
UDK: 811.163.42'271.1
929 Jonke Lj.
Review article
Received on April 14 2020

SLAVICA VRŠALJKO
University of Zadar, Department of Teachers and Preschool
Teachers Education
slavicav@unizd.hr

THE ROLE OF LJUDEVIT JONKE IN LINGUISTIC AND POLITICAL ISSUES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE SIGNING OF THE *DECLARATION ON THE NAME AND STATUS OF THE CROATIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE*

Abstract

The paper speaks about the role of Ljudevit Jonke, who has been a long-time authority in standard language as well as linguistic and political matters in Croatia according to Croatian standardology. Special emphasis is put on his role in the context of events before signing of the *Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language* and rejection of the document by the authorities of that time as well as condemnation of its signatories. In this context, Ljudevit Jonke imposed himself as a figure of immeasurable significance, responsible for reviving its aim in fighting for equal status of the Croatian language, especially in the 1960s and 1970s.

Keywords: Ljudevit Jonke; linguistic and political matters; *Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language*

1. Ljudevit Jonke – scientific, teaching and professional activity

Ljudevit Jonke was born in 1907 in Karlovac. In the linguistic literature, he is singled out as the most important Croatian linguist of the Croatian orientation in the second half of the 20th century. In addition to this merit, Ivo Pranjković summarizes his scientific, teaching and professional work in several categories, stating, among others, how he influenced the popularization, studying, translating and acquaintance of Croatian readers with Czech literature, and no one among Croats in the 20th century contributed more to it than Ljudevit Jonke. As the most important figure in the field of, as Pranjković says, “applied standardology”, he was the first to convincingly and argumentatively warn of the unjustly neglected linguistic activity of the representatives of the Zagreb Philological School, especially Adolf Weber Tkalčević and Bogoslav Šulek, which is particularly evident during many years of his editing the magazine *Jezik* as well as in numerous newspaper and magazine sections he edited, especially in the daily newspaper *Vjesnik* and the weekly magazine *Telegram*. In his writings he was always taking into account the so-called elastic stability, linguistic polyfunctionality and, instead of the principle of Vuk Karadžić “write as you speak”, he insisted on the principle “write as good writers write”. Finally, the role of Ljudevit Jonke as a long-time authority in standard language, as well as linguistic and political matters in Croatia from the 1950s to the beginning of the 1980s is immeasurable.¹

Despite the compromises he had to make, his basic starting point on the status of the Croatian language from the beginning to the end was unwavering, firm and clear: “the Croatian language has its historical, cultural, territorial and national peculiarities that must be expressed both in standardization processes and in language policy, and must not be sacrificed to any, as Pranjković says, “higher goals”.² He died in 1979 in Zagreb. When he passed away, *Vjesnik*, the leading Croatian daily at the

¹ Cf. IVO PRANJKOVIĆ, *Rasprave i članci /Ljudevit Jonke*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 2015., p. 20.

² Cf. *ibid.*

time, published on the last page: "Ljudevit Jonke died." Zagreb (Tanjug): "The Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts announced that Professor Ljudevit Jonke, PhD, a full member of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts and a retired Professor at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, died in Zagreb on Thursday at the age of 72."³

2. The development of the Croatian literary language in the 20th century as seen through the eyes of Ljudevit Jonke

The struggle for the type of literary language and its orthography began in 1836 and ended at the end of the 19th century with the appearance of *Hrvatski pravopis* by Ivan Broz in 1892 and *Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika* by Tomo Maretić in 1899. These works, which complement the *Rjecnik hrvatskoga jezika* by Franjo Iveković and Ivan Broz from 1901, compiled in the same spirit, in two, as Jonke says, "voluminous books"; paved the way and a solid basis for the further development of the Croatian literary language in the 20th century based on the New Stokavian Ijekavian dialects and phonetic spelling.⁴ Thus, the Croats entered the 20th century with Ijekavian pronunciation, and the Serbs mostly with Ekavian and to a lesser extent with Ijekavian. Broz's *Hrvatski pravopis* was introduced into Croatian schools as a compulsory textbook, so with new editions and later edited by Dragutin Boranić (*Pravopis hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* in 1921 and onwards, until the last edition in 1951) it stabilized the Latin orthography norm until 1960. On the other hand, Maretić's *Gramatika* experienced, in addition to the above-mentioned from 1899, two other editions, the second in 1931 and the third in 1963, which, as Jonke says: "established the grammatical norm of the Croatian literary language of Ijekavian pronunciation, while the same for Ekavian pronunciation of the Serbs was done by Belić's *Gramatika srpskohrvatskog jezika* from

³ MARKO SAMARDŽIJA, *Ljudevit Jonke*, Zavod za znanost o književnosti Filozofskog fakulteta, Zagreb, 1990., p. 91.

