

A linguistic landscape of Rijeka

Stolac, Diana; Hlavač, Jim

Authored book / Autorska knjiga

Publication status / Verzija rada: **Published version / Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)**

Publication year / Godina izdavanja: **2021**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:186:402999>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported / Imenovanje-Nekomercijalno-Bez prerada 3.0](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-02-23**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)

šta da?!

U OVOJ KUĆICI
UČIŠE SE PISMENOSTI
DJECA TRSATA
1846 - 1856
ISO - GODIŠNJICI ŠKOLE 1819 - 1969 OSNOVNA ŠKOLA TRSAT

↑
Diana Stolac
Jim Hlavač



A LINGVA DOLOSA LIBERA ME DOMINE

⚡ KREPAT MA NE MOLAT ⚡
MARISA MADIERI
FIUME, 1938. - TRIESTE, 1996.
SCRITTRICE DI FAMA EUROPEA
VISSE IN QUESTA CASA FINO AL 1949.
NELLE SUE OPERE VIVONO
CON AMORE E POESIA
LA BELLEZZA E LA COMPLESSITA'
DI QUESTA CITTA'
IL CONSIGLIO DELLA MINORANZA NAZIONALE
ITALIANA PER LA CITTA' DI FIUME

DO IT
Nationalni park / National Park

Risnjak
2500 m
REPUBLIKA HRVATSKA
REPUBBLICA DI CROAZIA
OŠ - SE BELVEDERE
RIJEKA - FIUME

Gromača

e-bike sharing
RIJEKLETA 24
KAVA ZA V

FIUMARA
koltrina OUTLET
EUGENIO BRESLIN
ARRESTATO AL 20
INTERNATO A SISTRIA
DI SAN SABBA
DEPORTATO 1944
AUSCHWITZ
ASSASSINATO IN DATA IGNITA
GABOR BAROCS
MINISTAR JESUIN PAC
UZ NASTAVNO SE OST
MARIOS GABO
A MADIERI KORNELIJ HOC
MERTON Z. JUDSON
ALLIOTTA E C
DOŠLINO GRADJANIN RIJEKE,
NA 17 PROMETA MARIJSKE VLAKE
23. 00. 1884. MARIJSKE AVENIJE.
A VILKOS DIZPOLJARA,
JANAKES KOZLE KARDIJA MINUSYER
M. MARIOS JUDSON MARIJER
M. MARIOS JUDSON MARIJER
MARIJER MARIJER MARIJER
MARIJER MARIJER MARIJER

SEKAD
RIJEKA
1 WAY
2 SAY
3 WORDS
4 YOU
I LOVE YOU
The BEERTIJA
KLUB.
RIPERAJ
MS
HOSTE

A LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF RIJEKA

51000
BALTHAZARGRAD

Volim grad koji teče...
KORZO

Diana Stolac & Jim Hlavač

A LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF RIJEKA

Diana Stolac & Jim Hlavač, A Linguistic Landscape of Rijeka

Photographs: Damir, Dunja and Darko Stolac

Support for the publication of this book has been provided by the following:

A Linguistic Landscape of Rijeka (Rijeka ECC2020 – 27 neighbourhoods – Neighbourhood Campus)

Croatia's literary heritage from the 18th to the 20th century (University of Rijeka, Project Support Grant: uniri-human-18-285.)

Reviewers: Professor Tanja Gradečak
Associate Professor Anastazija Vlastelić

Publisher: University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

On behalf of the publisher: Associate Professor Aleksandar Mijatović

Chief editor: Associate Professor Ines Srdoč-Konestra

Graphics: Grafomark, Zagreb

Printed by: Tiskara Sušak, Rijeka

Print run: 300 copies

ISBN: 978-953-361-048-1

CIP number of the electronic catalogue of the University of Rijeka Library:
150309004.

Copyright © 2021 University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Diana Stolac & Jim Hlavač

A LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF RIJEKA



University of Rijeka
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Rijeka 2021

Table of contents

Introductory remarks	7
I.	
Linguistic landscapes	13
The Croatian linguistic landscape	25
II.	
Rijeka's linguistic landscape through history	37
III.	
The linguistic landscape of modern-day Rijeka	51
Various languages everywhere around us	87
IV.	
Rijeka's identity in public signage	99
Varieties of signage found in public spaces	121
Advertising all around us	139
V.	
Rijeka – European Capital of Culture 2020	159
Something unexpected: COVID-19	167
VI.	
Primorje-Gorski Kotar County	179
VII.	
Concluding remarks	213
References	219
Notes on authors	228

This book was published with the financial support of the following: Ministry of Science and Education, Republic of Croatia; University of Rijeka; Primorje-Gorski Kotar County; City of Rijeka; Utility Company Čistoća Ltd; Croatian Chamber of Economy – Rijeka County Chamber.



Introductory remarks

It was not until the final decades of the twentieth century that linguistic landscapes emerged as a distinct area of research and the first decades of the twenty-first century have now witnessed a burgeoning of studies in this area. What these studies offer us is an insight into the language of public signs – from those in only one language to those in many languages. The first localities studied were usually ones where residents spoke different languages. Consequently, the initial theoretical and methodological principles that were postulated were informed by examples drawn from the southern periphery of the United States, from Canada and from Israel. Subsequent research now extends to localities across Europe such as the Netherlands, Belgium and beyond.

With the spread of English across the world and the ever-increasing effects of globalisation, it became apparent that linguistic landscape research was starting to provide new data about changes happening on the ground. From a situation in which signs in many localities used to be predominantly monolingual, the situation is now shifting and it has become evident that the linguistic picture of the world is steadily heading towards multilingualism.

While earlier studies focused on language policy, official signs and urban spaces, over time studies in other areas have now emerged, such as those focusing on linguistic heritage, private or commercial signs, advertising and graffiti. Findings have also come from other disciplines. For example, the interest that researchers in Tourism Studies have had in linguistic landscapes has opened up new perspectives towards what we know about rural areas. Further and more recent developments include a shift towards a broader interpretation of semiotics that includes signs without verbal components.

With this level of research interest worldwide, it was only logical that Croatian linguists would soon start to undertake their own linguistic landscape research and we can now point to a number of localities that have been studied. At the same time, it must be said that the 'map' of research sites in Croatia looks a bit 'bare', with only a scant spread of dots representing those areas that have so far been looked at. However, with increasing interest in this sociolinguistic discipline, we expect the number of research sites to increase.

This book adds to the body of existing research by studying another, further locality in Croatia. The book's official title is *A Linguistic Landscape of Rijeka*,

while its unofficial or working title could be said to be *A Description of Urban Rijeka through its Public Signs*.

For years, the first author has been photographing and recording signs in Rijeka's city centre, in its suburban areas and the outer fringes of the city as well as elsewhere in the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County. We hope that we can convey to readers a representation of the linguistic reality to be found in Rijeka and its surrounds. In doing so, we focus on visual texts in the public space that are in one language, in many languages or even in dialect.

With the aim of reaching as many readers as possible, we made the decision to publish three versions of this book in the following languages: Croatian, English and Italian.

Readers may notice a variation in the style used in the introductory sections of the book compared with the main part. This variation is intentional. The introductory sections of the book are theoretically and methodologically focused and provide an overview of research on linguistic landscapes conducted both inside and outside Croatia. The writing style is therefore academic and we concede that some readers may find this a little trying. The central sections of the book are written in a more popular scientific style and the picture book format is accompanied by written commentaries that are easily readable while remaining scientifically based.

Features common to the central sections of the book are: (I.) official public signs (that are within the domain of state and municipal administration, including street names); (II.) non-official public signs (that belong to institutions, organisations and signs that contain advertising); (III.) other signs (private signs found in public spaces, graffiti etc.). The signs are then described in terms of the linguistic form used: (A) Standard Croatian; (B) Standard Croatian plus one other language; (C) a language other than Croatian (e.g. Italian, Hungarian, English); (D) a Croatian dialect; (E) other. Further, we provide comments on: (a) the structure of the sign; (b) the choice of language; (c) the order of languages in multilingual signs; (d) conforming to official regulations; (e) not conforming to official norms or regulations etc. No less important is the fact that based on these features, it is possible to locate different attitudes, values, approaches and applications of normative standards and, in some cases, applications that do not reflect normative standards.

One impetus for this book was Rijeka being declared European Capital of Culture for 2020. In this book, Rijeka is presented as a traditionally multilingual and multicultural urban area that is characterised by tolerance. In a more concrete sense, Rijeka is presented here as part of the European cultural space of the 21st century, just as the historical references contained in

this book show Rijeka as a part of the European cultural space of previous centuries.

Visual documentation of a locality through photographs is integral to any description of a linguistic landscape. This task was begun by the authors, selflessly assisted by Damir Stolac, then continued by Dunja and Darko Stolac. All three of them, like the authors, had caught the 'linguistic landscape bug'. They surprised and impressed us with the things that their cameras were able to record.

We would like to express our gratitude to the reviewers of the original proposal for this book, Prof. Tanja Gradečak and Assoc. Prof. Anastazija Vlastelić, for their support and for their welcome words of advice, including comments such as, "stop keep adding" and "we don't think you should add another thing".

The initial proposal for this book and the accompanying exhibition at the main campus of the University of Rijeka was accepted by the Call for Grant Applications *Rijeka EPK2020 – 27 susjedstava – Susjedstvo Kampus* ('Rijeka ECC2020 – 27 neighbourhoods – Neighbourhood Campus') which provided the initial funding source for this book. Further financial support was received from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Rijeka that provided university funding for the project *Hrvatska pisana baština od 18. do 20. stoljeća* ('Croatia's literary heritage from the 18th to the 20th century') and from the Croatian Ministry of Science and Education. Further support for the publication of this book came from the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County, the City of Rijeka, Utility Company Čistoća Ltd, and the Croatian Chamber of Economy – Rijeka County Chamber. We kindly thank them all for their support.

And we take this opportunity to directly address you, dear readers, as we present this book to you with the hope that in whichever capacity you encounter Rijeka – either as a student, as a tourist, or as a transiting traveller – that you can get to know Rijeka as *your city, your neighbourhood* and as a lively urban entity. As a city in which you are welcome, as evidenced by the signs found on its buildings, buses, signposts and in many other places.

We invite you to 'sail into' and to 'disembark at', as we say in Croatian, *luka različitosti*, that is, 'a port of diversity' and to explore Rijeka's identity through its public signs.

Diana Stolac and Jim Hlavač

We think in language.
We think in words.
Language is the landscape of thought.

George Carlin

I.

Linguistic landscapes

The term 'landscape', in a basic sense, refers to the visible features of an area. That area can be in its 'natural' state or it can be an area that has been clearly shaped by humans. The term 'linguistic' refers to anything to do with language, so the designation 'linguistic landscape' refers to any recognisable presence of linguistic forms in an area, whether urban or rural. In line with a definition that considers landscape as visual entities, the first wave of research on linguistic landscapes examined almost exclusively visible signs. More recently, other types of presence in an area have also come to be studied, such as audible ones and most recently, interactive and multi-modal communication that takes place in public areas. We provide here an overview of some of the main trends and currents of research in this comparatively young sub-discipline.

The term 'linguistic landscape' was used for the first time by Landry and Bourhis (1997) in regard to the language of public signs located across different provinces of Canada. The activity that this designation refers to - namely the study of language(s) used in public areas - predates 1997, and there are many studies from before this time that can be retrospectively encompassed within the term 'linguistic landscape', e.g. Rosenbaum et al. (1977), Tulp (1978) or Wenzel (1996). While Landry and Bourhis' focus was across both urban and rural areas, in practice, most studies on linguistic landscape have focused on urban areas, e.g. Paris (Calvet, 1994), Rome (Griffin, 2004) or Bangkok (Huebner, 2006). As conglomerations of human activity, cities are linguistically rich localities. Sociolinguistically-based studies of speakers in cities, such as those by Labov (1972) for New York and Milroy (1980) for Belfast, informed much of the earlier work on linguistic landscapes in the 1980s and 1990s, and frameworks of used in urban dialectology and variationist sociolinguistics have been instrumental in providing a theoretical and methodological basis for studying public signs and other publicly visible written texts in cities. The influence of other streams of research such as ethnolinguistic vitality, language maintenance and shift, sociology of language, and language policy and planning is also obvious in many studies. Most

research has tended to be on urban areas and this has led to some using the term 'linguistic cityscape' as a synonym to 'linguistic landscape'.

An important consideration relating to our understanding of linguistic landscapes as a comparatively young sub-discipline of linguistics is the notion of 'sign'. Early frameworks of semiotic theory in the tradition of Ferdinand de Saussure put forward a bilateral relationship between a 'signifier' in its material form, and a 'signified' as its conceptual content (de Saussure, 1916: 65-70). A somewhat different framework is offered by Charles Peirce, an American philosopher, who propounds a triadic interaction that adds a third entity to the object and signifying element, namely an 'interpretant'. An interpretant is a reader or hearer whose process of interpretation or translation enables the matching of signifier with signified (Atkin, 2013). We are informed by the notion that human engagement with a sign rests on the process of *how* we interpret it, as well as the other two factors.

In the new millennium, the term 'geosemiotics', coined by Scollon and Scollon (2003: 2), has emerged which appears to function as a co-hyponym to the term 'linguistic landscape', referring to "the study of the social meaning of the material placement of signs and discourses and of our actions in the material world". While the term 'linguistic landscape' remains the most widely used one, the notion of 'geosemiotics' reflects a broadening of analysis so that alongside the content and form of texts, their multi-modality (as visible, audible and/or moving signs), as well as their emplacement and their interaction order are studied. This strand of research foregrounds the social and physical world in which signs are found, and is premised on the view that signs derive their meaning through their relation to other signs in their social and material environments. We return to these points later.

Early research often focused on cities that were bi- or multi-lingual, e.g. Brussels (Wenzel, 1996), Montreal (CLF, 2000) or Jerusalem (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006). These studies typically quantified signs, billboards, and other types of visual announcements according to the language that they were written in, and matched these to guidelines regulating the use of official languages (where these existed) and/or to the estimated number of speakers of each of the languages residing in the city. While these studies record quantitative data, they are also informed by areas such as social geography or demographics, language policy and research on multilingualism (i.e. di- and poly-glossia). Wenzel's (1996) study of 701

items of public signage located across a 12.3km long stretch of Brussels recorded that 56.6 % were in French, 24.2% in Dutch, 9.7% in English, 2.5% in other languages (usually those spoken by migrants to Brussels), while 7.1% lacked any text at all (i.e. the signs consisted of images only). The findings of Wenzel's study (1996) were congruent to the 'situation on the ground' in Brussels which is a predominantly Francophone city, but they were not congruent to official policy relating to public signs in Brussels which require that these be in both French and Dutch. The study from the *conseil de la langue française* in Quebec, Canada, (CLF, 2000: 51) of public signs in predominantly Francophone Montreal also records a high percentage of French only signage (73.3% in 1997 and 69.0% in 1999). But the legal requirement that French be used in *all* signs (with another language being allowed *after* or *below* it) was not evident amongst that percentage of signs (albeit small) that were in English only (4.5% in 1997 and 5.8% in 1999).

Ben Rafael et al.'s (2004) study on Jerusalem includes not only the two official languages of Israel, Hebrew and Arabic, but also English which is widely used, and cross-indexes the language/s of signage with three areas of Jerusalem with different ethno-religious profiles. The two most frequently reported conventions in each area are the following: a predominantly Jewish Israeli neighbourhood (in West Jerusalem) Hebrew only – 49.6%, Hebrew and English – 44.6%; a predominantly Israeli Palestinian neighbourhood (also in West Jerusalem) Hebrew and Arabic – 39.4%; Hebrew, Arabic and English – 24.1%; a predominantly Arabic-speaking neighbourhood (East Jerusalem) – Arabic and English 55.8%, Arabic only 20.9% (Ben-Rafael et al., 2004: 22; 2006: 17).

These previously mentioned studies related to the use of more than one language and the development of linguistic landscape as a sub-discipline has been strongly influenced by research on bi- and multi-lingualism. Public signage has the function, amongst others, of being a visible example of the presence of a language, and this function carries meaning not only as a means to convey referential content to those who see the sign, but has a symbolic meaning to show which language (or languages) appear(s) to have a sanctioned or official status, or fulfil a particular function in a locality. Those researching minority languages (whether indigenous ones or recently transposed ones via migration) now commonly draw on descriptions of localities' linguistic landscapes as an index of the *presence* of that minority language, e.g. Gorter, Aiestaran and Cenoz

(2012) and Lou (2016). The visibility of items encompassed by descriptions of linguistics landscapes means that activists and/or governmental authorities who seek to raise awareness of the presence and the functional use of a minority language may look first at public signs as a means to achieve this. For example, the Welsh Language Act 1993 required that local municipalities and other planning authorities use Welsh names for new streets or entities and encouraged local businesses to have bilingual signage. In 2009, the Welsh Assembly expressed its desire for Wales to be *seen* as a bilingual nation, and a planning guideline from that year stated that “signs can have a very visible impact on the character of the area, including its linguistic character” (Planning Guidance Wales 2000, cited in Hornsby and Vigers, 2012: 63-64).

While most researchers of linguistic landscape have a linguistics background, this example from Wales shows how the areas of social policy and urban planning can intersect with the discipline. In Scotland and in Wales, the form and placement of road signs that had Gaelic and Welsh respectively along with English included discussion with traffic management and public safety officials (Hornsby and Vigers, 2012). We can see that a number of actors and practices can determine the form of a sign, and the linguistic code used is but one aspect of these.

Other fields relevant to researchers of linguistic landscapes who wish to adopt an inter-disciplinary approach include political science, business and economics, graphic design, architecture, retail layout and shop-fittings, transport, tourism, events management, anthropology, occupational health and safety and so on. In fact, the number of fields is even wider as is pointed by Pavlenko (2010) in her description of public signs and texts used in Kyiv. Pavlenko (2010) draws on research from historical studies and even archaeology and shows how these may help us to gain a fuller picture of how and why signs, over time, have the linguistic form that they have. Linguistic landscapes are also interesting as examples of two forces at work in social relations: top-down ones that come from national (or regional or local, or more recently perhaps even supra-national) authorities that have regulations in regard to the use and form of public signs; bottom-up ones that come from the commercial sector, community groups or private individuals who use them to achieve other goals. Top-down examinations of linguistic landscapes call on researchers to be informed of areas such as public policy, party-political dynamics, demographics, sociology and the law (both executive

and judiciary). Bottom-up examinations may call for shared expertise in commerce, trade, tourism, social work and youth work, civic society and the NGO sector, sport, music as well as many other fields. The top-down/bottom-up contrast can be a variable applied in the quantification of signs: of 2,444 public and commercial signs in 29 station environments of the Tokyo underground railway system, Backhaus (2007: 81) reports that 71.3 % (n = 1,743) were bottom-up.

In another study of Kyiv, this time focusing on the use of Russian-language signage, Pavlenko (2012) informs us of the contemporary top-down policy according to which Ukrainian is the only official language of the country. She contextualises it with previous policies before 1991 and makes mention of the effect of internal migration of people from other parts of Ukraine (and other parts of the USSR) to Kyiv throughout the twentieth century and how this was instrumental in shaping the pre-1991 policies. Bottom-up data is drawn on in regard to Kyiv residents' reported proficiency levels in Ukrainian and Russian and their conventions of language use in various domains. This kind of multi-faceted approach is now a hallmark of linguistic landscape studies. An example of this is Szabó Gillinger, Sloboda, Šimičić and Vigers' (2012) project that encompasses four sites of data collection with each featuring multi-corpora samples. They look at local media (both print and electronic) and the websites of local government as their primary data corpus and augment this with situated ethnographic observation of written signs and the verbal language/s of residents used within the vicinity of these signs. A further component of their sample are language-focused interviews with residents of each locality.

Linguistic landscape studies often deal with language attitudes. Marten (2012) locates top-down attitudes of centralism and normativity for the almost total absence of signs in Latgalian, a local language spoken in eastern Latvian. Another study examines Scottish Gaelic, an endangered language, and how the introduction of this language in addition to English was received by locals. Hornsby and Vigers (2012: 60) report that the introduction of Gaelic-English road signs in western parts of Scotland was well received by local councils, but they identify a Gaelic-speaker – a speaker of the language who, it was hoped, would feel empowered by the inclusion of his language - who expressed concern that the addition of it could cause confusion for drivers. In the same context, and this time in relation to multi-lingual signage that contained the same two languages

alongside Polish, a language now spoken by a substantial number of recent migrants to the area, Hornsby and Vigers (2012: 61) report that there were no English-speaking informants who objected to the inclusion of Polish, which has an increasing number of speakers across Scotland. But they record reservations expressed by a Polish-speaker about Polish being treated in the same way as a local indigenous language, Gaelic. This shows that while many if not most speakers of minority languages support the visibility of their languages in public places, there can be other features that some feel make their inclusion questionable. Aiestaran, Cenoz and Gorter (2010: 232) quantified Spanish- and Basque-speakers' perceptions of the frequency of monolingual (in either language), bilingual or multilingual signs (with the addition of English or French) in Donostia/San Sebastian in northern Spain and report that both groups consider Spanish to be dominant overall, but Basque-speakers have the impression that Basque is used less frequently than Spanish-speakers do. These contrasting findings remind us of the role of the 'interpretant', i.e. the particular reader or viewer, in the way that signs are received.

Landry and Bourhis's (1997) original paper was very much focused on the presence of a language which, across Canada as a whole, has a minority status, namely French. As stated, ethnolinguistic vitality was a stream that informed much of the early linguistic landscape research and Landry and Bourhis (1997: 35) applied a principle of this framework as one of their departing premises: "the more the in-group language is used on government and private signs, the more individuals will perceive the in-group to have E[thnolinguistic] V[itality]". Other studies that study linguistic landscapes as an indicator of ethnolinguistic vitality include Shohamy and Ghazaleh-Mahajneh's (2012) investigation of the use of Arabic in Israel.

One thing that characterises most items included in linguistic landscape data samples of the first wave of studies is that they are examples of written not spoken language. The objects of research in these earlier studies included road signs, names of sites, streets, buildings, places and institutions, as well as commercial shopfront signage and advertising billboards. In distinguishing the 'authors' of these signs, Scollon and Scollon (2003: 175-189) propose a four-way distinction of: (1) municipal regulatory discourses; (2) municipal infrastructural discourses; (3) commercial discourses; (4) transgressive discourses. The first two discourses are clearly top-down ones, while (3) is likely to be shaped by

both top-down and bottom-up influences. To this group, we can add the discourses of sporting and cultural associations that are 'community' or 'not-for-profit' entities. Category (4) above is clearly bottom-up and texts expressing social protest, citizens' petitions or examples of anti-gentrification street art (Papen, 2012) can be classified in this category. Category (4) also encompasses discourses that are not necessarily transgressive, but still unexpected or quite personalised, such as hand-written notices of a missing pet stuck on a street lightpole or appeals written on cardboard by beggars. It may be that a fifth or further category exists - signs put up by associations such as sporting or cultural ones that are 'community' and/or 'not for profit' entities.

An aspect of the form of signs is their placement? This feature is identified by Scollon and Scollon (2003: 2) within their concept of geosemiotics, within which they use the label "place semiotics". What this means is that in the analysis of signs, things such as the code(s) used, order of textual content, font size etc., are taken into consideration, as well as the apparent longevity or durability of the material that the sign is made of.

Another related aspect is *where* the sign is located, and which of its surroundings it indexes in an immediate or relayed way. Lock (2003) contrasts signs on the Hong Kong Mass Transit Railway such as those that relate to the train or platform such as 'mind the gap', to advertisements that promote a film or beauty product which bear no relation to the public transport setting that they appear in. Barni and Bagna (2008) also employed the concept of place semiotics. They recorded 849 signs gathered from across parts of Rome, two of which have a high proportion of migrants and found that 23 different languages were represented, with Italian being the strongest one numerically. But according to the index of *size* (i.e. which language overall dominated the main parts of signs), it was in fact Chinese and Bengali that were more highly represented than Italian (or English) in their data sample. An interesting finding that is reported by Backhaus (2007) in relation to signs in and around Tokyo underground railway stations is that while Japanese and English are both widely used, the existence of a sizeable number of multilingual signs with simple English text given without a corresponding Japanese version implies that a minimal degree of proficiency in English has become a basic requirement in order to understand a Japanese sign these days. (Backhaus, 2007: 143)

Backhaus (2007: 143) extrapolates from this that “the completely monolingual Japanese reader is an exception, as it were – a new linguistic minority group left behind by current developments”. A similar implication follows for people reading advertisements in India. Bhatia (1987: 35) contended that “language mixing is the rule rather than the exception” and that product names appear usually only in English, followed by details of the product in English, Hindi or other Indian languages.

Although most signs are constructed in a way to allow the viewer to verbalise the content of the sign – the increasing use of non-alphabetical symbols and emoticons are perhaps making this harder – the form of a written sign need not be indicative of the usual verbal repertoires of the viewers of the signs. For example, a characteristic of diglossia in the German-speaking parts of Switzerland is that street signs are in High German, while most German-speakers amongst themselves use varieties of Swiss German. In India, a similar situation can exist where monolingual or bilingual signage often does not reflect the larger number of languages spoken in particular areas. In parts of Africa, a similar situation is often found where the language of a former colonial power is visible, perhaps with one major indigenous language, while other local indigenous languages or those with fewer speakers are not represented at all. Timor-Leste, has two official languages, Portuguese and Tetun. But 60% of signs counted in a survey in the capital Dili were in monolingual English, a smaller percentage were in Portuguese, and none at all were in Tetun (Holmes and Wilson, 2017: 119). In some cases, public signs can be in a language that almost none of the locals know. For example, after the partition of Macedonia in 1913, all villages in its Aegean part that was annexed by Greece received Hellenic place names and public signage in Greek only. In many of these villages, few if any of the locals used Greek as the languages they spoke were Macedonian, Vlah, Arnautian (Albanian), Turkish or other languages.

Another thing that characterises linguistic landscape data is that most signs, like written texts in general, are written in a *standard* version of a language. This may be an unsurprising observation if the public signs examined are ones erected by a national or other authority where laws or regulations require the use of a designated language (inevitably a standard version thereof) for such signs. This also means that when the use of regional languages is permitted, it is a *standard* version of the regional language that is employed, not any version of it, as Cenoz and

Gorter (2006) report for the Dutch Frisian city of Ljouwert/Leeuwarden. But visible texts such as the signs on commercial premises, advertising hoardings or real estate boards are not usually bound by legal or other regulations to use a standard variety and yet they almost always do, even if most of those viewing them do not use that standard variety very often. For example, the most widely spoken language in Trieste is Triestino, an urban vernacular belonging to the larger linguistic region of *Veneto* in north-east Italy. Despite Triestino being the most used vernacular there, over 99% of the 9,628 signs recorded across the city are in standard Italian (alongside some signs in standard Slovenian), with only 0.23% (n = 22) in Triestino. Those signs in Triestino index characteristics specific to Trieste, e.g. a sign advertising an audio-book of dialect poems reads *Trieste zità de veci?... No, de zente vissuda!* (‘Trieste, a city of old people? No, of people who have lived life to the full!’) (Blackwood, 2015: 88).

