

Vladislav B. SOTIROVIĆ

Mykolas Romeris University

THE BOUNDARIES OF ŠTOKAVIAN DIALECT AS THE BORDERS OF UNITED NATIONAL STATE OF ETHNO-LINGUISTIC SERBS

Summary. This research paper sets out to present linguistic aspect of ideological framework in making both Serbian national identity and national state building program created in the first half of 19th century by two different Serbian writers (Vuk Stefanović-Karadžić and Ilija Garašanin). In the following decades this “linguistic” framework of national identity became one of the cornerstones of Serbian national ideology and foreign policy. The question of national identity and creation of national state occupied the first place of agenda in the mind of the leading Serbian intellectuals and politicians in the first half of 19th century. Imbued by ideas of German Romanticism and French Revolution, Serbian patriotic public actors set up a goal to create an ideological-political framework for Serbian national liberation under foreign occupation – Roman Catholic Habsburg Monarchy and Islamic Ottoman Empire. The present work investigates the linguistic model of national identification of the South Slavs designed by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić in 1836 and the programme for the restructuring of the political map of the Balkan Peninsula drafted by Ilija Garašanin in 1844. This work is an attempt to reconstruct the understanding of Karadžić and Garašanin of those components of group consciousness which could affect the sense of belonging to the same community. There are three goals of this research paper: to investigate how language influenced Serbian national ideologies in the first half of the 19th century; to discuss how Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, the most influential Serbian 19th century philologist, and Ilija Garašanin, the most important Serbian 19th century politician, answer the fundamental question of Serbian nationalism from the perspective of the 19th century Romanticism: who are the Serbs and what are the borders of the united Serbian national state?; and to define the formation of structure of Serbian linguistic nationalism in the first half of the 19th century. Two research methods were applied were: the method of the text analysis of the prime historical sources and the method of comparison of different interpretations and understandings of the works by V. S. Karadžić and I. Garašanin. The main research results are that V. S. Karadžić’s understanding of the language in the conception of Serbian linguistic nationalism was primarily of ethnic nature and that I. Garašanin drafted a project of the united Serbian national state by implementing a linguistic model of Serb national identification developed by V. S. Karadžić.¹

Keywords: Balkans, Serbs, Serbia, Štokavian dialect, South Slavs.

¹ This paper is a part of the COST Action IS0803 research project: „Remaking Eastern Borders in Europe: A Network Exploring Social, Moral and Material Relocations of Europe’s Eastern Peripheries“.

Introduction

The research objects of this paper are Vuk Stefanović Karadžić's idea of Serbian linguistic nationhood and Ilija Garašanin's programme of Serbian linguistic statehood. The study aims at analysing the following main research problems: the questions of determination of Serbian nation, national idea and goals, methods and means for their attainment; the type of intellectual background for arousing-national awareness that emerged as the result of the fight for Serbian national liberation against the Ottoman Empire at the beginning of the 19th c. and the question of taking part in the creation of the unified programme for a subordinate Serbian nation on the Balkan Peninsula. We will also present different interpretations of the Karadžić' and Garašanin's works.

The method of text analysis and method of comparison are used in the investigation of the research objects of the paper. Both methods are used for the purpose of sociolinguistic examination of the role and function of language in the creation of the national ideology of the Serbs as a symbolic feature of national determination, internal national cohesion and distinction from other ethnolinguistic nations, especially from the neighbouring Croats and Bulgarians. Our research strategy has been to shift the focus of analysis from the level of official and public documents to the level of unofficial papers, programmatic-ideological and personal notes of the influential 19th century Serb patriots, ideologists and politicians, but above all of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić and Ilija Garašanin. By applying this methodology, we tried to reconstruct the opinions of influential 19th century South Slavic and other scientists and politicians about the problem of South Slav national identification, and to complete the picture of their work on resolving the "Serb Question" in South East Europe. By using this methodological approach, we aimed to highlight the structure of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić's linguistic model of national determination of the Serbs and other South Slavs, and the structure of Ilija Garašanin's project of political rearrangement of the Balkan Peninsula.

The works by both authors belong primarily to the history of South Slavic philology and nationalism, which unfortunately has not been given satisfactory attention by Yugoslav researchers in the last century, mainly because the topic of South Slavic nationalism (including the linguistic one) has been considered as ideologically "destructive" for Yugoslavia's multiethnic union. Therefore, the studies of nationalism, national determination and creation of national states, were either partially neglected or given subjective interpretations influenced by prevailing political views. However, the 19th and 20th century historical development of the South Slavs cannot be properly reconstructed without attempts to investigate objectively the development of the South Slavic nationalism, especially the linguistic one. This work is a contribution to these attempts.

