

KREŠIMIR MIČANOVIĆ
University of Zagreb, Croatia

„THE SPIRIT OF AVNOJ IN LANGUAGE POLICY“: LANGUAGE POLICY FROM THE END OF WORLD WAR II TO MID-1950S IN YUGOSLAVIA AND CROATIA

Słowa kluczowe: Yugoslavia, Croatia, language policy, standard languages, orthography.

ABSTRACT

The language issue in the multi-national and multi-language Yugoslav federation was oftentimes valued as a vital and political problem. This article analyses language policy in the post-war period, when such a language-politics system was formed that assigned no language *de iure* official status, and parliamentary practice confirmed the differentiation between the four languages of the Yugoslav peoples – Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian and Macedonian. Particular attention is given to language-related provisions in constitutional texts and philological discussions problematizing the question of whether there should exist two orthographic handbooks – Croatian and Serbian – or Croatian and Serbian linguists should create a unitary common handbook which would serve as a normative standard in the territory of the four federal units.

INTRODUCTION

The post-war years of the federation of Yugoslavia are often described as a period when the federal state, despite being a federative republic constitution-wise, was established as a centralist, unitary state, a system of state socialism in which the federal state and the ruling Communist Party of Yugoslavia had almost limitless power. In this period of revolutionary statism or administrative socialism, the areas of culture and education were delegated to federal units (cf. Radelić 2006, Goldstein 2008). The federal state formed a multilinguistic framework for language policy within which *de iure* no language was assigned the status of official (state) language, also making sure that federal laws and regulations were published in four issues – in Croatian, Macedonian, Slovenian, and Serbian – of the Official Gazette of the Democratic Federal Yugoslavia (DFY) or Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia (FPRY).

Literature states that in the post-war decade social theorists and control instances of the Communist Party gave barely any significance to the “Serbo-Croatian language issues” (Cvetković-Sander 2011: 103), i.e. that language issues were not considered particularly relevant in the then socialist Yugoslavia (Okuka 1998: 77). To support those estimates, in 1952 there was a poll in the Belgrade weekly *Nedeljne informativne novine* (*Weekly Informative Paper*) where respondents answered the question of how they per-

ceived “the issue of even closer bonding and connections among our cultural centres”, i.e. what they thought of “the need to strengthen and achieve the unity of our cultural life with the purpose of establishing a wide Yugoslavian foundation of our cultural, artistic and scientific creation” (cf. NIN: 8). Not a single poll respondent replied mentioning language as a means to achieve unity and closer connections among Yugoslavian cultural centres.

When writing about language policy, Croatian authors paint the post-war period pink. In the mid-1980s, when the communist government encourages the modification of the language-related provision in the Constitution of the Federal State of Croatia. The editorial team of *Jezik (Language)*, Zagreb-based journal dedicated to the culture of the Croatian standard language, fights such an initiative, invoking “the spirit of AVNOJ in language policy”, when in the post-war period, e.g. texts published in the Official Gazette, listing four languages: Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian and Macedonian (cf. Uredništvo 1985–1986). Stjepan Babić refers to the period between 1944 and 1953 as a time when the Croatian language developed “normally in the socio-political life, according to the situation and people using it and studying it” (Babić 1990: 5), establishing that “from AVNOJ to the Novi Sad Agreement, it was legally assured that the four languages – Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian and Macedonian – are equal” (Babić 2009: 107). In the foreword to his *Razlikovni rječnik srpskog i hrvatskog jezika (Differential Dictionary of Serbian and Croatian Languages)*, Vladimir Brodnjak reminisces about the post-war decade, remembering it as the golden age when the “Croatization of Serbian texts, or translating them to Croatian, was still a legitimate business rather than a counter-revolutionary effort” (Brodnjak 1991: VII).

THE LANGUAGES OF YUGOSLAV PEOPLES

During World War II, at the Second Session of AVNOJ in Jajce in 1943, it was decided, among other things, that Yugoslavia was to be established on a federative principle as a state of equal peoples. In the *Decision on the constitution of Yugoslavia on a federative principle*, it was established that Yugoslavia was being established and would be established “on a federative principle, which will ensure full equality of Serb, Croats, Slovenians, Macedonians and Montenegrins, i.e. peoples of Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina” (SLDFJa: 4). In the spirit of the proclaimed federative principle, in 1944 the Presidium of AVNOJ adopted the *Decision on publishing decisions and proclamations of the Anti-fascist Council of the people’s liberation of Yugoslavia, its Presidium and National committee in Serbian, Croatian, Slovene and Macedonian languages* – in its first version entitled *Law on Language Equality in the Democratic Federative Yugoslavia* (cf. Petranović, Zečević 1987: 731) – establishing that the four listed languages were equal “in the whole territory of Yugoslavia” (SLDFJb: 5). This decision by AVNOJ Presidium was further strengthened by the decision of the National Committee of the Liberation of Yugoslavia from December 1944, stating that the Official Gazette of the Democratic

Federative Yugoslavia shall be printed “in Serbian, Croatian, Slovene and Macedonian languages” (SLDFJc: 10).

