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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to present a synchronic description of the language of Miloš Lazarević, a little-known Serbian writer from Vojvodina, who until only recently had been totally neglected as a literary figure (see Ždralo 1973 and Dobrašinović 1960). The study of his language, heretofore never studied, is important in the history of the development of the modern Serbocroatian literary language. Lazarević was one of those early Serbs such as Ilić, Tirol, Kolarović, Nikolić, Gavrilović, and others (see Belić 1948:54 and Albin 1974a:44, footnote 21) who supported and attempted to follow--to one degree or another--Vuk Karadžić's language reforms at a very early date. The study of the language of these early adherents like Lazarević has been neglected in Serbocroatian philology. With this study the author hopes to begin rectifying the situation by helping to fill this gap in the history of the literary language.

Studying the language of these early adherents of Vuk Karadžić is important for a number of reasons. These people were the few who were willing to support Vuk at a very early and unpopular period for his reforms. Their attempts to base their writings on vernacular Serbian and to
free themselves from the strong influence of Slavenosерbian
required considerable initiative and courage in the face of
strong opposition. Although some of these early supporters
may today be seen as obscure literary figures or little-
known members of the society, the initial support they gave
Vuk in the 1820s and 1830s was crucial to this ultimate
victory. To what extent each of them succeeded in breaking
away from the traditional language and adhering to Vuk's
reforms should be studied, if the history of the development
of the literary language is to be fully understood.

In 1829 Vuk Karadžić published in his newspaper,
Danica, an article entitled "Material for a Beautiful
Serbian Novel." In this article he suggested a theme for a
romantic novel in the tradition of Serbian folk literature
and urged that "a Serbian LaFontaine or Walter Scott" write
such a novel on the great love of two peasant boys for the
same girl.¹

In 1831 Miloš Lazarević, an acquaintance of Vuk,
accepted this suggestion and published in Budapest his short
novella entitled Noble and Strong Love² based on this theme.
During that era of strong Serbian national pride, Lazarević
also staunchly supported Vuk's efforts in promoting national
culture among the Serbs. Accordingly, in the Preface
(p. [ix]) to his novella Lazarević states that he chose this
setting for his book because "the customs of our people in
that place have hardly been lost since their origin and
therefore have remained unchanged even today."³ Similarly, Lazarević notes (p. [viii]) that he was careful "not to impudently impose foreign customs on the people."⁴

_Plemenita i silna ljubov_ is a sentimental and idyllic novella with strong moralistic and nationalistic overtones. Briefly, the story depicts two young Serbian peasants, Milan and Ivan, who had been very close boyhood friends and who fall in love with the same beautiful shepherdess, Petra. The friends soon quarrel and end up nearly stabbing each other. As a solution to the predicament, Petra stands on Kosmaj mountain, and the two friends race up the hill to see who can reach her first and thereby become hers. Both die of exhaustion, one in Petra's arms, and she stabs and kills herself to be united with them in death.

In employing many of the features common to the romantic genre of literature, Lazarević presents Serbian culture in its very best light: the strong "natural" man; a pure, naïve love theme; the cult of friendship, nobleness, and virtue; presentation of simple, unaffected peasant life; the close, loving patriarchal family; beautiful lyric digressions on the countryside and the peasants in the fields; and an overall tender, sympathetic tone in the narration for the characters (Ždrale 1973:580). All in all, this work is an early attempt at writing the new genre of the novel in Serbian literature.⁵
Lazarević, as if to show the evils of the intrusion of foreign elements when the traditional values were lost, translated from the German a treatise entitled The Answer of the Society of Virtue and Wisdom in Germany Concerning the Question of the Society of Faith and Christianity in Stockholm, which was published together with Plemenita i silna ljubov. It is an abstract, polemical, and highly moralistic treatise on the evils of concubinage and the virtues of strong legal family ties and marriage as the only legitimate means for the propagation of the human race.

Miloš Lazarević originated from a Serbian intellectual family from Vojvodina, members of which had been engaged in various scientific and literary pursuits. Miloš's father, Jovan, was born in 1767 in Sremski Karlovci, where he later became a teacher at the famous Gymnasium. He wrote a treatise entitled On the Origins of the Serbian Kingdom. He also was an influential founding member of the "Karlovački krug," a literary society headed by Metropolitan Stratimirović (see Petrović 1960:56-59). Miloš's brother Lazar, a teacher at the Novi Sad Gymnasium, also engaged in literary activity, writing most notably two comedies, "Prijatelji" and "Vladimir i Kosara." Miloš himself, who lived most of his life in Zemun, where he also was a teacher, published in 1820 a translation from the German of the poem "Der Tod Abels" (1758) by the Swiss poet Solomon Gessner. Next came Plemenita i silna ljubov and Odgovor in 1831, and
in 1852 he published a translation entitled *Persian Tales,* again from the German. Miloš's last literary activity was in 1852, when he edited the Zemun newspaper *Srbski j narodnyj věstnik* (Ždral 1973:578).

All that is known about Lazarević's acquaintance with Vuk Karadžić comes from three letters he wrote to Vuk in 1831 (Lazarević 1831b; see appendix 3 below). That year Miloš was tutoring Vuk's son Sava in Zemun, and in the first letter he asked Vuk to reprimand his son for missing several lessons. The letters also show that Vuk was collecting subscriptions for Miloš's book and indicate that Miloš had sent Vuk 150 copies of it for distribution. Miloš also implored Vuk in the last letter to send the subscription money immediately so that he could pay off his creditors. Not surprisingly, all three letters were written in Vuk's reformed orthography, with only some minor deviations.

Lazarević's two works considered here, *Plemenita i silna ljubov* and *Odgovor,* were written near the end of the period of domination of the Slavenoserbian language, which had served as the literary language of the Vojvodinan Serbs approximately from the second quarter of the eighteenth century to the first decades of the nineteenth century, that is, roughly from the end of the use of Serbian Church Slavonic and the Srbuljski tradition to the advent of the new standard language codified by Vuk Karadžić and his supporters (Albin 1970a:489). This artificial literary
language had resulted from certain political circumstances affecting the Serbs who had fled to Vojvodina, then a part of Hungary, and who had turned to Russia for books and teachers to combat Catholicism, which the Austro-Hungarian Empire was trying to impose upon them (Herrity 1973:369; Vaillant 1952:82).

Thus, Russian Church Slavonic began to have a strong influence on the Serbs and eventually replaced Serbian Church Slavonic as the Serbian Orthodox liturgical language. Influential Serbian leaders such as Metropolitan Stratimirović and his followers believed that the popular language did not possess the means for higher expression, but that a combination of Church Slavonic with the popular language would best serve as the basis for a new literary language, which they termed Slavenoserbian (Slavenoserbski, Albin 1970a:486-88).

The resulting Slavenoserbian literary language was an artificial amalgamation of elements from Russian Church Slavonic and the popular Serbian language with Vojvodinian dialectal features. It was a macaronic, uncodified language without clear rules governing the enrichment of the popular language or the combining of the disparate elements. Accordingly, each writer of Slavenoserbian could combine Russian Church Slavonic, popular Serbian, and dialectal features as he wished, resulting in the lack of underlying
principles dictating the hierarchy of the different features or any internal unity in his works (Albin 1970a:488-89).  

Vuk and his followers, among them Miloš Lazarević, attacked this artificial language, for the most part inaccessible to the masses, and paved the way for a new literary language, based on spoken Serbian, which is the same literary language that is used today, with only minor changes. Being an early adherent of Vuk's language reforms, which would replace the Slavenserbian language with vernacular Serbian, Lazarević was dedicated to the idea of representing the speech of his characters and the narration of the novel in good vernacular Serbian. In the Preface to his novella (p. [viii]) he stated, "I paid attention that a Serb speaks Serbian and is fluent in Serbian" and concluded categorically (p. [ix]), "As a Serb, I wrote in Serbian for the Serbs." In concluding the Preface (p. [x]), Lazarević expressed the wish, "I want my dear young relations to understand this novella well." Discussing his use of Vuk's reformed orthography (p. [ix]), Lazarević said, "I could not have chosen a better nor more appropriate way of writing than in this simple way, which is the most perfected of all ways today."  

The synchronic description of Lazarević's language undertaken in this study is based upon Plemenita i silna ljubov and Odgovor, from a photocopy of one of the original copies of the book. This photocopy was obtained from Mr.
Lazar Ćurčić, librarian at the Library of the Matica Srpska in Novi Sad, who in conjunction with Professor Aleksandar Mladenović, a linguist at the University of Novi Sad, suggested the two texts for linguistic analysis. The corpus of data used for the description consists of an unpaginated Preface of 10 pages followed by 147 pages in continuous pagination including Plemenita i silna ljubov (pp. 1-69), Odgovor (pp. 71-124), and an addendum, "Imena G. G. Prenumeranta" (pp. 125-47), containing a list of the names and occupations of those "subscribers" who helped pay for the publication of the book. The book, printed in the Cyrillic alphabet, was published in 1831 in Buda (Budapest), Hungary. Excerpts from the book are contained in two appendices to this study in order to illustrate the literary style, the lexicon, and the linguistic features of the book. Every word of each of the various sections of the book was studied, and all, except those exemplifying the most common grammatical or phonological features, were recorded on three-by-five-inch cards in appropriate sections under the general headings of graphemes, orthographic conventions, lexicon, phonology, morphology, and syntax.

The orthography at times proved to be a problem in the description of the language of the book. Some points of the description must remain inconclusive as a result of having to rely on the graphemes of the text. For instance, is the example злоупотребление (101/17) with ле, not ље, a
reflection of the dialectal dissimilation characteristic of the Vojvodinian dialects (see pp. 48-49 below) or an example of the traditional Slavenoserbian orthography in which /ęe/ is represented by ĕe, not ňe (see pp. 148-49 below); or is it merely a typographical error? For this reason definitive resolutions about the nature of some features are not always possible.

This study is divided into two main parts, each containing five chapters. Because the subject matter of each chapter in part 1 corresponds to the respective chapter in part 2, the chapter numbering begins again with chapter 1 in part 2.

Chapter 1 of part 1 describes the graphemes and spelling conventions used by Lazarević. Chapter 2 presents a description of some phonological features which are characteristic of Lazarević's language, but which are not regular features of the modern standard literary language. A description of the nominal system, including substantives, adjectives, and pronouns, forms the subject matter of chapter 3. Chapter 4 sets forth various observations on the verbal system of Lazarević's two works and covers the formation of the various tenses. In chapter 5 some lexical and syntactic features characteristic of the two works are discussed.

Part 2 of this study draws upon and refers back to the description of Lazarević's language as presented in
part 1. It offers comparisons of his language with that of other Vojvodinian authors who wrote both before and after Lazarević's time and discusses in depth the various Slavenserbian and dialectal features attested in Lazarević's two literary works used in this study. The contents and purpose of part 2 are described in detail in the beginning of that part.
Notes to the Introduction

1 "Građa za lep srpski roman," cited from Dobrašinović 1960:179. All translations in the dissertation are mine.

2 Plemenita i silna ljubov (Lazarević 1831a); hereafter referred to by the original title.

3 "su nрави наšeg roda u onom mestu jedva malo што од svoje prvobitnosti izgubili, dakle jednako oni isti i nepremenuti do danas ostali."

4 "da drzko narodu nenametnom tuđe običaje."

5 Ždrale (1973) discusses Lazarević's contribution to the theory of the novel as a literary genre in Serbian literature. According to Ždrale, Lazarević was the first after Vuk Karadžić and Vidaković to treat the novel as a literary genre.

6 Odgovor društva dobrodjetelji i mudrosti u Nemačkoj na pitanje društva vjere i Hristianstva u Štokholmu (Lazarević 1831a); hereafter called Odgovor.


8 Entitled "Smrt Avelova" in Serbocroatian. Works mentioned in this paragraph are cited by Ždrale (1973).

9 Persijske basne za mlado i staro (Zemun, 1852).

10 Mladenović (1969a:44) outlines many of the important features of Slavenoserbian in the realm of phonology and morphology and determines in percentages the hierarchy of the various elements in the works of three Slavenoserbian writers.

11 The long and bitter "language war" that Vuk and his supporters waged against the Slavenoserbian supporters for the final acceptance of his reforms is documented in detail by Butler (1970) and Naylor (1978).

12 "Pazio sam da Srbljin srpski govori, srpski se vlada."

13 "Sam kao Srbljin srpski za Srblje pisao."
"Želimojim milima mladima srođnicima i srođnicama da ovu knjižicu dobro razumeu."

"Ni bolji, ni zdogniji način pisanja, od ovoj prostog, a od sviju danas najsovršenijeg izbrati ne bi mogao."
PART I

A DESCRIPTION OF LAZAREVIĆ'S LANGUAGE
CHAPTER I

GRAPHEMES AND ORTHOGRAPHIC CONVENTIONS

Graphemes

The graphemes Lazarević uses in his two works have been described on the basis of the phonemes that they represent. The description is limited to the three vowel phonemes /i/, /e/, and syllabic /ɾ/, which show minor variations in their orthographic representation in the corpus, and to the six consonant phonemes of which Vuk Karadžić codified the graphic representation, namely, /ć/, /š/, /ň/, /ł/, /j/, and /ź/. The graphemes representing the remaining phonemes were not involved in Vuk's reforms and show no orthographic variation in the corpus. Accordingly, the phonemes /a/, /o/, /u/, /p/, /b/, /t/, /d/, /k/, /g/, /c/, /ć/, /ś/, /ń/, /l/, /ź/, /ż/, /h/, /m/, /n/, /l/, and /r/ are consistently represented by the graphemes a, o, u, p, b, t, d, k, g, c, ć, ś, ń, ł, z, ż, h, m, n, l, and r, respectively.

Phoneme /i/

In most instances the phoneme /i/ is represented by the grapheme _IDLE in all environments (initial, medial, and
Phoneme /e/

The phoneme /e/, originating from /ĕ/, /e/, and /ę/, is most often represented by the grapheme e: [from /ĕ/] човеку 'man' (dat. sg.) 31/20, подсмева 'laugh at' (3 sg. pres.) 13/6, снегом 'snow' (instr. sg.) 21/19; [from /e/] теби 'you' (dat. sg.) 15/4, жела 'wish' (l-part.) 29/22, сељанка 'villagers' (gen. pl.) 59/3; [from /ę/] чедо 'child' (nom. sg.) 20/16, честан 'honorable' (masc. nom. sg.) 51/15, and реду 'order' (loc. sg.) 42/5.

However, Lazarević frequently writes je in those words that historically contain /ĕ/. It is quite probable that Lazarević was attempting to imitate the "southern speech" (južno narječje) of Vuk Karadžić and the folk poetry with the examples containing je, i.e., that he was attempting to write the jekavian forms of those words containing...
a historical /ě/. Throughout most of the nineteenth century a significant cult revolving around native Serbian folk literature existed among Serbian writers. These writers, such as Jovan Subotić, Jovan Ilić, Stojan Novaković, Jovan živanović, and others, were well acquainted with this folk literature and poetry, so it is natural that certain elements from this literature, especially the jekavian reflex for /ě/ and other "jekavisms," should find expression in their writings (Jerković 1972:65, footnote 207, and 67).

Lazarević's imitating of Vuk's language, however, is inconsistent, as can be expected from a native ekavian speaker. Both e and ie before a consonant may occur even with the same stem. Examples illustrating Lazarević's writing of both Vuk's jekavian and his own native ekavian forms follow, arranged by morpheme stems.

děl-

ej

djele nu 'literary work' (loc. sg.) [vi]/14
djela 'matters' (gen. pl.) 85/4
djelce 'small literary work' (nom. sg.) [vi]/3
djelana 'action' (gen. sg.) 91/4
djela ju 'act' (3 pl. pres.) 119/21
de

дјело 'literary work' (loc. sg.) [vi]/14
dёл 'matter' (instr. sg.) 17/3
djel 'matters' (gen. pl.) 85/4
djelce 'small literary work' (nom. sg.) [vi]/3
djelana 'action' (gen. sg.) 91/4
djela ju 'act' (3 pl. pres.) 119/21
'indivisibility' (nom. sg.) 79/10, 80/6, 82/9

'in indivisible' (instr. pl.) 84/1

'divided' (nonfem. loc. sg.) 84/3

'divide' (inf.) 86/14

'divided' (past pass. part.) 112/12

'determine' (inf.) 81/5

'determination' (gen. sg.) 80/5

'separate' (inf.) 88/7

'share' (3-part.) 4/17

'areas' (acc. pl.) 41/13

'inheritance' (acc. sg.) 85/3

'inherit' (3 pl. pres.) 116/10

'follow' (inf.) 23/16, 106/10

'follow' (3 sg. pres.) 41/8, 105/15

'consequently' (adv.) 93/15

'consequences' (acc. pl.) 95/10
**ne-**

**je**

**њешто**² 'something' (acc. sg.)
11/4, 27/22

**њека** 'some' (fem. nom. sg.)
4/21, 9/12

**њекоj** 'some' (fem. loc. sg.)
16/10, 26/3

**њеколико** 'several' (adv.)
49/12, 51/13

**Various Other Stems**

**je**

**њежна** 'tender' (nonfem. gen. sg.) 24/21

**њежниjer** 'more tender' (nonfem. gen. sg.) 56/13

**разњежени** 'affected' (gen. pl.) 62/5

**тјелесно**³ 'physical' (neut. acc. sg.) 96/9

**снабдјети** 'provide' (inf.) 95/20

**снабдјевање** 'providing' (acc. sg.) 96/19

**погрјешка** 'mistake' (nom. sg.) [v]/16

**грјеова**⁴ 'sins' (gen. pl.) 3/7

**свирјепа** 'fierce' (fem. nom. sg.) 41/6

**зјеницу** 'pupil of the eye' (acc. sg.) 12/9

**e**

**њека** 'some' (fem. nom. sg.)
22/21, 26/15

**њеку** 'some' (fem. acc. sg.)
26/10

**No corresponding examples found**
cусједа 'neighbor' (gen. sg.) 23/6

вјере 'belief' (gen. sg.) 71/9

дјетонаставник 'children's teacher' (nom. sg.) 126/20

мјестног 'local' (nonfem. gen. sg.) 139/2

пресједатељ 'representative' (nom. sg.) 145/17

Phoneme /r/

In nearly all instances Lazarević represents the syllabic phoneme /r/ by the grapheme р: крвави 'bloody' (gen. pl.) [iii]/5, Срби 'Serbs' (nom. pl.) [iii]/18, срце 'heart' (acc. sg.) [iv]/5, српски 'Serbian' (nom. sg.) [vi]/17, уздрже 'restrain' (3 pl. pres.) [viii]/2, прострле 'stretch' (l-part.) 1/16, трпим 'suffer' (1 sg. pres.) 18/15, смртно 'dead' (adv.) 23/5, прси 'breast' (nom. pl.) 25/1, свршио 'complete' (l-part.) 30/22, прђавим 'bad' (nonfem. instr. sg.) 36/13, загрли 'hug' (3 sg. pres.) 45/10, обрве 'eyebrows' (acc. pl.) 54/6.

In a very limited number of examples, however, the digraph ep is found: Србији 'Serbia' (loc. sg.) [iv]/9, жертвовати 'sacrifice' (inf.) 16/7, and жертвовало (l-part.) 96/18.

The grapheme _ is used by Lazarević (1) in declined or derivational forms of вр- 'summit' to indicate the
retention of the syllabic pronunciation of /ɾ/ occurring before a vowel, e.g., вр'овни 'supreme' (masc. nom. sg.) [iv]/8, вр'ови 'summits' (loc. pl.) 25/14, and вр'у 'summit' (loc. sg.) 25/21; but this orthographic convention is not used consistently, as the following examples attest: вр'у 'summit' (loc. sg.) 44/7 and вр'ови 'summits' (nom. pl.) 59/7; and (2) in a few instances after the prepositions к 'to, toward' and с 'with', in all probability to indicate the omission of the traditional graphemes в or в, e.g., с' нјима 'with them' 11/3, к' менi 'toward me' 10/25, and с' мојом браћом 'with my brothers' 35/19. Otherwise, с, са, к, and ко figure more frequently. No discernible distribution for the occurrence of с'/с/са or к'/к/ка is apparent.

The grapheme в is found in only two instances: нераздјелимость 'indivisibility' (nom. sg.) 79/10 and љубезни 'kind' (nom. sg.) 37/19.

Phoneme /j/

In word initial position the phoneme /j/ is consistently represented by the grapheme ж:

ja = /ja/: jabuke 'apples' (nom. pl.) 2/4, jарости 'rage' (loc. sg.) 13/31, жавора 'maple' (gen. sg.) 25/21, жарње 'lamb' (nom. sg.) 26/13, jaja 'eggs' (acc. pl.) 28/9, жаде 'sorrows' (acc. pl.) 42/6.

je = /je/: jeчам 'barley' (nom. sg.) 1/15, jeсен 'autumn' (acc. sg.) 2/17, jep 'because' (conj.) 40/13,
jedva 'hardly' (adv.) 55/5, jedljivu 'quick-tempered' (fem. acc. sg.) 55/18.

jo = /jo/: jow 'still' (adv.) [i]/7, joj 'her' (dat.) 10/16.

ju = /ju/: junački 'heroic' (gen. pl.) [ii]/17, jutro 'morning' (acc. sg.) 2/2, jurg 'south' (nom. sg.) 9/14.

ji = /ji/: jih6 'them' (acc.) 4/17, jimm 'them' (dat.) 45/8.

In word final position or before a consonant, /j/ is represented by ḣ in all but two instances in which the grapheme Ⱡ figures: svojih 'one's own' (fem. loc. sg.) [vi]/18 and chestnjajši 'most honorable' (masc. nom. sg.) 139/22. Otherwise, j = /j#/ or /jC/: najviše 'mostly' (adv.) [ii]/2, mejdan 'duel' (acc. sg.) 13/23, Mađaršćoj 'Hungary' (loc. sg.) [iii]/19, žnoj 'sweat' (nom. sg.) 15/10, velikoj 'great' (fem. loc. sg.) 48/8.

In intervocalic positions the grapheme j is usually, but not always, written. Only a small number of anomalies occur.

Vja = /Vja/: prijateľ 'friend' (nom. sg.) 15/7, słavuja 'nightingale' (gen. sg.) 5/2, moja 'my' (fem. nom. sg.) 22/12, pokoj 'peace' (gen. sg.) 26/9, pojača 'belt' (gen. sg.) 33/13, stojaše 'stand' (3 sg. imp.) 54/12, tražali 'last' (ł-part.) 57/15.

Compare, however, with some foreign borrowings where only V a occurs: liturgija 'liturgy' (nom. sg.) 59/12, žalviša
'salvia' (nom. sg.) 67/5, Христиана 'Christians' (gen. pl.) 120/1 [cf. Христијани 'Christians' (nom. pl.) 106/12], and Илиа 'Ilija' 125/1.

Vje = /Vje/: појезије7 'poetry' (gen. sg.) [ii]/7, изтражује 'investigate' (3 sg. pres.) [iv]/19, чујем 'hear' (1 sg. pres.) 14/1, одбијем 'repulse' (1 sg. pres.) 11/2, раније 'earlier' (adv.) 31/4, познајем 'recognize' (1 sg. pres.) 34/4, се бијете 'fight' (2 sg. pres.) 61/9, заједно 'together' (adv.) 64/10.

The writing of the grapheme j in this environment is also not totally consistent: познаем 'recognize' (1 pl. pres.) 105/1, мелодије 'melodies' (acc. pl.) 20/1; штатуе8 'statue' (gen. sg.) 60/3.

Vji = /Vji/: слабији 'weaker' (masc. nom. pl.) [i]/5, напојити 'water' (inf.) 14/7, уздисаји 'sighs' (nom. pl.) 16/13, твојим 'your' (nonfem. instr. sg.) 14/22, аблији 'courtyard' (loc. sg.) 46/9, боратији 'richer' (masc. nom. sg.) 52/1.

However, in a number of examples /Vji/ may be represented inconsistently by both Vi and Vji: заиста9 'indeed' (adv.) 21/11, but заиста [vii]/10; таити 'hide' (inf.) 10/4, but тајити 41/18; кои 'who' (masc. nom. pl.) [i]/3 and свакои 'everyone' (nom. sg.) 112/2, but кои (masc. nom. sg.) [ii]/7; мои 'my' (gen. pl.) 39/8, but моји 34/1.
\[Vjo = /Vjo/: \text{тиjo 'quiet' (adv.) 6/6, своjoj 'one's own'}\]
(fem. dat. sg.) 10/15, Божиоjoj 'God's' (fem. dat. sg.) 57/1.

The sequence \(Vo\) occurs in only one example: маћином 'step-mother' (instr. sg.) 98/9.

\[Vjy = /Vju/: \text{развију 'develop' (3 pl. pres.) [iv]/5, Божиуj 'God's' (nonfem. dat. sg.) 3/4, }\]
(.acc. sg.) 7/15, кроjy 'cut, style' (loc. sg.) 3/3, владаjy 'reign' (3 pl. pres.) [v]/10,
армониjу 'harmony' (acc. sg.) 24/17, обичаjy 'hero'
'custom' (loc. sg.) 33/21, обожава}jy 'adore'
(3 pl. pres.) 43/13, казу}jy 'tell' (3 pl. pres.)
53/13.

Phoneme /ć/
Lazarević writes the phoneme /ć/ with the grapheme \text{h} consistently in all environments:10

\[ha = /ća/: птицар 'bird dog' (nom. sg.) 5/1, облечала 'fly around' (l-part.) 24/24, лиш}a 'leaves' (gen. sg.)
58/10, обе}ha je 'promise' (2 pl. imper.) 64/1,
obува}ha 'include' (3 sg. pres.) 94/8.

\[he = /će/: проле}he 'spring' (acc. sg.) 4/11, о}he 'want'
(2 sg. pres.) 13/16, ве}he 'larger' (fem. acc. pl.)
23/22, уздрк}he 'quiver' (3 sg. pres.) 54/19,
цве}he 'flowers' (nom. pl.) 68/5.
\(\text{ho} = /\text{c}/: \text{несрећом} 'misfortune' (instr. sg.) 35/5, \text{кућом} 'household' (instr. sg.) 48/16, \text{брата} 'brothers' (voc. sg.) 63/14, \text{прелазењем} 'passing' (fem. dat. sg.) 111/2

\(\text{hy} = /\text{c}/: \text{худи} 'mood' (gen. sg.) [iv]/16, \text{спроти} 'toward' (prep.) 7/18, \text{тренутно} 'instant' (loc. sg.) 62/15.

\(\text{hi} = /\text{c}/: \text{поточни} 'streams' (nom. pl.) 1/13, \text{самоћни} 'solitude' (loc. sg.) 11/3, \text{пећини} 'cave' (loc. sg.) 40/21, \text{кућину} 'house' (acc. sg.) 45/18, \text{већим} 'larger' (nonfem. instr. sg.) 64/15.

\(\text{h} = /\text{c}/\text{ or } /\text{č}/: \text{помоћ} 'help' (acc. sg.) [iii]/4, \text{ноћ} 'night' (acc. sg.) 9/16, \text{несрећна} 'unhappy' (fem. nom. sg.) 12/25, \text{могућности} 'ability' (loc. sg.) 33/24.

\text{Phoneme } /\text{j}/

Just as consistently as with /\text{c}/, Lazarević represents /\text{j}/ by the grapheme Đ:\n
\(\text{Đa} = /\text{đ}/: \text{Мађарској} 'Hungary' (loc. sg.) [iii]/19, \text{Đака} 'schoolboys' (gen. pl.) 35/4, \text{пђави} 'bad' (nonfem. instr. sg.) 36/13, \text{слађа} 'sweeter' (fem. nom. sg., comp.) 59/1, \text{зрађа} 'aim' (3 sg. pres.) 5/11.

\(\text{Đe} = /\text{đ}/: \text{урођена} 'inborn' (past pass. part.) 4/21, \text{тврђер} 'firmer' (nonfem. gen. sg.) 9/2, \text{анђелско} 'angelic' (neut. nom. sg.) 26/7, \text{ђердан} 'necklace'
Palatal Phonemes /tʃ/ and /h/

These phonemes are nearly always written with the graphemes ћ and ћ кодифицировано by Vuk; only a few anomalies occur.

ъа = /tʃa/: Србаља 'Serbs' (gen. pl.) [i]/12, умиљасто 'lovably' (adv.) 25/20, неваљале 'wicked' (fem. acc. pl.) 37/5, пријатеља 'friend' (acc. sg.) 47/1, дугуљаста 'rather long' (neut. gen. sg.) 53/19.

The sequence ћ was found once in this environment to represent /tʃa/: родителја 'parents' (gen. pl.) 31/2.
ъе = /le/: земље 'earth' (gen. sg.) 17/21, најбоље 'best' (adv.) 29/11, учитеље 'teachers' (acc. pl.) 35/13, остваљено 'leave' (past pass. part.) 57/2, здравље 'health' (acc. sg.) 36/4.

ъо = /lo/: жељом 'desire' (instr. sg.) 9/7, што 'send' (l-part.) 38/7.

ъу = /lu/: љубко 'sweet' (neut. nom. sg.) 27/5, пољу 'field' (loc. sg.) 45/6, жељу 'desire' (acc. sg.) 49/19, људе 'people' (acc. pl.) 59/14.

In this environment the sequence ћъ is attested once, namely, љубезни 'kind' (nom. sg.) 37/19.

ъи = /li/: брижљиво 'diligently' (adv.) 9/25, немарљивости 'carelessness' (dat. sg.) 21/3, бодљиво 'thorny' (neut. nom. sg.) 29/16, шиве 'plums' (nom. pl.) 57/17, алине 'clothing' (acc. pl.) 62/11.

This phoneme segment is represented by ли once in the corpus: богобојазливи 'God-fearing' (masc. nom. pl.) 2/10.

ъ = /л#/ or /лс/: писатељ 'writer' (nom. sg.) [iii]/14, пријатељ 'friend' (nom. sg.) 15/1, непријатељства 'hostility' (gen. sg.) 15/15, незадовољност 'dissatisfaction' (nom. sg.) 41/9, вала 'perhaps' (adv.) 47/5, жељима 'desirous' (instr. pl.) 65/5.

ъа = /ла/: поклањали 'give' (l-part.) 4/15, ветрењасте 'flighty' (fem. nom. pl.) 32/20, јутрења 'morning' (nonfem. gen. sg.) 46/15, куцања 'beating' (gen. sg.) 62/1, створења 'creation' (gen. sg.) 26/6.
In a couple of attested examples ми incorrectly represents the phoneme sequence /ni/, apparently merely typographical errors (ми instead of ми), as /ни/ is not a permissible adjectival suffix in these morphemes: очишћени 'cleaned' (past pass. part.) 1/10 and народни 'folk' (masc. nom. pl.) 74/9. The sequence нji figures in another attested form, нjiовом 'their' (nonfem. loc. sg.) 4/20.

Ъ = /ъ/: детинство 'childhood' (gen. sg.) 56/4. No examples of /ъ/ are attested.
Phoneme /ʒ/

In all instances Lazarević represents the phoneme /ʒ/ by ű. The few examples of the grapheme ű in the corpus are the following: 13 јбунови 'bushes' (nom. pl.) 1/19, јбуна 'bush' (gen. sg.) 21/16, јена 'pocket' (gen. sg.) 37/17, сведоња 'testimony' (nom. sg.) 43/16, and ћуаке 'nooks' (acc. pl.) 95/5.

Orthographic Conventions

In this section is presented a description of the orthographic conventions that Lazarević used in his two works under consideration, for the purpose of determining to what extent he followed the traditional morphophonemic spelling of the Slavenoserbian writers or the reformed phonetic spelling of Vuk Karadžić. The extent to which Lazarević followed Vuk's reforms was determined by indicating in his spelling the assimilation as to voicing and/or manner of articulation of various consonant sequences and the simplification of various consonant clusters as heard in the spoken language. It was also determined to what extent these assimilations and simplifications are unreflected in his spelling, as in the traditional morphophonemic spelling of the various Slavenoserbian writers.

The study determined that in general Lazarević did not follow Vuk's spelling reforms nearly as closely as he adhered to Vuk's reformed alphabet. Accordingly,
morphophonemic spellings tend to prevail in Lazarević's language, although at times phonetic spellings in accord with Vuk's reforms may also occur. The following patterns emerge from the description: (1) regarding assimilation as to voicing, morphophonemic spelling is almost entirely retained in those examples having d plus a following voiceless consonant, except for a few examples which show complete assimilation as to place of articulation, e.g., oterati and otuda; (2) the examples having z plus a following voiceless consonant, as well as those having q and b plus a voiceless consonant and s plus a voiced consonant, are nearly evenly divided between those indicating assimilation as to voicing and those retaining their morphophonemic spelling, whereas the few examples having ž plus a voiceless consonant are always written phonetically; (3) regarding assimilation as to manner and/or place of articulation, Vuk's reforms are closely followed, for in all but five examples—radosću, oštuda, nedostatcima, družtva, and naloztvo—such assimilation is indicated in Lazarević's spelling; and (4) no general conclusions can be drawn concerning the simplification of various consonant clusters as reflected in the spelling, for even with the same morpheme the simplification may or may not be indicated, e.g., slastna, but slasnom.

The following is a definitive listing of examples illustrating either the morphophonemic or the phonetic
spelling as regards voicing, manner/place of articulation, and simplification of consonant clusters in the two works by Lazarević used in this study. The examples are given in the Latin alphabet, rather than in the Cyrillic alphabet used by Lazarević, for ease in reading and comparing.

### Assimilation as to Voicing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morphophonemic spelling</th>
<th>Phonetic spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d + Voiceless Consonant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>podporo 'support' (voc. sg.)</td>
<td>podporo 'support' (voc. sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>podporu (acc. sg.)</td>
<td>podporu (acc. sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>podčinjeno 'subjugate' (past pass. part.)</td>
<td>podčinjeno 'subjugate' (past pass. part.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>podsmeva14 'laugh at' (3 sg. pres.)</td>
<td>podsmeva14 'laugh at' (3 sg. pres.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>podseče 'cut off' (3 sg. pres.)</td>
<td>podseče 'cut off' (3 sg. pres.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>podkupiti 'attack verbally' (inf.)</td>
<td>podkupiti 'attack verbally' (inf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predstalja 'present' (3 sg. pres.)</td>
<td>predstalja 'present' (3 sg. pres.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predpostaljaju 'suppose' (3 pl. pres.)</td>
<td>predpostaljaju 'suppose' (3 pl. pres.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predpostaljati (inf.)</td>
<td>predpostaljati (inf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odpadalo 'fall off' (l-part.)</td>
<td>odpadalo 'fall off' (l-part.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odpustiš 'release' (2 sg. pres.)</td>
<td>odpustiš 'release' (2 sg. pres.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odpusti (3 sg. pres.)</td>
<td>odpusti (3 sg. pres.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Morphophonemic spelling

odpustila (l-part.) 28/13

odkud (odkuda) 'from where'
(adv.) [v]/15, 73/11,  
79/12

odkriti 'uncover' (inf.)
23/2, 26/9, 54/18

odkrile (l-part.) 31/6

odkrije (3 sg. pres.) 50/16

odčupati 'tear off' (inf.)
112/3

pripovedka 'short story'
(nom. sg.) [vi]/2

slijedstva 'consequences'
(acc. pl.) 95/10

sredstvo 'way, means' (nom.
sg.) 119/113

sredstva (acc. pl.) 80/1

neposredstveno 'indirectly'
(adv.) 122/17

ljudska 'human' (neut.
nom. pl.) 103/14

ljudskog (nonfem. gen. sg.)
104/2

sladku 'sweet' (fem. acc.
sg.) 24/17, 49/9

sladki (masc. nom. sg.)
10/19

sladkim (instr. pl.) 61/18

redko 'rarely' (adv.) 31/7

kadkad 'sometimes' (adv.)
57/7, 63/10

Phonetic spelling

odkriti (inf.) 21/10
Morphophonemic spelling

poredka 'order' (gen. sg.)
    76/8, 77/3

neporedku 'disorder' (dat. sg.)
    123/16

neporedkama 'instr. pl.'
    73/7

z + Voiceless Consonant

izpasti 'fall out' (inf.)
    11/7

izkaza 'state' (3 sg. aorist)
    55/11

izkažemo (1 pl. pres.)
    118/12

izprositi 'ask for a girl in marriage' (inf.)
    48/2

izcudi 'shed tears' (3 sg. pres.)
    9/14

iztražuje 'investigate'
    (3 sg. pres.) [iv] 9/19

izterivala 'herd out'
    (l-part) 10/23

izpred 'in front of' (adv.)
    11/12

izprva 'at first' (adv.)
    35/4, 64/10

izpralja 'straighten' (3 sg. pres.) [v] 10

izpočetka 'at first' (adv.)
    38/9

iztrebiti 'destroy' (inf.)
    50/13

Phonetic spelling

ispasti (inf.) 111/10

iskažuje (3 sg. pres.) 30/13

isprosi (3 sg. pres.) 115/4

isterana (past pass. part.)
    111/10

isplati 'pay off' (inf.)
    36/21
Morphophonemic spelling

razterati 'disperse' (inf.) 21/25

razsudi18 'reason' (2 sg. imper.) 29/17, 48/9

razčupan19 'pluck out' (past pass. part.) 21/2

razpaliti 'inflame' (inf.) [v]/3

se raztajale 'leave' (l-part.) 25/17

bezčest120 'deflower' (3 sg. pres.) 94/2

uztreba 'need' (3 sg. pres.) 52/7

uzpazim 'watch' (1 sg. pres.) 21/10

uzžive21 'enjoy' (3 pl. pres.) 31/22

Phonetic spelling

ispovedaju 'profess' (3 sg. pres.) 119/6

ispunja 'fulfill' (3 sg. pres.) 81/16

ispuni 'fulfill' (3 sg. pres.) 83/7

ispunijo (l-part.) 109/21

ispunjene (past pass. part.) 83/15

rasterala (l-part.) 63/9

rasplete 'unbraid' (3 sg. pres.) 65/12

rastrla 'rub' (l-part.) 6/7
### Morphophonemic spelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Phonetic Spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>drzko</td>
<td>'impudently'</td>
<td>teško</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francuzkinje</td>
<td>'Frenchwomen'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ž + Voiceless Consonant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odlašam²²</td>
<td>'alleviate'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drugčije</td>
<td>'different'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b + Voiceless Consonant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ljubko</td>
<td>'sweetly'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poljubcem</td>
<td>'kiss'</td>
<td>Srpski</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phonetic spelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Phonetic Spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teško</td>
<td>'difficult'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muškog</td>
<td>'masculine'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>najlakše</td>
<td>'easiest'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lakše</td>
<td>'easier'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umekšala</td>
<td>'soften'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ljupkim</td>
<td>'sweet'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srpski</td>
<td>'Serbian'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srpčeto</td>
<td>'young Serb'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Morphophonemic spelling

č + Voiced Consonant

svedodžba 'testimony' (nom. sg.) 43/16

s + Voiced Consonant

sgladio 'smooth' (l-part.)

