**Italian Speakers Learning Croatian as L2: Accents**

**Abstract**

The influence of one’s mother tongue in learning a foreign language is evident at all levels. The most enduring and prominent phenomenon in L1 transfer is the transfer of sounds, something which foreigners learning Croatian L2 usually point out. This paper focusses on deviations in the pronunciation of Croatian made by Italian-speaking students who attend the course *Croatian as L2 and FL* at Croaticum Centre of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb during their stay in Zagreb through the Erasmus Programme.

The analysis shows that the most frequent deviations from the standard pronunciation occur in two situations: (a) in polysyllabic words whose first syllable should be stressed in standard Croatian and (b) in certain verbs whose stressed syllable changes according to the word’s form. These results indicate that the subjects perceived the Zagreb accentual system as a familiar one and close to their mother tongue so that the tendency to stress the pen-ultimate syllable may prove the possibility of interference with the Italian accentual system.
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**1 Introduction**

 The influence of L1 is almost always present at all language levels. Signals of interference, however, are most prominent at the phonological level, because they are a consequence of the restructuring of another language’s phonemic inventory (Mori 2007: 9). Speakers may have difficulty producing certain characteristics of L2 when/if they do not notice them, because the same features are not functional in their mother tongue. In addition, it is possible that the same phonemic categories have different phonetic and acoustic components, so that the different types of phonetic interference that appear should also be taken into consideration in the sounds’ production and realization (Mori 2007: 9). It can be said, therefore, that features responsible for the recognition of the phonetic and phonological dimension of interlanguage determine the presence of the so-called *foreign* phonological and phonetic accent. However, there are features of interlanguage that are neither present in the mother tongue (L1) nor the L2, but which may occur at all levels, not only at the phonological one (Desnica Žerjavić 2006). M. Medved Krajnović (2010) comes to similar conclusions and, speaking of various types of errors[[1]](#footnote-1), considers interlanguage as an unpredictable category that depends upon the language acquisition context and upon student’s characteristics. Klein and Perdu (1992: 301) also think that interlanguage[[2]](#footnote-2) is not governed either by L1 or L2, but they do not describe the interlanguage pronunciation features.

After many years of experience in teaching Croatian as L2 and thanks to contacts with those who have acquired Croatian spontaneously, we have understood that the Croatian system of accents is the most problematic issue in the process of its acquisition, even for its native speakers.

 Research results (Banković-Mandić 2012) which inquired into Croatian speakers’ attitudes concerning the pronunciation of Croatian as L2 by non-native speakers have shown that Croatian speakers as non-professional evaluators evaluated rather highly the realization of the accents even in cases of incorrect pronunciation (i.e., in hypercorrect realization, which is based on the generalization that, in most Croatian words, the accent should be placed on the first syllable).

According to available information[[3]](#footnote-3), the Croatian accentual system is a marginal topic in university curricula in other countries, and it is approached theoretically without any phonetic practice. But even if students do get some theoretical knowledge, it is hardly sufficient for the acquisition and correct performance of Croatian accents. For example, mobility students from Poland who study at the Croaticum centre for Croatian as L2 are usually well acquainted with many theoretical issues concerning the Croatian accent system, yet at the same time they are unable to read the accent marks or even to identify the stressed syllable in words in which the accents are marked.

In the past few years, there have been a few Italian-speaking students among the mobility students enrolled in Croaticum’s Croatian language courses. On each occasion, during classes of phonetic exercises, some irregularities in the place of accent, which are common to almost all Italian speakers learning Croatian L2, were noticed. At the same time, this type of accent irregularity was not occurring so consistently among other foreign students whose mother tongue was not Italian.

The only systematic work that addresses the pronunciation of Italian phonemes by native Croatian speakers while suggesting necessary corrections dates back some fifty years (Orlandi 1964). More recently, Deželjin (1994), analysed how Croatian professional speakers pronounced isolated Italian words. Deželjin (2003) also studied how Croatian speakers evaluated Italian-speakers’ pronunciation of standard Italian, and Banković-Mandić (2012) examined how native Croatian speakers evaluate the pronunciation of Croatian as L2 speakers. Jelaska (2004) presented an overall review of observations made by speakers of Croatian as L2, on the Croatian accentuation system.

