

Izvorni naučni rad

UDK 811.13:81'27

UDK 811.163.44'373.613

Aleksandra BANJEVIĆ (Podgorica)

University of Montenegro

Faculty of Philology

ORCID number: 0000-0003-4728-8921

ab@t-com.me

THE RELEVANCE OF CULTURAL CONNECTIONS BETWEEN LANGUAGES AND THE PRESERVATION OF LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL HERITAGE (WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ROMANCE LANGUAGES)

Abstract: The role played by the contact of cultures in studying families of languages, and thereby also changes in languages, is a very important factor in the approach to language analysis today.

The subject of this paper is to show the very important relevance of cultural connections between languages.

The modern trend of studying foreign languages, which reflects the need of universal contact between people and nations, makes the studying of Romance loanwords even more significant precisely because of the need to preserve linguistic and cultural heritage for the generations to come.

Keywords: *cultural connections, language, language theory, cultural heritage, preservation of linguistic heritage, Romance languages*

Introduction

We attach importance to language also as a means which should help us to understand our own selves and the society we belong to, constantly bearing in mind that two basic purposes of language relate to thought and communication.

Language and language theory...

Speech is functional. It can be used to express every objective reality and every content of thought. The way of realising that content may be different, and may vary even in one type of speech. In other words, in every type of speech there exist potential opportunities for expressive innovations. They are particularly manifested when conventional dialectic forms are no longer in a state to adequately express new language content.

It is the task of stylistics and dialectology to examine all such “special cases”, all stylistic usages of expressive means, to explain them and to assign them a stylistic value. Since both the process and result of that work are linguistic, it follows that the study of any language or dialect without stylistic study is, in a linguistic sense, incomplete.¹

Leo Weisgerber’s² linguistic theory builds on the linguistic knowledge of Wilhelm von Humboldt³ who strove for the universal studying of a language in its connectedness with the language community and the outside world which is reflected in the language.

Language is one of the basic moments in constructing human existence, not only as a means for communicating in normal life, as an expressive means of artistic design, or as an aid in mastering the most diverse areas of human activity, but also as a powerful driver in the shaping of human beings.

Hence it can be said that language is the most significant and an important characteristic of being human (*Menschsein*). A language exists only as the language of a language community, but similarly there is no one who is not a member of a language community. That fact does not allow exceptions, so this refers to a law which encompasses all of humanity and which acts on it without exception (*Menschheitsgesetz der Sprache*).

Weisgerber formulated this law in the following way:

1. The law of the language community (*Gesetz der Sprachgemeinschaft*), which acts so that humanity is, necessarily and without exception, divided up into language communities.
2. The law of the mother tongue (*Gesetz der Muttersprache*), which includes every individual person in earliest childhood and fits them into a language community.
3. The law of the linguistic conditioning of human existence (*Gesetz des sprachbedingten Daseins*), which states that all people necessarily stand

¹ Rudolf Filipovic, *Suvremena lingvistika*, no. 1, Zagreb 1962, p. 11.

² Leo Weisgerber, *Vom Weltbild der deutschen Sprache*, Düsseldorf, 1953.

³ Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), *Über die Kawi-Sprache auf der Insel Java, Berlin*, 1836–1839 (published posthumously).

their whole lives under the conditions of language and, even more, that language ability is a basic characteristic of a human being.

According to the law of the language community, the division of humanity into language communities is precisely a result of the action of this law.

This division is a fact which allows no exceptions. This is the way things are today, and it has been like this throughout human history for as long as humans, as rational beings, have made use of language. Therefore we can say that this form of community is one of the basic forms of human communal living. Of course, that does not mean that this form cannot be overcome by other forms at one particular stage of development, for example by uniting several language communities into a single political entity, by combining two or more language communities into one, or by dividing one language community into a multitude of language communities, and we have a series of examples of this in the most recent or more distant past of humanity. But the final result of this process in every historical stage of consideration is always the same: the division into language communities, unconditionally and without exception.

The Law of the Mother Tongue...

Every person has experienced the action of this law in their own self: before beginning to think consciously, to choose or consciously decide, they find themselves included in a mother tongue. The connection between the individual and a mother tongue is so strong that there is no possibility of an individual growing up with two or more mother tongues (it is very possible that Weisgerber overestimates the action of this law, because cases of distinct bilingualism are, in practice, not rare).

Human life without language is unimaginable, and for this reason the possession of language separates the human being from all other forms of being. Despite humanity being equally gifted in mastering language, the result is a multitude of different languages.

There are three basic forms of judging the diversity of languages: diversity as an evil; as a help; and as a necessity.

The first understanding is most widespread. We find it in ordinary life, in the verdicts of philosophers and in the way it is represented by religion. It is based on the understanding of language as a means for communication. Everyone who has encountered difficulties in mastering a foreign language will consider the idea of introducing a single world language to be justified, even one which has been artificially created, which would enable easier communication for all of humanity. Philosophy and theology see the imperfecti-

on of humankind in the diversity of languages: if humanity is divided into a multitude of language groups, then that is an expression of the limitedness of the human spirit, the vagueness of its ways and the insecurities in setting its goals. The multitude of languages is, therefore, a reflection of imperfection, a necessary evil, but an evil which, with the development of the human spirit, could be nullified and overcome.

