

UDK 811.163.42'36''16/18''  
811.163.42'366.545''16/18''  
Izvorni znanstveni rad  
Rukopis primljen 13. III. 2018.  
Prihvaćen za tisak 10. V. 2018.

Marijana Horvat  
Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics, Zagreb  
*mhorvat@ihjj.hr*

Ljiljana Šarić  
University of Oslo  
Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages, Faculty of Humanities  
*ljiljana.saric@ilos.uio.no*

## THE DATIVE IN CROATIAN ŠTOKAVIAN AND KAJKAVIAN GRAMMARS UP TO 1860<sup>1</sup>

This article deals with the approach to the dative case in Kajkavian and Štokavian grammars from 1604 to 1859. We concentrate on seventeen grammars, primarily focusing on their presentation of the meaning of the dative case. Remarks related to the meaning of the dative are mainly found in the parts of these grammars discussing syntax, and to a lesser extent in other parts. A significant feature of the majority of the grammars examined is their presentation of what modern grammars consider dative and locative (constructions) under the same umbrella of the dative case or the “third” case. The reason for this is a “morphology first” rule: the identical morphological form (in the singular) influenced grammarians’ conceptualization of what are considered typical dative constructions (e.g., those with the preposition *k*) and locative ones (e.g., those with the preposition *u* in static contexts) as dative constructions. Including the dative and locative prepositions in the scope of a single case in the singular led to an implicit assumption about the semantic profile of the dative: it occurs in static and dynamic constructions, and its semantic profile is different in the singular and plural.

### 1. Introduction

This article investigates descriptions of dative constructions in selected Croatian grammars (both Štokavian and Kajkavian) from the period before and

---

<sup>1</sup> Ovaj je rad financirala Hrvatska zaklada za znanost projektom IP-2016-06-6619. / This work was fully supported by the Croatian Science Foundation under project IP-2016-06-6619.

during the Croatian National Revival, and it examines how historical Croatian grammarians described the dative case, starting with the first Croatian grammar, *Institutiones linguae Illyricae* (1604) by Bartol Kašić.

Because the Zagreb philological school is the logical and mostly consistent continuation of the work of the Illyrian movement led by Ljudevit Gaj between 1835 and 1848, and due to the fact that many of the same people were active among both the Illyrians and the Croatian philological school – mainly Vjekoslav Babukić and Antun Mažuranić (Pranjković 2015: 85) – the final year taken into consideration in this research is 1859, the year when the first study of Croatian syntax was published as a separate volume<sup>2</sup> (Veber's *Skladnja ilirskoga jezika za niže gimnazije*). *Skladnja* played a very valuable and special role in describing Croatian in the entire period before modern approaches to Croatian syntax (Brlobaš 2015: 445). This analysis presents the dative case in Croatian Štokavian and Kajkavian grammars from 1604 to 1859. The analysis covers seventeen grammar books. Importantly, the primary interest is not the morphological features of the dative case (i.e., its endings): the research primarily focuses on the meaning of the dative, the prepositions associated with it, the special features of the grammarians' descriptions, and their conclusions related to the identical morphological form of the dative and locative singular. The analysis traces the development of grammatical descriptions of dative constructions in the period examined.

## 2. A brief commentary on the dative

Contemporary grammars define the meaning of the dative case as directionality (*negranična direktivnost*), from which other meanings (belonging, giving, goal, and purpose) presumably developed.

In accordance with the cognitive linguistics view, we assume that all cases are meaningful units (although their meanings may overlap with the meanings of other units in their constructions). Furthermore, all case meanings, including the meanings of the dative, form a structured network of interconnected nodes. Analyses of the dative in Slavic approach the meaning of this case differently. For example, Belaj and Tanacković Faletar (2012) investigate the abstract, all-encompassing super-schematic meaning of the dative in Croatian and claim that this meaning is a meaning of abstract proximity. Janda and Clancy (2002) analyze numerous corpus examples, and they structure all of the meanings of the Russian dative around three nodes: RECEIVER, EXPERIENCER, and COMPETITOR, considering the first (RECEIVER) to be the central one: RECEIVER encompasses the use of the dative as an indirect object, and it can be related via various exten-

---

<sup>2</sup> See Pranjković 2015: 88.

sions to many other dative uses. Indeed, the indirect object uses seem to have a specific prominence: they are retained by migrant speakers when some others are lost due to language attrition (see, e.g., Skaaden forthcoming for Croatian).

An important feature of dative entities is their capacity for interaction: in the modern Slavic languages, most frequent dative entities are humans. This is emphasized by Janda and Clancy (2002) and Dąbrowska (1997). For this reason, Dąbrowska's analysis of the Polish dative defines its general meaning as the "target person" meaning: the target person in the dative case is affected by actions and processes taking place in his or her personal sphere. The dative uses across Slavic exhibit considerable commonalities, although certain uses are more prominent in some Slavic languages than in others. For example, the dative with the preposition *ku* is "almost obsolete" in Polish (Dąbrowska 1997: 136). The prepositional *k*-datives are primarily used with humans as destinations in Russian (Janda & Clancy 2002). However, this dative is common with human and non-human destinations in Croatian.<sup>3</sup>

In modern Croatian, the dative with a human referent in an indirect object construction is a prominent use – perhaps the most salient use – related to the receiver semantic node, but other uses in which target persons and a personal sphere are central (e.g., constructions with dative entities as experiencers of, for example, emotions and environmental conditions) are no less prominent.<sup>4</sup> Dative referents in allative constructions are also very frequently humans. This supports the idea of a typical dative in Croatian as the case of an "affected recipient" and its close relation to the personal sphere.

This assumption is reflected to various degrees in grammatical descriptions that, among other things, have didactic aims. Native speakers and language learners use them, among other things, to understand when certain language units are, can, or should be used – in other words, they are primarily interested in the meaning of these units reflected in their usage contexts. Grammatical descriptions tend to list various uses of the dative case, frequently emphasizing the grammatical variety of dative constructions. Very often, datives are described as dependent on certain verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. Although some general semantic features of the dative can be deduced from these descriptions, they present the semantic profile of this case as rather heterogenous and vague.

---

<sup>3</sup> It seems that human destinations are more frequent; this, however, must be examined using corpora. The allative use of the dative, especially when dative entities are inanimate, is generally not as prominent in the modern Slavic languages as it was in the past. This is especially true for the bare directional datives that are common in modern South Slavic languages based on the Štokavian dialect (see Šarić 1999).

<sup>4</sup> We do not have statistics showing which uses are most frequent, but we assume that the most frequent uses are cognitively prominent.

The following sections concentrate on seventeen grammars and investigate how these grammars (implicitly and explicitly) address the meaning of the dative case. We are primarily interested in the semantics of the dative as outlined in the grammars under investigation: we therefore pay less attention to morphological issues and primarily consider the details mentioned in the sections discussing parts of speech and various syntactic issues because remarks about the dative meanings were most often found in these parts.

### 3. The dative in selected Croatian grammars

The corpus used to analyze descriptions of the dative case consists of selected Croatian Štokavian and Kajkavian grammars.

The following Croatian Štokavian grammars were analyzed: *Institutionum linguae Illyricae libri duo* (1604) by Bartol Kašić,<sup>5</sup> *Gramatika talijanska kratko ili kratak nauk za naučiti latinski jezik* (1649) by Jakov Mikalja, *Istruzioni grammaticali della lingua illirica* (1728) by Ardelio Della Bella, *Svašta po malo iliti kratko složenje imena i riči u ilirski i njemački jezik* (1761) by Blaž Tadijanović, *Nova slavonska i nimačka gramatika* (1767) by Matija Antun Relković, *Grammatica Illirica* (1803) by Josip Voltić, *Grammatica della lingua illirica* (1808) by Francesco M. Appendini, *Nova ričoslovica ilirička* (1812) by Šime Starčević, *Grammatik der illyrischen Sprache* (1833) by Ignjat Alojzije Brlić, *Osnova slovnice slavjanske narčja ilirskoga* (1836) and *Ilirska slovnica* (1854) by Vjekoslav Babukić, *Slovnica Hèrvatska za gimnazije i realne škole* (1859) by Antun Mažuranić, and *Skladnja ilirskoga jezika za niže gimnazije* (1859) by Adolfo Veber Tkalčević. The Croatian Kajkavian grammars analyzed are: *Einleitung zur kroatischen Sprachlehre für Deutsche* (1783) by Ignac Szentmártony, *Kroatische Sprachlehre, oder Anweisung für Deutsche, die kroatische Sprache in kurzer Zeit gründlich zu erlernen* (1795) by Franjo Kornig, *Horvaczka grammatika oder kroatische Sprachlehre* (1810) by Josip E. Matijević, and *Grammatik der kroatischen Mundart* (1837) by Ignac Kristijanović.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> In *Institutiones*, Kašić described the Štokavian-Čakavian literary koinè. He based his grammar on the language of Štokavian-Čakavian literature. Therefore, in this grammar he accepted Štokavian, but he did not completely abandon his native Čakavian. See Gabrić-Bagarić (2010: 152, 155).

