HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Dalibor Brozović's Typology of Slavic Standard Languages and the Status of Standard Croatian
Author(s)	Matasović, Ranko
Citation	Acta Slavica Iaponica, 44, 25-51
Issue Date	2023
DOI	https://doi.org/10.14943/ASI.44.25
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/93407
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	02_Acta44_Ranko_Matasovic.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

Acta Slavica Iaponica, Tomus 44, pp. 25–51

Dalibor Brozović's Typology of Slavic Standard Languages and the Status of Standard Croatian*

Ranko Matasović

Introduction

Dalibor Brozović (1927–2009) was one of the most influential Croatian linguists of his generation. Besides being an accomplished dialectologist, he also contributed to sociolinguistic theory and comparative Slavic studies. His views on Croatian, as a separate standard Slavic language, and the history of its standardization are still generally accepted in Croatia, and his articles on the position of Croatian among the Slavic languages are compulsory reading for all students of Croatian language and literature in Croatian universities.[1] Brozović was writing his works on standardology during a particularly turbulent period of Croatian history: Yugoslavia was slowly opening its borders and becoming a less centralized country, and many Croatian intellectuals saw this as an opportunity to strive towards more national self-consciousness and independence in cultural and linguistic, if not political, matters.[2] "The Declaration on the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language" (1967), which was co-written by Brozović and supported and signed by most Croatian cultural institutions, was soon condemned by the ruling Communist Party. However, the dogma of a unitary Serbo-Croatian (with the so-called Serbian and Croatian variants), while still supported by the Party, was seriously challenged once and for all. As we shall see, Brozović actively contributed to the dismantling of that dogma by developing his typology of Slavic standard languages and by pointing out the differences between the Serbian and Croatian "variants," which, in his opinion, were equal to the differences between certain other separate standard languages.

* This paper was partly written during my research stay as a visiting professor at the Slavic-Eurasian Research Center of Hokkaido University, in the summer of 2022. I would like to thank Professor Motoki Nomachi for his many useful comments on the first draft of this paper. All of the remaining mistakes are, of course, my own.

1 See Krešimir Mićanović, *Varijacije na temu jezika i varijanata. Standardologija Dalibora Brozovića* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2010).

2 See, e.g., Ivo Banac, "Main Trends in the Croatian Language Question," *Most* 1 (1990), pp. 5–96, especially pp. 77–78.

In recent years, a number of criticisms of Brozović's views of standard languages in general, and Croatian in particular,[3] have been raised, but no overall attempt has yet been made to critically assess Brozović's general typology of Slavic standard languages and its application to standard Croatian.[4] In this article, we show that at least some of Brozović's publications on the subject are still relevant and that his original positions are tenable. We will show that his views on the status of Croatian as a separate standard language are a consequence of his typology of Slavic standard languages, which still stands out as one of the first attempts to apply the methods of language typology to standardology and sociolinguistics in the realm of Slavic studies.[5]

However, to understand Brozović's views on Croatian as a separate standard language, as well as its position among the other Slavic standards, one first needs to understand his terminology, as well as the methods he used in developing a typology of standard Slavic languages. Therefore, this paper has three sections: the first section explains Brozović's views on standard language and contrasts it with some alternative, more recent approaches; the second section presents his typology of Slavic standard languages and shows its consequences for the status of Croatian; finally, the third section of the paper evaluates Brozović's typology in light of recent sociolinguistic developments in Slavic languages and linguistics. We conclude this paper by arguing that

3 See Snježana Kordić, *Jezik i nacionalizam* (Zagreb: Durieux, 2010); Petar Vuković, "Vijeće za normu i teorija upravljanja jezikom," *Suvremena lingvistika* 82 (2016), pp. 219–235; Anđel Starčević, Mate Kapović, and Daliborka Sarić, *Jeziku je svejedno* (Zagreb: Sandorf, 2019). Most of these criticisms refer to Brozović's conservative attitudes with respect to the role of state institutions in language planning, as well as his puristic tendencies in his publications on Croatian linguistic norms. Some of these criticisms are discussed and answered in Ranko Matasović, "Branič jezika standardnoga," *Jezik* 2-3, 2020, pp. 41–59.

4 For critical assessments of Brozović's typology from a general, rather than a Croato-centric point of view, see Nikita Tolstoj, *Istorija i struktura slavjanskix literaturnyx jazykov* (Moscow: Nauka, 1988); Anna Kretschmer, "Zur Geschichte und Typologie slavischer Standardsprachen," *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 38:2 (1993), pp. 177–184; Monika Wingender, "Standardsprachlichkeit in der Slavia: Eine Überprüfung des Begriffsaparates," *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 43:2 (1998), pp. 127–139; Serhii Vakulenko, "Standardization Across State Boundaries: Modern Ukrainian as a Paradigmatic Case," in Wendy Ayres-Bennett and John Bellamy, eds., *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), pp. 546–575. However, the last-named author only deals with the version of Brozović's typology published in an article in *Slavia* in 1965, not with all of his publications on the subject that were later published in his book *Standardni jezik* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1970).

5 At approximately the same time, but apparently independently from Brozović, a typology of Slavic standard languages was developed by George Y. Shevelov (*Die ukrainische Schriftsprache 1798–1965: Ihre Entwicklung unter dem Einfluß der Dialekte* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1966), pp. 5–6, 164–165). Shevelov's typology is much sketchier than Brozović's, but it includes some typological parameters that were not used by Brozović; these are mentioned below.

Brozović, by showing how Slavic standard languages differ with respect to many typological parameters, actually challenged several widespread modern assumptions about standard languages and standard language ideologies.

Brozović and the Notion of a Standard Language

In this section, we will look at Brozović's use of the term *standard language*. Brozović was actually the linguist who introduced the notion of standard language in Croatian linguistics, and his views on standardology were especially developed during his research stay at the University of Michigan in 1969, where he become acquainted with the recent developments in American sociolinguistics.[6] Before Brozović's publications on standard languages, it was customary in Croatia, as well as in the rest of Yugoslavia, to speak about *literary* languages (Croat. *književni jezik*).[7] This term was used to cover the idioms used not only in literary production, but also in other forms of written communication. Before the development of electronic media, it was clear, of course, that non-oral forms of expression more or less equalled printed texts, but with the development of radio and, subsequently, television, this was no longer always the case. Also, the term *standard language* started to be used in the late nineteenth century in French, English, and other Western European traditions to refer to the language of the upper classes, replacing the more aristocratically sounding terms such as *language of the court*.[8] Yet it is important to note that, even in the 1960s, there was no consensus about what the term *standard language* actually denoted in each particular sociolinguistic situation, and whether it was equally applicable to all of them. In the Anglo-Saxon countries, *Standard English* could be used as a politically neutral term instead of the *King's* (or *Queen's*) *English*, but in France the expression *français standard* was more or less synonymous with *français* (as opposed to *patois*, which referred not only to idioms spoken by the lower classes, but also to dialects of French); likewise, in Italy, *italiano standard* was the same thing as *la lingua italiana* (in

6 The evolution of Brozović's sociolinguistic views and his use of terminology can be followed through a series of his articles published in the late sixties of the past century (and gathered in the volume *Jezik današnji 1965–1968* (Zagreb: Disput, 2016)). He used the term *standardni jezik* ("standard language") in a paper published in 1968 (ibid., p. 483), even before his stay in the USA.

