

THE TWOFOLD ORIGIN OF CLASSICAL ČAKAVIAN

WILLEM VERMEER¹

[Note on the 2008 version]

This article first appeared in *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 23, 1996, 255-318.

The 2008 version is identical to the printed version except for minor matters:

- For technical reasons the original page layout and numbering had to be sacrificed; the original page numbers have been added according to the following model: “by [p. 256] Rab”, which means that “by” is the last word of p. 255 and “Rab” the first of p. 256.
- The end notes of the original (pp. 311-313) have been changed to footnotes.
- Minor corrections (e.g. wrong brackets) and minor matters having to do with layout have been changed.
- Some order has been introduced in the use of abbreviations in lists of examples and the references section.
- In two cases necessary clarification has been added in square brackets and marked “Added 2008”.
- In one case a superfluous word has been crossed out (p. 39/302.)]

1.1 Classical Čakavian

Before the modern (Neoštokavian-based) standard language was adopted, in the course of the nineteenth century, the Serbo-Croat linguistic area had known many different writing traditions.² Among them, the practice of using the Latin alphabet for producing texts on a coastal or insular Čakavian basis is among the most colourful. It will be referred to here as “Classical Čakavian” or “ClČak”.

One can get some idea of the important place ClČak occupied for several centuries by looking at the impressive list of firsts to which it gave rise:

- The earliest running text in SCr written in the Latin alphabet is the ClČak Zadar “Red i zakon” of 1345.
- The earliest SCr book printed in the Latin alphabet is the ClČak Lectionary of 1495, better known as “Bernardinov Lekcionar”.

¹ I am indebted to Janneke Kalsbeek for references to the literature, and even more to Carl Ebeling and Henrik Birnbaum, whose puzzled comments on an early version of this paper (spring 1991) caused me to put it aside and to start all over again four years later.

² I stick to the traditional label of ‘Serbo-Croatian’ because from the point of view of the diachronic linguist a technical term denoting the dialect continuum traditionally referred to by it is indispensable and would have to be invented if it did not already exist. This choice should not be construed as implying a political preference. Indeed, I am very unhappy with the traditional requirement (which has always been widespread in SCr linguistics) that investigators of the history of the language should adapt their linguistic terminology to political priorities.

- The earliest extended piece of original secular literature written in SCr to be printed is Marko Marulić's ClĀak "Judita" of 1521. Since it was printed three times between 1521 and 1523, "Judita" can also with some justice be regarded as the earliest bestseller in SCr.
- The earliest prose novel in SCr is Zoranić's ClĀak "Planine", printed in 1569.
- The first printed SCr dictionary is Faust VranĀić's ClĀak "Dictionarium" of 1595.
- Like the contemporary written language of Dubrovnik, ClĀak was a forward-looking, vernacular-based tradition. ClĀak texts constitute a major source of information about the language actually spoken in Dalmatia from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century.

If the surviving texts are anything to go by, ClĀak arose in the fourteenth century in northern Dalmatia, i.e. in the area dominated by [p. 256] Rab, Zadar and Šibenik. By the closing decades of the fifteenth century it had spread to central Dalmatia, where it came to thrive in such coastal towns as Trogir and Split and on the islands of Hvar and BraĀ. The area where ClĀak was in active use at one time or other comprises (roughly speaking) the islands from Rab in the north-west to KorĀula in the south-east and the coastal towns of northern and central Dalmatia, among which Nin, Zadar, Šibenik, Trogir and Split are perhaps the most important.

No two ClĀak texts are linguistically quite identical. At least three complexes of facts may be involved.

First, the area where ClĀak was in use is characterized by a fair amount of dialectal differentiation, especially in the northwest. Much of this is manifestly old and it is reasonable to expect that some of it found its way into the texts. The connections between ClĀak and the dialects of the area are poorly understood and it is my ambition in this paper to dispel some of the haziness surrounding this issue.

Second, ClĀak can be assumed to have interacted to varying degrees with several other important traditions, most importantly:

- (1) the Croat (glagolitic) redaction of Church Slavonic,
- (2) the tradition of writing the vernacular (as distinct from Church Slavonic) in the glagolitic alphabet;
- (3) the written language of Dubrovnik.

Some interaction is known or suspected to have taken place among these traditions, but the precise degree of mutual indebtedness will have to be determined.

Third, it is reasonable to assume that the spoken language did not remain stationary from the middle of the fourteenth to the seventeenth century.

Earlier publications about features that display variation among different ClĀak texts (Vermeer 1987, 1988) have brought to light the existence of systematic differences between the language of early religious prose and that of the other major genres, in particular religious poetry (primarily octosyllabic verse) and secular literature (primarily dodecasyllabic verse). The language of early religious poetry appears to admit more readily than other genres northwestern elements of the kind found in the dialects spo-

ken on the islands around Zadar. By the beginning of the sixteenth century the difference between the genres was no longer very conspicuous.

It is the purpose of the present article to document and investigate further features that oppose the northwest to the southeast. After a brief introduction we shall be looking in detail at the reflexes of PSI *ǣ [p. 257] in the texts (2-6), which will turn out to show pretty clearly that ClČak results from a confluence of two distinct traditions (7); the pattern is confirmed and put into perspective by an investigation of the distribution of around a dozen further features (8-9) and a discussion of two late fourteenth-century texts belonging to different genres and known to have been copied by the same person (10).

1.2 The study of Classical Čakavian

The internal evolution of Classical Čakavian is still imperfectly understood. There are several reasons for this, most important the fact that only a minority of the available ClČak texts have been thoroughly described from a linguistic point of view. The principal ones that have been studied are the following:

- (1) “Red i zakon od primljenja na dil dobroga činjenja sestara naših reda svetoga oca našega Dominika” (RiZ). This brief prose text (62 lines) is the earliest surviving specimen of ClČak (1345). It has been published and its language has been exhaustively described by Dragica Malić (1977); on evidence for vowel length in the text see also Vermeer (1994: 467-468).
- (2) “Šibenska molitva” (ŠibMol). This brief and in several respects unique text was probably written or copied in the final decades of the fourteenth century by a certain Paulus de Sebenico. Its language constitutes the subject of an exhaustive investigation by Dragica Malić (1973).
- (3) “Žića sv. otaca” (ŽićSvO). This extended prose text, which by common consent originated in the fourteenth century (e.g. Malić 1987: 56), was published in 1939 by Vinko Premuda in the original orthography. As Stjepan Ivšić saw already (1939: 243-246), there are systematic differences between the first and the second part of ŽićSvO (the second part starts at the bottom of f. 40a with chapter 64) and it will sometimes be necessary to refer to “ŽićSvO1” (i.e. ff. 1a-40a) and “ŽićSvO2” (i.e. ff. 40a-134b) as if they are distinct documents. For the past decade, Dragica Malić has been working on ŽićSvO (cf. Malić 1987, 1988, 1989a, 1990a, 1990b, 1991, 1992-93); on the expression of vowel length in the text see also Vermeer (1994).
- (4) “Zadarski lekcionar” (ZadLekc). This well-known manuscript, which unfortunately carries no date, is generally regarded as a fifteenth-century copy of a fourteenth-century original. It was published by Rešetar (1894) in the original orthography. According to Rešetar [p. 258] (o.c.: V) the manuscript consists of three parts of unequal length, which were bound together only at a later moment:
 - (a) ff. 1a-97a: the lectionary proper;
 - (b) ff. 101a-107b: “blagoslov vode na vodokršte”;
 - (c) ff. 108a-117b: “više drugih blagoslova”.

The heterogeneity is increased by the fact that the lectionary proper was copied by three different hands: a first hand contributed ff. 1a-40b, a different one ff. 41a-75a and yet another one ff. 75a-96b; the second and third parts of the manuscript were copied by the first hand (ff. 101a-117b). There are some perceptible linguistic differences among the five sections of *ZadLekc* that can be distinguished in this way. The language of *ZadLekc* was described by Rešetar (1898a/b) in its relationship to that of the printed “Bernardin” Lectionary of 1495 and the Dubrovnik “Ranjina” Lectionary.

(5) “Korčulanski odlomak” (KorčOdl). This text corresponds very closely to the second part of *ZadLekc* (“blagoslov vode na vodokršte”: ff. 101a-107b), with the beginning (the text corresponding to f. 101a and most of f. 101b) missing. Linguistically speaking, KorčOdl is perceptibly more archaic than the corresponding section of *ZadLekc* and there are external reasons for assigning it to the fourteenth century. Rešetar (1898a/b) reports the principal differences between *ZadLekc* and KorčOdl, but since he had to rely on an unsatisfactory edition his observations can no longer be regarded as completely valid. A better edition was later published by Melich (1903: 49-61, original orthography). Melich’s edition has been superseded now by Malić’s (1989b: 10-20, modernized orthography), to which a discussion of the spelling system of the text is appended and a photographic reproduction of the original manuscript (o.c.: 48-56).

(6) “Bernardinov lektionar” (BernLekc), printed in Venice in 1495. BernLekc was reprinted in 1543 (by Benedikt Zborovčić) and 1586 (by Marko Andriolić Trogirinanin), was often copied by hand (e.g. in Dubrovnik) and strongly influenced later lectionaries. It was published by Maretić (1885: 1-201) in modern spelling. Recently, a photographic reproduction of the 1495 edition has become available (Bratulić 1991). Like *ZadLekc*, BernLekc is linguistically not completely homogeneous. Its language was described in considerable detail by Rešetar in his study of the language of the lectionaries (1898a/b).

(7) The old part of Lucić’s “Vrtal” (LucVrt). In the later decades of the sixteenth century Petar Lucić (not to be confused with several other people of the same name, in particular the poet Hanibal Lucić) [p. 259] compiled a collection of more or less religious texts (largely verse), which has become known as Lucić’s “Vrtal” (“Garden”). In the course of time, various parts of LucVrt were published by various scholars for various purposes, but it was only Nikica Kolumbić who, quite recently, published the manuscript in its entirety (1990) in modernized orthography. In the middle of the “Vrtal” (ff. 220-265) Petar Lucić incorporated an earlier manuscript that is generally assigned to the beginning of the sixteenth century and which has become known as the “old part” of LucVrt. Its language has been studied by Mladenović (1959). The old part of LucVrt consists of three quite different texts:

(7A) “Govorenje sv. Bernarda od duše osujene” (GovBern). GovBern is a brief religious play in octosyllabic verse (some 660 lines). It was published in modernized orthography by Kukuljević (1869: 312-339, verses 91-751), cf. also Kolumbić (o.c.: 409-428).

(7B) “Skazanje od nevoljnoga dne od suda ognjenoga, napokonji koji ima biti” (SkazND). SkazND is a religious play in octosyllabic verse (some 1070 lines). It was published in modernized orthography by Kukuljević (1869: 279-311), cf. also Kolumbić (o.c.: 429-461).

(7C) “Život blaženoga svetoga Ivana Krstitelja” (ŽivIvKrst). ŽivIvKrst is a saint’s life in prose. It was published in the original orthography by Badalić (1957: 48-56), cf. also Kolumbić (o.c.: 464-477). A second version of ŽivIvKrst has been transmitted in the manuscript known as the “Florence Miscellany” or “Firentinski zbornik” (“FirZb”) and was published by Verdiani in the original orthography in his edition of that manuscript (1973: 119-146).

(8) “Život svetoga Jerolima” (ŽivJer). ŽivJer is a saint’s life in prose that has been transmitted in at least two manuscripts. The version as transmitted in the Zagreb Academy manuscript Ib127 (formerly 341), was published by Jagić (1869: 226-236) in modern spelling. The version as transmitted by “FirZb” was published by Verdiani (1973: 151-170) in the original orthography. The language of the Zagreb copy of ŽivJer has been described by Mladenović (1964, 1964-65).

(9) “Život sv. Katarine” (ŽivKat). ŽivKat is a saint’s life in prose, transmitted in a manuscript that was discovered by Kukuljević in Zadar and is now kept in the Zagreb Academy as MS Ic6 (formerly 317). ŽivKat was published by Jagić (1869: 218-224) in modern orthography and its language has been studied by Mladenović (1966a, 1966b).

(10) Marko Marulić (1450-1524), who spent most of his life in the central Dalmatian town of Split, is the author of “Judita” (written in [p. 260] 1501, first printed in Venice in 1521), deservedly famous as a brilliant and linguistically very sophisticated piece of writing.³ A fair number of other texts by Marulić are extant, of which I would like to mention the following: (a) “Suzana” (a narrative poem in the same style as “Judita”, but considerably briefer), (b) two letters (“poslanice”) in prose, mainly containing homiletic material, (c) a translation of “De imitatione Christi”. “Judita” has been published many times and is best accessed in the 1950 reprint of the 1521 edition, on which all later editions are based. “Suzana” has survived in two manuscripts: LucVrt (ff. 287-307v) and MS R-6634 of the Zagreb University Library. The former version has several times been printed (e.g. Kolumbić o.c.: 506-527), the latter is available in Franičević and Morović (1979: 143-166). The “poslanice” were published by Fancev (1938). The translation of “De imitatione Christi”, both surviving manuscripts of which were believed lost for the major part of our century, was published not so long ago by Julije Derossi in Kulundžić and Derossi (1989: 35-129). The language of “Judita” and “Suzana” (the latter as transmitted in LucVrt) has been described by Hraste (1950) and Mladenović (1957, 1961-62); the latter has devoted a separate study to the language of the “poslanice” (1960). The translation of “De imitatione Christi” is still awaiting the attention of linguists.

(11) Petre Hektorović (1487-1572), who spent most of his life in Stari Grad and Hvar on the island of Hvar in central Dalmatia, is known primarily as the author of a collection of works that was printed in Venice in 1568, most important of which is the long poem “Ribanje i ribarsko prigovaranje” which he wrote in 1556 (some 1680 lines, primarily

³ Marulić’s “Judita” has recently become much more accessible than it used to be owing to Henry Cooper’s translation (1991), which pulls off the not inconsiderable feat of being both conscientious and readable.

dodecasyllabic). The language of the works published in the 1568 edition, a photographic reprint of which appeared in Zagreb in 1953, has been studied by several scholars, notably Mladenović (1968) and Wagner (1970).

(12) Petar Zoranić (born probably in 1508), whose activities are linked with the towns of Nin and Zadar in northern Dalmatia, is the author of a prose novel titled “Planine” which was printed in Venice in 1569 but probably written more than three decades earlier (1536). In addition to prose the text contains more than 1600 lines of verse. “Planine” has been republished several times and a photographic reprint of the 1569 edition was published in Zagreb in 1952. Zoranić’s language was described in great detail by Ružičić (1930-31). [p. 261]

1.3 The history of the study of Classical Čakavian

Nearly a century ago, Rešetar’s analysis of the language of the two lectionaries laid the groundwork for a history of ClČak.

For a long time very little was done with it and when at last interest in the subject revived, Ružičić’s choice (probably inspired by Belić) of Zoranić’s “Planine” as the subject for a monographic description could hardly have been more unfortunate: Zoranić was a conscious artist, who can be assumed to have freely selected different elements of his tradition according to esthetic criteria and whose attitude towards language tended towards purism, judging by his oft-quoted complaint in the preface: “jazik kim općimo pošpuren [(untimely) pregnant] jest latinskim”. In the absence of a picture of the tradition neither his language nor his artistic achievement can be adequately understood.

The same holds for Marulić, whose language started receiving attention shortly after the second world war in connection with the quincentenary of his birth. Marulić’s approach to language is characterized by “linguistic playfulness” (Cooper 1991: viii) and the results can be quite startling from a normal ClČak point of view.⁴ It was Aleksandar Mladenović who, while working on Marulić’s language (and perhaps influenced by Pavle Ivić), realized that it is impossible to appreciate the linguistic achievement of conscious artists like Marulić without some knowledge of average contemporary ClČak and who contributed to that knowledge by his study of ŽivJer, ŽivKat and the texts contained in the old sections of LucVrt. Towards the close of the sixties, Mladenović’s and Wagner’s monographic treatments of the language of Hektorović added considerably to our knowledge of ClČak because Hektorović, though like Marulić and Zoranić a conscious artist, differs from them in preferring an average type of ClČak.

Even after Mladenović and Wagner, our picture of ClČak remained hanging in the air because so little was known about the language of the oldest texts. Rešetar’s treatment of ZadLekc was the only study that gave some idea about what ClČak looked like before BernLekc and “Judita”. It was Dragica Malić of the Zagreb Academy Institute

⁴ Quite a few forms are attested only in Marulić and may, for all we know, have been invented by him, e.g. *Ipl teźmi* ‘those’ (“Judita” 4:85; elsewhere always *timi*). His predilection for endless past gerunds (*potrp*, *lup* instead of *potrpivši*, *lupivši*, cf. Mladenović (1957: 138) is without serious parallels in other texts.

who at last took the logical step and embarked on a systematic study of the language of the oldest ClČak manuscripts (RiZ, ŠibMol, KorčOdl, ŽićSvO), thereby laying the foundations for a genuine understanding of the rise and development of the ClČak tradition. The present study is deeply indebted to her work and her example. [p. 262]

1.4 A note on the material

For the purposes of this article, I have relied as far as possible on the published studies enumerated in section 1.2. However, it happened several times that a text had to be excerpted anew because the available descriptions turned out to be insufficiently informative with respect to one feature or other. This holds in particular for ZadLekc. As for ŽićSvO, it is likely that Dragica Malić is not yet done with it. However, in view of the key position the text occupies in the early history of ClČak I have not been able to avoid looking more closely into at least certain aspects of it, at the risk of duplicating her efforts. In such cases I have in general limited myself to the chapters 36 through 77 (ff. 20a-60b, pp. 128-165 of Premuda's edition).

As for texts that have not yet attracted the attention of linguists I have selected four:

(a) "Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga" (DiGrg). This lengthy prose text was copied in 1513 from a protograph about which nothing is known. The text has been published by Hamm in modernized orthography (1978: 67-212), together with the "Život sv. Grgura pape" (Živ-Grg) that is appended to the "Dijalozi" in the manuscript (Hamm o.c.: 215-223). For the purposes of this article the First Book of the "Dijalozi" has been examined (ff. 1r-35v = pp. 67-100 of the edition).

(b) "Rapska pjesmarica" (RabPjes). This manuscript was copied in 1471 by a certain Matheus de Piçicho de Arbo (Arbo is Italian for 'Rab'). It comprises four religious poems totalling nearly 1200 mostly octosyllabic lines. RabPjes was published by Cvito Fisković in the original orthography (1953: 41-67). On its language see Vermeer (1988: 632-634).

(c) "Psalmi Davidovi fra Luke Bračanina" (PsLuk). This complete prose translation of the psalms was copied in 1598 by fra Luka Bračanin, who is on record as having occupied high ecclesiastic functions in Zadar. The text was published in modernized orthography by Petar Karlić (1917: 1-129). In the case of PsLuk I have generally limited the search to the first fifty psalms.

(d) "Cantilena pro Sabatho" (CantSab). The term "Cantilena pro Sabatho" is used to refer to a text discovered not so long ago by A. Vízkelety in a Latin manuscript acquired by the National Library of Budapest in 1979. Photographs of the text were published by Vízkelety and Hadrovics (1984: 11-12), accompanied by a transliteration of the original (o.c.: 10, 13-14) and a modernized transcription (o.c.: 15-16). Vízkelety [p. 263] described the background of the manuscript (o.c.: 3-7) and Hadrovics contributed not only the two transcriptions, but also an essay in which he briefly examined a number of related texts (o.c.: 8-10, 33-37) and argued persuasively in favour of the following assumption concerning the origin of the text and the person of its copyist: first, the person who wrote down CantSab cannot himself have been its author; second, the copyist's hand-

writing is indistinguishable from that of the person who wrote down ŠibMol; there are good reasons for identifying the person who wrote down the two texts with one Paulus de Sclavonia or Paulus de Sibinico, who is on record as having held ecclesiastical functions in Šibenik and Zadar and some of whose activities were reported in documents that can be dated to the sixties, seventies and eighties of the fourteenth century (o.c.: 18-33). CantSab is a poem on the Crucifixion in octosyllabic verse (132 lines). It is among the earliest surviving representatives of a popular tradition of octosyllabic verse on religious subjects which is first attested in the glagolitic “Misal kneza Novaka” of 1368 and which survived in Dalmatia into the twentieth century, thereby providing one of the most impressive examples of cultural continuity in the SCr linguistic area. Among the texts in our corpus the tradition is represented by CantSab, RabPjes and the verse of LucVrt (GovBern and SkazND).

2.1 The reflex of *ě: ikavian versus i/e-kavian

Since part of the variation attested in ClČak obviously reflects local differences in the spoken language, it is necessary to compare the evidence of the texts with the facts attested in descriptions of modern dialects spoken along the coast and on the islands. First of all this requires a discussion of the two different reflexes of PSr *ě found in both types of sources (modern spoken dialects and ClČak texts): some systems are “purely ikavian”, whereas others are i/e-kavian according to what is known as “Jakubinskij’s rule”. It is important to be aware of exactly what the difference consists of.

Most of the area that used to be served by ClČak is “purely ikavian” in the sense that PSr *ě has in all positions merged with the outcome of the merger of *i and *y.

In the northwest, however, the reflex of *ě, though in most instances also *i*, has yielded *e*, merging with the outcome of the merger of **e* and **ę* in a limited set of positions, more precisely before dental consonants (*t, d, s, z, r, l, n*) which are not in their turn followed by a front [p. 264] vowel; this is the “i/e-kavian” reflex of *ě according to “Jakubinskij’s rule”.⁵

Familiar though the i/e-kavian reflex is, it has given rise to all kinds of misunderstandings, some of which I shall try to clear up in the following.