<sup>6</sup> This article uses reprints, translations, and transcriptions of the grammars in question published by the Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics, except for the grammars by Relković, Appendini, and Brlić (see Sources).

The grammars analyzed are not Croatian grammars only, and they are not always written in Croatian. Some of them are foreign-language grammars with Croatian language examples, and some are Croatian-language grammars with a foreign metalanguage. As is well known, the first Croatian grammar (1604) was written in Latin. The grammar by Jakov Mikalja (1649), for example, taught its readers Italian, but it is on the list of Croatian grammars because it contains Croatian translations of examples, some of its parts are in Croatian, and Croatian is its metalanguage. Therefore it is possible to reconstruct the Croatian language, not only on the basis of Croatian examples and declension models, but also thanks to Croatian language information from various additions (not belonging to the grammar *per se*) and from grammar instructions and lessons written in Croatian (Gabrić-Bagarić 2003: 66). Because each grammar is based on the language of a certain period, consequently only one stage of the literary language<sup>7</sup> is described; that is, one stage in a vertical historical development. The metalanguage part of a grammar is both an example of language use as well as a source for a historical-linguistic analysis at all levels: from phonology to syntax. At the same time, we cannot completely exclude a grammar-oriented approach because the description of a foreign language dictates the scope of the Croatian language material included (compare Gabrić-Bagarić & Horvat 2008: 138).

### 3.1. Description of the dative case in Croatian Štokavian grammars

The central part of the grammar by Kašić and Mikalja is dedicated to morphology; that is, to describing declension and conjugation samples. For our purpose, the morphological description can be easily disregarded, whereas the syntax does not have a separate chapter and the description of this language level is based on grammatical explanations and advice. In contrast to Kašić, who lists prepositions that go together with certain cases in a separate chapter, the grammar by Mikalja does not even include that sort of information, although there is a very short comment on prepositions, adverbs, conjunctions, and interjections on the last page of his grammar.<sup>8</sup> Importantly, due to the special features of the Croatian case system, Kašić (following the Latin model) could not simply apply the Latin model to the Croatian language of the time. Instead, he

---

<sup>7</sup> Croatian texts of the pre-standard period differ according to the language stylizations (Čakavian stylization, Štokavian stylization, Kajkavian stylization, and hybrids). For the written language of this pre-standard period, we use the term “literary language”.

<sup>8</sup> In that grammar, the basic syntactic rules were omitted, except instructions on the agreement of nouns and adjectives.

tried to solve the problem by introducing seven cases in the singular<sup>9</sup> and eight in the plural.<sup>10</sup> In the singular he omitted the locative case with the explanation that it corresponds to the dative: “Osmi će, samo u množini, s prijedlogom *ù*, to jest *in*, označavati stanje na mjestu. U jednini se, naime, umjesto osmoga padeža služimo dativom s istim prijedlogom” (Kašić 2002: 45).<sup>11</sup> Therefore he gives examples of prepositions that require the dative in the singular such as “*na* (*supra*),” which appears in front of nouns occurring with stative verbs, such as in *na otaru, na glavi nosi*; and then “*u* (*intra*)” as in *u kući, u crkvi, u vrtlu*;<sup>12</sup> “*pri* (*apud*)” as in *pri Ivanu, pri njivi*; *ka* or “*k* (*ad* or *uersus*)” as in *k divici, k gradu*; “*protiva, suprotiva, suprot* (*aduersus, contra*)” as in *protiva Bogu sagriših, suprot Stipanu*; “*po* (*per, super, post*)” as in *po putu, po obrazu, po smrti*; and “*oko, o* (*circa, de*)” as in *o tebi mislim* (cf. Kašić 2002: 361, 363). On the other hand, he describes the dative plural with only one preposition, “*ka, k* (*ad, uersus*),” saying that it is used mainly with verbs of motion towards a place: *k Rimljanom* (Kašić 2002: 365).<sup>13</sup> To Kašić, this distribution of prepositions seemed logical because the dative and locative singular were morphologically in distinct; that is, because of non-inclusion of the locative in the singular case paradigm.

Della Bella follows the case model used by Kašić, and he justifies the absence of the “eighth” case in the singular and its replacement with the dative in the same way.<sup>14</sup> His grammar explicitly states that the dative singular stands for or

---

<sup>9</sup> Nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, ablative, and the “seventh” case (instrumental).

<sup>10</sup> Nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, ablative, and the “seventh” (instrumental) and “eighth” (locative) cases.

<sup>11</sup> “The eighth will, only in the singular with the preposition *ù* – that is, *in* – designate static proximity. In the singular, instead of the ‘eighth’ case, we use the dative with the same preposition” (Kašić 2002: 45). Also, under the influence of the Latin case system, he introduces the ablative, which is morphologically identical to the genitive.

Kašić’s grammar was written in Latin. In this article we use the Croatian translation of the grammar, which was published by the Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics (2002; see Sources). The English translations of the quotes from the grammar are ours.

<sup>12</sup> Here, Kašić did not explicitly mention that the preposition *u* designates static proximity, as he did on page 45.

<sup>13</sup> With the “eighth” case (i.e., the locative in the plural), he gives only the preposition *u* ‘in’ and emphasizes that it goes with verbs indicating being at a place: *u vaših kućah, u dušicah svetih* (Kašić 2002: 365).

<sup>14</sup> “Premda imenice u jednini nemaju osmoga padeža s vlastitim nastavkom, taj se padež zamjenjuje dativom s prijedlogom *ù*, npr. *sto(j)i ù kući* – sta in casa, *imám te ù srcu* – ti ho nel cuore, *ja sam ù nevolji* – io sono in necessità” ‘Although nouns in the singular do not have the “eighth” case with its own ending, that case is replaced by the dative with the preposition *ù*; for example, *sto(j)i ù kući* – sta in casa, *imám te ù srcu* – ti ho nel cuore, *ja sam ù nevolji* – io sono in necessità’ (Della Bella 2006: 33).

replaces the “eighth” case, which implies awareness of a certain “illogicality” of the case system used in the grammar. The dative is dealt with in particular in the chapter on prepositions. Like Kašić, he describes different meanings of the preposition *po*, mainly illustrating its abstract (non-spatial) uses, but also temporal and spatial uses.

Ovaj prijedlog znači *conforme, secondo, come* i zahtijeva dativ, npr. *budi meni pò rječi tvojoj* – sia à me secondo la tua parola, *pò zakonu, pò pravdi* – secondo la legge, la giustizia. Zahtijeva dativ i kad znači *per*, npr. *Hò mandata la lettera per Pietro, per il servidore – poslo sam knjigu pò Petru, po slúzi*. Tako *po pútu* – per la strada, *pò meni* – per mezzo mio, *svako zlo pò gri(j)êhu* – ogni male per il peccato. Kad je imenica u množini, stavlja se u 8. padež . . . Ponekad znači *dopo* (nakon), npr. *pò njegovu porodu* – dopo la sua nascita, *pò Božiću* – dopo il Natale, *pò smrti* – dopo la morte . . . U značenju talijanskog *per*: *Date un danaro per uno – Dajte svakomu pò jedan dinár, daj svakomu pò jednu jabuku* – dà à ciascuno una mela. (Della Bella 2006: 97)<sup>15</sup>

He also follows Kašić in the explanation of the use of other prepositions with the dative; for example, *na* and *pri*. In static contexts, *na* requires the dative, which serves as the “eighth” case; for example, “*imam na glâvi* – hò sopra la testa, *s klobúkom na glâvi* – col cappello in testa” (Della Bella 2006: 97). The preposition *pri* is glossed with *appresso* and stands next to the dative (“*pri kralju* – appresso il rè, *pri meni, pri tebi* – appresso di me, appresso di te”). With the same preposition, it is also glossed as *a confronto* ‘in comparison with’: “*Svè je ništa pri Bogu* – Tuto è niente a confronto di Dio.” It means “*vicino* (pokrāj, uz)” or “*nel* (u)”; for example, “*pri potrebi* – vicino al bisogno, ò nel bisogno, *pri pogibli, pri nevolji*” (Della Bella 2006: 99). The preposition *o* is glossed with *nel* or *al* or *alle* and requires the dative, which replaces the “eighth” case

---

<sup>15</sup> “This preposition means *conforme, secondo, come* and requires the dative; for example, *budi meni pò rječi tvojoj* – sia à me secondo la tua parola, *pò zakonu, pò pravdi* – secondo la legge, la giustizia. It requires the dative even when it means *per*; for example, *Hò mandata la lettera per Pietro, per il servidore – poslo sam knjigu pò Petru, po slúzi*. Therefore *po pútu* – per la strada, *pò meni* – per mezzo mio, *svako zlo pò gri(j)êhu* – ogni male per il peccato. When a noun is in the plural, it is put into the ‘eighth’ case . . . Sometimes it means *dopo* (after); for example, *pò njegovu porodu* – dopo la sua nascita, *pò Božiću* – dopo il Natale, *pò smrti* – dopo la morte. . . in the Italian sense *per*: *Date un danaro per uno – Dajte svakomu pò jedan dinár, daj svakomu pò jednu jabuku* – dà à ciascuno una mela” (Della Bella 2006: 97).

