

“East” and “West” as Seen in the Structure of Serbian: Language Contact and Its Consequences¹

Motoki Nomachi

Abstract

This article analyzes various examples of language contact and linguistic change in the history of the Serbian languages, with special attention to the cultural opposition of the East and West. In the second section, after the Introduction, the author discusses the place of Serbian in the context of the Balkan Sprachbund. The third section deals with the influence of Russia as part of the East in the development of the Serbian literary language. The fourth section analyzes the influence of the Islamic East based on loanwords from Turkish and other “oriental languages.” In the fifth section, the author analyzes the structure of Serbian when observed in contact with German in light of the Danube or Carpathian Sprachbund.

Key words: Language contact, Russian, Balkan, Turkish, German.

1 The earlier version of this article was originally published in Japanese: In: N. Shiokawa et al. (eds.). *Eurasian World vol. 1 “East” and “West”*, Tokyo, 2012: 207–231. For this updated and enlarged version of the article, Shuko Nishihara (Hokkaido University) and Bojan Belić (University of Washington) kindly helped me to improve it. In addition, Predrag Piper (Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts) and Ljudmila Popović (Belgrade University) also kindly read the manuscript of this article and gave me useful suggestions. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to these colleagues.

1. Introduction: The Balkan Peninsula as a Crossroads of Languages and Cultures

Serbian is a member of the South Slavic branch of the Slavic languages, one of the main European language families, along with the Germanic and Romance languages. With approximately 11 million speakers, it is used primarily in Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina (particularly in the Republika Srpska) in the territories that make up the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

In the Balkan Peninsula, where Serbian is spoken, the Western and Eastern worlds meet, overlap, and confront each other, because the peninsula lies on the periphery of Europe, the geographic and cultural West, and at the same time, it borders the East that is Asia. However, the concepts of West and East do not apply only to the duality of Europe (the Christian world) and Asia (the Islamic world, in this case); they may be discerned even within the Christian cultural sphere. The opposition between Western Europe, traditionally linked to Roman Catholic culture, and the Byzantine or Orthodox cultural sphere encompassing Greece, Russia, and Eastern Europe, is one example, and the Balkan Peninsula has repeatedly witnessed the conflict of these two cultural hegemonies. It has developed as a crossroads of civilizations through a complex historical process, and the societal fluidity brought on by changes in the aforementioned dichotomy is probably the most significant feature of Serbian history.

Using Serbian as a case study, in this article, I discuss, from both synchronic and diachronic perspectives, how the influence of contact with the cultural spheres of the East and West manifested in and changed the language.

2. Serbian and the Balkan Peninsula Multilingualism: The “East” and “West” and Their Reflection in Serbian

2-1. Languages of the Balkan Peninsula and Balkan Sprachbund

The Balkan Peninsula is known for its plurality and close contact of ethnicities, languages, and cultures. The ancient languages once spoken there include Continental Celtic, Dacian (Daco-Mysian), Gothic, Greek, Illyrian, Macedonian, Phrygian, Pelasgian, and Thracian, which are thought to be Indo-European languages (Joseph 2013: 618). Current-

ly, the following Indo-European languages are spoken on the peninsula: Slavic languages, Romance languages, Greek, Albanian, Romani, Armenian, Circassian, and Judezmo. Among the non-Indo-European languages, Turkic languages such as Turkish and Gagauz have been documented (Joseph 2013: 619).

This multilingual situation arose from the frequent population shifts that resulted from various changes in the social, political, and economic circumstances on the Balkan Peninsula, refracted through the many cultural spheres that passed through historically. The simultaneous use of multiple languages arose out of necessity at some points and spontaneously at others, and as a result of continuous language contact, a Sprachbund—i.e., a region with shared linguistic features—took shape in the Balkan Peninsula.

According to Thomason (2001: 91), the term “Sprachbund” refers to a geographical region containing a group of three or more languages that, as a result of language contact rather than accident or a shared proto-language, have several common structural features. Such convergences of language structures may be observed in many parts of the world, but the case of the Balkan Peninsula, called the Balkan Sprachbund, is considered archetypal.

2-2. Standard Serbian in Light of Balkanisms: The “West” in Serbian

Common features of the Balkan languages—known as “Balkanisms”—are found in phonology/phonetics, morphology, syntax, lexicons, and idiomatic expressions. There are many theories regarding the origins of Balkanisms, for example, the influence of indigenous languages (substratum theory), influence of the language of conquerors or prestige in the area (suprastratum theory), shared drift based on code-switching, or the complementarity of languages in a multilingual situation with imperfect acquisition of those languages. However, no definitive conclusion has been reached, and discussing the validity of each theory is beyond the scope of the present article. Researchers are divided regarding the treatment of Balkanisms, the standard types of which, according to Joseph (2013: 621–623), are listed below²:

2 Here I omit lexical Balkanisms. For other scholars’ set of Balkanisms, for instance, see Aronson (2007: 4).

(1) Phonology

- a. the presence of a (stressed) mid-to-high central vowel
- b. the presence of *i-e-a-o-u* in the vowel inventory without phonological contrasts in quantity, openness, or nasalization
- c. devoicing of word-final stops
- d. development of nasal + voiced stop clusters (e.g. [mb] out of nasal + voiceless stop combinations, so that the former clusters are rare or nonexistent, or present only in loanwords);
- e. presence of *ð/θ* (voiced / voiceless interdental spirants)
- f. realization of /mj/ as [mj]

(2) Morphology

- g. a reduction in the nominal case system, especially a falling together of genitive and dative cases
- h. the formation of a future tense based on a reduced, often invariant, form of the verb *want*
- i. the use of an enclitic (postposed) definite article, typically occurring after the first word in the noun phrase
- j. analytic comparative adjective formations

(3) Syntax

- k. marking of personal direct objects with a preposition
- l. double determination in deixis, that is a demonstrative adjective co-occurring with a definite article and a noun (thus, *this-the-man*)
- m. possessive use of dative enclitic pronouns
- n. the use of verbal forms to distinguish actions on the basis of rel or presumed information-source, commonly referred to as marking a witness/reported distinction but also including nuances of surprise (admirative) and doubt (dubitative)
- o. the reduction in use of a nonfinite verbal complement (generally called an “infinitive” in traditional grammar) and its replacement by fully finite complements clauses
- p. the pleonastic use of weak object pronominal forms together with full noun phrase direct or indirect objects (“object doubling”)

Table 1 summarizes the distribution of the Balkanisms above in standard varieties of the Balkan languages.

Table 1. Distribution of the Balkanisms in the Major Standard Languages in the Balkans

	Bulgarian	Macedonian	Serbian	Albanian	Greek	Romanian	
(1)	a	+	–	–	+	–	+
	b	+	+	–	–	+	+
	c	+	+	–	+	+	+
	d	–	–	–	+	+	–
	e	–	–	–	+	+	–
	f	–	–	–	–	+	–
(2)	g	+	+	(+) ³	+	+	+
	h	+	+	+	+	+	+
	i	+	+	–	+	–	+
	j	+	+	–	+	–	+
(3)	k	–	–	(+) ⁴	–	–	–
	l	–	–	–	(+)	+	–
	m	+	+	+	+	+	+
	n	+	+	–	+	–	+
	o	+	+	(+) ⁵	+	–	+
	p	+	+	–	+	+	+
Total	11/16	10/16	2-5/16	12-3/16	10/16	11/16	

3 Serbian has seven cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, locative, and vocative), but some forms are identical, by which one can observe syncretism. Ivić (2001: 22) regards this phenomenon as a Balkanism. However, the degree of reduction is far lower in Serbian than in other Balkan languages.

4 This tendency can be seen in a nominal phrases with a number in the oblique case, especially when the number is higher than five: *Crtam dvema olovkama/sa dve olovke* ‘I am drawing a painting with two pencils,’ but only *crtam sa pet olovaka* ‘I am drawing a painting with five pencils.’

5 It is often pointed out that in Serbian, the use of the *da*-construction instead of the infinitive is more common than in Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin (cf. Станишић 1996: 132). Yet some evidence seems contrary to this traditional view (see Попов 1984: 28–30). For a historical interpretation, see Grickat (2004). According to Joseph (2009: 147), the infinitive replacement process is ongoing.

The score varies depending on which Balkanism is used as an index and whether non-standardized dialects of the various languages are included in the analysis.⁶ However, even though Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian, Greek, and Romanian have no direct shared genetic relation other than that they are Indo-European languages, since they belong to the Slavic, Albanian, Greek, and Romance language groups, respectively, their language structures show a significant degree of convergence.

