

## **How many Slavonic languages are there?**

This is a revised and adapted version of the inaugural Terry Wade Memorial Lecture, delivered in Glasgow University on 7 October 2009. The aim of this paper is not so much to come up with a definitive answer to the question posed in the title, as to demonstrate the impossibility of so doing, while at the same time examining some of the issues relating to language identity, language status and language content that affect the Slavonic languages at the present time.

As a starting point it is useful to compare the contents of two (fairly) recent works of reference. The survey volume edited by Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett and called simply *The Slavonic Languages* (Routledge, London & New York 1993) describes the following languages:

Old Church Slavonic	Sorbian
Bulgarian	Polish
Macedonian	Cassubian [Kashubian]
Serbo-Croat	Polabian
Slovene	Russian
Czech	Belorussian [Belorussian]
Slovak	Ukrainian

If Old Church Slavonic and Polabian are excluded for present purposes on the grounds that they are dead languages, that gives a modest total of twelve.

On the other hand, a volume edited by M. Okuka and G. Krenn, *Lexicon der Sprachen des Europäischen Ostens* (Wieser Encyklopädie des Europäischen Ostens, Vol. 10, Klagenfurt, 2002) presents a very different list of languages:

Aegean Macedonian	East Slovak
Old Church Slavonic	Podhalian
Banat Bulgarian	Polabian
Belarusian	Polish
Bosnian	Pomak
Bulgarian	Proto-Slavonic
Burgenland Croatian	Resian
Čakavian	Russian
Czech	Rusyn
Halšanski	Serbian
Kajkavian	Serbo-Croat
Kashubian	Slavjanoserbski
Croatian	Silesian
Lachian	Slovak
Lower Sorbian	Slovene
Macedonian	Slovinzian
Moravian	Ukrainian
Mazurian	Upper Sorbian
Molise Slavonic	Vičski
Montenegrin	West Polessian

This gives a list of forty languages, but of these four refer to languages that are no longer used (Old Church Slavonic, Polabian, Proto-Slavonic and Slavjanoserbski).

Both lists are in their own way perfectly reasonable, but they are clearly compiled according to different criteria. The Comrie and Corbett volume is explicitly concerned only with 'the generally recognized contemporary standard literary Slavonic languages' (p. 1), those languages that are 'either the (at least *de facto*) official language of an independent country or countries . . . or [are] used officially for some official purposes' (p. 2). The volume edited by Okuka and Krenn seeks to list every distinct Slavonic form of expression that has been reduced to writing. Both volumes make exceptions: the former includes Kashubian, which in 1993 did not meet the expressed criteria, while the latter includes Proto-Slavonic, which by definition was never written down. It is also worth noting here that linguistic verities are not necessarily eternal. If a volume following the same principles as those of Comrie and Corbett had been conducted seventy years ago, it would not have included Macedonian (and would have been less likely to make an exception for Kashubian); one published 100 years ago might well not have included Ukrainian or Belarusian, the status of which

was still contested. Were the exercise to be attempted now, the editors could choose to include an additional language, Rusyn, and they would probably want to adopt a different approach, if only in terms of nomenclature, to Serbo-Croat.

The issues prompted by these lists make the point that this question is not really for linguists at all. A wise old saw of uncertain paternity states that a language is a dialect with an army and a navy, and the relative ease with which the literal truth of that statement can be disproved does not alter the way in which it reveals that the question of what constitutes a separate language is essentially political. Essentially, it can be stated that a language acquires that status if it is mentioned as such in documents relating to the political or administrative procedures of any nation or region. Such documents might include: a constitution, a law on state or official languages, a law on minority or regional languages, the declaration which a nation makes upon ratification of the Council of Europe's Charter for Regional or Minority languages, other formal provisions that might be made concerning the role of a language or languages within a nation or region's education, administrative or broadcasting systems. From this it follows that it ought, at least in principle, to add up all the different Slavonic languages mentioned in

such documents to produce a definitive answer to the question posed here. While in the meantime it may be possible to coin a rather newer wise saw, which states that a language is a dialect in which it is possible to pass an examination.

