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Diachronic perspectives on change in spoken Croatian amongst Croatian indigenous minorities in Austria, Italy and Hungary

1 Introduction

This chapter provides a brief description of the linguistic features of the language varieties spoken by three groups of indigenous minorities located in Austria, Italy and Hungary. The respective minorities are: Burgenland Croats, 90% of whom reside in eastern Austria with smaller groups living in western Hungary and south-west Slovakia; Molise Croats, who form a linguistic enclave of three villages in the central Italian region of Molise;\(^1\) two indigenous Croatian minorities living in Hungary. The first group in Hungary are the Pomurje Croats (pomurski Hrvati) who are Kajkavian-speakers living in the Mura River Valley in south-west Hungary and the second group are the Croatian Bošnjaks and Šokacs (Bošnjaci i Šokci) who are Štokavian-speakers living in the south-central Hungarian region of Baranya. This chapter features contribution from the following authors in relation to the following language groups: Aleksandra Ščukanec for Burgenland Croatian (hereafter: ‘BGLD.Cro’); Walter Breu for Molise Croatian (hereafter: ‘MOL.Cro’); Dora Vuk for Croatian spoken in Hungary (hereafter: ‘HUN.Cro’ as a hypernym relating to both groups of Croatian-speakers in Hungary, with the abbreviations ‘HUN-Pom.Cro’ and ‘HUN-Bar.Cro’ to identify data from the Kajkavian speakers from Pomurje, and the Štokavian Bošnjaks and Šokacs from Baranya respectively). All three authors have completed extensive fieldwork amongst their respective language groups and data presented here are their own, unless stated otherwise.

\(^1\) The second author, Prof. Walter Breu, expresses his gratitude to the German Research Foundation (DFG) for their financial support of the field research in Molise (Italy) and more recently for their support for a project awarded to the University of Konstanz, Der slavische Verbalaspekt in süd- und westslavischen Sprachinseln ‘Slavic verbal aspect in South and West Slavic linguistic enclaves’. Prof. Walter Breu also conveys special thanks to Prof. Giovanni Piccoli (Acquaviva) for his assistance in collecting the data.
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As stated in chapter one, this edited volume contains papers that adopt a largely synchronic approach to language contact phenomena. However, and where available, linguistic data collected over a period of time are drawn on, allowing both synchronic and diachronic analysis. We are reminded that synchronic descriptions are momentary ‘snap-shots’ of phenomena that have developed in a particular way over time and that will continue to develop beyond that point in time at which a linguist captured a sample. To background synchronically focused presentations of the speech of Croatian diaspora communities, it is advantageous if these can be accompanied by diachronic descriptions of spoken (and written) forms of Croatian. Diachronic accounts of how Croatian has continued to be spoken (and written) over a long period of time in areas geographically distant or isolated from Croatia are instructive to us in many ways. Accounts of Croatian as a transposed, minority language continuing to be used over centuries in long-standing exclaves are of relevance to our understanding of what is happening in diaspora communities of more recent vintage. The language contact data presented in this chapter are diachronic in their description: examples of contemporary usage are discussed with reference to (historical) descriptions of the minority variety. Of particular interest are typological features – not only morphology and syntax – but features of classes of lexical items. Incidences of code-switching are also examined, along with phonology and pragmatics.

Two of the Croatian indigenous minorities that are examined here are in contact with languages – German (Burgenland Croats) and Italian (Molise Croats) – that are also the socially dominant language in the synchronic studies of Croatian-speakers in chapters 5, 6, 8 and 9. Thus a comparison of phenomena that occur in a long-standing situation of Croatian-German contact, such as Austria’s Burgenland, can be made with those occurring in a much more short-lived context of Croatian-German contact, such as that amongst the post-WWII or recently departed guest workers/emigrants to Austria or Germany. Such a comparison allows us to draw implications about the possible causes of language change and the role of other languages with which Croatian is in contact. Similarly, data from MOL.Cro may be instructional to analysis of the speech of more recently arrived Croatian-speakers elsewhere in Italy. The third Croatian indigenous minority examined here is in contact with Hungarian, a Finno-Ugric language, whose typological categories contrast greatly from those of Croatian.

In sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, a brief historical and sociolinguistic account of the migration and settlement of Croatian-speakers is provided together with a discussion on how Croatian as a minority language has been maintained in the three respective settings, Burgenland, Molise and Hungary. Language contact phenomena are presented in sections 2 to and 6. The lexicon, pragmatics and semantic/
phraseological features are presented in sections 2, 3 and 4 respectively with code-switching presented in section 5 and structural features in section 6.

Instances of contemporary data are mostly derived from naturalistic or elicited samples of spoken language from minority language speakers. Examples of written language are less often looked at, but not disregarded. The discussion focuses on the influence of the socio-politically dominant language on the Croatian minority language. That is, we foreground here language change that appears to be externally-motivated from the contact situation. The influence of HMLD.Cro, where relevant, is also discussed.

1.1 Burgenland Croatian (BGDL.Cro) – historical and sociolinguistic features

The Burgenland Croats (Gradišćanski Hrvati) are an ethnolinguistic minority located mostly in the Austrian federal state of Burgenland, with smaller numbers located in western Hungary and south-western Slovakia. Their ancestors left their homeland in the sixteenth century, fleeing the advancing Ottomans. Most originated from an area of central Croatia bounded by the rivers Sava, Kupa and Una stretching eastwards to western Slavonia, i.e. an area bounded today by Zagreb, Karlovac, Bihać and Jasenovac. Map 1 below shows the homeland areas from which the Burgenland Croats originate. Estimates of the number who left at this time vary from 60,000 (Valentić 1970) to 100,000 (Mohl 1974) to even 150,000 (Nagy 1989). As Croatia at that time was in political union with Hungary, the area that they migrated to, zapadna Ugarska ‘western Hungary’, was part of the same political entity and their migration can be seen as internal. Burgenland Croats lived in rural settlements in a region with a low population density. Geographical isolation and an agriculture-focused way of life meant that their linguistic repertoires were, over centuries, shaped by family-village networks. The communities that Burgenland Croats lived in can be considered sprachinseln or linguistic exclaves, but only some were monolingually Croatian, with most also containing German-speakers, less so Hungarian-speakers, and even less so Slovak-speakers.

Until the twentieth century, Hungarian was the socio-politically dominant language of the areas in which Burgenland Croats were domiciled, while German-speakers were numerically the largest contiguous group. Burgenland-Croatian-Hungarian-German trilingualism became a common feature amongst Burgenland Croats in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. State boundaries drawn in the twentieth century divided the area that they inhabited into three
political entities: 69 of the 82 settlements are located in the Austrian federal state of Burgenland, eight in Hungary, and five are in Slovakia.

There are five clusters of the 82 settlements (all rural) along a 150 km long belt running from Hrvatski Grob/Chorvátsky Grob (Slovakia) in the north to Žamar/Reinersdorf (Austria) in the south. As most live in Austria, the Burgenland capital city, Željezno/Eisenstadt is the political, cultural and educational centre for Burgenland Croats. In general, trilingualism has been replaced by bilingualism (Burgenland Croatian + respective national language) according to speakers’ country of residence. Although Hungarian was the socio-politically dominant language in the areas in which Burgenland Croats have historically lived, over the last century German has exerted a greater influence on Burgenland Croatian in Austria due to the numerical dominance of German-speakers (Benčić 1972; Neweklowsky 1975; Finka 1997).

Migration occurred in waves of different groups of speakers over a 50-year period, including speakers of all three major Croatian dialectal groups: Štokavian, Kajkavian and Čakavian. All three dialectal groups remain represented amongst today’s Burgenland Croats according to the area of origin of their ances-
tors, with the last dialect group, Čakavian the numerically strongest, and forming the model for a standard.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, dialectal variation between speakers hastened efforts to codify a common ‘standard Burgenland Croatian’, which now exists with trilingual, Burgenland Croatian – Standard Croatian – German dictionaries (Bencsics et al. 1982, 1991), a descriptive grammar (Sučić et al. 2003) and even textbooks for adult learners (Karall 1997) published towards the end of the twentieth century. Codification included attempted reduction in the number of German loan words and German-based calques (Benčić 1972), with efforts to replace these with domestic forms (i.e. Burgenland-based ones) and with HMLD.Cro forms.

Burgenland Croatian is a language that contains archaic forms characteristic of Croatian as it was spoken 500 years ago, e.g. palatal plosives [c], [j], verbal suffix 1SG.PRES -n. and distinct forms for DAT, INS and LOC nouns in PL. (In homeland Croatian, syncretism has occurred across these three cases in PL.) In the case of the first two above-mentioned phenomena, these still occur in regional and non-standard varieties of homeland Croatian, while the last instance demonstrates that a ‘reduction’ of peculiar case forms is not unknown in homeland varieties.

Examples drawn on here are from non-normative corpora, i.e. fieldwork descriptions from Hadrovics (1974), Neweklowsky (1978, 2010), Koschat (1978), Ščukanec (2011); and also from normative descriptions such as the Burgenland Croatian grammar (Sučić et al. 2003) and the following dictionaries Nimško-gradišćansko-hrvatsko-hrvatski rječnik (‘German-Burgenland Croatian-Croatian Dictionary’) (Bencsics et al. 1982), Gradišćansko-hrvatsko-hrvatsko-nimški rječnik (‘Burgenland Croatian-Croatian-German Dictionary’), (Bencsics et al. 1991). Linguistic forms presented here represent not only examples from standard Burgenland Croatian but also non-standard varieties.

Today, it is estimated that there are 25,000 to 30,000 Burgenland Croats living in Austria, the majority in Burgenland and up to 10,000 in nearby Vienna. There are up to 10,000 Burgenland Croats in Hungary. (According to the 2011 census, in two far-western counties Vas and Győr-Moson-Sopron, adjoining the Austrian border, 6,130 persons consider themselves [Burgenland] Croats, and 4,200 state their mother tongue as Croatian.) In Slovakia there are up to 2,000. (According to 2011 census results, only 1,022 persons consider themselves Burgenland Croats, and 1,234 state their mother tongue as Burgenland Croatian, Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic n.d.). Map 2 below shows the areas across Austria, Hungary, Slovakia and Czechia in which BGLD.Cro speakers live. Representatives of Burgenland Croats claim that the total number of Burgenland Croats in all three countries and abroad is around 50,000 to 55,000. In Austrian Burgenland, there are subsi-
Map 2: Area in which speakers of Burgenland Croatian live (Burgenland and eastern Lower Austria, Austria; far-western Hungary; south-west Slovakia; and southern Moravia, Czechia) (Houtzagers 2013: 254).
dised print and electronic resources in Burgenland Croatian, as well as regional and state support for numerous cultural activities. There are 29 bilingual primary schools and a secondary school gymnaziija/Gymnasium in Željezno/Eisenstadt, with bilingual instruction; however, the number of hours of instruction in Burgenland Croatian has decreased over the last 50 years (Kinda-Berlaković 2005).

As in other areas of Central Europe, there have been high levels of emigration to North America over the last century. In the period from the First World War to several years after the Second World War many Burgenland Croats immigrated to the USA, Canada and South America. Some authors claim that before the First World War 33,000 Burgenland Croats had moved to the USA. Some returned around 1929 and the Great Depression, but in the interwar period and after the Second World War a further 31,000 emigrated, mainly to North America. Language maintenance of Burgenland Croatian amongst diaspora-speakers has been shown to rarely extend beyond the first generation (cf. Neweklowsky 1979; Ščukanec 2011: 161–184). Since the start of the twentieth century, internal mobility within the countries that they live in is also a feature of Burgenland Croatian life. This has intensified contact with majority-language populations, mainly German-speaking, as Burgenland Croats have moved to urban areas for study or work, in particular to Vienna, where there is a well-established Burgenland Croatian community (Rotter 1996).

1.2 Molise Croats and Molise Croatian (MOL.Cro) – historical and sociolinguistic features

Molise Croatian (MOL.Cro) is still spoken in three villages adjacent to each other in the province of Campobasso in the southern Italian Region of Molise, about 35 km from the Adriatic Sea: Kruč/Acquaviva Collecroce, Mundimitar/Montemitro and Filič/San Felice del Molise. (Hereafter, only Croatian designations for the villages will be used.) The number of Slavic-speaking villages had been reduced to these three by the end of the nineteenth century. There are now only about one thousand speakers, mostly people in their forties or older who still actively use the minority language or who are at least able to understand it out of an overall

2 Alternative designations for the language of the Molise Croats include Molise Slavic and Na-našu or Na-našo (Mundimitar) – the last two used by the minority speakers themselves, especially in Mundimitar/Montemitro. These terms originally refer to an adverbial, meaning “in our manner” (Breu 2008: 74, 83). The traditional ethnonym for the inhabitants was Škavan < Ital. schiavone ‘Slav’, while the terms ‘Croat’, ‘Croatian’ have been in use in the Croatian linguistic research literature for the last few decades. For a short overview of MOL.Cro see Breu (2011c).
number of less than two thousand people living in these villages.\textsuperscript{3} The decline of the modern Molise Croatian community commenced around 1950, when emigration to Australia and to northern parts of Italy and Europe started. The 1951 census of the ISTAT still reported an overall number of 4,883 inhabitants of the three villages, about 60–80\% of whom would have been active speakers (Breu 2017a: 204–205).\textsuperscript{4}

In regard to the general use of MOL.Cro in the three villages, there are considerable local differences, with only very few fluent speakers left in Filič, a larger number in Mundimitar, and a moderate number in Kruč. All speakers of Molise Croatian are bilingual, using the southern Italian standard variety and less so the local Molise Italian dialect as their means of communication with people from outside their language community. Most speakers also use a southern Italian standard variety with their children and intergenerational transmission of the minority variety has almost completely ceased. On the other hand, in-group speakers consistently use MOL.Cro among themselves, even in dealings with the local administration. MOL.Cro examples given in this chapter are from Kruč unless otherwise stated.

Fluent speakers predominantly resort to code-switching in the sense of spontaneously mixing in longer Italian passages. But they do use (morphologically integrated) Italian terms whenever they need them, especially with respect to technical or administrative innovations. This is not true for ‘semi-speakers’ who use the language only occasionally as an in-group feature and who normally mix in whole Italian sentences or whose use of MOL.Cro is restricted to the insertion of words into speech that is otherwise Italian.

The ancestors of today’s Molise Croatians are thought to have migrated to Italy in the sixteenth century by sea after leaving their original homeland area of the western Neretva valley in Hercegovina. On route to Italy, their ancestors lived for some years in Dalmatia, which at that time was under the rule of the Venetian Empire. This assumption is based on the characteristics of their original dialect, with features identifying it to that part of the Štokavian-Ikavian territory where syllable-final \textsuperscript{-l} became \textsuperscript{-a}.\textsuperscript{5} Further, their speech lacks the \textsc{gen.pl} ending \textsuperscript{-\textipa{a}}. This

\textsuperscript{3} Population totals for the three villages on 1 January 2016 were: Acquaviva 672, Mundimitar 395, Filič 634, i.e. a total of 1701 inhabitants (Guida ai Comuni, alle Province ed alle Regioni d’Italia 2018).

\textsuperscript{4} For demographic data published by the Italian Istituto Nazionale di Statistica (ISTAT) in this chapter see also Breu (2018b: 182–187), contrasting, among other things, the demographic development of MOL.Cro with the situation in the nearby Albanian enclaves of Molise.

\textsuperscript{5} Relevant linguistic examples: MOL.Cro \textipa{što} ‘what’ ≠ \textipa{ča} (Čakavian), \textipa{kaj} (Kajkavian); \textipa{*rědъkъ} > MOL.Cro \textipa{ritak} ‘sparse’ ≠ Jekavian \textipa{rijetak}, Ekavian \textipa{redak} (Ikavian development of Protoslovian \textipa{jat}); \textipa{*nosilъ} > \textipa{*nosil} > \textipa{*nosia} > MOL.Cro \textipa{nosija} ‘carry (l-participle)’ ≠ HMLD.Cro \textipa{nosio}. 
is an indication that they left their original homeland before this form became widespread in Croatian in the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{6} Map 3 below shows the areas of origin in the homeland from which the ancestors of today’s MOL.Cro speakers migrated, together with the locations of the three remaining MOL.Cro villages.

\textbf{Map 3: Homeland from which speakers of MOL.Cro migrated in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century.}\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{6} For a description of the historical situation of the Molise Croats about a century ago, see Rešetar (1911). For an overview of the linguistic situation of several Slavic minorities in language contact situations, including Molise Croatian, see Breu (2011b).

\textsuperscript{7} Source of black and white map: D-maps.com (2020); source of colour image: Google Earth (2020).
Contact influence comes from two sources. Initially, it was the local Italian dialect that was the model for contact-induced change. But since Italy’s unification in the second half of the nineteenth century, standard Italian in its southern colloquial form has become more and more dominant and is now also a source for change and innovations.

MOL.Cro was traditionally a spoken language only. It was not until the end of the 1960s that some speakers started to write in their own vernacular. At the same time, there were others, mostly out-group members or foreigners, who began to render MOL.Cro in a written form, often employing mixed varieties that were more or less incomprehensible to in-group speakers. It was not until the twenty-first century that more elaborate examples of MOL.Cro in its written form were produced, albeit only a small number thereof. These include texts across a variety of genres, from poems to dramas, and from short stories to entire novels and even some examples of non-fiction.8

### 1.3 Croatian in Hungarian (HUN.Cro) as spoken by two indigenous communities: The Pomurje Croats and the Bošnjak- and Šokac-Croats – historical and sociolinguistic features

This section gives a brief overview on the current linguistic situation of all seven autochthonous Croatian ethnic minorities in Hungary. General sociolinguistic and demographic characteristics of the indigenous Croatian-speaking minorities in Hungary are provided, which then foreground a closer description of the two selected micro-communities. Of the available studies undertaken on Croatian in Hungary, most are dialectologically-focused, e.g. Barics, Blazsetin, Frankovics & Sokcsevits (1998), Rácz (2012), Gorjanac (2008), Tamaskó (2013) and Houtzagers (1999). More recently, sociolinguistic descriptions have been provided by Langenthal (2013) and Hergovich (2016). From a historical and linguistic point of view, the seven groups of Croatian-speakers in Hungary are descendants of Croats who left different parts of their homeland in different migration waves. Six of the seven groups live in non-conjoining areas and had little to do with each other.

---

8 See Breu (2017a, 2018a). Many poems have been published in the last two decades in Mundimir, above all in the ongoing series *S našimi riči* ['In our own words'] by Antonio Sammartino, starting in 2004. The only Molise Croat novelist is Nicola Gliosca from Kruč. He wrote *Sep aš Mena* in 2009, and altogether completed five novels. For some of his earlier works in other genres see University of Konstanz (n.d.).
until the 1950s with improved transport and communication opportunities within Hungary (Barić 2006: 35, 100). The varieties of Croatian spoken in Hungary reflect the dialectal spectrum of the Croatian language itself (Barić 2006: 15). All three major dialects, i.e. Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian, are present across the seven groups, with variation occurring across different subdialect groups as well. Map 4 shows the areas within modern-day Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina from which Croatian-speaking minorities in Hungary originate. The circle on the left around Velika Kaniža/Nagykanizsa shows the area where Pomurje Croats live; the circle on the right around Pečuh/Pécs and Mohač/Mohács shows the area where the Croatian Bošnjaci and Šokci communities live.

Map 4: Areas in modern-day Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina from which Croatian-speaking minority communities in Hungary originate. Source: Kitanics (2014).

The Burgenland Croats (Gradišćanski Hrvati), as outlined above in 4.1, are one of the oldest Croatian indigenous minorities living outside Croatia, with the eastern-
most members of this group living in western Hungary, adjoining the Austrian border (Sokcsevics 1998:3). In this part of Hungary, Kajkavian-based varieties can be found in some villages (Vedesin, Umok) around the north-west Hungarian town of Sopron (Barics, Blazsetin, Frankovics & Sokcsevits 1998; Houtzagers 1999). This section does not deal further with Burgenland Croats in Hungary, who are otherwise presented in section 1.1.

South of Burgenland along the river Mura in south-western Hungary, which forms the border between Hungary and Croatia, live the so-called Pomurje Croats (pomurski Hrvati) who speak a north-western sub-dialect of Kajkavian (Barić 2006: 22; Rácz 2009: 8–9, 301–302; Barics, Blazsetin, Frankovics & Sokcsevits 1998: 4). According to Kerecsényi’s theory (1983: 8), the Pomurje Croats migrated in the seventeenth century from Međimurje – which is in Croatia’s far north – to the other side of the Mura River. However, the most recent sociolinguistic and linguistic research conducted in the area (Rácz 2009, 2012) supports the view that they are a community autochthonous to Pomurje.

In central southern Hungary, a diversity of sub-dialects of the Štokavian dialect are spoken: several Ikavian and Ijekavian sub-dialects are used by Bošnjak-Croats (Bošnjaci) in the villages south of Pečuh/Pécs and by Šokac-Croats (Šokci) in the villages east of Pečuh/Pécs, as well as in Mohač/Mohács and Santovo/Hercegszántó. These two groups, the Štokavian-speaking Bošnjak-Croats and Šokac-Croats, who live in closer proximity to each other in the Pečuh region, are grouped together as one group in the presentation of data here. This group, and the Pomurje Croats from south-west Hungary, are the groups on which our description of Croatian spoken in Hungary focuses.

The long-standing isolation of the enclaves in relation to each other and also from their original homeland led to their separate development where, to a large extent, they differed from each other and from HMLD.Cro. As Barics, Blazsetin, Frankovics and Sokcsevits (1998: 19, 2006: 35–36) point out, the dialectal diversity of the above-mentioned linguistic enclaves, together with the generally immobile and rural lifestyle of their speakers led to the formation of local identities.

