

INDEXING OF DIALECT TEXTS

Jordana S. Marković*

University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Niš, Serbia

The work of Brankica Marković, titled “Towards the Indexing of Dialect Texts Published in the Republic of Serbia”, appeared in the Serbian 2020 dialectological collection no. LXVII. This bibliography of works, consisting of 116 pages, includes dialect texts from the period between 1905 and 2017, published in the “relevant scientific and professional periodicals and monographic publications in the Republic of Serbia”¹, according to the author herself.

The author divided the texts into three groups: texts which were not given a corpus description; texts which were given a partial corpus description, shorter or longer; and texts found in monographs, in sentences. The review is given chronologically within the scope of all of the aforementioned groups. Bibliographical units and the accompanying comments are given in the same script the text was written in – Cyrillic or Latin. Apart from the writing, the variability of the texts is also evident in other aspects – some are presented as connected speech, some as a separate whole separated with asterisks, and some are specially titled. Therefore, the necessity for uniformity is emphasised. That is, it is necessary to create a model for these texts, and to advocate for them to be titled, as this would complement and improve their pragmatism. The introductory part gives an overview of the works, which suggests what a dialect text should look like, and what type of data should be provided by such a text.

The Inventory, whose data is mentioned in this bibliography, consists of 252 units. On the other hand, the highest number of units (112) belongs to the group of texts presented as a contribution to the monograph or the dictionary. The group containing texts with shorter or longer corpus descriptions follows (105), and the smallest number of units (35) belongs to the group which contains dialect texts without a corpus description. Shtokavian, Chakavian, and Kaikavian texts are included in this list, but the Shtokavian texts are far more numerous and stem from all areas, that is, they belong to all dialects.

The first group consists of texts written and published between 1938 (e.g. the text by Branko Miletić from Ljimpljan as an illustration of the Crmnica speech) and 2017, the final publication year included in this inventory (e.g. the

* Corresponding author: Jordana S. Marković, University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Ćirila i Metodija 2, 18101 Niš, Serbia, jordana.markovic@filafk.ni.ac.rs

¹ Brankica Marković, “Towards the Indexing of Dialect Texts Published in the Republic of Serbia”, *Serbian Dialectological Collection LXVII*, Belgrade, Serbian Academy of Science and Arts and the Institute for the Serbian Language, 2020, 414.

text by Dragana Radovanović and Milica Dejanović from the village of Jažince in Sirinička župa).

The second group of texts starts with a text from the village of Brusje, from the Hvar Island in Dalmatia, which was recorded by Mate Hraste. The text was published in 1926/1927. This inventory of texts closes with the text of Olivera Totošković from Vlasotince, published in 2017.

The third group opens with a text by Aleksandar Belić, published in 1905 in the first “Serbian Dialectological Collection”. This is the oldest text in this inventory. The texts within this group originate from various parts of eastern and southern Serbia. The last in this group is a text published in 2017, written by Biljana Savić from Veliki Blašak, near Banjaluka.

Additionally, a shorter or a slightly more voluminous author’s text is provided for every bibliographical unit in this part, which complements the units by providing information related to the text in question.

The fact that texts from 2017, the last year of publication taken for review, are included in and contribute to each of the three categories cheers us up greatly. That means that authors with thematically different works realise the importance of dialect texts. Dialect texts are arguments in favour of the topic and, moreover, a source of precious data for readers. Furthermore, they are a source of precious data for researches and scholars of folk languages.

By collecting these contributions in one place and by publishing them, Branka Marković has made the endeavours of future researchers easier, i.e. she has made the search for dialect texts easier for those who will, in the future, be interested in the problems related to folk speeches.

In one part of this review, Marković classifies the texts according to the dialects they were written in. The author divides the texts into texts in the Shtokavian dialect, texts in the Chakavian dialect, and texts in the Kaikavian dialect. Furthermore, the Shtokavian dialect was further divided into: the Šumadija-Vojvodina dialect, Herzegovina-Krajina dialect, Kosovo-Resava dialect, Smederevo-Vršac dialect, Zeta-Sjenica dialect and the Prizren-Timok dialect area, followed by the more recent Ikavian Eastern Bosnian and Slavonic dialects, and transitional speech. The author attributes the Southwestern, Istrian, North Chakavian, Central Chakavian and South Chakavian dialects to the Chakavian dialect. The Kaikavian dialect is attributed to the Goran dialect and the Kaikavian speech in Banat, whereas the West Macedonian dialect was treated separately.

Since the purpose of this work is to find and record dialect texts printed in relevant publications, perhaps it might have been better if the author had not ventured into the classification of dialects. The classification needs to include the criteria on which it is based in order for it to be clear and obvious why a specific speech was placed in a specific category. Of course, that would burden this work and distract from its main task, so it would have been better to leave out this part.

The next part of this work provides valuable data about the sources reviewed for this very purpose.

The author made an effort to assemble the register of points and the register of authors. The former is given on the basis of the classification of dialects. The register of authors is divided into two parts, addressing authors whose works are in the Cyrillic or Latin script, respectively. In both of the registers, references to the bibliographical unit are made numerically.

Some ‘misunderstandings’ may occur due to the fact that it is impossible to know the names and precise locations of all the places whose speech was found in the observed texts. Such problems also include the existence of two different points bearing the same name, even if they are in a relatively limited space. Thus, Novo Selo was found in one such space, with reference to two monographs. Consequently, one might think the same village is being referred to, but this is not the case. The misunderstanding was created because both of the monographs deal with speeches from the south of Serbia – the speech of Niš and the surrounding villages, and the speech of Zaplanje. Novo Selo appears in both of these as a point, but one is located in the vicinity of Niš and the other in Zaplanje.

The author’s effort to remove such doubts is exemplified by the information added in brackets. Thus, for example, the added data *Bjelići* is used to specify where the place is located in the Odžaci point.

On page 116, Brankica Marković offers a very valuable bibliography of dialect texts, published between 1905 and 2017. The importance of this bibliography lies in the fact that all of the data on dialect texts from various regions, regardless of when they were written and what region they are from, can be accessed at any moment and can be found in the same place. These texts can be a valuable source of data about the language of a region. Moreover, there is also other information which current generations, and generations to come, can find useful for their research, because this information can, among other things, be used as support for their academic arguments. For those reasons, this bibliography must be regarded as well-constructed, and as a valuable contribution.