Croatian: The Twenty-Fourth Language of the European Union

Grčević, Mario; Grubišić, Vinko

JOURNAL OF CROATIAN STUDIES XLIX

JOURNAL OF

CROATIAN STUDIES

VOLUME XLIX 2017

ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE CROATIAN ACADEMY OF AMERICA, INC.

NEW YORK, NY

CONTENTS

VINKO BREŠIĆ, A Survey of Croatian Periodicals 7

ANTE ČUVALO, The Role of the *Hrvatski Književni list* (Croatian Literary Gazette) in the Croatian National Revival in the Late 1960s 21

GORAN BUTURAC, Croatia's Path in the Recession 31

KLARA VOLARIĆ, The Proposed Federalism of Frano Supilo and Stjepan Radić as a Solution to the Croatian Question Before World War I 45

ANDRIJANA KOS-LAJTMAN, A New Conceptuality in Contemporary Croatian Novels: The Novels of Jasna Horvat as Iconic Concepts 61

IVAN BOŠKOVIĆ, ORJUNA Ideology in Croatian Literature 71

MARIO GRČEVIĆ and VINKO GRUBIŠIĆ, Croatian: The Twenty-Fourth Language of the European Union 93

DOCUMENTS

The Struggle for the Recognition of the Croatian Language at the Library of Congress

Edited and with an introduction by Vinko Grubišić and Vladimir Bubrin

1. George C. Jerkovich, The "Serbo-Croatian Language" as Used by the Library of Congress

2. Luka Budak *et al.*, "Serbo-Croatian" (or Any Variant Thereof) in the Library of

Congress Cataloging System (Macquarie University petition to the Library of Congress) 114

BOOK REVIEWS

VLADIMIR BUBRIN and VINKO GRUBIŠIĆ, *The Glory and Fame: Croatian Renaissance Reader / Dike ter hvaljen'ja: hrvatska renesansna čitanka* (Iva Kurelac) 140

FRANZ POSSET, *Marcus Marulus and the Biblia Latina of 1489: An Approach to His Biblical Hermeneutics* (Damir Benko) 143

ZVONKO PANDŽIĆ, *Nepoznata proza Marka Marulića* (Vinko Grubišić) 148

SUZANA MARJANIĆ and ANTONIJA ZARADIJA KIŠ, *Vodič za čitanje životinje/a: Književna životinja – Kulturni bestijarij II. dio* (Mirela Holy) 151

MILICA GAČIĆ, *Englesko-hrvatski riječnik prava i međunarodnih i poslovnih odnosa* (John Kraljic) 155

EDWIGE RIDEL and AURORE NEUVILLE, *Ivan Meštrović chez Rodin: l'expression croate* and JASMINKA POKLEČKI STOŠIĆ and BARBARA VUJANOVIĆ, *Rodin u Meštrovićevu Zagrebu / Rodin in Meštrović's Zagreb* (Vladimir Bubrin) 157

JURAJ ŠKRIVANIĆ, *Povijest američkih Hrvata* (John Kraljić) 160

MIRJANA POLIĆ BOBIĆ, *Kalifornijski zapisi oca Ferdinanda Konščaka iz Družbe Isusove* (John Kraljić) 163

HENRY R. COOPER, ed., *An Anthology of Croatian Literature* (Vladimir Bubrin) 165

NOTES ON THE CONTRIBUTORS 169

Guest Editors: Vinko Grubišić and Vladimir Bubrin

Editing and layout: Katia Grubisic

texts represent a peculiar anachronism, as far from art as from the ideas of the time, and may be read only as homages to the allure of the ideograms and mythographs with which the ORJUNA members were carried away. In those texts with esthetic value, rhetoric dominates over esthetic quality. The opponent is a key figure in the texts and fiction of ORJUNA, who deliberately pitched the composition of their texts, the arrangement of content, techniques such as antitheses, enumerations, gradation, and so on, and metaphorical and stylistic questions.

ORJUNA had a significant stronghold in Split and in Dalmatia, though the ideology was never a dominant determination of the milieu and its social fabric. By promoting monarchical Yugoslavism to the detriment of the content and form of national identification, ORJUNA had quite a number of followers among notable families and individuals, including prominent literary authors. They promoted the ideology through their fiction and some through their lives as well, burdening literary expression with markedly ideological interventions. Integrating these ideological reflexes into their fiction in numerous, more or less literary ways, they subordinated their literary expression to an ideological purpose, restrained their art and often turned literary merit into an esthetic addendum to ideology. Moreover, some of the cited works were composed solely as promotional tools, which is evident in the choice of subject, the complexity of the characters and their features, the arrangement and organization of the plot, and the stylistic and rhetorical devices. Yet ORJUNA ideology cannot account for the overall performance of particular names. Apart from the works that paid tribute to the allure of ideo- and mythographs, a number of works, some of which we have presented here, are impossible to classify according to ideological criteria. Rather, they are worthy of esthetic and literary consideration, which will grant them longer literary and historical readings.

CROATIAN: THE TWENTY-FOURTH LANGUAGE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

Mario Grčević and Vinko Grubišić

Even before Croatia officially became a member in 2013, the European Union (EU) recognized Croatian as an official language. The full admission of the country into the EU was good news not only for Croatia, but also for Europe: as a Slavic and Mediterranean country, Croatia's accession into the European Union was a homecoming of sorts, after almost a century. Linguistic issues, however, remain.[1] Some further hoped that the entry of this latest, twenty-eighth member state, on July 1, 2013 into the European Union would be a panacea for all the problems concerning the Croatian language; others, more realistically, believed that there are deep, lasting misunderstandings and falsehoods about Croatia and the Croatian language that could not be so easily corrected.[2]

The most widely spoken mother tongue in the EU is German; a majority of European parliamentarians have German as their mother tongue. Whether they communicate in their own language or in English, parliamentarians in Brussels are encouraged to speak other languages in addition to their mother tongue.

