

Vilmos Voigt

Folklore, Dialectology, and Geolinguistics

In the past hundred years folklore and dialectology have continuously been closely knit. The publication of dialects, language and ethnographic atlases, phonographs, studies of folklore types and motives (in keeping with the "Finnish" school) and lately geolinguistics are all part of this orientation.

Folkloristika in dialektologija se v zadnjih sto letih neprestano prepletata. Objavljanje narečij, jezikovni in etnografski atlasi, fonografi, študije folklornih tipov in motivov (v skladu s »finsko« šolo) in v zadnjem času »geolingvistika« spadajo k tej usmeritvi.

All people walk, but Chinese people walk differently from Americans. All people use facial expressions and hand gestures, but those of Italians are different from those of the English (Sidney M. Lamb)

1. Folklore research and scholarly investigation of dialects are lovechildren of 19th century. The very term folklore was coined one-and-half century ago, when in 1846 an English antiquary William John Thoms, using the name Ambrose Merton, wrote a letter to The Atheneum in which he proposed that a "good Saxon compound, Folk-lore", be employed in place of such labels as Popular Antiquities and Popular Literature. His paper appeared only ten days later, and was published on August 22, 1846, no. 982, pp. 862-3 of the aforementioned journal.

In his article, often quoted and not so often seen, he enumerates the major components of folklore as "manners, customs, observances, superstitions, ballads, proverbs, etc. of the olden time", equating thus folklore with "the Lore of the people". According to Thoms' opinion, variants of the same folklore item occur everywhere ("How many such facts would one word from you evoke, from the north and from the south - from John o'Groat's to the Land's End!"), and on an international, comparative scale. ("The connection between the folklore of England ... and that of Germany is so intimate that such communications will probably serve to enrich some future edition of Grimm's My-

thology.") Thoms was aware of the importance of folklore investigations too. In the omitted part of the just quoted sentence, in parenthesis in the original, he boldly stresses his service in coining the term: "(remember I claim the honor of introducing the epithet Folklore, as Disraeli does of introducing Fatherland, into the literature of this country)".¹

Folklore has three significant features: a/ the same phenomena appear in all parts of English tradition; b/ it is international, has parallels from abroad; c/ it is inevitably important for one's own culture, as the home (Fatherland) is. Folklore is thus a special case of variants (labelled as dialects in linguistics), and is a universal phenomenon (as language is from the point of view of Geolinguistics). Since 1846 all good folklorists shared the same opinion, being thus also good dialectologists and geolinguists.

That statement is more than a bon mot. Throughout the 19th century at least half of the published folklore texts were recorded, transcribed, edited and analyzed by linguists, more precisely by experts of the dialects. Important folktale, folk song books were published not in literary language. The same idea was gained by several scholars, and it was soon accepted internationally as basic truth in studying folk traditions, including its verbal forms.

2. If we want to refer only one excellent example, the life work of the founder of Kazan school of modern dialectology, phonology and psycholinguistics, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1845–1929) would serve as a good case. His first field work (from 1872 on) among the South Slavic peoples resulted e.g. in publication of Resia valley Slovene texts (from Friul), with unprecedented accuracy. (See his: *Materialien zur südslawischen Dialektologie und Ethnographie*. I. Rosianische Texte, gesammelt in den Jahren 1872, 1873 und 1877. Sanktpetersburg 1895. 2. Sprachproben in den Mundarten der Slaven von Torre im Nordöstlichen Italien. Sanktpetersburg 1904.) His papers on Polish, South Slavic, Lithuanian and other folklore genres, including his publications of erotic folklore in the series "Kryptadia. Recueil de documents pour servir à l'étude des traditions populaires" are masterpieces of linguistic-philological commentaries to folklore texts. He was one of the editors of A. Juskiewicz's (Antanas Juska's) seven volumes large Lithuanian folk song material, improving continuously the principles of publication. (See for e.g., his "perfect" edition: *Litauische Volksweisen, gesammelt von A. Juskiewicz... endgültig bearbeitet, redigiert und herausgegeben von S. Noskowski und J. Baudouin de Courtenay*. I. Teil, Krakau 1890). In his theoretical studies he tried to draw a worldwide picture of languages and cultures. See for e.g., his inauguration speech for Dorpat university: *Übersicht der slavischen Sprachenwelt im Zusammenhange mit den andern arioeuropäischen (indogermanischen) Sprachen*, Leipzig 1884, or in a more general way in his summarizing essay: *Vermenschlichung der Sprache*. Hamburg 1893. Fieldwork, publication and general statements form here a unified method, valid for both linguistics and folklore research.

3. Institutionalized research in both domains show the same parallelism. If we want to exemplify the contacts just by one case, the works on dialectological atlas versus ethnographic atlas would serve best the task. It is a well known fact that the German philologist, Johann A. Schmeller had by 1821 already suggested a cartographic presentation of dialects in Bavaria. The major work, a model for many similar European projects, Georg Wenker's *Deutscher Sprachatlas* (shaping from 1876 on) tried to give a synchronic pic-

¹ I have to include the primary references into the text of my paper. In my notes I give only a very few secondary references, from which the interested reader could find further traces for studying the problem. The best available reprint of Thoms' article, with comments: Dundes, Alan : *The Study of Folklore*. Englewood Cliffs, 1965. PP.4-6.

ture of German dialects, using questionnaires (made by linguists and sent to free-willing intellectuals to answer the questions). The famous French *Atlas linguistique de la France* (1900) has used only some questions and maps of folklore importance. But the Swiss continuation of it (from 1919 on) tried already to include into the atlas of dialects in Switzerland important questions concerning material culture of the people. The German "ethnographic atlas" was very active from 1920 on, directed by eminent philologists and ethnographers, as John Meier and Adolf Spamer. They have asked 243 sets of questions, sent to 23 000 schools or individuals, and arrived to publish 120 maps between 1937 and 1940. (*Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde. I-VI. Lieferungen, herausgegeben von H. Harmjan - E. Röhr, Leipzig 1937-1939.*) The German "ethnographic atlas" has an adventurous and very political biography. Banned and misused by the Nazis, destroyed and saved during air raids over Berlin, finally the archive material was recovered in Bonn, where the linguist Matthias Zender was able to prepare new questionnaires (including more folklore topics, previously neglected by the directors of the project) and the "new series" with 12 maps was started (*Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde. Neue Folge, herausgegeben von Matthias Zender. 1. Lieferung. Marburg 1958*). Zender was able to publish also the "explanations" to the maps, an absolutely necessary, but often neglected part of the ethnographic atlas. (See: *Erläuterungen. Bd. 1. Marburg, 1959-1964.*) Without a scholarly analysis of the maps folklore, folk life or dialectology are nothing but preparatory publications. There are ingeniously various (false or semi-false) excuses, why some ethnographic atlas leaders were unable to summarize their material.

