

# COLONIAL VENETIAN AND SERBO-CROATIAN IN THE EASTERN ADRIATIC : A Case Study of Languages in Contact<sup>1</sup>

CHARLES E. BIDWELL

---

1.1 Venetian dialects are—or in some places were, until recently—spoken by at least a portion of the population in various places along the Eastern coast of the Adriatic. These include Trieste, various towns in Istria, particularly in a strip along the western coast, Fiume (Rijeka), various towns on the islands of the Gulf of Quarnero such as Lussinpiccolo (Lošinj mali) and Veglia (Krk), and in Zara (Zadar). These dialects may be called colonial, since in no case do they represent development of an autochthonous Romance speech, but are overlaid upon linguistic substrata which were either Slavic (Serbo-Croatian or Slovenian) or non-Venetian varieties of Romance (a variety of Friulan was apparently the original speech of Trieste and its immediate environs and was still spoken by some as late as the early nineteenth century; Istro-Romanic was the idiom of the non-Slavic population of Istria and still survives in heavily Venetianized form in Rovigno (Rovinj), Dignano (Vodnjan) and adjacent villages; further South, in the Quarnero and Dalmatia, Dalmato-Romanic was the original speech, the last speaker on the island of Veglia having died in the late nineteenth century).

The steady Venetianization of Romanic and Slavic populations in urban settlements of the East Adriatic coast is undoubtedly

- 
1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference, April 1965, and a still earlier version before the Linguistic Club of the University of Rochester in December 1962. Venetian and dialectal Serbo-Croatian items (excepting those from unaccented texts) are cited in phonemic transcription; items from the standard languages, Italian and Serbo-Croatian, or from unaccented texts are cited in standard orthography.

due first to the political hegemony of Venice through a great part of the late Middle Ages and early modern times, and secondly to the tremendous commercial and cultural ascendancy of the city of St. Mark which extended to areas not under its direct political control and persisted after the Venetian republic ceased to exist (Trieste and Fiume both were Venetianized as they began to flourish as trading centers of the then rising Austrian monarchy, apparently due to the fact that Venetian was a kind of lingua franca in the maritime commerce of the Adriatic and, indeed, of a large part of the Mediterranean).<sup>2</sup>

The Venetian dialect, though spoken by a minority concentrated in the urban centers of the East Adriatic area, exerted a disproportionate influence on the speech of the population with which it was in contact. This was undoubtedly due to the prestige of Venetian as a commercial and administrative language and to the fact that it was the language of officials sent out from Venice, who were apparently soon joined by members of the local upper classes. Venetian ended by absorbing local Romanic speech everywhere excepting only for the Istriote dialect of Rovigno and vicinity which only survives in half-Venetianized guise.

1.2 The colonial Venetian dialects which will be examined here are primarily those of Trieste, Fiume, Zara, and the town of Veglia. Data from other centers will be drawn upon to the extent it is available.<sup>3</sup>

- 
2. C.v. Jiraček (*Die Romanen in den Städten Dalmatiens während des Mittelalters*, vols. 48-9, of the *Denkschriften* of the Vienna Academy, 1902 and 1904) assigns the beginning of extensive Venetianization to the XIV-XV centuries. In the mid-fourteenth century plague wiped out a large part of the autochthonous Romanic population of the Dalmatian cities. Though the Venetians had earlier been active in Dalmatia, it was in these centuries that Venetian rule was established in the Dalmatian cities and coasts.
  3. I have drawn my data mainly from published studies—specifically from the following works:
    - C. Königes, *Veglia mai olasz nyelvjárása* (L'odierno dialetto di Veglia), Budapest, 1933.
    - G. Vidossich, "Studi sul dialetto triestino" in *Archeografo triestino* XXIII-IV, Trieste, 1897-8.
    - G. Pinguentini, *Dizionario storico etimologico fraseologico del dialetto triestino*, Trieste: Borsatti, 1954 plus *Supplemento*, Trieste: Borsatti, 1957.

1.3 Before turning to an examination of the dialects, I should like to advance the following two tentative hypotheses, based on our knowledge of colonial expansion of languages in general (e.g. Latin in the Roman Empire, Spanish in Latin America) and on the specific historic circumstances attending the expansion of Venetian.

(1) It is assumed that the dialect of Venice itself, rather than of its province—the *terra ferma*, which only relatively late was reduced to political dependency upon the Queen of the Adriatic—

