

Remark on New Research in Everyday Czech¹

Concetta Maglione

In the Czech language there exists, aside from the ‘literary’ (standard) language, a spoken form, which is generally regarded as a special and independent code. It has been known as Common Czech (hereafter CC) since Havránek (1934). The differences between CC and the Czech Literary Language (hereafter LC) are quite substantial. They concern not only the lexicon, phraseology and syntax, but also phonemics and morphology.

CC is the code used in everyday speech by a substantial majority of the population, independently of the social standing of the speaker. Its functions and geographical range are broader than those of any dialect or interdialect², and it spreads also thanks to its prestige. Being spoken in Bohemia and parts of Moravia³, CC is also the spoken language in Prague, the political capital and cultural center of the Czech Republic.

LC is (a) the written form of the Czech language, (b) taught at schools and (c) spoken in formal situations, but relatively rarely in informal conversations (at least in Bohemia). In such conversations, speakers often employ a switching between the two codes, which then constitutes a unique conversational style. Occasionally a speaker uses the literary norm in an effort to assert his or her social position. As a matter of fact, it is frequently an intellectual who employs this code switching. To many speakers it seems unnatural and artificial to employ LC in an informal situation, so that even educated persons, who have a good command of both codes, use non-literary elements. They do not want to pride themselves on their knowledge of the high-style speech.

In the past, Czech linguists assumed the existence of a third code, Colloquial Czech (*hovorová čeština*), which was understood to be the colloquial form of LC. However, in the United States, Kučera (1955) pointed out that conversations among intellectuals typically exhibit an oscillation (code-switching) between LC and CC, rather than a specific sub-code of LC. Among linguists in the Czech Republic, a discussion on these issues was started by Sgall (1960) and continued in the journal *Slovo a Slovesnost* in the years 1962-1963. More recently, see especially Stich’s characterizations of the lacunas in LC morphemics (there being no stylistically neutral LC forms e.g. for Instr. Plur., for the 1st Pers. Plur. in the conditional or for Nom./Acc. Plur. Neut., see Kraus et al. 1981); see also contributions such as Čermák and Sgall (1997) and the monograph by Sgall et al. (1992), which presents a synthesis of the results of the research. The issues concerning the relationships between LC and CC are crucial and deserve further attention, since the debates on the status of CC are still going on in Czech linguistics, and it is often still denied that the position of CC is basically different from that of Moravian dialects or interdialects. Most of the research on CC usage was carried out more than twenty years ago, and the polemics concerning the forms used in everyday speech, in informal public discussions and possibilities of further CC forms penetrating into (and being accepted in) standard usage continue on. The situation thus requires a fresh examination and interpretation of the recent state of everyday usage. Therefore this paper aims at an (at least partial) investigation of the usage and on its comparison with previous results.

Although the official codification of the norm of LC, and hence also the requirements in schools are conservative and traditional, many previously CC forms have been accepted into the codification of LC in several steps since the 1950s (notably those involving transitions between verb classes and between

¹ I am grateful to Charles Townsend, Petr Sgall and František Čermák, who carefully read my article, offered me many valuable suggestions and supported me in working with the material.

² The Hanák dialects are spoken in central, southern and western Moravia; the Lach dialects in north-eastern Moravia and in eastern Silesia; Moravian Slovak dialects in south-eastern Moravia.

³ Mainly in Western Moravia.

Feminine noun declension paradigms). Discussions among Czech linguists at home and abroad (see esp. the detailed analysis in Townsend 1990) continue. One of the crucial points is Sgall's claim that an important factor here has been not only the limited usage of LC in everyday speech, but the very prominence of CC. CC forms frequently turn up, for example, in television, radio interviews and in other semi-formal (public, although unofficial) kinds of communication. It is still an issue discussed whether a layer of CC can be understood to belong to a zone of a more or less neutral colloquial register, rather than being regarded as fully non-standard. Opinions differ as to whether the opposition "standard vs. non-standard" is to be considered clear-cut and decisive, or would it be better to see an intermediate zone of transition as significant for the functional stratification of Czech. Another round of issues often disputed concerns views on the acceptance of this or that group of CC phenomena into LC at a subsequent occasion, as has happened during the preceding decades step by step with many elements, such as *dal mně to* 'he gave it to me', *zavři ho (okno)* 'shut it (the window)', *mocht* 'to be able', *děkuju* 'I thank you', etc.

