

The Turkish Origin of the Particle *de* and Croatian Origin of the Interjection *deh*– A More Complete Etymological Contribution

Luka Velić

University of Zagreb

Abstract

In this article, we deal with the Turkish origin of the particle *de*, which differs from Skok's etymology, and with the Croatian origin of the interjection *deh*, which Skok also accepts. More precisely, we will show that *de* is of Turkish origin, whereas *deh* is Croatian. To investigate the data that enable such conclusions, we consult various linguistic sources (mostly about the Turkish language and the Croatian standard and dialects) and apply the general morphological knowledge (typological and diachronic), which also sheds light on the evolution of the Turkish word and, as a result, how it was adapted into Croatian.

Keywords: Croatian, *de*, *deh*, particle, Turkish

1. Introduction

The particle *de* was formerly (Skok, 1971: 386; *Rječnik...* [ARj., 1884–1886: 323]) thought to be of both Croatian and Turkish origin, depending on the kinds of examples in which it was found. Likewise, the 16th–18th-century interjection *deh* (not in use anymore) was thought to be a derivative of *de*. Our intent is to show that *de* is entirely of Turkish descent, and that *deh* is unrelated and entirely of Croatian origin. This position is informed by relevant sources on the various contexts in which *de* is used in Turkish (Čaušević, 1996; *Derleme sözlüğü* [DS later in the text], 1993) and related works on the Croatian standard and dialects (organised in order by type of sources: *Rječnik...* (ARj., 1884–1886; Barić et al. 1997; Silić and Pranjković, 2005; Lisac, 2003; 2008; 2010; Lončarić, 1996; Menac-Mihalić and Celinić, 2012; Šimundić, 1971; Raos, 1971; Velić, 2023; Gluhak, 1993; Skok, 1971; Matasović, 2008). Some sources (Kapetanović et al., 2010; Kranjčević, 2019; Malić, 1973; Moguš, 1977; Vončina, 1975) are used only for sidenotes in some footnotes and are not directly linked to the main topic (they are indirectly related to it with dialectological topics more widely). A comparison of the Croatian examples with those found in Turkish shows that

some Turkish uses paved the way for two Croatian uses of the borrowing *de*, namely the prepositional use (as in *Dé bir hikâye söyle*. (DS, 1993: 1391) „Come on, tell me a story.“) and most postpositional uses (as in *Ben de geldim*. [Čaušević, 1996: 425] „I, too, have come.“; *Gelsin de yapsın!* [*ibid.*: 425] „Dare he not do this!“). As for the examples from Croatian, we adduce data from sources that highlight the use of *de* in Croatian dialects (e.g. (Imotski-Bekija) *bâcidē(r)* (Šimundić, 1971: 153) „throw!“). Also, in regard to the development of the unrelated (originally Croatian) word *deh*, we cite examples from the phonological systems of several dialects (for example, from the dialect of Dubrovnik, which is very important to us here due to its retention of the *h* sound [cf. Lisac, 2003: 107]), which directly enable us to reconstruct how the word *deh* originated. Some of the data used for revealing the Croatian origin of *deh* is taken from the author's doctoral thesis (Velić, 2023), which offers crucial examples that most directly explain the possible phonological origin of *deh* (while the data from the aforementioned dialect of Dubrovnik we deem as supportive and not most directly linked, i.e. secondary to those found in (*ibid.*) [but phonologically also important]). The examples from the doctoral thesis are excerpted from recordings of two native speakers of the Knin dialect (of the areas of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin in Kninska krajina, all a part of the City of Knin administratively – namely, of Vrpolje and Kninsko Polje in this case), which were recorded and written down according to the Croatian dialectological standards. Overall, thirty-six informants (speakers) were recorded and studied (12 for each of the three settlements, 4 for every generation [young, middle, old], cf. *ibid.*: 6), and the examples that are of interest to us here (e.g. *dä* (*ibid.*: 31) „yes“ with front [ä], and (all interjections) *a(h)*, *e(h)*, *i(h)*, *o(h)*, *u(h)* and the particle (a variant of *dä* „yes“) *da(h)* – those data remain on recordings and are not in the author's doctoral thesis, as more common are the forms without *h* (*a*, *e* etc.), which are a part of the analysis there on various occasions and intimately familiar to the author, who is himself a native speaker of the dialect of Vrpolje¹.

The linguistic sources cited in the present analysis of the origin of the particle *de* offer insights into deeper developments concerning our matter: 1) on the nature of the development of the *yat* into *i* in the Southern Čakavian dialect (Lisac, 2003) so as to compare that development to a possible closing of [e] in the now dialectal Turkish *hayde* into [i] in the contemporary Turkish *ha(y)di* „come on“ as used in modern Standard Turkish; and 2) to understand the development of Turkish

¹ Excerpts of some of the recordings from that research are found in the Dialect samples section (Velić, 2023: 179–189). As we have already stated and pointed out earlier in this text, those excerpts adduced there are of no concern to us, since the recordings which were used for our examples are unrelated, i.e. separate from those cited in *ibid.*

grammar (cf. Čaušević, 1996) with respect to inherited features (the participial constructions and the absence of conjunctions in the earliest system) and borrowings (the conjunctions were borrowed in the later system, hence the example *ki* „that (relative pronoun/conjunction),“ which is of Persian origin [*ibid.*: 501]) so as to offer an accurate description of the peculiarity of the development of the Turkish adjectives *önceki* ‘former’ and *sonraki* ‘next, subsequent’ and a minimal possibility of phonological analogy (but still to be counted with) where the younger form *ha(y)di* may have taken the ending [i] from these two adjectives simply due to the similarity in the ending of all three adduced words, which is the vowel <-i> (although, the very plausible closing [e] > [i] in *hayde* > *ha(y)di* [from 1] was the much more likely development). Methodologically, we first deal with the origin of the particle *de*, showing it to be uniformly Turkish and how it was borrowed into Croatian by comparing the Turkish and Croatian examples. Then, we address two possible reasons why the now dialectal particle *hayde* (its second element similar to *de*) may have evolved into modern standard Turkish *ha(y)di*. Afterwards, we analyse the particle *deh* and show it to be of Croatian descent by comparing it to the data from the modern Knin dialect (i.e. of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin) which, as already stated, shows two features (found in *dä* „yes“ and the interjection *ah*) directly linked to the origins of *deh*, and also adducing some data from Croatian dialects pertaining to the retention of *h* or its loss (where the wider Dubrovnik area is conservative in its retention (Lisac, 2003: 107)). Although *deh* is now a part of the language of a bygone era, (Skok [1971: 386] says that it was used by Čakavian speakers from the 16th to 18th century] the two types of examples from the Knin dialect (which is today Štokavian, but historically Čakavian [Velić, 2023: 22]) offer a direct and simple insight into the formation of *deh* on the phonological level, thus formally showing connection to the Čakavian dialects of the 16th-18th centuries.

2. The particle *de*

The particle *de* „come on“ is not very common in Croatian although it belongs to the standard language according to some contemporary grammars: Barić et al. (1997: 283) and Silić and Pranjković (2005: 256) both adduce the word, though they differ in its categorisation. That is, it is not always a particle, although the author here views it as such. It is a rare and traditional loan word with an adhortative function, used in examples such as *De reci mi što imaš* ‘Please, tell me what you have’. Since it is adhortative, as a suffix it is always found with imperative forms, usually the 2nd Sg., e.g. (Imotski-Bekija) *bácidē(r)* ‘throw!’ (Šimundić, 1971: 153). This usage overlaps with that of the verb *dati* ‘to give’, as found in some dialects (cf. *De mi to!* ‘Give it to me!’ [my data]), and is

perceived to be nonstandard. Likewise, some literary works employ it as a suffix (e.g. *stander* „stop!“ [Raos, 1971: 13]). We find (*ibid.*) two words (probably an orthographic literary convention) in *reci der* ‘tell (me)’

²), and in the same form it is also found in some dialects (e.g. in Imotska krajina and Bekija in forms such as *bácidē(r)* ‘throw!’ [Šimundić, 1971: 153]), although that use is also nonstandard (this use is not found in the grammars cited [Barić et al., 1997; Silić and Pranjkić, 2005]).

