On the rendition of vowel length in Petre Hektorović’s Ribanje (1568)

Willem Vermeer

[Note on the 2009 version. This article first appeared in Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 24, 1998, 465-526. The present version is identical to the printed text with the following exceptions:
– A handful of obvious typos and very minor infelicities have been tacitly corrected.
– In one case (section 5.3 sub (1)) a clarifying remark has been added in square brackets to correct a misleading formulation.
– The endnotes (pp. 518-523) have been changed to footnotes.
– The page numbers of the original edition have been added, as in the following example: “which length”, meaning that “which” is the last word on p. 495 and “length” the first on p. 496. However, where words were originally printed partly on one and partly on another page, page numbers have been put after them rather than in the middle, as in “accentual instead of “accentual”.]

1.1 The purpose of this contribution

In 1568 the Venetian printer Giovanni Francesco Camocio (or Camozio) published a modest-looking book entitled RIBANYE I RIBARSCHO PRIGOVARANYE I RAZLICHE STVARI INE SLOXENE PO PETRETV HECTOROVICHIV HVARANINV. In the original edition, “Ribanje” opens as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Vit\'exe n\'aredn\'i} &= \text{Bartuceuichiu moy},\\
\text{Sfim giuibch\'i i medn\'i} &= \text{ch\'i znay\'u raz\'um tu\'y},\\
\text{Choy\'inas sfih br\'an\'i} &= \text{u potribe na\'fce},\\
I \text{brez c\'u\'arni h\'ran\'i} &= \text{chacho z\'late caf\'ce},\\
\text{Choy\'inas sfih chr\'un\'i} &= \text{po mnoga zlameny\'a},\\
\text{Choy\'in\'mo pripun\'i} &= \text{sfach\'ogo poc\'etny\'a},\\
\text{Naydoh \'ctech \'lpu \'tuar} &= \text{gdi m\'udri gouor\'e},\\
\text{Brez iz\'min\'e ni\'fct\'ar} &= \text{dugo \'ftat ne more}.\]

Most of the vowels that carry an acute accent in this fragment are long in most SCR systems that happen to have retained the inherited system of vowel quantities without fundamental changes.

The realization that the accents in the Hektorović’s 1568 book render vowel length is quite old, see already Maretić (1889: 23), cf. also Mladenović (1968: 22-23) and

\[1^1\text{I am indebted to Adriaan Barentsen for his moral support at a critical stage of the preparation of the typescript.}\]
\[2^2\text{Quoted on the basis of the photographic reproduction (1953).}\]
Wagner (1970: 25-29). Unfortunately the material has never been evaluated and it is the purpose of this contribution to make a beginning with that task by examining some of the principal features of Hektorović’s use of accent marks. Due to limitations of space and the complexity of the issues involved, discussion of many important problems will have to be deferred to another occasion.

The article is intended as a tribute to Milan Rešetar, whose epoch-making description of the language of the lectionaries appeared exactly a century ago and whose investigation of vowel quantity as marked in the texts of the sixteenth-century Dubrovnik playwright Marin Držić (Rešetar 1927) is so far the only detailed treatment of vowel length in a pre-modern Croatian text corpus written in the Latin alphabet. In my view the factual mistakes and incorrect readings Rešetar’s investigation contains (van den Berk 1969) do not detract from the value of his conclusions or the solidity of his method.  

1.2 The text

Although the 1568 edition may conceivably not have been the first, it is the earliest to have survived. A second edition appeared in 1638, again in Venice, with three of the “stvari ine” omitted and a large number of typographical errors added, a fact about which the critical notes accompanying Vončina’s edition (1986) leave no doubt. Since Hektorović’s manuscripts are lost and the second edition is entirely based on the first, the 1568 book is the closest we can get to Hektorović’s intentions.

All modern editions produced so far have suppressed all information about vowel length. This holds even for the critical editions published in the series Stari pisci hrvatski (1874 and 1986). Hence as a measure preliminary to making the present contribution possible at all it has proved necessary to establish a new text reproducing as closely as possible the 1568 edition, on the basis of the photographic reprint that appeared in Zagreb in 1953 and the textual remarks in the critical editions, in particular Vončina’s (1986). The problems raised by the text (most of which are anyhow marginal from the point of view of accentuation) will be discussed elsewhere.

In connection with the fourth centennial of the 1568 book quite a few publications were devoted to Hektorović’s language, notably Klaić (1968), Mladenović (1968), and Wagner (1970). There are few if any pre-modern Croatian authors about whose language so much has been written. Hektorović’s language is a representative of the great tradition of producing texts in the Latin alphabet on a coastal or insular Čakavian basis. The tradition appears to have arisen at some stage before the middle of the fourteenth century in North Dalmatia (Rab, Zadar, Šibenik) and subsequently spread...

---

3 Another important investigation into vowel quantity in a sixteenth-century text is Stjepan Ivšić’s well-known analysis of the language of Pergošić (1937), which however is much less detailed than Rešetar’s work on Marin Držić.

4 Several editions have limited themselves to “Ribanje”, omitting the “stvari ine” altogether; the most important of these are Ramiro Bujas’s 1951 edition, with its indispensable commentary, and Marko Grčić’s parallel translation published in 1988. For a list of editions up to the mid eighties see Vončina (1986: 33-34).
to Central Dalmatia (Split, Hvar). In the hands of Marulić, Hektorović, Zoranić, Baraković and others it became the vehicle of a remarkable secular literature. For a discussion of the origin of the tradition see Vermeer (1996; on Hektorović’s position in it see Table J, p. 305).\(^5\)

1.3 Accent symbols in Hektorović: generalities

The fragment quoted in the introduction, brief though it is, strongly suggests that the acute accent does not indicate the place of the stress. If it did, the frequent presence of two acute accents on the same word form (as in nárední, brání, hrdní, poctényá, múdrí) would be difficult to understand. Moreover, it is only in very few attested systems that we find the stress on the syllables that carry an accent mark in such examples as Vlêxe, sfachóga or izmíné. Such systems exist in two areas where the place of the stress is determined by a general rule that operates starting from the end of the word, as in classical Latin:

(1) Central Čakavian Oštarije and surroundings, on which see Ivić (1961: 200-202) with references to earlier literature.

(2) The northeastern part of the Kajkavian dialect area, e.g. Virje, on which see Fančev (1907) and Lončarić (1977: 228), cf. also the discussion in Vermeer (1979: 373-374).

Both areas are quite far away from Dalmatia. All Dalmatian prosodic systems we know anything about (from Rab in the north to Dubrovnik in the south) are much more conservative. Indeed, most of them have retained the Proto-Slavic place of the stress without significant modifications. This holds in particular for the systems that can be assumed to continue Hektorović’s linguistic background (Hvar and surrounding islands). Hence it would not be realistic to expect that the accentual system reflected in Hektorović’s language displays the effects of far-reaching innovations of the kind found in Oštarije and Virje.

It is also likely on the basis of the quoted fragment already that accent marks are not obligatory in the sense that they are printed on each and every vowel that happens to be long. The pronoun ‘koji’ is used twice in what would seem to be exactly

---

\(^5\) In this connection I would like to make my position clear on an issue that is often regarded as unproblematical. The undeniable fact that Classical Čakavian is close to the language actually spoken in North and Central Dalmatia has tempted scholars to jump to the conclusion that pre-modern Čakavian authors wrote in their local dialects, at least in principle, so that, say, Zoranić, Marulić and Hektorović are presented as using the spoken dialects of Zadar, Split and the western part of Hvar respectively. This picture is not only unlikely on general grounds (dialect poetry is by and large a product of Romanticism), but impossible to reconcile with the evidence of the texts themselves, which invariably combine features that can never have figured simultaneously in a single local dialect. An example: from the Split Lexiconary of 1495 onwards the masculine singular l-participle in -o (like modern standard bio) is quite common in Classical Čakavian. Yet with very few and marginal exceptions all Čakavian dialects have either retained the original ending -l or carried through innovations that are incompatible with the previous presence of -o (e.g. complete loss of final -l or the rise of forms like bija), all of which are also attested in Classical Čakavian.
parallel fashion (lines 3 and 5). Yet it carries no accent mark the first time (Choyinas) and an acute accent the next (Choyínas). Similarly if the acute accent in tuóy was intended, it is reasonable to expect one in moy, too.

The optional character of Hektorović’s accent marks is in line with practices of indicating prosodic features as current in pre-modern times. It gives rise to the problem of determining how often length is actually indicated and how often it is left unmarked. Borrowing Zaliznjak’s convenient term (1990: 18), we have to determine the “koëfficient vyražennosti” of vowel length in Hektorović’s book. This is the principal issue addressed in this contribution. It can only be approached on the basis of large quantities of factual material.

1.4 On presenting the material

The principles adhered to in listing examples are the following:

(1) Unless otherwise indicated, lists of examples are exhaustive. However, examples that are somehow problematic and could not have been incorporated without detailed discussion have been tacitly omitted.

(2) All examples are cited in the original orthography. Hektorović’s orthography is by a long stretch the best system for writing the language in the Latin alphabet to have been devised before the Counter-Reformation (e.g. Faust Vrančić and Bartol Kašić). Nothing is gained by transcribing examples in modernized orthography.

(3) Contrary to Hektorović’s practice, who often incorporates clitics into his word forms, modern word boundaries will be observed. If, for instance, it would be necessary to adduce the forms of the pronoun “koji” attested in the fragment given in the beginning of this article, they would be cited as follows: Nsm Choyi (3), Choyí (5), Ism/n Choyím (6), rather than Choyinas, Choyínas, Choyímſmo.

---

6 For Hektorović’s orthography see Mladenović (1968: 7-22) and Wagner (1970: 20-25). The principal differences with respect to the modern system are the following:

– s is printed as f and s, e.g. stado, paſtir;
– y corresponds to modern j, e.g. moy;
– Hektorović’s u stands for modern v and u, e.g. nouu ‘novu’; capital V is the equivalent of u, e.g. Vuidro ‘u vidro’; in certain clusters and in syllable-final position -v usually appears as f, e.g. sfe ‘sve’, sfoy ‘svoj’, plaʃ ‘play’, fpufř ‘spustiv’, neprődu ‘nepravdu’;
– modern š, š, and č appear as fc/se, x, and c respectively, whereas Hektorović’s c is the counterpart of modern c, e.g. sluſcay ‘suľašaj’, Zndíc ‘znaš’, potéxe ‘poteže’, caʃče ‘čašče’, mřixiçu ‘miřičcu’;
– modern lj/A/ and nj /ň/ appear as gl and gn (in syllable-final position or before i) or gli and gni (before other vowels than i), priategl ‘prijatelj’, Zadouoglni ‘zadovoljni’, zluooglti ‘zlovoljiti’, gliudem ‘ljudem’, gnimi ‘njimi’, gnìegu ‘njega’;
– modern k appears as ch, e.g. chacho ‘kako’, fcchodu ‘škodu’, sfachomu ‘svakomu’, chgnixçi ‘knjižnici’;
– modern ě appears as ch (in syllable-final position or before i) or chi (before other vowels than i), e.g. pomóč ‘pomoć’, uchi ‘veći’, xefčhi ‘češći’, urachiaʃče ‘vračašče’, frichiu ‘ričiu’;
– it follows that the only significant ambiguity is provided by the letter u and by the sequences gn, gl and ch in syllable-final position and before i.
(4) Only a single type of capital letters is used. Examples which in the original text begin with large initials followed by ordinary capitals (e.g. Vitéxe) will be quoted with ordinary capitals (e.g. Vitéxe).

References to the original text are provided according to the following system, which incorporates the traditional numbering of the verses of the various pieces; in addition to that, minor prose sections such as headings are explicitly included and the seven different pieces involved are identified by the use of letters (with absence of an identifying letter indicating “Ribanje”):

0a Title page of the book (prose).
0b Heading of “Ribanje” (prose).
0c Heading of the First Day of “Ribanje” (prose).
1-508 The First Day of “Ribanje” (verse).
508a Heading of the Second Day of “Ribanje” (prose).
509-1078 The Second Day of “Ribanje” (verse).
1078a Heading of the Third Day of “Ribanje” (prose).
1079-1684 The Third Day of “Ribanje” (verse).
a0 Heading of the first letter to Mikša Pelegrinović (prose).
a1-a60 Main text of the first letter to M.P. (prose).
a61 Concluding remark about the first letter to M.P. (prose).
b0 Heading of the second letter to M.P. (prose).
b1-b15 Main text of the second letter to M.P. (the nature of the material is heterogeneous: b1-b4 and b12 are prose, whereas b5-b11 and b13-b15 are verse reproducing lines 595-601 and 698-700 of “Ribanje” respectively).
c0 Heading of the letter to Gracioza Lovrinčeva (prose).
c1-c202 Text of the letter to G.L. (verse).
d0 Heading of the epitaph to Frane Hektorović (prose).
d1-d46 Text of the epitaph to F.H. (verse).
e0 Heading of the letter to Hjeronim Bartučević (prose).
e1-e60 Main text of the letter to H.B. (verse).
e60a-e60b Concluding remarks about the letter to H.B. (prose).
f0 Heading of the letter to “Mavro kalujer” alias Mavro Vetranović (prose).
f1-f160 Main text of the letter to M.k. (verse).
f160a-f160b Concluding remarks about the letter to M.k. (prose).

Unfortunately a traditional internal numbering is absent in the case of the two letters to Mikša Pelegrinović (the two major prose pieces) and I have been forced to adopt a system of my own devising, for which I refer to the Appendix.

A small proportion of the text (mainly headings of various kinds) is printed entirely in capitals. Since in such fragments no accent symbols are used they will not be taken into account here. They are: 0a, 0b, 0c, 508a, 1078a, a0, b0, b4, b12, c0, d0, e0, e60b, f0, f160b.
2.1 Some statistics

The text contains approximately 28581 vowel letters, of which some 3389 (12%) carry an accent symbol. These figures should be understood as approximations, despite their apparent exactness. The photographic reproduction does not allow one to tell in all cases whether or not a vowel carries an accent symbol and, if so, which. Moreover, the decision whether or not a given letter is a vowel letter is to some degree arbitrary, notably in the case of $u$, which corresponds to both $u$ and $v$ in modern orthography.

There are some differences between the five different types of vowel letters (see Table A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>basic colour</th>
<th>attested possibilities</th>
<th>number of attestations</th>
<th>of which accented</th>
<th>percentage accented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a, A, á, à</td>
<td>6937</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e, E, é, è</td>
<td>5330</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i, y, I, ñ, ñ</td>
<td>7773</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o, O, ó, Ó, ò</td>
<td>5524</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u, U, ú, ñ</td>
<td>3017</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A: proportion of accented vowels

2.2 The problem of í

The low frequency of í is caused by a curious property of the printed text. Table B shows what is going on. It turns out that the number of occurrences of í fluctuates much more strongly than that of the other vowels. From the beginning of “Ribanje” up to verse 800 the proportion of accented í is similar to that of é. Then it drops to about half of its earlier frequency. After verse 1411 of “Ribanje” there are only 24 attestations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stretch</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>í</th>
<th>í</th>
<th>perc. í</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-800</td>
<td>2576</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-1411</td>
<td>2195</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-1200</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201-1411</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412-f160a</td>
<td>3002</td>
<td>2978</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B: the case of í

In view of this it will be necessary in the sequel to differentiate between the three sections of the book, as follows:

- A (1-800): use of í comparable to that of other vowels.
- B (801-1411): í used considerably less than other accented vowels.
- C (1412-f160a): í virtually absent.
This is not the only problem involving the letter i. Wagner (1970: 27) has drawn attention to several instances of what would seem to look like the printed sequence ſí in positions in which length is surprising in the light of what is otherwise known about the average SCr accentual |471| system, e.g. poſidé (32), ſí (no reference, but many attestations, cf. 366, 371, 372, 373 etc.). Wagner regards these examples as “wypadki mylnego użycia znaku ´ na oznaczenie samogłosek krótkich”.

As a matter of fact it is unlikely that in such examples an acute was actually intended. The sequence ſí is usually printed as a single typographical unit and if it is, the dot on the i may resemble an acute accent and often does. There are several reasons for not actually reading acute accents in such cases.

Most importantly, the sequence ſí is frequently printed in this way in the Latin and Italian passages in the book in positions where an acute accent would be totally out of place, e.g. ſitim, prompſit, rſit, ſigna in the Latin poem on p. 49r. Unless we are prepared to read these words as *ſítim, prompſít, rſít, ſigna, we are not entitled either to read an acute accent in words that are printed in exactly similar fashion in the Croatian text.

Moreover, a genuine sequence ſí, with the i making up a distinct typographical element, is also used from time to time: Ns ſín ‘son’ (486), pr1s proſím (332), Is ſínçom (746). This shows that there was a perfectly satisfactory way of printing the sequence ſí if it was really considered necessary.

Finally, as seen by Wagner, if an acute accent is read in such instances of ſí with an acute-like dot on the i, we are stuck with quite a few examples of length that do not tally at all with the remainder of the evidence offered by Hektorović’s text, e.g. in Gs ſilé (22), imp2s beſidi (130), NAp beſide (543), NAp ſidine (477), du ſiromaha (528), imperf2/3s beſiyáſce (598), inf ſiſti (728), etc. It goes without saying, however, that this point will acquire force only after the principal characteristics of the accentual system reflected in Hektorović’s text will have been established, which is not yet the case.

