



The Unattainable Standard – Zagreb Dialect Meets Standard Croatian Accentuation

Mate Kapović

University of Zagreb
Zagreb, Croatia

Недосягаемая норма: на стыке диалектной загребской и литературной хорватской акцентуации

Мате Капович

Загребский университет
Загреб, Хорватия

Abstract

The paper discusses the accentual accommodation by speakers of the urban dialect of Zagreb (the capital of Croatia), which has a dynamic free accent, to the Standard Croatian (Neo-Štokavian) pitch accent (with rising and falling tones). The accommodation occurs in formal settings—the basis of this research is the corpus of 16 one-hour interviews with native Zagreb dialect speakers (8 male, 8 female) from a TV show on Croatian national television (HRT). The Zagreb dialect speakers cannot fully reproduce the prescribed standard accentuation, so they only approximate it by inconsistently changing the place of stress. The level of accommodation varies among speakers. The prescribed Croatian standard accentuation is different than in languages like English, because it cannot be acquired fully by many speakers due mainly to reasons of phonetic complexity. The basics of the Zagreb dialect accentuation and its complex relation to the standard language accentuation (due to many innovations in the dialect and a range of conservative and innovative varieties) are also analyzed. This paper is the first to describe the phenomenon in detail, based on concrete data.

Keywords

Zagreb dialect, Croatian, accent, accentuation, standard language, accommodation



Резюме

Статья освещает акцентное приспособление в речи носителей городского диалекта столицы Хорватии Загреба, имеющего разноместное силовое ударение, к литературному хорватскому (новоштокавскому) тональному ударению (с восходящими и нисходящими тонами). Приспособление происходит в формальной обстановке — эта работа основана на корпусе из 16 часовых интервью с носителями загребского диалекта (8 мужчин, 8 женщин) из передачи хорватского государственного телевидения (HRT) с массовой аудиторией. Загребчане не могут полностью воспроизвести нормативную акцентуацию, а лишь приближаются к ней, непоследовательно сдвигая ударение. Степень приспособления разнится от носителя к носителю. В данной работе это явление впервые подробно описано с учётом конкретных данных. Нормативная новоштокавская акцентуация отлична, например, от английской, в частности в том, что мало кто из хорватов-неновоштокавцев вполне овладевает акцентной нормой — прежде всего из-за её фонетической сложности. В работе также анализируются основы загребской акцентуации в её сложном отношении к нормативной (в связи с многочисленными инновациями в диалекте и наличием целого ряда более или менее архаичных и инновативных говоров).

Ключевые слова

загребский диалект, хорватский язык, ударение, акцентуация, литературный язык, приспособление

Standard Croatian is the official language of Croatia and a variety of Standard Štokavian (in official use, with regional differences, in neighboring Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro—commonly called Serbo-Croatian prior to 1990, nowadays also Bosnian/Croatian/Montenegrin/Serbian, i.e. BCMS).¹ Apart from the Štokavian dialect group (named for the interrogative/relative pronoun *što* ‘what’), spoken in Croatia and the four neighboring post-Yugoslav countries, two large dialect groups are also present in Croatia—Kajkavian (named after *kaj* ‘what’) in the North-West continental Croatia and Čakavian (after *ča* ‘what’) on the coast. The capital and largest city of Croatia, Zagreb, is located on the traditional Kajkavian territory (although the dialect is nowadays heavily Štokavized), which creates an interesting sociolinguistic dynamics in Croatia. The aim of this article is to illustrate the phenomenon of *unattainable standard norms* on the basis of the curious relationship between the Zagreb dialect and Standard Croatian accentuation.

The Zagreb urban dialect is not unified—it is rather a continuum ranging from more conservative Kajkavian variety(ies) (the conservative vernacular of the old inner city was first described in [Magner 1966]) to an innovative

¹ I would like to thank Marko Kapović, Mislav Benić and an anonymous reviewer for reading carefully and commenting on the first draft of the paper, and also Mikhail Oslon for his help with technical issues.

vernacular morphologically and lexically very close to the Standard Croatian (for a wider look on the linguistic panorama of Zagreb cf. [Šojat et al. 1998]).² Depending on the conservativeness of the speaker, there are a number of differences between the Zagreb dialect (ZgD) and Standard Croatian (SC)—e.g. the pronoun ‘what’ (ZgD *kaj*, used together with dialectal Štokavian *šta* and the SC/dialectal *što*—the latter form used mainly when unstressed, i.e. when it is a relative pronoun), phonology (like the preservation of the final *-l* in words like *posel* ‘job’ in more conservative ZgD, cf. SC *posao* and dialectal Štokavian and innovative ZgD *poso*), morphological differences (like the 3rd person present *ideju* ‘they go’ in a more conservative Zagreb dialect, unlike SC *idu*), lexical items (like *plac* ‘(open) market’ for SC *tržnica*), etc.

The accentual systems of ZgD (i.e. the accentual system of a great majority of people born in Zagreb, no matter how conservative or innovative their ZgD variety is) and SC are rather different. The accentual system of SC (and of other varieties of Standard Štokavian) is based on the so-called Neo-Štokavian accentual system (used on a wide territory of former Yugoslavia). Neo-Štokavian (Neo-Štok.) has free pitch accent with falling and rising tones in stressed syllables,³ traditionally marked with four diacritics (accounting for both pitch and length jointly): *slàva* [slâva] ‘fame’ (short falling), *lâđa* [lâ:dza] ‘boat’ (long falling), *màgla* [mâgla] ‘fog’ (short rising), *tráva* [trâ:va] ‘grass’ (long rising). Posttonic syllables can also be long, e.g. *kòkòš* [kòko:ʃ] ‘hen’. The accent can change in paradigm in an unpredictable manner: e.g. *rúka* ‘arm’—acc. sg. *rúku* but *lúka* ‘port’—acc. sg. *lúku*. This is, with some minor differences, the accentual system employed in many local dialects as well—for instance, in all big cities in Slavonia (the eastern part of Croatia) and Dalmatia (the southern part near the coast), like Osijek and Split.⁴

Unlike SC accentuation, which is rather complex, Zagreb dialect accentuation is rather simple (similar to English or Russian accentuation)—it has a free dynamic accent with no pitch or length distinctions. All of the SC words

² Unfortunately, no quantitative sociolinguistic research has ever been published on the Zagreb dialect (however, the author of this paper did do some preparatory fieldwork in Zagreb).

³ The pitch accent nature of Neo-Štokavian is sometimes underplayed (cf. [Lehiste, Ivić 1963: 20, 131–133]), but this is due to regional differences in Neo-Štokavian. In western Neo-Štokavian dialects (and thus in Standard Croatian), the distinction of falling and rising tones is indeed a pitch accent/tonal distinction (cf. also [Лехисте, Ивић 1996: 288]).

⁴ Similar systems, with various phonetic realizations, exist in Old Štokavian, Kajkavian and Čakavian as well—e.g. the most archaic dialects (Štokavian/Kajkavian/Čakavian alike) will distinguish *rūkâ* (pretonic length and final accent)—acc. sg. *rúku* and *lúkâ*—acc. sg. *lúkû* (the Neo-Štokavian rising accents originate in stress retraction). Non-Neo-Štokavian dialect may also exhibit various stress retractions, e.g. some Čakavian and most Kajkavian dialects have *rúka/lúka* (with the so-called “neo-acute” intonation, which is a slowly rising, level or slowly falling tone) instead of the older final accentuation (that corresponds to the final accentuation in, for instance, Russian).

adduced above are pronounced with the same accent—*sláva, mǎgla, tráva*, etc. The (morphologically conditioned) accentual mobility is also greatly reduced, cf. ZgD *kòkoš*—gen. pl. *kòkoši*—dat/loc/instr. pl. *kòkošima* to SC *kòkòš*—gen. pl. *kòkòši*—dat/loc/instr. pl. *kòkòšima* (though paradigmatic mobility can be reduced in some Neo-Štokavian dialects as well).⁵ However, words can still be distinguished by stress position, e.g. ZgD *plàkat* ‘to cry’ (SC *plàkati*, dial. Neo-Štok. *plàkat*) but *plakát* ‘poster, placard’ (SC *plàkāt*), or *mòrala* ‘she had to’ (SC *mòrala*) and *morála* ‘moral [gen. sg.]’ (SC *morála*). More or less the same type of accentual system (a paradigmatically simplified dynamic accent system) appears in some other big cities like Rijeka or Pula on the north-west coast.

There are various conflicting prestige patterns when it comes to the accentual system. The SC accentual system is prestigious – being used (fully or in partial approximation) by TV and radio announcers, actors in classical plays, many educated speakers, etc. It is prestigious mostly in formal situations (e.g. on television, public speaking, in schools, when reading, etc.) and only when “de-localized”, i.e. when the Neo-Štokavian accentual system is not interrelated with regional phonetic characteristics (and when the Neo-Štokavian accent is not too salient—e.g. when the lengths are not too long, tones too “exaggerated” and regional sounding, etc.). If paired with various regional characteristics (but sometimes also without it), Neo-Štokavian accent is paradoxically also often perceived as a “redneck accent” (Croatian *seljački naglasak* ‘[lit.] peasant accent’), due to it being spoken in many rural areas⁶ and not being the accent of the capital. On the other hand, ZgD accent, though not standard, is also prestigious (especially in non-formal but sometimes in formal situations⁷), being the accent of the capital⁸ (and of many media workers, public officials, public intellectuals, etc. from Zagreb). This is demonstrated by the fact that some Neo-Štokavians (and other newcomers) partially or fully adapt to the ZgD accent—this also occurs with some journalists of Neo-Štokavian origin in the media.⁹ The ZgD accent (both its nature and stress position) is an important

⁵ Some of the existing cases of mobility in ZgD seem to be in the process of disappearing, e.g. ZgD gen. sg. *imèna*—gen. pl. *imèna* (‘name’, cf. SC gen. sg. *imèna*—gen. pl. *iménā*) is slowly neutralizing in gen. sg/pl. *imèna*.

⁶ Though two of the largest four cities (Split and Osijek) also have Neo-Štokavian dialects.

