ANNALES

Anali za istrske in mediteranske študije
Annali di Studi istriani e mediterranei
Annals for Istrian and Mediterranean Studies
Series Historia et Sociologia, 35, 2025, 2

UDK 009 Annales, Ser. hist. sociol., 35, 2025, 2, pp. 139-236, Koper 2025 ISSN1408-5348

UDK 009

ISSN 1408-5348
e-ISSN 2591-1775

ANNALES

Anali za istrske in mediteranske študije
Annali di Studi istriani e mediterranei
Annals for Istrian and Mediterranean Studies

Series Historia et Sociologia, 35, 2025, 2

KOPER 2025

ISSN 1408-5348
e-ISSN 2591-1775

UDK 009

Letnik 35, leto 2025, številka 2

Tisk/*Stampa/Print:* Založništvo PADRE d.o.o.

Založnika/*Editori/Published by:* Zgodovinsko društvo za južno Primorsko - Koper / *Società storica del Litorale - Capodistria*© / Inštitut IRRIS za raziskave, razvoj in strategije družbe, kulture in okolja / *Institute IRRIS for Research, Development and Strategies of Society, Culture and Environment / Istituto IRRIS di ricerca, sviluppo e strategie della società, cultura e ambiente*©

Sedež uredništva/*Sede della redazione/*
Address of Editorial Board: SI-6000 Koper/*Capodistria,* Garibaldijeva/*Via Garibaldi 18*
e-mail: annaleszdjp@gmail.com, ***internet:*** https://zdjp.si

Redakcija te številke je bila zaključena 30. 06. 2025.

Sofinancirajo/*Supporto finanziario/*
Financially supported by: Javna agencija za znanstvenoraziskovalno in inovacijsko dejavnost Republike Slovenije (ARIS)

Annales - Series Historia et Sociologia izhaja štirikrat letno.

Maloprodajna cena tega zvezka je 11 EUR.

Naklada/*Tiratura/Circulation:* 300 izvodov/copie/copies

Revija Annales, Series Historia et Sociologia je vključena v naslednje podatkovne baze / *La rivista Annales, Series Historia et Sociologia è inserita nei seguenti data base / Articles appearing in this journal are abstracted and indexed in*: Clarivate Analytics (USA): Arts and Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI) in/and Current Contents / Arts & Humanities; IBZ, Internationale Bibliographie der Zeitschriftenliteratur (GER); Sociological Abstracts (USA); Referativnyi Zhurnal Viniti (RUS); European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH PLUS); Elsevier B. V.: SCOPUS (NL); Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ).

ANNALES · Ser. hist. sociol. · 35 · 2025 · 2

Anali za istrske in mediteranske študije - Annali di Studi istriani e mediterranei - Annals for Istrian and Mediterranean Studies

UDK 009 Volume 35, Koper 2025, issue 2 ISSN 1408-5348
e-ISSN 2591-1775

VSEBINA / *INDICE GENERALE / CONTENTS*

received: 2024-07-29 DOI 10.19233/ASHS.2025.16

TO THE METHODOLOGY OF DETERMINATION GENEALINGUISTIC LANGUAGE BORDERS: THE DELIMITATION OF LOCAL DIALECTS IN GORSKI KOTAR – A CASE STUDY

Januška GOSTENČNIK
ZRC SAZU, Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian language, Novi trg 4, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, Aškerčeva 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
University of Nova Gorica, School of Humanities, Vipavska cesta 13, 5000 Nova Gorica, Slovenia
e-mail: januska.gostencnik@zrc-sazu.si

ABSTRACT

The paper critically examines and evaluates two different methodological approaches to the determination of genealinguistic language, more specifically dialectal borders, using the case of the study of local dialects in the Gorski kotar region. Dialectology is defined as a science within genealogy, which is one of the three branches of linguistics (along with typolinguistics and sociolinguistics). It is emphasised that within dialectology, theorems and criteria from different branches of linguistics cannot be combined, and in this context a clearer definition of the meaning of the adjective Slovenian within the phrase Slovenian dialects is also given. The paper also provides a genealogical justification for the revised Map of Slovenian dialects (version 2023).

Keywords: Slovenian dialects, genealogy, dialectology, comparative Slavic linguistics, linguistic border, Slovenian Linguistic Atlas

CONTRIBUTO ALLA METODOLOGIA DI DETERMINAZIONE DEI CONFINI LINGUISTICI DAL PUNTO DI VISTA DELLA LINGUISTICA GENEALOGICA: CASO STUDIO SULLA DELIMITAZIONE DELLE PARLATE LOCALI NEL GORSKI KOTAR

SINTESI

L'articolo esamina e valuta criticamente due diversi approcci metodologici utilizzati nella determinazione della lingua in chiave genealogica, più precisamente dei confini dialettali, utilizzando il caso studio sulle parlate locali nella regione del Gorski kotar. La dialettologia viene definita come una scienza all'interno della linguistica genealogica, che è una delle tre branche principali della linguistica (insieme alla linguistica tipologica e alla sociolinguistica). Si sottolinea che all'interno della dialettologia, non è possibile combinare i teoremi e i criteri propri dei diversi rami della linguistica. In questo contesto viene anche fornita una definizione più precisa del significato dell'aggettivo "sloveno" all'interno dell'espressione "dialetti sloveni". Il documento offre anche una giustificazione genealogica per la revisione della Mappa dei dialetti sloveni (versione 2023).

Parole chiave: Dialetti sloveni, genealogia, dialettologia, linguistica slava comparata, confine linguistico, Atlante linguistico sloveno

INTRODUCTION[1]

This paper examines and critically evaluates two different methodological approaches used to locate a particular local dialect within a particular dialect, using the example of the study of Slovenian and Croatian[2] local dialects in the Gorski Kotar region. The first methodological approach is based on an already established methodology within dialectology, while the second combines the dialectological method with a methodology from another branch of linguistics, i.e. sociolinguistics.

In recent years, several clearly defined field studies have been carried out in the area of the Kostel and Čebranka dialects of the Lower Carniolan and Rovte dialect groups of the Slovenian language in the Gorski Kotar region of Croatia, which have traditionally up to now been classified in the West goran subdialect of the Kajkavian dialect group of the Croatian language.