2.3 Other irregular distributions

The only capital letter to appear with an accent symbol is Ō. It is attested only five times, always in the pronominal Ns Ōn and in a limited stretch of the book (1207, 1317, 1386, 1402, 1462). Inside this stretch there are three attestations of Ōn without an accent mark (1240, 1354, 1414), outside it another eleven (128, 389, 464, 538, 737, 757, 966, 1107, 1604, 1617, c51). When not printed with a capital letter, accented ŏn (365, 742, 777, 938, 1043, 1167, 1191, 1198, 1243, 1360, 1383, 1399, 1441, 1466, 1543, 1626) outnumbers unaccented on (29, 472 474, 489, 557, 606, 744, 1012, 1363, e59) by more than three to two (16/9).

Less spectacular fluctuations that appear to involve all vowels are presented in table C. It turns out that in the beginning of “Ribanje” the proportion of vowel letters provided with an acute accent is far above average. From then on to the end of “Ribanje” the proportion of vowels provided with an acute hovers around 13%, with the following exceptions: the two bugarſtice (523-591, 595-685) are much more sparingly accented than the main text, a fact that becomes evident as soon as one separates the
bugarštice from the dvanaesterci; the stretch consisting of the verses 701-800 is more consistently accented than average, whereas the stretch consisting of the verses 1401-1500 is sparingly accented. Note also that the “Stva rine” are significantly less abundantly accented than “Ribanje”.

Table C: accented vowels in different stretches of text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stretch</th>
<th>vowels</th>
<th>acute</th>
<th>á</th>
<th>é</th>
<th>í</th>
<th>ó, Ő, ú</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-100</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>220 (18%)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>158 (13%)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>164 (13%)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>160 (13%)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>166 (14%)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>126 (10%)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-700</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>100 (8%)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-700 bug.</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>162 (8%)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-700 dvan.</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>65 (13%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701-800</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>206 (16%)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-900</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>143 (12%)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1000</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>149 (12%)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-1100</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>156 (13%)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101-1200</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>163 (14%)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201-1300</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>161 (13%)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301-1400</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>159 (13%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401-1500</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>125 (10%)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501-1600</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>145 (12%)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-1684</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>126 (12%)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1-a61</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>170 (9%)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b1-b15</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c1-c100</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>114 (9%)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c101-c202</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>133 (11%)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d1-d46</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>35 (6%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e1-e60a</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>73 (10%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f1-f100</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>110 (9%)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f101-f160a</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>70 (9%)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C: accented vowels in different stretches of text

7 Given the fact that a dodecasyllabic line basically contains twelve syllables, one would expect any stretch of a hundred lines to contain exactly 1200 vowels. In reality, however, the number of vowels is always higher. There are four different reasons for this:
- quite a few dodecasyllabic lines contain more than twelve vowels because the poet expected adjacent vowels to be realized as a single syllable;
- in Ribanje, quite a few lines are prefaced by indications of the speaker, in particular “Pasc(h).” or “Nich.”;
- also in Ribanje, several poems containing longer lines have been incorporated;
- there are some minor sources of contamination, in particular typographical errors.
3.1 The grave accent: the material

Maretić describes Hektorović’s use of accent marks in the following words: “Hektorović upotrebljava znakove ‘i и ‘i ni obično biježi duge slogove; znak ‘ mnogo je rjedi od znaka ”” (1889: 23). Mladenović (1968: 22-23) and Wagner (1970: 27) agree. However nice this consensus may be, so far it rests on nothing more than the personal authority of three individuals who have not publicly evaluated the evidence. The first problem we are going to tackle is the question as to whether or not systematic differences between the use of the two accent symbols can be observed.

The grave accent is found in 49 examples, amounting to a mere 1.5% of the total number of vowels that carry an accent symbol. In the case of each example all attestations of the same or basically the same form marked with the acute accent are given. In most cases attestations that are not provided with any accent symbol are also given, to provide material for the preliminary discussion of the relationship between accented and unaccented forms in section 3.3.

(1) Adv zdòla (103). Although this form is not attested elsewhere, in comparable formations the element -dol- often carries an acute accent, cf. zlólu (b1, read: *zdólu), nizdóla (454), nizdolu (875), zdól (514), cf. also the acute accent on -gor- in zgóra (170, 343, 354, 384, 1165, c9), zgóri (454, 1620), uzgora (387), uzgór (838), zgór (1089, 1096), and absence of an accent symbol in zgora (d21), Zdol (f155).

(2) Aor3p odlúciſce (202). The same form is also attested with an acute: odlúciſce (839), cf. the acute accents in 1p odlúciſmo (735) and 1s odluícih (43, read: *odlúcih), and the absence of any accent symbol in 1s Odlucih (17), and gpt odlucif (f53).

(3) Gpt dàfsci (320). Although this particular form is not attested elsewhere, there are quite a few attestations of forms in -avši with an acute on the -a-: mucáfſci (207, 865), poglobádſci (1190), uzgádſci (417), pufčchiádſci (430), popegliádſci (1098), pozndádſci (768), popdádſci (751), obrádſci (767, d17), ucerádſci (507), stádſci (723),究竟是 (866), stáſci (1131), Stáſci (c12), postádſci (429, 1097), uftádſci (752), priužádſci (724), Pufčchiádſci (18), cf. also the acute in potocíſci (516), Sſſci (66), píſci (756), popíſci (240), bugariſci (688), Cuſci (365).

Absence of an accent symbol in the syllable preceding -vši is significantly less frequent in the case of -avši and much more frequent in that of -ivši and -uvši: slifcaufci (c115), zadaſci (d18), jurgacſci (1081), naſpaſci (508), Stafsci (652), stafsci (603), jtaſsci (558), stavuſci (e29), uſtaſsci (208, 1082), zasaufsci (c139), priháčaſsci (1189), pripréuaſsci (20), oſt̄auaſsci (19), Zábbiſci (833), izgubitſci (f10), razbiſsci (f9), sfarſciſci (1619), ſuarſciſci (689), fcchiedadſci (732), narédiſsci (731), pouidiſsci (463, 1138), Zacudijdſci (154), fcldiſsci (968), naciniſsci (1216), pochoſniſsci (757, read: *pochloſniſsci), napiſsci (967), pochripiſsci (293), potarpiſsci (1620), prihririſsci (c197), gouiriſsci (1215), odgouiriſsci (464), outoriſsci (c198), ochuſsci (239), obrátiſsci (294), ſnatſsci (a16), uputirſsci (758), Louſsci (1129), Poloxiſsci (647), douoziriſsci (1137), pouoziriſsci (515); cuſsci (156), Vzmačnuſsci (12), potégniſsci (1234), oddahnuſsci (1025), chlichnuſsci (c190), primuchnuſsci (1233).
(4) Npm Razúmnì (377). Although this particular form is not otherwise attested, the same ending is better attested with an acute, cf. druží (484), múdrí (7), mudrí (845, 971).

(5) Inf uzâyti (394). There are no other attestations of this form, cf. however the acute in náyti (393), dóyti (955), úyti (128), and in the following examples: pr3s náyde (1005), záyde (1006), dóyde (c84, f112), póyde (c198); imp1p náydimo (113); aor1s náydo (267), fáydo (268), 2/3s záyde (463), Izáyde (1135), úyde (127).

Absence of an accent mark is amply attested in the same forms (inf, pr3s, imp, aor1s and 2/3s), cf. inf Nayti (259), poyt (258, 387, c116), poity (18, a1), pr3s doyde (c197), doyde (70, possibly aorist), proyde (c106, c160, f111), proyde (f69, possibly aorist), imp2s doydi (685), aor1s doydo (157, c142), naydoh (45, a12), Naydoh (7), Naydôh (212), poydoh (1475, 1652, c141), 2/3s doyde (a31, c108), proyde (c107).

In other forms absence of an accent mark is the only attested possibility, cf. pr1s naydem (c121), naydu (c106), 2s doyde (544), 1p poydemo (617), 3p doyði (f12), f101), obaydá (c105), poydá (f11), poydu (c137); aor1p doydo (867, 1467, 1641), naydofmo (868), obaydofmo (1097), otaydofmo (1098), poydofmo (499, 1194), Poydofmo (109, 763, 1082), proydofo (1468), aor3p doydo (866, 1072, 1102, 1524), naydofce (1134), oyydofce (98), poydofce (1101, 1133, 1523), Poydofce (87).8

A curious regularity crops up in this material: accent marks are never used in the plural aorist forms, common as they are (22 attestations). The point will be taken up briefly below (section 5.3).

(6) Ns pût (416) ‘flesh’. The only other attestations of this form carry an acute: pút (413, f85).

(7) Inf razymgíti (619). This form is also attested with an acute: razymgíti (617). The material contains two further examples of an acute accent on the -i- preceding the -ti or -t of the infinitive: oťaút (34), praut (33). These examples are dwarfed by more than 300 infinitives in -iti or -it in which no accent symbol is present.

At this point a brief excursus is necessary to discuss Wagner’s assumption that the accent marks in praut and oťaút are mistakes (1970: 27). I think this idea (which Wagner merely states without trying to substantiate it) cannot be upheld.

To begin with, although the number of examples is small (4 + 1), it is large enough to make the idea that mistakes are involved unattractive in itself.

Furthermore, the acute in these examples is supported by the l-pns razxalílo (674) and by similar forms attested among polysyllabic verbs with infinitives in -ati and -nuti: pogledáti (235), trúyáti (190), Obrochuát (1026), nádiyáat (1252), dragoudála (524), Žopfouda (531), pohitáli (629), razbignúti (585).

As a matter of fact, the evidence of living dialects suggests the possibility that length in this position was a feature of Hektorovič’s language. As noted by Rešetar

8 In view of the limited occurrence of capital Ó, the value of the absence of an accent symbol in the first syllable of POydofce (509) is doubtful.
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(1900: 33) already, in the dialect of Stari Grad on Hvar *a has a long reflex (o, written as ŏ by Rešetar) in the infinitive and l-participle of (a)-stressed verbs, e.g. plȍvōt, plȍvōla, kȍćōt, kȍćoli. Later investigators have shown that this feature is widespread in the Čakavian dialects of Hvar and Brač, e.g. Brusje (Hvar) grȉjot, grȉjo(l), grȉjola, grȉjolo (Hraste 1926-27: 206), Brač glȅdo(t), glȅdola, glȅdolo (Hraste 1940: 59). Since the difference between long and short i and u has been obliterated in posttonic position in the dialects of Hvar and Brač, the evidence of the living dialects that continue Hektorović’s immediate linguistic background is inconclusive.

However, as was first noted, I think, by Rešetar (1900: 33, 159-160), length in (a)-stressed verbs in -iti, -ati and -nuti is widespread in the dialects of what is nowadays known as the “Zeta-Lovćen” group, e.g. Prčanj/Ozrin ići pȃmtīt, gȁzīt, kȕpīt, gȉnūt, umȕknūt. Later investigators have amply confirmed the correctness of Rešetar’s findings, cf., e.g., |476| “tematski vokal u infinitivu uvek je dug ako je nenaglašen”, and examples like pȃmtīt, pȃmtīla, gȁzīt, gȁzila, plȕkāt, kȕjāt, svȅtkovāt, komándovāt reported by Pešikan (1965: 72-76), cf. also udȃrīt, udȃrīli, pozdrȃvićeš (Ćupić 1977: 163, 165), and, in particular, Dragoljub Petrović’s explicit confirmation of the correctness of Rešetar’s observations about the dialects of the southern part of the Boka Kotorska, illustrated by examples like izrȅzāti, glȅdāla, rȅzāli, zadȉmīti, stȁvīli, pogȉnūti, prekȋnūla (Petrović 1974: 122).

As for areas closer to Hektorović’s home (in particular the coastal stretch and the islands between the southern part of the Boka Kotorska and Hvar), we are hampered by the fact that the dialects of South Dalmatia have been covered much less thoroughly than those of Montenegro. However, Pavle Ivić (1957: 406) has found length in Govedari on Mljet (-ati and -nuti), and Orebić and surroundings on Pelješac (apparently only -ati). In the dialects of neighbouring Korčula all three types of infinitives have length, at least if Kušar’s (1895: 333), Rešetar’s (1900: 33) and Moskovljević’s (1950: 185) observations are correct in principle, which is for the time being somewhat uncertain in view of the persistent unclarity about the synchronic phonology of the dialect. In (a)-stressed verbs in -nuti, length is also attested in Northwest Čakavian (Novi, Omišalj, Kastav) and Kajkavian (Bednja), see further Vermeer (1994: 481, with examples and references).9

(8) Zatím (686). This form is much better attested with an acute: zatímn (1473), Zatímn (73, 83, 163, 243, 497, 755, 1081), cf. also the acute in Is tím (415, 452) and numerous other attestations of the pronominal Is in -ím, cf. chítm (134, 346, 784, 1228, 1406), Chítm (783), Choyítm (6, 85), címn (895, a21), Cím (114, 1274), gnímn (62, 135, 223, 232, 753, 773, 1147, 1606), onímn (726), ouímn (745), sfímn (727). Absence of any

9 The form **iʃduihnuuch ‘i (v)zdvgvnuh’, which Dragica Malić (1989: 151) reads in the early Classical Čakavian text known as Žića sveth otaca (f. 19r), and which with its double vowel appears to point to a posttonic long vowel of the type intended here (Vermeer 1994: 481), has turned out to rest on an incorrect reading. The original text, which can now be consulted on the basis of the photographic reproduction published by Dragica Malić, has iʃduhnuuch (Malić 1997: 223). This makes no sense and has probably to be read as *iʃduhnuuch, which is actually the reading adopted by Vinko Premuda in his pioneering edition of the text (1939: 127).
accents symbol is even more frequent: *zatim* (912, 1621, c19, e29, f37), *Zatim* (289, 723, 848, 866, 1065, 1157, 1218, a47, c65, f12), *chachouim* (f142), *chim* (60, 958, f146), *Chim* (27), *choyim* (a1, e18), *Choyim* (b2), *cim* (943, 1296, c11, f131), *Cim* (1298, c34, f110), *gnim* (633, 643, 1211, 1605, c62), *onim* (a58), *Onim* (e16, possibly Dpl), *ouim* (a58, f141), *sfim* (a18, c173), *sfim* (1667, possibly Dpl), *fasim* (e20), *sfoyim* (639), *tachouim* (c15), *taohouim* (f142, read: *tachouim*), *Yednim* (1166).


(10) Gs comp *štáróga* (820). In the only other attestation of this form the stem syllable happens not to carry an accent: *staróga* (1219). Cf. however the acute in Nsm *ftáři* (1140), Dsm/nd *Starómu* (1656), Lsm/nd *ftářom* (a61, e60a), Npm *ftáři* (1298, 1366), Dp *ftářin* (146), Apm *ftáře* (a4), Asf *stárú* (72).

(11) NAsn *Chó* (893). This form is much better attested with an acute, cf. *chó* (211, 212, 893, 916, 921, 1034, 1156, 1269, 1482, 1636, f44), *Chó* (431, 1033). Absence of an accent mark is less frequent: *cho* (126, 141, 260, c141, f142), *Cho* (f46).

(12) Inf *razdilíti* (916). This form is attested once without an accent mark: *razdilíti* (561). Compare also the acute in *oddilíti* (569), l-pfs *razdilíla* (529), aor1p *razdilímo* (1193), *nadálišmo* (173). Absence of any accent mark is more frequent, cf. inf *dilíti* (1310), *Dilíti* (c118), pr3s *dili* (a27, d40), aor2/3s *nádilì* (c9, e18), *udilì* (c166), aor1p *dilížmo* (1666), aor3p *diliće* (77, 172), *nádilíše* (a21), l-pms *razdielo* (574), *nádilil* (e48), l-pfs *dilíla* (525), gpt *razdižif* (526).

(13) Pr3s *tirá* (1024). This same form is twice attested with an acute: *tirá* (809, 1391). The pr3s ending -a quite often has an acute, cf. *oblahcá* (900), *odnécfá* (1527), *búçá* (62), *napadá* (f77), *obádá* (1156), *obládá* (1611), *odchládá* (1155), *gledá* (863), *pogledá*
(c111), Vgledá (452), ušpredá (c112), dogodá (1030), bíga (1391), fcmigá (1392), chuhá (445, 449, 1241), důhá (446), oduarchí (1353), stráchí (1354), pripráfíla (f121), oftáuglí (f122), príčíngí (1399, read: “príčingí”), razcíngí (1400), imá (337, 396, 401, 421, 919, 1004, 1012, 1410, f129), nimá (846, 1023), oťimá (927), poymá (402), uyimá (205), uazimá (206, 1409), nímá (375, 377, 1049), zná (68, 486, 788, a47, c78, e54, f111), zná (doubtful) (475), Zná (1522), stará (814, 987, 1532), igrá (1036), proftírá (e49), izuirá (e50), pohuatá (1059), hitá (e3), prolítá (902), ʃplitá (f120), poʃartá (1228), biud (959, 1420), přibiú (1481), dobiú (960), odiú (1149), pochriuá (1482), príziú (f108), proftíuá (436), bíúa (50, 340, 435), zachrútá (339), nazútá (49), mnoxá (1048, f76), prígdvá (c158), slává (35), porová (36), sfívá (1136), syá (803). Absence of an accent symbol is less frequent, cf. upríáfrica (876), protíca (804), palá (384, read: *şpada), zapada (1066), ʃpoudá (c54), uyida (1039), docecha (547), pourachía (903), fíríchía (904), ʃtauglí (1323), oftáuglí (1324), ima (308, 802, 928, 1006, 1257, 1372, c18, f125), nima (446), uazimá (376, a27), zná (a25, f17, f69), tuapa (1374), príftupa (1373), zamíra (321), ozíra (1392), proftírá (322, read: *proftírá), zabíua (f62), zahuaglíua (1499), pochriuá (1500), obfíua (f61), razbiuá (1081), fíuá (1664), podbúya (1432), trúya (1431).