⁷ Zagreb dialect speakers often perceive the Zagreb accent as “neutral” (meaning primarily the Zagreb phonology and prosody), and other speakers as “having an accent.”

⁸ [Auer 2007: 111] mentions cases where the vernacular of the capital is closer to the standard variety than the dialect of newcomers. For Zagreb, this is true in some cases (e.g. for Zagreb morphology which is closer to the standard one than a morphology of some rural Kajkavian dialect), but not in the case of accentuation if the newcomer is Neo-Štokavian (though Zagreb accentuation is, considering stress positions, closer to the standard one if compared to rural Kajkavian dialectal accentuation).

⁹ Thus, for instance, an ex-journalist of the national Croatian radio-television (HRT) Hloverka Novak-Srzić, raised in the Neo-Štok. town of Makarska (later living and working in Zagreb), often partially accommodates to ZgD accent, at least when

and recognized feature of ZgD and a strong indicator of local identity—a non-ZgD accent is not very stigmatized socially among adults since almost half of Zagreb's population was born outside of Zagreb,¹⁰ but it is very stigmatized among elementary and high school children in Zagreb.

The question is—how do native speakers of the Zagreb dialect (with a simple dynamic stress) adapt to the complex pitch accent system of Standard Croatian? The fact is that the only speakers of SC that use a full-fledged (or near full-fledged) Neo-Štokavian accentual system (with the distinction of falling and rising tones), apart from very rare professionals (like some actors, media workers, philology university professors, etc.), are those that are native speakers of Neo-Štokavian (or are, less frequently, of Neo-Štokavian origin through parents). Non-Štokavian speakers generally cannot speak the standard dialect with the accentual system formally described in the SC grammar books and dictionaries (this goes for most non-Štokavian Croatian language experts as well). One of the tasks of this paper is to look at how speakers of the ZgD cope with SC accentuation.

It is a well-known fact that informants tend to speak differently when reading, shifting their pronunciation more toward the standard (cf. e.g. [Labov 2006²: 23, 150–151, 386, 394, 398; Bell 2007: 95]). This is also clear for many speakers of the ZgD. In 2010, the author of this paper interviewed a university-educated female speaker from Zagreb (born in 1944). In a one-

speaking publicly (obviously considering it as prestigious). Thus, even when being a guest in a show at the (Neo-Štokavian) Split based TV station (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G1R61xj6S1M>; last access on 23.06.2018), instead of saying *ponīzi* 'he humiliates' and *ispričāvām* 'I apologize' (which would be the accent in SC and her native dialect) she pronounces these verbs at the opening of the show as *ponīzi* and *ispričāvām* in an approximation to ZgD pronunciation *ponīzi* and *ispričāvām* (for many native speakers of Neo-Štokavian, it is difficult to eliminate tones and distinctive length when trying to speak ZgD so they just shift the stress position, while maintaining tone and stressed length distinctions intact). The host of the show *Nedjeljom u dva* Aleksandar Stanković is also a good example—he is originally a Neo-Štokavian speaker living in Zagreb. When talking, he mixes his native dialect pronunciation (which is rather close to the officially prescribed norm) and approximations of ZgD accent (with which he is surrounded in everyday life and which he obviously regards as prestigious, though formally clashing with the official norm). Thus, for example, he says (4 April 2014) *naprāviti* 'to do' (approximation of ZgD *naprāviti* with dynamic stress), *izvūkli* (2x) 'you took out' (approximation of ZgD *izvūkli*) but *zauzimate* 'you support/solicit' (no posttonic length in his dialect in this position), *prōgram* (2x) (cf. SC *nāpraviti*, *izvūkli*, *zauzimate*, *prōgram*). Of course, in other cases he (and some other Neo-Štokavians in Zagreb) would also pronounce *zauzimate* and *prōgrām* (in approximation for ZgD *zauzimate*, *prōgrām*). It is much less frequent that original speakers of Neo-Štokavian adapt completely to ZgD accent and dynamic accent (and use it both privately in Zagreb and publicly), though such cases do exist as well.

¹⁰ According to the 2011 census (http://www.dzs.hr/Hrv/censuses/census2011/results/htm/h01_01_25/h01_01_25_zup21.html; last access on 23.06.2018), 406.598 of 790.017 Zagreb inhabitants were born in Zagreb. Also, many ZgD speakers have at least one parent, and many have both of them, born outside of Zagreb (many of those are Neo-Štokavian speakers), which certainly has significant linguistic consequences.

hour long sociolinguistic interview, she had no less than 100% of normal ZgD accents, when using her usual vernacular (the interviewer also spoke with ZgD accent during the interview). Thus, for instance, she produced sentences like *ovaj režiser koi je to postavio, on to može postaviti u kazalištu. . .*¹¹ ‘the director that made the play, he can make it in the theater. . .’, with typical ZgD forms like *režiser* ‘director’, *postavio* ‘made/put’ and *postaviti* ‘to make/put’ (cf. SC *režisèr, postavio, postaviti*). However, when reading a short written passage, she had 23.33% of SC stress positions (i.e. the stress position was shifted to the SC position in 7 of 30 words in the text in which the ZgD and SC had differing stress positions). Thus, she read sentences like *pòdižu se javne zgrade i organizira se javni prijevoz* ‘public buildings are erected and public transportation is being organized’, with *organizira se* ‘it is being organized’ with the ZgD accent but *pòdižu* ‘they erect’ with SC stress position (cf. SC *pòdižū* and the usual ZgD accent *podīžu*). This is a common phenomenon in Zagreb. One must note here that what the speakers of the ZgD do is just shift the stress position (e.g. from *podīžu* to *pòdižu* in imitation of the SC *pòdižū*), while ignoring the tones and lengths, which are impossible to pronounce for a ZgD speaker, because their native dialect has no distinctive pitch/length. Of course, the 23.33% given above is just one example, given as an illustration, and valid for one individual speaker of ZgD only. The exact percentage of adaption of ZgD speakers to SC accent position when reading a text cannot be ascertained without special empiric research—this probably varies a lot, depends on various social and linguistic variables (like education, occupation, perhaps gender, dialectal background), etc.

The change in stress position, in an approximation of the SC accentuation (for instance, ZgD speakers pronouncing *kòlač* ‘cake’ in formal style instead of the usual ZgD *koláč*, using the SC form *kòlāč* as the model, but disregarding the short rising tone and posttonic length), has been noted in the literature ([Kapović 2007: 71; Idem 2011a: 68; Idem 2015: 36 g], not only for Zagreb dialect speakers, but has never been empirically studied¹². This is the aim of this paper—to see how this accommodation by the ZgD speakers to the SC accentuation occurs,¹³ how frequently it occurs, how many Zagreb

¹¹ The accent is marked only on the forms relevant for our discussion here.

¹² What prescriptive Croatian linguistics likes to do is to pretend that it is really important for everybody to learn the standard orthoepy, while completely disregarding the fact that it cannot be done, at least not in full, and that it is not done in practice. In any case, a partial accommodation to the Standard will be considered as “insufficient” and unworthy of serious research (the “serious” researchers, of course, focusing on prescriptive pseudolinguistics or, in the best case scenario, on rural dialects, etc.).

¹³ The term *accommodation* is used here neither in the sense of interpersonal accommodation (convergence) to an interactant, nor to long-term dialect accommodation [Auer 2007: 109], but as accommodation to formal conditions (in this case appearing on national television) in which speakers are expected to speak in a formal (i.e. more standard) manner.

speakers exhibit it, and what theoretical conclusions one can draw from this phenomenon.

An average ZgD (and Croatian, more generally) speaker perceives the difference between SC and ZgD accent position as a simple rule that the SC accent is always to the left of the ZgD accent—as in some of the forms we have already seen (e.g. SC *pòdižū* and ZgD *podīžu*, SC *kòlāč* and ZgD *koláč*). This is indeed true in many instances, but the real differences in stress position of SC and ZgD are actually more complex. Cf. also e.g. SC *autóbus* ‘bus’ ~ ZgD *autobus*, SC *životòpis* ‘CV’ ~ ZgD *životopis*, SC *plemènit* ‘noble’ ~ ZgD *plèmenit*, or SC *dalekòzor/dalekózor* ‘binoculars’ ~ ZgD *dálekozor*, etc. However, while certain more educated ZgD speakers do know that, for instance, the accent *životòpis* (the ZgD approximation of the SC accent) is the standard one, the only sociolinguistically salient perception is that “the standard accent is often on the syllable preceding the stressed one in Zagreb dialect” (see below for the usual accommodation types), e.g. ZgD *junák* ‘hero’ ~ SC *jùnāk* (*jùnāk* in ZgD approximation of SC), ZgD *nalázit(i)* ‘to find’ ~ SC *nàlaziti* (*nàlaziti* in ZgD approximation of SC),¹⁴ etc.

This research is based on the data provided by 16 native speakers of the Zagreb dialect that appeared from 2010 to 2016¹⁵ in a popular show *Nedjeljom u dva* (‘Sunday at two [o’clock]’) on the Croatian Radio-Television (HRT—the national public broadcaster in Croatia).¹⁶ This show was chosen because it has one guest only, provides almost a full hour of data, and is probably one of the most formal situations in which a speaker can ever find himself—speaking on prime-time television¹⁷ (especially since the show is usually “serious”, not just light entertainment). Thus, there is pressure on the speaker to talk as formally as possible, i.e. to adapt to viewers expecting a more formal variety of speech (cf. [Bell 1984: 172; Idem 2007: 97]).

The only conditions for a speaker to be randomly chosen for this research were that s/he was born and raised in Zagreb, that s/he was (if possible)

¹⁴ The historical origin of this relation is not always identical. In some cases, the Neo-Štokavian (SC) accent is to the left of the ZgD accent because ZgD preserves the older stress place (as in *junák* or *naláziti*), while Neo-Štokavian experienced the so-called Neo-Štokavian stress retraction (*junák* > *jùnāk*, *naláziti* > *nàlaziti*). In other cases, the reasons can be different—for instance, the relation of ZgD *v(j)eróvat(i)* ‘to trust’ to SC *vjèrovati* is due to Neo-Štokavian preserving the old stress place, while the ZgD stress place is secondary (generalized) by analogy to verbs as ZgD *bolóvat(i)* ‘to be sick’ (SC *bolóvati*).

