

# Grammaticalization and Language Contact between German and Slovene<sup>1</sup>

Alja Lipavic Oštir

## 1. Introduction

Slavic ancestors of the Slovene people inhabited a broad area of present-day Slovenia in the sixth century. In the seventh century, the principality of Karantania emerged, which after three centuries came first under Bavarian and then later under Frankish dominion. The settlement of Hungarians in Pannonia prevented direct contact of the Slovene-speaking population with the Western Slavs. Following the rise of the Habsburg monarchy in the thirteenth century, the provinces with a Slovene-speaking population belonged to the “Erbländer” of the monarchy, which stayed unchanged until the end of the First World War. In the provinces of Krain (Carniola), Kärnten (Carinthia), and Steiermark (Styria), the Slovene-speaking population lived closely together with the German-speaking population, which led to numerous influences, including linguistic ones; Slovene was mostly in touch with Austrian Bavarian dialects. In frontal contact, the Slovene-speaking population retreated and the language border moved south. Simultaneously, the German-speaking enclaves in the predominantly Slovene-speaking territory were Slovenized, with the exception of the Kočevje Germans, who kept their

---

1 Motoki Nomachi (Hokkaido University) kindly advised me on the analytic perfect, possessive perfect, and recipient passive in Slovene.

language identity till the end of the Second World War.<sup>2</sup> Despite the various forms of language pressure on the politically subordinate Slovene-speaking population, there was obviously enough room for a written Slovene tradition to develop: from its beginnings in the tenth century (the *Freising Manuscripts* / *Brižinski spomeniki* / *Freisinger Denkmäler*), through the Protestant written tradition, to the eventual norm of standard Slovene in the second half of the nineteenth century. Before 1848, Slovene-speaking children were taught in German and Latin, of course. After 1848 (*Nationalprinzip* in the monarchy), it was possible to establish Slovene schools. After 1918, the Slovene-speaking population found itself sharing a common political framework with the Southern Slavs, which resulted in intensive language contact with (Serbo-)Croatian and other languages, as well as in the development of Slovene-Serbo-Croatian functional bilingualism among the Slovene-speaking population.

Coexistence in the same political, geographical, and cultural area has affected both Slovene and German. This can be observed in lexical borrowings from Middle High German in the twentieth century. According to Toporišič,<sup>3</sup> the influence of German is manifest at all levels of speech, with the exception of phonology<sup>4</sup> and morphology. Contrary to this opinion, I believe German influence can be detected at all levels of speech, from phonology to syntax. This article later provides examples of the grammaticalization in Slovene that results from contact between languages; along with certain individual examples, other possible interpretations will be suggested. These theoretical starting points provide new findings about language contact in relation to the theory of gram-

---

2 J. Toporišič, *Slowenisch-deutsche Sprachkontakte* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1981), pp. 69–71.

3 Toporišič, *Slowenisch-deutsche Sprachkontakte*, p. 72.

4 This claim by Toporišič needs to be revised, since the accent in Slovene Styrian dialects on the Austrian border already shows the influence of German (for example, Slov. Styr. *ásfalt* vs. standard Slovene and other Slov. dialects *asfált*). See also C. M. Riehl, *Sprachkontaktforschung* (Tübingen: Narr, 2004), p. 89: “*Sehr früh kann man aber feststellen, dass prosodische Muster der Kontaktsprache nachgeahmt werden*” [We can conclude that Toporišič in his theory focuses only on central Slovene dialects].

matalization. Heine and Kuteva,<sup>5</sup> for example, stress that while certain parts of language, such as phonology and the lexicon, tend to be affected by pressure from other languages, grammar is considered immune to major restructuring. More recent studies have shown that this view is incorrect. As some of these studies have demonstrated, essentially any part of language structure can be transferred from one language to another. Changes in morphology and syntax are demonstrated by a series of research studies.<sup>6</sup> These changes can also be the result of universal principles of linguistic discourse and historical development, shared genetic relationships, parallel development, or drift; however, in this article, I provide examples that have resulted specifically from language contact between German and Slovene. Studies of the processes of grammaticalization in Slovenia are practically non-existent; the only extensive case study<sup>7</sup> deals with the issue of the analytic genitive in Slovene and German, while apart from this the term, grammaticalization appears separately from the existing theory of grammaticalization.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, language contact between German and Slovene is usually dealt with from the aspect of lexis adoption or the appearance of Germanisms. Extensive insight into language contact between German and Slovene is provided by Reindl's study from the year 2008.<sup>9</sup> In this study, the process of grammaticalization is not recognized or mentioned; however, this study is the only relatively broad overview of the result of German language influence on Slovene; therefore, I will use its materials but, of course, include other sources as well. By no means can this article deal with all examples of grammaticalization in Slovene that have appeared under the influence of German. Since such research is still in its initial stages and references are few, future research is necessary.

---

5 B. Heine and T. Kuteva, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change* (Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 1.

6 Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact*.