46/11

se zbio 'occur' (l-part.)

[viii]/18

zbaciti 'cast off' (inf.)

73/11

zgodniji 'more suitable'

(acc. sg.) [ix]/7

Assimilation as to Manner/Place of Articulation

Morphophonemic spelling

Phonetic spelling

s + Palatal Consonant

radosću 'happiness' (instr. sg.) 17/15

lišće 'leaves' (nom. sg.)

57/19

lišća (gen. sg.) 58/10

zamišljenju 'thoughts' (loc. sg.) 45/1

svojevolnošću 'arbitrariness'

(instr. sg.) 75/6

protivnošću 'adversity'

(instr. sg.) 121/5

šnjom²³ 'with her, it'

(instr.) 96/14,

110/1, 112/16, 113/8
### Morphophonemic spelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morphophonemic spelling</th>
<th>Phonetic spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snjim 'with him, it' (instr.)</td>
<td>šnjim 'with him, it' (instr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83/16, 108/17, 109/21, 113/14</td>
<td>83/16, 108/17, 109/21, 113/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raširiti [ &lt; raz + širiti] 'widen' (inf.)</td>
<td>raširiti [ &lt; raz + širiti] 'widen' (inf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82/7</td>
<td>82/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raširenim (past pass. part.)</td>
<td>raširenim (past pass. part.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82/14</td>
<td>82/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**d or t + Dental Consonant**

| od tuda 'from there' (adv.) | otuda 48/10, 51/11, 83/9, 96/6, 106/2 |
| 23/16, 79/21 | 23/16, 79/21 |

| nedostatcima 'shortage' (loc. pl.) | ocu [ < otcu] 'father' (dat. sg.) |
| 124/3 | 30/3 |

| otetati [ < od + terati] 'drive away' (inf.) | oterati [ < od + terati] 'drive away' (inf.) |
| 110/16 | 110/16 |

| otera (3 sg. pres.) | otera (3 sg. pres.) |
| 114/14 | 114/14 |

| odelili [ < od + delili] 'divide' (/-part.) | odelili [ < od + delili] 'divide' (/-part.) |
| 88/7 | 88/7 |

| prestaljajući [ < pred + staljati] 'present' (pres. act. part.) [ii]/15 | prestaljajući [ < pred + staljati] 'present' (pres. act. part.) [ii]/15 |

| presjedatelj [ < predsje-datelj] 'representative' (nom. sg.) | presjedatelj [ < predsje-datelj] 'representative' (nom. sg.) |
| 145/17 | 145/17 |

**ž + stv- (Partial Assimilation)**

| družtva 'friendship' (loc. sg.) | društva (gen. sg.) |
| 2/18 | 73/1 |
Morphophonemic spelling | Phonetic spelling
---|---
**naloztvo** 'concubinage' (nom. sg.) 100/21

**Simplification of Consonant Clusters**

Some words containing certain consonant clusters retain their morphophonemic spelling, while others are spelled phonetically, indicating the loss of pronunciation of the particular consonant. Fluctuation in spelling even with the same morpheme may occur:

Morphophonemic spelling | Phonetic spelling
---|---
-stn-
**mjestnog** 'local' (nonfem. gen. sg.) 139/2
**slastna** 'sweet' (fem. nom. sg.) [vii]/6
**cestnog** 'honorable' (nonfem. gen. sg.) 44/15
**radostno** 'gladly' (adv.) 46/1

**slasnom** (nonfem. loc. sg.) 110/19
**cesni** (masc. nom. sg.) 33/18
**radosnom** 'glad' (fem. instr. sg.) 5/7
**jakosni** 'strong' (masc. nom. sg.) 23/17
**najzalosniji** 'saddest' (gen. pl.) 101/1 [cf. *žalostan* (masc. nom. sg.) 21/6]
Morphophonemic spelling

-ždn- or -ždn-

pozdni 'late' (masc. acc. sg.) 66/16

nužna 'necessary' (fem. nom. sg.) 82/16 [cf: nuždan (masc. nom. sg.) 81/2]

-čst- or -čsk-

junačstvo 'heroism' (nom. sg.) 32/5

junačko 'heroic' (neut. nom. sg.) 54/16
Notes to Chapter I

1 In this study the following symbols and abbreviations will be used: / / and < > represent phonemic and morphophonemic forms, respectively. The letters C, Ć, and V represent a consonant, a palatal consonant, and a vowel, respectively. Grammatical terms are abbreviated as follows: nom. = nominative, acc. = accusative, gen. = genitive, loc. = locative, dat. = dative, instr. = instrumental, voc. = vocative, masc. = masculine, fem. = feminine, neut. = neuter, sg. = singular, pl. = plural, anim. = animate, inan. = inanimate, pres. = present, fut. = future, imper. = imperative, imp. = imperfect, part. = participle, act. = active, pass. = passive, inf. = infinitive, prep. = preposition, adv. = adverb, adj. = adjective. All examples cited from the corpus have been transliterated in the study except where a discussion of the Cyrillic graphemes necessitates their use. In the numbers following each cited example, the number before the slash (/) refers to the original page number in the corpus and the number after the slash designates the line number. The Roman numerals enclosed in brackets refer to the unpaginated Preface. All examples are cited in the form in which they occur in the texts, e.g., ma 'instant' for mah, odi 'walk' for hodi.

2 In the examples нешто, нека, некој, and неколико Lazarević wrote /н/ , apparently unaware that the proper jekavian pronunciation of Vuk's speech is analogous to the ekavian for /n/. Vuk cites неки as a possible form only in the Dalmatian dialects in his revised dictionary of 1852 (compare the same mistakes in Ignjatović's language, Jerković 1972:66).

3 The forms тјелесно, снабдјети, снабдјевање, and дјетонаставник (below) deviate from Vuk's prescribed forms as presented in his 1818 dictionary; instead of the тј and дј clusters, Vuk had ћ and ў respectively. In his 1852 revised dictionary, however, тј and дј were used.

4 Lazarević mistakenly coined this form for the word for 'sin', the correct jekavian form being грије (gen. sg. грија). See Karadžić (1818).

5 The reason for this inconsistency may possibly be that, as M. Ivić (1957:118) states, "although our normative grammar theoretically envisions even today the vocalic pronunciation of the consonant /x/ in умирјо and similar instances [i.e., before a vowel], such a pronunciation practically does not exist with people speaking the literary language in the territory of the People's Republic of Serbia."
The pronouns ји and јим have a prothetic j representing their Vojvodinan dialectal pronunciation (see Miletic 1940:20 for the same forms in Banat).

The modern Serbocroatian form is поезија without j between o and e in the orthography.

This form is in accord with the modern Serbocroatian form статија (gen. sg. статије) in that j is not present in its spelling.

This spelling without j is the prescribed form in the modern language.

Two aberrant forms where /č/ is represented by h—in all likelihood typographical errors—are disregarded: ђерку 'daughter' (acc. sg.) 11/17 [cf. ђерко (voc. sg.) 10/1] and насидена 'satiate' (past pass. part.) 98/1. This substitution of h for h and vice versa was fairly common in the works of other Vojvodinan writers (see Jerkovic 1972: 38-39, Mladenović 1964:35, and Kašić 1968:23).

In one example he figures for ђе, in all probability a typographical error: рођена 'born' (past pass. part.) 10/21.

Examples such as коблење, размишење, определење, раздјеленом, etc., with Џе, not ђе, have been interpreted as examples of a dissimilation of /le/ → /le/ common to some Vojvodinan subdialects, not as anomalies of the orthographic system (see pp. 48-49 below).

Few examples are attested because of the very limited distribution of /љ/ in Serbocroatian.

The examples podsmeva and podсећe with the morphophonemic spelling of the cluster ds are in accord with Vuk's and the modern Serbocroatian spelling. In the example предсталја, however, whereas the accepted form in modern Serbocroatian is представља with ds, Vuk prescribed a phonetic spelling such as Lazarević's corresponding example prestaljajući shows, with complete assimilation of the d as to voicing and place of articulation (see Belić 1971: 40-46 for a discussion of Vuk's and subsequent spelling reforms in Serbocroatian).

Vuk's and the modern Serbocroatian spelling is оčупати, with the complete assimilation of d indicated in the spelling.
The spelling of the words sljedstva, sredstvo, sredstva, and neposredstveno is in accord with Vuk's spelling reforms (cf. Vuk's gradski, gospodstvo; see Belić 1971: 41-42).

These forms of ljudski are in accord with Vuk's spelling based on his 1852 dictionary; his 1818 dictionary, however, gives the phonetic spelling ljucki (see Belić 1971: 41).

Vuk's dictionary and modern Serbocroatian have the spelling rasuditi with complete assimilation as to place of articulation of the cluster ss which should be formed after devoicing the prefix <raz-> to /ras-/.

The spelling of this form shows assimilation both as to voicing and as to manner of articulation in Vuk's dictionary and in modern Serbocroatian, raščupati.

The modern Serbocroatian form is spelled beščastiti; Vuk's dictionary gives only the noun beščast.

Vuk's and the modern Serbocroatian spelling is uživati, showing complete assimilation of the <uz-> prefix.

This word in Vuk's dictionary and in the modern language has the spelling olakšati, showing complete assimilation of the prefix <od-> to the stem.

In his writings Vuk also indicated this same assimilation as to manner of articulation. The assimilation of the preposition s with these pronouns is also a common feature of the various Vojvodinian subdialects (Milotić 1940:21; Mladenović 1962-63a:246; Nikolić 1964:330).

This form appears as junaštvo in Vuk's dictionary and in the modern language spelling.
CHAPTER II

PHONOLOGY

This chapter presents a description of the phonology of Lazarević's language. Those features of the phonology which are also regular features of modern standard Serbo-croatian, however, have been excluded from the discussion. Instead, only those features which are dialectal in nature and not a part of the modern literary language are presented here. The aspects of his phonology covered include (1) the presentation of the phonemes of his language, (2) the phonemes /h/, /v/, and /j/, (3) the substitution of /h/ by /k/, (4) the contraction of vocalic clusters, (5) the ikavisms of his language, (6) the replacement of the prefix <pri-> by <pre->, (7) the various consonantal dissimilations, and (8) the simplification of certain consonant clusters.

The Phonemes

The phonemic system of Lazarević's language as contained in Plemenita i silna ljubov and Odgovor is composed of six vocalic phonemes and twenty-five consonantal phonemes. They are given in the following diagram.
Table 1. The Phonemes of Lazarević's Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocalic Phonemes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ř</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonantal Phonemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plosives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unvoiced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(voiced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unvoiced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(voiced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unvoiced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(voiced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonorants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(voiced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phoneme /h/ is marginal to the phonemic system of Lazarević's language, as it is found in only a few words that are ecclesiastical or foreign borrowings. The examples with /h/ are: Epohe 'epochs' (acc. pl.) [v]/7, Monarha 'Monarch' (acc. sg.) [iv]/2, Hristijani 'Christians' (nom. pl.) 92/14, hristijansko 'Christian' (neut. acc. sg.) 124/9, paroh 'priest' (nom. sg.) 145/20. In Lazarević's language /h/ is not attested where expected on the basis of etymology and modern Serbocroatian. The following are but a few contrasting examples of this phonological feature:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lazarević's Language</th>
<th>Standard Serbocroatian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rastovi 'oak trees' (nom. pl.) 2/1</td>
<td>hrastovi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vatali 'grab' (l-part.) 4/18</td>
<td>hvatali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tedoste 'want' (2 pl. aorist) 7/3</td>
<td>htedoste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ladanokvno 'cold-bloodedly' (adv.) 42/9</td>
<td>hladnokrveno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rapavo 'rough' (neut. nom. sg.) 44/9</td>
<td>hrapavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>njiovog 'their' (nonfem. gen. sg.) [i] 5</td>
<td>njihovog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>izdahnuo 'exhale' (l-part.) 65/2</td>
<td>izdahnuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se nahodili 'be found' (l-part.) 56/7</td>
<td>se nahodili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>učenih 'learned' (gen. pl.) [vi] 8</td>
<td>učenih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ih 'them' (acc.) 4/17</td>
<td>ih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dođoh 'come' (1 sg. aorist) 47/3</td>
<td>dođoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrh 'summit' (acc. sg.) 54/12</td>
<td>vrh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In medial positions a transitional sound of /j/ or /v/, as found in the eastern variant of modern Serbocroatian, may occur instead of /h/ (see Belić 1971:119, 121-22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lazarević's Language</th>
<th>Standard Serbocroatian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tijo 'quietly' (adv.) 6/6, 8/17</td>
<td>tiho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>osmejivajućeise 'smile' (gerund) 10/25</td>
<td>osmejivajućeise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>podsmeva 'laugh at' (3 sg. pres.) 13/6</td>
<td>podsmeva or podsmeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suvi 'dry' (gen. pl.) 25/14</td>
<td>suvi or suhih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijailo 'Michael' (nom. sg.) 125/7</td>
<td>Mihailo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another phonological feature involving the phoneme /h/ in Lazarević's language is the substitution of /k/ for /h/ where /h/ is expected etymologically. The following substitutions are attested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lazarević's Language</th>
<th>Standard Serbocroatian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kteo² 'want' [vi]</td>
<td>hteo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nektede 'want' (3 sg. aorist)</td>
<td>htede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kteo 'want' (l-part.)</td>
<td>htelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zadrkta 'begin to shake' (3 sg. aorist)</td>
<td>zadrhta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drktajući 'shake' (gerund)</td>
<td>drhtajući</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contraction of Vocalic Clusters

A characteristic feature of Lazarević's phonology is the contraction of vocalic clusters, a feature not admissible in the standard written literary language. This contraction is found most frequently in the masculine singular of the l-participle in -o but may also occur with other parts of speech, e.g., ko < kao 'as'. Considerably more uncontracted forms occur in his language than contracted forms, however, and all but two of the contracted forms have the cluster -ao. Following are some examples of the contractions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracted Forms</th>
<th>Uncontracted Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ao/ → /o/: ko 'as' (conj.) 68/7</td>
<td>kao 25/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imo 'have' (l-part.) 16/13</td>
<td>imao [i]/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promiso 'providence' (nom. sg.) 84/2</td>
<td>promisao 86/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instead of the vowel contraction, the glide ţ is sometimes written in a vocalic cluster containing the high front vowel /i/: činijo 'make' 36/7, učinijo 'make' 86/15, sajedinijo 'unite' 86/17, oblagorodijo 'ennoble' 91/14, ispunijo 'fulfill' 109/21, nasitijo 'satisfy' 110/11, biblijoteka 'library' (nom. sg.) 130/8. But this feature is not consistent in Lazarević's language; many more examples are written without ţ than with it, e.g., pazio 'pay attention' [viii]/12, zaboravio 'forget' 14/5, odrastio 'grow up' 35/2.

Ikavisms

Lazarević's language is basically ekavian; that is, in the majority of instances /e/ appears as the reflex of /ē/. A few examples of the common ekavian reflex include
the following: lečiti 'heal' (inf.) [ii]/14, se odlepiti 'break off' (inf.) [vii]/9, vredno 'worthy' (adv.) [ix]/10, odleti 'fly away' (3 sg. pres.) 25/23, nedra 'bosom' (acc. pl.) 37/3, poslednjim 'last' (instr. pl.) 44/5, leta 'summer' (gen. sg.) 57/16.

However, a limited number of lexical ikavian forms or ikavisms (i.e., /i/ appearing as the reflex of /č/) are found in Lazarević's language. This feature occurs most frequently with the adverb gde 'where' and its compound forms: di [iii]/11, 3/19, 9/11, 19/5, 24/15, 25/20, 35/6; digod 'somewhere' 13/4, 101/12; nigdi 'nowhere' 32/15; dikoji 'some' (masc. nom. sg.) 44/6, 91/8. The ikavian reflex also occurs in the word gnezdo 'nest', e.g., gnjizdo (acc. sg.) 28/8, gnjizda (gen. sg.) 5/2.

Replacement of <pri-> by <pre->

Another dialectal feature in Lazarević's phonological system involves the substitution of the prefix <pri-> by <pre-> where <pri-> is expected on the basis of etymology. This substitution is not consistent in his works:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Literary Forms With &lt;Pri-&gt;</th>
<th>Forms with Substitution of &lt;Pre-&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pripovedka 'short story' (nom. sg.) [vi]/2</td>
<td>prepovedka 41/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pripovedao 'narrate' (v-part.) 20/13</td>
<td>prepovedajuće (pres. act. part.) [ii]/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se približavao 'approach' (v-part.) 25/8</td>
<td>se prebližavati (inf.) 55/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consonantal Dissimilations

Lazarević's language also furnishes examples of two different types of consonantal dissimilations not characteristic of the written literary language, but common in literary speech. The first type involves the consonant clusters /mn/ or /ᵐʱ/, in which the sonorant /n/ or /ᵐ/ denasalizes, becoming the liquid sonorant /l/ or /ˡ/, respectively. Examples of this dissimilation attested in Lazarević's two works are:
Lazarević's Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serbian Form</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mlogo 'much' (adv.)</td>
<td>[i]4, 33/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mlogi 'many' (gen. pl.)</td>
<td>4/6, 38/11, 47/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mlogoleto 'long-standing' (neut. nom. sg.)</td>
<td>34/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mlogoženstvo 'polygamy' (nom. sg.)</td>
<td>75/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mloženja 'multiplication' (gen. sg.)</td>
<td>78/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sumljaju 'doubt' (3 pl. pres.)</td>
<td>60/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sumlje 'doubt' (gen. sg.)</td>
<td>91/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second type of dissimilation, also not found in the standard literary language, occurs with the two substantival derivational suffixes <-ljenje> and <-njenje>. The first palatal sonorants dissimilate from the following palatal sonorants, resulting in the dental sonorants /l/ and /n/ (thus /-lene/ and /-neše/):^ koblenje 'presentiment' (nom. sg.) 11/12, razmišlenje 'meditation' (acc. sg.) 51/1, oprobjelenje 'determination' (nom. sg.) 85/15, 88/12, sjedinenje 'uniting' (nom. sg.) 90/9, sjedinjenju (dat. sg.) 86/19, 92/2, zloupotreblje 'abuse' (acc. sg.) 101/17, prestuplenje 'violation' (nom. sg.) 101/17.

Simplification of Consonant Clusters

A number of consonant clusters have been simplified by the loss of the first consonant. As with the other
phonological features, these dialectisms are not characteristic of the standard literary language. Some examples include:

- **#gd-**: di 'where' (adv.) [iii]/10, digod 'somewhere' (adv.) 13/4, dikoji 'some' (masc. nom. sg.) 44/6. In medial position, however, -gd- is retained: digdi 'here and there' (adv.) [ix]/17, nigdi 'nowhere' (adv.) 20/16.

- **-vlj-**: popraljati 'correct' (inf.) [iii]/17, pozdraljao 'greet' (ł-part.) 16/22, predstalja 'represent' (3 sg. pres.) 27/6, ostaljeno 'leave' (past pass. part.) 57/2, popraljenje 'correction' (acc. sg.) 74/20, upraljati 'govern' (inf.) 75/11, nastaljajuće 'continue' (pres. act. part.) 102/13, predpostaljaju 'assume' (3 pl. pres.) 105/10. While the majority of examples have -lj-, a few forms with -vlj- are nevertheless attested: pozdravljuju 'greet' (3 pl. pres.) 2/2, uživljenje 'enjoyment' (acc. sg.) 87/8, prestavljenjem 'presentation' (instr. sg.) 91/9.

- **-vd-**: ode 'here' (adv.) 86/6, 91/5, 94/6; however, ovde is found more frequently.
Notes to Chapter II

1. The absence of /h/ from Lazarević's phonemic system except in some foreign loan words may be explained either in terms of Lazarević's imitation of Vuk's language or the influence of Lazarević's own native Srem dialect (see part 2, chap. 2, pp. 153-55).

2. This morpheme appears more often, however, as <tet->, e.g., tede (3 sg. pres.) 8/13, teo (ℓ-part.) 9/3, tela (ℓ-part.) 9/24, tedoste (2 pl. aorist) 7/3, teli (ℓ-part.) 28/23.

3. From Vuk's time on, Serbocroatian orthographic rules have not permitted the writing of j with such ℓ-participles ending in -io or with words such as nacionalan, prionuti, and biblioteka, in which the -io cluster is located in the middle of the word, although /j/ is regularly pronounced in these environments (see Belić 1971:123 and Maretić 1963:45).

4. Forms that may possibly be imitations of Vuk's jekavian speech (i.e., /je/ resulting from /ě/) are discussed on pp. 15-19 above.

5. Many of the "ikavisms" resulting from morphological analogy to other forms are also regular features of the standard literary language and therefore are excluded from this discussion. They are found (1) in the comparative and superlative degrees, e.g., jasnije 'more clearly' (adv.) 19/17, najnesrećniji 'most unhappy' (nom. sg.) 28/15; (2) in negated forms of biti 'be', e.g., nisi (2 sg. pres.) 15/1, nije (3 sg. pres.) 3/2; (3) in the dat./loc. sg. of the personal and reflexive pronouns, e.g., meni 'I' (dat.) 46/18, sebi 'oneself' (loc.) [v]/8; and (4) in the gen. and dat./loc./instr. pl. of the pronominal and adjectival declensions, e.g., ovim 'these' (instr. pl.) 2/19, svima 'all' (loc. pl.) [vi]/1 (Ivić 1958:171-72). Other "ikavisms" resulting from morphological leveling are also manifested in verbs with stems originally ending in /-ěti/ (see pp. 107-8 below).

6. Historically, /ě/ occurring before /j/ gave /i/, as in the environment gdě je 'where is' (Ivić 1949-50:147). See p. 50 in this chapter for a discussion of the loss of /g/.

7. This feature, however, may reflect only the traditional Slavenoserbian orthographic convention in which solely the grapheme e indicated a preceding palatal consonant and may not be a dialectal Vojvodinian feature (see part 2, chap. 1, p. 149 below).
CHAPTER III

NOMINAL SYSTEM

This chapter presents a description of the morphology of the substantives, adjectives, and pronouns of Lazarević's language. In each of the three sections, paradigms and tables illustrating the desinences of the substantival, adjectival, and pronominal declensions have been constructed from the data. General observations on the various declensions and attested examples for the desinences have been arranged into two sections, those desinences of Lazarević's language found today in literary Serbocroatian and those dialectal or Slavenoserbian desinences not characteristic of the modern literary language. The latter desinences are discussed in detail in the appropriate sections of part 2, chapter 3.

Substantives

The description of the morphology of the substantival declensions is based on the grammatical categories of number, gender, and case. The category of number encompasses the opposition singular/plural. Inherent distinctions of gender (masculine, feminine, and neuter) are found
in the substantives, but only the modifying adjective can ascertain the gender of a substantive, e.g., moj deda 'my grandfather', moj babajka 'my father' (masc.), but moja tuga 'my sorrow', moja pripovedka 'my short story' (fem.). Although a correlation exists between the gender of a substantive and the declensional class to which it belongs, the two are not necessarily equivalent, and substantives of the same gender type may belong to different declensions. Declension I may be termed nonfeminine because it contains masculine and neuter stems, but no feminine stems. Declension II, the nonneuter declension, is composed of feminine and masculine animate substantives ending in <-a>, but no neuter stems. Declension III, the feminine declension, is made up of only feminine stems ending in <-#> and has no masculine or neuter substantives.

The expression of case is found in both numbers. In the singular the following five cases are distinguished: nominative, accusative, genitive, dative/locative, and instrumental. In the plural, however, only four cases are differentiated: nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative/locative/instrumental. In the singular direct cases (nominative and accusative) the substantival declensions have a three-way distinction of gender (masculine, feminine, and neuter). Moreover, in the accusative singular the additional opposition of masculine animate/masculine inanimate is also distinguished. In the remaining oblique
cases of the singular, the masculine and neuter genders fall together. In the plural, the three-way opposition of masculine/feminine/neuter exists in the nominative only; in the accusative there is only a neuter/nonneuter opposition. In the oblique cases of the plural, however, the three-way gender opposition has been eliminated.

The following are paradigms of the attested substantival desinences in Lazarević's works. Citations of examples displaying these desinences are given after the section of observations on the declensions.

Table 2. Substantival Declension Desinences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom./acc.</td>
<td>-#2</td>
<td>-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc.</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-om</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-a3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc./instr.</td>
<td>-ima4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-om4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ma5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ama7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued).

Declension II, Singular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Desinence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc.</td>
<td>-i8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-om</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Declension II, Plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Desinence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom./acc.</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc./instr.</td>
<td>-ama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Declension III, Singular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Desinence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom./acc.</td>
<td>-#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen./dat./loc./instr.</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-iju9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Declension III, Plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Desinence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom./acc.</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-iju10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc./instr.</td>
<td>-imaj11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ma12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table illustrates graphically the distribution of the desinences and the syncretism of cases within the three declensional classes.
Table 3. The Substantival Declension of Lazarević's Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-om</td>
<td>-ju</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>-ama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations on the Substantives

Consonantal alternations of the type K ~ C, K ~ Ć, ST ~ ŠĆ, and P ~ Plj, characteristic of the modern Serbo-croatian declension (see Naylor 1969:87-88), are also a regular feature of Lazarević's nominal system. The most widely distributed of the alternations is the K ~ C type, which occurs before desinences containing /i/ in the nominative, dative, locative, and instrumental plural of declension I and in the dative/locative singular of declension II. Only the /k ~ c/ and /g ~ z/ alternations are attested in the corpus. Because /h/ does not form a part of Lazarević's phonemic system, the /h ~ s/ alternation cannot be realized. In addition, no neuter substantives displaying the K ~ C alternation are attested.

/k ~ c/ - Declension I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nom. sg.</th>
<th>nom. pl.</th>
<th>dat., loc., or instr. pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zrak 'ray'</td>
<td>zraci 24/25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dužnik 'debtor'</td>
<td>dužnici 36/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>momak 'young man'</td>
<td>momci 53/11</td>
<td>momcima 32/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uzrok 'cause'</td>
<td>uzroci 81/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savremenik 'contemporary'</td>
<td>savremenici 122/1</td>
<td>savremenicima 121/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seljak 'peasant'</td>
<td>seljaci 2/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>srodnik 'relative'</td>
<td></td>
<td>srodnicima [x]/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nedostatak 'defect'</td>
<td></td>
<td>nedostatcima 124/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The K ~ Č alternation is found in the vocative singular form of masculine substantives ending in a velar (or a palatal derived from a velar):

/k ~ č/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nom. sg.</th>
<th>voc. sg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>otac 'father'</td>
<td>oče 42/2, 47/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The K ~ Č alternation regularly occurs in the plural cases of the two neuter substantives oko 'eye' and uho 'ear', which in turn become the declension III substantives oči and uši, respectively, e.g., oči (nom. pl.) 6/12; očiju (gen. pl.) 9/13, 24/22, 44/18; očima (loc. pl.) 5/8, 10/10; ušima 'ear' (loc. pl.) 50/5.

The ST ~ ŠĆ and P ~ Plj alternations occur only before the instrumental singular desinence <-ju> of declension III:

**ST ~ ŠĆ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>svojevolnost 'arbitrariness'</td>
<td>svojevolnošću 75/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protivnost 'disinclination'</td>
<td>protivnošću 121/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radost 'gladness'</td>
<td>radosću14 17/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P ~ Plj**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>krv 'blood'</td>
<td>krvlju 6/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vocalic alternations of the type <#> ~ /a/ before the desinence <-#> of the nominative and accusative singular
of declension I masculine substantives and of the type
<#> ñ /a/ before the genitive plural desinence <-a> of
declesion I and II substantives, both characteristic of
modern Serbocroatian (Naylor 1969:88), regularly occur in
Lazarević's language. Some examples of these alternations
follow:

/a/ before <-#>

(nom./acc. sg.)
starac 'old man' 49/2
slavujak 'nightingale' 28/5
momak 'young man' 33/18
sastanak 'meeting' 92/20
otac 'father' 36/17
poredak 'order' 45/20
san 'dream' 9/19
pošao 'affair' 63/19
smisao 'sense' 4/1
promisao 'providence' 86/12
dobitak 'profit' 81/11
cf. before other desinences

(staracu (dat. sg.) 42/1
slavujke (acc. pl.) 4/2
momkom (instr. sg.) 43/10
sastanka (gen. sg.) 107/15
oca (acc. sg.) 37/9
poredka (gen. sg.) 76/8
sna (gen. sg.) 46/7
poslu (loc. sg.) [viii]/2
smislu (loc. sg.) [i]/2
promislu (dat. sg.) 57/2
dobitka (gen. sg.) 111/19

/a/ before <-a>

(gen. pl.)
lovaca 'hunters' 6/21
momaka 'young men' 59/5
potomaka 'ancestors' 96/4
cf. before other desinences

lovci (nom. pl.) 7/16
momci (nom. pl.) 53/11
potomke (acc. pl.) 85/20
A special vocative form in <-e> is attested for declension I masculine animate substantives, e.g., sine 'son' 34/1, brate 'brother' 14/12, Radosave 'Radosav' 22/2, Milane 'Milan' 14/3, oče 'father' 42/2, Bože 'God' 23/17, druže 'friend' 6/14, Tvorče 'Creator' 17/7. Examples with <-u> after /ć/ are not attested.

Similarly, a vocative form in <-o> and one in <-i> exist for declension II and declension III substantives, respectively. Some examples of these vocative forms are: [declension II] čerko 'daughter' 10/1, majko 'mother' 10/17, podporo 'support' 11/20, Ljubosavo 'Ljubosava' 22/15, Petro 'Petra' 26/17, Ljubvo 'love' 36/8, bračo 'brothers' 63/14, deco 'children' 63/20, (masc.) starino 'old man' 46/16; [declension III] radosti 'gladness' 10/1, 11/20, ljubovi 'love' 13/13, strasti 'passion' 13/13.
The substantival desinences of Lazarević's language agree completely with those of the modern literary language in the singular declensions. As in the modern literary language, formal distinction of the direct cases of Lazarević's language (nominative and accusative) in the singular exists only with masculine animate substantives of declension I and with declension II substantives, which display the desinences <-a> and <-u>, respectively, in the accusative. Similarly, syncretism of the dative and locative singular is complete in all three declensional classes, <-u> being characteristic of declension I and <-i> of both declension II and III.

The plural declensions, however, show many desinences not characteristic of the modern literary language, especially in the dative, locative, and instrumental plural. The genitive plural desinence <-i> is found with some masculine substantives which do not admit this desinence in modern standard Serbocroatian, e.g., puti 'times'. In the dative, locative, and instrumental plural of declension I the desinences <-ama>, <-om>, and <-i> attested in Lazarević's works are not found in the modern literary language. Moreover, <-ma>, which is admissible with only a few substantives in the modern literary language, is more widely distributed among declension I and III substantives in Lazarević's language.
As in the modern literary language, formal distinction of the plural direct cases is limited only to masculine substantives which display <-i> in the nominative and <-e> in the accusative. Lazarević's language tends to show syncretism of the dative, locative, and instrumental plural, but this syncretism is not completely realized in all three declensional classes, as it is in the modern standard language. Complete syncretism of these cases is fully realized only in declension II (with the desinence <-ama>.

In the other two declensions this syncretism is not fully realized, since it involves only one or two of the various desinences that may occur in these cases. In declension I a tendency towards syncretism is apparent, in that the desinence <-ima> extends to all three of these cases and to both genders (masculine and neuter). On the other hand, the desinence <-i> extends only to the locative and instrumental for both genders, while <-ma> is restricted only to masculines in the dative and locative and to both genders in the instrumental. The desinence <-ama> in declension I extends to all three cases for neuter substantives only. The most restricted desinence is <-om>, which is limited solely to animate masculine substantives in the dative case. In declension III syncretism is also not completely realized in these cases; <-ima> is limited to the locative and instrumental, while <-ma> is restricted to the dative and instrumental. Observations about the syncretism in declension III
for these cases can only remain inconclusive, because of the very limited number of examples in the corpus.

Desinences Characteristic of the Modern Literary Language

In this section are cited examples of the desinences for the various cases, singular and plural, of the three declensions, as attested in Lazarević's works. Only a few examples illustrating the desinences characteristic of the modern literary language are presented. Later, in the next section, all the examples of desinences not characteristic of the modern literary language will be given.

Declension I, Singular
Nom./Acc.

<-#: (masc. nom.) zob 'oats' 1/16, adidar 'jewel' 12/4, starac 'old man' 49/2, soko17 'falcon' 66/12.
The accusative singular of masculine substantives contains the grammatical subcategory animate/inanimate. Accordingly, the accusative of masculine inanimate substantives is identical to the nominative, and the accusative of masculine animate substantives is identical to the genitive, as follows.

(masc. inan. acc.) predgovor 'preface' [ix]/22, ma [= mah] 'instant' 33/6, kamen 'rock' 64/12.
<-a>: (masc. anim. acc.) risa 'lynx' 13/15, kurjaka 'wolf' 26/13, pratioca 'companion' 40/18.

<-o>: (neut. nom.) stado 'flock' 2/5, trnje 'thorns' 29/16, djelce 'literary work' [vi]/3.
(neut. acc.) društvo 'company' 37/4, brdo 'hill' 61/21, jedinče 'only child' 46/1.

Gen.

<-a>: (masc.) bunara 'well' 11/14, labuda 'swan' 20/8, stra [= straha] 'fear' 58/4.
(neut.) jagnjeta 'lamb' 13/14, detinjstva 'childhood' 56/4, kucanja 'beating' 62/1.

Dat./Loc.

<-u>: (masc. dat.) strau [= strahu] 'fear' 3/4, tastu 'wife's father' 40/12, izvoru 'spring' 46/9.
(neut. dat.) gradančetu 'city boy' 3/8, seocu 'village' 44/20, vremenu 'time' 57/2.
(masc. loc.) smislu 'sense' [i]/2, lancu 'chain' 7/13, običaju 'habit' 46/8.
(neut. loc.) pucanju 'shooting' 5/15, detetu 'child' 3/25, brdu 'hill' 63/5.