Of interest is the fact that standard Serbian, which is one of the Western sub-branches of the South Slavic languages together with Slovene, does not show typical Balkan features when compared to the other Balkan languages listed in Table 1. Thus, it is natural that Serbian is often classified as a “periphery member” (see Feuillet 2012: 48–49, Асенова 2002: 16, Пипер 2007: 7) or one of the “second grade” languages of the Balkan Sprachbund (Schaller 1975: 191). On the other hand, Bulgarian and Macedonian are clearly core Balkan languages, even though they, like Serbian, belong to the Eastern Orthodox linguo-cultural sphere and share similar political, historical, and cultural experiences, e.g., Greek influence under the rule of the Byzantine Empire and Turkish influence under the rule of the Ottoman Empire, respectively. The structural convergence of these languages came about because of intensive language contact caused by population mixing (Alexander 1982: 17).

2-3. *Balkanized Serbian Dialects: The “East” in Serbian*

Turning attention from standard Serbian (whose foundation belongs to the East Hercegovina dialect and Vojvodina dialect, that is, the Serbian West) to the Eastern dialects, one notices a great change in the position of Serbian in the Balkan Sprachbund, particularly in the Balkanisms of the Prizren-Timok dialect group in southeastern Serbia.⁷

6 For instance, one can mention the unification of *gde* ‘where’ and *kud* ‘to where’ (cf. Seliščev 1925), the *have*-perfect (Lindstedt 1998, Friedman 2009), and proclitization of enclitic pronouns (Младенов 2008, Friedman 2009). However, these Balkanisms do not drastically change the main typological features of Serbian compared to other Balkan languages. See also Popov (1984: 21–43).

7 For the location of the dialect, classification of sub-dialects, and their characteristics, see Ivić (2001: 146–174), Stanišić (1985–1986: 246–265) and Peco (1991: 41–48).

Using 12 of the 16 Balkanisms shared between Bulgarian and Macedonian, a comparison with standard Serbian yields Table 2.⁸

Table 2. Balkanism Distribution in Prizren-Timok Dialect and Standard Serbian

	Prizren-Timok dialect	Examples	Standard Serbian	Examples
(1)	a	+ <i>dānāška</i> 'today'	–	
	b	+ <i>ja</i> 'I' [pron.] or 'hey' [interj.]	–	<i>jā</i> 'I': long vowel (falling accent) <i>jā</i> 'hey': short vowel (falling accent)
	c	+ <i>Stignaše na brek</i> 'they arrived at the bank' ⁹	–	<i>Stigli su na breg</i>
(2)	g	+ - three-case system (nominative, general objective, vocative) - syncretism of dative and genitive <i>kazala na carsku ćerku</i> 'she said to the daughter of the emperor' (dative equivalent) <i>kuća na mojega brata</i> 'the house of my brother' (genitive equivalent)	(+)	- seven-case system (with analytic tendency, tendency toward case syncretism) - distinction of dative and genitive <i>kazala je carskoj ćerki</i> (dative) <i>kuća mojega brata</i> (genitive)
	h	+ - inflection for person (<i>ću, ćeš, će...</i>) <i>ti ćeš da pogineš</i> 'you will die,' <i>ja ću reknem</i> 'I will say' - invariant for person <i>će</i> <i>ja će da pričam</i> 'I will say,' <i>kude će ideš</i> 'where will you go?'	+	- inflection for person (<i>ću, ćeš, će...</i>) <i>ti ćeš da pogineš, ja ću da kažem</i> - no invariants for person <i>ja ću da pričam, gde/kud ćeš da ideš</i>

8 This does not mean that these Balkanisms are found equally in all the dialects belonging to this group. Belić (1905), Remetić (1996), Ivić (2001), Ivić (2009) and Mišeska-Tomić (2006) were consulted for examples.

9 Remetić (1996: 444) attributes this phenomenon to a Turkish influence. According to him, however, there are cases where voiced stops are preserved word-finally. According to Stanišić (1995: 53), the devoicing of word-final stops can be also found in areas where Serbian has been in contact with Albanian.

(2)	i	+	<i>bratāt</i> ‘the brother’ <i>vinoto</i> ‘the wine’ <i>babata</i> ‘the old woman’	-	<i>taj brat</i> <i>to vino</i> <i>ta baba</i>
	j	+	comparative: <i>pobogat</i> ‘richer’ superlative: <i>najbogat</i> ‘richest’	-	comparative: <i>bogatiji</i> superlative: <i>najbogatiji</i>
	k	+	<i>posluži sās vino</i> ‘serve with wine’	(+)	<i>posluži vinom</i>
(3)	m	+	<i>uzeše ga od brata ti</i> ‘they took that from your brother’	(+)	<i>život i rad mu</i> ‘his life and work’ (rare usage)
	n	(+)	- admirative meaning of perfect form ¹⁰ <i>Ama ti si bil veliki junak!</i> ‘(I did not know that) You are such a great hero!’	-	
	o	+	See <i>h</i> in this table 2 ¹¹	(+)	- tendency to prefer subjunctive over infinitive <i>moram da idem/ići</i> ‘I have to go’ <i>volim da šetam/šetati</i> ‘I like walking’
	p	+	<i>mene me boli glava</i> ‘my head hurts’	-	<i>boli me glava</i>
Total		11-12/12		1-5/12	

As Table 2 shows, the Prizren-Timok dialect group possesses main features of the Balkan Sprachbund that are foreign to standard Serbian in many cases.

An examination of the list of Balkanisms, especially the (2) morphological and (3) syntactic features, shows there are features or tendencies that appear not only in Balkan languages, but also in many Western

10 According to Mišeska-Tomić (2006: 368), in South-Eastern Serbian dialects, the perfect can sometimes have an evidential function. However, the construction can be interpreted in different ways, and therefore, further research is needed on this type of usage.

11 However, according to Remetić (1996: 499), one can find the infinitive in the Prizren dialect, which he regards as the influence of the literary language: *Neč’e mogati da dodž’e* ‘S/he cannot come.’ In addition, although it is very rare, the use of infinitive as an archaic feature can be found in a folk song: *Ne može se od roda odvojiti* ‘He cannot separate from his clan’ (Павловић 1960: 41).

European languages today. Even (2i), the use of articles, may be called a common feature, if it is treated as a use of articles in general.¹²

It is difficult to determine why Balkan and Western European languages have similar structures despite their geographical separation. However, the mechanisms of some features are internally related. For instance, the tendency to use articles and loss of case inflections are probably not independent phenomena (cf. ЦИВЬЯН 1965, Mayer 1988). In addition, the complexation of tense-aspect systems in the Balkan Sprachbund and Western European languages is related to the simplification of nominal systems in both linguistic areas.¹³

Today it is agreed that Balkanisms originated from different languages, including varieties of Romance dialects, Greek dialects, Turkish and languages, which share common features with those languages. Furthermore, the South-Eastern Serbian dialects experienced many population shifts throughout their formation, and for geographical, historical, and cultural reasons they have had, compared to Western dialects of Serbian, more frequent contact with languages that had already undergone changes.¹⁴ As Popović (1960: 551–553) and Ivić (1990: 189–198)

12 For instance, Haspelmath (2001: 1492–1510) presents 12 grammatical features and 5 seemingly European features that characterize the core European languages. Among them, 10 features and 4 features, respectively, are found in the South-Eastern dialects of Serbian.

13 It is noteworthy that Issatchenko (1940: 189) pointed out that in modern European languages, there are two types, which he called essentially “verbal” and essentially “non-verbal” languages. German and Romance languages belong to the first group, and Slavic languages to the second group, with the exception of Bulgarian, which belongs to the first group. Obviously, now one can say that Macedonian and South-Eastern Serbian can be included in the first group, together with Bulgarian.

14 According to Stanišić (1995: 56) in Serbian dialects which have been in contact with Albanian one can find following syntactic features: procliticization (“inversion” according to Stanišić’s terminology), object doubling, analytic tendency et al. Stanišić regards these phenomena results of the Albanian influence. I agree with Stanišić, but one can also add that these Albanian features are shared with local Romance languages. In this context it is noteworthy that Serbian dialects in Kosovo have many evidences of direct influence of Albanian and Turkish particularly in the phonological structure and lexicon. For details, see Barjaktarević (1977: 11–135).

pointed out, some Serbian dialects, although they are far from the areas where the Balkan languages are concentrated, experienced “Balkanization” through contact with an already-Balkanized language.¹⁵ Many Balkanisms have been noted in the Banat dialect, which has had contact with Romanian. Thus, it is not surprising that Stojkov (1968: 97–102) proposed the idea of the Banat Sprachbund, in which the Romanian influence on the local Slavic dialects, including Serbian, is seen significantly in syntax and, to lesser extent, morphology.¹⁶

Regarding the languages of Western Europe, in addition to the analytic tendencies of Indo-European languages mentioned above, it is known that, historically, Latin, and to a lesser degree, Greek, maintained their prestige as literary languages in many areas and influenced Western European language structures. The Balkan languages may be said to share this feature.