The first thing that should be kept in mind is that the phonetic outcome of Jakubinskij’s rule has nowhere been exactly preserved in all forms in which it operated. This is because Jakubinskij’s rule results in paradigmatic alternations that must have invited analogical levellings, e.g. Nsg *mesto*, Gsg/Napl *mesta*, Gpl *mest*, but Lsg/Ipl *misti*, Lpl *mistih*, or: inf *rezati*, but pres3sg *riže*, or: inf *viditi*, l-p mpl *vidili*, but l-p msg *videl*, l-p fsg *videla*. Most of the alternations produced by Jakubinskij’s rule have been levelled out.

In all i/e-kavian systems that have been described so far, alternations within stems have been completely eliminated in inflexional paradigms. The Lpl of *mesto* is *mestih* (not ***mistih*), the Lsg of *mera* is *meri* (not ***miri*), *rizati* has replaced *rezati* (or, con-

⁵ Jakubinskij (1925), Meyer (1926: 241, 248-250, 1928: 49-71).

versely, *reže* has ousted *riže*), etc. A case of possible retention of the alternation will be dealt with below, section 3.1.

Alternations in derivational patterns have likewise been eliminated, with three types of exceptions:

- Verbal derivations in *-iti*, e.g. *bell/biliti*, *dell/diliti*, *mera/miriti*, *sled/sliditi*, *vetar/izvit-riti*. Exceptions (e.g. *beliti*, *isceliti*), though by and large less frequent, are also quite normal and of ancient standing.
- Derived imperfectives, e.g. *spoviditi/spovedati*.⁶ This is very exceptional. In general derived imperfectives have adopted the stem vowel of the basic verb, e.g. (in this case) *spovidati*.
- Cases where the derivational connection between different words has been obscured, e.g. *delo* ‘work, thing, action’ vs. *nedilja* ‘Sunday’ or *siditi* ‘sit’ vs. *sused* ‘neighbour’.

The elimination of alternations has often given rise to forms that superficially appear to contradict Jakubinskij’s rule. In *srida* ‘middle’ (in many systems contrasting with *sreda* ‘Wednesday’) the stem form that was phonetically regular in the Lsg (*sridi*) has been generalized, which is natural given the fact that the word denotes a location; the same has happened in *svit* ‘world’. The verb *rizati* ‘cut’ has generalized the stem form that was regular in the present tense and related forms (*riže*), etc.

Attested i/e-kavian systems tend to have *-e-* in such words as the following: *bel*, *beseda*, *bled*, *brest*, *cel*, *cena*, *cvet*, *člen*, *čreda*, *ded*, *del*, [p. 265] *delati*, *delo*, *dleto*, *dren*, *koleno*, *len*, *leto*, *mera*, *mesto*, *nevesta*, *obed*, *pesak*, *poleno*, *pred*, *presan*, *redak*, *sed*, *seno*, *sled*, *slez*, *sreda* ‘Wednesday’, *stena*, *strela*, *sused*, *svet* ‘advice’ (< **sōvētō*), *telo*, *tesan*, *testo*, *vera*, *vetar*, *zvezda*, *železo*. Note the virtual absence of verbs, caused by the fact that most verbal endings contain front vowels and cause the stem vowel to end up as *-i-*, which is then generalized. Note also the absence of endings, most of which did not satisfy the conditions for Jakubinskij’s rule; the only two endings in which the conditions were met at least in some cases are the *l*-participle ending in *-ěl* (e.g. fsg **-ela* vs. mpl **-ili*) and the infrequent passive past participle in *-ěn*, e.g. **viděn*. Most of i/e-kavian generalized *-i-* in both types of formations (for exceptions see below, section 2.3).

2.2 On how to delimit i/e-kavian from purely ikavian systems

An i/e-kavian dialect or text is one in which *i* is the most common reflex of PSI **ě*, but which has *-e-* in those words that have ended up with *-e-* as a consequence of Jakubinskij’s rule combined with the subsequent elimination of alternants. The question whether or not a dialect (or text) is i/e-kavian has to be answered on the basis of the set of words in which actual i/e-kavian systems actually have *e*, that is on the basis of a list along the lines of the one given above (*bel ... železo*).

⁶ Attested as such in the Omišalj dialect. [What is intended here is the existence of such examples as inf *spovīdit* ‘confess’, *l-p* fem *spovīdela*, derived imperfective inf *spovēdāt* pres 3sg *spovēdā*. (Added 2008.)]

It is important to realize that one cannot determine whether a dialect is i/e-kavian or purely ikavian by looking at stems, as has sometimes been done, particularly in recent years.⁷ This is because Jakubinskij's rule affects individual word forms and the subsequent levellings operate on inflexional paradigms and derivational patterns. Stems do not enter into it at all and can show different reflexes in different formations, as in *mera* vs. *miriti* or *sreda* 'Wednesday' vs. *srida* 'middle' or *pred* vs. *naprid*.

If one wants to determine whether a dialect is i/e-kavian or purely ikavian, the *-e-* in a word like *bel* is an indication that one is dealing with i/e-kavian, since an *-i-* in the same word (*bil*) would point to ikavian; the *-i-* in *biliti*, on the other hand, is irrelevant because it is regular in both i/e-kavian and ikavian. Yet both words are derived from the same stem. Similarly, whereas *vetar* (which is opposed to purely ikavian *vitar*) is significant, *vijati* proves nothing. It makes no sense to act as if the presence of *biliti* or *vijati* or other irrelevant material (such as *brime* or *človik* or *vrića*) makes a dialect "more ikavian" than it would be otherwise. And since alternations within inflexional paradigms have [p. 266] been eliminated, it makes no sense either to list such forms as *meri* or *mes-tih* or *videli* (or *vidila*) separately as if they are problematical deviations from Jakubinskij's rule rather than the normal reflexes found in i/e-kavian systems.

In analysing the attested facts it is important to take account of the actual outcomes of the levellings as we find them in actual i/e-kavian systems. The presence of *-i-* in *svit* 'world' or *srida* 'middle' or *rizati* or *naprid* does not constitute evidence that a given text or dialect is ikavian, because all (or virtually all) attested i/e-kavian systems have *-i-* in those words.

Before we shall be in a position to evaluate the reflexes of **ě* in the ClČak texts we need to be aware of two points involving individual words:

First, several words have always or nearly always *-e-* in whatever type of dialect they are attested and hence are not diagnostic; the most important among them are: *celov* (*celovati*, *celivati*), *cesar*, *peti* (*peteh*), *-većati* (*obećati*), *venac*, *vreteno*, and *zled* (cf. already Rešetar 1898a: 109).⁸

Second, the verb **sěsti* often has ekavian reflexes which can be attributed to generalization of the present tense stem **sęd-*, so that an *-e-* in *sesti* cannot be regarded as an indication of an i/e-kavian system (Ružičić 1930: 60, Ivić 1959: 175, Malić 1990a: 128).⁹

And, finally, it goes without saying that the presence of *-e-* in *vek* or *dekla* or *starešina* or *bolezniv* or *ovde* or *krepost* does not make a text i/e-kavian (or "more i/e-kavian") because Jakubinskij's rule generates *-i-* in the relevant positions, so that it does not account for the presence of *-e-* in these words.

⁷ Cf. the type of presentation chosen, e.g., by Damjanović (1979: 15-24), Hercigonja (1983: 6-35), and Malić (1990a), which conveys the message that the reflexes of **ě* found in i/e-kavian systems are extremely variable and obscures the vital distinction between reflexes that are normal in i/e-kavian systems and deviations that require [p. 312] comment. In my view this is a step backwards as compared with the presentation as inherited from Jakubinskij and still found in, e.g., Moguš (1966: 31-36, 1977, in particular 39-40).

⁸ For *vreteno* cf. the examples adduced by Jurišić (1973) s.v. *bretenò*.

⁹ Cf. *sěsti* in purely ikavian Vrgada (Jurišić 1973: 188) and Brusje (Dulčić and Dulčić 1985: 651).

2.3 Local differences within i/e-kavian; do ikavian and i/e-kavian shade imperceptibly one into the other?

One may wonder whether it is at all possible to determine the borderline between i/e-kavian and ikavian. Theoretically it is quite conceivable for it to have disappeared as a consequence of mutual dialect borrowing. After all, the list of words on the basis of which the presence of Jakubinskij's rule has to be determined is finite and not even very long. This brings us to the subject of local differences within i/e-kavian.

Local differences with respect to the details of the outcome of Jakubinskij's law have not been systematically investigated. Yet some local [p. 267] differentiation is known to exist, of which I would like to mention two kinds.

First, in the *l*-participle of verbs with infinitives in **-ěti*, *-e-* has been generalized in those dialects (situated in the extreme northwest) that have neocircumflex lengthening in the present tense (e.g. *plākat* vs. *plāče*) and *-i-* in dialects which, like all of Štokavian, lack neocircumflex (*plākat* vs. *plāče*), e.g. *videl* vs. *vidil*. The significance of this isogloss was first seen, I think, by Maļeckı (1929: 573 = 1963: 229-230). For further discussion see Vermeer (1982: 297-298).

Second, as has often been noticed (e.g. Finka 1977: 89-90), the number of examples that have *-i-* tends to rise as one travels southeast, in other words: as one gets closer to the purely ikavian area.

Although it is perfectly possible for the borderline between i/e-kavian and purely ikavian to have been effaced and to have been replaced by an indeterminate transitional area, so far no convincing examples of ambiguous systems have turned up. The dialect of Kali, on Ugljan (opposite Zadar in the southeast of the i/e-kavian area), may have *-i-* in *cvit*, *did*, *dilo*, *nevista*, and *zvizda*, but betrays itself as solidly i/e-kavian by its *-e-* in such words as *bel*, *cel*, *del*, *obed*, *koleno*, *leto*, *mesto*, *retko*, *sreda* 'Wednesday', *telo*, *tesno*, *testo*, *vetar* (Budovskaja and Houtzagers 1994: 102-105). Another area where the number of ikavian reflexes is above average is the central part of Pag (Kolan, Zubovići, Metajna, Pag/Košljun), which has *-i-* in *did*, *lito*, *misto*, *nevista*, and *vitar*, but *-e-* in such examples as *bel*, *beseda*, *cel*, *cvetati*, *del*, *delat*, *obed*, *redak*, *seno*, and *sused* (Houtzagers 1987: 71-72).

Nowadays, the isogloss separating i/e-kavian from ikavian runs close to Zadar, with Zadar and other coastal points on the ikavian side and Ugljan, immediately opposite Zadar, convincingly i/e-kavian, as we have seen. On the coast the most southeasterly i/e-kavian point is Senj.¹⁰

¹⁰ For the details of the i/e-kavian reflex of **ě* in the dialects of the area see in particular Belıć (1909: 184-187) on Novi, Vermeer (1984a: 278-280) on Omišalj (Krk), Hozjan (1990: 54-56) on Kras near Dobrinj (Krk), Moguš (1966: 33-35) on Senj, Kušar (1894: 2-3) on Rab, Hamm, Hraste and Guberina (1956: 73-75) on Susak (island near Lošinj), Manojlović (1970: 159-164) on Silba, Houtzagers (1987: 70-72) on the island of Pag to the extent that it is Čakavian (in other words: from Lun in the northwest to Pag/Košljun in the central part of the island), Cronia (1928-29: 75, 77) on Božava (Dugi Otok), Finka (1977: 88-90) on Sali (Dugi Otok), Budovskaja and Houtzagers (1994: 101-105) on Kali (Ugljan). See also: Jakić-Cestarić (1957) on the islands from the central part of Pag in the north to Dugi Otok and Pašman in the south. The most

If one is interested in systems that are intermediate between i/e-kavian and ikavian, the place to look is the island of Pašman, which is situated between i/e-kavian Ugljan and purely ikavian Vrgada. Unfortunately the available literature is both contradictory and poor in facts. It seems likely, however, that the northwest (Ždrelac, Banj and Dobropoljana) is i/e-kavian. As for the remainder of the island (Nevidane, Mrljane, Pašman, Kraj, Tkon), little definite is known. See further Jakić-Cestarić (1957: 413-416), Ivić (1961-62: 119), Manojlović (1970: 180), Lukežić (1990: 21).

It is quite possible (even likely) that the isogloss had a different course in the period when the ClČak texts were being written. The [p. 268] coastal area in particular has witnessed migrations that may (or may not) have pushed the isogloss in a north-westerly direction. However, at present we are not in a position to say more than that this may (or may not) have happened. From the point of view of the study of ClČak it is unfortunate that because of this the original position of the important town of Zadar (where quite a few ClČak texts originated) is unclear.

2.4 Three types of living dialects

For the purpose of this article three types of dialects will be distinguished (see also table A).

A: “i/e-kavian 1”, i.e. dialects with an i/e-kavian reflex of *ě, generalization of *-e-* in the *l*-participle of verbs in **-ěti* (*videl*), and neocircumflex in the present tense (*plâče*). Although these dialects are spoken just outside the area where ClČak was in active use, features characteristic of them occasionally penetrate into ClČak texts and they have to be taken into account:

- Novi Vinodolski (Hrvatsko Primorje opposite Krk) according to Belić (1909).
- Omišalj (Krk) according to Vermeer (1980, 1984a, unpublished material).
- Kras (near Dobrinj on Krk) according to Hozjan (1990, 1992).

B: “i/e-kavian 2”, i.e. dialects with an i/e-kavian reflex of *ě, generalization of *-i-* in the *l*-participle of verbs in **-ěti* (*vidil*), and absence of neocircumflex in the present tense. Dialects belonging to “i/e-kavian 2” are characteristic of the northwest of the ClČak area. Representatives of “i/e-kavian 2” are the following:

- Senj (Hrvatsko Primorje opposite Rab) according to Moguš (1966), cf. Jelka Ivšić (1931).
- Rab according to Kušar (1894).
- Susak (small island near Lošinj) according to Hamm, Hraste and Guberina (1956) and Vermeer (unpublished observations).
- Pag according to Houtzagers (1987: 70-72).
- Božava (the northern-most point on Dugi Otok) according to Cronia (1928-29).
- Sali (situated in the south of Dugi Otok) according to Finka (1977). [p. 269]

northwesterly purely ikavian Čakavian dialect of which a good description is available is Vrgada (Jurišić 1966, 1973).

- Kali (Ugljan) according to Budovskaja and Houtzagers (1994) and Houtzagers and Budovskaja (1996).

C: “(purely) ikavian”. Dialects with a consistently ikavian reflex of PSI *ě. The bulk of the ClČak territory is purely ikavian.

- Vrgada (small island opposite Biograd na moru) according to Jurišić (1966, 1973).
- Žirje (small island near Šibenik) according to Finka and Šojat (1968).
- Brusje (on Hvar) according to Hraste (1926-27) and Dulčić and Dulčić (1985), cf. also the data on other points on Hvar in Hraste (1935).
- Brač according to Hraste (1940).

type	points
i/e-kavian 1 (<i>videl</i> , neocircumflex)	Novi, archaic Krk (Omišalj, Kras)
i/e-kavian 2 (<i>vidil</i> , no neocirc.)	Senj, Rab, Susak, Pag, Dugi Otok (Božava, Sali), Ugljan (Kali)
purely ikavian	Vrgada, Žirje, Hvar (Brusje), Brač

Table A. Three types of dialects

There are some gaps in the record. Information on some of the Čakavian dialects spoken on islands near Zadar (e.g. Silba and Pašman) is fragmentary, as is information on such coastal dialects near Zadar as are not transparently Neo-Štokavian.

3 Texts with a consistently i/e-kavian reflex of *ě

Among published ClČak texts there are at least three which come close to being purely i/e-kavian in a way that reminds one of the state of affairs one is used to finding in living i/e-kavian dialects.

3.1 Žića svetih otaca

ŽićSvO has been known for a long time to be fairly consistently i/e-kavian (see in particular Ivšić 1939: 246 and Manojlović 1964: 97). The material has now been presented and discussed in its totality by Dragica Malić (1990a). It turns out that ŽićSvO has consistently or predominantly *-e-* in the following words: *bel, del, delo, obedvati, len, leto, mesto, nevesta, pesak, pred, presan, redak, sed, sused, sled, sreda, stena, telo, tesan, trezan, svedok, vera, svet, vetar, železo*. Those derivations that have *-i-* in i/e-kavian dialects also have *-i-* in ŽićSvO, e.g. *biliti, diliti, nedilja, obliniti, miriti, sliditi, tsniti*.

In some cases there is vacillation, most importantly:

- *lito* occurs once against the background of some twelve attestations of *leto*; similarly, two examples of *-i-* in *tilo* contrast with some 75 attestations of *-e-*. It is clear that *leto* and *telo* should be regarded as the normal forms.

- *pred* and *prid* are both very frequent; ŽićSvO₁, however, uses only *pred*, whereas ŽićSvO₂ uses both forms side by side.¹¹
- There is one example each of *-i-* in *slid* and *naslidovati* (both closely together in ŽićSvO₂) alongside *-e-* in *sled* (1x) and (*na*)*sledovati* (approx. 10x).
- *strila* is used (1x) alongside *strela* (2x).
- **svěť* ‘world’ is reflected as *svet* and *svit*. Here again there is a difference between the two sections of the MS: ŽićSvO₂ always (16x) has *svit* (in accordance with what is normal in living i/e-kavian dialects), with the exception of (once) Gsg *sveta* in the fixed combination *sega sveta*; ŽićSvO₁ always (8x) has *svet*, apart from twice Lsg *sviti* and the derivative *svitan* ‘secular’. Were it not for the small number of examples, one would be inclined to think that ŽićSvO₁ still reflects the paradigmatic alternation produced by Jakubinskij’s rule: NAsg *svet* (1x), Gsg *sveta* (3x), Dsg *svetu* (3x), Isg *svetom* (1x), Lsg *sviti* (2x) / *svet-* (1x; no ending written); both examples of Lsg *sviti* occur in contexts in which the stem form *svet-* is also attested (13b, 33b).

It is noteworthy that ŽićSvO has attestations of *-e-* in *l*-participles of verbs in **-ěti*: *otel* (5x), *oteli* (1x), *jimel* (2x), *spovidel* (1x), *videl* (4x) (Malić o.c.: 137-139). Indeed, ŽićSvO is the only ClČak text in which such examples are attested at all. As pointed out by Dragica Malić, they are fairly common in ŽićSvO₁ and avoided in ŽićSvO₂ with the exception of three attestations of *videl* occurring closely together in a single passage (45a/b).¹²

In this connection I would like to draw attention to such forms as (*u*)*činel* and *mislel* (ibid.), which have analogical *-e-*; some analogical spread of *-e-* is normal in dialects that have *l*-participles of the type *videl*, cf. *Novi zvoněli, govorěla* (Belić 1909: 249), but it is only in the archaic dialects of Krk (Omišalj/Dobrinj/Vrbnik), that the particular verbs that occur with *-e-* in ŽićSvO₁ also have *-e-*, e.g. *Omišalj činělo, učiněla, domšlela* (my material, cf. Vermeer 1980: 459).

The remarkable thing about ŽićSvO is its consistency, which approaches the kind of consistency one tends to find in actual speakers [p. 271] of living dialects. Since non-speakers of i/e-kavian find it very difficult to tell in which words to use *-e-* and in which *-i-*, I am strongly inclined to believe that the people who made ŽićSvO were either themselves native speakers of i/e-kavian or at least so thoroughly acquainted with it that they could pass for native speakers.

Dialectologically speaking ŽićSvO₁ appears to be intermediate between our “i/e-kavian 1” (as spoken on Krk) and “i/e-kavian 2”, but closer to the latter than to the former; ŽićSvO₂ is “i/e-kavian 2”. All this is reminiscent of the accentological evidence, which points to the presence of feature that have so far been found only in i/e-kavian 1 although the language of the text as a whole is closer to i/e-kavian 2 (see further Vermeer 1994: 486).

¹¹ The words *naprid* and *sprida* normally have *-i-* in i/e-kavian dialects and require no comment.

¹² In Premuda’s edition I can find only a single example of *videl* alongside two attestations of *vidil* with *-i-*.

3.2 Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga

DiGrg has *-e-* in the following words: Asg fem *celu* (19r), cf. also aor 2/3sg *isceli* (19v), aor 3pl *sceliše* (31v) (with analogical *-e-*), *del* (18r), but also once NAdu *dila* (31r), *delo* (12r 2x, 12v 2x, etc.), Gsg *dela* (12r), NApl *dela* (11v, 12r 3x, etc.), Gpl *del* (15v), Dsg *kolenu* (28v), NApl *kolena* (7v, 13r, 13v, 21r), *leto* (26v, 27r), Gpl *let* (16r, 30r), *mesto* (1r, 4r, 5r, 5v, 8v, 12r 2x, etc.), Gsg *mesta* (3v, 8v, 16v etc.), Dsg *mestu* (8v), Lsg *mestu* (9v), Lsg *mesti* (3v 2x), Lpl *mestih* (11v, 12r), Asg *nevestu* (28r) / *nevistu* (28r), *obed* (3r, 24r 2x), NApl *obedi* (24v), *pesak* (21v), *seno* (13r 2x), Gsg *sena* (13r, 13v), Gsg *senca* (13r), *telo* (6v, 15r, 29r, 32v, 33v), Gsg *tela* (4v, 28r, 32v), Isg *telom* (32v), Lsg *telu* (31v), Isg *telesnim* (4v), but also once Gsg *tila* (1r), *vera* (6v, 11r, 16r etc.), Gsg *vere* (2r, 2v, 4v, 9r, 16r etc.), Isg *verom* (16r), *verno* (29v), Gpl *vernih* (12r), Gsg *verovanja* (32v), *verovati* (17r 2x, 22r), *veruješ* (3v), *verujmo* (14v), *veruju* (2r, 6v), *verujući* (9r), Isg *vetrom* (15r).