7 A. Lipavic Oštir, *Gramatikalizacija roditeljske v nemščini in slovenščini* (Maribor: Zora, 2004).

8 Ibid., p. 35.

9 An example of a frequently cited study is H. Striedter-Temps, *Deutsche Lehnwörter im Slowenischen* (Berlin: Osteuropa-Institut, 1963); however, it only includes the level of phonology and is dated because of its publication year.

In researching the processes of grammaticalization, I rely on the theory of grammaticalization, for example, Lehmann's parameters of grammaticalization,<sup>10</sup> and the terminology as defined by Heine and Kuteva,<sup>11</sup> while I also consider the process of grammaticalization, for example, the theory of unidirectionality, as well as the presumption that grammaticalization is not a deterministic process. Examples are provided according to their appearance within the language system. Some are explained in more and some in less detail. The reason for such treatment is, of course, not their "importance" in the language but simply the fact that there are very few research studies dealing with the influence of German on Slovene that<sup>12</sup> go beyond the level of lexis; moreover, there is practically no research on the processes of grammaticalization in the Slovene language. Considering these facts, it seems useful to present individual phenomena and indicate research areas. The only exception is the phenomenon of the analytic genitive in Slovene, in whose case I can turn to my own research study.

---

10 Ch. Lehmann, *Thoughts on Grammaticalization. Revised and expanded version* (München: Lincom Europa, 1999).

11 Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact*; Heine and Kuteva, *The Changing Languages*.

12 Reindl, too, includes only selected sources, particularly several dialect studies. Mostly, these are studies of Slovene Styrian, Carinthian, and partly Pannonian dialects, which is in agreement with the presumption that German had its primary influence on areas close to the border. On the other hand, there is a lack of data for the Carniolan dialects, which also border on the German language space, and for other dialects from the inner parts of the Slovenian language space where the influence is also visible. From the sociolinguistic point of view, Slovene dialects today have a relatively high prestige, and they appear in the media as well as in schools. However, for the study of language influence and grammaticalization, analyzed materials of other varieties are needed, particularly of colloquial Slovene, varieties of slang, etc. Research into standard Slovene only (see the only comprehensive grammar of Slovene language, J. Toporišič, *Slovenska slovnica* (Maribor: Obzorja, 2000)) will not suffice, a claim that will be clarified in subsequent examples.

## 2. Examples

### 2-1. Gender Leveling

Gender leveling is a pattern by which human female participants in speech acts are referenced with masculine morphology in adjectives and participles. This means that case morphology that marks masculine gender adopts the function of marking feminine gender, which is a kind of generalization. Endings for the masculine gender adopt the role of expressing the natural feminine gender. The phenomenon is attested to in certain Slovenian dialects: in the Bled area and eastern parts of Upper Carniola, the subdialect of Prekmurje, Goričko, and the Raba Valley in Hungary, and the Haloze dialect of extreme southeast Styria.<sup>13</sup>

(1) *Dvanaist let sem bil (MASC) star (MASC), ko so me poslal v planine.* (Female speaker born in 1919)

“I was twelve years old when they sent me to the mountain pastures.”<sup>14</sup>

The origin of gender leveling remains unexplained.<sup>15</sup> The direct influence of German cannot be discounted because it provides a corresponding model in which participles and predicate adjectives do not distinguish gender. This correlates with the fact that in Slovene, morphological forms for the masculine gender generalize or mark all three genders, for example, the marking of certain neuter nouns with masculine forms. Unfortunately, dialectology offers no data on the use of this phenomenon with regards to age and other non-linguistic parameters. The influence of German on the Haloze dialect is questionable, since there is no reason for this one of all the Slovene Styrian dialects to have

---

13 D. Reindl, *Language Contact: German and Slovenian* (Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer, 2008), p. 72.

14 M. Bešter, “Govorjenje na fanta v gorenjskem narečju,” *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture* (Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 1998), p. 73; see also Reindl, *Language Contact*, p. 73.

15 T. Logar, *Dialektološke in jezikovnozgodovinske razprave* (Ljubljana: SAZU, 1996), p. 201; Z. Zorko, *Haloško narečje in druge dialektološke študije* (Maribor: Zora, 1998), p. 48; see also Reindl, *Language Contact*, p. 73.

a special position in language contact with German; after all, it is spoken in the very southeast close to the border with Croatia.

## 2-2. *Analytic Perfect*

For expressing past actions, Slovene dialects as well as standard Slovene use the analytic form of the verb *biti* [to be] + active resultative *l*-participle. The structure is stable, so the auxiliary *biti* is not dropped, and neither are the morphological suffixes of the participle, which differ with regard to gender and number. Heine and Kuteva<sup>16</sup> explain the origin of this structure with the process of grammaticalization under the influence of German, since the German Perfekt in the fifteenth century undergoes grammaticalization in the southeast part of the German language space. Since this is an SAE<sup>17</sup> phenomenon with its center in the surroundings of Paris in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and its expansion took place not only in the north Italian speech space but also in the German, the phenomenon is also notable in the neighboring Slavic languages (Czech, Slovak, Slovene, and partly Croatian and Serbian). We have no historical information on how and when this grammaticalization spread to the neighboring Slavic languages. Heine and Kuteva summarize the definition of the grammaticalization stages in the perfect by Thieroff,<sup>18</sup> according to which Slovene is placed at stage 3: the erst-while perfect marker starts to take over other typical features of past time markers. It can no longer be combined with future markers to form future perfects, and it acquires modal uses. Thus, Slovene falls into the group of other Slavic languages (Lower Sorbian, Polish, Czech, Belorussian, Ukrainian, and Russian) where the last stage has been reached and the process of grammaticalization from perfect to past time markers is nearing completion. Heine and Kuteva<sup>19</sup> illustrate the nature of the process