In summary, although standard Serbian is based on the Western dialects in the context of the dialectal opposition of East and West in the Serbian language, and it is geographically closer to Western Europe, entailing possible language contact (see Section 5 for details), its structure is rather archaic in comparison with those of the Western European languages, and it is certainly not an archetypal Balkan language. In contrast, as one heads East in the Serbian-speaking world, language structures becomes closer to that of the Western European type, despite the cultural separation from Western Europe. However, the West part of the Serbian-speaking world is the site of East-West cultural conflict and has been exposed to the influences of multilingualism. The key to this puzzling phenomenon—language contact in the Serbian world’s West—will be examined in Section 3.

15 It is not surprising that the standard Serbian can be a source of such “Balkanization.” According to Andrić (2009: 131), in the standard Hungarian the suffix ‘-hat/-het’ is added to express the ability of action: *írhat* ‘s/he can write,’ *maradhat* ‘s/he can stay.’ In Vojvodina where the influence of Serbian is strong, one can find such expressions or literary translations as *bir írni*, *bir maradni* in which *bir* is an equivalent of Serbian *moći* ‘can.’ These are clear cases of analyticism which is foreign to the standard Hungarian.

16 See also Bernštejn (1948) for the similar “Balkanization” of Slavic vernacular in Wallachia in the 14th–15th centuries.

3. Slavia Orthodoxa’s “East”: The East Slavic Influence in the 18th Century and Its Significance in the Formation of the Literary Language of Serbs

3-1. Historical Background

In Section 2, I presented linguistic features as evidence for placing Serbian among the languages of the Balkans, based on the geographical distribution of dialects in the context of language contact. This type of language contact is the “direct” or natural language contact of living languages spoken in everyday life. Of course, it is not only languages in proximity that can influence each other. For instance, the impact of Old Church Slavonic and the local Russian redaction of Church Slavonic in the Russian literary language is enormous (cf. Шахматов 1941: 70–89), though the contact with these prestigious language(s) is rather institutional, and the situation can be characterized as a diglossia (cf. Успенский 2002).

In a similar manner, in the history of Serbian (and Bulgarian), the Russian reduction of Church Slavonic and Russian literary language have played an important role as prestigious languages of Slavia Orthodoxa and the strongest Slavic country at that time.

According to Kulakovskij (1903: 248), the interaction between Russian and Serbian can be discerned as early as the 12th century,¹⁷ and the influence of Russian became strongest in the 18th century because of the political circumstances in the Balkans. Between the middle ages and the 18th century, what functioned as a literary language among Serbs was the *srpkoslovenski*, a Serbian redaction of Church Slavonic that had developed from Old Church Slavonic and absorbed local Serbian elements; cultural activities were mainly conducted in this language. Under the rule of the Ottoman Empire, however, the traditions of the language’s culture fell into decline. Indeed, the decline had already started at the end of the 16th century (cf. Кулаковский 1903: 260).

In 1690, discontented with the Ottoman rule, Arsenije III Čarnojević led the migration of tens of thousands of Serbs to the territory of the

17 For details of the early contact between Russians and South Slavic people, see the extensive article by Mošin (2002: 87–191).

Habsburg Empire (present-day Vojvodina and southern part of Hungary), with the permission of Emperor Leopold I. While these Serbs were accepted by the Habsburg authorities as fellow Christians, they were not allowed to publish Orthodox church-related material and were instead constantly exposed to Catholicizing measures such as the influx of Cyrillic material from the Jesuits. Furthermore, at a local level, as there were few clergymen who had received an Orthodox education and who could accurately read and write Church Slavonic, religious schools were not quite adequate (Unbegaun 1935: 27). The language of the Serbs at this time was full of loanwords from surrounding languages, to the point that Russian teacher Maxim Suvorov later described it as “Hungarian-Turkish-German-Serbian” (Кулаковский 1903: 236).

In 1718, fearing the decline of the Orthodox tradition, which has been an important source of identity among Serbs, the Belgrade Metropolitan Mojsije Petrović sent an impassioned letter to the Russian Emperor Peter the Great, practically the leader of the Slavia Orthodoxa as well as a nation of fellow Slavs with whom Serbs share the language, requesting the provision of prayer books, religious outfits and objects, funds for establishing schools, and experienced teachers (see Младеновић 1989: 10–11).¹⁸ In 1722, Peter the Great decided to support the Serbian Orthodox Church, and the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church realized the request in 1724. In addition to textbooks used in Russia at the time, such as Meletius Smotrytsky’s *Slavonic Grammar* (70 copies), Theophan Prokopovič’s *First Lessons for Children* (400 copies), and Feodor Polikarpov’s *Slavonic-Greek-Latin Dictionary* (10 copies), in 1725, synod interpreter Maxim Suvorov, who had stayed in Prague and was

18 In the history of the Russo-Serbian relationship, this action by Mojsije Petrović is always underlined. One has to agree with it, but it should be kept in mind that before this action, Serbs repeatedly asked the Holy Synod in Russia for material supports (especially books and icons), and indeed, they received support in the form of gifts from Russia and were familiar with the Russian redaction of Church Slavonic. For details, see Leščilovskaja (2006). In addition, on the secular level, Russian merchants dealing with such books and items came to the Balkans, though from time to time these imports were banned. For details, see Kostić (1912).

familiar with the situation of Slavs there, was dispatched as a teacher, and in 1726, the *Slavenskaja škola*, or the Slavonic School, was founded (cf. Рыварац 1898: 148). At this time, the official language of the Serbian Orthodox Church was changed from Serbian Church Slavonic to Russian Church Slavonic.¹⁹ This can be explained by the fact that the authoritative Smotrytsky’s grammar was accepted completely and later reprinted in the Balkans.

The Slavonic School was closed after four years, and the activity of Suvorov, according to Grujić (2013: 97), was not so successful. Having accepted the invitation of the Metropolitan Vikentij Jovanović, in 1732, Sinesije Zalutskij came. Soon after him, in 1733, Emanuil Kozačinskij and his colleagues²⁰ were dispatched from Kiev, but they returned a few years later after teaching at the *Slavjansko-Latinskaja škola*, or the Slavonic-Latin School. While these Russian and Ukrainian teachers stayed for only short periods and their activities were not fully successful, they exerted great influence in the history Serbian culture (cf. Пипер 2012: 9–19). The use of Russian Church Slavonic extended beyond churches into a variety of secular domains, functioning as a language of administration. In addition, the Russian literary languages of the time opened the doors to educated Serbs to reach publications in Russian, among which there were translations from Western European languages and by which Serbs became familiar with Western European culture.²¹ Additionally, Serbian literary activity, which had effectively disappeared since the Middle Ages, began anew.

In this period, under the influence of Russian secular publications, *graždanka*, the civil script devised by Peter the Great was introduced, at

19 One reason that the shift to Russian Church Slavonic and acceptance of the Russian language occurred in such a short time was the general but mistaken belief among the Serbs at the time that Russian Slavonic was the purest Slavonic of Saints Cyril and Methodius. By the way, today the official language of the Serbian Orthodox Church is the Serbian literary language. Though Russian Church Slavonic is used primarily for liturgy worship, there is a tendency to use Serbian as a language of liturgy (see Бајић 2007: 25).

20 For details of the activity of Kozačinskij, see Erlić (1980).

21 Needless to say, sometimes, the difference between these languages is not clear-cut.

least partially, into Serbian publications, and this script became the basis for modern Serbian. Furthermore, the emerged writers produced works in Russian for the intellectual readership of both Serbs and Russians. Examples include historiographies such as *The History of Various Slavic Peoples, Particularly the Bulgarians, Croats and Serbs* (1794) by Jovan Rajić, who was a pupil of Kozačinskij and later studied theology in Kiev; the first historiography on Serbs, *A Short Introduction to the History of the Slavo-Serbian People* (1765) by Pavle Julinac, a diplomat with Russian military experience; *The Life and Glorious Deeds of Peter the Great, Ruler of all Russia* (1772) by secular polymath Zaharija Orfelin; and pedagogic material such as *The New and Principal Slavo-Serbian Calligraphy* (1759), *Latin Primer* (1766), and *The First Lessons of the Latin Language* (1767). These works were basically written in Russian or were almost translations from Russian, especially the textbooks.²²

For the Serbian intellectuals who read these works, Russian Church Slavonic and Russian were “our Slavonic languages,” and as Tolstoj stated, they were recognized, not as foreign languages, but as alternative styles associated with different genres (1998: 254).²³ However, even as Slavonic languages, the Russian redaction of Church Slavonic and the Russian literary language were far removed from Serbian vernacular and could not be easily understood without special training. Out of this situation, a new literary language known as *Slavenosrpski*, or Slavo-Serbian,

22 See also Ostojić (1923: 112–123). The Russian of these works was that used in Russia’s secular domains, or one with many Church Slavonic elements. While Orfelin writes on the title page of *Peter the Great* that the biography was “written for the first time in Slavonic,” his understanding and the book’s linguistic morphology are not necessarily aligned.

