



UDC 811.163.42'367.625=111

811.163.42'367.633=111

Original scientific paper

Received on 23.01. 2012

Accepted for publication on 20.03. 2012

Maja Brala-Vukanović

Anita Memišević

University of Rijeka

Moving *od(-)* and *do(-)* in Croatian. An account of sources, goals and dual readings of the dative¹

This paper focuses on the Croatian P-elements *od* 'from' and *do* 'up to', which productively appear as both verbal prefixes (yielding either source- or goal-oriented motion verbs) and prepositions; in motion contexts these lexicalize TO (i.e., goals) or FROM (i.e., source paths). Furthermore, the pair allows for a very interesting alternation: a prefixed *od-/do-* motion verb is frequently followed by an *od* or *do* prepositional phrase. The resulting possible combinatorial patterns are interesting with respect to their semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic properties. A careful look at the various possibilities opens the way for analysis of what seems to be a previously undescribed property of the Croatian spatial prepositionless dative: a possible dual reading, generally of the adlative/ablative type.

Key words: Croatian; *od* 'from'; *do* 'up to'; source; goal; preposition; prefix; dual readings of the dative.

1. Introduction

The study presented in this paper is based on the following scholarly notions and assumptions:

¹ The authors wish to acknowledge their gratitude to Ljiljana Šarić for her patient support and insightful comments on earlier versions of this manuscript. We would also like to thank our colleague Dorjana Širola for her help in finding resources on etymological data on Ukrainian and Sorbian prepositions and prefixes.



- The idea that certain grammatical forms code only certain types of conceptual structures,² and that motion is of particular interest in this respect (e.g., Gumperz and Levinson 1996; Slobin 1985, 2000; Talmy 1985, 2003).
- The view that spatial language provides a particularly appropriate window for gaining insight into the language-mind relationship, and does so from both ends of investigation; that is, departing from language in order to understand the cognitive underpinning, and vice versa (see, e.g., Hickmann and Robert 2006; Levinson 2003; Šarić 2008; Talmy 2003; Tyler and Evans 2003).
- The observed goal-source asymmetry in both the linguistic and non-linguistic representation of motion. In fact, recent studies have provided ample support for the thesis that preferential attention is given to endpoints rather than beginnings of motion in both language and memory (e.g., Lakusta and Landau 2005; Markovskaya 2006; Papafragou 2010)³.

Departing from these scholarly premises, this paper focuses on two Croatian⁴ P-elements, *od* and *do*, in their usages as source/goal verbal prefixes and prepositions in motion contexts. Why did we choose to explore *od(-)* and *do(-)*? Four lines of argumentation are outlined below:

² This point is largely related to the increasing body of cognitive linguistic, psycholinguistic, and developmental work, which has been built on Slobin's (1985) idea of the "privileged set of grammaticizable notions"; that is, the view that there exists a difference between the kinds of meaning expressed by open-class and closed-class forms, with the meaning of the former being seen as essentially unbounded, whereas the meaning of the latter is viewed as being constrained.

³ It is true that there is a lot of literature claiming that the encoding of endpoints or other parts of a motion event is highly correlated with the presence/absence of certain grammatical features, in particular grammatical aspect—see, for example, Bylund and Jarvis (2011), who claim that speakers of aspect languages encode event endpoints to a lesser extent than do speakers of non-aspect languages—but the focal idea here is not related to typological implications (and relative frequency of elements coded), but the claim that the goal universally receives preferential treatment over source in human cognition (e.g., experiments on memory). The two findings (one is language-specific, and the other universalist) are actually not in contrast.

⁴ All the data, speakers' intuitions, and conclusions presented in this paper are relative to Croatian. An analysis of sources relative to bare dative constructions in Bosnian and Serbian (Palić 2010 and Antonić 2004, respectively) has shown no major differences with regard to this issue, and an analysis of possible differences relative to prefixal and prepositional *od(-)* and *do(-)* usages in languages other than Croatian is beyond the scope of this paper.



- 1) Verbal prefixes and prepositions in Indo-European languages a) have the same source, and b) are, furthermore, very frequently homophonous (i.e., they come in homophonous pairs). Moreover, c) homophonous pairs are generally characterized by highly comparable semantics. These three facts seemed sufficient to justify an investigation of the prefixal-prepositional combinatorial patterns and their meanings. Furthermore, the fact that *od* and *do* represent a “minimal pair” (see Section 2) represents an additional motive behind our choice of topic.
- 2) *Od* and *do* are two very high-frequency particles and are most centrally associated with the notions of source and goal, two concepts that have attracted a great deal of attention in cognitive semantics and that have proven to be of great explanatory potential when applied to the analysis of various linguistic phenomena, especially those related to motion (something that has not been systematically done for Croatian). Additional impetus for the subject of the research is given by the findings relative to the goal-over-source bias.
- 3) *Od(-)* and *do(-)* enter into all possible mutual combinations: verbs prefixed with either can combine with a PP prefixed with either—for example, *otrčati od majke/do majke* ‘to run off from the mother’/‘to run up to the mother (from somewhere)’, and *dotrčati od majke/do majke* ‘to come running from the mother’/‘to run up to the mother’. Furthermore, a subgroup of *od-/do-* prefixed verbs takes a *doPP*, which can appear in alternation with the NP in the dative case (sometimes yielding dual readings). To our knowledge, this fact has not been described in the literature and, as such, represents a particularly interesting linguistic phenomenon.
- 4) *Od/od-* and *do/do-* are present in all Slavic languages.⁵ As far as the treatment of these two prepositions and prefixes in the literature is concerned, the preposition *do* and the prefix *do-* have received significantly more attention in all major Slavic languages.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In the next section we briefly review the current most influential literature accounts of meaning and usage proposed for Croatian *od* and *do* in their prepositional and prefixal usages, pinpoint some possible shortcomings, analyze the semantic differences between different combinatorial patterns, with a particular eye to those that seem to be semantic equiv-

⁵ This is not to say that they will necessarily have the same form in all the languages (due to differences in the phonological changes and development between different Slavic languages). Due to extremely limited access to sources, we were unable to verify the existence or the status of the prepositions and prefixes *od/od-* and *do/do-* in Silesian.



alents (in alternations with or without what are seemingly redundant elements; i.e., repetition of the prefixal form in the preposition), and propose a systematic description of the source-goal patterns and constraints realized in all possible *od/do* combinations. Then, in Section 3, we take a systematic look at the directional PP/prepositionless dative alternation, focusing in particular on a property that has not received any attention in the extant work on the Croatian prepositionless dative: a possible dual reading, generally of the adlative/ablative type. Finally, in Section 4 we present our conclusions and propose a few possible directions for further research.