From the results of German folk life atlas, a more ambitious plan, i.e., to construct a European folk culture atlas arose. After dozens of meetings and with many sponsors, finally Matthias Zender was able to publish the first issue of the *Ethnologischer Atlas Europas und seine Nachbarländer* (Bonn 1980) which describes the calendar customs with bonfires in Europe. (As far as I can see, the theoretical background and perspectives behind the German European folk culture atlases were not very often studied. "Committees" and other groups of persons involved came regularly together for discussing "actual" problems, and they have cleared up several practical issues. Theory and method behind the project remained, however, unmentioned, or was substituted with some discussion on minor topics.² (It would be a very important task for an out-of-the-group observer to describe the folklore (or even the ethnographic) values of the various "European" folk culture atlases.

The first maps of the German atlas were about folk beliefs and customs. / E.g. Lucky or unlucky days within the week – Secular calendar customs (saint's day or kirmess, "Schützenfest", carnival etc.) – the name of the dark, figural spots in Moon; persons or other beings, who bring the newborn child to the birth, etc.– fires at several calendar customs, Easter egg lore, "Mother's day", birthday and "name's day", Advent's wreath, the figure who brings the Christmas presents, various denominations of the Christmas tree – St. Martin's day, marches with lamps or lights, noise-making instruments at calendar customs, Epiphany, food at Christmas, St. Nicholas (Santa Claus), harvest festivals etc. / It is easy to say that some of those are typical German, others continental, others European, others Christian (etc.) phenomena by their distribution. The order, in which in the publication they follow, is only in general a logical one. In practice the whole German atlas offers a haphazard selection and "system" of the otherwise very important data.

² For theoretical implications see, for e.g., Wiegmann, Günter: *Theoretische Konzepte der Europäischen Ethnologie. Diskussionen um Regeln und Modelle.* Münster, 1991. especially p. 207 sqq.

Without a very thorough evaluation of several folk culture atlases in Europe, the way and the degree, in which folklore of different peoples of the continent was represented, is again very different, sometimes even anecdotal. In the Swiss Atlas der schweizerischen Volkskunde (published by Paul Geiger and Richard Weiss from 1951 on) greetings, breakfast, food and drink at workdays and holidays occur, then calendar customs (Epiphany, Carnival, Palm Sunday, Easter, Whitsunday etc.) follow. The Austrian Österreichischer Volkskundeatlas (questionary was published by Ernst Burgstaller (1952), the maps and commentars by Ernst Burgstaller and Adolf Helbok from 1959 on) originally had 16 chapters of folk culture (e.g., the structure of the folk and its changes – the folk and its communities – “Begabungsverhältnisse im Volke” i.e., talented persons, “genii” from Austria, born between 1650 and 1850, according to the geographical map of their birthplaces – food – tools and work of the peasants – traffic and exchange – folk language and dialects – customary law folk beliefs – customs and feasts – folksong, folk theater, folk music and folk dance – legends – costumes – folk art – games and sports). The publication was effectuated in separate prints of maps and commentaries. E.g., as a part of the first series (1. Lieferung) to map 1., but referring to chapter VIII a summary of Austrian (German) dialects was published (1959: Eberhard Kranzmayer: Die deutschen Mundarten in Österreich), not very much differing from another publication of the second series (2. Lieferung, 1965, to map 16): Einzelne Dialekträume in Österreich, again by the leading linguist of Bavarian dialects, Eberhard Kranzmayer. He refers to the data of the Austrian linguistic atlas, and as for his method is regarded, to the famous Atlas linguistique français by Gilliéron and to the Italian (and Swiss Italian) handbook by K. Jaberg and J. Jud (Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz, Lieferungen I-VIII, Halle 1928-1943). Both the French and the Italian atlases focus on dialects and material culture, but in some cases they give information concerning sociolects as e.g., on the town (or better to say, “capital town”) dialects’ influence (from and around Rome or Paris) upon local peasant areas.

It will expand the limits of my paper, if I shall try to characterize the achievements of all the hitherto published European folk culture atlases. But I have to say that folklore material appears there in a vague kaleidoscopic manner. Sigurd Erixon from Stockholm was the leading personality in shaping new “European ethnology”. He was also the mastermind behind the Swedish atlas. After decades of careful preparations the first part was published in 1957. But the second part, with folklore problems, appeared many years later. (see: Atlas över svensk folkkultur. - Atlas of Swedish Folk Culture. II:1-2. Säger, tro och högtidssed - Popular Beliefs, Legends, and Calendar Customs. Redaktörer (Editors) / Åke Campbell – Åsa Nyman. Uppsala 1976.) Important and curious features occur on the 29 folklore maps: what the folk is saying concerning Giant’s Stone-Casts; How the Site of the First (New) Church was Indicated; The Wild Hunt (“Odens jakt”); Human Midwife at Fairy Birth; Waterspirits in the Shape of Men; The Werewolf; Stealing Milk by Witchcraft; The Murdered Child as Ghost; Bonfires (as Spring Custom); Birching (Easter or Christmas Custom); The Crane Comes with the Light. Sayings and Time Instructions concerning the Lighting of Houses in Spring; Traditions connected with Lucia, December 13th, etc., are very carefully represented.

For comparative research it is very important that also Swedish folk traditions from Finland (and from Estonia) be duly registered. (Unfortunately, among Swedish-American immigrants the questionnaire was never executed. In 1960 over a million persons of Swedish-American background were registered in the United States. Their social and cultural traditions were, of course, very different. The famous modern poet, Carl Sandburg was a second generation Swedish American. Greta Lovisa Gustafson Garbo is also

well known. But very few experts know that the famous movie actor playing the Chinese master detective, Charlie Chan was in fact a Swedish immigrant, Johan Verner Ölund (= Warner Oland in Americanized form). Folk culture of course nobody ever tried to ask them for a Swedish atlas. Traditions behind individuals in our world are not by theory, but by facts world-wide, a good scope for geo- (or global) linguistics.

