

UDK 811.163.4'36

Pregledni rad

**Vlasta RIŠNER (Osijek)**

Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

vrisner@ffos.hr

**Maja GLUŠAC (Osijek)**

Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

mglusac@ffos.hr

### **GREAT DISSENSION IN THE DESCRIPTION OF MINOR PARTS OF SPEECH – PREPOSITIONS AND ADVERBS IN CROATIAN NORMATIVE LITERATURE**

In this paper, the authors compare the lack of uniformities in the descriptions of prepositions and adverbs in the present-day Croatian normative literature and determine what caused the dissension. Special attention is paid to the mutual relation between adverbs and prepositions, i.e. to the discerning of these two parts of speech. Dissension of normative descriptions is observed in particular in the dictionary definitions of the parts of speech of prepositionalized instrumentals that are determined either as adverbs or as prepositions, or not mentioned in a separate entry. There is also a comparison of grammatical and lexicographical descriptions of the words *prije*, *poslije*, *blizu*, *bliže*, *niže*, *više*, *oko* i *okolo* which, depending on the sentence context, can belong to two parts of speech – adverbs and prepositions. The paper suggests that the determination of the appurtenance of a particular word to one of the groups of minor parts of speech requires various criteria to be taken into account.

Key words: *prepositions, adverbs, normative literature, Croatian language*

## 1. Introduction

In the grammar books from the past centuries adverbs were not described along with the prepositions, nor were both these parts of speech explicitly defined as *minor*. In Bartol Kašić's grammar book as "the fundamental initial effort in the field of Croatian linguistics"<sup>1</sup>, adverbs are placed next to verbs in the second part of the book, whereas prepositions, together with conjunctions and interjections, were placed into the third part as *small parts of the statement* (Kašić 1604 [2002]: 357). In more recent grammars<sup>2</sup> words are also defined differently in distinguishing between semantic and synsemantic words – adverbs were defined as semantic words and prepositions as synsemantic words. However, what seems clear in setting up criteria and classification of adverbs and prepositions as parts of speech with specific categorical meanings into groups, becomes questionable in concrete lexicographical, and partially also in grammatical descriptions of particular words. Prepositions are frequently determined as adverbs, which is especially obvious in the description of prepositionalized instrumentals. Since the determinations of particular parts of speech as adverbs and/or prepositions are intertwined and in some dictionaries and grammar books even neglected, in this paper both adverbs and prepositions are considered as *minor* parts of speech. A more elaborate definition of the syntagm *minor words* can be found in the book by Ivo Pranjković (2013) who sets out from the classification of words into words without full meaning or synsemantic words and words with their own full meaning or semantic words and thus, based on the necessary relation of a preposition with one of the case forms of a nominal word, he speaks of syntactic synsemanticity of prepositions and relates adverbs to a number of open questions – from the very definition, over the determination of adverbs as changeable part of speech by some grammarians, to a different relation between semanticity and synsemanticity in particular groups of adverbs. Because of this diversity, some adverbs are in some normative descriptions equalised with adjectives and in most grammars they are not discerned from modal words, also called sentence adverbs, which are also determined as particles. The necessity to reconsider the existing classification of parts of speech has also been discussed by B. Tafra (2005: 99-114) who points out the transformation as a grammatical and lexicographic problem and concludes that "morphological criterion [ought to] be combined with other criteria" (Tafra 2005: 112)

---

<sup>1</sup> The first more significant treatise about Kašić's grammar book was written by R. Katičić (1981: 5-129) after the grammar book was reprinted. The quotation is taken from the treatise (Katičić 1981: 5).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Barić & al. (1997: 99), Silić, Pranjković (2005: 39).

This paper's goal is to indicate the inconsistencies of criteria applied in the description of the mentioned parts of speech by comparing these descriptions in Croatian normative literature, and to point at the differentiation of complex and multi-member prepositions from prepositional phrases, prepositional government and determination of parts of speech produced by transformation. Descriptions of adverbs and prepositions are compared in the following grammar books and dictionaries: *Hrvatska gramatika* (Barić & al. 1997), *Praktična hrvatska gramatika* by Dragutin Raguž (1997), *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta* by Josip Silić and Ivo Pranjković (2005), *Glasovi i oblici hrvatskoga književnog jezika* (Babić & al., 2007), *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika* published by Leksikografski zavod and *Školska knjiga* (hence forward: *RHJ*), *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika* by Vladimir Anić (hence forward: *Anićev rječnik*), *Školski rječnik hrvatskoga jezika* by Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje (hence forward: *Školski rječnik*) and *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga standardnog jezika* by Školska knjiga (hence forward: *VRH*). There is also a comparison of the descriptions of prepositions and adverbs in current usage manuals, in particular in *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik* (Barić & al. 1999).

## 2. Prepositions and Adverbs in Grammar Books and Dictionaries

The study of adverbs as a part of speech in Croatian linguistic literature reveals a striking heterogeneousness causing many inconsistencies in their description, and it can be concluded that this is a consequence of the multifunctional nature of adverbs because of which various criteria are used in their description. Difficulties with the determination of adverbs as part of speech, as well as their discerning from other parts of speech begin already with the definition of adverbs in *Hrvatska gramatika* in which they are determined as “words that are added to other, usually semantical words in order to define them more closely” (Barić & al. 1997: 273). Since there is no mention of their unchangeability, they are not even demarcated from adjectives. In relation to the (un)changeability of adverbs in *Hrvatska gramatika* there is also the inclusion of adverbs into the group of changeable or partially changeable words because of the equalisation of semanticality with changeability, where adverbs are defined as semantical words along with nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns and verbs.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The causes of changeability of adverbs are also explained by the comparability of adverbs, whereby the definition of compared forms is imprecise, so that adverbs are considered both as changeable and unchangeable part of speech: “Each one of such adverbs can be considered as a separate word, and they can also, as it is sometimes done in dictionaries, be regarded as different forms of one and the same word; e.g. *brže* is described as comparative of

In Croatian grammar books, adverbs are described according to their qualification as changeable or unchangeable parts of speech, as well as depending on whether they are regarded as synsemantical or semantical parts of speech, according to their meanings, syntactic function and formation, whereby various criteria are being used. The methodology of description of a particular part of speech generally does not require the analysis of its relation towards some other part of speech although there have been such approaches as well: “The distinction between *poslije* (*after*) as preposition and as an adverb: *Poslije svih nespোরazuma postignuti su dogovori* [*After all misapprehensions agreements were reached.*](preposition) – *Dogovorili su se tek poslije* [*They haven’t agreed until after.*] (adverb). In the quoted sentence, an object (*poslije čega* = *after what*) is indirectly comprised with the adverb. The same applies for the preposition and adverb *prije* (*before*).“ (Barić & al. 1999: 189) In the mentioned explanation, two grammatical levels are being mixed; adverb as a part of speech is determined according to the morphological level, whereas an object is a part of the sentence organisation and therefore belongs to the syntactical level. Furthermore, even if the adverb in the said example is considered in the role of an adverbial of time, i.e., if we equalise the grammatical levels, the explanation still remains incorrect because objects and adverbials are included into the organisation of the sentence following the grammatical and lexical characteristics of the verb, i.e., the adverbial is inserted depending on the predicate.

