# (UN)REDUCED INFINITIVE AND ROMANCE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH ČINITI 'MAKE' AND ZA 'FOR' + INFINITIVE IN THE MONTENEGRIN WRITTEN LANGUAGE (1714–1828)

MILOŠ KRIVOKAPIĆ[1]

**Abstract.** In the Montenegrin written language of the 18th and first three decades of the 19th century we can see a number of constructions of foreign origin. Reduced and unreduced infinitive, Romance construction with činiti 'make' and za 'for' + infinitive are used. Most of these constructions are due to a strong influence of their spoken idiom, Montenegrin dialects and to a lesser extent the Italian language (for the za 'for' + infinitive construction). Just as words taken from Italian, the Romance constructions have long since settled in Montenegrin dialects and became their inseparable element. Military cooperation of Montenegro and the Venetian Republic had a direct influence on the language of Montenegrin rulers' representatives. Hence, za 'for' + infinitive Romance construction went from their communication to the language of diplomatic correspondence of Montenegrin rulers during that time and became its inseparable part.

**Keywords:** infinitive, lexical complement, syntactic complement, present tense with the conjunction *da* 'to', the construction *za* 'for' + infinitive, intentional sentence, cause.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the Montenegrin written language dating from the eighteenth and the first three decades of the nineteenth century, the infinitive was used as a lexical and syntactic complement, very rarely independently. As a complement, present tense with the conjunction *da* 'to' was used instead of the infinitive. The infinitive of the verbs want, can, and have, when making complex predicates[2], often served as a complement. The infinitive was rarely used with other incomplete verbs. Romance constructions were also present in the Montenegrin written language of the eighteenth century, with *činiti* 'make' with the meaning of the imperative *order*, but to express intentions, as well as *za* 'for' + infinitive which was used instead of a purpose clause, but showing cause and goal.

[1] University of Montenegro, krivokapicmilos@yahoo.com.

[2] Complex predicat is one which consists verb of incomplete meaning and a verb in present tense or infinitive: *đaci žele da uče* (verb with incomplete meaning + present tence with conjuction *da* 'to'), *đaci žele učiti* (verb with incomplete meaning + infinitive) 'students want to learn'.

RRL, **LXV**, *1*, p. 37–48, Bucureşti, 2020

**BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei**
**Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)**

## 2. THE INFINITIVE USED AS A SYNTACTIC AND LEXICAL COMPLEMENT

In the letters of Serdar and Governor Radonjić, dating from the 18th and the first three decades of the 19th century, the infinitive was used primarily as a complement[3], both syntactic and lexical, rarely independently. Instead of the infinitive, Radonjić used the present tense with the conjunction *da* 'to' as a complement.

The infinitive[4], an impersonal and undetermined verbal form, is a verbal noun by origin, indicating verbal action in the most neutral way unlike other verb forms (Piper *et al.* 2005: 470).

In the letters of Serdar and Governor Radonjić[5] (1714–1828), the infinitive was used as a lexical and syntactic complement, quite rarely independently[6]. Much more frequently, the infinitive is used rather as a complement of verbs of incomplete meaning, than with phrases including nouns, adjectives, and adverbs of incomplete meaning.

**2.1.** The impersonal usage of the verb valjati 'should' is complemented by the infinitive when the infinitive is used as the second part of a complex predicate, as evidenced by the following examples:

1) *valja* *je* *obedit* [MNE]
should.MOD to be.F.3SG accused falsely.SH.INF
'she should be accused falsely' (VIP12)

2) *valja* *čekati* odluku i osvetu
should.MOD wait.INF decision.OBJ.ACC and revenge.OBJ.ACC
gospocku [MNE]
Lord.POSS.ADJ
'the decision and revenge of the Lord should be awaited' (VIP13).

