



## GEOGRAPHIC AND LANGUAGE BORDERS OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

### Dževad Jahić , academician

A longtime professor at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo, one of the founders of the Bosniak Academy of Sciences and Arts and its Vice President

*This paper discusses the key theoretical issues of linguistic geography as a research method in linguistics and in relation to this gives a general picture of the linguistic and internal dialectical boundaries of Bosnia and Herzegovina considering the possibility and probability of the action of physical-geographical factors on the removal and preservation of these boundaries. In this methodological approach, the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina is referred to as a linguistic spatial entity whose integrity visibly matches with its physical-geographical integrity.*

**Key words:** *Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bosnian language, dialectical boundaries, linguistic geography, linguistic atlas, horizontal language differentiation, isogloss, isogloss bundle, language center, language peripherals, linguistic core, vertical language differentiation, lows' tongue, highs' tongue, livestock husbandry tongue, farming tongue*

### INTRODUCTION

In the linguistic science, from the middle of the nineteenth century, through concrete research and the creation of the first linguistic atlases, in France and Germany, only partially known and with cartographic materials confirmed, the tight link between geographical, or rather physical-geographical and linguistic, more precisely dialectical boundaries, has been actualized. In the swing of the European linguistic thought of the nineteenth century, in addition to the strong comparativistic or contrastive analysis of the material of the first Latin language and the Sanskrit and the establishment of a common Indo-European root and the founding of indoeuropistry, they began research in the field of linguistic geography, whose results at the end of the XIX century constitute a kind of foundation for the expansion and deepening of the research of linguistic landscapes by the linguistic method, research which was one of the most important and, to say, the most complex and scientifically most demanding for the 20th century linguistic theoretical thought. Namely, after the creation of a large number of linguistic atlases not only in France and Germany, but also much wider in Europe and Russia or the Soviet Union, linguistic theory in the field of so-called „the horizontal differentiation of languages“, that is, studying and interpreting the causes and legitimacy of the creation, development and alteration of linguistic and dialectical boundaries, has been very advanced. There were major discoveries and knowledge of how language boundaries are formed, what happens at the wider interspaces of these borders, what actually makes the boundaries in the linguistic sense, how they form, and what are the characteristics of the so-called bundles of isoglosses, and then how these bundles are grouped, thickened or diluted, under the influence of which inner-linguistic and which outer-linguistic factors, comes to, thus, the formation and relative stabilization of clearer linguistic and dialectical boundaries.

## I THEORY OF LINGUISTIC GEOGRAPHY

The theory of linguistic geography has come to the following knowledge:

*First.* Territorial differentiation of language is one of the basic laws of language development in general. In fact, it is a phenomenon that the linguistic dynamics, as the basic intrinsic legitimacy, is actually realized or occurs and reflects in a specific space, and that the intralanguage centrifugal and centripetal forces have their own specific reflexes on certain concrete dialectical or linguistic spaces. In this process of changing and creating quantitative language units, i.e. qualitative linguistic differences, the crucial role is played by the size of the linguistic or dialectical space, and in general the communication of speakers of the language or dialects within that space.

*Second.* In the sense of the above mentioned, there are two definitions, two phenomena, two language configurations in each language space. One is the central one, which is called the language core. It is a major part of a language space that in fact represents its center, core, or focus. This third term indicates that this part of the space is in fact „the main one“, meaning that it, with its linguistic potentials, characteristics and internal development dynamics, continually acts on the surrounding space, expanding its linguistic traits around itself, to the so-called peripheral, or surrounding areas. Thus, the concepts of the language center and linguistic periphery are formed, where the linguistic center is always discerned in every language space and its relation to the language periphery is discerned. The second language phenomenon is the lingual periphery, to which, or by what, are being spread, as we have said, at different pace, the wider features of the center, from the lingual core.

*Third.* The center and the periphery as a whole constitute a specific linguistic or dialectical space. The limits to which they reach are the limits of the reach of the typical linguistic lines of that space. These linguistic lines reach the second linguistic space with which they border. This implies more precise definition of the interlingual and inter-dialect boundaries.

*Fourth.* Language and dialectical boundaries exist and it is possible to define them more precisely, i.e. to determine what they represent in concrete terms, what actually forms them and what the lines on dialect maps actually mean and how and on what basis they are determined.

