

CONTEMPORARY STANDARD SLOVENE: A COMPLEX LINGUISTIC PHENOMENON

Dalibor Brozović*

The standard languages of today's world differ greatly one from another. Moreover, comparing and studying them makes sense only when we look exclusively at them as standardized idioms functioning in the most varied human communities of our globe. The situation in Europe is very different from that on other continents, and it is practically impossible to compare one European standard language, with respect to its genesis and development, its structure and substance, and its sociolinguistic functions, with all other existing standard languages. Yet, on the other hand, every idiom is a unique and unrepeatable phenomenon, and this is especially true of a standard language, the highest and most organized form of language. It is hard, therefore, to renounce the universal approach to a concrete European standard language: Slovene, the subject of this article, or for that matter any other. Of course, not all European standard languages are equally interesting; but, as Slovene in many ways belongs among the more original ones, it is harder to resist the temptation to look at the totality of the phenomenon from all sides.

Thus we are faced with a contradiction which can be resolved only by sacrificing either the universality of the scientific approach or the completeness of its range. As the focus of our interest is Slovene rather than general theoretical problems, there is no doubt what should be sacrificed: we are interested in Slovene within a framework which is natural for it and is sufficient to shed light on all its features from all sides. Even though, of course, all its unique specific features have for the most part been well known for a long time, one may presume that a complex approach, even to well known facts (with special attention to their mutual cause-and-effect relations on various levels) may cast new light on the Slovene standard language as a whole in the company of other standard idioms with which it is linked in some way or has specific similarities, i.e., with the (South) Slavic and the (Central) European languages. This is the framework to which we will adhere.

The particular features that make Contemporary Standard Slovene [henceforward, CSS] a somewhat unusual phenomenon in our part of the world, and in general, stem partly from the material base upon which it is built, and partly from the unique specifics of its civilizational superstructure. In principle, the concrete features of the material base of a standard, i.e., its dialect base, have little direct influence on the character and quality of a standard language *qua* standard language.¹ The concrete facts of the dialect base (phonological, grammatical and lexical) are not important for the standard language just in themselves—because, of course, all linguistic matter can be subject to standardization—but are important secondarily and relatively, above all in the relationship of the dialect base of the standard to the whole diasystem to which it belongs; and, in the first stages of standardization, that relationship is very important. Concrete language facts are also reflected in the practical standardization processes: it is obvious, for example, that under the same conditions a more homogeneous phonological system will create fewer practical problems in the normification of the graphemic inventory and the orthography that corresponds thereto. However, this is not the only reason for not treating only the civilizational superstructure of CSS but also its material base.

A standard language is really the unity of its base and its superstructure: it is first a **language** and only secondly a **standard**.² This means that whatever external shape it has as a language—as a human idiom—depends on the base, while its character and quality

as a linguistic instrument of a particular human collective for general human needs and for international civilization depend on the superstructure. We are concerned, then, with CSS in its totality, not simply as a standardized idiom. In other words, we cannot be content with just a sociolinguistic approach, but must turn our attention to both sides of the unity mentioned above. The material base of the standard will be analyzed by the methods and the conceptual arsenal of genetic and typological linguistics, bearing in mind both the diasystem in its entirety and that part of it which has served as the concrete dialect base of the standard language. The civilizational superstructure will be analyzed by sociolinguistic methods, applied to its genesis, its special paths of development, the character of its norm, and the relations with other standard languages past and present; as a result, sociolinguistic problems will be given more attention than others.

If we look first at the diasystem of the Slovene dialects as compared to the other Slavic diasystems, we find three essential features:

1. The Slovene diasystem is one of those in which some of the dialects show features typical not for the language group to which they belong but for one of the other two groups. In this respect Slovene differs fundamentally from Croato-Serbian/Serbo-Croatian [hereafter Cr-S or S-Cr],³ its partner in Western South Slavic.

2. In the dialects of the Slovene diasystem there are very many individual non-systematic reflections of Proto-Slavic dialectal differentiation, especially on the lexical level, some of which go back to Balto-Slavic. In this respect, and considering their small geographical distribution, the Slovene dialects are relatively unusual in the Slavic world (and, to judge from our present knowledge, are perhaps the most extreme).

3. The depth and extent of dialectal differentiation in the Slovene diasystem surpass all that is known to us in the Slavic world. This fact does not follow from the two just named; the first (predominantly) and the second (exclusively) depend on the presence of archaisms, while this third feature depends largely on innovations. This intensity of differentiation is usually explained by the topology, i.e., the mountainous character of the terrain; but this explanation, though doubtless valid for most of the facts, does not account for them all, and it is the task of scholarship to find additional explanations.

In the typological sense, too, the Slovene diasystem is original: first and foremost, in the grammatical category and the formal expression of the dual; but there are also more important and interesting examples of typological idiosyncrasy—whereas in the number and variety of prosodic and morphological models the Cr-S diasystem is the leader, with respect to vowel phonemes Slovene is second to none in the Slavic world and is among the first on the European continent. The number of different models is increased still further by the fact that a number of formally and phonetically identical vowels have an essentially different diachronic and synchronic distribution.

Also deserving of mention are the so-called *zasopli vokali* on the western periphery, which are of general theoretical phonetic interest; but in consonantism too we find one quite unusual phenomenon, viz., the opposition of distinctive secondary tonality in Luče, which, in its genesis and physical manifestation, is almost identical to the distinctive sharpness found in the territorially quite separate East Slavic dialects, and those of the eastern periphery of West and South Slavic. Typologically, this is a highly unusual situation: an isolated Slovene dialect, situated in between but remote from the two European belts with phonologically relevant sharpness, viz., the *Sprachbund* in the East (to which belong all the other Slavic dialects having this feature) and the zone of Celtic dialects on the northwestern edge of the continent.⁴

What importance do these facts have for the problematics of CSS? Of primary impor-

tance is the dialectal differentiation within the diasystem—all the rest is merely illustrative. A degree of differentiation of this kind presupposes certain additional difficulties in the formation of the language standard, particularly considering that the standard language did not evolve in the pre-industrial period and spring up, ready-made, for the use of modern civilization; we know that this was not the case in Slovenia, despite the existence of Trubar's traditional groundwork from Reformation times. Before considering all this, however, we should mention two favorable circumstances. First, despite its intensity, much of the existing dialectal differentiation (especially that which pertains to vowel-reduction) is really fairly superficial and recent, dating only from since the Reformation, when the groundwork for the modern standard was laid; to some extent, this neutralizes the severity of the problem. Second, in Slovenia as in most European lands the four relevant entities of ethnos : future nation : diasystem : future standard language stood in the optimal ratio of 1 : 1 : 1 : 1. This is a definite advantage: in Europe there are several cases where the ratio is different, and this necessarily complicates the situation, cf. in Slavic the case in Polish (i.e., Polish/Kashubian), Sorbian, and S-Cr.

