



UDC 81'28(497.5Split)

Original scientific paper

Accepted for publication on 26 September 2003

## Čakavian as Spoken by Four Sportsmen from Split

*Dunja Jutrović*  
*University of Maribor*  
*University of Rijeka*

The author presents Čakavian as spoken by four prominent Croatian sportsmen (Sobin, Ivanišević, Kukoč and Vlašić), all of them either from Split or lived there for a long time, and all of them using their local Čakavian vernacular in interviews given to newspapermen. On the basis of the statistical analysis of the phonological, morphological and syntactic variables, the author establishes the degree of usage of the Čakavian. The result of the analysis shows that Čakavian features that identify our speakers as Čakavian speakers is their use of the ikavian forms, the change of  $m > n$  in verbs, dropping of initial  $h$ 's, change of  $hv > f$  and the use of past participle forms.

### I. Introduction

For a number of years now I have been engaged in the study of the changes occurring in the Čakavian dialect of the city of Split, Croatia (see references). For this occasion I have chosen to present Čakavian as spoken by four very prominent Croatian sportsmen – all of them either from Split or lived there for a long time, and all of them using their local Čakavian vernacular in interviews given to newspapermen.<sup>1</sup> The language of the interviews closely approximates the spoken language; that is, the language that people normally use in everyday conversation.

The Čakavian dialect is one of the three main dialect groups in Croatia: Štokavian, Čakavian and Kajkavian, named after the interrogative-relative words for 'what' in each

<sup>1</sup> I met Damir Kalogjera when I was a student getting ready to start my graduate studies at the Pennsylvania State University. A friendly bond was established by the very fact that two islanders were living on the continent. But it was more than the fact of Damir's lively nature that brought understanding between him and me. It is his liberal attitude and open mindedness in matters of life, politics, and linguistic views and attitudes that I, and many colleagues that I know, cherish so much in him. It is my great pleasure to be able to contribute to his Festschrift.



dialect, which are *što*, *ča* and *kaj* respectively. According to their reflexes of proto-Slavic /e/ (called jat), these dialects are traditionally subdivided into ijekavian, ekavian, and ikavian varieties. For example, the word for ‘milk’ is **mljeko/mleko/mliko**, the first word being part of the standard language and the last two of the substandard varieties, ekavian and ikavian. But this is an idealized division, since there are many areas where the mixed varieties occur. Štokavian in its ijekavian form is the official standard language in Croatia.

The present study is restricted to the speech of a middle-aged ex-basketball player, Goran Sobin, from his interview by Hrvoje Prnjak from the weekly magazine the *Feral Tribune*, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, pp. 92-93, then Toni Kukoč, an NBA player who lives mainly in the United States (from an interview by Damir Pilić in the *Feral Tribune*, July 28<sup>th</sup>, 2001), the Wimbledon winner Goran Ivanišević (in an interview by Davor Burazin in the daily newspaper *Slobodna Dalmacija*, August 1<sup>st</sup> 2001) and the junior world record holder in high jump, Blanka Vlašić, in an interview by Milorad Bibić in the *Slobodna Dalmacija*, August 16<sup>th</sup> 2001.

Prof. Damir Kalogjera, who himself has published a number of articles on the Čakavian dialects, says “even today the language is still rich in dialectal differences” (1985:93). The dialect has changed, but what we are interested in is what, and how much, is left of it today. In other words, what are its most prominent features when spoken and used today?

I will proceed as follows: In the next section I will say something about the methodology, then in section III I will present a linguistic analysis. Section IV is dedicated to a commentary on the analysis and section V to possible theoretical implications and conclusions.