For all these reasons it is important to continue analyses of conversations among intellectuals in Bohemia, to which Hammer (1986) contributed substantially (now see also Šonková 1995).

The present paper is based on data collected in the Czech Republic between October 1999 and June 2000. In a single short paper, it is impossible to examine more than a set of the most frequent (and frequently discussed) phenomena from Czech phonemics and morphology in which CC differs from the codified norm of LC. Although a large part of the data has been collected from television recordings and from a session of the Civic Forum, so that everyday speech is not directly or completely represented there, the results may point to some of the main differences between LC and CC. Our recordings are composed of three groups of dialogues (it may be noted that this term, containing the prefix *dia-*, rather than *di-*, covers discourses of more than two participants). The participants were:

1. Seven native Czech speakers, indicated with the letters from A to G, among whom there were five men (A, B, C, E, F) and two women (D, G), have the following in common: (a) they were born in Bohemia and now live in Prague; this applies also to those listed under 2. and 3. below; (b) they are between the ages of 23 and 68; (c) they have college-level certificate (A, C, D) or a university degree; (d) they are currently employed in and/or interested in cultural domains such as photography (A), translating fiction (B), performing music (G), studying pedagogy (D). They all agreed to be recorded by me on a minidisk, but only later were they informed that I was searching CC forms. Before recording they knew only that some linguistic investigation was involved. Speaker C was recorded by his interlocutor himself and was informed about it only after the recording; a more detailed characterization of the individual speakers can be found in fn. 7.
2. Seven speakers recorded from television dialogues: *Bar Nic ve zlým* (Prima television, Prague, moderator Michal Prokop: 10/31/99 guests Jiří Suchý⁴ and Jiří Černý⁵; 11/14/99 guest Monika Pajerová and Martin Mejstřík⁶; 11/21/99 guests Václav Havel and Josef Škvorecký) and *Věšák* (ČT1 television, Prague, 05/03/2000, main guest Jiří Suchý);
3. thirteen speakers taking part in the activities of the *Civic Forum*, the Czech free assembly that emerged in November 1989 and started negotiating the new political arrangements⁷. At its sessions December 5 and December 9, recorded in our materials, Václav Havel was the main speaker, and his speech is thus the main object of our study, while the speech of the other participants is analyzed only with respect to the overall frequency data of this conversation.

⁴ Jiří Suchý: born 1931, a well known poet and singer, the founder of a very popular small theater.

⁵ Jiří Černý: born 1936, a music writer.

⁶ Monika Pajerová and Martin Mejstřík are well known as student activists from the events of November 1989.

⁷ The speakers were recorded during the meetings, then the recordings were transcribed and assembled by Jiří Suk in his book: *OBCANSKÉ FÓRUM*, November–December, Prague 1989, Vol. 2. Documents. I thank Mr. Suk and Mr. Josef Zvoníček for permitting me to use the original records.

The data as a whole comprise 114 pages (i.e. about 57 000 words): 59 pages (26 000 words) of private conversations; 38 pages (19 000 words) of television recordings; and 17 pages (12 000 words) of the Civic Forum discussions. They thus include discussions concerning different topics and domains (private, cultural, political) in various communicative situations (from private conversations to sessions of the Civic Forum).

As is often the case with similar investigations, we are only able to compare the relative frequencies of the individual forms among themselves, so that neither their absolute frequencies in our sample, nor the (perhaps gradually increasing) ratio of the use of CC forms in public conversations on television could be captured here.

First of all, phonological features of speech used in the dialogues were examined. (Due to the development of Czech phonology since the 14th century, some of these features should be classed nowadays more exactly as morphemic or morphophonemic.)