The closest parallel to the Swedish folk culture atlas is the Finnish one. The Swedish atlas dates back to the thirties, and it was not fully bi-lingual (Swedish-English). The history of the Finnish folk culture atlas is very informative in understanding the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of such a project. Finland got her freedom from the collapsed Tzarist empire in 1917, by the initiative of V.I. Lenin. The first time in her history the independent state issued in 1923 its Geographic Society (more precisely its Archaeological Committee) to produce "cartograms" for a new edition of Map of Finland. Suomen kartasto (Atlas of Finland) was published in 1925-1928 with 6 distribution maps of folk culture items - (boats, cheese and sour milk, houses, bread and pancakes etc.) In 1924 the research unit Sanakirjasäätiö ("Dictionary Foundation") was created with the main task to produce a complete archive of Finnish dialects. Linguists, as Lauri Hakulinen and Lauri Kettunen have published reports on the German-type linguistic geography, or a preliminary atlas of Finnish dialects. In 1935 Professor Albert Hämäläinen published a project for establishing a research institute of Finnish ethnography, the main task of which was to collect material for an atlas of Finnish folk culture. Kustaa Vilkuna, later the leading personality in Finnish ethnography, has studied German and Swedish works on ethnographic atlases, and under his guidance from 1937 onwards the actual preparations for a Finnish folk culture atlas were started. Vilkuna and the Swedish ethnographer Sigurd Erixon tried to connect the plans of atlases in Nordic countries, and have even asked for cooperation from their colleagues from the Baltic countries. During and after World War II the project slowed down. (But the first sketch of Finland-Swedish folk culture atlas was published soon. See: Ragna Ahlbäck: Kulturgeografiska kartor över Svenskfinland. Helsingfors 1945.) This book has 64 maps, and stays in a close coordination with the Swedish ethnographic atlas, which, in fact, was published in printed form only many years later. The actual preparation for publishing the Finnish atlas data was supported from 1962 on. According to the plans of the participants, four jointly edited atlas publications would be achieved: 1. ethnographic, 2. folkloristic, 3. dialectological atlases, and 4. place names of Finland. It was a special problem to collect and to check the names of Finnish settlements beyond the borders of the actual state of Finland, (i.e., in then Soviet-Karelia, in Sweden, North Norway, etc.) The maps in the Finnish folk culture atlas include data from all the above mentioned regions too, but, alas, do not refer to Finnish-American folk traditions. After many years of careful preparations, the first volume (Suomen kansankulttuurin kartasto - Atlas der finnischen Volkskultur - Atlas of Finnish Folk Culture. 1. Aineellinen kulttuuri - Materielle Kultur - Material Culture toimittanut /herausgegeben von/ edited by Toivo Vuorela. Helsinki, 1976) was published and it had 84 maps. The second volume, with about 100 maps is devoted to folklore. Maps and commentaries appear together, practically on the same pages. It is interesting to notice that the languages of the commentaries are Finnish, German and English (but not Swedish).

Not only for Slovaks and Hungarians, but for all European ethnographers the recently published Slovak folk culture atlas is of outmost importance. Fieldwork trips were started from 1971 on and from 1980 the actual editorial work was carried on with great care. The one-volume atlas (Etnografický Atlas Slovenska Bratislava 1990) directed by Božena Filová, edited in fact by Sona Kovacevicová, gives information in three languages, Slo-

vak, Russian and German. It is very complex work, which gives information of geographic, historical, religious and other topics. It contains 250 settlements, from all over in Slovakia (189 Slovakian, 37 Hungarian, 17 Karpatho-Ruthenian, 4 Goral and 3 previously German villages), but Slovaks from abroad (e.g., from Hungary), are not represented on the maps. More than 500 smaller or more detailed maps give references to various aspects of folk culture, including agriculture, animal husbandry, handwork, traffic, transport, food and drink, dresses, clothing, village communities, family systems, etc. Folklore, in the proper sense of the term, appear on about 150 maps, e.g., family customs and traditions, calendar customs, world view, folk legends and folk songs, folk art, folk theatre, dances, musical instruments and ensembles. The editors tried to give historical references too: the reader learns where the synagogues were in the villages, from which parts of Slovakia the 19th century folk song collections have published variants, from where "folk song and dance groups" are known.

(The drive to be complete gives unusual references too. E.g., as the oldest known "Slovak folk dance ensemble" is registered a group of dancers from county Orava, in fact in 1615 the Palatine of Hungary, Thurzó sent a small group of his servants to the university town Wittenberg, where his son was studying.)⁵ As far as I can see the Slovak ethnographic atlas does not give direct references to dialectology, but still it is one of the most detailed treasuries of European folk cultures. (The editors asked for reading their manuscripts Czech, Hungarian, Polish and Soviet ethnographers too, in order to obtain the necessary first comments on their work.) The next atlas, to be mentioned, is the Hungarian "Ethnographic atlas". We have various reports on it,⁶ thus it is very easy to tell its story. Following Swedish (etc.) suggestions, Béla Gunda made a proposal for it in 1939, and the first field work started in 1941. The war broke the gigantic plans – (700 villages had been selected as locations for the atlas) – and only from 1955 the work was continued. It got a unsurpassed high financial support from the Hungarian state (academy). 240 villages in Hungary were finally selected for the maps, and more places were added from the Hungarian villages in the neighbouring countries. Unfortunately, neither minorities in Hungary, nor Hungarians in America have been included. After many years of preparation, from 1987 on, the maps were published (*Magyar néprajzi atlasz - Atlas der ungarischen Volkskultur - Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture, szerkesztette (Edited by) Barabás, Jenő*). According to the plans three times three sets of maps will appear, presenting about 600 maps. (In the questionnaires 400 sets of problems were asked.) Unfortunately, the maps appear without commentaries, thus with the evaluation of the important work we have to wait for more years.

It will be an endless report to describe all the local, national, thematic or international ethnographic atlas works. If we want to summarize the results of that century-old investigation, the following remarks should be stressed.

1. Folk culture atlases were modeled from dialect atlases, and the two projects have much in common, both in fieldwork, data gathering or editing the material.

2. Usually folk culture atlases give detailed distribution maps concerning tools or customs, with carefully identified terms.

⁵ In the research history of Hungarian dances it is a well known fact, described in details by Réthei Prikkel, Marián: *A magyarság táncai*. Budapest, 1924. 132-133, that the story of the 1615 Wittenberg folk dance group stems from a literary work (based upon historical data?). See Mednyánszky, Alois: *Erzählungen, Sagen und Legenden aus Ungarns Vorzeit*. Pest, 1829. pp. 304-309, in a short story, named "Der Rector Magnificus".

⁶ Research history with further suggestions: Barabás, Jenő: *Kartográfiai módszer a néprajzban*. Budapest, 1963. It is not much joyful to compare that wishful thinking with the actual publication of the Hungarian Ethnographic Atlas.

3. Some folk culture atlases describe the migrations or historical data, which might elucidate strange or complicate distribution of several features in dialects.