2. Theoretical treatment(s) of *OD* – *DO*: the “odd pair”

Od and *do* belong to the group of “preposition pairs” (see Kovačević and Matas Ivanković 2007). This term, which is virtually non-existent in English accounts of prepositions, is used to indicate two prepositions that are frequently used together and are also semantic opposites in many cases (e.g., *to* – *from*, *into* – *out of*, *on* – *off*). Kovačević and Matas Ivanković pinpoint the semantic and structural pair integrity (whereby such prepositions become truly meaningful once put into pairs). This observation is further strengthened by the frequent idiomatic use of the pair.⁶

Before starting the literature review of *od* and *do*, we need to note a very peculiar fact: although *od* and *do* represent “opposite” prepositions (representing a complementary prepositional pair), their treatment in the literature is anything but “symmetrical.” In fact, *do* generally tends to be given more scholarly attention than *od* in both the traditional and cognitive linguistic treatments of Croatian prepositions (see, e.g., Pranjković 2009; Šarić 2008). The fact that the same seems to apply to English (e.g., Tyler and Evans devote 13 index entries in their 2003 book to ‘to’, whereas ‘from’ cannot be found in the same index, or as an element in the title of any of their books or papers, unlike ‘to’; see, e.g., Evans and Tyler 2004) is striking and raises a number of questions.

Although they are somewhat asymmetrical, the theoretical analyses of neither *od* nor *do* seem to be exhaustive. Most traditional Croatian grammar books (e.g., Barić et al. 2005; Ham 2002; Maretić 1963; Raguž 2010) approach the analysis of these prepositions in terms of merely listing them (from the perspective of us-

⁶ For example, *od usta do usta* ‘word-of-mouth’ (literally, ‘from mouth to mouth’).



ages frequently associated with the cases they appear with), but not providing any information about the overall semantic picture (i.e., about the feature(s) shared by all of the elements in the list). If their meaning is addressed at all, it happens when they are discussed in combination with the case that they appear with (the genitive case; see, e.g., Barić et al. 2005: 280; Raguž 2010: 148, 1997: 119–136), but even in this context the information provided is extremely limited and unsystematic, boiling down, for the spatial domain, to the adlative (approaching) sense expressed by *do* + genitive, and stating that *od* + genitive expresses separation or distancing (see Raguž 2010: 148, 1997: 127).

Probably the most valuable contribution to the traditional literature review is provided by the detailed and frequently cited studies of the meaning and usage patterns of Croatian prepositions by Silić and Pranjković (2005; see also Pranjković 1993).⁷ Writing about *do*, the authors summarize the senses expressed by these prepositions as centrally expressing the following senses: a) adlocativity, meaning that the Trajector⁸ (henceforth TR) is located in the immediate proximity/vicinity of the Landmark (LM); for example, (*tik do ograde*; that is, '(immediately) next to the fence'; b) directive locativity; the TR is moving in the direction of the LM; this sense is centrally realized as directive bounded locativity; for example, *dotrčati do zida* 'to run up to the wall'.

Albeit detailed, the above analysis still has the standard problem of all traditional approaches: it does not link the submeanings in any (motivated) way and it posits all submeanings as having equal status. Such problems have successfully been addressed and largely solved by the cognitive linguistic (CL) framework. It is indeed CL that underpins the analysis of prepositional meaning proposed by Šarić (2008), who views the semantics of the preposition *do* as being related to two general contexts: a) a dynamic one, in which *do* expresses reaching a goal/boundary (in the latter case, crossing the boundary as an optional element), or b) a static one, in which the central semantic component is that of a proximity relation (Šarić 2008: 163, 177–178, 250). The clear and central spatial mention of the notion of goal/boundary is, as shall later be seen, of particular relevance for our analysis.

⁷ When other traditional accounts include proposals of usage/meaning categories found in Silić and Pranjković (2005), we review only that source.

⁸ As in most cognitive linguistic treatments, we refer to the object whose motion (or location) is being specified as the Trajector, whereas the object with respect to which motion or location is being defined (i.e., the reference object) is termed the Landmark.



When analyzed in its prefixal function, the meaning of *do-* is described (Pranjković 1993; Silić and Pranjković 2005) in its primary role as expressing one of the following three senses a) a finite sense, b) a totive sense, and c) a durative sense.⁹ The prefix *do-* is also described (Pranjković 1993; Silić and Pranjković 2005) as being used to express the following meanings: d) ‘to (gradually) get/come close to’ and e) ‘to (gradually) lead to’.

The problem of traditional accounts noted for the preposition *do* (i.e., their unsystematicity, degree of arbitrariness, and non-exhaustive treatment), in the case of prefixes, is also complicated by the impossibility of understanding (and predicting) the verbs that they appear with. In order to try and propose a solution for these problems, we used Janda’s (1986) and Dąbrowska’s (1997) findings relative to the prefix *do-* in Russian and Polish as the basis for an analysis of all Croatian *do-*prefixed verbs¹⁰ (see Brala and Memišević, 2012). The analysis has shown that all the Croatian *do-*prefixed verbs can be divided into three major groups according to their senses (which are further subdivided into meaning subcategories). Due to space restrictions, we only present the three major groups of senses.

- 1) The Reach sense: these verbs express the meaning of ‘reach an end point’ (examples of verbs in this category include:
dotrčati ‘to run up to’
doći ‘to come’
doviknuti ‘to shout to someone’
- 2) The Add sense: these verbs express the meaning of ‘add to the already existing quantity’ and always take a direct object:
dosoliti ‘to add salt’
- 3) The Reach/Add sense: verbs belonging to this group can express either sense. The Reach vs. Add sense alternation is paralleled by a syntactic alternation. The Reach sense is expressed by *do-*prefixed verbs with a direct object, and the Add sense by *do-*prefixed verbs with a noun in the genitive:

⁹ The imperfective sense is actually realized through addition of the particle *iva/ava/ova* within the perfective verb (previously perfectivized by the prefixation of *od-* or *do-*).

¹⁰ The list was compiled based on the three largest Croatian dictionaries: *Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik*, *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, and *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. To ensure that no verbs were left out, we cross-checked them with Anić and Silić’s *Pravopis hrvatskoga jezika* and with *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik*. The list included only those verbs confirmed in standard Croatian and did not cover dialect verbs.



a) The Reach sense (*Dokovao je potkovu*ACC ‘He finished forging the horseshoe.’)

The implication here is that he finished the process of forging the horseshoe.

b) The Add sense (*Dokovao je još potkova*GEN ‘He forged more horseshoes’), meaning, in fact, that he forged additional horseshoes.

Other verbs in this category are *doliti* ‘to finish pouring (a liquid)/ add by pouring (liquid)’, *dosuti* ‘to finish pouring (a solid or a liquid)/to add by pouring (a solid or a liquid)’, *dopumpati*, ‘to finish pumping (air)/to add by pumping (air)’, and *dotočiti* ‘to finish pouring (a liquid)/to add by pouring (a liquid)’.

Moving on to the treatment of *od* in its prepositional and prefixal usages as presented in traditional Croatian grammars, we observe that the problems described with respect to *do* are also present with *od*. Again, the most exhaustive account of the usages of *od* is described as expressing the following sense categories (cf. Pranjković 1993; Silić and Pranjković 2005: 245): a) spatial distance or ultralocativity:¹¹ the TR is moving or is located away from the LM, b) lateral localization: the TR is located or moving laterally to or coming from one side (right or left) in relation to the LM, and c) ablativity: the TR is moving away from the LM.

