

## “Rudimentary” Bilingualism

(A report on work in progress)

*Damir Kalogjera*  
*Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb*

A considerable number of Romanisms in the form of words, phrases and other interference traces in the Dalmatian urban dialects have endured, together with other dialectal features, the pressures of standardization. A limited receptive and productive competence of Italian seems to linger there long after the presumed balanced community bilingualism had disappeared. The paper attempts at finding some sociolinguistic explanation for that state of the affairs, but leaves open the question whether and how the mass of loans in the dialect facilitate this “rudimentary” bilingualism and vice versa.

The outcome of the long lasting contacts of languages in the Eastern Adriatic coast is the present day vernacular of a clearly Croatian (Čakavian and Štokavian) grammatical structure characterized by a mass of adopted Romance elements, as Kahane (1986) puts it of a similar situation in the Ionian islands of Greece, at the overt and covert level. Most conspicuous i.e. overt elements are lexical items, syntagms and phraseology, and covert elements include calques at lexical and syntactic levels.

The overt items have been described by various dialectologists as a part of the non-standard dialectal vocabulary and several differential dictionaries of the coastal vernaculars include these items. Many of these have been etymologically analysed by the late Petar Skok (1950 etc.) and more recently both etymologically and structurally with considerable subtlety by Vojmir Vinja (1954 etc.) to whom this contribution is dedicated, then Žarko Muljačić (1969 etc.) and others. Less attention has been paid so far to this vernacular and the function of exoglossic elements in it as *discourse*, partly owing to the shortage of recordings of larger chunks of vernacular texts, partly because the vernacular is a variety which is rarely used in writing and in print to offer material for analysis.

Historical linguists have endeavoured to outline the developments which have brought to the present-day linguistic situation. Briefly, they would agree that the Slavs had contacts with speakers of different types of Romance varieties since their arrival in the present-day Southern Dalmatia, presumably in the 7th century. It was:

- a) the Romance of the Roman population of the cities,
- b) the postulated Dalmatian, a now extinct Romance idiom not yet definitely classified within Romance, and
- c) the Venetian dialect, nowadays most clearly in evidence among the Romance borrowings.<sup>1</sup>

Venice gained the possession of the East Mediterranean during and after the Crusades and very soon the Venetian dialect of Italian became the usual form of communication among regional aristocracy and bourgeoisie in the cities (Kahane 1986), where, in some cases, other varieties of Romance may have already been spoken (Skok 1950).

What remains to be fully understood is the process of what appears as a massive linguistic borrowing on the part of the Slavonic speaking population. It may be explained in a simple way as part of the process of their gradual penetration into the Romance speaking cities. From there the diffusion of the borrowings would have spread to the countryside, to the rural speakers of Slavonic, in more than one way. We must obviously presume a gradual development of some degree of community bilingualism in both population groups, the Romance and the Slavonic ones. (That bilingualism is still in the living memory of the oldest inhabitants of the southern Dalmatian cities.) This was combined with diglossia, with Romance as H and Slavonic as L, which had set the direction of borrowing. Gradually the use of Romance would have stopped being closely linked with the origin of the speakers in the cities and would have become connected with their social status.

Although this outline may seem at first sight a reasonably convincing explanation of the process, it still leaves out the role of the Romance speaking population in this language contact situation. Because the influx of the Romance element may have also resulted from the imperfect learning of Croatian by that group. They may have left in their Croatian Romance vocabulary items, phrases, and may even have calqued syntactic patterns. Their acquisition of Croatian as target language would have become particularly important when the balance between the two idioms was tipped (Dorian 1981:51), probably for demographic reasons (more rural population coming to the city), and much later by the acceptance of certain political doctrines and the spread of compulsory education.

That marked the beginning of language shift by which Croatian became the dominant language of the community, the shift which had been completed some fifty years ago. The suggested explanation would distinguish between *borrowing* and *sub-*

1. Considering the influx of Romanisms on the Balkans Muljačić (1987:319) writes: "Per le lingue balcaniche occidentali bisogna saper distinguere, nel medioevo, l'influsso delle lingue romanze autoctone che si sono poi estinte, quali il dalmatico e l'albano-romanzo, da quello italiano dialettale (veneziano e genovese) a standard (toscano)."