**2 Accentual characteristics of the Croatian standard language**

The standard Croatian language has a pitch-accent system. There are three features that determine the prosody of words in Croatian, that is, the Croatian accent system, and these are stress, length, and tone. The most-widely accepted description of the Croatian prosodic system speaks of four accents on stressed syllables and of length on non-stressed syllables, and it is the combination of these elements that makes Croatian prosody complex. Some scholars (Gvozdanović 1980, Lehiste and Ivić 1986, according to Jelaska 2004) consider that the traditional Croatian terms, that is, short falling accent (‶), short rising accent (**`**), long falling accent (**⌒**), and long rising accent (**´**), are not compatible with internationally accepted phonetic and phonological standards.[[4]](#footnote-4) According to Jelaska (2015), falling accents are defined as monosyllabic accent because tone and stress are assigned to the same syllable, whereas rising accents are seen as disyllabicaccents because stress is separated from tone and falls on one syllable while high tone goes to the syllable immediately following the stressed one. It has been proven that non-native speakers of Croatian (even if they are professional linguists) hear the accent on the post-stressed syllable in words with rising accents, whereas in words with falling accents, they are able to perceive the tone in the proper place, i.e., on the stressed syllable (Jelaska 2004).

Croatian, as many other languages (English, Italian, etc.), is a free or semi-free stress language (Škarić 2009: 117, Mandić 2007); nevertheless, in most cases the first syllable is stressed, while the second syllable is stressed in far fewer cases. As for other possibilities, only 6.7% of all words have stress on the third syllable, whereas the fourth syllable is stressed in barely 1.6% of all words.

The only stable characteristics of the acoustic realization of word accents in Croatian are place of stress and length. Tone, the least stable acoustic component, has little distinctive function (Bakran 1996: 249) and is not easily recognizable even for those Croatian speakers who are not of Štokavian origin. It is quite understandable that non-native speakers of Croatian must deal with the same type of difficulty, too, especially when asked to recognize tonal differences in short vowels. Therefore, the goal to pursue in teaching Croatian accents is to make Croatian L2 speakers able to recognize stress and length in some homographs, should length be a feature to distinguish between two words.

If a student learns Croatian L2 in a non-Štokavian area, his or her realization of accentuation will probably reveal the dialectal stress patterns of that area. In the process of teaching, there is no need to insist on standard stress, even at level B2 of the CEFRL, but it is important to inform Croatian L2 students about standard stress patterns (Banković-Mandić 2015) and help them by indicating the place of stress with a bold letter (Jelaska 2015: 53, Banković-Mandić 2015), as will be done hereafter when quoting Croatian examples.

**3 Accentual characteristics of the Italian language**

 The Italian language has lexical stress, and it is usually said that it is a free stress language, which means that any syllable can potentially be more prominent (Muljačić 1972: 103).[[5]](#footnote-5) In terms of the placement of the stressed syllable, i.e. the syllable in which greater force is used to pronounce it or which is perceived to be louder (Canepari, 1999: 148), Italian words can be divided[[6]](#footnote-6) into several groups. However, most frequently the penultimate syllable is stressed; that is, almost one half of the Italian lexical corpus is made up of paroxytones (Canepari 1999: 150). In addition, lexical stress, as a prosodic characteristic, can serve as a distinctive feature,[[7]](#footnote-7) as numerous homographic pairs have shown, because the only way to catch the right meaning of the word is by stressing the correct syllable. Within a word, the stress position can move with the addition of a suffix (since the word may undergo lexical trans-categorical changes (*utile + it****à*** *→ utilit****à,*** Scalise 1994), or a verb ending (the stress always remains on the root vowel: 3rd p. sg and pl. of present tense: ***a****ma –* ***a****mano*). A forward moving of the stress is possible when dealing with less frequent words (*c****a****duco* instead of *cad****u****co*, *persu****a****dere* instead of *persuad****e****re*) and with neologisms (*F****i****ninvest*), (Maturi 2006).