In light of the above, it is obvious that the degree of dialect differentiation plays an important part in the problematics of the language standard. We are above all concerned with the dialect base. Two fundamental parameters exist which govern the possibilities for **choice** of dialectal base: first, the dialect situated at the intersection of ethnic and national convergence and concentration (economic, cultural, political, administrative, etc.) vs. one which in this sense is peripheral; and second, the dialect which by its purely linguistic features allows a swift and effortless transposition to the other dialects of the same diasystem, or to a dialect that is divergent within that diasystem. A third possibility is a mere technicality (in fact, it is nothing more than a combination of the first two) and merely involves the question of whether the standard will be based on a single dialect or on a combination of two dialects, be this combination a natural one (a shift along the time axis) or an artificial one (the result of conscious efforts and intervention). In the Slavic world we have examples of most of these possibilities, and in the Slovene case we find a fairly favorable interlacing: the base of the language standard is a dialect which is simultaneously both the idiom at the intersection of ethnic concentration, and a transitional dialect within the Slovene diasystem. This latter feature was formerly explained as a more-or-less artificial compromise of "acceptable" (*Gorenjsko* and *Dolenjsko*) elements; but I think that today there can be no doubt of the natural dialectal homogeneity of the material base, inasmuch as it contains within itself so-called transitional features.⁵ On the other hand, it is a fact notwithstanding that the base acted as if it were a conscious compromise.

The greater the dialectal differentiation, the greater the importance of the above factors in the genesis of the standard language. It was therefore crucial that in Slovenia relatively favorable solutions were found, i.e., that the base of the standard was a dialect which was suitable according to extra-linguistic criteria, and neutral according to linguistic criteria. It can be freely stated that in any less favorable constellation the paths of development of Slovene standardization—which was tortuous enough in any case—would have been even more difficult, and would perhaps even have had a problematic result. It goes without saying that these circumstances had subsequent repercussions; to these we return below. But first we must continue our examination of the genesis of the Slovene standard.

The fact that the Slovene written language arose during the Reformation pretermineed certain essential features of the language: it came into being suddenly, as a supra-regional written idiom; processes of a standardizational character began to develop immediately; and social functional features predominated over those governed by belletristic criteria.

This is the external appearance of all the written and later standard idioms of Europe whose origin is linked to the Reformation.⁶ This means that in different, more favorable circumstances the final shape of Slovene could have been of the type to which all the other European languages belong that originated in the Reformation, i.e., primarily the Germanic ones. But conditions were different: in the 17th and part of the 18th centuries a stagnation ensued similar to the one that occurred in the Czech lands. This fact had a decisive significance for the final phases in the standardization of Slovene and for its final external shape—directly or indirectly, in all its individual features, and (no less) in its various social aspects.

Just as in Bohemia, stagnation undermined the autonomy of the written language, i.e., the independence of the organic development of the dialect type on which the future standard was to be based. The result was the rise of a common Slovene substandard, a phenomenon in many respect similar to what is known as *obecná čeština*. Genetically, the material is more or less the same as Trubar's written language, but on a more recent developmental level, because the authority and the prestige of the written language, bedevilled by stagnation, was unable to act as a brake against organic evolution. This Common Slovene supradialectal colloquial idiom—the future substandard—first began to compete with the traditional written language in many spheres of use, and then during the Revival Period (from the 1750s to the 1850s) helped shape the external form of the modern standard, i.e., promoted the notion that in the process of standardization not only did the traditional written language have to be **modernized** and its functions and spheres of use widened, but that it had to be **changed**, adapted to the results of organic developments that had occurred since Trubar's time. Similarly, if less intensely, the Common Slovene substandard affected the situation in the second half of the 19th century, and in a somewhat different way in our own century; and it is relevant today too.

The second consequence of stagnation is regionalism, which is in any case a regular occurrence at the beginning of any standardization process (in the Slavic world, Slovak is an outstanding example). In Slovenia, however, it did not obtain in any great measure at the time of the Reformation—when we would expect it—but occurred during the Revival Period. Again, it was a matter of authority and prestige. If a traditional written language does not have the necessary authority and prestige to keep regional impulses at bay, then its colloquial equivalent, lacking even that degree of normativeness attained by the written language, is likely to have still less authority and prestige. In this way a certain “linguistic accommodation” is created which favors inertia for a long period. This is most probably linked with the fact that among the Slovenes peripheral, so-called retardational phenomena held sway in vernacular writing for a relatively long time, as compared with other European and Slavic lands in which there occurred longer or shorter periods of delay in the acceptance of a common national standard language on the ethnic periphery, and/or among their own minorities in neighbouring countries, and/or in a diaspora.

In the National Revival Period attempts were made to resolve the contrast between the Reformation tradition and the results of organic development during the period of stagnation, on the one hand by arbitrary (and, moreover, internally contradictory) intervention in the linguistic substance and structure, with a resultant lack of general internal harmony and unity of the external form; and, on the other hand, by bizarre graphic endeavors, which are almost unique in Europe.⁷

The acceptance of *gajica* was not only the fruit of a (South) Slavic mood, but also a unique reaction to the bizarre alternatives of *bohoričica*. These two factors determined that *gajica* was somehow accepted swiftly and passively, more as a way out of the troubles of

the time than as the result of internal Slovene processes. The orthography of CSS does not have its own personal appearance as do the other Slavic Latin-based systems.⁸ This was why there were, in the subsequent processes of normification, so many dilemmas in orthography and orthoepy—difficult dilemmas which indeed originate for the most part in the very deficiencies of the graphic system.

Indeed it is not usually realized that in Slavic the Slovene *latinica* is exceptional: whereas there are deviations everywhere from the phonological graphemic ideal (of the Czech or of the Polish type), in Slovene there are no separate graphemic devices (with single letters or digraphs) for certain phonemes—schwa, and members of the mid-front and mid-back vocalic oppositions—and there is an unhappy solution to the relation between /u, v/ on the one hand and /l/ on the other. Of course, the trouble is that, if they are judged on their own merits, a non-phonological graphic principle has been applied in these cases. This kind of view would be romantic, not to say naive. The truth is that a phonological graphic system is in principle of higher quality than others; but there exist many Latin-based graphic systems that are as a whole non-phonological, but which in their historical development have crystallized and manage to function well nowadays. In the Slovene graphic system the real trouble is its heterogeneity, in that it is mostly phonological, but one part of it is not; hence the contradictions.

