

SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS
INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES

LVI



2025

BALCANICA

MIROSLAV MARIĆ *et al.*, *Intra-settlement Burials of Vinča Culture at Sajlovo 5* • ANDREY N. SOBOLEV, *The Balkan Linguistic and Cultural Union* • GORDANA ILIĆ MARKOVIĆ, *The Utilisation of Language as a Political Instrument* • STEFANA PAUNOVIĆ RODIĆ, *The Ruthenian Language in Serbia* • SILVIA NOTARFONSO, *Plague Epidemics and Sacrificial Offerings along the Danube* • BORIS MILOSAVLJEVIĆ, *The Family of Dr. Vladan Djordjević* • ANTONELLA FIORIO, *Carlo Sforza and the Attempt to Define a New Italian Foreign Policy* • FILIP ŠKILJAN, *Abuses against Serbs in the Districts of Otočac and Brinje* • PETAR VASIĆ, ALEKSANDAR REPEDŽIĆ, *Migration in Eastern Serbia* ~

ANNUAL OF THE INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES

UDC 930.85(4-12)

BELGRADE 2025

ISSN 0350-7653
eISSN 2406-0801

Gordana Ilić Marković*

*Department of Slavonic Studies
University of Vienna
Vienna, Austria*

A Neverending Story – The Utilisation of Language as a Political Instrument: National and Language Policy of Austria-Hungary in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Abstract: This article focuses on the content of language and national policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the Austro-Hungarian administration. It is based on documents, articles in official newspapers and insights into the activities of national and confessional societies and their journals. In this context, i.e. the cultural and national policy of the new government, education and publishing are highly significant. In order to foster a unified national consciousness, the Austro-Hungarian authorities implemented a range of policies, including one standard language, the promotion of a collective sense of national identity, and the establishment of institutions to serve the unified nation. For instance, the census was conducted solely based on religious affiliation, with no consideration of ethnic affiliation. The establishment of a unified national identity was further pursued through the conceptualisation of the glottonym “Land Language” (*zemaljski jezik/ Landessprache*). From the outset, the name of the language indicated a significant potential for conflict. These debates, primarily conducted in the press of various profiles and in the Diet of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Sarajevo, are pertinent to this analysis. The early 20th century was characterised by deliberate and seemingly indifferent deliberations in parliament on language policy and an ongoing discourse surrounding the South Slavic question, which had been a subject of discussion within the Monarchy for some time, and assumed increased importance for Bosnia and Herzegovina. Moreover, it was a period characterised by an escalation of social unrest. In 1913, the discourse on language policy entered its concluding phase. The legislation confirming the glottonym “Serbo-Croatian” with the use of two scripts in Bosnia and Herzegovina was enacted in January 1914. This was achieved through the synchronisation of the language name with that introduced in the other parts of the Monarchy during the 19th century. A mere six months later, the First World War broke out.

Keywords: Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, glottonymy, language policy, national versus confessional.

The Habsburg Monarchy had several internal and external official languages in the Austrian part (Cisleithania) of the Empire: German, Hungarian (Magyar), Polish, Czech, Ruthenian, Croatian, Italian, Romanian, Serbian, Slovak, and Slovenian.¹ The Slovak language was most frequently recorded together

* gordana.ilic.markovic@univie.ac.at

¹ The following information is provided on the official website of the Austrian Parliament: “From German to Czech to Croatian – in the Habsburg Monarchy at the end

with Czech as Czech-Slavic or Bohemian-Moravian-Slovak, and Italian as Italian-Ladino, depending on the period. In later censuses (from 1880), Serbian and Croatian were listed together as Serbian-Croatian in the Austrian part and as individual languages in the Hungarian part of the Dual Monarchy. Consequently, there were nine languages according to the majority of official documents. In practice, there were disagreements about which of these languages were used in which areas, but the Monarchy fostered a multilingual tradition in education and publishing (schools, press, printing). In addition, some were designated official languages, while some, with limited vocabularies, were considered languages in the context of the military. Depending on the number of speakers and their economic and cultural presence, it could be a colloquial or family language, but also a language of education in private or public schools, as well as an administrative language.

During the last few decades of the Monarchy's existence, its education policy suffered upheavals amidst national conflicts of interest. The language of instruction in primary or secondary schools was sometimes a question of religion. Choosing the language of instruction became a way to symbolically define the national identity of a community.² The Constitution of 1867 defined the language issue in Cisleithania as the "inviolable right to preserve and protect nationalities and languages", guaranteeing the use "of a common Land language³ in school, administration and public life".⁴ This formulation was by no means met with unanimous approval, neither within the Monarchy nor abroad. Around 1900, the Austrian Prime Minister stated that the language

of the 19th century there were nine common languages [...]: German, Czech, Polish, Ruthenian, Slovenian, Croatian, Serbian, Italian, Romanian and Hungarian". <https://www.parlament.gv.at> posting at 26 February 2024. The website of the House of Austrian History supplies this information on Austria's current language policy: "In the Habsburg Monarchy, multilingualism was the rule; there was not just one, but nine official languages (German, Hungarian, Bosnian–Croatian–Serbian, Italian, Polish, Romanian, Ruthenian, Slovenian and Czech)". <https://hdgoe.at/> These two statements do not align with the facts about language policy in the Habsburg Monarchy.

² The Revolution of 1848 could be considered the actual birth of the fundamental renewal of the Austrian education system. The education reform of Graf Thun (1848–1853) put great emphasis on teaching in the mother tongue, especially German. This reform created the conditions for the social and civic rise of the bourgeoisie in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, even though tuition fees rendered higher education a privilege of wealthy strata.

³ See note 28.

⁴ "Staatsgrundgesetz vom 21. Dezember 1867 über die allgemeinen Rechte der Staatsbürger," RGBl Nr. 142/1867, Art. 19, *Reichs-Gesetz-Blatt für das Kaisertum Österreich* (Vienna, 22 December 1867), 92–94.

issue was causing “stagnation across all areas of public life”.⁵ During his travels in Europe, Mark Twain attended a parliamentary session of the Dual Monarchy. In one of his texts, Twain wrote of his dismay at the multilingual practices of those accustomed to monolingualism.⁶ In reviewing the minutes of the sessions in the Vienna Parliament, the following phrases are particularly striking: “The member of parliament begins his speech in ... language, and then continues in German”. Nevertheless, regardless of how long a delegate had spoken in his native language beforehand, anything that was not said in German was not included in the stenographic notes. Stjepan Mitrov Ljubiša, a Serbian politician and writer and the representative of Dalmatia, was the first person to deliver an entire speech in a language other than German in the Viennese Parliament. On 11 September 1861, before the Constitution of 1867 was promulgated, he delivered his speech in Serbian.⁷ Subsequently, Ljubiša provided a German translation of his speech for the parliament. This ensured that the content was accurately documented in the parliamentary proceedings and made available for debate.

The President moves on to the agenda and gives the floor to Representative Ljubiša. He speaks Serbian and submits his speech, translated into German, together with a proposal. [...] After the President has handed this speech and the proposal in

⁵ M. Glettler, “Ökonomie und Nationalismus – ein Kernproblem im multinationalen Staat. Ein Vergleich der Politik Ernest von Koerber und Sandor Wekerles”, In *Gegenwart in Vergangenheit. Beiträge zur Kultur und Geschichte der Neuere und Neuesten Zeit*, ed. G. Jenal, (München: Oldenburg Verlag, 1993), 239–256, 249.

⁶ “Broadly speaking, all the nations in the empire hate the Government – but they all hate each other too, and with devoted and enthusiastic bitterness; no two of them can combine; the nation that rises must rise alone; then the others would joyfully join the Government against her, and she would have just a fly’s chance against a combination of spiders. [...] in Austria-Hungary there are nineteen public opinions – one for each state. No – two or three for each state, since there are two or three nationalities in each [...]. The House [Parliament] draws its membership of 425 deputies from the nineteen or twenty states heretofore mentioned. These men represent people who speak eleven different languages. That means eleven distinct varieties of jealousies, hostilities, and warring interests”, M. Twain, “Stirring Times in Austria”, *Harper’s Monthly Magazine* 96 (March 1898), New York, 530–540, quoted in: G. Ilić Marković, “From Serbian to Serbo-Croatian and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian in Austria: Migrant Pluricentricity Reflecting Complex Historical and Present Developments”. In *Pluricentric Languages and Non-Dominant Varieties Worldwide*, vol. 1: *Pluricentric Languages across Continents – Features and Usage*, ed. Rudolf Muhr (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2016), 442.

⁷ S. M. Ljubiša, *Govor poslanika na Carstvenij Savět Stefana Ljubiše, održan u sednici 11. septembra 1861. na srpskij jezik* (Vienna 1861), 1–4, quoted in M. Tepavčević, “Jedno poglavlje crnogorsko-italijanskih jezičkih, književnih i kulturnih veza: Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša”, *Studi Slavistici* XVI, no. 2 (2019), 17–36.

German to the stenographers for recording, the motion is supported by the House. [...] The motion by Representative Ljubiša is read out again and wins the minority of the vote.⁸

In the decades that followed, representatives from other nations often referred to this precedent set by the Serbian politician, even if they only began or ended their speeches in their native language. The importance of the native language issue and the scarcity of opportunities to use it were also emphasised in a report in the Serbian-Dalmatian Almanac,⁹ which claimed that in 1861 there were 33 Serbian schools in Dalmatia with 34 teachers (including one female teacher) for a total of 710 students. According to statistics, there were 78,000 Serbs that year. Apart from Budva, the birthplace of Stjepan M. Ljubiša, this region included Dubrovnik, Zadar, Kotor, and Šibenik, among other towns.

At that time, Bosnia and Herzegovina were still two provinces within the Ottoman Empire. The millet system was a framework that regulated the relationship between the political establishment and the various non-Muslim population groups. The non-Muslim demographic within the Ottoman Empire included Orthodox Christians, Armenians, Catholics, Jews and Protestants. The preservation of institutions, languages and traditions within respective communities was facilitated by this religion-based concept. The *Tanzimât* reforms and reorganization in the later Ottoman Empire increased the rights of the populace, including, in an unprecedented move, for the Empire's non-Muslims. The reforms included an administrative reorganisation, implemented through the Vilayet Law. The Bosnian Vilayet Decree was passed in 1865, with Herzegovina also becoming a separate province. The Ottoman Imperial Reform Edict from 1856 guaranteed equality in education without discriminating on religious and linguistic grounds, allowing and necessitating publishing work in minority languages. In the wake of these changes, printing houses needed to be established in each vilayet, primarily for publishing official newspapers, laws and regulations, but also for textbooks to be used in the handful of existing public

⁸ "Der Präsident übergeht ... zur Tagesordnung und erteilt dem Abgeordneten Ljubisa das Wort. Dieser spricht serbische und übergibt die Rede, in die Deutsche Sprache übersetzt, beifügend einen Antrag [...] Nachdem der Präsident diese Rede und den Antrag in deutscher Sprache den Stenographen zu Aufnahme übergeben hat, wird der Antrag vom h. Hause unterstützt. [...] Der Antrag des Abgeordneten Ljubisa wird abermals vorgelesen und bleibt bei der Abstimmung in der Minorität", "Protokoll der 53. Sitzung des Hauses der Abgeordneten des Reichsrates am 11. September 1861, Nr. 669/1861", *Stenographische Protokolle des Abgeordnetenhauses des Reichsrates 1861–1918*, 2. <https://alex.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/alex?aid=spa&datum=0001&page=5215&size=45>