---

16 Heine and Kuteva, *The Changing Languages*, pp. 36–37.

17 SAE = Standard Average European (M. Haspelmath, “How Young Is Standard Average European?” *Language Sciences* 20:3 (1998), pp.271–287).

18 R. Thieroff, “On the Areal Distribution of Tense-aspect Categories in Europe,” in D. Östen, ed., *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe* (Berlin-New York: Moton de Gruyter, 2000), pp. 265–305.

19 Heine and Kuteva, *The Changing Languages*, p. 38.

of grammaticalization of the analytic perfect through the disappearance of synthetic forms for expressing past tense in Slavic languages. Among these, there is a general process whereby the two synthetic aspect-tense forms, the imperfect and the aorist, were abandoned; but whereas the imperfect was lost early, the aorist was retained much longer. In Italian, it is the other way around: while the imperfect is retained, the aorist is disappearing, being replaced with the analytic perfect. The historical development of Slovene and the use of today's Slovene dialect in Resia<sup>20</sup> show that the developments are identical: the forms of the former aorist disappeared partly in Old Church Slavonic and partly later.<sup>21</sup> Some forms of the imperfect can be found in the *Freising Manuscripts (Brižinski spomeniki)*,<sup>22</sup> and it has disappeared in all dialects, apart from partly in Resia. This means that Slovene has what Breu<sup>23</sup> calls *einen romanischen Typ im slawischen Gewande* (a Romance type in Slavic dress). Such a development is intriguing, since we can lean on the impact of the Italian language on the Resia dialect as well as on other Slovene dialects in Italy (between Trieste and Udine), and partially also for the Slovene dialects in the far west of Carinthia, where a continuum with Italian dialects exists. On the other hand, it would be difficult to claim that such development is possible in the central and eastern Slovene language space, where the main language influence came from German and in part from Hungarian – and in the far south even from Croatian, where nowadays the aorist is in still use. One obstacle in clearing up these questions includes written sources. The aorist in written sources is practically non-existent; the imperfect is rare. The tradition of written sources in Slovene starts in the

---

20 An extremely archaic Slovene dialect, which is still spoken in the Resia Valley in Italy and which over the centuries had little contact with other Slovene dialects.

21 F. Ramovš, *Morfologija slovenskega jezika* (Ljubljana: DZS, 1952), pp. 144–145.

22 The oldest Slovene written document, probably originating from the tenth century.

23 W. Breu, “Der Faktor Sprachkontakt in einer dynamischen Typologie des Slavischen,” *Slavische Linguistik 1993* (Munich: Otto Sagner, 1994), p. 58; see also Heine and Kuteva, *The Changing Languages*, p. 39.

tenth century, but it has no continuity in the centuries to follow. Between the tenth century and the year 1550 when Protestant literature begins, we have only a few manuscripts with religious content and several other texts.

A brief overview of verbal categories shows that in Slovene, other analytical forms were also grammaticalized. Here are the structures of several Slovene tenses or modes: pluperfect: verb *to be* + verb *to be* in past tense + *l*-participle; future tense: verb *to be* in future tense + *l*-participle; passive: verb *to be* + passive participle; and conditional: *bi* [would] + *l*-participle. In the case of the conditional, the old form of the third-person singular (*bi*) has generalized for all persons. Unfortunately, Slovene studies offer no systematic overview of the chronological development of these forms; however, a diverse development of Slovene dialects in the west (in fact, the Resia dialect is the only documented one), in the center, and in the east of the Slovene language space can be presumed even with deficient written sources, if we consider that the Resia dialect follows the Italian model of preserving and dropping structures for expressing past tense. Generalization of this model to all dialects would be possible; however, it is not very probable, since the Resia dialect is relatively closed and isolated from other dialects; moreover, the large spread and diversity of Slovene dialects (approximately forty-eight of them) indicate a lack of contact among the speakers.

A more precise analysis of the appearance of analytical structures through the history of language and consideration of the regional aspect would enable us to answer the question of whether the whole system of verbal categories is the result of processes of grammaticalization under the influence of German and, for example, Italian, or whether it is something else. One of the principles of grammaticalization is that the transfer of grammaticalization from model language M to replica language R is unlikely to be completed; that is, we expect R to exhibit a less advanced stage of grammaticalization than M.<sup>24</sup> The previously described process of grammaticalization of the perfect, centered in the vicinity of Paris and spreading to the German- and north Italian-speaking area, with an

---

24 Heine and Kuteva, *The Changing Languages*, p. 182.



additional extension to the Slavic languages, is not congruent with this process of grammaticalization. German as model language M has the perfect at level 1 (northern German) and level 2 (southern German). For Slovene, contact with southern German is presumed; however, it is obvious that the process of grammaticalization in Slovene as replica language R went beyond the process in German as model language M.

