

MATIJAS BAKOVIĆ

University of Zagreb, Croatia

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7983-9148>

Copyright and License: Copyright by Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN, Kraków 2020. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution – NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-ND 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/legalcode.pl>).

ORIGINS OF THE PROPOSAL FOR ORTHOGRAPHY IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Key words: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, orthography, language policy, standard languages.

ABSTRACT

The focus of the paper¹ is the conflict centred around orthography in Bosnia and Herzegovina between advocates of the Karadžić-Daničić concept of language and those of a moderate morphophonemic concept based on the language of the Zagreb Philological School. Special attention will be dedicated to two sessions of the committee for orthography held in 1883 and to the proposal, presented by Kosta Hörmann and Ljuboję Dlustuř, for the preservation and recovery of morphophonemic orthography in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Their proposals will be compared with those presented by Vatroslav Jagić in his 1864 treatise *Nař pravopis*. The outcome and influence of this conflict on the state of orthography in Croatia will also be discussed.

INTRODUCTION

The second half of the 19th century in Croatia was marked by struggles between philological schools for orthographic prestige in education, and, consequently, in the crucially important aspects of society and culture. The struggles eventually boiled down to a collision of two different concepts¹ the hitherto predominant one of the Zagreb Philological School, whose influence was at its peak, and the emerging one of the Croatian supporters of Vuk Karadžić, who had been slowly gaining recognition in all major aspects of socio-political life. A fact scarcely mentioned in the literary sources of Croatian studies is that a similar conflict took place in Bosnia and Herzegovina as well. Although it did not last as long as in Croatia, its political orchestration was more conspicuous and, almost twenty years after Jagić's, it gave rise to a similar proposal clearly designed to preserve

¹ The paper is a revised and expanded part of the doctoral thesis *Jezik Sbornika zakona i naredaba za Bosnu i Hercegovinu od 1881. do 1884. i kulturno-političke prilike nakon austro-ugarske okupacije (1878.)* which focuses on the problem of orthography in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The thesis, written under the supervision of Associate Professor Mario Grčević, PhD, was defended on 11th June 2019 at the Faculty of Croatian Studies of the University of Zagreb.

morphophonemic orthography. The conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina was also one between the advocates of the orthography of the Zagreb Philological School and the Bosnian and Herzegovinian supporters of Karadžić's orthographic reform.

THE LANGUAGE SITUATION IN CROATIA IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY

In the second half of the 19th century, following the establishment of the *Štokavian* dialect as the Croatian language standard during the Illyrian Movement, Croatian philology was marked by the activities of, and opposition between, the Zagreb, Rijeka, and Zadar philological schools, along with the school established in the 1870s by the Croatian supporters of Vuk Karadžić². From its very beginnings, the Zagreb Philological School established a reputation for strictly adhering to the language concepts of the Illyrian Movement. Under the leadership of Adolfo Veber Tkalčević, and until its dissolution, the school consistently advocated the preservation of non-syncretised plural case endings in the dative, locative and instrumental forms. The school also emphasized the necessity of writing the genitive *h*, which would be the first feature to draw criticism from other philological schools, especially from the one in Rijeka and from the Croatian supporters of Vuk Karadžić. Over time, the Zagreb School abandoned the use of certain Illyrian features, such as writing the *e* with a caron (ě) and the so-called voiceless *e* (è) or *a* (à) in front of the vocalic *r*³, but it retained the markedly morphophonemic orthography, which would later become the main bone of contention between them and the Croatian supporters of Vuk Karadžić. Although initially numbered amongst its followers, Vatroslav Jagić⁴ would come to adopt positions opposed to those of the Zagreb School and

² For more on their differences of opinion, see Vince 2002. Additional details can also be found in Vince 1973 and 1975, as well as in Brozović 1985 and Jonke 1971. An overview of the developments is also presented in Samardžija 1997, especially in the paper "Hrvatsko jezikoslovlje od sedamdesetih godina XIX. stoljeća do godine 1918.", pp. 99–141, included in the book *Iz triju stoljeća hrvatskoga standardnog jezika*.

³ As early as in 1854, Bogoslav Šulek published two philological articles in the journal *Neven*: "Zašto izostavljamo *e* pred *r*-om u riečih *krv* itd.?" and "O dvoglasu *ie*", in which he clearly stated his position on these matters. In the first article, he explained why it was unnecessary to write the so-called voiceless *e*: "Everyone knows that Croats never pronounce the *a* or *e* in words such as *krv* etc. Moreover, people tend to make fun of those who insist on saying *sarce* or *parvi*. This is so true, that even those gentlemen who write the *e* before the *r* will admit to not pronouncing the *e* in such words. Only on some of our islands is the *a* pronounced in words such as *smardi* etc.; whereas the folk of Zagorje pronounce the *e* fully, e.g. *pervi*. However, this type of pronunciation is not expected to spread further. On the contrary, it is increasingly disappearing, as all other Croats pronounce these sounds only as semivowels. These, in turn, do not need to be written down, considering that most consonants can hardly be pronounced without a semivowel..." (Šulek 1854a). In the second article, he laid down the rules for writing the diphthong *ie*: "Therefore, when it is pronounced as short, it should be written as *je*, e.g. *ljepota*, *tjera*, etc., and when it is pronounced as long, it should be written as *ie*, e.g. *liep*, *vrieme*, *sieno*. This is a general rule, from which it follows that the same sound should be written either as *ie* or as *je*, depending on the length of its pronunciation". (Šulek 1854b, IX).

⁴ For instance, in the article "Quomodo scribamus nos?" published in 1859 in *Narodne novine*, he defended the standard of the Zagreb Philological School (cf. Katičić 2015, 66).

closer to those of the Croatian supporters of Vuk Karadžić, although he never formally belonged to their school.