The origin of the particle, on the other hand, has been a subject in two major sources concerning the Croatian language (ARj., 1884–1886: 323; Skok, 1971: 386), which differ on some points but offer the same etymology. In ARj. (1884–1886: 323) it is said to be of Croatian origin, stemming from the verb *děti* ‘to put’, namely, in its Ekavian form, likely **dej* > *de*, which is (or should be – we will challenge this view to a degree later) an apocopated (Slavic) imperative form in 2nd Sg. On the other hand, in traditional songs largely sung in Turkish (more precisely, with significant borrowings from Turkish) its origin is Turkish (*ibid.*), namely from the particle *de* and prepositionally *dé*, with a different origin than *de*, which is postpositional (though both Turkish particles yielded a single reflex in Croatian *de*, which continues to mirror the use of the two Turkish particles), as we will discuss later. On the latter use when the origin is Turkish, in Turkish-influenced songs in Slavic (Stefanović Karadžić’s Serbian songs, see below), we

² The author casually observes that the different marking (orthography) and pronunciation may be intentional in that novel, and that it is a part of the characters’ traits: the more conservative form *reci der* with unelided *-i#* is used by a priest in the work, and the priests were traditionally more educated than an average man in a community. Likewise, the merged *stander*, which is less conservative due to the elision of *-i* (< **stani der*), is used by Matan, the protagonist, who is less well-mannered than the priest who appears around at the same time in the plot. The writing *reci der* (the priest’s example) is probably a mere orthographic convention, as the pronunciation is expected to be like *stander*, with only the verb being stressed ([*rècidēr*]): to such pronunciation point the examples given for Imotski and Bekija (it is also the dialect of Raos’s *Prosjaci i sinovi* in the dialogues, or an influence for the dialogues in the work) by Šimundić (1971: 153–154), where we find the merged spelling, cf. *bácidē(r)* ‘throw!’ (in that dialect (*ibid.*) we find also such forms as *pódidē(r)mote* „let us go, (col.) let’s go“, also with stress solely on the verbal stem but with *-dē(r)-* carved between the root (*póđi-*) and the verbal ending (*-mo-*), with emphatic *-te* (originally the ending of the 2nd Pl. imp.)). Šimundić’s description of the dialects of Imotski and Bekija was done at the same time as the edition of Raos’s *Prosjaci i sinovi* that we consult here (both published in 1971), which reinforces the single stress on the verb in both *reci der* and *stander*, hence we may read these examples as [*rècidēr, ständēr*], with [i] still retained in [*rècidēr*] as a mark of the priest’s learnedness as opposed to its loss in [*ständēr*], indicating the lesser manners of Matan’s. Velić (2023: 158) also gives only the accent (= the stress) on the root (= the verb) all the examples (e.g. *viđ’dē* „go and take a look“) for the dialects of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin (all parts of the City of Knin) in Kninska krajina, which supports the verb-only stress in Imotski-Bekija more indirectly.

have the example (*ibid.*; the translation of the following sequence is left to a more versed Turkish speaker, as we state later in a footnote): *De bejan de jorgan de šalić de vesić de vele da noće* (in *Srpske narodne pjesme iz Hercegovine*, collected by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, as stated in [*ibid.*]). Such a view is somewhat altered by Skok (1971: 370, 386), who thinks that it is originally a demonstrative particle (cf. demonstrative root in PIE *d^(h)-) when it is found as the suffix *-da* in examples like *nuda*, *odida*, in the same way as *da* ‘yes’ or ‘that’ (conjunction), which is analysed by Matasović (2008: 249) as an old (Indo-European) aorist form of *dati*. We agree with Matasović’s etymology and view this *-da* as being of Croatian origin and built after particles like *te* (all Skok, 1971: 386) ‘and, then, so’. It is partly of Turkish origin in examples grammatically resembling Turkish ones, where one finds *de* instead of *da*, i.e. in Eastern Štokavian dialects (spoken almost exclusively by Serbs and Montenegrins, my note): for Serbian, Skok adduces (*ibid.*) the form *znamde* ‘I know’. *-Dē(r)* is also found in the Western Štokavian dialects (spoken exclusively by Croats and Bosniaks, my note), e.g. (Imotski-Bekija) *bácidē(r)* ‘throw!’ (2nd Sg. imp. [Šimundić, 1971: 153]). The Eastern Štokavian dialects have undergone more Turkish influence due to the longer presence of Ottoman rule in what is now the Republic of Serbia. There we also encounter examples like *hàjde* < Tur. *hayde*, which is a Turkish Balkanism (cf. *ibid.*). In contrast to the Eastern Štokavian dialects that have borrowed *hàjde*, some Croatian dialects preserve the inherited Croatian *odi* ‘come!’ (2nd Sg.), which is normal in the Kajkavian (in part Štokavised, particularly with regard to inflection) dialect of Zagreb, e.g. *odi vidi* ‘go and see, take a look, go and take a look’ – own data) or *hodi* = *odi* (rarer than *odi* in Zagreb, e.g. *hodi sim* ‘come this way, come with me, come here [hither]’ – also own data), both words with the same meaning as *hàjde* or *(h)àj(de)*, which also took root in some Western Štokavian dialects such as that of Knin (Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin, there as younger *ài* [Velić, 2023: 63]), e.g. *ài dóđi* ‘please, come; come’ (the example is new since *ài* appears with all verbs in 2nd Sg. and occasionally 2nd Pl. imperative – own data). Regarding the duality of *de* and *da* in the examples analysed (types *odida* [Croatian] and *znamde* [Serbian] – we add [Imotski-Bekija, Croatian *bácidē(r)*; Šimundić, 1971: 153] to complement the Serbian example *znamde*, with *-dē(r)* as a reflex also in Croatian), Skok (1971: 386) himself stresses at one point that *de/da* is of both native and foreign origin. At this point, we adhere to Skok’s definitions, since he merged the use and the etymology more accurately for the sake of brevity of the paragraphs, which is a departure from *Rječnik...*, where (2., 4.) *de* and *deh* are separate items. However, we oppose his views for reasons that we shall present later: we think of it (i.e. the particle, or its form *de* and its variant *da*) as solely a Turkish borrowing. This is because the Turkish postpositional use (e.g. *Ben de geldim* [Čaušević, 1996: 425] ‘I, too, have come’) also had two forms (*de*, *da*) according to a trivial rule of vowel harmony in that language, and prepositionally

had the form *dé* of different origin (see later on the origin; e.g. *Dé bir hikâye söyle*. [DS, 1993: 1391] ‘Come on, tell me a story’). Both exemplified uses (prepositional and postpositional) were borrowed into Croatian: cf. the difference between the prepositional *De reci mi što imaš*. ‘Come on, tell me what you have’ and the postpositional (Imotski-Bekija) *bácidē(r)* ‘throw!’ (Šimundić, 1971: 153). Furthermore, Turkish *de/dé* was borrowed into Croatian as a single *de*, although in prepositional use it remains stressed in Croatian as it was in Turkish, cf. *De reci mi...* << Tur. stressed *dé*, while *-dē(r)* in (Imotski-Bekija, *ibid.*) *bácidē(r)* ‘throw!’ << Tur. *de*. Also, Turkish *da* (a variant of *de*) is formally a source of *-da* in Skok's (1971: 386) type *nuda, odida* – typical (Skok's words) of Western Štokavian dialects, which are spoken by Croats alongside Bosniaks, which is important in this context since we are analysing the use of *de* in Croatian. As is clear from this brief analysis, all of Skok's (and ARj.'s – see later for more on the reflexes of the supposed imperative **děj*) examples of the use of *-de* and *-da* alongside the prepositional *de* (type *De reci mi...*) are entirely rendered as Turkish in origin: both lexically (all forms are Turkish borrowings) and syntactically (the Turkish prepositional and postpositional uses are also borrowed). However, the roots to which the original particle is attached (e.g. *odi-* in *odida* and Serbian *znam-* [the word is also a normal part of Croatian and the only current way to say ‘I know’ in the literary language

³] in *znamde*) remain fully of Slavic origin, so the root in e.g. (Imotski-Bekija) *bácidē(r)* ‘throw!’ (Šimundić, 1971: 153) remains of Croatian origin, whilst the suffixed *-dē(r)* is originally Turkish (<< Tur. *de*). In this respect Skok (1971: 386) was right, as in Serbian *znamde* he also separated the element *znam-* as inherently Slavic (in this case, Serbian), and the suffixed *-de* as correctly Turkish by borrowing. Our revelation of *de/-dē(r)/-da* as reflexes of the Turkish *dé/de*, with *da* in contrast to the former etymologies offered by Skok and ARj., who each saw some uses of *de* – spelled phonetically to denote a common element throughout, originally Turkish as we have shown – as Croatian and some as Turkish, is a departure from both original approaches (Skok's and, especially, ARj.'s). We

³ It holds true for the dialects of the biggest cities (Zagreb, Split, Rijeka and Osijek) and virtually for everyday use everywhere. In smaller towns and villages which do not have a very mixed population or have not suffered a considerable influence from other dialects where, among other things, *znâm* ‘I know’ (also in the same sense *znâti* ‘to know’) is the only form (as in most of the Štokavian – my data through long-term exposure and studying various dialects, and likewise by comparison to the Kajkavian and the Čakavian, where the dialects that are more diverse or archaic in this respect lexically are in better percentage within the Kajkavian and the Čakavian as a whole), one may find the reflex of the Common Slavonic **věmь* ‘I know’, which was also current in older Croatian texts until roughly the 16th century in Dalmatia (cf. *vite* 2nd Pl. present – own data) and Dubrovnik (cf. *vijem* 1st Sg. present – own data).

would, however, use Skok's examples in the discussion that follows alongside others (Šimundić, 1971; Čaušević, 1996) for the sake of a full comparison while analysing the similarity between the original Turkish and the borrowed Croatian uses of the particle. We shall, to a degree, side with Skok while depicting the origin of another, similar word – the interjection *deh* ‘come on’. First, we address the Turkish roots of the modern Croatian word *de*, and then, the Croatian (sic!) descent of *deh* (formerly depicted as if it were a possible derivative of *de* in Skok's (1971: 386) definition, hence wrongfully Turkish, which we shall reject in the part of the analysis that is centred upon it – *de* is Turkish, but the (bygone) *deh* is Croatian by origin).