Unfortunately, principle and practice do not always coincide, and a count of those Slavonic languages given official political or administration recognition is unlikely, after all, to produce an answer that will be seen as definitive. The first difficulty is that different political and administrative structures, sometimes within the same country, do not always agree with one another. The second is that on occasion a country may choose not to recognise a form of expression as a distinct language, even when this conflicts with the view taken by the majority of its speakers. Also possible is the reverse situation, where a country finds it expedient to recognise as a separate language a form of expression not so regarded by its speakers. An example from outside the Slavonic world is Moldovan, regarded by many of its speakers and by most linguists as a form of Romanian. It will thus be necessary to introduce a third criterion, namely that of identity.

A useful example of the interaction of linguistic, political and identity criteria is the case of Rusyn. Rusyn, sometimes known as Ruthenian, is usually reckoned to be an East Slavonic language, fairly close to Ukrainian. It is spoken in Western Ukraine, Eastern Slovakia and in parts of former Yugoslavia, especially the Serbian province of Vojvodina; there are small numbers of Rusyn speakers in other countries of the region. Rusyn is officially recognised as a minority language in Croatia, Romania, Serbia and Slovakia, but in Ukraine, which is probably where the greatest number of speakers live, the language receives no official recognition, being regarded instead as a variant of Ukrainian. Linguistically speaking, it is possible to argue that the Rusyn of former Yugoslavia is not the same language as the Rusyn of the Carpathians, although this view does not seem generally to be shared by the respective communities. On the other hand, the Polish law on minority languages recognises a language called Lemko. This is perceived by many to be another variant of Rusyn, albeit that some members of the Lemko community prefer to consider themselves Ukrainians. This division of opinion is reflected in the fact that different standards of Rusyn have been tending to evolve in the different communities, while at the present time attempts are being made to produce a single over-arching standard that could be applied in all the countries where the language is used.

Lemko is not the only uncertainty relating to Slavonic minority languages used in Poland. The declaration made by Poland consequent upon its recent ratification of the Council of Europe's Charter for Regional or Minority Languages mentions Lemko and also Kashub(ian), but it does not include Silesian, though some deputies from Silesia did raise the issue when the matter was going through the Polish Parliament. The status of Silesian is, in fact, a difficult issue: there is some publishing in Silesian, and in the last Polish census (2002) the numbers of people claiming to speak Silesian at home and Kashubian at home were almost identical; nevertheless, outside the Silesian community the language has very little recognition, and the prospects of it being any sort of official status are perhaps best described as uncertain.

A curious instance of administrative uncertainty is provided by Sorbian, a language spoken in parts of the former GDR. Sorbian is often treated as a single language (as in the Comrie and Corbett volume), but it has two distinct standardised varieties: Upper Sorbian and Lower Sorbian. One odd and presumably unintended consequence of German reunification and the creation of the new *Länder* was that Sorbian became subject to an

administrative division: speakers of Upper Sorbian found themselves living in Saxony; the areas where Lower Sorbian is spoken became part of Brandenburg. Each of the two *Länder* passed its own law on the status of Sorbian, and though the laws are similar in many respects, there is one significant difference: the law passed by the *Land* of Saxony refers to the Sorbian languages in the plural (in the dual in Sorbian), but the equivalent law in Brandenburg uses the singular in both languages. Nevertheless, the former law is officially published in German and Upper Sorbian, the latter in German and Lower Sorbian, and the fact that Lower Sorbian receives official support in Brandenburg in such areas as education and the mass media has improved the somewhat precarious position of that variety.

In the case of the Slavonic varieties spoken in the North-East of Italy administrative uncertainty arises from a difference between national and regional provisions. Article 2 of the Italian law on the protection of linguistic minorities mentions Slovene, and in the north-eastern region of Friuli-Venezia Giulia, in those parts of the provinces of Trieste and Gorizia that are contiguous with the border with Slovenia there are indeed Slovene-speaking communities who identify their language with the standard language of the neighbouring country. Elsewhere in the same region,

however, in the province of Udine, there are isolated communities who speak a Slavonic language which is not invariably identified with Slovene. Some members of these communities have campaigned for separate recognition for their forms of expression and have attained at least some degree of success. The latest law passed by the region of Friuli-Venezia Giulia concerning the protection of the Slovene minority (dating from 2007) does mention the separate existence of Resian and what it calls the linguistic varieties of three valleys, and Article 22 of this law allows for the possibility of financing activities to support these linguistic varieties, albeit that other articles indicate that in education and in administration it is Slovene (i.e. standard Slovene) that is to be used. In fact, it would appear that the issue has now been caught up in the infinitely complicated world of Northern Italian linguistic politics, and a close reading of the relevant web-sites suggests the possibility that lurking behind the question of cultural and linguistic identity is the possibly more exciting question of who gets their hands on the money coming from national, regional, provincial and EU sources; perhaps in the light of this it would not be unduly cynical to re-define a language as a dialect that qualifies for EU funding.

