

IMPACT OF NATIONALISM ON LANGUAGE-NAMING PRACTICES IN 19TH CENTURY CROATIA

NIKOLA ZEČEVIĆ

Abstract

This paper analyses the impact of nationalism on linguistic identity and linguistic standpoints in Croatia, in the 19th century. Its goal is not to deny or negate any linguistic idiom, but to deconstruct, through comparative quoting of prominent writers, linguists and politicians their multiple perception of linguistic identity in former Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia. It will also contextualize that period with the phenomenon of the modern (re)naming of Serbo-Croatian language, in particular naming of its four separate standardized variants.

Keywords: *Serbo-Croatian language, Illyrian language, Croatian language, Dalmatian language, Nationalism.*

Abstrakt

Práca sa zaoberá analýzou vplyvu nacionalizmu na jazykovú identitu a jazykové hľadiská v Chorvátsku v 19. storočí. Jej cieľ nie je popierať alebo negovať akýkoľvek jazykový idióm, ale aby komparáciou citácií popredných spisovateľov, lingvistov a politikov, rozloží ich vnímanie a mnohostrannosť jazykovej identity vo vtedajšom Chorvátsku, Slavónii a Dalmácii. Práca tiež uvedie do súvislosti vtedajšie časy s javom moderného (pre)menovania Srbsko-chorvátskeho jazyka, konkrétne samostatné pomenovanie jeho štyroch štandardizovaných variant.

Kľúčové slová: *srbochorvátčina, ilýrčina, chorvátčina, dalmatínčina, nacionalizmus.*

Introduction

The Serbo-Croatian¹ was the language predominantly used in the former Yugoslavia (1945 – 1991). It was the official language in four of the six federal states: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia², while the other two federal states (Macedonia, Slovenia) had their own national languages: Slovenian and Macedonian. Serbo-Croatian language was created on the basis of the *Vienna Literary Agreement* (28 March 1850) and the *Novi Sad Agreement* (10 December 1954).

So long as the *Vienna agreement* was in force, the *two-part name* of the language was not mentioned, but it was agreed that all South Slavs must have a common language. The signatories of the agreement, among others, were Vuk Stefanović Karadžić from Serbia, Ivan Mažuranić from Croatia and Franc Miklošič from Slovenia. Later, the Slovenian language has been left out of this standardization, because of its disparity, although the official language of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1918 – 1945) formally was called Serbo-Croato-Slovenian³. In socialist Yugoslavia, the Serbo-Croatian language was spoken by 73% of the population, so we can say that this language functioned as an unofficial *lingua franca*.

¹ Terms: a) Serbo-Croatian, b) Croato-Serbian, c) Serbian or Croatian, d) Croatian or Serbian, were used equally.

² In the Serbian autonomous provinces Vojvodina and Kosovo, minority languages (such as Hungarian or Albanian) were in official use.

³ Although the Slovenian language differs from Serbo-Croatian, the official state ideology in Kingdom of Yugoslavia insisted on the idea that Serbs, Croats and Slovenes are “three tribes of one Yugoslav nation”.

The Novi Sad Agreement provided that „the national language of Serbs, Croats and Montenegrins⁴ is single language” – Serbo-Croatian (Croato-Serbian), and that „officially, within the name of the language it is always necessary to emphasize both of its component parts (Croatian and Serbian)”. This language had two equal alphabets: Latin and Cyrillic; three pronunciations: Ekavian, Ijekavian and Ikavian; and three dialects: Štokavian, Kajkavian and Čakavian. After the breakup of Yugoslavia (1991 – 1995), there was a break-up of the Serbo-Croatian language, on whose ruins arose Serbian, Croatian⁵, Bosnian and Montenegrin language.

However, despite the different names of these standards, we can certainly say that there has not been any essential differentiation⁶ between them, so it comes to one polycentric language, with four different names. In this sense, Bernahrd Gröschel states „In addition, the constitutional declarations of some idiom as official language and constitutionally fixing of its name do not have sociolinguistic character, but political (...) Since the constitutional declaration of the official language is managed by non-scientific motives, it does not affect the sociolinguistics” (Kordić, 2010, p. 110).

