

# English Elements in Coffee Bar and Restaurant Names in Zadar (Analysis on the orthographic and morphological levels)

---

**Matković Hodanić, Lucija**

**Master's thesis / Diplomski rad**

**2024**

*Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj:* **University of Zadar / Sveučilište u Zadru**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:162:735105>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2024-12-31**



**Sveučilište u Zadru**  
Universitas Studiorum  
Jadertina | 1396 | 2002 |

*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[University of Zadar Institutional Repository](#)



DIGITALNI AKADEMSKI ARHIVI I REPOZITORIJ

Sveučilište u Zadru

Odjel za anglistiku

Diplomski Sveučilišni studij engleskog jezika i književnosti; smjer: nastavnički  
(dvopredmetni)

**Lucija Matković Hodanić**

**English Elements in Coffee Bar and Restaurant  
Names in Zadar (Analysis on the orthographic and  
morphological levels)**

**Diplomski rad**

Zadar, 2024.

Sveučilište u Zadru

Odjel za anglistiku

Diplomski Sveučilišni studij engleskog jezika i književnosti; smjer: nastavnički  
(dvopredmetni)

English Elements in Coffee Bar and Restaurant Names in Zadar (Analysis on the orthographic  
and morphological levels)

Diplomski rad

Student/ica:

Lucija Matković Hodanić

Mentor/ica:

dr.sc. Ivo Fabijanić

Zadar, 2024.



## Izjava o akademskoj čestitosti

Ja, **Lucija Matković Hodanić**, ovime izjavljujem da je moj **diplomski** rad pod naslovom **English Elements in Coffee Bar and Restaurant Names in Zadar (Analysis on the orthographic and morphological levels)** rezultat mojega vlastitog rada, da se temelji na mojim istraživanjima te da se oslanja na izvore i radove navedene u bilješkama i popisu literature. Ni jedan dio mojega rada nije napisan na nedopušten način, odnosno nije prepisan iz necitiranih radova i ne krši bilo čija autorska prava.

Izjavljujem da ni jedan dio ovoga rada nije iskorišten u kojem drugom radu pri bilo kojoj drugoj visokoškolskoj, znanstvenoj, obrazovnoj ili inoj ustanovi.

Sadržaj mojega rada u potpunosti odgovara sadržaju obranjenoga i nakon obrane uređenoga rada.

Zadar, 23. rujna 2024.

## *Table of Contents*

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Aim and goals .....	4
3. Languages in Contact.....	5
3.1. Language contact – definition.....	5
3.2. Explanation of language contact .....	6
3.3. A historical overview of languages in contact .....	7
4. Anglicisms .....	11
4.1. English as a global language.....	11
4.2. English and European languages .....	13
4.3. English and Croatian.....	15
4.4. Anglicisms – definition.....	17
4.5. Pseudoanglicisms .....	20
5. Adaptation of Anglicisms .....	22
5.1. Orthographic level .....	23
5.2. Phonological level.....	24
5.3. Morphological level .....	25
5.3.1. Transmorphemization .....	26
5.4. Semantic level.....	28
6. Methodological approach.....	31
6.1. Analysed corpus and sources .....	32
7. The examination of the corpus.....	43
7.1. The adaptation of Anglicisms - orthographic level.....	43
7.1.1. Pronunciation of the model .....	43
7.1.2. Orthography of the model.....	45
7.1.3. Combination of orthography and pronunciation.....	45

7.1.4. Intermediary language .....	46
7.1.5. Analysis of the corpus - orthographic level .....	46
7.2. The adaptation of Anglicisms - morphological level.....	51
7. 2. 1. Analysis of the corpus – morphological level.....	55
8. Conclusion .....	60
9. Works cited: .....	62
10. Summary: English Elements in Coffee Bar and Restaurant Names in Zadar.....	64
11. Sažetak: Engleski elementi u nazivima kafića i restorana u Zadru .....	65
Appendix: Zadar City Map .....	66

## 1. Introduction

The linguistic situation in certain countries, societies, and communities is inevitably connected to extralinguistic factors such as the economic and political power of the speakers of a particular language. Throughout history, the linguistic situation has been most influenced by the colonial expansions of major powers and population migrations, leading to languages being literally transferred from one part of the world to another and used as *lingua franca*s. For example, the spread of the Roman Empire established Latin as the *lingua franca* across the Mediterranean and a large part of Europe (Grbić: 2004, 243). A similar situation occurred several centuries later with European languages (English, French, Portuguese and Spanish) following the great discoveries and colonisation of the American continents, African countries, and Australia (ibid). Today, English has a similar influence, although it has achieved its status in a different manner. English owes its popularity and widespread use primarily to communication via the internet and the media. The global stock market, international banks, the majority of international corporations, and multilateral organisations such as the World Bank and various programmes promoting human rights, such as the United Nations, conduct and publish all their business and documents in English. As much as 75% of electronic mail and communication via the internet is conducted in English (ibid). However, English also owes its prestigious status to the entertainment industry. As much as 80% of all global films, videos, and television programmes are produced in English, mainly because the United States controls about 85% of the global film industry market. Thus, the English language has become an international language with a promising prospect of keeping its status in the future (ibid, 244).

The strong dominance of a single language inevitably leads to linguistic borrowing, most noticeably through the increasing number of Anglicisms in almost every language in the world. In this diploma thesis, we focus on Anglicisms in the names of coffee bars and restaurants in the city of Zadar because, as Vjekoslav Ćosić and Ana Mahnić-Ćosić have

observed, "these names form an integral part of our (linguistic) landscape due to the obligation and custom of displaying them at the entrances of the buildings in which they are located, but also beyond that, along roadsides, in the form of billboards" (Ćosić and Mahnić-Ćosić: 2001, 18). In today's context, it is important to emphasize the appearance of these names on the internet, particularly on social media platforms. Constant exposure to these names results in "their integration into our linguistic culture and creativity", and along with product names, they represent the most dynamic area of linguistic activity, an area where the highest number of new words (names) emerges (ibid).

To conduct an analysis of the adaptation of English elements in the names of coffee bar and restaurant names in the city of Zadar, at both orthographic and morphological levels, it is necessary to consider the broader context. Therefore, this diploma thesis presents the theory of language contact, terminology, and classification of fundamental concepts, along with a brief historical summary of the evolution of contact linguistics as a field of study and the emergence of English as a common *lingua franca*. Furthermore, the relationship between the Croatian and English languages is contextualised within the framework of historical contacts between the two languages, aiming to analyse the primary motivators and drivers of these interactions.



## 2. Aim and goals

The primary aim of this paper is to list all English elements in the coffee bar and restaurant names in Zadar and analyse their adaptation to the Croatian lexicon on the orthographic and morphological levels. Considering the complexity of the topic itself and the extensive research conducted to collect the corpus, this thesis is composed of several main parts. The primary purpose of the paper is thoroughly represented in the final section, while the first part of the paper is dedicated to an in-depth explanation of the theoretical framework provided by contact linguists, historical background of the interaction between the English and Croatian languages and a comprehensive analysis of Anglicisms in our language and the various degrees of their adaptation, with particular emphasis on orthographic and morphological levels. Methodological approach for this thesis was established by Croatian linguist Rudolf Filipović and his associates.

A corpus of English elements is found in the names of food and beverage establishments in Zadar. This list consists of 75 names of such establishments in Zadar that incorporate one or more Anglicisms. These names are presented in a table according to neighbourhoods they are located. Each establishment includes the corresponding address. For this research, the names and boundaries of the neighbourhoods are based on Zadar City Map provided by the Zadar Tourist Board (see Appendix), which includes a city-wide map and a map of Poluotok, the city center. However, the following analysis examines the degree of adaptation of Anglicisms on two levels - orthographic and morphological.

### 3. Languages in Contact

The term *languages in contact* was popularized by Uriel Weinreich after he introduced it in *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*, monography published in 1953 and it replaced previously used term *linguistic* or *language borrowing* (Filipović: 1986, 33). Even though, human languages are considered to be in contact for centuries, the theory of languages in contact has origins dating to the early 20th century.

First, the concept of language contact needs some clarification including terminology, historical overview and periodization. In the following subchapters, the definition and the explanation of the term is presented, as well as a brief historical exploration of contact linguistics with the focus on the work of the contact linguistic pioneers whose research provided a theoretical framework indispensable for all researches analysing borrowed linguistic material from English into the Croatian language, including this one.

#### 3.1. Language contact – definition

Following the structuralist linguistic heritage, research of the language contact was traditionally focused on the outcome of the process due to which at least one linguistic system had changed under the influence of another. According to Auer, *language contact* is here short for “contact-induced language change” (Auer: 2020, 147). Moreover, Joseph claims that the most straightforward outcome of the “influence of one language system over another is an addition to the lexicon, what is traditionally called *borrowing*, *producing borrowings* or *loanwords*” (Joseph: 2015, 303). The problem with such a structuralist approach to a language contact is that its explanatory value is limited, so modern contact linguists have shifted their focus from the idea of language systems influencing each other to bilingual language users as the true agents of the language contact.

In the introduction of his book *Theory of Languages in Contact*, Filipović declares that languages in contact can be defined as a linguistic phenomenon that occurs in both situations:

a) language borrowing – when a word or a phrase from a giving or a lending language ( $L_D$ ) is transferred to a receiving language ( $L_R$ ); or b) second language acquisition – when a speaker of a first language (mother tongue) ( $L_1$ ) decides to learn a second language ( $L_2$ ) (Filipović: 1986, 17). Moreover, Weinreich finds a direct link between language contact and bilingualism and claims that “two or more languages are considered in contact when they are alternately used by the same speaker, who can be described as bilingual” (Weinrich: 1963, 1 in Auer: 2020, 148). Consequently, the simultaneous usage of two different languages leads to a deviation from the language norm (either of the  $L_D$  or  $L_R$ ) known as *interference* (Filipović: 1986, 2). According to Thomason, the broadest definition of the language contact can be understood “as any linguistic change that is more probable to occur within a specific contact situation” (Thomason: 2001, 62-63 in Auer: 2020, 148). Finally, *Contact Linguistics* is a recently adopted term for the branch of linguistics critically investigating language contacts between (at least) two languages that is more than momentary, in theory and use (Filipović: 1986, 18). Contact Linguistics have formulated numerous linguistic principles related to *bilingualism*, *interference*, *language borrowing*, *language acquisition*, *language loss* or *language shift*, *language planning* and etc.

### 3.2. Explanation of language contact

Language contact is usually conditioned by various linguistic features of overlapping languages, as well as different social factors that involve speakers of different languages into communication with each other. Some linguists claim that “social factors are ultimately more influential than linguistic factors in driving contact-induced change” (Thomason: 2008, 47). Therefore, explanations of language contact often refers to generalized social/sociolinguistic situations “at the macro-contact level, i.e. when two large communities are involved” (Wheeler: 2008, 80). Myers-Scotton lists the following situations as potential for achieving language contact: a) military conquest followed by colonization; b) residing in a border region or an

ethnolinguistic enclave; c) economic or social migration ; d) education; e) use of international languages and f) ethnic consciousness (Myers-Scotton: 2002, 31-32). Wheeler provides a similar list of motivators for language contact: a) military imposition; b) attractiveness or usefulness of a language; c) intercommunication of two communities living in the same region and adopting languages and habits of each other; d) prestigious language; e) greater numbers – languages with more speakers often implies certain economic or political power (Wheeler: 2015, 80).

Conversely, Weinreich emphasizes the linguistic factor and the significance of structural criteria, asserting that when “two grammatical patterns interfere, the language that typically employs relatively free and invariant morphemes in its paradigms generally serves as the model for imitation” (Weinreich: 1963, 41 in Thomason: 2008, 52-53).

For the purposes of this paper, we will regard internal linguistic factors and social predictors as equally significant in shaping the outcome of language contact. These factors will be considered in the analysis of Anglicisms in the Croatian language, which will be conducted in the second part of this thesis.

### *3.3. A historical overview of languages in contact*

Language contact has been a common occurrence for thousands of years, with the mixing of words (and other linguistic elements) from different languages being acknowledged since ancient times. Joseph gives an example of the Romans acknowledging Greek loanwords in Latin (Joseph: 2015, 301). He notes their “use of the letter “y” to signify words of Greek origin” (ibid). However, Filipović attributes the first significant advancement in the systematic study of contact linguistics to the lexicographers of the 18th century. These lexicographers encountered loanwords during the compilation of lexical corpora (Filipović: 1986, 19). Nonetheless, the early scholars who laid the foundations for the study of language contact emerged in the 20th century (ibid). This historical overview is focused solely on prominent

linguists of the last hundred years, while acknowledging the significance of earlier linguists who addressed this topic.