23 This situation was not unique to Serbs. According to Xaburgaev (1984: 12), for Russians, Church Slavonic was perceived as a codified variety of their native tongue, which was contraposed to a colloquial variety of Russian. On page 13 of *A Short Introduction*, Julinac calls his language “our Russo-Slavonic or Serbo-Slavonic,” “our language.” The book is basically written in Russian with many Church Slavonic and some Serbian elements. The latter seems to have penetrated into his text not just for a stylistic purpose, but rather by chance, simply because it was Julinac’s native tongue.

emerged as a mix of numerous Serbian vernacular elements, the Russian Church Slavonic, Russian literary language, and at times even some elements of the Serbian redaction of Church Slavonic,²⁴ and this macaronic language would serve as one of the styles.

3-2. Path to the Vernacular: From Slavo-Serbian to Karadžić’s Reform

The first recorded use of Slavo-Serbian is attributed to Orfelin. To allow regular Serbs to read books in their “own language,” Orfelin published the literary journal *Slavenoserbskij magazin* ‘Slavo-Serbian Journal’ in 1768, for the South Slavic people. For this publication, he selected and translated essays and literary works dealing with topics of civil enlightenment, primarily from the Russian periodical *Ežemesjačnyja sočinenija* ‘Monthly Journal.’²⁵ One look at the Slavo-Serbian Journal’s foreword is enough to reveal the extent of mixture in Orfelin’s language.

мы овдѣ довольно упоменули, что мы трудитисе будемо токмо у собиранью готовыхъ сочиненияхъ, слѣдовательно разумѣти должно, что собственныя наши сочиненія не будутъ усмотрѣны у настоящемъ дѣлу.

‘We mentioned at length here that we will work hard at the gathering of only existing works. Therefore, it must be understood that in this publication, our original works will not be found.’

Although the initial clause *мы овдѣ довольно упоменули* may be taken lexically as either Serbian or Russian, with the exception of the adverb *овдѣ* ‘here,’ the past tense form without a copular verb is a grammatical feature of Russian (but not Russian Church Slavonic). Furthermore, while *упоменули* ‘mentioned’ may be a Russian verb, the Serbian *e* has replaced the Russian *я*. Next, the introduction of the subordinate clause

24 For the elements of the Serbian redaction of Church Slavonic in Slavo-Serbian, see Albijanić (2010).

25 It is Ostojić (1923) who identifies the source of articles as Monthly Journal. As for the language of the Slavo-Serbian Journal, the proportions of Serbian and Russian elements vary by section; thus, the language is closer to Russian in some sections and closer to the Serbian vernacular in others (see Младеновић 1965).

with *что* instead of the Serbian *да* is a feature of Russian. Regarding *мы трудитисе будемо* ‘we will work hard’ in the subordinate clause, while the vocabulary and forms are mainly Serbian, the phrase appears Russified because the Serbian future tense employs *хтети* ‘want’ as an auxiliary verb for future tense instead of the be-verb used in Russian, though here the form of the be-verb itself is Serbian in *-мо*. Additionally, the morpheme *се* in the reflexive verb *трудитисе* ‘work hard’ may be a Serbian form, but its placement as a verb suffix instead of a movable postfix is characteristic of Russian reflexive verbs. Finally, while the phrase *токмо у собирањю готовыхъ сочиненияхъ* ‘at the gathering of only existing works’ is lexically Russian and Church Slavonic, the Serbian preposition *у* is used instead of the Russian preposition *въ*, and the case inflection of the noun and the adjective is typical of the Vojvodina dialect (with a possible hypercorrection with regard to /x/ in the noun).²⁶

These features of Slavo-Serbian vary between works, genres, and even individual writers. The language contained many loanwords from Western European languages such as German, French, and Italian, in addition to Russian. It had no stable framework by today’s definition and was never established as a spoken language. Although the proportion of Serbian elements gradually increased and a kind of norm seemed to emerge over time (cf. Младеновић 1989), ultimately, as Slavo-Serbian was unable to liberate itself from Russian and Russian Church Slavonic elements, it failed to become a standard language comprehensible to the masses.

Slavo-Serbian continued to be used until the 19th century in southern Hungary and Vojvodina, the center of Serbian culture at the time. Gradually separating itself from the culture of geographically distant Russia, it was influenced by the Enlightenment and, subsequently, Romanticism in Western Europe, which was close to the Serbs, who became more familiar with the publications of those countries,²⁷ and it

26 Therefore, scholars such as Žuravlev (1982: 99) who simply regard Slavo-Serbian as “the literary Slavonic language of Russian redaction with non-significant Serbian elements” are obviously wrong.

27 As time went by, in libraries in Serbia, the number of Western European books grew in the 18th century.

evolved toward a standard language that was based on the vernacular. Through the Enlightenment-motivated activities of Dositej Obradović, Sava Mrkalj, and those who shared such ideas, a literary language based on the language of the people was at last established by Vuk Karadžić in the mid-19th century, in the context of the Revolution of 1848 in Europe, especially the Habsburg Empire.

The establishment of a standard language based on the vernacular signified the rejection of Slavo-Serbian, which lacked coherence in linguistic form, as well as the decisive split from Russian and Church Slavonic elements not present in the vernacular.²⁸ At the time, with some exceptional lexemes that were rooted in the vernacular,²⁹ Karadžić replaced words expressing abstract concepts that seemed Russian Church Slavonic in form with ones employing the vernacular (for instance, *человеколюбие* ‘philanthropy’ → *човекољубље*, *просвещение* ‘enlightenment’ → *просвјета* et al.).³⁰ For words with the Russian prefixes *вос/воз, в/во*, and *со*, he decided in favor of forms that employed either the Serbian Church Slavonic prefixes *вас/вас, ва*, or *са* or the vernacular prefixes *уз/уц, у*, or *с/са*. A certain amount of Russian Church Slavonic vocabulary remained, but since Karadžić’s reform, the abovementioned Russian influence on the development of the Serbian literary language has been minimal, and the traces of this institutional language contact in modern Serbian are slight and even negligible, when the general linguistic structure of contemporary Serbian is taken into account.³¹

3-3. Evaluation of the Russian Influence from a Present-day Perspective

After almost total elimination of Russian elements and no further intense contact with Russian, one may wonder what kind of influence Rus-

28 As Karadžić’s translation of the New Testament was intended for the masses, he included vocabulary that he judged to be “comprehensible to the masses,” even if the words did not exist in the vernacular.

29 For details, see Ivić (1991: 156–158).

30 For details, see Mošin (1974: 651–710).

31 Some words are so nativized that they are not recognized as Russian loanwords, such as *odličan* ‘excellent,’ *opasan* ‘dangerous,’ *izviniti* ‘to apologize,’ and *predložiti* ‘to suggest’ (see Brozović – Ivić 1988: 46). Additionally, the number of Russian loanwords increased during the socialist era, but this phenomenon does not fall under the scope of this article.

sian had on Serbian. Skerlić states that despite the vernacular language culture that began with the activities of Gavriilo Venclović between the late 17th and early 18th centuries, the development of a vernacular-based literary language was hindered by Russian Church Slavonic, Russian, and Slavo-Serbian languages that were distant from the Serbian vernacular (Скерлић 1966: 167). Pavić points out that the introduction of Russian Church Slavonic, which was incomprehensible to the masses, was an obstacle to the democratization of literature and religion (Павић: 1970: 38). Being in cultural decline at the time, however, Serbia had not maintained the high level of literacy that would promote a vernacular-based literary language. Even with the pressures of Habsburg Empire politics, such as Catholicization in the West, and the Ottoman Empire and Islamization in the East, however, Serbs were able to maintain their identity because they adopted Russian Church Slavonic as an official language, which secured the continuance and development of an educational system and cultural activities based on the traditions of Slavia Orthodoxa. Through publications in Russian or Russian translations from Western European languages, Serbs were also able to absorb Russian secular culture and the advanced cultures of Western Europe, leading to the formation of the Serbian intelligentsia mentioned above. Also, the civil script that came from Russia in the 18th century catalyzed the spread and development of Serbian.

In addition, as pointed out by Mladenović, the vernacular elements in Slavo-Serbian were not from the Ijekavian dialect adopted by Karadžić, but from the Ekavian dialect of Vojvodina. This is because the development of the Slavo-Serbian language tradition, with its Ekavian dialect elements, led to the establishment of the Ekavian dialect standard (in addition to Karadžić's Ijekavian-based standard), as well as to the Ekavian dialect-based development of present-day Serbian (Младеновић 2008: 150–151).

