

GEORGE THOMAS
(Hamilton)

THE ROLE OF GERMAN LOANWORDS IN SERBO-CROATIAN:
A SOCIOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

With its dialectal complexity, its pluricentric codification, the underlying cultural diversity of its speakers and the resulting centrifugal and centripetal relationships between its spoken and written varieties, the Serbo-Croatian (S-Cr) *diasystem*¹ throws out great descriptive challenges to the sociolinguist. On all these topics the late Pavle Ivić wrote with great passion and authority, not least in Ivić (1971). As a small token of respect for his huge contribution to the subject, I would like to address here the question of German (G) loanwords in the context of these broader issues.

Of all the major Western European languages, G has been the most widely known and used within the geographical area where S-Cr is spoken. While it has functioned as a language of wider communication throughout the area, it is that portion which formed part of the Habsburg Empire where contact with G has been most intensive and its impact, therefore, greatest.² Not surprisingly, there is a wealth of literature on the loanwords which resulted from this contact (Trivunac 1937, Striedter-Temps 1953 and Schneeweis 1960, Babić 1986). In recent years this has been augmented by a series of studies devoted to the role played by G in urban settings in Croatia, Slavonia and the Vojvodina, which formerly fell under Habsburg sovereignty (Mrazović 1996, Piškorec 1997, Dobrenov-Major 1997, Glovački-Bernardi 1998, Medić n.d.). The present study seeks to provide answers to a number of the questions — implicit and explicit — these previous contributions raised. First, can it be demonstrated that whereas the S standard has been generally receptive to loanwords Cr has — for puristic reasons — tended to avoid them as many commentators since Unbegaun

1 The term is taken from Brozović (1970, 14).

2 The question of the exposure of S-Cr-speakers to G has never been fully and systematically explored. I intend filling this gap in a separate publication in the near future.

(1932) have asserted? Second, to what does the speech of Novi Sad, the largest city in the Vojvodina, resemble that of Zagreb on the Cr side with respect to the use of G loanwords; and, finally, does it differ in this significantly from usage in Belgrade? For this purpose, a corpus of 143 lexical items, developed to investigate standard and nonstandard use of G loanwords in the core Slavonic languages of the former Habsburg Empire (Thomas 1998, 341–3), was tested for the Cr and S standard languages and for the everyday speech of Zagreb, Belgrade and Novi Sad.³

Only eleven G words out of these 143 have failed to give rise to a loanword in one of the examined varieties of S-Cr: *Häusl* 'privy', *Jahrmarkt* 'fair', *ja* 'yes', *Kammer* 'room', *kosten* 'to taste',⁴ *Kundschaft* 'clientele', *Mischmasch* 'hotchpotch', *prima* 'excellent', *putzen* 'to clean',⁵ *trumpfen* 'to trump (at cards)', *wünschen* 'to wish'. The representation of 92% of the items in some variety of S-Cr is higher than the other three languages in the original survey (Thomas 1998, 343). The figures for all varieties of Cr are 124 items (87%) and of S 99 items (69%). The difference is commensurate, in my view, with the relative historical exposure to G among Croats and Serbs.

When it comes to the respective standard languages, the first major indicator of a difference between them is that 40 loanwords are found in S as against only 27 in Cr. In addition to the 25 words identical to S and Cr (*akuratan* 'accurate, exact' (< G *akkurat*), *apoteka* 'apothecary' (< G *Apotheke*), *bal* 'ball, dance' (< G *Ball*), *direktan* 'direct' (< G *direkt*), *doktor* 'physician' (< G *Doktor*), *fakt* 'fact' (< G *Fakt*), *familija* 'family' (< G *Familie*), *frizura* 'hairdo' (< G *Frisur*), *kasa* 'cashier's wicket' (< G *Kasse*, Austrian G *Kassa*), *kredenc* 'sideboard' (< G *Kredenz*), *logor* 'camp' (< G *Lager*), *kuražan* 'courageous' (< G *Courage*), *kurva* 'prostitute' (< G *Hure*), *lavor* 'washbasin, washstand' (< regional G *Lavor*), *marš* 'march' (< G *Marsch*), *muzika* 'music' (< G *Musik*), *natura* 'nature' (< G *Natur*), *peron* 'railway platform' (< G *Perron*), *policajac* 'police officer' (< G *Polizei*), *radio* 'radio' (< G *Radio*), *rola* 'role' (< G *Rolle*), *šansa* 'chance,

³ The written sources were Magner (1966), Stevanović et al. (1967–76), Sabljak (1981), Anić (1991), Brodnjak (1992), Hudeček et al. (1999). The main native Cr informant, Berislav Fabek, was born in Zagreb shortly after the First World War. The S informant, Branka Popović, was born in Novi Sad during the Second World War, attended university there — by a happy coincidence Pavle Ivić was one of her teachers — and was subsequently employed for many years on the teaching staff at the University of Belgrade. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge their invaluable assistance.

⁴ In the meaning 'to cost', this word is used in Croatia and Serbia.