JAGIĆ'S PROPOSAL

Jagić presented his proposal⁵ for modifying the hitherto used orthography in 1864, in the treatise *Naš pravopis* ("Our Orthography"), published in the newly founded journal *Književnik*. Written in an effort to establish and systematise orthographic rules, the treatise contains the following statement: "I do not intend to repeat herein that which has been said time and again in order to bespeak and defend the principles of either the so-called euphony, or those of etymology: it is common knowledge that neither can serve as the sole basis for orthography". (Jagić 1864, 2). In order to resolve the implicit difficulties, of which he was quite aware, he established the following rule: "Within the limits of one and the same word (or its derivative), whether a noun or a verb, I will write it according to the correct pronunciation of its immutable part, particularly in the nominative". (Jagić 1864, 5, emphasis in the source). In his studies of language structure, he emphasised the following with regard to the observed duplication in writing of identical or similar vowels in certain words, which is not reflected in their pronunciation:

If we are just a tad consistent and careful, we will instantly conclude that, no matter how many times the **b** is next to the **p**, the **d** to the **t**, or the **z** to the **s**, by analogy, the result will always be duplication – **pp**, **tt**, **ss** – which the structure of the language does not permit. But, why the admonishment? Aren't we perfectly used to writing: *otresti se*, *otudjiti*, *otrti*, *otegnuti*, *potaknuti*, *preteći*, *ustati*, *usuditi se*, *usukati* instead of the forms containing the root: *odtresti*, *odtudjiti*, *odtrti*, *odtegnuti*, *podtaknuti*, *predteći*, *uzstati*, *uzsuditi*, *uzsukati* etc.⁶ Indeed we are: for that is absolutely correct, and therefore, if we thought about it at all, we would deduce that it was equally justified and legitimate to write *besraman*, *bestidan*, *isjeći*, *rasuditi*, *rastaviti*, *rasap*, *rasulo* etc.⁷ (Jagić 1864, 5, boldface in the source).

Concluding his observations, Jagić differentiates between the mutable and immutable part of a word, summarizing as follows: "all words in which changes to the root have solidified should be written euphonically, i.e. as heard in their pronunciation, e.g. *kći*, *pčela*, *vježbati* etc." (Jagić 1864, 176). With regard to the mutable part of a word, he writes: "we should write the form most similar to the root of the word, e.g. *napredka*, *sladka*, as derived from *sladak*, *napredak* etc." (Jagić 1864, 176), where he also includes

⁵ This paper does not discuss all the elements of Jagić's proposal, but only those relevant to the orthography subsequently proposed in Bosnia and Herzegovina. For more information, see Jagić 1864: vol. 1, pp. 1–34; vol. 2, pp. 151–180.

⁶ Translator's note: In Croatian, **b**, **p**, **d**, **t**, **z** and **s** are pronounced as [b], [p], [d], [t], [z] and [s], respectively, and undergo anticipatory assimilation when they come in the following pairs: /b+/p/=p+/p/; /d+/t/=t+/t/; /z+/s/=s+/s/. Unless otherwise noted, all phonetic transcriptions in the paper have been done according to the IPA system.

⁷ Translator's note: i.e. instead of *bezraman*, *bezstidan*, *izsjeći*, *razsuditi*, *razstaviti*, *razsap*, *razsulo*.

the writing of forms such as *ropski* and *gradski*, among other examples⁸. Furthermore, Jagić held that a word compounded with a proposition should be written

without modifications, thus: *izpasti*, *raztjerati*, *odkriti* etc.⁹ *S* (instead of *sa*) is the only proposition so amalgamated with the word next to it that we commonly write: *zdravlje*, *zdjela*, *zdola*, *odozdo*; which is why it would be better to write *zgod*a instead of *sgoda* and *ozbiljan* instead of *osbiljan* etc. (Jagić 1864, 176–177).

He added: “Slavic languages do not tolerate duplication” (Jagić 1864, 177), which is why he rejected the writing of duplicated consonants and suggested always writing *otvoriti* (instead of *odtvoriti*), *ustati* (instead of *uzstati*), *rasipnik* (instead of *razsipnik*), *rastaviti* (instead of *razstaviti*) etc. (Jagić 1864, 177). He also opposed the practice of writing the phoneme /t͡ɕ/ as *tj* in words “in which no-one pronounces it as *t-j*¹⁰ but rather, as *ć*”¹¹ (Jagić 1864, 177), and supported Šulek’s proposal of writing the yat reflex as *ie/je*. Finally, he defied writing *a* or *e* in front of *r* “because it is utterly non-Slavic and non-Croat” (Jagić 1864, 178), as well as writing *h* in the plural genitive. With regard to the latter, he noted that, if one felt obliged to write it (if it is so dear to their heart), “they should at least refrain from pronouncing it in this position and consider it purely a symbol”. (Jagić 1864, 178).

Therefore, Jagić’s article contains a proposal for a moderately morphophonemic orthography with clear rules for writing applied to certain problem areas that were long regarded as the bones of contention between supporters of different philological schools. Responses to Jagić’s treatise, as well as criticism of it, followed immediately – most notably by Adolfo Veber Tkalčević¹² (1864, 181–186), who took issue with the “euphony” espoused in it, and Bogoslav Šulek¹³ (1864, 283–291), a proponent of writing the letter *h* in the plural genitive (as well as in other word forms). Although it was not as successful as he had expected, Jagić’s proposal was not entirely rejected either, foreshadowing the coming orthographic disputes and changes¹⁴, which would culminate

⁸ Translator’s note: instead of *ropski* and *gratski* (*gracki*), which would be the result of assimilation.

⁹ Translator’s note: instead of *istjerati*, *raspasti*, *otkriti*, which would be the result of assimilation.

¹⁰ Translator’s note: corresponds to /t/+j/.

¹¹ Translator’s note: corresponds to /t͡ɕ/.

¹² In his *Response to “Our orthography”*, Veber-Tkalčević demonstrated his opposition already by applying different orthographic rules to it (including consistently writing the yat reflex as *ě*). This was only the beginning of the conflict between the two philologists, considering that, two years later, Veber would still stand by his opinion that the editorial board of *Književnik* had, “under the banner of Jagić’s article, unnecessarily deepened our orthographic divide” (Veber 1866, 2). Veber even accused Jagić of making his own response “unrecognizable”, and consequently, of citing Veber as the author of an article “I would never have claimed as mine” (Veber 1866, 2).

¹³ According to Vatroslav Jagić, the text which featured Šulek’s criticism, *Obrana ahavca* (“In Defense of Writing *h* in Genitive Plural”) was submitted to the journal too late and thus ended up being published in the “Criticism” section.

¹⁴ In his reports from the 1877 sessions of the (sub)committee for orthography, published in *Vienac*, Ladislav Mrazović noted the following: “The academia uses three orthographies, supported by Veber, Pavić

in the late 19th century. Had the proposal been accepted in full, it may have drawn other philologists to the cause of the “etymologists”, i.e. the advocates of a moderately morphophonemic orthography, as it would have clipped the wings of the Croatian supporters of Vuk Karadžić and outweighed their main arguments.