## II. Methodology

I have chosen to present phonological, morphological and syntactic Čakavian variables in the speech of the above-mentioned four sportsmen. These variables are analyzed within the Labovian framework (Labov 1982, 2001), i.e., every dialectal form is noted for each speaker together with every occurrence of standard forms and then the occurrence of the nonstandard form is expressed as a frequency index, according to the following formula:

$$\text{Frequency index} = \frac{\text{\#occurrences of dialectal forms}}{\text{\#occurrences of dialectal and standard forms}} \times 100$$

The hypothesis (by now a standard one) is that if a new feature moves into the system, younger speakers should use the new feature more often than the older ones. In our concrete case under investigation there should, at least, be some (significant) differences in the Čakavian of Sobin who is the oldest and Vlašić who is the youngest. Ivanišević and Kukoč



are expected to be much closer in their use of Čakavian as they are generationally close to one another. I shall comment on this in the final section.

### III. Linguistic variables

#### A. Phonological variables

##### 1. ijekavian - ikavian *Characteristic change of /jat/ into /i/.*

For example: triba (treba 'one ought to'); lipa (lijepa 'lovely'); najlipša (najljepša 'the most lovely')<sup>2</sup>

Some examples in **Sobin**: liti ('summer time'), posli ('after'), umisto ('instead'), vrmena ('time'), miseca ('month'). **Kukoč**: na svitu ('in the world'), tribali ('ought'), viruj ('believe'), razumiš ('you understand'), čovik ('man'). **Ivanišević**: lipo ('nice'), blid ('pale'), vidit ('to see'), naprid ('forward'). **Vlašić**: sriće ('happiness'), pisme ('songs'), udrila ('I hit'), tribala ('I needed'), cili ('whole').

In percentages:

Sobin uses ikavian forms in 88% of cases, Kukoč 80%, Ivanišević 70% and Vlašić 81%.

##### 2. Change of $m > n$ <sup>3</sup>

###### a. Verbs (*1st p. present tense*) $m > n$ :

Examples: nisan (nisam 'I am not'), guštan (guštam 'I enjoy'), činin (činim 'I am doing').<sup>3</sup> In **Sobin**: san ('I am'), nisan ('I am not'), iman ('I have'), iden ('I go'). **Kukoč**: ne razumin ('I don't understand'), ne volin ('I don't like'). **Ivanišević**: ne sićan se ('I don't remember'), treniran ('I practice'). **Vlašić**: glumin ('I act'), forsiran ('I force'), uđen ('I go in'), pogledan ('I look'), jeden ('I eat'), znan ('I know').

In percentages:

Sobin 83%, Kukoč 5%, Ivanišević 3% and Vlašić 97%.

###### b. Instrumental of nouns: $m > n$ :

Examples: uljen (uljem 'with the oil'), puten (putem 'by the way'), ticon (pticom 'with a bird')

No single example of this dialectal change. Only in some syntagms where the adjective is in the Čakavian form like: moj<sup>in</sup> imenom ('with my name') (Sobin). Even adjectives are in the standard form like: atletskom ('athletic'), velikom ('big') manekenskim ('fashion') (Vlašić)

<sup>2</sup> I first give general examples of the respective forms and then examples found in the corpus.

<sup>3</sup> On the change of  $m > n$  as well as the historical explanation of this change see Hraste (1970). Also see Moguš (1977). For additional bibliography see Jutronić (1985).



### 3. Phoneme /h/ has a number of variants in Čakavian

There are very few tokens of this change in each of the four texts so the percentages here must be taken to be somewhat relative.

#### a. Initial $h > 0$

Examples: itac (hitac 'shot'), u 'rani (u hrani 'in the food'), 'oće (hoće 'he will).

**Sobin:** tit (htjet 'to want') **Kukoč:** tija (htio 'he wanted'), oće (hoće 'he will') **Ivanišević:** tija (he wanted'), tili ('they wanted') **Vlašić:** (no examples)

In percentages:

Sobin 100%, Kukoč 100%, Ivanišević 67% and Vlašić (no examples)

#### b. Medial $h > 0$

Examples: njiova/ nji'ovoga, (njihova 'theirs')

**Sobin:** uvatili ('they caught'), uvatin ('I catch') **Kukoč:** (no examples) **Ivanišević:** only standard (njihove 'theirs') **Vlašić:** (no examples)

In percentages:

Sobin 80%, Kukoč (no examples), Ivanišević 0% and Vlašić (no examples)

#### c. final $h > 0$ :

Examples: nji (iz njih 'from them'), koji (kojih 'whose'), stariji (starijih 'older').