The low incidence in the use of vernacular varieties is perhaps surprising as advertisers (and others) wishing to evoke certain affective responses such as a sense of trust or sense of familiarity could possibly achieve this via non-standard varieties - sociolinguistic and dialectological studies often show that non-standard varieties are more frequently associated with these emotions than standard languages (Garrett, 2010). However, instances of the use of non-standard varieties are comparatively rare and therefore conspicuous. One example is *Host an Tschick?* ‘Got a cigarette butt?’ (ORE, 2015) which was printed on a pole resembling a cigarette with an opening at the top for butts to be deposited into. The local urban dialect of Vienna is used to appeal to smokers to dispose of their cigarette butts in an environmentally friendly way. In an unusual reversal of functions, Four’N Twenty, an Australian producer of meat pies, is enlisting non-standard Australian English and a campaign (via billboards and tv advertisements) for its preservation – ‘Save our slang’ – as a means to market its products (Adnews, 2017; Youtube, 2017). This last example shows how a food retailer seeks to interact with viewers who are invited not only to consume their product, but to consider their own forms of speech, indexing metalinguistic discourses.

As stated, the earlier studies of linguistic landscapes usually examined written texts and signs that were static. This in itself is not a shortcoming and the field of linguistic landscape represented a stream of research situated in or close to variationist sociolinguistics that otherwise had been established almost entirely on spoken language data. Linguistic

landscape studies often adopted a congruent approach but with data that was complementary as it was usually based on written language. As Blommaert and Maly (2014: 2) point out “LLS [linguistic landscape studies] compel sociolinguistics to pay more attention to *literacy*... [which] in sociolinguistic economies has traditionally been downplayed”. In this way, linguistic landscapes brought to the attention of linguists texts that were hitherto considered ubiquitous and perhaps less dynamic than spoken language ones. Today, multi-modal and interactive forms of communication exist in public spaces that have not so much replaced written inscriptions and signs, but exist alongside them, fulfilling other or partially equivalent functions. Cityscapes today include flat screen displays, video walls and other dynamic visual stimuli. These images on digital screens move and change, and still images of items that are part of a data sample may need to be augmented by video recordings that can capture the types of imagery that is present in many streetscapes.

Another type of non-static sign is that which is not digital but still moving, such as texts on cars, buses, trains, and also on clothes or bags that people carry around. The notion of ‘openness’ of public space may also need to be augmented to include texts in enclosed spaces, such as inside a taxi (Lock, 2003), a cinema or a restaurant (Cenoz and Gorter, 2006). Building on Scollon and Wong Scollon’s (2003) work and locating a research stream that represents ‘second wave linguistic landscape studies’, Jaworski and Thurlow (2010: 7) put forward the term “semiotic landscape” which they define as “any (public) space with visible inscription made through deliberate human intervention and meaning making.”

As can be seen, the types of texts and phenomena in the public space that linguistic landscape research encompasses has been steadily expanding. Graffiti has been a specialist area of interest for some time (e.g. Pennycook 2009, Radaviciute, 2017). Further research in linguistic landscapes has started to encompass auditory as well as visible phenomena, and the term *soundscape* is now sometimes used, usually as hyponym within a framework of linguistic landscape research, e.g. Mitchell (2010), Pappenhagen, Scarvaglieri and Redder (2016). The broadening of the field to include audible texts such as advertising jingles, public transport announcements or the speech of pedestrians offers the opportunity of comparative analysis of visible and auditory data from the same locality. This broadening of the types of corpora that can be encompassed in linguistic landscape research solves a problem identified by researchers

as the privileging of written forms of language over all other forms. This is what Spolsky and Cooper (1991: 7) were referring to when they made the comment that “public signs present a distorted picture of the nature of the sociolinguistic situation of their environment”. For this reason, studies such as those by Szabó Gillinger, Sloboda, Šimičić and Vigers (2012) have the potential to offer greater explanatory power through their collection of not only visual samples of localities, but also of spoken samples of residents or visitors in those localities.

Visible imagery and texts on people’s skins in the form of tattoos are not new, but the frequency of people bearing visible tattoos in many urban areas is now much greater than it was before, leading to the term ‘skin-scapes’ being coined. Peck and Stroud (2019) employ the term ‘body semiotics’ to refer to the appearance of texts and scripts on people’s skins that can be seen as objects of motion. They argue that even where these texts or scripts are not understood by others or even by the bearers themselves, they can be seen as a visible expression of hybridity and adoption (or appropriation) of other’s textual culture. Smell and tactile communication in the public space are areas that are further pushing the boundaries of linguistic landscape research (e.g. Domke, 2018; Hu, 2018; Pennycook, 2018).

One thing that is also apparent in some recent studies is their shift away from a quantification of particular items adopting instead an exploratory and explanatory approach in discussing a smaller number of phenomena as to how and why they fit into the place they are located in. This brings us to a distinction that was pointed out by Backhaus (2007) between ‘linguistic landscape’ and ‘linguistic landscaping’. The first term contains the noun form which refers to the result of actions (Singh, 2002), while the present participle form refers to the “planning and implementation of actions pertaining to language on signs” (Backhaus, 2007: 10). The present participle form alerts us to the processes going on that result in the appearance of signs and texts in public spaces (and their disappearance). This kind of approach is ethnographic in character and a key study paper that articulates an ethnographic and multi-faceted approach is from Blommaert and Maly (2014), entitled ‘Ethnographic linguistic landscape analysis and social change: A case study’. The paper is backgrounded by Blommaert’s (2013) book, ‘Ethnography, Superdiversity and Linguistic Landscapes: Chronicles of Complexity’. Blommaert and Maly (2014) examine the main shopping street in a superdiverse (i.e.

linguistically highly diverse) densely populated and low-income area in the Belgian city of Ghent as their object of interest. They background their study with a description of the city's development over the last 50 years which is followed by contemporary demographic information on residents' age, income level and nationality (based on data from census collections), and longitudinal information on residents who have registered their place of residence in Ghent. The focus of the study is on commercial businesses, and how their appearances change according to changing demographics, upward and downward mobility, infrastructural changes and geographic mobility of EU-residents and non-EU residents. Signs of transient employees and short-stay residents or employees are part of the area's streetscape as much as long-standing businesses and shops that re-present themselves linguistically according to shifting customer bases. These factors influence language choices and account for the functions performed and images projected by shopfronts that may be monolingual, bi- or multi-lingual.

Another feature that is part of many streetscapes are QR codes and URL addresses to websites and many visible and audible messages in public spaces now index online material. Examples given by Blommaert (2016) of these are company name stickers and artwork by graffiti artists contain URL addresses to their websites. Blommaert (2016: 99) makes the point that "localist interpretations of signs in public space now need to take into account the intense connections between such 'offline' signs and 'online' infrastructures of knowledge, interaction and identity that attribute meaning, function and value to such signs".

The scope of research on linguistic landscapes has now broadened greatly and encompasses a variety of phenomena. Each selection of phenomena is a contribution in its own way and as public spaces continue to change, so will the field, even if researchers were to concentrate on only the same localities or approaches to data collection – findings are likely to still change over time. What we can say with certainty is that linguistic landscape studies can intersect with a very wide variety of other disciplinary and subject areas, outside linguistics as well as within it.

The Croatian linguistic landscape

Research on and description of the signs that surround us have been a topic in Croatian linguistics for around twenty years and as such, this is one of the 'youngest' sub-fields of sociolinguistic and pragmatics research in Croatia. Amongst the terms used by Croatian linguists working in this field are *jezični krajolik* ('language landscape') which occurs alongside the terms *jezični krajobraz* ('language landscape/scenery'), *lingvistički krajobraz* ('linguistic landscape/scenery') and *jezični okoliš* ('language environment'), where it also appears clear that the last two terms are used less often.

The most authoritative source regarding the form and use of scientific terminology in Croatian is *STRUNA*, a database of specialist and technical terms hosted by the national Croatian Institute of Language and Linguistics. Of the first two terms mentioned above, *STRUNA*'s database contains the term *jezični krajolik* ('language landscape') without mention of any further equivalent terms, while the term *jezični krajobraz* ('language landscape/scenery') is not listed at all, either as a key term or as a synonym. Notwithstanding this, in the studies of some authors such as those of Grbavac (2012; 2014; 2018) it is the only term that is used.

In the *STRUNA* database, the term *jezični krajolik* ('language landscape') is classified within the area of ethnology and anthropology. An English translation of the term's definition in Croatian is "the total sum of linguistic signs visible in the public space of an urban or specific geographic area". This definition is broadened somewhat by the following addition: "The term encompasses public road signs, advertising signage, official signposts of streets and localities, signs on buildings and other examples of written texts in public places. Some authors employ this term to refer to the ways different languages are used in a particular country or a particular geographical area" (*STRUNA*, n.d.). Such a definition of *jezični krajolik* ('language landscape') means that the term encompasses studies of both urban and rural areas, although the number of studies of the latter remains small.

The previous chapter showed that in English, the equivalent terms *linguistic landscape* and *language landscape* are used, while the term *city landscape* with a narrower meaning is no longer widely used. The fact that two terms are used internationally as well as within Croatian academic discourse means that researchers have a choice between terms that have the same scope and application and those that don't differ from each other with regard to their definition. What we do find is that the vast majority of researchers refer to the definition provided by Landry and Bourhis (1997: 23), published at a time when research on linguistic signs in our environment was still at an early stage, namely that a linguistic landscape refers to "the visibility and salience of languages on public and commercial signs". Therefore, our aim is to research language use in public signage, and to see which languages or codes are used in signs. Broadly speaking, what this means is that we record, describe and discuss public signs in their sociolinguistic and cultural context. In this way, we arrive at a description of the linguistic identity of a space.

Although all researchers have the aim of ascertaining the significance of the linguistic forms used on public signs in particular urban areas, there can be certain nuances in the approach adopted. In Landry and Bourhis's (1997) empirical study mentioned above, the approach taken is an ethnolinguistically- and psycholinguistically-based one, while in Spolsky's (2006) study, the focus is more on language policy. Further, in the first decade of linguistic landscape research, many studies focused on multilingualism (Gorter 2006). Within the body of research articles on linguistic landscapes in Croatian-speaking areas, we can see all of these approaches represented, but particularly the latter.

Examination of particular spaces shows that monolingual signs are usually found to be most frequent. Looking beyond this, researchers tend to direct their attention to locating bi- or multilingual signs, including official and other types of signs. Evidence of this is found in the many edited volumes on linguistic landscapes published in the last decade, which include those that have a more theoretical approach over a wide span of spaces (Shohamy & Gorter 2009), as well as those that contain specific analyses of urban linguistic landscapes (Shohamy, Ben-Rafael & Barni 2010). While many of the earlier studies examined linguistically heterogeneous areas of Israel, Canada and areas of the United States along the border with Mexico, more recent studies address the need to look at the

linguistic landscape of other areas of the world (Spolsky & Cooper, 1991; Yanguas, 2009; Shohamy & Gorter, 2008).

There is now a growing number of studies that examine the linguistic landscape of European cities, particularly in the context of the European Union's policy of multilingualism, reflected in the increase in the number of journal articles (Wenzel 1996; Edelman 2006; Grbavac 2012, 2013) and books (Edelman 2010; Grbavac 2018) being published. Of particular interest are comparative studies of linguistic landscapes and we highlight here three conceptually different studies that, to a certain degree, can be applied to the situation of Croatia's linguistic landscape, or alternately, the linguistic landscape of Croatian-speaking areas.

One study examines signs in two urban centres, Mostar and Leuven, where the authors locate the following feature as being common to both cities: inhabitants having affiliations to different cultural groups (Grbavac, Jaspaert & Slowinska 2015).

A second study has as its starting point the historic, social and cultural changes in the last decade of the twentieth century that occurred across those areas of Eastern Europe that had been within the Soviet sphere of influence. Looking at the role of official state ideologies, Sloboda (2008) makes observations about the linguistic landscapes of post-Communist Belarus, the Czech Republic and Slovakia. Since his study focuses on the situation in three post-Communist countries that are also predominantly Slavic-speaking, its findings are of relevance to investigations of the Croatian linguistic landscape.

The third study features data from three localities: Český Těšín (Czech Republic), Békéscsaba (Hungary) and Llanelli (Great Britain) with a focus on language policy and, in particular, on the notion of 'advocacy coalitions' (Sloboda, Szabó Gillinger, Vigers & Šimičić 2010). The use of two languages that are regularly spoken in each of these localities is found to be different: Český Těšín (border town close to Poland; Czech and Polish – older monolingual signs in Czech are being replaced by bilingual ones; this is not a universally favoured practice in the town and there are occasional outbreaks of conflict including the vandalism of signs); Békéscsaba (city with a sizeable Slovak minority; Hungarian and Slovak – majority of signs in Hungarian only; Slovak signs found only at those sites that are of historical importance to the Slovak minority; co-operative relationship between the city's Hungarian- and Slovak-speaking

communities) – Llanelli (city in Wales; English and Welsh – consistently bilingual signage with languages in that order; both *top-down* and *bottom-up* signs; positive reception towards bilingual signage). Points of discussion in the paper include the possible negative effects of the presence of two languages on the ‘readability’ of signs, particularly traffic signs, which can be put forward as one of the possible reasons for having monolingual signs. The findings from this study are also applicable to Croatia’s linguistic landscape.

A particular focus of interest in recent years has been the study of signs that index the status of various minorities, particularly ethnic minorities (Cenoz & Gorter 2006), and we draw on two studies from 2016. The first one, based on data from the Central Balkans, brings to attention the differences that can exist in linguistic landscapes comparing central urban areas to those on the urban periphery with respect to the status of minority populations (Makartsev & Wahlström 2016). The second one examines the Slovenian minority in Italy (Mezgec 2016). Of particular interest is a study that examines the linguistic landscape of Subotica, a city in northern Serbia that has three official languages. The official language at the national level is Serbian, while in the municipality of Subotica as well as in many other localities across the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina in northern Serbia, Hungarian and Croatian are recognised minority languages, Croatian since only 2002. In relation to Subotica, where Hungarians constitute a relative majority of the city’s inhabitants, Vuković (2012) provides an overview of the use of Cyrillic-script Serbian alongside Hungarian and Croatian on state and local government signs. In relation to commercial and other, non-official signs, the language choice tends to be monolingual Serbian written in the Roman script, and to a lesser extent Roman-script Serbian together with Hungarian. In Vuković’s corpus of 94 selected signs, there are only three that are trilingual featuring Croatian alongside Serbian and Hungarian. Vuković (2012: 168) notes that the more frequent use of Serbian than the actual number of Serbs in the city can be attributed to the fact that there is a mismatch between the number of ethnic Croats and the number of those who nominate Croatian as the language they speak, with a certain number of Croats now declaring they speak Serbian as their mother tongue.

As the status of minorities and the languages of minorities in Croatia is now an important sociolinguistic topic and one that deals with language policy, further studies will likely focus on this topic. At present, though,

we find that much of the information on minorities and their languages is still drawn from studies that have their primary focus in other areas.

We now come to look at Croatian linguistic research where we find that the term *jezični krajolik* (‘language landscape’) was introduced at the start of the millenium and where, in the main, initial studies examined either urban areas or regions as a whole.

At the start of the millenium, Čosić and Mahnić-Čosić (2001) published a book that investigated the names of commercial businesses in Zadar County and the use of onomastic forms including those that are not of Croatian origin. They record contraventions to the Croatian law that pertains to commercial businesses or more specifically the regulation that “the name of a firm that is a commercial business must be in Croatian”. The authors describe the degree to which this regulation is contravened and the consequences of this using vivid language, stating that “on the basis of the extent of it and also the intensity of its spread, it resembles a grass fire that is spreading unstopably” (Čosić & Mahnić-Čosić 2001, foreword).

Osijek is a city that several studies focus on and we draw on two studies published in 2014. Both employ the term *jezični krajobraz* (‘language landscape/scenery’). The first study undertakes an analysis of Osijek’s linguistic landscape in terms of its sociolinguistic features, matching the city’s landscape with urban culture and seeking to address the question: “To what extent is Osijek’s linguistic landscape reflective of the influence of American culture and [the English] language?” (Gradečak-Erdeljić & Zlomislić 2014: 37). The authors distinguish a number of factors in answering this question, “such as geographic distribution, power relations, prestige, symbolic values, questions of identity, tourism, linguistic vitality and literacy” (Gradečak-Erdeljić & Zlomislić 2014: 37). Based on a large number of signs, the authors conclude that English is gradually taking on the role of preferred language and in this way Anglo-American cultural values are finding their way into Croatian everyday culture.

The other study on Osijek’s linguistic landscape from the same year, that of Kordić et al. (2014), presents a contemporary description of the city together with a description of the role that German has had in the city’s development since the beginning of the eighteenth century (Petrović 2001; Binder 2006). Statistical data based on signs recorded around the city show that most are in Croatian only, followed by Croatian-English bilin-

gual signs, then by signs that are monolingual English ones, while those signs that are in German are now so infrequent that they are grouped in the 'other' category. At the same time, when we examine that part of the sample that is based on the busiest or most frequented part of the city (Županijska Street together with Ante Starčević Square) the percentage of signs in Italian is as high as 11%. What this shows us is how much the linguistic image of a city can change over time.

Looking beyond Croatia's major urban centres, it is of note that as early as 2006, a study was conducted of the linguistic landscape of a relatively small town in central Croatia, Gospić (Vrcić-Mataija & Grahovac-Pražić 2006). Gospić is the administrative centre of the Lika-Senj County, and is a town which one may not readily expect to be the subject of linguistic landscape research as the town, at first glance, appears to be completely monolingual. Vrcić-Mataija and Grahovac-Pražić's comprehensive study investigated language use, awareness and attitudes or, in the words of the authors, "the maintenance of the town's identity and the correct use of language in public spaces" (Vrcić-Mataija & Grahovac-Pražić 2006: 178). With a focus on public buildings and places, the study examined public signage as well as advertising signs. In terms of the grammatical and lexical features of the language used on these signs, at times these conformed to standard Croatian, but at others they contained non-standard forms, with a significant number of English-origin borrowings also recorded. This has been found to be a common feature in all towns and cities in Croatia, and not only in Croatia, as the twenty-first century has progressed.

Istria presents itself as a region that is particularly intriguing regarding the subject of linguistic landscapes as it is situated in an area that has for centuries been a meeting place of both Slavic and Latin cultures. Two studies have been conducted on this region: Scotti Jurić's (2007) in relation to identity; and that of Šamo and Pliško (2018) on the Briuni National Park, a protected area that encompasses fourteen small islands off the south-west coast of Istria, and which is also an exclusive holiday and recreation destination. The latter study features much documented material that, as would be expected, reported the widespread use of Croatian and Italian, but also English and German, and to a lesser extent, Latin, Russian and French. Of note is the fact that the authors record multilingual signs that feature not only two or three languages, as is the

case elsewhere in many places in Croatia, but also a considerable number that feature four or five languages.

Istria's multicultural character and the presence of multiple languages in the region is the subject of a PhD dissertation by Jernej Pulić (2016), whose perspective was that of ethnology and anthropology rather than linguistics. Alongside multilingualism, which is described as a key feature of Istria, the study examines the maintenance of minority languages. More specifically, it focuses on Albanians in the cities of Pula and Rovinj and about language being a symbol of group or ethnic affiliation. This approach accords with an increased interest in minority languages in research on linguistic landscapes in general (Cenoz & Gorter 2006; Szabó Gillinger, Sloboda, Šimičić & Vigers 2012). In contrast to another Albanian community that has been living in Croatia for centuries – the Arbanasi located near Zadar who are considered an autochthonous community – the existence of an Albanian community in Istria is of relatively recent vintage, with this community having become established following trans-migration within the former Yugoslavia that occurred in the 1960s and 1970s (Šimičić & Bilić Meštrić 2018). It is difficult enough for speakers of minority languages that are considered autochthonous to attain the right for their language to be represented and used in the region they live. What Jernej Pulić (2016) shows is that for speakers of languages that have 'arrived' only just a few decades ago, it is even harder to gain recognition for their language due to an even greater number of obstacles.

Within the discipline of linguistics, the first PhD dissertation that specifically focused on the topic of linguistic landscapes was completed in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb in 2012 by Ivana Grbavac, who later revised her thesis and published it in book form (Grbavac 2018). Ivana Grbavac has become a leading scholar in linguistic landscape research and has published a large number of research papers and books and has become a prominent advocate for academic research in this area as well as in the area of linguistic identity in general. In many of her studies she provides an insight into Mostar's linguistic landscape, including changes from 1992 onwards, the year that war broke out in Bosnia-Herzegovina. She also matches Mostar with Leuven in Belgium and examines data sets comparatively. Her book on urban linguistic landscapes has become a model for further

research in terms of its theoretical, methodological and applied linguistics approach.

We move now to another PhD dissertation also completed at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb in 2019 by Marina Rončević. The dissertation examines Rijeka and is entitled *Jezični krajolik grada Rijeke između prošlosti i sadašnjosti* 'A linguistic landscape of the city of Rijeka between the past and the present'. We cite the abstract at the start of her dissertation, which shows what the focus, aim and findings of her study were: "The subject of this PhD dissertation is an interdisciplinary study of the continuity of multilingual practices and cultural pluralism in public spaces in Rijeka across different periods of the city's history, from the end of the 19th century to the present. [...] Within this 150-year period, Rijeka underwent political, social and economic changes which were reflected in the situation of different linguistic communities living in and around the city, and on language itself. Rijeka's development occurred in a multicultural environment in which not all languages had the same status and this inevitably led to an uneven distribution of linguistic capital" (Rončević 2019: 9).

Apart from research that focuses on a specific area, within the field of Croatian sociolinguistics some studies may have a particular thematic focus that can be (re-)interpreted from a linguistic landscape perspective. For example, research papers on advertising and linguistic landscapes have been published by Kuna and Kostanjevac (2011), Stolac and Vlastelić (2014) and by Stolac (2017). These studies examine advertising signs that feature multiple languages or one foreign language (usually English) and show that advertising is an important area that can reveal both linguistic and cultural influences. Stolac's (2019) study reveals some of the manipulative mechanisms employed in advertising found in public places.

Linguistic landscape studies can also inform research in an important area of sociolinguistics that is assuming increasing importance – that of language policy and gender (Spender 1980; Müller 1988; Pauwels 1991, 1988). For example, the conventions used on signs for law firms appear to be changing. Previously, a commercial sign outside the office of a female lawyer would feature the masculine form of the Croatian word for 'lawyer', namely *odvjetnik*, followed by the first name and surname of the lawyer herself. We now see a change to a model that has the equiv-

alent feminine form for 'lawyer', namely *odvjetnica* followed by the first name and surname (Stolac & Hlavac, in preparation).

This overview is not, of course, exhaustive. Nor can it be exhaustive as there is further research being undertaken all the time in this area. This includes recent research that examines signs without verbal components and that is undertaken according to various semiotic models (Nöth 2004).

This book is intended as a contribution that enhances our understanding of Croatian linguistic landscapes.

II.

Rijeka's linguistic landscape through history

Every linguistic landscape is an indicator of the time in which we observe it. If we were to be able to travel back in time to previous centuries, we would be in a position to locate what the linguistic characteristics of a particular locality were at a particular time. We know that in previous times there were considerably fewer public signs than there are now. But they still existed, whether as official ones or as non-official or private ones. As an example of this, documented records from the nineteenth century help us to ascertain what language was used in signage from that time.

There is relatively little documentary evidence from earlier periods available to us. Even so, we do have some insights into the languages of public space that were used at this time via indirect means. We look now to see what the situation was like at a time when Croatian-populated areas were not unified in one political entity or state.

Throughout the Middle Ages, the languages used in texts and written communications were Latin and Croatian Church Slavonic. We do not know how many public signs there were, but, since they would have existed, we assume that those in Latin would have been in the Roman-script alphabet and those that were written in a literary variety of Croatian of the time would have been written in Glagolitic or the Croatian Cyrillic-script alphabet. What exactly was written on taverns, inns, shops and along streets and roadways is something we do not know.

It is possible, for example, that iconic signs would have been more frequent than textual ones, such as the picture of a horseshoe hanging in front of a blacksmith's forge.

From the sixteenth century onwards we have several indirect sources. Romance languages are a significant part of our linguistic history. Latin was the language used in education, science, diplomacy and cross-border correspondence. At the same time, for many, literary, i.e. Florentine Italian was the language used in school instruction and, understandably, this language was used in signs in public spaces. However, the most in-

fluent Italian variety used was Venetian Italian as it was the language of official administration used across Dalmatia and there is extensive documentation available of its use, particularly for the eighteenth century (Šimunković 1995). At the same time, some studies support the contention that bilingual, Venetian Italian and Croatian signs also existed at the time.

Moving our focus from the Adriatic Sea to the continental parts of Croatia, a consequence of the personal union that Croatia had entered into with Hungary was that the Hungarian language began to make its influence felt on the Croatian language up until World War I. This occurred in many different ways and at many different levels. We can locate its influence in official and in non-official Croatian documents of the time, as well as on public signage.

As far as Germanic languages are concerned, German has had a presence in Croatian-populated areas from the time when these became part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, while English started to find a presence only from the end of the nineteenth century in areas along the Adriatic coast due mainly to maritime contacts and the possibility of inter-continental travel to North America. In the post-World War II era, contact with English has increased greatly. A further influence on areas with Croatian-speaking populations has been Turkish. Influence from Turkish has been mainly lexical rather than in the domain of public signage.

We believe that, in the past, all these languages were a visible part of the linguistic landscapes of Croatian-speaking areas, just as they are an indelible part of our cultural heritage. By the turn of the twentieth century, of course, the main language employed in written use across Croatian-speaking areas was Roman-script Croatian, notwithstanding certain inconsistencies in the form or choice of graphemes that writers used.

As we move now to examine Rijeka and its surrounds, we can confirm that all of the afore-mentioned languages were part of Rijeka's linguistic 'experiences' and therefore part of Rijeka's linguistic landscape. What is also worth noting at this point is Rijeka's history and the labels and names given to the area in centuries gone by (Matejčić 1988, Stolac 1996).

Rijeka is situated in the Kvarner Gulf at the confluence of the Rječina River into the Adriatic Sea. The city's current location as well as the phonological form of its name, Rijeka, are of comparatively recent vintage. In terms of Croatian linguistic categories, the name *Rijeka* is characteris-

tic of a particular contemporary pronunciation of the Proto-Slavic long vowel /ě/ (known as *yat*), that in Croatian has the phonetic value of [i:ɛ]. This pronunciation of the *yat* long vowel is known as *Ijekavian* pronunciation and is rendered graphemically as (ije). This spelling of the *yat* long vowel is found in the city's name, *Rijeka*.

Going back around 2,000 years, its name during the time of Ancient Rome was *Tarsatica* (or *Tarsatika* in Ancient Greek). Instances of this name being used are found in the writings of the Roman philosopher, Pliny the Elder and in Ptolemy's cartographical study *Geographike Hyphegesis*, better known as *Geography* from the second century CE. The settlement of Tarsatica was located in a central area of the old part of town, today known as *Gomila* (lit. 'Heap'), which is west of the Ancient Roman fortified wall known as the Liburnian Limes. Both Tarsatica, as well as the Limes, are located on the western bank of the Rječina River. The name of the river at that time was recorded as *Oineus potamos* or *Oeneus flumen*. In the period following the fall of Ancient Rome, this name came to be used in a more general sense as an appellative. This is something that occurred in relation to all names of rivers that flow into the Adriatic Sea from its eastern shores. The appellative *flumen/rijeka* meaning 'river' then came to be associated as the name of the settlement itself.

