

Speech of Croatian emigrants in the overseas countries and countries of Western Europe: The level of research attained

UDK:811.163.42(73+71=163.42)

811.163.42(94+931=163.42)

811.163.42(4-15=163.42)

Izvorni znanstveni rad/Refereed Research Paper

Sanja Zubčić, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, University of Rijeka

The article analyses publications of foreign and domestic Slavists about the speech of Croatian emigrants in the overseas countries (United States of America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand) and in countries of Western Europe. The publications are shown according to chronological principle and are grouped according to the common corpus of research. They are further analysed from either a sociolinguistic or purely linguistic approach depending on their theme, and most often as influence of the majority language of the country of immigration onto the grammatical structure of the native Croatian language in the works on record. In order to show the attainments of research, the publications are also analysed in relation to the country of immigration. The analysis has established guidelines for necessary future research.

The article has an annexed bibliography of domestic and foreign publications.

Key words: *Croatian language, Croatian emigrant communities, overseas countries, countries of Western Europe*

1. Introduction

The language of immigrant communities is a frequent topic of linguistic research, which focuses on either the native language of the immigrants, or the language of the country into which a particular community immigrated. Migration produces zones of direct contact of two languages, and thus are ideal opportunities for examining general principles and mechanisms of the languages in contact, and the changes produced by direct language-contact. Thus, it is not surprising that the majority of scholarly authorities in the field of the languages in contact theory developed more recent theoretical

approaches, dealing primarily with the analysis of the speech of bilingual minority communities.¹

Majority of published studies has occurred in the anglophone countries, mostly the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, which are also countries with significant immigration intakes. The studies published in these countries most frequently dealt with the influence of English language on native languages of immigrant communities.² The languages of immigrant communities in the European countries were also researched, but received comparatively much less attention.³ One of the probable reasons for such discrepancy is the fact that inter-continental emigration is sociologically differently structured from the immigration within Europe, so that the examples and nature of those two kinds of migration are structurally different, and it is also important to stress that the migrations within Europe were at a much later date. The majority of linguistic research is concentrating upon two issues caused by language interference: language maintenance and language-shift. The studies dealing with the language “maintenance” emphasize its socio-linguistic conditions, but very rarely or never deal with the degree of intra-linguistic coherence of the linguistic system itself.

Taking into account the existence of numerous Croatian diasporic communities,⁴ for whom the language is one of the basic conditions for keeping national identity, the primary aim of this paper is to show quantitative and qualitative aspects of the existing research into the language of Croatian emigrants. Furthermore, the paper will point to the specificity of those studies, show whether they correlate or diverge from the other immigrant communities existing in similar circumstances, and finally suggest possibilities for further research.

¹ In Croatia, pioneering research in the theory of language was conducted by R. Filipović, with his study of the influence of English language on the language of Croatian immigrants in the US (1986b). The pioneer of the theory of language-contact in bilingualism, Einar Haugen, used the experience of the Norwegian immigrant community in the United States (1953), while his collaborator Uriel Weinreich (1953) dealt with Romano-German bilingualism in Switzerland. In a more recent scholarship, it is worthy to mention the studies of M. Clyne, who researched language of immigrant communities in Australia (1991, etc.) with special attention focused on German-English bilingualism (1972, etc.). Contemporary theoretical research mostly relies on already published data, and a good example are the studies of one of the leading scholars in code-switching theory, C. Myers-Scotton (1993, etc.).

² E.g. the research of the impact on English to the language of immigrant communities in the US: most frequently German (cf. Costello 1985), but also Dutch (Daan 1971), Hungarian (Fenyvesi 1996), Swedish (Hasselmo 1961), Czech (Henzl 1980), etc. In Australia, the research has been conducted with the Italian community (Bettoni 1981), German (Clyne 1972), Danish (Søndergaard 1997), while in Canada the research is more sparse, e.g. with Italian community (Clivio 1986). Taking into account more significant level of immigration from Asian countries, in Australia more recently develops corpus of studies dealing with the language-contact between English and Mandarin, Cantonese, Japanese or Korean language. Cf. <http://mki.wisc.edu/News/Courses/LangandImm/bib1.html> (all web site references in the article last time assessed on 02/12/2010) for the list of the studies of languages of different immigrant communities in the US. The studies on the influence of English on Croatian will be discussed later in the paper.

³ On a language of Turkish community in the Netherlands wrote Backus 1996, on French-German interference see Treffers-Daller 1994, and on the impact of French on languages of different Arabic immigrant communities see Bentahila – Davies 1983.

⁴ There are mutually differing data on the number of the Croatians and their descendants outside Croatia. According to the estimates of A. Akrap (2003: 26) there are around 2,500,000 Croatians and their descendants living outside Europe and somewhere between 350,000 and 530,000 living in the countries of Western Europe.

2. Methodology

Croatian philological studies unfortunately have not produced a comprehensive bibliography of published scholarly studies dealing with the language of Croatian diaspora thus far. The task of compiling such a bibliography is additionally complicated by the fact that a large portion of those studies has been published outside Croatia, often in rather obscure and non-scholarly publications, the aim of this paper therefore is to produce a compilation of those publications. The data about the studies are collected firstly from the bibliographies of peer-refereed publications, the existing publications in Croatia,⁵ the publications outside Croatia which were available,⁶ library catalogues in and outside of Croatia, and through an internet search.⁷ The list of publications is by no means definite, and this paper represents only a beginning.

The studies will be presented in chronological order and by author's name. Furthermore, they will be analysed according to the country or continent where particular immigrant community lives and the type of description, in order to establish potential and expected deviations.

This paper will not analyse research of the speech of the Croats in so-called 'old' European diaspora, that is, the Croatian speech in autochthonous Croatian communities in Austria, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Romania, Serbia, Montenegro, Italy and in diaspora of the old diaspora in Bulgaria.⁸ There are many reasons for that decision. The main one being the fact that those are all communities of old diaspora, some dated as early as the late 15th century, so we cannot take into account generational disintegration, which is a key term in the contemporary theory of languages in contact, but also because those dialects are already reasonably well described by Croatian and also by Austrian and Hungarian philology.⁹

The main focus of this paper is the language of Croatian immigrants in Western Europe (Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Sweden, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Norway) and those in the overseas countries (North and South America, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa). It is important to take into account the fact that the immigration to Western Europe started on a larger scale mainly in the 1960s and 1970s, and to the overseas countries much earlier, in the mid-19th century, and also the fact that they mutually differ in a degree of social cohesiveness which is much stronger in the overseas diaspora,¹⁰ so we can expect differences in the approaches and the differences in description of the speech in these communities.

⁵ Cf. Nejašmić 1983.

⁶ Cf. Magner 1982. There are also useful bibliographies in Lenček – Okuka 1990 and Milivojević – Mihailović 1990.

⁷ There is bibliography of studies on research of language of immigrant communities in the USA available on <http://mki.wisc.edu/News/Courses/LangandImm/bib1.html>. A comprehensive list of worldwide linguistic publications *Linguistic Bibliography*, annually published by Brill, was also consulted.

⁸ On history of immigrations in those regions see Samardžija 2004/2005, with comprehensive bibliography.

⁹ Bibliography of publications about those languages is published in monographs dealing with three main Croatian dialects: *kajkavian* (Lončarić 1996), *štokavian* (Lisac 2003) and *čakavian* (Lisac 2009).

¹⁰ HE 2002: 673-674. The immigration into the overseas countries is characterised with so-called chain migration, resulting ultimately with compact immigrant communities, often connected with links of kinship and common place of birth. It is well-known that majority of inhabitants of Lovinac migrated into Canada, majority of population from the islands of Cres, Lošinj and Krk into New York (Božanić 1996, 1997).