Derivations from forms in which *-i-* is regular generally retain *i*, in accordance with the usual elimination of the alternations caused by Jakubinskij's rule. Examples: *naslidovati* (2v, 4v, 7r, 9v), aor 3sg *naslidova* (6v), pres *nasliduju* (2v) (cf. pres 3sg *slidi* (8r)), *povidati* (2r, 5r, 8r, 8r), *l-part. povidal* (2r, 15v, 16v), pres 1sg *povidam* (15v), pres 3pl *povidaju* (4v), ppp *povidano* (11r), *pripovidati* (11v, 12v) (cf. pres 2sg *poviš* (16v)), *pripovidajući* (10r 2x, 11v, 12r, 12v), *pripovidaj* (11v), *pripoviduj(u)ći* (11v), *pripovidanje* (12v), Gsg *pripovidanja* (12r), pres 1sg *zapovidam* (8v), aor 1sg *zapovidah* (8v), aor 2/3sg *zapovida* (8v, 11r, 12v, 13r), imperf 2/3sg *zapovidaše* (14r) (cf. *zapovid* (4v, 11r), Lsg *zapovidi* (6r)), *ulizovati* (8v), *ulizujući* (15v 2x) (cf. *ulisti* (8v), aor 2/3sg *ulize* (11r 2x, 15v), [p. 272] *ulizši* (16v)). The ikavian reflex in *naprid* (5r, 31r) and *naprida* (12r) is in accordance with what we find in living i/e-kavian systems.

In the following words we find *-i-* in opposition to what would be regular on the basis of Jakubinskij's rule: Gsg *bisa* (30r), *bisan* (30r), *bisnost* (30r), pres 3sg *diluje* (20r), *dilovanje* (20r), Lsg *dilovanju* (1v) (but also lsg *delovanju* (34r)), *prid* (1r, 12v, 14v 4x, 15r, 19r, 21r, 28r, 30r, 32v, 33v), *stina* (18v 2x, 19r), Gsg *stine* (18v), Asg *stinu* (19r), NApl *zvizde* (21v). As a matter of fact, the *-i-* of *bis* is normal in the i/e-kavian systems in which it is attested, e.g. Senj, Rab and Kali; *prid* has been reported for Pag/Košljun and *zvizda* for Rab and Kali.

In accordance with the state of affairs in "i/e-kavian 2", DiGrg has *-i-* in *l-participles* from verbs in **-ěti*, e.g. *zgoril* (18r), *htil* (4r, 7r, 19v) / *hti* (11v, 21v) / *otil* (2r, 2v, 11v)¹³, *htila* (26v), *htili* (5r); *imil* (9v) / *jimil* (4r, 13r, 31v); *vidil* (2r, 2r, 22r), *vidili* (23r).

Taken as a whole, the reflex of **ě* as found in DiGrg is fairly consistent and close to the one actually found nowadays in the i/e-kavian dialects of the islands near Zadar.

¹³ The form *hti* displays loss of syllable-final *-l*, which is quite frequent in DiGrg. To the best of my knowledge, DiGrg is the earliest ClČak text to have attestations of the phenomenon. It is frequent in ŽivJer (Mladenović 1964-65: 133-134) and several other texts, e.g. PsLuk. It is also widespread in the living Čakavian dialects of northern Dalmatia, e.g. Božava (Cronia 1928-29: 82-83), Vrgada and Zlarin (Jurišić 1966: 36-37).

3.3 Psalmi Davidovi fra Luke Bračanina

In some ways PsLuk resembles DiGrg, cf., to begin with, the following examples of *-e-*: *del* (49:18, 10b:7, 15:5), *delo* (43:2), *dela* NApl (8:4, 16:4, 18:2, 27:5, 32:4, 32:15, 44:2, 45:9), *del* Gpl (8:7), *delih* Lpl (27:4, 27:4, 27:5), and once *-i-* in *dilih* Lpl (61:13), *delovati* (11:6), *delovahu* (5:11), *l-p deloval* (43:2) / *delova* (17:22), *pres deluje* (14:2), *delujete* (6:9), *deluju* (5:7, 13:4, 24:4, 25:4, 27:3, 35:13), imperative *deluj* (26:14), *delujte* (30:25), *jilodelca* (2:9), *leto* (74:17), *leta* NApl (30:11, 60:7), *mesto* (22:2, 25:8, 30:9, 36:10, 36:36, 41:5), *mestu* Lsg (23:3, 43:20), once *-i-* in *na misto* (44:17), cf. analogical *-e-* in *l-p umestil* (30:9) / *umesti* (22:2), *umestivši* (17:34), *seno* (36:2, 71:16), *veru* Asg (39:4), *veri* Lsg (32:4), *verno* (18:8), *l-p veroval* (77:8), *verovali* (77:22), *vetar* (1:4), *vetra* Gsg (17:11, 17:43, 34:5), *vetru* Lsg (47:8).

Examples with *-i-* in forms in which the most normal i/e-kavian reflex would be *-e-* are the following: *besidah* Lpl (50:6), *cine* Gsg (43:13), *cinu* Asg (48:8), *dilovanju* Lsg (54:3), *nevistac* (18:6), *prid* (5:6, 5:9, 9:4, 9:20, 10a:5, 13:3, 14:4, 15:8, 16:15, 17:7, 17:13, 17:23, 17:25, 17:43, 18:7, 18:15, 21:26, 21:28, 21:30, 22:5, 25:3, 26:1, 30:20), *po miri* (38:6), *napridkovati* (1:3), *susidom* Dpl (30:12, 43:14), *strile* NApl (7:14, 10b:3, 17:15, 37:3, 44:6), *svit* ‘advice’ (13:6, 19:5), *sviti* Apl (12:2), *svitih* Lpl (10a:1), *svitovali* (30:14), *zavite* Apl (49:14), *nevridni* Npl (13:3), *pri-*[p. 273]*vridnoga* (20:4), *zvizde* NApl (8:4). As we saw just now, *prid* and *zvizda* are paralleled in DiGrg and attested in living i/e-kavian systems; *dilovanje* is also paralleled in DiGrg; *nevista* with *-i-* is attested on Pag (even in the north) and in Kali; *strila* is actually better attested with *-i-* than with *-e-*, even in the northwest (e.g. Novi, Rab) and the same holds for *vridan* (e.g. Omišalj, Senj), *mira* is attested in Sali on Dugi otok; nevertheless *besida*, *cina* and *susid* lack convincing parallels in good i/e-kavian sources and it looks as if PsLuk somewhat freer admits ikavian forms than living i/e-kavian systems and, for that matter, DiGrg.

PsLuk has numerous examples of *-i-* in forms that always or nearly always have *-i-* in i/e-kavian systems and therefore do not require comment, e.g. *-ciniti* (10a:1, 21:25, 43:22, 49:21), *(-)diliti* (6:9, 10a:1, 21:19, 43:19) and its derivative *dilevati* (21:12, 34:22, 37:22), *(-)listi* (5:8, 23:7, 23:9, 25:1, 25:11), including derivatives like *slizovati* (21:30) and *ulizovati* (14:2), *misec* (8:4), *siditi* (9:5, 25:4, 25:5, 28:10), *naslidovati* (22:6, 33:15, 36:1, 36:7, 36:8, 37:21) *srida* ‘middle’ (21:15, 21:23, 22:4, 39:9, 45:6, 47:10), *srit-* in the derivative *susritovanje* (18:7), *svital* (22:5), including numerous derivations, e.g. *svitlost* (4:7, 35:10, 36:6, 37:11, 42:3, 48:20), *prosvitliti* (12:4, 17:29, 26:1, 30:17, 33:6, 43:4), *prosvitlevati* (17:29, 18:9), *vid-* (e.g. *spovidati*, *povidati*, *pripovidati*, *zapovidati*) on nearly every page, including *svidok* with derivations (18:8, 24:10, 26:12, 34:11, 49:7).

Like DiGrg, PsLuk has *-i-* in *l*-participles from verbs in **-ěti*, e.g. *goril* (17:9), *hotil* (17:20, 39:7, 39:9, 40:12, 50:18), *nenavidil* (30:7, 35:5, 44:8, 49:17), *nenavidili* (24:19, 33:22, 43:11), *razumil* (13:2), *razumili* (27:5), *sidil* (9:5, 25:4), *vidil* (34:22, 36:25), *vidili* (47:9), *zanimil* (38:10).

Taken as a whole, PsLuk is reminiscent of DiGrg, but it admits ikavian forms somewhat more freely than both DiGrg and attested i/e-kavian systems.

4 Inconsistent reflexes of *ě

Alongside the three consistently i/e-kavian texts examined in the previous section, there are several texts in which ekavian forms according to Jakubinskij's rule and purely ikavian forms occur side by side.

4.1 Inconsistent i/e-kavian reflexes of *ě I: Zadarski Lekcionar

One of the most conspicuous and instructive examples of an inconsistently i/e-kavian text is ZadLekc. [p. 274]

According to Rešetar (1898a: 110), ZadLekc has always *-e-* in *nevesta/nevestica/nevestac, sused, vera* (with its numerous derivations), and the oblique stem *teles-* (with the derivation *telesan*) and *-e-* alongside *-i-* in a number of other words. This is suggestive, but since Rešetar (who worked before Jakubinskij's rule had been formulated) did not list ikavian forms where i/e-kavian systems tend to have *e*, we have to take a fresh look at the raw data.

Rešetar's observation that the frequent word *vera* and its numerous derivations are always (without a single exception) ekavian is correct and the same holds for the stem *teles-*, which is attested seven times in all parts of the manuscript (23b, 72b, 86b, 103b, 105a, 108b, 114a). On the other hand *prid* is always (hundreds of attestations) ikavian (with a single exception: 103a) and so is the very frequent word *svidok* (with derivations).

In the case of most other words in which Jakubinskij's rule applies we either find doublets or the number of attestations is too small (or the attestations occur too closely together in the text) for the absence of one of the possibilities to be significant. The most important are the following: *cena* (59b) / *cina* (21a, 21b), *cvit* (57a, 96b), *del* (63b, 69a) / *dil* (15a, 23b, 89a), cf. also the derivation *delak* (40b), *delo* (1b, 2b, 50b 3x, 62b, 71b, 73a, 77a, 89a, 95a 2x, 112a) / *dilo* (3b, 16a, 16b, 17b, 32a, 39a 3x, 60a, 85b, 88b, 89b, 114a, 114b), cf. also the derivation *delati* (63a, 70b), *koleno* (9b, 17a, 52b, 69a) / *kolino* (8a, 19b, 22b, 28a, 61b, 68a, 68b 12x, 69a 2x, 73b), *leto* (8a, 42b) / *lito* (8a, 15b, 56b, 111a), cf. also the derivation *letni* (96b), *mira* (71b), *mesto* (2a, 7a, 9b, 19b, 45a, 50a, 73b, 79b, 81a, 83a 2x, 84b, 92b, 101a, 101b, 105b, 106b, 107a, 113a 2x, 116b 4x, 117a) / *misto* (8b, 10b, 13a, 22b 2x, 25a, 28b, 31b 2x, 33a, 35b, 37a, 49a 2x, 50a, 111a, 115b, 117a), cf. also the derivation *premeščati* (1a), *nevesta* (76b), *nevestac* (91b 3x, 92a), *nevestica* (89b, 91b, 92a), *stena* (56a 2x) / *stina* (23b), *strila* (53b), *sused* (53b, 54a), *telo* (15b 2x, 77b 2x, 80b, 83b, 91a, 96b 4x) / *tilo* (17b, 18b, 23b 3x, 24a, 27a, 32b, 34a, 39a, 39b 4x, 64b, 71b, 89a 3x, 89b, 113a, 115b, 116a), *vitar* (57b, 58a 2x, 105a), *zvizda* (9a, 9b 3x, 81a, 96b).

It is clear from this that despite the presence of numerous ekavian forms that conform to Jakubinskij's rule and despite the consistently ekavian forms *vera* and *teles-*, ikavian forms tend to predominate in ZadLekc. Since Rešetar does not list words in which *-e-* is not reliably attested (*cvit, mira, prid, strila, vitar, zvizda*) his account conveys the impression that ZadLekc conforms closer to the i/e-kavian pattern than it actually does. [p. 275]

With respect to the relative frequency of ikavian and ekavian forms there are interesting differences between the three different parts of which ZadLekc consists and the three main hands it was written by. In the first section written by the first hand (ff. 1a-

40b) *-i-* outnumbers *-e-* by a factor of four to one (49:13), with all ekavian forms but one concentrated on ff. 1a-19b (in other words: ff. 20a-40a are consistently ikavian but for *vera* and *teles-*); in the section written by the second hand (41a-75a) and in the second and third parts of the manuscript (ff. 101a-117b, which were both copied by the first hand) ekavian and ikavian forms are more or less equally distributed (9:13 and 29:22 respectively); finally in the section written by the third hand ikavian forms are outnumbered by a factor one to three (9:27). Rešetar's observation that the stem *nevest-* is consistently ekavian, though correct in itself, conveys nothing significant about the language of ZadLekc because all eight occurrences happen to be attested in the section that was copied by the third scribe.¹⁴

scribe	folia	i/e
1	1a-19b	18/12
1	20a-40b	31/1
1	101a-117b	22/28
2	41a-75a	13/9
3	75a-96b	9/27

Table B. The sections of ZadLekc

Variation of the kind displayed by ZadLekc is unlike anything that has ever been actually attested in living dialects; real dialect speakers do not say *leto* or *mera* one moment and *lito* or *mira* the next. The chances are that it is an artificial phenomenon or the result of copying of an i/e-kavian original by scribes who felt free to introduce ikavian reflexes.

4.2 Inconsistent i/e-kavian reflexes of *ě II: Rapska Pjesmarica

The case of RabPjes is different, but no less interesting. RabPjes is the only piece of Čičak verse known to me in which i/e-kavian reflexes are common.

The material is the following: Apl fem *bele* (d120), NApl *dela* (b42) / Lpl *delih* (b38, c57) / NApl *dila* (b28, rhyme: *tila*), NApl *kolena* (d139), [p. 276] *mesto* (c51, d224, d455, d552) / *misto* (d568, d588) / Lsg *misti* (d497, rhyme: *vlisti*), *pred* (c3, d105, d161) / *prid* (d99, d139, d163), *telo* (d124, d856, d908, 910) / NApl *tela* (c56) / *tilo* (b19, rhyme: *gnilo*; b23, b25, d174, d402) / Gsg *tila* (b27, rhyme: *dila*) / Isg *tilom* (d517) / Lsg *tilu* (d889, imperfect rhyme: *sinu*), *vera* (d490) / Asg *veru* (d623) / Apl fem *verne* (d796) / *neverniče* (d832), Asg *zvezdu* (a31); the fact that all three attestations of the stem **cvět-* are ikavian can be attributed to the requirements of rhyme: pres 3sg (?) *cvita* (b12, rhyme: *svita*), Gsg *cvita* (d93, rhyme: *svita*), Gsg *cvitka* (b56, imperfect rhyme: *vika*).¹⁵

It is striking that not a single one of the ekavian forms is supported by a rhyme, whereas at least six of the ikavian forms cannot be replaced with an ekavian counterpart

¹⁴ The little section that was contributed by the fourth scribe (no. 234 on ff. 96b and 97a) contains the ekavian form *letni* (presupposing *-e-* in **leto*) and one attestation each of ikavian *cvit* and *zvizda*.

¹⁵ In the examples the orthography has been modernized. The references are to the lines of the four poems: "a1" means: "the first line of the first poem".

without doing damage (most importantly b12, b19, b56, d93, d497, d889). This is the pattern we expect to find if a carrier of an i/e-kavian dialect (or, alternatively, a person who preferred the i/e-kavian variety of ClČak) was copying a purely ikavian original. This is in accordance with the known fact that the manuscript was copied on i/e-kavian Rab (cf. Vermeer 1988: 633-634).

It follows that in the only ClČak verse text that has ekavian forms according to Jakubinskij's rule those forms were absent from the protograph and later introduced by a scribe.

4.3 Other texts with inconsistent reflexes of *ě

There are several further texts in which i/e-kavian reflexes occur in a purely ikavian average.

The service for Palm Sunday (100b-102b) as transmitted in BernLekc deviates strikingly from the main body of the text (which is purely ikavian) in that it offers ekavian attestations of *delo* (2x), *mesto* (1x), *presan* (1x) and *telo* (1x) alongside ikavian *dilo* (1x), *lito* (1x), *misto* (2x), *tilo* (1x) and, like DiGrg, PsLuk and ZadLekc, consistently *prid* (6x) (cf. Rešetar 1898a: 110).

ŽivJer has ekavian reflexes in *oblediti* 'become pale' (implying *bled*), *delak* (1x), *kole-no* (1x) alongside *kolino* (2x), *mesto* (1x) alongside *misto* (4x), *teles-* (1x) alongside *tilo* (9x), *vera* (10x) alongside *vira* (4x) (Mladenović 1964-65: 130-131).

It is interesting to note that the version of the same text as transmitted by Verdiani's FirZb (Verdiani 1973: 151-170), though very closely related to the one analysed by Mladenović, is more consistently ikavian, although its *leto* and *seno* (both once) still deviate from the standard ikavian pattern: *obliditi* (23v), *dilak* (28v), *dilo* (22v, 24r, 26v, 28v, 29r), [p. 277] *kolino* (26r, 27r, 28r), *leto* (22r), *lito* (21v, 22v, 24v 2x, 25r, 27r 2x, 27v, 28r), *mira* (28v), *misto* (27r 2x, 27v 2x), *prid* (21r, 23r, 24r, 25v, 26r 3x, 27r 2x, 28r 2x), *seno* (25v), *telesan* (27v), *tilo* (21r, 22r, 23v 2x, 24r, 27r, 27v 3x, 28r 4x, 28v), *vera* (21v 2x, 22r 3x, 22v 4x, 23r 2x, 24v, 28r), *vira* (24v 2x), *zvizda* (27r).

5 Purely ikavian texts

The overwhelming majority of remaining ClČak texts are purely ikavian, with one important restriction: ekavian *vera* and *teles-* are frequent alongside *vira* and *teles-* (and *tilo*). Other ekavian forms are exceptional at best. Some examples:

RiZ, the oldest ClČak text, offers the following examples: *dil* (3x), *dilo* (1x), *misto* (1x), *tilo* (1x). In this purely ikavian average the consistently ekavian reflex in *pred* (5x) is surprising and quite unlike anything found in later ikavian texts.

BernLekc is purely ikavian, but uses ekavian *vera* and *teles-* alongside *vira* and *teles-* (Rešetar 1898a: 110). As we have seen, the service for Palm Sunday (100b-102b) differs fundamentally from the main body of the text.

In ŽivKat *teles-* occurs once; *vera* (7x) and *vira* (2x) are both attested; *-e-* is also attested in single attestations of *mesto* (alongside three times *misto*) and *leto*; twice (*telo* / *tilo* and *delo* / *dilo*) an original *-e-* has been corrected to *-i-* (Mladenović 1966: 128-129).

The three texts that make up the old part of Lucić's "Vrtal" have some attestations of *vera* alongside (much more often) *vira* and once *teles-* alongside frequently *tilo* (Mladenović 1959: 123-124).

In Marulić's "Judita", "Suzana" and "poslanice" *vera* and *vira* are both frequent (with *vira* predominating); *teles-* occurs twice, *telo* 3x (alongside 5x *tilo*); other ekavian forms are limited to positions where rhyme can be assumed to have played a role (Mladenović 1957: 91-94, 1960: 133). Zoranić's "Planine" has once *teles-* alongside twice *tilo* and uses *vera* and *vira* interchangeably (Ružičić 1930: 43-60, in particular 56).

Hektorović has once *teles-* alongside several times *tilo* and appears to use *vera* and *vira* interchangeably, with a clear preference for the ekavian alternant (Mladenović 1968: 39-49).

This list could be extended, but the pattern would stay the same: in purely ikavian ClČak texts, ekavian *vera* and *teles-* were admissible, though not obligatory. |p. 278|

6 The verbal prefix **prě-*

In living i/e-kavian systems the verbal prefix **prě-* is usually reflected as *pre-*, see Belić (1909: 185-186) on Novi, Vermeer (1980: 465) on Omišalj, Moguš (1966: 35) on Senj, Kušar (1894: 3) on Rab, Hamm, Hraste and Guberina (1956: 173-174) on Susak, Manojlović (1970: 161) on Silba, Houtzagers (1987: 70, 72) on Pag, Budovskaja and Houtzagers (1994: 104) on Kali. Jakić-Cestarić (1957: 415) reports *pri-* for Olib and (as an optional variant alongside *pre-*) for Kukljica on Ugljan and Ždrelac on Pašman. This regularity holds at least for some of the i/e-kavian texts:

ŽićSvO has *pre-*, on which see Manojlović (1964: 97) and Malić (1990a: 134-135).