The second opinion about language as a help is based on the statement that a person, in different life circumstances, under different climatic conditions, with a different way of making a living and with completely different customs, needs a completely different language. The language must always be appropriate to the necessity of life and to the mastering of the immediate tasks. But this understanding still leaves an open question—is it not possible that what is common to all could be overcome by a single language, and what is conditioned by different life circumstances and events from life?

However, the diversity of languages does not affect only particular parts of a language but language as a whole, as Humboldt already noted. Diversity of languages exists as a necessity which is conditioned by different views of the world. The encounter between an objective being and the human spirit happens through the prism of the mother tongue's view of the world, into which are implanted the aspirations and views of a certain group of people, the consequences of historical events and the influence of various other external circumstances. In that sense, every language, if measured against the reality of an objective being, contains a one-sided subjective picture of the world. That one-sidedness is unavoidable and has a tendency to become even stronger, because not a single member of a language community can see into the mechanism of action of a mother tongue or has the possibility of critically opposing it. If the entirety of humankind possessed only one language, there would be only one one-sided subjective path to human knowledge through that one language.

An it is precisely the diversity of languages that allows a multitude of subjective paths to human knowledge, which in its entirety makes up something objective, a multitude of paths “not only to show already known truths, but to discover unknown truths”.⁴

Every individual language is a path “for the external world, with the help of the power contained in language, to be transformed into the sphere of the spirit”.⁵

It is true that the language community and mother tongue are in a constant process of mutual action (*Wechselwirkung*). But the emphasis which We-

⁴ Humboldt, *Über das vergleichende Studium*.

⁵ Humboldt, *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaus*, 1949.

isgerber, taking on Humboldt's basic thoughts, gives to language as a power which acts on the development of human thought, on the formation of the human spirit and knowledge of the outside world, seems overstated. In that way, the human spirit becomes a helpless instrument subject to the rules of language.⁶ Human knowledge is only to a small extent modified by language. The essence of knowledge is made up of human practice, understood in the broadest sense as scientific, productive, historical practice. Just as reality itself is infinite, the possibility of developing human knowledge is also infinite.

Humans, as beings gifted with the ability to speak, as social beings and as individuals, overcome the world around them with their language.

In language, what is reflected directly is not an image of the world, but the accumulated experience of all previous generations which extracted from the objectively existing reality that which is important for a certain group of people.

According to Humboldt's definition—that language is not *ERGON* (ἔργον) but *ENERGEIA* (ἐνέργεια)—for an adequate description of the phenomenon *language*, it is necessary to broaden the study to the connections between language and the outside world, that is, to how “the outside world is transformed into the sphere of the spirit”. With Humboldt, this opposition is highlighted as a “view of the world” (*Weltansicht*) and an “internal form of language” (*innere Sprachform*).

The entire problem of studying language can be methodically divided into four stages:

1. Study which relates to the vocal side of language (*lautbezogen*)
2. Study which relates to the content side of language (*inhaltbezogen*)
3. Study of the “*Leistung*” of language (*leistungbezogen*)
4. Study of the action of language (*wirkungbezogen*)

The first two stages have as their subject language as “*ergon*”. Language contents cannot be adequately described using the criteria by which the vocal side of language is studied, given that there does not exist a simple comparison between expression and content. Thus an adequate description of content also needs an adequate methodology. The third and fourth stages study language as “*energeia*”. The primary “*Leistung*” of language lies in turning the world into thoughts.

“But the actions which radiate from that already spiritually shaped world contained in language into all areas where language is used should be methodically separated from that thought transformation of the world; we are no

⁶ Vranički, *Dijalektički i historijski materijalizam*, Zagreb, 1958, p. 65.

longer talking about language-related shaping of the world but about overcoming the other human tasks through that already language-shaped world: how we use language in the area of everyday life, material culture, religion, art, science, etc. and what the consequences are which result from the influence of a language-based view of the world, as results in the work done on those areas of culture.”⁷

Hugo Schuchardt claimed that there was not a single pure language, that all languages are subject to mutual influences and that they are constantly mixing.⁸ In order to better understand language mixing and to arrive at some results in research, it is necessary, according to Schuchardt, to know the influences of social forces on language mixing, that is, it is necessary to know the history of the nations between which that mixing is taking place.

