1988: 103 [1990: 88], Brozović 1992: 359). A "polarization" was assumed, according to which the two varieties "overlap" (Brozović 1970: 36) or "neutralize" each other (which is criticized by Janković 1982) in the areas between Belgrade and Zagreb (especially in Bosnia and Montenegro).[15] This description is typical of *regional standard varieties* that have a center and a periphery. It can be assumed that this bipolar structure was inherited from the period before 1945 and that the lack of independence of the varieties of Bosnia and Montenegro can be explained by the centralism of the First Yugoslavia.

Since the 1960s, however, voices were raised calling for the recognition of the language used in the Bosnian and Montenegrin republics as the third and fourth *varijanta* (Hraste 1965, Isaković [1970] 1998), but most Serbian and Croatian linguists adhered to the bipolarity of Serbo-Croatian. Instead, they spoke of *bosansko-hercegovački* or *crnogorski književnojezični izraz* ('literary-language expression', Brozović in Brozović & Ivić 1988: 102f. [1990: 88], also *standardnojezička upotreba* 'standard-language usage', Janković 1982: 849), sometimes also *subvarijanta*, etc. (cf. Isaković 1998 [1970]: 241). This difference in terminology meant a certain degree of unequal treatment, which was reflected, among other things, in the fact that no separate internal codes (dictionaries, grammars) were developed for Bosnia and Montenegro. In this respect, *varijanta* can be translated into Ammon's terminology as 'standard variety of a full center' and *književnojezični izraz* or *subvarijanta* as 'standard variety of a semi-center'.

With the recognition of specific standard varieties for each of the four Yugoslav republics, they were each given areas of validity with clearly defined borders, thus changing from *regional* to *(sub)state* varieties "on a 'republican level'" ("na 'republičkom nivou'", Isaković 1998 [1970]: 245). (For the varieties of such federal 'states within a state' with great cultural autonomy, a new term would have to be added to 97 Ammon's model.) In this case, too, it can be assumed that this change had already been taking place gradually and did not only occur at the moment when science and politics recognized it.

The development of the variety structure between 1945 and 1995 proceeded so rapidly that the next stage of development was initiated almost simultaneously with the one just described. The much-praised "Declaration on the name and

[15] This overlap and the emphasis on the equality of both *varijante* sometimes led to surprising results. For example, in 1972, a Sarajevo edition of the *Matica* spelling rules of 1960 was published under the title *Pravopisni priručnik srpskohrvatskoga/hrvatskosrpskoga jezika* 'Spelling guide of the Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian language', in which the chapters (which had been specially reduced from 17 to the even number 16 for this purpose) were printed alternately in Cyrillic and Latin script (cf. Brborić 2000 [1972]: 45).

status of the Croatian literary language" ("Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika") of 13 March 1967 is often misunderstood in this regard. It did not claim that Croatian was an independent language (as the incorrectly abbreviated title of the 1991 new edition, *Deklaracija o hrvatskome jeziku*, suggests); rather, the term *književni jezik* is used throughout the text, which, as mentioned, can be translated as 'standard variety'. It is merely a question of the naming and use of this variety: instead of *zapadna varijanta* 'western variant' or even *hrvatskosrpska varijanta hrvatskosrpskoga/srpskohrvatskoga jezika* 'Croato-Serbian variant of the Croato-Serbian/Serbo-Croatian language', the signatories now wanted to call their standard variety *hrvatski književni jezik* 'Croatian literary language' (scil. *hrvatskosrpskoga jezika* 'of the Croato-Serbian language'), and they demanded that texts intended for Croatia be written in this variety.[16]

While these demands should actually be self-evident, the significance of the *Deklaracija* only becomes apparent in the reaction of Serbian writers in the *Predlog za razmišljanje* of March 19. They now demanded that "also all Croats living in the territory of the SR Serbia and all Serbs living in the territory of the SR Croatia" ("и свим Хрватима који живе на територији СР Србије и свим Србима који живе на територији СР Хрватске", Grupa članova UKS 2000 [1967]: 17) be granted the right to media and school instruction "in their language and script" ("на свом језику и писму", ibid.), which had not been the case previously (cf. Katičić 1984: 295).[17] This meant that the standard varieties were individualized for the first time, i.e. they were no longer tied to the borders of the republic in which a speaker lived, but to their nationality. To the extent that this demand was implemented, the (sub)state varieties of Bosnia, Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia became the *national* varieties of the Bosniaks, Croats, Montenegrins, and Serbs.