The treatment and research of (possible) Slovenian local dialects in the area of the Republic of Croatia is a sensitive topic, especially due to the tradition of national dialectologies related to dialect classification. The tradition of national dialectologies links the dialectal borders of two related South Slavic languages to the use of the official language of each country, and so the dialectal borders have so far been drawn along national borders. Thus, until recently, all local dialects within Croatia were classified as dialects of the Croatian language, even if linguistic facts contradicted this. In the entire area along the Croatian and Slovenian border, the dialectal border between them is drawn *per se* at the state border or at the rivers (Sotla, Kolpa, Dragonja), but from recent research in the Gorski Kotar area and the dialects along the Sotla (cf. Gostenčnik et al., 2022), we know that this is not the case on the ground, or that the rivers are at most a connecting element between the dialects, not a separating one.

It is precisely because of the two methodologically different approaches that there is also a need to clearly define the meaning of the adjective *Slovenian* within the phrase *Slovenian dialects* and, consequently, within the phrase *Slovenian language*, all in the context of dialectology as a linguistic scientific discipline, which must be free from national or sociolinguistic definitions.

This knowledge was already generally accepted within linguistics or dialectology decades ago (cf. Ramovš, 1935, 4; Brozović, 1996; Šekli, 2013, 3–4) and by that time it had become embedded in the collective consciousness of (some) linguists (dialectologists) to the extent that it no longer needed to be substantiated. In the last decade, however, especially due to the study of dialects in the area of the state border with Croatia, this approach has once again shown itself to be in need of justification or reiteration of what was taken for granted some time ago.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Linguistic as a scientific discipline

Linguistics as a scientific discipline is not a unified science, but is divided into three distinct disciplines according to the different aspects of the study of the language system.

Linguistics is divided into typolinguistics, sociolinguistics and genealogical linguistics. Typolinguistics is the descriptive study of the structure, grammar, phonetics and basic vocabulary of each idiom, comparing it, where appropriate, synchronically with other idioms. Sociolinguistics, or social linguistics, studies how speakers deal with an idiom, what it does for them, how they perceive and evaluate it in a social context, and how social circumstances affect the language system.

> *The main classificatory criterion is the* communicative role *that a given idiom has in society, whereby the literary or* standard language *typically presents the most prominent and prestigious linguistic variety. Note, however, that the sociolinguistic term* literary/standard language, *which refers to a sociolect,*

1 This article was written in the framework of the project Research of endangered dialects in the Slovene language area (Radgonski kot, Gradiščanska, Hum na Sutli with surroundings, Dubravica with surroundings (V6-2109, 1 October 2021-31 August 2024, https://isjfr.zrc-sazu.si/en/programi-in-projekti/research-of-endangered-dialects-in-the-slovene-language-area-radgonski-kot), co-financed by the Slovenian Agency for Scientific Research and Innovation and the Office of the Government of the Republic of Slovenia for Slovenians Abroad and Internationally, the project i-SLA - Interactive Atlas of Slovenian Dialects (L6-2628, 1 September 2020-31 August 2024, ARIS in SAZU, https://isjfr.zrc-sazu.si/en/node/101503) and the programme Slovenski jezik v sinhronem in diahronem razvoju (P6-0038).

2 The adjective "Croatian" is used in this article for the sake of simplicity or ease of understanding. In the context of genealinguistics, the appropriate genealogical term is Central South Slavic, which includes, among others, the Kajkavian dialect group discussed in this article. The term "Croatian language" as a super-denomination exists only within the sociolinguistic division of standard languages. The same applies to the term "Slovenian language", which in relation to Central South Slavic could be called North-Western South Slavic, a genealogical term. The mentioned geolects (namely Central and North-Western South Slavic) have given rise to different literary languages with national labels (for instance Slovenian language, Croatian language etc.). This article does not deal with the literary languages mentioned.

> *should not be confused with the genealogical linguistic term language, which designates a geolect*. (Šekli, 2023, 16)

"Genealogical linguistic studies the genetic relationship between lects and establishes their genealogical classification based on (the degree of) genetic affinity" (Šekli, 2023, 9). It is based on the wave and stem theory, which "although they often compete in science, they should be seen as complementary: not mutually exclusive, but complementary" (Ivić, 1960–1961, 99; translated by Gostenčnik).[3]

The knowledge and arguments (and therefore the concepts) of one do not necessarily apply to the other or to the third.

> *Genetic linguistics studies the relationship between idioms, that is, between languages and dialects, while typological linguistics studies internal structural relationships in a given idiom. Facts from one of these linguistic disciplines have no value as arguments in the other, and even less so in sociolinguistics, which studies the nature of individual idioms in relation to the collectives that support them. Of course, the facts from sociolinguistics are not valid in the other two linguistics either.* (Brozović, 1996, 87; translated by Gostenčnik)[4]

> *As far as their theoretical modelling and methodological approaches are concerned, the three main branches of linguistics are thoroughly independent from each other. Consequently, any kind of research results should not be automatically transferred from one to the other, which amounts to the fact that there are three autonomous types of linguistic classification of any given idiom that will typically need to be established*. (Šekli, 2023, 8)

Dialectology as part of genealogical linguistic

Part of genealogical linguistic is dialectology, which deals with organic idioms, from their present (phonetical) state to their original (phonetical) state, i. e. their common (phonetical) denominator.[5] Its main methods are the comparative method and the method of reconstruction. Its secondary task is to place a particular micro-organic idiom (i.e. the local dialect of a place) within a group of local dialects which may form a dialect at the next stage. In order to achieve this, it is necessary first to be familiar first with the synchronic state of the individual organic idiom, with the synchronic state of the neighbouring idiom, and so on, followed by the establishment of parallels, i.e. isoglosses. At this stage, these are isophones, i.e. isoglosses of phonetic phenomena, which are then grouped together into individual so-called isoglossic bundles. "Dialect classification is based on linguistic criteria, taking into consideration only the linguistic features of the individual geolects, Historical phonetics/phonology is undeniably the most important criterion for accurate genealogical linguistic classification" (Šekli, 2023, 43). The next level up from a dialect is a dialect group, and the whole of them constitutes a single linguistic system; in the context of the dialectology of Slovenian dialects, this is the *Slovenian linguistic system* or the *Slovenian language*. This is the highest abstraction of dialectology, and this is where its task ends.