7 See, e.g., Ljudevit Jonke, *Književni jezik u teoriji i praksi* (Zagreb: Znanje, 1965).

8 Brian Joseph, *Eloquence and Power: The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Languages* (London: Frances Pinter, 1987); Ulrich Ammon, "Standard Variety," in Ulrich Ammon et al. eds., *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004), pp. 273–283.

contradistinction to its numerous *dialetti*)[9] and in Germany the expression *Standarddeutsch* was used in the more or less the same sense as *Hochdeutsch*. In most Western countries, it was becoming increasingly usual to refer to standard languages only in the context of new idioms that were gaining official status in former European colonies, as well as to standard languages of Eastern Europe that gained their independence in the late nineteenth century or in the early twentieth century. It was tacitly assumed that all standard languages developed in a similar manner, and that Western European languages were universal models to be followed by standard languages in other parts of the world. Some of these "Eurocentric" assumptions can also be observed in Brozović's standardological publications.

Let us now look at Brozović's definition of the term *standard language*. It is not easy to translate into English, since it owes a lot of its terminology and phraseology to the Soviet-influenced Marxist modes of expression, but here is my best effort: "For the definition of standard language, it is important to say that it is an autonomous type of language that is always regulated and functionally polyvalent. It arises when an ethnic or national group, having become part of international civilization, starts to employ . . . its idiom, which had previously been functioning only to serve the needs of a [single] ethnic civilization."[10]

This definition leaves much to be desired in terms of clarity. We understand that "regulation" (*normiranost*) of a standard means that it always has an explicit norm, stating which words and constructions belong to it and which do not, while "polyvalence" means that it is, in principle at least, possible to speak about anything in a standard language, i.e., that it is not tied to one, or a few, functional domains. This is fully in line with Haugen's classic view of the standard as the variety with "minimal variation in form and maximal variation in function".[11] However, there are still two points that need clarification in Brozović's definition.

Firstly, we need to explain what is meant by "an autonomous type of language." Here, Brozović is following the Prague School of Linguistics, which emphasized that standard languages are autonomous with respect to the dialect

9 Other expressions with the same meaning were *common Italian, good Italian, literary Italian, classic Italian, correct Italian, supraregional Italian, normal Italian*, and *normed Italian*; see Nicoletta Maraschio and Tina Matarese, "The Role of Literature in Language Standardization: The Case of Italy," in Ayres-Bennett and Bellamy, *The Cambridge Handbook*, pp. 313–346.

10 Brozović, *Standardni jezik*, p. 28: "Bitno je za definiciju standardnog jezika da je on autonoman vid jezika, uvijek normiran i funkcionalno polivalentan, koji nastaje pošto se jedna etnička ili nacionalna formacija, uključivši se u internacionalnu civilizaciju, počne u njoj služiti svojim idiomom, koji je dotad funkcionirao samo za potrebe etničke civilizacije."

11 Einar Haugen, "Dialect, Language, Nation," *American Anthropologist* 68:4 (1966), pp. 922–935, p. 931.

(or dialects) which served as the source of their lexicon and grammar.[12] This means that the changes in such dialect(s) do not necessarily trigger a change in the standard language once it is formed. For example, standard Italian was based on the Tuscan dialect of Florence spoken by Dante and Boccaccio, but nowadays that dialect is quite different from modern standard Italian. Any change that may still happen in the Tuscan dialect will have zero effect on standard Italian, which is thus fully autonomous from it. This is similar in Slavic standard languages, although, for some languages (including Croatian), it has been argued that their standard forms should closely reflect the spoken dialect which had served as their basis, thus contradicting the principle of autonomy.[13]

Secondly, are we really sure that the development of a standard language is so closely tied to "becoming part of international civilization" (whatever that exactly means)? One could argue that there were standard languages (in the sense that they are prestigious and with minimal dialectal diversification) in pre-modern societies as well, before anything resembling "international civilization" existed. If Brozović meant that standardization necessarily involves modern civilization, with its admin-istrative, scientific, legal, and other terminologies, then one could argue that his view was rather parochial and Euro-centric, and that in such case there were no standard languages before the modern period. However, this would clearly contradict our intuition that languages like Latin, Sanskrit, and Japanese were standardized long before the development of modern science, technology, and civilization.

So, we see that Brozović's definition of s*tandard language* is idiosyncratic; moreover, it is rather different from the current notion of *standard language* that is found in most contemporary reference books. Here is the definition of *standard language* by Pavle Ivić and David Crystal, from the online edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.[14]

> Standard languages arise when a certain dialect begins to be used in written form, normally throughout a broader area than that of the dialect itself. The ways in which this language is used—e.g., in administrative matters, literature, and

12 Petar Vuković, "Autonomija standardnoga jezika," in Lada Badurina, ed., *Riječki filološki dani, knj. X.* (Rijeka: Odsjek za kroatistiku Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Rijeci, 2016), pp. 361–370.

13 See Radoslav Katičić, *Hrvatski jezik* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2010).

14 https://www.britannica.com/topic/dialect/Standard-languages (henceforth, all the websites mentioned were accessed in August 2022). This definition is given since it shows the most widespread, common-sense current meaning of the term *standard language*. Some linguists prefer to use the term *standard variety* instead (e.g., Ammon, "Standard Variety"), since a language can be viewed as the set of different varieties, the standard being only one of them. However, Brozović continued to use the term *standard language* throughout his long career.

> economic life—lead to the minimization of linguistic variation. The social prestige attached to the speech of the richest, most powerful, and most highly educated members of a society transforms their language into a model for others; it also contributes to the elimination of deviating linguistic forms.

This definition, while closer to what is today generally understood in linguistics under *standard language*, is also not without its problems. It tells us more how standard languages arise than what they actually are. It adds a further element of *prestige* to the definition of a standard, which was not mentioned by Brozović, but it does not say what that *prestige* is.[15] In some economically very stratified societies, the prestige of a standard may simply be the consequence of the fact that large portions of the society in which it is used do not have access to higher education[16] while, in other societies, the prestige may be of a different kind, which we might call cultural prestige: think of the prestige that a Catholic speaker of Standard Upper Lusatian enjoys in his or her endangered community (where German is the prestigious language in most spheres of public communication), or the prestige of a Welsh speaker among the Welsh people (in a country where English has a different kind of prestige and is a pathway to social advancement). Cultural prestige is not directly tied to economic benefits—rather, it helps the speaker of a given standard language gain social capital in his or her community, as well as show that one has internalized the cultural values of the community. Prestige is always a relative matter, and in most complex societies speaking a particular idiom may be associated with different kinds of prestige.

Therefore, before reconsidering Brozović's typology of standard languages, we have to admit that the very definition of the notion of *standard language* is not uncontroversial. Different researchers give slightly different definitions, or highlight certain features of different idioms that they find most relevant, or most interesting, for their research. This is not very much unlike the situation in other kinds of language typology, e.g., the syntactic typology of word order, where the notions such as *verb*, *subject*, or *object* are taken for

15 Many theorists tend to oversimplify matters and assume that *prestige* is always imposed by a social élite that controls the public discourse and the economic resources in a given society, cf., e.g., the following definition of language standardization by Dick Leith, *A Social History of English,* 2nd edition (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 33: "We shall see standardisation as a project, which took different forms at different times. It is only with hindsight, after all, that we can interpret the process at all: things may have felt very different in the past. One thing we can be clear about is that the process of standardisation cannot be seen as merely a matter of communal choice, an innocent attempt on the part of society as a whole to choose a variety that can be used for official purposes and, in addition, as a lingua franca among speakers of divergent dialects. It involves from the first the cultivation, by an elite, of a variety that can be regarded as exclusive. The embryonic standard is not seen as the most useful, or the most widely-used variety, but as the best."

