Iva Nazalević Čučević
Marija Malnar Jurišić
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Zagreb
Department of Croatian Language and Literature
Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10000 Zagreb
inazalev@ffzg.unizg.hr
mmalnar@ffzg.unizg.hr

SENTENCE NEGATION IN THE LOCAL DIALECTS OF THE ČABAR AREA

Syntactic negation is divided into sentence negation and partial negation. Sentence negation through a negated predicate negates the sentence content completely, while partial negation negates the content of a non-predicate member of the sentence structure. The paper analyzes the means of sentence negation in the local dialects of the Čabar area, morphological or syntactic, and their position in relation to the verb form in the predicate. Intensifiers of negative meaning and negative concord are also analyzed. The analysis is based on the material collected by directed field research, which, in addition to recording spontaneous speech, includes the dialect versions of standard language templates; the analysis also refers to examples from dialectological literature and sources.

1. Introduction

Čabar is a town located in the north of the Gorski Kotar region and it comprises five smaller settlements (Čabar, Gerovo, Plešce, Prezid and Tršće)[1] belong. According to the last census from 2021[2], the town has 3226 inhabitants, which, compared to the data collected previously,[3] indicates a continuous decline in the number of inhabitants and a notable increase of the elderly population.

---

[1] In the analysis that follows, the names of the settlements are abbreviated as Ča, Ge, Pr and Tr.

[2] The data for 2021, 2011, and 2001 is available at https://dzs.gov.hr/popisi-stanovnistva/421.

[3] The city of Čabar had 3770 inhabitants in 2011 and 4387 in 2001.

The subject of this paper[4] is the analysis of the means of expressing sentence negation in the local dialects of the Čabar area and the description of their position and distribution. In addition to the information on the research methodology, the introductory section of this paper provides a concise overview of approaches to negation within the framework of Croatian dialectological and standardological literature, an overview of syntactic negation in Standard Croatian and an overview of the distinctive characteristics of the Čabar local dialects.

The material on which the analysis is based has been collected on several occasions in conversation with native dialect speakers; part of the material was collected through a directed questionnaire and part was excerpted from recordings of spontaneous speech or from the existing literature and sources.

1.1. Negation within the framework of Croatian dialectological and standardological literature

1.1.1. The syntactic descriptions of the Croatian dialect corpus are not systematic and complete, so the description of negation in the local dialects discussed in this article, or in other local dialects, is non-existent. In the available dialectological literature, negation is approached sporadically and partially. Thus, for example, within the description of the morphological system of certain local dialects one can find notes on the negative forms of indefinite pronouns and the negated verb forms (cf. Lukežić and Turk 1998, Lončarić 2005, Lukežić 2015), and information on negation is sometimes found within the framework of concise syntactic descriptions, usually in connection with the order of clitics, prepositional-case expressions consisting of negative indefinite pronouns, and the stress of the negative particle (e.g. Lisac 2009, Ramadanović and Virč 2013).

1.1.2. The marginality of the description of negation in the dialectological literature is also characteristic of the literature focused on the Croatian standard language, as will appear from a brief overview given here. When it comes to the approach to negation in the grammars of the Croatian standard language, partial approaches are the norm. A more detailed description of negation was given by R. Katičić (1986: 127) in his discussion of the transformation of the sentence structure. Having stated that negation eliminates and denies the sentence expression contained in the sentence structure, he discussed the ways of expressing the negative form and its semantic and formal peculiarities.[5] Negation has usually

---

5   For example, Katičić points to the verb forms *nisam*, *neću* and *nemam*, in which the negative particle and the verb are fused, he mentions the negative imperative constructed with *nemoj*, *nemojmo* and *nemojte*, the occurrence of negative concord, the use of the conjunctions *ni*

been interpreted in connection with the so-called Slavic genitive (e.g. Maretić 1963, Pavešić (ed.) 1971, Katičić 1986, Silić and Pranjković 2005), temporal clauses with the subordinating conjunction *dok* and negative predicates (see Silić and Pranjković 2005), the verbs of concern, fear and anxiety accompanied by a declarative clause with the negative particle *ne*, e.g. *Bojim se da mu se što ne dogodi* 'I'm afraid that something will happen to him', *Strahuje da mu ne odvedu sina* 'He is afraid that his son will be taken away' (Raguž 1997), negation in contrast clauses (e.g. Silić and Pranjković 2005, Belaj and Tanacković Faletar 2020).[6]

1.1.3. Over the last decade there has been an increased interest in negation in the Croatian standard language. The theoretically sophisticated approaches to syntactic negation, in particular, provide excellent opportunities for the description of negation in local dialects. Several important linguistic monographs and separate papers have been published in which numerous phenomena related to negation are clarified. I. Nazalević Čučević (2022: 73), speaking about the achievements within the study of negation, writes:

> the means (mechanisms) of negation and their position in the contemporary Croatian language are listed and described (e.g. Zovko Dinković 2013, Nazalević Čučević 2016), a thorough overview of syntactic negation is given with regard to the division into sentence negation and partial negation (*ibid*.), syntactic and semantic peculiarities of phenomena related to negation such as those within multiple negation (double negation; negative concord and pleonastic or expletive negation) are described (e.g. Zovko Dinković 2021), the semantic implications of negation in sentences with different communicative aims are analyzed (e.g. Nazalević Čučević 2016), the relationship between negation and quantifiers is addressed (e.g. Zovko Dinković 2013, 2021), and the contribution of all of the above to the models of cognitive processing of negation is considered (e.g. Ćoso and Bogunović 2021), meaning that the negation processing is intensively studied (e.g. Ćoso and Bogunović 2016, 2019), etc. Some aspects of the research of negation also cover the historical perspective, such as the corpus of Croatian Glagolitic texts of the Church Slavonic period, where negation is interpreted at the morphological, syntactic and suprasyntactic level (e.g. Kovačević 2016). Some contributions are contrastive, comparing the use of negation in Croatian and English, such as I. Zovko Dinković (2013), who (...) gives the first systematic analysis of negation in Croatian, while I. Nazalević Čučević (2016) also approaches syntactic negation contrastively, but by analyzing it in Croatian and Macedonian.

and *niti*, the Slavic genitive, the use of the preposition *još* in negative constructions, the negation of non-predicate parts of sentence structure, and the obligatory negative form in sentences with adverbs *malo*, *umalo*, *malo što*, etc. R. Katičić (1986: 130) also states that with sentence negation, indefinite pronouns or adverbs are replaced by their negative forms, e.g. *Družba ništa ne govori* 'The company does not say anything', where *anything* is expressed in Croatian by *nothing* (*ništa*).

6   For a more detailed overview of how negation has been discussed in Croatian grammars, see Nazalević Čučević (2016).

We will use the insights from the reviewed studies of negation in Standard Croatian in the analysis of sentence negation in the local dialects of the Čabar area, in the hope of creating a framework for the continuation of research on syntactic negation in these local dialects and of motivating others to provide descriptions of negation in other local dialects.[7]

1.2. Syntactic negation in Standard Croatian

1.2.1. Syntactic negation is realized as sentence and partial. In sentence negation the negation of the predicate negates the entire sentence, while in partial or constituent negation a non-predicate sentence member is negated.[8]

1.2.2. The complete negation of the content of the sentence, i.e. sentence negation, in Standard Croatian is indicated by the means of negation in front of the personal verb form (e.g. *Ne idem nikamo* 'I'm not going anywhere', *Niti jedu niti piju* 'They neither eat nor drink') or as part of it (e.g. *Neću ići nikamo* 'I won't go anywhere', *Nisam išla nikamo* 'I didn't go anywhere', *Nemaš strpljenja* 'You have no patience'). From examples such as *Ne idem na ručak* 'I'm not going to lunch', *Niti nas zove niti dolazi* 'He neither calls us nor comes', it is clear that the sentence negation is realized syntactically by *ne* i *niti* before the verb, and in examples such as *Neću ići na ručak* 'I won't go to lunch', *Nisam bila na njegovoj rođendanskoj zabavi* 'I wasn't at his birthday party' it is realized morphologically, i.e. by means of the negative prefixes *ne-* and *ni-* attached to the verb[9].

1.2.3. The position of these means of sentence negation in Standard Croatian (and in other South Slavic standard languages) is fixed: negative particles come before the finite verb, while negative prefixes are part of it, so the negation affects everything found to the right side of it (see Zovko Dinković 2013). However, it should also be noted that the means of negation can come before the verb in impersonal use or as part of it, e.g. *Ne piti vodu!* 'Do not drink the water!',

---

[7] Interest in this topic is shown by MA level students in the Department of Croatian Language and Literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, who approach it in the context of seminar papers written for courses in syntax and of diploma essays in dialectology, e.g. Jelenčić (2023).