**Sobin:** only standard (današnjih 'today's'), (ih 'them'), **Kukoč:** odma ('immediately') (only 1 example) **Ivanišević:** only standard: (malih 'small', ih 'them') **Vlašić:** only standard: (svih 'all')

In percentages:

Sobin 0%, Kukoč 14%, Ivanišević 0% and Vlašić 0%

#### d. $h > v$ :

Examples: kuvadu (kuhaju 'they cook'), kruv (kruh 'bread') uvo (uho 'ear') gluvi (gluhi (deaf)

No example of this changes in the text of any of the speakers.

#### e. $h > j$ :

Examples: povrj (povrh 'above'); smij (smijeh 'laughter'), grijota (grehota 'shame'), praja, (praha 'from dust')

**Sobin:** only standard: strah ('fear'). **Kukoč, Ivanišević and Vlašić:** No instances of this change.

In percentages:

Sobin 0%, Kukoč (no example), Ivanišević (no example) and Vlašić (no example)

#### f. $hv > f$ :

Examples: zafalija (zahvalio 'he thanked')

**Sobin:** (no example), **Kukoč** (no example), **Ivanišević:** fala ('thank you') (one example) and **Vlašić:** zafalija ('he thanked') (only 1 example)



In percentages:

Sobin (no example), Kukoč (no example), Ivanišević 100% and Vlašić 100%

#### 4. The change of lj > j

Examples: boje (bolje 'better'); ljubav (ljubav 'love'), zemja (zemlja 'earth').

There are no instances of this change in the text of the four speakers. We only find the standard forms of which some of the examples are given below:

**Sobin:** bolji ('better'), prijatelju ('friend'), najgluplji ('the most stupid'), ljudi ('people'),  
**Kukoč:** najbolji ('the best'), volja ('will'), dalje ('further'), zemlju ('earth'), uvjerljivo ('convincingly').  
**Ivanišević:** zemlju ('earth'), ljudi ('people'), nediljom ('Sundays'), zaključiti ('to conclude') and  
**Vlašić:** medaljom ('with a medal'), pojavljujen ('I appear')

In percentages

Sobin 0%, Kukoč 0%, Ivanišević 0% and Vlašić 0%

#### 5. Change of đ > j

Examples: rojen (rođen 'born'), gospoja (gospođa 'lady') mlaje (mlađe 'younger').

There was no instance of this change in the texts of the four speakers.

**Table 1: Percentage of the phonological features**

Changes	Sobin	Kukoč	Ivanišević	Vlašić
(i)je > i	88	80	70	81
m > n				
verbs	83	5	3	97
nouns	0	0	0	0
Change of h				
initial h > 0	100	100	67	–
medial h > 0	80	–	0	–
final h > 0	0	14	0	0
h > v	–	–	–	–
h > j	–	–	–	0
hv > f	100	100	–	–
lj > j	0	0	0	0
đ > j	–	–	–	–

#### B. Morphological variables

The four dialectal morphological variables are the following:<sup>4</sup> The two verbal inflectional variables: (1) Past participle masculine gender and (2) Present tense, 3rd person

<sup>4</sup> The most complete bibliographies on research of Čakavian areas and features are Wagner (1973) and Šimunović (1976).



plural, and two nominal inflectional variables: (3) Genitive plural of nouns and (4) Dative/Locative/Instrumental plural of nouns.

### 1. The masculine form of the past participle

There are two variants of the masculine past participle. Verbs that have the vowel *-i* at the end of the stem before the infinitive ending *-ti* add the participle ending *-(j)a* or a zero ending to the stem. For example, the masc. p.p. of the verb **raditi** ‘to work’ is **radi/radi(j)a** in contrast to the standard realization **radio**. Verbs that do not have stem-final *-i* before the infinitive ending undergo change in the masculine form of the p.p. so that forms like **postao** ‘arose’ are realized as *posta* in Split Čakavian. For example: **gleda je** ‘he watched’ is the local variant of standard **gledao je**.

