

Branko Tošović, Arno Wonisch (ur.)

**Bošnjački pogledi na odnose
između bosanskog,
hrvatskog i srpskog jezika**

**Die bosniakische Sichtweise
der Unterschiede zwischen
dem Bosnischen, Kroatischen
und Serbischen**

Institut für Slawistik der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz
Institut za jezik Sarajevo
2009

Branko Tošović – Arno Wonisch (Graz)

The Bosniak View of the Interrelationship of Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian

This anthology contains the results of the project “The Differences between Bosnian/Bosniak, Croatian and Serbian” (Graz, 2006 to 2010, Project Identification Number P-19158-G03) conducted at the Department of Slavic Studies at the University of Graz (Austria). The project is led by Branko Tošović and was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung; FWF) in Vienna. The book at hand contains the collected works of Bosniak linguists which were published in three anthologies in the years 2006 to 2009. Additionally, it includes contributions, both already existing and recently written, composed by researchers who had expressed their interest in the publication of their articles in this book.

Hence this anthology about the interrelationship between Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian contains 28 contributions by 17 authors which were organised into the following thematic chapters and linguistic disciplines: I. General Aspects; II. Orthography; III. Lexis. Word Formation; IV. Phonetics. Phonology. Prosody; V. Morphology and VI. Syntax. The most extensive chapter with eleven contributions is that about the general differences and the general interrelationship of the Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian languages. All articles were written by authors living and working in Sarajevo who principally focus on the linguistic situation in their home-country of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The thematic arch spans from the initial definition of the term ‘Bosnian language idiom’ as the successor to the Bosnian-Herzegovinian standard language in the 20th century (Alija Isaković, Ibrahim Čedić and Muhamed Šator) through analyses of the contemporary (worldwide unique) sociolinguistic situation in the country (Ibrahim Čedić, Mevlida Karadža, Ismail Palić, Midhat Riđanović) to current trends in language development which have been encountered with increased frequency over the past years (Hanka Vajzović). Dževad Jahić’s “Fragmenti o jezičkim odnosima između bosanskog, hrvatskog i srpskog jezika – Fragments about the Linguistic Interrelationship of Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian” touches upon several topics by including a compilation of questions about the Bosnian language and its role with regard to Croatian and Serbian. Investigating the development of the Bosnian language as proclaimed in the early 1990s, Ibrahim Čedić concludes in his paper “Bosanskohercegovački standardnojezički izraz – bosanski jezik – The Bosnian-Herzegovinian Standard Language Idiom – the Bosnian Language” that it is the direct successor to the former Bosnian-Herzegovinian standard language without having experienced any major interventions or reforms. The contributions “Bosanskohercegovački jezički standard u XX vijeku – The Bosnian-Herzegovinian Language Standard in the 20th Century” and “Zajednički standardni jezik Bošnjaka, Crnogoraca, Hrvata i Srba – A Common Standard Language of Bosniaks, Mon-

tenegrins, Croats and Serbs” (Ibrahim Čedić) are also to be seen in this light. They interpret the development of the Bosnian language as the logical consequence and the historic (even if delayed) conciliation with regard to the standardisation of Croatian and Serbian, which had already occurred earlier. This thesis of equality of the Bosnian language had already been supported in the 1990s in Alija Isaković’s paper “Bosanski jezik – The Bosnian Language”. In this paper, Isaković – giving an appropriate and correct interpretation of the future – considers the development of a Montenegrin language in its own right as a possibility. Muhamed Šator’s contribution “Od Kallayevog monocentrizma do policentričnih jezičkih standarda – From Kalláy’s Monocentrism to the Polycentric Language Standards” ventures the furthest into the past by analysing the attempts by Benjámin von Kállay, the Austro-Hungarian governor of Bosnia and Herzegovina, to resolve the language conflict by strengthening the Bosniak Muslim identity.