*Fifth.* It is formed and more clearly defined the term of *isogloss*, i.e. a line that characterizes the spread of a concise linguistic line or phenomenon. Since the languages or dialects in their systems, that is, in the interlinguistic sense, abound with specific phonetic, morphological, prosodic and lexical characteristics, each of these traits constitutes one outgrowth, one boundary or line that characterizes the propagation of that character. Thus there is a defining of the widest concept of *Isogloss*, and then defining the narrower terms *isophone* (lines or boundaries of phonetic features), *izomorphes* (lines or boundaries of morphological features), *isotones* (lines or boundaries of accentual properties), *isolexes* (lines or boundaries lexical features) etc.

*Sixth.* It is found that the isoglosses in a particular area do not behave independently or separate from other isoglosses, but that they behave in a "group" or "systemic" manner. In this way, the concept of a *bundle of isoglosses is formed*, which means that the isogloss is never singled out and by itself, but it is grouped together with other isoglosses into the so-called bundles of isoglosses. This grouping, for example, is not only on the plane of isophones, but already in the plane of grouping different linguistic lines and at several inter-

language levels; means isophones, isomorphes, isotones and isolexes are grouped into bundles of isoglosses.

*Seventh.* It is exactly these bundles of isoglosses that make up what is traditionally called the dialectical or linguistic border. These borders are presented on dialectological maps, in dialectological atlases, or linguistic atlases, and modern linguistic science today has a huge number of these linguistic atlases. This means that everything that is on the map represented by different lines and which makes some boundaries, in fact, is the bundles of isoglosses, which in no case are not so narrowly located, as for practical reasons they had to be presented on maps.

*Eighth.* In this sense, linguistic science comes to the conclusion that dialectical boundaries are actually on the ground in fact much wider than they are presented on maps for purely practical and technical reasons. Thus, we speak about width or real distribution of dialectical boundaries, for which we could say that they extend on area of 10 to 50 kilometers wide, of course with possible deviations below and above these proportions, but only in rare and extravagant extreme circumstances.

*Ninth.* It is precisely in relation to this widespread dialectical boundaries that there are not at all rare occurrences that at these borders there are processes that lead to the fact that many linguistic lines often "skip" their native speaker spaces and "jump" into other adjacent spaces, i.e. are not unknown to those areas with which they are touched or bounded, while their concentration is still retained on the premises of the parent core or dialects, and whose thickness with other common features never comes into question.

*Tenth.* Dialectological maps represent, in fact, a large number of one-to-one individual isoglosses, through which, through the transparency of tracing paper, „it sees“ a more complete image of the dialectical space with its borders, i.e. the bundles of isoglosses.

The lawfulness of the presented and terminologically defined processes of horizontal linguistic stratification occur as a legality in the so-called normal or „average“ language conditions, or in areas where some „additional“, more radical out-of-linguistic processes are not occurring, which either inhibit or slow down the functioning of the language in their own way. Of course this is about the share of the so-called outer-linguistic factors that affect the language and its development. Simplified, these factors are divided into two types. The first factors are geographical, i.e. physical geographical. Other factors are historical, related to historical events with ethnicity or ethnicities, or language groups or communities in specific language spaces.

When it comes to the first outer linguistic factor, the geographical one, things in the linguistic theory stand like this. It starts from the axiom that geographic or physical-geographical factors directly influence the formation of linguistic and dialectical boundaries. This corresponds to the comprehensible phenomenon that geographical boundaries or physical-geographical features of space directly affect linguistic communication, meaning they either intensify contacts or reduce it, as well as complete interruption of contacts between speakers or the bearers of the language or dialects. This is most clearly seen in the boundaries between the languages themselves, which is a phenomenon that retrogressively affects the reduction of the contacts of the speakers of the two languages because they cannot be understood among themselves, because they are structurally, typologically, and so on, different languages have already been formed. However, with dialects and dialectical differences within certain languages and linguistic spaces, they are more complicated and more interesting for science. In particular, the physical-geographical characteristics of the dialectic space directly influence the formation of sharper or less sharp dialectical