According to Filipović, there are four prominent figures who pioneered the study of language contact and bilingualism in America and Canada during the 1940s and 1950s (Filipović: 1986, 33). Each of these four key contributors to the establishment of the field of the contact linguistics has conducted researches in different countries and socio-linguistic conditions.

1. Werner Leopold, who chronicled the progress of a bilingual child simultaneously acquiring English and German in four books, titled *Speech Development of the Bilingual Child* (1939-1949) (ibid).

2. Einar Haugen, who provided valuable theoretical and methodological framework for exploring languages in contact in his extensive monography *The Norwegian Language in America: The Study in Bilingual Behavior* (1953) (ibid). The monography discusses how Norwegian emigrants living in the United States have adapted their dialects under the influence of American English.

3. Uriel Weinreich, whose monography *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems* is considered as original and important as Haugen's monography and nowadays remains the fundamental base for studies of multilingualism and language contact. His research of the language contact between German, French and Roman in Switzerland in the early decades of the 20th century offers an insight into the linguistic system of bilinguals and introduces the concepts, principles and issues still relevant within the study of language contact (ibid).

4. William F. Mackey's famous article *Toward a redefinition of bilingualism*, published in Canadian Journal of Linguistics in 1962, redefined the concept of *bilingualism* claiming that bilingualism is not merely a feature of language, but rather a feature of its application (ibid).

Moreover, Filipović identifies three distinct periods of theoretical research focused on language contact issues (Filipović: 1986, 34):

1. First period is characterized by terms *language mixture* and *mixed languages*.
2. During the second period, the focus shifts to the term *language or linguistic borrowing*.
3. In the final period, the concept of *languages in contact* and *language contact* or *contact of languages* was incorporated into the terminology of linguists during that period.

Ultimately, Haugen redefines the concept of bilingualism to validate its foundational role in all language contact scenarios (Haugen: 1953, 7 cited in Filipović, 1986: 34). He replaced the traditional and rigid notion that a bilingual speaker must master the systems of two languages as a native speaker with a more flexible approach, suggesting that it is sufficient for a bilingual speaker to possess limited proficiency in a foreign language (ibid).

Taking into account the theories of all the above-mentioned four linguists, Filipović emphasizes the direction of the transfer of the loanword when two languages are in contact (Filipović: 1986, 34). The loanword transfer occurs between the giving language ( $L_G$ ) and the receiving language ( $L_R$ ). It can be achieved directly – *direct contact* or indirectly - *indirect or intermediary contact*. In the first situation, the result is *direct borrowing* and in the second one, *indirect or intermediary borrowing*. Direct borrowing occurs when a bilingual speaker adopts words directly from the giving language in the context of everyday communication, where  $L_G$  is considered dominant, prestigious, or the first language. (Filipović: 1986, 50). Conversely, intermediary borrowing is based on the intermediary element, which can be another language or the mass media – nowadays more effective mediator. The main difference between these two types is the result. Direct borrowing implies direct involvement of two speakers in an active communication and the range of the borrowing is much wider and covers whole linguistic

system, while indirect borrowing embraces just its fragments, mostly words and phrases (Filipović: 1986, 51).

## 4. Anglicisms

In this chapter, we will explore the dynamic relationship between English as a global *lingua franca* and European languages, with a particular emphasis on Croatian. Different aspects of a borrowing process will be investigated. This investigation will provide insights into how English influences vocabulary, syntax, and cultural aspects of these languages. Focus of our interest is transfer of vocabulary items between English ( $L_G$ ) and European languages, especially Croatian ( $L_R$ ). Moreover, we will introduce the broader phenomenon of English as a global language, considering its implications for linguistic diversity and cultural identity.

One of the results of this phenomenon is the appearance of Anglicisms in lexical systems of almost every language in the world. According to Surdučki, *lexical interference* or the transfer of words from one language to another, is the most obvious evidence of language borrowing (Surdučki: 1981, 198). The direct result of this interference is uncontrolled infiltration of English elements into almost every language in the world. In the following subchapters, definition and adaptation of words borrowed from English will be presented. Firstly, the notion *global language* needs clarification. Also, a brief historical overview and relevant linguistic researches of the linguistic contact between English and European languages, with emphasis on the language contact between English and Croatian, will be presented in following subchapters.

### 4.1. English as a global language

According to Crystal, “a language achieves a genuinely global status when it reaches a special status outside the mother tongue country” (Crystal: 1997, 3). That status can be achieved in two primary ways. Firstly, “a language can be designated as the official language of a country, serving as the medium of communication in domains such as government, law courts, mass media, and the educational system” (ibid, 4). Secondly, “a language can be prioritized in a country's foreign language teaching policy”, even if it holds no official status.



English is emerging as chief foreign language in educational system, frequently replacing other languages in the curriculum (ibid, 4). Over the last few centuries, English has undoubtedly emerged as a globally widespread language used in various spheres of life, with the majority of its speakers residing outside native English-speaking countries.

According to Žanić, to establish its position as a global language, we must examine English as a part of a *global linguistic ecosystem* and answer a few simple questions (Žanić: 2007, 232 cited in Barbarić: 2011, 96):

1. “Who uses English as their first language and who uses it as a second or foreign language?”
2. “What is the political and legal status of the language in its native country? What is the economic and political status of the country where the language is predominantly spoken? What is the economic power of the language speakers?”
3. “To what extent is the language prevalent in the scientific and technological domains of international communication, educational systems, cultural artifacts, and media production?”
4. “What are the attitudes and impressions about the language?”

In the following two paragraphs, responses to these questions will be provided, though not necessarily in the same order.

During the last six decades, “the number of English speakers has increased to such a degree that it widely exceeds the number of English native speakers” (Bosnar-Valković et al.: 2008, 1036). Currently, the English speaking population is estimated to be between 1.5 and 2 billion, with native speakers comprising only one-sixth of this total (ibid). By comparison, during the Shakespearean era, English was spoken by approximately seven million individuals, predominantly native speakers (ibid). But status of the global language, *lingua franca* or *common language* is not attained only by excessive number of speakers. Throughout history, diverse communities have interacted for economic or political reasons and required a common language for communication. One solution was “to develop a simplified language known as a

*pidgin*, formed by combining elements of at least two different languages” (Crystal: 1997, 11). Another option was to adopt the language of the most powerful ethnic group or colonial superpower for mutual communication. In both instances, English frequently became the language of choice.

Nowadays, English is globally used for numerous purposes, including the international tourist industry, diplomacy, sports, popular culture, mass media, technological and scientific development, teenage slang and of course as a language of the internet. All of the above mentioned facts influenced the change in the English language status that imposed itself as superior and dominant in relation to other world languages. The reasons for such situations can be categorized into two groups: sociolinguistic and non-linguistic (Bosnar-Valković et al.: 2008, 1036). According to Grbić, there is no such a thing as a superior or dominant language by its nature, its prestige is usually determined by extralinguistic factors and social relations (Grbić: 2004, 240). Crystal agrees that “the strong connection between language dominance and economic, technological, cultural, or religious influence can be observed” (Crystal: 1997, 5). It is believed that without a strong power foundation, no language can achieve international status as a medium of communication. Therefore, the social reality determines language usage because all languages and dialects of the world can be considered to be equally functional as communicational systems (Grbić: 2004, 241).

#### *4.2. English and European languages*

The spread of the English language into the continent of Europe started at the end of the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth centuries when European nations began to borrow English words from broader spectrum of semantic fields (Filipović: 1966, 103). The degree of contact intensified at the same time as Britain emerged as a prominent political and economic force in Europe (Bosnar-Valković et al.: 2008, 1037). The real invasion of English words began in the eighteenth century when traditionally borrowed trade terms and the names

of fish and boats were accompanied by words from different categories such as literature, science, philosophy and politics (Filipović: 1966, 103). The infiltration of the English element into the European vocabularies (especially French and German) gradually expanded during the nineteenth and twentieth century and the intensity of the language contact was at its peak after the Second World War (Bosnar-Valković et al.: 2008, 1037). According to Bosnar-Valković and associates, English has consistently been a major source of new vocabulary for European languages (ibid) ever since.

In his research titled *The English Element in the Main European Languages*, Rudolf Filipović endeavours to detect English elements within the collective European lexicon, commonly referred to as the *European pool*. This reservoir of vocabulary remains open for borrowing by all European languages “whenever a need appears” (Filipović: 1966, 106). He opted to investigate four language groups: Germanic, Romance, Slavonic, and Finno-Ugric, selecting a limited yet representative number of European languages as the focal point of his research. The criteria for selecting a particular language within a language family were either its significance within the European language family (as seen in the Romance group) or its linguistic characteristics pertinent to the research. Consequently, the languages he chose in the Germanic group were German, Dutch, Swedish and Norwegian; in the Romance group the study was conducted on the English element in Italian, Spanish, French and Romanian; from the Slavonic group, Russian, Serbo-Croat, Polish and Czech were in the centre of the attention; in the Finno-Ugric group of languages, he decided to study English element in Finnish and Hungarian. Filipović ultimately categorized a corpus of English loanwords according to their predominant areas of occurrence as follows: 1) food and beverages; 2) sports and recreational activities; 3) sciences and natural sciences; 4) social customs and attire; 5) commerce, economics, banking, units of measurement, and currency; 6) philosophy and religion; 7)

political and legal terminology; 8) transportation (Filipović: 1966, 112). He mentions just a few of the richest groups, some of them found in his subsequent special studies.

#### *4.3. English and Croatian*

Linguistic contact between English and Croatian started approximately simultaneously as the linguistic contact between English and European languages in general, but intensity of the contact has changed during the years. According to Turk and Opašić, as a language of a small European nation that has taken an active part in the European cultural movements, Croatian has shown tendencies to follow linguistic trends of the rest of the Europe and has accepted numerous English loanwords over the years (Turk, Opašić: 2008, 74). These trends have persisted unabated, ensuring that English continues to serve as the primary source language today. Consequently, language experts, politicians and ordinary citizens perceive a necessity to protect their native language from the pervasive influence of English loanwords (ibid). Nevertheless, the integration of Anglicisms into the Croatian lexical system is “primarily motivated by cultural-civilizational and scientific-technical reasons” (Bosnar-Valković et al.: 2008, 1037). This is because new concepts and terminology adopted from English language and culture often expose gaps in the Croatian vocabulary that require supplementation. In such instances, opting for the original term and adjusting the model to align with the lexicon of the receiving language appears to be the most rational choice, as equivalents from the recipient language seldom cover the entirety of the concept's meaning (ibid).

Croatian initially encountered the British variant of English within its own territory through mostly indirect means. This contact was facilitated primarily through German, French, and Italian as intermediary languages, and later through mass media channels (Bosnar-Valković et al.: 2008, 1037). Historically, during the period previously marked as particularly conducive to the infiltration of English words into European languages, Croatia was part of Yugoslavia, where Serbo-Croatian was an official language. Milan Surdučki identifies a direct

correlation between Yugoslavia's foreign policy and the excessive influx of English loanwords into the Serbo-Croatian language (Surdučki: 1981, 198-199). He asserts that Yugoslavia's liberal attitudes towards numerous Western ideas provided fertile ground for English influence following the end of the Second World War (ibid).

Outside the European continent, direct interaction between English and Croatian occurs when Croatian-speaking immigrant communities encounter the English language in predominantly English-speaking nations, primarily the United States and Australia (Bosnar-Valković et al.: 2008, 1037). Surdučki highlights that the increased emigration of Yugoslavs to countries where English is the primary language facilitated the initial direct interactions between the two languages (Surdučki: 1981, 198-199). He elaborates that Yugoslav immigrants who had become proficient in English and later returned home, played a direct role in disseminating English loanwords and fostering heightened interest in the English language within Yugoslavia. Consequently, this prompted the implementation of English language education in schools as a foreign language (ibid: 200).

Therefore, language contacts between English and Croatian can be divided into two main periods with significantly different characteristics (Sočanac et al.: 2005, 203). The first period, post-World War II, involved the adaptation of borrowed English elements into Croatian, a process that has been extensively studied by Rudolf Filipović. Then there is the second period, which began in the early nineties, characterized by more recent English loanwords that have undergone less or no adaptation at all. This second period has resulted in a relatively unexplored corpus of mostly unadapted English loanwords which enter the Croatian language as *ad hoc* borrowings and retain the characteristics of the English model (ibid: 180). These words appear to be completely identical in Croatian as they are in English and increase the share of the foreign material in the Croatian lexicon.