Della Bella’s grammar was written in Italian. In this article we use the Croatian translation of the grammar, which was published by the Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics (2006; see Sources). The English translations of the quotes from the grammar are ours.

in the singular. For example, “*Govorim ò tebi* – parlo di te, *Radiš ò zlu* – attendi al male.” In the plural it is used with the “eighth” case: “*Govoré ò mnozjeh grjes-jeh* – parlano di molti peccati, *Sablju ò pâsu, kopje ù ruci, lúk ò plećeh*” (Gundulić, *Osman*; Della Bella 2006: 99). The prepositions *protiva*, *suproč* are glossed with *contra* and are used with the dative: “*protiva Bogu* – contra Dio, *protiva meni* – contra di me; *suproč Bogu, suproč meni*” (Della Bella 2006: 101). The preposition *ka*, *k* indicates movement to a place: “*došo je k meni* – è venuto da me, *uteci se k Bogu* – ricorri a Dio, *pošo je k Rimu* – è andato verso Roma” (Della Bella 2006: 101).

Interestingly, *k*-dative examples contain more animate nouns than nouns for locations; it seems that in modern language, too, dative entities are primarily animate nouns.

From these remarks it follows that spatial uses of the preposition *pri* (compare *pri kralju*), as well as some of its non-spatial uses, have gone through many changes over time. For the preposition *o*, both abstract and concrete spatial uses are given, which are not closely related.

Della Bella considers syntactic questions in Chapter 23, in which he describes rules about constructions. In that chapter he also explains dative constructions that are explicitly called the “dative of benefit or harm”: “U ilirskom jeziku veći broj glagola može stajati uz dativ koji se naziva dativ koristi ili štete, npr. *tebi trudiš* – fatichi per te, per tuo utile. *Mladići zloćudni štetni su grádu* – i giovani di cattivi costumi sono di danno alla città” (Della Bella 2006: 107).<sup>16</sup> Then he describes how certain verbs assign the dative and some specific phrases, providing examples from the spoken language and literature.<sup>17</sup> We emphasize examples of today’s stylistically marked phrases which he listed with the verb *biti* ‘to be’: “*Bolje je biti progognjenu nego pomilovanu, Bolje je biti ubogu s apostolom nego bogatu s lakòmcima, Meni je drago biti ljubljenu od tebe*” (Della Bella 2006: 109).

We agree with Darija Gabrić-Bagarić, who states that the syntactic part of Della Bella’s grammar obviously proves its practical purpose: it should help users master communication in Croatian starting from Italian, or comparison with Italian: His examples from literary texts reveal that some uses were noticed only in the language of literature; he tried to explain them from the perspective of the rules of common language (Gabrić-Bagarić 2006: 135).

Blaž Tadijanović’s manual *Svašta po malo iliti kratko složenje imena i riči u ilirski i njemački jezik* (1761) is the first language (usage) manual and the pre-

---

<sup>16</sup> “In the Illyrian language, the majority of verbs can stand next to the dative case, which is called the dative of benefit or harm; for example, *tebi trudiš* – fatichi per te, per tuo utile. *Mladići zloćudni štetni su grádu* – i giovani di cattivi costumi sono didanno alla città” (Della Bella 2006: 107).

<sup>17</sup> See Della Bella 2006: 109, 111, 113.



decessor of Relković's grammar (*Nova slavonska i nimačka gramatika*, 1767) and Lanosović's grammar (*Neue Einleitung zur slavonischen Sprache*, 1778). In its third part (*od riječi koje se pridstavljaju prid imenih*), Tadijanović lists prepositions (as well as conjunctions and interjections), but does not provide any information about the cases that go with these prepositions. In his declension models that follow Latin grammar with the nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, and ablative (= genitive) cases, case names are not used. Cases are implicitly discussed by using questions and answers: “*Komu to no-siš? Ocu, dem Vatter*” (in the original, pages 122–123).

Relković (1767) provides a list of seven cases and their labels in a separate chapter devoted to cases (Poglavje 3, *Što je casus?* pp. 58–59): “nominativus, genitivus, dativus, accusativus, vocativus, ablativus, sedmi casus / instrumentalis seu societatis.” A brief description of case syntax (and, indirectly, meaning) is also provided: *dativus* is described with reference to its typical use in constructions with the verbs *davati* and *ukazivati* “koi komugod štogod daje, i ukazuje komu” (however, in that explanation, the case actually described is the nominative, and not the dative).<sup>18</sup>

In Chapter 7 (*De praepositione*, p. 228), a list of prepositions governing the dative (“*dativum vladaju*”) is given: “*prama (prama Bogu), protiva (protiva naravi), u (u crkvi), na (na glavi), po (po meni, po Uskrsu), pri (pri tebi), o (o meni), k' (k' Bogu), činje*<sup>19</sup> (*činje gradu*), *medju* (inter; *medju nama*).” The list contains the prepositions *u*, *na*, *pri* occurring in phrases describing static locations that modern grammars describe as locative prepositions, as well as *po* (exemplified by constructions with an abstract and temporal meaning), and *o* (exemplified by constructions carrying an abstract meaning). The preposition *medju* is also listed as a dative preposition.

This grammar devotes its third part to syntax (*De Syntaxi*), with a separate subchapter called *Od upravljenja riči*. The dative is mentioned in the discussion of verbs governing the dative and accusative (p. 252): examples illustrating the dative are *Rat je škodjiv puku*, *Ja sam pisao mojemu prijatelju*, *Ja vam to poklanjam*, and *Vi meni činite veliku ljubav* (p. 252). However, the dative is

---

<sup>18</sup> Some parts of the grammar briefly mention dative morphology: short forms of the pronominal dative (*nam, vam, jim*, p. 282). In the examples provided, the verbs *dati* and *donijeti* are used. However, the commentary does not reflect on these verbs. The use of the dative and accusative pronouns in the same construction, and whether short or long forms should be used, is also mentioned (p. 283; e.g., *dajte ga meni*).

<sup>19</sup> This is a very uncommon preposition, which is also confirmed in Voltić's grammar. We did not find any information about this word. The headword *čine* is confirmed in AR with two examples from Lastrić's work. In his work, this word is not a preposition and means ‘there’. See AR II: 27.

not linked to the verb meaning in these examples, although they employ typical verbs with dative nominals in an indirect object role: these uses are the central uses of the dative case from the diachronic and synchronic points of view.

Static spatial constructions with the preposition *u* + noun (e.g., *u Italiji*, pp. 272–273) are described as dative constructions. Interestingly, *kući* in the construction *idem kući* (p. 273) is described as a dative exceptionally used instead of an *u*-accusative designating a goal.

Short dative forms of personal pronouns in constructions such as *dajte mi* are described as a phenomenon linked to imperative constructions (pp. 280–281); these, however, are not linked to imperatives, but to the verbs used in the illustrating examples<sup>20</sup> that typically require a dative as an indirect object: *dati*, *pisati*, and *reći*.

The possessive dative (p. 285) *mi*, *ti*, *mu*, *joj* is described as an alternative to the possessive pronouns: “navlastito kada kod njih stojih Substantivum s’ Adverbiom Demonstrandi” (e.g., *Evo mi otac ide*).

The dative use is also reflected on in the discussion of impersonal verbs: several examples with *valjati* (p. 315) are listed (e.g., *Valja joj kruh peći*).

In the chapter *De syntaxi praepositionum* (pp. 358–366) in which prepositions that govern more than one case are discussed and illustrative constructions provided (in which, for example, the accusative and instrumental are contrasted), static constructions in which the prepositions *u* and *na* are used (e.g., *kada je pitanje gdi*), as well as those with the preposition *po*. All of them are described as dative constructions.

In Voltić’s *Ilirska gramatika*, published at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a Latin declension model was also adopted, which means that the “seventh” case (the instrumental case) was added in the singular, and the “seventh” and “eighth” in the plural (the instrumental and locative cases), as has been the case since Kašić introduced this model in his grammar. The only exception is the declension of the word *milost*, whose paradigm has seven cases in both the singular and plural.<sup>21</sup> Voltić mentions the dative case only in the chapter on prepo-

---

<sup>20</sup> Some of the examples used do not contain imperatives at all.

