

## AN EVALUATION OF GERMAN-CROATIAN CONTACT

Mark E. Nuckols

### Abstract

This paper is a study of the influence of German on Croatian. It attempts to provide a historical background and to summarize and evaluate the linguistic findings of some scholars in the field. The study focuses mainly on the period 1526–1918, when the Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia was under the political control of the Habsburg Empire, and it is also limited to the contact in those areas of the Croatian-speaking world that were under Habsburg rule, i.e. Croatia and Slavonia, not Dalmatia. I consider the socio-historical context of the contact and the history of the Croatian literary language before examining specifically the results of contact which are visible in the Croatian language of today. In evaluating the results of contact, I draw largely on the criteria developed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988), as well as on the work of other scholars and my own observations. Although the influence of German on Croatian is almost exclusively lexical, calquing from German is extensive and points to a higher degree of contact than might be expected: The large number of loanshifts and loanblends indicates a higher degree of bilingualism than pure loanwords would suggest.

### 1 Introduction

Historically, both South and West Slavic languages have been involved in language contact of one sort or another with neighboring non-Slavic languages. Under the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires in the Balkans, the predecessors of modern Bulgarian,

Macedonian, and Serbian felt the influence of Greek from the time of the conversion of the South Slavs to Christianity in the ninth century until the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks in 1453; then Turkish influence on the South Slavs became felt as the Ottoman Empire expanded northward and westward up the Balkan peninsula until roughly 1683, when it suffered a major defeat in its failed siege of Vienna, after which Turkish military domination of the region waned until the First World War. This military and political domination placed several nationalities under the auspices of the same rulers, not to mention the fact that many of the contiguous peoples lived in ethnically mixed areas, intermarried, and many of their members lived a nomadic shepherding lifestyle that brought them into frequent contact with speakers of various neighboring languages. This contact among speakers of the Balkan languages was sustained and intense enough to produce results typical of a Sprachbund. There have been several detailed studies (Schaller 1975, Joseph 1983) and several less detailed studies (Décsy 1973:105–23, Birnbaum 1965) of a Balkan Sprachbund involving Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian, Rumanian, and Greek, as well as the (at least limited) participation of Serbo-Croatian (namely the southernmost Torlak dialects), Arumanian, and other languages or dialects.

There has, however, been fairly limited discussion of the possible existence of a central European Sprachbund. Gyula Décsy (1973:87–105) writes of a “Danubian league” (*Donau-Bund*) involving the West Slavic languages Czech and Slovak, the western South Slavic languages Slovenian and Croatian (but not Serbian), and the neighboring Finno-Ugric language Hungarian, citing as causes of the development of this league geo- and socio-political conditions present in the Habsburg Empire from roughly the sixteenth century to 1918. Décsy also proposes that there are numerous other Sprachbünde on the European continent, although he does not suggest that any of them overlap. Eric Hamp (1979, 1989), however, does suggest that some European Sprachbünde overlap or coincide and that all the languages of the Balkans have been involved in one type or another of contact, though often with different neighbors, thus creating a “cluster” or “crossroads of Sprachbünde”, as suggested in the titles of his 1979 and 1989 articles respectively. Given the recent political fragmentation of the Balkans, which has produced the burning question of whether the language once known widely as “Serbo-Croatian” is really one language, two languages (Croatian and Serbian), or four (add Bosnian and Montenegrin), it is worth considering the different spheres of linguistic, cultural, and political influence or dominance that these two varieties of Serbo-Croatian underwent.

Croatian provides an interesting subject of study as a language involved in contact for another reason: it and its various dialects have been influenced and enriched by languages as diverse as Italian, German, Hungarian, and to a lesser extent, in its Bosnian dialects (many ethnic Croats in Bosnia still identify their language as Croatian), Turkish. The present study is limited to the influence that German has exercised on Croatian, which is indeed a large undertaking in itself, and this examination is by no means exhaustive; instead, this paper attempts to provide historical background and to summarize and evaluate the linguistic findings of some scholars in the field. The study focuses mainly on the period 1526–1918, when the Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia was under the political control of the Habsburg Empire, which in differing periods within this time

frame could be called variously the Holy Roman Empire (until 1806), the Austrian Empire (1806–1867) and Austria-Hungary (1867–1918). It is also limited to the contact in those areas of the Croatian-speaking world that were under Habsburg rule, i.e., Croatia and Slavonia, but not Dalmatia. It also excludes the Croats of Austria proper (namely Carinthia) who were a minority living among German speakers, which is quite a different situation from Croatia and Slavonia where Croats were the majority. I consider the socio-historical context of the contact and the history of the Croatian literary language, before examining specifically the results of contact that are visible in the Croatian language of today.

In evaluating the results of contact, I draw largely on the criteria developed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988:74–76), but I also make some suggestions and additions to the factors they consider, drawing on the work of other scholars and, to a lesser extent, my own observations. The influence of German on Croatian, it turns out, is almost exclusively limited to the lexicon, but the phenomenon of calquing from German is extensive and points to a higher degree of contact than might be realized by simply considering “lexical influence” without regard to the type of influence. As I argue later, the large extent of loanshifts (which include semantic extensions based on a foreign model as well as loan translations or calques) and loanblends (which contain an admixture of native and imported elements)—including many at the phrasal level—tends to indicate a higher degree of bilingualism than pure loanwords<sup>1</sup> would suggest. Some of the calquing between German and Croatian is syntactic in nature, which suggests that some grammatical changes in the structure of Croatian began developing under the influence of a limited number of semantically related lexical items. Joseph (1983:191–93) has suggested that finite complementation, one of the most notorious features of the Balkan Sprachbund, may well have become diffused in a like manner. Since this paper is limited to examining contact between two languages only, it cannot make a conclusion either about the existence of a central European Sprachbund or about whether Croatian should be considered a member (either core or peripheral), but it can make some determination of whether German-Croatian contact was sufficiently intimate in nature and intense in degree and whether it involved enough mutual bilingualism to be considered Sprachbund-like. Additional research considering the level of influence between Croatian and Hungarian would have to be completed before coming to any conclusions about the presence of Croatian in a central European Sprachbund, but it is hoped that the present examination will be a worthwhile endeavor in that direction.