According to Barić (2006), in the period between 1945 and 1947 – before the establishment of the Democratic Union of Hungarian South Slavs – an opportunity arose for the first time for the “political, cultural and linguistic” unification of all Croats in Hungary (Barić 2006: 35). The organisational unification of Hungarian Croats, Slovenes and Serbs in 1947 as an institution common to all three groups

9 This name refers to the region of their origin, i.e. Western Bosnia. However, this population is not co-terminous with today’s Muslim population in Bosnia-Hercegovina, who are also called Bošnjaci.
was not advantageous to the formation of a distinct Croatian identity in Hungary (Barić 2006: 35–37). In those three years Hungary had good relations with Yugoslavia and many educational and cultural institutions were founded, such as the minority school system in 1947. Bilateral teaching programs and cross-border cooperation flourished (Vidmarović 2008: 392, Föglein 1997: 4). However, after Tito’s split with the Soviet Union in 1948, all contacts with Yugoslavia were prohibited, and Pomurje (and Podravina) Croats living in border areas adjacent to Croatia were in some cases subjected to persecution (Föglein 1997: 9). Stalin’s death in 1953 brought an end to this period of non-contact, but it was not until the 1990s that the needs of minorities received measurable attention (Föglein 1997: 14).

Since the 1960s, inter-generational transmission of Croatian to younger generations has decreased substantially and native-like use of the minority language is today exclusively limited to older members of the communities (Grbić 1990: 337–338). Younger speakers often have restricted functional use of Croatian. Due to ongoing language shift, many of those speakers born in the 1960s and onwards have limited proficiency in their local Croatian dialect. For such speakers, Croatian may be used in little more than an emblematic way. For example, amongst some younger speakers, set collocations, formulaic or regularised short phrases are supplied from Croatian such as Ajmo, dečki! ‘Come on, boys!’ or Am naj gov’riti? ‘Really?’ while all other speech is in Hungarian. These insertions are usually syntactically dissociated from other elements and remain morphologically and phonologically unintegrated into Hungarian.

For those amongst whom language shift has occurred completely, we can speak of them as now being Hungarian monolinguals, while a further group is made up of Croatian-Hungarian bilinguals who speak modern Standard Croatian, a variety that they acquired through formal schooling at national minority schools in Hungary (Tamaskó 2013, Vuk research data corpus). The national minority schools were established in 1947, and until 1990, the term ‘Serbo-Croatian’ was employed as the designation for pupils’ minority language (Vidmarović 2008: 392).

The political changes that have occurred since 1990 have allowed minorities in Hungary to organise themselves politically, and for some, this activism has increased their visibility in the general public sphere. Although language shift from Croatian dialects to Hungarian is continuing in many areas, a development since 1990 has been a more recognised presence for standard Croatian as a language of instruction or as a school subject, as the variety of language to be used in the public sphere and in bi- or multi-lingual areas.

10 For a detailed overview of the use of Croatian dialect, standard Croatian and Hungarian in different domains across three generations of speakers of Croatian in Hungary, see Vuk (2016).
prestige in public life in Croatian-inhabited areas of Hungary that it did not enjoy before 1990 (Vuk 2016; Dobos 2013).

On the other hand, the promotion of minority values (culture, customs etc.) and the identity formation efforts of politically active members of the communities are influencing speakers’ self-perceptions: being Croat first of all means having Croatian ancestry, and being culturally active, and does not necessarily presuppose a native-like (or any) command of Croatian (Tamaskó 2013; Dobos 2013; Vuk 2016). The decreasing number of native speakers parallel with an increase in the number of those who declare themselves Croats in Hungarian censuses since 1921 is evidence of this tendency as Table 1 below demonstrates.

A result of the long-term language contact between Croatian and Hungarian in all of the linguistic enclaves is the large repertoire of Hungarian borrowings in local Croatian varieties and the incidence of habitual (i.e. largely unmarked) code-switching amongst many, particular older members (Tamaskó 2013; Hergovich 2016). Alternation between Hungarian and Croatian is a common, but perhaps less unmarked phenomenon in the speech of older community members when interacting amongst themselves (Tamaskó 2013; Hergovich 2016; Vuk research data corpus). Reflecting on their own mixed utterances, speakers may claim it is as part of either their own Croatian dialect or idiolect. Or they may provide a response that is well known to contact linguists researching bi-lingual groups: “It is neither Hungarian nor Croatian”. The following exchange between a granddaughter and her grandmother is such an example:
(1) *Mama! Kak si ve to rekla?* ‘Grandma! How did you say it?’  
*Hurvatski!* ‘In Croatian!’  
*Mert* je mađerski! ‘*Mert* [‘because’] is Hungarian!’  
Neje, i to je hurvatski. ‘It’s not. It is also Croatian.’

The metalinguistic comment from the grandmother about an established borrowing ‘occupying a place in both languages’ is understandable, given that her own home language consists of forms from both languages. Another metalinguistic observation, provided in standard Croatian by a 27-year old interviewee from Salanta, a Bošnjak-Croat village near Pečuh/Pécs, gives an insight into the ‘home language’ of one minority speaker:

(2) *Preformulirali smo [hrvatski jezik] onako kako nam se sviđa . . . malo i mađarski pričamo, malo i hrvatski, dakle u jednoj rečenici nekad imamo i mađarske riječi.* We’ve re-formed it [Croatian] as we see fit . . . we speak a little bit of Hungarian and a little bit of Croatian, so sometimes in the same sentence we have Hungarian words as well.

Descriptions of Croatian in Hungary are restricted to data from Kajkavian-speaking Pomurje-Croats and the Štokavian-speaking Bošnjak-Croats and Šokac-Croats. Linguistic analysis of HUN.Cro is taken from a corpus consisting of recorded interviews conducted with two older speakers of the Štokavian dialect spoken around Pečuh, two elder Kajkavian speaking informants (all four above 60 years), and two younger Štokavian speaking Bošnjaks (aged between 27 and 29). Data on lexical borrowings and morphological paradigms in HUN.Cro are taken from Rácz’s (2012) descriptions of the Kajkavian dialect, Gorjanac’s (2008) description of the Štokavian dialect of Santovo and Mandić’s (2016) dictionary of the Štokavian dialect of Santovo.

### 2 Lexicon

The term ‘lexicon’ refers to lexical items that etymologically belong(ed) to languages other than Croatian that appear in the speech (or writing) of Croatian-speakers. In long-standing contact situations, these lexical items are commonly termed ‘loanwords’ or ‘borrowings’ and these are forms that are likely to have become habitualised in speakers’ vernaculars. Apart from their original etymology, in a local (situational) sense, speakers otherwise perceive little or no difference between these forms and other forms in their lexicons. They are usually phono-
logically and morphologically integrated into Croatian, although this need not always be the case.

In BGLD.Cro, German and less often Hungarian have been source languages for loanwords and loan translations. Words with their origins from these languages can occur very commonly in most speakers’ vernaculars. Pawischitz (2014: 63) goes as far as to label this “massive lexical borrowing”, giving examples that “German loanwords [can be found] in everyday Burgenland Croatian communication”, eg. sojdot ← Soldat, ‘soldier’; kibl ← Kübel ‘bin’, “as well as words borrowed from Hungarian”, eg. bolt ← bolt, ‘shop’, jezer ← ezer ‘thousand’, and even some Slovak loans, eg. takaj ← taky ‘also’. BGLD.Cro bilingual and trilingual dictionaries that have been published bear evidence of input from German and Hungarian (Bencsics et al. 1982, 1991). While lexical borrowing was a frequent occurrence, there existed variation in the dispersal, frequency and stability of form of many borrowings. Initial attempts to develop a supra-regional code met with the challenge of codifying the large number of loanwords in use, many of which may have been specific to a cluster of villages only, and whether to draw on other means to unify the minority communities’ lexical stock.

As the largest of the three groups presented in this chapter, intra-group communication, variation amongst speakers and communities, and the introduction of formal schooling in Burgenland hastened efforts towards a standardisation. These commenced in the eighteenth century when ideological movements – national romanticism and Herder’s notion of language and nationality being mutually co-determinant – were in vogue, which precipitated efforts among some BGLD.Cro early lexicographers to replace loanwords with local neologisms or with models taken from HMLD.Cro. A discussion on lexicon and loanwords in BGLD.Cro therefore needs to draw attention to the standard descriptions of the language that contained fewer loanwords, and speakers’ vernaculars that continued to contain these. From one of the early codifiers of BGLD.Cro, the priest Jeremijaš Šosterić, a concern for ‘Croatianness’ and a purist sentiment are recognisable in his description of the language, as “clumsy, awkward, with its syntax influenced by Hungarian, German and Latin” (Benčić 1972: 16. Our translation). During this period, contacts with lexicographers in Croatia, who themselves were dealing with the same questions, led to instances of harmonisation and modelling based on homeland norms that helped retain (and replenish) Croatian lexical stock and re-affirm collocational, morphological and syntactic forms. Benčić (1972: 27–28) reports that the later stages of codification such as acceptance, implementation, expansion and cultivation had been completed by the middle of the twentieth century.
The few examples of code-switching in older texts indicate to us that code-switching was relatively infrequent and/or there were normative influences that discouraged written representation of ‘mixed language’. The bi- or trilingual repertoires of many speakers enabled them not only to communicate with various groups, but to employ code-switching as an intra-group speech variety, perhaps also as an inter-group one too in some cases. High-level proficiency in and frequent use of the macro-socially dominant languages German and Hungarian enabled the transfer or borrowing of forms that entered all speakers’ BGLD. Cro varieties. But we do not observe major language shift, and it is likely that there were social factors that sanctioned against ‘widespread use’ of German or Hungarian, or ‘extensive language mixing’ such as code-switching. The first one was geographical isolation, already mentioned above. The second is ‘social group’ or the status that Burgenland Croatians had vis-à-vis German-speakers who lived in their close proximity. We posit that this is analogous to the status that Hungarian-speakers have vis-à-vis German-speakers in Burgenland as reported by Gal (1979). This relates to their social status as peasants and agricultural labourers, while the status of many German-speakers was different: that of artisans, merchants or industrial workers. Socio-occupational differences matched linguistic ones, and Burgenland Croats’ continuing enactment of these socio-occupational roles enabled Croatian language maintenance. It is likely, therefore, that code-switching was negatively sanctioned due to it being a form of behaviour that transgressed social boundaries that were not readily crossed. To this, we can add the ‘nationality = language’ legacy of national romanticism that is present still today across central Europe. The textbook view of this ideology is that a person’s language indexes his/her ethnicity and vice versa. Social behaviour that includes ‘mixed language’ invokes a conceptualisation of ethnic identity that is hybrid or composite. There were (and are) still many macro-level, socio-political narratives that discouraged this form of behaviour.

As stated, in BGLD.Cro there are numerous loanwords that have entered the language from both German and Hungarian and the trilingual Burgenland-Croatian/standard Croatian/German dictionary lists hundreds of such borrowings. Contact with both languages is so long-standing that for some forms there are multiple vintages of loanwards, eg. archaic paurija (Ger. Bauernhof) > contemporary londvirtsřoft (Ger. Landwirtschaft) – ‘farm’; archaic fertuh (Ger. Vürtuch/Vortuch) > contemporary šiecn (Ger. Schürze) – ‘apron’. In other instances, a Hungarian loan (example 3) has been replaced by a more recent German-based one (example 4):
The Hungarian-origin loanword *nakinčen* has over time given way to *pešmikan*, based on German *schmücken* (‘decorate’). As previously mentioned, efforts to codify a supra-regional BGLD.Cro standard resulted in the creation of neologisms that referred to new terms or replaced established German (or Hungarian) borrowings. Example (5) shows two instances of such neologisms.

(5) BGLD.Cro          Eng.          Ger.          HMLD.Cro
ognjobranci          fire-fighters    Feuerwehr       vatrogasci
jedan dijel od roditeljov parent            Elternteil   roditelj

In print media, some of these forms, either neologisms or models adopted from standard Croatian, may not be well known to all speakers and German equivalents may be added, usually in brackets, e.g.:

(6) *Ovde usavršava telefonsko pojačalo – svoj prvi izum (Erfindung) . . .*  
Here he finished his work on a telephone amplifier – his first *izum* (Ger. *Erfindung*) *invention . . .*

While written texts may be reflective of writers’ attempt to avoid German loanwords, within the corpus of German borrowings in speakers’ verbal repertoires there are a large number of loans, including even separable verbs whose both parts are phonologically and morphologically integrated, eg. *ajnkafati ← einkaufen* ‘to go shopping’, *anrufati ← anrufen* ‘to ring up’. The presence of lexical transfers from German in diaspora varieties is also recorded in GER.Cro (Kresić Vukosav and Šimičić, this volume) and AUT.Cro (Ščukanec, this volume).

In contrast to Burgenland, amongst the Molise Croats there were few social and occupational features that differentiated them from local Italian-speakers. There was little or no physical isolation of Molise Croats from Italian-speakers.
and bilingualism is long-standing. In exogamous marriages in which an Italian-speaker moved to a MOL.Cro village, s/he usually acquired MOL.Cro, but Italian (or rather, Molise dialect) remained a code that was understood and used by both. Widespread lexical and deep structural borrowing point to a long history of bilingualism. In contrast to Burgenland, in Molise language choice itself did not index social or economic-occupational differences between different groups.

In MOL.Cro, apart from a very small number of Čakavisms like crikva ‘church’, the lexicon is Štokavian. The MOL.Cro lexicon does not necessarily correspond directly to the forms and/or meanings of HMLD.Cro (marked here in brackets), due to its dialectal base or to semantic change, eg. hiža ‘house’ (kuća), tuji ‘foreign’ (tuđi), kaša ‘earth, mud’ (HMLD.Cro kaša = ‘porridge’), lastavica ‘butterfly’ (HMLD.Cro lastavica = ‘swallow’), juha ‘noodle water’ (HMLD.Cro juha = ‘soup’). Further examples of innovations in the MOL.Cro lexicon, including semantic transfer can be found in Breu (2003: 355–363). The most prominent feature of the MOL.Cro lexicon is its extraordinarily high number of loanwords in almost all parts of speech, both in terms of word types and word tokens, with an average between 20% and 30% tokens (nouns up to almost 50%) in everyday spoken texts. Comparable corpora of other Slavic micro-languages in language contact situations have a loanword percentage of less than 5%. One of the main reasons for this difference is, apart from the high percentage of borrowed nouns and verbs, the borrowing of such elementary and frequent units as the complementiser and relativiser ke ~ ka ← Italian che ‘that, which’, the conjunction e ← e ‘and’ and prepositions like dopo ← dopo ‘after’ and senza ← senza ‘without’ and adverbs like già ← già ‘already’. MOL. Cro has its own rules for the integration of inflected parts of speech. Nouns are integrated into the two gender-determined declension classes, normally with the same gender as in the dominant model variety (standard or dialectal Italian), irrespective of the ending of the equivalent Italian form (see below 4.5.1).

In spite of many borrowings common to all three villages, there are also substantial differences in the three MOL.Cro dialects (Breu 2017a: 202). A typical example is the word for ‘field’. In the Kruč dialect the traditional term njiva continues to exist, while Mundimitar borrowed largo. In Filič an equivalent Italian term was borrowed: pajiz ← paese ‘village, country’. Mundimitar uses skrivit ←

---

11 For a comparison of oral texts from MOL.Cro with those from Upper Sorbian in Germany, Burgenland Croatian in Austria and Balkan Slavic varieties spoken in Greece, all of them glossed and with borrowings marked, see Adamou et al. (2013); for a detailed summary of lexical borrowing and code-switching in the three MOL.Cro villages, based on these texts, see Breu (2017b: 67–71). A statistical evaluation of borrowing is provided by Adamou et al. (2016).

12 For these and other borrowings see the dictionaries published by Breu & Piccoli (2000) for Kruč, and Piccoli & Sammartino (2000) for Mundimitar.
scrivere ‘to write’ or galo ← gallo ‘rooster’, while Kruč has retained the traditional terms pisat and pivac for ‘to write’ and ‘rooster’ respectively. The presence of lexical transfers from Italian in diaspora varieties is also recorded in ITAL.Cro (Županović Filipin, Hlavac and Piasevoli, this volume) and TRS.Cro (Piasevoli, this volume).

Lexical borrowings can be found in all dialects of HUN.Cro as well. However, their number and the features of their phonological and morphological adaptation vary according to the specific features of the respective subdialect. From a semantic point of view, Hungarian loanwords denote mostly (but not exclusively) concepts that are either technical/cultural innovations or concepts, which are part of Hungarian administrative or bureaucratic jargon. Examples are given in (7). The first two are from Baranya and the last two are from Pomurje speakers:

(7) HUN.Cro Eng. Hun. HMLD.Cro
beutalo referral(med.) beutaló uputnica
sines actor színész glumac
birov judge bíró sudac
sinpad stage színpad pozornica

On the other hand, there are Hungarian loanwords in HUN.Cro that are borrowings from Hungarian slang, such as fickov (Hun. fickó, ‘guy’) or čičkaš (Hun. csicskás, ‘bellboy who does everything’). Furthermore, in both dialects analysed here, there is a considerable number of German loanwords, some of which are present in particular dialects of HMLD.Cro, as well. Examples include the following:

(8) HUN.Cro Eng. Ger. HMLD.Cro
fertol quarter Viertel četvrt (frtalj)
ažiban railways Eisenbahn željeznica (ajznban)
mela flour Mehl brašno

2.1 Gender allocation of loanwords

In BGLD.Cro, gender allocation of borrowings from German and Hungarian is usually determined by the phonotactic features of the borrowing’s ending, i.e. borrowings ending in –a and many ending in –e are allocated feminine gender, while those ending in a consonant and other vowel endings, –o and –i, are allocated to masculine gender. An example of this is Hungarian origin város ‘town’, which is feminine in HMLD.Cro, i.e. varoš f, but masculine in BGLD.Cro, i.e. varoš M, glavni varoš ‘capital city’, stari varoš ‘old town’, plan varoša ‘city map’. There
can be variation in the allocation of gender where the German gender of a borrowing is retained (Hlavac 1991).

The following example shows how the consonant-final feature of one borrowing, Styling (Ger. neuter), determines its allocation to masculine gender in BLGD. Cro, while the feminine gender of another consonant-final borrowing, Sendung ('radio/tv program'), is retained.

(9) ki vrag je za ti
who devil-NOM.M.SG be-3SG for+ACC that-DEM.ACC.M.PL
Styling za sendungu zuständig?
styling-ACC.M.SG for+ACC program-ACC.F.SG responsible
‘Who the hell is responsible for the styling for the program?’

HMLD.Cro Koji vrag je odgovoran za stajling- M u emisiji-f?

Styling is a conventionalised English-origin borrowing in German, while Sendung, a feminine noun in German retains its gender in BGLD.Cro and is overtly marked as ACC.F.SG. As a collocation Styling in German is commonly followed by the preposition für [+ACC]. Here, its Croatian equivalent za [+ACC] is employed and Sendung attracts the feminine accusative suffix -u. (The retention of its gender in German (f) is unusual, as the phonotactic structure of words with word final –ung from German usually renders them M. in Croatian, eg. Ger. Kuppling-f > Cro. kuplung-M ‘clutch’). Further, zuständig ‘responsible’ is the final element in the sentence, and this form is also commonly collocated with für in a preceding position, i.e. für + . . . zuständig (‘responsible for . . .’). A tendency for German-origin nouns to be allocated masculine gender is also observable in contemporary diaspora varieties (see Kresić Vukosav and Šimičić; and Ščukanec, both this volume).

In MOL.Cro, there are only two genders for nouns. A three-gender distinction is still made in relation to adjectives (see below 6.1.2). Borrowed feminine nouns go into the only remaining feminine declension in -a, but with a stronger tendency to adopt the ending -i (< -i) in the GEN/DAT/INS.PL than traditional feminine nouns, e.g. Ital. finestra → funaštra ‘window’, GEN.PL funaštri, Ital. pace → pača ‘peace’. There are also exceptions, for example, when the final vowel in the Italian source is stressed. In this case, the loanwords in question either keep their feminine gender and remain uninflected, e.g. gioventù F → džuvindu F ‘youth’, or they change their gender and follow the alternating masculine paradigm of stems in -l. While the first possibility is found in all three dialects, the second one is restricted to Kruč, for example città f → čita M ‘town’, čitala GEN.SG.M (Breu 1998: 341).

As for masculine loanwords, they form their NOM/ACC.SG, as a rule, directly from the stem of the source word by replacing its original -o, -e ending with a zero
ending. If it is true that there is, in principle, only one masculine declension, it is also true that several subclasses important for loanword integration exist. Again -ī dominates in the marginal cases of the plural, but the form of the NOM/ACC. PL depends on the suffix and varies from dialect to dialect. The most common ending, at least in Kruč, is -a, e.g. ospite → ospit ‘guest’, ospita NOM/ACC.PL, ospiti GEN/DAT/INS.PL. However, for nouns with the suffix -un- the alternative ending -e is used, e.g. schiavone → Škavun ‘Slav’, Škavune NOM/ACC.PL, Škavuni GEN/DAT/INS.PL.

The form of the NOM/ACC.SG depends on the stem-final consonants. Most frequent is the zero ending, e.g. sugo → sug ‘sauce’. But when the stem ends in a consonant cluster either an alternating -a- is inserted into the cluster or the ending -a (Kruč and Filič) is chosen instead of Ø (with or without a change of M to F gender), for example brigante M → brighanat13 ‘bandit’ NOM.SG.M, brighanda GEN.SG.M, barile M → barla ‘barrel’ NOM=GEN.SG.M, apparecchio M → parekja NOM.SG.F ‘airplane’, parekje GEN.SG.F. In Mundimitar the traditional -o ending for (now vanished) neuter nouns is not restricted to ex-neuters but may appear rather freely in borrowed masculines, e.g. barile M → barilo ‘barrel’ NOM.SG.M, barila GEN.SG.M, largo ‘width, square’ NOM.SG.M → largo NOM.SG.M ‘field’. Stem alternations also exist, as in the case of stem-final -l, e.g. ospedale → spida NOM.SG.M ‘hospital’, spidala GEN.SG.M or martello → martaj NOM.SG.M ‘hammer’, martaja ~ martala GEN.SG.M. In the speech of diaspora speakers, variation in gender allocation of Italian-origin transfer is recorded. Sometimes it is phonotactic features and other times it is the gender of the transfer in Italian that determines gender allocation (see Županović Filipin, Hlavac and Piasevoli; and Piasevoli, both this volume).