⁹ T. Petranović, ed., *Srbsko-dalmatinskij almanah: ljubitelj prosvetešenija*, 21 (1862), 160–163. https://digitalna.nb.rs/view/URN:NBN:RS:ND_1E4FB4FCBA9259326D92A907276464A7-1862-K021

elementary schools. The Vilayet government entrusted this task to a Serbian printer and publisher from Zemun, Ignjat Sopron, who published materials in the Cyrillic, Arabic,¹⁰ Latin and Hebrew scripts. The linguistic landscape of Bosnia and of Herzegovina, as well as the entire Ottoman Empire, was characterised by multilingualism and the use of several scripts.¹¹ The first issue of the political and educational weekly *Bosanski vjestnik* [Bosnian Herald] appeared in April 1866, edited by Sopron and printed in Serbian Cyrillic. The newspaper remained in print until May 1867. From May 1866 to July 1878, Sopron's printing house published the province's official gazette, *Bosna* [Bosnia], with the two outer pages printed in Serbian Cyrillic and the inner pages in Ottoman Turkish and the Arabic script. The same establishment also printed a Serbian primer, an Ottoman Turkish grammar, books of folk poetry and several Jewish books. In 1868, the Sopron printing house in Sarajevo was renamed the "Bosnian Vilayet Printing House" at the behest of the Ottoman authorities.¹² Excluding publications in Ottoman Turkish and Hebrew, the practice of printing persisted in Serbian and utilised the recently reformed Cyrillic script and standardised grammar,¹³ which was already used in publishing, administration and the education systems of Austria-Hungary and Serbia.

Austro-Hungarian Empire – Bosnia and Herzegovina 1878–1918

In the autumn of 1878, Austria-Hungary occupied these two provinces.¹⁴ Article 25 of the Treaty of Berlin maintained Ottoman sovereignty over Bosnia and

¹⁰ This includes Arebica, a variant of the Arabic script used by Bosnian Muslims from the seventeenth to the early twentieth century to write their native Slavic language, notably in literature (the Alhamijado tradition), as well as in religious schoolbooks and administrative contexts.

¹¹ For more on the language situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina before 1878 see G. Neweklowsky, "Bosnien-Herzegowina vor 1878 zwischen Kroatisch und Serbisch". In *Herrschaft, Staat und Gesellschaft in Südosteuropa aus sprach- und kulturhistorischer Sicht*, ed. Gerhard Neweklowsky (Vienna: ÖAW, 2007), 28–73.

¹² After the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, this printing house changed its name to "K. und K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei" and began printing the new government's herald, *Bosansko-hercegovačke novine*, in 1878.

¹³ S. Mrkalj, *Salo debeloga jera libo azbukoprotres* (Budim, 1810); V. Stefanović Karadžić, *Srpska pismenica* (Vienna: Pečatnja Jovana Šnirera, 1814); V. Stefanović Karadžić, *Srpski rječnik* (Vienna: Štamparija jermenskog manastira, 1818); V. Stefanović Karadžić, *Prvi srpski bukvar* (Vienna: Slavjanoserbska knjižarnica, 1827).

¹⁴ The campaign lasted from 29 July to 20 October 1878, spanning almost three months of armed conflicts, which left several thousand dead and tens of thousands of refugees in its wake.

Herzegovina, granting the Austro-Hungarian Empire only the right to “occupy and administer” the two provinces. In essence this meant that, although Bosnia and Herzegovina were under Austro-Hungarian occupation and administration, they remained Ottoman territories.¹⁵

In order to shield the inhabitants of the new territory from the cultural and political influence of other South Slavs in the Monarchy, Austria-Hungary took steps from the very beginning to establish a separate nation and language. In the context of the recently established political landscape, it was to be expected that the Serbian ethnic group in Bosnia and Herzegovina would source support from both Serbia and the Serbs in the Monarchy. From 1878 onwards, the unification of all Croats under the Austro-Hungarian Empire fostered a sense of shared identity and culture. Hence, any efforts by the Croats and Serbs from Bosnia and Herzegovina to unite were seen as a threat to the internal politics of the new provinces, as well as a growing problem with regard to the South Slavic question. Bosnian Muslims could barely count on the support of the Ottoman Empire. The Bosnian and Herzegovinian administration was aware of this, which is why, from the outset, it focused on obstructing relations between Bosnian Serbs and Croats and those in the Monarchy, particularly contacts between the Serbian population of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Kingdom of Serbia. In its efforts to shape a new Slavic nation and a new South Slavic language, the administration found strengthening the economic and cultural position of the Bosnian Muslims to be the most effective approach. The Austro-Hungarian officer Joseph Philippovich von Philippsberg, who commanded the occupation troops in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the case of intervention, received instructions in 1875 that “religious issues should be given special consideration”, with “a particular focus on cultivating the Catholic population and bringing the Muslim population closer to them”.¹⁶ Meanwhile, the Muslim population was to be kept separate from the Orthodox population, who was to be strictly supervised. These instructions were reflected in the press from 1878 onwards.

¹⁵ In addition, the Austro-Hungarians were granted permission to establish military outposts in the Sanjak of Novi Pazar, which continued to be a part of the Ottoman Empire and under its administration. In 1908, the garrisons were withdrawn from the region. Notwithstanding the implementation of certain amendments in the context of local political life, these did not affect the domains of education and language policy. Consequently, the Sanjak of Novi Pazar does not fall within the scope of this paper.

¹⁶ R. Potz, “Das Islamgesetz 1912 und der religionsrechtlicher Diskurs in Österreich zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts”. In *Grundlagen der österreichischen Rechtskultur*, eds. T. Olechowsky, Ch. Neschwara, A. Lengauer (Vienna–Cologne–Weimar: Böhlau, 2010), 385–408; cf. G. Ilić Marković, *Roda Roda–Srpski dnevnik izveštača iz Prvog svetskog rata. Ratni presbiri Austrougarske monarhije* (Novi Sad–Belgrade: Prometej, 2017).

From previous experience with language policy regarding the nationalities of the Monarchy, the administrators knew from the outset that the name of the language, as well as the use of two or three scripts (Latin, Cyrillic and Arabic), could cause friction in the new provinces. The new administrators of Bosnia and Herzegovina attempted to counteract this with various measures. In concert with the education system, the press played a prominent role in achieving this aim. This intention is also evident from the census data, which used religion as a marker of identity. To establish a unified national identity, from the 1878 occupation onwards censuses were conducted solely based on religious affiliation, grouping the population into Mohammedan,¹⁷ Greek-Oriental Christians,¹⁸ Roman Catholic Christians, Israelites and “others”, e.g., Evangelists and Greek Catholic Christians. Like in the rest of Austria-Hungary, nationality and language were not recorded in censuses. According to the first census conducted under Habsburg rule in 1879, the population was 1,158,164. In 1885, Bosnia and Herzegovina had 1,336,091 inhabitants and by 1895 it had grown to 1,568,092. In terms of numbers, the religious group changed insignificantly and in 1895 amounted to: 673,246 “Greek-Oriental Christians”, 548,632 “Mohammedans”, 334,142 “Roman Catholic Christians”, 8,213 “Israelites” and 263 “others”.¹⁹ At the last census in the Monarchy in 1910, Bosnia and Herzegovina had 1,898,044 inhabitants, out of which: 825,338 Orthodox, 612,090 Muslims and 434,190 Catholics.²⁰ This religion-based differentiation was attributed solely to the understanding of identity held by the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In a publication by Hörnes from the Ethnographic–Anthropological Department of the Natural History Museum in Vienna, the local inhabitants are described as “not yet culturally advanced enough [...] to feel like one nation on the basis of language”.²¹ Religion thus took the place of language and/or the nation. From the very beginning, the authorities commissioned scientific research on these topics, with writers and painters also tasked with similar as-

¹⁷ In Austria-Hungary the German terms *Mohammedaner* and *Islamiten* were used, which was not appreciated by the Bosnian Muslims. In an article in the magazine *Behar*, an author advocated for naming the population of the Islamic religion as Muslims (*muslimani*) rather than Mohammedans (*muhamedanci*), with the latter understood pejoratively. Cf. O. Nuri-Hadžić, *Muslimani, a ne muhamedanci! – Poslanik, a ne prorok i propheta!* (Sarajevo: Behar, 1900), 45–46.

¹⁸ Meaning Serbian Orthodox. They also appeared in documents as Greek-Oriental, with the note “not united”.

¹⁹ *Bericht über die Verwaltung von Bosnien und der Herzegowina* (Vienna: K. und K. Gemeinsamen Finanzministerium, 1906), 6–8.

²⁰ *Bosna i Hercegovina u brojkanja* (Mostar: Hrvatska dionička tiskarna, 1911), 2.

²¹ M. Hörnes, *Bosnien und Herzegovina* (Vienna: Verlag von Karl Graef, 1889), 106.

signments. With a few exceptions, these literary travelogues and paintings were created without their authors ever having been to Bosnia and Herzegovina. Experts from various disciplines travelled the country on behalf of the government or used data collected by others to describe the population, customs, landscape, state of infrastructure and raw material reserves of the region in their treatises. The numerous richly illustrated journals and literary travelogues produced and distributed in Austria-Hungary and other countries “serve... cultural narratives less for the representation of foreign people and places than for the self-understanding and self-assurance of the hegemonic culture, which is the starting point of the representation”.²²

Though initially only subject to Austria-Hungarian military governance, on 26 February 1879, Bosnia and Herzegovina was placed under the authority of the Ministry of Finance. Given the peculiarities of the dualist system, the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina had been administered by the two halves of the Dual Monarchy through the Joint Finance Ministry. The Parliaments in Vienna and Budapest both reviewed the legislation, which ultimately required the emperor's approval. The Diet (*Landtag*) in Sarajevo was subordinate to these bodies.²³ In 1880, Austria-Hungary passed the Law of Governing Bosnia and Herzegovina, providing the legal framework for its administration of the region.²⁴

Benjamin von Kállay was appointed the Minister of Finance of the Dual Monarchy in 1882, thereby becoming the administrator of the Condominium of Bosnia and Herzegovina. He remained in this role until his death in 1903. The Austro-Hungarian press reported extensively on “bringing modernity, civilisation and order to Bosnia”. Another order was to create a tri-confessional nation, distinct from the other South Slavs. The postulation of a shared “Bosnian history” and a unified “Bosnian language” was crucial for this objective. In line with the publicly promoted image, numerous articles, scientific treatises, travel guides and exhibitions presented Bosnia and Herzegovina as a land of “exotic beauty” and “wonderful landscapes”, full of interesting customs. The administrators of Austria-Hungary were praised for bringing culture (*Kulturbringer*) to the region. Kállay used historical references to Bogomil theory to emphasise “Bosnian

²² See: C. Ruthner, *Habsburgs 'Dark Continent' Postkoloniale Lektüren zur österreichischen Literatur und Kultur im langen 19. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto, 2017), 257–312.

²³ Cf. F. Schmid, *Bosnien und die Herzegowina unter der Verwaltung Österreich-Ungarns* (Leipzig, 1914).