A review of the current language situation is contributed by Mevlida Karadža in “Sociolingvistički aspekti jezičke situacije u Bosni i Hercegovini – Sociolinguistic Aspects of the Language Situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, Ismail Palić in “Mogućnosti funkcioniranja triju standardnih jezika (bosanskoga, hrvatskoga i srpskoga) u Bosni i Hercegovini – The Possibility of Functioning of Three Standard Languages (Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian) in Bosnia and Herzegovina” and by Hanka Vajzović in “Savremena jezička situacija – komunikativna i simbolička funkcija jezika – The Current Language Situation – The Communicative and Symbolic Function of Language”. In their papers, these three authors investigate sociolinguistic aspects of the coexistence of three highly similar languages, which are primarily defined by their national affiliation. The focus therein is on concrete examples from the everyday social lives of users of nominally varying languages, which are to a very high degree mutually intelligible. Additionally, these contributions point out various legal and normative regulations about the status of the three languages of Bosnia and Herzegovina, namely Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian, as found in the country’s two entities (the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republika Srpska). Legal aspects are also investigated in another paper in the chapter: Hanka Vajzović’s contribution “Jezik i politika: kroatizacija jezika na prostoru Bosne i Hercegovine – agresija ili ustavno pravo? – Language and Politics: Croatisation of Language on the National Territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina – Aggression or Constitutional Right?” examines the process of increased Croatisation of the Bosnian language in the public arena of Bosnia and Herzegovina as experienced over the past years.

The second chapter of the publication at hand is dedicated to the, in times of development of new languages and glottonyms, ever so current question of orthography. The authors of this section are Ibrahim Čedić (“Neke pravopisne i fonološke razlike normi bosanskog, hrvatskog i srpskog jezika – Some Orthographic and Phonological Differences in the Norms of Bosnian,

Croatian and Serbian”), Senahid Halilović (“Osobenosti pravopisne norme bosanskoga, hrvatskog, crnogorskog i srpskog jezika – The Peculiarities of Orthographic Standards of Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian and Montenegrin”) and Hasnija Muratagić-Tuna (“Paralela aktuelnih pravopisa bosanskog, hrvatskog i srpskog jezika – Parallels of Contemporary Orthography of Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian”). While Ibrahim Ćedić and Hasnija Muratagić-Tuna demonstrate a synchronistic comparison between the current orthographic implementation of the three languages and use the common Serbo-Croat and Croato-Serbian orthography from the year 1960 as a historical reference, Senahid Halilović – editor of the first and only Bosnian orthography to date in the 1990s, offers a review back into the 19th century which forms the basis for the analysis of current solutions in the individual languages. All three contributions focus on the representation of different standardisations, which are offered in the currently valid orthographic resources of the Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian languages.

The chapter entitled “Leksika. Tvorba riječi – Lexis. Word Formation” comprises eight contributions by five authors which have for the most part already been published within the project “The Differences between the Bosnian/Bosniak, Croatian and Serbian Languages” (Graz, 2006–2010). Neda Memić (“Leksički transfer iz austrijskog njemačkog u bosanski, hrvatski i srpski jezik – Lexical Transfer from Austrian German into Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian”, “O prenošenju austrijskih i njemačkih toponima u bosanski, hrvatski i srpski jezik: o problemu egzonomima u savremenom jeziku – The Adoption of German Language Toponyms into Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian: the Problem of Exonyms in Contemporary Language”) focuses on the transfer and adoption of lexemes from the German language as spoken in Germany and Austria into the three successor languages to Serbo-Croat. Memić thereby demonstrates different ways of adoption on the levels of phonology, morphology and lexis. Within the latter, the adoption process of toponyms is investigated in most detail. The focus of Maja Midžić’s research is a document of great importance to and cause for dispute in the country of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which regulates the federal constitutional structure. It is the Dayton Agreement from 1995 which was translated into Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian from English and which Midžić investigated as a – at the time peacemaking – body of legislation with regard to its lexis (“Leksičke razlike u bosanskoj, hrvatskoj i srpskoj verziji Dejtonskog sporazuma – Lexical Differences in the Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian Versions of the Dayton Agreement”, “Najfrekventniji leksemi u Dejtonskom sporazumu – The Most Frequent Lexemes in the Dayton Agreement”). In light of the original English version of this document, the differences between the individual language versions must especially be considered bearing in mind the translational aspects such as the individual choice of translations. The English language is also at the centre of Edina Špago-Ćumurija’s investigation (“Engleski u trouglu bosanskog/hrvatskog/srpskog jezika – English in the Triangle between Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian”) which is dedicated to the lexis and exposes problems in