16 Think, for example, of the position of Hispanic immigrants and African Americans in the USA.

granted, although they are just as ambiguous as the notion of *standard language* is. So, for practical purposes, we will not think of *standard language* as a strictly defined term for which there are sufficient and necessary conditions that have to be fulfilled in order for the definition to be applicable. Rather, we will think of it as a notion based on "family resemblance" (a concept borrowed from Wittgenstein's philosophy): just like most members of a family are likely to share many features (such as complexion, height, hair and eye colour, etc.), but not necessarily all of them, or a single, "essential" feature, we will assume that the same holds for standard languages. In what follows, we will consider an idiom to be a standard language if it satisfies most (but not necessarily all) of the following criteria:[17]

(1) It is a written idiom (which does not exclude the existence of a spoken standard); it is not to be equated with *literary language*, i.e., with the medium in which only artistic, literary texts are composed;

(2) It is generally understood in an area transcending a single dialect;

(3) It has some public and/or official use in the community that understands it (although that community, or very large parts of it, may use different idioms in everyday communication);

(4) It has a certain prestige (either cultural or economic)[18] with respect to other idiom (or idioms) used by the respective community;

(5) It has an explicit norm (a set of grammatical rules and lexical choices which are considered acceptable), often prescribed by an authoritative body (such as a national academy);

(6) Texts written in it are translatable into other standard languages.[19]

Admittedly, these are not strict criteria, since an idiom can be considered a standard language even if it does not fulfil them all. However, as we will argue in the rest of this paper, standard languages are notions that cannot be defined strictly and to everyone's satisfaction. Different idioms can be more or less like

17 For a similar approach to the definition of a standard language, see Joseph, *Eloquence and Power*.

18 The difference between "standard language ideologies" that these two types of prestige tend to engender in a society can also be very different. For example, the cultural prestige possessed by Standard Irish (Gaelic) speakers in Ireland will probably be more connected with traditionalist values and nationalist ideology, while the economic prestige (reflected, e.g., in access to education, employability, and social mobility) gained by speakers of Quechua who learn Spanish in Bolivia will be associated with cultural values and ideologies spread by globalization processes.

19 Inter-translatability (the possibility to translate everything from one standard language into another) was first introduced as a criterion for standard languages by Joshua Fishman, "Language Modernization and Planning in Comparison with Other Types of National Modernization and Planning," in J. A. Fishman, ed., *Advances in Language Planning* (The Hague: De Gruyter, 1974), pp. 79–101, p. 81. It is also an important criterion for Brian Joseph, *Eloquence and Power*.

the prototypical standard language that fulfils all of the criteria, but such a prototypical standard probably does not exist, and has never existed, in the real world. The term *standard language* may still be useful in that it denotes a range of idioms that share a certain number of features, but also differ considerably with respect to many parameters. Determining these parameters is the task of the *typology of standard languages*.

The Sample of Standard Languages and the Typological Parameters

Any language typology consists of two elements: the sample of languages included in the study (since it is in practice impossible to analyse all human languages) and the typological parameters according to which at least some of the sampled languages differ. One may ask whether there is any particular reason why Brozović chose Slavic languages for his sample. Is there anything special about Slavic that would warrant this decision? After all, the division of languages into groups based on genetic criteria is a heritage of the nineteenth century, when comparative grammar was the model for all branches of linguistics, yet even today the division of language departments in our universities still reflects that ancient vogue. Would it not be more appropriate for a researcher to use a geographical, rather than genetic, criterion for sampling, and attempt to construct a typology of standard languages of Europe, or East Asia, or some other part of the world that shares certain cultural or other characteristics? Or, why not select a random sample of standard languages in different parts of the world, and compare them with respect to a selected set of features, as we would do in typological syntax, for example? Indeed, this would be methodologically more in order, but for practical reasons it is no wonder that Brozović limited himself to the Slavic branch of Indo-European languages. It is difficult to be competent in so many different languages as are spoken in Europe (not to speak of the whole world), and Brozović was a brilliant Slavic scholar who spoke most of the Slavic languages and knew a great deal about their history. However, the same methods that he applied in his typology of Slavic standard languages would also be applicable to Germanic, Romance, Celtic, or any other group of languages. So, for practical purposes, Slavic languages can be treated as a substitute for a random sample of standard languages that could be extended in future research.

Of course, not all Slavic languages are standardized, and this was as true at the time when Brozović wrote his articles as it is today, e.g., the Kashubian language in the north of Poland (although it shows some standardizing tendencies). The standard Slavic languages included in Brozović's typology are the following: Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian (of the East Slavic branch); Czech, Slovak, Polish, Upper Lusatian, and Lower Lusatian (West Slavic); Slovene, Bulgarian, and Macedonian; and "Serbo-Croatian" (with the variants

Serbian and Croatian which Brozović listed as separate entries in his tables). Bosnian and Montenegrin, which are considered by many Slavists to be new standard languages in the South Slavic group, were not taken into account by Brozović. However, in any contemporary typology of standard Slavic languages, they should be represented as well, and it is possible that in the future other presently non-standardized idioms will also be found.

And now, let us turn to the parameters that Brozović chose for his typological classification. In linguistic typology, a researcher is free to choose those parameters that he or she deems relevant, especially those that will enable them to show some empirical generalizations over the sampled languages. Besides that, the researcher can also select the features that he or she thinks best illustrate the "diversity space", i.e., the inherent diversity of the studied phenomenon. Therefore, the parameters Brozović chose for his typology at least to some extent reflect his own interests and biases.[20]

Here is the list of the typological parameters[21] used by Brozović in his publications on the typology of Slavic standard languages:

1. High degree of autonomy/elastic stability: Both terms have been borrowed from the Prague School. This parameter distinguishes those languages that are very much evolved from the dialect(s) that served as the basis of their standardization and those that are still rather close to it (or them). In the first group (languages marked as having a high degree of autonomy/elastic stability), Brozović included the following languages:

I. Russian, Polish, Upper Lusatian, Lower Lusatian, Czech, and Slovene (+)

And this is the second group (languages marked with (-) for this parameter):

II. Belarusian, Ukrainian, Slovak, Serbo-Croatian, Serbian, Croatian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian (-)

Note that languages marked with (+) have a decidedly longer history of standardization and that, in Brozović's opinion, both "Serbo-Croatian" and its variants (Serbian and Croatian) have a low degree of autonomy/elastic stability. In fact, this parameter is strongly correlated with the degree of standardization, so that languages marked with (+) are simply more standardized than the others. On the whole, Brozović's classification was probably correct, but naturally it cannot reflect some changes that occurred during the last fifty years. For example, during the last twenty years, there have been attempts to

20 For example, he was more interested in those parameters that relate standard languages to ethnic and national groups than to those that relate them to social class.

21 Brozović actually called them *criteria* (for the classification of standard languages), but we will use the terms *parameters* and *criteria* synonymously. Our list is selected from several of his publications on the typology of Slavic standard languages published in his book *Standardni jezik*.

make Croatian more autonomous with respect to its Štokavian base, and these attempts are reflected in the decision of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia to pronounce the "Golden Formula Ča-Kaj-Što" as part of the non-material cultural heritage of Croatia (in 2019).[22]

2. Languages with co-existent doublets (+) and those with polarized doublets (-): In Brozović's terminology, "doublets" (or "duplicate forms", *dublete*) are alternative grammatical rules or lexemes that co-exist in a standard, such as the pairs in Polish *drżeć/targać* "to hold" and *na dworze/na polu* "outside" in Warsaw and Cracow, respectively. Co-existent doublets exist in one and the same speech community, while by "polarized doublets" Brozović understands the situation in which one of the "doublets" belongs to only one speech community using a single standard language. This is the case, in Brozović's opinion, with "Serbo-Croatian", where one set of doublets (e.g., the "ekavian" pronunciation of words containing the reflex of the Proto-Slavic *ě, for instance, *mleko* "milk" and *belo* "white") characterizes the Serbian variant, while the other (e.g., the "ijekavian" pronunciation of *mlijeko* and *bijelo*) characterizes the Croatian variant.[23] Therefore, the classification of Slavic languages according to this parameter looks like this:

I. All Slavic languages except for "Serbo-Croatian" (+)

II. "Serbo-Croatian" (-)

On the whole, this parameter is not very useful, as it is used only to show that (in Brozović's opinion) "Serbo-Croatian" was a very atypical language (actually an amalgam of two separate standards, Serbian and Croatian), so it is unlikely that it would be included in any future typology of standard languages.