²⁴ *Reichsgesetzblatt*, 28 February 1880, no. 18.

uniqueness”.²⁵ The introduction of conscription in 1881/82 also contributed to this. Following the introduction of compulsory military service, the “Bosnian-Herzegovinian Infantry”²⁶ was established. These troops, colloquially known as the “Bosniaks” (*Bosniaken*), were multiethnic. In 1910, the grey fez officially became part of the uniform as a way to convey a common national identity. This term would subsequently feature in the title of the gazette *Bošnjak* [The Bosniak] (1891–1910), which is a pertinent source for official national policy during that period.²⁷

To foster a common national identity, Austria-Hungary introduced uniform names for institutions and documents, such as the “Land Museum” (*Zemaljski muzej/ Landesmuseum*) and the “Land Statute” (*Zemaljski statut/ Landesstatut*). This ultimately led to the creation of the glottonym “Land language” (*zemaljski jezik/ Landessprache*).²⁸ From the very beginning, the name of the language showed great potential for conflict, which did not subside until the Monarchy collapsed.

Public schools (four-year elementary schools) followed Austrian curricula and primarily used the Latin alphabet. Initially, non-commissioned officers worked as teachers until they were replaced by professional teachers with an Austrian license who came from other parts of the Monarchy. Alongside these schools, the number of denominational elementary schools also grew each year. In the 1904/05 school year, for example, there were 69 Serbian Orthodox, 32 Roman Catholic, one Protestant, and two Jewish elementary schools. The language of instruction was designated as the “Land language” The statement that the language of instruction in denominational and private schools is determined “according to the nationality of the school’s administrators”²⁹ primarily applied

²⁵ N. Clayer, “Der Balkan, Europa und der Islam” in: *Europa und die Grenzen im Kopf*. In *Enzyklopädie des europäischen Ostens*, eds. K. Kaser, D. Grashammer-Hohl, R. Pichler (Klagenfurt: Weiser, 2003), 303–328.

²⁶ Until the enactment of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Defence Law in 1912, they were not a part of the common Austro-Hungarian military force.

²⁷ See also T. Kraljačić, *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini (1882–1903)* (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1987), 224–227.

²⁸ Today, this idiom is mostly taken to mean “national” in Bosnia and Herzegovina., e.g. *Zemaljski muzej* (National Museum). Considering that the word “land” refers to territory rather than nation, which is important in this historical context, the language name given by the Austro-Hungarian government is translated as “Land language” in this paper – according to the original German (*Land-*) and the original term used in Bosnia (*zemaljski*) sometimes given in brackets. Here, the term “Land” refers to an administrative territory, not a state.

²⁹ *Bericht über die Verwaltung von Bosnien und der Herzegowina* (Vienna: K. und k. gemeinsamen Finanzministerium, 1906), 153–229.

to Hungarian, German, and Italian schools, but also indicated the possibility of using other language names in this type of school, which is also documented in separate annual school reports (*Školski vjesnik: Stručni list Zemaljske vlade za Bosnu i Hercegovinu* [School Herald: Professional Journal of the Provincial Government for Bosnia and Herzegovina]). Schoolbooks were standardised and they represented either translations of Austrian textbooks in German or the books that were already in use in the schools of Dalmatia, Slavonia, or Vojvodina. They were issued in Cyrillic for the “Serbian Orthodox denominational schools” and in Latin for all other elementary schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the above-mentioned regulation, it was noted that the language of instruction shall be the “local” or “Bosnian” language, using the Latin and Cyrillic scripts. The textbooks were ordered from Vienna, while books for language instruction and learning were directly received from Zagreb.³⁰ This affected the vocabulary of the written language, especially administrative language, and aroused resentment among the local population, particularly intellectuals. Only public schools, however, were required to use these textbooks exclusively. Denominational and private schools were run by religious communities or private persons. Alternative textbooks were permitted in those schools, provided they first underwent a review process by the administration prior to being authorised for use in schools. Upon the introduction of compulsory elementary education in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1912, the educational infrastructure included 331 public schools, 116 Orthodox schools, 28 Catholic schools, two Protestant schools, and ten private schools. A mere 26.7% of school-age children were enrolled in elementary school, excluding Muslim girls from the statistics.³¹

From 1885 onwards, several commercial schools were established that taught German and, in some cases, French or Italian alongside the “Land language”. The Imperial and Royal Military Boys’ Boarding School was founded in Sarajevo in 1879. German was the language of instruction, with the “Land language” as part of the curriculum, although it was taught for fewer hours than subjects such as French or geography.³² Higher girls’ schools existed only under Roman Catholic and Serbian Orthodox private sponsors. One report refers to the “Catholic Higher Girls’ School with Bosnian as the Language of Instruction”. The term “Land language” was also used in state-run teacher-training colleges, as well as in the few higher secondary schools (*Obergymnasien*) and secondary

³⁰ Ordinance of the State Government in Sarajevo of 10 May 1880, concerning the establishment of primary schools at which K.K. sergeants taught, “Verordnung der Landesregierung in Sarajevo von 10. Mai 1880, Nr. 9228”.

³¹ M. Papić, *Školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini za vrijeme okupacije (1878–1918)* (Sarajevo: Biblioteka kulturno nasljeđe, 1971), 51.

³² M. Papić, *Školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini za vrijeme okupacije (1878–1918)*, 187.

schools (*Realschulen*). Like in censuses, students were grouped by religious denomination in all statistics..

Throughout history, the political, educational, ideological, financial and, from time to time, linguistic and didactic justifications for requests to implement changes in the naming of the language(s) changed. The government addressed the language issue on multiple occasions and for a variety of reasons, including in the domains of administration, education and the military. The term “land” (*Land, zemaljski*) was used in official documents and for the names of institutions: Museum, Statute etc. However, due to the absence of a grammar or dictionary for the so-called “Land language”, it couldn’t be regarded as a standard language. Although this act is significant for research in glottonymy, it had no bearing on the existence of a language standard. Political institutions are principally responsible for establishing and designating a written language for communication in the public domain, such as in teaching, official documents and the media. This depended on the dominant political aspirations of the respective period. Language undoubtedly has an integrative function too, marking out a group’s identity. This can lead to the unification of several vernaculars into one written language and the forming of a new nation, or to the emergence of new national languages through language segregation. The vernacular, in all its varieties, and the literature that has developed within it (oral or written), remains unaffected by this process. Therefore, it is unsurprising that dictionaries and grammars with different names and standards are published simultaneously within one language area. As the American linguist Kenneth E. Naylor once put it, language becomes a flag.³³

The term “Land Language” was consistently used in government reports until 1907, when it was replaced by Serbo-Croatian. Except in the informal vernacular, the term “Bosnian language” appeared in some publications and the press and, occasionally, in documents issued domestically, for example, in internal school documents, but never in official Austro-Hungarian documents. For instance, the name “Bosnian” was used to refer to the language in the title of one school grammar book, which was published anonymously even though the author was well known. Several studies have attempted to determine whether the author of this grammar, a language teacher from Croatia called Franjo Vuletić, declined to sign a government-prescribed book or whether this was the decision of the state publisher.³⁴ His “Grammar of the Bosnian Language for Middle

³³ K. E. Nejlör, *Sociolingvistički problemi među južnim Slovenima* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1996), 11–37.

³⁴ M. Okuka, “Gramatike srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika u Bosni i Hercegovini od Vuka Karadžića do kraja austrougarske vladavine”. In *Književni jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini od Vuka Karadžića do kraja austrougarske vladavine* (München: Slavica-Verl. Kovač,

Schools” was published in the Cyrillic and Latin scripts in 1890.³⁵ The phonemic orthography, which was already used for Cyrillic printing by the Sopron printing house, remained in use for the “Serbian Primer”³⁶ and newspapers, reflecting the orthographic reform of the Serbian language implemented in the early 19th century. The phonemic orthography was also partially adopted in the 1830s by the representatives of the Croatian national revival movement (the so-called “Illyrian movement”) in the Latin script (the so-called *gajica*). *The language question appeared to be approaching a resolution through solutions that had already been implemented in other regions of Austria-Hungary.* The problem was finding a suitable glottonym. In summary, proposals for the name of the language bounced between toponym-based (Land language, Common Land language or Land language of Bosnia), preferred by the administration, and ethnic-based names (Serbian and Croatian), preferred by the Croats and Serbs, reflecting the existing normative linguistic frameworks for these two languages.

In the Provisional Regulation enacted during the initial year of occupation (1879),³⁷ Serbo-Croatian, using the Latin script, was designated the “official written language within Bosnia and Herzegovina”, while German was named the official language from the district administration level upwards. From the outset, the implementation of this regulation was modified in practice, resulting in new legislation. The decree on the designation of the language and script was issued by the Joint Ministry on 12 September, establishing “the Land language with the Latin script ... removing the word ‘Croatian’”, which had been used sporadically and unofficially in the first months of the occupation.³⁸ Subsequently, the decree on education passed on 26 August 1879 declared that two one-year courses were to be instituted in Sarajevo from 1 October 1879 “for children of all denominations, if possible”, with the objective of imparting instruction in the Land language in the Latin alphabet “with the intention of preparing students

1991), 140–145; Dž. Juzbašić, *Jezičko pitanje u Austrougarskoj politici* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1973); E. Kevro, “Naučni stavovi i njihova interpretacija o Gramatici bosanskog jezika iz 1890. u odnosu na (do sada poznatu) arhivsku građu”, *Književni jezik* 27 (2016), 57–92.

³⁵ *Gramatika bosanskog jezika za srednje škole, Nakladom zemaljske vlade za Bosnu i Hercegovinu* (Sarajevo: Štampa zemaljske štamparije, 1890).

³⁶ *Bukvar za osnovne škole. U vilajetu bosanskom* (Sarajevo: Vilajetska štamparija, 1867).

³⁷ “Provisorische Geschäftsordnung für die Behörden in Bosnien und der Herzegowina vom 16. Februar 1879, Allgemeine Bestimmungen §§, Landesgesetzblatt Bosnien und die Herzegowina 1878–1918, 26 (1879), 26–29.

<https://alex.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/alex?aid=lbh&datum=1878&page=38&size=45>

³⁸ “Erlass des Gemeinsamen Ministeriums, Nr. 4479”. *Landesgesetzblatt Bosnien und die Herzegowina 1878–1918*, 26 (1879), 317.

for subsequent enrolment in secondary education”.³⁹ In another regulation enacted on the same day, “the Land language of Bosnia” with the Latin script is listed as the language of instruction in secondary schools.⁴⁰

From 1880 onwards, the regulation on the designation of the language as “Land language” (*Landessprache*) was supplemented with the use of two scripts.

I have ordered that it be expressly stated that the language of education would be the Land language in Latin and Cyrillic letters, so that the Serbs would have no excuse to complain about supposed discrimination. (Excerpt from a report of the provincial government in Sarajevo dated 27 November 1879, No. 26491, concerning instruction using Cyrillic letters). [...] Regarding the Latin script specifically, the population should be informed that it is being taught in order to offer schoolchildren the opportunity to understand the official language and the official writing of the authorities here. [...] The political authorities should therefore not fail to educate the population of these countries in this sense and emphasise at every opportunity that, adhering to the basic law of equality, they strive to cultivate national and religious distinctiveness...” According to the regulation of the provincial government in Sarajevo dated 23 September 1880, No. 21339, the language of instruction in the municipal elementary schools is the Land language [*Landessprache*]⁴¹ – reading and writing the Latin and Cyrillic scripts, German is a compulsory subject, and the subjects of geography, history and natural sciences are to be taught “based on the prescribed readers.”⁴²

³⁹ “Verordnung der Landesregierung in Sarajevo, Nr. 16887, §§ 1, 3”. *Landesgesetzblatt Bosnien und die Herzegowina* 1878–1918, 26 (1879), 314.