## 2 Political history

The Triune Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia became part of the Kingdom of Hungary shortly after its native dynasty, the Trpimirovići, died out in 1091. In August 1526, the Croats again found themselves without a king when the Hungarian king Louis II Jagellon died on the battlefield at the Hungarian town of Mohács in a historically decisive contest with the Ottoman Turks. The Ottomans then pushed northwards to Buda and Pest, and their conquests led to the 150-year Turkish occupation

---

<sup>1</sup> Here, I am using the terminology of lexical contact phenomena in accordance with the classification of Haugen (1953) as found, with slight modifications, in Winford 2003.

of a large central swath of Hungary. The Jagellons had several years earlier made a pact with the Habsburgs that if the male line of one of the families should die out, the other family would take over their dominions. According to this treaty, the Habsburgs should have automatically become Hungarian sovereigns, but the matter still awaited a vote by the Hungarian nobility. The nobility elected a rival but was eventually forced to recognize the Habsburg dynasty; the Croatian diet, however, had supported the Habsburgs all along, and, in any event, most of them already considered the union with the Hungarian Crown of St. Stephen to have been dissolved by virtue of the fact that the Hungarian rulers had died out. The question of whether Croatia fell under the immediate rule of Vienna or of Budapest was never fully resolved before the dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy in the aftermath of World War I.

Croatia and Slavonia were under the administrative auspices of Vienna (Dalmatia had come under Venetian control in some areas and Turkish in others), and this administration was very centralized at first, since the Imperial government in Vienna wanted efficient coordination in terms of military efforts against the Turks. This centralization eased in the eighteenth century, following definitive military victories over the Ottomans in the late seventeenth century, although Croats, according to Banac (1984:231) were subject to another round of “absolutism and harsh Germanization that followed the defeat of the 1848 revolutionary wave”. The *Ausgleich* or “Compromise” of 1867 created the “Dual Monarchy” in which all matters pertaining to both Austria and Hungary were handled at the “imperial” level, and all matters affecting only Hungary were now handled at the “royal” level; i.e., Hungary remained a quasi-independent kingdom within the empire of Austria-Hungary. Hungary now enjoyed the right to determine her own internal politics in matters such as economy and education, while matters of defense and foreign relations were dealt with from the imperial capital of Vienna. The Croats, however, were not as fortunate as the Hungarians in terms of recognition of the historical rights, and many felt that, after the *Ausgleich*, they were exposed to Hungarian political domination and a strong dose of “Magyarization” or assimilation to Hungarian language and culture.

### 3 Socio-historical background

Décsy (1973:87–89) lists Serbo-Croatian as a member of what he considers to be a *Donau-Bund* or “Danubian League” which additionally includes Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, and Slovenian. Among the features of this area, Décsy claims, are initial stress, vowel quantity, minor role of diphthongs, lack of vowel reduction, and a strong tendency toward prefixation (“*grosse Präfixfreudigkeit*”). Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to examine in detail the possibility of Croatian’s membership in any proposed Sprachbünde, it is worth noting that Décsy mentions the influence of German in central Europe without including it in his *Donau-Bund*. Décsy recognizes the status of Latin and German as supranational languages and the deeply felt influence of German speakers on Czechs and Slovenes, yet he maintains that German influence on the Slovak and Croatian was relatively “negligible” (“*geringfügig*”—1973:88). The word “negligible” would seem to understate the degree of German influence on Slovak and Croatian, since, as he notes (89), German, alongside French, was the language of the Hungarian high nobility in the eighteenth century. The fact that the lower nobility tended to speak the local

language—Slovak, Magyar, or Serbo-Croatian—does not detract much from the influence of German (or other languages) on the local languages in the Kingdom of Hungary. If Décsy's observation on the lower nobility is correct, then it likely means that they preferred to speak the local language in their households and neighborhoods. No doubt these members of the lower nobility were by and large educated, and by the eighteenth century that education was acquired largely through German as a language of instruction. The lower nobility, then, seems to have represented a transitional group between the highest classes, which had a strong preference for German, and the lowest classes, which, in our area of focus, which would have displayed a strong tendency to speak Croatian.

In the whole area of the Donau-Bund, the middle class citizens of the towns and cities had been of German origin (*deutschstämmig*) since the Middle Ages, and from the eighteenth century onwards there were islands of rural German population. Furthermore, German served as the “common second language” of the Habsburg Monarchy from the sixteenth century to 1918. Décsy writes further that there was an “Austrian commercial dialect” which counted as a standard language, although it contained “observable deviations from the High German of non-Austrian lands”. As we shall see later, there are lexical items in colloquial Croatian that indeed likely came from colloquial Austrian. The presence of German-speakers, especially of economically and politically powerful ones, certainly would have provided a strong motivation for the population of Croatia and Slavonia to learn German, but these facts do not suffice to establish how many Croats knew German or how well.

Kessler (1981:159) finds, much like Décsy, that German was the common language of the middle and upper classes of the entire Habsburg monarchy (at least those who thought themselves “better”), and it was not just in Croatian-speaking areas that such people thought of the local language as a “lingua exotica”, a language to be used with the servants or a language of the “vulgar class”. “The German language”, he writes, “was in this case a status language, not a mother tongue in the emotionally loaded, nationalistic sense”. Kessler also notes that one of the leaders of the Illyrian movement responsible for codifying a united Serbo-Croatian language in the middle of the nineteenth century, Ljudevit Vukotinović, complained that “There are people who speak our [Croatian/local] language only when they are forced to, for instance with peasants or one's own servant”, but there were even some “especially in higher society who are ashamed to have a servant who is so primitive that one cannot” give him orders in a foreign language (i.e., not “our” language, Croatian). If Kessler paints an accurate picture here, then there clearly was a substantial amount of bilingualism in the Kingdom of Croatia and Slavonia by the nineteenth century, among Croats first and foremost, and to a lesser extent among German-speakers. It would appear that the higher the class (indeed, the more breeding a servant had), the greater the preference for German, though at some levels, the upper classes did not altogether disdain speaking the local language.