⁴ Cf. I. PRANJKOVIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

1932 onwards, all on the basis of New Stokavian pronunciations and the practice of Croatian and Serbian writers.”⁵

Jonke says that Maretić’s *Gramatika* conceived in this way, according to Vatroslav Jagić, will cause new difficulties due to the existence of the Ijekavian and Ekavian type of literary language, and he was right. Namely, as early as 4 November 1913, the editor of *Srpski književni glasnik* Jovan Skerlić proclaimed ideas about Serbs and Croats as one people and their literatures one literature, Serbo-Croatian in numerous magazine articles.⁶ These ideas continued to be advocated, and in part, as he further states, they were transferred to the new joint state of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, founded in 1918.⁷ The question of accepting one type of literary language instead of the other became, Jonke continues, much more difficult in the 20th century than in the middle of the 19th century, and much more difficult in the middle of the 20th century than in Skerlić’s time.

In June 1953 an invitation for the Novi Sad survey on language and orthography, was sent by the *Letopis Matice srpske* to a total of 110 writers, scientists and politicians, but only thirty-six sent their answers. In a large number of answers, as Jonke says: “dominates the spirit of political enthusiasm, unification and unitarism.”⁸ Smodlaka was the sharpest in expressing his opinion in the mentioned survey, saying: “... that the complete equalization of Serbian and Croatian literary language should be carried out only through compromise, such that the Serbian language (Ekavian pronunciation) would be written in Croatian letters (Gaj’s Latin orthography).”⁹ Others, as Jonke further states, and according to him, the majority, suggested the coexistence of Ekavian and Ijekavian dialects, but with different variations, “some suggested that each dialect should be limited to its own area, and some that both dialects should

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

⁶ More about it in the article by JOVAN SKERLIĆ, „Istočno ili južno narječje“, *Srpski književni glasnik*, Beograd, no. 10., 1913, p. 756. – 770. and 862. – 873.

⁷ Cf. I. PRANJKOVIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

⁸ LJUDEVIT JONKE, *Hrvatski književni jezik 19. i 20. stoljeća*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 1971., p. 212.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

be used at the same time in the entire area.¹⁰ According to the opinions expressed by Petar Skok, the greatest difficulty is different Croatian and Serbian terminology. Mate Hraste and Slavko Pavesić, on the other hand, think that both scripts and both dialects can still perform their function usefully, while Josip Hamm believes that the most important is to equalize the script, then two dialects will not present any difficulties. On the contrary, Aleksandar Belić believes that the differences are more pronounced in dialects than in the scripts. Jonke concludes that the survey showed that only two guests from Croatia declared their readiness to leave the Ijekavian type, all the others were against it.¹¹

Ljudevit Jonke also published the famous book *Književni jezik u teoriji i praksi*, in which, as he himself states in the preface, he tries to “speak about linguistic and orthographic issues in an accessible way, suitable for this moment and today’s man. We are actually lacking of books on language that would approach the readers and current needs.”¹²

3. The role of Ljudevit Jonke within the Novi Sad Agreement

Ivo Pranjkovic states that in socialist Yugoslavia, the national question should be resolved on the basis of equality of all peoples and nationalities of Yugoslavia, so the issue of the language of each people and nationality should also be resolved according to natural law and without any pressure.¹³ However, this was not the case because these relations and rights were not clearly defined, fixed, so *Matica srpska*, as mentioned above, organized a “survey on issues of Serbo-Croatian language and orthography” in Novi Sad in 1953, asking 110 writers to present their opinions on language problems in the *Letopis Matice srpske*. The answers were published in the *Letopis* from September 1953 to December 1954, and most of the answers showed their belief that neither of two

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

¹¹ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 215.

¹² LJUDEVIT JONKE, *Hrvatski književni jezik u teoriji i praksi*, Nakladni zavod Znanje, Zagreb, 1964., p. 6.

¹³ Cf. I. PRANJKOVIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

scripts or the two literary languages should be reduced to one script and one language. After that, on 10 December 1954, the Novi Sad Conclusions¹⁴ on the Croatian-Serbian language and orthography were signed. These Conclusions established the equality of both pronunciations (Ijekavian and Ekavian) and both scripts (Latin and Cyrillic). It was also established that the national language of Serbs, Croats and Montenegrins was one language so, in official use, both constituent parts should be pointed out (Serbo-Croatian, Croato-Serbian, Croatian or Serbian, Serbian or Croatian), but in unofficial use the names Croatian, Serbian were also allowed. It was concluded that the Croatian-Serbian commission of language experts will compose a common orthography and a dictionary of the literary language, and work to harmonize professional and scientific terminology.¹⁵

Among the Novi Sad meeting participants, on the Croatian side was Ljudevit Jonke himself, on whose participation Marko Samardžija states: “he partially deviated from his proposals in the survey (acceptance of a complex language name); strongly denies the claim that “Ekavian has more prospects in the future”; agrees that it is one language, but emphasizes the equality of both its types; advocates the writing of a common dictionary, but insists on a dictionary of literary language with confirmations from modern sources (“folk speech has already been noted”), he is optimistic and prone to compromise regarding the development of a common orthography, dictionary and terminology (“It has nothing to do with being Serb or Croat”). At the end he says: “Here (in language affairs - M. S.), sensitivity to brotherhood and unity is very important, but also sensitivity to the characteristics of both peoples.”¹⁶

¹⁴ Cf. *Pravopis hrvatskosrpskoga književnog jezika s pravopisnim rječnikom*, Matica hrvatska – Matica srpska, Zagreb – Novi Sad, 1960., p. 9. – 10. (transcription of text facsimile) states that the meeting participants, convened by the Editorial Board of the *Matica srpska*, upon the survey on Serbo-Croatian language and orthography, after a comprehensive discussion held from 8 to 10 December, 1954 in Novi Sad, adopted 10 conclusions.