(14) Pr3s dà (1029). The same form is much better attested with an acute accent, cf. dá (286, c112, c146, c200, f128); absence of an accent symbol occurs twice: da (1293, f159).

(15) The superlative formans in nàypyriya (1082). The same morpheme is once attested with an acute: ndyobogli (1021). In the overwhelming majority of cases, however, no accent mark is present, cf. naybogli (1440), naybogliá (46), naybogliá (961), nayboglí (522, 950, 1027, 1187, 1471, a54), nayboglíu (e10), Naybogliega (1381), and also naybargé (891, 902), naychorífíniyu (1356), naygore (1039), naylipglí (887), naylipglí (164), naylífèce (441, 503, 1267, 1451), Naylífce (1291), naymgnuí (331, e40), naymgniu (1181, a43), nayobicniyu (1355), nayyarúi (a35), nayparu (a6), nayslaye (432, f46), nayftariye (883), nayueči (a51), nayueči (1031, f120), nayueči (889), Nayueči (1399), Nayueči (802), nayuífèce (442, 1153), nayurubi (749, read: *nayurubi), nayyacé (895). |479|

The semantics of tense and aspect in Classical Čakavian has not been the subject of research worth speaking of and is at present very poorly understood. Hence it should be realized that for the time being it is impossible to separate reliably the pr3s from the aor2/3s, particularly in those cases that could be interpreted as historical presents. The list of examples should therefore be regarded as preliminary and suggestive rather than definitive and clinching. Forms in -á that I consider aorists are the following: pričá (1657), Póc (1649), Prígođá (a1), pochimá (845), uxdí (496), owpajá (660), pocowá (1145), xud (1141), yd (738); absence of an accent mark is attested in pouida (1147), posla (1161), Pozna (1139), upíja (a15), pochíta (1192), zamota (392), umota (102), fta (203), ofija (128, 1620), daroua (824, c11), saya (c157), priya (650, 651). Note that in this case absence of an accent mark is more frequent than presence of an acute. The chances are that in Hektorović’s language such forms as sta and posla had a short vowel, as they have in Vuk/Daničić. For the aorist forms of dati see under (43).
Gošpodár (1139). This form is better attested with an acute: Gošpodár (856, 1205), Gošpodár (291, read: *Gošpodár), cf. also the other case forms Gs Gošpodára (114, 246), DLs Gošpodáru (222, 590, 591, 684). Absence of an accent mark is attested once: Gošpodaróm (1325).

pàs ‘belt’ (1203). There are no other attestations of this word.

nàc (1331). In the same form, the acute accent is attested three times: nác (175, 1007, 1577), cf. also the acute in zác (721, 735, a30, a49), Zác (995, 1494, 1533, d6). Absence of an accent symbol is not attested in these words.

Gpr budùch (1347). This form is twice attested with an acute: budúch (27, f67).

With other verbs, the same ending is abundantly attested with an acute, cf. izticúch (342), techúch (330), ifčiúch (f54), Laxúch (1461), maxúch (1043), gledayúch (f73), czechayúch (c122), Nuchayúch (c135), znayúch (904, c121), povúch (1222), minuyúch (1070), obsluxuyúch (1360). Absence of an accent symbol is however more frequent: placuch (d44), bgliuduch (f132), moguch (24), techúch (1167), chaxuch (1400), pritéxuch (402), podnučayuch (1592), sľľcayuch (1232, f74), bučayuch (88), gledayuch (502), hayuch (c60), prďčchiayuch (446), pľučchiayuch (87), prďčhiayuch (1591), uprďgliayuch (1587), poťtpayuch (1231), dăruch (1588), Pitayuch ‘feed’ (1581), Pitáyuch ‘ask’ (f51), ftayuch (903), poťtayuch (501), poyuch (697), poduichuyuch (1069), občhučuyuch (1582), odc-hupuyuch (1581). The closely related ending -ući offers a similar picture: presence of an acute, though well attested, is less frequent than absence of an accent symbol, whereas in this case the grave accent is not attested at all, cf. prdľščuchi (447), buduchi (347, a44), pečuchí (1074), techuchi (70), ifčiúchi (c42), mečiuchí (1123), napiríuchi (694, 1067), slľčayuchi (a58), gledayűchi (233), hľáčiči (c39), pyűči (1238), chľčayűči (583) vs. fľĎcuchí (1639), primičuchi (448), potičuchi (188, 234, 633), máťčuchi (1640), buduchi (123), xelűči (a18), zacigniči (695), chnuči (f18), Profítăruchi (1071), dayuchi (c171), ufayuchi (a36), nučayuchí (c40), urachųayuchí (332), primayychí (1583), fsťayuchí (331), poháyayUCHí (1584), dáyuchí (242), xelųychí (c41), poyuchí (241), chľčųychučí (678), cťuyuchí (c172).

Pr3s nì (1372). In this form the acute accent is much more common: nì (33, 44, 389, 424, 460, 864, 1243, 1321, 1325, f43), Ni [480] (1339). Absence of any accent symbol is even more frequent: nì (358, 797, 991, 1150, 1276, 1455, 1521, 1549, c5, c49, c94, c134, e24, f55, f102, f143), Ni (393, 1342, 1435, c158, e40). In the other negated forms of the present tense of ‘be’ containing the morpheme ni- the facts are comparable, cf. 1s nifam (23, 92), 2s nis (739), 3p nifu (707) vs. nifam (c89), nifám (a29), Nifam (218), nifí (1253, a40), nifu (786, f55, f59), Nifů (707, 708, c179).

Gs Dobrotě (1407). See (9).

(21) Nsm comp práuì (1420). This case is related to that of štáróga (see (10)). The same form has four times an acute: práuì (255, 1667, c20, f1), cf. also the acute of Nsm práuô (1286), Gsm/n práuóga (366), Ism/n práuùm (c32), Gs fem práué (a6), DLs fem práúy (c54), Is fem práúóm (a43).
(23) Imp2s *zagrùbi* (1449). There are no other attestations of this form. In the only other attestation of the same verb the stem vowel carries an acute: pr3s *zagrùbi* (1544).

(24) Gerpr *cinèch* (1451). There is one other attestation of the same ending with a grave accent *zelèch* (f92, read: *xelèch*). The former example is also attested with an acute: pr3s *zagrúbi* (1544).

(25) Cèſto (1454). The same form is better attested with an acute accent: cèſto (1392), Cèto (446, f92), cf. also the acute in NApn cèſta (990). Absence of an accent mark is also common, cf. cefto (1239, 1684), Ceſto (597, b7), cf. also the absence of an accent mark in the collocation ceftochrát (865, c177).

(26) Ns mnòx (1573). There are no other attestations of this form.

(27) Ns *Yà* (1600). There is one other attestation of a grave accent in the same form: yà (c153), which however does not diminish the fact that the acute accent is much better attested: yà (91, 131, 161, 175, 188, 201, 239, 467, 484, 545, 557, 686, 743, 1090, 1103, 1185, 1209, 1211, 1513, 1601, 1663, c96, c97, e21, f36, f137), Yà (115, 137, 360, 1683). Absence of an accent mark is significantly less common: ya (76, 139, 143, 223, 255, 263, 560, 821, 1375, 1651, a42, c83, f7, f25, f42, f144, f155), Ya (785, 1619, c7).

(28) Imp2p náſtòyte (1656). This form is not otherwise attested. Imperatives ending in a vowel plus -j occasionally carry an acute, cf. 2s Pufčcháy (714), htìy (120), stóy (155), Cúy (1405), Verúy (c155), 2p znáyte (353), póyte ‘sing’ (1655). In an overwhelming majority of cases, however, such forms carry no accent symbol at all, cf. chuſcay (412, 423), sluſcay (412), day (15, 75, 213, 889, 1160, 1264, 1317, a25, c123), Day (d19), priday (1615), chay (1547), Pufčchiay (713 twice), fprauglìay (c118), imay (d19), znay (133, 290, 456, 859, 1213, 1643), znay (348), Szaznay (1269), cháray (1443), zamiray (c147), razbíray (702, 703), poftay (76), cuuay (1245), Cúuay (1020), poháyay (1263), Prolìy (425), woliy (1457), htiy (398, d21), Htiy (949), uiy (c121), pouiy (119), yi (1670), poy ‘go’ (75, 1052), Poy ‘go’ (405), zbroj (144), ftoy (1051, c163), naftoy (1289, 1327, 1337), náftoy (1247, d41), duay (c81), cuj (256, 1271), Cuj (1265), ischuſcuy (1335), nasliüx (1269), napriduy (c174), izíchuy (455, 1336), ufíłuy (c173), daruy (137), ueruy (418), Veruy (1034), wiruy (1390), miruy (1270), opfuy (1272), poctuy (194), Pametuy (852), chasuy (264, 897), 1p daymo.
(1574), Huymo (1577), Naftymo (1433), Milumy (1260), 2p poslufcayte (324), dayte (809), znayte (323), cuyte (1654).

(29) NAp fùardi (a12). This form is much better attested with an acute: NAp stuári (21, 1578, f99), NAp fùardi (196, 826, 1176, 1323, 1382, a55, f115), NAp Stuári (956), cf. also the acute in other forms of the same word: Ns stuar (a14, c95), Ns ſtuár (295, 915, 928, 1568, 1682, a6, a37, c67, f34), Gs ſtuári (944), Gs or NAp ſtuári (1297), Gp fùári (f127), Gp ſtuári (729), Ip ſtuári (1184). Attestations without an accent symbol are somewhat less numerous, cf. Ns stuar (449, 1301, a18, a27), ſtuar (7, 11, 292, 399, 412, c161, f7, f63), Gs or NAp ſtuari (153, 808, e25), NAp ſtuari (a41, a52, f154), Gp ſtuari (a22).

(30) L-pms poznàl (a45). This form is not otherwise attested. Roughly similar forms provided with an acute are not unknown, e.g. poslá (1667), uftá (514).

(31) Is laxòm (a46). This form is not otherwise attested. Other feminine nouns with an endingless Ns have a different ending (-yu). However, in nouns with a Ns in -a the ending -om usually has an acute accent, cf. ribóm (196), fablíčóm (641, 651), ſínčóm (187), befídóm (1500), Voyeuodóm (657), prauódóm (a7), chgnígóm (f153), díchóm (781), Vladichóm (a17), ríchóm (303, 395), ríchóm (1282), xeglíóm (e45), ſoglíóm (135), pomgnóm (a58), pómgnóm (f126), nepómgnóm (858), huálóm (782, 1180, c22, c88), sflóm (1204), argútóm (163), ranóm (d16), Licminóm (58), iftínóm (266, a43), druxinóm (520, 611, 657), ueróm (715), goróm (1223), zoróm (1224), lipótóm (513), rotóm (f18), dobrotóm (779), gláuóm (845), molitóm (c157), Mrixóm (90), Gspoyóm (a17). Absence of an accent symbol is less frequent, cf. druxbom (e21), dúcóm (1611), fcíbicóm (c193), duſcočóm (561), Chupiçóm (818), mrixariçóm (a2), ſínčóm (746), befidom (c44), chgnigom (a19), odchiom (f154), pomgniom (c163), pómgniom (206), Liuiom (a17), gorcînom (c103), druxinom (640), gorom (609).

(32) Nsn tô (a49). This form is much better attested with an acute accent: tô (57, 284, 733, 861, 1020, 1057, a17, a38, a58, c121, f47). It is even more frequent without an accent mark: to (15, 36, 256, 369, 473, 487, 532, 541, 545, 551, 553, 580, 598, 609, 612, 617, 633, 650, 652, 658, 667, 671, 675, 681, 1481, 1491, 1550, 1535, 1607, 1651, 1668, 1569, a42, a53, b8, c13, c83, f74, f125, f145, f152), To (885).

(33) PPP Nsf comp poctouánà (c1). Whereas this form is not otherwise attested, the ending is much more frequent with an acute, cf. drugá (344, a33), huýá (f64), iná (416), naybogliá (961), funcená (436), tretá (a34), uelá (1613, e2), yacá (896).

(34) PPP Nsn sim huáglieno (c13). The past passive participle of hvaliti is better attested with an acute accent, cf. NApn huágliena (1085, probably comp), Np masc sim huáglieni (42, 800), cf. also the verbal noun Gs húglíiá (1413), and the past pass part of pohvaliti: Nsf sim pohuágliena (a14), Npm sim pohuáglieni (934), Nsn sim po-huáglieno (478), Nsn P[o]huáglieno (e2, probably comp); absence of an accent mark is found in Isf comp pohuaglienom (a17).

(35) Pr3p chié (c33). This form is much better attested with an acute, cf. chié (39, 60, 585, 973, 977, 978, 985, 1282, 1345, 1497, c41, c113, c138, d30). Absence of an ac-
cent symbol is less frequent, cf. chie (302, 1528, c115). The only two attestations of the negated form lack an accent symbol: nèchie (845), Nechie (1348).

(36) Gs/m nòga (c38). This and similar forms are better attested with an acute, cf. mòga (1604, a20, e14), tuòga (589, 1397), sfòga (631). Absence of an accent mark is attested in moga (e45), tuoga (a40, e7, f152), sfoga (1640, f2).

(37) Gs frànè (c45). See (9).

(38) Gerpr molèchi (c59). The same form is better attested with an acute, cf. molèchi (1590, f49), and occurs once without an accent mark: molechi (c99). In the ending the acute is very frequent, cf. zarcéchi (307), tífécchi (1589), ucéchi (1056, 1587), gladéchi (1389, 1404), fidéchi (188), uídéchi (1642, c7), hodéchi (1555), ohodéchi (510), do-

dodéchi (771), prohodéchi (339, 499), brodéchi (77), cudéchi (1135), ufeléchi (187, 298), xeléchi (d20), boléchi (841), misléchi (211, 1299), Misléchi (c113), cinéchi (1015, 1069, 1460, 1556, 1585, f50), pinéchi (1070), fpéchi (1077), chupéchi (431), yidréchi (109, 212), xuberéchi (1078), gouréchi (297, 379, 500, 835, 876), Gouréchi (843), zoréchi (324), nofchéchi (842), podnofchéchi (1459), céchéchi (a45), letéchi (1099), htéchi (858, 873, 1102, 1193, d19, f89), hotéchi (a22, f94), caftéchi (1554), slauéchi (1390), louéchi (772, 1101, 1641), lexéchi (1016, c109), Poyéchi (1582), nafothyéchi (f47), uazoéchi (509, 836, 875, 969, 1136, 1624). Absence of an accent mark is less common, cf. múcechi (833), bcdechi (23), cdechi (380), cdechi (340), prohodechi (1100), brodechi (a58), cudechi (c48), trúdechi (24), xalechi (f11), huálechi (1403), mislechi (e47), sfitle-chi (1665), cinechi (c110, f12), linechi (1079), morechi (c60), gourechi (f93), chrâtechi (1588), Ctechi (f158), htechi (c160), xiveauchi (1311), nafothyechi (1586), slféchi (816, read: *slúxechi), uozechi (1080), puzechi (110), púzech (1623).

(39) Ip uráti (c120). There are no other attestations of this form.

(40) Ns yà (c153). See (27).

(41) Pr3p ozdrauè (c183). Although there are no other attestations of this particular form, the ending is abundantly attested with an acute, cf. glubitsé (1542), poigričé (f104), uzupié (f103), oudečé (f90), mucé (a34, f89), nasfáde (1010), fidé (165, c73), sfidé (f105), posfide (32), uidé (31, 305, 1485, 1572, f106), nenauide (1590), zápouide (306), hodie (c32, f117), nahodie (c31), shodé (857, c202), brodé (616), nauode (f118), ude (c187), cudé (789, 1227), zacudé (1308), prudé (c188), xudé (958), neuglivié (a34), hualé (e26), hrané (202), ciné (374, 1341, 1577), hiné (1298), progoné (1434), zuoné (1496), udré (1566), miré (1572), zamaré (1306), gouré (7, 356, 377, 985, c117), razgouré (319), chosé (14), nof (c187), donosé (13), traté (74), prau (1361), opraué (1506), sfrau (53), izsrau (c184), staué (54, 753), sfaué (300), ofstaué (1505), loué (741), darxé (a47), sluxé (311), slixé (811), droxé (312), broyé (1381, 1595), nafothyé (975), stroyé (1596). Absence of an accent symbol is much less common, cf. zgaré (f81), ofcscharbé (f82), sfrafé (58), blide (f75), uide (1002), dohode (186, 426), uzprohode (f29), cude (32), trúde (1299), fchine (a52), chupe ‘collect’ (f88), chojé (c188), nofe (d27), chüte (f83), fmüte (f84), protiue (f120), darfe (a52, read: *darxe), goye (f88), nafothyé (c149).
Adv barxè (c198). This form is also attested with an acute accent: barxé (227) and without an accent mark: barxe (195, 310), Barxe (1067), cf. also the acute in naybarxè (902), yacé (1067), cefchíé (1498), Vridniyé (1247); note that absence of an accent mark is much more frequent, cf. ufíce (697, 1180), Více (1096, 1180), nayufíce (1153), cefchí (1128), nayuechí (f120), Nayuechí (1399), daglí (1125), boglí (161, 766, 969, 1071, 1474, 1633, c87, c190, c194), nayboglí (522, a54), lipiglí (162, read: *lipglí), farcénie (c123), magní (24), Snaxnie (c191), gore (f74), naygore (1039), blixe (409), nixe (697), nayxle (f46).

