

SANJA ŠKIFIĆ — ANITA PAVIĆ PINTARIĆ

LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY IN CROATIA: HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVES ON LANGUAGE CONTACT (AND CONFLICT) IN THE ZADAR AND VARAŽDIN REGIONS

COBISS: 1.01

[HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.3986/JZ.30.2.06](https://doi.org/10.3986/JZ.30.2.06)

This article deals with historical and contemporary language contact between Croatian on the one hand and Italian and German on the other in the Zadar and Varaždin regions. It focuses on language contact identifiable in the analysis of linguistic items related to space and occurrences in space. Because language contact frequently results in language conflict, it also considers the possibility of correlating the two phenomena based on a corpus analysis and from the perspective of three areas of interest: language, individual language user(s), and society. The findings suggest that there is a difference between coastal and continental language contact and conflict in manners of naming places, but also that the contemporary language conflict between the languages analyzed is not as prominent as it was in the past.


Keywords: language contact, language conflict, Croatian, Italian loanwords, German loanwords

Jezikovna raznolikost na Hrvaškem: zgodovinske in sodobne perspektive jezikovnega stika (in konfliktov) v zadrski in varaždinski regiji

Prispevek obravnava zgodovinski in sodobni jezikovni stik med hrvaškim jezikom ter italijanskim in nemškim jezikom v zadrski in varaždinski regiji. Poudarek je na jezikovnem stiku, prepoznavnem pri analizi jezikovnih postavk, povezanih s prostorom in dogajanjem v prostoru. Ker jezikovni stik pogosto privede do jezikovnega konflikta, se prav tako upošteva možnost povezave obeh pojavov na podlagi analiziranega korpusa in z vidika treh področij zanimanja: jezika, posameznega uporabnika jezika in družbe. Rezultati kažejo, da obstaja razlika med obmorskim in celinskim jezikovnim stikom in konfliktom v načinih poimenovanja kraja, hkrati pa tudi, da sodobni jezikovni konflikt med analiziranimi jeziki ni tako izrazit, kot je bil v preteklosti.

Ključne besede: jezikovni stik, jezikovni konflikt, hrvaški jezik, italijanske izposojenke, nemške izposojenke

Sanja Škifić ■ Sveučilište u Zadru, Odjel za anglistiku ■ sskific@unizd.hr ■

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9858-7852>

Anita Pavić Pintarić ■ Sveučilište u Zadru, Odjel za germanistiku ■

apintari@unizd.hr ■  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5105-9999>



1 INTRODUCTION

In linguistics, language contact has been analyzed from a number of different perspectives. Because language contact relies on human contact, the analyses frequently include insight into the sociocultural dimension of a particular language contact situation. It is also due to the connection between language and human contact that studies of language conflict emerged. Each human contact includes the possibility of conflict, and this holds true for human contacts that include language. Although some scholars dealing with language conflict believe that every language contact includes some form of language conflict,¹ it can be questioned whether the coexistence of the two is necessary. Thus, the correlation between the two might be formulated by saying that (language) contact merely includes the possibility of (language) conflict. De Vries (1990) discusses two types of language conflict, whereby one occurs exclusively at the linguistic level, including contact between two linguistic systems, and the second includes contact between different linguistic communities. The latter may be manifested, for example, through linguistic minorities' demands for greater (linguistic) rights. Both analyses of language contact and language conflict may include focus on linguistic borrowing, instances of language use, and the social context (cf. Darquennes 2015: 9).

Croatia has had a turbulent history, and Croatian has come into contact with a number of different languages. Historically speaking, the most relevant and long-standing contacts include those with German and Italian due to foreign rule in different parts of Croatia. The Italian linguistic influence is most evident in coastal parts of Croatia (cf. Sočanac 2002: 133), whereas the influence of German is most evident in continental parts of Croatia (cf. Dragičević 2005). In the more contemporary context, Italians and Germans are recognized by the Croatian Constitution as among the twenty-two national minorities in Croatia. According to the 2021 census, Italians account for 0.36% of the population of Croatia and Germans account for 0.08%.² Today most Germans live in Osijek–Baranja County, Zagreb County, and Split–Dalmatia County,³ and most Italians live in Istria County, Primorje–Gorski Kotar County, Požega–Slavonia County, and Zagreb.⁴ The extent and nature of the presence of German and Italian as minority languages in the places in Croatia where most Italians and Germans live, but also elsewhere, is highly complex, and it became a more prominent issue especially after the European

1 See Section 2 regarding Nelde's First Law.

2 See GRC 1, <https://pravamanjina.gov.hr/nacionalne-manjine/nacionalne-manjine-u-republici-hrvatskoj/352>.

3 See GRC 2, <https://pravamanjina.gov.hr/nacionalne-manjine/nacionalne-manjine-u-republici-hrvatskoj/nijemci-i-austrijanci/373>.

4 See GRC 3, <https://pravamanjina.gov.hr/nacionalne-manjine/nacionalne-manjine-u-republici-hrvatskoj/talijani/381>.

Charter for Regional or Minority Languages entered into force in Croatia in 1998. Since then, Croatia has focused more on protecting and promoting its minority languages, and their status in Croatia is assessed by the Council of Europe's Committee of Experts.⁵

As the book by Pavić Pintarić and Škifić (2021) about the language of space in the Zadar region shows, many loanwords, mostly of Italian origin, are used for naming open and closed spaces. Italian loanwords are used for relief (e.g., *talaferma*), living (e.g., *pjanterin*), housing (e.g., *pergul*), and the sea (e.g., *sika*). Many Italian verbal loanwords also denote sailing and navigation (e.g., *burdižati*, *imbarkati*, *takati*). German loanwords naming space are not as numerous and mostly refer to closed spaces, such as *bajbok*, *birtija*, *šupa*, and *štala*. Culturally specific expressions primarily include nouns and verbs of movement that refer to the way of life and activities that people engage in within the types of space analyzed. It is therefore challenging to compare two different geographical spaces (seaside and continental) to investigate the role that German and Italian loanwords play in the linguistic expression of space.

This article focuses on historical and contemporary language contact and conflict between Croatian versus Italian and German in the Zadar and Varaždin regions (the former in the coastal area and the latter in the continental part of Croatia), with special attention to the characteristics of the sociohistorical context of contact between different cultures and languages that has led to the creation of space-related terms. The reason why these two regions were chosen for the research is that in the past Italian was the dominant foreign language in Zadar and it is still used in certain parts of Croatia on a daily basis, whereas German was dominant in Varaždin.⁶ Due to different dominant sources of borrowing in coastal and continental parts of Croatia and the contact between Croatian and Italian and between Croatian and German, it is possible to analyze potential language conflict through a comparison of the linguistic situation in the two areas. The linguistic items analyzed refer to space and various occurrences in space. This small-scale study investigates space-related terms that usually refer to people's way of life. Linguistic strategies for expressing spatial relations are a suitable source for investigating multilingualism. The environment that people live in shapes their vocabulary related to space.

The research questions are the following: What is the nature of language contact in the two Croatian regions? What types of language conflict can be identified

⁵ See, for example, Council of Europe (2020), *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Report of the Committee of Experts Presented to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in Accordance with Article 16 of the Charter, Sixth Report: Croatia*, <https://rm.coe.int/croatiaecrml6-en-rm2-docx/16809ec2e9>.

⁶ Zadar and Varaždin were chosen for this research because of the interest of both authors of this article, who had already investigated German and Italian loanwords in the language of both regions (e.g. Pavić Pintarić 2007; Pavić Pintarić – Škifić 2021).

in the two Croatian regions? What is the intensity of language conflict from a contemporary perspective? To answer these research questions, dictionaries and other sources dealing with space-related terms were consulted, and a questionnaire was administered to residents of the two regions. The aim of the questionnaire was to determine how familiar residents of the Zadar and Varaždin regions are with Croatian space-related terms of different origins, their attitudes toward borrowings, and language use. The questionnaire consisted of three parts and was administered among 110 residents of the Zadar and Varaždin regions from May to September 2022. Among the participants, fifty-two were from the Zadar region, and fifty-eight were from the Varaždin region.

2 LANGUAGE CONTACT AND CONFLICT

Language conflict is inextricably connected with language contact.⁷ This has been attested by many scholars that have analyzed language conflict, and it is most evident in the formulation of Nelde's First Law (cf. Salverda 2003: 130), one of the basic principles of conflict linguistics referring to the assumption that each language contact situation includes some form of language conflict. Because language is a means of human interaction, the analyses of the broader relationship between human contact and human conflict may also be taken into consideration in evaluating the validity of this assumption. Thus, Vallacher et al. (2013: 1) claim that "conflict is inherent in virtually every aspect of human encounter," and Oberschall (1978: 291) states that "conflict results from purposeful interaction among two or more parties in a competitive setting." Although Janicki (2015) perceives different manifestations of conflict as avoidable by means of careful and conscious language use, the author also makes reference to other scholars such as Hamelink (2011), who holds that "conflict is built into human relations and we cannot eliminate it" (cited in Janicki 2015: 1).

