

Neutralisation in the expression of location and destination of motion in Croatian

Zubčić, Sanja

Source / Izvornik: *Jezikoslovlje*, 2023, 24, 1 - 25

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

<https://doi.org/10.29162/jez.2023.1>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:186:486859>

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

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-12-30**



Repository / Repozitorij:

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





UDC 811.163.42'367=111

Original scientific article

Accepted for publication on 14. 6. 2023

<https://doi.org/10.29162/jez.2023.1>

Sanja Zubčić
Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci

Neutralisation in the expression of location and destination of motion in Croatian^{*}

In Croatian, the location and destination of motion are expressed mainly by various syntactic means, but their neutralisation is also described in the literature, especially in South Čakavian dialects. This paper examines the distribution of this phenomenon in written texts from the Middle Ages onwards, in Čakavian and Štokavian, and in contemporary Čakavian and Croatian Štokavian dialects, in order to determine its age and distribution. By comparing the distribution of this isogloss with the distribution of various Eastern Romance languages on the eastern Adriatic coast, its origin, previously associated with the Dalmatian language, will be more precisely determined.

Keywords: Croatian language, Čakavian dialects, Štokavian dialects, Dalmatian, Istro-Romanian, Krk-Romanian, syntax, neutralisation, location and destination of motion

In Croatian, there is an utmost difference between the way of expressing the location, as a static category, and the way of expressing the direction of motion, as a dynamic one.¹ The location is most often expressed by a phrase consisting of a preposition and a noun in locative case (*Živi u Rijeci*. 'He lives in Rijeka.'), while the direction of motion is expressed by prepositions accompanied by a noun in accusative case and verbs of motion (*Dolazim u Rijeku*. 'I am coming to Rijeka.'). This is the case in the standard variety of Croatian (Katičić 1991: 78) and in the Kajkavian

^{*} This paper was financed by the two University of Rijeka's projects: *Liber Fluminensis – prilozi za proučavanje hrvatskoga jezika u djelima riječkih tiskara do 20. stoljeća* (18-87-1222) and *Prilozi za istraživanje čakavskih dijalekata na području zapadne Hrvatske* (009-1012647-0900).

¹ In languages that have dispensed with the case system, the distinction is expressed with a preposition (English: *I am coming to Rijeka* : *He lives in Rijeka*; German: *Er wohnt in Rijeka* : *Ich komme nach Rijeka*).

group of dialects (Lončarić 1996: 121). However, in some dialects, as well as in literary works created in older linguistic periods, the neutralisation of this phenomenon is noted, i.e., both the location and the direction are expressed in the same way – by using the construction “preposition + noun in accusative case”² (*Živi u Riku*. ‘He lives in Rijeka.’). According to J. Lisac, this phenomenon “nije rijedak među štokavcima” ‘is not rare among Štokavians’ (2003: 27), and in the analysis of the syntax of particular Štokavian dialects in the same book, this feature stands out only in East-Herzegovinian, namely “u zapadnijim govorima (od istočne Hercegovine na zapad)” ‘in more western dialects (from eastern Herzegovina to the west)’ (2003: 104), in Zeta-South-Sandžak dialect (2003: 122) and in the Šumadija-Vojvodina dialect, under the influence of Romanian language (2003: 128). Peco (2007: 245, 246) states that the neutralisation in the East-Herzegovinian dialect is attested only in the area adjacent to Montenegro, as the neutralisation in the Montenegrin dialect is regular (Čirgić 2017: 118). There are two possibilities: either it spread from Montenegro, or it was brought to Herzegovina by the Montenegrin migrants. Either way, the neutralisation in the East-Herzegovinian dialect is a consequence of language contact and not of regular language development, if it is attested. This feature is not immanent in modern Croatian Štokavian dialects,³ while it is much more common in Čakavian (Finka 1971: 45, 46; Šimunović 1977: 62; Vidović 1978: 120; Lisac 2009: 28, 155). Finka (1971: 45–46) emphasises that this phenomenon is common in southeast Čakavian dialects, while it is rare in others.⁴ All the experts agree that this trait is of Romance origin, but Finka (1971: 46) and Lisac (2009: 183) are more precise and suggest that the trait is a result of the influence of the Dalmatian language.⁵

There are three major goals of this research:

1. to investigate the representation of this isogloss in written texts from the Middle Ages onwards, in Čakavian and Štokavian regions, and determine the antiquity of the isogloss on the basis of this data;

² Lj. Šarić studied the ways of expressing location in Slavic languages, but she approached the data from the point of view of cognitive linguistics, and extracted the data from standard Slavic languages.

³ For example, it was not attested in Bitelić, Neoštokavian Ikavian dialect of Dalmatia (Čurković 2014: 281).

⁴ It is interesting that B. Finka (1971: 46) describes this phenomenon as „najozbiljniji poremećaj u čakavskim oblicima” (‘a most serious disturbance in the Čakavian forms’). Such evaluations are completely unacceptable in contemporary dialectological methodology.

⁵ “Terminom dalmatski nazivamo ukupnost autohtonih romanskih varijeteta koji su se u srednjem vijeku govorili u nekim dalmatinskim gradovima, ali koji su se, nakon višestoljetnih simbiotskih procesa, jedan po jedan ‘ugasili’ prije početka 16. st., uz jedan jedini izuzetak: u gradu Krku na istoimenom otoku živjelo je, još u 19. st., nekoliko dalmatskih govornika” (‘The term *Dalmatian* refers to all the autochthonous Romance varieties that were spoken during the Medieval period in some Dalmatian towns, but which had, as a result of centuries-long symbiotic processes, before the beginning of the 16th century, ‘died out’ one by one, with the exception of one: in the Town of Krk, on the Island of Krk, several speakers of Dalmatian were still alive in the 19th century’) (Muljačić 1999: 1).

2. to analyse the distribution of the neutralisation isogloss in contemporary Čakavian dialects in order to confirm Finka's hypothesis, or to fill the potential gaps in it, and to research its distribution within the Štokavian dialects;
3. to determine the reasons for neutralisation in certain Čakavian dialects.

This paper was written according to traditional philological methods established in Croatian philology, and it combines a synchronic and diachronic approach. To achieve the first and third goal, the comparative-historical method is applied, while the second goal is met using the traditional dialectological method.

The incentive for writing this paper is also the insufficient research of historical syntax, for which data is extracted from written texts, but also from organic idioms (thereby it partially coincides with the equally unexplored dialectal syntax in Croatian philology (Jozić 2003)). Historical syntax is traditionally defined as a discipline that:

“a) proučava sintaksu u ranijim razdobljima jezičnoga razvoja; b) opisuje sintaktičke mijene u različitim fazama jezičnoga razvoja; c) odgovara na pitanje zašto je uopće došlo do određene promjene na razini sintakse.”⁶ (Fanego 1994: 13, according to Stolac and Vlastelić 2017: 642),

and this work tries to achieve all three goals.

The data used in that part of this study was excerpted from relevant dialectological studies on Čakavian and Štokavian dialects, from surveys of individual dialects (Šimunović and Olesch 1983; Šimunović 2011; Menac-Mihalić and Celinić 2012) and other text types (e.g., literary texts), if no dialectological description is available. The examples are presented exactly as they are written in the studies and surveys. Data used in the diachronic analysis was extracted from the relevant studies on different segments of the history of the Croatian language and important literary works of several authors.

1. History of neutralisation in Croatian

When it comes to the expression of location and motion destination, neutralisation is not a recent phenomenon in Croatian. To the contrary, there is plenty of evidence for it in the older history of language. The source of the greatest wealth of information is L. Zima's book *Njekoje, većinom sintaktične razlike između čakavštine,*

⁶ 'a) studies syntax in earlier periods of a linguistic period; b) describes syntactic changes in different phases of language development; c) answers the question of why there was a certain change at the level of syntax in the first place.'

kajkavštine i štokavštine (Some, primarily syntactic, distinctions between Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian) in which, based on numerous examples from written sources, he confirms the following hypothesis:

„Akusativ se mjesto lokativa nalazi često u starijoj čakavštini i kod starodubrovačkih pisaca uz prijedloge *na*, *po*, *u*, a u štokavštini na jugu (osobito u Crnoj gori) po najviše uz prijedloge *na* i *u*, dočim je rijedak taj pojav po ostalijem krajevima, gdje se štokavski govori, isto tako u novijoj čakavštini i u kajkavštini”⁷ (1887: 231).