Russian culture also played an important role in the development of Serbian literature, sometimes as a vehicle of other cultures. For instance, the arrival of new versification, namely, the syllabic versification that originally came from Polish versification via Ukrainian intermediation or directly from Ukrainian, was of importance for the development of Serbian literature (see Остојић 1905: 63, Павић 1991:

48).³² In this context, it is interesting to note that, while poetry written by Serbs in the 18th century generally employed multiple styles (i.e., Russian Church Slavonic, Russian literary language, and Slavo-Serbian), there were also works published almost entirely in the vernacular, such as Orfelin’s *Lament of Serbia* (1761) and *Lament of an Educated Youth* (1764).³³ The works of this time lacked originality and were mostly imitations of Russian and Ukrainian poetry in both form and content, but it may be said that Russian language literature opened the door for Serbs to promote their own literature in the vernacular, which will be elaborated later.

4. Contact with the Islamic “East”: What the Ottoman Empire Left to Serbian

4-1. Turkish Loanwords, or Orientalizam

The following is an excerpt from the poem *Iz bir Hadži-Bobina dolafa* ‘From the story of one Hadži-Bobin’ by Aleksa Šantić (1904).³⁴

<p><i>Iz Bir Hadži-Bobina golafa</i> <i>E baš ti ja nemam nimalo igbala!</i> <i>Na mene se digla velika avala:</i> <i>Dva dilbera, demek, birinci junaka,</i> <i>Iz mahale stare, Kalhanskog sokaka,</i> <i>Dva iluma, džanum, što pišu džeride,</i> <i>A što su im, biva, veoma šefide...</i></p>	<p>From the story of one Hadži-Bobin Alas, how utterly unlucky I am! A rather troublesome thing has happened; Two youths, yes, heroes among heroes Have come from the old town, the Kalhan street, Two scholars who—oh—write newspapers, A common thing, but very clear newspapers...</p>
--	---

³² According to Ljudmila Popović (personal communication), it is noteworthy that at that time Serbs were interested in Ukraine and Russia because they were also placed between the Turkish “East” and the Catholic “West” (i.e., Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) that was quite similar to the situation of the Serbs. See also Pavić (1991: 18).

³³ For instance, the title *Sětovanie naučennago mladago čelověka* ‘Lament of an Educated Youth’ is almost entirely Russian (Church Slavonic), and “Z. O. [Zaharija Orfelin] translated from Russian to Serbian” is written on the title page. The poem itself is written almost completely in the vernacular.

³⁴ Divna Tričković and Dalibor Kličković (University of Belgrade) assisted with the translation of this poem.

Šantić was a Serbian Orthodox Christian. He was born and grew up in Mostar, which was a part of the Ottoman Empire later occupied by Austro-Hungary. This poem employs, on purpose, an excessive number of Turkish loanwords (underlined above), and though it is not easily understood by modern Serbs without prior knowledge of Turkish words, it illustrates the extent to which the Turkish culture has penetrated Serbian.

While there have been various forms of contact historically between Slavic and Turkic languages, the Ottoman Empire's advance into the Balkan Peninsula (and subsequent conquest) was the decisive start of such contact for the Slavic vernaculars there. In the case of Serbian, the influence of Turkish grew stronger from the 15th century onward.

Aside from the term *tucizam*, which refers only to Turkish loanwords, Serbian linguistics also employs the term *orijentalizam* to refer to loanwords from the "oriental languages" in general (cf. Radić's article in this volume), because many originally Arabic words (e.g., *alat* 'tool,' *miraz* 'dowry,' *sat* 'time') and Persian words (e.g., *čarape* 'socks,' *kavez* 'basket,' *šećer* 'sugar') also entered Serbian via Turkish.³⁵

According to Peco (1987: 8–10), the first edition of Karadžić's *Serbian Dictionary* (1818) contains approximately 2,500 *orijentalizam* out of 26,270 words, and the second edition (1852) contains approximately 3,700 *orijentalizam* out of approximately 40,000 words. Abdullah Škaljić's famous dictionary *Turkish Loanwords in Serbo-Croatian* (1965) contains approximately 9,000 *orijentalizam*.³⁶ The Ottoman Empire's advance into the Balkan Peninsula brought vocabulary for hitherto unknown professions, technologies, industries, businesses, and sciences, which were in trade negotiations with Turks and other peoples under the Imperial rule. There were even cases of Christian villagers traveling to and from cities where Islamic culture had taken root and returning

35 See Akopdžanjan (2010) for extensive studies on the borrowings of Persian origin. Note also that many Greek words entered Serbian via Turkish (e.g., *krevet* 'bed,' *đubre* 'rubbish,' *sunder* 'sponge'). For the Greek influence, see Vlajić-Popović's article in this volume.

36 These are loanwords in present-day Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin, and the proportion of *orijentalizam* in each language is different. Bosnian spoken by Muslims has the most *orijentalizam*, and Bosnians (or Bosniaks) have a tendency to emphasize this vocabulary as a sign of difference from Serbian and Croatian (Jahić 2000: 28–31).

home with “cultured” urban vocabulary, which was then used instead of Serbian words. Today, many of these loanwords are no longer recognized as borrowings. To give a few examples, there are words describing persons (*mušterija* ‘customer,’ *zanatlija* ‘workman,’ *budala* ‘fool,’ *komšija* ‘neighbor’), words for implements (*kašika* ‘spoon,’ *makaze* ‘scissors,’ *boja* ‘color,’ *barut* ‘gunpowder,’ *top* ‘cannon’), household items (*jastuk* ‘pillow,’ *ćilim* ‘carpet,’ *šešir* ‘hat,’ *dugme* ‘button,’ *marama* ‘handkerchief,’ *peškir* ‘towel’), food (*rakija* ‘brandy,’ *kajmak* ‘cream,’ *šećer* ‘sugar,’ *biber* ‘pepper,’ *kajgana* ‘scrambled eggs’), parts of a building (*pendžer* ‘window,’ *kapija* ‘door,’ *kula* ‘tower,’ *tavan* ‘attic,’ *kube* ‘dome’), and adverbs (*baš* ‘truly,’ *ćak* ‘even,’ *taman* ‘just,’ *džabe* ‘only’) and interjections (*jok* ‘wrong!,’ *hajde* ‘hey!’).

The inclusion of *orijentalizam* in standard Serbian is also related to Karadžić’s language reform. In removing as many foreign words as possible, Karadžić considered the expulsion of *orijentalizam*, but as some foreign words had thoroughly entered the vernacular, he decided that retaining them was more appropriate than creating new vocabulary. For this reason, even when the New Testament translation into the vernacular contained around 30 *orijentalizam*.³⁷

4-2. *The Influence of Turkish on the Structure of Serbian*

While Serbian was strongly influenced by Turkish lexically,³⁸ its phonology and grammar were largely unaffected,³⁹ especially in the di-

37 Many *orijentalizam* can be found in the manuscripts of Gavril Venclović, who gave sermons in the vernacular in the 18th century, before the Russian influence became overwhelming. This supports the view that loanwords were rooted in the vernacular at the time and sometimes were more understandable for locals. See Jovanović (1911: 295–307).

38 Needless to say, the number of *orijentalizam* depends on the dialect. In general, their proportion is greater where there has been contact with Turkish on an everyday basis. For instance, according to Petrović (2012), there are more than 400 lexical units in the manuscript of Dimitrije Čerkić’s collection of Turkish loanwords in Prizren.

39 Again, there are some dialects in which Turkish seems to have had impacts, but some of them may be the result of the Albanian influence. See Remetić (1996: 537–538).

alects that later became bases of the Serbian literary language. This is because Serbian and Turkish genetically and typologically belong to different language groups. Other factors include the absence of a constant bilingual situation due to the relatively small Turkish population in Serbia, the non-adoption of a hardline Turkification policy against conquered peoples by the rulers of the multiethnic Ottoman Empire, and the relatively high status of Serbian resulting from the early securing of influence at court by Serbs who were Muslim converts.⁴⁰ In particular, the use of Turkish did not spread among Christian Serbs, nor were there many Turkish speakers among Muslims, and only a section of the elite was conversant in Arabic and Persian (Zirojević 2009: 80).⁴¹

However, especially where the language of South Slavic Muslims who are Štokavian speakers (mainly present-day Bosniaks) is concerned, the high frequency of the phoneme /h/ may be noted as the most representative instance of a minor phonological influence. From the 17th century onward, many Serbian dialects saw a weakening of /h/, which was replaced by /v/ and /j/ (e.g. *muha* → *muva* ‘fly,’ *streha* → *streja* ‘roof’), or disappeared entirely (e.g. *hljeb* → *ljeb* ‘bread,’ *odmah* → *odma* ‘immediately’).⁴² That /h/ was better preserved compared to the language of Christians in the same area, may be attributed to the fact that this phoneme was more easily preserved in Turkish loanwords (e.g. *halva* ‘halvah,’ *duhan* ‘tobacco’), as well as the influence of the Arabic used daily in madrasahs and mosques (e.g. *halal*, *Allah*). This influence also appears in the preservation of etymological /h/ in Slavic vocabulary (e.g. *lahak* ‘light,’ *mehak* ‘soft’).