The most clearly evident phonological divergences from the norm of LC by the variety of everyday speech known as Common Czech (CC) are in the vowels; see Fig. 1, where *-é*, *-ý* and *-ej* indicate the word-final position, *-éx*, *-ýx*, or *-ejx* indicate the position before a consonant in the ending (e.g. *dobrém*, *malých*), and *-ý-* (*-ej-*) denotes a position in the middle of a lexical morpheme. The letter *ý* is used for the vowel *í* in forms such as *plnýho*, *malýho*, *dobrýmu*, as is usual when CC forms occur in Czech fiction, in letters, etc.; note that written forms such as **plního* would misleadingly suggest a palatal pronunciation of the preceding consonant. (Thus, the Czech phoneme *í* is spelled *ý* in endings and *í* in word stems.) Note that $x > y$ is to be read as 'LC x vs. CC y '.

LC		CC
-é	>	-í(ý)
-éx	>	-í(ý)x
-é-	>	-í(ý)-
-ý	>	-ej
-ýx	>	-ejx
-ý-	>	-ej-
ú-	>	ou-
o-	>	vo-

Fig. 1.

The shortening of long vowels, typical in rapid speech and common in CC (especially in its East-Bohemian variety), has not been included in the present study.

Consonantal differences between the two systems mostly concern:

(a) consonant cluster simplification in CC, e.g. *kerej* instead of LC *který* 'which', *dyž* instead of *když* 'when', *ždycky/vdycky/dycky* instead of *vždycky* 'always', *spomenout si* instead of *vzpomenout si* 'to recall', *zvlášní* instead of *zvláště* 'special', *vemu* instead of *vezmu* 'I will take', *jesli/jesi/esli* instead of *jestli* 'whether', *méno* instead of *jméno* 'name' (also after a vowel), *pudu* instead of *půjdu* 'I will go', *pučit* instead of *půjčit* 'to lend';

(b) other simplifications, e.g. *štyři/štyry* instead of LC *čtyři* 'four', *porád* instead of *pořád* 'always', contraction of whole syllables (e.g., *páč* instead of *poněvadž* 'since', *prže* instead of *protože* 'because', *ňáký* instead of *nějaký* 'some') or other variants of consonants in clusters, such as *lepčí* instead of *lepší* 'better',

menčí instead of *menší* 'smaller', *špekulovat* instead of *spekulovat* 'to speculate', *šstudent* instead of *student* 'student', *študovat* instead of *studovat* 'to study'.

Family conversations were analyzed in four recordings of seven speakers (below marked with letters from A to G); see the data in Fig. 2. The types of phenomena studied are denoted here by the signs from Fig. 1 connected either with * or with \$ for typical CC or LC forms respectively, and each of the types is illustrated by an example; type *-ě-* (in stems, e.g. *péct* 'to bake') is not considered here because its occurrence is too low.

CONVERSATION S:	1	2	3	4
*-é dobrý pivo	96%/95	99%/213	94%/93	89%/44
\$-é dobré pivo	3%/3	0%/2	5%/4	10%/5
*-éx ve zlým	96%/21	93%/28	100%/3	92%/13
\$-éx ve zlém	3%/1	6%/2	0/0	7%/1
*-ý dobrej kluk	53%/41	78%/81	42%/29	52%/13
\$-ý dobrý kluk	46%/35	21%/21	57%/34	48%/12
*-ýx dobrejch	73%/18	42%/3	0/0	11%/1
\$-ýx dobrých	26%/8	57%/4	100%/2	88%/8
*-ý- bejt	20%/16	46%/32	36%/4	25%/1
\$-ý- být	80%/4	53%/37	63%/7	75%/3
\$ú- úřad	100%/14	100%/50	100%/8	100%/9

Fig. 2.

For the phenomena *-é* and *-éx* it should be noted that the CC forms overwhelmingly prevail (occurrence between 89% and 99%) in all recordings.

The situation is different for *-ý*, *-ýx* and *-ý-*. Apart from dialogue # 3 (where *-ej* in nominative and accusative endings occurs only in 42% of all cases tested), CC forms as alternating (in the code-switching) were employed more frequently, even though moderately (their frequency varies between 52% and 78%). The LC form of the type *-ýx* prevails in dialogues # 2 (moderately, 57%), # 3, # 4, while the CC form prevails only in # 1 (73%). For the type *-ý-*, the LC form prevails particularly in # 1 (80%) and # 4 (75%), while the frequency of its occurrence is lower in # 2 (53%) and # 4 (63%).

