PROJECT MUSE®

Convergence and Attrition: Serbian in Contact with English in Australia

Jovana Dimitrijević-Savić

Journal of Slavic Linguistics, Volume 16, Number 1, Winter - Spring 2008, pp. 57-90 (Article)

Published by Slavica Publishers

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/jsl.0.0010>

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/257805>

Convergence and Attrition: Serbian in Contact with English in Australia*

Jovana Dimitrijević-Savić

Abstract. The aim of this paper is to examine features resulting from language contact under conditions of language shift in a variety of Serbian spoken in a migrant community in Melbourne, Australia. Three categories of change are proposed: (i) change that makes Serbian more similar to English without simplifying it, exemplified by the resetting of the *pro*-drop parameter; (ii) change that simplifies the structures of Serbian without making them more similar to English, exemplified by leveling within the verbal inflectional paradigm and dropping of the 3sg auxiliary clitic *je*; and (iii) change that both simplifies the structures of Serbian and makes them more like English, exemplified by leveling within the nominal inflectional paradigm, use of full pronominal forms following the verb rather than clitic pronominal forms in second position, and placement of verbal auxiliary clitics and the reflexive clitic *se*.

1. Introduction

The migration of people is a leading cause of externally motivated language change. Except where a homogenous group moves to an isolated location, migration results in language (or dialect) contact (see Thomason 2001, Kerswill 2006) and, except in a few documented cases, for example, Pennsylvania German in the United States (Dorian 1978), language shift to the language of the host speech community (the host language) is complete in the space of three generations (see Romaine 1989, Grosjean 1982). The aim of this paper is to provide a description of language change under conditions of ongoing language shift in a Serbian migrant community in Australia (Dimitrijević 2005). Language contact is bringing about changes in the lexicon and structure of the

* This paper is a slightly revised version of a chapter in my Ph.D. thesis. I would like to thank Michael Clyne, who supervised my Ph.D. at the University of Melbourne, for providing helpful and encouraging feedback. The paper has benefited greatly from the insightful comments of two anonymous reviewers. All remaining errors are of course my own.

community language, a variety I refer to as Australian Serbian (AS), making it different from the variety I refer to as Homeland Serbian (HS).¹

Language change in a language contact situation characterized by ongoing language shift takes various forms. As the host language develops and the language of the migrant community diminishes, losing domains and speakers, the community language ultimately begins to lose structure. The loss of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and discourse structure is part of the gradual process of attrition. The ongoing simplification within the verbal paradigm in AS, where the more frequent ending *-u* replaces *-e* in the formation of the 3pl form of verbs in the present tense, is an example of attrition.

Attrition, however, is not the only kind of contact-induced language change encountered in language shift situations. As a result of contact-induced change, similarity between structures in the community language and corresponding structures in the host language may increase at the expense of maintaining difference, that is, language contact may result in convergence. The utterance in (1a) is an example of syntactic convergence in AS.²

(1) a. AS

a svako počne da smeje mi
and everyone_{NOM} begin_{PRES.3.SG} that laugh_{PRES.3.SG} I_{DAT}

b. HS

a svi počnu da mi se smeju
and everyone_{NOM.PL} begin_{PRES.3.PL} that I_{DAT} REFL laugh_{PRES.3.SG}
'and everyone begins to laugh at me'

¹ Standard Serbian is the model to which reference will be made.

² In this and all subsequent examples, transcription conventions are as follows:

NOM – nominative, GEN – genitive, DAT – dative, ACC – accusative, VOC – vocative, INSTR – instrumental, LOC – locative, 1 – first person, 2 – second person, 3 – third person, SG – singular, PL – plural, PRES – present tense, M – masculine, F – feminine, N – neuter, P – perfective, I – imperfective, AP – active participle, PP – past participle, AUX – auxiliary, NEG – negative, REFL – reflexive pronoun

Syntactic convergence will here refer to similarity between syntactic structures in one language (Serbian) in contact with another (English) increasing at the expense of difference (Clyne 2003). Convergence has variously been defined as the increasing agreement of languages in regards to features of their overall structure (Hock 1986: 492–512), or as increasing similarity between two or more languages in a particular area of grammar (Silva-Corvalán 1994: 4–5). McMahon (1994) has argued for three dimensions of difference between convergence and borrowing: (i) convergence requires long-term bilingualism; borrowing can occur with only limited bilingualism; (ii) convergence tends to affect syntax and morphology; borrowing tends to be limited to the lexicon; (iii) convergence is a mutual process, i.e., it affects both languages; borrowing is unilateral. In contrast to McMahon, I find that the changes considered to be the product of convergence in this paper are unilateral in that Serbian, but not English, is affected.

Contact-induced change under conditions of language shift also takes the form of transference (Clyne 1967, 2003) or direct importation of material and/or structures from the host language into the community language. Lexical transference from English is widespread in AS. Frequent transferred verbs include *komplejnovati* ‘to complain’ (HS *žaliti se*), *rentati* ‘to rent’ (HS *iznajmljivati*), *čekovati* ‘to check’ (HS *proveravati*), *šopingovati* ‘to shop’ (HS *kupovati*). Also numerous in AS are transferred nouns, e.g., *flet* ‘flat’ (HS *stan*), *rabiš* ‘rubbish’ (HS *đubre*), *barbakju* ‘barbecue’ (HS *roštilj*), *trak* ‘truck’ (HS *kamion*), *šop* ‘shop’ (HS *prodavnica*), *holidej* ‘holiday’ (HS *odmor, praznik*). In addition to lexical transference, other transference phenomena are also observable in AS. Example (2a) features an instance of syntactic transference produced by an AS speaker.

(2) a. AS

kad ja kažem svako smeje se
 when I_{NOM} say_{PRES.1.SG} everyone_{NOM} laugh_{PRES.3.SG} REFL
na mene
 on I_{ACC}

b. HS

kad ja kažem svi mi se smeju
 when I_{NOM} say_{PRES.1.SG} everyone_{NOM.PL} I_{DAT} REFL laugh_{PRES.3.SG}
 ‘when I say (it) everyone laughs at me’

The utterances in (1a) and (2a) feature two ways in which an AS speaker expressed 'laugh at me': the two realizations differ both from each other and from the realization in HS, *mi se smeju*. In HS when the indirect object is a pronoun its unmarked realization is a pronominal clitic in the dative, rather than the full pronominal form; the indirect object then precedes the verb. This contrasts with the preferred English SVO word order. In example (1a) the clitic *mi* appears in the position following the verb. The pronominal form in (2a) is not a clitic, unlike in HS (example 2b), but the object of the preposition *na* 'on'. In fact, there is a morpheme-for-morpheme correspondence in (2a) with the English 'laugh at me'. Therefore (1a) is an example of syntactic convergence, whereas (2a) is an instance of transference. Transference will not be discussed further in this paper, but a full account of transference from English in AS can be found in Dimitrijević 2004, 2005.

Finally, in language contact situations characterized by on-going language shift, some changes in the community language have multiple causes, with both attrition and interference from the host language contributing to bring about the change. A case in point is the generalization of case affixes in AS; for example, in AS the accusative is the default case form in syntactic environments requiring the dative case.

2. Methodology

The present analysis is based on 15.5 hours of tape-recorded sociolinguistic interviews conducted with first and second generation Serbian-English bilinguals in Melbourne, Australia. The informants had consented to participate in a broader study of the macro-social and micro-interactional bilingual language practices in a Serbian migrant community (for details, see Dimitrijević 2005). The interviews consisted of two parts. A language-use questionnaire and a social-network questionnaire were first completed orally. During the second part of the interview, informants were encouraged to share their experiences of and attitudes toward Australian and Serbian society and culture and to talk about their experiences in relation to language maintenance. It was expected that, owing to the nature of the topics and the fact that the informants and interviewer had interacted on numerous previous occasions in the course of participant observation carried out in a Melbourne Serbian Orthodox church-school community (*crkveno-školska*

zajednica), the informants' style during the interviews would approximate their everyday interactional style.