### **2-3. Possessive Perfect**

The phenomenon of this structure is dealt with in several studies. Breu,<sup>25</sup> for example, examines the possessive perfect, which developed in some Slavic languages (Sorbian, Czech, and Slovene) that have a long history of contact with German. This phenomenon is also an SAE one, for which Heine and Kuteva claim that replica constructions have not reached the same advanced stage of grammaticalization characterizing that of SAE languages. In their overview of grammaticalization of this structure, Heine and Kuteva<sup>26</sup> deal with the European space and beyond, and they suggest various potential theoretical opportunities for the development of this construction. Heine and Kuteva<sup>27</sup> classify the languages according to the level of grammaticalization of the structure, and in this classification, Slovene is at stage 1,<sup>28</sup> which means that possession is no longer the primary meaning of the construction: (a) only transitive verbs are allowed as main verbs; (b) the PPP-verb still has the structure of a modifier of the patient, agreeing with the patient noun phrase in case, number, and/or gender; (c) the possessive verb tends to be interpreted as an auxiliary and the PPP-verb, as the new main verb; and (d) the possessive and the PPP-verbs tend to be associated with one and the same agent. Here are two examples from modern Slovene:

---

25 W. Breu, "Überlegungen zu einer Klassifizierung des grammatischen Wandels im Sprachkontakt (am Beispiel slavischer Kontaktfälle)," *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49:1 (1996), p. 31; see also Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact*, p. 101; Heine and Kuteva, *The Changing Languages*, pp. 140–181.

26 Heine and Kuteva, *The Changing Languages*.

27 *Ibid.*, pp. 143–144.

28 This stage also includes other Slavic languages, with the exception of northern Russian, southwestern Macedonian, southern Thracian Bulgarian, and Kashubian.

(2) *Vse knjige imam original kupljene iz Amazona.*

All books I have (1.SG.PRES) originally bought (P.PL.FEM) out of Amazon.

“I have bought all original books from Amazon.” (www.slo-foto.net)

(3) *Imam zgrajeno stanovanje iz Ytonga.*

I have (1.SG.PRES) built (P.SG.NEUT) flat out of Ytong

“I have a flat built of Ytong.” (www.alter.si)

Considering the characteristics of stage 1, we can conclude that possession is no longer the primary meaning of the construction – both cases are about expressing possession (“to have books,” “to have a flat”), but the meaning in the foreground is also that I bought the books and I have them, or I built the flat and I have it. The meaning of possession is strongly present, since neither of the examples means that I have bought the books and I do not know to whom they belong (or that this is not expressed), or that I have built the flat and I do not know to whom it belongs (or that this is not expressed). Also, characteristics a-d above are valid for both examples.

In his study, Nomachi<sup>29</sup> discusses the possessive perfect in the context of distribution of the verbs *be* and *have* as markers of possessivity and aspectuality. Nomachi analyzes the possessive perfect (with examples from standard Slovene and recent newspapers) comparing the situation in Slovene with other Slavic languages and points out that this category is growing in Slovene but that it has not yet been grammaticalized. Because grammaticalization is not a deterministic process, further grammaticalization of this structure cannot be presumed. A development like this is possible and can be observed in some other Slavic languages, for example, Kashubian. Kashubian has a fully grammaticalized structure at stage 3, but Nomachi’s analysis<sup>30</sup> shows restrictions in the for-

---

29 *Номачи М.* От посессивности к аспектуальности: дистрибуция глаголов *imeti* и *biti* в словенском языке в типологическом освещении // *Slavia Meridionalis* VI. Polska Akademia Nauk, 2006. С. 65–90.

30 *М. Nomachi*, “On a Periphrastic Perfect in Kashubian Literary Language,” in *Nishi Surabugaku Ronshuu* 11 (2008), pp. 4–23.

mation of the structure, which are not the same as in German where a structure can be used simply as a marker of past tense.

#### 2-4. Analytic Genitive

In researching the analytic genitive in Slovene and German,<sup>31</sup> I deal with the most frequent structure that can replace the synthetic genitive in both languages, that is, the prepositional phrase with the German *von* (*das Haus von meinem Vater* [the house of my father]) and the Slovene *od* (*hiša od mojega očeta* [the house of my father]), and I explain its entry into usage through a process of grammaticalization where each grammatical sign obtains a new grammatical function, which we can describe as expressing possessivity. Both processes of grammaticalization are compared to the synthetical genitive in both languages and the possessive adjective in Slovene. In the analysis of both processes of grammaticalization, Lehmann's parameters of grammaticalization<sup>32</sup> were used, and according to all parameters, the analysis<sup>33</sup> showed a higher stage of grammaticalization of the German analytical genitive. So the structure itself is more frequent in German than in Slovene. Apart from this, the grammatical sign – the preposition *von* – cannot be replaced with any other preposition apart from a few dialectal instances, while the preposition *od* in Slovene can in some cases be replaced by the prepositions *izmed/med*. The German preposition also shows boundedness with the article, while in Slovene, boundedness is impossible. Moreover, the level of syntagmatic variability of *von* in a syntagm is higher than in the case of the Slovene preposition *od*; this means that the latter can appear in different positions in a syntagm. The Slovene analytical genitive can express fewer genitive aspects than the German. Furthermore, research