¹⁵ Most are from 2015 and 2016, but four older interviews had to be included (one from 2014, two from 2013, one from 2010) in order to take into account an equal number of female speakers (which are underrepresented in the show).

¹⁶ The shows are mostly easily accessible on the internet: <http://www.hrt.hr/enz/nedjeljom-u-2/>; <https://hrti.hrt.hr/#/search/term/nedjeljom%20u%20dva>; last access on 23.06.2018 (however, HRT regularly takes off older shows). Some shows are available also elsewhere on the internet (www.youtube.com/; <http://www.dailymotion.com/>; last access on 23.06.2018).

¹⁷ For sociolinguistic data from media broadcasts cf. [Milroy, Gordon 2003: 51].

a guest in the show in the last two years (the research was done in 2016), and that s/he spoke the Zagreb dialect (on which see below), while trying to get speakers of different age and sex (there are 8 males and 8 females in the sample). The problem with this type of data and sample is that it is not very heterogeneous—all interviewees in the sample are university educated (guests with only high-school education or less are rarely on the show), and most are middle class or even upper class. In the chosen random sample, 5 of the speakers are politicians (or were politicians at the time of the show), all of them highly positioned at one time during their careers, and most of the rest work in the entertainment industry (directors, actors, writers, singers):

Rajko Grlić (1947, male) –film director; Marijan Hanžeković (1952, male) –a prominent lawyer and one of the wealthiest capitalists in Croatia; Vesna Pusić (1953, female) –former member of the government; Jadranka Sloković (1953 or 1954, female) –one of the top lawyers in Croatia; Ivo Josipović (1957, male) –ex-president of Croatia and a university professor of law; Vitomira Lončar (1959, female) –actress and theater director; Željka Markić (1964, female) –activist and business woman; Zoran Milanović (1966, male) –ex-prime minister of Croatia; Milana Vuković Runjić (1970, female) –writer and publisher; Mirela Holy (1971, female) –former member of the government; Ivan Goran Vitez (1975, male) –film director; Ivona Juka (1976, female) –film director; Boris Jokić (1976, male) –sociologist/pedagogue working at an institute and public intellectual; Dario Juričan (1976, male) –film director; Mirela Priselac (1979, female) –singer; Ivan Tepeš (1980, male) –ex-vice president of the Croatian parliament.

Thus, the random sample taken from guests mostly in the last two years (with four older interviews due to gender diversity) is not socioeconomically diverse, which means that the results of the research can be taken as valid for educated, middle- and upper-class speakers only. It is possible that the results would be different in case of less educated people, but lower/working class people rarely get a chance to speak on such TV shows (at least not as the main guests). The speakers in the sample are also somewhat homogeneous generationally, since they are neither very young nor very old (for obvious reasons) –all were born between 1947 and 1980.

How do we establish who is a Zagreb dialect speaker? One criterion is that the person must be born and raised in Zagreb. In most cases, this means that s/he is a speaker of the ZgD dialect.¹⁸ The other criterion is that their dialect

¹⁸ This does not hold true in all cases. There are a number (but still a small minority) of cases where Zagreb born and raised children of Neo-Štokavian parents do speak Neo-Štokavian like their parents (either at home only or in general) and maintain the phonological and prosodical properties of Neo-Štokavian, like the full-fledged Neo-Štokavian pitch-accent system. Such cases sometimes appear not only in cases of individual speakers but in larger communities as well—for instance, in the

features mostly agree with what is expected of an average ZgD speaker—primarily that s/he has a dynamic accent (with the usual generalized stress positions), a phonological system that has no difference between *č* [tʃ] and *ć* [tɕ] (which are distinguished officially in SC and in many, usually rural or small-town, dialects but not in Zagreb and most other big cities¹⁹), and a fricative [v] (this phoneme is the approximant [ʋ] officially in SC and in many Štokavian dialects).

Many other traits of ZgD (both old and new) can occasionally be seen in our interviews as well (preserved in spite of the formal conditions of the speech act).²⁰ For instance, realizing stressed /i/ as [i] (typical of some speakers of ZgD) like *b[i]lo* ‘was [neut. sg.]’, *p[i]tam* ‘I ask’, *p[i]tate* ‘you ask [pl.]’ (M. Holy, D. Juričan, J. Sloković, I. Juka, Ž. Markić); occasional final devoicing (e.g. *òvok* ‘of this’—M. Hanžeković, *s kìm gòt* ‘with whomever’—V. Pusić, *nàpret* ‘forward’—I. G. Vitez, *mòk* ‘my [gen. sg.]’—V. Lončar, *bes* ‘without’—M. Holy; cf. SC *òvòg*, *s kìm gòd*, *nàprijèd*, *mòg*, *bez*); internal devoicing of *v* (acc. pl. *nòfce* ‘money’—V. Pusić, *Sáfka* [personal name]—R. Grlić, loc. sg. *práfcu* ‘direction’—M. Holy; cf. SC *nòvce*, *Sávka*, *právcu*); Kajkavian vocalism in *dvè* ‘two [fem.]’ (D. Juričan, M. Priselac; cf. SC *dvìje*); Kajkavian syncope in *vidli* ‘we saw’, *vidlo* ‘was seen’ (D. Juričan, V. Lončar, I. G. Vitez, I. Tepeš; M. Priselac; cf. SC *vidjeli*, -o), *vèlka* ‘big [fem.]’ (M. Hanžeković; cf. SC *vèlikā*), acc. sg. *gòdnu* ‘year’, gen. pl. *gòdna* ‘of years’ (V. Pusić, I. G. Vitez, I. Tepeš; cf. SC *gòdinu*, *gòdinā*, ZgD variant also *godinu*, -a), *nèmrem* ‘I can’t’, *nèmreš* ‘you can’t’, *nèmre* ‘s/he can’t’ (I. G. Vitez, M. Priselac, M. Hanžeković; cf. SC *ne mògu*, *nè možeš*, *nè može*); Kajkavian apocope in *onàk* ‘that way’ (D. Juričan, I. G. Vitez, V. Pusić, M. Priselac; cf. SC *onākō*); colloquial (not only Zagreb) *jel* ‘because’

neighborhood of Kozari Bok in Zagreb, where, due to a lot of recent, post-war Neo-Štokavian immigrants, many children tend to preserve a full-fledged Neo-Štokavian accentual system even in public (this should, however, be studied more carefully). Cf. [Auer 2007: 113] for such dense immigrant social networks that suppress linguistic accommodation to the dialect of the surrounding area. Such speakers would not be considered as ZgD speakers in this research and, in any case, do not appear in the sample. One may provisionally compare the coexistence of speakers of ZgD (which are the majority) and Zagreb-born Neo-Štokavian speakers (which are a tiny, though existing, minority) to, for instance, the coexistence of the local (mainly white working class) dialect of Chicago with African-American Vernacular English (spoken by many African Americans in Chicago). It would make no sense to research these different linguistic varieties as one and the same dialect just because the speakers of both were born and raised in the same town.

¹⁹ One of the speakers, Boris Jokić, however, seems to preserve the distinction, at least partly and not completely consistently (e.g. *reći* ‘say’: *slučaju* ‘case’, but *također* instead of *također* ‘also’, and also *Ilčić* instead of *Ilčić* (surname)). It is not clear if this is artificial or, perhaps more likely, a residuum of his parental dialect acquired in early childhood. Still, due to his being born in Zagreb and other linguistic features, we have counted him here as a ZgD speaker.

²⁰ The impression one gets is that specific Zagreb dialect characteristics appear more (or mainly) in the speech of those that do not have Neo-Štokavian parents.

(R. Grlić, Ž. Markić, D. Juričan, I. Tepeš; cf. SC *jer*); innovative gen. pl. *pivi* ‘of beers’ (D. Juričan; cf. SC *pivā*, also neuter and not feminine gender); verbal forms *dòbimo* ‘we get’, *dòbe* ‘they get’ (Ž. Markić, V. Lončar, M. Hanžeković; cf. SC *dòbijemo*, *dòbijū*), etc.

Other colloquial traits, typical not only of Zagreb, occur as well: the loss of intervocalic consonants [Kapović 2011b: 48] (e.g. *treamo* ‘we need’ – Ž. Markić, I. Tepeš; *glèajte* ‘look! [pl.]’ – M. Hanžeković, J. Sloković, Ž. Markić, Z. Milanović, M. Holy, M. Vuković Runjić; *reatelji* ‘(film) directors’ – I. G. Vitez; *viite* ‘you see [pl.]’ – Z. Milanović; *neak(o)* ‘somehow’ – I. G. Vitez, M. Priselac, *nèamo* – J. Sloković; cf. SC *trèbāmo*, *glèdājte*, *rèdatelji*, *vìdite*, *nèkāko*, *nēmāmo*); infinitives in *-t/-č* (e.g. *ràdit* ‘to work’ – V. Pusić, J. Sloković, Ž. Markić, M. Holy, *napravit* – R. Grlić, J. Sloković, D. Juričan, I. G. Vitez, I. Tepeš, M. Priselac, etc., *rěč* ‘to say’ – J. Sloković, V. Lončar, Ž. Markić, M. Holy, M. Priselac, etc.; cf. SC *-ti/-ći*); *šta* ‘what’ (R. Grlić, V. Pusić, Z. Milanović, I. Josipović, etc.; cf. SC *štò*);²¹ etc.

These interviews provide us with good examples of how educated middle/upper class inhabitants of Zagreb speak in the most formal situations. What we do not have, however, is a recording of the same speakers in non-formal situations. Considering the way they speak (e.g. having the dynamic accent and other traits of ZgD), it is quite safe to assume that (at least most of them) speak the usual ZgD at home and with their friends in informal situations – e.g., if they say both *nàpravio* and *naprāvio* ‘done’ on television that it would be just the expected ZgD *naprāvio* in informal conditions, which is the only vernacular ZgD accent. However, it is not impossible that some of them, especially those with Neo-Štokavian parents and a high percentage of SC stress positions on TV (like I. Josipović and B. Jokić – see below) exhibit such characteristics outside of formal conditions as well. While most people born in Zagreb speak the usual ZgD dialect (at least when it comes to stress and stress positions), it is not impossible that some have discrepancies due to the influence of their parents’ dialects, or their social status (e.g. being a university professor), etc. Of course, more complex scenarios are also entirely possible – e.g. speakers talking one way to their Neo-Štokavian parents (or Neo-Štokavian grandparents outside of Zagreb), another way with their Zagreb friends, and in a different manner on television; or speakers speaking Neo-Štokavian as children, then switching to ZgD later, and later again partially accommodating to SC, etc. All of this has to be taken into account, though it would hardly change the bulk of the data or the results.