Firstly, let us clarify the examples that will be the subject of our discussion. The particle *de/-dē(r)* is undoubtedly a Turkish loanword, as is also the alternative form *-da*, found only as a suffix (as in *nuda*, *odida* [*ibid.*], both meaning ‘come on’ or ‘go’). The particle or conjunction *da* (‘yes; that’) is another completely different word both etymologically and syntactically, as shown by Matasović (2008: 249) – it is an aorist form (3rd Sg.) of the verb *dāti* ‘to give’ and therefore of Croatian descent, well attested in all historical texts. Semantically, the origin from *dāti* ‘to give’ can be more deeply understood or reconstructed by means of the example *Vidim da radiš* ‘I see that you are working/busy’, which can be interpreted as ‘I see, given (= past participle of ‘to give’) that you are working/busy’, wherefore we adhere to Matasović's etymology.⁴ From now on,

⁴ The aorist tense is still widely used in grammars and in some dialects, e.g. Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin within the City of Knin (Velić, 2023), Bitelić in Hrvace (Čurković, 2014), the coast of Makarska (Kurtović Budja, 2009). In the dialects of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and Knin, the aorist is used mostly in fixed expressions or uses (although Velić does not state it, it is seen in the same type of most of the examples – the author confirms the distribution in this text). It is also rarer in the plural than in the singular in these dialects (almost all examples are in singular and only some verbs are counted in the plural as well – confirmed in this text). In the dialect of Bitelić, some verbs lack plural aorist forms, whereas on the coast of Makarska, it only occurs in 3rd Sg. The aorist tense is rare in contemporary Standard Croatian but was more common before. Nowadays, rare forms are frequent to a limited degree. In literature, the form *reče* ‘he/she said’ is 3rd Sg. from *reći* ‘to say, to tell’ (formally also 2nd Sg. since it is always 2nd=3rd Sg. in the aorist, whereas in the example „*Tko si ti? “reče Ivan* “ ‘Who are you?’” said John’ the form is always 3rd Sg. since it is a norm in the objective narration). We also find the colloquial, all-paradigmatic *bi* in (for example) *Ja bi to!* ‘I want this!’ which is originally a 3rd Sg. aorist form of *biti* ‘to be’ (the standard use shows different forms, also in the aorist: *bih – bi – bi* [sg.]; *bismo – biste – bi* [Pl.]), and some speakers in colloquial use have *reko(h)* ‘as I said’, also from *reći* ‘to say, to tell’ and in the 1st Sg. aorist). Since the aorist was more present/current in bygone eras (it is a common Slavic tense in origin), it is no wonder that

we are not dealing with the origin of the Croatian word *da* ‘yes; that’ (conj.), since this analysis focuses on the Turkish loanwords *de/-dē(r)/-da*.

Before further analysis, let us analyse the law of vowel harmony in one of the Turkish uses of the variant postpositional particle *da*. The law of vowel harmony, which affects Turkish and has never operated in Proto-Indo-European and Indo-European languages, is important for understanding the reflexes of the Turkish particle in Croatian when we analyse the uses of the particle and how it was borrowed into Croatian. The vowel harmony is a law that orders vowels of both the root and the endings (inflectional and compositional) to be of the same type of articulation. It also appears in neighbouring Hungarian, e.g. *bolt* ‘a shop’ N. sg. – *bolt-ok* ‘shops’ N. Pl. (i.e. pl. *-ok* if there is [o] in the root) but *kez* ‘a hand’ N. Sg. – *kez-ek* ‘hands’ N. Pl. (i.e. pl. *-ek* if there is [e] in the root). Since Croatian is an Indo-European language (within the Slavic branch of the Balto-Slavic sub-family), the two forms *de/-dē(r)* and *-da* do not conform to vowel harmony in Croatian (as seen by what roots they are suffixed to; see below) since it never took place in any Indo-European language. Instead, the lack of correspondence of the Croatian forms when compared to the Turkish ones is a genetical one (unrelated languages that never shared the phenomenon of vowel harmony) and the result of borrowing, since through borrowing a word always changes its form or function and is never the same as in the language from which it was borrowed. This vowel harmony is seen in Turkish examples like cf. *Gezmiş, görmüş, okumuş da* (Čaušević, 1996: 425) ‘He was travelling, was able to see and even read’. In this Turkish example, *da* is a phonological variant of *de*, with *-a* < *-e*

the syntactical conjunction *da* ‘that’ (or as particle ‘yes’) was an aorist form in origin, since it is well-known that some frequent words (in this case, a conjunction/particle) keep ancient etymologies and fully or partly abolished grammatical categories (in this case, the aorist tense). Since we hold that *da* is an old aorist form with semantical evolution ‘he/she/it gave > given > that (conj.)’, Skok’s (1971: 370) viewing of it as a PIE demonstrative (cf. PIE *d^h- in demonstrative meaning, found in Slavic [Croatian] in forms like *ovdje*, with *-dje* < **-dē* [younger] << **-de*, with **-d-* < PIE **d^h-*) must be rejected because it is semantically impossible that something that is originally demonstrative should have evolved into a root meaning ‘to give’. Besides, the root in Croatian (Slavic) *dāti* ‘to give’, *da-*, is found in other Indo-European languages (e.g. Latin *dāre* ‘to give’, Greek *δίδομι* ‘I give’) and was thus inherited from Proto-Indo-European, which thus had that root already (PIE **deh₃-*). Also, morphologically speaking the Croatian *da* ‘yes; that’ (conj.) is fully expected to be an aorist form (3rd Sg.) of *dāti* ‘to give’, i.e. it is a form that, if aorist by origin, suffered no analogy: namely, it has remained the same in the aorist in the modern Standard Croatian, where next to *dā* we may encounter a younger aorist form *dāde* (both 2nd/3rd Sg. aorist meaning ‘he/she/it gave’), with the second *-d-* element originally from the present tense, where it is old (Proto-Indo-European by reduplication) in *dādū* ‘they give’ whence, by later innovations in the present conjugation, it had spread to other persons, so that the second *-d-* is younger in *dādēm* ‘I give’ (the usual form is *dām* ‘I give’, which represents the older form of the 1st Sg. pres. diachronically).

based on the vowel harmony: the preceding vowel [u] in the suffix *-muş* is a velar vowel (*ibid.*: 9), and velar vowels require the suffix vowel to be *-a* (*da*) while it is otherwise an unaltered *-e* (in the original *de*) to conform to the vowel harmony. To put it briefly, depending on what vowel is in the root, the vowel in the particle is either *-e* (*de*) or *-a* (*da*). Henceforth, *da* in the preceding example is a positional (phonological) variant of the original *de*, so, judging by the analysed example, both *da* and the original unaltered *de* are of Turkish descent in Croatian. Also, Turkish employs derivation from *de*, having, for example, *haydi* and dialectal *hayde* ‘come on, go’ (and *dihe* ‘come on’ [rare nowadays rare]) as compounds. The origin of the Turkish *de* (stressed *dé*) itself is different and twofold, and it is one way that the stressed and only prepositionally used *dé* came to be, and in another one how the unstressed and only postpositionally used *de* and *da* evolved. The form *dihe* arises from the stressed *dé* in *Derleme sözlüğü* (DS, 1993: 1484). On the other hand, the unstressed *de* comes from an altogether different particle *dahi* < *taki/daki* (Čaušević, 1996: 422). The different origin of the two particles (*dé* and *de/da*) fully mirrors their uses: *dé* is used only prepositionally (cf. *Dé bir hikâye söyle* [DS, 1993: 1391]) and is a particle, while *de* is used postpositionally as a conjunction and particle, e.g. *Ben de geldim* (Čaušević, 1996: 425). To examine closely how the Turkish *de* (*dé*) came to be borrowed in Croatian, we shall consider other examples of its use in Turkish for a more precise explanation. The use in Turkish is partially similar to the one in Croatian. Concerning Turkish *dé* and borrowed Croatian *de* in the type *De reci mi...*, it is prepositional in both languages, e.g. in the clearly prepositional use in *Dé bir hikâye söyle*. (DS, 1993: 1391) ‘Come on, tell me a story’. ~ *De reci mi što imaš*. ‘Come on, tell me what you have’. Regarding Turkish *de/da* and borrowed Croatian *-dē(r)*, *-da* (quoting them for Croatian with a comma since they are not free alternating variants, as there is no vowel harmony in Croatian) the use is postpositional, e.g. *Ben de geldim*. (Čaušević, 1996: 425) ‘I, too, have come’. ~ (Imotski-Bekija) *bácidē(r)* ‘throw!’ (Šimundić, 1971: 153). As we can see in these examples of the postpositional use, while Turkish *de/da* is not a suffix, as it is not attached to the root as if it were an ordinary ending (= suffix, e.g. *karlı* ‘snowy, covered in snow’ from *kar* ‘snow’ + *-lı* [altered by vowel harmony from the original *-li*]), in Croatian dialects it is a formational ending and thus different from the original Turkish use, e.g. *bácidē(r)* ‘throw!’ in Imotski-Bekija dialects [Šimundić, 1971: 153]). Neither use (the prepositional or the postpositional one) in either Turkish or Croatian has become a part of inflection, i.e. the particle is nowhere an inflectional ending (or alternatively known as a case ending). This postpositional use in the Croatian dialectal (Imotski-Bekija) *bácidē(r)* (*ibid.*) is positionally directly borrowed from the aforementioned Turkish postpositional use (*Ben de geldim.*) as cited by Čaušević (1996: 425). However, the analysed dialectal Croatian use in *bácidē(r)* is also a descendant (borrowing) of another use in Turkish that is also grammatically postpositional but slightly more complex in

