

---

Jelena Živojinović

## Language Contact in Renaissance Ragusa

**Abstract:** The aim of this article is to provide the reader with a general overview of language change and results of language contact in Renaissance Ragusa. I will present the results of a synchronic study, based on the analysis of qualitative data pulled from a literary corpus reflecting the linguistic society of Ragusan Renaissance. Furthermore, the articles present a comparison with a smaller corpus of diachronic data, analyzed by Dragica Malić. Calques, phonological adaptations, and new combinatorial morphological creations containing a Romance root and a Slavic derivational morpheme, such as: It. *spacciarsi* > *spačati se* or It. *accomodarsi* > *akomodavati se*, will be explored through additional examples in order to highlight the underlying contact and change strategies.

**Keywords:** contact, Renaissance Ragusa, Dubrovnik, morphological change, transmorphemization

**Abstract:** Lo scopo di questo articolo è quello di presentare una panoramica generale sul mutamento linguistico e i risultati del contatto linguistico nella Ragusa rinascimentale (oggi Dubrovnik). Presenterò i risultati di uno studio sincronico basato sull'analisi qualitativa dei dati tratti da un corpus letterario che rispecchia la società linguistica del Rinascimento ragusano, oltre ad un corpus di dimensioni più ridotte dei dati diacronici, analizzati da Dragica Malić. Calchi, adattamenti fonologici ed innovazioni morfologiche contenenti una radice romanza e un morfema derivazionale slavo, quali it. *spacciarsi* > *spačati se* oppure *accomodarsi* > *akomodavati se*, verranno approfonditi attraverso ulteriori esempi in modo da mettere in luce le strategie di mutamento e il contatto sottostante.

**Keywords:** contatto, Ragusa rinascimentale, Dubrovnik, mutamento morfologico, transmorfemizzazione

## 1 Introduction

Renaissance Dubrovnik was a city of great importance, particularly due to its strategic position. It was a crossroad for merchants and fishermen, but also scholars from the entire Mediterranean. It is a characteristic example of how multiple languages coexisted within a relatively small area. During an initial stage (approx. 15<sup>th</sup> century) we identified three main components, two of which are Romance languages and one is Slavic. Namely, Ragusan, Venetian and a Slavic vernacular<sup>1</sup> held very specific sociolinguistic positions. Unfortunately, there are no remaining written records of Ragusan<sup>2</sup>, a Dalmatian-Romance language, whose genealogical classification is still debatable<sup>3</sup>. We do, however, have a wide literature from the Renaissance period in Ragusa, which clearly illustrates the sociolinguistic stratification of this time.

My focus in this research will be to provide an overview of some aspects of language contact in Dubrovnik. Key aspects of this topic will be described, starting from the causes of contact, both social and linguistic predictors—that should result in a context of multilingualism. My goal is to conclude this insight in the Ragusan language contact by presenting the analysis of a literary corpus of data provided by Marin Držić, along with the the analysis of the *Vatican Croatian Prayer Book* and the *Ragusan Academic Prayer Book*, by Dragica Malić.

I will start by displaying some major considerations in a socio-historical context, by describing legends and stories about the birth of Ragusa in Section 2. Section 3 will provide a brief explanation on the linguistic stratification and an overview of the spoken languages in Renaissance Dubrovnik. Section 4 will illustrate the state of research, while Section 5 presents some contact parameters and the filter used for the analysis of data. Namely, the phenomena of *transphonemization* and *transmorphemization*, developed by Rudolf Filipović will be introduced. Finally, Section 6 will summarize some results of both synchronic and diachronic corporuses in the perspective of contact-induced change.

1 There is not a specific label for this Slavic Shtokavian variety spoken in Dubrovnik. Certain documents, however, mention the term *lingua serviana*, such as *Diversa de Foris* 26, fol. 20<sup>r</sup> from 1613, stating: “Hic infra erunt registratae infrascriptae duae litterae ex lingua Serviana et caractere, recognitae prout ad mobilia extra 1613 folio 35 interpretatae per ser Paschalem de Primis cancellarium linguae Slavae”. It is often represented as Serbian, Croatian or even Serbo-Croatian. Nevertheless, such terminology is anachronistic.

2 There is, however, a poor, yet significant witness of an illustrious personage, Philippus de Diversis in the manuscript named “*Descriptio Ragusina edita ab eximio magro Philippo de Diversis Quartigianis Luccensis, A.D. MCCCCXL ab eo confecta*” that is located in the Franciscan monastery in Ragusa.

3 For further information on genealogical classification of Ragusan check Gordon (2005), Muljačić (1962; 1999; 2001a), Voegelin (1976) and Zamboni (1976) among others, who offer different views and perspectives.

## 2 Socio-historical Facts of Ragusa: A Brief Overview

Starting at the very beginning, the birth of Ragusa is considered emblematic regarding the issue of contact. As a matter of fact, a legend named Pavlimir, written by Junije Palmotić, states that the protagonist of the story was Prince Pavlimir, whose ancestors were forced to flee to Rome due to local intrigues. The young prince was later called by local authorities to return to the motherland, defeat the opponents and restore the ancestral regnum Sclavorum situated in the Western Balkans. His effort paid off and Pavlimir was able to build a new town named Dubrovnik, by creating a symbiosis of Romance and Slavic cultures, which are characteristic of the Dalmatian coast.