Aor2s zadà (d6). This form is not otherwise attested, but cf. the acute accent in aor2/3s podá (1577, c65), dá (294, 787, e53). Cf. also the absence of an accent symbol in podà (1577, c65), dá (294, 787, e53).

PPP NAp fem narèſcene (d38). Exactly the same form is also attested with an acute accent: naréſcene (776), cf. also the acute in Nsm naréſcen (c52), uréſcen (783), l‐pms naréſcio (a7).

Asf tachù (f34). Exactly the same form is also attested with an acute: tachú (292).

Pr3p ʃtepgliayú (f91). This is the only attestation of this verb.

Pr3p ſtinù (f91). Although this form is not otherwise attested, two similar ones are attested with an acute: uenú (d20), poſarnú (c176), as is the case with virtually all types of 3p in ſu: zamicú (444), oticú (897), doticú (354), iſticú (353, 443), pridičú (1073), pčú (15), dádu (811), napádu (579), grédú (984), pridú (179), yidú (1241), yidú (1262), budú (10, 33, 917, 1479, 1486, 1574, a23, f73), dobudú (f38), obaydú (c105), duydú (f12, f101), poydú (e11), moyú (287, 374), pechú (192), techú (462), choğliú (1369, c104), zouú (336, 411), uzmaxú (1389), potéxú (772), uexú (771), doſtixú (299), paduixú (300), slácyú (943), dayú (e37), uládayú (1614), padayú (55), pouidayú (1447), pomágayú (346), hayú (196), ſtępgliayú (f91), naslagniayú (f92), imayú (955, 990, 1224), uxiayú (1475), znayú (2, 956, 1599), pozmayú (370, 984), potiayú (f97), ſtarayú (989, f116), ſtępgliayú (f91), poydu (c137), naydu (974), poydu (c137), diu (476, c73), uapi (d5), rių (c74), ſtepgliayú (152), pocinú (f92), uarnu (c175), cháxu (1390), duixú (1153), uznaſcayu (c22), padayu (439, f82), ugániayu (1056), uogniayu (f81), imayú (1478, f115), nimayú (1002), znayú (1055, 1223, f152), pozmayú (1448, d34, e38), obstuayú (147), hitayú (148), pitayú (1001), motayú (f98), daruayú (a22), dobųayú (983), dių (e33), umiyú (a41), daryú (e34), fių (c74), potribyų (c184), cyų (e16, e25, f152), zadųcųyú (f86), uzpriporucųyú (c151), nappriųyú (c175), ludųyú (f105), Schračųyú (c92), zaslipgliųyú (1366), minųyú (144), ciųyú (e26), poctųyú (d36), chauųyú (e15), prichauųyú (d35), opuzųyú (f85).

11 These lists are not exhaustive.
3.2 The grave accent: discussion of the evidence

In the previous section all 49 attestations of the grave accent have been examined. The results can be summarized as follows:

- The pronoun *ja* (27, 40) provides the only instance of a form that is attested more than once with a grave accent. In that very form the acute accent is attested more than thirty times.
- Three endings are attested more than once with a grave accent: Gs *-e* (three times), pr3s *-a* (twice), gpr *-eć* (twice). In all three cases attestations carrying an acute are much more abundant.
- In 28 cases at least one attestation of the same word form carries an acute accent: 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 44, 45, 49. With very few exceptions there are more attestations of the acute than of the grave, whereas the reverse possibility never occurs at all.
- In 17 cases the form itself is not attested elsewhere, but attestations of closely related forms carry an acute accent: 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 23, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 41, 34, 47, 48.
- In four cases neither the form itself nor closely related forms are attested elsewhere: 17, 26, 39, 46.

These facts substantiate the correctness of the traditional assumption that the grave accent does not have an independent function, but is to be regarded merely as an infrequent optional variant of the acute.

3.3 A tentative regularity

The material that was presented to examine the function of the grave accent can also serve to enhance our understanding of the way accent symbols are used in Hektorović’s text, cf. Tables D-F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tira</th>
<th>da</th>
<th>nač</th>
<th>ja</th>
<th>stvari</th>
<th>stvar</th>
<th>hvaljen</th>
<th>-avši</th>
<th>najti</th>
<th>naj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acute</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bare</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D: accent symbols on a
The case of i differs from that of the other vowels in that, as we have seen, the frequency of accented i is different in different sections of the original text (see Table G).

The figures displayed in the Tables D through G bring to light the following tentative regularity:

- If a form carries an accent symbol once on one of the vowel letters a, e or o, the chances are that it does so in a majority of cases. The same holds for i in section A of the book.

This regularity represents a first move towards establishing the “koëfficient vyraženosti” of vowel length in Hektorović’s book. Deviations from the regularity should be regarded as potential sources of information, unless the number of examples is so small that any regularity can be expected to break down. As a matter of fact the material we have looked at so far contains several obvious deviations:

- If the vowel concerned is followed by -j- (printed as -y-), as it is in the examples of the type najti, naj-, dojde, stoj(te), an accent symbol [488] tends to be much less frequent. This point will be returned to in section 5.3.

- In the endings of the present gerund, u carries an accent mark in only two fifths of the cases (18/27 and 14/23). The difference with the gerund endings containing an e is striking. We shall be returning to this point below (5.1, 5.2).

- The form to constitutes the subject of the next section.
3.4 The case of to

As soon as one separates different types of context it becomes clear that the deviation is caused by the fact that there are several different kinds of to. For reasons that will become clear, in this case the word boundaries of the original will be respected:

(1) No acute is present whenever to is preceded by za (16x). In these cases, to is always printed together with the preceding word: záto (15, 1481), zátófe (1550), Záto (256, 473, 487, 1535, 1569), Zátoga (1607), Zátófe (1651, f125), Zato (369, 1491, a53, c83), zatoti (a42).12

(2) No acute is present in seventeen other examples in which to is printed together with the preceding word, which in all cases is obviously orthotonic: Onotomi (532), Nemoytomi (541), Nemoytofe (580), Nemoytoyoy (545, 551), Da rečito (553), Teretomi (598 = b8, 609, 667), Teretomu (650, 675), Nechatoyih (617), Zagnimomi (633), Staffcitomi (652), Odmetnito (658), Vehtomiye (671), Choyımtoye (681). Note that these examples, though quite numerous, are limited to the bugarštice and may be foreign to Hektorović’s language.

(3) Of the eleven instances of to printed as a separate word, it carries an acute accent in six cases, cf. Tomu chi to haye (284), yermife ciní to (733), A to (ca mogu znat) = yofc uchie cigníače (861), nemoy to dati (1057), uiy uchóm stányu = naydemfe to znayúčh (c121), A to naftoyéchi (f47) vs. Dami farçu pochoy = to ueci porody (36), Da paruo to biče fraxiće razredio (612), Daltiye to ime (c13), sfi chi to cuyu (f152), A ufc fcucgniai = to gore sльfçayuch (f74).

(4) In three cases to is printed together with following clitics and in most or all such cases it is probably to be regarded as orthotonic. In one of them it carries an acute accent: Toye yediní Bóg (885), Na tome douede (f145), nemoy = u tófe zaplesti (1020).

(5) In four cases, to is printed together with preceding a. In all four cases it carries an accent mark: Ató (a38), aťó (a17, a58), atò (a49). Here it is likely that a is to be regarded as proclitic and to as orthotonic, cf. the fact that in the same collocation it is also printed separately (e.g. 861). A related type of example is I nató (57), contrast Na tome (f145); if these two examples are representative, the case of na to is different from that of za to. It is also likely that the following case is similar: Neto čichia potrib = neg zarad gliúbauí (1668). Unfortunately here are no parallel examples with which it can be compared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>zato</th>
<th>teretomi</th>
<th>#to#</th>
<th>toje</th>
<th>ato, nato</th>
<th>enclitic</th>
<th>orthotonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accented</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bare</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H: accent symbols on to

12 Wagner (1970: 27) regards the acute in záto (256) as a mistake. This is completely arbitrary. Length in this form is not only amply confirmed in Hektorović’s text, but also well attested in living dialects.
It follows that there are at least two kinds of to. On the one hand a to which never carries an accent symbol in two types of cases in which it can plausibly be regarded as enclitic, on the other a to which is found in the remaining types of cases, in most if not all of which it must have been orthotonic and in which just over half of the attestations are provided with an acute. This analysis shows that the attestations of orthotonic to turn out to be well in accordance with the tentative regularity formulated in section 3.3.

4.1 More evidence

In the sections that follow we are going to investigate more thoroughly the validity of the tentative regularity proposed in section 3.3, by looking at a number of forms that have multiple attestations, at least one of which carries an acute accent.

4.2 Examples of á

(1) The inserted -a- in the Ns and Gp of dan (18/3): Ns dán (138, 253, 435, 906, 1186, c156, c159, d20), dan (1078, c169, f160a), Ns (uncertain) dán (e60a), Gp dán (17, 860, 1534, a16, a35, a61, e18, f23), cf. fyutradán (a31).

(2) The stem vowel of the noun dar (13/4): Ns dár (296, 1264, 1334, 1364, 1490, 1609), dar (d25), Gs dára (171, c185), DLs darú (c164), Is darom (e48), Np dáři (1365), Gp darof (a23), dáři (1314), Ap dáře (1361, c7). In Gp darof the stem vowel may actually have been short (cf. the discussion of such cases in Vermeer 1994: 473, with references).

(3) The stem vowel of the noun grad (20/3): Ns grád (28, 258, c3), Gs gráda (473, a1, f6), grada (b6), DLs grádu (598, 605, 1200, 1656, e11), Grádu (a9, a12, a21), gradu (b8), Vs gráde (599, b10), Gráde (600), gradu (b9, read: *grade), Np grádi (1614).

(4) The root hval- in several types of cases, in particular:
   – The stem vowel of the noun hvala (17/1): Ns húla (240, 593, 1501, e43), Gs húlē (1545), Gs húli (sic, 1518), As húlu (1317, 1615, a25, c12, e37), Is húluóm (782, 1180, c22, c88), NAp huále (294, 476), Huále (c171).
   – The stem vowel of the verb hvaliti (9/4): inf húliti (846), inf húlit (1313), aor1p húldjmo (759), gpr húdlechi (1403), aor2/3s Pohuéli (1149), aor1p príhúldjmo (844), aor1s zahúdlih (686), aor3p zahúdljfe (171, 316), vs. l-pmp hualili (c64), pr1s hualím (1375), pr3s Huali (e30), pr3p hualé (e26). To this the examples adduced in section 4.1 (34) have to be added (9/1).

   In other derivations no length is attested, cf. pr1s zahuagliuyu (f151), pr3s zahuagliua (1499), Np pohuale (c92).

(5) The stem vowel of the fem noun plav (17/4): Ns pláf (63, 168, 200, 225, 724, 753, 961, 1073, 1081, 1195, c195), plaf (50, 53, f8), Gs pláui (1106, 1185), DLs pláui (745, 1123), Is pláfyu (1098), Is Plauyu (837), NAp pláui (771).
(6) The stem vowel of the pronoun sam (34/12): Nsm Sám (522, 856, 890), sám (392, a40), jám (188, 225, 886, 951, 1308, 1385, 1400, 1635, a25, c11, f28), fam (207, 283, 664, d43, e21), Nsm/Adv jám (257 420, 464, 1131, 1342), Sám (c183), Sám (911), Gsn/n samoga (94, 1465, 1552, 1594), Nsm/Adv jám (257 420, 464, 1131, 1342), Sám (c183), Nsf sam (a9), Nsf sam (1653), Nsf sam (40), řámo (257 420, 464, 1131, 1342), řámo (141, 411), Zábif (1279), Zábif (1279), Gsf samé (277), Sám (1653), Gsm/n samoga (94, 1465, 1552, 1594), Nsf sam (a9), Nsf sam (1653), Gsf samé (277), Sám (1653), Gsm/n samoga (94, 1465, 1552, 1594), Nsf sam (a9), Nsf sam (1653), Gsf samé (277), Sám (1653), Gsm/n samoga (94, 1465, 1552, 1594)

(7) The prefix za- in zabiti and zaviditi (12/2): inf zábiti (d19), zabiti (f64), l-pmp zábili (816), pozábili (176), gpt Zábif (833), pr2s zabudef (c163), pr3s zábude (1244, 1402), aor2/3s zábi (209), aor3p pozábifice (872), Verbal Noun Gs zábitya (576), inf záuidit (c41), imperfects záuiyaſce (1489).

(8) The -a- in the endings of the present tense of ā-verbs:
- 1s (19/7): dám (453, a42, c12), Vfám (c33), napráfgliám (27), oſtaugliám (28, 599), Imám (1654), znám (159, 601, 601, 806, 944, c162, f38, f42), priciuám (e21), prixiuám (e22); narúcam (543), Plachiam (c159), oſtaugliam (b9), znam (263, b11, b11, c106).
- 2s (21/5): dáſc (120, c59), imáſc (487, 1285, 1343, a28, c71), nímáſc (1053), znáſc (119, 403, 462, 890, 941, 1670, 1672, c66, c67), Znáſc (141, 411, 420), izaznáſc (a36), pitáſc (c68); chuſcaſc (418), zádaſc (1294), imaſc (1344), znaſc (c87), poznaſc (a37).
- 3s (90/35), see section 4.1 (13-14) and Table D.
- 1p (2/0): nímámo (747), známo (364).
- 2p (1/0): znáte (217).
- 3pl: none of the more than twenty attestations adduced in section 4.1 (47) carries an accent mark on the -a-.

(9) The -a- in past gerunds in -av (16/4): dáť (755, c140), prigledáť (409), Dáf (d4), izabráť (1187), Veceráť (1076, 1510), poďáť (365, 497, 686, 1188, 1196), uťáť (293), Vtfáť (316, 469), putoudáť (962), řif (305, f41), Oſťaf (1001), Scházaf (1359).

4.3 Examples of é

(1) The stem of the noun teg (7/0): Ns tég (1627, c61, e7), Gs téga (55), Is Tégom (820), Is tége (c60), Ap tége (1556).

(2) The second stem syllable of the noun vitez (12/4): Ns Vitéz (476, 644), Vitez (533, 534, 652, 678), DLs uitězu (184), Vitéžu (a42), Vs Vitéxe (549, 677, 1667), Vitéxe (1), Vitéxe (e6, read: *Vitéxe), Np Vitézi (535, 1519), Gp Vitézl (166).

13 Wagner (1970: 27) regards the attestations of the acute accent in zábi (209) and pozábili (176) as mistakes. In view of the large number of supporting examples this is out of the question. Note that length is confirmed by Bartol Kašić (1617/1978), who has aor1p zábismo (144), l-part mp Zábili (144), and by the testimony of quite a few living varieties of Čakavian, not only such dialects as Omišalj (inf pozábil, l-part pozábila, pr1s pozábim, my material), Orbanic in Istrija (Kalsbeek 1998, section V.1.1), and Susak (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 183), but also systems that continue Hektorović’s immediate linguistic background, cf. Brusje inf zábūt, pr1s zóbín (Dulčić/Dulčić 1985: 738).
(3) Verbs of the types pisati, ležati, hvaliti and dignuti with a long é in the stem in at least one attestation (41/3): inf potézat (82), imperf2/3s istéžázúce (1110), pr3s pótéx (422), pr3p pótéxú (772), gpr přítėxuch (402); inf užáž (662), pr3p užážú (771), gpt priežážčí (724), pass part užážů (58), fauzán (27, 128), obžáž (156), obžážů (a11); inf tétáž (c137), pr3s tétáží (1093), gpr tétážech (850); inf fčélíė (189), gpr fčélíėch (f51), gpt fčélíėčí (732); aor1s narédžů (1506), gpt naréžů (731); pr3s hlépi (1024), imp2s hlépi (1297); l-pms naréžčio (a7), pass part naréžčů (c52), naréžčů (d78), naréžčů (d38); pr3s hřéni (307, 1599), imp2s hřéni (224); aor3p natéžů (870), gpt potéžů (1234), l-pfs uztežů (602) pr3p ustéžů (152), vs. pr3p ţtėx (e5), obžážů (e17), inf ţetáž (1627). 492

(4) The adverb opet (8/0): opěť (87, 354, 493, 526, 970, a27, f39).

(5) The adverb prem (9/5): prém (494, 728, 745, 919, 1065, 1619, 1647, c86), Prém (720), prem (172, 424, a6), Prem (43, 1345).

4.4 Examples of í

(1) The stem syllable of the noun svit ‘world’ (3/4, 0/6, 0/11): Ns sfít (42, 161), sfít (157, 788, 887, 895, 1521, 1529, c72, c178, f63, f102), Gs sfita (347), sfita (775, 901, c118), DLs sfítna (478, 929, 950, 1315, 1539, a51, c55), Ls sfítna (c156).