The close connection between language contact and language conflict is revealed in the identification of the overlap of the main areas of interest in the analyses of the two phenomena. Drawing on Nelde (1992) and Clyne (1996), Darquennes (2015: 9) discusses three such areas: language, individual language user(s), and society. According to Darquennes (2015), the three areas may clearly be distinguished in the sense that the "language" area refers to conflict at the intra-linguistic level (related to situations of linguistic borrowing), the "individual language

7 Although the notion of linguistic purism is not the central concept analyzed in this article, language contact and conflict are often related to issues associated with that concept. There is substantial literature dealing with linguistic purism. Thomas (1991), for example, discusses the distinction between external and internal linguistic purism.

user(s)” area refers to conflict that arises in actual language use (related to the use of different languages or language varieties in interpersonal language contact), and the “society” area refers to conflict that arises at the social level (related to the relationship between language, nationalism, and ethnic identity). Obviously, Nelde’s view (1997: 294) concerning the absence of symmetrical multilingualism appears most closely related to instances of social language conflict, where the focus is not so much on purely linguistic processes, but on issues related to power dynamics and status relations in a given social context.

To identify the common characteristics of social conflict and social language conflict, one can apply Coser’s (1957: 232) definition of social conflict as “a struggle over values or claims to status, power, and scarce resources, in which the aims of the conflict groups are not only to gain the desired values, but also to neutralize, injure, or eliminate rivals” (cited in Oberschall 1978: 291). Although the second part of the definition, in which neutralization and elimination of rivals is mentioned, might seem too extreme if applied to certain manifestations of social language conflict, the common characteristics of the two concepts are definitely found in the first part of the definition, which emphasizes the concepts of values, status, and power. Furthermore, in discussing social conflict, Coser (1957: 203) emphasizes that “there is never complete concordance between what individuals and groups within a system consider their just due and the system of allocation.” In contexts in which different linguistic groups do not feel that they have equal access to power or resources due to their ethnic or national background, language may be placed at the focus of such conflicts and struggles for equal rights.

On the other hand, in discussing the relationship between language conflict and violence, Laitin (2000: 532) claims that, in comparison to different manifestations of cultural conflict, language conflict has its own dynamics. This is attested by several findings, including the following: “the greater the language difference between the language of the minority group and that of the dominant group, the *lower* is the probability of violence,” and “language grievances when compounded by religious grievances (which are a reasonable predictor of rebellion) strongly and significantly *reduce* the magnitude of rebellion” (Laitin 2000: 532–533). One may conclude that, although there are similarities between different types of social conflict and language conflict, each has its own dynamic and set of idiosyncrasies, which becomes evident in cases in which some sort of social conflict interacts with language conflict. It is also noticeable that most recently scholars have started placing significant focus on the role of language in war and conflict. As attested by Kelly et al. (2019), in such analyses the methodology relies significantly on those applied in the humanities and social sciences—specifically, linguistics, war studies, translation studies, and transnational history. Within linguistics, areas that are most relevant for such analyses of conflict are ideologies of language, language

planning, language policy, multilingualism and contact between languages, linguistic landscapes, and status and prestige of different languages (cf. Kelly et al. 2019: 9).

Depending on the type of language conflict at hand, in most cases its analysis requires some sort of insight into the extralinguistic context. This means that both the social theories of conflict and the linguistic theories of language conflict need to be equally mutually informed. However, Jeffries and O’Driscoll (2019: 7) note the following:

Just as conflict scholars employ insights from linguistics on an ad hoc and partial basis, so linguistic scholarship has employed a scatter-gun approach to the social, focusing either on particular issues or events in order to advance theory or on particular settings in order to describe the nature of interaction within it. In both cases, conflict swims in and out of view, just one element of a larger whole.

Moreover, the close connection between the extralinguistic and linguistic aspects of conflict in society are clearly revealed in analyses of “language-oriented surface syndrome”, which arises in situations in which “over time, as a conflict regarding political, economic or other resources evolves, language takes up much more importance than it had at the start of the conflict” (Deen – Romans 2018: 5). This suggests that the line between what may be termed social conflict on the one hand and language conflict on the other may seem blurred at times, which is also revealed in the analyses of different language policies, whose aim might be to prevent and/or reduce both linguistic and non-linguistic conflict. Moreover, in a discussion of the role of language in human conflict causation and resolution, Chilton (1998: 2) emphasizes the fact that “language is profoundly implicated in all human social activity and cannot easily be isolated as a specific causal factor in violent conflicts.”

In relation to the three main areas of interest in the analysis of language contact and conflict, this article focuses on the language area by investigating space-related terms in Croatian that were borrowed from Italian and German. This is why special attention is paid to the characteristics of the sociohistorical context of contacts between different cultures and languages that led to the creation of such space-related terms. However, in addition to the “language” area, the study also focuses on the “individual language user(s)” area because it is possible to analyze the use of borrowed items from the two languages in different Croatian regions, which may lead to the creation of conflict at the level of interpersonal communication between speakers of different varieties of Croatian. In the case of social language conflict, it is necessary to evaluate this from both a historical and contemporary perspective.

3 LANGUAGE CONTACT AND LEXICAL BORROWING: ITALIAN AND GERMAN LOANWORDS IN CROATIAN

Tadmor (2009) identifies open-class words as more frequently borrowed lexical items than function words (cited in Seifart 2019: 16). It is no surprise that, in situations of borrowing linguistic material from other languages, lexical borrowing features strongly in analyses of language conflict. Davies and Dubinsky's (2018: 32) discussion of "the politics of borrowing words" reveals just how deeply the ease or difficulty of accepting a foreign element is embedded in the non-linguistic context the borrowing takes place in. For example, the authors discuss the resistance of the Francophone community in Quebec toward borrowings, especially those from English (Davies – Dubinsky 2018: 32). Matras (2019: 152) discusses motivations for borrowing and identifies the two most prominent ones: gaps in the recipient language and the prestige of the donor language. Obviously, the latter motivation is much more interesting from a sociolinguistic perspective because the analyses of the perceived statuses and levels of prestige of different languages or language varieties reveal a strong possibility of the emergence of language conflict due to the connection of the status of a language or a variety to the status of its speakers.

Various reasons have led to a number of loanwords from other languages that were in contact with Croatian during different historical periods. The history of contact with Italian, German, and Hungarian is very long because Croatia was part of the Habsburg Monarchy and the Republic of Venice. As Sočanac (2005: 10) points out, contacts between Croatian, French, Russian, and English are of recent date and refer to cultural borrowings, which may be connected to, for example, the significance of French and Russian literature in the nineteenth century.

What follows is an overview of Italian and German loanwords that have entered Croatian due to different sociohistorical and cultural reasons. As stated in the previous section, language contact may include certain forms of language conflict. Because Italian and German have been in contact with Croatian during various time periods, both as languages of the administration and as minority languages, this should provide sufficient information about language conflict.

3.1 Italian loanwords in Croatian

Croatia's geographical position, often denoted as a border between the East and the West, played an important role in shaping Croatian cultural identity and destiny throughout history. As Sočanac (2004: 50) points out, the Romance influence was strong on the Croatian Adriatic coast—in Istria, Dalmatia, and Dubrovnik—whereas the continental part of the country was less exposed to this influence. According to Sočanac (*ibid*: 103), Romance influence was strong in these areas from the beginning of Croatian settlements there.

Croatians first came in contact with varieties of Dalmatian Romance,⁸ which gradually became extinct. With Venetian rule over Istria and Dalmatia, it was the Venetian language that became the language of the ruling class as well as the dominant language of trade and navigation in the Mediterranean. Due to Dalmatian students that were educated at universities in Bologna and Padua, Tuscan was regarded as the language of culture. After the fall of Venice and a short period of Napoleonic rule, Dalmatia and Dubrovnik came under the rule of Austria (Sočanac 2002: 133). Italian remained the language of administration and education during the nineteenth century, and the language of offices and courts until 1912.

The century-long Croatian–Italian bilingualism on the coast was gradually lost in a number of localities⁹ through the affirmation of Croatian as the official language after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. However, many loanwords remained in the local dialects, marking tradition and local identity. In the nineteenth century, due to the development of various professions, there was a need for terminology, for which certain words were borrowed from Italian. Sočanac (2004: 190–192) lists many of them, connected to music (e.g., *violina, kantata, duet, sopran*), art (e.g., *pastel, sfumato*), architecture (e.g., *citadela, kupola*), literature (e.g., *burleska, pajac*), trade and banking (e.g., *banka, bjanko, kasa*), and in recent times cuisine (types of pasta, cheese, salami, dishes, and drinks). The Croatian standard incorporated some loanwords from dialects referring to the sea (e.g., *bonaca, laguna, marina*), fish (e.g., *brancin, orada*), vessels (e.g., *barka, gondola*), and sea winds (e.g., *bura, maestral, tramontana*). Several Italian exclamations also entered standard Croatian: *bravo, basta*, and *čin-čin* (a toast).