Besides Palmotić' drama, there is also a well-known historical version. Namely, Dubrovnik (as we know it today), which is a union of two different towns. In one instance, a town named *Ragusium* was built in the 7<sup>th</sup> century by a Latin population fleeing from a close town Epidaurus due to continuous attacks and thefts. They found shelter on a local island and in a short time they created *ex novo* a new homeland of great potential. In another instance, Slavic populations settled on the hills on the mainland, naming their town *Dubrovnik*. Recent archaeological excavations in the area of Pustijerna confirmed this version of a Latin and a Slavic component, where the remains of an early Christian church were found. In fact, the first attestations of Ragusa chronologically overlap the end of Epidaurus and the rise of a new maritime puissance. However, it should be emphasized that my topic of study is not the ethnicity of the population, but rather the linguistic component. Nonetheless, apart from the presence of numerous foreigners<sup>4</sup>, natives used to define themselves as Ragusans<sup>5</sup>, despite the continuous change of power at the top<sup>6</sup>. There was no patriotic attachment to the language<sup>7</sup> and this attitude made the difference concerning the linguistic situation and use of language.

Ragusa (Croat. Dubrovnik) was the perfect candidate for the development of language contact. Owing such a strategical geographical position, in a period when the Mediterranean was the center of European trade, Ragusa was a crossroad of merchants, craft workers, notaries and scholars. It was a point

---

4 One of the most known communities was the one from Prato, well described in Bettarini (2007; 2012).

5 Marino Darsa or Marin Držić, who will be introduced in Section 4, in fact, used to sign his works as “Marino Darsa raguseo” or “M.D.”.

6 Since its birth, Ragusa was governed, at times dominated and at times protected by several different powers that followed one another for centuries. At first Byzantium (ca. 7<sup>th</sup> century-1204) and sequentially, Venice (1204–1358), Hungary (1358–1526), the Ottoman Empire (1526–1684), and finally, Austria (1684–1806).

7 Kunčević (2012), Rešetar (1933c).

bridging east and west, the hinterland of the Balkans and the Sea. Although there were numerous attempts of submitting the town to major powers, among others Venice and the Ottoman Empire, in order to eliminate its rise and limitate its financial power, a wise way of ruling and stipulating alliances with neighbouring authorities was the key for survival. Furthermore, Dubrovnik was able to obtain a wide range of autonomy (although it was officially ruled by a foreign authority, first Venetian, then Hungarian, later Ottoman and finally, Austrian), which lasted for centuries, until the capture by Napoleon in 1808<sup>8</sup>. Such conditions, in addition to the Ragusan skilled diplomatic abilities in maintaining the most politically neutral position possible created the perfect environment for the development of a prosperous and flourishing culture.

### 3 A Multilinguistic Territory

Renaissance Dubrovnik is a characteristic example of how multiple languages can coexist along with a strong patriotic feeling. In this micro linguistic area a situation of multilingualism persisted for centuries. Even though this will not be the core and main topic of this article, the understanding of the diastatic dimension is key for the interpretation of language contact and change in this area. It is possible to detect several components (languages) whose use changed drastically over time by shifting from a trilingual society (made of Ragusan, Venetian and a local Slavic vernacular) to a multilingual one (made of Italian, Venetian, the Slavic vernacular and partially Ragusan). This shift can be confirmed by empirical evidence. I will now provide a brief insight into each of the mentioned languages.

Ragusan, sometimes considered as a dialect of Dalmatian and sometimes as one of the Dalmatian languages, represents the oldest variety of this very same language. Unfortunately, no written records of this language have been preserved. We are relatively certain about the fact that it was extinguished roughly around the end of 15<sup>th</sup> century, due to the predominance of both Venetian and the Slavic vernacular. It is important to mention that Ragusan had been the official language of Dubrovnik, even if for a very short period, in an attempt by the local authorities to revive the language. At first, we could consider it to be the only sociolinguistic substrate in Dubrovnik, whereas in the early Renaissance it backs up the Slavic vernacular as substrate.

A slightly different treatment was reserved to the Slavic vernacular, Italian and Venetian, which outlived the disappearance of the local autochthonous language

---

8 Further information on the historical background of Dubrovnik can be found in Carter (1971), Krekić (1961; 1972; 1980; 1997) and more.

and coexisted in an uneven symbiosis. The Slavic vernacular, initially adstrate language along with Venetian, slowly took over as the new substrate, replacing Ragusan. The reasons for this change are still unknown. We know that Dubrovnik was the destination for numerous migratory communities, both Slavic and Romance, but there does not seem to be a linguistically-driven motivation.

Venetian was the *lingua franca* as language of trade. The local population did not have a high proficiency of the language. Prior to diastatic change, it was an adstrate language, along with the Slavic vernacular—later a superstrate. It is reasonable to assume that, due to tipological relation, Venetian could have replaced Ragusan (as it did with Dalmatian in the remaining part of Dalmatia). However, as mentioned above, Venetian was restricted to a commercial use in the context of trade and common inhabitants did not have a high proficiency, which can also be confirmed by empirical evidence.