Adjectives are frequently integrated with three adjectival genders, two numbers, and an additional short form in the NOM.SG, for example giusto → jušti M, jušta F, jušto N, jušte PL, short form jušt M etc. ‘right’. As in HMLD.Cro, certain stems show alternations, e.g. fermo → fermi (long form), feram (short form) ‘firm’ NOM.SG.M; debolo → debali: debuj ‘weak’ NOM.SG.M. Most of the borrowed adjectives inflect for case, though there is also a certain tendency to leave borrowed adjectives altogether uninflected, even for gender and number, e.g., speciale → spečjal ‘special’, telefonico → telefonik ‘telephone’.14

Hungarian nouns do not have grammatical gender and the integration of Hungarian loanwords into Croatian is determined by loanword phonotactic fea-

---

13 The orthographical representation of gh [ɣ] is based on a consonant sound (velar voiceless fricative) borrowed from Molise dialect. For further details on the phonological features of MOL.Cro and orthographical representations, see Breu (1999, 2017b: 16–21).

14 For an overview of the morphological integration of borrowed nouns and adjectives in MOL.Cro see Breu (2017b: 63–65).
tures. Although HUN.Cro dialects have a three-gender-system, the integrated loanwords are allocated either feminine or masculine gender only. Loanwords which have an -a ending in Hungarian are transferred in their original form and belong to the feminine declension class, e.g. suka ← szuka ‘female dog’; marha ← marha ‘cattle’. Loanwords with a consonant ending are integrated as masculine, e.g. parast ← paraszt ‘peasant’; műhely ← műhely ‘repair shop’, or – by adding an –a ending which renders them feminine. e.g. ğonta ← csont ‘bone’. Loanwords that end in -o in Hungarian also belong to the masculine declension class, either as phonologically integrated lexemes, e.g. fickov ← fickó ‘guy’, or in their original form following the paradigm of the masculine declension class, e.g. ringlo (ACC/GEN ringloja) ← ringló, ‘yellow egg plum’ (cf. kino ‘cinema’ and biro ‘office’ in HMLD.Cro that are both usually masculine). Nouns ending in -e in Hungarian are allocated to the feminine class whereby the original -e ending is replaced with an -a ending, e.g. fela ← féle ‘sort’; figa ← füge ‘fig’; bölcsöda ← bölcsőde ‘day-care nursery’.

As mentioned, Hungarian loanwords in their original form are genderless. However, if they denote an animate referent with biological gender, this has an effect on the morphological markers that the loanword attracts, e.g. mafla (Hun. mafla, ‘stupid person’) denotes both females and males in Hungarian. However, in accordance with the gender marking rules of HUN.Cro mafla refers only to females, and its male counterpart mafleš is created by adding the suffix -eš. The same refers to the example ovodaš (Hun. ővodás, ‘children who attend preschool’) and ovodaška, the first denoting exclusively male children, the second female ones (cf. HMLD.Cro muško dijete u vrtiću ‘male child in a pre-school centre’ and žensko dijete u vrtiću ‘female child in a pre-school centre’).

Integration of adjectives is variable. Adjectives that are morphologically integrated into HUN.Cro via overt suffixes do so according to rules common to HMLD.Cro that require marking of gender, number (and case). For example, the adjective butasti-M.SG ‘stupid’ (HMLD.Cro glup) has the following further forms (all in NOM) to show morphological markers for gender and number: butasta-F.SG, butasto-N.SG, butasti-M.PL, butaste-F.PL, butasta N.PL. On the other hand, some adjectives remain morphologically unintegrated and hence indeclinable, such as the adjectives njugot (Hun. nyugodt, ‘relaxed’, HMLD.Cro miran) and normališ (Hun. normáltis, ‘normal’, HMLD.Cro normalan) as shown in the following examples:

(10) \( \begin{array}{ccc} 
\text{bila} & \text{sem} & \text{njugot} \\
\text{be-PTCP.F.SG} & \text{AUX-1SG} & \text{relaxed} \\
\text{I was relaxed.} & \text{(Vuk research data corpus)} 
\end{array} \)
2.2 Phonological and morphological integration of loanwords

The above section presented examples of gender allocation to loanwords, which in many instances occurs via overt morphology. This section presents data transferred items and phonological and/or morphological features that enable their integration.

In BGLD.Cro, German-origin verbs such as merkati ← merken, ‘to notice’ (HMLD.Cro zapažati, primjećivati) or šporiti ← sparen, ‘to save’ (HMLD.Cro štedjeti, šparati) are imperfective. These loans have been phonologically and morphologically integrated. When Croatian prefixes such as za or pri are affixed to these verbs, these verbs become perfective, ie. zamerkati ‘to have just noticed’ or prišporiti ‘to save up’.

In regard to the situation of MOL.Cro, Standard Italian has four verb classes, represented by their infinitives ending in -are, -ire and stressed and unstressed -ere. In relation to the integration of Italian verbs, MOL.Cro has two productive endings only, -at and -it, with all Italian verbs in -ere and -ire allocated to the latter class. The reason for this distribution may be found in the local Italian dialects, having been the only source for integration historically (Breu 1998: 341–342; 2017b: 65). Examples are amare → amat ‘to love’, servire → servit ‘to serve’, possedére → posedit ‘to possess’ and promèttere → primitit ‘to promise’. Verbal aspect is a feature that pertains to borrowings as well as domestic verbs, and prefixes or suffixes distinguish these. The rule is that telic source verbs become perfective, with a secondary imperfective partner formed by means of the suffix -iva-. Examples are: partire ‘depart, leave’ → partit PFV ⇒ parčivat 1PFV, fermare ‘to close’ → fermat PFV ⇒ fermivat 1PFV (Breu, Berghaus & Scholze 2017: 93–94, Breu 2017b: 65–66). In contrast to HMLD.Cro, there are no bi-aspectual loans of the type negirati ‘to negate’, i.e. MOL.Cro has nigat PFV and nigivat 1PFV.

In HUN.Cro, examples of phonologically adopted loanwords are reported amongst both groups of speakers. The following borrowings are recorded by Rácz (2012) for Pomurje-Croatian, and by Gorjanac (2008) for the Štokavian-speaking Šokac-Croats:
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### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUN.Cro</th>
<th>Eng.</th>
<th>Hun.</th>
<th>HMLD.Cro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>prothetic $j$ in initial position:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jezera</td>
<td>thousand</td>
<td>ezer</td>
<td>tisuća</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jegersek</td>
<td>Egerszeg</td>
<td>Egerszeg</td>
<td>(Hun. toponym)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUN.Cro</th>
<th>Eng.</th>
<th>Hun.</th>
<th>HMLD.Cro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>prothetic $v$ in final position:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birov</td>
<td>judge</td>
<td>bíró</td>
<td>sudac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turov</td>
<td>cottage cheese</td>
<td>túró</td>
<td>sir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>halov</td>
<td>net</td>
<td>háló</td>
<td>mreža</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUN.Cro</th>
<th>Eng.</th>
<th>Hun.</th>
<th>HMLD.Cro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>$d \leftarrow gy$:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d'ileš</td>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>gyűlés</td>
<td>sjednica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f'odlolt</td>
<td>ice cream</td>
<td>fagylalt</td>
<td>sladoled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following loanwords are morphologically integrated through an added morpheme. The phonotactic structure of the Hungarian original forms is a likely cause for suffixation here – addition of the suffix morpheme obviates the difficulty of declining a loanword that ends in –$i$ or –$:$. The following examples have the suffix –$ka$ for nouns, –$erati$ for verbs and –$sti$ for adjectives:

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUN.Cro</th>
<th>Eng.</th>
<th>Hun.</th>
<th>HMLD.Cro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>čokika</td>
<td>chocolate</td>
<td>csoki</td>
<td>čokolada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentöka</td>
<td>ambulance services</td>
<td>mentő</td>
<td>hitna pomoć</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masekerati</td>
<td>to be self-employed</td>
<td>maszekolni</td>
<td>raditi privatno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sirkasti</td>
<td>grey</td>
<td>szürke</td>
<td>siv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butasti</td>
<td>unwise</td>
<td>buta</td>
<td>glup/nepametan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also observe an instance of phonological integration of vowels where high front rounded ű [yx:] becomes unrounded i (gyűlés $\rightarrow$ d'ileš), while in another instance, the mid-front rounded vowel ŏ [ø:] remains, with only a shortening of its length to ŏ [ø], eg. mentő $\rightarrow$ mentöka. (This front rounded vowel does not exist in the vowel system of the Šokac-Croats, but the vowel of the Hungarian loanword is preserved in this example.) Palatal affricate gy [j] is rendered as the prepalatal affricate d [dz]. This is an example of transphonemisation to the closest available Croatian phoneme (Hlavac 1999a). The phonological and morphological integration of other-language items in contemporary diaspora varieties is usually determined by the generational membership of the speaker: first-generation speakers typically integrate lexical transfers both phonologically and morphologically; amongst second- and subsequent-generation speakers integration is more varia-
ble, dependent on the frequency of an item in communities’ idiolects with higher frequency co-occurring more frequently with integration (see Jutronić; Petrović; Hlavac and Stolac; and Stoffel and Hlavac, all this volume).

3 Discourse markers and pragmatic particles

Discourse markers and other pragmatic forms that have a function at the level of discourse may more easily traverse linguistic boundaries. In a structural sense, they are usually ‘extra-clausal’ items, often in turn-initial or turn-final position that are not part of the morphosyntactic grid of a clause. Further, they can be a reflection of the adoption of the pragmatic norms of the socially dominant language group. This adoption can be not only the function of a pragmatic marker, but also the form of that pragmatic marker as it occurs in the other language. The following have been adopted from Austrian German, with little or no phonological integration into BGLD.Cro:

(16) BGLD.Cro Eng. Ger. HMLD.Cro

virklji(h) really wirklich stvarno
übahaup(t) at all überhaupt uopće
gonc quite ganz dosta
filajht perhaps vielleicht možda

MOL.Cro has pragmatic particles such as alora ← allora ‘now’, ‘then’ (HMLD.Cro sada, tada), and ma ← ma ‘but’ (HMLD.Cro ali). The latter particle ma exists in HMLD.Cro too.15 Others, mainly conjunctions, include pèrò ‘but’ (HMLD.Cro ali), e ‘and’ (HMLD.Cro i), o and ol ‘or’ (HMLD.Cro ili), ka ‘that’ (HMLD.Cro što, da) and two words with the meaning ‘because’ p’ke (HMLD.Cro zato što) and the calque aje-ka (< Cro. jer ‘because’ + Mol. ka ‘that’).

In HUN.Cro, expressions from Hungarian such as istenem (‘oh my God’, HUN. Cro ištenem) or nem számít (‘it doesn’t matter’, HUN.Cro nem samit) are commonly used phrases.

15 It is listed by etymologists as an Italian borrowing (Skok, 1971: 343) or of two-fold origin as a hybrid of both Italian and Greek origin (“ukrštanjem nekoliko čestica = tal. ma: ali, ngrč. má.”) (Hrvatski jezični portal, n.d.), while there also remains the possibility that it is a contracted variant of Turkish-origin ama ‘but’.
The Hungarian conjunctions *mert* (‘because’, HMLD.Cro *jer*) and *de* (‘but’, HMLD.Cro *ali*) are used as integrated conjunctions in the Pomurje dialect. The HMLD.Cro equivalent of *mert* is not present at all in the Pomurje dialect (see above example (1) in section 1.3 above). The equivalent of the second conjunction, i.e. *de* (‘but’, HMLD.Cro *ali*) is present, but it has — similar to some other (Croatia-based) subdialects of the Kajkavian dialect — a disjunctive meaning (‘or’). There is no conjunction in Pomurje-Croatian that means ‘but’. Therefore the lexical gap is filled by the Hungarian equivalent *de*.\(^{16}\)

In the speech of Bošnjak-Croats from Pečuh, a habitual use of the unintegrated Hungarian conjunction *vagy* (‘or’, HMLD.Cro *ili*) can be observed. Amongst the same group of speakers, the phonologically integrated and de-semanticised particle *hát* (‘so’, ‘now’, HMLD.Cro *pa*) can also be observed:

\(^{16}\) According to Rácz (2012: 287) *ali* can have a twofold meaning, ‘but’ or ‘or’.

\(^{17}\) This tendency is in accordance with Matras’s (2009: 194–195, 2011: 216) findings regarding a hierarchy of borrowability for conjunctions. He reports that conjunctions with a contrastive meaning (*but*) are the most highly borrowable, followed by conjunctions with a sequential meaning (*and, or*) with both groups followed by those that express justification or reasoning (*so, because*).
These particles occur as discourse-based forms and are employed as forms reflective of the speaker’s positionality, and are not, as stated above, part of a clause’s morpho-syntactic grid. As such, these particles can be considered to be ‘extra-clausal’, occurring freely within or between clauses (Hlavac 2006). They also represent instances where speakers adopt not only a function typical of pragmatic norms of the other, socially dominant language group, but also an adoption of the form itself from that language group, along with its function. Examples of transferred discourse markers are found in CAN.Cro (Petrović, this volume), AUS.Cro (Hlavac and Stolac, this volume), NZ.Cro (Stoffel and Hlavac, this volume) and ARG.Cro (Skelin Horvat, Musulin and Blažević, this volume).

4 Calques – phraseological and semantic

Verb calques are common in BGLD.Cro as shown in section 6.2.1 below. Fixed expressions based on German models that consist of a verb+noun construction, where homeland Croatian typically employs a verb, are also found in the examples, with the replicated construction shown in bold in BGLD.Cro and German. HMLD.Cro equivalents are given at the end of each example.

(22) ja sam imao moj špas. (23) to mu je ležalo na srču
‘I had fun’ ‘it was close to his heart’
ich habe meinen Spaß gehabt es hat ihm am Herzen gelegen
dobro sam se zabavio do toga mu je bilo jako stalo

(24) spravljali su šale (25) ima s biljkami posla
‘they made jokes’ ‘it has to do with plants’
sie haben Scherze gemacht es hat mit Pflanzen zu tun
šalili su se odnosi se na biljke

(26) i oni su diozeli na veselju familije. (25) ima s biljkami posla
‘and they took part in the family celebration’ ‘it has to do with plants’
und die haben an der Familienfeier teilgenommen.
odnosi se na biljke

‘and they took part in the family celebration’
und die haben an der Familienfeier teilgenommen.
i oni su sudjelovali na obiteljskoj proslavi.

There are further instances in BGLD.Cro where the relationship of government between words, typically between verbs or prepositions and other words, requires morphosyntactic marking, and where German grammatical rules are transferred.
The following are further calques with longer sequences that replicate German models found in BGLD.Cro:

(27) vlak je nekoliko puti _ostao ležati na prugi, dokle nije_ . . .

‘The train **stopped** still many times until . . .’

Ger. der Zug _blieb_ mehrmals **auf der Strecke liegen**, bis . . .

HMLD.Cro vlak se nekoliko puta **zaustavio** sve dok nije . . .

(28) **U našem selu – hvala Bogu – se nije našao ni jedan človik, ki bi ovo _bio držao za dobro, i nije se našao, ki bi se bio ufao vanhititi Boga iz škole._**

‘In our village, thank God, there has never been anyone who thought **that it was a good idea**, there has never been anyone who has attempted to throw God out of school [the school curriculum]’.

Ger. **In unserem Dorf, Gott sei Dank, hat sich keiner gefunden, der dies für gut hält, es hat sich keiner gefunden, der es sich vorgenommen hätte, Gott aus dem Lehrplan zu entfernen.**

HMLD.Cro **U našem selu – hvala Bogu – nije se našao nijedan čovjek koji bi smatralo da je to dobro, nije se našao nitko tko bi pokušao izbaciti Boga iz škole (iz nastavnog plana).**

(29) **Ča za ličnost je bio Jožef Haydn i ča je dao svitu?**

‘**What kind of a personality was Joseph Haydn and what did he give to the world?**’

Ger. **Was für eine Person war Joseph Haydn . . .**

HMLD.Cro **Kakav je čovjek bio Joseph Haydn i što je dao svijetu?**

(30) **. . . kad je Martin četernajst let star nastal . . .**

‘**When Martin turned fourteen years old.**’

Ger. **als Martin **vierzehn Jahre alt wurde** . . .**

HMLD.Cro **kad je Martin **navršio četrnaest godina** . . .**

Instances of German-based calques and loan translations are found in the GER, Cro and AUT.Cro samples of contemporary diaspora speakers as well. (See Kresić Vukosav and Šimičić; and Ščukanec, both this volume). MOL.Cro has a number of calques. Below are three examples with the Italian equivalents based on Molise Italian:
Instances of Italian-based calques and loan translations are found in the ITAL.Cro and TRS.Cro samples of contemporary diaspora speakers as well. (See Županović Filipin, Hlavac and Piasevoli; and Piasevoli, both this volume).

An example of calques found in HUN.Cro is shown below (34). This example is an interesting one as it is a combination of code-switching, and at the same time, also a lexical calque. The syntactic structure of the Hungarian phrase *Mi a helyzet?* (what-N.SG the-DEF.ART situation-N.SG ‘What is new with you?’) is fully replicated in example (34). By inserting the obligatory copula *je*, the calqued structure is created in accordance with the syntactic rules of the replica language, Croatian. However, as the speakers do not know the Croatian equivalent of the word ‘situation’, they use its Hungarian counterpart, this way producing a mixed utterance, not just in terms of a covert syntactic structure, but on the overt formal level also. This phrase is commonly used by all Pomurje-Croats, even by the younger generation. Included here on the right is an equivalent construction from the speech of Bošnjak-Croats in Baranya, which itself is also a Hungarian-based calque.

The similar-meaning phrase *što je novina* (‘What is newspaper [= ‘news’]?’) is a calque of an equivalent Hungarian phrase, i.e. *mi újság?* (‘What is newspaper [= ‘news’]?’). The HUN.Cro dialects examined here are used almost exclusively in oral form only.

The (written) translation of more complex concepts, i.e. replication of compound constructions based on Hungarian models, is not a common strategy in
these communities. In some instances, compound nouns from Hungarian are transferred in their original form into Croatian with varying degrees of integration. However, since the 1950s, when the first efforts were made by intellectuals and others to provide Croatian equivalents for terms used by government institutions and public services, a number of loan translations can be found that are used in schools, minority institutions and public events. The following examples are from Győrvári (2012), who analysed pedagogic terminology in HUN.Cro:

(35)  
obavezna literature ← kötelező irodalom ‘required reading’, HMLD.Cro lektira 
dacša samouprava ← diákönkormányzat ‘student council’, HMLD.Cro viječe 
ucenika

In the first item in example (35) above, the Hungarian NP (obligatory + literature) is replicated in Croatian, despite the existence of a one-word Croatian equivalent. In regard to the second form in example (35) above, the Hungarian compound (diák + önkormányzat) is replicated, but in a syntactically modified form, as an NP. (These examples are not frequent, as homeland HMLD.Cro equivalents and terms were usually the ones borrowed and used, thus resulting in few differences specific to HUN.Cro). The last example shows how pattern replication works in Matras and Sakel’s (2007) understanding: the pivotal features of the concept are replicated in the replica language (the two elements: student + council), but at the same time, they are also modified according to the word-formation rules in Croatian, the result of which is an NP and not a compound noun as in the model language.

5 Code-switching

Code-switching is defined here as strings of words or sequences of spoken language that are transferred from one language into another, regardless of the position of the transferred items as alternations, embeddings, insertions or extra-clausal items. Our definition of code-switching includes some simplex forms and to an extent, these overlap with common discourse markers, e.g. weißt du (Ger. ‘you know’).

From BGLD.Cro we have some written examples of code-switching, where code-switching serves the purpose of clarification of an ‘indigenous’ form, riža through repetition of the same form with its local form, a conventionalised borrowing from German, rajz (‘Reis’). In some written texts, German translations of lesser-known local forms are provided.
(36)  *Tako uguljenu hajdu zamu u juhu i ju dinstaju na mjesto riže (rajza) uz meso.*

‘So the buckwheat is put into the soup and they let it stew instead of with *riža* (Ger. *Reis.*) ‘rice’ with meat.

A similar instance is given below, where *dičaki* ‘boys’ is followed by a paraphrase in BLGD.Cro (shown here in bold) after which a single-word German equivalent is provided (shown here in brackets, as in the original):

(37)  *U Beču je Haydn proživio skoro deset ljet med *dičaki*, *kih zadaća je u prvom redu bila da pjevaju* (Sängerknaben).

‘Haydn had been living in Vienna for almost ten years among the *boys, whose main task was to sing*’ (Sängerknaben. Ger. ‘Vienna Boys’ Choir’).

Sometimes analogies or phrases specific to German are transferred, and a Croatian gloss is provided that does not really function as a gloss, but as a marker that the writer otherwise wishes to apply a normative (ie. maximally Croatian) approach to lexical choices:

(38)  *Kad je negdo jako bogat, mu velu, da je bogat kao Krözus, perzijski kralj.*

‘When someone is very rich, it is said that he is as rich as *Croesus*, (Ger. *Krözus*) the king of Persia.’

