Languages of national minorities and ethnic groups
in the countries of what once was Yugoslavia*
(With special reference to Romance idioms)

August Kovačec,
Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb

This article gives a sketch of a multilingual situation within a federal state as Yugoslavia was till not long ago. Besides the elementary information concerning each one of the minority idioms, this paper presents the most important elements which serve to determine their sociolinguistic status and relations to each other.

Like the majority of European countries, the territories which constituted the Yugoslav Federation are also multinational and multilingual (Škiljan 1986, Kovačec 1986). But in what once was Yugoslavia there was no single "state language" or single supranational language that should be valid all over the territory of the federal state. In Yugoslavia there was neither one language nor one language variety spoken by an absolute majority of the population (Brozović 1983, Škiljan 1988). Another of the characteristics of the Yugoslav Federation was that not only the main Yugoslav nations (the South Slavs apart from the Bulgarians) but also every other national, ethnic or linguistic group wishing to do so was said to have, theoretically, an absolute right and liberty to use their own language or a variant of that language in all domains of public life (Rašić 1982, 1985; Brozović 1983, 1985; Kovačec 1986; Bugarski 1986, 1986a; Škiljan 1988). This meant that, as a rule, each community could organize all levels of schooling, publish newspapers and books in its own language, or in a variety of that language, and that at the same time it could be used in local administration (at least before the Serbian authorities ruined the autonomy of Kosovo and Vojvodina). In Yugoslavia there was no single "Yugoslav language", only several different Yugoslav languages (Kovačec 1986, Andrijašević-Erdeljac-Pupovac 1986).

---

* This paper was written in the spring of 1991; it deals as a rule with the linguistic situation in the Yugoslav countries in the 70's and 80's and does not take into account the political changes that have arisen in 1990 and 1991.

In spite of innumerable attempts at centralization, this situation persisted due to the historical circumstances which contributed to the foundation of the Yugoslav Federation. It coincided with some deeply implanted cultural and linguistic traditions of each of the ex-Yugoslav nations and ethnic groups. Nevertheless, while the Slovenes and Macedonians have their own and quite distinct languages, four ex-Yugoslav peoples (Croats, Montenegrins, "Moslems" and Serbs) use a language that from the genetic point of view can be considered as one and the same language but with at least two functionally different varieties or two functionally independent languages (western or Croatian, eastern or Serbian; Brozović 1983, 1985; Kovačec 1986; Škiljan 1988). Recently it has been possible to observe some facts that speak in favour of different language types corresponding to each Republic (Škiljan 1988).

The number of languages or their varieties is not the factor that differentiates the ex-Yugoslav area from other European countries, but rather the main distinctive feature is the specific character of the multiple relations between these languages as well as their status (Kovačec 1986).

Now let us review the languages of national minorities and ethnic groups spoken in the countries of what once was Yugoslavia. As there are only a few nonsystematic data concerning the number of speakers of each language in Yugoslavia, at least for some languages we will suppose that the number of speakers corresponds approximately to the number of (self)declared members of a given minority or ethnic group. In other cases the number of speakers is given according to my own estimation or following the figures proposed by other researchers. If there is no other indication, the figures in brackets derive from the census of 1981 (Statistički bilten, br. 1295, 1982). In the table the languages are grouped together according to the genetic principle (Indo-European and non-Indo-European; Slavic, Romance, Germanic etc.; cf. Rašić 1985, Kovačec 1986, Škiljan 1988). The table is followed by some comments about sociolinguistic problems.

INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES	
Slavic languages	
South Slavic	Bulgarian (36,189) Mostly in Serbia (30,769), specially in south-western Serbia (23,472)
West Slavic	*Polish* (3,043) Croatia, Vojvodina, Bosnia Czech (19,624) Croatia (15,061), Vojvodina (2,012) Slovak (80,334) Vojvodina (69,649), Croatia (6,533) Ruthenian (23,886) Vojvodina (19,305), Croatia (3,500)
East Slavic	Ukrainian (12,813) Vojvodina (5,001), Bosnia (4,502), Croatia (2,000) *Russian* (3,880) Mostly in towns of northern Serbia and Vojvodina

Table continues overleaf

Romance languages	
Rumanian dialects	Rumanian (Daco-Rumanian, 54,955) Vojvodina (47,289) *Vlach* (25,535) In north-western Serbia *Arumanian* (Macedonia: 6,392) Estimates to about 30,000 speakers of Arumanian *Megleno-Rumanian* (more than 2,000 speakers) *Istro-Rumanian* (between 1,200 and 1,500 speakers)

	Italian (15,132) Croatia (11,661), Slovenia (2,187)
	Istro-Romance (several hundreds of speakers in western Istria,
	    self-declared as Italians)
	Judeo-Spanish (several dozen of speakers, nowadays mostly
	    in Bosnia)

Germanic languages	
	German (8,712) Vojvodina (3,808), Croatia (2,175) *Judeo-German* Vojvodina, Croatia *Yiddish* (almost extinct)
Albanian group	
	Albanian (1,730,878) Kosovo (1,226,736), Macedonia (377,762) Serbia (72,484), Montenegro (37,735) *Arbanassian* Zadar – Croatia (several hundred persons)
Other Indo-European languages	

