DIALECT AND STANDARD LANGUAGE IN A MIGRANT SITUATION: THE CASE OF NEW ZEALAND CROATIAN

Hans-Peter Stoffel – University of Auckland

In Australia, New Zealand and the southern tip of South America, Slavonic languages exist at the very periphery of their territorial radius. Such languages have been referred to as languages *in diaspora*, *colonial* languages, languages *in emigration* or *migrant* languages (we shall use the term *migrant* language, which includes the speech of the descendants of migrants).[1]

The linguistic codes of these migrant languages experience considerable instability owing to the distance separating them from their home territories, in Central and Eastern Europe, and constant exposure to the dominant, host language. In many cases, this instability is complicated even further by the fact that they were originally transplanted to the periphery *on the basis of dialect*. Thus L_1 (dialect) now competes not only with its host languages L_2 (the local variant of English or Spanish), but also with its own standard, i.e. with L_1 (standard).[2]

The present article focuses on the situation of Croatian dialects from Dalmatia in New Zealand, broadly referred to here as New Zealand Croatian (NZC), vis-à-vis the Croatian Standard Language (StC). The consequences of the prolonged exposure of New Zealand Croatian to New Zealand English (NZE) will also be considered insofar as they are relevant to our migrant situation.

Within the context of research into migrant languages, problems of diglossia (even if knowledge of L_1(standard) is minimal or only passive) in a bilingual or multilingual situation have received

[1] For the term *diaspora*, cf. Stoffel (1993: 75); for *colonial*, cf. Olesch (1985: 127); for a general survey of Slavonic languages, in emigration communities, cf. Sussex (1993). For a survey of research into language contact in general, cf. Clyne (1975).

[2] For the descendants of migrants English is now L_1. NZ Croatian - if they still know it - is L_2.

relatively little attention.[3] Yet these problems are evident in almost identical form in most migrant communities where settlement originated in the nineteenth century. In this 'global' or 'universal' context, the case of New Zealand represents a unique laboratory for the study of dialect vs. standard due to the predominance of dialect speakers from a well-defined area, who have lived in considerable isolation from their home territories, especially between 1880 and 1950.[4]

***

Some 120 years ago, migrants from what was then part of Austria-Hungary began to arrive in New Zealand in larger numbers.[5] They came from an area along the central and southern Dalmatian coastline, especially between Makarska and the Pelješac Peninsula; from the off-shore islands of Brač, Hvar, Vis and Korčula, and from the coastal 'hinterland' with its centres Vrgorac and Imotski. Since that time, chain migration from the same areas has produced a numerically modest, but constant replenishment of the community in New Zealand. After World War II, and again after 1991, people from other parts of the former Yugoslavia started to arrive in larger numbers, but the Dalmatian element is still dominant, especially in Auckland and in the north.[6] The linguistic picture reflects these demographic

---

[3] For a discussion on the adaptation of loanwords from American-English in a migrant *dialect* context, cf. Jutronić-Tihomirović (1982). For the reception of loanwords from American-English in migrant Serbo-Croatian and in their home territory (former Yugoslavia), cf. Surdučki (1983).

[4] On the 'global context' and the structure of Slav migrant languages, cf. Stoffel (1988[1], 1991) and (1993), for a general survey of NZC, cf. Stoffel (1981, 1988[2], 1994), and Jakich (1975). For a history of people from former Yugoslavia in New Zealand, cf. Trlin (1979) or Čizmić (1981).

[5] According to Trlin (1979: 27), there were 5,438 arrivals between 1897 and 1914 (5,268 males and 170 females). For an interpretation of these figures, cf. Trlin (1979: 26–59). Nowadays, the number of people from former Yugoslavia and their descendants in NZ is estimated at between 50,000 and 70,000. They make up the second largest group of people from Continental Europe in New Zealand (the Dutch are the largest group).

[6] Not surprisingly, New Zealanders are accustomed to referring to people from former Yugoslavia as *Dalmatians*, *Dallies* or, in Maori, *Tarara* (cf. Stoffel, 1986). This is reflected in New Zealand lexicography and fiction by writers of

data: dialect-based L_1 almost completely dominated the scene until the 1950s. These dialects are Čakavian-Ikavian and Štokavian-Ikavian. The two differ from each other, in particular the Čakavian (spoken on most of the off-shore islands), from the Štokavian-based Štakavian as spoken in the 'hinterland', while coastal Štokavian occupies an 'intermediary position'. But most of these dialects share a number of major features which set them apart from Standard or 'Textbook' Croatian. Space does not allow us to enter into the intricacies of these dialects, but the following table produced by Thomas Magner outlines the *major* differences between Čakavian (based on the dialect of the city of Split) and Standard Croatian.[7] Most of its points are also relevant for the Štakavian-based dialects, especially for the coastal area between Baška Voda and Gradac.[8]