3. The third parameter distinguishes languages with continuous development from languages with interrupted development. This criterion takes into account, for example, that the history of Slovene, which began its

22 Cf. Drago Štambuk "Zlatna formula hrvatskoga jezika ča-kaj-što," *Filologija* 78 (2022), pp. 87–91. The purpose of this motion was to allow more elements of the other Croatian dialects (Čakavian and Kajkavian) to be incorporated into the standard language; however, it is too early to say whether this attempt will bear any fruit, especially since presently there is really no coordinated language planning in Croatia (cf. Mario Grčević, "Jezično planiranje i zakon o hrvatskom jeziku," *Filologija* 78 (2022), pp. 35–50).

23 It is important to note (and Brozović was aware of the fact) that Western Serbs (in Bosnia and Croatia, and Montenegro) used, and still do use, the ijekavian pronunciation in their variety of the Serbian standard. Also, the new standard languages, Bosnian and Montenegrin, which did not figure in Brozović's original typology, are based on the ijekavian pronunciation.

standardization with Trubar's works during the sixteenth century, but which was subsequently interrupted and delayed until the time of Prešeren (nineteenth century), is different from the history of the majority of Slavic languages whose standardization was more or less a continuous process. Czech, Croatian, and "Serbo-Croatian" were, however, marked with (+/-) because their standardization was not thoroughly without interruptions (in the Czech case because of intensive Germanization after the defeat of the Protestant cause in 1619 in the Battle of White Mountain, and in Croatian case because a number of partially standardized idioms, such as Kajkavian and Štokavian Ikavian, were given up in favour of the Neo-Štokavian standard promoted by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić and his followers). Therefore, the classification of languages according to this parameter is as follows:

I. All Slavic languages except Slovene, Czech, Croatian, Serbian, and "Serbo-Croatian" (+)

II. Slovene (-)

III. Czech, Croatian, Serbian, and "Serbo-Croatian" (+/-)

Some of Brozović's choices with respect to this parameter may be open to doubt: one may wonder, for example, whether Slovak was also one of the languages with interrupted development, since Bernolák's attempts at standardization on the basis of Western Slovak dialects were interrupted, and replaced by a standard based on Central Slovak dialects during Štúr's reform;[24] moreover, there were some interruptions in the development of Ukrainian as well, and one wonders if the Ukrainian case is so much different from the Croatian case, where, in spite of the dominance of the school of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić in the second half of the nineteenth century, there was also a lot of continuity with the earlier standardization processes (as Brozović himself had shown in his publications on the history of Croatian).[25] But, be that as it may, parameter 3 is still relevant in distinguishing between two rather different types of standard languages (at least with respect to their history). The new Slavic standard languages (Montenegrin and Bosnian) would be in the first group, as they are too young to be subject to any interruption in their processes of standardization.

4. The next parameter opposes languages with standard varieties that were created directly (+) with those that were formed on the basis of a pre-existing oral folklore tradition (-). In countries where oral folk poetry was widespread,

24 See Dubravka Sesar, *Putovima slavenskih književnih jezika: pregled standardizacije češkoga i drugih slavenskih jezika* (Zagreb: Zavod za lingvistiku, 1996).

25 See Vakulenko, "Standardization Across State Boundaries."

such as Ukraine[26] and the Balkan countries, the language of this traditional poetry was usually super-dialectal, and affected the standard variety to a large extent. For example, this was the case of the so-called Štokavian folklore koiné which contributed to the standardization of Croatian by influencing the language of such writers as Andrija Kačić Miošić and, later, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić. In most Slavic-speaking countries, such super-dialectal folklore poetry was either non-existent, or its influence on the development of the standard language was marginal. With respect to this parameter, the Slavic languages fall neatly into two groups:

I. Russian, Belarusian, Polish, Czech, Upper and Lower Lusatian, Slovene, Slovak, and Bulgarian (+)

II. Ukrainian, Croatian, Serbian, "Serbo-Croatian", and Macedonian (-)

This parameter is relevant when one is discussing the history of different standard languages, as it challenges the notion that standardization is necessarily tied to written forms of expression.[27] Brozović's classification of Slavic languages according to this parameter is essentially valid, although his estimation of the influence of the language of oral poetry on the development of Macedonian may have been exaggerated.

5. The fifth parameter distinguishes languages that have only a standard variety and their dialects, some of which can be very widespread and include the varieties spoken in large urban centres (the so-called inter-dialects) (+), and those that have a sub-standard form, different from the more formal (and often slightly archaic) standard (-). A good example of such a language is Standard Czech, which is based on the language of the Protestant writers of the sixteenth century, but which also has a very widespread substandard form (*obecná čeština*), a rather less archaic idiom than the written (formal) standard language.

I. All languages except for Czech and Slovene (+)

II. Czech and Slovene (-)

This classification is somewhat problematic, as it can be argued that some forms of sub-standards exist in other Slavic countries, not only in Slovenia and

26 Shevelov, *Die ukrainische Schriftsprache*.

27 One needs only to recall how much the oral epic tradition of Homer and Hesiod influenced the development of the common Greek standard language (*koiné*) in the Hellenistic period. A non-European example of the development of a proto-standard based on the language of oral poetry and preceding the standardization of the written language is found in Somali (Tomasz Kamusella, p.c.).

the Czech Republic.[28] For example, in Croatia, one could distinguish between several urban sub-standards, based on the speech of Zagreb, Varaždin, Osijek, Rijeka, and Split, respectively,[29] and even in the Czech Republic the situation is more complex than Brozović's classification implies, since the sub-standard of Brno is not identical to the sub-standard of Prague, or the Silesian region (e.g., in Opava). However, Brozović would probably have considered these idioms as urban inter-dialects, and distinguish them from true sub-standards, as the ones we prototypically find in Czech and Slovene. Whether such distinctions are justified in every particular case would require a discussion which is beyond the scope of this article.

6. The sixth parameter opposes the standard languages based on a cultural inter-dialect (+), roughly a variety spoken at the (non-strictly localizable) court or by a rather mobile upper class, to those that are lacking such an inter-dialect (-). Brozović's concept of "cultural inter-dialect" is not entirely clear, but essentially he has in mind what we would call "urban sub-standards" and "proto-standards" (e.g., the language spoken by the burghers and merchants of Prague in the sixteenth century) and idioms spoken by the nobility in feudal societies (e.g., the language of the Polish *szlachta*). Such idioms had enough prestige to be imitated by the other social groups, which facilitated the spontaneous standardization processes in countries in which they were widespread. According to this parameter, Brozović distinguishes two groups of Slavic languages:

I. Russian, Polish, and Czech (+)

II. All the other languages (-)

Since the notion of "cultural inter-dialect" is not clearly defined, and appears to denote rather different idioms, spoken by different social groups in different societies, it is doubtful how useful it would be in a contemporary typology of standard languages.

7. The next parameter opposes languages with all the polyvalent functions (+), i.e., languages in which texts from all functional domains can be composed, to languages that do not have all the functions (-), i.e., languages that have not reached the highest levels of standardization. Brozović's classification of Slavic standard languages with respect to this parameter looks like this:

28 The new standards, Bosnian and Macedonian, would accord with the majority of the Slavic languages (i.e., they would be marked with a (-)) with respect to this criterion.