In the 1990s, after the establishment of an independent state, the Croatian language became the only official state language, which “encouraged language purists’ campaigns in the first post-war period” (Nikolić-Hoyt and Sočanac: 2006, 3). The prime purists’ targets were Serbian words, but Anglicisms, as the strongest foreign influence were also seen “as a threat to the Croatian language as a powerful symbol of national identity” (ibid). Even though language purism is still most common attitude among Croatian linguists, prestigious power of Anglo-American English language and culture, as well as the necessity to name terms adopted from the giving language, have motivated enormous influx of English words and elements into Croatian (Sočanac et al.: 2005, 179).

Although the British variant initially laid the foundations for English and Croatian language contact, a substantial influx Americanisms testify of the dominance of the American variant in the period from the post-Second World War period up to the present day. Americanism is a term used for “a word, phrase or spelling that is mostly typical of the American variant of English used in other languages” (Mihaljević: 2021, 51). This situation can be perceived as a result of the desire to “keep up after a long period of relative isolation and one expression of the much desired westernization” (Bosnar-Valković et al.: 2011, 1038). Consequently, it includes Americanization and assimilation of American language norms that is particularly noticeable among younger individuals (ibid). Furthermore, from the 1980s onward, the language of the younger generation is tremendously influenced by the mass media dominated by the English language. Therefore, the language spoken by Croatian youth can be characterized as “a projection and product of the media implemented in their communication”, leading to the indiscriminate assimilation of Americanized content (ibid).

#### *4.4. Anglicisms – definition*

If there is no appropriate word to represent the new object, concept or term in the language, empty spaces in the vocabulary occur. These empty spaces can be filled in three

different ways: 1) by formation of a new word from already existing elements in the language; 2) by borrowing a word from a foreign language; or 3) by changing/adding meaning of the already existing word in the language (Filipović: 1990, 15). As previously mentioned in the preceding subchapter, the optimal approach for naming a new object or concept pertaining to English culture or civilization is to borrow a word from the donor language, adapt it, and integrate it into the recipient language. In his analysis of the collected corpus for the project *The English Element in the Main European Languages*, Filipović categorizes English loanwords into two primary groups: 1) *Anglicisms* – English words adapted according to the Croatian language system and incorporated into Croatian vocabulary; 2) *Pseudoanglicisms* or secondary Anglicisms – words that resemble English words and are constructed from English elements but do not exist in the English lexicon (Filipović: 1990, 16).

Even though both groups can effectively fill gaps in the vocabulary, Barnabić believes that Anglicisms are more productive and less dangerous for the receiving language than Pseudoanglicisms (Barnabić: 2011, 95). Filipović concludes that Anglicisms are predominantly used by elderly speakers who are interested in everyday events and international news. In contrast, younger speakers, who are more interested in entertainment such as music, movies, television, and sports, tend to use Pseudoanglicisms (Filipović: 1990, 21). However, he asserts that English loanwords go through an adaptation process on four levels. These four language levels are orthographic, phonological, morphological and semantic. Only after these words are completely modified to conform to the Croatian language system, they can be classified as Anglicisms (Filipović: 1986, 53). All these linguistic levels will be thoroughly examined in the subsequent subchapters.

To define term Anglicism, we first need to understand that all components of English vocabulary, regardless of their origin, are considered integral parts of the English lexicon. This includes words of Anglo-Saxon origin, as well as those adopted from other European or non-

European languages (Filipović: 1990,17). Words from the first group are transferred to the receiving language in their original form, while words from the other group are transferred in an adapted form that is fully integrated into the English language system (ibid). However, Filipović provides following definition of Anglicism: “An Anglicism is any word borrowed from the English language, denoting an object or a concept which is, at the moment of borrowing, an integral part of English culture and civilization; it need not to be of English origin, but it must be adapted to the linguistic system of English and integrated into the vocabulary of English” (ibid).

In his work *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo – razvoj – značenje*, Filipović expands the definition of Anglicisms by adding a third category - *internationalisms*. This term refers to technical terms used to denote scientific discoveries or achievements in various branches of British or American science, which are also considered Anglicisms (ibid: 17-18). An internationalism is typically based on a Latin or Greek word and modified to integrate into the English language system (ibid). Moreover, Anglicism is a general term recognized by linguists all over the world and includes all English variants - British, American, Canadian and New Zealandian.

In the Croatian language, it is translated as *anglicizam* or *anglizam* (Hrvatski jezični portal), but *anglizam* is recognized by contemporary Croatian linguists as more appropriate for two reasons: 1) It is more applicable in accordance to the whole terminology system – *anglist*, *anglistica*, *anglistika*, not *anglicist*, *anglicistica* or *anglicistika*; 2) Term *anglizam* is in harmony with most of other terms in Croatian denoting lexical unit transferred from one language to another – *germanizam*, *talijanizam*, *hispanizam*, *latinizam* (Mihaljević: 2021, 52).

However, the reasons for the emergence of Anglicisms in nearly every language worldwide are difficult to explain. Some view the presence of Anglicisms as a reflection of freedom of linguistic choice, while others attribute it to the lack of popularization of native



equivalents (Drljača Margić: 2011, 86). Certainly, it is necessary to look beyond the language itself to understand these reasons, considering the status of the language and the influence of its speakers, both historically and in contemporary times.

#### 4.5. *Pseudoanglicisms*

As mentioned before, Filidović defined Pseudoanglicisms as words in the receiving language that are not taken from English as the donor language, but are formed in the receiving language by English elements (Filipović: 1990, 19). Moreover, he claims that there is no major structural or systematic difference between Pseudoanglicisms and Anglicisms. His assumption is that Pseudoanglicisms occurred as a result of the specific sociolinguistic situation in the Europe that implied excessive interest in everything that came from English speaking countries (ibid, 20). In such an atmosphere, all conditions for the creation of new expressions from foreign elements were established. Nowadays, main source of the Pseudoanglicisms is the vocabulary of the journalists and commentators on the radio and television (ibid, 21). Language of the Croatian media with excessive number of English elements is the subject of numerous researches by Croatian linguists and has been causing interest (or even controversy) among experts (especially with purist tendencies) and the public for a long time. To be precise, in the core of their interest is the use of Pseudoanglicisms that journalists usually use without translation and explanation and under the assumption that the audience is familiar with these terms (Barbarić: 2011, 95). Moreover, Barbarić raises concern about special hybrid of Croatian and English - *Crenglish*<sup>1</sup> that is probable to become the common language of the Croatian media.

However, the formation of Pseudoanglicisms involves one of the following processes (Filipović: 1990, 19-20):

---

<sup>1</sup> Term *hrengleski* is introduced by Vilke i Medved Krajnović in 2006.

1) Composition: The first element of the word is an Anglicism, and the other is the English word *man*.

Anglicism + *man* = Pseudoanglicism, e.g., *golman*.

2) Derivation: new words are formed by adding suffix *-er* to Anglicism.

Anglicism + *-er/ -ist* = Pseudoanglicism, e.g.; *autostoper*, *džezzer*, *kombajner*, *teniser*, *veterpolist*

3) Ellipsis: a new word is created by leaving out the suffix *-ing* or one element of a compound, e.g., *boks*, *hepiend*, *surf*.

## 5. Adaptation of Anglicisms

During the process of language borrowing, the adaptation of the model from  $L_G$  to the rules of  $L_R$  is a crucial aspect (Filipović: 1986, 55). This adaptation entails various changes occurring at different stages and linguistic levels. Furthermore, two fundamental linguistic operations - *substitution* and *importation*, govern the whole process. Haugen defines *substitution* as a process in which any aspect of the model or the original pattern is replaced by its imitation or the equivalent from the receiving language (Haugen: 1950, 212). On the contrary, when a native speaker embraces a foreign word as part of his own language, he initiates a process of *importation*, thereby introducing innovation into the receiving language (ibid). Still, when adapting a model into a replica, substitution is much more common than importation (Filipović: 1986, 68). Both operations will be described further in the subsequent text, focusing on the specific linguistic level at which they occur.

Furthermore, the Haugen-Weinreich's theory proposes three stages of adaptation: model, compromised replica, and replica (ibid). However, Filipović deems the Haugen-Weinreich's theory inadequate, as some of the outcomes presented in his work *Engleski element u europskim jezicima* remained unclassified (ibid). Consequently, Filipović chooses to reassess both operations and their roles in the adaptation process, with a specific focus on examination of the nature of all changes that take place during the process. In general, these changes are categorized into two groups: *primary changes* and *secondary changes*.

Filipović claims that primary changes occur "from the moment of the transfer of the model until the integration of the replica into  $L_R$  system" (ibid, 56). Secondary changes, on the other hand, include alterations that occur on the replica "from the moment of its integration into the receiving language system onwards" (ibid). Based on this classification, we can distinguish between two types of adaptation: *primary adaptation* and *secondary adaptation*. Filipović perceives this division as an innovative approach to adaptation analysis, providing a

means to more precisely determine and classify changes that were not distinguished or thoroughly analysed in earlier theories (ibid). The theory incorporates two main elements: the chronological and qualitative elements, suggesting that adaptation is influenced not only by the chronological order but also by the nature of the changes involved in the process. In chronological terms, primary changes always precede secondary ones. However, the qualitative element holds greater relevance for this classification, as the quality of primary changes significantly differs from that of secondary changes.

Primary changes are characteristic of bilingualism and include contacts of two languages that are neither firm nor permanent, resulting in numerous variants of the compromise replica that change under the influence of both languages (ibid, 57). In contrast, secondary changes are stable and consistent, so no new compromise replicas are likely to appear in the period. Also, the replica is already an integral part of the  $L_R$  system, so even if there is any change in the replica, it is always in accordance with the tendencies of the receiving language and can be characterized as typical for a monolingual speaker (ibid).

### 5.1. Orthographic level

The orthography of the basic model of Anglicism is shaped by the orthography and pronunciation of the model itself, as well as by the influence of the intermediary language. Therefore, Filipović identifies four different ways in which the adaptation of Anglicisms occurs at the orthographic level (Filipović: 1990, 28):

- 1) According to the pronunciation of the model (*strike* /straɪk/ - *štrajk*).
- 2) According to the orthography of the model (*pilot* /paɪ.lət/ - *pilot*).
- 3) According to the combination of pronunciation and orthography (*interview* /'ɪn.tə.vjuː/ - *intervju*);
- 4) Under the influence of the intermediary language (*bluff* /blʌf/ *blef*<sup>d(nj)</sup>).

Even though the orthography of the replica may mirror the pronunciation of the model, it does not involve direct substitution of phonetic equivalents, as seen in transphonemization. Instead, the original phonetic elements from the donor language are transcribed using the closest available orthographic symbols or graphemes from the recipient language (Filipović: 1986, 68). Furthermore, both British and American English pronunciations can influence the phonological and orthographic forms of Anglicism, resulting in the emergence of parallel or varied versions of the same word. The integration of these diverse forms into the Croatian language is often associated with return of the immigrants from the United States, who adapt English loanwords according to the American variant of the language. Consequently, these loanwords coexist alongside previously accepted British versions of the models, such as *boss* Br /bɔ:s/ *bos* US /'bas/ *bas* (ibid, 70).

### 5.2. Phonological level

Rudolf Filipović employs the term *transphonemization* to describe the process of adapting Anglicisms at the phonological level through substitution (Filipović: 1990, 30). Essentially, the phonemes of the giving language (in this context English) are substituted by the equivalents from the receiving language (in this context Croatian) while forming the loanword (Filipović: 1986, 69). There are four main ways of the transphonemization (ibid):

- 1) direct substitution of the phonemes in written form of language;
- 2) direct substitution of the phonemes in oral form of the language;
- 3) substitution of the phonemes from L<sub>G</sub> with phonemes from L<sub>R</sub> through intermediary language in written form;
- 4) substitution of the phonemes from L<sub>G</sub> with the phonemes from L<sub>R</sub> through intermediary language in oral form.

Moreover, taking into account characteristics of the phonemic systems of the languages in contact, Filipović introduces three different types of transphonemization (ibid, 72):

1) *Complete transphonemization* covers those phonemes that are identical in the giving and receiving languages, e.g. /ʃ/ - /š/ *show* - *šou*; /dʒ/ - /dž/ *jam* - *džem*; /b/ - /b/ *bar* – *bar*; /i:/ - /i/ *team* – *tim*.

2) *Partial or compromise transphonemization* concerns those situation when the English phonemes differ from their Croatian equivalents, e.g. /ɔ/ - /o/ *box* – *boks*; /p/ - /p/ *punch* – *punč*. Regarding vowels, the contrast lies in the level of openness during articulation, while concerning consonants, the variation is apparent in both the degree of openness and the location of articulation.