There can be no doubt that the place where linguistic, political and identity criteria take on their most complex form is that occupied by the language formerly known as Serbo-Croat. Serbo-Croat is unusual as a language in that it has a fixed starting point and a fixed finishing point. It was created as a result of the Vienna agreement, signed in 1850 by a group of Serbian and Croatian writers who, incidentally, took the wise precaution of not giving their language a name, instead referring to it as *naš jezik* (our language); for most people it effectively came to an end as Yugoslavia disintegrated in the first half of the 1990s. In fact, though the political events of that decade have made the name unusable, the concept of Serbo-Croat may still have some value for certain linguistic purposes. This could be true especially for historical-comparative linguists, but also perhaps for those who are required to teach what are now considered different languages, but which differ only superficially and are still mutually comprehensible. In American institutions something called BCS (i.e. Bosnian-Croat-Serbian) is taught, while an anecdote tells of a Central European university which advertised courses in Bosnian, Croat and Serbian. Close examination revealed that these courses were scheduled to take place at the same time and in the same room; what the anecdote does not record is whether the lecturer was paid three times over.

For other purposes the distinct identity of Bosnian, Croat and Serbian is firmly established, and for the most part there is mutual and reciprocal recognition: thus, Bosnian and Croatian are recognised as minority languages in Serbia, and official web-sites in Bosnia and Herzegovina offer the choice of Bosnian, Croatian or Serbian. This is not to say that there are no unresolved issues, but the principal of three separate languages seems clear enough. Unfortunately, however, this principal fails to address what happens in Montenegro. Before Montenegro became independence in 2006, the language used there, when it was given a name at all, tended to be known officially as Serbian; Serbian was, for instance the language taught at Montenegro's university. Now things are a little different: Article 13 of the nation's Constitution states unambiguously that the official language is the *crnogorski jezik* (the Montenegrin language), and the web-site of the government of Montenegro offers you a choice of English or *crnogorski*. In what is, however, another example of political and administrative uncertainty the web-site of the President gives the slightly different choice of English and something called *crnogorsko-srpski* (Montenegrin-Serbian, perhaps), while the University of Montenegro continues to teach Serbian. The logic of post-Serbo-Croatian political linguistics suggests that

Montenegrin will in due course join the club of separate languages; at the moment it seems to have associate member status.

The issues relating to post-Serbo-Croat do not end there, because in addition to the languages used in what was once Yugoslavia there are two further varieties used elsewhere. In the Austrian region of Burgenland there is a population of Croat speakers who have adopted a standard which is different from that of the Croat used in Croatia. This variety, Burgenland Croatian, is included under that name in the Austrian declaration consequent on ratifying the Council of Europe's Charter for Regional or Minority languages and is taught within the Austrian education system; there is at least one Burgenland Croatian newspaper, and it so happens that the writer of these notes was present when what was almost certainly the first academic paper in Burgenland Croatian was presented (in Tartu in 2005). So it seems safe to say that Burgenland Croatian has a distinct political-administrative existence. The status of the other variety is rather more ambiguous. The Italian law on the protection of linguistic minorities includes Croatian, and this refers to a group of around 2,000 speakers in the region of Molise. Though the variety spoken (but only rarely written) differs from standard Croatian and is often referred to using terms such *naš jezik* or *na našu*, it

would seem that the language is not considered in terms other than as a dialect of Croat, and there is no official recognition of any separate status.

If a language is a dialect in which it is possible to pass an examination, then there is one more variety to consider, since there is one Slavonic language that is not recognised by any political entity, but in which it is indeed possible and in some circumstances necessary to pass an examination. Church Slavonic, a slightly modernised and standardised version of the medieval Old Church Slavonic and thus a language substantially different from modern Russian, is the liturgical language of the Russian Orthodox Church. Church Slavonic is more limited in its application than is another Church language, Latin: it does not seem, for example, to be the practice to produce new texts in the language. It is, however, used in church services and in other ecclesiastical texts that have not been translated into Russian, and anyone who wants to become a Russian Orthodox priest will need to pass an examination in Church Slavonic. That is a career open to only half of the population, and given the other limitations on its use, there may be case to be made for considering Church Slavonic to be half a language.

