WORDS OF ITALIAN ORIGIN IN THE WRITTEN LEGACY OF STEFAN MITROV LJUBIŠA

Cvijeta BRAJIČIĆ

University of Montenegro, Faculty of Philology, Danila Bojovića bb, 81400 Nikšić, Montenegro
e-mail: cvijetabrajicic@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the presence of words originating from Italian and its dialects in the written legacy of Montenegrin writer and politician Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša. Taking into account the fact that this author advocated the use of the vernacular language in literary work, as well as the statements made by linguistic experts that words of Italian origin constituted an integral part of the vernacular speech patterns of his homeland, it seems reasonable to assume that the written legacy of Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša ought to include elements of the Italian lexicon, despite him being a convinced opponent of the domination of foreign languages and cultures in his native land.

Keywords: Italian words, Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša, vernaculars, literary work, official correspondence

PAROLE DI ORIGINE ITALIANA NELL'EREDITÀ SCRITTA DI STEFAN MITROV LJUBIŠA

SINTESI

Il saggio tratta la presenza delle parole provenienti dall'italiano e dai suoi dialetti negli scritti dello scrittore e politico montenegrino Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša. Considerando che questo autore sosteneva l'uso della lingua nazionale nella letteratura, e tenendo conto del fatto che proveniva da aree in cui la componente lessicale italiana era presente in modo significativo, è ragionevole presumere che il suo linguaggio dovesse contenere elementi di lessico italiano, indipendentemente dal fatto che egli fosse, conformemente alle sue vedute politiche, contrario al dominio delle lingue e culture straniere nella sua terra natia.

Parole chiave: italianismi, Ljubiša, parlate popolari, opere letterarie, corrispondenza ufficiale

INTRODUCTION

This paper addresses the presence of words that originate from Italian and its dialects in the written legacy of the writer and politician Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša (1822–1878). In the introductory section, we examine the historical and political circumstances in Montenegro at the time of the public activity of this author. We also look at previous studies that deal with his work from various standpoints, and point out the somewhat contradictory conclusions reached by some experts analyzing the presence of foreign lexical components in his written legacy, primarily in his literary work. Although some sporadic reviews of Ljubiša's writings can be found in the last decades of the 19th as well as at the beginning of the 20th century (Nikčević, 2019, 44), the experts began to deal more seriously with the written legacy of this author from the 1970s (Tepavčević, 2017, 42). Among those who have so far discussed the work of Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša, we can identify two groups of authors. The first group comprises those who believe that this writer drew inspiration from the local folk tradition and cultural heritage, including the vernaculars, whose significant part consists of borrowings. This viewpoint is represented by Nikola Popović (2014, 59), who claims that Ljubiša matured as an author in an area where local and foreign cultures (primarily Italian) were closely intertwined. According to Popović (2014, 60) the first reviews of Ljubiša's writings were negative precisely because of the regional constraints of his language. The fact that Ljubiša's literary work was based on local cultural tradition was also remarked by his first critic, Croatian philologist and literature historian Ivan Milčetić, whose views are conveyed by Milorad Nikčević (2019, 94–95). Milčetić came to the conclusion that Ljubiša's writing was devoid of originality and that he was a mere recorder of the local folktales. In more recently published studies the experts perceive Ljubiša's attachment to the cultural patterns of his homeland, but also recognize his originality. Miodarka Tepavčević (2017, 45) believes that Ljubiša's language content is rooted in folk history and tradition, while Branislav Ostojić (2012, 11) argues that this author's language is closer to the standard than to the everyday speech, but that it still contains vernacular components. The second group of authors is represented by Olga Trofimkina (1983, 38) who believes that Ljubiša consciously refined his language in order to remove all foreign elements, with the aim of expressing his political views – opposition to foreign influence in

his homeland – through his literature. None of these experts, however, offered a comprehensive analysis of the presence of foreign lexis in Ljubisa's work. Therefore, we have decided to deal with this hitherto unexplored segment of Ljubiša's written legacy in order to determine to what extent his political views influenced the choices in his literary work. Our main goal is to ascertain whether the author chose to deny the linguistic reality of his region, or he accepted Italian loanwords as an integral part of the national language and transferred them into his opus.

However, to begin with, we must consider the very phenomenon of lexical borrowing. In linguistics, «*borrowing is the process of importing linguistic items from one linguistic system into another*» (Hoffer, 2002, 1). This phenomenon can be considered one of the most obvious consequences of language contact (Haspelmath, 2009, 36; Jourdan, 2002, 79; Filipović, 1986).

Haspelmath (2009, 39) argues that the most commonly borrowed words are related to technology and new discoveries, while the elements of so-called basic vocabulary[1] are less susceptible to transfer from one language to another. The adoption process can affect stems and affixes, but also locutions and grammatical schemes (Haspelmath, 2009, 36). This means that borrowing can occur in relation to linguistic material as well as language structures, that is, it can refer to the introduction of lexemes, affixes or entire sentences, but also to the adoption of the syntactic, morphological and semantic schemes of the model language (Haspelmath, 2009, 37). A particular form of loanwords is represented by calques, be they structural or semantic, and by so-called hybrids – forms composed of elements from two different language systems.

