

The Names of the Balkan Peoples and the Names of the Inhabitants of Balkan Countries in Lexicography (on the Example of the *Dictionary of Montenegrin National and Literary Language*)

Sanja Šubarić, *Faculty of Philology, University of Montenegro,
Nikšić, Montenegro (sanjas@ucg.ac.me)*

and

Jovana Đurčević, *Faculty of Philology, University of Montenegro,
Nikšić, Montenegro (jovanadj@ucg.ac.me)*

Abstract: Lexicography is yet another witness of the historic recurrence in the Balkans — fifty years after banning Miloš Moskovljević's *Dictionary of Contemporary Serbo-Croatian Literary Language with Language Manual* (1966), the distribution of the first volume of the *Dictionary of Montenegrin National and Literary Language* (2016) of the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts was stopped due to political reasons. Among other things, the representatives of the Albanian and Bosniak people in the Parliament of Montenegro demanded that the *Dictionary of Montenegrin National and Literary Language* be withdrawn due to the "offensive" and "discriminatory" definition of the terms *Albanian* and *Bosniak*. This has shown, once again, that Balkan ethnonyms and (or) demonyms have considerable weight in the descriptions of lexical material and that they can lead to the situation where politics defeats lexicography. That is why we will deal, primarily from a linguistic perspective, with the lexicographic definitions of ethnonyms and demonyms that are controversial in Montenegro. Starting from their foundation on ethnic or civic identity, we want to examine the possibilities and justification of the definition of these concepts bearing in mind the broader socio-political framework.

Keywords: ETHNONYM, DEMONYM, PEOPLE, INHABITANT, BALKANS, DICTIONARY, LEXICOGRAPHIC DEFINITION, REDEFINITION, ETHNIC IDENTITY, CIVIC IDENTITY

Opsomming: Die benamings van die Balkanvolke en die benamings van die inwoners van die Balkanlande in die leksikografie (met die *Dictionary of Montenegrin National and Literary Language* as voorbeeld). Die leksikografie is weereens 'n voorbeeld van die historiese herhalende gebeure in die Balkanlande — vyftig jaar nadat Miloš Moskovljević se *Dictionary of Contemporary Serbo-Croatian Literary Language with Language Manual* (1966), verban is, is die verspreiding van die eerste volume van die *Dictionary of Montenegrin National and Literary Language* (2016) van die Montenegrynse Akademie van Wetenskap en Kuns weens poli-

tieke redes gestaak. Die verteenwoordigers van die Albanese en Bosniese volke in die Parlement van Montenegro het onder andere daarop aangedring dat die *Dictionary of Montenegrin National and Literary Language* weens die "beledigende" en "diskriminerende" definisies van die terme *Albaniër* en *Bosniër* onttrek word. Dit het weereens getoon dat Balkan-etnionieme en (of) demoniemieme aansienlike invloed het op die beskrywings van leksikale materiaal en dat hierdie twee taalelemente tot die situasie kan lei waar die politiek die leksikografie die onderspit laat delf. Dit is waarom ons die leksikografiese definisies van etnionieme en demoniemieme wat kontroversieel in Montenegro is, hoofsaaklik vanuit 'n linguïstiese perspektief sal hanteer. Met hul basis van etniese en burgerlike identiteit as vertrekpunt wil ons die moontlikhede van en regverdiging vir die definisies van hierdie konsepte met inagneming van die groter sosio-politieke struktuur ondersoek.

Slutelwoorde: ETNONIEM, DEMONIEM, VOLKE, INWONER, BALKAN, WOORDEBOEK, LEKSIKOGRAFIESE DEFINISIE, HERDEFINISIE, ETNIESE IDENTITEIT, BURGERLIKE IDENTITEIT

1. Introduction

According to encyclopedic sources dating back to the times of the Yugoslav state, the geographical position of the Balkan Peninsula made this peninsula a "bridge and main road" between Europe and Asia. This explains the "ethnic mix, diversity of cultural and political influences, and turbulent history" of the Balkans (*Mala enciklopedija Prosveta, opšta enciklopedija*, 1 A-Lj: 119). The same sources emphasize that "Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Yugoslavia, European Turkey, and partly Romania" were formed as independent states in the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century, and that their "history is also the history of the Balkans" (*ibid.*). From today's perspective, it is certain that the last decade of the 20th century was marked by new military conflicts that paved the way for new inter-state border changes in the Balkans in the first decade of the 21st century.

The geographical map of the Balkans changed again on 21 May 2006, when Montenegro seceded from the state union with Serbia, which led to its international recognition. According to the results of the 2011 population census, Montenegro had 620,029 inhabitants belonging to different ethnic groups (Montenegrins, Serbs, Bosniaks, Albanians, Muslims, Croats, Roma, etc.).

According to Article 13 of the Constitution of Montenegro (Parliament of Montenegro 2007): "The official language in Montenegro is the Montenegrin language. The Cyrillic and Latin alphabets are of equal status. Serbian, Bosnian, Albanian, and Croatian are also in official use". This means that all four mutually intelligible national varieties of the once unified Serbo-Croatian language (Montenegrin, Serbian, Bosnian and Croatian) are in official use in Montenegro. However, Montenegro is characterized by a discrepancy "between national and linguistic declaration" (Bugarski 2018: 33). Although Montenegrins (44.98%) are more numerous than Serbs (28.73%) in Montenegro, the 2011 population census (Monstat 2011) shows that Serbian is spoken by 42.88% of the population,

and Montenegrin by 36.97%. Bosnian is the mother tongue of 5.33% of the population in Montenegro, where Bosniak is identified as the mother tongue by only 0.59% of the population. This implies that Bosniaks, who make up 8.65% of the population of Montenegro, predominantly call their language Bosnian. The census also shows that in Montenegro the Albanian language has a larger number of speakers (5.27%) in comparison to the number of inhabitants who declare themselves ethnically as Albanians (4.91%). The situation is different when it comes to Croatian — it is the mother tongue of 0.45% of the population, although Croats make up 0.97% of the population in Montenegro. The population census also showed that 2.03% of the population still call their language Serbo-Croatian, while 3.99% of the population did not want to declare with regard to this matter.

The complex situation with national and linguistic identity is also reflected in the educational system in Montenegro (for more on the problematic naming of subjects/courses in Montenegrin schools/faculties, see Šubarić 2018). Covering the "official language" (Montenegrin) and the languages in "official use" (Serbian, Bosnian and Croatian), a subject of instruction in Montenegrin schools was given a four-part name in 2011/2012: *Montenegrin-Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian language and literature*. However, the public university (University of Montenegro) offers only Montenegrin or Serbian (within separate study programs), with Montenegrin being the only general course in other study programs at the Faculty of Philology (foreign languages) from the academic year 2017/18. Unfortunately, linguists still strongly disagree on the matter of language standardization in spite of the fact that in 2009 and 2010 the Ministry of Education and Science of Montenegro helped standardize a Montenegrin language variety which (unlike Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian) has two additional phonemes and graphemes — *ś, ź*, recognizing, therefore, iotated forms that are unjustified from a systemic point of view. Many Montenegrin linguists do not agree with the normative variety of Montenegrin as it implies "archaization and dialecticization" (Bugarski 2018: 49).