In contemporary language the infinitive and the present tense with the conjunction *da* 'to' are both used with the impersonal form of the verb *valjati* 'should' as a complement (Stevanović 1969: 581, 735), which was the case in the letters of Radonjić, while in the

[3] Infinitive is used as lexical complement of the auxiliary verb *htjeti* 'will' for example: *Ona će otputovati sjutra* 'She will travel tomorrow'; as complement of the verbs with incomplete meaning for example: *Treba skuvati ručak* 'The lunch should be cooked'. When it is used as a complement it has the same meaning as if present tence with conjunction *da* 'to' was used for example: *Moraš gledati ovaj film* and *Moraš da gledaš ovaj film* have the same translation: 'You have to watch this film'.

[4] Infinitive is a simple tence which refers to an action or state, but it does not specify neither face, nor time nor the way of completing the action, for example: *govoriti* 'to say', *imati* 'to have', *peći* 'to bake'. The infinitive alone cannot be predicate in the sentence.

[5] Examples are taken from the doctoral thesis Krivokapić 2009 (Milos Krivokapić, "Language in the letters of Serdar and Gubernator Radonjić", Faculty of Philosophy, Novi Sad, 2009. The examples cited include the following abbreviations: VI-priest and Serdar Vuko Radonjić, S-Serdar and Governor Stanislav (Staniša) Radonjić, VII-Governor Vukale (Vukolaj) Radonjić, J-Governor Jovan Radonjić, VIII-Governor Vukolaj Radonjić, P-letter).

[6] Infinitive is used as a subject in the sentence when the action is given a certain attribute, description etc. For example: *Čitati knjige je korisno* 'Reading books is useful'. When used in this context it appears independently, for example: *čitati* 'to read' and as main member of the subject phrase, for example: *čitati knjige* 'reading books'.

BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)

language of Bishop Peter I (Ostojić 1976: 233–235) and in some Montenegrin dialects (Miletić 1940: 558) only the infinitive was used[7].

"In contemporary language, the infinitive can be used with verbs that can cause modification of other verbal action. It is undoubtedly a step forward in the development of this relationship. After all, the original relationship could be complicated due to the parallel use of sentences with *da* 'to' + the present tense and the infinitive, and when replacing the infinitive with a sentence with *da* 'to' + the present tense" (Belić 1999: 465–466). The use of the present tense with the conjunction *da* 'to' as a complement, instead of the infinitive used in the letters of Radonjić, is noted in the following examples:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3) | ne valja | da | mu | se omrazimo | [MNE] |
| | should.NEG.MOD | that | him.DAT | hate.REFL.PRS.1PL | |
| | 'we should not make him hate us' (VIP13) | | | | |
| 4) | valja | da | otgovorimo | | [MNE] |
| | should.MOD | to | reply.PRS.1PL | | |
| | 'we should reply' (SP20) | | | | |

It can be seen that the present tense construction in the second and third example is not a syntactic equivalent to the infinitive, because in order to be able to use the present tense with the conjunction *da* 'to' as a complement, it has to be accompanied by the reflexive word *se* '*oneself* ' to make the form impersonal. Only in this case, without changing the meaning and syntactic relationships, can the present with the conjunction be used as a complement instead of the infinitive (Stevanović 1969: 34).

**2.2.** As a complement, when part of a complex predicate, the infinitive of the verbs *htjeti* 'want', *moći* 'can', *imati* 'have' is often noticed:

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5) | ište | | ni | paša | da mu | što |
| | want.MOD.PRS.3SG | | us.DAT | pasha | to him.DAT | something.OBJ |
| | damo | i | hoćemo | | mu dati | vraga [MNE] |
| | give.PRS.1PL | and | will.PRS.1PL | | him.DAT give.INF | devil.OBJ.ACC |
| | 'pasha wants us to give him something, and we do not want to give him anything' (VIP9) | | | | | |
| 6) | hoće | doći | | glavari | u | nedelju [MNE] |
| | will.MOD.3PL | come.INF | | chiefs.SUBJ | on | Sunday |
| | 'chiefs want to come on Sunday' (VIP10) | | | | | |
| 7) | hoćemo | ti | pogodit | što | | uzmožemo [MNE] |
| | will.MOD.1PL | you.DAT | negotiate.SH.INF | something | | can.PRS.1PL |
| | 'we want to negotiate what we can' (VIP19) | | | | | |

[7] "Also the infinitive is found in literature and in those Montenegrin dialects in which the present tense with the conjunction *da* 'to' is used more frequently" (Ostojić 1976: 234).

BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)

8) guvernadura Lazarovića ne hoće sudom
governor.OBJ.ACC Lazarovic.PS.N will.NEG.MOD.PRS.3SG court.INS
otgovorit [MNE]
change mind.SH.INF
'The court will not make Governor Lazarovic change his mind' (SP4a)

9) ovo hoćemo obslužit [MNE]
this.OBJ will.PRS.1PL handle.SH.INF
'we want to handle this' (SP19)

10) hoće kupit svu Crnu Goru [MNE]
will.MOD.PRS.3SG buy.SH.INF all.ACC Montenegro.OBJ.ACC
'he wants to buy all of Montenegro' (SP25)

11) hoću se između ovijeh kabadahijah
will.MOD.REFL.PRS.1SG between these.GEN arrogant people.GEN
izmaći [MNE]
pull out.INF
'I want to escape from these arrogant people' (SP28)

12) ne hoće molit [MNE]
will.NEG.PRS.3SG pray.SH.INF
'he does not want to pray' (SP35)

13) ne imam o čemu služit [MNE]
have.NEG.PRS.1SG about what.DAT serve.SH.INF
'I have nothing to serve' (VIP7)

14) što ima dat [MNE]
what.OBJ.ACC have.PRS.3SG give.SH.INF
'what does he have to give' (SP37)

15) imam dati istijema vašijema suditima [MNE]
have.PRS.1SG give.INF same.DAT yours.DAT arbiters.DAT.PL
'I have to give to your arbiters' (JP1)

16) imam davati i ot vašijeh suditah
have.PRS.1SG give.INF and from yours.GEN arbiters.GEN.PL
skužavati, a i vašem preuzvišenstvu imam
receive payback.INF also and your.DAT eminence.DAT
have.PRS.1SG
platiti [MNE]
pay.INF
'I have to give and receive payback from your arbiters, and I have to pay to your eminence' (JP1)

17) ne možemo nać žive [MNE]
can.NEG.PRS.1PL find.SH.INF alive.OBJ.ACC
'we cannot find those who are alive' (SP3)

18) ma se nigda ne mogu ukanit [MNE]
PTCL REFL.1SG nowhere can. NEG.PRS.1SG make.SH.INF
'cannot make myself do it' (SP13)

19) to ja podnijet ne mogu [MNE]
that.OBJ.ACC I.SUBJ handle.SH.INF can.NEG.PRS.1SG
'I cannot stand that' (SP20)

BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)

20) ma ne možemo su manje dat na
PTCL can.NEG.PRS.1PL with less give.SH.INF on
znanje [MNE]
knowledge.OBJ.ACC
'we cannot make it known with less words' (SP24)

21) ma već trpijet ne možemo [MNE]
PTCL already handle.SH.INF can.NEG.PRS.1PL
'we already cannot tolerate this' (SP30)

22) što im se može dogodit [MNE]
what them.DAT REFL can.MOD happen.SH.INF
'what can happen to them' (SP42)

23) ne mogu se domisliti u čemu
can.NEG.PRS.1SG think of.REFL.INF in what.LOC
sam sagriješio [MNE]
sin.PFV.1SG
'I cannot think of what I have sinned' (SP43)

24) mogu hodit đe hoće [MNE]
can.MOD.PRS.1SG go.SH.INF where want.PRS.3PL
'I can go wherever they want' (VIIP1).

As the above examples show, the infinitive of the verb want has the meaning of wish or not wish. "The infinitive with the present tense of the verb want used in the meaning of wish, intend or to be ready sounds archaic nowadays, while in the works of the writers of earlier centuries, as well as in folk literature, the present tense of the verb want used with this meaning was often complemented by the infinitive"[8]. However, the present tense of this verb, especially in modern language, is more often complemented by the tense that carries a pronounced modal meaning, i.e. the present tense, rather than the infinitive" (Stevanović, 1969 :578). In the presented examples the infinitive verb have is used as an impersonal verb should, which is the case in the language of Peter Petrović I (Ostojić 1976: 234).