⁵ My S informant gives *pučval* 'wire wool' for the Vojvodina, indicating that the morpheme *puč-* has been available for forming new words.

prospects' (< G *Chance*), *šarm* 'charm' (< G *Charm*), *špricer* 'spritzer' (< G *Spritzer*), *teatar* 'theatre' (< G *Theater*)), there is one word where the Cr and S forms are markedly different (*šparoga* and *špargla* 'asparagus' respectively (< G *Spargel*), although the Zagreb nonstandard variety has the same form as S.

Since the impact of G on Cr seems to have been somewhat greater than on S, we have to find an explanation for the fact that with respect to the standard language the number of G loanwords in S is almost half again as large as in Cr. Such an explanation is readily available in the impact of xenophobic purism on the formation and cultivation of the Cr standard.⁶ Proof of the successful application of this 'tight normative filter' against G loanwords (Babić 1986, 12) is that all 13 of the words registered in the S standard but absent from standard Cr are used in the colloquial speech of Zagreb. A further indication of puristic intervention, albeit of moderate intensity, is the fact that, even in those instances where a G loanword is tolerated, users of standard Cr also have recourse, for the most part, to a native synonym. Serbs, on the other hand, are more often content to use the loanword in isolation in these cases. Another insight into the nature of Cr purism is offered by the observation that two of these words do not have a direct equivalent in standard Cr: *frajer* 'suitor, skirt chaser, prostitute's trick' (< G *Freier*), *šank* 'bar for dispensing drinks' (< southern and Austrian G *Schank*). Since, as we shall see, both loanwords are used in the Zagreb vernacular, this shows how *censoring purism* (Thomas 1991, 88–91) can deplete a standard language's expressive resources.

Turning to colloquial usage, there are 24 items which are common to all three urban idioms but which are excluded from the respective standard languages: *coltati/calnuti* 'to pay' (< G *zahlen*), *deka* 'duvet' (< G *Decke*), *firanga* 'curtain' (< G *Vorhang*), *fraj* 'free, without charge' (< G *frei*), *ganc* 'quite, totally' (< G *ganz*), *glanc* 'shine' (< G *Glanz*), *hohštapler* 'swindler' (< G *Hochstapler*), *kvartir* 'apartment' (< Austrian G *Quartier*), *luft* 'air' (< G *luft*), *muštra* 'model' (< G *Muster*), *peh* 'bad luck' (< G *Pech*), *šihta* 'shift' (< Austrian G *Schichte*), *šlus* 'end, stop' (< G *Schluß*), *šnajder* 'tailor' (< G *Schneider*), *špansirati/špacirati* 'to go for a walk' (< G *spazieren*), *špajz/špajza* 'larder, pantry' (< Austrian G *Speis*), *štambilj/štampilj*, *štemp(i)l* 'rubber stamp' (< G *Stempel*), *štimmung* 'cosy atmosphere' (< G *Stimmung*), *štrapac/štrapacan* 'effort/tiring' (< Austrian G *Strapaz-*), *štrudl/štrudla* 'strudel' (< G *Strudel*), *štih* 'trick (in cards)' (< G *Stich*),

⁶ For more on Cr purism, see Vince (1979–80), Katičić (1973–4), Thomas (1978, 1996).

šuster 'cobbler' (< G *Schuster*), *tišler* 'joiner, cabinet maker' (< G *Tischler*), *ziher* 'certain(ly)' (< G *sicher*).

To these we may also add the 40 loanwords registered in the Cr and S standards, since none of them can be considered high-style, bookish or specialist and are therefore also part of the active repertoire of the residents of the three urban centres. This gives a combined total of 64, which constitutes almost half of all the loanwords in the sample found in one or more of the varieties of S-Cr. We should, however, not lose sight of the fact that, as demonstrated above, one fifth of these lexemes bear radically different stylistic and socio-communicative functions in the Cr urban milieu from those in the two S cities.

Of the binary relationships, that between Zagreb and Novi Sad yields the highest number of common items (26): *ajzliban/ajznbaner* 'railway / railway worker' (< G *Eisenbahn(er)*), *baraka* 'shack, dilapidated house' (< G *Barack(e)*), *biflati* 'to swot, to cram, to learn parrot fashion' (< G *büffeln*), *fajn* 'fine, good' (< G *fein*), *flajšmašina* 'meat machine' (< G *Fleischmaschine*), *frajlal/frajlica* 'miss, young woman' (< G *Fräulein*), *frtalj* 'quarter, block' (< G *Viertel*), *furt/fort* 'on and on' (< G *fort und fort*), *gank/gajnk/gonk* 'corridor' (< G *Gang*), *grunt* 'base, foundation' (< G *Grund*), *hofirati* 'to court' (< G *hofieren*), *kajzeršmarn* 'type of dessert' (< G *Kaiserschmarren*), *kumst/humst* 'skill, smarts' (< G *Kunst*), *mebl* 'furniture' (< G *Möbel*), *medicina* 'medication' (< G *Medizin*), *servus/serbus* 'greeting' (< regional G *Servus*), *šmajhlati* 'to flatter, butter up' (< G *schmeicheln*), *šmuk* 'ornament, decoration' (< G *Schmuck*), *šnuftikla* 'handkerchief' (< southern and Austrian G *Schnupftüchl*), *špalta* 'newspaper column' (< G *Spalte*), *šparkasa* 'savings bank' (< G *Sparkasse*), *špigl* 'mirror' (< G *Spiegel*), *špitalj* 'hospital' (< Austrian G *Spital*), *štreka* 'permanent way' (< G *Strecke*), *švindl* 'swindle' (< G *Schwindel*), *urlaub/urlab/urlaup* 'vacation, leave' (< G *Urlaub*). To these might be added *befel* 'order' (< G *Befehl*), rejected by my Zagreb informant but documented for 1925 by Glovački-Bernardi (1998, 123) and in Finka (1984–). This would bring the number of loanwords confined to the Zagreb and Novi Sad idioms to 50.