Some older linguists, for example, Rasmus Rask and Max Muller, believed that mixed languages are only those languages in which, under the influence of another language, changes in morphology and syntax have happened, because, in their opinion, the borrowing of lexis does not influence the structure of a language. Later works by Herman Paul, Leonard Bloomfield and Uriel Weinreich shed much better light on that problem and on language “interference” (in sociolinguistics and foreign language teaching methodics, this is the term for errors which a speaker transfers into one language upon contact with that other language; also called “negative transfer”). The most frequent source of errors is in the process of learning a foreign language, where the mother tongue “interferes”; but interference can also appear in other contact situations, as in multilingualism⁹ where it is declared as a necessary element of every language, without which it could not live or develop.¹⁰

Traditional grammar takes as the basis of its study the vocal side of language. This is also understandable because the vocal side of language can be fixed and systematically shown in the form of formal grammar and alphabetical vocabulary lists. However, alphabetical vocabulary lists cannot give exact information about the content-related structure of language, because the criterion of determining the content, although practical, is chosen at random.

Apart from that, the explanations which lexicography gives us very often are not precise. Usually the collected material is boiled down to general facts about meaning:

1. Description of the subject

⁷ Leo Weisgerber, *Kräfte II*, p. 22.

⁸ Hugo Schuchardt, *Slawo-Deutsches und Slawo-Italianisches*, Graz, 1884, p. 3–5.

⁹ See: Corder, 1973, ch. 6.

¹⁰ R. Filipović, *Jezici u kontaktu i jezično posudjivanje*, *Suvremena lingvistika*, no. 4, Zagreb, 1967, p. 28–29.

2. Definition
3. Explanations from the family of words
4. Explanations using other words (synonyms) from the same or a foreign language
5. Illustration by means of individual examples
6. No explanation is given, under the assumption that the word is familiar or because it is too difficult to describe

Such facts, although also very exhaustive, can provide only a series of unconnected content-related elements. The failure to determine the meaning of words in this way lies, methodologically speaking, in the fact that the criterion of determination is the vocal form; such a determination is “*lautbezogen*” and cannot satisfy the demands for an exhaustive description of the content.

As a criterion for determining the content-related structure adequately, we should take the content which lies in the language interlayer between the outer world and the vocal form.

The content is connected to the vocal form, but is not determined by the vocal form, but by all the other content-related elements, together with which it constitutes a larger content-related unit. The content serves as part of the structural whole and for that reason, in order to adequately describe it, it is essential to know the structure as a whole and its place within that whole.

“In terms of its content, a language does not consist of individual parts which stand by themselves, but is split up as a unit into mutually acting smaller units. We call such groups semantic fields (*sprachliche Felder*).

“A semantic field is a snippet from the language interval, and is built as a unit from organically split acting groups of language symbols.”¹¹

The creation of words, the origin of “Vulgar Latin”, development and changes

Just one, relatively small, part of vocabulary has its content determined by the semantic field, because there is only a limited number of basic words found in language. All the rest of the vocabulary is derived from that basic vocabulary by means of suffixes and prefixes.

In principle, it can be said that the content of a compound does not arise through simply adding together the content of its component members.

The members of a compound usually only partially bring their content into the new unit, but the way in which the new content unit will be formed

¹¹ Leo Weisgerber, *Kräfte I*, p. 108.

depends on the type of compound and the effectiveness of the semantic niches (*Wortnische*) and semantic fields.

Similarly, groups of words cannot be reduced in terms of content to the sum of their parts, but as a unit have their place in the semantic fields.

So-called normalised words gain a special type of content-related determination. They are either taken from another language for the needs of a certain discipline—and in that case they are precisely defined—or else they are constructed on the possibilities of their own language, but according to a foreign model.

Words which originate in and which disappear from a language have a special place. No word assumes its role suddenly, nor does it lose its place in the system suddenly. Even normalised words need a long time to be adopted by a language community, to take their particular place in a semantic field. These cases are rare and are not of particularly great interest to the content-related structure of language.

Linguists have always been aware that language is not something static. Changes are something that are inherent to language. The only exceptions are extreme structuralist movements with an emphasis on a synchronous system.

Schuchardt in his work *Vokalismus des Vulgarlatein* wrote that Vulgar Latin was uniform; that opinion assumes a morpho-syntactical system which has been shaken to its foundations several times, but has still survived in its entirety:

Romance languages have many related grammatical systems, even though their phonology is very diverse and each one's lexis developed along its own path.

In our time, opinions about when "Vulgar Latin" originated are without any basis in fact. A spoken language does not have a year of birth. The views of Romanticists about when Latin ended as a spoken language—that is, when Romance languages were born—vary very widely.

A small number of American Romance scholars, first of all H. F. Muller¹² in the interwar period, were of the opinion that Vulgar Latin was uniform across the whole Roman world and that that uniformity lasted even up until the seventh century. This proposition was, linguistically, based on the study of official documents from the Merovingian period in France which demonstrate great uniformity and, what's more, demonstrate a relatively deep penetration of Romance languages. From this Muller concludes that in those charters we are not dealing with some artificial language, but with a real, living language which was in everyday use. It was only the period of Charlemagne, with his

¹² H. F. Muller, *L'époque mérovingienne. L'essai de synthèse de philologie*, New York, 1945; L. Furman Sas, *The Noun Declension System in Merovingian Latin*, Paris, 1937.

requirement that Latin should be cleansed and improved, with the so-called “Carolinian reform”, that create a deep gulf between the written and spoken language, while feudalism with its tendencies led to the end of language uniformity and caused the beginning of Romance languages.

