

Zvezdana Vrzić, Robert Doričić

LANGUAGE CONTACT AND STABILITY OF BASIC VOCABULARY: CROATIAN LOANWORDS FOR BODY PARTS IN VLASHKI/ZHEYANSKI (ISTRO-ROMANIAN)

dr. sc. Zvezdana Vrzić, Filozofski fakultet – New York University, zvrzic@ffri.hr, Rijeka – New York
Robert Doričić, mag. admin. sanit., Medicinski fakultet, robert.doricic@medri.uniri.hr, Rijeka

izvorni znanstveni članak

UDK 811.163.42:811.135.1(497.5-3 Istra)

811.135.1(497.5-3 Istra)'373.45:811.163.42

rukopis primljen: 17. 11. 2014.; prihvaćen za tisak: 18. 12. 2014.

Vlashki/Zheyanski, or Istro-Romanian, is a severely endangered Eastern Romance language spoken on the Istrian peninsula in Croatia. The language is now spoken by less than 120 fluent and active speakers, most of them over the age of 50. The Vlashki/Zheyanski-speaking communities are in the midst of the language shift to Croatian. Since cohabitation, population mix and bilingualism have characterized these communities for centuries, as a result of intense and long-term contact pressures, the language has undergone many lexical and structural changes under the influence of Croatian. In the lexical domain, the language has adopted many cultural borrowings, but also a significant number of core borrowings. The paper explores the extent of contact influence in the basic vocabulary of body part terms, a section of the lexicon assumed to be one of the most resistant to contact interference. Lexical equivalents of 46 body part meanings found in three different historical sources and in authors' own field data are compared. The comparison shows that a significant number of body part words has been borrowed from dialectal Croatian, that the number of loanwords has doubled since the beginning of the 20th century, that standard Croatian has become a factor of contact influence recently, and that the Zheyanski dialect of the language has preserved a greater number of native body part words.

Key words: *contact interference and lexical change; basic vocabulary; body part words; Istro-Romanian; Croatian loanwords*

1. Introduction¹

This paper examines the introduction of loanwords in the body part vocabulary of the Vlashki/Zheyanski (Istro-Romanian) language. After providing basic information about the language and its current endangerment status (see section 2), the paper describes the contact situation and defines the intensity of contact between Vlashki/Zheyanski and the relevant contact languages, primarily Croatian (see sections 3). The paper then discusses how this type of contact situation led to extensive borrowing from Croatian, including of the most basic vocabulary (see section 4). The extent of lexical borrowing from Croatian in the body part vocabulary is examined in more detail in section 5, where data representing different periods in the language's history and the two dialects of the language are analyzed.

2. About Vlashki/Zheyanski

2.1. The linguistic origin

Vlashki/Zheyanski is an endangered Balkan or Eastern Romance language spoken on the Istrian peninsula in northwestern Croatia. The terms Vlashki and Zheyanski are speakers' own names for the two regional varieties of the language known as Istro-Romanian in the linguistic literature. In this paper, the terms used by the speakers will be used, as they have an additional benefit of discriminating between two linguistically discrete forms of the language.

Vlashki/Zheyanski is one of the four sub-branches of the Proto-Romanian branch of Eastern Romance (Harris 1988: 22–24, Mallinson 1987: 303, Schulte 2009: 230). There is no agreement on when and how the different branches of Proto-Romanian split apart. Mallinson (1990: 303) dates the split in the second half of the first millennium. Linguistic evidence is often used to approximate the date when Vlashki/Zheyanski split off from the rest of Proto-Romanian: Since Vlashki/Zheyanski, unlike Romanian, but like Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian, does not have any Hungarian loanwords, it is posited that the split occurred before the time when Hungarian words started entering Daco-Romanian in the 10th or the 11th century (see Frățilă and Sârbu 1998: 13–17, Niculescu 1990: 67, Schulte 2009: 245, among others).

2.2. The linguistic area

The Vlashki/Zheyanski linguistic area is divided between the isolated northern village of Žejane, where Zheyanski is spoken, and Šušnjeveca and four surrounding villages further south from Žejane, where speakers refer to their language by the collective name Vlashki. The two locations are separated by a mountain and due to

¹ We would like to thank our language consultants Mauro (Edi) Doričić and Ivan Brkarić for their help. We would also like to thank two anonymous reviewers of this paper for their helpful comments and suggestions for changes and additions. All the shortcomings of this paper are our own.

geography, as well as the gravitational pull of different church parishes and local urban centers, speakers of Vlashki and Zheyanski, like their ancestors, have lived separate lives throughout their history in Istria with little, if any, contact.

2.3. The degree and causes of endangerment

According to the most recent estimates, there are now under 120 Vlashki/Zheyanski speakers in the villages. Speakers make around a third of the village population of around 400 (Croatian Census 2011). The estimated number of speakers at the end of the 19th century was considerably larger, around 2,500 (*Naselja i stanovništvo RH 1857 – 2001*). The number of speakers has been steadily declining ever since: It was halved by the 1960's, then reduced further dramatically—about ten times—between the 1960s and the present time (Orbanić 1995, Kovačec 1998, Filipi 2000, 2002, Vrzić and Singler, forthcoming).

The large majority of the fluent and active speakers of Vlashki/Zheyanski are now over the age of fifty. All are bilingual and have been speaking Vlashki/Zheyanski and Croatian since childhood. Since today's parents are either dominant in Croatian or are monolingual Croatian speakers, the transmission of Vlashki/Zheyanski to children has been largely interrupted, and replaced by Croatian.² Currently, Vlashki/Zheyanski has a limited role in the life of the villages and families and is restricted to communication with and among older family members and friends (Vrzić and Singler, forthcoming).

The main macro-sociolinguistic factors of the language shift to Croatian are the depopulation of the villages and the changes to the local economy and the traditional lifestyle brought about by industrialization and urbanization. Out-migration to nearby cities and abroad has been continuous since the beginning of the 20th century. It reached dramatic proportions after World War II. An economy based on subsistence agriculture, complemented by small trades and businesses, was gradually substituted by industrial and service industry employment outside the villages after World War II. These, and other, changes caused the decline in the instrumental value of Vlashki/Zheyanski and the reduction in its use. This was complemented by the lack of institutions supporting the language's maintenance, such as church or school, and an overall loss of both cultural and geographic isolation of the communities.