the adaptation of administrative documents written in English. Finally, Amela Šehović investigates the level of word formation (“Mocioni sufiksi u bosanskom, hrvatskom i srpskom jeziku (u nomina agentis et professionis) – Suffixes Used to Derive Female from Male Noun Forms in Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian (for Nomina agentis and Nomina professionis)”) by examining differences in the increasingly current question of derivation of female forms of the substantival classes Nomina agentis and Nomina professionis. An analysis based on literary resources is offered by Rašid Durić (“Stilematika bošnjačke prozne književnosti na izabranom modelu – The Stylematics of Bosniak Prose Using a Selected Model”), whose contributions analyses the lexical-stylistic characteristics of typically Bosnian lexemes in Bosniak literature.

The chapter about phonetics, phonology and prosody focuses on the one hand on questions of accentology and prosody (Naila Valjevac: “Akcentne sličnosti i razlike između bosanskog, hrvatskog i srpskog jezika s posebnim osvrtom na jezik u BiH – Accentual Similarities and Differences between the Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian Languages with Special Consideration of the Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, Bosanski standardni jezik i njegova prozodijska norma – The Bosnian Standard Language and its Prosodic Standard”; Alen Kalajdžija: “Nedosljednost prenošenja silaznih naglasaka na proklitike u morfološkim i leksičkim kategorijama – The Inconsequence of Applying Falling Accents on Proclitics in Morphological and Lexical Categories”). The other focus is on the levels of phonetics and phonology (Naila Valjevac: “Fonološka funkcija prozodema u bosanskom, hrvatskom i srpskom standardnom jeziku – The Phonological Function of Prosodemes in the Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian Standard Language”; Maja Midžić: “Fonetske razlike u bosanskoj, hrvatskoj i srpskoj verziji Dejtonskog sporazuma – Phonetic Differences between the Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian Version of the Dayton Agreement”). The question of accents among Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian proves particularly interesting as these languages have inherited a thoroughly complex system of accents from Serbo-Croat and Croato-Serbian. The conservation of accents and the degree of occurring deviations from the prosodic standard (which varies across the languages) form the core of Naila Valjevac’s and Alen Kalajdžija’s work. Maja Midžić refers to the varying frequency of realisations of individual phonemes by again investigating the Dayton Agreement.

Compared to the previous sections, the chapters about morphology and syntax are less comprehensive. This reflects the fact that research into the relationship between (very) closely related languages is generally more directed at general (and usually sociolinguistic) and lexical aspects. Based on several grammars of Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian and classified according to lexical categories, Senahid Halilović (“Morfološka norma bosanskog, hrvatskog i srpskog jezika – The Morphological Standard of Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian”) illustrates the essential differences between the three languages under

investigation, which in many cases do not have a differentiating function. They can be regarded as fairly frequent variants which are employed in the language to a varying degree. The fundamental identification of relativity and non-absoluteness for the relationship between Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian links to the final chapter of the syntax section. Edina Špago-Ćumurija ("Bosanski ili hrvatski? Sintaksičke razlike u kursevima bosanskog i hrvatskog jezika za strance – Bosnian or Croatian? Syntactical Differences in Courses of the Bosnian and Croatian Languages for Non-Native Speakers") points out that in most cases syntactical deviations do not have to be interpreted as actual differences.

Finally, it should be pointed out that this publication represents a first attempt to present the interrelationship of Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian (which have now also been joined by the Montenegrin language) in an individual and factual manner through contributions by renowned linguists of Bosniak ethnicity. Its 28 contributions comprise research on concrete material (texts of various styles and provenance, language corpora) which, from a linguistic point of view, represents the most complex case of a relationship between very closely related languages – the coexistence of the Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian (and nowadays Montenegrin) languages.