From the cognitive perspective, *od* is much more sporadically analyzed. Šarić (2008: 181–182) describes it as being used either with human sources, or with inanimate sources indicating removal from the location that was described with *kod* ‘by, near’, *u* ‘in’, *(po)kraj* ‘next to’, or a semantically related preposition before the movement took place. An interesting observation is found in Belaj (2010), whose analysis of Croatian *od*-headed PPs (with the NP therefore in the genitive case) observes that within localist theories of case the *od* + genitive noun pattern is viewed as the ablative sense; that is, one of the key semantic cases, the directional case.

¹¹ The term “prelocativity” is used in Croatian terminology mainly by Pranjković, interchangeable with the term “ultralocativity.”



In the prefixal usage, *od-* is described (Silić and Pranjković 2005: 148) as lexicalizing the following senses: a) totive, b) durative,¹² c) (the less central) additional meaning of ‘to (gradually) separate from something’, and d) translocativity: F is located or moving transversally with respect to G.

A CL-grounded analysis of *od-* (Brala and Memišević, in preparation)—again, largely based on Janda’s (1986) findings and overall comparable to the analysis of *do-* above (Brala and Memišević, 2012)—leads to the identification of six main senses, which again can be subdivided into subsenses. Due to space restrictions, only the main senses and some representative examples of each of them are reviewed here:

- 1) The Away sense: this sense indicates movement, both literal and metaphorical, away from the point of reference. Examples of verbs in this category include:
otrčati ‘to run off’
odrijemati ‘to nap for a while’
- 2) The Closure sense: this sense indicates closure and completion of activity, and these verbs generally take a direct object:
otpjevati ‘to finish singing’
odobrovoljiti ‘to cheer up’
odlediti ‘to defrost’
- 3) The Away/Closure sense: both senses are equally represented in verbs belonging to this group, which form a “bridge” between these two senses of the *od-* prefix:
odbiti ‘to refuse’
odučiti ‘to (cause someone) to no longer be in the habit of’
- 4) The Retribution sense: this sense implies some sort of response to a previous action usually performed by another actor:
odužiti se ‘to repay/return a favor’

¹² As already pointed out in footnote 9, we see the association of the prefix with the durativity sense as problematic. However, durativity/iterativity and perfectivity are not to be treated as one because durativity is considered an actional property, belonging to the intrinsic character of the situation denoted, and separate from aspect. We maintain that such a property does not stem from perfectivization; that is, the semantic-syntactic properties of the prefix (*od-* in this case).



odgovoriti ‘to respond’

- 5) The Sever sense: this sense implies that something has been severed from the whole/unit:

odlomiti ‘to break off’

otpasti ‘to fall off’

- 6) The Closure/Sever sense: the verbs in this group contain both sense components and form a “bridge” between these two senses of *od-* (an illustrative example is provided by the verb *oduzeti* ‘to take away’).

Before moving on, it is necessary to spend a moment and take a look at the Croatian case that is marked on the noun appearing in the prepositional phrase headed by both *od* and *do*.¹³ The most extensive cognitive analysis of the genitive in Croatian is found in Šarić (2008: passim), who observes that in the spatial domain the genitive case comprises three conceptual domains (i.e., the source, goal, and locative domains). Furthermore, she specifies that the genitive LM is the borderline that limits the motion of the TR, either as source or as goal, and these can be considered prototypical spatial usages of this case. Although the genitive designates dynamic relations in most of its spatial usages (genitive nouns are typically a source or a goal of the motion), *do* can be used in static contexts as well, and in these contexts *do* designates a proximity relation. Again, we find (spatial) *od* and *do* centrally associated with source and goal conceptual elements (in terms of case requirements, this time).

Before moving on, and for the purposes of our discussion later on, we conclude this section by recalling that the SOURCE-PATH-GOAL schema is one of the most common (i.e., salient) (conceptual) structures that emerge from bodily orientation, functioning, and interaction with the world (Lakoff 1987: 275; Johnson 1987: 27; Mandler 1996: 373).

Having reviewed some relevant Croatian literature treatments of *od* and *do*, we now integrate our analysis with an investigation of the syntactic behavior of *od* and *do* when employed simultaneously with the prefixed motion verb. This

¹³ In case-languages, prepositions are always linked with cases. Prepositions and cases in prepositional phrases are dependent on each other; a particular case cannot combine with all prepositions and a specific preposition can never co-occur with any or all cases. In Croatian, a single preposition can maximally combine with up to three different cases (e.g., *za* + ACC, GEN, INSTR). The genitive case has 72 primary and secondary prepositions.



opens up an interesting field of inquiry that, to our knowledge, has so far not been dealt with at all.

2.1. Od-do: (im)possible combinations

A possible explanation of the puzzling *od-do* asymmetry might lie in the semantics of these two prepositions; that is, the comparative (lack of) semantic transparency, but also “pragmatic primacy” of one preposition over the other. Is it possible, then, that the primacy of goal is reflected in the comparative primacy of (treatment of) the lexical status of *do* (i.e., of the P-element) lexicalizing the goal component? Furthermore, there is the possibility that one preposition (*do*) more readily integrates into surrounding sentential elements and more readily yields interpretations (conceptualization patterns’ construals) with respect to general experience and knowledge of the world (see also Tyler and Evans 2003) than the preposition *od* does. In fact, as is seen in detail below, upon closer examination it would appear that *do* has a number of very distinct and clear interpretative (and also informative) or rather analytical “advantages” over *od*. After all, people are forward-looking (i.e., forward-oriented) beings, and “motion toward” seems to have experiential, perceptual, attentional, and related cognitive primacy over “motion from.”

When it comes to the *od-do* “pair of opposites,” it should be observed that the pair can be used in the prefixed verb + PP construction, in which the following combinations are possible:

- 1) A *do*-prefixed verb is followed by a *do*-headed PP (as in *dotrčati do majke*, literally ‘up to-run to motherGEN’, meaning ‘to run up¹⁴ to the mother’) with the expression of endpoint (goal of motion component in the verbal prefix (implicit ground, marked with a small *g*), and the explicit expression of the ground (G) in the PP. The resulting pattern is indicated as: **gG (do-V + doPP)**.
- 2) An *od*-prefixed verb is followed by a *do*PP (as in *otrčati do majke*, literally ‘from-run to motherGEN’; that is, ‘to run away (from an implicit start of motion point) to the mother’). As will be seen, the start of the motion com-

¹⁴ In the original, the example is given in the infinitive form (*dotrčati*) and the infinitive translation into English disallows indication of the fact that the action has been completed (*dotrčati* actually means ‘to finish running up to’).



ponent expressed in the verbal prefix is implicitly linked to a source (an implicit source, marked with a small *s*), whereas the expression of the Ground is made explicit (G) through the PP. The resulting pattern is indicated as: **sG (od-V + doPP)**.