[8] Based on the examples such as *Uspijevam ne razmišljati o tome* 'I manage not to think about it', *On skriva ne četiri, nego šest stanova* 'He hides not four, but six apartments', *Došla je Ivana, a ne Nataša* 'Ivana came, not Nataša', *Okreni se, ali ne odmah* 'Turn around, but not right away', *Sve veze imaju svoje dobre i one ne baš tako dobre trenutke* 'All relationships have their good and not-so-good moments', *KFOR održava sigurnost ne samo na Kosovu već i u cijelom susjedstvu* 'KFOR maintains security not only in Kosovo but also in the entire region', *Igrali smo ni dobro ni loše* 'We played neither well nor badly', it is evident that partial negation negates, for example, the infinitive complement of the modal verb that carries the lexical meaning of the predicate, the object, the subject, the adverbial (see Nazalević Čučević 2016, 2022, Kovačević 2002).

[9] The list and description of negative means and their position in Croatian was first provided by I. Zovko Dinković (2013).

Nema vode 'There is no water', *Nikad nije bilo dovoljno novca* 'There was never enough money' (cf. Nazalević Čučević 2016).[10]

1.2.4. In this paper, we will also address negative concord in the local dialects of the Čabar area. Negative concord with the double and pleonastic negation is subsumed under multiple negation (Horn 2010, Zovko Dinković 2021). Negative concord and pleonastic negation, e.g. *Bojim se da mu se ne dogodi što loše* 'I'm afraid that something bad will happen to him', reflect the principle of *Duplex negatio negat*, while double negation, e.g. *Ne mogu biti nepristran* 'I can't be unbiased', reflects the principle of *Duplex negatio affirmat*. Negative concord is achieved via the occurrence of one or more negative expressions (*ni*-words) with the negated predicate, whereby the *ni*-word in Croatian and other South Slavic languages can come before or after the negated predicate, cf. *Čekat ću te kao što nitko nikada nikoga nije čekao* and *Čekat ću te kao što nije čekao nitko nikoga nikada* 'I will wait for you like no one has ever waited for anyone'[11].

1.3. Local dialects of the Čabar area

1.3.1. The local dialects of the Čabar area belong to the western type of the Gorski Kotar dialect (see and Lisac 2006: 135). It should be emphasized that the differences that can be observed among the local dialects of the settlements that make up the area are primarily noticeable at the phonological level. Finka (1974) already distinguished two dialect types there – the Gerovo-Čabar type and the Prezid type – which Barac-Grum adopted in her division into macrosystems (1993).

1.3.2. Certain differences among the local dialects can be observed at the level of the vowel system, where different reflexes of the original vowels are found (see also Malnar 2012). Thus, for example, **ə* in short syllables in the local dialect of Prezid appears as *ə/o*, with the prevalence of the reflex *o* (*də̀ska*, *də̀š*, *tə̀nak // pȍs*, *mȍgu̯a*), in the local dialects of Gerovo and Čabar the reflex is *ə/e* (*pə̀s*, *Čə̏bər // pė̀sa* G. sg., *vė́na*), while in Tršće the development goes in the direction of *e* (*dèš*, *pès*, *dèska*). With regard to the reflex of the front nasal **ę*, only the local dialect of Prezid is distinguished (*klę̀t*, *pę̀tok*, *rę̀p*), while in all the other local dialects we find the reflex *ī* (*rȋp*, *rȋt*, *svȋt*, *pačȋtek*). The back nasal in the local dialects of the Čabar area has not been equated with the original *ļ*, in whose place today we consistently find the reflex *ȍu̯* (*vȍu̯k*, *žȍu̯č*, *vȍu̯na*), but in the Prezid local dialect the back nasal is reflected as *ȍ* (*krȍk*, *mȍš*, *rȍbəc*),

---

[10]   The negation comes before the non-finite verb form in imperative constructions, while the suppletives *biti* and *imati*, when they mean 'to exist', are impersonal and are negated morphologically, i.e. by means of the prefixes *ne-* and *ni-*. On the syntactic-semantic status of the suppletives *biti* and *imati* see Nazalević Čučević and Belaj (2018).

[11]   This summary of multiple negation relies on the review provided by Nazalević Čučević (2022), see also Zovko Dinković (2021).

and in the remaining local dialects as *ů* (*mȗš*, *pȗt*, *gȗba*). It should be noted that in addition to the differences among the Čabar local dialects, there are also differences within individual local dialecs. This is particularly noticeable in the local dialect of the town of Čabar, where we distinguish two systems, the older one,[12] which is no longer in active use but was recorded in previously conducted research (cf. Malnar 2012, Gostenčnik 2018), and the newer one,[13] which is used by speakers today. For example, we can trace the differences between these two systems on the basis of how *ě* is reflected, where the older system departs from the prevailing development in the diphthong direction, which characterizes all other local idioms of this area (*nedẹ̏la*, *popẹ̄vaš*, *strẹ̏xa*, *svẹ̏ča*, *vẹ̏ter* (Ča, old) ~ *lẹ̏ip*, *mẹ̏ix*, *nevẹ̣ista*, *rasvẹ̣itle*, *rẹ̣ipa*, *žlẹ̏ip* (Pr; Tr; Ča, new; Ge). At the level of consonants, only the local dialect of Prezid is distinguished, in which the second type of cakavism is attested (*mȁčka*, *pȍś*, *źiẹ̣na*). However, it should be noted that this feature is sporadically present only in the speech of the oldest respondents and that today it is on the decline (> *mȁčka*, *pȍs*, *žiẹ̣na*).

1.3.3. At the syntactic level, no differences have been recorded among the local dialects of individual settlements.

1.4. Research methodology

The material on which the analysis is conducted has been collected on several occasions in conversation with native speakers of the local dialects of the Čabar area. Part of the material was collected through a directed questionnaire in Tršće and Prezid in which 5 respondents who met the established dialectological criteria were asked to provide dialect versions of sentences presented in Standard Croatian. All respondents were native speakers of the local dialects, mostly middle-aged and older (40−75 years); in order to determine possible changes, respondents belonging to a younger age group (up to 35 years) were examined. Part of the material was excerpted from recordings of spontaneous speech or from the existing literature and sources[14] (e.g. Arh[15] 2017, S. Malnar[16] 2002, M. Malnar[17] 2012,

---

[12] Here abbreviated as Ča, old.

[13] Here abbreviated as Ča, new.

[14] The examples taken from the literature (except Malnar 2012) are not adapted to the dialectological transcription of spoken attestations, but they are given here as found in the sources.

[15] B. Arh writes in the local dialect of Selo, which we include in the local dialect of Tršće, and examples taken from this source are thus cited.

[16] S. Malnar (2002) furnishes examples from the local dialect of the Ravnice, which we include in the local dialect of Tršće, and examples taken from this source are thus cited.

[17] M. Malnar (2012) furnishes examples from the local dialects of Tršće, Čabar and Prezid. Examples from Čabar and Prezid are selected from this source, and they are adapted to the current standards of dialectological transcription, which is also used in the recording of examples collected by field research for the purposes of this paper. The examples taken from this source are linked to specific survey sites (Ča, old; Ča, new; Pr).

Pochobradsky[18] 1996, 2008). In order to determine the perception of negation in the consciousness of the speaker, some respondents were also asked to write sentences in the local dialect, with the aim of observing whether negation is written together with or separately from the words it accompanies,[19] see 2.2. Some examples from the corpus are shortened for clarity.

2. The means of expressing sentence negation in the local dialects of the Čabar area

In the text below, through a series of examples we will discuss the morphological and syntactic ways of expressing sentence negation in the local dialects of the Čabar area. We will present the mechanisms of both morphological and syntactic ways of expressing sentence negation. We will also analyze the position of the means of sentence negation with regard to the predicate verb.

2.1. Morphological and syntactic ways of expressing sentence negation

Sentence negation can be expressed morphologically, i.e. by using negative prefixes, see (1) and (2).

(1) i. ***Nèi̯sen***   ***mi̇sleu̯a***   *o*   *tèn.*
NEG.am.1.sg.   think.past.part.sg.fem.   about   that.loc.[20]

   ii. *Jȇ̇st*   ***nèi̯sen***   ***mi̇sleu̯a***   *o*   *tèn.* (Tr)[21]
I.nom.sg.   NEG.am.1.sg.   think.past.part.sg.fem.   about   that.loc.
'I didn't think about that.'

---

[18]   Z. Pochobradsky (1996, 2008) writes in the local dialect of Gerovo, so examples taken from his sources are cited under this rubric.

[19]   These examples were also recorded by means of dialectological transcription, but the method of recording negation is preserved as respondents wrote it.

[20]   Abbreviations used in this paper: acc. – accusative, adj. – adjective, adv. – adverb, CJVB – conjunctional verb, CNJ – conjunction, CONEG – connective negator, dat. – dative, EXC – exclamator, EXT1 – existential meaning 1 - 'to spend an amount of time at a location', EXT2 – existential meaning 2 – 'to exist', fem. – feminine, gen. – genitive, imp. – imperative, IMPRS – impersonal, inf. – infinitive, inst. – instrumental, loc. – locative, masc. – masculine, NEG – negator, neu. – neuter, nom. – nominative, part. – participle, pass. – passive, past. – past, PFV – perfective, pl. – plural, POSS – possessive, pres. – present, PROH – prohibitive, PTCL – particle, refl. – reflexive, sg. – singular, SN – sentence negation.