⁴⁰ “Verordnung der Landesregierung in Sarajevo, Nr. 17012, § 2”. *Landesgesetzblatt Bosnien und die Herzegowina* 1878–1918, 26 (1879), 315.

⁴¹ The term “Land language of Bosnia” (*Bosnische Landessprache*) is used interchangeably in the same document for the year 1880.

⁴² “Ich habe die Anordnung getroffen, dass es ausdrücklich ausgesprochen wurde, die Unterrichtssprache sei die Landessprache in lateinischen und cyrillischen Lettern, damit den Serben kein Vorwand bliebe, sich über vermeintliche Zurücksetzung zu beklagen”, “Auszug aus einem Berichte der Landesregierung in Sarajevo vom 27. November 1879, Nr. 26491, betreffend den Unterricht mit Gebrauch der cyrillischen Lettern”, *Landesgesetzblatt Bosnien und die Herzegowina* 1878–1918, Gesetze, vol. I (1878–80), 319. “[...] Was speziell die Lateinschrift betrifft, so wolle die Bevölkerung belehrt werden, dass dieselbe [...] [deshalb] gelehrt wird, um der Schuljugend die Möglichkeit zu bieten, die Amtssprache und die Amtsschrift der hierländlichen Behörden zu verstehen [...] Die politischen Behörden sollen also nicht unterlassen, die Bevölkerung dieser Länder in diesem Sinne zu belehren, und bei jeder Gelegenheit zu betonen, dass man, an dem Grundgesetze der Gleichberechtigung festhaltend, dahin strebe, die nationalen und religiösen Eigentümlichkeit zu kultivieren...”, “Verordnung der Landesregierung in Sarajevo vom 23. September 80, Nr. 21339...” ist die Unterrichtssprache an den städtischen Volksschulen die Landessprache (Lesen und Schreiben der lateinischen und cyrillischen Schrift). Deutsch ist ein Pflichtgegenstand und die Fächer Geographie, Geschichte und Naturkunde sind “auf Grund der vorgeschriebenen Lesebüchern zu lehren”. *Landesgesetzblatt Bosnien und die Herzegowina* 1878–1918. Gesetze, vol. I (1878–80), 319–336.

From then on, official gazettes such as *Sarajevski list* (1881–1918) were printed in the Latin or Cyrillic script (and from 1916, only in the Latin script). Announcements were also published in both scripts. The linguistic expression varied slightly to reflect Serbian or Croatian, but it was increasingly perceived as one language. The situation was somewhat different with the literary language, which reflected not only a person's dialect and region, but also the specific vocabulary of a social group, as well as various sentence structures and morphological features. Religious affiliation could also influence the stylistics of individual users.

The term “Land language” prevailed in government documents, the official press and public education, with the use of both the Latin and Cyrillic alphabets. Croatian and Serbian continued to be used as labels for the language within their respective communities. Over time, the Muslim community increasingly adopted the term “Bosnian”.

In addition to the Dual Monarchy's identity policy, Mehmed-beg Kapetanović Ljubušak, the founder and editor of the newspaper *Bošnjak*, sought to unite all ethnic and religious groups in Bosnia under the name Bosniak (Bošnjak). The introduction of the Latin alphabet among the Muslim population can be attributed to this newspaper (1891–1910 in Sarajevo) and books on the life and culture of Bosnian Muslims published by Ljubušak in the Latin script. At the same time, publications in the Arabic and, even more so, Cyrillic scripts declined among the Muslim population.⁴³ This was in line with the administration's language policy and was supported and financially assisted by the state. The same Sarajevo-based printing house, “The Islamic Joint Stock Printing House” (*Islamska dionička štamparija*), printed the entertainment and educational newspaper *Behar* in the Latin script from 1900 to 1910. From then on, the Herald of the Muslim Community, *Gajret*, was also printed there in the Latin script. The first Muslim publisher, Mostar-based Muhamedi-Bakir Kalajdžić, published a Latin-script magazine called *Biser* [The Pearl], which, according to its subtitle, aimed to spread education among Bosnia and Herzegovina's Muslims. The name of the Muslim Community Organization's organ, “Musavat” (1906–1911), was rendered in three scripts – Latin, Cyrillic and Arabic – while the articles were printed in the Latin script. The proclamation of a unified nation, named after the territory, was not widely accepted by Serbs and Croats in

⁴³ *Sarajavski cvjetnik* (Gülşen-i Saray) [The Sarajevo Flower Garden], one of the first weekly newspapers with political and literary content, was printed at the Vilajet printing house (Sopron printing house) from 1868 to 1872. The newspaper, published in the Cyrillic (Serbian language) and Arabic (Ottoman Turkish language) scripts, was discontinued before the occupation.

Bosnia and Herzegovina. Shortly afterwards, the term “Bosniak” began to be used as the national identifier of the Bosnian Muslims.

However, the heterogeneous population of the Ottoman Empire, which was divided along religious lines, remained in place despite Austria-Hungary’s efforts to establish a new unified nation and language for both occupied provinces. These efforts included introducing neutral names for institutions and language, derived from territorial rather than national markers, for both occupied provinces. An exception was the domain of cultural and educational institutions, which were subject to segregation by denomination and financed by the respective religious communities or individual benefactors.

The three cultural associations—Croatian “*Napredak*”, Serbian “*Prosvjeta*” and Muslim “*Gajret*”—played a crucial role in culture and education, as well as in the political affairs of their respective communities. These associations and their publishing output, although modest, also contributed to the strengthening of the national identity of Croats, Serbs and Muslims. All these societies were originally founded to collect and award scholarships to pupils and students from their national or religious communities. In addition, each community disseminated its newspapers and magazines. These factors had a profound impact on the political landscape, language policy and the entire cultural environment of the region. The publications provided a wide range of content, including contributions on entertainment, religion, literature, science and education.

Croatian newspapers and magazines were published in the Latin script, with their language termed “Croatian”, while their Serbian counterparts used the Cyrillic script and the term “Serbian”. A certain degree of differentiation can be found in the newspapers and magazines of the Muslim community, whose publishing output mostly used the Latin script, with occasional articles also appearing in the Cyrillic and Arabic (*Arebica*) scripts in the early days. Newspapers did not openly state which language they used or what it was called. The following examples illustrate the significance of these publications. Information about this is provided both in the subtitles of these print media and in the announcements in the first issues. These newspapers published current news and were also important for the publication of both old and new literature. However, they also provided a platform for discussions that highlighted the divisions within the communities. These community heralds did not follow the official line proclaimed as “politically correct” by state-funded newspapers and magazines, and their texts were censored. The language issue was not a rare topic, and it was often discussed.

The most important Croatian newspaper in Bosnia and Herzegovina, *Hrvatski dnevnik*⁴⁴ [Croatian Daily], opined on the negative comments made by the Serbian community about public schools:

On public schools: The Bosnian-Herzegovinian education system initially faced significant hurdles, which hindered its progress and led to a notable decline in the participation of Muslim students. Our Orthodox compatriots disseminated astonishing information regarding Bosnian-Herzegovinian schools. It was rumoured in the bazaars and written in Serbian newspapers that the Bosnian-Herzegovinian administration had initially sought to utilise schools for turning Muslims away from their religion.⁴⁵

The leading Serbian magazine for literature, culture and social issues, *Bosanska vila* [Bosnian Fairy] (1885–1914), criticised the use of incorrect grammar in *Školski vjesnik* [School Newsletter], the official annual school report:

We like that the report is in both Cyrillic and Latin, but we are sorry that it is rife with grammatical errors. We found all these errors in the text written by a Herzegovina-born teacher. This goes to show how much influence the school has on the erosion of the native language, so it is no surprise that so many students fail because they do not understand what is being taught to them.⁴⁶

Bošnjak, the most prominent newspaper of the Muslim population, featured a debate on the use of the Cyrillic alphabet: “We have never used the Cyrillic alphabet, and we never will. If you don’t like it, you can leave. We have our Muslim brothers and the honourable Catholic Croats.”⁴⁷

Reports in the Viennese, Zagreb and Belgrade press on issues such as the language question in Bosnia and Herzegovina frequently referred to the lively discussions on this topic in the newspapers of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

State censorship did not only affect articles in non-government publications. It began with the names of books, such as the abovementioned “Bosnian Grammar Book”, and magazines. *Franjevački glasnik* [Franciscan Herald], printed in the town of Visoko, was an educational and religious herald, as stated

⁴⁴ The subtitle was: *Za interese bosansko-hercegovačkih Hrvata* [For the Interests of Bosnian-Herzegovinian Croats]. This newspaper, which mainly covered political topics, was published in Sarajevo irregularly from 1906 to 1918.

⁴⁵ “O narodnim školama: Na to bosansko–hercegovačko školstvo navalila se u početku Velika mora, koja ga je sprečavala u razvoju i koja je poglavito muslimane odbijala od škole. O bosansko-hercegovačkim školama naši su pravoslavni zemljaci ...širili najnevjerojatnije vijesti...tu se je javno po čaršijama govorilo i po srpskim novinama pisalo, kako bosansko–hercegovačka uprava hoće posredstvom škola da razvjeri u prvom redu muslimane”, *Hrvatski dnevnik*, Sarajevo, 28 May 1908, 2. Digital collection NUBBiH. <https://kolekcije.nub.ba/items/show/452>

⁴⁶ *Bosanska vila*, Sarajevo, 15 December 1902, XVII/25, 432.

⁴⁷ *Bošnjak*, Sarajevo, 28 May 1910, 4.

in its subtitles. The first issue was published in 1887 under the name *Franjevački jugoslovenski glasnik* [Franciscan Yugoslav Herald] due to the editors' intention to address all Croatian-speaking Franciscans residing in Austria-Hungary. On government orders, the name had to be immediately changed to *Franjevački bosansko-hercegovački glasnik* [Franciscan Bosnian-Herzegovinian Herald]. From 1895 to 1901, this newspaper was published as *Franjevački glasnik*; between 1902–1913, afterwords as *Serafski perivoj* [Seraphic Garden], before it was renamed *Naša misao* [Our Thought] in 1914–1919. School names were another matter that elicited government interference. The authorities stated “no objection to Greek-Oriental religious communities being allowed to name their denominational elementary schools ‘Serbian elementary schools’ (Srbsko narodno učilište), ... The combination ... ‘Serbian – true believer’ [Orthodox] should, however, be avoided, because it simultaneously denotes Serbian nationality”.⁴⁸

As decreed, the government and pro-government print media published in Sarajevo were in the “Land language”, in the Latin or in Latin and Cyrillic script. Censorship was unnecessary. The following publications were the most prominent: *Bosansko-hercegovačke novine* [Bosnian-Herzegovinian Newspaper] (1878–1881) in the Latin script, with some items in German; followed by *Sarajevski list* [Sarajevo Newspaper] (1881–1914) in the Latin and Cyrillic scripts, with some items in German; *Bosanska pošta* [Bosnian Post] (1896–1898, Latin script); *Bošnjak* (1891–1910, Latin script). The formation of a unified nation and language in Bosnia and Herzegovina was even promoted in the periodical *Glasnik Zemaljskog Muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine* [Gazette of the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina], the official organ of the Land Museum, founded in 1888. This periodical was published in Sarajevo four times a year. Selected contributions were published annually in the German language in Vienna. The Land Museum was a multifunctional institution that included a library, a museum of art history, history, ethnology and archaeology, and a publishing house. The name of the language in which the journal would be published was not mentioned in the first issue. However, a reference was made to the script:

It must be emphasised that material constraints make it impossible to publish *Glasnik* as two separate editions in the Latin and Cyrillic scripts. We are making

⁴⁸ “Demnach unterliegt es keinem Anstande den griechisch-orientalischen Cultusgemeinden zu gestatten, dass sie ihre confessionellen Volksschulen ‘serbische Volksschulen’ (Srbsko narodno učilište) nennen ... Die Verbindung ‘serbisch – echtgläubig’ [orthodox] wäre jedoch zu vermeiden, weil dadurch gerade die serbische Nationalität zugleich bezeichnet wird”, “Erlass des gemeinsamen Ministeriums vom 11. Oktober 1880, Nr. 6687 B. H., betreffend die Bezeichnung der serbischen Volksschulen”, *Landesgesetzblatt Bosnien und die Herzegowina 1878–1918*, 345.