Premodern naming of the language in Croatia

In the context of the naming the language in Croatia in the premodern times, it is best to quote the Croatian linguist Snježana Kordić: „The name *Croatian language* since 17th century until the middle of the 19th century was limited to Kajkavian (dialect), and thus opposed to the Štokavian and to the name *Slavonian language*, which was marked as Štokavian. Thus, for example, Reljković in his grammar *Nova slavonska i nimacska gramatika* (New Slavonic and German Grammar) from 1767 puts Slavonian language different from Croatian, (and) Dalmatian (...) He names his Štokavian as *Slavonian*, while he describes the for him foreign Kajkavian as *Croatian*. It was not an individual case, but common practice. (...)

There are number of confirmations that in the first half of the 19th century Slavonian still meant Štokavian, and Croatian meant Kajkavian, eg. in 1831 it was translated from the Štokavian to Kajkavian, under the title »Iz Szlavonzkoga na Horvatzki Jezik« (...). For example, Illyrian⁷ D. Rakovac in 1842, in *Mali katekizam za velike ljude* (Small Catechism for Great People) answers the question why they are called Illyrians rather than Croats, and for him that was because „literature is meant to extend to the rest of our brothers by blood and language namely: Slavonians, Dalmatians, Serbs, Carniolians, and all of south-western Slavs. Under the name Croatian it cannot stretch, because each of these would have claimed the right to name language and literature by its own” (Kordić, 2010, p. 272).

These are certainly not the only examples. Fausto Vrančić (Fausto Veranzio) from Šibenik had issued in 1595, in Venice, his five-language dictionary *Dictionarium quique nobilissimarum Europae linguarum, Latinae, Italicae, Germanicae, Damaticae et Ungaricae*, in which he names Čakavian dialect as Dalmatian language (Verenzio, 1595, p. 135).

Bartol Kašić from Pag, a Jesuit, in his dictionary *Razlika skladanja slovinska*, which was published in 1599, does not name his language as Croatian, but Slavic language („jezik slovinski”) or *lingua illyrica*, and *Bosnian, Dalmatian* or *Dubrovnik language* (Horvat, 1993, p.

⁴ Bosniaks at the time were still not recognized as a separate nation. They will be recognized under the national name *Muslims* in 1968, while in 1993 they declared the official national name – *Bosniaks*.

⁵ Cyrillic alphabet was put out from Croatian language as equal.

⁶ All attempts of linguistic purism, archaization of language and introduction of new letters minimally affected the criterion of mutual intelligibility.

⁷ The Illyrian Movement considered South Slavic population in the Balkans as descendants of the old Balkan Illyrians (inspired by the ideas of Slovakian ideologist of Pan-Slavism Ján Kollár).

17) Kašić also states in one letter from 1633 that the term *Illyrian provinces* refers to Istria, Croatia, Dalmatia, Bosnia, Ragusa, Herzegovina, Serbia, Slavonia and Sylvania. (Kordić, 2010, p. 269). At the same time, the Franciscan Provincial Franjo Glavinić (1585 – 1652) advocated for printing liturgical books in a language which must be universal, and for him it was *Bosnian* (Horvat, 1993, p. 12).⁸

It is interesting to mention one anthropological standpoint from 1870, published in *Slovenski Sviat*, in Zagreb: „By Yugoslavs, Slavic consciousness was related with our name. The language in which liturgical books were originally translated and which became the language of church and literature of the most Slavic people was called before and is called even today „Slavic language”⁹ („jezik slovjenski”).”

In the same publication there is a Faustin Vrančić's viewpoint that a language of Croats and Serbs is „Dalmatian, Croatian, Serbian or Bosnian, which is all the same”¹⁰, or Adam Bohorič's separate allegation of Croatian and Dalmatian language, and Peter Loderecker's notion of Dalmatian language in his dictionary from 1605.¹¹ It is important to say that citizens of Dubrovnik (Ragusa), from the end of the 15th century until the late 18th century, called their own language *lingua seruiana* (Kordić, 2010, p. 273).

All these examples are not implying that today the term *Croatian language* is anyhow disputable. However, they certainly suggest that the naming of languages, not only in today's Croatia, was articulated by nationalist (political) reasons, and not by scientific and linguistic ones. Premodern people of this area have had a multi-layered identity: local, regional, religious, etc.; and those identities were changing and mutating, depending on political trends.

