THE TWOFOLD ORIGIN OF CLASSICAL ČAKAVIAN

WILLEM VERMEER

[Note on the 2008 version
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. 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”.

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.

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 Čak “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 Čak “Planine”, printed in 1569.
– The first printed SCr dictionary is Faust Vrančić’s Čak “Dictionarium” of 1595.
– Like the contemporary written language of Dubrovnik, Čak was a forward-looking, vernacular-based tradition. Čak 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, Čak arose in the fourteenth century in northern Dalmatia, i.e. in the area dominated by 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 Brač. The area where Čak was in active use at one time or other comprises (roughly speaking) the islands from Rab in the north-west to Korčula 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 Čak texts are linguistically quite identical. At least three complexes of facts may be involved.

First, the area where Čak 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 Čak 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, Čak 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 Čak 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 PSl * č 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 primljena na dil dobrga činjenja sestar naših reda svetoga oca našega Dominika” (RiZ). This brief prose text (62 lines) is the earliest surviving specimen of CICak (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) “Žiča sv. otaca” (ŽičSvO). 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 ŽičSvO (the second part starts at the bottom of f. 40a with chapter 64) and it will sometimes be necessary to refer to “ŽičSvO1” (i.e. ff. 1a-40a) and “ŽičSvO2” (i.e. ff. 40a-134b) as if they are distinct documents. For the past decade, Dragica Malić has been working on ŽičSvO (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 (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 drugijeh 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, Korč-Odl 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 lekcionar” (BernLekc), printed in Venice in 1495. BernLekc was reprinted in 1543 (by Benedikt Zborovčić) and 1586 (by Marko Andriolić Trogiranin), 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) 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 osuvene” (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 Verdi 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 Verdi (1973: 151-170) in the original orthography. The language of the Zagreb copy of ŽivJer has been described by Mladenović (1966a, 1966b).

(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 (1964, 1964-65).

(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 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 Ružićić (1930-31).

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, Ružićić’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. 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 tezmi ‘those’ (“Judita” 4:85; elsewhere always timi). His predilection for endingless 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 Čak manuscripts (RiZ, ŠibMol, KorčOdl, ŽićSvO), thereby laying the foundations for a genuine understanding of the rise and development of the Čak 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 Čak 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” (ŽivorGrg) 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 Śibenico, 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 Čak 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 PSl *ě found in both types of sources (modern spoken dialects and Čak 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 Čak is “purely ikavian” in the sense that PSl *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 *ě in a limited set of positions, more precisely before dental consonants (t, d, s, z, l, n) which are not in their turn followed by a front 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/lpl 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 mistih (not **mistih), the Lsg of mera is meri (not **miri), rizati has replaced rezati (or, con-

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. beli/biliti, deli/diliti, mera/miriti, sled/sliditi, vetar/izviriti. 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. 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, črada, ded, del, [p. 265] delati, delo, dleto, dren, kolen, len, leto, mera, mesto, nevesta, obed, pesak, poleno, pred, presan, redak, sed, seno, sled, slez, sreda ‘Wednesday’, stena, strela, sused, svet ‘advice’ (< *sòvèto), 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 Jakubinskiij’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 PSl *ě, but which has -e- in those words that have ended up with -e- as a consequence of Jakubinskiij’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 spovidit ‘confess’, l-p fem spovidela, derived imperfective inf spovědát pres 3sg spovědů. (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. 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 vriča) makes a dialect “more ikavian” than it would be otherwise. And since alternations within inflexional paradigms have been eliminated, it makes no sense either to list such forms as mera vs. miriti or sreda ‘Wednesday’ vs. srida ‘middle’ or pred vs. naprid.

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 CIČak 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), -večati (obečati), venac, vreteno, and zled (cf. already Rešetar 1898a: 109).

Second, the verb *šesti often has ekavian reflexes which can be attributed to generalization of the present tense stem *šed-, so that an -e- in sesti cannot be regarded as an indication of an i/e-kavian system (Ružičić 1930: 60, Ivič 1959: 175, Malić 1990a: 128). And, finally, it goes without saying that the presence of -e- in vek or dekla or starešina or bolezni or ovde or krepot 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 comment. In my view this is a step backwards as compared with the presentation as inherited from Jakubinskij and still found in, e.g., Mogyš (1966: 31-36, 1977, in particular 39-40).