Tarsatica as an urban settlement disappeared after the Avars and Slavs arrived in the area. However, because there are no written records available after the fifth century, it may have disappeared even earlier. Slavs arrived in this area in the seventh century but did not settle in the area where Tarsatica was located; instead, they established a settlement on a hillside on the eastern shores of the Rječina River. A record from the ninth century contains the place name "apud Tharsaticam", meaning 'near Tarsatica'. In Croatian, this came to be known as *Trsat*. Later on, Trsat was one of the nine cities under the control of the Frankopan family, a Croatian noble family of the time. This is recorded in the *Vinodolski zakon* or 'Law Code of Vinodol' written in Glagolitic-script Croatian in 1288.

At that time, an urban settlement was re-established on the site of the ancient town of Tarsatica and records exist of the name of the town at that time. In all of these it is evident that the appellative form *flumen/rijeka* 'river' is used in relation to the settlement. For example, in court records from the nearby town of Pula from the years 1230-1232 we find mention of a person called "Dominicus de richa", which some historians believe may refer to a person whose name, translated into contemporary Croa-

tian, was “Dominik from Rika”. Here, the form ‘Rika’ is characteristic of the Ikavian pronunciation of the old common Slavic form of the word ‘river’ that contained a *yat* vowel, namely *rěka*, and is a variant to what has become the standard Ijekavian pronunciation, ‘Rijeka’. Another source is a forged document of the time (but concerning the part we are interested in, it is a reliable linguistic one), namely of a deed of donation from 1260 issued by King Bela to princes on the nearby island of Krk, where the name *Rika* is used in relation to the settlement. Others though believe that “Dominicus de richa” meant “Dominik, whose father was named Rika”, because they dispute that people living in the settlement at the time spoke with an Ikavian pronunciation. Dialectological studies of the Rijeka local idiom show that it belongs to the Čakavian dialect of Croatian, with a pronunciation of old Slavic *yat* rendered mainly as ‘e’. This variety of pronunciation is known as Ekavian pronunciation. According to this, one would expect the settlement to have been known locally as *Reka*.

At the end of the thirteenth century, in 1281, we locate the first instance of the town being identified by its Latin name in written records of the time; here the appellative form is also used: *Flumen*. However, this is but one of the labels used as other designations are found that include the name of the town’s patron saint. For example, the Latin name is *Flumen sancti Viti* (‘Flumen of Saint Vitus’), the Venetian name is *Fiume*, the old German name for it was *Sent Veyt am Pflaum* (or later spelt as *Sankt Veit am Pflaum*) meaning ‘Saint Vitus on the Pflaum River’. Its Hungarian name was *Fiume Város* ‘Fiume Town’, and in Croatian, it was known as *Reka* or *Rika*, according to whether speakers used Ekavian or Ikavian pronunciation.

The thirteenth century saw the first clear territorial boundary drawn between Rijeka and Trsat. Trsat belonged to the Kingdom of Croatia in personal union with the Kingdom of Hungary and was on the eastern side of the Rječina River. Rijeka, situated on the river’s western side, was part of the Holy Roman Empire, and later fell under Austrian Habsburg rule from 1465 onwards. This was not the last time in history that both towns were divided by a national border. After World War I, the Rječina River was the boundary line specified in the Treaty of Rome from 1924 that awarded Rijeka to Italy while the town of Sušak on the eastern side of the river became part of the newly formed Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Just five years before this, Sušak, as the single largest set-

tlement on the eastern side of the river and then larger than Trsat, had been elevated to the status of a city of Croatia and Slavonia on 23 October 1919 by the *Ban* or Viceroy of Croatia. As an urban area, it encompassed four municipalities, Sušak itself, along with three others, Trsat, Podvežica and Draga.

The image above shows the date inscribed into stone to mark the bound-



ary that was drawn between Sušak and Rijeka in 1924. The inscription is located on a stone along the *Mrtvi kanal*, lit. ‘Dead Channel’, a side-arm of the Rječina River.

We provide a re-cap here of key historical details. Throughout the centuries Rijeka was known by many designations: *Tarsatica*, *Flumen*, *Flumen sancti Viti*, *Fiume*, *Sent Veyt am Pflaum*, *Fiume Város*, *Reka*, *Rika*, *Rijeka*, and settlements on the eastern shores of the Rječina River became known as *Trsat* and *Sušak*. The town has seen many different rulers over time and apart from Croatian, the language of civil administration over the years has been German, Italian, Hungarian and even French during the time Napoleon occupied the town. These many changes have left their trace on the city’s linguistic landscape with perhaps the most visible evidence of this being frequent changes to street names.

We return to the subject of street names later and present here examples of the language used on signs of historical importance that we consider to be specific and characteristic of Rijeka's linguistic landscape.

There are several stone inscriptions written in Latin that can be found across the city. Latin was the language of science, diplomacy, learning and religious affairs until the mid-nineteenth century.



The inscription on the third sign shown here, *A lingua dolosa libera me domine*, translates as 'Lord, save me from deceitful tongues'.

Hungarian was an important language in Rijeka in the nineteenth century and at the start of the twentieth century. Signs that go back to this period can be found in places where this would be less expected, such as this bollard. It is one of three located on the western bank of the Dead Channel, one of the branches of the Rječina River.



There are numerous memorial plaques located around the city centre that serve to remind us of the financial interests that Hungary had in Rijeka as its main foreign-trade seaport.



As stated, the influence of Hungarian remained evident as recently as the start of the twentieth century. Today, the sign shown to the right is barely visible as it is located under the canopy of a pastry shop.



The Ottoman Turks never ruled Rijeka and historically there were no links of note between the city and the Ottoman Empire. However, one building in the centre of town near the main city market came to be known as the *Turkish House*. Two commemorative plaques provide details of this, one in Croatian, the other in Turkish.




In the post-World War II era in many non-Anglophone countries, English has become a part of the cityscape of many areas. But even before then, some cities already had ties to Great Britain and the USA, or they were host to people from these countries who may have had a measurable presence in them.


This was the case with Rijeka as evidenced by these two signs in two languages relating to a period early on in the twentieth century when Fiorello la Guardia was consular representative of the USA in Rijeka. This was about 30 years before he was to become the ninety-ninth mayor of New York.



A British maritime engineer, Robert Whitehead, also left his mark on Rijeka at the end of the nineteenth century, as well as other places where he worked. He was responsible for the development of naval torpedos and this colourful mural in a walkway just off the main pedestrian mall, the *Korzo*, is a tribute to him.



Another maritime engineer responsible for the development of torpedos was Ivan Vukić, known also by his Italian name, Giovanni Luppis. This mural of him, pictured with a torpedo preserves his memory. His name on the mural and the accompanying biographical text are in both Croatian and Italian.



Although many international linguistic landscape researchers focus their research on contemporary situations and track developments of recent years, we think it is important to have a knowledge of the history of an area whose linguistic landscape we examine. In this way we believe that we can understand the many layers of Rijeka's intriguing sociolinguistic profile.

The frequent changing of street names is enough of a reminder of changing developments as street name changes occurred every time a new power took control of the city. When we look at Rijeka, we see that it is a city that was subjected to many vicissitudes, and it was a city towards

which both Italians and Hungarians clearly showed their interest. It was also a city that passed through phases when it was under French or German rule, sometimes for longer periods, sometimes for shorter ones. So, it is no surprise that some streets can “recall” having multiple names.

Today, the names of streets and squares are not the same as those of previous centuries. In this respect, Rijeka is not alone and there are many other cities that share this feature. And as in other cities, there are relatively few clues to these former names that were changed for various reasons, most often political ones. However, these former names haven't completely disappeared and we can usually find out what they were at least indirectly as is the case with this sign for a restaurant named *Maslina* ‘The Olive Tree’. The heading in smaller letters under *Maslina* reads as *Na Zelenom trgu* meaning ‘on Green Square’. *Zeleni trg* ‘Green Square’ was the old name for what is now known as *Koblerov trg* ‘Kobler Square’.



We move now to a street built at the start of the twentieth century on what was then the city's northern periphery, which is now in the city centre. It was built next to what was the town's old fortress, the *Kaštel*, and became known as *Ulica Kaštel* ‘Kaštel Street’ or *Via Castello* in Italian. During the time of Italian rule, it changed its name to *Via Roma*, and after World War II it was renamed as an avenue that commemorated fallen soldiers and dead civilians, namely *Ulica žrtava fašizma* ‘Victims of Fascism Street’. This was, at least officially, the new name of the street, but the old, Italian name remained the one used by locals for some time to come. As time passed, the old name *Via Roma* no longer continued to be associated with the street itself but instead with a prominent building situated in it – the city prison. So, the sentence, *On ide u Via Romu* (‘He is

off to Via Roma’) does not mean that he is going to just any part of that street, it refers only to going to jail.

We now move to a street that bears a very famous person's name, *Uspon Michelangela Buonarrotija* ‘Michelangelo Buonarroti Rise’. The rise leads up Goljak hill, which in ancient times formed part of the Liburnian Limes, a fortified wall. At the end of the seventeenth century, Jesuits and members of the Brotherhood of Our Lady of Anguish erected three large crosses on top of the hill and built prayer shrines along a path up the hill that was marked out as the Stations of the Cross. The area began to be colloquially referred to by locals as *Kalvarija* ‘Calvary’. In the nineteenth century, the rise that led to the top of the hill was officially named *Ulica Kalvarija* ‘Calvary Street’. During the time of Italian rule, the rise was renamed *Uspon Buonarroti*, a name that continued to be used even after Rijeka was no longer under Italian rule. The old name for the rise, *Kalvarija*, was not reinstated until after 1993.

The naming of the street that was built to connect the western bank of the Rječina River with an area further west close to the city's foreshore is also interesting. During the time of Italian rule, the first section of the street was called *Via Garibaldi* only for it to be named after *Josip Kraš*, a Croatian Communist and Partisan who died in World War II and who was proclaimed a People's Hero of Yugoslavia. (The other section of the street was named *Ulica Pavla Rittera Vitezovića* ‘Pavao Ritter Vitezović Street’ who was a seventeenth-century Croatian writer and historian.) Through all these years, the name of the cinema that was located in the street was *Garibaldi*, so it's little wonder that this is the name that people in Rijeka remember the street by. In 1990, the cinema changed its name to *Kvarner*, and in 1995, the street changed its name to *Ulica Ante Starčevića* ‘Ante Starčević Street’ after the nineteenth century politician and writer. However, the street is still referred to colloquially as *Garibaldi*. Old street names continue to be used for quite some time in Rijeka, while the names of prominent buildings can be like ongoing orientation markers.

Looking at the following sets of names we can see how streets in the city centre have changed their name multiple times:

- *Strada del Governo* (‘Government Road’) > *Via Carducci* (‘Carducci Road’) > *Kapucinska ulica* (‘Capuchin Street’) > *Ulica Đure Đakovića* (‘Đure Đaković Street’) > *Ciottina ulica* (‘Giovanni Ciotta Street’)

- *Corsia Déak* (Cro. *Korzo Déak*, Eng. 'Déak Corso') > *Ulica Borisa Kidriča* ('Boris Kidrič Street') > *Ulica Petra Krešimira Četvrtoga / Trg kralja Tomislava* ('King Peter Krešimir IV Street') / ('King Tomislav Square')
- *Tvornička ulica* ('Factory Street') > *Ulica Đure Ružića* ('Đure Ružić Street') > *Ulica braće Šupak* ('Šupak Brothers Street') > *Ružićeva ulica* ('Ružić Street')
- *Trg Na Mostu* ('Bridge Square') > *Jelačićev trg* ('Viceroy Jelačić Square') > *Titov trg* ('Tito Square').

Some streets record names that go back for centuries. These are some of the oldest names that were given to narrow laneways known as *kale* or wider streets where locals would stroll up and down known as *kontrade*:

- *Kontrada sv. Marije* ('St. Mary's Promenade') or *Užarska kontrada* ('Ropemakers Promenade') > *Užarska ulica* ('Ropemakers Street')
- *Kala sv. Sebastijana* ('St. Sebastian's Lane') > *Kontrada sv. Sebastijana* ('St. Sebastian's Promenade') > *Ulica Marka Marulića* ('Marko Marulić Street').

All these names and all these changes left their mark on the linguistic landscape and in the minds of the city's inhabitants. For this reason, we cannot talk about a linguistic landscape as being something located only in the present.



III.

The linguistic landscape of modern-day Rijeka

The research literature on linguistic landscapes distinguishes signs according to whether they are 'top-down' or 'bottom-up'. The defining line between these two categories is not always that clear and in this section we have as our starting point those signs that adorn state-wide or national institutions and work from there 'downwards'. We commence therefore with signs that are official in their character and then move onto private and non-official ones.

The official domain encompasses signs of localities, streets, state and public amenities and so on. There are also official regulations that determine their form and appearance. Non-official or private signs are also presented in this chapter, and apart from the ones shown here, examples of them can be found in other chapters as well. Some non-official signs may give the impression that they are, in fact, official because the businesses or organisations that they belong to are listed in official gazettes. But according to classification criteria employed in linguistic landscape research, these signs are not considered official ones because their form and appearance are not determined by administrative regulations (Stolac 2018). But in some instances, the private and unofficial nature of the sign is quite evident as is the case, for example, with inscriptions found on gravestones.

Signs on public institutions and amenities, whether at the national, county or municipal level, conform to specific, pre-determined features. In the first place, these relate to the text on the sign itself, its shape and size, often also the typeface used and colour as well. And, of course, these features also relate to the actual language used and the fact that signs are usually monolingual and in standard Croatian. Some official signs are bilingual if there are legal requirements for them to be so.

The signs shown here have been checked and conform to these features.



Alongside the official and required features, some signs bear a trademark. The one shown here to the right stands out through its use of Croatian Glagolitic letters.



Schools are public institutions that conform to formally determined features, and signage on them is monolingual and in Croatian.



Legal regulation is required for a school sign to be in two languages. Those schools that provide instruction in one of the languages of Croatia's officially recognised minorities have bilingual signs, as is the case with the sign on this primary school for Croatia's Italian minority. There are a number of such primary schools and one secondary school in Rijeka (as well as many kindergartens).



In Rijeka, street names are monolingual but differ in their amount of text, ranging from those with only the street name, to those that have additional information, to those with quite detailed information especially when they have been named after a particular person. The signs can differ in their appearance and what they are made of, but it is those street names that are chiselled into stone facades that give the city its Mediterranean feel. Amongst some of streets endowed with street names made of stone are *Veslarska ulica* 'Rowers' Street', *Ulica Šišmiš* 'Bat Street', the *Korzo*, the main, pedestrians-only promenade in the centre of Rijeka, and *Stube cr-*

venog križa 'Red Cross Steps', Trg III Brigade Hrvatske vojske 'Square of the 3rd Brigade of the Croatian Army' and Ulica Dolac 'Dolac Street'.



Some signs feature more information which can be a welcome read for passers-by. The first photograph of *Jelačićev trg* or 'Jelačić Square' commemorates Josip Jelačić who was a *ban* or 'viceroy' in the mid-nineteenth century and who defended Croatia's interests at a time when it was sub-


ject to strong political pressure from Hungary. At that time both Croatia and Hungary were part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. *Volčićev trg* reminds passers-by of the life and achievements of Jakov Volčić from the neighbouring Istrian peninsula who was an active member of the Croatian National Revival in the nineteenth century. Other noteworthy people commemorated are Ivan Cvetko, a priest who campaigned to establish schools and increase literacy rates, Giovanni Ciotta, a former lord mayor of Rijeka, Josip Marohnić, a leading figure amongst emigre Croats in the USA, and Viktor Finderle, a doctor.




And perhaps the most information is to be found on new signs that have a QR code, as shown on this sign near the *Rimska vrata* or Roman Gate:



Rijeka's city centre has a long history evidenced by the many changes in names of the city's streets, while those street signs that have been restored to their original condition offer us a glimpse of times long past, as mentioned in detail in the previous chapter.



As a general rule, street signs are in standard Croatian. However, in the city centre, there is a small number of streets that have names originating from the local Čakavian dialect. For example, the street name *Pul vele crikve* (standard Croatian: *Pored velike crkve*) translates as 'By the big church'. There is a still larger number of Čakavian street names found in Rijeka's outlying areas.



The language used on some of the older street names does not always conform to the rules of Croatian grammar. On the street signs named after prominent people below, the names are given in the nominative case, *Ulica Giuseppe Duella* and *Ulica Antonio de Reno*. But after the word *ulica* 'street', they should be in the genitive case, i.e. represented in standard Croatian as *Ulica Giuseppea Duella* and *Ulica Antonija de Rena*:




It is not only streets, squares and other structures that can bear prominent names, bridges can as well. Such is the case with this sign that marks one of Rijeka's most beautiful bridges. This bridge, *Most hrvatskih branitelja iz domovinskog rata*, is dedicated to war veterans who fought in the Croatian War of Independence from 1991 to 1995. Even though the name of the bridge appears as a monolingual sign, what we find just next to it is a bilingual Croatian-English text with information on what the bridge and its surrounds symbolise.



When travelling towards a particular locality, we can usually see signs that inform us at regular intervals how far we are from it. Road signs with a green background tell us how to get to localities via the freeway.



Although signs that appear on the outskirts of a city are subject to official regulations, they can often vary in their appearance and even be quite creative. The second picture below *Prijatelj djece* translates roughly as 'The City of Rijeka – a child friendly city'.



A sign containing the name and coat-of-arms of a locality does not always have to be located at its entrance.



Signs showing the names of urban districts or suburbs are also subject to official regulations and always appear in black letters on a yellow background.



Road signs guide us around localities. Most of them are monolingual but they can also contain other semiotic markers, such as that of an aeroplane telling us how to get to the airport. Other examples are abbreviations (A, I, SLO) found on signs along roads that lead to particular countries (Austria, Italy, Slovenia).

Road signs not only show us how to get into and out of a city but also how to navigate our way through it. In most cases, these are monolingual.



Of help to travellers are those signs that contain caption images. Looking at the top left corner of the above sign, we can see that it provides directions on how to get to the port, the bus terminus and the railway station, while the images in the middle point us to hotels. These caption images are commonly used in contrast to the one shown at the base of the road sign that would be hard to decipher if it wasn't for the words *Astronomski centar* that show us the way to the 'Astronomy Centre'.



Bilingual road signs are found in places that are likely to be frequented by visitors, whether local or overseas ones.

Signs on buildings housing various institutions, organisations, business entities, offices and so on are subject to official regulation, even though hierarchically they are not on the same level as public buildings. In the research literature, these signs are sometimes considered official, sometimes semi-official as there are no national laws that specify their appearance.

Evidence supporting them being considered semi-official is provided by this assortment of signs that feature a high level of variation in their appearance as well as the textual information found on them.

In a building just off the *Korzo*, the main pedestrian mall in the centre of Rijeka, we can see five signs just above the entrance to the building. Two of them are official signs and feature the national coat-of-arms together with the name of the institution presented in a way that follows government regulations. These features therefore signify them as official (in this case, the Ombudsman and an educational institution). The signs at either end are those of the Rijeka branch of the Union of Technical Education and the Scouts Association of Rijeka. Neither organisation is a national-level one and so neither is bound by the practice or obligation to have an official-looking sign and this is evident from the different appearance of both signs. The sign of a private business in the middle shows that they have complete freedom in choosing the form of their signage, while at the bottom of the picture one can see the top part of two signs advertising a currency exchange outlet that bears a completely different appearance again.



There is even greater variation evident in the following photographs that show non-official or commercial signs. All across Rijeka one can see commercial signs belonging to private businesses. These signs may seem official-looking, but, as stated, there are no official regulations governing their appearance and the textual content and choice of language on them are left entirely up to the proprietor of the business.



Rijeka's Italian-speaking minority has a presence of its own, in both a physical as well as a linguistic sense. This symbiosis can be seen as a space that this community occupies in Rijeka's linguistic landscape. In this photograph, a sign marking this community's presence, the *Unione Italiana Fiume*, appears in both Italian and Croatian in between two other signs in Croatian. The one at the top relates to Rijeka's main theatre, *Hrvatsko narodno kazalište*, while the one below is of the main municipal library, *Gradska knjižnica Rijeka*.



Our overview of linguistic landscape themes contained discussion of language policy including that relating to gender. The sign below is especially interesting as it contains two parts each deserving comment. The upper part contains the neutral designation *odvjetnički ured* which means 'lawyer's office', while the lower part contains two features that when read together appear ambivalent. The first line contains the word *odvjetnica*, the Croatian term for 'lawyer' that contains the ending *-ica* marking the lawyer as female. The use of this form conveys the message that masculine forms for occupations are not generic and female forms of designations for professions should be identifiable as such. But the following line contains the internet address of the same lawyer containing the form *odvjetnik* (male) 'lawyer' followed by the female lawyer's surname. Using the masculine form *odvjetnik* only in the internet address is the traditional way of presenting occupations.



The names on shops and service providers' businesses are usually monolingual and in Croatian only. The name on the shop in the picture below *Primorka* means 'a woman from Primorje'. The word *Primorje* refers to an area known in English sometimes as the *Croatian Littoral* which is the northern Adriatic coastline area around Rijeka.



Less common are names of shops that contain dialectal words. The first word in the name of the shop below, *Koltrina*, is a local word meaning 'curtains'. The second one is *Mirakul* 'miracle', while *Šilica* shown in the third picture means 'seamstress'



While the issue of language may not be so important for the names of commercial businesses, for some types of services signs in multiple languages would probably be a good idea. This is the case for the sign of a pharmacy to the right, but identifiable only through the Croatian word *ljekarna*.



The same could be said for parking signs, because all of us know this is an important piece of information from our own experiences of being a tourist in a foreign country.



On the other hand, when it comes to payment, then bilingual signage is provided.



On the subject of parking, we can't help but notice errors in spelling, even though this is a separate topic that this book does not deal with. In Croatian, the preposition 'with' is spelt as just one letter, *s*, when it is in front of a vowel and most consonants. It is spelt as *sa* only when followed by a select group of consonants, which is not the case here. Instead, it should be *s osiguranim*. The sign translates as 'Except for residents of the building with secured parking rights'.



We return now to more laudable solutions that result in bilingual signage. As is well known, climbing up the wall of a pier is something that is considered dangerous. The same applies to standing under a heavy-weight object suspended from above.



Just near the two signs above was another bilingual sign, this time not with a message alerting us to danger. Instead, it has the message that your day becomes nicer when there is a *zagrljaj* in it, i.e. when you hug someone.



Turning our attention back to monolingual signs we find that there are very few monolingual signs where the language used is English.



We present two further pictures. The first one, 'Croatia in a box' is on a shop that targets tourists and so it seems justified that English was selected as the language to be used.



The second picture shown over the page was taken in Rijeka's main pedestrian strip, the *Korzo* and is of particular interest because it is intended for applicants seeking employment at a retailer whose premises were closed for renovations. Why was it in English? At first glance, this may seem odd, but at second glance less so. When you think about it and place this text in its wider context, the text says that they are seek-

ing applicants who know English. So, anyone who is not able to read and understand the message (*Hiring now!*) cannot in the first place be a possible candidate for employment.



One of the characteristics of stores selling healthy food is that they often feature hand-written signs, but it is not clear why they do so only in English. You would expect them to have them in Croatian too. We have no evidence for this, but maybe the choice of language used is itself a suggestion that the locals tend to over-eat, eat way too much meat and just buy up big on groceries in the big chain stores. Perhaps the suggestion is that we should catch on to global (vegan) trends in what we eat and the best way to convey such a message is via English. We're not sure though. Maybe we're misinterpreting this sign, but this type of advertising strategy is used so frequently that we believe it can't be a coincidence.



Just above the health food store is its name *Greencajg* with a carrot included as part of its name. You could say that this name is a double-hybrid according to its visual features (combining linguistic and non-linguistic elements) and the linguistic components that make up the name (Eng. *green* and a Croatian word that has been borrowed from German *cajg*). It's a very effective *green* pun on words, as its pronunciation is very similar to the Croatian word *grincajg* (an adaptation based on German *Grünzeug*) referring to 'green vegetables used in soups' and it replaces the first

part of the word *grin* with a near-homophone English word, *green*. It is this combining of linguistic forms that makes this sign stand out.



Playing with hybrid combinations is even more evident in the picture to the right through reference to the Croatian word *kolač* 'cake'. The sign has the word *KOKOLACH* and the removal of the Croatian diacritic symbol 'č' and its replacement with 'ch' at the end reflects English spelling conventions. The doubling of the first syllable *KO* resulting in *KOKO* is not a word in Croatian, but it's visually and phonologically congruent to the words following it, *TO GO*. Until now, the expression *to go* has been used only in relation to beverages, e.g. *kava* ('coffee') *to go*.



These hybrid signs attract our gaze and make us sit up and try and work out what they mean. However, they are the exception, not the rule. In Rijeka there is a large number of bilingual signs that usually contain the correct and conventional use

of language in both Croatian and English. Sometimes shop proprietors decide that it would be good to provide information in another language to attract foreign visitors. These are the situations in which bilingual (less often multilingual) signage is to be found and Croatian is usually the language that still appears first:



Here, the order is Croatian followed by Italian:



Although not so common, we can locate signs in which English or Italian appears first and then Croatian second.




If we look a little closer at some bilingual texts, we can see that they do not always follow the convention of having Croatian first, and sometimes the way they sequence information is inconsistent. In the street sign to the right, there are six pairs of words, five of them are Croatian-English, but the first pair is not in line with the rest and has *tobacco* followed by the word *tobacco*, as if the equivalent Croatian word *duhan* did not exist.



We observe that the majority of signs in Rijeka are in Croatian and this finding is in line with those from other linguistic landscape studies on urban areas in Croatia, such as Osijek (Kordić et al. 2014). Numerically, these are followed by bilingual signs while the number of multilingual signs is much smaller.

Some signs confirm our perception that English is a preferred language and that it is a language that wields cultural prestige, meaning that signs with English text also have this symbolic value. In this respect, the use of English in Rijeka's linguistic landscape is in line with signs found all around the world. Not even "big" languages like Spanish and Italian fare any better than "small" languages like Croatian.



We turn now to multilingual signs. One of the most common multilingual signs is for currency exchange outlets, which is understandable because they are a service for foreign tourists.



In contrast to the above sign, the following sign advertising olive oil shows that multiple languages can be used in sequence but this need not mean that they are used in the same way.

The equivalents in other languages for the Croatian term *maslinovo ulje* are: *olive oil* (Eng.), *Olivenöl* (Ger.) and *olio d'oliva* (Ital.). The Italian equivalent is not listed on the sign, and instead, another one that is semantically related is given in Italian, namely *extra vergine*, meaning 'extra virgin'. But neither the English equivalent nor the Croatian equivalent (i.e. *ekstra djevičansko*) are provided. This kind of inconsistency makes it look a little confusing.




There are multilingual panel displays set up around the city that inform tourists about Rijeka's cultural heritage and the city's cultural institutions and places of interest. The range of languages available is in line with tourists' needs. The more languages available, the more that tourists will be informed about things.