We can see where the problem lies if we compare the Slovene *latinica* with Italian. The same deficiency in mid-front and mid-back vowels obtains there, too, but there it is combined with the absence of a graphic opposition for the pairs /s, z/ and /c, ʒ/, the impossibility of distinguishing syllabic from asyllabic /i/ and /u/ in prevocalic positions, and the complex relations among the graphemes/digraphs “c g h qu s i” and the phonemes /k g č ž š/.⁹ Of course, the deficiencies in the graphic system need to be correlated with the orthography; but the Slovene orthography is morphophonological.¹⁰ This kind of orthography lacks the means to correct non-phonological graphic aberrations. Hence the Slovene orthography has internal heterogeneous features, and so the orthographic controversies are sharper than would be normal in a language which has reached the level of civilization attained by CSS.

For the complete, complex picture of CSS we must shed light on a whole series of problems concerning its genesis and its paths of development. Each of these problems would require its own independent treatment, but within a single account of the overall external form of CSS we can only touch upon the most important aspects of the most important problems. It is therefore perhaps better to simply list the main factors:

1. Built into the external form of CSS are the specifics of so-called model relations in the processes of standardization in the Austro-Hungarian lands. The role of model was played by German and by Czech, the latter in a twofold sense: both in its own right, and as an intermediary in those spheres where German was the model for calques, not only lexical and terminological but also grammatical and phraseological. Cr-S did not have a prominent role to play; in this respect Neo-Štokavian could be of no serious help, since it did not enjoy genuine prestige, regardless of any declarations or conscious intentions; for several reasons the Croatian variant was more active, but it was not a one-way relationship.¹¹ The phenomena of linguistic models in Austro-Hungary, especially of Slavic ones, have been accorded poor and biased treatment. The scale desirability vs. undesirability, i.e., from the various standpoints that were operative in the Austro-Hungarian and the Central Europe context in general, has been treated particularly poorly. Now and again a great deal is said on this subject, but not on the appropriate level.

2. Although it is not confined to these contexts, the specifics of Slovene purism are

similar. There is no doubt, however, that there exists a complex of Central European purisms (German, Hungarian, Austro-Slavic). In the case of Slovene it is mainly the Czech type of purism that is relevant. This is the favorite theme of various discussions, but they are all marred by a fallacy inherited from linguistic circles in Slavic centres which did not have their own purism of the Czech type: the fallacy that purism, as a linguistic phenomenon, is always identical to Czech purism, i.e., that there are no other kinds of purism.¹² In other words, the essence of all purism is really the means of dealing with what is evaluated as desirable or undesirable in the development of language. It goes without saying that the Czech type of purism, too, treats desirable and undesirable elements; but its essence lies in the puristic **treatment** of these elements. Unfortunately, this fallacy is accepted in Slovenia also, by both the adherents and the opponents of the Czech type of purism. This has stalled recognition of the fact that there are several purisms in Slovene, with different repertoires of desirable and undesirable features, and even purism directed against (Czech-style) purism. The second fallacy is that purism, as such, is totally negative. Moreover, among the targets of antipuristic purism have been the positive, functional and stabilized fruits of Slovene Czech-style purism. The harm ensuing from the former type of purism was as great as that caused by the latter type.

3. Some of the specifics of CSS stem from the fact that it has, throughout, developed within multilingual states: first in Austro-Hungary, then in Yugoslavia. A situation such as this automatically leads to problems in the distribution of spheres of use for the individual standard languages of the state, in administration, the military, the economy, education, trade, science, the media, culture, religious life and even everyday life. Besides, in conditions of this kind there necessarily develop special common features in terminology, nomenclature, phraseology, semantics, language habits, and so on. All these factors are reflected in the external form of the standard language.

4. The development of CSS is strongly marked by the fact that until 1918 it developed under the domination of a larger and more developed non-Slavic standard language—German universally, and also Italian and Hungarian regionally. After 1918 all three of these languages retained a dominant position for large Slovene minorities in neighboring countries. After 1945 only the greater part of the formerly Italian area was joined to the homeland. Domination by unrelated languages has a very marked impact on the external form of the standard language which is being dominated: the results of pressure, and the resistance to this pressure, are equally important, in that they both engage the language as a whole.

5. It is clear from the previous point to what extent the various aspects of the minorities problem are important for Slovene. Up to 1918, to be sure, the Slovenes were not a national minority (there did not exist a national “core” outside Austro-Hungary), but were simply an oppressed people. However, on the one hand we can speak about minority status in certain historical-administrative lands, while on the other hand the position of an oppressed nation and that of an oppressed minority are technically very similar. In the Interwar period, we can say that the question of its own national minorities in neighboring countries was in many ways more important for Slovene than for any other European language of the time.¹³

6. A large number of different characteristics of CSS are conditioned by the fact that, among the standard languages with which Slovene lived and developed in a state of co-existence (point 3), Slavic languages predominated, and moreover in the main were larger than Slovene, while some of them were also more extensively elaborated (thus Czech and Polish), or had greater potential (thus standard Neo-Štokavian as a whole entity.) This

fact is very important and requires concrete and detailed treatment for each period separately, because the mutual relationships that Slovene enjoyed with the individual languages were subject to considerable change. Indeed, this seems to be a key question, the more so because certain subjective factors caused greater problems than would be expected when related standard languages co-exist in a multi-national state.¹⁴

I think I have presented the network of specific circumstances which had a significant impact on the formation of the original form of CSS. They are presented separately, but in reality they are intertwined. They do however need to be strictly separated, for the very good reason that many of the misunderstandings and misinterpretations stem from the fact that it is not immediately clear what should be ascribed to the model of standardization, what to the Central European ("Czech") type of purism, what to the fact that the standardization of CSS took place alongside that of a number of other languages (with Slavic languages numerically preponderant but non-Slavic ones functionally dominant) and, finally, what to the minority complex. As well as their interweavings, each of these factors had its own formative role in the Slovene developmental process.