TEXTBOOK CROATIAN	SPLIT DIALECT
1. Ijekavian: *mlijeko* 'milk', *ljeto* 'summer', *ljetopisac* 'chronicler'	1. Ikavian in basic vocabulary: *mliko, lito*; Ijekavian in words borrowed from TC: *ljetopisac*
2. *lj*: *ljudi* 'people', *volja* 'will', *prijatelj* 'friend'	2. *j<lj*: *judi, voja, prijatej*
3. *dj*: *međa* 'boundary', *tuđ* 'foreign'	3. *j<đ*: *meja, tuj*
4. *-m*: *sedam* 'seven', *znam* ' I know'	4. *-n<-m: sedan, znan*
5. consonant clusters: *džep* 'pocket', *od sestre* 'from the sister'	5. reduction of consonant clusters: *žep, o sestre*
6. neo-Štokavian accents: *bàrbun* 'mullet', *sàstanak* 'meeting'	6. unshifted accents: *barbún*; double accent *sàstanàk*

both Dalmatian and Anglo-Celtic origin.

[7] For a concise, yet more detailed survey of all these dialects, cf. Strohal (1923), Brozović/Ivić (1988) and Peco (1989). For Čakavian, cf. Šimunović (1977). For the speech of the 'hinterland', cf. Šimundić (1971).

[8] Reprinted from Magner (1978: 411–413), with kind permission of the author.

7. interrogative: *što/šta* 'what'	7. *čạ*
8. genitive plural ending *-aµ* for nouns: *kûćā* 'houses', *sêlā* 'villages', *pròfesōrā* 'professors'	8. *-ø*: *kúč, sél*; *-i*: *profešúri*
9. plural endings (D, I, L cases) *-ma* for *a* nouns: *ženama* 'women'	9. *-n*: *ženan*
10. plural endings (D, I, L cases) *-ima* for masc. and neut. nouns: *profesorima*	10. *-iman: profešuriman*
11. third plural endings of present tense *-u*: *zovu* 'they call'; *-e*: *govore* 'they speak'	11. generalised *-u/-du*: *zovu/zovedu*; *govoru/govoridu*
12. Infinitive in *-ti*: *staviti* 'to place'	12. *-t*: *stavit*
13. masc. sing. ending, past tense, in *-o*: *rekao* 'he said', *radio* 'he worked'	13. no ending for verbs with *-a* in past stem: *reka*; *-ja* for others; *radija*
14. *za* plus verbal noun: *To je dobro za čitanje* 'That's good to read'	14. *za* plus infinitive: *To je dobro za čitat*
15. accusative case for end of motion; locative case for location: *Idem u Split* 'I'm going to Split', *Bio sam u Splitu* 'I was in Split'	15. confusion of these cases: *Gren u Splitu*, *Bija san u Split*; tendency to use accusative for both situations: *Gren u Split*, *Bija san u Split*
16. vocabulary as set forth in *pravopis* and dictionaries: *dugme* 'button', *šetnja* 'stroll', *prljavo* 'dirty'	16. up to 10% of vocabulary specific to Split and Dalmatian region: *botun, đir, šporko*

Based on data taken from New Zealand Croatian, we can add a number of items reflecting *frequently-heard* dialect features (vs. the Standard language, i.e. 'Textbook Croatian').

17. distinction between č/ć and dž/đ	17. distinction blurred, or only č/dž or ć/đ (in some dialects)

18. *može*	18. r<ž: *more*
19. *rasti*	19. e<a: *rest*
20. presence of *h*: *htio sam*	20. absence of h (in some dialects) *tija san*
21. plural extension *-ov-/-ev-*: *zubovi*	21. no Plural extension: *zubi* (in some dialects)
22. plural endings (D, I, L cases) *-ima* (masc., neut.), *-ama* (fem.): *zubovima*; *obalama* (cf. also Points 9 and 10)	22. *-im/-in*: *zubim/zubin*; *-am/-an*: *obalam/obalan* (cf. also Points 9 and 10)
23. bare case generally preferred: *Po pustinjama Novog Zelanda.*	23. extended use of the prepositions *od, sa, na*:[9] *Po pustinjan od Nove Zelande.*
24. verbal suffix *-nu-*: *metnuti*	24. verbal suffix *-ni-*: *metnit*

Migrants (Generations I and Ia)[10] bequeathed these dialects to subsequent generations, without any substantial dialect mixture. But their speech also contained a significant number of direct transfers from NZE, which they also bequeathed to subsequent generations. These were generally lexical transfers, for every English word or phrase was potentially 'borrowable'. They are of interest to us because they were fully integrated into the speech of migrants on the basis of *dialect* patterns. The following examples, taken from recorded interviews, highlight the integration of such lexical transfers into the *dialectal* inflexional patterns:

"Iz Mangonui smo došli s lanč*on*." (Instr. sg. masc.; first-generation informant from Živogošće, StC *-om*. E: From Mangonui we arrived by *lunch*.)