- 
- G. Depoli, "Il dialetto fiumano", in *Bullettino della deputazione fiumana di storia patria*, III. Fiume, 1913.
- H. Wengler, *Die heutige Mundart von Zara in Dalmatien*, Leipzig dissertation, 1916.
- G. Papanti, *I parlari italiani in certaldo*, Livorno, 1875.
- K. Jaberg and J. Jud, *Sprach und Sachatlas von Italien und der Südschweiz*, Zofingen, 1928 (especially the entries for Venice, Grado, Trieste, Pirano, Montona, Cherso, Fiume and—for Istriote—Rovigno and Dignano), cited as AIS.
- G. Berghoffer, *Il dialetto fiumano — Saggio grammaticale*, Fiume: Mohorovich, 1894.
- G. Lepscky, "On the Segmental Phonemes of Venetian and their classification", *Word* XIX (1963), 53-66.
- E. Rosman, *Vocabolario Veneto-Giuliano*, Rome, 1922 plus *Appendice*, Trieste, 1923.
- M. Deanović, *Avviamento allo studio del dialetto di Rovigno d'Istria*, Zagreb, 1954.
- P. Tekavčić, "Un testo istrioto", *Studia romanica et anglica Zagrabiensia* IX-X (1960), 75-84 (for Dignano).
- G. Rohlf, *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten I-III*, Bern, 1949-1954.
- H. Schuchardt, *Slawo-deutsches und Slawo-italienisches*, Graz, 1885.
- M. Mezorana, "Kratok pregled riječkog narječja", in J. Ravlić, *Rijeka*, Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1953, pp. 435-440.
- M. Bartoli, *Das Dalmatische I-II* (Schriften der Balkankommission, Linguistische Abteilung 4-5), Vienna, 1906 (This work deals, of course, primarily with Dalmatoromanic Vegliote, but contains certain information on the Venetian of the Quarnero area).
- C. Battisti, *Testi dialettali italiani I* (Beiheft 49 to the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*), Halle, 1914 (texts in Venetian, Istriote, and Friulan from Pola, Rovigno, Muggia, Trieste, Capriva, Fiumicello, Grado, Venice).
- In addition, I made some tape recordings of Fiuman dialect during a brief stay in 1962.

was the dominant variety of speech carried by the merchants and officials who implanted it in the Eastern Adriatic.

(2) It is assumed that colonial Venetian dialects may in many respects retain archaic features now extinct in the speech of Venice itself.

**2.0** Venetian, like all northern Italian dialects belongs to the western Romance group of languages, which show the following developments

(a) elimination of geminate consonants:

VL *passare* > *pasár* 'to pass'

(b) voicing of single intervocalic voiceless consonants

VL *casam* > *káza* 'house'

On the other hand, Venetian shows a rather remarkable conservatism. Spirantization or loss of intervocalic voiced stops is limited. Intervocalic *b* falls together with *v*, of course, as universally in the Romance domain and intervocalic *p* was voiced and then too became *v*, but intervocalic *d* and *g* are in part maintained. VL *i* after *n* gives *ñ* (as does also VL *gn*); VL *i* after *l* gave *l'* which has then evolved to *j* (*mulierem* > *muiér*); VL *ss, sk* before front vowel and *si* result in *s*. The vowel system is essentially that of Vulgar Latin:

i	u
e	o
e	o
	a

in stressed syllables, with neutralization of open and closed *e e* and *o o* in unstressed syllables.

As in most of northern Italy, so in Venetian, VL initial *k* before front vowel became *c* [ts] and VL *g* before front vowel became *ʒ* [dz] VL *j, di,* and *gi* merged, as in most of the Romanic area, with the reflex of *g* before front vowel, i.e. *ʒ*. VL intervocalic *k* before front vowel gave *z*. VL *ti, tti, ki,* and *kki* all gave *c*. This is the stage indicated by the earliest medieval documents in Venetian, and with the exception of the evolution of consonant plus *l* mentioned below, is essentially that of the conservative dialect recorded in Boerio's dictionary at the beginning of the

nineteenth century. <sup>4</sup> Examples (using forms attested in Boerio, but respelled in phonemic notation): *centum* > *cénto*, *acceptum* > *acéto*, *gentem* > *zénte*, *legit* > *léze*, *jam* > *zá*, *majorem* > *mazór*, *deorsum* > *zó*, *medium* > *mézo*, *pacem* > *páze*.

We know that the voicing of intervocalic stops and simplification of geminates reached northeastern Italy relatively late. <sup>5</sup> We assume that VL *k* before front vowel first became [č], the stage retained in standard Italian. VL *g* before front vowel, *dî* and *j* must likewise have been [dʃ] or [ǰ]; medially the reflex was strong or geminate (analogy with standard, i.e. central, Italian *maggiore*, *legge* points to this). Either before or after simplification of the geminates [č] and [ǰ] became [c, ʒ]. The precise chronology of this change with relation to loss of gemination is unimportant; for the sake of simplicity we assume it happened before. We then have initial /c/. medial /c/ < VL intervocalic *k* before front vowel, medial /cc/ < VL *kk* before front V and from *tîi*, *tî*, *kî*, *kkî* (again standard Italian indicates a “strong” or geminate reflex here). Likewise we have initial /ʒ/ (< *g* before front V) and medial /ʒʒ/ (< *g* before front V and *j*, *dî*, *gî*). Initial C and medial CC had “strong” articulation, while medial

- 
4. For references to medieval documents, see the texts of Venetian provenience in:  
 E. Monaci, *Crestomazia italiana dei primi secoli*, Rome, 1955 (new edition).  
 P. Savj-Lopez and M. Bartoli, *Altitalienische Chrestomathie*, Strassburg, 1903.  
 M. Deanović and P. Tekavčić, *Testi antichi italiani*, Zagreb, 1957.  
 W. v. Wartburg, *Raccolta di testi antichi italiani*, Bern, 1946.
  5. Cf. R. L. Politzer “A note on the north Italian voicing of intervocalic stops”, *Word* XI (1955), 416-19; and A. Martinet “Celtic Lenition and Western Romance Consonants”, *Language* XXVIII (1952), 192-217.

