

**THE ORTHOGRAPHY OF THE DASH IN THE
MACEDONIAN STANDARD LANGUAGE AND
THE JOURNALISTIC SUB-STYLE**

Violeta JANUŠEVA¹ Jana JURUKOVSKA²

Abstract

In the Macedonian language, little, or no attention at all is given to the important role of the punctuation and orthographic marks regarding the coherence and stylistic effects of the written texts they provide. Bearing in mind that the last edition of the Orthography (1988) has been used for approximately 20 years, the new edition of the Orthography of the Macedonian language was welcomed with hope that it would resolve, if not all, then, at least some of the dilemmas, unclarity and imprecision of the orthographic rules present in the late Orthography. Indeed, the new edition of the Orthography (2015) brings in changes, supplements and provides accurate information. However, the written practice is overloaded with countless examples of incorrect use, which refer to the use of punctuation and orthographic marks, especially of the dash, and this is not in accordance with the standard norm of the language. Hence, the paper's aim is to compare several basic rules regarding the use of the dash in the two editions of the Orthography (1998 and 2015) and to show that many mistakes are present in one relevant segment of the written practice, i.e. in the journalistic sub-style. The research has qualitative paradigm (analysis of content) and descriptive design. The methods used to process the data and to draw scientific conclusions are analysis, synthesis and comparison. From the analysis, it can be noticed, that the incorrect use of the dash appears partly due to the fact that some rules in the two editions are not clear and precise enough and are exposed to dual interpretations, as well as to the disrespect and the scarce concern of the language norm from the Macedonian language's speakers. The analysis supports the need of more frequent appearances of new editions of the Orthography in order to make the already existing rules more precise, and to give more publicity to the changes that have already been made in the new edition.

Key words: dash, Orthography, journals

1. Introduction

The language of one nation shows its spiritual treasure, its national identity, and is the perfect tool for communication. Thus, the language should be nourished, developed, enriched, and cultivated, so that it could respond to the needs of its users who have the obligation to respect the standard norm of the language. The correct use of the orthographic rules is imperative, and has a great importance for the correct expression in the written form. The incorrect use of the orthographic rules by the users leads to incorrect language solutions that are not in accordance with the spirit of the Macedonian standard language. This concerns also the rules for using the punctuation and orthographic marks, especially of the dash, because it is very relevant for the written expression and contributes to its equality and cohesion.

¹ Assoc. Prof. Dr., Violeta Januševa is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education in Bitola, Republic of Macedonia. violetajanuseva@gmail.com

² Faculty of Education, Bitola 7000, Republic of Macedonia. jana_juruk@yahoo.com

The incorrect use of the orthographic rules regarding the dash is frequently present in the journalistic sub-style of the Macedonian standard language. This sub-style should nourish the written realization of the language and should have serious approach toward it, because this sub-style should contribute to the affirmation of the standard norm of the language. Many people with different gender, age, profession, linguistic literacy etc. read these newspapers on a daily basis. Thus, it is most probable that the incorrect orthographic solutions, regardless of the causes of their occurrence, would start to appear in the daily writing practice of those people and this threatens the norm of the Macedonian modern language.

Bearing in mind that the last edition of the Orthography (1988), has been used for approximately 20 years, the new edition of the Orthography of the Macedonian language was welcomed with the hope that it would resolve, if not all, at least some of the dilemmas and impreciseness of the orthographic rules present in the late Orthography. Indeed, the new edition of the Orthography of the Macedonian language (2015) brings in changes, supplements and provides accurate information in all of the chapters of the last edition of the Orthography (1998). However, the written practice is still overloaded with mistakes that refer to the punctuation and orthographic marks, especially to the use of the dash. Hence, the paper's aim is to compare the rules regarding the use of the dash as punctuation and orthographic mark in the two editions of the Orthography (1998 and 2015). Moreover, the aim is to show that due to some of these rules being imprecise and unclear many mistakes in one relevant segment of the written practice, i.e. in the journalistic sub-style are present. On one hand, the incorrect use of the orthographic rules, regarding the dash, is mostly a result of the unfamiliarity with the developmental legitimacy of the Macedonian language; the scarce concern of the users of the Macedonian language for the written form of the language; and the lack of respect for the norms of the standard language. On the other, the incorrect use is partly a result of the lack of more precise information in certain orthographic rules that refer to the use of the dash. Thus, there is a need for revision of certain orthographic solutions for the dash as punctuation and orthographic mark, defined with the codification of the language; that is, a need for providing new rules and for making the rules, which already exist more precise because of the possibility for their different interpretation. Additionally, the need for dedicating more attention to the written realization of the language and for an increase in the responsibility of the proofreaders also appears as a very meaningful segment.