*stratum interference*. The former results in the entry of individual vocabulary items into the borrowing language, while the latter, which refers to the imperfect group learning during the language shift, results not only in lexical but also in other level elements to be found in the target language (Thomason 1983:70)<sup>2</sup>. The combination of the two processes would seem to be more satisfactory in explaining the amount of exoglossic element in the dialects under consideration.

The loans from Romance which are still a stable part of the dialect speakers' vocabulary are hard to ascribe to any particular domain and exclude from others, but they certainly do not belong only to the area of the so called *cultural borrowing* which demonstrates what one language group has learned from the other. *Intimate borrowing* between two languages in prolonged territorial contact has been less predictable in its selection of lexical terms. The most enduring loans seem to be those from the domains which are rarely required in the formal registers of the Croatian standard language.

While loans from kinship terminology (*kunjado*, It. cognato 'brother-in-law' covering 4 terms in Serbian and Croatian dialects: *djever*, *šurjak*, *svak*, *pašanic*; *barba*, It. dial. *barba* 'uncle', covering at least two: *stric*, *ujak*) may suggest the cultural switch from the life of the (Slavonic) rural cooperative or extended family to the urban nuclear family, it is less clear why should some terms which characterize a person socially have been borrowed or partly borrowed. Thus vocabulary items meaning destitute (*dešperadun*), gourmet (*bonkulović*), good-for-nothing (*bondanjente*), one who sings out of tune (*kampanarota*), one who wears glasses (*kvatroči*), one who is or wants to appear clever (*šjenca*), turn-coat (*setebandiere*), one who loves free meals (*manjamukte*) finally a hunch-back (*gobo*) are borrowed for no apparent reason. An answer to this question requires more research taking both *borrowing* and *substratum interference* into consideration. The tendency towards rather unexplainable borrowing in bilinguals has been noted by Haugen (1953) and termed *gratuitous borrowing*. Weinreich (1953: 59-60) believed that the prestige of the language explains loans beyond the actual needs (Romain 1989:65)<sup>3</sup>.

The recognition of some of these items as exoglossic, or at least dialectal and inappropriate for the use outside the local community, occurs in most cases at the beginning of the formal education. Since the diffusion of the Standard Croatian has always included a strong purist component (anti-Romance, anti-Germanic and somewhat more lenient towards Turkish) many young speakers of this dialect experience a shock when they learn that many of the items they have been using are "foreign", "corrupted" or "ridiculous". There has been usually no time nor adequate information in the school curricula for a more sociolinguistically elaborate approach to dialectal and exoglossic items.

2. It has been noted in the literature that contact-induced changes in a *shift* situation differ from the changes in a *maintenance* situation. A considerable part of the Romance element probably entered Croatian dialects in the former situation, i.e. in the process when Croatian was taking over the position of the dominant language in the community and speakers of Italian as L1 had to learn more Croatian.

3. Even educated speakers retain some of the Romance loans, denoting certain everyday items rarely needed in formal styles, as the only terms in their "langue" and are often unable to replace them quickly by the Standard forms. These terms are not necessarily linked to the regional features of life eg.: *špigete*, 'shoestrings', *skalini* 'a step of a stairway', *pot* 'pot', *šjole*, 'soles' etc. Such items cause breakdowns in communication with speakers from other parts of the country.

Under such pressure, plus those of the media and tourism, one would expect a quick demise of the dialect and especially its exoglossic items, but in reality the admittedly inevitable process has been rather slow and the items eventually pushed out of use seem to linger in the passive competence of local speakers for long periods of time and may be exploited when required in something termed the *intentional* use of dialect (Ammon 1988).

This brings us to the important question of how these numerous exoglossic items could survive so long after the active source of interference, i.e. active bilingualism, had dwindled off. Because in the meantime a language shift had gradually occurred with the influx of rural population into the cities the introduction of the Croatian language into elementary education under the influence of the Croatian national revival in Dalmatia in the 19th century and the foundation of the state of Yugoslavia in 1918 so that Croatian became the dominant language and bilingualism has been shrinking confined mainly to the older generation.

