

Anita Peti-Stantić / Mateusz-Milan Stanojević /
Goranka Antunović (eds.)

Language Varieties Between Norms and Attitudes

South Slavic Perspectives

Proceedings from the 2013 CALS Conference



PETER LANG
EDITION

Anita Peti-Stantić / Mateusz-Milan Stanojević / Goranka Antunović (eds.)

Language Varieties Between Norms and Attitudes

This volume brings together thirteen articles presented at the 27th International Conference of the Croatian Applied Linguistics Society held in Dubrovnik in 2013. The authors explore four groups of issues: stability and change at the intersection of the standard and other varieties; language policy and language attitudes in relation to the status of L1 and L2; bilingualism and multilingualism; translation solutions reaffirming and/or establishing the norm. The articles focus on the contemporary Croatian and Slovenian sociolinguistic situation, relating it to the current situation in Europe.

The Editors

Anita Peti-Stantić is a Full Professor at the Department of South Slavic Languages and Literatures, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. Her primary research interests include

historical and contemporary Slavic sociolinguistics, information structure and the hierarchy of grammatical structures, especially in populations such as aphasics, children and second language learners.

Mateusz-Milan Stanojević is an Assistant Professor at the Department of English, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. His primary research interests include cognitive grammar, conceptual metaphor, English as a Lingua Franca and online teaching.

Goranka Antunović is an Associate Professor at the Scandinavian Section of the English Department, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. Her primary research interests are in the field of translation studies, in particular translation norms and process studies, and Croatian-Swedish contrastive linguistics.

Language Varieties Between Norms and Attitudes

Anita Peti-Stantić / Mateusz-Milan Stanojević /
Goranka Antunović (eds.)

Language Varieties Between Norms and Attitudes

South Slavic Perspectives
Proceedings from the 2013 CALS Conference



PETER LANG
EDITION

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Language varieties between norms and attitudes : south Slavic perspectives : Proceedings from the 2013 CALS conference / Peti-Stantic, Anita ; Stanojevic, Mateusz-Milan ; Antunovic, Goranka (eds.). — Peter Lang Edition.

pages cm

"This book of proceedings brings together thirteen articles presented at the international conference entitled Standard Languages and Sociolects, organized by the Croatian Applied Linguistics Society (CALS) and held at the Center for Advanced Academic Studies (CAAS), University of Zagreb and the University of Dubrovnik from 18 to 20 April 2013. practice."

ISBN 978-3-631-66256-4 — ISBN 978-3-653-05361-6 (E-Book) 1. Language and languages—Variation—Croatia—Congresses. 2. Standard language—Croatia—Congresses. 3. Urban dialects—Croatia—Congresses. 4. Language policy—Croatia—Congresses. 5. Sociolinguistics—Croatia--Congresses. 6. Croatian language—Dialects—Congresses. 7. Applied linguistics—Croatia—Congresses. 8. Croatia—Languages—Congresses. I. Peti-Stantic, Anita, editor. II. Stanojevic, Mateusz-Milan, 1975- editor III. Antunovic, Goranka, 1962- editor. P40.5.U732C56 2015

306.4409497—dc23

2014046843

This book was published with the financial support of
the Croatian Applied Linguistics Society (CALS).

ISBN 978-3-631-66256-4 (Print)

E-ISBN 978-3-653-05361-6 (E-Book)

DOI 10.3726/978-3-653-05361-6

© Peter Lang GmbH

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Frankfurt am Main 2015

All rights reserved.

Peter Lang Edition is an Imprint of Peter Lang GmbH.

Peter Lang – Frankfurt am Main · Bern · Bruxelles · New York ·
Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

This publication has been peer reviewed.

www.peterlang.com

Table of Contents

<i>Anita Peti-Stantić – Mateusz-Milan Stanojević – Goranka Antunović</i> Preface.....	7
<i>Ivo Žanić</i> Dialect electrified or horse-drawn: Popular music as a form of (un)conscious language policy.....	13
<i>Monika Kalin Golob</i> Sociolects and media language: Modernity, attractiveness, democratisation and marketisation	35
<i>Silvana Vranić – Sanja Zubčić</i> Dialects in and around small urban centres in the northern Čakavian area: The current situation	49
<i>Nataša Pirih Svetina</i> Teaching one or more standards? Teaching Slovene— what, where, and for whom?	69
<i>Sanda Lucija Udier</i> Positioning the Croatian language by regulating Croatian as L2.....	85
<i>Milica Gačić – Kristina Cergol Kovačević</i> Multilingualism – English as a lingua franca and other second and foreign languages in Europe.....	103
<i>Nives Vidak – Sandra Didović Baranac – Daniela Falkoni-Mjehović</i> Attitudes of Croatian learners towards learning English, German and Spanish in a formal environment.....	121
<i>Renata Šamo – Ida Ćurić – Alenka Mikulec</i> A contribution to reconsidering the role of slang and colloquialisms in contemporary foreign language teaching.....	133
<i>Violeta Jurkovič</i> “Half Thrust to Port”: The potential of using The Mighty Ships series as a tool for the teaching of Maritime English vocabulary.....	151