3. Contact situation and contact influence

3.1. Bilingualism among the Vlashki/Zheyanski speakers

It is probable that speakers of Vlashki/Zheyanski in Istria have long been bilingual, even multilingual. While individual bilingualism in their native language and Croatian was common in the second half of the 19th and the early 20th centuries (Pușcariu 1926: 226, Kovačec 1984: 584), at that time, Croatian was mostly used in church and in

² In our 2009 count taken in Žejane, we established that around 85% of the speakers were over the age of 50 and there were no known speakers under the age of 25.

communication with Croatian-speaking neighbors.³ Vlashki/Zheyanski was the dominant language of village and family communication.⁴

Linguists believe that Vlashki/Zheyanski-Croatian bilingualism may go back to the time when the Vlach ancestors of today's Vlashki/Zheyanski speakers still lived in Dalmatia, before their migration to Istria in the early 16th century (Kovačec 1998: 237 and references given within, Filipi 2005: 344). It is also posited that the migration from Dalmatia to Istria involved mixed Vlashki/Zheyanski- and Croatian-speaking populations (Kovačec 1998: 244 and references cited within). Some evidence for this claim is provided by the fact that Croatian varieties spoken around Žejane and around Šušnjeвица and the adjoining villages are Croatian dialects brought into the area by Croatian settlers who, like Vlach shepherds, came here at the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th centuries (Ribarić 2002 (1940): 49, 56).

As suggested earlier, individual Vlashki/Zheyanski-Croatian bilingualism became pervasive after World War II. For the last three or four decades or so, it has been the leading feature of communication in the communities, where Croatian now competes with, and even predominates over, the community language in all domains.

In addition to the prolonged bilingualism involving Croatian, bilingualism involving Italian has been common among the Vlashki/Zheyanski speakers, especially before World War II (Kovačec 1998: 237, Vrzić and Singler, forthcoming). In the period between two world wars, the Istrian peninsula came under the political control of Italy and all elementary schooling was in Italian. However, the knowledge of Italian, the culturally prestigious and politically dominant language in the area, would have been necessary and/or desirable even before this period, especially in the Vlashki-speaking area.

Croatian has, however, always been the language of the Vlashki/Zheyanski speakers' closest neighbors, as well as the church, and the language toward which the villages have long been shifting. The earliest, mid-nineteenth-century, report on the communities already mentions that the language was essentially gone from everyday use in a more distant southern village of Skitača, once also Vlashki-speaking (cf. Miorescu 1996 (1900): 76). The advancing shift to Croatian was reported before World War II in Gradinje and Grobnik, two other formerly Vlashki-speaking villages (Puscariu 1926: 40). After World War II, for reasons established earlier, Croatian became the dominant and/or the first language of younger generations, and communities themselves have become bilingual, divided linguistically along the age lines. Hence, the contact with Croatian has been much more enduring and pervasive than the contact with Italian, and, consequently, it is the contact influence from Croatian that is of principal interest in this paper.

³ Schooling, not widely available or attended by many children before WWI, was in Croatian, too.

⁴ As testimonies by many older speakers today suggest, their Croatian-speaking grandparents and great-grandparents, who moved into Vlashki/Zheyanski villages due to marriage, were expected to, and most often did, learn Vlashki/Zheyanski, *the* community language (cf. also Ribarić 2002 (1940): 50).

3.2. Defining the contact situation and the direction of contact influence

Keeping in mind the information provided in the previous sections, the contact situation between Vlashki/Zheyanski and Croatian can be defined as “cohabitation and population mix over an extended period of time” (cf. Schulte 2009: 233ff. for the use of similar terms), marked by “extensive interaction” among the speakers of Vlashki/Zheyanski and Croatian and “long-term multigenerational bilingualism” in Vlashki/Zheyanski and Croatian on the part of a considerable number of, if not always all, speakers.

In their model of contact-induced language change, Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 35ff.) distinguish between two main types of contact situations—“language maintenance” and “language shift”—and two types of contact-induced language change processes—“borrowing interference” and “interference through shift.” They emphasize the importance of social factors, over linguistic ones, in contact-induced language change and claim, in contrast to many earlier authors, that there are no absolute linguistic constraints on contact interference. Extensive lexical and structural changes in the receiving language are possible under the influence of another language if social factors—such as economic and cultural pressures and demographic conditions requiring intense contact and bilingualism—warrant it.

Under the circumstances of language maintenance, when a native and a fluently spoken second language coexist in use over a long period of time, bilingual speakers adopt linguistic features of their second language for use in their first language. For Thomason and Kaufman, this type of contact influence is “borrowing interference.” In language shift situations, on the other hand, contact interference goes in the opposite direction: Speakers impose the features of their first language on their imperfectly learned second language through the mechanism of language transfer.

In “borrowing interference,” contact influence typically starts with the adoption of lexical items. In the case of “interference through shift,” contact influence begins with phonological and structural changes (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988: 74–75, 113). Ultimately, the intensity of the contact defines the *extent* and *kind* of influence; all linguistic features—lexical, phonological, syntactic and morphological—may be borrowed in either case.

It often occurs that both types of contacts between languages take place in the same language community, as communities might have different types of bilingual speakers. In the case of Vlashki/Zheyanski-speaking communities, language maintenance, and borrowing interference, is likely to have been the dominant form of language contact situation for a long period of time, even several centuries. In the course of this time, Croatian regional varieties have been exerting influence on the language and are at the root of many of its properties today.

Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 74–75) put forward the Borrowing Scale to account for the linguistic changes—their kind and course—expected to occur under the circumstances of language maintenance. This borrowing probability hierarchy includes

five contact situation types, ordered by an increasing degree of intensity of contact, from Type 1/“Casual contact” to Type 5/“Very strong cultural pressure.” The Borrowing Scale predicts that the more internally structured a particular language subsystem is, the greater the intensity of contact needs to be for the changes due to borrowing interference to take place in it. In Type 1/“Casual contact,” for example, only lexical borrowing is expected to occur, while in Type 5/“Very strong cultural pressure” heavy structural borrowing of “major structural features that cause significant typological disruption” (p. 75) is predicted.