(2) The stem syllable of the noun ríka (9/6, 1/1, 0/0): Ns rícha (318, 348), Gs rícě (854), rícě (277), DLs rící (315), rící (267), As ríchů (273), Ríců (325), Is ríchům (303, 395), NAp ríchů (345, 353, 400), ríče (462), Ríče (1230), Ip ríchami (342), ríčami (444).

(3) The Ns of the noun vrime (7/1, 3/3, 0/8): vuríme (106, 465, 469, 517, 523, 719, 773, 1026, 1029), Vríme (1027), vuríme (899, 1269, c59, c107, c141, c169, f129, f131), Vríme (177, 916, 1527, 1659).

(4) The stem vowel of the adjective líp (14/1, 7/4, 1/4): líp (1646), lípa (235, 244, 502, 1086), lípo (233, 524, 529, 623, 992, 1248, 1508), Lípo (235, 524, 525, 622, 623, 1105, 1375), lípu (7), lípi (245, 996); líp (c44), Lípa (c55), lípo (525, 1204, 1625, c140), lípu (1007, 1093), Lípu (1004).

(5) The NAp of the numeral tri (5/1, 0/2, 0/0): trí (43, 213, 283, 527, 543), trí (218, 1073, 1174).

(6) The Gp ending -i (4/1, 1/3, 0/7): píñí (1232), dináří (730), jtuáří (729), prozóří (151), Vitéží (166); rici (214), gliúdí (1522, 1612), dni (1658), limúní (1192), dáří (1314), jtuáří (f127), jtuář (a22), zuíří (1041), uťtí (c49, e50).

(7) The -i in the adjectival Ip ending -imi (0/2, 2/6, 0/7): ifchargúní (1270), dobrúní (1256) vs. dráguí (1202), mnogúmi (c1), Morúčchími (831), uifčchími (1152), nebečchími (978), oftalúmi (a51, c131), zlími (1254), obránúmi (c129), guoszenúmi (a11), uernúmi (c132), dobrúmi (c2), múdrúmi (804), bífrúmi (443), barzúmi (444). In the pro-
nouns there is a single example of an acute accent: tachími (1017), which is opposed to the following attestations without an accent mark: sfihi (803, 1116, 1184, a51, e38, e40), chimi (268, 1118), Chimi (c9, 493 | c10), tachími (1479), nichími (a2), gními (30, 174, 269, 580, 997, 1113, 1154, 1164, 1366, 1481, 1576, a34), oními (a3), timí (341, 977, 1115, 1575), ouími (461), choyími (a22, f149), moyími (92, a2, e39), tuoyími (e40).

(8) The -i in the adjectival Is and Dp endings -im (3/5, 2/5, 1/18): Sarbhčím (519), uefélími (a18), oholími (1310), pereními (639), sfétími (780), družími (1409) vs. Mládím (f111), prídragími (c154), sfachími (1450), fuachími (c97), glubchími (f141), tefčími (c98), nemichími (1588), tíhími (606), príftalími (1376), farceními (f141), ungilíeními (1309), uichofgními (a11), ifchàrgúmí (c25), iními (a53, e16), iftími (e15), rásámmími (794), doftoyími (f139), sfástími (1246), dobrími (d40), útími (641), práúmi (c32), sfáriyími (314), túyími (1328), Bodyími (c154), Mnozími (669), družími (1168, f27).

(9) In this connection it is interesting to notice that there is no single attestation of an acute in the adjectival GALp ending -i (0/4, 0/12, 0/15): máddíhí (1320), sfachí (168), golíhí (1582), oholíhí (947), pitomihi (1043), bludníhí (1587), Vmiglieníhí (948), ifchàrgúmíhí (1350), iníhí (1381), ufíñíhí (1592), Xalofníhí (1589), dobríhí (1042), múdríhí (41), priyíthí (c152), Príprofihí (1587), mínútíhí (17), Minyútíhí (e18), Martúíhí (1585), sfáriyíhí (272), dúyíhí (1041), drážíhí (d42), mnozíhí (1654, a8), družíhí (912, 1275, 1385, a38, a55, a57, c101), Družíhí (976). Among the pronouns there are no attestations of length either (0/15, 0/28, 0/49): sfíhí (3, 5, 485, 1033, 1212, 1222, 1265, 1330, 1410, 1522, 1536, 1591, a22, d23), sfíhí (1612, c140, d20, d42), chíhí (1448, 1519, 1546, 1573, 1578, a26, c136, c152), Chihí (23, 1116), gníhí (271, 276, 818, 994, 1091, 1150, 1155, 1202, 1304, 1380, 1480, 1521, 1525, 1599, 1624, a55, a57, c36, f40, f112, f127), oníhí (1590, a23, d20), ouíhí (17, e18), Chachouíhí (994), yíhí (147, 148, 219, 617, 619, 815, 984, 1105, 1108, 1111, 1172, 1214, 1242, 1234, 1521, 1527, 1577, 1586, 1599, a49, c116, c182, e25, f106), gíhí (1107, f106, read: *yíhí), sfoyíhí (40), choyíhí (797, 1520, c31), Choyíhí (1220, e36), moyíhí (39), tuoyíhí (1252, c49, e61, d42).

(10) The -i- in the endings of the present tense of -i-verbs:

- 1s (9/6, 5/1, 3/22): dúmí (135, 385, 1103, c159, c167), Dúmí (249, 373), uídím (a4), huálím (1375), Molím (1008), fímislími (1213), mmími (774, 785), profími (332), uími (136, 1013), prauími (26); dúmí (250, a57, f119), xelími (a60, c97), mollími (545, c95), mollími (sic, a25), wólími (1309, c96), fímidími (f41), umími (360, a5, c32), mními (254), ozrími (494) (c105), chiutiími (c103), uími (721, a47, c117, e3, f7, f38), Vímí (c186), pouími (a56), zbroýímí (c117, f41), tfoyími (253, f42).

- 2s (1/4, 2/11, 0/10): dobauíífí (1250), ftauíífí (417), oftauíífí (1247); uídíífí (601, b11, c85, f142), prohodiífí (f4), poudíífí (f3), poudííífí (a29), uelíífí (266), xelíífí (265), molíífí (c126), Vníífí (945), mníífí (1292), gowíífí (1053), progowíífí (c45), szatoríífí (c46), otuoríífí (1054), nójíífí (f3), ufíífí (909, 1291), proslauíífí (1249), naprauíífí (1248), pouíífí (910).

- 3s (32/20, 27/66, 1/96): izgubíí (987), naucíí (1384), dúíí (1383), uurudíí (1463), fidíí (1178), slobódíí (342), hódíí (335), nahódíí (939), obhódíí (336), dohódíí (343), uzhódíí (910).
Although no argumentation is provided, I am inclined to agree with this. On the one hand the *-a in the present tense often carries an acute accent; on the other the syllable -sel- in the adjective vesel and its derivations never carries an accent symbol (0/27), cf. ufel (136, 687, 696, 959, 1139, 1207, a12), Vefel (590), ufeľa (590), ufel (63, 70, 259, 685, 1468), Ufeľo (693, 1656), ufeľim (a18), ufeľa (830, 984), Neufeľ (1011), Neufeľo (722), inf ufeliti (115), pr2p ufeľite (241), imp2s ufeľ (d11), imp2p ufeľite (194), gps ufeľech (187, 298).

Elsewhere in Hektorović’s text there are several convincing examples of accent marks that appear to belong to an adjacent syllable, e.g. Ns xitach (1278), read: *xtach; Gs fina (166, read: *fina), mira (1023, read: *mira), pata (a16, read: *pata), DLs dar (c164, read: *daru), As gušťmi (1087, read: *gušťmi).
The stem syllable of the neuter noun more (26/6): Ns móre (145, 152, 336, 339, 343, 354, 374, 380, 393, 1070, 1468, 1650), more (330, c197, f14), Gs móra (344, 346, 353, 1166), mora (1670, a58), DLs móru (110, 444, 748, 837, 1190, 1476, 1515, 1639, 1646, 1650), moru (376).

The (only or final) stem syllable of other nouns, notably in the Ns. This requires some comment. In stem syllables, ó is rare, due not so much to some irregularity in Hektorović’s use of accent marks as to the fact that long *ó is infrequent in the Common Slavic dialect that underlies SCr and is often secondary and/or mysterious in attested varieties of the language. In Hektorović, several types of cases must be distinguished. To begin with, there are dvor and nož, which in most varieties of SCr are (b) stressed and retain length in all forms: Ns duór (1095, f124), Ns nóx (1406). In the case of both words, the characteristic retention of length is also attested in Hektorović: DLs duóru (747, c146), Gs nóxa (1047), cf. also the absence of an accent mark in Ap duoroue (664). Then there are several distinct types of nouns in which length in the Ns is opposed to absence of evidence for length in other forms:

(2a) Monosyllabic (c) stressed masculine nouns, where length is Common Slavic. It seems likely that most or all of the following cases of ó can be explained along these lines (14/4, not counting bog): bóch (1129), dóm (145), lóf (50, 79, 1643, 1676), plód (a24), ród (e57), rod (d7), róch (c122, f111), fchóch (f112), jmóch (1130), znóy (51), znóy (1472, c60, f59), zwóń (1044). The Ns of bog does not usually carry an acute accent (1/13), cf. Bóg (885), Bog (1160, 1333, 1338, 1541, 1577, a7, c9, c50, c116, c127, c200, e44, f160). There are no instances of ó in other attestations of these words, which are unfortunately too few to be very informative (0/4, again excluding Bog): DLs domu (259), Gs loua (173, 1511), Gs fchocha (235), cf. also Gs Boga (1408, 1551, 1593, c125, f1, f48), DLs Bogu (294, 316, 888, 1540, 1580, 1615, a25, c58, c80, e60), DLs Bugu (1396, read: *Bogu).

(2b) Feminine (c) stressed nouns, where length is Common Slavic at least in monosyllabic forms and where attested SCr tend to have length in polysyllabic forms as well (28/15): móch (401, 403, 421, 436, f127), nemóch (a31), nách (435, 906, 908,
1620), pomóch (38, 1416, c123, c153), chirpoft (975, 1224, 1355), Chripóft (1361), milóft (1334, a47, c57), shchupóft (1363), fmaróft (159, f70, f113, f136), uridnóft (a17, c78) vs. chirpoft (d24), Chripóft (1481), miloft (1144, 1613, c100), mladoft (f69), mudroft (e53), sfíloft (f61), slaboft (f76), sladchoft (1232), stároft (c108), fmaróft (f80), Tihóft (c23), uridnóft (f157), xaloft (d18). 16 Other forms of these and similar nouns never carry an acute, despite being quite frequent, e.g. Gs chofti (1107), nochi (253, f58), foli (73), DLs nochi (934), Is mochyu (433, a54, f49), nochyu (434, f50), NAp moch (c91), nemochi (f88); Gs chirpofti (799, 1378, 1419, 1490), milofti (1312, c14), Milofti (f48), mladofti (c26, d46), sladchofti (375), fmarófti (1320), Starofti (932), xalofti (d45), DLs milofti (592, 1502, c166), mladofti (f103), radofti (e52), sfílofti (1420), fmarófti (f104), uridnófti (1501), Vs Chripófti (f5), mladofti (d1), Tihófti (d15), Is chirpoftyu (937, a7), hárnofyu (f140), milofyu (c15, e48), sfíloftyu (e47), uridnóftyu (c16), NAp chirpofti (14, 483, 1412, 1433, 1518, a26, c165, c188, e36), dragofti (c25), hrabrofti (1525), milofti (a27, c80), pijofti (1258), radofti (1526, f56), slabofti (c91), tamnofti (1411), Ip chirpofti (c1). 17 (2c) Other cases of ó in the Ns: chógn (632), chogn (c189), pochóy (e58), pochoy (15, 36, 52, 1440, c59, f40, f60, f144), nepchoy (1462, d8), ftól (1063), zachón (1373), záchón (1359, 1544), zaslóu (747, read: *záslón). In attestations of other case forms of the same words the acute accent does not occur (0/25), cf. Gs chognia (608, 631), DLs chogniu (644, 647), Vs chogniu (634, 634, 635, 636, 636), Np chogni (981), Ap chognie (527, 602, 629, 630), Gs pochoya (c112, d46), Vs pochoyu (d12), Is ftoli (74), Is ftolóm (1267), Gs zachona (1570), Np zácheni (1595), Zácheni (1598), Zachone (c172). In such cases length is not Common Slavic or Common Scr, but due to a dialectal lengthening of originally short vowels followed by word-final resonants under certain conditions. Note that in many cases no length is marked, cf. (alongside the examples already given) Ns arbor (53), blagoslof (283), broy (826, 1116, 1150, 1504, c89, c102, c181, d42, e36, f43, f62), Izgouor (c44), odgouor (120, 889, a53), periuoy (1149, 1162), pochoy (1149, 1162), pochoyu (d12), Is ftoli (74), Is ftolóm (1267), Gs zachona (1570), Np zácheni (1595), Zácheni (1598), Zachone (c172). Indeed, the only examples that do carry an acute are ones in which it is reasonable to assume that the vowel concerned was originally stressed. (3) The adverb totu (8/3): tótu (174, 252, 317, 363, 1102, 1469, 1651), Tótu (1513), totu (507, 905), Totu (1073). (4) As we saw in section 3.1 (31), in feminine nouns the Is ending -om is provided with an accent mark in nearly three fourth of the attestations (42/16). The masculine/neuter Is ending -om also sometimes carries an accent mark, but only in a quarter of the cases (17/48): trúdóm (211), fnímóm (1406), ftolóm (1267), úmóm (485, 1284, f103), chipóm (f98), Gospodaróm (1325), mirmóm (960, 1377), Sulétóm (722), xuutóm (780); znóm (1353, f81), putóm (56), Gospodfom (a7), umiglienfom (a7), blagodárfom (e7) vs. xdríbom (1166), mífemom (828), obidom (1132), stidom (c43), trudom (15), trúdóm (f94), tégom (c60), Tégom (820), ftráhom (1108), yunachom (606).

16 Cf. also the length in mnóx (1573).
17 This list is not exhaustive.
For the correlating soft ending -em the evidence is comparable (2/13): 1Lícém (920), listyém (1156) vs. putem 'road' (c32), uinčem (1474), farčem (a18), pogliem (229), oblìcyem (1376), Vlyem (1063), Vmìnyem (118), chopyem (641), ofctaryem (1047), Oruxyem (126).

There cannot be much doubt about the underlying cause of the difference between the two endings: the -o- in the feminine ending is long wherever it is attested in SCr (of course provided that contrastive length is possible in the relevant position), whereas in the masculine/neuter ending it is short unless the system involved has lengthened short vowels before the reflex of syllable-final -m. The facts suggest that the prosodic system reflected by Hektorović’s use of accent marks had carried through lengthening of short o before word-final m (otherwise we would not find so many accented nouns), but only in part of the cases (otherwise the proportion of accented and unaccented o would be quite different), cf. the case of to analyzed in section 3.4. As we shall see, the difference is connected with the place of the stress.

Before turning to the effect of stress we have to remove from the sample two types of examples where length is probably underlying, i.e. not due to the influence of the syllable-final resonant.

(a) The case of listyém has to be interpreted against the background of the fact that neuter nouns with a stem in a consonant plus -j- often have length in endings that are ordinarily short, cf. Nás ribányé (a43), znányé (a43), radouanyé (a30), bitýé (1279), xitýé (172), fpmenutyé (1454), sdrayýé (f57), Gs Miloedyá (1579), Schoncányá (1678), pocténýá (6), uminyá (777), DLs ufányú (c122), mogliényú (c147), xitúnýú (13, 1485, c27), ftmpýú (492), bitúyé (f134), NAp šchładanyá (f53), Chiuchienyá (f84), zlamenyá (5), pityá (943).18 Nouns of this type have long endings in much of Dalmatian Čakavian, e.g. Vrgada (Jurišič 1966: 76). In the dialects that continue Hektorović’s immediate linguistic background, which have lost distinctive length in posttonic position, the relevant nouns have length only in case of end stress, and in the case of stem stress the tell-tale -o (a) in the Gs and NAp betrays the original presence of length (cf., e.g., Hraste 1935: 23-24, 1940: 40, Šimunović 1977: 11, 35-36).

(b) The nouns in -stvo (gospodstvo, umiljenstvo, blagodarstvo) may also have had long endings, as they often do in Dalmatian Čakavian, both in some of the systems that continue Hektorović’s immediate linguistic background (Hraste 1935: 24, Šimuno-

---

18 The lists of examples are not exhaustive. In all types of cases absence of an accent mark is more frequent.
vić 1977: 11, 35) and in Vrgada (Jurišić 1966: 76). If this is correct, it follows that the absence of accent marks in the other attestations of nouns in -stvo is due to chance, which is awkward but conceivable because of their small number: Ns diffstuo (1435), mnoftuo (1031), uboftu (1032), Gs Bogoliubftua (c20), umiglientftua (d15).

The elimination of two types of neuter derivations (those in -stvo and those with stems ending in consonant plus -j-) leaves 63 attestations of the Isg in -om (15/48) and 6 of that in -em (1/5).

Most nouns that are attested with an acute in the ending belong to Stang’s accent type (b) and accordingly have end stress (or the reflex of end stress) in the Is, cf. Brusje trūd trūdâ, život -votâ, putô -û (Dulčić/Dulčić 1985), Brač/Hvar/Vis trūd trūdâ, smîh smîhâ, stôl stôlâ, gospodôr gospodôrâ, život životâ, zîô, putô (Hraste/Šimunović/Olesch 1979), Vrgada trūd trūdâ, smîh smîhâ, stôl stôlâ, gospodâr gospodârâ, život životâ, zîô, lîcê (Jurišić 1973). And although mir is (c)-stressed in Brač/Hvar/Vis (mir mîra) and Vrgada (mir -a), it is (b)-stressed in the system described by Daničić (1925: 22).