If Guldescu (1970) is correct in many of his observations on the state of Croatian-Austrian relations from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, then there probably was even earlier language contact that occurred through the military. He notes: “Since the

fourteenth century the Habsburgs had ruled the partially Croatian province of Istria, although Venice had taken over the western shore of this peninsula. Croatian soldiers had long served, too, under the Counts of Görz (Gorica) who were Habsburg vassals ... ” (1970:15). There likely was a significant amount of language contact through Austrian-Croatian intermarriage. Guldescu further speaks of “inter-marriage and land inheritance on the part of the two nobilities”, remarking that “Military service under the Habsburg banners, the settlement of Austrian artisans and peasants in Croatia, and Croatian migrations to Austria effected a blending of the two populations also. Indubitably there is a heavy admixture of Austrian blood in the veins of many Croats today.”

Piškorec (1997:35) notes the participation of German-speaking population groups from the thirteenth century in the founding of Croatian towns and points to a special role for the German language that came with the establishment of a military border zone for defense against the Ottomans in the first half of the sixteenth century. His study considers this role in the town of Đurđevac, in the northeastern-most part of today’s Central Croatia, a few miles from the present-day border with Slavonia—and historically belonging to Slavonia—and just a little farther from the border with Hungary, but considerably distant from the modern borders of the German-speaking world. He observes that the military importance of the town shrank significantly after the border with the Ottoman Empire was “pushed back” by Austrian military successes late in the seventeenth century (1997:36). German nevertheless remained as an administrative language until 1871. Piškorec makes the noteworthy observation that “unlike other Croatian areas and towns, where an observable proportion of the population can be shown to have spoken German as a mother language, most of the inhabitants of Đurđevac were Croats of long-standing Croatian origin who first took up the German language on their educational and career paths” (1997:37). The first German-language school in Đurđevac was built between 1756 and 1759, and German was first used in religious instruction in the 1780s in “Slavic-German” schools. Priests appointed by the Zagreb bishop were, “as a rule”, Croats who had studied abroad and were competent in Latin and German (39). Additionally, knowledge of both spoken and written German was necessary for promotion in the military (41). Piškorec also notes that there were probably a relatively small number of people (apparently he means in the second half of the eighteenth century, but the context is not entirely clear), 16–60 individuals, who were fully bilingual and thus served as the most important vehicles of the German-Croatian contact in Đurđevac.

Piškorec’s observations are enlightening but, of course, do not give an entirely clear picture of the contact situation in the rest of Croatia and Slavonia. The fact that the town in his study was Slavonian and, as he notes, not originally under terribly strong German influence, would tend to coincide with Hamp’s (1989) observation (discussed below) that Slavonia experienced some German influence, but that it was not as heavy as that experienced by those Croatian areas farther west, i.e., closer to German-speaking Austria.

While the evidence cited above does point to a German dominance over Croatian, as opposed to a contact situation of equal bilingualism, it would be wrong to discount the German-Croatian interaction described here as not of a Sprachbund nature on that basis

alone.<sup>2</sup> As Thomason (2001:107–8) has noted, the Ottoman Turks exercised political and military domination in the Balkans, and their language contributed hundreds, if not thousands, of lexical items to the general Balkan vocabulary, yet Turkish does not display any of the typical Balkan features. Greek is traditionally considered a member of the Balkan Bund, although often treated as peripheral, since it has fewer structural Balkanisms than the core members Albanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Rumanian. Nevertheless, Greek, especially in the Byzantine period when the Hellenic world exerted a very strong cultural and political influence over the Balkans, contributed large numbers of words to the Balkan lexicon. Perhaps German, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, played a role in central Europe analogous to that of Greek in the Byzantine period and Turkish in the period of Ottoman domination of the Balkans?

In any event, in the socio-linguistic situation in Croatian-speaking areas, there is no evidence of language **shift**. Certainly neither of the groups abandoned its native language in favor of the other language. However, bilingualism was clearly present in Croatia and Slavonia, although the degree of bilingualism is a more complicated matter. We are left, then, to consider how this bilingualism affected Croatian (or German), but first, we should take up the status of Croatian as a literary language in order to avoid the misconception that German was so dominant in all spheres of (at least public) life, that it was such a prestige language, that among ethnic Germans and Croats, only the latter bothered to learn or speak the other's language.

#### 4 History of the Croatian literary language

The fact that German enjoyed the status of a prestige language and an administrative language after 1526 should in no way be taken to mean that Croatian was excluded from usage in literature and administration. A consideration of the history of literary Croatian is in order here.

To begin understanding the use of Croatian, or dialects thereof, as a literary language requires us to digress a bit historically from the time of Habsburg rule in Croatia and Slavonia, to “begin at the beginning”, so to speak. The role of the Cyrillo-Methodian mission is crucial to this sociolinguistic history. The year 864 is traditionally cited as the date when two Slavic-speaking brothers, Saints Cyril and Methodius, were summoned from their hometown of Thesaloniki in Greece (then part of the Byzantine Empire) to Christianize the West Slavs of the Great Moravian Empire, situated in what is now the Czech Republic and Slovakia. Part of their mission involved the translation of biblical and liturgical works into the Slavic vernacular, which for the most part still enjoyed relative unity in the Slavic-speaking world in the ninth century. The language employed by the brothers, which had some South Slavic features, has come to be known as Old Church Slavonic (OCS) or Church Slavic and was even accepted by the Roman pontiff for use as a liturgical language, though its status as a liturgical language has wavered over the

---

<sup>2</sup> Of course a Sprachbund situation requires three participating languages at the least. This study merely considers the intensity of the contact between these two languages. Hungarian-Croatian contact could easily involve another paper of this length. Note my comment on the number of languages involved in my discussion of criteria for evaluating contact phenomena early in §5.

centuries, especially after the Great Schism which divided Eastern and Western Christianity in 1066.

