Ronelle Alexander
University of California, Berkeley

DIALECTOLOGY

1. Scope of the discipline

Given that most linguistic description and analysis makes reference to the form of a language called the contemporary standard – normally defined as the code formulated in grammars and dictionaries, and spoken (with a somewhat wider range of acceptable variation) by educated native speakers – the sub-discipline of dialectology can be said to cover by far the broadest range of linguistic material, for it falls to dialectology to describe ALL the remaining spoken forms of a language.

The term "dialect" has several different connotations. In the broadest sense, it refers to any speech system the particular linguist has in mind; for instance, some linguists use it to refer to their own individual speech systems (as in, for instance, "in my dialect, X is possible but Y is not"). In the eyes of non-specialists (and, unfortunately, also of certain specialists), the term carries clearly marked emotional overtones, denoting speech elements considered as backward, deviant, archaic, quaint, or "colorful"). Less commonly, the term "dialect" can also refer to speech styles defined by social strata; such dialects are usually (though not always) perceived as occurring only in urban contexts. In the most neutral usage of the term – and its most frequent usage in Slavic linguistics – a dialect can be defined as "a non-standard self-contained linguistic system whose identity is articulated primarily with reference to geography". Although dialectology can clearly be seen as a unified discipline, both the subject matter, and the manner in which this matter is treated, vary considerably over the geographical expanse of Slavic. Much of what follows holds in general throughout the Slavic-speaking world, though the major focus is on South Slavic (and all the direct experiential evidence is drawn from work in areas of southeastern Slavic).

Modern dialectologists study the several non-standard linguistic systems under their purview both as individual languages in their own right, and as a continuum of related systems. In the latter instance, dialectologists pay particular attention to the several kinds and degrees of spatial differentiation (the terms "dialect geography" or "linguistic geography" are sometimes used to refer to this type of analysis). When one considers the extent of detail appropriate to the proper description of a single (standard) language and then multiplies this by the number of existing dialects, the scope of data to which dialectologists have access (and for which they are responsible) is truly mind-boggling. Indeed, the discipline owes a tremendous debt to the many devoted linguists, ethnographers, schoolteachers and enthusiastic laymen who have, over the last century and a half, amassed an enormous amount of recorded data. Much still remains to be recorded, and much of that which has been recorded is subject to reasoned skepticism (since the recording was done by hand, in the days before mechanical means were available), and/or still awaits satisfactory analysis. In addition, the coverage throughout Slavic as a whole is uneven: some areas are relatively thoroughly documented, while for others the coverage is surprisingly meager and scanty. All in all, however, there is sufficient data with which to work. Furthermore, the perceived crisis which gave dialectology such a boost in the 60s – the fear that regional dialects would completely wither away and die in the face of widespread literacy, the power of mass communication, and the self-evident prestige of the literary standard – has failed to come about as predicted. It is true that there has been mass out-migration from rural areas and skyrocketing growth of urban areas, and that many rural villages which were once completely isolated now form part of an areal complex whose center is a larger village or small town. But rural areas have not been depopulated to the extent feared. On the contrary, most rural areas retain a core population, and some are even thriving.

In large part, this is because Slavs as a whole seem to be very aware of their roots and very attached to them. The number of urban dwellers who still retain an active connection with family village roots is quite large, and the most natural expression of this connection is through speech. Of course, not all city dwellers wish to retain contact with their ancestral dialects, and not all who do wish to maintain this contact are able to do it more than passively. A number, however, remain bi-dialectal, shifting easily into the dia-

lect on return to the village. As for village speakers, it is true that a number of them are markedly upwardly mobile, which means that they disdain village connections and constantly attempt to acquire city speech as much as possible (sometimes successfully, and sometimes only partially). The majority, however, not only accept their rural status but actually take pride in it. The essential point is that dialectal speech is in general valued by its speakers, and while the valuation of it varies among city dwellers and throughout different parts of the Slavic world, dialectal speech is not disvalued anywhere sufficiently for there to be any imminent danger of its complete loss through the processes of total assimilation known as "language death".

2. Tools of the discipline

Once a large amount of data has been amassed, it needs to be put into usable format. Just as a single language description is usually ordered in terms of phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicon, so is the material from the many different regional dialects. A full description of a single dialect taken in isolation looks (or ought to look) like the grammar of a language. The essence of dialectology, however, is in its ability to analyze variation over space in a consistent manner, which is done by establishing metrics of differentiation. Surveying the range of differentiation with respect to a single variable, the analyst determines the point at which the several variables can no longer be said to be the "the same" and must be regarded as "different". This demarcation line, drawn on a map of the territory in question, is called an "isogloss". Evaluating the several different isoglosses in terms of structural importance (for instance, the presence or absence of vowel length is structurally much more significant than the degree of palatalization of a single consonant), dialectologists survey their interaction in spatial terms. By viewing the concatenation of isoglosses, and paying especial attention to the points where these isoglosses occur in "bundles", dialectologists are then able to separate the linguistic landscape into the different regional dialects and sub-dialects (the term *dialekt* or *narečie* is usually used for the larger division and the term *govor* for the smaller one).[1]

[1] These three words are cited in their Russian form; minor adjustments will produce the corresponding forms which are used with the same meaning in most other Slavic languages.

Not surprisingly, these linguistic divisions often coincide with physical, ethnic or political ones. Local inhabitants are quite sensitive to the "sameness" vs. "difference" of their own speech with respect to that of their neighbors, and often they have already named their own speech variant. Sometimes the name corresponds to some natural feature (such as the name of a mountain range or river valley); sometimes it corresponds to the name of an ethnic or political division, either ancient (such as "Thracian") or modern (such as "Eastern Bosnian"); sometimes it is purely geographical (such as "southwestern"); sometimes it is the name of the nearest large city; and sometimes it is a name of unclear origin (such as "Shope [*Šop*]" or "Torlak") which is so well established among the folk that even for the dialectologist to call it anything else would feel artificial and disingenuous. Individual isoglosses themselves, of course, are named for the linguistic feature to which they refer. The entire complex of isoglosses and their distribution is quite technical and detailed. Some isoglosses, however, such as that delineating the reflexes of the Common Slavic vowel *jat'*, are well known not only to all linguists but also to most of the general public. That is, most literate Bulgarians know what the *jatova granica* ("*jat'* demarcation line") is and where it runs; and practically everyone conversant with BCS (Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian) knows not only the conceptual difference between ekavian, ikavian and ijekavian – terms referring to areas where the *jat'* vowel is now pronounced as *-e-*, *-i-* or *-ije-*/*-je-*, respectively – but also the specific geographical distribution of these three different pronunciations.

Classification of the data into discrete dialectal regions is a necessary first step to analyzing the synchronic structure of variation or to using the evidence of variation in historical studies. Some dialectologists view classification as an end in itself. It is well that they do, when one considers the amount of work involved in sorting and tabulating the data and in devising ways for it to be displayed on maps. Cartography, which can take a number of different forms, is an essential tool for the clear presentation and understanding of dialectal variation. Maps can show either the general placement of dialect types or the specific distribution of several isoglosses respective to one another, or they can give a very detailed picture of the distribution of any one single variable. Most dialect studies include at least a few maps of each sort. Dialect atlases are composed almost exclusively of the latter kind of map.

Classification of dialectal variation also takes on intense importance in areas where ethnic or language boundaries are in dispute. For example, nearly all attempts at resolving "the Macedonian question" make reference to dialectal phenomena and to varying perceptions of the "sameness / difference" continuum. Indeed, tremendous energy has been expended throughout the last hundred years (and before) in determining the extent to which any one particular linguistic feature (and, by extension, the people whose speech it characterized and the land on which these people lived) was Serbian, Macedonian or Bulgarian. The very existence of Macedonian as something apart from Bulgarian has in fact been hotly debated by Macedonian and Bulgarian linguists, both of whom use the same dialectal data to support opposing (and very strongly held) points of view. The question of whether or not Kašubian is distinct from Polish is similarly debated (though less strongly, and without the potential for violence).

3. Dialectology and related disciplines

From a historical point of view, the recording and classification of dialectal differentiation has been important in the rise of national self-awareness, especially among peoples such as the Balkan Slavs, who were under foreign political domination until relatively recently. Additionally, the precise determination of the geographic correlates of linguistic differentiation is relevant to a number of related disciplines such as history, demography, geography, ethnography and the like. Not only is the speech of a people extremely tenacious, it is also its most intimate and precious possession (as well, of course, as one of its most necessary tools for survival). A careful study of the structure of dialectal differentiation, therefore, can give much valuable insight into earlier population distribution, patterns of movement, and relations of power between groups. Similarly, the close correlation between traditional forms of speech and other elements of traditional culture (such as instrumental music, ritual, narrative, song, dance, textile art, material construction and the like) indicates the usefulness of studying these several different cultural elements in close conjunction with one another.

Despite its clear (and broad) overlap with other disciplines in the humanities and social sciences, however, dialectology indisputably belongs within linguistics. The data of dialectology are of central concern to linguists in a number of ways. For instance, it is

only through a careful perusal of the richness of dialectal diversity that students of typology can become acquainted with the full range of manifested linguistic phenomena within the scope of a single language family. In addition, it is frequently the case that sound patterns tend to be more consistently implemented in dialects than they are in the sometimes artificially constructed standard literary languages. Secondly, dialectology is a crucial tool in historical linguistics. Written manuscripts may date from an earlier era, but one must approach the information they provide with great caution, since this information comes to us through so many different graphological and sociological layers (not to mention the manifold potential for simple human error on the part of the scribe). Dialects, on the other hand, can give a more direct (although still not unambiguous) window into earlier stages of language development. Furthermore, the data of a modern dialect occur within a naturally functioning speech system, the speakers of which can (with careful preparation of the experiment) provide additional clarification through listening and recognition tests. If one envisions the present dialectal landscape through the eyes of an archaeologist, one can see in it different layers of historical development waiting to be excavated; to use a different metaphor, one can visualize, on the linguistic geographic plane, how phylogeny recapitulates ontogeny. In actual fact, movement through space can (and often does, to a surprisingly precise degree) recapitulate movement through time. The term "diachrony" is a well-established label for the latter. Consequently, it made sense that the Serbian dialectologist Pavle Ivić would adopt the term "diatopy" (first coined by the linguist and philosopher Eugenio Coşeriu) to refer to the former.[2]

The bond between dialectology and historical linguistics (especially in the neogrammarian period) was so close, in fact, that the two disciplines often seemed to be the same (indeed, one could be viewed as embedded within the other, it being a matter of one's point of view as to which was embedded where). Consequently, the terms "historical linguistics" and "historical dialectology" often seem to be used interchangeably. Both the major 19th century theories of historical development (the *Stammbaumtheorie* or "family-tree theory", and the *Wellentheorie* or "wave theory") construe historical relationships between earlier and later linguistic states in terms of the dialectal differentiation from a presumed common ancestor, with historical movement seen as occurring not only

[2] Unfortunately, this second term does not appear to have been adopted into general usage among linguists.

through time but also through space. Attention to geographical distribution and spatial differentiation, and the use of terms such as "the dialects of Common Slavic" to refer to what are now seen as the separate daughter languages, attest to the central role of dialectology in historical linguistics. Indeed, the comparative method itself was based on the assumption of a broad span of dialectal data, since it was necessary to make reference to as many different systemic implementations as possible in order to assure the reliability of the reconstructions. It is traditional for handbooks of historical linguistics to include a survey of modern dialectal data, and to speak (implicitly or explicitly) in terms of a progressive arc of dialectal differentiation, in which the material of modern dialects either exemplifies the direction of change or fills in presumed "missing links".[3] Some of the most fruitful modern studies of dialectal data are those which utilize the inventory and distribution of dialectal variation to propose new chronologies of diachronic change. Enough cross-linguistic work has now been done that the simple patterning of isoglosses on a linguistic map will allow the experienced dialectologist to tell at a glance which elements are likely to be archaisms and which innovations, and to make well-educated guesses as to the most likely path of development.[4]

There is also considerable overlap between dialectology and the field of language contact. The term "dialect mixing", encountered frequently in historical studies (where it often functions as a catchall explanation of unclear phenomena), properly refers to contact and interference phenomena. Because the history of the Slavs has been marked by a great deal of movement and of mixing of populations, it is to be expected that different dialects and languages would have come into intense contact with each other and that different sorts of interference would have resulted. Sometimes this mixing is among closely related languages and dialects, and sometimes it is among languages and dialects which

[3] Because they fall more properly within the purview of "historical linguistics, " the standard historical handbooks for each language are not listed in the accompanying bibliography. However, it should be assumed that the best and most thorough of these handbooks will also give valuable information about the major dialect divisions. Anyone wishing to gain a basic knowledge of the dialects of a language should always consult not only the synchronic atlases and dialectological surveys, but also the appropriate historical grammars.

[4] The bibliography includes only those historical studies which are constructed according to this methodological goal (and only those done by US scholars). It is the nature of the field that historical studies should make reference to dialects and dialectal differentiation, and it is outside the scope of this piece to survey each such mention in Slavic historical linguistics.

are only distantly related (if at all). The study of Sprachbünde[5] (linguistic convergence areas) is of great significance to Slavists. This is partly because the world's most famous Sprachbund exemplar, the Balkan Sprachbund, numbers Slavic languages and dialects among its prime members (the Slavic members are Bulgarian, Macedonian and southeast Serbian dialects, and the non-Slavic members are Greek, Albanian and Balkan Romance). But it is also because many Slavists first encountered the concept of a "linguistic alliance" through the writings of N.S. Trubetzkoy and Roman Jakobson (whose importance to Slavic studies hardly can be overemphasized).[6] Other convergence areas which include Slavic languages and dialects are the Baltic Sprachbund (comprising north Slavic language, Baltic languages[7] and Finnic), and the Carpathian Sprachbund (including central Slavic languages, Hungarian and Romanian). Individual instances of contact – such as Turkish speakers living in Bulgaria, Croatian or Slovenian speakers living in Austria, or Sorbian speakers living in Germany – are also studied on this model. The constant contact of Slavic with other languages over the centuries has also meant that numerous scholars specializing in other areas have made important contributions to Slavic dialectology as well.[8] Although the complexity of contact situations (especially the multiple-contact scenario of a Sprachbund) often means that only one exemplar of each language can be considered (and it is usually the literary standard which is chosen as the default case), it is well known that the actual contact situations were played out exclusively in the spoken sphere, and that the contact itself was almost always instantiated among speakers of non-standard varieties of the languages in question. It is imperative, therefore, that Sprachbund linguistics develop ways in which to integrate the study of dialectal material in a more thorough and structured manner.[9]

---

[5] Usage differs as to whether the plural should take English form (*Sprachbunds*) or maintain the form of the original German (*Sprachbünde*).

[6] In fact, however, the concept had been introduced several years earlier (with respect to the Balkan Sprachbund) by the Danish scholar Kristian Sandfeld.

[7] Baltic and Slavic are closely related; some historical linguists consider there to have been a common Balto-Slavic language in much earlier periods. Sprachbund linguistics, however, studies the recent contact between language families which are now clearly distinct from one another.

[8] It is unfortunate that this forum includes no contribution on "contact linguistics," a field which is appropriately defined in its own right. The contribution of American Slavists to Balkan linguistics is especially significant; with few exceptions, however, a documentation of these contributions must unfortunately remain outside the scope of the present survey.

[9] The recent work of A.N. Sobolev and his team on the Balkan linguistic atlas provides a model for work of this sort (for discussion of this project, see below, and for citations, see section A.4 of the bibliography).