[21]   In some Kajkavian local dialects, negation can come after the auxiliary verb in the perfect tense (cf. Celinić 2020: 16), which may depend on the (un)explicated subject, cf. *Nèsam dòšla*, *Nèsäm dòjšo* i *Jà sam nè dòšla (k ńi̇ma)* and *Jȁ säm nè dòjšo (k ńi̇ma)* in the local dialect of Štrigova (Jelenčić 2023: 25). In the examples with the unexplicit subject, the auxiliary verb is morphologically negated, i.e. with the prefix *nè-*, while in the examples with the explicited subject it is negated syntactically, i.e. with the negative particle *nè*, so that it comes after it. Of course, the possibility of further research related to this issue is open.

(2) **Nȅi̥**   **šu̇lę**. (Pr)
     NEG.is.EXST2.IMPRS.pres.   school.gen.sg.

     'There is no school.'

and syntactically, with special words, primarily with a negative particle, see (3) and (4):

(3) **Na**   **nȍsen**   **ma̍sko**. (Pr)
     NEG   wear.1.sg.pres. mask.acc.sg.

     Jȅst   **na**   **nṷsen**   **ma̍sko**. (Tr)
     I.nom.   NEG   wear.1.sg.pres. mask.acc.sg.

     'I don't wear a mask.'

(4) **Nę̍**   **pi̍sat**   **pa**   **plȍče!** (Tr)
     NEG   write.inf.PROH   all over   the board.loc.sg.

     'Do not write on the board!'

From the examples (1)−(2) it is clear that the negative prefixes are part of the negated verb, that the negative particle is to the left of the verb, and that everything to the right of them is within their scope (3)−(4). On the basis of the examples (1) and (3), it is evident that the syntactic and morphological modes of sentence negation refer to personal verb forms, but also to those in impersonal use (2) and to impersonal or non-finite verbs (4). When it comes to the latter, we have in mind imperative constructions with the infinitive as an impersonal verb form negated by the negative particle *nę*, see (5), and existential constructions meaning 'to exist', see (6)−(7), where the verbal part of the subjectless construction in the function of the noun existential predicate (cf. Nazalević Čučević i Belaj 2018) is formed by the impersonal verb *bȅt* 'to be', cf. (35)−(36):

(5) **Nę̍**   **zȅjat!** (Tr)
     NEG   shout.inf.PROH

     'Do not shout!'

(6) *(F si̥ȅle*   /   *Dȅnes)*   **Nȅi̥**   **šu̇lę**   /
     (in village.loc.sg /   today.adv.)   NEG.is.EXST2.IMPRS school.gen.sg. /

     Jȍžęta   /   **lȅdi**   /   **stru̍ję**   /   **ži̥vę du̇šę**. (Tr)
     Jože.gen.sg. /   people.gen.pl. /   electricity.gen.sg. /   living soul.gen.sg.

     '(In the village / Today) There is no school / Jože / people / electricity / living soul.'

(7) *(F si̯ẹ̇le   /   Dẹ̇nes)   **Nẹ̈i̯**   **bu̯ȯ**
(in village.loc.sg / today.adv.) NEG.is.EXST2.IMPRS be.past.part.sg.neu.

šu̇lẹ   /   ***Jȯžẹta***   /   ***lẹ̇di***   /   ***strṷjẹ***   /
school.gen.sg.   /   Jože.gen.sg. /   people.gen.pl. /   electricity.gen.sg.   /

ži̇vẹ du̇šẹ. (Tr)
living soul.gen.sg.

'(In the village / Today) There is no school / Jože / people / electricity /
living soul.'

2.2. Presentation of the system of sentence negation in the local dialects of the Čabar area

The presentation of the means of sentence negation in the local dialects of the Čabar area is based on the analysis of the corpus already outlined, while all possibilities of writing examples with sentence negation are analyzed and described. Because local dialects are not standardized, it can be seen that the writing of the means of sentence negation is not uniform and that the authors of texts in dialect approach this issue differently. And while the syntactic mode of negation (negation with a negative word) in front of polysyllabic verbs that have their own accent is for the most part consistently implemented, which has been confirmed both in the literature and by our research (e.g. *na glĩda* 'he/she doesn't look', *na pama̋ga* 'he/she doesn't help', *nẹ verjȁ̋mẹn* 'I don't belive'), in the case of stress movement to the negative means before monosyllabic verbs, the notation can vary − the negation can be expressed morphologically and syntactically. By looking into the dialect texts of authors who write in the local dialects of the Čabar area, we find inconsistencies in the notation of the same author, e.g. *na bun*, but also *nabu*, *nabuš* (Pochobradsky 2008), *na da*, but also *nada* (Malnar 2002).

In the light of the above, we argue that the system of the different means of sentence negation in the analyzed local dialects consists of the negative prefixes *nĩ-*, *nẹ̇-*, *nẹ̈i̯-* and *nȧ-*, by which negation is realized morphologically, and the negators *na*/*nẹ*, *nȧ*, *nẹ̇* and *nẹ̇t*/*ni̇t*, by which negation is realized syntactically.

Following the model of presenting sentence negation in the Croatian standard language by I. Zovko Dinković (2013: 159), supplemented by the hypotheses of I. Nazalević Čučević (2016), the means of sentence negation of the analyzed local dialects are presented in Tables 1 and 2. In addition to the means of sentence negation, we provide data on distribution and examples, which are numbered and marked with the abbreviation of the local dialect to ensure clarity in the ensuing

discussion, while examples taken from the literature (e.g. S. Malnar 2002, M. Malnar 2012) and sources (e.g. Arh 2017, Pochobradsky 1996, 2008) are referred to in the text before the tables. Negated predicates are printed in bold letters. For the sake of clarity and economy, in the tables we use the abbreviation SN for the term *sentence negation*, although in some examples the predicate of the clause is negated, e.g. (10), (17), (20), (33)−(34), for which the term *clause negation* is normally used (see Zovko Dinković 2013, 2022).

The means of sentence negation in the analyzed local dialects alternate in some cases, e.g. *na* alternates with *nę* in the examples (22)−(23) and (24)−(27), and in some cases only one negative particle is possible, cf. *nę̇* in (30)−(32), which will never be *nȧ*. That is why we present them separately in the list of the means of sentence negation and in Table 2. The reasons are morphosyntactic and prosodic in nature (absence of accent). On the other hand, certain forms of verbs can be negated morphologically and syntactically, e.g. (10) and (30)−(31), which is also shown in the tables and explained in the discussion. The sentence negation of the verb *bȩ̇t* 'to be' in the existential meaning and the one within the analytic imperative are shown outside the tables, in separate subsections (2.5. and 2.6).

2.3. Expressing sentence negation by morphological means

For the clarity of Tables 1 and 2, references and notes are listed before the tables, not in the footnotes. Example (14) is taken from Malnar (2012: 181), (17) from Arh (2017: 26), (18) from Pochobradsky (2008: 25) and (19) from Pochobradsky (2008: 43). Negated finite verb in examples (13)−(14) cf. with *Kaj zijaš, se nejson duh?* (Pochobradsky 2008: 12), *Nekrej nejsen rjękua da zes vsaken sloven menavan* (...) (Arh 2017: 29). See 5.1.3. The negated verb in (16) cf. with *Tȧk srȯmak ję da nę̇ma ni kȧj špȧrat za čȑ̨nę dnȋ.* (Ča, old) (Malnar 2012: 190, 168). See 5.1.3.

2.4. Expressing sentence negation by syntactic means

Example (22) is taken from Malnar (2002: 171), (23) from Arh (2017: 11), (29) from Malnar (2002: 29), (30) from Arh (2017: 28), (31) from Malnar (2012: 173). Constructions such (32) express a prohibition, so PROH (for prohibitive) is written next to the infinitive in glosses.

ni̭-	nę̇-	nẹ̭i̭-	na̭-
– SN in the present tense of the modal verb 'to want' (8)–(9)	– SN in the aorist of the auxiliary verb *bẹt* 'to be' as part of the conditional (10), cf. (30)–(31)	– SN in the present tense of the existential verb *bẹt* 'to be' meaning 'to spend an amount of time at a location' (11), the copulative verb *bẹt* (12) and the auxiliary verb *bẹt* as part of the perfect tense (13)–(14)	– SN in the monosyllabic perfective present forms of the auxiliary verb *bẹt* ('to be') as part of the future tense (17)–(19), cf. (28)–(29)
(8) *Ničę prit na rȯžendan.* (Tr) 'He won't come to the birthday.'	(10) *Nẹbe tuȧ da spit zaprẹjo mẹjo.* (Tr) 'I wouldn't want them to close the borders again.'	(11) *Nẹi̭sen v Zȧgrẹbe.* (Tr) 'I'm not in Zagreb.'	(17) *Nadjou sę da sę nabu varnu.* (Tr) 'He hoped he wouldn't come back.'
(9) *Ničo tȯrto.* (Tr) 'I don't want cake.'		(12) *Nẹi̭ sričen.* (Tr) 'He is not happy.'	(18) *Nabu z mano Mica guspadareua.* (Ge) 'I will not be ruled by Mica.'
		(13) *Nigdẹr nẹi̭sen tȯ vidu.* (Tr) 'I've never seen that.'	(19) *Nabuš me valda toukua?* (Ge) 'You're not going to beat me, are you?'
		(14) (...) *nẹi̭smo fkȇp kȧzi pȧšle.* (Pr) 'We did not herd goats together.'	
		– SN in the present tense of the verb *jȇmet* 'to have' in the possessive meaning (15)–(16)	– SN in the monosyllabic present forms of the verb (20)–(21)
		(15) *Lȇdi v ȧutobusax nẹi̭majo mȧsk.* (Tr) 'People on buses don't have masks.'	(20) *Ȋvan nȧgrę f kino.* (Tr) 'Ivan doesn't go to the cinema.'
		(16) *Nẹi̭man tę ni na krȧj pȧmęte.* (Ča, new) 'You are not even on my mind.'	(21) *Nȧda me dnȧrję.* (Tr) 'He/She doesn't give me money.'