Vlashki/Zheyanski best fits Thomason’s and Kaufman’s Type 4/“Strong cultural pressure” situation, where, in addition to extensive lexical borrowing, a moderate structural borrowing occurs. Lexical borrowing in the language, in particular, the introduction of loanwords, will be discussed more in the next section. In addition, significant structural, even typological, changes have occurred in the language’s phonology, syntax and morphology under the influence of Croatian (cf. Kovačec 1998: 300–302, 315–316 for examples).

4. Lexical influence in Vlashki/Zheyanski

Of all Eastern Romance languages, Vlashki/Zheyanski is considered to have replaced the largest number of native Proto-Romanian words, most of them of Latin origin, by loanwords. Most loanwords originate in Istrian Croatian regional dialects. Italian, in particular, Istro-Venitian loanwords are much less numerous, and many may have, in fact, been borrowed from dialectal Croatian, heavily influenced by Istro-Venitian (cf. Kovačec 1995: 73). In glossaries and dictionaries, as many as 60% of Vlashki/Zheyanski words may be loanwords, the majority of them of Croatian origin (Pușcariu 1926: 200, Kovačec 1963: 3, Kovačec 1981: 581, Kovačec 1998: 306). This mass borrowing into Vlashki/Zheyanski was enabled by favorable sociolinguistic circumstances (cf. Tadmor 2009: 58): Vlashki/Zheyanski has been spoken in a very small and marginalized group, marked by widespread bilingualism, permissive attitudes toward lexical borrowing and no linguistic norm to conform to, among other factors.

In addition to a large number of “cultural borrowings” in Vlashki/Zheyanski, many Croatian, and Italian, loanwords are “core borrowings,” i.e. words which have replaced or co-existed with native Vlashki/Zheyanski words.⁵ In Vlashki/Zheyanski, loanwords can be found in all basic vocabulary semantic fields: numbers under 10, kinship terms, color terms, words for basic actions and cognition, as well as words for body parts, under consideration in the next section. Further, many function words are loanwords, such as determiners (e.g. *saki* ‘every’), complementizers (*neka* ‘in order to, so that’), conjunctions (*ali* ‘or’, *nego* ‘than’, *e* ‘and’), and prepositions (e.g. *za* ‘for’). Finally, structural, and typological, changes were brought about through the adoption of Croatian derivational (e.g. aspectual infix *-av-/-iv-*) and inflectional affixes (e.g. adjectival neuter gender suffix *-o*) (see Kovačec 1998 for more examples).

⁵ See Haspelmath (2009: 48–49) for more information about the distinction between “cultural borrowings” and “core borrowings.”

5. Croatian loanwords in the Vlashki/Zheyanski body part vocabulary

5.1. Haspelmath's and Tadmor's findings regarding the basic vocabulary

In their typological survey of loanwords, which included over forty languages, Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009) offer statistical support for long-standing assumptions regarding lexical borrowing proposed in the historical and typological linguistic literature. Their study shows that the semantic field “The body,” one of the twenty-four semantic fields they explore, is the third least likely to include words of non-native origin. On average, loanwords in this semantic field make just 14.2% of all words.⁶ In contrast, the highest borrowing semantic field, “Religion and Beliefs,” has the average borrowing rate of 41.2% (Tadmor 2009: 64). Tadmor explains that the low-borrowing-rate semantic fields “consist of concepts that are universal and shared by most human societies. Practically every language can be expected to have indigenous words for such concepts, and therefore has no need to borrow them” (p. 65).

In addition to the borrowability ranking of semantic fields, Haspelmath and Tadmor also put together a weighted list of basic vocabulary—the Leipzig-Jakarta List of Basic Vocabulary (Tadmor 2009: 68ff.). According to Tadmor (2009: 68), “It [the Leipzig-Jakarta List of Basic Vocabulary] is a full-fledged basic vocabulary ranking. It comprises the notions normally associated with the concept: stability (our age score), universality (our representation score), and simplicity (our analyzability score), as well as resistance to borrowing (our unborrowed score).” For example, of the 100 words on the list, the meaning ‘nose’ has the composite score of 0.864, which is the second highest after the meaning ‘fire’. As such, the meaning ‘nose’ is highly unlikely to be expressed by a loanword in any language. Relevantly for this paper, word meanings for body parts make the best represented semantic field on the Leipzig-Jakarta List; 17% of word meanings there are body part meanings.

5.2. Body part words in Vlashki/Zheyanski: Sources and sample

We undertook a historical comparison of body part words in Vlashki/Zheyanski and drew a list of words from three different published sources— Byhan (1899), Pușcariu (1929), and Kovačec (1998). To this, we added our own field data. The data presented in the sources were collected between 1857 and 1883, 1900 and 1908, 1961 and 1967, respectively, and together with our data, collected in 2012, they represent an approximate time frame of around 150 years in the language’s history.

Words for 97 body part meanings were identified in the three published sources. Of those, 46 meanings had word equivalents in all three published sources.⁷ We list

⁶ The semantic fields “Spatial relations” and “Sense perception” have even lower borrowing percentages, of 14.0% and 11.0% respectively.

⁷ Other important historical sources of lexical data for the language are: Filipi 2002a, *Atlante linguistico italiano* and *Atlasul lingvistic român*. The first two sources do not contain all the words listed in the sources we used. The third source was inaccessible to us during the preparation of this paper and could not be checked.

these 46 body part meanings with their modern Vlashki/Zheyanski word equivalents we collected in the table “Body Part Words in Vlashki/Zheyanski with their Source Words and with Comparison to Romanian,” found in the Appendix. The body part meanings and word equivalents are provided in the first two columns of the table.⁸ In the third column, Vlashki/Zheyanski words are compared to Romanian words for the same meanings provided in Schulte 2009b. Additional words are added to those listed in Schulte 2009, when they exist in dialectal varieties of Romanian and are cognate with the words existing in Vlashki/Zheyanski.⁹ All cognate words are considered to be native words in Vlashki/Zheyanski—regardless of whether they are of Latin or some other origin (e.g. Old Slavic)—since the goal is to identify loanwords which entered the language long after the Proto-Romanian split, as a result of the contact with Croatian. Finally, in the last column of the table, source words for all Vlashki/Zheyanski words in the second column are provided. With the exception of a few uncertain cases, loanwords for body parts in Vlashki/Zheyanski are of a relatively more recent, i.e. Croatian, origin, and seem to be the consequence of the contact between Vlashki/Zheyanski and Croatian in Istria.