¹⁵ *Letopis Matice srpske*, Novi Sad, no. 1., 1955, p. 1. – 126.: according to I. PRANJKOVIĆ, *Rasprave i članci...*, p. 206.

¹⁶ M. SAMARDŽIJA, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

It is clear that conclusions were reached at the meeting, but as Samardžija points out, it is difficult to say what was Jonke's share in their formulation. As he further states, he experienced them as a certain relief and a relatively favourable solution, in the best tradition of Croatian minimalist optimism. After returning from Novi Sad, Jonke exclaimed: "We have saved the Ijekavian!"¹⁷ However, shortly after the meeting, the conclusions proved to be "very flexible and adaptable to different interpretations and became grounds for numerous misunderstandings and controversies."¹⁸ However, thanks to protests and references to the conclusions of the Novi Sad Agreement by the editor-in-chief of *Jezik*, Ljudevit Jonke, the traditional Croatian terminology was returned.¹⁹ Hamm, Hraste, Jonke in their text on the Joint shows of our radio stations state that radio stations with their joint shows, more than books, can bring Serbian texts closer to Croatian listeners and, vice versa, Croatian texts to Serbian listeners. Furthermore, they point out that the radio stations Belgrade, Zagreb and Novi Sad "violate the principle of equality of both pronunciations when broadcasting news from 8 pm to midnight" and continue that in "the most important show, Ijekavian listeners are getting used to Ekavian, and Ekavian listeners are deprived of the opportunity to get used to Ijekavian in the main spoken show."²⁰

Apart from radio stations, indicators of non-compliance with Novi Sad Conclusions were also visible in public transport, for example "trains of *Jugoslavenske zeleznice* prohibiting the use of toilets "za vreme bavljenja voza" at the station were running on Yugoslav railways. You could travel comfortably if you booked "sediste" in the compartment with "grejanje" and "osvetljenje".²¹

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Cf. NATAŠA BAŠIĆ, „Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika u povijesti hrvatskoga jezika i jezikoslovlja”, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. LXIV. (2017.) no. 1., p. 3.

²⁰ JOSIP HAMM – MATE HRASTE – LJUDEVIT JONKE, „Zajedničke emisije naših radio-stanica“, *Jezik*, vol. VI. (1957.) no. 4., p. 104.

²¹ Cf. MATE ŠIMUNDIĆ, „O ravnopravnosti jezika na željeznici”, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. XVIII. (1970.) no. 2., p. 60. – 61.: according to N, BAŠIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

Although the linguists were more numerous, among the Croatian participants in the Novi Sad Meeting were four (J. Hamm, M. Hraste, LJ. Jonke and S. Pavesić), along with three writers (M. Božić, M. Franičević and J. Kaštelan), Jonke was the only one among them interested in standard-language issues, so it is very likely that at the scene of the constant battle for the Croatian literary language he was usually alone. That “loneliness in the eyes of the other party made him a symbol of resistance to the imposition of own (of course, infallible) views on the Croatian or Serbian language”, as Samardžija points out, and “later a target targeted by many”, from “semi-literate anonymous”, “naughty” writers and unyielding experts to marginal experts, united in an effort to create their own chimera of the one and only, ready to, often without any consideration or civility, remove everything that stands in their way.”²²

In the historical struggle of Croatian linguists against the intentions of the Novi Sad Agreement and their consequences in language practice, certainly the most prominent person, according to Brandt, was Ljudevit Jonke, head of the Department of Croatian Language at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb and successor of Prof. Ivšić. This struggle was fought at public symposia, congresses of linguists, in magazines and newspapers, and also at the board of *Matica hrvatska*.²³

The magazine *Jezik* published the statements of the board of *Matica hrvatska* stating, among other things, that the Novi Sad Agreement proved “inappropriate to be the basis for establishing equal linguistic relations” because, as they further claim, it “turned into a means of justifying linguistic inequality and imposing of the Serbian literary language of the Ekavian type” and finally conclude that due to all the above, “*Matica hrvatska* renounces the Novi Sad Agreement, considering it pointless and invalid since the historical reality has already refuted it, just like

²² M. SAMARDŽIJA, *op. cit.*, p. 92

²³ Cf. JELENA HEKMAN (ed.), *Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika: grada za povijest Deklaracije*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 1997., p. 160.

the Vienna Agreement before it.²⁴ Ljudevit Jonke himself²⁵ stated that “*Matica hrvatska* has no choice but to focus on its own forces to resolve autonomously issues of the Croatian people and literary language.”²⁶