Various criteria can be used in distinguishing adverbs from prepositions: distributional (adverbs accompany verbs and prepositions are used with an oblique case), syntactical (an adverb plays the role of a sentential part, whereas a preposition alone can not have such a role), semantical (an adverb has its own independent meaning, it answers questions for adverbs), accentual (an adverb carries its own accent). For example, in *Hrvatska gramatika* the difference between adverbs and prepositions is explained by means of the distributional criterion according to which the adverb/preposition is determined depending on the part of speech with which it is used: “Derived prepositions also include words that are used both as adverbs (with verbs) and as prepositions (with nouns).“ (Barić & al. 1997: 278) In *Glasovi i oblici hrvatskoga*

---

*brzo*, *najmanje* as superlative of *malo*, *dalje* as comparative of *daleko*.“ (Barić & al. 1997: 274) In *Gramatika bosanskoga jezika* (Jahić, Halilović, Palić 2000: 295-296) adverbs are also determined as unchangeable words, but it is pointed out that some adverbs are in fact changeable because they can be compared. In Croatian grammar books compared forms of adverbs are explained by their formation from the same form of the adjective in the neuter gender, and the possibility to compare adverbs is also rejected from the point of view of economy of the grammatical description. More about the topic in: Glušac (2012)

*književnog jezika* it is only mentioned that particular adverbs in a sentence may function as prepositions (Babić & al. 2007: 560). The difficulties in determining parts of speech are justified by the manner of creation of particular prepositions, i.e. by transformation. The accentual criterion is applied only by D. Raguž: “Basically, prepositions have no accent. The exception are longer prepositions with adverbial meanings or those with adverbial origin (*nasuprot, nadomak, unatoč, poslije, prije* etc.).“ (Raguž 1997: 118)

Along with various criteria according to which some grammarians differentiate parts of speech the mentioned explanations also include some “questionable” statements. The problem occurs in the determining and distinguishing of a new role of a particular word from a new part of speech.<sup>4</sup> Since the correct determination of a part of speech (adverb or preposition) also depends on the context, i.e. on the function in the sentence, and since outside of that context these words are both adverbs and prepositions, the assertions in which prepositions are described as adverbs “in a prepositional role” (Babić & al. 2007: 560), or in which adverbs are said to be prepositions “that have an adverbial meaning” (Raguž 1997: 118) or that can behave as adverbs (Raguž 1997: 130) can be considered as questionable. Similar solutions can also be found in the analysed dictionaries: for example, in Anić’s dictionary, as well as in *VRH*, *umjesto* is described as follows: „1. *prep* (with G) indicates that whatever it expresses has been replaced with something else (*došao je ~ nje-ga*); *mjesto*, *namjesto* [instead of] 2. (in *adv.* function with conjunctions *da, što*) indicates that one action, situation or the like has been replaced with another (*~ da radi, on se odmara*).“ Thus the description of one headword – which is a preposition – also describes an adverb.

Difficulties with normative descriptions of prepositions arise from the inconsistency in determining of the part of speech for a part of grammaticalized prepositions formed by transformation, in determining of the affiliation of a preposition to a specific case, as well as in drawing the line between prepositional phrases and prepositions. In modern Croatian language combination with different cases is used in the description of the preposition *prema* and of a part of the prepositions that are used with dative i genitive. Thus D. Raguž (1984: 103) says for the prepositions *nasuprot, suprot, nadomak, unatoč* and *usprkos* that “they are persistently prescribed with the dative case only by grammarians, although, in spite of all the efforts of language editors, these prepositions quite often steal through into the genitive case, especially in the spoken language (...) of which evidence can also be found in dictionaries.“

<sup>4</sup> B. Tafra (2005: 160) warns that even lexicographers sometimes make no distinction between the part of speech and its new role.

Furthermore, it must be pointed out that the mentioned prepositions are not found in all language manuals, which raises another question in their description: what is the criterion for the recording of stylistically marked words, first of all archaisms, in contemporary Croatian dictionaries? To show the presence or absence of particular prepositions in modern Croatian language, we have also compared the contemporary Croatian materials by examining the *Croatian National Corpus* (*Hrvatski nacionalni korpus*).

The following sections of the paper bring a comparison of the descriptions of adverbs and prepositions in contemporary dictionaries. According to the ways in which these two parts of speech intertwine, their descriptions in dictionaries can be classified in several groups: 1 – prepositions (which can not function as adverbs in any context); 2 – items that, depending on the context, function either as adverbs or as prepositions; 3 – items that are primarily prepositions but that are also mentioned as belonging to adverbs. The paper also examines the justification of the uneven preferment of a particular part of speech in dictionaries and points out the need to harmonize the citation of the primary parts of speech in relation to their etymology.

## 2.1 Prepositions and/or Prepositional Phrases

The lists of prepositions in Croatian grammar books are uneven partially due to the differences in understanding the structure of prepositions and prepositional phrases. Difficulties arise because of the fundamental understanding of prepositions that are in traditional descriptions identified with one word, whereas contemporary linguists more and more frequently consider stable prepositional phrases as prepositions as well<sup>5</sup>. Problems are further augmented by the difference in joint and separate writing of common combinations of prepositions and nouns, which is based on the understanding of whether coalescence has or hasn't been executed. Accordingly, groups of words are described as prepositions or as prepositional phrases. In Academy's grammar, for example, *u ime* is not considered as a preposition although authors point out its use in figurative sense ('at the expense of'). Expressions like *na dohvat*, *na domak* are also written separately and they are not considered as prepositions with the remark: "The boundaries of a part of speech in transformation are very vague so that some words can be accounted for in different ways." (Babić & al. 2007: 560), although in further text *nadohvat* and *nadomak* (each written

<sup>5</sup> Cf. for example the papers of V. Švačko and I. Matas Ivanković, and among grammarians the description in *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* by J. Silić and I. Pranjković.

as one word) are found as well, but even then they are not classified as prepositions: “If writing were considered, there would be more compound prepositions, *nădohvat* (*nadòhvat*), *nădomak* (*nadòmak*), *năkrāj*, *pòtkrāj*, yet they are today not regarded as prepositions but as connections of a preposition and a noun.” (Babić & al. 2007: 563) On the other hand, words such as *dovrh*, *svrh* and *uvrh*, *nadno* and *udno* are considered as prepositions – in these examples the concerned meaning is considerably more obvious, and grammaticalization has not been fully carried out (cf. *nadno mora* and *na samo morsko dno*).