differences, the boundaries or the bundles of isoglosses. In this sense, linguistic geography, as one of the dominant linguistic methods, but also of linguistic theories, reveals, interprets, explains that these physical-geographical factors influence linguistic or dialectic phenomena, more precisely on the internal differentiation of linguistic spaces. First of all, we have in mind the great mountain chains, the high and spacious mountains in their circuits, such as, for example, the case with our Balkan space and the Dinar massif, on the one hand, and the Alpine massif, on the other hand, or on the eastern Balkan mountain massifs, on the third hand, which could in principle influence the formation of dialectical and wider language boundaries. It all comes down to the theoretical knowledge that as far as mountain massifs are sharper, more spacious, so much deeper linguistic boundaries form on one side and on the other side, because the contacts between dialect speakers within the common wider language space are interrupted or disabled. Therefore, in principle, language boundaries are formed on one side and on the other side of large mountain massifs. In the second place, as a physical-geographical factor are water surfaces, primarily large rivers and lakes where rivers, sometimes even not so large are the main causes of the formation of linguistic boundaries. This happens when the inhabitants of both shores do not have more intense contacts, but also when the rivers coincide and with some other borders, primarily administrative-state ones, which will still be discussed. As the third physical-geographical factor that affects the linguistic boundaries and the formation of the speech space are large plains, which in principle reduce the linguistic differences and through which isoglosses go in a very spaced, razed, diluted form. Namely, in such areas rare dialectical borders are more pronounced because they mostly represent compact dialectic units and wider communication on them is easier, which is also related to the way of life of members of the dialect, their dealing with intensive crop farming, in contrast to the hill cattle husbandry population, about which, in terms of certain differences and in the language aspect, will also be words.

When it comes to the second outer linguistic factor, the historical one, in the theory of linguistic geography, it is important because it has an indirect link with a geographic factor, on the one hand, but without it; it is unavoidable in the consideration of the formation of linguistic boundaries. Starting from a historical linguistic axiom, language boundaries are partly a reflection of "historical boundaries", or dialectical boundaries are largely the result or reflection of those "historical boundaries", more precisely of historical movements and events closely related to the ethnos that speak in certain languages and its dialects. These historical factors relate primarily to the origins of ethnos, its cultural, religious and other characteristics, to the historical trends of the movement of this ethnos, its territorial expansion or narrowing, its internal migration dynamics, contacts with other ethnos, their cultures and language qualities, various interferences in this sense, etc. When it comes to historical factors that influence the formation of linguistic boundaries, then it is above all a very important relationship between state-administrative and language boundaries. Namely, the linguistic theory, and the linguistic geographic theory itself, especially its research practice, to say so, unambiguously indicate the close connection between these types of boundaries and language boundaries. In doing so, we have in mind the indirect link again with the geographical boundaries, since it is known that the state and internal administrative boundaries are often formed in accordance with certain geographical and physical-geographical regional factors, which, as we have seen, directly influence the formation of linguistic boundaries. In this way, these two types of factors, the geographical and historical factor, in fact together, as a whole, also affect the formation of linguistic differences, i.e. linguistic and dialectical boundaries.

## II LANGUAGE BORDERS OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

The question which arises here is how such a reasoned theoretical approach is reflected on the specific circumstances and causes of the formation of linguistic boundaries within Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the boundary regarding the integrity of the Bosnian language in relation to the neighboring ones, more than related, South Slavic languages, Serbian, Croatian and Montenegrin. This is certainly a very complex issue, to which we will only show some elements on this occasion. In doing so, we will partly try to separate the purely geographical factors from the historical ones, but it will be very difficult to achieve this in our Balkan and Bosnia-Herzegovina case, because in these areas of ours, these two, otherwise interconnected, factors intertwine in a special way. In fact, in the way in which European linguistic geography and in general linguistic diachronic methodology and theory have not found more reliable models for its more comprehensive and well-founded understanding and interpretation. In this sense, this contribution is also a challenge for the author, but a challenge that cannot be overly ambitious, precisely because of that mentioned discrepancy between the complexity of the Balkan language differentiation and interferences, and the mere uneducated or unwillingness of the linguistic theory to further investigate and explain these phenomena.