that it is followed by another verbal form. That particular use in Turkish (this use being a second source for the Croatian *bácidē(r)*, the first one directly being the Turkish use of the type *Ben de geldim* as previously analysed) we find in the sentences like *Gelsin de yapsın!* (*ibid.*) ‘Dare he not do this!’, where two verbs separated by the particle can be found with the first one being the head, thus Turk. *ben de ~ gelsin de* >> Cro. *báci-dē(r)*. The construction in the example *Gelsin de yapsın!* contains a postpositional *de* after an imperative (2nd Sg.), that is, in the same position syntactically (= postpositional) as in *Ben de geldim.*, where it is found after a pronoun (*ben* ‘I’) and not after the imperative. Neither use corresponds entirely to the Croatian dialectal use of this kind with respect to the word-class being used: Croatian (all Knin, own data) uses examples such as *Dóđđē vâmo!* ‘Come here (= hither)!’ *Pògledājdē sòbu čàs* ‘Take a look at your room for a while’ and *Dâjdē, ùzm’đē mǎlo!* ‘Come on, take some!’ (with the grammaticalised *dâjdē* ‘come on’ before another imperative, cf. (Velić, 2023: 158) translation ‘učini to!’ = (here) ‘come on!’). Although the postpositional use has been borrowed from Turkish into Croatian, since the languages are unrelated and typologically different very (Croatian is an inflective language, while Turkish is agglutinative), one cannot expect the same word classes to be used in the comparable constructions in both languages (besides, when something is borrowed from one language into another, it is adopted in the system of the latter, hence also the differences). However, both postpositional uses in Turkish (*Ben de geldim.*, *Gelsin de yapsın.*) have allowed the Croatian examples to gain ground, hence the various word classes in such examples from the Knin dialect as formerly cited. Note that in these examples from Knin *-dē* is always used without the element *-r*, which never appears in the dialect of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin (cf. *ibid.*) and differs from the example (Imotski-Bekija) *bácidē(r)*, where it can be found (but is also dropped). The recently analysed examples in Croatian and Turkish were of postpositional *de*. Such uses are all dialectal in Croatian, while the contemporary standard (though rare) already analysed prepositional use in *De reci mi što imaš* ‘Please, tell me what you have’ stems from the single prepositional use in the analysed Turkish example *Dé bir hikâye söyle* (DS, 1993: 1391) ‘Come on, tell me a story’. In contrast to the differences in postpositional uses in both languages, where there is no symmetry in the word classes used, the prepositional use in both languages share a verb (Cro. *reći* 2nd Sg. imp. ‘say!, tell!’ ~ Turk. *söyle* 2nd Sg. imp. ‘say, tell!’). This partially explains why the prepositional use is more faithfully borrowed into Croatian than the postpositional uses. On the other hand, apart from the two postpositional Turkish uses analysed (1) *Ben de geldim* and 2) *Gelsin de yapsın.*), the third case of the postpositional and the functionally emphatic use in Turkish *Gezmiş, görmüş, okumuş da* (Čaušević, 1996: 425) ‘He was travelling, was able to see and even read’ did not leave any mark on the use of *de* in Croatian. But the example *znamde* that Skok (1971: 386) adduces for

Serbian dialects may stem from the analysed use in Turkish, since *de* is formally attached to a verb in that example (*znamde* < *znam* + *de*), in the same manner whereby it follows the last verb in the Turkish example *Gezmiş, görmüş, okumuş da*, indicating the same type of use in both languages (Turkish and, via borrowing, Serbian in this case). Apart from the analysed uses of *de* that were adapted into Croatian (and, in the case of *znamde*, into Serbian) in a prepositional or postpositional form, a derivative in Croatian *deder* ‘come on, hey’ preserves a trace of the prepositional use, since it can be analysed as *DE-der*, where one encounters a fossilised *de*. These types of uses analysed for Croatian are the ones that Skok adduces in a briefer statement (he also adduces variants of some forms, e.g. *nekadire* ‘may it, let it...’ by Hektorović (Skok, 1971: 386), containing the element *-dire* ~ *-de(r)*, if it indeed is the same element⁵), next to a distinctively Serbian one (the formerly analysed *znamde* ‘I know’, as found in Kosovo and Metohija). As to why Skok did not see the *de* element as being of Turkish origin in all uses, it was perhaps compounds of Slavic origin like *ovdje/ovde* ‘here’ (the latter *ovde* now dialectal and being used historically; < **ovdē/*ovde*, with *ovdje* < **ovdē* containing the *yat* and *ovde* < **ovde*, with a short [e] originally and not originally the *yat*⁶ – both variants of the suffix (**-de* and **-dē*) were possible historically and were of strikingly demonstrative [adverbial and anaphoric] nature, and are directly comparable to the Sanskrit [= inherited Proto-Indo-European and in no way borrowed recently from Turkish] *-dā* in *ekadā* ‘once’

⁵ Reading the Turkish borrowing *-dē(r)* into the example *nekadire* is doubtful for three reasons: 1) the Čakavian texts of the 16th century have very few Turkish borrowings, although the quotations in ARj. (see footnote 10 for more detail) show that earlier in the 15th and 16th centuries Džore Držić (a Štokavian poet from Dubrovnik) and Marko Marulić (a Čakavian poet from Split) already had or employed Turkish prepositional *de* in their idioms, and 2) modern dialects (e.g. Imotski-Bekija with *bācidē(r)* ‘throw!’ [Šimundić, 1971: 153] have younger *-r*, while older stages also had *-re* in native words that contain that element (to my memory, the ancestors of the Croats in Molise employed the form *nikadare* ‘never’ in a document, the name of which I have forgotten) and 3) the first element (*neka-* ‘may, let it be’) and the *-re* itself, if it is from an older **že* as in e.g. Cro. *također* ‘as well, also, too’ (*-r* < *-re* < **že*), is also a Slavic element, which raises the possibility that the remaining *-di-* is a separate element and not a variant or an older form of the modern *-dē-* in *-dē(r)-*, though the particle *de* itself was already present in the idioms of Držić and Marulić, who wrote earlier than Hektorović, whose example is *nekadire*.

⁶ In some Croatian dialects, the suffixed *-de* is long in adverbs, e.g. *odāvdē* ‘from here’ in the dialect of Knin (my data). There one perhaps finds a case of influence from the Turkish particle *de*, usually with a long vowel (cf. *dōđīdē* ‘please, come here’ – own data, and similar forms in the imperative in Velić [2023: 158–159]) on the original adverbial *-de*, which is originally short. It may not be the only influence, as many other native adverbs, such as *vīšē* ‘more’, *bōljē* ‘better’ (compare *īnāče* ‘otherwise’, originally with a short vowel), may have contributed on a phonological level, themselves undergoing a phonological alteration before that.

from *ekas* ‘one’⁷), that led him to think of the (here provenly borrowed from Turkish) particle *de* as preserving the same demonstrative root as the originally Slavic (Croatian) suffixed **-de* (> now dialectal *-de* in *ovde*). Similarly, he may have seen the element *-da* in *nuda*, *odida* (also provenly from Turkish *da*, a variant of *de* by means of vowel harmony) as Croatian, linking it to Croatian *da* ‘yes; that’ (conj.), which Skok in another instance (*ibid.*: 370) indeed sees as an old demonstrative root, although we side with Matasović’s (2008) etymology as an aorist form of *dàti* ‘to give’ (this word is definitely Croatian). Thus, at this point we may observe that it may likely be the case that Skok confused the two sets of elements: 1) the Slavic (> Croatian, now dialectal) *-de* in *ovde* with the Turkish borrowing *-de* in *znamde*, as well as 2) the Slavic (> Croatian) *da* ‘yes; that (conj.)’ with the Turkish borrowing *-da* in *nuda*, *odida*. In addition to formerly showing that the variously attested adhortative particle *de/-dē(r)/-da* in Croatian dialects is Turkish by borrowing everywhere, we have shown that there are indeed similar elements in Slavic phonologically: dial. *-de* in *ovde* (confusion with the Turkish borrowing *de/-dē(r)*) and the unrelated *da* ‘yes; that’ (conj.; confusion with the Turkish borrowing *-da*). It is striking that these ‘false friends’ are very different syntactically, and neither of the two Croatian elements (*-de* in dial. *ovde*, *da*) is in any way adhortative, whilst the originally Turkish *de/-dē(r)/-da* has an almost prototypical adhortative meaning. A potential issue remains in the fact that Croatian dialectal *-de* in *ovde* and the Turkish borrowing *-de* in Serbian *znamde* look alike, since they share the position in the word, but by pointing out that this Serbian example was borrowed from the Turkish postpositional use of *de* of the type *gelsin de*, where both main words are verbal forms (*znam-* and *gelsin*), we have now clearly demonstrated that both the *-de* element and its feasible attachment to a verb were borrowed from Turkish in Serbian *znamde*. Moreover, the Croatian (Slavic) suffix **-de* (now in dialectal *ovde*), which is now unproductive, had never existed as a word on its own throughout the history of Croatian (see Gluhak, 1993: 227 for the etymology of a similar word, *gdjě*), while the postpositional *de/da* is still written as a separate

⁷ I accept the coexistence of both suffixes in Slavic (**-de* and **-dē* – Gluhak [1993: 227] sees **-de* as the original form for *-djě* in *gdjě*, and so **-de* is older in that word) since I have encountered it in one or two sources on the history of Croatian that I read when I was studying an unrelated topic. I am now regrettably now unable to remember these sources, but as a proof of the existence of both suffixes are the forms *ovdi* and *ovde*, that appear historically in predominantly Ikavian dialects (also by clear remembering) as they do in the modern Neo-Štokavian Ikavian dialects of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin (within the City of Knin administratively) in Kninska krajina (Velić, 2023: 23), predominantly as *ó(v)de*, which contains the reflex of **-de*, or as *ódí* or *óvdi* (where < **-dē*).

word in modern Turkish. This also indicates that Croatian borrowed this *de/da* from Turkish through language contact.