<i>Ivana Petrović</i> Verbal fluency in late Croatian-English bilinguals	169
<i>Nada Županović Filipin</i> Matched guise technique revisited: The Zagreb case study	181
<i>Snježana Veselica Majhut – Ivana Bašić</i> From foot to meter: Rendering of culture-specific items in popular fiction translations from English to Croatian	197
<i>Alenka Kocbek</i> Identifying translation-relevant information in legal texts.....	219

Anita Peti-Stantić – Mateusz-Milan Stanojević –
Goranka Antunović

Preface

This book of proceedings brings together thirteen articles presented at the international conference entitled *Standard Languages and Sociolects*, organized by the Croatian Applied Linguistics Society (CALs) and held at the Center for Advanced Academic Studies (CAAS), University of Zagreb and the University of Dubrovnik from 18 to 20 April 2013. The conference was envisaged as a forum for discussion about the status and corpus of contemporary standard languages and sociolects, focusing specifically on their relationship with urban and traditional dialects.

This volume (one of two volumes from the conference) contains articles that deal with standards, norms and varieties in the light of overt and covert attitudes, policy, teaching, and translation practice. Specifically, four groups of issues are explored: stability and change at the intersection of the standard and other varieties; language policy and attitudes toward languages in relation to the status of L1 and L2; bilingualism and multilingualism and its verbal component; translation solutions reaffirming and/or establishing the norm. These research questions are examined from the point of view of the contemporary Croatian and Slovenian sociolinguistic situations, relating them to the current situation in Europe. All of the papers, as we argue below, illustrate tensions between attitudes, policy and practice, including issues such as official and personal views of the standard, dialect leveling, policies towards the standard as a teaching norm, multilingualism as a policy vs. actual foreign language learning and norms in translation. In the following paragraphs we give a short overview of the contributions, based on which we argue that the difference between ascribing values, policy and actual practice is analogous to the diversity-relativity conflict evident in the field of cultural policy.

The first strand, stability and change at the intersection of the standard and other varieties from a sociolinguistic and dialectological point of view, brings together three articles. In his paper *Dialect electrified or horse-drawn: Popular music as a form of (un)conscious language policy* Ivo Žanić discusses the role of local dialects and the standard in popular music lyrics in Croatia. Based on an analysis of media interviews with two prominent Croatian front men whose bands play songs with lyrics largely written in their local dialect, Žanić presents

their self-reflexive view of their own discourse practices. In this way, he strongly argues for a socially situated linguistics, where the etic dichotomies (standard – dialect; native – foreign; stylistically marked – unmarked) are reevaluated from an emic perspective.

Monika Kalin Golob's article *Sociolects and media Language: Modernity, attractiveness, democratisation and marketisation* focuses on the way in which varieties have been treated in Slovenia in light entertainment shows, informative programs and advertisements. Her analysis shows that, despite the influence of external and internal standardizing pressures, different varieties are increasingly present in the media, as a result of democratization and marketization. Therefore, Kalin Golob calls for a reevaluation of the traditional model of language variation, whereby the language variety used changes only with regard to the more or less public circumstances of the speaking situation.

In their article entitled *Dialects in and around small urban centres in the northern Čakavian area: The current situation* Silvana Vranić and Sanja Zubčić present a longitudinal analysis of dialect change in small urban centers in the northern Croatian Adriatic area. Their analysis of the varieties spoken in Mošćenice, Cres, Veli Lošinj, Mali Lošinj and Osor shows that even these small urban centres exhibit the common characteristics of urban varieties, including dialect leveling. This calls for a reexamination of the traditional dialectal treatment of these varieties, which does not recognize their variability or hybrid structure.

The second strand deals with language policy (with regard to standards and multilingualism) and its relation to foreign language teaching. Nataša Pirih Svetina's article entitled *Teaching one or more standards? Teaching Slovene—what, where, and for whom?* focuses on teaching Slovene as part of bilingual education in Slovene communities in Italy and Austria. Based on a lexical and grammatical analysis of Slovene teaching materials used in these communities, Pirih Svetina shows that the Slovene language taught there differs from the Central Slovene standard. However, the high value ascribed to Central Slovene and the negative attitudes ascribed to the regional standards raise a host of social, sociolinguistic and policy-related issues, and the author suggests that only a multilingualism and diversity-focused public campaign could be a way of resolving them.

In her paper *Positioning the Croatian language by regulating Croatian as L2* Sanda Lucija Udier takes a look at the language policy in Croatia as evident from Croatian legislation. Udier finds that almost all legislation deals with Croatian as the first language, and finds no evidence of a coherent strategy for the regulation of Croatian as L2. Therefore, she argues for a systematic purpose-oriented

strategy, and finds it is necessary not only from the internal point of view, but also as a way of positioning of Croatian among other European languages.