At issue here was language mode, "the state of activation of the bilingual's languages and language processing mechanisms at a given point in time" (Grosjean 2001: 3). Language mode is regularly present in bilingualism research as an independent, a control, or a confounding variable (2001: 2) and should be controlled for when it is not the object of study. It is always safest to put bilinguals in either a monolingual or bilingual, as opposed to an intermediate mode. Grosjean (2001: 15–16) gives several suggestions for how this may be accomplished. In the case of research which aims to explore bilingual language practices, factors sufficient to put an informant in bilingual mode are, for example, showing interest in the informant's bilingualism, having a bilingual interviewer who belongs to the same bilingual community as the informant and with whom the informant is familiar, and setting up an interview situation conducive to a bilingual mode (no monolinguals present, a relaxed, non-normative atmosphere, etc.). This was the strategy adopted in the present study.

The analysis focused on identifying and accounting for the source of features by which the variety of Serbian spoken by the informants differed from HS. Because they occurred in a language shift situation, it was concluded that the observed changes resulted from language contact. It is not likely that internally motivated change might account for these features, because AS is a variety that has been in existence for less than a hundred years, a period too short for extensive internally-motivated change to take place. The procedure was to first establish whether a change was an interference feature or perhaps an indirect effect of language contact, specifically, a simplification or reduction that did not make the structure more similar to English, that is, attrition. If the direct influence of English was demonstrable in bringing about the change, the next step was to determine whether the change was the effect of convergence or of direct importation, that is, transference (Clyne 1967, 2003). Finally, a given feature was categorized as a change due to multiple causation if it was attributable to a confluence of attrition and convergence.

3. Simplification within the Verbal Paradigm

Serbian grammarians distinguish seven conjugation classes of verbs, differentiated by present stems and infinitive (aorist) stems. In the 3pl form of the verb in the present tense, classes I to V (*tresti* 'to shake': *tresem, treseš, trese, tresemo, tresete, tresu*; *orati* 'to plough': *orem, oreš, ore, oremo, orete, oru*; *brinuti* 'to worry': *brinem, brineš, brine, brinemo, brinete, brinu*; *čuti* 'to hear': *čujem, čuješ, čuje, čujemo, čujete, čuju*; *kovati* 'to forge': *kujem, kuješ, kuje, kujemo, kujete, kuju*; *pevati* 'to sing' *pevam, pevaš, peva, pevamo, pevate, pevaju*) differ from classes VI and VII (*nositi* 'to carry' *nosim, nosiš, nosi, nosimo, nosite, nose*; *držati* 'to hold' *držim, držiš, drži, držimo, držite, drže*) in that the former end in the vowel *-u*, whereas the latter end in *-e*. Compared to class VI and especially to class VII, the verbs in classes I to V are by far the more numerous.

In AS a levelling occurs whereby the more frequent ending *-u* replaces *-e* as the ending added to the present stem in the formation of the 3pl of verbs in the present tense, as in examples (3a), (4a), and (5a). This process of simplification within the verbal inflectional paradigm exemplifies attrition in AS resulting from direct contact with English.

(3) a. AS

nisam ja primetila da oni oću da uću
 NEG.be._{PRES.1.SG} I_{NOM} notice_{AP.F.SG} that they want that learn
 engleski
 English_{ACC.M.SG}

b. HS

nisam ja primetila da oni hoće da
 NEG.be._{PRES.1.SG} I_{NOM} notice_{AP.F.SG} that they want_{PRES.3.PL} that
 uće engleski
 learn_{PRES.3.PL} English_{ACC.M.SG}
 'I didn't notice that they wanted to study English'

(4) a. AS

mislu samo da smo mi loši
 think only that be_{AUX.1.PL} we_{NOM} bad_{NOM.M.PL}

(4) b. HS

misle samo da smo mi loši
 think_{PRES.3.PL} only that be_{AUX.1.PL} we_{NOM} bad_{NOM.M.PL}
 'they only think that we are bad'

(5) a. AS

oni *govoru* engleski među sobom
 they_{NOM} speak English_{ACC.M.SG} among REFL_{INST}

b. HS

oni *govore* engleski među sobom
 they_{NOM} speak_{PRES.3.PL} English_{ACC.M.SG} among REFL_{INST}
 'they speak English among themselves'

In some instances, an AS speaker may even reject the produced 3pl ending in *-e* and opt for a repair ending *-u*, as in (6a) below.

(6) a. AS

oni to u školu *neće* *neću*
 they_{NOM} that_{ACC.N.SG} in school_{ACC.F.SG} NEG.be_{AUX.3.PL} NEG.be

b. HS

oni to u školi *neće*
 they_{NOM} that_{ACC.N.SG} in school_{LOC.F.SG} NEG.be_{AUX.3.PL}
 'they don't want that in school'

In the case of one Australian-born speaker, the leveling process differs from that found in the speech of the other AS speakers interviewed. This speaker treats the present stem final *-j* of verbs in classes IV and V as part of the 3rd person plural present tense ending and generalizes the present stem ending *-e* to include verbs in classes VI and VII (the present stem of these verbs ends in *-i* in HS). This results in forms such as *želeju*, *budeju* and *misleju* in (7a), *ideju* and *stigneju* in (8a) and (9a), respectively.

(7) a. AS

možda oni ne *želeju* da *budeju* previše blizi
 maybe they_{NOM} not want that be too close
 jer ako *misleju* da *govoreju* srpski
 because if think that speak Serbian_{ACC.M.SG}

b. HS

možda oni ne *žele* da *budu* previše
 maybe they_{NOM} not want_{PRES.3.PL} that be_{PRES.3.PL} too
 bliski jer ako *misle* da *govore*
 close_{NOM.M.PL} because if think_{PRES.3.PL} that speak_{PRES.3.PL}
 srpski
 Serbian_{ACC.M.SG}

‘maybe they don’t want to be too close because if they mean to speak Serbian’

(8) a. AS

neki put novine ne *stigneju*
 some_{NOM.M.SG} occasion_{NOM.M.SG} newspaper_{NOM.F.PL} not arrive

b. HS

neki put novine ne
 some_{NOM.M.SG} occasion_{NOM.M.SG} newspaper_{NOM.F.PL} not
stignu
 arrive_{PRES.3.PL}

‘sometimes the newspaper doesn’t arrive’

(9) a. AS

da vidim kako oni *ideju*
 that see_{PRES.1.SG} how they_{NOM} go

b. HS

da vidim kako im *ide*
 that see_{PRES.1.SG} how they_{DAT} go_{PRES.3.SG}

‘to see how it’s going for them’

In a highly informative discussion of 3pl present tense verb forms in Štokavian dialects, Peco (1995) demonstrates that in numerous regional varieties, the older 3pl present tense ending *-e* is being replaced by the ending *-u* in the conjugation of class VI and VII verbs. Of particular interest is Peco's argument that some of the varieties in which *-e* has been completely supplanted by *-u* are "speech varieties of those places in which representatives of our language and some foreign language have lived together, and for a long time, or in which the speakers of our language have had prolonged contacts with speakers of the foreign language" (24).³ The varieties which, according to Peco, illustrate this change in a contact situation are spoken in Hungary, Romania, and Albania. No mention is made of the change as it occurs in the speech of migrants and their descendents, nor am I aware of any study which takes up this question. Furthermore, Peco shows that this change has also been observed in varieties located in the central Štokavian area, i.e., varieties shielded from direct contact-induced change, where, he argues, it is "the result of internal analogical generalizations" (24).⁴ The 3pl present tense ending *-e* of the far less numerous verbs in classes VI and VII is, by analogy with the formation of the 3pl present tense forms of verbs in classes I–V, being replaced by *-u* in these varieties. This leveling process in AS, however, is a result of language contact under conditions of language shift. Yet the same change has also been observed in varieties of HS. The part of the Serbian grammar system which proves to be most susceptible to attrition is precisely that part which has also proved most susceptible to internally motivated change in the form of an analogical simplification process.