Instr.

<-om>: (masc.) pojasom 'belt' 6/8, poljubcem 'kiss' 30/10, plačem 'weeping' 66/7.
(neut.) svrkutanjem 'chirping' 1/18, laskanjem 'flattering' 39/9, šipranjem 'underbrush' 59/9.
Declension I, Plural

Nom.

<-i>: (masc. nom.) Slaveni 'Slavs' [vi]/10, seljani 'villagers' 2/8, potočići 'little streams' 1/13, uzdisaji 'sighs' 16/13.

Masculine monosyllabic substantives often acquire the stem extension <-ov-> throughout the plural declension; this extended stem, however, is not consistently found. Some examples include the following: gajevi 'groves' 1/9, bregovi 'hills' 1/12, džbunovi 'bushes' 1/19, rastovi 'oak trees' 2/1, kosovi 'blackbirds' 2/2, sanovi 'dreams' 11/14, ocevi 'fathers' 61/16, lavovi 'lions' 60/19; but druzi 'friends' 8/2 [cf. drugova (gen. pl.) 37/8], bori 'pine trees' 58/9, risi 'lynxes' 60/19 [cf. risove (acc. pl.) 13/15], zraci 'rays' 24/25.

Nom./Acc.

<-e>: (masc. acc.) žeteoce 'harvesters' 1/18, pastire 'shepherds' 5/24, v'rove [sic] 'summits' 44/6.

<-a>: (neut. nom.) jela 'food' 3/10, kolena 'knees' 25/10, zvezda 'stars' 44/21.

(neut. acc.) nedra 'bosoms' 10/15, jaja 'eggs' 28/9, čeda 'children' 63/14.

Gen.

<-a>: (masc.) kamičaka 'small rocks' 1/14, daka 'pupils' 35/14, minuta 'minutes' 51/13, junaka 'heroes' 60/6.
(neut.) polja 'fields' 2/12, krila 'wings' 66/13.

<-i>: ljudi 'people' 3/6, 38/11, 40/11, 59/4, 102/1.

Dat./Loc./Instr.

<-ima>: (masc. dat.) srođnicima 'relations, kin' [x]/l, momcima 'young men' 32/23.

(neut. dat.) djelima 'actions, deeds' 91/20, 105/6.

(masc. loc.) slogovima 'syllables' [ix]/l5, zakonima 'laws' 75/10, 104/21, savremenicima 'contemporaries' 121/10, nedostatcima 'shortages' 124/2.

(neut. loc.) brdima 'hills' 4/13, srcima 'hearts' 62/10, djelima 'actions' 94/4.

(masc. instr.) druzima 'friends' 35/19, ustavima 'regulations' 77/8.

(neut. instr.) djelima 'actions, deeds' 94/17, 102/14.

Declension II, Singular

Nom.

<-a>: smutnja 'discord' 11/9, grlica 'turtledove' 27/4, guja 'snake' 55/10, (masc.) deda 'grandfather' 15/19.

Acc.

<-u>: pušku 'rifle' 8/12, tamu 'darkness' 26/10, osvetu 'revenge' 56/1, (masc.) babajku 'father' 64/21.

Gen.

<-e>: bitke 'battle' [iv]/7, kupine 'blackberry' 21/2, utrobe 'intestines' 62/13, (masc.) babe 'father' 12/7.
Dat./Loc.

<-i>: (dat.) večeri 'supper' 45/21, volji 'will' 57/1, 
zemlji 'ground' 60/4, (masc.) babi 'father' 17/5, 
44/11.
(loc.) ravnici 'plain' 2/3, šumici 'woods' 13/4, 
krčmi 'tavern' 40/9.

Instr.

<-om>: molitvom 'prayer' 3/18, stazicom 'path' 16/15, 
dolinom 'valley' 25/18.

Declension II, Plural

Nom./Acc.

<-e>: (nom.) česte 'thickets' 1/19, žile 'tendons' 13/12, 
kapljice 'drops' 54/10.
(acc.) kreštalice 'jays' 4/18, prepone 'obstacles' 
23/22, obrve 'eyebrows' 54/6.

Gen.

<-a>: dubljina 'depths' 24/14, ptičica 'birds' 28/3, 
poznanica 'acquaintances' 39/8, košnica 'beehives' 
52/8.

Dat./Loc./Instr.

<-ama>: (dat.) srodnicama 'relations' [x]/2, ovcama 'sheep' 
44/8, usnama 'lips' 44/16, decama 'children' 89/20.
(loc.) pesmama 'songs' [iii]/2, lipama 'linden trees' 
57/19, državama 'states' 104/12, uredbama 'decrees' 
77/11.
(instr.) zabavama 'amusements' 5/12, darama 'gifts' 37/21, zrakama 'rays' 44/5, zaslugama 'merits' 79/14.

Declension III, Singular

Nom./Acc.  

<-#>: (nom.) bezazlenost 'innocence' [vii]/19, umerenost 'moderation' 3/11, zavist 'envy' 12/25, propast 'ruin' 36/10, mati 'mother' 48/7.  
(acc.) ljubov 'love' [vii]/2, stalnost 'stability' [ix]/13, jesen 'autumn' 2/17, nezadovoljnost 'dissatisfaction' 41/8.

Gen.  

<-i>: ĉudi 'disposition' [iv]/16, prvobitnosti 'originality' [ix]/3, mladosti 'youth' 21/24, jeseni 'autumn' 57/16.

Dat./Loc.  

<-i>: (dat.) nemarljivosti 'carelessness' 21/3, [k]ćeri 'daughter' 55/12, ĉudi 'disposition' 111/3, urednosti 'order' 74/21.  
(loc.) slasti 'passion' 26/3, mladeži 'youth' 28/14, radosti 'joy' 29/8, mogućnosti 'possibility' 33/23.

Instr.  

<-i>: reči 'word' [x]/6, 82/8, 98/18, ĉesti 'honor' 113/17.  
<-ju>: krvlju 'blood' 6/4, svojevolnošću 'arbitrariness'
75/6, protivnošću 'disinclination' 121/5, radosću
[sic] 'gladness' 17/15.

Declension III, Plural

Nom./Acc.

<-i>: (nom.) vlasti 'authorities' [iii]/12, prsi 'chests'
25/1, reči 'words' 39/4, 50/4, kosti 'bones' 62/20.
(acc.) stvari 'things' [v]/1, reči 'words' 17/6,
37/17, 41/20, grudi 'chests' 65/15, oči 'eyes' 6/12.

Gen.

<-i>: nраvi 'temperaments' 4/21, misli 'thoughts' 12/12,
reči 'words' 4/6, 47/3, 47/19, sklonosti 'inclinations'
111/18, dužnosti 'duties' 122/11.
<-iju>: kostiju 'bones' 15/13, 53/18, prsiju 'chests' 11/7,
očiju 'eyes' 9/13, 24/22, 44/18.

Dat./Loc./Instr.

<-ima>: (dat.) No attested examples.

(loc.) očima 'eyes' 5/8, 10/10, ušima 'ears' 50/5,
prsima 'chests' 62/1.

(instr.) očima 'eyes' [x]/7, 24/10, 25/24, 41/20.

Desinences Not Characteristic of
the Modern Literary Language

Below are given the examples of desinences not
characteristic of the modern literary language that are found
in Lazarević's works. The examples occur only in the plural.
Declensions I and II, Plural

Gen.
<-i>: Certain substantives requiring <-a> in the modern standard literary language sometimes display <-i> (but having alternate forms with <-a>): puti 'times' 28/3 (but puta 12/15, 22/4, 22/17, 35/22, 49/12), minuti 'minutes' 16/11 (but minuta 51/13).

Dat.
<-om>: This desinence is found only with masculine animate substantives: ljubov svojim ljubeznikom odkrile 'confess love to their lovers' 31/5-6, mojim roditeljem . . . dugove praviti 'to make debts for my parents' 35/17-19, stvar roditeljim Petrinim kazao 'told the matter to Petra's parents' 51/1.

<-ma>: In the dative case this desinence is also limited to masculine animate substantives: vašim Sinovma mane nema 'your sons have no faults' 51/20-21, moralnim ljudma nemože biti svejedno 'moral people cannot be indifferent' 96/3-4.

<-ama>: One neuter substantive displays this desinence in the dative: k neizbrojenima sljedstvama 'to countless consequences' 109/12.

Loc.
<-i>: Both masculine inanimate and neuter substantives frequently display this desinence. It is interesting to note that all but one example with this dialectal
desinence occur in Plemenita i silna ljubov.
(masc.) kosoviće po lugovi 'mowing in the meadows' 4/15-16, u . . . drugi poslovi . . . vreme provodili 'spent time in [doing] other things' 5/16-17, o naši poslovi bavimo 'we deal with our concerns' 81/1-2, po rumeni obrazi je gladeći 'stroking her along her rosy cheeks' 11/18-19, šljive po dolovi . . . zaplavvetnile bile 'the plums had turned blue through the valleys' 57/17-18, grlice su po vr'ovi suvi rastova . . . posedale bile 'the doves had sat on the tops of dry oak trees' 25/14-15.
(neut.) noseći na svoji mladi rameni 'carrying on their young shoulders' 5/20-21, na portanski vrati 'at the church doors' 59/19-20.

<-ma>: As in the dative plural, this desinence is limited to masculine substantives: u jedinim členovma 'in single members' 76/7, pri raširenim našim poslovma 'with our widened concerns' 82/14-15.

<-ama>: This desinence is restricted to neuter substantives: u nepokvarenim srcama 'in unspoiled hearts' [vii]/12-13, o otnošenijama . . . brinutise 'to worry about relationships' 104/6, u otnošenijama 'in relationships' 123/4.

Instr.

<-i>: This is the most common instrumental plural desinence of declension I substantives and is found with both
masculine and neuter substantives:

(masc.) s tvoji roditelji 'with your parents' 34/14, sa talasi 'with waves' 68/3, sa svoji poslovi baviti 'be concerned with their own affairs' 79/11-12, gine . . . za njegovi novci 'dream of his money' 113/14-15.

(neut.) za ledi 'behind the back' 116/4.

<-ma>: Unlike in the dative and locative plural, not only masculine, but also neuter substantives may display this desinence:

(masc.) među ovim . . . ljudma 'among these people' 2/19-20, sa Graždanma 'with citizens' 75/20.

(neut.) s pleskajućim krilma 'with fluttering wings' 25/22-23, tresedi krilma 'with trembling wings' (lit. 'trembling with the wings') 28/6.

<-ama>: As in the dative and locative plural, this desinence is restricted to neuter substantives: pod krilama 'under the protection' [iv]/l, s nevaljalim ženskim licama 'with wicked women' 36/12, među licama 'among people' 96/20, s licama 'with people' 99/6, 105/18.

Declension III, Plural

Dat.

<-ma>: Only one dative plural substantive of declension III with this desinence is attested: se začudi njenim
pametnim rečma 'was amazed at her intelligent words'
32/19.

Instr.

<-ma>: More declension III substantives display this desinence in the instrumental plural than display the literary language desinence <-ima>: nji nemilim rečma odbijem 'I repulse them with unkind words' 11/2, Zapita ga ovim rečma 'questions him with these words' 22/2, mene ladnim rečma ‘… odbijas 'you repulse me with cold words' 30/11-12, s ovim gromovitim rečma 'with these thundering words' 36/16-17, tim sladkim rečma kano činma obuzeti 'overcome by those sweet words as by magic' 61/18-19, Umre Petra i s ovim rečma 'Petra dies with these words' 66/1.

Adjectives

In this study the adjectival declension has also been described on the basis of the same grammatical categories of number, case, and gender as exhibited by the substantives. It is important to note, however, that gender is not inherent in adjectives as it is in substantives; rather, the gender of an adjective is determined by the gender of the substantive that it modifies. The two types of adjectives described are possessive adjectives and descriptive adjectives. The former include the adjectives
ending in -ov or -in, e.g., Milanov 'Milan's, Petrin 'Petra's', Angelin 'Andjela's, Ivanov 'Ivan's', and Očin 'father's'; the latter include all other adjectives that characterize, limit, or modify the accompanying substantive, e.g., veliki 'great', veseli 'joyful', kratki 'short', glavni 'main', etc.

The following is a listing of all attested desinences for the adjectival declension. Attested examples from Lazarević's language which illustrate the various desinences are presented on pages 80-86, following some general observations on the adjectival declension.

Table 4. Adjectival Declension Desinences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>(inan.) -i</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(anim.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-og</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-og</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-oga24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-a25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc.</td>
<td>-om</td>
<td>-oj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-u26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-omy27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-im28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-im</td>
<td>-om</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i\textsuperscript{29}</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc./</td>
<td></td>
<td>-im</td>
<td>-i\textsuperscript{30}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table illustrates graphically the distribution of the desinences and the syncretism of cases in the adjectival declension.
Table 5. The Adjectival Declension of Lazarević's Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-i, -#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-og, -oga, -a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>-omu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-om, -u</td>
<td>-oj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>-om, -u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-im</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-om</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-im, -ima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations on the Adjectival Declension

A definite/indefinite opposition in the adjectival declension is limited to descriptive adjectives in only a few grammatical cases in the singular. Indisputable indefinite forms may occur only (1) with the desinence <-#> in the nominative and accusative singular of masculine adjectives, e.g., (nom.) strašan san 'horrible dream' 9/19, prav i zdrav razum 'correct and healthy reasoning' 3/23, vruć vetar 'hot wind' 10/8, nemarljiv i žalostan 'unattentive and sad' 21/6, pametan mladić 'intelligent young man' 50/6, naš čestan starac 'our honorable old man' 50/6, (acc.) prav smisao 'appropriate sense' 4/1; (2) with <-a> in the nonfeminine genitive singular, e.g., bez visoka i zamršena načina 'without a high and complicated manner' 4/7, iz krotka jagnjeta 'from a tame lamb' 13/14, čista i prava srca 'pure and genuine heart' 23/8, stasa vitka, lica okrugla 'slender physique, a round face' 24/18, srca nježna i vitka 'tender and supple heart' 24/21, posle obična jutrenja pozdrava 'after the usual morning greeting' 46/15, struka visoka 'tall frame' 53/18, lica duguljasta 'rather long face' 53/19, bez zakonna prenuđavanja 'without legal compulsion' 100/5; and (3) with <-u> in the nonfeminine dative and locative singular, e.g., u Milanovom okruglu licu 'in Milan's round face' 53/20, bezlobnu anđelu ravnja 'like a benevolent angel' 60/3.
Lazarević's language also provides numerous examples of a special adjectival desinence ending in <-a>, commonly referred to as the brojna forma or "quantification form." This form, rather than the regular adjectival desinence <-og>, is found with declension I masculines and neuters after the numerals two, three, and four (Naylor 1972:5). A few examples of the brojna forma are: ova dva mala Srpseta 'these two small Serbian boys' 5/11, dva verna druga 'two true friends' 6/10, dva ova zaljubljena momka 'these two lovestricken young men' 57/3, dva vitka bora 'two slim pine trees' 59/6, ova dva . . . junaka 'these two heroes' 64/9, druga dva krsta 'the two other crosses' 67/5.

The adjectival desinences of Lazarević's language conform closely to those of the modern literary language. However, some nonliterary desinences, namely <-im> in the nonfeminine locative singular and <-i> in the nonfeminine locative and instrumental plural, are attested, though infrequently. Moreover, the nonfeminine genitive singular <-oga> desinence, which occurs frequently in the modern literary language, is attested in only two examples, as is also <-omu> of the nonfeminine dative singular.

Restrictions on the distribution of the adjectival desinences as to adjectival type (possessive or descriptive) cannot be determined definitively because of the very limited number of possessive adjectives attested, but tentative conclusions on the distribution reveal that the possessive
adjectives have no definite/indefinite opposition as found with descriptive adjectives. Furthermore, the possessive adjectives display none of the nonliterary desinences: <-im> locative singular or <-i> locative and instrumental plural.

Syncretism of cases in the adjectival declension reflects more closely that of the modern literary language than do the substantival desinences, where the syncretism may involve only one of several desinences, especially in the dative, locative, and instrumental plural. Thus, in the adjectival declension, the dative and locative singular for both the feminine and the nonfeminine show formal identity of their desinences, as do the dative, locative, and instrumental plural of all genders. The only instances of non-syncretism in these cases are <-im>, which is characteristic solely of the locative singular, not of the dative singular; <-omu>, which is characteristic only of the dative singular, not of the locative singular; and <-i>, which is characteristic of the nonfeminine locative and instrumental plural, but not of the dative plural.

Adjectival Desinences Characteristic of the Modern Literary Language

Singular

Nom./Acc.

<-i>: (masc. nom.) Srpski rod 'Serbian nation' [vi]/17, strani trgovač 'foreign merchant' 36/14, strogi . . . i kajućise starac 'strict and repenting old man' 49/1.
(masc. acc.) u zreli vozrast 'to a mature age'
[viii]/10, nad bistri potok 'over a clear stream'
18/1, u ... jeseni svetac 'on an autumn holy day'
58/17.

<-#>:  This desinence is characteristic of the indefinite
adjectival forms (see above), the possessive adjectives,
and the anomolous adjective sav 'all, entire':
(masc. nom.) sav ... adidar 'entire jewel' 12/4,
Milanov otac 'Milan's father' 51/15.
(masc. acc.) sav ... događaj 'entire happening'
12/6, sav ... život 'entire life' 16/6, sav ... posao 'all work' 63/19.

<-o>:  (neut. nom.) straovito ukanje 'terrible shrieking'
11/11, bodljivo trnje 'a prickly thorn' 29/16,
Petrino postupanje 'Petra's behavior' 55/16.
(neut. acc.) u sadašnje vreme 'at the present time'
[ii]/1, umilno pevanje 'sweet singing' 17/12, belo
stado 'white flock' 25/4, očino pismo 'father's
letter' 39/13, oko Petrino 'Petra's eye' 50/1,
Andelino namerenje 'Andjela's intention' 51/9.

<-a>:  (fem. nom.) slastna i skotska ljubov 'passionate and
animalistic love' [vii]/7, njeka strašna smutnja
'some horrible discord' 11/9, sva radost 'all joy'
12/5, mati Petrina 'Petra's mother' 48/7.
(-u): (fem. acc.) veselu i obilnu jesen 'joyful and abundant autumn' 2/17, ljutu guju 'angry snake' 7/14, kćer Mladenovu 'Mladen's daughter' 47/6.

(-og): (masc. anim.) gorskog kurjaka 'mountain wolf' 26/13, nevaljalog i poganog pratioca 'wick and evil companion' 40/18, večnog i vernog druga 'eternal and true friend' 43/17.

Gen. 32

(-og): (nonfem.) čovečeskog života 'human life' [v]/7, posle kratkog vremena 'after a short time' 28/7, od . . . nevaljalog društva 'from the evil company' 36/22,

(-e): (fem.) nezrele mladeži 'immature youth' [vii]/20, od . . . usamljene devojke 'from a solitary girl' 7/8, bez svake sumnje 'without any doubt' 13/23, Ivanove majke 'Ivan's mother' 51/4.

Dat./Loc. 33

(-om): (nonfem. dat.) mladom Milanu 'young Milan' 3/6, neiskusnom srcu 'inexperienced heart' 29/13, k . . . dostojnom starcu 'to the worthy old man' 42/1. (nonfem. loc.) u srednjem veku 'in the Middle Ages' [ij]/8, po sadašnjem kroju 'according to the latest style' 3/3, na Milanovom licu 'on Milan's face' 33/19.

(-oj): (fem. dat.) materiji čitavoj 'the entire material' [ix]/6, ljubovi Božijoj 'God's love' 3/16, k Petri
Mladenovoj 'to Mladen's Petra' 44/12, Petrinoj majci 'Petra's mother' 50/19.

(fem. loc.) u prostoj i slobodnoj prirodi 'in the simple and free nature' 3/12, u strašnoj njekoj bolji 'in some terrible pain' 16/10, u jednoj krčmi 'in a tavern' 40/9.

Instr.

<-im>: (nonfem.) čudnovatim osećanjem 'strange feeling' 9/9, pod granatim brestom 'under a branchy elm tree' 25/19, s mirnim srcem 'with a peaceful heart' 44/18.

<-om>: (fem.) s radosnom suzom 'with a joyful tear' 5/7, nad jednom dolinom 'over one valley' 25/18, s Ivanovom materom 'with Ivan's mother' 48/8.

Plural

Nom./Acc.

<-i>: (masc. nom.) potočići bistri 'clear streams' 1/13, seljaci . . . prostosrdečni, bogobojazlivi i usrdni 'open-hearted, God-fearing and affectionate villagers' 2/8, roditelji Petrinj 'Petra's parents' 23/10.

<-e>: (masc. acc.) tuđe običaje 'foreign customs' [viii]/16, male slavujke 'small nightingales' 5/2, znatne troškove i dugove 'significant expenditure and debts' 35/18.

(fem. nom.) plodonosne kruške 'fruitful pear trees'
2/4, *tanke crne obrvice* 'slim black eyebrows' 24/23, 
*seoske skupštine* 'village meetings' 57/20.

(fem. acc.) *dugačke senke* 'long shadows' 24/13, *veće prepone* 'larger obstacles' 23/22, *sitne bele zube* 'small white teeth' 50/3.

<-a>: (neut. nom.) *Ivanova* . . . veća stada 'Ivan's larger flocks' 8/6, *večernja zvezda* 'evening stars' 44/2,
*srca* . . . čista i poštena 'clean and honorable hearts' 52/3.

(neut. acc.) *visoka mesta* 'high places' 3/17, *druga pozorišta* 'other sights' 26/1, *čeda dobra i poštena* 'good and honorable children' 63/15.

Gen. 34

<-i>: (all genders) *krome drugi gnusni i gadni poroka* 
'besides other loathsome and ugly vices' [vi]/12,
*nizi oblaka* 'low clouds' 1/2, *bez mlogi reči* 'without many words' 4/6, *iz dubljina šumski* 'from the forest depths' 24/14.

Dat./Loc./Instr.

<-im>: (all genders) This is the most frequent of the two desinences in all three cases:

(dat.) *pametnim rečma* 'intelligent words' 32/19,
*roditeljem Petrinim* 'Petra's parents' 51/1.

(loc.) *u . . . srpskim junackim pesmama* 'in Serbian heroic songs [iii]/1, *u nepokvarenim srcama* 'in unspoiled hearts' [vii]/13, *u kratkim slogovima* 'in
short syllables' [ix]/15, u ranim godinama 'in the early years' 98/1.

(instr.) detinjskim zabavama 'child's amusements' 5/12, ladnim rečma 'cold words' 30/11, s nevaljalim . . . licama 'with wicked people' 36/12.

<-ima>: (all genders)

(dat.) milima mladima srodnicima 'to my dear young relations' [x]/1, svima moralima djelima 'all moral actions' 91/20, k neizbrojenima sljedstvama 'to countless consequences' 109/12.

(loc.) u svima . . . godinama 'in all years' [vi]/1, u zakonima crkovnima i državnima 'in church and state laws' 104/21.

(instr.) željnima očima 'desirous eyes' 24/10, s raskosnima i lepim darama 'with luxurious and beautiful gifts' 37/21, među drugima seoskim devojkama 'among other village girls' 58/1, među različnim neporedkama 'among various disorders' 73/7, svetima formama 'holy forms' 91/15.

Adjectival Desinences Not Characteristic of the Modern Literary Language

Singular

Loc.

<-im>: (nonfem.) This desinence is attested in one example: u ljupkim zamišljenju 'in sweet thought' 45/1.
Plural
Loc./Instr.

<-i>: This desinence is restricted to the locative and instrumental cases of masculine and neuter descriptive adjectives:

(loc.) Milan . . . sa . . . Ivanom . . . noseći na . . . mladi rameni puške 'Milan and Ivan carrying rifles on [their] young shoulders' 5/18-21, su . . . u pucanju . . . i drugi poslovi . . . vreme provodili 'they spent their time shooting and [doing] other work' 5/15-17, Bosiljka uze đerku [sic] . . . i rukom po rumeni obrazi je gladeći 'Bosiljka took her daughter . . . and caressing her on her rosy cheeks with her hand' 11/17-19, Na portanski vrati . . . stadoše Milan i Ivan 'Milan and Ivan were standing at the churchyard doors' 59/19-21.

(instr.) Muški se sa ženski izmešali 'the men mingled with the women' 59/18-19.

Pronouns

The same grammatical categories of case, number, and gender as exhibited by substantives and adjectives have been used to describe the pronouns of Lazarević's works. The following types of pronouns are described: (1) the possessive pronouns--moj 'my', tvoj 'your' (familiar), svoj
'one's own', njegov 'his', njezin/njen 'her', naš 'our', vaš 'your', and nji[h]ov/njin 'their'; (2) the demonstrative pronouns--ovaj 'this, onaj 'that, taj 'that', takav (taki) 'such a', and onakav 'such a'; (3) the relative-interrogative pronouns--kakav 'what, what kind of', čiji 'whose', koji 'which, what, who', and the interrogatives ko 'who' and šta 'what'; and (4) the personal pronouns--ja 'I', ti 'you' (familiar), on 'he', ona 'she', ono 'it', mi 'we', vi 'you', oni/one 'they', and the reflexive pronoun sebe 'oneself'.

Indefinite, negative, and definite pronouns, e.g., neki 'some', neko 'someone', nijedan 'none', niko 'no one', svaki 'every', and svako 'everyone', are identical to the other pronouns in declension and have therefore been excluded from the description.

This section first presents the pronominal desinences and observations on the pronominal declension, followed by attested examples of all the desinences of the possessive, demonstrative, and relative-interrogative pronouns. Although the two interrogative pronouns ko 'who' and šta 'what' are nearly identical to the relative-interrogative pronoun koji 'which, what, who' in declension, separate paradigms and observations are given for them. Observations on the personal pronouns and a presentation of attested forms conclude the section.

The desinences displayed in the pronominal declension of Lazarević's language follow.
Table 6. Pronominal Declension Desinences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-#</td>
<td>-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>(inan.)</td>
<td>-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(anim.)</td>
<td>-og^36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-og</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-oga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc.</td>
<td>-om</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ome^37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-im</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc./</td>
<td>-im</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-ima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i^38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table illustrates graphically the distribution of the desinences and the syncretism of cases in the pronominal declension.
Table 7. The Pronominal Declension of Lazarević's Language

Singular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-og, -oga</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>-ome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ome</td>
<td>-oj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-om</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-im</td>
<td>-om</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-im, -ima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations on the Pronominal Declension

The pronominal declension displays the same desinences as the adjectival declension with the following exceptions: (1) the pronominal declension contains no definite/indefinite opposition; (2) the adjectival declension displays in the dative/locative singular <-omu> and <-im>, which are not admissible in the pronominal declension; and (3) the dative singular desinence <-ome> is attested only with the pronominal declension. Except for the locative and instrumental plural desinence <-i>, the pronominal desinences in Lazarević's language are identical to those of the modern standard literary language.

Restrictions on the distribution of the pronominal desinences as to type of pronoun (possessive, demonstrative, or relative-interrogative) are few. The dative singular desinence <-ome> is restricted to possessives and demonstratives, whereas the locative and instrumental desinence <-i> is limited solely to possessive pronouns. Moreover, the demonstratives exclude the desinence <-ima> and the relative-interrogatives <-im> in the dative/locative/instrumental plural.

Attested examples of demonstrative, possessive, and relative-interrogative pronouns from Lazarević's works include the following:
Singular
Nom/Acc.

<-#>: (masc. nom.) ovan način 'this manner' [i]/6, taj rod 'that kind' [i]/12, onaj mladić 'that young man' 31/7, moj deda 'my grandfather' 15/19, tvoj otac 'your father' 36/17, kakav događaj 'what event' 10/5, njegov otac 'his father' 20/7, razum njen 'her reasoning' 33/10, njezin glas 'her voice', 50/3, naš pol 'our feminine sex' 32/9, koji 'which one' 61/12.

(masc. acc.) na onaj potok 'to that stream' 19/5, za taj dan 'for that day' 25/16, svoj um 'their intellect' [iv]/5, savet moj 'my advice' 47/9.

<-o>: (neut. nom.) ovo postupanje 'this behavior' 55/16, takvo dete 'such a child' 95/8, njino namerenje 'their intention' 31/18, njegovo srce 'his heart' 54/3, lice, koje 'face, which' 96/7, kakvo blago 'what treasure' 52/12.

(neut. acc.) ono . . . zemljice 'that ground' 2/15, ovo lice 'this face' 24/23, tvoje pitanje 'your question' 29/18, svetovanje njivo 'their advice' 36/5.

<-a>: (fem. nom.) pripovedka ona 'that short story' [vi]/2, ta . . . strast 'that passion' 12/24, tvoja briga 'your worry' 22/12, mati njena 'her mother' 59/2,
kakva nesloga 'which discord' 52/10, čija 'whose' 30/22.

<-u>: (fem. acc.) na onu stranu 'to that side' 18/16, tu stvar 'that matter' 48/18, pod moju trepavicu 'under my eyelash' 22/18, njenu stidnoću 'her shyness' 52/15, kakvu iskru 'which spark' 15/14, Petra... koju 'Petra... whom' 59/21.

<-og>: (masc. anim. acc.) takog muža 'such a husband' 110/9, u tog pevca 'at that rooster' 5/10, našeg Milana 'our Milan' 22/17, na mog druga 'of my friend' 42/15.

Gen.

<-og>: (nonfem.) takog čoveka 'such a man' 112/6, posle ovog blagoslova 'after that blessing' 30/24, od tvog babe 'from your father' 12/6, mog pokoja radi 'for the sake of my peace' 26/9, lice, oko kog 'face, around which' 6/5.

<-oga>: (nonfem.) This desinence has an extremely limited distribution; the few attested examples are: svoga doma 'his home' 8/10, iz toga 'from that' 23/7, do toga 'to that' 37/6, svoga raja 'his paradise' 62/15, događaj... od koga 'event, from which' [viii]/19.

<-e>: (fem.) od take žene 'from such a woman' 111/16, od te nesreće 'from that unhappiness' 24/6, pored njene kućice 'near her house' 12/16, preko njiove volje
'against their will' 29/1, pripovedka . . . od koje 'short story from which' [v]/2.

Dat./Loc.

<-om>: (nonfem. dat.) k ovom . . . starcu 'to this old man' 42/1, tvom drugu 'your friend' 14/13, mom ocu 'my father' 40/12, kakov interesu 'which interest' 111/12.
(nonfem. loc.) u ovom životu 'in this life' 22/1, u tom strau 'in that fear' 26/14, u našem mestancu 'in our place' 31/2, po svom običaju 'by his habit' 33/21, veku . . . u kom 'century in which' [v]/9, lica . . . na kom 'face upon which' 24/19.

<-ome>: (nonfem. dat.) This desinence is limited solely to the possessive and demonstrative pronouns. All attested forms follow: k svome stadu 'to his flock' 16/16, 44/19, k mome babi 'to my father' 17/4, tome stadu 'that flock' 25/8, svome drugu 'his friend' 28/20, mome ocu 'my father' 30/2, svome tastu 'his father-in-law' 40/12, k tvome babi 'to your father' 44/11.

<-oj>: (fem. dat.) toj ljubovi 'that love' 50/14, toj . . . svezi 'that relationship' 100/2, majci svojoj 'her mother' 10/15, mojoj tuzi 'my sorrow' 41/15, životinje . . . kojoj 'animal to which' 94/16. (fem. loc.) u samoći onoj 'in that solitude' 11/3, u toj bolji 'in that pain' 24/2, o svojoj lepoti
'about her beauty' 18/6, u njegovoј starosti 'in his old age' 109/15, stranu . . . na kojoj 'side on which' 18/16.

Instr.

<-im>: (nonfem.) pod visom onim 'under that peak' 1/1, među onakvim čovekom 'between such a man' 95/4, svrku-tanjem svoјim 'its chirping' 1/18, nad tvojim jedinčem 'over your only son' 22/24, putem, kojim 'path, by which' 53/11.

<-om>: (fem.) s onom radosću 'with that joy' 17/15, s tom kućom 'with that household' 48/15, nesrećom mojom 'my misfortune' 35/5, s' mojom braćom 'with my brothers' 35/19, stazom, kojim 'path, by which' 21/17.

Plural

Nom./Acc.

<-i>: (masc. nom.) ovi njiovi jadi 'these sorrows of theirs' 57/13, naši Srblji 'our Serbs' [iii]/18, roditelji moji 'my parents' 35/1, jadi, koji 'sorrows, which' 57/13.

(masc. acc.) ove . . . kamene 'these rocks' 19/16, na moje učitelje 'to my teachers 35/13, na roditelje njene 'to her parents' 42/12, za kakve potomke 'for which ancestors' 84/16, bori, koјe grom udari 'pine trees, which lightning strikes' 58/9.
one devojke 'those girls' 32/20, ove . . . reći 'these words' 39/4, njegove galije 'his ships' 36/19, tvoje sestre 'your sisters' 39/2, vlasti . . . koje 'authorities . . . which' [iii]/12. onakove stvari 'such things' [iv]/19, na te reći 'to those words' 10/13, na tvoje trepavice 'on your eyelashes' 10/11, njene usnice 'her lips' 50/2, dražesti . . . koje bi ona trebala 'charms which she would need' 113/20. sljedstva . . . koja 'consequences which' 106/1. No demonstratives or possessives are attested. u njiova srca 'in their hearts' 52/9, svoja usta 'her mouth' 52/17, otnošenija . . . takva 'such relationships' 103/14. taki smisli 'such thoughts' 33/23, od oni moi poznanica 'of those acquaintances of mine' 39/8, iz njeni . . . očiju 'from her eyes' 9/13, od tvoji . . . sestara 'from your sisters' 38/21, momaka između koji 'young men among whom' 59/5. k njezinim nogama 'to her feet' 27/14, mojim roditeljem 'my parents' 35/17, k tvojim ovcama 'to your sheep' 44/8. No demonstratives or relative-interrogatives are attested.
(loc.) u . . . onim državama 'in those states'
104/11, u našim pesmama 'in our songs' [iii]/2, u svojim decama 'in his children' 85/1. No relative-interrogatives are attested.

(instr.) med ovim ljudma 'among those people' 2/19, tim . . . rečma 'those words' 61/18, s . . . mojim druzima 'with my friends' 15/19, sa svojim ustavima 'with its regulations' 77/8. No relative-interrogatives are attested.

<-ima>: (dat.) k usnama svojima 'to his lips' 44/16, ljubama svojima 'their sweethearts' 53/12, Bogoslovi, kojima je zanat 'theologians whose profession is' 74/10. No demonstratives are attested.

(loc.) u . . . svojima godinama 'in their years' [vi]/1, na tvojima očima 'on your eyes' 10/10, ravnice na kojima 'plains on which' 1/15. No demonstratives are attested.

(instr.) svojima . . . formama 'their forms' 91/15, svojima zrakama 'its rays' 44/5, stvari, s kojima 'things with which' [v]/1, devojaka . . . među kojima 'girls among whom' 59/8. No demonstratives are attested.
Desinences Not Characteristic of the Modern Literary Language

The only desinence of the pronominal declension not found in the modern literary language is <-i>, which is restricted to the locative and instrumental plural cases of possessive pronouns:

(loc.) na svoji ... rameni 'on their shoulders' 5/20, o naši poslovi 'about our affairs' 81/1, u svoji savremenica 'in their contemporaries' 121/10.

(instr.) s tvoji roditelji 'with your parents' 34/14, sa svoji poslovi 'with his affairs' 79/11, sa njegovi novci 'of his money' 113/14.