The aims of this paper and preliminary research are rather modest. One aim was to prove empirically that specific accentual accommodation to the

²¹ One guest (M. Priselac, a young singer – which is perhaps indicative) frequently used the dialectal ZgD *kaj* ‘what’ in the show – 11× (including *zakaj* ‘why’, *nekej* ‘something’ and *kaaznam* ‘I don’t know what’).

standard in formal situations does indeed occur. The other was to check if this phenomenon is typical of all or most Zagreb speakers or only some of them. Of course, this preliminary research can hardly plausibly answer all those questions (since the sample is small and only middle and upper-class speakers are represented) but it does offer us at least a glimpse of the problem. What this research also illuminates is the level of accommodation, i.e. how far a speaker of the ZgD accommodates to SC in formal situations. In spite of the small sample,²² as the results will show—the range of the level of accommodation seems to be quite large (from 0% to 82%). While the phenomenon of accentual accommodation is noted in the literature, as already noted, there were no empirical specifics nor any studies of the problem. Finally, the phenomenon of accentual accommodation will be theoretically discussed from a sociolinguistic and standardization point of view, which is perhaps the most important part of the paper. This research is not a detailed quantitative study of social variables in connection to linguistic variables. Due to a small and rather homogeneous sample (for reasons that are in large part technical as well²³), it is not possible to plausibly check the relevance of age and gender on the phenomenon of accommodation.²⁴ However, it does provide some general information about the phenomenon itself, which was previously not available.

The research was rather simple on the surface. One first had to find all forms in the hour-long interviews which had different stress positions in ZgD and SC, e.g. forms like *unosim* ‘I take in’ (ZgD *unòsim*, SC *ùnosim*) or *vojnìk* ‘soldier’ (ZgD *vojnik*, SC *vòjnik*). Then lists were made of the forms pronounced with the ZgD accent (like *unòsim* or *vojnik*) and of those with the accommodated SC stress place but with no tone/length distinctions (like *ùnosim* or *vòjnik*—which are the ZgD approximations of the SC accent). Then the exact percentage of the ZgD and approximated SC forms were calculated for each speaker. Most of the speakers had forms with both the ZgD accent and with the accommodated accent, often even in the same sentence—cf. for instances sentences (R. Grlić) *pa ga neko òsjeti i o njemu razmìsli* ‘and somebody feels it and thinks about it’

²² The sample of 16 people is small if compared with traditional sociolinguistic quantitative research (cf. [Tagliamonte 2006: 32–33]) and if considered as a sample for the whole of Zagreb (790.017). However, as already said, only 406.598 residents of Zagreb were born in Zagreb (and most are speakers of ZgD) and only about a third of those are university educated (cf. http://www.dzs.hr/Hrv_Eng/publication/2016/SI-1582.pdf, page 204; last access on 23.06.2018). Nonetheless, provisional statistical results in this paper should be regarded as illustrative and not necessarily statistically representative for all college educated ZgD speakers. In any case, in phonetic research it is not uncommon to have even fewer informants.

²³ Not all shows are available online, the number of female speakers from Zagreb in the show is rather limited (this is also true, to a smaller extent, for male speakers from Zagreb) and the greatest majority of guests are university educated.

²⁴ In a way, this study concerns the “stylistic” axis of linguistic variation, not the “social” one (cf. [Bell 1984: 145]), though it deals with just one (formal) style.

and *nešto napravi, ja to volim sam napraviti* '[. . .] does something, I like to do it myself', where one can see both forms with the ZgD accent (*razmisli* 'thinks about', *napraviti* 'to do') and forms with the accent in stress positions typical of SC (*osjeti* 'feels', *napravi* 'does'—cf. SC *osjeti, napravi*).²⁵

While the task itself seems easy, it is not always easy to ascertain what the ZgD accent is. It is not a problem to determine what the accent was in its most archaic variety, but the dialect is now in fluctuation with many accentual variants appearing side by side. Sometimes, conservative speakers pronounce a word one way, more innovative ones the other; sometimes people pronounce both variants; sometimes speakers differ in the way they pronounce a form. Still, in many cases it is very simple to say what the ZgD accent is. For instance, it is easy to agree that *vozač* 'driver' or *prevodiš* 'you translate' are spontaneous vernacular ZgD forms, while the forms *vòzač* and *prè vodiš* appear only sometimes in formal occasions as the result of partial accommodation to the SC stress position (cf. SC *vòzāč, prè vodiš*). The first two forms (*vozač, prevodiš*) are attested in the normal Zagreb vernacular and accepted as such by native speakers²⁶, while the other two (*vòzač, prè vodiš*) are not regarded as spontaneous vernacular forms²⁷. However, with other forms, the situation is more complex—e.g. the original ZgD accent is *ne mòra* 's/he doesn't have to' (cf. SC *nè mòrā*), and it is the way some (especially more conservative) speakers still pronounce it. However, many speakers of ZgD now also say (either exclusively or as a variant) *nè mora*, with the shifted accent, presumably under the influence of SC (and Neo-Štokavians in the city) but perhaps also because of some inner-ZgD tendencies (the accent tends to shift to *ne* 'not' in the present tense of modal verbs, see below). So if a form like *nè mora* is found

²⁵ This kind of accommodation to the standard accentuation is a frequent phenomenon. For instance, most animated films are synchronized to Croatian in Zagreb by mostly Zagreb dialect speakers. Thus, one can hear instances like the following (from the short animated film *Arthur*, "RTL kockica" television, December 8 2016/January 6 2017): *nemam otvarač za konzerve* 'I don't have a can opener'—*nemaš otvarač za konzerve?* 'you don't have a can opener?', where the first speaker uses the SC stress position in *otvarač* 'opener' (cf. SC *otvārač*) and *konzerve* 'cans' (cf. SC *konzērve*), and the other (who at other occasions also accommodates to the SC stress positions, as in *govoriš* 'you speak' instead of ZgD *govōriš*) uses the forms with ZgD stress positions *otvarāč, konzērve* right after the first one.

²⁶ Here I would like to thank Maja Milković, Daliborka Sarić, Anđel Starčević and the rest of my numerous informants for the Zagreb dialect. The author himself is both a native speaker of the Zagreb dialect and, as a child of Neo-Štokavian parents born in Zagreb, of Neo-Štokavian (children of Neo-Štokavian parents in Zagreb that are able to speak Neo-Štokavian with all its tones are a minority, since the majority of such children use the Zagreb dialect accentuation only, but such heritage speakers do exist—the author of the paper is aware of at least a couple of dozen such cases in Zagreb).

²⁷ Thus, the accentual accommodation phenomenon we are dealing with here occurs only in formal occasion—when trying to speak the standard language—it is not a feature of the vernacular (e.g. *govorim* 'I speak' is never heard in the normal Zagreb vernacular, only *govōrim*).

in an interview, this cannot be taken as an example of accommodation to the standard, since this is now also a vernacular form (at least as one possible variant) for many speakers of ZgD.

Some of the fluctuating forms,²⁸ most of them seen in the interviews, are (oldest ZgD form—OZgD, younger ZgD version—YZgD):²⁹

1) negative present of (mostly) modal verbs:³⁰ YZgD *nè moraš* ‘you don’t have to’ (OZgD *ne mōraš*; SC *nè mōrāš*), YZgD *nè treba* ‘it’s not necessary (to)’ (OZgD *ne trēba*; SC *nè trebā*), YZgD *nè valja* ‘it’s not good (to)’ (OZgD *ne vālja*; SC *nè valjā*), YZgD *nè voliš* ‘you don’t like (to)’ (OZgD *ne vōliš*; SC *nè vōliš*, dial. also *ně vōliš*), YZgD *nè bude* ‘if it won’t be’ (OZgD *ne būde* — but the original Kajkavian ZgD form is *nè bu*; SC *nè budē*)

2) present tense (and imperative and *l*-participle) of prefixed *-stanem*, *-stojim*, *-stajem* verbs: YZgD *prēstanem* ‘I stop’ (OZgD *prestānem*; SC *prēstanēm*), YZgD *nāstane* ‘it becomes’ (OZgD *nastāne*; SC *nāstanē*), etc.; YZgD *pōstoji* ‘it exists’ (OZgD *postōji*; SC *pōstōjī*, dial. also *postōjī*), etc.; YZgD *prēstajem* ‘I stop’ (OZgD *prestājem*; SC *prēstajēm*); YZgD *nēstajala* ‘disappeared’ (OZgD *nestājala*; SC *nēstajala*), etc.

3) some infinitives and *l*-participles (of verbs with no vowel suffix before the infinitive *-ti/-ći* and participle *-l-*): YZgD *pōmoč(i)* ‘to help’ (OZgD *po-mōč(i)*; SC *pōmoći*),³¹ YZgD *pōmogo* ‘helped [m.]’ (OZgD *pomōgo/pomōgel*; SC *pōmogao*), YZgD *pōbječ(i)* ‘to run away’ (OZgD *pob(j)ěč(i)*; SC *pōbjeći*),³² etc.

4) verbs in *-ovati* (infinitives and *l*-participles)³³: YZgD *djēlovat(i)* ‘to act’ (OZgD *djelōvat(i)*; SC *djēlovati*); YZgD *nēgodovat(i)* ‘to disapprove’ (OZgD

²⁸ In a quantitative study of the Zagreb vernacular, it would be possible to see the stratification of the newer and older forms, e.g. if younger speakers pronounce more forms like *pōstoji* (with the more innovative accent) rather than *postōji* (with the more conservative Zagreb accent).