<https://alex.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/alex?aid=lbh&datum=1878&page=359&size=45>.

every effort to preserve the integrity of both our scripts and to ensure that the publication remains inclusive in its presentation.⁴⁹

Constantin Hörmann, the Land Museum's long-serving director, founded and edited the luxury literary and art magazine *Nada* [Hope] from 1895 to 1903. This magazine was created as a counterpart to *Bosanska vila*, the only literary magazine in Bosnia and Herzegovina at the time, published in the Cyrillic script and the Serbian language. The intention behind this initiative was to create a space that would bring together writers and artists from a range of religious affiliations. *Nada* was printed in both the Latin and Cyrillic scripts, with literary contributions retaining the linguistic features of their respective authors.

In 1907, Kalláy's successor, Burián von Rajecz (Joint Finance Minister in Vienna, 1903–1912), issued a decree that abolished “referring to the language of these lands as Bosnian” and advocated for the designation “Serbo-Croatian”, with the continued use of the name “Land language”, if required, which in turn led to new conflicts.⁵⁰ Rajecz's decree did not speak about the existence or standard of a language, limiting itself to the name. Rajecz sought to prepare Bosnia and Herzegovina for annexation. One option he may have considered was incorporating the country into the Monarchy's structure by naming its language Serbo-Croatian, a term that was already in use. The idea of a South Slavic ethnic and linguistic community within the Austro-Hungarian Empire became increasingly prevalent in the 19th century, especially in its second half, due to the Empire's linguistic and education policies, which were promoted for economic, administrative and political reasons. The establishment of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts (JAZU) in Zagreb in 1866 provided an institutional framework for developing a unified language. In 1880, the JAZU began work on a joint Croatian-Serbian dictionary. The term “Serbo-Croatian” or “Serbian-Croatian” or “Croatian-Serbian” became established for official purposes in the Austrian part of the Monarchy. Parallel to this term, the glottonyms “Croatian”⁵¹

⁴⁹ *Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo, 1889/1, 5.

⁵⁰ ABH Landesregierung für Bosnien und Herzegowina, no. 168539, 4. 10. 1907, quoted in Dž. Juzbašić, *Jezičko pitanje u Austrougarskoj politici* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1973), 10.

⁵¹ A. Veber, *Slovnica hrvatska za srednja učilišta* (Zagreb, 1873); M. Divković, *Hrvatska gramatika* (Zagreb: Tiskom dioničke tiskare, 1879); I. Broz, *Hrvatski pravopis* (Zagreb, 1892); D. Parčić, *Rječnik hrvatsko-talijanski* (Zadar: Tisak i naklada Narodnog lista, 1907) [named “Illyrisch-Italienisches Wörterbuch” in the first edition of 1858]. The same year (1895) saw the publication of two editions of the same language textbooks in Vienna by the same printing house (A. Hartlebens's Verlag) and author (Emil Muža), one for Serbo-Croatian and one for Croatian: “Die Kunst, die Serbokroatische Sprache durch Selbstunterricht schnell zu erlernen” and “Praktische Grammatik der Kroatischen Sprache für den Selbstunterricht: Theoretisch-praktische Anleitung zur schnellen Erlernung durch Selbstunterricht”.

and “Serbian”⁵² also existed. The term “Serbo-Croatian” was in use at the University of Vienna, in the school system and the press (as evidenced by, among other things, study reports from the University of Vienna archives, school protocols, census data, press articles, etc.). The first grammars, dictionaries and textbooks that employ the double-barrelled designation in their titles or introductions date from this period: “Serbsko-Hervatski” or “Hervatsko-Serbski” or “Serbo-Croatian”. In this period, the double-barrelled name and the perception of Serbian and Croatian as one language became established in academic linguistic treatises and periodicals in Austria-Hungary, as well as in Germany, Great Britain and France.

As a result, the abovementioned “Grammar of the Bosnian language for Secondary Schools” in the Latin and Cyrillic scripts, edited in Sarajevo in 1890, was renamed in 1908 to the “Grammar of the Serbo-Croatian Language”.⁵³ Despite this, consistent implementation was not achieved. For example, the curriculum prescribed in 1908 for the establishment of commercial schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina used the term “language of instruction”.⁵⁴ Notably, the 1910 Land Statute (*Landesstatut/ Zemaljski statut*) for Bosnia and Herzegovina did not address the name and use of the language.⁵⁵ The language question constantly interfered with social and religious issues and became a political affair.

Attempts to create a new nation and language failed. The language issue in Bosnia and Herzegovina thus became part of the South Slav question in the

⁵² After two uprisings, Serbia gained autonomy within the Ottoman Empire in 1830. The borders of the Principality of Serbia were confirmed in 1833. Among other things, this led to a rapid expansion of elementary, secondary and higher education and publishing in the Serbian language, influencing further developments in language issues within Austria–Hungary. The glottonym “Serbian” is rarely found in state-sponsored books and institutions in the Austrian part of the Empire, but it was commonly used in self-funded schools and independently published books throughout the Dual Monarchy. This state of affairs intensified when Serbia gained full independence in 1878 and became a kingdom in 1882.

⁵³ This problem has continued to plague the region, with occasional hiatuses. Due to its complexity and the influence of various social and political factors, the development of a solution that would satisfy all parties involved has proven elusive.

⁵⁴ “Verordnung der Landesregierung für Bosnien und Herzegowina vom 20. Oktober 1908, Z. 173.928/., § 3”.

⁵⁵ “Allen Landesangehörigen ist die Wahrung der nationalen Eigenart und Sprache gewährleistet” [All citizens are guaranteed the preservation of their national identity and language], “Allerhöchste Entschliebung vom 17. Februar 1910. Landesstatut für Bosnien und Herzegowina, 23, § 11”, *Gesetz- und Verordnungsblatt für Bosnien und die Hercegovina*, 19/22 February 1910, available at: <https://fcjp.ba/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/Landesstatut.pdf>.

Empire. In the final decades of the Dual Monarchy, the language issue became a plaything of national conflicts of interest as well as a matter of religious belief, with the determination of the language of instruction serving as a symbolic definition of a community's national identity. The connections with the other South Slavs in the Monarchy were getting stronger, which led to government sanctions.⁵⁶ The growing working class and part of the educated class were increasingly interested in the idea of a unified South Slav identity. In 1910, 87% of the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina were still illiterate – a significant figure in the context of the language question, which was, in fact, more of a national and social one. This period saw several assassination attempts against the Monarchy's officials and dignitaries⁵⁷ and the increased frequency of revolts among the working class. The economic and educational reforms were implemented in a selective and piecemeal manner. This demonstrated the increasing urgency of finding a solution to the South Slavic issue within the Dual Monarchy.

Because of strict censorship in Bosnia and Herzegovina, alternative perspectives and critical voices were packaged in satirical texts or published beyond its borders, including in other parts of the Monarchy, where censorship was not as strict.⁵⁸ In Vienna, Kraus, an Austrian writer, criticised the Austrian policy in Bosnia:

⁵⁶ On 3 May 1913, a decree was issued dissolving all “social democratic sports, singing and music associations”, and “all Serbian national organisations”, “Verordnung der Landesregierung für Bosnien und Herzegowina vom 2. Mai 1913, Z. 2520, § 14”.

⁵⁷ In 1910, Bogdan Žerajić, a Serbian student from Herzegovina, shot Marijan Varešanin, the governor of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in Sarajevo. Žerajić was shot dead on the spot. He became a national hero among South Slavic youth. During the so-called inflation protests, the Dalmatian deputy Njeguš from Montenegro fired shots in the Vienna Parliament in 1911. In 1912, Croatian student Luka Jukić targeted Slavko Cuvaj, Ban of Croatia, in Zagreb. The Jukić trial gave rise to South Slavic demonstrations and slogans such as “Long live the unity of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs!”. He and his accomplices became national heroes among the South Slavs. In the same year, another assassination attempt was made on the same ban, who subsequently withdrew from political life. In 1913, Stjepan Dojčić assassinated the new administrator of Croatia, Ivan Škrlec. All these assassination attempts were motivated by the pursuit of social justice and the South Slavic question. Gavrilo Princip and his accomplices (Serbs, Croats and Muslims), who later killed Archduke Franz Ferdinand, also identified as “Yugoslavs” at their trial, rather than as Serbs, Croats or Muslims.

⁵⁸ S. Vervaeet, “Bosanska vila i Dvojna monarhija: Književni program bosanskohercegovačkih Srba i kulturna politika Austrougarske”. In *Susret kultura: zbornik radova* (Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2006), 659–669; M. Rizvić, *Književno stvaranje muslimanskih pisaca u Bosni i Hercegovini u doba austrougarske vlade* (Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti BiH, 1973).

It is necessary to show the true picture, as we always hear only enthusiastic praise from Bosnian visitors. [...] It should also be mentioned that in Bosnia, too, the Austrian strategy of playing one nation off against another was applied, and there were even ambitions to create a third nation. The confusion is getting worse and worse.⁵⁹

Governor Kállay found himself on the receiving end of critical comments in the United Kingdom. *The Spectator*, a London-based weekly, quoted statements Kállay had made in an interview published in another London-based outlet, the *Daily Chronicle* from 3 October 1895, subjecting them to a more detailed analysis. For demonstration purposes, here are some of Kállay's statements about Bosnia:

What we have tried to do is to build the new upon the old. In many respects the old Turkish law was admirable in principle, but utterly evaded in practice. We follow this wherever possible, and the content of the whole people, with the most insignificant exceptions, proves how right we are. [...] Austria is a great Occidental Empire, charged with the mission of carrying civilisation to Oriental peoples, – of one of which I myself am a member. Austria-Hungary stands midway between West and East, and it is translating the one for the other. It was the ambition of Austria to make of Bosnia-Herzegovina the highest civilisation of the Balkan Peninsula.⁶⁰

The Czech writer and journalist Josef Holeček published an article in the Kingdom of Serbia:

The government has decided to replace the word 'Serbian' with 'Bosnian'. But, for goodness' sake, what will happen to the Bosnian language in Herzegovina? Logically, it would have to be ordered that the 'Herzegovinian' language be used instead of 'Serbian', and in the Novi Pazar Sanjak, it would have to be called the 'Novi Pazar' language. If Mr Kallay's heartfelt wish were to be fulfilled and Dalmatia were to fall under his administration, he would have to introduce the 'Dalmatian' language by the force of his official power. This language has never existed, just as Bosnian or Herzegovinian.⁶¹

In 1904, Petar Kočić⁶² published his satirical drama *Jazavac pred sudom* [The Badger on Trial] in Zagreb, Croatia. The "cultural mission" in Bosnia and

⁵⁹ "Es tut ... Noth, das wahre Bild zu zeigen, als wir von den bosnischen Ausflüglern stets nur die begeisterten Lobpreisungen zu hören bekommen. ... Es sei nur noch erwähnt, Dass man auch in Bosnien das österreichische Prinzip der Ausspielung einer Nation gegen die andere in Anwendung brachte und sogar eine dritte schaffen wollte. Die Verwirrung wird immer ärger". In K. Kraus, "Kallays Cultursendung", *Die Fackel* 22 (1889), 7–9.