[9] Regarding the origin of this phenomenon, cf. Bidwell (1967: 27).

[10] Generation I (first generation): migrants; Generation Ia (children under the age of 10 who arrived together with the migrants); Generations II and III: second and third generations (NZ-born descendants of migrants).

"Da kako, juziš špir u švamp*in*." (Loc. pl., masc.; first-generation informant from Živogošće, StC *-ima*. E: Of course, one uses a (gum) spear in the *swamps* /to locate the resin/.)

"Kad se digne*n* ujutro, ima*n* ručak, učini*n* posteju, fidi*n* tica." (1st ps. sg. present tense; first-generation informant; grandparents from Vrgorac, StC: *-m*. E: When I get up in the morning, I have breakfast, I make /my/ bed and *feed* the bird.)

"Da li je on baka*Ø*, il da ste vi?" (3rd ps. sg. masc, past tense; first-generation informant from the island of Brač"; StC baka*o*. E: Was it he who *backed* /the horse in a horse race/ or was it you?)

"Sa Maori*man* govoriš ingleški." (Instr. pl. masc.; first-generation informant from Makarska; StC *-ima*. E: With the Maori one speaks English.)

***

Consideration of dialect features is important when determining whether a given phenomenon in the migrant speech is really a transfer ("an instance of interference" /Weinreich 1963:1/) from the host language, NZ English. Thus, the feminine gender of NZC *buka* (< NZE *book*) cannot really be explained by reference to the feminine gender of the so-called 'synonym' *knjiga*, because most speakers from Dalmatia use *liber/libar* (masc.) when avoiding the transfer. Equally, the phrase *Živin u Auckland-Ø* (StC: *u Auckland-u*) is not necessarily a direct consequence of contact with 'inflexionless' English. The phenomenon already existed in the dialects of the home territory (cf. table above), though contact with English may well have reinforced this feature.[11]

In the dialects outlined, loan-words from Italian (usually via Venetian) are very frequent, and have usually been totally integrated. The stems of such words often resemble English words of Latin/Romance origin. NZC words, therefore, such as *vala* or *muvit/movit*, are not direct transfers from English *valley* or (to) *move*. Both words exist in the dialects of the home

[11] For so-called 'reinforced grammatical categories', cf. Stoffel (19881: 384).

territory,[12] though again, closeness in form and meaning with NZE equivalents may well have reinforced their use in NZC.

Consideration of the dialect can also assist in the investigation of NZ English spoken by early first-generation migrants. Consequently, the 'puzzling' intervocalic /v/ in *krovéšon* can be explained by reference to the *dialectal* (Čakavian) intervocalic /v/: za*v*ustavit (StC: za*u*stavit) or re*v*ušit (Čakavian; cf. Italian riuscire).

The number of transfers from NZE among first-generation speakers seems to have reached saturation point at some stage in their linguistic development. The second and subsequent generations adopted these transfers as a matter of fact, added more lexical transfers, albeit in increasingly unassimilated form, and have produced, together with modifications at the structural level, an almost infinite number of dialect-based idiolects. However, research in New Zealand and elsewhere has shown that there nonetheless exists a *kind of* common representative denominator, which Haugen (1977: 98) calls the 'communicative norm'. This common denominator consists of a stock of features shared by those brought up under NZC/NZE bilingual conditions. This represents, essentially, a spoken type of dialect-based speech. Naturally, it is most prominent among those speakers of the second generation, whose competence and performance is still sufficient for a 'meaningful discourse' in NZC. For example:

Text 1:[13]

Moj otac, on je BIJA, kad je UNDA u New Zealand, on je BIJA *gomdiger* za, ja MISLIN, za devet petnaest godina kako je on meni kaziva. A onda kad je RAZUMIJA malo INGLEŠKI, UNDA je on IŠA u <u>biznes</u>, kako mi UNDA zovemo *štor*, *štorkiper* oli *gombajer*. On je TRGOVA u gomu, on je KUPOVA

[12] Cf. Olesch (1979: 567 and 1311). For a general survey, also cf. Gačić (1979) and Mušić (1972).

[13] Symbols: CAPITALS: words showing dialect features; <u>underlined</u>: direct unassimilated lexical transfers from English; *italics*: fully integrated lexical transfers, passed on by Generation I, e.g. *trajat*< NZE (to) try; *ringat* < NZE (to ring/ to telephone); ¶: hesitation.

i PRODA drugomu u Aucklandu, u city, znaš, on je REDIJA, on je KUPOVA gomu i on je REDIJA za MARKETU, šta MARKETU TRIBA, znaš, u different quality. I to je BIJA veliki RABOTA, moraš BIT, ja ne ZNAN kako, moraš IMAT ¶, ZNAT, kako se ono redi, kako MARKETA OČE CINA, i to je on ČINIJA. UNDA to on meni KAZIVA, on je to meni KAZIVA više puta, /..../.