The space of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the linguistic sense should first be viewed from a diachronic aspect, i.e. as a space in its territorial dynamics of horizontal differentiation, even regardless of the specific historical circumstances through which it passed. As far as linguistic science has managed to reach the linguistic past of this space, to say so, here is the Illyrian linguistic substrate, which is itself complex. But on this one-lingual substratum, other forms of linguistic contacts are added, which are the contacts with the Thracian language, then the Celtic and the Arian languages, so that this substrate appears as a very layered historical linguistic or speech phenomenon (without written traces) in which is still dominated by the most pronounced linguistic base, which is Illyrian. After the seventh century, with the gradual settlement of the Slavic and South Slavic tribes to the Balkans, the linguistic situation is even more complicated, since the contacts between the above complex Balkan substrata and South Slavic linguistic physiognomy, which itself change in their movements, not only in view of its division into a smaller eastern and larger western part, from which the Western Balkan Slavic languages are later developed. The time between the X and XV century is the time of medieval movements and the relative linguistic stabilization in this area, which primarily relates to the dialectic division of wider space into the Chakavian, Kakavian and Stokavian dialects, of which the third occupied the largest space, counting here and its center, the area of medieval Bosnia and the Huma. Since the Middle Ages Bosnia and Hum have been a linguistically compact space, inextricably with deeper dialectical boundaries or with borders structurally larger, and in this region dominated by the so-called western Stokavina, with the ikavian reflex of *jat* and *stokavstina*, a stagnation which borders the valleys of the Bosna and Neretva rivers with the eastern area, where the Ijekav reflex *jat* prevails. This is the famous Bosnian-huma cross, consisting of three Western stokavian and one eastern stokavian dialects, divided by the vertical line of the Bosna and Neretva rivers into the Ickavian and Ijekavian regions, and with the horizontal line they're divided into the northern part, which was scakavian ( *Šćap, ognjišće* ) and the southern part, which was stakavian (*štap, ognjište*). In this way, the reflex of the *jat* and the reflex of the old Praslavic groups, *stj, zdj, skj, zgj*, appears in the main criterion and the

recognition of the differentiation of the Bosnian-Huma space into four of its narrower parts. However, these four narrow lines do not call into question the dialectic Stokavian (Western stokavian and partly new stokavian) compactness and uniformity of this space..

The emergence and expansion of the Bosnian medieval state, from its first bannes, through Ban Kulin, to the Tvrtko Kotromanić The Second, already represents a historical factor that makes the central Balkan linguistic space even more compact through interstate communication, which in the best way show the medieval orders of the Bosnian rulers, from 1189 to the last Bosnian command of Stjepan Tomašević from 1461, depicting the widely accepted and all-understandable spoken, folk language of the state of Bosnia, which could be formed and developed only in its own home space and on no other, which is the basis for the emergence of the written Bosnian language in the Middle Ages. The original dialectic image of medieval Bosnia in the form of the Bosnian-huma cross represents its ethnic-language suburban state, since from the 16th century, BH terrain, in the period of several centuries of belonging to the Ottoman Empire, is subject to continuous migration movements and outbursts, in which the original linguistic picture is changing greatly. In rough terms, this is the spread of the southern new stokavian ijekavian speeches to the north and northwest, speech in the XIX century defined as the *vukovian southern dialect*, characterized by an ijekavian reflex, stakavism, new four-accent system, a seven-cases system, and so on. Regardless of this intense migration of the population from the Dinaric south to the Posavina North and Northwest, it means moving from the mountain cattle breeding areas to the flat, extremely fertile areas of the fertile land, the original dialectical medieval image and to this day maintains its basic contour. These are the features of the Bosnian dialects that are preserved and revealed in deeper and more detailed research and observations, as there is still no reliable dialectological literature. The old dialectic lines are stored in the speech substrate, especially in the lexical plane, and then on the phonetic-accent, which shows that linguistic and dialectical changes conditioned by outer linguistic ethnic-immigration factors do not occur so quickly, that they do not change the radically original speech picture, but rather the ones on this original image are settled, so the Bosnian dialects appear as very complex and layered speech types that require deeper scientific research and interpretation than those of the usual descriptive synchronous dialectical processing. Interestingly, by today, rivers Bosnia and Neretva still represent a broader boundary between Ijekavian (Eastern) and Ikavian (Western) speeches, but we emphasize in their complex substrate-migration form. It is also interesting that the physical-geographical division of bh. terrain in the southern mountain Dinaric and northern, "less mountainous", and going on to the Sava River, an even more basin part, that this division still preserves the coarse substratum speech physiognomy and the origin of the southern stakavinism compared to the northern scakavinism. The southern part of the BH area has a *štap, štene, kosište,*, and the northern one in his *dialectical* substrate still keeps the *šćap, šćene, kosišće*.