The linguistic situation in the EU is not an accurate reflection of the linguistic picture of Europe. Thus, for example Luxembourg is represented with three official languages, the Netherlands only with Dutch, and Spain

[1] On the place of the Croatian language in the European Union, see Mario Grčević, "Hrvatski jezik i Europska unija," *Jezik*, 58.2 (2011), 50-57; Mislav Ježić, "Hrvatski jezik na pragu Europske unije," *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012), 99-106; Radoslav Katičić, "Hrvatski jezik i Europa," *Hrvatska revija*, 13.2 (2013), 4-9; and Snježana Ramljak, "'Jezično' pristupanje Hrvatske Europskoj Uniji," *Politička misao*, 45.1 (2008), 159-177. On linguistic issues in multi-state federations, see Mario Grčević, "Hrvatski jezik u višenacionalnim državnim zajednicama," *Jezični varijeteti i nacionalni identiteti: Prilozi proučavanju standardnih jezika utemeljenih na štokavštini*, ed. Lada Badurina, Ivo Pranjković, and Josip Silić (Zagreb: Disput, 2009), pp. 179-184.

[2] See Radoslav Katičić, "O položaju hrvatskoga jezika," *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012), 112-117; and Radoslav Katičić, "Hrvatski jezik jedinstven je u svijetu," *Vijenac*, 530 (2014).

in Brussels is represented with only Spanish, because Catalan, Galician and Basque are considered regional languages.

Fifty-one percent of adults in EU countries understand English. After English, the most frequently used languages are German and French, both of which are officially spoken in more than one European country. Only three European languages, English, Spanish and Portuguese, are among the ten most common languages in the world.

The linguistic situation in Croatia today is not fundamentally different from that in other European countries. According to the 2001 census, Croats in Croatia make up 89.63% of the total population; Croatian is spoken by 96.12% of the country's inhabitants. Serbs in Croatia make up 4.54% of the total population and Serbian is spoken by 1.01% of the population of Croatia. In that same census, 0.11% of the population declared "Serbo-Croatian" to be their native tongue, while 0.05% identified "Croato-Serbian" as their language. "During one decade," as Jadranka Gvozdanović puts it, "that language completely disappeared, which proves that its basis was of an ideological and not of a linguistic nature."[3] Italians account for 0.45% of the total population of Croatia, and 0.46% declared Italian as their mother tongue. Languages spoken by other national minorities do not change the overall linguistic picture of Croatia.[4]

In 1990, while the country was still at war, the Sabor (Croatian Parliament) ratified the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia, calling it in its foreword "a document of great importance for the realization of the sovereignty of the Croatian nation and the state sovereignty of the Republic of Croatia."[5] Article 12 of the Constitution is explicit:

[3] Jadranka Gvozdanović, "Jezik i kulturni identitet Hrvata," *Kroatologija* 1.1 (2010), 39-57. Ed. Branka Tafra.

[4] Interestingly enough, in the same year, the demographic census in Serbia showed that Serbs in Serbia make up 82.86% of the total population and that the Serbian language is spoken by 88.3% of Serbian inhabitants. Croats account for 0.94% of the population in Serbia and Croatian is spoken by 0.4% of that country's total population. It is also worth noting that, while 1.08% of the inhabitants of Serbia self-identified as "Yugoslavs," none referred to their language as "Serbo-Croatian"; see Gvozdanović, *op. cit.*

[5] *The Constitution of the Republic of Croatia* (Zagreb: Narodne novine, 1998).

> The Croatian language and the Latin script shall be in official use in the Republic of Croatia. In individual local units, another language and the Cyrillic or some other script may be introduced into official use along with the Croatian language and the Latin script, under conditions specified by law.[6]

More than forty years ago, the well-known Croatian linguist Stjepan Babić, pointing out the challenges even for foreign Slavic-studies specialists of understanding the relationship between the Serbian and Croatian languages, noted,

> It is difficult to understand that the Croatian standard language, which is very similar to the Serbian language, is not less a standard language than the Polish language, which does not have such a similar language.[7]

The Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts stressed,

> The Croatian literary and standard language has been used to express all cultural and civilizational needs of its historical and national community. It functions for Croatians exactly in the same way as any other standard language for any other nation.[8]

Serbian is presently in official use in Serbia. Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian are the official languages of the multi-ethnic country of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In Montenegro, the Montenegrin language is spoken. Yet there remain universities, in both North America and in Europe, that still absurdly teach "Serbo-Croatian"—a language spoken nowhere.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] Stjepan Babić, "Lingvističko određenje hrvatskoga književnog jezika," *Jezik*, 18 (1971), 129-137.

[8] "Izjava HAZU o položaju hrvatskoga jezika," *Jezik*, 2.52 (2005), 41-48; rep. *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012), 193-201. See also "Izjava HAZU o srbijanskim posezanjima prema hrvatskoj književnoj baštini (2011)," *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012), 214-215; and "Izjava Razreda za filološke znanosti HAZU u povodu odluke ukidanja Vijeća za normu hrvatskoga standardnog jezika," *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012), 216-217.

To better understand the current position of the Croatian language, a rapid overview of its development seems necessary, to cover its beginnings to its standardization in the eighteenth century, and from then to our time, with the Republic of Croatia's entrance into the European Union.

As far as we know, during the oldest period of Croatian literacy in Dalmatia and Pannonia, where Croats settled in the seventh century, this Slavic tribe spoke its own old Slavic language. As early as the eleventh century, one of the oldest written texts in Croatian, the *Baščanska ploča* (Tablet of Baška, inscribed in 1100), shows the main particularities of the Croatian language, as distinct from other Slavic languages.