In the parliamentary life of this budding state – Democratic Federative Yugoslavia was proclaimed people’s republic under the name of Federative People’s Republic of Yugoslavia on the 29th of November 1945 – there were “language of four peoples”. In discussions on bills, objections were given in regards to the very text, in their nature linguistic and stylistic, but occasionally also such that would demonstrate then differences between Serbian and Croatian were indeed taken into account. So, the secretary of AVNOJ Presidium Mile Peruničić in the discussion on the bill on social insurance, notices that “the Serbian text should say ‘uprava’ instead of ‘ravnateljstvo’, while Croatian and other languages may say as is right for them” [both terms mean ‘directorate’] (cf. ZPA: 219). When discussing the “Law on the organization of the agricultural engineering service”, Vladislav Ribnikar, DFY minister of education, “would fully rework the style of one article, as the text is coarse, and there are also inappropriate expressions and words. The word ‘stroj’ should be replaced with ‘mašina’ throughout the text in the Serbian version, and then terminology needs to be aligned.” [both terms mean ‘machine’] (cf. RZP: 179).

The legislator was not unaware that listing four languages in the text of the law could be interpreted – of the four, two, Slovenian and Macedonian, were in no way contentious – as recognition that Croatian and Serbian were two languages. In a discussion on a bill on the Constitutional Assembly, Hinko Krizman suggested that instead of the formulation “in Serbian, Croatian, Slovene and Macedonian [na srpskom, hrvatskom, slovenačkom i makedonskom]”, the text should read “in Serbo-Croatian, Slovene and Macedonian [na srpsko-hrvatskom, slovenačkom i makedonskom]”, as he would not want to “legalize for the first time, this recognition of two languages, Serbian and Croatian [srpskog i hrvatskog], which are in fact one language”. Moša Pijade, the chairman of the Legislative committee, suggested, and this was adopted without any discussion, that while he fully understood Hinko’s intervention, the existing formulation to remain unaltered (cf. RZP: 307). In the end, the *Law on Constitutional Assembly* stated that proclamation and issue of the Constitution and regulations “shall be executed [...] in Serbian, Croatian, Slovene and Macedonian” (cf. SLDFJd: 598), and in the spirit of that provision, the *Constitution of the FPRY* (1946) was read in four languages: its first part in “the Serbian language”, second in “the Croatian language”, third in “the Slovene language” and the fourth in “the Macedonian language” (cf. SLFNRJa: 150).

CONSTITUTION(S) AND LANGUAGES

The differentiation among four languages of the Yugoslav peoples, i.e. the use of four linguonyms – Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Macedonian – confirmed in post-war Yugoslav parliamentary sessions, was not explicitly sanctioned in any federal laws, including the *Constitution of the Federative People’s Republic of Yugoslavia* adopted on the 31st

of January 1946. This *Constitution* defines FPRY as a federal people's state, republican in form, a community of peoples equal in right, who on grounds of their right to self-determination, including the right of secession, have expressed their will to live together in a federal state (cf. UFNJR: Article 1). *Constitution* then lists the people's republics: the People's Republic of Serbia (containing "Autonomous Province of Vojvodina and Autonomous Kosovo-Metohijan Region"), the People's Republic of Croatia, the People's Republic of Slovenia, the People's Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the People's Republic of Macedonia and the People's Republic of Montenegro – yet does not contain neither the names of the peoples and the names of national minorities living in the federative state. The Constitutional text contains three language-related provisions, but none of them includes the name of any language. Those provisions state that national minorities enjoy the right and protection of their cultural development and free use of their language (Article 13); that laws and other general regulations of FPRY are issued in languages of the people's republics (Article 65); and that trials before court occur in the languages of the republics, autonomous regions or autonomous provinces where the court is in session, while citizens who do not speak the language of the trial may use their own language (Article 20).

The first post-war constitutional text was drafted after the USSR Constitution (1936), meaning that it is highly likely that the Yugoslav version copied the formulations such as "the languages of the republics", "the languages of autonomous regions or autonomous provinces", as well as language-related provisions on issuing regulations and court trials. It is evident from the text of the Constitution that in FPRY there is not one single federative (state) language and that the legislators differentiate among three groups of languages, different in status. First, "the languages of the republics", in which laws are issued and which are used in court trial, then "the languages of autonomous regions or autonomous provinces", which are used in court proceedings, and lastly, the languages of national minorities.

The fact that the *FPRY Constitution* does not mention/lists the languages of those republics/regions/provinces is not an oversight, but a conscious decision by the legislator, i.e. the inner circle of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, made primarily so as to relieve the text of the Constitution of arbitrariness of whether Croatian and Serbian were two languages or one language. The new communist authority confronted that issue over and over again when writing the first draft of the constitutional text.

At the Constitutional Committee of the Federal Assembly, Miloš M. Moskovljević claimed that there were three languages: "Serbo-Croatian, as this is one language (there is no Montenegrin language)", Slovenian and Macedonian, suggesting that the *Constitution* should expressly state which languages the people's republic will use, which is mandatory for all, if all languages are obligatory for the supreme authority and other republics. Moskovljević's elaboration, in which he mentioned "the official language" of republics and "state language", usually mentioned in the Constitution "in the spirit of the state's official symbols", incited no (polemic) discussion. Only Moša Pijade, as chairman of the Constitutional Committee of the Federal Assembly ignored

Moskovljević's statement on Serbo-Croatian being one language in a brief comment/response. He asserted, and other Committee members supported him, that it was not necessary to introduce the languages of people's republics into the text of the constitution. He continued by saying that as regards to that matter, it was sufficient that all federal laws were to be published "in the four languages" (cf. UOS: 112, 123).

The decision on language-related provisions adopted in Assembly procedure, on which Vladimir Bakarić, then the leader of the Communist Party of Croatia, spoke, was made in the inner circle of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. According to Bakarić, the discussion on language-related provisions, primarily the complex relationship between Serbian and Croatian languages, took place within the then Politburo, the inner circle of Party leadership. In the end, the formulation was adopted listing all four languages, though such a proposal "was practically adopted, even could have been adopted", but at the same time it is impossible to deduce from the given formulation that Croatian and Serbian are considered the same language, which was one of the conclusions of those discussions (Bakarić 1983: 137).