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

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 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. plāk at vs. plāče) and -i- in dialects which, like all of Stokavian, lack neocircumflex (plāk at vs. plāče), e.g. videl vs. vidil. The significance of this isogloss was first seen, I think, by Malecki (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, dil o, nevista, and zvīzda, but betrays itself as solidly i/e-kavian by its -e- in such words as bel, cel, del, obed, koleno, leto, mesto, retko, sre dā ‘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, Zubović, 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 Belić (1909: 184-187) on Novi, Vermeer (1984a: 278-280) on Omišalj (Krk), Hožjan (1990: 54-56) on Kras near Dobrinj (Krk), Mogoš (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), Ivč (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 Ćak texts were being written. The 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 Ćak it is unfortunate that because of this the original position of the important town of Zadar (where quite a few Ćak 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 (plăče). Although these dialects are spoken just outside the area where Ćak was in active use, features characteristic of them occasionally penetrate into Ćak 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 Ćak 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]
Kali (Ugljan) according to Budovskaja and Houtzagers (1994) and Houtzagers and Budovskaja (1996).

C: “(purely) ikavian”. Dialects with a consistently ikavian reflex of PSl *ě. The bulk of the Čak 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).

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

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 ČiČak 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 Žiča sveti otaca

ŽičSvO 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 ŽičSvO 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 ŽičSvO, e.g. bili, diliti, nedilja, obliniti, miriti, sliditi, tisniti.

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.\(^1\)
- 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).
- *svět ‘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) (Malic o.c.: 137-139). Indeed, ŽićSvO is the only ClČak text in which such examples are attested at all. As pointed out by Dragica Malic, 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).\(^2\)

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 činelo, učiněla, domišlela (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).

---

\(^1\) The words naprid and sprida normally have -i- in i/e-kavian dialects and require no comment.

\(^2\) 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), NAdp dela (11v, 12r 3x, etc.), Gpl del (15v), Dsg kolenu (28v), NApl kolen (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 mesti (8v), Lsg mesti (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), Lsg telom (32v), Lsg telu (31v), Lsg telesnim (4v), but also once Gsg tila (1r), vera (6v, 11r, 16r etc.), Gsg vere (2r, 2v, 4v, 9r, 16r etc.), Lsg verom (16r), vero (29v), Gpl vernih (12r), Gsg verovanja (32v), verovati (17r 2x, 22r), veruješ (3v), verujmo (14v), veruju (2r, 6v), verujući (9r), Lsg 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, 11r, 12r, 12v), pripovidaj (11v), pripovidji(1)ći (11v), pripovidenje (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 zvize (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 *-eti, e.g. zgoriti (18r), hitil (4r, 7r, 19v) / hti (11v, 21v) / otil (2r, 2v, 11v)49, htila (26v), htili (5r); imil (9v) / jimir (4r, 13r, 31v); vidil (2r, 2r, 22r), vidili (23r).

Taken as a whole, the reflex of *e 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.

---

49 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 CIČak text to have attestations of the phenomenon. It is frequent in ZivJer (Mladenović 1964-65: 133-134) and several other texts, e.g. PšLuk. It is also widespread in the living Čakavian dialects of northern Dalmatia, e.g. Božava (Chronia 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),

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), zvize NApl (8:4). As we saw just now, prid and zvizza 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 i/kavian forms than living i/e-kavian systems and, for that matter, DiGrg.


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 ika-
vian 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 ZadLek. According to Rešetar (1898a: 110), ZadLekc has always -e- in nevesta/nevestical/neves-
tac, 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, 25b, 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), kolenko (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), mire (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 promešcati (18), nevesta (76b), nevestac (91b 2x, 92a), nevestica (89b, 91b, 92a), stena (56a 2x) / stina (23b), strila (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 con-
form 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 inter-
esting 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>scribe</th>
<th>folia</th>
<th>i/e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1a-19b</td>
<td>18/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20a-40b</td>
<td>31/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101a-117b</td>
<td>22/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41a-75a</td>
<td>13/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75a-96b</td>
<td>9/27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 ClČak verse known to me in which i/e-kavian reflexes are common.