Because this research refers to Italian influence on dialects of the town of Zadar and its region, the discussion below addresses Italian loanwords in that area. According to Marković (2019: 78), Italian loanwords are mostly present in Zadar's lexicon, followed by German and Turkish loanwords. Marković (2019: 109–123) notes the following semantic fields in which Italian loanwords are present: the individual (body and clothes; e.g., *škîna, štûmak, bälav, franzëte, šârpa*), the family (kitchen, house, and life in the family; e.g., *škâfa, pîrija, katrîda, intimëla*), at sea (e.g., *bonäca, prôva*), and crafts (e.g., *fjòk, roštjêra, fratacîn, livël*). Many loanwords are found in local dialects referring to groceries and food (e.g., *armelin, baškotin, biži, fritä, čičvarda, kapula, kukumar, marenda*) or preparing food (e.g., *gradele, pašabrod, teća, terina*) (cf. Kolanović 2001: 62–69).

8 Dalmatian Romance is a long-extinct indigenous group of Romance varieties that emerged in early medieval Dalmatia. It initially disappeared due to Slavic ethnic dominance and the significance of Venetian, which became the dominant Romance language (Sočanac 2004: 69).

9 The use of Italian is still quite noticeable in certain parts of Croatia, especially in Istria (see, e.g., Lalli Pačelat et al. (2020) regarding official bilingualism in Istria County).

3.2 German loanwords in Croatian

German influenced the continental part of Croatia. Contact began in the eighth and ninth centuries and lasted until the beginning of the twentieth century. According to Dragičević (2005: 85–88), the oldest document mentioning settlers from German-speaking countries (the so-called hospites) in Varaždin dates back to the thirteenth century. Habsburg rule over this part of Croatia began in the sixteenth century, when German and Austrian nobility were given land. The settlers that came were craftsmen and merchants, then doctors, pharmacists, and officers from today's Austria and southern Germany. During the reign of Maria Theresia and Joseph II in the eighteenth century, German was introduced in a large area of today's Croatia as the official language of the army, judiciary, and education, suppressing the dominant role of Latin. At the end of the eighteenth century, German was the language of the aristocracy and the educated part of the population, who studied at universities in German-speaking areas (in Vienna, Graz, Munich, and Berlin). After the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, German lost its prestigious status in Croatia. In today's standard Croatian, there are relatively few German loanwords (e.g., *šunka, cilj, šank, ribizl*), but they are still numerous in colloquial speech and dialects, mostly in northern and northwestern parts of Croatia. German played a role as a mediator language in borrowing loanwords from other languages, thanks to which many internationalisms or Europeanisms came into Croatian, such as *banknota, bankrot, bilanca, and luster* (Dragičević 2005: 89).

Stojić and Turk (2017: 36) present a detailed list of German loanwords according to the time of borrowing and emphasize the periods of the development of German: Old High German from 759 to 1050, Middle High German from 1050 to 1350, Early High German from 1350 to 1650, and New High German since 1650. They differentiate between loanwords from Germanic languages into Slavic languages in general (e.g., *badanj, bukva, hiža, hljeb, kabao*), loanwords from Old High German (e.g., *crkva, kloštar, pop*), loanwords from Middle High German (e.g., *ceh, cilj, graba*), and so on.

Examination of the dictionary of the dialect spoken in Varaždin by Pavić Pintarić (2007) revealed 1,929 German loanwords, mainly nouns, in the following semantic fields: food and kitchen (e.g., *bišofsbrot, cukerpeker, flajšmašina, kifl*), craft (e.g., *cokl, cvikcange, kramp, špahtl*), household (e.g., *brifkasl, ceker, špajza*), clothing (e.g., *ciferšlus, gojzerice, šos, štrample*), festivals and leisure (e.g., *fašnik, Krampus, ringšpil*), personal characteristics (e.g., *cvikeraš, hohštapler, huncut*), and occupations (e.g., *bedinerica, šinter, tapecirer*).

4 FAMILIARITY WITH BORROWED SPACE-RELATED TERMS, ATTITUDES TOWARD BORROWINGS, AND LANGUAGE USE

This section presents the research methodology, findings, and discussion.

4.1 Methodology

The research was conducted from May to September 2022 to determine familiarity with the meaning and origin of Croatian space-related terms of various origins among residents of the Zadar and Varaždin regions, their attitudes toward borrowings, and language use. The research included a questionnaire partially administered via Google forms and partially distributed in written form. The study included 110 participants, who were guaranteed complete anonymity in dissemination of the findings.

The questionnaire consisted of three parts. In the first part, the participants were asked to provide information about their age, sex, level of education, place of birth, place of residence, and duration of residence. They were also asked to identify, among the following, the languages that they knew or spoke: Italian, German, Turkish, English, and Hungarian. These languages were included in this part of the questionnaire because Italian, German, Turkish, and Hungarian are the languages Croatian has been in contact with for lengthy periods of time, and their speakers are among the twenty-two national minorities in Croatia. English is included because of its increased contemporary contact with Croatian. Because this study sought to learn more about language conflict with regard to Italian and German in two different regions, these two languages were offered to participants in the second part of the questionnaire, which consisted of thirty space-related terms (nouns and motion verbs) borrowed from Italian and German.¹⁰ For each of the thirty terms, the participants were first asked to state whether they were familiar with the term and then to identify its origin. The languages of origin that they could choose from were the following: English, Italian, German, Hungarian, and Turkish. On the historical contact and influence of Turkish, see Juraga (2010) and Vranić and Zubčić (2013), and for Hungarian see Turk (1997) and Stolac (2020). On the contemporary influence of English, see Drljača (2006) and Patekar (2019). Italian and German space-related terms included the following (in order of appearance on the questionnaire):¹¹

¹⁰ The terms on the questionnaire are discussed by various authors mentioned earlier. The origins of the terms are detailed in previous studies and in lexicographic sources such as *Hrvatski jezični portal* (<https://hjp.znanje.hr/>).

¹¹ The participants were presented with the thirty terms together with the five languages among which they had to identify the origin of the term. Here the terms are presented together with their part of speech, English gloss, and origin (n. = noun, v. = verb, I. = Italian origin, G. = German origin).

1. *laguna* n. 'lagoon' I.
2. *haustor* n. 'doorway' G.
3. *marina* n. 'marina' I.
4. *forum* n. 'forum'¹²
5. *birtija* n. 'bar, pub' G.
6. *gepek* n. 'trunk (of a car)' G.
7. *pijaca* n. 'marketplace' I.
8. *špajza* n. 'pantry' G.
9. *kasarna* n. 'barracks' G.
10. *kantun* n. 'corner' I.
11. *đirati* v. 'to walk about' I.
12. *dofurati* v. 'to bring' G.
13. *arivati* v. 'to arrive' I.
14. *došlepati* v. 'to tow' G.
15. *moviti se* v. 'to move' I.
16. *vižitati* v. 'to visit, inspect' I.
17. *špalcir* n. 'stroll' G.
18. *peškati* v. 'to fish' I.
19. *šlafcimer* n. 'bedroom' G.
20. *kuridur* n. 'corridor' I.
21. *docukati* v. 'to bring, tow' G.
22. *butiga* n. 'shop' I.
23. *buža* n. 'hole' I.
24. *becirk* n. 'district' G.
25. *laufati* v. 'to run around' G.
26. *pržun* n. 'prison' I.
27. *šloseraj* n. 'locksmith shop' G.
28. *štrant* n. 'beach' G.
29. *kapunjera* n. 'henhouse' I.
30. *bajbok* n. 'prison' G.

The third part of the questionnaire asked the participants the following questions:

1. Do you believe there are too many loanwords (terms of foreign origin) in Croatian? Explain your answer.
2. Do you believe other languages are a threat to Croatian? If so, which and why? Explain your answer.
3. Do you believe that instead of loanwords more native Croatian terms should be used? Explain your answer.
4. If there is a Croatian equivalent of a term of foreign origin for a concept, do you try to use the Croatian term instead of one of foreign origin? Explain your answer.
5. Do you encounter difficulties when communicating with speakers of Croatian dialects other than your own? If yes, which? Provide terms from other Croatian dialects that were not understandable to you when communicating with their speakers.

¹² The word *forum*, originally not Italian but of Latin origin, survived various administrations in Zadar, including the prominent Venetian one. The old *Forum* in Zadar is a landmark, together with the main street, *Kalelarga*, both very important for the life of the town (Pavić Pintarić – Škifić 2021: 64).

4.2 Findings

This section presents the findings of the research. After an overview of the participants' profiles, the findings related to the participants' familiarity with Croatian space-related terms of different origin are presented, followed by a presentation of the findings related to the participants' attitudes toward loanwords in Croatian and their language use.

4.2.1 Participants' profiles

Tables 1 and 2 present information on the participants from the Zadar and Varaždin region: their sex, age, highest educational level achieved, and knowledge of foreign languages.