It is important to note two terms in the research of language contact: *donor language* and *target language* (Filipović 1986b: 17). Contemporary theory of language contact also often uses the terms *matrix language* (ML) and *embedded language* (EL),¹¹ which are actually theoretical constructs conditioned by psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic factors occurring in the process known as *code-switching* (Myers-Scotton 1993). The determination of ML is not simple at all as it depends on the personal relationship of the speaker to the language, and is not necessarily identical to the term 'mother tongue.' However, in the case of the speech of the Croatian immigrants of the first and most frequently second generation ML is usually Croatian (Hlavac 2003: 198), so in that context the term ML is overlapping with the term 'target language'. Defining that language as 'Croatian' is partially correct, only as a sign of belonging to a higher hierarchical rank. The term 'Croatian' can not be related to the contemporary standard Croatia when discussing a speech of a large majority of Croatian immigrants. The speakers of the first generation brought with them their native vernacular idiom, belonging to one of three major Croatian dialects, and taught their children and grandchildren, the second and third generation of speakers, to speak using that particular idiom.¹² So, the status of the 'target language' and/or ML has local dialect as a defining linguistic unit, rather than standard language or some of the other higher abstract linguistic levels in dialectology. It is understandable that this thesis does not imply an isolationistic approach *per se*, as that particular approach would not be able to synthesize data into meaningful larger units. The thesis however implies a need to take into account all specificums of the target language when analyzing donor language, rather than having an equal approach to the process of phonological adaptation of English phoneme /d←/ in *štokavian* speech which has the phoneme /→/ and in *čakavian*, where the phoneme is absent so it needs to be transphonemized in different ways.

While selecting publications for the present paper, the significant problem arose with the interpretation of the terms "Yugoslav", which was usually indiscriminately applied to the immigrants who were citizens of former Yugoslavia, and "Serbo-Croatian", most frequently relating to the language of the immigrants or their ancestors from Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro. Both terms were very frequent in the works of non-Croatian scholars in the 1970s and 1980s, in accordance with Yugoslav unitarist policies, toward which some Croatian scholars were also inclined. Some of them unfortunately kept the same terminology even after the break-up of Yugoslavia and Croatian independence in the 1990s. Whether a particular study dealt with the Croatian language is determined through contextual analysis of the example and the origin of the speaker. That was a precise and satisfactory criterion. A significant problem was to determine whether the speakers of *štokavian* speech were Serbs or Croatians, especially in cases when the speakers originated from the regions where both of these

¹¹ These terms were not originally developed, but were inaugurated and redefined in Carol Myers-Scotton 1993. She defined ML as „language in which the speaker has high proficiency, although it is not necessarily his/her 'best' language“.

¹² This division on different generations of speakers in Croatian linguistics was introduced in Filipović 1986b: 51. More recent studies redefine it slightly, so that migrants who migrated as children of pre-school age (5-year olds and younger) are now included amongst the speakers of the second generation, because their entire education was in the majority language of the community where they settled, Hlavac 2003: 17.

nationalities live, and when there was not enough of additional data to assist with valid conclusion. Those situations were fortunately sparse, mostly because majority of the Croatian immigrants in overseas countries were not speakers of *štokavian* dialect.

3. Overview of the publications on speech of Croatian immigrants

3.1. Overseas countries

From the 1970s in Croatia, but also in the countries to which Croatians emigrated, there was a noticeable rise in interest for the language of the immigrants and the linguistic changes which occurred. This is not surprising for many reasons. Firstly, those were the years when the western countries developed, though declaratively, the concept of multiculturalism. Another important factor is that during this period began more significant research of the languages in contact began, which centered on bilingual speakers, such as the overwhelming majority of the immigrants.

The first published work dealing with the language of Croatian immigrants which the present study could detect (regrettably, it was not accessible to the author) is the article of Louis Adamic, entitled: *Yugoslav speech in America*¹³ published in 1927 in the prestigious journal *The American Mercury*.¹⁴ Since after his arrival to the US, Adamic for some time lived in the Croatian community in San Pedro, California, it is possible to assume that in this text he relates, though tangentially, to the speech of this community. In direct evidence to this idea might be the fact that the first significant study of the speech of Croatian immigrants by A. Albin and R. Alexander, published in 1972 under the title: *The Speech of Yugoslav Immigrants in San Pedro, California* is researching the speech of that same immigrant community, which would become the centre of interest of other American Slavists, for which Adamic's text might have been an inspiration. Although the title, *The Speech of Yugoslav Immigrants in San Pedro, California*, is not transparent, taking in account terminological inadequacy, understandable for the period, the majority of immigrants in that community are undoubtedly Croatians from Dalmatia, the islands of Brač, Hvar, Korčula, and especially Vis. Although this study did not have much resonance in the Croatian scholarship, mostly for its methodological shortfalls,¹⁵ it still remains

¹³ Adamic 1927 – *non videm*. Louis Adamic (Alojz Adamič) was born 1899 in Blato near Grosuplje, in modern Slovenia. For political reasons he emigrated to the US as 14-years old, joining to Croatian fishermen community in San Pedro. After experiencing hard labour, he gets job in daily newspapers of the Slovenian community *Narodni Glas* in New York, and after returning from the service in WWI Adamic becomes professional journalist and writer. He published few books and in 1934, he received State prize for his book *The Native's Return*. During WWII Adamic supported Yugoslav resistance movement. From 1949 he becomes associated fellow of the Slovenian Academy for Humanities and Sciences (SAZU). Adamic died under unclear circumstances in time of intense political turmoil in Yugoslavia. Also refer to: J. Petrič, *Svetovi Louisa Adamiča: ob tridesetletnici smrti* (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1981) and F. Adamič, *Spomini in pričevanja o življenju in delu Louisa Adamiča* (Ljubljana: Prešernova družba, 1983).

¹⁴ *The American Mercury* was published in New York between 1924 and 1981. In the 1920s and 1930s the journal was publishing most eminent American writers such as: E. O'Neill, W. Faulkner, S. Lewis, F. Scott Fitzgerald etc.

¹⁵ Authors are often criticized for their study a heterogeneous group of speakers (gender, age and level of education) from different areas of speech and yet for making the conclusions that are not in accordance with the results of the analysis. A methodological failures are analysed in the two representations of the

important as as pioneering attempt in this field of research. A. Albin continued to deal with the language of the same community (1976 and 1986)¹⁶ researching models for influence of English on the speech of the first and second generation of speakers. In 1976 American Slavists T. F. Magner and C. A. Ward published papers, which do not discuss actual speech, but rather deal with the position and preservation of the Croatian language in the US. With the same approach Ward in 1980 discussed intrafamily factors for preservation of the native Croatian idiom.

Amongst the Croatian linguists Dunja Jutronić was the first to show interest in the speech of Croatian immigrants in the US in 1973. She devoted most of her scholarly interest to this topic, including her doctoral dissertation. Her research focuses on three generations of *čakavian* speakers from the Punat on the island of Krk and the island of Dugi otok as well as some *kajkavian* speakers who moved to Steelton, Pennsylvania. This research resulted with numerous publications (1973, 1974a, 1974b, 1976) including the monograph *Hrvatski jezik u SAD (Croatian Language in the US)* [1985]. In three publications (1982, 1983, 1989) Jutronić presented new theoretical frameworks and determined models of adaptation for borrowed words, as well as the results of syntactical interference between the giving language and the receiving language.