Let us now turn to *Rječnik...* (ARj., 1884–1886: 323), which on the origin of *de* (proven by us to be a Turkish loanword everywhere) accepts an earlier (Jagić's) etymology as an imperative (2nd Sg.) from the verb *děti* 'to put'. It is decisively deemed untrue here for three reasons: 1) the original imperative, possibly **děj* (with our marking of *yat* as <ě>), should have produced various modern reflexes (putatively ***dej*, ***dij*) instead of only one (if *de* is considered a reflex of it in an Ekavian form, which we dismiss), 2) there is neither historically nor dialectally any such widespread loss of *-j* in the 2nd Sg. imperative that could have produced the rather widespread form *de* < **dej* in the modern dialects (to the author's knowledge, an occasional loss of *-j* was attested in the older literature of Dubrovnik for 2nd Sg. imperatives in *-aj*) and 3) the word is not attested in Kajkavian dialects, which are originally all Ekavian, and since most Croatian Štokavian dialects (and *de* is attested predominantly in Štokavian dialects, although it was also present in Marulić's Čakavian idiom, cf. *Rječnik...* under 2. *de*) are Ikavian or (I)jekavian, one would only expect a form ***dij* as a reflex of the apparent imperative **děj*, as *i* from the *yat* is a rule in some positions (e.g. before [j] in *smijeh* 'laughter' but *smijati se* 'to laugh') even in (I)jekavian dialects (and therefore in the Standard Croatian), while it is a completely expected reflex everywhere in Ikavian dialects, and so we would expect ***dij* there as well. Therefore, based on these three observations, we fully reject Jagić's etymology that sees *de* as an old (apocopated) imperative form of *děti* (again, with our marking of *yat* as <ě>), while previously we also proved that *de* was of Turkish origin in all its uses, thus correcting Skok's etymologies. At this point, we see that the particle *de*, the uses of which are of the types *De reci mi što imaš*, dialectal *bácidē(r)* and its variant, purely suffixed form *-da* (e.g. in dialectal *odida*), is undoubtedly borrowed from Turkish, where *de* and *da* alternated postpositionally on account of vowel harmony, but *dé*, which was itself of different origin than *de* and stressed in Turkish, was unaltered prepositionally since vowel harmony was impossible in that position as no word preceded *dé*. We have also demonstrated the Croatian descent of the demonstrative suffix **-de* (today in dialectal *ovde*, with the variant **-dě* that produced the standard word *ovdje*) and the conjunction/particle *da* 'that/yes'), which share no further common ancestry (**-de* is comparable to the Sanskrit demonstrative *-dā* in *ekadā* 'once', whereas *da* is very probably an aorist [3rd Sg.] form of the verb *dāti* 'to give' according to Matasović). To sum up the Turkish origin of the adhortative particle *de* based on all the accounts: 1) the striking similarity in use (prepositional, postpositional) in some examples in Turkish and Croatian points to its having been borrowed into Croatian from Turkish, 2) while the prepositional use has been well adapted (*De reci mi što imaš* 'Please, tell me what

you have' and dialectally [substituting **daj* 'you give' (Sg. imp.)] in *De mi to!* 'Give me that!'), the postpositional use reflects the binarity of Turkish forms per vowel harmony in Turkish (Cro. *-dē(r)*, *-da* phonologically [not by distribution, as Croatian never had vowel harmony in effect] ~ Turk. *de*, *da*) and 3) the prepositional use in Croatian originated from a single prepositional use in Turkish (as in: *Dé bir hikâye söyle* >> *De reci mi što imaš*), while the Croatian postpositional use has a twofold origin in a) the original postpositional Turkish use in *Ben de geldim* and b) from the original postpositional use in Turk. *Gelsin de yapsın!* (where both *ben de* and *gelsin de* are a source of forms [all dialectal] for examples like *bácidē(r)*, *odida*). Note the occasional *-r* in (Imotski-Bekija) *bácidē(r)* after we have stated the etymology of *de*: it is probably a Slavic element, the same one that we find in native Croatian (or Slavic) words *jer* 'because, since, for' and *također* 'also, as well, too', which is in turn from an older form **že*⁸ employing rhotacism (cf. also dialectal Croatian *more* < *može* 'he/she/it can; alright' (3rd Sg. pres.) in numerous Kajkavian, Čakavian and Štokavian dialects for rhotacism).⁹

⁸ The younger *-r* element, which underwent apocopation from an older **-re* < **-že*, can be found in more examples in some rarer standard forms, e.g. the conjunction *te* 'and, so, furthermore; therefore' has a now-archaic, old-fashioned or rare form *ter* that some authors (myself included) still frequently or occasionally use; there is also the old-fashioned *jerbo* 'because, since, for', a compound of *jer* and the fossilised *-bo* (originally a particle with a weak emphatic sense judging by older texts) or in various forms in various dialects, e.g. the Kajkavian verse *Pozabil te ne bum nigdar* 'I will never forget you (thee)', with *-r* in *nigdar* 'never' (cf. also the refined standard form *nigda* and the more usual *nikad(a)* without *-r*); dialects in Dalmatia both nowadays and historically exhibit that element, and here are some examples (some recently collected by authors): *ondar* (= standard *onda*) 'then, so' in the local dialect of Račišće on the island of Korčula (Menac-Mihalić and Celinić, 2012: 187), in popular songs sung in dialects – *nedir* (= standard *negdje*) 'somewhere', *nikor* (= standard *nitko*) 'no-one, none, nobody'; historically (16th c.) *jur* 'already' (substituted by standard *već* in the same sense, but preserved in the rare compound *jurve* 'already', as used by a handful of authors who employ a refined style of writing). The older form *-re* without apocopation, which directly stems from **-že*, is absent from standard Croatian but occurs nowadays and historically in some dialects and texts, e.g. *jêre* 'why' (kin to standard *jer* 'because, since, for' and the synonymous, though old-fashioned *jerbo*) in the dialect of Vrpolje in the City of Knin (Velić [2023] does not adduce that example as it was not attested during that research, but the author has been informed of it on several occasions), *bögarē ti* 'for God's sake' (the pronunciation is from the televised adaptation of Ivan Raos's *Prosjaci i sinovi*); in a document of the ancestors of the Croats in Molise (if I recall correctly) we find the form *nikadare* (modern standard Croatian only has *nikad(a)* in the same sense of 'never').

⁹ To my memory the *-r* may be of Turkish descent in *-dēr* as well, as I believe one of the professors that I contacted on occasion (I will not name him, as I cannot say anything specific about the information, and I believe that the information itself was lost in my e-mail texting) had a source that stated that a similar form with *-r* existed in Turkish. So it is left undecided here, although the *-r* element may also be Slavic at least in part, as found in words such as *također*.