5.3. Body part words in Vlashki/Zheyanski: Native words or Croatian loanwords?

Among the 46 body part meanings with word equivalents in Vlashki/Zheyanski in all four sources, 21 meanings are expressed with the same and only the native words in both Vlashki and Zheyanski in all four periods. These words are: *šânže/sânže*^{10,11} ‘blood’, *osu* ‘bone’, *kuru* ‘buttocks’, *ureklja* ‘ear’, *oklju* ‘eye’, *žâžetu* ‘finger’, *unġlja* ‘fingernail’, *frunta* ‘forehead’, *mâra* ‘hand/arm’, *kâpu* ‘head’, *jirima* ‘heart’, *žerunklju* ‘knee’, *piçoru* ‘leg/foot’, *fikâci* ‘liver’, *gura* ‘mouth’, *çica* ‘nipple/teat’, *nâsu* ‘nose’, *puca* ‘penis’, *koste* ‘rib’, *limba* ‘tongue’, and *dînte/dîntu* ‘tooth’. Ten additional meanings are expressed with native words, which, however, had coexisted in the past or coexist today with loanwords¹²: *kljeptu* ‘chest’, *bârba* ‘chin/beard’, *kovatu/kuvetu* ‘elbow’, *obrâzu/fâca* ‘face/cheek’, *peru* ‘hair/body hair’, *žinžirile/žinžive* ‘gums’, *çerbiça* ‘nape/neck’, *burîku* ‘navel’,

⁸ For reasons of space, we provide only the modern words for body parts in the Appendix. The full table, which includes body part words from the three older published sources we used for comparison, can be obtained from the authors.

⁹ This information was provided to us through personal communication in 2012 by Laura Spinu.

¹⁰ The orthography used in this paper was developed by Vrzić (2009). The phonetic values of the letters which do not correspond to the symbols of the International Phonetic Alphabet are: <â> [a], <â> [ɔ], <e> [æ], <c> [tʃ], <ç> [tʃ], <ç> [tʃ], <lj> [ʎ], <nj> [ɲ], <š> [ʃ], <ž> [ʒ]. For more information about this orthographic system and a comparison to the systems used by other authors, see <http://www.vlaski-zejanski.com/Learn/Language-lessons/writing>.

¹¹ The underlining marks the position of the word stress.

¹² The coexistence of native words with loanwords was taken into account even when a loanword's coexistence was attested in an earlier period, but not a later one. In such cases, coexistence of native words and loanwords did not lead, as it does not need to, to a lexical replacement, but it is an indication of the variability in usage and the language change trend.

umeru ‘shoulder’, and *špljira* ‘spleen’. In total, 31 body part meanings, out of a total of 46 meanings, or more than 67% of them, are expressed with native words in both dialects. For additional 4 meanings, native words have been preserved in Zheyanski, but not in Vlashki: *folele* vs. *târbuhu* ‘belly’, *žâna* vs. *obrovica* ‘eyebrow’, *pumânu* vs. *punja* ‘fist’, *mâca* vs. *budilele*, *drobu* ‘intestine(s)’. Finally, 8 native words were replaced by Croatian loanwords, sometimes different ones, in both dialects: *gârkljânu* ‘Adam’s apple/throat’, *hârbâtu* ‘back’, *životu*, *teline* ‘body’, *možlji/možljani*, *mozâk/mozgu* ‘brain’, *peta* ‘heel’, *mustâfele* ‘mustache’, *koža* ‘skin/hide’, and *štumihu*, *štumigu* ‘stomach’. Words for 3 other meanings—‘calf’, ‘sole of foot/foot’, and ‘throat’—are excluded from the count as they do not belong to the relevant categories.¹³ The table below presents this information.

Table 1: *Body part words in Vlashki/Zheyanski: Native words vs. loanwords count with the type of change*

Native words alone are in use in <i>both</i> dialects	21	
Native words coexist with loanwords (in whichever period)	10	7 native words coexist with loanwords in Vlashki; 1 native word coexists with a loanword in Zheyanski; 1 native word coexists with a loanword in both Vlashki and Zheyanski; 1 word is without dialect information
Native words were replaced with loanwords in one dialect	4	4 replacements by loanwords in Vlashki
Native words were replaced with loanwords in <i>both</i> dialects	8	
Other	3	
Total	46	

¹³ Today’s terms for ‘calf’, Zheyanski *grosa kârne* and Vlashki *hârbâtu de piçor*, are descriptive and use the language’s own resources (but the Croatian loanword *hârbâtu* ‘back’ is extended in meaning to form the Vlashki term). For the meaning ‘sole of the foot’, Zheyanski has *pâma*, a native word, but one obtained by meaning extension from *pâma* ‘palm’. In Vlashki, the new coinage *supiçor* is used today. The third word excluded from the count is *gut* ‘throat’, whose origin is uncertain: the word could be native in our sense, i.e. Latin or Old Slavic (Frătilă 2002), or borrowed from Chakavian Croatian (Kovačec 1993: 84).

The following table presents this information separately, for each dialect.