Examples from the corpus:

**Sobin**: *reka* (‘he said’), *ima* (‘he had’), *potpisa* (‘he signed’), *iša* (‘he went’), *naučija* (he learned’), *bija* (‘he was’). **Kukoč**: *igra* (‘he played’), *pita* (‘he asked’), *posla* (‘he sent’), *pustija* (‘he released’), *napravija* (‘he made’). **Ivanišević**: *šeta* (‘he took a walk’), *trča* (‘he ran’), *boja se* (‘he feared’), *minja* (‘he changed’), *sakrija* (‘he hid’), *unija je* (‘he brought in’). **Vlašić**: *puka* (‘he broke’), *iša* (‘he went’), *osvojiija* (‘he won’), *priskočija* (‘he helped’)

In percentages:

Sobin 100%, Kukoč 100 %, Ivanišević 70% and Vlašić 100%

### 2. Present tense, 3rd person plural

The 3rd person present plural form is realized by two endings *-du* or *-u*, while the standard language has, according to the different classes of verbs, three endings: *-u*, *-ju*, and *-e*. Thus we have Čakavian realizations like **pušu/pušidu** ‘they smoke’ for Cr. **puše**, **crtadu** ‘they draw’ for Cr. **crtaju**, and **plešedu** for Cr. **plešu** ‘they dance’. Although the frequency index is given together for both *-u/-du* endings it is important to mention that the long *-du* ending is used less frequently than the short *-u*.

Examples (very few instances) from the corpus have only standard forms for all the speakers:

**Sobin**: *nemaju* (‘they don’t have’), *moraju* (‘they have to’) **Kukoč**: *imaju* (‘they have’), *pestaju* (‘they fist fight’) **Ivanišević**: *govore* (‘they speak’). **Vlašić**: *govore* (‘they speak’)

In percentages:

Sobin 0%, Kukoč 0 %, Ivanišević 0% and Vlašić 0%.

### 3. Genitive plural nouns

The most common genitive plural ending for masculine nouns in the Split vernacular is *-i*, in contrast with Cr. *-a*. For example: **profešuri** for Cr. **profesora** ‘of the professors’. Some nouns have no ending in the genitive plural, which is otherwise characteristic of Čakavian feminine and neuter nouns such as: **puno pinez** for **puno pineza** ‘a lot of money’.



In Čakavian the genitive plural of feminine and neuter nouns have a zero ending on the root, while the standard language has an **-a** suffix. Thus **kuć** is the gen. pl. of **kuća** ‘house’; **sel** is the gen. pl. of **selo** ‘village’. In some words the Čakavian masculine ending appears: **medaji** for Cr. **medalja** ‘of medals’ or **diplomi** for Cr. **diploma** ‘of diplomas’, **desetak jaji** for Cr. **desetak jaja** ‘ten eggs’)

Examples from the corpus are a mixed lot:

**Sobin**: only standard forms like: pet godina (‘five years’), četiri miseca (‘four months’), milijun dolara (‘million dollars’) **Kukoč**: Only one instance of Čakavian ending; puti (‘many times’)

**Ivanišević**: uri (‘hours’) (only 1 example), **Vlašić**: novinara (newspaper men’) (standard form)

In percentages:

Sobin 0%, Kukoč 25 %, Ivanišević 100% and Vlašić 0%

#### 4. Dative/Locative/Instrumental plural

In standard Croatian characteristic endings for all three of these cases are the following: **-ama** for feminine nouns ending in **-a**, and **-ima** for masculine and neuter nouns, as well as and femine consonant-final nouns. The dialectal forms either have an additional **n**, as in **seliman**, **ženaman**, **radniciman** ‘villages’, ‘women’, ‘workers’, or there is a loss of **-a** and subsequently the **-m** becomes **-n** due to the Čakavian phonological rule that word-final **-m** in the inflectional endings changes to **n**’s. Thus **ženama**>**ženam**>**ženan**.