<sup>21</sup> In the German text, the naming of all cases is done meticulously with ordinal numbers (e.g., *die 7te*, *die 8te Endung*, etc.). In the Italian grammatical comment, the “first four” cases are mostly used with the names *nominativo*, *genitivo*, *dativo*, *accusativo*, and the vocative is not mentioned, the Croatian instrumental is called the “seventh” (*il 7mo caso*), and the locative is the “eighth” case (*l’8vo*). Furthermore, in Italian the “sixth” case also kept the name ablative (in German *die 6te Endung*). In Croatian that case has the same endings as the genitive; it is illustrated with the preposition *od*, and it was inherited from the Latin case system adopted by the predecessors of Voltić from Kašić onwards. (Horvat & Perić Gavrančić 2016: 174).

sitions, where he explains which prepositions go with which case (see Voltić 2016: 106–109): the dative is accompanied by the prepositions *činje*<sup>22</sup> (graf. *Csinje*), *k*, *po*, *pri*, *prama*, *proti*, *protiva*, *suprot*. He states that the preposition *po* with a stative verb in the singular requires the dative (e.g., *gledam po kući*), whereas in the plural it requires the genitive (e.g., *govori po mojih riči*). Interestingly, the genitive use of the preposition *po* is unusual. When it stands next to a verb of movement, *po* requires the accusative (e.g., *idem po prijatelja*). The prepositions *na* and *u* with static and posture verbs in the singular require the dative (*jesam u kući*, *sidim na stolici*), and in the plural the locative case (*pribivamo u kućah*, *sidimo na stolicah*). With verbs of movement they also require the accusative (*idem u kuću*, *postavljam na glavu*). This distribution of the prepositions is in accordance with descriptions by Kašić and Della Bella. The exclusion of the locative case from the case scheme in the singular influenced relating the prepositions *na*, *po*, and *u* to the dative. The unreliable lexeme *činje* connects Voltić with the grammar by Relković. In the syntactic part he also mentions that the question *to whom* is followed by a dative, as in *ja tebi želim svako dobro* (Voltić 2016: 119), and that personal pronouns in the dative are shortened (Voltić 2016: 125).

Appendini's *Grammatica della lingua illirica* (1808) was written in Italian and is based on the Dubrovnik dialect. The central part of the grammar contains morphological descriptions. It also contains a chapter on syntax. Like his predecessors, Appendini also has a different number of cases in the singular and plural: six cases in the singular (the “sixth” is the ablative, today's instrumental case) and seven in the plural (the “seventh” being *ablativo secondo*, which corresponds to today's locative case). That distribution influenced the choice of prepositions listed with the dative. Prepositions related to the dative are *protiva*, *suprotiva*, *suproč* (*protiva neprijatelju*); *prema* (*ja prema tebi*); *ka*, *k* (*k'onomu mjestu*) (p. 121). The prepositions *pri*, *o*, and *po* in the singular go with the dative, but in the plural with the locative: *pri onemu putu – pri prsijeh mojijeh*, *govorim o tebi – pišem o mnozijek stvarih*, *po obrazu – po prijateljeh* (p. 122). He relates to the dative some exclamations of pain and sorrow: *vajmeh*, *joh*, *jaoh*, *lele* (*Vajmeh meni*) (p. 123) as well as some verbs and adjectives: *i ne sebi*, *nu sinovom iliti sinovcem stabre*<sup>23</sup> *sade*; *ti si meni u isto doba štetan i koristan* (p. 125). The examples *bio sam u Rimu*, *stanujem u Dubrovniku*, and *stojim u kući* illustrate the use of the dative in the singular (p. 158).

---

<sup>22</sup> Voltić gives *verso* and *gegen* along with *činje* as its Italian and German equivalents, but that word is not a lemma in his *Ričoslovník*.

<sup>23</sup> Trees (= *staba*, see *stabar* AR XVI: 329–330); in the Italian example: *gli alberi*.

Šime Starčević, in his *Nova ričoslovica ilirička* (1812), omitted the ablative case, but he did not identify the locative, as a result of which he has six cases (*padanja*) in both numbers. In connection with this, he specifically states the difference from his predecessors (Volčić, Della Bella, Appendini, and Relković; Starčević 2002: 25). He did not name the cases, but he listed them numerically (*prvo padanje, drugo padanje, treće padanje...*). Omission of the locative also influenced his list of prepositions that go with the “third” *padanje* (i.e., the dative: *prema, proti, naproti, suproti, po, pri, u, na, k', ka, o*), as well as his explanation of the use of prepositions that go with each case (see Starčević 2002: 74, 102–106). He claims that the preposition *u* requires the “third” case if the question word is *gdje* ‘where’: *Bio sam u mlinu, našli smo ga u ovcam*. He makes remarks about his predecessors, saying that Appendini and the others were incorrect to say *nositi Boga pri prsijih svojih* instead of *pri prsim svojim* because *pri* allows only the “third” case (Starčević 2002: 103). Later in the text he remarks that Appendini should have said *Ište pomoć po prijateljim i lik po vilam*, and not *po prijateljijh, po vilah*, and not *ide po kućah, po skupštinah*, but *po kućam, po skupštinam*. The dative and locative had different endings in the plural, which Appendini clearly stated in his grammar. Starčević actually related locative prepositions to the dative form.

Ignjat Alojzije Brlić (*Grammatik der illyrischen Sprache*, 1833) introduced seven cases, matching the case system of modern Croatian in the singular and plural (the locative is the “seventh” case and the instrumental is the “sixth”). Each case is dealt with in a separate chapter, as is the dative case (pp. 270–271), both with and without a preposition (*primaknuti se k' trpezi; Petar je sagrišio protiv trećoj zapovidi Božjoj*). Brlić also gives a list of verbs with various meanings that are related to the dative. An important new approach is reflected in the fact that the prepositions *na, o, po*, and *u* are not related to the dative, but to the locative (see pp. 274–275).

The case system in both analyzed grammars by Babukić (*Osnova slovnice slavjanske narječja ilirskoga*, 1836, and *Ilirska slovnica*, 1854) contain seven cases in the singular, plural, and dual. Relevant to our analysis is only the list of prepositions requiring the dative case from the first grammar: *k, ka, ko* (*k meni, ka Kruševcu, ko tomu*); *prama; proti, protiv; suprot, suproč* (p. 55) and his remark about the “third” case being equal to the “sixth” (i.e., to the locative; p. 18). In *Ilirska slovnica* the following prepositions are listed: *k, ka; napram, naprama; prama, prema; prot, proti; protiv, protiva; proć; sproć, suproč, sproću; suprot, suproti* (pp. 333–334). The dative case is further discussed in the chapter on syntax, with examples from literary works (pp. 369–372). Babukić relates the dative to the case of the questions *komu* or *čemu* and lists a number of

different verbs (e.g., of speaking, giving, and taking) that require the dative; for example, *što biti / ne biti* (I početka *Bogu* nije (Palmotić, *Kristijada*)), *reći, kazati, govoriti, pomoći, imati/nemati* (*Njemu* neima jošte dvadeset godina.), *učiniti, dati, uzeti* (*Mraznoj zimi* dođe svrha / *S premal’jetna jur* dohoda / *Snijeg s planinskih kopneć vrha / Što uze goram, rijekam* poda (Gundulić, *Osman*)), *oteti, goditi, ugoditi, čuditi se, diviti se*. Then he lists adjectives that require the dative case; for example, *blag, mio, dobar, hud* (Nit me veće srjeća muči / *T e b i dobra, m e n i huda* (Gundulić, *Osman*)), *zgodan, nezgodan, ugodan, povoljan, dosadan*. He also lists certain adjectives and participles important for the use of the dative; for example, *vješt* (*vješt biti kakovu poslu – jeziku englezkomu, francezkomu*), *nevješt, priviknut, priučen, vikao*. He also discusses datives of personal pronouns used as possessive ones; for example, “*mi* (*Djedi mi* su svi otčini / *Cari iztočni previsoci: / Smjerni gorštaci u planini / Matere su moje otci* (Gundulić, *Osman*)), *ti* (*on ti je ujak = tvoj ujak*), *mu, joj, nam* (*Jakob nam je zet = naš zet*). Again he refers to prepositions with the dative case and in the end to exclamations that are confirmed with the dative; for example, *blago, teško, jao, joj, vajmeh, lele, kuku meni, tebi*, and *njemu*. Obviously, in this grammar, which is considered the first scholarly grammar,<sup>24</sup> Babukić noticed some meanings of the dative that are also found in modern grammatical descriptions (see Silić & Pranjković 2005: 219–220), such as the possessive dative, the dative of benefit or harm, and implicitly even the dative with the infinitive, although he did not give these datives these labels.

The only relevant part from *Slovnica Hèrvatska za gimnazije i realne škole* (1859) by Mažuranić, and from *Osnova slovnice slavjanske* by Babukić, is the list of prepositions requiring the dative: *k(a), prama, prema, proć, proti* (-v, -va), *suproć, suproti: k(a), prama, prema, proć, proti* (-v, -va), *suproć, suproti* (Mažuranić 2008: 156).