- 3) An *od*-prefixed verb is followed by an *od*-headed PP (as in *otrčati od majke*, literally, ‘from-run from motherGEN’, meaning ‘to run away from the mother’) with the expression of the endpoint (the goal of motion) both through the end-of-motion component of the verbal prefix (implicit ground, marked *g*), as well as the explicit expression of the Ground (G) in the PP. The resulting pattern is indicated as: **sS (od-V + odPP)**.
- 4) A *do*-prefixed verb is followed by an *od*-headed PP (as in *dotrčati od majke*, literally, ‘up-to-run from mother GEN’, meaning ‘to run up (to the point of end of motion) from the mother’) with the expression of the endpoint (the goal of motion) made implicit through the prefixed verb (thus the small *g*), and the explicit expression of the Ground (G) in the PP. The resulting pattern is indicated as: **gS (do-V + odPP)**.

It should also be observed that in the case of a PP headed by *do* (listed under 1 and 2 above), in some cases the entire prepositional phrase can alternate with a dative NP (see sentences (1a) and (1b) below). The restrictions on this alternation are discussed in more detail below, in Section 3, but note that at a general level they are linked to the feature of animacy, or rather what Beličová (1982), cited in Janda (1993: 56), calls “personhood.”

Two immediate questions follow from the above outline of source/goal combinatorial possibilities. First of all, what is the relation of the construction to the event frame (i.e., the speaker’s viewpoint)?¹⁵ Next, what is the difference in meaning (if any) between the alternate prefixed verb + *doPP* vs. the prefixed verb + bare dative NP constructions? Finally, do the answers to these two questions bear any relation to the goal-over-source bias?

In order to address these three questions, we asked 30 subjects (15 university students and 15 members of the general population, all native speakers of Croatian) to complete a short test in which they were asked to pictorially represent

¹⁵ The questions becomes particularly relevant if related, first, to the typology of frames of reference in Croatian (see Filipović 2007), but also typologically more distant languages, in which case it is interesting to examine the cross-linguistic effect on event conceptualization patterns; see, for example, Bylund and Jarvis (2011) for L2 effects on L1 event conceptualization patterns.



- (4) *Luka je* dotrčao od djeda.¹⁶
 Luka be-COP up-to-run-PST-PFV-SG-M from grandfather-GEN.SG.M
 Luka ran up from his grandfather'
 pattern: gS (doV + odPP)

The instances of speakers' placement were counted and are represented in Table 1 (the possibilities with the highest percentage of choices are highlighted):

Table 1. Placement of the speaker in the event frame: results.

Sentence	Speaker at Trajector	Speaker at Landmark	Speaker anywhere
(1a) Marko je dotrčao do majke.	3 (10%)	18 (60%)	9 (30%)
(1b) Marko je dotrčao majci.	2 (6.6%)	20 (66.6%)	8 (26.6%)
(2a) Ana je otrčala do bake.	16 (53.3%)	8 (26.6%)	6 (20%)
(2b) Ana je otrčala baki.	13 (43.3%)	6 (20%)	11 (36.6%)
(3) Sanja je otrčala od oca.	5 (16.6%)	19 (63.3%)	6 (20%)
(4) Luka je dotrčao od djeda.	28 (93.3%)	2 (6.6%)	0 (0%)

Departing from these results, we analyze the preferred viewpoint and the possible restrictions on the placement of the speaker in the event frame with respect to the source and goal of motion.

In sentences (1a) and (1b), our subjects preponderantly place the speaker's viewpoint at G (coincidental with the goal, in this case the mother, which is actually also coincidental with the *g* implicit at the end of motion, or the "reaching sense" of *do*). A relatively high portion of subjects (30%) feel that in gG constructions the speaker can be placed anywhere in the event frame except at source, and a number of them suggest that, if it were not like that, the construction chosen would be sG (otrčati *doPP/DAT NP*). This intuition is quite understandable if one bears in mind the fact that the constructions in (1) are of the gG type (the goal is implicit through the prefixal end of motion or reaching the end point of motion, which is furthermore coincidental with the reference object; i.e., the goal). It should also be noted that there is a slightly higher percentage of viewpoints placed at G in sentence (1b) (dative NP), which is understandable because in these sentences the goal is seen as the actual beneficiary of the verbal

¹⁶ The TR and LM referents were varied (i.e., they were different for each combinatorial possibility 1–4) in order to avoid priming effects.



action. The point is taken up below, when we contrast the perceived meaning of constructions (1a) vs. (1b) and (2a) vs. (2b).

Sentences (2a) and (2b) yielded more contrasting results than either sentence pair (1) or sentences (3) and (4). Although in both sentences (2a) and (2b) the preferred choice was coincidental with the TR (Ana), the response percentage for this possibility was not as high as in the remaining examples. In fact, when placing the speaker's viewpoint in (2a) and (2b), our subjects frequently expressed doubt (accompanying the proposed drawing with a question mark), or placed the speaker "anywhere in the event frame" (20% for (2a) and 36.6% for (2b)). Quite a considerable percentage of subjects placed the speaker as being coincidental with the LM. In other words, sentence pair (2) was the least homogenous in terms of our subjects' responses. A possible interpretation of this fact is that both sentences under (2), while expressing the start of motion component (i.e., implicit source) through the verbal prefix, actually at the sentence level ultimately place Ana as being coincidental with the goal of motion (i.e., the LM), thus leaving little option for the speaker to construct reference points for the source element (inherent in the verb). We thus believe that "Ana," seen as the preferred choice of viewpoint for both sentences under (2), could also be viewed as positioned in the proximity or coincidental with the goal (and yet, if we followed/knew about her motion from the start, this would provide information about the source component as well).

Sentence (3) was much more straightforward in terms of our subjects' responses. The majority of our subjects placed the speaker as coincidental with the source of motion (63.3%). This is not at all surprising, given the fact that in (3) we have an sS pattern—that is, a situation in which the goal is in no way present (expressed) or it possibly does not exist (yet)—because the motion could still be ongoing, there thus being no end of motion point reached.

Finally, sentence (4) yielded a perfectly clear, unequivocal picture: for gS situations (i.e., when the ground is implicit through the end of motion component, and S is explicit) the focus is on the goal of motion, which, although not specified, is placed coincidental with the moving entity (i.e., the TR; in this case, Luka) at sentence level upon the completion of its (or his) motion. In fact, this is the view of 93.3% of our subjects.

The first thing worth noting from the above is that the goal seems to receive preferential treatment in terms of the (perceived) speaker's placement in the



event frame, the only exception in this sense being sentence (3) (i.e., the sS pattern). Such a finding is fully in line with what one would expect given the goal-over-source bias introduced in the first part of this paper.