---

31 Lipavic Oštir, *Gramatikalizacija roditeljskega*.

32 Lehmann, *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*.

33 Analysis is based on 10,393 examples of the German synthetic genitive, 1,547 examples of the German analytic genitive, 3,825 examples of the Slovene synthetic genitive, 170 examples of the Slovene analytic genitive, and 1,235 examples of Slovene possessive adjectives (*očetova hiša* [father's house]) from all periods of German and Slovene language history.

that considered stages of grammaticalization according to Kilroe<sup>34</sup> has shown that the German analytical genitive is at the third stage of grammaticalization, which means that the structure is grammatical (the preposition *von* cannot be replaced by another preposition); on the other hand, the structure is not obligatory in all language situations.

The analytical genitive as a means of expressing possession is becoming more frequent, and in certain language situations, it is obligatory, which is again largely dependent on the variety of language. An analysis of the Slovene analytical genitive with consideration given to the same stages has shown that this structure appears at the second stage of grammaticalization, which means that the structure is generalized, but it is not yet grammatical nor will ever be, since we know that grammaticalization is not a deterministic process. All this is difficult to anticipate because of various usages in different varieties. Growing distribution of the structure can be noted in the course of development of the language; however, with standard Slovene, the structure withdraws to dialectal and colloquial usages. This is where its distribution grows, and individual examples – particularly of the partial genitive – appear in standard Slovene, while grammarians set no unified criteria for the standardization of a structure (according to Toporišič;<sup>35</sup> certain examples are allowed in standard Slovene, others not – all without argumentation).

Tesnière<sup>36</sup> explained the appearance of the Slovene analytical genitive by the influence of German and Italian. Gallis<sup>37</sup> opposes this claim and also mentions the analytical genitive in other areas as well as in other Slavic languages. Reindl<sup>38</sup> in his partial observation concludes that the Slovene analytical genitive appeared under the influence of German;

---

34 P. Kilroe, "The Grammaticalization of French à," in W. Pagliuca, ed., *Perspectives on Grammaticalization* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1994).

35 Toporišič, *Slovenska slovnica*, pp. 414 and 416.

36 L. Tesnière, "Sur le système casuel du slovène," *Mélanges Vendryes* (Coll. ling. XVII) (Paris, 1925), pp. 358–359.

37 A. Gallis, "Gebrauch der Präposition od statt des Genitivs des Eigentums oder der Zugehörigkeit im Serbokroatischen," in *Scando-Slavica* 1 (Kopenhagen: Munksgaard, 1954).

38 Reindl, *Language*, p. 118.

however, the structure had an independent internal development (shared with other Slavic languages). Tesnière mentions the appearance of the analytical genitive only in the Carinthian, Styrian, and Upper Carniolan dialects, but today, the structure extends to all dialects, even partly to standard Slovene. As mentioned before, other Slovene analytical verbal categories have also been grammaticalized, so shifts towards the analytical structure of language can be discerned, despite the preservation of case morphology. In the course of centuries, Slovene has been in contact with South Bavarian dialects, in which the analytic genitive was grammaticalized relatively late.<sup>39</sup> Can a marked and relatively rarely used structure, such as the analytical genitive in the Bavarian dialects, be the one to shape the structures of its neighboring language and start the process of grammaticalization? After all, the source of both prepositions is related and the connection with the ablative could relate to the *area* > *possessiveness* metaphor as the beginning of the process of grammaticalization. It seems that in the area of the nominal phrase, further research into the history of the Slovene language and the process of grammaticalization is necessary. Moreover, Heine and Kuteva<sup>40</sup> conclude that, in determining language influence, we must raise the question of what evidence there is of transfer having taken place and whether that change could have taken place without involving language contact. In certain cases, language contact can be understood as an additional factor that accelerated a particular grammaticalization process.

### **2-5. Modal Passive**

In the Slavic minority languages around the eastern fringes of the German-speaking territory, such as Upper Sorbian, Lower Sorbian, Kashubian, and Slovincian,<sup>41</sup> the German modal passive was replicated. The modal passive is a frequently used collocation consisting of the modal *wollen* [want] and the auxiliary *haben* [have] in combination with

---

39 G. Koß, “Realisierung von Kasusrelationen in den deutschen Dialekten,” in W. Besch, et al., ed., *Ein Handbuch zur deutschen und allgemeinen Dialektforschung*, band 2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1983), pp. 1243 and 1248.

40 Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact*, pp. 22–23.