**2.3.** The construction with *činiti* 'make', which is "treated as an Italianism" (Mladenović 1973: 78), is very frequent in the language of Andrija Zmajević (Pižurica 1989: 367), and is also noticed by A. Mladenović in its imperative meaning /to order/ in the language of Bishop Danilo and the Letters from Ceklin, from the second half of the 18th century (Mladenović 1973: 178; 1972: 56). Considering that, construction *činiti* 'make' + Infinitive is a calk (direct translation) of construction fare + infinito (costruzione fattiva): *činiti probavit vino* (fare digerire il vino) 'make the vine digest', *činiš vidjeti* (farsi vedere) 'make you be seen' (Županović 2008: 42-44), *činiti misliti* (fare parere) 'make an opinion' (Machiedo 1981:93), *činiti živjeti* (fare sussistere) 'make living' (Deanović 1933: 43), etc. In the letters of Radonjić, this construction is also present, but in the sense of expressing the intention to achieve something, as evidenced by the following examples:

[8] This is witnessed by numerous examples found in RJA: *A meni ne hoće dat pomoć u muci ljuveni* 'And they do not want to help me when in trouble' (D. Ranjina); "*Tako svak ureda hoće bježat, a ne umije* 'Thus, everyone wants to flee, and cannot do that' (I. Gundulić *et al.*)" (Stevanović 1969: 579).

BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)

25) i tu životinju činiti vratit [MNE]
and that.OBJ animal.OBJ.ACC make.SH.INF return.SH.INF
'make that animal return' (VIP18)

26) i naše plate činit imati [MNE]
and our salaries.OBJ.ACC make.SH.INF have.INF
'make us have our salaries' (SP6)

27) činimo naplatiti njegov dug [MNE]
make.PRS.1PL collect.INF his.OBJ debt.OBJ.ACC
'we are making an effort to collect his debt' (SP23)

28) činit ubit [MNE]
make.SH.INF kill.SH.INF
'make someone killed' (SP14)

29) sve činit donijet u moju kuću [MNE]
all make.SH.INF bring.SH.INF in my house.ACC
'make it all brought to my house' (SP27)

30) činit vratit životinju [MNE]
make.SH.INF return.SH.INF animal.OBJ.ACC
'make the animal return' (SP33)

31) nastojim činit vratit [MNE]
try.PRS.1SG make.SH.INF return.SH.INF
'I am trying to make it return' (SP35)

Other than in this construction, the meaning of having an intention is noticed in the example[9]:

30) idemo tužiti se [MNE]
go.PRS.1PL press charges.REFL.INF
'let us go to press charges' (SP19)

**2.4.** Infinitive with other verbs is rarely used as a complement in the letters of Radonjić[10]:

31) ne smijemo ot njih doći [MNE]
must not.PRS.1PL from them.GEN come.INF
'we are not allowed to return from them' (VIP2)

32) ne umijemo vi ništa iznova kazat [MNE]
know.NEG.PRS.1PL you.DAT.PL nothing.OBJ again tell.SH.INF
'we do not know how to tell you anything again' (VIP3)

33) iznova vi ne umijemo što pisat [MNE]
again you.DAT know.NEG.PRS.1PL something.OBJ write.SH.INF
'we do not know how to write you something again' (VIP6)

[9] In this case we do not have a calk *činiti* 'make' + infinitive (fare + infinito) but verb *ići* 'go' with infinitive.

[10] Compare Footnote 4 and 6.

BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)

34) počeo ostavljati oganj [MNE]
start.SH.PFV.M.3SG leave.INF fire.OBJ.ACC
'he started to leave the fire' (SP28)

35) dokle ne počne muka dohodit ot snijega [MNE]
until start.NEG.PRS.3SGdifficulty.SUBJ come.SH.INF from snow
'until the difficulty begins to come because of snow' (SP43)

In addition to these verbs in modern literary language, apart from the infinitive, the present tense with the conjunction da 'to' is used (Stevanović 1969: 732–733), which does not apply to the verb want when it is at the beginning of a sentence, while the infinitive is more frequent in today's Montenegrin dialects (Miletić 1940: 59–561; Pešikan 1965: 206), and the same applies to the language of Radonjić and Bishop Petar I (Ostojić 1976: 234).