In the main, Romance scholars have sharply rejected this hypothesis. It is extremely idealistic and does not take into account the linguistic and social reality.

Still, many respected Romance scholars have expressed the opinion that it is necessary to place the beginning, origin and birth of Romance languages in the seventh century; one of the points of emphasis, maybe the only definite one, is the conclusion of a bishop at the council of 813 AD in the city of Tours that preaching was taking place in the language of the people.

Other Romance scholars have located the division of the Romance world, and thereby also the origin of Romance languages, in an earlier period, even as early as the second and third centuries; Georges Straka, for example, was of this opinion primarily on the basis of phonetic innovations, because at that time, despite a certain cultural uniformity, there was no longer any linguistic uniformity and because of the many innovations the Romance speech varieties of some territories (Dacia, Sardinia, even western France) should already be counted as independent units.¹³

The Hungarian linguist Vidos (*B. E. Vidos, Manuale di linguistica romanza*), believes that the destruction of uniformity, to which the origin of Romance languages is connected, as much as one can talk about an origin at all, is precisely the destruction of the political community. Vidos is most probably exaggerating when he says that this is, above all, a spiritual and cultural destruction and compares the break-up of the Latin community with the break-up of the Spanish Empire in the New World: there, he claims, spiritual uniformity survived, while this was not present with the fall of the Western Roman Empire.

The imperceptible transition from spoken Latin to different national languages should be placed in the period between the fall of the Roman Empire and the ninth century.

There is no true transition from the Latin phase into the Romance phase.

We could here quote Skutsch’s metaphor about the layer of ice which covers a river: a living language arose under the ice of literature and is seen on the surface only here and there because of random cracks.

It would be revealed in its entirety when its time came.

¹³ See: Straka, “La dislocation linguistique de la Romania et la formation des langues romanes à la lumière de la chronologie relative des changements phonétiques”, *Revue de linguistique romane*, p. 20 (1956).

And that time did come when the old world was shaken, when the education network was weakened and when, correspondingly, its norm was shaken, which until then had preserved its uniformity and the rigidity of written language through school and because of which the written language seems to us so monolithic.¹⁴

The Roman Empire, in the period of the Caesars, under Trajan, achieved its greatest expansion, and thereby in Antiquity the Latin language also achieved its furthest borders. After then, some Romanised territories lost their Roman character (the British Isles, part of the Alps, northern Africa, most of the Balkan Peninsula), while the discovery of the New World spread Romance languages to new continents.

Classification of Romance languages...

The family of Romance languages forms an easily recognisable group among the world's languages, since its representatives emerged from a common, relatively well-known base: spoken Late Latin, which corresponds to the regional varieties of Latin spoken in Late Antiquity (that is, from the 4th – 6th centuries). Over the course of their history, spanning one and a half millennia, the Romance languages have evolved through gradual differentiation and divergence.

Nevertheless, geographical proximity and a mutual link to written Latin as a cultural and religious language have led to numerous interactions and parallel developments among Romance varieties. Their partially shared history accounts for the high degree of cohesion that can be observed among members of the Romance language family.¹⁵

Romance studies differentiate between the terms *Romania continua*, *Romania submersa* and *Romania nova*.

The classification of Romance languages is a very complicated question. First of all, Romance scholars, as we mentioned earlier, do not agree in their answer to the question of when the epoch of the Latin language finishes and when Romance languages “originate”. Some see this break already in the time of Roman occupation, while others think that the identity of a Romance language can be established only in the eighth century, and that earlier than this there

¹⁴ Skutsch, *Die lateinische Sprache* in the collection “*Die Kultur der Gegenwart*”, 1942; Vidos, *Manuale*, p. 190: “...il latino parlato rimase una corrente sotterranea, sepolta dal latino della cultura, perche quest’ultimo, come e stato detto giustamente, ha tenuto nascosto il corso naturale della lingua come uno stratto di ghiaccio.”

¹⁵ Glessgen, Martin, *A new companion to the Romance languages*, eBook Published: September 3, 2024, ISBN: 9783111329338, Hardcover Published: September 3, 2024 ISBN: 9783111329246 Funded by: Schweizerischer Nationalfonds (SNF), p. 3.

is no reliable evidence for the separation of a proto-Romance phase that was only to a certain extent unified, although with common characteristics.

The year of the Church's third Council of Tours cannot be a turning point, it is only undeniable evidence that there existed a gap between literary Latin and spoken Latin, and one that already stretched several generations back, otherwise there would not be a need for the Church to officially order preaching to be done in the language of the people.