Table 1. Morphological mode of negation − system of means

na/nę	nà	nę	nėt/nit
– SN in the present tense of the polysyllabic forms of the auxiliary verb *bėt* 'to be' as part of the future tense (22)–(23)	– SN in the present tense of monosyllabic forms of the auxiliary verb *bėt* 'to be' in the future tense	– SN in the aorist of the auxiliary verb *bėt* 'to be' as a part of the conditional (30)–(31), cf. (10)	– SN within the constituent clause
(22) (...) *me sal'ijo p'a:męt, al me jo na b'udo pasal'ile.* (Tr) 'They want my brain, but they won't take it from me.'	(28) *Såmu ga pėste, nėč mo nà bu.* (Tr) 'Just let him go, nothing will happen to him.'	(30) *Nę be ga rada sričaụa tazga, s parstme zapiknęnme vusę.* (Tr) 'I wouldn't like to meet him like that, with his fingers stuck in himself.'	(33) *Nė̄jsen nụàsu måsko nėt jo bùn nụàsu.* (Tr) 'I did not wear a mask and I will not wear one.'
(23) (...) *nigdęr sę nę budo prętignele da shvatliveh stvari.* (Tr) 'They will never extend to comprehensible things.'	(29) (...) *ok na bu reụma pręjšụa pa brinoụmo ụole, tok na bu pa n'ečen.* (Tr) 'If rheumatism won't go away after juniper oil, it won't go away after anything.'	(31) *Nę be tę ogovårjala ni za živo glåvo.* (Ča, old) 'I wouldn't gossip about you for a living.'	(34) *Nìt ga šlišeš nìt ga videš.* (Tr) 'You neither hear nor see him.'
– SN with synthetic verb forms		– SN within command constructions with infinitive	
(24) *Nėkrej na dėjivan.* (Tr) 'I don't work anywhere.'		(32) *Nę pisat pa plòče!* (Tr) 'Do not write on the board!'	
(25) *Na zastūpen ga / Nę zastūpen ga.* (Tr) 'I don't understand him.'			
(26) *Na måręn prit jùtre.* (Tr) 'I can't come tomorrow.'			
– terminative sentences with the subordinating conjunction *dok na / dok nę*			
(27) *Čåk mę dok nę pridęn / Čåk mę dok na pridęn.* (Tr) 'Wait for me until I come.'			

Table 2. Syntactic mode of negation − system of means

2.5. Sentence negation within an existential construction with the verb *bėt* 'to be'

In the local dialects of the Čabar area, the verb *bėt* 'to be' is used to express the existential meaning 'to exist'.[22] A impersonal verb form comes in an impersonal sentence with a genitive complement, forming with it an existential noun predicate (cf. Nazalević Čučević and Belaj 2018: 194). The verb *bėt* 'to be' is used consistently in both the present and the non-present tense, see (35)−(36), cf. (6)−(7):

(35) i. **Nẹ̇i̯**   **nȧstavę**.
NEG.is.EXST2.pres.IMPRS   classes.gen.sg.
'There are no classes.'

   ii. **Nẹ̇i̯**   **bu̯ȯ**   **nȧstavę**.
NEG.is.EXST2.pres.IMPRS   be.past.part.sg.neu.   classes.gen.sg.
'There were no classes.'

   iii. **Nę̣**   **be**   **bu̯ȯ**   **strụ̑ję**. (Tr)
NEG   is.EXST2.aor.IMPRS   be.past.part.sg.neu.   electricity.
'There would be no electricity.'

(36) *Šč̇i̯ra*   **ga**   **nẹ̇i̯**
yesterday.adv.   him.gen.sg.   NEG.is.EXST2.pres.IMPRS
bu̯ȯ   *v zgrȧde*. (Tr)
be.past.part.sg.neu.   in building.loc.sg.
'He was not in the building yesterday.'

The form of the third person singular of the present tense is − *nẹ̇i̯*.[23] From (35i−ii) it is clear that *nẹ̇i̯* is the form of both the present tense of the verb *bėt* 'to be' in the meaning of 'to exist' and the present tense of the auxiliary verb from which the past tense of the existential verb is formed (36). When that verb comes in the conditional, it is negated by the negative particle *nę* (35iii).

---

[22]   The verb *bėt* can express the existential meaning 'to spend an amount of time at a location', e.g. (11), and 'to exist', e.g. (35)−(36). The first is expressed by personal forms of the verb (we will use the abbreviation EXST1), the second by impersonal forms (we will use the abbreviation EXST2).

[23]   In the other persons, the forms of the auxiliary verb are preserved, cf. *neị̯sen, neị̯se*; *neị̯smo, neị̯stę, neị̯so* (cf. also Snoj 2003: 445).

2.6. Sentence negation in the context of the analytic imperative

The analytic imperative in the local dialects of the Čabar area is formed with *nȧkar*/*nėkar* for the singular, e.g. (37)–(38), and with *nakȁrmo*/*nekȁrmo* and *nakȁrtę*/*nekȁrtę*,[24] e.g. (39)−(40), for the plural, to which the infinitive of the verb is added (see Malnar Jurišić 2023: 62):

(37) **Nȧkar**   *sę*   *pačȗtet*   *krȋf*. (Tr)
NEG.CJVB.2.sg.   *se*.refl.   feel.inf.   guilty.adj.nom.sg.
'Do not feel guilty.'

(38) (...) **nakar**   *tok*   *vikat*. (Ge)[25]
NEG.CJVB.2.sg.   like that   shout.inf.
'(...) don't shout like that.'

(39) **Nakȁrmo**   *pėjt*   *v ȧutobus*   *bez mȧskę!* (Tr)
NEG.CJVB.1.pl.   enter.inf.   to bus.acc.sg.   without mask.gen.sg.
'Let's not get on the bus without a mask!'

(40) **Nekȁrtę**   *pėjt*   *na balkȍn!* (Tr)
NEG.CJVB.2.pl.   go.inf.   to balcony.acc.sg.
'Do not go to the balcony!'

3. Intensifiers of negative content

When it comes to intensifiers of negative content, we can speak of conjunction-intensifying and intensifying words, i.e. intensifiers, see 5.3. In (41) there is a conjunction-intensifying *nė*, and in (42) *nėt*:

(41) **Ne**   *jo*   *nȇisen*   *nṵȧsu,*
CONEG[26]   her.acc.sg.   NEG.am.1.sg.   wear.past.part.sg.masc.
nė   *jo*   *nȧbun*   *nṵȧsu*. (Tr)
CONEG   her.acc.sg.   NEG.be.PFV.pres.1.sg.   wear.past.part.sg.masc.
'I haven't worn it and I won't wear it.'

---

[24] The etymology of these forms should be analyzed. As we did not determine it at the time of writing this paper, we did not show them in the tables of means of negation. We interpret them as forms of the verb in the 1st pl., 2nd sg. and pl., which is used to express the imperative. Hence the abbreviation in the glosses – CJVB.

[25] Pochobradsky (2008: 15)

[26] For the use of the abbreviation CONEG see Auwera (2021), where it stands for connective negator. Auwera analyzes CoNeg *ni* and *niti* in Standard Croatian. Although *nėt* and *nȉt* both negates and connects, so in the literal sense it is a conjunctive negator, like Auwera we will also use this abbreviation for usages of the type (41)−(45). In them *nė*, *nėt*, *ni* are used with negated contents, connecting them and reinforcing the negative meaning.

220

(42) *Nėi̯son* *nu̯ȧseu̯* *mȧsko*

NEG.am.1.sg. wear.past.part.sg.masc. mask.acc.sg.

nėt *jo* *nȧbun*

CONEG her.acc.sg. NEG.be.PFV.pres.1.sg.

nu̯ȧsu. (Pr)

wear.past.part.sg.masc.