The field of sociolinguistics also has clear connections with dialectology in at least three directions. The first of these is the history of the development of literary languages, a sub-field of great interest to Slavists (linguists, historians and literary specialists alike), especially since most of the languages in question have been codified relatively recently in conjunction with considerable political turmoil and/or social change and national self-awakening. The various Slavic peoples have been very conscious of the extent to which their literary standard corresponds to the (or some particular) dialectal base of the language, and pay attention to the degree in which this codification process utilizes the dialectal base in a manner adequately reflecting the particular people's sense of themselves. Beyond these generalizations, the shape of the question depends on the particular arena. But although the dialectal base of the language under discussion remains to be defined in each particular instance, the point is that this dialectal base is always relevant. For instance, Russianists are concerned with the language levels defined ultimately by M.V. Lomonosov; and although the speech variant which is now usually called *prostorečie* is clearly at a lower end of the spectrum defined socially, everyone is conscious of its presence. To take another example, both Poles and Slovenes are very conscious of the different regional dialects of their language, some of which carry more prestige than others; and the extent to which one or the other of these forms the basis of the literary language is still a matter of intense discussion among scholars in both countries. Similarly, the shifting norms in the construction of standard Ukrainian continue to present scholars with material for study, as do the development of standard Croatian and standard Bosnian as part of the deconstruction of Serbo-Croatian. The case of Bulgarian presents yet another aspect of this problem, in that the codifiers of standard Bulgarian consciously strove to create a multi-dialectal language, combining elements of eastern and western dialects. In Bulgaria, the current debate is not so much about the source of these elements but rather about whether or not educated speakers should be required to learn an "unnatural" language, one which is not spoken in a natural context by any one dialectal group.[10]

The second two instances of overlap between dialectology and sociolinguistics concern dialects which are defined with respect to social parameters. One of these sub-

[10] The literature on each of these issues is enormous, and it is impossible in this brief space to document the several ways in which dialectology is involved.

fields, which is only marginally connected with dialectology, concerns the question of diglossia. Here, the obvious example is Czech, where several different "standards" reign; the Czech linguists who have discussed this issue in detail do not usually consider it within the framework of dialectology. The other sub-field is broader in scope, and concerns dialects which are defined either in terms of a particular population subgroup (such as a specific artisan guild, or a minority defined in religious or ethnic terms), or with reference to a specific urban area. It has become increasingly common to group studies of the latter type under the rubric "urban dialectology". Those who do this conflate two different types of analysis, however. One type is concerned with the fact that a number of urban areas accord prestige to a local speech style which the educated elite speak alongside the standard language (for example, the kajkavian speech of Zagreb differs markedly from standard Croatian). By contrast, the other is concerned with the complex gradation characteristic of "urban sprawl", and with the fact that dialect speakers who move to urban areas often continue to maintain certain elements of their rural dialects. Some scholars call only the first of these "urban dialectology'; indeed Bulgarian scholars refer to the second type of the study simply as "sociolinguistics". Overall, the attitudes in the various Slavic countries towards the very field of sociolinguistics have undergone considerable change since the fall of socialist governments (prior to that point, scholars were more or less constrained by Marxist ideology when describing socially-conditioned speech variation). The extent to which post-socialist sociolinguistic studies are viewed as part of dialectology varies; as in other arenas of massive social change, it will take time for the dust to settle.[11]

4. Survey of the discipline within the Slavic countries

Dialectology of the pre-modern period was connected with the two related disciplines of ethnography and historical linguistics. The discipline of ethnography came into being during the Romantic period of the early 19th century, when folklore and other manifestations of popular knowledge came to be seen as a window into the past and into a people's "ethnic soul". Ethnographers recorded the full range of the traditional way of

[11] All these sociolinguistic issues are of relevance to linguists in the countries concerned (and, at least in the first two cases, are well discussed in the West as well). With very few exceptions, however, they must re-

life of a particular area, and the speech of that area was but one of these manifestations. Many excellent dialect descriptions were embedded within larger ethnographic descriptions: sometimes investigators noted only a few words or phrases, or made brief remarks on characteristic pronunciation features; in other instances they produced much fuller descriptions of sounds and grammatical forms, gave sizeable word lists, and appended extensive examples of dialect speech.[12] Most often these "texts" are presented in one or another of the forms of folklore (such as folktales, folksongs, or legends). Sometimes, however, more neutral prose texts are included; these usually take the form of a narrative description of some aspect of traditional life. Such texts are valuable not only for their ethnographic content but also because they are the closest thing we have to a recording of running speech: as such they provide almost the only data we have about the dialectal syntax of previous generations. In general, folklore texts are less reliable as examples of dialect speech due to their formulaic nature (song texts in particular are likely to include phraseology which is dictated by the requirements of melody and metrics), although folktales often come quite close to neutral dialectal speech.

Historical linguistics, by contrast, saw its goal as the reconstruction of a Common Slavic ancestor, and for them, dialectal data was grist for the mill. One can imagine the excitement, therefore, when a Czech scholar announced in 1865 that he had heard nasal vowels in modern Slavic dialects spoken near modern Thessalonike, the homeland of Cyril and Methodius. Another issue which fascinated comparativists of the time (and continues to fascinate Slavic linguists today) was accentology. How was one to reconstruct a common ancestor to account for the striking diversity of modern accentual systems in any reasoned manner? Reconstructions came to be so hypothetically complex that at least one scholar complained of a "star-studded sky" (reconstructed forms that were not attested in any recorded spoken dialect were marked by a star). Nevertheless, to arrive at a systematic, internally consistent reconstruction, one had to rely on starred forms, because they sometimes supplied an essential key to the entire structural puzzle. In accentology, the key piece was something scholars decided to call the "neo-acute". They did this because despite the fact that no one had ever heard one (or expected to hear one), it

---

main outside the scope of the present survey.

nevertheless behaved in a consistent manner, mirroring the Common Slavic acute in certain ways but differing from it in others. Here, too, the evidence of dialectology helped unlock the puzzle. This came about when the Serbian scholar Aleksandar Belić "discovered the neo-acute" (that is, he found a tonal contour with a sharp phonetic rise occurring on exactly the segments where the reconstructions had predicted it) in the living speech of a coastal Dalmatian dialect (see Belić 1910).

On the basis of these early ethnographic and historical-comparative bases, dialectology as an organized effort came into being in the late 19th century, as a number of eminent scholars traveled far afield to research and record living dialects. Among these were Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, who made his famous study of the archaic Resian dialect of Slovene in 1875, and the Norwegian scholar Olaf Broch, who began field work in Serbia in 1889 and who was later to be instrumental in identifying the northern Russian speech variant Russenorsk (which is called by some a dialect and by others a pidgin). Others worked in their own home areas, formulating the bases and establishing the framework for the modern discipline. In the north, for instance, the Moscow Dialectological Commission, under the direction of N.A. Durnovo, N.N. Sokolov, and D.N. Ušakov, carried out the first large-scale questionnaire investigation, and published (in 1915) a description of East Slavic dialects together with a map whose boundaries are still referred to today. Further to the west, some of the classic work on Kashubian and Slovincian was done in this period (see Bronisch 1896 and Ščerba 1915 on Kashubian, and Lorenz 1903 on Slovincian). In the south, the influential *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* (based in Belgrade) was inaugurated in 1905 with Belić's classic study of southeast Serbian dialects, while the broadly humanistic Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti (or JAZU, based in Zagreb) published Stjepan Ivšić's similarly significant study of Posavian Slavonian dialects in 1913. The Vienna-based series *Schriften der Balkankomission* also published key descriptive studies of various South Slavic dialects (including Rešetar 1900, Miletich 1903, Broch 1903, and Miletich 1912).

In the interwar period, after the dissolution of the empires but before the coming of socialism to Eastern Europe, many excellent studies were published, among them

[12] An excellent example of a full dialect description embedded within an extensive ethnographic study is Zahariev 1918.

Vsevolod Hancov's 1923 classification of Ukrainian dialects, Alexander Išačenko's 1935 study of the Slovenian Rosental, Cvetan Todorov's 1936 monograph on northwest Bulgarian dialects, Ivšić's 1936 description of the kajkavian dialectal area, Reinhold Olesch's 1937 survey of the Polish dialects of Upper Silesia, and Ivan Pan'kevyč's study of Carpathian Ukraine dialects. But it was only after World War II that dialectology truly came into its own. This was partly because of the close fit between Marxist-Leninist ideology and the study of "the people's speech" (and the consequent large-scale state sponsorship of this study), but also because of the advent of structuralism – the shift in linguistic thinking which essentially legitimized dialectology as a discipline. The concept of "structural dialectology" was explicated in studies such as Weinreich 1954, Stankiewicz 1957 and Ivić 1963, and exemplified in Ivić's 1956 structural description of Serbo-Croatian dialects (made accessible to a Western public as explicit "structural dialectology" in Ivić 1958).[13] More to the point, it was the possibility of perceiving each individual dialect as a self-contained internally consistent linguistic system that allowed all the apparatus of modern descriptive linguistics to be applied to the description of individual dialects.[14] This, coupled with the decision of the post-war socialist states to commit such large amounts of resources (both in manpower and in publishing) to the enterprise of dialectology, allowed the production not only of large numbers of sophisticated individual dialect descriptions and broader, structurally oriented survey studies of dialectal distribution, but also the compilation and production of dialect atlases.

---

[13] Handbooks (often originally written as university course textbooks) giving a structurally-oriented overview of the dialectal differentiation of each language were also prepared at this time; many of these were later reprinted (sometimes directly, and sometimes with significant revision). The ones considered "classic" are Avanesov and Orlova 1964 (Russian); Blinava and Mjacel'skaja 1969/1980 (Belarusian); Žylko 1966 (Ukrainian); Urbańczyk 1962/1976, and Dejna 1973 (Polish); Bělič 1972 (Czech); Ivić 1956/2001 [German version 1958] and Peco 1978 (Serbo-Croatian); Logar 1975/1993 (Slovene); Stojkov 1962/1993 (Bulgarian); and a series of articles by Vidoeski, revised and collected in Vidoeski 1998-1999 [partially translated into English in 2006] (Macedonian). Vážný 1934 apparently remains the standard handbook for Slovak (but see also Pauliny 1963). For South Slavic and West Slavic as overall regions, see the excellent Polish-language handbook by Sławski (1962) and Kuraszkiewicz 1963, respectively. Finally, from the older period, see also Havránek 1934 for Czech and Nitsch 1923/1958) for Polish.

[14] Significant full-scale individual dialect descriptions had also been produced in pre-structuralist times; examples from the South Slavic region include Belić 1935 and Mirčev 1936. Many such descriptions appeared in ethnographic periodicals such as the Bulgarian *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija i narodopis*. In some areas, series devoted exclusively to dialectology were established, such as the above-mentioned *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* (published continually since 1905). Similar journals were established in other Yugoslav republics (*Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik, Bosanskohercegovački dijalektološki zbornik*), but only within the socialist period.

Some of the individual descriptions appeared as monographs within an established series,[15] and some appeared as longer articles in journals or as separate monographs.[16] Many a student wrote a senior thesis (or a Ph.D. dissertation) on his or her own native dialect, and some of these students went on to become outstanding general dialectologists. Other studies – either of individual dialects or of comparative data – were made by urban scholars who had become fascinated by the linguistic riches available in the nearby countryside and were now able to make a living studying them because the socialist states funded field travel and the compilation and publication of data. Indeed, the academic structure of socialist Slavic countries, with their extensive state-funded research institutes, was ideally suited for the production of dialect studies, both individual and comparative.[17]

To many, however, the crowing glory of dialectology was the atlas, and this was the goal of the largest work cadres among dialectologists in these institutes. Of course, cartography had been done earlier, and dialectal distribution had been depicted on maps either separately or as an addendum to the various historical grammars and early surveys. The concept of the linguistic atlas, however, which tabulates the results of uniform investigations over a large number of specific points within a language region, did not begin to be actualized in the Slavic lands until the 1950s (by comparison, the Germans, French and Italian Swiss had initiated their attempts in 1880, 1902, and 1928, respectively).[18] After the recovery from World War II and the institution of the socialist system throughout all Slavic countries, much effort was poured into this undertaking. Questionnaires were compiled,[19] data gathered through interviews (most preferably on site, although sometimes by mail) and then compiled and sorted (on thousands of small slips of paper),

[15] Again from the South Slavic region, there is the series *Trudove po bŭlgarska dialektologija* which includes many outstanding book-length dialect descriptions, among which can be cited Mladenov 1966 and Stojkov 1967; similarly, the series *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* includes book-length descriptions such as Ivić 1957.

[16] To take one example from each of the major South Slavic areas, there is Rigler 1963 (Slovenian), Jedvaj 1956 (kajkavian), Hamm et al. 1956 (čakavian), Peco 1964 (štokavian), Vidoeski 1962 (Macedonian), and Kabasanov 1955 (Bulgarian). For a full historical and bibliographical survey of South Slavic dialectology, see Alexander 2000.

[17] Examples of structurally-oriented comparative studies are Ivić 1960, 1961, and others.

[18] Here, Poland (known throughout the Slavic world for achievements in dialectology) provides an exception in the form of the sub-Carpathian dialect atlas edited by Małecki and Nitsch in 1934.

[19] Of course, this does not imply that no questionnaires had been used before this time. Indeed, the pre-World War I Moscow Dialect Commission had done much of its work on the basis of questionnaires.

maps were drawn and long lists of accompanying commentaries produced. All countries initiated such efforts, but the results varied according to a number of circumstances.

One of the most successful atlas projects has been the Bulgarian one, for several reasons. Not only had the Balkans traditionally been a focus of ethnographic research, the locus of much pre-war ethnography (as well as serious dialectological work) by Russians, Slovenes, Poles, French and others,[20] but traditional village life in Bulgaria managed to retain much of its vitality even after socialism began its massive transformation of all aspects of society. Researchers from other socialist countries thus continued to travel there (especially from the USSR, a country which not only developed very close political and academic ties with Bulgaria, but also placed such severe travel restrictions on its own citizens that Bulgaria was one of the very few approved destinations). Thus, when the gifted and energetic Stojko Stojkov created his comprehensive program for the systematic, uniform description of individual dialects and for the compilation of dialect atlases covering the entire country, he was able to call upon a large army of field workers not only from his own country but also from Russia (under the tutelage of S.B. Bernštejn, who also made major contributions to the design of the project and was the co-author of the eventual first volume). Stojkov established a network of over 1600 points throughout socialist Bulgaria (each point representing a single dialect in an area without new in-migration), expanded and standardized the questionnaire created earlier by Ben'o Conev, organized teams of students, teachers and visiting Soviet researchers, trained them in data-gathering principles, and sent them out to canvass each of these points in four different three-month periods throughout the time span 1956-1958. The resulting atlases, which appeared between 1964 and 1981 (despite Stojkov's premature death in 1969) are a model of their type. Three other atlases appeared in Bulgaria using the same format. They differed in that each had a more overt political goal, each being focused upon a border area and including material about dialects spoken within the confines of other political units. The first of these (1972) was devoted to a group of Bulgarian dialects spoken in a compact region of northern Greece and the second (1986) to a group of Bulgarian dialects spoken in an even more compact region of southeastern Serbia The final volume

[20] See, for instance, Oblak 1896; Seliščev 1918, 1929, 1931; Vaillant 1924; Małecki 1930, 1934, 1934-36, 1936; and Mazon 1939.