The aim of this paper is to emphasize the importance of rethinking the lexicographic model that defines identity designations such as *Albanian* and *Bosniak*, but also the fact that correct lexicographic definitions of this type require the interdisciplinary overcoming of existing terminological and conceptual inconsistencies inherent in discussions about ethnic and/or national names. Linguistic confrontation with political attitudes towards the identity feelings of ethnic minorities in today's Montenegro showed that minorities feel they belong to both their home and domicile state, which is why they expect their double identity should also be recognized lexicographically.

2. *Rječnik crnogorskog narodnog i književnog jezika (Dictionary of Montenegrin National and Literary Language) and historic recurrence*

At the beginning of April 2016, the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts

(MASA) published the first volume of *Rječnik crnogorskog narodnog i književnog jezika* (*Dictionary of Montenegrin National and Literary Language* — henceforth DMNLL) on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the independence of Montenegro. However, members of the Albanian and Bosniak people demanded the withdrawal of the *Dictionary* due to (among other things) the "offensive" and "discriminatory" definition of the entries *Albanian* and *Bosniak*. On 9 June, 2016, a "performance" inappropriate for democratic societies of the 21st century took place in the hall of the Parliament of Montenegro — a member of the Albanian Alternative Party in the Parliament of Montenegro destroyed the *Dictionary* using a paper shredder machine. At the suggestion of the MPs of the Albanian parties, the Parliament of Montenegro adopted a *Resolution on the Dictionary of Montenegrin National and Literary Language* as early as 30 July, 2016. This adoption suspended not only the distribution of the *Dictionary* but, unfortunately, also further work on it.

At this point, we need to return to the past to remind that another lexicographical edition in the Balkans experienced a similar fate fifty years earlier. In 1966, Miloš Moskovljević's (1884–1968) *Rječnik savremenog srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika sa jezičkim savetnikom* (*Dictionary of Contemporary Serbo-Croatian Literary Language with Language Manual*) (55,000 words) was banned for political reasons. Moskovljević's *Dictionary* (as well as the DMNLL) "was anathematized and banned" (Sretenović 2008) in the same year when it was published. This was due to the negative attitude towards "socialism, [...] revolution and the establishment of socialism" (Ćorić 2008: 210). After the publication of the text by Mirko Tepavac, the then editor of the daily newspaper *Politika*, the Belgrade District Court decided to destroy the entire edition of the *Dictionary* because of only three or four words "that were disturbing for the Central Committee of Serbia" (*ibid.*). In an interview given on the occasion of the publication of the monograph *The Life and Work of Miloš Moskovljević, 1884–1968*, Dr. Momčilo Isić explained that Tepavac (in his text in *Politika* from March 6, 1966) found fault with Moskovljević's dictionary because the noun *Croat* was not given as a dictionary entry (Lakićević 2018). Nevertheless, Moskovljević's *Dictionary* had multiple editions — in 1990 and 2001.

Thus, half a century after banning Moskovljević's *Dictionary* on the territory of former Yugoslavia, history repeats itself showing, once again, that Balkan ethnonyms and (or) demonyms have considerable weight in the descriptions of lexical material and that they can lead to the situation where politics defeats lexicography. Although the edition was published by the leading research institution in Montenegro as a contribution to the modern state identity, the deputies of the Montenegrin Parliament perceived it as an attack on multi-ethnic and multi-confessional Montenegro and the collective feelings of certain minority peoples.

Lexicographic activities by MASA on the Montenegrin language were stopped one year after the publication of the first volume of the DMNLL. The first volume of the DMNLL included 12,018 entries — those starting with the

letters A, B, and V (the Cyrillic alphabet, therefore such an order). In the meantime, the MASA lexicographic team also prepared the second volume, which included lexemes beginning with G and D (10,015 entries), but this volume still has not seen the light of day. MASA's controversial publication, unfortunately, once again shed light on the ethnic, demographic and even linguistic polarization in Montenegrin society, and with the interference of the Montenegrin media, it divided the general public as well. This ultimately causes an unfortunate delay in the establishment of lexical norms in Montenegrin.

Owing to the situation with the DMNLL, and our experience as both an editor and a member of the Editorial Board of the DMNLL, we will present the definitions of the lexemes *Albanian* and *Bosniak* from this *Dictionary* and point out their semantic structure. Bearing in mind that these definitions are based on ethnic or civic identity, we will examine the possibility and justification of their redefinition in view of the wider socio-political framework. In that sense, we will analyze the lexicographic status of the terms *ethnonym* and *demonym*, as well as their grammatical or linguistic representation (in the editions published during the official use of the former Serbo-Croatian language, as well as modern editions of the languages that are now spoken in the area of former Serbo-Croatian — Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, Serbian, commonly abbreviated as BCMS). With this analysis, we want to contribute to a more stable theoretical position of both terms, but also to a better conceptual understanding of the names that this paper focuses on.

In that context, we will dwell on the semantic content of the lexemes *people* and *inhabitant*, and try to shed light on the relationship between *a member of a people* and *an inhabitant of a country* from the perspective of multi-ethnic countries. Given the offered models of their lexical descriptions, the lexicographic question will actually deal with the scope and priority of semantic components — is it ethnic or territorial, i.e. civic identity that has priority in defining these names? We will use data from the last population census in Montenegro (2011), which was carried out by the Statistical Office of Montenegro¹. According to the results presented, it is clear that national and ethnic affiliation are equated in the census, which is why we will here treat these concepts as synonymous, without any further distinction between national and ethnic communities, that is, national and ethnic identity² (see Korunić 2003).

3. Linguistic terms *ethnonyms* and *demonyms*³

The critics of DMNLL (including linguists) identified the names that we deal with in this article as *ethnonyms* in their public appearances and statements.

From the linguistic perspective, this topic therefore first requires raising the question — should names as *Albanian*, *Bosnian*, *Bosniak*, *Bulgarian*, *Greek*, *Montenegrin*, *Croat*, *Serb*, *Macedonian*, *Slovene* (and their feminine forms) be defined exclusively as *ethnonyms*?

Considering the status of the term *ethnonym* in the linguistic literature, its frequent identification with the term *demonym*, and the way(s) of their lexicographic representation, we will tackle the question by examining the terms *ethnonym* and *demonym*. We will look into their meaning and semantic distance in lexicographic manuals, as well as their usage in grammatical or linguistic literature primarily belonging to the area of the former Serbo-Croatian language. That is how, bearing in mind the semantic content of the lexemes in question, we want to point out the inconsistencies in their defining, their unjustified identification, as well as the actual broader semantic scope of the term *demonym* compared to its traditional interpretation. We will also address the theoretical inconsistencies related to the nominal status of words belonging to the category of ethnonyms and demonyms, which is why they are defined both as names (proper nouns) and as appellatives (common nouns)⁴. Taking into consideration the modern orthographic standards of the BCMS language (proper nouns are capitalized), we treat these specific words as proper names or proper nouns.

At this point, we want to present the terminological distinction that we use as a theoretical background for the following study: 1. **ethnonym** — the name ascribed to a people or a member of a people; 2. **demonym** — the name denoting the inhabitants of a particular territory; the name of a person whose origin is linked to a certain territory.