## 2.2 Preposition *prema* – Dative and/or Locative

Comparison of normative literature normative literature confirms that the preposition *prema* is described as a dative preposition (Silić, Pranjković 2005: 221), locative preposition (Barić & al. 1997: 279) or as simultaneously a dative and locative preposition<sup>6</sup>, and these differences in description are caused by the impossibility to distinguish the forms of the preposition due to the dative-locative syncretism of modern new-štokavian endings. The preposition *prema* is described as belonging to both these cases in *Glasovi i oblici*, as well as in Raguž’s grammar (1997: 137-138), in which it is suggested that “it is difficult to always know exactly when *prema* is used with dative, and when it is used with locative, i.e., when the case form used with *prema* is that of dative, and when that of locative.” However, Raguž identifies *prema* as a dative preposition when it indicates directivity and orientation towards something, and as a locative preposition when it designates a position at the opposite side, comparison, a circumstance and a criterion (Raguž 1997: 138, 151-152). Nevertheless, the meaning criterion used by Raguž is insufficient – which is confirmed by the descriptions of the use of the preposition *prema* in the rest of the literature.

## 2.3 Prepositions *nasuprot*, *suprot*, *nadomak*, *unatoč*, *usprkos* – Dative and/or Genitive

In the consulted Croatian grammar books there is a group of prepositions whose agreement with a certain case has changed in the course of the last two, 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>, centuries. There have also been some replacements of lexical units or changes in their frequency. The reasons for this vary from normative changes through which, for example, the prepositional phrase *proti* + *D* as a feature of the Zagreb Philological School was replaced by the phrase *pro-*

<sup>6</sup> More about the preposition *prema* in Rišner 2009: 357-395.



*tiv* + G characteristic for Croatian followers of Vuk Karadžić, to intralingual changes: some dative prepositions go to genitive which, as the Croatian case with most new, secondary prepositions, helps in the creation of free dative. Such dative stands opposite to the preposition-marked locative. It should be noted that in contemporary Croatian grammar books and dictionaries different prepositions are at the same time defined as dative and genitive prepositions, and the governments of these two cases attached to the prepositions frequently do not match.

The linking of the prepositions *nasuprot*, *suprot*, *nadomak*, *unatoč* and *usprkos* with genitive instead of the previously preferred dative, which took place in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, is connected with the differences between the norm and the actual usage: although language advisers prescribe the above prepositions to be used with the dative case<sup>7</sup>, actual usage more and more frequently confirms their connection with genitive. In the compared contemporary Croatian grammar books cases used with the prepositions *nadomak*, *nadohvat*, *nasuprot*, *unatoč* and *usprkos* are defined differently; in most cases, with explanations, these prepositions are said to agree both with genitive and dative. D. Raguž (1997) describes *nadomak*, *nasuprot*, *unatoč* and *usprkos* as “dative prepositions with a tendency towards genitive”<sup>8</sup>, J. Silić and I. Pranjković (2005) suggest that *usprkos*, *unatoč*, *naprama* are used both with genitive and dative, and with some prepositions they also give stylistic and normative determinants: genitive with the preposition *spram* (*naspram*) is “rare and marked” (Silić, Pranjković 2005: 217), preposition *protiv* with dative, “if it ever occurs, is today highly uncommon” (Silić, Pranjković 2005: 223), *nasuprot* (*usuprot*) “is frequently used with genitive as well although the norm prescribes its usage with dative.” (Silić, Pranjković 2005: 218)

These two grammatical descriptions and lists differ from those in *Hrvatska gramatika* and *Glasovi i oblici* because *Hrvatska gramatika* (Barić & al. 1997: 277-280) does not register the possibility of both genitive and dative government for any of the listed prepositions; instead, *nadomak*, *nasuprot*, *proti*, *unatoč*, *usprkos* and *uprkos* are tied with dative, and *protiv* with genitive. There is no mention of the prepositions *usuprot*, *suprot* and *spram*. *Glasovi*

<sup>7</sup> For example, in the language manual *Govorimo hrvatski* it is said: “Unfortunately, it is not rarely heard that typical dative prepositions: *suprot*, *nasuprot*, *unatoč*, *usprkos* are used in front of genitive – *unatoč lošeg rezultata*, *usprkos velikih pritisaka*, *nasuprot Banskih dvora*, instead of the correct forms *unatoč lošem rezultatu*, *usprkos velikim pritiscima*, *nasuprot Banskim dvorima*.” (Dulčić ur. 1997: 366) *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik* (Barić & al. 1999.) also prescribes that the prepositions *nasuprot*, *unatoč* and *usprkos* are to be used exclusively with dative.

<sup>8</sup> In *Praktična hrvatska gramatika*, Raguž does not mention *usuprot* and *uprkos*, whereas *proti* and *suprot* are described as archaisms.



*i oblici* (Babić & al. 2007: 558-566) bring most archaisms and discuss the rare usage of some prepositions including *napram*, *naprama*, *naspram*, *naprema*, *suprot*, *usuprot*. However, rare usage is not fully equalized with stylistic markedness: “They are rarely used (...) but they can be used even today both in a stylistically neutral meaning or as only slightly stylistically marked.” (Babić & al. 2007: 562) The preposition *proti* is said to have become rare in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, whereas in the 19<sup>th</sup> century it was used quite frequently. The prepositions mentioned in the list with a particular case or cases include: with G: *naspram(a)*, with D: *proti*, *nasuprot*, *usuprot*, and with both G and D: *nadomak*, *protiv*, *spram*, *sprama*, *suprot*, *uprkos*, *usprkos*, *unatoč*. In *Glasovi i oblici* it is pointed out that *protiv* and *spram(a)* are common with genitive, whereas with dative they are used “only exceptionally”. In all other contemporary grammar books compared in this paper, these two prepositions are described only as genitive prepositions, unlike *unatoč*, for which *Glasovi i oblici* (Babić & al. 2007: 565) states: “Preposition *unatoč* usually agrees with dative, and only exceptionally with genitive”.

Prepositions for which the grammar books descriptions of genitive and dative government are uneven or which are defined as being used both with genitive and dative are shown in a table comparison of contemporary Croatian dictionaries:

Table 1.