From very early on, Croatian has consisted of three dialects, named after the interrogative pronouns "što," "ča" and "kaj," meaning "what." During the first centuries of the Croatian presence in the territory of Croatia, the Čakavian dialect ranged much farther than it does today, and its vestiges are still noticeable today in the speech of indigenous inhabitants in parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in some regions of the Dalmatian hinterland, in Lika, and in Dubrovnik. Important Medieval, Renaissance and Baroque literary works were written in Čakavian. In previous centuries, the Kajkavian dialect was also spoken across a much larger territory than today, and traces of the Kajkavian dialect are still evident in Slavonia. From the time of the Renaissance, important literary and scientific works were also written in Kajkavian.[9]

From the eleventh century onwards, Croats used their own language in the Roman Catholic liturgy (this was exceptional before the Second Vatican Council).[10] In their writing, they used three alphabets: Glagolitic, Croatian Cyrillic, and Latin. From the fifteenth century, literary and scientific works were written mainly in the Latin script, while the Glagolitic and Cyrillic alphabets were limited to epigraphic, ecclesiastical and judicial use.

In the Middle Ages, most texts were written in the so-called angular

[9] See Radoslav Katičić, *Litterarum studia: književnost i naobrazba ranoga hrvatskog srednjovjekovlja* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1988).

[10] "The Croatian Language in the Liturgy," *Journal of Croatian Studies*, 25-26 (1984-1985), 88-103.

Glagolitic alphabet, which, along with the *bosančica* or Croatian Cyrillic alphabet, was a specifically Croatian script. Bosančica was used by both Catholic and Islamic population in Bosnia and Herzegovina while the Orthodox Serbs used their own Cyrillic alphabet. During the Renaissance in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, known as the Golden Age of Croatian literature, literary texts were written in the Latin alphabet, which was already being adapted to the Croatian phonetic system (the Croatian graphemes č, ć, dž, đ, š and ž were written in various ways, mainly under influence of Italian orthography).

In the sixteenth century, during the short-lived Protestant literary movement in Urach, near Tübingen, Scripture and some other translated religious books were published in all three alphabets—Latin, Glagolitic and Cyrillic—but not even this deliberate dissemination could fully revive the use of Glagolitic or Cyrillic in Croatian literature. That Protestant movement was nonetheless pivotal in the history of the Croatian language. Reviewing Alojz Jembrih's *Stipan Konzul and the 'Bible' in Urach*, Ruben Knežević mentions especially the important seventh chapter, "The Name of the Language in the Printed Urach Croatian Editions (1561-1563)":

> This language is explicitly and consequently called Croatian (croatische, harvacki, and others), even when the works were printed in the Cyrillic alphabet ('im crobatischer Sprach mit cyrulischen Buchstaben gedruckt' *Postilla*, 1563). This original name of the language testifies to the linguistic and cultural independence of Croats in the period of the Reformation.[11]

In later centuries, during the Baroque and Enlightenment periods, the dominance of the Latin alphabet over the Croatian Cyrillic and Glagolitic alphabets would not change very much.

In the eighteenth century, according to Dalibor Brozović, the Croatian standard language was established.[12] In Dalmatia, Slavonia, and

[11] Ruben Knežević, "Alojz Jembrih's book *Stipan Konzul and the 'Bible' in Urach*," *Kairos – Evanđeoski teološki časopis*, 2.1 (2008), 137.

[12] Dalibor Brozović, *Standardni jezik* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1970). On standardization, see also Lada Badurina, "Hrvatska pravopisna norma u 20. stoljeću," *Hrvatski jezik u XX.*

Bosnia, writers wrote in the same Štokavian, mainly in the Ikavian dialect understood by all Croats. Already, the Croatian language was functionally polyvalent, included in various aspects of national and international culture.

This dialectic hierarchy settled in the first half of the nineteenth century with the Illyrian movement and the acceptance of the literary language based on Štokavian in the Kajkavian region. Proponents of the Illyrian movement, mostly speakers of Kajkavian, were willing to abandon their native Kajkavian and accept Štokavian for two main reasons: the majority of Croatians spoke Štokavian, and the rich literary works written in Dubrovnik, Bosnia and Slavonia were in Štokavian. It was decided to accept "Ijekavian Štokavian" as used by Dubrovnik writers.[13]

Not surprisingly for a Mediterranean nation, Croatia also produced an impressive number of literary, historical and scientific works in Latin. Latin, which was used in the Croatian parliament until 1847, was for many centuries an international vernacular, but also provided a means of resisting the aggressive Germanization and Magyarization by the Austro-Hungarian state administration.

In Vienna in 1850, the Vienna Literary Agreement was signed by several Croatian, Serbian, and one Slovene linguist (Franc Miklošič, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, Đura Daničić, Ivan Mažuranić, Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, Dimitrije Demeter, Vinko Pacel, and Stefan Pejaković).[14] The

stoljeću, ed. Marko Samardžija and Ivo Pranjković (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2006), pp. 145-158; Dalibor Brozović, *Povijest hrvatskoga književnog i standardnoga jezika* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2008); Radoslav Katičić, "Hrvatski jezični standard," *Izazovi globalizacije i hrvatski jezični standard*, ed. August Kovačec (Zagreb 2004), pp. 5-56; and Milan Moguš, *A History of the Croatian Language: Toward a Common Standard*, trans. Željko Bujas (Zagreb: Liber, 1995).