The (initial) Common Slovenian phonological system

There is a consensus within Slavic and thus Slovenian genealogical linguistic that each individual Slavic language system is defined according to its starting point. This means that a certain lexeme that is part of the inherited Slavic vocabulary can be phonetically derived to the so-called common linguistic or phonetic denominator within a certain language system. In the dialectology of the Slovenian language, the common linguistic denominator is represented by the so-called (initial) Common Slovenian phonological system (CSln.), which dates back to the late 11th or early 12th century (Logar, 1981, 29–33). This is the last stage of the common development of the Slovenian language just before its first dialectal breakdown, and the system is derived from the last common development stage of the Proto-Slavic language from the beginning of the 6th century.

The (initial) Common Slovenian phonological system contains an inventory of phonological units (i.e. an inventory of all phonemes and their representation in the system), prosody (including the place of

3 "[I]ako one u nauci često nastupaju konkurentno, ipak (ih) treba shvatiti komplementarno: one se ne isključuju već se dopunjuju" (Ivić, 1960–1961, 99).

4 *Genetska lingvistika proučava srodničke odnose među idiomima, to jest među jezicima i među dijalektima, a tipološka lingvistika proučava unutarnje strukturne odnose u pojedinome idiomu te uspoređuje takve odnose*. Činjenice *iz jedne od tih lingvistika nemaju vrijednosti argumenata u drugoj, a još manje u sociolingvistici, koja proučava prirodu pojedinih idioma u vezi s njihovim nositeljskim kolektivima. Naravno, ni činjenice iz sociolingvistike ne vrijede u drugim dvjema lingvistikama*. (Brozović, 1996, 87)

5 Although it "is important to understand that dialectology is a part of geneolinguistics and of geneolinguistics alone" (Brozović, 1996, 88; translated by Gostenčnik), dialectology and its findings can also act as an auxiliary science to, for example, ethnology or ethnography (e.g. the (non-)existence of a particular object and its term) or sociolinguistics (e.g. data on the change of dialectal and liturgical code in a particular local dialect due to extra-linguistic circumstances).

stress, the length or number of stressed and unstressed vowels, and the intonation or tonemicity), distribution of phonological units (classification restrictions, positional variations of phonemes, classification of accents and tonemes are described here) and origin of phonological units (in addition to symbols (signs, transcriptions) for phonemes and accents, the origin of phonemes from Proto-Slavic voices is given here).

Diachronic division of Slovenian dialects

The basis for the chronological reconstruction of a local dialect is provided by the reconstruction of the basic Slovenian vocalic systems (Rigler, 2001, 1357), with the help of which the local dialect can be genetically identified and assigned to a specific vocalic system or dialect macro-area according to the so-called older linguistic phenomena. The linguistic development of a particular language (vocalic) system is thus traced back to around the 14th century.

Slovenian dialect in the context of genealogical linguistic

The foundations for the definition and understanding of the adjective *Slovenian* within the phrase *Slovenian dialects* in the context of dialectology were laid by Fran Ramovš:

> *If we speak of language, we have before our eyes a group of dialects bound together by one of these dialects as a cultural dialect; in the same relation, history has also formed the same tribes as a society into a "nation", so that both are formed by history, political-social and cultural. Until and unless there is a cultural linguistic union, we speak only of dialects, and the name of a language is only culturally and historically substantiated and justified, while genetically the name of any dialect of that group should serve for the same designation*. (Ramovš, 1935, 4; translated by Gostenčnik)[6]

The same premise was later followed by Dalibor Brozović:

> *Dialects are then ranked as a language, a language in the genetic-linguistic sense. In science, according to an American linguist, we call it a diasystem language. The term diasystem means a system of common features for a certain number of idioms. Well then, the local dialects make up the diasystem of the local dialect group. Local dialect groups form a diasystem of dialects. Dialects form a diasystem, which we then call a group of dialects. Groups of dialects are thus classified as a language diasystem*. (Brozović, 2004, 3; translated by Gostenčnik)[7]

Recently also Matej Šekli: "In the framework of genealogical linguistic classification, the term *language* is to be defined as a geolect, which encompasses groups of dialects and their local varieties displaying the same set of linguistic features (i.e., archaisms and/or innovations)" (Šekli, 2023, 11). As for the adjective *Slovenian*:

> *In the present paper, the adjective Slovenian is used in the genetic-linguistic sense of "which is part of the Slovenian diasystem or Slovenian language, i.e., which exhibits Slovenian (and possibly non-Slovenian) linguistic innovations", but perhaps not in the politico-legal sense of "which is located on the territory of the Republic of Slovenia" or in the sociological sense of "which feels part of the Slovenian nation or Slovenian nationhood, a Slovenian". Similarly, the adjective "Kajkavian" is understood in the genetic-linguistic sense of "being part of the Kajkavian diasystem, i.e. exhibiting Kajkavian (and possibly non-Kajkavian) linguistic innovations", and not perhaps in the politico-legal sense of "being located on the territory of the Republic of Croatia" or in the sociological sense of "feeling part of the Croatian nation, a Croat". The author therefore does not directly link genetic linguistic categories such as "Slovenian diasystem, Slovenian language" with sociological categories such as "Slovenian nation, Slovenian nationhood", "being Slovenian", as he considers that*

6 Če *govorimo o jeziku, imamo torej pred očmi skupino dialektov, ki jo veže v enoto eden teh dialektov kot kulturni dialekt; v enakšni relaciji je zgodovina formirala tudi istorodna plemena kot družbo v »narod«, tako da sta oba formirana po zgodovini, politično-socialni in kulturni. Dokler in če ni kulturne jezikovne zveze, govorimo le o dialektih in ime kakega jezika je le kulturno-historično utemeljeno in upravičeno, genetično pa bi smelo služiti za isto označevanje ime katerega koli dialekta te skupine*. (Ramovš, 1935, 4)

7 *Dijalekti se svrstavaju u narječja. Ostali svijet kaže »u skupine dijalekata«. Slaveni imaju riječ narječje, koja nije iskorištena, pa se onda umjesto skupina dijalekata upotrebljava jedna riječ. Ali treba znati da su narječje i skupina dijalekata sinonimi. Narječja se onda svrstavaju u jezik, i to u genetskolingvističkom smislu shvaćen jezik. U znanosti to nazivamo, prema jednome američkom lingvistu, jezik dijasistem. Termin dijasistem znači sustav zajedničkih osobina za određeni broj idioma. Pa onda mjesni govori čine dijasistem skupine govora. Skupine govora* čine *dijasistem dijalekta. Dijalekti sačinjavaju dijasistem koji onda zovemo narječjem ili skupinom dijalekata. Tako se onda skupine dijalekata svrstavaju u jezik dijasistem*. (Brozović, 2004, 3)

such issues do not fall within the scope of genetic linguistics. (Šekli, 2013, 3–4; translated by Gostenčnik)[8]

Thus, all of them, on the basis of genealogical linguistics, interpret the same thing, namely that the collection of dialects constitutes a larger unit, i.e. a *language*, but in a genealogical sense. Consequently, within a specific branch of linguistics, i.e. dialectology, the phrase *Slovenian language* should also be understood, i.e. only as a collection of *Slovenian dialects*. We are dealing with a term that denotes several different concepts, depending on which branch it is used in. Thus, the adjective *Slovenian* cannot have a unique meaning, but can only have a specific meaning within a particular sub-branch. The same can be said of the phrase *Slovenian dialects*, which is terminologised within dialectology.