This process (which has already been outlined by Šipka 2003: 277) could be described as the *nationalization* of the Serbo-Croatian standard varieties, and its significance can hardly be overestimated. (Compare that during the Cold War, East German and West German each had their own internal codifications, which means that they were full centers, but only *state* varieties, whereas Austrian and Swiss German are *national* varieties.) Here, varieties previously determined by republic borders and state institutions were placed in the hands of individuals, and people

[16] The final trigger for this demand was the publication of the conclusions of the 5th Congress of the League of Composers (sic—not Communists!) of Yugoslavia in the Serbian variety, Slovene, and Macedonian only (Deklaracija 1991 [1967]: 9).

[17] Even the renaming of the official language in the Croatian constitution of 1974 apparently did not change this, as the language article clearly stated that Croatian Serbs used the same variety as Croats: "U SR Hrvatskoj u javnoj je upotrebi hrvatski književni jezik – standardni oblik narodnog jezika Hrvata i Srba u Hrvatskoj, koji se naziva hrvatski ili srpski" ("In the SR Croatia, the Croatian literary language is in public use—the standard form of the national language of Croats and Serbs in Croatia, which is called Croatian or Serbian"; cf. also Okuka 2000: 68f.).

felt this qualitative difference very clearly and put it into words 🗋98 by saying that their language had become 'independent' and had 'split off' from Serbo-Croatian. However, since this process—despite all purist neologisms *(tuđmanice)* and all "language censorship" ("Sprachzensur", Kordić 2004b)—was not characterized by any significant change in the substance of the language, these descriptions are inaccurate from a linguistic point of view. What began in 1967 and ended in Croatia with the 1990 constitution, which made the Croatian standard variety the official language but allowed for other "languages" and the Cyrillic script at the local level, was the elevation of this (sub)state variety to a *national* variety. In Bosnia, the authors of the 1993 constitution still assumed a uniform state variety, which, according to a law of 29 August 1993, could be called *Bosnian*, *Croatian*, or *Serbian* (Gröschel 2003: 162), and it was only the Dayton Constitution of 1995 (written in English in the original), which contains no provision on the state language but was practically translated into three different varieties, that completed the individualization and nationalization of the standard varieties. In Montenegro, it is still unclear whether nationalization has really been completed. Regardless of the renaming of the national language to *Montenegrin* in the Constitution of 19 October 2007 (which, like the *Deklaracija* of 1967, is 'only' a question of naming), I am not yet sure whether the 32% Serbs in Montenegro use a different standard variety from the 43% Montenegrins. Nikčević's orthography (1997), which actually prescribes a significant difference from the Serbian standard varieties of Serbia and Bosnia and would therefore probably not be accepted by Montenegrin Serbs, has apparently not been able to gain acceptance so far, and, conversely, Montenegrin Serbs seem to continue to use the Ijekavian standard of Montenegro, which they share with their ethnic Montenegrin neighbors. In this respect, Montenegrin should perhaps still be classified as the 'state variety of the Montenegrin nation state' for the time being and not yet as a *national* variety.

Since the settlement areas of the four nations have different borders than the four now independent republics, nationalization has given rise to complex variety structures: In addition to the full center of Croatia, the Croatian national variety includes Burgenland Croatian, Bosnian Croatian, and possibly Vojvodina Croatian as further state varieties; the Serbian national variety comprises the state varieties of Serbia ("srbijanski", Radovanović 2003: 238) and Bosnia, as well as possibly Montenegro (see above), Croatia (Krajina and Slavonia), and soon perhaps also Kosovo; and even the Bosnian national variety has state varieties outside Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Serbian and Montenegrin Sandžak (as well as in Croatia, cf. Halilović 1998: 19). In some of the cases mentioned, it would of course be necessary to examine more closely whether these are really independent varieties, but for the time being we can assume that they are, since according to Ammon (1995: 45; cf. also 64f.), "even the smallest linguistic differences" ("schon kleinste linguistische Unterschiede") are sufficient for this.

At the same time, Bosnia and Montenegro have risen from semi-centers to full centers in some respects, with the publication of prescriptive grammars and thus the beginnings of internal codifications. However, there are still no normative monolingual dictionaries, Bosnian grammars sometimes contradict each other considerably (cf. Lehfeldt 2003), and the standard set by Nikčević's (2001) Montenegrin grammar is followed by almost no one, so 🗋99 that Ammon's classification would have to be further differentiated here in order to more accurately represent the status of Bosnia and Montenegro as 'three-quarter centers'.