In the infinitive + infinitive construction, a reduced form of the infinitive to show purpose is registered more often[11]:

36) činit vratit [MNE]
make.SH.INF return.SH.INF
'to make return' (VIP18, SP23, SP35)

37) činit ubit [MNE]
make.SH.INF kill.SH.INF
'to make kill' (SP14)

38) činit donijet [MNE]
make.SH.INF bring.SH.INF
'to make bring' (SP27)

and also:

40) znati izgubiti [MNE]
know.INF lose.INF
'know how to lose' (SP19)

41) nastojati ugasiti [MNE]
try.INF extinguish.INF
'try to extinguish' (SP26)

42) nastojati vratit [MNE]
try.INF return.SH.INF
'try to return' (SP26)

These examples show that the reduced infinitive *činit* 'make', but also the non-reduced one *nastojati* 'try', are used in the meaning of intentions, and their semantic equivalent is the present tense with the conjunction da 'to'.

[11] Compare Footnote 2.

BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)

## 3. THE *ZA* 'FOR' + INFINITIVE CONSTRUCTION

The construction za 'for' + infinitive, according to Rešetar 1952: 93; Brajković 1893: 21; Gabrić-Bagarić 1984: 164[12] is taken from the Italian language and is used instead of intentional sentences. Mladenović says that the use of the infinitive in this construction today by a number of authors is explained by the influence of non-Slavic languages (Italian and German)[13]. This construction is a calk of Italian construction per + infinito: *za dobit* (per ottenere) 'for getting', *za moći proći vrime* (per poter passer tempo) 'for to can pass the time' (Županović 2008: 42–44), etc.

**3.1.** "Analysts examining the language of writers from the Northern region believe that the *za* 'for' + infinitive construction is a Germanism, and those who describe the language of writers from the southern region consider that it is a borrowing from Romance languages. A small group of linguists consider this construction to be Romance-Germanic, seeing the influence of both"[14]. Herta Kuna believes that the construction *za* 'for' + infinitive in the language of Dositej Obradović was "inspired by the influence of reading in: German, Italian, and French" (Kuna 1970: 111). B. Ostojić points out that "for the first time the connection *za* 'for' + infinitive was recorded in 1198 in the eastern areas of Serbo-Croatian language territories (Monumenta serbica, 4). The connection was later noted in the south, in a record from 1407 (Monumenta Serebica 2,59), as well as in many vernacular dialects, not only the southern ones gravitating towards Italy but northern and central dialects too". Ostojić stresses that this structure in the language of old Serbian writers, in the times of Vuk, and both before and after his time, cannot be of foreign influence, but it came into the language from vernacular languages, in most cases, and supported by the influence of literary tradition, declaring that this construction is seen as a Balkanism (Ostojić 1985: 125). These opinions show that there are obvious differences among linguists when it comes to this construction. Some argue that the construction *za* 'for' + infinitive is a Germanism, others see it as taken from Romance languages, the third group believes it is of Germanic-Romance origin, and the fourth one claims that it is a Balkanism. The thesis that this structure is taken from vernacular languages and that, in addition, it is a Balkanism, does not stand in the case of Radonjić, neither of the bishops of the Petrović dynasty, because old Montenegrin dialects (therefore, the dialect of Njeguši too) never knew this construction. Except for the very rare instances in Crmnica[15], the case is the same with other Montenegrin dialects. It is known and widely used by Bishop Danilo (Mladenović 1973: 177–178) and Bishop Peter I (Ostojić 1976: 238), as well as by Njegoš, while it was not registered by A. Mladenović in the language of Bishop Visarion Borilović (Mladenović 1977: 1–42).

Historical facts confirm that in the time of Visarion Bishop, who was an advocate of cooperation with Venice direct military, political and every other cooperation of Montenegro

[12] Gabrić-Bagarić say that it is a 'typical syntactic Italianism' (Gabrić-Bagarić 1984: 164).