The replacement of locative by accusative case was first recorded in legal texts⁸ written in the vernacular in as early as the 13th century, in 1250 in *Povaljska listina* (Charter of Povelja): *pisano u staru knjigu* ‘written in the old book’ (Kapetanović 2011: 107); in 1288 in *Vinodolski zakon* (Statute of Vinodol): *da bi vse dobre stare iskušene zakone u Vinodol činiti položiti v pisma* (‘for all the good old proven laws in Vinodol to be written down’) (Kuzmić 2009: 437). In *Vrbnički statut* (Vrbnik Statute), which was transcribed in Vrbnik in the 16th century from an original from 1388, replacement of locative by accusative with the prepositions *po* (‘along’) and *na* (‘on’) was noted: *ako po prvu tadbu ali po drugu tat ne bi imel čim platit* (‘if after the first theft or after the second the thief should not have the means to pay’) (Šepić 1953: 38).

Particularly numerous examples can be found in medieval literature. In poetry, such examples can be found in *Pjesmarica bratovštine Svih Svetih* (The Songbook of All Saints Fraternity) from Korčula, probably from the 15th century: *kad se za nas na križ muč* (‘when He was suffering for us on the cross’); *tilo se u grob već ne najde* (‘the body was not found in the grave’). But in the same song we also have: *najde u gradu pirujući* (‘found in the town celebrating’) (Zubčić and Holjevac 2013: 242). According to D. Malić’s (1972) analysis, this phenomenon was not attested in the oldest song-book *Pariška pjesmarica* (Parisian Songbook), while it is present in *Pićićeva pjesmarica* (The Pićić Poetic Miscellany) and *Osorsko-hvarska pjesmarica* (Osor-Hvar Poetic Miscellany): *jere ne imam, plačna majka, veće na svit sinka draga* (‘for I have no, weeping mother, other dear son in this world’); and in the mystery

⁷ ‘Accusative instead of locative is frequently found in older texts in Čakavian and in the works of old Dubrovnik authors with the prepositions *na* (‘on’), *po* (‘along’), *u* (‘in’), and in Štokavian in the south (especially in Montenegro), primarily with the prepositions *na* (‘on’) and *u* (‘in’), while this phenomenon is rare in the other areas where Štokavian is spoken, and it is the same in the newer Čakavian and Kajkavian.’

⁸ In the Medieval period in Croatia the type of text and the type of language used were mutually dependent. Thus, legal texts were written in the vernacular, most frequently Čakavian, language, non-liturgical texts were written in the Croatian recension of the Old Church Slavonic language, and liturgical texts were written in the Old Church Slavonic language.

play *Mišterij vele lip i slavan od Isusa* (*The Mighty Beautiful and Glorious Mystery of Jesus*): *kako visiš na križ nagi* ('how you hang on the cross naked').

The substitution of locative by accusative case has also been attested in the Renaissance literature. Marulić writes in his *Judita* (written in 1501, published in 1521): *bi u grad žaja* ('there was sadness in the city'); *hrabro si se nosil u sve boje tvoje* ('you behaved bravely in all your battles'), etc. (Horvat 2005: 254).⁹ In Držić's works, accusative, the case used with verbs of motion, frequently replaces locative and instrumental case, which are both used with stative verbs. However, this substitution is much more frequent in his poems: *na svit saj, ti s' raj moj jedini* ('in the whole world, you are my only heaven'); *kako taj ki u san uživa* ('like the one who enjoys a dream'); *pod pazuh nošaše* ('bore under the armpit'). The same can be found in the three coastal lectionaries from the 15th century (Rešetar 1898b: 187, 188): *Zadarski lektionar* (*Zadar Lectionary: porođen jest u grad Davidov* 'born in the city of David'), *Lekcionar Bernardina Splićanina* (*The Lectionary of Bernardin Splićanin: i kada biše Isus u Betaniji u dom Šimuna gubavoga* 'and when Jesus was in Bethany in the home of Simon the leper') and in *Ranjinin lektionar* (*Ranjina's Lectionary: pribivaju u Jeruzalem* 'are present in Jerusalem').¹⁰ M. Rešetar (1898b: 188) is the only one, besides A. Šepić (1953), who also lists examples in which the preposition *po* ('along') appears with the noun in accusative case and states that this is „po starijem običaju“ ('according to the older custom'). Since the preposition *po* always appears with the noun in locative case in all the dialectal data analysed in this survey, this particular piece of information indicates that Rešetar was writing about a very old linguistic trait.

To conclude, the replacement of locative by accusative case is a very old linguistic trait in Čakavian, first recorded in legal texts written in the vernacular in as early as the 13th century. It was attested along the Croatian coastal region, both in its northern and southern part, including in Dubrovnik's Štokavian Renaissance literature.

2. Distribution of neutralisation in Čakavian and Štokavian

2.1. Čakavian dialects with neutralisation

Finka (1971: 45–46) claimed that the substitution of locative by the accusative case in expressing the location and destination of motion is rare anywhere, except

⁹ It is interesting that Marulić rarely replaces the accusative with the locative: *od tada unide u gradu sušina* ('since then a drought reigned in the city') (Horvat 2005). This phenomenon is much rarer in Čakavian dialects, although it has been found in our corpus.

¹⁰ This lectionary was transcribed in 1508 in Dubrovnik by a young squire Nikša Ranjina from an original dating to the second half of the 15th century (Rešetar 1898a: 82).

in the South. In this part of the paper, we will present the results according to the contemporary status of researched Čakavian dialects. Despite the fact that there are numerous studies on Čakavian, very few deal with syntax, and therefore these results are presented according to the provided data.

On the Istrian peninsula, the substitution of locative by accusative indicates that the location is distributed in the following way: it has been attested as a systematic trait of the dialects of Jasenovik (*me bolī va lâhat* ‘I have a pain in my elbow’) and Zankovci (*Živi va Kršān* ‘he/she lives in Kršan’), while in the dialects of Nova Vas (*bīva san va Labīn* ‘I was in Labin’), Kostrčani (*su va Tūpljak* ‘are in Tupljak’), Letaj (*dēlamo va kōtal* ‘we are making it in the cauldron’), Grobnik (*bīva va Kršān* ‘he lives in Kršan’), Purgarija Čepić (*na kolēno mi je mūha* ‘there is a fly on my knee’), Lanišće (*va selō nas je mālo* ‘there are only a few of us in the village’) and Šušnjeвица (*rōjena na Brdo* ‘born in Brdo’) locative forms appear sporadically (Peršić 2011: 80, 81). These are the settlements and villages in which even nowadays the Istro-Romanian language is spoken (Nova Vas, Kostrčani, Letaj, Šušnjeвица, Jasenovik, Zankovci, Grobnik), as well as the villages located near them. The substitution occurs with prepositions *va* (‘in’), *u* (‘in’), *na* (‘on’), while the preposition *po* (‘along’) always appears with a noun in the locative case. The same situation has been attested in the dialect of Gradinje: *tu san bi osan dan va pržun, va Pazin* (‘I was here for eight days in prison, in Pazin’); *formirali smo bataljon va Cerovlje* (‘we formed a battalion in Cerovlje’); *prespa san jenu noć tamo va jenu kuću* (‘I slept one night there in one house’) (Škorić 1997: 32, 33).

Istro-Romanian and Krk-Romanian developed from the smallest of the four historical Romanian dialects, along with Daco-Romanian (Dacian), Megleno-Romanian, and Romanian. Krk-Romanian was used in Dubašnica¹¹ and Šotovento¹² and died out in the first half of the 19th century (Kovačec 1998: 241). Istro-Romanian is still preserved, but with a weak vitality of the linguistic community (Vrzić and Singler 2016), so it is on the UNESCO list of endangered languages. In the local community, they prefer the division of Istro-Romanian to *žejanski* (Zheyanski) and *vlaški* (Vlashki) (online source *Where is Vlaški and Žejanski spoken?*).

Nowadays, the Istro-Romanian language is spoken

¹¹ Dubašnica is a collective term for many villages (Barušić, Bogović, Krenenić, Ljutić, Milčetić, Milovčić, Oštrobradić, Porat, Radić, Sabljčić, Strilčić, Sv. Anton, Sv. Ivan, Turčić, Vantačić, Zidarić, Žgombić, and Malinska as the administrative center) located in the central part in the west of the island of Krk, where people communicate in the language type that is defined in literature as a more conservative model of the settler microsystem (Lukežić and Turk 1998: 74, 75).

¹² Šotovento is an area of several villages, located on the westernmost part of the island of Krk and consists of: Bajčić, Brusić, Brzac, Linardić, Milohnić, Nenadić, Pinezić, Poljica, Skrpčić and Žgaljić. The language type used there is a more innovative model of the immigrant microsystem (Lukežić and Turk 1998: 90).