Whether the described nationalization of the Serbo-Croatian standard varieties was a renationalization depends on whether the language forms used in the 19th century, for example by Ljudevit Gaj and Vuk Karadžić, were *national* varieties (which would then have been regionalized later) or perhaps rather regional or (sub)state varieties. In my opinion, there is some evidence to suggest that this was the case, i.e. that the chosen form of linguistic expression in the 19th century did not only depend on the area in which one lived, but that, for example, within Slavonia, Bosnia, or Krajina, Catholics and Orthodox Christians, even if they spoke the same dialect, used different standard varieties that, due to their religious affiliations, differed not only in their alphabets but also lexically and structurally. But then again, in the case of three of the four peoples it is at least questionable whether they can be described as fully developed nations in the 19th century. However, this question would require a detailed investigation that cannot be carried out within this framework.

## 4. Conclusion

The most important conclusion to be drawn is that, although no actual 'language division' took place around 1990, what happened was more than just a change in metalinguistic discourse or the creation of mere 'political languages' (since the national varieties undoubtedly also exist outside politics): the standard varieties of the four peoples were *nationalized*.

As stated in the introduction, it is by no means the aim of this article to use Ammon's terminology to demand that only the pluricentric totality of the varieties discussed should be referred to as *language*. In everyday life, there is no reason not to use the word *language* in all shades of its rich polysemy and therefore, just as one speaks of the *language of music*, the *language of bees*, *colloquial language*, *programming languages*, etc., one can also refer to Bosnian as a language or to Serbo-Croatian, depending on the context. In this sense, the *bon mot* attributed to Mark Twain (about England and America) and Karl Kraus (about Germany and Austria), among others, can of course also be applied (cf. Hägi 2006: 17): Bosniaks, Croats, Montenegrins, and Serbs are four nations divided by their common language.

In linguistics, however, the polysemous word *language* must either be converted into a clearly defined term, or it must be avoided in the same way as the word

*word*, which is also replaced by terms such as *lexeme*, *word form*, *word position*, *orthographic word*, *phonetic word*, etc. What is important is that the same terms are used for the same things, and different terms for different things. Therefore, for example, the Croatian national standard variety and the abstract English language unit that overarches American, British, and Australian English cannot be referred to with the same term; and if a term that deviates from international usage is introduced, like Brozović's (1970: 66) *diasystem* (cf. Mønnesland 2003), this term must also be applied consistently to German, English, French, etc.

Politics is not affected by the terminological requirements of linguistics, and so each country is free to name its official language 100 as it wishes, and of course each country can also demand that laws, treaties, EU regulations, etc. be drafted in its respective national variety, as Austria has demonstrated. However, linguistics could help explain to politicians what this means and that a national variety is much, much more than a list of words.

## References


Alexander, Ronelle. 2002/03. Bosnien, Croatian, Serbian: One language or three? *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 44/45. 1–35.

Ammon, Ulrich. 1995. *Die deutsche Sprache in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz: Das Problem der nationalen Varietäten.* Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

Auburger, Leopold. 1999. *Die kroatische Sprache und der Serbokroatismus.* Ulm (Donau): Hess.

Back, Otto & Fussy, Herberg (eds.). 2006. *Österreichisches Wörterbuch.* 40th edn. Wien: öbv, hpt. [1st edn. 1951.]

Brborić, Branislav. 2000. Šta novo donosi bosanski pravopis? In idem, *O jezičkom raskolu (Sociolingvistički ogledi I)*, 45–47. Beograd, Novi Sad: CPL, Prometej. [First published in *Front* 23(49) (748) of 8 Dec 1972, 35.]

Breu, Walter. 1998. Das Moliseslavische. In Rehder, Peter (ed.), *Einführung in die slavischen Sprachen (mit einer Einführung in die Balkanphilologie)*, 3rd edn., 274–278. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Brozović, Dalibor. 1970. *Standardni jezik: Teorija, usporedbe, geneza, povijest, suvremena zbilja.* Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska.

Brozović, Dalibor. 1992. Serbo-Croatian as a pluricentric language. In Clyne, Michael (ed.), *Pluricentric languages: Differing norms in different nations*, 347–380. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

Brozović, Dalibor & Pavle Ivić. 1988 [1990]. *Jezik, srpskohrvatski/hrvatskosrpski, hrvatski ili srpski.* Zagreb: Jugoslavenski Leksikografski Zavod Miroslav Krleža. [Main publication 1990 in *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, 2nd edn., vol. 6, 48–94. Zagreb: Jugoslavenski Leksikografski Zavod Miroslav Krleža.]