3.1 *Ethnonyms and demonyms in lexicographic publications*

The terms *ethnonym* and *demonym* do not have an equal status in onomastic and word-formation systems, and the same holds true for their lexicographic interpretations within different languages. Their unequal treatment can be confirmed in the available dictionaries of English and French⁵, as well as dictionaries of Serbo-Croatian or Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian (although the normativity of the standard language implies rules established by the orthography, grammar, and dictionary, the Montenegrin language still does not have a standard determined by the normative inventory of lexical material).

The close insight into the lexical descriptions of the above-mentioned terms in lexicographic publications of the former Serbo-Croatian language has shown the following.

Dictionaries of the Serbo-Croatian language (*Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika*; *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika*) only offer the entry *demonym*, which is, without terminological designation, defined as the name of inhabitants of a particular place or a country. This is also the case with the one-volume *Rečnik srpskoga jezika* (*Dictionary of the Serbian Language*).

Essentially, the entry *demonym* is treated in the same way in the dictionaries of the Bosnian language, as a term (Halilović, Palić and Šehović 2010) or as a word of general meaning (Jahić 2010). According to these dictionaries, *ethnonym* is not part of the lexicon of the Bosnian language. Furthermore, one of the dictionaries of Bosnian (*Rječnik bosanskog jezika* 2007) lacks both entries.

Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga standardnog jezika (*The Great Dictionary of the Croatian Standard Language*) has both entries — marked as linguistic terms — and defines them as follows: *demonym*, "a word derived from the name of a country, region, city or some other geographical term denoting its inhabitant", and *ethnonym*, "a name of an ethnic community, group or people". However, *Introductory comments* in this dictionary designate *demonym* as a word for "a member of a people or inhabitants", explaining further that these words are listed as part of the dictionary entry with the place name adjectives. In that way, the already presented semantic peculiarity of *demonyms* and *ethnonyms* as linguistic terms becomes problematic.

On that basis, we can note that the Croatian dictionary does not offer the names of the inhabitants of state territories as separate entries. Instead, the names of state territories are given within the passage interpreting a certain place name adjective (derived from the name of a territory), followed by male and female forms of the inhabitants of the given territory. A special lexical description is therefore missing. Hence, the names such as *Albanac*, *Albanka* (*Albanian*), *Crnogorac*, *Crnogorka* (*Montenegrin*), *Makedonac*, *Makedonka* (*Macedonian*) are qualified as "demonyms" but, quite unexpectedly, the same names or their plural forms⁶ as collective designations of ethnicity are not represented. According to the same principle, the entries *hrvatski* (*Croatian*) i *slovenski* (*Slovene*) are followed by the masculine and feminine forms of the demonyms *Hrvat*, *Hrvatica* (*Croat*), and *Slovenac*, *Slovenka* (*Slovene*), while the status of special lexical units is assigned to the forms *Hrvati* (*Croats*) and *Slovinci* (*Slovenes*) — plural forms are marked with the abbreviation *etn* — for the "specialized dictionary entry" of "ethnic communities (groups)".

The masculine and feminine forms *Bošnjak*, *Bošnjakinja* (*Bosniak*) are given the syntagmatic definition of "a member of a people", and they are also listed as part of the adjective entry *bošnjački* (*Bosniak*). In line with previous inconsistencies in the Croatian dictionary, the masculine and feminine forms *Srbin*, *Srpkinja* (*Serb*) are marked as "demonyms" within the entry *srpski*⁷ (*Serbian*), but *Srbi* (*Serbs*) has the status of a separate entry, denoting the name of a people.

Thus, although *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga standardnog jezika* (*Great Dictionary of the Croatian Standard Language*) differentiates between demonyms and ethnonyms as special lexical units or linguistic terms, the description of lexical material exclusively relies on demonyms — instead of the term *ethnonym*, the abbreviation *etn* is used or the descriptive identification — *a member of a people*. Bearing in mind certain segments of the specific edition, the general impression is that the semantic content of the terms *demonym* and *ethnonym* and the semantic difference between the *inhabitant of a state* – *a member of a people* are not consistently and adequately represented. On the other hand, it is surprising that *Hrvatska enciklopedija* (*Croatian Encyclopedia*) presents the terms *demonym* and *ethnonym* as synonymous.

Veliki rečnik stranih reči i izraza (*Dictionary of Foreign Words and Expressions*) by Klajn and Šipka (2007), defines an *ethnonym* as "the name of a people, a

member of a people", without labeling it terminologically. The demonym, on the other hand, is marked as a linguistic term denoting "inhabitants in relation to a particular populated place or a country". The same entries, however, cannot be found in *Rječnik stranih riječi (Dictionary of Foreign Words)* by Domović, Anić and Klaić (2001).

3.2 *Ethnonyms and demonyms in BCMS grammar books*

In the part reserved for noun formation, *Normativna gramatika srpskog jezika* pays special attention to the so-called *ethnic suffixes*, calling the derivatives formed by this type of suffix only as *demonyms* (Piper and Klajn 2013: 223). The primary definition of the term *demonym* is categorically inconsistent — "broadly speaking, demonyms do not only designate nationality but are also derived from the names of cities, countries, provinces, continents, etc." (ibid.). Based on such a formulation, it could be concluded that the noun *Crnogorac (Montenegrin)* is not derived from the two-part toponym *Crna Gora (Montenegro)* when it designates nationality (cf. Šimunović 2009: 201). Nevertheless, it can also be concluded that the noun *crnogorizacija (Montenegrization)* is a derivative belonging to demonyms. Evidently, the given definition not only neglects the semantic specificity of the terms *demonym* and *ethnonym* but also brings into question the terminological and use value of ethnonyms.

In *Gramatika bosanskoga jezika* (Jahić, Halilović and Palić 2000: 314, 150), *demonyms* are defined as nouns denoting ethnic or geographical affiliation, namely "belonging to a place, people, country, etc." The semantic value of the concept *demonym* includes, therefore, what belongs to the concept *ethnonym*.

The term *demonym* is also present in *Hrvatska gramatika* (Barić et al. 2005) in a chapter dealing with noun formation/suffixation. It is semantically identified as "a word designating the inhabitant of a settlement, region, country, continent, or the appellative for men or women in relation to where they come from" (Barić et al. 2005: 313)⁸.

Gramatika crnogorskoga jezika deals with the word-formation of "nouns referring to the inhabitants and members of a people/country" (Čirgić, Pranjković and Silić 2010: 141, 144), but their terminological naming by means of internationalisms of Greek origin (*demonyms – ethnonyms*) is missing.

The above-mentioned grammar books of the BCMS language show, therefore, that none of them identifies the nouns designating "members of a people" as ethnonyms — instead, such meaning is attributed to demonyms in the grammar books of Serbian and Bosnian.

3.3 *Ethnonyms and demonyms in onomastic descriptions*

The fact that the names of peoples and inhabitants are neglected from a theoretical perspective is expressed in the manual of lexicology by Šipka (2006).

Regardless of the time of publication and the linguistic circumstances at the time, the manual was made with the aim of "building a coherent and simple model of a general and Serbo-Croatian lexicon" (Šipka 2006: 7). In the chapter dedicated to onomastics as a "highly autonomous lexicological discipline" that is focused on the proper names, ethnonyms and demonyms are not identified as onomastic categories (Šipka 2006: 141-149, 245).