Additionally, St. Cyril devised an alphabet that was deemed to be better suited to the inventory of Slavic speech sounds than either Latin or Greek letters. That alphabet, as most (but not all) scholars agree, was the Glagolitic alphabet, which differs radically from either Latin or Greek. The alphabet that now bears his name, Cyrillic, is generally—but not entirely—agreed to have been invented by his disciples, and relies largely on Greek prototypes. Glagolitic has enjoyed a long-standing tradition in Croatia, one that has continued even to the present day, though with decreasing usage over the centuries and increasingly limited to the monasteries of the Istrian peninsula and the Dalmatian islands. Banac (1984:200–201) delineates the “Golden Age of Croatian Glagolitic” as roughly 1075–1475. After the Great Schism, however, OCS was no longer as sacred, and features of the local vernacular soon began creeping into the church language of Croatia, while at the same time, Croatia’s thorough identification with the Church of Rome meant increasing competition with Latin in ecclesiastical usage.

Even in Croatian secular society in the Middle Ages, many writers were clearly “Latinists”, meaning they preferred to write in Latin, although most of them did not altogether disdain the Croatian vernacular. Some writers of the late Middle Ages wrote mainly or exclusively in Croatian, while others attempted to write prose and poetry in both Latin and Croatian. By the fifteenth century, secular writing was almost exclusively in Latin letters, and the coastal town of Dubrovnik had become a literary center, so its local dialect became very influential in the development of the Croatian standard language. At the same time, a strong Italian influence entered into the literary culture of Dubrovnik following the acquisition of the Dalmatian communes by the Venetians in the late fifteenth century (Banac 1984:203–4).

Additionally, the Venetian prelates began resisting the use of the Slavic liturgy in the churches. Although the continued use of the Slavic liturgy was permitted, the Council of Trent (1545–47, 1551–52, 1562–63), convened in response to the Protestant Reformation to solidify Catholic dogma and practice, determined that liturgical services should be held in the ancient languages, with as little acquiescence to vernacular usage as possible, which had as a consequence a greater disparity between the OCS used in the traditional Slavic liturgy and the contemporary Croatian vernacular.

Early attempts at standardization of a Croatian literary language can be said to have begun roughly in the sixteenth century, though these attempts were neither as deliberate nor as political as those of the nineteenth century. The main obstacle to the formation of a single literary language was the existence of three main dialect groups for Croatian: the Čakavian, originally spoken in Istria and many Dalmatian islands; Kajkavian, indigenous mainly to Slavonia, including Zagreb; and Štokavian, originally spoken south of Kajkavian and east of Čakavian. (The names for these dialects come from the words for “what” as reflected in each of the dialects, although this is not necessarily the best criterion for dividing them.) The dialect question was further complicated by migrations, most notably those precipitated by the Ottoman conquests in the Balkans.

The sixteenth to nineteenth centuries also saw competition between the three scripts—Glagolitic, Latin, and Cyrillic—with Glagolitic gradually pushed back into Istria and restricted to Church usage, Latin winning out almost everywhere, and Cyrillic being used almost exclusively by Orthodox Slavs.

The nineteenth century saw the birth of the Illyrian movement (1835–48) which sought as its primary goal to unite all Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs. This involved the endeavour to devise a single literary language for the three groups. Although the attempt to include Slovene in this single, unifying language failed, a Serbo-Croatian literary standard was finally agreed upon. This standard was the result of numerous compromises, not simply that Serbs would use Cyrillic script and Croats Latin characters, but also that certain regional variations would be permitted. Štokavian had already gained tremendous ground in the eighteenth century, and in the nineteenth century it became the literary norm, due partly to the numerical superiority of its speakers in Croatian dialects alone, not to mention the fact that Serbs are overwhelmingly Štokavian speakers; thus the use of Štokavian was a very natural compromise.

Clearly, then, there was a continuous Croatian literature, as works were written and published in Croatian from the Middle Ages and with increasing frequency to the present day. In 1604 the first Croatian grammar, *Institutionum linguae illyricae*, was published by a Jesuit named Bartol Kasić. The seventeenth century also saw the translation of the Bible into modern Croatian idiom, and Jesuits worked at translating texts like the catechism into Croatian. Later, in the eighteenth century, works such as the sermons of Stefan Zagrebec in 1715–34, and Hilarion Gasparoti's *Czvet Szveteh* ('Blossom of the Saints', a hagiographical work) appeared (Hadrovics 1985:143). Katicić (1984:274) observes that by the middle of the eighteenth century

the already existing and largely unified Štokavian literary language in the east and south began to cover a wider range; work on the normalization of orthography and terminology was intensified, grammars were written and served as textbooks in schools. The penal code of Joseph II was translated into this language and was used in the courts for some time.

So there was a substantial literature published even before the Croats's national awakening in the nineteenth century, and as we can see from the above quote, there was significant use of Croatian in the schools and courts in the eighteenth century. We thus are faced with a complex situation in which it was advantageous, as we saw above, for Croats seeking positions in the military, the clergy, or trade to know German, yet German was not so dominant that no one in the upper classes bothered to learn Croatian, and Croatian was even beginning to enjoy some status in both educational and legal systems. These facts, of course, still say little about the spoken use of the two languages in more intimate settings (a point to which we shall turn later, citing the nature of certain lexical borrowings as evidence), although they do indicate that there was present on Croatian territory more than a mere "one-way bilingualism", a term used by Thomason and Kaufman (1988:95) to contrast with the "mutual bilingualism and multilingualism" of Sprachbund situations. The bilingualism in the area under study, however, was probably never fully

mutual, though it most likely did involve rather intimate contact, as we shall see from examples of the types of lexical borrowings found in the following section.

## 5 Degree of influence: An analysis of grammatical and lexical borrowing

In evaluating the contact situation involving Croatian and German, it is necessary to devise some criteria by which to judge certain results of contact. I outline in brief here the scale of five levels of intensity of contact devised by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 74–76) before suggesting some important additional considerations. The levels or categories are listed as follows:

1. Casual contact: lexical borrowing only
2. Slightly more intense contact: slight structural borrowing
3. More intense contact: slightly more structural borrowing
4. Strong cultural pressure: moderate structural borrowing
5. Very strong cultural pressure: heavy structural borrowing

Thomason and Kaufman (1988:95) indirectly place Sprachbund phenomena in the range of categories 4 and 5 when they claim that the linguistic results of the Balkan Sprachbund “include features characteristic of moderate to heavy structural borrowing”. However, they do not place Sprachbund phenomena directly within the rubric of this scale, because the scale is meant to apply to two-language situations and, as they note, “Sprachbund situations are notoriously messy” (95), i.e., they typically involve multidirectional borrowing, and one cannot place all the features of a Sprachbund within one neat isogloss. Let us consider, then, how some of Thomason and Kaufman’s criteria might be applied to Sprachbund situations.