(1988) bears the simple title "generalizing volume", and is laid out differently. Rather than depicting individual linguistic features on separate maps, it simply gives isoglosses of major structural features projected over a very expansive landscape, one which includes present-day Bulgaria, Macedonia, and significant portions of southern Serbia and northern Greece. The maps in this volume are sketchy in nature. However, the same material – depicted over the same broad landscape – was presented in much more detail (and with much higher production values) in 2001. The value of the linguistic data contained in this final atlas is undeniable; however, the fact that these data are presented with an explicit nationalistic aim[21] raises clearly the question of whether (and in what way) dialectology should be used as a political tool.[22]

In addition to their own internal dialect atlas projects,[23] most Slavic dialectologists also participated in multi-country efforts. The most ambitious in outline was the all-Slavic linguistic atlas (*Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas*), begun formally on the occasion of the Fourth international congress of Slavists in Moscow in 1958. The central board members drew up a network of over 800 points covering the entire area inhabited by Slavs, and compiled a standardized questionnaire of 3454 questions covering primarily phonological and lexical phenomena (with a few items from the sphere of morphology as well). Dialectological commissions were created in each of the Slavic countries to direct the data gathering, and representatives met annually in different venues throughout the Slavic world to discuss progress and problems of cartography. Most of these dialectologists were simultaneously directing the compilation of linguistic atlases in their own countries as well (not to mention holding down regular jobs and trying to survive in the post-war world); therefore it is not surprising that work progressed slowly. The questionnaire was published as early as 1965 (with supplementary reference material published in 1971 and 1978 [the latter was reissued in 1994]). The maps themselves are organized into two separate groups, one treating phonetics and "grammar" and the other treating lexicon

[21] The compilers present it as a "fundamentally scholarly work with important nationalistic significance", and claim that it provides "authentic proof for the unity of the Bulgarian language" (2001: 4) – in other words, "proof" that Macedonian dialects should be recognized as Bulgarian.

[22] The question is an important one, but not one which can be taken up within the confines of the present survey. It can be noted, however, that the maps drawn of "Macedonian dialects" by Macedonian scholars regularly include regions in southwestern Bulgaria and northern Greece (but without any accompanying nationalistic statements).

[23] For a listing of the major separate atlases, see section A of the appended bibliography.

and word formation. So far, one formal volume in each series has appeared, both dated 1988. One of these was published in Moscow and the other in Belgrade; succeeding volumes were to have emanated from various Slavic capitals (for instance, the Belarusian Academy of Sciences announced on its website summary for the year 1992 that it had completed work on tbe third volume of the lexical-word formation series). So far, however, no other maps in the all-Slavic format have appeared except for a set published separately by the Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences (also in 1988) under the cryptic title *Prilozi / Contributions* 13/1. This volume of *Prilozi* contained 18 maps from the phonetic-grammar series, and commentary by commission members from various countries; it was prepared unofficially by a group of scholars in the hopes of breaking an apparent logjam. Nearly two decades have passed, however, and only the series *Materialy i issledovanija*, containing short studies by commission members of individual issues based on OLA material, has continued to appear. Although most of the maps are apparently complete, it is unclear when (or whether) the full-scale atlas volumes will resume publication.[24]

By contrast, the all-Carpathian atlas (*Obščekarpatskij dialektologičeskij atlas*), which covers the languages and dialects of peoples along the Carpathian chain in Poland, the Czech republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Ukraine, and Moldova (and of related areas in Serbia, Bosnia, Macedonia, and Bulgaria), has completed its work: the seventh and last volume was published in 2003. This atlas is devoted almost exclusively to lexical phenomena relating to mountains and mountain life; areas of the Balkans are included in order to elucidate comparisons between lexical phenomena of the two different mountainous zones, the Balkans and the Carpathians. This is one of four multinational atlases covering both Slavic and non-Slavic data, and the only one not still in progress. The other three are funded almost entirely by West European sources. One is the Mediterranean dialect atlas (*Atlante linguistico mediterraneo*), which was founded by the Croatian Romance philologist Mirko Deanović, and comprises material from the Croatian, Slovenian

[24] Part of the difficulty is certainly due to the political events of 1989 and following. But there were problems earlier as well, over the issue of Macedonia. In 1983, the Bulgarian delegation protested the inclusion into the atlas of Macedonian points marked as such (and not as Bulgarian), and when other commission members refused to accede to their protests, the Bulgarians withdrew not only their delegation but also their data. Thus, when the maps did begin to appear, there was (to the shame of most Bulgarians) a blank space where the Bulgarian information should have been.

and Italian coastal areas; it is funded largely by Italian sources. The other is the European linguistic atlas (*Atlas linguarum Europae*), which includes points from all European countries and is devoted exclusively to lexicon and etymology; it is being compiled by computers in Germany and the Netherlands. The fourth effort, the Balkan dialect atlas, is directed by the Russian scholar A.N. Sobolev who holds joint appointments in St. Petersburg and Marburg. This project, described in more detail below, is funded almost exclusively by German sources.

Despite their work on all these multi-national projects, Slavic dialectologists were able to carry on linguistic geography in their own individual countries, with varying degrees of results. In general, the greatest progress has been made in Bulgaria and in the central Slavic regions of Poland, Belarus, Ukraine, and the Sorbian speech area located within Germany. Polish and Ukrainian dialectologists in particular have produced multi-volume atlases of the several different regions of their country (the latter paying particular attention to the Carpathian zone and areas transitional to Slovak). Extensive work has been done in Russia as well on a number of different projects, but only one has been brought to completion. Furthermore, while the central Slavic regions have produced atlases of maps illustrating the distribution of various linguistic phenomena, attention in Russia has been almost exclusively focused on the lexicon: a number of different dialect dictionaries, all quite voluminous, are in the process of production (on the dialects of the regions of Arxangels'k, Pskov, and Vologda, as well as the comprehensive *Slovar' russkix narodnyx govorov*). The three-volume *Dialektologičeskij atlas russkogo jazyka* (the one atlas to have been completed) constitutes the exception to this heavy focus on lexicography.

Finally, it may seem strange that Yugoslavia, the country which contained within its socialist borders the richest dialect variation of all, did not manage to bring any dialect atlas projects to completion. The reasons for this were partly academic, partly political and partly economic. On the academic side, the powerful linguistic establishment (represented by Aleksandar Belić in Serbia and Stjepan Ivšić in Croatia) disapproved of questionnaire work – which they saw as an excessively mechanical approach to dialectology – and insisted that attention be devoted instead to scrupulously complete descriptions of individual local dialects. Although their students (Pavle Ivić, Dalibor Brozović and oth-

ers) respected and carried on this tradition, they also worked hard in the socialist years to move the academic establishment into the world of atlas production as well. The political reasons need no elaboration: a federation of many different peoples, three different official languages (Slovene, Macedonian and Serbo-Croatian), and with multiple tensions between the different official "variants" of the major language, created a situation of considerable complexity. Nevertheless, despite this complexity, Yugoslav dialectologists at least set up the framework for a "Yugoslav" atlas encompassing all these systems, a framework in which dialectologists from all the different linguistic regions (and political units) participated. As more self-contained individual units (in both the linguistic and the political sense), the Slovene and Macedonian dialect commissions managed to collect relatively thorough amounts of data. Nevertheless, neither has yet managed to publish its full atlas.[25] Much data was also collected in the Serbo-Croatian speaking area, but since this area comprised four different political units, coordination was difficult. Furthermore, as Yugoslavia was the only Slavic country to take part in all four of the multi-national projects noted above, dialectologists were spread very thin. What the Yugoslavs did accomplish, though, is something that has not been done in any other Slavic country. They collated all the phonological responses to the massive All-Slavic linguistic atlas questionnaire from throughout Yugoslavia (spanning Slovene, Croatian, Serbian and Macedonian), and presented them according to a consistent format which they had created together in collaboration. The volume was published in 1981 under the editorship of Pavle Ivić. (A similar volume – devoted only to Macedonian dialects but with much more detail – was published under Božidar Vidoeski's name in 2000, the year after his death.)

The events of 1989-1991, of course, caused considerable changes. Socialism as a principle of political and socio-economic organization went out of being, and various processes of transition to new forms of government and economic systems were undertaken in the several Slavic countries. In addition, only two of these countries (Poland and Bulgaria) retained their pre-1989 boundaries intact; all the others split up into smaller units along ethnic or nationalist lines, creating a number of new countries. Of necessity, this had a considerable impact upon the practice of dialectology as a discipline. Like all

[25] The Slovenes published the questionnaire and commentary to their atlas in 1999, and the Macedonians published their questionnaire and atlas commentary in 2000.

other state-supported operations, the research institutes within which dialectologists worked were radically downsized. This meant that ongoing activity in the collection, collation and publication of dialect material (especially atlases) was either greatly reduced in scope or curtailed altogether. Furthermore, the very structure of these organizations changed when political units which had formerly been part of a multinational state now became independent countries of their own.

On the other hand, the scope of possible work was greatly expanded in most instances. No longer must dialectological research be carried out only by state-sponsored organizations under the guiding hand of a scholar with impeccable Party credentials, and published only in journals whose editorial boards were similarly politically correct. Research could now be done by anyone with the academic training (regardless of his or her political views), and published in any of a number of ways. In addition, the opening of formerly closed borders allowed free access not only to Western sources but also to collaboration with individual Western scholars or organizations, many of whom had wanted for years to work more directly with native dialectologists (especially in the field), but had until then been restricted to carefully supervised research in state archives (if they could even get permission to do that).

These far-reaching changes can be illustrated through several examples. The first concerns Bulgaria, and requires some background. In this country, there had been two major periods of dialectological activity during the socialist era. The first coincided with the life span of Stojko Stojkov, terminating in 1969 with his premature death. Dialectology of the Stojkov school (as it is called) was exemplary of structural linguistics at its best: scholars carried out multiple sorts of comparative investigations of dialect variation within Bulgaria according to generalized parameters recognized in Western linguistics (which had been adapted by Stojkov to the specific Bulgarian situation). Bulgarian dialects spoken outside Bulgaria were also studied: comprehensive projects collated material on Bulgarian dialects spoken in Romania and within the USSR. Dialects in Macedonia, Serbia and northern Greece, on the other hand, were ignored during this period. Although all Bulgarians considered these dialects to be “Bulgarian”, the party line of the time was that the nationalist tensions associated with this question were best left untouched, and that dialects spoken within the boundary of states which had adamantly refused to ac-

knowledge these dialects as Bulgarian should (at least for the time being) remain outside the purview of Bulgarian dialectology. The initial four volumes of the Bulgarian dialect atlas were compiled from this point of view. After Stojkov's death, however, a more nationalistic party line was taken. Not only was the scope of Bulgarian dialectology expressly and aggressively extended to the south and west (resulting among other things in the withdrawal of Bulgarian material from the all-Slavic dialect atlas and the publication of an openly hostile linguistic/political treatise protesting the independent existence of Macedonian), but Stojkov and his followers were discredited and their work called politically incorrect (several excellent dialectologists, most notably Maksim Mladenov, not only lost their jobs but also suffered the indignity of seeing their late parents become "non-persons").

When this second period ended with the fall of the socialist regime, it became once again possible to do dialectology from more than one point of view. Stojkov was rehabilitated, and in 1993 his classic handbook was reissued under the editorship of Mladenov, who not only updated the bibliography in copious amounts, but also added linguistic notes about Bulgarian dialects spoken in Greece and Macedonia. Conferences continued to be held and dialect studies published under the aegis of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences; however, the same activities could now also take place under private sponsorship. Furthermore, Western scholars wishing to collaborate with Bulgarian counterparts could do so privately, and did not need to work through the Academy or other politically approved institutions. One example is the 1996 collaborative project entitled "Revitalizing Bulgarian dialectology":[26] over a period of two weeks, a team of Bulgarian and North American students and professors worked in the field together with village informants, also doing data transcription and analysis on the spot. The project's goal was for North American students to learn field techniques from the Bulgarian side, and for Bulgarian students to learn modern analytic techniques from the North American side. The project succeeded not only in these immediate goals but also in a more long-range cross-fertilization, in that all three North American students included material from South

[26] The project was supported by the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), and the team leaders were Ronelle Alexander (U.S.) and Todor Bojadžiev and Vladimir Žobov (Bulgaria); Georgi Kolev (Bulgaria) also participated as co-leader in place of Bojadžiev who was not able to be part of the field ex-

Slavic dialects in their dissertations, and that one of the Bulgarian students entered graduate work in dialectology.

The second example concerns Russia, where dialectological work prior to 1991 was similarly carried out only according to governmentally-approved programs. After that period, however, considerable reorganization took place. Although it became more difficult for the broad-based work of many institutes to continue in the same manner as before, there was now the freedom for these institutes to work in less rigid ways, and for the dialectologists directing the work to travel and consult more freely with Western colleagues. In this regard, the recent work of L.L. Kasatkin and R.F. Kasatkina of Moscow is of particular note. Although they had been carrying out dialectological field research for many years before 1991, their work took on considerably new energy after that date. Many new students came to work with them, many more expeditions were undertaken, and much new material was published: Kasatkin's 1999 study is an outstanding example. These positive results are due partly to the new spirit of openness in the country, and partly to the highly fruitful collaboration underway between Kasatkin and Prof. Christian Sappok of the Ruhr University at Bochum, Germany. Thanks to German-based funding, the team (which also includes E. Moskina from Kirov) has been able to make field trips as far afield as Russkoe Ust'je in northeastern Siberia, as well as to the central Russian locales of Perm, Leka, and Kirov, the far northern village of Zolotica near Arxangels'k, and to the Medvedica river in southern Russia.[27] Another example of such collaboration was the joint field trip undertaken by scholars at the University of Tromsø in Norway and dialectologists from Moscow (led by O.E. Karmakova), who went in 2001 to areas in the far northwest of Russia near Scandinavian border. In 2004 the Norwegian team joined forces with the Bochum team, and the two groups traveled again to Russia.[28] The Linguistic Laboratory at Bochum is doing especially valuable work in digitizing field recordings from all these expeditions and making them more broadly available via an acoustic

---

pedition. See http://repositories.cdlib.org/uciaspubs/editedvolumes/2/ for the volume of papers resulting from the joint research project (this site contains a peer-reviewed electronic publication).

[27] For more information, on these trips, visit http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/LiLab/Landeskunde/ (site last consulted 8 January 2007).

[28] For more information on these expeditions, visit http://uit.no/humfak/2387/ (site last consulted 8 January 2007).

data base on the internet. This is an undertaking which holds great promise for the future of dialectology as a discipline.

The third example also concerns Russia, in that it exemplifies what an individual Russian scholar can organize with Western help. As a result of his doctoral research in the Balkans, A.N. Sobolev conceived the idea to organize a Balkan dialect atlas which would investigate twelve points – seven Slavic and five non-Slavic[29] – according to a consistent questionnaire. In addition to providing valuable information for each of the separate language groups, the atlas is concrete recognizition of the fact that the convergence phenomena which produced the Balkan Sprachbund had to have taken place at the level of spoken dialects. Sobolev, who has academic affiliations both in Marburg and St. Petersburg, convened a team of scholars and sponsoring institutions who have been working together since the mid-1990s, carrying out field expeditions in the several countries and meeting regularly to analyze the results. Reports of working sessions on the creation of what is called both the *Malyj dialektologičeskij atlas balkanskih jazykov* and the *Kleine Balkansprachatlas* began appearing in 1997; and the first atlas volume appeared in 2005.

The final example is individual in nature, and also represents the kind of undertaking that would not have been possible during the socialist period. Two scholars from the University of Toronto, Christina Kramer and Joseph Schallert, accompanied a Macedonian speaker from Toronto on a visit back to her native region – a Macedonian-speaking village located within Albania. Although they could obviously not carry out the sort of full-scaled dialectal analysis which requires an entire team, they were nevertheless able to gain a valuable *in situ* picture of a dialect which up till that point could only be studied in emigration.