Bugarski, Ranko. 2000. Serbo-Croatian: How many languages? In Kunzmann-Müller, Barbara (ed.), *Die Sprachen Südosteuropas heute: Umbrüche und Aufbruch*, 192–199. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Clyne, Michael (ed.). 1992. *Pluricentric languages: Differing norms in different nations.* Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

Danica 1835 = Slavenski puki (iz Herdera, Bečkoga izdanja). *Danica Horvatska, Slavonska i Dalmatinska* 1(33) (22 Aug 1835). 231–232. [Reprint in *Danica ilirska* (ed. by Ivo Frangeš and Mladen Kuzmanović), vol. 1, Zagreb: Liber 1970.]

[Davidović, Dimitrije.] 1816. Istoria Slavjana (G. Herderom). *Zabavnik* 1816. 248–254.

Deklaracija 1991 = *Deklaracija o hrvatskome jeziku: s prilozima i Deset teza.* (Ed. by Stjepan Babić, Dalibor Brozović and Josip Pavičić.) Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska. [First published in *Telegram*, 17 Mar 1967. 1.]

Duličenko, Aleksandr D. 2003. *Slavjanskie literaturnye mikrojazyki: Obrazcy tekstov.* Vol. 1. Tartu: Izdatel'stvo Tartuskogo universiteta.

European Union. 1995. *Documents concerning the accession of the Republic of Austria, the Republic of Finland and the Kingdom of Sweden to the European Union.* Vol. 2. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Greenberg, Robert D. 2004. *Language and identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and its disintegration.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gröschel, Bernhard. 2003. Postjugoslavische Amtssprachenregelungen – Soziolinguistische Argumente gegen die Einheitlichkeit des Serbokroatischen? *Srpski jezik* 8(1/2). 135–196.

Grupa članova UKS. 2000. Predlog za razmišljanje [povodom hrvatske jezičke deklaracije]. In Brborić, Branislav, *O jezičkom raskolu (Sociolingvistički ogledi I)*, 16–17. Beograd, Novi Sad: CPL, Prometej. [First published in the Zagreb edition of *Borba* 32(90) of 2 Apr 1967.]

Hägi, Sara. 2006. *Nationale Varietäten im Unterricht Deutsch als Fremdsprache.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Halilović, Senahid. 1998. *Bosanski jezik*. 2nd edn. Sarajevo: Baština.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. 1791. Slavische Völker. In idem, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit.* Vol. 4, chapter 16.4. Riga, Leipzig: Hartknoch. [Editions: *Sämmtliche Werke*, vol. 14, Berlin: Weidmann 1909, 277–280; *Herders Werke in fünf Bänden*, vol. 4, Berlin, Weimar: Aufbau 1964, 392–394.]

Hraste, Mate. 1965. O trećoj varijanti hrvatskosrpskog književnog jezika. *Jezik* 13(4). 106–113.

Isaković, Alija. 1998. Varijante na popravnom ispitu. In Halilović, Senahid, *Bosanski jezik*, 2nd edn., 241–258. Sarajevo: Baština. [Originally published in *Život* 19(11–12), 54–71.]

Janković, Srđan. 1982. Distinktivni pokazatelji standardnojezičke varijantnosti. *Naše teme* 26(5). 841–851.

Katičić, Radoslav. 1984. The making of Standard Serbo-Croat. In Picchio, Riccardo & Goldblatt, Harvey (eds.), *Aspects of the Slavonic language question*, 261–295. New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies.

Katičić, Radoslav. 1997. Undoing a "unified language": Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian. In Clyne, Michael (ed.), *Undoing and redoing corpus planning*, 165–191. Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

Keipert, Helmut. 2000. Herders „Slaven-Kapitel" in der „Danica Horvatska, Slavonska i Dalmatinska" (1835). In Jekutsch, Ulrike & Kroll, Walter (eds.), *Slavische Literaturen im Dialog: Festschrift für Reinhard Lauer zum 65. Geburtstag*, 129–140. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kloss, Heinz. 1952. *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen von 1800 bis 1950.* München.

König, Werner. 2005. *dtv-Atlas Deutsche Sprache.* 15th edn. München: dtv. [1st edn. 1978.]