3) *Free transphonemization* – is realized at the adaptation of the English phonemes with no even partial equivalents in Croatian, e.g. /ɜ:/ - /er/ *flirt* – *flert*; /ei/ - /ej/ *grape* – *grejp*. In this form of transphonemization, phonetic principles are not followed, as opposed to the first two examples. Instead, pronunciation is determined by either orthography or some factors outside the language itself, especially in situations where two languages differ in their phoneme inventory. In such cases, the recipient language lacks certain phonemes present in the donor language and has no equivalents for them. Free transphonemization is most common in the transfer of diphthongs, i.e. /ou/, /au/, /aɪ/, /eɪ/, /ɔɪ/, /ɪə/, /εə/, /ʊə/ because they do not exist in the Croatian language. Furthermore, specific English consonants with no equivalent in Croatian, such as dentals /θ/ and /ð/, nasal /ŋ/, and labial /w/, follow the principle of orthography or combination of orthography and pronunciation.

### 5.3. Morphological level

When discussing interference between the morphemes of the two languages in the contact, two basic principles can be distinguished: 1. First principle is an empirical conclusion that two languages in contact have no effect on each other's morphological system. 2. Second principle is based on the general division of the morphemes of a language into *bound morphemes* and *free morphemes* (Filipović: 1986, 116). According to Uriel Weinreich, bound

morphemes can be transferred to a  $L_R$  only under the special circumstances in very rare occasions (Weinrich 1953: 32 in Filipović: 1986, 116). This Weinreich's principle is not applicable to free morphemes. Free morphemes are part of the lexicon, which is understood to be an open language system and therefore, free morphemes enter the language system of  $L_R$  without restrictions in order to name new terms, objects, places or people (Filipović: 1986, 33). Einar Haugen's interpretation of the morphological adaptation ruling principle: "Since each loanword must be incorporated into the  $L_R$  system, it is morphologically analysed (adapted) according to the principles of the new language ( $L_R$ )" (Haugen: 1969, 439-440 in Filipović: 1986, 117). In practice, when a selected word is integrated into a language, it receives inflections of the  $L_R$  in order to feel like a word of that language and express its morphological categories, especially the ones that differs in  $L_G$  and  $L_R$ . This integration system of the loan material on the morphological level is gradual and includes three different phases: 1. formation of the *citation form*<sup>2</sup>; 2. coordination of the morphological categories of  $L_G$  and  $L_R$ ; and 3. incorporation of the loanwords in the system of the  $L_R$  (Filipović: 1986, 118). First, we will discuss primary changes based on the morphological structure of the replica. Secondary changes are closely related to the morphological categories and the transition from one part of speech to another and will be analysed in the later chapters.

### 5.3.1. Transmorphemization

Previously mentioned division on free and bound morphemes is a starting point for a further discussion about the adaptation of the loanwords on the morphological level since it depends on the model structure. Each word is formed of a free and a bound morpheme, but in some cases, bound morpheme can be zero morpheme (Haugen 1969: 389 in Filipović: 1986, 11). Hence, two possible ways of the word formation should be taken into account:

---

<sup>2</sup> Citation form is a word or a unit of language listed without context.

a) free morpheme + zero bound morpheme; and b) free morpheme + suffix. Transfer of free morphemes into a  $L_R$  is completely uninterrupted and free. In contrast, use of bound morphemes in the  $L_R$  is limited. It is possible for foreign bound morphemes to be a part of *compromise replica*, but its use is usually not permanent and it is eventually replaced by the suffix of the  $L_R$  (Filipović: 1990, 31). This process, known as *transmorphemization*, involves substitution of the morphological features. Filipović established a three-degree classification of transmorphemization (ibid, 32):

1. *Zero transmorphemization* occurs during primary adaptation, where the modifications are considered primary. This type of adaptation involves a zero morpheme and happens when a model is incorporated into the recipient language as a free morpheme. Consequently, there is no need for morphological adaptation of the citation form, and it is seamlessly integrated into the recipient language following prior transphonemization (Filipović: 1986, 119). It is common with nouns and adjectives, but excludes verbs. Only some of the examples are: *bridge – bridž*, *scout – skaut*, *nylon – najlon*, *fit – fit*, *fair – fer*.

2. *Compromise transmorphemization* occurs when the loanword retains a suffix - a bound morpheme from the  $L_G$  that is phonologically adapted, but does not exist in the morphological system of the  $L_R$  and appears in the language as a compromise replica (ibid: 121). Even though, compromise replica is unstable by its nature and tends to complete the process of adaptation, some foreign bound morphemes are completely accepted in the  $L_R$  and appears in Anglicisms (e.g. *-er* in *farmer*, *-ing* in *parking*) or Pseudoanglicisms (e.g. *-er* in *autostoper* or *džezzer*).

3. *Complete transmorphemization* is the final step of the substitution on the morphological level and continues the adaptation of the bound morpheme by replacing the suffix from the  $L_G$  with the  $L_R$  suffix of the same meaning and function (ibid: 123). This process, in which there is no change in part of speech, can involve two or three stages depending on the scenario: a) model – compromise replica – replica, e.g., *box-er – boks-er – boks-ač*; or b) model – replica,



e.g., *strik-er* – *štrajk-aš*). In both cases, the result is completely adapted replica that follows the stage of the primary adaptation (Filipović: 1990, 33). On the other hand, secondary adaptation includes a change in the part of speech and morphological categories, which will be discussed thoroughly in the chapter 7.2. *The Adaptation of Anglicisms - morphological level*.

#### 5.4. Semantic level

According to the semantic aspect of the linguistic borrowing, there are two different results of the language contact on the semantic level: 1) adaptation of the meaning of the model and 2) *semantic borrowing* (Filipović: 1986, 153). Louis Deroy defines semantic borrowing as “a new meaning added to the old meanings of the traditional words” (Deroy: 1956, 93 in Filipović: 1986, 155). It includes the transfer of the meaning from the  $L_G$  to an already existing word in the  $L_R$  and excludes the process of the actually materialized linguistic borrowing and adaptation of the model. Therefore, the focus of the analysis is aimed to the first category, i.e., the adaptation of the meaning of the model and basis for it is found in Hope’s classification of the semantic changes (Hope: 1960, 133 in Filipović: 1986, 157): 1) Changes in Semantic Extension; 2) Ellipsis; 3) Change of place names and proper names to common nouns; 4) Pejoration and Euphemism; and 5) Metaphor. However, Filipović expands Hope’s five-member system by adding the notion of the two-degree adaptation, i.e., primary and secondary adaptation and establishes a new division as a basic principle in explaining all the changes on the semantic level (Filipović: 1986, 161):

- 1) Zero Semantic Extension;
- 2) Restriction of meaning: a) in number of meaning and b) in semantic field;
- 3) Expansion of meaning: a) in number of meanings and b) in semantic field.

Additionally, Filipović proposes a tertiary level of adaptation—pejoration. However, this three-degree system of semantic adaptation has never gained widespread acceptance.

*Zero Semantic Extension* occurs when the meaning of Anglicism, i.e., replica retains its original meaning. This degree predominantly includes terms specific to specialized fields such as: a) food and beverages, b) sports, c) music and dance, d) occupations, e) dogs, f) clothing, g) card games, and others (ibid, 162). For example:

a) *beefsteak* – *biftek* = naglo pečeni goveđi odrezak

*gin and tonic* – *džin-tonic* = piće napravljeno od gina i tonica

b) *baseball* – *bejzbol* = vrsta igre loptom i palicom (na svakoj strani po 9 igrača)

c) *foxtrot* – *fokstrot* = živahan ples (i muzika za taj ples)

d) *businessman* – *biznismen* = poslovan čovjek

e) *poodle* – *pudl* = vrsta kudravog, inteligentog, poučljivog psa

f) *kilt* – *kilt* = muška karirana suknjica škotskih brđana

g) *poker* – *poker* = kartaška igra američkog podrijetla

*Restriction of meaning* involves the shift from a general meaning to a more specific one and “it is the most frequent change in the process of language borrowing” (Filipović: 1986, 164). Owing to the fact that a word from the L<sub>G</sub> usually covers multiple meanings, some of them are omitted during the transfer to the L<sub>R</sub> in order to name a specific concept, phenomenon or person from the cultural context of the L<sub>G</sub>. This restriction of meaning can happen in: a) number – loanword retains one or more meanings of model; or b) field – not only that replica keeps a limited number of meanings, but the field of meanings itself narrows. Examples are taken from the Webster’s dictionary with numerous meanings of the original term and a single meaning of a replica.

a) *folklore* (3) – *folklor* (the first meaning)

*hall* (8) – *hol* (5<sup>th</sup> b) meaning)

*party* (10) – *parti* (10<sup>th</sup> a) meaning)

b) *steward* (9) – *stjuard* (6<sup>th</sup> meaning).

*Expansion of meaning*, in contrast to the first two adaptations, falls under secondary changes, or secondary adaptation. For this change to occur, certain sociolinguistic conditions must be met (Filipović and Menac: 2005, 14). Filipović and Menac claim that “model must be completely integrated into the lexical system of  $L_R$  before expansion of meaning occurs” (ibid). Also, this adapted model must be in a free and spread usage in the vocabulary of the  $L_R$  for the considerable time. So, when all these conditions are met, these adapted loanwords with precise meaning can be used in a new context and their original meaning can be extended in either of these two ways: 1) in number of meanings; or 2) in field of meaning (ibid). Examples of the expansion of meaning are often in sports terminology, e.g. *out* and *corner*. However, in the process of the expansion of the meaning, it is not a rare case that created words do not exist as such in the English language, i.e. some Pseudoanglicisms occur, such as *glosser* or *darker* (Sočanac et al.: 2005, 202).

## 6. Methodological approach

Rudolf Filipović's approach served as the foundation for the development of the methodology used in this diploma thesis. Filipović, who spearheaded numerous projects in contact linguistics, made substantial contributions to the study of English loanwords. His books *Teorija jezika u kontaktu* and *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo – razvoj – značenje* serve as foundational texts for majority of studies on Anglicisms in Croatian, including this one. Additionally, he edited an English-Croatian dictionary titled *Rječnik Anglicizama u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku*, which is a crucial resource for this thesis. Over the years, many collaborators contributed to his work, but for this thesis, Antica Menac, co-author of *Engleski element u hrvatskome i ruskom jeziku*, is particularly noteworthy. All aforementioned books were originally written in Croatian, thus, selected sections were translated into English for this paper.

Building on Filipović's methodological framework, this thesis analyses a corpus of English elements found in the names of food and beverage establishments in Zadar and their orthographic and morphological adaptation. The data was collected through a field research method, and it is presented in two forms: on the official *Zadar City Map* provided by the *Zadar Tourist Board* and in a table listing the addresses and neighbourhood names marked on the map. Including the parameter of location was essential to ensure the credibility and validity of the collected data. The entire process is detailed in the following subchapter. The survey was conducted in October 2023, and the only criterion for selecting the names of food and beverage establishments was that they were open at the time.

It is impossible to conduct this research without at least mentioning similar previous studies in the Zadar County area. Vjekoslav Ćosić and Ana Mahnić-Ćosić, in their book *Zadar's Linguistic Landscapes (Company Names in Zadar County)*, listed the names of commercial enterprises in Zadar County and described the methods of their formation. They

collected their corpus from the *Business Directory of the Croatian Chamber of Commerce, Zadar County Chamber* from 1994, and from the *Croatian Economic Directory* from 1998, specifically the section related to Zadar County. Since the primary goal of their research was not to analyse foreign words in the collected corpus, they dedicated only a brief subchapter to English elements in the names of commercial enterprises. However, the list of names found on page 87 of their book indicates that the occurrence of Anglicisms in company names in the city of Zadar and Zadar County is not a recent phenomenon and that they were recorded in the previous century as well.

For the analysis of the adaptation of Anglicisms at the orthographic and morphological levels, it was essential to identify an Anglicism that is accepted in standard Croatian and its corresponding English model. These forms were found in the following sources: *Veliki rječnik hrvatskog standardnog jezika* written by Vladimir Anić, the online *Hrvatski jezični portal*, and Bratoljub Klaić's *Riječnik stranih riječi*. Also, three online English dictionaries were utilized to identify the English models: *The Cambridge Dictionary*, *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* and *Oxford English Dictionary*. Filipović's *Rječnik Anglicizama u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku*, as a vital part of his book *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo – razvoj – značenje*, was also used. The subsequent chapters provide a comprehensive analysis of these Anglicisms, examining both orthographic and morphological adaptations.