Table 1: Participants from the Zadar region (n = 52: six males, 11.5%; 46 females, 88.5%)

Age		Education level, n (%)				Foreign languages, n (%)			
Range	n (%)	HS	B	M	D	Eng.	Germ.	Turk.	Ital.
11–20	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
20–40	31 (59.6)	14 (45.2)	9 (29.0)	8 (25.8)	—	27 (87.1)	3 (9.7)	—	1 (3.2)
40–60	21 (40.4)	—	3 (14.3)	16 (76.2)	2 (9.5)	20 (95.2)	—	—	1 (4.8)
60+	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note: **HS** = high school, **B** = bachelor's degree, **M** = master's degree, **D** = doctorate, **Eng.** = English, **Germ.** = German, **Turk.** = Turkish, **Ital.** = Italian.

Table 2: Participants from the Varaždin region (n = 58: 13 males, 22.4%; 45 females, 77.6%)

Age		Education level, n (%)					Foreign languages, n (%)			
Range	n (%)	HS	B	M	D	Other	Eng.	Germ.	Turk.	Ital.
11–20	3 (5.2)	3 (100)	—	—	—	—	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	—	—
20–40	24 (41.4)	3 (12.5)	7 (29.2)	14 (58.3)	—	—	18 (75.0)	4 (16.7)	1 (4.2)	1 (4.2)
40–60	27 (46.6)	10 (37.0)	4 (14.8)	10 (37.0)	2 (7.4)	1 (3.7)	24 (88.9)	2 (7.4)	—	1 (3.7)
60+	4 (6.9)	—	3 (75.0)	1 (25.0)	—	—	1 (25.0)	3 (75.0)	—	—

Note: **HS** = high school; **B** = bachelor's degree; **M** = master's degree; **D** = doctorate; **Eng.** = English; **Germ.** = German; **Turk.** = Turkish; **Ital.** = Italian.

4.2.2 Participants' familiarity with Croatian space-related terms of different origins

This section presents the findings related to participants' familiarity with space-related terms. Among thirty selected terms of German and Italian origin, only one term, *marina*, was known to all fifty-two participants from the Zadar region. The following terms were not familiar to up to five participants: *laguna* (three), *forum* (three), *gepek* (two), *pijaca* (one), *špajza* (two), *kantun* (two), *đirati* (two), *došlepati* (four), *butiga* (four), and *buža* (four). As for the language of origin, there are different findings. Terms of Italian origin used in the Zadar region were

mostly recognized, but there were also some exceptions, even unusual ones. The term *marina*, known to all participants, is of Italian origin, but four participants related it to English. A relation to English was also stated for the term *laguna* by fourteen participants and the term *forum* by one. The term *pijaca*, which is used in everyday speech in the Zadar region, was related to English by one participant and also to Turkish by one. Other terms of Italian origin were related to Turkish and Hungarian; for example, *kantun* was related to Turkish by five participants and to Hungarian by one, *đirati* to Hungarian by three and to Turkish by one, *butiga* to English by three and to Turkish by one, and *buža* to Hungarian by five, to Turkish by three, and to German by one. Terms of German origin—*gepek*, *špajza*, and *došlepiti*—were mostly related to German by the participants. However, five participants related *gepek* to Hungarian, four to Turkish, and one to English. The verb *došlepiti* was related to Hungarian by four participants, to Turkish by three, to English by two, and to Italian by one. *Špajza* was related to Hungarian by thirteen participants, to Turkish by eight, to Italian by five, and to English by one.

The following terms, of either German or Italian origin, were not familiar to up to ten participants: *kapunjera* (six), *haustor* (seven), *birtija* (seven), *kasarna* (seven), *dofurati* (seven), *arivati* (ten), *vižitati* (ten), and *špancir* (ten). *Kapunjera* was mostly related to Italian, but two participants related it to German and one to English. Most participants recognized the German origin of *haustor*, except three that thought it was of Hungarian origin, another three related it to Turkish, and one to Italian. The terms *birtija* and *kasarna* were mostly related to Turkish. Thus, twenty-seven participants related *birtija* to Turkish, eleven to Hungarian, five to Italian, and only nine to German. *Kasarna* was identified as Turkish in origin by seventeen participants, fifteen related it to German, eleven to Italian, and nine to Hungarian. The verb *dofurati* was mostly related to German with the exceptions of ten participants that related it to Hungarian, four to Italian, three to Turkish, and one to English. The other three terms in this group—*arivati*, *vižitati*, and *špancir*—were related to different languages but by a smaller number of participants. *Arivati* was related to English by six participants, and to Hungarian and Turkish by one. *Vižitati* was mostly recognized as Italian, with the exception of eight participants that related it to English and two to German. *Špancir* was related to Hungarian by thirteen participants, to Turkish by three, and to Italian and English by one each.

Up to twenty participants were not familiar with the following terms: *laufati* (twelve), *pržun* (twelve), *peškati* (fourteen), *moviti se* (sixteen), and *šlafcimer* (eighteen). However, most of them recognized their German or Italian origin. The verb *laufati* was mostly related to German, but five participants thought it had a Hungarian origin, five related it to Italian, three to English, and one to Turkish. Another word of German origin, *šlafcimer*, was related mostly to German, with the exception of four participants relating it to Turkish, two to Hungarian, and one

to English. Three terms of Italian origin were also mostly recognized as such. The exceptions were answers of five participants that related *pržun* to Hungarian, four to Turkish, and three to German. *Peškati* was related to Hungarian and Turkish by three participants each, and to German by two, whereas *moviti se* was highly related to English by nineteen participants and to Turkish by three.

More than twenty participants were not familiar with *kuridur* (twenty-five), which was related to Turkish by ten, to English by seven, to Hungarian by four, and to German by two. Others recognized it as an Italian word. More than thirty participants were not familiar with these terms of German origin: *becirk* (thirty-four), *šloseraj* (thirty-five), *bajbok* (thirty-six), *štrant* (forty), and *docukati* (forty-one). Only a small number of them related the terms to the correct language of origin; for example, *bajbok* was related to Turkish by twenty-five participants, to Hungarian by sixteen, to German by seven, to Italian by three, and to English by one. The verb *docukati* was related to Hungarian by sixteen participants, to Italian by thirteen, to German by twelve, to Turkish by ten, and to English by one. *Becirk* was recognized as a German word by twenty-nine participants. Another twelve participants related it to Turkish, ten to Hungarian, and one to Italian. *Štrant* was related to Hungarian by eight participants, to Turkish by five, to English by four, to Italian by three, and to German by thirty-two. *Šloseraj* was related to Hungarian by nine participants, to Turkish by three, and to Italian and English by one each, whereas thirty-eight related it to German.

The findings related to participants from the Varaždin region show differences in comparison to the findings related to participants from the Zadar region. All fifty-eight participants were familiar with terms of German origin that are used in everyday communication: *birtija*, *došlepati*, *haustor*, *laufati*, and *špajza*. However, not all participants related them to German. *Laufati* was related to English by one participant, *došlepati* was related to Hungarian by four, *špajza* to Turkish by three, and to Hungarian by one; *haustor* was related to Turkish by four participants, to Hungarian by three, and to English by two; *birtija* was related to Turkish by fifteen participants, to Hungarian by fifteen, and to English by two.

Terms not familiar to up to five participants are of both German and Italian origin: *gepek* (one), *kantun* (one), *marina* (one), *pijaca* (one), *špancir* (one), *dofurati* (two), *forum* (two), *laguna* (four), and *šlafcimer* (four). However, a smaller number of participants related these terms to other languages. All participants related *špancir* to German, one related *šlafcimer* to English and one to Italian, and others related it to German. *Kantun* was related to German and Turkish by two participants each, to English by one, and the others related it to Italian. *Gepek* was related to Turkish by three participants, to English and Hungarian by two each, and to German by the other fifty-one. The Italian term

marina was related to English by seven participants, to Hungarian by two, and to German by one, whereas *pijaca* was related to Turkish by seven participants, and to Hungarian and German by three each; others correctly related both to Italian. The words *forum* and *laguna* were both related to English by seventeen participants, *forum* was further related to Turkish by six and to German by three, whereas *laguna* was related to Turkish by one. The verb *dofurati* was related to English by nine participants, to Hungarian by eight, to Turkish by five, to Italian by three, and to German by the others.

The terms *butiga* (six), *kasarna* (six), *docukati* (eight), and *đirati* (eight) were not familiar to up to ten participants. Participants related their origin to different languages: *butiga* was related to Turkish by four participants, to Hungarian and English by three each, to German by two, and to Italian by the rest; *đirati* was related to Turkish by ten participants, to Hungarian by four, to English and German by three each, and the rest related it to Italian; *docukati* was related to Hungarian by twelve participants, to Turkish by three, to English by two, to Italian by one, and to German by the rest; and *kasarna* was related to Turkish by fifteen participants, to Italian by ten, to Hungarian by eight, to English by one, and to German by the rest.