Milica Gačić and Kristina Cergol Kovačević deal with multilingualism as policy and actual (teaching, speaking) practice in Europe. In their paper, *Multilingualism – English as a lingua franca and other second and foreign languages in Europe*, they compare the current situation in Croatia and the rest of Europe with regard to foreign language learning. Analyzing a variety of European documents and using Eurobarometer studies, Gačić and Cergol Kovačević show that multilingualism has been embraced as a policy on the level of attitudes across Europe, that there is a rise of English as a Lingua Franca and that Croatia is “living up to the ideal of multilingualism” in this respect.

A closer view into multilingualism in Croatia is offered by the following two papers dealing with foreign language teaching. In their paper entitled *Attitudes of Croatian learners towards learning English, German and Spanish in a formal environment* Nives Vidak, Sandra Didović Baranac and Daniela Falkoni-Mjehović look into the attitudes and beliefs of secondary school students in Croatia towards learning English, German and Spanish. Overall, the results on this level confirm that Croatian students are indeed ready for multilingualism, as evident from their wish to learn foreign languages in general. However, the preponderance of English is evident too, as the students find English more enjoyable, easier to learn, speak and understand than the other two languages.

Renata Šamo, Ida Ćurić and Alenka Mikulec’s paper *A contribution to reconsidering the role of slang and colloquialism in contemporary foreign language teaching* deals with the issue of colloquial language and its relation to teaching English in Croatia. In particular, their study looks into Croatian students’ familiarity with British and American English slang and colloquial expressions. Their results show that, generally speaking, Croatian university students were not very familiar with these expressions, and that they were more familiar with American English than British English expressions. Based on this, the authors call for a reconsideration of the role of slang and colloquialisms in teaching English as a Foreign Language in Croatia.

The final paper in this strand, “*Half Thrust to Port*”: *The potential of using the Mighty Ships series as a tool for the teaching of Maritime English vocabulary* by Violeta Jurković deals with the importance of using authentic materials in teaching Maritime English, a division of English for Specific Purposes. Focusing on this particular variety, Jurković analyzes a number of documentary videos with regard to the vocabulary used in them, finds them suitable for teaching, and proposes several ways in which they can be used.

Our multilingual competence, both with regard to speaking ourselves or hearing others has a clear verbal component. This is precisely what the next strand deals with. In her paper entitled *Verbal fluency in late Croatian-English bilingual* Ivana Petrović presents a case study of two Croatian-English late bilingual speakers. Using a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods, Petrović looked into their verbal fluency, showing that their semantic verbal fluency performance was significantly better than their phonemic verbal fluency, and that they were more productive in the dominant language.

Nada Županović Filipin looks into the ways in which Zagreb secondary school students rate speakers who use the standard variety and the Zagreb Kajkavian vernacular. In her paper *Matched guise technique revisited: The Zagreb case study*, Županović Filipin shows that among her participants in Zagreb it is the standard, rather than the local variety, that is connected with both prestige and social solidarity. This result is in opposition to the de-standardization tendencies in some other regions of Croatia, and is explained by invoking the sociolinguistic situation in Zagreb, particularly the influx of non-Kajkavian population.

The final strand in the book deals with norms in translation. The paper *From foot to meter: Rendering of culture-specific items in popular fiction translations from English to Croatian* by Snježana Veselica Majhut and Ivana Bašić searches for trends in the way that culture-specific items (including units of measurement, forms of address and urban toponyms) were translated from English to Croatian in two periods (the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s). The results show that there are differences between the norms established for the two periods, and that the establishment of the new norm was preceded by a period of instability. Such a conclusion is clearly analogous to the leveling tendencies observed in standardization.

In her paper *Identifying translation-relevant information in legal texts* Alenka Kocbek seeks to answer the question of what norms and conventions to use when drafting legal texts in a lingua franca, nowadays mostly English. Kocbek argues for a critical application of the principle of cultural embeddedness, because the use of English as a Lingua Franca does not mean that the text should be automatically anchored in the Anglo-American legal system. For this purpose, the author suggests comparing the established cultural patterns (referred to as “culturemes”) of both the source and the target culture, and using the *skopos* theory approach.

Overall, the common theme of the volume are the more or less overt attitudes towards the construction of the relationship between norms, standards and varieties as evident from the Croatian and Slovenian daily life. All of the papers point

to the hybrid and stratified nature of language in its various guises, and the fact that our attitudes, practices and policies need to come to terms with this hybridity. A variety of discussions are offered, but they all seem to point to a somewhat inconsistent attitude towards language stratification. On the one hand, as language users, we are aware of the variety of languages and language varieties that we use and need, and on the other, coming to terms with this variety presents a problem. The problem is a result of our presumed (inner) need for a non-hybrid, rule-governed and (at least ostensibly) coherent system (cf. e.g. Kalogjera 2014 for a review of such attitudes towards the standard) as well as a result of a practical need for a common system (a lingua franca in the broadest of terms, a teaching standard, or a translation standard). This is further complicated by the policy of multilingualism, which is based on celebrating diversity.