In the late 1970s begins publication series of R. Filipović (1978, 1979, 1980a, 1980b, 1982a, 1982b, 1982c, 1982c, 1982d, 1984a, 1984b, 1985, 1986a, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1997, 1998) who started a very important scholarly project “Croatian dialects in the U.S. A. - Croatian-English bilingualism” (Filipović 1986b: 47). Filipović dealt mainly with the sociolinguistic survey of conditions for preservation of the mother tongue of Croatian immigrants, and the community to which he devoted the bulk of his work is Konavle community in Watsonville. In this sense, to this day his contribution to this topic is the most comprehensive.

In 1978, the Serbian linguist, Milan Surdučki¹⁷, published a comprehensive monograph section of which deals with borrowings from the English language in the language of the Croatian and Serbian immigrants in Canada. The bulk of his informants are the Serbs, and interviewed Croatian speakers are from Šmrika, Divoselo near Gospić, Srednja Gora near Udbina, and Radatovići in Žumberak. Since the researcher did not present samples of speech, it is difficult from this perspective to determine whether they are Croatians or Serbs, with the exception of speaker from Šmrika who is undoubtedly speaker of *čakavian*. In his works from 1983 and 1984, Surdučki tried to establish similarities and differences in the ways in which English as the donor language impacted on the standard language in the then Yugoslavia and the language of the immigrants to Canada.

In the second half of the 1970s research extend to the other end of the world, New Zealand, whose linguistic complexity to the wider scholraly community was discovered by H. P. Stoffel. Besides being a great contributor to scientific affirmation of the Croatian

book (Jutronić Jutronić 1975 and 1975b) and in the note of Filipović 1981: 36

¹⁶ In the publication from 1986 the author slavicised name and surname changing it from Alexander Albin to Aleksandar Albijanić.

¹⁷ The same autor analysed the influence of the English language on language of the immigrant press in 1966, focusing mostly on Serbian community.

language, as a longtime lecturer of Croatian language at the University of Auckland,¹⁸ Stoffel investigated the influence of the English language on Dalmatian *čakavians*, who represent the majority of the Croatian community in New Zealand (1976, 1981a, 1981b, 1988b, 1988c, 1991¹⁹) and emphasized the preservation of the circumstances of this idiom (1982, 1986, 1993). In his publication from 1991 he analyses the written maxims via corpus of texts on tombstones, private correspondence of Croatian migrants and the texts published in the emigrant Croatian media.²⁰ It is also important to note his work on the relationship between dialect and standard language in the Croatian emigrant community (1994),²¹ which was inevitably imposed upon him by working with students of Croatian origin. In his paper (1988) Stoffel drew attention to the complexity of the linguistic situation in New Zealand in which the Croatian language coexists with two languages, dominant English and equivalent Moorish as an autochthonous but the minority language. The beginning of more comprehensive research in New Zealand occurred in the year 1975 when unpublished MA Thesis of M. Jakich, about linguistic interference between Croatian and English, was passed.

In the 1980s research continues of linguistic borrowing in bilingual communities of Croatian immigrants in the United States. T. S. Gasiński investigated lexical borrowing in the speech of the Croatian community in Santa Clara Valley, California (1986), while I. Bauer researched syntactic deviations caused by the English language, in the media of the Croatian community in the United States (1983).

Systematic research into the language of Croatian communities in Australia starts only in the late 1990s. In 1991 J. Doucet published a study *First Generation Serbo-Croatian Speakers in Queensland: language maintenance and language shift*,²² where he explored the use of speech of 140 speakers among whom there were only 33 who were identified as Croats (1991: 272). Since the conclusions offered in this paper only tangentially touch the Croatian language, they are only partially the subject of interest for this work and they should be interpreted with caution. B. Škvorc publishes a text in 1998 dedicated to the organized preservation of the Croatian language in Australia and the problem of bilingualism in the family, examining the language of Croatian immigrants through sociolinguistic aspects.²³ At roughly the same time on the scholarly and academic scene appears a younger linguist of Croatian descent, Jim Hlavač, whose PhD thesis on the speech of the second generation of Croatian Australians was passed at the Monash University and published in 2003 as a book as were several papers of his (1999a, 1999b, 2009). It is a studious and thorough monograph which emerged in the “workshop” of M. Clyne, brilliant Australian linguist, who in his work encourages the

¹⁸ On his experiences as university lecturer see Stoffel 1979.

¹⁹ In this publication are used data from the existing studies: Albin – Alexander 1973, Jutronić-Tihomirović 1985, Surdučki 1978.

²⁰ We refer to the journals *Pučki List*, which was published in Split between 1891 and 1922 and in which Croatian emigrants published their written work, their ads and announcements of different kinds, as well as journals *Bratska Sloga*, *Napredak* and *Zora* which were published for a short time in New Zealand at the beginning of the 20th century.

²¹ This paper was published in *Croatian Studies Review* 2 with insignificant changes.

²² The paper was reprinted in 2004 without changes.

²³ This paper was with some changes and the same title published in Škvorc 2005.

existence of minority languages in Australia and writes and publishes extensively on that subject (cf. Clyne 1991.). Under Clyne's supervision many PhD thesis were produced about the languages of minority communities, which can serve as a good model of other states with significant level of immigration.

John Felix Clissa completed his MA thesis at the University of Western Australia in 1996 about the language of the immigrant community of the Molise Croats (from Italian central-Adriatic coast) in Western Australia, entitled: *Language shift and diglossia among the Italo-Croatian migrants from the Molise in Western Australia*. A year earlier he published a preliminary study under the same title. In 2001, this author published a book where he collected samples of speech by different speakers, classified them by topic, briefly analyzed the language and compiled a short glossary. This book is not a scholarly monograph, but it can serve as a data source for future students, with the fundamental objection that the texts are not accented and the book is not accompanied by audio recording. Although not entirely fitting into this overview, we should mention a dictionary of the dialect from the island of Vis (*Libar Viškiĝa jazika* 1997). It is mostly written from the materials originally collected by Roki-Andre Fortunato, who emigrated to the USA in 1916, arriving to San Pedro, California, probably the best described Croatian emigrant settlement in the world. The rest of the paper is also a work of Croatian emigrants, because the final version of the book emerged as an effort between Vis – Canada, where a direct descendant of Fortunato lives, and the book was published in Toronto.

At the end of this chapter, we should also mention the general outline of the history of migration, distribution and research into the Croatian language in the world, by M. Samardĝija (2004/2005).

3.2. Western Europe

Scholarly interest in the language of Croatian immigrants in Western Europe began in the late 1970s and expanded through the 1980s. The research was inaugurated by the scholars who at that time worked on the project JUBA (*jugoslaviska barn*), which was investigating the speech of children of Croatian immigrants in Sweden. Given the fact that in Sweden live immigrant communities of other nations who were Yugoslav citizens, in particular the Serbs, and that work with a sensitive population like children did not take into account their ethnicity, only part of the conclusions in these papers can be applied to the Croats and Croatian language. A majority of papers on this analysed group was created precisely as a result of this project and further scholarly interests of those who participated in the project. The author of most papers, individual or incurred in co-authorship, is L. Ğuroviĝ who was the leader of the project at the University of Lund in Sweden. This research began by M. Stankovski analysing the children's language of immigrants in Sweden by (1978, 1980). It was followed by the publication of K. Centerham (1982), who researched the problems at the lexical level in the same group of respondents.