3. The Turkish *haydi*

Now we shall briefly consider the etymology of the word (modern Turkish) *haydi* ‘come on’, since it also has an adhortative meaning and has been borrowed into Croatian as *hàjde* (cf. *hajde* in Albanian, which also reflects Turkish influence). Note that the older form of this Turkish adhortative (*hayde*) seemingly shares its final element (*-de*) with the particle discussed earlier. We can therefore treat Croatian *hàjde* as a compound of postpositional *de* (as does Skok [1971: 386]), much like the Serbian example *znamde*. Croatian *hàjde* is wholly Turkish in origin, though as stated earlier, the language retains other (Slavic) adhortative words with an identical meaning (e.g. *odi* and *hodi* [both 2nd Sg. imp.]). The examples of Croatian *de* (borrowed from Turkish) and Turkish *de* overlap syntactically, so it is obvious that their origin is the same, i.e. a Turkish word.¹⁰ According to Ekrem Čaušević, with whom I have had written correspondence, there is some uncertainty among scholars as to which Turkish word came first: *de* or the derived *ha(y)di* (dial. *hayde* [> Cro. *hàjde*]), or *dihe*. We may ultimately leave this question unanswered, but it is possible to make two assumptions as to how *ha(y)di* (with occasional dropping of *y* in modern Turkish) may have evolved from an earlier *hayde* (if this development indeed came from the latter word). Namely, the development is either a very plausible phonological one (with comparison on a typological basis with a similar development in some Croatian dialects) or a very unlikely (but still possible) morphological one (pertaining to word formation, not declension [i.e. not true morphology]). Phonologically speaking, it is highly possible that [e] in *hayde* suffered a closing into [i], which

¹⁰ For 2. *de* we adduce two examples from *Rječnik...: De, puče kršćanski, pomisli i gledaj* (by Marulić) ‘Come, ye Christian folk, think and watch’, *De kaži, jesi li što sagrišio* (by Džore Držić) ‘Please, speak if you made any sin’. On the other hand, for 4. *de* we adduce one instance of use: *De bejan de jorgan de šalić de vesić de vele da noće* (in *Srpske narodne pjesme iz Hercegovine*, collected by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić), which is left here to a more versed Turcologist for translation due to a seemingly mixed repertoire, consisting of simple Turkish loanwords and derivatives thereof. While the second example is lexically clearly Turkish (cf. Turk. *de*), it is clear that in the two examples of the particles by a Croatian poet and a poet from Dubrovnik the same lexical item is preserved, and we find the prepositional use of the type *De reci mi što imaš* ‘Please, tell me what you have’ in their two adduced examples, and since such use (and the particle *de* in general) we have proven to be Turkish (i.e. a Turkish borrowing), *de* in those two examples from Split and Dubrovnik is the same element and therefore of Turkish origin through a very early borrowing, which reflects a very early Turkish influence upon Croatian (there were some rare instances of Turkish loanwords in 15th c. texts which the author has consulted in passing). In *Rječnik...*, under 2. *de*, we also find examples such as *na de* ‘here’, which syntactically correspond to Skok’s *znamde*, which we have proven to be Turkish in origin (while they are held to be Croatian in *Rječnik...*). Therefore, it seems that *de* is one of the earliest loanwords of Turkish descent in the Croatian language, attested in Držić’s and Marulić’s idioms (one in the 15th c., and the other in the 16th c.).

led to *ha(y)di*. A reviewer of this text also brought to my attention the variant form *hayda*, which evolved from *hayde* through vowel harmony in Turkish. In *hayda*, we see the opening of [e] into [a], whereas in the development *ha(y)di* we see the opposite, i.e. the closing of [e] into [i] in an expected way, although neither the younger *ha(y)di* nor the older *hayde* conforms to the vowel harmony, while the form *hayda* appears to do so. A similar development of an older [e] or an e-type sound (namely, a possible pronunciation of the original *yat*) into [i] took place, according to Lisac (2003: 60), in the Croatian Southern Čakavian dialects, which are today and historically Ikavian. That development occurred in all circumstances in that dialect (except some rare instances of other reflexes of the original *yat*, which are remnants from earlier times when they were more normal or had a more widespread distribution¹¹), rendering the word-final

¹¹ No Čakavian dialect is purely uniform in its evolution of *yat*. This is not just the case for the well-known Central Čakavian dialects (i.e. those around Lika), which have a binary system of *i* and *e* as reflexes of the *yat* according to very precise circumstances. Analogy is also present in such cases due to the complexity of the phonological circumstances involving the original *yat*, and the consonant and vowel that follow it – i.e. the Jakubinskij-Meyer law (see Moguš, 1977 for details and examples). Northern (= Ekavian) and Southern (= Ikavian) Čakavian dialects also have exceptions to the dominant reflex (e.g. Ikavian in Northern Čakavian and Ekavian in Southern Čakavian, see *ibid.*). Also, no Neo-Štokavian Ikavian dialect is purely Ikavian and instead has its non-Ikavian archaisms (cf. Lisac [2008]: 106 for some frequent or normal Ekavisms – not all such examples originally contained the *yat*, but were perceived in some dialects as having had one, the so-called pseudo-Ekavisms, such as *železo* ‘iron’ [*ibid.*]). Rather than being archaisms, some unexpected reflexes may be an innovation resulting from migration. For instance, we find Jekavian words (i.e. where the short and long reflexes of the *yat* are pronounced as [je] [short syllable] and [je:] [long syllable]) in the Neo-Štokavian Ikavian dialects of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin (Velić [2023: 42]). Examples include *rijéka* ‘river’ (and very rarely *rika*, which *ibid.* does not list as attested since it did not show in that research) and frequently *rijêč* ‘word’ (and occasionally *rîč*). In an ongoing research project that commenced after finalising his doctoral thesis, the author discovered, by applying the geographic criterium and comparison with other dialects and historical texts (namely, the so-called „Šibenska molitva“ [„The Prayer from Šibenik“ – the provenance of the text is in fact uncertain; see most recently Kapetanović et al., 2010: 277]), that the dialects of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and Knin (especially the first two, since the reflexes are predominantly Jekavian in Knin, which is a comparatively new trait that is directly linked to the immigration of many speakers of Neo-Štokavian (I)jekavian dialects of Serbian ethnicity; *ibid.*: 20–21, 22–27, 46–49) still keep some old Ekavian examples (mostly in Jekavised forms) from the pre-Ottoman time when these dialects were still Čakavian. We cannot go into detail here, but since Kninska krajina is geographically more northerly than Šibenik and another possible place of origin for „Šibenska molitva“, Bribir in Skradin, thus closer to the area of Gacka which remains Central Čakavian (as seen in the most recent work of Kranjčević, 2019), and since the idiom of „Šibenska molitva“ exhibits some Ekavian examples next to prevailing Ikavian ones, we may hypothesise that the dialects of

development of [e] into [i] in Turkish *ha(y)di* highly plausible. On the morphological level, an analogy after compound adjectives like *önceki* ‘former’ and *sonraki* ‘next, subsequent, following’ seems only formally possible and only by means of a purely phonological analogy, more precisely the similarity of the ending of the three words, which is the vowel *-i*. It is possible that, beside the plausible phonological closing [e] > [i], there was also an analogical spreading of the word-final *-i* from *önceki* and *sonraki* upon *ha(y)di*, making both phenomena (the regular phonological closing and an analogical spreading of *-i*) possible in the evolution of *ha(y)di* from *hayde*. That analogy cannot be fully excluded as all three words end in *-i*. We find a similar case of pure analogy in Croatian (historical, my data – the word used to be common) *dosti* ‘much, a lot’ from an earlier (and now standard) *dosta* ‘much, a lot, enough’ (originally an aorist tense [3rd Sg.] of **dostati*, whose meaning we leave undecided), that could only have been borrowed from the infinitive ending *-ti* as the only omnipresent instance of short *-i* in the language. However, the adjectives *önceki* and *sonraki* in Turkish have a very different development (besides being another word-class, while *ha(y)di* is a particle) since they represent a contamination of the adverbs *önce* ‘before’ and *sonra* ‘after’ with the conjunction (originally Persian, since Turkish originally lacked true conjunctions, cf. Čaušević, 1996: 421, 501) *ki* ‘that’ (relative pronoun/conjunction)’. Since the particle *ha(y)di* and the adjectives *önceki* and *sonraki* are different word-classes and differ by origin, an analogy after the adjectives is rather unlikely in comparison to a highly plausible closing [e] > [i] in the evolution of *hayde* > *ha(y)di*. Nevertheless, we leave it open on the basis that the cited Croatian examples *dosti* and inf. *-ti* were also different categories formerly, and the analogy *dosti* << *dosta* / *-ti* was nevertheless possible, owing possibly to the fact that there were and still are infinitives of a similar structure to the newer *dosti*, such as *bosti* ‘to pierce’, *rasti* ‘to grow’.

4. The interjection *deh*

In contrast to *de* and its variants (*-dē(r)* and *-da*), which we have shown to be Turkish loanwords of twofold origin (1) Cro. *de* << Tur. *dé* and 2) Cro. *-dē(r)*, *-da* << Tur. *de/da*), the interjection *deh*, which Skok (1971: 386) views as a derivative of Turkish *de*, can be very convincingly shown to be of Croatian

Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and Knin were originally Central Čakavian and were Štokavised after the Ottoman conquest of the region in 1522 (cf. Velić, 2023: 19). Moreover, the Ekavian examples (now only a handful and mostly Jekavian but historically Ekavian according to the Jakubinskij-Meyer rule) is rivalled by Ikavian ones since the dialects of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and Knin are now Neo-Štokavian Ikavian (*ibid.*: 22).

descent. Indeed, it neither derives nor borrows its root from this Turkish particle. We may distinguish it here from the various derivatives – *de/-de(r)/-da*, *deder* and *hajde* – based on the collected data. These data, which were collected while transcribing two recordings and are related to the dialects of Knin (Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin within the City of Knin [Velić, 2023]), help us here to view the word *deh* as native Croatian. It is probably by a mere lexical and even semantical (exclamational; in both cases false) similarity to *de* that Skok (1971: 386) pronounced the word to be a blending of *de* and *ah*, or more precisely, made after *ah*, an interjection: therefore *de + (a)h > deh*, where *de* prevails phonologically. Indeed, this etymology depicts the word as Croatian (as does *Rječnik...*, where <h> is secondary [ARj., 1884–1886: 331]), but we shall delve further into its roots to discover the nature of the first component and the word overall. We will, in fact, keep in mind Skok's etymology (*de + ah*) for our account, which is very similar. First, *de-* in *deh*, in our opinion, shares no common part with the Turkish loanword *de* etymologically. Thus, from now on we offer insights into Croatian dialectology.