It seems that the inconsistencies evident in linguistic policy, attitudes and practices are analogous to the cultural vs. human rights conflict referred to by Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2006) in relation to cultural policy. Whereas the multilingualism policy is based on diversity (affirming the value of difference), we perceive the actual variety of practices and the hybridity within a single imagined community (Anderson 1991) as relativity (i.e. “a defensive response ... to a hierarchical ordering of terms based on an absolute or universal standard”; Kirshenblatt Gimblett 2006: 22).¹ However, as shown by a variety of papers in the volume based on sociolinguistic factors, ascribing values and a hierarchical ordering of varieties is what speakers do; at the same time leveling them. Hence the clear tensions in the attitude-policy-practice triad. We hope that the readers will find the discussions of these tensions stimulating and enlightening.

Finally, we would like to thank all the reviewers and contributors to this volume for all their work, as well as the staff at Peter Lang for their help in preparing the volume. Without all their help and support this volume would not have been possible.

References

- Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised and extended edition. London: Verso.
- Kalogjera, Damir. 2014. “Iz kritičkih i pragmatičkih rasprava o standardizaciji jezika.” In *Standardni jezici i sociolekti u 21. stoljeću*, edited by Anita

1 Note that this shows an essentializing view of imagined communities, whereby the aspects that connect them into a “single” imagined community also require the leveling of all other aspects, depriving the communities of their (potential) hybridity.

Peti-Stantić, Mateusz-Milan Stanojević and Goranka Antunović, 1–22. Zagreb: Srednja Europa, Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 2006. “World Heritage and Cultural Economics.” In *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations*, edited by Ivan Karp, Corinne A. Kratz, Lynn Szwaja, and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto, 161–202. Durham: Duke University Press.

Ivo Žanić

Dialect electrified or horse-drawn: Popular music as a form of (un)conscious language policy

Abstract

Two dogmas often prevail when language issues are discussed in Croatia. One argues that the standard language, although designed on a neo-Štokavian basis, permanently enriches itself from Kajkavian and Čakavian dialectal sources. The other one warns that local idioms are dying out because of the pressures of the standard language and Global English, as well as the younger generation's alienation from traditional ways of life. The mythologization of rural local idioms ignores the natural formation of urban and regional varieties, and new types of prestige-acquisition, in which popular culture genres, especially rock music, play an important role.

For that reason the author analyses media interviews with Edi Maružin, the leader of the band *Gustafi* from Istria, and with Pavle Sviličić, whose band *Kopito* is based in Zagreb, but its members are natives of Dalmatian islands; both of them write and sing in their native varieties. These sources have enabled relevant sociolinguistic insights, such as: a) the reconstruction of the speaker's linguistic biography and self-reflection; b) attitudes concerning relationships among the local idiom, the standard language and Global English; c) the perception that local idioms are not as endangered by the standard language as by the most prominent urban vernacular in the respective region; d) judgments on the supralocal intelligibility of their songs; e) conflicts with dialectal purists, etc.

This paper argues for further research into these linguistic practices and self-reflexive discourses, having in mind that they have a much stronger influence on the presence and the evaluation of dialects in the public sphere than do textbook examples of dialectal poetry from the national literary canon, or primary school workshops on "how our ancestors spoke".

1. Introduction

Aside from the theoretical and methodological position one takes, it is at present quite hard to discuss the complex relations within the synchronic Croatian

language continuum without taking into account two persistent dogmas that have for decades been substantially defining concepts and the mutual relationships between what we call the *standard language* and what we call *dialects*.

As for the first extreme, it reached its canonical wording in D. Brozović's assertion from 1971 that in the Croatian language, dialects "have a greater significance and more important role than what is average for the languages of other European peoples". Therefore, he continues, the standard language is "open even today" towards Kajkavian and Čakavian idioms, "freely adopts linguistic means from them", and such relation towards the dialects stands as "one of its essential traits" (1997: 11). This thesis is from time to time taken up by foreign Slavists, so L. Auburger emphasizes that the Croatian standard, because it acknowledges "the synchronic principle of tridialectalism (*tronarječnost*)", stands "open towards the two other main types of non-Štokavian Croatian dialects", i. e. Kajkavian and Čakavian. Croatian linguists "systematically and consistently apply this principle in (...) normative activities", especially with respect to the lexicon (2012: 121). Anyway, in quite an extensive footnote where some specific corroborations are supposed to be found, he just broadly reminds us of the principles of standardology advocated by the Zagreb Philological School in the second half of the 19th century and "later" Croatian linguists, its nominal followers, providing no names, quotations or examples.