### III EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL GEOGRAPHIC AND LINGUISTIC BORDERS

What does the external physical-geographical boundaries of Bosnia and Herzegovina mean in relation to the linguistic boundaries itself, that is, the state itself in relation to the linguistic and dialectical boundaries itself, and what the internal geographic and narrow administrative and regional boundaries mean for the establishment of the linguistic features, that is, the differences and intra-dialectical border?

We need to say immediately that there cannot be expected more clear and consistent matches and interdependence. They cannot be expected because of specific extremely dynamic outer linguistic, primarily migrational, factors that change that image. But it should also be noted that these "matches" and mutual connections still exist, and they are reflected in the deeper layers of the dialectical image of bh. space, its dialects and speech groups itself, but they reflect in their own way the internal dialectical boundaries and the mentioned bundles isoglosses. Let's emphasize immediately that the bundles of isoglosses within the BH space are extremely razed and diluted, precisely because of the powerful actions of the aforementioned outer linguistic factors of changing linguistic and dialectical characteristics and their internal relations.

We will first hold on to the outer, broader, or framework boundaries. As it is known, Bosnia and Herzegovina is a specific country in the entire territory of the Balkans. In physical-geographical terms, it is homogeneous in relation to the neighboring countries and countries because of the clear, stable and permanent natural boundaries of these areas, which primarily refers to the rivers Drina, Sava, Una, Cetina and Trebišnjica. Such a physical-geographical fact presupposes the existence of a geographical - but not only a geographical - whole, which preserves its complete physiognomy, for which, according to the laws of ethnical and linguistic movements, everything that accompanies the Bosnian ethnos and its language is bound. This first geographical circumstance actually in large part affects the formation of the external borders of the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina, but not only that. This physical-geographical circumstance also influences a very important legitimacy in the formation of languages in this region. It is the legitimacy of the linguistic spatiality of space. This means that this is a space on which a linguistic core is formed through history, which continually works on peripheral spaces, but mainly to the above mentioned river boundaries. At that, bh. space in the linguistic sense never represented a space in which the features of some other linguistic focal points spread beyond these borders. Everything that was formed in a linguistic sense as a core, was created and spread here, in the central Balkan region and in the framework of the western-style stokavstina. Bosnia and Herzegovina is not linguistically a place where the characteristics of other spatial and state spheres, Serbia and Croatia are assimilated in modern language, but its authentic characteristics have relations with other areas, have contacts with those areas in a purely ethnic, confessional and national sense. But it is not a place that "imports" language qualities from the east or from the west. This science knows, but this knowledge is not sufficient to prevent many manipulations of BiH. Linguistic space, construction, the substitution of theses, whose ultimate goal was always to deny BH. space as a geographical, historical, state and linguistic whole. Therefore, Bosnia is in a purely physical-geographical sense unique and integral as it is unique and integral and as linguistic space. This area has concluded with its historical features and circumstances and "helped" these historical circumstances to preserve its maturity and recognition in a purely spatial linguistic sense, even regardless of its well-known multi-religious and multi-ethnic characteristics.

In addition to this "hydronimic" circumstances of the bh. boundary, there is another physical-geographical circumstance that fits in its own way into this first, making bh. space also a compact and inextricable. It is the circumstance that its soil is kept in the unity of the mountain chain system from Dinara to the southern mountains at the border with Serbia and Montenegro. In this sense, a connected system of high fields extends from north to south, under which all the running waters i.e. the rivers Drina, Neretva, Bosna, Krivaja, Ukrina, Usora, Vrbanja, Lasva, Vrbas, Pliva, Unac, Sana, Una, as well as their numerous tributaries.