The three functions of language first appear in the communication model established by the German psychologist Karl Bühler (1879–1963) in 1934 (Sprachtheorie). His 'semiotic' model known as the 'Organon model', specifies three distinct elements within the act of communication:

1. the sender
2. the receiver (referred to as Empfänger in the original German model)
- the referential information (Gegenstände und Sachverhalte).¹⁶_{SEP}

Classification of Romance languages is complicated because language is not just a linguistic category, but it is also sociological one, and thereby purely linguistic criteria are not enough.

Most often, as we have already earlier mentioned, phonetic and phonological criteria are borne in mind; that is how it was with that well-known division into the eastern and western parts of the Roman Empire: the survival of the unvoiced Latin occlusive in the intervocalic position or sonorisation; the survival of the final –s for the formation of plurals and in the second person of verbs, or its dropping. Such a classification can be very significant, although it can characterise only one epoch in the history of the language; Italian, for example, falls according to this division into eastern Romance languages.

Still, this classification is no longer exemplified by the present tense, because it is certain that the Romanian language in many cases retained the old form, while Italian language underwent innovation; let us take the comparative particle *plus/magis* as an example.

We are attempting to cover the entire Romance language world in these units:

- Balkan Romance (Romanian, Dalmatian); Italo-Romance (Italian); Sardinian; The Balkan peninsula is the land mass bounded by the Black

¹⁶ Glessgen, Martin, *A new companion to the Romance languages*, eBook Published: September 3, 2024, ISBN: 9783111329338, Hardcover Published: September 3, 2024 ISBN: 9783111329246 Funded by: Schweizerischer Nationalfonds (SNF), p. 6.

Sea to the east, by the Sea of Marmara, the Aegean, Mediterranean, Ionian Seas to the south, by the Adriatic Sea to the west and by the rivers Danube and Sava to the north (but see fn. 1). Here, four distinct subgroups and several varieties of the Indo-European language family coexist: Albanian, Greek, the South Slavic languages Bulgarian, Macedonian, and some dialects of the Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian complex, the Eastern Romance languages Romanian, Istro-Romanian (spoken in Istria), Megleno-Romanian (spoken in a small area in northern Greece and the Republic of North Macedonia) and Aromanian (spoken in northern and central Greece, southern Albania, the Republic of North Macedonia and south-western Bulgaria).¹⁷

- Alpine Romance (Rhaeto-Romance, Ladin, Friulan);
- Gallo-Romance (French, Franco-Provençal, Occitan);
- Ibero-Romance (Catalonian, Spanish, Portuguese).

Other criteria are the statehood of the language or its literary significance. Statehood is by no means a condition of the status of a language: Occitan (=Provençal) was never a state language, although in the Middle Ages it was a language of local administration, and still no-one ever questioned its status as a separate Romance language, and it was even a source of European lyricism. Dante saw Provençal as a separate Romance language (“*lingua d’oco*”), while Friedrich Diez gave a scientific basis for that opinion in his work *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* (1836–42); he divides Romance languages into eastern (Romanian, Italian) and western (Old French and Old Provençal; Modern French; Spanish and Portuguese). If one takes the geographical spread of a language as a criterion, we note that this criterion can be very one-sided because linguistic phenomena often know nothing of abrupt borders, especially when we are talking about related languages.

Every classification is somehow violent, because it comes out of the literary language. The language reality of everyday spoken language can be completely different.

The history of language is narrowly connected to the history of the people who make use of that language.

What is of interest for the study of language is, primarily, the linguistic state. If a particular language disappeared but left some traces in the language of the conqueror, we call those traces the substratum. The superstratum refers to those language elements which have remained from a language which, for a shorter or longer time, was able to prevail over the local language and choke

¹⁷ Gardani, Francesco; Loporcaro, Michele; Giudici, Alberto (2021). *In and Around the Balkans: Romance Languages and the Making of Layered Languages*. *Journal of Language Contact*, 14 (1): 1-23, p.3.

it. Actually, the history of the Latin language clearly represents these two processes. Latin squeezed Celtic languages out of use in former Gaul.

Today's Celtic speech variants in the French region of Brittany are not direct descendants of Gallic languages from the time of the Roman expansion when Julius Caesar conquered it and onwards, but are the result of re-Celticisation in the fifth or sixth century, when some Celtic tribes, today's Bretons, had to withdraw from the British Isles before the Angles and Saxons, but a series of elements were received, primarily lexical ones, and many Celtic words became general Latin ones, for example: *carrus* – a four-wheeled cart, *betulla* – birch, *camisia* – shirt, etc.

Along with the substratum and superstratum, the term adstratum has also been coined—it attempts to show that this refers to the language influences of one language on another language.

The western Slovenian dialects, then Istria, Littoral and Dalmatia, for example, took on many Italianisms, the central and northern Slovenian dialects took on many Germanisms, while Serbian took on many Turkisms.

The world today is characterised by borrowing from the English language, especially American English.

As far as lexical lending is concerned, this is very recognisable, especially if we are familiar with a language which left some of its elements as a trace in the language which inherited it in a particular territory.