29 Katičić, *Hrvatski jezik.*

I. All languages except for Belarusian and both Lusatian languages (+)

II. Upper Lusatian and Lower Lusatian (-)

III. Belarusian (+/-)

It is clear why the Lusatian languages are not considered to have all the "polyvalent functions," as no scientific terminology was ever devised for them, and Belarusian is a special case since, although standardized terminologies have been proposed, the language was not used in certain public domains (Russian was used, and is still used, instead); even today, university instruction in the natural sciences in Belarus is in Russian as well as in Belarusian.[30] The two new Slavic standard languages (Montenegrin and Bosnian) likewise still have an underdeveloped scientific terminology (or use a mixture of Croatian and Serbian terminologies), so they would have to be classified in the same group as Belarusian. On the whole, this parameter is useful, but rather trivial, since it is used to classify languages with respect to their level of standardization.

8. The next parameter distinguishes languages used by only one nation, which uses no other standard (+), and those that are either used by members of several nations ("Serbo-Croatian"), or those whose speakers may be members of a separate nation mostly using a different language (the Lusatian languages, the speakers of which are partly German), as well as those cases where one nation uses more than one standard language (this again applies to Lusatian, since some speakers of Upper and Lower Lusatian feel they belong to a single nation, while others believe that there are two separate Lusatian nations (or "nationalities")). For this criterion, (-) means, in Brozović's words, that the formula "one language – one nation" is not valid. Surprisingly, Brozović classified Russian as a language "serving only one nation", which was not correct even at the time when he wrote his articles, and it is even less correct today (Standard Russian is largely used by Belarusians, some Ukrainians, and Kazakhs, among others). Be that as it may, his classification is as follows:

I. All languages except for both Lusatian languages and "Serbo-Croatian" (+)

II. Upper Lusatian, Lower Lusatian, and "Serbo-Croatian" (-)

Of course, "Serbo-Croatian" was a cover term for the two variants, which are today considered separate standard languages, each used principally by one nation; but matters are much more complicated, since there are Serbs in Croatia who speak Croatian, and Croats in Serbia that use Serbian (although in both countries Serbian and Croatian are recognized as separate standard

30 "Higher Education in Belarus," https://www.euroeducation.net/prof/belarco.htm.

languages used by the respective minorities).[31] Moreover, today, Montenegrin and Bosnian should be added to the list of languages "serving only one nation," while the situation with Russian is extremely complex (it is, of course, used by Russophone Ukrainians and Belarusians, as well as by other ethnic non-Russians in the countries of the former USSR). In contemporary sociolinguistics, it is usual to call standard languages that are used by different nations *polycentric standards* (e.g., German in Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Germany, Austria, Luxemburg, and Belgium, or Dutch in the Netherlands, Belgium, and Suriname).[32] However, it is often difficult to distinguish between a polycentric language with national variants and two different, mutually intelligible standards (e.g., Hindi and Urdu, or Croatian and Serbian according to the majority of Croatian linguists). Unless this difference is clearly explained, it is doubtful how useful Brozović's parameter "one language – one nation" would be in a future typology of standard languages.

9. The next parameter distinguishes languages that, as a rule, do not allow loan translation, or "calques" (+), from those that do (-). It is not clear why Brozović thought this criterion was important, or even significant in classifying standard languages, but it is true that some Slavic languages have a lot of calques (e.g., Czech has many loan translations from German),[33] while others more often resort to direct borrowing of lexemes (e.g., Russian, which nevertheless had some early calques from German). Slovak, Lower Lusatian, Croatian, and "Serbo-Croatian" were considered to be an "intermediate" type (they have some calques, but not as many as in Czech, for example); however, it is unclear whether this conclusion was based on any objective statistics.

---

31 According to the latest census (from 2022; cf. https://dzs.gov.hr/vijesti/objavljeni-konacni-rezultati-popisa-2021/1270), Serbs represent 3.20% of the population of Croatia; however, only 1.16% of the inhabitants of Croatia claim that Serbian is their mother tongue, which means that the majority of Croatian Serbs consider Croatian as their mother tongue (a very small number of Serbs living in Croatia may have claimed some other language, such as Hungarian, as their mother tongue).

32 Instead of *polycentric standards,* some scholars prefer the term *pluricentric standards* (e.g., Michael Clyne, ed., *Pluricentric Languages: Differing Norms in Different Nations* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992)), while others make a distinction, considering, e.g., English to be a polycentric standard, and German to be a pluricentric one. For our present purposes, it is not necessary to insist on such a distinction.

33 For example, typical Croatian calques are *tajnik* "secretary," *glasnogovornik* "spokesperson" (cf. German *Lautsprecher*), etc. It is possible that Brozović wanted to use this parameter to stress a further difference between Croatian and Serbian, which has significantly fewer calques (cf. Serbian *sekretar* "secretary," *port-parol* "spokesperson," etc.).

I. Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian, Polish, Serbian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian (+)

II. Czech, Upper Lusatian, and Slovene (-)

III. Slovak, Lower Lusatian, Croatian, and "Serbo-Croatian" (+/-)

10. The next parameter is presented as straightforward, but upon further examination reveals itself to be rather complicated: it opposes standard languages that were subject to strong purism during at least one period of their development (-) to those that were "free of purist tendencies" (+). It remains somewhat doubtful whether this criterion is quite so simple, as there are different kinds of purism, and puristic tendencies can be directed to different source languages at different periods; for example, in the late nineteenth century, Croatian purists purged the standard of many German loanwords, but did not mind keeping the Turkish loanwords attested in Karadžić's dictionary. During later periods, many Turkish loanwords were purged as well, and today English words are a favourite target of Croatian purists.[34] For some reason, Brozović did not include Bulgarian in the group of languages with puristic tendencies, although it was purged of many Turkish and Greek loans in the nineteenth century.[35] Therefore, Brozović's classification with respect to this parameter is as follows:

I. Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian, Serbian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian (+)

II. Czech, Slovene, Upper Lusatian, Lower Lusatian, and Slovak (-)

III. Croatian, "Serbo-Croatian", and Polish (+/-)

The problem with this parameter (apart from the somewhat arbitrary inclusion of Bulgarian among the non-puristic languages) is that it fails to distinguish different kinds of purisms.[36] For example, the selective purism directed towards loanwords from a single language needs to be distinguished from general purism directed towards any foreign words. Moreover, like many of Brozović's parameters, it does not distinguish diachrony (in some languages purism is mostly a thing of the past, like Czech) from synchrony (in some languages, like Slovene, purism is still very strong). But with some fine-tuning, distinguishing between puristic and non-puristic standard languages does appear to be an important typological parameter.

---

34 See, e.g., Starčević, Kapović and Sarić, *Jeziku je svejedno*.

35 These were often replaced by Russian words, but some Russianisms were later also discarded in favour of Bulgarian new formations (see, e.g., Vivian Pinto, "Bulgarian," in Alexander Schenker and Edward Stankiewicz, eds., *The Slavic Literary Languages: Formation and Development* (New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, 1980), pp. 37–51.

36 See George Thomas, *Linguistic Purism* (London: Longman, 1991).

11. Brozović's next parameter is problematic. He distinguished languages "serving a homogenous civilization" (+) from those that do not serve a homogenous civilization (-). This definition is indeed vague, and it is questionable if it even makes sense in today's globalized world, but what Brozović had in mind was the difference between languages whose lexica are full of words that are associated with only one cultural sphere (chiefly the Western civilization and Catholic/Protestant religious traditions, which is the case with the West Slavic languages), and those that, besides incorporating the vocabulary of modern civilization, still preserve layers of lexicon associated with different traditions (e.g., Orthodox Christianity in the case of Bulgarian, Macedonian, Serbian, and the East Slavic languages). Understood in this way, this parameter gives us the following classification:

I. Polish, Upper Lusatian, Lower Lusatian, Slovene, Czech, and Slovak (+)

II. "Serbo-Croatian", Serbian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian (-)

III. Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, and Croatian (+/-)

12. The next parameter distinguishes languages having a "homogenous dialectal basis", i.e., languages built on the basis of a single dialect (+), and those lacking such a basis (-).