4. The Resetting of the *pro*-Drop Parameter

Serbian is a *pro*-drop language. A personal pronoun functioning as the subject of a clause may be elided. After being introduced as the topic for the first time as either a full noun phrase or as a pronoun, the subject appears only when it is rhematic or contrasted. The speech of the

³ "Говори оних мјеста у којима заједно живе, и дуго, представници нашега језика и неког страног језика, или су носиоци нашега језика имали дуже контакте са носиоцима страног језика."

⁴ "Та појава је резултат унутарњих аналошких уопштавања."

Serbian-English bilinguals interviewed, however, is characterized by a relatively high incidence of semantically and pragmatically non-required overt subject pronouns, as in examples (10a) and (11a). Savić (1995) also notes this tendency in the speech of second-generation Serbian-English bilinguals in the United States: “the *pro*-drop parameter is being reset in accordance with English syntactic rules” (488).

(10) a. AS

ispitujem ga kao da on je na
question_{PRES.1.SG} he_{ACC} like that he_{NOM} be_{PRES.3.SG} at
sudu
court_{LOC.M.SG}

b. HS

ispitujem ga kao da je na sudu
question_{PRES.1.SG} he_{ACC} like that be_{PRES.3.SG} at court_{LOC.M.SG}
‘I question him like he is in court’

(11) a. AS

ja kad sam bila mala ja sam
I_{NOM} when be_{AUX.1.SG} be_{AP.F.SG} little_{NOM.F.SG} I_{NOM} be_{AUX.1.SG}
govorila naš jezik
speak_{AP.F.SG} our_{ACC.M.SG} language_{ACC.M.SG}

b. HS

kad sam bila mala ja sam
when be_{AUX.1.SG} be_{AP.F.SG} little_{NOM.F.SG} I_{NOM} be_{AUX.1.SG}
govorila naš jezik
speak_{AP.F.SG} our_{ACC.M.SG} language_{ACC.M.SG}
‘when I was little, I spoke our language’

The resetting of the *pro*-drop parameter in AS results from contact-induced change that makes AS more similar to English but does not result in the simplification of AS.

5. The Repositioning and Deletion of Enclitics

The order in which Serbian enclitics appear in the sentence is strictly fixed. They are grouped in the second position in the clause in the following order: *li* > AUX (except *je*) > DAT > ACC > GEN > *se* > *je* (Browne 1974). The interrogative clitic *li*, when present, always occurs first in the ordering. It is followed by the verbal auxiliary clitics as follows: (i) the clitic forms of the auxiliary *jesam* 'to be', 1SG *sam*, 2SG *si*, 1PL *smo*, 2PL *ste*, 3PL *su*; (ii) future tense auxiliary clitics based on the present tense of the verb *hteti* 'to want', 1SG *ću*, 2SG *ćeš*, 3SG *će*, 1PL *ćemo*, 2PL *ćete*, 3PL *će*; (iii) conditional mood auxiliary clitics based on the aorist forms of the verb *biti* 'to be', 1SG *bih*, 2SG *bi*, 3SG *bi*, 1PL *bismo*, 2PL *biste*, 3PL *bi*. Note that in their full emphatic forms these auxiliaries do not exhibit the distributional restriction which applies to their clitic forms. Pronominal clitics follow the verbal auxiliary clitics: Serbian has distinct clitic forms of personal pronouns in the accusative, genitive, and dative. The genitive forms, however, are practically identical to the accusative.⁵ Hence the order is: (i) accusative/genitive: 1SG *me*, 2SG *te*, 3SG.masc-neut. *ga*, 3SG.fem *je*, 1PL *nas*, 2PL *vas*, 3PL *ih*; (ii) dative: 1SG *mi*, 2SG *ti*, 3SG.masc-neut. *mu*, 3SG.fem. *joj*, 1PL *nam*, 2PL *vam*, 3PL *im*. The next-to-last position is occupied by the clitic form of the reflexive pronoun *sebe* which is *se*. Note that *se* can be a true reflexive object pronoun or a particle associated with particular verbs. The final position is reserved for the third person singular clitic form of the auxiliary *jesam*, which is *je*. Franks and King (2000: 211) note that although in all other Slavic languages the auxiliary clitics precede pronominal clitics, in South Slavic languages including Serbian the third person singular auxiliaries appear last in the cluster, i.e., following the pronominal clitics.

The so-called second position, the position occupied by clitics, refers to the position after the first constituent or after the first word of the first constituent. Only exceptionally does the clitic move to a position closer to the verb. A notable feature of Serbian is that clitics have the ability to intervene between elements of the initial phrase. A traditional description of second position in Serbian states that clitics come

⁵ The single divergence is the 3SG.F accusative clitic alternant *ju*, employed in Standard Serbian exclusively instead of the expected form *je* when it immediately precedes the 3SG auxiliary *je*.

in second position, which is after either the first prosodic word or the first syntactic phrase. At additional they must come directly after the subordinating conjunction *da* 'that', as in examples (12a) and (12b).⁶

Although the placement of clitics in a significant number of utterances by AS speakers corresponded in full to the rules of HS grammar, there were also numerous instances in which the positioning of clitics was notably different from HS usage. Some clitics were present but do not occupy second position, and some are absent entirely.

In AS pronominal clitics in the dative and accusative are often positioned after the verb to reflect word order in English, where in their unmarked realization both the direct and indirect object appear following the verb. Placement of the clitic pronoun after the verb instead of in second position is thus an example of convergence. Examples (12a) and (13a) each feature a pronominal clitic in the accusative, the direct objects of *su vozili* and *uče*, respectively, following the verb. In example (1a), cited earlier, the dative clitic, *mi*, likewise appears after the verb instead of following the subordinator *da*, in second position.

(12) a. AS

oni se trude kao da uče ih malo
 they_{NOM} REFL try_{PRES.3.PL} like that teach_{PRES.3.PL} they_{ACC} little
 srpski malo grčki
 Serbian_{ACC.M.SG} little Greek_{ACC.M.SG}

b. HS

oni se trude kao da ih uče malo
 they_{NOM} REFL try_{PRES.3.PL} like that they_{ACC} teach_{PRES.3.PL} little
 srpski malo grčki
 Serbian_{ACC.M.SG} little Greek_{ACC.M.SG}

'they try to teach them a little Serbian, a little Greek'

(13) a. AS

brat i njegova žena su
 brother_{NOM.M.SG} and his_{NOM.F.SG} wife_{NOM.F.SG} be_{AUX.3.PL}
 vozili me od erodrom
 drive_{AP.M.PL} I_{ACC} from airport_{ACC.M.SG}

⁶ See Browne 1974, Bennett 1986, Percus 1993, Halpern 1992, Radanović-Kocić 1988, and Progovac 1996 for extensive descriptive presentations of possible clitic placements

b. HS

brat i njegova žena su me
 brother_{NOM.M.SG} and his_{NOM.F.SG} wife_{NOM.F.SG} be_{AUX.3.PL} I_{ACC}
 vozili od aerodroma
 drive_{AP.M.PL} from airport_{GEN.M.SG}

‘my brother and his wife were driving me from the airport’

Unlike pronominal clitics, full forms in HS can appear in other than second position, including after the verb. They are used less frequently than clitic forms. The marked quality of full forms is exploited in contrastive focus, e.g., *Tražim tebe, a ne njega* ‘I am looking for you, not him’, or when the pronoun is placed clause-initially for emphasis, e.g., *Tebe tražim* ‘It is you I am looking for’. However, the full form of a personal pronoun is obligatory following a preposition, where it does not convey contrast or emphasis.