A similar proposal was also made in 1877¹⁵ as part of the committee for orthography’s efforts to counter the rise of the Croatian supporters of Vuk Karadžić to ever more important positions by preserving morphophonemic orthography in Croatia, i.e. by accepting a moderate version of it. In their own words, the issue was to finally decide

whether to adopt an orthography based on etymology or one based on phonetics. Considering that neither can, in fact, be fully adhered to, it is the main task of the committee to define the limits between the one and the other. The committee accepts only the principle according to which, if we follow the developments of the entirety of Croatian literature in this century, orthography should be based on etymology; however, without neglecting the phonetic principles of the Croatian language, which have governed its actual development. (Mrazović 1877, *II*, 179, emphasis in the source).

In accordance with these instructions, the subcommittee for schools continued with their work in *several sessions* and eventually submitted a report to the committee for schools at the session held on 6th March. Their suggestion, which the committee would accept, was that, contrary to Jagić’s proposal, words formed by adding prefixes should be written as, for instance, *oddieliti*, *razstaviti*, *obsipati*, *odpjevati*, *razljutiti*, *izžeti*, *izčupati* *16*, but also that “those words, for which it is no longer obvious that they were formed by prefixing a proposition” should be written as, for instance, *ustati*, *uskok*, *usukati*, *ustaviti*, *otvoriti*¹⁷ (Mrazović 1877, *14*, 218). The biggest opponent of these solutions was Armin Pavić¹⁸, who stated “that he would orally defend, before the regional committee for schools, the old Croatian orthography, as sanctioned by three centuries of history of the Croatian language” (Mrazović 1877, *14*, 219, emphasis in the source). Other suggestions accepted by the committee were writing the letter *h* in the genitive and writing the negative particle *ne* separately from the verb. With regard to the latter, Pavić’s comment that “where the negative particle has become fully amalgamated with the verb, i.e. in *niesam*, *nemam* and *neću*, the two should be written together” (Mrazović 1877, *14*, 221), was accepted.

and Jagić (along with Rački) respectively. However, these academics have also changed their own manner of writing several times.” (Mrazović 1877, *II*, 176).

¹⁵ The Committee for Schools convened twice, first time on 2nd February 1877. For more on these events, see Vince 2002, 620–622 and Bašić-Kosić 2006, 183–185.

¹⁶ Translator’s note: by suggesting this orthography, they stood in direct opposition to Jagić’s proposals for avoiding duplication and adhering to anticipatory assimilation.

¹⁷ Translator’s note: rather than *uzstati*, *uzskok*, *uzsukati*, *uzstaviti*, *odtvoriti*.

¹⁸ Armin Pavić (1844–1914), Croatian philologist, university professor, rector of the University of Zagreb, head of the Department of Theology and Instruction.

THE SITUATION IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Jagić made his proposal just when the confrontation between philological schools was gaining momentum in Croatia. However, the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina was fundamentally different, not only because the proposal had reached the region almost 20 years later, but also because of different political and social circumstances. In 1866¹⁹, during Ottoman rule, Bosnia and Herzegovina officially adopted Karadžić's Cyrillic script and predominantly phonemic orthography²⁰ in the official vilayet press (with Turkish versions printed in Arabic) and legislation. However, it could not be disregarded that ever since 1869, due to the fact that Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina had long before adopted the Latin script and had had a developed literary tradition, official administrative documents had been written in that script and according to the rules of the Zagreb Philological School's morphophonemic orthography. The latter had been in use for a long time by Franciscans in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Ottoman government had accepted this state of affairs and acknowledged the existence of "two scripts and two standard languages" (Okuka 1991, 49) in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The situation lasted until the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, when the Latin script and the language and orthography prescribed by the Zagreb Philological School became standard. Following numerous complaints by Orthodox Christians and Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina against certain content in the Croatian textbooks used in their country, the Regional Government decided to prepare and publish the first Bosnian and Herzegovinian textbook, which was to serve as the linguistic standard for all future ones. After a period of adjustment to the new circumstances, the biggest issue was that of the proper orthography to be used in the new textbook, which was meant to gradually replace the ones²¹ from Zagreb and Belgrade²². Namely, a choice

¹⁹ Two years earlier than in Serbia itself, where Karadžić's Cyrillic script wasn't officially adopted as the standard until 1868. Up to then, the Croats used the orthography and script of the Illyrian Movement brought to Bosnia and Herzegovina by Ivan Franjo Jukić from Zagreb, where he had also printed the first Bosnian and Herzegovinian journal, *Bosanski prijatelj*, in 1850.

²⁰ Ljiljana Nogo pointed out that the press from the Ottoman period still revealed a lot of ambivalence regarding these rules: "Even though Karadžić's reformed Cyrillic script was consistently adopted, the same cannot be said of his "Write as you speak" rule, which means that Karadžić's phonemic orthography was not consistently adopted either" (Nogo 1981, 162).

²¹ Catholic schools in the country were funded from abroad even before the occupation. For example, Austria-Hungary supplied them with textbooks from Croatia, as described in an 1872 report: "it is highly recommended, not only in the interest of education, but also of our politics, to gradually introduce the textbooks which our educational authorities have chosen for Croatian schools into Bosnian schools as well" (quoted in Papić 1982, 89).

²² During the first years of Austro-Hungarian rule, schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina used grammar guides from Croatia and Vojvodina, written by Veber and Živanović respectively. However, based on a document he retrieved from the Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Joint Ministry of Finance, no. 3804/1884, Šator claims that the schools of the time "used *Gramatika hrvatskog jezika* by Veber Tkalčević and Divković as a grammar book" (Šator 2003, 2). Even after the publication of the Bosnian grammar book *Gramatika bosanskoga jezika* in 1890, the schools still used Veber's *Slovnica hrvatska za srednja učilišta* because

had to be made between phonemic and morphophonemic orthography, considering that both types were in use and represented in Bosnian and Herzegovinian tradition. Even though, according to Ljuboje Dlustuš, at the session of the committee which deliberated on the future orthography, “objections were raised concerning the content of certain books, none were ever raised regarding their orthography” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883, underlined in the source), the issue of orthography became the most contentious one.

The task of preparing the first Bosnian and Herzegovinian textbook was awarded to Ljuboje Dlustuš²³, at the time the government advisor for education, who drafted the text of the *Počelnica* (“Primer”), written according to the rules of morphophonemic orthography used in Croatia. The manuscript was submitted for review to professors Franjo Klaić and Franjo Vuletić, who gave opposite opinions on it. Klaić’s negative review, written according to morphophonemic orthography, expressed astonishment at the very decision to print separate schoolbooks for Bosnia and Herzegovina:

First, I must state that I see absolutely no need to publish separate schoolbooks for Bosnian and Herzegovinian primary schools, since the same people live in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in the triune kingdom²⁴, and the former are equal to the latter by virtue of their language... (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883).