These reveal some of the conventions employed by those using BGLD.Cro in its written form for a readership across all dialectal groups. Language used in written documents tended and still tends to be more normative than spoken language. This accounts for the few examples of code-switching in written texts. Code-switching is a common phenomenon amongst many speakers, occurring on the basis of situational, sociolinguistic, thematic or other constellations. For some, when in the company of other bilinguals, it may be their *unmarked* speech variety. As stated, descriptions of code-switching often distinguish between examples of insertion, i.e. the embedding of one or more forms from another language, and alternation, i.e. a shift from language to another within the same turn. An example of insertion from the BGLD.Cro corpus is the following, with the insertion from German shown in bold:

(39)  *Šport mindestens trikrat na tjedan. To je sigurno, to držimo.*

‘Sport *at least* three times a week. That’s for sure. We hold to that.’
Ger. Sport mindestens dreimal die Woche. Das ist sicher, das halten wir ein.
HMLD.Cro Sport barem tri puta na tjedan. To je sigurno. Toga se držimo.

(40) Moramo jesti gesünderes Brot . . . ne pit Colu i tako nešto . . .
‘We should eat healthier bread . . . not drink Coca Cola and things like that . . .’
Ger. Wir sollen gesünderes Brot essen . . . und keine Cola oder so was trinken . . .
HMLD.Cro Moramo jesti zdraviji kruh . . . ne piti Coca-Colu i tako nešto

(41) A i zimske schuhe bi čovik mogao pravati . . .
‘And one could have needed winter shoes . . .’
Ger. Und Winterschuhe hätte man brauchen können . . .
HMLD.Cro A i zimske cipele bi čovjek mogao trebati . . .

German-Croatian code-switching is recorded in samples of speech from recently migrated speakers, e.g. GER.Cro (Kresić Vukosav and Šimičić, this volume) and AUT.Cro (Ščukanec, this volume). An example of alternation is given below from MOL.Cro, this as the initial code used by the speaker, followed by a long, alternated stretch in Italian, marked here in bold:

(42) Sma čekal ka sa furnjivaša kondzilj per discutere [il] problem[a], fuori dal consi[glio], per non dare . . . far perdere tempo, diciamo così, in consiglio.
‘We waited until the (city) council was going to finish in order to discuss the problem, outside the council, in order not to give . . . not to lose time, let’s say, at the council.’

Alternations can occur within (intra-clausal) or across (inter-clausal) clause boundaries. The example above contains intra-clausal code-switching. In some cases, lexical forms such as bilingual homophones (forms common to both languages with similar phonological forms) or established borrowings can function as ‘triggers’ (Clyne 1967, 2003; Hlavac 1999b) for alternational code-switching in which the speaker may be less aware or not aware at all that a change in language has occurred. In (42) above, a conventionalised borrowing kondzilj (‘council’) precedes the appearance of its Italian equivalent, consiglio in the second part of the utterance. It is not clear if alternation occurred here triggered by kondzilj or whether this reflects this speaker’s vernacular, which is characterised by unmarked code-switching. Examples (43) and (44) below are those of insertion.
The following example from MOL.Cro is taken from an account that contains an instance of insertion of an Italian adjective *russi* (‘Russian’ PL.m) ending instead of the MOL.Cro form *ruse* NOM.PL.M:

(43)  

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{bihu} \quad \text{mala} \quad \text{soldi} \quad \text{alora} \quad \text{bihu} \quad \text{ove} \\
&\text{be-IPRF.3PL} \quad \text{little} \quad \text{money-GEN.PL} \quad \text{then} \quad \text{be-IPRF.3PL} \quad \text{these-NOM} \\
&\text{tractor} \quad \text{russi} \quad \text{ke} \ldots \\
&\text{tractor-NOM.PL.M} \quad \text{russi-’Russian’ (NOM.PL.M)} \quad \text{REL}
\end{align*}
\]

‘There wasn’t much money, but there were these Russian tractors, which . . .’

The next example is a case of the insertion of a technical term, for which there is no word in MOL.Cro (*ping pong*, here: ‘tennis’) together with the Italian prepositions *da* ‘of’ and *a* ‘to(wards), at’. The insertion of Italian *sì* occurs rather frequently. *Sì* is a common discourse marker in some speakers’ vernaculars, functioning as an affirmative alongside MOL.Cro *keja* ‘yes’.

(44)  

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{je} \quad \text{reta:} \quad \text{sì} \quad \text{ stoju} \quad \text{lipa, one} \\
&AUX-3SG \quad \text{say-PTCP.SG.M} \quad \text{si ‘yes’ be-PRS.3PL} \quad \text{nicely they} \\
&\text{imaju} \quad \text{kamba} \quad \text{da ping pong} \quad \text{jokaju} \\
&\text{have-PRS.3PL} \quad \text{field-ACC.M.PL} \quad \text{de ping pong [=tennis]} \quad \text{play-PRS.3PL} \\
&a ping pong, \quad \text{ stoju} \quad \text{torko} \quad \text{lipa} \\
&\text{a ping pong [=tennis] be-PRS.3PL} \quad \text{so much well}
\end{align*}
\]

‘He said: “*Yes*, they’re fine. They have *tennis* courts. They play *tennis*. They’re getting on really well!”’

In the following example three nouns are listed with the only (complex) abstract term supplied from Italian:

(45)  

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{su} \quad \text{se frundal tri stvare ke biše} \\
&AUX-3PL \quad \text{REFL meet-PTCP.PL} \quad \text{three thing-NOM.PL.F} \quad \text{REL be-IPRF.3SG} \\
&\text{jena} \quad \text{oganj biše voda oš} \\
&\text{one-NOM.SG.M} \quad \text{fire-NOM.SG.M} \quad \text{be-IPRF.3SG} \quad \text{water-NOM.SG.F} \quad \text{and} \\
&\text{biše} \quad \text{l’onore della persona} \\
&\text{be-IPRF.3SG} \quad \text{the honour of the person}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Three things met, which was (= were): one was fire, there was water and there was *personal honour*.’

There are four words (and five morphemes) contained in the Italian code-switch *l’onore della persona*. However, this NP is semantically simplex and could also be classified as a borrowing. In (46) below, there is insertion of an Italian (dia-
Dialectal) phrase *cond delo stat* (‘on behalf of the state’, standard Italian: *conto dello Stato*) that could also be otherwise expressed by local MOL.Cro terms, themselves loan translations such as, *kunat do štata* or *kunat do luštat* or *za kunda do štata*:

(46)  
oνα    κε   ραβί    *cond delo stat*,    νε
that-NOM.SG.F REL work-PRS.3SG on behalf of the state NEG
čini
make-PRS.3SG
‘That one [field] that he [the Russian] works on, on behalf of the state, does not produce anything.’

Code-switching with repetition of a (Molise) Italian expression *tutta la not* (‘the whole night’, standard Ital: *tutta la notte*), with an equivalent expression in MOL. Cro *tuna noču*:

(47)  
je    stala    *tutta la not*,    tuna    noču
AUX-3SG stay-PTCP.SG.F all the night all night-ACC.SG.F
je    stala    sendza    spat.
AUX-3SG remain-PTCP.SG.F without sleep-INF
‘She spent the whole night, the whole night she spent without sleeping.’

The word order of (47) is the same in an equivalent Molise Italian utterance, eg. . . . *tutta la notte, tutta la notte è stata senza dormire*. Repetition of a phrase or construction from the other language, i.e. “bilingual couplets” (Hlavac 2011: 3795) with or without emphasis, is a frequent occurrence in diaspora vernaculars, including Italian-English ones (Kinder 1988). The following examples contain longer transferred sequences and can be considered alternations. As with larger numbers, indications of date and time in MOL.Cro are also always given in Italian (either a standard or local variety thereof):

(48)  
ma    biše    *la metà de la stagione*    biše
but be-IPRF.3SG alla metà della stagione [=summer] be-IPRF.3SG
maša    bi    dendr    *la fine de luljo e li pringipj d’aghušt*
must-IPRF.3SG be-INF between the end of July and the start of August
‘Well, it was in the middle of the season (=summer), it was, it was probably between the end of July and the beginning of August’. (cf. Standard Ital.: *fra la fine di luglio e l’inizio d’agosto*).
Examples (49) and (50) are both from Kruč while (51) is from Mundimitar. The examples are from separate interactions. Some turns are commenced in Italian that coincide with expressions of indignation, although it is not clear if the code-switches alone augment their conversational implicature.

(49)  *mi zbima partil con l’idea di fare una porcilaia, e zbima vrl [...] tama dol je [...] ‘we had started with the idea of making a pigsty, and we had put [...] down there, there is . . .’*

(50)  *kaka sa ne rabi? ‘how (= in what sense), you can’t work?’

    *non si può arare! Non si . . . sa ne more či l’aratura indzom. ‘you can’t plough! You can’t . . . you can’t do the ploughing, that’s it.’*

(51)  *niste pol van, ste stal doma? ‘didn’t you go to the fields, did you stay at home?’

    *come ti permetti reč ke smo stal doma? Sa smo dol. Ne vidiš ke smo još in tenuta militare, sporchi? ‘how do you take the liberty of saying that we stayed at home? We have arrived in this moment. Don’t you see that we are still in military uniform, dirty?’*

A ‘couplet’, *non si (Ital.) . . . sa ne more* (MOL.Cro) ‘you can’t’ occurs in example (50) above. The code-switches, both intra- and inter-clausal, appear unmarked. In the following example from Filič, alternation between both languages occurs multiple times again across and within clause boundaries:

(52)  *Je Dunat . . . conosciuto come perito, ja ga zovam sempr il deperita. Tra me e lui c’è un sfottò continuo ka sa furnjiva maj – ‘There is Donato . . . known as the specialist, I always call him the emaciated [a pun on words]. Between me and him there is continuous joking that never ends –’*

Sociolinguistic features such as reference to another speaker can account for incidences of inter-clausal code-switching. In the following example, the (Italian) speech of another is quoted verbatim, which accounts for the clause-length code-switches into Italian.
Diachronic perspectives on change in spoken Croatian: indigenous minorities

‘I did not see the king! Oh: “Always take it!” I’ll do it. [ji faccә, Standard Ital.: lo faccio io]: “What!” How is it now? Are you taking it?’

In MOL.Cro, larger numbers, e.g. kvarandòt or ‘forty-eight hours’ (Standard Ital.: quarantotto ore) are a common group of inserted forms and have almost entirely been borrowed from Italian. For example, alongside čjend ‘hundred’ (Ital. cento) the original form stotina ‘hundred’ is still used, albeit much less frequently. The occurrence of a higher number here may facilitate the occurrence of the code-switched phrase *se è possibile ‘if it is possible’ instead of an equivalent MOL.Cro phrase *si je posibil:

(54) utra kvarandòt or, se è possibile maša jima
within forty-eight hour if is possible must-IPRF.2SG must-INF
či ulja
make-INF oil-ACC.SG.M
‘[. . .] within forty-eight hours, if possible, you should make [=process] the oil’

Italian-Croatian code-switching is recorded in samples of speech from recently migrated speakers as well, e.g. ITAL.Cro (Županović Filipin, Hlavac and Piasevoli, this volume) and TRS.Cro (Piasevoli, this volume).

While examples of code-switching can be found in MOL.Cro speech as in the examples (43) to (54) above, what are far more common are established and fully integrated transfers (Breu 2017b: 65–72). The same applies to the HUN.Cro corpora. Here, code-switching appears to be generally less common. Instead of clause-length alternations, in HUN.Cro there is a greater frequency of single-form or simplex insertions, i.e. nouns, verbs, conjunctions or idiomatic expressions that are transferred from Hungarian. Where alternations do occur, they appear as infrequent examples of EL-islands (Myers-Scotton 2002). The facilitating factor for some instances of code-switching into Hungarian may be an established transfer which has become part of the speaker’s Croatian repertoire as in (55) below that contains the Hungarian subordinating conjunction *mert ‘because’. This subordinating form has entirely displaced the equivalent Croatian form in the Kajkavian dialect in Pomurje. In other instances, a more contemporary internationalism, such as CV in example (56) below accounts for the longer code-switch. Interestingly the ‘couplet’ in (56) is English and its repetition is given in Hungarian, which is likely to be more widely known than a Croatian equivalent.
(55) drugi den je vunji, mert a
other-ACC.m.sg day-ACC.m.sg be-3sg aunt-DAT.f.sg because DEF
mama v prvi hiži stajela
mother-NOM.f.sg in+LOC first-LOC.f.sg house-LOC.f.sg live-PTCP.f.sg
‘[...] next day from my aunty, because my grandmother lived in the first house’

(56) mogu uraditi ovaj . . . CV[sivi] önélétrajzot
can-PRS.1sg create-INF this-ACC.m.sg CV-ACC.m.sg CV-ACC.sg
‘I can create like a.....CV....CV [Hungarian].’

A further facilitating factor is the congruence of feature marking (Clyne 2003: 177–179) as shown in the examples below. In (57), the adverb anyagilag ‘financially’ is followed by its Croatian equivalent, financijsko ‘financially’ (HMLD.Cro financijski), which precedes dobro ‘good’. It is not clear whether the Croatian counterpart is given due to emphasis or amplification, or due to the speaker’s monitoring of their speech and the desire to ‘switch back’ to Croatian, or whether the speaker senses that the Hungarian adverb cannot qualify the Croatian adjective because it is perceived to be (momentarily or fundamentally) ‘non-congruent’ to this function. In (58), an adjective nove ‘new-ACC.m/f.Pl’ commences an adjectival phrase, but its head noun is supplied from Hungarian, dolgokat ‘things-ACC.Pl’, which bears only Hungarian morphological markers, including –t showing ACC case. In Hungarian, all nouns are marked for case, as are predicative adjectives, but attributive adjectives such as új ‘new’ in (58) below are not marked for case. In Croatian all parts of an NP bear identical case marking. As the head of the NP is from Hungarian, the speaker may feel that the case-marked adjective supplied from Croatian is not congruent to the structure of a Hungarian NP, and the counterpart adjective is inserted to immediately precede the Hungarian noun head.

(57) to je anyagilag vagy financijsko dobro
this be-3sg financially or financially-ADV good-ADJ.NOM.N.SG
‘This is financially or financially good/positive.’

(58) možete kupiti nove . . . új dolgokat
can-2PL buy-INF new-ACC.m/f.PL new thing-ACC.PL
‘You can buy new . . . new things.’

The only example of a complete switch into Hungarian is in (59). As the speaker did not appear to know the Croatian equivalent of the word ‘rails’, she used the Hungarian noun sín and continued in Hungarian until the end of the conversation.
The Hungarian superessive case is double marked with the Croatian preposition *na* (that would otherwise require ACC ‘onto’) and the Hungarian superessive case suffix –en (‘on’). The verb is repeated in the second (i.e. Hungarian) part of the utterance, this way solving the syntactic incongruence between the two parts of speech.

(59) \( \text{pak sem se popiknula na sineken} \) and then AUX-1sg REFL fall-PST.f.sg on rail-PL.SUP \\
edestem, a tojás, a bab, minden elment! \\
fall-PST.1SG the egg the bean everything go-PST.3SG \\
‘I fell on the rails, the eggs, the beans, everything was gone’

6 Morphosyntax

The following sections focus on structural features found in the speech of speakers in the three settings. Noun phrases and adjectives are presented first, followed by changes in verbal paradigms. Other structural phenomena such as valency of verbs, markedness of passive, word order changes and syntactic calques are presented towards the end of this section.

6.1 Paradigms – nouns and adjectives

This section presents examples of NPs that bear innovations in the marking of phi-features: gender, number and case, and the morphological features that are employed to mark these. HMLD.Cro has the following declension paradigm for nouns as shown below in Table 2:

Table 2: HMLD.Cro nominal declensions for all genders and both numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MASC.</th>
<th></th>
<th>FEM. I</th>
<th></th>
<th>NEUT.</th>
<th></th>
<th>FEM. II (-i stem)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SG.</td>
<td>PL.</td>
<td>SG.</td>
<td>PL.</td>
<td>SG.</td>
<td>PL.</td>
<td>SG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.</td>
<td>- Ø</td>
<td>-i, -ovi</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-o/-e</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-ima</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-ama</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-ima</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.</td>
<td>=N. or G.</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>=N.</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC.</td>
<td>=N., -e/-u</td>
<td>=N.</td>
<td>-a, -o</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>=N.</td>
<td>=N.</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC.</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-ima</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-ama</td>
<td>-u, -i</td>
<td>-ima</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS.</td>
<td>-om/-em</td>
<td>-ima</td>
<td>-om</td>
<td>-ama</td>
<td>-om/-em</td>
<td>-ima</td>
<td>-ju, -i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 3 below shows, in BGLD.Cro, declensions of nouns retain older forms, such as –ov/-ev for masculine and -Ø for feminine and neuter nouns in the GEN.

PL Syncretism of DAT, LOC and INS case endings for the PL (M, N, FEM.II–ima., FEM.I – ama) has not occurred as it has in HMLD.Cro.

Table 3: BGLD.Cro nominal declensions for all genders and both numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASC.</th>
<th>FEM. I</th>
<th>NEUT.</th>
<th>FEM. II (-i stem)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM.</td>
<td>- Ø</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-ov/-ev, – Ø, -i</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-om/-em</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.</td>
<td>=N.or G.</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>=N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC.</td>
<td>=N., -e/-u</td>
<td>=N.</td>
<td>=N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC.</td>
<td>=D., -i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-u, -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS.</td>
<td>-om/-em</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-om/-em</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other differences include the absence of the infix ov- in the plural for some monosyllabic M nouns, eg. HMLD.Cro gradovi NOM.M.PL ‘towns’, BGLD.Cro gradi NOM.M.PL ‘towns’, although it is possible that this represents an archaic form and it is HMLD.Cro that features the innovation. Distinct vocative forms are still retained much to the same degree that they are retained in HMLD.Cro, i.e. in the SG only. Loss of word-final velar fricative [-h] has led to a loss of the distinct LOC.PL suffixes as reported by Szucsich (2000):

(60a) u lip-ih hiža-h
     in+LOC beautiful-LOC.F.PL houses-LOC.F.PL

(60b) u lip-i hiža
     in+LOC beautiful-SYNCRETIC SUFFIX houses-SYNCRETIC SUFFIX

This change has occurred more recently than in HMLD.Cro. Loss of the velar fricative occurred in many varieties of HMLD.Cro and arguably its retention can be attributed to the conserving effect of the standard language. In nominal or adjectival paradigms, -h is found as an adjectival ending for GEN.PL only. Syncretism of the DAT/LOC/INS.PL nominal forms -ima (M, N), -ama (f), and –im for adjectives across all genders led to the disappearance of the –h suffix within the paradigm. We observe in (60) that a phonological change has led to the ‘loss’ of a distinct form, so that the ‘remaining morphology’ (-a) resembles that found in other
forms, e.g. NOM.F.SG. This comparatively recent change may also be responsible for avoidance strategies reported amongst some speakers. For example, Szucsich (2000) observes that younger speakers often display insecurity in distinguishing or producing LOC.PL forms, and this insecurity is a catalyst for avoidance of this form and employment of alternatives, eg:

(61) \( \text{pominati se o nekom} \)  
\( \text{talk-INF REFL about+LOC someone+LOC} \)

\( \text{pominati se prik koga} \)  
\( \text{talk-INF REFL about+ACC someone-ACC} \)

‘to talk about someone’ > ‘to talk about someone’

Ger.

\( \text{sich über jemanden unterhalten} \)  
\( \text{REFL about+ACC someone-ACC talk-INF} \)

In MOL.Cro only two declension classes have been preserved, governed exclusively by the gender category. So there is a masculine declension, based on the former o-declension of masculines and neuters, with alternative endings in some cases, going mainly back to the older opposition of neuters and masculines, for example \( -\text{a} (-\text{e}, -\text{o}) \) in the NOM/ACC.SG and \( -\text{e} -\text{ā} \) in the NOM/ACC.PL. The animacy opposition, with the ACC.SG being homonymous either with the NOM or with the GEN, has become optional. So, nouns referring to persons and animals are now usually declined as non-animate nouns (with variation), probably due to Italian influence, where grammatical animacy is missing, e.g. \( \text{Vidim na ljud (ACC=NOM)} \) as well as \( \text{vidim jenga ljudata (ACC=GEN)} \) ‘I see a man’. Table 4 below shows MOL.Cro nominal declensions from Kruč; suprasegmentals are omitted (see Breu 2017b: 22–34).