Different language-naming: Illyrian, Slavic, Croatian, Dalmatian, Bosnian...

Vjekoslav Babukić in his grammar from 1836, while wishing that his Štokavian grammar would be widely accepted, in the chapter on phonetics said: „We *Illyrians* (Serbs, Croats, Slavonians, Bosnians, Montenegrins, Herzegovinians, Dalmatians, Dubrovnikans, Bulgarians, Istrians, Styrians, Carniolians and Carinthians) have 29 letters...” (Kordić, 2010: 73) Then Ljudevit Gaj in 1839 notes: „The true natives so far could see that we do not make any difference, regarding the brotherly love between Croats, Serbs, Wends, Slavonians, Dalmatians, Bosniaks etc., but to invite all together in one Illyrian wheel” (Kordić, 2010, p. 266).

In newspaper *Danica Ilirska* from 1841, which was published in Zagreb and edited by Ljudevit Gaj, in a short article *Slavic languages* it is said: „Illyrian language (Serbian, Croatian, Carniolian, Dalmatian) is the language of the poetry”¹² while in a figurative travelogue from the following year, Croats and Dalmatians were clearly separated, specifically with the notion of Croatian-Dalmatian or just Dalmatian language: „*The island of Pag has twofold residents: the north side, with the town of Pag is inhabited by Croats, while Dalmatians live in the south. The first are Čakavian, second Štokavians. (...) The other day we were in Zadar: quite a nice town, but very, very Italianized, only the villagers, who are seen there, are speaking Dalmatian and they call themselves »Italians«! Illyrian language is taught in seminaries, but poor (...) The famous person for us in Zadar was Kuzmanić, professor (...) he knows very well Dalmatian language, and he is working on the dictionary, in which he will put only people's words. (...) From Zadar I went to the island of Ugljan. Residents here are still somewhere considered as Croats, but their language is not Croatian.*”¹³ And the following was written about Dubrovnik:

⁸ The universality of the Bosnian speech, according to Glavinić, lays in its overall intelligibility in most parts of South Slavic (Croatian) Catholic world.

⁹ Slovenski sviat, Nakladom Lav. Hartmána knjižara, Zagreb, 1870, p. 54.

¹⁰ Ibidem, p. 55.

¹¹ Ibidem, p. 53.

¹² Danica Ilirska (newspaper), *Slavjanski jezici*, vol. 34, Zagreb, 1841, p. 4.

¹³ ILIRSKA, D. *Ulomak još jednoga Sreznjevskova dopisa*, vol. 21, Zagreb, 1842, p. 3.

„After we took a rest for several hours in Cavtat, we went the same night with the boat to Dubrovnik. (...) In particular, you can hear three languages here: Dalmatian, Italian and French; every educated person speaks all three with distinction; and ordinary people yet more Dalmatian, than Italian.”¹⁴

Newspaper *Zora Dalmatinska* has published in 1847 Antolić's *Abecedar za dètcu (za naučiti se hervatski čitati polag novog pravopisa)*¹⁵ (Alphabet for Children (to learn to read Croatian for disposition of new orthography)). Soon after, Šime Starčević¹⁶ harshly attacked Croatian Illyrians: „Mr. Vjekoslav Babukić truly holds and defends horned Zagreb orthography (...) (but) he does not, and cannot have any reason to defend crazy and reckless introduction of eyesore letters ć, č, ě, š, ž. (...) As for Mr. Kaznačić, and Mr. Valentić, we know that they wanted to issue *Zora* with Zagreb orthography, but they had to quickly retreat, because they were in fact contrary to the most educated Dalmatians. (...) Dalmatians have their own, pure Dalmatian-Illyrian language (...) It would be therefore polite to advise Croats Sutlosavodravians, to join Dalmatians, if they want to speak real Illyrian. (...) Would it not therefore be a much politer for Smart Croats and smart Slavonians to reject any arrogance, and to join pure orthography of *Zora Dalmatinska*...”¹⁷