Nowadays conventional linguistic assessment would definitely classify these communities as monolingual. Only a very small number of their members would satisfy the generally accepted definition of the bilingual as a speaker who can produce "complete meaningful utterances in the other language" (Haugen 1953:I,7). The majority could hardly carry out coherent sustained interaction with a monolingual Italian speaker. And still, probably through their utilization of the mass of borrowed elements, the stable ones in the active use and those within the "passive competence", these speakers show a linguistic ability different from the one that speakers demonstrate when only usual cultural borrowing in the form of individual loan words are found in their language.

Looking at the social scene when seeking some answer to this phenomenon we should consider several facts. In the 19th century when the mentioned language shift was taking place and Croatian dialects and the Standard were taking over as the dominant majority language, Italian was still taught in schools as at least one of the subjects both during the Austria-Hungary rule and in pre-war Yugoslavia (1918–1941). There were also special Italian schools for the children of a small number of families that opted for the Italian citizenship. In the first half of the 20th century the particular area under investigation (the Southern Dalmatian island of Korčula) underwent two occupations by Italian troops, each lasting over two years (1918–1921; 1941–1943), accompanied by the ruthless policy of the occupying authorities to establish the Italian language as dominant in the area. Although resented by the majority of the local population, the policy may have acted as a boost to bilingualism at least among the "gifted" and motivated speakers who by the use of Italian lexis and occasional sentences may have influenced their own communication networks in the direction of revitalizing and motivating vocabulary items already existing in their passive competence.<sup>4</sup>

4. Antipathy towards a language and its speakers may not hinder the learning of a language for instrumental reasons. "This has been true in Ireland where the necessity of using English has overpowered antipathy towards English and English speakers" (Romaine 1989:43; referring to McNamara 1973). But cf. Gordon and Lambert 1972 for *instrumental* and *integrative* reasons in language acquisition.

At the level of community networks, the student of the Dalmatian urban communities will notice that certain families tend to use a more archaic dialect than others, including more exoglossic items. A little inquiry will disclose that behind that phenomenon there is a grandmother, a proverbial old aunt or some other member of the family who, for different reasons, has retained a certain degree of bilingualism. These events and individuals seem to have acted in the direction of the reinforcement of the existing Romance items and patterns.

The "extra"linguistic ability of the speakers of this dialect with regard to the *other* language seems to be evident from the use of items and patterns going deeper into the structure of it. Thus, besides the individual loan words, complete syntactic structures are sometimes borrowed at the overt or covert level. These are eg. complete phrases ((*ma*) *me fa fotta* 'It makes me angry'), which may be partly calqued (*čini mi fotu*), or entirely calqued (*čini mi jid*). These "third degree" syntactic calques are numerous: *čini(t) jubav* 'go steady', It. fare l'amore; *čini(t) znat* 'let know' It. fare sapere; *čini(t) gad* 'be disgusting', It. fare schifo, etc. The switching from the first to the second and third type structures according to circumstances is especially significant here.<sup>5</sup>

Further to this is the borrowing of grammatical words such as conjunctions: *ma* It. *ma*, Cr. 'ali'; *perke* It. *perche*, Cr. 'jer'. The latter is probably calqued in this position as *zašto* (the word which exists in St. Cr. but normally only as a question word):

Ni doša *perke* se razboli  
Ni doša *zašto* se razboli  
'He has not come because he fell ill'.<sup>6</sup>

Another type of borrowing which seems to mark a step further from the ordinary use of individual loan words are items (particles, adverbs, etc.) functioning as *discourse features*, the use of which requires a certain familiarity with their 'discourse meanings' since these are used almost identically as in the original language. Such loans are: *ma ke* It. *ma che* 'no way'; *kašpito*, It. *caspita* 'don't tell me!' (ironic); *altroke*, It. *altroché* 'but of course'; (*ma*) *insoma*, It. (*ma*) *insomma* 'be as it may...' *dunkve, donke*, It. *dunque* 'well then'. Some swear words like *oštija*, It. *ostia* could also go into this group<sup>7</sup>.

5. The Standard Croatian NP *običaj toga mjesta* in the dialect is *užanca od tega mista*, where the (redundant) preposition can only be explained by interference. Further, the preference for the prepositional constructions to adjective + noun in noun phrases like *juha od ribe* vs. St. Štokavian *riblja juha* 'fish soup', *juha od teleine* vs. St. Št. *teleća juha, ašešur od općine* vs. St. Št. *općinski prisjednik, vrata od grada* vs. St. Št. *gradska vrata* are probably due to interference at the syntactic level often denied or at least suspected in the literature.