Table 4: MOL.Cro nominal declensions for both genders and both numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MASC</th>
<th></th>
<th>FEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SG.</td>
<td>PL.</td>
<td>SG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>-Ø, -a</td>
<td>-a, -ē</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-Ø, -i</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-i, -ami</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>=N.or G.</td>
<td>=a, -e</td>
<td>=u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>-am, -om</td>
<td>-i, -ami</td>
<td>=om</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above paradigm does not include voc, as the nom form is used when addressing or calling out to others. The nominal paradigms of the dialects of Mundimitar and Filič differ somewhat from the declensions above (Breu 2017b: 22–34; Peša Matracki & Županović Filipin 2013). A distinct loc case is also absent from the above paradigm as the movement/position opposition between acc and loc has been lost and peculiarly loc morphology is found only in, for example, unanalysed adverbial phrases (Breu 2008). One of the most conspicuous features of the above paradigm is that MOL.Cro has completely lost its neuter gender in nouns. The influence of Italian seems obvious here as Italian has lost neuter gender. But neuter gender does remain in MOL.Cro as a relic form in specific contexts, namely with adjectives and pronouns in impersonal utterances (see below section 6.1.1). Breu (2013a) has shown that the contact situation accounts even for retention of neuter gender in MOL.Cro adjectives, due to the model of Molise Italian that itself has retained neuter gender in this case. Most frequently, former neuter nouns have become masculine, either keeping or losing their endings in the nom/acc.sg. In the latter case, only in Mundimitar (MM) is the original form retained, whereas otherwise -o and -e turn into -a (akanje or vowel reduction to -a), e.g. Kruč zlat (≠ zlato MM) ‘gold’; brda (≠brdo MM) ‘hill’; mor (all dialects) (≠more) ‘sea’; grozja (≠grozdje MM) ‘grapes’. In the Kruč variety, however, several former neuters have become feminine, e.g. sreba f (≠srebro m MM) ‘silver’, neba f (≠nebo m MM) ‘sky’. Former feminine nouns ending in a consonant (historical i-declension) have either kept their gender by entering the a-declension or they have turned into masculines retaining the original zero ending. In contrast to the formerly neuter nouns, for which the new gender distribution is arbitrary (though masculine gender is absolutely dominant), the new gender of the former fem.ii nouns depends on the gender of the Italian equivalent:18

(62) MOL.Cro Italian HMLD.Cro
riča f parola f word riječ f.ii
stvara f cosa f thing stvar f.ii
noča f notte f night noč f.ii
kost m osso m bone kost f.ii
krv m sangue m blood krv f.ii
pamet m giudizio m sense pamet f.ii

---

18 Even some f.i nouns (a-stems) are now masculine, for example, mbrav m ‘ant’ in Montemitro, but preserved as mbrava f in Kruč.
In the plural, grammatical gender has been lost completely, which is not a feature of the local Italian contact varieties. This is a secondary result of the NOM.PL merging with the genderless ACC.PL (Breu 2013a: 94–103).

As stated, language contact is responsible for the loss of LOC in MOL.Cro, as Italian does not differentiate between expressing ‘location’ and ‘motion towards a location’. In standard Italian in chiesa means both ‘in the church’ and ‘(in)to the church’. This polysemic model was copied by merging the LOC as a rule with the ACC, now expressing both concepts in MOL.Cro, too: e.g. stojim u crikvu (ACC.SG.F) ‘I am in the church’; su pol u crikvu (ACC.SG.F) ‘they went to the church’. But this full merger is only the final result, restricted, by now, to Kruč and Filič. In the DAT.SG.F, a characteristic difference has developed between the respective MOL.Cro varieties, with the original -i being preserved in Filič, but lost in Mundimitar for phonetic reasons and substituted by the accusative ending -u in Kruč, for example: divojki ≠ divojk ≠ divojku DAT.SG.F ‘girl’. The merger of the DAT with the ACC in Kruč seems to be a secondary effect of the disintegration of the LOC, originally linked with the DAT by at least partial homonymy. Therefore, the dialectal differentiation in the dative could also be an indirect consequence of language contact. In the Mundimitar dialect bare (unattributed) feminine nouns still take the form of the DAT that is traditionally identical with the LOC in the a-declension, and again homonymous for both concepts, e.g. stojim / su pol u crikv (DAT.SG.F) ‘I am in / they went to church’. At the same time, attributed feminines like all masculines show the accusative: u našu crikvu ACC.SG.F ‘in / to our church’. Things become still more complicated as the Mundimitar dialect has additionally developed an adverbial form in -o, again polysemic for both concepts, e.g. na-miso ‘in / to the mass’; na-našo ‘in / into our [language]’, the designation given to the MOL.Cro language in that village (Breu 2008).

As for the other case forms, the instrumental of means, originally expressed by bare nouns, merged with the comitative instrumental, resulting in an obligatory use of the preposition s ‘with’, e.g. je otvorila vrata s ‘with’+INS ključam ‘she opened the door with a key’. This corresponds to the Italian prepositional model con la chiave, equally polysemic for both functions. In standard HMLD.Cro the comitative instrumental is expressed without a preposition, e.g. otvorila je vrata ključem, while many non-standard HMLD.Cro varieties do include the preposition in the same construction. In the MOL.Cro genitive, we likewise find the preposition do ‘of’, corresponding to Italian di, although only optionally, e.g. hiže GEN.SG.F ~ do hiže GEN.SG.F. The genitive ending itself is preserved, as it is in all other grammatical cases. The influence of Italian di is apparent in the incidence of od ‘of’/‘from’ as a periphrastic marker of possession, together with GEN in diaspora varieties, e.g. ITAL.Cro (Županović Filipin, Hlavac and Piasevoli, this volume) and TRS.Cro (Piasevoli, this volume).

As there is no comprehensive grammatical description of the dialects of Šokac- and Bošnjak-Croats, the following table, Table 5, summarises the declen-
sion paradigms for nouns of the Pomurje-Croatian, the only systematically described Croatian dialect in Hungary, so far.

Table 5: HUN.Cro nominal declensions for both genders and both numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MASC.</th>
<th>FEM. I</th>
<th>NEUT.</th>
<th>FEM. II (-i stem)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SG.</td>
<td>PL.</td>
<td>SG.</td>
<td>PL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-of/-ef, -i, Ø</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-i, Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-om/-am, -em</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>=G, N</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-u, -a</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>aj/ej</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-aj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>-um</td>
<td>-ami/-omi,-mi</td>
<td>-um</td>
<td>-ami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The declension paradigm of Pomurje-Croatian (reconstructed by Rácz 2009, 2012) are similar to those of the corresponding Kajkavian-dialects of HMLD.Cro. (For a detailed overview of the case morphology of Kajkavian dialects see Lončarić 1996). Pomurje-Croatian has a richer case morphology than HMLD.Cro, which is demonstrated by the low number of syncretic forms in the plural.

There is a syncretism of ACC and GEN in M.SG both in animate and inanimate nouns, if they have a direct object function in the sentence, or if they are combined with the preposition po meaning ‘for’, e.g. Idi po stolca! (go-IMP. for-PREP chair-ACC.M.SG), literally ‘Go for the chair!’, i.e. ‘Bring the chair!’. Otherwise, NOM and ACC are syncretic in prepositional phrases, even for animate nouns. The only exception is the preposition za, which differentiates between animate and inanimate nouns. In prepositional phrases of za, the patterns are the same as in HMLD.Cro. The only vocative case marking is in F.SG, e.g. Maru! ‘Mara!’, mamul! ‘mum!’.

All monosyllabic M.PL nouns are short, e.g. noži ‘knives’, poži ‘snails’, rogi ‘horns’. The ending -ov/-ev (GEN.PL) from the old u-declension paradigm is transferred to the masculine declension paradigm (GEN.PL), whereby the voiced fricative ‘v’ is replaced by its voiceless counterpart ‘f’. Furthermore, the old ending -eh/-ah for LOC.PL is preserved, but the velar fricative ‘h’ is replaced by the palatal approximant j. The ending -ah comes from feminine paradigm, but its use is now extended to the masculine and neuter paradigms as well. The extended use of the suffix -ami in INS.PL in all three declension classes is a similar case.

A further specific feature compared to HMLD.Cro is the use of two different endings for marking DAT and LOC in neuter SG – making a distinction between
nouns with an -o and -e ending, e.g. v seli in village-LOC.N.SG ‘in the village’, na moriju on sea-LOC.N.SG ‘at the seaside’. The ending -i comes from the old palatal paradigm of neuter nouns. The suffix -u (from the old u-declension) is used for marking DAT and LOC in HMLD.Cro as well.

The Ø-ending in GEN.PL in all declension classes is also a difference compared to HMLD.Cro, and it is used for certain nouns in the masculine and neuter paradigms. In GEN.M.PL it occurs for the nouns penes ‘money’ and čas ‘time’ only, while in in GEN.N.PL it occurs for leto ‘year’ and drevo ‘wood’ only. However, it is interchangable in GEN.F.PL with the other alternative ending -i, e.g. žen-Ø and ženi ‘woman’-GEN.F.PL.

In HUN.Cro there are instances in which speakers show uncertainty in gender selection in the agreement patterns triggered by complex subjects. This variation in the marking of gender is shown in examples (63) to (65) below. Variation in the marking of gender in agreement patterns can be triggered by so-called problematic subjects (Corbett 2006), where grammatical gender is either different from the natural gender of the subject or whose gender is selected according to specific rules of agreement in Croatian. Such problematic subjects can be conjoined noun phrases, hybrid nouns and quantified nouns. It is not clear according to which criteria the gender of the subjects in the sentences below is allocated. In example (63) the target form is feminine plural; in (64) it is neuter plural, and in (65) it is neuter singular (cf. Pišković 2011; Babič 1998). (Examples (63) to (65) are from speakers of HUN.Cro who are younger than 30.) All the data in this section is from Rácz (2012) and Vuk’s data corpora.

(63) šuma i livada su bila zelena.
wood-NOM.F.SG and meadow-NOM.F.SG AUX-3Pl be-SG.F./PL.N green- SG.F./PL.N
‘The wood and the meadow are green.’

(64) djeca su se igrale u dvorištu
children.NOM.F.SG AUX-3Pl refl. play-PTCP.F.PL in+LOC
courtyard-SG.M.LOC
‘Children played in the courtyard.’

(65) pet knjiga su bila na stolu
five book-GEN.F.PL AUX-3Pl be-PTCP.F.SG./N.PL. on+LOC
table.SG.M.LOC
‘There were five books on the table.’
Suffix morphemes of Croatian adjectives and past participles are multi-feature morphemes, i.e. a single form indexes multiple features such as number, gender and case. Homophony of a suffix ending, e.g. –a as the suffix morpheme for NOM.F.SG and NOM.N.PL, with other endings is widespread. This is a phenomenon that is likely to facilitate syncretism, which has occurred elsewhere in HMLD.Cro. We observe comparable oscillation amongst speakers of HMLD.Cro in congruent constructions where morphology marking in the predicate is variable due to other, ‘problematic subjects’. In the examples given below, the legacy of number values (i.e. paucal or small groups numbering two to four) and the morphology usually required for nouns (for example animate nouns whose grammatical gender coincides with their natural gender) can lead to insecurity as to morphological marking. For HMLD. Cro speakers, such ‘problematic subjects’ can lead to variation in the form of predicate constructions. Three examples are given below:

(66a)  
\[ \text{dva muškarca su došla} \]
\[ \text{two+gen.sg man-PAUC AUX-3Pl came-PAUC (homophonous with N.PL form)} \]

(66b)  
\[ \text{dva muškarca su došli} \]
\[ \text{two+gen.sg man.PAUC AUX-3Pl came-M.PL} \]

(66c)  
\[ \text{dva muškarca je došlo} \]
\[ \text{two+gen.sg man.PAUC AUX-3sg came-N.SG} \]

‘Two men came.’

The first instance given above (66a) has agreement between the form of the participle and the paucal form of the subject, which is the normative and standard form. (This form is identical to the NEUT.PL ending.) This form is also arguably the most common form across non-standard varieties of HMLD.Cro. The second instance (66b) given above has a M.PL participle induced by the clearly plural and male features of the antecedent subject. This form is less frequent in non-standard varieties of HMLD.Cro, but it is also the only form used in BGLD.Cro (Benčić et al. 2003:164). The third instance (66c) has N.SG marking for the participle and a SG.AUX verb. The N.SG marking on the predicate verb is the required form when the subject denotes a larger number i.e. between ‘five’ to ‘nine’. But N.SG marked predicates are less common and considered non-standard when the subject denotes a less number such as ‘two’. Still, N.SG with paucal subjects is possible in many speakers’ vernaculars (Franks 2009: 362). Breu (2013b: 13) remarks that the paucal, perhaps surprisingly, is retained in
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MOL.Cro, eg. dva kafela PC teple nom.pl ‘two hot coffees’. (The adj teple ‘hot’ is post-posed as in most attributive constructions). Instances of variable case marking after lower number paucals are recorded in TRS.Cro (Piasevoli, this volume) and USA.Cro (Jutronić, this volume).

To return to the HUN.Cro examples above, the grammatical feature of gender-marking of nouns is non-existent in Hungarian. The forms contained in examples (63) to (65) above cannot be directly linked to the influence of Hungarian. Instead, they appear as a consequence of a general language contact situation.

In other NPs, there can be features preceding a noun that reflect forms modelled on the contact situation. In the following examples, written texts in BGLD.Cro feature attributive constructions preceding a noun. In BGLD.Cro NPs can occur in attributive position describing a following noun:

(67) BGLD.Cro . . . kani postaviti 35 metri visok jarbol
   . . . intends to set up a 35-metre high flagpole

Ger. . . . hat vor einen 35 Meter hohen Fahnenmast aufzustellen

HMLD.Cro . . . kani postaviti jarbol visok 35 metara.

HMLD.Cro does not allow multi-element NPs in an attributive position in the way that BGLD.Cro allows this. The usage of participial constructions in attributive position to form extended attributes (Ger. erweiterte Attribute) or extended participial modifiers (Ger. erweiterte Partizipialbestimmungen) is a feature of German syntax that can be transferred into BGLD. Cro, especially in written texts. (The same construction also exists in HMLD.Cro Kajkavian and this is also a result of German influence.) An example of an extended participial modifier is found below, again from a written text:

(68) BGLD.Cro Cesar je svaki dan išao okolo podneva po njem na trg, i je donde jednu svotu pinez hitio med onde jur na njega čekajuće ljude.
   ‘Caesar walked around the square every day at midday and threw a bundle of money at people waiting for him.’

Ger. Caesar ging jeden Tag um Mittag auf dem Platz spazieren und warf einmal ein Bündel Geld auf die auf ihn wartenden Leute.

HMLD.Cro Cesar je svaki dan oko podneva išao u šetnju na trg i jednom je bacio svotu novaca među ljude koji su ga čekali.

In HUN.Cro, some adjectives are indeclinable with most of them being borrowings from Hungarian – see above examples (10) and (11) – or from German, e.g. fest ‘strong’. Two other indeclinable adjectives huhu ‘crazy’ and šukšuk ‘crazy’
are onomathopoeic lexemes. Further to this, as in HMLD.Cro, adjectives can be functions as nominal subjects. Examples of this are \texttt{mrtef\textsubscript{M.SG}} (‘dead’) meaning ‘dead body, corpse’; \texttt{debeli\textsubscript{M.PL}} (‘fat’) meaning ‘fat people’; and \texttt{bogati\textsubscript{M.PL}} ‘rich’ denoting ‘rich people’ (Rácz 2012: 141–146). An instance of a nominalised adjective is given in (69):

\begin{align*}
(69) \text{mrtef} & \text{ je } \text{ pre } \text{ hiži.} \\
\text{dead-NOM.SG.M} & \text{ be-3SG at+LOC home-LOC.F.SG} \\
\text{‘The corpse is in the house.’}
\end{align*}

A common phenomenon in German is nominalisation with compound nouns (Ger. Komposita). Relatively few are recorded amongst BGLD.Cro speakers, and the example given below is uncharacteristic of the way that denotations or concepts expressed in German via compound nouns are rendered in BGLD.Cro:

\begin{align*}
(70) \text{Po maši je jur na korušu počelo željenje sričnih Vazmenih svetkov.} \\
\text{‘After mass the members of the choir started their well-wishing of Happy Easter to each other’}.
\end{align*}

Ger. Nach der heiligen Messe wünschten sich die Menschen im Kirchenchor schöne Ostertage.

HMLD.Cro Nakon mise je na koru počelo čestitanje uskrsnih blagdana.

\text{(Sučić et al. 2003: 595)}

Otherwise, BGLD.Cro equivalents of German compound nouns are expressed via NPs with multiple attributes or through extended attributes.

6.1.1 Adjectives

The nominal paradigms of BGLD.Cro and HUN.Cro have been presented above in 6.1. The adjectival paradigms in ‘HUN-Pom.Cro’ show a number of peculiar forms that are more numerous than that of HMLD.Cro due to its lack of syncretism of \texttt{LOC/}

\texttt{DAT/INS.PL} morphological markers. Instead of marking all three cases in plural by an \texttt{-im} ending as in HMLD.Cro, ‘HUN-Pom.Cro’ has an \texttt{-am} ending for \texttt{DAT}, an \texttt{-ami} ending for \texttt{INS}, and an \texttt{-aj} ending for \texttt{LOC} in all four declension classes. A detailed overview of the adjectival paradigms in ‘HUN-Pom.Cro’ is provided by Rácz (2012). The adjectival paradigms feature congruent differences in relation to HMLD.Cro, especially the adjectival paradigm of MOL.Cro. MOL.Cro adjectives, in contrast to nouns, have retained their three-gender system, with the productive neuter in \texttt{-o}
(base form before its shortening) being restricted to substantivisations, e.g. ono velko ‘the big (thing)’, jeno dobro ‘a good (thing)’. The different behaviour of the neuter with nouns and adjectives corresponds to a similar situation in Italian, especially in the central and southern dialects. The same is true for the preservation of the impersonal neuter of verbs (Breu 2013a: 105–111). A full description of MOL.Cro’s adjectival paradigm is not given here; see Breu (2017b: 34–37). Instead, comparative and superlative forms are presented here from MOL.Cro.

In MOL.Cro, in the category of comparison, the comparative and the superlative have been transformed into analytic constructions like veča lipi ‘more beautiful’, naveča lipi ‘most beautiful’, different from the traditional synthetic forms in HMLD.Cro of the type ljepši, najljepši. These analytical constructions correspond to Italian piú bello, il piú bello. The adaptation to the Italian model goes so far as to preserve exactly the same suppletive comparatives as Italian does, for example dobar – bolji ‘good, better’, grubi – gori ‘bad, worse’, just like Italian buono – migliore, cattivo – peggio. Moreover, as in the local Italian dialects, pleonastic forms like veča bolji ‘more better’ are possible. Even the frequent substitution of the adjectival comparative by the corresponding adverb has been copied. So instead of bolji the form bolje appears, just like Italians use the adverb meglio in the sense of the adjectival comparative migliore ‘better’ (Breu 2009).

In BGLD.Cro there are no differences in the formation of comparative and superlative forms vis-à-vis HMLD.Cro. In HUN.Pom.Cro comparative forms are either made by adding the infixes -š/-eš, e.g. mefek–mekši ‘soft-softer’, lepi-lepši ‘beautiful-more beautiful’; zdrav–zdraveši ‘healthy-healthier’, niski – nižeši ‘low-lower’. Comparative formation can occur in an analytical way, i.e. by combining the adverb bole ‘better’ with the positive form of the adjective, e.g. pijan – bole pijan ‘drunk – more drunk’. Some adjectives have both synthetic and analytical forms, e.g. široki – širši/bole široki ‘wide – wider’. Amongst a small number of adjectives, with both synthetic and analytical comparatives, a difference in the meanings of the two forms can be observed, e.g. dragi – dražeši ‘expensive – more expensive’ compared to dragi – bole dragi ‘nice – nicer’.

Superlative forms are made with the prefix naj-, which is added to the comparative form as in HMLD.Cro, e.g. lepi-lepši-najlepši ‘beautiful – more beautiful – the most beautiful’. On the other hand, there are analytical superlatives, which are either a combination of the adverb najbole ‘best’ (the superlative form of the adjective dober ‘good’), and the positive of another adjective, e.g. betežen – najbole betežen ‘sick – the most sick’, or they are made by adding different verbal prefixes such as prek ‘over’ or adverbs such as preveč or prekveč ‘too much’ to the positive form of the adjectives, e.g. pijan – preveč pijan ‘drunk – too drunk/the most drunk’. An instance of transferred comparative from English (with the
suffix \-er\) is recorded in the NZ.Cro sample \(\text{see Stoffel and Hlavac, this volume}\) and this form occurs periphrastically with the Croatian comparative više ‘more’.

### 6.2 Paradigms – verbs

BGLD.Cro, MOL.Cro and HUN.Cro feature the use of verb forms that contrast from that found in HMLD.Cro, or which are restricted to certain HMLD.Cro dialects. For example, BGLD.Cro, features an honorific 3Pl form used for 3SG subjects. This construction is known in some Kajkavian folk songs in HMLD.Cro:

\[
\text{(71) } \text{mamica } \text{su } \text{štrukle } \text{pekli } \text{meni} \\
\text{mummy-3SG.F AUX-3PL strudels.ACC.PL bake.PST.3PL.M me-DAT} \\
\text{nisu } \text{nikaj } \text{rekli} \\
\text{NEG.AUX-3PL nothing say.PST.3PL.M} \\
\text{‘Mummy (3SG) baked (3PL) strudels but [she] didn’t (3PL) tell (3PL) me.’}
\]

The line from this folk song contains a SG.F subject while all verb morphology, both AUX and PTCP, is clearly PL.M. According to Pišković (2011: 251), this construction is restricted to a small number of non-standard HMLD.Cro dialects. In BGLD.Cro this construction also occurs and it is most probably reinforced by an equivalent (but also marked) Ger. construction, eg. \text{der Herr Professor sind in den Ruhestand getreten} ‘the professor have retired’ (cf. Vulić and Petrović 1999: 51). Houtzagers (2012: 277) records the following example:

\[
\text{(72) } \text{njeguov } \text{otadz } \text{už } \text{vig } \text{živu} \\
\text{his-3SG.M father-3SG.M already still live-3PL} \\
\text{sat } \text{su } \text{sedamdesjet lit stari} \\
\text{now be-3PL seventy+GEN.PL year-gen.n.PL old-M.PL} \\
\text{‘His father are (= ‘is’) still alive. He are (= ‘is’) now seventy years old.’}
\]

This construction is, like its (Austrian) German counterpart, a marked one. In a comparison of 3sg verb forms found in a wide variety of speech samples Houtzagers (2012: 298) concludes that the form is used by “persons who are respected by the speaker in the affectionate way a child respects (or is by tradition bound to respect) an older relative”, with further limited instances of its use restricted to those expressing closeness to others, sometimes also non-relatives. Here, the transfer of a feature carrying socio-pragmatic information (an honorific form), the 3PL verb form with a 3SG subject, in German is carried over into the BGLD.Cro varieties of some speakers. The honorific third person plural is currently not a change to the verbal paradigm.
of BGLD.Cro (in the same way that the same form does not represent a change to the German verbal paradigm). But forms like this may lead to other more wide-ranging innovations.