4. As good as the folk culture atlases are for terms and forms, they give little for morphology or syntax of folk speech. Often linguists and ethnographers worked together in collecting and publishing their atlases, still diversity and not coordination is dominant between them.

5. As for folklore items, the atlases concentrate on such, which are easily to put on a map – (folk customs, supernatural beings, folk dresses, musical instruments and types of dances etc.) Important topics, which clearly show geographic distribution, as for e.g., folk tale types or folk ballad types, etc., which are usually left out of the ethnographic atlases.

4. My assumption: dialectological and ethnographic atlases in Europe are more or less the same, can easily be verified by contrast, if we are familiar with the very important trend in anthropology, called "cross-cultural studies". As early as 1889 Edvard B. Tylor (world famous author of *Primitive Culture*) assembled detailed data on social organization for some 350 ethnic units. In 1930 Hobhouse, Wheeler and Ginsberg classified some six hundred societies around the world according to method of obtaining food, and arranged them in the following sequence: lower hunters, higher hunters, agriculture I, pastoral I, agriculture II, pastoral II, agriculture III. Their study stopped at the descriptive level. Some years later (1937), a student of A.G. Keller in the sociology department at Yale, George P. Murdock had made a printed announcement of his new cross-cultural files and published his first correlation studies. His famous world-wide monograph, *Social structure* (1949 appeared) based on 250 societies. It was severely criticized by reviewers in anthropology, whose orientation was largely antievolutionary and antistatistical, but it was hailed as a major advance by other behavioral scientists and later took its place as a milestone of progress within comparative anthropology.⁵

The Yale Cross-Cultural Files were converted into the multi-university Human Relations Area Files (HRAF) in 1949. Moore (1961) and Ford (1967) published anthologies of works important for cross-cultural methodology. Murdock, in his "World Ethnographic Sample" (*American Anthropologist* 59/1957/: 664-87, gave a world-wide picture of 565 ethnic units and 210 cultural traits grouped into 30 sets of variables. Robert M. Marsh (*Comparative Sociology*, New York 1967) combined 467 societies from Murdock's 1957 sample and 114 contemporary national societies not included by Murdock. Murdock himself began publishing additional data coded on a still larger number of ethnic units in his journal *Ethnology* in 1962, and in 1967 assembled them in a book entitled *Ethnographic Atlas* (Pittsburgh 1967). The total number of societies was 863, but some of these were so close to others in geographical, linguistic, or cultural space that they were combined into 412 "clusters," some with multiple members and others with only a single member. In a later paper Murdock combined the 412 clusters of this study into 200 "provinces". (There are other important achievements both in collecting, sampling, and analyzing HRAF data, but for our points the aforesaid facts are the basic ones.) The cross-cultural methodology is not of dialectological character. Instead of a most careful "local" fixation of the facts, its aim is to give a "yes-or-no" bit for further comparative (and computational) treatment. It is close to global linguistics, and Murdock's "Ethnographic Atlas" is very far from European ethnographic (and linguistic) atlases.

⁵ The best short evaluation of the trend: Driver, Harold E.: *Cross-Cultural Studies*. In: Honigmann, John J. ed.: *Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. Chicago, 1973. pp. 327-367.

As far as folklore is concerned, there were several attempts to use HRAF files. One of the first, most interesting, and most frequently criticized world-wide summaries was by Alan Lomax and his team (*Folk Song Style and Culture* Washington 1968). The book in fact contains more than its title suggests. Using the "cantometrics experiment" methodology, it deals with folk song style, dance style and problems of correlations between song/dance and societies.

Other specialists have evaluated the correlations between HRAF culture typology and writing systems, art forms, games, religion, etc. The first summaries were made in the sixties, thus, I think, second generation summaries were very instructive again. And, I think also, it will give new impetus of geolinguistics, even as the cross-cultural methodology should be that we would need more precise world-wide distribution data concerning various folklore genres, forms, instruments, etc., E.g., we do not know, how many cultures use special types of musical instruments (drums, string instruments, chimes or gongs or bells casted from metals, etc.), perform laments, bride's laments, tell riddles and proverbs, play shadow or puppet theatre; make rock carvings or rock paintings etc. A world-wide "Folklore Atlas" would indeed be of great importance.

5. Questionairs and answers – a network of "correspondants" who return to the scholars the sent-out leaflets with important information – is a more than century old institution in European folklore research. Beside some preliminary works, (as e.g. the "Wiener Circularbrief by the Grimm brothers asking for texts of folktales and of other folk poetry samples (1815/, etc.,) in was the German philologist, Wilhelm Mannhardt, who in 1865 published his questionnaire. It was in two languages, German (Bitte) and French (Demande) concerning harvest and harvest customs. The two texts are not identical: the German version contains 25 sets of questions, while the French version groups the same problems into 34 sets of questions. Mannhardt printed 15.000 copies, and gave his home address (Danzig, Heumarkt 5) for the replies. Surprisingly positive was the answer, and we know of 2128 questionnaires with more or less detailed answers returned to him. The material was used in his magnificent *Wald- und Feldkulte* (1-2. Berlin, 1875-77), and was later summarized in an exemplary monograph by Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann (*Erntebrauch in der ländlichen Arbeitswelt des 19. Jahrhunderts Deutschland von 1865*, Marburg 1965). It is obvious that Mannhardt had asked for parallels to German customs known to him, thus the questionnaires which have been returned to him usually deal with German data from other countries too. Still in very many other countries the answers have described the harvest customs of various European peoples. (We know among others of 105 answers from East Prussia, 60 from Mecklenburg, 182 from Slesia, 159 from Hessen, 110 from Bavaria, 216 from Austro-Hungary, 5 from Poland, 10 from the Baltic Countries, 10 from Finland, 60 from Scandinavia, 44 from Switzerland, 7 from Italy, 100 from France (Alsace-Lorraine included).

In European ethnography and folklore the network of correspondants and questionnaires flourishes until today. In countries like Finland, Baltic States, Scandinavia, Ireland, Scotland, some parts of Germany and Austria this institution in very active even today. In other countries it is more or less absent, or only from time to time research centres ask for a set of questions. As far as I know, the sociolinguistic analysis of the answers or the correspondants was not taken seriously. I would say, it will be the task for future researchers. The informants usually send back not only the filled-in questionnaires, but also other information they feel of importance. Very often it is material of autobiographic character, and full with further folklore and ethnographic data. It is a gold mine for any coming folklore research.