The factors that characterize the standardization of CSS over the last two centuries are combined with features that characterize the base on which the standardization processes developed: the genetic and typological peculiarities of the diasystem on the one hand, and the dialectal base of the written language and the subsequent standard on the other; the Reformation type of origin of the written language that is the basis of the present-day standard; the periods of stagnation, and the processes of renewal following those periods; and the language substandard. But enough has been said on that already.

It will be freely admitted that the main factors presented above justify the characterization of CSS as a complex linguistic phenomenon. This is primarily true with regard to its genesis, which also shaped its present form and the ways in which it functions. It is perfectly natural that in the field of norms—usage norms and codification norms—exacerbated internal structural problems and contradictions should arise. However, this whole set of problems has an extralinguistic dimension as well as an intralinguistic one. Various notions about how this or that problem should be resolved have been linked, in quite unfortunate ways, with currents of ideas in Slovene society which are totally unconnected with language. These currents are highly specific, and laden with almost indistinguishable deposits from various phases of its highly tortuous evolutionary paths, so that the initial impulses are often forgotten.

Few outside Slovenia can find their way in this maze; and even Slovenes themselves, I would say, are oriented more by instinct than by any more exact parameters. The linguistic reflexes are even more involved, as is to be expected when one kind of problem is interfered with by the indefinite instruments of another. In a situation like this I can foresee two consequences: radicalization and emotionalization within these areas, and incomprehension outside them. Neither, of course, has failed to materialize.

Perhaps the most crucial point in this situation is that (to use the well-known Prague School term) the autonomy of the standard language—one of the most essential characteristics of standardness in a language—is threatened. This is a basic criterion in a standard language. The criteria of linguistics which do not deal directly with standard languages (e.g., dialectology, comparative linguistics), and extralinguistic ideological criteria which transfer mechanically and uncritically to linguistic problems their assemblage of what is desirable and what is undesirable, are irrelevant. This can be gleaned from much of the previous discussion.

The ideological radicalization and emotionalization of the language problem mentioned

above are manifested primarily in the implacable bias with which one or another aspect of individual sectors of the language problem is emphasized or denied. Thus, for example, there is in the elaboration of CSS a ubiquitous factor which we may simply call the Slavic orientation (leaving aside all the differences in the individual Slavic languages at various phases of development, and the particular language-sectors involved.) It is undeniable that this “Slavic orientation” has borne many different fruits which are firmly integrated into CSS, and that they have contributed considerably to the functional quality of its standardness.

An *a priori* negative attitude to that orientation leads inevitably to backwardness and impoverishment. On the one hand, it cannot be denied that unnecessary, uncritical and unselective notions within that orientation also introduced into CSS features of artificiality, lifelessness, heterogeneity, hybridness and de-ethnicization, so as to pose a direct threat to it. In the same way, it would be hard to deny that in the process of standardization even those completely assimilated and potentially functional non-Slavic elements, which are doubtless of a non-regional and Pan-Slovene character, were classified by narrow interest-groups as barbarisms. It is however also beyond doubt that a subsequent wholesale correction of that historical error—regardless of facts which are *faits accomplis*—would introduce into CSS an anarchy beyond any that has existed until now. Furthermore, it is quite correct, and there would be no point in denying, that in the processes of Slovene standardization the codificational aspects have in the Central European sense been over-emphasized. It is certain that there were good and bad sides to this question. However it is indubitable that a re-orientation along the lines of the Anglo-American approach to norms would result in a normative nihilism of an extremely harmful character: CSS has been definitively formed in a Central, and to some extent (South-)East, European setting. Moreover, it is possible to correct details only; the whole cannot be changed.

There is no need to delve further; anyone familiar with these problems will immediately understand the gist, while to the uninitiated even the most circumstantial treatment would be of little help. I should however like to briefly touch on the repercussions for genetic linguistics. Of course, as was mentioned right at the outset, genetic and typological criteria are irrelevant to the problems of standard languages. However, as was also said, the complexity of a standard language is conditioned by indicators in the domain of sociolinguistics, i.e., not only by elements in the civilizational superstructure. Thus one needs to say something about the genetic features and even more about the typological features of the material base of the language standard. In the discussion of Slovene problems of this kind, we encounter not only in Slovenistics and in Slavistics but even in general linguistics shortcomings similar to those mentioned in the discussion of sociolinguistic themes.

Mention was made at the outset that one of the salient features of the Slovene diasystem is that, unlike S-Cr which has no non-South Slavic features, it shares some West (primarily North-Western) Slavic isoglosses, primarily at the phonetic level. This is however not crucial: even if it is unquestionably true that the Slovene diasystem is nearer to West Slavic than the other South Slavic diasystems are, that does not in any way mean that it is itself nearer to West Slavic than it is to the other South Slavic diasystems. There are aberrations like this elsewhere in Slavic, but they do not call for reclassification; similarly, the Slovene diasystem remains in the South Slavic (more precisely, in the Western South Slavic) group.¹⁵

Although hardly anyone, of course, would maintain that Slovene belongs to the West Slavic group, we do encounter formulations to the effect that, compared with the rest of South Slavic, Slovene is **less** South Slavic in character; or that its underlay is West Slavic,

or is mixed, and it shared in South Slavic developments later. But these are all remnants of either a Neo-Grammarians way of thinking, or a certain romanticism; and they manifest a subconscious lack of conviction about the originality and separateness of Slovene. Specifically, the originality and independence of the Slovene diasystem do not depend on Slovene's being less South Slavic; they depend on the **way in which** it is South Slavic, the **way in which** it is Slavic at all. In this sense, Slovene is indeed one of the most original and individual of the Slavic languages, as was claimed at the outset; and this is not hard to prove.

There are a number of quantitative methods for classifying groups of cognate languages (or, in the case of typological or sociolinguistic comparison, groups of unrelated languages) so that the relative distance between individual idioms may be seen: genetically, Kroeber's and similar methods, and Swadesh's glottochronology;¹⁶ typologically, Greenberg's method. The Slavic languages have been compared using approaches of this kind, by Isačenko, Garvin, Mańczak, and others. Standard languages can also be compared, *qua* standard languages.¹⁷ Whatever treatment is applied, Slovene—both as a diasystem and as a standard language—always emerges as a peculiar and original phenomenon.