In HUN-Pom.Cro, Vuk also records similar instances of this use of a SG subject co-occuring with PL verb forms:

(73)  
\[ \text{tak su rekli} \]  
\[ \text{Štigarovi tetec} \]  
\[ \text{such AUX-3PL say-3PL.M Štigar-POSS.M.PL uncle-M.SG} \]  
\[ \text{‘That’s what Štigar’s uncle said’} \]

This type of use of pragmatic features carried via employment of a marked verb form is not unusual. Concord between second person forms (singular and plural, formal and non-formal) and verbal forms has, over time, changed in many Romance and Germanic languages. In addition to diachronic evidence, there is synchronic evidence for more recent innovations that have occurred in different national varieties of Spanish and Portuguese. Marked forms in BGLD.Cro can become unmarked ones, depending on a range of circumstances. The influence of HMLD.Cro and the codification of a standard BGLD.Cro, however, have a conserving effect rendering this kind of further change unlikely. Grammatically singular subjects also co-occur with plural verb forms in AUS.Cro (see Hlavac and Stolac, this volume). Here external influence is clear where the equivalent English forms (e.g. obitelj – family, većina – majority) usually call for plural predicates in English.

In MOL.Cro, the most important contact-induced change in its tense system is the development of a de-obligative future, formed with the auxiliary jimat ‘to have, must’. This verb originally only had possessive meaning, but by copying the polysemic model of southern Italian avé ‘to have, must’ it acquired the additional meanings of ‘must’ and the function of building a future tense referring to necessary or planned states of affairs. As MOL.Cro traditionally had a volitive future tense, formed with the auxiliary tit ‘will, to want’ (HMLD.Cro htjeti), a modal opposition between these future forms came into being, with the volitive future being reduced to a future of probability (Breu 2011a: 156–158):

(74)  
\[ \text{ču dokj mam dokj} \]  
\[ \text{will-1SG come-INF have-1SG come-INF} \]  
\[ \text{‘I will (probably) come.’  vs.  ‘I will come (as planned).’} \]

For a description of the MOL.Cro verb system, including full paradigms, based on the Kruč dialect with references to the other varieties, see Breu (2017b: 46–63).
Another important contact influence did not induce a new tense, but instead prevented its disappearance. In HMLD.Cro, as in most other Slavic languages, the past perfect is not commonly used and its use is marked, indicating emphasis. But in MOL.Cro it is frequent and productive, due to transfer of concord of tenses from Italian. This means that an event occurring prior to another event in the past must be expressed by the past perfect. The composition of this compound tense differs both from Croatian and from Italian in having a fixed particle bi (with variant ba in Mundimitar and Filič). It fuses in most forms with the perfect, for example, zbi doša ‘I/you had come’, derived from the perfects sa doša ‘I have come’ and si doša ‘you have come’. In the 1st and 2nd person of the plural it is even infixed, e.g. zbi ma dol ‘we had come’, from the perfect sa ma dol ‘we have come’. This particle bi (or ba) is different from the inflected conditional marker (in Kruč: bi for all sg forms, bima, bita, bi for pl forms – see below). An example is the paradigm of the past perfect in the Kruč dialect for ‘I have put’ sa bi vrfa (Mundimitar forms are different, with, for example smo ba vrl ~ zbamo vrl ‘we had put’). The forms of the MOL.Cro past perfect are given in Table 6 (Breu 2017b: 56–57).

Table 6: Past perfect forms in MOL.Cro – aux-bit + bi + ptcp (in part, fused).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MASC.</td>
<td>FEM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sa bi vrfa ~ zbi vrfa</td>
<td>sa bi vrla ~ zbi vrla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>si bi vrfa ~ zbi vrfa</td>
<td>si bi vrla ~ zbi vrla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>je bi vrfa</td>
<td>je bi vrla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another consequence of copying the concord of tenses is the development of analytic constructions for the future in the past, with the same modal opposition as in the normal future. These forms show the clitic imperfect of the auxiliaries from tit (‘will’, ‘to want’) and jimat (‘to have, must’), e.g.:

(75) čahu dokj vs. mahu dokj

\[ \text{will-IMPF.1SG} \text{ come-INF} \quad \text{have-IMPF.1SG} \text{ come-INF} \]

‘I would (probably) come.’  ‘I would come (as planned).’

The direct model for the de-obligative future in the past of the type mahu dokj ‘I would come (as planned)’ is the dialectal construction with the imperfect of avé ‘to have, must’ + infinitive. The volitive future in the past čahu dokj ‘I would
(probably) come’ is an internal analogical construction based on the modal opposition in the simple future. It exists only in the Kruč dialect. In standard Italian it is the (past) conditional that serves also as a future in the past, in the given case sarei venuto. Based on this model the MOL.Cro conditional bi doša can also be used as a third (neutral) form expressing the future in the past (Breu 2019: 403 fn. 23; 2017b: 335). Table 7 below sets out the 3sg.m verbs forms for the verb pitati ‘to ask’ found in BGLD.Cro, MOL.Cro (Kruč), HUN-Pom.Cro and HMLD.Cro.

Table 7: Verb tenses and forms in BGLD.Cro, MOL.Cro, HUN-Pom.Cro and HMLD.Cro.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BGLD.Cro</th>
<th>MOL.Cro</th>
<th>HUN-Pom.Cro</th>
<th>HMLD.Cro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>pitati</td>
<td>pitat</td>
<td>pitati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>pita (pitaju)</td>
<td>pita</td>
<td>pita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative (2sg)</td>
<td>pitaj</td>
<td>pitaj</td>
<td>pitaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>pitaša</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>je pitao</td>
<td>je pita</td>
<td>je pital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past perfect</td>
<td>je bio pitao</td>
<td>je bi pita</td>
<td>bil pital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future I</td>
<td>pitat će</td>
<td>ča pitat (probability) ma pitat (de-obligative)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future II</td>
<td>bude pitao</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>bo pital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future expressed in past</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>čaša pitat (probability) maša pitat (de-obligative)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional I</td>
<td>bi pitao</td>
<td>bi pita</td>
<td>bi pital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional II</td>
<td>bi bio imao</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>bil bi pital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present participle (present verbal adverb)</td>
<td>pitajući</td>
<td>pitajuč</td>
<td>pitajuč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past participle (past verbal adverb)</td>
<td>pitavši</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive participle</td>
<td>pitan</td>
<td>pitan</td>
<td>(po)pitaní</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perfect formation itself resisted contact influence, as it continues to be formed exclusively by means of the auxiliary bit and the active l-participle, as in sa doša ‘I have come’, differing from the Italian way of forming the perfect by means of avere ‘to have’ (or essere ‘to be’ with intransitives) and the passive participle. MOL.Cro has a construction that is not a fully developed verb tense but a marginal construction, formed with aux jimat ‘have’ and the passive n/t-participle. However,
it has only resultative function referring to the present: *jima dvi sprte pozane nazjamu*, i.e. literally ‘S/he has two baskets (having been) put to the ground’.

The category of aspect has kept its traditional composition of a morphosyntactic opposition of the imperfect and the perfect on the one side, e.g. *rabahu* ‘I was working’ vs. *sa rabija* ‘I worked’, and the derivative opposition of perfective vs. imperfective on the other. In view of the tendency for instances of morphosyntactic opposition to be subject to attrition, not only in Slavic languages spoken as minority ones in contact situations, but also ‘homeland varieties’, including HMLD.Cro where the perfect tense has almost completely replaced both the aorist and the imperfect, preservation of the imperfect in MOL.Cro may be viewed as an effect of language contact with Italian as the influencing model. The contact influence arguably goes much deeper. In all Slavic languages when at least one member of the older threefold opposition between imperfect, aorist and perfect was found to be attrited, it was always the imperfect that was lost first. This is a diachronic constant of Slavic. In Romance languages there is an opposite trend: the aorist is the first to disappear. This is exactly what has happened in the colloquial and dialectal Italian of Lower Molise: the aorist (*passato remoto*) has disappeared, while the imperfect was kept. MOL.Cro has followed this path by replacing the Slavic diachronic pattern with the Romance one (Breu 2011a: 163–169). In addition, as in Italian, the imperfect is obligatory for expressing processes and unlimited states and can never be replaced by the imperfective **l**-perfect, contrary to what has happened in HMLD.Cro. While the aorist has been lost in MOL.Cro, verbs with imperfective and perfective aspect can be rendered in the imperfect (Breu 2014).

Derivative aspect opposition has been preserved in MOL.Cro. There is only a slight difference with respect to other Slavic languages in that prefixation is no longer a productive means for building aspectual pairs, probably due to the fact that in Italian prefixes have no role in the semantic field of aspectuality. But traditional pairs like *krest IPFV / ukrest PFV* ‘to steal’ or *must IPFV / pomust PFV* ‘to milk’ continue to be used. In any case, the derivative aspect opposition based on suffixation like *kupit PFV vs. kupivat (MM kupiljat) ~ kupovat IPFV* is fully productive, even in borrowings, as mentioned above. The reason for this conservatism is probably due to the fact that in Italian there is no model for its reduction, just like in the category of case, apart from the **LOC**.

---

20 Both oppositions freely combine with each other, with special functions for the ‘contradictory’ combinations of the perfective imperfect (habituality) and the imperfective perfect (delimitation). See Breu (2014) for more details.

21 See Breu, Berghaus & Scholze (2017) for further details about the aspectual characteristics of MOL.Cro and other Slavic micro-languages in contact situations, including BGLD.Cro.
In the category of mood the functional polysemy of the imperfect has been copied from colloquial Italian, where the imperfect has both indicative (aspect-temporal) and counterfactual meaning. As a consequence, the MOL.Cro imperfect is competing now with the traditional bi-conditional and, indeed continually gaining ground, for example *dojahma IPRF.1PL = bihma COND.1PL dol PTCP.PL* ‘we would have come’. A counterfactual imperfect is very unusual in other Slavic languages (Breu 2011a: 173–175).

In MOL.Cro the contact situation appears to be responsible for instances of semi-calques such as *stojima siduč* ‘we are sitting’ that features the MOL.Cro verb *stat* ‘to stand, to be’ (cf. HMLD.Cro *stati* ‘to become’ and *stajati* ‘to stand’) and a gerund. This is not an example of grammaticalisation based on Ital. **PRS.PROGRESSIVE** formed by means of **AUX stare** ‘to be (located)’ plus **PRS.GERUND**, but an indirect calque of Italian *siamo seduti* ‘we are sitting’, with the gerund (present verbal adverb) *siduč* replacing the Italian (passive) past participle *seduti*. Local Ital. Molise varieties do not contain the Italian type of **PRS.PROGRESSIVE**, but instead the adverb *mo* ‘now’ is employed as a progressive marker with a present-tense verb *mo viene* ‘he is coming’. This construction is calqued in MOL.Cro as *sa gre* ‘he is coming’ (*sa = sada* ‘now’). A clear case of grammaticalisation has occurred based on the Italian imminentive, formed with the help of **stare per**, lit. ‘to be (located)’ + ‘for’, meaning ‘about to’ + INF, eg. *sta per partire* ‘s/he is about to leave’. The MOL.Cro equivalent is the construction *stat za + INF*, e.g. *stoji za partit* ‘s/he is about to leave’ (Breu 2011: 171–172).

HUN-Pom.Cro shows a simplified tense system compared with that of HMLD.Cro. From the five actively used tenses in HMLD.Cro, four are preserved: perfect and past perfect, present. The two aorist forms found in the corpus (*bi* ‘be’ and *reko* ‘tell.AOR.1SG’ ‘I told/I am telling’) are fossilised and have their own specific functions: the first one – in combination with an *l*-participle – marks the conditional mood as in HMLD.Cro, e.g. *bi rekel* ‘be-AOR.3SG. tell.PTCP.M.SG’ ‘he would tell’. The second is used as a discourse marker, in this instance as a turn commencer, e.g. *Reko, pem s tobom.* ‘tell’-AOR1SG, ‘go’-PRS.1SG, ‘with’-PREP ‘you’-SG. INS. ‘Actually, I will go with you’.

The verb *imati* (‘to have’) is exclusively used to express possessive meaning, i.e. it is not used in existential construction. That semantic gap has been filled by the special verb *jega* (‘there is’) and its negative form *nega* (‘there is not’). Both are fossilised forms and are indeclinable occurring only in the 3SG present. The logical subject in these constructions is in GEN (Rácz 2012, Vuk research data corpus). HMLD.Cro does not have a peculiar form used for existential constructions, and instead employs *ima* (‘have-PRS.3SG’) and *nema* (‘NEG+have-PRS.3SG’) as equivalents to HUN-Pom.Cro *jega* and *nega*.
An added difference compared to HMLD.Cro, is the simplified construction for marking unreal conditions in conditional sentences. The conjunctive *daj* (HMLD.Cro *da* ‘if’) and the indeclinable negative marker *nej* are combined with an *l*-participle. The construction is insofar simplified, as the original negative form of the verb *biti* (‘be’) is replaced by an indeclinable negative marker, and the main verb is always expressed by its *l*-participle form, irrespective of the temporal meaning of the construction. The tense of the main verb in HMLD.Cro changes according to the temporal reference, i.e. present unreal conditions are expressed by the present tense, past conditions by the past tense. In HUN-Pom.Cro, the main verb is always an *l*-participle, which is demonstrated in (78) and (79) below (Rácz 2012).

(78)  
*daj nej*  
tak dugo *spala,*  
*if NEG so long sleep-PST.F.SG everything*  
*bi mogla zgotoviti*  
*COND-2.SG can-PST.F.SG finish-INF*  
‘If you hadn’t been sleeping so long, you could have finished everything.’

HMLD.Cro

*da nisi tako dugo *spavalada*  
*COMP NEG.AUX-2SG so long sleep-PST.F.SG*  
*mogla bi sve završiti*  
*can-PST.F.SG COND.2SG everything finish-INF*

(79)  
*daj nej*  
vek *pil*  
*if NEG always drink-PST.M.SG be-PST.M.SG COND3.SG*  
trezen  
*sober-NOM.M.SG*  
‘If he didn’t always drink, he would be sober.’
Frequent employment of the reflexive pronoun se is a phenomenon typical for Kajkavian dialects. This tendency can also be observed in HUN-Pom.Cro as recorded by Rácz (2012) from whom all examples here are drawn. The reflexive pronoun is an obligatory argument in the following verbs that are non-reflexive verbs in HMLD. Cro: plakati se (HMLD.Cro plakati, ‘cry’), vučiti se (HMLD.Cro učiti, ‘learn’), zmisli ti se (HMLD.Cro izmisli ti, ‘think out’), stati se (HMLD.Cro u stati, ‘stand up’), vreti se (HMLD.Cro.Cro vreti, ‘boil’). The reflexive pronoun si (self.dat), which is a declined form of se, is also a frequent argument of verbs that are non-reflexive in HMLD.Cro e.g. misli ti si (HMLD.Cro misli ti, ‘think’), študerati si (HMLD.Cro raz misli ti, ‘think about’), sesti si (HMLD.Cro sjesti, ‘sit down’). In some particular verbs, the reflexive pronouns se and si have distinctive functions, eg. pumo či se (HMLD.Cro udebljati se, ‘gain weight’), pumo či si (HMLD.Cro moći, ‘to be able to do something’). In some cases, meaning differences are found with the same verb according to the presence of the reflexive marker, e.g. prati ‘wash’ (HMLD.Cro prati) and prati se ‘to menstruate’ (HMLD.Cro imati menstruaciju).

An area of interest in the contact situations is verbal aspect in which none of the other languages marks this feature in the way that Croatian, as a Slavic language, marks this. We are attentive to see if there is change occurring in this area and if there are any patterns to this. In the BGLD.Cro corpus, there are few instances of this, e.g.

(80) ja vam se zahvalim
    I you-DAT refl thank-PRES.PFV-1SG.
    ‘I thank you’

    HMLD.Cro
    ja vam zahvalj ujem
    I you-DAT thank-PRES.IPFV-1SG

Example (80) above is from a situation in which the speaker is directly addressing the other interlocutor expressing gratitude. This requires an IPFV verb but a PFV one instead is employed. The occurrence of refl se is likely to be accounted for by the German model with refl. i.e. ich bedanke mich (‘I thank myself’ = ‘I thank you’). This is of lesser interest here, more so as many non-standard varieties of HMLD.Cro feature zahvaliti/zahvaljivati ‘to thank’ also as a reflexive verb. What is of interest is that a present indicative is rendered via a PRES.PFV verb.
In the HUN.Cro corpus there are examples of change in the marking of aspect, i.e. the employment of PFV verbs in constructions that would otherwise require an IPFV verb. In example (81), the imperfective verb form is replaced by its default counterpart. The verb *dogoditi se* ‘to happen’ (as well as its close synonym *desiti se* ‘to happen’) is a telic verb, which denotes actions with an endpoint. Due to the resultative connotation of its semantic value, its default aspect is perfective. The imperfective form of the verb, *dogadati se* is used less frequently, i.e. when ongoing or durative telic actions are referred to. In example (81) from HUN-Bar. Cro (data from younger speakers) the two actions (‘see’ and ‘happen’) occur contemporaneously. Both have a durative meaning and the imperfective form is the expected one for both. However, for the second verb the perfective form is used.\(^{22}\)

(81) oni ne vide što se dogodi na dvorištu
they NEG see-3PL what refl happen-Pfv-3sg on+loc courtyard-loc.m.sg
‘They do not see what is happening in the courtyard.’

Example (82) below is another instance that, at least in the vernacular of this speaker, shows fluidity in the boundary between perfective and imperfective aspect. Although there are two parallel actions in the sentence (‘watching’ and ‘happening’), the two verbs have different aspect marking. Two imperfective verbs (*gledale* ‘watch-PtCP.IPFV.F.3Pl and *dešavalo* ‘happen-Prs.Pfv.n.3sg.’) would relate to two ongoing actions in the past. However, the combination below, containing an imperfective verb *gledale* and a perfective verb *desilo* with both referring to the same contemporaneous event, contravenes the features expressed through aspect distinction. As such, this utterance appears not only ‘ungrammatical’ to HMLD.Cro speakers, but unclear as to whether the verbs relate to the same contemporaneous event, or to two events.

(82) i mačke su gledale što se desilo
and cat-nom.f.pl. aux-3pl watch-ptcp.ipfv.f.3pl refl happen-ptcp.pfv.n.3sg
‘[…] and the cats were also watching what was happening.’

\(^{22}\) The verb *vidjeti* ‘see’ is biaspectral.
In a direct sense, the grammatical distinction of aspect is largely non-existent in Hungarian. (The presence of aspectual particles in Hungarian is not comparable to the typological feature of aspect that Slavic verbs possess.) This innovation cannot be directly linked to the influence of Hungarian. But the absence of a corresponding aspectual system or category in Hungarian verbs may function as an indirect influence in accounting for the above examples, i.e. aspect marking is not ‘checked’ as a feature of verb selection, and the ‘base’ form of the verb is employed as the default form. In most instances, the perfective is the ‘base’ form of the verb. This is the form that is used in ‘generalised’ meanings where information on completedness is no longer intended to be conveyed by the speaker via a particular verb form, thus the base (≈ perfective) form is used as the default. Looking further afield at contemporary diaspora language varieties, in cases where non-target aspect occurs, PFV verbs are found to be employed in constructions where otherwise IPFV verbs would be expected, e.g. ITAL.Cro (Županović Filipin, Hlavac and Piasevoli, this volume) TRS.Cro (Piasevoli, this volume) and AUS.Cro (Hlavac and Stolac, this volume).

6.2.1 Verb prefixes and verb constructions

A development in relation to verb forms is the prefixation of BGLD.Cro verbs with affixes that are Croatian equivalents of German derivational prefixes such as her (‘to here’ [towards speaker]), hin (‘to there’ [away from speaker]), unter (‘under’), weg (‘away’) etc. In his studies of Slavic vernaculars in the Pannonian basin, Hadrovics (1958) does not discount Hungarian influence in this innovation as Hungarian has equivalent particles or adverbs that function in a way similar to German forms. Although the choice of adverbs here is clearly based on German, it is possible that a similar use of Hungarian adverbs has a reinforcing effect.

\[(83)\]  
\[\begin{align*}
  \text{doli} & \leftarrow \text{Ger. nieder/unter/hinunter} \text{ ‘down, downwards’} \leftarrow \text{Hun. le/alá ‘down’} \\
  \text{gori} & \leftarrow \text{Ger. auf/hinauf/herauf} \text{ ‘up, upwards’} \leftarrow \text{Hun. fel ‘up’} \\
  \text{kraj} & \leftarrow \text{Ger. weg ‘away’} \leftarrow \text{Hun. elfélre ‘away’;}
  \\
  \text{najzad} & \leftarrow \text{Ger. zurück ‘back’} \leftarrow \text{Hun. vissza ‘back’}.
\end{align*}\]

In the examples listed above, the arrows represent ‘compound directionality’ of influence from German, and less directly from Hungarian. Further, Szucsich (2000) observes that this innovation includes prefixes based on prepositions such as Ger. vor ‘before, in front of’ and Hun. elő ‘forth’ that yield BGLD.Cro najpr ‘ahead’, as in si najpr zeti ‘to plan (ahead)’ (Ger. sich vornehmen). More noticeably,
this innovation can be based on adverbs as well, eg. Ger. herein/hinein/ein and Hun. be/bele that yield BGLD.Cro nutar ‘inside’ + verb, as in the following examples from Tornow (1992: 249):

(84) Kad se guščići izvalju, je donesemo nutra u toplu kuhinju
    ‘When the goslings have hatched out, we bring them into the warm kitchen’
    Ger. Wenn die Gänschen ausgeschlüpft sind, bringen wir sie in die warme Küche hinein.
    HMLD.Cro Kada se guščice izlegnu, donesemo ih u toplu kuhinju

The following examples are from Szucsich (2000) based on Hadrovics’s (1958) data:

(85) On je novine nutar doneso
    ‘He brought in the newspaper.’
    Ger. Er hat die Zeitung hereingebracht.
    HMLD.Cro Donio je novine (unutra).