On the other hand, in support of the frequent semantic differentiation of the terms *ethnonym* and *demonym* in the Croatian scientific context, we will mention *Uvod u hrvatsko jezikoslovlje* by Šimunović (2009). Ethnonyms and demonyms are singled out and defined in this truly unique contribution to the onomastics of Slavic languages as special anthroponymic categories in a separate subsection (5.2.4). Their definitions are, however, more precisely given in the previous part of the book (Šimunović 2009: 75): *demonym* — "the name of the inhabitant of a place, region", *ethnonym* — "the name of a people, nationality, ethnic group".

To a certain extent, Šimunović's interpretation of demonyms and ethnonyms is in accordance with his view that "the singular form of demonyms and ethnonyms has the characteristics of appellatives instead of names, although they retain some features of proper names in terms of their associative content," that is, their singular form does not identify a person as an individual but as a member of a particular collective/group (Šimunović 2009: 200-201) (cf. also Peti 1997). Šimunović (2009) also defines demonyms as "names" when they designate a particular "inhabitant of a place". Contrary to that, he (*ibid.*) does not define an ethnonym as a separate designation — as a name of a member of "a particular ethnicity/people/nationality". With regard to his definition of ethnonyms, we need to point out the (previously mentioned) theoretical disagreements in the interpretation of the nominal status of ethnonyms and demonyms (proper or common nouns), which is the reason why different lexicographic editions of Serbo-Croatian and BCMS offer different grammatical forms of ethnonyms: plural nominative naming ethnos as a group (*Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika* (*Dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian Literary Language*), *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga standardnog jezika*⁹ (*Great Dictionary of the Croatian Standard Language*, etc.)) or singular nominative naming a member of a particular ethnos (e.g. *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika* (*Dictionary of Serbo-Croatian Literary and Vernacular Language*), *Rečnik srpskoga jezika*¹⁰ (*Dictionary of the Serbian Language*), *Rječnik crnogorskog narodnog i književnog jezika* (*Dictionary of Montenegrin National and Literary Language*, etc.)).

Based on the above-mentioned, it can be concluded that the term *demonym* has a longer tradition than *ethnonym* and, therefore, a more stable theoretical position in the linguistic literature of the former Serbo-Croatian language: it always appears as a lexical unit in dictionaries, and mainly as a category of word-formation in current grammar books. Although their lexicographic definitions are generally homogenous, demonyms often have incomplete definitions (they are explained as words denoting people in relation to their residence, not origin).

However, from the perspective of word formation (dominantly incomplete in the previous sense) they are sometimes interpreted as ethnonyms in terms of their semantic content. The internationalism *ethnonym* is unjustifiably absent from most of the consulted lexicographic editions, and its terminological value is neglected in the word-formation classifications of nouns in BCMS or descriptions of their grammatical systems.

On the basis of a broader insight into the literature related to the former Serbo-Croatian language, and considering the editions consulted in this article, it can be concluded that the terminological delineation of the terms *ethnonym* and *demonym* has a relatively stable theoretical status in the Croatian literature — they have the status of autonomous linguistic units, and they are lexicographically defined and categorically positioned in the onomastic system. However, the lexical descriptions of the modern Croatian language show us that a theoretical demarcation is not always easily presented in lexicographic practice.

Considering the above, we can conclude that defining *ethnonyms* and *demonyms* as linguistic terms should be established and consistent (in dictionaries, grammar books, and onomastic descriptions). Ethnonyms should not be reduced to collective designations (peoples), because they also designate individuals as members of a collective (a people). As for demonyms, on the other hand, their definition should not exclude the territorial affiliation based on origin as these names identify individuals in relation to a particular place — the place of residence or origin. In the continuation of the paper, we will show that considering certain political and legal resolutions, their semantic content is wider.

3.4 The relationship between the terms *a people / a member of a people* — *an inhabitant of a country* from the perspective of multi-ethnic countries

Observing the terminological peculiarities of the internationalisms *demonym* and *ethnonym* as they are mainly presented in linguistic literature and dictionary editions, we will also dwell on the lexicographic definitions and semantic content of the concepts *a people* and *an inhabitant*.

As a lexical unit, the noun *narod* (a people) has several meanings. In accordance with our topic, we will only interpret the meaning identified as primary in lexicographic definitions. It is according to the primary meaning that this noun refers to a large community of people "with the same ethnic name", formed usually "on the shared origin, language, territory, tradition, culture, religion, social life, etc." (*Rečnik srpskoga jezika* 2007). Given the previously explained interpretations of the terms *ethnonym* and *demonym*, our impression is that their interpretations do not always take into account the semantic specificity of the concepts *a people*, *nation*, *nationality*. The fact that they (and other concepts related to them) are not terminologically differentiated can be proved by the results of the last population census in Montenegro, which showed that national affiliation and ethnic affiliation were perceived as one thing ("national or ethnic affiliation"¹¹) (Monstat 2011). Although the relation-

ship between *a people* and *a nation* is perceived as a complex one in the literature of various social disciplines, the space constraints of the article limit the discussion thereof. Certainly, these are not categories of the same value for social science experts, and the modern age has shed light on their political and legal distinction. It is also certain, however, that lexical descriptions of their meanings are often confused (see the entry *nation* in Vujaklija 2007), or that the dichotomy of *a people* – *a nation* does not have a precise lexicographic form (cf. *Rečnik srpskoga jezika* 2007), and is not, therefore, consistently present in the definition of individual identity designations. In that context, it is important to say that adequate semantic demarcation of the concepts of *a people* and *a nation*, from today's perspective, is important for lexicographic interpretations of the individual names of peoples or nations, but also that correct interpretations of that kind can be expected only after modern social sciences solve conceptual and terminological problems that usually follow discussions of "ethnic and national identity" and social identity in general (see Korunić 2003: 163).

Unlike the lexeme *people*, the lexical scope of the noun *inhabitant* is unambiguous and defined as *a person who is permanently or temporarily residing somewhere*.

The semantic interpretation of the lexeme *people* and *inhabitant* also raises the question of the distinction between the name of a people from the name of the inhabitants of a country, considering that the members of the people who have their own country are mostly the inhabitants of that country.

The statement that a member of a people is the same as "a resident of the country (if one refers to it as a state)" (Vuković 2007: 172; cf. 173-174) is not realistic from the perspective of demographic reality and multi-ethnic states. In fact, the given claim is denied by the fact that representatives of different peoples usually live in one state, but also that certain peoples do not have their own state territory. This claim can be opposed with data on the "national, or ethnic affiliation" of the Montenegrin population according to the 2011 census. Of the total population (620,029), 44.98% are Montenegrins, 28.73% Serbs, 8.65% Bosniaks, 4.91% Albanians, 3.31% Muslims, 1.01% Roma, 0.97% Croats, 0.15% Macedonians, 0.15% Russians, and 0.07% Bosnians. Interestingly, some declared themselves as Yugoslavs (0.19%), but there were also people declared as Serbs–Montenegrins, Montenegrins–Serbs, Muslims–Bosniaks, Bosniaks–Muslims, Muslims–Montenegrins, and Montenegrins–Muslims.