The federal Constitution left it to respective republics' constitutions to name their own languages. The constitutions of people's republics do not contain specific provisions on the (official) status and name of "the republic's language", but the name of the language is stated in the provision regulating court procedure (cf. UFNJR). In Croatia, this procedure is conducted in *Croatian or Serbian* (The Constitution of the People's Republic of Croatia, 1947, Article 112). In other republics: in Montenegro in *the Serbian language* (The Constitution of the People's Republic of Montenegro, 1946, Article 113), in Bosnia and Herzegovina in *Serbian or Croatian* (The Constitution of the People's Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1946, Article 114). In the constitutions of Slovenia and Macedonia, or marginal relevant to the discussion on the language issue at hand, in Slovenian (The Constitution of the People's Republic of Slovenia, 1947, Article 111), i.e. Macedonian (The Constitution of the People's Republic of Macedonia, 1946, Article 112). Of all republican constitutions, only that of the People's Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina expressly states the language in which laws and other regulations are published ("in Serbian or Croatian", Article 63).

The statutes of autonomous units stipulate that court procedures are conducted in "Serbo-Croatian, as well as the languages of national minorities at the relevant court's territory" (Statute of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina in the People's Republic of Serbia, Article 43, cf. SLAPV) and "in Serbian and Shqipta language", which are "used equally in all state services" (the Statute of the Autonomous Kosovo-Metohijan Region in the People's Republic of Serbia, Article 3, cf. SLAKMO). If one were to be guided by the provisions on court procedure, then a Croat spoke *Croatian or Serbian* at a Croatian court, *Serbian or Croatian* at a court in Bosnia and Herzegovina, *Serbo-Croatian* in Vojvodina, *Croatian* in Serbia, while a Serb spoke *Croatian or Serbian* at a Croatian court, *Serbian or Croatian* at a court in Bosnia and Herzegovina, *Serbo-Croatian* in Vojvodina, *Serbian* in Serbia and Kosovo – Metohija.

The constitutional laws adopted in 1953 at the federal and republican levels largely abrogated and altered the provisions of existing constitutions, yet as regards to language, the “Constitutional law on the foundations of social and political order in the Federative People’s Republic of Yugoslavia and federal government bodies” brought just one change. It was specified that federal laws are not only adopted, but also published in “languages of all people’s republics” (Article 19, Paragraph 1, cf. SLFNRJb). Neither the republican constitutional laws nor the “Constitutional law of the People’s Republic of Croatia on the foundations of social and political order and republican government bodies” changed existing language-related provisions in republican constitutions.

THE LANGUAGE STANDARD IN THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CROATIA

The post-war early days of scientific work in the field of linguistics are tightly connected to the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts, outside of which, as Hraste (1957: 41) claims, at that time “there is no organized scientific work in linguistics”. The Academy founded a Department for language and literature (1947), which then founded its Institute for language and literature (1948). Its Department for language “focused all efforts” on processing input for the Academy’s *Dictionary of Croatian or Serbian language*, but also “worked on preconditions for drafting a practical Dictionary of the Croatian literary language [Rječnik hrvatskoga književnog jezika]” by Julije Benešić (cf. JAZU: 88)¹.

Texts published by the Academy were harmonized with the linguistic standard as defined by Maretić’s grammar, Maretić’s language advisor and Boranić’s orthography handbook (Pavešić 1971: 7)². Those three handbooks, proscribed at the time of the Independent State of Croatia, again serve as a normative pointer in forming the Croatian language standard in the post-war period.

Though the new government included it in the list of forbidden books in 1945 (cf. Šarić 2008: 44), by all accounts, one should definitely add another book to the then basic standard-language code: Kruno Krstić and Petar Guberina’s *Razlike između hrvatskoga i srpskoga književnog jezika (Differences between the Croatian and Serbian literary language)* (1940). It is not known when (and whether, for that matter), this book was officially removed from that list, but it is apparent from the article by Miroslav Krleža

¹ The first part of the Academy’s dictionary – *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika, Dio I* – was published 1880–1882. Work on the dictionary was halted 1938–1947, and after that first volumes started being printed in 1948 (cf. Hraste 1957).

Julije Benešić did not succeed in completing the dictionary and the first volume was published 28 years after his death: Julije Benešić, *Rječnik hrvatskoga književnog jezika od preporoda do I. G. Kovačića. Svezak I. A-burkati*, Zagreb, 1985. The dictionary remains unfinished to this day: the 12th volume was published in 1990, and the next one 23 years after that: *Rječnik hrvatskoga književnog jezika od preporoda do I. G. Kovačića. Svezak XIII. S-spužvast*, 2013.

² Tomo Maretić, *Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb, ¹1899, ²1931; Tomo Maretić, *Hrvatski ili srpski jezični savjetnik za sve one, koji žele dobro govoriti i pisati književnim našim jezikom. Dopuna Broz–Ivekovićevu „Rječniku hrvatskoga jezika“*, Zagreb, 1924; Dragutin Boranić, *Pravopis hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, Zagreb, ⁸1941, ⁹1947, ¹⁰1951.

published in *Naprijed* (*Forward*), a paper of the Communist Party of Croatia, where he defended his associates, and himself from accusations that the Institute of Lexicography was “the cradle of Ustashe”, claiming that Zagreb *Borba* (*Struggle*) uses it regularly. In Krleža’s words, *Borba* publishes “its Croatian edition precisely following the directions” of Krstić and Guberina’s advisor on a daily basis (Krleža 1952)³.