To sum up, for the types *-é* and *-éx* the situations are very similar in all four recordings: the CC forms prevail. For *-ý*, *-ýx* and *-ý-*, namely the occurrence of *ý* (*ej*) both in endings and in stems, the situation is different: the switching is broader and unpredictable. Even in dialogue # 2, which took place in a very familiar context (after work, at home, with a single partner, no microphone was visible) and in which the speaker C at the time did not know about the recording, surprisingly the LC forms prevail over those with *ej*, although in other points he relatively often used CC forms.

The strong impact of individual attitudes can also be observed in the following Fig. 3, in which we list the differences among various speakers.

Speakers ⁸ :	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
*-é dobrý pivo	93%	100%	100%	98%	77%	100%	89%
\$-é dobré pivo	6%	0	0	1%	22%	0	10%
*-éx ve zlým	92%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	92%
\$-éx ve zlém	7%	0	0	7%	0	0	7%
*-ý dobrej kluk	47%	58%	87%	71%	71%	38%	52%
\$-ý dobrý kluk	52%	41%	12%	28%	28%	61%	48%
*-ýx dobrejch	53%	100%	75%	0	0	0	11%
\$-ýx dobrých	46%	0	25%	100%	0	100%	88%
*-ý- bejt	0	50%	44%	47%	50%	28%	25%
\$-ý- být	100%	50%	55%	52%	50%	71%	75%
\$ú- úřad	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Fig. 3

All the speakers made broad use of CC forms for *-é* and *-éx*. The situation again changes for *-ý*, *-ýx* and *-ý-*. Speaker C employed *-ej* in place of literary *-ý* much more frequently than all the other speakers. This should be ascribed to the higher spontaneity of this speaker. However, speaker B employed more *-ejx* compared with LC *-ýx*, and in some cases used also *-ej-* in stems more frequently than C did.

The average occurrences of the CC elements can be sketched schematically in the following Fig. 4:

⁸ A: man, 33 years old, from Hlasivo (near Tábor in Southern Bohemia), residing in Prague for 15 years, college level school; B: man, 40 years old, from Prague, university education; C: man, 31 years old, college level school, from Prachatice (Southwestern Bohemia), residing in Prague for 17 years; D: woman, 23 years old, college level school, from Prachatice, 3 years in Prague; E: man, 26 years old, university education, from Vrchlabí (Northeastern Bohemia), 8 years in Prague; F: man, 28 years old, university education, from Prague; G: woman, 68 years old, university education, Jindřichův Hradec (Southeastern Bohemia), 46 years in Prague.

CC	Conversations
1. -ý	97%
2. -ýx	94%
3. -ej	60%
4. -ejx	48%
5. -ej-	39%
6. -ou	0

Fig. 4.

Now we turn to the television recordings in Fig. 5.

CC	TV
1. -ý	58%
2. -ýx	48%
3. -ej	36%
4. -ejx	15%
5. -ej-	15%
6. ou-	0

Fig.5

It may be pointed out that the results found here are almost the same as those in the preceding conversations, but the frequency of occurrence of various CC elements is different. In general we can observe that the alternant *-ý* in place of the LC *-é* is the most frequently employed item. It is actually the most frequent variant in informal situations. Thus it can also be understood in a television context as a way to approach the audience. On the other hand, the usage of literary *-é* is felt to be very formal; thus, a speaker can use this ending when he wants to communicate a formality, to create a distance or a detachment from the interlocutor.

This usage in the television conversations may be illustrated by a part of the collected data (CC forms different from LC are written here in bold letters while exclusively LC forms are in italics):

Segment 1:

Černý: televize ... Je to prostě normální technic**ej** pokrok, kter**ej** díky tomu, že televize je taková jaká je prosakuje lidem i do jejich citov**ejch**, To si myslím, že není dobrý ...

'television... It's just normal progress in technology which, given what television is like, penetrates people's emotions... . I don't think that is good'

...já myslím, že záleží na tom kolik lidí chce člověk oslovovat tak pokud sta tisíce tak samozřejmě bez té televize to nejde...