Only one term falls in the group of up to twenty participants that were not familiar with it—*šloseraj* (fourteen)—but only one related it to Hungarian, and all others to German. Within the group of up to thirty participants not familiar with the terms were the following: *arivati* (twenty-one), *becirk* (twenty-four), *kuridur* (twenty-four), *bajbok* (twenty-seven), *pržun* (twenty-seven), and *buža* (twenty-nine). Among them, *bajbok* was mostly related to Turkish by twenty-seven participants, to English and German by nine each, to Hungarian by eight, and to Italian by five. Moreover, *kuridur* was highly related to Turkish by eighteen participants, to German and Hungarian by seven each, to English by four, and to Italian by twenty-two. *Buža* was related to Turkish by ten participants, to Hungarian by eight, to German by four, to English by two, and to Italian by thirty-four. *Pržun* was related to Hungarian by nine participants, to Turkish by eight, to German by three, to English by two, and to Italian by thirty-six. Six participants related *becirk* to Turkish, five to Hungarian, two to English, one to Italian, and the rest to German. The verb *arivati* was related to English by eleven participants, to Hungarian by six, to Turkish by three, to German by one, and to Italian by the rest.

More than thirty participants were not familiar with the following terms: *vižitatati* (thirty-three), *štrant* (thirty-four), *moviti se* (forty), *kapunjera* (forty-one), and *peškati* (forty-three). The verb *moviti se* was related to English as well as to Italian by seventeen participants each, to Hungarian by sixteen, to Turkish by six, and to German by two. The verb *peškati* was related to Hungarian by ten participants, to Turkish by eight, to German by five, and to Italian by thirty-five. The verb *vižitatati* was related to English by nine participants, to Turkish by seven, to Hungarian by four, to German

by one, and to Italian by thirty-seven. The German loanword *štrant* was related to Hungarian and Turkish by six participants each, to Italian by three, and to German by forty-three. The Italian loanword *kapunjera* was related to Turkish and Hungarian by three participants each, to German and English by one each, and to Italian by fifty.

4.2.3 Participants' attitudes toward loanwords in Croatian and language use

This section presents the findings related to participants' attitudes toward loanwords in Croatian and language use. In the last part of the questionnaire, the participants were asked to answer three questions that could reveal their attitudes toward borrowings and two questions related to their language use. They were first asked to answer whether they believed that there were too many loanwords in Croatian. The reason why the participants were asked this question lies in the fact that their attitudes toward the acceptability of borrowings provides an insight into perceived contemporary language conflict between Croatian and other languages. Namely, language conflict should primarily be understood as conflict between speakers or communities and only then between linguistic systems. Similarly, Winford (2003: 2) claims that language contact should be approached by viewing speakers of languages as primary elements of contact, who then mix elements of the two languages. Eighty-seven participants answered this question,¹³ among whom three (3.4%) were indecisive regarding the answer. Fifty participants among those that answered (57.5%) stated that there were too many loanwords in Croatian. Some of them simply answered "yes", whereas others explained their answer. The most frequently identified reasons why this was the case included historical reasons (foreign rule), technological development, and lack of development of native equivalents. For example:

P13:¹⁴ "Yes. Besides loanwords left from the past, in recent times it has become modern to insert foreign expressions into everyday speech."

P60: "Yes, especially connected to technology and social networks (*lajkati, šerati, streaming, uploadati, followeri, stalkati*).¹⁵ It is because Croatian adjusts to new trends too slowly, and, even when such terms are translated, we have already adopted the English ones, so they remain."

P41: "Yes, especially Italian ones due to the long rule of Italians on these territories."

P92: "Yes, they are increasing in numbers. There are terms of Turkish and Italian origin from the past, and now those of American origin."

P107: "Yes, especially because we keep borrowing more and more foreign words, and we are not creating new ones or we are creating them unsuccessfully."

Among the participants that answered this question, thirty-four (39.1%) stated that there were not too many loanwords. Some of them simply answered "no", whereas others explained their answer. The most frequently identified reasons why this was

¹³ The third part of the questionnaire was not completed by all participants.

¹⁴ I.e., participant number 13.

¹⁵ I.e., 'to like', 'to share', 'streaming', 'to upload', 'followers', 'to stalk'.

not the case included loanwords being an integrated part of local dialects, their contribution to the diversity and richness of the language, and loanwords being considered a natural result of language development. For example:

P3: “No. They are part of local dialects, and they frequently specify a certain more general concept.”

P18: “No. Croatia has been under the cultural influence of different nations for centuries, and foreign expressions are already a part of our language.”

P33: “No. I believe that loanwords contribute to the diversity of the language.”

P50: “No, loanwords adjust to Croatian. I like them because they help me identify more easily where the speaker comes from.”

P69: “No. I think that language lives and develops like the society (social and technological advancement) on a given territory.”

Related to the possibility of evaluating the perceived contemporary language conflict between Croatian and other languages, when asked whether they believed that other languages represented a threat to Croatian, and, if so, which ones and why, seventy participants answered, three of whom (4.3%) were indecisive. Thirty participants that answered (42.9%) gave a positive answer. Some of them simply answered “yes”, whereas others explained their answer. Among them, twenty-one participants identified English as the main threat to Croatian, and the most frequently identified reason for viewing it as a threat had to do with its global status, its increased use in the media and on social networks, and a perceived lack of connection between language and identity. For example:

P5: “English, due to the influence of social media.”

P15: “Yes, primarily English. Borrowings are all around us, especially among the younger generations, so that Croatian equivalents are decreasing in use and are forgotten.”

P23: “English, due to lack of understanding of the importance of maintaining one’s native language, poor language culture, lack of feeling that connects identity to language . . .”

P93: “English, due to its global influence.”

One participant identified German as a threat to Croatian, and one identified Italian together with English.

Thirty-seven of the participants that answered (52.9%) gave a negative answer. Some of them simply answered “no”, whereas others explained their answer. The most frequently provided reason why other languages are not considered a threat included viewing language change as a natural process and the authenticity of Croatian. For example:

P25: “I don’t believe that other languages are a threat to Croatian because language constantly changes.”

P49: “They are not a threat, but Croatian is spoken in a very small part of Europe.”

P100: “No, because Croatian is an official language of the EU.”

P109: “No. Despite the borrowings, Croatian is fairly authentic.”

The participants were next asked whether they believed that more native Croatian terms should be used instead of loanwords. Participants' feedback to this question also sheds light on the perceived contemporary language conflict between Croatian and other languages. Although it is usually quite challenging to recognize a language's native words because this raises the questions of when and where a boundary is drawn beyond which a term is no longer perceived as foreign, it is still possible to evaluate this aspect, especially in the contemporary framework. Namely, in recent decades, especially after the 1990s, there have been attempts to replace what are considered words of foreign origin with native Croatian terms.¹⁶

Eighty-eight participants answered this question. Among them, eleven participants (12.5%) were either indecisive about their answer or were rather careful about providing a "yes" or "no" answer. For example:

P17: "I believe that it would be better to use Croatian terms instead of loanwords, but it all depends who we are talking to and in what situation. For example, I use some Anglicisms with my family (when talking to those younger than myself), Germanisms (when talking to my brothers and sisters), but in writing emails, in telephone conversations I use Croatian terms. I would say that I use both loanwords and Croatian terms to the same extent."

P29: "Yes and no. I believe we should use Croatian terms for those loanwords that have an adequate but not complicated Croatian equivalent. Loanwords have become part of our language through the years, it is difficult to get rid of them, and people have become used to them."

P35: "I think there should be a balance and that we should not go to extremes."

P71: "We should use native terms in formal communication, while in informal communication we should use terms from our own dialect because they are close and are part of our cultural heritage."

Among the participants that answered this question, forty-one (46.6%) gave a negative answer. Some of them simply answered "no", whereas others explained their answer. The most frequently identified reasons for a negative answer had to do with viewing some Croatian equivalents as unnatural or awkward, viewing loanwords as fully incorporated into Croatian, and as a result of a natural process of language change. For example:

P8: "No, because words like *zrakomlat*¹⁷ instead of *helikopter* are nonsense."

P16: "No, because some of our words are awkward and funny."

P28: "Not in the context of already existing loanwords that people have become used to because it would be difficult to suddenly make people use new native terms."

P12: "I do not think so because the attempt to create new Croatian terms in the 1990s was pretty unsuccessful."

P52: "No, language changes all the time and it is difficult to influence that."

¹⁶ See, for example, the feedback of P8 on this question.

¹⁷ Literally 'air-beater', a neologism for 'helicopter'.

Among the participants that answered this question, thirty-six (40.9%) gave a positive answer. Some of them simply answered “yes”, whereas others explained their answer. The most frequently identified reason for an affirmative answer had to do with connecting the native terms to national identity and preserving cultural heritage. For example:

P4: “Yes, language is the identity of the people.”

P10: “Yes, we should take care of our language so that some words do not die out.”

P37: “Yes, otherwise the Croatian words will be forgotten.”

P44: “Yes, because we should not be ashamed of our language and acquire foreign words.”

