

pertinent background information for individual documents. The editors have faithfully preserved the original language and script of the materials, a feature which scholars interested in the history of the Serbian literary language will greatly appreciate.

THOMAS J. BUTLER
University of Wisconsin

HRVATSKI KNJIŽEVNI JEZIK I PITANJE VARIJANATA. Posebno izdanje časopisa "Kritika," vol. 1. Zagreb, 1969. 246 pp. 45 new dinars, paper. Available from Matica hrvatska.

RJEČNIK JEZIKA, ILI JEZIK RJEČNIKA? VARIJACIJE NA TEMU VARIJANATA. By *Dalibor Brozović*. "Kritika," vol. 2. Zagreb, 1969. 93 pp. 28 new dinars, paper. Available from Matica hrvatska.

STANDARDNI JEZIK. By *Dalibor Brozović*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1970. 180 pp.

The Serbo-Croatian language in its standardized form has been characteristically marked by the normative effort of Vuk Karadžić, who a century and a half ago decided to use a generalized version of certain Hercegovinian dialects as a basis for a common Serbo-Croatian literary language. For a long time Vuk's effort was remarkably successful. With the help of the schools, Vuk and his followers managed to impose a uniform set of norms upon a speaking community which had been highly differentiated dialectally. In fact, the product of that effort has survived to the present time in the textbooks, grammars, and linguistic studies as Standard (Literary) Serbo-Croatian.

Today, however, the majority of speakers of Serbo-Croatian live outside Vuk Karadžić's dialectal base and naturally deviate in many significant ways from the expected standard. Although the differences cannot cause any misunderstanding in communication, and in fact do not consistently distinguish the Serbs from the Croats, they nevertheless underlie the current desire of some language planners in Yugoslavia to replace the concept of a single Serbo-Croatian standard language by the normative concept of two literary languages—Croatian and Serbian—forever released from their hyphenated bondage.

As a matter of fact, most of the differences which at present seriously threaten to wreck Vuk's dream of Serbo-Croatian linguistic unity cannot be defined in purely linguistic terms and have to be approached as complex cultural phenomena encompassing religious, social, and economic factors and, in some areas, even a growing awareness of ethnic or tribal distinctiveness. Some of these complexities are deeply rooted in the past. Among them certainly the most fatal is the stubbornness of two alphabetic traditions which are traceable to the ancient distinction between Serbian and Croatian versions of Church Slavic: Serbian Church Slavic used the Cyrillic alphabet in the tradition of the Eastern Church, and Croatian Church Slavic used the Glagolitic and later the Latin alphabet in the tradition of the Western Church.

On the other hand, some aspects of the present linguistic crisis in Yugoslavia are best understood as a metamorphosis of political tensions between the two major cultural and industrial cities: Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia and the center of Serbian statism, and Zagreb, the center of Croatian separatism and during World War II the capital of an autonomous Croatian state.

The literature reflecting the present crisis is growing fast. In most cases, however, it is affected by the popularizing framework of the newspaper media, and therefore often appears as an opaque amalgam of cultural historicism, political positions, ethnic sensitivities, and linguistics itself. To a certain degree such opaqueness also characterizes the compendium published in Zagreb in 1969 under the title *Croatian Literary Language and the Problem of Variants*. The volume consists of reprints of the Croatian pieces that were the most instrumental in contributing to the recent language turmoil, including five articles by the Zagreb cultural reviewer, Professor Ljudevit Jonke, four articles by the normative grammarian Stjepan Babić, two articles by Radoslav Katičić, an erudite professor of general linguistics, a proclamation of the Zagreb Linguistic Circle, and a couple of minor contributions by Croatian publicists. The entire volume is introduced by two administrative decrees, one of which is signed by Marshal Josip Broz Tito himself. In this way the readers are reminded that the war leaders, including Tito, explicitly distinguished the Croatian language from the Serbian language and administratively promoted Serbian and Croatian to the same status as Slovenian on the one hand and Macedonian on the other.

The underlying theme of the entire volume is the right of the Croatian nationality to call its own language Croatian without the prefix or suffix Serbian. Nevertheless, two-thirds of the book is devoted to criticism of a new and still incomplete dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian (Croato-Serbian) Literary Language, two volumes of which became available in 1967. The appearance of a new dictionary provided an occasion to re-examine the very foundation of Serbo-Croatian unity in its various linguistic as well as extralinguistic aspects. Implicitly, Vuk's dream of linguistic and cultural unification of Serbs and Croats underwent a new scrutiny.