The largest contribution to the elucidation of this phenomenon consists of two special issues of the journal *Slavica Lundensia* (Vols. 9 and 11 for 1983 and 1987) which is

entirely dedicated to the topic.²⁴ L. Đurovič (1983a) introduces Vol. 9, entitled: *Lingua in Diaspora. Studies in the Language of the Second Generation of Yugoslav Immigrant Children in Sweden*, with a short introduction to the aims and objectives of the JUBA project. The first larger debate Stankovski - Đurovič - M. Tomašević (1983) is on the development structures of the mother tongue of children of immigrants in Sweden, where they speak about the various methodological problems. L. Đurovič has two papers in that same issue. One is the study of cases in children of emigrants (1983b), and the other deals with the formalization of flexion in the case of masculine nouns (1983c). Furthermore, Ann-Christin Friberg analyses the lexical layer identifying that considerable interference at the lexical level begins by entry into the Swedish educational system, and I. Dahlstrand deals with computer processing of data collected in the JUBA project. Volume 11 is a collection of papers entitled "*Child Language in Diaspora, Serbo-Croatian in West European Countries*", edited by L. Đurovič. Here Stankovski (1987) discusses the changes in inventory of consonants amongst the children of Croatian immigrants. L. Đurovič (1987) examines the development of grammatical systems in the researched population, and observes deviations from the grammatical system of their mother tongue. Mønnesland (1987) writes about the influence of the Norwegian language on the vocabulary of children of immigrants, and J. Matešić (1987) explores the semantic changes of words under the influence of German or Swedish. Sociolinguistic aspects of the lives of children in Sweden are dealt by K. Magnusson (1987) and also the group Pavlinić-Wolf - Ivazić - Anić (1987). M. Tomašević (1987) offered a methodical review of teaching the mother tongue of children of Croatian immigrants in Sweden. Wilfried Stölting (1987) extends the research to the situation in Germany, exposing the results of a scholarly project titled: *Bilingualism of Yugoslav students in Germany* based in Essen

In 1984 L. Đurovič also published three studies (1984a, b, c) which deal with the same problems, while his paper published in 1988 discusses the concept of language of immigrant groups. In the same group of scholars A. Pavlinić-Wolf started her work and she, either independently or in co-authorship with J. Anić and Z. Ivazić, (1983, 1987) shows in her work the sociolinguistic aspects of the life of that immigrant community. In later works, her interest spread to the linguistic situation in Denmark (1988, in co-authorship with K. Brčić and N. Jeftić) and offered an overview of Croatian communities in Western Europe (1993). Famous Croatian methodologist D. Rosandić also participated in the JUBA project and part of the results of the research was published in a separate study in 1989.

Increasing interest in the situation in Germany, where the largest Croatian immigrant community in Western Europe is located, started in the 1980s with P. Mrazović (1989) and M. Ljubešić investigating various aspects of the speech of children of Croatian immigrants. M. Runje (1990) speaks about ways to preserve the Croatian language in Germany. Of particular importance in this group of studies is the work of W. Stölting who, besides the already mentioned work, published a larger study in 1980.

²⁴ Those publications caused significant interest of scholarly community and received numerous reviews. M. Mihaljević (1988) reviewed both, and Heller (1986) and Leeming (1987) reviewed only volume 9.

4. Analysis

4.1. According to the method of analysis

The following works can be divided into two major groups:

1. Publications that discuss the speech of immigrants as a sociolinguistic fact and therefore examine the circumstances such as the use of mother tongue, and the conditions for its preservation;
2. Publications of strictly linguistic profile examining linguistic features of speech of Croatian immigrants.

To the first group of works belongs the opus of Filipović (1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1982b, 1982c, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1997), the works of American Slavists: Magner (1976) and Ward (1976, 1980), partly Stoffel (1981a, 1982), Škvorc (1998) and Clissa (1996). The sociolinguistic situation in the countries of Western Europe is dealt with in Pavlinić-Wolf (1983, 1987, 1988, 1993) and Runje (1990). All these works have in common an interpretation of the circumstances in which the Croatian emigrants most often use the Croatian language. They also draw attention to the areas where Croatian immigrants settled and suggest potential ways of preserving the Croatian language in the diaspora. In his influential study, Fishman (1966) established principles of sociolinguistic process whereby each valid sociolinguistic study should answer five basic questions: who speaks, with whom, what language, where and in what circumstances (Fishman 1966: 425) determining the area of language use (*domains*). Taking that into account, we can conclude that a great deal of work and transparent investigation of language, not only of Croatian immigrants, is still to be done in accordance with modern scientific knowledge. In this category, only Hlaváč (2009) and Doucet (1991, 2004), can be distinguished for the use of these principles.

The other group of papers, in which the problem of the speech of Croatian emigrant community is approached from the aspect of languages in contact theory, is more distinguished both quantitatively and qualitatively from the previous one. Thus they are potentially more interesting to those scholars who are engaged in the study of giving language and those interested in the receiving language. To this group belongs the first major study of the speech of Croatian immigrants by Albini and Alexander (1972) with the echoes in the later works of Albina / Albijanić (1976 and 1986). Of the Croatian scholars the biggest contribution is made by D. Jutronić who used collected material for the determination of the theoretical framework of linguistic borrowing, the model adaptation of borrowed words and scope of syntactic interference between giving language and the receiving language (1982, 1983, 1989). On the same track is the work of Gasiński (1986), Stoffel (1981b, 1988b, 1991), Surdučki (1966, 1978, 1983) and Hlaváč (1999a, 1999b). What they all have in common is the primary interest in the influence of the majority language onto the speech of Croatian immigrants, rather than the extent of preserved archaic features of the mother tongue. This idiom goes through

much slower changes from the same idiom in the homeland because it is not exposed to the Croatian standard language through education and media

The approach to the research of the speech of Croatian immigrants in Western Europe is quite different from that in the overseas countries. The focus of all researchers is the language of children of Croatian immigrants, while this segment is not isolated by the researchers in the overseas countries. Children, as a specific population group, are often the subject of interest in linguistics, especially in the research of languages in contact. However, it seems to me that this emphasis in research has been motivated by other factors, primarily by the attempt to explain and facilitate the learning of Croatian language (that is, as a teaching process and methodical act) which in the countries of Western Europe, as opposed to the overseas countries, has been and still is institutionalized and under the authority of the Croatian institutions. Due to the specific situation of the non-homogeneous immigrant community, with respect to the origin of the speakers, and the fact that children in those schools were taught the “other” standard version of the language, the description of the speech of Croatian emigrants in the countries of Western Europe and the overseas countries must be implemented from completely different methodological positions.

It seems important here to draw attention to three unique works, Bauer (1983), Surdučki (1966) and Stoffel (1991), which analysed the written discourse, mostly in the newspapers of Croatian immigrants, but also in the private letters of Croatian immigrants in the English speaking countries, that is in the USA, Canada and New Zealand. Given the differences in written and spoken discourse and the number of such publications, it would be necessary to make a systematic and thorough analysis of these texts in further research.

One thing is, without doubt, obvious in the way of describing the speech of Croatian immigrants: that each of the researchers adheres to the one principle, analyzing only one aspect. Since the degree of preservation of the language system depends primarily on a number of sociolinguistic factors, which are much more complex in the diaspora, it would be useful to combine both approaches for a comprehensive analysis in the future, that is, juxtapose each linguistic description with the sociolinguistic description of conditions in which the linguistic idiom exists.

4.2. According to the processing of the data

The representation of the collected works shows that a much larger number of papers has been published about the speech of expatriates in the overseas countries than those of the language of the immigrants in the countries of Western Europe. We can also see that the interest of researchers from the overseas countries is dispersed in few directions, while in the countries of Western Europe it is concentrated on Sweden, while the other countries are very poorly researched. The main reason for this stems from a variety of previously mentioned sociological characteristics of these two immigrant groups.