	<i>RHJ</i> ( <i>Dictionary of the Croatian Language</i> )	Anić's Dictionary	Školski rječnik ( <i>School Dictionary</i> )	<i>VRH</i> ( <i>Great Dictionary of Croatian Language</i> )
<b>nadomak</b>	preposition (example s D)	<i>nadomak</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>nadomak</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition (+ G)	preposition (+ G, D)	preposition (+ G, D)
<b>nadohvat</b>	preposition (example s D)	<i>nadohvat</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>nadohvat</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition (+ G, D)	preposition (+ G, D)	<i>nadohvat</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>nadohvat</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition (+ G, D)
<b>nasuprot</b>	<i>nasuprot</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition (example with D) <i>nasuprot</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb	<i>nasuprot</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>nasuprot</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition (+ D, G – <i>colloquial</i> )	preposition (+ D)	<i>nasuprot</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>nasuprot</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition (+ D, G)

<b>usuprot</b>	<i>usuprot</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>usuprot</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition (the example is with D)	<i>usuprot</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>usuprot</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	preposition (+ D), <i>archaic</i>	<i>usuprot</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb, <i>archaic</i> <i>usuprot</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition (+ D), <i>archaic</i> [ <i>Protivnici stadoše usuprot.</i> ]
<b>suproč</b> *	-	-	-	preposition, <i>bookish, archaic</i>
<b>suprot</b>	-	preposition (+ G, D)	-	preposition (+ G, D), <i>bookish</i>
<b>protiv</b>	preposition (examples with G)	<i>protiv</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition (+ G) <i>protiv</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb [ <i>biti ~ čega, koga</i> ]	preposition (+ G)	preposition (+ G)
<b>spram</b>	preposition, <i>raz. prema</i>	preposition (s G, rarely with D)	preposition, <i>archaic</i>	preposition (+ G)
<b>unatoč</b>	preposition (the example is with D)	preposition (no case indication, the example is with D)	preposition (+ D)	preposition (no case indication, the example is with D) - functions as adverb [ <i>cijelom svijetu unatoč</i> ]
<b>usprkos</b>	preposition	preposition (+ D i G, <i>razg.</i> ) and adverb [ <i>~ teškoćama</i> ]	preposition (+ D)	<i>usprkos</i> = <i>uprkos</i> preposition (+ D)

Dictionary descriptions are characterised by the following features:

1. Determination of the parts of speech is uncoordinated and hence the citation of one or more entries is uneven as well.

2. Examples in some dictionaries do not confirm the mentioned parts of speech – adverbs or prepositions. For example, *unatoč* is in *VRH* determined as a preposition, but it is also said that it can function as adverb, which is exemplified by the expression *cijelom svijetu unatoč* [*the whole world in spite*], where *unatoč* is a preposition in postposition. In the same dictionary, *usuprot* is determined both as an adverb and a preposition, and its prepositional use is exemplified by the sentence *Protivnici stadoše usuprot*. Criteria for

\* The table also contains the preposition *suproč*,

distinguishing adverbs and prepositions are particularly vague in Anić's dictionary which does not observe the fundamental syntactic principle for determining prepositions as a part of speech: it disregards the connection with the nominal word in the prepositional phrase. Thus *usprkos* is said to be an adverb in the example *usprkos teškoćama*, and *protiv* is determined as an adverb in the expression *biti protiv čega, koga*.

3. Articles mostly bring information about the case of the nominal word with which the preposition is used; an exception is *RJH* in which cases are not mentioned but they can be guessed from the examples.

4. A comparison of the cases used with a particular preposition shows that *RJH* keeps the older norm and with *nadomak*, *nadohvat*, *nasuprot*, *usuprot*, *unatoč* and *usprkos* it only brings nominal words in dative, whereas on the other side there is Anićev rječnik (Anić's dictionary) which confirms the penetration of the conversational language and which registers both genitive and dative with all mentioned prepositions with the exception of *unatoč*, with which there is no information about the case. The same applies even for the preposition *spram*.

5. Various stylistic and normative guidelines are being put forward<sup>9</sup>; prepositions are defined as bookish, archaic and colloquial. For example, the preposition *spram* is in *RJH* defined as colloquial, whereas the search results for the materials in *Hrvatska jezična riznica* confirm its appearance in literary texts of the 19<sup>th</sup>, but also of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries.<sup>10</sup> Since the subcorpus of printed materials in *Riznica* contains a great number of examples, even the normative determination as *archaism* in *Školski rječnik* is not fully confirmed. *VRH* also brings the forms *suprot* (which is also found in Anić's dictionary) and *suproč*. Although both are defined as bookish, and *suproč* is also marked as archaism, the criteria for their selection are not clear.

## 2.4 Prepositionalized Accusatives and Instrumentals in Grammar Books and Dictionaries

Prepositionalized accusatives and instrumentals came into existence through transformation or conversion. They are treated differently in grammars and dictionaries, which can be connected with the fact that they originated in different times. Prepositionalized accusatives were already described by grammarians of the Zagreb School and by Croatian Vukovians, and eight

<sup>9</sup> In *Školski rječnik* (2012: XVI) archaisms, regionalisms and colloquial words are mentioned as normative determinants.

<sup>10</sup> The books subcorpus contains 877 examples, many of which are found in the works of contemporary Croatian authors (e.g. N. Fabrio, G. Tribuson, I. Vrkljan and others).

words formed in that manner (*čelo, dno, duž, kraj, mjesto, put, sred, vrh*) are also mentioned in *Hrvatska gramatika* (Barić & al. 1997: 278), in the grammar book written by J. Silić and I. Pranjković (2005: 243) and in *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik* (Barić & al. 1999: 180–195). Grammaticalized noun *dno* functioning as a preposition is mentioned neither in D. Raguž's grammar book nor in *Glasovi i oblici*, and of all consulted dictionaries preposition *dno* is recorded only in *RHJ*, in which it is regarded as an archaism. Besides the preposition *dno*, *Školski rječnik* also doesn't mention *put, vrh* nor *čelo*. Preposition *čelo* is marked as an archaism both in Anićev rječnik, and in *VRH*. It is strange, however, that Anić considers the preposition *sred* as colloquial.

