

**REVIEW ON THE VI<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
OF DIALECTOLOGY AND GEOLINGUISTICS**

University of Maribor, Slovenia

14.-18. September. 2009

Ernestina Carrilho & Sandra Pereira (Univ. Lisbon)

{e.carrilho; spereira}@clul.ul.pt

The University of Maribor hosted the sixth edition of the international congress organized every three years by the International Society for Dialectology and Geolinguistics (SIDG). Most recent editions had been held at Riga (2003) and Braga (2006). In Maribor, the local organizing team lead by Mihaela Koletnik made this scientific meeting a remarkable event for current updates in dialectology and geolinguistics, but also for a really generous display of Slovenian culture and geo-attributes, the whole in a friendly, interactive and sounding atmosphere.

Attendance at the congress was fairly high and diverse, bringing together different generations of dialectologists, geolinguists and other scholars interested in the study of dialects, from within Slovenia and from several countries across the world, and across different affiliations: Austria (Alpsko-jadranska univerza v Celovcu, Alps Adriatic University Klagenfurt, Univ. Karla in Franca v Gradcu, Inst. of Lexicography of Austrian Dialects and Names), Belgium (Univ. Liège), Bulgaria (Inst. of the Balkan Studies of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences), Croatia (Univ. Zagreb, Inst. of Croatian Language and Linguistics), Cyprus (Univ. Cyprus), Czech Republic (Inst. of the Czech Language of the Academy of Sciences), Estonia (Inst. of the Estonian Language), Germany (Univ. Bamberg, Univ. Mannheim), Hungary (Eötvös Loránd Univ.), Italy (Univ. Udine, Centro Romanesco Trilussa, Univ. Bologna at Forlì), Japan (Japan Inst. of Dialectology, Univ. Niigata Prefecture, Meikai Univ., Shigakukan Univ., Hiroshima Univ. of Economics, National Inst. for Japanese Language, Univ. of Tokyo), Latvia (Univ. Latvia, Latvian Language Inst.), Lithuania (Vilnius Pedagogical Univ., Šiauliai Univ., Inst. of the Lithuanian language), Republic of Macedonia (Macedonian Language Inst. “Krstel Misirkov”), Netherlands (Vrije Univ. in Amsterdam), Norway (Univ. Trondheim), Poland (Univ. Łódź, Maria Curie-Skłodowska Univ.), Portugal (Univ. Lisboa), Romania (Romanian Academy / Univ. Bucharest), Spain (Univ. Barcelona,

Univ. Basque Country, Univ. Santiago de Compostela), Canada (York Univ.) and United States (Univ. Minnesota, Univ. Kansas). Although the Slovenian participation was dominant and enlightening as a whole, it must be acknowledged that, as in previous SIDG meetings, the presence and contribution of Japanese dialectology was particularly imposing.

The conference lasted for five days (14<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> September 2009), the last of them reserved for the VI<sup>th</sup> Extraordinary and the XI<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Assembly of SIDG, and for a special session of the *Atlas Linguarum Europae*. From 14<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> September 2009, the VI<sup>th</sup> SIDG Congress assembled a collection of six plenary lectures and eighty contributions in a triptych of parallel sessions, presented in different languages besides English (among which, French, German, Italian and Spanish), as usual in SIDG meetings. This congress was also remarkable, and exemplar, for the expressive presence of the host language along the entire program. During the all congress, one of the parallel sessions has been entirely presented in Slovene, which was also the language that welcomed the participants at the opening session (English translations being provided through an efficient visual presentation on a central screen).

The plenary lectures focused on different areas of dialectology, from internal and external aspects of Slavic dialectology to particular outputs of geolinguistic research, and also recent methodological advances in the study of dialects. The invited speakers were Zinza Zorko (Univ. Maribor), on “Morphology of the Pannonian dialectal group (synchronic and diachronic aspects)”; Marc L. Greenberg (Univ. Kansas), on “The meaning of South Slavic dialectology”; Koloman Brenner (Eötvös Loránd Univ.), on “Phonetic issues in the atlas of Hungarian German in Southern Hungary (UDSA)”; Herta Maurer Lausegger (Alpsko-jadranska univerza v Celovcu), on “Audiovisual dialectology: methods”; Klaus Geyer (Vilnius Pedagogical University), on “Intralingual subtitling of dialectal speech – choosing an appropriate translation strategy”; and, finally, Adam Sławomir Gala and Bożżena Ostromecka-Frączak (Univ. Łódź), on “The study of word formation in dialect and local dialect research”.