Historical background

In the first part of the 19th century, the historical and ethnic Serbian territories were divided among two states, the Habsburg Monarchy and the Ottoman Empire. The Orthodox Christians of *de facto* independent (from 1688) Montenegro declared themselves to be a part of the Serbian nation as well.² Montenegro was only nominally incorporated into the Ottoman administrative system with the governor or pa appointed by Ottoman Imperial Council, or *Divan*. The Serbian population was exclusively Orthodox Slavic only in present-day central Serbia, whilst in all other inhabited territories around central Serbia the Orthodox Serbs lived together with the South Slavic Muslims, Roman Catholics, other South Slavic Orthodox population as well as Muslim and Roman Catholic Albanians. During the First Insurrection (1804–1813) against the Ottoman authority Serbia had about 500,000 inhabitants, while in the mid-19th century there were most probably c. 2,000,000 Serbs under Ottoman administration (Božić, Ćirković, Ekmečić and Dedijer, 1973, p. 289). The Christian Serbs, as subordinate non-Muslim extra tax-paying social strata at the Ottoman Empire (“*raja*”=serfs), lived mainly in villages and were occupied with farming and cattle breeding. During the Ottoman period, Bosnia-Herzegovina became a symbol of ethnic and religious mixture and co-existence of Balkan peoples.³ At the beginning of the 19th century, the Muslims slightly outnumbered the Christian population in this Ottoman province, while the Serbs substantially outnumbered the Croats in the same province. According to French records from 1809, around 700,000 Christians lived in Bosnia-Herzegovina: the Orthodox were in the majority in western Bosnia and eastern Herzegovina, whilst the Catholics predominated in western Herzegovina (*Историја српског народа*, 1981–1986, p. 10–12). In the year of 1796 there were 51,071 Orthodox inhabitants, out of 256,000, in Dalmatia at that time under Venetian rule (Екмечић, 2010, p. 179). The ex-Yugoslav historians estimated that the total population of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1865 reached 1,278,850; the Orthodox 593,548, the Catholics 257,920, and the Muslims 419,628 (Božić, Ćirković, Ekmečić, Dedijer, 1973, p. 293). The Muslims had a privileged administrative, legal and social status. According to general Ottoman law, only the Muslims as the “Mohamed’s people” could get a state office and the Muslims, contrary to the Christians, did not pay an extra state-tax, the *harač*. Faith was the crucial point of political ideology and national determination under the Ottoman Empire (Itzkowitz, 1972; Inalcik, 1973). It was religion that linked the Balkan Muslims of South Slavic origin to the Turkish government, Turkish political ideology and Turkish state interests. It was because of their new religion that the South Slavic Muslims were given the disparaging name *Turks* by their Christian compatriots. Undoubtedly, the Islamization of

² Regarding ethnic and national identity of the Montenegrins, see Glomazić (1988).

³ Regarding the ethnic and national identity of the Muslims from Bosnia-Herzegovina, see Костић (2000).

a certain part of South Slavic population was one of the most remarkable achievements of the Ottoman administration.⁴

In the mid-19th century, a smaller number of Serbs lived under the Habsburg Monarchy. They were settled in the area of civil part of Hungary and Croatia and the military border region. When the Habsburg Monarchy gained the former Venetian lands of Dalmatia and Boka Kotorska at the Vienna Congress of 1815, the number of Serbian residents within the Habsburg Monarchy increased significantly (Николајевић, 1850): in 1792 there were 667,247 Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy, while in 1847 the Serbian population in both civil Hungary and Croatia and Austrian-run Military Border region reached of 896,902. The Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy enjoyed their historical rights based on the privileges given to them by several Habsburg emperors. These privileges permitted them ecclesiastic autonomy and educational autonomy. Within the Habsburg Monarchy, the cultural center for the Serbs before the mid-18th century was Vienna. It then shifted to Budapest because of intensified censorship in Vienna and in the end it was transferred to Novi Sad in the early 19th century.⁵ The religious life of the Serbs in the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy was concentrated in ancient monasteries and churches. The Serbian Orthodox church became a leading national institution preserving the national legends, historical memory of Serbian mediaeval statehood, a national language and letters. The main task of the Serbian Orthodox clergy in both Turkey and the Habsburg Monarchy was to keep the nation from being converted to either Islam or Roman Catholicism.⁶ For this purpose, they created a theory according to which only the Orthodox members of the South Slavic community can belong to the Serbian nation. The Cyrillic alphabet was of crucial importance to Serbs in the ethnically mixed areas. These letters became a remarkable symbol of their national identification, especially in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Slavonia, Dalmatia and Croatia.