With respect to the country of immigration, the majority of works deals with the situation in the USA, which is understandable given the fact that the largest Croatian community exists there, but also that the only scholarly project in Croatia dealing with this field, the one under the leadership of R. Filipović, was dedicated precisely to it. In the countries of Western Europe the best researched speech community is one in Sweden, and the reason for this is also the existence of scholarly research project JUBA – launched in 1982 in Lund whose primary goal was to establish a formal aspect of language amongst the school –age children of Croatian immigrants of first and second generation.²⁵

Listed below are publications classified by the subject of research:

I. The overseas countries

a) United States of America

Adamić 1927; Albin - Alexander 1972; Albin 1976, 1986; Magner 1976; Ward 1976; Jutronić 1973, 1974a, 1974b, 1976, 1982, 1983, 1985, 1989; Filipović 1978, 1979, 1980a, 1980b, 1982a, 1982b, 1982c, 1982d, 1984a, 1984b, 1985, 1986a, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1997; Bauer 1983; Gasiński 1986.

b) Canada

Surdučki 1978, 1983, 1984; Roki Fortunato 1997.

c) Australia and New Zealand

Jakich 1975; Stoffel 1981a, 1981b, 1982, 1986, 1988a, 1988b, 1988c, 1991, 1993, 1994 (New Zealand); Doucet 1991, 2004; Škvorc 1998, 2005; Hlavac 1999a, 1999b, 2003, 2009; Clissa 1995, 2001.

II. Western Europe

a) Sweden

Stankovski 1978, 1980, 1987; Centerham 1982; Đurović 1983a, 1983b, 1983c, 1984a, 1984b, 1984c, 1987, 1988; Pavlinić-Wolf 1983, 1987; Friberg 1983; Dahlstrand 1983; Stankovski - Đurović - Tomašević 1983; Matešić 1987; Magnusson 1987; Pavlinić-Wolf - Anić - Ivazić 1987; Tomašević 1987; Rosandić 1989.

b) Norway

Mønnesland 1987

c) Germany

Stölting 1980, 1987; Matešić 1987; Mrazović 1989; Ljubešić 1991, 1992, 1995; Runje 1990.

d) Denmark

Pavlinić - Wolf - Brčić - Jeftić 1988.

From the above discussion arise two matters. First, it is necessary to intensify the research of the speech of Croatian immigrants in Western Europe, particularly in the

²⁵ The project lasted 1982-1990. The leader was L. Đurović, and it included collaboration with scholars from Croatia (see more on http://www.juls.savba.sk/slovenski_jazykovedci/1976-1985/Durovic.%20Lubomir.html), and as a result was published methodological guide for work with the children of Croatian immigrants. (Rosandić 1983).

countries where the Croatian diaspora exists in more substantial numbers, such as Germany and, second, that this survey has not found a single publication or a resource that would in any way deal with the situation in South America and South Africa. Given the fact that the Croatian community in South America is very old and large and that it had low level of emigration in more recent times, differing from North America and Australia, it is possible to assume that the linguistic situation there is quite different from those in other overseas countries. Therefore, it seems to me that the primary interest of scholars working in the Croatian language in the diaspora should be to establish the degree of preservation of the Croatian language in South America. It would also be desirable to make sociolinguistic analysis of the possible conditions for its preservation followed by linguistic analysis of the speech of Croatian immigrants in view of the possible influence of the Spanish and Portuguese language as the majority languages in the countries of immigration and with regard to the degree of preservation of the native idiom.²⁶

Despite the fact that the Croatian community in South Africa is smaller than others around the world, and that there are about 7,000 Croatians living there, contemporary linguistic reality there should be looked into and researched in as immediate future as possible.

At the end of this survey it is worthwhile mentioning the works which could by its title implicate the affinity to this theme and which would assist in raising consciousness of Croatian linguists about the fact that apart from the existence of language within Croatia itself and eventually in the old diasporas there exist other large and numerous emigrant communities of speech which are also Croatian. The discussion by Radoslav Katičić in his paper *Hrvatski jezik u svijetu* (1997) does not touch this interesting theme; it in fact examines the position of the Croatian language in the world and offers recommendations for achieving the recognition of Croatian as an independent language in its own right. The second discussion is that of R. Filipović titled *Sjedinjene Američke Države* in which he, on the track of his own investigations, presents a contemporary linguistic state of affairs in the USA. It is a part of monograph *Hrvatski jezik* (1998) in which a separate segment entitled *Dijaspora* is dedicated to the speech of Croatian emigrants and which, with already mentioned work, is made up of the following discussions: *Gradišćanski Hrvati, Mađarska, Rumunjska i Južna Italija*. Conceptually and substantially it is not correct to single out only these units and not to mention the others in at least the introductory part of monograph. The third and the most important is the monograph titled *Hrvatski jezik u XX. stoljeću* (2006) which does not mention the Croatian language in the Croatian emigrant community at all, but all other segments are pedantically and systematically analysed. Here it is not the case of systematic neglect or even failure to recognize that the speech of Croatian expatriates is not a part of Croatian language, but about the specific historical moment during which priority issues within the homeland had to be resolved as well as lack of professional staffing and organizational capabilities which should be improved in future endeavours.

²⁶ Samardžija (2004/2005: 63) also warned on necessity of such a research. After that are opened two positions for lecturers in Argentina (Rosario and Buenos Aires) under the patronage of the Croatian Ministry for science, education and sport, which might represent good foundations for a future research.

5. Conclusion

Based on this analysis it is clear that in future research into the speech of Croatian emigrants, special attention should be directed to the following:

- Research of the extent to which sociolinguistic factors affect the influence of the majority language of the country of immigration onto the language of the Croatian community, using modern sociolinguistic principles;
- Research into the degree of preservation of the mother tongue in relation to the preservation of the same idiom in the homecountry, which would represent a significant contribution to the development of diachronic dialectology and the history of the Croatian language as a linguistic system;
- Research into the language of Croatian emigrant publications, identification of potential variations and comparison with the variations in spoken discourse;
- - Intensification of research on the speech of immigrants in the countries of Western Europe, particularly those in which there are significant communities of Croatian immigrants, such as Germany;
- An urgent start of linguistic research in the countries of South America and in South Africa;

Time and linguistic changes are successive, and thus the degree of cultural, and with it a degree of linguistic assimilation are strongly increased in the contemporary globalized world. I believe that because of the impossibility of the simultaneous implementation of all these studies, partly because of lack of material resources, and unfortunately, the lack of interest from Croatian linguists regarding the situation in the Diaspora, focus on researching Croatian communities in South America and South Africa should be the first priority.

6. Bibliography

6.1. Literature about the language of Croatian immigrants in the Overseas countries and countries of Western Europe

- Adamić, L.** 1927. Yugoslav speech in America. *American Mercury*. XII, 319-321.
- Albin, A.; Alexander, R.** 1972. *The Speech of Yugoslav Immigrants in San Pedro, California*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Albin, A.** 1976. A Yugoslav community in San Pedro, California. *General Linguistics*. 16, 78-94.
- Albijić, A.** 1982. San Pedro revisited: Language maintenance in the San Pedro Yugoslav Community. *The Slavic Languages in Emigre Communities*. Edmonton: Linguistic Research Inc., 11-22.
- Bauer, I.** 1983. Syntactic deviations in an American-Croatian newspaper: An approach to the phenomena of linguistic borrowing. *Folia Slavica*. 6/2, 253-263.
- Centerham, K.** 1982. *Aktivno poznavanje leksika u srpskohrvatskom i švedskom jeziku kod jugoslavenske dece predškolskoga uzrasta u Malmöu*. Lund: Lund Universitet.
- Clissa, J. F.** 1995. *Language shift and diglossia among the Italo-Croatian migrants from the Molise in Western Australia*. A preliminary study. Perth.