'I did not wear a mask and I will not wear one.'

In both examples, *nė* and *nėt* stand in front of the negated verb serving as predicate, thus reinforcing the negative meaning of the clauses and connecting them. Unlike the example of the use of *nėt* in (33)−(34), where it alternates with *nìt* and in addition to the conjunction-intensifying function also has the function of a negation mechanism, which is why we define it as a conjunctive-negative *nėt* or *nìt*, see 5.2.4, in (42) *nėt* comes with an already (morphologically) negated verb, achieving (only) a conjunction-intensifying function.

The same function, conjunction-intensifying, is performed by *ni*, as in (43)− (45):

(43) *Tu* *me* *nėi̯* **ni** *v‿vȧržęt*

That me.dat.sg. NEG.is.3.sg.pres. CONEG in pocket.acc.sg.

ni *z vȧržęta,* **ni** *nǫtre,*

CONEG out from pocket.gen.sg. CONEG inside.adv.

ni *vėn.* (Pr)[27]

CONEG outside.adv.

'It is neither in my pocket nor out of my pocket, neither inside nor outside.'

(44) *Nę̈ma* **ni** *glȧvę* **ni** *rȉpa.* (Ča, old)[28]

NEG.have.POSS.3.sg.pres. CONEG head.gen.sg. CONEG tail.gen.sg.

'It has neither head nor tail.'

(45) *Mi̯ęne* *nȧ* *gri* **ni** *v‿vȧržęt*

me.dat.sg. NEG go CONEG into pocket.acc. sg.

ni *z vȧržęta.* (Ča, new)[29]

CONEG out of pocket.gen.sg.

'It doesn't go into my pocket or out of my pocket.'

---

[27] Malnar (2012: 211)
[28] Malnar (2012: 173)
[29] Malnar (2012: 211)

As an intensifier of sentence negation, but not a conjunction, the intensifier *ni* or *ne* is used in examples of the type (46) and (47):

(46) **Nẹ̇isen**   *dabi̯ụa*   **ni**   *kụ̇lku*
     NEG.is.1.sg.pres.   get.past.part.sg.fem.   not.even   how.CNJ

     ję   *bụ̊ȁta*   *pad nụ̇aften.* (Tr)
     is.3.sg.pres.   mud.nom.gen.   under nail.ins.sg.

     'I didn't get anything.'

(47) **Ne**   *san*   *nevej*   *kaj*
     not.even   himself   NEG.know.3.sg.pres.   what.CNJ

     be   *san*   *zs sabo.* (Ge)[30]
     be.   himself   with himself.inst.sg.

     'He doesn't even know what to do with himself.'

4. Negative indefinite expressions

The list of negative indefinite expressions in the local dialects of the Čabar area is based on the list of such expressions in Standard Croatian by I. Zovko Dinković (2013: 220).[31] The list is relevant to the discussion of negative concord in the context of the analyzed local dialects, see 5.4.

Negative indefinite pronouns	*nebẹ̇den*/*nebẹ̇don* 'nobody', *nė̇č* 'nothing', *nḭko* 'nobody', *nė̇ščę* 'nobody', *nė̇kaku̯* 'any'
Negative indefinite adverbs	*nḭgdęr*/*nḭgdar* 'never', *nė̇kok* 'not at all', *nekȁ̊mer*/*nekȁ̊mor* 'nowhere', *nė̇krej* 'nowhere'[32]

Table 3. Negative indefinite expressions

---

[30]   Pochobradsky (2008: 46)

[31]   For the meaning of the negative indefinite adverb in Standard Croatian *nimalo* 'not a bit' the equivalent negative adverb is not used; instead we find the combination of the component *ne* with the component *ma̯u* – *ne ma̯u* − used to intensify the negative meaning of the sentence. For the negative adjective meaning 'none' *ne aden* is used, which is confirmed by S. Malnar (2014: 241). On the other hand, the same author (Malnar 2008: 196) states *neb'ędon*, *neb'ęna* for meaning 'none', which we consider to be used more often in the meaning of 'nobody' than 'none'.

[32]   For some adjectives and adverbs in the local dialects of the Čabar area we can find equivalents in English, while some have to be translated using an expression (or expressions) with similar meaning, e.g. *nė̇kok* 'not at all'.

On the basis of Table 3 it can be concluded that the indefinite expressions in the analyzed local dialects are *ni*-words, e.g. *nȉko*; *nȉgdęr*/*nȉgdar*, and *ne*-words, e.g. *nebẹ̏den*/*nebẹ̏don*; *nẹ̏č*.

5. Discussion

In this section we will consider everything presented in the previous section.

5.1. It is clear from Table 1 that the negative prefixes *nȋ-*, *nę̏-*, *nẹ̏ị-* and *nȁ-* represent the morphological means of negation. They come to the left of the finite form of the verb, negating the content of the sentence completely. It is clear from section 2.6. that the prefix *na-* is part of the forms *nȁkar*, *nakȃrmo* and *nakȃrtę*, which forms an analytic imperative with the infinitive. From section 2.5, which deals with negative existential constructions with the verb *bẹ̏t* 'to be' ('to exist'), it appears that the negative prefix is found in the non-personal verb form.

5.1.1. The prefix *nȋ-* negates the modal verb 'to want'[33], which is the holder of the grammatical meaning of the complex verbal predicate. We also consider the verb 'to have' in example (9) as a modal because it refers to an elided verb modifying its meaning, cf. **Nȋčo [jẹ̏st/pẹ̏č]** *tȏrto* 'I don't wont [to eat / to bake] the cake', and forming the so-called elliptical complex verbal predicate (see Belaj and Tanacković Faletar 2017: 180).

5.1.2. The prefix *nę̏-* negates the aorist of the auxiliary verb *bẹ̏t* 'to be' as a part of the conditional, while the morphological mode of negation alternates with the syntactic one, which means that instead of the prefix the same form is negated with the negative particle − *nę̏*, cf. (10) and (30)−(31), see also 5.2.3.

5.1.3. The negative prefix *nẹ̏ị-* negates the present forms of the verb *bẹ̏t* 'to be' of different syntactic and semantic value and the verb *jẹ̏met* 'to have' meaning 'to possess'. Therefore, the prefix *nẹ̏ị-* negates the present tense of the verb *bẹ̏t* meaning 'to spend an amount of time at a location'.[34] In addition to (11), we also give examples (48)−(50):

(48) *Mȉ*   **nẹ̏ịsmo**   *f xȉše,*
     we.nom.pl.   NEG.are.EXST1.pres.1.pl.   in house.loc.sg.
     mȉ   **smo**   *v zgrȁde.* (Tr)
     we.nom.pl.   are.EXST1.pres.1.pl.   in buildilg.loc.sg.
     'We are not in the house, we are in the building.'

---

[33]   The infinitive of the verb 'to want' (*htjeti*) is not confirmed. For more on this, see Malnar Jurišić (2023: 61).

[34]   See note 22 above.

(49) *Dèca*   **nȅi̯so**   *f sȍbe.* (Tr)

     children.nom.   NEG.are.EXST1.pres.   in room.loc.sg.

     'The children are not in the room.'

(50) *Šȅfica*   *zdȅj*   **nȅi̯**   *f firme.* (Tr)

     boss.nom.   now.adv.   NEG.is.EXST1.pres.3.pl.   in company.loc.sg.

     'The boss is not in the company now.'

It also negates the present form of the copulative verb *bȅt*, with (12) see and (51)−(53):

(51) *Tȕ*   **nȅi̯sen**   *i̯ȅ̦st!* (Tr)

     That.nom.   NEG.am.pres.   me.nom.

     'That's not me!'

(52) *Vȋ*   **nȅi̯ste̦**   *nȍrmalne!* (Tr)

     you.nom.2.pl.   NEG.are.pres.2.pl.   normal.adj.nom.pl.masc.

     'You are not sane!'

(53) **Nȅi̯**   *zadavȕlen*   *s pȍnudo.* (Tr)

     NEG.is.pres.3.sg.   satisfied.adj.nom.sg.   with offer.ins.sg.

     'He is not satisfied with the offer.'

When it comes to the negated present tense of the copulative and auxiliary verb *bȅt*, the prefix *nȅi̯-* can also be noted as *nej-*, which has been confirmed in several written sources and is in fact the result of the author's transcription that is not uniform with the dialectological one, e.g. *Kaj zijaš, se nejson duh?*[35] 'What are you shouting at, I'm not a ghost?'; *Nekrej nejsen rję̦kua da zes vsaken sloven menavan an kamadiček tję̦bę̦* (...)[36] 'I didn't say anywhere that with every letter I change a part of you.'

