

РЕЦЕНЗІЇ

Novica Vujović (Niksic)

*Faculty of Montenegrin Language and Literature – Cetinje
novica.vujovic@fcjk.me*

THE FIRST DIALECTOLOGY OF THE MONTENEGRIN LANGUAGE (Adnan Cirgić, *Dialectology of Montenegrin Language*, FMLL, 2017)

Summary: With the delight of Slavistic – Montenegrin study, a book on Montenegrin dialectology was published for the first time. Luckily, Adnan Cirgić comprises the whole knowledge of philology, selects relevant dialectology data adequately, and includes good knowledge in the area and experience with informers. This makes Cirgić's work highly valuable. *Dialectology of Montenegrin Language* offers a division of Montenegrin speech patterns into two large groups: Northwest and Southeast. The history of all important issues regarding Montenegrin dialectology is provided in detail, and the unjustified foundations of Serbocroatics' traditional approach towards Montenegrin language are removed.

Key words: Adnan Cirgić, Montenegrin language, dialectology, classification of Montenegrin language speech patterns.

The library, comprising the best contributions from the study discipline we refer to as Montenegrin dialectology, is enriched with the work written by a linguist Adnan Cirgić, the dean of the Faculty of Montenegrin Language and Literature. To speak honestly – and without exaggeration which is present more often than the truth here – Cirgić is nowadays the only true continuator of the generation of diligent dialectologists who proved themselves in the previous century. The number of those who recognized Adnan Cirgić's work as the first class literature on the topics researched by our linguist is not negligible, and this has been proved daily.

Dialectology of Montenegrin Language was published as the 19th book of *Montenegrina* library at the Faculty of Montenegrin language and literature. It is well known that Cirgić appears as an author of multiple books, monographs, textbooks, and manuals. Cirgić is a reviewer and an editor of a significant number of editions, then a (co)author of *Grammar of Montenegrin Language* and the author of *Spelling of Montenegrin Language* draft version. His book *Montenegrin Language in the Past and Present* (Institute for Montenegrin language and literature and Matica crnogorska, Podgorica 2011) is highly important and frequently quoted. The book comprises some of the works necessary for understanding the history of our language, classification of Montenegrin speech patterns and Montenegrin standard language in general. It has to be stated that it is an e-version available for users. We need to remind ourselves that until three years ago Cirgić's bibliography had included around six hundred units. Considering that, along with the dialectology (a specific area of his interests), he explores the history of the Montenegrin language, as well as the language in general. This linguist has been giving a great contribution to solving the so-called 'dark issues' of our philology from the early days. If we take all of his work into account, it is certain that no one has been better at writing about the dialectology of our language. It needs to be stated that everyone understands this: both those who support and follow him, and those who see the fight against the name and affirmation of the Montenegrin language through an argument precisely with him.

Cirgic's *Dialectology* comprises all the elements of a serious thought through dialectology. Moreover, he described and classified Montenegrin speech patterns through a unique methodology model which rejects fixed traditional linguistic views with determination. *Dialectology of Montenegrin Language* consists of the following chapters: "Preamble", "History of Research of Montenegrin Speech Patterns", "On the so far classifications of Montenegrin Speech Patterns", "The Problem of Classification of Montenegrin Speech Patterns", "Accentual System of Montenegrin Speech Patterns", "Alternants of Yat in Montenegrin Speech Patterns", "Destiny of Semivowels in Montenegrin Speech Patterns", "Destiny of AO Vowel Group in Montenegrin Speech Patterns", "Basic Features of Certain Speech Pattern Groups in Montenegro", "Northwest Montenegrin Speech Patterns", "South-east Montenegrin Speech Patterns" and "Summary". The summary is written in the Montenegrin, English, and Russian languages.

The author based his "History of Research of Montenegrin Speech Patterns" chapter on two huge volumes of portraits of scholars who explored Montenegrin language *Dialectologists and Montenegrin Language (until 1945)* and *Dialectologists and Montenegrin Language (after 1945)*. We are obliged by this fact to state that Cirgic, starting from the very entrance to the world of science, put all the pieces of Montenegrin dialectology together. We should also say that all of this ranks this book as one of the biggest monuments for all scholars – dialectologists who have been researching linguistic materials regarding the Montenegrin language – and those from Russia, Poland, Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as for Montenegrin – born linguists who lived all around ex-Yugoslavia. It is noticeable that the author of *Dialectology* has openly showed all the contributions and credits of his predecessors, just as he always has and until the end precisely reasoned each injustice when it came to a true condition testified in materials from the Montenegrin language field (this was confirmed in his comments on the work of Pavle Ivic, Asim Peco, Mitar Pesikan, and these are just a few mentioned).