Examples from our corpus are all in the standard forms:

**Sobin**: ribama (fishes’), guštima (pleasures’), tijelima (‘bodies’), doktorima (‘doctors’), centrima (‘centers’). **Kukoč**: svima (‘all’), ljudima (‘people’), pasima (‘dogs’), novinama (newspapers’). **Ivanišević**: svima (‘all’), vama (‘to you’), pizdarijama (‘nonsense’). **Vlašić**: traženjima (‘searches’), revijama (‘magazines’), s njima (‘with them’)

In percentages:

Sobin 0%, Kukoč 0 %, Ivanišević 0% and Vlašić 0%

**Table 2: Percentage of the morphological features**

Changes	Sobin	Kukoč	Ivanišević	Vlašić
Past participle	100	100	70	100
Present, 3rd p. pl.	0	0	0	0
Nouns, gen. pl.	0	25	100	0
D/L/I plural	0	0	0	0

#### C. Syntactic variables

Three syntactic variables are chosen.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Syntactic descriptions on which I rely are those of Finka (1971) and Šimunović (1977).





1. The mixing of locative and accusative as in the example: Bija sam u Split ( instead of Bio sam u Splitu 'I was in Split')
2. The interrogative-relative pronoun *ča* as in: A *ča* je sad ovo? ( instead of A što je sad ovo? 'What is this now?')
3. Construction *o'*+genitive instead of *od*+genitive like *prsten o' zlata* (the real standard should be the adjectival attribute as in *zlatni prsten*). All we are looking at in this case is the use of the shortened form *o'* instead of *od* ('of' 'from')

*What do we find in our corpus?*

1. There are no instances of the mixing of locative and accusative in Sobin, Ivanišević and Vlašić and the only example that we find in Kukoč is the standard use: U Philadelphiji (In Philadelphia).

In percentages: Sobin (no example), Kukoč 0%, Ivanišević (no example) and Vlašić (no example).

2. The use of interrogative-relative pronoun. All of the uses are standard forms. Sobin: *šta* (3x), Kukoč: *šta* (3x), Ivanišević: *što, šta* (8x), Vlašić: *šta* (1x).

In percentages: Sobin ( 0%), Kukoč 0%, Ivanišević 0% and Vlašić 0%.

3. Construction *od* ('o')+genitive Sobin: *od pet kila* ('of five kilos'), Kukoč: *od svih igrača* (of all the players'), *od broda* ('of the ship'), Ivanišević: *od malih nogu* ('from early age') Vlašić ((no example)

In percentages: Sobin ( 0%), Kukoč 0%, Ivanišević 0% and Vlašić (no example).

**Table 3: Percentage of the syntactic features**

Changes	Sobin	Kukoč	Ivanišević	Vlašić
mixing of L/A	–	0	–	–
<i>o'</i> + Gen.	0	0	0	–
pron. <i>ča</i>	0	0	0	0

The following table presents the percentages of all the variables under discussion:







**Table 4: Percentages for all Čakavian variables**

Changes	Sobin	Kukoč	Ivanišević	Vlašić
(i)je > i	88	80	70	8
m > n				
verbs	83	5	3	97
nouns	0	0	0	0
Change of h				
initial h > 0	100	100	67	–
medial h > 0	80	–	0	–
final h > 0	0	14	0	0
h > v	–	–	–	–
h > j	–	–	–	0
hv > f	100	100	–	–
lj > j	0	0	0	0
đ > j	–	–	–	–
Past participle	100	100	70	100
Present, 3rd p. pl.	0	0	0	0
Nouns, gen. pl.	0	25	100	0
D/L/I plural	0	0	0	0
Mixing of L/A	–	0	–	–
O' + Gen.	0	0	0	–
Pron. ča	0	0	0	0

#### IV. Comments on the analysis

On the basis of the statistical analysis of the chosen variables, here are some relevant comments. I follow the order of presentation of the variables as in the previous section.