⁶⁰ "Baron de Kallay's Achievement", *The Spectator*, London, 5 October 1895, 8–9.

⁶¹ J. Holeček, "Dvadesetogodišnja okupacija Bosne i Hercegovine", *Delo*, Belgrade, 1889, 444.

⁶² Petar Kočić (1877–1916) was a Serbian writer from Bosnia and Herzegovina and one of the most prominent representatives of an anti-Austrian resistance in Bosnian

Herzegovina, which the Dual Monarchy had consistently emphasised as its goal after the occupation, had little effect even after over 30 years. Political tensions in the annexed territories increased rather than decreased. Peasant revolts, strikes, dissent in the press and literature, and even assassinations were not uncommon. Kočić's satirical drama describes an old farmer who has lost a large part of his harvest due to the Austro-Hungarian tax, and who accuses the badger, which has devastated his harvest, at the district court – a metaphor for the suffering of the inhabitants of Bosnia.

Later on, some satirical and critical texts appeared in publications in Bosnia, including two literary works by Kočić. His satirical story *Jablan* [The Poplar], which he wrote as a student in Vienna, describes a fight between two bulls in Bosnia: one Bosnian and one Austrian. It was published in 1903 in Sarajevo.⁶³ The satire was further reinforced when it appeared in Alexander Roda Roda's German translation in the 1903 issue of a Vienna agricultural journal⁶⁴ dedicated to bulls.⁶⁵

Just like during the 18th and 19th centuries, when the Serbian-Croatian language in Hungary and Austria was under the lexical influence of Hungarian, German, Latin, etc., the language in Bosnia was subjected to the same process after the occupation, with expressions and phrases used by the Croats and Serbs from the Habsburg Monarchy joining in on this process. Petar Kočić describes the language situation in Bosnia in 1911:

After 33 years of Austrian domination, our language is so ruined that it's safe to say that today among the intelligentsia in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in the mother countries of our literary language, the dirtiest and most irregular language is written and spoken [...] The influence of the new administration and its institutions on our language is harmful. [...] This is a disgusting Serbo-Croatian malformation, that is inert, screwed, often quite incomprehensible [...] In addition to the courts and other public institutions, as well as newspapers and journalists, [...] our schools [...] have

cultural life. The journalist and satirist Savo Škarić, who died at a young age in 1909, also deserves a mention here. Like Kočić's works, his column in the Sarajevo newspaper *Srpska riječ* [The Serbian Word], which appeared under the title "Zembilj" from 1906 to 1909, was a strong critical voice in Bosnia. Škarić also addressed issues relating to language and school education.

⁶³ *Bosanska vila*, Sarajevo, 30 March 1902/VII, no. 6, 104–106.

⁶⁴ P. Kočić, "Jablan. Petar Kotschitsch, Authorisierte Übersetzung aus dem Serbischen von Roda Roda", *Die Wiener Landwirtschaftliche Zeitung*, Vienna 19 December 1903, 1–2.

⁶⁵ G. Ilić Marković, "Die Taschen voller Papier". In *P. Kočić: Jablan*, ed. G. Ilić Marković, N. Vukolić (Banja Luka–Belgrade: Zadužbina "Petar Kočić", 2007).

also tirelessly and systematically worked, and continue to work, to corrupt and heartlessly torture our language.⁶⁶

This confusing situation in the mother tongue was triggered by the politically motivated failure to introduce language standards that had existed since the 19th century, as well as by changing the name of the language. Additionally, the use of the German language by the local population was awkward and riddled with incorrect phrases. This affected all those who wanted to participate in political, economic and cultural life, and led to an uncertain and inferior attitude towards language. It is worth recalling the term “schizoglossia”, introduced in 1962 by the American linguist Haugen. Based on the standardisation of Norwegian, his native language, and also his and other US immigrants’ uncertainties in using the American and British varieties of English, he ironically describes this as schizoglossia, a linguistic “disorder” that could occur in speakers who are exposed to more than one variety of their native or a foreign language.⁶⁷

Language Conferences in 1913

In 1913, the debate about language policy entered its final phase, not only in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also in other parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The use of the domestic languages in Bohemia, Croatia and Slavonia, Bukovina, etc., in the education system, official documents and, in particular, in the military and railway sectors was discussed in Vienna and Budapest, as in previous years. While the interests of the inhabitants of these parts of the Monarchy could be represented by the delegates in the Austrian Reichsrat and the Hungarian Parliament (Reichstag), the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina did not have this option, as they had no delegates in the parliaments in Vienna

⁶⁶ P. Kočić, “Za srpski jezik”, *Otadžbina* 1 (1911). Quoted in: P. Kočić, *Sabrana djela* I–IV (Banja Luka–Belgrade: Besjeda, 2002), 310–313.

⁶⁷ “Although there are two official written languages, it is rather a case of schizoglossia than of diglossia, since these are little more than divergent dialects of one language. The official government policy during the past 25 years has been to promote the fusion of these two languages into one compromise norm [...] The introduction of writing made possible the infinite extension of the language community beyond the immediate reach of the voice. It made possible the building of nations and empires, which in their turn became extended speech communities. Within these the pressure against schizoglossia was directed above all at the normalization and standardization of writing, but with the growth of other means of communication through travel, it came to embrace also speech at least of those who travelled. Only by reducing what Hockett has called the noise of the code could the institutions of modern societies be built”. E. Haugen, “Schizoglossia and the Linguistic Norm”. In *Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics* 15, ed. Evelyn S. Firchow (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1962), 63–74.

and Budapest. The region had a passive legal status. Before a draft law could be introduced, the approval of both the Austrian and Hungarian governments was required before it could then be submitted for imperial approval. In 1910, Bosnia and Herzegovina was granted a Land Statute but no Land Constitution. The inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina were considered “members” of the Austro-Hungarian Empire but were not officially Austrian or Hungarian citizens.⁶⁸ The authority of the Diet in Sarajevo was very limited and restricted to secondary issues. The language issue, however, was of general interest and was discussed in Vienna and Budapest without representatives from Bosnia and Herzegovina. The legislative situation made it possible to put the language issue on the agenda of the Diet in Sarajevo and to form a commission that would present the matter to the ministries in Vienna and Budapest. This was also done. The members of this commission also sought to obtain the support of the Croatian and Serbian delegations in the parliaments of Vienna and Budapest. As in all other matters, the decision rested ultimately with the emperor or, as his representative, the Governor of Bosnia and Herzegovina. While the official newspapers of Bosnia and Herzegovina, such as the *Bosanska Pošta* and *Sarajevoer Blatt* [Sarajevski List], reported encouragingly on the positive developments in this matter, critical and sobering voices could be heard in the Austrian press, as well as in the privately owned newspapers of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The language issue regarding the status of Czech in relation to German in Bohemia, as well as Croatian in Croatia and Slavonia in relation to Hungarian, was of great interest and was the only language issue discussed at the parliamentary level. Notwithstanding the numerous economic and social concerns that resulted in political unrest, the question of language continued to dominate the Diet in Sarajevo throughout 1913.

The first session on the regulation of the official language and language of instruction in Bosnia and Herzegovina took place in the Diet (*Landtag*) in Sarajevo on 10 February. The legislative draft listed Serbo-Croatian with both scripts as the official language, including in oral and written external communications of the state railways in Bosnia and Herzegovina. On 19 February, a twelve-member delegation travelled to Vienna to brief Joint Finance Minister Bilinski on their activities. While the Ministry confirmed receiving the delegation, it denied that any negotiations had taken place, stating that “no such ne-

⁶⁸ N. Wurmbrand, *Die rechtliche Stellung Bosniens und der Herzegowina* (Leipzig–Vienna, 1915), 95; quoted in: H. Hautmann, “Kriegsjustiz in Bosnien-Herzegowina unter Habsburgs Herrschaft”. In *Zeithistoriker – Archivar – Aufklärer. Festschrift für Winfried R. Garscha*, eds. C. Kuretsidis-Haider and C. Schindler, (Vienna: DÖW, 2017), 67–81; cf. E. Bauer, *Zwischen Halbmond und Doppeladler. 40 Jahre Österreichische Verwaltung in Bosnien-Herzegowina* (Vienna–Munich: Herold Verlag, 1971).

gotiations had been planned” and that the delegation had travelled to Vienna “on their own initiative”. The Bosnian-Herzegovinian newspapers subsequently reported on “negotiations on the language issue in Vienna”, which was again denied in the government report “because the delegation did not have the mandate to conduct any negotiations”.⁶⁹ With varying degrees of success, members of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Diet undertook several visits to political representatives in Budapest and Vienna in the following months to present their case and obtain the necessary approval of the two parliaments of the Dual Monarchy. Returning to the Diet, they proceeded to submit reports on their meetings and participate in further debates. While the majority of the population initially focused on the implementation of their domestic language in all sectors of the country, with the question of naming the language of secondary importance, this issue increasingly became an obstacle. During the debate, the conflicting parties occasionally moved closer to each other, only to then take completely opposite positions – whether the language should be designated as the Land language, Serbo-Croatian or Croatian-Serbian. The District Government shrewdly brought the real language issue to the fore, which related to the continued use of the German language in strategically important sectors, noting that this matter was not within the Diet’s jurisdiction. The authority of that lay exclusively with the emperor. The decision, however, had a significant impact on the local population’s ability to obtain employment in the railway sector and was an important part of the initial legislative draft. This resulted in intense debates in the Diet and in the whole land. The existing cultural differences were looking for a way into the hegemonic situation. The question of the language name receded into the background. Finally, an agreement was reached on a language draft, which was essentially an adaptation of Austria-Hungary’s existing language regulations and not the result of a year of debates and efforts. The announcement suggests that it could be said to have been reached democratically. This was not yet legally binding, however, as the Diet could only approve legislative drafts and not laws. According to this provision, a law had to be reviewed and approved by both ministries of Austria-Hungary before it could be sanctioned by the emperor. The official report on the adoption of the language draft at the meeting of 30 December 1913 in the Diet in Sarajevo stated:

Sarajevo, 30 December. The Diet discussed the language draft during today’s session. The draft, which comprises six paragraphs, stipulates that Serbo-Croatian is to be designated as the official language and language of instruction, in all offices and institutions and for all branches of civil administration in Bosnia and Herzegovina,

⁶⁹ “Konferenzen über die Sprachenfrage”. In *Politische Chronik der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie*, IV – *Bosnisch-herzegowinischer Landtag 1913*, vol. 2, ed. K. Neisser (Vienna, 1913), 63–64.

both internally and externally. In the internal communications of the railway service, Serbo-Croatian is to be used strictly in accordance with military interests. Private schools that do not use Serbo-Croatian as the language of instruction can only be granted public status if they incorporate Serbo-Croatian as a compulsory subject. It is further stipulated that the two scripts of the Serbo-Croatian language are to be regarded as equal and must be used in parallel and equally in all official announcements, public notices, public records and seals. It is an established fact that individuals without proficiency in the Serbo-Croatian language are ineligible for employment in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian civil service or on the state railways. However, there exists a possibility of employment on a temporary basis, should special administrative interests so require. However, the persons concerned are required to acquire proficiency in Serbo-Croatian within three years; failure will result in the termination of their permanent employment. As such, employees already in service are obliged to learn the domestic language within three years of the publication of the law. Should they fail to do so, however, exceptions can be made to keep them in service.⁷⁰

A year later, after interruptions to parliamentary work due to social and political crises, the legislative draft on the language issue was adopted by the Diet in a session held from 31 December to 1 January 1914.