From the period of the Ottoman occupation of the Serbian people and lands in the 15th c., the essence of Serbian political ideology was national liberation and revival of national statehood. The national dream of a free and united Serbian state started to be realized at the beginning of the 19th century with two Serbian insurrections against the Turks in 1804–1813 and 1815. The Serbian state was re-established in 1815 and adopted its first modern constitution in 1835. Prince Miloš Obrenović I (1815–1839) continued to develop a national ideology of reviving Serbian statehood, namely designing a plan to enlarge the ancient state by incorporating into the united Serbia all the lands of the Ottoman Empire that were

⁴ Regarding historical development of the Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina, see Pinson (1996); Donia and Fine (1994).

⁵ Novi Sad, a present-day administrative center of Serbia's northern province of Vojvodina, was established in 1694. In the year of 1748 Novi Sad was granted a status of "free royal town" by the empress-queen Maria Theresa (Bjelaković and Vojnović, 2010, p. 156).

⁶ Regarding historical role of Serbian Orthodox Patriarchate of Peć in preservation of Serbian national and cultural identity in Ottoman Empire, see Sotirović (2008).

inhabited by a Serbian majority at that time, particularly Bosnia-Herzegovina, Raška and Kosovo-Metohija.⁷

Linguistically based national identity

While Prince Miloš's schemes were primarily based on the historical rights of the Serbs, during his reign, a new dimension was introduced into Serbian political thought with Vuk Stefanović Karadžić's (1787–1864) idea of linguistically based national identity. In his work "Serbs All and Everywhere"⁸ ("Срби сви и свуда"), Karadžić established criteria for determining Serbian national self-identity (Караџић, 1849, p. 1–27; Judah, 1997, 55, p. 61–62, Јовановић, 2002, p. 115–178). Up to 1836, Serbs were self-identified mainly as the Balkan community of Orthodox Christianity that both used the Cyrillic alphabet and maintained a national legend of the Kosovo tragedy in 1389 (Ćirković, 1994; Tomashevich, 1991, p. 210–215; Đorđević, 1991, p. 312–316; Mihaljčić, 1989, p. 207–233). This traditional and conservative religion-based approach to national identity did not satisfy the Serbian intelligentsia which was heavily influenced in the time of Karadžić by the 19th c. German definition of the self-national identity (i.e., all German-speaking population belongs to the German nation).⁹ Karadžić was inspired to apply the German language-based approach to the issue of what constituted Serbian identity (Милосављевић, 1997, p. 22–25). He chose the Štokavian dialect (штокавски дијалект) under the influence of at that time the leading Slavic philologists as the cardinal indicator of Serbian national identity, and called all South Slavs who spoke this dialect the Serbs. He considered all Bosnians and Herzegovinians to be ethnical Serbs because they spoke tokavian, but he distinguished three groups of Bosnians and Herzegovinians, taking religion into consideration: Serbs of "Greek-creed" (Eastern Orthodox), "Roman-creed" (Roman Catholic) and "Turkish-creed" (Muslim) (Караџић, 1849, p. 6–7); a similar opinion was maintained by Цвијић, 1906; Цвијић, 1922, p. 202–233). Karadžić was unable, however, to fix precisely the southeastern ethnic borders of Serbian nation within the framework of his model, as he did not know how many Serbs (i.e., Štokavian speakers) lived in Albania and Macedonia. In 1834, he was informed by some merchants of the existence of around 300 the so-called "Serbian" villages in western Macedonia. He had doubts about the correctness of this information; however, when he heard that the people from these villages spoke the "Slavic

⁷ Among all historical and ethnolinguistic Balkan territories claimed by the Serbs as their own, the region of Kosovo-Metohija was the most important. About the question of Kosovo-Metohija in Serbian history, see Самарџић (1989).

⁸ This work is not about the Serbs who are living everywhere from the point to claim that the whole world is populated only by the Serbs as it can be wrongly understood from the title. It is only about those South Slavs who have been considered as the Serbs and their populated territories at the South East Europe.

⁹ Regarding the genesis of modern German political thought, see Beiser (1992).

language”, since this could have meant either Bulgarian or Serbian (Караџић, 1849, p. 1; Милосављевић, 1997, p. 125; Стојанчевић, 1974, p. 74, 77), he acknowledged the existence of transitional zones between the Štokavian dialect and the Bulgarian language in western Bulgaria (Torlak and Zagorje regions), but he excluded most of Macedonia and Albania from his Štokavian-speaking zone (Караџић, 1909, p. 648). In the end, he was only able to conclude that Štokavian dialect was definitely spoken on the territory between the Timok River (on the present-day border between Serbia and Bulgaria) and the Šara Mountain (on the present-days state border between Serbia and Macedonia).