[13] See Mario Grčević, *Die Entstehung der kroatischen Literatursprache. Quellen und Beiträge zur kroatischen Kulturgeschichte* (Cologne-Weimar-Vienna: Böhlau, 1997); see also Monika Wingender, "Kroatisch," *Wiener Enzyklopädie des europäischen Ostens*, vol. 10, ed. Miloš Okuka (Klagenfurt – Celovec: Weiser, 2002), pp. 275-286.

[14] The English version of that agreement can be found in Stan Granic, "Pronouncements Concerning the Language of the Croats (1850-1995)," *Journal of Croatian Studies*, 41 (2000), 161-164.

agreement was not signed by any preeminent Croatian linguist of the time. The meeting had probably been initiated by the Slovene Franc Miklošič (1813-1891), who at that time was a well-known professor of Slavic studies and an employee of the Austrian government. By creating Serbo-Croatian, he wanted to create not only the linguistic but also the national unity of Croats and Serbs, to distance the Orthodox Serbs from Russia. The same plan was elaborated by one of the founders of Austroslavism, the Slovenian linguist and Austrian state licenser for Slavic books, Jernej Kopitar (1780-1844), who decided at the beginning of the nineteenth century, in agreement with Austrian authorities, to reform the Serbian language to distance it as much as possible from the Russian literary language and from the Orthodox church, and at the same time to align it with Western culture, to the Croatian language, and the Štokavian dialects in general. Kopitar found in Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787-1864) the ideal figure for his purposes. Kopitar's successor in Vienna, another Slovene, Franc Miklošič, made the serviceable Đura Daničić a propagator of Karadžić's ideas.[15] That project was successful insofar as the Serbs started to develop their literary language in the direction drawn by Jernej Kopitar and Vuk Stefanović Karadžić. However, Serbs never entirely adopted the ideas put forth by Kopitar, Karadžić and Daničić.

Austrian and Hungarian cultural circles close to the Austro-Hungarian government continued to promote a common Serbo-Croatian language, as the most solid tool of unification between the two most important nations in those parts of the monarchy liberated from the Ottoman yoke. The policy of linguistic unification also notably fit very neatly with the *Drang nach Osten* ("thrust to the East") notion of German expansion into Slavic territory.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, the best-known Croatian linguists (Vatroslav Jagić, Milan Rešetar, Pero Budmani, Mirko Divković, Tomo Maretić, and others) reformed the Croatian standard language so that the main language manuals (grammars, dictionaries and orthography

[15] Nataša Bašić, *Vuk Stefanović Karadžić između jezikoslovlja i politike* (Zagreb: Školske novine, 1991).

books) followed the so-called Vukovian linguistic ideas.

Hrvatski pravopis, a Croatian orthography by Ivan Broz (1852-1893), published in 1892, was in use until 1960, with the exception of the years between 1941 and 1945; under political pressure, it was published under Dragutin Boranić's name and with an altered title from 1921 onwards.

The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (1919-1929) and its successor, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1929-1940), prescribed one and the same language for Croats, Serbs and Slovenes, Serbo-Croato-Slovenian. In official use, however, the language was de facto Serbian. In 1929, the Ministry of Education published its *Pravopisna uputstva*, rules of orthography prepared under the authority of the 1923 orthography of the Serbian linguist Aleksandar Belić, a book intended for use in all public and middle schools. *Pravopisna uputstva* imposed the Serbian language as the *lingua communis* on Croats, Slovenes and Macedonians. Unhappy with this linguistic state unitarianism, Croatians returned to Dragutin Boranić's *Pravopis hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*.[16] This normative orthography of the "Croatian or Serbian Language" was a compromise of sorts, since naming the Croatian language by its national, Croatian name was simply prohibited. At the same time, some prominent Croatian politicians and intellectuals, such as Vladko Maček, Rudolf Herceg, Milica Vandekar-Devčić-Radić (daughter of the Croatian political leader Stjepan Radić) followed the rules of orthography close to the so-called Zagreb linguistic school of the nineteenth century and in accordance to which the laws of the Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia were published and in effect until the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

A turning point in Croatian linguistic development came in 1938 with the publication of the periodical *Hrvatski jezik*, the pages of which editor Stjepan Ivšić opened to practical advice and theoretical explanations. The bylaws of the Društvo 'Hrvatski jezik', the Croatian Language Society,

[16] Dragutin Boranić, *Pravopis hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* (Zagreb, 1921); see also Marko Samardžija, "Hrvatski jezik od početka XX. stoljeća do 1945," *Hrvatski jezik u XX. stoljeću*, ed. Jelena Hekman, Ivo Pranjković and Marko Samardžija (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2006), pp. 9-28.

the organization behind the periodical, read:

> The purpose of our Association consists in the cultivation of the Croatian language, that is to maintain the spirit of the Croatian language and strive for the correct usage of Croatian in all aspects of the spoken and written language.[17]

In 1940, Kruno Krstić and Petar Guberina published the seminal *Razlike između hrvatskoga i srpskoga književnog jezika* on differences between the Croatian and Serbian literary languages. Six years earlier, on the Serbian side, Radoslav Bošković had published a short but interesting article on the linguistic and stylistic differentiation of the Serbian and Croatian literary languages in *Naš jezik* (published by the Institut za srpski jerzik, Srpska Akademija nauka in Belgrade).[18]

At the dawn of the Independent State of Croatia (1941-1945) the Institute for the Croatian Language was founded, rejecting the return to the previous, Boranić, orthography, prescribing instead new linguistic directions that harkened back to pre-World War I norms, and introducing a "new" (but pre-1892) etymological orthography book, mandatory for all school and official usage. The Ministry of Education enacted the "Legal Regulation on the Croatian Language, its Purity and its Orthography." The overzealous linguistic purism came as a reaction against the previous influence of and mixture with the Serbian language.[19]

Unlike royalist Yugoslavia, during the first years of its existence, Communist Yugoslavia recognized four official languages: Croatian, Macedonian, Serbian and Slovenian. The first issue of the *Službeni list demokratske federativne Jugoslavije* (the Official Gazette of the Democratic Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) proclaimed:

[17] Stjepan Ivšić, *Hrvatski jezik* (Mainz: Liber, 1978); rep. *Hrvatski jezik*, 1.10 (1938-1939).