Preposition that came into existence through the transformation of instrumentals are described in different ways in contemporary Croatian normative literature. Their descriptions reach from complete negation of their prepositionality in *Glasovi i oblici* and *Tvorba riječi* by S. Babić, where nouns or adverbs are mentioned<sup>11</sup>, over a different description of particular nominal instrumentals in dictionaries (where some examples are also determined as adverbs), to the description of most prepositionalized instrumentals as prepositions (in Silić-Pranjković's grammar book and in *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik*). Dictionaries record grammaticalized instrumentals, but as parts of speech they determine them unevenly, frequently as adverbs, as shown in the following table:

<sup>11</sup> Although in *Glasovi i oblici* prepositionalized instrumentals are put before nouns in prepositional phrases (*diljem domovine, početkom veljače...*), they are declared to be nouns: "Although such usage is very close to prepositions, they are still not prepositions but nouns." (Babić & al. 2007: 560) In *Tvorba riječi* some of these instrumentals are recorded as well, but without the nominal word. In the group of examples, which are also defined as nouns, there are both prepositions and adverbs: "Instrumental of nouns is frequently used with prepositional meaning so that some of these are already considered as prepositions: *časkom, časom, dijelom, greškom, početkom, pomoću, povodom, razom, redom, silom, skokom, srećom, srkom, šapatom, šaptom, širom, tijekom, trkom, većinom, zorom...*" (Babić 1986: 506). It is impossible to determine the part of speech for all mentioned words without a context.

Table 2.

	<i>RHJ</i> ( <i>Dictionary of the Croatian Language</i> )	<i>Anićev rječnik</i> ( <i>Anić's Dictionary</i> )	<i>Školski rječnik</i> ( <i>School Dictionary</i> )	<i>VRH</i> ( <i>Great Dictionary of Croatian Language</i> )
<i>diljem</i>	preposition	adverb [~ domovine]	adverb [~ domovine]	adverb [putovati ~ domovine]
<i>krajem</i>	-	preposition	adverb [~ stoljeća]	adverb [~ godine/stoljeća]
<i>početkom</i>	-	adverb [~ godine]	adverb [~ godine]	adverb [~ godine/stoljeća]
<i>polovicom</i>	-	adverb (~ godine)	-	-
<i>polovinom</i>	-		-	-
<i>prigodom</i>	preposition	adverb	preposition	preposition
<i>prilikom</i>	preposition	adverb [~ zdravice]	preposition	preposition
<i>tijekom</i>	adverb [~ života]	preposition	preposition	preposition
<i>tokom</i>	adverb → <i>tijekom</i>	preposition	-	-

In all compared contemporary dictionaries only the instrumental *povodom* is mentioned and determined as a preposition, and not rarely grammaticalized instrumental is determined as adverb, and exemplified by a prepositional phrase in which it is obvious that, as a preposition, it requires and binds to itself a nominal word in genitive. Thus, for example, in *Anićev rječnik* *prilikom* is determined as an adverb for which the phrase *prilikom zdravice* is used as an example. There are many discrepancies in dictionaries between examples and determinations of parts of speech; for example, in the expression *početkom godine* the preposition *početkom* is in all dictionaries where it is mentioned determined as an adverb (of all compared dictionaries it is not mentioned only in *RHJ*).

With prepositionalized accusatives the situation is different: their usage is not growing but it is rather being reduced, especially in the words in which the referential meaning of nouns remained visible even in their prepositional use so that the desemanticization is smaller. Hence the lexical meaning of nouns *dno*, *čelo*, *put* and *vrh* limits the field of usage, and thus also reduces the frequency of homonymous prepositions formed by transformation. *Hrvatski nacionalni korpus* (*Croatian National Corpus*) contains no record of items

*vrh*, *dno* and *čelo* used as prepositions, which could lead to the conclusion about their omission from contemporary Croatian dictionaries<sup>12</sup>, or about the stylistic determinants suggesting their archaicity.

The comparison shows that lexicographers should take a look into computer materials, which is in modern language facilitated by three existing corpora<sup>13</sup>, when they are including or omitting a preposition from the dictionary of contemporary Croatian language, or when they provide normative and stylistic determinants. In that case, the determinant *razgovorno* would also be based on examples, which, for example, is not the case with the preposition *sred*, which is defined as such in Anićev rječnik<sup>14</sup>.

## **2.5 Blizu, niže, više, okolo, širom, poslije and prije – Adverbs and Prepositions**

Depending on the sentence context *blizu*, *niže*, *više*, *okolo*, *širom*, *poslije* and *prije* may be both prepositions and adverbs, but in normative literature they are primarily considered as adverbs, which can also be observed from the description of their formation through prepositionalization of adverbs (Babić & al. 2007: 559; Barić i dr 1999).<sup>15</sup> Since they are primarily adverbs, these words should in dictionaries be first determined as that part of speech, and only then as prepositions. However, comparative descriptions in four dictionaries of the Croatian language show a lack of uniformity. The following table with dictionary descriptions brings all words that are in any of the compared grammar books or dictionaries described simultaneously as adverbs and prepositions.

<sup>12</sup> *RHJ* differs from other dictionaries because it mentions all eight prepositionalized accusatives and, as parts of speech, determines them as prepositions.

<sup>13</sup> Three Croatian corpora, *Hrvatska jezična riznica*, *Hrvatski nacionalni korpus* and *hrWac 2.0*, are explicitly mentioned as materials for *VRH*.

<sup>14</sup> The preposition *putem* is determined as colloquial in several dictionaries; it is assumed that the lexicographers were guided by normative remarks about the necessity to replace this preposition with an instrumental (as, for example, in *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik*, 1999: 192), but it should be pointed out that *putem* is also frequently used in the language of administration in expressing means or manner (e.g. *putem medija* – *by means of/through media*). The problem is discussed in more detail in: Rišner 2016: 240.

<sup>15</sup> In *Jezični savjetnik s gramatikom* (Pavešić ed. 1971: 385) it is expressly said that *okolo*, *blizu*, *van*, *širom*, *više*, *niže*, *prije*, *poslije* are in fact adverbs. In the language manual *Govorimo hrvatski* (Dulčić ur. 1997: 372) N. Koharović also points out that *poslije* “in the Croatian language is primarily an adverb” and that even “Croatian lexicographers Mikalja, Della Bella, Stulli put its adverbial meaning in the first place.”

Table 3.