With the establishment of the Croatian Philological Society in 1950, a new stage in Croatian philology began, especially its linguistic segment. At the beginning of the school year 1952/53, the Society started publishing *Jezik* (*Language*), with the subtitle *Journal for the culture of the Croatian literary language*⁴, which was to, as was emphasized in the introduction, primarily present discussions and articles on the purity and regularity of the contemporary standard language, but also articles “from the history of the Croatian language, as far as they are related to the literary language, as well as articles from the wider field of science on language, as far as they are related to the creation and formation of the literary language”. The editorial board announced that it would cooperate with the journals *Naš jezik* (*Our language*) from Belgrade and *Pitanja savremenog književnog jezika* (*Issues of contemporary literary language*) from Sarajevo “in the spirit of mutual assistance and mutual respect, adopting every correct and unbiased view regarding all matters of our literary language” (Uredništvo 1952: 2).

The polemic commentary published in the final number of the first year provides a specific example of what the editorial board of *Jezik* does not accept as a correct and unbiased view. To be more precise, Serbian philologist Miloš S. Moskovljević (1952–1953: 155) in a critical review of the article “Slovenski i slovenački” by Josip Hamm claimed that all scientific reasons go in favour of the rule that all who “speak and write in Croatian or Serbian” should use the adjective *slovenački* (according to the nationality *Slovenci*), i.e. *slovenski*, with *Slovenci* being the word that denotes “the common name of all people close to us”. In the same issue with Moskovljević’s article, the editorial board warns “the esteemed language expert” that, though Croats and Serbs share one vernacular language – there are two literatures, two standard and communication practices, Croatian and Serbian, i.e. that linguists have the obligation to keep away from forcing anything that would cause harm to any party. Thus, in the tradition and practice of the Serbian literature the words *slovenački*, *slovenski*, *Slovenci* are used, whereas in the tradition and practice of Croatian literature, the words are *slovenski*, *slavenski*, *Slaveni* (Uredništvo 1952–1953).

The public discourse of the People’s Republic of Croatia in the post-war period was marked by the denominators *Croatian* (*Croatian standard language*) and *Croa-*

³ *Borba* was published simultaneously in Belgrade (written in Cyrillic) and Zagreb (in the Latin alphabet) from the 22nd of March 1948 to the 30th of December 1987. Initially *Borba* was the official gazette of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and from June 1954 the official gazette of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia.

⁴ Stjepan Ivšić suggested the journal be named *Hrvatski jezik* (*Croatian language*) – much like the journal published by the Society „Croatian language“ 1938–1939, with Ivšić serving as editor-in-chief. In the end, Antun Barac’s motion to name the journal *Jezik*, with the subtitle *Časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika* was adopted.

tian or Serbian. Denomination *Croatian or Serbian* obtained official status in Croatian schools. The post-war education ministry continued the practices of the Department of people's education of ZAVNOH, which during the war in 1944, in the curriculum for primary and general-education secondary schools lists "Croatian or Serbian language". From 1945 to mid-1950s, the transformation of obligatory schooling was followed by a series of curricula (Koren 2012: 66–87), and in all those numerous curricula for primary schools, as well as general-education secondary schools, as a rule, the name of the subject was *Croatian or Serbian*. In line with the curriculum, the title of new textbooks contained *Croatian or Serbian*, as well as the title of the first Croatian post-war grammar handbook (Ivan Brabec – Mate Hraste – Sreten Živković, *Gramatika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, Zagreb, 1952). In the same period, with *Croatian or Serbian* in school certificates and textbooks, some bilingual dictionaries are printed in Croatia (Drvodelić's, Golik's, Deanović's, Benešić's, Hurm's, Filipović's), which in the title contain the term *Croatian*⁵. From the mid-1950s in Croatia, the term Croatoserbian [hrvatskosrpski] gradually replaces *Croatian* and *Croatian or Serbian*. When in the early 1960s *Croatoserbian* almost completely replace other competing names from the public discourse, the denomination *Croatian* remained preserved in the Yugoslav Assembly until the adoption of the SFRY Constitution (1963).

HOW MANY STANDARD LANGUAGES ARE THERE IN YUGOSLAVIA?

Up until the poll by *Letopis Matice srpske*, initiated in 1953, Croatian and Serbian linguists did not open the Pandora's box of language identity and explicitly elaborate on issues connected to it. This does not mean that there are no casual objections and (conservative) polemical statements on whether *Croatian and Serbian* are two or one (standard) language. Such objections can be found in articles by the Croatian linguist Nikola Rončević and Serbian linguist Aleksandar Belić, where both discuss primarily on the normative prosody and accentuation of individual words.

In a critical review of an article by his Zagreb colleague Bratoljub Klaić, Rončević calls upon his lecture "literary languages in Yugoslavia", in which he explained the "hosts of a Zagreb radio station" that we have "four literary (official) languages which require further building: Serbian, Croatian, Macedonian, Slovenian", all in accordance "with political principles of our Federation" with the solution "given to us from the very top of our state administration and which is reflected in all official editions of our federal government". Taking into consideration the different normative accentuation of individual words, Rončević differentiates the Croatian (standard) language from

⁵ Milan Drvodelić, *Englesko-hrvatski rječnik. Prvi dio: Englesko-hrvatski*, 1946; Miroslav i Aleksandra Golik, *Džepni rusko-hrvatski rječnik*, 1946; Julije Benešić, *Hrvatsko-poljski rječnik*, 1949; Mirko Deanović, *Talijansko-hrvatski rječnik*, 1948 (first edition 1942); Milan Drvodelić, *Hrvatsko-engleski*, 1953; Milan Drvodelić, *Englesko-hrvatski rječnik*, 1954; Antun Hurm, *Njemačko-hrvatski rječnik s gramatičkim podacima i frazeologijom*, 1954; Rudolf Filipović et. al., *Englesko-hrvatski*, 1955. These general language dictionaries are joined by the first Croatian terminology dictionary in the post-war period: Vlatko Dabac, *Njemačko-hrvatski i hrvatsko-njemački elektrotehnički rječnik*, 1952.