Particularly significant was his comment that the proposed manuscript “with regard to its purpose, is almost identical to the Primer whose new edition will be published in Croatia” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883), by which he clearly implied that textbooks from Croatia should continue to be used in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He was especially critical of the fact that the textbook contained a large number of Turkisms which, according to him, did not belong there since school books were supposed “to cleanse the national language of Turkish words” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). The manuscript also received an opposite, i.e. positive, review from Franjo Vuletić²⁵, who focused little on the content, pointing out only in the introduction that

the newly published grammar book did not cover syntax. Thus, Veber’s *Slovnica* was used in Bosnia and Herzegovina even after it stopped being printed in Croatia, and would later be replaced with Divković’s textbook *Hrvatska sintaksa za školu* (“Croatian Syntax for Schools”). Ham (1998, 113–116) argues that *Gramatika bosanskoga jezika* was modelled on Veber’s *Slovnica*, which was one of the reasons why the latter continued to be used in Bosnia and Herzegovina for so long.

²³ Ljuboje Dlustuš was born in 1850 near Našice and worked as a teacher in Croatia. In 1878, he came to Bosnia and Herzegovina, where he soon became the government advisor for education, and later the editor of *Školski vjesnik* (“School Herald”). He died in Osijek in 1921.

²⁴ The Triune Kingdom (Croatian: *Trojedna kraljevina*) or Triune Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia.

²⁵ Vuletić is the “shadow” author of the 1890 *Gramatika bosanskoga jezika* (“Bosnian Grammar”). According to Šator (2004, 117 and further), Davorin Nemanić should be recognized as its coauthor, seeing that he introduced a number of changes to Vuletić’s text of the *Slovnica* (as Vuletić had originally titled the *Grammar*), including to the title itself, renaming the book *Gramatika* (for more information on the terminological changes introduced by Nemanić, see Šator 2004, 123–124; 2003, 1–13; 2008, 111).

“the content of the entire book provides the child with a fair amount of plain language and correct grammatical rules” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). As opposed to Klaić, he dedicated very little of his review – only a few introductory sentences – to the content of the manuscript because he deemed it more important to express his views on orthography:

Considering that the matter at hand is whether the orthography of this book should be the same as that of the previously published ones or modelled after popular pronunciation, which would make the study material more accessible in general to a child who has just begun learning how to read and write... (...) I consider the euphonic orthography to be more suitable than the etymological one. For this I have two main reasons: the pedagogical one, as I believe that the former will enable children to understand their study material better, and the linguistic and historical one, based on the clear understanding that euphonic orthography is truly characteristic of our people... (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883, underlined in the source).

His paragons of proper language were Dositej Obradović, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić and Đuro Daničić, who, in his opinion, all wrote in a vernacular which “is understood not only by the scholars, but by the common folk too” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). Nevertheless, rather than rejecting “etymology”, he suggested that it be taught in the higher grades:

Let us teach our youth the orthography which holds a greater benefit for their studies, using the pronunciation taught to them by their Bosnian and Herzegovinian mothers, while we prepare a path for them towards higher learning and teach them etymology only after they have mastered euphony. To each his own! (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883).

It seems that such contrary positions encouraged the government to form a committee tasked with resolving the orthographic dichotomy, since a decision had to be made as soon as possible and the textbook had to be printed. The committee, consisting of members of all three Bosnian and Herzegovinian confessions, met twice, on 31st March and 2nd April 1883, in Sarajevo. According to the minutes of these sessions (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883), the committee members were Antun Vuković, Knight of Vučidol (president of the committee), Mehmed-bey Kapetanović Ljubušak, Kosta Hörmann, Gjorgje Nikolajević, Father Alojzije Mišić (a Franciscan), Ivan V. Popović, Franjo Vuletić and Ljuboje Dlustuš (minute-taker). The fact that the first session was held on a Saturday, and the second already on the following Monday, reveals the utmost significance of the issue. At the very start of the session, the president of the committee asked Dlustuš to explain his decision “regarding the orthography used in his book” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). In his introductory statement, Dlustuš explained the overall complex situation concerning the choice between the two orthographies, scripts and even pronunciations that existed in literature at the time. From the very start, he dismissed the idea of adopting the Ekavian pronunciation, explaining that “the people in the region would have great difficulty adapting to the Ekavian dialect”, which was why the problem of orthography had arisen in the first place. He pointed

out: “Daničić's orthography has not been very widely adopted thus far”, emphasizing that “a child who had been taught this orthography would have nothing to read that was written according to it” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883), apart from a few works by Daničić and Karadžić and some newspapers, such as *Sarajevski list*, of which Ivan V. Popović was the editor. He also pointed out that, since “not a single schoolbook was printed in Daničić's orthography”, these would have to be imported from Belgrade, but that “being written in Ekavian, they would not be accepted by the local folk” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883, underlined in the source). He pointed out what he believed were the shortcomings of phonemic orthography and pronunciation, such as the pronunciation *ije*, which was unfamiliar to Ikavians in northern Bosnia, and the writing of certain future tense forms, such as *piće* (instead of *pit će*), which lead to it being confused with the noun *piće* (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883, underlined in the source). He believed that morphophonemic orthography was also more suitable from a didactical point of view, arguing that new words were adopted more easily if the student, upon seeing them, “was able to recognize their etymological origin, as opposed to merely writing them down as he had heard them” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). For all these reasons, he “decided in favour of etymological orthography”, as used in literature “throughout Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia”. As the standard dialect, he chose *south-Herzegovinian*, which he deemed suitable for Bosnia and Herzegovina, just like the *ie* sound, which “could be acceptable to Ikavians, Ekavians and Jekavians, more so than *ije* could be acceptable to the first two” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883, underlined in the source). He admitted that, since speakers in Bosnia and Herzegovina were unfamiliar with “the historical dative, prepositional and instrumental forms”, he had “in [his] manuscript, replaced them with southern forms” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883) in an effort to bring the opposing sides closer to an agreement.