In his work *Skladnja ilirskoga jezika za niže gimnazije* (1859), Adolfo Veber Tkalčević analyses the dative in a separate chapter (pp. 25–30). He also dedicates a separate chapter to the prepositional dative (pp. 58–59). His description of the dative is similar to the one Babukić gives in *Ilirska slovnica*, but is more elaborate. He indicates that the dative expresses the purpose of why something is happening and designates that someone is given or taken something (with this he makes remarks about the central uses of the dative that semantically define this case). Consequently, he relates the dative to a number of verbs with various meanings (e.g., *dati, uzimati, braniti, zapovijedati, pomoći, vje-*

---

<sup>24</sup> See the study by Branka Tafra along with the reprint of Babukić’s grammar (Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Zagreb, 2014).

*rovati, zahvaliti, laskati* – Dadoh *bratu* knjigu., Zahvali se *otcu*.). Then he mentions that sometimes a person or a thing is in the dative if an act does harm or brings benefit to him or her (Štogod tko čini, *sebi* čini.). He explains in detail the dative of goal, which occurs after the verbs *biti, služiti*, and sometimes *ra-bititi* (e.g., Izdajstvo je *čovjeku* na sramotu.). Veber also identifies the possessive dative (e.g., Gdje *ti* je kuća?), stating that a person appears in the dative in cases of oaths and pledges (e.g., Tako *mi* smrtno ure koja me čeka i koja me ne može proći.). Thus he identified the emphatic dative as a particular meaning of the dative, which is noted in contemporary grammars as well (e.g., Raguž 1997: 136; Silić & Pranjković 2005: 220). He also states that a person or a thing appears in the dative when compared to another by the verbs *biti, imati*, and *nemati* (e.g., To je narod savršen da *mu* na svijetu druge neima. Vraz, *Gusle i tambura*”). Thus he noticed the semantic role of the dative defined as COMPETITOR in literature today. Veber, like Babukić, lists adjectives that require the dative as well as interjections that occur with the dative. His description of the dative is specifically focused on identifying and describing verbs requiring the dative. For instance, he claims that the verb *biti* requires an animate dative when it means ‘to have’ (e.g., Što bi ti radio da *ti* je., Živa *ti* je mati.).<sup>25</sup> A dative of a person is also required by the verb *imati* when it refers to age (e.g., Kadija njega pita: Koliko *ti* ima godina? (Mažuranić, *Pogled u Bosnu*)). The verb *biti* also requires the dative when it is used generally, although a person does not have to be implicitly expressed (e.g., Bolje je (čovjeku) i *ranjenu* nego *ubijenu* biti., Bolje je biti i *izbijenu* nego posve *ubijenu*.). The last two examples illustrate the dative constructions with the infinitive. Regarding the prepositions that appear with the dative, it is important to state that Veber gives not only the list of prepositions but also their meanings. Thus, the preposition *k (ka)* is described as one that designates movement towards something and it means: a) a person or a place (e.g., Poslah slugu *k otcu*.; Pristupih *k postelji*.; Soliman pristupi *k Sigetu*.); b) a place as a goal of movement (e.g., Zimi lete lastavice *k jugu*.); c) the time at which something will happen (e.g., *K Uskrsu* vratiti će se vojači kući.); d) the object of *samostavnici prelazni* ‘transitive nouns’ (e.g., Ljubav *k narodu* zahteva te žrtve.); and e) a person or a thing whom/which something belongs to (e.g., Ovaj vrt spada *k ovoj kući*.). Other prepositions that he records are *prama (prema)* and *proti*, and he also illustrates their use considering their meanings (see Veber 2005: 58–59). Compared to other grammarians, Veber’s description of the dative is the most elaborate and precise.

---

<sup>25</sup> This is actually an example of the possessive dative (e.g., “Živa ti je mati. = Tvoja je mati živa.”).

### 3.2. Description of the dative in Kajkavian grammars

Ignac Szentmártony's grammar (*Einleitung zur kroatischen Sprache*, 1783) is the first published grammar of Kajkavian. Because of its "lack of theoretical linguistic considerations" (Štebih Golub 2014: 58), not much information about case syntax and semantics can be expected. Case<sup>26</sup> labels such as nominative, genitive, and so on are not used in this grammar at all: instead, the cases are labeled the "first" case, "second" case, and so on.<sup>27</sup> The label "third case" applies to a range of prepositional constructions that are considered dative and locative constructions in modern grammars.

The dative use in impersonal constructions (which is an important usage field of this case in the modern language), is acknowledged in this grammar in the commentary on impersonal verbs that are said to only be used in the singular with the dative (e.g., *veđa se meni*). In the context of the constructions *žal je* and *treba/trebe je* (es muss), it is indicated that "the person is in the 'third' case" (e.g., *bude mi žal; meni je trebe*). The dative is also said to be used with the "neuter gender of adjectives" (e.g., *milo mi je; drago mu bude*).

The fourth part of the grammar provides an overview of the indeclinable parts of speech, including prepositions (*O prijedlogu*), and lists prepositions governing the "third" case: *k; proti, naprot, naproti; suprot(i)*.<sup>28</sup> In the subsequent discussion and examples, the dative and locative constructions are all subsumed under the "third" case: the further prepositions requiring this case in the singular are *pri, ob*,<sup>29</sup> and *po* (e.g., *ob tretiji vuri, um die dritte Stunde; po proroku; po gore stavanju, nach der Auferstehung*);<sup>30</sup> it is further claimed that these prepositions govern the "second" case (the genitive) in the plural. The

---

<sup>26</sup> The grammars before the Croatian National Revival are influenced by grammars of Latin. Usually six cases reflecting the Latin system are listed in the singular and plural, including the ablative, which has an identical form to the genitive and is always linked to the preposition *od*. It remained in grammatical descriptions until the nineteenth century. (Štebih Golub 2014: 19).

<sup>27</sup> The German term used is *Endung* 'ending'. The equivalents of the "endings" are the following cases: the "first ending" is nominative; the "second ending" in the singular is genitive, and in the plural genitive and locative; the "third ending" is dative and locative in the singular, and in the plural dative only; the "fourth ending" is accusative, the "fifth ending" is vocative, and the "sixth ending" is instrumental. This model is also applied by Kornig and Matijević.

<sup>28</sup> The list contains the prototypical dative preposition in the contemporary language *k*; the remaining prepositions' modern counterparts are described as genitive and dative prepositions (e.g., *nasuprot*) pertaining to the "bookish" style (e.g., *suprot*), or as exclusively genitive prepositions (e.g., *protiv*). Protiv: <http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search>. Suprot: <http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search>; nasuprot: [http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search\\_by\\_id&id=e1ZvUBk%3D](http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=e1ZvUBk%3D).

<sup>29</sup> Another preposition, "*ob* (um)," requires the "sixth" case.

<sup>30</sup> In another meaning (glossed as "durch, nach") the "second" case is required with plural nouns.

same is claimed for the prepositions *o*, *na*, and *vu* in static contexts (e.g., *kada je pitanje gde, budu znamenja na suncu i mesecu i zvezdah*, Luka 21).

The “third” case is also mentioned in a few contexts discussing morphology, in which, for example, prepositional constructions are provided as illustrations of certain claims: for instance, the construction with the preposition *pri* (e.g., *pri dobrom bogu*) illustrates dropping of the final vowel in adjectives in the section on morphology. In another context, short forms of pronouns used in the “second,” “third,” and “fourth” cases (e.g., *me*, *mi*) are mentioned (p. 91).

All in all, this grammar does not provide much information about the syntax and semantics of the “third” case, except for mentioning its use in impersonal constructions and with prepositions.

Kornig (*Kroatische Sprachlehre*, 1795) uses the same case labels as Szentmártony, but provides more details about different dative uses. Kornig also subsumes under the label “third” case in the singular the phenomena that modern grammarians describe as two separate ones: the dative and locative.<sup>31</sup> The “third” case is briefly mentioned<sup>32</sup> or discussed in some additional detail in different contexts, including those about declension and endings, and long and short forms of pronouns that appear in some case forms (including the “third” case). Furthermore, this case is discussed in the context of impersonal verbs and the case of pronouns in constructions with these verbs (e.g., *Pravih je bezličnih glagola veoma malo i uz njih uvijek stoji osobna zamjenica u trećem ili četvrtom padežu*, p. 176) The list of prepositions that “require” this case (Part 3) is the same as in Szentmártony (*k*; *proti*, *naproti*, *naprot*, *suprot(i)*). Kornig follows Szentmártony in his descriptions of case uses with some prepositions in the singular and plural: in his view, *pri*,<sup>33</sup> *na*, and *vu* require the “third” case only in the singular. For *na* and *vu*, the difference between their use with the “third” and “fourth” cases is explained with the help of the questions used (*kam* versus *gde*).<sup>34</sup> For *ob* and *po*, it is claimed that they require three cases:<sup>35</sup> *ob* (um, herum) requires the “third” case in the singular (e.g., *ob pol dnevu um Mittagszeit*), as does *po* (in its spatial and temporal meaning: *durch*, *nach*, *po lozi je zajec prešel*).