There is just one item common to each of the other binary relationships: *handlovati* 'to trade' (< G *handeln*) for Belgrade and Novi Sad, *cimer* 'room-mate' (< G *Zimmer* 'room') for Belgrade and Zagreb. Clearly the Novi Sad and Zagreb vernaculars have more in common with each other with respect to G loanwords than the two S cities do. Even if we factor in items from the respective standard varieties, we still arrive at a figure for items common to Novi Sad and Zagreb of 90, compared with one for Novi Sad and Belgrade of 65. This clearly indicates that, as a result of sharing in the heritage of the Habsburg Empire and extensive and inten-

sive contact with G, the spoken varieties of Zagreb and Novi Sad have undergone a high degree of convergence. In contrast, the location of Belgrade outside the Habsburg Empire and the lack of the kind of extensive and intensive contact with G experienced by generations of residents of Novi Sad has brought about a considerable divergence between the spoken varieties of the two major S cities. This divergence would doubtless have been even greater were it not for the fact that on the S side so many G loanwords have penetrated the standard language.

Nevertheless, there are still two important differences between Zagreb and Novi Sad in the use of G loanwords. In the first place, while the speech of Novi Sad has just two additional G loanwords not shared with either of the other cities (*kurirati* 'to treat, to cure' < G *kurieren*, *vandrovati* 'to roam, to ramble'), there are 29 such items in the Zagreb urban vernacular: *cajt* 'time' (< G *Zeit*), *caitunge* 'newspaper' (< G *Zeitung*), *cukerpeker* 'confectioner' (< Austrian G *Zuckerbäcker*), *cuksfirer* 'guard (on a train)' (< Austrian G *Zugsführer*), *dakl* 'dachshund' (< G *Dack(e)l*), *drot* 'wire, line' (< G *Draht*), *fajfa* 'saxophone, penis' (< G *Pfeife* 'pipe'), *fana* 'banner' (< G *Fahne*), *fara* 'parish' (< G *Pfarre*), *fašing/fašnik* 'mardi gras' (< regional G *Fasching*),⁷ *glajz* 'track at a railway station' (< G *G(e)leis(e)*), *hec* 'fun, joke' (< Austrian G *Hetz*), *kasl* 'mailbox' (< G *Kasten* 'box, chest'), *koh* 'cook, chef' (< G *Koch*),⁸ *ksiht* 'face, mug' (< G *Gesicht*), *kšeft* 'business, deal' (< G *Geschäft*), *mašinfirer* 'engine driver' (< Austrian G *Maschinführer*), *mirakul* 'miracle' (< G *Mirakel*), *muterica* 'mother' (< G *Mutter*), *nemlih* 'namely' (< G *nämlich*), *nor/norc* 'fool, idiot' (< G *Narr*), *pajzl* 'pub, bawdy house' (< Austrian, Bavarian G *Beisel*), *partaja* 'political party' (< G *Partei*), *špajs* 'fun' (< G *Spaß*), *špek* 'bacon, lard' (< G *Speck*), *špraha* 'language' (< G *Sprache*), *štrof* 'punishment' (< G *Strafe*), *švigertohter* 'step-daughter' (< G *Schwiegertochter*), *tringelt* 'tip' (< G *Trinkgeld*). To this list one should add *gauner* 'thief' (< G *Gauner*), rejected by my informant but documented by Glovacki-Bernardi (1998, 152) in a source from 1925.

Thus, while there is a total of three Germanisms used in Novi Sad but not in Zagreb, there is a corresponding figure of 30 items known in Zagreb but absent in Novi Sad. This is to be explained by differences in the exposure to G in Croatia and the Vojvodina. First, the Serbs had migrated in numbers to the Vojvodina only in 1699, so that the time-depth of their contact with G was considerably less. Secondly, after the First World War and the incorporation of the Vojvodina into the new Yugoslav state

⁷ The form *fašnik* is now listed in Hudeček et al. (1999).

⁸ The word *koh* is used in S but in the meaning of 'pudding'.

there had been a large-scale in-migration into the Vojvodina of Serbs from Serbia proper. This state of affairs was to be intensified still further after the Second World War by the forcible emigration of G-speakers from the province and their replacement by a second wave of non-Vojvodinian Serb immigrants (Wehler 1980, 63–6). As a result, standard S became the most widespread form of discourse in Novi Sad, the vernacular of the older residents of the city with its repertoire of Germanisms being reduced to something of an historical relic (Dobrenov-Major 1997). In Zagreb, on the other hand, the kajkavian vernacular enjoyed considerable prestige among immigrants to Zagreb (Šojat 1979), including those from regions of Croatia where G influence had been minimal. As a consequence, the latter have tended to acquire a repertoire of G loanwords as they have accommodated their speech towards the Zagreb vernacular.