**4 Objective of the study**

Considering the accents produced by the Italian-speaking students of Croatian as well as the fact that Italian is a free-stress language in which paroxytones dominate, we hypothesized that the Italian-speaking students attending Croaticum would favour the Zagreb accent system instead of the standard one. The Zagreb variety[[8]](#footnote-8) of spoken Croatian is unique in its prosody, i.e., it has a dynamic accent without any variation in length, so that the accent may be realized as semi-long, very short, or prolonged, without any distinctive function (Kapović 2006). Besides, the Zagreb accentual system is simpler, especially when dealing with verbal forms (the place of stress of the infinitive is retained in the present, perfect and imperative).

In accordance with this evidence, related both to the mother tongue of our students and to their target language, the aim of this research was twofold. First, we wanted to find out in what cases Croatian words pronounced by the Italian-speaking students would be stressed differently from the Croatian standard. Second, the intention was to find out whether the Zagreb accentual system, notably different from the standard Croatian system, can influence the pronunciation of the Italian-speaking students learning Croatian during their Erasmus stay in Zagreb.

**5 Method of the research and subjects**

The present research is based upon audio recordings of twelve Italian-speaking students who attended Croaticum's Croatian Language Learning Programme at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Zagreb in 2012 and 2016. On each occasion, they were asked to do an oral task (See Supplements 1, 2, and 3). The recorded material, lasting 34 minutes and made in a well-known environment – their classroom – was subject to the accent analysis. In the first recorded document, eleven Italian-speaking students read a short text entitled “Mlijeko”[Milk];in the second one, three students read the Croatian version of the IPA sample text entitled “Sjeverni ledeni vjetar” [The North Wind and the Sun]; in the third document, three subjects read isolated words which correspond to the accent models practiced in class, as well as sentences produced autonomously but formed with words learnt in class.

The text of “Mlijeko” (66 items) mostly contains two-syllable words (30), followed monosyllabic words (25), three-syllable words (8), and finally, four-syllable words (3). In the text “Sjeverni ledeni vjetar”(116 items), the most numerous are monosyllable words (38), followed by three-syllable words (32 items), two-syllable words (29), four-syllable words (5), and five-syllable words (2).

The list of isolated words included 12 nouns and 12 verbs, because the aim was to test the pronunciation of three accentual types. First, there were disyllabic nouns with a long vowel in the singular Nominative case in standard Croatian pronunciation and with a stress on the mid-syllable in plural Genitive case (e.g., *v****o****jnik, vojn****i****ka*). The second type were nouns with the suffixes –*ač* and –*aš*, since words of this type are stressed on the penultimate or on the first syllable in standard Croatian pronunciation, whereas in the Zagreb variety they are pronounced with the stress on the last syllable. The third type were verbs whose stressed syllable varies, mainly in infinitive and present, and sometimes even in the imperative form (e.g., *gov****o****riti*, *g****o****vorim*, *Gov****o****ri!*).

In order to compare the prosody of our twelve Italian-speaking subject, the same texts were also read by other foreign students in the same group, whose L1 was Polish, Russian, Spanish, and Chinese, and whose competence in Croatian was roughly the same, i.e., ranging from B1 to B2 + (See Table 1).

Table 1: *Level of knowledge of Croatian language according to CEFRL*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Speaker | Language competence in Croatian L2 according to CEFRL |
| Giulia | B1 |
| Niccolo  | B1 |
| Maria | B2 |
| Caterina | B2 |
| Alessia | B2 |
| Marta | B2 |
| Paolo | B2 |
| Pierluca | B2 |
| Marco | B2 |
| Kristina | B2 |
| Marina | B2+ |
| Valentina | B2+ |