“u selu Žejane (...) na istočnom rubu Čićarije (...) te u više sela i zaselaka jugozapadno od Učke uz sjeverne rubove Čepičkog polja: Šušnjeвица, Nova Vas, Jasenovik, Letaj i Brdo sa zaselcima kao što su Kostrčani, Dolinščina, Zankovci, Perasi, Brig itd.” “U selima Grobnik i Gradinje istrorumunjski se, kao govor sela, ugasio tijekom 20. st. (...), a u 19. st. prestao se govoriti na otoku Krku i u selu Skitači”¹³ (Kovačec 1998: 233).

Since the speakers of this language live in everyday contact with speakers of Čakavian, bilingualism is an immanent phenomenon for them. Istro-Romanian is a language of Romance origin and it has no syntactic declension. Instead, cases are expressed through particles or prepositions. These linguistic means enable the expression of nominative and accusative, as well as genitive and dative case, while the vocative case has special grammatical morphemes only occasionally (Kovačec 1998: 274). Since there were no special means for the expression of locative case, and therefore no way to distinguish between the case expressing the destination of motion and the case expressing the location, they were both expressed by the addition of a particle used for accusative case: *poberújs se vérzele ân desétile míseť*, with the meaning ‘cabbage is harvested in October’, which uses the same expressive means as *ne a mes âm plés*, *ne a mes contró âv*, meaning ‘whether they were going to a dance, or wherever they were going’.¹⁴ Considering that none of the above analysed Istrian dialects distinguish the case which expresses the destination of motion from the case which expresses the location, we can assume that this linguistic trait is the result of the influence of the Istro-Romanian language.

The dialects of the Island of Krk are famous for their linguistic diversity. This isogloss divides them too. In the conservative dialect of Omišalj, and in the dialects of Dobrinj, Vrbnik and Baška this neutralisation has never been recorded, while it is present in the older immigrant dialect of the Dubašnica and Šotovento type and in the dialect of Njivice.¹⁵ I. Milčetić (1895) does not mention the presence of this phenomenon in any of the analysed dialects of the islands in the Kvarner bay, including the Dubašnica dialect, of which he was a native speaker. In contemporary Dubašnica and Šotovento dialect, the neutralisation is obligatory (Dubašnica, Sv.

¹³ ‘In the village of Žejane on the eastern rim of Čićarija and in several villages and hamlets south-west of Učka along the northern rim of Čepičko polje: Šušnjeвица, Nova Vas, Jasenovik, Letaj and Brdo with hamlets such as Kostrčani, Dolinščina, Zankovci, Perasi, Brig, etc.’ ‘In the Grobnik and Gradinje villages Istro-Romanian as the language of the village became extinct in the 20th century, and in the 19th century the inhabitants of the Island of Krk and of Skitača stopped using it.’

¹⁴ The examples used to explain and confirm this hypothesis were taken from Kovačec 1998: 302, 303.

¹⁵ I. Lukežić (1998: 208, 226, 242) specifies that the substitution is systematic in phrases which contain the prepositions *u* (‘in’) and *na* (‘on’), while locative case is used more frequently with the prepositions *o* (‘about’) and *po* (‘along’).

Anton: *Ovôc je u Dubašnicu bilo vâvik* ‘In Dubašnica there have always been sheep’, *Kî je na m^uôre – navigùje, kî je u pòrat – premišljùje* ‘He who is at sea sails, and he who is in port has doubts’ proverb; Šotovento, Nenadići: *Šlî smo u Nenadić* ‘we went to Nenadić’, *Bîla je u sêlo* ‘She was in the village’.¹⁶ The same phenomenon was first recorded at a much earlier time, in the first half of the 18th century. The inventory of the Monastery of St. Mary Magdalene in Porat, which was recorded during this period, has been preserved (Badurina 2013). Since the friars were local people, they kept these records in their vernacular, and such texts can be used as sources of information on historical dialectology. This particular source confirms the existence of neutralisation: *20 koz u Mata Budislavića na pašu* (‘20 goats put to pasture with Mate Budislavić’); *krave ke su na pašu* (‘cows that are put out to pasture’); *škrine u kamare i po mostiru* (‘chests in rooms and around the monastery’), but also: *kuhinja i u njoj* (‘kitchen and in it’) (Badurina 2013: 32, 39, 51, 63). The neutralisation never occurs when the preposition is *po* (‘along/around’). In the introductory parts of annual inventories, where liturgical objects are listed (altar, tabernacle, statues of saints, etc.) locative case is used systematically. This syntactic exclusiveness can also be explained by the Romance, or more precisely, Krk-Romanian, influence. Istro-Romanians settled in the northeastern part of the island of Krk, in Dubašnica and Šotovento. They lived there until the mid 19th century, when the last speaker of the Krk-Romanian language, Mate Bajčić, died.¹⁷ The domicile population called them Vlasi or Vlašići. This language was never described, and the only extant records written in this language are those of two prayers: *Our Father* and *Hail Mary* (Feretić 1903: 88). Since Krk-Romanian and Istro-Romanian have the same origin, we can assume that they had the same basic grammatical structure and conclude that the neutralisation confirmed in the Čakavian dialects who are neighbouring (or were neighboured by) the dialects on a Romance basis, is a result of the influence of the same Eastern Romance, Romanian variety. Therefore, the substitution of locative and instrumental case by accusative case in the contemporary Čakavian dialects of Dubašnica and Šotovento is a result of influence of this Romance variety.

The linguistic reality of the Town of Krk is very complex, both on the synchronic and on the diachronic level. The oldest dialect is Vegliot (a dialect of Dalmatian) which was used by the town inhabitants to communicate with each other. The later settlers, most of whom came from the surrounding villages and hamlets on the Island of Krk, brought their own dialects. As a result, a specific Čakavian koine is used in the town nowadays in addition to the standard variety of the Croatian language (Turk 1996: 102). Nowadays, the indigenous population living in the town is scarce. They are bilingual and use the Krk Venetian (Veian) dialect (Spicijarić Paškvan

¹⁶ Data were collected as part of my own fieldwork.

¹⁷ See Kovačec (1998: 244, 245), for the extent to which Krk-Romanian has been studied.

2021), and a low variety of Standard Croatian (Pavičić 1998: 42). A systematic neutralisation of locative and accusative case has been recorded in the contemporary idiolect of the Town of Krk: *oni se sjećaju kako je bilo u Krk* ('they remember what it was like in Krk'); *ove kuće u grad* ('these houses in the town'); *sada je u Koper* ('he is now in Koper'); *sama san bila u kuću* ('I was alone in the house'); *ples je bil u otel* ('the dance was held at the hotel'); *konzolato je prije bilo u Zagreb* ('the consulate used to be in Zagreb') (Pavičić 1998: 35). A superficial interpretation might explain this phenomenon as a result of the influence of Dubašnica and Šotovento dialects. However, the dialects of settlements that gravitate towards the Town of Krk, such as those of Punat and Kornić, do not exhibit this phenomenon, and neither do any of the dialects of the settlements where indigenous population lives. Therefore, this is clearly a result of the Romance influence from the indigenous Vegliot language.

In the dialects of the Island of Rab, according to Kušar (1894: 48, 49), the distinction between the expression of location and destination does not exist, but both are expressed with the help of a noun in locative case without a preposition: *Jâ stojîn Lošinj* ('I live in Lošinj'); but also *Grên Lošinj, Zâdri, varôši, môri, nebesî* ('I am going to Lošinj, Zadar, towns, sea, heaven').

„U gradu se slabo pazi na razliku između mirovanja i kretanja kod prijedloga *na, va* ili *u* itd., pa se, i kad je mirovanje upotrebljava ponajviše akuzativ; tako se kaže na pr. *drži ga na kolena, pasiva vrime va plač* (ali kod seljana: *va plaču*)“¹⁸ (Kušar 1894: 48, 49).

In the studies on the dialect of the town of Pag, N. Kustić noted that the neutralisation of locative and accusative case is sporadic: *Užâli smo c'êlu nôc s'p'ât u crikav* ('we used to be in church all night'); *Ne s'âmo u stajôn* ('nor only in the certain period'); *ki je bi u P'âg* ('who was in Pag') (Kustić 2001: 83, 86, 88). In addition to the Town of Pag dialect, S. Vranić (2003: 156) found this phenomenon in the three settlements in Brbat: Metajna (*Bila san na simitar* ('I was at the graveyard')); *Bî je u Rîku* ('He was in Rijeka'), Zubovići and Kustići, but also in the Šimuni dialect (*ôvdi u Šimûni* ('here in Šimuni'); *Pa su rādîli u P'âg* ('Then they worked in Pag')) which belongs to the Kolan group of dialects. In the Kolan dialect itself and in that of Novalja, the phenomenon has not been recorded.