	Romany (168,197) Serbia (57,140), Vojvodina (34,126), Kosovo
	    (19,693), Macedonia (43,223), Bosnia-Herzegovina
	    (7,251), Croatia (3,858), Montenegro (1,471), Slove-
	    nia (1,435)
	Greek (1,641 Greeks – 1,832 speakers of Greek) Serbia,
	    Macedonia
	Armenian (several dozen) Macedonia, Serbia

NON-INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES	
North-west Caucassian (Adyghe) family	*Circassian* (several hundred speakers) Kosovo
Turkic branch of the Altaic family	Turkish (101,291) Macedonia (86,691), Kosovo (12,513) *Yurukh* (several thousand) eastern Macedonia
Finno-Ugric sub-family of Uralic languages	Hungarian (426,867) Vojvodina (385,356), Croatia (26,439), Slovenia (9,456)

In the official juridical and political Yugoslav terminology a distinction was made between *nations* (peoples), *"nationalities"* (national minorities) and *ethnic groups* and, consequently, between the *languages of the (Yugoslav) nations, languages of*

17

"*nationalities*" and *languages of ethnic groups*. From the very start we must emphasize that the boundaries between these three groups were neither constant nor always clear (Brozović 1985, Kovačec 1986, Škiljan 1988); the differences between them had more theoretical than practical value. The term *languages of nations* applied to the languages of south Slavic peoples apart from Bulgarians; these peoples had their national republics in Yugoslavia, and the majority of their members lived in Yugoslavia. A language of a people was an official language and the one in public use in its respective republic, but it was also recognized as official all over the federal territory.

The term *language of "nationality"* normally designated the languages of those national minorities whose main communities (as well as cultural and linguistic models) were situated outside Yugoslavia (Albanian, Hungarian, Turkish, Italian, Rumanian, Czech, Slovak, Ukrainian, Bulgarian, etc.). The status of "nationality" was given to those groups that were "sufficiently autochthonous" (Škiljan 1988). The majority of the languages of national minorities find considerable support – material as well as psychological – in their mother communities abroad (Kovačec 1986). The standard language of a minority is usually the same as the standard language of the mother nation, that is the standard language in the mother country. Consequently, a standard language of a "nationality" is constanly fashioned after the pattern of the standard language in the mother country. So standard Italian in Croatia or Slovenia is essentially the same as standard Italian in Italy. But the speakers of minority languages (apart from Albanians and more rarely Hungarians) as a rule are bilingual to a higher or lower degree: i.e., besides their own language they also use a language of some ex-yugoslav people (Brozović 1985, Kovačec 1986, Škiljan 1988).

Autochthonous groups without sufficient concentration of numbers, those with an insufficiently expressed national individuality (like Vlachs of north-western Serbia), or the groups endowed with a historical tradition of nomadism (like Romanies) had the status of ethnic groups, and their languages were classified as *languages of ethnic groups* (Škiljan 1988). Whereas the status of minority languages as well as the status of the languages of peoples was fixed by juridical, administrative and political documents at the level of the Federation, republics, regions, communes, etc., the languages of ethnic groups as a rule remained outside of the regulations of Yugoslav political and administrative authorities, which often meant that they were also on the brink of legality (Kovačec 1986).

The languages of peoples and languages of "nationalities" are supported by a corresponding national consciousness and a certain national (self-)identification (in these parts of Europe language is an important element of national identification; Brozović 1985) as well as by a series of other extralinguistic institutions which use the languages in question (e.g., schools, administration, the church, the media, folklore, etc.). At the same time, the languages of ethnic groups within a given community did not correspond to any particular or generally accepted national consciousness (Kovačec 1986). Whatever may be the language they use in private communication, the members of an ethnic group as a rule accepted the national consciousness of the community within which they lived. In this way the members of Istro-Rumanian and "Arbanassian" ethnic groups stated that they are Croats, the Istro-Romans declared themselves to be Italians, the majority of Vlachs are declared as Serbs (only a minority of Vlachs have their particular national consciousness), the Arumanians of Macedonia are mostly declared as Macedonians, the Yurukhs as Turks, etc. (Kovačec 1984, 1984a, 1986). Even in the

cases where the majority of an ethnic group lives on a compact territory outside ex-Yugoslavia (e.g., about 300,000 Arumanians in Greece), the ethnic groups did not try to find support in a related community abroad: as a rule they accepted the national consciousness of a Yugoslav people or of a prestigious "nationality" with whom they lived. As a standard language they used a standard language of a people or of a "nationality" (Kovačec 1986, Škiljan, 1988). Italian is the standard language of Istro--Romans; Istro-Rumanians and "Arbanassians" use Croatian; the standard language of the Vlach ethnic group is Serbian; Circassians use Albanian (and sometimes Turkish) as a standard language; Macedonian is the standard language of Arumanians and Megleno-Rumanians (Kovačec 1986). Institutions like schools, administration, the church, the media, etc. almost never use a language of an ethnic group. Sometimes an ethnic group (especially a very small group) hardly possesses any elements of its particular folklore in its own language. Apart from some local anecdotes, the Istro-Rumanians recount in their own language the stories they have taken from the surrounding Croatian-speaking population, but when they sing songs in verse, they never use Istro-Rumanian: they sing almost exclusively in Croatian (occasionally in Italian), that is in a language with a considerably higher number of speakers. This is because all the members of an ethnic group are normally bilingual. Their bilingualism is obligatory, general and active, and the language of a people or a "nationality" is used in practically all kinds of communication situations (Kovačec 1984, 1986).