My data include utterances, such as example (14a), in which the direct object is the full form of a personal pronoun positioned after the verb, not the pronominal clitic in second position which would be expected in HS usage.

(14) a. AS

sada ću da izbacim tebe iz kola
 now will_{PRES.1.SG} that throw_{PRES.1.SG} you_{ACC.SG} from
 car_{GEN.F.SG}

b. HS

sada ću da te izbacim iz kola
 now will_{PRES.1.SG} that you_{ACC.SG} throw_{PRES.1.SG} from
 car_{GEN.F.SG}

‘now I will throw you out of the car’

In her work on convergence in the speech of Serbian-English bilinguals in the United States, Savić (1995: 488) discusses an utterance very similar to (14a) in that the direct object, the full form of a personal pronoun, follows the verb:

- (15) Mi smo zvali tebe, tol'ko nam bilo
 we_{NOM} be_{AUX.1.PL} call_{AP.M.PL} you_{ACC.SG} so much we_{DAT} be_{AUX.N.SG}
 dosadno ovde...
 boring_{NOM.N.SG} here
 'We called you, we were so bored here...'

Savić (1995) proposes that the positioning of a direct object following the verb is best explained as an instance of "word order fixed in accordance with the English SVO rule." She goes on to argue that SVO order in this utterance is "not ungrammatical in Serbian," but is "a marked word order which, in this particular sentence, does not comply with the pragmatic rules of Serbian. This type of marked word order needs to be accompanied by a stress on the DO pronoun (in which case it would mark a focus, with a similar purpose as the English emphatic construction *It was YOU that we called*), which was not the case in this particular example" (488). Unfortunately, the only example of word order converging towards the English which Savić presents for discussion (she reports finding only three in her data) involves a personal pronoun object. This may make it more difficult to evaluate the explanation proposed. Nevertheless, I believe Savić's account warrants further commentary.

First, Savić fails to clarify that in Serbian, SVO is a marked word order when the direct or indirect object is a pronoun, but not when it is a noun. In the latter case, it is the SOV order which is marked. Compare *Mi smo zvali radio stanicu* 'We called the radio station' and *Mi smo radio stanicu zvali* 'It was the radio station we called'. Savić does not correctly interpret the pragmatic content of *Mi smo zvali tebe* as compared to *Mi smo tebe zvali*. Unless the focus is on both the subject and direct object simultaneously, *Mi smo zvali tebe* implies contrast, as the focus is on the subject rather than on the direct object. The corresponding English construction would be 'It was us that called you'. Conversely, the focus in *Mi smo tebe zvali* is on the direct object 'It was you that we called', which then uses the full rather than the clitic form of the pronoun. Whether or not *tebe* is stressed is relevant, but the implication of the presence/absence of stress is other than what is argued by Savić. If stressed, *tebe* in compliance with the pragmatic rules of HS would have to appear following the verbal auxiliary clitic.

Savić's claim that "word order [is] fixed in accordance with the English SVO rule" (1995: 488) is too broad to be useful for my material. Speakers of AS produce utterances, such as (8a), in which the direct object *to* 'that' appears before the verb. Even more to the point are utterances such as (39a) below, where the direct object, *puno kontakt* 'much contact', precedes the verb. Furthermore, the positioning of personal pronoun objects, in both full and clitic form, in a significant number of utterances by AS speakers corresponds in full to the rules of HS grammar. Consider the positioning of the clitic pronoun indirect object *mi* in examples (20a) and (21a). The only claim which can rightly be made on the basis of the available data is that personal pronouns—full, as in the example from Savić in (15) and in (14a), as well as clitic, as in examples (1a), (12a), and (13a)—may, when in the role of indirect or direct object, be positioned in the speech of Serbian migrants and their descendants so as to converge towards English SVO word order.

The positioning of another pronominal form converges towards the English in AS. In HS usage, the reflexive pronoun/particle *se*, as has already been discussed, occupies the second position in the clause. In AS, *se* is frequently positioned following the verb, as in (16a) and (17a). One explanation might be that this is mirroring the position of the reflexive pronoun in English and therefore constitutes an instance of convergence.⁷

(16) a. AS

kad sam vratila se u Englesku
when be_{PRES,1.SG} return_{AP,F.SG} REFL in England_{ACC,F.SG}

b. HS

kad sam se vratila u Englesku
when be_{PRES,1.SG} REFL return_{AP,F.SG} in England_{ACC,F.SG}
'when I returned to England'

⁷ Another explanation might be that the speaker is treating the reflexive verb as a single lexical item whose parts always come in the same order. I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for proposing this interesting alternative explanation.

(17) a. AS

ja mislim da je granica
 I_{NOM} think_{PRES.1.SG} that be_{AUX.3.SG} boundary_{NOM.F.SG}
 počela da gubi se
 begin_{AP.F.SG} that lose_{PRES.3.SG} REFL

b. HS

ja mislim da je granica
 I_{NOM} think_{PRES.1.SG} that be_{AUX.3.SG} boundary_{NOM.F.SG}
 počela da se gubi
 begin_{AP.F.SG} that REFL lose_{PRES.3.SG}
 ‘I think the boundary started to disappear’

Much more rarely, the enclitic *se* is absent entirely, as in example (1a) above or example (18a) below. Loss of reflexivity in *sećati se* (18a) and *smejati se* (1a) is attributable to convergence, as neither *laugh* nor *remember* is reflexive in English.

(18) a. AS

to sve sećam gde je
 that_{NOM.N.SG} all_{NOM.N.SG} remember_{PRES.1.SG} where be_{AUX.3.SG}
 sve
 all_{NOM.N.SG}

b. HS

to se sve sećam gde
 that_{NOM.N.SG} REFL all_{NOM.N.SG} remember_{PRES.1.SG} where
 je sve
 be_{AUX.3.SG} all_{NOM.N.SG}
 ‘I remember everything, where everything is’

Like pronominal clitics, verbal clitics may also be positioned differently in AS than in HS. As in example (19a), the clitic forms of the auxiliary *jesam*, which together with the active participle form the perfect tense, often do not appear in second position, but follow the subject and precede the participle instead, as auxiliaries do in English.