However, it is also true that some definitions within Slovenian linguistics create unwanted confusion. Toporišič, in his explanation of the cue *dialectal parsing* (Sln. *narečno razčlenjevanje*) wrote that "the division of the supposedly unified (vernacular) language of all Slovenians into smaller units is due to the recurrent linguistic developmental units, which are not the same in the whole area of the Slovenian language" (Toporišič, 1992, 124; translated by Gostenčnik).[9] The definition given with the added syntax of "all Slovenians" is unnecessary from a dialectological point of view and may provoke unnecessary reactions. However, the above should be placed in the context of the time and should serve as a starting point for possible corrections.

THE ISSUE

In the Slovenian Linguistic Atlas (SLA), the first volume of which was published in 2011, seven border towns were added to the original network of localities where dialect material is collected (the so-called control points), namely in Croatia (Medžimurje, Posotelje, the Kolpe Valley, Gorski Kotar and Istria),[10] as it was assumed on the basis of previous research[11] that these local dialects show certain dialectal developments characteristic of Slovenian dialects (SLA 1.2, 2011, 22). However, on the basis of the systematically collected dialectal material and a detailed analysis, it was already possible to confirm, at the time of the publication of the second volume of SLA in 2016, that genealogically speaking these are in fact local dialects of a Slovenian language system, which were thus included in the SLA network as regular points (SLA 2.2, 2016, 20).

Until recently, on published dialect maps, the entire dialectal border between Slovenian and Croatian dialects ran along the state border. This situation is shown both in Logar-Rigler's Map of Slovenian dialects[12] from 1983 (Logar & Rigler, 1983) and in the Map of the Kajkavskog dialect (Lončarić, 1996). After a series of dialectological research,[13] various publications (cf. Šekli, 2013; 2018; Gostenčnik, 2018; 2020; 2023) and based on the analysis of the dialectal material for the individual newly added SLA localities in Croatia, the revised Map of Slovenian Dialects (version 2023) was published with the publication of the third volume of the SLA (SLA 3. 1, 2023, 11), where a change was made in the Gorski

8 *V pričujočem prispevku je pridevnik slovenski uporabljan v genetolingvističnem pomenu »ki je del slovenskega diasistema oz. slovenskega jezika, tj. ki izkazuje splošnoslovenske (in morebitne nesplošnoslovenske) jezikovne inovacije«, ne pa morda v političnoupravnem pomenu »ki se nahaja na ozemlju Republike Slovenije« ali sociološkem smislu »ki se čuti del slovenskega naroda oz. slovenske nacije, Slovenec/Slovenka«. Prav tako je pridevnik kajkavski razumljen v genetolingvističnem pomenu »ki je del kajkavskega diasistema, tj. ki izkazuje splošnokajkavske (in morebitne nesplošnokajkavske) jezikovne inovacije«, ne pa morda v političnoupravnem pomenu »ki se nahaja na ozemlju Republike Hrvaške« ali sociološkem smislu »ki se čuti del hrvaškega naroda oz. hrvaške nacije, Hrvat/Hrvatica«. Avtor torej genetolingvistične kategorije kot na primer »slovenski diasistem, slovenski jezik« ne povezuje neposredno s sociološkimi kategorijami, kot so na primer »slovenski narod, slovenska nacija«, »biti Slovenec/Slovenka«, saj tovrstna problematika po njegovem mnenju ne sodi na področje genetolingvistike.* (Šekli, 2013, 3–4)

9 "[D]elitev domnevno enotnega (ljudskega) jezika vseh Slovencev na manjše enote zaradi ponavljajočih se jezikovnih razvojnih enot, ki niso enake na celotnem področju slovenskega jezika" (Toporišič, 1992, 124).

10 These are Banfi (SLA T407), Hum na Sutli (SLA T408), Dubravica (SLA T409), Čabar/Čeber (SLA T410), Ravnice (SLA T411), Ravna Gora (SLA T412) and Brest (SLA T413).

11 For a summary of older treatments in the Gorski Kotar area, cf. Gostenčnik (2018, 25, 29–31), and for the Central Styrian and Kozjansko-Bizeljsko area, Gostenčnik et al. (2022, 80–81).

12 Tine Logar wrote in his manuscript field notes from the Gorski Kotar area that "the same language is also widespread in the hills beyond the Kolpa in Croatia" (page 1 of the typescript). For more on this, cf. Gostenčnik (2018, 25).

13 Among others, the following researches: Slovenian local dialects in the Surroundings of Skrad, Croatia (3 June 2020-31 December 2020), Research on Slovenian local dialects in the Gorski Kotar (work) (13 November 2020-31 December 2020), Research on Endangered Dialects in the Slovenian Language Space (Radgonski kot, Gradiška, Hum na Sutli and surroundings, Dubravica and surroundings) (1 October 2021-31 August 2024). Within the mentioned surveys, a proven research methodology was used to collect dialectal material, namely both synchronic and diachronic linguistics methods, viz.: 1) guided interview method, i.e. survey method – collecting material in the field directly from local speakers using a pre-prepared questionnaire; 2) the substitution method – for the linguistic analysis of forms adopted from language to language; 3) the etymological method – for the determination of the morphemic structure of lexemes; 4) the comparative method – for the linguistic identification of the material; 5) the structural method – for the determination of the position of a linguistic element within the linguistic plane of the language under study (Gostenčnik et al., 2022, 77).

Figure 1: Extract from the Map of Slovenian dialects (version 2023) – the area of the Čebranka and Kostel dialects and Ravna Gora (SLA 3.1, 2023, 11).