- Clissa, J. F.** 2001. *The Fountain and the Squeezebox – La Fontana e L’Organetto – Funda aš Orginet*. Perth: Picton Press.
- Dahlstrand, I.** 1983. Data Processing in the JUBA Project. *Slavica Lundensia*. 9, 107-122.
- Doucet, J.** 1991. First generation Serbo-Croatian Speakers in Queensland: language maintenance and language shift. *Language in Australia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 270-284.
- Doucet, J.** 2004. First generation Serbo-Croatian Speakers in Queensland: language maintenance and language shift. *Language in Australia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 270-284.
- Đurovič, L.** 1983a. JUBA - a Short Introduction. *Slavica Lundensia*. 9, 7-10.
- Đurovič, L.** 1983b. The case systems in the language of diaspora children. *Slavica Lundensia*. 9, 21-94.
- Đurovič, L.** 1983c. Formalizing the S/C Flexion for the Automatic Morphological Analysis. *Slavica Lundensia*. 9, 123-148.
- Đurovič, L.** 1984a. Grammatical Systems in the Diaspora Language (Serbo-Croatian) of School Beginners. *Proceedings from Child Language Symposium*. Lund: Child Language Research Institute. 1, 17.
- Đurovič, L.** 1984b. The Diaspora Children’s Serbo-Croatian. *Language and Literary Theory. In Honor of Ladislav Matejka*. Ann Arbor, Michigan Slavic Publications. 19-27.
- Đurovič, L.** 1984c. Ispitivanje jezika vtoroj generaciji jugoslavov v Švecii. *Scando-Slavica*. 30, 205-20
- Đurovič, L.** 1987. The development of grammar systems in diaspora children’s language. *Slavica Lundensia*. 11, 51-85.
- Đurovič, L.** 1988. The concept of diaspora language. *Slavica Lundensia*. 12, 7-9.
- Filipović, R.** 1978. Očuvanje materinskog govora naših iseljenika u SAD pod pritiskom jezika prestiža. *Iseljeničtvo naroda i narodnosti Jugoslavije i njegove uzajamne veze s domovinom*. Zagreb: Zavod za migracije i narodnosti. 530-539.
- Filipović, R.** 1979. Proučavanje hrvatskih dijalekata u SAD. *Bilten zavoda za lingvistiku*. 3, 4-19.
- Filipović, R.** 1980a. Croatian Dialects as Markers of Croatian Ethnicity in the United States. *The Role of Ethnicity in American Society*, University of Zagreb and Commission for Educational Exchanges between the USA and Yugoslavia. 99-108.
- Filipović, R.** 1980b. Hrvatski dijalekti u kontaktu s engleskim jezikom na području SAD. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*. 5, 33-37.
- Filipović, R.** 1982a. Ispitivanje hrvatskih dijalekata bilingvnih govornika u neposrednome posuđivanju. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*. 6, 157-160.
- Filipović, R.** 1982b. Sudbina hrvatskih prezimena na engleskom govornom području u SAD. *Onomastica jugoslavica*. 10, 39-46.
- Filipović, R.** 1982c. Male Konavle u Kaliforniji - Konavljeni u Watsonvillu. Njihov odnos prema konavoskom govoru. *Konavoski zbornik*. 1, 168-173.
- Filipović, R.** 1982d. Serbo-Croatian in the United States: Croatian Dialects in Contact with American English. *The Slavic languages in Emigre Communities*. Edmonton: Linguistic Research Inc., 23-31.
- Filipović, R.** 1984a. Sociolingvistički uvjet za očuvanje konavoskog dijalekta u Watsonville-u – U.S.A. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*. 7, 89-97.

-
- Filipović, R.** 1984b. Croatian Dialects in the United States: Sociolinguistic Aspects. *Folia Slavica*. 6, 278-292.
- Filipović, R.** 1985. Sociolingvistički uvjeti očuvanja konavoskog dijalekta u Watsonvilleu (SAD). *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*. 7, 89- 97.
- Filipović, R.** 1986a. Croatian Surnames in the Process of Dialect-Shift and Dialect-Maintenance. *Spracherwerb und Mehrsprachigkeit. Festschrift für Els Oksaar*. 161-173.
- Filipović, R.** 1991. Neposredni jezični dodiri u hrvatskim dijalektima u SAD. *Senjski zbornik*. 18, 31-40.
- Filipović, R.** 1992a. Croatian Dialects as Markers of Croatian Ethnicity in the United States. *Dubrovnik*. 5, 185-193.
- Filipović, R.** 1992b. How have Croatian Americans preserved their Mother Tongue. *Susret svjetova, Hrvati i Amerike*. 159-167.
- Filipović, R.** 1997. Sociolingvistički uvjeti za održanje hrvatskih dijalekata u SAD. *Prvi hrvatski slavistički kongres: zbornik radova*. Pula - Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo. 1, 447-451.
- Friberg, A. C.** 1983. The Vocabulary Text. *Slavica Lundensia*. 9, 95-106.
- Gasiński, T. Z.** 1986. English elements in the speech of the Croatian immigrant community of Santa Clara Valley, California. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku*. 29/2, 31-45.
- Heller, M.** 1986. Lingua in Diaspora: Studies in the Language of the Second Generation of Yugoslav Immigrant Children in Sweden (review). *Language*. 2, 482-483.
- Hlavac, J.** 1999a. 32 years on and still triggering: Psycholinguistic processes as motivation for switching amongst Croatian-English bilinguals. *Monash University Linguistics Papers*. 2/1, 11-24.
- Hlavac, J.** 1999b. Phonological integration of English transfers in Croatian. Evidence from the Croatian speech of second-generation Croatian Australians. *Filologija*. 32, 39-74.
- Hlavac, J.** 2003. *Second-generation speech. Lexicon, code-switching and morpho-syntax of Croatian-English bilinguals*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Hlavac, J.** 2009. Hrvatski jezik među Australcima hrvatskoga podrijetla. *Jezična politika i jezična stvarnost*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku. 84-94.
- Jakich, M.** 1975. *A Personal Description of the Interference Occurring in the Serbo-Croatian/English Language Contact Situation in New Zealand*. Unpublished MA thesis. Wellington: Victoria University.
- Jutronić, D.** 1973. Američki, engleski i hrvatski (čakavski dijalekt) u kontaktu (Fonološka i gramatička adaptacija posuđenica). *Čakavska rič*. 1, 71-99.
- Jutronić, D.** 1974a. The Serbo-Croatian Language in Steelton, PA. *General Linguistics*. 14, 15-34.
- Jutronić, D.** 1974b. Upotreba i održavanje hrvatskoga jezika (čakavskoga i kajkavskoga dijalekta) kod naših iseljenika i njihove djece rođene u SAD. *Čakavska rič*. 1, 17-39.
- Jutronić, D.** 1975a. Jedna studija o govoru naših iseljenika u San Pedru u Kaliforniji. *Čakavska rič*. 5/2, 67-77.
- Jutronić, D.** 1975b. Albin - Alexander, The Speech of Yugoslav Immigrants in San Pedro. prikaz knjige. *General Linguistics*. 2, 107-114.
- Jutronić, D.** 1976. Language maintenance and language shift of the Serbo-Croatian language in Steelton, Pennsylvania. *General Linguistics*. 16, 166-168.
-