Interrogative Pronouns Ko 'Who' and Šta (Što) 'What'

The interrogative pronouns ko and šta (što) display some, but not all, of the forms prescribed by Vuk Karadžić and found in the modern literary language. No forms with -u are attested in the dative and locative (e.g., komu and čemu), nor with -e in the instrumental (e.g., kime and čime). Both monosyllabic and disyllabic forms are found in Lazarević's language, e.g., kog, čem, kim, kom, koga, and kome. Only monosyllabic forms are found in the instrumental of ko and in the locative of šta, only disyllabic forms in the accusative and genitive of ko, and both monosyllabic and disyllabic forms in the dative of ko. Determination of which forms predominate in his works cannot be made because of the
limited amount of examples attested. Paradigms of the attested forms of ko and šta (što) are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ko</th>
<th>šta (što)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>nom.</strong></td>
<td>ko 56/15, 100/8, 102/9</td>
<td>šta [ii]/2, 14/13, 23/7, 34/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>što 9/3, 50/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>acc.</strong></td>
<td>koga [ii]/10, 2/22, 13/20, 30/23, 51/15, 53/8</td>
<td>šta 14/1, 23/16, 26/23, 52/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kog 108/8</td>
<td>što 16/24, 38/7, 52/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gen.</strong></td>
<td>koga 25/1, 33/12, 33/14</td>
<td>No examples found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dat./loc.</strong></td>
<td>(dat.) kom 8/13, 43/6, 103/1</td>
<td>No examples found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kome 2/22, 20/8, 31/8, 32/24, 51/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            | (loc.) na kom 24/19  | ni o čem 49/15,  
|            |                     | u čem 108/1        |
|            |                     | o čem [iii]/7      |
| **instr.** | s kim 32/11         | No examples found  |

Observations on the Personal Pronouns

The attested forms of the personal pronouns in Lazarević’s works are identical to those prescribed by Vuk and to those found in the modern literary language, with only minor variations: (1) the accusative and dative cases of the pronoun 'they', ji and jim, which Vuk prescribed as i and im, have a written prothetic glide /j/; (2) the modern
literary shape for the accusative case of the preceding pronoun is _ih_ with the phoneme /h/, not a part of Lazarević's phonemic system; and (3) Lazarević's use of clitic forms after prepositions, admissible in Vuk's grammar, is no longer generally prescribed in the modern literary language.

Syncretism of cases with all the attested personal pronouns also conforms to Vuk's grammar and the modern literary language. Except for the third person singular pronoun _ona_, which formally distinguishes the genitive and accusative cases, all other persons and numbers of the personal pronoun declension display complete formal identity of these two cases. Moreover, all persons in the singular show complete formal identity of the dative and locative cases as well. Syncretism of the dative, locative and instrumental plural in Lazarević's language is complete in the third person plural, but in the other two persons in the plural the extent of the syncretism cannot be ascertained, since only clitic forms in the dative are attested.

Lazarević frequently uses the dative case of the personal pronouns instead of possessive adjectives or the genitive case of substantives to express possession. Some examples of this dialectal construction, known as the dative of possession, include the following: _pa jim na njoj_ oči ostaše 'their eyes remained on her' 6/11, _sve kao što joj je na srcu ležalo_ 'everything as it laid on her heart' 10/15, _očel smeti u oči mi pogledati_ 'if he will dare to
look in my eyes' 13/25, uzdisaji su mu prsi jako razdirali 'the sighs greatly tormented his chest' 16/13, to mu je sve jače srce kucalo 'his heart beat all the stronger' 25/9, da je ona grdna tuga na čelu mu nestala 'that that huge burden disappeared on his forehead' 46/3, umilne reči njemu su neprestano u ušima bile 'the sweet words were constantly in his ears' 50/4, kroz dušu mu prođe 'goes through his soul' 60/13.

Occasionally both a possessive pronoun and the dative of possession may be found, e.g., da ti od gladi ne poumiru tvoje sestre 'that your sisters will not die from hunger' 39/1, da jim Bog stari njiov život okonča 'that God take their old life' 66/14, ali njiova jim je mladost sasvim nestala 'their youthfulness completely disappeared' 58/6.

The personal pronouns display both long and short (clitic) forms, which are limited solely to the accusative and dative cases. The attested forms are declined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Form</th>
<th>Clitic Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Person Singular:</strong> ja 'I'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.: ja [vi]/5, 10/1, 26/23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc./gen.: mene 7/12, 12/19, 13/3, 61/9</td>
<td>acc.: me 10/13, 10/23, 11/15, 22/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc.: meni 10/25, 28/1, 28/23, 46/18</td>
<td>dat.: mi 23/13, 26/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.: mnom 11/9, 32/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Form</td>
<td>Clitic Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Person Singular: ti 'you</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ti 10/7, 13/14,</td>
<td>acc.: te 22/9, 26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc./gen.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tebe 10/17, 12/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/22, 34/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tebi 10/1, 22/5,</td>
<td>dat.: ti 10/20, 43/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/2, 42/2,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tobom 15/2, 27/18,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Person Singular: on 'he', ono 'it', ona 'she'</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gender distinction for these pronouns is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine/nonfeminine in all cases except the nomi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native, which has a three-way masculine/feminine/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neuter distinction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(masc.) on 3/4, 12/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(neut.) ono [vi]/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fem.) ona [vii]/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc./gen.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nonfem.) njega 8/18, 43/13</td>
<td>acc.: (nonfem.) ga 13/22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20/14, 37/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fem. acc.) nju 9/5, 26/3, 31/10,</td>
<td>acc.: (fem.) je 6/10,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50/21</td>
<td>9/19, 27/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fem. gen.) nje 60/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nonfem.) njemu 23/20, 64/18</td>
<td>dat.: (nonfem.) mu 3/2,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/15, 20/15, 30/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fem.) njoj 41 26/9, 39/11</td>
<td>dat.: (fem.) joj 10/16,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18/15, 53/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Long Form

instr.: (nonfem.) njim 21/9, 25/10, 42/16, 60/18
     njime 13/11, 32/25, 41/6, 63/18
     (fem.) njom 9/11, 18/15, 62/2, 65/4
     njome (one example) 55/5

First Person Plural: mi 'we'

nom.: mi 23/18

acc./gen.: nas 11/10, 15/15, 51/14

dat./loc./
     instr.: (dat. & loc., no examples found)
     dat.: nam 11/13, 23/18, 47/12
     instr.: nama 15/17

Second Person Plural: vi 'you'

nom.: vi 7/5, 61/9

acc./gen.: vas 7/4, 30/19, 63/17

dat./loc./
     instr.: (dat. & loc., no examples found)
     dat.: vam 7/6, 61/14
     instr.: vama 7/9, 7/11

Third Person Plural: oni, one 'they'

No gender distinctions are made for the third person plural personal pronouns except in the nominative case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Form</th>
<th>Clitic Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>nom:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(masc.) oni 29/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fem.) one 43/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(neut.) no examples found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>acc./gen.:</strong> nji [viii]/1, 11/2, 30/3</td>
<td>acc.: ji 4/16, 5/3, 44/9, 62/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dat./loc./</strong> injr.: njima [iii]/12, 4/19, 31/6, 52/5, 53/9, 65/12, 67/8</td>
<td>dat.: jim 31/4, 52/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive Pronoun: sebe 'oneself'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>acc./gen.:</strong> sebe [v]/6, 9/4, 54/3</td>
<td>acc.: se 42 7/21, 7/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dat./loc.:</strong> sebi [iii]/10, [v]/8, 11/17, 54/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>instr.:</strong> sobom 4/17, 13/18, 31/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes to Chapter III

1 In Lazarević's language, however, such syncretism of the dative/locative/instrumental plural is only partially realized (see pp. 54, 70-74 below).

2 Occurs only with animate substantives in the accusative case.

3 Occurs with two masculine substantives which display both <-a> and <-i>.

4 Restricted to masculine animate substantives in the dative only.

5 Not found with neuter substantives in the dative or locative.

6 Not found in the dative.

7 Limited to neuter substantives.

8 No masculine substantives attested in the locative singular or in any of the plural cases of declension II.

9 Restricted to the instrumental, where both <-ju> and <-i> are attested. Lazarević does not follow the distribution of these two desinences of the instrumental as prescribed in the modern literary language, in which <-ju> is used when no modifiers accompany the substantive (see Stefanović 1964:244-45).

10 Found solely with substantives designating parts of the body.

11 Excluding the dative.

12 Excluding the locative.

13 In one example, however, the alternation does not occur: tugi 29/8.

14 In this example /s/ rather than the expected /š/ is in all probability a typographical error.

15 The <*> ~ /a/ vocalic alternation before the desinence <#>, also found with declension III substantives in modern Serbo-Croatian (e.g., misao ~ misli 'thought'), is not attested in the corpus.
The substantives brado and deco are suppletive plurals—the singular forms are brat 'brother' and dete 'child'.

Before the <-#> desinence of the nom./acc. sg. of this and similar substantives, stem-final /-l/ is not realized phonetically (cf., however, gen. sg. sokola).

Stems ending in /-lac#/ before <-#> of the nom. sg. are realized as /-oc-/ before all other desinences.

This is a diminutive of djelo. The modern Serbo-croatian form is djeoce instead of djelce.

This is a diminutive of jedinac.

This third-declension substantive is irregular; attested forms in the other cases include: materi (dat. sg.) 50/15, matere (gen. sg.) 58/2, 98/8, materom (instr. sg.) 48/8, 95/19, mater (acc. sg.) 112/17, mater (nom. pl.) 61/16.

This and other Slavenoserbian lexicon are discussed in part 1, chap. 5, pp. 121-27.

Restricted to the possessive adjectives, indefinite adjectival forms and the adjective sav 'all, entire'.

Limited to two attested examples only.

Characteristic of the indefinite adjectival forms only.

Also characteristic of the indefinite adjectival forms only.

Marginally distributed—two attested examples.

Attested with one rare example in the corpus.

Limited solely to the adjective sav 'all, entire'.

Attested only in the locative and instrumental cases with masculine and neuter substantives.

The vocalic alternation <#> ~ /a/ occurs before <-#> in those adjectives that would have inadmissible consonantal clusters, such as *strasišn, *čestn, *pametn, *žalostn, *dobr, etc.
The genitive singular desinence <-oga> is restricted to one attested form with sav 'entire' and one substantival adjective: svega sela 'the entire village' 20/5, drugoga the other one' 52/2.

The desinence <-omu> is restricted to the adjective sav 'all, entire' and one substantival adjective: svemu svetu 'the entire world' 19/10, odraslomu 'adult' 5/16.

One adjective displays the desinence <-iju> in this case: sviju ljekara 'all doctors' 3/13, od sviju ovdašnji naroda 'of all local people' [i]/10.

In addition to the nominative form, ko differs in form from koji in the instrumental, where koji displays the form kojim and ko the form kim. The pronoun koji also does not display the dative singular desinence <-ome> that is frequently attested with ko.

In the accusative, genitive, and dative/locative singular, uncontracted forms of the pronouns, e.g., mojeg(a), kojeg(a), mojem, kojem, tijem, etc., are not attested in Lazarević's language.

Restricted to only the dative case in the corpus.

Attested only in the locative and instrumental plural with possessive pronouns.

The forms ovaj, taj, onaj, moj, tvoj, and kakav are restricted to the masculine nominative and inanimate accusative singular; otherwise, the stems ov-, t-, on-, m-, tv-, and kakv- are found.

Similarly, Lazarević also employs the dative case of substantives or the reflexive pronoun sebe to express possession in a few examples: majci svojoj u nedra padnuli 'having fallen into her mother's lap' 10/14, u krilo miloj Petri pade 'fell into dear Petra's lap' 65/8, stara Bosiljka uze derku sebi u krilo 'old Bosiljka took her daughter into her lap' 11/17.

The particle -zi is frequently found attached to this form: njojzi [ii]/16, 26/11, 45/21, 53/13, 54/18.

The clitic form se is used after a preposition: za se 7/21, 7/25.
CHAPTER IV

VERBAL SYSTEM

The grammatical categories of person-number and tense serve as the basis for the description of the verbal system. The category of number shows the singular/plural opposition only and each number has three persons--first, second, and third.

The description of Lazarević's verbal system includes general observations on verbal stem changes, consonantal alternations, and "infinitive-expression." Following these observations, the desinences, formation, and attested examples of the present, future, present perfect, aorist, imperfect, and pluperfect tenses are presented.

Observations on the Verbal System

The verbal stems which originally ended in /ē/ have stem-final /i/ in Lazarević's language instead of /e/, which is characteristic of the eastern variant of the standard literary language.1 Examples of all verbs with this stem-final /i/ in his language follow: vidiše 'see' (3 pl. aorist) 6/11, vidila (l-part.) 9/25, 10/18, 28/3, sedio 'sit'
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Moreover, a number of verbs in Lazarević's two works acquire a <-d-> suffix, with some verbs displaying alternate forms with and without <-d->, e.g., dam 'give' (1 sg. pres.) 53/1, but dadem 47/9; razviju 'develop' (3 pl. pres.) [iv]/5, but razvijadu 95/16; ostaše 'remain' (3 pl. aorist) 6/12, but ostadoše 66/11; zna 'know' (3 sg. pres.) 116/8, but znade 7/6. This suffix is nearly always found with verbs having stem-final <-aju> in the third person plural in his language. Some examples follow: imadu 'have' [iii]/1, [x]/6, 52/6, znadu 'know' [vii]/3, 29/8, uzdadu 'give' [viii]/5, izdadu 'give' 23/11, moradu 'must' 33/2, dadu 'give' 35/3, netrebadu 'not be necessary' 88/3, se razvijadu 'develop' 95/13, se vospitavadu 'be instructed' 103/5, nemadu 'not have' 116/12.

In the aorist tense some verb stems have the <-d-> suffix as well: teđoste 'want' (2 pl.) 7/3, znadoše 'know' (3 pl.) 7/16, 66/11, tede 'want' (3 sg.) 8/13, stade 'start, begin' (3 sg.) 11/19, stadoše 'stand' (3 pl.) 59/20, imadoše 'have' (3 pl.) 66/13.

Numerous consonantal alternations, which are characteristic of modern Serbocroatian, occur with the various verb stem types in combination with the desinences of the
present or imperfect tenses, the past passive participles, or the imperative. The K ~ C alternations occur with the imperative; the K ~ Č alternations with the present and imperfect tenses, the past passive participle, and the imperative; and the P ~ Plj alternations with the imperfect tense and the past passive participles. The following alternations are attested in Lazarević's language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonemic alternation</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Other forms with alternations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K ~ C g ~ z</td>
<td>pomoći 'help'</td>
<td>pomozi (imper.) 23/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K ~ Č k ~ č</td>
<td>jaukati 'scream'</td>
<td>jaučem (1 sg. pres.) 40/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c ~ č</td>
<td>nicati 'sprout'</td>
<td>niče (3 sg. pres.) 57/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g ~ ž</td>
<td>legati 'lie'</td>
<td>leži (3 sg. pres.) 1/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h ~ š</td>
<td>jahati 'ride'</td>
<td>jaši (3 sg. pres.) 53/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s ~ š</td>
<td>disati 'breathe'</td>
<td>dišem (1 sg. pres.) 16/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z ~ ž</td>
<td>vezati 'tie'</td>
<td>vežem (1 sg. pres.) 68/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sk ~ št</td>
<td>iskati 'seek'</td>
<td>ištem (1 sg. pres.) 39/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ht ~ šć</td>
<td>uzdrhtati 'quiver'</td>
<td>uzdrkće (3 sg. pres.) 26/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st ~ šć</td>
<td>očistiti 'clean'</td>
<td>očišćenji (past pass. part.) 1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>št ~ šć</td>
<td>dopuštati 'allow'</td>
<td>dopušća (3 sg. pres.) 34/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl ~ šlj</td>
<td>misliti 'think'</td>
<td>mišljaše (3 sg. imp.) 7/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t ~ ĉ</td>
<td>prevrtati 'upset'</td>
<td>prevrćeš (2 sg. pres.) 16/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d ~ ž</td>
<td>zaviditi 'envy'</td>
<td>zavićaše (3 sg. imp.) 8/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ~ ř</td>
<td>goniti 'chase'</td>
<td>gonjena (past pass. part.) 6/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Lazarević's language, the infinitive of a sentence is often replaced by a construction of *da* plus a present tense form of the verb. Some examples of this construction include the following: *kakav treba da bude Roman 'what a novel is supposed to be'* [i1]/4, *tedoste da me samu zatečete 'did you want to find me alone'* 7/3, *tela bi što da mu rekne 'she wanted to tell him something'* 27/11, *tela je da beži 'she wanted to run'* 26/14, *moje namerenje da se doma vratim 'my intention to return home'* 39/13, *zato sad poiti Petru da potraži 'therefore he now rushes to find Petra'* 53/15, *zaželi da za njima trči 'she wanted to run after them'* 65/12.

Nevertheless, in a nearly equal number of instances, Lazarević uses infinitive constructions rather than *da* constructions: *kako treba dete raniti i odevati 'how one should feed and dress a child'* 3/14, *počeo je jako venuti 'he began to wither greatly'* 12/18, *smem li ja tebi na tvoje pitanje*
odgovoriti 'dare I answer your question' 29/17, želila bi s
tobom vek provoditi 'I would like to spend a century with
you' 29/22, počeo sam ići 'I began to go' 35/15, počnem
uzdisati i razmišljati 'I began to sigh and ponder' 39/5,
naša je naj veća briga dete naše izbaviti 'our greatest task
is to save our child' 48/13, je njegovo srce više izvan sebe
sile svoje pokazati ktele 'his heart wanted to show its
strengths more outside of itself' 54/3.

The desinences and formation of the present, future,
present perfect, aorist, imperfect, and pluperfect tenses
are presented below with attested examples from the corpus.

**Present Tense**

The present tense has the following desinences,
which are attached to the present tense markers <-i->, <-e->,
or <-#->: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First person</td>
<td>-m, -u7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person</td>
<td>-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third person</td>
<td>-#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few attested forms for each number and person follow:

**First person singular:**

<-m>: odbijem 'repulse' 11/2, ljubim 'love' 27/19, smem
'dare' 29/17, dođem 'come' 35/5, počnem 'begin' 39/5,
se obećavam 'promise' 43/21.
Second person singular:
<-š>: očeš 'want' 13/16, čutiš 'be silent' 22/9, lebdiš
'hover' 22/24, se sastaneš 'meet' 32/15, oklevaš
'hesitate' 47/10.

Third person singular:
<-#>: bleji 'bleat' 2/6, vara 'deceive' 11/22, grize
'torment' 14/16, klone 'droop' 37/15, svlači 'take
off' 62/11.

First person plural:
<-mo>: vidimo 'see' [v]/20, uživamo 'enjoy' 3/20, zabranimo
'forbid' 23/21, bežimo 'run' 39/17, prosimo 'ask in
marriage' 47/11.

Second person plural:
<-te>: zatečete 'find' 7/4, se bijete 'fight' 61/9, imate
'have' 63/15.

Third person plural:
<-#>: čuvaju 'preserve' [iii]/14, žubore 'gurgle' 1/14,
pozdravljaju 'greet' 2/2, zaslužuju 'deserve' 38/25,
zagrlje 'hug' 45/15.

Future Tense

The future tense is most frequently formed with the
short forms of the auxiliary verb (h)teti 'want' plus the
infinitive. Some examples of its formation are:
First person singular:
ču se opravdati 'justify oneself' 15/21, ču poljubiti 'kiss' 29/19, ču stati 'stand up' 61/10.

Second person singular:
češ pobediti 'overcome' 34/8, češ javiti 'inform' 47/21.

Third person singular:
če razgolicati 'reveal' [v]/l, če se pozlediti 'be injured' 15/5, če okončati 'finish' 63/19.

First person plural:
čemo se ogledati 'look at each other' 13/24, čemo napojiti 'water' 14/7, čemo izprositi 'ask for' 48/1.

Second person plural:
No examples found.

Third person plural:
če živiti 'live' [iii]/ll, če se ostresti 'get rid of' 56/8, če sljedovati 'follow' 122/1.

The short form of the auxiliary is also sometimes joined to a truncated infinitive form to make the future tense:
First person singular:
povrebaču 'lie in wait' 13/8, gledaču 'look' 48/18, izostaviču 'omit' 34/24.

Third person singular:
uvatiče 'grab' 7/11, vezate 'tie' 7/12, raniče 'feed' 7/13.
The formation of the future tense with the long form of the auxiliary verb (h)teti 'want' plus the infinitive is only rarely attested:

Second person singular:

οćeš moći 'be able' 41/2.

Third person singular:


First person plural:

οćemo odgovoriti 'answer' 97/10.

Present Perfect Tense

The usual and most frequently attested past tense is the present perfect tense. It is formed with the short forms of the auxiliary verb biti 'be' in conjunction with the past active participle in -1 (l-part.). The short forms of the auxiliary verb are:

First person singular sam 47/18
Second person singular si 34/1
Third person singular je 10/16
First person plural smo 32/12
Second person plural ste 30/18
Third person plural su [ix]/1

The l-participle agrees in number and gender with the subject of the sentence; the person is expressed with the various short forms of the auxiliary verb biti given
above. The $\ell$-participle agreement shows the following shapes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>-o$^8$</td>
<td>-la</td>
<td>-lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>-li</td>
<td>-le</td>
<td>-la</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few attested examples for each person and number are listed below:

**First person singular:**

(masc.) sam morao 'have to' [viii]/23, sam odrastio 'grow up' 35/2, sam se zakleo 'swear' 39/10.

(fem.) sam izterivala 'drive out' 10/22, sam razbrala 'disperse' 22/6, sam navikla 'get used to' 29/3.

**Second person singular:**

(masc.) si zaboravio 'forget' 14/5, si trebovao 'need' 38/7, si želio 'desire' 43/21.

(fem.) si bila 'be' 10/7, si klonula 'droop' 10/9, nisi večerала 'not have dinner' 10/9.

**Third person singular:**

(masc.) se zbio$^9$ 'occur' [viii]/18, je zabo 'stick' 7/24, je zabrinuo se 'become worried' 21/14.

(fem.) je razdavajala 'separate' 4/20, je obuzela 'overcome' 22/20, je vladala 'reign' 45/20.

(neut.) se dogodilo 'happen' 10/3, je obasjalo 'illuminate' 44/4, je razjarilo 'anger' 55/17.
First person plural:

(masc.) smo delili 'share' 14/18, smo se sastali 'meet' 22/3, smo vidili 'see' 57/4.

(fem.) No examples attested.

Second person plural:

No examples found.

Third person plural:

(masc.) su dobivali 'acquire' 2/16, su razdirali 'torment' 16/13, su trčali 'run' 64/10.

(fem.) su svetale 'flower' 18/4, su se podavile 'drown' 36/19, su parale 'rip' 39/4.

(neut.) su krepila 'strengthen' 3/10,

**Aorist Tense**

The aorist is productive in Lazarević's language only in the third person singular and plural; elsewhere, few forms are attested. This tense displays the following desinences, which are added to the tense marker <-#-> or <-o->:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>-#¹⁰</td>
<td>None attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>-#</td>
<td>-ste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>-#</td>
<td>-še</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aorist is usually formed from perfective verbs; nevertheless, a number of imperfective verbs in the aorist
are also attested. These include: približavaš se 'approach' (3 pl.) 11/1, mučiše 'torment' (3 pl.) 11/15, se povračaš 'return' (3 pl.) 24/19, and se tešiše 'console oneself' (3 pl.) 66/6.

Some examples of the aorist tense follow: 11

First person singular:

dođo 'come' 47/3.

Second person singular:

vidil' [= vidi li] 'see' 6/14, ostavi 'leave' 46/18, dođe 'come' 46/18, 46/21.

Third person singular:
;zadrkta 'begin to shake' 6/21, sede 'sit' 8/17, briznu 'burst out' 10/14, uze 'take' 11/17, poče 'begin' 16/18, izkaza 'state' 55/11, zape 'stumble' 64/13, klonu 'droop' 65/7, omrazi 'alienate' 56/2, dotrča 'run as far as' 65/3, osta 'remain' 66/5, prepuče 'burst' 64/18.

First person plural:

No examples attested.

Second person plural:

tedoše 'want' 7/3.

Third person plural:

pođoše 'leave' 7/17, se vratiše 'return' 8/2, rastaše se 'say good-bye' 8/8, povikaše 'shout' 6/13, rekoše 'say' 6/20, pritekoše 'run up to' 6/20, nadoše 'find' 10/23, dočekaše 'wait' 45/15,
The imperfect tense is unproductive in the corpus, being limited entirely to a few examples in the third person singular. This tense is formed from imperfective verbs only. The third person singular desinence is <-še>, which is added to the marker <-a-> denoting the tense. In addition, the various consonantal alternations described above (pp. 108-109) are realized before the <-a-> tense marker. The following is an exhaustive listing of the examples of the imperfect: imadaše 'have' 2/21; znadaše 'know' 3/16; bjaše 'be' 4/9, 9/2, 24/17, 24/21, 53/18, 59/8 and bijaše 8/21, 8/23, 59/15; mišljaše 'think' 7/22, 9/3, 56/1; tajaše 'hide' 7/23; zavidaše 'envy' 8/3; veljaše 'say' 8/5; se vidjaše 'seem' 8/15; idaše 'go' 13/20, 25/6; življaše 'live' 55/6 (also without the consonantal alternation, mojaše 54/13); and obladaše 'control' 62/3.

The pluperfect tense is formed with the present perfect tense of the auxiliary verb biti 'be' in conjunction with the past active participle in -l (the
l-participle), which agrees in gender and number with the subject, as in the present perfect tense. The present perfect tense of the auxiliary verb biti has the following forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>masc.</th>
<th>fem.</th>
<th>neut.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>sam bio</td>
<td>no examples attested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>and plural</td>
<td>no examples attested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>je bio</td>
<td>je bila</td>
<td>je bilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>su bili</td>
<td>su bile</td>
<td>su bila</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In four examples the imperfect tense form of the auxiliary, bijaše or bjaše, replaces the present perfect form: se približavao bijaše 'approach' 25/7, se odmako bijaše 'move away' 51/3, se zaptio bijaše 'become stiff' 64/6, and uteko bjaše 'run away' 64/14.

Some attested forms for the pluperfect tense are listed below:

First person singular:

(masc.) sam smislio bio 'devise' 38/1, sam se zadužio 'get into debt' 40/1.
(fem.) No examples found.

Third person singular:

(masc.) je opazio bio 'notice' 20/9, se opasao bio 'put a belt on' 46/14, je preteko bio 'overtake' 50/21.
(fem.) se bila nagnula 'bend' 18/1, je zasleplila
bila 'blind' 49/14, se popela bila 'climb' 63/1.
(neut.) se rodilo biolo 'rise' 54/7, je uvenulo bilo 'wither' 63/6, je umrlo bilo 'die' 67/1.

Third person plural:
(masc.) su zatvorili bili 'imprison' 40/13, su izišli bili 'go out' 45/5, su počeli bili 'begin' 57/14.
(fem.) su zabreknule bile 'swell up' 13/12, oladnile bile 'grow cold' 27/13, su zaplavetnile bile 'turn blue' 57/17.
(neut.) se ukazala bila 'appear' 44/21.
Notes on Chapter IV

1. One such stem, however, is attested in his language with the ekavian reflex /e/ as found in the eastern variant instead of /i/: voleti 'love' (inf.) 8/8, vole (3 sq. pres.) 12/19, 52/17; but compare volila (l-part.) 30/16. The morphological leveling of /i/ into those stems originally having /ě/ is discussed in part 2, chap. 4, pp. 204-6.

2. These dialectal forms with <-d->, not prescribed for the standard literary language, are discussed in part 2, chap. 4, pp. 206-9.

3. One attested form having stem-final <-eju> in the standard literary language also displays stem-final <-du>, i.e., razumedu 'understand' [x]/3.

4. See Naylor (1975) for a succinct, complete description of these various alternations occurring in the verbal system of modern Serbocroatian.

5. Consonantal alternations of the verbal system not attested in the corpus include /tk ~ č/, /zd ~ žd/, /sn ~ šn/, /zn ~ žn/, and /k ~ c/.

6. This alternation is only partially realized in Lazarević's language, as /h/ is substituted by /k/ in this cluster (see p. 45 above).

7. This desinence is found only with the verb moći 'be able' and the short forms of the auxiliary verb (h)teti 'want' used in future tense constructions, e.g., mogu 'I am able' 15/2, ču učiniti 'I shall do' 41/18, gledaću 'I shall look' 48/18 (see pp. 112-13 in this chapter).

8. Stem-final <-1#> is realized as /-o/ (compare also with substantives, e.g., orao 'eagle' but gen. sg. oralu).

9. The auxiliary verb is regularly omitted in the third person singular when the reflexive particle se is used.

10. The desinences for the first person singular and plural in the standard literary language are <-h> and <-smo>, respectively. Lazarević's first person singular <-#>, however, is in accord with Vuk's prescribed form (Karadžić 1894-96 2,i:70).

11. This list excludes those examples displaying the <-d-> suffix (see p. 107 above).
CHAPTER V

LEXICAL AND SYNTACTIC FEATURES

Lexical Features

On the basis of the orthography and certain suffixes and morphemes, a sizeable number of words in Lazarević's language are marked as Slavenoserbian lexical borrowings. These words are recognized as being Slavenoserbian by the presence of the graphemes e, o, er, št, šd, and č where a, å (or #), r, č, š, and c, respectively, would be expected on the basis of vernacular Serbian phonology. In addition, such suffixes as <-ije>, <-telno>, and <-imost> also mark certain words as being Slavenoserbian. In some instances these Slavenoserbian forms also have corresponding vernacular Serbian forms. As expected, the majority of Slavenoserbian forms occur in the Preface and in the second half of the corpus (Odgovor), since these sections are written in a more elevated style and present more abstract and polemical ideas than the novella, which is written in a simple vernacular style. Examples of these Slavenoserbian forms and their parallel Serbian vernacular forms include the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grapheme</th>
<th>Slavenoserbian form</th>
<th>Modern Serbo-croatian equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e:</td>
<td><em>prostosrđeni</em> 'openhearted' (masc. nom. pl.) 2/9</td>
<td><em>prostosrđeni</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>srđenu 'hearty' (fem. acc. sg.) 23/4</td>
<td>srđani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>otečestvo 'fatherland' (acc. sg.) 34/24</td>
<td>otdžbina²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ljubezni 'kind' (masc. nom. sg.) 37/19</td>
<td>ljubazni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>čovečeskog³ 'human, humane' (nonfem. gen. sg.) [v]7/120/14; čovečeska (fem. nom. sg.) 93/18</td>
<td>čovečanski, čovečani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>česti 'honor' (loc. sg.) 122/6</td>
<td>čast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>čestan 'honorable' (masc. nom. sg.) 51/15</td>
<td>častan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>česni 'honorable' (masc. nom. sg.) 33/18</td>
<td>časni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bezčestit 'disgrace' (3 sg. pres.) 94/2</td>
<td>sramotiti, beščastiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>členova 'members' (gen. pl.) 76/4</td>
<td>član</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o:</td>
<td>najsovršenijeg 'most perfect' (nonfem. gen. sg.) [ix]/8</td>
<td>najsovršeni [cf. also savršio⁴ 'complete' (l-part.) 62/2; savršenstvo 'perfection' (neut. acc. sg.) 123/20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sovokupan 'whole, joint' (masc. nom. sg.) 112/11</td>
<td>savakupni (masc. nom. sg.) 86/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapheme</td>
<td>Slavenoserbian form</td>
<td>Modern Serbo-croatian equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o:</td>
<td>sotvori 'create' (3 sg. aorist) 20/3</td>
<td>stvoriti [cf. also stvoren 'created' (past pass. part.) [viii]/6; stvorenja 'creation' (gen. sg.) 26/6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ljubov 'love' (nom. sg.) [vi]/6</td>
<td>ljubav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ljubovno 'affectionately' (adv.) 31/22</td>
<td>ljubavno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vospitanje 'upbringing' (acc. sg.) 3/3</td>
<td>vaspitanje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vospitati 'raise' (inf.) 96/2</td>
<td>vaspitati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ko 'to, toward' (prep.) 3/22, 86/7</td>
<td>ka, k, prema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sostojise 'consist of' (3 sg. pres.) 77/18</td>
<td>sastojati se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nesoglasiju 'disagreement' (loc. sg.) 97/20</td>
<td>nesaglasnost, neslaganje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sotim 'with it' (adv.) [vii]/16, [viii]/23, 58/19</td>
<td>sa tim, s tim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kotom 'in addition, besides' (adv.) 31/13; kotome 11/14</td>
<td>k tome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voopšte 'in general' (adv.) 79/19, 85/15</td>
<td>uopšte, uopće</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>er:</td>
<td>Serbijе 'Serbia' (loc. sg.) [iv]/9</td>
<td>Srbija [cf. also Srblji 'Serbs' (nom. pl.) [iii]/18]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grapheme  Slavenoserbian form  Modern Serbo-croatian equivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>er:</th>
<th>žertvovati 'sacrifice'</th>
<th>žrtvovati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(inf.) 16/7;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>žertvuje (3 sg. pres.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112/19;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>žertvovala (l-part.)</td>
<td>96/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čertice</td>
<td>'features' (nom. pl.)</td>
<td>crtica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24/19, 53/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>št:6</td>
<td>voopšte 'in general' (adv.)</td>
<td>uopšte, uopće</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79/19, 85/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budušte</td>
<td>'future' (acc. sg.)</td>
<td>budućnost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85/2, 114/5;</td>
<td>'future'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>buduštem 'future' (nonfem. loc. sg.)</td>
<td>(acc. sg.) 114/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žd:7</td>
<td>graždanski 'citizen's, civil' (gen. pl.)</td>
<td>građanski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>graždana 'citizens' (gen. pl.)</td>
<td>građani 'citizens' (nom. pl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76/12;</td>
<td>105/16;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>graždanma (instr. pl.)</td>
<td>građana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75/20</td>
<td>(gen. pl.) 104/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nadeždom 'hope' (instr. sg.)</td>
<td>nada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45/2;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nadežde (gen. sg.)</td>
<td>84/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>č:</td>
<td>čertice 'features' (nom. pl.)</td>
<td>crtica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24/19, 53/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of the words displaying Slavenoserbian suffixes, compared with their modern Serbocroatian equivalents, are given in the following list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Slaveno-Serbian Form</th>
<th>Modern Serbo-Croatian Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;-ije&gt;:</td>
<td>nesoglasiju 'disagreement'</td>
<td>neslaganje, nesaglasnost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(loc. sg.) 97/20</td>
<td>uslovije 'condition' (nom. sg.) 85/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>usloviije 'condition' (nom. sg.) 85/16</td>
<td>sjedinenje 'uniting' (loc. sg.) 77/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>otnošenija 'relationships' (acc. pl.) 93/2</td>
<td>odnos, veza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>istolkovaniju 'interpretation' (loc. sg.) 93/4</td>
<td>tumačenje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bitija 'existence' (gen. sg.) 79/1</td>
<td>postojanje, bivanje [cf. biće 'being, creature']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blagopolučije 'benefit' (acc. sg.) 85/3</td>
<td>korist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nasljedije 'inheritance, legacy' (acc. sg.) 85/3</td>
<td>nasleđe, nasledstvo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zvanija 'title, rank' (gen. sg.) 113/17</td>
<td>zvanje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>koristoljubije 'greed' (nom. sg.) 81/16</td>
<td>koristoljublje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zavedeniju 'establishment (loc. sg.) 74/10</td>
<td>ustanova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opredjelenija 'determination' (gen. sg.) 80/5</td>
<td>opredeljenje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bezakonijem 'lawlessness' (instr. sg.) 75/7</td>
<td>bezakonje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;-imost&gt;:</td>
<td>nerazdjeljimost 'indivisibility' (nom. sg.) 79/10, 80/6, 82/9</td>
<td>nedeljivost, nerazdjeljivost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;-telno&gt;:</td>
<td>sljedovatelno 'consequently' (adv.) 93/9, 103/15</td>
<td>sledstveno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Certain other lexical items in Lazarević's language are characteristic of Slavenoserbian (having been borrowed originally from Russian Church Slavonic). The corresponding Serbocroatian words are either completely different morphemes or different shapes of the same morphemes found in Slavenoserbian. These include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slavenoserbian</th>
<th>Modern Serbocroatian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>čast 'part' (acc. sg.) 24/11, 85/6</td>
<td>deo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žarkog 'hot' (nonfem. gen. sg.) 24/15</td>
<td>vrući</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestuplenje 'violation' (nom. sg.) 106/16</td>
<td>prestup, prekršaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krome 'besides' (prep.) [vi]/11, 105/18</td>
<td>osim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spravedljivi 'just' (masc. nom. sg.) 78/6</td>
<td>pravedni, ispravni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vozrast 'age' (acc. sg.) [viii]/10</td>
<td>uzrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polučiti 'receive' (inf.) 80/3</td>
<td>dobiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ljubimog 'favorite' (nonfem. gen. sg.) [vii]/9</td>
<td>omiljeni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>istolkovati 'interpret' (inf.) 74/6</td>
<td>protumačiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sljedstva 'consequences' (gen. pl.) 106/1</td>
<td>posledica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neposredstveno 'directly' (adv.) 122/17</td>
<td>neposredno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pevac 'singer, poet' (nom. sg.) 35/24</td>
<td>pevač, pesnik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otnošenija 'relationships' (acc. pl.) 93/2</td>
<td>odnos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Syntactic Features

A few syntactic constructions in Lazarević's language are also characteristic of the works of the Slavenoserbian writers from Vojvodina (see part 2, chap. 5). These archaic constructions, no longer prescribed for the standard literary language, involve the dative absolute constructions, the position of predicate verbs in a sentence, the separation of adjectives and pronouns from the head substantive, and the position of the reflexive pronoun se within a sentence.