The relatively late date of the changes treated here is indicated by the fact that *Sarasín* ‘Saracen, Arab’ shows the reflex of VL intervocalic /k/ (assuming that Venetian borrowed the term from Byzantine Greek *Sarakínos* and not, say, later from Old French). The term could hardly have been current in Venetian before the appearance of the Saracens in the Western Mediterranean (late seventh, century) or the Adriatic (ninth century). This squares with the evidence of the eighth century documents examined by Politzer which seem to indicate that phonemic voicing of intervocalic consonants and simplification of geminates had not yet taken place in the eastern part of North Italy.

C were “weak”; medial /c/ lost its stop element thus merging with /s/. At this point phonemic voicing of intervocalic C and simplification of medial geminates supervened; this explains the otherwise puzzling north Italian evolution *pacem* > *páze*, but *legit* > *léze*.

The consonant system represented by our earliest Venetian documents was then

p	t	k	f	s	c
b	d	g	v	z	ʒ
m	n	ñ			l j r

This consonant system is also that of the Zaratine dialect described by Wengler.

Medieval Venetian texts show the Latin clusters, C plus *l* (*fl*, *pl*, *bl*, *kl*, *gl*), still intact; later, through a stage C plus [l'], we have the result [fi<sub>l</sub> pi<sub>l</sub> bi<sub>l</sub> ki<sub>l</sub> gi<sub>l</sub>], as in the Italian domain generally.<sup>6</sup> As in many regions of Italy, [ki > č] and [gi > ž], resulting in a new /č ž/ in the system: *clavem* > *čáve* ‘key’ (cf. It. /kjáve/), *žara* < *glaream* ‘gravel’ (cf. It. /gjája/). Before this change Old French and Provençal items with ž were borrowed with /ʒ/: *zardín*, *zálo* (cf. OFr. *jardin*, *jalne*)—after this change items with /č ž/, particularly from standard Italian, could enter the system as loans. The city of Venice has now merged /c ʒ/ to /s z/ (cf. Lepscky); Boerio already mentioned the loss of /c/ (and presumably also of /ʒ/) as characteristic of the “ceto popolare” and of many Venetians of other classes.

For our four varieties of colonial Venetian (Trieste, Fiume, Veglia, Zara) we then have this maximum (overall) system, which seems identical with the conservative Venetian described by Boerio:

vowels	consonants
i                      u	p t k f s c č
e                      o	b d g v z ʒ ž
a	l m n ñ r

6. However, in some scribes, this may represent an archaizing writing: thus Giacomino da Verona (13th century) has *clera* [čera] ‘face’; cf. OFr. *chiere* (cf. G. Rohlfs *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache* I Bern, 1949, p. 294). Ž. Muljačić (*Naše dalmatskomletačke posudjenice* *Jezik* 1959-60, p. 130) maintains the change took place in the fourteenth century.

The phonemes /s/ and /z/ have allophones freely varying as [s~š] and [z~ž]; [š] and [ž] symbolize an apicopalatal articulation giving the acoustic impression of a sound midway between s and š.

Before velars or juncture /n/ has a velar allophone [ŋ]. In many varieties of Venetian /j/ freely alternates with /ǰ/. apparently a post-medieval development.

We may assume that the foregoing maximum system was that implanted by the earlier waves of Venetian colonists, except for the affricates /č ž/, since in earlier Venetian stop plus /l/ had not yet evolved to stop plus /j/. That this change took place after the establishment of Venetian in many of the localities of the Eastern Adriatic is attested by the loanword from Serbo-Croatian *blekati* in the Venetian of Veglia, which appears as *bjekár* in that dialect (Königes, *op. cit.*, 29). The system implanted then is identical with that of the medieval documents (and, except for the sequences C+l, with modern Zaratine) mentioned above.

Of the foregoing maximal system, Trieste, Fiume and Veglia have lost the distinctions *e* vs. *e*, *o* vs. *o*. Zara apparently still has it (Wengler, who is pre-phonemic, quotes forms such as *koto* vs. *oto*, *kolera* vs. *pregizera*).

There is a widespread tendency to weaken the affricates /c ʒ/ to the corresponding fricatives /s z/, thus eliminating the affricates from the system; some varieties appear to have eliminated /ʒ/ but retained /c/, confirming the general tendency (attested for example in Slavic) for voiced affricates to be less stable than unvoiced ones. Along with Venice, as mentioned above, Veglia, most of Istria, and innovating idiolects in Trieste have undergone this weakening of the affricates /c ʒ/ to the corresponding spirants /s z/.<sup>7</sup> In Fiume, Pola, and Cherso /c/ is retained but /ʒ/ weakened and merged with /z/. Zara, on the other hand has

7. G. Pinguentini, *op. cit.*, X, "È da osservarsi che molti, specie nei ceti popolari, invece della z aspra (i.e. /c/. CEB), pronunciano s aspra (i.e. /s/)" A number of examples are given, including *paláso* < *palá-co*, 'palace' *sínkue* < *cínkue* 'five'. Rosman, *op. cit.*, 105, says "... (a Trièste, Pirano, Albóna, Fiume, nei Lussini, a Chèrso e a Zara) si pronunciano con z sórda" (i.e. /c/), but the AIS data do not bear this out for Trieste or Pirano, which have /s/ there. The AIS indicates /ʒ>z/ but /c/ remains in Cherso and Fiume (Albona, the Lussini, Veglia, and Zara are not entered in the AIS) and my own observations confirm this for Fiume.

retained /c ʒ/ and merged /č ʒ/ with them, as we shall see below in section 3.3.