Karadžić’s ideas were strongly influenced by the theory developed by the leading 19th century Slavic philologists such as Dositej Obradović, Pavel Josef Šafařík, Jan Kollár, Josef Dobrovský, Jernej Kopitar and Franc Miklošič, who claimed that the genuine Slovene dialect was Kajkavian, the native Croatian dialect was Čakavian and that the true Serbian (and only Serbian) dialect was Štokavian (and only Štokavian) (Обрадовић, 1783/1975, p. 147; Обрадовић, 1969, p. 363–364; Šafařík, 1826, 1933, 1842/1955, p. 146–147; Kopitar, 1810, 1984; Dobrovský, 1792/1818; Kollár, 1835; Miklošič, 1852/1879; Теодоровић, 1845; Милосављевић, 1997). Karadžić’s concept of language-based Serbian nationhood had a significant impact on the 19th and 20th century scholars, both Serbs and others. First, it gave impetus to the revision of the traditional picture of Serbian ethnic territories in the Balkans. Second, as a result of Karadžić’s theory, the claim to a large Serbian population in western Bulgaria and most of Macedonia and Albania was abandoned. Later, the literary and cultural legacy of Dubrovnik was asserted to be exclusively Serbian (Цвијић, 1906, p. 43–44; Цвијић, 1922; Gravier, 1919, p. 29–32; Радојчић, 1927; Бакотић, 1938/1991, p. 64–81, 110–121; Николајевић, 1840, 1850).

United national state

The ideology of Serbian national statehood reached its final stage as Ilija Garašanin (1812–1874) combined historical and national rights of the Serbs, by drafting a plan for consolidation of all Serbian lands and people within a single national state.¹⁰ This plan was primarily based on Karadžić’s framework of national identity of the Serbs. Garašanin’s *Načertanije (Outline)* became one of the most significant and influential works in the history of South Slavic political thought, greatly influencing the development of the Serbian national program and foreign policy in the 19th and 20th centuries. Written in 1844 as a top-secret paper submitted only to Prince Aleksandar Karađorđević I (1842–1858), it became known in Austro-Hungarian diplomatic circles in 1888, and a wider audience became familiar with the text in 1906 when a Belgrade journal published it (Lampe, 1996, p. 52). The original is not attested, and the text can be only reconstructed from several copies

¹⁰ About Ilija Garašanin as a statesman and diplomat, see MacKenzie (1985).

(Љушић, 1993, p. 1–5). Varying interpretations of Garašanin's ultimate idea of statehood arise because he did not succeed in completing the original *Načertanije* that was delivered to Prince Aleksandar (MacKenzie, 1985). To a large extent, Garašanin was inspired by three works written in 1843 and 1844 and translated into Serbian language: *САВЕТИ* (*The Advise*) by Polish Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski (1770–1861), a leader of the Polish émigrés in Paris; *Фрагмент из српске историје* (*A Fragment from the History of Serbia*) by the Englishman David Urkwart, and *План* (*The Plan*) by Francisco Zach, a Czech. These authors championed the idea of creating a united South Slavic state under the leadership of Serbia, intended as a barrier to Russian and Austrian political influence in the Balkans. This united South Slavic state (as a kind of Yugoslavia) would be placed under French and British protection (Aleksić, 1954, p. 68–71). However, Garašanin did not accept the plan to unite Serbia with all South Slavic territories of the Habsburg Monarchy into a single, federal state of Yugoslavia; on the contrary, he advocated the creation of a single centralized Serbian national state whose boundaries would embrace only a complete Serbian national entity, as well as some of the historical Serbian lands. "The Načertanije itself uses the language of romantic nationalism to propose a Serbian state..." (Lampe, 1996, p. 52). There appear to be two reasons why Garašanin designed a united Serbian national state, and not a South Slavic or Yugoslavian (without Bulgaria) one: 1) he favored the idea of an ethnically uniform state, as advocated by the German Romanticists (Lampe, 1996, 52); and 2) apparently he believed that a multinational South Slavic state would easily disintegrate as a result of frequent struggles between the different nations. In short, he believed that only an ethnically uniform state organization could be inherently stable. Garašanin designed his plans in expectation that both the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy would be dismantled in the immediate future. In his view, in the event of Austrian and Ottoman dismemberment the principal duty of Serbia would be to gather all ethnic Serbs, and a certain number of Serbian historical lands, into a single national state organization. The core of a united Serbian state would be the Principality of Serbia, which had at that time the status of an autonomous tributary territory inside the Ottoman Empire. Garašanin had foreseen two stages to rallying the Serbs toward a united state. In the first stage, Serbia would annex all the Serbian ethnic and a few of the historical territories within the Ottoman Empire: i.e., Bosnia-Herzegovina, part of western Bulgaria, Montenegro, Raška, part of northern Albania and, finally, Kosovo-Metohija.¹¹ The lands of the Habsburg Monarchy that were inhabited by Serbs — Croatia, Slavonia, Srem, Bačka, Banat and Dalmatia — would witness the same destiny in the second phase of Serbian reunification. This timetable would correspond to