### 6.1. Analysed corpus and sources

When presenting the collected corpus in this research, it must be noted that more than half consists of non-integrated, internationalized English words or symbols. These items are not considered part of the Standard Croatian language lexicon and are not listed in any of the Croatian language dictionaries used in this research. Nevertheless, given their significant presence in the names of establishments providing food and beverage services in Zadar, they cannot be ignored. As Nikolić-Hoyt points out, it is important to attempt to record and describe

these *new* English words in the Croatian language, as they belong to the “contemporary state of the Croatian language system and the current (socio)linguistic constellations in Europe” (Sočanac et al.: 2005, 180). It is impossible to predict how long these terms will persist in the language or whether they will eventually become an integral part of the Croatian lexicon. Therefore, all English words that have not undergone adaptation and are used as *ad hoc* borrowings are considered Anglicisms and are listed and presented in this chapter. They are also included in the following chapters, which deal with the analysis of orthographic and morphological adaptation of Anglicisms.

Although nearly every hospitality establishment serving drinks includes the Anglicism *bar* in its name, for the purposes of this research, we have excluded names that do not contain any other English element besides this Anglicism. Still, Anglicism *bar* is part of the corpus and will be analysed in the following pages.

The following table, Table 1, presents 75 names of food and beverage establishments in the city of Zadar that include one or more English words or elements in their names. The names are organized according to the neighbourhoods they belong to, with each entry listing the corresponding address and the identifying number assigned to it on the map. The neighbourhoods are listed alphabetically (English alphabet with Croatian graphemes at the end), and their boundaries are not easily defined. For the purposes of this research, I used the names and boundaries of the neighbourhoods as depicted on the map of the city of Zadar issued by Zadar Tourist Board. It includes two maps: a map of the entire city and a map of Poluotok, which is the city centre. Both of them can be found in Appendix. The table consists of four columns titled: Neighbourhood, Full name of a food or beverage establishment, Address and Number on the map (see Appendix).

Table 1: Coffee bar and restaurant names in Zadar containing one or more English elements listed by neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	Full name of a food or beverage establishment	Address	Number on the map
Arbanasi	Caffe bar Tequila Sunrise	Put Klementa	1
Bili Brig	Caffe bar Biberon Cakes	Bleiburških žrtava 4	2
	Caffe bar City	Šibenska ulica 4	3
	Caffe bar Exit	Vinkovačka ulica 35b	4
	Caffe bar Hill	Šibenska ulica 9k	5
	Caffe bar Korner	Put Pudarice 13d	6
Brodarica	Gourmet & Grill Sfinga	Obala kneza Trpimira 12a	7
Crvene kuće	Cherry	Jadranska cesta 75	8
	KFC	Zagrebačka ulica 2a	9
	Twiga lounge bar	Antuna Dobronića 1	10
Gornji Bilig	Caffe Bar Ex	Ulica Hrvatskog Sabora 14	11
Jazine 1	Art caffe	Polačišće 4	12
	Butler Gourmet & Cocktails Garden	Obala kralja Tomislava 1	13
	Caffe Bar Harmony	Zrinsko frankopanska ulica 10	14
	City Bar	Polačišće 4	16
	Podroom Night Club	Obala kneza Tomislava 1	17

	Richard Gyros and Sweets	Obala kneza Branimira 2f	18
	Topsy bar	Obala kneza Branimira 2c	19
Jazine 2	Caffe bar ET	Ante Starčevića 11b	20
	Gagi's	Put Murvice 12d	21
Kolovare	Caffe Bar Popaj	Kolovare ulica 11	22
	Cuba Libre beach bar	Kolovare bb	23
	Vanilla bar	Kolovare ulica 11	24
Maslina	Caffe bar Night Dream	Otočkoga bataljuna 7	25
Novi Bokanjac	Caffe bar Red Point	Put Bokanjca 99	26
Plovanija	Pink Panther	Kožinski prilaz 1	27
Poluotok	Art Kavana	Ulica Bartola Kašića 1	28
	Bob Rock's - Bubble Waffle & Bubble Tea	Varoška ulica 5	29
	Caffe bar Docker	Šime Ljubavca 2	30
	Chill & Grill	Ul. Frana Supila 2	31
	Coffee & Cake	Braće Vranjana 12	32
	Crazy Pizza	Stomorica 1	33
	Deja Brew Pub	Borelli 8	34
	Downtown	Ulica Ruđera Boškovića 6	35
	Golden Garden	Borelli 12	36
	Gray Bar	Narodni trg 2	37



	Lounge & Bar Ledana	Park Kraljice Jelene Madijevke	38
	Morita bar & kitchen	Braće Bersa 1	39
	Mystique Bar & More	Ruđera Boškovića 4	40
	Pet Bunara Dine & Wine	Stratico ulica 1	41
	Proto food & more	Stratico ulica 1	42
	Providur restaurant & wine bar	Trg Petra Zoranića 6	43
	The Botanist	Mihovila Pavlinovića 4	44
	The Factory Bar	Rudera Boškovića 4	45
	The Garden Lounge	Bedemi zadarskih pobuna 2a	46
	Wine Bar Dišpet	Svete Nediljice 2	47
Puntamika	Beach Bar Bamboo	Obala Kneza Domagoja 19	48
	Burgers & more	Antuna Gustava Matoša 36	49
	Famous Beach Bar & Grill	Majstora Radovana 7	50
	Forty Bar Coffee & Food	Obala kneza Domagoja 1	51
	Yachting Bar & Club	Obala kneza Domagoja 1	52
Sinjoretovo	Code Bar	Ul. Nikole Jurišića 1a	53

	Fresh & Easy	Ulica 4. Gardijske Brigade 69	54
Višnjik	Caffe Bar One Way (The Red One)	Ulica Stjepana Radića 42 c	55
	Kamera's bar Gin & Coffee	Domovinskog rata 2	56
	THE BAR	Andrije Hebranga 10 d	57
Voštarnica	BackStage Bar Pub	Andrije Hebranga 9	58
	Brlog craft beer bar & shop	Ulica Andrije Hebranga 6	59
	Caffe bar IN	Franje Tuđmana 46	60
	Coffee Time	Andrije Hebranga 11 c	61
	Destino Coffee & Wine bar	Postrojbi specijlna policije Zadar 2	62
	Harbor Cookhouse & Club	Obala kneza Branimira 6 a	63
	Hype Club	Obala kneza Branimira 6 a	64
	Mini bar	Ulica bana Josipa Jelačića 27	65
	Pirate bar	Obala kneza Branimira 4	66
Škambinje	Foodie	Akcije Maslenica 1	67
	Jadera Ice Bar	Akcije Maslenica 1	68

	Mc'Donalds	Akcije Maslenica 1	69
	McCafe	Akcije Maslenica 1	70
	Mex	Akcije Maslenica 1	71
	Wok Me	Akcije Maslenica 1	72
Špada	Caffe Bar Queens	Benka Benkovića 1a	73
	Caffe bar Street	Put Bokanjca 18	74
	Lo-Cal Grill	Put Nina 2	75
	Monster Kebab	Benka Benkovića bb	15

Among these 75 names, many contain more than one English element, and many are repeated. By analysing names from the table above, I have compiled a corpus of Anglicisms presented in the following table – Table 2. It consists of three columns - Model (English word), Replica (Anglicism), and, if they exist, other variants recorded in Croatian language dictionaries. These dictionaries are indicated in parentheses next to each variant, referring either to the *Hrvatski jezični portal* or to Filipović's *Rječnik anglicizama*. These variants of the same Anglicism are significant as they reflect different levels of integration of English loanwords into the Croatian linguistic system (Sočanac et al.: 2005, 191). According to Nikolić-Hoyt, these discrepancies arise because there is a dual objective: “to conform to the norms of the Standard Croatian language by selecting the most adapted variant, while simultaneously acknowledging the prestigious global status of English, which usually includes a retention of its recognizable original form” (ibid). Given that the main goal of this research is analysis of the orthographic and morphological adaptation of Anglicisms to the Croatian language system, these Anglicisms from the aforementioned corpus will be analysed in the following chapters.

Table 2: Corpus of Anglicisms

<b>Model</b>	<b>Replica</b>	<b>Variants</b>
<i>art</i>	<i>art</i>	
<i>backstage</i>	<i>backstage</i>	
<i>bamboo</i>	<i>bamboo</i>	<i>bambus, bambusovina</i> (Hrvatski jezični portal)
<i>bar</i>	<i>bar</i>	
<i>beach bar</i>	<i>beach bar</i>	
<i>Bob Rock's</i>	<i>Bob Rock's</i>	
<i>botanist</i>	<i>botanist</i>	<i>botaničar, botanik</i> (Hrvatski jezični portal)
<i>bubble tea</i>	<i>bubble tea</i>	
<i>bubble waffle</i>	<i>bubble waffle</i>	<i>bubble vafl</i> (Hrvatski jezični portal)
<i>burger</i>	<i>burger</i>	
<i>butler</i>	<i>butler</i>	<i>batler</i> (Hrvatski jezični portal)
<i>cake(s)</i>	<i>cake(s)</i>	<i>keks(i)</i> (Filipović's Rječnik anglicizama)
<i>chill</i>	<i>chill</i>	
<i>city</i>	<i>city</i>	
<i>club</i>	<i>club</i>	<i>klub</i> (Filipović's Rječnik anglicizama)
<i>cocktail</i>	<i>cocktail</i>	<i>koktel</i> (Hrvatski jezični portal)
<i>code</i>	<i>code</i>	<i>kod</i> (Hrvatski jezični portal)
<i>cookhouse</i>	<i>cookhouse</i>	
<i>craft beer</i>	<i>craft beer</i>	
<i>crazy</i>	<i>crazy</i>	

<i>crispy</i>	<i>crispy</i>	
<i>deja brew</i>	<i>deja brew</i>	
<i>dine &amp; wine</i>	<i>dine &amp; wine</i>	
<i>docker</i>	<i>docker</i>	
<i>downtown</i>	<i>downtown</i>	
<i>easy</i>	<i>easy</i>	
<i>ex</i>	<i>ex</i>	
<i>exit</i>	<i>exit</i>	
<i>factory</i>	<i>factory</i>	
<i>famous</i>	<i>famous</i>	
<i>fast food</i>	<i>fast food</i>	
<i>foodie</i>	<i>foodie</i>	<i>foody</i> (Hrvatski jezični portal)
<i>food</i>	<i>food</i>	
<i>forty</i>	<i>forty</i>	<i>forti</i> (Filipović's Rječnik anglicizama)
<i>fresh</i>	<i>fresh</i>	
<i>Gagi's</i>	<i>Gagi's</i>	
<i>garden</i>	<i>garden</i>	
<i>gin</i>	<i>gin</i>	<i>đin, džin</i> (Filipović's Rječnik anglicizama)
<i>golden</i>	<i>golden</i>	
<i>gray</i>	<i>gray</i>	
<i>grill</i>	<i>grill</i>	<i>gril</i> (Filipović's Rječnik anglicizama)
<i>harbor</i>	<i>harbor</i>	
<i>harmony</i>	<i>harmony</i>	<i>harmonija</i> (Hrvatski jezični portal)
<i>hill</i>	<i>hill</i>	

<i>hype</i>	<i>hype</i>	
<i>ice bar</i>	<i>ice bar</i>	
<i>in</i>	<i>in</i>	
<i>Kambara's</i>	<i>Kambara's</i>	
<i>KFC</i>	<i>KFC</i>	
<i>kitchen</i>	<i>kitchen</i>	
<i>corner</i>	<i>korner</i>	
<i>lounge</i>	<i>lounge</i>	
<i>McCafe</i>	<i>McCafe</i>	
<i>McDonalds</i>	<i>McDonalds</i>	
<i>me</i>	<i>me</i>	
<i>mini</i>	<i>mini</i>	
<i>monster</i>	<i>monster</i>	
<i>more</i>	<i>more</i>	
<i>night club</i>	<i>night club</i>	
<i>night dream</i>	<i>night dream</i>	
<i>one</i>	<i>one</i>	
<i>Pink Panther</i>	<i>pink panther</i>	
<i>pirate</i>	<i>pirate</i>	
<i>Popeye</i>	<i>Popaj</i>	
<i>pub</i>	<i>pub</i>	
<i>Queens</i>	<i>Queens</i>	
<i>red</i>	<i>red</i>	
<i>red point</i>	<i>red point</i>	

<i>shop</i>	<i>shop</i>	
<i>street</i>	<i>street</i>	
<i>sweets</i>	<i>sweets</i>	
<i>the</i>	<i>the</i>	
<i>topsy</i>	<i>topsy</i>	
<i>time</i>	<i>time</i>	
<i>vanilla</i>	<i>vanilla</i>	<i>vanilija</i> (Hrvatski jezični portal)
<i>way</i>	<i>way</i>	
<i>wine bar</i>	<i>wine bar</i>	
<i>yachting</i>	<i>yachting</i>	

## 7. The examination of the corpus

As previously indicated, Anglicisms undergo the process of adaptation to the Croatian language system on four different levels in order to become an integral part of the Croatian lexicon. Given that the primary objective of this research is the orthographic and morphological adaptation of Anglicisms to the Croatian language system, the Anglicisms from the aforementioned corpus will be analysed in this section.