Dative Absolute Constructions

This type of syntactic construction is composed of a present active participle and a substantive, both in the dative case. It was used to designate some simultaneous action in a clause of a sentence. The few examples of its formation from Lazarević's language are the following:

Tako govorećem Milanu sa sobom 'thus while Milan was talking with himself' 33/11, ali meni tako mislećem 'but while I was thinking thus' 39/6, Milanu sa sobom borećem se 'while Milan was fighting with himself' 13/18, idućem mu na jugoistočnu
stranu od brda Kosmaja 'while he was walking on the south­east side of Kosmaj hill' 19/3.

Position of Predicate Verbs in a Sentence

In contrast to modern standard Serbocroatian, Lazarević frequently places predicate verbs (infinitive, auxiliary verb, participle, or other verbal form) at the end of the sentence or clause. Some examples of this feature are: Jasam u njemu dokazati kteo, da . . . 'In it I wanted to show that' [vi]/5; Slavni i izredni grčki Narod nije ni jednog Romana u pravom smislu imao 'The famous and outstanding Greek nation did not have even one novel in the true sense' [i]/1; koga je glavno namenjenje karakter onog naroda za koga se piše, opisivati i razvijati 'of which the main intention is to describe the character of that people for which it is written' [ii]/8; Ja ću sav ovaj događaj od tvog babe zatajati 'I will hide this entire event from your father' 12/6; koji je kadar i sav svoj život, tvoj samo da izbavi, žertvovati 'who is ready to sacrifice his entire life only to free yours' 16/5; da je već sunce . . . v'rove [sic] jablanova obasjalo 'that the sun has already illumi­nated the tops of the poplar trees' 44/4; Kad je Petri blizu došao bio, sasvim iznemogne 'when he had come up close to Petra, he became completely exhausted' 55/3; lišće je na lipama žutiti počela 'the leaves on the linden trees
began to turn yellow' 57/19; on junačko svoje srce zadržati nemožé 'he could not restrain his heroic heart' 60/14.

Separation of Adjectives and Pronouns from the Head Substantive

In a number of examples Lazarević separates various modifiers from a head substantive by a word or a construction such as a prepositional phrase, an enclitic form, or a modifying substantive in the genitive. The following are some examples: Sama još zaostala pod goricom Petra slušajući milo Slavuja pojanje 'Petra herself lagged behind near the hill while listening to the sweet singing of the nightingale' 6/3; Zar ne kobi koga od nas Majko straovito sove ukanje u dubljini rasta izpred kuće? 'Mother, isn't the horrible screeching of the owl in the depths of the oak tree in front of the house a bad omen for one of us?' 11/11; i ljubov sam joj moju izjavio 'I expressed my love to her' 42/7; Jelen nije brži na čistini, niti soko pod oblakom: nego ova dva uz brdo junaka 'A deer isn't quicker in a clearing nor a falcon under a cloud than those two heroes [going] up the hill' 64/7.

Position of the Reflexive Pronoun Se

Lazarević generally places the clitic reflexive pronoun se in the position prescribed in the modern standard literary language, i.e., following the first stressed word in a clause. A few examples are: Zašto se kod nas sad
Romani najviše pišu? 'Why are novels most often written here now?' [ii]/3; a budući da se vreme ne zna 'but being that the time is not known' [viii]/17; Ovde se bregovi podizali 'Here the banks rose' 1/12; Radosave, od kako smo se mi sastali 'Radosav, ever since we met' 22/3; Kad se u jutru od kratkog sna trgnem 'When in the morning I jump up from a short nap' 37/11; Tako se naposledak sasvim preda toj ljubovi 'Thus, as a consequence, he completely devotes himself to that love' 50/13.

However, se often follows and is attached to the verb form to which it refers, thus occurring in positions other than after the first stressed word in a clause: od te ljubovi čuvatise treba 'it is necessary to abstain from that love' [vii]/16; da na ljubovi k Bogu osnivase i ljubov ko bližnjima 'that love towards close ones is also based on the love towards God' 3/21; opet oni večno sojuzitise ne uzmogu 'nevertheless, they will not be able to be united eternally' 31/15; koga je bela brada do pojasa spustilase 'whose white beard extended to the belt' 33/13; je Ivan već njekoliko puta s Petrom slučajno susretaose 'Ivan had already met Petra accidentally several times' 49/12; koliko Zakon (Religija) ima otnošenija k drugom polu mešatise 'if religion has any right to interfere with the opposite sex' 90/16; mi nemožemo njojzi pravo odreći, o otnošenijama i vospitanju svoji građana brinutise 'we cannot refuse it the right to care for the interrelationships
and education of its citizens' 104/6; njegova bitnost sastojise dakle u izvršivanju svoji dužnosti 'its essence lies therefore in the completion of its obligations' 122/10.
Notes to Chapter V

1 See Kuna (1970:225-42) and Butler (1970:64-75) for a detailed discussion of Slavenoserbian features such as these and others in the works of Obradović and Vidaković, respectively.

2 The corresponding modern Serbocroatian words in this example and others below, e.g., čovečanski, čovečani for čovečeskog, nesaglasnost for nesoglasiju, nerazdeljivost for nerazdjeljimost, pevač for pevac, are formed with different suffixes even though they have the same morphemes in their stems. Often the modern Serbocroatian equivalents may also have completely different morphemes for their stems, e.g., tumačenje for istolkovaniju, dco for čast, sjediniti for sojužitise, as shown in the comparative examples.

3 Here and in some of the following examples the grapheme under consideration is not underlined when the word contains two of the same grapheme, one of which has a different origin than that under consideration.

4 In these forms and in sajedineniju (p. 126) Lazarević uses the Serbian Church Slavonic forms with the prefix <sa->, whereas the modern Serbocroatian equivalents have <s->, as seen in the examples stvoren and stvorenja (p. 124).

5 The words vaspitanje, vaspitati, and uopšte are Serbian Church Slavonic forms which have been retained in modern Serbocroatian. The form uopšte is only a partial Serbian Church Slavonic form (< vaopšte); the true vernacular form for this word is uopće, used by speakers of Serbocroatian in certain areas, including Vojvodina.

6 Certain words having this Slavenoserbian phonological feature are regular forms of the eastern variant of modern Serbocroatian and as such as not included in this section. They include opšta 'common' (fem. nom. sg.) [v]/15 and najopštiji 'most common' (masc. nom. sg.) 90/2.

7 Nuždan 'necessary' (masc. nom. sg.) 81/2 (or nužan) and nužđe 'necessity' (gen. sg.) [ix]/20 are also regular forms of the eastern variant of modern Serbocroatian (Benson 1971) and as such have been excluded here.

8 The Serbocroatian equivalent for this suffix is <-je>. It is interesting to note that all the examples with <-ije> come from Odgovor.
This placement of the predicate verb comes from the influence of German and/or Russian word order and is a common feature of the various Slavenoserbian writers (see part 2, chap. 5, pp. 219-20).

This Slavenoserbian syntactic feature is discussed in part 2, chap. 5, pp. 220-21.

This same syntactic feature, an influence of Church Slavonic verbs in -sja, is commonly found in the language of the other Vojvodinian writers of that period (see part 2, chap. 5, pp. 221-23).
PART II

DISCUSSION OF THE DIALECTAL AND SLAVENO SERBIAN FEATURES
OF LAZAREVIĆ'S LANGUAGE (WITH COMPARISONS TO THE
LANGUAGE OF OTHER VOJVODINIAN WRITERS OF THE
EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES)
GENERAL REMARKS

Part 2 of this study discusses certain linguistic features of Lazarević's language (as described in part 1) compared with those of some other Vojvodinian writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and with the modern literary language. Those linguistic features of Lazarević's language to be discussed include either Vojvodinian dialectal or Slavenoserbian features, both not characteristic of modern standard Serbocroatian. For purposes of illustration, comparison, and contrast, part 1 cites extensively the numerous dialectal studies on the Vojvodinian subdialects of Serbocroatian and the various philological studies concerning the language of other Vojvodinian writers.

The dialectal studies referred to include those dealing with specific Vojvodinian subdialects (Banat: P. Ivić 1949-50 and Miletic 1940; Srem: Mladenović 1962-63a and Nikolić 1964; and Bačka: Popović 1949 and 1950) as well as those discussing the Vojvodinian dialect in general (Moskovljević 1938a; 1938b; Albin 1970c; 1972a; P. Ivić 1958; Popović 1952; and Karadžić 1894-96).

The studies of the language of the following writers have been drawn upon: Jovan Rajić (Mladenović 1964); Milovan Vidaković (Kašić 1968); Jakov Ignjatović (Jerković 1972);
Dositej Obradović (Kuna 1970); the newspaper *Slavenno-Serbskija Vědomosti* (henceforth Vedomosti) edited by Stefan Novaković (Albin 1968a); and Zaharije Orfelin (Mladenović 1960).¹

The writers were selected because they, as Lazarević, all lived in Vojvodina and because their works reflect to a greater or lesser degree the same Vojvodinian dialectal features as found in Lazarević's language. Moreover, they were chosen because most of them wrote during the height of the Slavenoserbian domination in the literary language and as a result of their works are good examples of that artificial language.² Ignjatović was also selected because he, like Lazarević, represents the later generation writing after the end of the Slavenoserbian domination but whose works, as Lazarević's, still reflect certain of its features.

Brief portraits of these writers follow:

Jovan Rajić (1726-1802) -- Born in Sremski Karlovci where he spent the first fifteen years of his life and his last thirty years, the most productive for his writing. Although he wrote mainly in Slavenoserbian, nevertheless he also wrote in the vernacular language.

Milovan Vidaković (1780-1851) -- Born in Serbia but moved to Srem as a child. During his life he lived in various places in Vojvodina and Hungary. This Slavenoserbian writer was one of the main opponents of Vuk
Karadžić and his reforms in the 1820s.

Jakov Ignjatović (1882-1889)—Born in Szentendre north of Budapest, Hungary where a Serbian colony existed. He lived in various areas of Vojvodina and Hungary including Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad, and Budapest.

Dositej Obradović (1742-1811)—Born in Čakovo in the Banat area of Vojvodina (now Romania). This central literary figure of the eighteenth century was one of the last, but probably the most important, of the Slavenoserbian writers, although he attempted to introduce popular elements into his writings.

Slaveno-Serbskija Vedomosti—A weekly newspaper published from 1792 to 1794 by Stefan Novaković in Novi Sad. This newspaper is an excellent specimen of the Slavenoserbian language.

Zaharije Orfelin (1725-1785)—another eighteenth-century writer from Vojvodina whose most important works date from 1761 to 1783. In 1768 he started the publication of the first literary, entertaining, and scientific journal among the Serbs—the Slaveno-Serbski Magazin.

The organization of part 2 parallels that of part 1. Chapter 1 discusses Lazarević's use of certain Slavenoserbian graphemes also characteristic of the works of the other Vojvodinian writers. The specific items to be discussed in this chapter include the following: the graphemes i and ı representing /i/ (pp. 14-15); 3 the sequence je as a
reflex of /ě/ (pp. 15-19); the graphemes representing /ř/ (pp. 19-20); the graphemes ñ and ň (pp. 19-20); and the graphemic representations of /j/ (pp. 20-23) and /ř/ and /ň/ (pp. 25-27). Also included in chapter 1 is a discussion of the orthographic conventions used by the other Vojvodinian writers in comparison with those used by Lazarević (pp. 28-38).

In chapter 2 the dialectal phonological features of Lazarević's language are discussed in context of the various Vojvodinian dialects and the other writers' works. Those features include the absence of the phoneme /h/ (pp. 43-44); the substitution of /h/ by /k/ (p. 45); the contraction of vocalic clusters (pp. 45-46); the dissimilation of /mn/ → /ml/ (pp. 48-49); the glide /j/ before the high vowel /i/ (p. 46); the dissimilation of the suffixes /-leñe/ and /-neñe/ (p. 49); the lack of K-Č type consonantal alternations in neuter substantives (pp. 57-58); the simplification of various consonant clusters (pp. 49-50); the "ikavisms" (pp. 46-47); and the substitution of the prefix <pri-> by <pre-> (pp. 47-48).

The nominal system of Lazarević's language—the dialectal and Slavenoserbian desinences in his and the other writers' works—forms the subject matter of chapter 3. These desinences include the <-i> genitive plural with declension I and II substantives (p. 71); <-om> dative plural (p. 71); <-ama> in the dative/locative/instrumental
plural (neuter substantives) (pp. 71-73); \textit{<-ma>} in the dative/locative/instrumental plural (declensions I and III) (pp. 71-74); and \textit{<-i>} in the instrumental and locative plural declension I (pp. 71-73). Also discussed in chapter 3 are the adjectival and pronominal dialectal desinences \textit{<-im>} in the dative/locative singular (p. 85); \textit{<-i>} in the locative and instrumental plural (pp. 86, 97) and the indefinite desinences \textit{<-a>} and \textit{<-u>} (pp. 78-79). A discussion of the dative of possession expressed with personal pronouns (pp. 99-100) concludes the chapter.

Chapter 4 covers some dialectal features found in Lazarević's and the other writers' verbal systems. These include the morphological leveling of \textit{/i/} into verb stems originally ending in \textit{/ți/} (pp. 107-8) and the verbal suffix \textit{<-d->} (p. 108). In addition, the extent and productivity of the aorist (pp. 116-18), the imperfect (p. 118) and the replacement of infinitives by \textit{da} constructions (pp. 110-11) in the various dialects and each writer's language are also examined.

A few archaic syntactic features in the language of Lazarević and the other writers are presented in chapter 5. These features include the following: the position of the predicate verb at the end of a sentence or clause (pp. 129-30); the separation of attributes from the head substantive (p. 130); and the position of the reflexive pronoun \textit{se} (pp. 130-31).
Following chapter 5, concluding comments summarizing findings of this study of Lazarević's language are presented. They summarize the nature of the orthographic conventions, graphemes, phonology, morphology, and syntax of his language and attempt to arrive at some tentative answers to the following questions: (1) Because Lazarević stated he wrote in Serbian for Serbs, to what extent are native vernacular features present in his language? (2) To what extent is the traditional Slavonoserbian language reflected in the graphemes and orthographic conventions, phonology, morphology, lexicon, and syntax of his language? (3) As an early adherent of Vuk's orthographic reforms, how closely does Lazarević in actuality adhere to the reforms? and (4) In general, how does Lazarević's language compare to that of the other Vojvodinian writers in all these aspects? Finally, some general remarks on Lazarević's role in promoting Vuk's language reforms and his place in the history of the development of the modern Serbocroatian literary language conclude the study.
Notes to General Remarks

1 Throughout part 2 references to these studies usually will be made by indicating the Vojvodinian writer's last name and the date and page numbers of the study, e.g., Rajić (1964:21), without mention of the name of the author of the particular work. In addition, Obradović's first name Dositej will be cited rather than his last name as this is the customary manner of reference in Yugoslav literary and philological studies.

2 It should be noted, however, that the main purpose of Mladenović's study of Rajić's language (1964) is a description of the popular elements of his language.

3 The page numbers following each item to be discussed in part 2 refer to the place in part 1 where each feature is described in Lazarević's language.
CHAPTER I

GRAPHEMES AND ORTHOGRAPHIC CONVENTIONS

Graphemes

The graphemes that Lazarević employs in his two works used in this study correspond almost entirely to the alphabet codified by Vuk Karadžić in his grammar of 1818 (see Karadžić 1818:XXIX; 1894-96 2:i:27, 85). Most important is the fact that Lazarević consistently writes the six graphemes that form the main part of Vuk's orthographic reforms: j, b, u, v, h, and h (see part 1, chap. 1, p. 14). Nevertheless, occasional anomalies may be found that represent deviations from Vuk's alphabet. These anomalies are discussed below. Comparisons are made with other Vojvodinan writers and examples of their usage are given.¹

Graphemes i and v Representing /i/

The other Vojvodinan writers discussed here also use these two, as well as a variety of other graphemes, to represent the phoneme /i/: ů, ū, ū, i, j, l, v, and ų. The use of some of these graphemes by several of the writers is shown below. Like Lazarević, Vidaković writes v in some foreign words, especially Greek, e.g., cτυνυ 'style' and
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Cумеонь 'Simeon', as do also Dositej, Rajiće, and Vedomosti:  
(Dositej) тигарь 'tiger', тубъ 'type'; (Rajiće) сымвол 'symbol', турфане 'tyrants'; (Vedomosti) систеуму 'system',  
Курилъ 'Cyrill', and Сумеонь 'Simeon'.

Rajić, Vidaković, and Ignjatović also use the  
grapheme й, while Dositej and Vedomosti have only й.  
Vidaković writes й in environments before a vowel, before  
/j/, and in some foreign words, as does Lazarević: любио 'love', піяннича 'drunk', філологів 'philosophers', and  
lітература 'literature'. The same conditions for the  
writing of the grapheme й occur in Rajić's and Ignjatović's  
works as well, e.g., (Rajiće) періодъ 'period', нѣкій 'some',  
бібліотеке 'library', смиреніе 'soothing'; (Ignjatović)  
mнѣніе 'opinion', примити 'accept', and политіке 'politics'.

The Sequence je Representing /ĕ/

Of the Vojvodinian writers studied here, only  
Ignjatović in addition to Lazarević uses je to represent /ĕ/  
and to imitate Vuk's language, e.g., двє 'two', дјелили  
'divided', рјегодо 'rarely', увјек 'always', рјеч 'word',  
дјела 'works', неже 'tender', гдје 'where', and мјесеца  
'month'. Otherwise, Dositej, Rajić, Vidaković, and Vedo­
mosti all represent this phoneme by е and ј: (Dositej)  
dвема 'two', совъть 'advice', дњу 'children'; (Rajić)  
lђта 'summer', кроме 'besides'; (Vidaković) вѣрни 'true',
The Graphemes Representing /r/

Lazarević uses many of the same graphemes to represent /r/ as the other writers use, although some of them employ even more graphemes for this phoneme. Vidaković shows the greatest amount of diversity in this regard: p, p̌, p̂, ep (and other Slavenoserbian combinations, such as op, pe, ap, and po), e.g., сердце 'heart', крстъ 'cross' сардечно 'sincerely', обръ 'eyebrows', крви 'blood', огр'дним 'gigantic', кормарница 'innkeeper', окр'знути 'scratched', кровавъ 'bloody', and умрьо 'die'. He often corresponds to the Russian manner of spelling. Similarly, Dositej uses several graphemes for this phoneme: p, ep (also op, po, pe), p̌, and ţ, e.g., древо 'tree', гречъ 'Greek', зrna 'grain', держати 'hold', вр'a 'summit', and Ґкати 'snore'. Ignjatović shows nearly as much variety: (p, ep, p̌, p̂, and ţ), e.g., пръвъ 'first', Сербиé 'Serbia', and умрьо 'die' (also умр'o and умр'o). The smallest number of graphemes is used in Vedomosti: p, ep, and ap (rarely); in Orfelin: p, p̂, and ep (pe, op); and in Rajić, who uses only two graphemes: p̂ and ep.

The Graphemes ɾ and ɾ

Although Lazarević for all practical purposes had eliminated these two graphemes from his works, they are
commonly found in the works of the other writers. These
graphemes, of course, carry no phonemic representation, and
the writing of both graphemes is generally accomplished
without any set rules by the various writers: (Ignjatović)
цвъл 'goal', съмъ 'I am', въеъ 'already', петъ 'five', but
also петъ, веъ, and съмъ; (Dositej) попъ 'priest', Србинъ
'Serb', грекъ 'Greek', печалъ 'sorrow'; (Vedomosti) веъ
'already' and веъ, данъ 'day' and данъ; (Rajić) мысълъ
'thought' and мысълъ; and (Vidaković) ноћъ 'night', and
младънъ 'young man'.

The Graphemic Representation for /j/

/j#/ or /jc/

In word final position or before a consonant /j/ is
regularly represented by й (or я) in the works of the Vojvodinian writers, but in only two isolated instances in
Lazarević's two writings. Examples of this grapheme include
(Ignjatović) найвеъе 'largest', Србски 'Serbian';
(Vedomosti) овай 'this', неймамо 'we do not have'; (Vidaković) айдемо 'let's go', младъ 'young'; (Rajić)
недостойне 'unworthy', своой 'one's own'; (Dositej)
казу 'tell', пръьвой 'first', and майка 'mother'.

/Vja/

The various Vojvodinian writers normally indicate
this phonemic sequence by V plus the grapheme я: (Vedomosti)
Априлия 'April', непръятелемъ 'enemy'; (Rajić) пъянство
'drunkenness', сиао 'sow'; (Vidaković) обычная 'custom', увеселение 'merriment'; (Ignjatović) чия 'whose', and притетъ 'friend'. However, in accord with the traditional Slavenoserbican orthography, the phoneme /j/ may not always be indicated orthographically, usually in foreign loan words, as is the case in Lazarevic’s language: (Vedomosti) фамил’ахъ 'families', порцъа 'portions'; (Rajić) историа 'history', трапедиа 'tragedy'; (Vidaković) идеањ или идеањ 'ideas', дилектъ 'dialect', and преп’мерациа 'renumeration'.

/Vje/

Although Lazarevic indicates this phonemic sequence by Ve in only three instances and by Vje elsewhere, Ve is the usual way of indicating this sequence in the orthography of the various Vojvodinian Slavenoserbican writers (ε was also used): (Ignjatović) ние 'is not', Србиа 'Serbia', чуемо 'we hear', своє 'one's own'; (Rajić) моємъ 'my', познаемо 'we recognize', показае 'he shows'; (Vedomosti) ние 'is not', трое 'three', трае 'lasts', чье 'he hears'; (Vidaković) остае 'he remains', стае 'he stands', and шбявление 'announcement'.

/Vjo/ and /Vji/

These phonetic sequences are regularly represented by Vo and Vih, respectively (/j/ is occasionally indicated by й), in the works of the various writers, but only rarely (six instances, see pp. 22-23 below). Examples of the
orthographic representation of these sequences include:

(Vedomosti) фамилиомь 'family', баионети 'bayonets',
Армеиомь 'army', найсспособниз 'most capable', моихь 'my';
(Vidaković) кои 'who', случаи 'incident', Сербиомь 'Serbia',
своимъ 'one's own'; (Rajić) чимь 'whose', кои 'who' (but
also кои), твоиомь 'your', коомь 'who', историомъ 'history';
(Ignjatović) Србиомь 'Serbia', стои 'it costs', Сербиомь
'Serbia', моимь 'my'; (Dositej) библиотеку 'library',
твоиом, 'your', коом 'who', and твои 'your'.

Graphemic Representation for /ʟ/ and /ň/

Whereas Lazarević in almost all instances uses Vuk's
graphemes љ and њ, the other writers of that period write
with a wide variety of graphemes representing these two
phonemes. Lazarević deviates from Vuk's alphabet in only a
few instances with љ, љь, ли, ле, and нљ. Of these
graphemes, only Lazarević uses љь in any environment to
indicate a palatal /ʟ/. However, all the writers use љь
in various environments and to varying degrees to indicate
this palatal phoneme, e.g., (Vidaković) before љь, љь, and о:
шльве 'plums', дале 'farther', земльомь 'land'; (Rajić,
inffrequently) учитель 'teacher', родитее 'parent';
(Dositej, infrequently) хранитель 'sustainer', пристье
'friend', пасульомь 'beans'; (Vedomosti) земльомь 'land',
Крааль 'king', Непристье 'enemy'; (Ignjatović, very
frequently) јављашь 'you appear', даље 'farther', хальину 'dress', вольом 'will', and љубезна 'kind'.

All the writers (including Lazarević in one example) use ли to represent /li/: (Vidaković, rarely) земли 'land', пантлике 'tapes'; (Rajić, frequently) лаживца 'liar', пошлите 'send'; (Vedomosti) халине 'dress', воли 'will'; (Dositej) шливовици 'plum brandy', шуплини 'cavities', and (Ignjatović) променљивости 'variability'.

Examples of the sequence не, which may represent either /le/ based on the Slavenoserbian orthography or /le/ indicating the Vojvodinian dialectal dissimulation, is also found in the various other writers' works, e.g., (Rajić) огњем 'fire', последњег 'last'; (Vidaković) задовољен 'satisfied', згрлени 'embraced'; (Dositej) опредељен јо 'determination', краљевском 'royal'; (Ignjatović) уживљен 'enjoyment', злоупотребљен 'misuse'; (Orfelin) теглено 'pulling, stretching', and молење 'praying'.

Only three of the writers besides Lazarević use the grapheme нј to represent a palatal /ɲ/, and each has only one or two rare examples: (Rajić) нјор 'her', нјом 'him'; (Dositej) пребиванје 'residing'; and (Ignjatović) изјасненја 'clarification'.

Orthographic Conventions

Whereas Lazarević closely adheres to the alphabet codified by Vuk, his orthography, to a large extent, is
representative of the traditional Slavenosерbian orthographic principles employed by the various other Vojvodinian writers, in whose works morphophonemic spelling generally predominates. Nevertheless, these writers' orthography, like Lazarević's, shows numerous examples that are written phonetically. Mladenović (1964:46-47) concludes that in Rajić's language phonetic spelling is best observed with /z/ + /s/ in prefixes and even more in stems plus suffixes. Assimilation as to place of articulation is rarely represented, however. Only one example shows /šć < sć/. In the remaining instances Rajić writes unassimilated /zč, sč, s č, cč, s č, sň, s ň, and zč/. Moreover, his orthography is both morphophonemic and phonetic as far as the simplification of consonant clusters is concerned; some clusters remain unchanged, others may or may not be simplified, and still others are consistently simplified in their spelling.

Kašić (1968:32) concludes that in Vidaković's works phonetic spelling is reflected more often in conjunction with suffixes than in conjunction with prefixes. Usually only those prefixes ending in /z/ or /s/ are indicated with assimilation as to voicing to the following stem. Assimilation as to place of articulation is indicated, but only rarely, with suffixes and not at all with prefixes. Consonant simplifications are indicated only with the prefix cluster /zs/ and with the suffix clusters /stn/, /šć/, /čsk/, /gk/, and /dc/.
In the *Vedomosti* (1968a:39-40) assimilation as to voicing most often occurs when the first phoneme of the consonant cluster is /z/; it occurs less frequently with /s/ or /ž/. In addition, assimilation as to place of articulation is indicated only when the first phoneme of the cluster is /s/ and sometimes /ž/.

Dositej's works (1970:46-50) basically are written in the traditional Slavenoserbian morphophonemic orthography, though not consistently, as is the case with the other writers. With the possible exception of Lazarević's language, it is Ignjatović's language (1972:42-48) that shows the greatest extent of phonetic representation in orthography, in conjunction with the various prefixes, suffixes, and stems. This is to be expected, since Ignjatović is the latest of all the Vojvodinian writers under consideration and since he wrote entirely after Vuk's reforms.
Note to Chapter I

1 Detailed discussions of each writer's usage, as well as the examples cited throughout this chapter, can be found in the following references: Dositej (1970:30-42), Vidaković (1968:14-26), Rajić (1964:23-41), Ignjatović (1972:33-40, 48-49, 65-66), Vedomosti (1968a:5-20), and Orfelin (1960:157). For an explanation of the system of references in part 2, see p. 142, note 1.
CHAPTER II

PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES

The Absence of the Phoneme /h/ in the Phonemic System

P. Ivić (1958:172) states that the absence of /h/ is a common feature of the phonemic system of the majority of the Šumadija-Vojvodinian subdialects. In the Srem subdialect /h/ does not form a part of the phonemic system; in intervocalic positions /j/ or /v/ may occur in place of /h/, and frequently /h/ is replaced by /k/, e.g., ruvo 'clothes', čoja 'cloth, fabric' and siromak 'pauper' (Nikolić 1964: 323-26). Nikolić adds, however, that when /h/ is found in the modern Srem subdialect, it is because of the influence of Church or external secular culture, e.g., Duhovi 'Pentecost', Hristos 'Christ' and prihod 'income'. In the speech of Sremski Karlovci and Kovilje, a village near Sremski Karlovci, /h/ is either absent in the phonemic system or has been substituted by /v/, /w/, /j/, or /k/, e.g., vr 'summit', teti 'want', muva 'fly', snaja 'daughter-in-law' and siromaka 'pauper' (Mladenović 1962-63a:246). The phonemic system of the Banat subdialect also lacks /h/ with the exception of some minor secondary developments such as
"hrdav" 'bad', and "homa" [= odmah] 'immediately' (P. Ivić 1949-50:149). Miletić (1940:20) also confirms the absence of /h/ in the Banat subdialect except in some foreign loan words, e.g., "hamišan" (or "amišan") 'greedy'.

Unlike Lazarević, the other Vojvodinian writers more often than not do attempt to include the phoneme /h/ in the phonemic systems of their languages. (See Vidaković (1968:53-54); Rajić (1964:76-77); Ignjatović (1972:77); Vedomosti (1968a:44); Orfelin (1960:160-161); and Dositej (1970:75). Much inconsistency is apparent, however. Mladenović (1960:160) states that the writing of h in Orfelin's language may indicate the influence of the traditional Slavenoserbian orthography or possibly the influence of either Church Slavonic or Russian. In Rajić's language (1964:76-77) /h/ is missing in only some categories of words (such as with the adjectival pronouns njiov and svoji, for example). Similarly, in Orfelin's works (1960:160), certain words are always attested without /h/, indicating that they form a part of his language only in that form. Moreover, Dositej (1970:75) does not always indicate /h/ even in Church Slavonic words, and in Greek and Latin words it is sometimes not found initially; in native Serbian words more examples without /h/ than with are attested; and as with the other Vojvodinian writers (see below) /h/ is often substituted by other phonemes in his language.
As in Lazarević's language and in the other Vojvodinian subdialects, the phonemes /v/ or /j/ often replace /h/ in the language of most of the other writers: Vidaković (1968:54)—suvo 'dry', buva 'flea', duva 'blow', kujna 'kitchen'; Rajić (1964:77)—skuva 'cook', kuvarici 'cook' (no examples with /j/); Orfelin (1960:160)—ruvo 'clothes', smej 'laughter', mačiju 'step-mother', najeri 'twist'; and Dositej (1970:76)—smjaja 'laugher', sgruva 'do hastily', Majaila 'Michael', greja 'sin', and leju 'flower bed'.

The Substitution of /h/ by /k/

Nikolić (1964:326) cites this substitution as occurring in the Srem dialect, e.g., drkću 'shake' and zaktevo 'demand'; Mladenović (1962-63a:246) cites it in the speech of Sremski Karlovci with the verb zahtevati 'demand', e.g., zakteva, zaktevala; and Miletić (1940:20) gives it in the Banat subdialect, e.g., poktevati 'demand' and dakćati 'pant'. This particular dialectal feature is not mentioned in the literature covering the other subdialects, however.

In the medial position only, Vidaković's language (1968:54) shows /kt/ solely in the verb zaktevati 'demand' (cf. also in the language of Vedomosti (1968a:44), e.g., zaktevaju, zakteva, and zaktevao, and in the language of Orfelin (1960:160), e.g., zakteva and zaktevalo). Rajić's language (1964:77), however, shows this substitution in
medial position with both zahtevati 'demand' and zahteti 'want', e.g., zakte, zaktelo, and zaktevaju. In Ignjatović's language (1972-78) this substitution is quite rare, being limited to only a couple of examples with the verb drhtati 'tremble', e.g., drktajući (and drkćućiim). Dositej's language (1970:76) shows this feature also in medial position with the two verbs zahtevati 'demand' and drhtati 'shake', e.g., zakteva, zaktevamo, drktao, and drkće.

None of the other Vojvodinian writers shows this substitution in initial position, as Lazarević does, e.g., kteo 'want'. Mladenović (1964:77, footnote 269) mentions, however, that Venclović, an eighteenth-century Serbian writer, as Lazarević, also has this substitution in initial position, e.g., kteo and ktela 'want'. In his diachronic study of eighteenth-century Vojvodinian writers, Albin (1974:67-68) found that this feature, even in initial position, was widely found even as early as the beginning of the eighteenth century, e.g., kteo 'want', zakteva 'demand' and zakteo 'want'.

**Contraction of Vocalic Clusters**

P. Ivić (1958:172) cites only the cluster ao (following a long rising accent), e.g., došo, as undergoing contraction in the Šumadija-Vojvodinian dialect. Mosković (1938a:21) states, however, that vowel contraction is strongly developed and forms not only like došo 'come' and
imo 'have', but also uzo 'take', dono 'bring' and vido 'see' (i.e., with eo, eo, and io, respectively) undergo contraction. In the Srem dialect all vocalic clusters of the Ṽ-participle except io are consistently contracted if the first of the two vowels is unaccented and if a secondary /v/ does not develop, e.g., reko 'say', dono 'bring', and promeno 'put' (Nikolić 1964:322). Moreover, the contraction may occur in other categories of words as well, as in Lazarević's language, although not consistently, e.g., okrug 'round', veso 'happy', and debo 'fat'.

In the speech of Sremeški Karlovci the clusters ao, eo, and uo also regularly contract, e.g., pevo 'sing', uzo 'take', digo 'raise', okreno 'turn', and meto 'put' (Mladenović 1962-63a:246); and in the Banat subdialect Miletić (1940:18) states that this type of contraction is common, e.g., poso 'work', kiso 'sour', and Bograd 'Belgrad' (also with Ṽ-participles if the contracted vowel is unaccented, e.g., imo 'have', kreno 'move', and ušo 'leave').

Vidaković, as a rule, does not have contracted forms of ao, eo, and uo; Kašić (1968:49-50) attests only two contracted forms in the entirety of Vidaković's works analyzed, i.e., presėko 'cut across' and veso 'happy'. Similarly, Mladenović (1964:69) has recorded only one contracted example (darivo 'give a present to') in Rajić's language, and Albin (1968a:33) concludes that these contractions are very rare in Vedomosti (only with ao,
e.g., prizno 'recognize' and razsēo 'be split'). Moreover, these vocalic clusters remain completely unchanged in Orfelin's language (1960:157) and are contracted in only a very few instances in Dositej's language (1970:69) with clusters in parts of speech other than the l-participle, e.g., ka (or ko) 'as' and amo 'hither'.

In the language of the later Vojvodinian writer Ignjatović (1972:72), more instances of the contraction (with ao frequently and uo once) are evident, as in Lazarević's language. Kašić (1968:49, footnote 202) points out that the later Vojvodinian writer Branko Radičević also uses contracted forms. Mladenović (1964:69), conjecturing on the sparse examples of vowel contractions in Rajić's language, states that this may mark the beginning of the process of vowel contractions in Rajić's language and for that matter in the various Vojvodinian subdialects. Albin (1974:62-63) supports this supposition by stating that this feature was not common at all in the works of the older eighteenth-century Vojvodinian writers. In this diachronic study, Albin found that the vowel contraction developed very late in the eighteenth century, with 1790 being the first date of an attested form in his corpus of material.

**Dissimilation of /mn/ → /ml/**

According to Nikolić (1964:333) the consonant cluster mn in the word mnogo 'many' appears regularly as mlogo
throughout the entire Srem area. Mladenović (1962-63a:246-47) has also recorded this and the /mn → ml/ dissimilation in Sremski Karlovci, e.g., sumljam 'doubt' (1 sg. pres.) and osumljično 'suspicious' (adv.), alongside sumnja 'doubt', however. But such dissimilations have not been recorded in the Banat subdialect by either Miletić (1940) or P. Ivić (1949-50).