[13] Mladenović says that the origin of foreign language influence should be explained, for example, on the speech of Zmijanje (Mladenović 1973: 178).

[14] Some authors are precise and point out that this is an Italianism, others say that the aforementioned relationship came under the influence of the French language, while others point out that this phenomenon entered the language of writers from the German language (Ostojić 1985: 125).

[15] In the Speech of Crmnica, *za* 'for' + infinitive is interpreted as an Italianism (Miletić 1940: 561).

BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)

and Montenegrins with the Venetian Republic began. It was well known that the first Governor of Montenegro, Antonio Bolica from Kotor, was the commissioner for Signoria. Since then many Montenegrin rulers and commanders fought for the Venetian Republic in brigand gangs and military formations (and were paid for it by the Republic of Venice), primarily in Perast, across the Boka Kotorska Bay and beyond. In the Morej war, Venetians together with the help of Montenegrins and Croats of Boka Kotorska Bay liberated Risan (1684) and Herceg Novi (1687) from the Turks. So, based on historical facts, this implies that before direct contacts with representatives of the Venetian authorities, at the time of Bishop Visaron Borilović (late 17th century) this construction[16] was not registered, and after two decades of cooperation[17] it was used by Bishop Danilo (early 18th century), Visarion's successor as the head of the archiepiscopate, while in the language of Peter I (about 100 years after Visarion) it was used very frequently, as in the language of Andrija Zmajević who, undoubtedly, was in direct communication with representatives of the Venetian administration. The second assumption that this construction is a Germanism, as far as Radonjić is concerned, and Montenegro as a whole, does not stand, because during the reign of Austria, until the end of the 19th century, the language of Boka's administration was Italian, not German (Musić 1972: 63). Therefore, this fact in itself suggests that this construction entered the vocabulary of Radonjić (and Bishop Petrović as well) through regular communication with representatives of the Venetian government, and was then passed into written form from their (personal) conversational language. Thus, the za 'for' + infinitive construction is not influenced by the Italian conversational language, but exclusively results from the Venetian administration's influence on the language of Montenegrin rulers, not the people, which is why it is not registered in Montenegrin dialects[18].

**3.2.** The construction *za* 'for' + infinitive is used in these letters instead of intentional sentences[19], as evidenced by the following examples:

43) tako smo sada bili na neko kmetstvo za
so be.PRS.1PL now be.SH.PFV.1PL on some serfdom.ACC for
pomirit Cuce i Bjelice [MNE]
make peace.SH.INF Cuce.PS.N.ACC and Bjelice.PS.N.ACC
'So we have just come from a serfdom to make peace ("for to make peace") between Cuce and Bjelice' (VIP10)

44) ma ja dolazim za primit zapovijed
PTCL I.SUBJ come.PRS.1SG for receive.SH.INF command.OBJ.ACC
i poslužit moga principa [MNE]
and serve.SH.INF my.OBJ.ACC ruler.OBJ.ACC
'however I come to receive orders ("for to receive") and serve my ruler' (SP20)

[16] Judicial and administrative terminology penetrated the northwest Boka Kotorska Bay in the late 17th century – that is, at the time of Bishop Visarion Borilović (Musić 1972: 64).

[17] Military-political cooperation between Montenegro and the Republic of Venice.

[18] Except for the aforementioned Crmnica speech, stretching, almost, to the sea.

[19] Gabrić-Bagarić indicates that the most distinctive common feature of all the writers of the 18th century is the use of the construction 'for' + infinitive as a substitute for the dependent, most usually purpose clause (Gabrić-Bagarić 2007: 138). Recorded in Montenegrin literature (Rotković 2009: 47, 56). Herta Kuna points out that "in earlier epochs the construction za 'for' + infinitive was widely used for deliberate sentences, on the entire Serbo-Croatian territory" (Kuna 1986: 278).

BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)

45) ma bi bila potreba za nastojat ugasit
PTCL be.POT.F.3SG need.NOM for try.SH.INF extinguish
ovi oganj dokle se nije
this.OBJ.ACC fire.OBJ.ACC until REFL be.NEG.PRS.3SG
veći ražega [MNE]
bigger grow.SH.PFV.3SG
'we should try ("for to try") to extinguish this fire before it grows' (SP26)

46) i ot druge za oblegat ih i
and from other.GEN.PL for oath.SH.INF them.ACC and
vrć među njima kmetove [MNE]
put.SH.INF among them.INS serf.PL.OBJ.ACC
'and oath ("for to oath") to the others and put the serfs among them' (SP26)

47) zašto polovica bijehu konteni da me obede
why half be happy.PST.PFV to I.OBJ.ACC hate.PRS.3PL
za puštit Krtoljane [MNE]
for let go.SH.INF Krtoljani.PS.N.OBJ.ACC
'why was half of them ready to hate me for letting Krtoljani go' (SP26)

The *za* 'for' + infinitive construction in the example: *ja knez Marko od Njeguša za ne umijet pisat bijem mohurom* 'I Prince Marko from Njeguši put a stamp because I cannot write ("for not being able to write")' (VIP1) was used instead of an adverbial of cause clause, and semantic synonyms of for are: as, since, because, due to, as a result of that; while in the example *hitah za poći da ih pristignem dokle ih nijesu ubili* 'I hurried to arrive ("for to arrive") before they get killed' (SP26) the sentence has a target meaning (with some temporality), and the present tense with the conjunction da 'to' is its syntactic equivalent.

The use of reduced and not reduced forms of the infinitive in the construction: *za* 'for' + infinitive is almost uniform. However, it can be noticed that the reduced form is used slightly more, as evidenced by the following examples:

48) za pomirit [MNE]
for make peace.SH.INF
'to make peace' (VIP10)

49) za dovest [MNE]
for bring.SH.INF
'to bring' (SP4)

50) za primit [MNE]
for receive.SH.INF
'to receive' (SP10, SP20)

51) za poći [MNE]
for go. INF
'to go' (SP26)

52) za prikazat [MNE]
for display.SH.INF
'to display' (SP37)

53) za ubit [MNE]
for kill.SH.INF
'to kill' (SP4)

BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)

54) za smirit [MNE]
for calm down.SH.INF
'to calm down' (SP6)

55) za obslužit [MNE]
for serve.SH.INF
'to serve' (SP10)

56) za propitat i prokurit [MNE]
for examine.SH.INF and figure out.SH.INF
'to examine and figure out' (SP16)

## 4. CONCLUSION

The infinitive is rarely used independently in the letters of Serdar and Governor Radonjic, it is often registered as a lexical and syntactic complement, and rarely used with other verbs with incomplete meaning. The present tense with the conjunction *da* 'to' is used as a complement instead of the infinitive by Radonjics. The infinitive of the verbs want, can and have is often used as a complement in complex predicates. In addition, the za 'for' + infinitive construction is used by Radonjics. This non-Slavic construction which is used instead of intentional sentences, but also in the sense of cause and purpose, is in conflict with today's Montenegrin linguistic standards, while the use of reduced and non-reduced forms of the infinitive in the construction of za 'for' + infinitive is practically uniform. The za 'for' + infinitive construction in the language and letters of Serdar and Governor Radonjic results from the influence of the Venetian administration's language on the language of Montenegrin rulers and is therefore not registered in Montenegrin dialects, except sporadically in Crmnica.

### ABBREVIATIONS

ACC – Accusative, ADJ – Adjective, DAT – Dative, F – Feminine, GEN – Genitive, INF – Infinitive, INS – Instrumental, LOC – Locative, MOD – Modal, N – Noun, NEG – Negative, OBJ – Object, PFV – Perfective, PL – Plural, POSS – Possessive, POT – Potential, PRS – Present, PS – Personal, PST – Past, PTCL – Particle, REFL – Reflexive, SG – Singular, SH – Short form, SUBJ – Subject

### REFERENCES

Belić, A., 1999, *Izabrana dela*, III, IV, V, VI, VII, Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Novi Sad, Budućnost.

Brajković, T., 1893, *Peraški dijalekat*, Kotor, Program C. K. Državne velike gimnazije u Kotoru za školsku 1892-1893, Zagreb, 3–21.