On the islands of Lošinj, Zadar and Šibenik archipelagos this phenomenon has not been recorded. The only exception is the Žirje dialect in which, according to Finka and Šojat (1968: 179), the phenomenon is rare, and the authors note it in only

¹⁸ 'In the town, little attention is paid to the distinction between being at a location and motion when it comes to the use of prepositions *na* ('on'), *va* ('in') or *u* ('in'), etc., and as a result, even when they talk about location, they primarily use accusative case. Therefore, they say *drži ga na kolena* ('he is holding him on his knees'), *pasiva vrime va plač* ('she spends time crying'), but the village folk use: *va plaču* 'in crying.'

two examples: *stȃli su nĭkoliko misĕci ũ zbjeg u El-Šātu* ('they spent several months as refugees in El-Shatt'); *ĭman dvȃ brȃta u Mĕriku* ('I have two brothers in America'). Since the phenomenon was confirmed only in those two cases, and at the same time the local dialect of *Žirje* differs from all the other dialects of the Zadar and Lošinj archipelagos, we will consider it marginal and will not consider it a relevant feature in further research.

Further south, this syntactic trait has been confirmed on the Island of Šolta but, according to Galović (2019: 261), it is rather rare: *ōna žĭve u Mȃžarsku* ('she lives in Hungary'); *mōj ōtac je imȃ duĉȃn u Gōrne Sĕlo* ('my father had a shop in Gornje Selo'). Neutralisation is most frequent in Stomorska (Galović 2019: 261).

According to the numerous studies on the dialects spoken on the island of Brač, it is sporadic in the Nerežišća dialect: *Mĭ smo bili tȃmo u Žmĭrne, u Tȃrsku* ('We were there in Izmir, in Turkey'); *tȃmo u Kĭnu* ('there in China'), but also *kō jedōn škōj na mōrũ*, etc. (Šimunović and Olesch 1983: 28–31). The situation is similar in the Supetar dialect: *ōbicaĭ da še cȃva na grōbje mĭtve* ('the custom to keep the dead bodies at the graveyard'); *ondȃ ga še cȃva u grobȃrnĭcu* ('then it is kept in the mortuary'), but *U Āfrici i Amĕrici šan ništō ucinĭ* ('In Africa and America I accomplished something'), etc. (Šimunović and Olesch 1983: 54–56). However, in both dialects the examples in which locative case is used are more numerous. On the other hand, in Bol, the neutralisation of locative and accusative, and even instrumental case is significantly more frequent: *bĭ san u Splĭt* ('I was in Split'); *spōli smo pōl bōr* ('we slept under a pine tree'); *stojĭ pril kũcu i glĕdo cȃru na posnĭstru* ('he is standing in front of the house and looking at the girl in the window') (Šimunović 2006: 35). The same is attested in Ložišće (*Cĭlo popōlnĕ san bila na grōbje* ('I was in the cemetery whole afternoon')) (Galović and Valerijev 2021: 60) and in Milna (*jer ni bilo u kuću ni vodĕ* ('because there was no water either in the house'); *bilo je deve mešarnic u Milnu* ('there used to be nine butcher shops in Milna'); *u Milnu šu bili dvi glazbe* ('there used to be two orchestras in Milna')) (Menac-Mihalić and Celinić 2012: 118). In all mentioned dialects the preposition *po* ('along') always appears with the locative case.

This neutralisation has also been recorded in some dialects of the island of Hvar. In Svirĕ and Stari Grad, the substitution is sporadic and it always occurs with toponyms: *tvōj Visko bĭ je u Jȃgodnu* ('your Visko was in Jagodna'), but *i u tōn oštarĭji* ('and in that pub') (Svirĕ; Šimunović and Olesch 1983: 62); *nabȃsala na te ĭste jũde kakō u Zaštražĭšće* ('I happened to bump into those same people I bumped into in Zastrazišće'), but also *partezȃni su bili guōre na Ćũki* ('the partisans were up, at Ćuka') (Sv. Nedjelja; Šimunović and Olesch 1983: 71). The neutralisation is also sporadic in Brusje, and as a result, a sentence has been recorded in which it takes place in one phrase, while in another it does not: *ĭša son jō i stojĭn tȃko, i stojĭn na vrōta ol sakristĭje. A u sakrestĭji su trĭ kakō grĕba* ('I went there and I am standing like that I

am standing at the sacristy door and there are like these three graves in the sacristy') (Šimunović and Olesch 1983: 82). It is significantly more systematic in Sveta Nedjelja: *U purtèlu stoji parūn; ne dohōdi skūpo u naše mīsto* ('nothing expensive comes to our place'); *sa velikon brōdōn i kjūčīman u rūke* ('with a big boat and keys in his hand'); *Tēbi je odrēđeno mīsto na ovā vèlika vrōta na līvu rūku* ('your place is at this big door on the left side'), but also *gonīli vīnō u mīhiman, na tovāriman i mūlīman* ('transported wine in wineskins, on donkeys and mules') (Šimunović and Olesch 1983: 67, 68). The substitution is most systematic in Jelsa: *sūtradōn u noćī smo spōli ū tu kūću* ('the next night we slept in that house'); *tuō je nōjškartiji čovīk ča je bī u Jēlsu* ('this is the stingiest man that has ever lived in Jelsa'); *govōri da je bī u Splīt* ('he is saying that he was in Split'), even though we can find examples such as *jedōn čovīk u brōde* ('one man on the boat') (Šimunović and Olesch 1983: 74).

As far as the dialects spoken on the Island of Vis are concerned, more confirmations have been found in Komiža. Examples in the dialects of Šimunović and Olesch 1983 and Menac-Mihalić and Celinić 2012 have been attested. In the more recent one, which was recorded in 2004, the phenomenon has been recorded in several examples: *ondā še dūjde dōma u konōbu i ondā še u konōbu nastāvi fēsta* ('then we come home to the wine-cellar, and then we continue the party in the wine-cellar'); *kad je u konōbu* ('when he is in the wine-cellar'); *onda je u ruke* ('then it is in the hands'); *Kad je ū ruke, ondā je tō svē* ('When it is in the hands, then that is it') (2012: 99). In a very extensive older note by Pavle Mardešić Centin from 1977, no confirmation that the neutralisation occurs can be found. In a shorter survey of the Vis dialect (Luka), Hraste (1937: 153) noted: *a onī drūgi picigamōrt ca je bī(l) u kašil govōri*. Considering that the data seems to be contradictory, we examined the recordings of and notes on all the dialects spoken on the island of Vis (those of the area of the town of Vis, the villages in the south-eastern part of the island, the area of Komiža and all the villages in the Komiža municipality, including Biševo and Sveti Andrija), that were recorded by J. Božanić in 2002. The results show that the neutralisation is dominant in all the dialects spoken on the island of Vis: *Prī rāta u Komīžu* ('Before the war in Komiža') (181); *Bīlo je svīta na rīvu, ma kākvi Amērika* ('there were lots of people at the own quay, what America') (181, 182); *A imōl je škvēr u Pōlu* ('and he used to own a shipyard in Pula') (182); *Po Zāgrēbu, u Jubjānu, na Rīkū i tāmō, prodovālo se je vīnō* (In Zagreb, in Ljubljana, in Rijeka and there, wine used to be sold') (191); *A tī nīsī smīl na tūju zēmju grōdīt* ('and you were not allowed to build on another person's land') (199). The locative form is used rarely to denote location: *A jelnū māšku je imōl na brodū* ('But he had one cat on the boat') (183). In all the dialects the preposition *po* ('along') always appears with a noun in locative case: *dūšla onā po jemātvi na ložjē* ('it appeared on the vines after the grapes were picked') (190). Based on this analysis, we conclude that the neutralisation of locative and accusative case is frequent and dominant in the dialects of the Island of Vis.

According to the survey of the dialects of the Island of Korčula that has been reported in Šimunović and Olesch 1983, the neutralisation of locative and accusative case has not been recorded in the Pupnat and Žrnovo dialects. In a survey of the Račišće dialect (Menac-Mihalić and Celinić 2012: 186–189) the neutralisation is rare (*i to bi se saml'lo u žrvna* ‘and that would be ground in a mill/using a grindstone’), while the locative forms are more frequent: *ja saⁿ spavala na slami* (‘I slept on straw’); *nosu malo dite na prsima* (‘they are carrying a young child on their breast’). However, one instance of neutralisation of locative and accusative has been recorded in Račišće. This phenomenon has been described (Finka 1971: 45), but in our corpus there is only one instance: *bile bi došle Ciganjke u selu* (‘Gypsy women used to come to the village’) (Menac-Mihalić and Celinić 2012: 187).