In relation to grammar, while there is no evidence of syntactic borrowing, loanword formation patterns may be widely observed. The fol-

40 Within the Ottoman Empire, Serbian was used in diplomatic communications with the Balkan territories until the mid-16th century.

41 There were even individuals who wrote literary works in Arabic and Persian, and a tradition of representing Slavic in Arabic script was formed.

42 In modern standard Serbian, the phoneme /h/ has been “reintroduced” in cases where it existed etymologically. This is because the rendering of /h/ according to etymology in the Dubrovnik dialect (in which literature flourished during the Middle Ages) was taken into consideration.

lowing morphemes are characteristic examples of word formation, and while they are borrowed as vocabulary in some cases, new vocabulary may also be derived by combining them with Serbian words.

–*ana* [Turkish: –*hane/–ane/–ne*] → place where something exists or is done (e.g. *šećerana* ‘sugar factory,’ *kafana* ‘bar,’ *oružana* ‘armory’ [Serbian: *oružje* ‘weapon’])

–*čija/džija* [Turkish: –*çi/–çı/–çü/–çu*] → profession, or person with a certain quality (e.g. *buregdžija* ‘burek [Turkish-style pastry] maker,’ *bostandžija* ‘watermelon seller,’ *mlekadžija* ‘milkman’ [Serbian: *mleko* ‘milk’])

–*lija* [Turkish: –*li/–lu/–lü/–lu*] → person/agent possessing a certain mental state, lineage, or external feature (e.g. *parajlija* ‘rich person,’ *Sarajlija* ‘person from Sarajevo,’ *fakultetlija* ‘person who studied at university’ [Serbian: *fakultet* ‘a faculty unit of a university’])

–*luk* [Turkish: –*lik/–lık/–lük/–luk*] → abstract idea, or group of people (e.g. *komšilik* ‘neighbors,’ *hadžilik* ‘worship,’ *prostakluk* ‘simplicity’ [Serbian: *prostak* ‘simple person’])

According to Radić, the derivations from these word formations may, when competing with native Serbian words, have negative connotations compared to their Serbian counterparts (Радић 2001: 189; see also Stachowski 1961). While the word formations have not caused any essential changes in Serbian’s grammatical structure, they have enriched the language as elements of the East, which characterizes modern Serbian, and they indicate a shared cultural background with other South Slavic languages, especially Macedonian and Bulgarian—from the time of Ottoman rule.

5. Contact with the “West”: The influence of German

In the history of Serbian, the Western European languages such as French, Italian, German, and Hungarian also had influence in several channels. Serbian did not have direct contact with French, and there was no possible influence from Russian. Some Štokavian dialects spoken on

the coast of the Adriatic Sea have had close contact with Italian (together with various local Romance dialects; see Popović 1960, Brozović – Ivić 1988: 44, among others). The influence of Hungarian, a language that is both typologically and genetically distant, can be found mostly in the lexicon (cf. Hadrovics 1985), though there are seemingly Hungarian influences in the phonological structure of some Serbian dialects (see Popović 1960: 579). Among these Western European languages,⁴³ German has had the greatest influence.

It is hard to determine when Slavic and Germanic peoples first came into contact, but due to the presence of loanwords from Gothic and Old High German in Proto-Slavic, it is plausible that contact was established fairly early. On the other hand, the start of Serbian's direct contact with German can be traced back to the 13th century, with the phenomena of Saxon settlers and subsequent borrowing of mining-related vocabulary.

The German influence had been strongest since the 17th century, when a part of present-day Serbia came under the Habsburg Empire.⁴⁴ In particular, elements of German entered the Serbian spoken in Vojvodina and southern Hungary, where German migrants settled. Lexemes from other Western European languages also entered via German. These tendencies continued until the start of the 20th century, when the status of German in Serbia began to decline.

5-1. Lexical Influence

Depending on the researcher, the number of German loanwords in Serbian is said to be approximately 100 to 4,000 (cf. Striedter-Temps 1958, Schneeweis et al. 1960). Differing opinions on when contact with German began, or whether to include standards, dialects, derivatives, and

43 It goes without saying that linguistically Hungarian does not belong to the Indo-European language family, but here I mention Hungarian as an administrative language of the Kingdom of Hungary which was one of the representative of Western European Culture.

44 According to Fishman (2010: 57), “the Germans considered the South Slavs in particular as their own destined sphere of influence, both culturally and politically, and it was there that foreign and domestic Germanophiles and Russophiles struggled endlessly for supremacy from the 18th to the 20th century.”

so on, are the reasons for this wide range; yet by any account, the number is significant. The German loanwords contained in the *Dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian Literary Language* (1967–1976) may be categorized into 23 semantic groups, according to Alanović (1999–2001: 306–307), and there are a significant number of lexical categories related to daily life. They are listed below in descending order by the number of borrowings.

- (1) actors/agents (e.g. *šuster* ‘tailor,’ *štreber* ‘careerist,’ *kelner* ‘waiter’)
- (2) implements (e.g. *kramp* ‘pickaxe,’ *letlampa* ‘gas burner,’ *kran* ‘crane’)
- (3) household items (e.g. *šerpa* ‘pot,’ *šolja* ‘cup,’ *šindra* ‘thatching’)
- (4) clothing (e.g. *mantil* ‘coat,’ *jakna* ‘jacket,’ *rajer* ‘feather, as on a hat’)
- (5) food (e.g. *šunka* ‘ham,’ *puter* ‘butter,’ *senf* ‘mustard’)
- (6) institutions/facilities (e.g. *pošta* ‘post office,’ *ceh* ‘guild,’ *kupleraj* ‘brothel’)⁴⁵

According to Živanović (2011), who conducted a survey in Vojvodina, culinary words borrowed from German are less familiar, especially among the younger generation.

5-2. Grammatical Influence

Grammatical borrowing occurred on a smaller scale compared to vocabulary borrowing, as the influence of German was not strong enough to change the grammatical structure of Serbian. This was because German language acquisition did not take root among the population even though it was the dominant, official language of the Habsburg Empire, and with the exception of Vojvodina, neither bilingual use of Serbian and German nor cultural Germanization took place. The following examples

45 The remaining categories are as follows: (7) military terms, (8) printing, (9) the arts, (10) transport facilities, (11) animal names, (12) plant names, (13) mining and geography, (14) medicine, (15) finance, (16) sports, (17) religion, (18) measuring instruments and units, (19) titles and designations, (20) familial terms, (21) names of races, (22) exercise equipment, and (23) grammatical terms. Alanović used the *Dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian Literary Language* for his corpus, which is why some examples characteristic of modern Croatian are included.

of grammatical borrowings, especially on the level of word formation, should be understood as peripheral to Serbian's grammar system.

The *-irati* form of the infinitive may be raised as an example of morphological borrowing. This is a borrowing of the German *-ieren*, and is a highly productive type of verbal word formation (e.g. *telefonirati* 'to make a telephone call,' *adresirati* 'to call out to someone,' *ludirati se* 'to lose one's mind' [*lud* 'crazy']).

There are also word formations where Serbian translations are modeled after German vocabulary (e.g. *kišobran* 'umbrella' ← *kiša* 'rain' + *braniti* 'to protect' [German: *Regenschirm* ← *Regen* 'rain' + *schirmen* 'to protect'], *pismonoša* 'postman' ← *pismo* 'letter' + *noša* 'carrier' [German: *Briefträger* ← *Brief* 'letter' + *Träger* 'carrier']). Furthermore, because verbs in both languages may be semantically altered by prefixes, structurally speaking, borrowings occur easily in translation (e.g. *poduzeti* 'to undertake' ← *pod* 'under' + *uzeti* 'to take' [German: *unternehmen* ← *unter* 'under' + *nehmen* 'to take']).⁴⁶

Examples of syntactic borrowing include the "preposition *za* + infinitive" construction used in speech (e.g. *kafa za poneti* 'coffee to go,' which is a borrowing of the "preposition *zu* + infinitive" construction in German),⁴⁷ as well as the "dati 'to give' + infinitive" (or *da*-construction) causative form (e.g. *dati piti* 'to make someone drink' [German: *zu trinken geben*]). Also, the use of the preposition *za* to mean "for some purpose" (e.g. *Institut za srpski jezik* 'Institute of the Serbian language' [German: *Institut für serbische Sprache*]) and the preposition *od* to mean "of" (e.g. *sestra od Jovana* 'sister of Jovan' [German: *Schwester von Hans*]) has been modeled after German. Finally, the formation of noun-noun compounds rather than adjective-noun compounds may be attributed initially to the influence of German, but today, this process is extremely productive due to the influence of English, which has a similar compounding pattern (e.g. *rok pevač* 'rock singer,' *tabu tema* 'taboo topic').