**6 Analysis of results and discussion**

In this study we will take into consideration only those irregularities[[9]](#footnote-9) that reveal a wrong place of stress, in regard to the Croatian standard place of stress, while those concerning accent quality are neglected. The Italian-speaking subjects at B2+ level did not make any mistake in the place of stress in the text “Mlijeko”, while the irregularities produced by other students, particularly those regarding the most problematic word, *osvjež****e****nje*, are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: *Irregularities in the place of stress in the text “Mlijeko”*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Speaker | Language competence in Croatian L2 according to CEFRL | Pronunciation of the word *osvje****že****nje* | Other irregularities  |
| Giulia | B1 | osvjež**e**nje | pri-pre-mlje-nompri-jeloma |
| Niccolò  | B1 | osvj**e**ženje | - |
| Maria | B2 | o-svje-že-nje | svjedno (wrong reading) |
| Caterina | B2 | osvj**e**ženje | - |
| Alessia | B2 | osvj**e**ženje | - |
| Marta | B2 | osvj**e**ženje | pripremlj**e**nom |
| Paolo | B2 | osvj**e**ženje | - |
| Marco | B2 | osvjež**e**nje | - |
| Kristina | B2 | osvj**e**ženje | - |

One student (B2), quite unexpectedly, read the word *osvjež****e****nje* as if it were divided into syllables and the other six read that word as if it were a proparoxytone, i.e., *osvj****e****ženje*. The same error was made by one subject of B1 level.

The irregularities in the place of stress in the text “Sjeverni ledeni vjetar” are represented in Table 3.

*Tablica 3: Irregularities in the place of stress in the text “Sjeverni ledeni vjetar”*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Speaker | Language Competence in Croatian L2 according to CEFRL | Place of stress *pr****e****pirali* | Place of stress *pr****i****padne* | Place of stress ***u****mjereno* | Place of stress ***Pre****pusti* | Other irregularities in the place of stress  |
| Giulia | B1 | prep**i**rali | pr**i**padne | **u**mjereno | pr**e**pusti | odl**u**če,o-djeću |
| Niccolò  | B1 | prep**i**rali | prip**a**dne | **u**mjereno | prep**u**sti,  | n**a**vuče, t**o**plini, uvjerav**a**nje |
| Marta | B2 | prep**i**rali | pr**i**padne |  umj**e**reno  |  pr**e**pusti |  n**a**vuče, (uv*j***e**renje) |
| Paolo | B2 | prep**i**rali |  prip**a**dne  | umj**e**reno |  prep**u**sti | pobj**e**da, zap**o**če, odj**e**ću, prit**i**snut, pov**i**si |

Irregularities concerning the place of stress in the text “Sjeverni ledeni vjetar” are not as uniform as they are in the text “Mlijeko”. However, all subjects read the 1st p. sg. perfect tense of the verb *pr****e****pirati se* in the same way – i.e., *pr***e***pirati se – prep****i****rali su se*. Two subjects stressed the second syllable in the 3rd p. sg. present tense of the verb *pr****i****pasti*: *pri****pa****dne*. Two subjects read the adverb ***u****mjereno* stressing the second syllable (*umj****e****reno*). Two ssubjects maintained the stress on the second syllable in the 3rd p. sg. aorist of the verb *prep****u****stiti,* while in the verb *navući,* two subjects stressed the first syllable of the same form (*n****a****vuče)*. Individual irregularities are listed in the last column of Table 3.

Table 4 shows irregularities relative to the pronunciation of isolated words practised during the students’ Phonetic Exercises course.

*Table 4: Irregularities in the place of stress when reading isolated words*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Speaker | Language competence of Croatian L2 according to CEFRL | Deviations and mistakes in the place of stress  |
| Marta | B2 | - |
| Paolo | B2 | - |
| Pierluca | B2 | šeš**i**r, pr**i**premati, gov**o**rim, G**o**vori! |

Two subjects read all of the assigned isolated words correctly. The third subject, who at the time lived and worked in Zagreb and attended, quite unregularly, lectures at Croaticum, made some mistakes. Two inaccuracies actually corresponded to the accent system of the Zagreb variety of spoken Croatian, and the other two were real errors due mainly to superficial acquisition and were an example of hyper-corrected stressing. These errors (***pri****premati,* ***Go****vori!*) are frequent in the speech of native Croatian speakers of the non-Štokavian origin who try to speak with a standard accent.