[18] Radoslav Bošković, "O jezičkoj i stilskoj diferencijaciji srpskoga i hrvatskog književnog jezika," *Naš jezik*, 3 (1935), 277-282.

[19] See Marko Samardžija, *Hrvatski jezik u Nezavisnoj Državi Hrvatskoj* (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1993).

> All decisions and proclamations [...] shall be published officially [...] in the Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian and Macedonian languages. Each of these languages is considered to be equal throughout the entire territory of Yugoslavia.[20]

Despite its egalitarian display, however, the statement remained just empty words.

In Communist Yugoslavia, approximately a century after the Vienna agreement, discussions began, among both politicians and some linguists and writers, on new ideas for a common language for Serbs and Croats, despite the complications of the previous painful attempts at unification. (The language situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Montenegro was not addressed at that time.) Thus, in 1954, the Novi Sad Agreement was signed, with renewed and increased efforts to support state unitarianism and to create a *lingua communis*. The Serbian language and the Croatian language were given new names, Serbo-Croatian and Croato-Serbian respectively, and Serbian linguistic domination became evident in several areas of public life such as the military, administration, diplomatic service, and so on.

As a reaction against the reduction of Croatian to second-rate status and the imposition of Serbian as the *lingua communis* of the whole territory of Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, numerous Croatian individuals and cultural institutions signed the *Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika*.[21] Many Croatian linguists and writers as well as almost all the signatory institutions faced harsh consequences. The *Deklaracija*, which held that the Croatian language should follow its natural development without political interference, became a key event in the history of the Croatian language.

[20] *Službeni list demokratske federativne Jugoslavije*, 1, February 1, 1945, 5.

[21] The *Deklaracija*... was published for the first time in the Zagreb literary weekly *Telegram* (359; March 17, 1967) and several times since. An English translation was included in Christopher Spalatin, "Serbo-Croatian or Serbian and Croatian? Consideration on the Croatian Declaration and Serbian Proposal of March 1967," *Journal of Croatian Studies*, 7-8 (1966-1967), 3-13. The text of the *Declaration* with a commentary can be found in *Kolo*, 1-2 (2009), 69-221.

In 1974, the Croatian language was constitutionally recognized as the official language of the Socialist Republic of Croatia, but continued to be beset by political impositions. Language manuals that had in their title the term "Croatian," for instance, became easy targets for politically motivated attacks.

In spite of political malversations in both the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and in the post-war communist state, the language was entrenched among its speakers:

> The Croatian people preserved their language and its national, Croatian name. Even if the interrelations of Croatian and Serbian have no analogous case in the world, Croatian, by the will of the Croatian nation, is nevertheless different from Serbian, just as—culturally, historically and functionally—Dutch is different from German, Norwegian from Danish, Slovak from Czech. In the same way that the Galician language, after the defeat of fascism in democratic Spain, is recognized as a separate language, different from Spanish and Portuguese, so is Croatian different from Serbian, by its cultural and historical tradition and by linguistic structure as well.[22]

Today, the identity of the Croatian language is very clear. As Croatian linguist Mate Kapović puts it:

> There are no problems in today's Croatia, there is no question of what to call the Croatian language—beyond any doubt, the opinion of all Croats is to call it solely by the Croatian name. Today the Croatian language functions, without any problem, as the official Croatian language.[23]

[22] "Promemorija Matice hrvatske o hrvatskome jeziku (1995)," *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012), 189-192; on the status of the Croatian language throughout the twentieth century, see also Mile Mamić, "Hrvatsko jezično zakonodavstvo i jezična politika u 20. stoljeću," *Hrvatski jezik u XX. stoljeću*, ed. Jelena Hekman, Ivo Pranjković, and Marko Samardžija (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2006), pp. 59-70.

[23] Mate Kapović, "Položaj hrvatskog jezika u svijetu danas," *Kolo*, 1-2 (2009),204; see also Ivo Pranjković, "Hrvatski jezik od godine 1945. do 2000.," *Hrvatski jezik u XX. stoljeću*, ed. Jelena Hekman, Ivo Pranjković, and Marko Samardžija (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2006),

The struggle for the independence of Croatia and the Croatian language was well known to Croats living abroad. In several democratic countries, there were major educational discrepancies between primary and secondary schools on the one hand and universities on the other. In Canada and Australia, in primary-school classes and at the high-school level, Croatian was officially recognized as an individual language and its teaching enjoyed financial support from the government; however, the Slavic departments of several universities continued to offer "Serbo-Croatian" courses (with or without the hyphen), taught in most cases either as Serbian or as Croatian, depending on the lecturer. Since 1982, the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS) has listed Croatian and Serbian separately.

The first university chair for Croatian language and culture was founded at Macquarie University in Sydney, Australia in 1983; another followed in Canada at the University of Waterloo, in 1988. Later, several European universities also changed their course offerings, so that today, for example, Cambridge University teaches Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin and Serbian—and rightly so. It is the fundamental right of any nation to call its language by its national name. *Suum cuique*![24]

Political efforts to unify Serbian and Croatian have resulted in their *rapprochement* but not in their unification (a multitude of polemical works by Croatian and Serbian linguists on the subject are likely of interest only to the narrowest of specialists in the history of South-Slavic languages).[25] Internationally, on September 1, 2008, the American Library of Congress

pp. 29-58.