Apart from eliciting information relative to the proposed goal-over-source bias, the above test was also designed to investigate another issue; that is, to elicit (the differences in) readings of the *do* PP / DAT NP alternation. In fact, as part of the same task, our subjects were also asked to describe the perceived difference in meaning (if any) between sentences under a) vs. those under b) in examples (1) and (2). The observed tendency was that, in cases when the prefixed motion verb is followed by a *do*PP, the goal (i.e., the genitive noun within the PP) is perceived as the point being reached, coming to/coming close to the point (i.e., in the Path sense), whereas in examples under b) (prefixed verb followed by the dative NP), the dative referent (i.e., the point of end of motion/goal) is perceived more in the beneficiary sense. In other words, (1a) is interpreted as ‘coming to/close to the mother, not even necessarily reaching her, coming towards the mother’, whereas (1b) is perceived in the sense of ‘the mother hugs him, he comes to her for advice, to talk to her’ and so on. These intuitions are fully in line with the results obtained by Brala (2002) and Brala and Rubinić (2011), which support the view that the prefixed verb plus PP combinatorial pattern focuses more on the (physical) elements of Path, whereas the prefixed verb + NP in the ACC or DAT focuses more on the completion, resultative sense of the verbal action—or, rather, affectedness of the dative referent by the sentence event.¹⁷

To our knowledge, the first mention of a possible difference in the meanings of two such constructions (albeit focusing *only* on the adlative PP with a dative NP/prepositionless dative alternation) is found in Vlahović (1953: 28, cited in Šarić 1999: 341), who views the prepositionless dative motion construction as expressing a distant object with an affective value, whereas the preposition, in his case *k(a)*, + dative noun is merely an adverbial without affective value. A somewhat different analysis of the (possible) difference in the meaning between the two patterns in the adlative PP DAT / dative NP alternation is proposed by Katičić (2002: 90), who suggests that motion with a prepositionless dative is stylistically marked and more concise. Other authors, who, like Silić and

¹⁷ We use the term “event” rather than “verbal action” here because we want to distinguish between affectedness in terms of the “personal sphere” typical for the dative (see the discussion in Section 3 below), and the affectedness of the object that “suffers” (i.e., “undergoes”) the verbal action, which is typical of the accusative referent.



Pranjković (2005: 221), address the issue of a bare directional dative vs. PP in cases when the preposition governs the noun in the dative case, such as *k(a)*, generally view the preposition as being redundant, and some predict an evolution of the (spatial) dative in the direction of a prepositionless case (Raguž 2010: 166).

The *do*PP / DAT NP alternation discussed above opens up another interesting line of inquiry. Consider the following alternation:

(5) a. Odnio *je kolač od*
from-take-PST.PFV.SG.M be-COP cake from
bake.
grandmother-GEN.SG.F
'He took the cake away from the grandmother'

(5) b. Odnio *je kolač baki.*
from-take-PST.PFV.SG.M be-COP cake grandmother-DAT.SG.F
'He took the cake away from his grandmother'/'He took the cake to his grandmother'

Sentence (5b) can, in fact, be read in two ways. To our knowledge, this possibility of a dual reading of the dative NP has not been dealt with in Croatian grammatical literature so far, and it is addressed in detail in the next section.

3. The dual reading of the (directional) dative

The phenomenon relative to the dual reading of the dative NP appears to be as curious as it is underexplored. We start looking into the issue by observing the following: when it comes to spatial (more specifically, motion) contexts, in the Croatian grammatical tradition the dative has been analyzed only in its “directional,” “approaching,” or “target” (“ordered/positive vector”) sense. A thorough literature review has revealed that the spatial senses¹⁸ associated with this case boil down to a) dynamic information in the utterance, directionality, and purpose (Barić et al. 2005: 102); b) directionality (frequently with verbs of giving), des-

¹⁸ Given the scope of this paper, the remaining non-spatial senses of the dative are not reviewed here. We only mention (and occasionally analyze) the senses that are structurally closely related and help us gain better insight into the issue being focused on.



ignation of a goal (Raguž 1997: 136–138, 2010: 164–167); and c) directional sense/non-terminative directivity (Silić and Pranjković 2005: 219–223).

This summary of senses, boiling down to the directionality notion (occasionally associated with the goal/target), has its origin in the traditional literature. An important fact needs to be noted at this point: most traditional accounts see the spatial (or, rather, directional) dative as one of the (marginal) uses. As said, traditional approaches, which basically yield lists of different uses, generally exhausted through lists of examples that are pretty much arbitrarily grouped following relatively unsystematic criteria (ranging from formal, via semantic, to purely contextual), leave the reader with the assumption that the categories of uses/submeanings are ordered in the list by frequency of use. The implication, then, is that the higher ordered category is closer to the “core sense” (i.e., the central meaning). Following such implicit logic, most accounts see the spatial directional meaning as being marginal to the dative, the only exception in this sense being Silić and Pranjković (2005), who actually begin their list of dative usages (senses) with the bare dative of the type *Idem Ivanu* ‘I am going to Ivan/Ivan’s place’. The authors (Silić and Pranjković 2005) define it as *negranična direktivnost* ‘non-terminative directivity’¹⁹ and view this as the central meaning of the dative case (this fact has been perceptively noted by Šarić 2008: 219–220, footnote 11).

This latter observation becomes of particular interest when we address the issue of the (Croatian) dative from the cognitive perspective. The two most relevant sources in this respect for our purposes are Šarić (2008: chapter 4), and Tanacković Faletar (2010: 152–181). It would be expected for a CL approach to put space at the *origo* of the meaning (extensions); that is, at the center of the semantic network. However, the literature review of the CL-based dative analyses (of Croatian, but also of other Slavic languages; see below), has shown a high degree of divergence in this sense, and the relation of the spatial dative to

¹⁹The original syntagm used is *negranična direktivnost*, but no specification as to what exactly *negranična* means is found. Šarić (2008) proposes ‘non-terminative directionality’ as the translation equivalent for the original syntagm. ‘Non-terminative’ is, indeed, an adequate translation of *negranična*. However, given the primary equivalence of non-terminative with Croatian *nesvršen/-a*, which, in turn, has primary temporal connotations, the translation choice might be somewhat confusing. *Negranična* is, in fact, to be intended exclusively in the spatial/un-boundedness sense, implying that object B is moving toward object A, which serves exclusively as a landmark (an orienting reference object), with no information about the realization of movement (unlike in the accusative case; Pranjković, personal communication).



other dative meanings (i.e., other domains of dative use) remains a major challenge (see Šarić 2008: 208–211). It is actually the case that even most CL-based analyses (see, e.g., Dąbrowska’s 1997 seminal analysis of the Polish dative, Janda’s 1993 detailed and insightful investigation of the Czech dative, and also Palić’s 2010 work on Bosnian and Antonić’s 2004 analysis of the Serbian dative) do not posit space at the core of the semantic network of this case. Even Šarić’s (2008) analysis views the spatial/directional (bare) dative as not being necessarily directly linked to other senses (most frequently associated with the concept of target person/personal sphere of influence). In most of these cases, family resemblances might be a more viable explanation of the internal linkage within the semantic category of the dative case. The only exception in this sense is Tanacković Faletar (2010), who claims that the two large subgroups of dative semantics—the “spatial/directional/allative” and the “target person”—should be put under a common denominator; that is, abstracted and linked to a higher ordered concept (Tanacković Faletar 2010: 156–157).