The material is the following: Apl fem *bele* (d120), NApI *dela* (b42) / Lpl *delih* (b38, c57) / NApI *dila* (b28, rhyme: *tila*), NApI *kolena* (d139), |p. 276| *mesto* (c51, d224, d455, d552) / *misto* (d568, d588) / Lsg *misti* (d497, rhyme: *vlista*), pred (c3, d105, d161) / prid (d99, d139, d163), *telo* (d124, d856, d908, 910) / NApI *tela* (c56) / *tilo* (b19, rhyme: *gnilo*; b23, b25, d174, d402) / Gsg *tila* (b27, rhyme: *dila*) / 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 *zviza*.

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 Jakubinski’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), kolino (26r, 27r, 28r), leto (22r), lito (21v, 22v, 24v 2x, 25r, 27r 2x, 27v, 28r), miro (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 tiles- (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 tiles- (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 (Ružićić 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 *pre-*

In living i/e-kavian systems the verbal prefix *pre-* 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:

ŽićeSvo 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).


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: *pribivati* (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), *priboditi* (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), *premešati* (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 *pre-* 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 2x, 84b 2x, 89b, 92a, 94a 2x) vs. 16x pri- (77b, 78b 2x, 79a 2x, 80a, 80b 2x, 81a, 81b, 87a, 90a, 92b, 93b 2x).

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

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

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

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 to be expected. Moreover, it was geographically close to the most active centers of the glagolitic tradition. And we know that ČiČak 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 ČiČak 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 *-ê is common and sometimes even general.
Living dialects in which the ending -i (< *-ië) 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-Novı, 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 CIČak. 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. 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.

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 gršniku/grišnici (48a), u Jerosolimi (21b), u drugom kantuni (58b), u jednom kantuni (58b), u mesti (26a, 26b, 36a), u mom mesti (55a), va nom mesti (21b), va onomje mesti (59a), vom godi mesti (31b), u jednom molstiri (sic) (51b), u mostiri (24b), na nebi (52b), u pokoji (26b), u srci (48b), u srci mom (48a), u srci svom (50a), na sviti (33b), na trzi (21b), (u) vrtli (23a), u tom govorenji (43a), va vsakom čiščenji (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 mesti (19r), u onom mesti (3v, 3v, 33r), u rečenom mesti (33r), na onem (33r), u sni (9v, 14r), na sem sviti (14v), u onom vrtli (8v), va vsem vrtli (26r), u ovom životi (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 onom gradu (31v), u vsem gradu (29r), na grlu (6t), 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 koňu (14r), u kom listu (14r), u maštelu (23r), u onom...

16 The reflexes of the preposition *v> 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 *v>, e.g. ŽiĆSVO (see the examples given by Malić l.c.) and ZadLeks (Rešetar 1898a: 104-105). For practical reasons the preposition has always been normalized as u in the examples.

[p. 313]
mestu (20r), u rečenom mestu (9v), u tom rečenom 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 rečenom mostiru (8r), u nauku (1r, 4r), na nebu (34v), pri ognju (29r), u ocu (23v), u veliku perikulu (18r), u tom polju (13r), u redu koludsarom (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 trsi (33v), u svetu životu (16r), u činjenju (34r), u delovanju (34r), u dilovanju (iv), u ispunjenju (2r), u koliki lubavi i poštenju (24v), u onom letenju (4r), u veliku skučanju [p. 283] (31r), u videnju (13v), u vidinju (11v), u kraštvu nebeskom (14r), u umiljenstvu (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 ŽičSVO.