The parallel sessions featured a wide collection of papers which were slightly grouped by language (besides the Slovenian session, also an English session and, concomitantly, a plurilinguistic one). As Martin Haase (president of SIDG) states in the Abstract booklet (p. 13), the following main areas of topics were covered at the conference: “new methodological and technical approaches to language geography,

dialect literacy, dialect dynamics between standardization and dialectalization, emergent languages, language and dialect contact, *sprachbund*, linguistic implications of globalization, diachronic atlases and other research projects.”

In what follows we provide a non-exhaustive report on the different contributions, in which we will not strictly stick to these particular areas. Instead, we will consider a less detailed partition, accounting first and more exhaustively for those papers that focused on advances on diverse aspects of geolinguistics (or linguistic geography): mainly, projects, methods and outcomes of linguistic atlases in different linguistic domains (in 1). In a second move, we will report on a selection of papers that, while dispensing with such methodology, nevertheless approached different issues on linguistic variation in connection with space (2). Finally, we consider very briefly some papers that explored external factors of dialect variation and those that considered the import of dialects from within other areas of study (3).

## **1. Geolinguistics: projects, methods and outcomes**

The conference featured several presentations of geolinguistic projects, most of them spanning over (or near) the Slavic areal domain. From a comprehensive geolinguistic project of regional Slovene atlases (as conceived by T. Logar and F. Crevatin), Rada Cossutta presented the *Dialect and Lexical Atlas of Slovene in the Trieste Area* (SDLA-Ts), from the late 80s, and more recent (2005-2006) *Dialect and Lexical Atlas of Slovene in Slovene Istria* (SDLA-SI I-II), inaugural for Slovene in the Istrian domain and allowing a cartographic view of the distribution of Romance and German borrowings, besides Slovene, in this area. Suzana Giljanović talked about the work on the *Dialectal Atlas of Slovene Istria and Kras* (DASIK [NASIK]), which covers the domain of Slovene Istria and Kras and gathers lexical information from neighbouring languages in the area. Additionally, Goran Filipi presented two regional linguistic atlases for endangered languages in the Istrian peninsula: the *Istriot Linguistic Atlas* (ILA) on the Istriot languages in Southern Istria and the *Istroroumanian Linguistic Atlas* (IrLA) on the Northern Istroroumanian languages. Mijo Lončarić accounted for the Croatian earlier representation in geolinguistic projects (such as the *Slavic Linguistic Atlas* (OLA) and the *Atlas Linguarum Europae* (ALE)), focusing on the current status

of the *Croatian Language Atlas*, under development. Moving on to the Baltic languages, Anna Stafecka presented a Latvian and Lithuanian common project for the *Atlas of the Baltic Languages*, reporting on its last three years as a pilot project and emphasizing the comparative import of such a commitment.

Other talks focused on various methodological issues in geolinguistic projects. Ubavka Gajdova, who presented the *Macedonian Dialect Atlas*, discussed methodological decisions behind the lexical and cartographic inaugural presentation in the latest edition of “From the geography of the lexis in the dialects of the Macedonian language”. Cartographical methods in the *Slovene Linguistic Atlas* (SLA), and how they developed from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century until the present, were the central concern of Jožica Škofic’s presentation. Current cartography in the SLA involves computer tools allowing, among others, the organisation of the relevant databases, automated map-making and choosing among several types of interpretive map-representation; for this purpose, special software has been designed, relating the particular database *SlovarRed* to the geographical information system (GIS), which permits more accuracy on the spatial representation and distribution of variants, a convenient plasticity of the cartographical options and also the analysis of dialectal data at different linguistic levels, as illustrated by concrete dialectal lexemes.

As for the domain of Baltic languages, Violeta Meiliūnaitė explained how the linguistic resources for geolinguistics developed in Lithuania, and how they come to permit to compare data from different periods. Particular attention has been given to the Dialect Archive of the Institute of the Lithuanian Language, which features about 6,800 hours of tape recordings and about 4,000 card index files. At present, a database is being created which will permit public and downloadable access to these materials. Methodological issues concerning the *Atlas of the Baltic Languages* were central in the presentations of Danguolė Mikulėnienė and of Asta Leskauskaitė. While D. Mikulėnienė discussed aspects relating to the selection and presentation of data on the first maps of this Atlas (essentially data from the *Atlas of the Lithuanian Language*, the *Atlas of the Latvian Language* and the *Atlas Linguarum Europae*), A. Leskauskaitė explained the principles of commentary writing, important also under a comparative approach. Commentaries include notes on prevalence of a lexeme in the dialects of Lithuanian and Latvian; etymological notes and references; diachronic information

about the use of the word between the sixteenth and the eighteenth centuries; and examples.