(19) a. AS

pošto moji roditelji su došli u
 since my_{NOM.M.PL} parent_{NOM.M.PL} be_{AUX.3.PL} come_{AP.M.PL} in
 jednom periodu kad bilo je
 one_{LOC.M.SG} period_{LOC.M.SG} when be_{AP.N.SG} be_{AUX.3.SG}
 mali broj takozvanih
 small_{NOM.M.SG} number_{NOM.M.SG} so-called_{GEN.M.PL}
 jugoslovenskih migranata
 Yugoslav_{GEN.M.PL} migrant_{GEN.M.PL}

b. HS

pošto su moji roditelji došli u
 since be_{AUX.3.PL} my_{NOM.M.PL} parent_{NOM.M.PL} come_{AP.M.PL} in
 jednom periodu kad je bio
 one_{LOC.M.SG} period_{NOM.M.SG} when be_{AUX.3.SG} be_{AP.M.SG}
 mali broj takozvanih
 small_{NOM.M.SG} number_{NOM.M.SG} so-called_{GEN.M.PL}
 jugoslovenskih migranata
 Yugoslav_{GEN.M.PL} migrant_{GEN.M.PL}
 ‘since my parents came in a period when there was a small
 number of so-called Yugoslav migrants’

Similarly, the enclitic forms of the auxiliary *jesam* frequently do not move to second position in the clause once the subject has been dropped. In (20a), the enclitic *sam* is positioned directly after the coordinating conjunction *i* ‘and’. The ordering of constituents (coordinator, auxiliary, participle), therefore, appears to converge towards the ordering of constituents in English after coordinators such as *and*, which allow ellipsis of the subject if the subject of the clause they introduce is co-referential with that of the preceding linked clause.

(20) a. AS

ali više kad sam bila tamo i oko onda
 but more when be_{AUX.1.SG} be_{AP.F.SG} there and around then
mi lakše bilo i *sam* mogla lakše da
 I_{DAT} easier be_{AP.N.SG} and be_{AUX.1.SG} could_{AP.F.SG} easier that
 razgovaram da šalim se
 talk_{PRES.1.SG} that joke_{PRES.1.SG} REFL

b. HS

ali kad sam bila tamo i oko duže onda
 but when be_{AUX.1.SG} be_{AP.F.SG} there and around longer then
mi je lakše bilo i mogla *sam*
 I_{DAT} be_{AUX.3.SG} easier be_{AP.N.SG} and could_{AP.F.SG} be_{AUX.1.SG}
 lakše da razgovaram da se šalim
 easier that talk_{PRES.1.SG} that REFL joke_{PRES.1.SG}
 'but when I was there and around longer then it was easier
 for me and I could talk more easily, joke'

Apart from being positioned so that the ordering of constituents converges towards word order in English, one verbal clitic may also be dropped in AS. The 3sg clitic *je* is occasionally dropped from clauses in which it acts as the linking verb, as in example (21a).

(21) a. AS

sve *mi* to sada lakše nego što
 all_{NOM.N.SG} I_{DAT} that_{NOM.N.SG} now easier_{NOM.N.SG} than sub
 je bilo kad sam bila mlađa
 be_{AUX.3.SG} be_{AP.N.SG} when be_{AUX.1.SG} be_{AP.F.SG} younger_{NOM.F.SG}

b. HS

sve *mi je* to sada lakše
 all_{NOM.N.SG} I_{DAT} be_{AUX.3.SG} that_{NOM.N.SG} now easier_{NOM.N.SG}
 nego što je bilo kad sam bila
 than sub be_{AUX.3.SG} be_{AP.N.SG} when be_{AUX.1.SG} be_{AP.F.SG}
 mlađa
 younger_{NOM.F.SG}
 'all that is easier for me now than it was when I was
 younger'

Much more frequently, however, *je* is dropped in AS when it is part of the verb in the perfect tense (AUX + AP). Regardless of whether its position in HS is following the participle, as in the first clause of example (22b), or preceding it, as in the third clause of (22b) and the second clause of (23b), in AS (examples (22a) and (23a)) the auxiliary *je* may be dropped from the verb phrase.

(22) a. AS

bito *smešno* *zato kad* *sam* *stigla*
*be*_{AP.N.SG} *funny*_{NOM.N.SG} *so* *when* *be*_{AUX.1.SG} *arrive*_{AP.F.SG}
sve *ličilo* *isto*
*everything*_{NOM.N.SG} *resemble*_{AP.N.SG} *same*_{NOM.N.SG}

b. HS

bito *je* *smešno* *zato što* *kad* *sam*
*be*_{AP.N.SG} *be*_{PRES.3.SG} *funny*_{NOM.N.SG} *because* *when* *be*_{AUX.1.SG}
stigla *sve* *je* *izgledalo* *isto*
*arrive*_{AP.F.SG} *everything* *be*_{PRES.3.SG} *look*_{AP.N.SG} *same*_{NOM.N.SG}
 'it was funny because when I arrived everything looked the same'

(23) a. AS

kad *sam* *ja* *imala* *šes' sedam godina*
when *be*_{AUX.1.SG} *I*_{NOM} *have*_{AP.F.SG} *six* *seven* *year*_{GEN.F.PL}
ona *upoznala* *GERMAN*
*she*_{NOM} *meet*_{AP.F.SG} *German*

b. HS

kad *sam* *ja* *imala* *šest sedam godina*
when *be*_{AUX.1.SG} *I*_{NOM} *have*_{AP.F.SG} *six* *seven* *year*_{GEN.F.PL}
ona *je* *upoznala* *Nemca*
*she*_{NOM} *be*_{AUX.3.SG} *meet*_{AP.F.SG} *German*_{ACC.M.SG}
 'when I was six, seven years old, she met a German'

The deletion of the auxiliary as in (22a) and (23a), is not to be confused with the so-called *krnji perfekt* ('truncated perfect'): a form of

the perfect tense without the auxiliary. This form of the perfect tense is common in narration, as in example (24).

(24) AS

i bila jedna žena tamo i ona
 and be_{AUX.F.SG} one_{NOM.F.SG} woman_{NOM.F.SG} there and she_{NOM}
 kaže ja tu blizu živim i ovo i
 say_{PRES.3.SG} I_{NOM} here close live_{PRES.1.SG} and this_{NOM.N.SG} and
 ono i dala mi njen broj
 that_{NOM.N.SG} and give_{AP.F.SG} I_{DAT} her_{ACC.M.SG} number_{ACC.M.SG}
 ‘and there was a woman there and she says I live near here and
 this and that and she gave me her number’

Jelena Savić (1994: 110–11; 1995: 487) also notes that in a variety of Serbian spoken by second-generation speakers in the United States *je* “is being deleted in the formation of the analytic past tense.” Her examples (1995: 487) are reproduced below:

- (25) a. YEAH, njemu je bilo lako, pošto on
 yeah he_{DAT} be_{AUX.3.SG} be_{AP.N.SG} easy because he_{NOM}
 radio pretprošlog ljeta u
 work_{AP.M.SG} one-before-last_{GEN.N.SG} summer_{GEN.N.SG} in
 US STEEL, so njemu bilo lako da dobije JOB
 US Steel so he_{DAT} be_{AP.N.SG} easy that get_{PRES.3.SG} job

b. HS

da, njemu je bilo lako, pošto je on
 yes he_{DAT} be_{AUX.3.SG} be_{AP.N.SG} easy because be_{AUX.3.SG} he_{NOM}
 radio pretprošlog ljeta u
 work_{AP.M.SG} one-before-last_{GEN.N.SG} summer_{GEN.N.SG} in
 US STEEL, tako da je njemu bilo lako da
 US Steel so that be_{AUX.1.SG} he_{DAT} be_{AP.N.SG} easy that
 dobije posao
 get_{PRES.3.SG} job_{ACC.M.SG}
 ‘yeah, it was easy for him, because he worked at US Steel the
 summer before last, so it was easy for him to get a job’

- (26) a. *bito* *ljepo* [*sic*]
 *be*_{AP.N.SG} *beautiful*_{NOM.N.SG}
- b. HS
- bito* *je* *ljepo* [*sic*]
 *be*_{AP.N.SG} *be*_{AUX.3.SG} *beautiful*_{NOM.N.SG}
 ‘it was beautiful’

Savić correctly contends that this type of change involves an analogical simplification process, but the explanation is not convincing. She writes:

The auxiliary *be* deletion represents another example of a structural convergence process fed by analogy within the verbal paradigm. The gapping of the auxiliary verb *biti* in past tense forms in Serbian occurs only in cases of conjoined VPs with prepositions [*sic*] *i* ‘and’ and *a* ‘but, and’, and in past tenses of reflexive verbs. The already operating gapping rule has triggered a levelling process in the Serbian grammar of bilinguals, which has resulted in creation of structures in which the auxiliary verb is deleted in sentences containing more than one VP which are *not* [emphasis in original] conjoined by the above two conjunctions, and ultimately in one-VP sentences where the verb *biti* is used as a copula. (1995: 487)

This argument is problematic for several reasons. First, in HS (and in AS) it is possible to have two or more conjoined perfect tenses and to use an auxiliary only in the first one. The dropping of the second, third, etc. auxiliary may here be termed gapping. Gapping is quite different from what takes place in clitic combinations involving *se*, the clitic form of the reflexive pronoun *sebe* in the accusative. Unwieldy clitic combinations are routinely resolved in HS by dropping *je* in sequences of *se* + *je*, but also by dropping *je* after the pronominal clitics *me* and *te* (Franks and King 2000: 30), for example, *setio te se* ‘he remembered you’. However, in clitic combinations involving *se* and *me/te* and any auxiliary clitic other than *je*, the auxiliary clitic is not

dropped.⁸ Compare, for example, **setili te se* vs. *setili su te se* ‘they remembered you’.

Second, it is telling that in both of the examples Savić presents in which *biti* is a copula the verb is in the perfect tense. Even more important, in all three examples which Savić presents to illustrate the deletion of the auxiliary from the verb phrase in the perfect tense, the verb is in the third person singular. This leads to the conclusion that in Savić's material, as in mine, *je* is the only auxiliary clitic deleted from the perfect tense verb phrase. Yet Savić extends her argument to all forms of the auxiliaries *jesam* and *biti*.

Je-dropping in AS, regardless of whether *je* functions as a copula or is the past tense auxiliary form, is not a change I attribute to convergence. In English, it is possible to have two conjoined tenses and to use the auxiliary only in the first one, just as in both HS and AS. English grammar, however, does not provide for the deletion of the auxiliary in other contexts, nor does it provide for the deletion of forms of *be* in its capacity as a linking verb. *Je*-dropping, instead, is attributable to attrition due to *je* being less stable than other auxiliary clitics. Mišeska Tomić (1996) proposes that as *je* appears to be a stem or host rather than an agreement ending, unlike the other clitic forms of *jesam* (compare *sam* vs. *jesam* and *je* vs. *jeste*), *je* is better understood as a verb in contrast with the other verbal auxiliary clitics. She writes: “At present, *je* has dual character; it functions as a clitic (which is always placed at the end of the clitic cluster) and as a nonclitic auxiliary. Its clitic role, is, however, receding; it is to be expected that in due course the slot of the 3rd person singular auxiliary clitic in the Serbo-Croatian clitic cluster will be left empty; [*sic*] as it is in Macedonian” (841). *Je*-dropping in AS is the result of direct contact with English under conditions of language shift, but it also represents a simplification process which could conceivably result from internally induced language change in HS.

6. Simplification within the Nominal Paradigm

Universal markedness, the distinction between linguistic features deriving from universal tendencies of occurrence (Thomason 2001: 270),

⁸ One exception is the truncated form of the perfect tense (*krunji perfekt*) discussed in relation to example (24).

has been identified as one of the main factors affecting the outcome of contact-induced change (Thomason and Kaufman 1988, Thomason 2001). Marked structures have been shown to be attrited as a result of language contact more commonly than structures which are more basic, natural, and/or frequent. When contact occurs between a language pair such as Serbian, a language with flexional morphology, and English, a language with analytic morphosyntax, in a context of ongoing shift from Serbian to English, a markedness-governed simplification of the rich Serbian inflectional system is bound to occur. One aspect of this simplification is the generalization of one case affix to several different case functions. The source of loss of case-markings in AS is arguably the joint effect of convergence toward English, in which nominals present a two-case system,⁹ and attrition within the case marking system.¹⁰

Perhaps the most systematic account of reduction in the case systems of Serbo-Croatian speakers in a language-contact situation is provided by Ćurović (1983) as part of a larger project focusing on second generation Serbo-Croatian speakers in Sweden. Based on the case systems of his informants, Ćurović was able to construct a model of case system implicativity. The ordering NOM > ACC > GEN > LOC > INSTR > DAT > VOC is proposed to progress (left to right) from the least frequently attrited (NOM > ACC) to the most frequently attrited (INSTR > DAT > VOC) cases (1983: 24). In other words, Ćurović's prediction is that cases from the, broadly speaking, right-hand side of the continuum will attrite first, while cases to the left will continue to be employed as default forms. In particular, Ćurović reports the use of the accusative as the default case where syntactic relations require the use of the locative, instrumental, or dative, terming the accusative a *casus praepositionalis generalis* (26). Following Ćurović, I will discuss general tendencies in non-target case marking in terms of the replacement of more marked and more frequently attrited cases by less marked cases which provide the default, non-target form.

The process whereby the accusative becomes the default case form in syntactic environments requiring the dative case is perhaps most

⁹ The notable exception is the six pronouns which present a three-case system.

¹⁰ Reduction of the case-marking system, commonly referred to as the loss of the distinction between locative and accusative cases (e.g., Alexander 2000), is a well-documented feature in southeastern dialects of Serbian.

clearly evident in the case of pronominals, in the paradigms of which the nominative and accusative case forms are discrete. In (27a), the clitic pronominal in the dative *mi* in second position is replaced by *mene*, the full pronominal form in the accusative following the verb, as the realization of the indirect object converges toward the English *me*. The full form corresponding to the clitic *mi* is *meni*, the suppletive full form of the first personal singular pronoun in the dative and the locative.

(27) a. AS

ili kažu mene odakle ste
or say_{PRES.3.PL} I_{ACCFrom} where from be_{PRES.3.PL}

b. HS

ili *mi* kažu odakle ste
or I_{DAT} say_{PRES.3.PL} where from be_{PRES.3.PL}
'or they tell me where you are from'

(28) a. AS

da sam razgovarala sa rođaci
that be_{AUX.1.SG} talk_{AP.F.SG} with cousin_{NOM.M.PL}

b. HS

da sam razgovarala sa rođacima
that be_{AUX.1.SG} talk_{AP.F.SG} with cousin_{INST.M.PL}
'that I spoke with relatives'

(29) a. AS

sa njih i njihova deca i deca
with they_{ACC} and their_{NOM} child_{NOM} and child_{NOM}
od deca
from child_{NOM}

b. HS

sa njima i njihovom decom i decom
with they_{INST} and their_{INST} child_{INST} and child_{INST}
od dece
from child_{GEN}

'with them and their children and their children's children'

(30) a. AS

razgovara sa *njegovu* *sestru*
 talk_{PRES.3.SG} with his_{ACC.F.SG} sister_{ACC.F.SG}

b. HS

razgovara s *njegovom* *sestrom*
 talk_{PRES.3.SG} with his_{INST.F.SG} sister_{INST.F.SG}
 'talks with his sister'

(31) a. AS

upotrebili engleski umešano sa *srpski*
 use_{AP.M.PL} English_{ACC.M.SG} mixed_{PP.N.SG} with Serbian_{ACC.M.SG}

b. HS

upotrebili engleski pomešano sa *srpskim*
 use_{AP.M.PL} English_{ACC.M.SG} mixed_{PP.N.SG} with Serbian_{INST.M.SG}
 'used English mixed with Serbian'