	<i>RHJ</i>	<i>Anićev rječnik</i>	<i>Školski rječnik</i>	<i>VRH</i>
<i>blizu</i>	<i>blizu</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>blizu</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	<i>blizu</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>blizu</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	<i>blizu</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>blizu</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	<i>blizu</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>blizu</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition
<i>širo</i>	<i>širo</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>širo</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	<i>širo</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>širo</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	adverb [putovati ~ domovine] [~ otvoriti vrata]	<i>širo</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb [otvoriti širok vrata] [putovati širok zemlje] <i>širo</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition [širok Zemlje]*
<i>poslije</i>	<i>poslije</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>poslije</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition <i>colloq.</i>	<i>poslije</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition <i>poslije</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb <i>poslije</i> <sup>3</sup> – conjunction with the word <i>nego</i>	<i>poslije</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>poslije</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	<i>poslije</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>poslije</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition
<i>prije</i>	<i>prije</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>prije</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	<i>prije</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition <i>prije</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb	<i>prije</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>prije</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	<i>prije</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>prije</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition
<i>više</i>	<i>više</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>više</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	<i>više</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition <i>više</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb	<i>više</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>više</i> <sup>2</sup> – particle <i>više</i> <sup>3</sup> – preposition	<i>više</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>više</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition
<i>niže</i>	preposition → <i>ispod</i>	<i>niže</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition <i>niže</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb	-	<i>niže</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition <i>niže</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb
<i>oko</i>	<i>oko</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition <i>oko</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb	<i>oko</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition <i>oko</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb	<i>oko</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>oko</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	<i>oko</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>oko</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition
<i>okolo</i>	<i>okolo</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>okolo</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition	adverb (amplified) v. <i>oko</i>	<i>okolo</i> <sup>1</sup> – adverb <i>okolo</i> <sup>2</sup> – preposition v. <i>oko</i>	<i>okolo</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition → <i>oko</i> <i>okolo</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb
<i>mimo</i>	preposition	preposition	preposition	preposition
<i>pored</i>	preposition → <i>po-kraj</i> **	preposition	preposition → <i>blizu, kod, kraj, pokraj, uz</i>	preposition
<i>usprkos</i>	preposition	preposition and adverb	preposition	preposition

\* The tables do not bring all of the examples for the use of entries that are given in the dictionaries.

\*\* A part of the normative literature recommends the replacement of the preposition *pored* with the preposition *pokraj*



Only *blizu* and *širom* are in all consulted dictionaries primarily determined as adverbs and then as prepositions. However, aberrations are found in the description of the adverb *širom* in two dictionaries: in *Školski rječnik*, as well as in *VRH*, adverb *širom* is accompanied by examples *putovati širom domovine* and *putovati širom zemlje* in which *širom* is a preposition, and not an adverb.

In three dictionaries *poslije* is first described as adverb, and then as a preposition; only in Anićev rječnik it is first described as a preposition and then as an adverb, as well as a conjunction in combination with the word *nego*. There are also differences in normative annotations: in *RHJ* the preposition *poslije* is considered as a characteristic of the colloquial style. There is also a similar situation with *prije* and *više* – only Anićev rječnik first describes the prepositions *prije* and *više*, and then the same adverbs. The greatest aberration is found in the comparison of determinations of the preposition/adverb *niže*. In Anićev rječnik and in *VRH* it is first described as a preposition, and then as an adverb, in *RHJ* it is only described as a preposition, and in *Školski rječnik* it is not described at all. *Mimo*, *pored*, *usprkos*, *oko* and *okolo* can be both adverbs and prepositions (cf. Barić & al. 1997: 278), but it is not possible to give a precise account of their origin, i.e., of the primary part of speech. For example, *okolo* is described as an adverb from which the preposition was formed through prepositionalization (Babić & al. 2007: 559), which is also corroborated with dictionary descriptions: in three dictionaries it is in the first place described as an adverb and then also as a preposition. Yet, in *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik* it is described as an “archaic preposition” (Barić & al. 1999: 187).<sup>16</sup> In compliance with this description is also the definition in *VRH* where the preposition *okolo* is mentioned in the first place with a reference to the preposition *oko*, and it is followed by the adverb *okolo* in the second place. Descriptions of the adverb/preposition *oko* are divided as well: in *RHJ* and Anićev rječnik it is first described as a preposition, and then as an adverb, whereas in *Školski rječnik* and in *VRH* the order of descriptions is reversed, they first mention the adverb and then the preposition. *Mimo*, *pored* and *usprkos*, for which *Hrvatska gramatika* (Barić & al. 1997: 278) states that they can be both prepositions and adverbs, are in all four dictionaries described only as adverbs. Only Anićev rječnik describes *usprkos* in the second place also as an adverb, but within the same entry.

It can be concluded that primary affiliation to a particular part of speech is not a criterion that is strictly followed by contemporary Croatian lexicographers.

<sup>16</sup> The origin of the preposition *okoli*, which has evolved into the prepositions *okolo* and *oko*, is described as a result of the merging of the preposition *o* and locative of the noun *kolo* (Gluhak 1993: 329; Skok 1988: 127)

## 2.6 *Do, po, osim* – Adverbs and/or Prepositions?

In contemporary Croatian normative literature there is also no unified determination of the part of speech for prepositions *do*, *po* and *osim* – of all compared grammar books, these words are only in *Hrvatska gramatika* also considered as adverbs: “Words *do*, *po*, *osim* are also used as adverbs although they are much more frequently used as prepositions, e.g. *Od zgrade ne osta do temelj. Vratit će se do nekoliko dana. Po nekoliko dana nije dolazio kući. Išao je korak po korak. Morao sam tovariti vreću po vreću.*” (Barić & al. 1997: 276) This is also confirmed in dictionaries: in all four compared dictionaries *do* is primarily a preposition (in *RHJ* and in *Školski rječnik* it is only described as preposition), whereas in *Anićev rječnik*,<sup>17</sup> and in *VRH*, it is also described as adverb:

Table 4.

	<i>RHJ</i>	<i>Anićev rječnik</i>	<i>Školski rječnik</i>	<i>VRH</i>
<i>do</i>	preposition	<i>do</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition <i>do</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb exception; only, exclusively [ <i>nitko ~ ja</i> ] approximation; <i>oko</i> , <i>otprilike</i> [ <i>~ dva metra</i> ] cause [ <i>to je ~ hrane</i> ] pleonasm, language of literature, usually in expression: [ <i>~ dva ~ tri puta</i> ]	preposition	<i>do</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition 6. indicates that something is exempted from something [ <i>ne osjećati ništa do tuge</i> ] → <i>osim</i> <i>do</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb a) approximation [ <i>do dva metra</i> ] → <i>oko</i> , <i>otprilike</i> b) cause [ <i>To je do hrane. To stoji do mene.</i> ] c) exception [ <i>Nitko do ja. Majci ništa preče do djeteta.</i> ] d) pleonasm [ <i>Do dva, do tri puta.</i> ]

The comparison of the mentioned dictionary descriptions of the adverb *do* with the dictionary and grammar book descriptions of the preposition *do* shows complete semantical overlaps – all four meanings (including a pleona-

<sup>17</sup> In *Anićev rječnik* preposition *do* is incompletely described, only three of its meanings are mentioned: 1. place in the immediate vicinity of which the movement ends (*~ zemlje*) 2. contiguity; kraj, uz (*~ prozora*) 3. margins of the verbal action in the sense of marginal immediacy (*doći do zida*).

sm as a stylistic feature) used in dictionaries to describe the adverb *do* are in the grammar books associated with the preposition:

1. Adverb *do* in the meaning of the exemption (*samo, jedino*): *Nitko do ja. Majci ništa preče do djeteta.* (Anić; VRH)

The meaning of exemption which is in VRH illustrated with the adverb *do* (*majci ništa preče do djeteta.*) is congruous with the meaning of exemption which is in that dictionary illustrated with the preposition *do* (*ne osjećati ništa do tuge*). *Do* is considered as a preposition also in the examples with the same meaning in *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik: nema nikoga do sina jedinca* (Barić & al. 1999: 180), as well as in the grammar book by J. Silić and I. Pranjković (2005: 206): *Nismo jeli ništa do kruha i vode.*, with an annotation that such expressions are stylistically marked in modern Croatian language.