19 The three important Dalmatian dialect dictionaries are the following: (a) Dulčić and Dulčić (1985), devoted to Brusje on Hvar; (b) Hraste/Šimunović/Olesch (1979), which incorporates lexical material from the Čakavian dialects of Brač, Hvar and Vis; (c) Jurišić (1973), devoted to the dialect of the small island of Vrgada opposite Biograd na Moru in North Dalmatia. Although all three dictionaries are extremely informative, each of them has its own drawbacks from the point of view of the problem that is being investigated in the present contribution. (a) The Dulčić/Dulčić dictionary does not incorporate many words the dialect shares with the standard language and by that token omits quite a bit of information that is vital from an accentological point of view. (b) The Hraste e.a. dictionary combines information from different dialects, which forces the authors to adopt a certain amount of normalization, particularly in phonological matters. This is unfortunate, because the synchronic phonology of the dialects of the Brač/Hvar/Vis area has been shown to display quite a few local differences, in particular with respect to the continuation of vowel quantity, in other words: with respect to the very feature that is the subject of the present article. Matters are made worse by the contradictions present in the literature, which point to unresolved phonological problems. As an example I would like to mention the question whether or not the dialect of Komiža on the island of Vis (one of the major sources of the dictionary) has contrastive vowel quantity at all and if so, in which positions. Whereas several investigators report quantity distinctions, Pavle Ivić states (on the basis of unpublished investigations by Robert Earl Whyte, whose work is explicitly discounted by Hraste/Šimunović/Olesch 1979: XIV) “da je došlo do prefonologizacije kvantitete u vokalski kvalitet” (1972: 264), in other words: that contrastive vowel quantity has been eliminated. Šimunović (1981a: 259-260) has it both ways: after giving distinct systems consisting of long and short vowels he states that the difference sometimes disappears, leaving the reader with the problem of conjecturing what on earth is going on. (c) Jurišić’s dictionary, which lacks the serious dialectological and lexicographic drawbacks of the other two dictionaries, describes a North Dalmatian dialect that cannot be regarded as an immediate continuation of Hektorović’s linguistic background; nevertheless I have decided to adduce material from it because it is the most closely related system to have retained posttonic vowel length as such and to have been thoroughly described.

20 In the chapter of the Fonološki opisi that is devoted to Vrbanj on Hvar, Šimunović quotes the Ns of the word with a long rising tone: mir, opposed to mîr (i.e., in conventional notation, mîr) ‘wall’ (1981b: 273). If correct, this would imply that mir ‘peace’ is (b)-stressed in a dialect that is among those that immediately continue Hektorović’s linguistic background. However, it is possible that something has gone
Turning now to the nouns that are not attested with an accent mark on the ending -om, most of them belong to accent type (a) or (c) in most SCr systems and as such can be expected to have stem stress in the Isg, cf. Brusje mîsec -a, obîd obîda, têg -a, strôh (given s.v. strôšć; the falling tone implies (c)-stress), pôbuk -a, krûh -a, stôn -a, pelîn -îna, glôs -a, Gs dînêva (implying a stem-stressed Is), pokrôv -krôva, blôgo -a, tilô -a, brîme brîmena, Brač/Hvar/Vis mîsec - , obîd obîda, stîd - , têg - , strôh - , ôblok - , pôbuk - 21 , krûh - , rûzûm - , stôn - , pelîn pelîna, dôr - , glôs - , Gs dînêva (implying stem stress in the Is), pokrôv pokrôva, blôgo, dîlo, tîlo, îme îmena, brîme brîmena, vrîme vrîmena, zîolo, Vrgada mîsêc mîsêca, obîd -a, stîd -a, strâh -a, ôblâk -a, pôbuk -a, krûh krûva, rûzûm -a, stîn -a, nîćîn or nîćîn, Gs nîćîna, pelîn pelîna, dîr -a, glîâs -a, Is dînêvon (s.v. dîân), pokrôv pokrôva, bîlîgo -a, dîlo -a, tîlo tîla, îme -ena, brîme -ena, vrîme vrîmena, zîlîto zîlîta. The noun junak always has (b)-stress: Brusje junôk -nôkå, Brač/Hvar/Vis junôk junôkå, Vrgada junôk -ûkå.

The evidence is contradictory in the case of four nouns: Brusje ždrîb -a, pehôr -hôrå, rêp rêpå, Brač/Hvar/Vis kîp kîpå, ždrîb ždrîbå (explicitly limited to Brač), pehôr pehâra, rêp rêpå, Vrgada kîp -a, ždrîb -a, pehôr -ûrå -ûrâ, rêp -a.

Seven nouns are not attested in any of the three Dalmatian dialect dictionaries: um, Sulet, ribnjak, tik, ščitak, muk, poklon, so we have to look further afield. For the purposes of this article will be limited to the Vuk/Daničić system, where the noun um is (b)-stressed (ûm ûma), whereas ribnjak, tik and poklon are not: ribnjâk, tîjek - , 500 poklôn. This leaves three unattested nouns. The noun ščitak is a diminutive of a (b)-stressed noun (štût štûta) and accordingly must have been (b)-stressed. The accentuation of muk (which is a very rare word) is not reliably attested, nor is that of the toponym Sulet, which appears to have died out in the living language (it has yielded to Šolta), cf. on both words the Zagreb Academy Dictionary.

In cases of vacillation among sources I shall assume that the type of accentuation attested geographically closest to Hektorović stands the best chance of being the same as the one found in the system he was rendering (e.g. Brusje prevails over Brač/Hvar/Vis, Vrgada over Vuk/Daničić, etc.). It follows that we expect stress on the ending in trud, smih, stol, um, kîp, gospodar, život, zlo, puto, ždrîb, junak, ščitak, rep (19 attestations: 12/7), and on the stem in mir, mîsec, obîd, stîd, têg, strah, ribnjak, oblak, tik, pôbuk, muk, krûh, rûzûm, stân, načîn, pelîn, poklon, dôr, pehâr, glîas, dînêv-, pokrôv, blôgo, dîlo, tîlo, îme, brîme, vrîme, zîlîto (45 attestations: 2/43).

This shows pretty conclusively that the appearance of an accent symbol on the masculine/neuter Isg ending -om depends on the accentual type of the noun involved. Note that mir, which is the only noun that is attested with an accent mark on the end-

---

21 The posttonic length indicated in the Ns and implied for the Gs (because no separate Gs is given) clashes with the short vowel indicated in Is pôbukon given in the example (from Brusje) and with the statement that “Nach dem Akzent sind alle Längen gekürzt worden” (o.c.: XXIV). It is probably a mistake of some kind.
ing in Hektorović without being (b)-stressed in the best available evidence, is (b)-stressed in Vuk/Daničić (mîr míra).

(5) The adjectival ending -oga (30/14): drugóga (48), yáchóga (c136), yunacchóga (235), Bráčchóga (720), tanchóga (55), gliidjchóga (1413), nebeťchóga (c125), Nebeťchóga (f1), morfchóga (56, 1511), zalóga (1260), uelóga (1110), umárlóga (1454), lacnóga (1581), xédnóga (1582), perenóga (238), Difnóga (596), duhoťnóga (1580), teleńnóga (1579), izuarpńnóga (819), sfértnóga (924), Slaunóga (a1), lounóga (171), Staróga (1219), ftároga (820), múdróga (1322), sfetrńnóga (786), sfémogoga (e46), drugoga (110), yunacchoga (608), Nebeťchoga (f54), ribarńshoga (a20), tihóga (559), Tihóga (563), felmoga (a61), perenoga (237), difnoga (b6), ftnrtnoga (a33), dobrog (848, 1259), zũoga (980, read: *xũoga). The acute accent on -ga in fceńtnoque (f160a) is best regarded as a displaced accent mark instead of *fćeńtnoque (see note 15). An acute accent in the ending -oga is also attested in several pronouns, in particular:

- ki (12/8): chóga (149, 321, 439, a16, c71, f35, f35), Chóga (97, 774, 790, 1110, e41), choga (476, 1009, 1272, 1415, c94, c126), Choga (1358, 1418);
- svaki (1/6): sfachóga (6), sfachoga (504, 1453, 1638, c37, c135, c186);
- taki (2/1): tachóga (479, 923), tachoga (c185);
- moj/tvoj/svoj (7/6), see for the examples section 4.1(36);
- ovi (1/6): ouóga (e13) vs. ouoga (135, 365, 1109, 1220, a58, f36).

In other pronouns the acute is not attested at all, cf.:

- niki (0/3): nichoga (1272, 1398), Nichoga (1333);
- sam (0/4): ftnoga (94, 1465, 1552, 1594);
- jedan (0/3): yednoga (47, 979, 1551);
- oni (0/14): onoga (109, 245, 346, 410, 490, 503, 560, 576, 1512, a1, a20, a31, a58), Onoga (1263);
- taj (0/20): toga (17, 93, 136, 246, 285, 309, 345, 409, 466, 475, 480, 489, 785, 841, 847, 1209, 1253, 1375, 1603, a19), Toga (1473).

The corresponding soft ending -ega, which is much less frequent than -oga, is attested as follows in the adjectives (3/5): uicgnięga (f110), mlayęga (250), ftaryęga (249) vs. Naybogliega (1381), magniega (215), ifchargniega (1594), treyęga (530), Boxyęga (c18). There is a single case of an acute accent in a pronoun: nafęęga (1680), cf. absence of an accent symbol in the following attestations: nafęęga (a50, f160a), sfęęga (452, 1147, 1541, 1593, c69, f109, f118), Sfęęga (f71, uncertain), gnęęga (27, 115, 679, 774, 1180, 1207, 1359, 1430, 1542, 1552, 1602, 1606), Gnieęga (c170, f49), tęęga (451), sfęęęga (596), moyęęga (562, 1148), suoyęęga (b6), tųoyęęga (c17).

(6) The adjectival DLs ending -omu (8/4): drugómu (1557), yunáčchómu (644), ribarfchómu (a37), read: *ribarfchómu), tihómu (837), uelómu (1038), recenómu (a21), yedńómnu (1318), Stárómu (1656); drugómu (979, 1326), cudnómu (1486), Izuarfnómu (a42). In the pronouns the facts are the following:

- ki (5/4): chómu (142, 789, 1570, d7), Chómu (355) vs. chomu (1130, a35, a44), Chomu (1019);
– svaki (1/11): sfachomu (f107), sfachomu (26, 219, 260, 1037, 1050, 1246, 1316, 1380, 1540, f80), Sfachomu (911);
– taki: no examples;
– maj/tvoj/svoj (7/4): mómu (25, 197), tuómou (367, c47, c48), sfómu (1012, 1558), sfoomu (385, 756, f147), tuomu (f148);
– ovi (0/6): ouomu (198, 929, 1315, 1539, a1, f108);
– moj/tvoj/svoj (7/4): mómu (25, 197), tuómu (367, c47, c48), sfómu (1012, 1558), sfoomu (385, 756, f147), tuomu (f148);
– sam: no examples; jéden (0/2): Yednomu (1557), yednomu (96);
– oni (0/4): onomu (1264, a37, a42, a44);
– ovi (0/6): ouomu (198, 929, 1315, 1539, a1, f108);
– niki (0/3): nichomu (1325, f37), Nichomu (1334);
– taj (0/15): Tomu (32, 198, 368, 386, 389, 901, 930, 1011, 1095, 1289, 1329, 1379, 1595), Tomu (284).

The corresponding soft ending -emu happens not to be attested in adjectives. In the pronouns there are attestations of length in ki and moj/tvoj/svoj, but not in other types of cases, cf. choyému (1488, f29), moyému (c147) vs. cemu (472, 936, 954, 991), nafcemu (1516, a21), sfemum (368, 687, 768, 844, 1317, 1602, a44, a59, c56), gniemu (116, 255, 484, 487, 557, 661, 665, 686, 767, 843, 1601, 1005, a27, c168), Gniemu (731), ſemum (c55), temu (f30), sfoyemum (644).

4.6 Examples of ù

(1) The stem syllable of the noun ljudi (14/7): Np gliúdi (74, 1227, 1477, c22), Glíúdi (797, 1308), gliud (190, 996, a58, c115), Gp gliúdi (1522, 1612), Dp gliúdem (957, 1021, 1447, f120), gliudem (10, 794), Ip gliúdi (1479, 1504), gliudi (e38).

(2) The stem syllable of the noun put (11/5): Ns pút (688, 842, 865, 1676, a4, a43, c20), put (111, f110), Gs púta (366, 1512), puta (a31), putá (a16), DLs pútu (c144), Is putem (c32), Ap púte (a26), cf. the use of the Ns of put as a preposition: pút (78, 172, 1136), put (110).

(3) The second stem syllable of the noun razum (16/4): Ns razúm (2, 787, 1500, 1611, c99, e35, e53), Razúm (1480), razum (255, c17, e19, f146), Gs razúma (479, 1321), Razúma (792), DLs razúmu (367, 1303), Is razúmom (1333, 1374, 1613). Note the parralellism with vitez.

(4) The stem syllable of the noun duša (11/3): Ns dúsca (1610), Gs dú́ʃe (f65), NAp dúʃe (1566), Dúʃe (1540), As dúʃcu (927, 1344, 1368, c124, e20), As Dúʃcu (f128), Is dúʃcom (1611); DLs dúʃci (1578), As dúʃcu (a33, c104).

(5) The root drug-/druž- in several types of cases, in particular:
– The noun drug (5/1): Gs drúga (c17, c68), Vs drúxe (519), Np drúzi (175, 1099) vs. Vs druše (132).
– The noun družba (5/3): Ns drúxbba (231), Gs drúxbé (c192), DLs drúxbi (267), As drúxbu (690), Drúxbu (c40) vs. Ns družba (798), As družbu (1088), Is družbom (e21).
– The verb družiti (4/1): inf združiti (f160), aor1p fdrúxímo (1132), l-pfs sdrúxila (a17), ppp fdrúxeni (a5), vs. pr3p druxé (312).
Other derivations from the same root never carry an acute, e.g. the frequent noun \textit{družina} (0/16) and the adjective \textit{družben} (with its derivative noun \textit{družbenik}), \textit{Ns družina} (275, 588, 590, 602, 603, e29), \textit{Gs družiné} (1660), \textit{DLs družini} (856), \textit{As družinu} (830), \textit{Is družinóm} (520, 611, 657), \textit{druxino} (640), \textit{Vs družino} (532, 619, 666); \textit{druž-bene} (691), \textit{Np družbeniči} (d27).

(6) The root \textit{liub-} in several types of cases:
- The stem syllable of the feminine noun \textit{ljubav} (9/8): \textit{Ns gliúbaf} (1143, 1323), \textit{Glíubaf} (e5), \textit{Gs gliúbaut} (264, 766, 1668, c19, c125), \textit{Is gliúbafyu} (a5) vs. \textit{Ns gliubaf} (a6, d31, f60), \textit{Glíubaf} (f150), \textit{Gs gliúbaui} (d26, f153), \textit{DLs gliúbaui} (c54, e43).
- The stem syllable of the verb \textit{ljubiti} (14/5): \textit{inf gliúbiti} (1418, 1444, 1606), \textit{gliúbit} (1603), \textit{aor2/3s Pogliúbi} (1145), \textit{pr3s gliúbi} (1543), \textit{pr2p gliúbate} (1597), \textit{pr3p gliúbé} (1542), \textit{imp2s gliúbi} (1450), \textit{imp1p gliúbimo} (1261), \textit{imp1p Glíúbimo} (1259), \textit{gpr gliúbech} (1593), \textit{ppp gliúbglien} (1604), \textit{gliúbglien} (a10); \textit{inf gliúbit} (40), \textit{l-pms obgliúbio} (571, 572), \textit{pr3s gliubí} (1600), \textit{imp1p gliúbimo} (1607).

Several other derivations from the same root never carry an acute, in particular the adjective \textit{ljubak} (0/7): \textit{gliubach} (1327), \textit{gliubcha} (1538), \textit{gliubchí} (2), \textit{gliubchim} (f141), \textit{gpr gliubcho} (571, 572), \textit{pr3s gliubi} (1600), \textit{imp1p gliubimo} (1607).

(7) The root \textit{slug-/služ-} in several types of cases, in particular:
- The stem vowel of the noun \textit{sluga} (4/1): \textit{Ns slúga} (232, 1420), \textit{NAp slúge} (680), \textit{Dp slúgam} (c151) vs. \textit{Dp slugam} (c154).
- The stem vowel of the noun \textit{služba} (2/1): \textit{As slúxbu} (691, f50), \textit{As slušbu} (242).
- The stem vowel of the verb \textit{služiti} (13/2): \textit{inf slúxiti} (134, 767, 1326), \textit{aor3p slúxifce} (817), \textit{pr1s slúxu} (718), \textit{pr3s obslúxite} (1598), \textit{pr3p slúxé} (811), \textit{imp2s obslúxki} (1548), \textit{imp1p slúximo} (1608), \textit{gpr slúxechi} (816, read: *slúxechi), \textit{imperf3p slúxáhu} (a3), \textit{slúxahú} (271), \textit{ppp sláxeni} (a3) vs. \textit{inf fluxiti} (116), \textit{pr3p sluxé} (311).