As for the opposite stance, it is summarized in the foreword to an otherwise excellent monograph on the Kajkavian dialect of the Međimurje region. According to the author, the "gradual retreat" of dialects and local idioms from public life is accelerated not only by the global influence of English, but by the "domination of the standard language as well". Its "doors (...) are being permanently closed against the genuine Croatian lexis of Kajkavian and Čakavian dialects", while the modern media "in most cases ignore authentic local idioms" (Bartolić 2008: xi).

The two theses – the standard language as *permanently open*, and as *permanently closed* – are obviously irreconcilable. In a certain way they are connected by a series of public interventions after the break-up of Yugoslavia. In the 1990s many amateurs and some language professionals began to promote the idea that in non-Štokavian dialects there is a strong lexical potential waiting to be activated in order to *de-Yugoslavize* or *re-Croatize* the standard language. In 1997 a newspaper article called for a deliberate replacement of Serbisms, Turkisms and "unnecessary" Grecisms with lexical Kajkavisms and Čakavisms, and provoked an interesting reaction on the part of the then politically influential linguist S. Babić. When the promoters of such a pro-dialectal language policy, he wrote,

are asked what this action would “actually mean”, there is no answer, nor should there be one. For, the dialects “in their main body have already been exhausted”, they have already given to the standard “what they could give”, and what remains are more or less “stylistically marked words” like *vritnjak*, *fešta* and *norijada* (Babić 2004: 19).

Accidentally or not, these three lexemes vividly demonstrate a conceptual disorientation on both of these opposing sides, as they readdress the definition “dialect” from a new point of view, and consider the linguistic level or domain with respect to which the lexemes are “stylistically marked”.

It is not hard to see that what lies in the background of this almost ritualistic syntagm are the theoretical tenets of the Zagreb stylistic school from the 1960s and 1970s, at the time undoubtedly innovative in its immanent approach to the literary text as a self-contained, autonomous entity. Decades later its postulates cannot withstand criticism from the perspective of modern approaches that annul the deeply rooted dichotomy between *stylistically marked* and *stylistically unmarked* (or *neutral*) texts. From the point of view of discourse theory, only the system can be treated as neutral, *unmarked*, but not the *realization*. For that reason, instead of speaking about style, one should speak about “the relational nature of speech”, about a text that “*always* belongs to a situation, to a frame against which it establishes a *relation*” (Kovačević and Badurina 2001: 37).

The three lexemes which are, even though “stylistically marked”, formally allowed to enter the standard language, bear witness to how it is mistaken, and for the standard dysfunctional as well, to see explicitly and implicitly normativized varieties as stable and clearly distinguishable entities, rather than dynamic points of a continuum with series of variable top-down and bottom-up hybridizations. This methodological failure is even greater since urbanization, modernization and massive post-WWII internal migrations have stimulated multi-layered interferences and, interweaving with linguistic influences of the mass media and popular culture, have given rise to the transformation of historical dialects into interdialects, regional koines and urban vernaculars that, as often as not, have for their speakers much higher prestige than the standard language.

In the second half of the 20th century this was especially the case with regard to the two most populous as well as economically and culturally most influential Croatian cities, both situated outside the Štokavian dialectal area – the country’s capital Zagreb (cf. Međeral-Sučević 2007) and Split, the regional center of Dalmatia (cf. Jutronić 2010). In addition, from the mid-1990s a regional koine in the making is gradually becoming the prestigious idiom of young urban population in Istria region (cf. Kalapoš 2002; Sujoldžić 2008). The overall linguistic dynamics

have been especially complex – or creative – because the above mentioned internal migrations, seen from a dialectological perspective, were generally realized as a continuous move of Štokavian-speaking population, including Croats from Bosnia-Herzegovina, to the historically Kajkavian Zagreb area and the historically Čakavian Adriatic coast, where both Dalmatia and Istria are located.

By coincidence, Babić's lexical selection impeccably demonstrates the three main points of newly produced types of contacts among varieties and consequential normativist misunderstanding.

2. “Stylistic markedness” vs. the dynamics of the language continuum

The first lexeme – *vritnjak* ‘a kick in the ass’ – is an unambiguously identifiable dialectalism and an example of organic Kajkavian word-formation, so it can be said that here we have a textbook case of the standard language's “openness” and of its bottom-up “enrichment” within the frame and upon the criteria of the traditional, clearly distinguishable standard/ dialect dichotomy. The only problem lies in the fact that the formal corpus planning comes more than a century too late.

During a fiery debate in the *Sabor* (the Croatian Parliament) on October 5, 1885, unitarian pro-Hungarian *ban* (viceroy) D. Khuen-Héderváry was kicked exactly in this way by the enraged Croatian Party of Rights representative J. Gržanić, and the term immediately entered the public sphere – a process natural in the then still mostly Kajkavian-speaking Zagreb. But, as the newspapers published in Zagreb were at the same time intended for a nation-wide public, and were therefore printed in the neo-Štokavian-based standard language, this lexeme served perfectly well to avoid the Štokavian word for that part of the human body, which would have sounded crude and morally scandalous, all the more so because the word itself could not have been hidden in a derived form, like that of Kajkavian (formed from the prefix *v* ‘in’ + *rit* ‘ass’ + the nominal suffix *-njak*), but would have had to be clearly exposed in a circumlocution, as in the English translation above.