This can be graphically demonstrated by a special procedure, which, as far as I know, has never been applied before, and which is highly suitable for the illustration of the genetic independence of a particular language as a diasystem on the one hand and for consideration of the genetic and sociolinguistic specificity of a standard language on the other. It involves comparing those lexical units which in each idiom are the most original, the most susceptible to idiosyncratic innovation but the most resistant to borrowing: the various particles, conjunctions, prepositions, modals (i.e., adverbs of non-adjectival, non-pronominal and non-numerical character) and so on. Without any pretense to exhaustiveness I have compiled and here present an *ad hoc* list of 59 such units from CSS. The approximate Cr-S translation is given alongside each, to illustrate the contrast which obtains in this part of the lexicon.

Sln	Cr-S	Sln	S-Cr
ampak	već, nego	prejle	maloprije
anti	valjda	razen	osim, izuzev
baje	tobože	res	zaista
bliz	valjda, već	saj	tà; pa
bolj	više	seveda	naravno, dakako
bržkone	vjerojatno	sicer	inaće
celo	čak	skoz(i)	skroz; stalno; posve; kroz
če	ako, kad; da li	sploh	uopće; općenito; svuda
čeprav	iako, premda, mada	stopr(a)v	tek, istom
češ	tobože, kao da	še	još
čez	preko; kroz; za	takoj	odmah, smjesta
dasi	iako, mada, makar	toda	ali, međjutim
davi	jutros	torej	dakle
drevi	večeras	tudi	takodjer
in	i	vedno	uvijek, neprestano
kar	odjednom; prilično; samo	vendar	ipak
ker	jer	venkaj	van, napolje
kljub	usprkos, unatoč	venomer	neprestano, neprekidno
kmalu	uskoro, ubrzo; zamalo	vnic	natrag; nauznak

komaj	jedva, tek	vsaj	bar(em); najmanje
ko	kad; pošto; ako	vselej	svaki put; uvijek
kot	kao; nego	zdaj	sada, ovaj čas
le	samo, tek	zelo	veoma, vrlo
liki	kao, poput	zgodaj	rano
menda	valjda	zgolj	samo, isključivo
nalašč	namjerno, hotimice	zmeraj	uvijek, neprestano
namreč	naime; to jest	zoper	protiv
pokonci	uspravno	zunaj	vani, napolju; izvan
precěj	prilično, podosta	že	već; doduše
prècej	odmah, smjesta		

This list tells us a great deal. In the first place, these units will strike every non-Slovene Slav as quite foreign—including anyone from the S-Cr-speaking area, with the exception of Kajkavian Croats, who will understand about 10% of the total (though not all will understand the same 10%). Similarly, the more Western Čakavians, for obvious geographical reasons, will understand two or three of these lexemes. Furthermore, the unmistakable autonomy and originality of this particular lexical inventory bears witness not only to the distinct genetic independence of the Slovene diasystem, but also to the emphatic independence of the “language spirit” of CSS. Of course, this assertion requires a fuller explanation, but here it will be given only in the most general terms.

These 59 lexemes were chosen on the principle that they were different from Neo-Štokavian; and it is clear that there are many lexical items in the same category which would have been the same as, or similar to, the corresponding Cr-S ones; this is rather less true of the other Slavic languages. In order to obtain a faithful and complete picture, it would be necessary to select a representative sample of lexemes of this kind (exactly 100 would be the most practical number) and find true equivalents in all the Standard Slavic languages. Then one would doubtless see that the smaller, younger and less developed Slavic languages depend to a greater or lesser extent on the larger, older and more developed one with respect to the inventory of “little words” of this kind, which play such a key role in the formation of phraseology and (even more) syntax—those two crucial acquisitions that are so essential in the process of standardization. It is easy to understand that the otherwise elusive “spirit of the language” is more directly and intimately linked with these words than with the inventory of nouns, adjectives and verbs, to say nothing of pronouns and numerals. In lists such as these CSS will doubtless be seen as a strikingly individual, even isolated language in the sphere of the Standard Slavic languages.

Another theme is the character of the relationship between Slovene and S-Cr. Here, contrary tendencies may be noted. The tendency towards maintaining one’s distance cannot be justified. There can be no doubt that within the South Slavic language group Slovene and Cr-S form one sub-group, and Macedonian and Bulgarian form the other, in the same way that West Slavic has three sub-groups (Czech-Slovak, Sorbian and Lekhitic) while the whole East Slavic group functions internally as if it were one sub-group. In other words, the relationship between Slovene and S-Cr is basically the same as that between Macedonian and Bulgarian, between Czech and Slovak, between Upper and Lower Sorbian, among Polish, Kashubian and Polabian, and among Russian, Belorussian and Ukrainian. The existence of a Cr-S/Slovene sub-group is affirmed also by their ancient common innovations, like the genitive desinence *-ga* (everywhere else: *-go*), the merging of the two Proto-Slavic jers in a stable new schwa (everywhere else the two jers do not merge), and

the re-phonemicization and non-merging of the palatalized /l'e l'i n'e n'i/ and the palatal /le li né ní/ series (which merge everywhere else.) The existence of a Western South Slavic sub-group cannot therefore be in doubt; but it should be pointed out that within this relationship there is markedly greater independence than in the other Slavic sub-groups.¹⁸

On the other hand, the special closeness of the Slovene and S-Cr diasystems is no reason for treating the distinctiveness of Slovene as something incomplete, "half-finished," or of no importance. Least of all is it justified to represent such attitudes as ideologically progressive, internationalistic, and so on. Such viewpoints are totally unacceptable, irrespective of whether they are held within or outside Slovenia, and of the impulses that motivate them.

Some now quite old-fashioned, impressionistic and in their time naive views of the nature of the relationship between the Slovene and Kajkavian dialects have contributed to the blurring of the real distinction between the Slovene and Cr-S diasystems. Again, it is a matter of confusing two crucially different formulations. It is true that the Kajkavian dialects are closer to the Slovene dialects than are any other S-Cr dialects—it would be unusual if it were **not** so!—but it is untrue that they are closer to them than to any other Cr-S dialects. Apart from the method of glottometric comparisons mentioned above, this would be demonstrated by the list of "minor words" (cf. above) in several typical Kajkavian and Slovene dialects, as compared with some Čakavian and Štokavian and even Torlak dialects (however surprising this might appear at first glance).¹⁹

This error, made when speaking about Slovene and Kajkavian dialects, is reflected terminologically. On the interlinguistic level it matters very little whether the present-day word for "what" is a reflex of Proto-Slavic *čīso (West Slavic *co*), or *čīto, or *kū, or *čī. If we call all the dialects having the reflex of *kū "Kajkavian," then, for the sake of consistency, we would have to call all the dialects with the reflex of *čīto "Štokavian"—thus, Upper Sorbian and all the East Slavic dialects, as well as all the Štokavian and Torlak dialects of S-Cr—and we would have to call all the West Slavic dialects (excepting Upper Sorbian) "Čokavian," (bearing in mind that Central Slovak is phonetically of a South Slavic type.)²⁰ The terms "Kajkavian," "Čakavian" and "Štokavian" are merely terminological labels of a technical character, and make sense only in the context of Cr-S dialectology. No scientific tradition or even custom can justify going beyond that context, whatever the motives.