A loanword can retain its original form and meaning, or it can undergo a process of adaptation to the phonological and morphological system of the recipient language. Adaptation can be either primary or secondary. Primary adaptation includes the changes a word undergoes from the moment it becomes part of a language until its complete integration. Secondary adaptation concerns those changes to which a particular word is subjected after its integration into the borrowing language.[2] In some cases, adaptation is necessary to make the word usable in the recipient language (Hoffer, 2002, 8). However, the degree of adaptation can vary, based on several factors. If a word has been recently introduced into the recipient language, it can stabilize in it without adaptation, and even retain its original pronunciation. The usual

---

1 Thomason uses the term *core vocabulary* (2001, 71).

2 Besides the terms *source/borrowing language*, the pairs *donor/recipient language* and *model/replica language* are also present in the relevant literature. Rudolf Filipović (1989) uses the term *lending language*.

terms for the non adapted words are foreignisms and – significantly rarer – xenisms. This category differs from that of words that have undergone the adaptation process and have become an integral part of the recipient language (Haspelmath, 2009, 42). For recent or unadapted loanwords, it is relatively easy to determine the donor language; however, the identification of older loanwords is much more complex, given that those words have «acclimatized» to the recipient language. One of the mechanisms used by linguists consists of the identification of all similarities in form and meaning that a given word from one language shares with another word from another language (Haspelmath, 2009, 45). In this procedure, it is important to rule out the possibility that the analyzed words have a common «ancestor» or a word that both derive from. Another problem faced by experts in this process consists of determining the direction of any borrowing. This involves identifying the model language on the one hand, and the recipient language on the other. One of the applicable criteria is establishing to what extent a certain word can be analyzed in both languages, starting from the assumption that there are greater opportunities for its decomposition into morphemes in the donor language. A further criterion for determining the source language is the degree of phonological integration,[3] as well as the presence of a certain word in languages similar to the model language, but not to the recipient language.

Words of foreign origin can also be classified according to the reasons for their entry into a specific language. This distinction comprises two broad groups: one is loanwords that have entered a language to designate new, previously non-existent terms or content, while the other is loanwords that have become part of a new language system, although a term of equal or similar meaning exists in the recipient language. The words borrowed to indicate new terms or concepts are usually called loanwords by necessity or cultural borrowings, while it could be said that the adoption of «unnecessary» words, or core borrowings, is conditioned by non--linguistic reasons – historical, geographical and political factors.[4] Haspelmath (2009, 46) considers the term «loanword by necessity» a little simplistic, since each language should have sufficient potential within it to create new lexemes. In his view, the degree of acceptance of a loanword in a particular language is directly influenced by the status of the donor language in the recipient language community (Haspelmath, 2009, 48). The status of the model language also affects the adoption of the lexical

material that replaces the existing elements of the lexicon of certain language. Considering the linguistic community as a whole, this type of loanword is influenced by many factors - historical ties, geographical proximity and political relations. On the other hand, from the individual's point of view, the process of adopting lexical elements of foreign origin is conditioned by the prestige of the model language. Some researchers believe that this type of loanwords originates from the need of a language to expand its lexical fund or to create synonyms (Weinreich, 1968). Weinreich (1968, 60) is of the opinion that adoption may also be conditioned by internal factors related to the recipient language, such as the necessity of eliminating low frequency words, as well as avoiding the accumulation of homonyms. The status of a loanword can also be influenced by a negative attitude towards a particular language. In this case, words coming from the model language have a negative connotation and their use is limited to informal language registers, mainly for the purpose of obtaining a comic effect. In addition to the two types of loanwords mentioned above, there is a third less common type, which Haspelmath (2009, 50) defines as a «*therapeutic loanword*», which takes place if a certain word becomes taboo in a language.

In the linguistic sphere, it is important to make a distinction between borrowing and imposition. Imposition occurs in linguistic relations where there is a substratum-superstratum relationship, which presupposes the existence of a subordinate and of a dominant language. In this situation, the adoption process mainly concerns phonology and syntax. On the other hand, the borrowing process between neighboring languages that develop in parallel mainly concernes vocabulary, although it can extend to other segments of the language structure (Haspelmath, 2009, 51). We should also mention intimate borrowing, which «*refers to the situations in which two or more languages are used in a single geographical area by a single political community*» (Hoffer, 1996, 543).

Lastly, the loanword adaptation process takes place within four subsystems, and therefore four types of adaptation can be distinguished:

1. Phonological adaptation;
2. Orthographical adaptation;
3. Morphological adaptation; and
4. Semantic adaptation (Sočanac, 2004, 2).

According to Filipović (1986, 68–70), phonological adaptation or transfonemization includes

---

3   More about phonological integration in Heath (1984) and Humbley (1974).
4   Myers-Scotton (2002, 239) defines cultural borrowings as "*words for objects new to the culture* […], *but also for new concepts*", while core borrowings are "*words that more or less duplicate already existing words in the L1*".

replacing the phonological elements of the model language with the phonological elements of the recipient language. Transfonemization can be:

1. Complete – this presupposes a complete correspondence between the phonemes of the model and those of the replica;
2. Partial/compromise – this involves a partial correspondence between the phonemes of the model and the replica; or
3. Free – this implies significant differences between the individual phonemes of the model and the replica.

When analyzing the degree of phonological adaptation, it is necessary to compare the phonological systems of the model and the recipient language, their prosodic characteristics and the methods of distribution of the phonemes (Fon Coetsem, 1988). From a phonological point of view, the loanword can be modeled on the basis of orthography or pronunciation in the recipient language. If the adaptation is made according to orthography, it can be done in several ways:

1. The original orthography can be preserved;
2. The orthography can be adapted to the recipient language system, using different graphemes for the same phoneme in the two languages; or
3. The orthography can be conditioned by an intermediary language.

The morphological adaptation of the loanword may be primary or secondary. Primary adaptation implies changes that occur in the process of the assimilation of the loanword. In this process, three types of morphological substitutions or transmorphemizations can be distinguished:

1. Zero transmorphemization – this «*is represented by the formula free morpheme and zero bound morpheme*» (Filipović, 1989, 57);
2. Compromise transmorphemization – this implies the existence of a free morpheme and of the donor's language bound morpheme; or
3. Complete transmorphemization – implies the replacement of the donor's language bound morpheme with the corresponding bound morpheme of the recipient language (Filipović, 1986, 117–123).