6. "It has been claimed that lexical borrowing and interference tend not to affect the so called 'core' vocabulary (e.g. body parts, numbers, personal pronouns, conjunction) but this is not true either" (Romain 1989:64). Loan-words for body parts are represented in these dialects (e.g. *škinja*, It. *schiena*, 'back'; *špale*, It. *spalle* shoulders, etc.) as well as conjunctions. Numbers are also used as nonce-borrowings, especially 1-100. They are certainly present in the passive competence of these speakers.

7. Some more loan "discourse features" used in these dialects are (here given in their replica versions):

*almeno* 'at least', *apena* 'just', *anci* 'what is more', *altrimenti* 'otherwise', *ben* 'well', *certo* 'certainly', *čirka* 'roughly', *de rešto* 'after all', *dunkve/donke* 'well then', *foši* 'perhaps', *in fin dei konti*, 'at the end', *invece* 'instead', *meno mal* 'never mind', *propio* 'indeed', *perfin*, 'even', *perbako* 'for God's sake', *per kazo* 'in case', *presapoko* 'roughly', *senica škerco* 'truly, indeed', etc. Some of these items may be used alone in short exchanges as either a response (e.g. *meno mal!*) or as exchange initiation (*dunkve?*) and they may impress the native speaker as highly idiomatic when coming from a foreigner.

A process which also seems to point towards this special ability of the speakers of this dialect is the *intentional archaization* of the text which could be described as the selection of those items which happen to be rare in everyday unintentional use but are retained in the 'passive competence' of the speakers in a community. Archaization is the speaker's or writer's hypothesis on what the 'genuine, unspoiled, old-fashioned' dialect sounded or looked like.

Intentional use of the dialect is found more frequently with sophisticated or "gifted" speakers, aware, intuitively or rationally, of different layers or varieties within a local dialect (Ammon 1988).

What seems to be especially interesting in the archaization process in our case is that besides an increase of the archaic endoglossic items, exoglossic elements become even more dense in the text represented by individual loan words, phrases, syntactic collocations etc., approaching the point of saturation of Romance items in the Croatian structural pattern culminating in utterances in which virtually each open class lexical item is Romance<sup>8</sup>. The sheer amount of these exoglossic items available to the dialect speaker, or at least decodable by him, supports our idea of special linguistic capacity of these speakers. Intentional archaization and the role of the exoglossic element in it will be illustrated here by a comparison of two texts. The first (surreptitiously recorded in 1989) is a relaxed talk of an eighty-five-year old woman reporting about her connections with and a visit to a local church. This text should illustrate the unintentional use of the dialect. The second text is a passage from a letter addressed to the present author in which the writer complains that his services were not engaged in a piece of dialectal research, and it is *intentionally archaized*. The two texts of approximately the same length show fifty per cent difference in the number of Romance lexical items with a larger number prevailing, of course, in the archaized text (see Appendices 1 and 2).

In support of the hypothesis of special linguistic ability concerning the *other* language one should also mention the observation that speakers of the other Serbian and Croatian dialects on joining these communities and settling there are known to have more difficulty in mastering the exoglossic component of this vernacular than the endoglossic component. From the point of view of the local 'de facto' norm for the Romance items (not necessarily identical to the native speakers' norm), these "strangers" mispronounce sounds and sound clusters, their stress tends to be "wrong" and they often misunderstand and misuse lexical items. This claim results from

8. Examples saturated with exoglossic items have been described in the literature. Bloomfield noted (133:471) "apparently, a long speech could be made entirely in Gipsy words with English phonetics and grammar". Romaine (1989:66) writes: "In extreme cases, the language may share lexical affiliation with one language, while having the structural traits of another." We must note that this situation is far from being constant in our case. It occurs from time to time. That "gifted" speakers are aware of it witness the probably made up but eminently possible sentence, now part of the folklore: *Vapor je arivo u porat i subito partio* 'The ship arrived in the port and immediately left' with *vapor, arivo, porat, subito* and *partio* being exoglossic items. In the Zagreb area similar sentences are made up with German loans: *Bedinerica štampa špajzimer* 'The cleaning woman is hoovering the dining-room' with *bedinerica, štampa, špajzimer* as exoglossic elements. Incidentally, the exoglossic items in the examples are all typical cultural borrowings.