Italian held the prestige of a literary language, used for the sake of literature, especially in prose works, whereas Slavic, on the other hand, appeared in poems<sup>9</sup>. Further information on diastatic change can be found in Živojinović (in preparation).

#### 4 State of Research

“We speak of *language contact* when two or more languages (or varieties of languages) interact with one another.” This is how Campbell (2013: 298) started his chapter on language contact in a handbook, which is still considered as the reference point for historical linguistics studies. It is important to include in this definition because, as Thomason (cf. 2001) points out, the fact that two or more languages are used in the same place and at the same time. Considering both definitions, which are very general, I will attempt to describe certain points of Slavic-Romance contact in a literary context by presenting a synchronic analysis of comedies written by Marino Darsa (1508–1567), a Ragusan playwright and prose writer. However, Jakobson (1987: 16) notes that “any evolution possesses a systemic character and that any system is dynamic in nature”. Therefore, the set of both diachronic and synchronic considerations is needed to provide a clearer picture of language contact. In order to strengthen my point, I will add a smaller diachronic component by incorporating the analysis of certain manuscripts, in particular the *Vatican Croatian Prayer Book*<sup>10</sup>, presented in Malić (2006, 2015).

9 However, we do not lack poems written by Ragusan authors in Italian, such as Girolamo Papal, born in Split in 1460, Nicola Naljesković (ca. 1510–1587) and Nikola Gučetić (1549–1610).

10 Città di Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica, Barb.Lat.370.

On one hand, the texts I have examined are illustrative of the linguistic situation in Ragusa in the Renaissance period. These written records retrace the oral production and exemplify diastatic and diaphasic variation of the questioned area. Nonetheless, Darsa resorted to linguistic stereotyping, the poetic function in this linguistic heterogeneity of the text serves to foreground the humor related to language interference and code-switching. However, certain works, such as *Dundo Maroje*<sup>11</sup>, reveal a realistic urban sociolinguistic situation. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that this work faithfully represents the language spoken in Ragusa in this period. His knowledge of the Slavic vernacular, Italian and Venetian<sup>12</sup> was unquestionable, due to his multiple and extended stays, first in Siena and later in Venice, where he died. His works bear witness of extensive use of code switching, illustrating a high multilingual proficiency of his characters. For example, Italian propositions are used as larger units to replace the Slavic vernacular ones, but, in the same way, we also find commutations on a smaller scale. However, both single adjuncts and larger propositions are used only as unbound forms. In fact, infra-sentential code-switching (also called code-mixing<sup>13</sup>) is tendentially very rare and it can easily be argued that it might potentially be considered an example of Darsa's literary virtuosity or, more likely, a reflection of a multilingual society where code-switching is used to connote semantically and/or syntactically different concepts. In fact, we find the same issue, but with a slightly different outcome, in the following examples:

TRIP- ČETA:	Vidim, ti si našje- nac; see you compa- are triot	<i>siate</i> be	<i>il</i> the	<i>ben</i> <i>vegnuo</i> , welcome	dobar si došao! good are come
	'I see, you are our compatriot, be welcome, be welcome!' (First act, scene 1)				
TRIPČE:	[...] da t' služim	<i>un</i> <i>boccal</i> <i>de vin</i>	s	dobre	volje, brate.
	To to serve you	a mug of wine	with	good	will brother
	'Let me bring you a stein of wine of my good will, brother' (First act, scene 8)				

11 First performed in 1551, the year of its composition remains unknown.

12 Besides the Slavic vernacular and Italian, he also knew other languages: Latin, German and Turkish, which is evident from the use of certain specific elements in his works.

13 The terminology of code-switching and code-mixing, as used here, belongs to Muysken (2000: 250–278), who assumes that code-mixing is a distinctive phenomenon occurring in "all cases when lexical items and grammatical features from languages appear in one sentence."

PIJERO: [...] *Stiamo a veder* kao će ova rabota proć.  
 Let's to see how will this job go (pass by)  
 'Let's see how this deal goes'

Such examples allow us to understand the type of switching and mixing that this bilingual, or even trilingual community had chosen. The level of the linguistic competence is very proficient, though not a native level. This leads us towards drawing a possible hypothesis on the type of multilingualism characterized by asymmetry due the use of a specific type of commutation, which only involves larger chunks and avoids code-mixing at the morphological level.

On the other hand, the manuscript analyzed by Malić is the oldest Croatian vernacular prayer book and the finest example of the early shtokavian vernacular literary idiom. Therefore, such data present a precious set, helping us to explore diachrony. In particular, Dragica Malić (2006; 2015) provides a decomposition of lexicon of the two oldest Ragusan Latin<sup>14</sup> prayer books so far. Her work relies on many articles written by Rešetar<sup>15</sup> who conducted an investigation on the Ragusan monuments. She focused on loanwords and calques, also called *tudjinke*<sup>16</sup> in Rešetar (1952), and provided a brief insight in a basic structure and etymology of the word. What will result from a comparison of the two types of data will allow us to draw a conclusion with respect to the interaction between variation and contact in this specific area.

## 4 Methodology and Parameters of Contact

The inspection of both the synchronic and diachronic corpuses has been conducted by applying the theories of transphonemization and transmorphemization on the level of morphological and lexical analysis.