While the languages of peoples and "nationalities" represented the object of a highly politicized and public interest, there was neither interest nor care for the languages of ethnic groups, outside perhaps the professional groups of linguists and folklorists. As for status, the languages of peoples and languages of "nationalities" were always official on some level. On the other hand the languages of ethnic groups as a rule were "unofficial languages without support" or, at best, "tolerated languages" or even "unofficial languages with support" (Škiljan 1988).

It must be said that languages could pass from one category to another. It is probable that the Romany language, a language of an ethnic group (or rather of a group of ethnic groups), was beginning to reach the status of a language of "nationality" (Šipka 1989, Rašić, 1989). The same thing would hardly have been possible for Arumanian because there are no longer any Arumanian communities with an important number of speakers. The position of Ruthenian was torn between the status of a language of a Yugoslav people (it was only in Yugoslavia that Ruthenians officially constituted a separate national, cultural and linguistic community; Gustavsson 1975) and that of a language of an ethnic group (the Ruthenians do not have a real mother country which would support them).

Let us now see some facts about individual languages of "nationalities" and ethnic groups spoken in Yugoslavia. Like the local speech of Serbs in the same region, the every-day speech of Bulgarians in south-eastern Serbia belongs to the "Torlak" dialect ("prizrensko-timočki" dijalekt) of Serbian (/Serbo-Croatian). In 1878 the communes in question came under Bulgarian rule. Bulgaria gave the inhabitants of that area schools, the Bulgarian standard language and Bulgarian national consciousness. The population kept the Bulgarian standard language and Bulgarian national consciousness even after World War One, when this area was incorporated into Serbia. This historical background can also explain the fluctuation concerning the number of Bulgarians in south--eastern Serbia.

The Ruthenian language is usually classified as East Slavic (Duličenko 1972, Gustavsson 1975) and this is corroborated by some facts of a cultural nature: Ruthenians are Uniates (Graeco-Catholics) like Ukrainians, they use the Ukrainian cyrillic alphabet and, traditionally, Ruthenians are closely connected with Ukrainians. It is necessary to emphasize that the linguistic basis of Ruthenian is eastern Slovak, while the Ukrainian (East Slavic) elements may be regarded as a cultural deposit; the main reason why the Ruthenians often lean on the Ukrainian community is their religion and not their language. All that is to say that the Ruthenian language could be classified, from a geographical and political point of view, as a Yugoslav language, from a genetic point of view as a west Slavic language, and from a cultural point of view as an East Slavic language.

As for the Romance languages in Yugoslavia, it is difficult to establish a constant or predictable relation between the number of members of a Romance "nationality" (or group) and the number of (native) speakers of a Romance language. It is interesting to underline that Yugoslavia was the only country in which the four "historical dialects" (or four groups of historical dialects) of Rumanian were spoken. At the same time speakers of different dialectal variants of Rumanian are not always Rumanians (Kovačec 1986). Only in Vojvodina, above all in the villages of southern Banat, do the speakers of the Daco-Rumanian dialect have Rumanian national consciousness and, as a general rule, they consider Rumania to be their mother country, at least from a cultural and linguistic point of view (Flora 1969). The speakers of a similar and historically very close variety of Rumanian in north-eastern Serbia sometimes declared themselves as Vlachs (Vlasi) and much more often as Serbs: about 130,000 speakers of the Vlach language correspond to only about 25,000 declared Vlachs. More often than not, the members of this population do not identify themselves with the population of the same language from the opposite bank of the Danube, either in terms of national consciousness or in a cultural and linguistic sense, in spite of the fact that the majority of the Vlach population came from Oltenia (Serb. *Carani*, Rum. *Ţărani*) and from the Rumanian Banat (Serb. *Ungurjani*, Rum. *Ungureni*) during the 18th and 19th centuries (Petrovici 1941, 1947; Timoc 1967; Marjanović 1981). Serbian Vlachs have never had organized schooling in their language; apart from their folklore, they have always had all their institutions (church, etc.) only in Serbian. In reality they never relied on the support of the large linguistic and cultural area on the opposite bank of the Danube. And finally this population of shepherds and peasants has never had any prestige among the surrounding Serbian population. All these facts may explain some important fluctuations concerning the number of Vlachs in the post-war years – 1948: 93,440; 1953: 24,047; 1961: 13,680; 1971: 14,724; 1981: 25,535 in comparision with several hundred thousand people in the interwar period (Petrovici 1947).

In Macedonia there are no longer any compact Megleno-Rumanian settlements, and more than half of the over 2,000 Megleno-Rumanians are refugees from Greece after the civil war (Atanasov 1984). Most of them are declared as Macedonians, and only sporadically as (Macedonian) Vlachs. As there are no public institutions which use Megleno-Rumanian, bilingualism is obligatory among the Megleno-Rumanian population, and this language has receeded in Macedonia recently.