(second-generation informant; of Dalmatian/Maori parentage; 1977)

Text 2:[13]

BIJA SAN [...] dvaest i tri kad smo se oženili. I došli smo. Ja san UVIK ŽIVIJA ovde, kad smo se oženili. UNDE smo gradili kuču i, kako bi REKA ¶ Je, je, mi smo ¶ kuča je bila stara kuča, pa smo je nismo ¶ je razbili - demolished it. Kad smo ¶ pa ZNADEN, ZNA SAN jedan čovjek šta je GRADIJA, i mi smo *dali ruku* [...] pa smo se gradili kuču. A po ¶ smo mu ¶ muzili krave, koliko [...] a kad smo došli ovde naprvo, NISAN IMA nego četrdeset i SEDAN. A pa unda smo OKOLO sta, ¶ deset petnaest godina. A smo UNDA muzili dosta, ¶ sto i pedeset, UNDA TRIBALO me UVIK¶ UNDA *implojit* koga drugoga da RABOTA, a za nas ja SAN UNDA ODLUČIA da ću FINIT muzit krave i da ču UNDA priokrenit na meso — beef [...].

(second-generation informant; 1977)

***

On the other hand, Standard Croatian - or what could be regarded as such at the turn of the century - was essentially a written language for the earliest migrants (~1880–1920), many of whom were illiterate or semi-literate. But as one of our informants tells us in a recorded interview (1972), they were good listeners, and many of them taught themselves the basics of the written standard, because 'literary ability' was looked upon in high regard:

Text 3:

[In the evenings] mi bi *škrepali* gomu, strugali gomu. A neko bi uvik čita — to je bilo u stara doba — imali bi naše stare historijske knjige i onda bi jedan bi čita, a drugi bi slušali. Bilo je, bilo je *g*¶ smolokopača koji nisu znali ni čitat ni pisat. Oni bi pomiljivo to slušali i oni bi bili sposobni, sposobni kasnije to pripovidat reči do reči, tako su bili zainteresirani. I tako je life, život je bija u *ka* ¶ u logorima, I mean u naseobinama, vesea. Bavilo se čitanjen, pisanjen, svjetskon politiki, i tako dalje ... [...].

(first-generation informant, born 1896 near Vrgorac. He was widely-read, wrote his own 'memoirs' in Croatian and cared for 'correct language'. When a transfer from NZE crept into his story he immediately gave a Croatian 'equivalent' or loan-translation, or avoided the transfer after some hesitation: *škrepat*/strugat, *g(omdigera)*/smolokopača, life/život, *k(ampima)*/logorima. The only exception is I mean. An example of this informant's written language can be seen below, Text 10).

Those persons belonging to the generation of the earliest migrants who did read printed material would have come across a type of 'Standard Croatian' in the *Puc"ki List* (published in Split between 1891 and 1922, and known among migrants in New Zealand) and in a number of - usually rather short-lived - Auckland-based Croatian newspapers at the beginning of the twentieth century, such as *Bratska Sloga* (Brotherly Unity), *Napredak* (Progress) and *Zora* (*The Dawn*). These newspapers are, among other things, of interest to us on account of the regularly published 'letters to the editor' (which may, however, have been'doctored'). Their spelling conventions were based on Ikavian or Ijekavian, but they were not uniform, even within the same given newspaper (e.g. *Pučki List*: Što je nova po svitu /1896/. Što je nova po svijetu /1896/. Što je nova po svietu /1901/)[14]:

[14] *Pučki List* used the Štokavian-Ikavian dialect between 1891 and 1896, and then adopted Štokavian-Ijekavian. For a long time it used the *Korijenski pravopis* (cf. Vidović; 1975: 51).

Text 4:[15]

Iz Nove Zelande na 21 Svibnja 1901
Evo imade već do sada 15 dana, otkada se je ukazala na nebu u ovoj zemlji zviezda, koja nosi barjak za sobom. Inglezi se čude ovomu zlamenju.

Molim vas, stavite ovo u naš omiljeli "Pučki List".
Vaš Domoradac [...]

(*Pučki List*, No. 14, 1901)

Text 5:

Amerikansko Zubarski Parlor
[...] Napravlja nebnice i napunja supljotine pokvarenih zubih. Nase vadjenje zubih bez boli poznato je po cijeloj Novoj Zelandi. Tko naruci umjetne zube stari mu se vade bez platno. [...]

(*Zora*, 10.7.1915)

Text 6:

Kratke viesti
Bolnica od Aucklanda jest najvisa, i najprostorija zgradja u Novoj Zelandiji. [...]
Gospodin Marconi idje u Ameriku dojduceg Listopada da predstavi njegov *brzojav bez zice*: kojeg on sam jest dao na vidjelo. [...]
Rusko-Siberska zeljeznica jest dosla do Irkutsk. [...]