Regarding the negation of the copulative predicate, we would also point out the following: in principle, in the local dialects of the Čabar area, negative forms of adjectives[37] such as *nezahvalan* 'ungrateful', *nezainteresiran* 'disinterested',

---

[35]   Pochobradsky (2008: 12)

[36]   Arh (2017: 29)

[37]   I. Zovko Dinković (2013: 198), speaking about inherently negative words in the Standard Croatian, states: »Inherently negative words can be divided into two groups. The first group consists of negative words that are formed by adding affixes to the positive form of an adjective, noun or adverb, while the second group consists of words that do not contain a negative morpheme, but have a negative meaning, i.e. a semantically descending implication.« The author explains that morphologically related negative forms of adjectives »are mostly formed from adjectives that have a positive meaning in themselves. In doing so, we distinguish between affirmativeness and positivity from negation and negativity, because words that carry a negative meaning are not necessarily negative.«

nerazuman 'unreasonable', *neuredan* 'untidy', *nepraktičan* 'unpractical' are not used; the same is true of the Standard Croatian constructions of the type *Zbog toga je nesretan* 'That's why he's unhappy', *Ovaj je usisavač nepraktičan* 'This vacuum cleaner is unpractical'.[38] Instead, negative attribution (cf. Vasilj, Žagmešter and Nazalević Čučević 2022) is mostly expressed by constructions with a negated copulative verb and a positive adjective form. In other words, the negative meaning is not expressed at the lexical level, but at the sentence level – *Zȧtu nȇi̯ srȉčen* 'That's why he's not happy', *Tȁ usisavȃč nȇi̯ prȁktičan* 'That vacuum cleaner is not practical'.

The prefix *nȇi̯-* also negates the present tense of the auxiliary verb *bȅt* as part of the perfect tense, with (13)−(14) see (54)−(55):

(54) (...) *nȅč*   *mo*   **nȇi̯sen**   *krȉvga*
      nothing.acc.   him.dat.   NEG.am.pres.   wrong.adj.gen.sg.
      narȋdu. (Tr)
      do.past.part.sg.masc.
      'I did nothing wrong to him.'

(55) *Pȧjou̯*   *sen*   *nȅkej*
      eat.past.part.sg.masc.   am.pres.   something.acc.
      z nȕk,   **nȇi̯sen**   *jȅmu*
      off feet.gen.pl.   NEG.am.pres.   have.past.part.sg.masc.
      cȧjt   *prȧf*   *ni*   *pȧjest*. (Tr)
      time.acc.sg.   properly.adv.   not.even   eat.inf.
      'I ate something off my feet, I didn't even have time to eat properly.'

When it comes to the verb *jȅmet* 'imati' in the possessive meaning, its present form is also negated by the prefix *nȇi̯-*, with (15)−(16), see (56)−(58):

(56) *U̯ȧn*   **nȇi̯ma**   *ne*   *sȩ̏stri*
      he.nom.   NEG.have.pres.3.sg.   CONEG   sister.gen.sg.
      ne   *brȃta*. (Tr)
      CONEG   brother.gen.sg.
      'He has neither sister nor brother.'

---

[38] We find rare examples such as *nȧsu̯an* 'unsalted' or *nasrȋčen/nasrȩ̏čon* 'unhappy' (cf. Malnar 2008). A negative attribution within the copulative predicate expressed by an inherently negative adjective, e.g. *Tȉ se nȅuredan* 'You are untidy', could be interpreted as an innovation.

(57) **Nȅi̯man**   *dnȁrju*   *za bȩdastu̯ȁčȩ.* (Tr)

     NEG.have.pres.1.sg.   money.gen.pl.   for.nonsense.acc.pl.

     'I have no money for nonsense.'

(58) **Nȅi̯majo**   *cȧjt*   *za nȧs.* (Pr)

     NEG.have.pres.3.pl.   time.acc.sg.   for us.acc.

     'They don't have time for us.'

In addition to (16), we have also referred to the example from the older system of the local dialect of Čabar − *Tȁk srȯmak jȩ da nȩ̏ma ni kȧj špȁrat za čȓnȩ dnȉ*, from which it is clear that due to different phonological developments the negative prefix, which in today's local dialect has the form *nȅi̯-*, assumes the form *nȅ̏-*, while *nȩ̏ma* similarly appears in contrast to today's *nȅi̯ma*.

5.1.4. The prefix *nȧ-* negates monosyllabic perfective present forms of the auxiliary verb *bȅt* 'to be' in the future tense and monosyllabic present forms of verbs such as **grȩsti*[39] or *dȧt* 'to give'. In relation to the first, in addition to (17)−(19), we also give examples (59)−(62):

(59) *(...) nekamer*   **nabu**   **uodešu**. (Tr)[40]

     nowhere.adv.   NEG.be.PFV.pres.3.sg.   go.past.part.sg.masc.

     'He won't go anywhere.'

(60) *O,*   *kok*   *sen*   *sȩ*

     EXC   how.adv.   am.pres.1.sg.   *se*.refl.

     baua (...)   *da*   *vȩč*   *nigdȩr*

     fear.past.part.sg.fem.   CNJ   PTCL   never.adv.

     nabuš   **zešu** *(...).* (Tr)[41]

     NEG.be.PFV.pres.2.sg.   come out.past.part. sg.masc.

     'Oh, how I was afraid (...) that you would never come out again (...).'

(61) *(...)* **nabun**   **uodešua**. (Tr)[42]

     NEG.be.PFV.pres.1.sg.   leave.past.part.sg.fem.

     '(...) I will not leave.'

---

[39]   The verb **grȩsti* did not preserve its infinitive form. It preserved the present tense conjugation (Malnar Jurišić 2023: 62).

[40]   Arh (2017: 13)

[41]   Arh (2017: 30)

[42]   Arh (2017: 40)

(62)   *Ne*   *jo*   *něisen*   *nu̯ȧsu*

        CONEG   her.acc.   NEG.am.pres.1.sg.   wear.past.part.sg.masc.

        ne   *jo*   **nȧbun**   **nu̯ȧsu**. (Tr)

        CONEG   her.acc.   NEG.be.PFV.pres.1.sg.   wear.past.part.sg.masc.

        'I haven't worn it and I won't wear it.'

The morphological mode of negation is confirmed in sources, e.g. in the local dialects of Tršće and Gerovo. Based on the analysis of examples collected through directed research and from the literature, we determined the unevenness in noting the negation – the analyzed forms of the verb *bȅt* were syntactically negated in the collected examples, for instance in (28)−(29) with the negative particle *nȧ*, in (33) with the conjunction-negation *nȅt*, see 5. 2. 1. The inconsistency was also found in one and the same author. Thus, Z. Pochobradsky (2008) negates that form with both a prefix and a negative particle, cf. (18)−(19) and *Na bun valda i na Mucko naljeteu?*[43] 'I won't run into Mucka either?'.

The prefix *nȧ-* also negates the monosyllabic present forms of the verbs **grȩsti – nȧgrȩ* and *dȧt – nȧda*. In addition to (20)−(21), we also give examples (63)−(64):

(63)   **Nȧgrȩn**   *jȕtre*   *f šȕlo.* (Tr)

        NEG.go.pres.1.sg.   tomorrow   to school.acc.sg.

        'I'm not going to school tomorrow.'

(64)   **Nȧdan**   *mo*   *dȇvjat.* (Tr)

        NEG.let.pres.1.sg.   him.dat.   go wild.inf.

        'I don't let him go wild.'

5.2. Table 2 shows that the means of the syntactic mode of sentence negation are: *na/nȩ*, *nȧ*, *nȩ̇* and *nȅt/nȉt*. It is clear that the negative particle and the conjunctive-negative *nȅt* and *nȉt* are located to the left of the finite verb, negating the content of the sentence completely. From examples (32) and (72)−(73) it is clear that a negative prefix can also be used to negate a non-finite verb form, namely an infinitive in command constructions. These means can alternate in some situations, in others they cannot, while in some instead of the means of the syntactic mode we find the morphological means, i.e. a prefix. No other sentence element comes between the negative particle (or prefix) and the verb.

5.2.1. The negative particles *na* and *nȩ* can alternate in several situations. These negative particles negate the polysyllabic perfective present forms of the auxiliary verb *bȅt* in the composition of the future tense (22)−(23). They also

---

[43]   Pochobradsky (2008: 13)

negate synthetic verb forms; in addition to (24)−(26) we also give examples (65)−(68):

(65) **Ne**   **muoreš**   *d'ns*   *ne*   *paštjenu*
NEG   can.pres.2.sg.   today.adv.   not.even   properly.adv.
puopet (...) (Ge)[44]
drink.inf.
'Today, you can't even properly have a drink (...)'

(66) (...) **nę**   **menavajo**   *sę* (...)   **nę**   **glidajo** (...) (Tr)[45]
NEG   change.pres.3.pl.   *se*.refl.   NEG   look.pres.3.pl.
'(...) they don't change (...) they don't look (...)'

(67) **Na**   **mȍren**   **spȧt**,
NEG   can.pres.1.sg.   sleep.inf.
nȇsen   *ni*   *vȯka*   *stȧsnela*. (Ča, old)[46]
NEG.am.pres.   not.even   eye.gen.sg.   squeeze.past.part.sg.fem.
'I can't sleep, I haven't even closed my eyes.'