**3.0** We may suppose the following phonemic system for the Serbo-Croatian dialects the Venetian speakers encountered at the beginning of the period of intensive contacts:

p	t	tʷ	k		i	u
b	d	(dʷ)	g		e	o
	s	š	x			a
v	z	ž			vowel length: —	
	c	č	r		accents: ˘ ˙ (distinguished only	
m	n	ñ			in long vowels; ˘ only, in short vowel)	
l	lʷ	j				

This supposes that the changes of the immediate post-Common Slavic period (loss of the *jers*, *nasals*, and *jat'* as phonemes) were completed before the period of intensive contact with Venetian.

The /dʷ/ may at this period have been in the process of merging with /j/. or this change may have been completed.<sup>8</sup>

**3.1** A very widespread phenomenon in the coastal dialects of Serbo-Croatian is the replacement of /m/ before juncture by /n/. This is certainly due to Romanic influence. Venetian tolerates only one nasal in pre-junctural position. In most varieties, it is the [ŋ] allophone of /n/, though Cherso has [n] and Pirano generalizes /m/ rather than /n/.

Note that the result in the Slavic overall system is not the same as in Venetian; while Venetian permits only one nasal in final (pre-junctural) position, Serbo-Croatian dialects affected change final /m/ to /n/, but still maintain a contrast /n/ vs. /ñ/ finally ([ñ] may however best be analysed as a cluster /nj/).<sup>9</sup> Also, final

8. In čakavski and kajkavski Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian, Common Slavic /dʷ/ merges with /j/. Serbo-Croatian čakavski texts from as early as the turn of the XIII/XIV century show /j/ as reflex of Common Slavic /dʷ/. Cf. the document dated 1309 on p. 19 of S. Živković and S. Bosanac *Pregled historijskog razvoja hrvatsko-srpskoga jezika*, Zagreb, 1940. Earlier than this documentary evidence fails us for the reflex of CS1. /dʷ/ in the coast dialects; earlier documents are heavily colored by Church Slavic.

9. Slovenian dialects bordering areas of Venetian and Friulan speech also show /m#/>/n#/ Eastern Friulan, like Venetian, shows a coalescence of /m/ and /n/ (in most varieties as [ŋ], in some places as [m]) in pre-junctural position, but, unlike Venetian and like the



/n/ in Serbo-Croatian nowhere, to my knowledge, shows the allophone [ŋ]. Cf. /jíman/ = Standard Serbo-Croatian *imam* 'I have', /vazàn/ = standard Croatian *vazam* 'Easter'.

3.2 Likewise due to Venetian influence is the change  $l' > j$  e.g. /jūdi/ = *ljudi* /jūbìt/ = *ljubiti* (older Serbo-Croatian, as evidenced by the documents, did not yet have this change, while the Venetian of some documents as early as the thirteenth century does), though indeed this change is a very common one, attested in many languages (French, Latin-American Spanish, Hungarian, Italian dialects other than Venetian) and in Serbo-Croatian now extends to areas beyond that of immediate Venetian-Serbo-Croatian contact. Interestingly, some Slovenian dialects bordering the Romanic area show this same change.<sup>10</sup>

3.3 Another phonological development is coastal Serbo-Croatian specifically due to Venetian influence is the famous "cakavism" noted by number of workers and given detailed study by Małecki; this, like the analogous Polish "mazurzenie" involves merging of the "hushing" series of sibilants and affricates with the corresponding "hissing" series, resulting in a semi-palatal series of sibilants and affricates:<sup>11</sup>

s, š > ś      z, ž > ź      c, č > ć

As is well known, modern Venetian /s/ and /z/ are semi-palatal; medieval Venetian at the beginning of the period of intensive contact had not yet evolved VL *kl, gl* to the *č, ž* of modern Venetian, but had already evolved early *č, ž, š* (from VL *k, g* before front vowel, etc.) to /c ʒ s/. as evidenced by our medieval Venetian documents. Thus like modern Zaratine, medieval colonial Venetian had no distinction of hushing vs. hissing phonemes, but a single series, presumably semi-palatal. As a result of Venetian influence, the Slavic dialects of a large number of coas-

---

Slavic dialects, permits /ñ/ in that position. Thus, [áŋ] 'year', [áñ] 'years'.

10. Specifically, the dialects of so-called Venetian Slovenia, (whose immediate Romanic neighbors, however, are Friulan speakers); Fran Ramovš, *Kratka zgodovina slovenskega jezika* I, Ljubljana, 1936, p. 126.
11. See I. Popović, *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1960, p. 560-1. and M. Małecki, *Cakawizm z uwzględnieniem zjawisk podobnych*, Kraków, 1929.

tal urban centers on the Adriatic coast have likewise lost the hushing-hissing distinction, merging the two series into one. This phenomenon, called *cakavism* (from the pronunciation of dialectal *ča* 'what' as *ca*) is, as mentioned, primarily urban, having made little headway outside the cities and towns and, according to Malecki, not older than the XVIIth century. (though in Lošinj, for example we have evidence of it from the XVIth century).<sup>12</sup>