2. Adverb *do* in the meaning of approximation (*oko, otprilike*): *do dva metra* (Anić, VRH)

Although the meaning of approximation is not described in the grammar book by J. Silić and I. Pranjković, the preposition *do* is described by i. Pranjković (2001: 28) on the basis of examples (*pa on kupi*) *do tri tone blaga*; he speaks about the *prepositional subcase* metronal which is used to indicate a measure, but also points out that such expressions are characteristic for oral epic poetry.

3. The meaning of cause: *To je do hrane. To stoji do mene.* (Anić, VRH)

Causal meaning of the preposition *do* is explained by Raguž (1997: 123) on the examples *Nije to do mene. To nije do hrane.*, suggesting that such expressions are more frequent in conversation and as style reserve.

4. Pleonasm (of the language of literature): *Do dva, do tri puta.* (Anić, VRH)

As a specific characteristic of oral folk creation J. Silić and I. Pranjković (2005: 206) describe the preposition *do* used with numbers, e.g. *Pa ga čeka do dva do tri dana.*, with the annotation that in such expressions the preposition *do* actually functions as some sort of an amplifying particle (intensifier)“.

Unlike the preposition *do* which is in dictionaries also described as an adverb, *po* is in all four consulted dictionaries described only as a preposition. With the exception of *Hrvatska gramatika* (Barić & al. 1997: 276) *po* is in similar usage considered as a preposition: for example, J. Silić and I. Pranjković (2005: 227) state that the preposition *po* may be used in front of numerals, i.e. in front of indeclinable quantity expressions in accusative phrases of measure; although they do not give an example similar to that in *Hrvatska gramatika* (*po nekoliko dana nije dolazio kući*), their example can be explained by means of the mentioned meaning of measure in a prepositional phrase with an indeclinable quantity word. Two other examples (*korak po korak; vreću po vreću*)

are in the language manual *Govorimo hrvatski* described by means of the meaning of distribution, and *po* functions as a preposition: *Djeca ulaze dvoje po dvoje*. (Dulčić ur. 1997: 391).

Of the four observed dictionaries, only Anićev rječnik determines *osim* as an adverb as well, with the meaning 'izuzimajući' ('with the exception of') and as an example it gives the clause *druži se sa svima osim s njim*. However, in Anićev rječnik the meaning of exemption is also illustrated with the preposition *osim*: *svi osim njega, sve je znao osim pjevati*:

Table 5.

	<i>RHJ</i>	Anićev rječnik	<i>Školski rječnik</i>	<i>VRH</i>
<b><i>osim</i></b>	<i>osim</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition <i>osim</i> <sup>2</sup> – conjunction in connection with <i>što</i>	<i>osim</i> <sup>1</sup> – preposition 1. in the meaning of exemption [ <i>svi ~ njega, sve je znao, ~ pjevati</i> ]; <i>izuzev, izim</i> 2. in the meaning of inclusion [ <i>~ leksikografa na projektu rade i drugi stručnjaci</i> ]; <i>uz, pored</i> 3. <i>archaic</i> in the meaning 'izvan' (outside of) [ <i>biti ~ kuće</i> ] <i>osim</i> <sup>2</sup> – adverb in the meaning 'izuzimajući' [ <i>druži se sa svima ~ s njim</i> ]; <i>samo, jedino</i> <i>osim</i> <sup>3</sup> – conjunction in connection with <i>što, ako, da, kad</i> forms compound conjunctions or conjunction phrases that connect sentences by limiting, narrowing the content of the main clause	preposition	preposition exemption from something association, adding to someone 3. used as conjunction in the connection <i>osim što</i>

Although in *Hrvatska gramatika* (Barić & al. 1997: 276) it is said that *osim* can also be an adverb, no example is provided that would support its adverbial use. A similar situation is found in *Praktična hrvatska gramatika* by D. Raguž; *osim* is described as a preposition (*Ne treba mi ništa osim ovoga.*), but there is also the following remark: "In the same positions *osim* also behaves as an adverb, which means that it is then followed by the nominative case: *Ne treba mi ništa osim ovo.*" (Raguž 1997: 129-130) When *osim* is in question, S. Težak also mentions the case as the indicator of the part of speech: "As a preposition it is always congruent with genitive: (...), and as an adverb it stands in front of nouns that are not in genitive, and in tandem with conjunctions, most frequently with *ako* and *što*." (Težak 1999: 271) Determination of *osim* as an adverb is examined by I. Matas Ivanković who believes that such determination may be supported by the fact that in some examples *osim*

may be replaced with the past participle *izuzevši* or by the present participle *izuzimajući* and that *osim* introduces an adverbial. However, she also concludes that there are several reasons that negate the affiliation of the word *osim* to adverbs as a part of speech: “Nevertheless, *osim* does not answer adverbial questions (...), it does not give a closer explanation of another word (...) and, unlike adverbs that can be omitted from the sentence still keeping the sentence grammatically correct (although some semantical definitions are lost – *Pjesma je lako pamtljiva*. → *Pjesma je pamtljiva*.; ...), *osim* can not be omitted from the sentence without rendering the sentence structurally incomplete.” (Matas Ivanković 2005: 90-91)

### 3. Conclusion

Prepositions are considered a “very limited set of words” (Babić & al. 2007: 560), but the comparison of their lists in normative literature, as well as of stylistic and normative determinants relating to them indicate the need to check the criteria for their determination as a part of speech. Observing the morphosyntactic criteria according to which the grammaticalized form of noun in front of a nominal word as determinant is considered as a preposition would lead to an increase in the number of prepositions in dictionaries and grammar books, and also, for example, instrumentals in expressions *diljem domovine*, *krajem stoljeća*, *tijekom života* would no longer be determined as adverbs. It can also be concluded that a group of prepositions as synsemantic words, but also of adverbs as semantic words, require the checking of the criteria for affiliation of words to a particular part of speech, as well the checking of the definitions of parts of speech themselves. One of the reasons for the existing mess is certainly the mixing of syntactic and morphological or morphosyntactic criteria – if a word is in the function of an adverbial it is instantly determined as an adverb, regardless of the fact that it is a part of a prepositional phrase. Furthermore, there are quite a few problems connected only with prepositions, where prepositions are considered in the sense of traditional descriptions in which they are equalised with one word, whereas in the opinion of contemporary linguists, prepositions also more frequently include prepositional phrases that do not allow the insertion of attributes between their constituent parts. Some differences in the normative literature are related to orthography as well, so that prepositions or prepositional phrases are described with respect to the way in which they are written, i.e. whether the common combinations of prepositions and nouns are written together or as separate words, depending on whether based on whether their coalescence has or has not taken place.