participant observation in two different dialect areas (the one under observation, and in Zagreb with German as the other language) and is endorsed by the folk description of the phenomenon. Namely, speakers from the coast believe that the "continentals" are incapable of using Romanisms correctly and the Zagreb dialect speakers ridicule Dalmatian dialect speakers' articulation of Germanisms. In any case this claim requires further observation or experimental proof. If it were to prove true, it would lead to the conclusion that the underlying competence of the speakers of different Serbian and Croatian dialects is not identical. This would make interesting evidence in any debates on the so called *panlectal* grammar as the model of adult native speakers' competence, according to which speakers of each dialect classified under the same language possess a deeper competence underlying all dialects (Trudgill 1980).

Talking within a different theoretical framework, there seems to be a trace of grammatical and semantic *motivation* in the use of Romanisms by the coastal speakers which is absent in speakers of other dialects. And if one were to be suspicious of the current speculations concerning underlying structures in language and preferring more pragmatic explanations, then the very quantity of the loans at several language levels could explain this vague motivation by some kind of *analogy*. False analogies and contaminations are also common.

Let us add another folk description here. Many speakers of these southern Dalmatian urban vernaculars tend to claim, if asked, that they know some Italian. On closer inspection, eg. when they communicate with Italian tourists, it will be seen that they generally *overreport* their command of that language and that the majority would hardly satisfy the requirement put forward by the conventional definition of a bilingual. The mass of loans in their primary language probably helps them understand simple questions, but what comes as answers to these requires a lot of good will on the part of the native speaker of Italian to decode.

The mass of Romance items which persist in the speech of certain groups in these communities, some fifty years after active bilingualism had disappeared, seems to make these speakers still very peculiar monolinguals. When the communicative need arises, they are capable of considerable receptive and admittedly very restricted productive skill in a kind of "deviant" language, variety containing elements of dialectal and standard Italian. The peculiarity of these monolinguals is – to echo Diebold (1964:505) – "that some real measure of concealed bilingualism may be discovered in them".

When claiming bilingual status for these speakers, one relies on the current broadening of the views on bilingualism which may be illustrated with the difference between the definitions of the phenomenon by Bloomfield: "native-like control of two languages" (1933:56) and that suggested by Haugen (1953, vol. I:7) twenty years later according to which "bilingualism begins when the native speaker of one language can produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language". The latter definition and further findings in the field have initiated an inconclusive debate on what is the minimal control of the other language necessary for a speaker to be classified as bilingual. Several concepts have been developed to cover the various degrees of bilingualism as noted by students in their field research. The description of our case

would not be helped much by the concepts of *balanced* bilingualism, also known as *ambilingualism* (Halliday, McIntosh, Strevens 1968) and *equilingualism* (Baetens-Beardsmore 1982:9) and only partly by the concepts of *compound* and *coordinate* bilingualism, mainly because those concepts presume a high degree of control of the other language such that researchers have to apply elaborated experiments to establish which of the two languages is dominant. In our case this seems to be rather obvious at first sight and hardly requires inventive experimentation. However, support for our case may be found in concepts of *passive* or *receptive* bilingualism, *semibilingualism* (Hockett 1958) and all varieties of these, where there is a sizeable disproportion between the control of the two languages, the cases with a lack of productive skill but with the ability to understand utterances.

A certain similarity to the case we want to capture can be found in the work carried out by Dorian (1981) on Gaelic-English bilingual communities in Scotland, where she found some speakers with minimum productive control of Scottish Gaelic but considerable receptive competence of established speech patterns, i.e. pieces of formulaic speech. Dorian noted that in spite of the weak productive control of these speakers their communicative competence in Gaelic was so good that it virtually concealed their inadequate spoken command of the language. It seems to me that we find a similar situation in the simple Italian put together by the "concealed" bilinguals in South Dalmatian urban communities in which the above mentioned phrases, sayings, proverbs, discourse particles etc. presumably transferred from their Croatian dialectal usage may call the addressee's bluff and mislead him into believing that the addressor is a fluent speaker of some Italian dialect. On the other hand less felicitous use of these formulaic blocks with regard to the stylistic level or register (e. g. "baby-talk" for adult speech) may cause consternation or sound ridiculous to the native speaker of Italian<sup>9</sup>.