Table 5 shows all irregularities found in sentences[[10]](#footnote-10) that the subjects formed autonomously following the given instructions.

*Table 5: Irregularities in reading the autonomously formed sentences*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Speaker | Language competence of Croatian L2 according to CEFRL | The place of stress of given words | The place of stress in non-given words |
| Marta | B2 | - | - |
| Paolo | B2 | - | zabor**a**vio, z**a**datke |
| Pierluca | B2 | kap**u**t, šeš**i**r, gov**o**ri, gov**o**re (2x) | ut**a**kmici |

As can be seen, two respondents read all isolated words with standard accents, and one of them also read the rest of her text correctly. The other one incorrectly pronounced two words that had not been given as obligatory. The first one, *zabor****a****vio,* is typical of the Zagreb accentual system, while the second one, *z****a****datke,* is an example of a hyper-corrected place of stress.[[11]](#footnote-11) The pronunciation of the third respondent was deviant in the place of stress five times, and each time the place of stress was typical of the Zagreb accentual system.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Summoning up the examples in Tables 4 and 5, and in particular the pronunciation of the verbal forms *gov****o****rim, gov****o****ri, gov****o****re*, *zabor****a****vio, odl****u****če*, *pov****i****si,* it is obvious that interference caused by the Italian stress system is not very probable. Even though proparoxytones represent the most frequent stress pattern in Italian, in the pronunciation of verb forms, should an ending be added, the primary stress in regular verbs remains on the root vowel (with the exception of some forms of the aorist and imperfect tenses). In Croatian, however, the stress is not always stable on the root syllable (*gov****o****riti* vs. *g****o****vori*, 3rd p. sg. pres.). Besides, the analysis of all the observed irregularities concerning the place of stress in the production of the Italian-speaking students shows that certain types were not perceived in the prosody of L1 speakers of other languages, such as Polish, who were in the same teaching group.

**7 Conclusions**

Teaching accents in Croatian to Italian speakers can be difficult, particularly when they are supposed to pronounce multi-syllabic or certain lesser-known words and their pronunciation is observed to have peculiarities that do not appear in the enunciation of those students whose mother-tongue is other than Italian.

Apart from some sporadic examples in which erroneous pronunciation is probably due to the well-known generalization that, in standard Croatian, the first syllable is usually stressed (*pr****i****premati*, *n****av****uče, t****o****plina,* etc.), there are words that are constantly pronounced erroneously, and these phenomena need to be explained.

Our Italian-speaking subjects made mistakes in the pronunciation of disyllabic nouns and of some trisyllabic verbs because they were pronouncing them with the stress on the syllable that speakers of the Zagreb variety of Croatian would stress (*kap****u****t, šeš****i****r, gov****o****ri*, 3rd p.sg. pres. tense, *odl****u****če*). They neglected the rules of the standard Croatian pronunciation particularly when pronouncing nouns because, as some of them declared, the Zagreb accentual system, being close to their mother tongue system of pronunciation, helped them to make some useful analogies. Therefore, not only is the prevalence of the Zagreb stress pattern apparent in the examples *gov****o****ri, gov****o****re*, *zabor****a****vio* and *odl****u****če*, but forms such as *zabor****a****vio* and *odl****u****če* prove that there is no interference with the mother-tongue stress system whatsoever. In fact, their speech strengthens the thesis that the Zagreb accentual system (which is simpler than the standard Croatian stress system) and the Italian stress system have some elements in common.