### Literature:

- Anić, Vladimir. 2004. *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Novi Liber.
- Babić, Stjepan. 1986. *Tvorba riječi u hrvatskome književnome jeziku*. Zagreb: HAZU, Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Babić, Stjepan; Brozović, Dalibor; Škarić, Ivo; Težak, Stjepko. 2007. *Glasovi i oblici hrvatskoga književnoga jezika*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Babić, Stjepan; Brozović, Dalibor; Škarić, Ivo; Težak, Stjepko. 2007. *Glasovi i oblici hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Barić, Eugenija; Hudeček, Lana; Koharović, Nebojša.; Lončarić, Mijo; Lukenda, Marko; Mamić, Mile; Mihaljević, Milica; Šarić, Ljiljana; Švačko, Vanja; Vukojević, Luka; Zečević, Vesna; Žagar, Mateo. 1999. *Hrvatski jezični savjetnik*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Pergamena, Školske novine.
- Barić, Eugenija; Lončarić, Mijo; Malić, Dragica; Pavešić, Slavko; Peti, Mirko; Zečević, Vesna; Znika, Marija. 1997. *Hrvatska gramatika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Dulčić, Mihovil ur. 1997. *Govorimo hrvatski. Jezični savjeti*. Zagreb: Hrvatski radio, Naklada Naprijed.
- Gluhak, Alemko. 1993. *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Zagreb: August Cesarec.
- Glušac, Maja. 2012. "Prilozi kao vrsta riječi u hrvatskoj jezikoslovnoj literaturi". *Proceedings of the Fifth Slavistic Congress held in Rijeka from 7<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> September 2010*, Vol. I, Filozofski fakultet, Rijeka, pp. 405-413.
- Jahić, Dževad; Halilović, Senahid; Palić, Ismail, 2000. *Gramatika bosanskoga jezika*. Zenica: Dom štampe.
- Katičić, Radoslav. 1981. Gramatika Bartola Kašića. *Rad JAZU* 388. Zagreb. 5-129.
- Kašić, Bartol. 1604. *Institutionum linguae Illyricae libri duo*. Reprint and translation of the original: *Osnove ilirskoga jezika u dvije knjige*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb. 2002.
- Matas Ivanković, Ivana. 2005. „Osim – riječ bez valencijskih ograničenja“. *Filologija* 44, 85-98.
- Pavešić, Slavko ur. 1971. *Jezični savjetnik s gramatikom*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Pranjković, Ivo. 2001. *Druga hrvatska skladnja*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Pranjković, Ivo. 2013. *Gramatička značenja*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Raguž, Dragutin. 1984. „S kojim se padežom slaže prijedlog *prema*?“. *Jezik* 31/4, 97-108.

- Raguž, Dragutin. 1997. *Praktična hrvatska gramatika*. Zagreb: Medicinska naklada.
- Rišner, Vlasta. 2009. „Prijedlog prema između dativa i lokativa“. *Jezični varijeteti i nacionalni identiteti, Prilozi proučavanju standardnih jezika utemeljenih na štokavštini*. Ur. L. Badurina, I. Pranjković, J. Silić. Zagreb : DISPUT d.o.o. za izdavačku djelatnost, 357-375.
- Rišner, Vlasta. 2016. „Jezik medija kao s(t)jecište različitih stilova“. *Jezik medija nekada i sada*. Proceedings of the conference held on 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> June 2014. Zagreb, Osijek: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku, pp. 236-262.
- Rišner, Vlasta; Glušac, Maja. 2011. *Kroz mijene i dodire publicističkoga stila*. Osijek: Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku.
- *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, 2000. ur. J. Šonje. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, Školska knjiga.
- Silić, Josip; Pranjković, Ivo. 2005. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Skok, Petar. 1988. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Zagreb: JAZU.
- *Školski rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, 2012. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Školska knjiga.
- Tafra, Branka. 2005. *Od riječi do rječnika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Težak, Stjepko. 1999. *Hrvatski naš (ne)zaboravljeni*. Zagreb: Tipex.
- *Veliki rječnik hrvatskog standardnog jezika*. 2015. ed. Lj. Jojić. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

### Sources:

- *Hrvatski nacionalni korpus*: <http://www.hnk.ffzg.hr/>; last accessed on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2016
- *Hrvatska jezična riznica*: <http://riznica.ihjj.hr/index.hr.html>; last accessed on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2016



**Vlasta RIŠNER & Maja GLUŠAC**

**VELIK NESKLAD OKO OPISA *MALIH* VRSTA RIJEČI – PRILOZI I  
PRIJEDLOZI U HRVATSKOJ NORMATIVNOJ LITERATURI**

U radu se uspoređuju neujednačenosti opisa priloga i prijedloga u suvremenoj hrvatskoj normativnoj literaturi te utvrđuju razlozi pojave nesklada. Osobita se pozornost pridaje međusobnom odnosu priloga i prijedloga, odnosno razlikovanju tih dviju vrsta riječi. Nesklad se normativnih opisa uočava osobito pri rječničkim određenjima vrste riječi poprijedloženih instrumentala koji se određuju kao prilozi, kao prijedlozi ili se pak ne navode u posebnoj natuknici. Uspoređuju se i gramatički i leksikografski opisi riječi *prije, poslije, blizu, bliže, niže, više, oko i okolo koje*, ovisno o rečeničnom kontekstu, mogu pripadati dvjema vrstama riječi – prilozima i prijedlozima. U radu se pokazuje kako pri određivanju pripadnosti pojedine riječi kojoj od skupina *malih* vrsta riječi u obzir treba uzeti različite kriterije.

Ključne riječi: *prijedlozi, prilozi, normativna literatura, hrvatski jezik*