²⁹ In some loanwords, Neo-Štokavian speakers also vacillate, e.g. they use not only the SC form (with the retracted accent) *elēmēt* ‘element’, but also forms with no retraction: *elemēt*. In cases like these, the author still decided to count forms like *elemēt* as ZgD, because it is widely known that such forms in the formal standard have the retracted accent like *elēmēt* (i.e. *elēmēt* in ZgD approximation of SC).

³⁰ The forms *nè znam* ‘I don’t know’, *nè sm(ij)em* ‘I mustn’t’, *nè dam* ‘I am not giving’, *nè bum* ‘I won’t’ are not relevant in this context since the base forms are monosyllabic, where ZgD always has the accent retracted to the negative particle *ne* (*nè znam* functions prosodically just like the prefixed forms like *sāznam* ‘I get to know’). Cf. also rural Kajkavian (in Turopolje, south of Zagreb) *ně bōm* [Šojat 1982: 410] and *ně znam* [Kapović 2015: 361]. The form *nè možeš* ‘you can’t’ can only have this accent in Zagreb, due to the original (and still existing) Kajkavian form *nēmreš* (cf. the accent *ne možeš* in Rijeka, which has the accentual system very similar to Zagreb—this accent does not occur in Zagreb).

³¹ Perhaps also in *l*-participle *pōmogla* ‘helped [fem.]’ together with *pomōgla* (SC *pōmogla*).

³² Both of these have the *-ne*-present (ZgD *pomōgnem* ‘I help’, *pobēgnem* ‘I run away’). In verbs with *-e*-presents there are no variant forms, cf. ZgD *narāst* ‘to grow’—*narāstem* ‘I grow’ (there is no vernacular ***nārast* in Zagreb, cf. SC *nārāstī*).

³³ Most of these verbs are originally of literary nature.

negodovati(i); SC *nègodovati*); YZgD *škòlovat(i)* ‘to school’ (OZgD *škòlovat(i)*; SC *škòlovati*); YZgD *sàvjetovat(i)* ‘to advise’ (OZgD *savjetovati(i)*; SC *sàvjetovati*; YZgD *sùdjelovat(i)* ‘to be a part of’ (OZgD *sudjelovati(i)*; SC *sùdjelovati*), etc.³⁴

5) feminine nouns with (usually) older internal stress:³⁵ YZgD *lòpata* ‘shovel’ (OZgD *lopàta*; SC *lòpata*); YZgD *kòšara* ‘basket’ (OZgD *košàra*; SC *kòšara*); YZgD *Peščènica* ‘a neighborhood in Zagreb’ (OZgD *Peščènica*; SC *Peščènica*), etc.

6) individual “bookish” sounding words: YZgD *istraživački* ‘research-’ (OZgD *istraživàčki* – cf. ZgD *istraživáč* ‘researcher’; SC *istraživàčki*), YZgD *òdređeni* [adj.] ‘certain’ (OZgD also *odrèđeni* but always *odrèđen* [part.] ‘set’; SC *òdrèđeni*), YZgD *òkrugli stol* ‘round table’ (but often *okrugli* ‘round’ outside of the phrase; SC *òkrūgli*), etc.

The main types that show the change of the stress position in accommodation to SC are:

1) verbs (infinitive, present tense, past participle, passive participle, verbal nouns): e.g. ZgD *izváditi* ‘to take out’ → *izvaditi* (cf. SC *izvaditi*), ZgD *unòsim* ‘I carry in’ → *unosim* (cf. SC *unosim*), ZgD *povùkla* ‘she pulled’ → *povukla* (cf. SC *povùkla*), ZgD *podjèljen* ‘dealt out’ → *pòdjeljen* (cf. SC *pòdijeljen*), ZgD *izvođenje* ‘performance’ → *izvođenje* (cf. SC *izvođenje*)

2) some negated presents: e.g. ZgD *ne čuje* ‘doesn’t hear’ → *nè čuje* (cf. SC *nè čujē*)

3) oxytonic and paroxytonic forms (nouns, adjectives, adverbs): e.g. ZgD *dijalòg* ‘dialogue’ → *dijàlog* (cf. SC *dijàlog*), ZgD *čuvàr* ‘keeper’ → *čúvar* (cf. SC *čùvār*), ZgD *refòrma* ‘reform’ → *rèforma* (cf. SC *rèfòrma*), ZgD *ùjutro* ‘in the morning’ → *újutro* (cf. SC *ùjutro*)

4) some preposition + pronoun combinations: e.g. ZgD *za mène* ‘for me’ → *zà mene* (cf. SC *zà mene*)

³⁴ However, the frequent verb *v(j)erovati(i)* ‘to believe, trust’ still has just the older ZgD accent (though this accent is, diachronically speaking, secondary in comparison to SC *vjèrovati*). In these words, SC preserves the old (Proto-Slavic) accentual distinction between verbs like *ljètovati* ‘to spend summer vacations’ and *bolovati* ‘to be ill’, while OZgD generalizes the same accentual type in all cases (*l(j)etovat* like *bolovat*). In other words, while Štokavian can preserve the original accentual oppositions in verbs in *-ovati* (though secondary accent forms due to levelling, like *bòlovati*, occur there as well), with some verbs having root accent and other suffix accent (due to different original accentuation of the root), ZgD never distinguishes the types *vjèrovati* and *kupovati* ‘to buy’ in the infinitive (ZgD *v(j)erovati(i)*, *kupovati(i)* – however, OZgD has *vèrujem* ‘I believe’ but *kupujem* ‘I buy’ in the present). ZgD can be superficially phonetically more archaic when it comes to preserving the older stress position (e.g. ZgD can preserve the old stress position in *lopàta* ‘shovel’, while the accent is retracted in SC *lòpata*), Neo-Štokavian (and SC) are always more archaic than ZgD when it comes to preservation of the old paradigmatic oppositions. Cf. also the following footnote for the case of the *-ovina* suffix.

³⁵ In some cases, the historical origin is slightly different. Thus, older (“more vernacular”) ZgD *Hercegòvina* ‘Herzegovina’ is not the older accent in absolute sense but due to analogy to forms like *imovina* ‘property’, *kupovina* ‘buying’, etc., while younger ZgD *Hercegovina* is due to the influence of SC *Hercegovina*.

When the speakers of the ZgD accommodate to SC accentuation, sometimes hypercorrect forms occur. For instance, standard verbs like *nàpraviti* ‘to make, do’ (present *nàpravim* ‘I do’), with the accent on the first syllable in all forms (*nàpravljen* ‘done, made’, *nàpravio* ‘did’, *nàpravil!* ‘do!’), are approximated to *nàpraviti*–*nàpravim*, etc. (cf. ZgD *nàpràvit(i)*–*nàpràvim* with the fixed stem-stress in all forms). However, in verbs like the standard *najàviti* ‘to announce’ only the present tense (1^{sg} *nàjāvīm*) and the participle *nàjāvljen* ‘announced [passive]’ (cf. ZgD *najàvit(i)*–*najàvim*–*najàvljen* with the fixed stress, just like in *nàpraviti*) have the shift (cf. *najàvio* ‘announced [active]’, *najàvil!* ‘announce!’). Thus, by analogy to the approximated *najàvim*–*najàvljen* and *nàpraviti*–*nàpravio*–*nàpravil!*, it is easy for Zagreb dialect speakers to produce hypercorrect forms like *nàjaviti* (though Štokavian has *najàviti*). Since the speakers of ZgD do not have a distinction between *pràviti* ‘to make’ and *jàviti* ‘to let know’ (´ shifts to the preceding syllable in Neo-Štokavian but ´ does not), and have to memorize that the accent shifts in *nàjāvīm* and *nàpraviti* but not in *najàviti*, it is relatively easy for them to produce hypercorrect forms like *nàjaviti*, which are then often scorned by Neo-Štokavians, who feel these forms as “made up” and “non-existent”. Neo-Štokavians sometimes protest (for instance in social media, in letters to the traditional media, in listeners’ calls, etc.) against the public (TV or radio) use of ZgD forms such *nàpraviti*–hypercorrect forms often cause even more protests. Such hypercorrect forms can, for instance, be produced by journalists from Zagreb (or Rijeka, etc.) trying to accommodate to SC, but making mistakes while doing so. It would perhaps be expected that such hypercorrections would feature highly in our sample of Zagreb speakers. However, somewhat surprisingly, there are almost no examples of it in our corpus—the only real example is gen. sg. *odàzivanja* ‘responding to’ (J. Sloković, cf. SC *odazívànja*, ZgD *odazivanja*).³⁶ This is one of the surprising minor findings of the research. While one would have to research the accentual accommodation of journalists from Zagreb to make plausible conclusions (to see how many hypercorrections they exhibit), one can speculate that there are almost no examples of hypercorrection in our corpus because most of the speakers in question feel the need to accommodate to SC, but do not feel the pressure to get *every* (or most) SC stress positions right, as perhaps the journalists do (due to public speaking being their job).³⁷ Thus,

³⁶ There are other two possible instances, that are, however, slightly strange. The same speaker also says *tješkode* ‘anguish [nom. pl.]’ (cf. SC *tješkòbe* and ZgD *tješkòbe*—this is a rather “bookish” word), but this would be an unusual hypercorrection. One other speaker (I. Tepeš) pronounced *pòštovati* ‘to honor’ (2×) (cf. SC *poštòvati* and ZgD *poštòvat(i)*), which may be a hypercorrection, but it could also be due to the mentioned ZgD innovative tendency to shift the accent to the root in the verbs in *-ovati* (under the influence of Štokavian), for which see above.