**4.0** Having treated the Venetian origin of "cakavism" in Serbo-Croatian dialects, we are ready to turn to the treatment by the local Venetian dialects of the *VL* sequences *kl* and *gl*, which as we have seen were still intact in medieval Venetian during the period colloquial Venetian was implanted. Subsequently *kl* developed to /č/ (through [kl̥] and [k̠i]) in the Venetian of Venice and in other Venetian speaking areas including Trieste. The evolution in Fiume and in Zara, where colloquial Venetian was in contact with Serbo-Croatian dialects which presumably already had merged [č š ž] with [c s z], is curious. In Fiume (and on the Quarnero islands) the Venetian reflex of earlier /kl/ is reported by a number of observers to resemble the čakavski Cr. phoneme /t̥/. while in Zara the reflex of *kl* merges with *c*. Thus Zaratine /cáro/ < *clarum* 'clear' and Fiuman /t̥'amáj/ < *clamavi* 'I called'. The corresponding sequence *gl* gives /ž/ (sometimes alternating with /j/) in the city of Venice and also /ž/ (in some places alternating with /j/) in non-colonial Venetian dialects. In Fiume and the Quarnero (e.g. Veglia, Cherso) /j/ usually results; in Trieste and Istria /j/ or /ž/; in Zara we have /j/ initially, /ž/ postconsonantly.

Many varieties of Venetian, particularly that of the city of Venice, freely replace /j/ with /ž/: /mája ~ máža/ (/j/ < /ʎ/) 'knitted shirt', /jéri ~ žéri/ 'yesterday' Slavic names with /j/ are usually borrowed in Venetian with /ž/ (transcribed *gi*, *g*); thus, *Giurco* (i.e. *Jurko*) the name of a Croat in a seventeenth century Venetian comedy, *Giurina* (i.e. *Jurina*) the family name of one of Bartoli's monoglot Venetian informants from Veglia, *Gerolimich* (i.e. *Jerolimić*) name of a family of Triestine shipping magnates. It would appear that when /gl/ underwent the evolution through /gi/ to /ž/, there may have been a period when /ž/ freely alter-

12. Cf. J. Hamm, M. Hraste, P. Guberina, "Govor otoka Suska", *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* I, p. 26-27.

nated with [j]; the former being perhaps the more emphatic deliberate variant, /j/ the more relaxed variant.

In the East Adriatic area we find a tendency to merge the *gl* reflex, the voiced counterpart of the [tʰ] or [č] < *kl*, with /j/ (or in Zara, in part, with /ʒ/. the voiced counterpart of the /c/ with which *kl* merged there). Further, in borrowings from standard Italian, /ʒ/ is replaced by /j/. Thus Fiuman /jústo/ = It. *giusto*, /jardín/ (vs. older Ven. *zardín*) = It. *giardino*.

Historically the voiced counterpart of čakavski SCr. /tʰ/ evolved to /j/ and /j/ is also used to render foreign /ʒ/ (thus *jeneral* 'general' in older čakavski documents). Fiume and the Venetian Quarnero settlements rest largely upon a Croatian čakavski substratum (together with Dalmato-Romanic in Veglia and the other Quarnero towns). The čakavski tendency to replace foreign /ʒ/ and to associate [dʰ ~ ʒ] of neighboring or older Slavic dialects with /j/ led naturally to the resolution of *gl* > Venetian /ʒ/ to /j/, particularly as /j/ was in free variation with /ʒ/ in non-colonial Venetian dialects. Fiuman /j/ also replaced Tuscan /ʒ/ in borrowings from the standard language. It must be remembered that Fiume's growth as a commercial center was late and attracted a mass of immigrants, both from nearby Slavic areas and from non-Venetian Italian areas (Ancona, etc.); the Fiuman dialect is much more heavily permeated by elements from the standard language than is the Venetian of Venice or even of Trieste, which underwent a similar period of growth and immigration. This would account for the large number of Fiuman words where /j/ continues VL *g* before front vowel, *j*, or *dj*: *jústo*, *já*, *péjo*, etc.; these must be loans from the standard, not part of the Venetian inheritance.

In Trieste the picture is similar, though more complex. The substratum was Ladin (Friulan), completely Venetianized only in the last century; there was an Italian immigration and a Slavic adstratum (here mainly Slovenian rather than čakavski — however Slovenian too evolved older /dʰ/ to /j/ and has no voiced counterpart to /č/), but they were not as strong as in Fiume; hence the hesitation between /ʒ/ and /j/ in the resolution of /gl/ and in loans from the standard language.

Zara, as stated, merged the reflexes of /kl/ and /gl/ with phonemes already present; /kl/ > /c/ and *gl* > /j/ initially and /ʒ/ after consonant. Zaratine thus remains faithful to the medieval Venetian phonemic system.

5.0 Finally, some mention should also be made regarding the similarity of sentence melody in čakavski SCr. dialects and colonial Venetian. This melody is generally referred to as *kantáda* 'sing-song' or *kaláda* 'cadence, downglide' and has been characterized by a number of authors (Colombis, Bartoli, Schuchardt, Vidossich); a composite of their remarks would include energetic articulation with a strong expiratory accent, prolongation or drawling (*stiracchiatura*) of the stressed syllable and unvoicing (whispering) of unstressed final vowels. Bartoli states that Istria and the Quarnero have a noticeably different *kantáda* from Dalmatia.