Legend:
dolenjska narečna skupina = Lower Carniolan dialect group
čebranško narečje = Čebranka dialect
kostelsko narečje = Kostel dialect
rovtarska narečna skupina = Rovte dialect group
priseljenski govori v Gorskem Kotarju = immigrant local dialects in Gorski Kotar

Figure 2: Extract from the Map of Slovenian dialects (version 2023); Legend (SLA 3.1, 2023, 11).

Kotar area, namely the newly established Slovenian dialect border, which now also extends into Croatia. In this process, exclusively genealogical criteria were used (with the comparative method and method of reconstruction).

Recently, however, some authors (Celinić, Menac-Mihelić, Malnar Jurišić, Marinković) have begun to use the so-called "combined" methodological approach to the geographical determination of language and, more specifically, dialectal borders, which places (more) emphasis on sociolinguistics (and also on the consideration of the national-state border), despite the fact that genealogical linguistic and sociolinguistics are two different branches of linguistics, each with its own theorems and criteria. The local dialects of the Gorski Kotar region have been studied several times, both with the methodologically appropriate, i.e. genealogical approach, and with the so-called "combined" methodological approach, which includes sociolinguistic criteria.

The Čebranka and the Kostel dialect in Gorski Kotar

According to genealogical criteria, the local dialects in the Gorski Kotar part of the region belong to the Lower Carniolan dialect group of the Slovenian language (and not to the Kajkavian dialect group of the Croatian language, as the dialects do not show any typical Kajkavian characteristics). This classification of the local dialects is based on a methodological approach that does not include criteria originally used in other branches of linguistics. Namely, the dialects on the Croatian side of the border are defined as part of the Slovenian linguistic diasystem on the basis of the common linguistic (sound) innovations that delimited Slovenian from the rest of the western South Slavic languages (10th-12th centuries) and the linguistic development until around the 14th century, when the main dialect macro-areas were already formed. All of the treated local dialects studied show defining characteristics of the southern Slovenian dialects or, within them, of the Lower Carniolan dialect macro-area. Within this, individual defining characteristics (older vowel, accent and consonant characteristics and younger linguistic phenomena) link them into two distinct units, that is to say the Čebranka and Kostel dialects (Gostenčnik, 2018; 2020).

In the field of dialectology, this has been supported or acknowledged by various linguists in the past, such as: "The dialects of Fužine, Skrad, Gerovo and Čabar in Gorski kotar show a clearcut southern Slovenian (Lower Carniolan-Inner Carniolan) basis" (Ivić, 1961, 21). " I think we won't make a mistake if we connect the state of Delnice with the state of Lower Carniolan, and in this way we will have to deal with the whole area from Delnice to Gerovo, Zamost and Prezid, including Babno Polje on the Slovenian side" (Lisac, 2006, 59; translated by Gostenčnik).[14] "The Goran dialect in Gorski Kotar is really Kajkavian only in its smaller eastern part (Lukovdol, Severin na Kupa), while the larger western part (Delnice, Fužine, Čabar, etc.) is actually genetically a Slovenian dialect (i.e. genetically and historically it belongs to the group of dialects that today we call "Slovenian"), which is clearly manifested in the accentuation" (Kapović, 2015, 45; translated by Gostenčnik).[15] Pronk (2010, 129), too, concludes that the Goran local dialects need not be considered mixed and that their native basis is evident if viewed in the context of nearby South Slavic dialects.

On the other hand, some other linguists, while acknowledging the obvious phonetic deviations of the above-mentioned local dialects from the main Kajkavian definitional features, resort to an inappropriate "combined" methodological approach, for example:

> *For this reason, it is not possible to determine which local dialect belong to Croatian and which to Slovenian solely on the basis of genetic-linguistic criteria. For such a determination it is necessary to introduce an additional criterion. Since the linguistic units into which local languages are divided are called national names, this criterion should be the nationality of the speakers.* (Celinić & Menac-Mihalić, 2017, 102; translated by Gostenčnik)[16]

> *How to interpret this phenomenon in the Croatian local dialects, the local dialects of the Croats in the west of Croatia, given the established pattern according to which the progressive shift of the old PSl. circumflex is characteristic of the Slovenian language? How is the absence of this phenomenon in the Slovenian local dialects, the local dialects of Slovenes in the east of Slovenia,*

14 "Mislim da nećemo pogriješiti povežemo li ipak delničko stanje s dolenjskim, a tako moramo postupati i s čitavim terenom od Delnica prema Gerovu, Zamostu i Prezidu uključujući i Babno Polje na slovenskoj strani" (Lisac, 2006, 59).

15 "Goranski je pak dijalekt u Gorskom kotaru stvarno kajkavski samo na svom manjem istočnom području (Lukovdol, Severin na Kupi), dok je veći zapadni dio (Delnice, Fužine, Čabar itd.) zapravo genetski gledano slovenski dijalekt (tj. genetski i povijesno pripada skupini dijalekata koju danas zovemo "slovenskima"), što se jasno očituje u akcentuaciji" (Kapović, 2015, 45).

16 "Zbog toga isključivim genetskolingvističkim kriterijima nije moguće odrediti koji govor pripada hrvatskom, a koji slovenskom jeziku. Za takvo je određenje nužno uvesti dodatni kriterij. Budući da se jezične jedinice u koje se mjesni govori svrstavaju nazivaju nacionalnim imenima, taj kriterij treba biti nacionalna pripadnost govornika" (Celinić & Menac-Mihalić, 2017, 102).

to be interpreted? (Celinić & Menac-Mihalić, 2017, 92; translated by Gostenčnik)[17]

The same is also true of Marija Malnar Jurišić in her review of the monograph Gostenčnik, 2018, who acknowledges that the languages of the area represent a linguistic continuum, but that "it is equally indisputable that the local dialects are spoken by Croats and Slovenians, and that they are spoken in Croatia as well as in Slovenia" (Malnar Jurišić, 2018, 164; translated by Gostenčnik).[18] It is further pointed out that the decision not to burden the monograph with data on the national affiliation of the dialect speakers is not appropriate, as at least those dialect speakers who do not identify themselves nationally should be defined differently than only speakers of the Slovenian language, and a neutral term should be used. For, as she goes on to say, the speakers from the Gorski Kotar area are speakers of local dialects which we classify as Croatian, that is to say, dialects spoken by Croats in the Republic of Croatia, and are thus undoubtedly part of the Kajkavian dialect group of the Croatian language:

In addition, as mentioned above, the author [Januška Gostenčnik, author's note] *notes in the introductory part that the research did not include sociolinguistic features, such as the nationality of the respondents. This statement in particular could be somewhat debatable. In the case of the exclusion of national affiliation, i.e. the identification of the speaker (which should not be neglected in this type of research), it is necessary to exclude the naming of linguistic features by national names. It seems logical that the local dialect of speakers who do not identify themselves nationally should be called a neutral term and not be included in the Slovenian language. Speakers of local dialects from the area of Gorski Kotar are speakers of local dialects that are included in the Croatian language, these are local dialects spoken by Croats in the Republic of Croatia, and as such are undoubtedly part of the Kajkavian dialect and the Croatian language. To call their local dialect Slovenian, i.e. to include it in a dialect defined as Slovenian, which directly implies the exclusion of Croatian (or Kajkavian), is not acceptable at all. When dealing with the newly established Čebranka dialect, it is necessary to take into account the fact that it is spoken by speakers of different nationalities, which raises the question of contact between two closely related languages, and thus the question of how to approach such a problem, in which the national name of the language of another, neighbouring nation is not imposed on the language of one nation. In fact, the set approach can cause (is already causing) unnecessary disputes and have (is already having) bad consequences for mutual relations. It is therefore necessary to revise the existing terminology for the dialectology of the 21st century, which will interpret the state of the organic local dialects in precisely defined and unambiguous terms, without national-linguistic overlaps, and which alone will allow the situation of the linguistic continuum – in which we are connected by numerous isoglosses and not, it seems, separated by a single one – to be used for the unencumbered development of dialectological research in the South Slavic West, as well as for the development of national dialectologies for the future.* (Malnar Jurišić, 2018, 165–166; translated by Gostenčnik)[19]

17 "Kako interpretirati tu pojavu u hrvatskim govorima, govorima Hrvata na zapadu Hrvatske, s obzirom na ustaljeni obrazac prema kojemu je progresivni pomak starih psl. cirkumfleksa karakteristika slovenskoga jezika? Kako interpretirati izostanak te pojave u slovenskim govorima, govorima Slovenaca na istoku Slovenije?" (Celinić & Menac-Mihalić, 2017, 92).

18 "[A]li je isto tako nesporno da njima govore i Hrvati i Slovenci i da se njima govori i u Hrvatskoj i u Sloveniji" (Malnar Jurišić, 2018, 164).

19 *Osim toga, u uvodnom dijelu, kao što je i spomenuto, autorica (Januška Gostenčnik, op. avtorice) napominje kako istraživanje nije uključivalo sociolingvističke značajke, kao npr. narodnost ispitanika. Upravo bi ta konstatacija mogla biti pomalo diskutabilna. Naime, u slučaju isključivanja nacionalne pripadnosti, tj. identifikacije govornika (a što u ovakvom tipu istraživanja ipak ne bi smjelo biti zanemarivo), potrebno je isključiti i imenovanje jezičnih značajka nacionalnim imenom. Čini se tako logičnim da je i govor govornika koji nisu nacionalno determinirani potrebno nazvati neutralnim terminom, a ne uvrstiti ga u slovenski jezik. Govornici govora s područja Gorskoga kotara govornici su mjesnih govora koje ubrajamo u hrvatski jezik, to su govori kojima govore Hrvati u Republici Hrvatskoj i kao takvi nesumnjivo su dijelom kajkavskog narječja i hrvatskog jezika. Nazivanje njihova govora slovenskim, tj. njegovo uvrštavanje u dijalekt koji se definira kao slovenski, a što direktno implicira isključivanje hrvatskog (ili kajkavskog), nije nikako prihvatljivo. U obradi novoutvrđenog čabranskog dijalekta svakako treba uzeti u obzir činjenicu da njime govore govornici različite nacionalne pripadnosti, što otvara problematiku dodira dvaju bliskosrodnih jezika, a samim time i pitanje pristupa takvoj problematici u kojoj se jeziku jednog naroda neće nametati nacionalno ime jezika drugog, susjednog naroda. Postavljeni pristup, naime, može izazvati (već izaziva) i nepotrebne prijepore i imati (već ima) loše posljedice na međusobne odnose. Potrebno je stoga revidirati postojeću terminologiju za dijalektologiju 21. stoljeća, koja će stanje organskih govora interpretirati točno definiranim i nedvosmislenim terminima, bez nacionalnojezičnih presezanja, a što jedino omogućuje da situaciju jezičnoga kontinuuma – u kojem smo povezani brojnim izoglosama, a ni jednom, čini se, razdvojeni – iskoristimo za neopterećen razvoj dijalektoloških istraživanja na južnoslavenskom zapadu, kao i za razvoj nacionalnih dijalektologija za budućnost.* (Malnar Jurišić, 2018, 165–166)

Marina Marinković, in her commentary on the same monograph, agrees when she mentions that sociolinguistic criteria have been neglected, i.e. the dialect speaker's self-perception of his or her language. "In the aforementioned Slovenian monograph (i.e. Gostenčnik, 2018, author's note), the classification of the analysed local dialects completely ignored sociolinguistic criteria, i.e. the attitude of the analysed speakers towards their language affiliation, which also leads to incomplete conclusions" (Marinković, 2018, 43; translated by Gostenčnik).[20] However, within dialectology itself, the focus cannot be on the so-called linguistic belonging or linguistic identity of the individual/dialect speaker, and the way in which a dialect speaker linguistically identifies himself/herself with a dialect cannot be decisive in determining geographical dialect borders.

Ravna Gora

The local dialect of Ravna Gora in the Gorski Kotar region of Croatia has been discussed several times before.[21] The first relevant treatment was written by the linguist Nikola Majnarić (1938–1939), who classified it as an immigrant Slovenian Rovte local dialect. Majnarić, as a native speaker of the local dialect of Ravna Gora, cites his own dialectal material, and for each characteristic he also provides information on which Rovte dialect linguistic parallels can be found, drawing information from Fran Ramovš's monograph *Dialekti* (1935), and concludes: "I would just like only that, to determine the place of the local dialects of Ravna Gora among the Slovenian dialects (which will not be so difficult with Ramovš's beautiful and carefully compiled book)" (Majnarić, 1938–1939, 135; translated by Gostenčnik).[22]

The most recent treatment is in Gostenčnik (2023),[23] where it is (again) shown that on the basis of its vocalic and consonantal characteristics a local dialect of Ravna Gora cannot be classified as part of a Kajkavian dialect group as it is lacking all typical Kajkavian defining characteristics. On the basis of the old and newly collected dialect material, Majnarić's classification is confirmed, namely the (immigrant) local dialect is interpreted as part of the Rovte dialect group of the Slovenian language. The local dialect is dialectally classified according to long vowel reflexes and younger accentual withdrawals, as well as some other defining characteristics which, as a cluster, define the Rovte dialects or at least a part of them.