2. Review of literature

Though it is very important, this topic, as already mentioned, is treated as something that is not significant. In the modern Macedonian language, there are only two unpublished master thesis dedicated to this issue and one scientific paper. Januševa and Jurukovska (2016, p. 233–246) stress out the relevance of the difference between the punctuation and orthographic marks. Analyzing, the primary sources in teaching the Macedonian orthography, the Macedonian teaching curricula and the Macedonian language textbooks in the primary education, they discover that, these sources provide wrong information regarding the classification of the punctuation and orthographic marks, and that this reflects the wrong usages of these marks from the students. Jurukovska (2016), taking into account only the last edition of the Orthography (1998), shows the difference between the use of the dash and the hyphen. She analyzes extensive material that refers to four functional styles in the Macedonian language (scientific, administrative, publicist and literary). She demonstrates significant number of deviations regarding the use of the dash and hyphen. According to Jurukovska, most of the orthographic rules that regulate the use of these marks (Orthography, 1998, p. 139–141; 150–151) do not contain precise information. Taseska (2012), taking into consideration the last edition of the Orthography (1998), examines the students' orthographic mistakes in their written practice in the

primary education. She refers to several chapters of the Orthography and classified students' mistakes in several groups. One of the conclusions from her research was that the students do not know to use the quotation marks correctly. This is directly connected with the use of the dash in the direct speech.

3. The methodology of the research

The research has qualitative paradigm (analysis of content) and descriptive design. The methods used to process the data and to draw scientific conclusions are analysis, synthesis and comparison. The orthographic rules for the use of the dash as punctuation and orthographic mark are excerpted from the Orthography of the modern Macedonian language (1998, p. 138–140; 142–146) and the Orthography of the Macedonian language (2015, p. 121–123; 137–139). First, the orthographic rules for the use of the dash as punctuation and orthographic mark in the edition from 1998 are being analyzed regarding how clear and explicit they are for the speakers of the Macedonian language. What follows are the examples of incorrect use in the journals from 2010 until 2015, taking into account that the new edition comes out in 2015. Then, these rules are compared with the same rules in the new edition of the Orthography (2015) in order to get an insight into the changes, supplements and the correctness, and then the rules from the new edition are analyzed regarding their preciseness, clearness and possibility for double interpretation again. Then, examples of incorrect use in the journals are cited again, this time, from the journals from 2017 in order to see whether there are significant changes in the use of this mark. In the analysis of the material, certain explanations about the correct use of the dash rely on rules that regulates the direct speech (1998, p. 142–146; 2015, p. 126–129), which are not a subject of elaboration of this paper but are relevant to the analysis because they contain additional explanation about the correct use of the dash. The examples of incorrect use of the dash are present in the web sites of the following daily journals, from 2015: D – Dnevnik, 23.6.2015, 12.5.2015; Telma, 23.6.2015; Alon.mk, 23.6.2015; ohriddenes, 23.6.2015; Uv – Utrinski vesnik, 3.4.2015; from 2017: D – Dnevnik, 3.5.2017, 19.4.2017, 20.3.2017, 3.3.2017, 26.2.2017, 19.1.2017; Uv – Utrinski vesnik, 28.4.2017, 26.4.2017, 25.4.2017, 26.3.2017. First, the original Macedonian example and the translation of the Macedonian examples in square brackets are given. Then, in round brackets, the name of the source is given.

4. Results and discussion

The following part contains the results of the research and the discussion.

4.1. The dash as a punctuation mark

4.1.1. According to the late edition of the Orthography (1998, p. 138, pt. 375), in the chapter that regulates the use of the dash it is said that the dash is commonly used in texts instead of the double quotation marks in the direct speech. This rule does not provide additional information about the place of the sentences that present the direct speech (in the beginning or in the middle of the texts). The explanation “instead of the double quotation marks” can lead to the conclusion that the dash and the double quotation marks can be marks for direct speech. Nevertheless, this explanation can also lead to the wrong conclusion that instead of the double quotation marks, one should use the dash. The examples in the Orthography, clearly show the use of the dash only when the direct speech begins in a new line. This contributes for two things. First, for firming the users' opinion, i.e. for using the dash in the direct speech, only if the sentences that present the direct speech are in new line, and second, for making mistakes in the written practice, i.e. for using the dash in the direct speech even though the sentences that present it are not in a new line. One cannot find the information about the use of an appropriate mark when the sentence that presents direct speech is not in a new line in

the chapter for the use of the dash, but should address the chapter that regulates the marks used for direct speech in the Orthography (1998, p. 142–143, pt. 391 a, b). This chapter clearly shows the differentiation, i.e. the use of the dash in the direct speech when the sentence begins in a new line, and the use of the double quotation marks when the sentence is not in a new line. This can confuse the users of the Orthography. Yet, the rule and the given examples are clear enough, i.e. the use of the dash in the beginning of the sentences that present the direct speech. However, regarding this use, in the daily newspapers, there are many wrong examples, which show that the dash incorrectly interchanges with the hyphen. Ex.:

- (1) - *Vo sekoj slučaj ... [- In any case ...]; - So tekot na vremeto ... [- As the time passes ...]* (Pavlovska, 3.4.2015, Uv);
- (2) - *Imeto „Gnasni deca“ ... [-The name „Loathsome children“ ...]; -Da se vodi biznis [-To run a business ...]* (Zdravkovska, 23.6.2015, D).