The former Yugoslavia, of course, presents a completely different set of changes. Only there had the pre-1989 period allowed relative freedom of inquiry, of publication possibilities, and of travel (both to the West by Yugoslav scholars and within Yugoslavia by Western researchers). Contacts between Yugoslavia and the West were well developed, and much fruitful collaborative research had been carried out (albeit only at the in-

dividual level; no large-scale collaborative field work projects had been mounted). The brutally violent wars of succession which began in 1991, however, changed everything. Colleagues who formerly worked easily and well with each other within a single country were subsequently prevented by their new nationalist governments from having any contact with each other, and institutes which formerly functioned well became impoverished almost overnight as a result of escalating war costs (and in the case of Serbia, of economic sanctions imposed by the West). Although recovery is now underway, and scholars from the separate nations are beginning to re-establish contact, much has changed. The material that used to be studied as "Serbo-Croatian dialects" is now split according to national-ethnic (and religious) lines, a situation which obliges scholars in the new states to focus only on the ethnically-appropriate dialects and to ignore others in the immediate area.[30] Perhaps the most far-reaching (and tragic) change, however, has been in the dialectal landscape itself. The massive involuntary displacements of populations, and destruction of previously stable rural environments, will make any sort of "normal" field work impossible for decades to come in many regions of the former Yugoslavia (most notably in Bosnia-Herzegovina). Some rural areas have survived relatively untouched, of course, and are being studied again now that the economy and political structures are beginning to stabilize. Study in the disrupted areas, however, must be left to future generations of scholars (who will regard these sets of displacements as only one more stage in the turbulent migrational history of the Balkans).[31]

On a brighter note, the technological advances of the current decade have allowed for much innovative progress. The work of the Bochum school in digitizing dialectal material has already been mentioned, and it is now becoming possible for older reference books to be reissued together with audio recordings of dialectal speech.[32] In addition, Russian scholars have created an on-line dialect atlas for use in schools,[33] and two Slo-

---

[29] The Slavic points are from Croatia, Serbia, Montenegro and Macedonia (one point each) and Bulgaria (three points); while the non-Slavic ones comprise Albanian (two points, from within Albania), Greek (two points) and Vlah, also called Aromanian (one point, within Greece).
[30] See Ivić 1998-1999 and Lisac 2003 for examples of this approach; for commentary, see Alexander 2005.
[31] Non-military disasters have also changed dialectal landscapes irretrievably. For instance, the Chernobyl catastrophe has altered forever the formerly stable distribution of Ukrainian and Belarusian dialects.
[32] One instance is the Slovene handbook of Logar in its 1993 reissue; there are no doubt others.
[33] To view this atlas visit http://www.gramota.ru/book/village/ (site last consulted 8 January 2007). The atlas was compiled under the direction of L.A. Bukrinskaja.

vene scholars have used computerized means to create a lexical dialect atlas of the Istrian peninsula.[34] On the more traditional side, work that has taken decades to complete is now coming to exciting fruition. One example is the analysis of the Novgorod excavations by A.A. Zaliznjak, allowing both the reconstruction of the ancient Novgorod dialect and its relationship with modern dialects, and another is the work on the syntax of Aegean Macedonian by Zuzana Topolinska, herself a specialist on Kashubian dialects. All these achievements bode well for the future of dialectology.

5. Contributions of West European scholars to Slavic dialectology

Before moving to the role of dialectology in North American scholarship, it is well to consider briefly the role of West European scholars in Slavic dialectology. Because they are geographically closer to the Slavic lands (if not ideologically closer), these scholars have had a better opportunity to become involved in the concrete gathering and analysis of dialectal data in the Slavic lands. It is usually a given, of course, that the actual process of recording dialectal data should be done on the spot. That is, because the great majority of dialects do not exist in written form (some would say that the two concepts are mutually exclusive), dialect data must be recorded directly from dialect speakers by the dialectologist: whenever possible, this is done *in situ* where the dialect is spoken, "in the field", and almost always in rural contexts. Furthermore, in order to guarantee that the material is "pure" (maximally free from influence by the prestige norm, which is almost always the literary standard), those doing the recording must have a clear sense of what pure dialect sounds like in any one instance, must be able to switch readily between different dialects (at least passively), and must convince the informants that they understand (and accept as viable) not only their speech but also their way of life. For all these reasons, the primary collection of dialect data is almost always done by native speakers of the language in question.

However, a number of West European scholars have made significant contributions to this effort as well, among whom native speakers of Germanic languages predominate by far. Significant mention should be made of the Norwegian phonetician Olaf

[34] See the bibliographic notes, section A3; also listed there is an earlier atlas treating eastern Serbian and western Bulgarian dialects (it, however, was compiled using much less sophisticated machine techniques).

Broch, working at the turn of the last century with a fine ear which caught phonetic distinctions that were borne out decades later by machine analysis. Also to be noted are the German-speaking scholars Norbert Reiter and Gerhard Neweklowsky and the Australian Peter Hill (presently working in Germany), all of whom who have worked in the field with South Slavic dialect material. In addition, the French scholar Marcel Courthiade has worked with Slavic dialect speakers in eastern Albania. But the most consistently productive have been the Dutch group of scholars trained by C.L. Ebeling of Amsterdam University. Thanks to Ebeling's insistence that his students work with the most immediate sources of dialectal data (the informants themselves, and on their own home ground) and to his continued support of their work through vicissitudes expected and unexpected, Dutch Slavists have produced an impressive amount of first-hand dialect studies, contributing not only valuable new data but also sophisticated analysis of these data. Their work includes monograph-length field studies of individual areal dialects in Macedonia (by Peter Hendriks and Ben Groen), of čakavian dialects in Istria (by Janneke Kalsbeek) and off the Dalmatian coast (by Peter Houtzagers), of the archaic diaspora Slovenian dialect of Rezia located in northern Italy (by Han Steenwijk), and of diaspora kajkavian dialects in Hungary (again by Houtzagers), as well as numerous article-length studies by both Houtzagers and Willem Vermeer. One of these monographs (Kalsbeek 1998) was judged so outstanding, in fact, that it won the AATSEEL prize for the best monograph in Slavic linguistics (perhaps the first time this American association has given its award to a non-American scholar). In addition, it should be noted that Vermeer has not only produced a number of excellent analytical studies on a broad range of Slovene, kajkavian and čakavian dialectal data, but he has also given considerable guidance to younger scholars (Dutch and American alike) working in South Slavic dialectology. In light of all this achievement, it is a great pity that Slavic linguistics in the Netherlands no longer seems to embrace dialectology. Indeed, it is quite ironic to note that the dissertation of a young Dutch scholar, Margje Post, was based on dialectological field work in Russia – but that the dissertation was completed not at a university not in her home country but rather at a university in Norway (she is the first of the Tromsø group to finish a Ph.D. on the basis of the joint field work expeditions mentioned earlier).

6. Role of North American scholars in the discipline

Just as the coming of Roman Jakobson to U.S. shores heralded the beginning of Slavic linguistics as a growth industry, so did the coming of three Slavic scholars to the U.S. make dialectology a part of this structuralist linguistic effort. Two of these scholars came from Poland, a country with a distinguished record in both philology and dialectology. Each of these was a post-war émigré who made a remarkable scholarly career in his new adopted land. Edward Stankiewicz's ground-breaking articles on structural dialectology (1956, 1957) spelled out in detail how U.S. Slavists could work towards a positive answer to the query posed by Uriel Weinreich.[35] Throughout his many works on the typology of Slavic accent and Slavic morphophonemics,[36] Stankiewicz continually utilized dialect data as well as data from standard languages. He trained his students in a careful and thorough approach to these data, exacting from them the same high standards he applied to his own work. At least three of these students (Linda Gabor, Robert Greenberg, and Kenneth Naylor) wrote dissertations based on dialect material gathered in the field,[37] and all but one of them went on to specialize in South Slavic and to do research on South Slavic dialectology. Likewise, Zbigniew Gołąb, who had already done significant field work among Slavic dialect speakers in northern Greece before emigrating to the U.S.,[38] gave students such as Masha Belyavski-Frank and Victor Friedman solid grounding in doing research with dialectal material.[39] Although the bulk of Gołąb's work was not directly concerned with dialectology, his magnetic presence was such that students were inspired by all aspects of his work.

It is noteworthy that although Stankiewicz's first published study in dialectology (1956) deals with Polish dialects, the work of all his students focusing on dialectology (as well as that of Gołąb's students) dealt with South Slavic. Clearly, students wanted the direct contact with dialect speakers, and in those days, Yugoslavia was the only place

[35] "Is a Structural Dialectology Possible?" (Weinreich 1954).
[36] Most of these articles are now collected together in Stankiewicz 1979 and Stankiewicz 1986.
[37] A fourth, Keith Langston, was set to go to the field in Croatia in the early 1990s, but was prevented by the outbreak of war; instead, he completed a dissertation on čakavian dialects using archival data.
[38] See Gołąb 1960-61 and 1962-63, on the dialects of Suxo and Visoka earlier studied by Małecki.
[39] It should be noted that Friedman's primary work areas (in which he has been extremely prolific) are sociolinguistics (of literary Macedonian) and language contact (among Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian, Vlach, Romany and Balkan Turkish; cf. also his work among Caucasian languages), two areas which, although they impinge indirectly upon the topic of the present contribution, are not sufficiently close to it to be included into this survey.

they could get it. But touristic availability was not the only reason students flocked to study South Slavic dialectology. Just as Europeans of earlier generations had been fascinated by the diversity of accentual problems (from both the descriptive and historical points of view), so now were many of their American colleagues drawn by the same magnet, and the rich variation of accentual systems among South Slavic dialects provided an irresistible gold mine of field data. Perhaps the most significant impetus to work with South Slavic dialects (and their accentual systems), however, was the charismatic presence of a single gifted, energetic and affable scholar, Pavle Ivić – the third of the three Slavist scholars responsible for the introduction of dialectology into the mainstream of U.S. Slavic linguistics. Although Ivić lived all his life in his native Yugoslavia [Serbia], he was fortunate enough to be able to make many visits to the West. He kept up a large network of scholarly contacts throughout the world, and made himself available to the many students who came from other countries to work with him. Three American Slavists (and one general linguist) went to Novi Sad to work with Ivić (Ronelle Alexander, Wayles Browne, Kenneth Naylor, and Sarah Grey Thomason), and three of the four wrote dissertations based on field work in Yugoslavia.[40] Ivić also functioned as an unofficial conduit for contacts between scholars from many different lands with interests in South Slavic dialectology, making sure that young Dutch, French, German, Russian and American South Slavists with common interests knew of each other's work. Finally, Ivić's long-term collaborative work with the American phonetician Ilse Lehiste resulted in many co-authored works. Although most of this work deals with prosodic phenomena in the standard language, the two also included dialectal material in their broad scope of investigation. All in all, the presence of Pavle Ivić has made an enormous contribution to Slavic linguistics in the U.S.

Another line of dialectological studies in the U.S. emanates indirectly from Roman Jakobson through his student Henning Andersen. This research model is essentially a diachronic one, in which close and careful attention is paid to dialectal data and to the structured patterns of their distribution, resulting in innovative analyses which constitute

[40] See Naylor 1967, Thomason 1968 and Alexander 1975. Thomason's later work is in general language contact studies, although she often cites examples from Serbo-Croatian; see also Thomason 1977. Alexander's work has remained within South Slavic dialectology, and is being passed on to the next generation, cf.

significant contributions to questions of historical phonology and morphophonemics. These research efforts cover all branches of Slavic. Works by Andersen and Alan Timberlake span the three language families;[41] works by Michael Flier are centered upon East Slavic,[42] and those by Ronelle Alexander focus on South Slavic and Balkan Slavic.[43] Because most of the work underlying these studies is done archivally (of the above group only Alexander has collected data in the field as well),[44] it constitutes an important element within American Slavic linguistics, demonstrating to students that one need not do field work in order to utilize dialectal material either for study or as a valuable resource for historical and typological studies.

Other North American Slavists have included dialectology in their purview, but usually as a secondary interest; one can note here Philip Davis (akan'je in Russian), Ronald Feldstein (historical phonology of Slovene), Mark Elson (historical morphology of Macedonian), Grace Fielder (perfect tenses in Macedonian), Harold Klagstad (Bulgarian dialectal phonemes), and Raymond Miller and Curt Woolhiser (Belarusian dialectal phenomena). Thomas Magner has made several studies of "city dialects" in Yugoslavia, including Split, Niš, and – most notably – Zagreb kajkavian;[45] Robert Whyte worked on his own describing the dialect of Komiža (a town located on the čakavian-speaking island of Vis), while Frank Gladney deserves special mention for having compiled a reverse index to the massive dictionary of Russian dialects.

As a general rule, American dialectologists have worked within the traditional framework of European dialectology, or within the structuralist framework they learned from Roman Jakobson or his students. Formal linguistics has remained far from their purview; indeed, to many, the gap between "dialectology" and "formal linguistics" would seem unbridgeable, since formal linguists usually work exclusively with standard lan-

---

the dissertations of her students Joseph Schallert (1984) and Matthew Baerman (1999), and subsequent work by these two scholars.

[41] Of works listed in the bibliography, Timberlake 1978, 1981, and 1983a-b are relevant here.

[42] Of works listed in the bibliography, Flier 1978, 1988, 1993, and 1998 are relevant here.

[43] Of works listed in the bibliography, Alexander 1978, 1983, 1988, 1993 and 1999 are relevant here.

[44] It is germane at this point to mention the dissertation of Marc Greenberg (1990), which was written under the direction of three of these four scholars, and which did include field work (in Slovenia). It is also relevant that Greenberg's student Grant Lundberg went on to work in the field in Slovenia as well. In addition, Tom Priestly has devoted considerable energy to field work in a single Slovenian-speaking village, and the work of the late Rado Lencek on western South Slavic is unique in its breadth.

[45] On city dialects, see also Franks 1988 on the Zagreb dialect, and Sims 2005 on the Split dialect.

guages. Nevertheless, there were a few early attempts to consider dialectal data within the framework of generative phonology, both by established linguists such as Morris Halle and Horace Lunt, and by Lunt's students Mark Elson and Ernest Scatton. In recent years, however, there has been an upsurge of interest in dialectal data by formal linguists, both Slavists such as Christina Bethin and Keith Langston[46] and general linguists such as Jonathan Barnes, Katherine Crosswhite, and Andrea Sims. This, too, bodes well for the future.

7. The current status, and future, of the Slavic dialectology in the U.S.

Although the achievements noted above are indeed impressive, it must be noted that they are still considered peripheral to the discipline of Slavic linguistics as a whole (at least within the U.S.). Practically all students of Slavic, and nearly all professional Slavic linguists as well, focus their attention on the literary standards. Dialectal data are normally seen not only as "extra" material to be fitted in on the side but also as material which is usually too complex or difficult to be readily integrated into mainstream linguistic analysis. This difficulty stems partly from the perceived inaccessibility of dialectal data. Linguists are used to working directly with speakers of the languages in question, and speakers of rural Slavic dialects are without exception far away (both geographically and culturally) from American Slavists. In addition, the pre-1989 conditions ruled out any contact at all with dialect speakers (except in Yugoslavia). Even there, field work was admittedly stressful,[47] and it was difficult to get adequate training (or any training at all) in practical field techniques.

A second difficulty stems from the general tenor of the field in the U.S. Graduate students in linguistics are under very heavy pressure to demonstrate competence in the most recent theories, and they are not usually able to do more than acquire a good command of the standard language of their interest together with the basics of historical and comparative data. Many professional linguists view individual data as valuable if they prove or disprove theories, but give a much lower priority to the acquisition and study for its own sake of a broad diapason of data (especially the "messy" sort of data that is un-

[46] In this regard, see also Lundberg 2001b.
[47] Not all linguists have the particular sort of aptitude (some might call it "stomach") for field work.

avoidable in dialectology). Notwithstanding the fact that even despite this disciplinary pressure Slavists tend to have a relatively greater respect for dialect data than linguists specializing in other language areas, there is still considerable pressure upon students of Slavic linguistics to be theoretically up to date – and there are only so many hours in a day. Curiously enough, the situation in (at least some) Slavic countries seems to be almost the opposite. Students in these countries are often quite skilled in working with rural variants of their own language, but have relatively little exposure to or practice with linguistic theory or with the type of analytic thinking that is developed through constant contact with such theories. It is in such situations that joint field expeditions of the sort described earlier can be of such value to both sides (Alexander and Zhobov 2004 describe the concrete results of the 1996 North American - Bulgarian expedition in this regard). It is also heartening to see that formal linguists are beginning to recognize the value of dialectal data (as noted by the references above).