Albin's study (1974:66) of several eighteenth-century Vojvodinian writers shows that the dissimilation of /mn/ to /ml/ in the adjective mnogi 'many' is reflected in the works of some of these writers, with the first attested example appearing as early as 1765. However, this feature is only rarely or very infrequently found with the majority of the eighteenth and nineteenth-century Vojvodinian writers considered in this study. The /mn/ or /mn/ type of dissimilation in initial position does not occur in Vidaković's language (1968:56), Rajić's language (1964:75), or in Orfelin's language (1960:160). Similarly, in the language of Vedomosti (1968a:41) /mn/ in the adjective mnogi and in the adverb mnogo is retained in all but one example; /mnl/ in the verb sumnjati 'doubt' is also retained. Kuna (1970:79-80) states that in Dositej's works forms with /ml/ are exceptional, e.g., mlogo 'many' and premlogi 'too many', and /mn/ remains unchanged. But Ignjatović's language (1972:86-87) contains considerably more examples of the assimilated forms than any other author except Lazarević,
although the largest number of examples in his works still retain /mn/, e.g., mložstvom 'multitude', mloštvo 'multitude', and mloqm 'many'. Examples of words with /mň/, however, remain unassimilated, as in all the other authors except Lazarević, e.g., sumnja 'doubt' and sumnjivu 'suspected'.

Glide /j/ after the High Vowel /i/

In the Banat subdialect the glide /j/ is regularly found after the high vowel /i/, e.g., ijako, ijevo, and ijoca (Miletić 1940:20). This particular feature is not discussed in the other dialectal literature, however.

Of all the Vojvodinian writers, only the language of Ignjatović (1972:80-81) displays this feature, e.g., perijodu 'period', čijodom 'straight pin', provodijo 'spend', gostijoničar 'innkeeper', bijo 'was', internacijonalan 'international', šijo 'sow', protekcijona 'protectionist' but also protekcionih, bio and šio. Jerković (1972:80, footnote 254) also adds that this "secondary j" was for a long time a feature of Vuk's language and was also attested in the manuscripts of Branko Radičević. Furthermore, Jerković asserts that Maretić (1963) in his Gramatika (p. 45) feels this is a phonetic feature of the language and reproaches Vuk for finally omitting it in words such as dioba 'division', vidio 'see', činio 'make' and govorio 'speak'. Maretić believes that "in these and similar
words the /j/ is heard so clearly that no one can deny it."

The Dissimilation of the Suffixes <-ljenje> and <-njenje> + /leñe/ and /neñe/

In his Srpska gramatika, Vuk mentions the verbal suffixes -lenje and -nenje as occurring in the "Resavo and Srem dialects" alongside the regular forms -ljenje and -njenje, e.g., molenje 'requesting', bolenje 'aching', and branenje 'defending' (the former being more common than the latter) (Karadžić 1894-96 2,1:84). The dissimilated forms -lenje and -nenje are also cited by Moskovljević (1938a: 25) as being common to all three of the Vojvodinian subdialects, e.g., molenje 'requesting' and bunenje 'agitating'. Moreover, Mladenović (1962-63a:247) attests these dissimilated forms in Sremski Karlovci as does Miletić (1940:29) in the Banat subdialect, e.g., obolenje 'disease', palenje 'igniting', and osvetlenje 'lighting' (in addition to the regular forms bunjenje 'agitation', lepljenje 'gluing', etc.).

Because of problems associated with the orthographic representation in the various writers' language, as with Lazarević's orthography, discussion of this type of assimilation among the eighteenth and nineteenth-century writers can only remain conjectural. The grapheme e following ñ or n represented the palatal consonants /l/ and /n/ in the traditional Slavenosерbian spelling. Concerning this point, Mladenović (1964:39, footnote 105) states that Rajić
most frequently represented /tie/ and /nje/ by лб and нб, but also by ne and he, so examples such as сажалена 'compassion' and моленб 'begging' may represent either the traditional Church Slavonic orthography or the dissimilation known in the Vojvodinian subdialects. Similarly, Mladenović (1960:160) states that examples such as тегленю 'pulling' and увеселениъ 'amusement' in Orfelin's works cannot be positive proof of this type of dissimilation.

Similar orthographic problems do not permit Albin (1968a:41) to conclude that examples such as палент 'igniting', грабленъ 'seizing', изгубленъ 'loosing', мышлёнъ 'opinion' and роблянъ 'robbing' may also represent this type of dissimilation. Jerković (1972:83), however, states categorically that examples in Ignjatović's language such as обеленье 'whitening', осветление 'lighting', and сажаленье 'pity' represent this dissimilation, in spite of the fact that /l/ and /n/ are represented correctly in the orthography in other examples, e.g., запаленье 'igniting', обеленьем 'whitening', and доселенья 'settling'.

No Consonantal Alternations of the Type $K \rightarrow C$

Although only one example of a velar not undergoing this $K \rightarrow C$ alternation is attested in Lazarević's language, the lack of this type of alternation is a common feature of the Vojvodinian subdialects with declension II substantives in the dative and locative singular. Moskovljević (1938a:
25) asserts that the alternation /k ~ c/ does not occur in
the Vojvodinian subdialects, e.g., majki 'mother' and
devojki 'daughter'. Furthermore, the Srem subdialect has
none of the K ~ C alternations; instead, they have been
eliminated through analogy with the other cases, e.g.,
knjigi 'book', zadrugi 'collective', and prugi 'tracks'
(Nikolić 1964:339-40). The /k ~ c/ and /g ~ z/ alterna­
tions also do not occur in the speech of Sremski Karlovci
(Mladenović 1962-63a:247), e.g., čerki 'daughter', nogi
'foot', nor in the Banat subdialect even in the comparative
degree of adjectives or before the <-in> or <-ica> suffixes,
e.g., jabuki 'apple', sluqi 'servant', gorkii 'bitterer',
krepkii 'stronger', devojkin 'the girl's', and slikica 'small
picture' (Miletić 1940:24).

With most of the Vojvodinian writers, examples both
undergoing and lacking these consonantal alternations are
found. However, none of the writers show any examples of
/h ~ s/. Vidaković's language (1968:63-64) shows numerous
examples of substantives undergoing the /k ~ c/ alternation,
but even more examples without the alternation, especially
with consonant clusters, e.g., prilici 'opportunity' (but
kryški 'pear'), politiki 'politics', and pripovedki 'short
story'. Only one example of /g ~ z/ is attested: nozi
'foot'; in the other instances only /g/ occurs: brigi
'concern', zalogi 'pledge', and tugì 'sorrow'. The same
situation occurs in Rajić's language (1964:87): both /k ~ c/

and /k/ unaltered may be found but no examples of /g ~ z/, e.g., nauci 'science', bitki 'battle', snagi 'power', and spregi 'team of animals'.

Kuna (1970:85) states that these alternations tend to be unrealized in Dositej's language and that examples without the alternations are numerous in his language (no examples given, however). An analysis of Ignjatović's writings (1972:99-100) show that in the greatest number of instances the two alternations occur (with one example of /h ~ s/), but that nevertheless, in a significant number of instances, the alternations are not realized: kupci 'bathroom', struci 'profession', supruzi 'wife', snazi 'strength', svezci 'notebook', snasi 'daughter-in-law'; but fabriki 'factory', azbuki 'alphabet', čestitki 'congratulations', and negi 'care'. Similarly, Orfelin's language (1960:165) provides examples mainly of unalternated consonants, e.g., podvalki 'deceit', komadki 'piece', and bešiki 'cradle' (but srodnici 'relatives', proroci 'causes'). As with Orfelin, in the language of Vedomosti (1968a:46) the consonant alternations are not widely represented at all; the /g ~ z/ alternation is attested once and /h ~ s/ not at all: snahi 'daughter-in-law' and něgi 'care', but rěci 'river' and oluci 'gutter'.
Simplification of Consonant Clusters

The loss of the sonorant /v/ in the sonorant group /vlj/ occurs frequently in the Srem dialect (Nikolić 1964: 324-25), e.g., pozdralja 'greet', izostaljali 'omit', and ostaljaju 'leave'. The loss of /v/, however, is not consistent in this subdialect; Nikolić furnishes nearly as many examples in which /v/ is retained, e.g., ostavljaju 'leave', zdravlje 'health', and sastavlja 'assemble'. In addition, in Sremski Karlovci, Mladenović (1962-63a:246) states that /v/ is lost in the verbal stems -stavljati and -pravljati and others, e.g., ostaljam 'leave', opraljo 'repair', spralja 'make', and zaboraljati 'forget'. In the Banat subdialect /v/, which is normally retained in this subdialect, has also been lost before /lj/, e.g., opraljam 'repair', ponalju 'repeat', and bratoljov 'brother's' (Miletić 1940:20).

Lazarević's language also provides some examples of the simplification of the consonant clusters /#gd-/ and /-vd-/; this feature is found in the Srem subdialect: the /g/ of the adverb gdi 'where' is lost, but in compound forms, as Lazarević's language shows, it is retained, e.g., di 'where', but nigdi 'nowhere', and svagdi 'everywhere' (Nikolić 1964:333; 313-14). This dialect also shows the loss of initial /p/ and /k/ in initial consonant clusters in certain morphemes, e.g., čela 'bee', tica 'bird', and di 'daughter', and /d/ in the morpheme oma 'immediately'
(Nikolić 1964:333). The phoneme /v/ in ovde 'here' either takes on a bilabial pronunciation or is lost, e.g., oYde or ode (Nikolić 1964:314, 324). Mladenović (1962-63a:246) also records simplification of various consonant clusters in Sremski Karlovci, where the clusters /#gd-/, /#kč-/, and /#pt-/ become /#d-/, /#č-/, and /#t-/, respectively, e.g., di 'where', či 'daughter', čerka 'daughter', tica 'bird', and čela 'bee'. Similarly, /-vd-/ and /-dm-/ appear simply as /-d-/ and /-m-/, respectively, e.g., ode 'hear' and oma 'immediately'. The simplification of consonant clusters is not discussed in the literature on the Banat or Bačka subdialects or in the literature on the Vojvodinian subdialects in general.

Most of the Vojvodinian writers studied retain the consonant clusters /-vlj-/, /#gd-/, and /-vd-/, which are simplified in Lazarević's language. These and other clusters may occasionally be simplified, however, especially in Vidaković's and Ignjatović's writings. The writers showing the least amount of consonantal simplification are Rajić, Orfelin, and in Vedomosti. In Rajić's works (1964:78-79) the following clusters remain unchanged: /#gd-/, /#kč-/, /#ps-/, /#pt-/, /#pč-/, /#pš-/, /-vd-/, /-gn-/, /-dn-/, /-kt-/, /-nd-/, /-sc-/, and /-šč-/. The clusters /-vlj-/ and /-tn-/ may be simplified, although in many more examples than not, they remain intact, e.g., predstalja 'present', ostalën 'remain', and metuo 'put'.
Mladenović (1960:160-61) presents no evidence for the simplification of these various consonant clusters in Orfelin's language. Similarly, in Dositej's language (1970:81-82) the various consonant clusters in initial position are nearly always retained; exceptions, mainly from the earliest period of his writing, are quite rare, e.g., čerko 'daughter', de 'where' and nice 'nowhere'. In medial position the plosives /t/ and /d/ may or may not be retained, depending on whether a Serbian vernacular or a Russian Church Slavonic form is in question, e.g., pakosne 'malicious', prazniku 'holiday', nužna 'necessary' pakostno 'malicious', radostno 'glad', slastna 'delicious', and prazdnik 'holiday'. In the remaining clusters, the representation is almost always retained on the basis of the traditional orthography. In the language of Vedomosti (1968a:38-39, 42-43) the groups /-vlj-/ and /-tn-/ are rarely simplified, e.g., ostavljali 'left' and metnuta 'put', but rastaleni 'separated' and metuo 'put', and in medial position the groups /-dc-/ , /-sti-/ , /-tč-/ , /-tc-/ , and /-tč-/ are sometimes simplified.

On the other extreme, Vidaković and Ignjatović show much more simplification of these consonant clusters. Vidaković (1968:57-59) simplifies, though not always consistently, the following clusters in medial position: /-bvl-/ , /-bd-/ , /-vč-/ , /-vlj-/ , /-vn-/ /-db-/ , /-mn-/ , /-stn-/ , /-tn-/ , and /-vstv-/ . Similarly, Ignjatović
(1972:88-90) simplifies nearly all of these consonant clusters, although again not entirely consistently.

**Ikavisms**

Lazarević's language shows some traces of the feature commonly referred to as "ikavisms" by various Yugoslav linguists, in which /i/ appears as the reflex of /ē/. The various dialectal studies have shown that the number of such ikavisms in Vojvodina is very limited and that differences exist among the various subdialects of the area. Explanations on the origin of the ikavisms are also quite divergent among the various linguists. Basically, two schools of thought have arisen concerning their origin. One school believes that the various ikavisms still found in Vojvodina resulted from the waves of ikavian Bosnian speakers who migrated to the Vojvodina area. Among those adhering to this concept are Belić, Moskovljević, and Nikolić. Belić believes that an ikavian population from Eastern Bosnia, between the Bosna and Drina rivers, gradually entered Serbia, Srem, Bačka and Banat from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries and brought with them the ikavisms (Moskovljević 1938a:10-11). Similarly, Moskovljević (1938a:22-23) argues that the former population of Vojvodina before the fifteenth century was predominantly ikavian and that ekavian speakers began to settle there to any great extent only from the beginning of the
fifteenth century. Because of wars with the Turks, the ikavian population perished, but remnants of their speech remained with the ekavian speakers. Nikolić (1964:375-89) supports Belić's suppositions on the origin of the ikavisms.

The other school of thought (P. Ivić and Albin) believes that the ikavisms are only the result of phonological assimilation and morphological levelings (P. Ivić 1958:171-72 and 1949-50:147-48). According to P. Ivić (1949-50:147), "ikavisms" resulted from the fronting of /ě/ by the following front glide /j/, e.g., (in the Banat subdialect), stariji 'older', nije 'is not', di 'where' (< dě je 'where is'), smijati 'laugh', bijaše 'was' (imperfect), and grijati 'heat'. In addition, ikavisms also resulted from morphological analogies: meni 'to me' (by analogy with duši 'soul'), nisam 'I am not' (by analogy with nije 'is not'), viditi 'see' (by analogy with vidi [3 sg. pres.]), niki 'some' and nikolko 'some' (by analogy with the prefix ni-), oti 'these' (gen. pl.) (by analogy with moji[h] 'my'), and pri- where pre- is expected etymologically, e.g., privari 'cheat' (by analogy with verbs having the original prefix pri-, e.g., pri[h]vati 'hold' and prilegne 'lie down'.) Ivić also cites several sporadic "lexical ikavisms": gnjizdo 'nest', gnjivan 'angry', sikira 'ax', vidrica 'small pail', osim 'except', and izrikom 'explicitly'. Albin (1972a) supports Ivić's suppositions by showing that the various "ikavisms" in the Vojvodinian dialects arose generally during the last
quarter of the eighteenth century, therefore at a much later date than that posited by Belić and Nikolić for the Bosnian influence.

Nikolić (1964:311-13) cites the following "ikavisms" of various origins as being characteristic of the Srem subdialect: di 'where', nigdi 'nowhere', gnjizdo 'nest', sikira 'ax', dite 'child', but neko 'no one', ovde 'here', and koleba 'hut, cabin'. The verb forms vijati 'winnow', grijati 'heat', sijati 'sow', and smijati 'laugh' are characteristic of western Srem, while the regular ekavian forms vejati, grejati, sejati, and smejati se are found in eastern Srem. Similarly, Mladenović (1962-63a: 246) lists the following "ikavisms" as being characteristic of the area of Sremski Karlovci and Kovilje: gnjizdo 'nest', di je 'where is', priko (or preko) 'across', niki (or neki) 'some', sikira 'ax', osim 'except', but smeje 'smile' and greje 'warm'.

All the Vojvodinian writers, like Lazarević, display these same types of "ikavisms", in varying degrees, that are still found in the Vojvodinian subdialects today. An analysis of the "ikavisms" in Vidaković's language (1968:43-44; 46) shows the following: in the verbal forms /ē + j/ as a rule appears as the ekavian reflex /ej/ in Vidaković's language, e.g., smejati se 'laugh', ugrejana 'warm' and ovejava 'winnow', whereas forms with /ij/ are rare, e.g., osijalo 'sow', osmijavajut'i se 'laugh' and
pougrie 'heat'. Moreover, negative forms of biti most often have i and only rarely ie, the jekavian reflex, e.g., nisu, nie, nismo, but niesmo and nieste. The prefix ne-
'some' regularly appears as e or ē in all but one example: nešto 'something', nekoliko 'several', něko 'someone', někij 'some', but ništo 'something'. In addition, the prepositions pred 'before' and preko 'across' appear uniformly with the ekavian reflex while the adverb gde 'where' and its compound forms usually have the ikavian form gdi (but with e in only two rare examples), e.g., gdigod 'somewhere', negdi 'somewhere', nigdi 'nowhere', but gde 'where' and negde 'somewhere'. As far as lexical ikavisms are concerned, grehota 'sin' and vedrica 'little pail' have e, but koleba 'cabin' is found with both i and e. Moreover, sekira 'ax' is written with both the traditional grapheme ē and with i (indicating its ikavian pronunciation in Vidaković's language). The noun gnězdo 'nest', however, is only found written with ē, so no conclusion as to its true pronunciation can be ascertained. Ikavian forms are also found in the words donikle 'somewhat' and izrykom 'explicitly'.

Rajić (1964:61-63) has fewer ikavian forms than Vidaković. Those verbs having /ēj/ always have the ekavian reflex as do pred 'before', preko 'across', and those adjectives and pronouns formed with ne- 'some', e.g., nekakvo 'some' and neko 'someone.' Ikavian forms are found in only
a very limited number of examples in his language: gdi 'where', gdikoju 'some', něgdì 'somewhere' (but also něgde), osim' 'except' (but more frequently osem'), and sikirica 'small ax'.

Determining the presence of ikavian forms in *Vedomosti* (1968a:27-30) is complicated by the fact that the traditional grapheme ě is used in many instances, so that the real pronunciation cannot ascertained, e.g., sějao 'sow', smějaše 'laugh', razsějana 'diffuse', gnězdo 'nest', sěkira 'ax', něčto 'something', and někogda 'sometime' (but also two examples níčto and nígđě). Ikavian forms occur with negative forms of biti, gdi 'where', gdigod' 'some­where', and ovdi 'here', while ekavian forms regularly occur with preko 'across' and pred 'before'.

Dositej's and Ignjatović's languages display con­siderable fluctuation in these various ekavian or ikavian forms. Kuna (1970:59-62) states that a certain number of ikavisms can be found in Dositej's language, some being "pure" ikavisms from the ikavian-speaking area of the Dalmation coast where he spent some time, e.g., sridu 'Wednesday', vrimenu 'time', razdriti 'tear up', and prida se 'devote oneself to'. The remaining ikavisms in his language, as is the case with the other Vojvodinian writers, are a reflection of the dialectal characteristics of the Vojvodinian ekavian subdialects. Verbs having /ěj/ originally appear with both reflexes: smijati 'laugh',
prosijati 'glisten', grie 'warm', siemo 'sow', but seju 'sow', smejao 'laugh', grejali 'warm', and razvejati 'scatter'. No ekavian forms with the prefix ne- are attested in his language, but a relatively significant number of forms like gdi 'where' and its compound forms can be found alongside the ekavian equivalents. Other ikavian items in Dositej's language include ovdi 'here' (only as an exception), sriča 'fortune', sikira 'ax', gnizdo 'nest', ugnizdati 'build a nest', koliba 'cabin', and osim 'except'.

Similar to Dositej's language, Ignjatović's language (1972:58-62) also shows a considerable amount of fluctuation in these forms, although ekavian forms tend to prevail. The ikavian negative forms of biti 'be' prevail, although three occurrences of the ekavian neje 'he is not' are attested. Ikavian forms of gde 'where' and its compounds are found alongside both ekavian and jekavian forms. However, with verbs having /ěj/ originally, as with the prefix ne-, only ekavian or jekavian forms occur: se smjejati 'laugh', sjejali 'sow', grejati 'warm', neka 'some', njekij 'some', and nješto 'something'. In addition, some lexical items in his language display both reflexes, e.g., sekirom and sikirica 'ax', donekle and donikle 'somewhat', koliba and koleba 'cabin', and mislele and mislio 'think', whereas other forms have only the ekavian or jekavian reflex, e.g., gnjezdo 'nest', gnjev 'anger', pred 'before', and preko 'across'.
Mladenović (1960:154) mentions only a few ikavian forms as occurring in Orfelin's language, e.g., gdi 'where', svagdi 'everywhere', but pred 'before' and preko 'across'.

The Substitution of the Original Prefix <pri-> by <pre->

In the Šumadija-Vojvodina dialect, in the area where <pre-> originated from <pre->, as a rule <pre-> instead of <pri-> is found, e.g., prevati 'hold' (P. Ivić 1958:172). Moskovljević (1938a:22) also cites examples with <pre-> in place of <pri-> in the Vojvodinian subdialects, e.g., prepoveda 'short story' and prepaliti 'light', which he believes is a consequence of the mixing of the ikavian and ekavian pronunciations. In the Srem subdialect <pre-> often replaces an original <pri->, but not consistently, as is the case in Lazarević's language, e.g., prevatio 'hold', pretisak 'pressure', but priliku 'opportunity' and priredio 'organize' (Nikolić 1964:312-13). The same is true of the area of Sremski Karlovci (Mladenović 1962-63a:246). In the Banat subdialect, however, this feature is very rare (Miletić 1940:18). Nikolić (1964:388) explains the reason for the confusion of <pre-> and <pri-> by the fact that in the ikavian Šumadija-Vojvodina area <pri-> (originating from <pre->) existed originally, and later ekavian settlers from Serbia brought the prefix <pre-> (originating from <pre->), thus causing the confusion of the two forms.
The confusing of these two prefixes is found in varying degrees among the writers considered here: (1) some only substitute <pre-> for an original <pri-> (as Lazarević, although not consistently); (2) others confuse and interchange both prefixes, at least to some extent, although they are used correctly in some instances; and (3) still others use the prefixes correctly, as the etymology requires, and show little or no interchanging of the two. To the first category belongs the language of Ignjatović (1972:60-61) and Lazarević, e.g., prepravila 'prepare', prepovedaju 'narrate', prejaviti se 'report', and premaniti 'entice', but correctly in pritisne 'press upon', pripravi 'prepare', etc. The original prefix <pré-> appears regularly as <pre->, e.g., prebacio 'overturn' and pretvorili 'transform'.

The language of Vidaković, Dositej, and Vedomosti belongs to the second category. In Vidaković's works (1968: 43-44) <pri-> is often replaced by <pre->, e.g., prekrajka 'edge', prepeku 'hot day', and preneo 'bring'. However, the prefix <pri-> replaces <pre-> in his language only rarely, e.g., privijali 'bend, fold' and prilivahu se 'overflow'. As with Vidaković, Vedomosti (1968a:29-30) frequently replaces <pri-> by <pre-> but <pre-> by <pri-> to only a very limited degree, as in pribyvališča 'home, abode' and prikinute 'interrupt'. Dositej's language (1970:60-61) shows ample examples of both types of substitutions, e.g.,
previkle 'get used to', prešinjava 'cause', premorava 'compel', but pridanost 'devotion', prigoriti 'burn through' and prigorke 'mountain fairy'.

To the third category belong Orfelin and Rajić. In the works of Orfelin (1960:154-55) that were analyzed, <pre-> and <pri-> were used correctly in all but two examples, e.g., privozet' 'transport' and premorao 'compel'. Similarly, Rajić's language (1964:62) shows replacement of <pri-> by <pre-> in only four instances: prepovedku 'short story', premamlēnja 'enticement', prepravnostiju 'preparedness', and prečesējuju 'give someone communion'.
Notes to Chapter II

1 In his diachronic study of eighteenth-century Vojvodinian writers Albin (1974:66) concluded that the absence of /h/ was also a very common feature of these writers' works and that /h/ was not found in the earliest works of the eighteenth century, if not earlier, even before the eighteenth century.

2 It cannot be entirely ruled out, however, that the absence of /h/ from the phonemic system of Lazarević's language may be due to his attempts at imitating Vuk Karadžić's language rather than as a reflexion of the speech of his native Vojvodina area.

3 In citing examples from the language of the Vojvodinian writers, the Slavenoserbian graphemes ⟨g⟩, ⟨j⟩, ⟨ı⟩, ⟨u⟩, ⟨е⟩, ⟨л⟩, ⟨м⟩, ⟨н⟩, ⟨о⟩, and ⟨у⟩ have been transliterated as ⟨u⟩, ⟨i⟩, ⟨ı⟩, ⟨j⟩, ⟨ja⟩, ⟨e⟩, ⟨xc⟩, ⟨i⟩, ⟨y⟩, ⟨ju⟩, and ⟨o⟩, respectively, in this and the following chapters of the study.

4 Albin (1974:68-70), in his study of phonological features of eighteenth-century Vojvodinian writers, found evidence for the simplification of the following consonant clusters: /#gd-, /-vlj-, /-dm- and /-tn-. According to his corpus of data, the simplification of /#gd-/) to /#g-/) in gde 'where' first appeared late in the eighteenth century in 1789. Moreover /-lj/ for /-vlj-/) appeared quite early, since it is found in Venclovic's works; the simplification of /-dm-/) in odmah 'immediately' existed in the first sources of the eighteenth century, although not in wide use; and /-t-/ for /-tn-) in the verb metnuti 'put' appeared only at the end of the eighteenth century.

5 These same linguists also consider the morphological leveling of -iti in verbs originally having /-eti/) and the prefix <pri-> for <pre-) (see pp. 174-76) as "morphological ikavisms."
CHAPTER III

NOMINAL SYSTEM

Substantives

In this section various substantival desinences used by the Vojvodinian writers will be discussed and compared.

<-i> Genitive Plural

In the Vojvodinian subdialects "the genitive plural desinence <-i> is preferred over <-a>," e.g., puti 'times', redi 'rows', minuti 'minutes', and sumnji 'doubts' (Moskovljević 1938a:25). Concerning this desinence, Vuk (1894-96 2, i:41) mentions in his Srpska gramatika only that puti, rather than puta, is found in Srem, Bačka, and Banat. But Nikolić (1964:336) indicates that this desinence is more common in the Srem subdialect than in the literary language today with masculine substantives following units of measure or quantity, e.g., deset meteri 'ten meters', kolko puti 'how many times', and kolko listi 'how many leaves, pages'.

This desinence is also found today to a considerable extent in the speech of Sremski Karlovci (alongside <-iju> and <-a>), e.g., mnogi mravi¹ 'many ants', deset žalbi 'ten complaints', mnogo crvi 'many worms', and pet molbi 'five
requests' (Mladenović 1962-63a:247). Moreover, the genitive plural <-i> is also very common in the northeast Banat subdialect with substantives of all three genders following units of measure and quantity, e.g., pet komadi 'five pieces', šezdez dinari 'sixty dinars', četrnajs krsti 'fourteen crosses', sedam crkvi 'seven churches', and šez dani 'six days' (Miletić 1940:23).

All of the Vojvodinian writers use the <-i> genitive plural desinence, some to a greater degree than others, but all more frequently than present-day writers of the modern literary language. Vidaković (1968:64) employs this desinence with substantives ending in <-a> when the stems contain a consonant cluster in which /-a/ is not inserted before the genitive plural <-a> desinence, e.g., maslinki 'olives', služavkij 'servants', and igrij 'games'. As in the various subdialects today, masculine declension I substantives denoting quantity often acquire this desinence in Vidaković's language (1968:64-65): několiko komadij 'several pieces', několiko mesecy 'several months', and mnogo puti 'many times' (also několiko puta). However, one example of <-i> used with a substantive not denoting quantity is attested: vinogradi 'vineyards'.

Rajić, Vedomosti, Dositej, and Orfelin all use this desinence, although relatively infrequently as compared to the other genitive plural desinences, and usually, but not always, with units of measure and quantity: (Rajić
několiko satí 'several hours', pet' fr'tali 'five quarters', o[t] ... zyby 'from teeth'; (Vedomosti [1968a:48]) soldati 'soldiers', několiko listi 'many letters', bombi 'bombs', stvari 'things', strani 'sides', čjúdi 'moods' (this desinence found with masculine and feminine, but no neuter substantives); (Orfelín [1960:163]) petel'ki 'stalks', šišarki 'gallflies', neranži 'oranges', komadi 'pieces', sati 'hours'; (Dositej [1970:100, 111], with masculine and feminine, but no neuter substantives) zubi 'teeth', mjeseci 'months', marjaši 'coins', ljúdi 'people', koliko puti 'how many times', redi 'rows', pari 'pairs', crvi 'worms', minuti 'minutes', smutni 'discord', vrusti 'kinds', forinti 'forints', and pomoranči 'oranges' (but also forinta and pomoranča).

Ignjátović (1972:107-12) employs <-i> the most frequently of all these writers, with all three genders and especially after substantives denoting measurement and quantity, e.g., pedeset rifi 'fifty ells' (a measurement), vrati 'door', od vinogradi 'from the vineyards', puno soldati 'full of soldiers', iz prvi koli 'from the first cart', usti 'mouth' (but also usta), puti 'times' (also puta), pleći 'shoulders' (also pleća), kalfi 'journeyman' (also kalfa), and funti 'pounds'.
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<-om> Dative Plural (Declension I)

In his Srpska gramatika Vuk states that this desinence may be heard in dialects, especially in Bačka (in the cities and especially with nouns that contain the <-ov-> or <-ev-> extension in the plural), e.g., volovom 'oxen', sokolovom 'falcons', carevom 'czars', prijateljem 'friends', and momkom 'young men' (Karadžić 1894-96 2,i:39 footnote). Moskovljević (1938a:25) claims that this archaic desinence is a feature of the entire Vojvodina region, e.g., volovom 'oxen' and prijateljem 'friends'. He qualifies this supposition, however, by stating that "if these forms are truly heard among ekavian speakers, they of course appeared under the influence of the Bunjevci" (i.e., the Croatians in Subotica). This desinence is not attested today in either the Srem subdialect (Nikolić 1964:337) or in the Banat subdialect (P. Ivić 1949-50:149). Furthermore, Popović (1949:485) states that this desinence is also not attested in the ekavian subdialect of Bačka.\(^2\) This statement contradicts Vuk's claim of the existence of this desinence in Bačka, but with the passage of over one hundred years it may have long since passed out of usage in that area.

The <-om> desinence is the most frequent of all the desinences in the dative plural of declension I masculines for all of the writers except Ignjatović and Lazarević.\(^3\) Kašić (1968:67) suggests that <-om> could still have been used in Vidaković's time (although probably marginally).
He believes that Russian Church Slavonic influenced the almost exclusive use of this desinence for the dative plural in his language and that the possible existence of this desinence in some of the subdialects reinforced its usage in his language. Examples of its occurrence in Vidaković's works (1968:66) include the following: putnikom' 'travelers', gradovom' 'cities', konem' 'horses', and stricevom' 'uncles'.

Rajić's language (1964:89) also includes a few examples of this desinence with neuter substantives as well: dělom' 'things' and licem' 'people'. In the language of Vedomosti no neuters display this desinence, while in Orfelin's and Dositej's works occasional rare examples of a neuter with this desinence are found: (Vedomosti [1968a:50]) Graždanom' 'citizens', žetaocem' 'reapers', čitatelem' 'readers'; (Orfelin [1960:163]) bolestnikom' 'patients', mužem' 'husbands', zapovědem' 'commands', dětem' 'children'; (Dositej [1970:100, 106]) mravom' 'ants', lavom' 'lions', orlovom' 'eagles', čadom' 'children', and poselom' 'visits'.

In the language of the Vojvodinian writers of the later period, Ignjatović and Lazarević, this desinence is more limited, occurring only three times in Lazarević's works and twice in Ignjatović's, with the substantive Turkom' 'Turks'. 
<-ama> in the Dative, Locative, and Instrumental Plural (Neuter Substantives)

Only very limited and sporadic occurrences of this desinence are mentioned in the dialectal literature of the Vojvodina area. Mladenović (1962-63a:247) has recorded it in the town of Kovilja (near Sremski Karlovci) in the dative plural with substantives denoting the young of animals, e.g., pilićama 'chickens', pačićama 'ducklings', and gušćicama 'goslings'. P. Ivić (1957:163-67) has recorded this desinence in the speech of the Galipol Serbs. He postulates that this desinence became generalized from feminine substantives into neuter substantives by analogy because the neuter nominative and accusative plural ends in <-a>; therefore, from the neuter substantives -a was generalized into all cases of the plural.

P. Ivić (1958b:334) has also attested this desinence in a certain area of Banat with neuter substantives in the dative/instrumental plural along with <-ima>, and he also cites <-ama> as being a part of the morphological systems of several other Serbocroatian dialects in the locative plural of declension I substantives (see P. Ivić 1959-60).

Vuk prescribed the use of this desinence with neuter substantives ending in <-ije> for the dative, locative, and instrumental plural in his grammar of 1818 (Karadžić 1894-96 2,i:45) and used <-ama> in such words of
Church Slavonic origin in his letters (see Kuna 1970:106, footnote 430).

Among the Vojvodinian writers the <-ama> desinence is used the most frequently by Rajić, Dositej, and, to a lesser extent, Ignjatović. Orfelin's language lacks this desinence entirely; Vedomosti (1968a:52-53) contains only two rare instances with neuter substantives, once each in the instrumental and locative plural, e.g., dobrama 'goods'; and Vidaković (1968:67) employs it in only one instance in the dative plural: ustama 'mouth'.

In Rajić's language (1964:89-91), with masculine substantives this desinence is found rarely in the dative, frequently in the instrumental, and very rarely in the locative: (dat.) zakonama 'laws', narodama 'people', grēhama 'sins'; (loc.) slēdama 'traces'; (instr.) načinama 'manners', ezykama 'languages', učastnikama 'participants', and postupkama 'acts'. With neuter substantives <-ama> is attested frequently in the instrumental, but not at all in the other two cases: oblakama 'clouds', licama 'people', bedstvama 'misfortunes', krilama 'wings', srdcama 'hearts', delama 'deeds', etc.

In Dositej's works (1970:106-8), as in Rajić's, <-ama> is attested rather frequently in the instrumental, but only rarely or as an exception in the other two cases. However, it is limited solely to neuter substantives in declension I, as in Lazarević's language: (dat.)
predstavičnjama 'presentations'; (loc.) krilama 'wings',
zabluždenijama 'errors'; (instr.) kolesama 'wheels',
čuvstvama 'feelings', pismama 'letters', and carstvama 'kingdoms'.

Lazarević's use of <-ama> compares most closely to
that of Ignjatović (1972:114-17), in whose language this
desinence is attested with only one neuter substantive in
the dative, srcama 'hearts'; with a small number of neuter
examples in the locative, e.g., drustvama 'societies',
vremenama 'times', plećama 'shoulders', mestama 'places',
srcama 'hearts'; and somewhat more frequently in the instru­
mental, e.g., plodama 'fruits' (one masculine substantive
only), dokazatelstvama 'evidence', and drvama 'trees'.

<-ma> in the Dative, Locative, and Instrumental
Plural (Declension I and III)

This desinence is not characteristic of any of the
Vojvodinian subdialects today. It is mentioned only once
in the dialectal material as being attested with one sub­
stantive in Srem (konjma alongside konjima 'horses'), but
according to Nikolić (1964:337), it cannot be ascertained
whether the desinence in question originated from the dual
desinence <-ma> or whether it is merely a later reduction.
Vuk prescribed the use of this desinence with only three
substantives of declension I: zubma 'teeth', konjma
'horses', and ljudma (or ljudima) 'people'. In declension
III, however, Vuk permitted <-ma> with all substantives,
even though <-ima> would seem to be the preferred desinence, being indicated first in the paradigms, with <-ma> following in parentheses (Karadžić 1894-96 2,i:42-44). In reality, however, Vuk uses predominately <-ma> with declension III substantives in his writings (Stevanović 1963-64:81-83).

Lazarević employs this desinence with six different substantival stems, both masculine and neuter in declension I: sinma 'sons', ljudma 'people', členma 'members', poslovma 'concerns', krilma 'wings', and graždanma 'citizens'. Similarly, this desinence forms a part of the morphological systems of all the other Vojvodinian writers, to varying degrees, in all three cases and both genders of declension I. However, <-ma> is generally one of the least frequently used of all the desinences in the three cases for all the writers, especially in Dositej's language (1970:115). The remaining writers, except Ignjatović, generally have no more than five and as few as one attested form with <-ma> in the various cases (see Mladenović 1960:163-64; Kašić 1968:67-70; Albin 1968a:50-51, 53; and Mladenović 1964:89-91). Ignjatović (1972:113-17), whose language displays the widest use of this desinence, best provides examples of the types of substantives, both masculine and neuter, occurring with <-ma>: (dat.) Sultanma 'Sultans', vratma 'doors', poklonma 'gifts', mladićma 'young men'; (loc.) djelma 'works', inštitutma 'institutes', časopisma 'journals', krevetma
'beds', vremenma 'times'; (instr.) poglavarma 'chiefs, heads', konjma 'horses', and ustma 'mouths'.