I. Russian, Belarusian, Lower Lusatian, Upper Lusatian, Czech, Slovak, Croatian, Serbian,[37] and Macedonian (+)

II. Ukrainian, Polish, Slovene, and Bulgarian (-)

III. "Serbo-Croatian" (+/-)

It is not quite clear why Brozović chose to classify Ukrainian as a standard based on more than one dialect, since Western Ukrainisms in standard Ukrainian belong chiefly to the lexicon, rather than the grammar. This is clearly a different situation from the one we can observe in Polish, where Mazovian, Great Polish, and Little Polish elements are present in all language levels. Be that as it may, one might also wonder whether "Serbo-Croatian" should be classified as an "intermediary" type; Brozović probably had in mind the fact that the "supra-variant" standard promoted in Yugoslavia contained ekavian and ijekavian elements, but this is in no way comparable to the situation in Polish or Slovene, which are truly based on a mixture of dialects. However, even if some details are debatable, the difference between standards based on a

37 Of course, Serbian has its Western variant in Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Croatia, which is based on a slightly different ijekavian dialect than the Serbian standard in Serbia. Brozović was aware of this fact, but he chose to ignore it with respect to this parameter.

single dialect and those based on a mixture of dialects is useful and applicable in non-Slavic languages as well (cf. the difference between German, which has a rather mixed origin, and French, which is essentially based on the Franconian dialect of Île-de-France).

13. Languages with a "homegrown basis" of the standard (+) and those with foreign elements in the basis of the standard (-): By "foreign elements," Brozović understood the Church Slavonicisms in the grammar and vocabulary of Russian and Bulgarian, i.e., those words and constructions that did not belong to any spoken Russian and Bulgarian dialects. The classification looks as follows:

I. All languages except Russian and Bulgarian (+)

II. Russian and Bulgarian (-)

This parameter is quite idiosyncratic and it is highly questionable whether it can be applied to non-Slavic languages. Even within Slavic, it is of limited use, since it singles out just two languages for which it can be said that they were under a strong influence of a related language in the early phase of standardization; it just so happens that this language was the closely related Church Slavonic; in other language groups, one could probably compare the influence of Old French on English in the early phases of its standardization, with the not-so-important difference that Old French is related to English at a much deeper level. As such, parameter 13 is one of those parameters in Brozović's typology that is mostly relevant for comparing the diachronic aspects of different standards, rather than for their present, synchronic state.

14. The next parameter distinguishes between languages that were standardized mostly using their own lexical material (+) from those that were influenced by related languages, chiefly Slavic languages with a greater number of speakers (-); for example, Bulgarian, Belarusian, and Ukrainian were under the strong influence of Russian, while both Lusatian languages were strongly influenced by Czech.

I. Russian, Polish, Czech, Slovak, Croatian, Serbian, and "Serbo-Croatian" (+)

II. Belarusian, Ukrainian, Upper Lusatian, Lower Lusatian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian (-)

III. Slovene (+/-)

For some reason, Brozović did not acknowledge the influence of Czech (and Russian) on Croatian, or Czech on Slovak, thus marking both languages

with (+).[38] Moreover, Slovene was treated as an intermediate case, probably because it borrowed many lexical items from Croatian (and Czech, to a lesser extent). However, here, Brozović's judgement seems to be based on his intuition, rather than an objective evaluation of evidence (or any exact statistics). Lexical influence of closely related languages during the standardization process can be observed in other groups of languages as well, e.g., the influence of Low German on Swedish, or French on Romanian (and most other Romance languages).

We summarize this section with the help of a table (Table 1), which shows the whole classification of Slavic standard languages according to Brozović's criteria.

Table 1: Brozović's typological classification of Slavic standard languages

	R	Br	U	Cr	Srb	S-Cr	Sln	M	Bg	Cz	Sk	P	UL	LL
1	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
2	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+
4	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
5	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
6	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-
7	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
8	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
9	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	-	+	+	-	+/-	+	-	+/-
10	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	-	+	+	-	-	+/-	-	-
11	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
12	+	+	-	+	+	+/-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+
13	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
14	+	-	-	+	+	+	+/-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-

The Implications of Brozović's Typology for the Status of Croatian

Brozović intended his typology to achieve a number of different goals: firstly, the binary principle (doubtlessly due to Jakobson's influence), according to which every feature is assigned either (+) or (-) (with a few "intermediary" types marked with (+/-)), allows for every standard to have an unique typological profile. Moreover, Brozović thought that assigning numerical values to marks + (2) +/- (1) i – (0) allows the researcher to establish a "scale"

38 That Brozović may have been mistaken in the classification of languages according to his parameters does not invalidate his typology, since random mistakes would tend to statistically cancel each other and the overall "diversity space" will be adequately represented in the typology.

of standard languages and show how much each of them deviates from the "étalon" (a typical standard language). This then led him to assert that "Serbo-Croatian" was very much unlike other Slavic standards, and very far removed from the "étalon". Furthermore, the Serbian and Croatian "variants" were, according to Brozović's typology, more different from each other than some other pairs of Slavic standard languages. For example, they differ with respect to three parameters, while Upper and Lower Lusatian differ in only one parameter. Brozović was certainly aiming to show that, if his parameters are taken seriously, Croatian and Serbian would have to be treated as separate standard languages (just like the two Lusatian languages) rather than "variants" of a single language. However, he did not dare make such a claim, since the official language policy in Yugoslavia was clear in that respect: there was only one standard language ("Serbo-Croatian") with two "variants", as they were called by the late sixties, namely Serbian and Croatian. As a Communist Party member (although he was a political dissident within the party structures), Brozović could face political prosecution for contradicting the party line and claiming that Serbian and Croatian were actually distinct standard languages. The person who drew that conclusion was Brozović's friend and colleague, Stjepan Babić (1925–2021), who was not a party member and who was generally considered to be apolitical, but a highly respected linguist.[39] In a paper published in the journal *Jezik*, he criticized Brozović for not going a step further and admitting that "Serbo-Croatian" is just an abstraction, not a concrete standard language with a single norm. Here is the crucial paragraph from Babić's article (in my translation):

> Brozović does not compare categories of the same level. All the Slavic standard languages and both "variants" belong to one category, and "Serbo-Croatian" to another. As a dialect is not concrete with respect to a local speech variety, likewise, "Serbo-Croatian" is not concrete with respect to Serbian and Croatian, which are concrete standard languages. In a certain sense, this is admitted by Brozović himself: "This means that a nationally non-homogenous standard language exists, in principle, only as an abstraction, but is realized in practice only as its variants." However, he does not take this into account since he treats "Serbo-Croatian" as a concrete language. . . . All of this shows that, according to Brozović's own criteria, only one conclusion is possible: there is one dia-system on the basis of which

39 As far as we know, Babić was not sanctioned for publishing the paper; at the time, claiming that Croatian was a separate language was enough to have you expelled from the Party, but not to have you imprisoned (provided you were not a known political opponent of the regime).

two standard languages are built, Croatian and Serbian, rather than two variants of a single standard language. [40]

Thus, we see that the most lasting consequence of Brozović's typology of Slavic standard languages was the demonstration that Croatian was actually a separate standard language, a thesis that was quite revolutionary[41] at the time when it was first formulated by Babić, who deduced it from Brozović's own typology. Today, this thesis is generally accepted in Croatia, where almost all linguists concede that Croatian is indeed mutually intelligible with Serbian (as well as Bosnian and Montenegrin), but that, as a standard language, it is a separate idiom. This thesis, which is the basis of the official language policy of Croatia, is also implicitly accepted by the European Union, since Croatian (under that name) was recognized as one of the official languages of the EU, when Croatia joined the Union in 2013.