- Jutronic-Tihomirović, D.** 1982. The effect of dialectal variations on the adaptation of loanwords. *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics*. 5, 63-73.
- Jutronic-Tihomirović, D.** 1983. A contribution to the study of syntactic interference in language contact. *Folia Slavica*. 6/2, 310-320.
- Jutronic-Tihomirović, D.** 1985. *Hrvatski jezik u SAD*. Split: Logos.
- Jutronic-Tihomirović, D.** 1989. Jezično prilagođavanje na sintaktičkom nivou. *Radovi razdjela filoloških znanosti*. 18, 51-60.
- Leeming, H.** 1987. Lingua in Diaspora: Studies in the Language of the Second Generation of Yugoslav Immigrant Children in Sweden (review). *The Slavonic and East European Review*. 4, 621-622.
- Ljubešić, M.** 1991. Jezični razvoj djece jugoslavenskih migranata u SR Njemačkoj. *Migracijske teme*. 5/4, 353-361.
- Ljubešić, M.** 1992. Prilog poznavanju migracijske dvojezičnosti. *Migracijske teme*. 8/1, 55-67.
- Ljubešić, M.; Schöler, H.** 1995. Sentence imitation by monolingual and bilingual children. *Logopedija*. 1/2, 15-21.
- Magner, T. F.** 1976. The melting pot and language maintenance in South Slavic immigrant groups. *General Linguistics*. 16/2-3, 59-67.
- Magnusson, K.** 1987. Language and Cultural Identity: Yugoslav Youth in Sweden. *Slavica Lundensia*. 11, 133-158.
- Matešić, J.** 1987. O ulozu leksika pri učenju stranog jezika djece jugoslavenskih radnika u dijaspori. *Slavica Lundensia*. 11, 101-112.
- Mihaljević, M.** 1988. Dvije knjige o govoru naše djece u Švedskoj. *Jezik*. 1-2, 59-64.
- Mønnesland, S.** 1987. Norwegian Interference in the Language of Yugoslav Children in Norway. *Slavica Lundensia*. 11, 87-100.
- Mrazović, P.** 1989. Neke karakteristike govornog i pisanog nemačkog i srpskohrvatskog jezika dece migranata u SR Nemačkoj. *Interkulturalizam kao oblik obrazovanja dece migranata van domovine*. Novi Sad: Institut za južnoslovenske jezike Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu. 70-77.
- Pavlinić-Wolf, A.** 1983. Considerations Concerning the Language Development of Yugoslav Migrant Children in European Host Countries. *Grazer Linguistische Studien*. 19, 88-105.
- Pavlinić-Wolf, A.; Anić, J.; Ivazić, Z.** 1987. Jezik jugoslavenske djece koja žive u Švedskoj (Preliminarni rezultati sociolingvističkog istraživanja). *Slavica Lundensia*. 11, 159-173.
- Pavlinić-Wolf; Brčić, K.; Jeftić, N.** 1988. Supplementary mother-tongue education and the linguistic development of Yugoslav children in Denmark. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 9/1-2, 151-167.
- Pavlinić, A.** 1993. Croatian and Serbian as a diaspora language in Western Europe. *Immigrant Languages in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 101-118.
- Roki-Fortunato, A.** 1997. *Libar Viškiga jezika*. Toronto: Libar Publishing.
- Rosandić, D.** 1989. Neki postupci u empirijskom istraživanju dvojezičnosti djece jugoslavenskih migranata. *Interkulturalizam kao oblik obrazovanja dece migranata van domovine*. Novi Sad: Institut za južnoslovenske jezike Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu. 100-115.
- Runje, M.** 1990. Održavanje hrvatskog jezika u dijaspori u Njemačkoj. *Marulić*. 23/1, 42-47.

- Samardžija, M.** 2004./2005. Hrvatski jezik i Hrvati izvan Hrvatske. *Croatian Studies Review*. 3-4, 55-69.
- Stankovski, M.** 1978. Procesi redukcije fonološkog sistema srpskohrvatskog kod djece doseljenika u švedskoj jezičnoj sredini. *Slavica Lundensia*. 6, 21-50.
- Stankovski, M.** 1980. Prvi jezik druge generacije. *Rasprave o migracijama*. 68/1, 141-158.
- Stankovski, M.** 1987. Obstruenti u sistemima fonema i njihove destrukcije u populaciji D07. arhiva za jezike u dijaspori. *Slavica Lundensia*. 11, 7-32.
- Stankovski, M.; Đurović, L.; Tomašević, M.** 1983. Development structures in the family language of Yugoslav immigrant children in a Swedish language environment. *Slavica Lundensia*. 9, 11-20.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1976. The Serbo-Croatian Language Spoken in New Zealand. *Iseljenički kalendar*. 240-242.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1979. Two Years of Teaching Croatian/Serbian at the University of Auckland, New Zealand. *Iseljenički kalendar*. 114-116.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1981a. Observations on the Serbo-Croatian Language in New Zealand. *New Zealand Slavonic Journal*. 1, 53-64.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1981b. The morphological adaptation of loanwords from English in New Zealand Serbo-Croatian. *Wiener Slavistischer Almanach*. 7, 243-252.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1982. Language Maintenance and Language Shift of the Serbo-Croatian Language in a New Zealand Dalmatian Community. *The Slavic languages in emigre communities*. Edmonton, Linguistic Research Inc. 121-139.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1986. Slavische Volksgruppen in Uebersee: Ethnika für die Dalmatiner in Neuseeland. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*. 45/2, 258-268.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1988a. Slavisches in Polynisien. Zur Geschichte des serbokroatisch-maorisch-englischen Sprachkontakts in Neuseeland. *Slavic themes. Papers from two hemispheres*. Neuried: Hieronymus. 349-370.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1988b. Bi-Aspectual Loan-Verbs in Migrant Serbo-Croatian. *New Zealand Slavonic Journal. Part 1. Serbo-Croatian Colloquium Papers*. 1-7.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1988c. Veränderungen morphosyntaktischer Strukturen in slavischen Auswanderersprachen. *Schweizerische Beiträge zum 10. Internationalen Slavistenkongress, Sofia 1988*. Bern.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1991. Common features in the morphological adaptation of English loanwords in migrant Serbo-Croatian. *Languages in Contact and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 417-430.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1993. Slav migrant languages in the «New World»: Cases of *Migranto-before-death?* *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies*. 7/1, 75-89.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 1994. Dialect and Standard Language in the Migrant Situation: The Case of New Zealand Croatian. *New Zealand Slavonic Journal. Festschrift in honour of Patric Waddington*. 153-170.
- Stoffel, H. P.** 2002/2003. Dialect and Standard Language in a Migrant Situation: The Case of New Zealand Croatian. *Croatian Studies Review*. 2, 1-23.
- Stölting, W.** 1980. *Die Zweisprachigkeit jugoslawischer Schuler in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Weisbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Stölting, W.** 1987. Die Wanderung Jugoslawischer Migrantenkinder durch die bilinguale Kompetenz. *Slavica Lundensia*. 11, 113-132.
- Surdučki, M.** 1966. English loanwords in the Serbo-Croatian immigrant press. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*. 12/1, 52-63, 12/2, 123-135.

- Surdučki, Milan.** 1978. *Srpskohrvatski i engleski u kontaktu: rečnik i morfološka analiza engleskih pozajmljenica u standardnom srpskohrvatskom jeziku i jeziku Srba i Hrvata iseljenika u Kanadi*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Surdučki, M.** 1983. Standardni srpskohrvatski i iseljenički srpskohrvatski u kontaktu s engleskim: sličnosti i razlike. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku*. 26/2, 101-108.
- Surdučki, M.** 1984. English-Serbo-Croatian contacts in Canada and Yugoslavia. *Melbourne Slavonic Studies*. 18, 15-26.
- Škvorc, B.** 1998. Nekoliko napomena o broju Hrvata, hrvatskom jeziku, školama i hrvatskim medijima u Australiji. *Društvena istraživanja*. 1-2, 189-206.
- Škvorc, B.** 2005. *Australski Hrvatski. Mitovi i stvarnost*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatskih iseljenika.
- Tomašević, M.** 1987. Lingvistiska aspekter pa hemspraksundervisningen i den svenska skolan. *Slavica Lundensia*, 11, 175-193.
- Ward, C. A.** 1976. The Serbian nad Croatian Communities in Milwaukee. *General Linguistics*. 16/2-3, 151-165.
- Ward, C. A.** 1980. Intrafamiliar patterns and Croatian language maintenance in America. *Studies in Ethnicity. The East European Experience in America*. 3-14.