On the other hand, Ignatije Al. Berlić wrote an article in *Zora Dalmatinska*, regarding menace of *people's language* in Dubrovnik by Croatian language policy: „That's how our new writers behave, they want to correct language, or to destroy it and spoil it!! - As it seems, they have taken old Dubrovnikans for experiment, or maybe Croatian language? (...) In fact they do not respect neither our closest brothers Serbs, with which we have to agree and connect in the literature, sooner or later, because in the Serbian books you will not find such anti-linguistic gross errors (...) Hey people, hey brothers! Take Vuk's grammar, it is not written only from the mouth of the people in Serbia, Herzegovina, Banat, Syrmia and Montenegro, but still every word, every case, and everything else is lifted and lined from people's songs and books, so what do you want more?”¹⁸

One year later, in the same newspaper Matija Ban in his article *Domovini mojoj* (To my Homeland), while advocating the unification of Dalmatia with Croatia and Slavonia, notes: „I have defended in all places and from everybody the honour of our Dalmatian name, and I am defending it right now; here from the Dalmatian land, from the country of my brothers, I say to the whole Yugoslav world that entire Dalmatian people never trampled their own nationality, nor it ever will. (...) It would be a betrayal, it would be the last folly, would be the largest shame, what centuries would never wash, but what could never tarnish the true Dalmatian. I say *true Dalmatian*, because true Dalmatians are not those people who do not even want to know our own mother tongue. (...) I am just asking, whose representatives can be considered as a natural and legitimate deputies of Dalmatian people; those who will require in Dalmatia Dalmatian language and national alliance with the brothers (...); or others that will require in

¹⁴ ILIRSKA, D. *Ulomak još jednoga Sreznjevskova dopisa*, vol. 22, Zagreb, 1842, p. 2 – 3.

¹⁵ *Dalmatinska Zora* (newspaper), vol. 11, Zadar, 1847, p. 1 – 4.

¹⁶ Šime Starčević (1784 – 1859) – priest and linguist from Lika, uncle of famous Croatian politician and writer Ante Starčević. In: *Zora Dalmatinska* from 1847 we can find a proper eulogy to Šime Starčević by Franjo Turić Ličanin: „From our great native priest Mr. Šime Starčević, who is doing everything to support and raise our country to the level of rejoicing, I received volumes of *Zora* from this year (...) I can not guess why our people are so careless about *Zora*. Well Dalmatian language is our language too. Lika and Dalmatia are two twin sisters.” (source: Turić, Franjo, *Slavno uredništvo*, in: *Zora Dalmatinska*, vol. 4, Zadar, 1847, p. 1.)

¹⁷ STARČEVIĆ, Š. 1847. Priateljska opomena. In: *Zora Dalmatinska*, vol. 17, p. 1 – 3.

¹⁸ BERLIĆ, I. 1847. O izobrazenju i knjixenstvu. In: *Zora Dalmatinska*, vol. 20, p. 2 – 3.

Dalmatia Italian language...”¹⁹ However, as Ivo Banac said, although Matija Ban presented himself as a Slav from Dubrovnik, he was greatly influenced by what Banac defined as *linguistic Serbianism* (referring his poetic greeting to *mother Serbia*, from 1844) (Banac, 1983, p. 459).

During 1849 Ante Kuzmanić, editor of *Zora Dalmatinska*, publishes articles with escalation of convictions towards national separatism in Dalmatia: „But foreign boyarship after realizing that the scope of *Italianism* wasn't helpful, invented *Dalmatianism* to separate us (...) from our oldest brothers, like there behind Velebit everything is woof; like that Dalmatians are some particular nation in the world, without knowing that in Bosnia, Hercegovina, Serbia, Banat, Slavonia, etc. people are singing and talking in the same way like those here at Kolar, and through the other Dalmatian krajinas. (...) This sermon of mine, all the way is related to the basis of our society, to our Croatian nationality, which could not have two languages (...). We hold firmly to our brothers Croats; their merits are great (...); their heritage, it should be our heritage too.”²⁰

In this context, we can say that *Zora Dalmatinska* or its editorial staff, acted from Croatian national positions, which however did not have an anti-Serb subtext (on the contrary). It was further seen in Kuzmanić's articles („Serbs our brothers”), but also in epistle of *Lička pastirica* (Shepherdess from Lika, again pseudonym of Šime Starčević) – *From the Serbs*, in which Starčević disputes the etymological derivation of the word *Serb* from Latini Servus, Serbula, Servii (serves), and insists on their Illyrian origin.²¹