---

<sup>31</sup> In the plural, the genitive and locative are described as a single case (the “second” case). This results in the assumption that the preposition *pri* requires two different cases: one in the singular, and another one in the plural (Štebih Golub 2015: 18).

<sup>32</sup> The dative is also mentioned in the context discussing the interjection *jaj*, which, when it implies a threat, requires the dative (e.g., *Jaj, vam!*).

<sup>33</sup> It requires the “second” case in the plural (e.g., *pri Bogu i pri ljudih*).

<sup>34</sup> The prepositions require the “second” case in the plural (e.g., *budu znamenja na Suncu i Mesecu i zvezdah*).

<sup>35</sup> The description is taken from Szentmártony (2014: 139).



The “third” case is given special attention in the discussion of nouns, adjectives, and verbs: importantly, it is related to the meaning of nouns that “designate someone’s harm or benefit” (“na čiju se štetu ili korist što dešava”); for instance, *Ne davaj tvojoj deci zločestu peldu*. K-datives are further required by adjectives designating an ability or speed: (sposobnost, brzinu): *prikladen, neprikladen; priličen, spreten, len; hiter; pripraven; gotov* (e.g., *Ov človek je prikladen, priličen k vsakomu poslu*. Dieser Mensch ist zu jeder Arbeit geschickt.; *Ti si jako len k delu*. Du bist sehr faul zur Arbeit.); this use is not usual with all of the adjectives listed in contemporary Štokavian. Some of these adjectives occur with the “fourth” case with the prepositions *za* (glossed with *zu*) and *na* (glossed with *zu*).

Specific attention is given to some groups of verbs requiring the dative: these verbs denote giving, taking, benefit, or harm, and always require the dative as “an answer to the question *to whom*.” The illustrating examples include *Daj meni moje nazad. To meni hasni, tebi pako škodi*. Further verbs linked to the dative use are equivalents of the verbs *order, forbid, say, and promise* (e.g., *Ne obetaj nikomu kaj dati ne moreš.*); *forgive, reply, oppose, show, point, summon, call, compare* (e.g., *Ne moramo se poglavarskoj oblasti suprotstaviti.*; *Prispodobil me je mojoj materi, ili, k mojoj materi.*;<sup>36</sup> *Zovi mi tvoje dete simo!*); *approve, disapprove, want, narrate, complain, thank* (e.g., *Želi tebi i celoj hiži vse dobro.*; *Zahvalujem njim za prijeto dobročinstvo.*). The equivalents of *give, bring, pay, help, violently take, borrow, add, entrust, prefer, and ignore* are said to require the “‘third’ case of a person in addition to the ‘fourth’ case of a thing” (e.g., *Donesel sem deci jednu ticu.*).

The third case is also mentioned in the discussion of the use of short forms of personal pronouns (e.g., *Prodaj mi toga konja.*) and their position in the sentence. It is also mentioned as part of constructions with impersonal verbs that require the dative of personal nouns (e.g., *Fali mi još penez.*).

To sum up, this grammar provides essential information about the dative, not only linking it to certain prepositions, but also identifying some verbs that typically govern this case (“glagoli koji znače davanje, uzimanje, korist ili štetu”), and which are parts of prototypical dative constructions in the modern language. Some other verbs are simply listed without further explanation; however, the list alone indicates their similarity to the verbs of giving and taking.

Josip Ernest Matijević’s *Horvaczka grammatika oder kroatische Sprachlehre* (1810) followed the case system model by Kornig: he identifies six cases, but he does not name them, he calls them the first, second, third, fourth, fifth,

---

<sup>36</sup> An alternative construction, *z mojom materjum*, is also provided.

sixth ending (see Štebih Golub 2017: 21). The “third ending” in the singular corresponds to the dative and locative, but in the plural only to the dative. Regarding the list of prepositions that go with the dative, and in his remarks about the dative in the syntactic part of the grammar, he also follows Kornig.

In Kristijanović’s grammar (*Gramatika horvatskoga narječja*, 1837) the dative is given attention in different contexts, in which the reader is given an overall image of the meanings of this case. The majority of these meanings is acknowledged in contemporary grammars and can be found in contemporary standard Croatian.<sup>37</sup>

The dative is either briefly mentioned or examined in more or less detail in the discussion of morphological issues (declension, the dative’s (alternative) endings, the position of short forms of dative personal pronouns in a sentence; p. 223) and parts of speech: the subsection discussing adverbs (*O prilozima*, p. 225) mentions the dative as an answer to the question *kam?* ‘where to’. It is stated that the answers contain either accusative constructions with *vu*, *v*, or *na*, or datives with *k* and *proti* (e.g., *kam ideš? v Zagreb, k Savi, zur Save, k mostu*). Interestingly, in these examples the dative referents are inanimate nouns. Dative uses are also briefly mentioned in the section on interjections. In the section on prepositions (*O prijedlogu*, pp. 151ff.), the list of dative prepositions contains *k*, *proti*, *naproti*, *suprot*, and *suproti* (p. 154).<sup>38</sup>

In a separate part on syntax (*Druga glava, O sintaksi*), eight parts of speech are separately discussed, including “how they govern the cases.” The dative (p. 196) is a specific topic of the section called *O upravljanju imena. Imenice*, in which it is defined as a) the goal of an action, “a person or thing towards which the meaning of the verb is directed, and which is an answer to the question ‘*komu? wem?*’” (e.g. *ja sem tebi i celoj hiži tvoji vnogo dobra učinil*), b) as a case occurring with the prepositions *k*, *proti*, *naproti*, and *suproti* (p. 196) used to designate “movement or proximity of some place” (e.g., *odišiel je k starešem svojem*); c) the dative with the preposition *k* is required by some nouns, including *želja*, *privolenje*, *ljubav*, *nagnenje*; *nagib*, *običaj*, and *navada* (e.g., *človek koj želju k navukom ima, nema nagnenje k lenosti*). Finally, d) the dative “fits well” with some nouns and pronouns instead of the genitive (e.g., *neprijatelj duši svojoj (duše svoje)*; p. 197).

In the section on adjectives (*Pridjevi* (pp. 202ff.); *O dativu*), a few specific semantic groups of adjectives occurring with the dative are identified. These

---

<sup>37</sup> The locative is described as a separate case, and the ablative is not included in this grammar. Consequently, the case system is in accordance with modern grammatical descriptions of Croatian.

<sup>38</sup> *Pri* and *o* are described as locative prepositions, as are *na* and *vu* in static contexts.

adjectives designate benefit or harm, comfort, equality, or difficulty (e.g., *molitva je vsakomu hasnovita; zločesto pajdaštvo je vsakomu škodljivo, dete ocu spodobno; vzemi tebi jednaku*), capability, or speed (e.g., *k vsakom poslu prikladen človek; hiter, fleten k delu*). The list also includes a few adjectives that are not semantically labeled: *neprikladen, spreten, len, and gotov*. In the context of these adjectives, accusative constructions (e.g., *prikladen za navuk, zum Lernen tauglich.*) are juxtaposed with the dative constructions. The remaining adjectives identified as occurring in dative constructions are not semantically but formally described with regard to their morphology (“*pridjevi sastavljeni od po, pre i pri*”): *pokoren, povoljen, preporučen, potreben, spodoben, poslušen, and povdan*.

In the section on adverbial phrases (*O rekciiji priloga*, p. 217), the dative use in constructions with some adverbs (e.g., *prijetno Bogu i ljudem dobrem*) is explained by referring to the requirements of the adjectives that these adverbs relate to. In constructions such as *dobro, hudo, and teško mu je*, the dative is “dependent on the person of the verb” (*ovisi od lica glagola*, p. 217).

The dative is discussed in some detail in the section *O upravljanju glagola* (pp. 209ff.). First, in contexts with impersonal verbs that “require the genitive of a thing and the dative of a person”: *fali mi, menjka mi, zmenjkava mi, nestaje mi peněz, hoće mi se vina piti; neće mi se teh norijih; milo mi je siromaškeh ljudih; treba nam je pomoći Božje* (p. 209).

A separate paragraph is devoted to the dative related to a few semantic groups of verbs: those that designate harm or benefit, gratitude or lack of it, giving, and taking. These verbs require, in addition to an accusative, a dative of an entity that benefits or experiences harm (e.g., *vkrali su mi mojega najboljšega konja*). Verbs with *proti* or *suproti* require the dative (e.g., *protigovoriti vučenem ljudem*).