During the 18th and 19th centuries Arumanians had a very important role in the national revival as well as in the political and cultural life of all the peoples in the Balkans,

including also Macedonians and Serbs (Capidan 1932, Kovačec 1986). There is an impressive number of eminent people of Arumanian origin in Serbian and Macedonian cultural and political history during last two centureis, in spite of the fact that the Arumanians, especially those in towns, were very often spokesmen for Greek culture and language (Gołąb 1984, Kovačec 1986). According to the census of 1981, there were 6,392 declared Vlachs (= Arumanians) in Macedonia, but according to the estimates of Rumanian dialectologists there may be 30,000 speakers of Arumanian in the Republic of Macedonia (Caragiu-Marioțeanu 1975, Saramandu 1984), and most of them are declared as Macedonians. After World War Two the majority of Arumanians went to live in towns, so there are no longer any important or compact Arumanian settlements in Macedonia (Saramandu 1984). It is hardly possible that the Arumanian movement for cultural and linguistic revival, which began in the early eighties, will be able to prolong the existence of this linguistic community, particularly as too many Arumanians have asserted themselves as prominent personalities in Macedonian public life.

No census takes account of the 1,250 Istro-Rumanians, who, in spite of their distinct language, have no particular national consciousness and declare themselves as Croats. Without any extra-linguistic institution to make use of their language, Istro-Rumanians use Croatian as their standard language and they become bilingual from their earliest days (Pușcariu 1926, 1919; Coteanu 1957, 1957a; Flora 1962; Petrovici-Neiescu 1964; Kovačec 1984). As a consequence of their bilingualism, the structure of their language has changed considerably under Croatian, and partly also Italian, influence (Pușcariu 1926, 1929; Petrovici 1957; Flora 1975; Kovačec 1963, 1968, 1971, 1981, 1984a).

As for their language and culture, the Rumanians of Vojvodina lean on the large community in Rumania (the standard Rumanian language is the same in Vojvodina and in Rumania; Magdu 1986). At the same time, as regards their standard language, the Vlachs of north-eastern Serbia lean on Serbs; Megleno-Rumanians and Arumanians on Macedonians, and Istro-Rumanians on Croats. Among these five groups with Ruma-nian idioms there are neither constant bonds nor consciousness of a cultural and speech community (Kovačec 1986).

In Yugoslavia there were 15,132 declared members of Italian "nationality", 19,409 people that declared Italian to be their first language, and at least 20,000 people (Croats and Slovenes) able to speak Italian more or less fluently. At the same time we must take into account the constant decrease in the number of declared Italians in the post-war period (1948: 79,375; 1953: 35,874; 1961: 25,615; 1971: 21,797; 1981: 15,132). We must also take into account the fact that in the western regions of what was Yugoslavia bilingualism was normal among Italians as well as among Croats and Slovenes (Milani--Kruljac 1985). Unlike the Italian language imported into Istria during the Middle Ages, Istro-Romance is an autochthonous Romance idiom of the western coast of Istria and, in its origin, it has certain similarities with the extinguished Dalmatin language (Skok 1934, 1940, 1943; Deanović 1954; Tekavčić 1967, 1967a, 1975, 1976). Istro-Romans consider themselves to be Italians and use Italian as their standard language. Small groups of Italians in Slavonia and northern Bosnia seem to be – as far as their standard language is concerned – in the same situation as Istro-Rumanians and "Arbanassians".

The spoken language of Jewish communities has no particular importance as a mark of ethnic or national identification. Judeo-Spanish, spoken before World War Two by about 23,000 people (Wagner 1930; Baruch 1930, 1935; Crews 1935), is now almost

extinct (spoken only by several dozen old persons) (Kovačec 1968a, 1973, 1976, 1988). Yugoslavia did not belong to the Yiddish area and there are only few persons able to speak Yiddish. Judeo-German was more widespread in Yugoslavia, but because of the holocaust of the Jewish population during World War Two even this language is also dying out. Of more than 400,000 Germans before World War Two (especially in Vojvodina), in 1981 there were only 8,712 persons declared as Germans. Germans are not organized as a "nationality" (Škiljan 1988).

The Albanian "nationality" has more members than some Yugoslav peoples; it represents the minority with the greatest number of speakers and with the most dynamic demographic growth. In practice, in the Yugoslav Federation the Albanian language sometimes had the same status as the languages of the Yugoslav peoples. The "Arbanassians" of Zadar in Dalmatia, speaking a variety of north-Albanian, had no constant bonds with other Albanian-speaking groups in Yugoslavia; they accepted Croatian national consciousness and Croatian as their standard language (Ajeti 1961, Krstić 1987).

The Romany language could be classified as a language of an ethnic group rather than as a language of a "nationality" (Lukić 1989), and this in spite of its high number of speakers (168,197). The characteristics of the Romany groups are: a marked scattering of their speakers (Uhlik 1947, 1973; Sredanović 1989; Šiftar 1989; Lutovac 1989), their dependence on other national and linguistic groups (there were neither compact Romany regions nor independent Romany settlements, there existed only Romany suburbs or districts) and at the same time, specially in some regions, a very pronounced isolation because of its lower social status (Rašić 1989), as well as due to prejudice against the Romany population. All these facts taken together explain large differences between various censuses of population as well as the discrepancy between the results of censuses and some estimates (according to certain estimates there were 600,000 Romanies in Yugoslavia). Parts of the Romany population speak different languages as their mother tongue (Turkish, Rumanian, Hungarian, etc.); in comparison with 168,197 declared Romanies, the census of 1981 gives only 140,618 people claiming Romany as their mother tongue. In Serbia and Macedonia Romanies speak the so-called Balkan Romany dialects and in other parts of ex-Yugoslavia the so-called Wallachian Romany dialects with a strong Rumanian influence (Uhlik 1947, 1973; Gostl 1969; Sredanović 1989). Although no spectacular results were obtained, it must be said that there are schools, publishing activities, theatre, etc. in Romany (Šipka 1989, Sredanović 1989).