**Ikavian forms** are prominent in all of the speakers. For comparison's sake, in Miljenko Smoje's writings we find a level of about 85% (see Jutronić 1997).

**The change of m > n** in the present tense is a prevalent characteristic of the Čakavian dialect. This is consistent with Smoje's writings, where we find it in 98% of the cases. The youngest among them, Blanka Vlašić, uses it the most (97%), followed by the oldest, Sobin (83%). The minimal use of it by Kukoč (5%) and Ivanišević (3%) is very surprising. The instrumental of nouns is down to 0%. In general, its use is less prevalent than in the verbs, but the complete absence of it is also unanticipated, since we do not find it in other investigations (see the references). Since both of these features have been shown to be characteristic for contemporary Čakavian even in its written form (Sonja Senjanović up to 75%, Đermano Senjanović 40%, see Jutronić in print, and Smoje 78%), one can posit two



possible explanations: 1. The interviewers were not consistent in transcribing this feature in print although it was used in the spoken language or 2. the speakers did not use it. One of these hypotheses might be confirmed if one could listen to the taped interviews, which, on this occasion, I was not able to do.

As mentioned before, the loss of and **change in the phoneme /h/** are hardly significant here, since there are so few instances of this. Nevertheless, the phoneme /h/ is mostly dropped in the initial position. This process is also common to the conversational style of the standard language where /h/ is dropped at the beginnings of words like *ajduk* instead of *hajduk* ('highwayman') and also at the ends of words (See Brozović 1976). There is also a consistent change of hv > f, like *fala* instead of *hvala* (see the data for Vlašić and Ivanišević).<sup>6</sup>

**Change of lj > j** is not found in the texts of the four speakers. This is to be expected, since this is one Čakavian feature that is definitely disappearing from the dialect, while in the conversational spoken Čakavian it has almost entirely ceased to be used. (Jutronić 1985). This is one of the phonological characteristics of the Čakavian dialect that is definitely dying out and might disappear completely.

#### **Change of đ > j**

This is the feature that is dying out the most. As early as 1976 Finka wrote: "the acceptance of đ is more frequent not only in the loanwords but also in the words with the original čakavian j... This tendency penetrates independently of the fact to which speaking group or to which dialectal Čakavian type the concrete speech system belongs" (1976 : 147). This feature is felt to be old-fashioned, especially for the contemporary reader. We do not find it in these short interviews, since in general there are not very many words with the phoneme *đ*.

#### **What can we say about morphological changes?**

It is obvious at first glance that the past participle is the most resistant to change in the direction of standard forms, while the greatest loss of usage of dialectal morphological features is found in the D/L/I plural of nouns, and, surprisingly, there is no use of the dialectal forms for present tense third person plural. There are very few instances of 3rd p. present tense in our corpus so it would be unwise to draw any general conclusion. This is particularly so because the lack of dialectal forms is in direct contradiction with some other investigations that I have done, in which this feature appears up to 30% of the time, even in the youngest generation (see Jutronić 2001). One conclusion that can safely be drawn is that the change in the present tense is more frequent than that in the past participle.

**As far as syntactic features are concerned** the interrogative relative pronoun *ča* as a symbol of Čakavian has been completely lost. This finding is consistent with most con-

<sup>6</sup> Brozović says: 'The second important feature is the non-obligatoriness and rarity of the sound h which has been replaced by zero or v, and more rarely by j' (1976: 60-61).





temporary urban speech. The other features, when they appear, such as mixing of locative and accusative, are not found in the speech of these four speakers. We cannot draw any conclusions from such a small sample of Čakavian syntactic features, but in comparison to phonological variables and to some extent morphological, we cannot speak of any syntactic peculiarities still evident in the speech of these sportsmen. This is in no way surprising, since the differences in syntax between the standard language and Čakavian are far less important than those in phonology and morphology. Thus Finka says: “We cannot practically give a detailed description of the syntax of the Čakavian dialect since the dialectologist hardly touched upon this question. This is understandable since the syntax of the Čakavian is in principle in harmony with the state that we find in Croatian in general and moreover in its general characteristics goes along with the syntax of other Slavic languages” (1971 : 42).