4. Lexemes *Albanian* and *Bosniak* in the DMNLL

In societies with a diverse ethnic/national mosaic, the reality is heavily burdened with collective feelings. What best confirms this is the question addressed to the MASA after the publication of the first volume of the DMNLL — "Does MASA advocate ethnically pure states when it defines ethnonyms according to the state they allegedly come from?"¹² (Čirgić 2016: 788). It could be concluded that such a question resulted from the lexicographic definitions of the entries

*Albanian, Austrian, Bosnian, Bosniak, Bulgarian*¹³ and their feminine forms in Montenegrin. However, in the case of the DMNLL, both professionals and laymen problematized only the definition of the entries *Albanian* and *Bosniak*.

The lexeme *Albanian* in the DMNLL is defined as "an inhabitant of Albania; one having their origin from Albania" (see Appendix A). The same type of definition is also used for the forms such as *Bosnian, Bulgarian, etc.*

When it comes to the lexeme *Bosniak*, two meanings are identified: "1. A member of the Bosniak people, a Muslim who lives in Bosnia or one having their origin from Bosnia 2. A member of the South Slavic people who are followers of Islam, mainly residing in Bosnia" (ibid.) (see Appendix B).

The gender-specific word pairs are defined in the same way: Albanac – Albanka (Albanian), Bošnjak – Bošnjakinja (Bosniak) or Bosanac – Bosanka (Bosnian), and Bugarin – Bugarka (Bulgarian), etc.

Unlike *Bosniak*, the entry *Albanian* is defined as a demonym in the DMNL *Dictionary* (both categories — inhabitants and origin imply geographic affiliation). However, the same dictionary does not define the lexeme *Albanian* as an ethnonym. It is evident that the lexicographic content in question lacks a part which identifies the Albanian people as a cultural-historical category or a part by which nationality is primarily determined on the basis of perceived origin — on the so-called spiritual level, i.e. as a member of something "which is only a concept in linguistics" (Vuković 2007: 174). In that sense, it can be concluded that the lexicographic description is not complete. On the other hand, the noun *Albanian* as a derivative representing demonym (based on its constituent elements) has a proper definition from a linguistic perspective — this is confirmed by the ways in which word formation is treated in the grammatical literature of the BCMS language. In that regard, it is worth mentioning that the lexeme *Albanian* is, for example, defined in the DMNLL in the same way as in *Fjalor i shqipes së sotme (Dictionary of Modern Albanian)* of the Albanian Academy of Sciences and Arts (2002). Although perfectly aware of that, Albanian politicians in Montenegro remained resolute that the DMNLL definition was discriminatory.

Political representatives of the Albanian and Bosniak people in Montenegro, but also some linguists, indicated strong disapproval of the definitions of *Albanian* and *Bosniak* in the *MASA Dictionary* because they did not recognize these two peoples as autochthonous constituents of Montenegrin society, and according to Albanian politicians, the definition of *Albanian* lacked yet another important segment — the fact that "Albania is the mother country of all Albanians, wherever they live" (*Cafe del Montenegro* 2016). After the publication of the DMNLL, political interpretations of the problematic definitions emphasized the fact that these are minority peoples who represent an autochthonous part of Montenegrin society, but that Montenegro is not their mother country. Regardless of the political and legal scope of the concept *mother country*, it is certain, however, that the linguistic scope of defining an *Albanian* as "a person of Albanian origin" does not exclude the sense of belonging of Albanians born

in Montenegro to Albania as their home country. Exactly the same feeling is present in the definition in the *Dictionary of Modern Albanian*. In this regard, it is important to understand the lexeme *origin*: its semantic content implies *belonging or background of a person acquired by birth – belonging to a family, nation, state, class, etc.* In this case, it would imply belonging to a country acquired by ethnicity, not by place of birth.

Unlike the noun *Albanian*, as we have shown, the entry *Bosniak* in the DMNLL is primarily a designation of ethnic-religious identity; its "spiritual" dimension is partially visible in the geographical designation, and its semantic content is interpreted similarly in *Rječnik bosanskoga jezika*¹⁴ (Halilović, Palić and Šehović 2010). Thus, the DMNLL does not primarily link the lexeme *Bosniak* with the meaning derived from its form, based on which Jahić (2020) sees it as an ethnic designation semantically identical with the form *Bosanac* (*Bosnian*) and *Bošnjanim*, *Bošnjanim* ("formed from the root *Bos-* and the South Slavic suffix *-(n)jak*").

In relation to Jahić's interpretation, it is now interesting to look at the fact that in *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika* (*Dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian Literary Language*) (1967–1976), a synonymous definition is given for the entry *Bošnjak* (*Bosniak*) – "a. *Bosanac*" (*Bosnian*), whereby the lexeme *Bosanac* (*Bosnian*) is explained as "a person from Bosnia". In fact, according to the lexicographic interpretation of the time, these two lexical units designated spatial affiliation to the "province of Bosnia" instead of ethnic/national affiliation (that is why they are offered in the singular form, unlike other peoples of Yugoslavia – *Macedonians*, *Slovenes*, *Serbs*, *Croats* and *Montenegrins*, who were represented in the plural form¹⁵). The modern perspective sheds light on the "socio-historical principle" (Ristić 2006: 97), which is why the same dictionary marks the secondary meaning of the noun *Bosniak* — "a Muslim from Bosnia" as "obsolete" — therefore, a component of the current semantic content of the lexeme *Bosniak* (see *Bošnjak* in the *Rečnik srpskoga jezika* 2007) was *out of date* (*no longer in use*) in the seventies of the XX century.

Although renominations and lexical redefinitions reflect the functioning of language in a certain social environment, a linguistic fact cannot be ignored in this particular case — the country of Bosnia makes "the formal and semantic basis" of the name *Bosniak* (Jahić 2020). Lexical description of the entry *Bosniak* should thus be based on it, regardless of the demographic profile of a certain area.

Concerning the lexical definition of the lexeme *Bosniak* in the DMNLL, we have linguistic responsibility to pay attention to the elements that were ignored by the critics of the *Dictionary*: the semantic components reflecting the inclusion or hyponymic relationship are represented as different — the meaning of a *Bosniak* as a "member of the Bosniak people" is singled out as the primary and special one compared to the meaning expressing a *Bosniak* as a "member of the South Slavic people ...". In doing so, the principle of a circular definition was applied: the entry *Bosniak* is defined with the relative adjective *bošnjački* (*Bosniak*) which has a grammatical definition ("relating to *Bosniaks*") and whose

lexical meaning should be revealed by the definition of the basic word — *Bosniak*. Circular lexicographic definitions are, however, also present in the analysis of this type of entry in the other contemporary lexicographical editions. For example, *Rječnik bosanskog jezika (Dictionary of the Bosnian Language)* (2007), defines the lexeme *Bošnjak (Bosniak)* by the adjective *bošnjački (Bosniak)* – as a "member of the Bosniak nation" (cf.: adj. *Bosniak* – "relating to Bosniaks"). Although the specific definition does not convey the specifics of the Bosniak people, the ethnic/national feelings of their members were not hurt — or the reactions were not recognized.

4.1 Designations of national and territorial affiliation and their political-legal contextualization in Montenegro

We believe that the criticism of the given lexicographic definitions needs to be contextualized with the following data.