¹¹ In reality it happened during the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913. This war started by four Balkan states (Serbia, Bulgaria, Montenegro and Greece) because of their fear of Austro-Hungarian and Italian territorial expansion in southern and eastern parts of the Balkans, at that time still under the Ottoman rule (Дамњановић, Здравковић, 2012, p. 5).

Garašanin's prediction that the Ottoman Empire would collapse first, followed by the Habsburg Monarchy.¹²

Historiographic interpretations

In Serbian, Croatian, Yugoslav and international historiography, there is a heated dispute regarding the principles on which Garašanin based his idea. The first group of them believe that Garašanin, at the time of writing *Načertanije* the Serbian Minister of Internal Affairs, sought to create a Serbian national state on the principle of historical state rights alone. They argue that Garašanin took as a model state the glorious Serbian mediaeval empire, which lasted from 1346 to 1371, and hence that he did not consider the territories settled by the Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy since they had not been included into Serbian mediaeval empire, but focused only on those within the Ottoman state because they composed Serbian mediaeval empire. In their view, Garašanin always referred to the Serbian Empire during the reign of Stefan Dušan (1331–1355, proclaimed emperor in 1346)¹³, the borders of which reached the Drina River on the west, the Sava and Danube Rivers on the north, the Chalkidiki Peninsula on the east, and the Albanian seacoast and Gulf of Corinth on the south: i.e., the territories of Croatia, Slavonia, Srem, Bačka, Banat and Bosnia-Herzegovina, which were not included in the medieval Serbian empire, were not treated by him as historically Serbian. In contrast, the second group claims that Garašanin advocated the creation of a national state on the basis of both Serbian ethnic and historical state rights. This view relies on the last chapter of *Načertanije*, in which Garašanin urged Serbian nationalist propaganda in the territories settled by the Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy, as well as in western Bulgaria. Hence, according to this second group, Garašanin clearly regarded these territories as part of a united Serbian state. In order to settle this problem, one should take into consideration primarily the whole text of *Načertanije*. It is clear that Garašanin did not call for Macedonia to be included in the Serbian national state and that he favored annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina. The first group correctly interprets Garašanin's idea that 19th century Serbia might continue to evolve into a great Serbian state — a process which was started by the mediaeval Serbian rulers and interrupted by the Ottoman destruction of Serbian state in 1459. They do not, however, properly understand Garašanin's notion of "Greater Serbia." He did not want to direct Serbia's foreign policy toward the Aegean and Ionian seas, as was the case in the Middle Ages. Clearly, Lampe's opinion that Garašanin intended to include Macedonia and a part of southern Adriatic littoral into unified Serbia was wrong

¹² Serbia's unification with Montenegro and the South Slavic lands of Austria-Hungary occurred in November/December 1918 as a consequence of the First World War. However, not Garašanin's United (Greater) Serbia, but Yugoslavia was created under the original name of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes Sotirović(2012).

¹³ About the emperor Stefan Dušan and his Serbian Empire, see Стевановић (2001).

(Lampe, 1996, p. 52). In fact, to champion Serbian territorial expansion toward the southern portion of the Balkan Peninsula, Garašanin turned his eyes toward the western part of the Balkan Peninsula (Sotirović, 2011).