P80: “Yes, because many Croatian terms will disappear at this rate.”

Connected to the rationale behind asking the previous questions, which focused on participants’ attitudes in relation to perceived contemporary language conflict, the participants were next asked about their language use to establish a correlation with perceived language conflict. Namely, they were asked whether they paid attention to using a Croatian term instead of one of foreign origin if there is a Croatian equivalent of the term, which ninety-one participants answered. Among them, thirty-eight (41.8%) gave a negative answer. Some of them simply answered “no”, whereas others explained their answer. Most of them stated that they did not think much about it because they use the term that is more natural or is used more frequently, and that they have grown accustomed to. For example:

P20: “I am not bothered by it; I express myself in the way it ‘entered my ear.’”

P19: “No, if the term of foreign origin is used more frequently.”

P39: “No, I do not think about it.”

P74: “No, because some words have not been accepted.”

Among the participants that answered this question, twenty-seven (29.7%) gave a positive answer. Some of them simply answered “yes”, whereas others explained their answer, most of which had to do with affection toward Croatian or their profession. For example:

P22: “Yes, I try to pay attention to that because I love Croatian and it is not nice for me to use loanwords.”

P76: “Yes, most of the time, due to my profession.”

P85: “Yes, for sure. I do not find the other option cultural. When I speak my language, I maximally try to speak my language, when I speak a foreign one, I speak a foreign one.”

P86: “Yes. I prefer to choose our words if they are not forcefully made up.”

As many as twenty-six participants among those that answered (28.6%) stated that they did not know or that they paid attention to doing so sometimes, and, among them, some explained their answer by stating that it mostly depended on the interlocutor or type of situation.

P7: “Sometimes. It depends on who the interlocutor is.”

P31: “It depends on the situation.”

P67: “Only in formal communication so that I can be understood by interlocutors from all parts of Croatia.”

P79: “It depends on the context. At the formal level (in writing) I prefer to choose the Croatian equivalent (if I know it), while in other cases I will use a loanword that is more frequently used in spoken language.”

Finally, the participants were asked whether they encountered difficulties in communicating with speakers of Croatian dialects other than their own, and, if so, which. They were also asked to identify terms from other Croatian dialects that were not understandable, which they did to a significant extent.

Among the ninety-four participants that answered this question, thirty-four (36.2%) stated that they had not encountered such difficulties. Some gave only a negative answer, whereas others mostly explained it as an opportunity to learn something new; for example:

P14: “No, if I do not understand a word, I ask and remember.”

P34: “I never encounter difficulties, only a possibility to hear and learn something new.”

P46: “There are no problems in communication because the meaning of a word (if it is unknown) is understood from the context. For example, *buža*.”¹⁸

P91: “I cannot say that I encounter difficulties. It is certainly nice to enrich one’s vocabulary with other dialects.”

Thirty-two participants that answered (34%) gave a positive answer. Some simply answered “yes”, whereas others identified problems with different aspects of dialects other than their own, depending on their origin. Most participants from the Zadar region identified problems with northern Croatian dialects, whereas those from the Varaždin region identified problems with southern Croatian dialects. For example:

P11: “Yes, Dalmatian dialects are most unfamiliar to me.”

P63: “Yes, the inability to understand certain words and dialects, especially of people from islands.”

P64: “Yes. Everything from the Zagorje dialect.”

P87: “Yes, I encounter difficulties with understanding words, especially from Croats from northern Croatia (the Međimurje region), and also due to differences in accent with the same words I use.”

Among them, one participant identified problems with some speakers of her own dialect:

P94: “Unfortunately, I encounter difficulties in communicating with speakers of my own (Kajkavian) dialect, mostly with speakers from Bednja. The first time I encountered speakers of the local Bednja dialect, I understood almost nothing.”

18 The standard equivalent is *rupa* ‘hole’.

Among the participants that answered this question, twenty-eight (29.8%) stated that they sometimes encountered such difficulties. As was the case with participants that gave a positive answer, participants from the Zadar region sometimes identified problems with northern Croatian dialects, whereas those from the Varaždin region sometimes identified problems with southern Croatian dialects.

P68: “I am Kajkavian and I sometimes did not understand Dalmatians, nor did they understand me, especially if I used my village dialect.”

P32: “Sometimes; for example, the word *bičve*.”¹⁹

P48: “Sometimes. Dalmatian – *lancun*, *luk* (which is actually *češnjak*), *ridipet*,²⁰ in expressing time.”

P86: “It is difficult to understand people from Zagorje because there are so many Germanisms and it sounds almost Slovenian.”

4.3 Discussion

Regarding familiarity with Croatian space-related terms of German and Italian origin, it can be observed that the participants from the Zadar region were not familiar with the German loanwords *bajbok*, *becirk*, *docukati*, *šloseraj*, and *štrant*, but they mostly recognized their origin, probably due to their morphemic structure. It was only in the case of the term *bajbok* that the morphemic structure reminded them of Turkish and Hungarian. The participants from the Varaždin region were not familiar with the loanwords of Italian origin *buža*, *kapunjera*, *kuridur*, *moviti se*, *peškati*, *pržun*, and *vižitati*. However, up to half of them recognized the Italian origin, whereas the others related them to Turkish and Hungarian to a greater extent than to other languages offered. These participants also did not recognize the old German loanwords *bajbok*, *becirk*, and *štrant*, which are obviously not used in their everyday communication. Like the participants from the Zadar region, they also related *bajbok* to a high degree to Turkish, but also to Hungarian, English, and Italian. It seems that participants from both towns refer to Hungarian and Turkish when they are not sure about the origin of the loanwords. Some of the participants that stated they did not know the loanwords *arivati*, *moviti se*, *vižitati*, *laguna*, and *kuridur* connected their origin with English due to structural similarity.²¹

All participants from the Varaždin region were familiar with the following terms of German origin: the nouns *špajza*, *haustor*, and *birtija* and the movement verbs *laufati* and *došlepati*. This could indicate that participants from the Varaždin region communicated more in dialect, given the numbers of loanwords known to the participants from the Zadar region (where the only term that all participants

¹⁹ The standard equivalent is *čarape* ‘socks’.

²⁰ I.e., *lancun* ‘bed sheet’, for which the standard equivalent is *plahta*; *luk* ‘onion’; *češnjak* ‘garlic’; *ridipet* ‘bra’, for which the standard equivalent is *grudnjak*.

²¹ The structural similarities between the Croatian and English terms refer to the following: *arivati* ‘to arrive’, *moviti se* ‘to move’, *vižitati* ‘to visit’, *laguna* ‘lagoon’, and *kuridur* ‘corridor’.

from the Zadar region were familiar with was *marina*). However, the participants from the Zadar region showed better familiarity with loanwords from both languages investigated, German and Italian. This can be explained by the fact that, due to the town's location on the Adriatic coast, they had contact with more languages and their morphemic structure.

It seems that the level of education as well as the knowledge of different languages did not play a role in the findings. Common knowledge of the past and the languages that came into contact with Croatian helped them recognize the origin according to the morphemic structure.

Regarding the participants' attitudes toward borrowings, the majority expressed the belief that there were too many loanwords in Croatian, and they explained this belief primarily by historical reasons (foreign rule), technological development, and lack of development of native equivalents. Those that did not express such a belief explained it primarily by viewing loanwords as an integrated part of local dialects, by their contribution to the diversity and richness of the language, and by viewing them as a natural result of language development. Somewhat fewer participants believed that other languages represented a threat to Croatian than those that believed otherwise. English was predominantly viewed as a threat, primarily due to its global status, its increased use in the media and on social networks, and a perceived lack of connection between language and identity. Those that did not see other languages as a threat primarily viewed language change as a natural process or emphasized the authenticity of Croatian. Somewhat fewer participants also believed that more native Croatian terms should be used instead of loanwords than those that believed otherwise. Those that believed that more native Croatian terms should be used primarily connected them with national identity and preservation of cultural heritage. Those that believed otherwise viewed some Croatian equivalents as unnatural or awkward and loanwords as fully incorporated into Croatian as a result of natural language change. Regarding language use, more participants categorically stated that they did not pay attention to using the Croatian term instead of one of foreign origin than those that did not. However, for a significant number of participants it also depended on the context of use. Those that did not pay attention to it explained it primarily by simply not thinking about it or by habitual and more natural use of loanwords. Those that paid attention to it connected it to affection toward Croatian or their profession. There was only a slight difference between the number of participants that stated that they encountered difficulties in communicating with speakers of Croatian dialects other than their own, the number of participants that sometimes encountered them, and the number of those that stated that they did not encounter such difficulties. Among those that identified such difficulties, most of those from the Zadar region identified difficulties

with northern Croatian dialects, whereas most of those from the Varaždin region identified difficulties with southern Croatian dialects.

5 CONCLUSION

Issues related to language contact and conflict may be analyzed from a number of different perspectives, and they may involve focus on one or more areas of interest. In relation to the three main areas of interest in the analyses of language contact and conflict according to Darquennes (2015: 9), various findings in this article should be addressed.