(32) a. AS

opet sam počela srpski sa *njea*
 again be_{AUX.1.SG} begin_{AP.F.SG} Serbian_{ACC.M.SG} with he_{ACC}

b. HS

opet sam počela srpski s *njim*
 again be_{AUX.1.SG} begin_{AP.F.SG} Serbian_{ACC.M.SG} with he_{INST}
 'again I began [speaking] Serbian with him'

(33) a. AS

da razgovaram sa *njih*
 that talk_{PRES.1.SG} with they_{ACC}

b. HS

da razgovaram s *njima*
 that talk_{PRES.1.SG} with they_{INST}
 'to talk with them'

The non-target realizations of the instrumental case for nominals in the singular and pronominals, singular and plural, tend to be accusa-

tive case forms. This is in keeping with Đurovič's (1983) prediction of the accusative as the *casus praepositionalis generalis*. In syntactic environments requiring the instrumental case the non-target realization of nominals in the plural tends to be the nominative case form. The exception in the plural is only apparent. Case markings in the plural are identical for the locative, dative, and instrumental; for all but one declension type (*a*-type masculine nouns, e.g., *čovjek* 'man', NOM, *čoveka*, GEN), nominative and accusative case forms also have the same endings. The replacement of instrumental by nominative forms may be a further simplification of case marking in the plural.

Savić (1994, 1995) and Hlavac (2003) both report a high incidence of accusative forms replacing target locative case in the speech of second-generation Serbian-English bilinguals in the United States and of second-generation Croatian-English bilinguals in Australia, respectively. Numerous instances of the non-target realization of the locative case by accusative case forms are also present in this corpus, for example, the utterances in (34a) and (35a).

(34) a. AS

mi smo u *ovu* zemlju
 we_{NOM} be_{AUX.1.PL} in this_{ACC.F.SG} country_{ACC.F.SG}

b. HS

mi smo u *ovoj* zemlji
 we_{NOM} be_{AUX.1.PL} in this_{LOC.F.SG} country_{LOC.F.SG}
 'we are in this country'

(35) a. AS

nisam čula samo na *televiziju*
 NEG.be_{AUX.1.SG} hear_{AP.F.SG} only on television_{ACC.F.SG}

b. HS

nisam čula samo na *televiziji*
 NEG.be_{AUX.1.SG} hear_{AP.F.SG} only on television_{LOC.F.SG}
 'I haven't heard it except on television'

The locative occurs very frequently as the target case form in the corpus because of interview content, for example, in the phrases 'in English' (target realization *na engleskom*; non-target realization *na*

engleski) and 'in ours', meaning 'in our language' (target realization *na našem*, non-target realization *na naše*). One example of an utterance featuring both phrases is presented in (36a):

(36) a. AS

mogu da objasnim YOU KNOW lakše na
 can_{PRES.1.SG} that explain_{PRES.1.SG} you know easier on
engleski nego na *naše*
 English_{ACC.M.SG} than on ours_{ACC.N.SG}

b. HS

mogu da objasnim znaš lakše na
 can_{PRES.1.SG} that explain_{PRES.1.SG} know_{PRES.2.SG} easier on
engleskom nego na *našem*
 English_{LOC.M.SG} than on ours_{LOC.M.SG}

'I can explain it more easily in English than in our language'

Again, this is in keeping with Đurovič's (1983) model of case system implicativity. Furthermore, both the locative and the accusative are governed by the prepositions *u* 'in' and *na* 'on'. This helps explain non-target realizations of the accusative by locative forms in the utterances in (37a) and (38a). Hlavac (2003: 316) also reports the replacement of target accusative forms by non-target locative forms:

(37) a. AS

koji su ušli u kancelariji
 who_{NOM.M.PL} be_{AUX.3.PL} enter_{AP.M.PL} in office_{LOC.F.SG}

b. HS

koji su ušli u kancelariju
 who_{NOM.M.PL} be_{AUX.3.PL} enter_{AP.M.PL} in office_{ACC.F.SG}

'who entered the office'

(38) a. AS

možda da sam otišla malo duže u Nemačkoj
 maybe that be_{AUX.1.SG} go_{AP.F.SG} little longer in Germany_{LOC.F.SG}

(38) b. HS

možda da sam otišla na malo duže u
 maybe that be_{AUX.1.SG} go_{AP.F.SG} at little longer in
Nemačku
 Germany_{ACC.F.SG}
 ‘maybe if I had gone for a little longer to Germany’

Genitive case is replaced by either nominative or accusative forms. The non-target realizations of masculine gender, that is, *a*-type declension nouns, tend to be nominative case forms, regardless of whether the accusative case form of the said noun is identical to the nominative form, as is the case for *kontakt* in (39a) or *ponedeljak* in (40a), or to the genitive form, as in the case of *prijatelj* in example (41a). Non-target realizations of the genitive for feminine gender *e*-type nouns (e.g., NOM *subota* ‘Saturday’ for GEN *subote*) may be accusative forms, as in the utterance in (40a):

(39) a. AS

puno *kontakt* sam imala
 much contact_{NOM.M.SG} be_{AUX.1.SG} have_{AP.F.SG}

b. HS

puno *kontakta* sam imala
 much contact_{GEN.M.SG} be_{AUX.1.SG} have_{AP.F.SG}
 ‘I had much contact’

(40) a. AS

idem *svaki* *ponedeljak* i *subotu*
 go_{PRES.1.SG} every_{ACC.M.SG} Monday_{ACC.M.SG} and Saturday_{ACC.F.SG}

b. HS

idem *svakog* *ponedeljka* i *subote*
 go_{PRES.1.SG} every_{GEN.M.SG} Monday_{GEN.M.SG} and
 Saturday_{GEN.F.SG}
 ‘I go every Monday and Saturday’

(41) a. AS

pismo od *tatin* *prijatelj*
 letter_{NOM.N.SG} from dad's_{NOM.M.SG} friend_{NOM.M.SG}

b. HS

pismo od *tatinog* *prijatelja*
 letter_{NOM.N.SG} from dad's_{GEN.M.SG} friend_{GEN.M.SG}
 'a letter from dad's friend'

Finally, the non-target realizations of the accusative case are, apart from the already discussed case of nominals functioning as the complements of the prepositions *u* and *na*, replaced by nominative case forms, as in examples (42a), (43a), and (44a). As is the case with the nominative and accusative case supplying default forms where non-target genitive case marking occurs, the nominative as the default choice where non-target accusative forms occur is also in keeping with the predictions of Đurovič's (1983) implicative model.