Josip Lisac disagrees with Majnarić's classification, but his argument is sociolinguistic:

> *Nikola Majnarić (1938–1939, 145) showed that in one part of the town there were mainly settled Slovenes (among whom there were also Slovenised Germans)… Our eminent philologist both local dialects of Ravna Gora (as well as most of the Kajkavian Goran idioms) considers to be Slovenian, which is a scientific position worthy of all respect, but especially if one takes into account the national composition of the population and the use of the Croatian literary language in all activities, a different view of the problem is also possible, which does not allow a closer connection with the so-called central Kajkavian dialects, but justifies the inclusion of the local language of Ravna Gora among the Croatian-Serbian idioms*. (Lisac, 1989, 107; translated by Gostenčnik)[24]

And so on:

> *The Goran dialect is divided into two subdialects, a much smaller eastern one (the area around Lukovdol and Severin na Kupa) and a larger western one (the entire area from Zaumol and Plemenitaš to the west). Ravna Gora as a whole therefore belongs to the western sub-dialect, but it has a separate, special position within it, and this with regard to the characteristics of the majority of the local dialect of Ravna Gora, which deviates significantly from the average physiognomy of the sub-dialect, while the minority of the local dialects - as we have already mentioned - fits much better into*

20 "U spomenutoj slovenskoj monografiji (tj. Gostenčnik, 2018, op. avtorice) pri klasifikaciji analiziranih govora zanemareni su potpuno sociolingvistički kriteriji, odnosno stav ispitanih govornika o njihovoj jezičnoj pripadnosti, što također vodi do nepotpunih zaključaka" (Marinković, 2018, 43).

21 For a summary of all previous treatments, cf. Gostenčnik (2023, 43–51).

22 "Htio bih samo to, da odredim ravnogorskom narječju mjesto među slovenačkim narječjima (što uz lijepu i brižno sastavljenu Ramovšemu knjigu neće više biti ni tako teško" (Majnarić, 1938–1939, 135).

23 Two linguistic systems coexist in Ravna Gora, and this paper focuses on the local dialect of the western (or upper) part.

24 *Nikola Majnarić (1938–1939, 145) pokazao je da su u jednom dijelu mjesta bili u većini doseljeni Slovenci (među kojima je bilo i poslovenjenih Nijemaca) … Taj naš istaknuti filolog oba ravnogorska govora (kao i većinu kajkavskih goranskih idioma) drži slovenskima što je znanstveni stav vrijedan svakog poštovanja, ali ponajprije ako se uzme u obzir nacionalni sastav stanovništva i uporaba hrvatskoga književnog jezika u svem djelovanju – moguć je i drugačiji pogled na problem koji doduše ne omogućuje prisnije povezivanje s tzv. središnjim kajkavskim dijalektima, međutim ipak opravdava uvrštavanje i ravnogorskoga govora među hrvatskosrpske idiome*. (Lisac, 1989, 107)

the sub-dialect, but we will not deal with it in detail in these concluding considerations. The reasons for the isolation of the majority of the local dialect of Ravna Gora are quite clear and relate to the majority of the ethnic groups that speak this idiom. (Lisac, 1989, 108; translated by Gostenčnik)[25]

To sum up, Lisac's argument for why the mentioned local dialect does not belong to the Rovte dialect group of the Slovenian language is that the speakers of this local dialect are Croatian by nationality and that they use Croatian literary language in public life.

CONCLUSION

The determination of geographical language (dialectal) borders is one of the tasks of dialectology, and thus the task of the dialectologist. The knowledge of historical phonetics, the relative chronology of various phonetic phenomena, the use of comparative method and method of reconstruction, as well as a good synchronic knowledge of a given local dialect, is a prerequisite for the relevant placement of a given local dialect within a given dialect. Consequently, the phrase *Slovenian dialects* is also a dialectological term that should be interpreted in a genealogical sense. In the same context, the term *Slovenian language* should also be understood as a set of Slovenian dialects, which should be considered independently of the speaker's place of residence in a particular country, the speaker's nationality, the literary language he or she (primarily) uses, and the speaker's self-perception of his or her local dialect. Dialectology, like any other science, must have clearly defined concepts, clear boundaries between them, and consistent criteria.

25 *Goranski dijalekt dijelimo u dva poddijalekta, mnogo manji istočni (područje oko Lukovdola i Severina na Kupi) i veći zapadni (sav teren od Zaumola i Plemenitaša na zapad). Ravna Gora, dakle, u cjelini pripada zapadnom poddijalektu, ali ima u njem izdvojen, poseban položaj, i to s obzirom na osobine većinskoga ravnogorskoga govora koji znatno odstupa od prosječne fizionomije poddijalekta, dok se manjinski govor u poddijalekt uklapa – kako smo već napomenuli – osjetno bolje, međutim, njime se u ovim zaključnim razmatranjima nećemo opširnije baviti. Uzroci izdvojenosti većinskoga ravnogorskog govora posve su jasni i odnose se na većinu etnosa što tim idiomom govori.* (Lisac, 1989, 108)

K METODOLOGIJI DOLOČANJA ZEMLJEPISNIH JEZIKOVNIH MEJ: PRIMER RAZMEJEVANJA GOVOROV V GORSKEM KOTARJU

Januška GOSTENČNIK
ZRC SAZU, Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša, Novi trg 4, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta, Aškerčeva 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
Univerza v Novi Gorici, Fakulteta za humanistiko, Vipavska cesta 13, 5000 Nova Gorica, Slovenija
e-mail: januska.gostencnik@zrc-sazu.si