One potentially useful source for offering at least an indication of the number of Slavonic languages is Wikipedia. Since Wikipedia is to a large extent self-generated, it might be expected to provide a useful, if not infallible insight into language identity. In fact, the total number of Slavonic Wikipedias at present in existence is nineteen, these being:

Беларуская	Македонски
Беларуская (Тарашкевіца)	Polski
Български	Русский
Bosanski	Slovenčina
Česky	Slovenščina
Kaszëbsczi	Српски/Srpski
Словѣнскъ	
	Srpskohrvatski/Српскохрватски
Dolnoserbski	Ślůnski
Hrvatski	Українська
Hornjoserbsce	

This list has some noteworthy features: Serbo-Croat is included alongside Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian; both Kashubian and Silesian are present, as are the two varieties of Sorbian; there are two forms of Belarusian, the so-

called Taraškevica being the name used for the pre-1933 standard, generally regarded as less close to Russian than the later version; there is even a version of Wikipedia in Church Slavonic. None the less, it may be felt that compared to the range of Romance and Germanic varieties that have their own versions of Wikipedia, the Slavonic languages are not all that well represented. In fact, Wikipedia is not quite as self-generated as it might appear, and there is some control over the appearance of new versions. If one delves into the bowels of the Wikipedia system it is possible to find lists of those versions that have been proposed and rejected: these include Montenegrin (on two occasions), something called Pa-prostu (probably the same as the West Polessian that appears on Okuka and Krenn's list), Pannonian Rusyn and Surzhyk (see below). A perusal of the arguments that have been made for rejecting these proposals suggests that they have victims of a new and tighter policy towards the creation of new language versions of Wikipedia, as well perhaps of North American and North European attitudes to linguistic and cultural identity. At the same time some proposals have been somewhat more fanciful, and it is not difficult to see why Cyrillic Polish, Latinised Russian, Pre-reform Russian, Radical Croatian (an older orthography) and Ukrainian Latin were not accepted.

One version of Wikipedia that enjoyed a brief life in 2006-7 was something called Siberian Russian. This is supposedly based on the traditional Russian dialects of Siberia and on the face of it sounds no less implausible than, say, Veneto or West-Vlams. Nevertheless, the Siberian Russian Wikipedia was closed down and the entries, such as they were, deleted, the reason given being that the 'dialect' was in effect the invention of one man (Jaroslav Zolotarev) and the whole project was never intended as anything other than a hoax or a joke. That being the case, Zolotarev found another outlet for his project, and the (his?) сибирской говор has its own web-site ([volgota.com](http://volgota.com)).

The other rejected variety that requires comment here is Surzhyk (*suržyk*). This is a mixture of Ukrainian and Russian and is one of two contact languages (the other being *trasjanka*, a mixture of Belarusian and Russian) that arise from the problems of navigating between two closely related language systems. *Suržyk* and *trasjanka* seem to have come into being as a result of native speakers of Ukrainian and Belarusian respectively attempting to come to terms with the standard Russian they encountered in the mass media, in public administration, education and elsewhere. Since Ukraine gained independence and pursued a policy of promoting Ukrainian, there is reported to have come into being a 'reverse' *suržyk*, created by native

speakers of Russian trying to come to terms with the standard Ukrainian they see all around them; the predominant position of Russian in Belarus makes the corresponding development in that country less likely. *Suržyk* appears to be carving out a niche for itself in the linguo-cultural life of Ukraine: more than 10% of the population claim to speak *suržyk*, and *suržyk* can be found in certain popular forms of writing. This, together with the attempt to create a separate Wikipedia, suggests that *suržyk* is starting to acquire some of the characteristics of a 'real' language which can in certain circumstances be used intentionally. The problem remains, however, that *suržyk* is not really a system, and is thus very difficult to describe and impossible to codify. In any case the perception of it in many circles as a form of 'faulty Ukrainian' would seem certain prevent it from gaining any sort of official recognition in the foreseeable future. Unlike *trasjanka*, which seems to be mostly used by older speakers and which may eventually be squeezed out by standard Russian, *suržyk* may well flourish, but perhaps it will do so in a form comparable to the version of Sicilian used in the novels of Andrea Camilleri or to the Scottish urban speech favoured in some television programmes and by some novelists.