His presentation resulted in the formation of two opposite camps: Ljuboje Dlustuš, Kosta Hörmann and Alojzije Mišić advocated morphophonemic orthography, Ivan V. Popović, Franjo Vuletić and Đorđe Nikolajević were in favour of a phonemic one, while Mehmed-bey Kapetanović Ljubušak proposed retaining the existing compromissory approach, noting that it should be considered, “for certain words, (...) how a Bosniak would pronounce and write them” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). The debates clearly demonstrate that their participants were familiar with the developments in their neighbouring countries, especially in Croatia. In fact, they used them to corroborate their own proposals. First, Popović referenced Daničić and the Yugoslav Academy of Science and Arts with regard to the orthography of their dictionary, which was *phonemic*. By using it, he claimed, the Academy “marked the path for the future, concluding that we should all defer to authorities such as Daničić and the Academy” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). Popović's view that Croats in Croatia would be forced to accept phonemic orthography if it was introduced into Bosnian schools “because then the Croats would be motivated to adopt phonemic orthography as well” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883), is especially poignant and

would later prove to be correct. What is even more interesting is that, in the source document, i.e. the minutes taken by Dlustuš, the word *pobuđeni* (“motivated”) is written above the crossed-out word *prisiljeni* “forced”, which reveals the real intentions and the link between the two events. The evidence suggests that the handwriting in this document is Dlustuš’s: it is unlikely that he, as the minute-taker, would have crossed out and added anything that hadn’t been said, which is why it is possible that Popović corrected himself when he realized the weight of his own words. Hörmann replied to him, arguing that “the fact that the Academy published Daničić’s dictionary written in his own orthography does not entail that it legally instituted that orthography”, and that

this is proven by the fact that certain academics still use the same orthography which they had used before the dictionary was published and by the fact that the Academy publishes books other than the dictionary, in the orthographies used by their authors (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883).

What makes this debate interesting is that the arguments used in it, i.e. those referring to the Yugoslav Academy of Science and Arts, would be reiterated by the government in their explanation of the introduction of phonemic orthography in Bosnia and Herzegovina (cf. Papić 1976, 177).

Considering that nobody had renounced their previously held positions at the first session, at the very start of the second one, Hörmann restated his position

that the manner of writing used by the advocates of phonemic orthography does not correspond to the way people speak in Bosnia, considering that no one here says “svojjjem”, “kojjjem” etc.

Immediately afterwards he presented “a proposal, drafted in agreement with Dlustuš” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883), which reads as follows:

I.

Let it be decreed that textbooks in Bosnia and Herzegovina be written according to etymological orthography, with the following modifications:

- a) Dual forms (ending in *-ma*, *-ama*, *-ima*) should be used in the plural dative, prepositional and instrumental.
- b) Words whose etymological orthography resembles their phonemic structure should be written according to the way they are spoken by the common folk of the region, for example, *rastanak* should be written instead of *razstanak* etc.
- c) In the higher grades of primary school and in secondary school, children should be introduced to phonemic orthography as well. For this reason, the rules of phonemic orthography should be covered in secondary-school grammar books and, for the sake of practice, several texts written according to these rules and the southern speech should be included in secondary-school readers.
- d) Foreign words should be written according to their pronunciation, except for proper nouns, which should be written exactly as they are in the language of origin, followed by their pronunciation in parentheses. Words from modern foreign languages should be written according to the orthography of the language to which they belong, followed by their pronunciation in parentheses.
- e) Grammatical terms in grammar books should be denoted according to their use in both Croatian and Serbian grammar.

II.

Each new school book manuscript should be reviewed by a committee made up of the intelligentsia of the region and the advocates of both orthographies, in order to rid the language of foreign influences and words incomprehensible to the common folk, excluding, however, the introduction of localisms and inappropriate terms (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883).

As is clear from the quotation, Hörmann and Dlustuš proposed a fairly moderate version of morphophonemic orthography, but even this proposal met with opposition from Vuletić and Popović, who argued in favour of phonemic orthography. In his response, Hörmann clearly emphasized that “etymological orthography is legally sanctioned in the monarchy” and that “all school books, laws and official publications” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883) were written according to it. For him, this cleared all dilemmas as to which orthography was to be adopted in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Kapetanović stated that, since the existing dichotomy was to no-one's liking, the solution should be sought amongst the people, explaining that “it would hardly be a disgrace to adopt a word used by the people”, regardless of how it would end up being spelled. Although he, in principle, supported a compromise, his proposal to adopt “separate symbols, such as those in the Cyrillic alphabet (...) for the sounds *lj, nj, dj*”²⁶ (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883), sided him firmly with the advocates of phonemic orthography. Popović, on the other hand, categorically dismissed even the possibility of a compromise, arguing that “one can make compromises in politics, but not when it comes to scientific matters” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). According to him, the government guidelines were clear and to be complied with, considering that the ultimate aim of textbooks, apart from cultural education, was to prevent the people from harboring “separatist aspirations”, and to raise the children “in such a way that they, as Bosniaks, become valiant subjects and citizens” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). That would, naturally, be best achieved by introducing phonemic orthography, due to the fact that the introduction of the morphophonemic one in books written in Cyrillic could provoke, amongst “the intelligentsia”, a sentiment that “something novel and foreign was being introduced” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). Eventually, he believed, this would cause divisions amongst the children. Furthermore, he referred to an incident in Croatia where the government had school books printed “some in the Latin, some in the Cyrillic script, but with etymological orthography used even in the ones in Cyrillic” – as this had prompted complaints from the Serbs, he reasoned that a similar situation could occur in Bosnia and Herzegovina as well, seeing that “etymology would cause a schism, whereas phonemics would bring unity” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). To his arguments, Dlustuš and Hörmann immediately and unanimously retorted that their proposal was not a compromise between two solutions, but rather, that “its aim is the adoption of etymological orthography” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina

²⁶ Translator's note: The sounds correspond to the phonemes /ʎ/, /ɲ/ and /ǰ/ respectively.

8–75, 1883). However, they claimed, the form in which it was presented was due to the fact that “the limits between etymological and phonemic orthography cannot be clearly defined” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). Dlustuš even noted that Serbs in Croatia had not risen against the orthography of books in Cyrillic, but rather, he correctly observed, “the conflict had a completely different motivation” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). In the discussion that followed, none of the participants departed from their principles, although they did agree, to a certain extent, that students needed to be familiar with both orthographies. Nevertheless, they could not agree on which orthography was to be taught from the first grade and which was to be introduced later. They clearly understood that the type of orthography which the children were taught from the first grade would end up as the predominant one, which is why they were unable to reach an agreement. Specifically, it was assumed that if the “etymological” orthography became the dominant one, this would mean a victory for the Croats, whereas if the “phonemic” orthography prevailed, the Serbs would prevail. Kapetanović argued that certain *Mohammedans* favoured neither orthography because they believed that they would otherwise be considered pro-Serb or pro-Croat. Therefore, he stated that it would be best to preserve the existing state of affairs, but other members did not support his view.