(*Bratska Sloga*, 15.5.1899)

Other locally-produced texts stemming from the earliest periods of Dalmatian settlement include inscriptions on graveyards or the works of the 'poets of the gumfields', Mate Stula (from Podača), Ante Pucar (from Kozica) and, best known among them, Ante Kosović (born Zaostrog 1882, died Auckland 1958):

[15] All texts throughout the article are based on written sources and contain the spelling (with or without - correct or incorrect - diacritics) in which they originally appeared.

Text 7:

Ovdje pocivaju kosti Andrie
Dragobratovica
rodjen 1870
umro 11 Setember (*sic*!) 1890
Pokoj mu vicnji.

(Inscription on gravestone. Ahipara)

Text 8:

Dalmacijo moja Domovino
Rodno misto draga otačbino
Mnogo puta rad tebe uzdahnem
Kad na misa ti moju napaneš
I razmislim slatke ugodnosti
Što u mojoj provedoh mladosti
Liti, zimi ol blage jeseni,
Meni dani bili su veseli.

(Ante Kosović; from *Dalmatinac iz Tudjine*, Split 1908: 7)

The oldest informants say that they wrote letters 'home' to Dalmatia - including, as we can see in Text 4 and Text 13, letters to newspapers. They also wrote to fellow first-generation migrants in New Zealand or elsewhere in the world, such as the Americas or Australia. But this activity decreased with permanent settlement and advancing years. The language of such letters - if they still exist - remains to be studied. Notwithstanding, we have at our disposal personal letters written by first-generation migrants in their eighties during the 1970s. The 'standard' used in these letters varies from writer to writer, but it usually contains at least some of the dialect features outlined in Magner's table (cf. above). Transfers from NZE - at least at the lexical level - are not numerous, given that these writers were conscious of what they considered the 'beauty of their language'. The style of their language can be very formal and appear somewhat antiquated to the modern reader, but it is a feature which we can also observe in

other written languages of older country-based people in Europe and elsewhere. For example:

Text 9:

Štovani gospodine,

Želim Vas obavjestiti dasam primio Vaše ljubazno pismo sa Krasnim Kalendarom tako isto i "Christmas Card" koje sume duboko pokrenule i jako razveselile. Osobito promatrajuć na one krasne vrhunce od Švicarskih gora (Alps) pokrivene sa bijelim snigom i okičene sa prekrasnim cviječem u različitim bojama, koje sačinjavaju izvanredan pogled i dubok utisak u našim srcima. [...].

(1974)

Text 10:

Dear [...],

U kratko i prosto da priznam prijem Vašeg pisma, zahvalnost na posluženom materijalu i priklopljeni upitnik.
Želja je da ispunim hrvatske riječi koje su se upotrebljavale kod prostih polupismenih ili bolje, većina nepismenih hrvatskih smolokopača na sjevernim smolovnim zemljištima N.Z..
Mnogi nazivi su djelomično ili posve iskrivljeni i novo stvoreni. To nije samo kod nas. To nažalost naša domaća tiskovna društva praksiraju i natječu ko da više unese tuđinštine u naš nekoć lijepi jezik. [...]

(1972)

Text 11:

Dragi [...], draga [...],

Najljepša vam hvala na vašem pismu i dobrim željama. Mala nam [...] dobro napreduje.
Želimo vam najugodnije putovanje da ugodno vrijeme provedete sa vašim dragim i milim i da imate uživanje u našoj ljubljenoj staroj Europi, koja je toliko pretrpila [...]

(1981)

In their letters and other comments, the oldest amongst first-generation migrants often apologise for their erratic knowledge of written Croatian:

Text 12:

I hope you understand some of my writing. Jer ja slabo pisem moj jezik i Englesky. Zelivan Vama i Vasoj gospodi svako dobro i uspjeh u vasem zanimanju. Puno vas pozdravljamo svi.

Vas san [...]

(1973)

But for these migrants, the problem of tackling their host-language L_2, NZ English, was far more vital than the acquisition of good Standard Croatian. In letters, as well as in tape-recorded interviews, they constantly mention the problem.

Text 13:

Kako je našima u Novoj Zelandi

Towai, dne 6 Srpnja 1904

[...] Teško nam je i s toga, što ne znademo ingleški. U tugjem si svietu kao niem, kad ne znaš jezika. Držimo se mi amo Hrvati jedan drugoga kao sliepac sliepca, jer inače, ako se izgubiš megju tugje ljude, što ćeš? kako li ćeš? [...]

(From a letter to *Pučki List*, No 18, 1904)

Given that trade activities in kauri resin (*kaurska smola*, *kaurska goma*, etc.) was generally done in English, it was of paramount importance to acquire the basics of the host language as fast as possible. This included the professional vocabulary relating to work. Not surprisingly, therefore, this is evident in the following note in the Auckland-based newspaper *Napredak*:

Text 14:

Nekoliko broja nasih dopisnika zeli bi da bude ciena smole u Ingleskom jeziku tiskano, ako ste u vecini protivni spravni smo ukinuti.