(42) a. AS

ako zoveš *jedan* *rođak* *onda*
 if call_{PRES.2.SG} one_{NOM.M.SG} relative_{NOM.M.SG} then
 moraš da zoveš *drugi* *rođak*
 must_{PRES.2.SG} that call_{PRES.2.SG} other_{NOM.M.SG} relative_{NOM.M.SG}

b. HS

ako zoveš *jednog* *rođaka* *onda*
 if call_{PRES.2.SG} one_{ACC.M.SG} relative_{ACC.M.SG} then
 moraš da zoveš *drugog* *rođaka*
 must_{PRES.2.SG} that call_{PRES.2.SG} other_{ACC.M.SG} relative_{ACC.M.SG}
 'if you call one relative then you must call another relative'

(43) a. AS

bacili na *ljudi*
 throw_{AP.M.PL} on people_{NOM.M.PL}

b. HS

bacili na *ljude*
 throw_{AP.M.PL} on people_{ACC.M.PL}
 'threw it at people'

(44) a. AS

vi pročitajte *cela* *knjiga*
 you_{NOM.PL} read_{PRES.3.PL} entire_{NOM.F.SG} book_{NOM.F.SG}

b. HS

vi pročitajte *celu* *knjigu*
 you_{NOM.PL} read_{PRES.3.PL} entire_{ACC.F.SG} book_{ACC.F.SG}
 ‘you read the entire book’

7. Concluding Remarks

This paper has discussed a number of features by which the variety of Serbian spoken by Serbian migrants and their descendants in Melbourne, Australia, (AS) differs from Homeland Serbian (HS). These features are categorized according to their respective sources, that is, the type of contact-induced change which they represent. Simplification within the verbal inflectional paradigm and *je*-dropping are considered to result from attrition. The following were categorized as changes resulting from convergence toward English: the re-setting of the *pro*-drop parameter, placement of the clitic pronoun after its verb rather than in second position, use of the full pronoun following the verb where the clitic form in second position would be expected in HS, placement of *se* after the verb, rather than in second position as in HS, and deletion of *se* (loss of reflexivity), as well as the placement of clitic forms of the auxiliary *jesam* following the subject and/or preceding the participle in the formation of the past tense. Simplification within the nominal inflectional paradigm is categorized as change due to multiple causes, attrition and convergence.

Three additional categories of change are proposed: (i) change that does not simplify the structure of Serbian but does bring about increased similarity with English; (ii) change that simplifies the structure of Serbian but does not bring it closer to English; and (iii) change that simplifies a Serbian structure and makes it more similar to English. Convergence as the sole cause of change results in change that simplifies a Serbian structure and makes it more similar to English, with the exception of the resetting of the *pro*-drop parameter in AS, a product of convergence that does not result in simplification yet brings about increased similarity with English. Attrition causes changes that simplify the structure of Serbian without bringing about increased simi-

larity with corresponding English structures. Finally, change caused by convergence and attrition is one which simplifies a Serbian structure and makes it more similar to English.

The resetting of the *pro*-drop parameter was discussed as an example of convergence in this corpus. Pronominal clitics and full pronominal forms in AS constitute an area of particular interest, as their positioning is demonstrably another effect of syntactic convergence. For instance, pronominal clitics in the dative and accusative are positioned following rather than preceding the verb, that is, in the position commonly occupied by the indirect and direct object according to the rules of English syntax.

Like all languages, receding languages undergo internally-motivated change, in addition to contact-induced change. In a migrant context, once the direct influence of the host language has been ruled out as the source of the change, it is sometimes difficult to decide whether a feature observed in a receding language is the effect of attrition or of an internally motivated change. In AS the leveling process whereby *-u* is replacing *-e* in 3pl forms of class VI and VII verbs in the present tense is a result of language contact under conditions of language shift, the result of attrition. As such analogical simplification has also been observed in varieties of HS for which language contact can be ruled out as a source of change (Peco 1995), it is possible to conclude that the part of the Serbian grammar system which proves to be most susceptible to attrition is precisely that part which is also most susceptible to internally motivated change. Another case in point is the simplification of the nominal inflectional paradigm in AS as a result of direct contact with English under language-shift conditions.

Attrition and convergence have been identified as causes of the simplification of the case-marking system observed in AS. Only the inflectional markings of nouns which also occur in HS were considered in this paper. Another potentially rewarding avenue of research would be to investigate the inflectional marking of AS nouns transferred from English that do not occur in HS and compare the results. It would also be of interest to investigate changes to the Serbian case-marking system in a migrant context where Serbian is in contact with a language that features a more complex nominal inflectional paradigm than does English. Further research on contact-induced change in Serbian as it is spoken in migrant communities undergoing shift to English is necessary. Research on change in Serbian induced by contact

with English has been undertaken in Australia (Dimitrijević 2005), Canada (Surdučki 1978), and the United States (Savić 1994, 1995), but more is needed. The same is true of Serbian in contact with languages other than English. Finally, crosslinguistic comparison with other Slavic languages in similar migrant contexts is needed.

References

- Alexander, Ronelle. (2000) *In honor of diversity: The linguistic resources of the Balkans*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures.
- Appel, René and Pieter Muysken. (1987) *Bilingualism and language contact*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Bennett, David C. (1986) "Towards an explanation of word-order differences between Slovene and Serbo-Croat". *The Slavonic and east European review* 64(1): 1–24.
- Browne, Wayles. (1974) "On the problem of enclitic placement in Serbo-Croatian". Richard D. Brecht and Catherine V. Chvany, eds. *Slavic transformational syntax*. Ann Arbor: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Michigan, 36–52. [*Michigan Slavic Materials*, 10]
- Clyne, Michael. (1967) *Transference and triggering*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- . (2003) *Dynamics of language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dimitrijević, Jovana. (2005) *Bilingual language practices in a migrant community: Language shift and code-switching in a Serbian language community in Melbourne, Australia*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Melbourne.
- . (2004) "Contact-induced change in a case of language shift: The Serbian language in Australia". *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* 47(1–2): 75–91.
- Dorian, Nancy. (1978) "The dying dialect and the role of the schools: East Sutherland Gaelic and Pennsylvania Dutch". Paper presented at the 1978 Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics.
- Đurovič, L'ubomir. (1983) "The case systems in the language of diaspora children". *Slavica Lundensia* 9: 275–308.

- Franks, Steven and Tracy Holloway King. (2000) *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grosjean, François. (1982) *Life with two languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . (2001) "The bilingual's language modes". Janet Nicol, ed. *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1–22.
- Halpern, Aaron Lars. (1992) *Topics in the placement and morphology of clitics*. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.
- Hlavac, Jim. (2003) *Second-generation speech: Lexicon, code-switching and morpho-syntax of Croatian-English bilingualism*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. (1986) *Principles of historical linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kaufman, Dorit. (1997) "Attrition of Hebrew in the United States: Sociolinguistic perspectives". Elite Olshtain, ed. *Immigration, identity, and language*. Hebrew University Jerusalem: Magnes Publications, 173–95.
- Kerswill, Paul. (2006). "Migration and language". Klaus Mattheier, Ulrich Ammon, and Peter Trudgill, eds. *Sociolinguistics/ Soziolinguistik: An international handbook of the science of language and society*, Vol. 3, 2nd ed. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- McMahon, April M. S. (1994) *Understanding language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mišeska Tomić, Olga. (1996) "The Balkan Slavic clausal clitics". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 14: 811–72.
- Peco, Asim. (1995) "Treće lice množine prezenta glagola tipa *nositi, voljeti, i držati* u govorima štokavskog narječja". *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 41: 491–520.
- Percus, Orin. (1993) "The captious clitic: Problems in Serbo-Croatian clitic placement". Ms., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. (1996) "Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the second position". Aaron L. Halpern and Arnold M. Zwicky, eds. *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 411–28.
- Radanović-Kocić, Vesna. (1988) *The grammar of Serbo-Croatian clitics: A synchronic and diachronic perspective*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Romaine, Suzanne. (1989) *Bilingualism*. London: Basil Blackwell.

- Savić, Jelena. (1994) *Serbian/English and Spanish/English code-switching: Toward a more comprehensive model*. Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University.
- . (1995) "Structural convergence and language change: Evidence from Serbian/English code-switching". *Language in society* 24(4): 475–92.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. (1994) *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Surdučki, Milan. (1978) *Srpskohrvatski i engleski u kontaktu*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey. (2001) *Language contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. (1988) *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Plitvička 17
18000 Niš
Serbia
jade@eunet.yu

Received: September 2006
Revised: February 2007