In declension III, only two desinences are attested in the dative, locative, and instrumental plural in the works of Dositej (1970:113-14) and Ignjatović (1972:119), as well as Lazarević; these are <-ma> and <-ima>. In Dositej's works the <-ma> desinence is restricted to a small circle of lexical items such as stvar 'thing', reč 'speech', kći 'daughter', and vešt 'thing', whereas <-ima> is used much more widely: rečma 'words', strastma 'passions', vrstma 'varieties', veštma 'things', but lažima 'lies', kokošima 'chickens', and čudima 'moods'. In Ignjatović's language (1972:119) <-ima> is more common than <-ma> in the instrumental; both desinences occur nearly equally in the locative; and the very few examples in the dative show two examples with <-ima> and one with <-ma>.

In the grammatical systems of the other writers, however, a variety of desinences occur in these cases of declension III substantives, yet <-ima>--the modern literary desinence--occurs very rarely. The following desinences occur in the systems of the various writers: (Vedomosti [1968a:60-61]) <-em>, <-ma>, <-ima>, <-i>, and <-eh>; (Viđaković [1968:71]) <-em>, <-ma>, <-mi>, <-i>, and <-eh>; (Rajić [1964:96]) <-em>, <-ma>, <-ima>, <-mi>, <-eh>, and <-ama>; (Orfelin [1960:163-64]) <-ima>, <-ma>, and <-mi>.
In his Srpska gramatika Vuk mentions that he was aware that the <-ima> desinence without <-ma> (i.e., <-i>) existed in Serbia, especially in Srem, Bačka, and Banat, and he furnishes the following examples: s jeleni 'with deer', na volov 'on oxen', u kotlovi 'in kettles', po brdi 'along the hills', and s koli 'with wagons' (Karadžić 1894-96 2,i:40, 45). This desinence is still found today in the Vojvodinian subdialects (Moskovljević 1938a:25). P. Ivić (1958:173) specifies that both <-i> and <-ima> may be found in the Vojvodinian subdialects, e.g., zubi/zubima 'teeth' and po seli/po selima 'through the villages'. In the Srem subdialect this archaic instrumental plural desinence, a continuation of the original instrumental plural desinence, is well attested but is less common than the literary desinence <-ima> and is used only in conjunction with prepositions, e.g., š njegovi koli 'with his carts', za njegovi leđi 'behind his back', and s volovski koli 'with ox carts' (Nikolić 1964:337). The locative plural <-i> originating from -mek has also been retained in the Srem subdialect, where it predominates with toponymics <-ima> being considerably less common); with other substantives, however, <-i> is less common than <-ima>, e.g., u Karlovci 'in Karlovci', u Petrovci (or u Petrovcima) 'in Petrovci', na vrati 'at the door', na svečari (or na svečarima) 'at
the name-day party', and na leđi 'on the back' (Nikolić 1964:337-38).

In Sremski Karlovci and Kovičje, Mladenović (1962-63a:247) has also recorded <-i> as well as <-ima> in the instrumental and locative plural, e.g., s naši seljaci 'with our villagers', s konji 'with horses', po mlogi sela 'through many villages', z dobri ljudima 'with good people', and po brdima 'along the hills'. In the Banat subdialect, <-i> occurs in some places more frequently and in other places less frequently than <-ima>, but nevertheless it is found throughout the entire Banat region, e.g., s ovi ja(j)i 'with these eggs', po jarkovi 'through the ditches', and s tanki brkovi 'with a thin moustache' (P. Ivić 1949-50:149). Miletić (1940:23) also corroborates the occurrence of this desinence in Banat, as does Popović (1949:485) for the ekavian area of Bačka and in the village of Begeć in Bačka (1950:131), e.g., po ritovi 'through the marshes' and na konji 'on horses'.

The <-i> desinence is the most frequent of all the desinences in the instrumental and locative plural for declension I masculine substantives in the language of Rajić (1964:89-91, 96), Dositej (1970:101, 103, 107-8, 115), Vedomosti (1968a:51-52, 61), and Vidaković (1968:68-69). As in Lazarević's language, the <-i> desinence also occurs with neuter substantives in these two cases among the four writers, but it is not the most frequent of the desinences
except in the locative plural of Vidaković. Some examples of the occurrence of this desinence with masculines in these writers' works are: (Rajić) (instr.) sa . . . skutovi 'with skirts', sa diavoli 'with devils', mećju . . . prorocy 'among prophets', s' orli 'with eagles'; (loc.) na . . . drumovi 'on roads', u Karlovci 'in Karlovci', po sokaci 'along the streets'; (Vidaković) (instr.) sa seljani 'with villagers', s' . . . neprijatel'ı 'with enemies', so . . . rukavy 'with sleeves'; (loc.) po . . . lugovi 'through the meadows', o . . . kralevi 'about the kings', o . . . gromovy 'about the thunder'; (Vedomosti) (instr.) meždu Tergovci 'among merchants', pod' Generali 'under the Generals', s' zakopi 'with burials'; (loc.) u . . . uzrocy 'in causes', u . . . preděli 'in areas', u Novcy 'in the newspaper'; (Dositej) (instr.) među Russi 'among the Russians', s' golubovi 'with pigeons'; (loc.) na prestoli 'on the thrones', and u seljani 'among the villagers'.

Examples of neuter substantives with <-i> include the following: (Rajić) (instr.) s' . . . děly 'with matters', obstojatelstvy 'circumstances'; (loc.) po sely 'through the villages', u . . . rebri 'in the ribs'; (Vidaković) (loc.) u . . . lěti 'in the summers', na krili 'on wings', po sely 'in villages'; (Vedomosti) (instr.) za leći 'behind the back', za . . . koli 'behind the cart', s' . . . městi 'with places'; (loc.) na . . . městi 'at places', po seli 'through the villages'; (Dositej) (instr.) pred vrati 'in
front of the door', s'parčeti 'with pieces', krili 'wings'; (loc.) u nědri 'in the bosom', na rameni 'on the shoulders', na koleni 'on the knees', and na drevesi 'on the trees'.

In Ignjatović's language (1972:114-16), however, the modern literary language desinence <-ima> predominates over all the other desinences of his language in these two cases (as with Lazarević's language in the locative plural), and less and less examples of <-i> and <-ma> occur in his later writings. Moreover, unlike with the other writers, <-i> occurs in the dative plural in two instances. Examples from Ignjatović's works are: (dat.) k vrati 'toward the door', prema ti koli 'toward your cart'; (instr.) med zubi 'between the teeth', za leđi 'behind the back', sa lađari 'with the boatman', sa drugovi 'with friends'; (loc.) po sokaci 'along the streets', po ... městi 'through places', u zubi 'in the teeth', u ustić 'in the mouth', and na leđi 'on the back'.

Orfelin (1960:164) also uses <-i> with both masculines and neuters in these same two cases, but no data on the frequency of <-i> compared to the other desinences is provided. Examples are: (instr.) kamečki 'little rocks', obruči 'hoops', penžeri 'windows', krily 'wings'; (loc.) koli 'cart', Karlovci 'Karlovci', and opanci 'peasant shoes'.

Adjectives and Pronouns

In this section will be discussed desinences used by the Vojvodinian writers for adjectives and pronouns.

<-im> Dative/Locative Singular

In the Preface to his Srpske narodne poslovico of 1836, Vuk lamented that in Srem, Bačka, and Banat the people not only say u Novim Sadu 'in Novi Sad' and na dobrom konju 'on a good horse', but they also write this ending in books (Moskovljević 1938a:6). According to Moskovljević (1938a:25-26), this desinence is found in the dative and locative singular in the entire Vojvodina area, e.g., u Novim Sadu 'in Novi Sad', ovim čoveku 'for this man', and mojim bratu 'for my brother'. Moreover, P. Ivić (1958:173) stipulates that in the Šumadija-Vojvodinian dialect this desinence is found in the adjectival and pronominal declensions in the locative and somewhat less frequently in the dative, e.g., o tim 'about that' and kazo starim dedi 'I told the old man'.

Moskovljević explains the origin of this desinence as a mixing of the Kosovsko-Resavski subdialect and the speech of ikavian speakers. In the Kosovsko-Resavski subdialect, the ending is <-em>, not <-om>, in these cases: mojem bratu 'for my brother', ovem čovekem 'for this man', and s ovem čovekem 'with this man'. The Kosovsko-Resavski speakers, after having migrated to eastern Šumadija and
Vojvodina, began to say *ovim čovekom* instead of *ovem covekem* among the ikavian speakers. Since they said *ovem čoveku* in the dative, they began to pronounce this *ovem* as the ikavian *ovim*, hence *ovim čoveku*. Belić and P. Ivić also support this theory of the Kosovo-Resavski settlers' bringing to the Vojvodina area <-em> which was subsequently changed to <-im>. The fact that <-im> is more widely distributed in areas near the Resavski subdialect also supports this theory (P. Ivić 1949-50:150).

This desinence is common in the dative/locative singular of adjectives, pronouns, and numbers in the Srem subdialect, although it is not found uniformly or consistently throughout the area. It occurs more often in the locative than in the dative and is especially common in southeast Srem; in western Srem, however, this desinence does not occur in the dative. With the pronouns on, ko, and šta, <-im> has also been generalized in the locative singular, e.g., *na njime* 'on him' and *o kim* 'about whom'. This desinence, however, has not been totally generalized in Srem; in a significant number of instances <-om> also figures (Nikolić 1964:344-45).

The <-im> desinence is also noted in the speech of Sremski Karlovci (and especially Kovilje), e.g., *o mojim drugu* 'about my friend' and *na tim pastuvu* 'on that stallion' (Mladenović 1962-63a:248), and in the ekavian dialect of Bačka (more in the eastern than in the western
area of the subdialect; Popović 1949:485). In the village of Begeč, however, as in western Bačka and in western Srem, <-om>, not <-im>, is found (Popović 1950:131).

The <-im> desinence is well attested in the Banat subdialect as well (Moskovljević 1940:59; P. Ivić 1949-50:150; Miletić 1940:25). In the northwest area of Banat <-im> is less frequently found and is limited to the locative, but in the extreme northwest section in Krs <-om> replaces <-im>, even in the locative, e.g., u našom selu 'in our village' (P. Ivić 1949-50:150).

Although this desinence has been generalized to a considerable extent in the various Vojvodinian subdialects, it is not reflected to any great degree in the works of the various eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Vojvodinian writers, including Lazarević. The largest number of occurrences of <-im> generalized into the dative/locative singular is found with Vidaković (10), followed by Dositej (5), and Vedomosti, Ignjatović, and Rajić (1 each). Examples from each of the writers follow: (Vidaković [1968:81])

*stariim' bjaše ime 'the old man's name was', u svakim*

*slučaju 'in any case', u malo prostim' odelu 'in somewhat rustic clothing', u čim' 'in whose', pri koim' 'with whom'; (Dositej [1970:118]) pri najhućem' i najnevaljaliim' srcu

*with the worst and most wicked heart', na ovim' svetu 'in this world'; (Ignjatović [1972:142]) da imam na kim decu

*ostaviti 'so that I have something to leave to some*
children'; (Vedomosti [1968a:71]) na edinym' korablju 'on a single ship'; and (Rajič [1964:107, footnote 370]) pri svem' tim' 'with all that'.

<-i> Locative and Instrumental Plural

Vuk cited this desinence as being characteristic of the Srem and Bačka subdialects, e.g., s dobri koli 'with good carts', po zelenl livada 'through the green meadows', and u Srpski novina 'in a Serbian newspaper' (Karadžić 1894-96 2,i:49). This desinence still exists today in the Srem dialect, although not as much as the literary desinences <-im> and <-ima>, e.g., za moji leđi 'behind my back', na crkveni vrati 'at the church doors', and na vaši koli 'in your cart' (Nikolić 1964:345-46). It is also attested in Sremski Karlovci and Kovilje, e.g., po mlogi seli 'through many villages', o svoji golubovi 'about his pigeons', and o moji sinovi 'about my sons' (Mladenović 1962-63a:247).

In the Banat subdialect this desinence is found more often with an adjective or pronoun than with a substantive, e.g., z drveni plugovi 'with wood plows', s oti kožama 'with these leathers', and s moi decama 'with my children' (P. Ivić 1949-50:149-50; Miletić 1940:23). P. Ivić has not recorded the opposite phenomenon of <-i> with the substantive and the literary desinence <-im> with the adjective or pronoun, e.g. *sa sigurnim(a) sanduci 'with secure trunks'. In the Srem dialect, however, this arrangement has been
attested: s otim novci 'with this money', na jednim vrati 'at the same door', and s poljskim radovi 'with Polish goods' (Nikolić 1964:346). P. Ivić believes that <-i> is a continuation of the original <-i> desinence only in the locative and that the instrumental plural can in no way be a continuation of тa (or η, e.g., новы, сини); rather, he believes that it is an innovation created by analogy with the substantival desinence <-i> and reinforced by the syncretism of the instrumental and locative plural in substantives.

All the Vojvodinian writers employ the <-i> adjectival-pronominal desinence in the locative and instrumental plural except Orfelin (1960:168), in whose language only -ихъ figures in the locative plural. Moreover, <-i> is attested in the dative plural as well in Ignjatović's language (1972:143). This desinence occurs the most frequently in Vidaković's and Ignjatović's works but does not occur as frequently as the other desinences, especially <-im(a)> in these two cases. The following serve as examples of <-i> in the works of the various Vojvodinian writers: (Orfelin [1960:168]) (instr.) s' moi hрабри vitezi 'with my brave knights', s' чадми moi 'with my children', hрабри saldati 'brave soldiers'; (Vedomosti [1968a:73]) (instr.) над муžеви нiovi 'over their husbands', s' друзи негови 'with his friends'; (loc.) na mnogi мeсти 'in many places', u нiovi koli 'in their cart'; (Vidaković
Like the Srem subdialect, some of the writers' works also provide examples of other desinences besides <-i> in conjunction with substantives ending in <-i>: (Vidaković [1968:85]) s' momcy svoimi 'with their young men', s' pervima Narodi 'with the first people', s' širokimi hodnicy 'with wide corridors', kosimi zracy 'with slanting rays', raznimy drevesy 'with various trees'; (Rajić [1964:89-91]) s' kožnima kraevi 'with leather edges', nepristojnima razgovory 'indecent conversations', o našima grêhovi 'about our sins'; (Vedomosti [1968a:73]) u vašimi pozdnimi lêti 'during your late summers', o onimi dêli 'about those matters', na onimi mêsti 'in those places'; (Orfelin...
The opposite arrangement of the adjective ending in <-i> but the substantive having a desinence other than <-i>, as may be found in the Banat subdialect, is attested in only three examples in the works of some of the Vojvodinian writers: (Vedomosti [1968a:52, 73]) u . . . okrestni Magazinami 'in local stores', u Cervenni Kapicami 'in red caps'; (Orfelin [1960:168]) s' čadmi moi 'with my children'.

The Indefinite Desinences <-a> Genitive Singular and <-u> Dative Singular

The use of these indefinite desinences is very limited today in the various Vojvodinian subdialects. They are now used only in a few fixed expressions, in a partitive sense, or sometimes with the names of holidays. Examples from the Srem subdialect (Nikolić 1964:346-47) include the following: bela luka 'some garlic', kisela kupusa 'some sauerkraut', Vidova dana 'St. Vitus's Day', Spasova dana 'Ascension Day', o Spasovu danu 'about Ascension Day', do lakša života 'the easy life', do prva dana 'until the first day', and debela brava 'fat head of cattle'. Similarly, in Sremski Karlovci the indefinite desinence <-a> is used in a partitive meaning, e.g., suva mesa 'some dried meat', crna luka 'some onions', and bela luka 'some garlic'. With the names of holidays, however, the indefinite forms are not
used there, e.g., uoči Đurđevog dana 'on the eve of St. George's Day' and uoči Krstovog dana 'on the eve of Holy Cross Day' (Mladenović 1962-63a:248). In Banat, the distinction between the definite and indefinite desinences is limited to the nominative singular and the partitive genitive, e.g., kupila sam žuta pasulja, bela luka 'I bought some yellow beans and some garlic' (Miletić 1940:33).

Examples of the indefinite desinences <-a> and <-u> can be found in the writings of each of the Vojvodinian writers, but as in Lazarević's works, these desinences are extremely restricted and totally unproductive. This, however, contradicts Stevanović's statement (1964:265):

Although in the earlier periods in the development of our new literature, with writers from the middle of the nineteenth century and somewhat later, in Vuk Karadžić's language, let's say, and his immediate followers, we very often find nominal forms of descriptive adjectives in subordinate cases as well. With the newer and the newest writers, as in the present spoken language of our cultural centers, particularly in the ekavian areas, these forms are rarer.

Those modifiers with <-a> and <-u> in the works of the Vojvodinian writers are also usually found in certain set expressions, in partitive genitive, in possessive genitive, or in qualitative genitive meanings, although in many instances no definite rules for their use in a particular sentence can be ascertained. Examples of indefinite forms in Rajić's works (1964:107-8) include: (gen.-acc.) vreme vtorog' něgova prišestvija 'the time of His Second Coming',
nikakva dobra 'no good', verna raba tvoga 'your true servant'; (dat.-loc.) po obeščaniju Davidovu 'on David's promise', and po slovu Pavlovu 'according to Paul's word'. Possessive adjectives in -ov, -ev, and -in, however, may take the definitive adjectival desinences as well, e.g., početak nêgovog' života 'the beginning of his life' and Božie' pravosudija 'God's justice'.

Albin (1968a:72) states that "strict differentiation of indefinite/definite adjectival forms, as in Vuk's works, is not known in the language of the Vedomosti." A few examples of indefinite forms from this newspaper are: (gen.-acc.) berza konja 'a swift horse', nikakova uspêha 'no success'; (dat.-loc.) licu Monarhovu 'the Monarch's face', Synu Davidovu 'David's son', and po primêru nêgovu 'according to his example'.

A few indefinite forms, sometimes in conjunction with a definite form, as in Lazarević's language, are found in Orfelin's language (1960:167): ubi nêna muža 'killed her husband', lêpa bêloga meda 'beautiful white bear cub', and negašena kreča 'unslaked lime'. Jerković (1972:145-46) concludes that the opposition indefinite/definite has been completely eliminated in Ignjatović's language and that the largest number of examples appear as partitive genitives, possessive adjectives, or quantitative genitives: kisela mleka 'some sour milk', bio čovek plemenita duha 'the man had a noble spirit', and vole bogata trgovca 'she loves the
rich merchant'. Similarly, Kašić (1968:82) concludes that the indefinite/definite opposition has also been eliminated from Vidaković's language. He gives similar examples for the use of the indefinite forms: bela luka 'some garlic', mlada sira 'some new cheese', pomoštiju Boga milostiva 'with the help of gracious God', and zdrava junaka 'healthy youth'.

The Dative of Possession Expressed with Personal Pronouns

The dative of possession, although limited to only the dative enclitics of the personal pronouns, is a characteristic feature of the Srem subdialect and the colloquial literary language today (Nikolić 1964:365), e.g., ode momak i otac mu i mati 'the young man and his father and mother left' and a mati, živa ti još? 'and is your mother still living?'.

In the language of Vedomosti (1968a:98) the dative of possession is limited to the dative enclitic forms of the personal pronouns: uzeli mu Kassy 'they took his money' and krov1 mu e tolika iz* noge izisla 'so much of his blood flowed from his legs'. In Vidaković's and Dositej's works, as in Lazarević's, the dative of possession may also occur with substantives (though very infrequently): (Vidaković [1968:117]) gdě su mu brat'a 'where are his brothers', gdě e Vam1 družstvo 'where is your company', da e mati Svetozaru 'that Svetozar's mother is', tko_vam1 e glava cerkvi 'who is
head of your church; (Dositej [1970:185]) jeř mi kolena poda

mnom drkěu 'because my knees are trembling under me' and

kakva bi slava lavu bila da utuče miša 'what glory would a

lion have in killing a mouse'.

Notes to Chapter III

1 These four examples and some others listed below with <-i-> are also accepted forms in the standard literary language. Alternate forms, e.g., crvi and crva, žalbi and žalba, crkava and crkvi, are often allowable for many of these examples in the standard language (Stevanović 1964:207, 235).

2 According to an oral communication to Nikolić, however, Popović stated that "in Bačka the dat. pl. <-om> can be found" (see Nikolić 1964:337). Popović also claims in his article on the speech of Gospođinci in Bačka that this is sometimes a possible desinence (Jerković 1972:114). This desinence has also been recorded in Posavina by Ivšić (1913:215).

3 The <-om> desinence is also attested in other cases and declensions in the works of the various Vojvodinian writers.

4 In the language of Radišević, also a Vojvodinian writer of the later period, this desinence is again very rare and, according to V. Ilić, is taken by him from folk poetry (Jerković 1972:114).

5 Belić (1969a:70) states that "in Serbian dialects the desinence <-ma> is found much more frequently than in the literary language . . . and thusly in the Slavonian dialects: ljudma, konjma, sinovma, kokošma," etc.
CHAPTER IV

VERBAL SYSTEM

The Morphological Leveling of /i/ in Verbs Ending in /ěti/

In the Šumadija-Vojvodinian dialect P. Ivić (1958:172 states that the infinitive stem of most verbs of the type videti ending originally in -ěti now have stem final /i/, e.g., viditi 'see' and živili 'live'. This morphological leveling was brought about by analogy with the /i/ in the present stem and with verbs of the type moliti : molim 'request'. Similarly, Moskovljević (1938a:21) confirms that verbs originally having -ěti infinitive stems always end in -iti in the Vojvodinian subdialects and many of these verbs have entered educated literary speech. In the Srem subdialect such verbs may end in both -eti (less frequently) and -iti (much more frequently) (Nikolić 1964:314).

This morphological leveling has also been recorded in Sremski Karlovci (Mladenović 1962-63a:246) and in the Banat subdialect, e.g., viditi 'see', mrzila 'hate' (patterned after vidi, mrzi 3 sg. pres., P. Ivić 1949-50:147) and ostarila 'age', trpila 'suffer' and mrziti 'hate' (Miletić 1940:29). As the sole example in Lazarević's language (vole 'love' [3 sg. pres.], p. 121, footnote 1) shows,
the opposite leveling of /e/ into the present stem also occurs in the Vojvodinian subdialects, e.g., bole 'ache' (3 sg. pres.), izgore 'burn down' (3 sg. pres.), and odolemo 'overcome' (1 sg. pres.) (Miletić 1940:29; Moskovljević 1934a:22). In Sremski Karlovci /e/ is regularly found in the present stem in the following verbs: gorem 'burn' (1 sg. pres.), volem 'love' (1 sg. pres.), and bole 'ache' (3 sg. pres.) (Mladenović 1962-63a:246).

The morphological leveling of /i/ is a common feature of all the Vojvodinian writers. Just as all the writers have /i/ in nearly all instances with those verbal stems in question, they nevertheless display stems in /e/ characteristic of the standard literary language: (Vidaković [1968:42]) živeti 'live', sedeti 'sit', boleti 'ache', goreti 'burn'; (Rajić [1964:60-61]) izgorela 'burn up' (also goriti), zagoreti 'burn', preodoleti 'overcome' (cf. preodoliti); (Vedomosti [1968a:29]) videti 'see', preboleti 'ache', zabolela 'ache' (cf. zabolila), izgorele 'burn up'; (Orfelin [1960:154]) izgoreo, zagoreo 'burn up'; (Ignjatović [1972:59-60]) trpeti 'suffer', zavideli 'envy'; and (Dositej [1970:60]) okorela 'become addicted', izgore 'burn up' and preodoleću 'overcome'. Vidaković (1968:42), like Lazarević, also shows the opposite leveling of /e/ into the present tense: bole 'ache' (3 sg. pres.), volem 'love' (1 sg. pres.) and gore 'burn' (3 sg. pres.) (cf., however, gori,
boli). The opposite leveling is not mentioned in the various studies of the other Vojvodinian writers.

**Verbal Suffix <-d->**

Vuk's only mention of the <-d-> suffix in his Srpska gramatika concerns the three verbs dati 'give', znati 'know', and imati 'have', which he indicates may have alternate forms with or without <-d-> in the Srem area, e.g., dam or dadem, znam or znadem, and imam or imadem (Karadžić 1894-96 2,i:73). Albin's study (1970c) on the use of the stem-final <-du> (3rd pl. pres.) by Vojvodinian writers from 1748-1810 shows that the generalization of <-du> to all verb classes, although only infrequently found with some verb classes, was well established by the end of this period of investigation.

In the contemporary Vojvodinian subdialects the <-du> desinence has been generalized into all verb classes, unlike in Lazarević's language, although this generalization is not always consistently found, e.g., uzmedu or uzu 'they take' (P. Ivić 1958:177).

In the modern Srem dialect Nikolić (1964:357) has found that the verbs dati and znati have dual present forms in all persons, dam or dadem and znam or znadem. However, the forms dadem, etc., and znadem, etc., are characteristic only of western Srem, whereas dam and znam are more frequent in eastern Srem. Moskovljević (1938a:26) also
indicates the generalization of this desinence in all the Vojvodinian subdialects also to verb classes other than those ending in <-aju> or <-eju>: idedu 'they go', pevadu 'they sing', and vididu 'they see'. Nikolić (1964:350) corroborates this generalization (though not consistent) of <-du> to all verb classes in the Srem subdialect, e.g., možedu 'they can', legnedu 'they lie down', imadu 'they have', grdidu 'they make ugly', dižedu 'they move', and oćedu 'they will, want'.

The language of Sremski Karlovci and Kovilje (Mladenović 1962-63a:247) shows the same inconsistencies in the occurrence of <-du>. Either stem final <-aju> or <-adu> or both may occur with the same verb, e.g., daju or dadu 'they give', čitaju or čitadu 'they read', večeradu 'they sup', and vatadu 'they seize'. However, only <-edu> and not <-eju> is attested, e.g., smedu 'they dare' and razumedu 'they understand'.

In Banat, all verbs in the 3rd person plural present tense may have a parallel <-du> ending (P. Ivić 1949-50:152): zovedu 'they call', krenedu 'they move', dobijedu 'they obtain', pravidu 'they create', motadu 'wind up', možedu 'they can', oćedu 'they want', and zredu 'they ripen' (see also Miletić 1940:27). However, in the ekavian dialect of Bačka <-du> is found much less frequently than the normal ending (Popović 1949:486).
All the Vojvodinian writers, including Lazarević, display the desinence <-du> in their works, but in general this feature is found quite infrequently, especially as compared to the great frequency with which the generalization of <-d-> to all stems is found in the subdialects today. For the most part, this feature is nearly always limited to the 3rd person plural in the works of all the writers and is restricted to only those verbs ending in <-eju> or <-aju> in the 3rd person plural and to hteti 'want'. This suffix is not found in the other persons and is found with stem types other than <-eju> or <-aju> only in Vidaković's language. Moreover, all the writers, as Lazarević, show much inconsistency in the use of <-d->. Forms conforming to the modern literary norm are most often found, however.

Examples of <-d-> from the various authors follow: (Orfelin [1960:171]) only with the following verbs: znadu 'they know', znade 'he knows', imadu 'they have' (also ima 'he has'), and dadut 'they give'; (Dositej [1970:130-31]) restricted to a relatively small number of verbs: moradu 'they must', umedu 'they know how', hoćedu 'they want, will', razumedu 'they understand', and valjadu 'they roll'; (Vedomosti [1968a:81]) restricted to verbs ending in <-eju> and <-aju>: priznadu 'they admit', moradu 'they must', smedu 'they dare', and znadu 'they know'; (Rajić [1964:117-18]) also limited only to verbs ending in <-aju> and <-eju>,
and hteti 'want', with one example of <-du> with another stem: izgoredu 'they burn up', p. 117; (Ignjatović [1972: 158-59]): as with the other writers, the literary forms predominate but <-du> may occur with verbs in <-aju>, and <-eju>, and hteti also, e.g., ostaviti nečedu 'they won't stay', venčadu se 'they marry', se upoznadu 'they become acquainted', and grede 'it warms'; and (Vidaković [1968:92]): the verbs dati, znati, imati and their compound forms ending in <-aju>, a few verbs in <-eju>, and hteti may have this suffix, e.g., predadu 'they hand over', prodadu 'they sell', prispedu 'they arrive' and hočedu 'they want, will', although <-du> may occur in a few rare instances with other verb stems: izid'edu 'they leave', nad'edu 'they find', and dod'edu 'they arrive.'

**Use of the Aorist**

In the Vojvodinian subdialects the aorist is still found but its usage has decreased. Moreover, the 3rd person plural replaces the 2nd person plural, e.g., vi dođoše 'you arrived', and in many areas the 3rd person forms may also substitute for the 1st person forms, respectively, e.g., ja odo 'I left' and mi odoše 'we left' (Ivić 1958:173).

In Srem, the use of the aorist is limited and not all of the persons are attested (Nikolić 1964:351-52). The 1st person singular is used only with certain verbs, e.g., odo 'I left' and reko 'I said'. As Ivić has indicated,
the 3rd person singular may be found instead of the 1st person singular, e.g., ja vas zadrža dugo 'I have detained you a long time'. Moreover, the 2nd person singular is no longer found, but the 3rd person singular is still frequently used, e.g., ispeče 'he baked', dode 'he arrived' and pojavi 'he appeared'. The 1st person plural is rarely heard today in Srem; the few examples include pismo 'we wrote', ostašmo 'we remained' and sastašmo 'we met' (š appearing by analogy with the 3rd person plural). Nikolić has not attested the 2nd person plural in Srem but instead has found the use of the 3rd person plural in place of it, e.g., vi odošće 'you left'. The 3rd person plural, however, is still frequently used: dočekaše 'they waited', dođošće 'they arrived', stadošće 'they stood' and izgubije 'they lost'.

The 3rd person plural and to a lesser extent the 3rd person singular are still productive in Banat, e.g., konji đipiše 'the horses jumped' and on prođe nuz nas 'he passed by us' (P. Ivić 1949-50:151-52). As in Srem, the 3rd person forms may replace the 1st person forms, e.g., mi projurišće 'we rushed by' and ja sad ode 'I left'; the 2nd person forms have vanished; and only remnants of the 1st person singular remain, e.g., odo 'I left' and reko 'I said'.

As in Lazarević's language, the aorist is used rather frequently in the writings of all the other
Vojvodinian writers especially for the 3rd person forms, whereas the 2nd person forms are attested only infrequently. In addition, the formation of the aorist with imperfect verbal stems is found but only very infrequently, e.g., (Vedomosti [1968a:82, footnote 302]) otgovaraše 'they answered'; (Rajić [1964:120]) branismo (se) 'we defended ourselves', pisah' 'I wrote', prosih' 'I requested'; (Vidaković [1968:95]) magoše 'they were able'; (Dositej [1970:146]) kaza 'I said'; (Ignjatović [1972:162-63]) se razgovaraše 'they conversed', čitaše 'they read', mišljaše 'they thought', dolaziše 'they arrived', and gledaše 'they looked'.

Examples of the aorist attested in the works of the various writers include the following: (Vidaković [1968:95]) odoh' 'I left', uze 'you took', nasmeja 'he made someone laugh', dobismo 'we acquired', skidoste 'you took down', počeše 'they began'; (Rajić [1964:119-20]) rarely used the aorist in his translations, but in his letters and especially in his verse the aorist is often encountered, e.g., poslah' 'I sent', dade 'he gave', padosmo 'we fell', izvoliste 'you allowed' and navališe 'they rolled'; (Vedomosti [1968a:82-83]) usudih' sja 'I dared', izgnah' 'I chased out', približi sja 'he approached', izgubismo 'we lost' and dođoše 'they arrived'; (Orfelin [1960:172]) osta 'I remained', pade 'he fell' and napregoše 'they tightened'; (Dositej [1970:144-47]) the aorist is well represented in
Dositej's works and is a reflection of his vernacular Serbian, since it is used mainly with Serbian vernacular items, although some Russian Church Slavonic aorist formations may be found, e.g., *projdohom* 'they passed through' and *vozveličašasja* 'they increased'; examples of the aorist with vernacular lexicon include *odo* 'I left', *mimoićo* 'I passed by', *izćeznu* 'I disappeared', *ću* 'you heard', *iskopa* 'he dug', *počupasmo* 'we plucked', *naučiste* 'you taught', *naspavaše* 'they had a good sleep' and *držaše* 'they held'; and (Ignjatović [1972:163-64]) *htedoh* 'I wanted', *reće* 'you said', *nasta* 'he originated', *mogosmo* 'we were able', *rekoste* 'you said' and *se rastadoše* 'they departed'.

**Use of the Imperfect Tense**

In the contemporary Vojvodinian subdialects the imperfect tense is used to a much lesser extent than in Lazarević's time, over 120 to 130 years ago, judging by the extent of this tense in the works of the various eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writers. P. Ivić (1958:173) states that in Vojvodina the imperfect has practically been lost. Besides the form *bijaše* 'was', Nikolić (1964:352) was not able to record a single imperfect tense form in the Srem subdialect. Moreover, Mladenović (1962-63a:248-49) makes no mention of the imperfect in Sremski Karlovci or Kovilje, and in Banat Ivić (1949-50:151) states categorically that
it has been lost completely (see also Miletić 1940:28).
Moreover, no mention of the imperfect is made for the Bačka subdialect (Popović 1949 and 1950).

The various writers show considerable diversity in their frequency of use of the imperfect. On the one hand, it is not attested at all in Orfelin's language and is extremely limited in Rajić's, Vidaković's, Lazarević's, and to a lesser extent in Vedomosti. On the other hand, Kašić (1968:94) asserts that the imperfect, as the aorist, is common in Vidaković's language. He adds, however, that the forms of the imperfect occur in almost all instances in only the 3rd person forms. Similarly, Kuna (1970:147) states that the imperfect occurs very frequently in Dositej's works but adds several caveats: it is limited almost exclusively to the 3rd person forms; it occurs mainly with Russian Church Slavonic words; many variations from the literary norm occur in its formation; and it is mainly a literary form, since it does not occur in his letters, but only in strictly literary texts. Kuna also adds that Dositej's frequent use of the imperfect may partially be explained by his remembrances of the Montenegrin and Dalmatian dialects. Jerković (1972:164) offers the supposition that although the imperfect was losing ground in vernacular speech rather early, it nevertheless was preserved as a feature of the literary language because the language of Vuk's folklore was taken as a model in literature.
Only six examples of the imperfect are attested in Rajić's works (1964:120), e.g., trajaše 'he lasted', beše 'he was', predavaše 'he handed over', prigotovljaje 'he prepared', mišljaše 'he thought', and čekasmo 'we waited for'. Vedomosti (1963a:83) has imperfect forms mainly in the 3rd person forms but also Church Slavonic forms, especially in the 1st person plural: stoyaše 'he stood', iskaše 'he looked for', radovahu sja 'they were glad', pojahu 'they changed', molihom sja 'we prayed', slyšahom 'we listened' and bjahu 'they were'.

Jerković (1972:164–65) states that the imperfect is rare in Ignjatović's works; only 86 examples are attested in his voluminous works. The greatest number of examples occur with the verb biti 'be' and in the 3rd person, no examples in the 2nd person are attested, e.g., byjah 'I was', myšljah 'I thought', očekivaše 'he waited for', govoraše 'he was speaking', besmo 'we were', razgovarasmo 'we conversed' and odupirahu 'they resisted'. In Vidaković's works (1968:94) only five examples of the 1st person singular are attested and the remaining numerous examples are found in the 3rd person, e.g., mogah 'I was able', neviđa 'I hated', mišlja 'I thought', beja 'I was', čeka 'I waited for', mučaše 'he tormented', načinjaše 'he began' and umnožavahu 'they multiplied'. Although the imperfect occurs in the majority of instances in the 3rd person in Dositej's works (1972:148–50), nevertheless,
some examples in the 1st person have been attested: mogah' 'I was able', značah' 'I knew', govorah' 'I spoke', mišljasmo se 'we thought' and željah' 'I wished'.

Replacement of the Infinitive by the da Construction

Of the various writers, Ignjatović, Vidaković, and Dositej use the infinitive more than the da construction, whereas Lazarević, Rajić, and Vedomosti use both constructions on a nearly equal basis. Those writers favoring the infinitive construction are more representative of the older period of the ekavian literary language, as today the da construction predominates in the eastern ekavian variety of Serbocroatian.