The next two chapters of the book are dedicated to the classification of Montenegrin speech patterns. *Dialectology of Montenegrin Language* classifies our speech patterns in northwest and southeast. The author considers a traditional classification of those speech patterns in two, as it used to be claimed, strictly classified areas. The classification was followed by the affirmation of characteristics which explained the division of Montenegrin speech patterns, as well as such terminological solution that parts of titles from nearby countries were usually taken for the titles in Montenegrin language. Therefore, the book we represent resolves and rejects a traditional approach towards our language, and in Montenegro in general, seeing it as not a unified cultural, spiritual and language area (within that context, we have to emphasize Cirgic's accurate explanation of terms *Herzegovinian*, *Herzegovina*, *Old Montenegro* etc). The term *east – Herzegovinian dialect* was used for our northwest speech patterns, while southeast speech patterns had multiple terms: *east – Montenegrin dialect*, *Zeta – Lovcen dialect*, *Zeta – Sjenica dialect*, *Zeta – southern Sandzak dialect*, *Zeta – Upper Polim dialect* etc. While approaching this issue, Cirgic confirmed that "boundaries of speech patterns, dialects and languages coincide with state boundaries only in seldom situations (when those boundaries take some steep mountain slopes, river canyons, impassable woods and go through poorly populated areas), in which case Montenegro does not represent an exception of any kind" (p. 43). What is even more important for our story is given in the sentence: "It is important to determine the center of language occurrences which mark a certain dialect or a speech pattern" (p. 43). In order to approach this overall, Cirgic puts a special emphasis on the issue of migration. Movement directions of Montenegrin citizens (the author confirms this with the most influential Serbian linguist from the second half of the 20th century) explain a spreading of overall Montenegrin language features beyond Montenegrin state boundary.

It was mentioned that the tendencies of traditional approach regarding linguistic material in Montenegro reflected, among other things, the division of two dialects, as well as the necessity that their descriptions were done in accordance with the similarities they have with speech patterns outside Montenegrin boundaries. Detailed analysis showed that differences “between northwest Montenegrin speech patterns and speech patterns of east, the Herzegovinian dialect, is much bigger than it used to be (traditionally) mentioned. If we exclude accents of those speech patterns, we can firmly state that they (northwest Montenegrin speech patterns – N. V.) are a part of the Montenegrin *koine* layer, i. e. they are inseparable from *Montenegrin speech patterns as a whole* because there is not a single feature from the Montenegrin ‘archaic’ speech patterns i. e. southeast Montenegro speech patterns, that does not appear among the mentioned ones” (p. 61). There is no doubt, based on the existing materials left by generations of dialectologists, we could discern that “the greatest number of features found in them is mutual for the one and the other ‘dialect’ in Montenegro” (p. 49). In any event, the author simply states the facts and fairly relies on the literature: “No matter of an unacceptable naming of Montenegrin speech patterns and unsustainability of some interpretations, the contribution of those dialectologists to the Montenegristics is enormous because they provided an abundance of materials which stand as the confirmation for the existence of Montenegrin language and Montenegrin speech patterns as a whole, i. e. the framework which serves against their thesis on the existence of two strictly divided dialects on the territory of Montenegro” (p. 44-45).

Furthermore, *Dialectology* contains a list of common characteristics of Montenegrin speech patterns (created according to classifications and material described by Pavle Ivic and Asim Peco):

“1. ijekavica; 2. longer forms of adverbial – adjective shift (e.g. *tije(h)*, *tijem*); 3. jekavica jotation (*tě >će*, *cě >će*, *dě >đe*, *sě >še*, *zě >že*); 4. *dvje*, *svje*, *cvje > đe*, *še*, *će* (e. g. *međed*, *šedok*, *Četko*); 5. quite present jotation of labials; 6. consonants system extended by phonemes *ś i ź*; 7. *ě + j > i* (e. g. *cio*, *sijati*), however verbal adjective participle has the following forms as well: *šedeo*, *video*; 8. *-st*, *-zd*, *-št > -s*, *-z*, *-š* (e. g. *plas*, *groz*, *priš*); 9. frequent usage *-j < -đ*, *-ć* (e. g. *goj*, *doj*, *moj*); 10. frequent usage of infinitive without *-i* at the end (e. g. *trčat*, *pričat*); 11. dative and locative *mene*, *tebe*, *sebe*; 12. enclitics *ni* and *vi*; 13. active usage of aorist and imperfect; 14. declination *Pero – Pera – Peru...*; 15. altered relation between cases of place and direction; 16. usage of genitive in plural instead of locative in plural with the preposition *po* (e. g. *po kuća*)” (p. 50).