On their level 4, we find “major structural features that cause relatively little typological change”. On the level of phonology, this may include “new distinctive features in contrastive sets represented in native vocabulary ... new syllable structure constraints”. Grammatically, it may involve “fairly extensive word order changes” and “borrowed inflectional affixes and categories”. Level 5 involves even more intense contact, and, in the description provided by Thomason and Kaufman, it involves “major structural features that cause significant typological disruption” such as “added morphophonemic rules”, “changes in word structure rules (e.g. adding prefixes in a language that was exclusively suffixing or a change from flexional toward agglutinative morphology)”, “extensive ordering changes in morphosyntax (e.g. development of ergative morphosyntax)”, and so forth. Level 3, just a step below the Sprachbund level, may involve the phonemicization of previously allophonic variations, “easily borrowed prosodic and syllable-structure features”, and some changes in word order.

In terms of the lexicon, Thomason and Kaufman distinguish between what may be termed “cultural borrowing” or “need borrowing” of lexical items at level 1 and the borrowing of function words in categories 2 and 3. No lexical borrowings are listed in their borrowing scale (74–76) at levels 4 and 5; however the authors discuss in their examples following the scale numerous instances where lexical borrowing has acted as a

vehicle for structural change. They mention, for instance, that in Ossetic (Iranian), “lexical borrowing from Caucasian languages ... is heavy; through these loanwords Ossetic has acquired a series of glottalized stop phonemes that have also spread to native Iranian words ...” (84). This phonemic borrowing and spread to native vocabulary falls into their level 3. They evaluate contact between Chinese and the Mongolian language Baonan as lying between categories 4 and 5, with structural interference including “lexical semantics, e.g. new functions for the native Baonan verb meaning ‘hit’, to match the functions of the corresponding verb in Chinese” (90).

Despite this last example, which is, of course, a case of loanshift, there is no explicit discussion of calquing of compounds (simple calques) as opposed to calquing of more complex phrases (complex calquing) in Thomason and Kaufman’s scale, even if the existence of such a difference is implied. Birnbaum (1965) and Schaller (1975) both suggest phraseological similarities as a Balkan Sprachbund phenomenon, and calquing has been proposed as a Sprachbund feature by Campbell and colleagues (1986:553–55), who list fifty-five examples of “semantic calques or loan translations” (in their terminology) in Meso-America. Certainly calquing should be given higher priority than “pure loanwords” (again Haugen’s terminology), at least those of the cultural- or need- borrowing type, in the scale of contact-induced change, for calquing provides better evidence of bilingualism, since it involves the translation of words and phrases directly from one language into another and therefore requires rather refined L2 knowledge.

This translating of phrases sometimes even compromises “normal” patterns in the borrowing languages. Therefore, I would like to suggest that calques, especially when extensive, may begin to promote grammatical changes (this is suggested by Thomason and Kaufman, but they only mention borrowing affixes); that is, certain new patterns from the lending language may begin to “creep in” to the borrowing language at the lexical level (see discussion with exemplification below). More extensive grammatical change is possible in situations of heavy calquing, as opposed to the less extensive level three example of borrowed affixes, for example. Let me suggest then, that extensive calquing should be included as a Sprachbund phenomenon, especially where it

- a. produces observable changes in word-formation patterns
- b. affects large classes of lexical items in a manner that at least approaches structural diffusion.

We should also consider the differences among types of lexical borrowing: pure loanwords, where borrowed items appear in the borrowing language essentially in the same form in which they appeared in the lending language; simple calques, by which is understood lexical items such as compound words in which the borrowing language translates the two components of the word more or less directly and literally; and complex calques. In the last category are phrasal calques, in which we find common expressions, figures of speech, collocations, and turns of phrases translated word for word, as nearly as possible; and morphosyntactic calques, which may involve the borrowing of case government (or rules of assignment), the function of certain verbs as auxiliary verbs, or similar borrow-

ings. Using these more precisely defined criteria then, let us consider the nature of German lexical and grammatical influence on Croatian.

### 5.1 Morphological and phonological adaptation of loanwords

We find that German loanwords are adapted phonologically and morphologically (for the most part) to Croatian. Phonologically, for instance, front rounded vowels are rendered as front unrounded vowels (in German loanwords) as in Gm. *Bühne* > ĐCr *bine* ‘stage’. Reduced or schwa sounds, which also do not exist in Croatian, are usually rendered as /a/, which is “the only central vowel in Croatian”. Sometimes, however, schwa sounds may be rendered /e/ under the influence of German orthography, as in Gm. *Besteck* > *beštek* ‘bribe’, as noted by Piškorec (1997:72). Not only are standard German language and orthography influential; Piškorec also mentions that colloquial pronunciation of the German models often plays a role as well, as in Gm. *zurück* > ĐCr. *curuk* ‘back (return)’, with the second vowel being rendered unrounded under the apparent influence of Bavarian models. Both Magner (1966) and Piškorec (1997) find that borrowed verbs tend to be formed by adding Croatian infinitive endings, such as *-noti* or *-uvati*, as in Gm. *drücken* > *druknoti* ‘push, press’ and *danken* > *dekuvati* ‘thank’. The verbs can then be conjugated easily in accordance with ordinary rules of Croatian grammar. Nouns borrowed from German are typically left as they are, though they sometimes cause difficulty in inflection in Croatian; in some instances, German nouns that do not have an ending typical for the Croatian singular are made into pluralia tantum, as in Gm. *Spielhose* (sg.) > ĐCr *špilhoze* ‘playpants’. Some adjectives borrowed from German are uninflectable in Croatian for either case, number, or degree because their endings do not work well with either derivational patterns or agreement patterns in Croatian; three examples given by Piškorec (1997:72) are *fraj*, *fro*, and *šik* from Gm. *frei*, *froh*, and *schick* ‘free’, ‘early’, and ‘chic’, respectively. In these examples, it would seem strange to add the vowels *-y*, *-a*, and *-o* to the ending in order to form the definite nominative singular for the masculine, feminine, and neuter genders respectively. A few uninflectable items aside, then, there is no real evidence that these borrowings are leading to a “breakdown” of the Croatian inflectional system.