(No. 18, 1907)

Migrants from Dalmatia in other parts of the world encountered the same linguistic problems. Thus, the *Pučki List* received the following 'poem' on the English language from a Dalmatian-born migrant in the USA:

Text 15:

Puno j'lakše izgrćat žeravu
neg engleski primati u glavu;
taj je jezik tvrgji od kamena;
u svietu nema mučnijega!
Englez zbori ko[bez zuba[žena;
bi rekao da žvače sijena;
oba t'uha valja nakloniti;
ako ćes" ga štogod razumiti.
Ak' engleški hoćeš govoriti.
obe t' usne valja prikupiti;
megju zube jezik zatirati,
ak' engleški hoćeš glagoljati.

For the second generation, born in New Zealand, as well as the third generation, the incentive to learn written 'Standard' Croatian was minimal. This is especially true for the period between 1920 and 1950, when the need and pressure to 'assimilate' was great, and contacts with Dalmatia were few and far between. Thus, the predominance of dialect-based oral Croatian - if the language was maintained at all - has characterised New Zealand Croatian until well into the late 1970s, when most of the first, Dalmatian-born generation passed on.

Examples of written Croatian of a personal nature are infrequent among the second generation. But where they do exist, they

contain a far greater number of dialectisms and transfers than is evident in the examples from the first generation. The written language of this second generation presents an almost exact mirror of their spoken New Zealand Croatian and of the common denominator, such as we find it in Text 1 and Text 2 (above). The following is an extract from a daughter's letter to her mother. It is an excellent example of second-generation dialect-based New Zealand Croatian (naturally, her spelling system is her own creation):

Text 16:[16]

-Jane i Joe i DITSA doshli ovde na Sunday i yutros otishli put Italy. Bila je Jane pisala davno da MORE BIT da oni poju u America i da MORE bit da doju u Los Angeles. Anyway ya SAN noy pisala moj telephone number i YOPET NISAN nikoga chula, UNDA okolo 1/4 to ponoch telephone *ringa* i to bila Jane. Rekla da me ye *trayala ringa* CILU vecher i da NISAN bila doma. Jane rekla dasu samo odluchili doch ovde na Friday morning. Bili u New York pa na Friday morning da Joe REKA dache u Los Angeles i da su sve brzo TRIBALI se OPREMI i hurry up i brzo UZET tickets i sve na hurry [...]
Ali je sada Barbara zaruchena. Rekli su da IMA SE OZENI. Anyway pozdravi svakoga. I hope daye svak allright. Love to all,

[...]

(1972)

During the 1970s and 1980s, newsletters from clubs where the Dalmatian element predominates displayed similar features, though their language and spelling, obviously, were closer to the standard norm than the spelling system in Text 16. For example:

Text 17:

- Godišnji izlet će bit u Long Bay kao lani. Uredi čemo barbeque. Lani 'barbeque' je bija veliki uspjeh.
Pozivjemo svakoga kojise intersira da dođe u utorak 9 Decembra 1975 u prostorijama od kluba na 7.30 p.m.

[16] Cf. note 13 (above).

Ako nemožete docč telefoniraj [...]

(1975)

Naturally, the situation is somewhat different amongst more recent arrivals, or where a conscious effort is made to learn or maintain the language, or where Croatian is learned like any other foreign language in a language course.

***

The strong influence of the dialects of migrants on the NZC of their descendants is also evident in the work of many students of Dalmatian ancestry in the Croatian language course for beginners at the University of Auckland.[17] Though the topic of 'dialect vs. standard language' is taught on a contrastive basis, dialectisms turn up with amazing consistency, particularly at the beginning of the course in free composition (and, of course, in exercises in the spoken language). Most students hear only dialect-based NZC, especially in their conversations with their grandparents.

Interference from dialect forms occurs more or less in line with the points outlined in Magner's table. While insecurity in the spelling of </e/je/ije/i/> can also be observed in the work of students with no specific Croatian background, the insecurity in distinguishing between <č/ć> and <dž/đ>, and even the older <gj>, is definitely a consequence of dialect influence and earlier spelling conventions. The following examples are taken from a selection of the written work of students with a greater or lesser prior knowledge of Croatian (those with no prior knowledge, and students from outside the Croatian-language community, do not generally make *this kind* of error):[18]

-Zagre*bć*ani (PS) voli*du* (MS) posjetiti velesajam.

Narod *od* (MS) Zagreba vol*u* (MS) posjetiti velesajam.

[17] An introductory course of two hours per week at Stage I level.

[18] Abbreviations refer to areas in which errors occur: L = lexicon; MS = morphology and syntax; PS = phonetics/phonology/spelling.

Mi smo svi *finili* (L) ispite za fakultet.