The Croatian Philological Society joined this statement, considering the Novi Sad Agreement “pointless and invalid” because it “incompletely and inaccurately reflects the language situation, so its formulation cannot be considered scientifically based.”²⁷

The Novi Sad Agreement was followed by turbulent periods in Croatian language history, followed by the *Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language* reactions, and finally the Croatian Spring. Kresimir Mićanović talks more about that, stating:

Opponents of the language policy based on the Novi Sad Agreement after the collapse of the Croatian Spring were ideologically disqualified, but it was no longer realistic (or it was no longer possible to create political pressure that was strong enough) to commit them to implement the Novi Sad Conclusions. The work on a unique literary language – as designed by the Novi Sad Agreement – definitely failed.²⁸

4. Review of the *Pravopis hrvatskosrpskoga književnog jezika, 1960*

Although the *Declaration* happened very soon after noticing the ineffectiveness of the Novi Sad Agreement, which will be discussed later,

²⁴ „Novosadski dogovor odbačen – Izjava Matice hrvatske“, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. XVIII. (1970.) no. 5., p. 138.

²⁵ In 1970, he was elected president by the assembly of *Matica hrvatska*. Cf. KREŠIMIR MIĆANOVIĆ, „Ljudevit Jonke na braniku hrvatskoga jezika“, *Vijenac*, Zagreb, br. 571., January 21, 2016.

²⁶ K. MIĆANOVIĆ, *op. cit.*

²⁷ „Novosadski dogovor odbačen – Zaključak Hrvatskoga filološkog društva“, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. XVIII. (1970.) no. 5., p. 138.

²⁸ KREŠIMIR MIĆANOVIĆ, „Jezična politika s kraja 60-ih i početkom 70-ih: u procijepu između autonomije i centralizma“, TVRTKO JAKOVINA (ed.), *Hrvatsko proljeće 40 godina poslije*, Centar za demokraciju i pravo Miko Tripalo – Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu – Fakultet političkih znanosti Sveučilišta u Zagrebu – Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb, 2012., p. 285.

it is important to point out Jonke's activity arising from the consequences of the mentioned agreement. Namely, he was engaged in about three projects arising from the meeting in Novi Sad: writing a common orthography, composing a dictionary and participation in the terminology commission. In the spirit of the Novi Sad Conclusions, *Pravopis hrvatskosrpskoga književnog jezika* in Latin and Ijekavian, and *Pravopis srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika* in Cyrillic and Ekavian, were prepared and published in 1960. Furthermore, a joint editorial board of Croatian and Serbian linguists started to compose a dictionary of the literary language of Croatian and Serbian, so the first two volumes of the dictionary were published in 1967 (from letters A to K), entitled *Rječnik hrvatskosrpskoga književnog jezika* in Latin and Ijekavian in Zagreb, and *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika* in Cyrillic and Ekavian in Novi Sad. These dictionaries were equally documented by examples from Croatian and Serbian writers, experts, etc. There was also formed a Yugoslav commission for the development of common terminology which decided not to equate, but to prescribe terms, emphasizing the terms more adequate for its function.²⁹

The publication of the *Pravopis* was greeted with enthusiasm, and Jonke was one of its stylists whose role was to acquaint the Croatian cultural public with the new orthographic solutions, especially those that represented a break with the previous Croatian orthographic tradition. On the occasion of its publication, Jonke stated the following:

But its appearance will be an important day in the development of the literary language of Croats, Serbs and Montenegrins. It stems from a proper understanding of the idea of brotherhood and unity of our peoples, and strengthens that idea. Some solutions, even duplicities, cease to be only Croatian or only Serbian, they become both Croatian and Serbian, they become our common solutions, just as our life in our socialist Yugoslavia.³⁰

²⁹ Cf. I. PRANJKOVIĆ, *Rasprave i članci...*, p. 207.

³⁰ LJUDEVIT JONKE, „Glavni zaključci pravopisne komisije”, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. V. (1957.) no. 3., p. 74.

In preparing the orthography of both then existing traditions, Broz and Boranić's among Croats and Belić's among Serbs, built on the same phonological principles, the newly established orthography commission, whose members were Jonke and Stevanović, faced numerous differences.

Jonke published a series of polemical articles on the subject in various newspapers of the former Yugoslavia. Namely, as Samardžija states, it is no coincidence that the most part of the Novi Sad Conclusions was formulated in such way that different interpretations of their "true meaning" began several months upon signing. For example, this is clearly evident from the polemical articles between Stevanović and Jonke (in the diary *Borba* M. Stevanović *Pred pristupanje ostvarenju Novosadskih zaključaka*, 19 April 1955; Lj. Jonke *Uoči provođenja novosadskih zaključaka*, 30 April 1955, and M. Stevanović *Novosadski dogovor prema odzivima na nj*, *Naš jezik*, VI, 5-6. and Lj. Jonke *Nekoliko riječi o odjecima novosadskog sastanka*, *Jezik*, IV., 104. – 108.)³¹ Among many polemics, those on writing the future tense I. stands out. Namely, Stevanović states and explains the opinion that the future tense of the verbs with the infinitive ending -ti, when immediately followed by the enclitic present of the auxiliary verb to want, is only a compound, not a complex verb tense. He actually defends Belić's solution and the attempt to implement it in a common orthography. On the other hand, Jonke refutes Stevanović's opinion, referring to the Croatian orthographic tradition from the 19th century, Maretić and confirmations from recent Croatian writers, concluding that future tense I is indeed a complex verb tense.³² Jonke also argued with Stevanović over the terms Croato-Serbian and Serbo-Croatian, believing that the first term means "the Ijekavian variant of the literary language as it was predominantly developed in Croatia" and the second, Serbo-Croatian, "the Ekavian variant of the literary language as it was predominantly developed in Serbia." Stevanović resolutely