“Serbo-Croatian, i.e. Serbian and Croatian as a single language”. Such a differentiation is by no means unusual because, as he claims, Serbian authors too “use a special *Serbian* language and a common *Serbo-Croatian*” (Rončević 1950: 737, 738).

This is the article that Rončević referred to for Belić in the conclusion of his text entitled “From recent accentuation”. The central objection of the Belgrade professor is that there are not four standard languages, but “only three: Slovenian, Serbo-Croatian (Serbian or Croatian) with two alphabets and two literary pronunciations, and Macedonian”. In Rončević’s accentuation suggestions for individual words, which should hold a normative status in the language that Rončević calls Croatian, Belić sees “the legitimation of various regional characteristics” which deviate from the “common literary language”. He perceives the new procedure with disapproval, seeing it as an aspiration to “deepen the differences among different centres so as to, in all likelihood, prompt the creation of individual literary language”. Unlike Rončević, Belić did not believe that the issue on the number of standard languages should be considered in relation to the political constitution of Yugoslavia or, for instance, the fact that there are four editions of the *Official Gazette*. Belić admits that there are “more nationalities and individual republics”, but that there are not that many standard languages as there are nations and federal units (Belić 1951: 236, 237). Previously, in an article written on the occasion of 100th anniversary of the Vienna Literary Agreement, in which he celebrates Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, “his immortal thoughts on the unity of the Serbo-Croatian literary language”, he expressly states that the unity of our standard language remained intact even when the “people’s liberation efforts” proclaimed as one of its primary principles “the self-determination of peoples”, i.e. when “Montenegrins established their people’s republic, Croatians theirs, Bosnians theirs, Serbs in Serbia with Kosmet and Vojvodina their” people’s republic (Belić 1950: 346).

ORTHOGRAPHY HANDBOOK: ONE OR TWO?

In August 1945, just before the beginning of the school year, the education authorities in Croatia decided that “until further notice” Boranić’s orthographic handbook *Pravopis hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* printed at the time of Banovina Hrvatska in 1940 and 1941 shall remain “in official use”. This decision officially confirmed the return to the orthography before the Ustasha government prescribed the so-called “root orthography”. A new edition of Boranić’s orthography handbook was printed in 1947, and the last one in 1951.

After the publication of that final issue, which was proclaimed inadequate among Croatian linguists, the Orthography section of the Croatian Philological Society started working on the Croatian orthographic handbook, *Pravopis hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. In late 1952 Aleksandar Belić’s orthographic handbook, *Pravopis srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika*⁶ was published in Belgrade, which provided impetus for the discus-

⁶ Aleksandar Belić, *Pravopis srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika*, novo, dopunjeno i ispravljeno izdanje, Belgrade, 1950 (printing completed in early December 1952).

sion on orthographic differences between Croatian and Serbian. The crucial question being: will there remain two handbooks, one Croatian and one Serbian, or should the common one be created?

Even before *Letopis Matice srpske* started that *Anketa o pitanjima srpskohrvatskog jezika i pravopisa* (Poll on issues of the Serbo-Croatian language and orthography), articles of Croatian philologists investigated the topic of one common spelling. For instance, Klaić, when reviewing the book of Sarajevo-based professor Jovan Vuković *Pravopisna pravila i uputstva za pisanje ijekavskih glasovnih oblika* (1949) stated that some journalists had already started writing following Vuković's rules and guidelines. If that claim has grounds, it would mean that this Bosnian and Herzegovinian orthography handbook shook the normative status of Boranić's handbook. In the conclusion to his article, he advocates for a single "ije"-based orthography, "which will be acceptable for all, for all people in our language region" (Klaić 1950: 524). In the article entitled "Naš pravopis" ("Our orthography"), Hraste made a detailed demonstration of differences between "Belić's (Belgrade) and Boranić's (Zagreb) orthography", then considered the idea of a common orthography. He believes "that everyone feels, that it would be most correct, for one language to have one orthography", but he does not question the right of respective federal units to decide on their own cultural matters, including orthography (Hraste 1950: 16–17).

In a series of articles published in the 1950s, Aleksandar Belić and Mihailo Stevanović, two prominent Serbian linguists largely determined the attitudes and formed negotiating positions of the Serbian side as regards "the question of the Serbo-Croatian language and orthography". Unlike Croatian linguists, Belić and Stevanović had a rather clear attitude that a unitary orthography handbook should be composed for Serbs and Croats. Furthermore, they had a more or less completed plan on the procedure of making such an orthographic handbook even before the start of the poll in *Letopis Matice srpske*.