This panel display in the *Korzo* in the centre of town has a uniform appearance and features text in six languages.



One attraction in Rijeka is *Trsat*, a centuries-old walled fortress that rises above the city. Visitors to Trsat are provided with detailed information in six languages about the castle itself and about one of Croatia's most famous noble families, the *Frankopan* family, with one of its prominent members buried there.



The choice of foreign languages used in combination with Croatian is not always the same. In the picture to the right, the order is Croatian, Slovenian and English.



The city's name *Rijeka* means 'river', while the actual river that it is built on is called *Rječina*. The *Rječina* divides into two side-arms before flowing into the Adriatic Sea and one of its branches became known as the *Mrtvi kanal*, lit. 'Dead Channel' and used to be used as a harbour. A wealth of information is provided about this area and its maritime importance.



Names of localities around Rijeka are often used in the names of businesses, as can be seen with the use of *Mrtvi kanal* on the facade of a shop selling models of ships. In the second picture, the name *Kantrida* is used, referring to a well-known district of Rijeka.



We should not forget the many areas that feature numerous non-official and private signs, which are commonplace across Rijeka's linguistic landscape just as they are across all cityscapes.

We have seen (and throughout this book we will continue to see) examples of signs on buildings, road signs, billboards, suspended and free-standing hoardings, signs on vehicles and boats, and we include here some of the less common ones as well.

You can recognise Rijeka's Mediterranean character in this sign on a barrel that beckons us into a fish restaurant:



Signs on rubbish bins can contain ecological messages or instructions on the disposal of waste. These are examples of the 'educative function' that some signs in our linguistic landscape may have. In Rijeka, recyclable waste is separated from ordinary rubbish. The three pictures below are of recycling collection facilities: plastic bottles, cans and drink containers in the first picture; cooking oil in the second picture; and for used clothes in the third picture.



A special kind of sign is a material-based one that is hung and suspended between buildings that usually announces cultural events such as theatre productions, art exhibitions, concerts and similar such events.



Other cloth banners that flutter in the wind are those attached to buildings of the University of Rijeka and to a gallery.




We conclude this section with a picture of Rijeka's main theatre which regularly changes the signs on its facade, many of which contain thought-provoking messages. The first one below *Ovo je hram kulture* translates as 'This is a temple of culture'. The second one has a very tongue-in-cheek title, *Trgovački Centar „Zajc“ – 1500 m² zatvoreno/closed*



chiuso/geschlossen. This sign appeared during one of the city's lockdown periods. It was a message analogous to other messages that were frequently seen stuck on the entrance doors of local shopping complexes, i.e. 'Closed "Zajc" Shopping Centre 1,500 m²'.

Continuing this section that presents images of Rijeka's cultural life and historical legacy it is important to note that the city has a large number of commemorative plaques that draw attention to particular institutions, events or persons of note from the last two centuries. Most of these are located in the city centre and are usually in Croatian as is the case with the one below that commemorates the existence of one of the first elementary schools established. The primary school in Trsat was established in 1819 and the stone inscription celebrates the acquisition of literacy skills that the school enabled. The next one is of one of the earliest Croatian secondary schools or *gimnazije* of the time. The third picture reminds us of the establishment of the city's oldest Croatian-language newspaper *Novi list* ('The New Gazette'), while the fourth one is located on the facade of the building where the composer Ivan Zajc was born on 3 August 1832. A similar dedication is given in the fifth picture that celebrates the birthplace of the writer, Hadrijan Mandel-Bademić, born in Trsat on 22 November 1863. The last picture is of a commemorative plaque placed by local railway workers who on 15 April 1983 celebrated the 110th anniversary of the construction of the Rijeka-Zagreb railway track.



Along with inscriptions in Croatian, on this commemorative plaque we can see textual fragments in Italian as well. This plaque placed on the house he was born in, is in memory of Ivan Kobler, a noteworthy lawyer, parliamentarian, writer and intellectual who was born in Rijeka and who died there as well.




Many Italians left a lasting legacy on Rijeka and the pictures below show bilingual plaques that contain details of people's contributions to the city's literary and cultural life. This stone plaque adorns the birthplace of Irma Gramatica who was a famous theatre and film actress born on 25 November 1869.



The following bilingual plaque was erected in memory of Mario Gennari and Giuseppe Duella born in 1917 and 1918 respectively and who were both members of the Croatian Communist Party based in Rijeka. Both were Italian. They fought for fraternity and unity amongst Croats and Italians and died for this cause in military combat just before the end of World War II.



Some historical persons of note are commemorated on murals, such as Laval Nugen. The word *Nižan* is given in brackets afterwards to help readers know how to pronounce his surname which is an unusual one for this area.



We continue by visiting other places where we find further signs. Once it used to be the case that signs would be stationary and passers-by saw them in one place only. For decades now we have been witness to signs that are mobile and move around. The first ones were official signs on cars or trucks, such as *za vlastite potrebe* meaning 'own-account transport operations'. But today we are surrounded by messages and advertising signs on public transport. They usually change in regular cycles and apart from being advertisements they can also convey cultural, sporting, humanitarian or socially important messages.

The first picture below is of a small van with the messages *Čuvamo planet Zemlju* and *Ekoplanet*. The first translates as 'We care for planet Earth' and the second one means 'Ecoplanet'. The second one is a beverage transport vehicle for a beachside cafe and bar called *Morski prasac*, which is actually the name of a species of shark, the *Angular Roughshark*. The

third van, with signage in English only, belongs to a motor mechanic who specialises in gear and gearbox maintenance.





Things that move and can spread messages more so than stationary signs. Buses often rotate their signage depending on the contracting entity paying for it. The messages and languages used change all the time, but some messages stay around a bit longer, such as this one, *Vozim na plin* 'I'm running on gas', with the rhyming line below reading *Prema prirodi sam pristojan i fin* 'Towards nature I am polite and well-behaved'. Sporting the back section of the bus in the second picture is the line *Tiša od tišine*, meaning 'Quieter than quiet'.



Rijeka is a seaside city and has a thriving port. Rijeka lives and breathes the sea. Whenever it is docked in port, the training ship *Kraljica mora* 'Queen of the sea' commands people's attention, just like the old ship *Uragan* 'Hurricane' (about which there will be more later on in the book).



Rijeka is the home port to many ships. The main passenger ship company servicing Croatia's coastline is *Jadrolinija*. On the left is one of its larger ships, *Marko Polo*, or 'Marco Polo' as he is known in English, was born further south on the Dalmatian island of Korčula. The picture on the right shows a smaller fishing trawler called *Tunj* meaning 'Bluefin Tuna'.




Just a little further along are boats from other countries that spend the winter moored up to a dock. They fly under foreign flags and bear names from different languages that are an addition to our linguistic landscape.



And to conclude: a message does not need to contain text for it to be perfectly comprehensible. Iconic symbols are so well known that the addition of text would almost represent a duplication of information. This picture of two pedestrians would still be completely comprehensible without the accompanying text. However, the accompanying text *pješaćka zona* that means 'pedestrian zone', leaves absolutely no doubt about its meaning.



There are further text-free visual images that we have no problem understanding, such as the images of the pedestrian on these traffic lights that seek to promote gender equality by depicting female pedestrians.



There's also no doubt what this tradesperson does for a living:



Based on this overview, we can conclude that official public buildings found in Rijeka's linguistic landscape are in one language only, namely standard Croatian, a requirement regulated by the official language policy. Where legal regulations allow it, official signs are bilingual as can be seen on the signs of the schools for Rijeka's Italian-speaking minority.

In the non-official and private sector signage is mostly monolingual, but there are also bilingual signs (Croatian-English, Croatian-Italian, less commonly other combinations), and some multilingual ones.

Multilingual signs are frequent and justifiably so in areas to do with tourism where text in a larger range of languages can reach a larger number of recipients.

This picture of Rijeka is in line with the descriptions of the linguistic landscape of other urban areas in Croatia.

Various languages everywhere around us

When people in Rijeka talk about the use of foreign languages in signs, they most commonly think of the use of English words in their local linguistic landscape. This is something well known in other parts of the world as well. A casual walk around the city reveals to us languages that we expect to see there, but also languages that we less expect to see there, and the latter ones are the ones we are focusing on here. As well as other languages we come across different scripts. Often these signs are bilingual with Croatian as the 'host' language. We present a selection of those found around the city.

In Rijeka there are not only a large number of names of non-official or private organisations that are in foreign languages but also many official organisations as well. This is to be expected since there are schools as well as kindergartens for Rijeka's ethnic Italian minority where the language of instruction is Italian. These are examples of *top-down* signs:



If on the same premises there are other organisations operating, the signs for those organisations can also be bilingual, as can be seen above on the sign of the Rijeka Society of Martial Arts, shown here as *Društvo bo-*

rilačkih vještina „Rijeka“ / Societe delle arti marziali „Rijeka“. (The Italian designation of the martial arts club contains the spelling *Societe* rather than standard Italian spelling *Società* for ‘Society’.)

Another group of organisations that have bilingual and official signage are consulates. Rijeka has always been the seat of several foreign consulates and their official name plaques are bilingual with the language of the foreign country given first, followed by Croatian. The pictures below are plaques of the Austrian, Albanian, Serbian and Swedish consulates in Rijeka. While the Swedish sign is in Swedish only, the sign for the Albanian consulate is in Albanian, Croatian and English.



At the end of the nineteenth century the consul representing Imperial Czarist Russia in Rijeka was a Macedonian, Andrija Petkovič, who was also a respected educator and intellectual. This bilingual Croatian-Macedonian plaque, placed on the building that he was consul in for 19 years, gives details about his life.



This is the plaque of the honorary consulate of the Republic of Macedonia in Rijeka. As it is a more contemporary sign, we are not surprised that alongside Macedonian and Croatian, the name of the consulate is given in English as well.



Rijeka’s Macedonian community is quite active and there are several official plaques at the front entrance of their premises. The official nature of them is evident in their size, black background, use of gold-coloured letters and national coat-of-arms. The national flag of North Macedonia is visible as well as the official emblems of the City of Rijeka and the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County.



A third group of signs can be categorised as semi-official. Examples of these are signs on gifts to Rijeka from its sister cities, such as this one in Japanese on a fountain and lantern donated by the sister city of Kawasaki shown over the page.



Another plaque that belongs to this category commemorates the donation that Qatar made to Rijeka's Islamic Centre. The plaque is in Croatian, Arabic and English. What is also noteworthy is that the date is given twice: according to both the Gregorian and the Islamic calendar.



Some foreign languages are rarely seen on signs around the city and may appear only on signage specific to specialty shops or on restaurants that serve that country's cuisine, such as the one here to the right.



In Rijeka's linguistic landscape we see that alongside texts in the Roman-script alphabet there are also texts written in other scripts. The following example shows a Cyrillic-script text on a plaque of the Orthodox church in the city centre. The plaque has the same text in Roman-script letters underneath. It translates as 'Serbian Orthodox Church of Saint Nikolay'.



Apart from official and semi-official signs in Croatian and other languages, Rijeka's linguistic cityscape is characterised by a very large number of non-official, private and commercial signs. These feature a great deal of variety in the language choices and in some places it is not always easy to determine which one is the most frequent choice. Overall, monolingual Croatian signs predominate followed by monolingual English signs. Bilingual signs are the next most frequent followed by trilingual ones as mentioned in the previous chapter.

We present several short texts that are temporary missives written in chalk on small blackboards. They are written in English and contain affable wishes to passers-by, many of whom would be able to understand them.



Other signs employ another strategy to 'speak to' and attract customers, in this case during Rijeka's warm weather. One shop selling refreshments displays a sign with the English words *Fresh lemonade* plus the syntagm *to go* which now appears to be omnipresent.



When we remark on signs being small in size this does not mean that the message they have to convey is of any less interest. We present here an image of a concrete block with four brass plates in it, set into the pavement. The brass plates commemorate residents of Rijeka who were deported to concentration camps during World War II. The brass plates are part of an international project called *Stolpersteine*, a German word that literally means 'stumbling stones' or metaphorically 'stumbling blocks' and around 75,000 have been set into the pavement in localities across Europe. The term *Stolperstein* is now used in English, while the Croatian term is *kamen spoticanja*, a calque based on the German original. The Stolpersteins here are in memory of Eugenio Lipschitz and his wife, Giannetta Zipszer Lipschitz, both of whom lived nearby. Two plaques are in Croatian and two are in Italian. The Stolpersteins give details of the years they were born, arrested, interned and deported. The date that they were both killed in Auschwitz remains unknown. These Stolpersteins in Rijeka were the first to be installed in Croatia.



In the twenty-first century people are likely to be exposed to languages and scripts that may have been previously unknown to them. At Rijeka's Youth Club, young tourists left the following messages. As they're written in chalk and keeping in mind Rijeka's notoriously wet weather, it's not clear how legible they will be after the next good soak:



This is not an exhaustive list of languages found in Rijeka's linguistic landscape. For instance, further languages that we have not yet mentioned can be found on gravestones at both of Rijeka's cemeteries, in Trsat and in the Kozala district. It is likely that on those gravestones we would also be able to locate examples of other scripts and alphabets as well (as is the case with the Jewish Cemetery in Kozala).

In any case, it is worth remembering that some foreign languages are not only a part of Rijeka's history but also part of Rijeka's collective memory that lives on today. Numerous memorial plaques dot the city's linguistic

landscape that attract the attention of passers-by, whether local or from afar. We provide here some signs that were placed in memory of noteworthy people or events. In the ones shown on the right, the position and status of Hungarian and Italian in Rijeka are evident, both then and also now. The first one is of the facade of the convent belonging to the order of the *Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus* with signage in both Croatian and Italian. The second one is of the Hungarian politician and journalist Miklós Vásárhelyi, born in Rijeka in 1917, with dedications in Croatian, Hungarian and Italian.



The following plaque is witness to Croatian-Hungarian sporting relations. It was perhaps no coincidence that the famous engineer, Robert Whitehead, an Englishman (!), was instrumental in the organisation of a football match. The plaque gives details of a match played between employees of the Hungarian State Railways and the Rijeka Technical Association on the occasion of the opening of the railway line between Rijeka and Karlovac in central Croatia.




The memorial plaque dedicated to Marisa Madieri is certainly one that invites us to stand still for a moment and recall her literary work. Rijeka's multilingualism and multiculturalism was a frequent focus in her work. The plaque has the following dedication, describing her, in both Croatian and Italian, as, 'a writer of European fame who lived in this house until 1949. Through her literary work she extolled both love and poetic expression and in doing so she made Rijeka's beauty and diversity known to others'.



Census collections conducted in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries record that many residents knew and used Slovene. The memorial plaque shown below is evidence of the city's Croatian-Slovene ties. It commemorates the businessman and philanthropist Josip Gorup, who was born in Slovenia and who died in Rijeka in 1912. Gorup was instrumental in the construction of Rijeka's *Grand Hotel Europe* built in 1874.



To conclude, we present a sign in a language that connects all people – Esperanto. The first Esperanto Society in Croatia was formed in Rijeka in 1907. This stone plaque located in the centre of town on the *Korzo* commemorates the founding of the *Adriatika Ligo Esperantista*, the ‘Adriatic Esperantist League’.



IV.

Rijeka's identity in public signage

Many signs in the city contain identifying markers or symbols that relate to Rijeka. These include the name of the city itself, *Rijeka*, or less frequently the name of the city in Italian, *Fiume*, or even more infrequently its name in Latin, *Flumen*. Other markers or symbols are the prefix *RI* that appears on the registration plates of all vehicles registered in Rijeka, *RK* for all vessels registered at the port of Rijeka, and the city's telephone area code prefix, *051*. Walking around Rijeka, we are also able to locate other signs that relate to the city's identity across a variety of fields such as sports and culture, and others such as the University of Rijeka and the Marian shrine at Trsat.

The word *rijeka* spelt with lower-case 'r' means 'river' and is a common noun, but when spelt with an upper-case 'R' as in the name of the city, it then becomes a proper noun. This means that use of the word 'rijeka' can lead to intentional ambiguities such as the motif on the umbrella below. The words *Rijeka užitka* mean 'a river of enjoyment', but the association of the city *Rijeka* with the term for 'enjoyment' is quite deliberate.



Rijeka is a city located on the river 'Rječina', a word etymologically derived from *rijeka* 'river'. Not only does the city's name clearly show that it is close to water, the water source of the river Rječina is itself boundless and inexhaustible, hence the Latin motto of the city, *indeficienter* 'unceasing' that can be seen below the double-headed eagle that forms the city's coat-of-arms. Even without the motto, a double-headed eagle is used as a symbol of the city as the picture of the bus below shows. The

third picture is of a mural with a scene of a boat with an aqua-white sail (the colours of Rijeka's main football team) at sea with the motif *Volim grad koji teče*. This is an affectionate and ambivalent declaration that can be found in many places across the city. (For example, a picture on one of the following pages of the registration plate of a car and a bumper-bar sticker say the same thing.) It translates as 'I love a city that flows' and references the fact that the name *Rijeka* refers to a (flowing) river. Of course, a 'city that flows' is a metaphor that conjures up positive images of a city that is in motion, dynamic and keeping up with things.



In most instances, textual forms that refer to Rijeka are more common. In the second picture below, the combination of *Rijeka* with two English words, *Rijeka City Card*, has a more 'international' tone to it.



The designation *Fiume* has traditionally been the city's Italian name. On some roadsigns the name *Fiume* is given alongside *Rijeka*, and there are calls for this to be made a more frequent practice. Within the city itself, *Fiume* is used as a part of the commercial name of private enterprises. On the left, it appears as part of the name of a cafe while on the right, it is part of the name of a taxi company.



The cry *Forza Fiume*, which translates approximately as 'Go Rijeka!', is a popular chant of the fans of the city's main football club, NK Rijeka.



The term *Flumen*, the Latin name for the city, is not very commonly sighted and one of the few instances of it being used is shown here to the right, where it is the brand name of a local beer.




A more commonly encountered word in Rijeka is *Fluminensia*, a word derived from the city's Latin name, which refers to 'things that come from Rijeka'. For example, the works of the famous nineteenth-century scholar and philologist, Fran Kurelac, are referred to by this term. Although we cannot locate any externally visible uses of this word, it is a term that is part of Rijeka's linguistic landscape if we accept a broad definition for this to encompass also building interiors, digital spaces and so on.

Another word etymologically from the Latin or Italian name of the city is *Fiumara*, which is the name of one of Rijeka's main streets.



The contraction *RI* is found on the registration plates of all vehicles registered in Rijeka and it has become a label by which Rijeka is readily recognised. It can occur on its own, as in the name of the cafe below. Or, it can occur with or even within another word, as in the name *ŠtoRIja* which is the name of a local eatery.



Other recent uses of the contraction *RI* can be found in the names of commercial businesses, *Riperaj* and *Ricikleta*. The shop called *Riperaj* is a repair shop, and the play on words is based on the prefix *RI* combined with the suffix *-eraj*, which refers to a physical entity in the same way that *-ery* does in English, e.g. *eatery*, *bakery*. *Ricikleta* is the name for electric bicycles that can be hired. The name *Ricikleta* has the prefix *RI* combined with *cikleta*, based on the last three syllables of the Italian word for bicycle, *bicicletta*. Even the designated parking areas for these electric bikes are called *Ricikletino parkiralište* 'parking spot for Ricikleta'.





The second and third letters in the name of Rijeka's annual book fair *vRIsak* ('Shriek') also feature the city's characteristic acronym.



Rijeka is a city known for its rock music scene. The poster to the right features the word *PJESMARICA* meaning 'songbook' in upper case script. To the left of the lion is the word *RIKA!* meaning



'roar!', followed by *RIROCK* 'Rijeka rock' referring to locally produced rock music. For Croatian-speakers whose home dialect has Ikavian pronunciation, the word *Rika* is the way that they would normally pronounce the name of the city, Rijeka.

As stated, the prefix *RI* appears on the registration plates of all vehicles in the city and surrounding areas. Some vehicle owners like to add extra features that make Rijeka's identity more visible. With the permission of the owner of the vehicle shown to the right, we point to three characteristic symbols that are visible on the rear part of this car: *RI* as the prefix for the area, the number *051*, which is the telephone area code number for Rijeka and the message on the car's bumper-bar *Volim grad koji teče* 'I love a city that flows'. The message is, as stated previously, a metaphoric reference to the name of the city that means 'river'.



The telephone area code *051* is found in the name of this driving school:



Sea and river vessels registered in Rijeka bear the registration prefix *RK* not *RI*. As this is a prefix made up of two consonants, it does not lend itself well to be combined with other names and labels. There are no incidences of it being used metaphorically as an identifying marker and its use is restricted to boats only.



Some characteristic symbols of Rijeka are known outside Rijeka, some are known only to locals. The latter is the case in relation to the *Trsatski zmaj*, the 'Trsat Dragon':



The daily newspaper *Novi list* 'The New Gazette' is well known beyond Rijeka. The newspaper was established over a century ago by Frano Supilo. The visual image on the side of the bus below says *NOVI120LIST* with the number '120' referring to the fact that in 2020, *Novi list* celebrated its 120th anniversary. In the picture of the plaque below, this reads as *Ulica Frana Supila* 'Frano Supilo Street'. Frano Supilo (1870-1917) is described as a *politikar i novinar* 'politician and journalist' and as the *utemeljitelj Novog lista*, 'the founder of Novi list'.



Amongst the city's many cultural institutions, one stands out in particular, *Hrvatsko narodno kazalište Ivana pl. Zajca* 'Ivan Zajc Croatian National Theatre'. Cloth banners suspended across the facade of the theatre announce the theatrical productions being performed there. In the first picture below that our camera caught, we can see in upper case letters *Riječki diptih* 'A Rijeka Diptych'. A 'diptych' is a painting that stretches across two hinged wooden panels which may be closed like a book. The term *diptih* 'diptych' is used here metaphorically to refer to two theatrical plays that together focus on a single or common theme. In this case,

the common theme is 'life in Rijeka'. The first play is *Leica format* based on a novel of the same name written by the late Daša Drndić (1946-2018), one of Croatia's most famous writers. The book was translated into English with the same title. The other play that focuses on Rijekan society is *Vježbanje života* 'Practicing life' by Nedjeljko Fabrio (1937-2018). Although neither Drndić nor Fabrio was born in Rijeka, both of them lived most of their adult life in the city and were considered Rijeka writers.

The picture on the right shows a statue in honour of Ivan Zajc. The inscription contains the words *Ivan pl. Zajc*, literally meaning 'Ivan the noble Zajc', which refers to his elevation to the ranks of the nobility based on his many achievements. Below this are the words *Hrvatski skladatelj* 'Croatian composer' with the years of his birth and death, 1832 and 1914'.



Messages and missives that reference performances held in Rijeka's National Theatre are visible and mobile across the city thanks to visual imagery on city buses. The first picture has the words *Vježbanje različitosti* 'Practicing diversity'. This is not actually the name of a play, but an intentionally ambiguous message. The word *vježbanje* 'practicing' indexes the first word of Nedjeljko Fabrio's play *Vježbanje života* 'Practicing life' that was mentioned above, and this message is meant as an advertisement for the play. The catchphrase 'practicing diversity' was widely used ahead of and during 2020, the year when Rijeka was a European Capital of Culture. The second picture contains the title *Opera* 'Opera'

and is an open invitation for people to attend opera performances also held at the Ivan Zajc Croatian National Theatre.



During the winter months, Rijeka celebrates *Carnevale*, which is known as the city's 'fifth' season. The words *Riječki karneval*, as it is known in Croatian, adorn the city streets, as shown below where these words appear on banners that are suspended above the city's main pedestrian mall, the *Korzo*.



Amongst the masks that some *Carnevale* revellers adorn is that of the *Riječki morčić*, the 'Rijeka mori good luck charm'. In fact, it has been the mascot and trademark of Rijeka's *Carnevale* since 1991. The blackamoor figure with the gold earrings is likely to have come from Venice, where



it is known as *moretto*. The picture above shows a colourful mask that stands for optimism, positive energy and protection from harm to the

wearer. The *Riječki morčić* can be found across the city: the picture on the right above shows the façade of a restaurant named *Restoran Morčić*.

Another thing that characterises the citizens of Rijeka is their love of sports, particularly football. The main club *HNK Rijeka* 'Rijeka Football Club' and the city's other club, *Orijent* based in Sušak, the eastern part of the city, are things that the locals grow up with and which remain an important part of their lives. The picture below shows a plaque that commemorates the founding of a football club, known then under the name *Kvarner*. The plaque reads:

U ovoj je zgradi 29. srpnja 1946. godine osnovan nogometni klub "Kvarner", današnji HNK "Rijeka". Povodom 60. obljetnice kluba. Grad Rijeka.

'The football club "Kvarner" was founded in this building on 29 July 1946. It is now known under its current name "HNK Rijeka". On the occasion of the club's 60th anniversary. City of Rijeka.'



Rijeka Football Club's supporters are known as the *Armada*. The *Armada* fans consider all of Rijeka as their own home turf. There are numerous symbols



and reminders of their presence to be found across their city, and these are a part of the city's linguistic landscape. Their trademark slogan is *Način života* 'Way of life'.

The texts in murals painted by members of the *Armada* are monolingual and usually in standard Croatian, less often dialect. What is usually apparent is that each group of *Armada* fans also show which *kvart*, i.e. 'area' or 'quarter' of the city they belong to. The creators of the murals often like to use every possible opportunity to integrate other symbols characteristic of Rijeka in their artwork. The picture below contains the text *Nad stijenama KantRide* 'Above the rocks of Kantrida'. Kantrida is the city suburb where Rijeka Football Club's home ground is located. Within the word *KANTRIDA* the letters *RI* stand out as they are written in a different colour from the rest of the word, namely white. Choice of the colour white is not accidental. Due to their predominantly white colours, Rijeka Football Club players are known as *bijeli* 'the white ones'.

Another mural by *Armada* fans features two ships, each with a recognisable insignia on the mainsail. The ship on the left has Rijeka Football Club's logo while the one on the right has the Croatian red-and-white 'chequerboard' coat-of-arms. A deceased fan is honoured in the mural with the words, *I zvijezde iznad Rijeke plaču u čast našem prijatelju i navijaču. Rijeka u srcu. Armada do groba.* 'Even the stars in the sky above Rijeka shed tears in honour of our friend and fellow supporter. Rijeka in our heart. We remain with *Armada* to our grave.'



Some parts of the city with a strong local identity, such as *Sušak*, feature wall murals with their name of the locality in Glagolitic script as shown in the picture on the next page. The one on the right celebrates *Sušaćani*, the locals of Sušak.



The 'fish-like' design of this sign is very becoming of a seaside city. It features the letters *Samo Rijeka* 'Only Rijeka' arranged together in the shape of a shark.



Stickers and other messages from Rijeka Football Club supporters can be found in the least likely of places, such as on the railing above a garden bed in a city park. The sticker reads *Sloboda navijačima* 'Freedom to the supporters'. This message is a playful variation of the more well-known phrase *Sloboda narodu* 'Freedom to the people'.



In Sušak, in the eastern part of Rijeka, the football ground that the local club *Orijent* plays at features the slogan *Vavek naprvo* 'Always [moving] forward'. Linguistically, this slogan is not in standard Croatian, but in the Čakavian dialect spoken in this area of the Croatian Littoral.