DiGrg prefers *pre-*, cf. *prehiniti* (14v), aor 2/3sg *preminu* (31v/32r), *premitati* (28v), aor 2/3sg *prestraši* (13r), l-p *prestrašil* (14r), ger.pret *prestrašiv* (8v), pres 3sg *prestupa* (12v), but does not completely avoid *pri-*, e.g. pres 3sg *pribiva* (24v).

PsLuk has always *pri-*. The examples are admittedly rather onesided: *pribivati* 'dwell' (including *pribivališće*) (2:4, 5:6, 5:12, 9:8, 9:12, 14:1, 14:1, 16:12, 17:12, 18:6, 18:10, 21:4, 22:6, 23:1, 24:13, 25:8, 26:4, 26:5, 26:5, 26:6, 28:10, 29:6, 30:14, 30:21), *priobratiti* (*priobraćenje*) (7:12, 9:4, 22:3).

ZadLekc is predictably complex. In accordance with the optional character of the i/e-kavian reflex in this text we find both *pre-* and *pri-*, with *pri-* predominating: *prebivati* (63a 2x, 79a 2x, 92a) / *pribivati* (43b, 50b, 55b, 58b, 62b, 70b, 71a 2x, 74a, 77b, 78b 2x, 79a 2x, 80a, 80b, 87a, 90a, 92b, 93b 2x, 101b, 102a 2x, 106a, 113a, 116b, 117a, 117b), *pribroditi* (81a), *predati* (21a, 60a, 73a 2x, 74a, 83a 2x, 94a 2x) / *pridati* (17b, 18a 2x, 19b, 20a, 21a 3x, 21b/22a, 27b, 31a, 34a 2x, 40a, 55a, 80b, 87b), *predavati* (39a, 84b 2x) / *pridavati* (18a 2x, 19b, 28b, 39a), *prehiniti* (83a), *premagati* (89b) / *primagati* (117a), *premešćati* (1a), *prenesti* (81a), *preroditi* (51a 2x) / *priroditi* (81b), *pristajati* (106a), *pristati* (58a), *pristrašiti* (34a, 38a, 50a). As was to be expected, the two variants of **prě-* are not evenly distributed among the different parts of the manuscript. True, *pri-* predominates in the case of all three scribes, but the first scribe again proves to be the one that is furthest removed from the i/e-kavian tradition: he almost seems to avoid *pre-*, with a meager three attestations (1a, 21a, 39a), contrasting with 31 instances of *pri-* (17b, 18a 4x, 19b 2x, 20a, 21a 3x, 21b/22a, 27b, 28b, 31a, 34a 3x, 38a, 39a, 40a; 101b, 102a 2x, 106a 2x, 113a, 116b, 117a 2x,

117b). The [p. 279] second scribe has 8x *pre-* (51a 2x, 60a, 63a 2x, 73a 2x, 74a) vs. 12x *pri-* (43b, 50a, 50b, 55a, 55b, 58a, 58b, 62b, 70b, 71a 2x, 74a), the third scribe 12x *pre-* (79a 2x, 81a, 83a 3x, 84b 2x, 89b, 92a, 94a 2x) vs. 16x *pri-* (77b, 78b 2x, 79a 2x, 80a, 80b 2x, 81a, 81b, 87a, 87b, 90a, 92b, 93b 2x).

RabPjes prefers *pre-*, cf. aor 2/3sg *preda* (d17, d590), *pregrišenje* (d965), *prejti* (c54), pres 1sg *preminu* (d513), aor 3pl *premogoše* (d243), pres 3sg or aor 2/3sg *prenemaga* (d904, d953), *prestati* (d389), imperative *prestani* (d331), aor 2/3sg *prestraši* (d238), aor 2/3sg *pretarpi* (d966). There are only one or two clear attestations of *pri-*: pres 1sg *pri-daju* (d553), pres 2sg *pristaneš* (b36).

ŽivJer has no examples of *pre-* and several in which *pri-* probably reflects **prě-*, e.g. *pribiva* pres 3sg (228), *pribivahu* imperf 3pl (229), *pristraših* aor 1sg (235), *pristrašiše* aor 3pl (231, 232).

In purely ikavian texts the prefix *pre-*, though very rare, is not completely avoided, cf., e.g. Marulić *premogu* (“Judita” 2:308), Zoranić *prenesti* (“Planine” 6v), aor 2/3sg *prenese* (68r), *pregaziti* (68r), *preskočiv* (71r), in both cases contrasting with a large number of attestations of *pri-*.

7. The twofold origin of Classical Čakavian: preliminary discussion

The evidence presented above shows that with respect to the reflex of PSl **ě* two traditions are to be distinguished within early ClČak: an i/e-kavian one and an ikavian one. See Table C.

tradition	texts
i/e-kavian	ŽićSvO1 (<i>videl/vidil</i>), ŽićSvO2, DiGrg, PsLuk (<i>vidil</i>)
inconsistent	ZadLekc (see also Table B), RabPjes; ŽivJer, the service for Palm Sunday in BernLekc
purely ikavian	most remaining prose, e.g. RiZ (1345) and BernLekc (except for the service for Palm Sunday); all poetry except RabPjes; all secular literature

Table C. The reflex of PSl **ě* in different ClČak texts

The i/e-kavian tradition is characteristic of religious prose, as shown eloquently by the only pure representatives: ŽićSvO, DiGrg, PsLuk. Some other important prose texts, in particular ZadLekc and ŽivJer, have inconsistent reflexes that are not paralleled in living systems. [p. 280] BernLekc, which was produced in an area that is geographically very far removed from the closest i/e-kavian dialect, is the earliest prose text of some length to be purely ikavian. Even BernLekc, however, contains a fragment that is more strongly i/e-kavian than is usual in the ikavian tradition.

Poetry, on the other hand, is nearly always ikavian. The only exception is RabPjes, which, however, is demonstrably an adaptation of an ikavian original and so not a genuine exception at all.

Things look as if at a relatively early stage in the development of Classical Čakavian (presumably around the middle of the fourteenth century or somewhat earlier) a vigorous tradition of writing religious prose in the vernacular and in the Latin alphabet arose

in the *i/e*-kavian northwest. Among extant texts, *ŽićSvO* may give the best impression of the type of language that was used. Subsequently texts that had been produced in the northwest came to be copied also outside the area where *i/e*-kavian was actually spoken and in the process they were gradually adapted to the local average. *ZadLekc* and *ŽivJer* look like products of this development. By the time ikavian had been accepted as a suitable medium for religious prose, tell-tale evidence of the earlier predominance of *i/e*-kavian was retained in the optional use of ekavian *vera* and *teles-*, both of which typically belong to the language of religion.

One wonders where the *i/e*-kavian tradition came into being. It is reasonable to assume that it arose in an area where *i/e*-kavian was actually spoken.

Unfortunately, as we have seen there is some uncertainty about the exact course of the isogloss separating *i/e*-kavian from ikavian and the position of Zadar is unclear. For the time being however the evidence appears to favour the assumption that Zadar was ikavian. First, *RiZ* is ikavian. Second, all later texts that can be linked with Zadar or its immediate surroundings appear to be purely ikavian (see the table in Malić 1990a: 130-131), apart from *ZadLekc*, which however makes sense only as an attempt to adapt an earlier *i/e*-kavian text to ikavian surroundings. If Zadar would have been *i/e*-kavian, the particular mixture of features found in *ZadLekc* would be difficult to understand. So for the time being the evidence appears to favour the assumption that Zadar was ikavian in the fourteenth century already.

If the *i/e*-kavian tradition did not arise in Zadar, where did it? I think for the time being the most likely place is Rab. Rab was at the time a bishop's see and as such a place where some religious activity is [p. 281] to be expected. Moreover, it was geographically close to the most active centers of the glagolitic tradition. And we know that *ClČak* texts were copied in Rab at a relatively early date (*RabPjes*, 1471); by the way, the fact that the person who copied *RabPjes* did not hesitate to introduce *i/e*-kavian into the text he was copying is significant in itself because it suggests that he regarded *i/e*-kavian as suitable for writing. Note also that *ŽićSvO* was discovered on Rab (Premuda 1939: 103).

As for the massively ikavian language of poetry, it may show that the tradition of composing octosyllabic verse on religious subjects arose in ikavian areas. There is no denying that the tradition was most tenacious precisely in ikavian Central Dalmatia and on Hvar it survived into modern times.

8. Other isoglosses

We shall now be looking at some other isoglosses that also separate a small northwestern area from the main body of the area where *ClČak* was in use.

8.1 LsgMN *-u* vs. *-i*

In standard SCr and in all of the Štokavian dialect area the Lsg of masculine and neuter nouns ends without exception in the ending *-u*, which originated in the *u*-stems. This differs from what we find in many western (Čakavian and Kajkavian) dialect areas, where the original *o*-stem ending **-ě* is common and sometimes even general.

Living dialects in which the ending *-i* (< **-ě*) has been found (usually alongside *-u*) include Novi (Belić 1909: 186, 208-222), Kras (Hozjan 1992: 44, 46), Rab (Kušar 1894: 28) and Susak (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 73, 100). Judging by the available descriptions (which are not always very explicit), *-u* is general to the south and east of the line Susak-Rab-Novi, e.g. in Senj (Moguš 1966: 64-67, 72-74), Pag (Houtzagers 1987: 78), Dugi Otok (Cronia 1928-29: 92, Finka 1977: 104, 106), Kali (Houtzagers and Budovskaja 1996, section 2.2-4), Vrgada (Jurišić 1966: 73).

The observed dichotomy recurs in ClČak. Before looking at some of the facts, however, one complication has to be faced. The prepositions that govern the locative are *u/v* (with the variant *va*), *na*, *o*, *pri* and *po*.¹⁶ Since, however, *po* behaves differently from the others (see, e.g., Rešetar 1898b: 128-129), locatives governed by *po* will not be taken into account here. [p. 282]

In ŽićSvO both endings occur, but in the sections I have examined, *-i* predominates by a factor of four to one. The only examples of *-u* are the following: *u duhu* (60a), *u grihu smrtnom* (44b), *u miru* (53a), *u svom računu* (20a), *u redu mom* (55a), *u strahu* (29a), *u strahu božjem* (59b). The remaining examples have *-i*: *u bozi* (21b, 38b), *u deli božji* (39a), *va Egipti* (48b), *u gradi* (40a, 48b), *u jednom gradi* (55a), *va mni, nedostojnom grišnikil/grišnici* (48a), *u Jerosolimi* (21b), *u drugom kantuni* (58b), *u jednom kantuni* (58b), *u mestu* (26a, 26b, 36a), *u mom mestu* (55a), *va nom mestu* (21b), *va onomje mestu* (59a), *u kom godu mestu* (31b), *u jednom molstiri* (sic) (51b), *u mostiri* (24b), *na nebi* (52b), *u pokoji* (26b), *u srcu* (48b), *u srcu mom* (48a), *u srcu svom* (50a), *na sviti* (33b), *na trzi* (21b), (*u*) *vrtli* (23a), *u tom govorenju* (43a), *va vsakom činjenju* (35a). All seven attestations of *-u* are masculine nouns having a long vowel in the final or only stem syllable; four of the seven attestations involve nouns with a stem in *-h*, where the selection of *-u* avoids the awkward alternation *h/s* caused by the second palatalization of velars, as in *strah* vs. ***strasi*.

In the First Book of DiGrg, the ending *-i*, though not avoided, is outnumbered by more than six to one. The examples of *-i* are the following: *u grobi* (32v), *na konci* (33r), *na onom mestu* (19r), *u onom mestu* (3v, 3v, 33r), *u rečenom mestu* (33r), *na ognju* (33r), *u snu* (9v, 14r), *na sem sviti* (14v), *u onom vrtli* (8v), *va vsem vertli* (26r), *u ovom životu* (32v). The examples of *-u* are the following: *pri bogu* (16v), *u boju onom* (9v), *u duhu svetomu vičnem* (23v), *u jednom elementu* (34v), *u evanjelju* (29r), *u gradu* (16r, 30r), *u nom gradu* (22r), *u tom gradu* (31v), *va vsem gradu* (29r), *na grlu* (6r), *u fratarskom habitu* (9v), *u gradu rečenom Jakinu* (17v, 17v), *u Jakinu* (3r, 16r), *u tom gradu Jakinu* (17v, 17v), *na kolcu* (8v, 9r), *na kođu* (14r), *u kom listu* (14r), *u mašteli* (23r), *u onom*

¹⁶ The reflexes of the preposition **vъ* provide another feature opposing the northwest (which has *v*) to the southeast (which has *u*). It is difficult to trace the difference in the texts, which rarely differentiate consistently between /v/ and /u/. Nevertheless the preposition is frequent enough to be identified in texts in which *f* is used optionally alongside *u* to render /v/, as in ŽićSvO: "Slovo *u* upotrebljava se kao grafem za *u* i za *v*, slovo *f* (i *ff*) kao grafem za *f* i za *v*, dok se slovo *v* upotrebljava kao pozicijska varijanta slova *u* na početku riječi, uglavnom kad je potrebno veliko slovo" (Malić 1989a: 147). In several such texts it is clear that *v* occurs as a reflex of **vъ*, e.e. ŽićSvO (see the examples given by Malić l.c.) and ZadLekc (Rešetar 1898a: 104-105). For practical reasons the preposition has always been normalized as *u* in the examples.

mestu (20r), *u rečenom mestu* (9v), *u tom rečenomu mestu* (27v), *u kom mirakulu* (10v), *v tom toliku mirakulu* (6v), *u kom mostiru* (3v), *u mostiru* (14r, 15v, 18r, 20v), *u onom mostiru* (10r), *u svojem mostiru* (14r), *u tom mostiru* (19v), *u tom rečenom mostiru* (11r), *u tom reče(no)m mostiru* (8r), *u nauku* (1r, 4r), *na nebu* (34v), *pri ogñu* (29r), *u ocu* (23v), *u veliku perikulu* (18r), *u tom poļu* (13r), *u redu koludarskom* (1r, 16r), *u Rimu* (9v, 11r, 11v), *na jednom selu* (30v), *na selu* (3r), [u] *srcu* (2v), *u srcu* (8r, 16v, 17r), *u tom stanu* (25r), *na stolu* (3v), *na svitu* (34r), *na ovom slipom svitu* (14r), *na sem svitu* (14v, 14v, 21r, 21r), *u trsju* (33v), *u svetu životu* (16r), *u čiñenju* (34r), *u delovanju* (34r), *u dilo- vanju* (1v), *u ispuñenju* (2r), *u koliki ljubavi i poštenju* (24v), *u onom letenju* (4r), *u veliku skućanju* [p. 283] (31r), *u videnju* (13v), *u vidinju* (11v), *u kraljestvu nebeskom* (14r), *u umiļenstvu* (17v). Of the fourteen examples of *-i* there is only a single one with a long vowel in the final or only stem syllable (the traditional collocation *na sem sviti*). The distribution is complementary to the one we found in ŽićSvO.

In PsLuk, *-u* appears to be the only option. In the first twenty-five psalms, the following examples occur: *u bogu* (3:3), *u bogu momu* (17:30), *u boju* (23:8), *u dobru* (24:13), *u gñivu svomu* (2:5), *u gñivu tvomu* (6:2), *u mestu svetomu ñegovu* (23:3), *u milo- srdju* (20:8), *u množstvu* (5:8), *u narodu pravednomu* (13:6), *na nebu* (10b:4), *u paklu* (6:6, 15:10), *u putu* (1:1, 24:12), *u putu svomu* (24:9), *u snu* (3:6), *u shraniteļu tvomu* (19:6, 20:6), *u skrovitu* (10a:9, 16:12), *u spasiteļu tvomu* (9:16), *u srcu* (11:3), *u srcu svomu* (10a:6, 10a:11, 10a:13, 13:1, 14:3), *u srcu vašemu* (4:5), *u svemu srcu momu* (9:2), *u strahu* (2:11), *u strahu tvomu* (5:8), *u sudu* (9:8, 24:9), *u suncu* (18:6), *u templu svetomu svomu* (10b:4), *u ulju* (22:5), *u zakonu Gospodinovu* (1:2), *u zakonu ñegovu* (1:2), *u obsluženju* (18:12), *u priobraćenju* (9:4), *u produženju* (22:6), *u skukanju momu* (6:7), *u slišanju* (18:45), *u stanju* (7:7), *u ufanju* (15:9), *u veselju* (20:7). Note the use of the dative form of attributive pronouns and adjectives (e.g. *u svemu srcu momu*), a pattern that is very common in ClČak texts written after 1500.

In ZadLekc, both *-i* and *-u* are abundant (with *-i* being somewhat more frequent than *-u*). However, the choice between the two endings is not arbitrary. To begin with, as was noted already by Rešetar (1898b: 128-129), *-u* strongly predominates (by at least seven to one) in nouns with a stem ending in a velar consonant, where *-u* avoids the alternations caused by the second palatalization of velars, as in *jazik/jazici*, *bog/bozi*, *strah/strasi* cf. *u dobići* (105b), *u jazici* (60a), *pri potoci vodenom* (96b), *u susi* (31a), vs. *-u* in: *u ovom ĉloviku* (30a), *u sem ĉloviku* (30b), *u Damasku* (46a, 46b, 46b), *u duhu* (53a, 82a, 83b), *u duhu svetu* (71a), *na istoku* (9a, 9b), *u Jeriku* (63b), *u kamiku* (24a, 32b), *u vsakom ... nauku* (85a), *u posluhu* (48a), *u puku* (4a, 17b, 40a, 70a), *u puku pošto- vanom* (63a), *u puku poštovano(m)* (94b), *u puku svom* (86a), *u strahu* (69a, 85b), *na trgu* (40a), *na vrhu maslinskom* (111b). However, there is more. Discounting nouns with stems in a velar, *-i* strongly predominates (by more than five to one) in neuter nouns, e.g. *u vsakom dobrom deli* (62b), *u sirovi drivi* (31a), *u jimeni* (105b), *na mesti ravni* (83a), *u drugom mesti* (7a), *u onom mesti* (116b, 116b), *u onom misti* (37a), *na nebi* (51b), *u pitji* (42a, 105b), *u poļi* (63b), *na pristolji* (28a, 68a, 73b), *u srci* (25b), *na srci svojem* (62a), *u srci svo-*[p. 284]*jem* (2b), *u vanjelji* (1a), *u vidrci* (59a), *u vidri* (59a, 59a), *o deve- tom vrimeni* (23a); *u jedinstvi* (71b, 101b, 108b, 109b, 110b, 112a, 113a, 113b, 114b, 114b, 116b, 117b), *u jedi(n)stvi* (107b), *u kraljestvi* (27a, 28a, 61b, 61b), *u kraljestvi nebeskom* (88b,

88b), u kraljestvi nebesko(m) (67a), u novom kraljestvi (18b), u tom kraljestvi (2a), u trojstvi (109b), u Žudejstvi (56b), u vsem Žudestvi (36b); o četvrtom bđinji (57b), u govorenji gnegovi (49b), u jidenji (42a), u napuće(n)ji (63a), u poniženji ŕnegovi (85b), u postavljenji (104a), u poštenji (48a), u poznanji (71b), u pribivanji (55b), u pribivanji svetom (94b), u pripovidanji (34a), u proslavljenji (48a), u p(ri)rojenji (73b), u strpinji vašem (85a), u stvorenji (116b), u vidinji (46a), u vladanji (14a, 14a), u vsakom ustrpinji (85a), u zabinji (84a), u zdržanji (104a), opposed to much less frequent -u in: u vsakom mestu (81a), u plemenu svetom (86b), u počalu (64b), u telu (91a), na almuštvu (54b), u bližistvu (54a), u kraljestvu (33a), u kom godi stvorenju (105b), u okropljenju (48a), u onom samom mišljenju (82a), u posvećenju (48a), u rasliku kršćenju (42a). The ending -i predominates even stronger (by six to one) in toponyms, e.g. u Betlemi (6b, 9a), u Egipti (37b), u Israeli (10a, 14a), u Jerusalemi (15b, 30a, 33b, 36b, 46b, 46b, 47b, 48b, 63a, 94b), u Jer(usa)limi (37b), u Jordani (13b), u Libani (63a), u Ponti (37b), opposed to a mere three attestations of -u: u Betlemu (9b), u Jerusalemu (93a), u Sionu (63a).¹⁷ On the other hand, in nouns denoting persons -u is the only ending attested: u gospodinu (71a, 89a, 95a), u Isukrstu (70a, 70b, 70b, 76b), va Isukrstu (70a, 80a), u Isukrstu gospodinu (1b), u Isukrstu gospodinu našem (91a), u Isukrstu gospodinom našem [sic] (76a), va Isukrstu gospodinu našem (72a), u mužū svršenu (71b), u otcu (50b), u predragom sinu svom (70b). This leaves masculine nouns with a stem not ending in a velar and denoting neither persons nor locations; such nouns have -i in a minority of cases: o blagdani (30b), u dvori (22a), va dvori (20b), na križi (22a, 22a, 22a, 22b), na puti (114b), u sni (6a, 8b, 8b, 55b), va sni (1a, 10a), na stoli (27b), na sviti (3b, 12b, 36a, 36a), na sem sviti (1b), na tałuri (64a), u zakoni gospodiŕi (74b), whereas -u is more frequent: u blagoslovu (85b), u blagosl(o)vu (62a), u glasu ŕihovu (86b), u gradu (8b, 30b, 60b, 63a), u ... gradu (9a), u gradu posvećenom (94b), u narodu (62b), u ognū (81b), u ognū gorućem (77b), u plodu (81a), u redu (52b), u redu svojem (40a), na sudu (22a), u sudu (10b), na ovo(m) svitu (77b), na tałuru (64b), na tałuru (64b), u templu (15a), u vinogradu svojem (42a), u zakonu (43b), u zakonu gospodiŕevi (47b), u zakonu gospodiŕi (47b), u zakonu ŕih (73a). In such cases the choice may sometimes be lexically conditioned, as suggested by the six [p. 285] attestations of *gradu* and the six times *va sni* or *u sni*. On the other hand the individual preferences of the different scribes may have something to do with it. The proportion of -i and -u in the five sections of the MS is as follows: A1: 21/11; A2: 26/10; A3: 22/2; B: 37/39 C: 9/24. This shows that the first scribe is much more likely to use -i than the other two.¹⁸

¹⁷ This is similar to Susak, where -i appears to be limited to toponyms, e.g. *na Sūjci, v Lošinū, na Mūli, f Selū, v Rāji* 'in Paradise', whereas in other cases one finds -u, e.g. *na pīrū, v životū, v m^uōru* and -i is the Lpl, as in *po tūh mēsti*. Similarly, in Kras the ending -i "ostvaruje se u sintaktičnim svezama kojima se označava mjesto ili vrijeme" (Hozjan 1992: 44).