Finally, Dezső Juhász and Erika Terbe reported on the completion of the 11<sup>th</sup> and last volume of *The Atlas of Hungarian Dialects in Romania* (RMNyA), an atlas that extends the material from Romania represented in *The Atlas of Hungarian Dialects* (MNyA). Concomitantly, the digitalisation of MNyA permitted the integration of both atlases into a single electronic database, allowing for new dialectological and corpus linguistics research, the preparation of integrated maps through computer cartography, and also new synchronic and diachronic explorations.

Geolinguistic materials from diverse linguistic domains were also the basis for a fairly varied collection of more particular contributions. Yoshio Ebata (from Japan) presented his proposal for a “Linguistic Atlas Dynamics”, as the possible unification among his “linguistic atlas chronology” and “structural dialectology and dynamics”, as created by Newton, he clarifies. Vilja Oja (from Estonia) talked about “contacts between Finnic and Indo-European languages on linguistic maps”, exploring sources such as the *Atlas linguarum Fennicarum* and the *Atlas Linguarum Europae* to elucidate some intricacies of the distribution and routes of loanwords. Gotzon Aurrekoetxea (from the Basque Country, Spain) presented results from the *Sociogeolinguistic Atlas of the Basque Language* (EAS), considered together with data from the *Linguistic Atlas of the Basque Language* (EHHA). Such an approach permitted a sociolinguistic regard across different generations of informants, taking into account the variation manifested in the areas of morphology and syntax, besides the lexicon. Takuichiro Onishi (from Japan) presented a talk on the “Diffusing process of dialectological distribution” that acknowledges the connection between linguistic changes as seen in the *Grammar Atlas of Japanese Dialects* (GAJ), social features and dialectological distributions.

Geolinguistic studies were also the basis for the spatial perspective on South-Danubian Romanian presented by Nicolae Saramandu (from Romania), who also focused on Aromanian as a geographically central language in the Balkan Peninsula. Mojca Horvat (from Slovenia) applies well-known geolinguistics methods to the study of a dialect as represented in regional linguistic atlases, presenting some “isoglosses in the Prekmurje dialect”.

Phonetic issues arising as a geolinguistic outcome were considered by Karmen Kenda Jež (from Slovenia), who presented a paper on a micro- and a macroview on “the reflexes of \*E in Slovenian dialects in Slovenian and Slavic Linguistic Atlases”.

Few presentations focused on morphological and on syntactic aspects of linguistic variation, considered on the basis of geolinguistic materials. Tjaša Jakop (from Slovenia) presented the geographical distribution of the dual category in the dialects of Slovene, with the help of morphological maps drawn from the materials for the *Slovene Linguistic Atlas* (along the lines in Jakop 2008).

Taking into account a huge amount of data on the verbal inflection in Catalan dialects (original materials by Alcover and Moll, integrated into a database allowing dynamic maps), Maria-Pilar Perea (from Catalogne, Spain) and Hiroto Ueda (from Japan) stressed the interest of using a wide range of quantitative data techniques for the interpretation and linguistic analysis of hugely numerous dialectal materials. Several methods were presented for the analysis of variation on verb morphology, based on frequency, correlation, cluster analysis, and principal component analysis. Ernestina Carrilho and Sandra Pereira (from Portugal) presented some aspects of syntactic variation in European Portuguese from a geolinguistic perspective. From the materials gathered for the main Portuguese linguistic atlases, geographically distributed as they appear in the dialect corpus CORDIAL-SIN, it was shown that the areal distribution of certain (non-standard) constructions is restricted to particular areas and conforms to important dialectal boundaries already established within European Portuguese (Cintra 1971).