At this point we have to refer to gigantic American works, based on the same principle. To mention only the two most important ones. The Frank C. Brown Collection of North Carolina Folklore in seven volumes (General Editor Newman Ivey White, Durham, Duke University Press) should first be mentioned. The volumes concerning games and rhymes, folk ballads, folk songs, music of the ballads and of the songs are important as very fine collections. The best volumes of the collection are volumes VI and VII, Popular Beliefs and Superstitions (edited by Wayland D. Hand, 1961-1964). They contain 8569 folk belief texts, classified by the then most elaborate system, cross-references and the index are of the size of a small monograph. It is a vademecum inevitable for any publication of folk belief traditions. The texts are in English, and the publication does not distinguish the different ethnic background of the informants. Giving a thorough reference to them, it would be very easy to make a "Folk belief atlas" of North Carolina.

The other publication is unequalled in every respect. Popular Beliefs and Superstitions. A compendium of American Folklore. From the Ohio Collection of Newbell Niles Puckett, edited by Wayland D. Hand - Anna Casetta and Sandra B. Thiederman (Volume 1-2, and Indexes as volume 3 Boston 1981) is a collection of 36209 folk belief texts. The indices are printed on pages 1553 to 1825, in a separate volume. Because the Ohio collection was multiethnic, there is an "ethnic finding list", which lists the ethnic groups involved, from Acadian French, African, Albanian, American Indian, Amish, Armenian... English... Hawaiian, Hollander, Honduran, Hungarian ...Ukrainian, Welsh, West Indian and Yugoslavian. All the texts were registered in English, still it is important interethnic material, which could be arranged also by maps, or other comparative methods. Because of the careful references to the original information, the checking of languages is possible.

6. Last but not least the instrumental registration of folklore forms are also of great importance in regard to dialectography and dialectology. First the phonographs, then various registration methods for producing musical records, later tape recorders, nowadays video and other recording has saved billions and billions of folklore items. It is a well-known story in Hungarian research history, that the Hungarian folklorist, Béla Vikár was the first, who used the phonograph in registering folk songs. On 10th september 1900, in Paris, at the international folklore congress (Congrès des traditions populaires), Azoulay presented the new instrument, the phonograph, telling to the participants that with the help of the Anthropological Society in Paris they had studied French dialects by using the phonograph, and that they were establishing a card index of the records. During the World Exposition in Paris, Azoulay used the same instrument in registering folk songs from the free-willing visitors to the expo. And for the participants of the folklore congress he played some of them: Chinese, Indian, Arabic, Greek, Serbian, Russian, Polish and other songs. Because of Hungarians present in the room, Azoulay played a "Hungarian folk song record" too. But it was the famous Hungarian poet's, Petöfi's work, sung to the tunes of the Polish anthem!/. The chairman of the session, Beauquier noticed the musical style, explaining it by the fact, that Hungarians, being an island in Slavic ocean, received very much in their music from their neighbours. (It is not the important point in the story, that when the Hungarian participants told him about the mistake, it became clear that a waiter in a pub fooled the French recorder.) The more important fact is that just after Azoulay's musical program, Paul Sébillot, the best French folklorist in his time and secretary-general of the folklore congress in Paris read the paper by Béla Vikár *Recueil phonographique des chants populaires de la Hongrie*, in which he was telling about his phonograph recording (from 1896 on), reaching by then about 2000 items. A selection of those was already in the archive of the Hungarian Na-

tional Museum. Moreover, in the Hungarian Pavillon at the Paris world exhibition there was presented a map, showing 300 wax cylinder records, giving a full distribution of two traditional Hungarian folk ballads. According to Vikár, musical dialects and dialects in the proper sense of the term are very closely related in Hungary. In his paper there were references to Ignác Kúnos, who has collected Turkish folk songs by phonograph, and to the linguist, József Balassa, who used the phonograph in recording Hungarian dialect texts. Gyula Sebestyén, himself present at the Paris meeting, (and who wrote the report on it) mentioned the fact too that for his collection of midwinter quiete-songs (*regös-ének*) he was also using phonographs.⁶

It is an open question, who was the very first in registering folk speech or folklore by phonograph. Edison's first phonograph was worked out as early as 1877. According to some references, the American Benjamin Ives Gilman used it for registering Chinese and Indian music from 1892 on. But it is beyond any doubt that during the last decade of 19th century the instrument was used in Hungary, for very special problems in folklore and linguistics.

In fact, at the same time the new invention appealed several scholars. Friedrich Exner, Sigmund Exner and Lange have initiated in Vienna in 1899 the "Phonogramm-Archiv-Kommission der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien". Milan Resetar used the instrument for describing the eastern border of Croatian dialects in Slavonia. Kretschmer has studied the local vernacular in the Greek islands Lesbos and Mytiline, in 1901 Richard von Wettstein used the same instrument in Southern Brasil, not only for registering Indian texts, but also for recording the voices of the nature. Wilhelm Hein worked with the phonograph on the island Soqotra, and Rudolf Pöch in North-East New Guinea, (then under German rule). The first folk song collection published from phonograms was by E. Lineva (*Velikorusskija pesni v narodnoj garmonizaciji Vyp. 1. Sankt-Petersburg 1904*). A. D. Grigorev used the same instrument during his three field trips to the Archangel province in North Russia (1901). His collection was published some years later (*Arhangelskija byliny i istoriceskija pesni.*, Moskva 1904). The famous Czech folklorist, Jiri Polivka, who had a keen interest in reviewing phonographic folklore researches, refers⁷ to Georgian, other Caucasian, Galician, White Russian, Hutzul, Slovakian and other field work reports of publications. He knew of various new (small and light) types of phonographs, used for e.g., by Felix von Luschan in his field work in North Syria.⁸ When during summer of 1912 L.A. Biró was commissioned by the Vienna Phonogramm-Archiv to collect Hungarian dialects and folklore texts (a register of his recording was published soon hereafter: *Magyarische Sprach- und Gesangsaufnahmen. Wien 1913, - XXXI. Mitteilung der Phonogramm-Archiv-Kommission der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*) it was practically the end of the first "golden age" of instrumental recording of both dialects and folklore.

7. The later development of registering traditional texts could be a good topic of another review.

8. In folklore research the methodology of the so-called "geographic-historical" (or "Finnish") school is well known, and in some times and places is even typical or dominant. This trend can be traced back to the second half of the 19th century, and its first golden age was around the turn of this century. To describe its methodology in a nut-

⁶ See his report: Sebestyén, Gyula: A párizsi folklorista kongresszus. *Ethnographia* 12 (1901) pp. 251-253.

⁷ Polivka, Jiří: Fonograf ve službě národopisu. In: *Národopisný Vestník Československý* 1 (1906) pp. 167-174.