All these rivers practically or represent lines for providing wider bundles of isoglosses of outer boundaries, or narrower or wider bundles of isoglosses the formation of inner linguistic or dialectical borders of Bosnia and Herzegovina. All of this is naturally reflected in a specific layered form. Namely, these boundaries are not available to determine and precise "at first glance", because they are linguistic, and not some other "more precise" borders. These are the relative external and internal dialectical boundaries of the BH space, because other geological factors are added to the other types of outer linguistic factors, and these are the ones that are ethnically, most historically speaking. In our case, they are primarily migration. But even when they are primarily migratory, the BH space preserves the linguistic continuity of the western stokavstina and the genetic connection with medieval formations of speech and dialects. This is especially revealed in the population that preserves the Bosnian ethnic continuity, starting from the Bogumil, through the continuity from the Ottoman rule, to the present time, in which the ethnicity clearly forms, through its affiliation with the Bosnian language, its motherland Bosnia, testifying to the Bosnian uninterrupted linguistic continuity, which also means historical continuity and cultural continuity

The most prominent language edifices in terms of the formation of the external linguistic boundaries of Bosnia and Herzegovina are its larger rivers, which are primarily Sava and Drina. The Sava is the northern border to the Posavje Scakavian, and partly the Kajkavian speeches, and the Drina to the eastern ekavian speeches. From the Drina to the west, the Bosna and Neretva rivers, as we have already said, represent an important internal vertical boundary between the original Ijekavian (eastern) and ikavian (western) reflex jat, which still leaves its visible traces in the speech substrates today. The internists of Bosnia and Vrbas are the areas of more prominent preserved Western stokavian lines, where predominantly there is ikavism and scakavism, while the internist between Vrbas and Sana also frames the western Bosnian language type, in many respects different from the previous eastern central Bosnian. River Una represents the westernmost river border towards Croatia and towards the southwestern Kvarner or Dalmatian hinterland, predominantly Chakavian, which also applies to Cetina, while much southeastern Trebišnjica represents a wider linguistic border to the Stokavian dialects of the Dubrovnik hinterland, partly by the chakavised expansion of the Chakavian dialectic lines along the Adriatic coast. It is also interesting that the influx of the main mentioned rivers into narrower speech space is largely represented by broader intergovernmental borders within the subdialectic entities of the Bosnian language. So, for example, Lim, as the right tributary of the Drina River, and Prača, as the left tributary of the Drina River, form the broader border between inner iekavian stokavian east Bosnian speeches, dividing them to the northern ones, closer to the more advanced northern and western Bosnian speeches, and to the southern, closer to East Herzegovina speeches. Even the tributaries of these rivers in cases of some isoglosses represent the boundaries between the spreading of two different dialect lines, as is the case with Bioštica or with the Zeljeznica, or with one and the other Rakitnica (tributary of Praca and the tributary of Neretva), and to mention the tributaries of Bosnia, the Krivaja and Fojnica, which also represent wider borders within the southern, Fojnica subdialect, etc., etc.

It is well known that the Dinaric mountain massif is in the northwest-southeast direction and that many mountains of this massif are located in the southern part of our country. As it goes north and northwest, the mountains are smaller and lower, gradually moving into a slightly wavy and plain area. This physical-geographical circumstance conditioned the direction of migration from the south and south-eastern Dinaric hotspots