The intricate relationship between the ideological considerations and the scientific observations of the linguistic facts is approached most straightforwardly by Professor Jonke, who (in the concluding essay to the volume) rigorously appeals to the linguists to attune their scholarly conclusions to the needs of the socialistic structure of contemporary Yugoslavia by recognizing that Serbo-Croatian is used by more than one nationality—the Croats, the Serbs, and the Montenegrins, and also the Moslems in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Although Professor Jonke accepts the scholarly point of view that the Serbo-Croatian dialects constitute one natural body, he nevertheless emphasizes that each nationality has the privilege of referring to its linguistic usage in its own terms. Hence, he argues that the Croats, an autonomous nationality, should not be forced to speak and write Serbo-Croatian if they feel that they speak Croatian and use the Croatian literary language.

A profound desire to separate political facts from the linguistic facts characterizes the position of Professor Dalibor Brozović, who has become the most articulate Croatian discussant of the underlying base of the Croatian and Serbian literary variants in their relationship to the Vukovian (or classical) Serbo-Croatian on the one hand and to the natural Serbo-Croatian dialects on the other. His contributions, which constitute an important complement to the Zagreb compendium, were issued as a separate volume entitled *Dictionary of a Language, or the Language of a Dictionary?*

The dialectal unity of Serbo-Croatian, formed by natural dialectal processes, is considered by Brozović as a fundamentally different structure than the normative systems produced by the language planners and shaped according to the cultural habits and political needs of the Croatian nationality as distinct from the Serbian

nationality. The complex problems of language standardization, brought into focus by the contemporary language crisis in Yugoslavia, have challenged Brozović to restate his observations in a more theoretical framework involving other Slavic languages and other Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages as well. A collection of his contributions appeared in 1970 in a volume entitled *Standard Language*. In the introductory chapter to his book, Brozović points out that linguists have often neglected the intricate relationship between the natural processes of linguistic systems and the role of normativization intentionally imposed by the language planners.

According to Brozović, the normative processes of standardization deserve a special approach which should not confuse linguistic factors with the sociocultural products. He shows that such a distinction is particularly needed in the areas where language communication is shaped in connection with the needs of tribal and ethnic distinctiveness of developing nations. In this framework the present Serbo-Croatian language conflict is seen as a sociolinguistic case comparable to similar cases in Africa, South America, Asia, and so forth, where the languages have a sensitive relationship to the growing nationalism in its transitional stages of clan and tribal identification. Thus Serbo-Croatian, which has attracted linguistic investigation for decades because of the unique preservation of its ancient Indo-European heritage, becomes in its present political crisis the subject of a new science to which Brozović has provided a substantial epistemological groundwork. In fact, his *Standard Language* is the most civilized and learned contribution to the present language conflict in Yugoslavia, a conflict which otherwise has displayed many personal and local aspects obscuring rather than elucidating the painful growth of a cultural language in the Balkans.

LADISLAV MATEJKA
University of Michigan

ISTORIJA NA MAKEDONSKIOT NAROD. 3 vols. Edited by *Mihailo Apostolski* et al. Skopje: "Nova Makedonija," 1969.

ISTORIJA MAKEDONSKOG NARODA. 3 vols. Edited by *Mihailo Apostolski* et al. Belgrade: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika Socijalističke Republike Srbije, 1970. Vol. 1: OD PRAISTORIJE DO KRAJA XVIII VEKA. 321 pp. 100 new dinars. Vol. 2: OD POČETKA XIX VEKA DO KRAJA PRVOG SVETSKOG RATA. 414 pp. 110 new dinars. Vol. 3: PERIOD IZMEĐU DVA SVETSKA RATA I NARODNA REVOLUCIJA (1918–1945). 449 pp. 120 new dinars.

Yugoslav historians have had difficulty solving the problems of writing a unified synthesis of the history of their several peoples. Vladimir Ćorović's *Istorija Jugoslavije* (Belgrade, 1933), published before the Second World War, was a bold attempt to produce such a history, but it fell short of its goal. It did not provide good coverage of many basic historical problems and was written with patriotic fervor.

The resurgent nationalisms and efforts to fit the history of the Yugoslav peoples into a Marxian scheme of periodization stand as barriers to objective inquiry. The irreconcilability of ethnic and Marxian interpretations was amply manifested during the long discussions preparatory to the writing of the "History