³⁷ Cf. e.g. the announcer (a native of Kajkavian Pitomača) of the central informative show *Dnevnik* on HRT national television (December 21st 2016) saying the hypercorrect *požèlio* ‘wished [m.]’ (cf. ZgD *požèlio* and SC *požèlio*).

our speakers would accommodate to the SC accentuation only in instances when they are sure of the accent's position in SC and just leave the ZgD stress positions where they are not sure. There are perhaps some indications that would support this hypothesis. If we take a look at the five speakers that shift the accent in 20% or less of the instances, one can see that this occurs in some frequent and known verbs, where the speakers are sure the SC stress positions is different from the one in ZgD. These are forms like (various others could be listed as well):

1) the derivatives of *-laziti* like SC *dòlaziti* 'to come', *ùlaziti* 'to come in' etc. (ZgD *dolàziti(i)*, *ulàziti(i)*): *pròlaze* 'they pass through' (2×), *ùlaze* 'they come in', *òdlaze* 'they go out' (V. Pusić), *dòlaze* 'they come' (V. Pusić–4×, M. Vuković Runjić), *òdlazi* 's/he goes away' (M. Vuković Runjić), *nàlazimo* 'we find' (Ž. Markić), *pròlazi* 's/he passes' (M. Priselac)

2) various forms of SC *nàpraviti* 'to make' (ZgD *napràvit(i)*): *nàpraviti* (2×), *nàpravi* 's/he makes', *nàprave* (2×) 'they make', *nàpravio* (2×) 'he made', *nàpravilo* 'made [sg. n.]' (Ž. Markić), *nàpraviti* (Ž. Markić–4×, M. Priselac), *nàpravimo* 'we make' (M. Priselac–2×), *nàpravili* 'made [pl. m.]' (3×), *nàpravljeno* 'made [sg. n.]' (V. Pusić)

3) negative presents of frequent verbs like *nè mislim* 'I don't think' (V. Pusić, Ž. Markić 6×, M. Vuković Runjić), *nè vidim* 'I don't see' (V. Pusić), *nè vidi* 's/he doesn't see' (Ž. Markić), *nè čuje* 's/he doesn't hear' (M. Priselac)

4) present tense derivatives of *-stavljati* like *prèdstavlja* 's/he introduces' (Ž. Markić, cf. SC *prèdstāvjljā*), *pòstavlja* 's/he places' (M. Priselac, cf. SC *pòstāvjljā*)

5) forms of *vjèrovati* 'to believe, trust' (ZgD *v(j)eròvat(i)*): *nè vjerujem* 'I don't believe' (2×), *nè vjeruju* (Ž. Markić, cf. ZgD *ne y(j)èrujem*, SC *nè vjerujēm*), *vjèrovao* 'he trusted' (M. Vuković Runjić), *vjèrovali* 'trusted [pl. m.]' (M. Priselac)

6) some *l*-participle forms of verbs with the present in *-e-* (where the accent is always on the first syllable in SC) like *òtišla* 'she went', *pòrasli* 'grew up [pl.]' (M. Hanžeković, cf. ZgD *otišla*, *porásli*)

7) prepositional forms with *taj–ta–to* 'this one [m/f/n]' like SC *nà tō* 'on this [n.]': *nà taj* 'on this' (V. Pusić), *zà to* 'for this' (2×) (Ž. Markić—together with ZgD *za tō* 2×), *ù to* 'into this' (M. Hanžeković)

8) various ZgD nominal disyllabic oxytones (where the SC always had barytones) like *Jòrdan* 'Jordan [country]' (V. Pusić), *pròblem* 'problem' (V. Pusić–6×, M. Vuković Runjić–2×), *pjèvač* 'singer' (M. Priselac), *Hájduk* (name of a football club), *pròces* 'process' (M. Hanžeković), *hòror* 'horror', *dèmon* 'demon' (M. Vuković Runjić)³⁸

³⁸ This type of shift is sometimes attested in the vernacular as well, as emphatic means, but very rarely and only in certain forms—e.g. sometimes the usual *kreten* 'idiot' is

The rounded percentages³⁹ of the use of the standard variants for the speakers in the sample are:

Ivo Josipović (1957) 82% (199 of 242)
 Zoran Milanović (1966) 63% (111 of 176)
 Boris Jokić (1976) 60% (160 of 265)
 Rajko Grlić (1947) 53% (70 of 133)
 Vitomira Lončar (1959) 43% (113 of 263)
 Ivona Juka (1976) 30% (59 of 194)
 Ivan Tepeš (1980) 27% (48 of 177)
 Jadranka Sloković (1953) 25% (53 of 210)
 Vesna Pusić (1953) 20% (35 of 172)
 Željka Markić (1964) 18% (38 of 215)
 Mirela Priselac (1979) 12% (15 of 124)
 Marijan Hanžeković (1952) 11% (14 of 132)
 Milana Vuković Runjić (1970) 6% (11 of 179)
 Mirela Holy (1971) 0,5% (1 of 206)
 Dario Juričan (1976) 0% (0 of 166)
 Ivan Goran Vitez (1975) 0% (0 of 144)

As can be seen, the range is from 0% for two younger male film directors (for whom, due to their age and occupation it is not difficult to imagine that they would aspire to local prestige, even on public television) to the staggering 82% of the older university professor, politician, composer and ex-president of Croatia (again, not surprising, especially considering his Neo-Štokavian roots). The statistics for the stress accommodation to SC stress position that can be drawn from the results are:

average accommodation: 28%
 average male accommodation: 37%
 average female accommodation: 19%
 average politicians' accommodation: 39%
 average non-politicians' accommodation: 23%
 average accommodation by speakers born before 1955: 27%
 average accommodation by speakers born between 1955 and 1969: 51%
 average accommodation by speakers born before 1969: 39%
 average accommodation by speakers born after 1970: 17%

What can we deduce from such results? The obvious conclusion would be that (at least for university educated middle and upper-class speakers in the

pronounced emphatically as *krèten* (cf. SC/Neo-Štokavian *krètèn*), as in *on je baš krèten* 'he is really an idiot'.

³⁹ The percentages are rounded because the number of variables is rather small so giving two decimal places could imply an actually non-existing accuracy (i.e. 69/133 is 51,88%, 70/133 is 52,63%, and 71/133 is 53,38%). Thus, rounded percentages are enough in order to give a good impression of the differences among the speakers.

most formal of circumstances) the accommodation to standard stress position is a real and rather frequent phenomenon, averaging at slightly less than 30% (the results change only marginally even if we do not take into account the top and lowest percentages). It is reasonable to assume that a similar average percentage would be obtained with a larger sample as well. This shows that Standard Croatian accentuation does indeed have prestige for the majority of (university educated middle/upper class) Zagreb-born speakers. Only two out of sixteen (13%) exhibited a completely vernacular accent—three (19%) if we add the speaker with only 1 accommodated form (*nè dāje* ‘doesn’t give’ for ZgD *ne dāje*, cf. SC *nè dājē*). 75% of the speakers (12 of 16) show more than 10% of accommodated stress positions, 56% of the speakers (9 of 16) show more than 20% of it, 38% (6 of 16) show more than 30%, and 25% (4 of 16) show more than 50% of accommodation. Obviously, one cannot claim that these numbers are indeed statistically relevant and we provide them here more as an illustration of a phenomenon in question.

Other possible conclusions that can be drawn from these statistics are also obviously very tentative and provisional, due to the small sample. Because of this, they should be regarded as illustrative only and a basis for more thorough research in the future. In our sample, it seems that men talk much more formally than women (37% to 19%). This seems rather odd, though it may not contradict the general sociolinguistic finding that “Women conform more closely than men to sociolinguistic norms that are overtly prescribed. . .” [Labov 2001: 293], since this is not an issue of a vernacular exhibiting both the prestige and colloquial forms (as in English *-in/-ing* or the like), but the question of accommodation to the norms of the standard dialect in very formal conditions. However, this result may just as well be due to pure chance and the small sample, because the top four results are by males with Neo-Štokavian parents. It is quite reasonable to expect that the home language, if it is Neo-Štokavian (i.e. very close to Standard Croatian), can influence public speech—if a speaker is more familiar with this type of accentuation, it will be easier for him/her to use it more when speaking publicly/formally⁴⁰. Thus, the difference between males and females in our random sample can be completely coincidental (male speakers without the highest four scores are at a meager 9%). However, the problem with Neo-Štokavian heritage and influence of the parents’ (or parent’s) dialect is that for most speakers in our sample it is not possible to know where the speakers’ parents are from.⁴¹ Even if it is known (as

⁴⁰ The speaker with the highest percentage of SC stress position (Ivo Josipović) sometimes, though very rarely and marginally, pronounces even the SC *pitch-accent* prosodies. He is the only one in the sample that does even though his regular system is the ZgD dynamic accent.

⁴¹ In the TV show that was analyzed in this paper, in the case of one speaker (D. Juričan—who had 0% of SC stress positions) we do know how his mother talks, because she actually appeared in the show (she had a very salient ZgD dynamic accent).

it is, for instance, for the former president and prime minister), that may not mean much by itself because it is impossible to know how they spoke at home when their children were growing up⁴² (as already mentioned, there are some Neo-Štokavians that do adapt to the ZgD accent—this is not very frequent, but is not unattested⁴³).

The tentative results also seem to show that politicians (five of them in the sample) speak more formally (with more accommodation to the standard stress position) than non-politicians: 39% to 23%. This is a result that may be confirmed with a larger sample as well and, in any case, seems logical—politicians, due to the nature of their work, do have to generally appeal to everybody (to people in all regions), which makes accommodation to the standard dialect a good choice. In the case of M. Holy, the politician with just 0,5% of accommodation (all others have more than 20%), it may not be a coincidence that in the show she claimed that her (left-liberal) party mostly aspires to young people and to the North/North-West “urban” parts of Croatia (where in a number of cities “Zagreb-like” urban dialects are spoken or aspired to⁴⁴). This perhaps may have influenced the way she spoke in public. Her being relatively young (born 1971) may play a role as well—it is interesting to note that the other younger politician in the sample, I. Tepeš (born 1980), had a significant percentage of accommodation to the SC stress position (27%). However, unlike the left-liberal urban base in the North/North-West of Croatia that M. Holy aspired to, I. Tepeš’s party is right-wing to hard right, which makes adhering

⁴² Even speakers’ recollection on this are of little, if any, use.