What can we say as we look to the future? For one, it seems clear that the Slavic linguistics of the future can (and should) be a discipline in which dialectology takes a much more central role. In a world which now recognizes that all peoples have a right to self-expression of their own heritage, it is unconscionable for students and scholars to value only that form of a language which has been accorded political primacy. It is true that students must begin by learning a standardized form, and that everyone needs to master the same norm both for communicative purposes and for knowledge of a central literary canon. Beyond that, however, it is the responsibility (and privilege) of linguists to become acquainted with as many different implementations of a language's variety as possible. Not only does the range of dialectal variation give unparalleled insight into the typological scope and historical development of a language, but the dialects themselves carry great meaning for the people who speak them, as well as giving insight into the cultural identity of these people.

The issue is on the surface inseparable from that of endangered languages, a cause espoused of late by a number of linguists. The deep and significant truth was stated by one of these linguists pithily in the sentence "When a language dies, a culture dies". Linguists have taken up this cause not only on the behalf of minority peoples whose language is under threat of assimilation to that of a politically and economically more pow-

erful population, but also on behalf of linguists themselves, and their right to have access to as much data as possible about the diversity of human language. The United Nations and other world bodies have accepted and lent active support to the principle that each people should have the right to express itself in its own language. A dialect, as a self-contained linguistic system expressing the identity of a certain well-defined group, is in principle therefore no different from the language of an "endangered" minority population. Consequently, it should be equally valued by linguists for all the above reasons. In fact, the only difference between dialects and endangered languages seems to be that most dialects are not particularly endangered: they continue to be spoken by rural folk, who continue (more or less) to keep the same relationship to city people as in generations past.

In the new century, it will be necessary to move into a different perception of peoples, of relations between peoples, and of the role of scholars in this regard. It is no longer possible for scholars to remain in seclusion, analyzing the same closed body of material in terms of the same highly abstract models and speaking only to each other using the same extremely exclusionary technical terms. Rather, it is time to bring to the fore the fact that language exists in a social and geographical context, that languages are spoken by many specific groups of people, and that the form of language varies over space in a regular, structured manner. Furthermore, these variations are significant not only in the abstract sense of typology or diachrony, but also in terms of the peoples themselves. Traditions are important. Many native peoples who have retained their deep-seated traditions in the face of heavy pressure to assimilate are now receiving recognition for the power of this traditional knowledge and admiration for their perseverance in keeping it alive. Dialects represent traditional knowledge of exactly the same sort, knowledge which is not only valuable in its own light, but which is also of great use to scholars when it is studied in a cross-disciplinary manner. The need for greater cross-fertilization between disciplines in the new century has already been noted at many levels of the educational establishment: to meet the demands of a more globalized world and of students who will need to function in this world, it is necessary that the educational enterprise find ways to move beyond the separationist divisions of disciplines and sub-disciplines as they are presently

viewed, and to pay greater recognition to those areas of study which are inherently able to transcend these divisions. Dialectology is quite obviously one of these areas of study.

The above are the reaons why dialectology should be studied. The best reason of all to become a dialectologist, however, is for the sheer joy of it. A linguist studies languages because he or she loves language – and where else can one find such purely exciting and natural linguistic phenomena as among rural, uneducated spontaneous speakers? The context of city languages is well known to all educated speakers, as are the means of adaptation, social code switching and prestige levels. Rural dialects present language data in the raw, and bring the linguist directly in contact with the essentials of linguistic structures that have survived through many generations without the superimposed normativity of standard languages. This experience of face-to-face contact with different cultures, and with ways of life which have endured for centuries and continue to endure, can be a transforming one for students. Given, therefore, that one accepts the desirability of making dialectology more central within the discipline, the question still remains of how such a shift can be made. As noted above, dialectology seems inaccessible to most students. Not only are the pressures of the discipline currently slanted towards the mastery of abstract theories and the niceties of standard languages, but the locales where dialects are spoken are situated very far away, village speakers are harder to come into contact with than urban speakers, and the linguistic material is more complex and more difficult to assimilate.

These difficulties are all real ones, but they are not insurmountable. With respect to “the pressure of the discipline”, there is a simple and obvious answer. It is teachers who determine these pressures (by placing requirements on students), and therefore it is teachers who can (and must) make the shift. If teachers continue to value the mastery of abstract theories and of the exclusivity of the standard language over the acquisition of a broad scope of variation in data, then nothing will change. But if teachers admit the value of a broad scope of data, and pass this value judgment on to their students, they can then learn how to make accessible to their students the material which students will then begin to want to learn. One vivid way to make dialectology more real and more attractive to students is by inviting specialists from Slavic lands as visiting scholars: just as Pavle Ivić energized many an American student in the 1960s, so can the scholars who today carry

on the legacy of dialectology in the different Slavic countries bring this energy and excitement to the current generation of students.

As for the distance, it is true that the locales where dialects are spoken are far away, but they are not significantly farther than the capital cities. Furthermore, the Slavic countries are now so much more accessible than before that it is a golden moment to make the shift in emphasis. Indeed, we now have – for the first time in history – *both* a developed discipline of Slavic linguistics in the West *and* open access to Slavic countries. It is also true that village speakers are harder to come in contact with than urban speakers, but only if one goes in cold. The obvious solution is to work in collaboration with native dialectologists. Now that the political barriers are dissolved, dialectologists in the Slavic countries are willing and eager to work with Western scholars and their students. The 1996 IREX project in Bulgaria is one example of collaborative work, and the more elaborate German-Russian projects and Norwegian-Russian ones are another. In both instances, the benefits are obvious: Western scholars and students reap immense benefits from the ready access to data and from the first-hand experience of working with native specialists, and Slavic scholars reap the benefit of Western analytic experience, and – on a more prosaic but no less necessary level – Western fundings (since, as in any serious endeavor, it takes non-trivial amounts of institutional support to get the job done properly). Finally, the objection that the linguistic material is more complex and more difficult to assimilate is in fact a red herring: anything worth learning is difficult at first. All that is needed is at hand: the handbooks are there, the knowledge of linguistic structure is there, and the native specialists are now there in a way they never were before. Once someone decides that something is worth learning, the means to learn it can easily be found. Again, the 1996 IREX expedition showed that students can learn to work with dialectal material if they are given proper guidance and training, and that even students who do not yet have full mastery of the standard language can learn the techniques, goals (and become imbued with the excitement) of dialectology.

In sum, now more than ever is the time for dialectology to take a more central role in Slavic linguistics. This shift of emphasis can be achieved partly by a simple change of attitude on the part of teachers here in the U.S., once they move towards recognizing the value of studying dialectal variation. It is not necessary to do active field work in order to

appreciate the value of dialectal data and to work actively with these data. For many students, however, field work is one of the great attractions of dialectology, and the promise of field work can become a way to attract and keep students. To make this shift of emphasis within the discipline – a shift of the scope that will make it possible to get students out to the field to be able to work systematically with their Slavic counterparts – will require considerably more effort and organization, as well as active efforts to acquire extramural funding. The results to be obtained are of such great potential value that the extra work should be seen not as an insurmountable hurdle but as one of the great and exciting challenges of the new century.

6. Bibliography

The bibliography which follows is separated into three basic sections. *Section A,* which includes major atlases and dictionaries, is divided into four sub-sections. The first three are devoted to the three major branches of Slavic (East, West, and South) and the fourth to general works. Titles in these sections are alphabetized by the name of the work, since only sometimes is the name of the work's compiler or editor available. *Section B* is a highly selective list of works by Slavic and other European scholars on Slavic dialectology. As the literature in each of the Slavic countries on these topics is vast, only a few representative titles are listed here. *Section C*, by contrast, is a more complete (though still not exhaustive) listing of works on Slavic dialectology by North American scholars.

A1. East Slavic, reference

Arxangel'skij oblastnoj slovar', ed. O.G. Gecova, 1980 - . Moscow: Nauka.

Atlas russkix narodnyx govorov central'nyx oblastej k vostoku ot Moskvy: vstupitel'nye stat'i, spravočnye materialy i kommentarii k kartam, ed. R.I. Avanesov, 1957. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.

Atlas ukrajins'kyx hovoriv sxidnoji slovaččyny, ed. Vasil Latta et al.,1991. Bratislava: Slovacké pedahohičné vydatelstvo.

Atlas ukrajins'koji movy I-III, ed. Ja. V. Zakrev'ska and I.H. Matvijas, 1984-2001. Kiev: Naukova dumka.

Dialektologičeskij atlas russkogo jazyka: Centr evropejskoj časti SSSR I-III, ed. R.I. Avanesov and S.V. Bromlej, 1986-1996. Moscow: Nauka.

Dyjalektalahičny atlas belaruskaj movy: Ustupnaja artykuly, davedačnyja materyjaly i kamentaryi da kart, ed. R.I. Avanesov, K.K. Krapiva and Ju.F. Mackevič, 1963. Minsk: Vydatelstva Akademii navuk BSSR.

Hovory ukrajins'koji movy (Zbirnyk tekstiv), ed. F.T. Žylko, 1977. Kiev: Vydatel'stvo Radians'ka škola.
A Lexical Atlas of the Hutsul Dialects of the Ukrainian Language, ed. Janusz Rieger, 1996. Warsaw: Semper / Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Linghvističnyi atlas ukrajinskyx hovoriv sxidnoji slovaččyny, ed. Zuzana Hanudel, 1981 - . Bratislava: Slovacké pedahogičné vydatelstvo.
Linhvistyčnaja heahrafija i hrupouka belaruskix havorak I-II, ed. R.I. Avanesov, K.K. Atrakovič and Ju. F. Mackevič, 1968-69. Minsk: Navuka i texnika.
Linhvističnyj atlas Nyžn'oji Prypjati, ed. T.V. Nazarova, 1985. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
Linhvističnyj atlas ukrajins'skyx narodnyx hovoriv Zakarpats'koï oblasti URSR, ed. I.O Dzendzelivskyi, 1958 - . Užhorod: Užhorodskyi deržavnyj universitet.
Narysy pa belaruskaj dyjalektalohii, ed. R.I. Avansov et al., 1964. Minsk: Instytut movaznaustva imja Jakuba Kolasa.
Novgorodskij oblastnoj slovar', ed. V.P. Strogova. 1992 - . Novgorod: Izdatel'stvo Novgorodskogo pedinstituta.
Pskovskij oblastnoj slovar' s istoričeskimi dannymi, ed. B.A. Larin et al., 1967 - . Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta.
Slovar' russkix govorov Sibiri, ed. A.I. Fedorova, 1999 - . Novosibirsk: Nauka, Sibirskoe predprijatie RAN.
Slovar' russkix narodnyx govorov, ed. F.P. Filin, 1965 - . Leningrad: Nauka.
Slovar' vologodskix govorov, ed. T.G. Panikarovskaja, 1983 - . Vologda: Vologodskij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut.

A2. West Slavic, reference

Atlas gwar bojkowskich I-VII, Institut słowianoznawstwa PAN, 1980-91. Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
Atlas gwar mazowieckich, Komitet językoznawstwa PAN. 1971. Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
Atlas gwar polskich I-IV, ed. Karol Dejna, 1998-2002. Warsaw: Upowszechnianie nauki.
Atlas gwar polskich, sector VII (kielecki), ed. Karol Dejna. 1994. Łódż: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
Atlas gwar wschodnioslowiańskich Białostocczyzny, ed. Stanisława Glinka, Antonina Obrębska-Jabłonska and Janusz Siatkowski, 1980- . Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
Atlas językowy dawnej Lemkowszczyzny, ed Zdzisław Stieber, 1956-64. Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
Atlas językowy kaszubszczyzny i dialektów sąsiednich, ed Zdzisław Stieber, 1964 - . Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
Atlas językowy polskiego Podkarpacia, ed. Mieczysław Małecki and Kazimierz Nitsch, 1934. Kraków: Nakład polskiej akademji umiejętności skład główny.
Atlas slovenského jazyka. Vokalizmus a konsonantizmus; mapy; uvod, komentar, ed. Jozef Stolc, 1968. Bratislava: SAV.
Mały atlas gwar polskich, ed. Kazimierz Nitsch, 1957. Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Sorbische Sprachatlas / Serbsky rečny atlas I-XV, ed. Helmut Fasske, 1965-1996. Bautzen-Budyšin: Domowina Verlag.

A3. South Slavic, reference

Bŭlgarski dialekten atlas.
I: *Jugoistočna Bŭlgarija,* ed. Stojko Stojkov and S.B. Bernštejn, 1964. Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
II: *Severoistočna Bŭlgarija*, ed. Stojko Stojkov, 1966. Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
III: *Jugozapadna Bŭlgarija,* 1975, Institut za bŭlgarski ezik. Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
IV: *Severozapadna Bŭlgarija*, 1981, Institut za bŭlgarski ezik. Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
Bŭlgarski govori ot Egejska Makedonija, Dramsko, Sjarsko, Valoviško, ed. Iordan Ivanov*,* 1972. Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
Severozapadni bŭlgarski govori v Caribrodsko i Bosilegradsko, ed. Rangel Božkov, 1986. Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
Obobštavašt tom, ed. Ivan Kočev, 1988. Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
Obobštavašt tom I-III: Fonetika, akcentologija, leksika, ed. L. Antonova-Vasileva et al., 2001. Sofia: Knigoizdatelska kŭšta Trud.

Karta slovenskih narečij v priročni izdaji, ed. Fran Ramovš, 1957. Ljubljana: Cankarevja založba.

Makedonski dialekten atlas I: Prašalnik za sobiranje materijal za makedonskiot dijalekten atlas, ed. Božidar Vidoeski, 2000. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik.

Slovenski dialektološki leksikalni atlas slovenske Istre, ed. Rada Cossutta and Franco Crevatin, 2005. Koper: Zgodovinsko društvo za južno Primorsko.

Sprachatlas Ostserbiens und Westbulgariens I: Problemstellung, Materialien und Kommentare, Kartenanalyse; II: Sprachkarten; III. Texte, 1998, ed. Andrej Sobolev. Marburg: Biblionverlag.

Vodnik po zbirki narečnega gradiva za slovenski lingvistični atlas (SLA), ed. Francka Benedik. 1999. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.

A4. General, reference

*Malyj dialektologičeskij atlas balkanskih jazykov / Kleine Balkansprachatlas***,** ed. A.N. Sobolev et al.
Sintaktičeskaja programma, 1997. St. Petersburg: Institut lingvističeskix issledovanij RAN.
Materialy rabočix soveščanija II-V, 1998-2003. St. Petersburg: Institut lingvističeskix issledovanij RAN.
Serija grammatičeskaja, s preimučšestvennym vnimaniem k strukture balkanoslavjanskix jazykov. Tom I: Kategorii imeni suščestvitel'nogo, 2005. Munich: Biblion Verlag.