Lexical borrowing, however, is not limited to loanwords—there are hundreds of calques in Croatian based on German models. This, in my opinion, makes Thomason and Kaufman’s scale too limiting a gauge of bilingualism in a contact situation, since it does not take into account the **type** of lexical borrowing, and calquing typically requires a much more refined bilingualism than does borrowing.

### 5.2 Loanwords, calques, and “intimate” borrowings

Rammelmeyer (1975:128) insists that “The Lexicon has changed more than any other area of the Serbo-Croatian language within the last two centuries”, and concludes that German served as the most influential model for this change. He finds large numbers of German loanwords and loan translations in Serbo-Croatian from dictionaries compiled at the beginning of the nineteenth century and determines that these words must have been well-established in the lexicon in the eighteenth century (130–31). As to the means

of transmission, Rammelmeyer points to the fact that many calques were created out of the need to express new ideas in culture and science, adding that some literary loan translations may have been produced rather *ad hoc* during the process of translation from German. Such loan coinages by lexicographers count for little in the discussion of contact between the spoken languages, since they occur entirely in the quiet of scholars' studies and have nothing to do with the kind of immediate, intimate, and spontaneous contact among speakers that one seeks in a hypothetical Sprachbund setting.

However, not all or even most of the lexical influence came about by lexicographers deliberately coining new words on the basis of German models (or models from Latin and Greek). Magner (1966) finds numerous German loans that seem to be the sort that would have been transmitted through colloquial speech, such as *ganz* 'completely, entirely', a word that is used with very high frequency in German, and *ziher* (< Gm. *Sicher*) 'surely', again, a very high frequency word in German. Magner finds adjectives, nouns, adverbs, and verbs borrowed from German or based directly on German roots. Rammelmeyer notes that most German loanwords in SCr are of a material nature, i.e., they refer to concrete, everyday objects from "material culture" and are used in colloquial speech (1975:129). He adds the important comment that it is actually the loan translation, not the loanword, that is typically considered the "more educated" variant. He lists doublets such as the following, given with their German source words:

	German source word	Colloquial loanword	Calque, standard Croatian	Meaning
(1)	Weck-er wake-AGV	veker-ica waker-DIM	budi-lica wake-AGV/DIM	'alarm clock'
(2)	Kell-ner cellar-AGV	kelner	konob-ar cellar-AGV	'waiter'
(3)	Schnitz-el cut-DIM	snicla	od-rez-ak off-cut-DIM	'cutlet'

Rammelmeyer lists hundreds of loan translations in his glossary, though the vast majority of them are literary or scientific in nature and would not have been the result of spoken contact between the languages. Still, there are significant numbers of items that would likely be the result of spoken contact. Below are listed a few examples for illustration.

(4)	–maćuh-ica stepmother-DIM	Stiefmutter-chen stepmother-DIM	'pansy'
-----	------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------

As this is neither a scientific name nor a likely a need borrowing, this term was probably not calqued by botanists; therefore it was probably transmitted by ordinary contact between speakers, and it shows a subtlety of knowledge of the source language's use of the

diminutive for ‘mother-in-law’. Furthermore, the association of “stepmother” with “pansy” is so arbitrary that it must be a calque, i.e., it cannot be mere coincidence.

- |     |                           |                         |               |
|-----|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| (5) | -pred-soblje<br>fore-room | Vor-zimmer<br>fore-room | ‘antechamber’ |
|-----|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|

This would seem to be the type of word one would expect to be transmitted in the social setting described above, that is, in the communications between upper classes (the only people who would likely have such a feature in their home) and servants.

- |     |                                |                                |                       |
|-----|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| (6) | -op-hod-ljiv<br>around-go-like | um-gäng-lich<br>around-go-like | ‘friendly, easygoing’ |
|-----|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|

This would seem to be the type of word that would be transmitted in colloquial speech, rather than a high style.

For a look at the more general influence of German in central Europe and its relation to the language of Croats, let us consider the following quote from Hamp (1989):

We may illustrate the differential penetration of “Habsburgisms” with an interesting series: In Serbia we hear *hvala lepo*, a visible calque on *danke schön* [literally “thanks prettily”]; the first element is simply replaced without regard for the fact that the source was a verb with its subject deleted, but the second element conserves (anomalously) the adverbial syntax. Further west, in Slavonija, we hear *hvala l(ij)epa*, with the adjectival concord required by the NP *schönen Dank*; this implies, for an earlier time, a more sensitive bilingualism. Moving yet further west, we have *najlepšia hvala = schönsten Dank* [where Croatian uses the superlative form of the adjective as in German], which required earlier a yet more refined grammatical bilingualism.

Hamp’s claim that German influence is felt more clearly the farther west one goes stands to reason: not only are the more westward areas of Serbia and Croatia closer to the German-speaking world, but they also have a longer history of German settlement and the Habsburg Dynasty ruled these areas since earlier times. Although the extension of a single group of related phrases provides only a very limited example, it is quite clear that calques from German do become more common as one moves westward, and such loan translations are, as Unbegaun (1932:28–32) observes, more common in Slovene than in Croatian, and more common in Croatian than in Serbian.

For another look at “Habsburgisms”, Magner’s 1966 study of Zagreb dialect provides a few interesting polite expressions. The greeting *zdravobóg*, a compound which adds the word ‘god’ to a salutation meaning literally ‘greetings’ (Magner 1966:80), represents a calque of the notoriously “Austrian” (but still found elsewhere in the southern German-speaking world) expression *Griß Gott*, meaning literally ‘May God greet [you]’. *Servus*, from Lat. ‘servant/slave’, originally suggesting “I am at your service”, a meaning

likely now obscure to most speakers, is another notorious “Austrianism”, variations of which are found in Hungary and Slovakia and at least in this Zagreb dialect of Croatian. Another likely “Habsburgism” is the clearly German expression *kistijánt/kistihánt* < Gm. *Ich küsse die Hand* meaning literally “I kiss the [your] hand”, a greeting which is used still frequently in Hungary (*Kezét csokolom*), but which has apparently fallen out of use elsewhere in the former Habsburg Empire. It also has a calqued counterpart in an expression realized variously in Zagreb Croatian as *merúke/mruke/ljubimrúke*, the last of which means clearly “I kiss [your] hand”, although the first two are clearly epenthetic versions which have eliminated all but the conjugational ending of the verb.