In PsLuk, -u appears to be the only option. In the first twenty-five psalms, the following examples occur: u bogu (33), u bogu momu (17:30), u boju (23:8), u dobru (24:13), u gniva svomu (2:5), u gniva tvomu (6:2), u mestu svetomu ĉegovu (23:3), u milosrdju (20:8), u množtvu (5:8), u narodu pravednomu (13:6), na nebu (10b:4), u paklu (6:6, 15:10), u putu (11, 24:12), u putu svomu (24:9), u snu (3:6), u shranitelju tvomu (19:6, 20:6), u skrovitu (10a:9, 16:12), u spastelu 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 ĉegovu (1:2), u obsluženju (18:12), u priobračenu (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 CICaK 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/boki, strahu/strasi cf. u dobici (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), v svakom ... nauku (85a), u posluhu (48a), u puku (4a, 17b, 40a, 70a), u puku poštovano (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 svakom dobrom deli (62b), u sirovi drivi (31a), u jimeni (105b), na mesti ravnī (83a), u drugom mesti (7a), u onom mesti (116b, 116b), u onom misti (37a), na nebi (51b), u pitji (42a, 105b), na poli (63b), na pristoji (28a, 68a, 73b), u srci (25b), na srci svojem (62a), i srci svoj [p. 284]jem (1b), u vanjelji (1a), u vidrci (59a), u vidri (59a, 59a), o devetom vrimeni (23a), i jedinstvi (71b, 101b, 108b, 109b, 110b, 112a, 113a, 113b, 114b, 114b, 116b, 117b), i jedi(n)stvi (107b), u kraštvu (27a, 28a, 61b, 61b), u kraštvu nebeskom (88b,
persons nor locations; such nouns have
This leaves masculine nouns with a stem not ending in a velar and denoting neither

This is similar to Susak, where 


18 This is similar to Susak, where 

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 razbojnic). 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).

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 (Ruzićić 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.
ŽićSvO, RabPjes -i predominates massively
DiGrg -i is present, but heavily outnumbered
PsLuk -i is absent
ZadLekc -i and -u are both frequent
BernLekc -i constitutes a minority
other ikavian prose texts -i is exceptional
poetry (religious and secular) -i is used only if -u 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 (< *-e) in those ending in a palatal consonant or -c, e.g. *vrtli, *obedi vs. *koše, *oce.

The two endings have been retained in something like their original distribution only in some of the archaic dialects of Krk (Omišalj/Dobrinj/Vrbič), where the case system has otherwise been restructured to accommodate a distinction between “(male) persons” and “other” (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 *ě. Generalization of -i has been found in i/e-kavian Novi (Belič 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 Šenj (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).

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), koći (13v), ti koći (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),

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), řegovi 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 řihove (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), puke (15:10), puke Gospodinove (17:22), puke vico (24:4), sine človickaske (10b:5, p. 288 44:3), sine človickaske (32:13), suđe (7:14, 9:17), sve suprotivnice moje (3:8), teliće (49:9, 50:21), sve tovariše (44:8), uze nihove (2:3), vole (8:8), zavite (49:14), zavite moje (21:26), zloince (36:1), zube (3:8). Most (nine) examples of -i involve the word dan: dni (36:18, 36:19), dni dobre (39:13), dni moji (38:6), po sve dni (7:12), sve dni (22:6, 26:4), u dni nihovi (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 moi (12:2).

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

The same holds for RabPjes, to the extent that the limited number of examples enables one to tell, cf. čavli (d850), vsi narodi i vsi ludi (d712, rhyming with Npl trudi), skuti (d661), vlasi (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 odredene 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 moi as against zavite moje. The same holds for dual forms of neuter nouns, e.g. oči řegovi (10a9) or oči tvoji (16:2) and sometimes even for feminine nouns with a Nsg in a consonant ("i-stems"), e.g. kosti moi (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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text</th>
<th>details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ŽićSvO, DiGrg, ŽivIvKrst</td>
<td>always or nearly always -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZadLekc, RabPjes, Zoranić</td>
<td>-i and -e interchangeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BernLekc, PsLuk, Živ Jer</td>
<td>-i constitutes minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remaining texts (Marulić, Hektorović etc.)</td>
<td>(nearly) always -e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E. Apl -i vs. -e

8.3 Isgf -u vs. -um vs. -ovl/-ev vs. -o vs. -om

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

- -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).
- -ovl/-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 ČiČak 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 -ovl/-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 želev 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 -ovl/-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), zemljom (196b), tobom (200a, 200b), cf. also such formations as milostjom božjom (193b), moćju tvojom (194b).