¹⁸ The breakdown among the different groups of cases one can distinguish is as follows: A1/vel./-u: 4, A1/neu./-i: 7, A1/top./-i: 6, A1/top./-u: 2, A1/pers./-u: 1, A1/rest/-i: 8, A1/rest/-u: 4; A2/vel./-i: 1, A2/vel./-u: 6, A2/neu./-i: 9, A2/neu./-u: 1, A2/top./-i: 6, A2/rest/-i: 10, A2/rest/-u: 3; A3/vel./-i: 1, A3/vel./-u: 1, A3/neu./-i: 20, A3/neu./-u: 1, A3/rest/-i: 1; B/vel./-i: 1, B/vel./-u: 10, B/neu./-i: 26, B/neu./-u: 8, B/top./-i: 6, B/top./-u: 1, B/pers./-u: 9, B/rest/-i: 4, B/rest/-u: 11; C/vel./-u: 6, C/neu./-i: 8, C/neu./-u: 4, C/top./-i: 1, C/top./-u: 1, C/pers./-u: 6, C/rest/-u: 7, D/vel./-i: 1.

RabPjes has only a single example of *-u*: *na svitu* (4:826). All other examples (which are admittedly rather onesided) have *-i*: *na krili* (4:854, possibly a Lpl), *na križi* (4:465, 4:475, 4:496, 4:561, 4:605, 4:619, 4:631, 4:680), *na rameni* (4:286), *na rastanci* (4:529, rhyming with *majci*), *na sviti* (4:824), *na tom misti* (4:497, rhyming with *vlisti*), *u sem človici* (4:192), *u srci mojem* (4:755), *u trnovi ... vinci* (4:404, rhyming with *razbojnici*). Note especially *-i* in *človici*, which contravenes simultaneously two of the tendencies observed in ZadLekc, where, as we have seen, both nouns with stems in a velar and nouns denoting persons tend to have *-u*. Note also that the forms in *-i* are firmly anchored in the poem, not only because some of them occur in rhyming positions, but also because some of them are found in fixed formulas, notably *mrući na križi* (4:496, 4:561, 4:605) and *Isus na križi* (4:465, 4:631).

In ŽivJer there is only a single example of *-i*: *u sni* (Mladenović 1964-65: 144).

In purely ikavian texts, use of the ending *-i* is narrowly circumscribed:

In BernLekc the ending *-i* constitutes a small minority. It occurs in particular in categories in which it is frequent in the language of ZadLekc, e.g. neuter nouns (most often those with a Nsg in *-je*) and toponyms (cf. Rešetar *ibid.*). Many instances of *-i* were removed in later editions of the lectionary.

In the old part of LucVrt, *-i* is exceptional: apart from the collocation *na nebi* (which occurs in other texts that otherwise avoid *-i*) and examples where rhyme prevents the use of *-u*, there is only a single attestation of *-i* (Mladenović 1959: 138).

In ŽivKat *-u* is general with the possible exception of *na nebesi* (Mladenović 1966: 140).

Marulić has regularly *-u* with the exception of the fixed collocation *na nebi*, the old *i*-stem *na puti* and cases where *-u* would have yielded unacceptable rhymes (Mladenović 1957: 123, 1960: 137). [p. 286]

Hektorović uses *-i* only if *-u* would give rise to a problematic rhyme (Mladenović 1968: 88).

In Zoranić a tiny minority of cases has *-i*, largely examples that are also common elsewhere, e.g. *nebi* and *sni* (Ružičić 1931: 50).

The acceptability of *-i* in ikavian poetry is no superficial fact: the ending occurs in traditional lines of ancient standing, e.g. the following lines from CantSab:

Simo, sinu, simo, k majci!
Simo, sinu, na rastanci. (22a-b.)

which are obviously related to the following lines from RabPjes:

ka mni pozri, tvojoj majci
jer smo, sinu, na rastanci. (d528-d529.)

It is conceivable that the ikavian poetic tradition originated at a stage when the ending *-i* (which is after all an archaism) was still alive in the ikavian dialects of central Dalmatia.

<i>text</i>	<i>details</i>
ŽićSvO, RabPjes	<i>-i</i> predominates massively
DiGrg	<i>-i</i> is present, but heavily outnumbered
PsLuk	<i>-i</i> is absent
ZadLekc	<i>-i</i> and <i>-u</i> are both frequent
BernLekc	<i>-i</i> constitutes a minority
other ikavian prose texts	<i>-i</i> is exceptional
poetry (religious and secular)	<i>-i</i> is used only if <i>-u</i> would yield an unacceptable rhyme

Table D. Lsg in *-i* or *-u*

8.2 AplM *-i* vs. *-e*

In the Apl we expect **-i* < **-y* in masculine nouns ending in a non-palatal consonant (excepting *c*) and **-e* (< **-ę*) in those ending in a palatal consonant or *-c*, e.g. **vrtli*, **obedi* vs. **końe*, **oce*.

The two endings have been retained in something like their original distribution only in some of the archaic dialects of Krk (Omišalj/Dobrinj/Vrbnik), where the case system has otherwise been restructured to accommodate a distinction between “(male) persons” and “other [p. 287] entities” (for details see Vermeer 1984a: 284-286, on Kras see now also Hozjan 1992: 44).

Elsewhere one of the two endings has usually been generalized. Judging by the available data, there is a pretty close correlation between the ending of the Apl and the reflex of PSl **ĕ*. Generalization of *-i* has been found in *i/e*-kavian Novi (Belić 1909: 208-215), Rab (Kušar 1894: 30), Susak (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 101), Pag (Houtzagers 1987: 79), Božava (Cronia 1928-29: 93), and Kali (Houtzagers and Budovskaja 1996, section 2.2); the only *i/e*-kavian dialect to have generalized *-e* appears to be Senj (Moguš 1966: 64-67). On the other hand the only ikavian dialect known to have generalized *-i* is Vrgada (Jurišić 1966: 70). Other ikavian dialects have *-e*, e.g. Žirje (Finka and Šojat 1968: 166).¹⁹

The evidence furnished by the texts that belong to the *i/e*-kavian tradition (wholly or in part) is the following:

ŽićSvO. Ivšić draws attention to Apl *grisi* (50a). In the sections I have examined, the ending *-i* is quite common, e.g. *pinezi* (20b, 21b, 51a), *grisi* (46a, 47b, 49b, 50a, 52a, 53a) / *grihi* (36a 2x), *konopci* (57b), *obrazi* (44b, 46b 2x), *sakramenti* (58a, 59b), *učenici* (52a), whereas there are only two examples of *-e*, both close together in the same word, the stem of which ends in a palatal consonant: *stupiće* (26a 2x).

In the First Book of DiGrg all examples I have found have *-i*: *djavli* (27v, 28r, 32v), *ki dukati* (25r), *gubavci* (32r), *ki glasi* (20v), *svoji grisi* (34r), *koludri* (15v, 18v), *svoji koludri* (13v, 15v), *svi ostali koludri* (18v), *koñi* (13v), *ti koñi* (5r 2x), *kusci* (19r), *svi oni kusci* (19r), *listi* (14r), *ni Longobardi* (15v), *mirakuli* (17v, 34r), *ti toliki mirakuli* (6r), *novi mirakuli* (19v), *mnozi mirakuli* (32v), *nauci* (2v), *nemoćnici* (32v), *obedi* (24v), *pinezi* (25v 2x),

¹⁹ Of course there is nothing inherently *i/e*-kavian about the ending *-i* and the ending *-e* is common enough in *i/e*-kavian dialects spoken elsewhere, e.g. in the Burgenland.

mnogi pinezi (5v), *oni pinezi* (25r), *pinezi pokradeni* (25r), *moji pinezi* (25r), *negovi pinezi* (25v), *svi sudi mostirski* (20r), *oni sudi* (20r) *tapuni* (23r 2x), *svoji učenici* (9v) cf. also *ki* used independently (25v).

PsLuk has in most cases *-e*. Apart from *vike* in the fixed combination *u vike* ‘in saecula’ (5:12, 9:6, 10a:16, 11:8, 14:5, etc.) there are the following examples: *boke* (7:10), *boke moje* (25:2), *citre* (28:5), *dare* (14:5), *grade njihove* (9:7), *grihe* (18:13), *sve grihe* (24:18), *jarce* (49:9), *jeline* (28:9), *kraje* (2:8), *lakte moje* (17:35), *narode* (2:8, 9:6, 43:3, 46:4), *neprijatele moje* (17:38, 17:41, 24:19, 29:2), *neprijatele naše* (43:6), *ostatke svoje* (16:14), *puke* (7:9, 9:9, 43:3, 46:4), *pute* (15:10), *pute Gospodinove* (17:22), *pute tvoje* (24:4), *sine človičaskе* (10b:5, [p. 288] 44:3), *sinove človičaskе* (11:9), *sve sinove človičaskе* (32:13), *sude* (7:14, 9:17), *sve suprotivnike moje* (3:8), *telice* (49:9, 50:21), *sve tovariše* (44:8), *uzle njihove* (2:3), *vole* (8:8), *zavite* (49:14), *zavite moje* (21:26), *zločince* (36:1), *zube* (3:8). Most (nine) examples of *-i* involve the word *dan*: *dni* (36:18, 36:19), *dni dobre* (33:13), *dni moji* (38:6), *po sve dni* (7:12), *sve dni* (22:6, 26:4), *u dni njihovi* (43:2), *u dni stare* (43:2). The remaining four examples of *-i* are: *citri* (28:5, 36:35), *pinezi svoji* (14:5), *puti moji* (38:2), *sviti moji* (12:2).²⁰

In *ZadLekc* *-i* and *-e* appear to be used interchangeably (Rešetar 1898b: 131).²¹

The same holds for *RabPjes*, to the extent that the limited number of examples enables one to tell, cf. *čavli* (d850), *vs narodi i vsi ljudi* (d712, rhyming with Npl *trudi*), *skuti* (d661), *vlas* (d330) vs. *po sve danke* (d776), *grihe* (b43, c28, d469). Nouns which regularly have *-e* in the Npl also have *-e* in the Apl, e.g. *karstjane* (a8, a38, d474), *židove* (d692).

ŽivJer has a single attestation of *-i* alongside more frequent *-e* (Mladenović 1964-65: 144).

Among the texts that belong to the purely ikavian tradition there are major differences (unfortunately *RiZ* contains no relevant examples, see Malić 1977: 92):

In *BernLekc* the ending *-i* occurs “vrlo rijetko” (Rešetar 1898b: 131).

In *ŽivIvKrst* as attested in the old part of *LucVrt* the ending *-i* predominates, although *-e* is not avoided; in the verse transmitted in the old part of *LucVrt* *-i* is rare unless it helps to sustain a rhyme (Mladenović 1959: 138).

ŽivKat offers several convincing attestations of *-i* (Mladenović 1966b: 141).

Marulić avoids *-i* almost completely (a single exception) unless it is forced on him (Mladenović 1957: 123-124, 1960: 137-138).

Hektorović avoids the ending *-i* even more consistently than Marulić (Mladenović 1968: 89).

In Zoranić the two endings are “raspoređeni na pojedine određene imenice bez ikakvih glasovnih uslova” (Ružičić 1931: 50, cf. the examples on p. 51).

²⁰ Note the fact that possessive (and demonstrative) pronouns also take the ending *-i*, e.g. *sviti moji* as against *zavite moje*. The same holds for dual forms of neuter nouns, e.g. *oči negovi* (10a:9) or *oči tvoji* (16:2) and sometimes even for feminine nouns with a Nsg in a consonant (“*i*-stems”), e.g. *kosti moji* (30:11, 31:3). In the texts, such deviations from the normal state of affairs cluster with other northwestern features.

²¹ The details would have to be investigated.

Although the picture is far from being clear-cut, some suggestive tendencies can be discerned. The ending *-i* is dominant or at least frequent in most purely or predominantly i/e-kavian texts, apart from PsLuk and ŽivJer, where it constitutes a minority; it is clearly avoided [p. 289] as much as possible by Marulić and Hektorović, but attested quite convincingly in other texts belonging to the ikavian tradition, in particular BernLekc, ŽivIvKrst, ŽivKat and Zoranić. In the present state of the evidence it is unclear how this is to be interpreted; on the one hand it is likely that prose admitted *-i* more readily than verse, at least in the period around 1500 (cf. in particular BernLekc and ŽivIvKrst as compared with Marulić and GovBern/SkazND); on the other it is conceivable that there was a difference between the Zadar area and central Dalmatia.

text	details
ŽićSvO, DiGrg, ŽivIvKrst	always or nearly always <i>-i</i>
ZadLekc, RabPjes, Zoranić	<i>-i</i> and <i>-e</i> interchangeable
BernLekc, PsLuk, ŽivJer	<i>-i</i> constitutes minority
remaining texts (Marulić, Hektorović etc.)	(nearly) always <i>-e</i>

Table E. Apl *-i* vs. *-e*

8.3 IsgF *-u* vs. *-um* vs. *-ov/-ev* vs. *-o* vs. *-om*

The instrumental singular ending of nouns in *-a* (and corresponding pronominal forms) offers several different reflexes in Čakavian dialects:

- *-u* (< **-o*, cf. its regular correspondence *-o* in Istrian Čakavian). Example: Susak (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 109-112).
- *-um* (usually > *-un*). This ending is found in the North-West Čakavian dialects of the Kastavština, the Hrvatsko Primorje and Krk. Examples: Novi (Belić 1909: 223-228), Omišalj (Vermeer 1984a: 282), Kras (Hozjan 1992: 46, 51).
- *-ov/-ev*. This ending is limited to the dialects spoken on the islands of Silba and Olib (Milčetić 1895: 122).
- *-o*. Outside Istria (where PSl. **o* has merged with *o*, so that *-o* is the phonetically regular reflex of **-o*) this ending is limited to Božava on Dugi Otok (Cronia 1928-29: 96).
- *-om* (usually > *-on*, in some cases > *-un*). This ending (which is the same as the one found in the entire Štokavian dialect area) is general to the south and east of the line Božava – Olib – Krk – Novi. Examples: Senj (Moguš 1966: 62), Rab (Kušar 1894: 28), Pag (Houtzagers 1987: 80), Sali on Dugi Otok (Finka 1977: 107), Vrgada (Jurišić 1966: 78), Žirje (Finka and Šojat 1968: 166). [p. 290]

In the earliest ClČak texts some of this variety is still reflected. Alongside a single (and hence not quite certain) attestation of *-u* in KorčOdl (193a, Malić 1989: 10, cf. Rešetar 1898b: 127), there are at least two texts in which *-ov/-ev* (as in the present-day dialect of Silba and Olib) is amply attested. One of them is ŽićSvO, cf. *so odkrvenov glavov, s velikov žeļev* and numerous other examples (Ivšić 1939: 247). The other is ŠibMol (on which see further below, section 10). After ŽićSvO and ŠibMol (both of which belong to the fourteenth century) the ending *-ov/-ev* virtually disappears from the tradition.

As for the ending *-om*, it is attested from an early stage on:

RiZ has *stranom*, *priurom* (2x) and *vodom*, cf. also the adjectives *svetom* and *većom* (Malić 1977: 93).

Apart from the single possible example of *-u*, KorčOdl has *-om*, e.g. *vodom* (200b), *zemļom* (196b), *tobom* (200a, 200b), cf. also such formations as *milostjom božjom* (193b), *moćju tvojom* (194b).

RabPjes has *grubom pezom* (a56), *vo[j]skom* (d13), *mojom ranom* (d89), *nebeskom pićom* (d208), *trubļom* (d254), *krunom tarnovom* (d289), *divom* (d349), *tugom* (d510, d580, d625, d723, d797, d934, d952), *vodom* (d670), *nogom* (d727), cf. *mnom* (d488, d604, 950), *tobom* (c45, d72, d78, d420, d496, d539, d883), *sobom* (d460, d983), *ńom* (d7, d11, d281, d506), cf. also *smartju moju* (d624, rhyme: *tugom*; d638), *svojom smartjom* (d711). Against the overwhelming presence of *-om* the single attestation of *-ov* looks rather insignificant: *tugov* (d11). One would be justified in dismissing the form as a copying error, were it not for the fact that it was clearly intended by the copyist: “precr-tano *m* na kraju i umetnuto slovo *u*” (Fisković 1953: 68, note 63). Even more extraordinary is *-u* in *Mandalinu* (d785, rhyme: *mili sinu*), where replacement with a more common ending would have yielded an unacceptable rhyme.

In all other ClČak texts *-om* is the only possibility. This holds even for *ZadLekc*, cf. *Rešetar* (1898b: 127-128, implicitly).

8.4 The soft pronominal DLsg fem *-ej*

In modern standard SCr, the pronominal and adjectival DLsg fem ends in *-oj*, irrespective of the final consonant of the stem, e.g. *joj*, *njoj*, *mojoj*, *većernjoj*. The same holds for most dialects and old texts. However, there is an important exception: several ClČak texts of the *i/e*-kavian tradition have examples of *-ej* in stems ending in a palatal consonant: [p. 291]

ŽićSvO: *jej* (43a, 49a, 50b, 51b 4x), *ńej* (49a, 49b, 50b, 52a 2x), *mojej* (32a, 41b, 42b), *svojej* (28b), *našej* (42a, 46a), cf. also *bratjej* (27a, 34b, 52b). Forms in *-oj* are considerably less frequent, e.g. *joj* (51b).

In DiGrg *-ej* also occurs, e.g. *božjej* (14v, 38r, 42v, 51v, 70v, 80r, 81r, 90v 2x, 92v, 97r, 106r, 110r), *svojej* (19r, 24v, 39v, 44v, 49r, 68r, 68v, 71r, 84v, 101r), sometimes the final *-j* appears to be absent, resulting in forms that are indistinguishable from the Gsg, e.g. *moje[j]* (25v), *svoje[j]* (6v). Occasional examples of *-oj* also occur, e.g. *svojoj* (111r), *kozjoj* (97v), *našoj* (114r, 114r); curiously enough, the personal pronoun always ends in *-oj*, cf. *joj* (69r 3x, 91r, 91r, 94v 2x, 95r 2x, 97v 3x, 106r, 106v), *ńoj* (28v, 72v 3x, 82r, 88r, 95r, 98r, 107r, 108r).

In PsLuk only *-oj* is used, e.g. *joj* (3:3), *mojoj* (3:3, 7:9, 7:9, 10b:1, 17:7, 17:21, 17:25, 21:23), *svojoj* (2:5, 10a:9, 10a:10, 20:10), *tvojoj* (6:2, 7:7, 11:9, 15:10, 16:8, 20:2, 20:14, 24:5, 25:3).²²

²² In this case I have limited the search to the first twenty-five psalms.

In ZadLekc both *-ej* (including *-e*, as in DiGrg) and *-oj* occur frequently, with *-ej* predominating (Rešetar 1898b: 147). In view of the facts of DiGrg it may not be accidental that **ńej* is not attested although *ńoj* is frequent.

RabPjes. Both possibilities are found side by side: *jej* (d338, d569, d577, d669), *mojej* (d91), *svojej* (d941, rhyme: *spokoj*), *tvojej* (d345); *joj* (d31, d32, d317, d372, d668, d789), *tvojoj* (d178, d528), *ńoj* (d165), *našoj* (d310). The fact that in d941 *svojej* has to rhyme with *spokoj* shows yet again that the language of the original text from which RabPjes was copied must have conformed to the southeastern tradition and that elements of the i/e-kavian tradition are secondary (cf. Vermeer 1988: 633-634).

ŽivJer has only *-oj* (Mladenović 1964-65: 146).

I am not aware of any text belonging to the ikavian tradition in which *-ej* has been observed even once; *-oj* is the only attested ending in BernLekc (Rešetar 1898b: 147), the old part of LucVrt (Mladenović 1959: 141-142), ŽivKat (Mladenović 1966: 143), Marulić (Mladenović 1957: 130-131), Hektorović (Mladenović 1968: 99), Zoranić (Ružičić 1931: 64).