This study has shown that the Italian-speaking students (but not the others, whose mother tongues are not Italian) often stress the pen-penultimate syllable, and this tendency resulted in some acceptable variances in stress position as well as in hypercorrect pronunciation (*z****a****datke*, *t****o****plina*) that must be corrected. However, even if the type of stress variance is neglected, these realizations prove the possibility of interference with the Italian accentual system, for which there are two possible explanations. First, if we assume that our subjects interpreted *o-* in *osvjež****e****nje* and *u-* in ***u****mjereno* as prefixes, it is evident that they continued to stress the root vowel because of the fact that prefixes in Italian cannot cause any alteration in stress position: thus cf. *mj****e****reno* – *umj****e****reno*\*. Therefore, a great number of variances in the pronunciation of verbs *prep****i****rali, prip****a****dne, prep****u****sti*, in which *pre-* and *pri-* were probably interpreted as prefixes, speak in favour of this premise. The realizations *osvj****e****ženje\** and *umj****e****reno\** might have also been motivated by L1 influence, as it is known that Italian speakers often stress the pen-penultimate syllable in unknown, rare, or recently formed words.

Wrongly stressed words, such as *odj****e****ću, pobj****e****da* can be also the result of the mother tongue stress system influence, in which, as has already been mentioned, paroxytones dominate.

Because this study had a restricted number of subjects, all of whom were from a relatively small and limited geographical territory, these conclusive remarks are not to be treated as definite. However, these annotations should be useful as directives to help understand what causes wrong stress position and thus wrong pronunciation, as well as other sorts of prosodic difficulties that Italian-speaking people learning Croatian cope with.
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**Supplement 1**

Text *Mlijeko*

*Netko voli piti mlijeko iz čaše, netko iz šalice. Mlijeko iz plastične boce može se piti iz bilo čega. Važnije je s čime se pije. S gorkim kakaom, ukusno je osvježenje. S toplom čokoladom nas grije. U slast će vam ići čaj i mlijeko. No, s čime ćete piti mlijeko, svejedno je. Važno je da ga pijete jer – dobit ćete puno kalcija i sačuvati svoje kosti od prijeloma.*

**Supplement 2**

Text *Sjeverni ledeni vjetar*

*Sjeverni ledeni vjetar i Sunce su se prepirali o svojoj snazi. Stoga odluče da onome od njih pripadne pobjeda koji svuče čovjeka putnika. Vjetar započe snažno puhati, a budući da je čovjek čvrsto držao odjeću, navali on još jače. Čovjek pak, još jače od studeni pritisnut, navuče na sebe još više odjeće, dok se vjetar ne umori i prepusti ga tada Suncu. Ono u početku zasija umjereno. Kad je čovjek skinuo suvišak odjeće, povisi ono još jače žegu dok se čovjek, u nemogućnosti da odoli sunčevoj toplini, ne svuče i ne pođe na kupanje u rijeku tekućicu. Priča pokazuje da je često uspješnije uvjeravanje negoli nasilje.*

**Supplement 3**

1. Zadatak (Exercise 1):

Pročitajte riječi (Read the following words): *ormar, ormara, vojnik, vojnika, mladić, mladića, šešir, šešira, tenisač, nogometaš, navijač, plivač, pripremati, pripremam, pripremiti, pripremim, otvarati, otvoriti, otvorim, govoriti, govorim, Pripremi! Govori!*

1. Zadatak (Exercise 2):

Oblikujte rečenice iz prvog zadatka tako da upotrijebite 5 imenica i 5 glagola. (Form sentences using 5 nouns and 5 verbs from Exercise 1).

**Riassunto**

Nel processo di apprendimento di L2, l'influsso di L1 è percepibile a tutti i livelli linguistici. Il transfer più evidente e durativo è quello che riguarda i suoni e perciò gli apprendenti stranieri della lingua croata sostengono che nel processo d’acquisizione della lingua croata il problema maggiore è, appunto, il sistema di accentazione. Il presente lavoro si prefigge di far vedere le irregolarità nella posizione dell'accento che si notano nella pronuncia degli italofoni che, essendo in mobilità, seguono il modulo universitario *Hrvatski kao drugi strani jezik* (ll croato L2) presso il centro Croaticum della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Zagabria. Le irregolarità più frequenti prodotte dagli italofoni si presentano nelle parole polisillabiche che in croato standard portano l'accento sulla prima sillaba e in certi verbi croati il cui accento cambia secondo la forma.