The event being politically too important and far-reaching to be ignored or only broadly described, both the quality press and historiography found the dialectalism useful and soon terminologized it as *saborski vritnjak*, *The Parliamentary Kick in the Ass*. As such, it can still be found in academic papers, that is in the most formal of all registers, functioning as a terminological euphemism, in other words as “stylistically marked” within the standard language frame (and a neutral colloquialism in its original Kajkavian context). What is more, because of

its frequency, manifest also in the press and higher educational levels textbooks and handbooks, it has lost its initial “markedness”, and it is hard to see the reason why it should be restored, as well as to find a way to do it.¹

The second lexeme – *fešta* ‘celebration, feast, party’ – is rightly considered a Čakavism, and a traditionally conceived dialectalism in the same sense as *vritnjak*. What remains out of sight is that it exists in the Dubrovnik neo-Štokavian dialect as well, in the form of *fešta*, while such variation does not exist in the case of *vritnjak*. A logical question arises as to why the standard language has preference given preference to the Čakavian instead of the neo-Štokavian form, the latter even being theoretically much more appropriate because it comes from the dialect on whose phonetics and morphology the standard language is historically based.

An answer cannot be given within traditional normativist categories and in terms of “stylistic markedness”, but sociolinguistically it is easily attainable. The form *fešta*, used in Čakavian idioms of Dalmatia (and Istria), has been promoted on the national level – strongly, but spontaneously – from the early 1960s through various genres of popular culture: movies, sitcoms, soap-operas, and popular music, all painting the picture of stereotypical endless summers in sunny Dalmatia, where people are light-hearted, musical and always ready for some open-air *fešta*. It can thus be said that by the end of the 1970s there was no Croatian inland speaker not to have the word at least in his or her passive repertoire.

The role of Dubrovnik in tourist development and national self-representation evolved along a different course: if you wanted to experience a sophisticated urban environment, a site of internationally renowned Renaissance and Baroque artistic achievements, and high-culture national symbols, Dubrovnik was the place to go, but if you were inclined to an informal *fešta* with locals in a little fishermen village or on a romantic beach, you went to Dalmatia.

These socio-economic developments have produced new relations and hierarchies of dialects, both between them, and in relation to the supposedly neutral, supraregional national standard. By now everyone knows *fešta* and almost everyone, including national and inland local media normally use it with the general

1 All the media with a daily section about various anniversaries from national and world history, titled *TV-almanac* or *It happened on this very day*, always use the syntagm *saborski vritnjak*. Gržanić was sentenced to six months’ imprisonment, and after serving the term, he was publicly presented with a silver half-boot containing the inscription *To the fearless defender of our rights*, commissioned by citizens of his native Senj. The boot is included among the historical exhibits in the Parliament Memorial Hall, and the official text on the explanatory plaque uses the same expression.

connotation of a festivity of any kind. The word has lost its regional and dialectal connotations, and now is part of the nation-wide colloquial register, having pushed its standard-language synonyms *slavlje* and *proslava* into the most formal communicative situations.

In result, the word can no longer be viewed as a localism or dialectalism, as “stylistically marked” with regard to “stylistically neutral” standard language lexemes. It is now effectively “neutral”, while the Dubrovnik neo-Štokavian form *fešta* retains the status of a dialectalism. Consequently, when the national media extensively report about the Saint Vlaho (Blaise) celebration to honor the patron saint of Dubrovnik, they typically use the local form of the noun, *fešta*, knowing that it bears a widely recognizable “stylistic markedness”, but one established relative to the form *fešta*, which is now *de facto* neutral and supraregional, and not relative to the only *de iure* neutral *slavlje* or *proslava*.

The third of Babić’s lexemes – *norijada* ‘a massive public celebration of the secondary-school graduation-day, with young people singing, screaming and dancing in the streets’ – shows another type of dysfunctionality of the traditional concept of organic idioms in a contemporary sociolinguistic context.

Although this word is implied to be a model lexical Kajkavism in a clear-cut dialect/ standard dichotomy, it turns out to be something else. The fact is that it derives from the Kajkavism *nori* ‘crazy, foolish’, from German *Narr*, but that adjectival stem gives in organic Kajkavian idioms the noun *norija*, with various local accents (*nòrija*, *noríja*, *noríja*, *norǐja*), meaning ‘insanity, folly, crazy business’. The form *norijada* has the same dialectal root, but is the result of a word-formation model that does not exist in historic Kajkavian, but has relatively recently been developed within the urban vernacular of the young population in Zagreb, using an international suffix of Greek origin *-ijada*, on the model of the *Olympiad*, *pleiad* and the likes. It is very productive in colloquial registers nation-wide, but non-existent in “authentic” dialects.