In one more sense the situation described by Dorian (1981) is comparable with Italian in some communities of South Dalmatia, namely, that except for this "deviant" variant it is virtually dead there.

Another description of an unsymmetrical use of two languages which encourages us in classifying our case as bilingualism is the concept of *incipient bilingualism* as presented by Diebold (1964). This is, according to him, a stage in the contact of two languages, the Indian language Huave and Spanish, in the community of San Mateo del Mar on the Pacific Coast of Mexico, "a predominantly monolingual community in which some individuals are becoming bilingual" (Diebold 1964:496). Thus he deals with the

9. At the beginning of the Italian occupation in 1941, when we were 9 or 10, our Croatian teachers were sacked and Italian teachers, without a word of our language, took their place. In the first days, when our command of Italian was negligible, a school pal of mine, pressed by the natural necessity, got up and asked the teacher: "Signor maestro, pošo far pišin". The teacher laughed, but understood his plight. The anecdote illustrates both an example of rudimentary bilingualism realized in a typical situation of pressure for communication and the mixing of levels or styles. In this case the borrowed phrase "far pišin" 'to make a pee', available in Croatian dialectal "baby talk" was used in the situation where an adult euphemism had been expected. It is also significant as evidence that the young speaker had realized that the phrase was functional in a different language.



initial stage of two languages in contact. He tested orally the Spanish vocabulary (with the aid of a 100-word lexicostatistics list in Huave) of Huave speakers who had declared themselves *monolingual* in an official Government census and compared the scores with those of the speakers classified as *coordinate* and *subordinate* bilinguals. The results tallied with the folk stereotypes according to which the Huave are capable of minimal use of Spanish but still find it difficult to combine words into larger phrase constructions, namely, the "monolingual" Huave had shown a considerable command of Spanish vocabulary items. This test had been the only instrument that he could think of to quantify the minimal control of Spanish that he had noted among the self-declared monolinguals.

Diebold's proposal has another feature of interest in comparison with our case. His *incipient* bilingualism covers the initial stage of individual bilingualism, we are dealing with bilingualism in a final stage before the total disappearance of the other language from the community, therefore it could be appropriately labelled as *rudimentary* bilingualism.

Short of a quantification of this bilingualism, we had better follow at least two of the four points that Mackey (1968:555) suggests as essential in describing it: *degree*, *function*, *alternation* and *interference*. Concerning the *degree*, it is a highly asymmetrical bilingualism in which the control of the other language is limited to a certain amount of receptive competence and a rather weak productive control deprived of a repertoire of styles and registers and available only for short exchanges. Contrary to *subordinate* bilinguals, like those who picked up their second language at school, these bilinguals may occasionally sound very idiomatic, and it is partly such features that one has in mind when mentioning their communicative competence.

The other language of this unsymmetrical bilingualism carries out certain *functions* in the community. The receptive competence serves (admittedly less and less these days) in situations in which a bilingual of the older generation inadvertently switches to Italian. As the communities are situated in a tourist region, a non-Italian visitor would occasionally try Italian as a means of communication with the local people letting accommodation, and more recently Italian tourists have been turning up in greater numbers. There is also an opportunity to watch some channels of Italian TV.

One of the traditional functions of this weak productive skill has been that of a vehicle for short exchanges between parents about topics that the children are not meant to understand. This also used to be done in front of the domestic help coming from the villages, who, it was stereotypically believed, would not understand. Finally, a saying or a proverb in Italian interspersed through local conversation signals the speaker's belonging to the group.

Rudimentary bilingualism which we have tried to outline here on the basis of participant observation and introspection requires further objective documentation. Students of languages in contact and of bilingualism will want some quantitative data on the control of the grammatical system and the size of the vocabulary of the other language. However, as has been noted in the literature, the communicative competence of these speakers will be difficult to test quantitatively. An important theoretical

question remains, namely, to what extent the mass of Romance element in the "primary" language of these bilinguals, who hardly discriminate between the exoglossic and the endoglossic elements, participates in facilitating bilingualism. Did these elements become recognized as exoglossic, reinterpreted, motivated and activated during the periods of exposure to the lending language brought about by sociopolitical events such as e.g. those reported above. At least one proposal put forward in the literature so far would reject that explanation<sup>10</sup>.