Obščekarpatskij dialektologičeskij atlas, ed. G.P. Klepikova et al.
Voprosnik. Moscow, ed. S.B Bernštejn, 1981. Moscow: Nauka.
Vstupitel'nyj vypusk, ed. Božidar Vidoeski, 1987. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite.
Vypusk 1, ed. R.J. Udler, 1989. Kišiňov: Štininca.
Vypusk 2, ed. S. B. Bernštejn, 1988. Moscow: Nauka.
Vypusk 3, ed. J. Rieger, 1991. Warsaw: Komitet językoznawstwa PAN.
Vypusk 4, ed. J.V. Zakrevska, 1993. Lv'iv: Instytut ukraïnoznavstva.
Vypusk 5, ed. Rudolf Šrámek, 1997. Bratislava.
Vypusk 6, ed. Lajos Balog et al., 2001. Budapest: Tinta.
Vypusk 7, ed. Dragoljub Petrović, 2003. Belgrade: Institut za srpski jezik - Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, katedra za srpski jezik i lingvistiku.
Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas.
Voprosnik, ed. R.I. Avanesov, 1965. Moscow: Nauka.
Indeks i kommentarii k kartam, 1971. Moscow: Nauka.
Vstupitel'nyj vypusk: obščie principy, spravočnye materialy, ed. R.I. Avanesov, 1978. Moscow: Nauka. Revised edition 1994.
Materialy i issledovanija, 1974 - Moscow [various].
Serija fonetiko-grammatičeskaja, vypusk 1, refleksy jat', 1988. Belgrade.
Serija leksiko-slovoobrazovatel'naja, vypusk 1, životnyj mir, 1988. Moscow: Nauka.
[Additional materials on jat' and nasal vowels] *Prilozi* 13/1, 1988. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite.

B. Works by Slavic/European scholars

Avanesov, R.I. and V.G. Orlova. 1964. *Russkaja dialektologija.* Moscow: Nauka.
Belić, Aleksandar. 1905. *Dijalekti istočne i južne Srbije* (= *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 1). Belgrade: Srpska kraljevska akademija.
Belić, Aleksandar. 1906. Dialektologičeskaja karta serbskago jazyka. *Sbornik po slavjanovedeniju* 2. St. Petersburg.
Belić, Aleksandar. 1910. Zamětki po čakavskim govoram. *Izvestija otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti* 14/2: 181-266. St. Petersburg.
Belić, Aleksandar. 1935. *Galički dijalekat* (= *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 5). Belgrade: Srpska kraljevska akademija.
Bělič, Jaromír. 1972. *Nástin české dialektologie*. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
Blinava, E., and E. Mjacel'skaja. 1969. *Belaruskaja dyjalektalohija*. Minsk.
Blinava, E., and E. Mjacel'skaja. 1980. *Belaruskaja dyjalektalohija* (2d. edition, revised and expanded). Minsk: Vyšejšaja škola.
Broch, Olaf. 1903. *Die Dialekte des südlichsten Serbiens* (= *Schriften der Balkankommission* 3). Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Bromlej, S.V. and L.N. Bulatova. 1972. *Očerki morfologii russkix govorov*. Moscow: Nauka.
Bronisch, G. 1896. Kaschubische Dialektstudien. *Archiv fur slavische Philologie* 17: 321-408. Berlin: Weidmann.

Bukrinskaja, I.A. et al., 2003. *Jazyk russkoj derevni, škol'nyj dialektologičeskij atlas*. Moscow: Institut russkogo jazyka RAN. http://www.gramota.ru/book/village/ (site last consulted 8 January 2007).

Courthiade, Marcel. 1988. Les derniers vestiges du parler slave de Boboščica et Drenovene (Albania). *Communications de la delegation française au X-e Congrès international des slavistes* (= *Revue des études slaves* 60/1), 139-157. Paris: Institut d'études slaves.

de Courtenay, Baudouin. 1875. *Opyt fonetiki rez'janskix govorov.* Warsaw: E. Vende - St. Petersburg: D.E. Kožančikova.

Dejna, Karol. 1957. *Gwary ukraińske Tarnopolszczyzny*. Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Dejna, Karol. 1973. *Dialekty polskie.* Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Dejna, Karol. 1993. *Dialekty polskie* (2nd edition, revised and expanded). Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Durnovo, N.A., N.N. Sokolov, and D.N. Ušakov. 1915. *Opyt dialektologičeskoj karti russkogo jazyka v Evrope s priloženiem očerka russkoj dialektologii*. Moscow: Trudy moskovskoj dialektologičeskoj komissii.

Ferrell. James. 1973. The Study of Slovene Dialects since the Second World War. *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 6: 113-132. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Groen, B.M. 1977. *A Structural Description of the Macedonian Dialect of Dihovo*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.

Hamm, Josip, Mate Hraste and Petar Guberina. 1956. Govor otoka Suska. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1: 7-213. Jugoslovenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

Hancov, Vsevolod. 1923. *Dijalektolohična klasyfikacija ukrajins'kix hovoriv*. Kiev: Ukraijinska akademija nauk. Reprinted 1975 (Cologne: Slavisch Institut der Universität)

Havránek, Bohuslav. 1934. Nářeči česká. *Československá vlastivěda* 3: 84-218. Prague: Sfinx.

Hendriks, Peter. 1976. *The Radožda-Vevčani Dialect of Macedonian: Structure, Texts, Lexicon*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.

Hill, Peter. 1991. *The Dialect of Gorno Kalenik.* Columbus: Slavica.

Houtzagers, H.P. 1984-85. Vowel Systems of the Ekavian Dialects Spoken on Cres and Lošinj. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 27-28: 885-893. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Houtzagers, H.P. 1985. *The Čakavian Dialect of Orlec on the Island of Cres* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 5). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Houtzagers, H.P. 1999. *The Kajkavian Dialect of Hidegseg and Fertohomok* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 27). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Isačenko, Aleksander. 1935. *Narečje vasi Sele na Rozu.* Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna.

Ivanova, A.F. 1969. *Slovar' govorov Podmoskov'ja.* Moscow: Moskovskij oblastnoj pedagogičeskij institut im. N.K. Krupskaja.

Ivić, Pavle. 1956. *Dijalektologija srpskohrvatskog jezika, uvod i štokavsko narečje.* Novi Sad: Matica srpska. Reprinted 2001 (Sremski Karlovci - Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića).

Ivić, Pavle. 1957. *O govoru galipoljskih Srba* (= *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 12). Belgrade: Institut za srpskohrvatski jezik.

Ivić, Pavle. 1958. *Die serbokroatischen Dialekte, ihre Struktur und Entwicklung I: Allgemeines und die štokavische Dialektgruppe*. The Hague: Mouton.
Ivić, Pavle. 1960. O deklinacionim oblicima u srpskohrvatskom dijalektima 2. *Godišnjak filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 5: 75-97.
Ivić, Pavle. 1961 The Functional Yield of Prosodic Features in the Pattern of Serbo-Croatian Dialects. *Word* 17: 293-308. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
Ivić, Pavle. 1963. Sur l'importance des caractéristiques structurales pour la description et la classification des dialectes. *Orbis* 12: 117-131. Louvain: Centre internationale de dialectologie générale.
Ivić, Pavle. 1967. The Serbocroatian Case System in Diachrony and Diatopy. *To Honor Roman Jakobson, Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday, 11 October 1966,* 995-1008. The Hague: Mouton.
Ivić, Pavle, ed. 1981. *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*. Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine.
Ivić, Pavle. 1998-1999. Srpski dijalekti i njihova klasifikacija I-II. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 41, 2 (1998): 113-132; 42 (1999): 303-354. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
Ivšić, Stjepan. 1913. Današnji posavski govor. *Rad Jugoslovenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 196:124-254; 197: 9-138.
Ivšić, Stjepan. 1936. Jezik Hrvata kajkavaca. *Ljetopis Jugoslovenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 49 (for 1934-35): 47-88.
Jedvaj, Josip. 1956. Bednjanski govor. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1: 279-330. Zagreb: Jugoslovenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
Kabasanov, Stajko. 1955. Govorŭt na s. Momčilovci, Smoljansko. *Izvestija na Instituta za bŭlgarski ezik* 4: 5-101. Sofia.
Kalsbeek, Janneke. 1998. *The Čakavian Dialect of Orbanići near Zminj in Istria* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 25). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Kasatkin, L.L. 1999. *Sovremennaja russkaja dijalektnaja i literaturnaja fonetika kak istočnik dlja istorii russogo jazyka.* Moscow: Nauka.
Kuraszkiewicz, Władysław. 1963. *Zarys dialektologii wschodniosłowiańskiej z wyborem tekstów gwarowych. Warsaw:* Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
Kuraszkiewicz, Władysław. 1985. *Ruthenica: Studia z historycznej i wspolczesnej dialektologii wschodniosłowianskiej*. Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
Lisac, Josip. 2003. *Hrvatska dijalektologija 1: Hrvatski dijalekti i govori štokavskog narječja i hrvatski govori torlačkog narječja*. Zagreb: Golden marketing.
Logar, Tine. 1975. *Slovenska narečja.* Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
Logar, Tine. 1993. *Slovenska narečja* (revised edition, with maps and audio cassettes) Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
Lorentz, Friedrich. 1903. *Slovinzische Grammatik.* St. Petersburg: Izdanie otdelenija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk.
Lorentz, Friedrich. 1959. *Der kaschubische Dialekt von Gorrenschyn.* Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
Małecki, Mieczysław. 1930. *Przegląd słowiańskich gwar Istrji* (= *Prace komisji językowej* 17). Kraków: Nakład Polskiej akademji umiejętności.
Małecki, Mieczysław. 1934. Drobiazgi z Macedonji. *Lud słowiański* 3/2, 26-287. Kraków: Gebethner i Wolff.

Małecki, Mieczysław. 1934-36. *Dwie gwary macedońskie, Suxo i Wysoka w Soluńskiem I-II*. Kraków: Gebethner i Wolff.
Małecki, Mieczysław. 1936. O zróżnicowaniu gwar Bogdańskia w pd.-wschodniej Macedonji. *Lud slowiański* 5/1, 90-106. Kraków: Gebethner i Wolff.
Mazon, Andre. 1939. *Documents, contes et chansons slaves de l'Albanie du sud.* Paris: Librairie Droz.
Miletich, Ljubomir. 1903. Das Ostbulgarische (= *Schriften der Balkankomission* 2). Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Miletich, Ljubomir. 1912. Die Rhodopenmundarten der bulgarischen Sprache (= *Schriften der Balkankomission* 10). Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Mirčev, Kiril. 1936. *Nevrokopskijat govor* (= *Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet, istoriko-filologičeski fakultet* 32). Sofia.
Mladenov, Maksim. 1966. *Ixtimanskijat govor* (= *Trudove po bŭlgarska dialekologija* 2). Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
Moguš, Milan. 1977. *Čakavsko narjecje: Fonologija.* Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
Neweklowsky, Gerhard. 1978. *Die kroatischen Dialekte des Burgenlandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete* (= *Schriften der Balkankomission* 25). Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Nitsch, Kazimierz. 1923/1957. Dialetkty języka polskiego. *Wybór pism polonistycznych 4.* Wrocław - Kraków: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
Oblak, Vatroslav. 1896. *Macedonische Studien, die slavischen Dialekte des südlichen und nordwestlichen Macedoniens.* Vienna: Carl Gerold's Sohn.
Olesch, Reinhold. 1937. *Die slavischen Dialekte Oberschlesiens*. Berlin: Universität Berlin.
Olesch, Reinhold. 1937. Beiträge zur oberschlesischen Dialektforschung: Die Mundart der Kobylorse. Leipzig: Veröffentlichungen des slavischen Institut der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Berlin. Reprinted 1968 (Liechtenstein: Kraus).
Orlova, V.G., et al. 1970. *Obrazovanie severnorusskogo narečija i srednerusskix govorov (po materialam lingvističeskoj geografii).* Moscow: Nauka.
Pan'kevyč, Ivan. 1938. *Ukrajins'ki hovory pidkarpatsk'oji Rusy i sumeznyx oblastej*. Prague: Nákladni sboru pro výzkum Slovenská a Podkarpatské Rusi.
Pauliny, Eugen. 1963. *Fonologický vývin slovenciny*. Bratislava: Vydavatel'stvo slovenskej akadémie vied.
Peco, Asim. 1964. Govor istočne Hercegovine. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 14: 1-200. Belgrade: Institut za srpskohrvatski jezik.
Peco, Asim. 1978. *Pregled srpskohrvatskih dijalekata*. Belgrade: Naučna knjiga.
Post, Margje. 2005. *The Pragmatic Particle DAK in the Dialect of Varzuga (Kola Peninsula): An Information Structuring Device in Informal Spontaneous Speech*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tromsø.
Reiter, Norbert. 1964. *Der Dialekt von Titov Veles* (= *Slavistische Veröffentlichungen* 32). Berlin: Osteuropa Institut.
Rešetar, Milan. 1900. *Die serbokroatische Betonung südwestlicher Mundarten* (= *Schriften der Balkankomission* 1). Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Rigler, Jakob. 1963. *Južnotranjski govori, akcent in glasoslovje govorov med Snežnikom in Slavnikom*. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.

Ščerba, L.V. 1915. Vostočnoluzičkoe narečie. *Zapiski istoriko-filologičeskii fakultet imperatorskago petrogradskago universiteta* 128. St. Petersburg.
Seliščev, A.M. 1918. *Očerki makedonskoj dialektologii*. Kazan': Umid. Facsimile reprint 1981 (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo).
Seliščev, A.M. 1929. *Polog i ego bolgarskoe naselenie: Istoričeskie, etnografičeskie i dialektologičeskie očerki severozapadnoj Makedonii.* Sofia: Makedonski naučen institut. Facsimile reprint 1981 (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo).
Seliščev, A.M. 1931. *Slavjanskoe naselenie v Albanii*. Sofia: Makedonski naučen institut. Facsimile reprint 1979 (Köln: Bohlau).
Sławski, Franciszek. 1962. *Zarys dialektologii poludniowosłowiańskiej z wyborem tekstów gwarowych.* Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
Steenwijk, Han. 1992. *The Slovene Dialect of Resia, San Giorgio* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 18). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Stieber, Zdzisław. 1938. Sposoby powstawania słowiańskich gwar przejściowych. *Prace komisji językowej* 27. Krakow: Polska Akadema umiejętności.
Stojkov, Stojko. 1967. *Banatskijat govor* (= *Trudove po bŭlgarska dialekologija* 3). Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
Stojkov, Stojko. 1962. *Bŭlgarska dialektologija,* 2nd edition. Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
Stojkov, Stojko. 1993. *Bŭlgarska dialektologija,* 3rd edition, ed. Maksim Mladenov. Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
Thomas, Paul-Louis. 1996. Les parlers de Niš (Serbie) et des villages environnants. *Facta universitatis, series linguistics and literature* 1/3: 141-155. Niš: Faculty of Philosophy.
Toma (= Thomas), P.L. 1994. Govori Niša i okolni sela u sociolingvističkoj perspektivi. *Zbornik za filologiju i linvistiku* 38/1: 185-191. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
Todorov, Cvetan. 1936. *Severozapadnite bŭlgarski govori* (= *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija i narodopis* 41). Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
Topolinska, Zuzanna. 1974. *A Historical Phonology of the Kashubian Dialects of Polish.* The Hague: Mouton.
Topolinska, Zuzanna. 1989. A Contribution to the History of the Internal Phonological Differentiation of Lekhitic. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 32/2: 59-98. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
Topolinjska, Zuzana. 1995-1997. *Makedonskite dijalekti vo Egejska Makedonija I (1-2): Sintaksa*. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite.
Urbańczyk, Stanisław. 1968. *Zarys dialektologii polskiej.* Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
Vaillant, Andre. 1924. Les parlers de Nivica e Turija (Macédoine occidentale). *Revue des études slaves* 4: 53-66. Paris: Institut d'études slaves.
Vážný, Vaclav. 1934. Nářeči slovenská. *Československá vlastivěda* 3: 219-310. Prague: Sfinx.
Vermeer, Willem. 1979. Innovations in the Kajkavian Dialect of Bednja. *Dutch Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists*, ed. Jan Meijer, 347-381. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Vermeer, Willem. 1980. Die Konjugation in der nordwestčakavischen Mundart Omišaljs. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 1: 439-472. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Vermeer, Willem. 1982. On the Principal Sources for the Study of Čakavian Dialects with Neocircumflex in Adjectives and *e*-Presents. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 2: 279-341. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Vermeer, Willem. 1983. The Rise and Fall of the Kajkavian Vowel System. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 3: 439-477. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Vermeer, Willem. 1987. The Treatment of the Proto-Slavic Falling Tone in the Resian Dialects of Slovene. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 10: 275-293. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Vermeer, Willem. 1988. Remarks on Variation in Classical Čakavian. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 11: 621-645. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Vermeer, Willem 1996. The Twofold Origin of Classical Čakavian. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 23: 255-318. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Vidoeski, Božidar. 1962. *Kumanovskiot govor*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik.
Vidoeski, Božidar. 1983. Macedonian dialects. In: Koneski, Blaže. *A Historical Phonology of the Macedonian Language*, tr. Victor Friedman. Wiesbaden: Carl Winter.
Vidoeski, Božidar. 1998-1999. *Dijalektite na makedonskiot jazik* I-III. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite.
Vidoeski, Božidar. 2000a. *Fonološki bazi na govorite na makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite.
Vidoeski, Božidar. 2000b. *Tekstovi od dijalektite na makedonskiot jazik.* Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik.
Vidoeski, Božidar. 2006. *The Dialects of Macedonian*, tr. Paul Foster. Bloomington: Slavica.
Zaliznjak, A.A. 1995. *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt.* Moscow: Škola jazyki russkoj kulturi.
Zaliznjak, A.A. 2004. *Drevnenovgorodskij dialect, pererabotannoe s učetom materiala naxodok 1995-2003 g.* Moscow: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN.
Zahariev, Iordan. 1918. *Kjustendilsko kraište* (= *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija i narodopis* 32). Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.
Žylko, F.T. 1966. *Narysy z dialektolohii ukrajins'koji movy*. Kiev: Radians'ka škola.