Though in modern dialects retention of the ending *-ej* has a very limited distribution it has been reported for i/e-kavian Susak: *jej* (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 115, 152, 160, 168, 175, 182, 183), *n'ěj* (o.c.: 115, 157), *moj'ěj* (o.c.: 116). The ending is also used in the closely related dialects spoken on the island of Lošinj (Hamm, Hraste [p. 292] and Guberina 1956: 47), which is confirmed by Peter Houtzagers (personal communication), who has found the ending in Čunski, on Lošinj. Note in this connection that in Božava the Dsg fem of *on* is *jī* (sic) alongside *jōj* (Cronia 1928-29: 99), cf. Finka's clitic form *je* (sic) alongside "naglašeni oblik" *ńōj* (1977: 124). It is conceivable that these forms, too, reflect **jej*. [The words "these forms" refer to *jī* and *je*. (Added 2008.)]

8.5 *na nom* vs. *na onom*

In many of the dialects that used to be served by the ClČak tradition the position of the initial *o-* of the demonstrative pronouns corresponding to standard *ovaj* and *onaj* is rather special: on the one hand it can be omitted, yielding such forms as *na noj ńivi*; on the other it can be added to other pronouns, in particular the ones corresponding to standard *taj* and *koi*, yielding such forms as *od otoga* and *s okim*. The details, which are often rather intricate, are different in different dialects.

In most of ClČak initial *o-* is fixed, as in the modern standard language. In some of the texts of the i/e-kavian tradition, however, the demonstrative pronouns *ov* and *on* can lose the initial *o-* when preceded by a preposition, in particular *na* and *va/u*:

ŽićSvO. If the sections I have excerpted are representative, there is a difference between ŽićSvO₁ and ŽićSvO₂. The former consistently omits initial *o-*, as in *va n život* (20a), *va nom mesti* (21b), *va nu bo noć* (22b), *va voj žalosti* (23b), *va vu noć* (30b, 31a), *na vo(m) svet(i)* (35a), *va no vrime* (38a). In ŽićSvO₂, on the other hand, *o-* is fixed, e.g. *va ovōj riči* (44a), *na ovu milost* (45b), *za onih* (used independently) (50b, 53b), *va ovomje mesti* (59a). Note however that the number of examples in the sections I have examined is limited.

In DiGrg the type *na nom* is about as common as the normal type *na onom*: *po 'v put* (8r), *po 'ni ljudi* (30v), *po 'nih stranah* (32v), *u 'ni Longobardi* (15v), *u 'nih stranah* (33r), *u 'no vrime* (4v, 9v, 10v, 26v), *u 'nom gradu* (22r), *u 'nu dragu* (13r), *za 'no* (17v), *za 'nu dičicu* (31r), *za 'nu kripost* (30r) vs. *na ovom slipom svitu* (14r), *u ovih gorah* (3v), *u ovom životi* (32v), *na onom mestu* (19r), *po onom daržanju* (19v), *po onom ogñu* (29r), *po onu dičicu* (31), *u ono ... vrime* (5v), *u ono vrime* (30r), *u onom* (9v), *u onom mestu* (3v, 33r), *u onom mestu* (20r), *u onom mostiru* (10r), *u onom vertli* (8v), *u onu ženu* (28r), *V ono vrime* (10v). [p. 293]

In PsLuk demonstrative and possessive pronouns are always placed after the noun with which they belong; as a consequence all attestations I have found are used independently; in them initial *o-* is fixed: *u onomu* (30:14, 36:7), *u onih* (32:18), *u ovoga* (26:3), *u ovomu* (40:12), *za ovu* (31:6).

Rešetar draws attention to several examples in *ZadLekc* and *KorčOdl* (1898a: 153).

RabPjes has a single attestation of *va voj tuzi* (d765) and no other relevant attestations one way or the other.

In ŽivJer I have found only the following relevant examples, all of which have *o-*: *na ovom svitu* (236, twice), *u ovu uru* (236).

text	status of the type <i>na nom</i>
ŽićSvO1	present to the exclusion of the type <i>na onom</i>
DiGrg	both types equally common
PsLuk, ŽićSvO2	absent
ZadLekc	present, but infrequent
RabPjes	two attestations (no counterexamples)
Zoranić	a few examples, limited to verse
remaining texts	absent (in particular: BernLekc, Marulić, Hektorović)

Table F. Type *na nom* (as distinct from *na onom*)

In purely ikavian texts the phenomenon is exceptional. For Zoranić, Ružičić (1931: 10) adduces four attestations, all of which occur in verse: *u voj*, *u vih*, *u ve*, *pri voj*.

In other ikavian texts, the phenomenon is not attested, e.g.:

BernLekc (Rešetar 1898a: 153, implicitly).

Marulić's "Judita" and "Suzana" (Mladenović 1957: 107). In my opinion, the form *vo* 'evo' which Mladenović mentions in this context does not belong here, first because it is an interjection, which (whatever its etymology) stands outside the paradigm of the demonstrative pronoun *ov* and, second, because the absence of the initial *o-* is not conditioned by the presence of a preposition.

Hektorović (Mladenović 1968: 69). [p. 294]

8.6 The pronominal stem **vbs-*

The Nsg msc of the frequent pronoun *vbsb* is always *vas* in ClČak, in accordance with well-established sound laws. In the remaining forms and in derivations two different

shapes of the stem are attested: (a) *vs-* and (b) *sv-*, the latter with a metathesis that is rarely found outside this very stem.²³ This duality recurs in the spoken dialects: in the north-west of the Čakavian area we find *s-*, which reflects earlier **vs-* with regular loss of *v-*. The clearest example is provided by the dialect of Novi Vinodolski, cf. Gsg *segã* ‘svega’ etc. (Belić 1909: 196, 236); the loss of initial *v-* is regular, cf. its loss in *šenãc* ‘louse’ < **vš-*, *zãmēn* ‘I take’ < **vzamem* (Belić o.c.: 196). Elsewhere we often find *sv-* with metathesis, as in modern standard SCr, e.g. Senj (Moguš 1966: 82), Susak (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 84, 117), Božava (Cronia 1928-29: 71, 100). The details are not everywhere straightforward:

- In Omišalj, metathesis is regular in the pronoun *ves*, e.g. *svã*, unless it is preceded by the preposition *s* ‘with’, in which case the preposition takes the otherwise unusual shape *se-* (with vocalization of the jer) and the stem appears as *s-* (with loss of *-v-*): *se sîm*, *se sûm*, *se sîmi*; in derivations *-v-* is optional, e.g. *sěki* / *svěkî*, *sěčesa* / *svěčesa* ‘svačega’, *sěkako*, *sěkakov*, *sěkamo*, *zisěkûda* ‘from everywhere’, *posûda* ‘everywhere’ (cf. Vermeer 1984a: 283).²⁴
- In Rab, *sv-* is normal, but “ñeki (...) izostavljaju *v* i u zamjenici *svã*, *svě*” (Kušar 1894: 7).
- In Vrgada, *sv-* is normal as well (Jurišić 1966: 51, 86), but we find *s-* alongside *sv-* in *s(v)emogûći* ‘allmighty’ (Jurišić 1973: 202).

The earliest ClČak attestations of metathesis are two examples of *sve* in RiZ, which occur alongside two examples of NApl fem *vse* and one of *vsakoga* (Malić 1977: 89). This shows that some systems had carried through metathesis as early as the middle of the fourteenth century. Nevertheless several later texts of considerable length retain *vs-* consistently. The facts are the following:

ŽićSvO. Apart from once *sve* (41a), all examples I have found have *vs-*, e.g. *vsã* (45a, 48b, 51a), *vse* (22b, 24a, 31b, 42b, 43a, 48b), *sa vsega* (48a), *sa vsem* (25b), *vsî* (46b, 48b, 51a, 52a, 52b), *vsîh* (43a, 47a, 48b, 52b), *oda vsîh* (53a), *po vsîh* (42a, 51a), *va vsîh* (42b), *vsîm* (60a), *preda vsîmi* (33b, 47b); *vsaki* (51b), *oda vsakoje* (36b), *sa vsakim* (28b), *va vsakoj* (31b), *vsagdi* (27a).

DiGrg is rather special. Both *vs-* and *sv-* are attested, with metathesized *sv-* outnumbering unmetathesized *vs-* by two to one, at least in [p. 295] the First Book (58x *sv-* vs. 26x *vs-*). It turns out however that the choice between the two alternants is not always completely arbitrary. Not counting the word ‘allmighty’ and leaving apart cases in which the pronoun is preceded by a preposition, there are 27 attestations of *sv-* (1r 2x, 2r, 2v, 3v, 5r, 7r, 8v 2x, 9v, 11r, 13v, 15r, 18v, 19r, 20r, 22v 2x, 23r 3x, 25r 2x, 25v, 26r 2x,

²³ A third alternant is less unequivocally established, *vz. s-*, i.e. historically identical with alternant (a) with subsequent loss of the initial *v-* in the unusual cluster *vs-*. The form *sude* ‘svuda’ in ŽKa, which Mladenović explains as a form “sa neizvršenom metatezom i sa izgubljenim inicijalnim *v-*” (1966: 136), though at first glance not strange in view of such modern dialect forms as Omišalj *posûda*, is without reliable parallels in Classical Čakavian and could very well due to be a scribal error (accidental omission of a letter in **suude*).

²⁴ Cf. also Kras (Hozjan 1990: 62-63). Unfortunately it is not clear whether or not the resemblance goes so far as to include the peculiar behaviour of the preposition *s* found in Omišalj.

26v) vs. 9 cases of *vs-* (16r, 17v, 20v 2x, 22v 2x, 27r, 29r, 30r). If however the pronoun is preceded by a preposition ending in a “nepostojano *a*”, non-metathesized *vs-* appears to be obligatory (9 attestations without counterexamples): *oda vsih* (2v, 34v, 34v), *prida vsim* (28r), *sa vsom* (16r, 23v), *va vsem* (26r, 29r), *va vsoj* (9r). This is reminiscent of the state of affairs nowadays found in the Omišalj dialect. After other prepositions we find both alternants: *po svih* (22v), *u svi* (20r), *za sve* (27r), vs. *za vse* (26v 2x). There is a hint of a similar distribution in the case of the pronoun *svak*. The metathesized alternant is attested 24 times, 20x not preceded by a preposition (1r, 4r 3x, 15r, 15v, 16r, 18r, 20r, 21r, 23r, 23v 2x, 24v, 25r, 30v 2x, 31v, 32v 2x), after prepositions there are the following attestations: *od svake* (9v), *od svakoga* (1r, 7r), *sverhu svakih* (1r), *u svako* (12r); the alternant *vsak-*, without metathesis, occurs only twice, once not preceded by a preposition (31r) and once preceded by a preposition ending in a “nepostojano *a*”: *oda vsake* (32v). The word ‘allmighty’ has three times *sv-* (*svemoguć:* 9v, 20v, 21v) and four times *vs-* (*vsemoguć:* 2r, 6v, 21r 2x).

PsLuk always has *sv-*: *sva* (9:2, 19:7, 25:7), *sve* (3:8, 9:15, 11:4, 15:3, 21:15, 21:18, 21:24, 21:25, 21:28, 22:6, 24:18), *svemu* (9:2), *svi* (1:13, 5:12 2x, 6:9, 6:11, 9:18, 9:20, 13:4, 17:23, 21:8, 21:28, 21:30 2x, 23:1, 24:3, 24:4, 24:10), *svih* (5:7 2x, 7:2, 17:31, 19:4, 24:22), *svim* (10a:5), *svoj* (8:2, 8:10, 18:5); *svaki* (12:2, 19:5), *svaka* (8:8), *svako* (10a:5), *svaku* (6:7).

Of ZadLekc, Rešetar reports that it “ima još bez izuzetka stari red suglasnikâ” (1898b: 122).

RabPjes shows that cases of non-metathesized *vs-* can be purely traditional, without necessarily reflecting the spoken language. True, non-metathesized forms of *vas* are common (e.g. b14, b25, b37, b44, c15, c41, d19, d45, d57, d82, d94, d100, d124, d133, d137, d138, d173, d175, d177, d178, d179, d190, d192, d232, d242, d261, d301, d364, d384, d500, d523, d601, d618, d623, d636, d649, d650, d661, d705, d712, d712, d715, d776, d776, d809, d823, d826, d841, d843, d856, d859, d865, d889, d905, d911, d913, d923, d945, d949, d951, d957, d976, d983, d986), as is non-metathesized *vs-* in the derivations *vsak* (a21, [p. 296] c57, d12, d23, d181, d211, d655, d749) and *vsud-* (d535, d571). Examples of metathesis are not absent, but constitute a minority: five times *sv-* (a64, b10, c9, d315) and once *svude* (d288). However, there are at least three examples of initial *vs-* in the pronoun *svoj*: Gsg msc *vsoga* ‘svoga’ (d231), Asg fem *vsoju* ‘svoju’ (d434), NApl fem *vsoje* ‘svoje’ (d978). Not surprisingly, initial *sv-* (*svoj*) is much more common (c44, d57, d93, d112, d543, d559, d560, d563, d575, d711, d715, d719, d863, d895, d941). Since it is pretty unlikely that metathesis in *svoj* (> **vsoj*) was a feature of the spoken language this suggests that in the language of the scribe both **vs-* and *svoj* started in *sv-* and that he (though well aware of the fact that in the case of the pronoun *vas*, tradition prescribed *vs-*) did not manage to take the correct decision in every single case.

ŽivJer has consistently *sv-* (Mladenović 1964-65: 138).

In the texts of the ikavian tradition the picture is the following:

BernLekc uses *vs-* and *sv-* side by side, with suggestive differences between the different sections of the text, for which I refer to Rešetar (1898b: 122).

Marulić has always *sv-*, with two isolated exceptions in “Judita” (Mladenović 1957: 113, 1960: 136).

We find consistently *sv-* in the old part of LucVrt, in ŽivKat (Mladenović 1959: 132, 1966: 136), and in the works of Hektorović (Mladenović 1968: 74) and Zoranić (Ružičić 1931: 35).

8.7 Absence of initial *h-* in *hot-/hoć-* ‘want’

The forms of the Clčak verb corresponding to modern standard SCr *htjeti* ‘want’ are extremely diverse:

- In some forms (e.g. infinitive, *l*-participle, aorist, imperfect) the stem can occur with or without *-o-*, e.g. inf. *hotiti* or *htiti*.
- In orthotonic forms the initial *h-* of the stem can be present or absent: *hot-* vs. *ot-*, *ht-* vs. *t-*.
- The second person singular of the present tense can end in zero or *-eš(i)*, e.g. *(h)oč* or *(h)očeš/(h)očeši*.
- The third person plural of the present tense can end in *-te* or *-će*: orthotonic *(h)ote* or *(h)oće*, clitic *te* or *će*.

Most of the differentiation observed in Clčak has also been found in the modern dialects. It is not the place here for a complete discussion because we shall be paying attention only to the presence or absence of [p. 297] initial *h-* in those cases where it is followed by *-o-*, i.e. in *hot-* or *hoć-*, e.g. aor 1sg *otih* vs. *hotih*. Note that in Classical Čakavian, loss of *h* is limited to one or two special cases and that general loss of *h* (nowadays quite widespread in SCr dialects, although rare along the coast and on the islands) is not attested. The evidence of the texts is as follows:

ŽićSvO appears to prefer forms in *o-*, but by no means avoids *ho-* (21x *o-* vs. 12x *ho-*): pres 2sg *očeš* (20a, 22b, 25a, 35a), pres 3sg *oće* (22b, 28b, 39a), pres 2pl *očete* (32b, 58b, 59a), gerpres *oteći* (38b), imperf 2/3sg *otiše* (27b, 51b), imperf 3pl *otihu* (39b, 49b), *l*-p *otel* (32b, 36b 2x) / *otil* (33a), *l*-p ntrsg *otilo* (42b), *l*-p mscpl *otili* (34b), vs. pres 1sg *hoću* (52a, 58b), pres 2sg *hoćeš* (49a 2x), pres 3sg *hoće* (47a), gerpres *hoteći* (21b, 44b, 59a), inf *hotiti* (48a), imperf 2/3sg *hotiše* (20b, 40b), imperf 3pl *hotihu* (41b). If the sections I have examined are representative, there is a difference between ŽićSvO₁, which strongly prefers *ot-* (16x *o-* vs. 2x *ho-*), and ŽićSvO₂, which has a preference for *ho-* (5x *o-* vs. 10x *ho-*).

In DiGrg absence of *h-* predominates overwhelmingly (if the First Book is representative): pres 1sg *oću* (2r, 5r, 8r, 13r, 22r, 30v, 34v), pres 2sg *oć* (22r) / *očeš* (19v, 30v), pres 3sg *oće* (4r), pres 1pl *očemo* (24r, 32r), imperf 2/3sg *otiše* (6r, 7v, 17v), *l*-p mscsg *otil* (2r, 2v, 11v), alongside sporadic attestations of *h-*: *hoću* (2v, 7v), cf. NApl *hotinja* (24r).

In PsLuk *h-* is never omitted: *hoću* pres 1sg (17:50; 26:3), *hoće* pres 3sg (21:9, 33:13), *hoće* pres 3pl (34:27, 39:15), *hoće* pres 3sg/pl (34:27), *hoti* aor 2/3sg (35:4), *hotil* (17:20, 39:7, 39:9, 40:12, 50:18), *hotinje* (35:3).

As for ZadLekc, Rešetar (1898b: 111) states that *o-* occurs “često” in it. Although that is correct, *ho-* predominates by three to one: if I have counted correctly, *ho-* occurs 95 times (1a, 2a 2x, 5a, 5b 2x, 10b, 12a 2x, 12b, 13a 2x, 15b, 16a, 18a 2x, 19a 2x, 21b 2x, 22a, 23a, 25a, 26a, 26b, 27a, 27b, 28b, 29a, 30b, 31a, 32b, 33a, 36b, 43b, 44b 4x, 46a, 47a, 47b, 49a, 49b, 51a, 53a 2x, 53b 2x, 54a, 55a, 55a/55b, 55b, 62a, 62b, 64a 3x, 67a, 71a, 73a, 74a 2x, 76b,

77a 3x, 78a, 79a, 79b 2x, 80b, 81a, 81b, 82a, 82b 3x, 83b, 84b, 85a 2x, 85b, 89b, 90a, 90b, 91a, 91b 2x, 95b, 110b, 111a, 113a, 113b, 115b); on the other hand there are only 28 attestations of *o-* (5b, 17b, 44a, 46b, 61b, 62a 2x, 71a, 72a, 73a 2x, 74a, 74b 3x, 81b, 89a 4x, 91a, 108a 3x, 111a 3x, 116a).

In RabPjes absence of *h-* predominates, but its presence is not exceptional either (13 vs. 6 attestations), cf. pres 1sg *oću* (c19, d381, d382, [p. 298] d624), pres 3sg *oće* (b44, c1, c13, c17, c18), pres 3pl *ote* (c16), aor 2/3sg *oti* (d161, d710), *l-p* mscsg *otil* (d703), alongside: pres 1sg *hoću* (d68), pres 2sg *hoć* (355) / *hoćeš* (d399), pres 3sg *hoće* (d4), pres 1pl *hoćemo* (d109), aor 2/3sg *hoti* (d112), cf. also Vermeer (1988: 634).

ŽivJer has a single example of pres 3pl *ote* alongside more frequent retention of *h-* (Mladenović 1964-65: 143).

In some ikavian texts in which *h-* is usually present, it is absent in one or two atypical cases. Examples of such texts are BernLekc (where *o-* is “vrlo rijetko” according to Rešetar 1898b: 111) and Zoranić’s “Planine” (with a single attestation of pres 1sg *oću*, Ružičić 1931: 40).

In the texts that make up the old part of LucVrt, “oblici glagola *hotiti/htiti* imaju uvek *h-*” (Mladenović 1959: 136) and the same holds for ŽivKat (Mladenović 1966: 138-139) and the language of Marulić (Mladenović 1957: 120, 1960: 137) and Hektorović (Mladenović 1968: 83).

The northwestern distribution of *o-*, which is quite clear-cut in the texts, is no longer characteristic of the spoken dialects, where absence of *h-* is everywhere the norm, although it is optionally present here and there.

text	details
ŽićSvO1 and DiGrg	nearly always <i>o-</i>
RabPjes	prefers <i>o-</i> without avoiding <i>ho-</i>
ŽićSvO2 and ZadLekc	prefer <i>ho-</i> without avoiding <i>o-</i>
remaining texts (even PsLuk, ŽivJer)	<i>o-</i> exceptional or absent

Table G. Absence of initial *h-* in **hot-*, e.g. *otil* instead of *hotil*

8.8 *kadi* vs. *gdi* ‘where’

The word meaning ‘where’ occurs in two variants in ClČak: *kadi* and *gdi*. The dichotomy has its origin in the spoken dialects: *kadi* (or *kade*) has been reported for most of the i/e-kavian northwest: Novi (Belić 1909: 238), Omišalj (Vermeer 1984a: 279), Kras (Hozjan 1990: 56), Senj (Moguš 1966: 25), Rab (Kušar 1894: 2), Susak (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 143, 162), Silba (Manojlović 1970: 164), Dugi otok (Cronia 1928-29: 71, 108, 109, Finka 1977: 90), most of the island dialects studied by Jakić-Cestarić (1957: 417). For Novalja, Zubovići and Pag (on Pag), however, Houtzagers (1987: 70) reports *di* (< *gdi*) alongside *kadi*; exclusive use of *di* has been reported for i/e-kavian Ugljan (minus Lukoran, Jakić-Cestarić 1957: 417, cf. Budovskaja and [p. 299] Houtzagers 1994: 102 on Kali). All ikavian dialects have *di*, too, e.g. Vrgada (Jurišić 1966: 25), Žirje (Finka and Šojat 1968: 132).