**Parole chiave**: accenti, l'italiano L1, il croato LS

1. According to Medved Krajnović (2010: 22), there are (a) interlanguage errors, caused by L1; (b) intralanguage errors, caused either by the student's ability of language processing at some point of language acquisition or by various strategies that the student uses; (c) errors caused by teaching; (d) accidental errors, caused by non-language elements such as tiredness, stress, speed communication, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Although Klein and Perdu (1992) have proved that interlanguage is a language system with its own grammatical principles and that it is independent both of L1 and of L2, it can be said that it is dependent, because at stage three, when grammatically more complex statements are produced, L1 transfer is greater. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. We are referring to data gained by Erasmus students incoming from universities in Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Macedonia and Slovenia. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Although these diacritics are not compatible with world-wide accepted signs, they are part of a long Croatian and Slavic tradition, and therefore will not be easily replaced (Jelaska 2004). IPA (2009) uses the symbol ᴗ for rising tones and the symbol ᴖ for falling tones, while length is complemented by a colon. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Muljačić informs that Devoto and Massaro (1962: 21-28) mention certain phoneme sequences that to a certain extent can limit stress freedom. That is, a word, unless it is a loanword (*pol****i****zza*) or a proper name of foreign origin (*T****a****ranto,* ***O****tranto, L****e****panto*), must have a lexical stress on the penultimate syllable if it ends with a consonantal sequence in which the second consonant is /l/ or /r/, or with a sequence of three consonantal phonemes before the final non-accented vowel in a three-syllabic or a poly-syllabic word (Muljačić 1972: 104). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. In Italian, the syllables are counted backwards. Consequently, there are oxytones, in which the stressed last syllable is indicated graphically (*citt****à****, virt****ù***); paroxytones, in which the penultimate syllable is stressed (*par****o****la, am****i****co*); proparoxytones, in which the antepenultimate syllable is stressed (*pr****e****ndilo, M****o****dena*); words in which the fourth syllable counting backwards is stressed (*andi****a****mocene, p****o****rtaglielo*); and words in which even the fifth (*f****a****bbricamelo*) or the sixth (*f****a****bbricamicelo*) syllable from the end is stressed (Canepari 1999: 153). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The most frequently quoted pairs are: ***a****ncora vs. anc****o****ra, pr****i****ncipi vs. princ****i****pi, m****a****rtiri vs. mart****i****ri,* (Canepari 1999: 149), *abit****i****no vs.* ***a****bitino* itd. (Muljačić, 1972: 104) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The term “Zagreb variety” should not be set equal to Kapović’s term “common Zagreber dialect”, even though it is quite close to it, because, Kapović’s term (2006: ) includes all speech varieties in the city of Zagreb, i.e., “a traditional Zagreb Kaikavian dialect variety (varieties), a standard language variety and the Stokavian substandard spoken by Stokavian immigrants in Zagreb” (Kapović 2006). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. In this paper, *irregularity* is a hypernym for (a) a mistake, i.e., wrong prosodic realization which is not acceptable either in standard Croatian or in any Croatian dialect, and (b) a deviation, a prosodic pattern acceptable in any substandard Croatian variant, vertical or horizontal. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The produced sentences have not been corrected.

“U ormaru ima puno stvari. Ovo je moj mladić. Nogometaš ima lijep šešir. Otvori vrata, toplo je! Ne govorim ruski jezik.” [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. “Otvaram ormar svaki dan. Mladić je zabor**a**vio z**a**datke. Stari ljudi ponekad nose šešir kad idu u kazalište. Otvori vrata!” [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. “Otvaram ormar i uzimam kap**u**t. Nogometaši gov**o**re o prošloj ut**a**kmici. Lice vojnika sve gov**o**re o ratu. Mladić pripr**e**mi! To je jako čudno, šešir gov**o**ri.” [↑](#footnote-ref-12)