One question that may be thought to take care of itself is which languages are Slavonic and which are not Slavonic, and in general this is the case. Nevertheless, issues can arise in relation to the extent and nature of Slavonic elements within languages that are not usually thought of as being Slavonic. After the incorporation of Bessarabia into the Soviet Union in 1940, the Soviet authorities devoted considerable efforts to the creation of a separate Moldovan language, distinct from Romanian. One of the devices used to this end was to emphasise the Slavonic contribution to the formation and development of this supposed Moldovan language.

The Israeli scholar Paul Wexler makes the interesting claim that Yiddish is what he calls the fifteenth Slavonic language: that is, it is not originally a Germanic language, as is usually argued, but started out as a form of Sorbian, being later relexified by the incorporation of a substantial number of Germanic elements. Intriguingly he then takes the argument further: since, as he suggests, Modern Hebrew is in essence a relexified version of Yiddish, this in turn makes Modern Hebrew a Slavonic language. Wexler's theory has not, it seems, gained a great deal of support, but the question of the Slavonic influence on the phonology and syntax of Modern Hebrew is one of considerable interest.

Finally, for those who are dissatisfied with the existing Slavonic languages, there remains the possibility of inventing one's own. Following the sound principle that the best way to keep a secret is to post it on the Internet, there are buried in the depths of that medium a number of what may be termed pan-Slavonic languages. One such is Slovio, which is described by its proponents in the following terms:

Sxto es Slovio? Slovio es novju mezxunardju jazika ktor razumijut extirsto milion ludis na celoju zemla. Slovio mozxete upotrebit dla gvorenje so extirsto milion slavju Ludis ot Praga do Vladivostok; ot Sankt Peterburg cxerez Varsxava do Varna; ot Sredzemju Morie i ot Severju Morie do Tihju Okean. Slovio imajt prostju, logikju gramatia i Slovio es idealju jazika dla dnesju ludis. Ucxijte Slovio tper!

Slovio appears to originate in Slovakia, and this may be no coincidence, since Slovak is sometimes perceived to be the most 'central' of the Slavonic languages. It is something of a *tour de force*, but it seems to be based on two fallacies: the first is that all Slavonic languages are mutually incomprehensible; the second is that someone who has gone to the trouble to learn one real Slavonic language is going to find it worth while to go to the

trouble of learning an artificial one, however simplified its grammar. On the other hand, it may be observed that attempts to create a pan-Slavonic language have a history that long pre-dates the arrival of the Internet: the first such effort was probably that of the Croatian priest and scholar Juraj Križanić, whose somewhat misleadingly titled *Gramatično izkazanje ob ruskom jeziku* was published in 1666.

Perhaps the time has now come to return to the real world and draw some conclusions. At the outset it was stated that no attempt would be made to provide a definitive answer to the question posed in the title, and this promise will be maintained. It was also suggested that in principle it ought to be possible to determine the number of Slavonic languages that have some sort of official political or administrative recognition, but that practical difficulties put even that modest aspiration out of reach. Indeed, ambiguities were identified over the status of Montenegrin, over Resian and the other Slavonic varieties spoken in the province of Udine and over the number of Sorbian languages. As a consequence, all that can be said is that depending on what decisions are made about these doubtful cases, the total number of languages as determined by this criterion will be somewhere between 19 and 22:

Russian	Croatian
Belarusian	Burgenland Croatian
Ukrainian	Slovene
Rusyn	(Resian, other varieties)
Lemko	Slovak
Church Slavonic	Czech
Bulgarian	Upper Sorbian
Macedonian	Lower Sorbian
Serbian	Polish
Montenegrin	Kashubian
Bosnian	

Counts based on other criteria could easily reach a much higher figure, but the relatively modest total of around twenty is higher than might have been accepted, and the presence of a number of languages that do not appear in the Comrie and Corbett volume would seem to point to a process of language creation, in the sense of a tendency to extend official recognition to an increasing number of varieties. And if one looks at the various political and administrative provisions that exist in the different European countries, including the United Kingdom, it can be seen that this process of language

creation applies not just to the Slavonic languages or to the countries of East-Central Europe, but throughout the continent.