This was because his ultimate aim was to unite all Serbs in Southeastern Europe, not to unite all South Slavs. In practice, this meant that the 19th century Principality of Serbia should be expanded to include the western Balkan territories, where Serbs had settled, but not the southern ones, where the language-based Serbs either had disappeared or were a minority. Garašanin could not have supported the policy of medieval Serbian state expansion southward, because he advocated the German Romanticist principle of establishing a single national state organization. If Garašanin's united Serbian national state organization is compared with Karadžić's picture of Serbian language-based national expansion, it is clear that both of them were speaking about the same territories. It can be concluded that the central ideological principle behind Garašanin's design of a united Serbian state was Karadžić's language-based model of national identity. In our opinion, the "Greater Serbia" in Garašanin's *Načertanije* was nothing other than a united language-based Serbs within a single state as Garašanin adopted Karadžić's language-based concept of nation and hence identified Serbs with the Štokavian-speaking South Slavic population. Garašanin excluded Macedonia from his concept of language-based Serbian statehood because he had adopted Karadžić's opinion that there were no Štokavian-speakers in most part of Macedonia and Albania (Венелини, 1829–1841, p. 1–5; Хитрово, 1963, p. 241–242). He also, however, had adopted Karadžić's claim that the entire population of Bosnia-Herzegovina belonged to the language-based Serbian nationality, and hence he included Bosnia-Herzegovina within the language-based Serbian national state organization (Lampe, 1996, p. 52). Moreover, he understood Karadžić's transitional zones in western Bulgaria to be territories inhabited by Štokavian speakers. According to the same principle, the territories of Croatia, Dalmatia, Slavonia, Bačka, Srem and Banat would also be included in Garašanin's language-based Serbian state. Such a state could be called *Štokavia* ("Штокавија") more accurately.¹⁴

Findings and conclusions

The present investigation has resulted in the following main conclusions. V. S. Karadžić's understanding of language in the conception of Serbian linguistic national identity model was primarily of ethnic nature as he considered the Serbian language (Štokavian dialect) as the crucial integral part of Serbian national identification. In 1844 Ilija Garašanin drafted his project of a united Serbian national state by implementing a linguistic model of Serb national identification, which was earlier, in 1836, developed by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić.

¹⁴ See Figure 1 and Figure 2.

National projects of the Serbian liberation and unification were based on the ideological constructions to consolidate all Serbs (in the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy) and to create the Serbian state, which became the chief subject in Vuk Stefanović-Karadžić's *Srbi svi i svuda* (*Serbs All and Everywhere*) and in Ilija Garašanin's *Načertanije* (*Draft*). Both these works have been the most meaningful and influential theory for the definition of the nationhood, national idea, national aims and basis for the national policy in the future. They are written as a matter of Serb national self-defence policy against the Croat claims of the time that all Roman Catholic Štokavian speakers belong to the Croatia and as such their populated territories have to be included into a Greater Croatia (Sotirović, 2011). *Srbi svi i svuda* constructed a model of national determination based on a linguistic criterion: the entire Štokavian-speaking South-Slavic population, regardless of denominations (Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Muslim, etc.), belongs to the genuine Serbdom. *Načertanije* composed a secret plan of Serbia's foreign national policy based on both Karadžić's linguistic model of national identification and historical rights of the Serbs: the creation of a unified Serbian state in the Balkans which should embrace all linguistic Serbs and all Serbian territories from both the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy.¹⁵

References

- Бакотић, Л. (1938/1991). *Срби у Далмацији од пада Млетачке Републике до уједињења*. Београд.
- Beiser, F. (1992). *Enlightenment, Revolution, and Romanticism: The Genesis of Modern German Political Thought, 1790–1800*, Harvard (USA): Harvard University Press, Mass.
- Bjelaković, I., & Vojnović, J. (2010). *Let's Learn Serbian*, 1. Novi Sad: Univerzitet u Novom Sadu.
- Božić, I., Ćirković, S., Ekmečić, M., & Dedijer, V. (1973). *Istorija Jugoslavije*. Београд: Prosveta.
- Цвијић, Ј. (1906). *Основе за географију и геологију Македоније и Старе Србије*. Београд.
- Цвијић, Ј. (1922). *Метанастазичка кретања, њихови узроци и последице*. Београд.
- Ćirković, S. (1994). Religious Factor in Forming of Cultural and National Identity. *Religion & War*. Belgrade.
- Дамњановић, Н., & Здравковић, В. (2012). *Слике рата. Балкански ратови на разгледницама у Историјском музеју Србије*, Београд: Историјски музеј Србије.
- Dobrovský, J. (1792/1818). *Geschichte der böhmische Sprache und Literatur*. Wien.
- Donia, J., R., & Fine, J. (1994). *Bosnia and Hercegovina: A Tradition Betrayed*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Екмечић, М. (2010). *Дуго кретање између клања и орања. Историја Срба у новом веку (1492–1992)*. Београд: EVRO GIUNTI.

¹⁵ About the full version of the research results on this topic, see Sotirović (2011).