Table 2: *Body part words in the Vlashki dialect and the Zheyanski dialect: Native words vs. loanwords count with the type of change*

	Vlashki	Zheyanski	Dialect not known
Native words alone are in use	22	32	
Native words coexist with loanwords (in whichever period)	8	2	1
Native words were replaced with loanwords	12 (26.6%)	8 (17.4%)	
Other	3	3	
Total	45	45	

It is apparent from the Table 2 above that Zheyanski has conserved more native words and adopted fewer loanwords: Zheyanski expresses 32 body part meanings using *only* the native words. For two additional meanings, native words are used in variation with loanwords, and, if we also include the case of coexistence where the dialect could not be determined, 36 native body part words are now used in Zheyanski, making 78% of the total number of words in our sample. Vlashki expresses 22 body part meanings using *only* the native words. For 8 additional meanings, native words were or are used in Vlashki alongside loanwords in one or more of the periods attested, and if we also include the case of coexistence where the dialect could not be determined, 31 native words are used in Vlashki, or around 67% of the total. The difference between the two dialects becomes further obvious when the numbers of loanwords (Vlashki, 12 vs. Zheyanski, 8) and the numbers of native words used in variation with loanwords (Vlashki, 8+1 vs. Zheyanski, 2+1) are compared. Taken together, the numbers demonstrate the greater propensity in Vlashki toward the adoption of loanwords.¹⁴

The source words of the loanwords are Croatian in most, if not all, cases. Usually, loanwords come from the regional Chakavian Croatian varieties. The Croatian source words for Vlashki/Zheyanski loanwords, including those that coexist or had coexisted with native words earlier, without replacing them, are listed here: ‘Adam’s apple/throat’: *grkljan*, ‘back’: *hrbat*, *lopatica*, *život*; ‘belly’: *trbuh*; ‘body’: *telo*, *telino*; ‘brain’: *možljen*, *mozak*, ‘calf’: *cipel(j)*, *hrbat* (in Vl. *hârbâtu de pičor*); ‘chest’: *štumig*; ‘chin/beard’: *brada*, *barbuc*; ‘elbow’: *lakat*; ‘eyebrow’: *obrva*, *obrvice*; ‘fist’: *punja*, *šaka*; ‘heel’: *peta*; ‘intestine(s):

¹⁴ Similar observations, both in regard to the lexicon and in reference to other levels of linguistic structure, were made before (cf. Kovačec 1998: 300–302, 306–314, and references within). This is likely to be due to an older and/or more extensive practice of bilingualism in the villages where the Vlashki dialect is/was spoken. A sociolinguistic study on language use, attitudes and identity, carried out recently by Vrzić and Singler (forthcoming), provides information pointing in this direction. The language shift to Croatian started earlier, and is now more advanced, in the Vlashki-speaking villages than in the Zheyanski-speaking village.

budele, utroba, olito, drob; ‘mustache’: *mustafe*; ‘nape’: *batica*; ‘navel’: *pupak*; ‘shoulder’: *rame(na)*; ‘skin/hide’: *koža*; ‘sole of the foot’: *stopalo, stopa*; ‘spleen’: *slezena, slezina, porebrica*; and, ‘stomach’: *štumig*.^{15,16}

It is notable that the influence of standard Croatian can now be observed in this part of the Vlashki/Zheyanski vocabulary as well. Standard Croatian words, already widespread as source words for cultural borrowings in Vlashki/Zheyanski, are now also being adopted as core borrowings: The Croatian loanwords *mozāk* and *mozgu* ‘brain’ now coexist with the older Chakavian Croatian loanwords *mōžlji* and *mōžljani*. The Croatian loanword *slezena* ‘spleen’ seems to be pushing out the older Chakavian Croatian loanwords *slezina*, *sležena* and *slezenica*, which have been in competition with the native word *špljira*.

In conclusion, the borrowing of lexical items from Croatian—mostly from Croatian regional dialects, but since recently also from standard Croatian—has been the dominant form of lexical change in this part of the vocabulary in our sample. Lexical changes of other types are much less frequent, but are attested, such as the formation of descriptive terms, e.g. ‘calf’: *grosa kārne* ‘lit. large flesh’, *kārna de pičor* ‘lit. leg flesh’, *hārbātu de pičor* ‘lit. back of the leg’; calquing, e.g. ‘gums’: *kārna di la dīnc* ‘lit. flesh of the tooth’ on analogy with Croatian *zubno meso* ‘lit. tooth flesh’; coinage, e.g. ‘sole of the foot’: *supičor* ‘lit. underfoot’; and meaning extension, e.g. ‘sole [of the foot]’: *pāma* [*de pičor*] ‘lit. palm [of the foot]’.

The comparison between the data from the late 19th and the early 20th centuries and the data from the 1960s and the current time shows that the process of replacement of native body part words by loanwords has continued: While loanwords had replaced a number of native body part words already in the two older sources, their number in Vlashki/Zheyanski has almost doubled between the two earliest sources and now.

At the same time, it is interesting to note how the body part vocabulary in Vlashki/Zheyanski still fits the predictions about this semantic field made by Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009). In the list in the Appendix, 15 body part meanings, those marked with the superscript ^{L-J}, are also those that figure among 17 such meanings on the Leipzig-Jakarta List of Basic Vocabulary (Tadmor 2009: 69–71). As mentioned earlier, the body part meanings make the largest semantic group on the list of meanings which, cross-linguistically, are the least likely lexical items to be replaced by loanwords (Tadmor 2009: 69–71). Indeed, Vlashki/Zheyanski largely confirms this: Among 15 words for body parts in our list in the Appendix, corresponding to the meanings on the Leipzig-Jakarta List, all but one are native Vlashki/Zheyanski words, proving their special resistance to borrowing.¹⁷

¹⁵ This list does not include possible Croatian source words for ‘gums’, ‘calf’ and ‘throat’, *čerenj, riba*, and *gut*, respectively, which are either of unknown or uncertain origin (cf. note 13 regarding *gut*).

¹⁶ Note that Chakavian Croatian words *štumig, punja, budele* and, likely, *mustafe* are Istro-Venitian loanwords.

¹⁷ The likely Croatian loanword, *koža*, has been used for the meaning ‘skin’ since the earliest attestation.

6. Conclusion

Under the circumstances of extensive individual and community bilingualism, and an advancing language shift, the basic vocabulary for body parts in Vlashki/Zheyanski has been undergoing lexical changes, principally, through the replacement of native Vlashki/Zheyanski words by Croatian loanwords. The introduction of loanwords can be attested in both dialects of the language: In our sample of 46 body part terms, loanwords make over 26% of body part words in Vlashki and 17% in Zheyanski. Of the two dialects, Vlashki is the less conservative variety, spoken in the villages where language shift to Croatian has started earlier and is now in a more advanced stage. While the percentage of loanwords in this most resistant segment of the language's vocabulary is much smaller than in other, less basic, areas of the lexicon, it is considerable and in line with the language's long-standing contact with Croatian.