C. Works by North American scholars

Alexander, Ronelle. 1975. *Torlak Accentuation* (= *Slavistische Beiträge* 94). Munich: Otto Sagner.
Alexander, Ronelle. 1976. Transitional West Bulgarian Dialects, a Structural Approach. *Bulgaria Past And Present, Studies in History, Literature, Economics, Music, Sociology, Folklore and Linguistics*, ed. Thomas Butler, 310-316. Columbus: American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies.
Alexander, Ronelle. 1978. Pravci morfofonološke promene u balkanoslavenskim dijalektima, akcentuacija imperativa. *American Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists, v. 1: Linguistics and Poetics*, ed. Henrik Birnbaum, 26-44. Columbus: Slavica.
Alexander, Ronelle. 1981. External and Internal Change in Balkan Slavic. *Folia Slavica* 4/2: 188-197. Columbus: Slavica.
Alexander, Ronelle. 1983. Directions of Morphophonemic Change in Balkan Slavic, the Accentuation of the Present Tense. *American Contributions to the Ninth Interna-*

tional Congress of Slavists, *v. 1: Linguistics*, ed. Michael S. Flier, 9-49. Columbus: Slavica.

Alexander, Ronelle. 1984-85. Areal Linguistics and South Slavic Linguistics, the Case of Balkan Slavic. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 27-28: 39-47. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Alexander, Ronelle. 1987. Animacy in Balkan Slavic. *Language, Literature, Linguistics, in Honor of Francis J. Whitfield on His Seventieth Birthday, March 25, 1986,* ed. Michael Flier and Simon Karlinsky, 1-12. Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialties.

Alexander, Ronelle. 1988. The Accentuation of Neuter Nouns in Balkan Slavic. *American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists, v 2: Linguistics,* ed. Alexander Schenker, 7-34. Columbus: Slavica.

Alexander, Ronelle. 1991-93. The Balkan Nature of Macedonian Stress Phenomena. *Makedonski jazik* 42-44: 105-114.

Alexander, Ronelle. 1993. Remarks on the Evolution of South Slavic Prosodic Systems. *American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists*, *v 2: Linguistics*, ed. Robert Maguire and Alan Timberlake, 181-201. Columbus: Slavica.

Alexander, Ronelle. 1994 The Prosodic Systems of Balkan Slavic: A Partial Typology. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 37/1-2: 23-40. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Alexander, Ronelle. 1995. Standard Macedonian "Accentual Units" and Macedonian Dialectology. *Studies in Macedonian Language, Literature and Culture*, ed. Benjamin Stolz, 1-16. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.

Alexander, Ronelle. 1999. Word Order and Prosody in Balkan Slavic: The Case of Thrace. *Dialektologija i lingvistična geografija*, ed. Vasilka Radeva et al., 61-73. Sofia: Univerzitetsko izdatelstvo Kliment Oxhridski.

Alexander, Ronelle. 2000. *In Honor of Diversity: The Linguistic Riches of the Balkans*. Columbus: Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures, Ohio State University.

Alexander, Ronelle. 2004a. Introduction. *Revitalizing Bulgarian Dialectology*, ed. Ronelle Alexander and Vladimir Zhobov. http://repositories.cdlib.org/uciaspubs/editedvolumes/2/introduction/

Alexander, Ronelle. 2004b. The Vitality, and the Revitalizing, of Bulgarian Dialectology. *Revitalizing Bulgarian Dialectology*, ed. Ronelle Alexander and Vladimir Zhobov. http://repositories.cdlib.org/uciaspubs/editedvolumes/2/2/

Alexander, Ronelle. 2004c. The Scope of Double Accent in Bulgarian Dialects. *Revitalizing Bulgarian Dialectology*, ed. Ronelle Alexander and Vladimir Zhobov. http://repositories.cdlib.org/uciaspubs/editedvolumes/2/9/

Alexander, Ronelle. 2005. Does Serbo-Croatian Dialectology Still Exist? *Jazyki i dialekty malyx etničeskix grupp na Balkanax*, ed. Andrej Sobolev and Alexander Rusakov, 30-42. St.Petersburg - Munich: Biblion Verlag.

Alexander, Ronelle, and Vladimir Zhobov. 2004. Towards a Revitalization of Bulgarian Dialectology. *Revitalizing Bulgarian Dialectology*, ed. Ronelle Alexander and Vladimir Zhobov. http://repositories.cdlib.org/uciaspubs/editedvolumes/2/13/

Andersen, Henning. 1969a. Lenition in Common Slavic. *Language* 45: 553-574. Linguistic Society of America.

Andersen, Henning. 1969b. The Change of **ot* to **od*, a Central Slavic Innovation. *Die Welt der Slaven* 14: 315-330. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Andersen, Henning. 1970. Kashubian *dobetk* '*dobytek'* and Its Kind. *Die Welt der Slaven* 15: 61-76. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Andersen, Henning. 1978. Perceptual and Conceptual Factors in Abductive Innovations. *Recent Developments in Historical Phonology*, ed. Jacek Fisiak, 1-22. The Hague: Mouton.

Andersen, Henning. 1988. Center and Periphery: Adoption, Diffusion, and Spread. *Historical Dialectology: Regional and Social,* ed. Jacek Fisiak, 39-83. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Andersen, Henning. 1996. *Reconstructing Prehistorical Dialects, Initial Vowels in Slavic and Baltic*. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Andersen, Henning. 1999. The Western South Slavic Contrast Sn. *sah-ni-ti* // SC *sah-nu-ti*. *Slovenski jezik / Slovene Language Studies* 2: 47-62. Ljubljana: Institut za slovenski jezik / Lawrence: University of Kansas.

Baerman, Matthew. 1999. *The Evolution of Fixed Stress in Slavic*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Baerman, Matthew. 2004. Post-stressing Complementizers in Erkeč (Kozičino). *Revitalizing Bulgarian Dialectology*, ed. Ronelle Alexander and Vladimir Zhobov. http://repositories.cdlib.org/uciaspubs/editedvolumes/2/10/

Barnes, Jonathan. 2004. Palatalization in Bulgarian Dialects, an Experiment in Phoneme Categorization. *Revitalizing Bulgarian Dialectology*, ed. Ronelle Alexander and Vladimir Zhobov. http://repositories.cdlib.org/uciaspubs/editedvolumes/2/3/

Belyavski-Frank, Masha. 1983a. *The "Balkan Conditional" in Dialectal Serbo-Croatian*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.

Belyavski-Frank, Masha. 1983b. The Pattern of Some (Mainly) Morphological Features in Southern Serbian Dialects. *Makedonski jazik* 34: 213-230. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik.

Belyavski-Frank, Masha. 1986. The Semantics of the Balkan Conditional in Dialectal Serbo-Croatian. *Folia Slavica* 8/1: 7-28. Columbus: Slavica.

Bethin, Christina. 2005. On Pretonic Length in Belarusian and Ukrainian Nadsnovs'ki Dialects. *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics, The South Carolina Meeting, 2004* [FASL 13], ed. Steven Franks, Frank Gladney and Mila Petrova Tasseva-Kurktchieva, 52-67. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.

Bethin, Christina. 2006. Stress and Tone in East Slavic Dialects. *Phonology* 23: 125-156. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bethin, Christina. Forthcoming. Word Prosody in the Vladimir-Volga Basin Dialects of Russian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 15/2. Bloomington: Slavica.

Birnbaum, Henrik. 1965. Balkanslavisch und Südslavisch, zur Reichweite der Balkanismen im südslavischen Sprachraum. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 3: 12-63. Munich: R. Trofenik.

Crosswhite, Katherine. 2000. Length Neutralization and Vowel Lengthening in Orlec Čakavian. *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Phildelphia Meeting* [FASL 8], ed. Tracy Holloway King and Irina A. Sekerina, 152-167. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Crosswhite, Katherine. 2001. Predicting Syllabicity and Moraicity in Dihovo Macedonian. *University of Rochester Working Papers in the Languages Sciences* 2/1: 1-22. Rochester.

Davis, Philip. 1970. A Classification of Dissimilative Dialects of Russian. *Orbis* 2/19: 360-376. Louvain: Centre internationale de dialectologie générale.

Elliott, Elisabeth M. 2004. Imam ('Have') Plus Past Passive Participle in the Bulgarian Erkeč Dialect. *Revitalizing Bulgarian Dialectology*, ed. Ronelle Alexander and Vladimir Zhobov. http://repositories.cdlib.org/uciaspubs/editedvolumes/2/7/

Elson, Mark. 1983. On the Evolution of the Present Tense in Macedonian Dialects. *Die Welt der Slaven* 28: 131-140. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Feldstein, Ronald. 1984-85. Diphthongal jat' Reflexes in Slovene Dialects. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 27-28: 851-860. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Fielder, Grace. 1999. Auxiliary Variation in Eastern Macedonian Dialects, a Discourse Analysis of Pehčevo Oral Narrative. *Guard the Word Well Bound, Proceedings of the Third North American-Macedonian Conference on Macedonian Studies*, ed. Christina Kramer and Brian Cook (= *Indiana Slavic Studies* 10), 57-69. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Fielder, Grace. 2002-2003. The Perfect in Eastern Macedonian Dialects. In: *Studies in Macedonian Language, Literature and Culture, Proceedings of the Fourth North American-Macedonian Conference,* 137-146. Skopje: Univerzitet Kiril i Metodii.

Flier, Michael. 1978. On the Velar Infinitive in East Slavic. *American Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists, v. 1: Linguistics and Poetics*, ed. Henrik Birnbaum, 269-306. Columbus: Slavica.

Flier, Michael. 1979. On Obojansk Dissimilative Jakan'e, the Canonical Case of Absolute Neutralization. *Recent Advances in Phonological Theory*, ed. D. Goyvaerts, L. Theyskens and J. Taeldeman, 39-98. Ghent: Communication and Cognition.

Flier, Michael. 1983. The Origin of the Desinence *-ovo* in Russian. *From Los Angeles to Kiev, Papers on the Occasion of the Ninth International Congress of Slavists*, ed. Vladimir Markov and Dean Worth, 85–104. Columbus: Slavica.

Flier, Michael. 1988. Morphophonemic Consequences of the Development of Tense Jers in East Slavic. *American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists, v. 2: Linguistics,* ed. Alexander Schenker, 91-105. Columbus: Slavica.

Flier, Michael. 1993. Final Sonorant Clusters in East Slavic. *American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists*, *v. 2: Linguistics,* ed. Robert Maguire and Alan Timberlake, 251-269. Columbus: Slavica.

Flier, Michael. 1996. The Role of Segmentation, Rank, and Natural Class in Ukrainian Dialectology. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 18/1-2: 137-153. Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

Flier, Michael. 1998. The Jer Shift and Consequent Mechanisms of Sharping (Palatalization) in East Slavic. *American Contributions to the Twelfth International Congress of Slavists*, ed. Robert Maguire and Alan Timberlake, 360-374. Bloomington: Slavica.

Franks, Steven. 1988. Factors Affecting Sibilarization in Zagreb Speech. *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 37: 45-60. Columbus: Slavica.

Friedman, Victor. 1976. Dialectal Synchrony and Diachronic Syntax, the Macedonian Perfect. *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax*, 96-104. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Friedman, Victor. 1977. The Morphology of Case in Southeast Serbian Dialects. *Folia Slavica* 1: 76-88. Columbus: Slavica.

Friedman, Victor. 1988. Za složenite minati vreminja vo dihovskiot govor vo sporedba so makedonskiot literaturen jazik i so drugite dijalekti. *Jazičnite pojavi vo Bitola i bitolsko deneska i vo minatoto,*193-200. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite.

Friedman. Victor. 1988. Morphological Innovation and Semantic Shift in Macedonian. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 24/1: 34-41. Munich: R. Trofenik.

Friedman, Victor. 1998. Grammatical Gaps and Lexical Gaps, Aspect and the Lexicon in Macedonian. *Jazykovědné aktuality, informativní zpravodaj českých jazykovědců* 35: 40-45. Prague: Jazykovědné sdružení při ČSAV.

Gabor, Linda Ann. 1979. *The Morphology of the Dialect of Berovo within the Context of the Macedonian Dialects*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.

Gladney, Frank, comp. 1991. *Reverse Index to the Dictionary of Russian Dialects (Slovar' russkix narodnyx govorov, vols. 1-25), Preliminary Version.* Urbana: University of Illinois Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures.

Gledni (= Gladney), F., et al., eds. 2000. *Inversionnyi indeks k Slovarju russkix narodnyx govorov*. St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo S.-Peterburgskogo universiteta.

Gołąb, Zbigniew. 1960-63. Dva makedonska govora (na Suxo i Visoka vo Solunsko. *Makedonski jazik* 11-12/1-2: 113-182; 13-14/1-2: 173-276. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik.

Greenberg, Marc. 1987. Prozodične možnosti v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku in slovenskih narečjih. *Slavistična revija* 35/2: 171-186. Ljubljana: Institut za slovenski jezik.

Greenberg, Marc. 1988. On the Vocalization of the Jers in Slovak. *Die Welt der Slaven* 33: 43-62. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Greenberg, Marc. 1990. *A Historical Analysis of the Phonology and Accentuation of the Prekmurje Dialect of Slovene.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Greenberg, Marc. 1992b. The Prosodic Possibilities of Modern Standard Slovene and Slovene Dialects. *California Slavic Studies* 14: 287-309. Berkeley - Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Greenberg, Marc. 1993. Glasoslovni opis treh prekmurskih govorov in komentar k zgodovinskemu glasoslovju in oblikoglasju prekmurskega narečja. *Slavistična revija* 41: 465-487. Ljubljana: Institut za slovenski jezik.

Greenberg, Marc. 1994a. Archaisms and Innovations in the Dialect of Središče (Southeastern Prlekija, Slovenia). *Indiana Slavic Studies* 7: 90-102. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Greenberg, Marc. 1994b. Circumflex Advancement in Prekmurje and Beyond. *Journal of the Society for Slovene Studies* 14/1: 69-91. New York.