There is a sign on this wall that is also written in Čakavian saying *Pikala se takala se bala sa Sušaka* 'Kicked around, knocked around - the soccer ball from Sušak'.



A catchphrase that is commonly associated with Rijeka's football supporters, but not just them, is the following one that sums up the mentality of people living in Rijeka: *Krepat, ma ne molat*. It is a phrase in the local dialect that translates as 'Die, but don't give up'. It can be found in many places across the city, in many different iterations:



The phrase *Krepat, ma ne molat* 'Die, but don't give up' says a lot about the people of Rijeka. Another phrase that is closely associated with the city is: *Šta da?* People are readily recognised as coming from Rijeka when they use this phrase elsewhere in Croatia. It roughly translates as 'You what?' or 'Really, you don't say!' It's an everyday expression, used in many different contexts, and it has found its way onto signs found around the city, including these two businesses. The picture on the left shows *šta da?!* as the name of a Rijeka souvenir shop. The picture on the right reads *Trgovina. "Svašta nešto! Šta da?"* meaning 'Store. "Something of all sorts of things. You don't say?"'



Signs in the Čakavian dialect are rare, and for that reason, very interesting to examine. The picture on the left has a Čakavian-speaking fisherman complaining that the fish aren't biting. The seagull replies in Čakavian that 'it looks like his wife will need to go to the market'. What are even rarer are those signs in *Fiumano*, the local variety of Italian that is spoken in Rijeka. The restaurant in the picture on the right bears a Fiuman name, *Molo longo* meaning 'Long Wharf'.



Another characteristic symbol of Rijeka and its surrounds is the *mlikarica*. This is a dialect word meaning 'milkmaid', as shown in the pictures below:



In past centuries, the town of Grobnik situated 5km further inland, and the area around it, used to supply Rijeka with milk. Even though it is now many decades since the last milkmaid carried milk down the windy, 12km road to Rijeka, amongst many people there is still a clear memory of and emotional bond towards those women who would rise before dawn, milk their cows and then make the long trek into Rijeka carrying the heavy canisters of milk. They then needed to sell their milk as soon as possible, especially in the summer months so that it would not spoil, but in winter as well so that they could return home as quickly as possible to avoid being out in the cold too long. A city square and the above statue commemorate those milkmaids. The symbol of the milkmaid can be found across the city. The picture above shows this iconic image symbol along one of the paths that the milkmaids were known to walk down on their way into the city.

Rijeka is known as an industrial centre. The name *3. maj* '3rd May' appears on a huge crane next to the city shipyards. These were established in 1892 and were first known as *Kvarnersko brodogradilište* 'Kvarner Shipyards', then as *Danubius*, a name given to it by its owners who were based in Hungary then as *Cantieri navali del Quarnero* 'Kvarner Shipyards' in Italian. The date '3rd May' commemorates the departure of Axis troops from Rijeka in 1945.



Every city has a specific landmark that distinguishes it from the surrounding localities and very often from all other places in the region that it is located in. Rijeka has the Trsat Shrine. The picture on the left has, at the top, the heading *Svetište Majke Božje Trsatske* 'Marian Shrine of Trsat'. Under this are the words, *Hrvatski Nazaret* 'Croatian Nazareth', followed

by *Gospa Trsatska* 'Our Lady of Trsat'. She is then described according to the following three attributes: *Zvijezda mora* 'Star of the Sea'; *Kraljica Jadrana* 'Queen of the Adriatic'; and *Čuvarica Grada Rijeke* 'Guardian of the City of Rijeka'. One part of the Trsat Shrine that is conspicuous from the perspective of the city's linguistic landscape is the collection of votive plaques on a wall that contain private messages of devotion, in particular expressions of gratitude to the Virgin Mary.



The long set of steps that lead from the coastline up to the shrine in Trsat are known as *Stube Petra Kružića* 'The Steps of Petar Kružić', named after a soldier and member of the Croatian nobility who is buried in Trsat.



A less arduous way to get to Trsat is marked out on these road signs:



One of Rijeka's streets is named after Antun Mihanović, a poet who wrote the words to the national anthem while residing in Rijeka. A mural of him is visible on the side of the building photographed below. The barely legible lyrics of the national anthem can be just made out on the side of the building.



Another of the city's streets is named after the eastern Croatian city of Vukovar, that was laid siege to at the start of the Croatian War of Independence from August to November 1991.



A municipal mini-bus spreads goodwill with the following message written on the side of it: *Rijeka zdravi grad*. This means 'Rijeka is a healthy city'. This is one of the many syntagms that can be found across the city that emphasise the city's positive qualities. Another one is *Rijeka – prijatelj djece* 'The City of Rijeka – a child friendly city'.

Another thing about Rijeka is that its university has a strong profile. This means that as a centre of learning, the university spreads its positive and youthful 'vibes' around the city. These 'vibes' are felt most of all in the Trsat area where the main campus is located. A road sign with directions to the main campus is a recognisable sign of its presence alongside other prominent buildings located in Trsat.



Some of the signage on the campus conforms to the national regulations on the appearance of signs for official institutions. The picture to the right has the Croatian coat-of-arms at the top, followed by *Republika Hrvatska* 'Republic of Croatia'. Below this is the title of the institute, *Akademija primijenjenih umjetnosti, Sveučilišta u Rijeci, Rijeka* 'Academy of Applied Arts, University of Rijeka, Rijeka'.



Other signs have a more free or creative appearance. The picture on the left shows the facade of the *Filozofski fakultet* 'Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences', while the one on the right shows the *Građevinski fakultet* 'Faculty of Civil Engineering'.



An interesting thing about Rijeka is that people orientate themselves by buildings and institutions rather than the names of streets. For example, the name of this bus station is *Teta Roža* 'Aunty Rosie' named after a cafe located just nearby.



We conclude with something that combines the old with the new, which is something that Rijeka is renowned for. This is shown here visibly through a retro-designed stone pedestal with the Latin phrase *Vox Populi*. Anyone who feels the need to address the public and speak freely can do so on this plinth that has the feel of being a *Speakers' Corner*.



These are just a selection of signs that are characteristic of Rijeka's identity. They are, perhaps, the most visible and conspicuous ones that the city is renowned for. All urban and rural spaces have such characteristic signs that are an important part of a space's linguistic landscape.

Varieties of signage found in public spaces

The greatest level of diversity in the linguistic landscape of Rijeka is to be found on the city's privately-owned entities, in particular on commercial as well as residential buildings. Within this context, we also include the city's cemeteries, which can be seen as containing a valuable repository of private missives visible in a public place. These missives index not only complex personal stories, but also the city's cultural and historical heritage. We commence by looking firstly at signs that contain the names of service outlets.

These signs can feature the use of multiple languages (including protected product names) and the names of some service outlets can be read in different ways. The first 'layer' of meaning contained in the name of the café pictured below, namely *Karolina*, is that it refers to a girl's name, the English equivalent of which is 'Caroline'. The second 'layer' of meaning is accessible only to those that are familiar with Rijeka's history. Here, the café indexes the historical figure *Karolina Belinić* or *Karolina Riječka* (meaning 'Karolina of Rijeka'), who played a small but significant role in the city's defence. At that time, Rijeka was under French rule, and in 1813 it was attacked by British naval vessels that subjected the city centre and its port facilities to heavy gunfire.



Some signs contain the city's name as an attribute. The sign below *Kuća riječkog kruha* translates roughly as 'Home of Rijeka's bread'.



In some instances, more than just linguistic skills are needed to decipher what some of the names of businesses actually mean. For example, what does the name of the beach bar below, called *Empeduja* mean? This word is not to be found in any dictionary and we need to look further afield to work out what it means. Its meaning relates to the abbreviation *MP2*, which here is not pronounced according to how it would otherwise be in Croatian, namely *em-pey-dva*, but as *em-pey-duya*, with the initials *MP* referring to the first letters of the name *Morski prasac* (meaning 'Angular roughshark', a type of shark local to the Adriatic Sea and the Mediterranean Sea in general) and the number 2. This beach bar lies on Rijeka's Kantrida beach and is the second in a chain of hospitality outlets that have the distinctive name, *Morski prasac*. This then explains the bar's reference to the acronym *MP2*.



Some business names contain a direct reference to the service area that they deal with. Flower shops often bear names of particular flowers. The flower shop pictured below is called *Čičak* 'Thistle', although it is likely that shoppers would be more interested in other types of flowers and plants.



The flower shop adjacent to the city cemetery in Trsat bears the name *Ne zaboravi me* 'Don't forget me'. The name of the shop sends out a double message. The first one is that visitors to the cemetery should not forget to observe the local custom of marking a visit to a family member's grave by leaving flowers on it. The second one is that *Ne zaboravi me* is also the Croatian name for a flower that has an equivalent name in English, 'Forget-me-not'.



As in many other cities, in Rijeka some businesses have names and descriptions of their products or services in English. The image to the right shows a business that appears to stand out quite conspicuously from its immediate environment. Located on *Frankopanski trg* 'Frankopan Square' and just adjacent to the Trsat Monastery and Trsat Castle, this business appeals to those customers interested in natural and ecologically-sustainable products.



In contrast, the sign on the restaurant on the following page is in Italian only and functions as an invitation for diners to enjoy Italian cuisine.



The fact that almost everything can be *TO GO*, (i.e. food and drink that can be consumed as 'take-away') is born out in the name of the food outlet shown on the right *GRILL & BURGER TO GO*:



Domestic announcements in public places can also relate to people's pets. The caption next to the dog's head says *Moj dom. Moja pravila*. 'My home. My rules.'



Some signs bring a smile to our faces through their visual or graphic features. One example is a bar called *THE BEERTIJA KLUB*. It contains the English definite article *the* and it contains a double-e in the spelling of its main name, *BEERTIJA*. The double-e in English, pronounced as a long 'ee', is rendered in Croatian as 'i'. The bar's name, therefore, is an 'English-inspired' variation of the spelling of the Croatian word for 'bar' or 'pub', namely *BIRTIJA*. While *KLUB* is the way 'club' is spelt in Croatian, it's sufficiently close to the English spelling to be comprehensible to others as well. The situation is made even more confusing – or ridiculous, as the case may be – by the name of the establishment next door to it, *DAS HOSTEL*, which contains the German definite article, *das* 'the' preceding *hostel*, which is now a widely used internationalism.



The sign to the right indexes multiple meanings. A hostel with a picture of a bed and the name *Kosy* conjures up an image of it being 'cozy' and comfortable. The other meaning that it indexes is that the word *kosy* is pronounced in Croatian in the same way that the word *kosi* is pronounced, and *kosi* means 'leaning'. This hostel is located just near Rijeka's *Leaning Tower*. This is another one of the city's attractions – Pisa is not the only city with a leaning tower. Rijeka has one too!



On the subject of humour and humorous plays on words, the message shown in the picture on the right is one of the features of Rijeka's linguistic landscape that all locals notice and comment on. Some business signs and hoardings have become famous due to references to current affairs or as playful asides in their own right. The café shown here to the right is the *Caffè La Guardia*. The café is named after *Fiorello La Guardia*, a long-time mayor of New York in the 1930s and 1940s, who was the Consular Agent of the United States in Rijeka from 1903 to 1906. The message that attracts locals' attention is *Od sutra sve besplatno* 'As of tomorrow, everything's free of charge'.



Some signs change almost daily and often relate to recent events. The one on the right reads as: *Ispunjavamo imovinske kartice* 'We fill out declarations of assets forms'. This message indexes media reports at the time of ministers being unable to fill out forms where they declare their ownership of assets or being unable to provide correct amounts for the assets owned. Thus, this café offers 'assistance' to those politicians (and others) who 'lack the capacity' to fill in asset declaration forms. The play on words is apparent to Croatian-speakers, who are accustomed to business entities featuring a sign starting with *Ispunjavamo...*, meaning 'We fulfil...' and the object that usually follows is usually something commercially-related, such as *Ispunjavamo vaše administrativne potrebe* 'We fulfil your administrative needs' or *Ispunjavamo vaše kulinarske želje* 'We fulfil your culinary wishes'.



Another play on words is the name *Pametna ploča* that consists of two words which together are a calque of English *smartboard* (or *smart board*). *Ploča* is a hypernym that can also refer to a 'blackboard' (or 'chalkboard' in US English), that is, a school-place requisite that most older (and still some younger) people had learnt to write with. The words *Pametna ploča* written in chalk on a small school blackboard outside a business are meant as a tongue-in-cheek reminder that simple, hand-written messages can have a 'smart' feel about them.



Some signs contain serious messages such as enrolling in a language course. The poster shown below is from the *Dante School of Foreign Languages*. The name *Dante*, of course, brings to mind the Italian writer and philosopher, Dante. In Croatian, the word *dante* is very similar in pronunciation to the words *da te...?* meaning 'Can I do... something to you', e.g. *Dante [= da te] nešto pitam?* 'Can I ask you something?'. Here, *Absolutely* is combined with *Dante* to have a similarly humorous effect.



Graffiti occupies a special place in contemporary urban spaces. Graffiti can appear on the spur of the moment. It can appear as the product of someone's impulses or creative urges. It can appear as a result of long-standing deliberations and be highly organised. There are examples of graffiti that we may consider a vandalization of public space. There are examples of graffiti that we may consider an improvement to an area. Put simply, there are all types of graffiti.

The texts that graffiti can contain are also diverse, from a person's initials or haphazardly scribbled letters and words to concise texts. These can be in Croatian or in another language. Most often this is English. The types of visual representations that graffiti encompasses are therefore broad and Rijeka is no exception.

We commence with examples of graffiti that seek to beautify their environment. Some people may not consider them examples of graffiti as they resulted from artistic projects commissioned by the city's urban authority. This is evident from the themes, content and rollout methods used to decorate wall spaces around the city. As such, they can also be considered examples of street wall art. This certainly applies to the visual image and its surrounds showing Ivan Zajc (1832-1914) who was born in Rijeka and who was a famous composer. Next to his picture are explanatory texts about his life in both Croatian and English.




The artistic decoration of the wall pictured on the next page was also officially commissioned. It contains a picture painted by a famous local painter, Vojo Radoičić, and the association to childhood themes is made clear through the visual image used and through the text *Učenički dom Podmurvice* 'Primary Student Centre of Podmurvice'. Podmurvice is a suburb of Rijeka.



Some graffiti artists just like to leave evidence of having been in a particular place. An example is given in the picture here where someone just scrawled *Samo Rijeka* 'Only Rijeka' as if to say that for them, this is the only place that exists.



A more loaded message is conveyed by the following example of graffiti that alludes to life's complexities (written in a colloquial style that is often characteristic of many examples of graffiti):



A MORAS IĆ NAZAD DA BI IŠO NAPRIJED!

'BUT YOU HAVE TO GO BACKWARDS IN ORDER TO MOVE FORWARD!'

And some comment about our 'time-poor' lives. The original message on the picture on the right was *IMA VREMENA* 'THERE IS TIME'. Someone else then added the letter *N* in front of *IMA*, making it *NIMA* which means 'THERE IS NOT' (in the Čakavian Ikavian dialect spoken in areas surrounding Rijeka). The addition of the grapheme (N) changes the meaning of the text to something contrary, namely 'THERE IS NO TIME'.



However, most graffiti is barely legible and not so easy to decipher. But maybe that in itself is a message. The first image below contains the text: *LjUBAV SE ZOVE IMENOM TVOJIM. L+G* 'THE WORD LOVE IS CALLED YOUR NAME. L+G' with an illegible tag signature.



Similar to other varieties of signage, amongst the examples of graffiti there are also messages that are in English only:



As stated, cemeteries occupy a particular place in the linguistic landscape of any city. Every cemetery has certain features that draw people to it notwithstanding the sense of loss and mourning that every cemetery has. In Croatia, there are two architecturally striking cemeteries that are well known both domestically as well as beyond the country's borders. The first one is the town cemetery in Varaždin, located in the far north of the country, which is famous for its landscape architecture and its rich botanical arrangements featuring thousands of trees, plants and flowers. The second one is Zagreb's main cemetery, *Mirogoj*. The name of the cemetery is not accidental; as a word *mirogoj* is made up of two words, *mir* meaning 'peace' and *goj* which as a suffix has the meaning 'cultivating'. Thus, the cemetery's name is suggestive of 'cultivating peace'. Mirogoj is famous for its many long arcades most of which feature porticos and it is famous for the way its graveyards are surrounded by landscaped greenery. The arcades feature the graves of noteworthy citizens, most prominently those of famous or acclaimed writers. As such, walking around the cemetery reading the tombstones almost feels like reading a book of not only the city's history but of Croatian history in general.


Rijeka has two older cemeteries, one in Trsat and the other in Kozala. They both offer narratives of Rijeka's history, while those from the city's new cemetery, in Drenova, offer more contemporary ones. The sign below is what greets visitors when they visit Trsat Cemetery:




As one would expect, most tombstones commemorate people who represent a wide cross-section of the city's deceased citizens. Nonetheless, some of the inscriptions can be memorable, such as the following reading:

OVDJE POČIVA / IVAN SRDAR / U NAPONU SVOJE / SNAGE / NEMILOM SMRČU / UGRABLJEN LJUBAVI / SVOJE / DNE 27 SRPNJA 1902 / U 32 GODINE / DOBI SVOJE


HERE LIES IVAN SRDAR. TAKEN FROM US AT THE AGE OF 32, IN THE BEST YEARS OF HIS LIFE, DUE TO A TERRIBLE EVENT. OUR LOVE FOR HIM STILL REMAINS. 27 JULY 1902.



In the past, it was the custom to record the deceased's occupation or other information about their status in society. The tombstones below are of Rudolf Reschner, a *šumarski savjetnik* 'forest management advisor', Krunoslav Mažuranić-Janković who was a *sudac* then an *odvjetnik* 'judge' then 'lawyer', while his brothers Petar and Marijan were a *župnik* and *odvjetnik* 'parish priest' and 'lawyer' respectively. The third tombstone is of Otello Cheracci who was a *capitano marittimo* or 'ship captain'.



The town cemetery in Kozala is like a repository of various languages and scripts. One thing that stands out about the tombstones of those with surnames ending in the characteristically Slavic *-ić* suffix is the variation in the spelling of this as *-ich*.






The cemetery in Kozala has the grave of one of Rijeka's most famous daughters. She was a nun, known in Croatian as *Marija Krucifiksa Kozulić*, and in Italian as *Maria Crocifissa Cosulich*. She was the founder of the Catholic order of the Daughters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the only religious order indigenous to the Archdiocese of Rijeka. Her beatification commenced in 2008.



In the Jewish section of the cemetery, the first names and surnames of the deceased are usually in Italian, sometimes with some biographical information. The longer texts underneath the deceased people's names are then in Hebrew. For example, *SABINA WEISBERGER NATA BODNER* relates to a woman, 'SABINA WEISBERGER née BODNER'. Another shows: *GIUSEPPE DOTT. FRANK RABBINO CAPO 1867 – 1937* relating to 'Doctor Giuseppe Frank, Chief Rabbi. 1867-1937'.

This picture shows the monument dedicated to the Jewish victims of nazism.



At the Kozala cemetery, there are numerous gravestones commemorating those who fought on the side of the Partisans during WWII, which in Croatian is known as the *Narodnooslobodilačka borba*, 'the People's Liberation Struggle'. The pictures shown below are of the *Partizansko groblje* or *Cimitero partigiano* 'Partisan Graveyard'. The texts on the gravestones tend to follow a common and uniform pattern. The last picture below shows the gravestones of Mario Gennari and Giuseppe Duella, both of whom are mentioned in the chapter on modern-day signs.



Some gravestone inscriptions offer a wealth of sociolinguistic information. For example, there are gravestones that relate to the families of Croatian emigrants. On some of these it is possible to trace the history of the families, details of how they emigrated, how they found their way in a new country, often with accompanying linguistic features that are evidence of this. While we were not able to locate examples of such gravestones in Rijeka's cemeteries, what we were able to locate was examples of family graves that the families themselves were no longer continuing to use. These relate to those of Italian families that left in 1945 and the following years, and to the Jewish section of the Kozala cemetery.

The new cemetery in Drenova has one striking feature. The cemetery contains a dedication and commemorative plaque from doctors and medical students who express their gratitude to people whose organs were made available for donation to other people: *Spomen obilježje onima koji su poklonili svoje tijelo za izučavanje i napredak medicinske znanosti. Neka im sije ovo vječno svjetlo. S pijetetom i zahvalnošću. Studenti i djelatnici Medicinskog fakulteta, Sveučilišta u Rijeci*. 'Commemorating those who donated their organs to serve the interests of medical science and its advancement. May this eternal flame forever shine on them. In pious gratitude – Students and Staff of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Rijeka'.



As we can see, the gravestones in the new cemetery in Drenova provide a more contemporary picture of Croatian life and this cemetery includes graves of those who fell in the recent Croatian War of Independence, which in Croatian is known as the *Domovinski rat*, lit. 'Homeland War'.

The first picture on the next page shows a sign with the words *Aleja hrvatskih branitelja* 'Avenue of Croatian Military Veterans'. The second one contains the following:

Blago mirotvorcima, njihovo je kraljevstvo nebesko kao riječki dragovoljci HV poginuli u Bilaju 14. XII. 1991. Laka im bila hrvatska gruda. U znak sjećanja, 118. Brigada HV Gospić. 'The kingdom of heaven belongs to those who are honoured as peacekeepers. In memory of those citizens of Rijeka who volunteered to fight in the Croatian Army and who fell in the battle for the village of Bilaj on 14th December 1991. May they rest in peace, buried in their beloved Croatia. Soldiers of the 118th Brigade of the Croatian Army, based in Gospić'.

Advertising all around us



There are also signs in Arabic and Turkish at the new cemetery in Drenova.

The city's cemeteries are witness to the diversity of languages that are part of Rijeka's history and cultural heritage. In this way, the private and perhaps even intimate world of tombstone inscriptions is a part of the city's linguistic landscape. It is not an example of 'top-down' signage, but certain common features are ascertainable. These relate to the linguistic codes used, the textual content, and to the presentation of texts.

Advertising is a characteristic of contemporary linguistic landscapes all across the world. Indeed, when we talk to others about signs that surround us, they usually think of advertising signs because these types of signs are all around us. They can be omnipotent, obvious and often very large in size and with a colour scheme that is very bright. Some people are irritated by the overuse of English. Others don't like the fact that advertising can distract them while driving. Still others draw attention to the use of language which may needlessly contravene our own linguistic norms. And some dislike marketing campaigns that feature the same, monotonous kind of advertising signs or variations of them wherever we look. One thing is for sure – we can't help but notice them.

Advertising is a communication model based on marketing directed towards a broad range of consumers in contrast to a communication model used with business partners. When interacting with business partners and other associates what usually happens is that information that is communicated is relevant to the maintenance of a long-term association (where the genre of discourse used is that of administrative language). But in the case of advertising, the presence of relevant information is not (always) obvious (Đurin 1999). Sometimes, key pieces of information may be missing in an advertisement, and the elliptic nature of the advertisement is the feature that attracts our attention. In other instances, an advertising sign can feature a type of discourse that contains multiple media in it, in which textual, visual and auditory components are interlinked.

An advertisement is a complex semiotic sign that promotes the value of the product. It is a form of media that has the purpose of informing potential consumers about a particular product or service (Stolac – Vlastelić 2014). At the same time, it avails itself of stimuli that will enable a particular message to be conveyed about a product or service that will induce potential consumers to become actual consumers. The aim of advertising is for it to reach every possible consumer and when we look at it closely, we can locate not only objective attributes but also some subjective ones as well.

The idea behind every form of advertisement is for it to be noticed. It should attract people's attention straight away. It's therefore understandable that a fundamental aim of the message contained in an advertisement is for it to contain text in a condensed form. This means that it attempts to convey maximum content in minimum form, or in simple terms, with as few words as possible it seeks to turn the consumer of the message into a consumer of the product or service. This requires a great deal of creative input and linguistic skill, and, of course, a great deal of effort and competence in the area of other, non-linguistic stimuli. It is this blending of linguistic, visual and auditory features that forms the architectural structure of an advertisement and that enables it to achieve specific effects.

We can surmise by saying that advertisements can be characterised as being brief, condensed, comprehensible, modern, creative, appellative, often multi-layered and sophisticated, both spectacular and ceremonial, and often shocking and aggressive (Udier, 2006).

The most conspicuous types of advertising are billboards, posters, texts displayed in shop windows, messaging hung across buildings undergoing renovation and signs on public vehicles (buses, taxis). When looking at a linguistic landscape, our attention is focused on linguistic features. But it is important to ascertain what the extralinguistic context of the advertising message is for it to be understood in its entirety.


For years we have been collecting data and when we examine our corpus of data we find that advertisements that are monolingual are the most numerous, followed by bilingual ones, with multilingual ones being quite infrequent. In terms of the languages that the advertisements are in, these are Croatian, English, Italian and other foreign languages. There are also examples of the use of dialect and colloquial, non-standard language. Some advertisements in Croatian contain the use of hybrid forms as well.

As stated, most signs in Rijeka are in one language only, and this applies also to advertisements, which are in Croatian, as could be expected. This is a feature of the linguistic landscape of any country that specifies which language is to be used in the public realm and advertising is simply in line with this. The purpose of advertising is to reach consumers and the language best understood by most consumers in Rijeka is Croatian.

Bilingualism is a common feature of those areas where ethnic minorities live. But while official signs in these areas may be bilingual, this does not mean that non-official and commercial signs need to be bilingual, and the same applies to advertising signs.

A detailed study on the use of advertising in linguistic landscapes was undertaken by Stolac (2018) and we draw the reader's attention to this study and the examples contained in it and cite here a select group of them. The linguistic variety used in advertising is standard Croatian, which is in line with government regulations. The types of advertisements found on billboards in Rijeka are the same as those found elsewhere in Croatia.

The advertisement shown on the right contains a play on words but everything in the advertisement is still comprehensible and there is no other sub-text present in it. The beer's name is *Pan*, which is just a brand name with no other meaning. The caption *Pan. Osvježi dan!* means 'Pan. Refresh your day!' It contains the allusion to beer as a refreshing beverage and the allusion that Pan beer refreshes your day.



But there are other types of advertisements that index a wider context. The image below is an advertisement for another beer brand, *Ožujsko*, the most popular beer in Croatia that for over a decade has been an official sponsor of the Croatian national football team. The advertisement containing images of four members of the Croatian national team in victorious pose references the success of the team at the 2018 World Cup where they were runners-up in the Final. The name *Ožujsko*, therefore, is associated with success. In the picture itself in small letters on the right hand side, there is a caption that says *Zakon broj 215* meaning 'Law no. 215', while the bigger caption *Nećemo odustati* translates as 'We will not give up'. The small-font caption references an expression in colloquial Croatian, *Žuja je zakon*, which reads as 'Ožujsko is the law' but is better translated as 'Ožujsko rules'. (*Žuja* is an abbrev-



viated, non-standard form of *Ožujsko*). The larger-font caption *Nećemo odustati* 'We will not give up' clearly plays on the image of the fortitude and tenacity of the Croatian national team in achieving great success. There is a secondary meaning to *Nećemo odustati*, which translates as 'We will not refrain from...' and the association with beer in the advertisement suggests to the reader that the Croatian national football team will not refrain from drinking *Ožujsko* beer. By extension, use of the first person plural form 'we' allows the reader to co-identify with the players and to share their intention not to refrain from consuming *Ožujsko* beer.