Secondary adaptation may occur when the loanword is fully integrated into the recipient language and as such becomes a part of the morphological processes.

Semantic adaptation can also occur at the primary or the secondary level. At the primary level of semantic adaptation, the following changes occur:

1. Zero meaning extension – the meaning of the model remains unchanged; or
2. A narrowing of meaning – a word from a donor language can refer to a number of meanings or to a semantic field. Narrowing the number of meanings implies choosing one specific meaning of the loanword that is retained in the recipient language.

Secondary semantic adaptation also implies two types of changes:

1. Expanding the number of meanings; or
2. Expanding the semantic field.

The changes in meaning that occur in primary adaptation can be defined as the transfer of meaning, while those that take place during secondary adaptation and that are conditioned by the use of a loanword in the recipient language are defined as the adaptation of meaning (Filipović, 1986, 180).

Srđan Musić also dealt with the degree of adaptation of loanwords, offering a somewhat simpler classification than the one presented above (Musić, 1972, 74). Analyzing the level of the adaptation of loanwords, Musić starts from their classification based on the degree and manner of their assimilation. According to this classification, the categorization of loanwords is based on the degree of assimilation at the phonemic and morphemic levels. At the phonemic level, three categories of words can be distinguished – unassimilated, partially assimilated and completely assimilated words. Three groups of words can also be identified with regard to the degree of assimilation at the morphemic level. These are unadapted loanwords, semi-adapted loanwords and semantic translations (calques). Musić believes that Montenegrin vernaculars easily assimilate loanwords from Romance languages in general, and those from Italian language and the Venetian dialect in particular, primarily because of the similarity of the vocalic systems. He supports this claim with the results of his research, in which he recorded a very small number of phonetically unadapted or semi-adapted words (Musić, 1972, 76).

When discussing the categorisation of loanwords according to the degree of their assimilation at the morphemic level, Musić takes Klajn's definition of morphological assimilation, which consists of «*adding cases or other suffixes from the recipient language (if the word passes from analytic to synthetic language) or keeping only one inflected form (in the opposite case)*» (Klajn, 1967, 15–16).

Loanwords of Romance origin penetrated the language of the Montenegrin coast and hinterland in several phases. The oldest loanwords date back to the time of Balkan Vulgar Latin and cover almost the entire former Serbo-Croatian-speaking area. The second wave of penetration of Romanisms refers to the so-called Dalmatian period and affected the coastal areas, primarily the Croatian coast. The third, neo-Romance layer of loanwords, consists of words that originate from Tuscan, being literary Italian, and the Venetian dialect. In the 19th century, loanwords of Romance origin entered the vernaculars of Montenegro in two ways – directly, through direct contacts on the Adriatic coast, and indirectly, thanks to German influence (Musić, 1972, 35–40). In this paper, we mainly deal with the last two groups of loanwords.

HISTORICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE MONTENEGRIN AND ITALIAN TERRITORIES

Italy, and especially The Republic of Venice, has been present in different ways for centuries in the region of the eastern Adriatic and its presence has left traces in almost all spheres of society. The influence of Italy, and Venice in particular, was strongest on the Montenegrin coast, especially in the Bay of Kotor. Venice briefly ruled Kotor during the War of Chioggia against Genoa between 1378 and 1381 (Prokači, 2010, 67). At that time, Venetian troops invaded the city, looted many private and public buildings, including churches, and then caused additional damage by starting fires (Božić, 1979, 28). In spite of these incidents, in an attempt to protect itself from Turkish invasion after the fall of the Serbian Empire, to which the city belonged, Kotor was placed under the protection of Venice in 1420 and remained under its rule until the fall of the Venetian Republic in 1797 (Andrijašević & Rastoder, 2006, 15). After Kotor, the territory of Paštrovići fell under Venetian control in 1423, and then the city of Budva in 1442. However, the Venetian estates on the Montenegrin coast did not all have the same status. For example, the Venetians managed the city of Kotor (It. Cattaro) with special care, given the strategic importance of its position, while Paštrovići managed to preserve its self-government based on tribal organization throughout Venetian rule, even at times fighting for a higher degree of autonomy. The city of Budva, although a border town, seemed to be pushed into the background (Stanojević, 1976, 180). The Venetian governor in this city bore the title of *podestà*, and for a short period of time he held the title of *provveditore* (Da Mosto, 1940, 19). The remaining parts of the Boka (Risan, Herceg Novi) changed their masters more often. With brief interruptions, these territories were under Ottoman

rule from 1483 until the 1680s, when, after the Ottoman-Venetian war, it became part of the Republic of Venice (Stanojević, 1976, 178). The towns of Bar, Ulcinj, and Sutorina in the Boka were exceptions to this, in that they belonged to the Ottoman Empire for centuries (Milošević, 1972, 18). After the fall of Venice and the Treaty of Campo Formio (1797), the Bay of Kotor was placed under the authority of the Habsburg dynasty (Andrijašević & Rastoder, 2006, 100). During Napoleon's conquest these territories were briefly annexed by Montenegro. This area was under the rule of France from 1807 to 1814, when it became part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Andrijašević & Rastoder, 2006, 101). Taking into consideration the extensive presence of Italy in the political life of these territories that today form part of Montenegrin, we would expect traces of Italian influence not only in art and culture, but in the language structure as well, given the fact that, for centuries, Italian remained the official language of administration within all the Montenegrin territories under Venetian rule. The issue of the presence of Italian words in Montenegrin vernaculars has been addressed by several linguistic experts, such as Srđan Musić, who examined the distribution of expressions originating from Romance languages in the folk speech of the northwestern Boka, and Vesna Lipovac Radulović, who discussed the presence of words of Italian origin in the spoken language of the southeastern part of the Bay of Kotor as well as in Paštrovići and Budva, the hometown of Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša.