41 *Ibid.*, pp. 41–42.

the main verb in the past perfect participle and expressing the grammatical meaning of “want to get something done.” Heine and Kuteva do not mention Slovene; however, the structure is also partly grammaticalized in this language, because the following dialectal usage is possible:

(4) *Lase je hotela imeti pobarvane.*

hair (she) did (AUX, 3.PERS.SG.) want (PPP, 3.PERS.SG, FEM) to have dyed (P, PL.MASC)

“She wanted to have her hair dyed.”

The modal verb *hoteti* [want] appears in the structure and is conjugated, and next to it, there are the auxiliary *imeti* [have] in the infinitive form and the passive participle. The structure has a passive meaning; it can be formed in the past tense, as the above example shows, as well as in present tense (*Lase hoče imeti pobarvane* [She wants to have her hair dyed]) and in the future tense (*Lase bo hotela imeti pobarvane* [She will want to have her hair dyed]).

In Slovene, the structure has been examined neither historically nor according to its dialectal expansion.

## 2-6. Subject pronouns

In Slovene dialects, particularly those along the border,<sup>42</sup> the use of a personal pronoun is perceived in places where there should be a zero pronoun, since this is a pro-drop language:

(5) ... *jaz* (PERS.PRON., 1.PERS.SG) *sem se z Liksu spoznala...* (Female speaker born 1925, Carinthian dialect, Zorko 1995, 216)

“... I met Liksa ...”

Such usage can be found in other Slavic languages, for example, Sorbian, and Burgenland Croatian and among migrants in non-pro-drop

---

42 M. Koletnik, *Slovenskogoriško narečje* (Maribor: Zora, 2001), p. 254 (Slovene Styrian dialects); Zorko, *Haloško narečje*, p. 298 (Slovene Carinthian dialects).

language environments.<sup>43</sup> Štumberger, too, reports on the usage of personal pronouns in the Slovene language of migrant societies in Germany, particularly with the second generation of migrants that grew up bilingually with German and Slovene.<sup>44</sup> Unfortunately, Štumberger provides neither numerical data nor comparative examples where the personal pronoun is not used. This would enable an analysis according to the criteria of grammaticalization provided by Heine and Kuteva,<sup>45</sup> which comprise frequency (personal pronouns acquiring a higher frequency of use); context extension (their use tending to be generalized); change in meaning (pronouns losing the originally serving pragmatically defined functions and assuming the syntactic function of representing subjects (or objects)). Examples include the following:

(6) *Oni* (PERS.PRON., 3.PERS.PL) *to poslajo v Nemčijo* (Slovene female migrant in Germany, Štumberger 2007, 104)  
 “They send this to Germany.”

(7) *Jaz* (PERS.PRON., 1.PERS.SG) *sem iskala po internetu* (Slovene female migrant in Germany, Štumberger 2007, 104)  
 “I searched on the Internet.”

## 2-7. Article

Slovene is a language with case morphology; it distinguishes among suffix variants as well as among various declensions for each of three genders; at the same time, it also distinguishes among three numbers: singular, dual, and plural. This creates a relatively complicated system of declension patterns. The noun does not express the categories of definiteness or indefiniteness; however, these categories are morphologically marked in adjectives (*velik avto* [a big car] versus *veliki avto* [the big car]). So in principle, the noun has no article, but such cases can be found. The phenomenon has been researched, but not from the point of

---

43 Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact*, p. 47.

44 S. Štumberger, *Slovenščina pri Slovencih v Nemčiji* (Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 2007), p. 103.

45 Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact*, p. 70.

view of grammaticalization. In research studies, the most recent insight is offered by Reindl,<sup>46</sup> who locates the cause of the phenomenon of definite articles and indefinite articles in language contact with German.

### 2-7-1. *Definite Articles*

The definite article appears in the dialectal forms *to* (N.SG.), *ti* (M.SG.), *ta* (F.SG.), and others (*ta mlajša hčera* [the younger daughter]); these appear in most dialects, not only in the border ones. The definite article is proclitic and unstressed, and as in standard German, it may appear with superlative forms of adjectives (*najtavečji* [the biggest]). Heine and Kuteva<sup>47</sup> found a higher stage of grammaticalization of the definite article in the Resia dialect.<sup>48</sup> Historically and today, speakers of this dialect have had little contact with German but more with Italian and Friulian, which are both familiar with the system of definite articles.

A connection between the definite article phenomenon and the adjectival category of definiteness/indefiniteness is mentioned by Koletnik,<sup>49</sup> who lists definite articles in the Slovenske Gorice dialect (Slovene Styria) and reports that the article does not decline and may serve to nominalize an adjective (*ti mladi* [the young one]). In this dialect, the adjective has lost its ability to express definiteness and indefiniteness. The same observation is made for the dialect of Oplotnica (Slovene Styria) and for the dialects of East Carinthia.<sup>50</sup>

The loss of expression of the definiteness category and the appearance of the definite article require more precise treatment. How can we understand these two changes and their correlation? Did the loss of definiteness appear first, or did the appearance of definite article usage make morphological marking redundant?