According to the new edition of the Orthography (2015, p. 121, pt. 286 a), the dash is used before sentences that present the direct speech when they begin in a new line. It is obvious that additional information about the place of the sentences that present the direct speech in the new edition is explicitly shown. The explanation “instead of the double quotation marks” given in the late edition, in the new edition is omitted and this firms the wrong opinion about the use of the dash when the sentences that present the direct speech are not in a new line. However, the information about the use of an appropriate mark when the sentences that present the direct speech are not in new line, cannot be found here, and again one should address the chapter that regulates the use of the marks for the direct speech in the Orthography (2015, p. 124, pt. 306 a, b). These rules clearly show the differentiation of these two marks in the direct speech, which is the same as in the late edition of the Orthography. Hence, in both of the editions, the same basic rule for the use of the dash in the direct speech when the sentence begins in a new line in the chapter that regulates the use of the dash is given. In the same time, the same additional information about the use of the double quotation marks in the direct speech when the sentence is not in a new line in the chapter that regulates the use of the marks for direct speech is given. This can also confuse the users of the Orthography. It is noticeable that in order for the rule to be comprehended in its completeness, one needs to address other chapter in both of the edition. Moreover, it is clear that though these rules are in use for about 20 years (in both of the editions the rule is the same), the insufficient care of the Macedonian speakers for the language norm and its disrespect cannot be neglected as a reason for deviations from the language norm. In continuance, there are examples of the incorrectly interchange of the dash with the hyphen form the journals printed in 2017. Ex.:

- (3) - *Nie sme ... [- We are ...]; - Mene ne me ucenuval ... [- I was not blackmailed]; - Platenikot na Albancite ... [- The mercenary of the Albanians]* (Gjorgjevski, B., 3.5.2017, D);
- (4) - *Vo soglasnost so ... [-In accordance with ...]* (26.2.2017, D).

Therefore, the new edition of the Orthography should enrich the basic rule for the use of the dash in the beginning of the sentence that presents the direct speech with additional information that will indicate that the double quotation mark can also be used for the direct speech when the sentences are not in a new line. This would, surely, decrease the number of the mistakes in the written practice of the journalistic sub-style. This would also make the basic rule more precise and complete and the users would find information about the use of the dash and the double quotation marks on the same place.

4.1.2. According to the late Orthography (1998, p. 143, pt. 391 b), when the sentences presenting the direct speech are not in a new line, a double quotation mark should be written at the beginning and at the end of the sentence. As mentioned before, this rule is present in the chapter that regulates the use of marks for direct speech, and not in the chapter dedicated to the use of the dash. Once again, one needs to address another chapter in the Orthography in order to find information of what happens if the direct speech is not in a new line. This, surely, contributes the wrong use of the dash and the double quotation marks. Nonetheless, in the daily newspapers, there are many examples in which the authors use double quotation marks at the beginning and at the end of the sentence instead of a dash, even though the direct speech begins in a new line, which is incorrect. Ex.:

(5) „Žalime što Čekovski ... [*We regret that Čekovski ...*] (23.6.2016, D).

Further, mostly because of the impreciseness and incompleteness of the rule in section 4.1.1., it can be noticed that various printed and electronic media present the same information in a different manner, i.e. with a use of a dash, which is correct, with a use of a double quotation marks, which is incorrect or with a hyphen which is incorrect. Ex.:

(6) - Žalime što Čekovski ...[- *We regret that Čekovski ...*] (23.6.2015, D); „Žalime što Čekovski ...“ [*We regret that Čekovski ...*] (23.6.2015 Telma); - Žalime što Čekovski ... [- *We regret that Čekovski ...*](23.6.2015, a1on.mk); -Žalime što Čekovski ... [-*We regret that Čekovski ...*] (23.6.2015, ohrdidenes).