J. Lisac (2009: 183) noted that in Lastovo both the locative and instrumental case have the same form as the accusative case when used to refer to a location. However, in the surveys published in Šimunović and Olesch (1983: 113, 114) and in an entry by M. Tomelić Čurlin published in Lisac (2009: 185) no confirmation of such a substitution can be found. Instead, locative forms are systematically used when referring to a location: *da možu pāmēt u Dubrovniku kúpīt* (‘if they could buy brains in Dubrovnik’); *a u onen kašunu* (‘and in that stone shepherds’ hut’); *nè smijū srēs u mjěstu* (‘not allowed to meet in the village’). Kušar (1893) also did not find any examples of such a substitution.

The only two Čakavian¹⁹ dialects not located on an island in which the neutralisation of locative and accusative case has been recorded, according to contemporary research, are the dialects of Split and Trogir, both ancient cities. This substitution has been recorded in various surveys of the Split dialect and in both of the sources we used. However, parallel forms without the substitution are always present, e.g., *a u škūlu sq jēmâ sâme dīje* (‘in school I used to get only Ds’); *Nīma piněz vīše u bājku* (‘there is no more money in the bank’), but also *treba ga stimat ka tovara u jematvi* (‘he/it needs to be pushed like a donkey during the harvest’) (Menac-Mihalić and Celinić 2012: 198–199). The diachronic status of this trait in the Split dialect has been studied by D. Jutronić (2010: 457, 458). Based on the analysis of the language used by various authors who speak the Split dialect in various situations (literary works, newspaper articles, interviews, songs, television shows, etc.), such as Miljenko Smoje (b. 1923), Ante Doplančić (b. 1939), Sonja Senjanović-Peračić (b. 1926), Đermano Ćićo Senjanović (b. 1949), Ranko Mladina (b. 1949), Oliver Dragojević²⁰

¹⁹ The idiom of the city of Split was originally a part of the South Čakavian, Ikavian dialect. However, around the middle of the previous century various idioms, Čakavian island idioms, but also Štokavian from Dalmatinska Zagora, began to mix in the city, and as a result the present-day idiom of Split differs from the original one. For more on this topic see Jutronić (2004, 2010).

²⁰ The analysed data includes an interview with O. Dragojević and the texts of his songs written by various authors in the Čakavian Ikavian dialect.

(b. 1947), Robert Pauletić (b. 1965), Arijana Čulina (b. 1966), Teo Peričić (b. 1972), Petra Nižetić (b. 1981), Marijana Batinić (b. 1981), Petar Grašo (b. 1976), D. Jutronić (2010: 267) presents the following Chart with the percentage of substitution of the locative case by accusative:




Chart 1: The percentage of substitution of the locative case by accusative in some Split dialect speakers in 20th century

She concludes that this trait varies in the Split dialect and that its use is significantly less frequent than it used to be. Taking into consideration the type of variance, Jutronić stresses that this trait cannot be explained by the principle of salience²¹ because the trait itself is not stigmatised – its use nowadays mostly serves localisation purposes because it immediately identifies the speaker as a person from Dalmatia and brings to mind that particular cultural circle. Therefore, its use is distinctive (2010: 268).

The neutralisation of locative and accusative case when referring to a location has also been observed in the Trogir dialect. If we are to judge by the work by D. Geić and M. Slade Šilović (1994: 14), this substitution is very systematic, but the authors relate it to the perfect tense and list the following examples: *Bija san u Split* ('I was in Split'); *Bija san na rivu* ('I was at the waterfront'); *Živija je na selo* ('He lived in the country'). However, if we take a look at M. Slade Šilović's poetry, it becomes evident that the substitution is frequent, but not completely systematic, and that it does not only occur with the perfect tense: *obe ruke na bunar slomila*

²¹ For more on this principle see Jutronić (2010: 31–33). The main hypothesis of the principle is that the prominent, distinctive traits should be the first to disappear from the system.

zalivajuć cviće ('she broke both her arms at the well when she was watering flowers') (Slade Šilović 1976: 144); *u let jidu, u let srce srcen inbazdaju, u let se jubidu i skriceđu o' ludoga veseja* (referring to orniths) (Slade Šilović 1976: 149, 150); *Svi smo u jedan karilac* ('we are all in one bounded part') (Slade Šilović 1976: 150); *U jono ditinjasto vrime* ('in those childhood days') (Slade Šilović 1976: 153). The following observation is interesting:

„Mnogi ispitanici, osobito oni koji se u razgovoru žele prikazati obrazovanijima i kulturnijima ('finijima'), u prezentu vrše zamjenu nominativa sing. dativom²²: *Gren u Splitu. Gren na rivi*“²³ (Geić – Slade Šilović 1994: 14).

This is actually a substitution of accusative by locative case, a substitution that has been observed and described, but that is quite rare nowadays.²⁴ The substitution of instrumental by accusative case has also been noted in the poetry by M. Slade Šilović (1976: 150): *Pod nogu aparana mladost*²⁵.

Since Kaštela is located between Split and Trogir, it was investigated whether the phenomenon was also attested in their dialect through the analysis of two published texts in the Čakavian dialect of Kaštela, in the play *Studinki* by M. M. Bradarić (2001) and in prose texts published in *Zbornik radova Literarno-likovno-filmski natječaj Gradske knjižnice Kaštela "Kaštelanske štorije" 2015./2016.*, edited by Dobrić and Galović (*Collection of Literary-artistic-film competition of the City Library of Kaštela "Kaštelan štorija" 2015/2016*) (in the absence of a thorough dialectological description). The analysis revealed that neutralisation was not attested in the works (*dok nismo svè završili u crkvi* ('until we finished everything in the church') (Bradarić 2001: 90); *kad san svršija prvi razred gimnazije u Splitu* ('I have finished first grade of grammar school in Split') (Zbornik 2016: 18). Although Kaštela is located between two points where neutralisation is attested, it is absent in their written texts, and the reason for this is probably the fact that Kaštela was mostly a rural area where there was no (significant) influence of the Romance idiom.

Among the cities of the Antiquity, the occurrence is not confirmed in the contemporary dialect of Zadar (Marković 2012: 328), nor in the language of Zoranić's

²² Their grammatical description is wrong. Instead of nominative, it should be accusative, instead of dative should be locative. But the sentences are correct.

²³ 'Many subjects, especially those who want to present themselves as more educated and cultured ('fancier') during the conversation/interview, replace the nominative case by the singular dative with the present tense: *Gren u Splitu*. ('I am going to Split'), *Gren na rivi* ('I am going to the town quay').'

²⁴ The substitution may be caused by hypercorrectness, as one of the reviewers of this paper suggested, but since it is rare in some contemporary Čakavian dialects, it cannot be caused by hypercorrectness alone.

²⁵ Example is excerpted from the poem and therefore hard to translate.

works (Ružičić 1930: 10: 50–55), but it is confirmed in the *Zadar Lectionary*²⁶ (Rešetar 1898a: 81). Similarly, there is no neutralisation in the dialects of the island of Cres that belonged to the Diocese of Osor.

According to the traditional division, the Čakavian languages on the Pelješac peninsula are located in its western part (Orebić, Kučište, Viganj), and Štokavian in the eastern part (from the town of Ston to Janjina) (Milas 1891). According to contemporary research, there is a mix of linguistic features in the central zone, so today the dialects are Čakavian-Štokavian (Tomelić Ćurlin 2008: 115–117). Regardless of whether they are Čakavian, Štokavian or the mixed dialects of Pelješac, the replacement of the locative by the accusative is not attested in them (Milas 1891; Tomelić Ćurlin 2008).

2.2. Štokavian dialects with neutralisation

Budmani recorded that in the idiom of Dubrovnik, the locative case is substituted by the accusative case in phrases that contain the prepositions *na* ('on'), *o* ('about'), *u* ('in'). In addition to this type of substitution, he also recorded the substitution of the instrumental case by accusative. Budmani calls this trait a Montenegrin mistake and stresses: „Ako ko takovu pogrešku čuje od Dubrovčanina, neka slobodno promisli, da ovomu mati nije Dubrovkinja“²⁷ (Budmani 1883: 179). Budmani, therefore, does not consider the substitution of locative by accusative case to be an autochthonous trait of the Dubrovnik dialect. Despite this, it is quite frequent in the works by M. Držić (Rešetar 1933: 248), Š. Menčetić (*Ter mi si na misal dan i noć sunačce* 'And you are on my mind day and night sunshine'), D. Zlatarić (*Vaze te smrt prika, jaoh, u cvit mladih dni* 'You were taken by death, woe, in the flower of your youth'), I. Đorđić (*po usta oca nebeskoga izgovara* 'by the mouth of the Holy Father he pronounce'), J. Palmotić (*On zahvali veseo nîmi na viteško obećanje* 'he thanked them, happy, for their knightly promise'), etc.²⁸, as well as in the Dubrovnik archives from the 17th and 18th century: *ostavljam u svetu gospođu* ('I leave it in Holy lady') (Laznibat 1996: 177). The same trait is also very frequent in the language of *frančezarije* written in Dubrovnik during the same period with the prepositions *na* ('on') and *u* ('in'):²⁹ *još u djetinjstvo* ('as early as in childhood'); *koga u svoj život nije nigda ni video* ('whom he had not yet seen anywhere in his life'); *neću veće u život vjerovat*

²⁶ Although Rešetar records that the *Lectionary* was created in Zadar or in its vicinity, it is difficult to determine this with written texts due to the possibility of their transmission. Therefore, this information should be received *cum grano salis*.