[24] On the status of the Croatian language during the political upheavals of the late twentieth century, see Stjepan Babić, *Hrvatski jezik u političkom vrtlogu* (Zagreb: Ante Pelivan and Danica Pelivan, 1990); Mario Grčević, "Über die kroatischen Sprachveränderungender 90-er Jahre zwischen Information, Desinformation und Sprachpolitik," *Die slawischen Sprachen*, 67 (2001), 23-77; and Marko Samardžija, *Hrvatski jezik u Nezavisnoj Državi Hrvatskoj* (Zagreb: Hrvatska Sveučilišna Naklada, 1993).

[25] See Dalibor Brozović, "Hrvatski jezik, njegovo mjesto unutar južnoslavenskih i drugih slavenskih jezika, njegove povijesne mijene kao jezika hrvatske književnosti," *Hrvatska književnost prema evropskim književnostima* (Zagreb: Liber, 1970), pp. 3-88.

finally added to its ISO 639-2 Codes for the Representation of Names of Languages "hrv" for Croatian and "srp" for Serbian, to the satisfaction of both Croatian and Serbian cultural institutions.[26]

With the change of the government in Croatia in 2012, several not only unnecessary but also damaging linguistic policies were introduced, leading to confrontations between the Ministry of Science, Education and Sport and high school teachers, parents, and linguists in regards to school manuals, and especially one recent orthography book proposed by the ministry.

Another grave political mistake was the abolition of the Council for Croatian Language Norms on May 8, 2012. The Council had been established in 2005, with the well-known linguist Radoslav Katičić as president, and consisting of representatives from all university Croatian language and literature departments, as well as from two of the most prestigious Croatian cultural institutions, Matica hrvatska and the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts. Such a body, for the maintenance and setting of Croatian linguistic norms, has never been more necessary. As several Croatian linguists have pointed out, if the Council is not re-established and the results of the work of its members is ignored, there could be very undesirable consequences.[27]

One of the linguistic issues in Croatia today is the unresolved question of orthography. Currently, in Croatian schools, media and administration, there are several orthography books in use, even if from 2005 to 2013 *Hrvatski školski pravopis* by Stjepan Babić, Sanda Ham, and Milan Moguš was exclusively used, as recommended by the Ministry of Science, Education and Sport at the time.[28] That orthography was in full accordance with the Council for Croatian Language Norms. Having

[26] See Tihomil Maštrović, "Međunarodno priznanje hrvatskoga jezika," *Kolo* 5-6 (2012), 172-181.

[27] See August Kovačec, "Hrvatska danas – bez sustavne jezične politike," *Kolo* 5-6 (2012),107-111; and Artur Bagdasarov, "Ima li Hrvatska jezičnu politiku?" *Hrvatsko Slovo*, April 1, 2011, 26- 27.

[28] See Sanda Ham, "Vijeće za normu i Hrvatski školski pravopis," *Jezik*, 56.1 (2009), 24-30.

abolished the Council, minister Željko Jovanović appointed the Institute of the Croatian Language and Linguistics to assume the role of the Council. He also recommended that the Croatian Orthography prepared in 2013 by the aforementioned institute should be accepted by all elementary and high schools. Yet that orthography has not been accepted by the most competent Croatian language institutions. The well-known linguist Nataša Bašić calls it unscientific:

> Compared to other modern orthography books of other nations, and even to those of our immediate neighbors (i.e. Slovenes and Serbs) from a methodological point of view it is outdated and uninviting. It cannot be mastered in any logical way, there is a mixing of various levels of contents and expressions so that the rules have to be learned individually and by heart.[29]

Bašić believes that initiatives for writing that book came from politicians in order to fulfill their own objectives.

It is very clear that a project to write another orthography with the support of politicians is a first-rate political act with a purpose to abolish established language norms and natural language development. During the last few decades there have been several similar attempts.[30]

How long can such recommendations last? Most likely until another government in the future decides to table the question of orthographical norms again. It should be pointed out that the linguistic situation in Croatia had already taken a wrong turn during the previous government, with politicians meddling in linguistic questions.[31] In a hair-splitting polemical argument on how to write the negation of the future tense of the verb *to want*—"ne ću" or "neću," in one word or two—former Croatian Prime Minister Ivo Sanader threw in his two cents' worth, declaring that he was

[29] Nataša Bašić, "U povodu objave Hrvatskoga pravopisa Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Politika ili struka?" *Jezik*, 61.1-2 (2014), 67-74.

[30] *Ibid.* ; see also "Zaključci Društva hrvatskih književnika o hrvatskom strandardnom jeziku," *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012), 218-219.

[31] See Ranko Matasović, "Četiri crna scenarija o budućnosti hrvatskoga jezika (i razlozi zašto oni nisu vjerojatni)," *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012), 167-171.

against the conclusions of the Council for Croatian Language Norms: "I shall never write 'ne ću'!"[32] The well-known (and now late) linguist Dubravko Škiljan considered it "a ritual between science and politics."[33] In such cases, as ever, *Caesar supra grammaticos*—the ruler has the upper hand. Fortunately, *Caesar non supra grammaticam*.

Orthographic misunderstandings are a sign of a linguistic negligence in general. As far as Croatian prosody is concerned, there are practically two separate systems: the traditional, standard Štokavian, supported by the *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik*[34] guide to correct usage, and the one used mainly in the Croatian capital of Zagreb: 'pr***o***gram' versus 'progr***a***m', "d***o***laziti' versus 'dol***a***ziti', '***u*** školu' versus 'u šk***o***lu', etc.