The minuscule Circassian community in Kosovo speaks a language belonging to the north-west Caucassian or Adyghe language family. But the standard language of this trilingual and quadrilingual population is Albanian and partly Turkish (Pittard 1935; Paris 1977, 1978; Özbek 1986). Although there were 101,291 declared Turks in Yugo-slavia, there were only 82,090 people claiming Turkish as their first language. The Turkish minority uses its language in very different spheres of life and in different institutions. In the past the Turkish language had a powerful influence on Yugoslav languages (Skok 1935). It is very difficult to isolate from the Turks the Yurukhs of Macedonia: a population now speaking a west-Rumelian Turkish dialect (Jašar-Nasteva 1986) but which seems to have spoken a variety of Turkmenian in the past. In spite of their social status, Yurukhs appear as members of the Turkish "nationality" (Kovačec

1986). The Hungarian language belongs to the Finno-Ugric sub-family of Uralic languages and it is an important "nationality" language which sometimes achieves the same status as the languages of peoples (Mikeš 1983, Mikeš-Lük-Junger 1978).

Albanian, Istro-Romance and the different varieties of Rumanian (in spite of some late Rumanian migrations within the Yugoslav territories) may be considered as pre- -Slavic languages of these parts of the Balkans (Puşcariu 1926; Skok 1934; Barić 1937, 1954, 1959; Deanović 1954; Çabej 1960). Although it is more recent, the presence of Hungarian in the northern parts of ex-Yugoslavia is very old too. Italian was imported into Istria and the northern Adriatic islands during the Venetian domination in the Middle Ages (Skok 1940, Muljačić 1962, 1971). Judeo-Spanish was implanted in the Yugoslav countries under Ottoman domination after the 15th century. It seems that Yurukh transhumant shepherds came to Macedonia as a vanguard of Ottoman Turks (Truhelka 1934, 1941). Circassians were settled by the Turkish authorities as borderers along the frontier with Serbia in the 19th century. All the West- and East-Slavic minorities, Italians, and in part also Germans and Hungarians, were settled in the Pannonian regions of ex-Yugoslavia (Vojvodina and Slavonia) by Austrian and Austro- -Hungarian authorities during the 18th and 19th centuries (Kovačec 1986), with the exception of the majority of Russians who came to Yugoslavia only after the October Revolution.

On the basis of this brief survey we can note that in such conditions it is not always easy to transform language equality into reality as is suggested in constitutional documents and political declarations. The true status and position of the language of a national minority or of an ethnic group depends on numerous social, demographic, economic, cultural and political factors, as well as on geolinguistic, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic conditions (Škiljan 1988). There is a great difference between a group with a highly developed consciousness about the self-reliance of its own language and another group which may maintain its language only thanks to the inertia of tradition. The true status of a language depends on the social structure and cultural level of the language community, on its number of speakers and on the compactness of the group and of its territory, on the self-reliance of the group and on its consciousness of its own cultural and linguistic particularity in comparison with other communities, on the degree of organization of the community, and on how long the tradition in the use of the language has lasted, on the intensity of relations with the mother country, etc., with many factors being at work (Vinja 1957, Kovačec 1986).

Be that as it may, in quite large parts of the ex-Yugoslav territories where communities of national minorities and ethnic groups live, bilingualism and diglossia are spread not only among the members of minority groups (with some exceptions for Albanians and Hungarians) but sometimes also among the members of the ex-Yugoslav nations. The bilingualism itself depends on different linguistic and extra-linguistic factors, such as the genetic closeness between languages, their structural and areal proximity, cultural relationship etc. (Kovačec 1968, 1986).

In the contact between languages of "nationalities" and languages of peoples there is no fundamental difference in comparison with the contact, for instance, between standard Italian and English or standard Slovene and German. Considering that it is a question of languages which are protected by a series of institutions, the quite natural

and unavoidable interferences between languages in contact are normally reduced to their lowest level: they almost never reach the grammatical structure of the language. Apart from a particular administrative terminology, the Croatian and Slovene influence on Italian or the Macedonian influence upon Turkish is almost insignificant and as superficial as the English influence on standard Italian in Italy.

On the other hand the languages of ethnic groups (which are not protected by the action of different extra-linguistic institutions) usually accept foreign influences much more freely and without hindrance. Unlike the languages of peoples and "nationalities", which are conservative and preserve the inherited language material and linguistic structures (as well as the general typological character of the language), the languages of ethnic groups are often subject to changes which can have repercussions also on the typological level.

With some languages of ethnic groups we can observe directly the same processes as those which have led to the formation of so-called linguistic leagues. Under the influence of a foreign language, the language of an ethnic group (a language without protecting institutions) can radically change its phonological and grammatical structure, as well as its vocabulary (Vinja 1957, 1986). Istro-Rumanian nowadays has a phonological system whose inventory of phonemes is almost identical with that of the surrounding Croatian čakavian (Petrovici 1957). In Istro-Rumanian the neuter gender of the Rumanian type (Fr. "ambigenre") has been abandoned and replaced, following the pattern of Croatian, by the neuter of the Slavic type; Istro-Rumanian has developed the possibility of a systematic (grammatical) expression of the verbal aspect like in Croatian, etc. Such examples are numerous, not only in Istro-Rumanian but also in Judeo-Spanish, Megleno-Rumanian, Vlach, etc.