⁴³ For instance, the parents of Ivo Josipović, the ex-president of Croatia (who has 82% of accommodation to SC accent position), are from the Neo-Štokavian town of Baška Voda on the southern coast of Croatia. It is reasonable to assume that they spoke with Neo-Štokavian accent at their Zagreb home (since most Neo-Štokavians living in Zagreb generally preserve their accentual system), which then may have influenced their son, at least when trying to speak formally. However, the fact that they come from a Neo-Štokavian region does not necessarily mean that they speak/spoke Neo-Štokavian, as already said. For instance, compare the case of the brothers Mate and Goran Granić, both highly positioned politicians in the 1990’s that also grew up in Baška Voda—both of them are now living in Zagreb and speak, at least in public, with the ZgD dynamic accent. Another similar case is of Milorad Pupovac, a long-time politician stemming from a Neo-Štokavian region, who also adopted the ZgD dynamic accent (even though he is also a linguist). However, cases such as these are minority cases. An indicative example is the one of the long-time mayor of Zagreb Milan Bandić, born and raised in Bosnia and Herzegovina (thus a Neo-Štokavian). Despite living most of his life in Zagreb, he cannot get rid of his Neo-Štokavian accent (which even still has a slight Herzegovina regional ring to it), although he constantly tries to speak in Zagreb dialect for political reasons (often to the ridicule of many native Zagreb speakers because he usually fails miserably in trying to imitate the dialect).

⁴⁴ For instance, Rijeka, Karlovac and cities on the western coast of the Istrian peninsula all have an accentual system very similar to that of Zagreb. Likewise, people from rural areas (where rural Kajkavian and Čakavian dialects, usually with pitch accent, are spoken) gravitate to that kind of urban dialects (and accentual systems) when trying to sound more formal (cf. [Kapović 2004]).

to SC accentual norms more useful, since many of the regions that vote for the right are Neo-Štokavian. Of course, while this speculation could perhaps be valid for these two (and perhaps some similar) cases, there is no indication that political ideology influences accent in formal occasions in general (the four highest percentages were by speakers that are very openly liberal).

The provisional results also seem to clearly show that there is a big difference between speakers born prior to 1969 (who have a 39% average accommodation) and those born after (who have a 17% average accommodation). That the younger generation speaks less formally and adheres less to the prescribed norms than the older one is not surprising, and research on larger samples would probably confirm these results. What one cannot tell is whether this is a permanent shift (in which younger generations generally do not consider SC as prestigious as do older ones) or whether this is some kind of age grading (i.e. that people tend to speak less formally when younger and more formally when they get older).

What the results do show is that the standard accentuation does have prestige. If it did not, there would be no accommodation to it. But—if it is prestigious, why is it then just partially accommodated to? Why do speakers of the Zagreb dialect adapt to it only by way of stress position (while ignoring tone and length) and only inconsistently (in approximately 30% of cases)? Why did 15 (out of 16) speakers use just the Štokavian/Standard pronoun *što* ‘what’ (and its common colloquial variant *šta*) and not the typically Kajkavian (and Zagreb) pronoun *kaj* (only one speaker used it, but probably consciously) in contrast to accentuation?

The problem is that the Standard Croatian accentuation is not a normative fact of the same level as the standard form of the interrogative-relative pronoun. While it is relatively easy for anyone to learn that in SC one ought to say not *kaj* but *što* (though it may be more difficult not to use the colloquial variant *šta* when speaking formally), or that one should not say *ideju* ‘they go’ (which is a more conservative ZgD form) but only *idu* ‘they go’, the same is not true in the case of the accentuation. Standard Croatian (Neo-Štokavian) accentuation is rather complex (being a pitch-accent system with distinctive length) and for the majority of speakers with a different (especially dynamic) accentual system it is practically impossible to learn.⁴⁵ Standard accentuation is not taught (except very shortly in theoretical terms) in school—even if it were, it would take years for a non-Štokavian to learn it. And even if non-Štokavians were all to learn it—it would be useless. As the case of Zagreb shows—the language

⁴⁵ This is not the case in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where all speakers are either Neo-Štokavian or, less frequently, Old Štokavian (but that still means that they have all the Neo-Štokavian prosodies in their dialect). In Serbia and Montenegro, as in Croatia (but unlike Bosnia and Herzegovina), there are also dialects with dynamic accentuation and the situation is rather similar, *mutatis mutandis*, to the one in Croatia.

works just fine without pitch-accent.⁴⁶ Average speakers of Croatian, if they are not native Štokavians, never learn Štokavian accentuation in full, with the tones, because they have no need to and there is no social or linguistic pressure or enticement to do so. Exceptions occur only in very special cases—e.g. in the case of some actors, some linguists, announcers in national television, some people of Neo-Štokavian heritage,⁴⁷ etc.

As we have seen, speakers are not always consistent in their use of certain standard features and forms, even in the most formal of circumstances. For example, while it is clear that the standard has only infinitives ending in *-ti/-ći* (and everybody would always write it like that in formal circumstances), that does not mean that colloquial short forms *-t/-ć* do not also appear. They do—and frequently. The reason for this is not that it is difficult to pronounce or remember that the formal form is *imati* ‘to have’ and not *imat*—it is just that most speakers find it difficult to completely monitor their own speech (or simply do not consider it necessary to use the standard forms in a completely consistent manner). Thus, certain colloquial traits are preserved. Furthermore, since such features are rarely noticed by the public and ostracized, there is no real motivation to wipe them out completely in public. On the other hand, while it is easy to pronounce *imati* or to write it (and sometimes even say it) consistently, for a speaker of the Zagreb dialect it is practically impossible to learn the full-fledged Standard Croatian accentuation. Even if it were actively taught in school (which it is not), it would be very difficult. As already illustrated, the standard accent is just too complex for a speaker to acquire as a full-fledged system if their native accentual system is too different from it. The closest one can usually get, if natively speaking a dynamic stress dialect, is to partially accommodate in stress position to the standard (as we have seen). For an average speaker of an urban dialect with dynamic accent (like Zagreb dialect) it is virtually impossible to memorize all the words with a correct SC accent (including the cases where the accent is not on the same syllable) and to be able to pronounce the tones and length properly.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Similar to how a foreigner can speak Japanese or Mandarin without the proper native tones and still be understood (if fluent).

⁴⁷ For instance, a ZgD speaker with Neo-Štokavian parents may use only ZgD dynamic accent in normal everyday speech and most situations. However, being exposed to Neo-Štokavian accent since early childhood (through his/her parents but perhaps also through regular visits to Neo-Štokavian regions, where his/her parents were born), the speaker can have a passive knowledge of the Neo-Štokavian stress system and may occasionally, often only partially, use it when speaking in formal situations (especially if the speaker is of public profession—e.g. a journalist, politician, etc.) or sometimes when in interaction with other Neo-Štokavian speakers. Such and similar examples do exist.

⁴⁸ Neo-Štokavian rising prosodies are notorious for their complex nature—due to not having just the rising intonation in the accented word (which can differ in different dialects) but also exhibiting a high tone in postaccentual syllable. Thus, *kòra* ‘crust’ is HL, while *kòsa* ‘hair’ is LH (the postaccentual *-a* is low after the short falling accent and high after the short rising accent).

This is what I call *the unattainable standard* in this paper. By that I mean a feature of a standard language that is formally prescribed in grammars (and other standard-language handbooks), but which in practice (due to its complex linguistic features) is not adopted fully in formal situations by speakers because of differing dialectal backgrounds (e.g. in the case of the Standard Croatian and the speakers of the Zagreb dialect). The only speakers that can master the standard fully in that regard are those whose native dialect is close to the standardized variety (except for the aforementioned actors,⁴⁹ TV announcers, etc.). Thus, formally prescribed features are in practice not really expected to be attained (though language prescriptivists will not admit this openly, nor will they sometimes even notice the fact).

In this regard, the formally prescribed accentuation in Croatian is not of the same type as the one prescribed in languages like English or Russian. There, the standard accentuation is (phonetics-wise) fairly simple to learn⁵⁰— what is needed is basically just to learn that certain forms have a different accentuation in the standard dialect (e.g. that the word *police* is stressed on the second and not the first syllable⁵¹). In Croatian, for speakers of dialects with accentual systems not close to the standard one (not just speakers from Zagreb but from most Kajkavian areas in the North-West and from North Čakavian areas on the northern coast of Croatia), that is not the case. It is not that the standard accentuation is unattainable because it is just difficult to memorize the standard stress position in all forms (which it is) and because the accommodation to the standard stress position is only partial (which it is, as we have seen), but also because for non-Štokavian speakers it is phonetically practically impossible to learn it as a second system (especially since there is no social pressure to do that).⁵² That task would be not unlike learning a complex accentual system of a foreign language (e.g., a native speaker of English learning Japanese), the only difference being that it is not a foreign language. The accommodation is not consistent in the already mentioned case of the infinitive (i.e. the speakers usually use both the colloquial *imat* as well as the

⁴⁹ However, what one should stress is that actors that are not native Neo-Štokavians but are able to imitate the Štokavian accent (in case they need it in one of their parts), still usually speak with dynamic accent when talking normally in formal occasions. Also, some actors of non-Neo-Štokavian origin use the same type of approximated standard accentuation even when acting in very old-fashioned classical plays, where a very formal standard usage would be more appropriate.

⁵⁰ Of course, Russian accentuation is more complex than English since the accent is mobile (e.g. *golová*—acc^{sg} *gólovu* 'head') and more variation is possible.

⁵¹ For instance, this English word has initial accent in the US South (and in African-American Vernacular English) but has final stress in General American (Standard English).

⁵² Even when speakers of the Zagreb dialect move to a Neo-Štokavian region (e.g. to Split), they usually maintain their native dynamic stress, though there are also examples of total dialectal accommodation as well. However, in those cases speakers are immersed in the other accentual system, which is not the case with the standard dialect.

formal *imati* ‘to have’ when speaking in formal circumstances—cf. the English *-ing/-in* in this regard), however in that case it is not phonetically impossible (nor very difficult) to learn how to pronounce *imati*—it is just that the formal form is not always used. In the case of the unattainable standard (like the SC accentuation), many speakers are just not able to imagine how something should “really” be pronounced in the standard dialect. Thus, the standard accentuation is just loosely approximated (e.g. *čúvar* ‘keeper’ for the official SC *čūvār*), which is realistically the best an average speaker can do (in spite of the official grammars and prescriptivists pretending that it is possible to fully learn the standard accentuation, to which they will always pay lip service⁵³).