## V. Possible theoretical considerations

*What conclusions can be drawn from the analysis presented and what suggestions can be given?*

1. Many linguists have indicated that the dominant trend in the Split dialect is a general shift towards the ikavian of Štokavian spoken in the Dalmatian hinterland, and that this speech is prevalent today in the spoken language of the city. So, for example, at the end of his article Magner makes a prediction about the future of the Split dialect in the coming decade: “In 1986 the Split dialect will be, if my prediction is accurate, a form of speech distinguished from Textbook Croatian by its ikavian forms, a small core of distinctive words, and a few morphological peculiarities” (1978 : 433).

2. Such predictions are generally true, on the whole, but on the basis of statistical analysis we can surely say more. The most interesting finding here, as in the other investigations done so far, is that not all of the Čakavian variables show an equal rate of change. Phonological variables (like some changes of h (hv > f, h > 0 initially, ikavian forms, and change of m > n in verbs are most stable and resistant to change. Morphological features show the least change in the past participle of the verbs, and none of the possible syntactic features are existent in the speech of these four sportsmen.

### **Why should this be?**

In other places I have offered two possible explanations involving stigmatization and the principle of saliency. Stigmatization concerns the making of ‘mistakes’ (see M. Ivić 1965). Unpleasant mistakes in relation to the norm are lost first. The principle of saliency is similar. Dialect levelling involves the eradication of socially or locally marked variants



in conditions of social or geographical mobility and resultant dialect contact. In other words, the more salient (socially marked) features are stronger candidates for change (see Jutronić in print).

In our present corpus we have a small sample of speech, and thus we should be restrained in drawing major conclusions. Still, looking at the statistical analysis, something can be said. There is a negative conclusion to the presupposed hypothesis that there should be some (significant) differences at least between the speech of Sobin, who is the oldest and Vlašić who is the youngest. There is no major difference between these. On the other hand, in the cases of the use of the ikavian forms and the change of  $m > n$ , we would not even expect a great difference since these are the features that have most often been retained in the Čakavian dialect. In other instances we do not have enough basis for any definite conclusions, since in a number of cases there is no instance of the variables. In the case of the past participle, there is no surprise that this is used 100% in the dialectal form, since again this is the least salient morphological feature. On the other hand, the dialectal use of D/L/I has not been preserved at all since it is felt to be socially marked.

#### What is then the order of change?

The most salient to least salient features are as follows:

**1. All of the syntactic variable (0%); 2. morphological (Gen, D/L/I, present tense (0%)). 2. phonological (lj > j, đ > j (0%); most of changes of h (0%); nouns  $m > n$  0%. 3. change of  $m > n$  in verbs (82 to 97%) 4. ikavian forms (70 to 88%). 5.  $h > 0$  initially and  $hv > f$  (100%) 6. past. participle (100%).**

Thus 3 to 6 are the prominent (least salient) Čakavian features that identify our speakers as Čakavian speakers. Their use of the ikavian forms, the change of  $m > n$  in verbs, dropping of initial h's change of  $hv > f$  and the use of past participle forms.<sup>7</sup>

## REFERENCES

- Brozović, Dalibor (1976). "O suvremenoj zadarskoj miksoglotiji i o njenim društveno-povijesnim i lingvističkim pretpostavkama". *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru* 14-15. 59-63.
- Finka, Božidar (1971). "Čakavsko narječje" in *Čakavska rič* V. 1-72.
- 1979. "O novim tendencijama i pojavama u čakavskom narječju". *Filologija* 9. 145-148.
- Hraste, Mate (1948). *Osobine govora otoka Šolte, Čiova, Drvenika i susjedne obale*. Rad JAZU 272.123-57.
- (1970). "O prijelazu glasa -m u -n (-n > -m)" *Filologija* 6. 69 - 75.
- (1980). *Čakavski dijalekt*. Enciklopedija Jugoslavije, knjiga 4, Zagreb 1980.