(68) *Nȋ̇emo*   *nȧko*   *nȇč*   **na**   **mȧrę**,
him.dat.sg.   nobody.nom.   nothing   NEG   can.pres.3.sg.
u̇ȧn   *sę*   *nȧkoga*   **na**   **bȧji**. (Tr)
he.nom.   *se*.refl.   nobody.gen.   NEG   fear.3.sg.pres.
'Nobody can do anything to him, he is not afraid of anyone.'

The same negative particle also alternate in terminative sentences. The terminative meaning of a temporal clause is marked with the subordinating conjunction *dok nę*, i.e. *dok na*, cf. (27).

5.2.2. The negative particle *nȧ* negates the monosyllabic verb forms. That particle alternates with the prefix *na-*, cf. (17)−(19) and (28)−(29), see and 5.1.4.

5.2.3. The negative particle *nę* negates the aorist of the auxiliary verb *bȇt* as part of the conditional. It can alternate with the prefix *nę-*, cf. (10) and (30)−(31). The syntactic way of negating this form of the verb *bȇt* is also supported by examples (69)−(71):

---

[44] Pochobradsky (2008: 40)

[45] Arh (2017: 11)

[46] Malnar (2012: 209)

(69) *Da*   *sə̀n*   *tę*   *zes‿svę̆čo*   *jeskǎ̀la,*
CNJ   am.pres.   you.acc.sg.   with candle.ins.sg.   look.past.part.sg.fem.
pa   *tę*   ***nę***   ***be***   ***dobìla***. (Ča, old)[47]
CNJ   you.acc.sg.   NEG   be.ao.1.sg.   get.past.part.sg.fem.
'If I had looked for you with a candle, I wouldn't have found you.'

(70) *Tune*   ***ne***   ***be***   *ne*
Tune.nom.   NEG   be.ao.3.sg.   not.even
gmr   *da*   *prejk*   ***ne***
die.past.part.sg.masc.   CNJ   before.adv.   NEG
be   ***adošu***   *v Prvo pričest.* (Ge)[48]
be.ao.3.sg.   go.past.part.sg.masc.   to Prva pričest.acc.sg.
'Tune would not have died if he had not gone to Prva pričest first.'

(71) (...) *pab'užen*   *ję*   *dę*
religious.adj.nom.sg.masc.   is.pres.3.sg.   CNJ
nę   ***be***   *ž'ignanę*
NEG   be.ao.3.sg.   holy.adj.gen.sg.
u̯adi   ***sk'aliu̯***. (Tr)[49]
water.gen.sg.fem.   blur.past.part.sg.masc.
'He is religious so as not to blur the holy water.'

This duality of expression of negation was ascertained on the basis of inconsistencies found in the recording of the material taken from the literature and written sources, and in the results collected by directed research, see and 5.1.2.

The negative particle *nę̇* also negates the infinitive in command constructions, see (32) and (72)−(73):

(72) ***Nę̇***   ***pę̇jt***   *f xìšo*   *f čȇi̯vlax!* (Tr)
NEG   go.inf.PROH   to house.acc.sg.   in shoes.loc.pl.
'Do not go into the house in shoes!'

(73) ***Nę̇***   ***glȋdat***   *čȇz u̯ȧknu!* (Tr)
NEG   look.inf.PROH   through window.acc.sg.
'Don't look through the window!'

---

[47] Malnar (2012: 204)
[48] Pochobradsky (2008: 21)
[49] Malnar (2002: 234)

5.2.4. Among the means of sentence and clause negation are also the conjunction-negations *nėt* and *niˈt*, which are used less frequently in relation to the previously mentioned means of sentence negation. They negate the predicates of the copulative sentence in such a way that they appear in both sentences (34) or only in the second, while the first is negated in a syntactic or morphological way (33). As a negative means of sentence negation, *niˈt* is more often used by younger speakers.

5.3. In section 3, we also spoke of *nėt* as an intensifier of negative meaning. Contrary to what is described in 5.2.4, *nėt* can have a conjunction-intensifying function in addition to the conjunctive-negating function (42). Conjunction--intensifying words are both *nė* (41) and *ni* (43)−(45). *Ni* is represented in the corpora particularly well, see (74):

(74) *Tȯk*　　　*dę̆la*　　　*da*　　　*nę̆ma*
so.adv.　　works.3.sg.　　CNJ　　NEG.have.3.sg.

ni　　　*svı̄tka*　　　**ni**　　　*pı̄tka.* (Ča, old)[50]
CONEG　　holiday.acc.　　CONEG　　friday.acc.

'He/She works so hard that there is no holiday.'

Ne and *ni* can also have only an intensifying function, see (46)−(47) and (75)−(77):

(75) **Ni**　　　*za drȁgoga*　　　*Bȯga*　　　*da*　　　*tuˈ*
not.even　for dear　　　　　God.acc.　　CNJ　　that.acc.

nę̆i̯se　　　*narı̄du.* (Tr)
NEG.are　do.past.part.sg.masc.

'For God's sake, don't do it.'

(76) *Nę̆*　　　*vei̯*　　　　*se*　　　　　　　**ni**　　　*rėt*
NEG　　know.pres.3.sg.　himself/herself.dat.　not.even　ass.acc.

u̯obrı̇sat. (Tr)
wipe.inf.

'He/She doesn't even know how to wipe his/her own ass.'

(77) *Tu*　　　*nę̆i̯*　　　*mi̯ę̆ne*　　　**ne**　　　*na krȧj*
that.nom.　NEG.is.pres.3.sg.　me.dat.sg.　not.even　at end.loc.sg.

pȁmęte. (Pr)[51]
mind.gen.

'That doesn't even cross my mind.'

---

[50]　Malnar (2012: 204)
[51]　Malnar (2012: 190)

5.4. Examples (24), (28), (54), (59)−(60) and (68) illustrate negative concord, i.e. that with a negated predicate in the same sentence all indefinite expressions are negative and form a unique negative meaning (Zovko Dinković 2021: 173−174; see Zovko Dinković 2013; Nazalević Čučević 2016). Table 3 shows the negative indefinite expressions – negative indefinite pronouns and adverbs. We presented the hypothesis that negative indefinite expressions in the analyzed local dialect are formed by *ni*-words and *ne*-words, (78)−(80):

(78) **Ne̊č̌** ga ne̊i̯sen kri̊vu pråšou̯. (Tr)
nothing.acc. him NEG.am.pres. wrong.adv. ask.past.part.sg.masc.
'I didn't ask him anything wrong.'

(79) **Nebe̊den** mo na mårę ne̊č̌. (Tr)
nobody.nom. him.dat. NEG can.pres. nothing.acc.
'Nobody can do anything to him.'

(80) *Tihe suzi matere* **nigdar** *na budo*
silent.nom.pl. tears.nom.pl. mother.gen. never NEG be.PFV.pres.
zjoukane. (Ge)[52]
shed.nom.
'A mother's silent tears will never be shed.'

With regard to the negative concord, it should be noted that in prepositional- -case expressions with negative indefinite pronouns there is no tmesis, see (81)−(87):

(84) *Na be̊žin* **u̯od ni̊koga**. (Tr)
NEG running.1.sg.pres. from nobody.gen.
'I'm not running away from anyone.'

(85) *Na drůže sę* **z nebe̊nen** (...). (Tr)
NEG hang.out.3.sg. *se*.refl. with nobody.ins.
'He/She doesn't hang out with anyone (...)'

(86) *Na menåvan sę* **za ni̊koga**. (Tr)
NEG change.pres.1.sg. *se*.refl. for nobody.acc.
'I don't change for anyone.'

(87) *Na vi̊rjen v* **nebe̊nga**. (Tr)
NEG believe.pres.1.sg. in nobody.acc.
'I don't believe in anyone.'

---

[52] Pochobradsky (1996: 42)

Examples (78)−(80) and (84)−(87) show that a negative indefinite pronoun can appear both before and after the negated predicate.

6. Conclusion

On the basis of the examples from the corpora the paper describes the means of morphological and syntactic expression of sentence negation in the local dialects of the Čabar area and analyzes their distribution and position (see Tables 1 and 2). In addition, reference is made to intensifiers of negative meaning and negative indefinite expressions, which appear with sentence negation, resulting in negative concord. It has been determined that the negating prefixes *nȋ-*, *nę̇-*, *nė̤i̯- and nȧ-* are means of morphological negation, and *na*/*nę*, *nȧ*, *nę̇* and *nė̇t*/*nȋt* are means of syntactic negation. Both are to the left of the negating verb, which means that the negation has everything to the right of it within its scope. It is also evident that the same form of a verb within one mode of negation, e.g. syntactic, can be negated by one or the other negation, or that it can be negated by one or the other mode of negation, i.e. prefix or the negative particle. In addition to this peculiarity of sentence negation in the local dialects of the Čabar area, we have determined, for example, the variety of conjunction-intensifying and intensifying words with sentence negation (*nė̇t*, *nė̇*, *ni*); the use of the verb *bė̇t* 'to be' to express the existential meaning of '(not) to exist' in both the present and the non-present tense; non-use of inherently negative adjectives, i.e. negation at the lexical level in attribution constructions such as *Ovaj je usisavač nepraktičan*, but the expression of negative attribution at the sentence level – *Ta usisavȁč nė̤i̯ prȧktičan.* As part of further research on negation in the analyzed local dialects, the presence of expletive negation and the use of double negation should be analyzed. It would be interesting to determine the presence of partial negation. A similar research model should also be applied to the description of (sentence) negation in other local dialects.