Greenberg, Marc. 1996. The Vowel System of the Središče Dialect (Prlekija, Slovenia) Based on the Descriptions of Karel Ozvald. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 23: 87-99. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Greenberg, Marc. 1999. Multiple Causation in the Spread and Reversal of a Sound Change: Rhotacism in South Slavic. *Slovenski jezik / Slovene Language Studies* 2: 63-76. Ljubljana: Institut za slovenski jezik / Lawrence: University of Kansas.

Greenberg, Robert. 1992. *The Appellative Expressions in the Balkan Slavic Languages.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University. New Haven.

Greenberg, Robert. 1994. Southwest Balkan Linguistic Contacts, Evidence from Appellative Language. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 2: 273-281. Columbus: Slavica.

Greenberg, Robert. 1996a. The Politics of Dialects among Serbs, Croats, and Muslims in the former Yugoslavia. *East European Politics and Societies* 10: 393-415. American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies.

Greenberg, Robert. 1996b. *The Balkan Slavic Appelative*. Munich: Newcastle-Lincom.

Greenberg, Robert. 1998. Dialects and Ethnicity in the Former Yugoslavia, the Case of Southern Baranja (Croatia). *Slavic and East European Journal* 42: 710-22. American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages.

Halle, Morris. 1965. Akan'e, the Treatment of Unstressed Nondiffuse Vowels in Southern Great Russian Dialects. *Symbolae linguisticae in honorem Georgii Kuryłowicz*, ed. Adam Heinz et al., 103-109. Warsaw - Kraków: Polska akademia nauk.

Ivić, Pavle, and Ronelle Alexander. 1973. Refonologizacija količestva v kačestve glasnogo v odnom jugovostočnom serbskom govore. *Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas: Materialy i issledvanija* 1973, 18-21. Moscow: Nauka.

Klagstad, Harold. 1958. A Phonemic Analysis of Some Bulgarian Dialects. *American Contributions to the Fifth International Congress of Slavists*, 157-168. The Hague: Mouton.

Kramer, Christina. 2003. Between Dialect and Standard: Towards a Morphology of the Verbal System of the Macedonian Dialect of Vrbnik, Albania. *Na Prof. Zuzana Topolinjska po povod sedumdeset godišninata*, ed. Maksim Karanfilovski et al. (= *Slavistički studii 10)*, 209-218. Skopje: Filološki fakultet "Blaže Koneski".

Kramer, Christina. 2005. Pronominal Variation in the Dialect of Vrbnik, Albania. *Balkanistica* 18: 61-70. Southeast European Studies Association.

Langston, Keith. 1994. *The Accentuation of the Čakavian Dialects of Serbo-Croatian*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University. New Haven.

Langston, Keith. 1998. On the Boundary of Phonology and Morphology: Prosodic Alternations in Čakavian Nominal Inflection. *Balkanistica* 11: 31-53. Southeast European Studies Association.

Langston, Keith. 1999. Analyzing the Accentual Patterns of the Čakavian Dialects. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 11: 1-21. Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

Langston, Keith. 2003. Derivational vs. Non-Derivational Approaches: Phonologically Opaque Alternations of Quantity in the Čakavian Dialects. *Die Welt der Slaven* 48: 169-186. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Langston, Keith. 2006. *Čakavian Prosody: The Accentual Patterns of the Čakavian Dialects of Croatian*. Bloomington: Slavica.

Langston, Keith. Forthcoming. Common Slavic Accentual Paradigm (d): A Reevaluation of Evidence from Čakavian. *Tones and Theories: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology*, ed. Mate Kapović and Ranko Matasović. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.

Lehiste, Ilse, and Pavle Ivić. 1974. Akustični opis akcentskog sistema jednog čakavskog govora. *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane* 3: 159-172. Belgrade: Međunarodni slavistički centar.

Lehiste, Ilse, and Pavle Ivić. 1977. Fonetska analiza jedne slavonske akcentuacije. *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane* 6/1: 67-84. Belgrade: Međunarodni slavistički centar.

Lehiste, Ilse, and Pavle Ivić. 1986. *Word and Sentence Prosody in Serbocroatian.* Cambridge: MIT Press. [on dialectology: pp. 75-82]

Lencek, Rado. 1978. Čakavisms in Western Slovene Dialects. *Folia Slavica* 2: 211-228. Columbus: Slavica.

Lencek, Rado. 1981. A Note on the *-m* > *-n* Change in South Slavic Dialects. *Folia Slavica* 4/2-3: 317-326. Columbus: Slavica.

Lencek, Rado. 1982. *The Structure and History of the Slovene Language.* Columbus: Slavica.

Lencek, Rado. 1983. From Language Interference to the Influence of Area in Linguistic Geography. *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists*, *v. 1: Linguistics,* ed. Michael Flier, 185-191. Columbus: Slavica.

Lencek, Rado. 1984-1985. Is There a *-ni-* : *-ne-* Isogloss in the South Slavic Speech Area? *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 27-28: 395-403. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Lencek, Rado. 1988. On the System of Isoglosses in the Western South Slavic Dialects. *American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists*, *v. 2: Linguistics*, ed. Alexander Schenker, 199-241. Columbus: Slavica.

Lencek, Rado. 1989. Notes on the Evolution Pattern of the Common Slavic **g* > *γ* and *-g* > *-x* in Slovene Dialects. *Riglerjev zbornik* (= *Slavistična revija* 37), 219-231. Maribor: Slavistično društvo Slovenije.

Lundberg, Grant. 1999. Preliminary Report on Dialectological Fieldwork in Haloze, Slovenia. *Slovenski jezik* / *Slovene Linguistic Studies* 2: 91-108. Ljubljana: Institut za slovenski jezik / Lawrence: University of Kansas.

Lundberg, Grant. 2001a. Loss of Tonemic Oppositions in Eastern Haloze, Slovenia: An Instrumental Study. *Balkanistica* 14: 83-100. Association of Southeast European Studies.

Lundberg, Grant. 2001b. Typology of Tone Loss in Haloze, Slovenia: An Acoustic and Autosegmental Analysis. *Slovenski jezik* / *Slovene Linguistic Studies* 3: 169-189. Ljubljana: Institut za slovenski jezik / Lawrence: University of Kansas.

Lundberg, Grant. 2003a. A Preliminary Report on Dialectological Fieldwork in Northwestern Croatia: Brezova Gora and the Croatian-Slovene Dialect Continuum. *Slovenski jezik* / *Slovene Linguistic Studies* 4: 55-64. Ljubljana: Institut za slovenski jezik / Lawrence: University of Kansas.

Lundberg, Grant. 2003b. Phonological Results of an Ancient Border Shift; Vocalic Merger in Northeastern Slovene. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 13. Bloomington: Slavica.

Lundberg, Grant. 2005. Dialect Divergence on the Slovene-Croatian National Border. *Balkanistica* 18: 71-84. Association of Southeast European Studies.

Lunt, Horace G. 1963. A Note on Slovenian Dialect Syntax. *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 7: 14-17. The Hague: Mouton.

Lunt, Horace G. 1974. On Accent and Verbal Paradigms, the Case of Novo Selo (Vidin). *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 16/1: 37-50. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Magner, Thomas F. 1966. *A Zagreb Kajkavian Dialect*. College Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Magner, Thomas F. 1971. Kajkavian Koine. *Symbolae in honorem Georgii Y. Shevelov*, 309-316. Munich: Universita libra Ucrainensis.

Magner, Thomas F. 1975. The Dialect of Split: A Preliminary Sketch. *Xenia Slavica: A Festschrift for Gojko Ružičić*, ed. Rado Lencek and Boris Unbegaun, 125-132. The Hague: Mouton.

Magner, Thomas F. 1978a. City Dialects in Yugoslavia. *American Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists, v. 1: Linguistics and Poetics*, ed. Henrik Birnbaum, 465-482. Columbus: Slavica.

Magner, Thomas F. 1978b. Digolossia in Split. *Folia Slavica* 1: 400-436. Columbus: Slavica.

Magner, Thomas F. 1984. A Century of the Niš Dialect. *Language and Language Theory*, ed. Benjamin Stolz, 133-145. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.

Miller, Raymond. 1980. *The Geographical Distribution of Present-Tense Endings in Belorussian Dialects*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University. Cambridge.

Miller, Raymond. 1988. The Third Person Plural Present Tense and Common Slavic Dialectology. *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 37: 7-34. Columbus: Slavica.

Naylor, Kenneth. 1966a. The Classification of Serbocroatian Dialects. *Slavic and East European Journal* 10: 453-457. American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages.

Naylor, Kenneth. 1966b. A Comparison of the Nominal Declension of the Čakavian Dialects, Literary Serbocroatian and Russian. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 9: 67-72. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Naylor, Kenneth. 1967. *The Nominal Declension of the Čakavian Serbocroatian Dialects and Literary Serbocroatian Compared with That of Russian*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.

Naylor, Kenneth. 1970. A Contribution to the Discussion of the Novi ´ . *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 13/1: 252-255. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Naylor, Kenneth. 1973a. Bulgarian Dialects in the South Slavic Framework. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 16/2: 33-38. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Naylor, Kenneth. 1973b. A Morphological Classification of South Slavic Dialects. *American Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists,* ed. Ladislav Matejka, 275-284. The Hague: Mouton.

Naylor, Kenneth. 1974. Notes on Čakavian Prosody. *Topics in Slavic Phonology,* ed. Demetrios Koubourlis, 152-166. Cambridge: Slavica.

Priestly, Tom M. S. 1977. Consonantal Alternations in the Dialect of Sele Fara. *Papers in Slovene Studies* 1976, 120-164. New York: Society for Slovene Studies.

Priestly, Tom M. S. 1987. Verb Productivity: Evidence from Three Varieties of Slovene. *Slovene Studies* 9: 195-203. New York: Society for Slovene Studies.

Priestly, Tom M. S. 1981. Variation on an Alternation: The Fate of the "Kasna Palatalizacija" in Sele Fara, Carinthia. *Slovene Studies* 2/2: 63-77. New York: Society for Slovene Studies.

Scatton, Ernest. 1976. Forms such as [*cal*]/[*cali*] in Dialects of East Balkan Slavic. *Slavic Linguistics and Language Teaching,* ed. Thomas Magner, 240-248. Cambridge: Slavica.

Scatton, Ernest. 1981. To Mark It, To Mark It: Person-Number in Western Bulgarian (Godeč). *Folia Slavica* 4/2-3: 365-370. Columbus: Slavica.

Scatton, Ernest. 1998. Vowel Reduction and Jat' in Bulgarian Dialects. *And Meaning for a Life Entire: Festschrift for Charles A. Moser on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. P. Rollberg. Bloomington: Slavica.

Scatton, Ernest, and D.B. Johnson. 1972. Generativna interpretacija na jatovija preglas v bŭlgarskite dialekti. *Izvestija na Instituta za bŭlgarski ezik* 20: 91-107. Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite.

Schallert, W.J. 1984. *Accentuation in Macedonian Dialects*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Schallert, W.J. 1988. Fixed and Mobile Stress in the Balkan Slavic Verb, Synchrony. *American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists*, *v. 2: Linguistics*, ed. Alexander Schenker, 335-363. Columbus: Slavica.

Schallert, Joseph. 1993. The Historical Accentuation of the Definite Singular Masculine Form in Balkan Slavic Dialects with Free Stress. *American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists*, *v. 2: Linguistics*, ed. Robert Maguire and Alan Timberlake, 392-407. Columbus: Slavica.

Schallert, Joseph. 1996. The Historical Accentuation of Neuter Nouns in the Eastern Macedonian Dialect of Maleševo. *Studia linguistica polono-meridiano-slavica* 8: 199-205.

Schallert, Joseph. 1999. A Comparative Historical Analysis of Nominal Accentuation in Archaic (Maleševo) and Transitional (Nivičino) Eastern Macedonian Dialects. *Guard the Word Well Bound, Proceedings of the Third North American-Macedonian Conference on Macedonian Studies*, ed. Christina Kramer and Brian Cook (= *Indiana Slavic Studies* 10), 135-153. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Schallert, Joseph. 2003. Stem Restructuring in the Development of Common Slavic **nogъtь* and the Like in Balkan Slavic Dialects. *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 45: 141-200. Canadian Association of Slavists.

Schallert, Joseph. 2004. The Accentuation of Common Slavic **goląb* in Macedonian Dialects. *Macedonian Studies: Papers from the Fifth International Macedonian - North American Conference on Macedonian Studies*, ed. Brian Joseph and M.A. Johnson, 233-250. Columbus: Ohio State University

Schallert, Joseph. 2005. Historical Phonology of the Macedonian Dialect of Vrbnik (Albania). *Balkanistica* 18: 85-112. Association of Southeast European Studies.

Sims, Andrea. 2005. Declension Hopping in Dialectal Croatian: Two Predictions of Frequency. *Yearbook of Morphology 2005*, ed. Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle. Dordrecht: Springer.

Stankiewicz, Edward. 1965. Neutralizacja rodzaju nijakiego w dialektach sloweńskich. *Studia z filologii polskiej i slowiańskiej* 5: 179-187. Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.

Stankiewicz, Edward. 1956. The Phonemic Patterns of the Polish Dialects, a Study in Structural Dialectology. *For Roman Jakobson, Essays on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday, 11 October 1956,* ed. Morris Halle et al., 518-531. The Hague: Mouton.

Stankiewicz, Edward. 1957. On Discreteness and Continuity in Structural Dialectology. *Word* 13: 44-59. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

Stankiewicz, Edward. 1973. The Accent and Grammatical Categories of the *a*-Stems in South Slavic. *Južnoslovenski filolog* 30: 190-202. Belgrade: Institut za srpsko-hrvatski jezik.

Stankiewicz, Edward. 1979. *Studies in Slavic Morphophonemics and Accentology.* Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.

Stankiewicz, Edward. 1986. *The Slavic Languages, Unity in Diversity*. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Thomason, Sarah Grey. 1968. *Noun Suffixation in Serbo-Croatian Dialects.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University. New Haven.

Thomason, Sarah Grey. 1977. A Fragment of Serbo-Croatian Declensional History. *Folia Slavica* 1: 124-155. Columbus: Slavica.

Timberlake, Alan. 1974a. *The Nominative Object in Slavic, Baltic and West Finnic* (= *Slavistische Beiträge* 82). Munich: Otto Sagner.

Timberlake, Alan. 1974b. The Nominative Object in North Russian. *Slavic Transformational Syntax*, ed. Richard Brecht and Catherine Chvany, 219-243. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.

Timberlake, Alan. 1976. Subject Properties in the North Russian Passive. *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles Li, 545-570. New York: Academic Press.

Timberlake, Alan. 1978. Uniform and Alternating Environments in Phonological Change. *Folia Slavica* 2: 312-328. Columbus: Slavica.

Timberlake, Alan. 1981. Dual Reflexes of **dj* in Slavic and a Morphological Constraint in Sound Change. *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 233: 25-54. The Hague: Mouton.

Timberlake, Alan. 1983a. Compensatory Lengthening in Slavic 1: Conditions and Dialect Geography. *From Los Angeles to Kiev, Papers on the Occasion of the Ninth International Congress of Slavists*, ed. Vladimir Markov and Dean Worth, 207-235. Columbus: Slavica.

Timberlake, Alan. 1983b. Compensatory Lengthening in Slavic 2: Phonetic Reconstruction. *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists*, v. 1: Linguistics, ed. Michael Flier, 293-319. Columbus: Slavica.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1954. Is a Structural Dialectology Possible? *Word* 10: 388-400. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

Whyte, Robert. 1967. *Komiški, a Čakavian Dialect, its Verbal Morphology with Texts and Concorded Glossary.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Zhobov, Vladimir, Ronelle Alexander and Georgi Kolev. 2004. Hierarchies of Stress Assignment in Bulgarian Dialects. *Revitalizing Bulgarian Dialectology*, ed. Ronelle Alexander and Vladimir Zhobov. http://repositories.cdlib.org/uciaspubs/editedvolumes/2/12/