A Re-evaluation of Brozović's Typology

Looking back at Brozović's typology, one may wonder how successful it was, as a scientific project and, above all, how useful it has been. We have mentioned

40 Stjepan Babić, "Lingvističko određenje hrvatskoga književnog jezika," *Jezik* 18:5 (1970–71), pp. 129–137; "Brozović ne uspoređuje kategorije iste vrijednosti. Svi slavenski standardni jezici i obje 'varijante' pripadaju istoj kategoriji, a hs. 'standardni jezik' drugoj. Kao što je dijalekat nekonkretan prema mjesnom govoru, isto tako hs. standardni jezik mora biti nekonkretan prema hrvatskom i srpskom koji su konkretni standardni jezici. To u jednom smislu priznaje i sam Brozović: 'To znači da nacionalno nehomogen standardni jezik egzistira u principu zapravo samo apstraktno, ali praktički se realizira i u pismu i u govoru gotovo samo u vidu varijanata'. Ipak to ne uzima u obzir kad s hs. postupa kao s konkretnim jezikom. . . . Sve to jasno pokazuje da je prema Brozovićevim kriterijima jedino valjan ovakav zaključak: na jednom dijasistemu izgrađena su dva standardna jezika: hrvatski i srpski, a ne dvije varijante jednoga standardnog jezika" (pp. 133–135). Brozović placed a lot of emphasis on his thesis that standard languages are always concrete—in the sense that they are defined by a norm stating what is and what is not standard (see above), in contrast to abstract idioms, such as dialects, which are generalizations over concrete local forms of speech. This is another instance where his views on standard languages contrast with those found in contemporary standardological literature, where standard languages are interpreted as sets of abstract norms to which everyday usage may more or less conform (e.g., James and Lesley Milroy, *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English* (London: Routledge, 2012), p. 19.

41 Before Brozović's publications, even the Croatian nationalists did not refer to standard Croatian as a separate language from Serbian, except for a limited time during the WWII, when Croatia was ruled by the fascist Ustasha regime (on the language policy during that period, see Marko Samardžija, *Hrvatski jezik u Nezavisnoj državi Hrvatskoj* (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1993)). In the "Declaration on the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language" from 1967, the term "standard language" is not used at all (although Croatian "literary language" is claimed to be a separate language).

above that one of the principal tasks of a language typology is to enable the researcher to establish correlations between the presence or absence of different features in language, like the famous Greenbergian implicational universals in syntactic typology. It would be interesting to see if such correlations exist between the presence or absence of different features in the typology of standard languages. For example, it is probably true (and unsurprising) that languages with strong puristic tendencies are usually not those that have been strongly influenced by closely related languages. However, no such correlations were established by Brozović, and the reason is probably that the sample of languages examined (only the Slavic standard languages) was too small. If one were to extend the sample to standard languages belonging to other branches of Indo-European, or to other language families, it is possible that such empirical generalizations, or implicational universals, could be discovered. But this has not been done so far.

Moreover, we have seen above that some of the parameters in Brozović's typology are either too vague (we have mentioned above that the notion of inter-dialect is not clearly defined), or have not stood the test of time, i.e., they are no longer relevant (e.g., the parameter connecting standard languages with one or more "civilizations"). One could also object that Brozović has not taken into account all the parameters that could be used to distinguish different types of standard languages. Here is a tentative list of such features that could be added: firstly, standard languages clearly differ in the symbolic value they have in the communities that use them. For some communities, having their own (standard) language plays a great role in the self-identification of the respective community, while for other communities language is not such an important factor.[42] Until quite recently, speaking standard Ukrainian, rather than Russian, was not a very strong element for self-identification of many Ukrainians, and in Belarus even the president, Mr. Lukašenko, is not a very fluent speaker of standard Belarusian. It is clearly a fact that language does not play the same symbolic role in the culture of different nations, and this fact should somehow be incorporated into a comprehensive typology of standard languages (and it should probably replace Brozović's parameter of "languages serving only one nation / languages serving more than one nation"). It is perhaps no wonder that those nations that had to struggle to preserve the independence and identity of their language against pressures of a different, usually neighbouring nation, tend to place more value on the symbolic power of their own language

42 Outside of Slavic, one should compare Wales, where speaking the Welsh language has a high symbolic value for the self-identification of the Welsh people, with Scotland, where language does not play such a role (one can be a proud Scotsman and speak only standard English, perhaps with some Scottish flair, but speaking Scottish Gaelic is not considered to be an important element of national identity (although symbolic importance is attached to Scots English)); in Wales, on the other hand, speaking Welsh is considered to be one of the main symbols of Welsh patriotism).

than other nations whose language was never seriously threatened. In the first group, one would probably place languages such as Macedonian, Croatian, Slovak, and Ukrainian, and in the second group languages such as Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian, while, for example, Slovene and Czech would be in an intermediary group (their languages were threatened, but at earlier stages of their development than the others). Needless to say, all of these claims about the relative symbolic importance of standard languages to their speakers could, and should, be tested empirically, preferably by large-scale parallel polls in all the Slavic-speaking countries.

Strong symbolic value for self-identification of speakers is certainly correlated with the cultural prestige of a language, but it is not quite the same thing, since cultural prestige can also take different forms. Speaking a particular variety of Rhaeto-Romance is associated with high cultural prestige in certain cantons of Switzerland, but their speakers are just as Swiss as their German- or Italian-speaking neighbours, i.e., the language is not so important as a symbol of national identity. It remains to be seen if the Slavic languages could be evaluated with respect to the parameter of the level of cultural prestige associated with the standard variety. A related, but different, parameter would rank languages with respect to the economic prestige associated with the standard: in economically more stratified societies, such as Russia or Bulgaria,[43] one expects that the economic prestige of speaking the standard variety will be higher than in more egalitarian societies (e.g., the Czech Republic or Slovenia), where universal education in the standard language has been widely accessible for decades, if not for centuries.

Another parameter that should be added in a more extensive typology would distinguish between those languages that have standard varieties that were created and/or maintained with strong involvement of state institutions, and those standard languages that evolved more spontaneously. Outside of Slavic, this parameter allows us to distinguish cases such as English, which was standardized without significant effort from state institutions, and French, whose standardization would be unthinkable without L'*Académie* Française and similar institutions. Within Slavic, the only languages whose standardization was due to a deliberate state campaign are Russian (chiefly during the eighteenth century, but the actual standard owes more to the language spoken at the imperial court than to the precepts of the Russian Academy of Sciences), Polish (in the eighteenth century, before the country lost its independence), and Croatian, which owes its final standardized form to the conscious political programme of the pro-Hungarian party (*mađaroni*) in late-nineteenth-century Croatia.[44] Nearly all the other Slavic standards received some sort of legal

43 The economic stratification of a society can be measured by the Gini index, and Gini indexes for different countries are widely available on the Internet (see, e.g., https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/indicators/SI.POV.GINI/rankings/europe).

44 Katičić, *Hrvatski jezik*.

codification in their respective states, at some point of their history, but the roles played by the states in the standardization of those languages was significantly smaller.[45]

Finally, Slavic languages today differ with respect to the influence exercised by activists for women's, LGBT, and other minority rights in the societies which use them. In some Slavic countries, debates about the gendered uses of languages are an important issue (e.g., in the Czech Republic, and to some extent also in Serbia, where a law on "Gender Equality" including many stipulations on language use[46] was recently passed), whereas in other countries these matters are hardly ever raised in public discourse (e.g., in Belarus and Bulgaria); in this respect, too, it seems that the Slavic standard languages would fall into two types rather neatly.