6.2. Other literature

- Akrap, A.** 2003. Migracije Hrvata u posljednjem desetljeću 20. stoljeća. *Hrvatska dijaspora u Crkvi i domovini*. Frankfurt na Majni. 23-56.
- Antić, Lj.** 1991. *Hrvati u Južnoj Americi do godine 1914*. Zagreb: Stvarnost.
- Antić Lj.** 2002. *Hrvati i Amerika*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada – Hrvatska matica iseljenika.
- Backus, A.** 1996. *Two in one. Bilingual Speech of Turkish Immigrants in The Netherlands*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Bentahila, A.; Davies, E.** 1983. The Syntax of Arabic-French Code –Switching. *Lingua*. 59, 301-309.
- Bettoni, C.** 1981. *Italian in North Queensland. Changes in the speech of first and second generation bilinguals*. Townsville: James Cook University of North Queensland.
- Bozanić, A.** 1996. *Hrvatsko iseljeničtvo u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama i Krčani u New Yorku*. Krčki zbornik. sv. 34, Krk – New York: Podružnica Društva za hrvatsku povjesnicu – Krčki klubovi u New Yorku.
- Bozanić, A.** 1997. *Iseljenici cresko-lošinjskog otočja u New Yorku i okolici: jedno stoljeće organiziranog društvenog života naših otočana u New Yorku*. Cres - Mali Lošinj: Grad Mali Lošinj - Katedra Čakavskog sabora Cres-Lošinj.
- Clivio, G. P.** 1986. Competing loanwords and loanshifts in Toronto's italiese. *Altro Polo. Italian Abroad. Studies on Language contact in English-speaking countries*. Sydney: Fridrick May Foundation for Italian Studies. 129-146.
- Clyne, M.** 1991. *Community Languages. The Australian Experience*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Clyne, M.** 1972. Some (German-English) Language Contact Phenomena at the Discourse Level. *Studies for Einar Haugen*. The Hauge: Mouton. 132-144.
- Costello, J.** 1985. Pennsylvania German: Social and Linguistic Aspect. *Deutsch als Muttersprache in den Vereinigten Staaten II*. Stuttgart: Steiner. 111-120.

-
- Čizmić, I.** 1981. *Iz Dalmacije u Novi Zeland - povijest jugoslavenske naseobine na Novom Zelandu*. Zagreb: Globus – Matica iseljenika Hrvatske.
- Čizmić, I.** 1998. Iseljavanje iz Hrvatske u Ameriku kao dio europskih migracijskih tijekomova. *Društvena istraživanja*. 1-2, 33-34, 127-147.
- Daan, J.** 1971. Bilingualism of Dutch Immigrants in the U.S.A. *Dichtung, Sprache, Gesellschaft. Akten des IV Internationalen Germanisten Kongresses 1970 in Princeton*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum Verlag. 205-213.
- Fenyvesi, A.** 1996. The case of American Hungarian case: morphological change in McKeesport, PA. *Acta Linguistica Hongarica*. 43/3-4, 381-404.
- Filipović, R.** 1986b. *Teorija jezika u kontaktu*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Školska knjiga.
- Fishman, J.** 1966. Language Maintenance and Language Shift as a Field of Inquiry. *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton. 424-458.
- Hasselmo, N.** 1961. *American Swedish*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Harvard University.
- Haugen, E.** 1953. *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Henzl, V. M.** 1980. American Czech: A comparative study of linguistic modifications in immigrant and young children speech. *The Slavic languages in emigre communities*. Edmonton: Linguistic Research Inc. 33-46.
- HE** 2002, Hrvati. *Hrvatska enciklopedija*. 4. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža. 673-675.
- Hranilović, N.; Čizmić, I.** 1991. Hrvatski iseljenici i politika multikulturalizma u Kanadi. *Iseljenički kalendar*. 71-75.
- Laušić, A.; Anić, J.** 2000. *Južna Afrika i Hrvati*. Zagreb: Institut za migracije i narodnosti.
- Lenček, R., Okuka, M.** 1990. *A bibliography of recent literature of recent literature on Macedonian, Serbo-Croatian, and Slovene Languages*. Geisteswelt der Südsloven NS, 1. München: Slavica.
- Lisac, J.** 2003. *Hrvatska dijalektologija 1. (Hrvatski dijalekti i govori štokavskog narječja i hrvatski govori torlačkog narječja)*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga.
- Lisac, J.** 2009. *Hrvatska dijalektologija 2. (Čakavsko narječje)*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga.
- Lončarić, M.** 1996. *Kajkavsko narječje*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Magner, T. F.** 1982. Bibliography of publication on immigrant Slavic languages in the United States. *The Slavic languages in emigre communities*. Edmonton: Linguistic Research Inc. 89-95.
- Milivojević, D.; Mihailovic, V. D.** 1990. *Yugoslav linguistics in English 1900-1980: a bibliography*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- Musalo, T.** 2003. *Hrvati na jugu Afrike (1757-1997)*. Zagreb: Hrvatska matica iseljenika – Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- Myers-Scotton, C.** 1993. *Duelling Languages. Grammatical Structure inn Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Nejašmić, I.** 1983. *Bibliografija radova o unutrašnjoj migraciji stanovništva Jugoslavije u poslijeratnom razdoblju (1945-1981)*. Zagreb: Centar za istraživanje migracija.
- Rosandić, D.** 1983. *Riječ materinska. Priručnik za dopunsku nastavu hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika izvan domovine*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Søndergaard, B.** 1997. Syntactic Interference in Australian Danish. *Plurilingua. Recent studies in contact linguistics*. Bonn: Dümmler. 349-355.
-

- Šutalo, I.** 2004. *Croatians in Australia : pioneers, settlers and their descendants*. Kent Town: Wakefield Press.
- Tkalčević, M.** 1992. *Hrvati u Australiji*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- Treffers-Daller, J.** 1994. *Mixing Two Languages. Franch-Dutch Contact in a Comparative Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyer.
- Weinreich, U.** 1953. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York, XII.

Istraženost govora hrvatskih iseljenika u prekomorskim zemljama i zemljama Zapadne Europe

Sažetak

U radu se analiziraju radovi stranih i domaćih slavista o govoru hrvatskih iseljenika u prekomorskim zemljama (Sjedinjene Američke Države, Kanada, Australija i Novi Zeland) i u zemljama Zapadne Europe. Radovi se prikazuju prema kronološkome načelu i grupiraju prema zajedničkome korpusu istraživanja. Dalje se analiziraju s obzirom na pristup temi koji je ili sociolingvistički ili čisto lingvistički, a u dosadašnjim se radovima najčešće analizira utjecaj većinskoga jezika zemlje u koju su doselili na gramatičku strukturu materinskoga, hrvatskoga jezika. Kako bi se prikazali dosezi istraživanja, radovi se analiziraju i prema zemlji useljenja. Analizom su utvrđene smjernice za nužna buduća istraživanja.

Radu je pridana i bibliografija radova iz domaćih i stranih publikacija.

Ključne riječi: *hrvatski jezik, hrvatsko iseljeničtvo, prekomorske zemlje, zemlje Zapadne Europe*