### 4.1 Transphonemization

First introduced in Filipović (1978), the term of *transphonemization* has often been used by Yugoslav, or better, Serbian and Croatian scholars to designate the function of substitution on the phonological level. In particular, it has been used by Rudolf Filipović in his studies on anglicisms in Serbo-Croatian. The concept

14 By Latin here I mean the Latin (or Roman) alphabet, as opposed to the manuscripts written in Cyrillic.

15 She specifically mentions Rešetar (1907; 1933a; 1933b; 1933c; 1936; 1938; 1938b; 1952).

16 In Šulek (1990), *tudjinke* simply stand for *Fremdwort*. There is no mention of any specific analysis in terms of types of borrowings.

refers to the process of adaptation of loanwords, or better of their switch into a replica. It splits into three distinguished types: 1) complete transphonemization, 2) partial or compromise transphonemization and 3) free transphonemization.

Firstly, in complete transphonemization, the description corresponds to phonemes in the borrowing language. For example, Engl. /dʒ/ vs. Croatian grapheme *dž*, as in *jeep* /dʒi:p/ vs. *džip* /dʒip/.

Secondly, partial or compromise transphonemization retraces the original phonemes that differ in part from the ones in the borrowing language. For example, Eng. /æ/ vs. Croatian *e*, as in *jam* /dʒæm/ vs. *džem* /dʒem/. Filipović claims that several consonants illustrate partial transphonemization very well, that is, the English phoneme *transphonemizes* by allowing a free change of place of articulation, but by maintaining the same manner.

Lastly, free transphonemization occurs very frequently and depends on the similarities and differences on the phonological systems of the borrowing language and the lending language. Namely, it occurs when the phonological form of the replica is formed according to the orthographic model of the donor language and not its pronunciation. For example, Engl. /ə/ allows several outcomes in Croatian. We find Engl. *Yorkshire* /'jɔ:kʃə/ vs. Croat. *Jorkšir* /'jorkʃir/, or Engl. *pyjamas* /pə'dʒɑ:məz/ vs. Croat. *pidžama* /pi'dʒama/.

## 4.2 Transmorphemization

The process of *transmorphemization* occurs in contexts of morphological substitution. Filipović (1979; 1980), who invented this term, uses it

“to cover changes occurring when a morpheme of the donor language, according to the basic principle of morphological adaptation begins with the formation of the *citation form* of the loan, and goes on in the creation of inflected forms, whatever the part of speech may be.”

Similar to the above-mentioned process of transphonemization, this one as well splits into three different types: 1) zero transphonemization, 2) compromise transmorphemization and 3) complete transmorphemization. All three types are explained below, along with the original tables of examples from Filipović (1980).

Firstly, zero transmorphemization occurs when the borrowing language takes a free morpheme with a zero bound morpheme.



English word	Loan
stem + zero suffix	free morpheme + zero bound morpheme
<i>bridge</i> <i>cup</i> <i>nylon</i> <i>scout</i>	<i>bridž</i> /brɪdʒ/ <i>kep</i> /kɛp/ <i>najlon</i> /'nailon/ <i>skaut</i> /skaut/

Table 1: Zero transmorphemization

Secondly, in a compromise transmorphemization a loan keeps a final bound morpheme of the donor language. This bound morpheme does not conform to the borrowing morphological system and therefore, maintains a compromise replica.

English word	Loan
stem + suffix	free morpheme + E bound morpheme
<i>dribbl-er</i> <i>farm-er</i> <i>sprint-er</i> <i>dop-ing</i> <i>park-ing</i> <i>train-ing</i>	<i>dribl-er</i> /'dribler/ <i>farm-er</i> /'farmer/ <i>sprint-er</i> /'sprinter/ <i>dop-ing</i> /'dopiŋ/ <i>park-ing</i> /'parkiŋ/ <i>tren-ing</i> /'treniŋ/

Table 2: Compromise transmorphemization

And lastly – as a complete transmorphemization, a bound morpheme is replaced by a borrowing language bound morpheme.

English word	Foreign word	Loan word
model	compromise replica	replica
stem + suffix	free morpheme – E bound morpheme	Free morpheme – Cr bound morpheme
<i>box-er</i>	<i>boks-er</i>	<i>boks-ač</i> /'boksatʃ/

Table 3: Complete transmorphemization

## 5 Results of Contact

### 5.1 Borrowings and Their Phonological Adaptation

Investigations on language contact usually prefer the lexical sphere, which is the most sensitive area regarding the influence of foreign elements. One of the two main outcomes of contact-induced change is borrowing, which is usually associated with situations of language maintenance and is defined as “the in-

corporation of foreign features into a group's native language by speakers of that language" (Thomason / Kaufman 1988: 37). There is a continuum in borrowing, from words that remain relatively foreign and unassimilated in pronunciation and spelling, through those that become more or less acclimatized to forms that have been assimilated so fully that their exotic origin is entirely obscured. There are numerous Italian lexemes in Darsa's comedies, but the largest part of this group underwent a long process of phonetic/phonological adaptation. In fact, it is very rare to find foreign, non-adapted words, because almost all the foreign lexemes are loanwords, integrated words, whose orthography was adapted if compared to the receiving language form. Tagliavini (1942: 379–381) synthesized the Slavic-Italian contact in the following way:

“Dovunque esistono contatti tra due popoli e due lingue si determinano influssi reciproci; nel caso dell'italiano e del croato<sup>17</sup> e dei loro rispettivi dialetti, gli influssi linguistici e le penetrazioni lessicali sono avvenute però quasi unicamente in un solo senso, e cioè dall'italiano sul croato, mentre i dialetti italiani sono rimasti immuni da influssi slavi [...]. La differenza quantitativa e qualitativa tra i due flussi di scambi lessicali si deve al diverso prestigio delle due lingue e al fatto che mentre, sul litorale e nelle isole di Dalmazia, gli Slavi hanno generalmente conosciuto l'italiano, gli Italiani solo molto raramente hanno conosciuto e parlato il croato.”