Furthermore, the “passive object” (*trpni objekt*) is frequently a dative, especially with some specific verbs, the meaning of which is not further elaborated: *čuditi se; podložiti se komu, prilizavati se komu; zahvaliti se komu; preporučiti/preporučati se komu; vklanjati se komu, gospodi streči; komu nagajati; zameriti se komu; smejati se njim, veruvati komu; reče, veli, govori njim; and veseliti se komu* (p. 212).<sup>39</sup>

A specific group of verbs, those with the prefix *pri-*, is identified as requiring datives with the preposition *k*. These are verbs of movement and approach

---

<sup>39</sup> The dative is mentioned in the context of the verb “*dam* (lassen)” + infinitive: “*ne daj mu se napeljati* (lass dich von ihm nicht verführen),” and of the verb *biti*, which is followed by a dative when it is equivalent to *imam*; thus, the dative can be found in *ne znam kaj mi je včiniti*.

(e.g., *primekni se k stolu; dojeti k susedu*). Finally, some verbs are mentioned that require the dative with the prepositions *proti*, *suproti*, and *naproti* (e.g., *zagrešiti proti Bogu*, p. 213).

The dative in temporal expressions is compared to some other case uses: days of the week occur with *v*-accusatives in the singular and *po*-datives in the plural. After the question “when will something happen” the words *poldan*, *večer*, and *leto*, nouns for holidays, and datives with the preposition *k* are used (*k poldnevu, k Vuzmu*). Temporal constructions with the preposition *po* (e.g., *po dnevnu, po noći*; pp. 201, 202) are considered dative phrases.

Datives with the prepositions *k*, *proti*, and *naproti* are considered proximity expressions (e.g., *Dojeti k selu, k vratam; proti/naproti mostu najlepše se je voziti*; p. 204).<sup>40</sup>

The existence of *ethical datives* (the author does not label them in this way) is acknowledged in the section *O slaganju zamjenica* (p. 170). These datives (specifically, *mi* and *ti*) occurring in questions and exclamations “have no meaning that can be translated [into German]” (e.g., “*dobro mi došel! ali ti ga je prevaril!* der hat ihn aber betrogen”). The same is true for *possessive datives* (which are not labeled as such): possessive pronouns are said to be frequently substituted by short datives of personal pronouns (*osobito ako se u rečenici pojavljuju pokazni i upitni prilozi*), for example, *je li si mi videl konja? Ovo ti otec ide*. Interestingly, in the illustrative examples nouns meaning ‘mother’, ‘father’, and ‘horse’ are used: entities belonging to the personal sphere of an entity, a crucial feature of the dative meaning according to contemporary semantic descriptions of this case.

Because this grammar has a separate section on syntax, more dative uses are identified than in Szentmártony and Kornig. Some prototypical examples of datives that modern approaches and grammars describe as possessive and ethical are given some attention.

#### 4. Conclusion

The description of the dative in the grammars analyzed predominantly depends on case systems given in each grammar; that is, on the number and differentiation of cases in the singular and plural. This primarily refers to grammars in which the dative and locative are taken as one case in the singular due to their similarity in form, which consequently resulted in claims that the prepositions *na*, *o*, *u*, *po*, and *pri* go with the dative in the singular, and with the loca-

---

<sup>40</sup> *Do*-genitives are also possible in similar contexts (e.g., *dojeti do Zagreba, do mesta*; p. 204).

tive in the plural. Although even the first grammarians (Kašić, and even more so Della Bella) identified and described the basic features of the dative, many conclusions drawn by them about the meanings and distribution of prepositions were “suppressed” by the semantic non-differentiation between the dative and locative in the singular mentioned above. An important step forward in describing prepositions, and thus a breakthrough in descriptions of the dative, occurred with the appearance of Brlić’s grammar in 1833 and the introduction of seven cases in the singular and plural (matching the modern case system, except for the order of the locative and instrumental), whereas one could consider Babukić’s *Ilirska slovnica* and Veber’s *Skladnja* to be forerunners of the modern approaches in the description of the dative.

Interestingly, all grammars that describe the preposition *prema* (or *prama*) relate these prepositions to the dative, whereas modern grammars express diverging views: some grammars say that the preposition occurs only with locative (Barić et al. 1995: 279; Težak & Babić 2000: 298), whereas others relate it only to the dative (Silić & Pranjković 2005: 243), or to both the dative and locative, with a remark about the dative being used in the meaning of direction and in cases in which it is possible to replace it with *k* (Raguž 1997: 138). We assume that the concordance of the preposition *prema* with the locative has not been influenced only by the syncretism of dative and locative endings: the most prominent dative preposition in the modern language tends to be solely *k(a)* because all other dative prepositions, despite the requirements of the standard norm, are gradually being used with the genitive (e.g., *nasuprot kuće*). Because in today’s colloquial speech even the preposition *k* does not appear and the dative without a preposition is used instead (e.g., *Idem liječniku*), the dative is starting to gain the features of a case without a preposition, as opposed to the locative, which always occurs with prepositions.

The grammars that devote more space to the dative include more extensive descriptions (of their parts on syntax). For example, certain verbs, nouns, and adjectives are identified as regularly occurring with the dative. Individual grammars further specify the meaning of these units, labeling them, for example, adjectives and verbs expressing benefit or harm. Furthermore, individual grammars strongly relate the semantic profile of the dative to verbs of giving and taking, which are related to the core meaning of the dative in the historical and modern perspectives. Some other grammars provide illustrative examples of dative uses of these verbs, but do not provide any meta-commentary about their meaning that indicates the importance of these verbs for the semantic profile of the dative.

Sources:

- APPENDINI, FRANCESCO MARIA. 1808. *Grammatica della lingua Illirica*. Dubrovnik.
- BABUKIĆ, VJEKOSLAV. 2013. *Osnova slovnice slavjanske narječja ilirskoga*. Reprint of the first edition (1836). In: Branka Tafra. *Vjekoslav Babukić, Osnova slovnice slavjanske narječja ilirskoga*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- BABUKIĆ, VJEKOSLAV. 2014. *Ilirska slovnica*. Reprint of the first edition (1854). Research study: Branka Tafra. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- BRLIĆ, IGUNJAT ALOJZIJE. 1833. *Grammatik der illyrischen Sprache, wie solche in Bosnien, Dalmatien, Slavonien, Serbien, Ragusa & c. dann von den Illyriern in Banat und Ungarn gesprochen wird. Für Teutsche verfasst und herausgegeben von Ignatz Al. Berlich*. Ofen.
- DELLA BELLA, ARDELIO. 2006. *Istruzioni grammaticali della lingua illirica / Gramatičke pouke o ilirskome jeziku*. Reprint of the first edition (1728). Translation: Nives Sironić-Bonefačić. Research study: Darija Gabrić-Bagarić. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- KAŠIĆ, BARTOL. 2002. *Institutionum linguae Illyricae libri duo / Osnove ilirskoga jezika u dvije knjige*. Reprint of the first edition (1604). Translation: Sanja Perić Gavrančić. Research study: Darija Gabrić-Bagarić. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- KORNIG, FRANJO. 2015. *Horvatska gramatika ili uputa Nijemcima kako da u kratkome vremenu temeljito nauče horvatski jezik*. Translation: Barbara Štebih Golub. In: Barbara Štebih Golub. *Franjo Kornig i njegova Horvatska gramatika*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- KRISTIЈANOVIĆ, IGNAC. 2012. *Grammatik der kroatischen Mundart / Gramatika horvatskoga narječja*. Reprint of the first edition (1837). Translation and research study: Barbara Štebih Golub. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- MATIJEVIĆ, JOSIP ERNEST. 2017. *Horvaczka grammatikā ili kroatische Sprachlehre*. Translation: Barbara Štebih Golub. In: Barbara Štebih Golub. *Horvatska gramatika J. E. Matijevića*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- MAŽURANIĆ, ANTUN. 2008. *Slovnica Hèrvatska za gimnazije i realne škole*. Reprint of the first edition (1859). Foreword: Radoslav Katičić. Research study: Željka Brlobaš. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- MIKALJA, JAKOV. 2008. *Gramatika talijanska ukratko ili kratak nauk za naučiti latinski jezik*. Reprint of the first edition (1649). Transcription: Marijana Horvat. Research study: Darija Gabrić-Bagarić and Marijana Horvat. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.