On my playing of one of my recordings of Fiuman Italian to a group of čakavski speakers they remarked on the similarity of the sentence melody to their own, stating that it sounded like Italian spoken with čakavski intonations; čakavski speakers feel they can hear the «čakavski acute» (sharp rising stress contour on long syllable) in colonial Venetian spoken with affect. In čakavski SCr. however the acute is part of a system of phonemic stress distinctions within the domain of the word, while in colonial Venetian it would seem to belong to the system Trager calls vocal qualifiers (see G. L. Trager, «Paralanguage, a first approximation», *SIL* 13 [1958], 1-12). It is interesting to note however that, in the čakavski of Susak (Hraste-Hamm-Gubarina, 62-3, 136-7) at least, there is a tendency to convert utterance final acutes to falling stress in non-affective speech and to convert falling to acute under affect. The same dialect has a tendency to lengthen phonemically short syllables under stress (*op. cit.*, p. 52).

6.0 Mutual syntactic influences. While there appears to have been little or no borrowing either way in morphology (a few derivational affixes mentioned in 7.0 below would constitute an exception), there has been a modest syntactic influence in both directions. On the Venetian side, Slavic syntactic patterns have been mentioned by a number of authors, starting with Schuchardt. Use of the impersonal reflexive (with indirect object indicating person affected) to indicate need or desire has been noted by Schuchardt for Trieste and Pirano and by Depoli for Fiume: *me se dórme* 'I feel like sleeping' (literally 'It sleeps to me'), *me se máña* 'I feel like eating' (cf. SCr. *meni se spava, meni se jede*). Likewise due to Slavic influence is the extensive use in colonial Venetian of the reflexive with a number of verbs which in non-

colonial Venetian and Italian do not usually appear in the reflexive: Thus, in Fiume (Depoli) *jogárse* 'to play' (SCr. *igrati se*), *la se ride* 'She's laughing' (SCr. *ona se smije*); cf. It. *giocare*, (*ella*) *ride* with no reflexive. Depoli reports this tendency for Fiume and Schuchardt for a number of points in Dalmatia<sup>13</sup>. Often attributed to Slavic influence is the tendency in Venetian to use the third person reflexive pronoun in the first and second persons; as already pointed out by Schuchardt however (and confirmed by AIS), this tendency is widespread in north Italian dialects of areas far removed from any possible Slavic influence. The most that can be said is that in colonial Venetian this usage is probably reinforced by the analogous construction in Slavic.

Use of the conditional to indicate habitual past action, reported by Schuchardt for Spalato (p. 123) is certainly due to SCr. influence, but again may not represent usage of native speakers: *...el mio fónto pádre el andaría...* 'My late father would go...' (cf. SCr. *moj pokojni otac bi išao...*).

The tendency for the indicative to replace the subjunctive in a number of construction, reported for Fiume (Depoli), Trieste (Vidossich), Dignano (Tekavčić) is again due to Slavic influence (Slavic languages have no subjunctive forms). This must particularly be true for optative constructions with *ke*. Cf. analogous SCr. constructions with *da*: *ke védo sta róba* 'Let me see this stuff.' Cf. SCr. *da vidim ovu robu*, It. *che veda (io) questa roba*. Related is the tendency to use the conditional in the if-clause of unreal conditions reported for Trieste, Fiume, Istriote (Deanović, Tekavčić). In Serbo-Croatian the conditional may be used in the if-clause (after *ako* 'if') of unreal conditions as well as in the result clause. Thus in Fiume: *se mi vorío, podarío* (It. *se volessi, potrebbi*) 'if I wanted to, I could' Cf. SCr. *ako bih želio, mogao bih*. However, a number of authors (Depoli for Fiume, Schuchardt for Trieste and Fiume, Deanović for Istriote) report more or less free variation between conditional and past subjunctive in both clauses of unreal conditions. In general the sequence of tenses in subordinate clauses tends to follow the Slavic rather than the Italian pattern. (In Serbo-Croatian and Slavic languages generally the tense of the subordinate clause is chosen with time reference in relation

13. Schuchardt unfortunately usually fails to make clear whether the usages he reports are those of native speakers of colonial Venetian or of Slavs to whom Venetian was a second language, perhaps imperfectly mastered.

to the time indicated by the tense of the main verb rather than in relation to the moment of speaking. Thus, where Italian or English says *Credevo che egli venisse* 'I believed he was coming' (dependent clause verb in past; reference to moment of speaking), Serbo-Croatian and with it colonial Venetian say *verovao sam da dolazi, mi kredévo k el vjén* (dependent clause verb in present, reference to the point in the past indicated by the past tense of the main clause).

Mezorana cites the unpopularity of the passive in Fiuman which parallels Serbo-Croatian usage: *i lo ga macá* 'He was killed' (literally; 'they killed him'); cf. Serbo-Croatian *ubili su ga* vs. the It. passive, *venne ucciso, é stato ucciso*. However, Italian dialects not infrequently prefer active to passive constructions (Rohlf's II, p. 578-9). The same author also attributes the Fiuman negative imperative construction to a Serbo-Croatian model: *no stá andár vía* (sg.) 'don't go away' *no sté komprár* (pl.) 'don't buy' (cf. Serbo-Croatian *nemoj otići, nemojte kupovati*). The analogy is not complete however, as *stár* 'to stand, be' is not altogether parallel to the defective verb *nemoj-* used only in negative imperatives. Mezorana attributes the ethical dative in Fiuman to Slavic influence; however, this usage is also widespread in many Italian dialects (cf. Rohlf's II, p. 445).