<sup>7</sup> I thank my colleagues from Maribor, dr. Victor Kennedy and dr. Michelle Gadpaille for proofreading this article.



- Ivić, Milka (1965). Jezična individualnost grada. Izraz 819.740-747.
- Jutronić, Dunja (1985). "Aspekti socijalne ili urbane dijalektologije". Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru 24. 29-38.
- (1989). "Language change in an urban setting". Yugoslav general linguistics and literary studies in Eastern Europe, ur. M. Radovanovic. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
  - (1992). "Standard Language and Dialects in Contact". Language Planning in Yugoslavia. eds. Bugarski i Hawkesworth. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers. 201-211.
  - (1996). "Jezična analiza komunikacijskog učinka pjesama Olivera Dragojevića". Jezik i komunikacija eds. Marin Andrijašević i Lovorka Zergollern-Miletić. 1996 : 282-288.
  - (1997). "Analiza čakavskog diskusa u napisima Miljenka Smoje". eds. Andrijašević i Zergollern-Miletić. 1997: 295-301.
  - (2000). "A Possible Sociolinguistic Universal" History and Perspectives of Language Study, eds. Tomić, O. & M. Radovanović. 257-269. Amsterdam : John Benjamins.
  - (2001). Morphological changes in the urban vernacular of the city of Split" International Journal of the Sociology of Language (IJSL) 2001 : 65-78.
  - (2002 in print). "Čakavski dijalekt kroz dvije generacije - prilog teoriji jezične promjene". Čakavska rič 1-2.
- Kalogjera, Damir (1985). "Attitudes toward Serbo-Croatian language varieties". IJSL 52.93-111.
- Labov, William (1982). Building on empirical foundations. Perspectives on historical linguistics, eds. Winfred P. Lehmann & Yakov Malkiel, 17-93. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- (2001). Principles of Linguistic Change, Social Factors. Basil Blackwell.
- Magner, Thomas F. (1978). Diglossia in Split. Sociolinguistic problems in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Yugoslavia, eds. Thomas F. Magner & W. Schmalsteig, 400-437. Columbus: Slavica Publishers.
- Milroy, Lesley (1980). Language and social networks. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Milroy, Lesley (2002). "Mobility, contact and language change - working with contemporary speech communities". Journal of Sociolinguistics 6/1. 2002 : 3-15.
- Moguš, Milan (1977). Čakavsko narječje. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Radovanović, Milorad. ed. (1989). Yugoslav General Linguistics. Amstedram/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Šimunović, Petar (1976). "Građa za čakavsku bibliografiju". Čakavska rič 1.67-99.
- Trudgill, Peter (1986). Dialects in contact. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Tomelić, Marijana (2000). "Splitska čakavština u tekstovima Ante Kovačića". Čakavska rič 1-2: 71-131.
- Vidović, Radovan (1978). Čakavske studije. Split: Čakavski sabor
- Vidović, Radovan (1993). Jadranske leksičke studije. Split: Književni krug.
- Wagner, Zdeslav (1973). "Čakavština u zadnjih petnaest godina". Čakavska rič 1.39-71.





## ČAKAVŠTINA U GOVORU ČETVERO SPLITSKIH SPORTAŠA

U ovom radu analizira se čakavski govor četvero hrvatskih sportaša (Sobin, Ivanišević, Kukoć i Vlašić). Svi ti govornici su Splićani ili su u Splitu dugo živjeli i svi govore lokalnim čakavskim narječjem u intervjuima za novine. Na temelju statističke analize fonoloških, morfoloških i sintaktičkih varijabli, autorica kod svakog ispitanika utvrđuje stupanj upotrebe čakavštine. Analiza pokazuje da su čakavska obilježja koja govornike identificiraju kao čakavce sljedeća: uporaba ikavskih oblika; m>n u glagolima; elizija početnoga /h/; hv>f te karakteristični oblici participa.