Once more, we can find large numbers of calques from various areas of life which would not so likely have been deliberate coinages created by lexicographers, as the following examples from Rammelmeyer (1975) illustrate (hyphens here indicate morpheme boundaries and do not reflect orthographical convention):

- |       |                                  |   |     |                                   |   |
|-------|----------------------------------|---|-----|-----------------------------------|---|
| (7)   | bodljivo svinjce<br>prickly pig  | <   | Gm. | Stachels-chwein<br>prickly pig    | ‘porcupine’                             |
| (8)   | brako-lom<br>marriage-break      | <   | Gm. | Ehe-bruch<br>marriage-break       | ‘adultery’                              |
| (9)   | dugo-prst-ic<br>long-finger-AGV  | <   | Gm. | Lang-finger<br>long-finger        | ‘thief’                                 |
| (10)  | dzep-arac<br>pocket-money        | <   | Gm. | Taschen-geld<br>pocket-money      | ‘allowance’                             |
| (11a) | is-puh<br>out-puff               | <   | Gm. | Aus-puff<br>out-puff              | ‘exhaust’                               |
| (11b) | auspuh                           | —variant of (11a), a loanblend and, according to Rammelmeyer, a folk etymology. |     |                                   |   |
| (12)  | iz-luft-ati<br>out-air-INF       | <   | Gm. | aus-luft-en<br>out-air-INF        | ‘to air out’<br>(loanblend)             |
| (13)  | iz-nos<br>out-carry (noun)       | <   | Gm. | Be-trag<br>CAUS-carry (noun)      | ‘amount, sum<br>(e.g. total on a bill)’ |
| (14)  | kameno-lom<br>stone-break (noun) | <   | Gm. | Stein-bruch<br>stone-break (noun) | ‘quarry’                                |
| (15)  | kreditno sposoban<br>credit able | <   | Gm. | kredit-fähig<br>credit-able       | ‘credit-worthy’                         |

- (16) leden-jak < Gm. Eis-vogel 'kingfisher'  
 ice-AGV ice-bird  
 (here the association with ice seems to be rather arbitrary)
- (17a) u-pad-ljiv < Gm. auf-fäll-ig 'conspicuous'  
 at-fall-ADJ at-fall-ADJ
- (17b) u oci padajuc < Gm. in die Auge fallen 'catch someone's eye'  
 'fall in the eye' 'fall in the eye'

Example (17b) approaches the type of borrowings I have referred to as “complex calques”. More such complex calques are demonstrated by the following examples:

- (18) Cr. iz-davati se za koga (za sto)  
 out-give Refl.Pron. for someone-ACC (for something-ACC)
- Gm. sich für jemanden (für etwas) ausgeben  
 Refl.Pron. for someone-ACC (for something-ACC) out-give  
 'pretend to be (i.e., imitate, impersonate) someone (something)'

- (19a) iz-loziti (dijete) < (ein Kind) aus-setzen  
 out-set-INF (child-ACC) (a child-ACC) out-set  
 'to expose' (as in a child to something like the weather)

There is likewise a reflexive expression:

- (19b) iz-loziti se (opasnosti) < sich (einer Gefahr) aussetzen  
 out-set-INF Refl.Pron. danger-DAT Refl.Pron. danger-DAT out-set-INF  
 'to expose oneself (to a danger)'
- (20) o-dugo-vlačiti < in die Länge ziehen  
 PF-long-pull/draw in the length pull  
 'drag out, hesitate'

Although Rammelmeyer lists over three hundred calques, I have tried to pick out a number that are not likely to be “learned calques”, i.e., the type that would be created rather deliberately and artificially by lexicographers. The words in this list come from various walks of life: finance, nature, industry, domestic life, and the streets. Of course, there are large numbers of a military, scientific, legal, academic, or technical nature, and these are much more numerous. But I think the sampling above at least begins to demonstrate that there must have been considerable spoken contact between Germans and Croats during the period in question, especially in the larger towns such as Zagreb, and that the Croats often did have a good command of German, not only in terms of their knowledge of root words, but also in their knowledge of German derivational patterns.

### 5.3 Syntactic borrowing through the lexicon

I begin this section by pointing out that one commonly cited Balkan areal “structural” feature might just as well be classified as a lexical feature; that is, it is somewhere between lexical and grammatical in nature. The “one-on-ten” construction for the numbers 11 to 19 is cited by Schaller (1975:150–51) as a Balkanism, with due attention to the fact that it was present in OCS (Birnbäum (1965:21) also notes its presence in all of Slavic), and to the fact that this formation pattern is also found in Hungarian. One should also note that this pattern has been extended in Hungarian to the numbers 21 to 29. In addition to its presence in Hungarian, and in Balkan and other Slavic languages, this feature is also found in Albanian and Rumanian, so it is probably correct to refer to it as a Balkan Sprachbund feature, although it is not exclusively Balkan. I am in partial agreement over its classification as a grammatical feature, however, since it is perhaps more accurately described as a word-formation pattern, and one that affects only a very limited number of lexical items. So it does not have the extensiveness in terms of the lexicon that one looks for in a Sprachbund feature.

One feature occurring in Zagreb dialects of Serbo-Croatian that points to calquing as a source of structural change is an example of syntactic calquing noticed by Thomas Magner. Magner (1966:48) points to the tendency in this dialect, following a likely model of German, to use adverbs rather than the usual Slavic means of prefixation to express direction in verbal expression. Thus, we have (standard) SC *silazim* ‘I go down/descend’ vs. Zagreb *ja idem dole* after the Gm. *ich gehe hinunter*, and SC *izlazim* ‘I go out’ vs. Zagreb *ja idem van* < Gm. *ich gehe hinaus*. Magner lists several such examples, claiming that this usage is “extensive” and “preferred” in this dialect.