The linguistic situation in the ex-Yugoslav countries is not unusual so much in terms of the number or the variety of languages and linguistic types, but above all in terms of the very particular relations established among the languages and sometimes because of the results of their contact.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations

JKR   —   Jezik i kultura Roma (Međunarodni naučni skup) / Romany Language and Culture (International symposium) / (Sarajevo, 9–11.VI 1986), Sarajevo, 1989;
KR   —   Kulturni radnik, Zagreb;
SRAZ   —   Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia, Zagreb;
RIEB   —   Revue Internationale des Etudes Balkaniques, Belgrade, I (1934), II (1935);
TDR   —   Tratat de dialectologie românească, Craiova, 1984;

AJETI, Idriz (1961) Istorijski razvitak gegijskog govora Arbanasa kod Zadra, *Naučno društvo NR Bosne i Hercegovine, Djela, Knjiga XVI, Balkanološki institut, Knjiga 3*, Sarajevo;

ANDRIJAŠEVIĆ, Mladen – ERDELJAC, Vlasta – PUPOVAC, Milorad (1986) Jezična politika u Jugoslaviji, KR XXXIX/1, Zagreb, pp. 97–105;

ATANASOV, Petar (1984) Meglenoromâna, TDR, Craiova, pp. 476–550;

BARIĆ, Henrik (1937) O uzajamnim odnosima balkanskih jezika, I, Ilirsko- romanska jezička grupa, Beograd;

BARIĆ, Henrik (1954) Lingvističke studije, *Naučno društvo NR Bosne i Hercegovine, Djela, Knj. I, Odjeljenje istorisko-filoloških nauka, Knj. 1*, Sarajevo (specially the chapter: Poreklo Arbanasa u svetlu jezika, pp. 7–48);

BARIĆ, Henrik (1959) Istorija arbanaškog jezika, Sarajevo;

BARUCH, Kalmi (1930) El judeo-español de Bosnia, *Revista de Filología Española*, Tomo CVII, Madrid, pp. 113–154 (the same text translated by Muhamed Nezirović: Kalmi BARUH (1976) Jevrejsko-španski jezik u Bosni, *Radio Sarajevo – Treći program*, br. 15/76, Sarajevo, pp. 281–312);

BARUCH, Kalmi (1935) Les Juifs balkaniques et leur langue, RIEB II, Belgrade, pp. 173–179;

BROZOVIĆ, Dalibor (1983) Die soziolinguistische Situation in der jugoslawischen Föderation, *Wiener slawistisches Jahrbuch*, XXIX, Wien, pp. 9–23;

BROZOVIĆ, Dalibor (1985) O funkcioniranju jezika u jugoslavenskoj federaciji (Sociolingvistička situacija u jednoj višejezičnoj i višenacionalnoj evropskoj državnoj zajednici), *Jugoslavenski seminar za strane slaviste*, 35, Zadar, pp. 21–47;

BUGARSKI, Ranko (1986) Jezik u društvu, Beograd;

BUGARSKI, Ranko (1986a) Pogled na jezičku politiku i jezičko planiranje u Jugoslaviji, KR XXXIX/1, Zagreb, pp. 72–82;

CAPIDAN, Theodor (1932) Aromânii. Dialectul aromân. Studiu lingvistic, Bucureşti;

CARAGIU-MARIOŢEANU, Matilda (1975) Compendiu de dialectologie română (nord- si sud--dunareană), Bucureşti;

COTEANU, Ion (1957) Cum dispare o limbă (istroromână), Bucureşti;

COTEANU, Ion (1957a) A propos des langues mixtes (sur l'istro-roumain), *Mélanges linguistiques publiés à l'occasion du VIIIᵉ Congrès international des Linguistes à Oslo, du 5 au 9 aout 1957, Bucarest;*

CREWS, Cynthia M. (1935) Recherches sur le judéo-espagnol dans les pays balkaniques, Paris;

ÇABEJ, Eqrem (1960) Hyrje në historinë e gjuhës shqipe. Fonetika historike e shqipes, Tiranë (/Priština, 1970);

DEANOVIĆ, Mirko (1954) Avviamento allo studio del dialetto di Rovigno d'Istria. Grammatica, testi, glossario, Zagreb;

DULIČENKO, A. D. (1972) Stanovlenie i razvitie russinskogo jazyka v Jugoslavii, *Sovetskoe slavjanovedenie*, 3, pp. 38–50;

FLORA, Radu (1969) Rumunski banatski govori u svetlu lingvističke geografije, I–II, Beograd;

FLORA, Radu (1975) Gli italianismi nell'istroromano, *Italica belgradensia*, I, Belgrado, pp. 45–63;

FLORA, Radu (1962) Despre stadiul actual al istroromânei, *Fonetică* si dialectologie, 4, Bucureşti, pp. 135–170;

GOLĄB, Zbigniew (1984) The Arumanian Dialect of Kruševo in SR Macedonia, SFR Yugoslavia, Skopje;

GOSTL, Igor (1989) Jezik i kultura Roma u velikim svjetskim enciklopedijama, JKR, Sarajevo, pp. 35–49;

GUSTAVSSON, Sven R. (1975) Rusinerna i Jugoslavien, deras kultur och språk, Stockholm;