POVZETEK

V prispevku se opredeli dialektologija kot znanost znotraj geneolingvistike, ki predstavlja eno izmed treh (poleg tipolingvistike in sociolingvistike) vej jezikoslovja. Poudarjeno je, da se znotraj dialektologije ne more kombinirati teoremov in kriterijev iz posameznih različnih vej. Jasno se opredeli pomen pridevnika slovenski znotraj besedne zveze (termina) slovenska narečja (slovenski jezik), in sicer vse v kontekstu dialektologije kot jezikoslovne znanstvene discipline, ki mora biti razbremenjena nacionalnih ali sociolingvističnih opredelitev. Kritično se pretrese in ovrednoti dva različna metodološka pristopa, uporabljena pri določanju zemljepisno jezikovnih, natančneje narečnih mej, in sicer na primeru preučevanja slovenskih in hrvaških narečij v Gorskem Kotarju. Prvi metodološki pristop izhaja iz že vzpostavljene metodologije (s primerjalno metodo in metodo rekonstrukcije) znotraj dialektologije kot dela geneolingvistike. Pri nekaterih avtorjih (podani so konkretni primeri) se je namreč v zadnjem času vzpostavil še drugi, t. i. »kombinirani« metodološki pristop, ki združuje dialektološko metodo z metodologijo iz druge veje jezikoslovja, tj. sociolingvistike (tudi ob upoštevanju in sklicevanju na državno-nacionalne meje), ki je neustrezen. Dialektologija mora, kot vse druge znanosti, imeti jasno definirane pojme, postavljene jasne meje med njimi in vzpostavljene dosledne kriterije. V prispevku je tako dialektološko/geneolingvistično utemeljena tudi prenovljena Karta slovenskih narečij (različica 2023).

Ključne besede: slovenska narečja, geneolingvistika, dialektologija, primerjalno slovansko jezikoslovje, jezikovna meja, Slovenski lingvistični atlas

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brozović, Dalibor (1996): Sociolingvistika prema genetskoj i tipološkoj lingvistici. Suvremena lingvistika, 41–42, 87–94.

Brozović, Dalibor (2004): O dijalektologiji kao jezikoslovnoj disciplini. Suvremena lingvistika, 57–58, 1–12.

Celinić, Anita & Mira Menac-Mihalić (2017): Izoglosa progresivnoga pomaka starih praslavenskih cirkumfleksa na području hrvatskoga jezika. Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik, 21, 91–110.

Gostenčnik, Januška (2018): Krajevni govori ob Čabranki in zgornji Kolpi. Ljubljana, Založba ZRC.

Gostenčnik, Januška (2020): Kostelsko narečje. Slavistična revija, 68, 3, 353–372.

Gostenčnik, Januška (2023): Narečna klasifikacija govora Ravne Gore v Gorskem kotarju. Slovenski jezik – Slovene linguistic studies, 15, 41–73.

Gostenčnik, Januška, Kenda-Jež, Karmen & Mojca Kumin Horvat (2022): Ogrožena narečja v slovenskem jezikovnem prostoru. Jezikoslovni zapiski: zbornik Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša, 10, 2, 103–119.

Ivić, Pavle (1960–1961): Osnovni aspekti strukturalne dijalekatske diferencijacije. Makedonski jazik, 1–2, 81–104.

Ivić, Pavle (1961): Prilozi poznavanju dijalektske slike zapadne Hrvatske. Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu, Knjiga VI., 191–212.

Kapović, Mate (2015): Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije: Fonetika. Zagreb, Matica Hrvatska.

Lisac, Josip (1989): Problem obrađenosti leksika goranskih govora. Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik, 8, 61–68.

Lisac, Josip (2006): Tragom zavičaja: delnički govor i govor Gornjih Turni u svjetlosti goranskih kajkavskih govora. Split, Književni krug.

Logar, Tine (1981): Izhodiščni splošnoslovenski fonološki sistem. Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih općeslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom. Sarajevo, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, 29–33.

Logar, Tine & Jakob Rigler (1983): Karta slovenskih narečij. Ljubljana, Univerzum.

Lončarić, Mijo (1996): Kajkavsko narječje. Zagreb, Školska knjiga.

Majnarić, Nikola (1938–1939): Jedno rovtarsko narječje u Gorskom Kotaru. Južnoslovenski filolog, 3, 135–149.

Malnar Jurišić, Marija (2018): Prikazi i ocjene: Govori na granici. Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik, 22, 161–166.

Marinković, Marina (2018): Kajkavski govori istočnoga Gorskoga kotara. Zagreb – Delnice, Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada – Matica hrvatska, Ogranak.

Pronk, Tijmen (2010): Rani razvoj goranskih govora. Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 36, 1, 97–133.

Ramovš, Fran (1935): Historična gramatika slovenskega jezika, 7, Dialekti. Ljubljana, Učiteljska tiskarna.

Rigler, Jakob (2001): Zbrani spisi. Ljubljana, Založba ZRC.

SLA 1.2 (2011) – Škofic, Jožica, Gostenčnik, Januška, Horvat, Mojca, Jakop, Tjaša, Kenda-Jež, Karmen, Kostelec, Petra, Nartnik, Vladimir, Petek, Urška, Smole, Vera, Šekli, Matej & Danila Zuljan Kumar (2011): Slovenski lingvistični atlas 1: človek (telo, bolezni, družina) 2: komentarji. Ljubljana, Založba ZRC.

SLA 2.2 (2016) – Škofic, Jožica, Gostenčnik, Januška, Hazler, Vito, Horvat, Mojca, Jakop, Tjaša, Ježovnik, Janoš, Kenda-Jež, Karmen, Nartnik, Vlado, Smole, Vera, Šekli, Matej & Danila Zuljan Kumar (2016): Slovenski lingvistični atlas 2: kmetija, 2: komentarji. Ljubljana, Založba ZRC.

SLA 3.1 (2023) – Škofic, Jožica, Gostenčnik, Januška, Hazler, Vito, Jakop, Tjaša, Kenda-Jež, Karmen, Kumin Horvat, Mojca, Ježovnik, Janoš, Nartnik, Vlado, Pahor, Nina, Smole, Vera, Šekli, Matej & Danila Zuljan Kumar (2023): Slovenski lingvistični atlas 3: kmetovanje, 1: atlas. Ljubljana, Založba ZRC.

Šekli, Matej (2013): Zemljepisnojezikoslovna členitev kajkavščine ter slovensko-kajkavska jezikovna meja. Slovenski jezik – Slovene linguistic studies, 9, 3–53.

Šekli, Matej (2018): Tipologija lingvogenez slovanskih jezikov. Ljubljana, Založba ZRC.

Šekli, Matej (2023): On the Genealogical Linguistic Classification of Slavic Languages and their Dialect Macro-areas. Dialectologia, revista electrònica, 11, 5–49.

Toporišič, Jože (1992): Enciklopedija slovenskega jezika. Ljubljana, Cankarjeva založba.