I believe that the important point to be gleaned from this example is that, if certain parallel turns of phrases are calqued, and there are enough of them affecting a large enough class of lexical items, such as verbs of motion as in this example, then we have the beginnings of structural diffusion. This, essentially, is the observation that has been made by King (2000). In other words, new grammatical patterns can “creep in”, so to speak, at the grammatical level. I do not bring up this instance of calquing in one limited dialect of SC in order to suggest it as a Sprachbund feature (though it probably should be investigated further), but rather to illustrate further the notion of “structural diffusion through the lexicon” that was discussed above for numeral formations. More attention needs to be devoted to the type and extent of calquing observable in contact situations, something that Unbegaun no doubt saw the need for when writing his comparison of the Balkan and central European areas in the quote above.

## 6 Conclusion

While Thomason and Kaufman’s scale provides largely adequate criteria for determining the closeness of contact between languages, it seems to me that the scale could be refined somewhat in terms of its use of lexical transfer as a measure. Their consideration of lexical transfer does not distinguish between borrowing of single lexical items and calquing, even though the latter sometimes may require a more sophisticated know-

ledge of the L2 than the former does. In other words, as we have seen from many of the foregoing examples, rather precise word-formation patterns may often be invoked in translating not only root words, but also less obvious linguistic structures such as diminutive suffixes. To be certain, the transfer of morphological and syntactic features from L2 to L1 is an indicator of a closer contact situation than mere lexical transfer generally is. But perhaps in some situations, a more refined knowledge of the L2 may result in a greater ease in switching between L1 and L2, in switching between disparate structures or linguistic systems without interference occurring. In such a situation of more highly developed bilingualism, might not the greatest sign of close contact actually be lexical transfer in the form of calquing, rather than grammatical transfer?

Unbegaun (1932:47) writes of several German-influenced Slavic languages under consideration that “the four languages in question, Croatian, Slovene, Czech and Sorbian, all offer in effect the common trait of being spoken by populations more or less bilingual and accustomed to making use of calques to some extent”. He concludes his article with the following words:

We have spoken for a long time of the linguistic community of the Balkan world, a community which affirms itself by general traits of vocabulary and syntax, and indeed of morphology. But, if we someday take to determining a similar community of central Europe, it is the calque which will be its most characteristic indicator. (1932:48)

Unbegaun is probably correct to observe that Croats’ bilingualism is “less developed” (28) than that of the Czechs (where something approaching structural influence can be observed in the development of a quasi-definite article and a quasi-compound perfect tense with ‘have’ + past participle). He is also right, in my opinion, to include the Croats in a central European “linguistic community” or Sprachbund, even if their participation in it tends to be somewhat less pronounced, somewhat more at the peripheries of the linguistic area.

### References:

- BANAC, IVO. 1984. Main trends in the Croatian language question. *Aspects of the Slavic language question. Volume I: Church Slavonic—South Slavic—West Slavic*, ed. by Riccardo Picchio and Harvey Goldblatt, 189–259. New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies.
- BIRNBAUM, HENRIK. 1965. Balkanslavisch und Südslavisch: Zur Rechtweite der Balkanismen im südslavischen Sprachraum. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 3.12–63.
- CAMPBELL, LYLE; TERRENCE KAUFMAN; and THOMAS C. SMITH-STARK. 1986. Meso-America as a linguistic area. *Language* 26.34.530–70.

- DÉCSY, GYULA. 1973. *Die linguistische Struktur Europas*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- GULDESCU, STANKO. 1970. *The Croatian-Slavonian Kingdom: 1526–1792*. The Hague: Mouton.
- HADROVICS, L. 1985. The status of the Croatian regional languages immediately before Gaj's Reforms. *The formation of the Slavonic literary languages*, ed. by Gerald Stone and Dean Worth, 133–46. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- HAMP, ERIC. 1979. Linguistic areas or clusters? *Quatrième Congrès International des Études du Sud-est Européen: Abrégés des communications*, 282–83. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- HAMP, ERIC. 1989. Yugoslavia – a crossroads of Sprachbünde. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 25. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- HAUGEN, EINAR. 1953. *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior. Vol. I: The bilingual community. Vol. II: The American dialects of Norwegian*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. (Reprinted 1969.)
- JOSEPH, BRIAN D. 1983. *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive: A study in areal, general, and historical linguistics*. (Cambridge studies in linguistics, Supplementary volume 1.) Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- KATICIĆ, RADOSLAV. 1984. The making of standard Serbo-Croatian. *Aspects of the Slavic language question. Volume I: Church Slavonic—South Slavic—West Slavic*, ed. by Riccardo Picchio and Harvey Goldblatt. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- KESSLER, WOLFGANG. 1981. *Politik, Kultur und Gesellschaft in Kroatien und Slawonien in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts: Historiographie und Grundlagen*. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag.
- KING, RUTH. 2000. *The lexical basis of grammatical borrowing: A Prince Edward Island French case study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- MAGNER, THOMAS F. 1966. *A Zagreb Kajkavian dialect*. (The Pennsylvania State University studies 18.) University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.
- PIŠKOREC, VELIMER. 1997. *Deutsches Lehngut in der kajkavischen Mundart von Durđevac in Kroatien. Schriften zur deutschen Sprache in Österreich, Band 22*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- RAMMELMEYER, MATTHIAS. 1975. *Die deutschen Lehnübersetzungen im Serbokroatischen: Beiträge zur Lexikologie und Wortbildung*. Franz Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag.

SCHALLER, HELMUT W. 1975. *Die Balkansprachen: I Eine Einführung in die Balkanphilologie*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

THOMASON, SARAH. 2001. *Language contact*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

THOMASON, SARAH GREY, and TERRENCE KAUFMAN. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

UNBEGAUN, BORIS. 1932. Le calque dans les langues slaves littéraires. *Revue des études slaves* 12.19–48.

WINFORD, DONALD. 2003. *An introduction to contact linguistics*. (Language in society 33.) Oxford: Blackwell.