³¹ Cf. MARKO SAMARDŽIJA, *Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika 1967.-2017.*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 2017., p. 300.

³² Cf. M. SAMARDŽIJA, *Ljudevit Jonke...*, p. 96.

claims that these terms are “objectively absolute synonyms.”³³ Ljudevit Jonke, now a bit tired of the long struggle over the position of language, states:

Certainly, given that our unitarians are so persistent and constantly repeat and impose their sweet but harmful theses, and given that Prof. Rašković is now the president of the Association of Slavic Societies of Yugoslavia, so the scope of his work is large, I think it’s time for Matica hrvatska, Croatian Philological Society, JAZU Language Institute, Croatian Writers’ Association to take care of the proper development of literary language in our country and in public. As I said, I am tired of carrying it on my shoulders and being subjected to so many insults, public and behind the scenes, even though my conscientious and selfless work did not deserve it.³⁴

Much was written about the repercussions of orthographic solutions and the consequences of printing the *Pravopis* after the Novi Sad Agreement, also in more recent times, for example, Natasa Basic states:

Considering that the *Pravopis* from 1960 already equated the Ekavian and (I)Jekavian pronunciations, with some solutions in favour of the Ekavian (*bezgresan modreti, ogrev, pogreska, prevod, prevoz, strelica*), as opposed to Jekavian norm (*bezgrjesan, modrejti, ogrjev, pogrjeska, prijevod, prijevoz, strjelica*), and left to the free choice of the writer, as well as the composed writing of the future I as a distinctive feature of Serbian orthographic heritage (*pisaću*), the Croatian standard language and orthographic norm was damaged at the very beginning, i.e. subordinated to the Serbian norm.³⁵

After publication of the above reference books, there was some joint orthographic activity, but only in the form of studying orthographic issues, without thinking about the possibility of joint development of a new one.³⁶

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

³⁴ LJUDEVIT JONKE, „U čemu je bit spora?“, *Telegram*, Zagreb, vol. VII., no. 309., April, 1 1966., p. 2.

³⁵ N. BAŠIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

³⁶ Cf. J. HEKMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

5. *Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language - reasons, paragraphs*

Namely, it is already pointed out that the Novi Sad Agreement justifiably declared the common linguistic basis of the Serbian and Croatian literary language without denying the historical, cultural-historical, national and political truth about the right of each nation to its own linguistic identity of national and cultural life. However, despite the clarity of these principles, certain inaccuracies in the formulations have allowed distortions and violations within the broader phenomena of turning into the reality of our social and economic life.³⁷ The socialist society of that time obliged them to take all necessary steps in the field of their activities - language, literature, science and culture in general - to realize in direct practice all the principles of, as they state, the socialist system.

Prior to the publication of the *Declaration*, a commission was formed to draft it, but it is not clear who were the members. Miroslav Brandt's text in the book on the *Declaration* (1967-1997) states:

Today opinions differ on who was in that commission, and the idea that there were seven members came from the circle of insufficiently informed people. But that has not been confirmed. And its composition is also controversial. It is undeniable that, beside me, the members were R. Katičić, T. Ladan, and Sl. Pavešić. As I found out subsequently, V. Pavlečić was also in it, and it is disputable whether S. Mihalić was also in it or not, he will know best. V. Blašković was not, although I believed it while writing for "Panorama" according to some indications. D. Brozović was by no means in the commission since at that time he was not a member of the central Board, nor did he live in Zagreb, but in Zadar.³⁸

Stjepan Babić also in the text *Kako smo pripremali Deklaraciju* states that seven members were elected to draft the text, but at that time he did not know about the seventh. They were: Miroslav Brandt, Dalibor Brozović, Radoslav Katičić, who signed with his own hand what they agreed on, Slavko Pavešić, Slavko Mihalić, Tomislav Ladan, the seventh

³⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 26.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

member was unknown.³⁹ It was later established that the seventh member in the room of *Matica* was Vlatko Pavletić. Babić further mentions the role of Ljudevit Jonke in the whole story about the *Declaration*:

If the adoption of the *Declaration* was a normal procedure for submitting amendments to the SFRY constitution, it would be understandable that one of the main figures was the main fighter for equality of the Croatian literary language, and not Brandt, the party secretary in MH, i.e. a political figure. Why Prof. Jonke wasn't involved from the beginning, I can't say.⁴⁰