The minutes of the session reveal that Hörmann and Dlustuš were familiar with Jagić’s orthographic solutions (or that they at least kept up with developments in Croatia at the time) and that they favoured them (see point “b” above) over the proposals of the subcommittee for schools. They were also aware of the specific Bosnian and Herzegovinian environment in which they were active and of the fact that only a moderate proposal for a morphophonemic orthography²⁷ had the potential to become the language standard in the region. As opposed to Jagić, who held that “*h* must be written in the plural genitive of adjectives and in the locative” (Jagić 1864, 178), grounding their arguments in the Bosnian and Herzegovinian reality, Hörmann and Dlustuš dismissed this principle and introduced *dual forms* (ending in –*ma*, –*ama*, –*ima*) (see point “a” of the proposal). At the session of the committee held on 31 March 1883, during a discussion on orthography and plural case endings, Vuletić stated “that one of his students asked him why he had to write differently from how his parents had taught him to speak”. Dlustuš “responded that the plural forms used by etymologists could not be a matter of discussion here, since he himself had abandoned them and, as far as he was familiar with the views of certain members of the Committee on the matter, they all agreed with him”. (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883). Another of Dlustuš’s responses reveals that he was also familiar with the conclusions of the orthographic committee for schools. Namely, his response to Popović recalls the position of Janko Jurković at the first session held on 2nd February 1877, where the latter stated “that even though various hypotheses emerge daily in the natural sciences, schools do

²⁷ In fact, the minutes of the sessions, kept by Dlustuš himself, were written according to such moderate morphophonemic orthography.

not immediately embrace them”, and that that “seemed to be the case with orthography as well”, adding that “schools could only accept the knowledge that had already fully crystallised” (Mrazović 1877, 178). In a similar vein, Dlustuš, dismissing phonemic orthography, stated: “The school is a conservative institution, it does not accept novelties – not even the most commendable ones – as soon as they arise, but adopts only that which has already taken root in daily life” (Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883), meaning that, in his opinion, it would have been best to retain the current circumstances in Bosnia and Herzegovina until it was evident that the new trends had stood the test of time. Interestingly, Ljuboje Dlustuš was an especially ardent defender of “etymological” orthography until he became aware of the political decision which opposed it. He then quietly accepted the new state of affairs, likely justifying it with the activities of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts in Zagreb, which the government was keen to invoke whenever it suited it. Later, in an article published in *Bosanska vila*, he would even (in contradiction to his own position stated during the sessions of the first committee), comment thus on the activities of the second language committee:

It was mentioned in the local press two or three years ago that I had not even known how to write before I had come to Bosnia and learnt it here. While I agreed with it, when I submitted my first manuscript to the government, I said something like: I can vouch for the accuracy and adequate methodical adaptation of these manuscripts; as far as their language is concerned, I cannot claim that it is as pure and beautiful as that expressed in the speech of the folk of these lands, since I was raised and grew up in such times and such circumstances, in which our books had already begun to claim their rightful place and break free from foreign dominance and influence. I had therefore recommended to the government to form a committee of local folk, preferably alphabets, or at least illiterates, who would then shape the language of the schoolbooks according to the ear and spirit of the people. And so it was. (Dlustuš 1910, 220–221).

Even though the government later claimed that it had intentionally included under-educated people in the work of the committee, it is evident from the rest of Dlustuš’s article and the list of committee members²⁸ he had provided that this was not the case, regardless of the fact that Dlustuš himself regretted it being so (“which I almost regret”, Dlustuš 1910, 221).

After the government realized there would be no agreement between the opposing sides, it decided to intervene. In its letter of 15th May 1883, it proposed to the Joint Ministry of Finance that phonemic orthography be introduced in Bosnia and Herzegovina²⁹. Considering that such a position represented a radical departure from the language policy of the time, there were efforts to explain it as thoroughly as possible, sometimes using rather dubious arguments. Thus, one could read that phonemic orthography was

²⁸ According to Dlustuš’s article in *Bosanska vila*, the members of the new committee were Đorđe Nikolajević, Mehmed-bey Kapetanović, Miloš Mandić, Nezir ef. Skalić, Antonije Jefanović, Đuro Bujher, Kosta Hörmann (president), Nikola Kašiković, Jefan Despić, Nikola T. Kašiković and Ljuboje Dlustuš.

²⁹ Solak (2014, 117) confirms that this was a political decision, rather than a scientific one: “It is likely that the Government could have implemented a different language policy and adopted etymological orthography, as it had been expected to do, but no political interventions were carried out to that end”.

“better suited to the development of modern literature in the Serbo-Croatian language” (quoted in Papić 1976, 176), even though that same government would attempt to stave off any possible influence of either Croatian or Serbian literature in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Furthermore, by stating that the proposed orthography was “more adequate from a didactic point of view” (quoted in Papić 1976, 176), the government placed itself resolutely on the side of the advocates of phonemic orthography, regardless of the fact that both sides claimed the same kind of adequacy for their own proposals at the sessions of the language committee. The “didactic” argument was a particular point of contention between Popović and Vuletić on one side and Ljuboje Dlustuš on the other, as the latter defended his manuscript of the *Primer* and the proposal for a combined orthography. Still, the most conspicuous was the following explanation of the government: “phonemics is not preferred out of **shrewdness and political reasons**. The phonemic system is applied to all works written in Cyrillic, whereas the introduction of etymological orthography **would be impossible if the Cyrillic script was retained**” (quoted in Papić 1976, 177, boldface by M.B.). The government had obviously deliberately omitted from this explanation the Serbian standard-language tradition before Karadžić, which included both the Cyrillic script and etymological orthography, just as it had omitted its own inaugural years and official publications, such as the first issues of *Bosansko-hercegovačke novine* (“Bosnian and Herzegovinan Gazette”) in Cyrillic, in which we can find “etymological” forms such as долазка, изправом, изказати, казнити ње, одпутити etc. (*Bosansko-hercegovačke novine*, no. 34 of 29th December 1878). Furthermore, the following statement reveals that the government's actions were indeed based on “shrewdness and political reasons”:

Considering that **Eastern Orthodox Christians comprise the majority of the population in Bosnia and Herzegovina, that they have a great deal of cultural sensibility** and, in part, good confessional schools, **their interests must be taken into account** (quoted in Papić 1976, 177, boldface by M.B.).