The second difference concerns the socio-stylistic function of these loanwords, which can be illustrated by analyzing the ratio of words considered limited to non-standard usage to those accepted into the standard language in the respective urban centres. Thus, if we compare the status of those 90 words common to Zagreb and Novi Sad usage, the ratio of non-standard to standard items in Novi Sad is a little over 5 : 4, compared with approximately 5 : 2 in Zagreb. If we extend this comparison to include all G loanwords in our sample for each of the two urban centres, then it can be seen that the gap between them widens still further: to 3 : 2 in Novi Sad and almost 4 : 1 in Zagreb.⁹

As we have already established, this difference has its roots in the moderate xenophobic and elitist purism which characterizes the prevailing attitude to the standard language in Croatia.¹⁰ But it is also tied to the existence of another important sociolinguistic factor in Zagreb: *diglossia*. This diglossia maintained a strict distinction between the Cr standard language used for formal, written discourse and a kajkavian urban idiom used for purposes of informal communication (Magner 1966). As we have seen, about 20% of the G loanwords in our sample are used in both the formal (H) and the informal (L) code, while the remaining 80% are confined to the L code. However, according to Magner, the rigorously maintained distinction between the H and L codes is showing signs of disintegration with the development of intermediary varieties between the two extremes. As this trend develops still further, it will have an effect on the status of G

⁹ This ratio tallies fairly closely with the 5.7 : 1 calculated by Babić (1986, 6–7) for the number of Schneiweis' 2977 G loanwords accepted in standard Cr.

¹⁰ As Herrity (1978) has demonstrated, there was no lack of puristic sentiment in Serbia; the difference is that it did not gain support among S language cultivators.

loanwords. It has been noted, for example, that the number of loanwords in Cr labelled as „low colloquial“, „slang“ or „jargon“ is already very small (*biflati, fabrika, fah, frajer, šnajder*), especially compared with Cz and Sln with 78 and 37 such items respectively (Thomas 1998, 345). It would seem that Cr is evolving in the direction of a situation, where the G loanwords are appropriate in speech but not in writing. However, it will be interesting to see whether some widely used Germanisms, especially those for which there is no ready native equivalent exists or where there is little overlap of meaning with a native word, will find their way into use at the more formal end of the socio-communicative spectrum. Of course, for this to happen would require a rejection of the extreme, elitist and xenophobic purism, which has characterized cultivation of the Cr standard language over the past decade. The outcome of any such relaxation of the „normative filter“ would have the effect of raising to standard status in Zagreb many of the words which have already achieved that status in Belgrade and Novi Sad. Signs that this is already beginning to happen are provided by the fact that a number of loanwords previously ignored or stigmatized in earlier Cr dictionaries are now admitted in Anić (1991) and especially Hudeček et al. (1999) without stylistic or local marking, e.g. *akuratan, direktan, doktor, fakt, familija, fašnik, kredenc, kurva, marš, natura, peron, rola, policajac, šarm, šansa*.

Given the ever diminishing role of G in the region, the obsolescence of these G loanwords needs to be addressed, particularly those which have not received the *imprimatur* of the dictionaries of the respective standard languages. There are only very few instances where words are flagged as „obsolete“ or „archaic“ in the lexicographical sources or were firmly rejected by my informants, e.g. for Zagreb: *medicina, špital*. However, the fact that all my informants, without solicitation, remarked that their parents would have been able to furnish a much fuller list reflects the widespread perception that there has indeed been a considerable reduction in the active use of Germanisms in all three urban communities.

Mrazović (1996, 214) also documents a marked retreat in the use and understanding of G loanwords among young people in the Vojvodina. However, she makes no distinction in her figures between standard and non-standard usage. Among the words in our sample (or their derivatives), which Mrazović (1996, 216) claims are understood by all her respondents are the following: *cimerka, fah, farba, flaša, fleka, glancati, kasa, kasirka, knedla, marš, muštra, peh, plac, puter, sos, šank, šnicla, špricer, štrudla, viršla*. To these should be added those words which all the youngest respondents say they understand but a few individuals claim — improbably in my view — not to use: *kredenac, krigla, šnajder, šnuftikla, špajz,*

štimung. There are also other items from our list which are understood by more than two thirds of the youngest generation surveyed by Mrazović (1996, 216–28): *calovati, deka, firanga, fraj, frajla/frajlica, frižak, frtalj, kunst, lager, luft, mebl, ruksak, soft, špargla, štambilj, štrapac*. In most cases, the numbers for the active use of these words falls are much lower, indicating that they are beginning to drop out of use. At the other end of the spectrum are a number of words which are understood by less than two thirds of the youngest respondents and are actively used only by a very small minority: *ajzliban, drot, fašing, gonk/gong, grunt, kvartir, špacirati, špitalj, tišler, tringelt, vandrokaš*. These words are probably becoming obsolete in the present-day Vojvodina. Significantly, two of these disappearing words (*drot, fašing*) were not even suggested by my informant.