'I think that depends on how many people one wants to address, if it is hundreds of thousands, then it's of course impossible without television'

...já už sem asi tak před dvaceti lety v nějakém rozhovoru říkal, že si myslím, že takové společné menovatele vkusu jako byli Rembrandt, Thomas Mann, Beatles, Presley, to už nebude...

'Some twenty years ago in an interview I said that I think that such common denominators of taste as Rembrandt, Thomas Mann, the Beatles, Presley, will not be any more'

...tam sem opravdu čet ty politické komentáře, myslím, že je to nezměrně zodpovědné, čestné a bych řek i krásné povolání a..."

'there I really read the political commentaries, I think that it's an immensely responsible, honourable and I would say beautiful profession and...'

Segment 2:

Havel: ... že prostě sem tak šílený vlastenec a tak zásadový ... a člověk, který když začne nějaké dílo tak ho musí v té zemi dodělat a tak dále. Já bych řekl, že asi tam jakési vznášené důvody byly [...], ale vedle nich hraje velmi významnou roli prostý fakt, že sem český balík prostě ...

'that I'm such a crazy patriot and so high-principled... and when a person starts some work, than he must finish it in that country etc. I would say, that maybe there were some lofty reasons, but ...'

... že to je naprosto přechodný, přechodné hnutí antitotalitní po tu dobu transiitní a že, no, bylo to naivní myslet si, že tak rychle vzniknou a vystabilizuje se nějaký politický spektrum ...

'... that it is absolutely transitory, a transitory antitotalitarian movement for the transitional period and that, well, it would be naive to think that a new political spectrum would emerge and stabilized itself so quickly ...'

Segment 3:

Mejstřík: Já samozřejmě politiku sleduju, protože tady žiju a to už jiný asi nebudu, ... ale ta politika, o které asi mluvíme, je nějaká vyššího... vyššího prostě stupně ... protože já nezpochybňuju to, že... že by možná bylo vhodné vymyslet nějakou jinou [...] myšlenku, která by Evropu sjednocovala, ale zatím to je *dle mýho* názoru převážně vo ekonomice,...

'Of course, I keep an eye on politics, because I live here and (probably always will live here) ... but that politics were probably speaking to of, is of a higher ... simply higher level ... because I've no doubt that maybe it would be appropriate to think up another idea which would unify Europe, but up to now, in my opinion, mainly economics is concerned, ... '

On the other hand, the alternant *ej* (especially if not word-final) may be used in television in a context where the speaker wants to be understood to be speaking frankly, informally, cf. the following segments:

Segment 4:

Havel: ... kdy mi nabízeli emigraci výměnou za to, že nezavřou *mý* příbuzný, takový vydírání to bylo a já najednou, říkal sem si, o sobě *mohu* rozhodovat, když se rozhodnu *bejt* pět let ve vězení *radší* než...

'... when they proposed to me emigration as an exchange for their not arresting my relatives, it was such blackmail, and all of a sudden I thought: I can decide for myself, if I decide to prefer five years in prison, rather than ...'

Já sem možná byl trochu vnímanej jako takovej bezmocnej, obyčejnej, bezradnej, vyjevanej občánek, kterej přemoh jakési megamašinérie.

'Perhaps I was perceived a little as a kind of powerless, ordinary, helpless, jittery small citizen who had surmounted some mega political organization.'

Segment 5:

Suchý: ... ale druhej den při snídani maminka už cejtla, že tomu musí udělat nějakou tečku, tak dyž mi dávala tu snídani, tak říkala: no, chlapče, herec z tebe nebude! ... já sem šílenej, víte? Já sbírám vopravdu tolik věcí.

'but the next day at breakfast Mother felt already that she must put an end to it, so that giving me my breakfast she told me: well, boy, you will not become an actor! ... I am crazy, you know? I really collect so many different things.'

Let us analyze this in detail, with reference to each of the television programs analyzed.