- Dorđević, D. (1991). The Tradition of Kosovo in the Formation of Modern Serbian Statehood in the Nineteenth Century. In Vucinich, W. S., & Emmeret, T. A. (Eds.), *Kosovo: The Legacy of a Medieval Battle*. Minneapolis.
- Glomazić, M. (1988). *Etničko i nacionalno biće Crnogoraca*. Beograd: TRZ „PANPUBLIK“.
- Gravier, G. (1919). *Les frontiérs historiques de la Serbie*. Paris.
- Хитрово, М. А. (1963). Славянский архив, *Сборник статей и материалов*. Москва.
- Itzkowitz, N. (1972). *Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition*. New York.
- Inalcik, H. (1973). *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age, 1300–1600*. New York.
- Јовановић, М. (2002). *Језик и друштвена историја. Друштвеноисторијски оквири полемике о српском књижевном језику*. Београд.
- Judah, T. (1997). *The Serbs. History, Myth & the Destruction of Yugoslavia*. New Haven-London: Yale University Press.
- Караџић, В. С. (1849). Срби сви и свуда. *Ковчежић за историју, језик и обичаје Срба сва три закона*, № 1. Беч.
- Караџић, В., С. (1909). *Вукова преписка*, том IV. Београд.
- Kollár, J. (1835). О књижевној заимности међу народи и наречјима словенским. *Сербски народни лист*.
- Kopitar, J. (1810). Patriotske fantazije jednog Slovena. *Vaterländische Blätter*.
- Kopitar, J. (1984). *Serbica*. Beograd.
- Костић, М. Л. (2000). *Наука утврђује народност Б-Х муслимана*. Србиње-Нови Сад: Добраца књига.
- Lampe, J. R. (1996). *Yugoslavia as History. Twice There Was a Country*. Cambridge.
- Љушић, Р. (1993). *Књига о Начертанију. Национални и државни програм кнежевине Србије (1844)*. Београд: БИГЗ.
- MacKenzie, D. (1985). *Ilija Garašanin: Balkan Bismarck*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mihaljčić, R. (1989). *The Battle of Kosovo in History and Popular Tradition*. Belgrade: BIGZ.
- Miklošič, F. (1852/1879). Serbisch und chorvatisch. *Vergleichende Gramatik der slawischen Sprachen*. Wien.
- Милосављевић, П. (1997). *Срби и њихов језик. Хрестоматија*. Приштина.
- Николајевић, Ђ. (1840). *Српски споменици*. Београд.
- Николајевић, Ђ. (1850). Епархија православна у Далмацији. *Српско-далматински магазин*, 15. Задар.
- Обрадовић, Д. (1783/1975). Писмо Харалампију. *Живот и прикљученија*. Нови Сад.
- Обрадовић, Д. (1969). Јест ли полезно у простом дијалекту на штампу што издавати. *Изабрани списи*. Нови Сад.
- Радојчић, Н. (1927). Географско знање о Србији почетком XIX века. *Географско друштво*. Београд.
- Pinson, M. (ed.) (1996). *The Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Their Historic Development from the Middle Ages to the Dissolution of Yugoslavia*. Harvard (USA): Harvard Middle Eastern Monographs XXVIII.
- Историја српског народа* (1981–1986). том. V (1). Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности.

- Самарцић, Р., Ђирковић, М. С., Зиројевић, О., Тричковић, Р., Батаковић, Т. Д., Ђуретић, В., Чавошки, К., Јевтић, А. (1989). *Косово и Метохија у српској историји*. Београд: Друштво за чување споменика и неговање традиција ослободилачких ратова Србије до 1918. године у Београду-Подружница у Швајцарској-Српска књижевна задруга.
- Стевановић, М. (2001). *Душаново царство*. Београд: Књига-комерц.
- Sotirović, B. V. (2008). The Historical Role of the Patriarchate of Peć in Preservation of Serbian National and Cultural Identity. *Актуалне проблеме науке у контексте православних традиција*. Сборник материјала међународној научно-практичкој конференцији, 28–29 фебруара 2008 године, Армавир, Русија.
- Sotirović, B. V. (2011). *Srpski komonvelt*. Vilnius: Štamparija Pedagoškog univerziteta u Viljnusu.
- Sotirović, B. V. (2012). *Creation of the First Yugoslavia: How the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes Was Established in 1918*. Saarbrücken: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Стојанчевић, В., 1974: Једна неиспуњена жеља Вукова, *Ковчежић за историју Срба сва три закона*, 12, 74–77. Београд.
- Šafařík, P. J. (1826). *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten*. Buda.
- Šafařík, P. J. (1833). *Serbische Lesekörner*. Pest.
- Šafařík, P. J. (1842/1955). *Slowansky narodopis*. Praha.
- Теодоровић, Д. (1845). *О књижевној узајамности између различитих племена и неречја славјанског народа од Јована Колара*. Београд.
- Tomashevich, G. (1991). The Battle of Kosovo and the Serbian Church. In Vucinich, W., S., & Emmeret, T. A. (Eds.), *Kosovo: The Legacy of a Medieval Battle*. Minneapolis.
- Венелини, Ю. М. (1829–1841). Древные и нынешние Болгаре въ политическомъ, народописномъ и религиозномъ ихъ къ Россіямъ. *Историко-критическія изысканія*, второй год, VIII, 241, 7 с. Москва.