What is more, this derivative denotes a phenomenon which, unlike the more general *norija*, did not take place in the traditional rural environment, nor does it occur there even today if there is no secondary school around. Additionally, when the two lexemes do co-exist in Kajkavian-speaking regions, they are semantically differentiated: *norija*, besides being felt to be archaic, denotes primarily an individual act or behavior at any given opportunity, while *norijada* exclusively denotes an organized group engagement in tomfoolery at a unique occasion.

Other Croatian speakers do not generally have any direct interaction with organic idioms of Kajkavian-speaking (sub)regions, rural or urban, but only with

those Kajkavian lexical, morphological and other traits which are integrated into the Zagreb vernacular, and which from that source enter the discourse of the public sphere or the repertoires of non-Kajkavian speakers, while they also serve as a feedback to the repertoires of organic Kajkavian speakers. For all of them, Kajkavians and non-Kajkavians, innovations like *norijada* are first of all Zagrebisms, elements from the prestigious and influential speech of the metropolis, and only after that, if at all, Kajkavisms, that is dialectalisms in the traditional sense.

The public celebration and its original name spread from Zagreb into its wider region, and during the last decade has swept over the whole country, following the same pattern: at the first stage to regional centers whose vernaculars are prestigious in their respective zones of influence, and then to smaller surrounding towns. It is therefore reasonable to ask whether the term *norijada* in the perception of Štokavian-speaking secondary-school graduates in Vinkovci is a lexical – and sociocultural – import primarily from their regional centre of Osijek, only 30 km away, or from Zagreb, but it seems sure that they do not perceive the term as a Kajkavian dialectalism.

So, in a wider view, Babić's three-part dialectal lexical selection for the targeted "enrichment" of the standard language turns out to belong to several different categories: *vritnjak* has long since been accepted into more formal registers of the standard language in the firm status of a euphemism; *fešta* functions as an item of nation-wide informal spoken and mass-media standard Croatian, i.e., it belongs to General neo-Štokavian, with almost no regional or dialectal connotations; *norijada*, originally from Zagreb slang, rapidly acquired a safe status in supraregional transgenerational General neo-Štokavian as well, and is highly terminologized.

The importance of introducing the category of speakers' perception into any serious discussion about interactions between standard and non-standard varieties can be substantiated from many perspectives. A few years ago research on the linguistic competence among older elementary school pupils was carried out in Sv. Ivan Zelina, a small town 30 km north of Zagreb. Those Kajkavian-speaking early adolescents showed a high degree of linguistic intuition and were able to recognize about 700 loanwords, belonging to two groups – traditional Kajkavian Germanisms that have been integrated in the dialect for centuries and newly borrowed colloquial Anglicisms. They correctly identify words by source language, understand them and use them properly in communication (Bistrički 2010).

However, two examples can be found that do not fit the rule in a particularly telling manner: neither the exclamation *Džizus!*, from English 'Jesus!', nor the

noun *spika* ‘way of speaking, conversation’, from the English verb ‘to speak’, were recognized as Anglicisms, but the former was by analogy associated with Kajkavian dialectal *Jezuš!*, as opposed to the standard Croatian form *Isus(e)!*, while the latter item was perceived as a Zagrebism.

Undoubtedly, global Anglicisms are prestigious, but evidently not in an absolute scope: among young speakers, their origin may sometimes be easily overshadowed by the stronger prestige of a regional centre vernacular, although they are otherwise exceptionally able to identify words by their origin. As the former lexeme shows, the prestige of Global English can be overlapped even by the otherwise non-prestigious but native organic Kajkavian, which indicates that adolescents are not as alienated from the dialect as they are usually thought to be. It would be closer to the truth to say that they modernize the dialect in their own way, i.e., they give symbolic legitimacy to the organic form *Jezuš!* on a new communicational level.

3. Young speakers and dialect change

Changes are thus constantly occurring not only in language as structure, but also in the perceptions of the standard language and dialects, as well as in the perceptions of foreign languages, the latter being one more player that enters the game, sometimes as such, sometimes in quite an unexpected disguise, turning the role of the whole individual and group repertoire into a kind of ecological *habitat*. It is precisely the adolescents who, within the patterns of becoming involved in various social groups with various motivations and impulses (rock music included), come up with functions of dialectal and other non-standard varieties as group symbols. These unpredictable processes obviously imply a certain “slangification (*gergalizzazione*) or paraslangification (*paragergalizzazione*) of a dialect” (Berrutto 1994: 38).

The Anglicisms of young speakers are thus more often than not different from the Anglicisms of standardologists and dialectologists: they may signify Berruttoian (para)slangification of dialect, although we should rather call it its symbolic extension, as well as its socio-cultural domestication on a more prestigious, urbanized level, i.e., the speaker’s self-identification with a domestic urban centre rather than with an external, “alien” one.