⁸ See the series: *Mitteilung... der Phonogramm-Archiv-Kommission der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*.

shell: variants of folklore texts are grouped into thematic units, called types. By textological means the origin, development and distribution of the types can be studied, often reconstructed. Full lists of variants and types were made, which often have maps for better understanding of "geographic distribution" or "historical modifications". (Hence the name of the school.) In principle various genres in folklore could be studied in this way, and in practice some narrative genres have served as good examples. There are local, national or international lists of folk tale types, folk legend types, folk ballad types, etc. The types are grouped into larger thematic units, those again into sub-genres, and finally whole genres (like tale, ballad etc.) are represented in catalogues. Very soon the idea of international type indices was formed, and the first international tale type index appeared in year 1910 by the Finnish scholar, Antti Aarne (*Verzeichnis der Märchentypen* Helsinki). Today the third, revised edition is in use (Stith Thompson: *The Types of the Folktale. A Classification and Bibliography*. Helsinki 1961.—FFCommunications 184).

Another method is that kind of comparative folklore research which singles out the "smallest distinctive units" of the folklore texts, called motifs, and to make a thematic index of those. The first edition of the international systematization of the motifs was made by Stith Thompson, leading American scholar of the "geographic-historical" school: *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature* (I-IV. Helsinki, 1932-36). He has suggested to write different "national" or "regional" motif-indices too. After their appearance, between 1955 and 1958 the new, revised edition of the international motif-index was published (Bloomington and Copenhagen), and currently the first discussions have been made concerning the necessity of collecting the material for a new, updated, third edition of it.⁹

Motif- and type-indices store the largest amount of folklore data immediately available in a systematized way to international scholarship. Their data and the methods used there are very important for comparative linguistics, philology, etc., because the geographic distribution of folklore texts, motif variations and combinations are indicated there in a way which is easily understandable not only for folklorists. The distribution of motifs and types was caused by ethnic, historical, cultural, religious and other migrations, movements and developments. Thus it can mirror similar linguistic phenomena, or, to the contrary, not show parallels to supposed events in the life and history of dialects. The world-wide ambitions of folklore indices will help the global geolinguistics in many ways. Often the specific terms used in comparative folklore research (a.s. ecotypes for special "local" forms, ethnic or cultural boundaries of various genres, subgenres, etc.) can also be used in dialectology, either as borrowings, or as metaphors. In spite of close contacts between folklorists and linguists, any observers should subscribe to my statement that until now linguists did not use this kind of folklore data and methodology to the degree it would deserve, to the degree it can help the study geolinguistics.

9. It was not my aim to be exhaustive and list all the important domains, where dialectology and folkloristics should meet. Furthermore I found it not appropriate to tell you in a plenary paper, a full survey of the subject but only to present to you my own understanding of the phenomena and features common in dialectology and folklore studies. I have found it more reasonable to refer to important trends and their results in folklore researches, because I see the world-wide contacts between the two ways of studying similar phenomena are by far not optimally close to each other. The modern research technique and routines (such as data based computer methods) will help much in approaching our researches, and to make it in fact compatible.

⁹ This project was scheduled for discussion at the 10th congress of International Folk-Narrative Research Society, Innsbruck, 1992.

10. If we want to make finally a very short list of possible joint works, we can say that in folklore research the collecting and registering, then storing and editing of the texts is not much different from that in dialectology. The use of instrumental devices makes our material equally usable for linguists too. Distribution maps (either in atlases, or type and motif indices) show terms and their semantics very well. I think, linguistic atlases are better in presenting the actual forms of words, phrases, etc. But for semantics the folklore and ethnographic atlases and indices are by far more open, more general. For morphology I do not find close similarities between linguistic and folklore publications.

And the last (and at the same time the most important) problem. Who shows better a particular culture? The linguist, that is dialectology and geolinguistics, or the ethnographer in his/her works? I know, language is necessary to the understanding and life of any culture. But folklore or ethnographic phenomena represent the way of life and the thought of the people involved. Thanks to modern folklore (and ethnographic) research the methods are good enough to show the contacts with environment and culture, to present historical and social changes. A good folkloristics is able to express the way of life of the group studied. That is why I am very optimistic about the future cooperation between dialectology, geolinguistics and folklore researches. They are twins, and even if they walk in different places, their steps and roads are similar; their roads lead in the same direction.¹⁰

Povzetek

Folklor, dialektologija in geolingvistika

1. Raziskovanje folklorne in dialektologije sta pomembni znanstveni disciplini vse od 19. stol. dalje, ko so začeli raziskovati tradicionalne kulture različnih ljudstev.

Izraz folklor je skoval angleški starinoslovec William John Thoms, ki je pod psevdonimom Ambrose Merton l. 1846 v pismu časniku *The Atheneum* predlagal, naj dobra saksonska sestavljenka 'folk-lore' nadomesti dotedanje izraze. V članku je naštel glavne elemente folklorne: »šege, opažanja, praznovanja, balade itd.« in tako torej enačil folklor z »the lore of the people« (znanje, duhovni zaklad). Opozoril je že na variante znotraj Anglije, na mednarodne vzporednice in na pomembnost folklornih raziskav za lastno narodno kulturo. Folklor je po njegovem poseben primer variant (ki se v lingvistiki označujejo kot dialekti) in je hkrati univerzalni fenomen (kakor jezik s stališča geolingvistike). Po l. 1846 so vsi dobri folkloristi delili to mnenje in so bili hkrati dialektologi in geolingvisti. V 19. stoletju so vsaj pol objavljene folklorne zabeležili, transkribirali, izdali in analizirali lingvisti, natančneje dialektologi. Načelo je bilo kmalu mednarodno sprejeto.

2. Primer vezi med folkloristiko in dialektologijo je življenjsko delo ustanovitelja Kazanove šole moderne dialektologije, fonologije in psiholingvistike, Jana Baudouina de Courteneya (1845-1929). Rezultat njegovega prvega terenskega dela (od 1872 dalje) je bila nadvse natančna objava slovenskih besedil iz Rezije (Sanktpetersburg 1895). Komentiral in objavljajl je tudi poljsko in litavsko folklorno blago, pri čemer je nenehno izboljševal načela objave. Njegovo terensko delo, objave in splošne trditve grade enotno metodo, veljavno tako za jezikoslovne kot za folkloristične raziskave.