46 For the details of German calques, see the extensive work by Rammelmeyer (1975).

47 According to Mladenović (1964: 144), Jovan Rajić often used this construction in his works on the Serbian vernacular: e.g., *za ispraviti pogrešnosti* 'in order to correct wrongness.'

5-3. German and Serbian within the Danube Sprachbund or Central European Sprachbund

The contact between German and Serbian (or Serbo-Croatian) can be viewed within the larger framework of the Central European language contact zone. Skalička (2006: 1053) posited the Danube Sprachbund, citing the structural similarities of Hungarian, Slovak, Czech, Serbo-Croatian, and German. In a line with this direction, in his latest work, Thomas (2008) proposed the following features within the Carpathian Sprachbund:

Phonological features:

- a. phonemic pitch
- b. initial stress
- c. phonemic opposition of length
- d. loss of the palatalized correlation
- e. medial *l*
- f. umlauting

Morpho-syntactic features:

- g. three-tense system
- h. perfect as a simple preterite
- i. periphrastic future with a become-verb
- j. double perfect as a pluperfect
- k. definite article
- l. indefinite article

Based on the distribution of these features, German can be regarded as a core language of the linguistic area (4 phonological features, 5 morpho-syntactic features). Among these phonological features, Serbian possesses *a*, *c*, and *e*, while *b* and *d* may be called “tendencies,” and this is even a weak tendency in the case of *b*.⁴⁸ Among the morpho-syntactic

48 Immediately, one has to mention that the features *a*, *c*, *e*, and *j* are not the result of the linguistic convergence of this area but are inherited from Proto-Slavic with significant modifications. Thus, these features should be coincidental ones rather than areal features.

features, Serbian has *j*. As for the other features, *g*, *h*, *k*, and *l* might be also included, but they are far from constant features even in the Vojvodina dialect, let alone the standard language.⁴⁹

Even if one accepts the idea that the language contact with German played some role in preserving these features in Serbian, the contact itself cannot be said to have actively influenced Serbian language structure. Within the Danube or Carpathian Sprachbund, too, the position of Serbian is rather peripheral.

6. Conclusion

Taking into the account the linguistic, geographical, and political facts of the Balkan Peninsula, the Russian Empire, Ottoman Empire, and Habsburg Empire, both in synchrony and diachrony, this article has examined the structure of Serbian and its changes from the perspectives of language contact and tried to place the language in the Balkans and beyond. It can be concluded that, while the vocabularies and grammatical elements of multiple languages have entered modern Serbian through its long exposure to the diverse influences of both Eastern and Western cultures, the language was not assimilated or absorbed by either of the dominant languages. On the contrary, as once Popović (1960: 495) pointed out, by and large, the contemporary Serbian literary language has preserved, to a greater extent, archaic structures inherited (and, of course, modified in the course of their development) from Proto-Slavonic, compared to the other Slavic languages.

One reason for this is the fact that despite Serbia's position as a linguistic crossroads with a long history of multilingualism and continu-

49 According to Ivić (2001), in the Vojvodina dialects, the imperfect is practically lost, and the use of the aorist has also declined, though the degree varies from one sub-dialect to another. This means that there are tendencies toward the features *g* and *h*. As for the feature *l*, according to Ivić et al (1997: 368), the number *jedan* 'one' can function as an indefinite noun whose meaning is close to the indefinite article, in both the literary language and Vojvodina dialect. In addition, in Vojvodina, use of the pluperfect is very rare (cf. Окука 2008: 135), which excludes *i* from the features of Serbian.

ous language contact, the degree of multilingual contact experienced by eastern Herzegovina in particular—the basis for modern standard Serbian—was not significant, nor was there a stable bilingual environment for Serbian speakers. Vojvodina, which saw the usage of multiple languages, became the center of Serbian culture and resisted assimilation into a multilingual society. Furthermore, due to factors such as the Ottoman Empire’s policies, the situation was not conducive to bilingualism.

There are also geographical and cultural reasons for the qualitative weakness of the language contact. Although Serbian culture has historically been the crossroads of Eastern and Western cultures, it simultaneously existed on the periphery of the Orthodox, Islamic, and Western European cultural spheres, which could be an obstacle to cultural assimilation. Russia may have been culturally close, but due to the geographical distance, Russification in terms of language or culture was not continuous, nor did it take root.⁵⁰

In this article, I have described how Serbian language structure changed as a result of several types of language contact, including contact whose results were lost in the course of the language’s history. I have also shown the importance of interdisciplinary approaches to language contact. Applied to the whole Slavophone world, this interdisciplinary typological research will provide new insights into the research on Slavic language cultures, Serbian included.

50 According to Predrag Piper (personal communication), one has to take into consideration the fact that the Serbian national cultural identity, which had firmly taken root in mountainous rural areas, was built on the rejection of Islam and its culture and on accepting the influence of Western culture. The urban Serbian culture in the territory of the Habsburg Empire was on the way to accepting a higher degree of influence from the “East” (i.e., Russia), thanks to Russian Church Slavonic in the church, but also Russian achievements in science and literature. This was, to some extent, a result of the language policy of the Serbian Orthodox Church and Russia. The language policy of the Habsburg Empire toward Serbs prevented Russian influence and permanently distanced Serbian culture from Russian influence, particularly the Serbian literary language from the Russian literary language. Thus, the present-day linguistic situation is a result of these language policies at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century.

References

- Akopdžanjan Žana. 2010. *Reči persijskog porekla u govoru naroda bivše Jugoslavije*. Beograd: Društvo srpsko-iranskog prijateljstva.
- Alexander Ronelle. 1983. "On the Definition of Sprachbund Boundaries: The Place of Balkan Slavic." Reiter Norbert (hrsg.). *Ziele und Wege der Balkanlinguistik. Beiträge zur Tagung vom 2.-6. März 1981 in Berlin*. Band 8. Berlin: Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität Berlin, 13–26.
- Andrić Edita. 2009. *U duhu jezičke i kulturne koegzistencije*. Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga.
- Aronson Howard I. 2007. *The Balkan Linguistic League, "Orientalism," and Linguistic Typology*. New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Feuillet Jack. 2012. *Linguistique comparée des langues balkaniques*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves.
- Fishman Joshua A. 2010. *European Vernacular Literacy: A Sociolinguistic and Historical Introduction*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Friedman Victor. 2009. "Balkans as a Linguistic Area." Browne K., Ogilvie (eds.). *Concise Encyclopedia of Languages of the World*. Oxford: Elsevier, 119–133.
- Haarmann Harald. 1976. *Aspekte der Arealtypologie: Die Problematik der europäischen Sprachbünde*. Tübingen: TBL Verlag Gunter Narr.
- Hadrovics László. 1985. *Ungarisch Elemente im Serbokroatischen*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Issatchenko Alexander. 1940. "Tense and Auxiliary Verbs with Special Reference to Slavic Languages." *Journal of the Linguistic Society of America* 16: 189–198.
- Jahić Dževad. *Bosanski jezik u 100 pitanja i 100 odgovora*. Zenica: ZE Company, 2000.
- Joseph Brian. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph Brian. 1992. "The Balkan Languages." Frawley William, Bright William (eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindstedt Jouko. 2005. *Kontakto kun Balkanio*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Mayer Gerald L. 1988. *The Definite Article in Contemporary Standard Bulgarian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Mišeska-Tomić Olga. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund: Morpho-syntactic Features*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Okuka Miloš. 2008. *Srpski dijalekti*. Zagrebu: SKD Prosvjeta.
- Peco Asim. 1991. *Pregled srpskohrvatskih dijalekata*. Beograd: Naučna Knjiga.