Examples of both constructions include the following: (Vidaković [1968:127]) moram' tražiti što esti 'I have to find something to eat', but ne smeju da se usude 'I don't dare have the courage'; (Ignjatović [1972:263-64]) ona se poče izvinjavati 'she begins to excuse herself', but marao je glavu na krevet da položi 'he had to lay his head on the bed'; (Rajić [1964:144]) onomad' sam' zaboravio kupiti 'the other day I forgot to buy', but dužan' e svakij da nju ne izgubi 'everyone should not lose it'; and (Vedomosti [1968a:101]) prinudio ga vratiti se 'I had to return it' (no examples of the da construction occur).
Kuna (1970:209) explains that the infinitive is not used in Dositej's native dialect to nearly such an extent as in his works and that his exaggerated use of the infinitive can most probably be explained by the strong influence of Russian Church Slavonic on his works. It may also be possible that Dositej consciously replaced the da plus present tense construction with the infinitive to obtain more literary expression in his works. Kuna (1970:208) presents only examples of the infinitive construction in his works, e.g., osuđen . . . otrov piti 'condemned to drink poison' and samo jednu milost imam od vas prositi 'I have only one favor to ask you'.
Notes to Chapter IV

1Popović (1952) discusses in considerable detail the diversity of desinences in the 3rd person pl. present tense in the various Vojvodinian subdialects and classifies these subdialects on the basis of this diversity into four types: I—Ekavian Bačka and Srem type (e.g., vide 'see', pevaju 'sing', tresedu 'shake'; II—Banat type (e.g., vidu, pevu, pevau, tresedu); III—Bunjevački type (e.g., vide, vidu, pivaju, pivaje, tresedu) and IV—Sokački (ikavian) type (e.g., vidu, pivu).

2This is in accord with the present-day situation in the Srem subdialect in which both constructions are heard nearly equally as frequently (Nikolić (1964:368).

3Extensive penetration of the da construction in the ekavian area as a replacement for the infinitive occurred in the period following Vuk. Jerković suggests that it would be interesting to confirm to what extent the changing of the cultural center of the Serbs to Belgrade in the second half of the nineteenth century is associated with this replacement of constructions (see Jerković 1972:263 and footnote 790).
CHAPTER V

SYNTACTIC FEATURES

The syntax of Lazarević's works reflects a number of features characteristic of the works of the Slaveno-serbian writers of Vojvodina under consideration. These features, which are today felt to be archaic and which no longer form a part of the literary language, are discussed below.

**Dative Absolute Constructions**

Some absolute constructions, though not with the dative, are found in Vuk's writings (see M. Ivić 1957:123). But of all the studies on the Vojvodinian writers the dative absolute is described only in the language of Vidaković (see Kašić 1968:120). Some examples are: *Pastyru ovo kazujut' i, Svetozar' . . . na nego pogledaše 'while the shepherd was saying this, Svetozar looked at him' and hodajut' i im' oboicy u tihom' razgovoru . . . čuju puške 'while they both are walking in quiet conversation, they hear guns'.
Position of the Predicate Verb at the End of a Sentence or Clause

This syntactic feature is generally considered to have originated under the influence of German and/or Russian syntax and ultimately of Latin syntax, which influenced Russian at the end of the seventeenth century (see M. Ivč 1957:123; Mladenović 1964:136; Kuna 1970:164-65; and Albin 1968a:94). This feature is commonly found in the works of all the Vojvodinian writers, although word order that is characteristic of the modern literary language may also be found. Examples of this common feature in Rajić's works (1964:136-37) include the following: 

```
budemo li my u traženju takve budalastine sav' naš' život' provoditi?
'will we be spending our entire lives seeking such foolishness?' and
er' e svak' svoga plemena poglavica byo 'because each one was the head of his tribe'.
```

Kašić (1968:109-10) feels that although this feature may reflect the influence of other foreign languages, it must foremost of all be interpreted as the writers' adopting the spirit of the literary language of that period. In Vidaković's works the predicate forms go mainly at the end, but they may also be found in the order characteristic of the modern literary language: 

```
hot'u, da im' pokazem', što može edan' pravyj muž', edan' staryj vojnik' učiniti 'I want to show them what a real man and an old soldier can do'; but
```

U nědelju kad' izyde . . . iz' cerkve, ne ide u
kerčmu, no upravo doma 'On Sunday when he leaves church, he doesn't go to a tavern, but straight home'.

Examples of this syntactic feature in the works of some of the other Vojvodinian writers include the following:
(Dositej [1970:164-65]) da iz nji ništa drugo nego zavist govori 'that from them nothing other than envy is speaking' and da svi narodi, krasnonaravni i prosvešteni vam . . . pokazuju 'that all natural and enlightened people show you';
(Vedomosti [1968a:94]) kral' e osobito Hercogu . . . blagodario 'the king especially thanked Hercog'; (Ignjatović [1972:190]) a putnici sutradan opet krenu se 'the travelers start out again tomorrow'.

The Separation of Attributes from the Head Substantive

Various modifiers and the head substantive are often separated by a phrase (a participle construction, an enclitic, a noun in the genitive case, etc.) in the works of the Vojvodinian writers, including Lazarević. Kuna (1970:165-66) postulates that the source of this Slaveno-serbian feature is Russian or Russian Church Slavonic, in which modifiers and nouns are regularly separated in this way. Furthermore, examples such as s jagñeta nezlobiva kožom 'with the hide of a good lamb', in which a genitive construction intervenes, probably originate either from the Saxon genitive or Russian Church Slavonic (ultimately from the Latin genitivus qualitatis). Other examples from
Dositej's works are: našu vjernu k njima ljubov 'our true love for them', dobri i razumni misle i govore ljudi 'kind and intelligent people think and speak', and o slavnoj velikoga Petra kćeri 'about Peter the Great's famous daughter'.

This same syntactic construction is also found in the other writers' works: (Vedomosti [1968a:93-94], rarely) laku e dobio ranu 'he received a light wound', o želamaom u svemu uspěhu 'about the success wished in everything'; (Rajič [1964:136]) sva drugih' ljudi dela 'all the concerns of other people', ovo našega estetstva slabost 'this weakness of our nature'; (Vidaković [1968:108], frequently) druga su mu děca 'his other children are', za něgovo k nam' prijatelstvo 'for his friendship towards us'; (Ignjatović [1972:188], frequently) u udaljenu u palati sobu 'into the secluded room in the palace', and u crkvi veliku sam' sveču upalo 'I lit the large candle in the church'.

The Position of the Reflexive Pronoun Se

In the language of the various writers, as in Lazarević's works, the reflexive pronoun se may be placed in the correct position following the first stressed word of a sentence or clause, as prescribed for the modern literary language. However, se is often found in other positions in the sentence, sometimes being located after and attached to the verb form. Mladenović (1964:137) postulates that those
examples where the pronoun se is attached to or immediately follows the verb resulted from the influence of Church Slavonic verbs in -sja.

Examples from the various writers' works illustrate the possible positions for se in a sentence: (Vedomosti [1968a:95]) da se Francuzy na Kapitulaciju sklone 'that the French capitulate', but u kom' iošt' duh' života nahodio se 'in whom the breath of life was still found', sve polč u ednu ledinu učinilo se 'the entire field was made into one lawn'; (Rajić [1964:137]) koe se pri nama nahode 'which are found with us', ne by se ty začudio 'so that you wouldn't be surprised', but zato smo branili se 'for this reason we defended ourselves', koi sami sebi pokazuete se 'which you show to yourselves'; (Ignjatović [1972:190]) sad se moraju obiteljske stvari ureçivati 'now they have to put their family matters in order', no nijedna mi se nije dopala 'not one of them pleased me', but tako ja opet oporavim se 'thus I am convalescing again', Šamika smeje se 'Šamika laughs'.

In Dositej's works (1970:167-68) se in most instances is not found in the correct clitic position at the beginning of the sentence or clause, e.g., sreća velika što nije se slobodno ženiti 'it is great fortune that I'm not permitted to get married' (cf. Leander rekao mi je da 'Leander told me that'). Such positioning of se may only partially have resulted from the influence of Russian Church Slavonic because similar examples of se in such positions
can be found in Dositej's native speech of Gada; moreover, 
se is rarely placed directly after the verb, as in poneže 
u nevrijeme čuva se ot ognja 'because during bad weather 
[it] is protected from fire'.
CHAPTER VI

OBSERVATIONS ON LAZAREVIĆ'S LANGUAGE

In general, Lazarević's *Plemenita i silna ljubov* represents a very early and successful attempt of a Serbian author at writing a novel in good vernacular Serbian reflecting considerably his native Vojvodinian dialect and free of most Slavenoserbian features and conventions. It also adheres quite closely to Vuk Karadžić's newly codified edicts for the literary language. To be sure, Lazarević does not entirely avoid some Slavenoserbian features; these no doubt had a strong influence on him. However, these features tend to be found mainly in the second work, *Odgovor*, which is not surprising because of its didactic and polemical nature.

Specifically, Lazarević adheres very closely to the graphemes of the alphabet codified by Vuk. A few deviations from Vuk's alphabet do occur, e.g., ћ, ћ, ћ, ћ, ć, ţ, ľ and Č which represent some of the traditional graphemes found in the works of the other Vojvodinian writers under consideration. Nevertheless, these deviations are so sporadic and infrequent in Lazarević's language that for all practical purposes it may be concluded
that he had freed his language of these superfluous graphemes that encumber the works of the other writers.

In the realm of spelling conventions, however, Lazarević was not nearly as successful in following Vuk's reforms. Lazarević's spelling in more instances than not shows the strong influence of the morphophonemic spelling followed for the most part by the Slavenoserbian writers. Lazarević does indicate phonetically, in accordance with Vuk's norms, assimilation as to manner and/or place of articulation and also quite often the sequence _ + voiceless consonant. With the possible exception of Lazarević's use of some archaic syntactic features, however, it is in the area of orthography that Lazarević's language is most similar to that of the Slavenoserbian Vojvodinian writers and the least similar to Vuk's reforms.

The phonological system of Lazarević's language displays a number of dialectal features characteristic of his native Vojvodina. Some of these dialectal features, such as the absence of /h/ from the phonemic system, the dissililation of /mn/→/ml/, the substitution of the prefix <pri-> by <pre->, and the contraction of vowel clusters, are common features of his phonological system, whereas the other dialectal features--the "ikavisms", the simplification of consonant clusters, the substitution of /h/ by /k/, the dissililation of the suffixes <-ljenje> and
<njenje> and the lack of consonantal alternations of the type K ~ C—form a more (or very) limited part of his phonological system. These various phonological features are also found in the language of the other writers from Vojvodina but considerable variation exists between the extent of these features in their works and Lazarević's two works. Unlike Lazarević, who may have been trying to imitate Vuk's language as concerns the absence of /h/, the other writers for the most part attempt to write the phoneme /h/ in its proper etymological place. Moreover, the contraction of vocalic clusters occurs less frequently and very sporadically in comparison to Lazarević's language (with the exception, perhaps, of Ignjatović's language) as does the dissimilation of /mn/ and the simplification of consonant clusters (except in Vidaković's and Ignjatović's works). However, the language of the other Vojvodinian writers shows more examples of "ikavisms" and examples without the consonantal alternations of the type K ~ C than Lazarević's language does. But the extent of the morphological leveling of /i/ in verbs, the substitution of /h/ in certain morphemes, and the possible dissimilation of the two suffixes <-lenje> and <-njenje> is nearly equally reflected in the language of all the writers. The extent of the substitution of <pri-> by <pre-> and vice-versa, however, varies greatly from author to author, and insertion of the glide /j/ before /i/ is the most limited
feature, being found only in Lazarević's and Ignjatović's works.

The morphology of Lazarević's language, as the phonology, contains a number of features and desinences characteristic of the Vojvodinian subdialects that do not form a part of the literary language as codified by Vuk or as found today. These dialectal features, some of which are found in the other writer's works as well, include the desinences <-i> of declension I instrumental and locative plural substantives, the expanded use of the <-i> genitive plural desinence, <-im> dative/locative singular and <-i> locative and instrumental plural adjectival desinences, the verbal suffix <-d->, the morphological leveling of /i/ into all forms of verbs ending in -eti in the standard literary language (and originally from /-ěti/) and the fairly frequent replacement of the infinitive by the da construction.

Moreover, his language displays three desinences that are characteristic of the Slavenoserbian language of the other Vojvodinian writers--<-ma> in the dative, locative, and instrumental plural (declensions I and III), the <-om> dative plural of declension I, and <-ama> in the dative, locative, and instrumental plural of declension I. It cannot be entirely ruled out, however, that Lazarević's use of these three desinences may also reflect dialectal features from the Vojvodinian subdialects, as inconclusive
and fragmentary evidence points to the existence of these three desinences as well in various areas of Vojvodina. In addition, Lazarević's language, as the language of the other writers, is notable for its more productive use of the aorist and imperfect tenses and the indefinite adjectival desinences <-a> and <-u> in comparison with the modern literary language. However, the most striking feature is the relatively minor influence of the Slavenserbian morphology on Lazarević's language. With the possible exception of his very restricted use of the three aforementioned desinences characteristic of the Slavenserbian Vojvodinian writers, Lazarević's morphology is free of all the multitude of archaic Slavenserbian desinences and conforms quite closely with the modern literary language codified by Vuk Karadžić, except for the relatively infrequent occurrences of certain dialectal desinences.

Lazarević's two works contain Slavenserbian lexical items, but their number is very restricted. His works also have a number of now archaic syntactic features also characteristic of the works of the Slavenserbian writers. Most of these features resulted from the strong influence of Russian Church Slavonic and to a lesser extent possibly of German and ultimately Latin. It is these syntactic features and the morphophonemic spelling that most distinguish Lazarević's language from the modern literary language.
Although the other Vojvodinian writers' works contain many of the same vernacular and dialectal elements as Lazarević's, their works, even with the later writer Ignjatović, who wrote after Lazarević, are nevertheless written in Slavenoserbian for the most part. Lazarević's two works are among the first to break away to a large extent from the Slavenoserbian tradition and to follow Vuk's edicts for a new literary language.

Lazarević did this at a time of strong opposition to Vuk and his language reforms, especially by the leaders of the Serbian Orthodox Church and other influential leaders and societies.\textsuperscript{1} He no doubt was branded a radical by these members of the society and must have endured a considerable degree of ostracism.\textsuperscript{2} Lazarević precedes by nearly two decades two other Vojvodinian Serbs, Branko Radičević and Đura Daničić, who had considerable influence in bringing about the acceptance of Vuk's reforms. It is highly probable that Radičević and Daničić were acquainted with Lazarević's two works described in this study and may have been influenced and inspired by his novel written in nearly pure vernacular language and using Vuk's reformed alphabet. His novel showed them rich possibilities of expression and lyric beauty of the vernacular language. Had it not been for early supporters of Vuk such as Lazarević, his reforms might never have been accepted as fully as they were or at best their general acceptance may
have been delayed for several more decades after the 1860s. If Vuk had not gained the early initial support that he did, it is entirely possible that his reforms would have been entirely ineffectual and quickly stamped out by the strong opposing forces. It is even conceivable that had this happened, the artificial Slavenoserbrian language, in one form or another, would still be functioning as the literary language of the Serbs today.

The language of other early Vojvodinian adherents of Vuk's reforms also needs to be studied. That early period in Vuk's "struggle" was crucial and needed the support writers like Lazarević extended to him. Lazarević deserves a recognized place in the history of the development of modern Serbocroatian not so much for his contributions as one of the first after Vuk and Vidaković to treat the novel as a literary genre in Serbian literature (see p. 11, note 5 and Ždrale 1973), but as a "maverick" writer who was willing to thrust aside the strong tradition of an artificial, archaic language to lend his support to unpopular reforms at a very early date and to show the literary possibilities of the vernacular Serbian language upon which the modern literary language is based.
Notes to Chapter VI

1 In the very year of the publication of Lazarević's *Plemenita i silna ljubov* (1831) the *Letopis* of Matica Srpska attacked the "evil" Serbian grammars and dictionaries which "were harming the Serbian Church and were leading to destruction" (Pavlović 1953:90).

2 This may account for the fact that Lazarević, for unknown reasons, reverted back to the traditional orthography in his later writings (Dobrašinović 1960:180).
APPENDIXES

Included in the appendixes are illustrative excerpts from Lazarević's writing. Appendix 1 includes photocopied samples of pages from *Plemenita i silna ljubov*. Appendix 2 gives examples from *Odgovor društva dobrodjetelji i mudrošti u Nemačkoj na pitanje društva vjere i Hristianstva u Štokholmu*. Provided also, in Appendix 3, are copies of Lazarević's letters to Vuk Karadžić, written in 1831, reproduced from *Vukova prepiska*, published in Belgrade in 1912.
Appendix 1

Selected Excerpts from Plemenita i silna ljubov

ПЛЕМЕНИТА И СИЛНА
ЉУБОВ
ОД
МИЛОША ЛАЗАРЕВИЋА.

(Edle und mächtige Liebe.)

У ВУДИМУ
Племени Краљ: Свеучилишта Пеуштанског. 1851.
ПРЕДГОВОР.

Славни и изредни грчки Народ, није ни једног Романа у правом смислу имао а Римљани, консу што се Паука пицало, много слабији бил, још мање: јер у време њиховог царовања, овај начин писања још ни позната није био; који је тек у средњем веку од Арапа у Европу донешен, и скоро од свију овдешњих народа примљен био. — II код нас Србања уведен је најрод писања.
ића, и у садашње време Романисе највише пишу. — А шта је по Роман? зашто се код нас сад Романи највише пишу? и какав треба да буде Роман?
Роман је списука преподавајући Појезије, који се с оним бави, што је већ прошло, и ко- 
га је главно намерено карактер опог Народа, за кога се пише, 
описавани и развијани, и ње- 
га не нагло, него мало по мало 
од боље његове душевне било му 
кајве, лечили. Пити пак добро- 
дјешељ какву преподавајући до- 
брим начином њега к њој дра- 
кости. — Измеђ Романа и ју-
начки песама велика је разлика: 
Ове малог у себи чудновати до- 
га.
— о —

gađaja imadu, kao čimpose u na-
shim srpskim junackim pesama
vidi n. n. da bila iz gorice
viins, i borcemese u pomoc do-
če. Da doljene gavranu krvavi
kluinova, i da govoru. A u Rom-
aunu sve sto presnauje, o cem ke-
mo malo nize govorinu.

Romane se onda najvise pi-
shu, kad ljudi vesci sebi zemlje,
di keживинu, predobiju, kad
se u njima razlike vlasini u-
vedu, koje sve u miru i redu
chvaju. Onda Pisanje Romana
izlazi, i ima kaj, karakter
narda oписива i neta po-
pračani. II moje uzrok iho
nashi Srbi saj pisnu Romane: i sto di? u Majorsoj,

* jep
Jer su ovdje između pod krilama svemilosnivog svog Monarha i Imperatora Francu, i u bez-
vednost svog imanja žive, i
glede da svoj um razviju i srce
ukraste. Posađa vremea kosovske
bitke, u vremenu Karadjordje, a
basi i sada kad vrovini kiess Mil-
don Obrenović u Srbiji vlada,
prijavuje naj više junačke
pесме; jer Narod sluša i želi,
da junačkim svojim vladanjem kada
pad sebe obezvedi.

Роман (кога сесирница је и
пилала) као граници Појезије
не ирео да буде роб. Худи Пис
апела, који пише да сам време
брже провео, и да другим пре-
крашит, и који изражује она-
ко-
копе сигарит, с којима ће само у младићу срце разголицанит, и фантизацију у њему разпалити; које иначе друго не значи; него младеж наподигти, да душом блуди, и себе убија. Он преба да различне Епохе човеческог живота у себи садржи; преба да пороке, који у оном веку владају, у ком пише, израља, и на добродјевељ мами. А то најбоље ради, кад једно или два лица узме, и та од детинства њиховог пратећи описивали почне. Одкуда се после и опшир добродјевељ и погрјешка Наци је видини може. Цепина, да у овом мом малом дјелу Милан, Иван и Пепра нису доживили старости, да видимо како бисе
у свима својима годинама, владали: али приповедка она, од које је ово дјелце поштала, тако је низиславала. П запо оно и није прави Роман. — Јасам у њему доказали кинео, да је племенина љубов силна: и кинео сам оправдаши од учили Племаца на мој мили род бачену љагу, да Славени међу којима се и Срби броју, кроме други гнусни и гадни порока, (које је високоувеше Господин Шафарик у свом славном дјелу Geschichte der Slavischen Sprache und Literatur право и красно рефуширао, и за које му Српски род вечно благодари) као што у својом Шпаниспици веле и гроб фин-
Љубов, ј. само скопски љубе;
а за племенину љубов ону искру небесну ништа негада. Из овог малог дјелеца видисе, да је Србији и за чисту и племенину љубов сиворен. — Зар сласна и скопска љубов може бити тако сила? и поспојана? да се од љубимог предмета одлики не може? Зајиста не може, то је благорода и чиста љубов, која само у непоквареним срцама жиле своје ударе, и за коју је само Човек способан, која се зове „једна и та вечна“. — По сопним више од пе љубови чуванисе преба, да она у неприлици и у невреме свој корен не удари. А какоће се беззлености незреле Младежи од пог сачувани моции? Кад је ро-

dips-
дипељи или место њих путори у непреспаном послу уздрже, њој књижине за читаште изберу, и одмор у друштву с великим обзиром уздаду. Младеж пак вођу своју покори војни Роднеља своју у практичком свом животу искусни будући, умеће ји од сваког зла спасавани, и непокварен у зрели возрасни доверени.

У целом овом дјелу назно- сам да по својосни Романа мало пре реченог, Србин српски говори, српскисе плала љ. јеспа држко народу ненаменом туђе обичаје, а будући да се време незна, у ком се овај догађај збито од кога је ово дјелце посматало, по сам га у оно премесило, у које сам за добро судило, а као писање и смео: Но у овом сам сопшт мање опасан морао бити.
пи, што су нрави нашег рода у оном месу једва мало што од своје првобитности изгуби-
ли, дакле једнако они испит и непременути до данас остави. —
Материји чишавој, ни бољи, ни згоднији начин писања, од овог
простог, а од свију данас нај
совршенијег избрани не би мо-
гао; на кога обрачу јер предви
ншло ређи, — дисе од почешка
преписања Азбуке до данас шо-
лико за његову енглијску, и на
пробитачно борило? — Шпиц
је тако испо просит и у краш-
ким слоговима, само што сам
дига у описању раснећег аф-
фекун побудиштити Сцена, и
dihota Природе, испина без
нужде, по навалице децемесежи-
ni пок, Проза дао. Завршива-
јући овај предговор велим, да
сам као Србиши Српски за Србље
1 ** пи
писао, и желим мојим милима младима сродницима и Сродницима да ову књижницу добро разумеду, и да јим ум колико боље развије и срце украси, с једном речи, да ову асну имаду, коју сам ја кад сам писао пред очима имао.

У Земуну 30 Мая 1850.

М. Л.
Сељани овог месна, пород крашу, проспе природе, проспосредачки, богобојажни и усрдни, љубимцу се и нази ли како да је само једно колено било: и предма широки поља и ниска дугачки имали нису; ништа мање, трудом и знојем својим оно мало земљице радећи, полик су добивали, да су задовољно и весело, веселу и обилну јесен дочекивали, и зиму у дружину, пгр и веселу проводили. Међу овим добром људма живио је и наш сопар Радосав, који измањане Сина јединца, коме је било име Милан, и која је он још од колевке како душу сво.

1) Quercus robur, 2) sorbus torminalis. Lina.
Своју љубио, и на његову сваку спо-ну назио; и ако му није знао дапи вестинане по саданшем кроју; он га је ничим мање научио спрау Божију и некреној љубови своји другова и други људи. Младом Милану била је већа обрана од грејева пецина шта: нехели грађачешу чинаве књиге моралне и правила владана. Тело су му боће крепила пренош јела и умереносе, првим штапању и сказању у просној и слободној природи: нехили сад свију зекара нају-чензији преписи, како преба деше рацини и одевши. Стари Радосав пелпашане чедо своје љубови Божијој позившући на висока места С. Писма, обучени: њему је досва било моли-ством "Ове нас" деше своје упу-чини, да јеси Бог, да све што у-живамо од Бога имамо, и да на љубови к Богу осливасе и љубов ко ближњима. — Прав и здрав разум родинеља Миланови, још од млади његови годиница могли су и у де-шепу
шепу такођер превође о прав смисло, без ви-
сока и замрзена натина во спамбави,
ултви. Срце њенове чисто и без сва-
ки прикривања будући, и у чуду је
тако најлакше, једним само при-
мером, без млоги речи, породило.
Безазложен тако дене рашило је и-
грануше другујући са својим малим
суседом Иваном који биоње Син
Драговина. Свегда су скоро зајед-
но били, заједно у пролеће, љуби-
чицу 1), преселицу 2), подолови, а
по брдима, гориштим 3), кукурек 4,
бели новчић 5) браци, и један дру-
гом поклањали. Заједно у лепо ко-
совиће по лугоци пражили, и пра-
вично је међу собом делоти; или у
ниму на пругао крицапаце лапали
и с њима се забалали. По првом
пом цвиовом друговању опек је на
чешно њека урођена сила парави раз-
двајала: тако Милан би се често
запла-

1) Viola martia, 2) Hyacinthus botryside,
3) Adonis vernalis, 4) Hellebor niger,
5) Anemone nemorosa,
заплакао, као би видио да Панаар мао славујке с гњизда прођује, а он не би могао једи избавити. А Пана бисе луцио, као кобац грлицу, коју је из шуме у чиствину одбио био, увашили не би могао. Као би Милан с радосном сужом у очима слушао слушајући умилно певање Славуја, онда би Пана спреду спремао, да на нишан у пог певца згађа. Тако су ова два мала Српчета расцрнала, дешвишено своје де- шивским забавама провођећи, до деветнаесте своје године, као су већ у пуцану, у јашечу коња, и други послови који се одраслицу при- своји, време проводили.

Милан једном са својим другом Панаох одов лов досећи изну недалеко од Космаја, посећи на свој млади рамени пуцке. — Даница је већ пребледила била, и Сунце рано прве своје зраке иза Космаја пуцајући, руменилом својим пастире и пастир- ке опомињало, да за својим белим ста-
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спадом опаду. Сама још заостала под горњом Пентра слушајући миљо Славуја појање, и умилајући на потоку своје крљу и меком наивно лице, око ког се смеђа коса, капо магла кад нијо преко Менеца прелази, расипла. Спас је впитки појасом ушегла, и росну је малђу *) за њега задела.

Из луга излазећи опазе је два верна друга видине је, па јим на њој очи остане, а срца јим из груди настава. Једним гласом повикаше, друже бране! види ли лепо- не девојке? Можели је пи глађеши, да не зажелиш је за љубовцу имани?

„Од како је свеп постапена
Ип је лепши цвећ преламано“.

То решио на девојца приметио екоти дева и задржио како срна од лова."

*) Corydallis bulbosa.
**) Ut vidj ut perfii, Virg. Ecl. VIII.
Љовац преко горе гоњена, пак закликша као из горице виле. „Верни други познаници моји, и не досипа да ме саму запечати, и да вас пунич изневада овамо наведе, како је било по ап и Бог мили знају: не шако Вам препути имени Божија, бежине од мече усамљене девојке, није адем да сама олде с вама будем, а имам и браца Радивоја, који ако чује, да сам с Вама сама била, увапшће тужну мече, везаће ме докле неге Сунца и Месяца, разине меч кано кучку на данцу, и биће покако љушту гују и најгору људију. — Млади ловци незнао љуђи, а једне ређи, већ пођоше преко брда напраг (неко спрођу овог цвета рајског, девојачке безалепости, свако у свом серцу осећа стра и почилање) ћу моћ љу, из лов це пазе, и свак за се о девојци мишљаше, један од другог љубов најаше. У обо је серца Амор спрету дубоко забо, а Мома је обојину како за се обајала. обо.
Сад Милан и Иван један поред другог спану, и једним кораком своје трчање почињу. Један ни је бржи на чешници, али соко под блаком: него ова два уз брдо јунака. Изирва ју заједно трчали, ниси се знађе који је бржи, који пак косији; док један први Иван о камен не запе, а Милан пред њим један корак уписко бјаше. Иван же сток, скоком великом хвеле Милана да спитне; але је јако запишио бја ше; јер је бржи него ветар био, и у њему жуч прелуче. Паде мртав јунак за девојком, паде ли ногом у маче. Паде, љубов га погуби; на остали пресипара бабајку и Мажку.
ку. Милан познајући да му друг Иване већ је изданио; него трчи без обзира, п тек до Пенире доирича, пред њом на колена паде, и обузе је својим жељнима рукама; ал и њега веће силе оснавије, и он клову главом, како цветак, кад му се корен подсеће, и у крило милој Пенири паде, и њему је љушти Амор конац живопис пресеко. Кад по једна Пепра види скочи како влала, косе расплете и замечи да за њима трчи, и да ји сусниче, скочи, нож иза паса трже, на посеље кроз беле груди и сама беби срце прободе. Попече јој крица из неста ра и напоји црну земљицу.

"Те је од ње капља крви пала
Ониће расце смиље и босиље.

4 * Умре
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Умре Пепра и с овим речма о Во- же! саједини мо тао горе с њима, да анђелски поживим — душу своју Богу предаде!

Жалост, туга у свем сељу о- ста, једним гласом свеггорко пла- каше и плачем се иснише.

И плакаше је њека радости *). Ал престарили родитељи плакани немогове, јер у њима срце обумр- ло, пипи за се шио знадоше. О- сприодоше како сви соко без своји- крила, и жељу једну имадоше, да- јим Бог спари њивов живом оконча.

По обичају сарађе ји, и да би овај људи догађај и за позди свем- казували могли, закопају свако ди-

*)) Est quae
dum, cor eru-uptas
је године умрло било, и сваки гроб кретом назначе. Тако први у по
брда креп крет показује гроб Ивана, који је први мртавца, по ком ра-
сте пелец и пойска жалаци, а друга
da крета на вр брда, која је један
спрам другог споје значе гробове
Милана и Петре, по њима се повила
душница 1), стиндак 2), смиље 5) и
босиле 4).

1) Thymus serpillum
2) Caucalis grandiflora
3) Granphalium arenarium
4) Ocymum basilicum.
Appendix 2

Selected Excerpts from Odgovor

ОДГОВОР ДРУШТВА
ДОБРОДЈЕТЕЉИ
и
МУДРОСТИ
у
НЕМАЧКОЈ
на
ПИТАЊЕ ДРУШТВА
ВЈЕРЕ и ХРИСТИЈАНСТВА
у
ШТОКХОЛМУ.
од
М. Л.

(преведено с Немецког.)

* * *
Шкодил Закону (Религији) и друштву људском као два лица различитог пола невентана прописа уредбе законке заједно живе, и колико је ascenpije вештање, него такав непоредан живопи?

Међу различним непоредкама, који се из злоразумљеног слободе чувствова, и из рђаве воље, сваку свезу граждански и морални односенија са себе забацили рађају; одкуда и немарљивост спрођу блага и добро разушени усправа закона произилази, споји без сваке борбе и безбрачије, и промена брака са конкубинатом.

Ми
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Ми овде нећемо опет оно старо
мужење, да се закон вога ма гази, и
да се разправност права укорењава,
pовнораваши; него ћемо само различи-
не умеше, које од безбрачија и не-
наложен конкубината рађају испол-
kовати.

Кад би ми били црковни препо-
ведници и народни учитељи, и кад
би се у нашем заведенију наодили Ђо-
гослови, којима је занат на оружка
науке; онда би ми наш предмет од
стране Закона започели, и погрјеши-
ке безбрачива и конкубинана по Мој-
сеовом на црковном закону изјаснили.
По ми смештамо наше исказање више
од стране моралне и полицијске, на-
дајући да ћемо с ове стране више
асеписи; ако само наш одговор ис-
камо намерење, повраћење и повра-
так к уредности полуци.

Љу
Ништа тако поредак целог со- 
спава друштва човеческог не садр- 
жава, као добро конзеквенција једи- 
них чланова.

Што се од чистије у целој скуп- 
шпини треба да изјави: то строжи- 
ју мора бити у јединим члановима.

Уредбе поредка гражданског 
дружства, кад је испиту од запове- 
дни деспотичког монарха; него 
кад су резултат зрењ описивања 
шипи се добара. Граждани своји пиче, 
немогу већег и бољег намерена има-
ни; него упамети, фразичко, 
полициво и морално благо Гражда-
на. Оне постају благојашни прописе, 
чрез који граждани срећни бивају, и 
који се само добром Конзеквенцијом 
получили могу. Ако је тако, то 
је морало искушено друштво човече-
ско
Ма под уредбама поредка разумевамо: уредбе закона, Морала и државе заједно: јер једна уредба свега из друге прописнице. Тако је уредба Морала прва пропис, из ког се Закон (Религија) са својим уснавља ма развија; а држава је дужна, блага ради своји граждани, сва своја уснављања по уредбама Морала и Закона кројим, или још боље, уредбе државе преба да уредбе Морала и Закона потврде као што најчистија политика заједно и најчистија морал мора бити. — У овом саједињењу Енергије са Консеквенциом се стонисе цело Садржање свију уредбе поредка; уредбе морала и Закона потврдjuјe државна власти, и државни устави јесу цео поредак морални
CCXCVII.

МИЛОШ ЛАЗАРЕВИЋ

1.

Благородни Господине!

Ваши почитајемо писмо од 14-го об. 30х. СМ. Ја вам особито благодарим и даље се препоручујем. Пренумеранте сам ваше таки посло, и моем комисопору наложио, да ји неизоставно да труковати.

Ваши Сава добро учи српски, само ми је јако што често изостаје зато молим вас мало га покарајте.

Ја би сак и вама дошло да се с вама састанем, али верујем да сав најбољи послу.

С особитим почитањем

У Земуну 24. феб. 831.

покорни

Лазаревић.

[Ориг. у арх. С. К. Академије бр. 4088]

2.

Благородни,

Високоучени Господине!

На 114. имена Пренумеранта на моју књигу шаљем вам 150 књига с покором молбом, да би сте учинили милост кокино за Пренумерацију вашу узтребате, да разнађете; а друге Екземиларе да дате разпечати. За 114 Ек. примио сам од вас 14. феб. СЗ1. 25 ф. СМЗ. 30 х. а други пут 10 ф. опет у СМЗ. тако сасвим 35 ф. 30 х. СМЗ. а остаје 21 ф. 30. х. СМЗ. за који Рест вас особито молим да ми што брже адресирајући На мог Шогора Марка Павковића пошлете;
јер мој рђави комисионер мене у дуг баца, а кредитор неће да чека.
На вашу к мени милост осланајући се надам се да ћете моју покорну молбу испунити.
У Земуну 12. Јуна 1831.
Вашег Благородија
покорни слуга
Лазаревић.

Р. С. Ваш Сава сад је много приљежнији него пре, дао сам и катихиесић да пише, у С. Српском језику.
Тако че и я вас покорно молим да новце преко мене пошлете й за оне друге кните ћо више имаде!
Остајем ваш покоран ј

Марко Павкович.

[Споља:] Благородному и високоученом Господину
Врху Стеф. Крашићу
филозофије доктору и многи учени друштива
член: поресон:
У Београд.
[Ориг. у арх. С. К. Академије бр. 4089]

3.

Благородни и
Високоучени Господине!

Нужда ме велика натоци да вашем Благородију с мојом молбом онет досадан будем. Пре три недеље молио сам по-ивно да би ми заоставише новце од Г. Пренумеранта послали милост учинили, и будући да ваше високо звање можда не допустило то таки сиришти: то вас сад при свему закли-најући молим и онет молим да ми тај Рест пошлете; јер ме та моја књига у дуг ували: а Господар Јовановић који имаде љубовь штампарију исплатити, више неће да ме чека: а није ни право. Зато високоблагородни Господине! примите моју нужду к вашем благом срцу, и изволите мне те новце атре-
цањући на мог Шогора Марка Павковића (у канцеларији код истог Г. Алекс. Јовановића) што скорије послати.
У Земуну 14. Јуліја 1831.

Вашег Благородија
покорић слуга
Дазаревић.

Ваш Сава љуби вам руку.

Такође и вас молим да скорим временом повише поштете који чете вам велику любов показати, врбо смо у великој Нужди.

Марко Павкович.

[Смеља као на претходном].

[Ориг. у арх. С. К. Академије бр. 4090]
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