3. Tudi institucionalizirane raziskave na obeh področjih kažejo enake vzporednosti. Dobra ilustracija je delo za dialektološke in etnografske atlase. *Deutscher Sprachatlas* Geografa Wenkerja

¹⁰ It is not necessary to list here all the pertinent publications. Recently the theoretical implications of ethnographic and linguistic cooperation were raised in important publications, for e.g.: *Wörter und Sachen. Österreichische und deutsche Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Dialektologie Frankreichs. Ein französisch - deutsch - österreichisches Projekt.* Herausgegeben von Klaus Beitt und Isac Chiva. Redigiert von Eva Kausel. Wien, 1992. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften - Philosophisch - historische Klasse - Sitzungsberichte, 586. Band = Mitteilungen des Instituts für Gegenwartsvolkswissenschaften - Nr.20).

(od 1876 dalje) je prvi skušal z vprašalniki sestaviti sinhrono podobo nemških dialektov. Slavni francoski Atlas linguistique (1900) je uporabil šele nekaj vprašanj in kart folklornega pomena, švicarsko nadaljevanje pa je že skušalo vključiti vprašanja ljudske materialne kulture. Biografija nemškega »etnografskega atlasa« je pustolovska in zelo politično obarvana. Priprave so tekale od leta 1920, vprašalnice so bile razposlane na 23000 šol ali posameznikov in v letih 1937-1939 je izšel Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde I.-VI. Nacisti so ga prepovedali in zlorabili, arhiv je bil uničen in rešen med zračnimi napadi na Berlin; končno je lingvist Matthias Zender v Bonnu lahko nadaljeval z bolj folklorno obarvanimi vprašalnici in začel izdajati novo serijo (1958). Dodal je tudi Pojasnila, vsekakor potrebni, pa pogosto zanemarjeni del etnološkega atlasa, saj brez znanstvene analize karte niso drugega kot pripravljalne objave. Rezultati nemškega etnografskega atlasa so vzpodbudili ambicioznejši načrt in leta 1980 je M. Zender v Bonnu izdal Ethnologischer Atlas Europas. Avtor članka meni, da je M. Zender med pripravami z »odbori« razčistil prenekatero praktično vprašanje, teorija in metoda za projektom pa sta ostali neomenjeni. Bila bi pomembna naloga za kakega nepristranskega opazovalca, da bi folkloristično ali (etnografsko) ovrednotil različne »evropske« atlase o ljudski kulturi.

Prva karta nemškega atlasa se nanaša na ljudsko verovanje in šege. Vrsten red le-teh v publikaciji je le v glavnem logičen. Nemški atlas ponuja naključen izbor in »sistem« sicer zelo pomembnih podatkov.

Tudi brez temeljite ocene različnih atlasov o ljudski kulturi v Evropi se lahko trdi, da sta način in stopnja predstavitve folklorne različnosti ljudstev zelo različna, včasih celo anekdotična. Tako so v avstrijskem navedeni talentirani ljudje, »geniji« iz Avstrije, rojeni med 1650 in 1850 itd. Kot del prve serije avstrijskega atlasa je izšel pregled avstrijskih (nemških) narečij. Avtor E. Kranzmayer se sklicuje na podatke avstrijskega lingvističnega atlasa, v metodi pa se opira na slavni francoski ter na italijanski lingvistični atlas. Oba vzornika se osredotočata na narečja in materialno kulturo, v nekaterih primerih pa informirata tudi o sociolektih, npr. o vplivu dialektov prestolnic (Rim, Pariz) na okoliška kmetijska področja.

Folklorno gradivo je v neštetihi doslej objavljenih evropskih atlasih o ljudski kulturi prikazano na nejasen kalejdoskopski način. Vodilni duh, ki je stal za švedskim atlasom, je bil Sigurd Erixon. Prvi del je izšel 1957, drugi, s folklornimi podatki, pa šele 1976. Tudi tu so navedeni pomembni, pa tudi čudni podatki. Za primerjalne raziskave so pomembni zapisi švedske ljudske tradicije z ozemlja Finske in Estonije. Žal pa povpraševanje ni bilo nikoli izpeljano med švedsko-ameriški izseljenci.

Zanimiva in poučna je zgodovina finskega atlasa. Finska je dobila svobodo po zlomu carske Rusije l. 1917 na pobudo V. I. Lenina. Nova neodvisna država je prvič v svoji zgodovini l. 1923 ustanovila geografsko društvo, ki naj bi pripravilo karte za novi zemljevid Finske. V finskem atlasu je bilo že 6 kart s predmeti ljudske kulture. L. 1944 so ustanovili slovarsko fondacijo za ustanovitev kompletnih arhivov finskih narečij. Kustaa Viljuna, kasneje vodilna osebnost v finski etnografiji, je l. 1937 začel dejanske priprave za finski atlas o ljudski kulturi. Viljuna in švedski raziskovalec Sigurd Erixon sta skušala povezati načrte atlasov v nordijskih in celo baltičskih državah. Prvi osnutek finko-švedskega atlasa je izšel l. 1945, priprave za objavo pravega finskega atlasa pa tečejo od 1962. Izšel naj bi etnografski, folklorni, dialektološki in krajevni atlas Finske. Posebno težko je bilo zbrati in preveriti imena finskih naselij zunaj meja države Finske. Karte o finski kulturi vključujejo podatke iz sovjetske Karelije, Švedske in severne Norveške, žal pa ne obravnavajo finko-ameriškega izročila. L. 1976 je izšel I. del – materialna kultura, II. del pa je posvečen folklori.

Ne le za Slovake in Madžare, ampak za vse evropske etnografe je zelo pomemben slovaški etnografski atlas, ki je izšel l. 1990. To je zelo kompleksno delo, ki informira o geografiji, zgodovini, religiji in drugih temah. Na dialektologijo se ta atlas ne nanaša, vendar je ena najpodrobnejših zakladnic evropskih ljudskih kultur.

Avtor zamisli o madžarskem etnografskem atlasu je bil Béla Gunda l. 1939. Voja je pretrgala orjaški načrt (za atlas je bilo izbranih 700 vasi!) in delo se je nadaljevalo šele 1955 z velikansko podporo madžarske države. Atlas je začel izhajati l. 1987; žal so karte brez komentarjev.

Pregled etnografskih atlasov strne avtor v tehle pripombah:

1. Atlasi o ljudski kulturi so se zgledovali po atlasih dialektov in oba projekta imata veliko skupnega, tako pri terenskem delu kot tudi pri zbiranju podatkov ali objavljanju gradiva.