²⁷ 'If someone should hear a person from Dubrovnik make such a mistake, they can safely assume that the person's mother is not from Dubrovnik.'

²⁸ The examples from works by Š. Menčetić, D. Zlatarić and I. Đorđić were taken from Zima (1887: 233).

²⁹ The author claims that the substitution occurs with the preposition *po* ('along') although she does not list any examples.

nijednomu ('I will no longer believe anyone as long as I live'); *umrijet u mladost* ('to die in youth') (Lovrić Jović 2014: 173).

In the contemporary Dubrovnik dialect, the neutralisation is not attested (Lisac 2003: 106–110; Vulić 2007).

In the dialects of Konavle, the substitution of locative by accusative case occurs sporadically: *bila sam i na pašu* ('I also went with the animals to pasture'); *pèklo se na vatru* ('it was baked/roasted on the fire'); *u moju mnădōs sàsvijem mălo je bilo* ('when I was young there was just a little'), etc. In most cases the substitution does not take place and the goal of motion and location are expressed by means of different cases (Kašić 1995: 342 (102)). According to Lisac (2003: 98–102) and Dominik (2018) neutralisation is not attested in the contemporary Konavle dialect.

The conclusion of this chapter is a dialectological map, presented in the final chapter (*Conclusion*), which marks the dialects in which neutralisation is attested today. At the same time, due to unequal conditions of data³⁰ collection, differences in the frequency of neutralisation will not be marked on the map.

3. Origin of neutralisation

Undoubtedly, neutralisation in expressing location and destination of motion in Croatian is of Romance origin. J. Lisac emphasises that Dalmatian

„nije poznavao razlike pri uporabi prijedloga *ubi* „gdje“ i *quo* „kamo“, pa je kasnije samo *ubi* rabljen, a time je nestalo potrebe za razlikovanjem padežnih morfema uz glagole mirovanja i kretanja, tj. lokativa od akuzativa”³¹ (2009: 183).

If this thesis is correct, the areas where neutralisation is confirmed would have to coincide with the areas where the Dalmatian language was spoken. The Dalmatian language is the common term for autochthonous Romance languages that developed from Vulgar Latin in the cities along the Adriatic coast in the Middle Ages (Muljačić 1999: 3). Ž. Muljačić divides the Dalmatian language into North Dalmatian or Iadertine, which was spoken in six cities of the Byzantine Theme (district) of Lower Dalmatia (Krk/Curicum, Osor/Absarus, Rab/Arba, Zadar/Iader(a), Trogir/Tragurium, Split/Spalatum), and Ragusan, the language spoken in the northern-

³⁰ Namely, the data for this discussion was extracted in different ways, which vary from chrestomathies, through scientific monographs, articles, and dictionaries, to dialect descriptions and literary texts. In addition, such a method does not allow insight into generational stratification, which certainly exists, but which was not of interest in this paper.

³¹ '(Dalmatian) did not make any distinction when it came to the use of prepositions *ubi* 'where' (location) and *quo* 'where to' (direction/destination), and in the later period only *ubi* was used, and as a result the need to distinguish between the case morphemes used with stative verbs and verbs of motion, that is, between locative and accusative case, disappeared.'

most city of Upper Dalmatia (Dubrovnik/Ragusium). The Labeatian language is also mentioned, but Muljačić does not determine whether it is an independent, third Dalmatian language, or a dialect of an existing Dalmatian language. It was used in other cities of Upper Dalmatia (Kotor/Catarum, Budva/But(h)ua, Bar/Antibarium, Ulcinj/Olcinium, Lješ/Lissus, Skadar/Scutari and Drivast/Drivast(i)um) (Muljačić 2000: 326).

This research confirmed that neutralisation is attested in the following Čakavian and Štokavian dialects, which were (or still are) in contact with any of the versions of the pre-Venetian Romance languages and Romanian language:

1. Dalmatian

1.1. North Dalmatian ~ a) the Vegliot city of Krk; b) Rab; c) Pag, Metajna, Zubovići, Kustići;³² d) Šolta (Stomorska); e) Brač: Nerežišća, Supetar, Bol, Ložišće, Milna; f) Hvar: Hvar, Svirče, Sv. Nedjelja, Brusje, Jelsa; g) Vis: Vis, Komiža, Biševo, Sv. Andrija; h) Korčula: Račišće; i) Split; j) Trogir

- among the old cities of the Antiquity where Dalmatian was spoken, it was not attested in Cres, while it was found only in 15th century Zadar (if the *Zadar Lectionary* was truly created in Zadar or its immediate vicinity);

- The contemporary Čakavian dialect of Osor has died out (Vranić and Zubčić 2015: 58–60), and neutralisation has not been confirmed in the neighbouring dialects of Cres (cf. Houtzagers 1985: 60, 61) and Lošinj (cf. Zubčić 2017: 749).

1.2. Ragusan ~ The occurrence is not preserved in the contemporary Dubrovnik dialect, but it is well preserved in the language of older Dubrovnik literature. Therefore, we assume that neutralisation was part of the Dubrovnik dialect, but it was numbed due to contact with the neighbouring Neo-Štokavian dialects. The phenomenon can be found in the region of Konavle, and it is possible that this is a remnant of an old feature from Dubrovnik, or that it is supported by contemporary neighbouring Montenegrin dialects in which it is systematic (Čirgić 2017: 118).

2.

2.1. Istro-Romanian ~ Jasenovik, Zankovci, Nova Vas, Kostrčani, Letaj, Purgarija Čepić, Lanišće, Šušnjeva; Gradinje, Grobnik.

³² On the island of Pag, there were no municipalities where Dalmatian was spoken, and in the Middle Ages, the island was already “both spiritually and secularly divided between Rab and Zadar or Nin” (Vranić 2002: 16, according to Sujoldžić et al. 1986: 183). Therefore, it is difficult to determine whether the analyzed syntactic feature came to the Pag local dialects from the Antiquity cities of Rab or Zadar as cities where Dalmatian was spoken, but it is undoubtedly the result of this influence.

2.2. **Krk-Romanian** ~ Dubašnica, Šotovento.

Among the Romance idioms still used in communication on the eastern coast of the Adriatic, there are many colonial Venetian idioms (Muljačić 1999: 5) in the old Romance urban centres, where they are more or less vital even today (Spicijarić Paškvan 2021; Plešković 2019). The influence of these idioms is dominant at the lexical level, so they are not of interest to us. A special group of Romance idioms is formed by the Istriot or Istro-Romance language, which is a part of pre-Venetian autochthonous Romance languages of the Istrian peninsula. Today, it is preserved only in six places: Rovinj, Vodnjan, Bale, Fažana, Galizana, and Šišan, and it is unstopably slipping into the colonial Istro-Venetian. In the literature on the Čakavian dialects bordering them (the languages of the Southwestern Istrian dialect), neutralisation in the way of expressing the location and the destination of motion has not been attested (Hraste 1966). This confirms that Istriot, although Romance, is structurally different from other pre-Venetian Romance languages, Istro-Romanian and Dalmatian.