In contact with various nations throughout history, Croatians have accepted numerous foreign words into the Croatian lexicon. In addition to the influence of classical Greek and Latin, numerous loan words and expressions have been borrowed from Italian, French, German, and Turkish.[35] Recently, many anglicisms have been absorbed into Croatian, with considerable orthographical hesitation: *downloadati* or *daunlodati* (to download), *fajl* or *fajla* (file), *mails* or *mejlovi* (emails), *gemovi* or *gejmovi* (games), *shoping*, *shopping* or *šoping* (shopping), *newyorški* or *njujorški* (of New York)... According to Andrea Sapunar Knežević and Marijana Togonal:

> The lack of a system for accepting foreign words is the result of a lack of unity in Croatian orthographic norms. Since there is no orthographic book that has been generally accepted, and since various orthography books provide different explanations, with various orthographic doubts, there are, in the media and in other written texts, various [inconsistent] solutions.[36]

[32] Mario Grčević, "Položaj hrvatskoga jezika danas," *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012), 143-166.

[33] *Ibid.*

[34] Eugenija Barić *et al.*, *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik* (Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 1999).

[35] See Marija Turk, "Hrvatski u kontaktu tijekom 20. stoljeća," *Hrvatski jezik u XX. stoljeću*, ed. Jelena Hekman, Ivo Pranjković and Marko Samardžija (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2006), pp. 423-447.

[36] Andrea Sapunar Knežević, and Marijana Togonal, "Hrvatski jezik i mediji," *Kolo*, 5-6

English syntax recently has the most marked influence on Croatian syntax. Knežević and Togonal mention expressions such as "kontakt program," "WIP gosti," "HT dionice," "EU zastupnik," "BDT rast," "internet bankarstvo," "HR nogomet," "LTE mreža," "Weekend Media Festival," 'Zagreb Wine Gourmet Festival," and "ski sezona" where the influence of English syntax is clearly noticeable.[37]

Relations between the Croatian language and the minority languages in some localities have not been resolved, either in accordance with the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia or with language policies in other European countries. The same could be said on the use of various foreign languages in Croatia. Namely, in some hiring procedures in foreign, mostly multinational companies where knowledge of some foreign language is of a paramount importance, knowledge of Croatian is often neglected. Having seen questions about linguistic competence in multinationals, Dragutin Lesar, president of the *Hrvatski laburisti* (Croatian Labour Party), submitted in 2010 legal proposals regarding the usage of the Croatian language and other languages in Croatia. The Hrvatska demokratska zajednica (HDZ – Croatian Democratic Union), which at the time was in power (in coalition with other parties) turned down those proposals without any discussion on linguistic issues, under the pretext that the use of the Croatian language and the Latin alphabet was constitutionally guaranteed and therefore sufficient. Two years later, in 2012, the new government of Prime Minister Zoran Milanović's Socijaldemokratska partija Hrvatske (SDP – Social Democratic Party of Croatia) refused the same proposal, this time with the excuse that the Croatian language would become "one of the official languages of the European Union, as defined by laws of the European Union."[38] Thus both right- and left-leaning governments did not want to take into consideration the fact that many members of the EU

(2012), 182-188.

[37] *Ibid.*; see also Mario Grčević, "Vanjskopolitički utjecaji na hrvatski književnojezični razvoj u drugoj polovici XIX. stoljeća," *Jezik*, 60:1-2 (2014), 42-67.

[38] Grčević, 2012, *op. cit.*

(France, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belgium, Finland, Romania, and Hungary) explicitly regulate the right of their official or state language(s) with special laws. As things currently stand in Croatia, only the language(s) of minorities are legally regulated.

One of the oldest and the most important Croatian cultural institutions, Matica hrvatska, published in its biweekly *Vijenac*, in 2013, its own linguistic propositions concerning the public use of the Croatian language. Here are some excerpts of these propositions:

> (1) In all domains of public life in the Republic of Croatia, written and oral communications should be in Croatian, except when, in accordance with the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia, another language or another script of a national minority may be used in addition to Croatian, and except when some international agreement obliges Croatia to use another language and another script.
>
> [...]
>
> (7) International agreements made in the Republic of Croatia must have their Croatian version in the Croatian language.
>
> [...]
>
> (15) In conferring citizenship of the Republic of Croatia, the level of knowledge of Croatian should be defined by a special law.
>
> (16) The Council for Croatian Language Norms shall be the advisory body that systematically oversees the Croatian language and provides a creditable opinion on the official use of the Croatian language.[39]

Since the rights of the Croatian language as the official language of the Republic of Croatia have not been legally defined, unnecessary problems frequently arise. Thus for example, several Istrian toponyms

[39] "Prvi prijedlog zakona o javnoj uporabi hrvatskog jezika," *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012), 223-239; see also "Zakon o javnoj uporabi hrvatskoga jezika (nacrt)," *Vijenac*, 514, November 14, 2013; Artur Bagdasarov, "Zakon o hrvatskom jeziku i pravopisni koncenzus," *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012),135-166.

in Croatian legal wording have recently become bilingual (Croatian and Italian). The name of the largest Istrian city, Pula, has become Pula-Pola in official Croatian use and in Croatian law texts. Italian is an official language in the city of Pula, even though Italians account for only 4.43% of the population. This would-be bilingualism is in contradiction with the law, which stipulates that any inhabited place can become bilingual if at least one third of its population speaks another language.

This kind of bilingualism in Pula, and in other parts of Istria, has been obtained through political bargaining. When Ivo Sanader's HDZ had to form a coalition, the party desperately needed voting members. Furio Radin, representative of the Italian minority, offered in December 2003 to become a member of the governing coalition if Sanader would satisfy his demands on the rights of the Italian language and accept toponyms in both Croatian and Italian. Later Sanader's government affirmed that they did so under the pressure of the EU administration in Brussels. Naturally, the Italian minority sees Radin as a national hero, but, the question remains: What would happen if other European countries accepted similar bargains?