It is interesting to mention the writing of Josip Grubišić and his essay *Protresanje* (Shake) about *Croato-Dalmatians*: „Our brothers from upper Croatia overtook us with their order in people's literature, courage, in the patriotism, and we Dalmatians cannot do anything else but to honour our older brothers Croats, who are inspiring us with such nobility of courage and patriotism”.²² In one of the next issues Grubišić published article *Opomena mojim zemljacima* (Warning for my Compatriots), in which he expressed the desire for union of Dalmatia and Croatia, but he also says: „Dalmatian nation does not have to give up its own nationality, and in defiance to all Italian converts, and German converts, has to be worshiped as one, and not the last, glorious branches of the wide Slavic tree.”²³

The construction *Dalmatian nation* was not the only one which was mentioned in that time. In 1848 Croats and Slavonians, or „Croato-Slavonians” have made demand for binominal Croato-Slavonian nation, which included Orthodox Christians too, because „52 of 105 present MPs, all traders, intellectuals and military frontiersmen, were of Orthodox religion” (Kordić, 2010, pp. 208, 209).

In the magazine *Bosanski prijatelj* from 1850, which was published in Zagreb and edited by Ivan Franjo Jukić, in the chapter *Bosnian Literature* (subtitle: Writers, who have written in Cyrillic alphabet) states: „In addition Bosnian manuscripts and later printed books were written in pure Illyrian language. This Cyrillic was used, not only by the Bosnian Catholics, but also in Dalmatia, Slavonia and Serbia”.²⁴ Description continues with the list of writers who were using Cyrillic alphabet, especially friar Matija Divković and his writing *Plač blažene djevice Marije* (Cry of Blessed Virgin Mary): „It begins with different prayers, very beautiful, valuable and useful, as much for the monks, so for the secular people; and those prayers were collected and

¹⁹ BAN, M. 1848. Domovini mojoj. In: *Zora Dalmatinska*, vol. 18, p. 2.

²⁰ KUZMANIĆ, A. 1849. Slovo rečeno u Zadru (...). In: *Zora Dalmatinska*, vol. 6, p. 2 – 4.

²¹ Poslanica Ličke pastirice. Od Serblah. In: *Zora Dalmatinska*, vol. 5, 1848, p. 3 – 4.

²² GRUBIŠIĆ, J. 1848. Protresanje. In: *Zora Dalmatinska*, vol. 34, 1848, p. 3.

²³ GRUBIŠIĆ, J. 1848. Opomena mojim zemljacima. In: *Zora Dalmatinska*, vol. 41, p. 3.

²⁴ Književnost bosanska. 1850. In: *Bosanski prijatelj*, vol. 1, Zagreb, p. 26.

translated from Latin language into Bosnian language, with Serbian letters by divine (...) in Venice (1632).”²⁵

However, in the journal *Napredak* from 1873, which was published in Zagreb and was presented as the voice of the *Croatian Teaching and Literary Assembly*, Janko Tomić in his text *Croatian writers*, in the context of the Cyrillic alphabet, says: „Stjepan Matijević translated into Bosnian language *Izповiedaonik* (Rome 1630) and its language is beautiful.” Tomić further interprets the reasons for the publication of similar religious books: „It was a pity small group of Bosniaks, who took a care of salvation for the souls of their faithful, the way that they considered seemly. But although Bosnia needed more religious books, Roman propaganda was not so inflammable in its work, like during the cultivation of Glagolitic; it preferred to publish the writings printed in Latin, which outweighed Cyrillic in Bosnia during 17th and 18th century, with complete overcome in the 19th century.”²⁶

The events in the Dalmatian parliament (Dalmatinski sabor) of that time are worth mentioning. *The Report of the Committee for the equalization of the Italian and Slavic language* was asking from the parliament that „during this session it is necessary to take legal measures to equalize properly Slavo-Dalmatian language with Italian language, equalize it as much in teaching as in criminal and civil jurisdiction” (Spisi Dalmatinskog Pokrajinskog Sabora, 1864, p. 100).