The new edition of the Orthography provides exactly the same rule (2015, p. 126, pt. 306 b), i.e. if the direct speech is not in a new line, the double quotation marks should be used, and not the dash. As seen before, the rule is present in the chapter that regulates the use of the marks for direct speech and not for the use of the dash. The user should address this other chapter to understand the use of the double quotation marks in a direct speech. This can be a reason for the incorrect use of the dash in this case, though the scarce concern of the Macedonian language's speakers towards the orthographic rules cannot be neglected. Because it is a matter of exactly the same rule in both of the edition, it is clear that this rule is in use for about 20 years. Still, in the texts form the journalistic sub-style, many incorrect examples are noticed, i.e. use of the double quotation marks when the direct speech begins in a new line. Ex.:

(7) „Ova e osobeno ...“, ... [*This is especially ...*, ...] (3.3.2017, D); „Napravivme ...“ ... [*We have made ...* ...] (28.4.2017, Uv); „Ovaa debata ...“ ... [*This debate ...* ...] (26.4.2017Uv); „Imame plan i strategija ...“ [*We have a plan and a strategy ...*] (Popovska, 25.4.2017, Uv).

Bearing in mind these two rules (section 4.1.1. and 4.1.2.) it is clear that both editions of the Orthography offer the same rules, the same impreciseness and incompleteness. Still, the fact that these rules are in use for approximately 20 years cannot be neglected. 20 years are more than enough for the users to get familiar with the orthography of these two marks and to strengthen their correct use in the written practice. Therefore, the only conclusion is that the wrong examples increase due to imprecise information in both of the editions of the Orthography, nonfamiliarity with the developmental legitimacy of the Macedonian language, the scarce concern of the users of the Macedonian language about the written form of the language, and the lack of respect for the norms of the standard language.

Regarding these two rules, it could be noticed that in some of the examples there is an empty space between the incorrectly used hyphen and the word after it, whereas in some

of the examples there is not an empty space. It is also obvious that there is not an empty space between the quotation mark at the beginning and at the end of the text, when the text is in direct speech. In the late Orthography (1998, p. 138–140; 142–146), there is not a rule, which indicates whether there should be or there should not be an empty space between the dash and the word after it, when used for direct speech. Additionally, there is not a rule, which regulate whether there should be an empty space between the double quotation mark at the beginning and at the end of the text, when the text is in direct speech. The examples given in the Orthography, as illustrations of the use of these rules, show that there is an empty space between the dash and the word after it. The examples in the Orthography, used as illustrations of other rules that regulate the use of the dash as a punctuation mark, show that there is also an empty space between the dash and the word after it. There are examples in the Orthography for the use of the double quotation mark at the beginning and at the end of the sentence when the direct speech is not in a new line (Orthography, 1998, p. 142–146). However, from these examples it cannot be noticed if there is or there is not an empty space between the first and the last word of the sentence that presents the direct speech and the double quotation marks. These examples are written in italic and that creates visual illusion that there is an empty space between the double quotation mark at the beginning and the end of sentence that represents the direct speech. Therefore, it is obvious that there is a need for new rule that will precise the abovementioned weaknesses. In the new edition of the Orthography (2015, p. 121) in the segment that regulates the rules for the use of the dash, there is a general statement. This statement explicitly indicates the use of the dash at the beginning and in the middle of the sentence and recommends the use of the empty space from both sides. As for the double quotation marks, the new edition of the Orthography (2015, p. 143, pt. 331 b) also provides a rule which regulates that empty space should not be used between the double quotation marks and the text given in double quotation marks. Though the new edition of the Orthography clearly states the use of the empty space regarding the dash, still there are many incorrect written example even in the newspapers that comes out after the new edition of the Orthography. They can be seen in the examples 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6. Hence, the only inference is that the incorrect examples are still present because of the ignorance of the evolution of the Macedonian language, and the disrespect of the standard language's norm from its users.

4.1.3. Regarding the use of the dash and the double quotation marks in the direct speech, the Orthography (1998, p. 144, pt. 395 a, b), in the chapter for the use of appropriate marks in the direct speech, and not in the chapter for the use of the dash, regulates their use when there are explaining words after the direct speech. In this case, depending on the character of the sentence that presents the direct speech, there should be an appropriate mark after the sentence, and then, the dash is used and after the dash, the explaining words are given. The Orthography states that authors can omit the comma after the sentence that present the direct speech. This means that the dash appears twice, at the beginning of the direct speech, that is, in the new line before the sentence that represents the direct speech, and after the sentence if there are explaining words. There are many incorrect examples in the newspaper sub-style regarding this rule. Most often, the incorrect use refers to the use of the hyphen instead of the dash in the beginning and in the middle of the sentence, before the explaining words. However, these examples show that there is an empty space on both sides of the incorrectly used hyphen, which is correct. Ex.:

(8) -Vo ... - velat vo ... [-In the first six months...- say in ...] (Manasiev, 23.6.2015, D); - Imeto ... sme zadovolni - veli ... [-The name... we are satisfied - says ...] (Zdravkovska, 23.6.2015, D); -Ne ... vo stranstvo... - dodava [-No ... abroad... - adds] (Zdravkovska,

23.6.2015, D); ... ljubov ... - objasnuva Andonovski [... love... - explains Andonovski] (Stojanov, 23.6.2015, D).