Gabrić-Bagarić, D., 1984, *Jezik Bartola Kašića*, Sarajevo, Institut za jezik i književnost, Posebna izdanja 5, Sarajevo.

Gabrić-Bagarić, D., 2007, *Književnojezična norma franjevačkih pisaca 18.stoljeća*–sastavnica jezičnostandardizacijskih procesa, Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 33, 133–145.

Grujić, B., 2005, *Latinsko-srpski rječnik*, Cetinje, Obod.

Deanović, M., 1933, "Odrazi talijanske akademije "degli Arcadi" preko Jadrana", *Rad JAZU*, knjiga 111, 1244.

Dragićević,R., 1940: *Guvernaduri u Crnoj Gori* (1717-1830), Cetinje, Obod.

BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)

Ivić, P.,1972: O dijalekatskom obliku ge 'gde', *Zbornik za jezik i književnost*, Društvo za srpskohrvatski jezik i književnost Crne Gore, knj. I, 33–39.
Krivokapić, M., 2009, *Jezik u pismima serdara i guvernadura Radonjić,* doktorska disertacija, Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu.
Kuna, H., 1970, *Jezičke karakteristike književnih djela Dositeja Obradovića*, Djela, knj. XXXVI, Odjeljenje društvenih nauka knj. 21, Sarajevo, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine.
Kuna, H., 1986, *Bilješke o jeziku bosanskohercegovačke periodike austrougarskog vremena*, *Književni jezik, Sarajevo*, XV, 3–4, 274–279.
Machiedo, M., 1981, "Leonardo da Vinci i poezija", *Rad JAZU*, knjiga XXI. JAZU, Grafički zavod Hrvatske, Zagreb, 1–216.
Miletić, B., 1940, *Crmnički govor*, *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik*, knj.IX, Beograd, 211–663.
Mladenović, A., 1977, "Jezik u pismima cetinjskog vladike Visariona s kraja XVII veka", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku*, XX/1, 1–44.
Mladenović, A., 1973, *Jezik vladike Danila*, Novi Sad, Matica srpska.
Mladenović, A., 1972, "Jezik triju ceklinskih pisama iz druge polovine XVIII veka", *Zbornik za jezik i književnost*, Društvo za srpskohrvatski jezik i književnost Crne Gore, knj. I, 45–58.
Musić, S., 1972, *Romanizmi u severo-zapadnoj Boki Kotorskoj*, Beograd, Filološki fakultet Beogradskog univerziteta, knj. XVI.
Ostojić, B., 1976, *Jezik Petra I Petrovića*, Titograd, CANU.
Ostojić, B., 1985, *O crnogorskom književnojezičkom izrazu* Nikšić, Univerzitetska riječ.
Pešikan, M., 1965, "Starocrnogorski, srednjokatunski i lješanski govori", *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik*, knj. XV, 1–294.
Pižurica, M., 1989, *Jezik Andrije Zmajevića*, Titograd, Crnogorska akademija nauka i umjetnosti.
Piper et al. 2005, *Sintaksa savremenog srpskog jezika-prosta rečenica*, u redakciji Milke Ivić, Beograd, Institut za srpski jezik SANU, Beogradska knjiga, Novi Sad, Matica srpska.
Rešetar, M., 1952, *Najstarija dubrovačka proza*, Beograd, Naučna knjiga.
Rotković, R., 2009, "Uvod u izučavanje jezika bokokotorskih prikazanja s posebnim osvrtom na jezik Ivana Antuna Nenadića", *Lingua Montenegrina*, Cetinje, 4, 3–60.
Stevanović, M., 1933-1934, *Istočnocrnogorski dialect*, *Južnoslovenski filolog*, XIII, 1–128.
Stevanović, M., 1969, *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik*, Beograd, Naučno delo.
Županović, N., 2008, "Analiza talijanizama u Hvarkinji Martina Benetovića", *Fluminensia*, god. 20, br. 1, str. 33–53.

**BDD-A30837 © 2020 Editura Academiei**
**Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 02:42:40 UTC)**