---

46 Reindl, *Language Contact*, pp. 131–132.

47 Heine and Kuteva, *The Changing Languages*, p. 115.

48 A. D. Duličenko, “Das Resianische,” in P. Rehder, ed., *Einführung in die Slavischen Sprachen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998), p. 246.

49 Koletnik, *Slovenskogoriško narečje*, p. 143; see also Reindl, *Language Contact*, p. 132.

50 Z. Zorko, *Narečna podoba Dravske doline* (Maribor: Kulturni forum, 1995), pp. 336–337.



### 2-7-2. *The Indefinite Article en [one]*

Slovenian dialects (from Carinthia, Haloze, and Slovenske Gorice in Styria) also use an indefinite article formed on the basis of the number “one,” and it is stressed (*Ona je bila en tak lepi otrok* [She was such a beautiful child]). In their overview of the development stages of the indefinite article in European languages, Heine and Kuteva<sup>51</sup> establish that we have no conclusive data on the stage of development of “one” into an indefinite article. We can use the numeral for “one” *en* (M.SG.), *ena* (F.SG.), and *eno* (N.SG.) as an indefinite article. Some data for the Resia dialect exist, but they are insufficient.

The appearance of definite and indefinite articles suggests that research into both language phenomena is mandatory. Dialectology offers data only for certain dialects. Sociolinguistic factors, which show an extension of colloquial language, urban language, and slang into the dialects, also require investigation. For standard Slovene, articles are not an issue, since this variety of language is still strongly under the influence of the purism that appeared particularly in the nineteenth century. The purist movement strived to banish all signs of German influence from the standard language as well as from other language varieties – on the lexical as well as on other levels.

### 2-8. *Onikanje*

*Onikanje* is the use of the third-person plural pronoun and/or corresponding verbal forms in polite address. As Reindl points out,<sup>52</sup> it is a phenomenon that clearly made its way into Slovene through German influence but gradually eroded during the twentieth century. It is less common to encounter individuals using *onikanje* today, but it has not completely died out.

If we use *onikanje* today, it seems archaic, or it can acquire ironic undertones in the sense of mocking the addressee or a third person: *Rektor so rekli, da ne bo božičnice* [The rectors (they) have said there will be no financial stimulation at Christmas].

---

51 Heine and Kuteva, *The Changing Languages*, p. 124.

52 Reindl, *Language Contact*, p. 165.

Apart from onikanje, Slovene also has a mode of informal address, the T-form, and at the same time, a mode of formal address, the V-form. In the nineteenth century, we find examples of onikanje in literary works, and the structure was also recommended by grammarians, for example, by Murko.<sup>53</sup> Considering the structure of the German *Siezen*, which uses the third-person plural to address a second person, it could be deduced that the Slovene onikanje is a structure that follows the German model, while the T-form in Slovene is built from the second-person singular/dual/plural, depending on the context. There is a difference between the German *Siezen* and the Slovene onikanje: the German system of *Siezen* did not merely supplant the “native” system of marking formality and informality in the address system. Instead, it entered the address system and underwent modification and extension itself, being applied to third-person referents.

Similar structures or processes of grammaticalization can also be seen in other Slavic languages,<sup>54</sup> for example, in the Silesian dialects of Polish, which were intensively exposed to contact with German. Onikanje in Polish as well as in Slovene is a typical case of replica grammaticalization: model language German (M) has undergone a process of grammaticalization whereby the third-person plural pronoun was grammaticalized to a second-person singular pronoun to be used for polite/formal reference (Mx). Polish/Slovene (R) speakers replicated this process by extending the use of the third-person plural pronoun (Ry) to a new function (Rx). The precondition for the process of grammaticalization is sufficient information for replication, which can be a result of considering the sociolinguistic bilingual situation.

## **2-9. Combinations of Numerals**

In Slovene, numerals from twenty-one onwards are formed in the ones-tens order (*petindvajset* [five and twenty]). German also uses this

---

53 A. Murko, *Theoretisch-practische Grammatik der Slowenischen Sprache in Steiermark, Kärnten, Krain und dem illyrischen Küstenlande* (Grätz: Verlag der Fr. Ferstl'schen Buchhandlung, 1843), pp. 58–59; see also Reindl, *Language Contact*, p. 166.

54 Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact*, p. 92.

method of formation (*fünfundzwanzig* [five and twenty]), and it can also be seen in several other Slavic languages like Czech, Upper Sorbian, and Burgenland Croatian,<sup>55</sup> while such numeral formation is non-existent in other Slavic languages and in Old Church Slavonic where the tens-ones system was in use. The structure or formation of numerals was, obviously, received from German, but it has not fully grammaticalized, since grammar books from the mid twentieth century still allow both types of formation, that is, tens-ones and ones-tens, but quote the latter pattern as more frequent. The tens-ones formation method is today accepted in standard Slovene and can be found in the majority of dialects and other varieties; only some dialects still practice partial usage of both types (for example, according to various dialectologists, the Prekmurje dialects use the ones-tens order for numbers from twenty-one to thirty-nine and the tens-ones order for higher numbers).<sup>56</sup>