In the new edition of the Orthography (2015, p. 121, pt. 286 b; 128, pt. 309 a) this rule that regulates the use of the dash before the explaining words (the words of the author) is present twice. Once, in the chapter, that regulates the use of the dash and second time in the chapter that regulates the use of the double quotation marks in the direct speech. The second rule explains that after the sentence that presents the direct speech there should be an appropriate mark (period, comma, exclamation mark, question mark, or three dots). Here the information that the authors can omit the comma is not present. Therefore, it is obvious that this rule is the same one from the late edition of the Orthography and that only difference is that the new edition does not contain the information about the comma, and there is no explanation why. However, the rule is the same in both of the editions. This means that it is in use for approximately 20 years and deviations from the norm are not expected. Still, the journalistic texts are full of this kind of deviation. Ex.:

(9) - Nie sme ... - reče ... [-We are ... - said ...]; - Mene ... - reče ... [-I...- said ...];

- Platenikot na Albancite ... - pišuva vlijateljnot srpski vesnik [- The mercenaries of the Albanians ... - write the influent Serbian journal] (Gjorgjevski, 3.5.2017, D).

Regarding this rule, it should be mentioned that the new edition has made a step forward. It clarifies that the explaining words are the words form the author because there are many rules that regulates the direct speech and many kind of explaining words could be present. In the late edition, there is not an explanation like this and it could be understand that this refers to any explaining words, which leads to confusions. Thus, the mistakes found in the journalistic texts refer that the only reason for them is the disrespect of the language norm form the speakers of the Macedonian language.

4.1.4. According to the Orthography (1998, p. 139, pt. 377), in the chapter for the use of the dash, the dash is used before a word, an expression or a sentence to emphasize them. Regarding this rule, it is important to indicate the dilemma about its applicability because it is very difficult to estimate the thought of the author of the text. Thus, it is very difficult to determine whether the author wants to emphasize certain words, expressions, or sentences. Although the rule indicates the use of the dash before a word in order to emphasize it, the examples in the Orthography does not refer to single word, but rather to an expression or a sentence. On assumption that in the below mentioned examples the authors aim is to emphasize, it is obvious that there are many incorrect examples in which the authors use the hyphen instead of the dash. Ex.:

(10) ... pa potoa - zdravje, koncerti [... and then - health, concerts]; ... site ... i sekao - ubavini [... all ... and of course - beauties]; I ako ne im dademe prostor - SRAMOTA ZA SITE NAS! [And if we do not give them space - SHAME ON US] (Pavlovska, 3.4.2015, Uv).

The new edition of the Orthography (2015, p. 122, pt. 289) in the part dedicated to the use of the dash, suggests the use of the dash before part of the sentence that should be emphasized. Then, in the pt. 289 a, it is said that the dash is used before the words: it, all, only, nothing etc. and the following example is given:

(11) Ljubovta – toa e večno vospevano čuvstvo ... [Love – it is the eternal praised feeling ...].

The dash is used before the word it. Although the rule seems to be clear and precise, it interferes with the rule from the late Orthography (1998, p. 139, pt. 379), which states

that the dash is used when the noun predicate connects with the subject through the demonstrative pronoun it. Here the following example is given:

(12) *Mirot – toa e ideal ... [Peace – it is an ideal ...].*

Thus, it is obvious that the separate rule from the late edition in the new edition is introduced as a new rule, and it does not mention the noun predicate. This leads to wrong and double interpretation. However, the rule is simpler and clearer in the late edition of the Orthography.

4.1.5. According to the late Orthography (1998, p. 140, p. 384), the dash is used when writing compound sentences instead of the omitted predicate which is given in the first clause. The rule is clear and precise. However, in the daily newspapers, there are incorrect examples because the authors have used a hyphen instead of a dash. Ex.:

(13) *... za mnogumina beše nacionalistički, a za drugi mnogumina - antiglobalistički [... for many people it was nationalistic, and for many other people - antiglobalistic] (Pavlovska, 3.4.2015: Uv).*

The new edition cites the exact same rule (2015, p. 123, pt. 291). Still, though the rule exist for more than 15 years it is obvious that the hyphen is used instead of the dash.