### 7.1. *The adaptation of Anglicisms - orthographic level*

Prior to conducting the analysis of the collected corpus, a more detailed explanation of the theoretical background of adaptation on the orthographic level should be provided. As previously discussed in the theoretical section of this paper, there are four main principles according to which the orthography of Anglicisms is formed: “based on the model's pronunciation, based on the model's orthography, a combination of the model's pronunciation and orthography, and under the influence of an intermediary language” (Filipović: 1990, 28).

English and Croatian are both written in the same script, i.e., the Latin alphabet, which greatly influences the process of forming the orthography of Anglicisms (Filipović and Menac: 2005, 16). However, the alphabets of these two languages are not identical. The English alphabet consists of twenty six graphemes: “⟨a⟩, ⟨b⟩, ⟨c⟩, ⟨d⟩, ⟨e⟩, ⟨f⟩, ⟨g⟩, ⟨h⟩, ⟨i⟩, ⟨j⟩, ⟨k⟩, ⟨l⟩, ⟨m⟩, ⟨n⟩, ⟨o⟩, ⟨p⟩, ⟨q⟩, ⟨r⟩, ⟨s⟩, ⟨t⟩, ⟨u⟩, ⟨v⟩, ⟨w⟩, ⟨x⟩, ⟨y⟩, ⟨z⟩” (ibid). Croatian alphabet includes thirty letters: “⟨a⟩, ⟨b⟩, ⟨c⟩, ⟨č⟩, ⟨ć⟩, ⟨d⟩, ⟨dž⟩, ⟨đ⟩, ⟨e⟩, ⟨f⟩, ⟨g⟩, ⟨h⟩, ⟨i⟩, ⟨j⟩, ⟨k⟩, ⟨l⟩, ⟨lj⟩, ⟨m⟩, ⟨n⟩, ⟨nj⟩, ⟨o⟩, ⟨p⟩, ⟨r⟩, ⟨s⟩, ⟨š⟩, ⟨t⟩, ⟨u⟩, ⟨v⟩, ⟨z⟩, ⟨ž⟩” (ibid).

#### 7.1.1. *Pronunciation of the model*

For the analysis of the orthography of Anglicisms formed according to the model's pronunciation is important to identify which graphemes of  $L_R$  can represent the phonemes of  $L_G$  (Sočanac et al.: 2005, 189). Specifically, in English, a single grapheme can represent multiple phonemes, meaning the same grapheme sometimes denotes different phonemes. In



contrast, in Croatian, each phoneme is consistently represented by a corresponding grapheme (ibid). In other words, the English phonological system consists of forty four phonemes, while the Croatian alphabet has thirty graphemes (Filipović and Menac: 2005, 17). Therefore, there are certain discrepancies when forty four phonemes need to be recorded using thirty written characters.

Thus, Nikolić-Hoyt, relying on Filipović's classification, divided all vowel, consonant, and diphthong phonemes into three groups and demonstrated how to correctly represent English phonemes using Croatian graphemes: "First group includes five English vowels /i:/, /e/, /ʌ/, /ɔ:/, /u:/ and sixteen consonants /b/, /g/, /m/, /n/, /f/, /v/, /l/, /h/, /s/, /z/, /ʃ/, /ʒ/, /tʃ/, /dʒ/, /j/, /r/ in/. Since these have corresponding phonemes in Croatian, they are represented by corresponding Croatian graphemes: ⟨i⟩, ⟨e⟩, ⟨a⟩, ⟨o⟩, ⟨u⟩ and ⟨b⟩, ⟨g⟩, ⟨m⟩, ⟨n⟩, ⟨f⟩, ⟨v⟩, ⟨l⟩, ⟨h⟩, ⟨s⟩, ⟨z⟩, ⟨š⟩, ⟨ž⟩, ⟨č⟩, ⟨dž⟩, ⟨j⟩, ⟨r⟩" (Sočanac et al.: 2005, 189-190). In the second group, five English vowel phonemes /ɪ/, /æ/, /a:/, /ɒ/, /ʊ/ are represented by Croatian orthographic equivalents: ⟨i⟩, ⟨e⟩, ⟨a⟩, ⟨o⟩, ⟨u⟩, while four English consonant phonemes /p/, /t/, /d/, /k/ are represented by Croatian graphemes ⟨p⟩, ⟨t⟩, ⟨d⟩, ⟨k⟩ (ibid).

The third group consists of eight English diphthong phonemes, which can be replaced in two possible ways. As diphthongs are absent in the Croatian language, they must be substituted with the nearest orthographic equivalents. First possibility is the reduction of English diphthongs into Croatian monophthongs and the second one is replacement of diphthong by bisyllabic cluster. In the first scenario, Nikolić-Hoyt claims that "English diphthongs /eɪ/, /aɪ/, /ɔɪ/, /aʊ/ become Croatian two-letter monosyllabic clusters ⟨ej⟩, ⟨aj⟩, ⟨oj⟩ and ⟨au⟩. On the other hand, /əʊ/, /iə/, /eə/, /ʊə/ can be represented as ⟨ou⟩, ⟨ir⟩, ⟨er⟩ and ⟨ur⟩" (ibid). Additionally, this group includes four English consonant phonemes /θ/, /ð/, /ŋ/, /w/. In Anglicisms, they are represented by Croatian graphemes ⟨t⟩, ⟨d⟩, ⟨ng⟩, and ⟨v⟩ (ibid).

### 7.1.2. Orthography of the model

Filipović notes that there are certain deviations from direct orthographic alignment between the English model and Croatian replica during the adaptation process. Specifically, the issue arises because these two languages have fundamentally different methods of forming orthography. While  $L_G$ , i.e., English has an orthography based on the etymology of words,  $L_R$ , i.e., Croatian forms its orthography on the principle of a grapheme for a phoneme, meaning the orthography relies on pronunciation (Filipović: 1990, 56). Still, there are two fundamental principles that facilitate adaptation to orthography:

1. “English double consonants are replaced by single Croatian grapheme:  $\langle bb \rangle \rightarrow \langle b \rangle$ ,  $\langle ll \rangle \rightarrow \langle l \rangle$ ,  $\langle mm \rangle \rightarrow \langle m \rangle$ ,  $\langle ss \rangle \rightarrow \langle s \rangle$ ,  $\langle tt \rangle \rightarrow \langle t \rangle$ ” (ibid).
2. “Letters of the English alphabet that do not exist in Croatian are replaced based on the principle of similar pronunciation:  $\langle q \rangle \rightarrow \langle kv \rangle$ ,  $\langle w \rangle \rightarrow \langle v \rangle$ ,  $\langle x \rangle \rightarrow \langle ks \rangle$ ,  $\langle y \rangle \rightarrow \langle j \rangle$ ” (ibid).

In recent times, a significant number of “new Anglicisms” retain the orthographic form of the model, i.e., English orthography. Nikolić-Hoyt associates this phenomenon “with the prestigious status of the English language and culture in the contemporary world” (Sočanac et al: 2005, 190). The retention of the original spelling of the source, which characterizes the completely unadapted forms of *new* English words in Croatian, is supported by numerous examples from the corpus of this research.

### 7.1.3. Combination of orthography and pronunciation

In this type of adaptation, the spelling of Anglicisms is formed by considering both, pronunciation and orthography. For instance, English *interview* /'intəvjʊ:/ becomes Croatian *intervju* /intervju/, where the first part copies the orthography of the model and the second part model's pronunciation. In the cases like *dealer* /'di:lə/ > *diler* /diler/, the process is reversed. Filipović also describes another scenario where an Anglicism maintains its original English spelling, but adjusts its pronunciation to fit Croatian standards through transphonemization

(Filipović: 1990, 57). For instance, *casual* /'kæʒuəl/ is adapted as *casual* /kežual/. Due to the fact that these cases involve a combination of Croatianised pronunciation and original orthography, this third category of orthographic adaptation of Anglicisms is the most numerous (ibid).

#### 7.1.4. Intermediary language

“The adaptation of the English model is sometimes influenced by the intermediary language because the transfer of the model into the recipient language was not direct” (Filipović and Menac: 2005, 18). Determining the extent of the intermediary language's influence on the formation of the spelling of Anglicisms is not always straightforward. Throughout history, the most common intermediary languages were French and German, whereas today, according to Nikolić-Hoyt, English words are most often adopted directly from the model language through various media channels, without influence from other languages on the process of creating replica.

#### 7.1.5. Analysis of the corpus - orthographic level

The following table presents an analysis of the orthographic adaptation of Anglicisms, showing a model, a replica, and the method of adaptation employed. The table with five columns presents models alongside four possible adaptation on the orthographic level: according to pronunciation, according to orthography, a combination of orthography and pronunciation, and under the influence of the intermediary language. The models are organized alphabetically. Both the model and its replica are provided with their respective transcriptions if pronunciation is relevant for the adaptation process, mostly in the cases when orthography is formed according to the pronunciation or the combination of orthography and pronunciation.

Table 3: Orthographic analysis of Anglicisms

Model	Pronunciation	Orthography	Combination of orthography	Intermediary language

			<b>and pronunciation</b>	
<i>art</i> /ɑ:t/		<i>art</i> /art/		
<i>backstage</i> /bæk'steɪdʒ/			<i>backstage</i> /bekstejdʒ/	
<i>bamboo</i> /bæm'bu:/		<i>bamboo</i> /bambu/		
<i>bar</i> /bɑ:r/		<i>bar</i> /bar/		
<i>beach bar</i>		<i>beach bar</i>		
<i>Bob Rock's</i>		<i>Bob Rock's</i>		
<i>botanist</i>		<i>botanist</i>		
<i>bubble tea</i>		<i>bubble tea</i>		
<i>bubble waffle</i>		<i>bubble waffle</i>		
<i>burger</i> /'bɜ:.gər/			<i>burger</i> /burger/	
<i>butler</i> /'bʌt.lər/			<i>butler</i> /batler/	
<i>cake(s)</i>				
<i>chill</i>				
<i>city</i> /'sɪt.i/			<i>city</i> /siti/	
<i>club</i>		<i>club</i>		
<i>cocktail</i> /'kɒk.teɪl/			<i>cocktail</i> /kɒktel/	
<i>code</i>		<i>code</i>		
<i>cookhouse</i>		<i>cookhouse</i>		
<i>corner</i> /'kɔ:nə/			<i>korner</i> /kɒrner/	

<i>craft beer</i>		<i>craft beer</i>		
<i>crazy</i>		<i>crazy</i>		
<i>crispy</i>		<i>crispy</i>		
<i>deja brew</i>		<i>deja brew</i>		
<i>dine &amp; wine</i>		<i>dine &amp; wine</i>		
<i>docker</i>		<i>docker</i>		
<i>downtown</i>		<i>downtown</i>		
<i>easy</i>		<i>easy</i>		
<i>ex</i>		<i>ex</i>		
<i>exit</i>		<i>exit</i>		
<i>factory</i>		<i>factory</i>		
<i>famous</i>		<i>famous</i>		
<i>fast food</i>		<i>fast food</i>		
<i>foodie</i> /'fu:.di/			<i>foodie</i> /fudi/	
<i>food</i>		<i>food</i>		
<i>forty</i> /'fɔ:.ti/			<i>forty</i> /forti/	
<i>fresh</i>		<i>fresh</i>		
<i>Gagi's</i>		<i>Gagi's</i>		
<i>garden</i> /'gɑ:.dən/		<i>garden</i> /garden/		
<i>gin</i> /dʒɪn/		<i>gin</i> /dʒɪn/		
<i>golden</i> /'gəʊl.dən/		<i>golden</i> /golden/		
<i>gray</i> /greɪ/			<i>gray</i> /grej/	

<i>grill</i> /grɪl/		<i>grill</i> /grɪl/		
<i>harbor</i>		<i>harbor</i>		
<i>harmony</i>		<i>harmony</i>		
<i>hill</i>		<i>hill</i>		
<i>hype</i>		<i>hype</i>		
<i>ice bar</i>		<i>ice bar</i>		
<i>in</i>		<i>in</i>		
<i>Kambara's</i>		<i>Kambara's</i>		
<i>KFC</i>		<i>KFC</i>		
<i>kitchen</i>		<i>kitchen</i>		
<i>lounge</i> /laʊndʒ/		<i>lounge</i> /laʊnd/		
<i>McCafe</i>		<i>McCafe</i>		
<i>McDonald's</i>		<i>McDonald's</i>		
<i>me</i>		<i>me</i>		
<i>mini</i> /'mɪn.i/		<i>mini</i> /mini/		
<i>monster</i> /'mɒn.stər/			<i>monster</i> /monster/	
<i>more</i>		<i>more</i>		
<i>night club</i>		<i>night club</i>		
<i>night dream</i>		<i>night dream</i>		
<i>one</i>		<i>one</i>		
<i>Pink Panther</i> /pɪŋk 'pæn.θər/		<i>pink panther</i> /pink panter/		
<i>pirate</i>		<i>pirate</i>		