In January 1914, the resulting decree proclaimed Serbo-Croatian, with the use of two scripts, as the official language of Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁷¹

⁷⁰ "Sarajevo, 30. Dezember. Der Landtag beriet in seiner heutigen Sitzung die Sprachenvorlage. Daraus sechs Paragraphen bestehende Entwurf bestimmt die Festsetzung der serbokroatischen Amts- und Unterrichtssprache bei sämtlichen Behörden, Ämtern und Anstalten für alle Zweige der Zivilverwaltung im Verwaltungsbereiche Bosniens und der Herzegowina im inneren wie im äußeren Dienstverkehr. Allein im inneren Dienste der Landesbahnen wird die serbokroatische Sprache nur soweit benützt, als es die militärischen Interessen gestatten. Den Privatschulen mit nicht serbokroatischer Unterrichtssprache kann nur dann das Öffentlichkeitsrecht verliehen werden, wenn sie die serbokroatische Sprache als obligaten Lehrgegenstand führen. Die beiden Schriftarten der serbokroatischen Sprache sind gleichberechtigt und müssen gleichzeitig und gleichmäßig bei allen amtlichen Verlautbarungen, öffentlichen Kundmachungen, öffentlichen Aufschriften und Siegeln angewendet werden. Niemand kann im bosnisch-herzegowinischen Landesdienst oder bei den Landesbahnen angestellt werden, der nicht der serbokroatischen Sprache mächtig ist. – wenn besondere Interessen der Verwaltung es erfordern, kann dies Provisorisch geschehen. Die Betreffenden müssen aber binnen dreier Jahre die serbokroatische Sprache erlernen, ansonsten können sie nicht definitiv angestellt werden. Bereits im Dienste befindliche Angestellte sind verpflichtet, binnen dreier Jahre nach der Publikation des Gesetzes die Landessprache zu erlernen, sonst kann ein weiteres Verbleiben im Dienste nur ausnahmsweise gestattet werden". *Parlamentarische Chronik, Bosnisch-herzegowinischer Landtag*, 1913/12, 865.

⁷¹ "The Law on the Regulation of Official and Educational Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina", *Stenografski izvještaj II sjednice sabora Bosne i Hercegovine*, 3 December 1914, ABH, ZMF, Pr. BH, 10/1914.

The Parliament [...] has passed a decree determining Serbo-Croatian as the Land language. It is to be considered the internal and external official language. Henceforth, the German language shall be used for military purposes in the railway service only.⁷²

This achieved synchronisation with the language names introduced in the other parts of the Monarchy at the end of the 19th century within the framework of the “South Slavic question”. Only six months later, the war broke out. As a Serbian symbol, the Cyrillic alphabet was avoided in Bosnia and Herzegovina’s public life but not banned in internal government communications. While Governor Potiorek (1911–1914) had not addressed it explicitly, the new Governor Sarkotić turned his attention to this issue immediately upon assuming office in December 1914. Due to existing laws and the Austrian-Hungarian defeats up to the autumn of 1915, the name “Serbian” and the Cyrillic script were not outlawed officially, but remained largely absent. Finally, when the use of the Serbian language and the Cyrillic alphabet was banned completely in Serbia, which was occupied at the end of 1915, the authorities also enacted this regulation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁷³ Soon afterwards, the same interdict was imposed in occupied Montenegro. Basically, from then on, the regulations regarding the name of the language and use of the script reflected the initial decree of 1879: Serbo-Croatian with the Latin script.

Conclusion

In summary, the language policy strategies pursued in Bosnia and Herzegovina and, more broadly, in the entire Dual Monarchy, can be viewed as a roundabout with several exits, most of which were dead ends, with only a few proving accident-free. This is by no means an exceptional case in global language policy, regardless of the historical period.

In the Provisional Regulation during the initial year of occupation (1879), Serbo-Croatian with the Latin script was named the “official written language within Bosnia and Herzegovina”, while German was designated as the official language from the district administration level upwards. From 1880 onwards,

⁷² “Der Landtag [...] hat ein Sprachengesetz erledigt, durch welches Serbokroatisch als Landessprache festgesetzt wird. Es hat als innere und äußere Amtssprache zu gelten. Nur im Eisenbahndienst wird auch fernerhin noch aus militärischen Gründen nebenbei die deutsche Sprache zulässig sein”, *Neuigkeits-Welt-Blatt*, Vienna, 8 January 1914, 13.

⁷³ For more on the issue of language and education policy during the occupation of Serbia and Montenegro, see G. Ilić Marković, “Okupacioni list Beogradske novine / Belgrader Nachrichten 1915–1918”, *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane* (Beograd: MSC, 2015), 143–156.

the regulation on the designation of the language as “Land language” (*Landessprache*) was supplemented by the use of the Cyrillic and Latin scripts. The terms “Croatian” and “Serbian” continued to be used for naming the language of these communities. The term “Bosnian” was temporarily adopted by the Muslim community, predominantly with the Latin script. In 1907, the designation “Serbo-Croatian”, with the use of both scripts, became official, with the continued use of the term Land language if required. In January 1914, the Serbo-Croatian language, written in two scripts, was proclaimed the official language of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In July of the same year, the First World War broke out. The term “Serbo-Croatian” for the language was maintained, while the Cyrillic script was used infrequently and avoided until it was finally banned in early 1916.

The current language policy of Bosnia and Herzegovina continues to be informed by this historical background. According to the 2019 census,⁷⁴ Bosnia and Herzegovina had 3,531,159 inhabitants, of whom 1,866,585 listed Bosnian as their mother tongue, 1,086,027 Serbian, and 515,481 Croatian.⁷⁵ On top of this, 27,299 people identified as speakers of Serbo-Croatian, and 1,897 opted for the three-part term Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian. This correlates broadly with the data on national affiliation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, whose population includes 1,769,592 Bosniaks, 1,086,733 Serbs, and 544,780 Croats.⁷⁶ Mirroring the introduction of the term Bosniaks (1993),⁷⁷ Bosnian is also referred to as Bosniak language in linguistic circles outside of Bosnia, while Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina refer to their language as Croatian and Serbs as Serbian. This further reinforces the correlation of nation–language–religion in Bosnia and Herzegovina today.

From 1918 onwards, in the interwar period, during the Second World War, and up to the present day, various language policy measures have been implemented in the newly founded states.⁷⁸ All of them reflected the prevailing politics of the respective nascent states and primarily sought to establish

⁷⁴ The census conducted in October 2013 provided the basis for these results, which remained controversial.

⁷⁵ *Census of Population, Households and Dwellings in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Ethnicity/ National Affiliation, Religion and Mother Tongue* (Sarajevo: Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2019), 957–984.

⁷⁶ A few of them identified themselves as Bosnian (37,110), Bosnian and Herzegovinian (11,406), Herzegovinian (498), Muslim, Bosnian Muslim (242), Yugoslav (2,570).

⁷⁷ Until 1974 “Bosnian Muslims”, and from 1974 a constituent nation of Yugoslavia designated as “Muslims” (with capital M), in contrast to “muslims” (lowercase) referring to the religious group.

⁷⁸ On language issues in public schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1945 to the 1970s see M. Okuka, *Jezik i politika* (Sarajevo: Oslobođenje, 1983).

the name of the language, regardless of whether they were followed by standardisation attempts. In the First and Second Austrian Republics (1918–1938, from 1945), the term “Serbo-Croatian” was retained in public discourse and for academic purposes. At a time when there were no standard works for the Bosnian language, the tripartite term “Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian” (BCS, without slashes) was adopted in the Austrian public education sector (including universities) in the 1992/93 school year and verified in 1996 by circular letter.⁷⁹ The acronym B/C/S (B/K/S) continues to dominate in Austria’s public sector, amidst an enduring absence of normative grammars to regulate its usage. In elementary public schools, teaching materials using this tripartite language name were developed by the teachers themselves, as well as some publications printed in Austria to cater to mother tongue lessons offered in public schools. To date, there is no clear institutional consensus in Austria as to whether this is one pluricentric language or three standard languages, as attested by the predominant use of the plural “languages”, immediately followed by the abbreviation BKS (without separators, conversely implying that this is one language) – “languages BKS”. As in the time of the Monarchy, the number of privately funded education models operating alongside the public school system has been growing since the 1990s. These are organised by Serbian, Croatian and Bosniak civic associations or religious communities, referring to the languages as Croatian, Serbian or Bosnian. Since 1993, several inquiries on the distinction and division of the Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian languages versus maintaining it as a single language have been made at the state level, citizens’ initiatives have cropped up, and conferences have been held. Experts have been consulted and their papers presented. Nevertheless, this issue has caused endless debate among parents, teachers, and students, as well as in the political sphere and educational institutions, year after year. According to the circular issued by the Austrian Ministry of Education in 2014,⁸⁰ differentiated internal language programmes for Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian can be offered, depending on the pupil groups and the availability of teachers for these languages. The registration form issued by the Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research for mother tongue (first language) teaching allows the name of the desired language to be defined by the applicant.

Glottonymy is once again coming to the fore.

⁷⁹ No. 10/1996, GZ. 27.901/8-V/5a/96.

⁸⁰ No. 12/2014 – GZ BMBF-27.901/0025-I/Va/14.

Bibliography

Archival sources

Arhiv Bosne i Hercegovine (ABH)

Zbirka Ministarstva finansija (ZMF), Protokoli Bosanskog sabora (Pr. BH):

Stenografski izvještaj II sjednice sabora Bosne i Hercegovine, 3. Decembar 1914 [Stenographic Report of the Second Session of the Diet of Bosnia and Herzegovina]. Pr. BH, 10/1914

Published sources and literature

Bauer, E. *Zwischen Halbmond und Doppeladler. 40 Jahre Österreichische Verwaltung in Bosnien-Herzegowina* [Between Crescent and Double Eagle: 40 Years of Austrian Administration in Bosnia-Herzegovina]. Vienna–Munich: Herold Verlag, 1971.

Bericht über die Verwaltung von Bosnien und der Herzegovina [Report on the Administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina]. Vienna: K. und k. gemeinsamen Finanzministerium, 1906.