It has to be said that not all the processes taking place in the Slavonic languages are new. The disintegration of Serbo-Croat into four distinct languages reflects the tendency towards the creation of a situation of one language for one country that was characteristic of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The integrationist tendencies in Rusyn seem, on the other hand, to reflect those movements that led to the appearance of Serbo-Croat in the mid-nineteenth century. And, as was noted earlier, even the practice of inventing pan-Slavonic languages has a history that goes back over 300 years.

None the less, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Slavonic languages are involved in a Europe-wide phenomenon that may be called language fragmentation. This is the same phenomenon that has seen the official recognition of Scots and Ulster Scots in the United Kingdom, Low German, North Frisian and Sater Frisian in Germany, Friulian, Franco-Provençal and Sardinian in Italy. It sees the replacement of the traditional structure of standard languages and sub-standard dialects with a much more

complex system in which the previous sharp distinction gives way to a series of gradual transitions. In place of standard and sub-standard there is a scale of standardisation, with some newly recognised languages enjoying different degrees of partial standardisation. Likewise with functions: if in the past standard state languages enjoyed a monopoly in the fields of education, administration and the mass media, now they share their position with regional or minority languages, which might be taught at all levels of the education or only at primary or primary and secondary level; which might figure extensively in the national or regional mass media system or might do so only marginally. To take a specific example, the linguistic space occupied up to about twenty years ago by standard Polish is now taken up by standard Polish, by Kashubian, which has a presence in the education and the mass media and which is moving towards standardisation, and by Silesian, not officially recognised and not part of the education system, but present in the mass media and with the potential for a degree of standardisation. It is possible that in the future other varieties, for example that of the Podhale region, will also gain access to this space.

It is possible to identify two factors that are bringing about this linguistic fragmentation. The first is an undoubted change in political and cultural

attitudes towards regional and minority languages that has taken place throughout Europe within the last two decades or so and which is reflected in international instruments, such as the Council of Europe's Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, as well as in a whole raft of national and regional laws and other provisions in individual states. This change first appeared in Western Europe; it may in part have been set off by what happened in Spain after the death of General Franco. In the 1990s it spread rapidly to Central and Eastern Europe, where it was imposed on not always willing governments as part of the box-ticking process of transition.

It has to be said that the politics of language fragmentation are not always as simple as they may at first appear. This is reflected in Ukraine, which is willing to recognise 13 minority languages, but not Rusyn, since this, along with *suržyk*, is seen as undermining a language that has only just achieved the status of being unambiguously a state and an official language; it is also reflected in the arguments about whether Resian and the other Slavonic varieties of the province of Udine are or are not the same as Slovene. It seems that in many instances support for regional or minority languages is still seen as zero-sum game: support for language X means undermining

language Y. And when it comes to dividing up the funding that may accompany political support, it generally is a zero-sum game.

The second factor is the appearance of the new media, and especially the Internet. The traditional mass media, and especially radio and television tended, deliberately or otherwise, to promote national and state languages; there are indeed some countries where television is credited with having played a major role in establishing the national language as the main means of communication throughout the country. The Internet, however, is different: setting up a web-site is financially and technically much easier than setting up a newspaper or a broadcasting station; Internet sites operate for the most part in an environment free from government control or censorship. Reach is automatically global, but size of readership is rarely an important consideration. In these circumstances it is relatively easy for a group or even an individual with an interest in promoting a linguistic variety to place this variety in the public domain. And where there is a significant community of speakers it is possible to establish periodicals, publish learning materials and create fora where matters relating to language use and language standardisation can be debated. And where people can disagree, fall out with one another and go off to create their own new variety with a

different standard. Of the making of new Slavonic languages there is no end.

### Selected reading

Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett (eds), *The Slavonic Languages*, Routledge, London & New York, 1993.

M. Okuka and G. Krenn (eds), *Lexicon der Sprachen des Europäischen Ostens* (Wieser Encyklopädie des Europäischen Ostens, Vol. 10), Klagenfurt, 2002.

A.D. Duličenko, *Slavjanskije literaturnye mikrojazyki*, I-II, Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, Tartu, 2003-04.

The Council of Europe's Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and accompanying documents can be found at:

<[http://www.coe.int/T/E/Legal\\_Affairs/Local\\_and\\_regional\\_Democracy/Regional\\_or\\_Minority\\_languages/](http://www.coe.int/T/E/Legal_Affairs/Local_and_regional_Democracy/Regional_or_Minority_languages/)>