(8) The root \textit{trud-} in several types of cases, in particular:
- The stem vowel of the noun \textit{trud} (9/3): \textit{Ns trúd} (35, 518, e44), \textit{Gs trúda} (f51, f60, f86), \textit{DLs trúdu} (446), \textit{Is trúdóm} (211), \textit{trúdom} (f94) vs. \textit{Ns trud} (a35), \textit{Gs truda} (86), \textit{Is trudom} (15).
- The stem vowel of the verb \textit{truditi} (9/1): \textit{aor3p trúdiſce} (1186), \textit{l-pms utrúdio} (1120), \textit{pr3s trúdě} (744), \textit{trúdi} (850, 1036), \textit{pr3p trúde} (1304, c168), \textit{gpr trúdechi} (24) vs. \textit{aor3p utrudíſce} (82).


5.1 Accent marks on vowels not followed by a syllable-final resonant

For a discussion of the material presented in the preceding sections to make sense, we have to distinguish between vowels followed by syllable-final resonants on the one
hand and all other positions on the other. For the present section it is only the latter that are at issue. Table I summarizes the facts as found in stem syllables.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vowel</th>
<th>references</th>
<th>attestations</th>
<th>accented</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.1 (16, 29), 4.2 (2-6)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>3.1 (25), 4.3 (1-4)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (A)</td>
<td>3.1 (12), 4.4 (1-4)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (B)</td>
<td>idem</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (C)</td>
<td>idem</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>3.1 (1), 4.5 (1-3)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>id., excluding bog</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>3.1 (2, 5), 4.6 (1-8)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I: accent symbols expressing long vowels in stem syllables

Taken as a whole this confirms the tentative regularity formulated in section 3.3 on the basis of a limited sample: if a stem vowel is long, the odds that its length will be expressed are at least two to one. Generally speaking this regularity holds for all individual cases as well, with allowance being made for the statistical distortions that gain the upper hand as the number of relevant examples becomes smaller.

One individual case deviates strikingly from the general tendency: in the noun bog Hektorović prefers not to write an accent symbol.

Endings present a partly different picture, see Table J. Here again, word forms ending in a syllable-final resonant have not been taken into account (pr1s -am and -im, Is/Dp -im, Is -om), nor have endings that are poorly attested. In the case of -i-, attention is limited to the state of affairs to be found in section A of the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pr3s</th>
<th>pr2s</th>
<th>Gs</th>
<th>pr3p</th>
<th>gps</th>
<th>adj</th>
<th>pr3p</th>
<th>gps</th>
<th>pr3p</th>
<th>acc.</th>
<th>unm.</th>
<th>att.</th>
<th>perc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-aš</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-eč</td>
<td>og-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-uč</td>
<td>-ući</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-eč</td>
<td>og-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-uč</td>
<td>-ući</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-eč</td>
<td>og-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-uč</td>
<td>-ući</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-eč</td>
<td>og-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-uč</td>
<td>-ući</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-eč</td>
<td>og-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-uč</td>
<td>-ući</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-eč</td>
<td>og-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-uč</td>
<td>-ući</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-eč</td>
<td>og-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-uč</td>
<td>-ući</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-eč</td>
<td>og-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-uč</td>
<td>-ući</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-eč</td>
<td>og-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-uč</td>
<td>-ući</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-eč</td>
<td>og-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-uč</td>
<td>-ući</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table J: endings containing long vowels not followed by a syllable-final resonant

Generally speaking, here too the tentative regularity formulated in section 3.3 is corroborated. Note that as in the case of stems the proportion of marked vowels is highest in the case of a and e.

The only important departure from the regularity is provided by the low proportion of marked vowels in the case of the gerund endings -uć and -ući. This is a point we shall be returning to.

22 Note that Ns of gospodar, stvar, dar, plav, sam, razum have not been counted because in them the vowel involved is followed by a syllable-final resonant.
5.2 Accent marks on originally long vowels followed by a syllable-final resonant

In investigating vowels followed by a syllable-final resonant one has to take into account an additional complication arising from the fact that in this position length can have broadly speaking two types of origin: it can be either original or the outcome of a relatively recent lengthening process of short vowels followed by tautosyllabic resonants. Although for reasons of space an exhaustive discussion of this complex subject will have to await a later occasion, there is no harm in summarizing the tendencies that come to light in the material surveyed so far.

In stems, vowels with original or underlying length followed by a tautosyllabic resonant appear to behave no differently from long vowels in other positions, as shown in Table K.

Note however the limitations of the evidence. In view of the small number of relevant examples attention is limited to word forms containing word-final resonants. The only vowel to be abundantly attested in different types of cases is a; the vowels e, o, and u are each attested only in a single type of cases; i is not attested at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vowel</th>
<th>references</th>
<th>attestations</th>
<th>accented</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.1 (16, 29), 4.2 (1-2, 5-6)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>4.3 (5)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>3.1 (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>4.6 (3)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K: stems containing original (underlying) long vowels followed by tautosyllabic resonants

As they are, the figures conform closely to the regularity formulated in sections 3.3 and 5.1. The same holds for all individual instances apart from that of the Ns of stvar, where accented and unaccented attestations are more or less equally frequent (11/12, see 3.1 (29)). Endings are displayed in Table L.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reference</th>
<th>pr1s -am</th>
<th>adj Is/Dp -im</th>
<th>pr1s -im</th>
<th>Is -om</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accented</td>
<td>4.2 (8)</td>
<td>4.4 (8)</td>
<td>4.4 (10)</td>
<td>3.1 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unmarked</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3/2/1</td>
<td>9/5/3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attestations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5/5/18</td>
<td>6/1/22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage marked</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>37%/28%/5%</td>
<td>60%/83%/12%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table L: endings containing or presumably containing underlying long vowels followed by tautosyllabic resonants

Again the limitations of the available facts have to be kept in mind. In all cases the resonant involved is word-final -m. For the vowels e and u there is no evidence. Within these limitations, we find that the facts concerning the vowels a and o are in conformity with the regularity proposed in sections 3.3 and 5.1. In the case of i, it turns out that we have to distinguish between adjectival endings and the pr1s of the verb. This point requires some discussion.
One might be inclined to attribute the difference between the adjectival endings and the verbal pr1s to a statistical fluctuation caused by the small numbers involved. That it is not is shown by the fact that it recurs in all three sections of the book.

Moreover, a quite similar difference crops up among some closely related forms. Though here, too, the numbers are small, they consistently point in the same direction: in the present tense of the verb length is reasonably common, cf. 2s -iš (1/4, 2/11, 0/10), 1p -imo (2/2, 1/3, 0/5), 2p -ite (3/2, 0/0, 0/4), whereas in the oblique plural cases of the adjective length is positively exotic, cf. 1p -imi (0/2, 2/6, 0/7), GALp -ih (0/4, 0/12, 0/15). Note however that even in section A of the book, the proportion of accented ī in the pr1-2s and pr1-2p taken together is lower than the regularity formulated in sections 3.3 and 5.1 would lead one to expect: 15/23, or 39% of the total number of attestations. The pr3s, by contrast, is quite normal, with 61% (Table J).

This is reminiscent (almost down to the exact percentages) of the relatively low proportion of accented vowels in the case of the gerund endings -ćuć and -ćući as compared with the pr3pl ending -u. It turns out that at least in endings, Hektorović was less inclined to indicate length on the high vowels in non-final position than he was to do on the same vowels in final position and on all other vowels in all positions. We shall come across some more examples of this in section 5.3.

The case of the adjectives is clearly very different. There, length is downright exceptional and the chances are that in Hektorović’s prosodic system the -i- was or could be short in adjectival endings. Note however that the -o- was very obviously long, at least in -oga and -omu.

5.3 Accent marks on originally short vowels followed by a syllable-final resonant

We can now turn to cases of length that are due to lengthening of an originally short vowel followed by a syllable-final resonant. Such instances of length are quite frequent in Hektorović’s language, but the details are intricate and not always straightforward, even apart from the obvious fact that we cannot in the case of every single vowel determine in advance whether it has to count as underlyingly long or short.

We have examined in detail the case of the masculine/neuter Is ending -om (section 4.5 (4)). If the ending can be assumed to have been stressed, an accent mark is present by and large according to the regularity formulated in sections 3.3 and 5.1, quite as if we are dealing with original length. If, on the other hand, it was not stressed, accent marks appear exceptionally, if ever.

This is not the only type of cases where lengthening of short vowels followed by syllable-final resonants appears to depend on the presence of stress. Although in most cases the evidence is less abundant, we find it also in the endingless Ns of nouns and adjectives with a stem in -l, cf. Chabəł (1467), ftol (1063), māl (513, 1339, c157), zdil (932) vs. uartal (1087), pofal (c151, f31), izzibil (1422), mįfal (1383, f30, f123), mal (1631, c89, f43), mįl (780, 1337, c52, c7), prįstal (c43), uefel (136, 687, 696, 959, 1139, 1207, a12), Vefel (590), Neufel (1011).
Monosyllabic forms (stol, mal, zal, mil) will be assumed to have been stressed. As for the other examples, cf. Brusje Kabol, vartal, posol, vseolo, Brač/Hvar/Vis Kabol, vartal, posol, misal, vseol, Vrgada Kabala, vrela, posla, misla, vesela. The noun izgibil and the adjective pristal are not attested in any of the three Dalmatian dialect dictionaries; for izgibil cf. however Brač/Hvar/Vis pognibil, which has the same morphological structure; for pristal cf. Vuk/Daničić pristao, pointing to stress on the final syllable.

In examples in which end stress is certain or plausible (Kabola, posola, stola, mala, zala, pristala), length is indicated in half of the cases (6/6), whereas among those words that are likely to have had non-final stress (vartala, misala, vesela), there are no examples of length (0/13); mil and izgibil have not been counted here because only a single one of the relevant attestations is found in section A of the book, so that the evidence is without value.

Cases of lengthening of vowels in arguably unstressed syllables are so rare that they have probably to be explained as underlingly long. Although limitations of space preclude a complete discussion of the material, it is interesting as an illustration to take a look at the masculine singular of the l-participle, where forms with underly- and secondary length are inextricably intertwined. Several types of cases have to be distinguished:

1. If the vowel preceding the -l is an -a- reflecting *a, presence of an acute [read: accent mark, WV 2009] is frequent (9/9): dal (739), Nahitál (741), pal (c158), poslal (1667), poznàl (a45), slišal (a38), uftál (514), uzbúyal (1340), ijiúal (a54), vs. Dal (c13, c17, c43), imal (c90), jiijal (a54), pijul (a44), radoul (a29), filoul (386), Tirali (f26). In dal it is reasonable to expect underlyng length; in pal, posol, ulost, uzbujal, imal, ispal, and pisl one expects final stress and hence lengthening; in nahital, slišal, spival, radoval, siloval, and tirali one expects non-final stress and hence no accent marks, unless the vowel is underlingly long. Since Nahitál and slišal display an acute accent, we have to conclude that these forms had underlyng length, which strikes one as surprising at first sight, but is actually quite in line with the evidence provided by the accent marks in pohitáli (629) and infinitives like pogledáti (235), which also point to underlyng length (see section 3.1 (6)). We have to conclude that any -a- reflecting *a preceding the final -l of the masculine singular of the l-participle is long. This is exactly what we find in the dialects that continue Hektorovič's immediate linguistic background, where -a- < *a is always reflected as -o- in the masculine singular of the l-participle, cf. prola, grjo(l), grjola (both with underlyng length, cf. прола, проло, грио, грио), cívòl (with underlyng brevity, cf. čívàla, čívàlo), examples given by Hraste (1926-27: 205-206).

2. If the vowel preceding the -l is an -a- reflecting a secondary jer, an acute is excep- tional (1/17): muchál (797), dotechal (1355), mogal (a6, a46), odrechal (250), Pomarchal (d45), počal (573, a41), potechal (225), Rechal (1547), rechal (226, 390, 1356, c90, c133, f17), stechal (249), zatechal (f18). Except in pošal one expects non-final
stress in all these cases. The Hvar dialects have unstressed -a- (i.e. the reflex of short *a) in such examples, cf. Brusje *trésa(l), strīga(l) (Hraste 1926-27: 202).  

(3) If the vowel preceding the -l is an -i- (reflecting *i or *ě), an acute is less frequent than in the case of -a- reflecting *a even in the case of section A of the book (8/13, 1/8, 0/18): bil (773, 783, 1140), čúplil (760), čtil (774: read: *cčtil), hodil (759, 779), htíl (760), imil (740) vs. bil (460, 764, 780, 794, 906, 1682, e8, e13), Bil (1667), buga-ril (a54), chiuiil (f144), dicil (784), gouril (459, 1046, f27), htíl (373, 739, 1045, 1055, c51), imil (793), mnil (f28), nadilil (e48), ochrilil (e47), ostauil (e8), oftauil (1254), outril (460), Plátil (247), poftauil (1253), pozlougiiil (a24), priprauil (c119), sloxil (f156), fril (1139), ñtauil (a42), uidil (401, e39), umil (480, a54), zapoudil (1338). The low proportion of accented vowels probably reflects Hektorović's disinclination to provide high vowels with an accent mark in non-final position in endings.

(4) Other vowels are too rare to offer suitable material for discussion (2/4): cúl (774), pocél (a35) vs. Cul (283, 1487), cul (467), fel (960).

The connection between stress and lengthening of short vowels has a counterpart in the dialects that continue Hektorović's immediate linguistic background. As usual we have to be content with the fact that information about posttonic length has been retained only in the case of *a. In the following examples from Hvar we find o reflecting stressed *a and a reflecting posttonic *a: dlóm, krój, róžóň, pakól, badóň, kaból, jából, nóróń, jedsóm, vs. Pětar, vártal, čával, jával, Pával. In the case of underlying length we find o even in posttonic position, e.g. óblok Gs ħbloka, ríbor [510] Gs rēbora, Gp móčok, prósoc, dōloc (examples from Hraste 1935: 17-35).

It by no means follows from this that the state of affairs reflected by the accent marks in Hektorović's book is identical to the one attested in the modern dialects of Hvar and Brač. The most striking difference consists in that in Hektorović's book, length is much less consistently indicated than one would expect on the basis of the regularity formulated in sections 3.3 and 5.1.

This appears to hold already to some extent for forms ending in -l. It holds much more strongly for forms in -j, of which we examined an example above (section 3.1 (28)). Substantially the same pattern recurs in all types of material. The Nsm of the possessive pronouns moj, tvoj and svoj, to give another example, occasionally carries...
an acute accent, but usually does not (4/43): móy (a32), tuóy (2, c51, e57) vs. moy (1, 35, 132, 223, 263, 279, 519, 546, 825, 1612, 1676, a43, a53, e3, e20, e40, e44, f39, f145), Moy (600, b10), tuoy (566, 592, 859, 914, 1248, 1251, 1290, 1338, 1359, 1398, 1501, a60, c82, c99, d7, e13, e19, e35, f146), sfoy (16, 122, 481, 754, 942, 1084, 1363, 1461, 1500, c5, c151, c200, e55). Or compare the Ns of kraj (3/9): chráy (277, 1090, 1629), vs. chray (60, 720, 788, 1616, c18, c77, f9, f22), Chrhay (1070).

The challenge posed by this material can be formulated as follows: the examples carry an accent mark in too many cases to make the assumption of mistakes plausible, but the proportion of accented and unaccented forms does not conform to the regularity formulated in sections 3.3 and 5.1. This clashes with everything we have seen so far of Hektorović’s use of accent marks.

I think an explanation has to be found along the following lines. Lengthening of originally short vowels followed by syllable-final resonants is the consequence of an earlier neutralization of the contrastive difference between long and short vowels in the relevant position. This stage is still found as such (usually in part of the cases) in quite a few living dialects, e.g. that of Novi Vinodolski, where a distinction between short and long vowels followed by syllable-final resonants exists only in pretonic position. Otherwise speakers of the dialect tend to lengthen non-contrastively any vowel that is followed by a tautosyllabic resonant. They are actually unable to pronounce a convincing short vowel even in non-dialectal words like hotel (realized as hotẽl) even when speaking the standard language. In rapid speech the impression that all vowels followed by syllable-final resonants are long tends however to disappear.25

I assume that Hektorović’s book expresses a stage at which vowel length was optional or perhaps even neutralized in vowels followed by syllable-final -j and probably -l. Hektorović used accent marks in those cases that for whatever reason he found sufficiently salient. This practice may also account for the curious rule we came across in section 3.1 (5) while examining the compounds of *iti (i.e. examples like najti): accent marks are attested in the following forms: inf, pr3s, imp1p, aor1s, and aor2/3s; on the other hand accent marks never appear in the plural forms of the aorist.

6. Vowel length in the stem of the verb činiti

To wind up the discussion we shall take a brief look at the kind of patterns that become noticeable as one gains some insight into the workings of Hektorović’s way of using accent marks. As an example I shall choose the frequent verb činiti. In attested accentual systems, the verb činiti ordinarily has a short stem vowel in all forms. There are however several types of exceptions to this:

---

25 These observations are based on my own lengthy exposure to the dialect in 1973 and 1974. Contrary to what is the case in most SCR systems, v does not count as a resonant. The fact that in pretonic position the distinction is not neutralized is clear from Steinhauer’s analysis (1973: 169-170) of the data in Belić (1909). The fact that the impression of length tends to disappear in rapid speech (which is not the case with ordinary length) has a counterpart in Belić’s practice of not indicating length in clitics like san, joj etc. (Steinhauer 1973: 170).
– If the imperative is formed without an ending, the stem vowel is occasionally lengthened in those systems that lengthen short vowels followed by syllable-final resonants, e.g. Vrgada čin (Jurišić 1973: 37). As a matter of fact this is rare both in Vrgada and in related dialects, to the extent that they have been described in sufficient detail.