Bosna i Hercegovina u brojkama [Bosnia and Herzegovina in Figures]. Mostar: Hrvatska dionička tiskarna, 1911.

Broz, I. *Hrvatski pravopis* [Croatian Orthography]. Zagreb, 1892.

Bukvar za osnovne škole. U vilajetu bosanskom. [Spelling Book for Elementary Schools. In the Bosnian Vilayet]. Sarajevo: Vilajetska štamparija, 1867.

Census of Population, Households and Dwellings in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Ethnicity/ National Affiliation, Religion and Mother Tongue. Sarajevo: Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2019, 957–984.

Clayer, N. “Der Balkan, Europa und der Islam” [The Balkans, Europe, and Islam]. In *Europa und die Grenzen im Kopf. Enzyklopädie des europäischen Ostens*. In eds. K. Kaser, D. Grashammer-Hohl and R. Pichler, 303–328. Klagenfurt: Weiser, 2003.

Divković, M. *Hrvatska gramatika* [Croatian Grammar]. Zagreb: Tiskom dioničke tiskare, 1879.

Gletler, M. “Ökonomie und Nationalismus – ein Kernproblem im multinationalen Staat. Ein Vergleich der Politik Ernest von Koerber und Sandor Wekerles”, In *Gegenwart in Vergangenheit. Beiträge zur Kultur und Geschichte der Neueren und Neuesten Zeit*, ed. G. Jenal, (München: Oldenburg Verlag, 1993), 239–256.

Gramatika bosanskog jezika za srednje škole [Grammar of the Bosnian Language for Secondary Schools]. Sarajevo: Štampa zemaljske štamparije, 1890.

Haugen, E. “Schizoglossia and the Linguistic Norm”. In *Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics* 15, ed. Evelyn S. Firchow, 63–74. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1962.

Hautmann, H. “Kriegsjustiz in Bosnien-Herzegowina unter Habsburgs Herrschaft” [War Justice in Bosnia-Herzegovina under Habsburg Rule]. In *Zeithistoriker – Ar-*

- chivar – Aufklärer. Festschrift für Winfried R. Garscha*, eds. C. Kuretsidis-Haider and C. Schindler, 67–81. Vienna: DÖW, 2017.
- Holeček, J. “Dvadesetogodišnja okupacija Bosne i Hercegovine” [Twenty Years of the Occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina]. *Delo*, Belgrade, 1889, 420–452.
- Hörnes, M. *Bosnien und Hercegovina* [Bosnia and Herzegovina]. Vienna: Verlag von Karl Graef, 1889.
- Ilić Marković, G. “Die Taschen voller Papier” [Pockets Full of Paper]. In P. Kočić, *Jablan*, eds. Gordana Ilić Marković, Nikola Vukolić, Banja Luka–Belgrade: Zadužbina ‘Petar Kočić’, 2007, 40f.
- Ilić Marković, G. “Okupacioni list Beogradske novine / Belgrader Nachrichten 1915–1918” [The Occupation Paper *Beogradske novine / Belgrader Nachrichten* 1915–1918]. In *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane*, Belgrade: MSC, 2015, 143–156.
- Ilić Marković, G. “From Serbian to Serbo-Croatian and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian in Austria: Migrant Pluricentricity Reflecting Complex Historical and Present Developments”. In *Pluricentric Languages and Non-Dominant Varieties Worldwide*, Vol. 1: *Pluricentric Languages across Continents — Features and Usage*, ed. Rudolf Muhr, 433–448. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2016.
- Ilić Marković, G. *Roda Roda – Srpski dnevnik izveštača iz Prvog svetskog rata. Ratni presbiter Austrougarske monarhije* [Roda Roda – A Serbian Diary of a War Correspondents in the World War I. The War Press Bureau of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy]. Novi Sad–Belgrade: Prometej, 2017.
- Juzbašić, Dž. *Jezičko pitanje u Austrougarskoj politici* [The Language Question in Austro-Hungarian Policy]. Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1973.
- Kevro, E. “Naučni stavovi i njihova interpretacija o Gramatici bosanskog jezika iz 1890. u odnosu na (do sada poznatu) arhivsku građu” [Scholarly Positions and their Interpretation on the 1890 Grammar of the Bosnian Language in Relation to the Currently Known Archival Material]. *Književni jezik* 27 (2016), 57–92.
- Kočić, P. “Jablan. Petar Kotschitsch, Authorisierte Übersetzung aus dem Serbischen von Roda Roda” [Jablan. Authorized Translation from Serbian by Roda Roda]. *Die Wiener Landwirtschaftliche Zeitung*, 101, 19 December 1903, 1–2.
- Kočić, P. *Sabrana djela I–IV* [Collected Works I–IV]. Banja Luka–Belgrade: Besjeda, 2002, 310–313.
- “Konferenzen über die Sprachenfrage” [Conferences on the Language Question]. In *Politische Chronik der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie. IV – Bosnisch-herzegowinischer Landtag* [Political Chronicle of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. IV – Bosnian-Herzegovinian Diet], 1913, vol. 2, ed. K. Neisser. Vienna, 1913.
- Kraljačić, T. *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini (1882–1903)* [Kállay’s Regime in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1882–1903)]. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1987.
- Landesgesetzblatt Bosnien und die Herzegowina 1878–1918*, (1879). Available at <https://alex.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/alex?apm=o&aid=lbh&datum=1878>
- Landesgesetzblatt Bosnien und die Herzegowina 1878–1918*, (1908). Available at <https://fcjp.ba/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/Landesstatut.pdf>

- Landesgesetzblatt Bosnien und die Herzegowina 1878–1918*, (1910). Available at <https://alex.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/alex?apm=0&aid=lbh&datum=1910>
- Landesgesetzblatt Bosnien und die Herzegowina 1878–1918*, (1913). Available at <https://alex.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/alex?aid=lbh&datum=1913&pos=9&size=45>
- Mrkalj, S. *Salo debeloga jera libo azbukoprotres* [Fat of the Thick Yer]. Budim, 1810.
- Nejlor, K. E. *Sociolingvistički problemi među južnim Slovenima* [Sociolinguistic Problems among the South Slavs]. Belgrade: Prosveta, 1996.
- Neweklowsky, G. "Bosnien-Herzegowina vor 1878 zwischen Kroatisch und Serbisch" [Bosnia-Herzegovina before 1878 between Croatian and Serbian]. In *Herrschaft, Staat und Gesellschaft in Südosteuropa aus sprach- und kulturhistorischer Sicht*, ed. Gerhard Neweklowsky, 28–73. Vienna: ÖAW, 2007.
- Nuri-Hadžić, O. *Muslimani, a ne muhamedanci! – Poslanik, a ne prorok i propheta!* [Muslims, Not Mohammedans! – The Messenger, Not a Prophet and "Propheta"!]. Sarajevo: Behar, 1900.
- Okuka, M. "Gramatike srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika u Bosni i Hercegovini od Vuka Karadžića do kraja austrougarske vladavine" [Grammars of the Serbo-Croatian Literary Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina from Vuk Karadžić to the End of Austro-Hungarian Rule]. In *Književni jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini od Vuka Karadžića do kraja austrougarske vladavine* [Literary Language in Bosnia and Herzegovina from Vuk Karadžić to the End of the Austro-Hungarian Rule], München: Slavica Verlag dr. Anton Kovač, 1991, 140–145.
- Okuka, M. *Jezik i politika* [Language and Politics]. Sarajevo: Oslobođenje, 1983.
- Papić, M. *Školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini za vrijeme okupacije (1878–1918)* [Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the Occupation (1878–1918)]. Sarajevo: Biblioteka kulturno nasljeđe, 1971.
- Parčić, D. *Rječnik hrvatsko-talijanski* [Croatian-Italian Dictionary]. Zadar: tisak i naklada Narodnog lista, 1907.
- Parlamentarische Chronik. Bosnisch-herzegowinischer Landtag* [Bosnian-Herzegovinian Diet], 1913/12, 865.
- Petranović, T. ed., *Srbsko-dalmatinskij almanah: ljubitelj prosvještenija* [Serbian-Dalmatian Almanac], 21, 1862.
- Potz, R. "Das Islamgesetz 1912 und der religionsrechtliche Diskurs in Österreich zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts" [The 1912 Islam Act and the Legal-Religious Discourse in Austria at the Beginning of the 20th Century]. In *Grundlagen der österreichischen Rechtskultur*, eds. T. Olechowsky, C. Neschwara, and A. Lengauer, 385–408. Wien–Köln–Weimar: Böhlau, 2010.
- Rizvić, M. *Književno stvaranje muslimanskih pisaca u Bosni i Hercegovini u doba austrougarske vlade*. [The Literary Production of Muslim Writers in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the Austro-Hungarian Rule]. Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti BiH, 1973.
- Ruthner, C. *Habsburgs 'Dark Continent': Postkoloniale Lektüren zur österreichischen Literatur und Kultur im langen 19. Jahrhundert* [Habsburg's 'Dark Continent': Postcolo-

- nial Readings on Austrian Literature and Culture in the Long 19th Century]. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto, 2017.
- Schmid, F. *Bosnien und die Herzegowina unter der Verwaltung Österreich-Ungarns* [Bosnia and Herzegovina under Austro-Hungarian Administration]. Leipzig: Veit & Co., 1914.
- Staatsgrundgesetz vom 21. Dezember 1867 über die allgemeinen Rechte der Staatsbürger*, RGBI Nr. 142/1867, Art. 19 [Basic Law of 21 December 1867 on the General Rights of Nationals in the Kingdoms and Länder represented in the Council of the Realm]. *Reichs-Gesetz-Blatt für das Kaisertum Österreich* (Vienna, 22 December 1867), 92–94.
- Stefanović Karadžić, V. *Prvi srpski bukvar* [The First Serbian Spelling Book]. Vienna: Slavjanoserbska knjižarnica, 1827.
- Stefanović Karadžić, V. *Srpska pismenica* [Serbian Grammar]. Vienna: Pečatnja Jovana Šnirera, 1814.
- Stefanović Karadžić, V. *Srpski rječnik* [Serbian Dictionary]. Vienna: Štamparija jermen-skog manastira, 1818.
- Tepavčević, M. “Jedno poglavlje crnogorsko-italijanskih jezičkih, književnih i kulturnih veza: Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša” [A Chapter in Montenegrin–Italian Linguistic, Literary and Cultural Relations: Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša]. *Studi Slavistici* XVI, no. 2 (2019), 17–36.
- Twain, M. “Stirring Times in Austria”. *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine for March*, 1898, vol. 96), 530–540.
- Veber, A. *Slovnica hervatska za srednja učilišta* [Croatian Grammar for Secondary Schools]. Zagreb, 1873.
- Verordnung der Landesregierung in Sarajevo von 10. Mai 1880, Nr. 9228* [Ordinance of the State Government in Sarajevo of 10 May 1880, No. 9228]. Klagenfurt: Wieser, 1880.
- Vervaet, S. “Bosanska vila i Dvojna monarhija: Književni program bosanskohercegovačkih Srba i kulturna politika Austrougarske” [Bosanska vila and the Dual Monarchy: The Literary Program of the Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Cultural Policy of Austria-Hungary]. In *Susret kultura: zbornik radova* (Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2006), 659–669.

ISSN 0350-7653



9 770350 765003 >