While proposing a possible solution to this idea in terms of “oriented (verbal) force,” (i.e., “directionality”), Tanacković Faletar (2010) fails to observe the peculiar feature of some (spatial) datives that we have pinpointed above in (5b); that is, the fact that with some verbs and in certain contexts some bare datives have a dual reading. This possibility of a dual reading of some datives is also not captured by Šarić (1999, 2008), who at the same time very pertinently notes that the Croatian prepositions *k(a)*, *prema*, *kod*, and *do* select NPs—marked dative for *k(a)* and *prema*, and genitive for *kod*, and *do*—yielding PPs that, in their expression of a directional sense (motion toward a goal), can be replaced by the semantically equivalent NP in the dative, as illustrated by the following examples: a) *Idem Petru*. ‘I’m going to Petar’s (place)’; b) *Idem k Petru* ‘I’m going to Petar’s (place)’/‘I am going toward Petar’; c) *Idem prema Petru* ‘I am going toward Petar’; all PPs with a dative NP; and d) *Idem u Petra* ‘I’m going to Petar’s (place)’/ *Idem do Petra* ‘I’m going to Petar’s (place)’; both with a genitive NP (examples from Šarić 2008: 245)

One possible reason why Šarić fails to mention the dual meaning of some prepositionless dative readings is, obviously, that the verb *ići* (‘to go’) employed in the examples does not allow for the dual reading. However, consider:

- (6) *Marko bježi* *Petru.*
Marko run-away-PRS-IPFV-SG Petar-DAT.SG.M



<i>otrčati</i>	‘to run off’
<i>pobjeći</i>	‘to run away’
<i>pobirati</i>	‘to take away’ (but also ‘pick’, in the non-spatial sense)
<i>pogurati</i>	‘to give a push’
<i>prebjeći</i>	‘to defect; turn over’ (in the military sense)
<i>prenijeti</i>	‘to carry somewhere (to a certain location)’
<i>preseliti</i>	‘to move’ (as in move to London)
<i>tjerati</i>	‘to chase’
<i>umaći</i>	‘to run (away) successfully, manage to run (away)’
<i>uteći</i>	‘to run (away) successfully, flee’
<i>zbrisati</i>	‘to run away, abscond’

Albeit somewhat marginal to our analysis, here we also note that there exists a subset of non-spatial verbs (see Brala and Rubinić, in prep.) that select a dative NP that can be interpreted in two ways; for example: *kupiti* ‘to buy’ and *prodati* ‘to sell’, as in:

(8) *Kupio sam mu šešir.*
buy-PST-PFV-SG-M be-COP he-DAT-SG-M hat

Possible readings of sentence (8) are ‘I bought the hat for him [as a gift]’ or ‘I bought it from him [because I know he has been having serious financial problems]’.²²

(9) *Prodao sam mu auto.*
sell-PST-PFV-SG-M be-COP he-DAT-SG-M car

Possible readings of sentence (9) are: ‘I sold the car to him’ OR ‘I sold his car for him/on his behalf [he could never do it himself, he is a lousy seller]’.

Other verbs belonging to this category that can appear with a dual reading of the dative NP are *otkupiti* ‘to buy up/off’, *ukrasti* ‘to steal’, *pobirati* ‘to pick, harvest’, *preuzeti* ‘to take over’, *ugrabiti* ‘to grab’, and *uzeti* ‘to take (away)’.

It is standard practice to deal with a particular subcategory of verbs taking the dative, called “verbs of benefit and harm,” in the context of dative analysis (e.g.,

²² These two readings do not exhaust all the possible semantic interpretations of sentence 8 (or 9) because the possessive dative also opens up space for alternative options (e.g., ‘I bought his hat’ for sentence 8).



Janda 1993: 68; Silić and Pranjković 2005: 220). This subcategory seems to be very relevant for our purposes; that is, for interpreting the dual reading of the (spatial) prepositionless dative. In fact, at times, the benefactive/malefactive alternation is in itself ambiguous, and its interpretation is possible only with the help of the context.²³ The benefactive/malefactive example proposed by Tanacković Faletar (2010: 162, 164) is: *Marko je Ivanu posudio/oduzeo automobil* ‘Marko has loaned the car to Ivan/taken the car from Ivan’. The difference between the two is explained in terms of the fact that with *posuditi* ‘to lend’ Ivan becomes the beneficiary of the accusative referent (the car), whereas in the case of *oduzeti* ‘to take away from’ the accusative referent is lost from the domain of the personal sphere²⁴ of the dative referent. In both cases, the dative is explained not through the concrete (beneficial or harmful) result of the verbal action, but through the fact that the dative referent has been affected by the event expressed in the sentence, in which the event is seen as the force oriented toward the dative referent and in which the event can affect this referent in any way (direction) allowed for by the context. In fact, it is possible to take the malefactive example sentence above, change the verb *oduzeti* ‘to take away from’ and replace it with the contextually nearly synonymous *uzeti* ‘to take’, and end up with the ambiguous reading of a dative referent analyzed in (5a) and (5b) above.

The readings of the benefactive/malefactive (i.e., the non-spatial dative ambiguity on the one hand, and the spatial dative ambiguity on the other) are in many ways parallel and worth looking at simultaneously. The key to both sets of interpretations, and possibly to the interpretation of the dative case, is not to be found in the fact that the verbal action (centrally defining the sentence) event or the entities involved in the event are oriented/directed in a certain way (i.e., *toward* the dative referent), which, as has been seen in the literature review, seems to be the most frequently proposed reading of all (Croatian) spatial datives, and some authors view it as the prototypical reading of the dative. Rather, much along the lines of what has been suggested by Dąbrowska (1997), we maintain that the

²³ Tanacković-Faletar (2010: 164) notes the ambiguity of senses for the dative of intention / benefactive dative, but fails to note the benefactive/malefactive alternation and the spatial dative dual readings.

²⁴ The notion of “personal sphere” is taken from Dąbrowska (1997), who defines it as comprising “the persons, objects, locations and facts sufficiently closely associated with an individual that any changes in them are likely to affect the individual as well” (Dąbrowska 1997: 16–17). She continues to explain that this “individual who is perceived as affected by the action, process, or state taking place within or impinging upon his personal sphere” is the “target person” (Dąbrowska 1997).



core sense of the dative (spatial and non-spatial) lies in the (potential) affectedness of the (personal sphere of the) dative referent by the verbal event. Crucially, while agreeing that the conceptual metaphor PROCESSES ARE PHYSICAL FORCES and while certainly acknowledging the fact that force is a vectorial (i.e., directed) notion, we believe that it is reductionist and misleading to observe the dative exclusively or even primarily through the directivity lens. Indeed, to our knowledge, the problem of most available analyses of the dative seems to be determined exactly by the fact that the “affectedness” of the dative referent by the verbal action, clearly recognized and described in most of them, has been viewed all too often in the target/recipient/approaching/reach/goal/etc. sense; that is, in terms of a “positive” scalar value (applied to a physical or metaphorical spatial directional context), and rarely (practically only in the benefit/harm opposition) allowing for the “opposite end”; that is, the source/distancing/severing/etc. negative (or detrimental) sense.²⁵ However, leaving spatial directionality out of the picture (and perhaps, as suggested by our findings in 2.1., leaving it to the semantics of the verb), suddenly yields a very flexible and accommodating reading of the dative, which is exhausted through its having the potential to affect or having an effect on the dative referent in terms of its personal sphere (as defined by Dąbrowska 1997; see footnote 24, this paper), and in which it is this last component of the personal sphere that differentiates the dative from other cases and explains why most accounts of the dative cannot be complete unless they rely on animacy (or, rather, the personal/personhood sphere). Let us further illustrate this position with a few examples:

- (10) *Eva bježi majci od/do*
Eva run-PRS-IPFV-SG-M mother-DAT-SG-F/ from/up to
majke.
mother-GEN-SG-F

The construction with the bare dative NP can be interpreted in the two ways discussed with respect to the alternation in sentence (6) above; that is, *Eva* could be running to(ward) the mother or away from her; these two readings depend on the

²⁵ This remark interestingly parallels Janda’s (1993) observation relative to the mechanisms of extension to different semantic fields, in which antonymy is centrally recognized in relation to prototypical dative usages as a tendency to unite opposites (Janda 1993: 100). She writes that “the semantic import of the clause can be reversed, using verbs that indicate *take* rather than *give*” (Janda 1993: 58). Also note that among the mechanisms of extension to different semantic fields she also mentions metonymy, which seems to apply to the acceptability of the bare dative with “library” (possibly metonymically viewed as “librarian”) in sentence (12).