It is much more difficult with phonetic and morpho-syntactical phenomena, especially when we are talking about a language which has disappeared and, along with that, is insufficiently well-known. We can mention phenomena from Italian dialectal phonetics which are, in the opinion of some linguists, traces of the Etruscan language; specifically, the aspirated pronunciation of voiceless plosive consonants (occlusives) in the intervocalic position is a phenomenon called “*gorgia Toscana*”, which we encounter in Tuscany, therefore approximately on the territory of former Etruria. An example can be the pronunciation of the voiceless velar /k/ between two vowels: It. *la casa*, Tusc. /lahasa/, cf. It. *in casa* /inkasa/.

In the study of language we have various theories about strata. Structuralists consider that explanations with the system of a language take precedence and that general explanations also take precedence. A stratum is always something specific; a generally well-known phenomena is the simplification of a system in a language if that language is adopted by another nation. The majority of linguists are considering an explanation with the help of substrata, that is, with the help of the influence of a language which, at least in that area, disappeared, that it has its significance and justification if it is possible to more easily and better explain some phenomenon within that language.

One should pay great attention to distinguishing the action of strata from actual lending, which is the introduction of a new element into a system which, still, remains constant.

The spreading of the Latin language and the gradual transition of that language into Romance languages provides abundant material for proving and rejecting the theory of the action of substrata. However, not all Romanticists share this opinion. One of the opponents of the “substratistic” interpretation was the famous German Romance scholar Gerhard Rohlfs (1892–1986);¹⁸ in his opinion, the aspirating of voiceless occlusives in Tuscany cannot be the remains of Etruscan phonology.

The opinion about the late appearance of substrata was actually rejected by the Spanish philologist Ramon Menendez Pidal (1869–1968).¹⁹ Two language phenomena can survive for a relatively long time, even next to each other for a long time in the same language group, on the same territory. Don Ramon believes that those who claim that in language development there are certain hidden forces which remain passive for a relatively long time and then suddenly appear and cause linguistic change are not in the right.

In language, or at least not in *langue* in Saussure’s sense, there is probably not a single phenomenon which would appear immediately, suddenly. We are not talking about passivity, we are talking about living phenomena, words, forms, uses, which no one notices because texts do not reveal them. Something we also need to emphasise is that our knowledge of the language reality of previous epochs is very limited precisely because we know only written works and through them we conclude about the state of the language in the spoken language of that time.

Study of language avoids untested hypotheses which attempt to explain a phenomenon in the language sphere which is not sufficiently known.

The Balkan Peninsula is a problem in itself, where, as we earlier noted, several languages of different generations live in some type of symbiosis.

A long time has already passed since significant linguists, among them Kopitar and Miklošič, did a lot of thinking about the fact that there are many common phenomena and that this refers not only to borrowing of language elements. Miklošič’s work about Slavic and Romance elements in the Albanian language discusses this.²⁰

The second part of “*Die romanische Elemente im Albanischen*” relates to Romance influences. Miklošič gives the example of 930 words of Latin,

¹⁸ See: Rohlfs, *Grammatica storica*, I, 196.

¹⁹ Ramon Menendez Pidal, “Modo de obrar el substrato linguistico”, *Revista de filologia española* 34, Madrid, 1950.

²⁰ F. Miklošič, *Albanische Forschungen*, I–II, Vienna, 1871.

that is, of Romance origin; there is also an overview of the study of sounds added. Throughout the work, Miklošič compares reflections in the Romanian language.²¹

The Danish linguist, Kristian Sandfeld, called his work *Linguistique balkanique* a fundamental work for determining the relatedness between Balkan languages.

For Sandfeld the origin of almost all common phenomena is the Greek language—the disappearance of infinitives, the forming of the future, the use of the dative of the personal pronoun for a possessive adjective, for example: Ser. *Otac mi je kod kuće* (my father is home), Rom. *din parte-mi* (from my side)—and not some imaginary pre-Greek, pre-Romance, pre-Illyrian language which would represent a Balkan substratum.

Attributing a particular language phenomenon to the influence of a substratum is not an explanation. It is very often only a statement that the explanation for an innovation should be sought outside the language in which it took place.

It is not necessary to especially prove that there are language interferences as soon as languages come into contact.

Through considering language, we come to the conclusion that there are no pure languages, that is, languages that do not have in them a single foreign element. The truth is, still, that there were languages which disappeared or at least whose territory was greatly reduced...

Conclusion

Today, globalisation presents several challenges for critical thinking. First of all there is the need for the processing of a large quantity of different information and sources, then the acknowledgement and overcoming of prejudices which can influence perspectives.

We are agreed that modern events cannot be considered without knowing the past and historical processes.

Apart from that, it can be difficult to cope with the insecurity and ambiguity of linguistic situations and problems while solutions are still being adjusted and innovated.

Critical thinking is the ability to analyse, evaluate and synthesise information from various sources and perspectives, then use this to solve problems, make decisions and communicate effectively.