TV	HAVEL ŠKVORECKÝ	SUCHÝ ČERNÝ	PAJEROVÁ MEJSTRÍK	SUCHÝ AND OTHERS
*-é dobrý pivo	43%	61%	69%	73%
\$-é dobré pivo	56%	38%	30%	26%
*-éx ve zlým	28%	42%	60%	68%
\$-éx ve zlém	71%	57%	39%	31%
*-ý dobrej kluk	43%	44%	38%	28%
\$-ý dobrý kluk	56%	55%	61%	72%
*-ýx dobrejch	11%	28%	6%	20%
\$-ýx dobrých	88%	71%	93%	80%
*-ý- bejt	12%	23%	4%	23%
\$-ý- být	87%	77%	96%	76%
\$ú- úřad	100%	100%	100%	100%

Fig. 6.

Again, none of the programs contained a complete prevalence of all the non-literary elements. Actually, if we compare the first three television programs with each other (they are programs of the same type, namely interviews with well-known personalities), we note out that the CC forms had higher occurrences of the phenomena *-é* and *-éx* in “Pajerová-Mejstřík”, while in “Suchý-Černý” and “Havel-Škvorecký” a higher usage of *-ý* has been recorded. As for *-ýx* and *-ý-* the program in which there is the highest usage of CC elements (in its basic outline the LC forms prevail) is “Suchý-Černý”. We may observe that the frequency of various CC elements may vary widely from one speaker to another, and even that individual speakers are far from being consistent in their usage.

Let us examine the speech of President Václav Havel and of the poet and singer Jiří Suchý. They are intellectuals with different public roles, but both of them employed CC elements (see Fig. 7). Suchý in

particular employed them with a higher frequency; let us recall that, occasionally, he even argues about his own deliberate use of the different registers of the Czech language, saying, e.g., that he (also when speaking for the media) switches between LC and 'colloquial' usage, since in a private conversation with friends, LC is perceived as 'putting on airs'.⁹

TV	HAVEL	SUCHÝ
*-é dobrý pivo	33%	95%
\$-é dobré pivo	66%	4%
*-ex ve zlým	9%	40%
\$-ex ve zlém	90%	60%
*-ý dobrej kluk	36%	42%
\$-ý dobrý kluk	63%	57%
*-ýx dobrejch	0	80%
\$-ýx dobrých	100%	20%
*-ý- bejt	5%	37%
\$-ý- být	94%	62%
\$ú- úřad	100%	100%

Fig. 7.

It is interesting to look at the speech of Václav Havel, not yet invested with president authority, in a semi-formal context such as the discussions in the beginnings of the Civic Forum, i.e. in a situation that was not screened through television.

⁹ See Hlavsová (1999).

Havel	CF
*-é dobrý pivo	51%
\$-é dobré pivo	48%
*-éx ve zlým	47%
\$-éx ve zlém	52%
*-ý dobrej kluk	55%
\$-ý dobrý kluk	45%
*-ýx dobrejch	36%
\$-ýx dobrých	63%
*-ý- bejt	38%
\$-ý- být	61%
*ú- ouřad	4%
\$ú- úřad	95%

Fig. 8.

We can then observe Václav Havel in the same context again, noting that his register changed in the individual dialogues (Dialogue 39, 40 and 61) in accordance with the greater or lesser emotionality of the situation.

Havel	CF39	CF40	CF61
*-é dobrý pivo	40%	53%	53%
\$-é dobré pivo	59%	46%	46%
*-éx ve zlým	66%	29%	64%
\$-éx ve zlém	33%	70%	35%
*-ý dobrej kluk	50%	45%	64%
\$-ý dobrý kluk	50%	54%	35%
*-ýx dobrejch	16%	12%	56%
\$-ýx dobrých	83%	87%	43%
*-ý- bejt	40%	30%	50%
\$-ý- být	60%	69%	50%
*ú- ouřad	0	7%	0
\$ú- úřad	100%	92%	100%

Fig. 9.

This distribution may suggest that the CC elements for the types *-ýx* and *-ý* are markers of a more emotional state (in # 61). The CC forms for *-é* (*dobrý pivo*) mark both 40 and 61 as more emotional.