RabPjes has

grubom pezom (a56), 
vodom (203b),

tobom (200a, 200b), cf. also such formations as milostjom božjom (193b), moćju tvojom (194b).

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, večernjoj. 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:

ŽićSvO: jej (43a, 49a, 50b, 51b 4x), njej (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. mojej][ (25v), svojej][ (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), njoj (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), tvjojoj (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 (d94), 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 southe astern 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), njej (o.c.: 115, 157), mojej (o.c.: 116). The ending is also used in the closely related dialects spoken on the island of Lošinj (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 47), which is confirmed by Peter Houtzagers (personal communication), who has found the ending in Ćunski, on Lošinj. Note in this connection that in Božava the Dsg fem of on is jì (sic) alongside jȳj (Cronia 1928-29: 99), cf. Finka’s clitic form je (sic) alongside “naglašeni oblik” nȳj (1977: 124). It is conceivable that these forms, too, reflect *jej. [The words “these forms” refer to jì and je. (Added 2008.)]

8.5 na nom vs. na onom

In many of the dialects that used to be served by the CliČak 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 nívì; on the other it can be added to other pronouns, in particular the ones corresponding to standard taj and koji, yielding such forms as od otoga and s okim. The details, which are often rather intricate, are different in different dialects.

In most of CliČak 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 valu:

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 m život (20a), va nom mesti (21b), va nu bo noć (22b), va voj žalosti (23b), va vo noć (30b, 31a), na vo(m) svet(i) (35a), va no vreme (38a). In ŽićSvo2, on the other hand, o- is fixed, e.g. va ovoj rići (44a), na ovu mlost (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 žudi (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 dićicu (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 ogištu (29r), po onu dićicu (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).

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).

### Table F. Type *na_nom* (as distinct from *na_onom*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text</th>
<th>status of the type <em>na_nom</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ŽićSvO1</td>
<td>present to the exclusion of the type <em>na_onom</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiGrg</td>
<td>both types equally common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsLuk, ŽićSvO2</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZadLekc</td>
<td>present, but infrequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RabPjes</td>
<td>two attestations (no counterexamples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoranić</td>
<td>a few examples, limited to verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remaining texts</td>
<td>absent (in particular: BernLekc, Marulić, Hektorović)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In purely ikavian texts the phenomenon is exceptional. For Zoranić, Ružić (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).

### 8.6 The pronominal stem *vbs-*

The Nsg msc of the frequent pronoun *vbs* 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. 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 sega 'svega' etc. (Belić 1909: 196, 236); the loss of initial v- is regular, cf. its loss in šenac 'louse' < *vš-, zâmën '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. svā, 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 šim, se šūm, se šimi; in derivations -v- is optional, e.g. sēki / svēki, sēčesa / svečesa 'svačega', sēkako, sēkakov, sēkamo, zisekuda 'from everywhere', postūda 'everywhere' (cf. Vermeer 1984a: 283).

- In Rab, sv- is normal, but “úteki (...) izostavljaju v i u zamjenici svā, svā” (Kušar 1894: 7).

- In Vrgada, sv- is normal as well (Jurišić 1966: 51, 86), but we find s- alongside sv- in s(v)emošuči '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 (Mašić 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. vsa (45a, 48b, 51a), vse (22b, 24a, 31b, 42b, 43a, 48b), sa vsega (48a), sa vsem (25b), vsi (46b, 48b, 51a, 52a, 52b), vsih (43a, 47a, 48b, 52b), oda vsih (53a), po vsih (42a, 51a), va vsih (42b), vsim (60a), predva vsimi (32b, 47b); vsaki (51b), oda vsakoe (36b), sa vsakim (28b), va vsakoj (31b), vsad (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. 265] 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.