4.2. The dash as an orthographic mark

4.2.1. According to the late Orthography (1998, p. 149, pt. 406 v), the dash is used between the names of the places when signifying the distance between two or more places, or when signifying the direction of movement from one place to other. From the analysis of the material, it is clear that, in the daily newspapers, there are incorrect examples because the authors have used a hyphen instead of a dash. Ex.:

(14) *... so patot Melnički Most - Centar Župa [...with the road Melnički Most - Centar Župa]; ... Patriot pravec Debar - Mavrovo ... [... The route Debar - Mavrovo ...] (Todorovska, 23.6.2015, D).*

The new edition lists the same rule (2015, p. 137, pt. 317 v), and additional information about the presence of the empty space is explicitly provided. Thus, the rule is clear, precise and enriched with new information and incorrect examples are not expected. However, there are many wrong examples in the journalistic texts published after the new edition come out. Ex.:

(15) *... pravec Teranci - Kučičino ... [... the route Teranci - Kučičino ... (26.4.2017, D); ... na relacija Kičevo - Ohrid ... [... on relation Kičevo - Ohrid ...]; pravec Resen - Bitola ... [... the route Resen - Bitola ...] (19.1.2017, D).*

4.2.2. The late Orthography (1998, p. 149, pt. 407 a), regulates the use of the dash between two names connected in one notion. The following examples are given:

(16) *Natprevarot Pobeda–Rabotnički ... [The competition Pobeda–Rabotnički]; Duetot Sarievski–Nikolova [The duet Sarievski–Nikolova ...].*

The rule is not precise enough, because it is not clear why the name of two football clubs should signify one notion. The Orthography clearly stated that there should not be an empty space in these cases (1998, p. 149, pt. 407 b). In the journalistic texts, there are examples written with a dash, which is correct, but in the examples, there is an empty space on both sides of the dash, which, according to the Orthography, is not correct:

(17) ... *Bolivija – Peru, a potoa ... Argentina – Kolumbija u Brazil – Paragvaj* [... *Bolivia – Peru, and then ... Argentina – Colombia and Brazil – Paraguay*] (24.6.2015, D); ... *Vardar – Metalurg* ... (15.5.2015, D).

Further, there are examples with incorrect use of a hyphen instead of a dash, with or without an empty space:

(18) ... *Vardar - Metalurg ...; Pelister - Metalurg ...; Vardar - Vardar SCBT ...* (15.5.2015, D); ... *Vardar-Renova, Rabotnički-Škendija, Teteks-Bregalnica ...* (12.5.2015, D) – these are the names of a Macedonian football clubs.

The new edition provides the same rule as well as additional information that refer to the presence of an empty space on both side of the dash in these cases. The rule is also enriched with the information that the dash is used when it presents the relation 'between' or 'against' between two nouns (Orthography, 2015, p. 138, 318 g). The following example is given:

(19) *Natprevarot Makedonja – Srbija ...* [*The competition Macedonia – Serbia ...*].

The information about the empty space here is opposite to the one in the late Orthography and this can lead to the confusion, i.e. whether there should be or not an empty space when it comes to names of the football clubs. However, the rule in the new edition is more precise and in the spirit of the Macedonian language norm. Here, the explanation that these two nouns should signify one notion, which brings in confusions, is not present. As for the name of the duet, in the new edition, it is given as a separate rule and it says that when two names are connected in one notion, the dash without an empty space should be used. The following example is listed (Orthography, 2015, p. 138, 318 a):

(20) *Duetot Selimova-Želčevski e ...* [*The duet Selimova-Želčevski is more ...*].

Selimova-Želčevski refers to the surnames of two famous singers that are married. Bearing in mind that the duet always implies two persons it is not clear why it signifies one notion. Does the marital status have some connection with this explanation? There is no explanation in the new edition. Thus, the only explanation here is that the dash is used instead of the conjunction *i* (and) that connects the two names and many examples from 2017 confirmed this claim, because the name of the duet is written with the conjunction *and*.

4.2.3. In the late Orthography (1998: 149, pt. 406 a, b) it is said that the dash is used instead of the preposition *until* between two numbers. The following examples are given:

(21) *(1982 – 1988); (1914 – 1918); Čovekot imaše 30 – 35 godini* [*The man has 30 – 35 years*].

There is no additional information about the empty space, but the examples indicate that there should be an empty space on both side of the dash.

The new Orthography precise this rule indicating that the dash with space of both sides should be used when it signifies the relation *from – until* (Orthography, 2015, p. 137, 317 a). The rule is clear and precise. Still, there are many wrong examples in the journalistic texts published after the new edition come out. Ex.:

(22) ... *Boris Tadić (2004-2012) ... Voislav Koštunica (2000-2003) ... Milan Milutinović (1997-2002) ... Svetozar Marković (2003-2006) – names and surnames of the Serbian presidents – (Uv, 26.3.2017); ... from 1012-1956 ...; from 1948- 1971 g. ...* (28.4.2017, D).