4. Conclusion


Based on the conducted research, it is possible to draw the following conclusions:

- In written documents, the neutralisation of the location and the destination of motion was confirmed very early, in the second half of the 13th century, equally in the north of the coastal area, in the Glagolitic *Statute of Vinodol* from 1288, and in the south in the Cyrillic *Charter of Povelja* from the island of Brač from 1250. Although the feature was preserved over the centuries, it lost its intensity and, over time, completely disappeared in some dialects, such as Zadar or Dubrovnik, and the same process of numbing is still active, thus the research shows its rapid disappearance in Split. Likewise, this feature is prominent in other contemporary Čakavian dialects, and in the effort of dialect leveling, it is often lost,³³ which is aided by the strong influence of the standard language.
- B. Finka's thesis that neutralisation in the expression of location and destination of motion is predominant in the southern Čakavian dialects is only partially correct. Although the feature is predominant in the dialects of Split and Trogir and the central Dalmatian islands of Šolta, Hvar, Brač, Vis, and in Račišće on Korčula, this research proved that the isogloss is much wider

³³ For the appearance of leveling of other linguistic features and its causes, see Vranić and Zubčić (2015: 65, 66).

and that it also extends to dialects in northeastern Istria and some dialects in the northern islands (Krk, Rab, Pag). In the central Čakavian area, the phenomenon has not been confirmed, except in Zadar in the 15th century, if the *Zadar Lectionary* was created in Zadar or in its vicinity. From the list and the map, it is clear that isogloss spread towards the islands, and that it has been preserved there for the longest period and with the greatest intensity.

- This analysis shows that the substitution of locative by accusative case in the literary texts mainly in constructions with the prepositions *u* and *na*, and less frequently with *po* (once *pod*). In the contemporary Čakavian and Štokavian dialects, there is no neutralisation in constructions with *po*. The reason is that the main meaning of the prepositions *va / v / u* and *na* is the location and destination of movement. Other prepositions have a different meaning and are not neutralised. Since neutralisation with *po* is attested only in the older text, this could mean that this preposition had a wider spatial meaning, similar to *va / v / u* and *na* in the past.
- Based on the conducted research, a dialectological map was created, with marked points where neutralisation was attested, according to the current state of research, which determined the approximate stratification of this isogloss. It is clear from the map that the neutralisation was attested in the Čakavian dialects on the coast and islands. Among the Štokavian dialects, it was partially attested only in Konavle and was a feature of the Dubrovnik dialect in the 15th and 16th century (again in the maritime area). The isogloss is therefore not conditioned by belonging to either of the two groups of dialects.
- By comparing the geographical location of the places in which neutralisation is confirmed with the places in which some of eastern Romance idioms is used or was used in the past, a major parallel was established, i.e., the occurrence is much more frequent in those Čakavian and Štokavian dialects which are in contact (or were in contact during some of the older stages of linguistic development) with pre-Venetian Romance idioms, i.e., with both dialects of Dalmatian (North Dalmatian and Ragusian), which has already been written about in the literature, and with the Istro-Romanian language on Krk or in northeastern Istria, which was not previously described. The conclusion of this part of the analysis is that the neutralisation of location and destination of motion in the analysed Čakavian and Štokavian languages was based on the Romance dialect of Dalmatian, Istro-Romanian and Krk-Romanian languages. Among the pre-Venetian Romance idioms, Istriotic is also spoken in Istria, but this phenomenon has not been confirmed in the Čakavian dialects that are in contact with it.



Map 1: Distribution of neutralisation in Čakavian and Štokavian and its overlaps with pre-Venetian Romance and Romanian idioms

(map by Matija Mužek)

Bibliography

- Badurina, Andelko. 2013. *Inventar samostana Sv. Marije Magdalene u Portu na otoku Krku (1734.- 1878.)*. Rijeka – Zagreb: Glosa – Provincijalat franjevacâ trećoredaca glagoljaša.
- Bradarić, Marija Meri. 2001. *Studenki*. Kaštel Novi: Osnovna škola Bijaći.
- Brozović, Dalibor. 1963. O rekonstrukciji predmigracionog mozaika hrvatskosrpskih dijalekata. *Filologija* 4. 45–56.
- Brozović, Dalibor; Ivić, Pavle. 1988. *Jezik, srpskohrvatski/ hrvatskosrpski, hrvatski ili srpski*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod »Miroslav Krleža«.
- Božanić, Joško. 2002. Facende otoka Visa. Prilog istraživanju leksika govora otoka Visa. *Čakavska rič* 30. 177–332.
- Budmani, Pero. 1883. Dubrovački dijalekt kako se sada govori. *Rad JAZU* 65. 155–179.
- Čirgić, Adnan. 2017. *Dijalektologija crnogorskoga jezika*. Cetinje: Fakultet za crnogorski jezik i književnost.
- Čurković, Dijana. 2014. *Govor Bitelića*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Rijeka.
- Dobrić, Renata; Galović, Filip (eds.). 2016. *Zbornik radova Literarno-likovno-filmski natječaj Gradske knjižnice Kaštela „Kaštelanske storije“ 2015./2016.* Kaštela: Gradska knjižnica Kaštela.
- Dominik, Petra. 2018. *Opis konavoskog govora*. Unpublished MA thesis. University of Zagreb.
- Feretić, Ivan. 1903. Latinski, talijanski, „ćuski“ i „vlaški“ jezik na Krku godine 1819. *Pučki prijatelj* 11. 87–88.
- Finka, Božidar; Šojat, Antun. 1968. Govor otoka Žirja. *Rasprave Instituta za jezik JAZU* 1. 121–220.
- Finka, Božidar. 1971. Čakavsko narječje. *Čakavska rič* 1. 11–71.
- Galović, Filip. 2019. *Govori otoka Šolte*. Šolta; Zagreb: Općina Šolta; Hrvatsko katoličko sveučilište.
- Galović, Filip; Valerijev, Pavle. 2021. *Rječnik govora mjesta Ložišća na otoku Braču*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko katoličko sveučilište.
- Geić, Duško; Slade Šilović, Mirko. 1994. *Rječnik trogirskog čakavskog govora*. Trogir: Muzej grada Trogira.
- Horvat, Marijana. 2005. *Jezik Marulićeva djela* Od naslidovan'ja Isukrstova i od pogarjen'ja tašćin segasvitnjih. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Zagreb.
- Houtzagers, Hubrecht P. 1985. *The Čakavian dialect of Orlec on the island of Cres*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Hraste, Mate. 1937. Osobine govora ostrva Visa. In *Zbornik u čast A. Belića*, 147–154. Beograd: Mlada Srbija.
- Hraste, Mate. 1947. Osobine govora otoka Šolte, Čiova, Drvenika i susjedne obale. *Rad JAZU* 272. 123–156.
- Hraste, Mate; Guberina Petar. 1956. Govor otoka Suska. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1. 7–213.
- Hraste, Mate. 1966. Govori jugozapadne Istre. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 2. 5–28.
- Jozić, Željko. 2003. O istraživanju dijalekatske sintakse. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 12. 97–102.
- Jutronić, Dunja. 2004. Što je ostalo od splitskog čakavskog dijalekta? In Lukežić, Irvin (ed.), *Riječki filološki dani*, 5, 233–245. Rijeka: Filozofski fakultet.
- Jutronić, Dunja. 2010. *Spliski govor. Od vapore do trajekta*. Split: Naklada Bošković.

- Kapetanović, Amir. 2011. Čakavski hrvatski književni jezik. In Katičić, Radoslav; Lisac, Josip (eds.), *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika*, 2, 77–124. Zagreb: Croatica.
- Kašić, Zorka. 1995. Govor Konavala. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 41. 241–393.
- Katičić, Radoslav. 1991. *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti; Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Kovačec, August. 1998. *Istrorununjsko-hrvatski rječnik (s gramatikom i tekstovima)*. Pula: Znanstvena udruga Mediteran.
- Kustić, Nikola. 2001. *Cakavski govor grada Paga s rječnikom*. Zagreb: Društvo Pažana i prijatelja grada Paga u Zagrebu.
- Kušar, Marcel. 1893. Glavne osobine lastovskog narječja. *Nastavni vjesnik* 1. 319–327.
- Kušar, Marcel. 1894. Rapski dijalekat. *Rad JAZU* 118. 1–54.
- Kuzmić, Boris. 2009. Jezik hrvatskih srednjovjekovnih pravnih spomenika. In Damjanović, Stjepan (ed.), *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika*, 1, 405–455. Zagreb: Croatica.
- Laznibat, Velimir. 1996. *Govor Dubrovnika u 17. i 18. stoljeću (na osnovi arhivskih spisa)*. Mostar: Sveučilište u Mostaru.
- Lisac, Josip. 2009. *Hrvatska dijalektologija 2. Čakavsko narječje*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga.
- Lončarić, Mijo. 1996. *Kajkavsko narječje*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Lovrić Jović, Ivana. 2014. *O starome dubrovačkom govoru nazbilj. Jezična analiza dubrovačkih frančezarija*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.
- Lukežić, Iva; Turk, Marija. 1998. *Govori otoka Krka*. Crikvenica: Libellus.
- Malić, Dragica. 1972. *Jezik prve hrvatske pjesmarice*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo.
- Mardešić-Centin, Pavao. 1977. Rječnik komiškog govora. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 4. 265–321.
- Marković, Irena. 2012. Jezični utjecaji i promjene u suvremenom govoru Zadra. *Croatia et Slavica Iadertina* 7/8: 313–335.
- Matasović, Ranko. 2008. *Poredbenopovijesna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Menac-Mihalić, Mira; Celinić, Anita. 2012. *Ozvučena čitanka iz hrvatske dijalektologije. Sveučilišni udžbenik s nosačem zvuka*. Zagreb: KNJIGRA.
- Milas, Matej. 1891. Današnji trpanjski dijalekt. *Rad JAZU* 103. 63–82.
- Milčetić, Ivan. 1895. Čakavština Kvarnerskih otoka. *Rad JAZU* 121. 92–131.
- Muljačić, Žarko. 1999. Dalmatski, *Fluminensia*, 1–2. 1–30.
- Muljačić, Žarko. 2000. *Das Dalmatische. Studien zu einer untergegangenen Sprache*. Köln-Weimer-Wien: Böhlau Verlag.
- Oblak, Vatroslav. 1894. Der Dialekt von Lastovo. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 16. 426–450.
- Pavičić, Milica. 1998. *Suvremeni idiolektatski mozaik grada Krka*. Unpublished MA thesis. University of Rijeka.
- Peco, Asim. 1964. Govor istočne Hercegovine. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 14. 241–393.
- Peco, Asim. 2007. Govori istočne i centralne Hercegovine. In Halilović, Senahid (ed.) *Izabrana djela*, 1, Sarajevo: Bosansko filološko društvo.
- Peršić, Nada. 2011. *Jezične značajke južne skupine govora čepičkoga tipa*. Unpublished MA thesis. University of Rijeka.