Such a synthesis partially confirms my previous hypothesis on the distinction of substrate/ superstrate that attributes a major percentage of distribution to the local Slavic vernacular (which is assumed to be the substrate language) and a minor one to Italian (superstrate). Moving back to loanwords and their orthographic adaptation, Županović (2008) noticed that there are (more or less) ten different innovations that need to be spotted. They are: transphonemization zero, degemination, the change /o/ > /u/, /e/ > /i/, /i/ > /e/, /ie/ > /i/, the insertion of the grapheme *j* inside /ia/ and /io/, an exchange between fricatives and affricates, an exchange of palatals and an exchange of sibilants. I will now present a few examples of phonological adaptation from either Venetian and/or Italian into Slavic, some of which have been detected by Županović (2008). At first, transphonemization occurs in type zero, free morpheme + zero bound morpheme, as in the following examples:

Venetian	Slavic vernacular of Ragusa	Italia
<i>banda</i> /'bānda/	<i>banda</i> /'bānda/	<i>banda</i> /'bānda/
<i>natura</i> /na'tura/	<i>natura</i> /na'tura/	<i>natura</i> /na'tura/
<i>segreto</i> /se'kretol/	<i>sekreto</i> /se'kretol/	<i>segreto</i> /se'gretol/
<i>fortuna</i> /for'tuna/	<i>fortuna</i> /for'tuna/	<i>fortuna</i> /for'tuna/
<i>ventura</i> /ven'tura/	<i>ventura</i> /ven'tura/	<i>ventura</i> /ven'tura/

17 Many scholars have addressed the Slavic component in Ragusa as to Croatian, to reconnect to today's political-linguistic distinction.

Secondly, degemination is a very common feature that we often find in the passage of lexemes from Italian to Neo-Shtokavian, which is also typical of Venetian.

<i>bagatela</i> /baga'tela/	<i>bagatela</i> /baga'tela/	<i>bagatella</i> /baga'tella/
<i>alegrezza</i> /ale'gressa/	<i>alegreca</i> /ale'gretsa/	<i>allegrezza</i> /al'legrettsa/
<i>facenda</i> /fa'zenda/	<i>fačenda</i> /fa'tʃenda/	<i>faccenda</i> /fatʃ'tʃenda/

Probably the most common vowel change is /o/ > /u/ that we find in numerous examples in, as Županović (2008) specifies, both stressed and unstressed syllables. Again, this feature was very common in Venetian as well.

<i>torto</i> /'tɔrto/	<i>turto</i> /'turto/	<i>torto</i> /'tɔrto/
<i>curt</i> /kurt/	<i>kurto</i> /'kurto/	<i>corto</i> /'kɔrto/
<i>scapolo</i> /'skapolo/	<i>skapulat</i> <sup>18</sup> /'skapulat/	<i>scapolo</i> /'skapolo/

Italian diphthongs are subjected to a change that splits into two different directions. On one hand, they are simplified into one single vowel, so that we obtain /ie/ > /i/ as in the following examples:

<i>cancelier</i> /kanze'ljer/	<i>kancilir</i> /kan'tsilir/	<i>cancelliere</i> /kantʃel'ljere/
<i>forestier</i> /fores'tjer/	<i>furistijer</i> /furis'tijer/	<i>forestiero</i> /fores'tjero/

The diphthong /ua/ instead, undergoes the transformation into /va/, as in:

<i>persuader</i> /persua'der/	<i>pervadit</i> /pers'vadit/	<i>persuadere</i> /persua'dere/
<i>sguazzeto</i> /zgwa'seto/	<i>gvacet</i> /'gvatset/	<i>guazzetto</i> /gwats'tsetto/

On the other hand, certain /ia/ and /io/ diphthongs are separated by the intervocalic element /j/.

<i>fastidio</i> /fas'tidjo/	<i>fastidijo</i> /fas'tidijo/	<i>fastidio</i> /fas'tidjo/
<i>bestia</i> /'bestja/	<i>beštija</i> /'beštija/	<i>bestia</i> /'bestja/
<i>furia</i> /'furja/	<i>furija</i> /'furija/	<i>furia</i> /'furja/
<i>colanina</i> /kola'nina/	<i>kolajina</i> /ko'lajina/	<i>collanina</i> /'kollanina/

Several consonantal changes are not to be forgotten. Mostly fricatives and affricates have undergone this change.