According to these instructions from the government, Dlustuš's original manuscript was revised and its orthography was changed from morphophonemic to phonemic. In a letter of 28th May 1883, the Joint Ministry of Finance agreed with the government's decision, and the textbook was finally printed in both the Cyrillic and the Latin script in 10,000 copies. This brought an end to the orthographic turmoil in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Morphophonemic orthography, which had had a key role in the inclusion of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Austro-Hungarian administration system since 1878, was removed from official government publications.

There has been a growing number of accounts that this particular decision of the government of Bosnia and Herzegovina affected the decisions on language policy in Croatia as well. On one occasion, Antun Radić quoted Ivan Broz, the author of the phonemic *Hrvatski pravopis* (“Croatian Orthography”), who had told him

that the efforts of the Zagreb School had been a misconception and caused a great deal of damage to the Croats. Namely, the government of Bosnia and Herzegovina has introduced phonemic orthography,

which has also been introduced into Croatian schools in Dalmatia. If we retain the phonemic (sic!) orthography, we will lose these regions – their schools will not be able to use our school books. And the consequences of that loss will be far greater than what we might gain by associating with the Slovenes through etymological orthography (Radić 1907, 4).

Another interesting comment on these events came from Tomo Maretić, the author of the second major work influenced by Vuk Karadžić, *Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika* (“Grammar and Stylistics of the Croatian or Serbian Standard Language”). According to him, Bosnia and Herzegovina was one of the reasons behind the final victory of the Croatian supporters of Vuk Karadžić and the introduction of phonemic orthography:

Of all the arguments presented to Ban Kršnjavi when his signature was requested on the decree, the most pertinent was the one that phonemic orthography and the new case endings were used in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the city of Dubrovnik. To this, the Ban replied: “If our monarchy does not oppose the phonemic orthography and new case endings in Bosnia, Herzegovina and Dubrovnik, surely neither of them will cause disturbance in Croatia and Slavonia” (Maretić 1932, 19).

Concurrent with their statements is that of Stjepan Ivšić, who reported being told by Klaić “that Matica hrvatska replaced the older forms (of the plural dative, locative and instrumental) in its books with the newer ones and introduced phonemic orthography because of Bosnia, whose government had done both”. (Ivšić 1938, 13). These statements confirm Popović's claim, presented at the first session of the committee for orthography, that after the orthographic issue was resolved in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Croats would be “motivated” – meaning, in fact, forced – “to adopt phonemic orthography”.

The true nature and objectives of the politics of the time are likely best represented in a letter from 11th February 1884 written by Regional Governor Appel to Benjamin Kallay on the subject of the introduction of a geography textbook. It contains the following explanation of language policy:

With regard to the local language situation, the Regional Government wishes to state the following:

According to a description of the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the geography textbook, all the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina speak the same language (“The entire population of Bosnia and Herzegovina speaks the same language”); the intention of this statement was to avoid calling the language spoken in our country either Serbian or Croatian, as it is referred to abroad, in order to emphasize the Serbian or Croatian ethnicity of the locals. In this case, the aim was to prevent such designations at all costs.

[...] The Regional Government avails itself of the opportunity to supplicate Your Excellency for an authorisation to amend the part of the textbook which refers to the language, and to call that language “Bosnian” (The amendment should read as follows: “The entire... etc. speaks the same language, which is Bosnian”). Here, it can be omitted that the language spoken in Bosnia and Herzegovina represents a dialect of the language called Serbian and Croatian by scholars. Thus, to these two terms, a third would be added, equal in status, which would elevate the heretofore dialect to the status of a separate language (Šipka 2001, 102).

Therefore, any mention of Croatian and Serbian in Bosnia and Herzegovina was to be avoided at all costs and, owing to the intervention in the textbook, the language was named Bosnian, in spite of factual circumstances.

The issue of orthography briefly resurfaced in 1892, when the Joint Ministry of Finance requested a “more detailed explanation of its reasons for choosing phonemic orthography” (Papić 1976, 185) from the Regional Government. The request proves that there were still advocates of morphophonemic orthography even nine years after the introduction of phonemic orthography in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and that they were most likely responsible for putting the orthographic issue up for another debate. The Regional Government was thus compelled to once again issue a statement, pointing out that the committee's members had been appointed

from the three most eminent religious communities in the country, considering that the influence of religious differences on the orthography of the native folk is not to be overlooked; moreover, **people with a lower degree of literacy were deliberately appointed to the committee** because it had been rightfully assumed that they had been less influenced by foreign standard languages, unlike the standard languages of the Serbs and the Croats had been, to their detriment (Papić 1976, 186, boldface by M.B.).

However, as we have already seen from their structure, both committees did include experts, which is why the above-stated argument of the Regional Government does not stand up to scrutiny. Namely, it was the Government, rather than the members of these committees, that had the final say. Finally, by referencing the introduction of phonemic orthography in Zagreb in 1892, the Government dismissed all objections to its decision.

CONCLUSION

Although Croatian studies have mostly been focused on philological conflicts in Croatia in the second half of the 19th century, this paper shows that these conflicts did not bypass Bosnia and Herzegovina. The specific circumstances in the region led the Regional Government to assume an active role in shaping language policy and directing the course of its implementation, in line with the developments in Zagreb. In 1883, after the language of the Zagreb Philological School had served its purpose during the first years of the occupation, and considering that linguistic changes were on the horizon in Croatia too, the Government decided to resolve the orthographic dichotomy in Bosnia and Herzegovina once and for all. However, the formed language committees produced only an illusion of expert debate and language policy, considering that the real decisions were made by the Government, which, in the end, used the number of Eastern Orthodox inhabitants of the region as the central argument for the introduction of phonemic orthography. Considering that Latin had to remain the main script of Catholics and Moslems, a compromise in the form of phonemic orthography was introduced in order to appease the Eastern Orthodox element in Bosnia and Herzegovina. By reconciling the orthography of Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina and prioritizing the Latin script, Austro-Hungarian authorities strove to alienate the Serbs from their tradition and wrest them from Russian influence. On the other hand, these decisions of the Regional Government cannot be considered independently of

the language policy in Croatia, seeing that the Hungarian ruling elites in both countries often acted in collusion³⁰ to suppress any potential ideas of the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Croatia. As a cultural centre, Zagreb undoubtedly played a significant role in these developments in Bosnia and Herzegovina (especially if we consider the activities of Bishop Strossmayer and the Yugoslav Academy of Science and Arts), but it is time to acknowledge the fact that, although the mentioned conflict did not last as long in Bosnia and Herzegovina, it did carry more political significance. In that respect, what was implemented in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1883 would later be emulated in Croatia.