In the both editions of the Orthography (1998 and 2015), there is not a rule that would indicate which mark should be used between the name of a certain institution and the city in which the institution is located. Except for the comma, which use in this case is correct, the newspaper sub-style, but also the daily writing practice in general, show use of the dash and hyphen the same purpose. However, the use of a hyphen indicate that there is an incomplete unification of two parts of a compound word (a use that belongs to the hyphen), but the name of the institution and the name of the city are two separate and independent word forms, and not parts of a compound word. If taking into account the already given information about the use of the dash, it is more natural that this kind of examples exploits the use of the dash with an empty space on both sides. The use of the hyphen, in these cases, is unacceptable. Still, there are many wrong examples in the journalistic text, from 2015 and 2017. Ex.:

(23) *Evropskiot univerzitet - R. Makedonija* [The European university - R. of Macedonia] (9.10.2015, Uv); *Univerzitetot „Sveti Kiril i Metodij“ - Skopje ...* [University „St. Cyril and Methodius“ - Skopje] (16.12.2015, Uv); *Univerzitetot „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“ - Bitola* [University „St. Kliment Ohridski“ - Bitola]; *Univerzitet „Goce Delčev“-Štip* [University “Goce Delčev”-Štip] (11.8.2015, Uv).

Examples from 2017:

(24) *... vo Osnovnoto javno обвинителство - Skopje ...* [... in the Primary public prosecutors - Skopje ...] (20.3.2017, D); *... „Pivara“ ... - Skopje ...*[... “Brewery” - Skopje ...] (19.4.2017, D); *... Evrovizija-2017 ...* [Eurovision-2017 ...] (Lušin, 19.4.2017, D).

5. Conclusion

The result of the research and the discussion, demonstrate that there are many wrong and incorrect examples in the journalistic sub-style that are not in accordance with the Macedonian orthographic norm. In most of the examples, the dash is incorrectly interchanged with the hyphen, without taking into consideration that they are two different marks, which have their own orthographic rules. This is an indicator that the language competencies of the text’s writers should improve as well as that the role of the proofreaders in shaping the final version of the texts in accordance with the orthographic norms.

From the analysis, it is obvious that some of the rules are in a certain degree imprecise and this leads to the possibility of their dual interpretation, depending on the manner the use of the dash is understood by the authors, editors or proofreaders. Hence, some of the rules are more precise in the late edition, and some of them are more precise in the new edition. The mistakes are a result of lack of precise information in some of the rules. Thus, the paper encourages new editions of the contemporary Orthography, which will resolve all the dilemmas and make the rule more precise and understandable for all its users. It can be seen that for some of the examples the Orthography does not provide rules. Consequently, the new edition of the Orthography should also provide new orthographic rules, which would be a reflection of the contemporary reality of the language.

References

- Group of authors. (2015). *Pravopis na makedonskiot jazik* [The Orthography of the Macedonian language]. Skopje: Insitut za makedonski jazik “K. Misirkov”, pp. 121–123; 137–139
- Januševa, V., Jurukovska, J. (2016). The relevance of the differences between punctuation and orthographic marks in teaching the Macedonian language in

primary education. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 4 (2), pp. 233-246, DOI: 10.18033/ilja.385

Jurkovska, J. (2016). Crtata i crtičkata vo pišanata praktika na standardniot makedonski jazik [The dash and hyphen in the written practice of the standard Macedonian language]. Unpublished master thesis. Bitola: University "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", Faculty of Education

Taseska, M. (2012). Pravopisnite greški vo pismenoto izrazuvanje kaj ucenicite od I i II ciklus od osnovnoto obrazovanie [The orthographic mistakes in the students' written expression from the I and II cycle of the primary education]. Unpublished master thesis. Bitola: University "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", Faculty of Education

Vidoeski, B., Dimitrovski, T., Koneski, K., Ugrinova-Skalovska, R. (1998). *Pravopis na makedonskiot literaturni jazik. Izdanie so izmenet i dopolnet tekst. [Orthography of the modern Macedonian language. Edition with changed and complemented text]*. Skopje: Prosvetno delo, pp. 138-141; 142-146

Excerpts from

Gjorgjevski, B. (3.5.2017). Makedoncite se ist narod so Srbite i Bugarite? Smešno i apsurdno [Macedonians are the same people with the Serbians and Bulgarians? Ridiculous and absurd]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2poVqkn>, 4.5.2017

Lušin, M. (19.4.2017). Za hibridnata ludnica [For the hybrid madhouse]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2qxqu1r>, 5.5.2017

Manasiev, A. (23.6.2015). Citostaticite i vijagrite se najopasnite lekovi što se švercuvaat vo Makedonija [The citostatics and Viagra are the most dangerous drugs that have been smuggled in Macedonia]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2pzUQws>, 26.12.2015

N/A. (23.6.2015). Makedonija bez Čekovski na EP vo septemvri [Macedonia without Čekovski on the EC in September]. Telma. <http://bit.ly/2plcU13>, 25.12.2015

N/A. (23.6.2015). Makedonija bez Čekovski na EP 2015 [Macedonia without Čekovski on the EC 2015]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2q6LM38>, 26.12.2015

N/A. (23.6.2015). Makedonija bez Čekovski na EP 2015 [Macedonia without Čekovski on the EC 2015]. Alon.mk. <http://bit.ly/2q41Aol>, 25.12.2015