References

- Byhan, Arthur (1899) "Istrorumänisches Glossar", *Iahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache*, 4, 174–396.
- Croatian Census 2011*, Croatian Bureau of Statistics, <http://www.dzs.hr/Hrv/censuses/census2011/censuslogo.htm>, accessed on Sept. 29, 2014.
- Dex Online: Dicționare ale limbii române*, <http://dexonline.ro>, accessed on Oct. 20, 2014.
- Du Nay, André (1996) *The Origins of the Rumanians: The Early history of the Rumanian Language*, Matthias Corvinus Publishing, Toronto-Buffalo.
- Filipi, Goran (2000) "Entomonimi nell'istrorumenno moderno", *Processi di convergenza e differenziazione nelle lingue dell'Europa medievale e moderna*, eds. Fabiano Fusco, Vincenzo Orioles and Alice Parmeggiani, Udine, 207–232.
- Filipi, Goran (2002a) *Istrorumunjski lingvistički atlas = Atlasul Lingvistic Istroromân = Atlante Linguistico Istrorumenno*, Znanstvena udruga Mediteran, Pula.
- Filipi, Goran (2002b) "About the Istrian-Romanian forms of the *splira* type", *Annales*, 12, 2, 415–420.
- Filipi, Goran (2005) "Istrorumunjski", in *Istarska enciklopedija*, eds. Miroslav Bertoša and Robert Matijašić, Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, Zagreb, 344–345.
- Frățilă, Vasile, Sârbu, Richard (1998) *Dialectul Istroromân: Texte și glosar*, Editura Amarcord, Timișoara.
- Frățilă, Vasile (2002) "Terminologia corpului în dialectul istroromân", *Tabula*, 6, 121–135.
- Harris, Martin (1988) "The Romance languages", *The Romance Languages*, eds. Martin Harris and Nigel Vincent, Oxford University Press, New York, 1–25.
- Haspelmath, Martin, Uri, Tadmor (2009) "The Loanword Typology project and the World Loanword Database", *Loanwords in the World's Languages*, eds. Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, 1–34.

- Haspelmath, Martin (2009) "Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues", *Loanwords in the World's Languages*, eds. Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, 35–54.
- Istarski rječnik*, Histria Croatica – C.A.S.H., <http://istarski-rjecnik.com/projekt>, accessed on Oct. 20, 2014.
- Kovačec, August (1963) "Note de lexicologie istroroumaine: Sur la disparition des mots anciens et leur remplacement par des mots croates", *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabienisia*, 15–16, 3–39.
- Kovačec, August (1981) "Les différences lexicales entre l'istroroumain du nord et l'istroroumain du sud", *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabienisia*, 26, 1–2, 57–83.
- Kovačec, August (1984) "Istroromâna", *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, ed. Valeriu Rusu, Scrisul Românesc, Craiova, 550–590.
- Kovačec, August (1993) "Neki problemi istrorumunjske etimologije", *Etimologija*, ed. Vojmir Vinja, Zagreb, 81–91.
- Kovačec, August (1995) "Jezik istarskih 'Rumunja'", *Annales* 6, 65–76.
- Kovačec, August (1998) *Istrorumunjsko-hrvatski rječnik (sa gramatikom i tekstovima)*, Znanstvena udruga Mediteran, Pula.
- Maiorescu Ioan (1996 (1900)) *Itinerario in Istria e vocabolario istriano-romeno*, Edizioni Parnaso, Trieste.
- Mallinson, Graham (1987) "Rumanian", *The World's Major Languages*, ed. Bernard Comrie, Oxford University Press, New York/Oxford, 303–321.
- Milevoj, Marijan (1992) *Gonanponase: Rječnik labinskog govora*, Labin.
- Mohorovičić-Maričin, Franjo (2001) *Rječnik čakavskog govora Rukavca i bliže okolice*, Adamić, Rijeka-Opatija-Matulji.
- Naselja i stanovništvo RH 1857 – 2001, *Croatian Bureau of Statistics*, <http://www.dzs.hr>, accessed on Sept. 29, 2014.
- Niculescu, Alexandru (1990) *Outline History of the Romanian Language*, Unipress, Padova.
- Orbanić, Srđa (1995) "Status attuale delle comunità istro-romene", *Annales*, 6, 57–64.
- Pellis, Ugo, Lorenzo Massobrio, Matteo Bartoli et al. (1995) *Atlante lingvistico italiano, Volume I: XX*. Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, Libreria dello Stato, Roma.
- Pușcariu, Sextil (1926) *Studii istroromâne, Vol. III: Bibliografie critică, listele lui Bartoli, texte inedite, note, glosare*, Cultura națională, București.
- Pușcariu, Sextil (ed.) (1938) *Atlasul lingvistic român*, Muzeul Limbii Române din Cluj, Cluj.
- Ribarić, Josip (2002 (1940)) *O istarskim dijalektima: Razmještaj južnoslavenskih dijalekata na poluotoku Istri s opisom vodičkog govora*, Josip Turčinovic, Pazin.

- Schulte, Kim (2009a) "Loanwords in Romanian", *Loanwords in the World's Languages*, eds. Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, 230–259.
- Schulte, Kim (2009b) "Romanian vocabulary", *World Loanword Database*, eds. Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor, *Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology*, <http://wold.cld.org/vocabulary/8>, accessed on Sept. 23, 2014.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, University of California Press, Berkeley/Los Angeles/Oxford.
- Vrzić, Zvezdana (2009, July) "Kako pisati vlaški ili žejanski jezik? [How to write Vlashki or Zheyanski?]", paper presented at the Days of the Vlashki/Zheyanski Language Conference, Šušnjevića, Croatia.
- Vrzić, Zvezdana and John V. Singler (forthcoming) "Identity and language shift among Vlashki/Zheyanski speakers in Croatia", *Proceedings to the International Conference on Endangered Languages in Europe 2013, Language Documentation & Conservation*, University of Hawai'i Press.