²¹ See: K. Sandfeld, *Linguistique balkanique*, p. 163.

It is also important to maintain critical awareness about one's own position and the ethical and social implications of one's own choices.

Globalisation is a process of increasing interpersonal connectedness and interdependence between people, cultures and economies around the world, and that the strength and the greatest wealth of the present day and the modern world lie in that commonality and unity of cognition and knowledge.

Works cited

- Rudolf Filipovic, *Suvremena lingvistika*, no. 1, Zagreb 1962, p. 11.
- Leo Weisgerber, *Vom Weltbild der deutschen Sprache*, Düsseldorf, 1953.
- Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), *Über die Kawi-Sprache auf der Insel Java*, Berlin, 1836–1839 (published posthumously).
- Humboldt, *Über das vergleichende Studium*.
- Humboldt, *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaus*, 1949.
- Vranički, *Dijalektički i historijski materijalizam*, Zagreb, 1958, p. 65.
- Leo Weisgerber, *Kräfte II*, p. 22.
- Hugo Schuchardt, *Slawo-Deutsches und Slawo-Italianisches*, Graz, 1884, p. 3–5.
- See: Corder, 1973, ch. 6.
- Rudolf Filipović, *Jezici u kontaktu i jezično posudjivanje*, *Suvremena lingvistika*, no. 4, Zagreb, 1967, p. 28–29.
- Leo Weisgerber, *Kräfte I*, p. 108.
- H. F. Muller, *L'époque mérovingienne. L'essai de synthèse de philologie*, New York, 1945; L. Furman Sas, *The Noun Declension System in Merovingian Latin*, Paris, 1937.
- See: Straka, "La dislocation linguistique de la Romania et la formation des langues romanes à la lumière de la chronologie relative des changements phonétiques", *Revue de linguistique romane*, p. 20 (1956).
- Skutsch, *Die lateinische Sprache in the collection "Die Kultur der Gegenwart"*, 1942; Vidos, *Manuale*, p. 190: "...il latino parlato rimase una corrente sotteranea, sepolta dal latino della cultura, perche quest'ultimo, come e stato detto giustamente, ha tenuto nascosto il corso naturale della lingua come uno stratto di ghiaccio."
- Glessgen, Martin, *A new companion to the Romance languages*, eBook Published: September 3, 2024, ISBN: 9783111329338, Hardcover Published: September 3, 2024 ISBN: 9783111329246 Funded by: Schweizerischer Nationalfonds (SNF), p. 3.
- Glessgen, Martin, *A new companion to the Romance languages*, eBook Published: September 3, 2024, ISBN: 9783111329338, Hardcover Published:

September 3, 2024 ISBN: 9783111329246 Funded by: Schweizerischer Nationalfonds (SNF), p. 6.

- Gardani, Francesco; Loporcaro, Michele; Giudici, Alberto (2021). *In and Around the Balkans: Romance Languages and the Making of Layered Languages*. Journal of Language Contact, 14 (1):1-23, p.3.
- See: Rohlf, Grammatica storica, I, 196.
- Ramon Menendez Pidal, "Modo de obrar el substrato linguistico", Revista de filologia española 34, Madrid, 1950.
- F. Miklošič, Albanische Forschungen, I–II, Vienna, 1871.
- See: K. Sandfeld, Linguistique balkanique, p. 163.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atanasov, P. (1984). *Meglenoromâna*". *Tratat de dialectologie românească*. Craiova. OCLC 17234929.
- Atanasov, P. (1988). *Aromanski studii. Prilozi kon balkanistikata*. With B. Nastev. Skopje: Ogledalo. OCLC 27434443.
- Atanasov, P. (1990). *Le mégléno-roumain de nos jours. Une approche linguistique*. *Balkan-Archiv*, Neue Folge – Beiheft, Band 7. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag. OCLC 27338043.
- Atanasov, P. (2002) "Meglenoromâna astăzi". Editura Academiei Române. OCLC 608489657.
- Atanasov, P. (2008-2013). "Atlasul lingvistic al dialectului meglenoromân (ALDM)". Editura Academiei Române. 1–2. OCLC 876598100.
- Bammesberger, A. & T. Vennemann. (2001), (eds.). *Languages in Pre-historic Europe*, Winter, Heidelberg.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*, New York, 444 and on.
- Bonnard, H. (1950). *Grammaire française des lycées et collèges*, t. 2, 1584-1585, Sudel de Liège, fasc. CXLI).
- Crystall, D. (1997). *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Crystall, D. (1969). *Prosodic Systems and Intonation in English*, Cambridge University Press.
- Deroy, L. (1956). *L'emprunt linguistique*, Paris, 47-56.
- Deroy, L. (1956). *L'emprunt linguistique*, Paris, Les belles lettres, 261-269; un vol. 16 x 25, XII-470 pp. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et
- Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fasc. CXLI).
- Dubois, J. (1962). *Étude sur la dérivation suffixale en français moderne et contemporain*, Paris, 3-4.