<i>geloso/geloxo</i> /dʒe'lozo/	<i>lužiljuz</i> /lu'ʒiɫuz/	<i>geloso</i> /dʒe'lozo/
<i>capricio</i> /kap'risio/	<i>kapric</i> /'kaprits/	<i>capriccio</i> /ka'pɾitʃjo/

Dealing with consonants, we also find the velar sibilant /s/ transforming into a post-velar sibilant /ʃ/.

<sup>18</sup> An example of complete transmorphemization.

<i>pistola</i> /pis'tola/	<i>pištola</i> /piʃ'tola/	<i>pistola</i> /pis'tola/
<i>scrign</i> /skrijn/	<i>škrinjō</i> /ʃ'krijno/	<i>scrigno</i> /s'krijno/
<i>scale</i> /s'kale/	<i>škale</i> /ʃ'kale/	<i>scale</i> /s'kale/

Some other transformations are worth being mentioned, even though the following examples do not occur as frequently as the previous ones:

/k/ – /g/	<i>fadiga</i> /fa'diga/	<i>fatiga</i> /fa'tiga/	<i>fatica</i> /fa'tika/
/z/ – /ʒ/	<i>usar/uxar</i> /u'zare/	<i>užat</i> /'uʒat/	<i>usare</i> /u'szare/

## 5.2 Morphological Change in Synchronic Data

All the three processes of *transmorphemization* can be detected in the morphological change that occurred as a consequence to the Slavic-Italian contact. It mostly involved the categories of nouns, verbs and adjectives. Starting from zero transmorphemization, we assist in a process of morphological adaptation through the loss of the final bound morpheme. Such characteristics are common in lexemes containing the suffixes *-o* and *-e*, usually marking masculine singular lexemes, as in the following examples, all taken from *Dundo Maroje*, involving the categories of nouns and adjectives:

Venetian	Slavic vernacular of Ragusa	Italian
<i>consejo</i> /kon'sejo/	<i>konselj</i> /'kõnseʎ/	<i>consiglio</i> /kon'siʎʎo/
<i>segno</i> /'sejno/	<i>senj</i> /sej/	<i>segno</i> /'sejno/
<i>compagno</i> /kon'paɲno/	<i>kompanj</i> /'kompaɲ/	<i>compagno</i> /kom'paɲno/
<i>ato</i> /ato/	<i>at</i> /at/	<i>atto</i> /'atto/
<i>vilan</i> /vi'lan/	<i>vilan</i> /'vilan/	<i>villano</i> /vil'lano/
<i>galante</i> /ga'lante/	<i>galant</i> /'galant/	<i>galante</i> /ga'lante/
<i>degno</i> /'dejno/	<i>denj</i> /dej/	<i>degno</i> /'dejno/
<i>spirito</i> /s'pɪrito/	<i>irit</i> /s'pɪrit/	<i>spirito</i> /s'pɪrito/
<i>paso</i> /'paso/	<i>pas</i> /pas/	<i>passo</i> /'passo/
<i>vestido</i> /ves'tido/	<i>vestit</i> /'vestit/	<i>vestito</i> /ves'tito/

The process of compromise transmorphemization is the one that probably occurred more often in the Italian-Ragusan Slavic vernacular change. As it is possible to notice in the following examples, Italian bound morpheme is maintained in the final Slavic outcome. Due to the discrepancy between the two languages, only degemination materialized, as in the following nouns:

<i>vedoela</i> /vedo'ela/	<i>veduvela</i> /vedu'vela/	<i>vedovella</i> /vedo'vella/
<i>mascarada</i> /maska'rada/	<i>maškerata</i> /maʃke'rata/	<i>mascherata</i> /maske'rata/
<i>osto</i> /'otse/	<i>ošte</i> /'oʃte/	<i>oste</i> /'oste/
<i>alegrezza</i> /ale'gressa/	<i>alegreca</i> /ale'gretsca/	<i>allegrezza</i> /al'legrettsa/

During morphological adaptation of both nominal and adjectival categories, it is relatively common to find a graphemic insertion *-a-*, a feature standing between a phonological and a morphological use, applied in order to break longer chains of consonants that usually do not occur in the standard Shtokavian form. For example:

<i>impediment</i> /inpedi'ment/ <i>apuntamento</i> apunta'mento/	<i>impedimenat</i> / impedi'menat/ <i>apuntamenat</i> / apunta'menat/	<i>impedimento</i> / impedi'mento/ <i>appuntamento</i> / appunta'mento/
---	--	--

Concerning the adaptation of Italian suffixes, we have to mention certain common nouns, usually ending with *-tur* and deriving from the Italian *-tore* or *-ijer*, coming from *-iere*. Here are listed some examples found in *Dundo Maroje*:

<i>dotor</i> /do'tor/ <i>forestier</i> /fores'tjer/ <i>tavolier</i> /tavo'ljer/	<i>doktur</i> /dok'tur/ <i>furistijer</i> /furi's'tijer/ <i>tavulijer</i> /tavu'lijer/	<i>dottore</i> /dot'tore/ <i>forestiero</i> /fores'tjero/ <i>tavoliere</i> /tavo'ljere/
---	--	---

Along with compromise transmorphemization, we also find a conspicuous amount of complete transmorphemization in verbal borrowings, where the standard Italian suffix is substituted with its Slavic equivalents *-iti* and *-ati*<sup>19</sup>. What is fundamental to mention is that in this category we find integrated loanwords, that resulted from the application of the morpheme marking the infinitive. Also important to mention is that we can notice a phonetic and graphic adaptation of such loanwords, whose meaning does not change, except for fewer exceptions that will be seen below:

<i>alozar</i> /alo'zar/ <i>bastar</i> /bas'tar/ <i>abandonar</i> / abando'nar/ <i>acomodarse</i> / akomo'darse/ <i>consumar</i> /konsu'mar/	<i>alodžati</i> /a'lodžati/ <i>bastati</i> /'bastati/ <i>abandonati</i> / aban'donati/ <i>akomodavati se</i> <sup>20</sup> / akomo'davati se/ <i>konsumati</i> /kon'sumati/	<i>alloggiare</i> /allodž'džare/ <i>bastare</i> /bas'tare/ <i>abbandonare</i> / abbando'nare/ <i>accomodarsi</i> / akkomo'darsi/ <i>consumare</i> /konsu'mare/
---	---	--

19 We find a very similar pattern in Županović (2008). However, she spotted a conversion into verbal suffixes *-at* and *-it*, whereas in Držić, we find the integral version that is also used nowadays.

20 The additional morpheme *-va-* is also called imperfective morpheme, whose function is only aspectual and serves to derive imperfective verbs from the perfective ones.

## 5.2 Evidence from the Diachronic Corpus

Dragica Malić has conducted an extensive research on a conspicuous number of manuscripts in the domain of Slavic lexicology and lexicography. Of great importance are her above-mentioned articles on Ragusan loanwords that resulted out of her detailed examination of the *Croatian Vatican Prayer Book*<sup>21</sup> (V<sup>1</sup> from this point further) and *Ragusan Academic Prayer Book*<sup>22</sup> (A from this point further). These two manuscripts represent the oldest written Ragusan prayer books and here I only consider the non-Slavic corpus analyzed by Malić. Despite lexical adaptations, it is possible to detect all three types of transmorphemization in her examples.

zero transmorphemization	<i>devoto</i> > <i>devot</i> (V <sup>1</sup> 145v) <i>balsamo</i> > <i>balsam</i> (V <sup>1</sup> 19r, 47v) <i>isopo</i> > <i>isop</i> (A 79r, 89v, 114r) <i>timpano</i> > <i>timpan</i> (V <sup>1</sup> 29v) / <i>tinpan</i> (V <sup>1</sup> 28v, A 16r)
compromise transmorphemization	<i>devozione</i> > <i>devocijun</i> (A 98r, 101r) <i>principe</i> > <i>prinčip</i> (V <sup>1</sup> 102v, 118v) Lat. <i>glutto</i> > <i>glotunstvo</i> (V <sup>1</sup> 155v) Lat. <i>psalterium</i> > <i>psaltijer</i> (A 16r) / <i>psaltir</i> (V <sup>1</sup> 28v)
complete transmorphemization	<i>disperarsi</i> > <i>desperati se</i> (V <sup>1</sup> 149r) <i>adorare</i> > <i>adorati</i> (A 133v) <i>castigare</i> > <i>kastigati</i> (A 108r, 111r) <i>mancare</i> > <i>pomankati</i> (V <sup>1</sup> 80v, 85r, A 115v, 120r)

Such examples fit perfectly within the framework developed by Rudolf Filipović. Furthermore, there is an evident similarity between data pulled out from both the synchronic and diachronic corpuses, which seem to be using the very same pattern of loanword adaptation. Because of such congruency, it is likely that synchronic data find confirmation in diachrony, and therefore, the hypothesis of contacted-induced change is confirmed.

## 6 Conclusion and Research Desiderata

Ragusa is undoubtedly a cultural centre with a very interesting historical and linguistic background, characterized by multidimensional complexity. Its socio-cultural status in the period of Renaissance reflected the sociolinguistic situation, which is well illustrated in the Darsa's work. The combination of data pulled out from some of the most important literary works in the Slavic Adriatic area and some of the oldest written records in Ragusa provides an intriguing

21 Dating back to year 1400 ca.

22 Mid-15<sup>th</sup> century manuscript.

insight into Renaissance language use. The work by Rudolf Filipović acts as a filter to the analysis of adaptation of loanwords and as a unifier of the two corpora. The result of this binomial is a confirmation of language change due to contact. However, in the perspective of a future work, it would be necessary to broaden the corpus of diachronic data, by analyzing Cyrillic manuscripts as well.