* * *

All these facts and circumstances confirm that CSS is truly a highly individual linguistic phenomenon, in its material base, the way it evolved, its special paths of development and in the specific circumstances in which it was elaborated. This may therefore perhaps explain a certain instability of norms, both in usage and in codification. But there are proportionately more vacillations in the CSS orthographic, orthoepic, grammatical and lexical norms than we might have expected, considering that we are dealing, not with a young, non-elaborated standard language, but with a fairly mature one; one which moreover functions well **in practice** in a noticeably high civilization; one which is the vehicle of a modern literature (especially its extraordinary poetry) whose quality meets the most exacting European standards; one that can boast a fine tradition of linguistic scholarship. It is clear, therefore, that we are faced with a quite atypical situation. This can be adequately illustrated by a single detail: the contemporary prosodic norm or, to be more precise, its tonal aspect.

In the European tradition of standard languages it is an almost exceptionless rule that when a norm of usage tolerates the co-existence of two different realizations, the codifi-

cational norm prefers the one which is older and more traditional (especially if it more differentiating), more so if it still enjoys real social prestige. CSS may be spoken with or without distinctive pitch, largely depending on the dialect base of the individual speaker. The pronunciation with distinctive pitch is doubtless older and more differentiating, has a normative tradition, and also enjoys prestige (which is evident from the fact that speakers with distinctive pitch do not take the trouble to lose it, while those without it try to imitate it.) In this situation we are however faced with the curious fact that the codificational norm has recently begun to recognize the existence of both prosodic realizations side by side.

An interested bystander is hardly able to enter into an examination of the causes of the individual unsatisfactory traits of CSS. Yet they cannot all be explained away by objective circumstances. It seems, as already mentioned, that in the attempt to solve individual problems, a sense of measure and moderation was sometimes lacking. Nor were there sufficiently clear and above all holistic conceptions, or good vision. We can only hope that time will put everything in its place, although the present situation does not give grounds for optimism.

Finally, it is necessary to say a little more about how CSS is viewed within Slavic and general linguistics, as well as in non-Slavic lay circles. As regards the scholarly approach, one would expect a linguistic phenomenon as interesting and original as CSS to attract special attention. It seems, however, that this expectation is no longer justified. Scholarly interest, apart from among professional Slovenists, is concentrated mainly on Slavic comparativist needs (e.g., dialectology, or the specifics of typology). It is clear that in such contexts the original features of Slovene are bound to arouse special attention, but in all these instances Slovene is treated as an object of comparison and confrontation, not as an object of independent study. With respect to CSS we have even less ground for satisfaction, the more so because it is clear from what has been stated that it is an extraordinarily interesting subject for sociolinguistic investigation. Perhaps part of the fault lies in the widespread prejudice in Slavic circles, to the effect that Slovene is impossibly hard to learn.

Leaving aside the scholarly aspect we shall conclude this study with a short glance at the problems of CSS in the Yugoslav community. We shall not bother with general interlingual relations (a subject in its own right), but shall rather examine specific problems which arise in the practical everyday contacts of non-Slovene citizens with the Slovene language. In recent years, considering the migratory movements in both the Yugoslav and the European employment markets, this subject has become especially relevant.

In the examination of these problems, Slovene and even more the rest of Yugoslav linguistics has been found wanting, as have Yugoslav sociology and, even more so, Yugoslav sociolinguistics. Thus everything has been left for the wider public, which is not and cannot be a match for the problems that have arisen. Clearly, public consciousness is unaware that language conflicts are a frequent occurrence in the modern world, and that the many different statements about them on all continents have already been described systematically and in great detail in a host of sociolinguistic works (to mention only the contributions by Joshua Fishman and the collections of articles by others that he has edited.)²¹ The very realization that such occurrences are neither new nor exceptional but appear regularly whenever there arises a certain concatenation of circumstances naturally serves to alleviate the concrete manifestations of the phenomenon. But in our country, alas, such a realization has been totally absent.

In a foreign language setting every person who does not know the language has certain practical difficulties. A great deal of time is required to master a new language; also, there

has to be a willingness to invest the effort; also needed is a consciousness of the utility and justification for learning it; and further, the setting itself must welcome such efforts. In language contact it is not only important to understand a language; it is also extremely important that both sides have an understanding of each other.

In treating the Slovene setting,²² we further encounter three "aggravating circumstances." The first is that between Slovene society and a large part of the non-Slovene work force we have, generally speaking, the largest civilizational gap that can be found within Yugoslavia; this alone is a sufficient generator of conflict situations. The second is that CSS is, as exhaustively documented here, an uncommonly complex linguistic phenomenon. Thirdly, the language problems have come to be intertwined with certain specific Yugoslav controversies, which did not in the past much concern Slovenia itself.

The third theme we shall leave on one side, since we prefer not to move away from linguistic problems.²³ We do not need to spend much time of the first, either: its manifestations are well known in the literature on countries in which situations arise that are familiar to us only in the contacts between Slovenes and non-Slovenes. In its totality of features and levels CSS is quite different from all the forms of Neo-Štokavian.²⁴ It is a question here of language attitude. From all that has been said above about the specific paths of development of CSS, it must be clear that nowhere in Europe is that problematical and often manipulatively misused slogan "language is the true homeland" as valid as in Slovenia. Anybody unfamiliar with this problem will fail to properly grasp the Slovene attitude to the mother tongue, and, what is more, will interpret it wrongly. Nothing is more natural than that such an interpretation should provoke a disproportionate reaction from the Slovene side, because a person with the language attitudes that are normal in Slovenia cannot properly grasp the origins of the misinterpretations of his attitudes, and will necessarily ascribe ill-intentioned motives to them. This will then be greeted as a false accusation, and so on.