Summing up, it should be noted that the key to interpreting the dative, in all its usages, including the spatial ones, is the issue of the affectedness of the dative referent by the event; that is, if the referent can suffer, absorb, receive, or be impacted by (the outcome of) the event expressed. Crucially, as shown above, this affectedness need not necessarily be physical; it can also be psychological.²⁷ Thus, the lexicalization of the situation of “Marko running” in sentence (6) is not guided (primarily) by directionality in the spatial sense. Rather, key to reading/interpreting the sentence is the question of whether and how the dative referent (in this example, Petar) is affected by Marko’s running; is Marko running because he wants to get to Petar, which puts Petar in the positions to absorb the action (in Janda’s terms²⁸), or because Marko is running away from him (severing, distancing himself), which makes Petar affected by Marko not wanting to be near him.

Support for our claims is also found in McIntyre’s (2006) analysis of German vs. English datives. McIntyre’s view is also that the dative should be discussed in terms of events because according to him datives are event-related, not entity-related.

4. Conclusion

Departing from an analysis of source and goal elements, as lexicalized in various combinations of prefixal and prepositional *od* and *do* elements in Croatian, we observed the following: a) elements of directionality (of motion) seem to be associated with the verb (primarily with the prefix); b) elements of the physical path (primarily source and goal) seem to be associated with the prepositional phrase (i.e., with the preposition); c) the bare dative in spatial contexts is associ-

²⁷ Consider, for example, *Dijete mi je plakalo čitavu noć* ‘The child has been crying (to me) all night’ (preventing me from sleeping), psychological affectedness. Ethical and emphatic datives are of this type.

²⁸ “The dative plays a unique role; it is both an object of a verb and a subject to a potential verb, both controlled and controlling. The very nature of this double role suggests that the dative referent must be capable of both absorbing an action and reacting to it. In addition to prompting the choice of human referents, this feature of the dative ... makes it possible for it to pass subjecthood tests in impersonal constructions ... and also accounts for readings of modality and benefit or harm ... often associated with the dative (inanimate objects and, to some extent, animals are excluded because they lack the ability to respond and thus sense harm or benefit)” (Janda 1993: 56).



ated with the affectedness of the dative referent by the verbal action; that is, (sentence) event, rather than with the notion of “directionality”; and d) the alternation between start of motion and end of motion—that is, implicit and explicit source/goal combinations and the (perceived) position of the speaker in the different possibilities—has confirmed the goal-over-source bias.

Our analysis also led us to examine a peculiar property of some (spatial) bare datives: a possible dual reading, generally of the adlative/ablative type. The fact that such bare datives receive their first readings in the adlative (up to, toward) sense, but also the fact that the possible alternation of the reading of such constructions with the ablative sense has not been described in the extant work on the Croatian prepositionless dative, seems to be a further, and strong, argument supporting the goal-over-source bias.²⁹

At the same time, the analysis of the bare dative has provided support for the claim that the (Croatian) dative is to be viewed in terms of “verbal/event force” acting on the personal, or rather personhood, sphere of the dative referent, which is, in turn, able to be physically or psychologically affected by it. Such a reading of the dative is called for in non-spatial contexts, as well as in spatial ones. Focusing on directionality in spatial contexts, and naming spatial datives as directional, thus seems to be misleading.

We conclude by recalling a notion proposed in the early stages of this paper: given the fact that users of language are forward-looking (i.e., forward-oriented) beings (and thus “motion toward” has clear experiential, perceptual, attentional, and related advantages over “motion from”), there is the possibility that one preposition (*do*) will more readily integrate into surrounding sentential elements and more readily yield interpretations (conceptualization patterns’ construals) with respect to general experience and knowledge of the world (see also Tyler and Evans 2003). Possibly linked to this is also the observation that *do* is more autonomous in meaning construction than *od* (contrast the possibility of expressing the adlative relation *parkiran je do bolnice* ‘he is parked next to the hospital’ vs. the impossibility of the ablative *parkiran je od bolnice* ‘he is parked (away) from the hospital’).

²⁹ The fact that language users realize the possibility of the ablative reading only when conditioned by the context, and that scholars working on the Croatian dative have left “negative directivity” and “severing directivity” out of focus, speaks very strongly in favor of the goal-over-source bias.



Although it is obviously related to the goal-over-source bias, these facts—just like our observations relative to the goal-over-source bias, as well as those regarding the semantics of the dative—need to be further explored with respect to how they affect language structure. The big question of language structure, especially when observed from the perspective of the language-cognition relation, is still one of the most intriguing questions, and possibly among the most important ones that the linguistic community is facing. Departing from where this paper ends, the search for answers is likely to need to include further examination of the dual dative reading of non-spatial bare datives in Croatian, as well as the investigation of the (possible)³⁰ ambiguity of readings in the context of the semantic and syntactic properties of the dative in other languages (Slavic and non-Slavic).

References

- Anić, Vladimir (2003). *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Novi liber.
- Anić, Vladimir, Dunja Brozović Rončević, Ivo Goldstein, Slavko Goldstein, Ljiljana Jojić, Ranko Matasović, Ivo Pranjković, Marko Samardžija (2002). *Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik*. Zagreb: Novi liber.
- Anić, Vladimir, Josip Silić (2001). *Pravopis hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Novi liber, Školska knjiga.
- Antonić, Ivana (2004). Sintaksa i semantika dativa. *Južnoslovenski filolog* 40: 69–97.
- Barić, Eugenija, Lana Hudeček, Nebojša Kohorović, Mijo Lončarić, Marko Lukenda, Mile Mamić, Milica Mihaljević, Vanja Švačko, Luka Vukojević, Vesna Zečević, Mateo Žagar (1999). *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje – Pergamena – Školske novine.
- Barić, Eugenija, Mijo Lončarić, Dragica Malić, Slavko Pavešić, Mirko Peti, Vesna Zečević, Marija Žnika (2005). *Hrvatska gramatika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Belaj, Branimir (2010). Prostorni odnosi kao temelj padežnih značenja – shematičnost i polisemija hrvatskoga prijedložno-padežnog izraza *od*+genitiv. Birtić, Matea, Dunja Brozović Rončević, eds. *Sintaksa padeža*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Filozofski fakultet Osijek.
- Beličová, Helena (1982). *Sémantická struktura věty a kategorie pádu*. Prague: Academia.
- Brala, Marija (2002). The semantics and grammar of ‘motion’. Evidence from Croatian pre-fixes vs. prepositions. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 15: 7–30.