## Bibliography

- Assenza, Elvira. 2016. The Asymmetric Multi-language Model: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Pattern to Explain Code-Switching by Unbalanced Multilinguals. In: Keith Allan / Alessandro Capone / Istvan Kecskes (eds.): *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*. Cham: Springer, 861–899.
- Auer, Peter. (ed.). 2013. *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bartoli, Matteo. 2000. *Il dalmatico*. Vol. 2. Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.
- Bettarini, Francesco. 2007. I Toscani al servizio della città di Ragusa (Dubrovnik) nella prima metà del Quattrocento. *Medioevo Adriatico* (Vol. 1). 135–150.
- Birnbaum, Henrik. 1974. *On medieval and Renaissance Slavic writing. Selected essays*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Čale, Frano (ed.). 1987. *Držić: Djela*. Zagreb: Centar za kulturnu djelatnost.
- Carter, Francis. 1971. The Commerce of the Dubrovnik Republic, 1500–1700. In: *The Economic History Review* 24(3), 370–394.
- Dotto, Diego (ed.). 2008. *Scriptae venezianeggianti a Ragusa nel XIV secolo. Edizione e commento di testi volgari dell'Archivio di Stato di Dubrovnik*. Rome: Viella.
- Dotto, Diego. 2009. Un testo venezianeggiante del 1323 e un cancelliere pistoiese a Ragusa. In: *Bollettino dell'Atlante Lessicale degli antichi volgari italiani* 2(2), 1000–1022.
- Filipović, Rudolf. 1979. Transmorphemization—the most common form of substitution on the morphological level. In: *Filologija* 9, 177–183.
- Filipović, Rudolf. 1980. Transmorfemizacija: reinterpretacija supstitucije na morfološkoj razini. In: *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabienia. Revue publiée par les Sections romane, italienne et anglaise de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Zagreb* 25, 1–8.
- Filipović, Rudolf. 1982. Phonologization and activation of latent phonemes in linguistic borrowing. In: *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 12(1), 36–47.
- Grčević, Mario. 2012. Jezik Marina Držića prema jeziku Biblije Bartola Kašića i Dubrovačkoga misala. In: *Filologija* 56, 23–49.
- Greenberg, Robert D. 2004. *Language and identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and its disintegration*. Oxford: OUP.
- Grković-Major, Jasmina. 2011. The Development of Predicative Possession in Slavic Languages. In: Motoki Nomachi (ed.): *The Grammar of Possessivity in South Slavic Languages. Diachronic and Synchronic Perspective*. Sapporo: Slavic Research Centre, Hokkaido University, 35–54.
- Hickey, Raymond (eds.). 2010. *The handbook of language contact*. Hoboken / New Jersey: Wiley.

- Jakobson, Roman. 1987. *Language in literature*. Cambridge / Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Krekić, Bariša. 1961. *Dubrovnik (Raguse) et le Levant au moyen âge*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Krekić, Bariša. 1972. *Dubrovnik in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries: A city between East and West*. Norman / Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Krekić, Bariša. 1980. *Dubrovnik, Italy, and the Balkans in the late Middle Ages*. London: Variorum Reprints.
- Krekić, Bariša. 1997. *Dubrovnik: A Mediterranean Urban Society, 1300–1600*. London: Variorum Reprints.
- Kunčević, Lovro. (2012). *The Myth of Ragusa: Discourses on Civic Identity in an Adriatic City-State (1350–1600)*. Dissertation. Central European Univ.
- Malić, Dragica. 2006. Najstarije dubrovačke “tuđinke”. In: *Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 31(1), 165–209.
- Malić, Dragica. 2015. Suodnos tiskanoga ćirilčkoga dubrovačkog molitvenika i rukopisnoga latiničkoga drugoga vatikanskog. In: *Filologija* 62, 139–160.
- Malinar, Smiljka. 2004. Italiano e croato sulla costa orientale dell’Adriatico Dai primi secoli all’Ottocento (I). In: *Studia romanica et anglica Zagrabiensia* 47, 283–310.
- Muljačić, Žarko. 1999. Dalmatski. In: *Fluminensia: časopis za filološka istraživanja* 11(1–2), 1–30.
- Muljačić, Žarko. 2000. *Das Dalmatische. Studien zu einer untergegangenen Sprache*. Wien: Böhlau.
- Muljačić, Žarko. 2003. O dalmatoromanizmima u Marulićevim djelima. In: *Colloquia Maruliana* 12, 131–142.
- Pinelli, Paola (ed.). 2010. *Firenze e Dubrovnik all’epoca di Marino Darsa (1508–1567)*. Atti della giornata di studi, Firenze, 31 gennaio 2009. Firenze: Firenze University Press.
- Rešetar, Milan. 1933c. Jezik Marina Držića. In: *Rad JAZU* 248, 99–240.
- Stojan, Slavica. 2009. Darsa e i suoi personaggi nella quotidianità della Ragusa rinascimentale. In: *Studi slavistici* 5(1), 49–64.
- Tagliavini, Carlo. 1942. Sugli elementi italiani del croato. In: *Reale Accademia d’Italia: Italia e Croazia*, Roma, 377–454.
- Vončina, Josip. 1982. Scenski jezik Marina Držića i kazališna baština u Dubrovniku. In: *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Istraživačkog centra Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Dubrovniku* 19–20, 249–261.
- Živojinović, Jelena. In preparation. Sociolinguistic stratification in the Renaissance Ragusa.
- Županović, Nada. 2008. Analiza talijanizama u Hvarkinji Martina Benetovića. In: *Fluminensia: časopis za filološka istraživanja* 20(1), 33–53.



Jelena Živojinović, BA MA  
University of Verona  
Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures  
Lungadige Porta Vittoria 41  
37129 Verona  
Italy  
jelena.zivojinovic@univr.it

UiT The Arctic University of Norway  
Department of Language and Culture (ISK) / CASTL  
Teorifagbygget 4.367, UiT Campus Tromsø  
9019 Tromsø  
Norway  
jelena.zivojinovic@uit.no



---

## II Varieties in Contact



---

## **Varieties of German in Austria**