LJUBIŠA'S POLITICAL AND LITERARY ACTIVITY

The city of Budva, as already mentioned, was part of Austrian Dalmatia from 1815 to 1918, which encompassed several formerly Venetian possessions on part of the Croatian coast and in the Bay of Kotor. Dalmatia was one of the poorest and least developed provinces in the Austria territories, where the middle class was almost non-existent, and nationally conscious intellectuals were very rare (Petrović, 1976, 126). The government was based on a static and complicated administrative system with a huge number of staff. These officials, both foreigners and members of the local population, had to speak Italian, because it remained the official language of local administration, the judiciary and education in this region even after the fall of the Venetian Republic. This layer of society represented a stronghold of the Austrian authorities and was the main opponent of the creation of national Slavic states in this part of the Balkan Peninsula (Petrović, 1976, 126). As a reaction to this policy, nationally conscious intellectuals founded the Slavic Front that, from 1861, acted through the Popular Party, of which Stefan Mitrov

Ljubiša was an active member from its foundation. As one of the most prominent representatives of this party from the Bay of Kotor, he worked in the Dalmatian Parliament and as part of the Imperial Council in Vienna.

His political activity was focused primarily on the revival of the national consciousness of the local population and on the preservation of its national identity. Ljubiša considered language one of the essential elements of the identity of his people and therefore he dealt seriously with the role and position of language in society. He fought for his native language, not only as a politician, but also as a writer. His first work entitled *Общество Паштровско у окружію Которскомъ (The tribe of Pastrovici in the region of Kotor)* was published in the journal «Srpsko-dalmatinski magazin» (The Serbian-Dalmatian Magazine) in 1845 (Tepavčević, 2010, 14). After that, he published a series of articles, polemics and discussions in various newspapers, connecting his political activity with his role as a journalist.

Ljubiša began publishing his literary works relatively late, initially as individual short stories in various magazines. He published the story *Šćepan Mali kako o njemu narod povijeda (Stephen the Little in the folktales)* in 1868.The narratives *Prodaja Patrijare Brkića (The selling of Patriarch Brkic), Kanjoš Macedonović, Pop Andrović novi Obilić (Priest Androvic the new Obilic), Skočiđevojka (Maiden's Leap)* and others were issued over the following years. His collection *Pripovijesti crnogorske i primorske (The stories from Montenegro and the Coastland)* was printed in 1875 in Dubrovnik, while *Pričanja Vuka Dojčevića (The storytelling of Vuk Dojcevic)* was published in Vienna between 1877 and 1879. The only poetic work he published is the poem *Boj na Visu (The battle of Vis),* printed in 1866 (Tepavčević, 2010, 15). Besides his literary works, Ljubiša left a large number of letters which now have primarily cultural and historical value, as well as a number of speeches and interpellations which are also the subject of our interest. Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša is known as one of the most ardent supporters of the language reform promoted by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić. Some believe that by accepting Karadžić's principles, Ljubiša tried to make his language more similar to the vernacular of his region and, more generally, of Montenegro. However, there are differing views. Thus, Branislav Ostojic claims that «*the linguistic structure in Ljubiša's works is closer to the standard language than to the vernacular*» and that «*the characteristics of the literary language are predominant in his writings*» (Ostojić, 2012, 11). He adds, however, that Ljubiša's literary works «*contain a number of relevant vernacular elements, so that his writings*

[...] *preserve enough information for dialectology and folklore studies*» (Ostojić, 2012, 11).

At the same time, according to Olga Trofimkina (1983, 38) Ljubiša aspired to eliminate the influence of foreign languages in his literary works, as far as was possible. This author says that Ljubiša was a national language expert, «*but at the same time an outstanding master of literary expression*», who «*did not simply transmit everyday spoken language in literature, but worked actively on improving his expression*», so that «*the reader gets the impression of the complete authenticity of the vernacular used in his writings*» (Trofimkina, 1983, 39). Analyzing only one part of Ljubiša's lexis – borrowed words – she came to the conclusion that the writer tried to make his linguistic expression to the greatest possible extent free of loanwords, including lexis of Italian origin, despite its prevalence in the vernaculars of the coastal areas (Trofimkina, 1983, 39). According to her, this can be explained by the writer's attitude towards his own language, but also by his political convictions which were discussed earlier. Trofimkina further claims that in the corpus she processed, she registered only 8 out of 400 Italian loanwords that Vaso Tomanovic gathered in his article on foreign words in the speech of the Bay of Kotor, and 7 more examples that Tomanovic did not mention in his research. She believes that these are mainly words that became part of the spoken language in the coastal areas together with the objects they refer to, since these objects were not denoted in the vernacular (Trofimkina, 1983, 40). Taking into account all of the above, it could be concluded that Olga Trofimkina believes that Ljubiša the politician, a self-confessed «anti-Italian»,[5] transmitted his political views into his literary works.

The Italian author Luka Vaglio has a different viewpoint. He points out that Ljubiša admired Italy and Italians in general, who in his day were fighting for the unification of Italy and thus aimed to accomplish what the writer wanted his own people to achieve (Vaglio, 2009, XXVI). He indicates the special respect Ljubiša had for the work of the Italian Romantic writer Alessandro Manzoni (1785–1873). It is believed that this Italian author had an impact on Ljubiša's work and that Ljubiša borrowed certain narrative techniques and secrets of the craft of literature from him. In addition to this, according to Vaglio, Manzoni may have served as a source of inspiration for the themes and motifs which Ljubiša elaborated in his stories. Vaglio does not negate the widely accepted view that Ljubiša was one of the staunchest advocates of the equality of languages and nations in Austria; he does, however, believe that Ljubiša still recognized the importance of

---

5   This term is used by Rade Petrović (1976).

the Italian linguistic and cultural influence on the Montenegrin coast. Vaglio claims that the presence of Italian loanwords and words originating from the Venetian dialect represent the most interesting aspect of Ljubiša's writings. These loanwords, in his opinion, reflect the real vernacular and reperesent an integral part of the everyday lexis. In our analysis, we aim to ascertain whether, as Trofimkina claims, Ljubiša the politician affected some of the choices made by Ljubiša the writer and forced him to deny the linguistic reality of his region in which Italian loanwords undoubtedly existed, or if, in fact, the writer, as stated by Luca Vaglio, accepted words of Italian origin as an integral part of the national language and transferred them into his opus.