(86) Oni su grad nutar zeli
    ‘They took control of the city.’
    Ger. Sie haben die Stadt eingenommen.
    HMLD.Cro Preuzeli su kontrolu nad gradom.

Verbal prefixation with an adverbial form is infrequent in most Slavic standard languages (Szucsich 2000), but is found in other Slavic languages in close contact with German, namely Upper and Lower Sorbian. Prefixes bear semantic more so than morphosyntactic features. In some cases however, there is no semantic ‘addition’ to the verb, as the content referential value of the Croatian stem already contains this meaning, cf. BGLD.Cro dolidonesti and HMLD. Croatian donijeti below. (The adverb doli means ‘down’, while gori means ‘up’).

(87) dolidonesti gorizeti krajpogledati skrozdjiti
    ‘bring here’ ‘take there’ ‘look away’ ‘come through’
    Ger. herbringen hinnehmenwegblicken durchkommen
    HMLD.Cro donijeti uzeti pogledati ustranu proći/prijeći

Similar constructions consisting of prefix+verb occur in HUN.Cro. These constructions, understood here as combinations of particular adverbs/prefixes + verbs, can result in new meanings that are not derivable from the original meaning of the two elements of the construction (cf. Goldberg 1995; Wasserscheidt 2015). Hungarian prefix+verb constructions are replicated in the HUN.Cro corpus. In
example (88) the Hungarian construction *fent lenni* (lit. ‘be up’), meaning ‘being awake’, is replicated through a combination of the appropriate adverb *gori*\(^{23}\) and verb *biti* in Croatian.

\[(88)\] dej ne-\textit{j} tako dugo \textit{gori bila}
\[\begin{align*}
\text{if} & \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{so} \quad \text{long} \quad \text{up} \quad \text{be-PTCP.F.SG} \\
\text{‘If you} & \quad \text{hadn’t been up} \quad [= \text{‘awake’}] \quad \text{for so long [last night]}! \end{align*}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HMLD.Cro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>da nisi ostala budna do kasno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP NEG.AUX-2SG stay-PTCP.F.SG awake-F until late</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example (89) below is more complex. The model construction in Hungarian *le-nézni* (literally ‘down see’ = ‘underestimate’) consists of a co-verb (*le*) and a verb (*nézni*). Similar to most co-verbs (also called verbal particles or verbal prefixes) in Hungarian, *le* has an adverbial origin, and to some extent – in combination with particular verbs – it has preserved its original spatial meaning (‘down, downwards’).\(^{24}\) The Croatian equivalents of *le* differ from each other in their phonological form as well as in the extent of their morphological bounded-ness. For instance, the degree of boundedness depends on whether the prefixal *pod-* ‘under-’ (a bound morpheme) or adverbial *dolje* ‘down’ (a free morpheme) is used.

\[(89)\] \textit{na-\textit{j}} me \textit{dole gledati}
\[\begin{align*}
\text{NEG.IMP.2SG} & \quad \text{me-ACC} \quad \text{down-ADV} \quad \text{look-INF} \\
\text{‘Do not} & \quad \text{underestimate} \quad \text{me}!\end{align*}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HMLD.Cro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nemoj me podcjenjivati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.IMP.2SG me-ACC underestimate-INF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the original Hungarian structure consists of a prefix and a verb, its replica structure in Croatian has both an adverbial *dole* ‘down’ and a verb *gledati* ‘look’. This means that instead of a corresponding Croatian prefix, such as *pod*
‘under’ (as in the HMLD.Cro equivalent), the Hungarian construction is replicated of the adverb dolje being used in combination with the verb.

The replication of prefixed verbs through an adverbial construction (‘adverb + verb’) seems to be a common strategy not just in HUN.Cro but in BGLD.Cro, as well. There could be two reasons for this. The first one lies in the more adverbial and less aspectual character of the Hungarian and German verbal prefixes – compared with their Croatian counterparts (Pátrovics 2002; Hadrovics 1976). This facilitates the replication through an adverb + verb construction. Further, bound morphemes such as verbal prefixes, are less accessible for pattern replication (Matras 2009: 244; Romaine 1995: 64) than free lexical items (e.g. adverbs in Croatian) and this can be a further facilitator for this type of replication.25

In MOL.Cro, an instance of contact-induced change is the use of the l-participle sta as a variety of bija in the perfect of bit ‘to be’. This use is based on the model of Ital. essere ‘to be’ and stare ‘to be (in a place or situation)’ that share a common past participle form stato, e.g., Di si sta (= bija) učer? ‘Where were you yesterday?’ Breu (1992: 117).

A phenomenon of ‘double prefixing’ verbs can be observed in HUN-Pom.Cro. The function of double prefixes is to mark added semantic value, i.e. satisfaction with the result of a particular action, or to express a higher level of intensity of the action concerned. Example (90) is an instance of double prefixing of s- ‘around’ and po- ‘a bit’ that expresses the speaker’s satisfaction. In (91), the prefixes are z- and ne-.

(90) **pobral** je višne
    gather-PtCP.m.sg AUX-3sg cherry-ACC.f.Pl
    spobral je išče i listije
    gather-PtCP.m.sg AUX-3sg furthermore also leaf-ACC.n.sg

‘He gathered the cherries and **picked** up even the leaves.’ (Rácz 2012: 189)

HMLD.Cro: **pobrao** je višnje, **pokupio** je još i lišće

(91) **znebuhal** je dete kak kona
    beat-PtCP.m.sg AUX3-sg child-sg.ACC like horse-ACC.sg.m

‘He beat the child like a horse.’

HMLD.Cro: **istukao** je dijete kao konja

The passive exists in HMLD.Cro although its use is less frequent in spoken language compared to most Germanic languages and historically, normative authorities have

---

25 There is a Croatian [prefix + verb] construction with the same meaning, **podcijeniti**.
considered that it does not represent ‘good style’ in either spoken or written Croatian (Pavičić 1982). In BGLD.Cro, passive constructions occur frequently, largely under the influence of German. In Croatian, as in all Slavic languages, passive is typically marked as high register, formal and characteristic of official contexts (Pranjković 2001). In German (as in English) it is common and usually unmarked. Example (92) below is a non-active sentence featuring a reflexive construction:

(92) *imamo drugi tjedan filmski večer koji se organizira od našeg društva . . .*

‘Next week we’re having a movie night organized by our society . . .’

Ger.  Nächste Woche haben wir einen Filmabend, der von unserem Verein organisiert wird.

HMLD.Cro  Sljedeći tjedan imamo filmsku večer koju organizira naše društvo.

In MOL.Cro, besides the traditional passive, formed with the AUX bit ‘to be’, and the reflexive passive, a passive construction has developed that is based on employment of venire ‘to come’ as an AUX as in Italian, eg. gre činjen (‘come’ PRS.3SG + ‘make’ PASS.PTCP) ‘is being made’, cf. Ital. viene fatto (‘come’ PRS.3SG + ‘make’ PASS.PTCP). Things are complicated by the fact that in MOL.Cro, as in many other Slavic languages, gre does not only mean ‘to come’ PRS.3SG, but also ‘to go’. By copying another construction of Italian, namely the andative deontic passive of the type va fatto (‘go’ PRS.3SG + ‘make’ PASS.PTCP) ‘has to be made’, a corresponding deontic passive has developed in MOL.Cro as well. As a consequence, gre činjen is ambiguous, in the sense that it does not only mean ‘is being made’, but also ‘has to be made’ (Breu & Makarova 2019).

### 6.3 Other paradigms – articles and numbers

This section presents data on the possible development of an article and forms (and agreement) of numbers. All other three contact languages, German, Italian and Hungarian, have articles. In regard to BGLD.Cro, Neweklowsky (1978) locates some incidences of an emerging *definite* article through the use of a demonstrative. But instances of such use remain comparatively rare. In Neweklowsky’s (1978: 43, 231, 207) opinion, preservation of the definite vs. indefinite distinction in the adjectives of most BGLD.Cro dialects has obviated a tendency for the feature of definiteness to be expressed through means of an article, as in German. In regard to MOL.Cro an article system with the category *indefinite* article based on the form jena ‘one’ has developed and is most frequently used in its short inflected form na. The model for
this development is the corresponding polysemy of Italian *uno*. A definite article based on demonstratives such as *ovi* ‘this’ or *oni* ‘that’ did not, however, develop in MOL.Cro. The reason for this is that there is no corresponding polysemic model: in Italian, the definite article *il* does not have any demonstrative function (Breu 2012). The development of an indefinite article before a definite one is very unusual in the languages of the world, which underlines the role of language contact in this case. Table 8 contains the declensional forms of *jena* ‘one’ and the indefinite pronoun *nike* ‘several’ (HMLD.Cro *neki*), whose use in MOL.Cro is restricted to the PL only. The plural of *jena* itself is most often used with *pluralia tantum*, for example *jene* NOM.PL. Both long forms (LF) and short forms (SF) are given, with the latter group’s use restricted to attributive functions, preceding a noun. As an equivalent indefinite article, only unstressed forms are used. In order to show the exact pronunciation including vowel quantity and whispered vowels (marked by a diacritic ring underneath), this table is given with phonetic transcription (to show grammatical oppositions like *jéna* NOM.SG.M: *jéːna* NOM.SG.F). The acute accent refers to rising pitch, in *nike* stress is on the first syllable with unmarked/falling pitch.

**Table 8:** Full paradigm of *jena* ‘one’ as an indefinite article in MOL.Cro.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M.SG</th>
<th>F.SG</th>
<th>N.SG</th>
<th>M/F.PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>jéna</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>jéːna</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>jén(o)ga</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>jéne</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>jén(o)mu</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>jé:ny</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>= N./G.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>jé:ny</td>
<td>nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>jén(i)me</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>jénoːm</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides the existence of a short form and the total loss of the original *-d-* in the stem (cf. HMLD.Cro *jedn-*), some long forms bear unexpected suffix markers. For example, the masculine NOM.SG form is *jéna* (with a full *-a*), while the feminine NOM.SG form is *jéːna* (with a whispered *-a*, causing lengthening of the stressed vowel). The merger of the DAT.SG.F. and ACC.SG.F (*jéːny*) occurs here as in other inflected categories in the Kruč dialect of MOL.Cro. In a similar way, the original NOM.PL forms have been substituted by ACC.PL. Despite the loss of the neuter in nouns, this gender is maintained in the singular when referring to substantivised adjectives and adverbs. Especially with substantivised adjectives, showing an original long *-o*, the neuter often preserves the original pronunciation that has not undergone phonetic change to *-a* (‘akanje’), e.g. *na mala* N ‘a little’, *jeno dobro* N ‘a good (thing)*'.
Influence from Molise Italian on the MOL.Cro indefinite article is evident through the model of a short form *nu, na* (that does not exist in Standard Italian), as shown in Table 9 below. The term ‘independent’ used in Table 9 refers to the non-attributive, substantivised use of the number.

**Table 9: Morphology of the indefinite article in Italian, Molise Italian and MOL.Cro.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attributive</th>
<th>Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MASC.</strong></td>
<td><strong>FEM.</strong></td>
<td><strong>MASC.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Italian</td>
<td>uno, un</td>
<td>una, un’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molise Italian</td>
<td>nu, n’</td>
<td>na, n’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL.Cro</td>
<td>jena, na</td>
<td>jena, na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the MOL.Cro indefinite article exactly follows the usage of Italian *uno*, its absence is always interpreted as a definite article, for example *nu hįţu ACC.SG.F* ‘a house’: *hįţu ACC.SG.F* ‘the house’. In this way a definite “zero article” Ø came into being, which in juxtaposition with the indefinite article forms a complete system, the more so as in Italian the definite article is also used in generic contexts and with mass nouns, e.g. *il latte = MOL.Cro mblika NOM.SG* ‘milk’. Examples of the use of the MOL.Cro indef. article are given below, together with equivalent forms from Italian and HMLD.Cro (Breu 2012: 283–301):

(93) *Ja jiskam na mičicij.*
    ‘I am looking for a friend (of mine).’
    Cerco un amico.
    Tražim Ø prijatelja.

(94) *Ja ču jimat na mičicij.*
    ‘I would like to have a (any) friend.’
    Voglio avere un amico.
    Volio bih imati Ø prijatelja.

(95) *Si ta čuje na polidzjot, ta meče pržuna.*
    ‘If a (any) policeman hears you, he will lock you up.’
    Se ti sente un poliziotto, ti mette in prigione.
    Ako te čuje Ø policajac, stavit će te u zatvor.

(96) *Zov na medik!*
    ‘Call a doctor!’
    Chiama un medico!
    Zovi Ø doktora!

Examples of the use of *jedan* performing the function of an article-like attributive are also found in other varieties of heritage Croatian, e.g. TRS.Cro (see Piasevoli, this volume), CAN.Cro (see Petrović, this volume), AUS.Cro (see Hlavac and Stolac, this volume) and ARG.Cro (see Skelin Horvat, Musulin and Blažević, this volume).
Apart from conjunctions, particles and prepositions mentioned in sections 3 and 6.2.1 above, another category of borrowings in MOL.Cro are numbers. In combination with nouns of Slavic origin and with fully integrated loanwords, the numbers from 1 to 4 are used only in their Croatian-based form, i.e. *jena, dva/dvi, tri, četar* ‘one, two, three, four’. Numbers containing *jena* are declined, as are those with *dva/dvi* (*dvahi/dvihí, dvami/dvimi*) and *tri* (*trihi, trimi*). From *četar* onwards inflection does not usually occur (Breu 2013b: 16–17), with the exception of the (numeral) nouns *stotina* ‘hundred’ and *miljar* ‘thousand’. The corresponding borrowings from the Molise Italian dialect, i.e. *nu, duj, tre, kvatr* ‘one, two, three, four’ only combine with morphologically non-integrated loanwords. In contrast, forms from 5 to 10 and for 100 can be drawn from either language, with integrated forms borrowed from Italian predominating, i.e. *čing, sèj, sèt, ôt, nôv, dijač, čjend* ‘five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, hundred’ rather than *pet, šest, sedam, osam, devet, deset, stotina*. With the exception of *stotina* ‘hundred’, beyond 10 only Romance-based forms are used, e.g. *unic* (cf. Ital. *undici*), *dudič, tridič* (~*tredič*), *kvatordič, kvinič, sidič* (~*sedič*), *dičasèt, dičòt* (~*dičidot*), *dičinòv, vind* (cf. Ital. *venti*), *vindòt* (cf. Ital. *ventotto*), *trendun* (cf. Ital. *trentuno*), ‘eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty, twenty-eight, thirty-one’ (Breu 2013b).

### 6.4 Word order

This section examines changes in word order patterns of conjunctions, adverbials, clitics, attributive adjectives and negative forms. In contrast to Croatian, the position of the conjunction *aber* ‘but’ in German sentences is almost arbitrary. It can appear between the subject and predicate as a coordinating conjunction, at the beginning of a coordinative sentence, between the predicate and adverbial, as well as in other places. German *aber* can also function as an intensifier. In BGLD.Cro we locate instances in which the Croatian equivalent *ali* ‘but’ functions more as an intensifier than as a contrasting linking word, and where it occurs in places unknown in HMLD.Cro. In HMLD.Cro *ali* can either occur at the beginning of a main clause or at the beginning of an adversative clause, and as a coordinating conjunction only. Example (97) contains *ali* as an adverbial intensifier positioned between a modal and a main verb:

\[(97)\]  
*Moram ali priznati da me je i dobra plaća veselila.*  
‘I have to admit **though** that the good salary made me happy.’  
Ich muss **aber** zugeben, dass ich mich über das gute Gehalt gefreut habe.  
**Medutim** moram priznati da me i dobra plaća veselila.
Verb-final influence from German is apparent in the following example where an infinitive clause with a verb in clause-final position concludes the utterance. In HMLD.Cro, these constituents are not discontinuous but adjacent to each other:

(98) *Lipo od njih, da su nas došli iz takove daljine** pohodit.**
    ‘It’s nice of them that they travelled so far to **visit** us.’
    Es ist schön von ihnen, dass sie von so weit gekommen sind um uns zu **besuchen.**
    Lijepo od njih što su nas došli **posjetiti** izdaleka. (Sučić et al. 2003: 595)

In German subordinate clauses, the main verb is in final position. The same word order is shown in the following example in BGLD.Cro. (The calque based on Ger. *es liegt an* ‘it lies on’ = ‘it is attributable to’ is evident here – cf. 4.4.4)

(99) *Vindar bi rado znao, kaj to more ležati.***
    ‘But I would like to know what could be the cause of that.’
    Aber ich würde gerne wissen . . . woran das **liegen kann.**
    Ali bih rado znao **zašto** je to tako? (Sučić et al. 2003: 595)

In spoken varieties of BGLD.Cro, there are examples of numerals given in the order as they are given in German, eg:

(100) *jedanidvadeset petipedeset***
    ‘one-and-twenty’ ‘five-and-fifty’
    einundzwanzig fünfundfünfzig

This pre-posing of single-digit numbers in front of values between twenty and ninety-nine is adopted from German, but was not a feature included in the standardisation of BGLD.Cro. Verbal short forms or clitics, e.g. *ću* (will-FUT.AUX.1SG – short form) instead of *hoću* (will-FUT.AUX.1SG – long form), or *si* (be-COP/AUX.2SG – short form) instead of *jesi* (be-COP/AUX.2SG – long form) can appear in initial position. This is a feature shared with some Čakavian and Kajkavian dialects and its occurrence is likely to be due to this influence.

(101) *ćete mi ga dati***
    FUT.AUX-2PL me-dAt it-ACC give-INF
    ‘Will you give it to me?’
    HMLD.Cro: **hoćete mi ga dati?**
In standard Croatian, clitic forms cannot occur in initial position and their position, immediately\(^{26}\) or anywhere after initial position, is determined hierarchically according to the following word order rules:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>particle</th>
<th>AUX</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>ACC/GEN</th>
<th>REFL</th>
<th>3SG.AUX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ordering of clitic is generally followed in most non-standard varieties of HMLD.Cro, as it is across most Slavic languages (Franks & King 2000). At the same time, many non-standard varieties allow clitic placement in initial position. To return to BGLD.Cro, Browne (2014) reports that while first and second person ACC and GEN clitics precede the reflexive, third person ACC and GEN clitics can follow the reflexive:

(103a)  
\[ \text{boju me se} \]
\[ \text{fear-3Pl me-GEN REFL} \]
\[ \text{‘They fear me’} \]
 \[ \text{vs.} \]

(103b)  
\[ \text{boju se ga}^{27} \]
\[ \text{fear-3Pl REFL him-GEN} \]
\[ \text{‘They fear him.’} \]

Browne (2014: 91) describes pronoun clitic placement after a reflexive as uncharacteristic of Slavic languages in general, including non-standard varieties. He addresses the possible influence of local German varieties, namely Burgenlän-

\(^{26}\) In sentences with clitics, the ‘obligatory’ placement of a clitic in second position has become a feature of high register standard Croatian. For example, the sentence my student found him in high register standard Croatian is moj ga je student našao (‘my him-ACC has-3SG student found’), while in a less marked sentence, a clitic is not placed between the initial possessive pronoun and the noun and the word order is moj student ga je našao (‘my student him-ACC has-3SG found’) (Browne 2014).

\(^{27}\) Browne (2014) adds that the 3SG.GEN clitic can also precede the REFL, i.e. boju ga se.
disch (the east central Bavarian/Austrian dialect spoken in Burgenland) that has clitic pronouns, as opposed to standard German. However, Browne (2014: 92) is hesitant to attribute this innovation in BGLD.Cro to the local German variety as this variety does not distinguish reflexive pronouns from non-reflexive pronouns in that way that Slavic languages do.

In MOL.Cro the position of clitics is similar to that in Italian. A prohibition of clitics in initial position does not exist, e.g. sa mu ga da (AUX.1sg him-DAT it-ACC give-PTCP.SG.M) ‘I gave it to him’. In this sentence, there are three clitics at the very beginning that all precede the verb (Breu 2019: 417–420). Another word order innovation is the contact-induced positioning of adjectival attributes after the noun. Post-positioning of adjectival attributes is allowable in HMLD.Cro but is restricted to ‘poetic’ or stylistically marked texts. In MOL.Cro post-positioning of attributive adjectives as in the examples: na hiža stara ‘a house old’, tartuf crni ‘the truffle black’, and na stvara velka ‘a thing big’ is not marked and occurs commonly and much more frequently than pre-positioning. The different positions of the attributes lead in some cases to oppositions of the type je na brižna žena ‘she is a poor woman’ (pitiable, because something awful has happened to her) vs. je na žena brižna. ‘she is a poor woman’ (she has no money) as in Italian: è una povera donna vs. è una donna povera; similarly, na dobri ljud ‘a good man’ (good character) vs. na ljud dobri ‘a talented man’ (Breu 2019: 416–417). Word order innovations can relate to the position of NEG particles in clauses. In regard to HUN.Cro, the word order rules of Hungarian negative sentences are often replicated in contact varieties. In Hungarian both focus and background negation are possible (Kiss 2011), with this rule often applying to HUN.Cro. What this means is that instead of negating the verb, which is the only option in HMLD.Cro, other elements, such as the adverb in example (104) or the sentence object in example (105) are negated. In (104) and (105), these NEG particles function as the only markers of negation in these sentences.