Kordić, Snježana. 2004a. Pro und kontra: „Serbokroatisch" heute. In Krause, Marion & Sappok, Christian (eds.), *Slavistische Linguistik 2002: Referate des XXVIII. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens, Bochum, 10. 9.–12. 9. 2002*, 97–148. München: Sagner.

Kordić, Snježana. 2004b. Die aktuelle Sprachzensur in Kroatien. In: Symanzik, Bernhard & Birkfellner, Gerhard & Sproede, Alfred (eds.), *Sprache · Literatur · Politik: Ost- und Südosteuropa im Wandel*, 259–272. Hamburg: Dr. Kovač.

Lehfeldt, Werner. 2003. O stanju kodifikacije bosanskoga jezika. *Wiener slawistischer Almanach,* Sonderband 57. 147–151.

Lehfeldt, Werner. 1999. Zur gegenwärtigen Situation des Bosnischen. *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 45. 83–90.

Manifest 2004 = [Henisch, Peter & Hintze, Christian Ide & Muhr, Rudolf & Schindel, Robert & Streeruwitz, Marlene.] „Österreichisch" als eigene Sprache! Keine „deutsche" Rechtschreibreform mehr! Besondere Beachtung des europäischen Kontextes! *Der Standard* 14./15.08.2004, 31. https://archiv.sfd.at/sprache/ (last checked 22 Mar 2026).

Markhardt, Heidemarie. 2006. 10 Jahre „Austriazismenprotokoll" in der EU: Wirkung und Nichtwirkung – Chancen und Herausforderungen. In Muhr, Rudolf & Sellner, Manfred B. (eds.), *Zehn Jahre Forschung zum Österreichischen Deutsch: 1995–2005; Eine Bilanz*, 11–38. Wien, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Mønnesland, Svein. 2003. O pojmu "dijasistem". *Wiener slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 57. 153–160.

Nikčević, Vojislav. 1997. *Pravopis crnogorskog jezika.* Cetinje: Crnogorski PEN Centar.

Nikčević, Vojislav. 2001. *Gramatika crnogorskog jezika.* Podgorica: Dukljanska Akademija Nauka i Umjetnosti.

Okuka, Miloš. 1998. *Eine Sprache – viele Erben: Sprachpolitik als Nationalisierungsinstrument in Ex-Jugoslavien.* Klagenfurt: Wieser.

Okuka, Miloš. 2000. Jezik u ustavima triju Jugoslavija, Hrvatske i Bosne i Hercegovine. *Riječ* 6(1/2). 66–76.

Pranjković, Ivo. 2006. Hrvatski i srpski su jedan jezik [razgovarala Vesna Laušić]. *Slobodna Dalmacija* 7 Feb 2006. https://web.archive.org/web/20090318214353/http://arhiv.slobodnadalmacija.hr/20060207/kultura01.asp (last checked 22 Mar 2026).

Radovanović, Milorad. 2003. Srpski jezik na početku milenijuma: Inventar eksternih i internih pitanja. *Wiener slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 57. 233–243.

Rehder, Peter. 1998. Das Serbokroatische. In idem (ed.), *Einführung in die slavischen Sprachen (mit einer Einführung in die Balkanphilologie)*, 3rd edn., 300–309. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Silić, Josip. 1996. Hrvatski jezik kao sustav i kao standard. In Turk, Marija (ed.), *Riječki filološki dani: Zbornik radova s Međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa*, vol. 1, 187–194. Rijeka: Pedagoški fakultet.

Šipka, Milan. 2003. Jezik Bošnjaka, Hrvata, Srba i Crnogoraca – problem klasifikacije i nominacije idioma. *Wiener slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 57. 255–282.

Stamatović, Pavle. 1832. Slavenski narodi. *Serbskïj lětopis, nastavlěn Ġeodorom Pavlovičem* 8(3) (30). 27–31.

Sučić, Robert. 2005. "… mir ljudem … ki su dobre volje!". *Glasilo Hrvatskoga kulturnoga društva u Gradišću* 2007(6). 1.

Thomas, Paul-Louis. 1994. Serbo-croate, serbe, croate…, bosniaque, monténégrin: Une, deux…, trois, quatre langues? *Revue des études slaves* 66(1). 237–259.

Vuk Stefanović Karadžić. 1849. Srbi svi i svuda. In idem, *Kovčežić za istoriju, jezik i običaje Srba sva tri zakona*, 1–27. Beč: Štamparija Jermenskoga manastira. [Reprinted in *Sabrana dela*, vol. 17, 31–48. Beograd: Prosveta 1972.]