On the Cr side, the situation is more open to question. For example, Glovacki-Bernardi (1998) does not tell us whether there were significant differences in the usage of the two age cohorts surveyed — one in their forties, the other in their seventies — or which 120 words were given to a group of 25 schoolchildren. Most of these words were known to them and apart from some recent immigrants from Bosnia-Herzegovina, there was no variation on the basis of the parents' birthplace. The only word from our sample cited by her as no longer in use is *viršl* (Glovacki-Bernardi 1998, 112). Šojat (1998, 39) confirms that even in the centre of Zagreb the number of the Germanisms has decreased significantly since the time when Magner (1966) carried out his investigations. Of 500 nouns of G origin listed by Magner, 33 are not used by Šojat but most of the verbs are (Šojat 1998, 57). In the suburbs, except in households which have moved out of the centre, there has been a still greater decrease in the number of G loanwords (Šojat 1998, 55). Among those words which Šojat (198, 56, 66–7) claims not to have heard are the following items from our sample: *ajzbaner, cukerpekeraj, cuksfirer, fana, ksiht, mašinfirer, špraha* (though the last is used in *Šatrovački*, the Zagreb slang).¹¹ Still to be heard, though, are words such as *farba, firange, fort/furt, gemiš, plac, špihl* as well as *cajt, hec* (these last with stylistic colouring) (Šojat 1998, 66–7). Those Germanisms which have not survived have been replaced by words from standard Cr or by loans from some other source. This is not surprising in view of the fact that Zagreb kajkavian, now rarely heard in unbroken discourse without admixtures of štokavian, is giving way to *štokavština*, the variant of standard Cr realized by substandard Zagreb speakers, as the idiom which characterizes the speaker as a „true“

¹¹ For more on Germanisms in *Šatrovački*, see Juričić & Kess (1977).

Zagrepčanin (Šojat 1998, 71). It will be interesting to see how many G loanwords survive this shift in the L code from kajkavian to štokavian.

Two studies of loanwords in rural kajkavian speech communities provide some points of comparison with the situation in Zagreb. Horvath-Dronske (1995, 374) claims there are about 1,000 G loanwords in current active use in the Krapina area without providing a full list but citing from our sample *drek, frajer, hohštapler, urla(u)b* (p. 112). More promising is Piškorec (1997, 83–145), who gives 66 of the 114 words found in our Zagreb sample, including two words which have been identified as archaic or obsolete in Zagreb: *meducin, špital*. It may be argued that a small town or the countryside will have been more likely to retain kajkavian together with its characteristic repertoire of Germanisms as its L code than the expanding and industrializing national capital. Nevertheless, the data collected by Piškorec independently of Glovacki-Bernardi (1998), Magner (1966) and myself seems to confirm the stable and pervasive nature of the lexical impact of G on the historically kajkavian landscape as a whole. Moreover, it seems reasonable to assume that those words listed in both Piškorec and my own materials belong to the solid core of those Germanisms, which have been fully integrated into local usage and, as such, are likely to remain so (in the case of discrepancies in form of pronunciation, Zagreb items are given first): *apoteka/japoteka, baraka, befel, biflati, puter, drot, drek, fah* (also *fakman* in Piškorec), *farba, fašing/fašenk, fajn, flaša, flek/fleka, flajšmašina, frajla, fraj, friški, gank, ganc, kšeft/šeft, glanc, knedl/kneglin, krigl/kriglin, kumst, lager, luft, medicinal/meducin, mebl/meblin, mustra, par, paradajz, fara, fajfa, peh, plac, kvartir/kvarter, ruksak/rupsak, saft, šank, šlus, šmajhlati/šmajlati, šnajder/šnajdar, šnicl/šnicel, šuster/šustar, švindler, ziher, špargla/šparglin, špancirati/špancerati, špek, špajza, špigl/špiglin, špital, štih, štrapac, štreka, štrof, štrudl/štrukel, tišler/tišlar, tringelt, urlab, frtal, firanga/feringa, vandrati, calati/coltati, cajt, cajtung*. Finally, it is worth remembering that there are G loanwords not used universally but retaining a firm place in the active vocabulary of certain social groups, e.g. *blic* 'flash' (< G *Blitz*), even though not registered in any dictionary of standard S, the only word used by photographers, *špan* 'stringing on a tennis racket' (< G *Spanne*), not in general use but indispensable to tennis players (Mrazović 1996, 209, 215).