(104) ne često koristim onaj standardni
     NEG often use-1SG that-ACC.M.SG standard-ACC.M.SG
     jezik
     language-ACC.SG
     ‘I hardly speak the standard [. . .] language.’
Instances of change in word order, including leftward fronting of clitics, are recorded in some contemporary diaspora varieties of Croatian, e.g. TRS.Cro (Piassevoli, this volume), USA.Cro (Jutronić, this volume), CAN.Cro (Petrović, this volume).

6.5 Syntactic and semantic calques

This section contains examples of syntactic constructions or semantic fields replicated in a contact variety of Croatian from other-language models. In BGLD.Cro, there are constructions that mirror German verb+preposition constructions, where a verb form is employed that matches the collocational or semantic features of German. In example (106) below, employment of na ‘on’ following čekati ‘to wait’ is based on the German model:

(106) stalno čeka na svoju mamu

‘she is always waiting for her mum’

Ger. ständig wartet sie auf ihre Mutti
HMLD.Cro stalno čeka svoju mamu.

The equivalent HMLD.Cro does not require a preposition. Other examples from BGLD.Cro are: ja se veselim na Zagreb ‘I am looking forward to Zagreb’, cf. Ger. ich freue mich schon auf Zagreb, HMLD.Cro radujem se dolasku u Zagreb; and oduševljen sam od toga ‘I’m delighted about it’, cf. Ger. ich bin davon begeistert, HMLD.Cro oduševljen sam time.

The following examples are instances of replications, which have a direct or indirect effect on the clause structure. Direct change is understood here as replication of complete clause templates. In contrast to this, indirect change means some kind of clause restructuring, due to a former (or parallel) contact-induced grammaticalisation of one of the clause constituents. The following examples (107b) and (108b) bear a new pattern for marking indefiniteness – ima (‘have-PRS.3SG’)

(105) ne to pitam
 NEG that ask-1sg
‘I am not asking that [but something else]!’

HMLD.Cro
ne pitam to
NEG ask-1sg that
+ REL.PRON + verb – that is emerging. The sentences presented below are not comprehensible to speakers of HMLD.Cro, but they can still be frequently heard among speakers of HUN-Bar.Cro. These examples represent the replication of the corresponding, widely used Hungarian structure, van ‘be’ + REL.PRON (+ verb). Two Hungarian sentences, (107a) and (108a) taken from the Hungarian-English parallel corpus Hunglish.hu (n.d.) demonstrate this construction:

(107a)  
\[
\text{van aki} \ folytatja \ \text{van aki} \\
\text{be-PRS.3SG who-3SG continue-PRS.3SG be-3SG who-3SG} \\
\text{képtelen rá} \\
\text{incapable-sg it-sUbl} \\
\text{‘Some continue [to do something]; some are incapable of it.’}
\]

(108a)  
\[
\text{van amikor azt jelenti az illető meghalt} \\
\text{be-PRS.3SG when it-ACC mean-PRS.3SG the person die-PST.3SG} \\
\text{‘Sometimes it means somebody’s dead.’}
\]

Replica sentences below, numbered here as (107b) and (108b), consist of the Croatian verb imati ‘to have’, which in existential constructions performs a function similar to Hungarian van ‘to be’. However, in contrast to Hungarian van, the Croatian verb imati cannot be combined with a relative clause in HMLD.Cro without the presence of an overt subject. The replica structure has a function similar to that of the indefinite pronouns: ima + tko = netko/neki ‘somebody’, ima + kad ‘there is + when’ = katkad/ponekad/nekad ‘sometimes’ etc.

(107b)  
\[
\text{ima tko priča, ima tko ne} \\
\text{have-3SG who speak-3SG have-3SG who NEG} \\
\text{‘Some of them speak a little bit, some of them not at all.’}
\]

28 Sentences such as Ima ljudi koji pričaju (have-PRS.3.SG. people-GEN.M.PL who-M.PL.N. speak-PRS.3.PL.; ‘There are people who speak [. . .]’) i.e. sentences with an overt logical (not syntactic) subject in the main clause are possible in contemporary Croatian.

29 Wasserscheidt (2015) also analyses these structures claiming that the first one has a similar corresponding structure with the additional conjunction da ‘that’ inserted between the relative pronoun and the verb. However, despite the formal similarities that structure has a different function: it refers to somebody’s existence, but has no pronominal meaning. In the sentence ima tko da priča ‘there is somebody who can speak’, the speaker’s existence is additionally emphasised, and not relativized, as in (107b) and (108b) above.
There are new use patterns for the connectors *zato* ‘therefore’, *onda* ‘then’ and *ne
da* ‘so that + NEG.’ Examples (109) and (110) are instances of a so-called extension
across categories (Heine & Kuteva 2005: 54), which refers to an extension of the
grammatical function of particular words in the replica language, modelled on a
corresponding multifunctional role of their counterparts in the model language.
In example (109), the connector *zato*, which is a causative adverb in Croatian,
serves as a connector in concessive clauses; this is a function it does not have
in HMLD.Cro. Possible concessive conjunctions in standard HMLD.Cro are *opet
corresponding Hungarian model word *azért* ‘therefore’ has the same adverbial
function, as *zato* in contemporary HMLD.Cro, and at the same time it can serve
as a connector in concessive clauses. The reason for this is that it can also be a
connector in concessive sentences.30

(109) *zato* *fali* *ova* *sredina*
though miss-PRS.3SG this-NOM.F.SG community-NOM.F.SG
‘**Nevertheless** I miss this community.’

HMLD.Cro

*ipak* *mi* *nedostaje* *ova* *sredina*
though me-DAT miss-PRS.3SG this-NOM.F.SG community-NOM.F.SG

A similar occurrence is found in the following example: the function of the Cro-
atian temporal conjunction *onda* ‘when’, ‘then’ is extended. This occurs through
modelling on the polyfunctional character of the corresponding Hungarian con-
junction *akkor* ‘then’, which is also used as a conditional conjunction.31

30 E.g. *azért szép!* (lit. ‘because beautiful.’) which means ‘though she is beautiful!’
31 In standard HMLD.Cro, the order of clauses in conditional sentences is the other way around:
the subordinate clause is in the first place, and it is invoked by the conjunctions *ako* ‘if’, *ukoliko
‘in as much as’, ‘in so far as’, *kada* ‘when’. The main clause comes after the subordinate one with
no conjunction between them (Silić & Pranjković 2007: 348–350).
The function of the Hungarian conjunction *nemhogy* (lit. ‘not that’, meaning ‘instead of’) – which invokes the subordinate clause in unreal conditional sentences – is grammaticalized in HUN.Cro through a compound conjunction *ne + da/kaj* (‘NEG + COMP/WHAT [INTERROG. PRONOUN]’) that is modelled on the Hungarian structure as shown in example (111) below. Further, the Hungarian model structure *nemhogy + verbcond* is completely replicated. The conjunction *ne kaj* (Hun. *nemhogy* ‘instead of’) invokes a counterfactual condition and is expressed via a verb in conditional mood.\(^{32}\)

\[(111) \text{ ne kaj } \text{ bi } \text{ bili } \text{ pre } \text{ mene}\]

\begin{verbatim}
ne kaj bi bili pre mene
not that COND.3PL be.PTCP.M.PL before+GEN me-GEN
‘instead of being before me [. . .]’
\end{verbatim}

Elsewhere, examples of an extended use of the conjunction complementiser *da* ‘that’ are recorded. This occurs as the Hungarian complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ (HMLD.Cro *da*) can be connected with other elements – mostly adverbs and relative pronouns – in subordinate clauses in Hungarian (Kenesei, Vago & Fenyvesi 1998; Kiss 2002). Due to the high frequency of combined complementizers in Hungarian,\(^{33}\) in HUN.Cro, the equivalent conjunction *da* is used and combined with relative pronouns (examples 112 and 113) in object clauses in the same way that *hogy* ‘that/what’ is in Hungarian.

\[(110) \text{ onda } \text{ bih } \text{ imala } \text{ pozitivno } \text{ mišljenje}\]

\begin{verbatim}
onda bih imala pozitivno mišljenje
then COND.1SG have.PTCP.F.SG positive-ACC.N.SG opinion-ACC.N.SG
‘I would have positive opinion about them, if [. . .]’
\end{verbatim}

\[(111) \text{ ne kaj } \text{ bi bili pre mene}\]

\begin{verbatim}
ne kaj bi bili pre mene
not that COND.3PL be.PTCP.M.PL before+GEN me-GEN
‘instead of being before me [. . .]’
\end{verbatim}

\[(112) \text{ umjesto da budu prije mene}\]

\begin{verbatim}
umjesto da budu prije mene
instead COMP be-PRS.3PL before+GEN me-GEN
\end{verbatim}

\[(113) \text{ umjesto } \text{ da budu prije mene}\]

\begin{verbatim}
umjesto da budu prije mene
instead COMP be-PRS.3PL before+GEN me-GEN
\end{verbatim}

\(^{32}\) In standard HMLD.Cro, counterfactual conditions are invoked by the conjunction *da* ‘that’, and the verb is in the indicative mood in either present or in one of the past tenses.

\(^{33}\) E.g. *Tudom, hogy mit csináltál*, lit. I know that what you have done’, meaning: ‘I know what have you done.’
Aleksandra Ščukanec, Walter Breu and Dora Vuk

A similar example comes from Rácz (2012: 259) from HUN-Pom.Cro-speakers:

(113) pitala sam ju da de dela
ask-PTC-F-SG AUX-1SG she.ACC that-COMP where work-PRS.3SG
‘I asked her [that] where she works’

At the syntactic level there are distinctive features that illustrate the influence of German. The most obvious is the usage of commas in subordinate clauses according to the rules of German grammar and models. This is closely connected to the regular occurrence of the finite verb at the end of a clause.

(114) što je za mene tako super je, da se brzo uživim i da se onda ćutim doma . . .
‘it is great for me that I can quickly relax and that I started to feel like I’m at home . . .’

Ger.: was für mich so super ist, dass ich mich schnell einleben kann und mich wie zu Hause fühlen.
HMLD.Cro meni je super jer se brzo uživim i počnem se osjećati kao kod kuće.

This is not only an example of a finite verb at the end of a subordinate clause, but also of the usage of a typical German structure: Was für mich so super ist . . .

We now shift our attention to semantic calques. In the following example, the German verb leiden ‘suffer’ influences selection of trpi ‘suffer/tolerate-3sg’. German leiden, usually occurring with a NEG can precede objects that are human or non-human, e.g. Ich kann ihn/das nicht leiden ‘I can't suffer him/it’; while the combination leiden an (‘suffer from’) can precede designations of illnesses, e.g. Sie leidet an Krebs ‘She’s suffering from cancer’. In HMLD.Cro, trpjeti ‘to
tolerate’ is used for the first function, while *patiti* ‘to suffer’ is used intransitively or with a preposition *patiti od* ‘suffer from’ and an illness designation. We classify example (115) as both a syntactic and semantic calque as the preposition employed is also based on the German model and simultaneously there is semantic transference of the broader semantic features of German *leiden* that are transferred onto *trpjeti*.

(115)  
\begin{align*}  
\text{u Austriji} & \quad \textbf{trpi} \ 800.000 \ ljudi \ \textit{na migreni} \text{ } \\
\text{in Austria} & \quad 800,000 \ \text{people} \ \textit{suffer from} \ migrating. \\
\text{HMLD.Cro} & \quad \text{U Austriji} \ 800.000 \ ljudi \ \textit{pati od} \ \text{migrene}. \\
\end{align*}

Instances of syntactic calques occur in various diaspora varieties of Croatian, e.g. AUT.Cro (Ščukanec, this volume), ITAL.Cro (Županović Filipin, Hlavac and Piasevoli, this volume) TRS.Cro (Piasevoli, this volume), USA.Cro (Jutronić, this volume) and AUS.Cro (Hlavac and Stolac, this volume).

7 Conclusion

This chapter set out to provide a description of contact linguistic features present in BGLD.Cro, MOL.Cro and HUN.Cro. The first two have been physically dislocated from HMLD.Cro for approx. 500 years. In the case of MOL.Cro this has resulted in a very high percentage of borrowings and semantic calques in the lexicon and there are contact-induced structural developments in all fields of grammar. Alongside a substantial number of imported items that can be described as ‘matter borrowing’, we can also observe ‘pattern borrowing’, i.e. lexico-semantic and syntactic frames that are borrowed into minority Croatian (Matras and Sakel 2007). The transfer of polysemies present in Italian model varieties has been the most important factor for the creation of new oppositions in the replica system or, at least, new functions for existing grammatical forms. In some cases, MOL.Cro may have had a predisposition for some of these changes, as could be argued in view of initial stages of such developments in the overall history of Croatian or especially in its Dalmatian dialects. Nevertheless, it has been the situation of total language contact over the last 500 years that has made MOL.Cro in many respects behave more like a Romance than a Slavic variety. There are, however, also many areas, such as verbal aspect, the case system (except for the locative), or the formation of the perfect, in which it has remained very similar to today’s HMLD.Cro.
In regard to the lexicon, archaic forms rarely used in HMLD.Cro varieties exist alongside those adopted from German, (Molise) Italian and Hungarian. The semantic fields and contexts that these relate to are varied, ranging from physical realia, designations used in public life to forms spread by various media and beyond. Transfers are almost always integrated, phonologically and/or morphologically. For nouns, this means that assignment to a Croatian gender usually occurs based on the phonotactic form of the transfer, in particular its word-final structure. Those ending in a consonant are usually allocated masculine gender and this usually overrides the influence of the gender of an equivalent Croatian form. The word-final ending -a of feminine transfers from Italian usually leads to these forms remaining feminine in MOL.Cro. Transfers in MOL.Cro can undergo word-final vowel -o deletion to facilitate integration, while in HUN.Cro this ending is retained but transfers are still allocated masculine gender. Overall, the phonotactic structure of loanwords, rather than the gender of the loanword in the donor language is likely to determine gender allocation in BGLD.Cro and HUN.Cro. In MOL.Cro the gender of Italian equivalents is influential and can lead either to addition of a suffix, -a, or to FEM.II nouns sometimes becoming masculine.

Verbs are less frequently borrowed but some regularities are apparent: Italian -are verbs are integrated as -at MOL.Cro verbs, while Italian -ire and -ere verbs bear the MOL.Cro -it verbal suffix. Conspicuous in the BGLD.Cro data are German separable verbs with particles that appear to be used inseparably in BGLD.Cro, e.g. *ajnkafati ← einkaufen* ‘to go shopping’ – *idem nešto ajnkafati* ‘I’m going to go shopping’. Their use is very often restricted to verbs occurring in second position following modals or other commonly used verbs such as *iči ‘to go’* and they commonly appear as infinitive forms only. In contrast, transfers based on German verb + adverb construction, e.g. *krajpogledati ← wegblicken* ‘look away’ can occur as two separate items. Discourse markers (e.g. *virklji ← wirklich*), high-frequency adverbs (e.g. *alora ← allora*) and exclamations (e.g. *jaj ištenem ← ištenem*) are reported in all three varieties. Instances occur in which these co-occur additively to domestic (Croatian) equivalents as semantically distinct ‘supplements’, or even where little distinction exists between the two and idiolectal or context-specific features determine their occurrence, e.g. MOL.Cro *p’ke ← perché* vs. *aje-ka* ‘because’.

Phraseological and semantic calques abound in the three varieties. This is unsurprising, but perhaps a feature worthy of attention as one that is present and often very widespread in long-standing contact situations. Studies of bi- or multi-lingual speech communities of a more recent vintage (e.g. Gregor 2003; Goldbach 2005) record code-switching (i.e. lexical sequences of one- or multi-word insertions to longer stretches or alternations) as a statistically more prominent contact linguistic phenomenon than calques. To be sure, code-switches
are recorded in corpora that describe all three varieties. But as a proportion of language contact phenomenon that occur in these long-standing, bi- or multi-lingual settings, code-switching is not a conspicuous or frequent feature. This is of particular note, especially where code-switching in more recent, bi- or multi-lingual settings appears to be reported as a frequent feature, eg. Russian-German bilinguals in Berlin (Goldbach 2005); Kinyarwanda-French bilinguals in Belgium (Gafaranga 2007), and where one may have the supposition that in longer-standing settings, the incidence of code-switching would be even greater. Habitual code-switching need not be but is commonly a precursor to language shift. The three settings studied here are long-standing contact situations in which the speech community members here have, over time, been able to withstand language shift. Therefore, code-switching does not figure as a common occurrence in these settings, as the presence of this would likely have led to their abandonment of the minority languages in the first place. So, the paucity of code-switching amongst these groups of ‘maintainers’ is evidence that code-switching often can be a precursor to shift. In a related sense, the employment of phraseological calques and loan translations may be a strategy to obviate code-switching – this was an observation made by Clyne (2003) in relation to transposed situations. Amongst the speakers of these minority languages, features other than code-switching are more prominent.

Structural comparison reveals the following: in the nominal paradigm, BGLD.Cro shows few differences compared to HMLD.Cro. In part this is due to the standardisation of a BGLD.Cro literary language in which models from HMLD.Cro were drawn on. MOL.Cro has a reduced, two-gender system for nouns and distinct forms for three or four of the cases, depending on number or case i.e. loss of LOC and VOC. (The three-gender distinction is still retained for adjectives.) The effect of this is that in MOL.Cro, the distinction between location and motion has been lost, with the ACC performing both functions. All INS forms in MOL.Cro are comitative ones requiring use of the preposition s ‘with’. The preposition do+GEN ‘of’ (used differently from HMLD in which do is a spatial and temporal preposition meaning ‘up to’) is also used in possessive GEN constructions, although its use is not obligatory in all GEN constructions. Non-distinction of animate and inanimate masculine nouns occurs in MOL.Cro (with some exceptions involving GEN case forms). Non-distinction of animate and inanimate masculine nouns in DIR.OBJ position occurs also in HUN-Pom.Cro except after some prepositions such as po (‘for’, i.e. ‘to fetch for’) or za (‘for’, i.e. ‘awarded to’). At the same time, HUN-Pom.Cro retains distinct forms for DAT, LOC and INS in the PL, which have undergone syncretism in HMLD.Cro.

Multi-item attributive constructions occur in BGLD.Cro, modelled on German, while in MOL.Cro, comparatives and superlatives are mostly analytic constructions with veća ‘more’ preceding the adjective or adverb, modelled on the function of
Ital. *più*. In the same way, in HUN-Pom.Cro *bole* ‘better’ can be employed as a comparative marker, as can the equivalent superlative *najbole* ‘best’ along with suffix-marked comparatives and prefix- and suffix-marked superlatives.

Non-congruence between subject and verb morphology can occur in BGLD.Cro and HUN.Cro. In the latter, non-congruence can occur between subjects with a grammatical gender that is different from the natural gender of the subject. (This phenomenon occurs in HMLD.Cro as well.) More conspicuous are sg subjects with pl predicates that occur in both BGLD.Cro and HUN.Cro, albeit in a small number of instances. These constructions occur as an equally-marked phenomenon in some non-standard varieties of HMLD.Cro spoken in northern Croatia.

A more paradigmatic change is the development of a de-obligative future in MOL.Cro that employs *jimat* ‘to have, must’, based on the model of southern Italian *avé* that has the function of a future referring to necessary or planned states of affairs. This has resulted in a narrowing of the meaning of conventional future constructed via *tit* ‘will, to want’ to denote the probability of the future action. Contact with Italian also accounts for the retention or more widespread use of the past perfect compared to HMLD.Cro. The form *bi* is combined with, and in some cases even infixed into the aux *bit* ‘to be’. The imperfect (but not the aorist) is fully retained in MOL.Cro, in contrast to HMDL.Cro. The opposite has occurred in HUN-Pom.Cro. with retention of perfect, past perfect, present and loss of the aorist as a full tense. Elsewhere in HUN-Pom.Cro, the future II is the only tense used to refer to future actions.

Instances are recorded in BGLD.Cro and HUN-Bar.Cro in which perfective verbs are used in contextual meanings that refer to ongoing or durative actions that otherwise require imperfective verbs. Where non-target use of aspectual forms occurs, it is perfective verbs that are employed in place of imperfective verbs, not vice versa.

‘Double’ prefixes are recorded in HUN.Cro in which two verbal prefixes mark a verb not only as perfective but with specific semantic meaning. Croatian equivalents of German and Hungarian (separable) verb particles are combined with Croatian verbs resulting in semantically ‘double-marked’ verb constructions, e.g. *dolidonesti* ‘bring here’ (Ger. *herbringen*) or *gori biti* ‘stay up’ (Hun. *fent lenni*). In regard to the situation of HUN.Cro, despite the fact that aspect (and gender) do not have a corresponding morphologically marked category in the dominant Hungarian language,34 the increased insecurity in aspect (and gender) marking

---

34 By claiming that there is no corresponding aspect in Hungarian, we mean that there is no morphologically marked aspect. However, it does not mean that perfective and imperfective aspectual meanings are non-existent in Hungarian (see Dahl 1985, Csirmaz 2003).
in the speech of younger speakers of HUN.Cro cannot be clearly attributed to the influence of Hungarian. The same tendencies can be detected in other (diaspora) contact situations with languages both overtly marking gender and/or some kind of aspect distinctions (Montrul 2002; Polinsky 2008; Benmamoun, Montrul & Polinksy 2013; Scontras, Fuchs & Polinksy 2015; Schwartz et al. 2015).

Conspicuous is the development of an indefinite article in MOL.Cro, based on the form for ‘one’, jena, usually produced in its shortened form na. In line with MOL.Cro adjectives, there are forms for all three genders. Word order changes occur at sentence level in BGLD.Cro with rightward movement of non-finite verbs and in the ordering of components in compound numerals such as jedanidvadeset ‘one-and-twenty’ (Ger. einundzwanzig). In MOL.Cro the position of the clitics has adapted to the verb-centred model of Italian. Examples of calques of syntactic structures from the respective donor languages are also recorded.
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