JAŠAR-NASTEVA, Olivera (1986) Prilog kon proučavanjeto na Jurucite od Radoviško (I. Istorisko--ekonomski i etnografski podatoci; II. Glavni osobenosti na govorot), *Etnogeneza na Juricite i nivnoto naseluvanje na Balkanot*, Skopje, pp. 125–146;

KOVAČEC, August (1968) Observations sur les influences croates dans la grammaire istroroumaine, *La Linguistique*, IV/1, Paris, pp. 79–115;

KOVAČEC, August (1968a) Les Séfardim en Yugoslavie et leur langue (D'après quelques publications yougoslaves), SRAZ, N° 25–26, Zagreb, pp. 161–177;

KOVAČEC, August (1971) Descrierea istroromânei actuale, Bucureşti;

KOVAČEC, August (1973) Un texto judeoespañol de Dubrovnik, SRAZ, N° 33–36, 1972–1973, Zagreb, pp. 501–531;

KOVAČEC, August (1976) La lengua de los Sefardíes de Ragusa (Dubrovnik), *Bollettino dell'Atlante Linguistico Mediterraneo*, N° 13–15, 1971–1973, Firenze, pp. 335–343;

KOVAČEC, August (1981) Les différences lexicales entre l'istroroumain du nord et l'istroroumain du sud, SRAZ, XXVI(1–2), Zagreb, pp. 58–83;

KOVAČEC, August (1986) Jugoslaviens romanska minoriteter och deras språk, Uppsala Multiethnic Papers, 6, Jugoslavien i april 1984 (By Sven Gustavsson and Ingvar Svanberg), Uppsala, 1986, pp. 63–82;

KOVAČEC, August (1984) Istroromâna, TDR, Craiova, pp. 550–591;

KOVAČEC, August (1986a) Jezici narodnosti i etničkih skupina u Jugoslaviji, KR XXXIX/1, Zagreb, pp. 83–96 (the same text was reproduced in the volume: Jezici i politike. Jezična politika u višejezičnim zajednicama, Biblioteka "Naše teme", priredio Milorad Pupovac, Zagreb, 1988, pp. 56–57);

KOVAČEC, August (1988) Sobre el valor de las unidades t...y d... en ei judeo-español de Sarajevo y Dubrovnik, SRAZ, XXXI–XXXII, 1986–1987, Zagreb, pp. 156–169;

KRSTIĆ, Kruno (1987) Rječnik govora zadarskih Arbanasa, Zadar;

LUKIĆ, Radomir D. (1989) Etnička zajednica Roma, JKR, Sarajevo, pp. 29–39;

LUTOVAC, Momčilo S. (1989) Neke specifičnosti iz tradicije Roma u Crnoj Gori, Sarajevo, pp. 151–154;

MAGDU, Lia (1986) Proza scriitorilor români din Voivodina (1945–1985), Studii de limbă si de stil, Panciova;

MARJANOVIĆ, Miloš (1981) Društvene i kulturne promene u selima vlaške etničke zajednice Negotinske krajine, Posebna izdanja SANU, Knj. 32, Beograd;

MIKEŠ, Melanija (1982) Microsociolinguistics of Hungarian-Serbo-croatian Bilingualism, Language Spread. Studies in Diffusion and Social Change, Ed. Robert L. Cooper, Bloomington, pp. 337–352;

MIKEŠ, Melanija (1983) Instruction in Mother Tongue in Yugoslavia, Prospects, 1, pp. 121–131;

MIKEŠ, Melanija – LÜK, Albina – JUNGER, Ferenc (1978) O dvojezičnosti u Jugoslaviji, Kultura, 40, Beograd, pp. 82–99;

MILANI KRULJAC, Nelida (1985) La comunità italiana in Jugoslavia fra diglosia e bilinguismo, Zagreb (manuscript of doctoral thesis);

MULJAČIĆ, Žarko (1962) Dalmatski elementi u mletački pisanim dubrovačkim dokumentima 14. st. Prilog raguzejskoj dijakronoj fonologiji i dalmatsko-mletačkoj konvergenciji, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Rad 327, Zagreb;

MULJAČIĆ, Žarko (1971) Dalmate, in Perre Bec, Manuel pratique de philologie romane, Tome II, Paris;

ÖZBEK, Batiray (1986) Erzählungen der letzten Tscherkessen auf dem Amselfeld, coll. Ethnographie der Tscherkessen 4, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn;

PARIS, Catherine (1977) La souris, le grain de sel et la feuille sèche. Texte tcherkesse en dialecte abzakh, Bedi kartlisa/Revue de kartvélologie, XXXV, Paris, pp. 28–45;

PARIS, Catherine (1978) Deux histoires tcherkesses (Dialecte abzakh), Bedi kartlisa/Revue de kartvélologie, vol. XXXVI, Paris, pp. 17–24;

PETROVICI, Emil (1941) Românii dintre Timoc si Morava, Transilvania, Cluj, pp. 180–184;

PETROVICI, Emil (1947) Notă de folclor de la românii din Valea Mlavei, Anuarul Arhivei de Folclor, Tom VI, Bucureşti, pp. 43–75;

PETROVICI, Emil (1957) Kann das Phonemsystem einer Sprache durch fremden Einfluss umgestaltet werden?..., The Hague;