Finally, as outcomes from linguistic atlases, some presentations explored different aspects of lexical variation. Francisco Dubert García and Xulio Sousa Fernández (from Galicia, Spain) extended to the data in the *Atlas Lingüístico de la Península Ibérica* (ALPI) the approach taken by Cintra (1962) for the study of lexical areas in the Portuguese territory and by themselves with respect to the Galician-speaking area (Dubert and Sousa 2002). As a result, a collection of linguistic maps has been presented showing certain well-defined lexical areas within the Iberian domain, and also allowing an interesting connection with the initial work by Cintra (in particular, with respect to those innovative words that appear as exclusive of part of the Portuguese territory: *almece* ‘whey’, *maninha* ‘sterile female’, *amojo* ‘udder’). As part of a larger research project, Xosé Afonso Álvarez Pérez (from Portugal) presented the lexical areas defined

by the names of some fruit trees, within the Galician territory and the Northern area of Portugal. The main sources for this comparative areal study were the *Atlas Linguístico-Etnográfico de Portugal e da Galiza* (ALEPG) and the *Atlas Linguístico Galego* (ALGa).

Finally, beyond the Iberian domain, Esther Baiwir (from Belgium) considered the distribution of the designations for ‘twins’ in dialects from Wallonia. Variation between a system of a plural name (like *twins*) and a singular collective term has been examined, on the basis of the materials drawn from the *Linguistic Atlas of Wallonia* (ALW).

## **2. Dialectology (I): aspects of areal linguistic variation**

We turn now briefly to some presentations that dispensed with the geolinguistic methodology but nevertheless focused on issues relating to the linguistic manifestation of variation. We begin by a collection of papers focused on lexical variation.

Some of these papers considered diverse aspects of dictionaries. Đuro Blažeka (from Croatia) talked about raw dialectological materials used in a scholarly dictionary, *The Dictionary of the Ludbreg Podravina region*, and about the necessary collaboration between amateurs in the field and the professional scholar, which plays a major role in the tandem. The dialectal materials in *The Estonian Etymological Dictionary* were the subject of Iris Metsmägi's paper. Libuše Čížmarová and Milena Šipková talked about the *Dictionary of Moravian and Silesian Anoikonyms (Minor Place Names)*. The first one presented this dictionary as a new type of anoikonymic dictionary with linguistic interpretation. Milena Šipková showed the programs that are used to create the dictionary entry, which also allow to generate maps. The paper by Eveline Wandl Vogt gave a huge importance to the meaning of location in the *Dictionary of Bavarian Dialects* and in the *Database of Bavarian Dialects*. Karin Marc Bratina made a presentation on *Dictionary of Dialectal Idioms*, concerning animal idioms in the Slovene Istrian vernaculars.

As far as thesaurus are concerned, there were two presentations on the topic. On one hand, Agris Timuška showed the *Latvian Dialectal Dictionary*, a regional sub-dialectal thesaurus, a project launched in the nineties and still in progress. On the other hand, with a presentation named “Thesaurus – proof that the Graz Department of Slavic

studies is alive and well”, Ludvik Karničar described the work done in the last decades on the *Thesaurus of the Slovene folk language in Austrian Carinthia*.

With respect to lexical idioms, Vera Smole used a body idiom with the component *oko* (eye) to study the variation between Slovene dialects.

About linguistic terminologies, two presentations came up at the congress. Ljudmila Bokal talked about Slovenian ski terminology, one of the first to be written down, based on the Slovenian dictionaries. Mihaela Koletnik showed the Prekmurian agricultural vocabulary, which is disappearing among the younger generations in spite of being a part of the Slavic substratum. The language contact was also an important issue of this paper.

In a communication named “Lexis of an old farming procedure, *steljeraja*, in Carinthia”, Anja Benko also focused on language contact to talk about the lexis of a working activity. She compared the Mežica-Carinthian lexis to that of Podjuna-Carinthian, exploring similarities and differences between the two groups.

Regina Kvašyte also studied the language contact from a lexical perspective. Specifically, she analysed the lexis of toponyms and the ethnonyms used by the Lithuanians living in Latvia.

Finally, Natalija Ulčnik analysed the lexicographical material issued in a supplement to a novel written in the Prekmurje dialect. This supplement consists in more than 3000 entries which the reader may otherwise ignore. It may be a contribution for the study of this dialect.

Non-exhaustively, we may also refer to papers dealing with different aspects of phonological, morphological or morphosyntactic variation. Fumio Inoue presented a paper on “the S-shaped curve of phonological standardization”, calculating the number of years necessary for the completion of linguistic change in Tsuruoka and Yamazoe areas. Klementina Jurančič Petek talked about the “Influence of Slovene dialects on the pronunciation of English as foreign language”, which appears to be particularly evident in the vowels.