First, regarding the “language” area (referring to conflict related to language borrowing situations), contacts between Croatian and other languages in the past were primarily a result of contacts with conquering nations, subsequently resulting in minorities living in certain areas. Regarding Croatian contact with German and Italian, it was noted in the theoretical part dealing with Italian and German loanwords in Croatian that language contact with Italian primarily occurred in coastal Croatian areas, whereas contact with German primarily occurred in continental Croatian areas. Lexical borrowings from the two languages in different Croatian areas have contributed to the divergence between coastal and continental varieties of Croatian, which leads to potential language conflict. Thus, it seems possible to speak of language conflict between Croatian and the foreign elements from German and Italian. However, it was already noted that language conflict should primarily be understood as conflict between speakers or communities and only then between linguistic systems (cf. Winford 2003: 2), which is why research among communities affected by language “contact” should be conducted to investigate their language attitudes and use.

Second, the findings of the study conducted among the inhabitants of the Zadar and Varaždin regions contribute to an understanding of the “individual language user(s)” area of interest (referring to conflict in actual language use). In analyzing the participants’ familiarity with German and Italian loanwords, there were instances in which they were not familiar with certain terms but were able to correctly recognize their origin, probably due to their morphemic structure. Structural similarity was also noted in cases of incorrect identification of the origin of the term (e.g., the incorrect identification of certain terms as being of English origin). The findings suggest that participants from the Varaždin region communicated more in their own dialect due to their greater familiarity with certain terms of German origin. The participants from the Zadar region showed greater familiarity with both German and Italian loanwords. This is probably because they came into contact with more languages and their morphemic structure due to the town’s location on the Adriatic coast.

Regarding the participants' attitudes toward borrowings, there were mixed views. The belief that there were too many loanwords in Croatian was primarily explained by historical reasons (foreign rule), technological development, and lack of development of native equivalents, whereas the belief that this was not the case was explained by viewing loanwords as an integrated part of local dialects, by seeing their contribution to the diversity and richness of the language, and by viewing them as a natural result of language development. English was predominantly viewed as a threat, primarily due to its global status, its increased use in the media and on social networks, and a perceived lack of connection between language and identity. The belief that more native Croatian terms should be used was justified by the connection to national identity and preservation of cultural heritage, whereas the belief that this was not the case was justified by viewing some Croatian equivalents as unnatural or awkward and loanwords as fully incorporated into Croatian, and by viewing language change as a natural process. Regarding language use, paying attention to using the Croatian term instead of one of foreign origin largely depended on the context of use. The participants identified a significant number of terms that represented a problem in communication with speakers of Croatian dialects other than their own. Among those that identified difficulties in communicating with speakers of Croatian dialects other than their own, most of those from the Zadar region identified difficulties with northern Croatian dialects, whereas most of those from the Varaždin region identified difficulties with southern Croatian dialects. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a certain conflict in the "individual language user(s)" area.

Third, regarding the "society" area of interest referring to conflict that arises at the social level (related to the relationship between language, nationalism, and ethnic identity), it can be concluded that, because these terms were borrowed in the past and this was related to the sociopolitical context of the time, one may speak of social language conflict primarily from a historical perspective. However, it should be noted that the emphasis on national identity and preservation of cultural heritage in some participants' feedback regarding their attitudes toward borrowings points to a conflict that is recognizable within this area as well. From a contemporary perspective and based on participants' feedback, such conflict primarily relates to the status and role of English, and not Italian and German, whose loanwords entered Croatian much earlier and have obviously become accepted in Croatian to a greater extent over the course of time.

Finally, the explanation of the findings in relation to the three main areas of interest in the analyses of language contact and conflict also provides answers to the research questions addressed in this article: What is the nature of language contacts in the two Croatian regions? What types of language conflict may be identified in the two Croatian regions? What is the intensity of language conflict from a contemporary perspective?

The findings suggest that there is a difference between Croatian coastal and continental language contact and conflict identifiable in manners of naming places, which is related to differences in sociohistorical changes that occurred in different parts of Croatia and that led to language contact between Croatian and the two languages analyzed. From the historical perspective and with regard to the relationship between Croatian on one hand, and German and Italian on the other, one may speak of the type of language conflict that de Vries (1990) describes as one that includes contact between different linguistic communities. From the contemporary perspective and with regard to the relationship between Croatian on one hand, and German and Italian on the other, one may primarily speak of language conflict that exists at the linguistic level (de Vries 1990) and is related to lexical borrowings. The findings also point to the fact that the more recent and increasingly intense contacts between Croatian and English as the global *lingua franca* might have contributed to lesser prominence of contemporary language conflict between the languages analyzed (Croatian on one hand, and Italian and German on the other) because the tensions between two linguistic systems in contact are most prominent in earlier stages of contact.

REFERENCES

- Chilton 1998** = Paul A. Chilton, The role of language in human conflict: prolegomena to the investigation of language as a factor in conflict causation and resolution, in: *Language and Conflict: a Neglected Relationship*, ed. Sue Wright, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998, 2–17.
- Clyne 1996** = Michael Clyne, Sprache, Sprachbenutzer, Sprachbereich, in: *Contact Linguistics 1*, eds. Hans Goebel – Peter H. Nelde – Wolfgang Wölck – Zdeněk Starý, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1996, 12–22.
- Coser 1957** = Lewis A. Coser, Social conflict and the theory of social change, *The British Journal of Sociology* 8.3 (1957), 197–207.
- Council of Europe 2020** = Council of Europe, *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Report of the Committee of Experts presented to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in accordance with Article 16 of the Charter, Sixth Report: Croatia, 2020*, <https://rm.coe.int/croatiaecrml6-en-rm2-docx/16809ec2e9>.
- Darquennes 2015** = Jeroen Darquennes, Language conflict research: a state of the art, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 235 (2015), 7–32.
- Davies – Dubinsky 2018** = William D. Davies – Stanley Dubinsky, *Language Conflict and Language Rights: Ethnolinguistic Perspectives on Human Conflict*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- de Vries 1990** = John de Vries, Language planning as conflict management, in: *Language Attitudes and Language Conflict*, ed. Peter H. Nelde, Bonn: Dümmler, 1990 (Plurilingua IX), 17–27.
- Deen – Romans 2018** = Bob Deen – William Romans, Introduction: shaping language policies to promote stability, in: *Language Policy and Conflict Prevention*, eds. Iryna Ulasiuk – Laurentiu Hadircă – William Romans, Leiden: Brill Nijhoff, 2018, 1–22.
- Dragičević 2005** = Dragica Dragičević, Hrvatski u dodiru s njemačkim jezikom, in: *Hrvatski jezik u dodiru s europskim jezicima: prilagodba posuđenica*, eds. Lelija Sočanac – Orsolya Žagar-Szentesi – Dragica Dragičević – Ljuba Dabo-Denegri – Antica Menac – Anja Nikolić-Hoyt, Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus, 2005, 85–113.
- Drljača 2006** = Branka Drljača, Anglizmi u ekonomskome nazivlju hrvatskoga jezika i standardnojezična norma, *Fluminensia* 18.1 (2006), 65–85.