towards the north and northwest. Here, however, the question arises as to whether the high Bosnian and Herzegovina mountains act on the formation of some linguistic boundaries and whether in this BH case of ours, we can speak of the factor of mountain massifs, which, according to the knowledge of linguistic geography, form linguistic boundaries. In our case, however, this is not a common situation where the mountains really represent some dialectal boundaries precisely because of the historical circumstances of the direction of the migration from the mountain south to the plain north. Namely, when it comes to the direction of these migrations, it should be said that it is directed, as it is usually stated in our dialectological literature, perpendicular to mountain massifs and reefs, that these migration currents cross these mountains or move in the direction of the southeast-northwest, in the direction of the dinaric mountainous system. In this regard, we concluded that the high mountains in principle in our bh. circumstances do not constitute some pronounced internal dialectal boundaries. Another outer linguistic circumstance causes also that the high mountains in our circumstances are not the causes of horizontal dialectal differentiation. This is the mode of economic circumstance of the population living below these mountains livestocking in its borders, where there is contact between, usually herders, on one side and on the other side of the mountain. When, however, a certain micro dialect phenomena, especially those of lexical nature, even somewhat phonetic and accentual, is in question, we cannot safely dispose influence of mountainous border of the formation of some differences, or the formation of those changes and differences that in principle belong to the horizontal, or the spatial differentiation of language. This is especially true for some kind of dialect boundaries between northerly Bosnian mountains Maglic, Zelengora, Lelija, Treskavica, Bjelasnica, Visocica, Vranica and southern mountains of Hercegovina Čvrtnica, Prenj, Čabulja, Crvanj and Velez. It is still to some extent about a larger dialectal borderlands between northerly Bosnian and southern Herzegovina's speech, especially when it comes to stakavism and šćakavism, the accentual variations, as well as the values of singular and bicameral reflexes jat, while south of the Bosnian mountains certainly have thickening Herzegovinian dialect feature, which in the area north of the Bosnian mountains are increasingly farther from neighboring Herzegovinian focus of stops practically in wider areas of the southern mountains of Herzegovina, increasingly drawing near the northern Bosnian dialectic's cores. We will mention as well northwestern mountain ranges closer to the sea, mountains Pješevicu and Dinara, which accounted for a border between West Bosnia, substrate ikavian-sćakavian speech, and Dalmatian stokavian-sćakavian or expressive čakavian speech closer to the Dalmatian coast. This direction of the mountain ranges on the inside of Bosnia and Herzegovina is followed by the fields, such as the Livno field and Duvanjsko field, and Popovo field in the Dubrovnik hinterland.

Regarding the impact of the mountain physical-geographical factors to create dialectal boundaries, in theory, linguistic geography, it is always about how and how these factors affect the so-called horizontal i.e. territorial stratification of the language in the classical spatial sense. In this same theory, however, there are only foreshadowed, still undeveloped thesis that this factor is not associated with horizontal differencing language more precisely with *vertical differentiation of language*, a thesis which is largely initially being planned and by the author of these lines, the manuscript of his yet unpublished book „*Theses and metathesis of the Bosnian language*“. The author proceeds from one hypothesis to high mountain ranges and methods of animal husbandry and communication speakers' dialects that gravitate to these mountains and can cause the formation or deepening of linguistic difference proportionally to what altitudes frequented by residents and speakers of particular

dialects. The general argument is that places at higher altitudes have to some extent formed some linguistic traits and habits that are not in the plan, in terms of the difference in the vertical spatial sense, different from the characteristics of lowland speech. This would be a part of such a hypothesis forming two concepts or two terminology phrases: *lowland speech* and *altitude speech*, which would apply only to the existence of so-called micro dialectic differences or differentiation, perhaps the most on the lexical level. This would be entailed to the possibility of forming a synonymous term *arable talk* and *Livestock talk*, which of course should not be taken literally, but to understand them so that they represent the probability or possibility of certain linguistic differentiation within the same dialects which have a direct connection with the spatial, physical-geographical, terrain factor in terms of its „altitude“ feature. It is possible that the author of these lines can be considered the founder of this hypothesis, which should be by the better, more detailed field research and consultation of existing literature on BH speeches, either turn into a thesis, or reject it as a theoretical assumption that the practical research sample cannot be proven.

## CONCLUSION

Since territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina is interconnected by the system of rivers, mountains and fields into a unified whole so that geographical circumstance, as directly as indirectly, acted on lingual compactness and internal differentiation of B & H linguistic region within this compactness, completeness and linguistic distinctiveness and authenticity.

## Literature

Author's books and their literature and resources: *Jezik, nacija, nacionalizam*, Sarajevo 1990.; *Jezik bosanskih Muslimana*, Sarajevo 1991.; *Bošnjački narod i njegov jezik*, Sarajevo 1999.; *Bosanski jezik u 100 pitanja i 100 odgovora*, Sarajevo 1999.; *Gramatika bosanskog jezika (Uvod)*, Zenica 2000.; *Ijekavskoštakavski govori istočne Bosne*, Sarajevo 2002.; *Teze i metateze o bosanskom jeziku (rukopis u formiranju)*

## Author

**Dževad Jahić** (1948), philologist and writer, professor at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo, regular member of the Bosniak Academy of Sciences and Arts. Author of six books on linguistics and Bosnistics and capital lexicographical works of multi-part piece “*Dictionary of Bosnian language*”, as well as four books of lyrical prose and a novel *Ustraga*.