## Appendix I

*Text 1* (surreptitiously recorded relaxed talk) (1989) K. 85

*Ajme meni, Gospe moja, ja govori(n), a sve – ja sve njima reče(n), mene moja Gospa – neka govori što hoću – od Konselacijuni čuva. I ovu godinu sa(n) bila... Je, ponili su me. Ivo me isa – čeka(j), e, Ivo, – Ivo me isa na ruke tun doli na put. I onda su me ponili s auto(n)... Duško me poni priko cile crkve, tamo me je poni di je kapela od Gospe. Jer me Ivo doni do pri vrata od crkve... A znaš koliko sa(n) ja unde godina učinila? Skoro pedese(t) godina. I fregala, i prala, i tonige, i redila. I nisa(n) imala ni sapluna, i davala moju bjankariju. I male tonige bi oprala. Neka se sa(d) nadje kogo!*

Oh, Our Lady, I say, and all the time – I keep telling them all the time, Our Lady – let them say what they want – of Consolation protects me. I was there this year as well... Yes, they took me, Ivo raised me – wait, yes, Ivo – took me down to the road in his arms. And they took me in the car... Duško carried me across the whole church, he took me there where Our Lady's Chapel is as Ivo had brought me in front of the church door. And do you know how many years I had spent there? Almost fifty years. And I was scrubbing, and washing, and tunics, and cleaned. And I didn't even have soap, and I gave my own linen. I would wash small tunics as well. Let them now find somebody!

### *Romance items (overt)*

ajme excl. It. ahimè

konselacijuni f. gen. sg. It. conciliazione 'consolation'

isa act. part. m. It. issare 'raise', 'lift up'

10. Concerning the Huave-Spanish language contact and Huave borrowing from Spanish Diebold says: "The Spanish derived elements here are those which occur in the Huave *langue*, which are learned by monolingual and bilingual alike in the normal childhood acquisition of Huave. Although bilingual skills may later acquaint the speaker with the Spanish model, he never recognizes that relationship between that and the integrated replica." (Diebold 1964:501). *It is our feeling that we could hardly place models and replicas so far apart. But this again may be due to sociopolitical events which by the fresh exposure of monolingual speakers to the lending language helped them recognize the integrated replicas, parts of their langue, acquired in childhood, as exoglossic element which may be re-used in Italian and hence, their "rudimentary" bilingualism. Rare bilinguals in the community surviving after the active bilingualism had died out may also have contributed to that state of affairs.*

fregala act. part. f. It. fregare 'scrub'  
tonige f. pl. It. dial. tunica 'tunic (worn by religious brethren)'  
bjankarija f. acc. sg. It. biancheria 'linen'

## Appendix 2

Text 2 (a passage from a letter intentionally archaized)

Prvo i prvo niste se *rivolsili* na *indiric* koji *pritendi* da bude štovan kao *najfetiviji aleat* pokojnoga Jubota Grčine i što se *almeno* može *tratat* kao njegov *ajutant* u pisanijama o našega mista i to *persona* od prve svite.

Ja san uvik bi za *rišpet* i od ovon *fačendi* san obazna ka san *intra* na *diskoras* o temu svemu i o temu tun, kako se je već dobro *intonala* rič po mistu da je odo temu tun cila Plokata počela čavrja. Nahodin se *ofenden* ali neću poraci tega sà po *bati muzun*, ma isto bi moga *konfermat* da me je *debota araza*.

First of all, you have not turned to the address that considers himself to be respected as the most genuine ally of the late Jubo Grčina and who can at least be taken as his aid in the writings about our town and at that a personality of the first order.

I have always been respectful and I learned about this affair when I chanced to have heard a talk about all that, that the word had widely spread around the town so that the entire Main Square had started gossiping about it. I feel offended but I am not going to sulk about it although I could say that I have been very close to that.