- Plešković, Maša. 2019. *Vitalnost fijumanskoga dijalekta – stanje i perspektive na početku 21. stoljeća*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Rijeka.
- Rešetar, Milan. 1898a. Primorski lekcionari 15. vijeka. *Rad JAZU* 134. 80–160.
- Rešetar, Milan. 1898b. Primorski lekcionari 15. vijeka. *Rad JAZU* 136. 90–199.
- Rešetar, Milan. 1933. Jezik Marina Držića. *Rad JAZU* 248. 99–240.
- Ribarić, Josip. 1953. Izvještaj o proučavanju perojskoga govora na poluotoku Istri. *Ljetopis JAZU* 57. 249–255.
- Ružičić, Gojko. 1930. Jezik Petra Zoranića. Zadarski dijalekat u početku 16. veka. *Južnoslavenski filolog* 9. 1–91; 10. 1–90.
- Škorić, Doris. 1997. *Prvi dijalektološki opis mjesnoga govora Gradinja*. Unpublished MA thesis. University of Rijeka.
- Slade Šilović, Mirko. 1976. Moj Trogir. *Čakavska rič* 1. 144–166.
- Smoje, Miljenko. 2004. *Kronika o našem Malom Mistu*. Split: Marjan tisak.
- Spicijarić Paškvan, Nina. 2021. Vitality of the Krk Venetian (Veian) dialect. *Govor* 1. 23–43.
- Stolac, Diana; Vlastelić, Anastazija. 2017. Metodološki izazovi suvremenih istraživanja povijesne sintakse hrvatskoga jezika. In Genis, René; de Haard, Eric; Lučić, Radovan (eds.), *Definitely Perfect. Festschrift for Janneke Kalsbeek*, 641–658. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Pegasus.
- Sujoldžić, Anita; Rudan, Pavao; Jovanović, Veljko; Jančićević, Branka; Chaventre, Andre. 1986. The island of Pag – Ethnohistory, demography and migration. *Collegium Antropologicum* 11. 181–199.
- Šarić, Ljiljana. 2008. *Spatial Concepts in Slavic: A Cognitive Linguistic Study of Prepositions and Cases*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Šepić, Ante. 1953. Jezik hrvatskih općinskih statuta istarskih i primorskih. Prilog historičkoj gramatici hrvatskog jezika. *Rad JAZU* 295. 5–40.
- Šimunović, Petar. 1977. Čakavština srednjodalmatinskih otoka. *Čakavska rič* VII/1. 5–63.
- Šimunović, Petar; Olesch, Reinhold. 1983. *Čakavisch-deutsches Lexikon III. Čakavische Texte*. Köln – Wien: Böhlau Verlag.
- Šimunović, Petar. 2006. *Rječnik bračkih čakavskih govora*. Supetar: Brevijar.
- Šimunović, Petar. 2011. Čakavska čitanka. *Tekstovi – Prikazbe – Priručni rječnik – Bibliografija*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga.
- Tomelić Ćurlin, Marijana. 2008. *Fonologija i morfologija govora središnjeg područja poluotoka Pelješca*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Zagreb.
- Turk, Marija. 1996. Komentar uz tekst K. H. Meyera. In Meyer, Karl H. *Čakavština otoka Krka*, 101–108. Rijeka: Izdavački centar Rijeka.
- Vidović, Radovan. 1978. *Čakavske studije*. Split: Čakavski sabor.
- Vranić, Silvana. 2002. *Govori sjeverozapadnoga makrosustava na otoku Pagu. I. Fonologija*. Rijeka: Ogranak Matice hrvatske; Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci.
- Vranić, Silvana. 2003. Iz sintakse paških govora. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 12. 151–167.
- Vranić, Silvana; Zubčić, Sanja. 2015. Dialects in and around small urban centres in the northern Čakavian area: The current situation. In Peti-Stantić, Anita; Stanojević, Mateusz-Milan; Antunović, Goranka (eds.), *Language Varieties Between Norms and Attitudes - South Slavic Perspectives: Proceedings from the 2013 CALS Conference*, 49–68. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Edition.

- Vrzić, Zvezdana; Singler, John V. 2016. Identity and language shift among Vlashki/Zheyanski speakers in Croatia. In Ferreira, Vera; Bouda, Peter (eds.), *Language Documentation and Conservation in Europe*, 51–68. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Vulić, Sanja. 2007. Dubrovački govor od početka 20. do početka 21. stoljeća. In Babić, Vanda; Matek Šmit, Zdenka (eds.), *Zadarski filološki dani*, 1, 97–112. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru.
- Zima, Luka. 1887. *Njekoje, većinom sintaktične razlike između čakavštine, kajkavštine i štokavštine*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Zubčić, Sanja; Holjevac, Sanja. 2013. Jezik Korčulanske pjesmarice bratovštine svih svetih iz 15. stoljeća. In Durić, Dejan (ed.), *Književno stvaralaštvo, jezik i kultura na otoku Korčuli*, 1, 233–251. Korčula – Rijeka: Gradska knjižnica Ivan Vidali Korčula – Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci.
- Zubčić, Sanja. 2017. O nekadašnjem čakavskom govoru Maloga Lošinja. In Genis, René; de Haard, Eric; Lučić, Radovan (eds.), *Definitely Perfect. Festschrift for Janneke Kalsbeek*, 735–755. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Pegasus.

Online sources

IE: data from *Istarska enciklopedija* taken from: <http://istra.lzmk.hr/clanak.aspx?id=2062> (accessed on 25 March 2015).

The language and community today. Where is Vlaški and Žejanski spoken? “*Preservation of the Vlaški and Žejanski Language* Available at: vlaski-zejanski.com (accessed in December of 2022).

NEUTRALIZACIJA U IZRAŽAVANJU MJESTA I SMJERA KRETANJA U HRVATSKOM JEZIKU

U glavnini se hrvatskoga jezika, a misli se pod tim i na standardni jezik i na organske idiome, mjesto i cilj kretanja izražavaju različitim sintaktičkim sredstvima no u literaturi je opisana i njihova neutralizacija, i to primarno u južnim čakavskim govorima. U ovom se radu istražuje proširenost te pojave u pisanim tekstovima od srednjega vijeka naovamo, na čakavskom i štokavskom području te u suvremenim čakavskim i hrvatskim štokavskim govorima, kako bi se utvrdila njezina starina i rasprostiranje. Uspoređujući rasprostiranje te izoglose s rasprostranjenošću različitih romanskih jezika na istočnom dijelu jadranske obale, preciznije će se odrediti njezino podrijetlo koje se dosad dovodilo u vezu s dalmatskim jezikom.

Ključne riječi: hrvatski jezik, čakavski govori, štokavski govori, dalmatski, istrorumunjski, krčkorununjski, sintaksa, neutralizacija, mjesto i cilj kretanja

The address of the author:

Sanja Zubčić

Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci

HR – 51 000 Rijeka, Sveučilišna avenija 4

sanja.zubcic@ffri.uniri.hr