However, Babić says that Miroslav Brandt sees the reasons for not including Jonke in the fact that he had great trouble due to the fight for the Croatian language, so they wanted to save him from even bigger ones, Dalibor Brozović shares the same opinion:

Today, it is understandable why Ljudevit Jonke and Stjepan Babić were not in the Commission, although it would be natural to appoint them to that Commission considering their position and function in matters of the Croatian language. One could speculate today about the reasons, but the fact was that these two, if things went wrong, should not have been endangered for various reasons, including the magazine *Jezik* that had to continue to be published.⁴¹

The paragraphs of the *Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language* were published in the *Telegram*, a Yugoslav newspaper for social and cultural events, year VIII, no. 359. – Zagreb, 17 March 1967. The first paragraph of the Declaration states:

On that basis, the signed Croatian cultural and scientific institutions and organizations consider it necessary:

³⁹ Cf. J. HEKMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

⁴⁰ STJEPAN BABIĆ, „Deklaracija – činjenice i pretpostavke”, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. LV. (2008.) no. 1., p. 17.

⁴¹ Stjepan Babić cites this text according to the content of the paragraph, which, as he states, is completely clear from the letters of M. Stevanović, Z. Milisavac and MH published in *Vjesnik* on 26.3. 1967. (S. BABIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 17.)

- 1) To establish a clear and unequivocal equality of four literary languages by a constitutional regulation: Slovene, Croatian, Serbian and Macedonian.

For this purpose, the wording of the SFRY Constitution, Article 131, should be amended, and should read as follows:

“Federal laws and other general acts of federal bodies are published in an authentic text in four literary languages of the people of Yugoslavia: Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Macedonian. In official communication, the bodies of the federation must adhere to the principles of equality of all languages of the peoples of Yugoslavia.” The rights of the languages of the peoples of Yugoslavia should be ensured by an adequate formulation.⁴²

The previous constitutional provision on “Serbo-Croatian or Croato-Serbian language” with its inaccuracy enables the two terms to be understood as synonyms, and this has happened in practice. As a concrete example the Conclusions of the Fifth Assembly of the Yugoslav Composers’ Association are cited. Thus, the signed institutions and organizations believe that in such cases the Croatian people are not represented and have been brought into an unequal position.⁴³

- 2) In accordance to the above requirements and explanations, it is necessary to ensure the consistent application of the Croatian literary language in schools, journalism, public and political life, on radio and television whenever the Croatian population is involved, and that officials, teachers and public workers, regardless of origin, officially use the literary language of the environment in which they work.

We submit this Declaration ⁴⁴to the Parliament of the SRH, the Federal Assembly of the SFRY and our entire public in order to unambiguously

⁴² „Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskoga jezika“, *Telegram*, Zagreb, vol. VIII, no. 359., 17 March 1967., p. 3.

⁴³ Cf. J. HEKMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

⁴⁴ Referring to: Matica hrvatska; Croatian Writers’ Association; PEN Club, Croatian Centre; Croatian Philological Society; Department of Philology of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts; Department of Contemporary Literature of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts; Institute of Language of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts; Institute of Literature and Theatrology of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts; Department of Contemporary Croatian-Serbian Language, Faculty of Philosophy in Zadar; Department of Contemporary Croatian-Serbian Language, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb; Department of History of the Croatian Language and Dialectology, FHSS in

formulate the stated principles during the preparation of the amendment of the Constitution and accordingly ensure their full application in our social life.⁴⁵

The *Declaration* was published, as stated, in the *Telegram* on 17 March 1967, thanks to Deputy Editor Slavko Mihalić, who refused to withdraw the text from printing.⁴⁶

Apart from participating directly or indirectly in its creation, they also gave their own review after being published, so Dalibor Brozović took the *Declaration* as a document that went down in history and will be taught in schools in the future in the same way as *Kratka osnova* of Ljudevit Gaj. In addition, it showed that Croatian people can organize resistance that, although broken at the time, tended to succeed one day.⁴⁷

Stjepan Babić considers the *Declaration* to be a “boundary between two periods” because it marks the end of one time and the beginning of another. Namely, immediately after being published, a shift occurred in the field of vocabulary. The words *tacka*, *tacno* and *tacnost* were abandoned, and with them other foreign words or words that had a Serbian character because the Croatian language flow went in the direction of Šulek, Dabac and Ladan.⁴⁸ Furthermore, there was a difference in the terminology of certain professions:

It was felt the most in the field of literary criticism and cultural journalism, so for example, *muzika* gave way to *glazba*, *kompozicija* to *skladba*, *kompozitor* to *skladatelj*, the word *tijek* spread rapidly, etc. It had such power that it started to penetrate into social and state area. *Fond za na-*

Zagreb; Department of Yugoslav Literature, Faculty of FHSS in Zagreb; Department of Older Croatian Literature, Faculty of FFSH in Zagreb; Department of Recent Croatian Literature, Faculty of FHSS in Zagreb; Institute of Linguistics, Faculty of FHSS in Zagreb; Institute for Literary Studies, FHSS in Zagreb; Old Church Slavonic Institute in Zagreb; Croatian Literary Translators Association.