This degree of specialization is one of the characteristics of G loanwords in S-Cr as a whole: they tend to be assignable to a relatively small group of well defined semantic spheres (examples taken from those common to Novi Sad and Zagreb): — (i) the private, domestic world: 'corridor', 'curtain', 'mirror', 'room-mate', 'apartment', 'pantry', 'wash-basin', 'furniture',

'sideboard', 'duvet', 'family', 'medication', 'handkerchief'; (ii) food, drink, their preparation and service: 'schnitzel', 'sausage', 'asparagus', 'tomato', 'strudel', 'kaiserschmarren', 'dumpling', 'butter', juice (from meat), 'sauce, gravy', 'meat-grinder', 'bottle', 'beer-mug', 'spritzer'; (iii) tavern life and the entertainment: 'bar (for dispensing drinks)', 'woman of ill repute', 'to court', 'ladies' man', 'girl', tip', trick (in cards)', 'cosy atmosphere', 'music', 'ball, dance'; (iv) public life, commerce, manufacturing, professions and trades: 'town square', 'cashier', 'cash-desk', 'to buy', 'swindler', 'savings bank', 'factory', 'shift', 'doctor', 'pharmacy', 'speciality', 'cobbler', 'joiner', 'tailor', 'radio', 'theatre', 'police officer', 'rubber stamp', 'newspaper column', 'quarter (of a town)', 'hospital'; (v) railways: 'guard', 'engine driver', 'platform', 'track, permanent way'; (vi) military: 'march', 'camp', 'order'; (vii) miscellaneous: 'air', 'nature', 'bad luck', 'courage', 'colour', 'charm', 'prospects', 'role', 'hairdo', 'shine, glitter', 'spot', 'model', 'wire', 'jewellery', 'rucksack', 'leave, vacation', 'to paint', 'to flatter', 'to clean', 'to roam, to hike', 'to go for a walk', 'hike', 'exhaustion', 'to swot, to bone up'; (viii) greetings, adjectives, adverbs and particles: 'hello! (lit. your servant)', 'exact(ly)', 'direct(ly)', 'fine', 'certain(ly)', 'fact', 'free', 'fresh', 'totally', 'end of story', 'on and on'.

In general, one can say that G loanwords are associated more with public than private life and with a town and village setting rather than peasant life, which fits well with patterns of contact between G and S-Cr. It also reflects the impact of the Austrian way of life and Habsburg institutions on the Cr- and S-speaking residents of Croatia and the Vojvodina.

It has been observed (for example, by Kazazis 1969, 95) that in language contact situations like these loanwords far from being seen as prestige items in the repertoire of native speakers are forced down the stylistic and social ladder. This frees them to take on expressive (and especially pejorative or familiar) connotations and in the urban slang to develop meanings not motivated by the source word in the G original: — (i) expressive or slang: in Novi Sad and Belgrade *calnuti*; in Zagreb *fabrika*, *fah*, *familija*, *frajer*, *lager*, *šnajder*; (ii) pejorative: in Zagreb *baraka*, *biflati*, *špitalj*, *pajzl*; (iii) new meanings: in all three urban centres: *luft* 'air' > 'free time', *farbati* 'to colour' > 'to tell lies'; in Zagreb slang *viršl* 'hot dog' > 'slender penis', *fajfa* 'pipe' > 'saxophone, penis'.

The source of the loanwords also tells us something about the nature of the contact situation.¹² 27 of them are confined to Austro-Bavarian us-

¹² The main lexicographical sources consulted were *Duden, Das große Fremdwörterbuch* (Mannheim/Vienna/Zürich 1994) and *Wie sagt man in Österreich? Wörterbuch der österreichischen Besonderheiten* (Mannheim/Vienna/Zürich 1989). I would also like to express my gratitude to my Germanist colleagues at McMaster University, Gerhart Teuscher and Gerald Chapple, for their comments and advice on the G material.

age, have a distinctly Austro-Bavarian origin or are used in a form or with a meaning which is encountered only in the south G area: *akkurat* (Austrian in the meaning 'exactly, in fact'), *Beisel* 'run down tavern' (Austro-Bavarian), *Eisenbahner* 'railway man' (Austrian), *Fasching* 'carnival, mardi gras' (originally Austro-Bavarian, now used more widely), *Grund* (Austrian in the sense of 'peasant landholding'), *Hetz* (Austro-Bavarian in the meaning 'joke, fun'), *Kaiserschmarren* 'type of dessert' (southern), *Kassier* 'cashier' (Austrian, Swiss or South G in this form), *Kastl* 'box' (southern in this form), *Knödel* 'dumpling' (originally Austro-Bavarian), *Krügel* 'beer-mug, mug of beer' (Austrian), *Lavor* 'washbasin, washstand' (southern), *Maschinführer* 'engine driver' (form without the infix *-en-* Austrian), *Perron* 'railway platform' (now common only in Austria and Switzerland), *Quartier* 'apartment' (only Austrian in this meaning), *Sauce* 'sauce, gravy' (pronounced [zo:s] in Austria), *Schank* 'bar for dispensing drinks' (southern in this form), *Schichte* 'shift' (Austrian in this form), *Schnitzel* 'schnitzel, cutlet' (originally Austrian), *Schnupftüchl* 'handkerchief' (southern), *Servus* 'form of greeting' (Austro-Bavarian), *Speis* 'larder' (Austro-Bavarian), *Spital* 'hospital' (Austrian), *Strapaz-* 'tired, worn out' (Austrian in this form), *Strudel* 'type of pastry' (originally Austro-Bavarian), *Zuckerbäcker* 'confectioner' (Austrian in this meaning), *Zugführer* 'railway guard' (form with *-s-* infix Austrian).