Appendix: Body Part Words in Vlashki/Zheyanski with their Source Words and with Comparison to Romanian

Body Part Meaning	Vlashki/Zheyanski Word Today	Romanian Word ¹⁸	Source Word for Vlashki/Zheyanski ¹⁹
Adam's apple/ throat	Zhe. gârkľjãnu Vl. zaletãvãcu de gârkľjãn ²⁰	mărul lui Adam (Not in Schulte 2009)	1) Cr. grkľjan 2) Chak. Cr. zaletavac ²¹
back	hãrbãtu	spate 1 Gr.	Chak. Cr. hrbat
belly	Zhe. folele Vl. tãrbuhu	burtã, abdomen, pãntece, vintre; foale 3 Alb., 1 uncertain: Lat., Fr., 5, 5	1) Lat. föllis 2) Chak. Cr. trbuh
^{L-J} blood ²²	Zhe. sãnze Vl. šãnze	sãnge 5	Lat. sanguis
body	Zhe. životu de om Vl. telina de om	trup, corp 1 Sl.; 1 uncertain: Fr., Lat., Ger.	1) Chak. Cr. život 2) Chak. Cr. telino, or, coinage: Cr. telo + -ina (B, F) ²³
^{L-J} bone	osu	os 5	1) Lat. ossum 2) Lat. costa
brain	Zhe. mozãk, moźłji Vl. mozgu, moźljani	creier 5	1) Chak. Cr. moźjani (F), moźjeni, moźljen 2) Cr. mozak
buttocks	ķuru	sezut, fund, dos, bucã; ķur 5, 5, 5, 5	Lat. culus
calf	Zhe. grosa ķarne Vl. hãrbãtu de piķor	pulpã 5	1) descriptive term 2) descriptive term

¹⁸ Romanian words and their sources listed in this column come from Schulte 2009. Additional Romanian words, usually, non-standard or regional, not provided by Schulte, are added here when they are cognate with the Vlashki/Zheyanski words. Numbers indicate the origin of words as provided by Schulte: 5 no evidence for borrowing (i.e. of Latin origin); 4 very little evidence for borrowing; 3 perhaps borrowed; 2 probably borrowed; 1 clearly borrowed. Romanian words in boldface are cognate to words in Vlashki/Zheyanski.

¹⁹ Source words are listed in the order of Vlashki/Zheyanski words in the second column. This etymological information is based on suggestions provided by Byhan (1899), Frãtilã (2003) and Kovačec (1981, 1993, 1995, 1998). *Dex Online: Dicționare ale limbii române* was also used for comparison. In most cases, *Istarski rječnik* was consulted for Chakavian Croatian source words.

²⁰ Vl.=Vlashki, Zhe.=Zheyanski.

²¹ Chak. Cr.=Chakavian Croatian dialect; Cr.=Croatian; Gr.=Greek; It.=Italian; Istro-Ven.=Istro-Venitian (dialect of Italian); Rom.=Romanian, Sl.=Slavic. The meaning of source words is not indicated unless it is significantly different from the body part meanings provided in the first column.

²² The superscript ^{L-J} in front of a word means that the word is found on the Leipzig-Jakarta List of Basic Vocabulary (Tadmor 2009: 68–71).

²³ F=Frãtilã 1998, B=Byhan 1899, Fi=Filipi 2002b. Author's last name initial is provided with those etymologies which have not been widely accepted and/or repeated by other authors.

Body Part Meaning	Vlaski/Zheyanski Word Today	Romanian Word	Source Word for Vlaski/Zheyanski
chest	kljeptu	piept 5	1) Lat. pectus
chin/beard	bârba 'chin, beard', peri de bârba 'beard'; Vl. also: barbu 'chin, beard', peri de barbu 'beard'	bârbie 'chin'; barbă 'beard' 5, 5	1) Lat. barba, cf. Chak. Cr. barba 'chin, beard' 2) descriptive term 3) Chak. Cr. barbuc 'beard' < Istro-Ven. barbuc, barbucso 4) descriptive term
^{L-J} ear	ureklja	ureche 5	Lat. auricula
elbow	Zhe. kuvetu Vl. kovatu	cot 5	Lat. cubitum (F)
^{L-J} eye	oklju	ochi 5	Lat. oculus
eyebrow	Zhe. žâna Vl. obrovica	sprânceană 5	1) Lat. *genna 'eyelid', cf. Rom. geană 'eyelash' 3) Chak. Cr. obrvice
face/cheek	obrâzu Zhe. also: fâca	față , chip, obraz , figură 5, 1 Hung., 1 Sl., 1 Fr.	1) Sl. obraz 2) Lat. facies; cf. also Chak. Cr. faca '
finger	žâžetu	deget 5	Lat. digitus
finger nail	unglja	unghie 5	Lat. ungula
fist	Zhe. punja Vl. pumânu	pumn (Not in Schulte 2009)	1) Chak. Cr. punja < It. pugno 2) Lat. pugnus
forehead	frunta	frunte 5	Lat. frons
gums	Zhe. žinžirile Vl. žinživele	gingie 5	Lat. gingiva, *gingina
^{L-J} hair/body hair	peri 'hair', peru 'a hair'	păr (peri) 5	Lat. pilus
^{L-J} hand/arm	mâra	mână 5	Lat. manus
head	kâpu	cap 5	Lat. caput
heart	jirima	inimă , cord 5, 5	Lat. anima
heel	peta	călcâi 5	Cr. peta
intestine(s)	Zhe. mâca Vl. budilele , drobu	măruntaie, intestin, viscere, vintre; mațe 5, 1 Lat., Fr., 1 Lat., Fr., 5	1) Lat. matia 2) Chak. Cr. budele < Istro-Ven. budele 3) Old Sl. *drobu (F), cf. Rom. drob 'piece, bit' and Chak. Cr. drob