After *Dialectology of Montenegrin language*, the reliance on the destiny of yat and the accentual system as criteria for the division of Montenegrin speech patterns is clearly unsustainable. Cirgic was talking about the division of our speech patterns even earlier, corrected some of his conclusions, added new findings, and gave a firm judgment on the classifications done before his ones: “all divisions of Montenegrin speech patterns so far are deficient, mostly out of two reasons: 1. because the fact that Montenegrin speech patterns are types beyond dialectology is neglected. i. e. they represent a separate whole, and the main differences among them concern accents; 2. because there is not a common criterion for their division. The later reason naturally comes from the first one, and it has been already seen that *yat alteration* being a basic criterion for the division of shtokavian speech patterns is not significant that much if we talk about Montenegrin speech patterns. On the other hand, if we take accents of local speech patterns into consideration, we will see that certain speech patterns, with various accents, coincide in most of other characteristics” (p. 72–73).

We have mentioned that Montenegrin speech patterns are divided into two large groups: northwest and southeast. Certain more distinctive features within the later group of

our speech patterns are presented through the division of southeast Montenegrin speech patterns in eight groups: 1. branch of a speech pattern under Lovcen 2. branch of Ozrinici speech pattern (including Brocanac), 3. branch of southeast Boka speech pattern, 4. branch of Mrkovic speech pattern, 5. the one belonging to Kuci – Piperi – Bratnozici, 6. belonging to Zeta – Podgorica, 7. belonging to lowland Pjesivci – Bjelopavlici – Vasojevici and 8. branch of Rozaje – Petnjica – Bijelo Polje speech patterns.

Cigic's division of Montenegrin speech patterns based on the accentual system gave five types:

1. both descending accents on the open ultima (from Dobrota to Grbalj and area of Kuci – Piperi – Bratnozici);

2. the type in which a short – descending accent cannot be found on the open ultima (from Pastrovici to the very south of the coast, Crmnica, Rijecka nahija and Kantska nahija without Ozrinici and Brocanac);

3. two descending and a long – ascending accent (Ozrinici (Cevo villages), Brocanac and Plav – Gusinje area);

4. both descending and both ascending accents, with short – descending accent which could be found on all syllables apart from ultima (Lower Pjesivci, Bjelopavlici, Lim – Ibar area);

5. accentual system with four members without descending accents out of the first layer and preserved post – accentual length (northwest Montenegro).

Regarding this, we have the author's conclusion that features of the accentual system are "the main imposing difference among Montenegrin speech patterns".

Adnan Cirgic perceived the division of Montenegrin speech patterns from the aspect of destiny of old half – vowel, as well as *ao* vowel group. When we talk about half – vowel, i. e. its alternant (a vowel between *a* and *e*), we have testimonies in "the whole coast from Dobrota to the very south. From there it includes a complete close hinterland and goes deeply into the inland" (more details in the chapter on the destiny of half – vowels).

An overview on the issues of *ao* vowel group destiny is given, i. e. areals of its compression in long *a* or long *o*.

It is visible that each Cirgic's claim is supported by literature (see the literature p. 163 – 174) or by the condition in a speech pattern of a particular area with which the author is familiar. A great value of the book is in precise and clearly done charts (six in total).

Although the interest in certain characteristics of Montenegrin language started even during the first half of the 19th century, and in spite of the fact that speech patterns of Montenegrin language are among the best described in the Slavic world – competition of Montenegrin language dialectology was postponed until today. The truth is that this exceptional book provides an answer to a very big question carried on the backs of Montenegroistics through the whole 20th century. The foundations of the approach are recognized as well as hard work of a diligent linguist who constantly fights against ignorance and barren discussions with dialectologists not moving from their offices. He rejects, above other things, many questions of our prosaic ethno – linguistics. The author gives cultural dimension to this book, and thus helps researchers of other disciplines to easily liberate themselves from traditional mislead where they still exist.

Today when we start from the fact that Montenegrin language has the right to be a valuable member of Slavic language family, these editions of Montenegrin philology – above all the editions of Faculty of Montenegrin language and literature in Cetinje – confirm the identity of that language in historical, spiritual and cultural content of multiethnic Montenegro. A need to realize all this consistently through a unique and clear language policy is in front of us.

Therefore, several conclusions imposed themselves:

1. A book on Montenegrin dialectology is written for the first time.
2. Positively, the complete philology knowledge, an adequate selection of relevant dialectology data are collected, as well as a good knowledge of the area and experience with informers, which is a great value of all Cirgic work. *Dialectology of Montenegrin Language* came from the highest place of Montenegristics.
3. To the delight of Slavic – Montenegristic study, the book has a long way to go, and it will find its full meaning and significance in the scientific work and on scientific conferences.