Appendices



Figure 1. "Sub-dialects of Štokavian dialect" by Pavle Ivić. A territory of Štokavian dialect is covering Central Serbia, Kosovo-Metohija, Vojvodina, Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Dalmatia, Slavonia and part of Croatia proper

СРПСКИ НАЦИОНАЛНИ ПРОГРАМ



Ни после војних пораза 1389, 1915, 1941, 1996. и 1999. као народ нисмо признали окупацију.

Нећемо је признати ни данас, ма шта званичне власти потписале и учиниле.

Српска држава у својој целости, под националном управом, једини је јемац опстанка нације.

Историја се не мери партијским конгресима нити састанцима "међународне заједнице", већ правдом, истином и љубављу.

Као народ, ми још жудимо за тим тројством, наши непријатељи не.

Досада смо многе претрајали, док су они своје неправде, лажи и мржњу понели са собом у заборав.

Историја је дуга и једино Бог вечан. Борбе нам неће недостајати докле год будемо живели на раскрсници светова. Ко то не жели да схвати нити трпи, слободан је да се сели. Што је до 1914. било насељем и повешћу српско, биће наше док је људи достојних српског имена.



Figure 2. 21st century Serb national programme based on both Vuk Stefanović Karadžić's linguistic model of Serb ethnonational identity and Ilija Garašanin's idea of creation of united national state of the Serbs

Vladislav B. SOTIROVIĆ

Mykolo Romerio universitetas

ŠTOKAVŲ DIALEKTO ŽYMĖS KAIP ETNOLINGVISTINĖS SERBŲ TAUTINĖS VALSTYBĖS RIBOS

Santrauka. Šiame straipsnyje analizuojami dviejų serbų amžininkų – Vuko Stefanovičiaus-Karadžičiaus ir Iljos Garašanino – darbai, kuriuose konstruojami lingvistiniai serbų tautinio identiteto aspektai ir tautinės valstybės programa XIX a. pirmojoje pusėje. Vėlesniais dešimtmečiais šis „kalbos“ pagrindu kuriamas tautinis identitas tapo esmine serbų nacionalinės ideologijos ir užsienio politikos gaire. Tai atsispindėjo XIX a. intelektualų darbuose ir politinėse valstybės valdymo programose. Paveikti vokiečių romantizmo ir Prancūzijos revoliucijos idėjų, Serbijos valstybinės politikos formuotojai siekė parengti ir įgyvendinti tautinio išsivadavimo iš katalikiškos Habsburgų monarchijos ir musulmoniškos Otomanų imperijos okupacijos planą. Analizuojamas lingvistinis pietų slavų tautų etninio identiteto modelis, 1836 m. sukurtas V. Stefanovičiaus-Karadžičiaus, ir I. Garašanino darbuose braižytas politinis Blakanų pusiasalio žemėlapis. Straipsnyje siekiama trijų tikslų: išnagrinėti XIX a. pirmosios pusės diskursą, lėmusį ideologinius serbų etninio identiteto aspektus, romantizmo įtaka serbų tautos savivokai ir nacionalinei valstybei formotis bei serbų lingvistinio nacionalizmo apraiškas. Istorinių tekstų ir V. Stefanovičiaus-Karadžičiaus bei I. Garašanino darbų interpretacijų lyginamoji analizė leidžia daryti išvadas, kad lingvistinis serbų etninio identiteto modelis buvo pritaikytas politiniam serbų nacionalinės valstybės kūrimo projektui. Straipsnyje naudojami tekso analizės ir lyginamosios analizės metodai, padedantys atskleisti sociolingvistinius tautinės savimonės raidos aspektus ir raiškos ypatumus, ypač tiriant distanciją nuo kaimyninių kroatų ir bulgarų tautų. Detaliai nagrinėjami XIX a. V. Stefanovičiaus-Karadžičiaus ir I. Garašanino neoficialūs programiniai-propagandiniai dokumentai ir asmeniniai užrašai, – taip pakeistas tyrimo objektas nuo oficialių dokumentų diskursyvinės analizės link.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: Balkanai, serbai, Serbija, štokavų dialektas, pietų slavai.