A further reproach to Brozović's typology could be that the way the values (+) and (-) were assigned to binary features was somewhat arbitrary, so that quantifying the differences between individual languages does not make any sense.[47] Brozović's logic seems to have been to assign the value (+) to binary features that are characteristic of more standardized languages. However, it is still doubtful, for example, why languages "with a homegrown dialectal basis" and those "free of purist tendencies" were assigned the value (+) for these features, while those that were standardized on the basis of various dialects and those that were (or are) subject to purism were assigned (-), rather than vice versa. Of course, if one acknowledges that the choice between (+) and (-) in such cases is arbitrary, then the quantification of Brozović's typology will make little sense, since different choices would make individual languages look closer or more distant (depending on the choices of values). Indeed, the very principle of binarity is objectionable, since we may wonder if all the features are really reducible to just two values (with a few exceptional cases that were assigned (+/-)). A more justifiable approach would be to introduce scalar values, say from one to ten, so that every language would be assigned a single

45 Standard Ukrainian, for example, arose first as a language of poets and intellectuals, and received some sort of state support only in the Soviet period (and, of course, much more so after Ukraine became an independent country, but by that time the language had already been standardized).

46 See Kristina Cvetinčanin Knežević and Jelena Lalatović, *Priručnik za upotrebu rodno osetljivog jezika*, available on the website: https://www.rodnaravnopravnost.gov.rs/sites/default/files/2019-07/Priruc%CC%8Cnik%20za%20upotrebu%20rodno%20osetljivog%20jezika_latinica_0.pdf, 2019. For Slovene, cf. Ursula Doleschal, "Genderlinguistik im Slowenischen. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen einer genderfairen Sprache," in Dennis Scheller-Boltz, ed., *New Approaches to Gender and Queer Research in Slavonic Studies: Proceedings of the International Conference "Language as a Constitutive Element of a Gendered Society—Developments, Perspectives, and Possibilities in the Slavonic Languages" (Innsbruck, 1-4 October 2014)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015), pp. 87–100; this volume contains other interesting contributions to the "gender question" in contemporary Slavic languages.

47 Cf. Tolstoj, *Istorija i struktura.*

value on that scale for every feature. So it could be argued, for example, that languages like Russian, Polish, and Czech have all the polyvalent functions of a standard language (with a value of 10), Macedonian and Ukrainian maybe less so (with a value of 9), while Belarusian is even less polyvalent (with a value of 6 or 7); the Lusatian languages would figure even lower on that scale, say with a value of 5 or lower. However, it would be difficult to avoid subjectivity in assigning values to languages if such an approach were selected, so unless a new methodology for a quantification of values were discovered, one is bound to be left with binary features. But one has to be aware that marking a group of languages with the value (+) simply means that these languages, as a group, have that feature significantly more than the languages that are assigned the value (-): this does not mean that there are no differences, with respect to that feature, within the two groups of languages.[48]

The last problem of Brozović's typology, which had already been mentioned by contemporary critics,[49] is that it tends to blur the distinction between synchronic parameters, according to which standard languages differ in their present state, and diachronic parameters, that may or may not have influenced their development in the past, but are currently not relevant.[50] For example, one could argue that it is perfectly irrelevant to current language use whether the standard was based on only one dialect (as is the case with Russian and Czech), or is a dialect mixture (as is the case with Polish and Slovene); likewise, perhaps it is irrelevant to the current speaker whether a language was, at some point of its history, purified from many loanwords (as is the case with Czech and Slovene), or not (as is, arguably, the case with Russian). The speakers do not need to know (and generally do not know) the etymology of the words they are using. This criticism is valid, of course, and any researcher should be aware that typologizing the current states of standard languages is a different thing from constructing typologies of their historical developments. However, as with any cultural phenomenon (and standard languages are cultural

48 For example, if both Croatian and Slovene are marked (+) for the feature "presence of puristic tendencies", this does not mean that both languages are equally puristic, just that there is a big difference between them, as a group, and the languages marked with (-) for that feature (e.g., Russian, which does not mean that there were absolutely no puristic tendencies in the history of Russian).

49 Tolstoj, *Istorija i struktura*; Wingender, "Standardsprachlichkeit in der Slavia."

50 The same criticism would apply to the parameters used by Shevelov in his typology (*Die ukrainische Schriftsprache*); for example, his opposition of languages with a *fixed centre of development* (such as Russian) and those with a *movable centre of development* (such as Ukrainian), which is correlated with, but not identical to, Brozović's Parameter 12, also tells us more about the history of standardization of particular languages than about their current situation. The same applies to Shevelov's thesis that languages that were initially standardized during the Baroque period are in some ways quite different from those that were standardized during the period of Romanticism (an opposition that is lacking in Brozović's typology).

phenomena), the history of a standard language is often inextricably linked with its present, and, in a sense, it defines it: a language is what it has become over the centuries of its development, not just what it is at any definite point in time. Various historical developments are established as traditions that define the contemporary values and attitudes of speakers. Thus, it may well be that speakers of languages standardized on the basis of dialect mixtures tend to develop a different attitude towards the use of dialects than speakers of languages that are based on a single dialect—and these attitudes, in turn, affect the symbolic value that the standard plays in particular societies. And past puristic periods may establish traditions that affect the stylistic values attributed to loanwords in later, non-puristic periods in the development of individual standard languages. All of this could, and should, be empirically checked by sociolinguistic research in the future, but such considerations warn us that it may not be appropriate to dismiss out of hand the relevance of the history of standard languages for their current usage and the attitude of their speakers towards them.[51]

Conclusions

We have shown above how important was Brozović's typology of Slavic standard languages in formulating the thesis that Croatian is an independent standard language, rather than a "variant" of Serbo-Croatian. Although not universally accepted outside of Croatia, this thesis has become the basis of modern Croatian language identity. Even after the collapse of the "Croatian Spring" movement in 1971, and the Communist Party's condemnation of the "Declaration on the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language," Brozović's views on the Croatian standard remained highly influential in the last decades of the communist regime and especially after its collapse in 1990. On a more general level, we have shown that, although Brozović's typology does not allow us to formulate empirically established correlations between different features (parametric values) of standard languages, it nevertheless gives us an insight into the *diversity space* of Slavic standard languages—i.e., it shows us how different in many respects these idioms really are. Although Brozović limited himself only to Slavic languages, this is, we believe, his lasting contribution to sociolinguistics, since most current sociolinguistic theories take a rather simplistic view by treating all standard languages as more or less

51 A similar approach to problems of language identity and history is advocated in Ranko Matasović, *Lingvistička povijest Europe* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2016).

alike, differing only in their degree of standardisation[52] (understood as the distance from a completely uniform, perfectly polyvalent and most prestigious idiom used by a speech community). Related to this is the view that standard languages come with a uniform "standard language ideology," which is generally thought to be conservative, oppressive, and used by the elites to control the public discourse and limit the accessibility of public space to the underprivileged groups in a society.[53] Re-reading Brozović's publications on the typology of Slavic standard languages, written more than a half a century ago, shows us that such views are oversimplifications.

Rather than offering a fixed set of conclusions at the end this article, we would rather like to close it with an important question that arises if the consequences of Brozović's typology of Slavic standard languages are taken seriously. Namely, if Slavic standard languages differ so much with respect to so many features that define their origin, development, and status in the societies that use them, relationships with other idioms used by those societies, as well as the cultural attitudes of the members of those societies to their respective standard languages, then are we really using the term *standard language* in the same sense across different societies and cultures? Indeed, is *standard language* a useful term at all?[54]

52 Cf., e.g., Peter Auer, "Dialect vs. Standard: A Typology of Scenarios in Europe," in B. Kortman and Johan Van der Auwera, eds., *The Languages and Linguistics in Europe* (Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 2011), pp. 485–500.

53 E.g. Joseph, *Eloquence and Power*; Milroy and Milroy, *Authority in Language*; Starčević, Kapović, and Sarić, *Jeziku je svejedno.*

54 See David Smakman, "The Definition of the Standard Language: A Survey in Seven Countries," *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* no. 218 (2012), pp. 25–58, on the difficulties of applying the term *standard language* consistently in different cultural, ethnic, and political contexts and recall our reasons, given above, for defining "standard language" as a concept based on "family resemblance" rather than sufficient and necessary conditions.