Of course, Croatia is not the only example of such a sociolinguistic situation. We have already mentioned the similar examples of Serbia and Montenegro (which also have a Neo-Štokavian standard dialect, but not all dialects are Neo-Štokavian)—and of Slovenia, where only 1/3 of the dialects have pitch accent, while the standard accentuation is optionally tonal [Cf. Toporišič 2004: 63–64; Kapović 2015: 84–85]. One could also adduce the examples of Lithuania or Japan, which also have complex standard pitch-accent systems. In Lithuania, the standard dialect also has a rather complex pitch-accent system with three prosodemes and complex mobile accent (cf. [Girdenis 2014: 240–246; Young 2017: 492–494]). However, just as in Croatia, the speakers from the capital, Vilnius, have a dynamic accent.⁵⁴ When speaking the standard dialect, they still maintain their dynamic accent, because it is not reasonable to expect that a complex pitch-accent system can be learned in school or that it would make sense to insist on it. Of course, just like in Croatia, there are no communication problems. In Japan, the standard accentuation is based on the Tokyo dialect accentuation (cf. [Shibatani 1990: 186] for the Tokyo dialect, “considered as the standard language”⁵⁵). Since other Japanese dialects have different accentual systems (cf. [Ibid.: 177–184] for a short overview of some systems), the only people that can speak Standard Japanese with full-fledged standard accentuation are generally the native speakers of the Tokyo dialect. Thus, even professors of Japanese, if they originated from, let us say, Kyoto or Osaka, do not use the officially prescribed Japanese accentuation but their own dialectal one.⁵⁶

⁵³ Thus, a well-known Croatian prescriptivist (with poor linguistic skills), Marko Alerić, will publicly insist that it is very important to speak with the full-fledged standard accentuation, but in reality even he himself usually uses the Zagreb dynamic accent (him being a native of Zagreb) and only rarely pronounces the Neo-Štokavian prosodemes (which he is able to accomplish due to his Neo-Štokavian parents and to him being a university professor of Croatian).

⁵⁴ However, in the Slovene capital of Ljubljana a tonal dialect is spoken—though the majority of Slovene dialects have lost tonal distinctions (cf. [Greenberg 2000: 159–161]).

⁵⁵ For a short overview of the Tokyo accentual system cf. e.g. [Haraguchi 1999: 5–15].

⁵⁶ Cf. [Shibatani 1990: 186–187] for the concept of *kyōtū-go* ‘common language’ (“heavily influenced by the standard but retains dialectal traits, such as accentual features”).

Similar situations can be found, *mutatis mutandis*, elsewhere (for instance, in Latvia, Vietnam and other countries with complex pitch-accent/tonal systems in standard language and dialects).

What we call here the *unattainable standard* is a sociolinguistic phenomenon that occurs when a feature (mostly phonological or prosodic) is officially prescribed in the grammar of the standard dialect, but in practice it is not really acquired or acquirable by large groups of native speakers, due to the phonetic complexity of the feature and the lack of realistic social pressure and conditions in which such a complex feature could even theoretically be apprehended. In this paper, we have tried to illustrate this phenomenon with the example of Zagreb-dialect and Standard Croatian accentuation.

Bibliography

Auer 2007

Auer P., “Mobility, Contact and Accommodation”, in: C. Llamas, L. Mullany, P. Stockwell, eds., *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, London; New York, 2007, 109–115.

Bell 1984

Bell A., “Language style as audience design”, *Language in Society*, 1984, 13, 145–204.

——— 2007

Bell A., “Style and Linguistic Repertoire”, in: C. Llamas, L. Mullany, P. Stockwell, eds., *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, London; New York, 2007, 95–100.

Girdenis 2014

Girdenis A., *Theoretical Foundations of Lithuanian Phonology*, Vilnius, 2014.

Greenberg 2000

Greenberg M. L., *A Historical Phonology of the Slovene Language*, Heidelberg, 2000.

Haraguchi 1999

Haraguchi Sh., “Accent”, in: N. Tsujimura, ed., *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, Malden; Oxford, 1999, 1–30.

Kapović 2004

Kapović M., “Jezični utjecaj velikih gradova [The Linguistic Influence of Big Cities]”, *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 30, 2004, 97–105. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/9464>

——— 2007

Kapović M., “Hrvatski standard—evolucija ili revolucija? Problem hrvatskoga pravopisa i pravogovora [Croatian Standard Language—Evolution or Revolution? Problems of Croatian Orthography and Orthoepy]”, *Jezičoslovlje*, 8 (1), 2007, 61–76. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/30754>

——— 2011a

Kapović M., *Čiji je jezik?* [Who does Language Belong to?], Zagreb, 2011. https://bib.irb.hr/datoteka/503036.Kapovic_Ciji_je_jezik.pdf

——— 2011b

Kapović M., “Language, Ideology and Politics in Croatia”, *Slavia centralis*, 4(2), 2011, 45–56. <https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/handle/1808/8578>

——— 2015

Kapović M., *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije. Fonetika* [The History of Croatian Accentuation. Phonetics], Zagreb, 2015. https://bib.irb.hr/datoteka/793569.Kapovic_Mate_2015_Povijest_hrvatske_akcentuacije_Fonetika_Matica_hrvatska_Zagreb.pdf

- Labov 2001
Labov W., *Principles of Linguistic Change. Volume 2: Social Factors*, Malden; Oxford, 2001.
- 2006
Labov W., *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, New York, 2006² [1966¹].
- Lehiste, Ivić 1963
Lehiste I., Ivić P., *Accent in Serbocroatian: an experimental study*, Ann Arbor, 1963.
- Magner 1966
Magner T. F., *A Zagreb Kajkavian Dialect*, University Park, 1966.
- Milroy, Gordon 2003
Milroy L., Gordon M., *Sociolinguistics. Method and Interpretation*, Malden, 2003.
- Shibatani 1990
Shibatani M., *The Languages of Japan*, Cambridge, 1990.
- Šojat 1982
Šojat A., “Turopoljski govori [Dialects of Turopolje]”, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, 6, 1982, 317–493.
- Šojat et al. 1998
Šojat A. et al., *Zagrebački kaj. Govor grada i prigradskih naselja* [The Zagreb kaj. The Dialect of the City and the Suburban Communities], Zagreb, 1998.
- Tagliamonte 2006
Tagliamonte S. A., *Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge, 2006.
- Toporišič 2004
Toporišič J., *Slovenska slovnica*, Maribor, 2004.
- Young 2017
Young S., “Baltic”, in: M. Kapović, ed., *The Indo-European Languages*, London; New York, 2017, 486–518.
- Лехисте, Ивић 1996
Лехисте И., Ивић П., *Прозодија речи и реченице у српскохрватском језику*, Сремски Карловци; Нови Сад, 1996 [translation of: Lehiste I., Ivić P., *Word and Sentence Prosody in Serbocroatian*, Cambridge, 1986.]

References

- Auer P., “Mobility, Contact and Accommodation,” in: C. Llamas, L. Mullany, P. Stockwell, eds., *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, London, New York, 2007, 109–115.
- Bell A., “Language style as audience design,” in: *Language in Society*, 13, 1984, 145–204.
- Bell A., “Style and Linguistic Repertoire,” in: C. Llamas, L. Mullany, P. Stockwell, eds., *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, London, New York, 2007, 95–100.
- Girdenis A., *Theoretical Foundations of Lithuanian Phonology*, Vilnius, 2014.
- Greenberg M. L., *A Historical Phonology of the Slovene Language*, Heidelberg, 2000.
- Haraguchi Sh., “Accent,” in: N. Tsujimura, ed., *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, Malden, Oxford, 1999, 1–30.
- Kapović M., “The Linguistic Influence of Big Cities,” *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 30, 2004, 97–105 (cited according to: Portal of Scientific Journals of Croatia: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/>; last access on: 24.05.2018).
- Kapović M., “Croatian Standard Language—Evolution or Revolution? Problems of Croatian Orthography and Orthoepy,” *Jezikoslovlje*, 8 (1), 2007, 61–76 (cited according to: Portal of Scientific Journals of Croatia: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/>; last access on: 24.05.2018).
- Kapović M., *Who does Language Belong to?*, Zagreb, 2011 (cited according to: Hrvatska znanstvena bibliografija: <https://bib.irb.hr/>; last access on: 24.05.2018).
- Kapović M., “Language, Ideology and Politics in Croatia,” in: *Slavia centralis*, 4 (2), 2011, 45–56 (cited according to: KU ScholarWorks (<https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/>); last access on: 24.05.2018).
- Kapović M., *The History of Croatian Accentuation. Phonetics*, Zagreb, 2015 (cited according to:

Hrvatska znanstvena bibliografija: <https://bib.irb.hr/>; last access on: 24.05.2018).

Labov W., *Principles of Linguistic Change. Volume 2: Social Factors*, Malden, Oxford, 2001.

Labov W., *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, New York, 2009.

Lehiste I., Ivić P., *Accent in Serbocroatian: an experimental study*, Ann Arbor, 1963.

Lehiste I., Ivić P. *Prozodija reči i rečenice u srpsko-hrvatskom jeziku*, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad, 1996 [trans. of: Lehiste I., Ivić P., *Word and Sentence Prosody in Serbocroatian*, Cambridge, 1986]

Magner T. F., *A Zagreb Kajkavian Dialect*, University Park, 1966.

Milroy L., Gordon M., *Sociolinguistics. Method and Interpretation*, Malden, 2003.

Shibatani M., *The Languages of Japan*, Cambridge, 1990.

Šojat A., "Turopoljski govori", in: *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, 6, 1982, 317–493.

Šojat A. et al., *Zagrebački kaj. Govor grada i prigradskih naselja*, Zagreb, 1998.

Tagliamonte S. A., *Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge, 2006.

Toporišič J., *Slovenska slovnica*, Maribor, 2004.

Young S., "Baltic," in: M. Kapović, ed., *The Indo-European Languages*, London, New York, 2017, 486–518.

Mate Kapović

Department of linguistics

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

University of Zagreb

Ivana Lučića 3, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia

mkapovic@ffzg.hr

Received November 25, 2017