Livada je puna *flura*. (L)

Livada je puna cv*igje*. (PS)

Vratila se *za ići* vani. (MS)

Nemoj zaboraviti doč (PS) u središte gradu *na quarat* do tri. (MS,L)

***

It would appear that for many descendants of migrants, the standard language - especially in its written form - remains a somewhat exotic and distant phenomenon, existing as some sort of 'extra' at the periphery of the 'much more important' spoken form of the language passed on by their ancestors. There certainly is no systematic diglossia between higher (standard) and lower (dialect) variants of the language in the migrant community, though a first-generation Čakavian speaker of the early twentieth century would endeavour to write as best as he could - 'prema gramatici' - in what he perceived to be the standard language. For the majority of descendants of these pioneer gumdiggers, however, Croatian is by and large a spoken medium (if they still have an active knowledge of the language at all). Not surprisingly, in our surveys on NZC (1977/78 in Northland, 1990/91 in Auckland city) the items 'read' and 'write', which constitute the essential areas of the standard language, regularly receive the lowest self-ratings amongst the second and third generations. In our survey on language maintenance and language shift in Auckland, answers to the relevant questions (61 respondents) revealed that there is very little 'reading' and 'writing' in Croatian - at least amongst those who completed the questionnaire! But the second generation still indicates that it has a sufficient aural knowledge of the literary language - i.e. a passive knowledge of the spoken language (Question /a/ - but these self-evaluations would have to be put to the test). At the same time, the second and especially the third generations find it difficult to understand

the written standard language even in journalistic publications specifically addressed to migrants from Croatia (Question /b/):

/a/ *If speeches were made in Standard Croatian at a gathering (club, reunion, church, etc.), how would you understand such speeches?*

Responses:

GENERATION	I	II	III
With no difficulty	91%	53%	12%
The gist	9%	23%	25%
I would switch off	-	12%	51%
No answer	-	12%	12%

/b/ *Can you read Croatian texts in publications such as MATICA or ISELJENIČKI KALENDAR?*

Responses:

GENERATION	I	II	III
Without difficulty	73%	18%	-
With difficulty	18%	57%	25%
Too strenuous	5%	11%	13%
No, not at all	-	11%	50%
No answer	4%	3%	12%

***

Though the standard language is a relatively 'distant' phenomenon for the descendants of migrant pioneers, they are nevertheless aware that it is important both in its home territory and for more recent newcomers from 'back home'. Those persons who speak the standard language are admired as people who are able to speak 'prema gramatici'. And though the dialects are complete linguistic systems as well, and are spoken according to (their specific) 'gramatika', they enjoy a low prestige. Apologies are often made for speaking in a dialect (such as being 'little educated'), but they seem to refer not so much to the dialect as such, but to what the speakers - and listeners - perceive as 'contaminated' speech, i.e. to the fact that a speaker's NZC contains far too many recognisable transfers from NZE ('onaj pidžin'!). Leading members of the community, especially teachers, people of older generations with a strong sense of 'correctness', as well as more recent arrivals, are often keen purists and thereby reinforce the low status of dialects. Moreover, adherence to an accepted standard norm is closely linked with ethnicity, culture and religion in the Slavonic world.

It is difficult to generalise in this area, even within the NZ context. But one can perhaps say that, where the *Dalmatian* element was, and is predominant, language loyalty[19] as expressed in correct (written) Standard Croatian has not been a *major* issue in the past. Conversely, those who have fervently advocated language as constituting an integral and compulsory factor for Croatian identity have also promoted the use of the 'correct' Standard language more vigorously.

***

In spite of the strong position of dialect-based NZC speech in the past, it is fair to conclude that the *standard* language will become more prominent in the future.[20] Most of the second-generation informants regard NZE as their L_1, their primary language, and the third generation has virtually merged - linguistically and

[19] As distinct from cultural loyalty or 'heritage'.

[20] Cf. general comments on the future of Slavonic languages in emigration (Stoffel 1993: 84–87).

otherwise - into the NZ Pakeha or Maori society.[21] At the same time, new arrivals, often from parts of the former Yugoslavia other than Dalmatia, from urban areas, and with a higher level of education (including English as a foreign language), have been exposed to the standard language over a longer period of time than the original immigrants and their descendants. Moreover, these new immigrants do not generally adopt the 'ready-made' NZC speech of the pioneers and their descendants. When these newcomers adopt English elements, they do so directly from NZE rather than via the speech of the older pioneers and their descendants. They would also have been exposed to 'normed' anglicisms in the standard languages of their home territories in the former Yugoslavia.[22]

In addition, increased methods of communication (airlines, fax, e-mail, etc.), audio-visual means, open borders, and - for better or worse - enhanced nationalism in the home territories represent additional stimuli for the spread of the standard Language. If Croatian, and other languages of the former Yugoslavia, are to be preserved in New Zealand well into the twenty-first century, this will probably be achieved in a form closer to the standard language(s) than has been the case in the past.