In that respect it is hard to find logic in the intentions of various workshops, revitalization projects and round tables based on the concept of “the preservation of dialectal diversity” (Hranjec 2009: 453), because human communication naturally produces diversity and it is in no way endangered except in the case when only one type of it is selected to be entitled with status and value

legitimacy. That, then, is rather a petrification than a protection, and inevitably leads to the romantic idealization of the patriarchal agrarian autarchy communicatively served by those organic idioms. In reality such an approach stands not for resistance to the “domination” of the standard language, whatever this term may mean, but to the processes of supra-local koineization.

Let it be said that there is no intention here to devalue the ethnologically and socio-culturally- focused teaching of school children and their consciousness-raising on historical linguistic issues when the projects are adequately methodologically prepared, and when they have the additional purpose of deconstructing negative linguistic stereotypes. It must therefore be noted that some prominent academics, engaged in the promotion of traditional dialects and their cultural value, have very early seen the dangers that are inevitable if the revitalization of local idioms remains trapped in a romanticized past.

The highly esteemed Čakavian poet and cultural historian Zvane Črnja (1920–1991) was eager to stress more than four decades ago that “we here in Istria”, while “reviving the Čakavian tradition and exalting its values”, are not pleading for its rescue “at any cost” and its “conservation”, because that would “mean to take a stand against the living processes of cultural and spiritual development”. He thinks not that the idiom of his native Žminj will disappear, “but that it is changing too”, that the Žminj Čakavian speech of his childhood “was considerably different than the one spoken today”, that “transformations are manifest, and as we do live in peculiarly dynamic times (...) they will be even more apparent in the future” (Jeličić 1971: 126–127). The historian Miroslav Brandt (1914–2002), a “native Štokavian-speaker from Srijem”, as he considered it important to stress, added that if a hypothetical boy, born that very day on that site, some twenty years later should start to write in the Žminj Čakavian idiom, it “would probably be some other Čakavian type, but it will serve him well to express some other reality too, no longer the one of Črnja’s childhood” (Jeličić 1971: 130).

These two attitudes remained in the minority even on that occasion, opposed to all the other participants at the round table – literary historians, writers and publishers – who reiterated abstract notions about “the soul of the dialect” and lamented “the dying world of our ancestors”. In that light, it would be useful to see what the new childhoods, adolescences and youths look like.

4. Rock musicians’ self-reflexive discourses on language

Authors and performers in the genres of popular culture are important initiators and protagonists of new linguistic processes, they are new language policy

actors of their own kind, as popular culture turns out to be a medium of local and supralocal distribution and legitimization, even diversification of local organic idioms and their varieties. Their relations and attitudes toward the idioms they use are diverse and multi-layered, as often as not conflicting, but nevertheless relevant for an insight into the new aspects of inter-varietal patterning. In this section two of those self-referential discourses are analyzed and tentatively categorized.

The band *Kopito (The Hoof)*, self-branded as “multi-insular” because its core members are natives of the Dalmatian islands Vis, Korčula and Brač, was founded in 2003 in Zagreb, where it is still based and where all the members live and work. Their sound can roughly be described as a basic rock group with a wind-section, which enables them to incorporate elements of calypso, reggae and ska into what critics have called a “Caribbean-Mediterranean synthesis”, and has made them a very popular live act, primarily in Zagreb area and along the coast. They sing in the native local idiom of their leader or, better to say, in some stylization based upon it, in this particular case the dialect spoken on Vis.

Late in 2007 the band announced the release of their second CD *Teotar akvarelo (Water-color Theatre)*. The texts on it, clarinet player Vlade Matulić says, “will essentially be more serious”, but “even less intelligible”, than those on their debut CD *Riba (Fish)*, issued in 2006. The main author, lead singer and bass player Pavle Sviličić adds that such an evolution stems from the fact that he “had started to learn more and more old Vis words”, which “are really hard to hear today”, the reason being that “young people in the area are increasingly under the influence of the city of Split”. Anyway, as his parents and kinsfolk on the island “constantly speak in Vis idiom”, every now and then he hears a new word, “something can be learned from books”, and by and large, “some new and interesting word can be found at every moment” (Vukušić 2007).

The founder, main author, guitar player and lead singer of the band *Gustafi*, Edi Maružin, was born in the Istria region, where he still lives and where the band is permanently based. He started his professional music career in the early 1980s within a group named *Gustaph y njegovi dobri duhovi*, playing a kind of experimental post-punk. By 1992 he designed a completely new musical concept, blending elements of Istrian folk music with global popular music genres ranging from Tex-Mex and Mexican mariachi to blues, classic rock and roll and New Orleans dance music. As an integral part of this profound change he abandoned writing lyrics in standard Croatian and turned to a kind of sub-regional koine based upon the Čakavian idioms of his native south-western Istria. With a very danceable style, *Gustafi* immediately became the darlings of Istrian youth