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 ŽK, 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 posuđa, is without reliable parallels in Classical Čakavian and could very well due to be a scribal error (accidental omission of a letter in *suude).

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 (2or), za sve (27r), vs. za vse (26v 2x). There is a hint of a similar distribution in the case of the pronoun vsak. 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, 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).


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, 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, 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, d755, d711, d715, d719, d863, d895, d941). Since it is pretty unlikely that metathesis in svoj (*vsaj) 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 ho-/hot- ‘want’
The forms of the ClČak verb corresponding to modern standard SCr hjeti ‘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)oć or (h)otėš/(h)otėši.
- The third person plural of the present tense can end in -te or -ė: orthotonic (h)ote or (h)oče, clitic te or ė.

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 othi 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:

ŽičSVO 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 oče (22b, 28b, 39a), pres 2pl očete (32b, 58b, 59a), gerpres oteči (38b), imperf 2/3sg otiše (27b, 51b), imperfect 3pl otihi (39b, 49b), l-p ote (32b, 36b 2x) / otil (33a), l-p ntrsg onili (42b), l-p mscpl otili (34b), vs. pres 1sg hoću (52a, 58b), pres 2sg hočeš (49a 2x), pres 3sg hoče (47a), gerpres hoteci (21b, 44b, 59a), infer hotiti (48a), imperfect 2/3sg hotiše (20b, 40b), imperfect 3pl hotihu (41b). If the sections I have examined are representative, there is a difference between ŽičSVO1, which strongly prefers ot- (16x o- vs. 2x ho-), and ŽičSVO2, 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 oče (4r), pres 1pl očemo (24r, 32r), imperfect 2/3sg otiše (6r, 7v, 17v), l-p mscpl onil (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 (219, 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,
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 3sg *hoće* (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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text</th>
<th>details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ŽićSvO1 and DiGrg</td>
<td>nearly always <em>o-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RabPjes</td>
<td>prefers <em>o-</em> without avoiding <em>ho-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŽićSvO2 and ZadLekc</td>
<td>prefer <em>ho-</em> without avoiding <em>o-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remaining texts (even PsLuk, ŽivJer)</td>
<td><em>o-</em> exceptional or absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### 8.8 *kadi* vs. *gdi* ‘where’

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 outnumbers 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, 88:30, 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 (Ruzičić 1930: 76). [p. 300]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text</th>
<th>details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ŽićSvO, PsLuk</td>
<td>kadi frequent, gdi absent or exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiGrg</td>
<td>gdi outnumbers kadi by four to one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RabPjes</td>
<td>gdi used exclusively (or nearly so)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZadLekc</td>
<td>gdi frequent, kadi exceptional (no attestations on ff. 1-40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BernLekc</td>
<td>gdi frequent, kadi exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoranić</td>
<td>gdi predominates over kadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remainder</td>
<td>kadi exceptional or absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (priti vs. dojti, primesti 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 priti (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 priti.
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.

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

Table I: priti 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, póć, 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 pripejšt. As for the latter verb, Belić’s gloss “pelšt : ‘gnat’” (o.c.: 246) cannot be correct unless a shift 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. upelšti ‘usher in’ in RiZ (Malčić 1977: 124).

In Omišalj we find prȋst, prepejšt, prepejšt (with pre- < pr- < pri-). In Susak has numerous attestations of prít ‘doći’ (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 86, 117, 119, 120, 174 etc.), parněst < *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 dóc (Kušar 1894: 41) and donit (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 dôjti (1928-29: 81, 102, 107, 108, 110) and dopelšt (o.c.: 103, 106) without giving examples of *priti and *pripelšt.

For Kali, Houtzagers and Budovskaja mention duõjti, doniẽsti, doviẽsti, but not *priti, *prniẽsti or any other potentially relevant compounds with pri- (1996, sections 3.12 and 3.13).