Given these facts it is not surprising that in the texts there is a clear connection between an i/e-kavian reflex of **ě* and/or a northwestern origin and the presence of *kadi*:

In *ŽićSvO* *kadi* is frequent (23a, 23b, 24a, 25b, 26b, 33a, 36a, 50b 3x, 51a 2x, 57a, 57b). In the section of the text I have examined I have found only a single example of *gdi* (32b).

In *DiGrg* both *kadi* and *gdi* are common, but the latter outnumbered the former by four to one: *gdi* (3v, 4r, 6v, 12v, 13r, 14v, 15v, 18r, 20r, 27r, 28v, 29r 2x, 30r, 31v 3x, 32r, 33v, 34v), *kadi* (5r, 13r, 20r, 26v, 32v).

In *PsLuk* I have found no attestations of *gdi*, as against some ten examples of *kadi* (13:5, 41:4, 41:11, 52:6, 77:17, 78:10, 83:4, 88:50, 118:32).

Both *ZadLekc* and *BernLekc* “imaju uz običnije *gdi* katkada i *kadi*” (Rešetar 1898a: 101). The fact (duly noted by Rešetar) that *kadi* does not occur in the first section of *ZadLekc* copied by the first scribe (1-40) may not be accidental (1898b: 177).

In *RabPjes* *gdi* predominates (17x: b2, b4, b8, b10, b14, b36, b38, b41, b57, c22, d69, d70, d108, d236, d359, d614, d886), to the virtual exclusion of *kadi* (a single uncertain example: d878), cf. also twice *nigdir* (d736, d799). This can be explained by the fact that the northwestern features were added by the scribe. Since replacement of *gdi* with *kadi* would have produced lines with one syllable too many, the scribe had no choice but to stick to the linguistic structure of his southwestern original.

ŽivJer has some ten attestations of *gdi*, whereas *kadi* is absent.

The evidence of the remaining ikavian texts is the following:

ŽivKat has three times *gdi* (1b, 6a, 6b) and no examples of *kadi*.

ŽivIvKrst has twice *gdi* (255v, 257v) and no examples of *kadi*.

Marulić has no examples of *kadi* as against more than fifty of *gdi* (not counting *gdino* and *nigdir*).

Hektorović has only *gdi* (Mladenović 1968: 46, 115, implicitly).

Zoranić uses *kadi* and *gdi* side by side, apparently with *gdi* predominating (Ružičić 1930: 76). [p. 300]

text	details
<i>ŽićSvO</i> , <i>PsLuk</i>	<i>kadi</i> frequent, <i>gdi</i> absent or exceptional
<i>DiGrg</i>	<i>gdi</i> outnumbered <i>kadi</i> by four to one
<i>RabPjes</i>	<i>gdi</i> used exclusively (or nearly so)
<i>ZadLekc</i>	<i>gdi</i> frequent, <i>kadi</i> exceptional (no attestations on ff. 1-40)
<i>BernLekc</i>	<i>gdi</i> frequent, <i>kadi</i> exceptional
<i>Zoranić</i>	<i>gdi</i> predominates over <i>kadi</i>
remainder of the texts	<i>kadi</i> exceptional or absent

Table H. *kadi* vs. *gdi* “where”

8.9 The verbal prefixes *pri-* vs. *do-*

The use of the prefixes *pri-* and *do-* in verbs of motion (*prići* vs. *doći*, *prinesti* vs. *donesti* etc.) is in some ways related to the question of the i/e-kavian vs. the ikavian tradition. I

have presented and discussed some of the facts in detail elsewhere (Vermeer 1988: 626-639). The relevant patterns are complex.

The texts of the i/e-kavian tradition clearly prefer *pri-*:

ŽićSvO: >250/0.

DiGrg: >300/90. ŽivGrg: 17/3.

PsLuk: 80/3.

ZadLekc: 225/6; *do-* is limited to other verbs than *dojti* (e.g. *dovesti*).

RabPjes: 26/4. As usual, RabPjes has a story of its own to tell. Its four examples of *dojti* are dwarfed by some twenty attestations of *pri-* (plus five cases of *pri-* in other verbs of movement). What is more important, all examples of *dojti* are inevitable from the point of view of rhyme, which is not the case in half of the attestations of *pri-*.

ŽivJer: 17/1; the only example of *do-* is attested in *donesti*.

Outside the i/e-kavian tradition there are several major prose texts that also seem to prefer *pri-*, in particular BernLekc (>325/>120), ŽivIvKrst (35/4), and ŽivKat (14/3).

In verse (RabPjes excepted) and in secular literature (most of which is verse and all of which belongs to the ikavian tradition) both *do-* and *pri-* are used, but *do-* is consistently preferred. Examples:

SkazND (from the old part of LucVrt): 4/8. [p. 301]

Marulić's "Judita": 23/34 (prose: 9/7, verse: 14/27).

Marulić's "Suzana": 2/16.

Hektorović's "Ribanje ...": 3/52. A similar almost complete avoidance of *pri-* is found in Hanibal Lucić, also from Hvar.

The prose sections of Zoranić's "Planine": 34/85. Roughly comparable figures are characteristic of the poetry of Zoranić's younger fellow-townsmen Karnarutić and Baraković.

Exclusive use of *do-* is attested in an important late sixteenth-century text from Hvar that is not among the texts we are looking at in the present article: Martin Benetević's prose comedy "Hvarkinja" as published by Karlić (1916: 250-327): 0/>100.

text	<i>pri-</i> vs. <i>dojti</i> (number of attestations)
ŽićSvO	>225/0
DiGrg	>240/>50
PsLuk	35/1
ZadLekc	>150/0
RabPjes	21/4; the examples of <i>dojti</i> cannot be replaced with <i>pri-</i> without doing damage.
BernLekc	>275/>75
Marulić	verse: 15/31
Zoranić's prose	28/65; comparable: Karnarutić.
Hektorović	3/42; comparable: Hanibal Lucić.
Benetević's Hvarkinja	0/>100

Table I: *pri-* vs. *dojti*

The evidence of the dialects is not always easy to evaluate because the matter is not often explicitly mentioned, so that one has to go by more or less accidental attestations:

The only compounds of **iti* Belić gives in his description of the Novi dialect are *nác*, *póc*, *obác* and *prít* (1909: 195, 241), which would imply that **dóc* is absent or rare. On the other hand he does give *doněst* (alongside *prněst* with *pr-* < *pri-*) and *dověst* (o.c.: 239). To the extent that this suggests that *doněst* and *dověst* are used in the meaning ‘bring’ it is not in accordance with my own observations: the verbs that are used in this meaning are *prněst* and *pripeļāt*. As for the latter verb, Belić’s gloss “*peļāt* : ‘gnat’” (o.c.: 246) cannot be correct unless a shift [p. 302] of meaning (‘chase’ > ‘lead’) [has] took place between 1908 and 1973, which is very unlikely considering the fact that this verb is attested with the meaning ‘lead’ from the fourteenth century onwards, cf. *upeļati* ‘usher in’ in RiZ (Malić 1977: 124).

In Omišalj we find *prít*, *preněst*, *prepejāt* (with *pre-* < *pr-* < *pri-*).²⁵

Susak has numerous attestations of *prít* ‘doći’ (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 86, 117, 119, 120, 174 etc.), *parniěst* < **prnesti* (o.c.: 59, 67, 75, 120 etc.), as against no attestations of *do-*. This is supported by my own observations.

For Senj Moguš gives only *do-* (1966: 121, 136).

Rab has *dôc* (Kušar 1894: 41) and *donīt* (o.c.: 39).

For Pag, Houtzagers (1987: 83, 85) mentions forms derived from **dojti*, **donesti* and **doletiti*, but not from compounds with *pri-*.

For Božava, Cronia mentions *dōjti* (1928-29: 81, 102, 107, 108, 110) and *dopeļāt* (o.c.: 103, 106) without giving examples of **prīti* and **pripeļāt*.

For Kali, Houtzagers and Budovskaja mention *duōjti*, *doniěsti*, *doviěsti*, but not **prīti*, **prniěsti* or any other potentially relevant compounds with *pri-* (1996, sections 3.12 and 3.13).

Vrgada has *dōjti*, *donīti*, *dověsti* (Jurišić 1973: 47-49), but no **prīti* or **prnīti* (o.c.: 170); since the verb *privěsti* (ibid.) means ‘prevesti’ it contains the prefix **prě-* and does not belong here.

If these facts are representative, the *priti/dojti* isogloss runs from Susak to Novi by way of Krk. The course of the isogloss is nearly the same as the one involving the generalization of the Lsg ending *-u* (see section 8.1), with only Rab occupying a different position.

8.10 Some other isoglosses

One could go on like this for some time, e.g.:

(1) The element *-olik-*, which appears in such words as *toliko*, can occasionally have an *-u-* in the first syllable, yielding such forms as *tuliko* or *tuko* corresponding to the more frequent forms *toliko* and *toko*. In the dialects *-u-* has a distinctly northwestern distribution; it has been found in Novi (Belić 1909: 183), Omišalj (Vermeer 1984a: 281), Senj (Moguš 1966: 30), Rab (Kušar 1894: 45). Retention of *-o-*, on the other hand, has been

²⁵ In most of those Čakavian dialects that combine *pri-* with verbs of motion, the reflex of *pri-* in **prinesti* is *pr-*.

reported for Susak (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 69)²⁶, Božava (Cronia 1928-29: 100), Vrgada (Jurišić 1973: 92, 217 etc.). The northwestern distribution is to some extent reflected in the texts. Examples of *-u-* occur in: DiGrg (rare), ZadLekc (Rešetar 1898a: [p. 303] 107), RabPjes (fairly frequent), Zoranić (Ružičić 1930: 90). It is absent from ŽićSvO, PsLuk, and ŽivJer (on which see Mladenović 1964-65: 136); most purely ikavian texts have no examples either, e.g. the early part of LucVrt (Mladenović 1959: 128), ŽivKat (Mladenović 1966b: 134), Marulić (Mladenović 1957: 103, 1960: 134) and Hektorović (Mladenović 1968: 58).

(2) The stem *mnog-* can appear with a modified initial consonant cluster as *vnog-*. The phenomenon is frequent in ŽićSvO, ZadLekc (Rešetar 1898b: 107) and RabPjes (Vermeer 1988: 633), but appears to be absent from DiGrg, PsLuk and ŽivJer and the texts of the ikavian tradition. It cannot be traced very well in the living dialects because the lexeme *mnog-* is rarely reported and appears most often to have been lost. Note however that i/e-kavian Božava has *vnõgo* (Cronia 1928-29: 85) whereas ikavian Žirje has *mlõgo* which presupposes earlier **mnõgo* (Finka and Šojat 1968: 140).

And there is much more. The Nsg of the pronoun meaning ‘who’ can appear as *gdo* or as *tko*, the pronoun meaning ‘nothing’ as *nišće* or *ništare*, the preposition **vz* as *v* or *u* (cf. note 16); in addition there are several syntactic differences, e.g. the use of *-i* in combinations like *moji oči* instead of more normal *moje oči* (cf. note 20). In the northwestern texts the use of the Gpl as Apl is more developed than in the southwest, as illustrated by the following passage from Mt. 2:7 in the version of ZadLekc and BernLekc respectively:

Tada Irud, otaj zazvavši *kraļev*, ļubeznivo poča uprašati od nīh vrime od zvizde ka se je ukazala nīm (ZadLekc 9b).

Tada Irud, zazvavši otajno *kraļe*, podmudro ispita od nīh vrime od zvizde ka se je ukazala nīm (BernLekc 8a).

I intend to return to these points on another occasion.

9. Discussion

An i/e-kavian reflex tends to be accompanied with varying degrees of consistency by other features, most of which have nowadays a northwestern distribution in the living dialects:

– **LsgMN *-i* vs. *-u***. There is no ClČak text of any length in which the Lsg ending *-u* is not attested. However, *-i* (nowadays limited to the extreme northwest) is significantly more frequent than *-u* in ŽićSvO, the first scribe of ZadLekc and RabPjes, and fairly common in DiGrg, [p. 304] the other scribes of ZadLekc and BernLekc. It is absent or

²⁶ Forms like *koluko*, with *-u-* instead of *-i-* in the second syllable (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina o.c.: 69, 70) are the outcome of attempts to render the peculiar realization of /i/ in the relevant position and do not indicate that the second syllable actually contains the phoneme /u/.

exceptional in all other texts (including PsLuk and ŽivJer), but it is freely used in verse to help create rhymes.

– **Apl msc -i vs. -e.** The ending *-i* (nowadays present in nearly all i/e-kavian dialects and absent from nearly all ikavian ones) predominates in ŽićSvO, DiGrg and ŽivIvKrst, is freely used in ZadLekc, RabPjes and Zoranić, and not avoided in PsLuk, BernLekc and ŽivJer.

– **IsgF.** The ending *-ov*, which nowadays is limited to the i/e-kavian dialects of Silba and Olib, is normal in the most consistently i/e-kavian text (ŽićSvO₁₋₂) and, as we shall see, in ŠibMol (section 10). There is uncertain evidence for the ending in RabPjes. Otherwise all ClČak texts have *-om*, which is also common in modern dialects, both ikavian and i/e-kavian ones.

– **The soft pronominal DLsgf in -ej.** The ending *-ej*, which nowadays occurs only in a few i/e-kavian dialects spoken near Lošinj, is frequent in ŽićSvO, DiGrg, ZadLekc and RabPjes. Otherwise it is absent from the tradition.

– **na nom vs. na onom.** Loss of *o-* in *on* or *ov* after prepositions ending in a vowel occurs in ŽićSvO₁, DiGrg, ZadLekc and RabPjes. Elsewhere the phenomenon is exceptional (Zoranić) or unknown.

– **vs- vs. sv-.** Metathesized *sv-* is attested as early as the Zadar RiZ of 1345. Unmetathesized *vs-*, which has persisted to this day (though always with loss of initial *v-*) in the extreme northwest, is common or predominant in ŽićSvO, DiGrg, ZadLekc, RabPjes and BernLekc. Elsewhere it is exceptional or absent. The evidence of RabPjes shows that unmetathesized forms in the texts can be purely traditional.

– **ot-/oć- vs. hot-/hoć-.** Absence of *h-* is common in ŽićSvO, DiGrg, ZadLekc and RabPjes, and sporadic not only in ŽivJer, but also in a few ikavian texts (BernLekc and Zoranić). Everywhere else *h-* is obligatory.

– **kadi vs. gdi.** The northwestern form *kadi* (nowadays present in most i/e-kavian dialects and absent everywhere else) is frequent in ŽićSvO, DiGrg, and PsLuk; it occurs alongside more frequent *gdi* in ZadLekc, but not in ŽivJer. Elsewhere *kadi* is sporadic and can be interpreted as a remnant of the i/e-kavian tradition along the lines of *vera*. It remains to be seen whether or not this also holds for Zoranić. The predominance of *gdi* in RabPjes can be explained by the obvious fact that in the case of this text the northwestern features were added by the scribe. Since replacement of *gdi* with *kadi* would have produced [p. 305] lines with one syllable too many, the scribe had no choice but to stick to the linguistic structure of his original.

– **pri- vs. do-.** The verbal prefix *pri-* (nowadays limited to the extreme northwest) predominates in all texts with an i/e-kavian component (ŽićSvO, DiGrg, PsLuk, ZadLekc, RabPjes, ŽivJer), and also in BernLekc, ŽivIvKrst and ŽivKat. In verse and secular literature *do-* is preferred and writers from Hvar actually seem to avoid *pri-*.

	* <i>ě</i>	*- <i>ěl</i>	* <i>prě-</i>	Lsg	Apl	Isg	- <i>ej</i>	<i>va voj</i>	<i>vs-</i>	<i>hot-</i>	<i>kadi</i>	<i>pri-</i>
ŽićSvO1	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
ŽićSvO2	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
DiGrg	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
PsLuk	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
ZadLekc	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
RabPjes	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+
ŽivJer	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
BernLekc	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+
Marulić	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zoranić	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-
Hektorović	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table J: presence of northwestern features in the texts²⁷

Table J, which displays some of the results of this investigation in highly simplified form, shows that there are two extreme types, the most northwesterly one represented by ŽićSvO1, the most southeasterly one by secular texts from central Dalmatia (Marulić and Hektorović).

There are several kinds of intermediate possibilities, not all of which may have the same background:

- (1) Some (in particular those found in ŽićSvO2 and DiGrg) may represent legitimate variation within the i/e-kavian tradition.
- (2) Some (in particular those found in PsLuk, ZadLekc and ŽivJer) may represent the outcome of a process of adaptation of i/e-kavian texts to ikavian preferences. This may also explain some features of BernLekc. There is some evidence that for some time the use of certain northwestern features was possible in prose texts produced in ikavian surroundings.
- (3) The presence of some northwestern elements in Zoranić cannot at present be interpreted. It may just reflect the fact that Zoranić [p. 306] writes in prose, yet I do not think that that is the whole story. Zoranić's relatively generous use of *pri-* recurs in Karnarutić and Baraković and may suggest that a more liberal admission of some northwestern elements (notably also the Apl ending *-i*) may have been a feature of ClČak as written in Zadar.

9.1 Prose and verse

The ClČak texts reflect two distinct traditions, both of which were in existence in the fourteenth century at the latest:

First, a tradition of religious prose which must have arisen in i/e-kavian surroundings, most probably on Rab. It is reasonable to assume that this tradition received impulses

²⁷ A plus sign means that the relevant feature is present and not obviously exceptional, a minus sign that it is absent or exceptional.

from the glagolitic tradition. Probably its best surviving representatives are ŽićSvO and DiGrg.

Second, a tradition of octosyllabic verse dialectologically most closely related to the purely ikavian type of Čakavian spoken in Dalmatia and nowadays continued by the dialects of such islands as Vrgada, Žirje, Hvar and Brač.

In the course of the fifteenth century the texts and practices of the i/e-kavian tradition spread southeastward (first to Zadar and then to central Dalmatia) and the i/e-kavian reflex of **ě* and many other northwestern features were gradually abandoned in favour of a type of language which until then had been limited to verse. Several transitional texts are extant and the northwestern origin of ClČak religious prose is evident in the optional survival of several northwestern features in later ClČak, e.g. ekavian *vera* and *teles-* in otherwise purely ikavian texts, or the use of the prefix *pri-*.

As a secular literature arose in Dalmatia in the early years of the sixteenth century it naturally adopted a language modelled largely on that found in traditional octosyllabic verse, which was anyhow closely related to the dialect Marulić, Hektorović, Zoranić and others must have spoken at home.

In interpreting these facts it is important to keep in mind first that all isoglosses involved have their own individual geography (although they all divide the area involved into a relatively small northwestern and a relatively big southwestern chunk) and second that it is by no means certain that they have not shifted since the texts were written. It is tempting to use the texts as evidence for tracing the shifting of the isoglosses. Nowadays absence of initial *h-* in *hot-/hoć-* is widespread in [p. 307] the insular dialects. The concentration of this feature in the texts of the i/e-kavian tradition suggests that half a millennium ago it had a northwestern distribution.

However, unless forced by strong evidence we should never simplify matters to such an extent that we start equating Marulić's language with the contemporary dialect of Split or Zoranić's language with "Zadarski dijalekat u početku XVI veka". Both authors wrote ClČak, freely selecting admissible (or, in the case of Marulić, making up seemingly impossible) variants according criteria that we are not yet in a position to fully reconstruct. It is reasonable to assume that every time Marulić or Zoranić wrote *pri*ti they consciously or unconsciously departed from their native dialects in favour of a form they may have found more dignified. And it is quite unreasonable to assume that Zoranić's home dialect admitted *bil*, *bio* and *bija* as alternative forms of the mscsg of the *l*-participle of *biti*, the way Zoranić does in his novel (Ružičić 1930: 80-84).

In ClČak texts, northwestern elements can always be due to the tradition. The traditional character of northwestern elements can easily be made plausible in individual cases, of which I shall mention one.

BernLekc and Marulić's "Judita" were both produced in the southeast (in or near Split) within a few years of each other. Linguistically, the two texts are in many ways closely related. Yet the former is significantly more tolerant of northwestern elements (see Table K).

text	Lsg in <i>-i</i>	Apl in <i>-i</i>	<i>kadi</i>	<i>pri/doi</i>	<i>vs-</i>
BernLekc	tolerated	tolerated	tolerated	3/1	frequent
Judita	avoided	avoided	avoided	2/3	exceptional

Table K. Comparison of BernLekc (1495) and “Judita” (1501)

The differences cannot be attributed to geographical or temporal factors. Instead they merely reflect the fact that BernLekc is a piece of traditional religious prose, whereas Judita is a piece of original secular verse. Note however the high proportion of *pri-* in “Judita”, which is out of step with what we find in other secular texts from central Dalmatia and may reflect the biblical subject. [p. 308]

10 Cantilena pro Sabatho and its relationship with Šibenska Molitva

We are now in a position to look at CantSab. To begin with, the text has *-i-* in the following examples that would have *-i-* in all of ClČak and are not therefore indicative: *bihu* imperf 3pl (16), *ra[z]dilismo* aor 1pl (43), *izadrismo* aor 1pl (17; rhyme: *ponovismo*), *driva* (15, rhyme: *živa*), *drivu* (19, rhyme: *živu*), *grišni* (36), *zgriših* aor 1sg (52 2x), *zgrišismo* aor 1pl (49, rhyme: *izgubismo*), *kripi* (57 2x), *namistivši* (54), *riti* ‘say’ (52), *simo* (22 3x), *svitil<ti>nici* (6), *tišaše* (53, rhyme: *zvaše*), *utiši* (56), *vike* (68), *vikom* (68), *odvitnica* (60, rhyme: *pomoćni[ca]*), *vrime* (1); in word-final position and/or in endings: *gdi* (with widespread analogical final **-ě*; 14, 33 2x, 45), *mnozih* (5), *obima* (43), *majci* (17, 22 rhyming with *rastanci*, 52), *rastanci* (22, rhyming with *majci*), *smim* (51), *uzletiti* (20, rhyming with *polubiti*).