Bartoli mentions as Fiuman (and Vegliote, I, 245) deletion of the main verb in short replies to questions with a verbal construction; such deletion is quite foreign to standard Italian but usual in Serbo-Croatian (as in English). Thus, while standard Italian answers to *Hai mangiato qualcosa?* 'Have you eaten anything?' either simply *Si* or *Si, ho mangiato*, Fiuman may reply /sí gó/ 'Yes, I have'. Cf. the completely parallel Serbo-Croatian *Jesi jeo? Da, jesam*.

Various authors have attributed differences in the usage of prepositions from that of standard Italian to Slavic influence, but this is hard to demonstrate. The Triestine and Fiuman tendency to mark an animate object with the preposition *a* has been attributed to a need to distinguish formally object from subject on analogy with the Slavic case system (a similar development in Rumanian involving the preposition *pe* has also been attributed to Slavic influence), but an identical usage (*a* marking animate objects) exists in Spanish and in Italian dialects (Southern Italy, Rohlf's II, p. 435) removed from Slavic influence.

6.2 Venetian influence on Slavic syntax is somewhat harder to *demonstrate*.<sup>14</sup> The increased use of prepositional constructions (replacing oblique cases without prepositions) in the coastal regions is doubtless due to Romanic influence (perhaps first Dalmato-Romanic, then in perhaps stronger measure Venetian); thus we have: *na* plus accusative corresponding to various prepositional phrases in Italian. Cf. Ragusan Serbo-Croatian (heard by this author) *bàrka na vésla*, It. *battello a remi* 'boat (powered by) oars'; from Susak (Hraste et al.) *kolòr na naránžu*, It. *colore (d')arancia* 'orange color', cf. standard Serbo-Croatian *boja naranče* with genitive case; *od* plus genitive corresponding to phrases with *di* in Italian (where standard Serbo-Croatian would have the genitive case), from Senj (Tijan) *prid kuću odi dona Vitezić* 'before the house of Father Vitezić' (cf. standard Serbo-Croatian *pred kućom dona Vitezića*) *socijetad odi sopilarov* 'fife corps' (cf. standard *društvo sopilara*); from Kastav (Jardas) *paron od Brgudi* cf. Venetian *parón de B.* 'owner of Brgud'.

The use of such prepositions as *za* 'for' and *bez* 'without' with the infinitive (where the standard language would have the verbal noun) parallels the use of *per* and *senza* with the infinitive in Italian. Thus: *voda za pit* 'water for drinking' (cf. It. *acqua per bere*, standard Serbo-Croatian *voda za pijenje*).

Coalescence of the function of cases in the coastal dialects is attributed by Popović (566 et seq.) to Romanic influence. Venetian, like Italian, lacking a case system, cannot make a distinction between the allative and locative use of prepositions like *a*, *in*.

14. Most of the syntactic influences here mentioned have been treated in I. Popović, *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache*, Wiesbaden, 1960. Čakavski examples are taken from P. Tijan "Senjske štorije i čakule (svršetak)" in *Zbornik za život i običaje hrvatskog naroda* 32, no. 2 (1940), 197-260 (Senj); J. Hamm, M. Hraste, P. Guberina, "Govor Otoka Suska" *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* I (1956), 7-213 (Susak); I. Jardas, "Kastavština" *Zbornik za život i običaje južnih Slavena* 39, (1957), 5-416 (Kastav). I have accented the examples for which accents were given in the source texts, using the following symbols // "rising" stress, /' "falling" stress, /—/ vowel length; this symbolization is not intended to prejudice my phonemic analysis of vowel length as vowel gemination, of rising stress in čakavski as stress on the second vowel of a two vowel sequence and falling stress as stress on the first vowel of a sequence or on a single "short" vowel. Rising stress in štokavski is analysed as geminate stress carried over two syllables.

Thus It. *Siamo a Roma, in Svizzera* 'We are in Rome, in Switzerland' *Andiamo a Roma, in Svizzera* 'We're going to Rome, to Switzerland'. Slavic languages possessing a case system (e.g. standard Serbo-Croatian) distinguish the allative use of certain prepositions (with accusative) from the locative use (with locative or instrumental). Many coastal dialects have blurred this distinction (the cases occurring in apparently free variation without regard to the locative/allative distinction) and Popović points out that this is attested already in medieval SCr. documents. Cf. the following from a letter written by a woman native of Kastav but living in America: *Ti hodi va Meriki* (locative case) 'You come to America' *da bin šla v stari kraj umret* (accusative case) 'that I would go to the old country to die' *da ćeš ti poć Meriku* (accusative case with no preposition) 'that you will go to America' (Jardas, p. 359).