- Filipović, R. (1986). Teorija jezika u kontaktu, Uvod u lingvistiku jezičnih dodira, Zagreb.
- Filipović, R. (1967). Principi lingvističkog posudjivanja III. Semantički aspekt,
- Filološki pregled, 1- 4, p. 13-94; Teorija jezika u kontaktu, Zagreb, 1968, 161-168.
- Gardani, Francesco; Loporcaro, Michele; Giudici, Alberto (2021). *In and Around the Balkans: Romance Languages and the Making of Layered Languages*. Journal of Language Contact, 14 (1)
- Glessgen, M. (2024). *A new companion to the Romance languages*, eBook Published: September 3, ISBN: 9783111329338, Hardcover Published: September 3, 2024 ISBN: 9783111329246 Funded by: Schweizerischer Nationalfonds (SNF)
- Haugen, E. (1950). “Model” and “replica” are terms introduced by E. Haugen in The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing, Language, p. 210.
- Caraman, P. (1993). “Obrzęd koleđ o wa nia u Słowian i u Ru- munów: studjum porównawcze, W Krakowie. Nakł. Polskiej Akademji Umiejęt noś ci. [http://www.world- cat.org/title/ obrzed-koledowania-u- sowian-i-u-rumunow-studjum-po- rownawcze/](http://www.world-cat.org/title/ obrzed-koledowania-u- sowian-i-u-rumunow-studjum-po- rownawcze/) oclc/716923477&referer= brief_results
- Hope, T. E. (1971). Lexical borrowing in the Romance Languages, Volume I and II. Language and Style Series, X. Basil Blackwell, Oxford. xiv , 782 pp, 662-667.
- Humboldt von W. (1820). Über das vergleichende Studium. In: Bd.IV.
- Hyrkkänen, J. (1973). *Der lexikalische Einfluss des Italienischen auf das Kroatische des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Helsinki.
- Jernej, J. (1998). Sugli italianismi penetrati nel serbo-croato negli ultimi cento anni. Studia romanica 1/1, Zagreb, 54-82. R. Literarum studia. MH.
- Klajn, I. (1978). Razgovori o jeziku, Beograd, 44-49.
- Kovačec, A. (1967). *Bilingvizam i aloglotski utjecaji na morfosintaktičku strukturu jezika. Suvremena lingvistika 4*, Zagreb, 101-114.
- Kurelac, F. (1872). Vlaške reči u jeziku našem, Rad JAZU, XX, 93-137.
- Lyons, J. (1970). Linguistique générale, Paris, 150.
- Muljačić, Ž. (2000). *Das Dalmatische. Studien zu einer untergegangenen Sprache. Böhlau Verlag, Köln–Weimar–Wien*.
- Novak, G. (1962). Jadransko more u sukobima i borbama kroz stoljeća, Vojno delo, Beograd, 15-36.
- Popović, M. (2005). Reči francuskog porekla u srpskom jeziku, Beograd.
- Rey-Debove, J. (1973). La sémiotique de l’emprunt lexical, Travaux de linguistique.

- Salverda de Grave, J. J. (1906). *De Franse Woorden in het Nederlands*, Amsterdam.
- Skok, P. (1940). *Osnovi romanske lingvistike*, Zagreb, 1940, Vol. I, 6-130.
- Skok, P. (1934). *Dolazak Slovena na Mediteran*, Split, Jadr. straz, 18-25.
- Skok, P. (1951). *Prilog metodi proučavanja romanizama u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku*, Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta I, Zagreb, 445-485.
- Tagliavini, C. (1942). *Sugli elementi italiani del Croato*, in *Italia e Croazia*, Roma, 377-455.
- Unbegaun, B. (1932). *Le calque dans les langues slaves litteraires*, *Révue des etudes slaves*, XII, fasc. 1-2, 19.
- Weinreich, U. (2001). *Languages in Contact* (various editions), Zbornik Zagrebačke slavističke škole. Zagreb, 105-190.

Aleksandra BANJEVIĆ

**RELEVANTNOST KULTURNIH VEZA IZMEDJU
JEZIKA I OČUVANJE JEZIČKO-KULTURNE BAŠTINE
(S POSEBNIM OSVRTOM NA ROMANIZME)**

Uloga koju igra kontakt kultura u izučavanju jezičkih porodica, a samim time i jezičkih promjena predstavlja veoma važan činilac u pristupu jezičkim analizama danas.

Predmet rada je da pokaže veoma važnu relevantnost kulturnih veza izmedju jezika.

Savremeni trend učenja stranih jezika koji odslikava potrebu univerzalnih kontaktiranja medju ljudima i narodima čini još značajnijim proučavanje romanskih posudjenica upravo zbog očuvanja jezičko-kulturne baštine pokoljenjima koja dolaze.

Ključne riječi: *kulturne veze, jezik, teorija jezika, kulturna baština, očuvanje jezičke baštine, romanski jezici*