<i>Popeye</i> /'pɒp.əi/	<i>Popaj</i> /popaj/			
<i>pub</i> /pʌb/		<i>pub</i> /pab/		
<i>Queens</i>		<i>Queens</i>		
<i>red</i>		<i>red</i>		
<i>red point</i>		<i>red point</i>		
<i>shop</i>		<i>shop</i>		
<i>street</i>		<i>street</i>		
<i>sweets</i>		<i>sweets</i>		
<i>the (bar)</i>		<i>the (bar)</i>		
<i>topsy</i>		<i>topsy</i>		
<i>time</i>		<i>time</i>		
<i>vanilla</i>		<i>vanilla</i>		
<i>way</i>		<i>way</i>		
<i>wine bar</i>		<i>wine bar</i>		
<i>yachting</i> /'jɒtɪŋ/			<i>yachting</i> /jahting/	

When we convert the analysis from the table into numbers, we obtain the following results: 64 Anglicisms were adapted based on orthography alone, 11 Anglicisms were adapted considering a combination of pronunciation and orthography, and only one example showed the orthography of the replica formed according to the pronunciation of the original model. There were no instances of orthographic adaptation influenced by an intermediary language in our corpus. Given that most Anglicisms enter the Croatian language in written form, these results are not surprising. Additionally, as previously mentioned, direct contact between these

two languages is now standard, with German and French having historically given up their roles as intermediary languages to mass media. This is confirmed by the results of this analysis, which did not record any instances of intermediary language influence on the formation of the replicas' orthography.

Moreover, considering their prevalence, Anglicisms that retained original English orthography but have a Croatianised pronunciation deserve special attention. According to Filipović's classification, these Anglicisms fall into the category where the orthography of replica is "a combination of pronunciation and orthography of the model" (Filipović: 1990, 57). Filipović argues that this category is the most numerous precisely because of such examples, and in our research, it ranks second in terms of frequency. In this case, the Croatianised pronunciation of Anglicisms is regarded as the measure of adaptation, with pronunciation often considered a possible future written version of the Anglicism (ibid, 50). However, this research shows opposite results. Many Anglicisms such as *butler*, *cocktail*, *forty* and *gin* have variants formed according to pronunciation, recorded in Filipović's Dictionary of Anglicisms: *batler*, *koktel*, *forti*, *đin* or *džin*. This indicates that alongside Anglicisms with higher levels of adaptation and better alignment with the Croatian language system, those retaining the original English orthography have been chosen. We will not delve into the reasons for such choices, but it can be noted that it contradicts the established tendency that if a foreign term lacks a suitable equivalent in the language, the borrowed terms chosen are typically those with the highest degree of adaptation.

## 7.2. The adaptation of Anglicisms - morphological level

In the theoretical part, we have already outlined the changes through which the citation form of the model undergoes during its adaptation and transition into the basic form of the recipient language, explained the differences between free and bound morphemes, and explained the concept of transmorphemization along with its degrees. In this section, we will analyse how



these rules of transmorphemization apply to parts of speech and grammatical morphological categories associated with them. Specifically, morphological adaptation occurs due to differences between the morphological systems of two languages in contact, so it is necessary to first identify these differences between English and Croatian morphological systems.

According to Nikolić-Hoyt, there are numerous differences in the morphological systems of the English and Croatian languages. The first difference is in the way the basic form of four main types of words: nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs, is created. In the English language, they fall into the category of the citation form based on the principle of a free morpheme + zero bound morpheme, while in the Croatian language, there are characteristic inflections for individual parts of speech and their morphological categories, i.e., gender, number, and case for nominal words (nouns, pronouns, adjectives, and numbers) and person, number, tense, mood, and aspect for verbs (Sočanac et al.: 2005, 192). Therefore, morphological adaptation of the model, in addition to forming the basic morphological form of replica, also includes the synchronization of morphological categories between the two languages (Filipović: 1990, 34).

Second difference in how gender is determined in English and Croatian. “In English, gender is natural, whereas in Croatian, it is grammatical” (Filipović: 1990, 34). Consequently, since the gender of an Anglicism is conveyed through a bound morpheme, gender adaptation includes the process of transmorphemization. However, a zero morpheme can also indicate the gender of the Anglicism (ibid). This applies to Anglicisms that retain their natural gender, such as masculine nouns referring to male individuals like *cowboy*, *gentleman* and *pilot*. Anglicisms that consist of a zero morpheme and end with a consonant are generally considered masculine, e.g.: *clown* > *klaun*, *golf* > *golf*, *lift* > *lift*, *tennis* > *tenis*, etc. Filipović named this phenomenon *the tendency of the masculine gender* and included in this category Anglicisms ending in -o, -

*i*, or *-u*. This is seen as a form of innovation in the morphological system, as it diverges from the Croatian language rule that nouns ending in *-o* are usually neuter.

On the other hand, gender based on biological sex is assigned to female naming nouns by using the suffix *-a*, which is a typical Croatian suffix for feminine nouns. Through zero transmorphemization, a few English models ending in *-a* have been adopted. Since bound morphemes are typically not borrowed from a giving language, most of these feminine nouns ending in *-a* are created through the process of compromise transmorphemization, such as *stewardess* > *stjuardesa*. In some cases, the feminine gender of Anglicism is a result of *contamination*, i.e., semantic analogy between words in the recipient language, such as *farm* > *farma* (analogy with the word *zemlja*) or *jungle* > *džungla* (analogy with *šuma*) (Filipović and Menac: 2005, 40).

Moreover, English verbs do not have an infinitive inflection that distinguishes them from the other types of words, so the rules of verb formation in the Croatian language dictate the process of the basic verb form development of Anglicisms (Filipović: 1990, 35). While English verbs often do not visibly differ from nouns in form, verbs in Croatian typically end with the recognizable infinitive inflection *-ti*, less commonly *-ći*. Only inflection *-ti* is used in forming verb Anglicisms infinitive form and various verb suffixes can precede it (Filipović and Menac: 2005, 41). The most common suffixes in verb formation are:

*-a-* as in *box* > *boksati*, *mix* > *miksati*

*-ira-* as in *boycott* > *bojkotirati*, *foul* > *faulirati*, *sponsor* > *sponzorirati*

*-izira-* as in *standard* > *standardizirati*,

and *-ova-* as in *lynch* > *linčovati*.

Prefixes are typical for secondary adaptation of verb Anglicisms and the most frequently selected ones are:

*iz-* (*is-*), e.g.: *box* > *boksati* > *izboksati*

*na-*, e.g.: *tattoo* > *tetovirati* > *natetovirati*

*po-*, e.g.: *spray* > *sprejati* > *posprejati*

*pre-*, e.g., *code* > *kodirati* > *prekodirati*

*pro-*, e.g., *mix* > *miksati* > *promiksati*

*za-* and *de-*, e.g. *code* > *kodirati* > *dekodirati*.

In all the examples given, prefixes were used to change the aspect of the verb. This is another major difference between English and Croatian morphological systems. The English verb system lacks this morphological category, whereas Croatian verbs can be categorized according to verb aspect as follows: verbs that have forms for both perfective and imperfective aspects, verbs that appear in only one aspect, and biaspectual verbs in which both perfective and imperfective meanings are conveyed by the same form and the verbal aspect is defined by context (Filipović and Menac: 2005, 49). Filipović and Menac add that “English verb model typically have a single morphological form and do not express verbal aspect, but during primary adaptation, verbs are fully integrated and can indicate either perfective, imperfective, or biaspectual aspects” (ibid). During the secondary adaptation, biaspectual and imperfective verbs are additionally adapted, using prefixes, suffixes or infixes, in order to denote the perfective aspect (Filipović: 1990, 35-36). Some examples are listed above.

Nikolić-Hoyt categorized English borrowed adjectives into two groups (Sočanac et al: 2005, 196-197). The first group consists of adjectives that are directly borrowed from English. Some of these Anglicisms are “new borrowings” that remain completely unadapted and are considered foreign words, e.g., *dry*, *fake*, *juicy*. The others are Anglicisms that have been adapted in primary adaptation on both phonological and morphological levels, representing compromise replicas because they have retained all morphological features of English adjectives, e.g., *fit* and *seksi*. Their basic form is created by zero transmorphemization as they have a zero bound morpheme. The second group consists of adjectives adapted through

secondary adaptation. These adjectives are derived from the base form of an already adapted English borrowed noun, achieved through complete transmorphemization using Croatian adjective suffixes: *-an*, *-ov*, *-ski*. They show all morphological characteristics of Croatian adjectives. For instance: *rekordan*, *lordov* and *darkerski*.

### 7. 2. 1. Analysis of the corpus – morphological level

According to Haugen, statistical data indicate that borrowed material primarily consists of three types of words: nouns (approximately 75%), verbs (18%), and adjectives (slightly over 3%) (Haugen: 1969, 406 cited in Filipović and Menac: 2005, 38). This study partially supports that Haugen's claim. The majority of Anglicisms from the corpus are nouns, with a smaller number of adjectives and only two verbs. However, the corpus also contains some other types of words that are not typical of language borrowing, such as the definite article *the*, the conjunction *&*, the preposition *in*, the pronoun *me*, and the number *one*. In the following text, we will use tables to illustrate the different levels of morphological adaptation of Anglicisms from the corpus. Table 4 includes those Anglicisms formed through zero transmorphemization, meaning that the model enters the receiving language as a free (foreign) morpheme without any bound morphemes, and the replica is accepted into the morphological system of L<sub>R</sub> without any formal changes (Sočanac et al.: 2005, 193). The table contains two columns - the first lists the English model, while the second one presents the Anglicism in the Croatian language.

Table 4: Zero transmorphemization

English model	Anglicism
free morpheme + zero suffix	free morpheme + zero bound morpheme
<i>art</i>	<i>art</i>
<i>backstage</i>	<i>backstage</i>
<i>bamboo</i>	<i>bamboo</i>
<i>bar</i>	<i>bar</i>
<i>beach bar</i>	<i>beach bar</i>

<i>bubble tea</i>	<i>bubble tea</i>
<i>bubble waffle</i>	<i>bubble waffle</i>
<i>chill</i>	<i>chill</i>
<i>city</i>	<i>city</i>
<i>club</i>	<i>club</i>
<i>cocktail</i>	<i>cocktail</i>
<i>code</i>	<i>code</i>
<i>cookhouse</i>	<i>cookhouse</i>
<i>corner</i>	<i>korner</i>
<i>craft beer</i>	<i>craft beer</i>
<i>crazy</i>	<i>crazy</i>
<i>crispy</i>	<i>crispy</i>
<i>deja brew</i>	<i>deja brew</i>
<i>dine &amp; wine</i>	<i>dine &amp; wine</i>
<i>downtown</i>	<i>downtown</i>
<i>easy</i>	<i>easy</i>
<i>ex</i>	<i>ex</i>
<i>exit</i>	<i>exit</i>
<i>factory</i>	<i>factory</i>
<i>famous</i>	<i>famous</i>
<i>fast food</i>	<i>fast food</i>
<i>food</i>	<i>food</i>
<i>forty</i>	<i>forty</i>
<i>fresh</i>	<i>fresh</i>
<i>garden</i>	<i>garden</i>
<i>gin</i>	<i>gin</i>
<i>grill</i>	<i>grill</i>
<i>harbor</i>	<i>harbor</i>
<i>harmony</i>	<i>harmony</i>
<i>hill</i>	<i>hill</i>
<i>hype</i>	<i>hype</i>
<i>ice bar</i>	<i>ice bar</i>

<i>in</i>	<i>in</i>
<i>KFC</i>	<i>KFC</i>
<i>kitchen</i>	<i>kitchen</i>
<i>lounge</i>	<i>lounge</i>
<i>McCafe</i>	<i>McCafe</i>
<i>me</i>	<i>me</i>
<i>mini</i>	<i>mini</i>
<i>monster</i>	<i>monster</i>
<i>more</i>	<i>more</i>
<i>night club</i>	<i>night club</i>
<i>night dream</i>	<i>night dream</i>
<i>one</i>	<i>one</i>
<i>Pink Panther</i>	<i>Pink Panther</i>
<i>pirate</i>	<i>pirate</i>
<i>Popeye</i>	<i>Popaj</i>
<i>pub</i>	<i>pub</i>
<i>red</i>	<i>red</i>
<i>red point</i>	<i>red point</i>
<i>shop</i>	<i>shop</i>
<i>street</i>	<i>street</i>
<i>topsy</i>	<i>topsy</i>

The table lists as many as 58 examples of zero transmorphemization of Anglicisms from the corpus. This type of transmorphemization is, in fact, quite common because a large number of nouns in both languages, English and Croatian, end in a consonant and have no bound morpheme (Soćanac et al.: 2005, 193). Just a few examples from the corpus are: *art*, *bar*, *beach bar*, *chill*, *club*, *cocktail*, *gin*, *grill*, *harbor*, *shop*, and *street*. This group also includes English nouns that end in *-y*, *-i*, or *-u*, because in the Croatian language, these vowels cannot be found in the final position of the nominative singular of native words. Therefore, they retain the vowel as part of the base in Anglicism and behave like native nouns that have a zero morpheme in the

nominative singular (ibid). Examples found in the corpus: *bubble waffle*, *code*, *city*, *factory*, *forty* and *hype*.