Unlike the *Constitution* from 1992, which designates Montenegro as the national state of the Montenegrin people, the *Constitution* from 2007 (the latest one) defines Montenegro as a civic state, in which the bearer of sovereignty is the "citizen with Montenegrin citizenship", and the preamble of the *Constitution* stipulates that "Montenegro is inhabited by Montenegrins, Serbs, Bosniacs, Albanians, Muslims, Croats and the others who are committed to democratic and civic Montenegro"¹⁶. The current constitution, therefore, does not define Montenegro as a national state of Montenegrins (not even in the preamble of the above-mentioned nations); it is the "multinational state" or "national neutrality" (Stojanović 2021: 94) that is set as one of its basic principles. Of course, all residents of Montenegro with Montenegrin citizenship are Montenegrins: even if they are not part of the Montenegrin people, they are Montenegrins according to their civic identity — and their demonym is *Montenegrins*. In other words, all Montenegrins as citizens of Montenegro do not belong to the majority of Montenegrin people. Namely, Serbs, Bosniaks, Albanians, Muslims, Croats, etc. are members of ethnic groups in Montenegro and are united with the Montenegrin people by the demonym *Montenegrins*. However, as shown by the interpretations given within the 2011 population census, the demonym *Montenegrin* also belongs to foreign citizens and stateless persons with permanent or temporary residence in Montenegro (Monstat 2011). Even more broadly, the demonym *Montenegrin* also belongs to the foreign citizens who live outside of Montenegro but who have obtained Montenegrin citizenship (eg, so-called economic citizenship obtained by investing money in the local economy). This actually suggests that the contemporary meaning of demonyms (designating territorial affiliation) is actually broader in comparison to its constituent elements that we first presented. The demonym *Montenegrin*, for example, does not only designate a person who lives in Montenegro (with or without Montenegrin citizenship) and one having their origin from Montenegro — it also

designates an individual with Montenegrin citizenship who does not live in Montenegro.

In view of the consequences that followed after the publication of the first volume of the DMNLL (2016), and for the sake of the future lexicographic activities in Montenegro, a question needs to be addressed — does the concept of Montenegro as a civic state imply that civic identity has priority over ethnic identity in lexicographic descriptions of the designations such as *Montenegrin*, *Serb*, *Bosniak*, *Albanian*, *Muslim*, *Croat*, etc.? The affirmative answer would imply that these names are primarily identified as demonyms — designating the inhabitants of the state territory they are named after (if they are derived from the name of a particular state territory) / designating the individuals who come from that territory / designating citizens of Montenegro — which also implies the harmonization of linguistic and non-linguistic criteria in the arrangement of their components of meaning, and then as ethnonyms — as names of peoples specified linguistically (language family) and geographically (home country). With such a model, minority ethnic communities would (in line with their expectations after the publication of the DMNLL) be identified both according to the domicile and home country. In that sense, however, Muslims and Serbs in Montenegro should be given special lexicographic attention. For Montenegrin Muslims (unlike Albanians, Bosniaks and Croats), Montenegro is their "only homeland" and "their mother tongue is Montenegrin" (Tomović 2011). On the other hand, Serbs in Montenegro are divided when it comes to their home state (Serbia/Montenegro), which is yet another confirmation that the ethnic peculiarities of the Balkans are difficult to include in lexicographic models of national and territorial affiliation.

Concerning the ethnic image of Montenegro, we need to add that the last census (2011) in Montenegro showed that 427 persons (0.07% of the population) identified themselves as *Bosanci* (*Bosnians*). In theory, however, this particular name should not be identified with national identity as it belongs to the political and legal framework and as such exclusively refers to the identity of the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This type of divergence represents precisely one of the issues and topics within the sphere of social sciences, and lexicographic descriptions depend on the interpretations in this field. On the other hand, the political-legal simplification of the name *Bosnian* as a designation of exclusively civic identity is contrary to philological or linguistic interpretations which emphasize that in linguistic terms "there is no difference" between the designations *Bošnjak* (*Bosniak*) and *Bosanac* (*Bosnian*), or *Bošnjakin*, *Bošnjak*, *Bošnjak* and *Bosanac* as they all "stem from *Bos-*, designating the specific Bosnian space, country and its historical, cultural and linguistic being" (Jahić 2020). In light of this divergence, lexicography faces an important question — how to overcome the disparity of linguistic and political-legal interpretation of certain linguistic designations, as well as the fact that collective identity feelings in the Balkans cannot always fit into the theoretical framework of the social sciences. While answers to this type of question require interdisciplinary engagement, lexico-

graphic definitions of ethnic/national identity designations (based on the meaning of their constituent elements) presuppose both political and legal basis and demarcation of certain conceptual categories.

5. Conclusion

Although the problematic definitions from the DMNLL are more or less standard in dictionaries of other languages of the Balkans and monolingual dictionaries of world languages, it is obvious that today's situation in the Balkans imposes their reconsideration and redefinition. The DMNLL has shown that Balkan societies are "still heavily burdened by collective feelings" (Vukčević 2015: 20), which is why the lexical description of the names of Balkan peoples and the names of the inhabitants of Balkan countries is a very sensitive issue that requires careful examination by experts from various fields. After the publication of the DMNLL, dictionary ethnic and civic identifications were not within the framework of objective scientific postulates and lexicographic principles and were generally "defined" by the media coverage of politicians who articulated the collective feelings of their voters. Nevertheless, Montenegrin lexicography is confronted with specific expectations of unsatisfied ethnic/national groups — their collective identity feelings are based on their affiliation to both the "domicile" and "mother country".

Aware of the complex identity issue that stopped the lexicographic endeavors of the highest-ranking scientific institution in Montenegro, this article has tried to present the issues that exceed linguistic competencies and are important for the establishment of a proper model for the lexicographic definitions of the identity designations — a model that would reflect what is known as an ideal type of identity in the sociological literature (the identity that includes ethnic-cultural and territorial-political/civic elements). Certainly, such a model of the definition implies a difference between categories *a member of a people* and *an inhabitant of a country*, but our study has shown that it should also include the category of *a citizen of a country* (as citizenship is a legal relationship that is not exclusively conditioned by the place/country of residence). Along with the precise and consistent linguistic demarcation of the terms *ethnonym* and *demonym*, the definition should also be expanded to include demonyms as a derivative motivated by the name of a country (a person who belongs to a particular country as a place of residence, origin, or citizenship — regardless of the place of residence). Apart from raising important questions and offering insights for further research, this article has also demonstrated that linguistics needs to be complemented by other disciplines when it comes to the lexicographic descriptions of the Balkan names and the priority of their semantic components. It is only the interdisciplinary engagement that can, therefore, solve issues of this kind and prevent any potential negative reactions to future lexical descriptions.