CORPUS ANALYSIS

Our corpus consists of Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša's collected works published in 1988 in the critical edition prepared by Đ. Radović, N. Vuković, R. Rot-ković and M. Luketić. This edition includes Ljubiša's literary works, his translations, articles, speeches and interpellations, private and official letters and its bio-bibliography with attachments. In the analyzed corpus, we determined the presence of 251 words of Italian origin, of which there were 211 nouns, 25 verbs, 14 adjectives and one adverb. The collected material was compared with the Italian words recor-ded in the works of Srđan Musić (1972) and Vesna Lipovac Radulović (1997, 2004, 2009). Their works were selected for comparison in order to determine the extent to which Ljubiša's Italian lexicon coin-cides with the loanwords present in folk speech, despite the fact that the presence of Italian words in these vernaculars was examined aproximately a hundred years after the author's death. The original meaning of the registered terms was verified using two monolingual dictionaries of Italian, Zingarelli's and De Mauro's, as well as Boerio's dictionary of the Venetian dialect. Of the total number of Italian loanwords registered in the corpus, 139 examples (55.37%) were registered in the vernaculars we used for comparison, while the remaining 112 (44.63%) were not present in the works by Srđan Musić and Vesna Lipovac Radulović. When analyzing the corpus, it can be seen that those words originating from Italian present in Ljubiša's literary works almost always occur in the vernaculars. For example, in his *Pričanja Vuka Dojčevića* 32 Italian loanwords were recorded, of which 25 (78.12%) occur in the spoken language of the text. *Pripovijesti crnogorske i pri-morske* contains 29 words of Italian origin, of which 25 lexemes,or 86.2% of the total, are present in a vernacular context. In most cases, these terms refer to certain spheres of everyday life and represent an integral part of the language of Ljubiša's homeland,

whose use, as previously stated, the writer strongly promoted. This can be seen from the following examples:

lopiža – *lat. lapidea* – a crock;
škrabijica – *ven. scarabatolo (shelf)* – a drawer;
korec – *it. corpetto* – a vest, women's blouse;
krap – *it. carpa* – a carp;
loćika – *it. lattuga* – a lettuce;
cukar – *it. zucchero ven. zucaro* - sugar;
leća – *it. lenticchia* - lentils;
širun – *ven. suro* - a kind of sea fish;
palomnić – *it. palamita, ven. palamida* – Atlantic bonito, a type of fish;
sapa – *it. salpa* – a type of mollusc;
galija – *it. galea, ven. galia* – a ship with oars, which often uses prisoners to man those oars;
rinčak – *it. rezzaglio, rizzagio* - a kind of fishing net;
tuna – *ven. togna* – a fishing line with a hook;
noštromo – *it. nostromo* – the commander of the deck of a ship;
palj – *it. pala (shovel)* – a shovel which removes water from the boat.

The remaining written legacy of Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša also contains words of Italian origin, but to a lesser degree than his literary works. It should also be noted that the Italian loanwords in this segment of our corpus are present to a much lesser degree in the lists of vernaculars that we used for comparison. In the 48 examples of Ljubiša's speeches and inter-pellations that we reviewed, we registered 36 words originating from Italian. 14 of these terms (38.88%) occur in the vernaculars of the Boka, Budva and Paštrovići. Ten of these terms were recorded by both Vesna Radulović Lipovac and Srđan Musić, while two words were registered only in the north-west part of the Bay of Kotor, and two expressions were found only in the vernacular of Budva and Paštrovići. Most of them refer to various spheres of everyday life:

đimnazija – *it. ginnasio* – a gymnasium;
škatula – *it. scatola* – a box;
oćale – *it. occhiali* – glasses;
ćokolata – *it. cioccolata* – chocolate;
dacija – *it. dazio* – duties, taxes.

Some of these terms have a different or narrower meaning in the vernaculars. For example, the term *financa (it. finanza)* in Ljubiša's writings means *«finance»,* while in the vernacular it used to mean *«tax collector».* The original meaning of the term is *«finance; financial police».* The noun *štatut (it. statu-to)* in the vernacular means *«regulation, law»* while in Ljubiša's language it means *«rules».* In Ljubiša's language, the term *matrikula (it. matricola)* means *«a memorial book, register»,* while in the vernaculars

of the coast the same noun is used with the sense of a *«seaman's book, sailors'document.»* In Italian, the term has the first indicated meaning. From the part of the corpus concerning Ljubiša's speeches and interpellations, we also extracted a certain number of words that are not present in the vernacular. The most common in this group are examples belonging to administrative and political terminology:

burokrata – *it. burocrate* – a bureaucrat;
eksekutivni – *it. esecutivo* – executive;
burokracija – *it. burocrazia* – bureaucracy;
Gibelin – *it. Ghibellino* – a Ghibelline;
ministerijalni – *it. ministeriale* – ministerial;
korolar – *it. corollario* – a necessary consequence, a conclusion;
Đunta – *it. Giunta (Committee, Council)* – here: the National Committee.