In practice such scenarios will always contain some brief interludes of subjective primitivism. An individual confronted with many troubles will often subjectively experience practical language difficulties as needless extra disturbance. Somewhere in his subconscious it may appear to him that Slovenes speak Slovene not for the reasons that he speaks his own language at home, but somehow so as to make life more difficult for him, maliciously. Such an explicitly formulated assertion may appear stupid, but for the subconscious it is psychologically convincing, and it can provide an explanation for individual behavior. On the other hand, it is understandable that reactions to such behavior will not always be well-mannered. Thus we have a setting for potential conflict, which may then become the subject of further convictions.

This is still not the worst scenario; the worst occurs when, in certain Yugoslav settings, is published an intellectual elaboration of attitudes and behavior which, in their primitive version, are still understandable. This provides the impulse for the multiplication and intensification of the conflicts and disagreements, and someone who was perhaps not even altogether sure of the correctness of and justification for his attitudes and actions will find encouragement for them. In this way, the problems are exacerbated. Of course, they lie beyond the complex and extraordinarily interesting nature of Contemporary Standard Slovene; but, unfortunately, at the present time I cannot help mentioning them.

University of Zadar
Translated by George Thomas, McMaster University

EDITORIAL NOTE: The standard language spoken to the South and East of Slovene is here deliberately referred to as “Croato-Serbian” and “Serbo-Croatian,” and abbreviated as *Cr-S* and *S-Cr*, **alternately**. See also the author’s third note, below.

NOTES

- * Originally presented as the International Symposium held at the Oddelek za slovanske jezike in književnosti Filozofske fakultete v Ljubljani, July 1-3, 1986. For the original text, see Brozović 1988; this is an expanded version with additional notes, which only give a selection of references to works on the Slovene language from the complete bibliography which could be compiled for this paper, since it treats the whole language problem in all its complexity. This paper favors a basic orientation to the problem, and thus refers to little from the recent literature apart from Nećak-Lük & Štrukelj 1984 and Rigler 1986. For further bibliographic reference, see the relevant entries in Simonič 1903-05, Šlebinger 1913, and the editions of the *Slovenska bibliografija* from 1929 to 1986; the individual sections in *Rocznik slawistyczny*, *Južnoslovenski filolog*, *Revue des études slaves*, “New publications in language and linguistics” in *Slovene Studies*, *Biografije in bibliografije univerzitetnih učiteljev in sodelavcev* (Ljubljana), *Biografije in bibliografije znanstvenih in strokovnih sodelavcev SAZU*, and *Jezik in slovstvo 1955-1985. Bibliografsko kazalo* (Ljubljana 1985). Bibliographies of individual Slovene linguists are to be found in several non-(bio)bibliographical editions, thus *Letopis SAZU* and *Slavistična revija* — in the latter, for Nahtigal in 1948, for Ramovš in 1950, for Bajec in 1972, and for Logar and for Toporišič in 1987. Of books by individuals that are especially rich in bibliographic data I would single out Breznik 1982, Lencek 1982 and Rigler 1986. A special onomastic bibliography by Bezljaj can be found in *Onomastica jugoslavica* 9 (1981). Finally, *Slovenski biografski leksikon* (which has been appearing periodically since 1925) and *Primorski slovenski leksikon* (which has been appearing in Gorica since 1974) contain, as well as biographies of individual Slovene linguists, also shorter bibliographies of their works on a regular basis. As far as non-Slovene (and non-Slavic) linguists are concerned, many bibliographical data will be found in individual numbers of *Linguistica* (Ljubljana). Of course, in the writings by Slovene non-Slavists there are also many contributions that are explicitly or secondarily relevant to Slovenistics.
1. The great Czech linguist Bohuslav Havránek (1963) spoke at length of some of these exceptional features, which are of some rarity.
 2. My Slavistic and general linguistic positions, on which this work is based, were set out for the first time 20 years ago (Brozović 1967); the terminology on standard languages is also provided there.
 3. Since recently there have been many controversies about terminology in this area, I insist on the synonymy between “Croato-Serbian” and “Serbo-Croatian.” It is necessary to add that synonymous with these two terms are also “Croatian or Serbian” and, in the reverse order, “Croatian or Serbian.” A neutral term is “Standard Neo-Štokavian,” on the analogy of Standard Castilian and Standard Tuscan.
 4. Only lexical problems have been treated in the volumes of the European Linguistic Atlas that have appeared to date, see ALE 1983-86. When, however, the structural-typological volumes appear, the Slovene diasystem will be represented four times by oasis-like phenomena: the area of phonological sharpness in Luče; the somewhat wider oasis-area with the Carinthian phonemic glottal stop; the even wider one with the morphological dual; and the widest of all, with phonologically relevant pitch. Only in the last-named are non-Slovene dialects also involved. I am not familiar with a similar example on the European continent: even the most widespread diasystems do not have so many oasis-like phenomena.
 5. In this respect I agree with the views of Rigler 1986a, 1986b on the material base of Trubar’s language and also that of the contemporary standard.
 6. Typologically more different are those standard languages which are linked with the Renaissance, primarily those in the Mediterranean lands. In them, belletristics and communicational criteria, respectively, predominate over social and expressive ones.
 7. Attempts elsewhere in the Slavic world to mix Latin and Cyrillic scripts, apart from the creation of new graphemes, remained exclusively in the realm of eccentricities, and even then co-occurred with regionalist tendencies and inertia.