The word *deh*, purely phonologically speaking, is very simple: it is monosyllabic with a *-h* element that in the current Croatian language appears not as a true phoneme, but as a sigh in words like *ah*, *eh* (all for the dialects of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin in the City of Knin – all such interjections are only present in recordings, so Velić [2023] does not cite them for those dialects). The [h] sound varies in frequency among the dialects. It is well preserved in some, while in others it undergoes various changes. Generally speaking, it is well preserved in Čakavian (Lisac, 2010: 21). Exceptions are the mainland Southern Čakavian dialects, e.g. that of Split, which is more innovative than the dialect of Zadar. The dialect of Zadar preserves *h* in some places (cf. Hraste, 1964: 449), whereas it was already absent in the idiom of Split residents born at the end of the 19th century. For speakers of the Split dialect, we have the examples *odmar* (x3 on one page, with *-r* as in *također* ‘as well, also, too’) < **odma* < **odmah* ‘immediately’, *ijadu austrijски fforîni* (G. pl.) ‘a thousand Austrian *fforini*’ (Vidović, 1992: 30–42), with only the Turkish loanword *harem* (*ibid.*: 35) keeping *h*, which is an import.¹² *H* is also preserved in Kajkavian

¹² That is one of the more striking and earlier Štokavian influences in the traditional Split Čakavian dialect. As Kapović (2004: 101) puts it in regard to the code-shifting of the insular Čakavian speakers around Split towards the Split dialect in the context of Split's influence as a regional centre of Dalmatia: „*Tako se govornici čakavskoga, žele li govoriti standardno, prebacuju na splitski izgovor koji je bliži standardnomu zato što je tradicionalni splitski čakavski*

(Lončarić, 1996: 90 – the exception being the eastern dialects) and generally prone to substitution in most Croatian Štokavian dialects (Lisac, 2003: 20), with the exception of the one spoken in the wider Dubrovnik area (for which there are substituted examples at the end of words, cf. *ibid.*: 107). Skok considers *deh* to be Čakavian, and both he and *Rječnik...* stress that it was used from 16th to 18th century, while *de* is attested by the end of the 15th century. That is plausible even in modern Čakavian, since [h] appears in the final position (i.e. where it is usually absent in Štokavian). The retention of [h] in that position is also visible in the literature (and dialect) of Dubrovnik, for which we adduce the word (also an interjection) *vajmeh* < **vaj* ‘woe, trouble’ + **me* (Acc. of the pronoun *ja* ‘I’). The Čakavian literature and the Štokavian literature of Dubrovnik share a lot of common features (in various degrees throughout their history into the modern day), and the retention of [h] is one of them. Since both words, *deh* and *vajmeh*, are interjections, they are subject to multiple alterations aside from being phonologically conservative, which is why we think that Skok's etymology, where two words are visible in *deh*, may not, in fact, be correct. Since the interjections are prone to changes, being largely exclamatory and thus affective, and since [h] in *deh*, *vajmeh* and *uh* was or is more of a sigh than a „true“ phoneme, understanding *deh* as a contamination of two words (*de*, *ah*), as Skok does, seems too complex for a word that is a mere exclamation and thus unmotivated. If a word is unmotivated, it most probably originated as one word or root and not two per Skok's etymology. These interjections also share some traits with onomatopoeic words like *ì-á* (a donkey's vocalisation). Therefore, we think that the etymology and the means of formation of *deh* are a lot simpler than in Skok's definition. More precisely, we think that the etymology of *deh* involves one word, and that this word has an *-h* in pronunciation. Relying on the data concerning the Štokavian dialect of Knin (i.e. Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin all within the City of Knin) – where the [h] sound is quite unstable and has undergone numerous shifts (cf. Velić, 2023: 55) – we have observed that [h] does appear (though rarely) at the end of interjections and particles: *a(h)*, *e(h)*, *i(h)*, *o(h)*, *u(h)*, and even *da(h)* ‘yes’. These six examples remain on the recordings and were not picked by Velić (*ibid.*) in the main analysis for the three dialects, as such interjections with *-h* are not very regular, and *-h* is typically heard as a ‘sigh’ there. Another trait, this time of a phonetic nature, has been observed there: the words *šta* ‘what’ and *da* ‘yes’ are sometimes pronounced with [ä], i.e. [štä], [dä] (cf. *ibid.*: 31), and the word *čä* ‘away’ is attested with *e*

govor već otprije jako poštokavljen (kao i većina drugih primorskih mjesta u Dalmaciji) zbog velika pritiska doseljenih štokavaca.“ Here Kapović describes the strong Štokavian influence of the past on the dialect slightly prior to the year 2004, when he published the work that we cite here.

under the influence of the palatal *ć* in *ài ćè* in a full transition $a > e$ (wherein *ä* in *štä, dä* was a middle phase) in *ibid.* When we summarise the data that these two independent insights have brought to us, we can speculate that Skok's *deh* is, in fact, an altered *dah*, or **dah*. *Dä* also appears non-fronted in the three dialects (*ibid.*), and as an interjection it may shift to *dä*, whereas *ćä* becomes *ćè*. Also, *däh* appears with *-h* (a sigh, or a weakened, less energetic *h*). With these three observations of the dialects in question – (1) *da* with original *a*, 2) fronting into *dä* and *ćè*, and 3) the possibility of *-h* in *dah* by combining and free alternation (to which interjections are prone, as these examples show), we may derive the 16th–18th-century Čakavian *deh* from the same elements: a fully fronted **de* (possibly even [*dä-*], but written as the *de-* part of *deh*, since Croatian traditionally lacked the <*ä*> spelling), and the possibility of *-h* as a phonological extension, not a new word. Interjections are simple, time-resistant and common in not so closely related idioms: for example, the author observes that Italian has [*a*] as an exclamation/interjection, similar to Croatian *a(h)*. Since the Čakavian *deh* and the data from the three dialects described are both Croatian, i.e. very closely related idioms, and that the three dialects studied were also historically Čakavian (*ibid.*: 22) and still occasionally keep *h* in some other words beside interjections (*ibid.*: 55–59; a mark of conservatism also shared by Čakavian idioms, but to a greater extent), coupled with the presence of all the phonological elements needed for identification of the 16th–18th c. *deh* in the three studied dialects (*da*, both fronting types *dä* and *ćè*, final *-h*) and the fact that interjections are generally prone to free changes since they are exclamatory and thus affective, and finally, given the plausibility that <*e*> marked both [*ä*] and [*e*], and that 16th–18th c. *deh* is very similar to the data in the three dialects studied, it is logical to read *deh*, if not as *de* with an occasional „sigh“ (= *h*), then as either [*deh*] or [*däh*]. To expand on the fact that one spelling (<*deh*>) may denote two forms ([*deh*], [*däh*]), many dialects (including the three studied for all vowels to varying degrees [*ibid.*: 31–33]) often have free variation in pronunciation of certain vowels alongside one dominant pronunciation.¹³ It is also crucial to note that phonologically [*a*], [*ä*] and [*e*] form a continuum (cf. the development in the analysed forms: *da* – *dä* – *ćè*), allowing a full conclusion: 1. since the three studied dialects have *da*, *dah* and *dä* and 2. that the spelling of the 16th–18th c. *deh* due to the aforesaid vowel flexibility in pronunciation in the current dialects

¹³ In the dialects of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin, one occasionally finds a more open pronunciation of *e*, although the more closed pronunciation of *e* is more widespread. Also, [*e*] in these dialects is usually a bit closed (Velić, 2023: 31). Free vowel oscillations are noted in other dialects, both by research (e.g. in Vrlička krajina, Galić [2019: 77] notices partial closing in long [*e:*] and [*o:*]) or casually by hearing (e.g. in the Kajkavian dialect of Zagreb, [*e*] is usually more closed but can be pronounced in a more open way too).