The advertisement also contains a stereotype. The first stereotype that it works from is that the target consumer for beer advertisements is male or groups of men. These men are likely to be of mid-to-low social status, young to middle-aged and perhaps likely to engage in certain rituals based on male bonding and entertainment. For this reason, countless beer advertisements make associations to football and there are no women to be seen. And this is exactly what is found in this advertisement. We could just as easily well swap it for any other beer advertisement, but we don't need to, because any other advertisement is likely to contain the same stereotype.


These images and messages that we are exposed to daily affect us and it is hardly surprising that this influences how we think and that we may start to emulate such behaviour when, for example, we ourselves are watching a sports match. These are clear indicators of the influence that a linguistic landscape can have on the formation of stereotypes.

Some advertisements contain minor digressions from standard Croatian usually to achieve a stylistic effect. The following advertisement is from a bank:

- *A s kim Vi bankarite?*

This question translates as 'And who do you bank with?'. This sounds quite normal in English as the word *bank* can function both as a noun as well as a verb. But, in Croatian, the equivalent term *banka* 'bank' can occur as a noun only. The creation of a verb *bankirati* 'to bank' derived from the noun, *banka*, is a neologism, which not only catches people's attention as most neologisms do, it also reads like a translation of an equivalent English sentence. In this way, the advertisement indexes the English language, and 'things to do with English or the Anglophone world' which, in turn, is indexical of contemporary trends and modern

practices. This phrase has become associated with this particular bank, which is one of the biggest in Rijeka and which has used a variety of different advertising posters for marketing purposes. A neologism with the same meaning, but with slightly different spelling (*bankarenje* 'banking') is found in the advertisement on the right that 'welcomes George to the future of banking'.



We dwell for a moment to look at a pasta advertisement shown below. There is also a digression from standard Croatian in this advertisement. In contrast to the previous advertisements, this sign is directly connected with Rijeka and is not found in areas outside Rijeka.



The choice of a local word from Rijeka, *pašta*, meaning ‘pasta’ is the key to the message. Viewers associate the word *pašta* with a whole range of products under the label *PaštaRla*. (A packet of pasta with the label *PaštaRla* is visible in the picture.) The word *PaštaRla* contains the capitalised letters *RI* at the end which is the hallmark abbreviated form for the city of Rijeka. (The letters *RI* are found on the registration plates of all vehicles registered in Rijeka and *RI* has become the trademark abbreviation to refer to Rijeka.) Pasta products within the *PaštaRla* range are manufactured in Rijeka. The text *Pusti pašti na volju* translates as ‘Let your pasta run free’. This sounds unusual, but this text contains a clever variation of one letter from a well-known phrase, *Pusti mašti na volju* which means ‘Let your imagination run free’.

The association of *pašta* with *mašta* goes even further. A word related to *mašta*, namely *maštarija*, means *fantasy* and it is the positive connotation that this word has that has given rise to another neologism *paštarija*, which is suggestive of ‘fantastically created pasta’.



Many smaller poster signs feature local terms, often those of Italian origin such as *butiga* (Ital. *bottega*) meaning ‘shop’ or ‘store’, *delicija* (Ital. *delizia*) meaning ‘delicacy’, *pinca* (Venetian Ital. *pinza*) a type of sweet bread eaten at Easter, and *pašta* (Ital. *pasta*) as mentioned, some of which can be found on the poster shown above on the door of a local store:

One of our hypotheses that dialectal forms are more likely to be used for the advertising of local products is confirmed. *Miči sir* (standard Croatian: *Maleni sir*) advertises a local cheese that is sold in small, separate packages ideal for salads or for a *međubrok*, a ‘snack in between’.




In general, however, it is unusual for billboards and larger signs to contain local or dialect expressions, and the following one that contains two words from the local Čakavian dialect is exceptional. The advertisement contains an interrogative phrase that functions as a statement, *Ča će ti takuin kad imaš mobitel* meaning ‘Why do you need a wallet when you’ve got a mobile phone’. The words *ča* ‘what’ and *takuin* ‘wallet’ are Čakavian dialect and index the speech of the local area.



The same applies to this message on a vehicle of a service provider for mobile phones. It reads *Ma neće meni posal uteć!* meaning 'Really no job will escape me' suggesting that the provider is so reliable that any businessperson using their services will have no gaps in coverage. The words *posal* and the truncated form of the infinitive verb *uteći* > *uteć* 'to escape' are characteristic of the Rijeka vernacular.



Returning to monolingual advertisements in standard Croatian, the billboard in the picture on the right could be seen for a long time just near a freeway turn-off on the approach to Rijeka. The billboard showed a picture of a piece of furniture with four shelves with the message, *Složite svoje police* means 'Sort out your shelves'.



The word *police* has two meanings, 'shelves' and 'insurance policies', and the billboard conveys an ambiguous message. The first meaning conveyed is obvious: the viewer expects that it is about tidying things up and putting them in their place so that they look nice. But, perhaps unsurprisingly, it was an insurance company that commissioned this billboard advertisement, and so it is this meaning of the word *police* that comes to mind and makes us think of taking out life insurance, or housing or car insurance and so on. We can usually work out fairly well what the suggested meaning is in most advertisements, notwithstanding the almost complete absence of any text and only a few hints given in the accompanying visuals.

In other signs that are monolingual, the language used is English. This is to be expected as 'global English' is used all across the advertising world as a language of importance through which marketing messages can be conveyed. In this way, English functions as a *lingua franca*, as a system of codes that enable communication across multiple languages.

When looking at English-language advertisements that are found across Croatia, it is not obvious that they are located in the Croatian linguistic landscape as they could just as easily be located anywhere. The homogenisation of advertising in one language only is something that has swept across the world and identical advertisements are now found everywhere. As they are part of so many different linguistic landscapes, we are left to ask ourselves whether we consider them to be part of each individual linguistic landscape, or whether they are all part of a single, global linguistic landscape. As evidence for this, we observe that the following slogans on roadside billboards could be located anywhere in the world:

- *Just do it!*
- *McDonald's I'm, loving it!*

There are cases when English appears to be an appropriate choice of language when the advertisements themselves target tourists. The two pictures below contain messages that are of use to tourists: the first one addresses tourists' electronic communication needs; the second one provides advice on supermarkets.



Both pictures call on foreign visitors to be like the locals. They literally call on visitors to Rijeka to relax or shop *like a local*. At the same time, in the heart of downtown Rijeka, we located the following A-frame advertisement that is congruent to the ones above with the following message: *Don't be a stranger*.



And together with the call *don't be a stranger*, the advertisement markets the fact that the hospitality outlet has *beer-to-go*. When one looks carefully at the wording of some advertisements, one can see that the predicate *to go*, with or without a hyphen, can be combined with other foods and drinks, such as salads. The picture shown here to the right contains a hybrid message containing the Croatian word *salate* 'salads' with *to go*. This remains the only other example of its kind where a Croatian noun is combined with the predicate *to go*.



It's rare for signs that are monolingual to be not in Croatian or English. The sign to the right is one of the few examples of this where Italian-speaking visitors are invited in Italian to *Pensa da locale* 'Think locally', and then to *Bevi locale* 'Drink locally', namely *Karlovačko pivo*, a beer brewed in the nearby city of Karlovac.



Billboard signs usually foremost feature a picture that is accompanied by a short text, typically a slogan. This format is used for an advertisement for Belgian beer where we find the following caption in French:

- *Joie de Bière* 'Joy of Beer'

and the following caption for a perfume:

- *Chanel. Le corps actif.* 'Chanel. The active body'

or for German cars together with German text:

- *Opel. Wir leben Autos* 'Opel. We live cars'
- *Volkswagen – Das Auto.* 'Volkswagen – The car'

The last advertisement has given rise to another one, this time not advertising a German product but a local one, namely a Croatian-based live stream radio channel:

- *Das radio Laganini*

Here, the noun *radio* is in lower case and its spelling is in line with the rules of Croatian, not German punctuation. In this way, what looks to be a monolingual name turns out to be a hybrid text. To add to this, the name of the radio, *Laganini* is also a play on words containing an intriguing hybrid form consisting of the Croatian adjective *lagan* 'easy' and an Italian suffix with a diminutive meaning, *-ini*. The effect is that people reading the message know that what is being advertised is a radio station with 'easy-listening' content.

Apart from these monolingual signs in languages other than Croatian we also report signs in shop windows informing shoppers of discount sales via the Italian word *saldi*.



The conclusion we come to is that monolingual signage is the most common form of signage in Rijeka's linguistic landscape. In regard to bilingual advertisements, the corpus of collected data shows that there are two groups: those that contain text in both languages with the same content, in other words, one is an exact translation of the other; those that have text that has been freely translated or adapted. The arrangement of languages, i.e., which one comes first and which second usually indicates which language was the source language. But it is possible that this is not always a reliable indicator and a more reliable one may be the language of the product's country of origin.

In most Croatian-English bilingual advertisements there is a direct and literal translation from one language into the other, as is shown in the following slogans:

- *Always Coca Cola – Uvijek Coca Cola.*
- *Water I trust. Voda kojoj vjerujem.*




In the first slogan on the previous page, the first part in English is the source or original slogan and the second part is a translation. The two slogans can appear together on the same advertisement, but they can also appear separately, on their own. In the second slogan, it's a Croatian product that is being advertised, but the original, Croatian slogan is placed second. By positioning the translation ahead of the Croatian text, the advertisement conveys the importance of English as a carrier of prestige. For this reason, in these kinds of bilingual advertisements, it is not really possible to conceive of them as being two languages of equal standing.

It is of interest to look at two advertisements from the same company, in this case, Croatia's most widespread supermarket chain, *Konzum*. One of the advertisements contains the following text with only one word, *lubenica*, supplied from Croatian while the rest is in English:

- *LUBENICA Croatian word for watermelon*

A dictionary entry translation into English is provided for this popular variety of fruit eaten in summer. The same structure is replicated in this advertisement too, *KONZUM. Croatian word for supermarket*



There is no direct translation, not even a partial one, while *Konzum* is not an equivalent to the word *supermarket* in the way that *lubenica* is to *watermelon*. In this way, the advertisement is not a provider of information. On the contrary, it actually creates the false impression that the Croatian word for 'supermarket' is *Konzum*. But, it does fulfil its main function: it steers foreign visitors towards *Konzum* supermarkets.

Walking around the city we come across more make-shift, stand-up advertisements that have signage in two languages. Some of them contain spelling mistakes while some of them contain inconsistencies in the way different languages are combined or set out. The sign on the left has the

first three rows in English only. The fourth and five rows combine Croatian *pića* and *pokloni* with English *drinks* and *gifts*.

In the second picture, the sign attached to the facade of the store is in Croatian only and has the words *duhani* '(varieties of) tobacco', *lule* 'pipes', *vodene lule* 'waterpipes', *pušački pribor* 'smoking accessories', *igračke* 'toys' and *parfemi* 'perfumes'. The advertising stand placed in front of it features the following English words sign-written on it *tobacco shop* and *souvenirs*. On the blackboard below, other, more specific goods that the shop sells are in Croatian (*kubanske cigare* 'Cuban cigars') or represented via integrated borrowings from English (*blunt-ovi* 'blunts'), loan translations (*kamenčići za nargilu* 'shisha aroma stones') or by Croatian words that undergo semantic extension (*mrvilice* 'grinders').



We come now to an advertisement for a beverage that is popular amongst young people. When the advertisement first appeared, the target audience clearly understood its English-Croatian hybridity. *OMG NOVA BOCA!* ('OMG A NEW BOTTLE').

Two Croatian words *nova boca* 'new bottle' are combined with the English acronym *OMG* ('Oh my God'), which is well known amongst young people in Croatia. Just below this, the label also contains the words *Odabrali teensi*, which means 'chosen by teenagers'. *Teensi* 'teenagers' is a lexical transfer that has been phonologically adapted and morphologically integrated into Croatian.



Some elderly citizens who do not use acronyms employed in internet-based communication did not understand the abbreviation *OMG* (*Oh, my God!*). But one abbreviation that would have been comprehensible to them is contained on the sign to the right displayed in a shop window on Fiumara, one of Rijeka's main streets. *JSL ZA NOVU BOCU?*



While *OMG* was an English-origin acronym, *JSL* is a Croatian one. The abbreviation *JSL* stands for *Jesi li..?* 'Are you..?', and consists of the copula conjugated in the second person *jesi* and the interrogative particle *li*. The pronunciation of these letters in Croatian, *J-S-L*, is itself very similar to the full interrogative form *Jesi li*. The remaining part, *za novu bocu* means 'for a new bottle', and a free translation of the message on this advertisement is, 'Would you like another bottle?'. The acronym *JSL* is characteristic of how younger generations communicate. The creator of this inventive abbreviation displays an enviable level of knowledge of sociolinguistics and pragmatics.

Apart from English being present in the Croatian linguistic landscape we also locate bilingual advertising signs in Croatian and Italian. The Italian text *Che buona mortadella!* 'What good mortadella [= cured meat]!' While the Croatian text, *Savršena na svakom jeziku*, translates in two ways: 'Excellent in any language' and 'Excellent on every tongue'.

- *Che buona mortadella! Savršena na svakom jeziku.*

Bilingual advertisements in other languages are rare. In border areas, some advertisements occasionally feature text in both Croatian and Hungarian, or in both Croatian and Slovenian. No such advertisements are found in Rijeka's linguistic landscape. In the collected data sample we do not record any examples of bilingual signage in two foreign languages, i.e. signage that does not include Croatian. In general, multilingual signage is rare across the Croatian linguistic landscape and this is the case for Rijeka as well.

But one area that is characterised by multilingual signage is the one that intersects with both advertising and public information, and in this area the signage is functionally based. In Rijeka, as elsewhere in Croatia, tourist information signs are in Croatian and English and often in further languages as well. In the past, these were German, Italian and/or French, while more recently other languages have been added such as Czech, Slovak, Polish, Russian and Hungarian.

Apart from information from the national or regional tourist boards, use of multiple languages is to be found on the signage of private businesses and tour operators, although sometimes there can be shortcomings in terms of spelling or grammatical accuracy.

We observe also that multilingualism is more frequently a characteristic of information-focused signage rather than advertising. This applies across the Croatian linguistic landscape as it does to Rijeka's linguistic landscape. Based on the collected data sample – advertising in public spaces: on billboards, building signs and vehicles – we can see what the basic characteristics of the Croatian and Rijeka's linguistic landscapes are. Most signs are in one language only: in standard Croatian (less so hybrid forms of various Croatian vernaculars), with only a much smaller number appearing in foreign languages. Where this is the case, we observe that English is the language most often used. Monolingual signs in any other language are uncommon. Those advertising signs that contain text in Italian, German or French most commonly have these as part of the product brand or as part of a specific advertising slogan.

Bilingual signage is most commonly in Croatian and another language (e.g. English, Italian), and we do not record any examples of advertisements in two foreign languages. (This leads us to assume that such signage if it were to occur would be very exceptional.) Multilingual advertisements are uncommon, but where they do appear, Croatian and English are always amongst the languages used on them.

Comparing the linguistic characteristics of advertisements with other signs found in the public space (Stolac 2018) we can see that within Croatia, there is a practice of monolingual signage with the possibility of the use of two languages, in which the second language is usually English. This, of course, depends on the type of signage and also whether the sign is an official one or not so that the choice of language changes accordingly.

The quantitative presence of English in Croatia's linguistic landscape is significant. The trend appears to be that both the proportion of text that is in English will increase, and that the number of spaces that English is used in will also increase.

Acceptance of language contact, the overcoming of linguistic barriers and the facilitation of communication via multiple languages is one thing. But it is another thing when the development of one's own language is disregarded due to the impression that some other language is more appropriate to a particular form of communication. In the area of marketing, the prevailing and imposed view is that English is a lan-

guage that wields prestige and is a language that will more readily and more easily market a product or service. But this view is not in line with the situation on the ground. Our comments about the way that foreign models are adopted in an apparently uncritical way and that domestic ones tend to be disregarded are not based on traditional views or ones advocating purism. Instead, they are intended to alert the reader to certain trends in language policy. Even if some people working in marketing may conceive of standard Croatian as being rigid and inflexible, they can still avail themselves of other linguistic forms, such as vernacular styles and varieties of slang specific to particular age groups, or they can employ forms of speech based on local dialects forms ahead of using another language. A good example of the use of local Čakavian dialect is an advertisement, shown above, for cash-free banking *Ča će ti takuin kad imaš mobitel* 'Why do you need a wallet when you've got a mobile phone'. If use of vernacular or dialect varieties were to be more frequent, this would then perhaps be an indicator of linguistic tolerance and language planning across the Croatian linguistic landscape, which is different from the situation that we have at the moment.

V.

Rijeka – European capital of culture 2020

A major event for Rijeka was its successful candidature to be a European Capital of Culture (ECC) for 2020. Towards the end of 2019, the whole city, and in particular the city's cultural scene, came alive to the rhythm of *EPK2020*, which is the Croatian equivalent of the acronym 'ECC2020'.



Throughout the year 2019 there had been announcements and information about the city's upcoming role as ECC2020 and these were made visible right across the city centre. The city's characteristic ECC2020 insignia was present and evident in not only cultural events preceding 2020, but on buildings and structures, both stationary and mobile, on land and on water. In a word, reminders of the forthcoming ECC2020 were *everywhere*.



Beyond the city centre, the visibility of ECC2020 insignia and other marketing texts was less obvious. In some of the outer areas of the city, sometimes the only reminder of it was to be found on the side of a bus.



The city counted down the days and even the hours until the official and festive commencement of Rijeka as a European Capital of Culture for 2020. As the date and time for the commencement of the ECC drew closer, one of the most obvious reminders of how many days and hours remained was this upbeat digital panel that played music and that invited passers-by to engage with scheduled EEC program events in an interactive way.



Unfortunately, the pandemic caused by the outbreak of the Corona virus caused a prompt halt to the first events just as they were underway. As a result, the locals as well as (potential) visitors to the city were deprived of the many cultural events that were scheduled for the year. Similarly, the specific nature of Rijeka's linguistic landscape as an ECC for 2020 was something that we all missed out on.

The central hub of all ECC2020-related activities was the *RiHub*. A street sign photographed on the right guided visitors to find their way to the hub.



It was not only the city centre that hosted ECC2020 events; many of Rijeka's suburbs got in on the act and came up with their program of events. The image printed on the t-shirt to the right is from the seaside suburb of Kantrida and contains the heading E/FKK. Underneath the visual image, Kantrida is described as an *Europski kvart kulture*, a 'European suburb of culture' with further details of the names and venues of cultural events given below.



While most descriptions of linguistic landscapes do not always encompass slogans and texts that people may wear on t-shirts, in the context of Rijeka ECC2020, this example can be counted as one.

While the summer and then autumn months of 2020 saw a greatly reduced number of events compared to the number originally planned, one major event that did take place in autumn was a colourful exhibition in honour of Professor Balthazar at Rijeka's Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art. In fact, the exhibition declared Rijeka to be *51000 Balthazargrad* or 'Balthazar Town, 51000' which is the city's postcode. Who was Professor Balthazar? Professor Balthazar was the central character of a famous animated series produced for children in the 1970s. Originally produced in Zagreb, the series enjoyed international success and was shown on television in other European countries, as well as in North America and Asia. As a 'nutty' but affable professor, Professor Balthazar became a familiar figure who was much loved by generations of school-children (and then adults) in Croatia from this time on.

The 'Balthazar Town' exhibition attracted attention through its visual appeal, bright colours and interactive features that allowed children to get to know Professor Balthazar and for their parents and grandparents to reminisce on their memories of cartoons that they had watched as children. The bowler hat was Professor Balthazar's characteristic trademark and the image of his hat accompanied all visual and textual announcements of the exhibition. This can be seen on the side of this bus.



Apart from advertising hoardings and visual messages painted on city buses it is interesting to note how an official plaque declaring Rijeka *Balthazar Town* was placed below the official town plaques outside the offices of the City Council and the Lord Mayor.



Older visitors to the *Balthazar Town* exhibition enjoyed reliving memories from their childhood and viewing again the well-known cartoon series. The younger visitors were able to learn about Professor Balthazar's many inventions. Most visitors to the exhibition did not know that although the series was produced in Zagreb, it was in fact Rijeka that provided the creators of the series with the inspiration to develop the story of a 'made-up' city.

Although texts that form the corpora of most studies are usually short and brief, longer texts can also be part of any city's linguistic landscape. Longer texts tend to be less common though, as they require passers-by to stop and spend a bit of time reading through them. The preparations for Rijeka as ECC2020 resulted in texts being placed across the city, many of them of some length such as the one below that is about Professor Balthazar's steamship, *Uragan* meaning 'Hurricane'.



Another example of a longer text can be found on this installation that contains the message in English, *I am not a robot*.



Something unexpected: COVID-19

An unplanned chapter in this book – and the reason for this is that it was an unplanned chapter in all of our lives – is the pandemic, caused by a virus which at the beginning, in Croatian, was spelt *corona* or *korona*. This is because the phonetic value of the first consonant in the word is /k/, which in Croatian is better represented via the grapheme ⟨k⟩. The name of the illness itself is COVID-19 (and spelt as such in Croatian) named after the year that the nature of the condition was confirmed, 2019.

A pandemic is something that does not happen so often. But when it happens, it changes our lives entirely, profoundly, turning things upside down in every way.

At the same time, a linguistic landscape, whether we like it or not, reflects these events and changes and we have been witness to the landscape that we live in being rapidly transformed into something else. All of a sudden, we became surrounded by slogans, sayings, thoughts and actions that previously we would never have thought about. One of them is *washing our hands*. For example, the slogans that surrounded us at the start of the pandemic advised us *not to wash our hands any way we liked*, but to wash our hands *the correct way*.

Right from the outset, and at a time when the dangers of the Corona virus were just starting to become known, the Croatian Red Cross published instructions on the correct way to wash your hands. At the time, people were still going to work, and the word “pandemic” was still uncommon. The language used in instructions was Croatian only as the local Red Cross officials thought that locals would be the only ones reading the instructions:



It soon became evident that washing your hands thoroughly was not enough to address the problem the virus posed. Face masks were needed. But, at the time they were not readily available and so people's creative abilities started to come to the fore. The cityscape of Rijeka began to be changed by people wearing masks.

What then followed was the complete shutting down of things, which even in Croatian was at times referred to as a *lockdown*. Our linguistic landscape was reduced to what we could see through our windows and from our balconies, and what we viewed on various electronic devices like television, computer, mobile phone and so on. And many people, much more so than before, turned their attention to social media. Although this was not a visual representation of Rijeka's linguistic landscape, this was part of the visual linguistic landscape that the people of Rijeka took in. It became our replacement linguistic landscape.

On these screens the most common image shown was one that contained an imperative in the form of an instruction: *Ostanimo doma* 'Let's stay at home'. The picture on the right shows *Ostanimo doma* as a hashtag, while the instruction below it in upper case letters, *ZAUSTAVIMO KORONAVIRUS!* translates as 'Let's stop the Corona virus!'.



At the time, the public health response teams were holding press conferences at regular intervals, usually daily, sometimes even multiple times on the same day. During this time, certain phrases or syntagms began to take on new meanings. One of the frequently heard ones was 'when all of this is over', or to quote the Croatian phrase, *kada sve prođe*. The hope then was that this might be in two weeks' time.

The following billboard was posted at a major Rijeka intersection. It was placed there at the outbreak of the pandemic in early spring 2020. The message on it with a picture of a whipper-snipper read:

Iduća dva tjedna su ključna. -700 kn Akcija! Vrijeme je za Husqvarnu!

'The next two weeks are crucial. Sale price reduction of 700 kuna!
It's time for Husqvarna!'

Normally we would read this sign as a reference to the coming spring months and the need to work in the garden, and that it would be a good idea to purchase a good piece of garden maintenance equipment. However, in the context of awaiting the end of the lockdown period, this message announcing working in the garden in spring took on a different meaning as people looked forward to ending a difficult period when they had to do things very differently from how they otherwise did them, i.e. having to spend time inside their four walls instead of outside in nature. The advertisement was also rather optimistic sounding, referring to *dva ključna tjedna*, the 'two crucial weeks'.



As stated, the slogan *Ostanimo doma* 'Let's stay at home' was one of the instructions that the national public health response team repeated in all its public addresses from 16 March to 5 May 2020. From then on, they replaced this instruction with *Ostanimo odgovorni* 'Let's stay responsible', which is the one that has been used throughout 2021.

Clever marketing strategists played around with this phrase with the result being a hybrid expression that may be confusing, or funny, or even slightly tongue-in-cheek due to the word-play contained in it. The advertisement is from a bank advertising its electronic transfer services. The lower-case text on the advertisement shown on the following page is the following: *Šalji i primaj lovu. Brzo, besplatno i od doma* 'Send and

receive dough. Quickly, at no cost and from home'. The lexeme *doma* 'home' became a very commonly used one. Another instance of the use of the word *doma* in the advertisement is the hashtag: #ostanidoma. This is the 2nd sg. imperative form *ostani* ('stay') of the official slogan which is 1st pl: *ostanimo doma* 'let's stay home'.

We return now to the main text in the upper central part of the advertisement, *KEKS pay. DOMA stay*. This text caught on firstly due to the way it rhymes, secondly due to the way that it plays with words from two languages, and thirdly because it contains the word *keks*, which has multiple meanings: 'biscuit' and 'for nothing'. So, the marketing phrase '*KEKS pay. DOMA stay*' means something like 'You can do your transactions with us as quickly as it takes to say the word "keks" ('biscuit') and still stay home'.



Other examples of a play on words are the following two sentences that appear in contrast to each other. They appeared to be reflective of what was happening in our world and were shown on the Croatian TV station, RTL. *Budite pozitivni* means 'Be positive' and *Ostanite negativni* means 'Stay negative'

In contrast to the larger commercial and retail "players", most small businesses and service providers informed customers in their own way as to how they would interact with them so that these were in line with the recommendations of the public health response team. Sometimes this was done with questionable success.

In an effort to provide as much information as possible, they often overdid the number of notices that they put at their shop entrances. This created visual and textual chaos, and in auditory linguistic terms, it was like high volume noise.



On the other hand, other businesses decided to reduce the amount of information provided to the most important things only, and their instructions were in fact the easiest for customers to take in:



When it became evident that the restrictions in mobility and commercial activity would be finally relaxed, news of this was greeted with widespread joy and the feeling that life was returning to normal. On one shop window this was announced in English – *Life is back* – and straight away at that, with a 50% discount:



The photograph to the right conveys its message not via text but via the image shown in the shop window – that of two shop window dummies wearing face masks. In a way, they resembled most of us, or at least the shoppers who walked past their store. In this way, they had somehow become a bit more like ‘one of us’.



Throughout 2020 various instructions were issued to the citizens of Rijeka. Firstly, they were instructed to adhere to certain measures to minimise the risk of virus transmission. Sometimes these instructions were laxer, sometimes they were stricter. These restrictions determined whether people could meet in enclosed spaces or only out in the open,

whether they could meet for a meal together or just a coffee, or whether they could not meet at all. Something new, namely the *novo normalno*, ‘the new normal’ emerged.