³⁰ Even if the readings of the translations of what are ambiguous alternate pairs in Croatian do not turn out to be ambiguous in other languages, it would still be very interesting to see which linguistic means are employed to render each of the possible source-language options.



- Brala, Marija, Anita Memišević (2012). Getting 'do' in Croatian. Goals, boundaries and more in prefixal semantics. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 57.1: 71-92.
- Brala, Marija, Anita Memišević (in preparation). The Croatian prefix *od-*. Beyond sources, into principled and motivated networks.
- Brala, Marija, Nensi Rubinić (2011). Prostorni prijedlozi i prefiksi u hrvatskome jeziku. Kognitivnosemantička analiza. *Fluminensia* 23.2 :21-37.
- Brala, Marija, Nensi Rubinić (in preparation). The dual dative (an integral part of Rubinić's master's thesis *The Croatian Dative*).
- Bylund, Emanuel, Scott Jarvis (2011). L2 effects on L1 event conceptualization patterns. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition (special issue on crosslinguistic influence in bilinguals' concepts and conceptualizations, guest-edited by Scott Jarvis)* 14 (1): 47-59.
- Dąbrowska, Eva (1997). *Cognitive Semantics and the Polish Dative*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Evans, Vyvyan, Andrea Tyler (2004). Rethinking English "prepositions of movement": The case of to and through. Cuyckens, Hubert, Walter de Mulder, Tanja Mortelmans, eds. *Adpositions of Movement. Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 18. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 247-270.
- Filipović, Luna (2007). *Talking about Motion. A Crosslinguistic Investigation of Lexicalization Patterns*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gumperz, John, Stephen Levinson, eds. (1996). *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ham, Sanda (2002). *Školska gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Hickmann, Maya, Stéphane Robert, eds. (2006). *Space in Language. Linguistic Systems and Cognitive Categories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Janda, Laura Alexis (1986). *A Semantic Analysis of the Russian Verbal Prefixes za-, pere-, do- and ot-*. Munich: Otto Sagner.
- Janda, Laura Alexis (1993). *A Geography of Case Semantics: The Czech Dative and the Russian Instrumental*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Johnson, Mark (1987). *The Body in the Mind. The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination and Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Katičić, Radoslav (2002). *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Kovačević, Barbara, Ivana Matas Ivanković (2007). Parni prijedlozi. *Rasprave instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 33: 245-261.
- Lakoff, George (1987). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakusta, Laura, Barbara Landau (2005). Starting at the end: The importance of goals in spatial language. *Cognition* 96: 1-33.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (2003). *Space in Language and Cognition. Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Mandler, Jean Matter (1996). Preverbal representation and language. Bloom, Paul, Mary A. Peterson, Lynn Nadel, Merrill F. Garrett, eds. *Language and Space*. Cambridge, MA: Bradford Books, 365–383.
- Maretić, Tomo (1963). *Gramatika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Markovskaya, Evgenia (2006). Goal-source asymmetry and Russian spatial prefixes. Svenonius, Peter, ed. *Tromsø Working Papers in Language and Linguistics: Special Issue on Adpositions (Nordlyd)* 33: 200–219.
- McIntyre, Andrew (2006). The interpretation of German datives and English *have*. Hole, P. Daniel, Andre Meinunger, Werner Abraham, eds. *Datives and Other Cases*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 185–211.
- Palić, Ismail (2010). *Dativ u bosanskome jeziku*. Sarajevo: Bookline.
- Papafragou, Anna (2010). Source/goal asymmetries in motion representation: Implications for language production and comprehension. *Cognitive Science* 34: 1064–1092.
- Pranjković, Ivo (1993). *Hrvatska skladnja. Rasprave iz sintakse hrvatskoga standardnog jezika*. Zagreb: Hrvatska Sveučilišna Naklada.
- Pranjković, Ivo (2009). Prostorna značenja u hrvatskome jeziku. Mićanović, Krešimir, ed. *Prostor u jeziku/Knjževnost i kultura šezdesetih, Zbornik radova 37. seminara Zagrebačke slavističke škole*, 11–19.
- Raguž, Dragutin (1997). *Praktična hrvatska gramatika*. Zagreb: Medicinska naklada.
- Raguž, Dragutin (2010). *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Author.
- Šarić, Ljiljana (1999). Dativ smjera u hrvatskome jeziku. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 25.1: 323–344.
- Šarić, Ljiljana (2008). *Spatial Concepts in Slavic. A Cognitive Linguistic Study of Prepositions and Cases*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Silić, Josip, Ivo Pranjković (2005). *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Slobin, Dan I., ed. (1985). *The Crosslinguistic Study of Language Acquisition. Vol. 2: Theoretical Issues*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Slobin, Dan I. (2000). Verbalized events: A dynamic approach to linguistic relativity and determinism. Niemeier, Susanne, René Dirven, eds. *Evidence for Linguistic Relativity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 107–138.
- Šonje, Jure, ed. (2000). *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža i Školska knjiga.
- Talmy, Leonard (1985). Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. Shopen, Timothy, ed. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. III: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 255–282.
- Talmy, Leonard (2003). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics, Vol. II: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Tanacković Faletar, Goran (2010). *Semantički opis nesamostalnih (kosih) padeža u hrvatskome jeziku i njegove sintaktičke implikacije*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Osijek.



Tyler, Andrea, Vyvyan Evans (2003). *The Semantics of English Prepositions: Spatial Sciences, Embodied Meaning, and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Vlahović, Stjepan (1953). Idem Vladi – Idem k Vladi (osvrt). *Jezik*. 2.1: 28.

Authors' address:

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Rijeka
Slavka Krautzeka bb
51 000 Rijeka, Croatia
E-mail: mbrala@ffri.hr
E-mail: amemisevic@ffri.hr

KRETANJE OD – DO U HRVATSKOME. ANALIZA POLAZIŠTA, CILJEVA I DVOJNIH ČITANJA DATIVA

Ovaj rad istražuje hrvatske 'P-elemente' *od* i *do* koji su vrlo česti i kao prefiksi (tvoreći glagole kretanja koji kodiraju polazište ili cilj) i kao prijedlozi. U kontekstima koji opisuju kretanje leksikaliziraju OD (polazište) ili DO (cilj). Nadalje, ovaj par dopušta vrlo zanimljivu alternaciju: prefigurirani *od-/do-* glagoli kretanja često su popraćeni prijedložnim frazama koje započinju s *od* ili *do*. Rezultirajuće moguće strukture zanimljive su s obzirom na semantička, sintaktička i pragmatička svojstva. Pažljivo proučavanje raznih mogućnosti otvara put analizi onoga što je prethodno neopisano svojstvo hrvatskoga prostornog dativa bez prijedloga – moguće dvojno čitanje, uglavnom adlativno/ablativnoga tipa.

Cljučne riječi: hrvatski; od; do; polazište; cilj; prijedlog; prefiks; dvojna čitanja dativa.