8. From a purely theoretical, hypothetical point of view we can conceive of such a combinatorily original graphic system on the supposition that the graphemes "f" and especially "ě" were introduced at the appropriate time. Today it is of course too late to think about past omissions.
9. For the opposition between non-syllabic and syllabic /w, u/, cf. *la quale* "which" /lakwále/ vs. *lacuale* "lacustrine" /lakuále/; for that between non-syllabic and syllabic /j, i/, cf. *piano* "slowly" /pjáno/ vs. *Piano* "pertaining to the epoch of Roman Popes names Pius" /piáno/, see Muljačić 1969: 423 [= Muljačić 1972: 244]. Of course, of primary interest for Slovene is the relationship /w : u/, but the comparisons which Muljačić draws between the Italian and Cr-S vowel inventory are even more interesting for the Slovene system; the difference is that in Italian /ž/ and phonemic schwa are absent, and in Slovene /ž/ is absent.
10. I.e., based on the morphophonological principle, as in the majority of Slavic languages. Exceptions to this rule are the two orthographies of Cr-S and the orthography of Macedonian on the one hand, and on the other to some extent the otherwise morphophonological Russian orthography, which with its larger share of the historical principle is a special case.
11. Slovene influence in Croatia is stronger and broader than is usually thought. This would be a very interesting theme for investigation.
12. There is no reason why the attitude of Vuk Karadžić to Church Slavonicisms and Russianisms, or the Bulgarian attitude to Turkisms, should not be classified with puristic behavior.
13. The position of Macedonian after World War II was similar.
14. For a typology of the existing phenomena, see Brozović 1968, 1983.
15. Examples of similar aberrations: the East Bulgarian dialects (which are less aberrant than Slovene) and the Central Slovak dialects (which are more so.) We would not think of classifying the East Bulgarian dialects as East Slavic, or the Central Slovak dialects as South Slavic; they remain indubitably South Slavic and West Slavic, respectively.
16. This should of course be understood as glottometry rather than as glottochronology.
17. See Brozović 1967, 1970.
18. Perhaps only the relationship between the Polish diasystem and extinct Polabian could be compared with that between Slovene and S-Cr; but this is an academic point.
19. Similar errors have led Bulgarian Slavists astray: the unquestionably true formulation that the Torlak dialects are closer to Bulgarian (and Eastern South Slavic dialects in general) than to other Cr-S dialects (and, again, it would be most unusual if it were not so!) has been misconstrued to suggest that they are closer to them than to other S-Cr dialects.
20. I.e., /čs/ → /č/ and does not → /c/, as—in South Slavic—/šs/ → /š/ and does not → /s/, as occurs in West Slavic.
21. This does not mean that I agree with Fishman's interpretations and notions, which contain many overt and concealed reflections of linguistic neo-colonialism, and of what in sociolinguistics is (drastically) called "glottophagia."
22. For the circumstances of modern Slovene, e.g., Nećak-Lük & Štrukelj 1984 is relevant.
23. In contemporary Yugoslav conditions language questions have already extended into extra-linguistic spheres; this is reflected not only in the mass media but in society generally, both in political and in governmental forums.
24. This is somewhat less true of the Croatian variant, but in any case it is not Croatian-Slovene language contacts that are the most relevant.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALE 1983-86 = *Atlas linguarum Europae. Commentaires*, I. Fascicule I, 1983; Fascicule II, 1986; *Cartes*, Fascicule I, 1983; Fascicule II, 1986. Assen (Netherlands): van Gorcum.
- Breznik, Anton. 1982. *Jezikoslovne razprave*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica.
- Brozović, Dalibor. 1967. "Slavjanske standartne jazyki i sravnitel'nyj metod," *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 16/1: 3-33; for a fuller version in Croatian, see 9-62 in Brozović 1970.
- , 1968. "Tipovi dvojnih i višestrukih odnosa medju slavenskim standardnim jezicima," *Radovi Zavoda za slavensku filologiju* (Zagreb) 10: 41-53; for a fuller version in Croatian, see 63-83 in Brozović 1970.
- , 1970. *Standarni jezik* Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- , 1983. "Die soziolinguistische Situation in der jugoslawischen Föderation," *Wiener slawistisches Jahrbuch* 29: 9-23. The fuller Croatian version is "O funkcioniranju jezika u jugoslavenskoj federaciji (Sociolingvistička situacija u jednoj višejezičnoj i višenacionalnoj evropskoj zajedni-

- ci),” *Književni jezik* (Sarajevo) 14/2 (1985) 65-85.
- , 1988. “Suvremeni slovenski standardni jezik — kompleksan lingvistički fenomen,” 245-260 in B. Paternu and F. Jakopin, eds., *Sodobni slovenski jezik, književnost in kultura. Mednarodni simpozij v Ljubljani od 1. do 3. julija 1986*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Nećak-Lük, Albina, & Inka Štrukelj, eds., 1984. *Dvojezičnost. Individualne in družbene razsežnosti*. Ljubljana.: Društvo za uporabo jezikoslovja SR Slovenije.
- Havránek, Bohuslav. 1963. “K adaptaci fonologických systemů ve spisovných jazycích slovanských,” 282-293 in B. Havránek, *Studie o spisovnem jazyce*. Prague: ČSAV.
- Lencek, Rado L. 1982. *The Structure and History of the Slovene Language*. Columbus OH: Slavica.
- Muljačić, Ž. 1969. *Fonologia generale e fonologia della lingua italiana*. Bologna: il Mulino. [= *Opća fonologija i fonologija suvremenoga talijanskog jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1972.]
- Rigler, Jakob. 1986a. *Razprave o slovenskem jeziku*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica.
- , 1986b. “O jeziku slovenskih reformatorjev,” 17-39 in Rigler 1986a.
- , 1986c. “Osnove Trubarjevega jezika,” 40-47 in Rigler 1986a.
- Simonič, Franc. 1903-05. *Slovenska bibliografija 1550-1900*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica.
- Šlebinger, Janko. 1913. *Slovenska bibliografija za leta 1907-1912*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica.

POVZETEK

SODOBNI SLOVENSKI STANDARDNI JEZIK - KOMPLEKSNI LINGVISTIČNI POJAV

Vsak idiom je enkrat in neponovljiv pojav, a ne vsak v enaki meri. Med njimi spada slovenski standardni jezik v mnogočem k bolj izvirnim. Čeprav so njegove značilnosti že zdavnaj dobro znane, lahko določen kompleksni pristop nanovo osvetli celoto, če slovenski jezik primerjamo z drugimi idiomi, s katerimi je bil povezan, tj. z (južno)slovanskimi in (srednje)evropskimi.

Značilnosti, zaradi katerih je slovenski standardni jezik precej nenavaden pojav, izvirajo deloma iz osnove, na kateri je zgrajen, in deloma iz svojevrstnih značilnosti njegove jezikovno-civilizacijske nagradnje. Osnovo standarda analiziramo z metodami genetske in tipološke lingvistike, upoštevaje diasistem v celoti in tudi tisti njegov del, ki je služil kot konkretna dialektna osnova za jezikovni standard. Civilizacijsko-jezikovno nagradnjo analiziramo s sociolingvističnimi metodami ter raziskujemo genezo, posebne razvojne poti, karakter norme in odnose z drugimi standardnimi jeziki v preteklosti in sedanosti.

Ne samo izvirni značaj samih dejstev, ampak še bolj samosvoj značaj njihovih medsebojnih odvisnosti dajeta splošno podobo, ki je izredno zanimiva in spodbudna, in to tako v slovanskih in splošningvističnih pogledih.