This proposal was further observed by the representative of the municipality of Dubrovnik and Cavtat, Juraj Pulić (January 16, 1863), in which he asks: „Let this Excellent Parliament (...) find and decide (...) that the mother and the national language of Dalmatia, Slavic language (indicated too as Slavo-Dalmatian) (...) is equal with the benevolent guest language of the province, Italian” (Spisi Dalmatinskog Pokrajinskog Sabora, 1864, Ibidem) A year later, however, during a session of the Dalmatian parliament, Pulić requested the introduction of the Croatian language: „Let this Excellent Parliament and the Government of His Majesty recognize: a) exigency to introduce native vernacular Croatian language in auxiliary and smaller classrooms...” (Spisi Dalmatinskog Pokrajinskog Sabora, 1864, p. 118).

At that time the famous Split mayor and autonomist ('Italianist') Dr. Antun Bajamonti intensively promoted the idea of a separate Dalmatian identity towards Croatia: „What is a better opportunity for us autonomous people to show how much honesty and truthfulness was in our speeches? What is a better opportunity to show that, while opposing the union with Croatia, we did not fight against our language and our ethnicity? What is a better opportunity to prove, with one word, that our promises and our arguments are corresponding with the proclamation *Slavs tomorrow, but Croats never?* (...) On the other hand, gentlemen, the solution to the disagreement on the union with Croatia does not depend on us. If, in addition, the supreme state's interest is to Croatize us, we will have to accept it; if on the contrary it is necessary to leave us as we are Slavo-Dalmatians, we will stay that way” (Spisi Dalmatinskog Pokrajinskog Sabora, 1864, p. 111)

From this we can see that the people of today's Croatia, in its historical regions: inner Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia, harboured multiple identities. Some were considered members of the Dalmatian people (nation?), but were in favour of the primary political unity with the Croats and Slavonians, while considering themselves at the same time as members of the Illyrian or Slavic nation, which included other South Slavic peoples such as the Serbs. Some considered Dalmatian people as historical part of the Croatian nation, without negating the affiliation of this dualism with wider *Illyrian / Slavic nation*. The minority still insisted on complete individuality of Dalmatian people towards the Croatian nation. The same categorical framework can be applied to the practices of language naming. While some were saying that they have their Dalmatian or Bosnian language, considering it as the same with the Croatian and

²⁵ Ibidem, p. 30.

²⁶ TOMIĆ, J. Hrvatski pisci. In: *Napredak, Zagreb, 1873, vol.14, p. 424.*

other South Slavic languages (Serbian), others believed that the Dalmatian or Bosnian language are part of the wide Croatian language, which is the same with the Serbian language; and both are usually the common language known as *Illyrian* or *Slavic*.

On political and linguistic unity of Croats and Serbs

In parallel with nationalistic tensions, we can find multiple examples of Croatian-Serbian cooperation and interdependence. Thus, for example, Ban Josip Jelačić²⁷, in his *Proclamation to Croat and Serb people* from 1848 says: „Receive fraternal and affectionate greetings to all our people, and to the clergy of both churches...”²⁸

On the other hand, it is interesting to mention the speech of Serbian politician Božidar Petranović in Knin, on 6 July 1848: „My loving brothers (...) I will try hard (and I know my brothers that you will willingly hear this) I will try as soon as possible to introduce our beloved Croatian language in the schools and in the courts. So you my labour brothers will understand everything which will be discussed in the court (...) We are Croatians, so we have to keep our nationality and language as the apple of the eye, and to defend it until the last drop of blood – my brothers *Ristians and Christians*, we are all children of one father, who is in heaven, we are all the truly one-blood brothers.”²⁹ Although Petranović’s words can be interpreted in two ways, if we take into account that a decade earlier he claimed that the inhabitants of Dalmatia are Serbs (Banac, 1983, p. 454), it is certain that in the context of this statement he wanted to say that Croats and Serbs actually belong to the one Croatian nation, in political sense.