However, the frequency of the CC forms for *-éx* in Dialogue 39 is higher than in Dialogue 40 (and even in Dialogue 61). This might suggest that the CC variant *-ýx* (*ve zlým*) indicates more familiarity.

The CC form for *ú-* is quite specific here (its single occurrence was the form *ouplně* 'fully').

The overall percentages of CC items in the Civic Forum discussions analyzed are summarized in Fig. 10.

CC	CF
1. -ej	47%
2. -ý	46%
3. -ýx	42%
4. -ejx	41%
5. -ej-	32%
6. ou-	2%

Fig. 10.

The closeness of the frequencies of the CC form *-ej* and the LC form *-ý* (47% and 52%) might be explained simply by the higher degree of expressiveness that the non-literary ending has (LC forms often are felt as too bookish, or as 'putting on airs', as e.g. J. Suchý puts it (see above), so that they are less frequently used in contexts or situations requiring expressiveness.) Thus in the present case its frequency is not much higher than that of other CC items because the speakers were in a semi-formal situation (on the whole the literary elements prevail), even though the dialogues document a high degree of emotional and familiar behavior.

Our analysis of the frequency of occurrence of CC items thus yields the following general results, i.e. total percentages of CC forms in all the materials from the research reported on in the present paper:

CC	
1. -ý	72%
2. -ý-	60%
3. -ýx	58%
4. -ej	49%
5. -ej-	28%
6. -ejx	28%
7. vo-	24%
8. -ou	0%

Fig. 11.

The CC element that occurs more than all the others is *-ý* as opposed to *-é* in endings.

This result confirms Kučera's¹⁰ and Hammer's results, but is at variance with the first position of *-ej* on Kravčíšínová-Bednářová's scale. The main disparity in the results concerns CC *j*, which in our scale occurred more frequently than *ej* in all positions.

Regarding prothetic *v-*, the total percentage of its occurrence is 24% (see Fig. 11), but as Fig. 12 shows, *vo-* occurs much more frequently in function words (e.g. pronouns and prepositions) than in autosemantic words.

<i>vo-</i> in autosemantic words	16%
<i>vo-</i> in function words	31%

Fig. 12.

The situation is the same in every single group of recordings of conversation; the occurrence of *vo-* is lower in autosemantic words than in function words (see Fig. 13).

Conversation	<i>vo-</i> autosemantic words	34%
	<i>vo-</i> function words	55%
Television	<i>vo-</i> autosemantic words	8%
	<i>vo-</i> function words	15%
Civic Forum	<i>o-</i>	99%
	<i>vo-</i>	0%

Fig. 13.

On the whole, in the area of phonemics (and morphophonemics), the results obtained confirm for the most part those obtained earlier by Kučera, Kravčíšínová, Hammer and others.

In morphemics, most of the items concern smaller classes of words, and thus are not frequent enough to lead to clear results in an investigation of the range presented here. Hence we cannot analyse the use of forms such as *nesem/neseme*, *tisk(l)/tisknul*, *holi/hole* and others. We shall comment only on those items that occur with the highest frequency in our samples.

The instrumental plural with the CC ending *-ma* is very frequent; it appears in 50% of the analysed cases. We have further classified the endings, as Fig. 14 shows.

<i>-ma</i> →	<i>lidma</i> , <i>kostma</i>	69%
	<i>ženama</i> , <i>těma</i>	55%
	<i>domama</i>	31%

Fig. 14.

¹⁰ It should be noted that Kučera investigated the alternant *j* without any differentiation between the word final position and a position followed by a consonant, or in word stems; similarly, he investigated *ej* in endings without differentiation between the final position and non-final followed by a consonant.

The first example, *lidma/kostma*, is a case of the ending *-ma* preceded by a consonant. The frequency of words of this group is relatively low, but whenever they do occur, the CC ending prevails over the LC ending.

Ženama/těma involves feminine nouns, adjectives and pronouns. The CC forms slightly exceed the LC forms, indicating that in familiar conversation their use is frequent¹¹.

Domama is the CC form for *domy*, masculine and neuter nouns in instrumental plural. Its occurrence is relatively low (let us remark that in this case the CC forms are one syllable longer than the LC forms), but in familiar conversation it strongly prevails¹².