Vrgada has døjti, donit, dovėst (Jurišić 1973: 47-49), but no *priti or *prniẽti (o.c.: 170); since the verb privẽsti (ibid.) means ‘prevesti’ it contains the prefix *pré- 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 (Vermeir 184a: 281), Senj (Moguş 1966: 30), Rab (Kušar 1984: 45). Retention of -o-, on the other hand, has been

In most of those Čakavian dialects that combine pri- with verbs of motion, the reflex of pri- in *prnesti is pr-.
reported for Susak (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 69), 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 Žić-SvO, 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), Živ-Kat (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 vnôgo (Cronia 1928-29: 85) whereas ikavian Žirje has mlôgo which presupposes earlier *mnôgo (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 *vъ 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 kralev, ljubeznivo poča uprašati od njih vreme od zvizde ka se je ukazala njim (ZadLekc 9b).
Tada Irud, zazvavši otajno kralev, podmudro ispita od njih vreme od zvizde ka se je ukazala njim (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 CIČak 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 /ul/.
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 CIČak 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-/loć- 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-.
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 Žić SvO₁, 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 Žić SvO₂ and DiGrk) may represent legitimate variation within the i/e-kavian tradition.
2. Some (in particular those found in Ps Luk, 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 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

---

**Table J: presence of northwestern features in the texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>ě</em></th>
<th><em>-ěl</em></th>
<th><em>pré</em>-</th>
<th>Lsg</th>
<th>Apl</th>
<th>Lsg</th>
<th>-ej</th>
<th>va voj</th>
<th>vs-</th>
<th>hot-</th>
<th>kadi</th>
<th>pri-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Žić SvO₁</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žić SvO₂</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiGrk</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps Luk</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZadLekc</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RabPjes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŽivJer</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BernLekc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marulić</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoranić</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hektorović</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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 ŽićeSvO 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 *téles- 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-/*hoće- is widespread in 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 dijalekt 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 priti 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).
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]dirismo 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]>nic (6), tisže (53, rhyme: zvaše), utiši (56), vike (68), vikom (68), odvitnica (60, rhyme: pomo[ni][ca]), vrime (1); in word-final position and/or in endings: gdi (with widespread analogical final *=če; 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 DiGr, Ps Luk 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 (Malic 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 DiGr, Ps Luk and the third scribe of ZadLekc prefer zvizada.

As for the verbal prefix *pre-, ŠibMol has no absolutely certain examples (Malic 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 ŽićeSvo, but virtually unknown elsewhere in CIČak. 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), vsi (48, 49, 57), vsih (56 2x, 64), vsim (59, 66).

7. **hot/-ot-.** Both texts have ho-: CantSab hoće (20, 39, 63), pres 2pl hoće<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: najdosmo) and priti (51, rhyme: učiniti). Of these examples, the form dojdosmo, which was not forced on the author by versifica-<p. 310>tion (*prodismo would have been equally suitable), is to be taken more seriously than priti, 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 CIČak (Vermeer 1988: 631-632).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*ě</th>
<th>-ěl</th>
<th>prė-</th>
<th>Lsg</th>
<th>Apl</th>
<th>Isg</th>
<th>-ej</th>
<th>va voj</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>hot-</th>
<th>kadi</th>
<th>pri-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ŠibMol</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CantSab</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I: northwestern features in ŠibMol and CantSab

*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. Šib Mol 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 (ŽičSvO, Silba). The differences between Šib Mol and CantSab reflect and symbolize the twofold origin of Člčak.

University of Leiden

ABBREVIATIONS

BernLekc
Bernardinov leckionar (Maretić 1885: 1-201).
CantSab
Cantilena pro Sabatho (Vízkelety and Hadrovics 1984: 10, 13-16).
DiGrg
FirZb
GovBern
KoGl
Korčulanske glose (Melich 1903: 42-47).
KorčOdl
LucVrt
Lucičev Vrtal, see: GovBern, SkazND, ŽivlvKrst.
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 leckionar (Rešetar 1894: 1-95).
ŽivGrg
ŽivlvKrst
Život blaženoga svetoga Ivana Krstitelja (Badalić 1957: 48-56).
ŽivJer
ŽivKat
ŽičSvO
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