In addition, a number of loanwords reflect Austro-Bavarian dialectal pronunciation: (i) [a] > [o], e.g. G *Draht* > Cr *drot*, G *Gang* > S *gonk* (but Cr *gank*), G *Narr* > Cr *nor*, G *Strafe* > Cr *štrof* (but also *štrafa*), but note also G *Eisenbahner* > Cr *ajzenbaner*, G *Fach* > S/Cr *fah*, G *Sprache* > Cr *špraha*, G *zahlen* > S/Cr *calnuti* (but kajkavian dialect *coltati*); (ii) [ü] > [i], e.g. G *büffeln* > S/Cr *biflati*, G *Krügel* > S/Cr *krigla*, G *Maschinführer*, *Zugführer* > Cr *mašinfirer*, *cuksfirer*, G *Schnupftüchl* > S/Cr *šnuftikla*, G *Wurst* > Cr *vuršt*, G *Würstel* > S/Cr *viršla*; (iii) [ö] > [e], e.g. G *Knödel* > Cr *knedl*, S *knedla*, G *Möbel* > S/Cr *mebl*; (iv) [oj] > [aj], e.g. G *Fräulein* > S/Cr *frajla*; (v) [aw] > [a:], e.g. G *Urlaub* > Cr *urlab* (but also S/Cr *urlaub*); (vi) [s] > [š] before [p] and [t] in non-initial position, e.g. G *Schuster* > Cr *šušter* (but also S/Cr *šuster*), G *Wurs*, *Würstel* > Cr *vuršt*, S/Cr *viršla*, but also note G *Kunst* > S/Cr *kumst*; (vii) [b] > [p] at the beginning of free morphemes, e.g. G *Beisel* > Cr *pajzl*, G *Butter* > S/Cr *puter*, G *Zuckerbäcker* > Cr *cukerpeker* (but also *cukerbeker*), but note also G *Eisenbahner* > Cr *ajznbaner*; (viii) loss of internal or final schwa, e.g. G *Geschäft* > Cr *kšeft*, G *Gesicht* > Cr *ksiht*.

In sum, there are 41 items — most of them in the non-standard varieties of Cr and S — which reflect some Austrian linguistic feature or other. With very few exceptions (e.g. *gonk/gank*, *šuster/šušter*, *urlab/urlaub*),

there are no instances of a discrepancy between Cr and S reflections of this Austrian material, which indicates that all varieties of S-Cr have been influenced by a specifically Austrian form of G.

Conclusions

1. The impact of a moderate puristic paradigm of a xenophobic and elitist orientation can be detected in the treatment of G loanwords in standard Cr, whereas in standard S — consistent with the Vukovian paradigm — many have been accepted as stylistically unmarked items.

2. The number of loanwords found in both Novi Sad and Zagreb, the two cities formerly within the confines of the former Habsburg Empire, is much greater than those common to the two S cities, Novi Sad and Belgrade.

3. A significant number of G loanwords used in Novi Sad have not found their way into the S standard, possibly as the outcome of the ethnographic bias in Vuk's conception of the standard language and his negative attitude to urban usage compared to that of the peasant.¹³

4. Zagreb and Novi Sad conform to a pattern in the use of G loanwords in the other Austro-Slavonic capitals, Ljubljana, Prague and Bratislava.

5. There are also parallels between the situation in Zagreb and Novi Sad with the status and function of certain Turkisms in the everyday speech of Sarajevo and Italianisms in Split. This topic deserves to be explored in more detail.

6. The impact of G on the colloquial speech of Novi Sad was evidently less than in Zagreb, and there appears to have been a greater degree of attrition there than in Cr capital. Zagreb was also — at least historically — diglossic with a kajkavian dialect richly imbued with G loanwords.¹⁴ In Novi Sad, where the colloquial and the standard shared the same dialectal base, G loanwords were in a much more exposed state. It remains to be seen whether the rise of a kajkavian-influenced štokavian as the L code in Zagreb (Šojat 1998, 71–3) will exercise further attrition on these G loanwords but it is clear that for some of them obsolescence is already well advanced. Confirmation of this process calls for coordinated, empirical research on all three urban speech communities.

¹³ For more existence of a relatively stable, urban-based written idiom prior to Vuk's reforms, see Keipert (1998).

¹⁴ Significantly — as evident, for example, in Finka (1984–), Cr linguists seem ready to accept words such as *befel*, *cajt*, *cajtunga* as legitimate components of standard kajkavian even though they have been spurned by standard Cr.

7. Finally, concentration on the standard languages has meant that centrifugal tendencies in the usage of the state and republican capitals have received most attention, but we should not lose sight of those centripetal factors affecting the relationship of the informal varieties of language spoken across the S-Cr diasystem.