Bibliography

Ch. Bidwell (1967), "Colonial Venetian and Serbo-Croatian in the Eastern Adriatic: A Case Study of Languages in Contact", in: *General Linguistics* 7: 13-30.I.

D. Brozović; P. Ivić (1988), *Jezik, Srpskohrvatski/Hrvatskosrpski, Hrvatski ili Srpski*, Izvadak iz II izdanja Enciklopedije Jugoslavije, Zagreb.

I. Čizmić (1981), *Iz Dalmacije u Novi Zeland*, Zagreb.

[21] Naturally, those persons who study Croatian - more or less like any other foreign language - are not included in this statement.
[22] Cf. also Surdučki (1983: 105–108).

M. Clyne (1975), *Forschungsbericht Sprachkontakt*, Kronberg/Ts.

J. Gačić (1979), "Romanski elementi u splitskom Čakavskom govoru", in: *Čakavska rič* 1: 3-55.

E. Haugen (1977), "Norm and Deviation in Bilingual Communities", in: *Bilingualism. Psychological, Social and Educational Implications* (P. A. Hornby, ed.), New York: 91-102.

M. Jakich (1975), *A Personal Description of the Interference Occurring in the Serbo-Croatian/English Language Contact Situation in New Zealand*, extended essay for MA (unpublished), Victoria University, Wellington.

D. Jutronić-Tihomirović (1982), "The Effect of Dialectal Variations on the Adaption of Loanwords", in: *The Slavic Languages in Emigré Communities*, Carbondale and Edmonton: 61-71.

T. Magner (1978), "Diglossia in Split", in: *Folia Slavica* 1/3: 400-436.

S. Music (1972), *Romanizmi u severo-zapadnoj Boki Kotorskoj (Filološki fakultet Beogradskog univerziteta*, 43), Beograd .

R. Olesch, ed. (1979), *Cakavisch-deutsches Wörterbuch. Teil I*, Köln, Wien.

R. Olesch (1985), "Interferenz und Integration im Kolonialen Sorbisch", in: *Slavica Hierosolymitana* VII: 127-131.

A. Peco (1989), *Pregled srpskohrvatskih dijalekata*, Beograd.

M. Šimundić (1971), *Govor imotske krajine i Bekije*, Sarajevo.

P. Šimunović (1977), "Čakavština srednjodalmatinskih otoka", in: *Čakavska rič"* 1: 5-63.

H.-P. Stoffel (1981), "Observations on the Serbo-Croatian Language in New Zealand", in: *New Zealand Slavonic Journal* 1: 53-64.

H.-P. Stoffel (1986), "Slavische Volksgruppen in Uebersee: Ethnika für die Dalmatiner in Neuseeland", in: *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* (Bonn, Zürich), 45/2: 258-268.

H.-P. Stoffel (1988[1]), "Veränderungen morphosyntaktischer Strukturen in slavischen Auswanderersprachen", in: *Schweizerische Beiträge zum 10. Internationalen Slavistenkongress, Sofija 1988*, Bern: 339-359.

H.-P. Stoffel (1988[2]), "Slavisches in Polynesien. Zum serbokroatisch-maorisch-englischen Sprachkontakt in Neuseeland", in: *Slavic Themes: Papers From Two Hemispheres* (=*Selecta Slavica* 12), Neuried: 349-370.

H.-P. Stoffel (1991), "Common Trends in the Morphological Adaptation of Loanwords in Serbo-Croatian Migrant Dialects", in: *Languages in Contact and Contrast* (= *Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs*, 54; V. Ivir, D. Kalogjera, eds.), Berlin: 417-429.

H.-P. Stoffel, (1993), "Slav Migrant Languages in the 'New World': Cases of *Migranto-before-death*?", in: *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies* 7/1: 75–89.

H.-P. Stoffel (1994, forthcoming), "The Dalmatians and Their Language", in: *Atlas of Languages for Intercultural Communication in the Pacific and Asian Regions* (P. Mühlhäusler, D. Tyron, S. Wurm, eds.), Berlin.

R. Strohal (1923), *Hrvatski dijalekti*, Zagreb.

M. Surdučki (1983), "Standardni srpskohrvatski i iseljenički srpskohrvatski u kontaktu s engleskim. Sličnosti i razlike", in: *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* (Novi Sad) XXIV/2: 101-108.

R. Sussex (1993), "Slavonic Languages in Emigration", in: *The Slavonic Languages* (B. Comrie, G. C. Corbett, eds.), London, New York: 999-1036.

A. Trlin (1979), *Now Respected, Once Despised: Yugoslavs in New Zealand*, Palmerston North.

R. Vidović (1975), "Splitski 'Pučki List' i slika života štokavske i čakavske Dalmacije na njegovim stranicama", in: *Čakavska rič"* 1: 47–117.

U. Weinreich (1963), *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*, New York.