Endnotes

1. [https://www.monstat.org/userfiles/file/popis2011/saopstenje/saopstenje\(1\).pdf](https://www.monstat.org/userfiles/file/popis2011/saopstenje/saopstenje(1).pdf), accessed on July 17, 2022.
2. At this point, we need to remind that different social science theories distinguish between two types of nations — *ethnic* (*Eastern, German, cultural*) and *civic* (*Western, French, political, state*) models of the nation. According to this classification, the geographical area of Central and Eastern Europe is characterized by an ethnic model — a nation is an ethnos, representing a community with a shared cultural heritage, ancestry, history, and tradition. Unlike the civic model (Western Europe, the USA), where the concept of nation is equated with the state and its territory (nationality = citizenship), the ethnic model is centered around the national community: "the state also includes national minorities that do not constitute a nation", which is why "terms *nation* and *state* are not synonymous" (Nedeljković 2007: 19; cf. Tamir 2019; see also Bugarski 2018: 16). However, in addition to ethnic and civic models of the nation, some theoreticians also recognize "plural" type of nation/nationalism (Smith 2003: 215).
3. Instead of the term *ethnic*, here we use the term *demonym* because the English noun *ethnic* refers only to a member/person belonging to an ethnic group, not also to the residents of a particular territory (or a state).
4. For the dichotomy "ime – naziv" in BCMS, here we use the dichotomy "name – appellative" (which is grammatically analogous to the dichotomy between proper nouns and common nouns/appellatives).
5. The semantic content of the terms *etnonim* and *etnik* in the BCMS language is expressed in English with the forms *ethnonym* and *demonym* (*Merriam-Webster* and the OED defines both terms, *Cambridge Dictionary* defines only the term *demonym*. Cf. in French: *etnique* ("3. linguistique"): *Dictionnaire de L'Académie Française*.
6. Ethnonyms are given in their plural form (plural nominative) in this *Dictionary* (discussed further in the following text). However, the names of the Balkan peoples as separate entries are selectively represented: e.g. *Croats*, *Slovenes*, and *Serbs*, for example, have the status of an entry, but that is not the case with *Montenegrins*, *Bosniaks*, *Macedonians*, *Albanians*, *Greeks*, *Bulgarians* ...
7. The entry *srpski* (*Serbian*) includes the masculine and feminine forms *Srbin*, *Srpkinja* (*Serb*), but the official name of the state associated with the demonym is missing. Based on the qualification of the forms *Srbin*, *Srpkinja* (*Serb*) as a demonym, it can be assumed they are semantically equivalent to the demonyms *Srbijanac*, *Srbijanka* (*Serb*) — although such semantic equivalence is not specified (cf. *srpski* with *srbijanski* and *hrvatski*).
8. In comparison to other similar publications, only this grammar book defines demonyms and as words designating people according to their origin.
9. For example: *Slovinci* (*Slovenians*) "ethn South Slavic peoples mainly living in today's Slovenia ..."
10. For example: *Slovenac* (*Slovenian*) ... "a member of the Western group of South Slavic peoples mainly living in today's Slovenia".
11. The form *or*, in this case, has the meaning of an explicative word — *to be precise, namely* ... (some linguists believe that usage is wrong; cf. Klajn 2009: 183 and *Dictionary of the Serbian Language* 2007).

12. Although the question was signed by a linguist, we cannot ignore its imprecision — the definitions here do not identify the origin/etymology of ethnonyms; instead, they identify the origin and/or civic affiliation of the bearers of the concrete names. It is also obvious that the terminological, semantic and lexicographic value of demonyms is neglected by the question.
13. Although the linguistic difference between ethnonyms and demonyms was ignored in the question addressed to the MASA, we have left out the determinants *American, African, Australian, Balkan* (represented in Volume I of the DMNLL because they are lexemes whose basic meaning exclusively designates territorial affiliation).
14. In the Bosnian dictionary, this part of the lexical description is marked with the abbreviation *etn.* — according to the *Dictionary List of Abbreviations, etn.* refers to the noun *etnik* (BCMS word for a *demonym*) or adjective *etnički* (*ethnic* in BCMS). The same dictionary does not define Bosniaks as members of the Islamic religion: "2. *etn.* A member of the South Slavic people, mostly settled in Bosnia and Herzegovina."
15. Muslims received the status of one of the constituent nations in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1971, although they already had an entry (singular form) designating a member of a people in the III volume of the same dictionary in 1969.
16. Clearly, the Roma are not recognized in the preamble (1.01% of the total population).

References

Dictionaries and encyclopedias

- Akademia e Shkencave e Shqipërisë.** 2002. *Fjalor i shqipes së sotme*. Tiranë: Instituti i Gjuhësisë dhe i Letërsisë, Botimet Toena.
- Cambridge Dictionary.* 2022. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>. Accessed on July 17, 2022.
- Dictionnaire de L'Académie Française.* 2022. <https://www.dictionnaire-academie.fr/>. Accessed on July 17, 2022.
- Merriam-Webster.* 2022. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>. Accessed on July 17, 2022.
- Domović, Ž., Š. Anić and N. Klaić.** 2001. *Rječnik stranih riječi*. Belgrade: Evro.
- Halilović, S., I. Palić and A. Šehović.** 2010. *Rječnik bosanskoga jezika*. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet u Sarajevu.
- Hrvatska enciklopedija, mrežno izdanje.* <http://www.enciklopedija.hr/>. Accessed on July 17, 2022.
- Institut za jezik.** 2007. *Rječnik bosanskog jezika*. Sarajevo: Institut za jezik.
- Jahić, Dž.** 2010. *Rječnik bosanskog jezika 2 (D–F)*. Sarajevo: Bošnjačka asocijacija.
- Klajn, I.** 2009. *Rečnik jezičkih nedoumica*. Novi Sad: Prometej.
- Klajn, I. and M. Šipka.** 2007. *Veliki rečnik stranih reči i izraza*. Novi Sad: Prometej.
- Matica srpska, Matica hrvatska.** 1967–1976. *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika 1–6*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska (1–3, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska).
- Matica srpska.** 2007. *Rečnik srpskoga jezika*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Montenegrin Association of Sciences and Arts.** 2016. *Rječnik crnogorskog narodnog i književnog jezika (Montenegrin Dictionary of Vernacular and Literary Language)*. Podgorica: Montenegrin Association of Sciences and Arts.
- Oxford English Dictionary.* <https://www.oed.com/>. Accessed on July 17, 2022.

- Prosveta.** 1970. *Opšta enciklopedija: Mala enciklopedija Prosveta 1 A–Lj*. Belgrade: Prosveta.
- Serbian Association of Sciences and Arts.** 1959–(2020). *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika 1–(21)*. Belgrade: SANU.
- Školska knjiga.** 2015. *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga standardnog jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Vujaklija, M.** 1996/97. *Leksikon stranih reči i izraza*. Belgrade: Prosveta.