The corpus dedicated to the written legacy of Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša also includes his letters. In the critical edition of the entire preserved writings of this author, 125 of these were published. Twenty-three letters were written in a foreign language (either German or Italian), and the remaining 102, which are the object of our interest, were written in his native language. In Ljubiša's letters, we registered 118 words that originate from Italian and its dialects. Of that number, 56 words (47.45%) are registered in the vernaculars. Eight terms (6.77%) appear only in Srđan Musić's dictionary, while 14 words (11.86%) are present exclusively in Vesna Lipovac Radulović's vocabulary list. Both authors recorded 34 of the terms (28.81%). We also note that Italian loanwords appear more frequently in informal letters, especially in correspondence with family members or close friends, while in official correspondence words of Italian origin are considerably less frequent. For example, in a very short letter addressed to his cousin Visarion (Vasilije) Ljubiša in Constantinople in 1849, 7 words of Italian origin occur:

Salonić – *it. Salonicco* – Thessaloniki;
butiga – *it. bottega* – a shop;
komeštibil – *it. commestibili* – food products;
frankati – *it. affrancare* – pay postage;
konat – *it. conto* – account;
skužati – *it. escutere* – to hunt down your debt, charge;
preša – *it. pressa* – haste.

From the above examples, the vernaculars do not register the proper noun *Salonić* and the verb *frankati*. In contrast to this example, in letters intended for officials of the Austrian Empire, political opponents or the editors to whom he send his works, words of Italian origin occur only sporadically, and these are usually technical terms from the spheres of the law and politics:

ezekucija – *it. esecuzione* – execution;
Dieta – *it. Dieta* – Parliament;
tribunal – *it. tribunale* – the court;
pericija – *it. perizia* – expertise;
apelati se – *it. appellarsi* – to complain;
gabineto – *it. gabinetto* – cabinet, the Ministry;
senjatura – *it. segnatura* – a signature;
šuplika – *it. supplica* – a petition;
rikurs – *it. ricorso* – an appeal;
seduta – *it. seduta* – a session.

From the above mentioned examples, the vernacular registers the expressions *tribunal* and *apelat se*, while some economic terms that Ljubiša used in his letters are not present:

asenjirati – *it. assegnare* – to assign, allot;
recevitur – *it. ricevitore* – a tax collector, collector;
kaša – *it. cassa* – a fund;
dita – *it. ditta* – a firm, company;
direcion – *it. direzione* – management;
reversal – *it. reversal* – a receipt;
oferta – *it. offerta* – an offer;
kontabilitad – *it. contabilità* – accounting;
pjeđario – *it. pieggio (surety, guarantor)* – here: the guarantee, surety;
konvencion – *it. convenzione* – a contract agreement.

Words that are present both in Ljubiša's letters and in the vernaculars are main deal with different spheres of everyday life, such as the household, types of food or maritime terminology:

ura – *it. ora (time)* – a clock;
tinel – *it. tinello* – a dining room;
skala – *it. scala* - stairs;
đardin – *it. giardino* – a garden;
rožalija – *it. rosolio* – a type of liquor;
biž – *ven. biso* – peas;
gof – *ven. gofo* – a kind of marine fish;
kaštiga – *it. castigo* – a penalty;
inđenjer – *it. ingegnere* – an engineer;
banda – *it. banda* – a side;
familja – *it. famiglia* – a family;
kolpo – *it. colpo* – stroke;
riceta – *it. ricetta* – a prescription;
rest – *it. resto* – the amount of something that remains;
manin – *ven. manin* – a bracelet;
cerot – *it. cerotto* – a patch, lining;
vapor – *it. vapore* – a steamer;
fortunal – *it. fortunale* – a storm, a storm at sea;
kalafit – *it. calafato* – the repairman on ships;
porat – *it. porto* – a port.

Some of the terms that occur in Ljubiša's legacy show minor or major differences in meaning when compared to the same words used in the vernacu-

lars of the Boka, Budva and Paštrovići. The Italian loanwords recorded in Ljubiša's letters do not have a more generic meaning than those that occur in the local languages. The most important difference between the two groups of terms is the number of meanings. The expressions registered in the vernaculars often have multiple meanings, while Ljubiša uses only one of those. The noun *kaštiga (it. castigo)* in Ljubiša's writings means «*punishment*», while in the local languages, in addition to that meaning, the same word can also mean «*evil, misfortune or miracle*». In Italian, this noun can mean «*a very boring person,*» while it also signifies «*accident, evil*» in the expression *castigo di Dio*. The noun *banda (it.banda)* in Ljubiša's language is used in the sense of «*side*», while in the vernaculars it can also mean «*a brass band; a group of bandits*». In the original language, this noun can offer all of meanings. Ljubiša uses the noun *kolpo (it. colpo)* in the sense of «*shock*», while in the local languages it can mean «*heart attack, stroke; a gust of wind, waves and rain*». This term has each of the above meanings in Italian. The term *cerot (it. cerotto)* in Ljubiša's usage means «*patch, ointment, compress*», while in the vernacular it may be used in the sense of «*boring person*». In Italian, the noun has all of these meanings, depending on context. Ljubiša uses the noun *resto (it. resto)* to refer to «*rest*», while in the vernaculars of the coast it can also mean «*residue*».