- Popović Ivan. 1960. *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Radovanović Milorad (red.). 1996. *Српску језук. Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.
- Rammelmeyer Matthias. 1975. *Die deutschen Lehnübersetzungen im Serbokroatischen. Beiträge zur Lexikologie und Wortbildung*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.
- Schaller Helmut. 1975. *Die Balkansprachen: Eine Einführung in die Balkanphilologie*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Schneeweis Edmund. 1960. *Die deutschen Lehnwörter im Serbokroatischen in Kulturgeschichtlicher Sicht*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & CO.
- Selišček Afanasij. 1925. “Des traits linguistiques communs aux langues balkaniques: Un balkanisme ancien en bulgare.” *Revue des études slaves* 5: 5–25.
- Skalička Vladimír. 2006. “K problému dunajského jazykového svazu.” *Souborné dílo*. III díl. Praha: Karolinum.
- Stachowski Stanisław. 1961. *Przyrostki obcego pochodzenia w języku serbochorwackim*. Kraków: Nakładem Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Striedter-Temps Hildegard. 1958. *Deutsche Lehnwörter im Serbokroatischen*. Berlin: Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität Berlin.
- Škaljić Abdulah. 1965. *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Thomas George. 2008. “Exploring the Parameters of a Central European Sprachbund.” *Canadian Slavonic Papers*. Vol. L, Nos. 1–2: 123–153.
- Thomason Sarah. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Unbegaun Boris. 1935. *Les début de la langue littéraire chez les Serbes*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.
- Zirojević Olga. 2009. *Srbija pod turskom vlašću 1459–1804*. Beograd: Srpski geneološki centar.
- Алановић Миливој. 1999–2001. „Германизми у речнику српскохрватскога књижевног језика“. *Прилози проучавању језика* 30–32: 297–310.
- Албјиганић Александар. 2010. *Прилози о српском преддуковском књижевном језику*. Београд: Завод за уџбенике.
- Асенова Петја. 2002. *Балканско езикознание. Основни проблеми на балканския езиков съюз*. Велико Търново: Faber.
- Бајић Ружица. 2007. *Богослужбени језик*. Београд: Манастир Бањска.
- Барјактаревић Данило. 1977. *Дијалектолошка истраживања*. Приштина: Јединство.

- Белић Александар. 1905. *Дијалекти источне и јужне Србије*. Београд: Српска краљевска академија.
- Бернштајн Самуил Б. 1948. *Разыскания в области болгарской исторической диалектологии. Язык валашских грамот XIV–XV веков*. т. 1. Москва: Академия наук СССР.
- Грицкат Ирена. 2004. *Студије из историје српскохрватског језика*. Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства.
- Грковић-Мејџор Јасмина и др. (ред.). 2011. *Говор новог сада. Свеска 2: Морфосинтаксичке лексичке и прагматичке особине*. Нови Сад: Филозофски факултет у Новом Саду.
- Грујић Радосав М. 2013. *Српске школе (од 1718–1739 г.)*. Прилог културној историји српског народа. Нови сад: Матица српска.
- Ерчић Властимир. 1980. *Мануил (Михаил) Козачинскиј и његова Траедокомедија*. Нови Сад: Институт за књижевност и уметност.
- Журавлев Владимир К. 1982. *Внешние и внутренние факторы языковой эволюции*. Москва: Наука.
- Ивић Павле. 1985. *Дијалектологија српскохрватског језика: Увод и итокавско наречје*. Нови Сад: Матица српска.
- Ивић Павле. 1990. *О језику некадашњем и садашњем*. Приштина: Јединство.
- Ивић Павле. 1991. *О Вуку Караџићу*. Сремски Карловци-Нови Сад: Издавачка књижевница Зорана Стојановића.
- Ивић Павле. 1998. *Преглед историје српског језика*. Сремски Карловци-Нови Сад: Издавачка књижевница Зорана Стојановића.
- Ивић Павле. 2001. *Дијалектологија српскохрватског језика. Увод и итокавско наречје*. Сремски Карловци-Нови Сад: Издавачка књижевница Зорана Стојановића.
- Ивић Павле и др. 1997. „Банатски говори шумадијско-војвођанског дијалекта. Друга књига: морфологија, синтакса, закључци“, *Српски дијалектолошки зборник XLII*.
- Јовановић Владан С. 1911. „Гаврило Стефановић, Венцловић“, *Српски дијалектолошки зборник II*: 105–306.
- Костић Мита. 1912. „Рускосрпска књижевна трговина Терезијанског доба“. *Извештај српке прав. велике гимназије карловачке. за школ. годину 1911./12*. Сремски Карловци: Српска Манастирска Штампарија, 1–18.
- Кулаковский Платон А. 1903. „Начало русской школы у сербов в XVIII в.: Очерк из истории русского влияния на югославянские литературы“. *Известия отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук*. кн. 2–3.
- Лещиловская Инна И. 2006. *Сербский народ и Россия в XVIII веке*. Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя.

- Младенов Максим. 2008. *Диалектология, балканистика, етнолингвистика*. Софија: Св. Климент Охридски.
- Младеновић Александар. 1964. *О народном језику Јована Рајића*. Нови Сад: Матица српска.
- Младеновић Александар. 1989. *Славеносрпски језик: студије и чланци*. Нови Сад: Књижевна заједница Новог сада.
- Младеновић Александар. 2008. *Историја српског језика*. Београд: Чигоја штампа.
- Мошин Владимир. 1974. *Вуков Нови Завјет*. Београд: Просвета.
- Мошин Владимир. 2002. *Избрани дела. Книга прва*. Скопје: Менора.
- Остојић Тихомир. 1905. *Српска књижевност од велике сеобе до Доситеја Обрадовића*. Сремски Карловци: Српска манастирска штампарија.
- Остојић Тихомир. 1923. *Захарија Орфелин. Живот и рад му*. Београд: Српска краљевска академија наука и уметности.
- Павић Милорад. 1970. *Историја српске књижевности барокног доба (XVII и XVIII век)*. Београд: Нолит.
- Павић Милорад. 1991. *Историја српске књижевности. Барок*. т. 2. Београд: Научна књига.
- Петровић Снежана. 2012. *Турцизми у српском призренском говору*. Београд: Институт за српски језик сану.
- Пецо Асим. 1987. *Турцизми у Вуковим рјечницима*. Београд: Вук Караџић.
- Пипер Предраг. 2007. „Српски у кругу словенских језика“. *Књижевност и језик*. бр. 1–2: 1–12.
- Пипер Предраг. 2012. *Лингвистичка русистика. Студије и чланци*. Београд: Филолошки факултет.
- Попов Бојан. 1984. „Положај српскохрватског језика у балканском језичком савезу“. *Јужнословенски филолог* LXIX: 21–43.
- Радић Првослав. 2001. *Турски суфикси у српском језику*. Београд: Институт за српски језик САНУ.
- Реметић Слободан. 1996. *Српски призренски говор I (гласови и облици)*. Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности.
- Руварац Димитрије. 1898. „Мојсије Петровић, метрополит београдски“. *Споменик XXXIV*. Београд: Српска краљевска академија.
- Скерлић Јован. 1966. *Српска књижевност у XVIII веку*. Београд: Просвета.
- Станишић Вања. 1985–1986. „Балканизми у српскохрватском језику“. *Балканика. годишњак балканолошког института XVI–XVII*.: 245–265.
- Станишић Вања. 1995. *Српско-албански језички односи*. Београд: Балканолошки институт.

- Стойков Стойко. 1968. „Банатският езиков съюз“. *Славянска филология*. т. 10: София: БАН, 97–102.
- Толстой Никита И. 1998. „Литературный язык сербов в XVIII–начале XIX в.“. *Избранные труды*. Москва: Языки русской культуры.
- Успенский Борис А. 2002. *История русского литературного языка (XI–XVII вв.)*. Москва: Аспект пресс.
- Хабургаев Георгий А. 1984. «Старославянский-церковнославянский-русский литературный». Горшкова К.В. (ред.). *История русского языка в древнейший период*. Москва: МГУ, 5–35.
- Цивьян Татьяна В. 1965. *Имя существительное в балканских языках*. Москва: Наука.
- Шахматов Алексей А. 1941. *Очерк современного русского литературного языка*. Москва: Государственное учебно-педагогическое издательство наркомпроса РСФСР.

Мотоки Номати

«Восток» и «Запад» в структуре сербского языка: языковые контакты и их результат

Резюме

В настоящей статье анализируется несколько репрезентативных элементов «Востока» и «Запада» и их оппозиции в структуре и ее изменении в сербском языке с синхронической и диахронической точек зрения. При анализе особое внимание уделяется роли языкового контакта. Сначала характеризуются структурные особенности названного языка в свете балканского языкового союза. Затем анализируется русское влияние на развитие сербского языка и его значение как одного из двух «Востоков» для Сербии. Следующий раздел посвящается анализу влияния на сербский язык турецкого языка и его культуры в качестве другого «Востока». Последний раздел изучает влияние западных языков с особым вниманием на немецкий язык в свете центральноевропейского (придунайского) языкового союза. В результате анализа, проведенного в названных разделах, автор приходит к заключению, что сравнительно хорошо сохраненная архаичность сербского языка проистекает именно из-за его периферийности как с точки зрения «Востока», так и «Запада».

Ключевые слова: языковой контакт, Балканы, русский, турецкий, немецкий.