In an interview to *Borba* on the occasion of publishing his orthographic handbook – when answering the question – what he thought of "harmonizing orthographic rules for all those who speak and write the same literary language regardless of the republic they happen to reside in" – he readily offered his own handbook as a starting point or temporary solution (Belić 1952a). Hraste fired a rather quick response in an article "A unitary orthography" published in *Vjesnik* (Zagreb news daily). There he again presents the opinion that it would be the most natural for one standard language to have one harmonized orthography, yet explains that such an orthography can be achieved only by agreement, which implies compromises on both sides. Hraste clearly rejects Belić's proposal, not in the capacity as orthography expert, but as a Croat: "For Croats it would be quite difficult to agree to his proposal and accept that orthography handbook as a temporary solution". In the existing situation, Boranić's *Pravopis* "must be the standard in all schools and for all cultural workers in Croatia until a new orthography handbook is written and given approval to by the people's authorities" (Hraste 1952).

Belić fervently advocated for a unitary orthography, which is evident from articles in which he announces an orthographic action, which was indeed started several months later by the editorial board of *Letopis Matice srpske* by publishing the poll and questionnaire.

In the article entitled “Okolo jezika i pravopisa” (“On language and orthography”), Belić explained in more detail what he stated in the *Borba* interview. Namely, orthographic unity is necessary for cultural and educational purposes, equal writing school be not only mandatory for schools, but also “generally accepted” or “generally recognized”, and this unity can be achieved only by agreement, as orthography contains many issues which are “questions of mutual agreement and compromise”. He concludes with strong hope in “smart action” which can bear good fruit if well prepared (Belić 1952b: 81).

In early 1953, Belgrade *Politika* (*Politics*) published a series of articles on the topic of orthography, mostly regarding Belić’s handbook. One of the articles in the series was a text by Belgrade’s secondary school teacher, in which he calls for an agreement on orthography between Serbs and Croats in the ongoing year (Toholj 1953), as well as an article by *Politika*’s Zagreb correspondent on the making of “a new Croatian orthography handbook” by the Croatian Philological Society. In the final part of the article, which speaks affirmatively on Croatian orthography, the journalist suddenly announces “the great people’s task” before Croatian and Serbian linguists and writers: “to create a single Serbo-Croatian orthography and terminology, for which there have been mutual and strong aspirations for some time” (Ostojić 1953).

Antun Barac, the greatest authority of Croatian literary historiography, joined the discussion on orthography in the Belgrade daily, followed promptly by Aleksandar Belić. Their articles clearly demonstrate two opposing views on whether Croats and Serbs should have a common orthographic handbook, or, as until then, each their own. Barac, then also the president of the Croatian Philological Society where he worked in full steam on a new Croatian orthographic handbook, explained all the reasons why “unification of orthographies should not be seen as one of the most pressing cultural issues of our time”. He advocated for the creation of an orthographic handbook on Croatian and Serbian sides respectively, and then possibly considering the “unification” of those two orthographies (Barac 1953).

While Barac opposes “the nervous rush” and guessing that maybe a year or two will pass, a decade or two until the orthographic unification is implemented, Belić is in a hurry and he cannot wait that long. In an extensive article under the title “Notes on Serbo-Croatian orthography”, published a mere week after Barac’s, he writes on the orthographic agreement “of all our republics using the Serbo-Croatian language” and, relying on the appropriate official ideological rhetoric, announces its achievement: “Today, when brotherhood and unity are getting stronger and stronger among our peoples, we must be convinced that time when this will become a matter of serious discussion – is not far” (Belić 1953: 6).

In an article with a programmatic title “Za jedinstven pravopis srpskohrvatskog jezika” (“For a unitary orthography of the Serbo-Croatian language”), Mihailo Stevanović

considers in great detail the orthographic issues, especially on the need for a unitary orthography of the Serbo-Croatian standard language. In his interpretation, it is not questionable that all agree that a unitary orthographic handbook should be created, but the only difference is that some believe the removal of orthographic discrepancies should be approached as soon as possible, for others it is not a pressing matter and therefore there is no need to rush. Stevanović believes that the differences in orthography in Serbian and Croatian are not extensive, and are thus easy to remove and in the end to achieve the unitary orthography. His estimate of orthographic differences will be adopted later on by many authors of poll-based articles and participants of the meeting at Novi Sad. Stevanović suggested the creation of a common orthographic handbook be handed to a committee – which will indeed happen later – composed of experts, linguists, writers, journalists and teachers, selected by institutions as their representatives (Stevanović 1953).

The editorial board of *Letopis Matice srpske* paid particular attention to orthography in their poll, with orthography becoming a top topic, on which the most prominent Serbian and Croatian writers, scientists, political and public officials were expected to give their opinion. While Zagreb-based *Jezik* published articles on the orthography of the Croatian standard language, *Letopis* of Novi Sad printed articles advocating the creation of a unitary orthography valid in all four republics, including Croatia.

The debate on orthographic differences was instigated as a burning issue in the 1950s, though a significant segment of the population of four central people's republics was completely unaware of that, as they were illiterate, half-literate and functionally poorly literate⁷. Independently of the general level of language culture, oftentimes this question of language in the Yugoslav society had a significant symbolic weight. In early 1954, and the first volume of *The Encyclopaedia of Yugoslavia* sent in print; Miroslav Krleža, the director of the Institute of Lexicography was asked by a journalist on language, orthography and writing in the encyclopaedic editions already in the first sentence responds: "It is a highly delicate issue. [...] we will print the *Encyclopaedia* on some bilateral orthographic handbook, using both Boranić and Belić" (Krleža 1954). In spring of the same year, in the heat of the poll by *Letopis Matice srpske*, a draft of the orthographic handbook of the Croatian standard language was completed, and by the end of the year the meeting in Novi Sad was concluded with the agreement that Croatian and Serbian experts should create a common orthographic handbook, which *de facto* meant that the Orthography Section of the Croatian Philological Society on a Croatian orthographic handbook would have to abolish all activities.