REFERENCES

- Anić, V. 1991 *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika* (Zagreb).
- Babić, Stjepan 1986 Deutsche Lehnwörter in der kroatischen Literatursprache, in: *Festschrift für Herbert Bräuer zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. R. Olesch & H. Rothe (Cologne/Vienna), 1–13.
- Brodnjak, V. 1992 *Razlikovni rječnik srpkoga i hrvatskoga jezika* (Zagreb).
- Brozović, Dalibor 1970 *Standardni jezik* (Zagreb).
- Dobrenov-Major, Maria 1997 Stribt die Donaumonarchie erst jetzt endgültig? Das Verschwinden der Austriazismen in der Sprache der Vojvodinaer Serben durch Migration und Emigration, in: *Österreichisches Deutsch und andere nationale Varietäten plurizentrischer Sprachen in Europa*, ed. Rudolf Muhr & Richard Schrodtt (Vienna), 350–72.
- Finka, Božidar (ed.) 1984– *Rječnik hrvatskoga kajkavskoga književnog jezika* (Zagreb), Vols 1–3.
- Glovacki-Bernardi, Zrinjka 1998 *Deutsche Lehnwörter in der Stadtsprache von Zagreb (= Schriften zur deutschen Sprache in Österreich, Band 24)* (Frankfurt am Main Berlin / Bern / New York / Paris / Vienna), 95–249.
- Herrity, Peter 1978 Puristic Attitudes in Serbia in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century, *Slavonic and East European Review* 56, 202–23.
- Horvath-Dronске, Renate 1995 Die Übernahme von Lehnwörtern aus dem österreichischen-deutschen Sprachraum im kajkawischen Dialekt von Hrvatsko Zagorje (Kroatien), in: *Österreichisches Deutsch: Linguistische, sozialpsychologische und sprachpolitische Aspekte einer nationalen Variante des Deutschen*, ed. Rudolf Muhr, Richard Schrodtt, Peter Wiesinger (Vienna), 374–9.
- Hudeček, Lane et al. (ed.), 1999 *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik* (Zagreb).
- Ivić, Pavle 1971 *Srpski narod i njegov jezik* (Belgrade).
- Juričić, Želimir, B. & J. F. Kess 1977 Germanisms in Zagreb Croatian šatrovački, *Germano-Slavica* 2.4, 285–94.
- Katičić, Radoslav 1973–4 O purzimu, *Jezik* 21, 84–90.
- Kazazis, Kostas 1969 The Status of Turkisms in the Present-Day Balkan Languages, in: *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change. Contributions to the International Conference Held at UCLA, 23–28 Oc-*

- tober, 1969, ed. Henrik Birnbaum & Speros Vryonis (The Hague / Paris), 87–116).
- Keipert, Helmut
1998 Gesprächsstilisierung in E. Jankovićs Übersetzung 'Blagodarni sin' (1789): I. Die Anredeformen, *Die Welt der Slaven* 43, 239–58.
- Magner, Thomas F.
1966 *A Zagreb Kajkavian Dialect* (University Park, Pennsylvania).
- Medić, Ivo n.d. Kulturno-historijsko značenje i lingvistička analiza njemačkih pozajmljenica kod zagrebačkih obrtnika (Unpublished dissertation of Zagreb University).
- Mrazović, Pavica
1996 Germanizmi u govornom jeziku Vojvodana, in: *O leksičkim pozajmljenicama* (Zbornik radova sa naučnog skupa „Strane reči i izrazi u srpskom jeziku“) (Subotica/Belgrade 1996), 209–230.
- Piškorec, Velimir
1997 *Deutsches Lehngut in der kajkavischen kroatischen Mundart von Đurđevac in Kroatien* (Schriften zur deutschen Sprache in Österreich, Band 22) (Frankfurt am Main / Berlin / Bern / New York / Paris / Vienna).
- Sabljak, Tomislav
1981 *Rječnik šatrovačkog govora* (Zagreb).
- Schneeweis,
Edmund 1960 *Die deutschen Lehnwörter im Serbokroatischen in kulturgeschichtlicher Sicht* (Berlin).
- Stevanović, Mihailo
et al. 1967–76 *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika*, 6 vols. (Novi Sad).
- Striedter-Temps,
Hildegard. 1953 *Deutsche Lehnwörter im Serbokroatischen* (Berlin).
- Šojat, Antun 1979 Standardni jezik i dialekt u urbanim sredinama SR Hrvatske, *Rasprave Zavoda za jezik Instituta za filologiju i folkloristiku* 4/5, 119–22.
- 1998 Zagrebački gradski govor u prošlosti i sadašnjosti, in: *Zagrebački kaj. govor grada i prigradskih naselja*, ed. Antun Šojat et al. (Zagreb), 7–87.
- Thomas, George
1978 The Origin and Nature of Lexical Purism in the Croatian Variant of Serbo-Croatian, *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 20, 405–20.
- 1991 *Linguistic Purism* (London & New York).
- 1996 The Impact of Purism on the Development of the Croatian Standard Language in the Nineteenth Century, *Fluminensia* 8, 49–62.
- 1998 The Role of German Loanwords in the Slavic Languages of the Former Habsburg Empire, *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 39, 333–59.
- Trivunac, Miloš
1937 *Nemački utjecaji u našem jeziku* (Belgrade).
- Unbegaun, Boris O.
1932 Le calque dans les langues slaves, *Révue des études slaves* 12, 19–51.
- Vince, Zlatko
1979–80 I jezična čistoća i funkcionalnost, *Jezik* 27, 65–79.
- Wehler, Hans-Ulrich 1980 *Nationalitätenpolitik in Jugoslawien. Die deutsche Minderheit 1918–1978* (Göttingen).