From the very start of Croatia's official Croatian presence in Brussels, there was an unhelpful surprise in store for the Croatian representatives: according to a rumor, participants in working groups who were using the headsets to follow proceedings expecting an interpretation into Croatian heard what sounded like Serbian. Since no one wanted to comment on the situation, it is not possible to ascertain whether this was an erroneous impression, or if the European Union had assigned Serbian interpreters to the task.[40]

Regardless, the incident was a good warning that Croatian representatives in Brussels, like representatives of any other nation, should be cautious and not accept partial or superficial linguistic solutions.

It would be illusory to think that there will be no proposal in the European parliament to suppress languages spoken by smaller member-

[40] Tomislav Krasnec, "U Bruxelleskom bunkeru: Izgubljeni u prijevodu: netočno preveden propis," *Večernji list*, July 22, 2013: 29.

nations. The German Slavist and politician Wolf Oschlies, in his article on Balkan tongues in the European Union in *Eurasisches Magazin*,[41] displays a startling ignorance of the Croatian language and its history, in spite of the existence of comprehensive and up-to-date German-language works on the subject, such as Leopold Auburger's *Die kroatische Sprache und der Serbokroatismus*[42] and Josip Matešić's German-Croatian dictionary.[43] Unfortunately, Oschlies is certainly not the only Slavist who offers uninformed advice without taking into consideration the European tenet of equal rights for all nations. Two of the most prestigious Croatian cultural institutions, Matica hrvatska and the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, reacted to this reductive approach to the Croatian language: Matica hrvatska stressed in 1995 the "inalienable right of the Croatian nation to use its own language with its own name,"[44] while the Academy emphasized in a declaration in 2005 that pushing back or discriminating against the Croatian language would be considered in the same light as discrimination against Croats, their language and their culture, not just in the Republic of Croatia but also in Bosnia and Herzegovina, of which Croatians are a constituent nation. The Academy held that it would be a blunt violation of human rights, undermining the legal basis of the international organization of the United Nations and of the European Union.[45]

The European Union is an association of free and independent

[41] Wolf Oschlies, "Die Zungen des Balkans in der europäischen Union," *Eurasisches Magazin*, December 28, 2006. On Wolf Oschlies's work, see also Mario Grčević, "Elementare Tatsachen und falsche Vorstellungen über die kroatische Sprache," *Filologija*, 48 (2007), 29-39.

[42] Leopold Auburger, *Die kroatische Sprache und der Serbokroatismus* (Ulm-Donau: Gerhard Hess Verlag, 1999); *Hrvatski jezik i serbokroatizam*, trans. Nikolina Palašić (Rijeka: Maveda and Hrvatsko filološko društvo, 2009); see also Leopold Auburger, "Položaj hrvatskoga književog jezika i njegova pravopisa—jučer, danas i sutra," *Kolo*, 5-6 (2012), 118-134.

[43] Josip Matešić, *Das Deutsch-Kroatisches Universalwörterbuch* (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 2005).

[44] "Promemorija Matice hrvatske o hrvatskome jeziku (1995), *op. cit.*; on the historical role of Matica hrvatska vis-à-vis the Croatian language, see Stjepan Damjanović, "Matica hrvatska i hrvatski jezik u 20. stoljeću," *Hrvatski jezik u XX. stoljeću*, ed. Marko Samardžija and Ivo Pranjković (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2006), pp. 275-295.

[45] "Izjava HAZU o položaju hrvatskoga jezika," *op. cit.*

nations, each with its own identity and own language or languages. Yet some European parliamentarians occasionally raise the issue of the cost of translation and interpretation into so many languages. German EU member Jürgen Schröder cautioned that the EU should avoid the fatal mistake of the former Soviet Union, which imposed the Russian language on non-Russian and even on non-Slavic nations; nevertheless, Schröder suggested that twenty-three languages (not including Croatian, as Croatia was not yet a member state at the time) was too expensive.

The disintegration of Yugoslavia also brought about the demise of "Serbo-Croatian." However, according to Schröder, since speakers of the "new languages" that comprised the former speakers of Serbo-Croatian are able to understand each other, once Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia all become members of the EU, Union communications should not be translated or interpreted into Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian, but these languages should simply alternate.[46]

The question is not only linguistic, though it is shockingly obtuse to suggest that language can be reduced to mere intelligibility; the issue is geopolitical, national, historical. Could one not also make the argument that Dutch parliamentarians in Brussels can easily understand German, therefore rendering the use of Dutch in the EU superfluous? Unfortunately, some European parliamentarians share Schröder's views.

The Croatian government should take measures to revive the Council for Croatian Language Norms as soon as possible, to include representatives of all those institutions that were previously part of the Council. That Council should prepare an orthography acceptable to all, and recommend legislative protection for Croatian as the official language of Croatia, on the use of minority languages and scripts, and on the relationship of Croatian to minority languages. Minority-language policies should be modeled on those of other EU member countries. These recommendations, and Council activities, should be carried out in a non-partisan fashion by qualified language experts and without influence

[46] See Mario Grčević, "Hrvatska ne smije pristati na bošnjačko-hrvatsko-srpski jezik u EU," *Hrvatsko slovo*, 735 and 736 (2009).

from the government.

The European Union must be conscious that Croatians have had a long and painful linguistic history under both the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and Communist Yugoslavia, and that Croatia cannot and will not accept any kind of amalgamation with any other similar Slavic language or languages, or any other treatment that might differ from the way in which other EU member country languages are treated.