⁷ The same year that the poll was started, the second post-war census was conducted. Statistical data for the four central people's republics: PR Croatia around 16%, OR Serbia around 28%, PR Bosnia and Herzegovina around 40%, PR Montenegro around 30% of the illiterate in the population. In total, FPRY had illiteracy rate of around 25%, in Slovenia around 2%, and Macedonia around 35% (cf. PS).

FINAL REMARKS: AN INTRODUCTION TO A NEW ERA

At a three-day meeting of Croatian and Serbian linguists, writers, cultural and scientific workers in Novi Sad in December 1954, conclusions were made which obliged Croatian and Serbian linguists to draft basic standard-language handbooks. This Agreement of Novi Sad, known as such not only by participants, i.e. authors and signatories of those conclusions, forms a ground-breaking act in the formation of a single, common, centralist language policy for the territory of the four republics – Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia – of the Yugoslav federation. The specific effects of such a language policy were orthographic unification, meaning that previous differences between Boranić's *Pravopis hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* and Belić's *Pravopis srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika* were almost completely eliminated, and the promotion of linguonyms Serbo-Croatian [srpskohrvatski] and Croato-Serbian [hrvatskosrpski], which *de facto* obtained official status. The Agreement of Novi Sad served as a normative and firm linguistic and political framework for the next ten or so years, a framework which was gradually, but strongly shaken in the late 1960s.

REFERENCES

- Babić S. 1990: *Hrvatski jezik u političkom vrtlogu*, Zagreb: Pelivan.
- Babić S. 2009: Hrvatski jezik za komunističkoga razdoblja, *Jezik* 3, 106–114.
- Bakarić V. 1983: *Socijalistički samoupravni sistem i društvena reprodukcija*, Treća knjiga, Zagreb: Informator.
- Barac A. 1953: Napomene uz diskusiju o pravopisu, *Politika* 14426, 15.2.1953, 7.
- Belić A. 1950: Redak jubilej, *Naš jezik* 9–10, 343–348.
- Belić A. 1951: Iz novije akcentuacije, *Naš jezik* 7–10, 227–237.
- Belić A. 1952a: Vuk Karadžić nam je pokazao pravi put, *Borba* 308, 21.12.1952, 7.
- Belić A. 1952b: Oko jezika i pravopisa, *Naš jezik* 3–4, 75–82.
- Belić A. 1953: Napomene o srpskohrvatskom pravopisu, *Politika* 14431, 20.2.1953, 6.
- Brodnjak V. 1991: *Razlikovni rječnik srpskog i hrvatskog jezika*, Zagreb: Školske novine.
- Cvetković-Sander K. 2011: *Sprachpolitik und nationale Identität im sozialistischen Jugoslawien (1945–1991)*. Serbokroatisch, Albanisch, Makedonisch und Slowenisch, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Goldstein I. 2008: *Hrvatska 1918–2008*, Zagreb: EPH – Liber.
- Hraste M. 1950: Naš pravopis, *Pedagoški rad* 1–2, 14–20.
- Hraste M. 1952: Jedinstveni pravopis, *Vjesnik* 2417, 28.12.1952, 5.
- Hraste M. 1957: Rad na lingvistici i filologiji u Narodnoj Republici Hrvatskoj zadnjih deset godina. In: *Beogradski međunarodni slavistički sastanak (15–21. IX. 1955)*: Beograd: Izdanje Organizacionog odbora, 41–46.
- JAZU – *Ljetopis Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti za godine 1946.–1948.*: knjiga 54, 1949. Zagreb: JAZU.