(and the fact that we lacked <ä> in our writing system) practically represented either [*deh*] and [*däh*] with almost full certainty and 3. that *-h* is a „sigh“ and thus occasionally found in interjections (in the recordings from the three dialects *-h* appeared occasionally among a few examples in rows, e.g. *Da, da, dax, da.* from a middle-aged speaker) puts the forms *da(h)* and *dä* from the three dialects studied in a direct and closed continuum and equation with the bygone 16th-18th c. *deh*. This full phonological continuum (*da(h)*, *dä* and *deh* differ only in the quality of the vowel) mirrors the development attested fully in the three studied dialects (*da – dä – ćë*), in turn mirroring the phonological continuum of [a], [ä] and [e], rendering *deh* most certainly a Croatian word and, furthermore, conceivable by the elements in the three dialects studied (*da(h)*, *dä*, *ćë*) due to a full identification at the phonological level ([d], [e]/[ä], [h]). The full and most precise conclusion is that the bygone *deh* is certainly a Croatian word and, since it was an interjection, could be derived similarly to the forms in the modern Štokavian (formerly Čakavian) dialects of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin. Of course, there is a time gap and a possible difference in meaning that separates the 16th-18th c. *deh* and the data from the three studied dialects, but it is possible to imagine the origin of *deh* using the data offered by the three studied dialects that yield the final *deh* combined. To draw a two-part conclusion on the whole matter: 1) the word *deh* is certainly Croatian while the word *de/-dē(r)/-da* is provenly Turkish, and therefore unrelated and 2) our etymology of *deh* actually sides very well with Skok's in that our data gave us an etymology of [*de*]/[*dä*] + [h], whereas Skok (1971: 386) claimed that *deh* was modelled after *ah*. This renders his view of *deh* an interjection like *ah*, with [h] in common as in other forms (also in the three studied dialects: *eh, ih, oh, uh* and *dah*). The only difference in Skok's etymology is that in his view the element *de-* in *deh* remains of Turkish origin, which we have proven wrong and to be the etymology of *de/-dē(r)/-da*. Therefore, a closing conclusion at the end of the analysis is that one needs to fully separate the etymology of words *de/-dē(r)/-da*, which are borrowings from Turkish, from the word *deh*, which is a native Croatian interjection in whose etymology one finds varying alternations (vocalic and consonantal) typical of interjections.

5. Conclusion

A careful analysis of the similarities and differences between the usages in Croatian and Turkish shows that the particle *de/-dē(r)/-da* is entirely of Turkish origin, contrary to earlier etymologies (ARj.'s, Skok's) who viewed it as Croatian in some examples. A detailed analysis also shows that it shares no etymology with the originally Slavic (Croatian) words/elements *da* „yes; that (conj.)“ and *-de* in dialectal *ovde*, which also both stem from completely different roots. The

Turkish word *ha(y)di*, which is possibly related to Turkish *de/da*, may have taken the newer *-i#* by a plausible closing [e] > [i] (from now dialectal *hayde*) or a less plausible analogy after the ending vowel of the contaminated adjectives *önceki* „former“ and *sonraki* „next, subsequent“. A detailed phonological analysis based most directly on the data from the dialects of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin within the City of Knin in Kninska krajina, and also on the peculiarities of other dialects (most notably that of Dubrovnik), shows that the 16th–18th century Čakavian interjection *deh* is certainly of Croatian origin and can be derived from data from the dialects of Vrpolje, Kninsko Polje and the settlement of Knin, since *deh* forms a phonological continuum with these data.

Bibliography

Barić, E., Lončarić, M., Malić, D., Pavešić, S., Peti, M., Zečević, V., Znika, M. (1997). *Hrvatska gramatika*. Školska knjiga.

Čaušević, E. (1996). *Gramatika suvremenoga turskog jezika*. Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.

Ćurković, D. (2014). *Govor Bitelića*. Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci (Doctoral thesis).

Daničić, Đ., Valjavac, M. & Budmani, P. (Eds.). (1884–1886). *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* (= ARJ.). Dio 2, Četa – đavlji. Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

DS = *Derleme sözlüğü: Türkiye'de halk ağzından derleme sözlüğü* (1993). Vol. 4 (D). Ankara.

Galić, J. (2019). *Fonološki opis novoštokavskih ikavskih govora Vrličke krajine u svjetlu drugih govora Dalmatinske zagore*. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina*, 15(1), 73–104.

Gluhak, A. (1993). *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. August Cesarec.

Hraste, M. (1964). O govoru Zadra i okolice. In J. Ravlić (Ed.). *Zbornik Zadar* (pp. 443–456). Matica hrvatska.

Kapetanović, A., Malić, D. & Štrkalj Despot, K. (2010). *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovno pjesništvo: pjesme, plačevi i prikazanja na starohrvatskom jeziku*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.

Kapović, M. (2004). *Jezični utjecaj velikih gradova*. *Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 30(1), 97–105.

Kranjčević, M. (2019). *Gacki čakavski govori s područja Otočca – zaštićeno nematerijalno kulturno dobro Republike Hrvatske*. *Senjski zbornik: prilozi za geografiju, etnologiju, gospodarstvo, povijest i kulturu*, 456(1), 337–344.

- Kurtović Budja, I. (2009). *Govori Makarskog primorja: fonologija i morfologija*. Ivana Kurtović Budja (doctoral thesis).
- Lisac, J. (2003). *Hrvatska dijalektologija 1. Hrvatski dijalekti i govori štokavskog narječja i hrvatski govori torlačkog narječja*. Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga.
- Lisac, J. (2008). *Govori Dalmatinske zagore kao dio novoštokavskog ikavskog dijalekta. Croatica et Slavica Iadertina*, 4(4), 105–114.
- Lisac, J. (2010). *Hrvatska dijalektologija 2. Čakavsko narječje*. Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga.
- Lončarić, M. (1996). *Kajkavsko narječje*. Školska knjiga.
- Malić, D. (1973). *ŠIBENSKA MOLITVA: filološka monografija. Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 2(1), 81–190.
- Matasović, R. (2008). *Poredbenopovijesna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Matica hrvatska.
- Menac-Mihalić, M. & Celinić, A. (2012). *Ozvučena čitanka iz hrvatske dijalektologije*. Knjigra.
- Moguš, M. (1977). *Čakavsko narječje: fonologija*. Školska knjiga.
- Raos, I. (1971). *Prosjaci i sinovi*. Matica hrvatska.
- Silić, J. & Pranjković, I. (2005). *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Školska knjiga.
- Skok, P. (1971). *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Knj. 1, A–J. Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Šimundić, M. (1971). *Govor Imotske krajine i Bekije*. Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine.
- Velić, L. (2023). *Fonologija i morfologija novoštokavskih ikavskih govora Vrpolja, Kninskoga Polja i Knina*. Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (doctoral thesis).
- Vidović, R. (1992). *Primjer dvostrukog različitog naglaska u splitskom čakavskom govoru (vernakularu) prve polovice XX. stoljeća. Čakavska rič: Polugodišnjak za proučavanje čakavske riječi*, 20/2, 27–50.
- Vončina, J. (1975). *Zagonetka „Šibenske molitve“*. *Croatica: časopis za hrvatski jezik, književnost i kulturu*, 6(6), 7–38.

Sažetak

Članak je u detalje pokazao da je u hrvatskome jeziku i etimologija u potpunosti, kao i uporaba s tim u skladu glede poticajne (adhortativne) čestice *de* (koja dolazi i sufiksarno u oblicima *-dē(r)* i *-da*, ovisno o govoru iz kojega skupljeni su podatci) isključivo iz turskoga jezika, u kojemu i danas se rabi te je građa iz današnjega turskoga, uz drugu

suvremenu građu, omogućila vrlo precizan uvid u podrijetlo i uporabu te čestice u turskome i, posuđivanjem, njihov odraz u hrvatskome jeziku (gdje je prepozicijsko *de* danas još uvijek standardnom riječju, no vrlo se rijetko rabi). Takav pristup, koji nedvosmisleno otkriva tursko podrijetlo toj čestici, predstavlja odmak od ranijih etimologa (Skoka i izdanja tzv. Akademijina rječnika), koji su ovisno o uporabi analizirali tu česticu i kao hrvatski element. Prema analizi razvidno je da su rezultati Skoka i tzv. Akademijina rječnika bili nepotpuni jer se pravilnom usporedbom položaja i značenja odraza te turske čestice u hrvatskom i turskom pokazuje da su svi oblici i rečenice koji sadržavaju poticajni element *de/-dē(r)/-da* precizno došli iz pojedinih uporabnih obrazaca koji se i danas koriste u turskome jeziku, dakle *de* i njezini oblici semantičko-sintaktička su turska posuđenica u hrvatskome (osim toga, pokazuje se i da su neki srpski primjeri koje Skok navodi podrijetlom od turske uporabe te čestice koja nije dala odjeka u hrvatskome). Preciznije, vidi se i razlika u prepozicijskoj i postpozicijskoj uporabi i u hrvatskom i u turskom, pri čemu u turskom čestica, koja sinkronijski glasi [de] u obama slučajevima (iako je naglašena samo u prepozicijskom položaju), različita podrijetla u prepozicijskoj i postpozicijskoj uporabi. Turska riječ *ha(y)di*, koja je možda srodna riječi *de*, mogla je razviti -i prema starijemu *hayde* pravilnim zatvaranjem [e] u [i] ili analogijom prema dočetu -i u pridjeva *önceki* 'prijašnji' i *sonraki* 'sljedeći'. Pokazalo se i da je riječ *deh*, čakavski uzvik iz razdoblja od šesnaestoga do osamnaestoga stoljeća, za razliku od turske posuđenice *de/-dē(r)/-da* posve hrvatskoga podrijetla i da se na fonološkoj razini (promjenjivost samoglasnika i zajednički suglasnički sastav te oslabljeni izgovor h) posve može usporediti s dostupnim podacima iz novoštokavskih ikavskih (a povijesno čakavskih) govora Vrpolja, Kninskoga Polja i Knina u sastavu Grada Knina, pomoću kojih jako se uvjerljivo i izvodi taj oblik *deh*.

Ključne riječi: hrvatski, *de*, *deh*, čestica, turski.