In the examined corpus, we noted a certain number of words that are recorded both in Ljubiša's writings and in the vernaculars, but which have completely different meanings. The noun *riganj (ven. rigano – cord)* in Ljubiša's use indicates the type of instrument of torture, while in the vernacular this term means «*a rope used to bind fishing nets*». In the dictionary of the Venetian dialect which we consulted, only the latter meaning is registered. The verb *surgati (it. sorgere – to pick up, rise up, go out)* in Ljubiša's language means «*to break*», while in the vernacular it appears to mean «*to throw (anchor) into the sea; push down*». Furthermore, in Italian there is an obsolete form of the same verb that can mean «*to anchor*». The term *dispensa (it. dispensa)* in Ljubiša's writing means «*freedom from any obligation or regulations*», while in the vernacular it is used to mean «*a (boat) storage*». In Italian, this noun has both of these meanings. The term *ura (it.ora)* in Ljubiša's language means «*watch*», while in the local languages it is used exclusively in the sense of «*hour*». In Italian, this noun has only the second of these meanings. In the vernaculars of the Montenegrin coastal area the noun *impreza (it. impresa)* means «*company*», while in Ljubiša's usage it means «*enterprise*». Both meanings are present in the original language. The noun *kartela (it. cartella)* means «*policy*» in Ljubiša's language, while the same noun in the vernaculars means «*lottery ticket; folder, binder*». All of these meanings are present in Italian. In vernaculars term *konsulta (it. consulta)* occurs with meaning «*medical consulting team*», while in Ljubiša's language it means «*consultation*». It should be noted that the meaning of this word present in the vernaculars is referred to as obsolete in dictionaries of Italian.

Discussing the process of the adaptation of the loanwords, the authors that have dealt with this issue so far believe that Montenegrin vernaculars easily assimilate words from Romance languages in general, in particular those that originate from the Italian language or the Venetian dialect, mainly due to the similarity of the vocalic systems. This claim is corroborated by the research results of Srdan Musić (1972) who dealt with the presence of Romanisms in the vernacular of the Bay of Kotor, in which he recorded a very small number of words that were phonologically not assimilated or partially assimilated. However, in the loan adoption process, some forms undergo changes which are not conditioned by the need for adaptation, but by certain other factors, such as dialectal influences, analogies, assimilations and dissimilations (Sočanac, 2004, 118). We came to the same conclusions when analyzing our corpus – the words of Italian origin registered in the written legacy of Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša are adapted according to the same rules that apply to the lexis that entered the Montenegrin vernaculars. This conclusion is valid when discussing the process of adaptation at the phonological or morphological, as well as the semantic level. The vocal changes are mainly conditioned by assimilation or dissimilation, while, generally speaking, morphological changes are related to gender change, which is conditioned by the fact that in Italian, unlike in Montenegrin, there is no category of neuter gender. Of the semantic changes, as mentioned previously, the most common is the narrowing of the number of meanings, which is primarily reflected in the choice of one of all the possible meanings that a particular word may have in the source language. In doing so, as we have shown, the selected meaning of the loanword used by Ljubiša in certain cases differs from the meaning that is most frequent in the vernaculars.

CONCLUSIONS

Our study was conducted in order to determine the extent to which the political attitudes of Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša motivated him to exclude Italian loanwords from his written language, in spite of the fact that those terms were an integral part of the spoken language of his homeland. It has been already pointed out that some experts who have studied Ljubiša's writings state that the words of Italian origin in his

written legacy are present in negligible percentages, and that they believe this to be a consequence of his conscious decision to convey his political views through the language choices he made. There are those who hold the opposite view and believe that Italian loanwords, as an integral part of lexis of Ljubiša's homeland, entered into his language. Based on our research we may present a few conclusions. Firstly, the Italian lexical component in Ljubiša's written legacy is much more prevalent than some authors believe. Secondly, the frequency of Italian loanwords in Ljubiša's writings is conditioned by the kind of text he was writing and by the intended audience. In his literary works, Italian loanwords are present, but the interesting fact is that these words of Italian origin largely coincide with those that are present in the vernaculars of the coastal regions. As to the representation of Italian lexis in Ljubiša's letters, it is necessary to make a distinction between his official correspondence with various government representative or officials, and his letters to friends and family members. In the second group, Italian loanwords are much more frequent, while their number in official letters, as well as in speeches and interpellations, is negligible. From the above, it could be concluded that in official correspondence, Ljubiša the politician emphasized, through his linguistic choices, his opposition to Italian as an alien language, but in his literary creations as well as in private correspondence, he did not manage to completely exclude the Italian loanwords, since they were an integral part of his national language, whose use he strongly advocated. Finally, all the loanwords of Italian origin registered in the presented corpus have been adapted according to the same rules and models that follow the Italian loanwords in the Montenegrin vernaculars, and changes occur in them according to the same principles – these are mainly caused by dialectal influences, analogies, assimilation or dissimilation.

BESEDE ITALIJANSKEGA IZVORA V PISNI ZAPUŠČINI STEFANA MITROVA LJUBIŠE

Cvijeta BRAJIČIĆ
Univerza v Črni gori, Filološka fakulteta, Danila Bojovića bb, 81400 Nikšić, Črna gora
e-mail: cvijetabrajicic@yahoo.com

POVZETEK

Namen pričujočega prispevka je bil ugotoviti, v kolikšni meri je politična naravnanost črnogorskega pisatelja in politika Stefana Mitrova Ljubiše vplivala na to, da je iz svojega jezika izključil italijanske izposojenke, kljub temu, da so bili ti izrazi prisotni v govorjenem jeziku tedanje Črne gore. Na podlagi raziskave smo prišli do več zaključkov; italijanska leksikalna komponenta v Ljubišini pisni zapuščini je veliko bolj prisotna, kot so do sedaj menili nekateri avtorji, pogostnost italijanskih izposojenk v njegovih besedilih pa je pogojena z vrsto besedila in ciljno publiko. Ugotovimo lahko, da je Ljubiša kot politik v uradni korespondenci s svojimi jezikovnimi odločitvami poudarjal svoje nasprotovanje italijanščini kot tujemu jeziku. Po drugi strani pa v svojih literarnih delih in zasebni korespondenci ni uspel popolnoma izključiti italijanske leksikalne komponente, saj je bila ta integralni del narodnega jezika, katerega uporabo je močno zagovarjal.