⁴⁵ „Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju...“, p. 3.

⁴⁶ Cf. N. BAŠIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁴⁷ Cf. J. HEKMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

⁴⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 212.

ucni rad was replaced by *Fond za znanstveni rad*, even *saobracajna dozvola* was officially changed to *prometna dozvola*.⁴⁹

Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language clearly showed the following:

... where Serbs are targeting in the language area and Serbian transgressions were eye-opening for Croatian cultural workers in and around the language area thirty years ago, and then the Matica hrvatska the *Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language*, knowing that it has more importance than its cause. Although formally it was only a letter to the Federal Assembly to change the language formulation in the SFRY Constitution, this document was a resounding NO said by Croatian philologists and writers, first to themselves that they must not continue on the path of unitarism, that it should be stopped once and for all, then they clearly told the entire Croatian people that this path is disastrous for us, and then they said NO! to the Communist Party of SRC and SFRY, and finally to all Serbs. It was really a historical NO, a milestone in Croatian politics in general, and in Croatian language policy in particular.⁵⁰

March 1967 was not only stormy in Croatia upon the publication of the *Declaration*, but also in Serbia⁵¹ when a group of Serbian writers published the *Predlog za razmišljanje* as a kind of response to the *Declaration*.

By 20 April 1967 and the conclusions reached at VII Plenum of the Central Committee of the Croatian Communists, there was not a single day in Croatian newspapers, but also in the newspapers of “fraternal republics” without news of unanimous condemnations of the *Declaration* (sometimes along with it of the *Predloga za razmišljanje* as its “chauvinistic counterpart”)...⁵²

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 210.

⁵¹ Serbian historians also addressed this issue, so Slobodan Selinić publishes the article „Josip Broz Tito i sporovi oko jezika u Jugoslaviji 1967.“, *Istorija 20. veka*, Beograd, no. 1., 2017., p. 149. – 166.

⁵² M. SAMARDŽIJA, *Deklaracija...*, p. 309.

6. (Non) acceptance of the *Declaration*

Given the historical picture of the time, it is quite understandable that the *Declaration* was not accepted by the political system of the time. It is known that very soon after its signing, efforts were made to determine the individual political responsibilities of the initiators and signatories of the *Declaration*. Thus, for example, Vlatko Pavletić, one of the signatories of the *Declaration*, was excluded from the League of Communists. Furthermore, at the meeting of the Base Organization of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zadar, Dalibor Brozović was expelled from the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, and Franjo Švelec received a final warning. Miroslav Brandt, Ljudevit Jonke, Ivo Frangeš, Josip Pupačić and nine other members of the League of Communists were punished at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb.⁵³ Of course, the statements of the directors of the competent signatory institutions were also requested. As Ljudevit Jonke was the director of the Institute for Language of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts at the time, he stated the following: “The Institute received the text of the *Declaration* from *Matica hrvatska* and, after being deliberated from 13 to 15 March at the plenum of all the scientific staff of the Institute, the text has been read, discussed and adopted in its entirety and unanimously, according to the understanding expressed in the signatory’s statement of March, 25.”⁵⁴

Jonke, also the president of the Croatian Literary Translators Association, stated:

On 14 March the Association received a letter and the text of the *Declaration* from *Matica hrvatska*. As the decision was to be made on Wednesday (15 March), the Association did not have time to convene all its members at such short notice. Therefore, the board of the Association held a meeting on 15 March and the text of the *Declaration* was unanimously adopted.⁵⁵

⁵³ Cf. J. HEKMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

The events end of the 1960s were written about in all current newspapers, so the *Declaration* and the Serbian *Predlog za razmišljanje* were addressed primarily by the *Telegram* from Zagreb (which published the *Declaration*), *Vjesnik*, *Večernji list* and *Studentski list*, *Borba* and *Politika* from Belgrade, and *Oslobodenje* from Sarajevo.

The *Telegram*, under the title *Odgovornost članova Saveza komunističara*, published the sentences imposed on the members of the League of Communists who participated in the creation and acceptance of the *Declaration*. The text reads, among other things: “All the basic organizations of the League unanimously assessed the unusually harmful political consequences caused by the *Declaration* and emphasized the need for a mature communist attitude in considering the situation and drawing conclusions for future ideological action.”⁵⁶

Apart from the *Telegram*, other newspapers also condemned those events.⁵⁷ *Studentski list*, in addition to stating that without “real scientific argumentation it indicates that this document has primarily political significance”⁵⁸, published texts on punishing the signatories of the *Declaration* who were members of League of Communists.⁵⁹

Conclusion

After studying Jonke’s linguistic and political engagement, Pranjković’s (2015) claim that he was the most important figure in the field of

⁵⁶ „Odgovornost članova Saveza komunističara“, *Telegram*, Zagreb, vol. VIII., no. 362., 7 April 1967., p. 3.