The basic form of English adjectival loanwords is also created through zero transphonemization because they have a zero bound morpheme (ibid, 196). Some examples from the corpus include: *craft*, *crazy*, *crispy*, *easy*, *ex*, *famous*, *fresh*, *mini* and *red*. These are “new Anglicisms”, unadapted, and they fall into the category of foreign words in the Croatian language. They represent compromise replicas as they have retained all the morphological characteristics of English adjectives (invariability) but have not adopted the main characteristics of adjectives in Croatian (marking gender, number, and case) (ibid). Additionally, these loanwords do not fit into the system of adjectival comparison in Croatian. Instead, they form the comparative descriptively using the word *više*, such as *više crazy*, *više crispy* and *više fresh*.

The second degree of morphological adaptation is compromise transmorphemization. It includes Anglicisms with a bound morpheme, specifically a suffix typical of the English language that does not exist in Croatian. English bound morphemes mostly have equivalents in Croatian, but at this level of morphological adaptation, the English morpheme is not replaced by its Croatian equivalent; instead, it is retained and becomes an integral part of the Anglicism. Anglicisms from the corpus that have undergone this second degree of transmorphemization are listed in Table 5. It has two columns - the first lists the English model and the second lists the Anglicism. Additionally, each word is divided into its free and bound morphemes to highlight the presence of English bound morpheme in both examples.

Table 5: Compromise transmorphemisation

<b>English model</b> free morpheme + suffix	<b>Anglicism</b> free morpheme + English bound morpheme
<i>Bob Rock-'s</i>	<i>Bob Rock-'s</i>
<i>botan-ist</i>	<i>botan-ist</i>

<i>burg-er</i>	<i>burg-er</i>
<i>butl-er</i>	<i>butl-er</i>
<i>cake-s</i>	<i>cake-s</i>
<i>dock-er</i>	<i>dock-er</i>
<i>food-ie</i>	<i>food-ie</i>
<i>Gagi- 's</i>	<i>Gagi- 's</i>
<i>gold-en</i>	<i>gold-en</i>
<i>Kamera- 's</i>	<i>Kamera- 's</i>
<i>McDonald- 's</i>	<i>McDonald- 's</i>
<i>Queen-s</i>	<i>Queen-s</i>
<i>sweet-s</i>	<i>sweet-s</i>
<i>yacht-ing</i>	<i>yacht-ing</i>

Within the corpus of Anglicisms in the names of coffee bar and restaurant names in the city of Zadar, a total of 14 have undergone compromise transmorphemization—eight nouns and five adjectives. The bound morpheme *-er*, usually denoting the agent of an action, appears in three examples: *butler*, *burger*, and *docker*. The agent can also be expressed with the suffix *-ist*, as in the example *botanist*. Among other English bound morphemes, we find *-ie* in *foodie*, *-ing* in *yachting*, and the bound morpheme *-s*, which denotes plurality in English and is retained in Croatian in examples like *cakes* and *sweets*. When it comes to adjectival Anglicisms, we find bound morphemes such as *-en* in *golden* and possessive marker *- 's* in *Bob Rock's*, *Gagi's*, *Kamera's*, and *McDonald's*.

The final degree of transmorphemization is complete transmorphemization. There are relatively few new examples of complete transmorphemization because “new Anglicisms” are mostly unadapted and unintegrated English words in Croatian (ibid, 194). This is also confirmed by the results of this study, as there is not a single example of complete transmorphemization recorded in the corpus.



## 8. Conclusion

Given the extensive exposure of Croatian speakers to English, resulting from Croatia's involvement in the globalization of the modern world and the influence of English as a global language, the common use of Anglicisms in the Croatian language is unsurprising. In this thesis, after an extensive theoretical overview, we presented the orthographic and morphological adaptation of Anglicisms from a corpus of coffee bar and restaurant names in the city of Zadar. The analysis on the orthographic level showed that most of Anglicisms were adapted on the orthographic level based on the model's orthography, 63 items. Most of them retained the original orthographic form of the model, even though there are higher degrees of adaptation to Croatian orthography available for some variants. The combination of the model's pronunciation and orthography is found in 11 examples, which kept the original English orthography and introduced Croatianized pronunciation. There is not a single example of an Anglicism in the corpus adapted under the influence of an intermediary language, only one of them is adapted on the orthographic level based on the model's pronunciation.

When discussing the adaptation of Anglicisms at the morphological level, the majority of loanwords have undergone the first degree of adaptation—zero transmorphemization. A total of 58 examples of Anglicisms from the corpus have been integrated into the Croatian language system without any morphological modifications. There have been 14 recorded instances of compromise transmorphemization, in which the  $L_R$  incorporates not only free morphemes but also bound morphemes from the  $L_G$ , such as *-er*, *-ist*, *-ie*, *-ing*, *-s*, and *-'s*. There are no examples of complete transmorphemization, indicating that there are no instances of Anglicisms being fully morphologically adapted to the Croatian language.

In the names of coffee bars and restaurants in Zadar, there is a significantly greater number of “new Anglicisms”, entering the language in their original form as foreign words, mostly unadapted to fit Croatian language rules and are now part of its vocabulary.

Additionally, when there is a choice between different variants of the same word, differing only in their level of adaptation, the variants with recognizable English orthography and English bound morphemes are usually chosen.

## 9. Works cited:

1. Anić, Vladimir. *Školski rječnik hrvatskog jezika*. Zagreb: Znanje, 2015. Print
2. Auer, Peter. "Language Contact". *The Routledge Handbook of Language Contact* (2020): 147-167. PDF
4. Bosnar-Valković et al. "The Americanization of the Croatian Language". *Coll. Antropol.* 32 (2008) 4: 1035–1042. PDF
5. Cambridge Dictionary <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/> Web. 10 November 2023
6. Crystal, David. *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print
7. Ćosić, Vjekoslav i Mahnić-Ćosić, Ana. *Zadarski jezični krajolici (Imena tvrtki u Zadarskoj županiji)*. Zadar: Matica hrvatska, 2001. Print
8. Drljača Margić, Branka. "Contemporary English influence on Croatian: a university students' perspective". *Language Contact Around the Globe* (2011): 73-93. Web. 30 January 2018
9. Drljača Margić, Branka. "Latentno posuđivanje u hrvatskome i drugim jezicima-posljedice I otpori". *Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 35 (2010.): 53-71. Web. 2 February 2018
10. Filipović, Rudolf. *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo – razvoj – značenje*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti: Školska knjiga, 1990. Print
11. Filipović, Rudolf. "The English Element in the Main European Languages". *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabienia : Revue publiée par les Sections romane, italienne et anglaise de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Zagreb, Vol. - No. 21-22* (1966)
12. Filipović, Rudolf. *Teorija jezika u kontaktu*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti: Školska knjiga, 1986. Print
13. Filipović, Rudolf i Menac, Antica. *Engleski element u hrvatskome i ruskom jeziku*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2005. Print
14. Free Online Oxford Dictionary <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/>
15. Grbić, Jadranka. "Jezični procesi, identitet i globalizacija". *Nar. umjet.* 41/2 (2004): 235-253. Web.
16. Haugen, Einar. "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing" *Language* 26 (1950): 210-23. Web. 04 February 2018
17. Hrvatski jezični portal <https://hjp.znanje.hr/> Web. 31 May 2024

18. Joseph, Brian D. "Language Contact" *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2015): 300–306. Web.
19. Menac, Antica et al. "Ortografska adaptacija modela šest europskih jezika u hrvatskome" *Filologija* 34 (2001): 139-174. Web. 31 January 2018
20. Merriam Webster Dictionary <https://www.merriam-webster.com/> Web. 31 May 2024
21. Mihaljević, Milica. Anglizmi i pseudoanglizmi u hrvatskom jeziku.
22. Myers-Scotton, C. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002
23. Perković, Anica and Rata, Georgeta. "English Borrowings in Croatian and Romanian" *Journal of Linguistic Studies* 1 (2008): 65-74. Web. 04 February 2018
24. Perković, Anica et al. "Lexical Categories in English: Restaurant (An Etymological Approach)" *Journal of Linguistic Studies* 1 (2008): 59-65. Web. 04 February 2018
25. Sočanac, Lelija et al. *Hrvatski jezik u dodiru s europskim jezicima: prilagodba posuđenica*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus, 2005. Print
26. Sočanac, Lelija i Nikolić-Hoyt, Anja. "English In Croatia: Past and Present" *TRANS No.16*. Zagreb: Linguistic Research Institute 2005
27. Surdučki, Milan. "Recent English Loanwords in Standard Serbo-Croatian" *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 23 (1981): 198-206. Web. 04 February 2018
28. Thomason, Sarah G. "Social and Linguistic Factors as Predictors of Contact-Induced Change" *Journal of language contact — THEMA* 2 (2008): 42-56. Web
29. Weinreich, Uriel. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton Publisher, 1963.
30. Wheeler, Eric S. "A Framework for Studying Languages in Contact: a Prolegomenon to a Theory" *Word* Vol 61. N.1 (2015): 75-88. Web
31. Windorf, Donald. *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Pub., 2003. Pdf

## **10. Summary: English Elements in Coffee Bar and Restaurant Names in Zadar**

This diploma thesis offers an examination of language contact between English and Croatian through a study of English elements present in the names of coffee bars and restaurants in Zadar. The primary objective of this research was to identify and classify Anglicisms within these names, assessing their level of adaptation in terms of orthography and morphology using Filipović's methodology.

The first section of the thesis provides a theoretical foundation, defining concepts of language contact and language borrowing. It includes a concise historical overview of interactions between English and other European languages, with a specific focus on Croatian, and explores the pervasive influence of English as a global language.

The second section comprises a thorough examination of the orthographic and morphological adaptation of Anglicisms from the corpus. Orthography of the Anglicism is formed according to the pronunciation of the model, according to the model's orthography, the combination of the orthography and pronunciation or under the influence of intermediary language. On the other hand, morphological adaptation includes three phases: zero, compromise and complete transmorphemization.

Key words: English, global language, Anglicisms, Croatian, language contact, adaptation, orthographic, morphological

## **11. Sažetak: Engleski elementi u nazivima kafića i restorana u Zadru**

Ovaj diplomski rad donosi pregled jezičnog dodira između engleskog i hrvatskog jezika kroz proučavanje engleskih elemenata prisutnih u nazivima kafića i restorana u Zadru. Glavni cilj istraživanja bio je identificirati i klasificirati anglizme u tim nazivima te analizirati njihovu razinu prilagodbe na ortografskoj i morfološkoj razini slijedeći metodologiju Rudolfa Filipovića.

Prvi dio rada donosi teorijsku osnovu, definira pojmove jezičnog kontakta i jezičnog posuđivanja. Uključuje sažeti povijesni pregled odnosa između engleskog jezika i drugih europskih jezika, s posebnim naglaskom na hrvatski jezik, te istražuje sveprisutni utjecaj engleskog kao globalnog jezika.

Drugi dio rada obuhvaća temeljitu analizu ortografske i morfološke prilagodbe anglizama, Ortografija anglizma oblikuje se prema izgovoru modela, prema ortografiji modela, kombinacijom ortografije i izgovora ili pod utjecajem jezika posrednika. S druge strane, morfološka prilagodba uključuje tri faze: nultu, kompromisnu i potpunu transmorfemizaciju.

Ključne riječi: engleski, globalni jezik, anglizmi, hrvatski jezik, jezični kontakt, prilagodba, ortografska, morfološka

## Appendix: Zadar City Map