Ključne besede: italijanske besede, Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša, ljudski jezik, literarno delo, uradna korespondenca

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrijašević, Ž. & Š. Rastoder (2006): Crna Gora i velike sile. Podgorica, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.

Boerio, G. (1998): Dizionario del dialetto veneziano. Firenze, Giunti Editore.

Božić, I. (1979): Nemirno Pomorje XV veka. Beograd, Srpska književna zadruga.

Da Mosto, A. (1940): L'archivio di stato di Venezia, tomo II – Archivi dell'amministrazione provinciale della Repubblica Veneta, archivi delle rappresentanze diplomatiche e consolari, archivi dei governi succeduti alla Repubblica Veneta, archivi degli istituti religiosi e archivi minori. Roma, Biblioteca d'arte editirice.

De Mauro, T. (2000): Dizionario della lingua italiana. Torino, Paravia.

Filipović, R. (1986): Teorija jezika u kontaktu. Uvod u lingvistiku jezičnih dodira. Zagreb, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

Filipović, R. (1989): Some Contributions to the Theory of Contact Linguistics. In: Radovanović, M. (ed.): Yugoslav general linguistics. Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing, 47–71.

Fon Coetsem, F. (1988): Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language. Dordrecht, Foris Publications.

Haspelmath, M. (2009): Lexical Borrowing: Concepts and Issues. In: Haspelmath, M. & U. Tadmor (eds.): Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook. Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton Publishers, 35–54.

Heath, J. G. (1984): Language Contact and Language Change. Annual Review of Anthropology, 13, 367–384.

Hoffer, L. B. (1996): Borrowing. In: Goebl, H. et al. (eds.): Kontaktlinguistik/Contact Linguistics/Linguistique de contact. Berlin-New York, Walter de Gruyter, 541–548.

Hoffer, L. B. (2002): Language Borrowing and Language Diffusion: an Overview. Intercultural Communication Studies, XI, 4, 1–37.

Humbley, J. (1974): Vers une typologie de l'emprunt linguistique. Cahiers de Lexicologie, 25, II, 46–70.

Jourdan, C. (2002): Contatto. In: Duranti, A. (ed): Culture e discorso, un lessico per le scienze umane. Roma, Metelmi, 79–84.

Klajn, I. (1967): Strana reč – šta je to? Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku, br. 10, 7–24.

Lipovac Radulović, V. (1997): Romanizmi u Crnoj Gori – Budva i Paštrovići. Novi Sad, Matica srpska.

Lipovac Radulović, V. (2004): Romanizmi u Crnoj Gori – Jugoistočni dio Boke Kotorske. Novi Sad, Matica srpska.

Lipovac Radulović, V. (2009): Romanismi lessicali in Montenegro. Budua e Pastrovici. La parte sud-orientale delle Bocche di Cattaro. Roma, Il Calamo.

Ljubiša, S. M. (1988): Sabrana djela. Kritičko izdanje. Titograd, CANU, „Univerzitetska riječ", Istorijski arhiv Budva.

Milošević, M. (1972): Boka Kotorska, Bar i Ulcinj u Kiparskom ratu (1570–1573). Boka – Zbornik radova iz nauke, kulture i umjetnosti, 4, Herceg Novi, 17–58.

Musić, S. (1972): Romanizmi u severo-zapadnoj Boki Kotorskoj. Beograd, Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.

Myers Scotton, C. (2002): Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Nikčević, M. (2019): Književno-kulturne veze na rubovima Mediterana. Osijek, Hrvatsko-crnogorsko društvo prijateljstva „Croatica – Montenegrina".

Ostojić, B. (2012): Snaga i moć jezika Stefana Mitrova Ljubiše i njegov udio u izgradnji Vukovog modela književnog jezika. In: Medigović-Stefanović, M. (ed.): Paštrovići – govorni i pisani jezik. zbornik radova. Beograd, Udruženje Paštrovića i prijatelja Paštrovića u Beogradu „Drobni pijesak", 9–13.

Petrović, R. (1976): Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša – nacionalni i politički radnik. In: Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša – prilozi sa skupa održanog u Titogradu i Budvi. Titograd, CANU, 125–147.

Popović, N. (2014): Odnos folklornog i narativnog u Pričanjima Vuka Dojčevića S. M. Ljubiše. Matica crnogorska, XV, 58, 53–92.

Prokači, Đ. (2010): Istorija Italijana. Podgorica, CID-Filozofski fakultet, Nikšić.

Sočanac, L. (2004): Hrvatsko-talijanski jezični dodiri, sa rječnikom talijanizama u standardnome hrvatskom jeziku i dubrovačkoj dramskoj književnosti. Zagreb, Nakladni zavod Globus.

Stanojević, G. (1976): Crna Gora od pada Crnojevića do vladike Danila Petrovića. In: Vujović, D. (ed.): Crna Gora – monografija. Beograd, Književne novine, 176–193.

Tepavčević, M. (2010): Jezik Stefana Mitrova Ljubiše. Podgorica, CANU.

Tepavčević, M. (2017): Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša i Crna Gora – povijesne i kulturne veze. Annales, Series Historia et Sociologia, 27, 1, 41–52.

Thomason, S. G. (2001): Language Contact: An Introduction. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Trofimkina, O. (1983): O stranim rečima u jeziku S. M. Ljubiše. Beograd, MSC.

Vaglio, L. (2009): Romanismi lessicali in Montenegro. Introduzione all'edizione italiana. Roma, Il Calamo.

Weinreich, U. (1968): Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems. The Hague, De Gruyter Mouton Publishers.

Zingarelli, N. (2000): Vocabolario della lingua italiana. Bologna, Zanichelli Editore.TopofForm