Body Part Meaning	Vlashki/Zheyanski Word Today	Romanian Word	Source Word for Vlashki/Zheyanski
^{L-J} knee	žerunklju	genunchi 5	Lat. *geniculum
^{L-J} leg/foot	pičoru	picior 'leg, foot', labă 'foot' 5, 1 Hung., Sl.	Lat. petiolus
^{L-J} liver	fikâci	ficat 5	Lat. ficatum
^{L-J} mouth	gura	gură 5	Lat. gula 'throat, neck'
mustache	mustâfele	mustață (Not in Schulte 2009)	Chak. Cr. mustafe
^{L-J} nape/neck	čerbjča Zhe. also: batica	ceafă, grumaz; cerbice 1 Alb., 3 Alb.	1) Lat. cervix 2) uncertain: Chak. Cr. batica 'small head (of an object)'
navel	buriku	buric, ombilic 5, 1 Fr.	Lat. umbilicus, *umbulicus
nipple/teat	čica	țâtă, sfârc, mamelă 5, 3 unidentifiable, 1 Fr.	Lat. *titia, cf. cognate words in all contact languages
^{L-J} nose	nâsu	nas 5	Lat. nasus
penis	puca	penis, pulă; puță 1 Fr., Lat., 5	Lat. *praeputium (F)
rib	kostele	coastă 5	Lat. costa
shoulder	umeru	umăr 5	Lat. humerus
^{L-J} skin	koža	piele 5	Old Sl. koža (F), cf. Rom. coajă 'bark' and Cr. koža
sole of the foot	Zhe. pâma Vl. supičor	talpă (Not in Schulte 2009)	1) Lat. palma, cf. Vl./Zhe. pâma 'palm' 2) coinage: sup-pičor 'lit. under-foot'
spleen	špljira Zhe. also: slezina, podrebrica Vl. also: slezena	splină 1 Gr.	1) Lat. splēn (Fi) 2) Chak. Cr. slezin(a) 3) uncertain: Cr. *porebrica 'lat. pleura' 4) Cr. slezena
stomach	Zhe. štumihu Vl. štumigu	stomac 1 Fr., Gr.	Chak. Cr. štumig
throat	gutu	gâtlej, beregată 5, 4 Serb.	Uncertain: Old Sl. glütü or Lat. guttur (F), cf. Rom. gât 'neck' and Chak. Cr. gut 'throat, neck'
^{L-J} tongue	limba	limbă 5	Lat. lingua
^{L-J} tooth	Zhe. dinte Vl. dîntu	dinte 5	Lat. dens

SAŽETAK

Zvezdana Vrzić, Robert Doričić

JEZIČNI DODIR I STABILNOST OSNOVNOGA VOKABULARA: HRVATSKE POSUĐENICE ZA DIJELOVE TIJELA U VLAŠKOM/ŽEJANSKOM (ISTRORUMUNJSKOM)

Vlaški/žejanski, jezik poznat u lingvistici kao istrorumunjski, ozbiljno je ugrožen istočni romanski jezik koji se govori na istarskom poluotoku u Hrvatskoj. Prema skorašnjim procjenama, jezik govori manje od 120 aktivnih i tečnih govornika, većinom starijih od 50 godina. Zajednice u kojima se govori vlaški/žejanski su trenutno u uznapredovalom procesu zamjene vlaškog/žejanskog hrvatskim jezikom u svakodnevnoj upotrebi. Kako kohabitacija, miješanje stanovništva i dvojezičnost na vlaškom/žejanskom i hrvatskom karakteriziraju ove zajednice već više stoljeća, pod utjecajem snažnih i dugoročnih kontaktnih pritisaka, jezik je pod hrvatskim utjecajem pretrpio niz leksičkih i strukturalnih promjena. Na leksičkoj razini, jezik je usvojio ne samo veliki broj kulturnih posuđenica već i veći broj, takozvanih „jezgrenih” posuđenica, tj. riječi koje su zamijenile postojeće izvorne riječi.

Ovaj rad istražuje razmjere kontaktnih utjecaja u osnovnom vokabularu, posebice među riječima za dijelove tijela, kako se one smatraju među onima koje su najrezistentnije prema kontaktnom utjecaju. U tri tiskana izvora (Byhan 1899, Pušcariu 1926 i Kovačec 1998) i u vlastitoj građi pronađeni su leksički ekvivalenti za 46 značenja za dijelove tijela. Riječi za dijelove tijela iz sva četiri razdoblja u vlaškom/žejanskom uspoređuju se s rumunjskim riječima i daje se njihovo porijeklo. Sve riječi istog korijena, bez obzira da li su originalno latinske ili nekog drugog porijekla (npr. slavenskog), smatraju se izvornima u našem uzorku. U radu su od interesa samo recentnije posuđenice, posebice hrvatskog porijekla, koje su ušle u jezik dugo nakon njegova razdvajanja od proto-rumunjskog, prije svega u kontaktu s čakavskim narječjem.

Usporedba pokazuje da je značajan broj riječi za dijelove tijela u vlaškom/žejanskom posuđen iz čakavskog narječja, s time da je broj posuđenica u vlaškom (13) veći nego u žejanskom (9). U vlaškom je također veći i broj slučajeva gdje izvorna riječ koegzistira u upotrebi s hrvatskom posuđenicom, što dodatno ukazuje na veći kontaktni pritisak u tom narječju. Ako se uspoređi stanje u jeziku u dva starija izvora s današnjim stanjem, primjećuje se da je broj posuđenica gotovo udvostručen od početka 20. stoljeća do danas. Također je značajno da je odnedavno standardni hrvatski postao faktor kontaktnog utjecaja. Istovremeno, zanimljivo je da među 15 riječi na našem popisu, koje se nalaze među 100 osnovnih riječi na „Jakarta-Leipzig listi osnovnog vokabulara”, ima samo jedna hrvatska posuđenica. To potvrđuje predikcije Haspelmatha i Tadmora (2009), koji su na temelju velikog uzorka raznovrsnih svjetskih jezika zaključili da su ove riječi najrezistentnije prema kontaktnom utjecaju, čak i u uvjetima jezičnog dodira vrlo velikog intenziteta, koji karakterizira dodir vlaškog/žejanskog i hrvatskog.

Ključne riječi: *kontaktni utjecaj i leksičke promjene; osnovni vokabular; riječi za dijelove tijela; istrorumunjski; hrvatske posuđenice*