CantSab has also *-i-* in three forms in which Jakubinskij’s rule produces *e*: *sidu* (50), *tilo* (42), *prid* (51); *-e-* occurs in *vera* (5), remarkably enough rhyming with *pastira*, and Hadrovics concludes correctly: “Man würde *vira* erwarten, die Änderung muß vom Abschreiber stammen” (Vízkelety and Hadrovics 1984: 16). As we have seen, ekavian *vera* is frequent in ClČak texts that are otherwise consistently ikavian and as long as it is unknown when this practice arose, the form *vera* cannot be used to conclude anything very significant about the dialect of the scribe. Conversely ikavian *prid* does not necessarily point to a purely ikavian system because, as we have seen, it occurs even in Žić-SvO and is general (to the exclusion of *pred*) in DiGrg, PsLuk and ZadLekc. If the two remaining forms *sidu* and *tilo* are representative, they suggest at most that the scribe did not introduce ekavian forms according to Jakubinskij’s rule in cases in which doing so would not have caused any harm.

ŠibMol, on the other hand, has consistently *vera*, once Lsg *teli* alongside *tilo* (also once) and once Vsg *zvezdo* (Malić 1973: 113-114). Unfortunately the number of examples is small and the *-e-* of *vera* and *telo* is not indicative. The ekavian form *zvezda* is however remarkable, because even DiGrg, PsLuk and the third scribe of ZadLekc prefer *zvizda*.

As for the verbal prefix **prě-*, ŠibMol has no absolutely certain examples (Malić 1973: 113) and the single attestation in CantSab has *-i-*: aor 2/3sg *prida* (55). [p. 309]

The evidence offered by CantSab and ŠibMol taken together hints at the possibility that CantSab reflects a different (more southwesterly) type of language than ŠibMol.

1. **LsgMN**. ŠibMol has four times *-i* and no attestations of *-u* (Malić 1973: 136), which puts ŠibMol in the northwest. Unfortunately CantSab is uninformative. Leaving aside examples that are governed by the preposition *po*, there is one attestation each of *-u* and *-i*, neither of which can be substituted by the other without dire consequences: *gradu* (50, rhyme: *bradu*), *rastanci* (22, rhyme: *k majci*). In view of this, the difference between ŠibMol and CantSab is not significant.

2. **AplM**. ŠibMol happens not to contain relevant examples (Malić 1973: 138). The only examples attested in CantSab have *-e*: *apostole* (47), *čavle* (17), *glase* (11, rhyme: *spase*), *oce* (61), *sinke* (59), *vike* (68). This supports the very slight evidence provided by the reflex of PSl. *ě, which also would seem to place CantSab in the ikavian tradition.

3. **IsgF**. ŠibMol: *mukov*, *voļov*, cf. also *oblastev*, *pultev*, *karvev* (Malić 1973: 139-140, cf. also 144). As we have seen, the same ending is frequent in ŽićSvO, but virtually unknown elsewhere in ClČak. The relevant examples of CantSab are the following: *rukom* (28), *silom* (17), cf. *tobom* (38); *žalostju* (48). This suggests strongly that ŠibMol is a representative of a more northwesterly linguistic tradition than CantSab.

4. **-ej/-oj**. No relevant attestations in ŠibMol or CantSab.

5. **na onom/na nom**. ŠibMol has five attestations of southwestern *v onoj* closely together in a single passage. No relevant attestations in CantSab.

6. **vs-/sv-**. Both texts have consistently *vs-*. ŠibMol has more than 25 attestations (Malić 1973: 133, 183-184) and CantSab the following thirteen examples: *vsa* (27), *vse* (18, 47, 68), *vsem* (60), *vsī* (48, 49, 57), *vsih* (56 2x, 64), *vsim* (59, 66).

7. **hot-/ot-**. Both texts have *ho-*: CantSab *hoće* (20, 39, 63), pres 2pl *hoćet<e>* (45). ŠibMol has 6x *ho-* as against no examples of *o-* (Malić 1973: 178).

8. **gdi/kadi**. There are no relevant attestations in ŠibMol. CantSab has four times *gdi* (14, 33 2x, 45) and no attestations of *kadi*, which is in accordance with the south-eastern orientation we have observed in other contexts.

9. **pri-/do-**. CantSab has two relevant examples: *dojdosmo* (47, rhyme: *najdosm[o]*) and *pri* (51, rhyme: *učiniti*). Of these examples, the form *dojdosmo*, which was not forced on the author by versification (p. 310) (**pridosmo* would have been equally suitable), is to be taken more seriously than *pri*, which cannot be replaced with **dojti* and which allows of an interpretation ‘approach’ (rather than ‘come’). Note that *dojdosmo* is by far the earliest attestation of the prefix *do-* in ClČak (Vermeer 1988: 631-632).

	*ě	-ěl	prě-	Lsg	Apl	Isg	-ej	va voj	vs-	hot-	kadi	pri-
ŠibMol	+	o	-	+	o	+	o	-	+	-	o	o
CantSab	-	o	-	o	-	-	o	o	+	-	-	-

Table L: northwestern features in ŠibMol and CantSab²⁸

²⁸ In this table a zero denotes the absence of relevant evidence.

Nothing in CantSab links the text to the i/e-kavian tradition apart from non-metathesized *vs-* (which strictly speaking is an archaism) and perhaps *-e-* in *vera*, which however was demonstrably absent from the protograph and introduced by the scribe; its use of the Apl ending *-e* and in particular the prefix *do-* are evidence of southwestern colouring. ŠibMol differs in two ways: first, it has one or two ekavian forms that appear to point to the i/e-kavian tradition (in particular *zvezdo*); second, it uses the Isg ending *-ov/-ev*, which is otherwise limited to i/e-kavian systems (ŽićSvO, Silba). The differences between ŠibMol and CantSab reflect and symbolize the twofold origin of ClČak.

University of Leiden

ABBREVIATIONS

BernLekc	Bernardinov lekcionar (Maretić 1885: 1-201).
CantSab	Cantilena pro Sabatho (Vízkelety and Hadrovics 1984: 10, 13-16).
DiGrg	Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga (Hamm 1978: 67-212).
FirZb	Firentinski zbornik (Verdiani 1973: 107-307).
GovBern	Govorenje sv. Bernarda od duše osujene (Kukuljević 1869: 312-339).
KoGl	Korčulanske glose (Melich 1903: 42-47).
KorčOdl	Korčulanski odlomak (Melich 1903: 49-61, Malić 1989b: 10-20).
LucVrt	Lucićevo Vrtal, see: GovBern, SkazND, ŽivIvKrst.
PsLuk	Psalmi Luka Bračanina (Karlić 1917). [p. 311]
RabPjes	Rapska pjesmarica (Fisković 1953: 41-67)
RiZ	Red i zakon od primljenja na dil ... (Malić 1977: 60-64).
SkazND	Skazanje od nevoljnoga dne od suda ognjenoga, napokonji koji ima biti (Kukuljević 1869: 279-311).
ŠibMol	Šibenska molitva (Malić 1973: 86-93).
ZadLekc	Zadarski lekcionar (Rešetar 1894: 1-95).
ŽivGrg	Život sv. Grgura pape (Hamm 1978: 215-223).
ŽivIvKrst	Život blaženoga svetoga Ivana Krstitelja (Badalić 1957: 48-56).
ŽivJer	Život sv. Jerolima (Jagić 1869: 226-236).
ŽivKat	Život sv. Katarine (Jagić 1869: 218-224).
ŽićSvO	Žića svetih otaca (Premuda 1939: 111-210). [p. 314]

REFERENCES

- Badalić, J.
1957 "Marulićevi hrvatski autografi u arhivu Jugoslavenske akademije", *Filologija* 1, 37-57.
- Belić, A.
1909 "Zamětki po čakavskim govoram", *Izvēstija Otdělenija ruskago jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj akademii nauk* 14/2, 181-266.
- Bratulić, J.
1991 (ed.) *Lekcionar Bernardina Splitsanina 1495.: pretisak*, Split: Književni krug and Zavod za znanstveni i umjetnički rad (= *Knjiga Mediterana* 6).

- Budovskaja, E. and P. Houtzagers
1994 "Phonological characteristics of the Čakavian dialect of Kali on the island of Ugljan", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 22, 93-109.
- Cooper, H.R.
1991 *The Book of Marko Marulić of Split in the which is Contained the History of the Holy Widow Judith, ...*, New York: Columbia University Press (= *East European Monographs* 302).
- Cronia, A.
1928-29 "Građa o božavskom narječju", *Južnoslovenski filolog* 7, 69-110.
- Damjanović, Stj.
1979 "Refleks jata u korizmenjaku Kolunićeva zbornika", *Radovi Zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 16, 13-31.
- Dulčić, J. and P. Dulčić
1985 *Rječnik bruškoga govora*, Zagreb: JAZU (= *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 7/2).
- Fancev, F.
1932 "Građa za povijest hrvatske crkvene drame", *Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 11, 11-63.
1938 "Dvije poslanice Marka Pecinića (Marulića) benediktinki Katarini Obirtića", *Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 13, 187-192.
- Finka, B.
1977 "Dugootočki čakavski govori", *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 4, 7-178.
- Finka, B. and A. Šojat
1968 "Govor otoka Žirja", *Rasprave Instituta za jezik* 1, 121-220.
- Fisković, Cv.
1953 "Rapska pjesmarica iz druge polovice XV. stoljeća", *Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 24, 25-71.
- Franičević, M. and H. Morović
1979 *Marko Marulić, Versi harvacki*, Split: Čakavski sabor.
- Hadrovics, L.
1984 "Cantilena pro Sabatho (Starohrvatska pasionska pjesma iz 14. stoljeća.)", *Filologija* 12, 7-25. [p. 315]
- Hamm, J.
1978 *Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga u prijevodu iz godine 1513.*, Zagreb: JAZU (= *Stari pisci hrvatski* 38).
- Hamm, J., M. Hraste and P. Guberina
1956 "Govor otoka Suska", *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1, 7-213.
- Hektorović, P.
1568 *Ribanye i ribarscho prigovaranye i razliche stvari ine sloxene po Petretv Hectorovichiv Hvaraninv*, Venice (Gioanfrancesco Camotio); reprint Zagreb, 1953.
- Hercigonja, E.
1983 "Prilog istraživanju ikavsko-ekavske zakonitosti u čakavštini 15. stoljeća", *Radovi Zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 18, 1-42.
- Houtzagers, H.P.
1987 "On the phonology and morphology of the Čakavian dialects spoken on the island of Pag", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 10, 65-90.
- Houtzagers, H.P. and E. Budovskaja
1996 "Nominal and verbal inflexion in the Čakavian dialect of Kali on the island of Ugljan", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 23, 1996, 143-166.
- Hozjan, Snj.
1990 "Fonološki prikaz mjesnoga govora Krasa (reprezentanta dobrinjskoga govornog tipa)", *Rasprave ZJ* 16, 45-66.
1992 "Govor Krasa na otoku Krku (deklinacija)", *Rasprave ZHJ* 18, 43-55.

- Hraste, M.
 1926-27 "Crtice o bruškom dialektu", *Južnoslovenski filolog* 6, 180-214.
 1935 "Čakavski dijalekat ostrva Hvara", *Južnoslovenski filolog* 14, 1-55.
 1940 "Čakavski dijalekat ostrva Brača", *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 10, 1-65.
 1950 "Crtice o Marulićevoj čakavštini", *Zbornik u proslavu petstogodišnjice rođenja Marka Marulića*, 245-277.
- Hraste, M., P. Šimunović and R. Olesch
 1979 *Čakavisches-deutsches Lexikon* 1, Köln/Wien (Böhlau) (= *Slavistische Forschungen* 25/1).
- Ivić, Pavle
 1959 review of Hamm, Hraste and Guberina (1956), *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 2, 171-183.
 1961-62 "Prilog rekonstrukciji predmigracione dijalekatske slike srpskohrvatske jezičke oblasti", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 4-5, 117-129.
- Ivšić, Jelka
 1931 "Ђ u senjskom govoru", *Južnoslovenski filolog* 10, 171-178.
- Ivšić, Stj.
 1939 "Nekoliko napomena uz starohrvatski tekst 'Žića sv. otaca'", *Starine* 40, 225-251.
- Jagić, V.
 1869 "Ogledi stare hrvatske proze", *Starine* 1, 216-236.
- Jakić-Cestarić, V.
 1957 "Refleks jata na sjevernodalmatinskim otocima", *Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru* 3, 407-420. [p. 316]
- Jakubinskij, L.
 1925 "Die Vertretung des urslav. ě im Čakavischen", *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 1, 381-396.
- Jurišić, B.
 1966 *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade I. Uvod*, Zagreb.
 1973 *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade II. Rječnik*, Zagreb.
- Karlić, P.
 1916 "Martin Benetević: Hvarkinja", *Grada za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 8, 247-327.
 1917 *Psalmi Davidovi fra Luke Bračanina*, Zagreb (= *Djela JAZU* 27).
- Kolumbić, N.
 1990 *Petar Lucić. Vartal*, Split: Književni krug.
- Kukuljević, I.
 1869 *Pjesme Marka Marulića*, Zagreb (= *Stari pisci hrvatski* 1).
- Kulundžić, Zv. and J. Derossi (eds.)
 1989 *Od naslidovanja Isukarstova ... preveo ... Marko Marulić*, Zadar-Duvno (= *Knjižnica "Svete baštine"* 27).
- Kušar, M.
 1894 "Rapski dijalekat", *Rad JAZU* 118, 1-54.
- Lukežić, Iva
 1990 *Čakavski ikavsko-ekavski dijalekt*, Rijeka: Izdavački centar Rijeka.
- Małecki, M.
 1929 "O podział gwar Krku", *Prace filologiczne* 14, 563-581.
 1963 "O podjeli krčkih govora", *Filologija* 4, 223-235 (translation of Małecki 1929).
- Malić, D.
 1973 "Šibenska molitva (filološka monografija)", *Rasprave IJ* 2, 81-190.
 1977 "'Red i zakon' zadarskih dominikanki iz 1345. godine (Prikaz jezika najstarijega hrvatskog latiničkog spomenika)", *Rasprave IJ* 3, 59-128.
 1987 "Slogotvorni r i l u starohrvatskom latiničkom rukopisu 'Žića sv. otaca'", *Rasprave ZJ* 13, 55-63.
 1988 "Porijeklo i značenje riječi *eje/efje* iz 'Žića s. otaca'", *Rasprave ZJ* 14, 105-122.

- 1989a "Grafija i pravopis hrvatskog latiničkog rukopisa 14. stoljeća 'Žića sv. otaca'", *Rasprave ZJ* 15, 129-177.
- 1989b "Prilog istraživanju hrvatske latiničke književnosti 14. stoljeća. Odlomak Korčulanskog lektionara", *Croatica* 31-32, 7-56.
- 1990a "Refleksi jata u 'Žićima svetih otaca'", *Rasprave ZJ* 16, 115-149.
- 1990b "Tragovi glagoljičke tradicije u starohrvatskom latiničkom rukopisu 'Žića sv. otaca'", *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 36, 239-245.
- 1991 "Samoglasničke pojave u 'Žićima svetih otaca'", *Rasprave ZJ* 17, 83-122.
- 1992 "Crkvenoslavenska jezična tradicija u hrvatskim latiničkim rukopisima 14. stoljeća", *Rasprave ZJ* 18, 99-117.
- 1992-93 "Izricanje budućnosti u 'Žićima svetih otaca'", *Filologija* 20-21, 283-292.
- Manojlović, Sv. N.
1964 "Ekavizmi u zadarskim tekstovima XIV-XVII stoljeća", *Radovi ANUBiH* 24, *Odjeljenje istorijsko-filoloških nauka* 8, 95-106. [p. 317]
- 1970 "Sudari ekavizama i ikavizama na ostrvu Silbi", *Radovi ANUBiH* 38, *Odjeljenje društvenih nauka* 13, 153-183.
- Maretić, T.
1885 *Lekcionarij Bernardina Splječanina po prvom izdanju od god. 1495.*, Zagreb (= *Djela JAZU* 5).
- Marulić, M.
1521 *Libar Marca Marula Splichianina Vchomse usdarsi Istoria Sfete udouice Iudit u uersih haruacchi slosena / chacho ona ubi uoiuodu Olopherna Posridu uoische gnegoue / i oslodobi puch israelschi od ueliche pogibili*, Venice: Guilielmo da Fontaneto de Monteferrato (reprint Zagreb, 1950).
- Melich, J.
1903 "Misekönyv a XIV. századból", *Magyar könyvszemle* 9, 36-64.
- Meyer, K.H.
1926 "Beiträge zum Čakavischen", *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 40, 222-265.
- 1928 *Untersuchungen zur Čakavština der Insel Krk (Veglia)*, Leipzig.
- Milčetić, I.
1895 "Čakavština Kvarnerskih otoka", *Rad JAZU* 121, 92-131.
- Mladenović, A.
1957 "Fonetske i morfološke osobine Marulićevog jezika", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 2, 89-144.
- 1959 "Grafija i jezik dalmatinskih čakavskih rukopisa u arhivu Jugoslavenske akademije", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 4, 117-150.
- 1960 "O jeziku Marulićevih poslanica", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 5, 129-142.
- 1961-62 "Prilog proučavanju čakavskih rukopisa iz Dalmacije: grafija i ortografija Suzane", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 4-5, 211-216.
- 1964 "Prilog proučavanju čakavskih rukopisa iz Dalmacije (II): grafija i ortografija 'Života sv. Jeronima'", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 7, 103-107.
- 1964-65 "Jezik 'Života svetog Jeronima'", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 8, 129-158.
- 1966a "Prilog proučavanju čakavskih rukopisa iz Dalmacije (III): grafija i ortografija 'Života sv. Katarine'", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 7, 103-107.
- 1966b "Osobine jezika 'Života sv. Katarine'", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 9, 127-156.
- 1968 *Jezik Petra Hektorovića*, Novi Sad (Matica Srpska).
- Moguš, M.
1966 "Današnji senjski govor", *Senjski zbornik* 2, 5-152.
- 1977 *Čakavsko narječje*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

- Premuda, V.
1939 "Starohrvatski latinički rukopis 'Žića sv. otaca'", *Starine* 40, 103-220.
- Rešetar, M.
1894 *Zadarski i Ranjinin lekcionar*, Zagreb (= *Djela JAZU* 13),
1898a "Primorski lekcionari XV. vijeka", *Rad JAZU* 134, 80-160.
1898b "Primorski lekcionari XV. vijeka (Konac)", *Rad JAZU* 136, 97-199.
- Ružičić, G. S.
1930 "Jezik Petra Zoranića. Zadarski dijalekat u početku XVI veka", *Južnoslovenski filolog* 9, 1-91. [p. 318]
1931 "Jezik Petra Zoranića. Zadarski dijalekat u početku XVI veka (Nastavak)", *Južnoslovenski filolog* 10, 1-90.
- Verdiani, Carlo
1973 *O Marulićevu autorstvu Firentinskoga hrvatskog zbornika iz XV stoljeća*, Split (Čakavski sabor/Katedra za književnost i kulturu).
- Vermeer, W.R.
1975 "Problems in the synchronic and diachronic phonology of Susak čakavian", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 18/2, 139-159.
1980 "Die Konjugation in der nordwestčakavischen Mundart Omišalj", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 1, 439-472.
1982 "On the principal sources for the study of čakavian dialects with neocircumflex in adjectives and *e*-presents", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 2, 279-340.
1984a "Opozicija tipa "živo/neživo" u množini u jednom čakavskom sistemu (Omišalj)", *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane: referati i saopštenja* 13/1, 275-288.
1984b "On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: the quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and related issues", *Folia Linguistica Historica* 5/2, 331-395.
1987 "Glagol *iti* u južnočakavskom književnom jeziku Mletačke Dalmacije", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 30/1, 111-127.
1988 "Remarks on variation in Classical Čakavian", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 11, 621-646.
1989 "Traces of an early Romance isogloss in Western Balkan Slavic", *Slavistična Revija* 37/1-3, 15-30.
1994 "Vowel length in Čakavian texts from the fourteenth century", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 22, 467-491.
- Vízkelety, A. and L. Hadrovics
1984 "Ein altkroatisches Passionslied aus dem 14. Jahrhundert", *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 30, 3-37.
- Wagner, Z.
1970 *Ze studiów nad językiem Petra Hektorovicia*, Wrocław/Warszawa/Kraków.
- Zoranić, P.
1569 *Planine che zdarxe usebi Pisni pete po Pastirich, Pripouisti, i Prituori Iunachou i Dekliç, i Mnoge ostale stuari sloxene po Petru Zoranichiu Nignaninu*, Venice (reprint Zagreb, 1952).