People found it very hard to accept the fact that they were prohibited from being able to sit down in cafes, which is the favourite place for most people to socialise at. This applies to Rijeka as it does across Croatia. In response, cafes turned to providing take-away coffee by placing signs saying *kava za van* ‘coffee for outside’, or *kava to go*, ‘coffee to go’. The number of these signs increased greatly and the term *to go* started to be used for other drinks as well.

The following picture can be classified as an example of monolingual English-language signage due to the text *Kissing point*. What is also important is to view it in its entirety as the atmosphere of it is evident from the whole picture – instead of a group of people, it’s a group of brown bears who are socialising at this pastry shop:



Restaurant closures were announced in late autumn. One of Rijeka’s legendary venues known for reflecting the popular mood posted the following sign outside its premises with a message that has a clearly biblical association. The message written on the blackboard is: *Posljednja večera* ‘The Last Supper’.



The arrival of vaccines and the possibility that the pandemic could be halted, or at least for its effects to be lessened, heralded the slogan *Misli na druge... cijepi se!* 'Think of others... get vaccinated!' This slogan could be seen on television screens, social media, badges and other places. Those slogans that were intended for tourists were invariably in English, and they attempted to fulfil the function of presenting Croatia as a desirable tourist destination *and* as a safe place to spend one's holidays, *Safe stay in Croatia* and *Safe travels*:




The way that people adhered to the safety measures alternated according to the measures themselves. As mentioned, sometimes the measures were strict, sometimes they were lax. In spring 2021, cafes were finally allowed to reopen. Some cafes in Rijeka greeted patrons again with an *After lockdown akcija* or a 'Post-lockdown Special Offer'. This was reminiscent of the 50% discount advertised in shop windows in autumn 2020.



And how did mass information campaigns and communication protocols otherwise characterise Rijeka's linguistic landscape in 2021? Throughout 2021 the physical appearance of entrances to buildings actually became less cluttered. The number of instructions was reduced and people were no longer bombarded with all kinds of notifications. Large shopping centres reduced the number of notices to only a few important ones. These ranged from requests: *Molimo vas, dezinficirajte ruke.* 'Please disinfect your hands.', *Molimo vas, držite međusobni razmak od 2 m.* 'Please maintain a distance of 2 m.'; to notifications such as *Obavezno nošenje maski* 'Masks must be worn'; to prohibitions, *Zabranjeno grupiranje osoba.* 'Gathering in groups is prohibited.'



Individually printed out or hand-written notices remained a part of the linguistic landscape only when they contained temporary or specific messages, such as what the permitted number of people was in a certain area. The sign on the right has the following message: *Poštovani kupci, molimo da u prodajno mjesto ne ulazi više od 4 osobe istodobno! Hvala.* 'Dear customers, we kindly request that no more than 4 people enter the store premises at the same time! Thank you'.



As reported above, the COVID-19 pandemic led to coffee being marketed as *kava ZA VAN* ('coffee FOR OUTSIDE') or *kava TO GO* ('coffee TO GO'). What has developed from this is that this predicate is now being applied to other drinks as well. We now encounter the same constructions in contexts where we would not expect it, such as wine. The hand-written wine list below is advertising a white wine from a local winemaker, Gospoja Winery. This winery is based in the town of Vrbnik on Krk island on the other side of the Kvarner Gulf from Rijeka. Their wine, based on a local variety of grapes called *Žlahtina*, is marketed on a menu board containing the words *za van* 'for outside' and the converse form *za tu* 'for here (inside)'.



We conclude this chapter here, but the COVID-19 still remains with us. The *staro normalno* 'old normal' has not returned. The fears and concerns that the Corona virus brought to our lives are still there. They remain with us as we follow further changes in the city's linguistic landscape.

VI.

Primorje-Gorski Kotar County

When a tourist travels to a foreign country they usually look out for information in their own language or at least in a language that they understand. At border crossings, the established protocol is that signage will be in the language of the country that the tourist is entering as well as in the language of the country that they are just exiting.

Croatia is a popular tourist destination and it is common for information to be provided in multiple languages. The picture on the right features eight languages and is taken from a road sign on the Croatian-Slovenian border. (The north west part of the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County itself borders with Slovenia.) The other languages include major international ones such as English, German, French and Italian, as well as those of the countries from which tourists often originate such as Hungarian and Czech.



When tourists arrive in Rijeka from Pula, situated on the coast of the Istrian peninsula just to the west of the city, they are greeted by signage that identifies the city as both *Rijeka* and as *Fiume*.



The first reminder for tourists that they have entered the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County is a welcome sign in four languages. The welcoming signage is matched also by signs that say *goodbye* to travellers, also in the same four languages. The Primorje-Gorski Kotar County is known in Croatian as Croatia's 'blue-green' county due to its coastline and extensive forests in the county's interior. The sign on the left contains also the message *U našu plavo-zelenu PGŽ* 'Welcome to our blue-green county' with the initials PGŽ referring to the county's acronym in Croatian, *Primorsko-goranska županija*.




The motorway that runs through much of the county is known as *Goranka*. The word *Goranka* is a girl's name. However, the reason why the motorway is called *Goranka* is that the second part of the county's name in Croatian is *goranska* meaning mountainous. It is common in Croatian for toponyms to be given female names that are derived from a characteristic typical of the area.



Unfortunately, one effect of the motorway that was completed around twenty years ago is that travellers no longer need to stop on their way through the county. At best, they may make a short stop to have a rest. In the past, people using the local roads would often stop by in villages or towns. Signage for rest stops such as the one in Lepenica shown on the right is usually monolingual with symbols used to denote the function being referred to.



At the same time, road signs for national parks, such as this one for Risnjak, are bilingual.



Visitors, whether local or from abroad, need to be informed about the features of the locality that they are staying in. This brings up the question of which language and what kind of information should be provided. On the sign on the right, which is located at the well-known Svežanj beach in the town of Kostrena, English is the language used to inform visitors about the local emergency telephone number and about the contact availability times of life-guard facilities. A large amount of further information that would otherwise be conveyed in written text is given here via symbols that are well known internationally and that are visible in the right-hand part of the picture.



Many of the towns along the coast feature attractively designed place name signs. Depending on the municipality, sometimes these can be located in the centre of town. An example of such a sign is given on the right for the town of Kostrena.



If we are feeling a little peckish and located in a particular part of Rijeka, we can drop into an eatery called *McChevap* or even have food delivered to us from them.



The play on words alluding to *McDonald's* is obvious and can't be missed. At the same time, it can't be denied that it actually works as well.

When we talk about the areas just surrounding Rijeka, we should also ensure that we include in our analysis of their linguistic landscapes those features that are clearly local ones. These include designations that relate to the local onomastic features and also to words from the local dialect. This is the case with many of the streets in the Drenova district of Rijeka, which not so long ago was actually a village outside the city boundaries. Many of the street names relate to old localities that evidence the lexical, phonological and grammatical characteristics of the local Čakavian dialect.



There is an even greater presence of dialect-origin words the more you venture out into the towns and villages located further away from Rijeka. This poster on the right from a place called *Grobnik* is advertising the masks that are worn at the start of festivities for the Rijeka Carnevale on 7 January. The masked parties held are described in the local dialect as *najbolje na svitu* 'the best in the world'. Another dialect-origin word *paričani* performs the function of asking if they're 'ready' for the festivities?



Masked parties are something that Rijeka and the surrounding area are renowned for during the season of Carnevale. One of the characteristic things about the festivities is that so many things relating to Carnevale are dialect-origin and some signs are monolingual and written only in

the Čakavian dialect such as this one for *Balinjerada* in the neighbouring town of Opatija. The series of floats and go-karts that make up the *Balinjerada* parade are so popular that a monument has been erected in Opatija to commemorate and celebrate this festival. A public text that describes it, complete with QR code, is however written in Standard Croatian.



These are just a selection of many of the signs that are part of the linguistic landscape of the areas just outside Rijeka. Let's wander around the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County through both its coastal as well as mountainous areas to see which things are common to both areas and which ones are distinct.

The coastal part of the county is characterised by numerous signs to do with tourism, the maritime industry or vineyards. These range from roadside signs to the names of commercial enterprises.

The sign on the following page reminds us that the town of Novi Vinodolski is a well known grape-growing area situated along one of Croatia's 'vineyard routes'. What we also see in this picture is something commonplace in the coastal area of the county: multilingual signage advertising the availability of private accommodation rooms.



These messages as well as others such as a local caravan park are part of the signage that greet tourists as they enter the town of Povile.



The town of Selce greets travellers with a large sign featuring symbols relating to facilities of interest to tourists.



Apart from symbols, some road signs have text messages as well.

The sign below features text in Croatian only.




In Selce there are a large number of signs that guide travellers around the town, particularly to where many of them are likely to want to go, namely the beach, shown here via the Croatian word *plaža*.



If any tourist was not sure what area they were located in, the name of this restaurant makes it clear to them. It's called *Sidro* 'Anchor' and is a reminder that this is an area with a long maritime tradition.




On our way from the southern part of the county heading north, we pay a visit to the town of Crikvenica. It's a town geared to seaside tourism and many hotels and restaurants have names that relate to its coastal location or local topography. The ones photographed below are named after local wind currents: *Burin* derived from the fierce, dry and cold wind that can blow up the east coast of the Adriatic Sea, known as the *Bura*; on the right, *Nevera* refers to any kind of stormy weather that makes it unsafe to be out at sea.



Other hospitality outlets bear names that index the town's maritime traditions. *Trabakul* is the Croatian word for a type of cargo vessel known in Italian as *trabaccolo*, while *Crni mol* means 'The Black Dock'.



This eatery on the right features the use of a word from Istria, *al-trokè*, to refer to a particular variety of grilled delicacies.



In Crikvenica, tourists have the opportunity to visit an exhibition of *Miće barke*, local words that refer to 'Small Boats'.



Olive trees are widely grown in the area and the pictures below feature a *toš* or olive press. The sign outside a shop in the background is that of *Croatia osiguranje* 'Croatia Insurance', an insurance company that dates back to the nineteenth century.



Crikvenica has an effigy of the *Malik*, a mythical figure that is familiar to many children of this area. Information on the *Malik* is made available in Croatian, Italian, German and English.




The sign on the right is in both Croatian and English. But, for English-speakers, it is likely to still be elliptic as it does not make clear that Crikvenica has only certain areas set aside for dog-owners to walk their dogs and where they are allowed to be unleashed. A literal translation of the Croatian text *tu se igram* 'I play here' is not enough to tell tourists that what this really means is 'This area is set aside for dogs to be unleashed under the supervision of their owners.'



The sign on the right is also not clear enough in what it needs to convey. The Croatian source text *Tu se NE igrate* is translated literally as ‘I do NOT play here’. The sign to its right with information on the *Dječje igralište* ‘Children’s playground’ is in Croatian only. It is not likely to be clear to English-speakers that in this area, dogs must be kept on a leash to ensure that children can play freely and safely.



Located in the hinterland of these coastal towns is an area known as *Vinodol*. The sign on the right offers tourists information on what this area has to offer.



Stopping to look around the town of Drivenik, we sight a sign that says *Grad Drivenik* that directs tourists to the old castle located in the town. Below this sign is one with the same words on it, *Grad Drivenik*, but spelt out in letters of the old Glagolitic alphabet. The Glagolitic alphabet is an old alphabet that remained in use in Croatian-speaking areas until the late nineteenth century. The use of Glagolitic on the road sign is not accidental. There is a symbolic association between the use of Glagolitic and an old text, the *Vinodolski zakon* or ‘Law Code of Vinodol’ from 1288. The old castle in Drivenik is mentioned in the Law Code.




This is, of course, a modern sign. But we can also see how it is a creative way of making visible the intangible cultural heritage that this area is famous for – use of the Glagolitic script.


Across the county, texts in the local Čakavian dialect are more common than in Rijeka. The one on the right is from the small town of Hreljin. It contains an advertisement for a local beer and indexes a relationship that is a well-known trope in many cultures: that between a son-in-law and his mother-in-law. It reads, *Hreljin!!! Aš mi je punica va Krasice pa tamo ne moren 'Hreljin!!!* Because my mother-in-law is in Krasica and I don’t have to go there’. This is followed by the caption (in Standard Croatian) *Mala pivovara za veliko pivo* ‘A small brewery for a great beer’.



From the linguistic landscape of the town of Bakar, south of Rijeka, we re-produce a text that contains a wonderful example of verse in Čakavian. The text is dedicated to a primary school that has been instrumental in teaching children literacy skills for over 100 years.





The linguistic heritage of Bakar features texts in Latin as well as in the Glagolitic alphabets with signs in both Croatian and Italian.



Bakar's maritime heritage is long and illustrious and encompasses the training of sailors and ship captains as well as the schools that devised maritime terminology in Croatian. The sign on the right is of the Bakar Maritime School.



An important component of the local fishery industry is tuna. The picture below shows texts in Croatian, English, German and Italian on the history of tuna fishing in the area and contemporary developments.




Summer is the time when lots of events are held, including a summer festival known as *Margaretino Leto* 'Margareta's Summer' and the text on the right is written mainly in Standard Croatian with some words taken from the local Čakavian dialect.



Just to Rijeka's west is the city of Opatija and several other small coastal towns. Opatija is the city in Croatia that has the longest tradition as a tourist destination, going back to the time of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the late nineteenth century. In the modern-day era, it has been able to maintain its reputation as a popular destination for tourists and this is evident from this road sign directing tourists to the many hotels located in the area. Newspaper stands in the city stock newspapers from all across Europe in many different languages.




Public signage is in Croatian. Where this is also directed at tourists, signage is provided in two or more languages:



A model replica of St. Jacob's Church is worthy of note not only through the provision of information in many languages, but also due to the descriptive text provided in Braille for the visually-impaired.



Commemorative plaques are a common sight across the city of Opatija. They are placed in memory and honour of famous persons who either resided for some time there or who were frequent visitors. Most of these plaques are bilingual. The plaque in Croatian and English on the right commemo-



morates Leo Henryk Sternbach born in Opatija and who became famous as the inventor of valium. The plaque on the right is in Croatian and Hungarian and was placed in honour of a famous Hungarian literary figure, Lőrinc Szabó. He was a resident in one of the city's hotels for a long period in 1934 and at that time wrote a number of literary works.



In Croatia's linguistic landscape it's rare to come across a public text in Polish. The one photographed on the right commemorates the Polish military leader, Józef Piłsudski, who resided in Opatija just before the outbreak of World War I.



Just like Hollywood, Opatija has a sidewalk featuring built-in inscriptions to famous people as paving stones. These are in Croatian only and the ones that are shown below are of: Ivo Robić, a singer and musician; Tin Ujević, a writer and poet; Fabijan Šovagović, an actor; Slavoljub Eduard Penkala, a scientist and inventor; the world-famous scientist and inventor Nikola Tesla whose speciality area was physics; Korado Korlević, a scientist and astronomer.







Some signs would fulfil their purpose in a better way if they were to also feature translations, such as this one warning of an area that is slippery and that pedestrians enter this area at their own risk.



There are many similarities in the linguistic landscape of Opatija compared to another coastal town nearby, Lovran. This relates to the focus on tourism and the multilingual nature of public signage. It also relates to multilingual posters informing tourists about the local culture and history. In places, there is even information provided about the local Čakavian dialect. The first picture below has a description of the water-bearers of Lovran known locally as the *Lovranski vodonoš*. The second one is about the *Dvije kule* or *Two Towers*.



Mount Učka is the mountain that rises up behind the Opatija Riviera. Information on the nature park surrounding Mount Učka is provided in many languages.



On the side of the Učka Nature Park facing the small coastal town of Mošćenička Draga are info-boards giving details of the *Trebisća – Perun*. *Trebisće* is a mythical village of the area that was once a settlement but then later abandoned. It retained significance to the locals because the name of the village contains the word *treba* meaning ‘sacrifice’ in Old Slavic. The name *Perun* refers to a Slavic mythical figure.



Islands located in the Kvarner Bay make up a considerable part of the county's total surface area, for example, *Krk* (Ital.: 'Veglia') and *Cres* (Ital.: 'Cherso'). Both islands have a strong focus on both tourism and the maritime industry. This is ascertainable through the many multilingual signs to be found on both of them.


We start with Krk, known to some people in Croatia as the cradle of Croatian literature written in the Glagolitic script due to the large number of signs and texts in that alphabet located on the island, and especially due to the *Bašćanska ploča* or 'Baška Tablet'. The Baška Tablet dates from around 1100 CE and is famous for being the oldest known example of an Old Croatian text written in the Glagolitic alphabet. In the area where the Baška Tablet was found, large Glagolitic letters now dot the landscape marking a literary route that one can walk along. These letters are a vivid reminder of the area's literary heritage and of its tradition of Glagolitic-script texts that were still being used there up until the start of the twentieth century.



An inscription in Glagolitic script can be found under the motif of a rose on the facade of the Church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary in Omišalj, a town lying on the north coast of Krk.

The Glagolitic inscription on the church in Omišalj is set into stone high up and is discernible with the help of a camera lens but otherwise hard to make out for passers-by. As such, it is more an example of the locality's 'latent' linguistic landscape.

The town of Vrbnik has some interesting signs that point the way to the narrowest street in the world.



The signs are bilingual in both Croatian and English. What is striking is the hybrid spelling of the place name, Vrbnik. The second last letter 'i' is rendered by the equivalent letter in the Glagolitic alphabet.

We move now to another island, Cres, that is located close to Rijeka. It is so close that it is visible from many people's lounge room windows or balconies. Cres is located at a latitude of 45 degrees (north), which is also the name of a bar as shown on this verandah pictured on the right.



Some road signs on Cres draw our attention to the specific traffic rules that apply in some of the coastal towns that have very narrow streets.




The names of streets contain clear reminders to us that we are in a coastal area heavily influenced by the maritime industry. The first sign, *Riva creskih kapetana* means roughly 'Water-front boulevard in honour of ship captains from Cres'. *Jadranska obala* means simply 'Adriatic Coast', while *Osorska ulica* 'Osor Street' relates to a small village port on Cres island.



On Cres there is also a town by the same name. In the town of Cres itself, multilingual signage is a reminder of the importance of maritime tourism.



Monolingual signs are usually in Croatian. But one of the most common monolingual signs is one in English reading *No stress on Cres* which sends a clear message to tourists about what they can expect on the island.



The *Riva* or Waterfront Boulevard is an excellent spot for advertising one's products or services. These range here from ones of interest to tourists only such as accommodation or car and boat rental. But they can also be directed at locals such as the bleached sign advertising laundry services. The third picture below informs anyone in the area that WIFI internet is accessible.



As elsewhere along the coast, English is used to advertise the availability of guest accommodation. Not long ago, the most common text used for this purpose was *Zimmer frei*, a German phrase meaning 'Rooms available'. But this phrase is now much less common and no longer a part of the linguistic landscape of the area.



As in all localities along the Adriatic coast, local products are available on sale and the names of these products are given firstly in Croatian, then in English, Italian and German.




On the mainland side of Rijeka, just above the city at a reasonably high altitude, lies the town of Kastav. There we find three signs each made of a different type of material which bear witness to the different periods that they were made in. The oldest one is inscribed into stone. It is one that not only provides us with geological information, but it is a reminder of the work of the many stonemasons from that area.

The inscription on the right shows the altitude that the town is located at, namely 377 metres above sea level. This is a common sight on many inscriptions found across the county. The inscription is situated just next to the church of Saint *Jelena Križarica* ('Saint Helena, the Cross Bearer, mother of Constantine') and it shows also the height of its church tower, 32 metres.



The first sign below sign commemorates one of the first 'reading rooms' in this area, labelled here as a *čitalnica*. This is the Čakavian version of the word, which in standard Croatian is *čitaonica*. The following sign, with a similar design, is from the small locality of *Crekvina*. It is placed on a church that was under construction in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries but which was never fully built.



Another sign with similar significance is of a street in the heart of the town of *Kastav* in Rijeka's hinterland. The sign is in Čakavian and translates into English as 'Kastav Statute Street' commemorating a legal document from 1400 that was written in the Croatian Glagolitic script.



The town of *Kastav* also features signs with other kinds of designs such as this one of a barrel with the words *Bačvarska zbirka* 'Barrel collection'. This sign relates to the town's barrel-making heritage with coopers residing in the area for centuries.



The form of signage in the county's more mountainous areas can be quite different from that found in coastal parts. For example, signs there are more likely to be made of wood. The one below is of the Serbian Orthodox monastery, *Gomirje*, thought to have been founded in 1600. In general, there are fewer signs in multiple languages and those that are there have been placed there for the steadily growing tourist industry. Tourism has been progressively increasing in the interior areas of the *Primorje-Gorski Kotar* county.



Roadsigns on the way to *Fužine*, a popular destination for tourists wanting to explore Croatia's mountainous areas, show a variety of attractions in the local area. Despite *Fužine's* popularity as a tourist destination, in general, there are still fewer hotels here compared to the coastal areas of the county.



In the town of Fužine itself, there are warning signs just near the town's lake, *Bajersko jezero* 'Lake Bajer' about the dangers of swimming in it, and a sign on the side of a local model train, the *Fužine Expres*.



When entering a locality, signs usually welcome visitors with a greeting in many languages. Symbols also inform them of the tourist facilities available.



Most signs in the Gorski Kotar area of the county are monolingual and in standard Croatian only. The area is one where all three major Croatian dialects – Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian – border on each other. Regrettably, there are comparatively few signs that bear witness to this. The sign on the following page on the left directs visitors to *Petehovac*, a hiking and recreational centre that has a ski slope in winter. The picture on the right shows the *Gostionica. Kauzlarićevi Dvori*. This is a famous restaurant in the town of Delnice that serves local delicacies of the Gorski Kotar region.



One recent tourism initiative focuses on the presence of one of Croatia's most noble families, the *Frankopan* family, who wielded great influence in Croatian society from the twelfth to the seventeenth centuries. The initiative *Putovima Frankopana* 'In the footsteps of the Frankopans' has resulted in information about this family being placed on road signs as well, such as local castles. The Frankopans intermarried with another family from the Croatian nobility, the *Zrinski* family. Here the roadsign guides travellers to the Zrinski Castle located in the town of Brod on the Kupa river. Another sign directs travellers to the *Dvorac Zrinskih* 'the Zrinski's Palace' located in Čabar, a nearby town. The third is in reference to the Risnjak National Park.



This publication went into press at the end of 2021. To conclude this chapter, we add an Advent flavour to the book by including pictures of local names on roads signs, such as *Mrkat* and *Kurijera*. Some signs specify how many steps it takes to walk to surrounding localities, like *Jadranovo*, *Selce* and *Dramalj*.



We observe that the globally recognised term *Xmas* is visible here as well.

VII.

Concluding remarks

A kind of ‘concluding remark’ for this book on Rijeka’s linguistic landscape had already been made before the preparation of this final manuscript. This was at the time when Rijeka still had the status of being a *European Capital of Culture in 2020* which was extended into 2021. This ‘concluding remark’ was an exhibition of 20 posters on public display that was one of the activities held under the auspices of the program *Rijeka ECC2020 – 27 Neighbourhoods – Neighbourhood Campus*.



The exhibition was put on at two venues that are both popular walkways. As a result, the exhibition attracted much attention. The exhibition was first held in November 2020 in an outside display area on the grounds of the main campus of the University of Rijeka. In September 2021, the exhibition was put on in Rijeka’s main pedestrian thoroughfare, the *Korzo*, where it attracted a great deal of attention. Media outlets also reported on both iterations of the exhibition. The exhibition featured a number of concluding observations that we now expand on here.

We start by re-visiting, step by step, some of the hypotheses that we had at the commencement of our investigation of the linguistic landscape of Rijeka and its surrounds. The first hypothesis relates to legislative requirements. Article 12 of the Croatian constitution specifies that “Croatian, written in the Roman-script alphabet, is the official language”. Our hypothesis that Croatian would be the language used in official signs

on public buildings as an example of a *top-down* influence on language choice was confirmed.

Official signs on publicly funded facilities and institutions for recognised ethnic minorities have bilingual signage. This is also in line with legislative regulations.

Our analysis of the much larger number of non-official signs shows that, like official signs, they are usually in Croatian and that they follow the lexical, grammatical and graphemic norms of standard Croatian.

Bilingual signage can also be found among the non-official signs with the most frequent combinations being Croatian and English, or Croatian and Italian. Croatian is usually the first given language and the font size and style are usually the same for both languages.

Our second hypothesis had to do with Rijeka's history, in particular the nineteenth century, and the languages that have characterised the city's linguistic profile. This hypothesis was also confirmed as we were able to locate examples of the use of these languages in the city's current linguistic landscape.

In the first instance, we find that Italian has had a considerable influence on the city. In our corpus we recorded a large number of commemorative plaques, followed by a smaller number of other kinds of signs as well as those missives that can be found on tombstones and elsewhere in the city's cemeteries.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, capital investment from Hungary played a considerable role in the development of the city in general, and especially of its port facilities. There are numerous texts in Hungarian found across Rijeka that are witness to the influence that Hungary once had on the city's public life.

Although Rijeka was part of what was first known as the Habsburg Empire, and later on as the Austro-Hungarian Empire, there are comparatively few examples of German-language texts.

On the other hand, the names and surnames of the city's residents found in Rijeka's cemeteries bear witness to the fact that there were residents from all parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Evidence for this is the fact that there are many different denominations that are represented across the city graveyards.

If we go back a century further or more, we locate evidence of signage in Latin. Latin retains a presence in Rijeka's linguistic landscape through missives found under a rose window of a church and on various public buildings.

Languages other than the above-mentioned ones are less frequently encountered in Rijeka. Where they do appear, it is usually in relation to restaurants or specialist stores that may display names or texts in French, Spanish, Japanese, Chinese and so on.

There are, however, features that can account for the presence of other languages as was seen from the images of gifts from Rijeka's sister cities or of the city's new mosque.

A key hypothesis that we kept in mind when undertaking the study of the city's linguistic landscape was the following. A majority of studies on linguistic landscapes across the world mention the considerable presence of English, even in localities where this language had had little measurable presence until the second half of the twentieth century. This development is a consequence of globalisation and the prestige that texts written in English now wield. We allow ourselves the following observation based on the corpus of visual images that we have collated to say that in many cases, this prestige may be somewhat misplaced or perhaps be a projection of certain views only. In almost all instances, the same referential content contained in English text could have been expressed in the domestic variety of the relevant localities without any change to the expressive value of the content. In many cases, and with a different approach to linguistic creativity, an equivalent level of marketing success may have been achievable through employment of local vernaculars or the use of dialect.

As a port city, English has had a presence in Rijeka since the nineteenth century. From the end of that century, and from then on but particularly in the post-WWII era its influence has increased substantially as it has in many other countries.

As the research literature tells us, in the twenty-first century, English continues to occupy a very prominent place in the 'global linguistic landscape'. This is ascertainable by the presence of English monolingual signs in localities and areas that are otherwise not in Anglophone or English-speaking countries. We assumed that this may be the case for Rijeka.