In the journal *Napredak*, Antun Pečan in his work *Nešto o Obradoviću i duhu njegovih djela* (Something about Obradović and the spirit of his works) observes the life and ideas of Dositej Obradović³⁰, and very affirmatively concludes: „Obradović did not deal with the name of the nation and nationality (in the narrow sense). He witnessed already then in his soul that the name or term are not related with the literature or people’s education, but that the language is a proof of people’s unity. Therefore, he did not ask who is Croat, who is Serb, Šokac or Bunjevac, but in his noble spirit, he was asking: „Who speaks my language?”³¹ It is interesting to say that the editorial board of *Napredak*, at this Pečan’s conclusion added a footnote: „Travelling with Vuk (Karadžić) through Croatia and Dalmatia was exceedingly pleasant. When someone told him he spoke Croatian, he would add: But it is Serbian; to whom he said, I speak Serbian, they would respond: that’s truly Croatian. And so it is.”³² Pečan was also very particular about the existence of the Croato-Serbian or Serbo-Croatian common literature referring to the Dositej’s statement: „Who does not know that the people of Montenegro, Herzegovina, Bosnia, Serbia, Croatia, Slavonia, Syrmia, Banat and Bačka, except Vlachs, speak the same language?” Pečan then very suggestively concludes: „If Croats and Serbs would have more people like Obradović today, when our every writer and patriot, before he tackles the job, would have in mind Obradović’s words, there would be less fragmentation among the people

²⁷ Josip Jelačić (1801 – 1859) – Croatian ban, which will abolish serfdom in Croatia. He initiated the establishment of *Croatian Theater* and was responsible for raising the *Diocese of Zagreb* to the rank of Archdiocese. On his initiative, the *Society of Yugoslav History* will be founded in 1850.

²⁸ Narodu hervatskome i serbskome u trojednoj kraljevini Dalmacie Hervatske i Slavonie ljubezni pozdrav. In: *Zora Dalmatinska*, vol. 29, Zadar, 1848, p. 2 – 3.

²⁹ Slovo rečeno u Kninu na 6 serpnja tek. Od gosp. D.ra Boxidara Petranovicha prid izbiračima.... In: *Zora Dalmatinska*, vol. 29, Zadar, 1848, p. 1 – 2.

³⁰ Dositej Obradović (1742 – 1811) – Serbian writer, philosopher and one of the creators of Serbian national revival.

³¹ PECHAN, A. 1873. Nešto ob Obradoviću i duhu njegovih diela. In: *Napredak*, vol. 4, Zagreb, p. 58.

³² Ibidem

and the book, less justice to the name of a Croat and a Serb, but generally more useful and concise books, which would represent to the whole world the uniqueness of language of all the aforementioned peoples. If we are to benefit from Obradović's idea, we should leave fighting each other for the name of a Croat or a Serb, therefore we should not make excuses whether to say Croatian, Serbian, Croato-Serbian or Serbo-Croatian language, but to work with the concerted forces on the education of our people with beautiful literary language, which is indeed one common language."³³

Furthermore, Ivan Mažuranić in his grammar *Slovnica Hrvatska* from 1859 states: „The Croatian language is a Slavic dialect, which is spoken in both parts of Croatia (Austrian and Turkish), Dalmatia, Istria, Serbia and Montenegro, although it is called Serbian by Serbs. [...] In addition to the absence of general national name, our language could be called by Kopitar: Croato-Serbian, or: Serbo-Croatian” (Kordić, 2010, p. 274). In the same year, Vatroslav Jagić in the magazine *Narodne novine*, argues that the Croats mostly spread the idea of a common south Slavic nation: „from north to the south, from east to the west, Illyrian responded to Illyrian, or as we now say Yugoslav to Yugoslav; and in all this who was the leader? Kajkavian Croats” (Kordić, 2010, p. 209).

It is particularly interesting to note that the Croatian Parliament (Hrvatski sabor) in 1861, voted to name the official language as Yugoslavian: „Let them arise gentlemen, who is to be called (language) 'People's' (a small minority). – Who is to be called 'Croato-Slavonian'? (Nobody). – Who is, to be called 'Croatian or Serbian'? (Minority) – Who is, to be called 'Yugoslavian'? (Majority)” (Kordić, 2010, p. 274). At the very end, officials from Vienna refused this request, so the Parliament in 1867 declared the name of official language as 'Croatian or Serbian', which was acceptable. Ten years later, the Dalmatian Parliament voted for the name Croato-Serbian or Serbo-Croatian, as the official language.