REFERENCES

- Bašić-Kosić, N. 2006. *Vukovci i hrvatski jezični standard*, doctoral thesis. Osijek: Josip Juraj Strossmayer University, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities.
- Brozović, D. 1985. "Jezična i pravopisna previranja u Hrvatskoj na prijelazu iz 19. u 20. stoljeće". *Jezičnik* 33(1): 1–15.
- Dlustuš, Lj. 1910. "Za narodno jedinstvo. Uspomene i misli". *Bosanska vila* 12–15: 220–222.
- Ham, S. 1998. *Jezični zagrebačke filološke škole*. Osijek: Matica hrvatska, Osijek Branch.
- Ivšić, S. 1938. "Etimologija i fonetika u našem pravopisu". *Hrvatski jezik* 1: 3–13.
- Jagić, V. 1864. "Naš pravopis". *Književnik* 1(1): 1–34; 1(2): 151–180.
- Jonke, Lj. 1971. *Hrvatski književni jezik u 19. i 20. stoljeću*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Katičić, R. 2015. "Hrvatski jezik od narodnoga preporoda do kraja 19. Stoljeća". *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika: 4. knjiga, 19. stoljeće*: 35–75.
- Malbaša, A. 1940. "Hrvatski i srpski nacionalni problem za vrijeme režima Benjamina Kallaya". *Prilozi proučavanju Jugoslovenskog pitanja u Austro-ugarskoj*: 1–2.
- Maretić, T. 1932. "Jedna značajna četrdesetogodišnjica – Kako je došlo do uvođenja fonetskog pravopisa u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji 1892". *Pravda* XXVIII: 6–9.
- Mrazović, L. 1877. "Ob ustanovi hrvatskoga pravopisa". *Vienac* 11: 176–179; 13: 210–211; 14: 217–221.
- Nogo, Lj. 1981. "Fonetske, leksičke i morfološke osobine «Sarajevskog cvjetnika»". *Radovi* 8: 135–241.
- Okuka, M. 1991. "Usvajanje Vukova jezika i pravopisa u administrativno-pravnim spisima turske administracije u Bosni i Hercegovini". In *Književni jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini od Vuka Karadžića do kraja austrougarske vladavine*, eds. M. Okuka, and L. Stančić. München: Slavica Verlag dr. Anton Kovač, 47–51.
- Papić, M. 1982. *Hrvatsko školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini do 1918. godine*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.
- Papić, M. 1976. *Tragom kulturnog nasljeđa*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Radić, A. 1907. "Hrvatski književni jezik". *Glas Matice Hrvatske* II(1–2): 2–4.
- Samarđžija, M. 1997. *Iz triju stoljeća hrvatskoga standardnog jezika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

³⁰ The fact that Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina were ruled by two Hungarians, Khuen Héderváry (1883–1903) and Benjamin Kallay (1882–1883), cannot be considered independently from a unified Hungarian policy towards Slavs. Malbaša (1940, 9) confirms this: "Hungarian policies in Bosnia and Croatia were practically always coordinated".

- Solak, E. 2014. *Rasprave o jeziku u Bosni i Hercegovini od 1850. do 1914. godine. Sociolingvistički pristup*. Sarajevo: Institute for Language, Edicija Posebna izdanja, Book 20.
- Šator, M. 2003. "Ko je autor Gramatike bosanskoga jezika (1890)". *Književni jezik* 21(2): 1–13.
- Šator, M. 2004. *Bosanski/hrvatski/srpski jezik u BiH do 1914*. Mostar: Džemal Bijedić University, Faculty of Humanities.
- Šator, M. 2008. "Jezička politika u vrijeme Austro-Ugarske". *Bosanski jezik, Časopis za kulturu bosanskoga književnog jezika* 5: 103–131.
- Šipka, M. 2001. *Standardni jezik i nacionalni odnosi u Bosni i Hercegovini (1850–2000). Dokumenti*. Sarajevo: Sarajevo Institute for Language.
- Šulek, B. 1854a. "Zašto izostavljamo e pred r-om u riečih krv itd.?" *Neven* III(1), nonpaginated.
- Šulek, B. 1854b. "O dvoglascu ie. In Literary supplement 2". *Neven* III(15): V–X.
- Šulek, B. 1864. "Obrana ahavca". *Književnik* I(2): 283–291.
- Veber, A. 1866. "Zadnji odgovor g. Jagiću". *Domobran* III(1): 2.
- Veber-Tkalčević, A. 1864. "Odgovor na «Naš pravopis»". *Književnik* I(2): 181–186.
- Vince, Z. 1973. "Različiti pogledi na hrvatski književni jezik XIX. stoljeća". *Radovi Instituta Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Zadru* XX: 343–357.
- Vince, Z. 1975. "Zakret u hrvatskom književnom jeziku potkraj 19. stoljeća". *Croatica* 6: 131–159.
- Vince, Z. 2002. *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika. Lingvističko-kulturnopovijesni prikaz filoloških škola i njihovih izvora* (third revised edition). Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.

SOURCES

- Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina 8–75, 1883.
- Bosansko-hercegovačke novine* (29th December 1878), no. 34.
- Glavni pregled političkoga razdielenja Bosne i Hercegovine polag popisa od 16. lipnja 1879*.

Źródła koncepcji ortograficznej w Bośni i Hercegowinie

Słowa kluczowe: Bośnia i Hercegowina, Chorwacja, ortografia, polityka językowa, język standardowy.

STRESZCZENIE

Artykuł skupia się na sporze wokół ortografii w Bośni i Hercegowinie między zwolennikami koncepcji języka Karadzicia i Daničića oraz umiarkowanej koncepcji morfofonicznej opartej na języku Zagrzebskiej Szkoły Filologicznej. Szczególną uwagę poświęcono dwóm sesjom komitetu ds. ortografii, które odbyły się w 1883 roku, oraz propozycji, którą przedstawili Kosta Hörmann i Ljuboje Dlustuš, dotyczącej zachowania i odtworzenia ortografii morfofonicznej w Bośni i Hercegowinie. Ich propozycje porównano z propozycjami przedstawionymi przez Vatroslava Jagicia w traktacie *Naš pravopis* z 1864 roku. W artykule omówiono także rezultaty i wpływ tego konfliktu na stan ortografii w Chorwacji.