N/A. (23.6.2015). Čekovski nema da igra na EP 2015 [Čekovski will not play on EC 2015]. Ohriddenes. <http://bit.ly/2r0WgiU>, 26.12.2016

N/A. (23.6.2015). Čile so site orudija kje udri na Urugvaj [Chile will strike Uruguay with its entire instruments]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2r10B6n>, 26.12.2015

N/A. (3.3.2017). Albancite da si ja zemat sudbinata vo svoi race [The Albanians should take the destiny in their hands]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2pDCY3C>, 5.5.2017

N/A. (26.2.2017). Zaev od Ivanov kje go bara mandatot za vlada [Zaev will ask Ivanov the mandate for the government]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2q6BQZf>, 5.5.2017

N/A. (26.4.2017). Se asfaltira nov alternativen pat na istokot [A new alternative road is being asphalted on the east]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2q6pPTV>, 11.5.2017

N/A. (19.1.2017). Zabрани za kamioni poradi obilniot sneg na prevoite [Restriction for trucks due to the big snow on the folds]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2pDSuFT>, 11.5.2017

- N/A. (15.5.2015). Očekivano finale Vardar - Metalurg vo rakometniot kup na Makedonija [Expected finale Vardar - Metalurg in the handball cup of Macedonia]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2r7btR1>, 11.5.2017
- N/A. (12.5.2015). Protestite gi pomestija prvligaškite mečevi v sabota [The protests dislocate the first league competition on Saturday]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2q81kW5>, 11.5.2015
- N/A. (20.3.2017). Oliver Spasovski ne se javi na raspit kaj obvinitelot [Oliver Spasovski does not show himself on the questioning at the prosecutor]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2qZl7Id>, 4.5.2017
- N/A. (19.4.2017). Edukativna rabotilnica za decata „Zelena planeta“ vo Gjorče Petrov [Educational workshop for children “The Green planet” in Gjorče Petrov]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2q8hKO5>, 5.5.2017
- N/A. (28.4.2017). Zaev: Imaše obid za ubistvo so umisla [Zaev: There was an attempt for murder with intention]. Utrinski vesnik (Uv). <http://bit.ly/2pDB7f0>, 7.5.2017
- N/A. (26.4.2017). Sela: Zakon za SJO i specijalen sud, pa izbori [Sela: Law for SPP and special court, then elections]. Utrinski vesnik (Uv). <http://bit.ly/2qYoG1x>, 9.5.2017
- N/A. (26.3.2017). Site srpski pretsedатели [All the presidents of Serbia]. Utrinski vesnik (Uv). <http://bit.ly/2qZbvUp>, 11.5.2017
- N/A. (9.10.2015). Kulturnoto nasledstvo kako modna inspiracija [The cultural heritage as a inspiration in the fashion]. Utrinski vesnik (Uv). <http://bit.ly/2qhaSxM>, 14.5.2017
- N/A. (16.12.2015). DIK dobi eksperti so partiska preporaka [SEC has experts with party's reference]. Utrinski vesnik (Uv). <http://bit.ly/2rg51r9>, 14.5.2017
- N/A. (11.8.2015). Počnuvaat upisite na fakultetite [The enrollment on the faculties starts]. Utrinski vesnik (Uv). <http://bit.ly/2pz7gZt>, 14.5.2017
- Nikolovski, Z. (28.4.2017). Albanija – nov člen na stariot balkanski sojuz [Albania – new member of the old Balkan alliance]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2q6zIRx>, 5.5.2017
- Pavlovska, J. (3.4.2015). Gorazd Čapovski frontmen na „Mizar“ - bez politički angažman, rok- muzikata e mrtva [Gorazd Čapovski frontmen na “Mizar” - without political engagement the roc music is death]. Utrinski vesnik (Uv). <http://bit.ly/2r17Qeu>, 25.12.2015
- Popovska, T. (25.4.2017). Zaev i Ahmeti dogovaraat deblokiranje na Sobranieto [Zaev and Ahmeti arrange to unblock the Parliament]. Utrinski vesnik (Uv). <http://bit.ly/2qwTRRw>, 9.5.2017
- Stojanov, Gj. (23.6.2015). Sudot kje odluči dali lažam [The court will decide whether I am laying]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2q3Ud1e>, 26.12.2015
- Todorovska, V. (23.6.2015). Okolu 2000 žiteli na Centar Župa vekje nema da gazat po kal i prav [Approximately 2000 citizens will no longer walk on mud and dust]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2py4u1M>, 26.12.2015
- Zdravkovska, Ž. (23.6.2015). „Gnasni deca stanaa pozitiven biznis-primer vo Makedonija [“The Loathsome children” became a positive business-example in Macedonia]. Dnevnik (D). <http://bit.ly/2pAePL7>, 25.12.2015