### Romance items (overt)

*rivolsili* act. part. pl. It. rivolgersi 'turn to'  
*indiric* m. It. indirizzo 'address'  
*pritendi* 3rd sg. pres. It. pretendere 'aspire'  
*najfetiviji* superl. It. effettivo 'genuine'  
*aleat* m. It. alleato 'ally'  
*almeno* adv. It. almeno 'at least'  
*tratat* inf. It. trattare 'treat'  
*ajutant* m. It. aiutante 'aid'  
*persona* f. It. persona 'personality'  
*rišpet* m. It. rispetto 'respect'  
*fačendi* gen. sg. It. facenda 'matter' 'event'  
*intra* act. part. m. It. entrare 'happen to come'  
*diskoras* acc. sg. m. It. discorso 'conversation'  
*intonala* act. part. f. It. intonare 'start singing'  
*ofenden* pass. part. m. It. offendere 'offend'

bati muzun phr. batter il muson (?) 'sulk'  
 konfermat inf. It. confermare 'confirm'  
 debota adv. It. dial. de botto 'almost'  
 araza act. part. m. It. rasare 'pass by closely'

#### REFERENCES

- AMMON, U. (1988) "International Dialect Use in the Federal Republic of Germany" *The Canberra Linguist*, Vol. XVII No. 1, July/October 1988. pp. 28–42
- BEATENS-BEARDSMORE, H. (1982) *Bilingualism: Basic Principles*. Clevedon, Avon: Tieto Ltd.
- BLOOMFIELD, L. (1933) *Language*, New York: Halt.
- DIEBOLD, Richard (1964) "Incipient Bilingualism." In Hymes, D. ed. *Language in Culture and Society*. New York. Harper and Row. pp. 495–506
- DORIAN, N. C. (1981) *Language Death. The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- FILIPOVIĆ, R. (1986) *Teorija jezika u kontaktu. Uvod u lingvistiku jezičnih dodira*. Zagreb, JAZU i Školska knjiga.
- HALLIDAY M. A. K., McINTOSH A., STREVEENS, P. (1986) "The users and uses of language." In Fishman J. ed. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague. Mouton. pp. 139–69.
- HOCKETT, C. F. (1958) *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: MacGillan.
- JERNEJ, Josip (1966) "Neprevedive (gramatičke) riječi kao poseban tip jezičke interferencije." In Filipović, R. ed. *Suvremena lingvistika*, No 4. Jezici u kontaktu i jezično posuđivanje. Zagreb. Sveučilište.
- KAHANE, Henry (1986) "A typology of a prestige language." *Language* Vol. 62, Number 3, pp. 495–508
- KALOGJERA, D. (1989) "Serbo-Croatian Dialects and School in Yugoslavia." Ammon, U., Mattheier K. J., Nelde, P. H. eds. *Sociolinguistica*. Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- MULJAČIĆ, Ž. (1969) "Scambi lessicali tra l'Italia Meridionale e la Croazia," *Abruzzo VII* (1969)2, Roma 1970, pp. 45–55.
- MULJAČIĆ, Ž. (1971) *Introduzione allo studio della lingua italiana*. Torino: Einandi.
- ROMAINE, S. (1989) *Bilingualism*. Oxford. Blackwell.
- SKOK, Petar (1950) *Slavenstvo i Romanstvo na Jadranskim otocima*. Zagreb. Jadranski institut Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti.
- THOMASON, S. G. (1983) "Genetic relationship and the case Ma'a (Mbugu)", *Studies in African Linguistics*, 14, 195–231.
- TRUDGILL, P. (1983) "Polylectal grammars and cross-dialect communication", *On Dialect*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- VINJA, Vojmir (1954) "O nekim oblicima romansko-slavenskog jezičnog miješanja". In Barac A., Deanović M., Jonke L.J., Novak G., Pregrad Z. eds. *Zbornik radova*, Zagreb, Školska knjiga, pp. 199–208.
- WEINREICH, Uriel (1963) *Languages in Contact*. The Hague. Mouton.

## "RUDIMENTARNI" BILINGVIZAM

Veći broj romanizama u obliku riječi, fraza i drugih tragova interferencije, zajedno s ostalim dija-  
lekatskim obilježjima, odolijeva pritiscima standardizacije u urbanim govorima južne Dalmacije. Ograničena  
proizvodna i receptivna kompetencija talijanskog čini se da tinja u određenim grupama dalmatinskih urbanih  
govornika dugo nakon što je nestao pretpostavljeni aktivni bilingvizam tih zajednica. Članak pokušava naći  
neka sociolingvistička objašnjenja za takvu situaciju, ali ostavlja otvoreno pitanje da li velik broj posudjenica  
olakšava održavanje tog rudimentarnog bilingvizma i obratno.