Chitsuko Fukushima, in a presentation on “Making paradigms of verbs and adjectives using a dialect corpus”, described the procedure followed to obtain patterns of verb conjugation and patterns of adjective conjugation from a dialect corpus, as part of the making of a Japanese dialect dictionary.



Manuela Nevaci (from Romania) presented her “Dialectal research into spoken Aromanian on the Balkan Peninsula”, developed on the basis of field research and recordings of dialectal texts from urban and rural areas, and providing a general overview on lexical, phonetic and morphological aspects of these Aromanian dialects.

On a more discourse-related plan, Branislava Vičar talked about “Discourse-referential procedures in the film script *Traktor, Ljubezen in rock’n’roll*”, in which the dialogue is written in the Goričko subdialect of the Prekmurje dialect.

### **3. Dialectology (II): corpora; external factors of linguistic variation; dialects from within other disciplines.**

To conclude, we may refer to a selection of talks that escaped the previous partitions. We begin by mentioning the presentation of different types of corpora featuring dialectal data: Maria-Pilar Perea talked about the “Computerisation of a corpus of personal correspondence spanning the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries: a study of linguistic variation”. This recently published corpus of Antoni M. Alcover’s personal correspondence in different languages (Catalan, Castilian, German, Latin, a.o.) amounts to more than 3,500,000 words and, besides providing biographical and cultural interesting information, also gives linguistic material relevant for the study of the Catalan language of the period, and specially of the linguistic interference between Catalan and Castilian at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Sára Vargha Fruzsina presented “The new oral corpus and related talking maps of Hungarian dialects from the 1960s”, a searchable oral corpus composed of time-aligned phonetic transcriptions from selected locations where fieldwork for the *Atlas of Hungarian Dialects* was conducted. Ernestina Carrilho (also on behalf of Catarina Magro) presented the project *Duplex* as part of the implementation of an online linguistic resource feeding the empirical demands of dialect syntax: in particular, this project provides a layer of searchable syntactic annotation to CORDIAL-SIN, the *Syntax-oriented Corpus of Portuguese Dialects*, already available online as a tagged corpus.

Other papers connected aspects of linguistic variation to particular external factors, relevant for dialect propagation and change, for instance. Akemi Yamashita talked about “Dialect propagation from Kyoto to the North” and the instrumental role of

the Kosei-railway in such a propagation; Michael Linn presented a paper on the “Change in the English of the Finns on the iron range” in correlation with the strength of ethnic identity.

Isabel A. Knoerrich Aldabo discussed the effective existence of a *sprachbund* between Romance and Maghrebi; Anna Kolláth presented some “Contact phenomena and dialectalism in the use of the Hungarian language in the Pomurje region”; Genovaitė Kačiuškienė talked about the “Attitude of intellectuals in Šiauliai (Lithuania) towards their native dialect”; Anton Schellander presented “Speaker strategies for maintaining functionality of Slovene dialect speech in the bilingual linguistic situation of Austrian Carinthia”.

The interest in dialects and in aspects relating to dialectology could also be found in other presentations that focused on the representation of dialectal features or on the cultural endowment of dialect preservation: Barbara Ivančič Kutin talked about “Live story telling and its transcoding into a written record”; Porfirio Grazioli presented “Ciociaria: cultura e dialetto”.

All in all, we must acknowledge the success of this Slovenian VI<sup>th</sup> edition of the SIDG Congress and the fruitful diversity of contributions and of participants, thus displaying the lively way how dialectology and geolinguistics, in particular, enlighten our knowledge of linguistic variation.

## References

- CINTRA, Luis Filipe Lindley (1962) “Áreas lexicais no território português”, *Boletim de Filologia*, XX, Lisboa: Centro de Estudos Filológicos, 273-307.
- CINTRA, Luis Filipe Lindley (1971) “Nova proposta de classificação dos dialectos galego-portugueses”, *Boletim de Filologia*, XXII, Lisboa: Centro de Estudos Filológicos, 81-116.
- DUBERT GARCÍA, Francisco and Xulio Sousa Fernández (2002) “Áreas lexicais galegas e portuguesas. A proposta de Cintra aplicada ó galego”, in R. Álvarez/F. Dubert/X. Sousa (eds.) *Dialectoloxía e Léxico*, Santiago de Compostela: ILG/Consello da Cultura Galega, 193-222.
- JALOP, Tjaša (2008) *Dvojina v slovenskih narečjih (The Dual in Slovene Dialects)*, *Linguistica et Philologica*, 21.