### 2-10. Verbal Prefixes

In Slovene, the category of verbal aspect exists, and for the formation of aspectual, contrasts the root of the word changes (*počim* [I crack (once)] – *pokam* [I am cracking]), or various prefixes are used. Reindl<sup>57</sup> ascertains that the prefixes for forming aspectual contrasts often resemble German verbal prefixes: Ger. *aus-* / Slov. *iz-* [out], Ger. *ausarbeiten* = Slov. *izdelati* [to elaborate, draw up], Ger. *hinein-* / Slov. *v-* [in], Ger. *sich hineinmischen* = Slov. *vmešavati se* [to get involved], etc. Reindl explains that these prefixes are not necessarily translations of German prefixes but appeared by chance, since they are based on semantically equivalent metaphors. These prefixes have grammaticalized as language signs for expressing perfectiveness/imperfectiveness of verb action. Therefore, these prepositions are grammatical language signs that have acquired new grammatical roles through grammaticalization. Undoubtedly, broader research is necessary in order to confirm or reject the thesis that this is an influence from German. At first glance, this hypothesis seems well grounded; however, since this is about a verb

---

55 Prim. Reindl, *Language Contact*, p. 90.

56 Ibid., p. 91.

57 Ibid., p. 83.

category, well developed and typical particularly of Slavic languages,<sup>58</sup> it is less plausible. Forming aspectual pairs with prefixes is a principle younger than primary changing of the original word. Language contact would thus mean that the language developed a system of expressing aspectual contrasts following the model of a different language. In Slovene, verbal prefixes form a closed category and are accepted as part of standard Slovene.

### 2-11. *Za as an Infinitive Marker*

The German *zu* is a particle that is sometimes used to mark the infinitive, for example, *Bücher zu schreiben* [books to write]. Standard varieties of Slavic languages do not use such a device,<sup>59</sup> but it is encountered frequently in colloquial Slovene, Polish, Croatian, and Czech. An example from Slovene is as follows:

(8) *Kje okoli Postojne je kaj dobrega za pojesti?*

where around Postojna is something good to (PREP.) eat (INF.)

“Where around Postojna is there something good to (PREP.) eat (INF.)?”  
(med.over.net.forum)

The example shows the preposition *za* next to the infinitive. It cannot be replaced by any other preposition. In German, the usage of the prepositions *zu* and *für* is possible; the former is used with infinitives and the latter with nominalized verbs. Both usages coincide in Austrian Bavarian dialects, which explains the use of only one preposition in Slovene and thus supports the transition of the form. The irreplaceability of the *za* preposition also speaks in favor of the fact that the form has achieved a higher stage of grammaticalization. It appears particularly in dialects and in colloquial language; it is not mentioned in the only comprehensive grammar of the Slovene language.<sup>60</sup>

---

58 See, for example, B. Comrie, *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

59 Reindl, *Language Contact*, p. 100.

60 Toporišič, *Slovenska slovnica*.

## 2-12. Recipient Passive

The recipient passive can be found in some West Slavic languages (Kashubian, Czech, Slovak, Upper Sorbian, and Lower Sorbian) and in Slovene and Burgenland Croatian. The structure is most probably a replica structure from German, which has this structure in its verbal system (*Die Bücher habe ich geschenkt bekommen* [The books were given to me as a gift]).

The recipient passive in Slovene has the structure verb *dobiti* [to get] + participle *-n* with endings for gender and number. Examples can be found in different varieties of Slovene:

(9) *Prakso sem dobil plačano.* (Colloquial Slovene)

“I got paid for my practical work.” (forum.feri.uni-mb.si/)

(10) *Kaj si dobo nalogo popravljeno?* (Female speaker, student, Slovene Styrian dialect)

“Did you get your written paper corrected?”

(11) *Tisti, ki je odklonil, je dobil povrnjeno.* (Standard Slovene, 2003, scientific text)

“The one who declined regretted it.”

The structure is mentioned in the grammar of Murko<sup>61</sup> as a *barbarismus*, which is a purist interpretation of the nineteenth century when the German influence on Slovene was interpreted as extremely negative.

## 3. Conclusion

The phenomena of processes of grammaticalization in Slovene under the influence of German differ among themselves according to whether completely new categories are grammaticalized (for example, articles and the modal passive), or whether grammaticalization has in-

---

61 Murko, *Theoretisch-practische Grammatik*; see also Reindl, *Language Contact*, p. 109.

fluenced new forms for expressing existing categories (gender leveling, analytic perfect, possessive perfect, analytic genitive, subject pronouns, onikanje, combinations of numbers, *za* as an infinitive marker, verbal prefixes, and the recipient passive). In these processes, language signs or combinations thereof become grammatical signs, or existing grammatical signs acquire new grammatical roles. In these processes, Slovene proves to be a language that was strongly under the influence of German, but also that of Italian (abandoning the aorist and the imperfect), while the influence of Hungarian as well as the possible influence of Croatian are extremely locally restricted. Unfortunately, an overview of the processes of grammaticalization opens more questions than it provides answers. It shows the area of new research that would help complete the picture with examples as well as with explanations of these phenomena.