This hypothesis has been only partly confirmed. What we found is that the number of English-only signs is exceptionally small and in some cases, their occurrence was actually to be expected such as those found on the facades of souvenir shops. In terms of the number of bilingual signs, these are most commonly in both Croatian and English. But the actual overall number of them as well as the type(s) of functions that they perform is quite limited and usually to do with the advertising of products or services. When we look at multilingual signage, we find that English is used usually immediately following Croatian. It is then followed by other major international languages such as German and Italian. Instances of the use of four or more languages relate usually to tourist information panels or to advertising signs.

We do note, however, that actual designations for some types of services can appear only in their English form, e.g. *Beauty studio* which is different from the equivalent Croatian term that was still in use up until the end of the twentieth century, namely *Kozmetički salon*.

What is also interesting is the way that the graphemic form of some English words is adapted and combined with domestic words. For example, we could not help but comment on the creativity evident in forms such as *Beertija*, which is pronounced as *Birtija* (a Croatian word meaning 'pub' or 'bar') or *Boonker* which most locals would pronounce as *Bunker*. Another example is *kolach* referring to 'cake', where the diacritic symbol of the standard Croatian word, *kolač*, is intentionally omitted.

Of course, our conclusions are based on the current situation that we have documented. This is not to say that Rijeka would not witness a substantial increase in the presence of English-language signage in public places as has been known to happen in other urban centres.

If we look further to examine not only the use of different languages but also the use of different scripts, we anticipated that we would locate examples of Glagolitic script, at least on the islands if not so much in Rijeka itself. This expectation was confirmed: the number of texts written in Glagolitic in Rijeka is comparatively small, while the number of texts found on the islands, particularly on the islands of Krk and Cres was larger.

Alongside the function of providing referential information, commercial signs also seek to attract people's attention. For this reason, a case could

be made for Glagolitic text to be used judiciously which many people would find intriguing.

When it comes to advertising, use of vernacular language and of dialectal forms has been shown to be effective, and we find evidence of this on large-size billboards located in Rijeka and its surrounding areas. At the same time, we did not record a substantial number of texts that are entirely in the local Čakavian dialect, and instances of the use of the local Italian dialect, Fiuman, were still even rarer.

We did have more success in locating texts containing dialectal features and even complete passages in dialect in the areas surrounding Rijeka, particularly in rural areas. This confirmed our hypothesis that there is a greater textual (as well as spoken) use of dialects in regional or rural areas.

In relation to graffiti our hypothesis that vernacular language and English would be used prominently was found to be correct.

Sport is an important part of Rijeka's identity and we assumed that graffiti and other 'transgressive' texts produced by sports fans would contain characteristics of the local dialect. But this did not prove to be the case and there are only a few examples of this. In one of the above chapters, we showed an image of the motto of Orijent Football Club that is in the Čakavian dialect, *Pikala se takala se bala sa Sušaka* 'It was kicked around, knocked around - the soccer ball from Sušak'. Another example of the use of dialect is the catch cry, *Važ je naš!* 'The tin pot [= trophy] is ours!', that can be heard right across Rijeka whenever Rijeka Football Club wins some silverware. Most instances of graffiti produced by the *Armada*, Rijeka's die-hard fans, are in standard Croatian.

Rijeka is located in an area that experiences not only climatic turbulence through strong winds, high rainfall and changeable weather, it is a city that has experienced significant political turbulence throughout its history. While Croatian is used consistently in official signs and on signs that are of a commercial or private nature, we find that bilingual signage is common, with Croatian occurring in combination with English or Italian. On larger information signs intended for tourists it is possible to locate the use of multiple languages.

For centuries, Rijeka was part of a larger, multicultural and multilingual political entity, the Habsburg Empire which later became the Aus-

tro-Hungarian Empire. The consequence of the presence of this political entity is that a number of languages can be found on official signs from this era, as well as on monuments and commemorative plaques. Along with Croatian, we locate texts written in Italian, Hungarian, German, Latin as well as other languages. As stated, dialectal forms or the use of Croatian's historically older alphabet, Glagolitic, are rare and tend to be found mainly in the more outlying areas of the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County.

This book reflects our view of Rijeka's linguistic landscape as the authors of this manuscript and these photographs. The photographs in this book capture momentary images recorded over the last few years of this city that is a 'river' in more ways than one. When we decided which images to include, we intentionally excluded texts that contained overtly political content such as that contained in electoral campaign messages as well as texts that contained examples of gratuitously coarse language or hate speech. We hope that after reading this book, readers will wander around Rijeka, and in so doing, add to their own picture of the city.

References

- Adnews. (2017). *Four'N Twenty pies launches Aussie Slang words campaign*. <https://www.adnews.com.au/campaigns/four-n-twenty-pies-launches-aussie-slang-words-campaign> (19. 4. 2020)
- Aiestaran, J., Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2010). Multilingual cityscapes: Perceptions and preferences of the inhabitants of the city of Donostia-San Sebastian. In: E. Shohamy, M. Barni & E. Ben-Rafael (Eds.) *Linguistic Landscape and Transnationalism: Focus on the City*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 219-234.
- Atkin, A. (2013). Peirce's Theory of Signs. In: E. N. Zalta (Ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. (Summer 2013 Edition) <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2013/entries/peirce-semiotics/> (19. 4. 2020)
- Backhaus, P. (2007). *Linguistic Landscapes. A Comparative Study of Urban Multilingualism in Tokyo*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Backhaus, P. (2008). Rules and Regulations in Linguistic Landscaping. A Comparative Perspective. In: E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.) *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*. London and New York: Routledge. 157-172.
- Barni, M., & Bagna, C. (2008). A mapping technique and the linguistic landscape. In: E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.) *Linguistic Landscape*. London and New York: Routledge. 166-180.
- Ben-Rafael, E., Shohamy, E., Amara, M., & Trumper-Hecht, N. (2004). *Linguistic Landscape and Multiculturalism. A Jewish-Arab Comparative Study*. Tel Aviv: Tami Steinmetz Center for Peace Research.
- Ben-Rafael, E., Shohamy, E., Amara, M., & Trumper-Hecht, N. (2006). Linguistic landscape as a symbolic construction of the public space. The case of Israel. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. 3(1), 7-30.
- Bhatia, T. (1987). English in advertising: multiple mixing and media. *World Englishes*. 6(1), 33-48.
- Binder, T. (2006). *Njemačke posuđenice u hrvatskom govoru Osijeka*. (preveo V. Petrović) [*German loanwords in the Croatian vernacular of the city of Osijek*. transl. by V. Petrović]. Zagreb: FF Press.
- Blackwood, R. (2015). Peripherality in the Border Areas: Trieste and Northern Catalonia. In: R. Blackwood & S. Tufi (Eds.) *The Linguistic Landscape of the Mediterranean*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 75-1-3.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, Superdiversity and Linguistic Landscapes: Chronicles of Complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Blommaert, J. (2016). "Meeting of Styles" and the online infrastructures of graffiti. *Applied Linguistics Review*. 7(2), 99-115.
- Blommaert, J. & Maly, I. (2014). Ethnographic linguistic landscape analysis and social change: A case study. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*. Paper 100.
- Calvet, L.-J. (1994). *Les voix de la ville: Introduction à la sociolinguistique urbaine*. [The voices of the city: An introduction to urban sociolinguistics.] Paris: Payot et Rivages.
- Cenoz, J., & D. Gorter. (2006). Linguistic landscape and minority languages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. 3, 67-80.
- CLF [Conseil de la langue française]. (2000). *La langue de l'affichage à Montréal de 1997 à 1999*. [The language of signage in Montreal from 1997 to 1999.] Quebec: Conseil de la langue française.
- Ćosić, V. & Mahnić-Ćosić, A. (2001): *Zadarski jezični krajolici. Imena tortki u Zadarskoj županiji*. [Zadar's linguistic landscapes. The names of businesses in Zadar County]. Zadar: Matica hrvatska.
- Domke, Christine. (2018). Multimodality in the City: On the Media, Perception and Locatedness of Public Textscapes. In: M. Pütz & N. Mundt (Eds.). *Expanding the Linguistic Landscape Linguistic Diversity, Multimodality and the Use of Space as a Semiotic Resource*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 115-131.
- Durin, S. (1999). Reklamna poruka. [The Advertising Message.] In: L. Badurina, N. Ivanetić, B. Pritchard & D. Stolac (Eds.). *Teorija i mogućnosti primjene pragmatolingvistike*. [Theory and Possibilities of Applied Pragmatolinguistics.] Zagreb – Rijeka: Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku. 203–219.
- Edelman, L. (2006). The linguistic landscape of Kalverstraat A pilot study. In: T. Koole, J. Nortier & B. Tahitu (Eds.) *Artikelen van de Vijfde sociolinguïstische conferentie* [Fifth Sociolinguistics Conference.] Delft: Eburon. 148-155.
- Edelman, L. (2010). *Linguistic Landscapes in the Netherlands – A Study of Multilingualism in Amsterdam and Friesland*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gorter, D. (Ed.) (2006): *Linguistic landscape: A new approach to multilingualism*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Gorter, D., Aiestaran, J. & Cenoz, J. (2012). The revitalization of Basque and the linguistic landscape of Donostia-San Sebastián. In: D. Gorter, H. Marten & L. Van Mensel (Eds.) *Minority languages in the linguistic landscape*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 148-163.
- Gradečak-Erdeljić, T. – Zlomisljić, J. (2014): Linguistic landscape in the city of Osijek. *HUM – časopis Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Mostaru*. [HUM – Journal of the Faculty of Arts, University of Mostar.] IX(11-12), 7-37.
- Grbavac, I. (2012): Pregled istraživanja jezičnoga krajobraza. [An overview of linguistic landscape studies] *HUM – časopis Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Mostaru*. [HUM – Journal of the Faculty of Arts, University of Mostar.] VII(9), 67-89.
- Grbavac, I. (2013). Linguistic landscape in Mostar. *Jezikoslovlje*. 14 (2-3), 501-515.
- Grbavac, I. (2014). Promjene u jezičnom krajobrazu Mostara nakon 1992. godine: sinkronijski presjek. [Post-1992 changes in Mostar's linguistic landscape: A synchronic-focused cross-sectional study] In: A. Peti-Stantić, M. Stanojević & G. Antunović (Eds.). *Standardni jezici i sociolekti u 21. stoljeću, Zbornik radova s međunarodnoga znanstvenoga skupa Hrvatskog društva za primijenjenu lingvistiku* [Standard languages and sociolects in the 21st century. Conference proceedings of the Croatian Society for Applied Linguistics] Zagreb: Srednja Europa, Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku, 101-118.
- Grbavac, I. (2018). *Uvod u istraživanja jezičnoga krajobraza*. [An introduction to the study of linguistic landscapes] Mostar: Filozofski fakultet.
- Grbavac, I., Jaspaert, K. & Slowinska, D. (2015). The Linguistic Landscapes of Mostar and Leuven: A Comparative Study. In: A. Akbarov (Ed.) *The Practice of Foreign Language Teaching: Theories and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 255-268.
- Griffin, J. (2004). The presence of written English on the streets of Rome. *English Today*. 20, 3-7.
- Holmes, J. & Wilson, N. (2017). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. [Fifth Edition]. London: Routledge.
- Hornsby, M. & Vigers, D. (2012). Minority Semiotic Landscapes: An Ideological Minefield? In: D. Gorter, H. Marten & L. Van Mensel (Eds.) *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 57-73.
- Hu, Y.-H. (2018). Multilingual Audio Announcements: Power and Identity. In: M. Pütz, N. Mundt (Eds.) *Expanding the Linguistic Landscape Linguistic Diversity, Multimodality and the Use of Space as a Semiotic Resource*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 132-152.
- Huebner, T. (2006). Bangkok's linguistic landscapes: Environmental print co-demixing and language change. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. 3(1): 31-51.
- Jaworski, A. & Thurlow, C. (2010). Introducing semiotic landscapes. In: A. Jaworski & C. Thurlow (Eds.) *Semiotic landscapes: Language, image and space*. London & New York: Continuum. 1-40.
- Jaworski, A. (2012). Metrolingual art: Multilingualism and heteroglossia. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. 18(2): 134-158.

- Jernej Pulić, M. (2016). *Jezik kao kapital u istarskom multikulturalnom okruženju*. (doktorski rad, rkp.) [Language as a form of capital in the multicultural region of Istria. PhD thesis, manuscript]. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
- Kordić, Lj., Čuljak, A. & Bionda, A. (2014). Jezični krajobraz grada Osijeka – komparativni pristup. [A linguistic landscape of the city of Osijek: a comparative approach] In: A. Peti-Stantić, M. Stanojević & G. Antunović (Eds.). *Standardni jezici i sociolekti u 21. stoljeću, Zbornik radova s međunarodnoga znanstvenoga skupa Hrvatskog društva za primijenjenu lingvistiku* [Standard languages and sociolects in the 21st century. Conference proceedings of the Croatian Society for Applied Linguistics] Zagreb: Srednja Europa, Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku. 77-100.
- Kuna, B. & Kostanjevac, D. (2011). O hibridnom jeziku u reklamama, [Observations on the use of hybrid language in advertising signs] In: V. Karabalić, M. Aleksa Varga & L. Pon (Eds.) *Diskurs i dijalog: Teorije, metode i primjene* [Discourse and dialogue: theories, methods and applications] Osijek: Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku i Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku, Osijek. 207-222.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Landry, R. & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997) Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality. An empirical study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. 16(1): 23-49.
- Lock, G. (2003). Being international, local and Chinese: Advertisements on the Hong Kong Mass Transit Railway. *Visual Communication*. 2(2): 195-214.
- Lou, J. J. (2016). *The Linguistic Landscape of Chinatown: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Makartsev, M. & Wahlström, M. (Eds.) (2016). *In Search of the Center and Periphery: Linguistic Attitudes, Minorities, and Landscapes in the Central Balkans*. Slavica Helsingiensia 49, Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Marten, H. (2012). 'Latgalian is not a language': Linguistic landscapes in Eastern Latvia and how they reflect centralist attitudes. In: D. Gorter, H. Marten & L. Van Mensel (Eds.) *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 19-35.
- Matejčić, R. (1988). *Kako čitati grad*. [How to read a city] Rijeka: Izdavački centar Rijeka.
- Mezgec, M. (2016). Linguistic Landscape as a Mirror: the Case of the Slovene Minority in Italy. *Treatises and Documents. Journal of Ethnic Studies / Razprave in gradivo. Revija za narodnostna vprašanja*. 77: 67-86.
- Milroy, L. (1980). *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mitchell, T. (2010). A Latino community takes hold: Reproducing semiotic landscapes in media discourse. In: A. Jaworski and C. Thurlow (Eds.) *Semiotic landscapes: Language, image, space*. London and New York: Continuum. 168-186.
- Müller, U. (1988) Empfehlungen für Gleichberechtigung von Frauen und Männern in der Sprache einer Kommunalverwaltung [Recommendations for male-female equality in the language use of a municipal administration]. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 16: 323.
- Nöth, W. (2004): *Priručnik semiotike* [A handbook of semiotics] Zagreb: Ceres.
- ORF [Österreichischer Rundfunk] (2015). Der Kampf um die Stammtischhoheit. [The battle for the hearts and minds of ordinary people] <https://orf.at/v2/stories/2301769/2301771/> (19. 4. 2020)
- Papen, Uta. (2012). Commercial discourses, gentrification and citizens' protest: The linguistic landscape of Prenzlauer Berg, Berlin. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 16(1): 56-80.
- Pappenhagen, R. Scarvaglieri, C. & Redder, A. (2016) Expanding the linguistic landscape scenery? Action theory and "linguistic soundscaping". In: R. Blackwood, E. Lanza & H. Woldemariam (Eds.) *Negotiating and Contesting Identities in Linguistic Landscapes*. 147-162.
- Pauwels, A. (1991). *Non-Discriminatory Language*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Pauwels, A. (1998) *Women Changing Language*. London: Longman.
- Pavlenko, A. (2010). Linguistic landscape of Kyiv, Ukraine: A diachronic study. In: E. Shohamy, E. Ben-Rafael and M. Barni (Eds.) *Linguistic Landscape in the City*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 133-150.
- Pavlenko, A. (2012). Transgression as the Norm: Russian in Linguistic Landscape of Kyiv, Ukraine. In: D. Gorter, H. Marten and L. Van Mensel (Eds.) *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 36-56.
- Peck, A. & Williams, Q. (2019). Skinscapes with Frictions: an Analysis of Zef Hip Hop "Stoeka Style" Tattoos. In: A. Peck, C. Stroud & Q. Williams (Eds.) *Making sense of people and place in linguistic landscapes*. London: Bloomsbury Academic UK. 91-106.
- Pennycook, A. (2009). Linguistic landscapes and the transgressive semiotics of graffiti. In: E. Shohamy & D. Gorter *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery* (Eds.) New York: Routledge. 302-312.
- Pennycook, A. (2018). Linguistic Landscapes and Semiotic Assemblages. In: M. Pütz, N. Mundt (Eds.). *Expanding the Linguistic Landscape Linguistic Diversity, Multimodality and the Use of Space as a Semiotic Resource*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 75-88.

- Petrović, V. (Ed.) (2001). *Essekerisch. Das Osijeker Deutsch*. [‘Essekerisch. The local German vernacular of the city of Osijek’] Wien: Edition Praesens.
- Radaviciute, J. (2017). Linguistic landscape of Tbilise: a case study of graffiti. *Respectus Philologicus*. 32(37): 80-90.
- Rončević, M. (2019). *Jezični krajolik grada Rijeke između prošlosti i sadašnjosti*. (doktorski rad, rkp.) [Linguistic landscape of the city of Rijeka between past and present. PhD thesis, manuscript]. Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet.
- Rosenbaum, Y., Nadel, E., Cooper, R. & Fishman, J. (1977). English on Keren Kayemet Street. In: J. Fishman, R. Cooper & A. Conrad (Eds.) *The Spread of English*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. 179-196.
- de Saussure, F. (1916). *Course in General Linguistics*. [trans. By W. Baskin] In: C. Bally, A. Sehehaye & A. Riedlinger (Eds.) London: McGraw-Hill.
- Scollon, R. and Wong Scollon, S. (2003). *Discourses in Place: Language in the Material World*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Scotti Jurić, R. (2007). Interkulturalna komunikacija u Istri: koegzistencija identiteta. [Intercultural communication in Istria: a co-existence of identities] In: J. Granić (Ed.). *Jezik i identiteti* [Language and identities] Zagreb, Split: HDPL. 559-567.
- Shohamy, E. & Ghazaleh-Majajneh, M. (2012). Linguistic landscape as a tool for interpreting language vitality: Arabic as a ‘minority’ language in Israel. In: D. Gorter, H. Marten & L. Van Mensel (Eds.) *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 89-108.
- Shohamy, E. & Gorter, D. (Eds.) (2009). *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*. New York: Routledge.
- Shohamy, E., Ben-Rafael, E. & Barni, M. (Eds.) (2010). *Linguistic Landscape in the City*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Singh, U. (2002). Linguistic landscaping: and overview. In: N. Itagi & S. Singh (Eds.) *Linguistic Landscaping in India with Particular Reference to the New States. Proceedings of a Seminar*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages and Mahatma Gandhi International Hindi University. 7-19.
- Sloboda, M., Szabó Gillinger, E., Vigers, D. & Šimičić, L. (2010). Carrying out a language policy change: advocacy coalitions and the management of linguistic landscape. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. 11(2): 95–113.
- Sloboda, M. (2009). State Ideology and Linguistic Landscape. A Comparative Analysis of (Post)communist Belarus, Czech Republic and Slovakia. In: E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.). *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*. New York: Routledge. 213-228.
- Spender, D. (1980). *Man made language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Spolsky, B. & Cooper, R. (1991). *The Languages of Jerusalem*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2006): *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stolac, D. (1996). Nazivi ulica u Rijeci u prošlosti i danas. [The names of streets in Rijeka in the past and today.] In: P. Odaloš (Ed.) *Urbanonymá a kontexte histórie a súčasnosti*. [Urbanonymy in the context of history and the present] Banská Bystrica – Bratislava: Pedagogická Fakulta Univerzity Mateja Bela. 235-242.
- Stolac, D. & Vlastelić, A. (2014). *Jezik reklama*. [The language of advertisements]. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada i Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci.
- Stolac, D. (2018). Reklame i jezični krajolik. [Advertisements and the linguistic landscape] In: D. Stolac i A. Vlastelić (Eds.) *Jezik i njegovi učinci*. [Language and its effects] Zagreb: Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku i Srednja Europa, 301-316.
- Stolac, D. & Hlavac, J. (in preparation): Gender equality and the formalisation of occupational designations in Croatian with reference to word formation conventions.
- STRUNA [Hrvatsko strukovno nazivlje / Croatian terminology portal] (n.d.) Natuknica za pretraživanje: *jezični krajolik* [Keyword search: *jezični krajolik* ‘linguistic landscape’] [www.struna.ihj.hr / #naziv/jezicni-krajolik/21442 / #naziv](http://www.struna.ihj.hr/#naziv/jezicni-krajolik/21442/#naziv) (22.4.2021)
- Szabó Gillinger, E., Sloboda, M., Šimičić, L. & Vigers, D. (2012). *Discourse coalitions for and against minority languages on signs: linguistic landscape as a social issue*. In: D. Gorter, H. Marten & L. Van Mensel (Eds.) *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 263-281.
- Šamo, R. & Pliško, L. (2018). The Linguistic Landscape in the Brijuni National Park. *HUM – časopis Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Mostaru*. [HUM – Journal of the Faculty of Arts, University of Mostar.] XIII(20): 66-86.
- Šimičić, L. & Bilić Meštrić, K. (2018). *Arbanaški na raskrižju. Vitalitet i održivost jednog manjinskog jezika*. [Arbanaški at the cross-roads. The vitality and the sustainability of a minority language]. Zagreb: Srednja Europa.
- Šimunković, Lj. (1996). *Mletački dvojezični proglašeni u Dalmaciji u 18. stoljeću*. [Bilingual declarations issued by the Republic of Venice in Dalmatia in the eighteenth century] Split: Književni krug.
- Tulp, S. (1978). Reclame en tweetaligheid: Een onderzoek naar de geografische verspreiding van franstalige en nederlndstalige affiches in Brussel. [Advertising and bilingualism: An investigation into the geographical distribution of French and Dutch posters in Brussels.] *Taal en sociale integratie*. [Language and Social Integration] 1. 261-288.

Udier, S. L. (2006). O jeziku reklame. [On the language of advertising] In: J. Granić (Ed.), *Jezik i mediji – jedan jezik: više svjetova*. [Language and the media – one language: many worlds] Zagreb – Split: Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku. 711–721.

Vrcić-Mataija, S. & Grahovac-Pražić, V. (2006). Skrb za jezik na javnim gradskim prostorima. [Awareness of language use in urban public spaces] *Jezik: časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, [Jezik 'Language': Journal on issues to do with the Croatian literary language] 53: 177-187.

Vuković, P. (2012). Jezični krajobraz Subotice [A linguistic landscape of Subotica] *Godišnjak za znanstvena istraživanja* [Yearbook of Scientific Research] 4, 163-178.

Wenzel, V. (1996). Reclame en tweetaligheid in Brussel: Een empirisch onderzoek naar de spreiding van Nederlandstalige en Franstalige affiches. [Advertising and bilingualism in Brussels: An empirical study of the distribution of Dutch and French notices]. In Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Ed.) *Brusselse thema's 3*. [Brussels Themes 3]: Brussels: Vrije Universiteit. 45-74.

Yanguas, I. (2009). The Linguistic Landscape of Two Hispanic Neighborhoods in Washington D.C., *Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada*, 8, 30-44.

Youtube. (2017). *Save Our Slang – SOS*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=20&v=iaPaZ0pEhQ&feature=emb_logo (10. 5. 2020)



During the second author, Jim Hlavač's visit to Rijeka in 2015 as an invited guest lecturer at the University of Rijeka's Research Symposium Series, the first author, Diana Stolac, broached the idea of Rijeka and its linguistic landscape as a research project. This was when 'the seed was planted' and this photograph, taken on Rijeka's *Korzo*, is a fitting image to document this. What then followed was the recording, collection, collation and description of photographs and other images. The authors were greatly assisted in this by friends and colleagues of Diana Stolac whom we warmly thank here: Adriana, Anastazija, Biljana, Danijela, Gianna, Kristian and many, many more.

Notes on authors

Professor **Diana Stolac** is based in the Department of Croatian Language and Literature in the Faculty of Humanities of Social Sciences at the University of Rijeka. Her research areas are: historical linguistics, syntax, Slavic Studies, terminology, sociolinguistics, heritage Croatian in the diaspora, linguistic landscapes and language and advertising. She is the author of seven books and over 150 scientific papers. She has led numerous projects in the fields of sociolinguistics and maritime terminology, and is currently leading a project on the history of Standard Croatian. She has also been a project member of a Slovak-based study on the manipulation of language. She is a member of the Committee for Sociolinguistics and of the Committee for Stylistics of the prestigious International Slavic Studies Committee. From 2007 she led the Higher Degree Research and Doctoral Studies program of the Faculty of Humanities of Social Sciences in the area 'History and Dialectology of the Croatian Language'. She is a member of the editorial board of the following scientific journals: *Fluminensia*, the *Croatian Studies Review* and *Zeszyty Cyrilo-Methodiańskie / Cyrillo-Methodian Papers*.

Dr **Jim Hlavac** is a senior lecturer in Translation and Interpreting Studies at Monash University, Melbourne. He teaches into the Master of Interpreting and Translation Studies at that university. He is a certified and practising interpreter and translator working in Croatian, German and English. He is the author or co-author of three books, co-editor of three further books, author or co-author of 53 research articles and 18 book chapters. He has published widely in the field of Translation and Interpreting Studies and also in the related disciplines of multilingualism, contact linguistics, intercultural communication, pragmatics and language maintenance/shift.



University of Rijeka
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Rijeka 2021

Every community has the habit of documenting itself, either at various points in time or in relation to geographical areas. Communities also seek to be documented in ways that reflect how we record things across the world in general. The linguistic landscape framework provides a formal and structured approach to the documentation of communities. Foregrounded by a diachronic and synchronic overview of the linguistic landscape of Rijeka and its surrounding areas, this book goes beyond providing a snapshot of a city's local features and employs a contemporary methodological approach in its description and discussion of a substantial corpus of visual and textual data. With its comprehensive appraisal of aspects relevant to linguistic landscape research, this book is comparable to leading monographs and edited volumes that have been published in this field in recent years.

Prof. Tanja Gradečak (University of Osijek)

Rijeka is a city with a rich multicultural and multilingual heritage. Latin, Hungarian, and French have, at times, been the city's official languages as well as Italian. All these languages have all co-existed alongside Croatian and local vernaculars of Croatian such as Cakavica with English being the most recent and conspicuous addition. Prefaced by an overview of the languages that have been part of Rijeka's identity over time, this book provides a thorough and vivid description of the city's contemporary linguistic identity. As the first-ever monograph on Rijeka's linguistic landscape, this book offers a detailed description of differences and similarities in the use, function and contextual setting of various linguistic codes recorded across the city and the surrounding Primorje-Gorski Kotar county. It is a welcome addition to the research literature on Croatian sociolinguistics and an excellent example of the way scientific research can be made accessible to a broad audience.

Assoc. Prof. Anastazija Vlastelić (University of Rijeka)