PETROVICI, Emil si NEIESCU, PETRU (1964) Persistenţa insulelor lingvistice. Constatări făcute cu prilejul unor anchete dialectale la istroromâni, meglenoromâni şi aromâni, Cercetări de lingvistică, IX/2, Cluj, pp. 187–214;

PITTARD, Eugène (1935) Les peuples que les Turcs ont amenés dans les Balkans, RIEB, II, Belgrade, pp. 195–200;

PUȘCARIU, Sextil Studii istroromâne (in colaborare cu M. Bartoli, A. Belulovici şi A. Byhan), Bucureşti; (1905–1906) Vol. I: Texte; (1926) Vol. II: Introducere, gramatică, caracterizarea dialectului istroromân; (1929) Vol. III: Bibliografie critică, listele lui Bartoli, texte inedite, note, glosar;

RAŠIĆ, Nikola (1982) Jezična situacija i jezična politika na Balkanu – jugoslavenski primjer, Traženja, XII/26, Slavonska Požega;

RAŠIĆ, Nikola (1985) La lingva situacio en Jugoslavio, Etnismo, N° 34, Hannover;

RAŠIĆ, Nikola (1989) Mogući zadaci romske sociolingvistike, JKR, Sarajevo, pp. 181–185;

SARAMANDU, Nicolae (1984) Aromâna, TDR, Craiova, pp. 423–476;

SKOK, Petar (1935) Restes de la langue turque dans les Balkans, RIEB II, Belgrade, pp. 247–260;

SKOK, Petar (1934) Dolazak Slovena na Mediteran, Split;

SKOK, Petar (1940) Osnovi romanske lingvistike, sv. I, Zagreb;

SKOK, Petar (1943) Considérations sur le plus ancien istro-roman, *Festschrift J. Jud, Romanica Helvetica,* XX, Genève- Zürich, pp. 472–485;

SREDANOVIĆ, Đorđe (1989) Jezik i kultura Roma u jugoslovenskoj enciklopedistici, JKR, Sarajevo, pp. 51–58;

Statistički bilten 1295 (1982) Nacionalni sastav stanovništva. Konačni rezultati, Beograd;

SIFTAR, Vanek (1989) Jezik i kultura Roma u Sloveniji (osobito Prekomurju), JKR, Sarajevo, pp. 143–150;

ŠIPKA, Milan (2989) Potreba, značaj i perspektive proučavanja jezika i kulture Roma, JKR, Sarajevo, pp. XXXIII–XXXIX;

ŠKILJAN, Dubravko (1986) Prolegomena našoj jezičnoj politici, KR XXXIX/1, Zagreb, pp. 50–51;

ŠKILJAN, Dubravko (1988) Jezična politika, Zagreb;

TEKAVČIĆ, Pavao (1967) Današnji istroromanski dijalekt Vodnjana, *Rad JAZU,* br. 348, Zagreb;

TEKAVČIĆ, Pavao (1967a) Su alcune particolarità nella coniugazione rovignese, *Travaux de Linguistique et Littérature,* V/1, Strasbourg, pp. 225–233;

TEKAVČIĆ, Pavao (1975) Caratteristiche e problemi del verbo istrioto, SRAZ, 39, Zagreb, pp. 55–105;

TEKAVČIĆ, Pavao (1976) Per un atlante linguistico istriano (Con speciale rigurdo ai dialetti istroromanzi), SRAZ 40, Zagreb, pp. 227–240;

TIMOC, Cristea Sandu (1967) Cîntece bătrîneşti şi doine, Bucureşti;

TRUHELKA, Ćiro (1934) Über die Balkan Yürüken, RIEB I, Belgrade, pp. 89–99;

TRUHELKA, Ćiro (1941) Macedonski Juruci. Studije o podrijetlu, Zagreb;

UHLIK, Rade (1947) Srpsko-hrvatsko-ciganski rečnik (Romane alava), Sarajevo;

UHLIK, Rade (1955) Romane čhibače, Sarajevo;

UHLIK, Rade (1973) Govori jugoslovenskih Cigana u okviru balkanskog jezičnog procesa, *Materijali Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine,* Knj. 8, Sarajevo;

VINJA, Vojmir (1957) I tipi di incroci neolatino slavi, in Studia Romanica Zagrabiensia, N° 3.

VINJA, Vojmir (1986) Jadranska fauna – Etimologija i struktura naziva, I–II, Zagreb – Split.

WAGNER, Max Leopold (1930) Caracteres generales del judeo-español de Oriente, Madrid;

JEZICI NACIONALNIH MANJINA I ETNIČKIH SKUPINA U ZEMLJAMA NEKADAŠNJE JUGOSLAVIJE
(S posebnim obzirom na romanske jezike)

U ovom se članku daje prikaz jezika nacionalnih manjina i etničkih skupina na području zemalja koje su tvorile bivšu SFR Jugoslaviju. U pregledu se navodi broj govornika za pojedine jezike, a zatim osnovni podaci o njihovoj raširenosti i drugim relevantnim kulturnim, povijesnim, sociolingvističkim itd. značajkama; jezici su prikazani prema genetskoj pripadnosti kao i prema njihovu svojstvu jezika nacionalne manjine ili jezika etničke skupine. Osobito romanski jezici na tlu bivše Jugoslavije pokrivaju vrlo širok spektar socio-lingvističkih i funkcionalnih statusa. Na temelju svih iznesenih podataka nastoje se skicirati osnovni kriteriji za vrednovanje statusa pojedinih jezika.