Other literature

- Barić, E., M. Lončarić, D. Malić, S. Pavešić, M. Peti, V. Zečević and M. Znika.** 2005. *Hrvatska gramatika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Bugarški, R.** 2018. *Govorite li zajednički?* Belgrade: Biblioteka XX vek.
- Cafe del Montenegro.** 2016. *Đeljošaj traži da CANU hitno povuče Rječnik crnogorskog jezika*. 17 May. Available: <https://www.cdm.me/drustvo/deljosaj-trazi-da-canu-hitno-povuce-rjecnik-crnogorskog-jezika/>. Accessed on July 17, 2022.
- Čirgić, A.** 2016. Ova bruka osta dovijeka. *Matica* 66: 784-789.
- Čirgić, A., I. Pranjković and J. Silić.** 2010. *Gramatika crnogorskoga jezika*. Podgorica: Ministarstvo prosvjete i nauke.
- Čorić, B.** 2008. *Tvorba imenica u srpskom jeziku*. Belgrade: Društvo za srpski jezik i književnost Srbije.
- Jahić, Dž.** 2020. Bošnjaniin, Bošnjak, Bosanac su sinonimski nazivi za matični narod Bosne. *INS*, December 3, 2020. <https://www.ins.ba/bs/article/11922/dzevad-jahic-bosnjaniin-bosnjak-bosanac-susinonimski-nazivi-za-maticni-narod-bosne>. Accessed on July 17, 2022.
- Jahić, Dž., S. Halilović and I. Palić.** 2000. *Gramatika bosanskoga jezika*. Zenica: Dom štampe.
- Korunić, P.** 2003. Nacija i nacionalni identitet: uz porijeklo i integraciju hrvatske nacije. *Zgodovinski časopis* 57(1–2): 163-208.
- Lakićević, M.** 2018. Interview Momčilo Isić: Miloš Moskovljević — The Author of the Dictionary whose Word Was Taken Away. *Novi magazin*, 27 February 2018. Available: <https://novimagazin.rs/vesti/169307-intervju-momcilo-istic-milos-moskovljevi---autor-renika-kome-je-oduzeta-re>. Accessed on July 17, 2022.
- Monstat (Montenegro Statistical Office).** 2011. *Census of Population of Population, Households and Dwellings in Montenegro 2011*. Available: [https://www.monstat.org/userfiles/file/popis2011/saopstenje/saopstenje\(1\).pdf](https://www.monstat.org/userfiles/file/popis2011/saopstenje/saopstenje(1).pdf). Accessed July 17, 2022.
- Nedeljković, S.** 2007. *Čast, krv i suze — ogledi iz antropologije etniciteta i nacionalizma (Honor, Blood and Tears — Experiments from Anthropology of Ethnicity and Nationalism)*. Belgrade: Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta.
- Parliament of Montenegro.** 2007. *Constitution*. Available: <https://www.skupstina.me/me/ustav-crne-gore>.
- Peti, M.** 1997. Koje su imenske riječi etnici i etnonimi? *Folia onomastica Croatica* 6: 99-112.
- Piper, P. and I. Klajn.** 2013. *Normativna gramatika srpskog jezika*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Ristić, S.** 2006. *Raslojenost leksike srpskog jezika i leksička norma*. Belgrade: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.
- Smith, D.A.** 2003. *Nacionalizam i modernizam: Kritički pregled suvremenih teorija nacija i nacionalizma*. Prevela: Mirjana Paić Jurinić. Zagreb: Fakultet političkih znanosti.
- Sretenović, M.** 2008. Sudbina jednog rečnika. *Politika*, 22 January 2008. Available: <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/11666/Sudbina-jednog-recnika>. Accessed on July 17, 2022.

- Stojanović, M.** 2021. Neobičan slučaj kontinuiteta državnih institucija Crne Gore. *Studia iuridica Montenegrina* 3(1): 75-99.
- Šimunović, P.** 2009. *Uvod u hrvatsko imenoslovlje*. Zagreb: Golden Marketing — Tehnička knjiga.
- Šipka, D.** 2006. *Osnovi leksikologije i srodnih disciplina*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Šubarić, S.** 2018. Rod u gramatičkom opisu imenica (prilog stabilnosti kategorije imeničkog roda). *Folia linguistica et litteraria — časopis za nauku o jeziku i književnosti* 20: 21-44.
- Tamir, Y.** 2019. Not So Civic: Is There a Difference Between Ethnic and Civic Nationalism? *Annual Review of Political Science* 22: 419-434.
- Tomović, P.** 2011. Popis u Crnoj Gori dijeli i Bošnjake i Muslimane. *Radio Slobodna Europa*, 21 January 2011. Available: https://www.slobodnaevropa.org/a/crna_gora_popis_stavnovnistva_bosnjaci_muslimani/2283323.html. Accessed on July 17, 2022.
- Vukčević, D.K.** 2015. Tri misli o identitetu (Three Thoughts on Identity). Vukčević, D.K. 2015. *O identitetu*: 13-23. Podgorica: CANU.
- Vuković, S.** 2007. Onomastička terminologija. *Čakavska rič* XXXV(1): 139-184.

Appendix A: Dictionary scanned text — lexeme *Albanac* (*Albanian*)

Албанац м. [ѝен. јд. Албѝанца, вок. јд. Албѝанче, инсѝир. јд. Албѝанцем, ѝен. мн. Албѝанѝа] сѝѝановник Албаније; онај који је ѝоријеклом из Албаније.

албанизѝација ж. [ѝен. јд. -ѝ] намеѝѝање албанскоѝ језика, кулѝуре и обичаја друѝим народима. — Питајуѝи се нудио је и неке одговоре — на основу искустава издѝеглица православног живѝа из Албаније које је било изложено систематској албанизацији, нарочито у времену послѝје II свѝетског рата 1945. године. (Лак. II)

албанизѝрање с. ѝл. им. од албанизѝраѝи.

албанизѝрати сврш. и несврш. [ѝрез. албанизѝрѝм, -ајѝ/албанизѝрајѝ, ѝрил. сѝд. албанизѝрајѝѝи] в. албанизѝваѝи. — Наиме, иако су Малисори албанизѝрани, ѝихов говор се знатно разликује од стандардног албанског ... (Ник. В. II)

албанизѝвање (албанизѝвање, изг.) с. ѝл. им. од албанизѝваѝи.

албанизѝвати (албанизѝваѝи, изг.) сврш. и несврш. [ѝрез. -ујѝм] I ѝреобраѝиѝи/ѝреобраѝаѝи у Албанце; намеѝѝнуѝи/намеѝѝаѝи албански језик, кулѝуру и обичаје друѝим народима. II ~ се ѝосѝѝа(ја)ѝи Албанац; годѝи(ја)ѝи обиѝежје Албанца.

Албанија ж. [ѝен. јд. -ѝ] држава у заѝадном дијелу Балканскоѝ ѝолуосѝрва.

Албанка ж. [ѝен. јд. -ѝ, даѝи. јд. -ки] сѝѝановница Албаније; она која је ѝоријеклом из Албаније.

албанѝлог м. (+ ж.) [вок. јд. албанѝложе, ном. мн. албанѝлози] сѝѝручњак за албанѝлоѝију. (Даш. II)

албанѝлогија (албанѝлѝгија, изг.) ж. [ѝен. јд. -ѝ] наука која се дави изучавањем албанскоѝ језика, књижевносѝи и кулѝуре. — Чак 29 универзитетских професора и научника из Албаније држало је предавања на постдипломским студијама Приштинског универзитета из албанѝлогије и историје. (Лак. I)

Appendix B: Dictionary scanned text — lexeme *Bošnjak* (*Bosniak*)

Бошња̋к м. [іен. јд. Бошња̋ка, вок. јд. Бошња̋че, ном. мн. Бошња̋ци] **1.** ириядник бошњачкої народа, муслиман који живи у Босни или је иоријеклом из Босне. **2.** ириядник јужнословенскої народа исламске вјероисповијесїи, уїлавном насїањен у Босни.

Бошња̋киња ж. [іен. јд. -е̋] **1.** ириядница бошњачкої народа, муслиманка која живи у Босни или је иоријеклом из Босне. **2.** ириядница јужнословенскої народа исламске вјероисповијесїи, уїлавном насїањена у Босни.

Бошња̋чкї, -а̋, -о̋ који се односи на Бошњаке: ~ кулїура.