⁵⁷ In the text of Josip Pavičić „Hajka bez premca – Kronologija“ (J. HEKMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 85. – 94.) are published the events of March and April 1967, centred on the *Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language*, composed mainly on the basis of newspaper writing

⁵⁸ *Studentski list*, vol. XXII., no. 10., March 28, 1967., p. 3. (M. SAMARDŽIJA, *Deklaracija...*, p. 185.)

⁵⁹ It is also stated that Miroslav Brandt, Ljudevit Jonke, Milan Mirić, Želimir Falout received final warnings, Ivo Frangeš, Josip Pupačić were reprimanded, Miroslav Vaupotić, Rafo Bogišić, Stanko Lasić, Nikola Milićević, Milan Moguš, Danilo Pejović, Dragutin Rosandić, Miroslav Šicel, Vojmir Vinja were warned. The University Committee of the League of Communists did not agree with the decisions of the base organizations. Namely, it was decided to exclude Miroslav Brandt, Ivo Frangeš, Ljudevit Jonke from the League, and Josip Pupačić and Miroslav Vaupotić received final warnings. „Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju...“, p. 93.

“applied standardology”, guided in his linguistic work by the principle “write as good writers write”, was confirmed once again. However, his linguistic work has always, especially in the 60s and 70s of the last century, been shrouded in a veil of political events, which will be especially evident in the period before signing the *Declaration*, during and after its publication. Although at that time he was the director of the Institute of Language of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts, surprisingly, he was not a signatory of the document, which was explained by Dalibor Brozović many years after. Namely, he notes that it is understandable why Ljudevit Jonke and Stjepan Babić were not in the Commission, although it would be natural to appoint them to that Commission considering their position and function in matters of the Croatian language. However, the fact was that these two, if things went wrong, should not have been endangered for various reasons, including the magazine *Jezik* that had to continue to be published. Unfortunately, all those who were engaged in the *Declaration* were punished or received a “final warning”, including Ljudevit Jonke himself.

Bibliography

- BABIĆ, STJEPAN, „Deklaracija – činjenice i pretpostavke”, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. LV. (2008.) no. 1., pp. 12. – 19.
- BAŠIĆ, NATAŠA, „Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika u povijesti hrvatskoga jezika i jezikoslovlja”, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. LXIV. (2017.) no. 1., p. 3. – 14
- „Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskoga jezika“, *Telegram*, Zagreb, vol. VIII., no. 359., 17 March 1967., p. 3.
- HAMM, JOSIP – HRASTE, MATE – JONKE, LJUDEVIT, „Zajedničke emisije naših radio-stanica“, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. VI. (1957,) no. 4., pp. 103. – 105.
- HEKMAN, JELENA (ed.), *Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika: građa za povijest Deklaracije*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 1997.

- JONKE, LJUDEVIT, „Glavni zaključci pravopisne komisije“, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. V. (1957.) no. 3., pp. 65. – 74.
- JONKE, LJUDEVIT, *Hrvatski književni jezik u teoriji i praksi*, Nakladni zavod Znanje, Zagreb, 1964.
- JONKE, LJUDEVIT, „U čemu je bit spora?“, *Telegram*, Zagreb, vol. VII., no. 309., April, 1 1966.
- JONKE, LJUDEVIT, *Hrvatski književni jezik 19. i 20. stoljeća*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 1971.
- MIĆANOVIĆ, KREŠIMIR, „Jezična politika s kraja 60-ih i početkom 70-ih: u procijepu između autonomije i centralizma“, JAKOVINA, TVRTKO (ed.), *Hrvatsko proljeće 40 godina poslije*, Centar za demokraciju i pravo Miko Tripalo – Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu – Fakultet političkih znanosti Sveučilišta u Zagrebu – Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb, 2012., pp. 271. – 291.
- MIĆANOVIĆ, KREŠIMIR, „Ljudevit Jonke na braniku hrvatskoga jezika“, *Vijenac*, Zagreb, br. 571., January 21, 2016.
- „Novosadski dogovor odbačen – Izjava Matice hrvatske“, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. XVIII. (1970.) no. 5., pp. 138.
- „Zaključak Hrvatskoga filološkog društva“, *Jezik*, Zagreb, vol. XVIII. (1970.) no. 5., pp. 138. – 139.
- PRANJKOVIĆ, IVO, *Rasprave i članci / Ljudevit Jonke*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 2015.
- *Pravopis hrvatskosrpskoga književnog jezika s pravopisnim rječnikom*, Matica hrvatska – Matica srpska, Zagreb – Novi Sad, 1960.
- SAMARDŽIJA, MARKO, *Ljudevit Jonke*, Zavod za znanost o književnosti Filozofskog fakulteta, Zagreb, 1990.
- SAMARDŽIJA, MARKO, *Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika 1967.- 2017.*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 2017.
- SKELINIĆ, SLOBODAN, „Josip Broz Tito i sporovi oko jezika u Jugoslaviji 1967“, *Istorija 20. veka*, Beograd, no. 1., 2017., p. 149. – 166.
- „Odgovornost članova Saveza komunista“, *Telegram*, Zagreb, vol. VIII., no. 362., April 7, 1967., p. 3.