2. Ponavadi predstavljajo atlasih o ljudski kulturi podrobne karte o orodju ali šegah s skrbno preverjenimi termini.
3. Nekateri atlasih opisujejo selitve ali zgodovinske podatke, ki lahko osvetlijo nenavadno ali zapleteno porazdelitev različnih značilnosti v dialektih.
4. Atlasih so dobri glede izrazov in oblik, malo pa povedo o morfologiji ali sintaksi ljudskega govora.
5. Kar zadeva folkloro, se atlasih osredotočajo na lahko upodobljive šege, bajna bitja, nošo, inštrumente, tipe plesa itd. Pomembne teme, ki jasno kažejo zemljepisno porazdelitev, npr. praviljični ali baladni tipi, so iz atlasih ponavadi izpuščene.
6. Avtorjevo hipotezo, da so evropski dialektološki in etnološki atlasih bolj ali manj enaki, je po njegovem lahko preveriti z nasprotjem, če poznamo pomembno smer v antropologiji, t. im. primerjalne študije (cross-cultural studies).

Že l. 1889 je Edvard B. Taylor (svetovno znani avtor Prvobitne kulture) zbral podrobne podatke o družbeni organizaciji kakih 350 etnoloških enot. L. 1930 so Hobhouse, Wheeler in Ginsberg klasificirali približno 600 družb po svetu glede na način pridobivanja hrane. Svetovna monografija nekdanjega študenta iz Yalea G. P. Murdocka *Social structure* (1949), zasnovana na 250 družbah, je po začetnem nasprotovanju obveljala za mejnik napredka v primerjalni etnologiji. Yaleski primerjalni arhivi so bili l. 1949 reorganizirani v *Human Relations Area Files* (HRAF), arhive za območja človeških odnosov.

Primerjalna metodologija ni dialektološka. Namesto skrbnega krajevnega ugotavljanja dejstev zbira zgolj pritrdilne ali nikalne odgovore za nadaljnjo primerjalno (in računalniško) obdelavo. Bližja je globalni lingvistiki in Murdockov Etnološki atlas je zelo daleč od evropskih etnoloških (in lingvističnih) atlasov.

Več avtorjev je skušalo uporabiti tipologijo HRAF pri svojih raziskavah, tako Alan Lomax s sodelavci za ugotavljanje razmerja med načinom petja/plesa in družbami, marsikaj s tega področja pa je ostalo še neobdelano. Avtor članka meni, da bi bil svetovni folklorni atlas res pomemben.

5. Mreža informatorjev, ki odgovarja znanstvenikom na razposlane ankete, je več kot stoletje stara institucija v evropskem folklornem raziskovanju. Nemški filolog Wilhelm Mannhardt je 1865 razposlal svojo francosko-nemško vprašalnico o žetvi in žetvenih šegah. Dobljeno gradivo je bilo uporabljeno v *Wald- und Feldkulte* (1875-77). V mnogih evropskih državah take mreže cvetijo vse do danes, ponekod redno, drugod občasno. Avtor ugotavlja, da še niso bile narejene resne sociolingvistične analize informatorjev ali odgovorov, ki često vsebujejo tudi druge podatke, npr. avtobiografske in bodo še zlata jama za prihodnje folkloristične raziskave.

Tu opozarja avtor še na gigantska ameriška dela, zasnovana na istem načelu. Eno najpomembnejših je Zbirka folklorne iz Severne Karoline avtorja Franka C. Browna z odličnima zvezkoma o ljudskem verovanju in praznoverju. Druga pa je vseameriška zbirka na isto temo iz Ohio Collection Newballa Nilesa Pucketa. Zbirka je multietnična in vsebuje tudi seznam obravnavanih etničnih skupin – od akadjskih, afriških vse do jugoslovanskih.

6. Ne nazadnje je velikega pomena za dialektografijo in dialektologijo instrumentalno zapisovanje folklornih oblik, vse od fonografov do najmodernejših današnjih sredstev. Po nekaterih pričevanjih je prvi uporabljal fonograf za zapisovanje kitajske in indijske glasbe Američan Benjamin I. Gilman od 1892 dalje. Na Madžarskem je bil prvi Béla Vikár, ki je zapisoval s fonografom od 1896 dalje in je trdil, da so glasbeni -dialekti- in dialekti v pravem pomenu besede na Madžarskem v tesni povezavi. F. Exner, S. Exner in Lange pa so leta 1899 dali pobudo za ustanovitev Phonogramm-Archivs-Kommission der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien.

7. Razvoj zapisovanja tradicionalnih besedil v zadnjem času bi bil po avtorjevem mnenju dobra tema za poseben članek.

8. Pri raziskovanju folklorne je dobro znana metodologija -geografsko-historične- ali -finske- šole: variante folklornih besedil so razporejene v tematske enote, imenovane tipi. S tekstološkimi

sredstvi se preučuje izvir, razvoj in porazdelitev tipov. Prvi mednarodni indeks pravljčnih tipov je l. 1910 izdal finski znanstvenik Antti Aarne. Danes je v rabi tretja, revidirana izdaja Stitha Thompsona iz 1961.

Druga metoda pa pri folklornih besedilih išče »najmanjše razločljive enote«, imenovane motivi in sestavlja tematske indekse le-teh. Prvo mednarodno sistematizacijo motivov je izdal Američan Stith Thompson v letih 1932-36. Na njegovo pobudo so izšli tudi nacionalni ali regionalni indeksi, zdaj pa se načrtuje že tretja izdaja mednarodnega kataloga.

Porazdelitev motivov in tipov so povzročile etnične, zgodovinske, kulturne in religiozne spremembe in se zato lahko ujema (ali pa ne!) z spremembami v narečjih; folklorni indeksi bi bili lahko v pomoč geolingvistiki. Avtor ugotavlja, da jih lingvisti doslej niso uporabljali v dovoljni meri.

9. Avtor ni nameraval izčrpati vseh stičnih področij dialektologije in folkloristike. Želel je le poudariti pomembne smeri in dosežke na področju folklornih raziskav, saj vidi, da povezave med obema vedama, ki preučujeta podobne pojave, še daleč niso optimalne. Sodobne tehnike, npr. računalniška, bodo obe veji naredili kompatibilni.

10. Tako zbiranje in zapisovanje kot urejanje in izdajanje gradiva sta v folkloristiki in dialektologiji podobni. Lingvistični atlasi bolje predstavljajo morfologijo besed, glede semantike pa so folklorni in etnografski atlasi bolj odprti in širši.

In zadnje, najpomembnejše vprašanje: Kdo bolje odslkava kako kulturo? Lingvist, t.j. dialektolog in geolingvist, ali etnograf? Avtor se zaveda pomembnosti jezika za razumevanje kulture, toda etnograf predstavlja način življenja in mišljenja ljudi. Obetavna prihodnost je v sodelovanju obeh znanosti - dvojčic.

Za popolne podatke o citiranih delih glej originalni angleški članek.