Dr. Đuro Šurmin in his *Povijest književnosti hrvatske i srpske* (History of Croatian and Serbian Literature), from 1898 states: „Naming of the language 'Dubrovnikian', 'Dalmatian', 'Bosnian', 'Croatian', 'Slavonian' proves fragmentation (of Croats). If that was so among educated people, simple people had no idea about anything. The names Slavic or Illyrian are showing that there was a thought of unity, but it was impossible to implement it.” (Šurmin, 1898: 149) Šurmin further adds: „Without one common literary language we could not reach national unity. There were some initiatives, in order to arrange some kind of bond, because we can see that already Šporer (Matić) in his "Illyrian" almanac for the year 1823 fought for a standard language for all of southern Slavs” (Šurmin, 1898, p. 150). Regarding the name of the language, he continued: „It has been mentioned that today for the language which is used by Croats and Serbs, we have two main names: Croatian language among the Croats and Serbian language among the Serbs. In order to prove as much as unity of language, they began to call it Croatian or Serbian language, although it is justified to have only one national name. In the old monuments for the whole at first we knew only for those national names; but when splitting of political life came, then they went to the regional names in Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, Bosnia, Slavonia and others. To even greater confusion, writers brought in general names: Slavic and Illyrian. (...) Many times we have read it in the books; it was created because of ignorance of some foreign writers, who held that the Croatian and Serbian people are Slavic, so that was only generally written”³⁴ (Šurmin, 1898, p. 8).

Conclusion

It follows that political circumstances greatly influenced the definition of official language policy in Croatia, in the 19th century. This period was marked by an acute dilemma: How to call a common language? Illyrian, Slavic, Yugoslavian, Croato-Serbian, Serbo-

³³ Ibidem, p. 59.

³⁴ Ibidem, p. 8.

Croatian...? Examples of regional linguistic particularism / separatism (Dalmatian, Slavonian, Bosnian...) almost disappeared before the end of the 19th century.

The decision of philologists from Zagreb to adopt the Štokavian dialect (the most widespread among the South Slavs) as the official one, although in Zagreb they spoke Kajkavian, was a proof of desires for a general Croatian linguistic standard, which would unite with Serbian standard (which was totally Štokavian) and thus establish the common language of the Croats and Serbs.

A two-part name: Serbo-Croatian or Croato-Serbian was used by Jacob Grimm in 1824, followed by Jernej Kopitar in 1836, and from 1854 it was regularly used in grammars that were published in Zagreb (Kordić, 2010, pp. 127, 128). Pero Budmani published in Vienna his *Grammatica della lingua serbo-croatica (illirica)*, as a result of work in the *Dubrovnik High School*, where Serbo-Croatian was also taught as a first language (Rešetar, 1873, p. 49).

Accordingly, if we take into the account that there are four languages which have been standardized on the basis of the Serbo-Croatian language, we can say with complete certainty that these are only four standardized variants of one polycentric standard language, especially because the differences between the standards are inessential and not systemic and do not affect the criterion of mutual intelligibility.

In the 19th century and today, the language-naming practices have been conditioned by different historical and political circumstances. In this sense, we should not ignore the irresistible dynamics of changes in the local and global level, which imposes new conditions and new needs. Especially if we consider that global trends are intensively affecting disappearance of a large number of languages, around the world. Which includes the fact that maybe in the future the existence (and survival) of the language will become much more important than its name.

Bibliography

- BÁNA, I. 1983. The Confessional "Rule" and the Dubrovnik Exception: The Orgins of the "Serb-Catholic" Circle in Nineteenth-Century Dalmatia. In: *Slavic Review*, Vol. 42, No. 3.
- HORVAT, V. 1993. *Bartol Kašić i njegov Ritual rimski u razvoju hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Ritval Rimski (reprint), Kršćanska sadašnjost.
- KORDIĆ, S. 2010. *Jezik i nacionalizam*. Zagreb: Durieux.
- REŠETAR, M. 1873. *Izviješće o C. K. Višoj Dubrovačkoj Gimnaziji, koncem školske 1872 – 73*. Dubrovnik.
- ŠURM, Đ. 1898. *Povijest književnosti hrvatske i srpske*. Zagreb: Knjižara Law Hartmana.
- VERENAZIO, F. 1595. *Dictionarium quique nobilissimarum Europae linguarum, Latinae, Italicae, Germanicae, Damaticae et Ungaricae*. Apud Nicolaum Morettum.

Kontakt

Mr (MA) Nikola Zečević

University of Donja Gorica

Humanistic Studies

Department: International Relations and Diplomacy

Oktoih 1, Donja Gorica

81000 Podgorica

Email: nikola.zecevic@udg.edu.me