In the conditional the 1st Pers. Plur. auxiliary form is *bysme/(kdy)bysme* instead of LC *bychom/(kdy)bychom* in 56% of the cases¹³.

In the Neut. Pl. the CC adjectival ending is *-ý* instead of *-á*; the pronoun and participle ending is *-y* instead of *-a* (thus, Neut. Pl. is not distinguished from Fem. Pl. in CC forms agreeing with nouns). The analysed constructions are *malý města* 'small towns' and *ty města byly* 'those towns were' (see Fig. 15 and 16), in which the differences of the Neuter and Feminine genders are abolished even in the Nominative and Accusative cases of all adjectives and other words exhibiting grammatical agreement.

Malý města	
Conversation	100%
TV ¹⁴	0
CF	30%
Tot	69%

Fig. 15.

Ty města byly	
Conversation	100%
TV	100%
CF	42%
Tot	85%

Fig. 16.

The CC forms in *-ý* and *-y* are always used in family conversations and are also common in colloquial standard speech (CF and TV). The first type is present with a very low frequency in the situations of a more or less intimate character (CF). The second type is always used also in public semiformal situations (in TV).

¹¹ In *Conversation* 93% of occurrences; in *CF* 53%; in *TV* 26%.

¹² *Conversation* 70%; *CF* 45%; *TV* 8%.

¹³ *Conversation* 87%; *CF* 38%; *TV* 42%.

¹⁴ Only one standard sample.

We may conclude that the situation in morphemics, characterized in previous research, still applies: Although the specific rates differ from one sample to another, the oscillation or code-switching between Common Czech forms and their literary counterparts is still present. This oscillation is characteristic not only of private conversations of educated people in Bohemia, but also of unofficial public dialogues. It appears that in this sense, many Common Czech forms can be characterized as belonging to a lower (colloquial) level of the Standard language although this is often denied in discussions among linguists in the Czech Republic. In other words, our results confirm the appropriateness of the view (which still seems to be a minority view in Czech Republic, although it is strongly maintained among specialists in Czech abroad) that the existence and importance of an intermediate layer with unclear boundaries between standard and non-standard forms should be acknowledged, and that the notion of an opposition between LC and CC as a sharp and exclusive dividing line might be abandoned.

References

- Čermák, F. and P. Sgall (1997) "Výzkum mluvené češtiny: jeho situace a potřeby" (Research in spoken Czech: Its situation and requirements). *Slovo a slovesnost* 58, 15-25.
- Hammer, L. (1986) "Code-switching in colloquial Czech". In: J.L. Mey, ed. *Language and discourse: Test and protest*, Amsterdam, 455-473.
- Havránek, B. (1934) "Nářečí česká" (Czech dialects). *Československá vlastivěda* 3, Prague, 84-210.
- Hlavsová, J. (1999) "Jazyk Jiřího Suchého" (The language of Jiří Suchý). *Týdeník Rozhlas*, No. 45, p. 11.
- Kraus, J. et al. (1981) "Současný stav a vývojové perspektivy kodifikace spisovné češtiny" (The present state and the prospects for the codification of Standard Czech). *Slovo a slovesnost* 42, 228-238.
- Kravčíšínová, K. and B. Bednářová (1968) "Z výzkumu běžně mluvené češtiny" (From research on everyday spoken Czech). *Slavica Pragensia* 10, 305-320.
- Kučera, H. (1955) "Phonemic variation of spoken Czech". *Slavic Word*, Supplement to *Word* 11, 575-602.
- Sgall, P. (1960) "Obichodno-razgovornyj češskij jazyk" (Everyday Conversation Czech). *Voprosy jazykoznanija* No. 2, 11-20.
- Sgall, P., Hronek J., Horecký J. and A. Stich (1992). *Code switching in Czech as a challenge for sociolinguistics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Šonková, J. (1995). *Lingvistické zpracování jazyka na počítači: Morfologie mluvené češtiny* (A linguistic processing of language using computers). Ph.D. dissertation, Charles University of Prague.
- Townsend, C.E. (1990) *A description of spoken Prague Czech*. Slavica Publishers, Columbus, OH.