Sources

Arh, Branka. 2017. *Zad za dęvit uaglu.* Čabar: Ogranak Matice hrvatske u Čabru.

Malnar, Marija. 2012. *Fonološki opis čabarskih govora na frazeološkom korpusu.* Doctoral thesis. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

Malnar, Slavko. 2002. *Pamejnek.* Čabar: Ogranak Matice hrvatske u Čabru.

Pochobradsky, Zlatko. 1996. *Raki. Prpuvtke.* Čabar: Srednja škola „Vladimir Nazor" Čabar.

Pochobradsky, Zlatko. 2008. *Tune i Ive.* Čabar: Ogranak Matice hrvatske u Čabru.

References

Barac-Grum, Vida. 1993. *Čakavsko-kajkavski govorni kontakt u Gorskom kotaru*. Rijeka: Izdavački centar Rijeka.

Belaj, Branimir; Tanacković Faletar, Goran. 2017. *Kognitivna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika. Knjiga druga. Sintaksa jednostavne rečenice*. Zagreb: Disput.

Belaj, Branimir; Tanacković Faletar, Goran. 2020. *Kognitivna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika. Knjiga treća. Sintaksa složene rečenice*. Zagreb: Disput.

Celinić, Anita. 2020. Kajkavsko narječje / Kajkavian. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, 24, Zagreb, 1−37.

Ćoso, Bojana; Bogunović, Irena. 2016. Cognitive processing of verbal quantifiers in the context of affirmative and negative sentences: A Croatian study. *Research in language*, 14 (3), 203−220. https://doi.org/10.1515/rela-2016-0013 (accesed 15 March 2024)

Ćoso, Bojana; Bogunović, Irena. 2019. The role of linguistic cues in bilingual negation processing. *International journal of bilingualism*, 23 (1), 21−36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006917698840 (accesed 15 March 2024)

Ćoso, Bojana; Bogunović, Irena. 2021. Eksperimentalni pristup negaciji: istraživanja u hrvatskome jeziku i njihov doprinos modelima obrade negacije. *Fluminensia*, 33 (2), 359−385. https://doi.org/10.31820/f.33.2.11 (accesed 17 February 2024)

Finka, Božidar. 1974. Gorskokotarska kajkavština u našem dijalekatskom mozaiku. *Kajkavski zbornik*. Ed. Joža Skok, Miroslav Šicel i Antun Šojat. Zlatar: Narodno sveučilište „Ivan Goran Kovačić", 29−43.

Gostenčnik, Januška. 2018. *Krajevni govori ob Čabranki in zgornji Kolpi*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC SAZU.

Horn, Laurence R. 2010. Multiple negation in English and other languages. *The Expression of Negation*. Ed. L. R. Horn. Berlin − New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 111−149.

Jelenčić, Lea. 2023. *Izražavanje sintaktičke negacije u mjesnom govoru Štrigove*. Master's thesis. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

Katičić, Radoslav. 1986. *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Globus i HAZU.

Kovačević, Ana. 2016. *Negacija od čestice do teksta. Usporedna i povijesna raščlamba negacije u hrvatskoglagoljskoj pismenosti*. Zagreb: Staroslavenski institut.

Kovačević, Miloš. 2002. *Sintaksička negacija u srpskome jeziku*. Niš: Izdavačka jedinica Univerziteta.

Lisac, Josip. 2006. *Tragom zavičaja*. Split: Književni krug.

Lisac, Josip. 2009. *Hrvatska dijalektologija 2. Čakavsko narječje*. Zagreb: Golden marketing − Tehnička knjiga.

Lončarić, Mijo. 2005. *Kajkaviana i Alia. Ogledi o kajkavskom i drugim hrvatskim govorima*. Čakovec − Zagreb: Zrinski − Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.

Lukežić, Iva. 2015. *Zajednička povijest hrvatskih narječja. Morfologija 2*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada − Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci − Katedra Čakavskoga sabora Grobnišćine.

Lukežić, Iva; Turk, Marija. 1998. *Govori otoka Krka*. Crikvenica: Libellus.

Malnar Jurišić, Marija. 2023. *Frazeologija govora Tršća u Gorskome kotaru s opisom govora i rječnicima*. Čabar: Ogranak Matice hrvatske u Čabru.

Malnar, Marija. 2012. *Fonološki opis čabarskih govora na frazeološkom korpusu*. Doctoral thesis. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

Malnar, Slavko. 2008. *Rječnik govora čabarskog kraja*. Čabar: Ogranak Matice hrvatske u Čabru.

Malnar, Slavko. 2014. *Rječnik govora čabarskog kraja: hrvatski standardni jezik − dụamač pamejnek.* Čabar: Ogranak Matice hrvatske u Čabru.

Maretić, Tomo. 1963. *Gramatika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

Nazalević Čučević, Iva. 2016. *Sintaktička negacija. Usporedna analiza sintaktičke negacije u hrvatskome i makedonskome jeziku*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.

Nazalević Čučević, Iva. 2020. Predikat u hrvatskome jeziku. *HINIZ – Hrvatski inojezični*. Ur. Zrinka Jelaska i Igor Marko Gligorić. Zagreb – Klagenfurt: Hrvatsko filološko društvo − Institut für Slawistik, Universität Klagenfurt, 195–221, https://www.hfiloloskod.hr/images/HFD/Knjige/Kroatini/HINIZ.pdf (accesed 15 March 2024)

Nazalević Čučević, Iva. 2022. Minus i minus daju plus – o dvostrukoj negaciji u hrvatskome. *Binarnosti i suprotnosti u hrvatskome jeziku, književnosti i kulturi. Zbornik radova 49. seminara Zagrebačke slavističke škole*. Ed. Igor Marko Gligorić i Iva Nazalević Čučević. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet u Zagrebu, 71−94.

Nazalević Čučević, Iva; Belaj, Branimir. 2018. Sintaktičko-semantički status egzistencijalnih glagola *biti*, *imati* i *trebati*. *Croatica*, 42 (62), Zagreb, 179–204.

Pavešić, Slavko (ed.). 1971. *Jezični savjetnik s gramatikom*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

Raguž, Dragutin. 1997. *Praktična hrvatska gramatika*. Zagreb: Hrvatska medicinska naklada.

Ramadanović, Ermina; Virč, Ines. 2013. Redoslijed nenaglašenih sintatktičkih jedinica u kajkavštini. *Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 39 (2), Zagreb, 603−630.

Silić, Josip; Pranjković, Ivo. 2005. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta.* Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Snoj, Marko. 2003. *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Ljubljana: Modrijan.

van der Auwera, Johan. 2021. Quirky negative concord: Croatian, Spanish and French *ni*'s. *Jezikoslovlje*, 22. (2.), 195−225. https://doi.org/10.29162/jez.2021.5 (accesed 15. February 2024)

Vasilj, Darko; Žagmešter, Ana; Nazalević Čučević, Iva. 2022. Identifikacija i atribucija na (supra)sintaktičkoj razini u hrvatskome jeziku. *Slavistična prepletanja 1*. Ed. Gjoko Nikolovski i Natalija Ulčnik. Maribor: Univerza v Mariboru, Univerzitetna založba, 37−58. https://doi.org/10.18690/um.ff.3.2022 (accesed 15 March 2024)

Zovko Dinković, Irena. 2013. *Negacija u jeziku. Konstrastivna analiza negacije u engleskome i hrvatskome jeziku*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.

Zovko Dinković, Irena. 2021. *O dvostrukoj negaciji i niječnome slaganju*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.

Rečenična negacija u govorima čabarskoga područja

Sažetak

Sintaktička se negacija u jezikoslovlju dijeli na rečeničnu i parcijalnu. Rečeničnom se negacijom preko zanijekanoga predikata niječe rečenični sadržaj u cijelosti, a parcijalnom se niječe sadržaj kojega nepredikatnoga člana rečeničnoga ustroja. U radu se analiziraju sredstva rečenične negacije u govorima čabarskoga područja, morfološka ili sintaktička, te njihov položaj u odnosu na glagolski oblik u predikatu. Upućuje se i na pojačivače niječnoga značenja te niječno slaganje. Analiza se temelji na građi prikupljenoj usmjerenim terenskim istraživanjem, koji uz snimanje spontanoga govora uključuje i prijevod rečenica sa standarda na govor, te na primjerima iz dijalektološke literature i izvora.

Ključne riječi: kajkavsko narječje, čabarski govori, sintaktička negacija, rečenična negacija

Keywords: Kajkavian group of dialects, Čabar local dialects, syntactic negation, sentence negation