- GRC 1** = Government of the Republic of Croatia, Office for Human Rights and the Rights of National Minorities, *National Minorities in the Republic of Croatia – Ured za ljudska prava i prava nacionalnih manjina - Nacionalne manjine u Republici Hrvatskoj*, <https://pravamanjina.gov.hr/nacionalne-manjine/nacionalne-manjine-u-republici-hrvatskoj/352>.
- GRC 2** = Government of the Republic of Croatia, Office for Human Rights and the Rights of National Minorities, *Germans and Austrians – Ured za ljudska prava i prava nacionalnih manjina - Nijemci i Austrijanci*, <https://pravamanjina.gov.hr/nacionalne-manjine/nacionalne-manjine-u-republici-hrvatskoj/nijemci-i-austrijanci/373>.
- GRC 3** = Government of the Republic of Croatia, Office for Human Rights and the Rights of National Minorities, *Italians – Ured za ljudska prava i prava nacionalnih manjina - Talijani*, <https://pravamanjina.gov.hr/nacionalne-manjine/nacionalne-manjine-u-republici-hrvatskoj/talijani/381>.
- Hrvatski jezični portal** = *Hrvatski jezični portal*, <https://hjp.znanje.hr/>.
- Janicki 2015** = Karol Janicki, *Language and Conflict: Selected Issues*, London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- Jeffries – O’Driscoll 2019** = Lesley Jeffries – Jim O’Driscoll, Introduction: the origins of *The Routledge Handbook of Language in Conflict*, in: *The Routledge Handbook of Language in Conflict*, eds. Matthew Evans – Lesley Jeffries – Jim O’Driscoll, London: Routledge, 2019, 1–10.
- Juraga 2010** = Edo Juraga, Turcizmi u murterskom govoru, *Čakavska rič* 38.1–2 (2010), 333–342.
- Kelly – Footitt – Salama-Carr 2019** = Michael Kelly – Hilary Footitt – Myriam Salama-Carr, Introduction: the shock of war, in: *The Palgrave Handbook of Languages and Conflict*, eds. Michael Kelly – Hilary Footitt – Myriam Salama-Carr, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019, 1–25.
- Kolanović 2001** = Barbara Kolanović, Na Pašmanu ni nikada glada bilo... (gastro-lingvistički opis života na otoku Pašmanu), *Čakavska rič* 29.2 (2001), 47–72.
- Laitin 2000** = David D. Laitin, Language conflict and violence: the straw that strengthens the camel’s back, in: *International Conflict Resolution After the Cold War*, eds. Paul C. Stern – Daniel Drucman, National Research Council, Committee on International Conflict Resolution, Commission on Behavioural and Social Sciences and Education, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 2000, 531–568.
- Lalli Pačelat – Brkić Bakarić – Matticchio 2020** = Ivana Lalli Pačelat – Marija Brkić Bakarić – Isabella Matticchio, Službena dvojezičnost u Istarskoj županiji: stanje i perspektive, *Rasprave* 46.2 (2020), 815–837.
- Marković 2019** = Irena Marković, *Govori grada Zadra s rječnikom romanizama*, Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada – Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru, 2019.
- Matras 2019** = Yaron Matras, Borrowing, in: *Language Contact: a International Handbook*, eds. Jeroen Darquennes – Joseph C. Salmons – Wim Vandenbussche, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2019, 148–158.
- Nelde 1992** = Peter H. Nelde, Multilingualism and contact linguistics, in: *Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution: Studies in Honour of René Dirven on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, ed. Martin Pütz, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1992, 379–397.
- Nelde 1997** = Peter H. Nelde, Language conflict, in: *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, ed. Florian Coulmas, Oxford: Blackwell, 1997, 285–300.
- Oberschall 1978** = Anthony Oberschall, Theories of social conflict, *Annual Review of Sociology* 4 (1978), 291–315.
- Patekar 2019** = Jakob Patekar, Prihvatljivost prevedenica kao zamjena za anglizme, *Fluminensia* 31.2 (2019), 143–179.
- Pavić Pintarić 2007** = Anita Pavić Pintarić, Deutsche Lehnwörter im „Wörterbuch des Kajkawischen in Varaždin“, *Klagenfurter Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 34–36 (2007), 265–278.
- Pavić Pintarić – Škifić 2021** = Anita Pavić Pintarić – Sanja Škifić, *Prostor i kretanje u govorima zadarskoga kraja*, Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru, 2021.
- Salverda 2003** = Reinier Salverda, Conflict linguistics and the case of multilingualism in London, in: *Methodology of Conflict Linguistics*, eds. Klaus Bochmann – Peter H. Nelde – Wolfgang Wölck, Sankt Augustin: Asgard-Verlag Dr. Werner Hippe GmbH, 2003 (Plurilingua XXIV), 129–143.
- Seifart 2019** = Frank Seifart, Contact-induced change, in: *Language Contact: an International Hand-*

- book, eds. Jeroen Darquennes – Joseph C. Salmons – Wim Vandenbussche, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2019, 13–24.
- Sočanac 2002** = Lelija Sočanac, Talijanizmi u hrvatskome jeziku, *Suvremena lingvistika* 53–54 (2002), 127–142.
- Sočanac 2004** = Lelija Sočanac, *Hrvatsko-talijanski jezični dodiri: s rječnikom talijanizama u standardnome hrvatskom jeziku i dubrovačkoj dramskoj književnosti*, Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus, 2004.
- Sočanac 2005** = Lelija Sočanac, Uvod: teorija i metodologija, in: *Hrvatski jezik u dodiru s europskim jezicima: prilagodba posuđenica*, eds. Lelija Sočanac – Orsolya Žagar-Szentesi – Dragica Dragičević – Ljuba Dabo-Denegri – Antica Menac – Anja Nikolić-Hoyt, Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus, 2005, 9–17.
- Stojić – Turk 2017** = Aneta Stojić – Marija Turk, *Deutsch-kroatische Sprachkontakte: historische Entwicklung und aktuelle Perspektiven auf lexikalischer Ebene*, Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto, 2017.
- Stolac 2020** = Diana Stolac, Pogled u mađarsko-hrvatske leksičke dodire, in: *Lučar cijelosti: zbornik radova posvećen 95. rođendanu Bulcsúa Lászlóa*, editor-in-chief Bojan Marotti, Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada – Matica hrvatska – Hrvatsko filološko društvo – Društvo mađarskih znanstvenika i umjetnika u Hrvatskoj, 2020, 205–222.
- Tadmor 2009** = Uri Tadmor, Loanwords in the world's languages: findings and results, in: *Loanwords in the World's Languages: a Comparative Handbook*, eds. Martin Haspelmath – Uri Tadmor, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2009, 55–75.
- Thomas 1991** = George Thomas, *Linguistic purism*, London: Longman, 1991.
- Turk 1997** = Marija Turk, Hungarizmi u hrvatskoj frazeologiji, in: *Hrvati i Mađari u svjetlu prožimanja kultura i jezika*, ed. Stjepan Blažetin, Pečuh: Hrvatski znanstveni zavod, 1997, 265–273.
- Vallacher et al. 2013** = Robin R. Vallacher – Peter T. Coleman – Andrzej Nowak – Lan Bui-Wrzosinska – Larry Liebovitch – Katharina Kugler – Andrea Bartoli, Overview: conflict in human experience, in: *Attracted to Conflict: Dynamic Foundations of Destructive Social Relations*, eds. Robin R. Vallacher – Peter T. Coleman – Andrzej Nowak – Lan Bui-Wrzosinska – Larry Liebovitch – Katharina Kugler – Andrea Bartoli, Heidelberg: Springer, 2013, 1–18.
- Vranić – Zubčić 2013** = Silvana Vranić – Sanja Zubčić, Turcizmi u frazemima hrvatskih govora, *Filologija* 60 (2013), 103–145.
- Winford 2003** = Donald Winford, *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

POVZETEK

Jezikovna raznolikost na Hrvaškem: zgodovinske in sodobne perspektive jezikovnega stika (in konfliktov) v zadrski in varaždinski regiji

Prispevek obravnava zgodovinski in sodobni jezikovni stik ter konflikt med hrvaškim jezikom in italijanskim ter nemškim jezikom v zadrski in varaždinski regiji. Poudarek je na jezikovnem stiku, ki je prepoznaven pri analizi jezikovnih postavk, povezanih s prostorom in dogajanjem v prostoru. Ker jezikovni stik pogosto vodi do jezikovnih konfliktov, se prispevek osredotoča na povezovanje teh pojavov na podlagi analiziranega korpusa z vidika treh interesnih področij: jezika, posameznega jezikovnega uporabnika (uporabnikov) in družbe. Posebna pozornost je namenjena značilnostim družbenozgodovinskega konteksta stikov med različnimi kulturami in jeziki, kar je privedlo do oblikovanja prostorskih izrazov. Takšen pristop omogoča vpogled v naravo jezikovnih stikov ter analizo različnih vrst in intenzivnosti jezikovnega konflikta, ki nastaja ob jezikovnem stiku. Raziskovalna vprašanja so naslednja: Kakšna je narava jezikovnih stikov v dveh hrvaških regijah? Katere vrste jezikovnega konflikta lahko prepoznamo v obeh hrvaških regijah? Kakšna je intenzivnost jezikovnega konflikta s sodobnega vidika? Metodologija vključuje analizo relevantnih virov, v katerih so navedeni izrazi, ter uporabo anketnega vprašalnika med prebivalci obeh regij. Rezultati kažejo, da obstaja razlika med stikom z obalnim in kontinentalnim jezikom

ter konfliktom, kar je razvidno iz načina poimenovanja krajev. To je povezano z razlikami v družbenozgodovinskih spremembah, ki so se zgodile v različnih delih Hrvaške in so privedle do jezikovnega stika med hrvaškim in obema analiziranimi jezikoma. Z zgodovinskega vidika in v zvezi z odnosom med hrvaščino na eni strani ter nemščino in italijanščino na drugi strani lahko govorimo o vrsti jezikovnega konflikta, ki ga de Vries (1990) opisuje kot konflikt, ki se ne pojavlja le na strukturalni ravni, ampak vključuje stik med različnimi jezikovnimi skupnostmi. Iz sodobne perspektive se jezikovni konflikt med hrvaščino ter nemščino in italijanščino pojavlja predvsem na jezikovni ravni (de Vries 1990) in je povezan z leksikalnimi posojili. Rezultati kažejo tudi, da so novejši in vse intenzivnejši stiki med hrvaščino in angleščino kot globalno *linguo franco* morda prispevali k manjši pomembnosti sodobnega jezikovnega konflikta med analiziranimi jeziki, saj so napetosti med dvema jezikovnim sistemoma v stiku najbolj izrazite v zgodnejših fazah stika.