- RELKOVIĆ, MATIJA ANTUN. 1767. *Nova slavonska i nimačka gramatika / Neue Slavonische und Deutsche Grammatik*. Zagreb.
- STARČEVIĆ, ŠIME. 2002. *Nova ricsoslovica iliriska*. Reprint of the first edition (1812). Research study: Branka Tafra. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- SZENTMÁRTONY, IGNAC. 2014. *Einleitung zur kroatischen Sprachlehre für Deutsche / Uvod u nauk o horvatskom jeziku*. Reprint of the first edition (1783). Translation: Barbara Štebih Golub. In: Barbara Štebih Golub. *Ignacije Szentmártony i Uvod u nauk o horvatskome jeziku*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- TADIJANOVIĆ, BLAŽ. 2012. *Svašta po malo iliti kratko složenje imena i riči u ilirski i njemački jezik*. In: Marijana Horvat i Ermina Ramadanović. *Jezikoslovni priručnik Blaža Tadijanovića Svašta po malo iliti kratko složenje imena i riči u ilirski i njemački jezik (1761.)*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb. 2012.
- VOLTIĆ, JOSIP. 2016. *Grammatica Illirica / Ilirska gramatika (1803.)*. Reprint of the first edition (1803). Translation: Sanja Perić Gavrančić. Transcription and research study: Marijana Horvat and Sanja Perić Gavrančić. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- WEBER, ADOLFO. 2005. *Skladnja ilirskoga jezika za niže gimnazije*. Reprint of the first edition (1859). Research study: Ivo Pranjković. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.

## References:

- BARIĆ, EUGENIJA AT AL. 1995. *Hrvatska gramatika*. Školska knjiga. Zagreb.
- BELAJ, BRANIMIR; TANACKOVIĆ FALETAR, GORAN. 2012. Space, Conceptualization and Case Meaning: A Cognitive Account of the Dative in Croatian. *Cognitive Linguistics Between Universality and Variation*. Eds. Brdar, Mario; Rafaelli, Ida; Žic Fuchs, Milena. Newcastle upon Tyne. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 53–92.
- BRLOBAŠ, ŽELJKA. 2015. Hrvatske gramatike u 19. stoljeću. Eds. Lisac, Josip; Pranjković, Ivo; Samardžija, Marko. *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika 4: 19. stoljeće*. Chief editor: Ante Bičanić. Croatica. Zagreb. 431–467.
- DAŃBROWSKA, EWA. 1997. Cognitive Semantics and the Polish Dative. *Cognitive linguistic research*. 9. Walter de Gruyter. Berlin.
- GABRIĆ-BAGARIĆ, DARIJA 2003. Jezik u gramatikama južnih hrvatskih prostora 17. i 18. stoljeća. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 29. Zagreb. 65–86.

- GABRIĆ-BAGARIĆ, DARIJA 2006. Ardelio Della Bella – gramatičar. In: Ardelio Della Bella. *Istruzioni grammaticali della lingua illirica / Gramatičke pouke o ilirskome jeziku*. Reprint of the first edition (1728). Translation: Nives Sironić-Bonefačić. Research study: Darija Gabrić-Bagarić. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb. 127–151.
- GABRIĆ-BAGARIĆ, DARIJA; HORVAT, MARIJANA. 2008. *Gramatika talijanska ukratko* (1649.) Jakova Mikalje. In: Jakov Mikalja. *Gramatika talijanska ukratko ili kratka nauk za naučiti latinski jezik*. Reprint of the first edition (1649). Transcription: Marijana Horvat. Research study: Darija Gabrić-Bagarić and Marijana Horvat. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb. 2008. 105–168.
- GABRIĆ-BAGARIĆ, DARIJA 2010. Četiri ishodišta hrvatskoga standardnoga jezika. *Fluminensia: časopis za filološka istraživanja* 22/1. Zagreb. 149–162.
- HORVAT, MARIJANA; PERIĆ GAVRANČIĆ, SANJA. 2016. Život i djelo Josipa Voltića. In: Voltić, Josip. *Grammatica Illirica / Ilirska gramatika*. Reprint of the first edition (1803). Translation: Sanja Perić Gavrančić. Transcription and research study: Marijana Horvat and Sanja Perić Gavrančić. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb. 2016. 139–185.
- JANDA, LAURA A.; CLANCY, STEVEN J. 2002. *The case book for Russian*. Slavića Publishers.
- PRANJKOVIĆ, IVO. 2015. Filološke škole i hrvatski standardni jezik u drugoj polovici 19. stoljeća. Eds. Lisac, Josip; Pranjković, Ivo; Samardžija, Marko. *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika 4: 19. stoljeće*. Chief editor: Ante Bičanić. Croatica. Zagreb. 77–111.
- RAGUŽ, DRAGUTIN. 1997. *Praktična hrvatska gramatika*. Medicinska naklada. Zagreb.
1880. – 1976. *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. I–XXIII. JAZU. Zagreb. (= AR)
- SILIĆ, JOSIP; PRANJKOVIĆ, IVO. 2005. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*. Školska knjiga. Zagreb.
- SKAADEN, HANNE. (forthcoming). Tu i tamo se gađam padežima – ‘Here and there I struggle with my cases’. Croatian Migrant Speakers in a Norwegian Environment and their Use of Dative. In: *Diaspora Language Contact. The Speech of Croatian Speakers Abroad*. Ed. by Jim Hlaváč and Diana Stolac.
- ŠARIĆ, LJILJANA. 1999. Dativ smjera u hrvatskome jeziku. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 25. 323–344.
- ŠTEBIH GOLUB, BARBARA. 2014. *Ignacije Szentmártony i Uvod u nauk o horvatskome jeziku*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- ŠTEBIH GOLUB, BARBARA. 2015. *Franjo Kornig i njegova Hrvatska gramatika*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.



- ŠTEBIH GOLUB, BARBARA. 2017. *Horvatska gramatika J. E. Matijevića*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- TAFRA, BRANKA. 2014. Prva hrvatska znanstvena gramatika. In: Vjekoslav Babukić. 2014. *Ilirska slovnica*. Reprint of the first edition (1854). Research study: Branka Tafra. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb. 467–531.
- TEŽAK, STJEPKO; BABIĆ, STJEPAN. 2000. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika. Priručnik za osnovno jezično obrazovanje*. Školska knjiga. Zagreb.
- VOLTIĆ, JOSIP. 1803. *Ričoslovník (Vocabolario – Wörterbuch) illiričkoga, italijanskoga i nimačkoga jezika s jednom pridpostavljenom gramatikom illi pismenstvom*. U priteštenici Kurtzbecka. Beč.
- <http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search>. (21 January 2018)

## Dativ u hrvatskim štokavskim i kajkavskim gramatikama do 1860.

### Sažetak

U članku se istražuje opis dativnih konstrukcija u odabranim hrvatskim štokavskim i kajkavskim slovnicama objavljenima u razdoblju od 1604. do 1859. godine, odnosno od pojave prve hrvatske gramatike *Institutionum linguae Illyricae libri duo* (1604.) Bartola Kašića do *Skladnje ilirskoga jezika za niže gimnazije* (1859.) Adolfa Vebera Tkalčevića, prve hrvatske sintakse tiskane kao posebna knjiga. Analizom je obuhvaćeno 17 gramatika, a propituje se na koji su način stari hrvatski gramatičari obrađivali dativ te donose zaključci o njegovu poimanju u starijoj hrvatskoj gramatikografiji. Istraživanje je ponajprije usmjereno na značenje dativa, njegove karakteristične prijedloge te gramatičke opise i zaključke koje su gramatičari izvodili na temelju identičnoga morfološkog oblika dativa i lokativa u jednini.

Činjenice da se hrvatska gramatička tradicija razvijala pod utjecajem latinske gramatike te isti oblik dativa i lokativa jednine u hrvatskom jeziku utjecale su na variranje broja i poimanja padeža u gramatikama promatranoga razdoblja, stoga i na izbor prijedloga koji su se pripisivali dativu. Naime, važno je obilježje većine proučavanih gramatika zajednički prikaz kao dativa onoga što se u suvremenim gramatikama smatra dativom i lokativom, ponajprije kada je riječ o jednini. Drugim riječima, identičan morfološki oblik (u jednini) utjecao je na gramatičku konceptualizaciju onoga što se smatra tipičnim dativnim konstrukcijama (npr. s prijedlogom *k*) i tipičnim lokativnim konstrukcijama (npr. s prijedlogom *u* u statičnom kontekstu) samo kao dativne konstrukcije. Uklju-

čivanje dativnih i lokativnih prijedloga u djelokrug jednoga padeža (dativa) u jednini može dovesti do implicitnih pretpostavki o semantičkom profilu dativa: pojavljuje se i u statičnim i u dinamičnim konstrukcijama, a njegov je semantički profil različit u jednini i množini.

Do važnih je promjena u opisu dativa u hrvatskome jeziku došlo uključivanjem lokativa u padežni sustav u jednini i s tim u vezi pojavom i ustaljivanjem sustava od sedam padeža u jednini i množini.

Keywords: dative, prepositions with the dative, Croatian pre-standard grammars, Illyrian grammars, grammars by the Zagreb philological school, Croatian, Slavic languages

Ključne riječi: dativ, prijedlozi s dativom, hrvatske dopreporodne gramatike, ilirske gramatike, gramatike zagrebačke filološke škole, hrvatski jezik, slavenski jezici