Similarly the blurring of the distinction of sociative (preposition *s*+instrumental) and instrumental proper (instrumental case alone) apparently results from Romanic influence (Venetian, like Italian and other Romanic tongues has only the phrase with *kon* for both). In Slavic this has led to generalization of *sa* plus instrumental in both meanings in many areas or, conversely in some areas, generalization of the instrumental alone, or even free variation. Thus we have from Kastav: *s pokojnen barbun Jožinun Marčejun* 'with the late Uncle Joe Marčej' and *Ja san delal Zvane Markovićen* 'I was working with Zvane Marković'.

Surprisingly increased use of prepositions and blurring of semantic distinctions in case usage seems not to have led to a loss of inflexional complexity; most Serbo-Croatian ča-dialects possess a greater number of distinct case endings than does the standard language.

Likewise due to Romanic influence is the possibility in coastal Serbo-Croatian (and in Standard Slovenian) of enclitics occurring in utterance initial position (standard Serbo-Croatian rigidly excludes enclitics from this position). Thus: regional *su mi suze na oči* vs. standard *Suze su mi u očima*. 'There are tears in my eyes' or the placement of enclitic between the negative proclitic and the verb (in the standard language this proclitic is inseparable from the item it negates) *ne se prodaje grojze* vs. standard Serbo-Croatian *ne prodaje se grožđe*. (cf. It. *non si vende uva*) 'Grapes aren't sold here.'



Pleonastic use of enclitic (conjunctive) pronouns in the presence of a full form (disjunctive) pronoun object or a noun object is present in colonial Venetian as in many Italian dialects (this usage is also common to Spanish and to the languages of the southern and eastern Balkans). Thus: *fége lógo ala žénte ke pasa* (Rosman) 'Make way for people passing by', *el te ga bastonádo a tí* 'He gave you a beating.' Popović reports a similar usage in some varieties of Istrian Serbo-Croatian *mene me boli glava* 'I have a headache' (literally 'My head hurts me'). I have not been able to find any other attestation of this usage in coastal Serbo-Croatian, though it is, of course, widespread in the eastern and southern varieties of Serbo-Croatian, which constitute a transitional area to the Balkan *Sprachbund*.

Indeed, most of the syntactic features ascribed above to Dalmato-Romanic and Venetian influence in the coastal area are found elsewhere in the Serbo-Croatian speech area. Thus confusion of the locative and allative appears in Montenegro (where Popović posits combined Romanic and Albanian influence) and neighboring areas and in the Banat (Rumanian influence is posited). Confusion of the sociative and instrumental is widespread in substandard Serbo-Croatian, the prepositional phrase usually replacing the simple case usage (*pišem s olovkom* 'I'm writing with a pencil' vs. standard *pišem olovkom*). The spread of this usage may well be due to other non-Slavic influences converging with that of Venetian in the coastal areas; most likely of German in the areas formerly subject to Austria-Hungary and possibly Rumanian, Albanian, or Greek elsewhere. German influence may also be involved in the spread of *za* plus infinitive in interior Croatia (Magner reports it in Zagreb<sup>15</sup>) cf. German: *Wasser zum trinken* 'water to drink' Placement of enclitics in initial position occurs in the Banat (Rumanian influence) and elsewhere in the south and east (Balkan *Sprachbund*).

**7.0** Lexicon. Colonial Venetian has given the local Slavic dialects a vast number of loanwords; one need only peruse texts from the coastal area published for dialectological or ethnographic purposes to convince oneself of the immense cultural influence Venice formerly exercised in these parts. A modest number of these loans have entered the standard language: *bòca* 'bottle' *màja* 'knitted shirt', *píjaca* 'market place', *ceráda* 'waterproof tarpaulin'

15. *A Zagreb Kajkavian Dialect*, Penn State Studies # 18, 1966, p. 49.

*rúža* 'rose', etc. Loans in the opposite direction are not numerous. A very modest number are reported by Popović (466-7), by Depoli for Fiume (312-3), and by Pinguentini for Trieste from Slovenian (*Supplemento*, 12-14). Interesting is the borrowing, in Fiuman, of the Slavic suffix complex *-ic-a*, *-ov-ic-a* which is attached to non-Slavic roots. Thus *kápo* 'head, foreman' *kapovíca* 'foreman's wife'.

While colonial Venetian underwent a by no means negligible Slavic «substratum» influence in phonology and syntax, due to assimilation of Slavic speakers and presence of many bilinguals (except in western Istria and Trieste, completely monolingual speakers of colonial Venetian must have always been a small minority), colonial Venetian did not borrow much in lexicon from the Slavs, doubtless because in the period of Venetian ascendancy Venetian was the prestige language and Venetian urban culture was materially more advanced than the Slavic, so that cultural and lexical innovations flowed from Venetian to Slavic.<sup>16</sup>

*University of Pittsburgh*

- 
16. Depoli, writing while Fiume was under Hungary, states "gran parte di fiumani conosce anche il croato," while Jaberg and Jud (*Der Sprachatlas als Forschungsinstrument*, Halle, 1928, p. 91), writing while Fiume was under Italy, state "Die meisten Fiumaner reden neben ihrer Stadtmundart den Kroatischen Dialekt des umgebenden Landes." Concerning Cherso the latter say "Nur im Städtchen wird Italienisch gesprochen" Bartoli (*Das Dalmatische*, Vienna, 1906), on the other hand, states that in the town of Veglia, other than to about 100 Slavs in the episcopal curia and such of the merchant class as dealt habitually with surrounding country people, Slavic was not known even as a second language (vol. I, p. 226).