- Klaić B. 1950: Misli uz jedan pravopisni priručnik. Osvrt na knjigu dra Jovana Vukovića: Pravopisna pravila i uputstva za pisanje ijekavskih glasovnih oblika, *Hrvatsko kolo* 3, 517–524.
- Koren S. 2012: *Politika povijesti u Jugoslaviji (1945–1960)*, Zagreb: Srednja Europa.
- Krleža M. 1952: Odgovor na pismo „Da li je to moguće“, *Naprijed* 18, 25.4.1952, 2.
- Krleža M. 1954: Enciklopedija Jugoslavije – originalno i jedinstveno delo, *Politika* 14729, 31.1.1954, 7.
- Moskovljević M.S. 1952–1953: Slovenački ili slovenski? *Jezik* 5, 153–155.
- NIN – Anketa NIN-a. *Nedeljne informativne novine* 96, 2.11.1952, 8–9.
- Okuka M. 1998: *Eine Sprache – viele Erben. Sprachpolitik als Nationalisierungsinstrument in Ex-Jugoslawien*, Klagenfurt: Wieser Verlag.
- Ostojić S. 1953: Stručnjaci za pitanja jezika i književnosti pripremaju izradu novog hrvatskog pravopisa, *Politika* 14419, 8.2.1953, 6.
- Pavešić S. (ed.) 1971: *Jezični savjetnik s gramatikom*, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Petranović B., Zečević, M. 1987: *Jugoslovenski federalizam: Ideje i stvarnost. Tematska zbirka dokumenta, Drugi tom 1943–1986*, Beograd: Prosveta.
- PS – *Popis stanovništva 1953. Knjiga IX. Pismenost i školska sprema. Podaci za srezove prema upravnoj podeli u 1953 godini*, 1960. Beograd: Savezni zavod za statistiku.
- Radelić Z. 2006: *Hrvatska u Jugoslaviji 1945.–1991. Od zajedništva do razlaza*, Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest – Školska knjiga.
- Rončević N. 1950: Diskusija o jeziku. Moja predavanja i A. B. Klaić, *Hrvatsko kolo* 4, 736–740.
- RZP – *Rad zakonodavnih odbora Predsedništva Antifašističkog veća narodnog oslobođenja Jugoslavije i Privremene narodne skupštine DFJ: (3 aprila – 25 oktobra 1945): po stenografskim beleškama i drugim izvorima*, 1952, Beograd: Prezidijum Narodne skupštine FNRJ.
- SLAKMO – Statut Autonomne Kosovsko-metohijske oblasti u Narodnoj Republici Srbiji. *Službeni list Autonomne Kosovsko-metohijske oblasti u Narodnoj Republici Srbiji* 10, 27.11.1948, 74–78.
- SLAPV – Statut Autonomne pokrajine Vojvodine u Narodnoj Republici Srbiji. *Službeni list Autonomne pokrajine Vojvodine Narodne Republike Srbije* 15, 27.11.1948, 125–131.
- SLDFJa – Odluka o izgradnji Jugoslavije na federativnom principu [29.11.1943]. *Službeni list Demokratske Federativne Jugoslavije* 1, 1.2.1945, 4.
- SLDFJb – Odluka o objavljivanju odluka i proglašenja Antifašističkog vijeća narodnog oslobođenja Jugoslavije, njegovog Predsjedništva i Nacionalnog komiteta na srpskom, hrvatskom, slovenačkom i makedonskom jeziku [15.1.1944]. *Službeni list Demokratske Federativne Jugoslavije* 1, 1.2.1945, 5.
- SLDFJc – Odluka o „Službenom listu Demokratske Federativne Jugoslavije“ [19.12.1944]. *Službeni list Demokratske Federativne Jugoslavije* 1, 1.2.1945, 10.
- SLDFJd – Zakon o Ustavotvornoj skupštini. *Službeni list Demokratske Federativne Jugoslavije* 63, 24.8.1945, 597–598.
- SLFNRJa – Zapisnik IV. zajedničke sjednice obadva domova Ustavotvorne skupštine Federativne Narodne Republike Jugoslavije, održane 31. siječnja 1946. godine u Beogradu. *Službeni list Federativne Narodne Republike Jugoslavije* 14, 15.2.1946, 149–151.
- SLFNrJb – Ustavni zakon o osnovama društvenog i političkog uređenja Federativne Narodne Republike Jugoslavije i saveznim organima vlasti. *Službeni list Federativne Narodne Republike Jugoslavije* 3, 14.1.1953, 21–32.
- Stevanović M. 1953: Za jedinstven pravopis srpskohrvatskog jezika, *Naš jezik* 5–8, 149–170.

- Šarić T. 2008: *Kulturna politika vlasti u NR Hrvatskoj – primjer Matice hrvatske 1945.–1952.*, Magistarski rad. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Toholj S. 1953: Potreba pravopisnog dogovora Hrvata i Srba, *Politika* 14417, 6.2.1953, 5.
- Tošović, B., Wonisch, A. 2010: *Hrvatski pogledi na odnose između hrvatskoga, srpskoga i bosansko-ga/bošnjačkoga jezika – Die kroatische Sichtweise der Unterschiede zwischen dem Kroatischen, Serbischen und Bosnischen/Bosniakischen*. Graz – Zagreb: Institut für Slawistik der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz – Izvori.
- UFNRJ – *Ustav FNRJ i ustavi narodnih republika*. Beograd: Službeni list FNRJ, 1950 (Zbirka zakona FNRJ br. 22).
- UOS – *Ustavotvorni odbori Savezne Skupštine i Skupštine naroda. Stenografske beleške: 10. decembar 1945 – 4. januar 1946*, [s. a.]. Beograd: Narodna skupština FNRJ.
- Uredništvo 1952: Uvodna riječ, *Jezik* 1, 1–3.
- Uredništvo 1952–1953: Osvrt na Moskovljevićeve zaključke, *Jezik* 5, 155–156.
- Uredništvo 1985–1986: Avnojski duh u jezičnoj politici, *Jezik* 2, 8.
- ZPA – *Zakonodavni rad Pretsedništva Antifašističkog veća narodnog oslobođenja Jugoslavije i Pretsedništva Privremene narodne skupštine DFJ (19 novembra 1944 – 27 oktobra 1945) po stenografskim beleškama i drugim izvorima*, 1951. Beograd: Prezidijum Narodne skupštine FNRJ.

STRESZCZENIE

“Duch AVNOJ-u w polityce językowej“: Polityka językowa od końca II wojny światowej do połowy lat 50. XX wieku w Jugosławii i Chorwacji

Słowa kluczowe: Jugosławia, Chorwacja, polityka językowa, języki standardowe, ortografia.

Kwestia językowa w wielonarodowej i wielojęzycznej federacji jugosłowiańskiej była nierzadko traktowana jako ważki problem polityczny. Niniejszy artykuł analizuje politykę językową w okresie powojennym, kiedy ukształtowała się polityka językowa nie dająca żadnemu z języków oficjalnego statusu, a praktyka parlamentarna potwierdzała rozróżnienie między czterema językami ludności jugosłowiańskiej – chorwackim, serbskim, słoweńskim i macedońskim. Szczególną uwagę poświęcono przepisom dotyczącym języka w zapisach konstytucyjnych i dyskusjach filologicznych. Podnoszono w nich pytanie, czy powinny istnieć dwa podręczniki ortograficzne – chorwacki i serbski – lub, czy językoznawcy chorwaccy i serbscy powinni stworzyć wspólny podręcznik, który służyłby jako normatywny standard obowiązujący na terytorium czterech jednostek federacji.