– In some dialects some compounds have a long stem vowel throughout and are, accordingly, (b)-stressed, e.g. Omišalj pr3s činī, l-pms činēlo, inf učinīt, pr3s učinī, imp2s učinī, l-pms učinē, l-pfs učinēla, PPP učińenō vs. načini, pr3s načini, imp2s načinīl/nāčinī, l-pfs načinīla, PPP načińen (Vermeer 1980: 461).

In Hektorović, the stem vowel of činiti ordinarily does not carry an acute accent, cf. inf ciniti (946, 950, 1305, 1434), cinit (834, 1384), rasčiniti (859), uciniti (545, 1458, a22), ucinit (1343), l-pms cinio (880), l-pmp cinili (520), gpt nacinifīci (1216), aor1s Činizh (53, 1185), ucinizh (c83), aor2/3s cinī (1159), ucini (d3), Vcini (292), aor1p ucinizifino (749), aor3p cinifice (1644), ucinifice (1188, 1663), imperfl3s cignidifce (861), imperfl3p cigniahu (1212), pr3s cinī (37, 357, 400, 733, 1038, 1315, 1382), cinī (434, 923, 1424, 1550, c145), cin[i] (1209), rasčini (f31), ucini (f15), pr2p cinīte (242), pr3p cinē (374, 1341, 1577), gpr cinéčhi (1015, 1069, 1460, 1556, 1585, f50), cinechi (c110, f12), cinéch (1417), cinèch (1451).

Nevertheless an acute accent is printed on the stem vowel in a small number of forms:

– To begin with, there are several attestations of length in the imperative in zero: 2s cín (1254), Cín (1245), cin (1265, 1281), Cín (1059), Vcin (1286), 1p cinmo (1579), Vcímno (221), 2p Cínte (1598).

– More surprisingly, there is also an attestation of length in an imperative in -i: 2s cíni (279), cf. cíni (488, 1297), Čini (1332), ucinī (404, 1266), 1p cinimo (295, 1569).

– Finally, we find an acute accent in the only attestation of the pr1s in -u: cígniū (690).

Although it is always possible to regard these forms as errors, examples of vowels that are incorrectly indicated as long are exceedingly rare in Hektorović’s text. Moreover, most of them involve acute accents that belong on an adjacent syllable, e.g. Gs putā (a16) instead of *pūta (see note 15) and since neither the imperative ending -i nor the pr1sg ending -u are ordinarily long, cíni and cígniū cannot plausibly be regarded as mistakes of this kind.

In this context it is interesting to see that the imperative has a long stem vowel in Bartol Kašić’s printed Piesni duhovnae of 1617, an interesting text in which a complex

26 The initial stress of načini is the consequence of an optional rule according to which additional urgency is imparted to an imperative by stressing the initial syllable (for further examples and a brief description of the semantics of this phenomenon see Vermeer 1980: 449-450).

27 A thirty-page discussion of this point which was part of an early version of this contribution had to be left out for reasons of space.
system of accent symbols, double vowels, and double consonants is employed to indicate vowel length and the place of the stress.

In Kašić, as in Hektorović, most attestations of činiti have no indication of length in the stem vowel, cf. inf cinitti (10, 105), cinitti (47, 89), Cinitti (2, 133), cinit’ (111, 112), cinit’ (149), Cinit’ (92), aor3p cinifce (35, 100), cinifce (116, 148, 155), cínifce (sic) (67), l-pms cinil (sic) (59), cínílo (162), (42, 162), l-pfs cinílla (13, 143), l-pmp cinilli (17), Cinilli (78), pr1s cinijm (74, 133), pr3s cínij (94, 104, 126), cínij (2, 14, 30, 41, 44, 94, 117, 118, 136), Cínij (62), pr3p ciné (51, 61, 128), gpr cínéch’ (162), cínéch’ (44, 124), imperf3p cignahu (127); inf ucinítti (93), ucinit’ (59, 67, 93, 114), Vcinút’ (5), Vcinít’ (149), aor1s ucinih (69, 127), ucinih (165), aor2/3s ücčini (89), uccini (12, 57, 160), Vccini (57, 158), l-pms ucinil (130), ucinio (18, 29, 59, 130, 142, 159), Ucinio (26, 144), gpt ucinívfi (59), Ucinívfi (151).

Length is also absent (in contradistinction to what we find in Hektorović’s system) in all attestations of the imperative if it is endiess, cf. imp2s cin’ (70), cin’ (16), Cin’ (50, 116, 129), ucín’ (31), Vcin’ (135). Like Hektorović, however, Kašić has length as soon as the imperative |513| takes the ending -i, cf. imp2s cijni (20, 166), Cijni (113), 2p cijnite (13), 2p cinitte (7).28

In addition Kašić has length in the aor2/3s of the simple verb: cijni (56, 104, 164), aor2/3s Cijni (104). In the case of this form Hektorović’s evidence (consisting as it does of a single attestation that is not provided with an accent mark) is inconclusive.

As for the pr1s in -u, which unfortunately is not attested in Kašić, it is important to realize that familiar accentological rules force one to expect length. In SCr, the simple verb činiti usually belongs to Stang’s accent type (c). Now if the stem contains a heavy syllabic nucleus, as it does in the case of čin-, one expects to find length in disyllabic stem-stressed forms, e.g. pr1s *činu, aor2/3s *čini.29

End-stressed forms, on the other hand, must have had a short vowel in the stem, e.g. aor1s *činlxъ, in the same way that the Vuk/Daničić system opposes As rȗku to DILp rȗkama. In the noun, where stem-stressed forms are both basic and numerous, analogical reintroduction of length in end-stressed forms has been common, beginning with a very early generalization of length in disyllabic forms, see Kortlandt (1975: 33); in other types of cases traces of brevity abound, cf. in addition to Daničić’s rȗkama such examples as Omišalj Lp stupȋh (opposed to NAp stȗpi, my material; the dialect lacks a tonal contrast), Vrgada Gp sinõv, DILp sinĩn opposed to Ns sȋn, Gs sȋna (Jurišić 1966: 74-75).

It follows that Hektorović’s cijniu can be regarded as a genuine attestation of a long vowel which has to be reconstructed on the basis of well-established accentological laws, but has so far failed to turn up in real life, on the one hand because the pr1s in -u is poorly attested in material that has preserved evidence of vowel length, and on the other because length has tended to be analogically replaced with the short

28 Cf. also the examples from Ivan Bandulavić’s edition of the Lectionary (1613) quoted by Daničić (1925: 282, originally 1872).
29 On the accentuation of the (c)-stressed pr1s see Stang (1957: 108-111); for other evidence of stem stress in the (c)-stressed pr1s in SCr see also Vermeer (1984: 347n).
vowel that is regular in the overwhelming majority of forms (which are end-stressed) and in the corresponding forms of compounds (which are not disyllabic), cf. Vuk/Đaničić aor2/3s lůči.

7. Conclusions

(1) In the 1568 edition of Hektorović’s selected works a comfortable majority of long vowels (between three and four fifths) are provided with accent marks. There are two major exceptions to this:

(1a) For i the regularity holds only in the first 800 verses of “Ribanje”, after which accented í becomes much less frequent. [514]

(1b) In endings, the vowels i and u conform to the regularity only in absolute final position, whereas in non-final position only about two fifths of arguably long vowels are indicated as such.

(2) An examination of all relevant examples confirms the traditional view (Maretić, Mladenović, Wagner) that the grave accent is not functionally distinct from the acute.

(3) Lengthening of short vowels followed by syllable-final resonants is never indicated in arguably unstressed syllables.

(4) In stressed syllables length is indicated regularly before word-final -m, in half of the cases before word-final -l and only rarely before word-final -j.

(5) Although this contribution has been devoted not so much to Hektorović’s language as to his use of accent marks, we have had occasion to notice several features of his language that remain hidden if one does not consider the prosodic facts, e.g.:

(5a) The evidence shows that Hektorović distinguished clitic to containing a short -o from orthotonic to containing a long -ő.

(5b) Hektorović has evidence of length in the infinitive and the l-participle of polysyllabic (a)-stressed verbs not only in -ati (where the modern dialects that continue Hektorović’s immediate linguistic background have the regular reflex of length), but also in verbs in -iti and -nuti, where the evidence of the modern dialects of Hvar and Brač is inconclusive.

(5c) It appears that in the adjectival inflection the -i- in the Is ending -im and the oblique endings of the plural was short.

(5d) Hektorović’s accent marks show the presence in the (c)-stressed verb činiti of length alternations that have not so far been observed in living material.

(5e) If Hektorović’s text is reliable, the old name of the island nowadays called Šolta was (b)-stressed: *Sulēt, Gs *Sulētā.

University of Leiden

Appendix

This Appendix contains the text of Hektorović’s two prose letters to Mikša Pelegričinović, in order to enable the reader to follow the system of references (for which see further section 1.4). [515]
OVO PISCE PETRE HECTOROVICH HVARANIN, POCTOVANOMV
GOSPODINV MICHSCI PELEGROINOVICHIV, VLASTELINV HVARSCHOMV,
CHANCILIRV ZADARSCHOWMV.

PRigodámi fe po ouomu napochongniem uſcharſenyu Pelegrínouichiu mili
poyeti do onoga Slauñogó Gráda (choyimfe sfi dicimo) Dubrounicha,

fnichimi rodyaci i ñpriategli moyimi, u ormánu brigentiu, łyednóm mrixari-
çom pod zapouid naču,

gdi nas bífce duádefét po broyu, meu onimi choyi slúxáhu i chí slúxeni bihu,
lífce prifidác, namirnichóf i priatégl,

Na chí pút ueleme poadtchñ uxoļia da uídím i ŵtåré ñpriateglie i noup,
naualftito niché nígda paruo neuidine,

I doſcadſci tamo priyati bífmo i ŵdrúxeni ſuelichom glíubafyu choyuti neumim
i ſpišati ni mogu,

i prem dabih mogal bilabi ŵtuár uele duga pobráyati gliubaf imíloſcchii choyui
priyámbiy no paruuo od oné prísflité i práué Goſpodé

(Choyu chachoye Bog miloſtiui Goſpodjuótuól darouaou, tachoṣyuve pamétyu i
uminyem i umiglënftüm i blagódrũtüm i praudóm i chrpoſtyu nārēčio)

i potóm choyufmo imalod od priatégl mnozih,

Sáno ti30 nayedno gouoru, ne líʃo u Grádu da uafdi u darxaii i chotáru
gnieouu gdigodiſmo doſcti (a proſcilglám i uiddi dōfi)

uaſdiſmo bili po cudnouati nácín uidići glíuβglieni i obilno obdarouáni,

tacho dagimfmo31 oftali sfin uechi nego guozdenimi uerugami uichofgnim
nácínom obézani,

Vchóm Grádu meu ŵtuari iné naydohfe ueduc nemalo,

chada uidihi diye i ondi poznánio ime tuoye yere iſpiſuón bih doſti za tebe,

I uelémi pohuagliena bi lýubcha tuoyu, chachonoству zamirita i izuaríña,

choyúno ti nichad u pridgniá urímena sloxi náredno i ſpiša,

Schóga putá nachon ŕuídefet i ſét dán uráfttie domóm, pouidán mi bi
yedan glas uele drág i ugodan,

ató daſeye tuoya uríndnít sdrúxila i Goſpodgróa Liuiom Vladíchom narednóm
plementei i pohuaglienom,

Zachu stuar tiſe raduyu fa sfin farčem i uefelím, xeliucliuam dug xiouot,
ſchladan, miran, cefit i dobar, 516

I za Zlaménye od toga ſcağliuti fouóm chgnigom pripiſano

(izuau onoga ribáñga móga i ribarſchoga prigoaranyay)

ono cím uen u recenóm Grádu Dubrouniu i potom u nácemu, na
zaurachyenia nadľiſce,

hotéchi tebe od sfih ſtuari choyimi mene daruayu dińchina ućiniti,

Toytichie biži na mifto onih daro rcholdie budú priatéglie na pir poſiſati,

30 At first sight the source appears to give Sánoti, but closer examination shows that the third letter is
really an m, the left-most section of which is no longer visible.
31 Read: *dayimfmo. 523
[a24] I pouidaṣcemi do nichicho urimena potóm, daṭiše pozlouogli yeretiye parui plód pomagnchao,
[a25] Nemoy molinte, da na sfém day huálu Bogu, Choyi fám i yedini, zna canamye za boglie,
[a26] i chinam dáye mnoge púte po chih moremo chirpoštī od uftarpanyā pochazati,
[a27] Choyi nam dili miloštī i dáye ono caye drago gniemy, i uazima opět (chachono stuar sfōyu) chadaye gniemu ugodno,
[a28] Buditi dofti poznati da ḳamáče uireniçu plodnu, cafí (tachoše meni mni) uele xelio,
[a29] Néchiu daše pocudifc daṭiše nifám pria radoual nego šada,
[a30] yedno zác i pozdno radouanyé nie nigdár pohuyenó,
[a31] drugo zaftco i nemogoh, yere fyutradán choyáče uárnū ţputa onoga doydemi yedna cudnouata nemóč
[a32] choyuti neumim izrechi, i choyami omrazi xiuot móy,
[a33] Zatóm drugá choyáme douede do s-profita myaʃca, tacho daʃi yedua u ţfaru chipu neʊglnu ofucu oftaui,
[a34] za gními tretá i cetuárta (choyemi ne tribuye pobrazi) tacho da ouo ʃeʃtī miféc tece da me mucé i neuoglié
[a35] i maloye dán da ťamfe pocel duizati ŏodra i pomalo poʃtupati, u chomu stányu nay parui trud priyáh tebi ouo ťifati,
[a36] ufayuchi chaʃa izaznáʃc iʃtu od mene, da michieʃc sfe priyáti za dobro,
[a37] Azafcto imám ťungnú nemalu datichi u onomu ťibaʃchómu prigouaranyu yedna ţtuár biti neʊgdnna dochleyoy uzroch nepoznaʃc,
[a38] Ató yereʃi (moxebiti) i od druzih sliʃcál bugarʃchiçe one choyéʃu moyi ribái bugarli, i onu iʃtu piʃan choyu obadua zayedno pripiuaʃce,
[a39] immiʃte damichiʃc rechi uʃebi,
[a40] Zaʃfco niʃi sám od tuoga uma choyegodi bugarʃčine i piʃan izmislio i sloxio,
| 517 |
[a41] negoʃi poʃcaʃ one ťtuarı che i druži umiyu pouidati?
[a42] zatotí dám znati, Daʃam ya uelichu pómgniu ţtuaiʃ iʃpiʃati Izuarʃnomu Vitézu onomu
[a43] i dati na znanyé sfe ribanyé moye i uas pút moy práuom iʃtinóm onacho chachofye bio, ne priloʃif yeʃnu ric naymagniʃu,
[a44] Yerfe ináʃo nie priʃtoyalо ni onomu chomu piʃah, ni meni choyiʃam piʃal, budúchémi drága bilá uaf∆ ţifna ufemui,
[a45] I toliʃco uechie, Zaʃfcto tchogobdi ctéʃci poznál daʃu iʃi douo niʃo sloxene i izmifcglıe
[a46] mogalbi potóm uerouati i darxati daye i sfe oʃtałó ono slaxɔm sloxeno i izmifcglıeno,
[a47] Zatim yofcchie uim da zná tuoya milólft, Chachono Latini darxé (prauo i

32 Read: *mifέc*.
33 Read: *ribarʃchómu*. 
doftoyno) Historiu za ric iftinnu,

yereyoy štauglieno yeft ime od one rici choyáfe zoue Hifter, ca zlamenuye uidiney ali poznaney,

atò zác nitchor ini nepífce tey stuari nego tchoiyhye uidio i poznao,

Tachoti i mi i sfe sfìrane nafcega yezicha

(choyiše meu sfìmi oftalimi na sfitu nayboglie cìpifal sfe ono caye Paľchoy i Nichola bugarił i fpiuál,

Choyimye Paľchoy i Nichola sfachi pošebi bugarščiçu bugario,

Choye stuarı ališu oni od družii naucili ali druži od gnih, toy meni nifctore ni daye ni odnośi,

I achochie dati pouim ono cafe meni mni

dimti daye uechie prilicno ch iftini dafuše oni od družii naucili nego druži od gnih,

atò yerefy oni ribari i gliudi od mora, choyi brodechifè nigda fouim anigda šonim, nifctoši od ouoga a nifcto od onoga slifcali, i špomgniöm slifcayùchi naucili,

I nòmi135 neostoaye da rechu za fada, nego datifè u sfem priporucuyem,

d ad xelim sfachi tuoy napridach i pocntenye i caft chachofam xelio uafda chrát,

Vítárom Huáru na duádešet dán mifeça octobra fedmoga godicchia od špafinya, uarhu tifúchia pét fát i petdesfét. | 518 |

PETRE HECTOROVICH ISTOMV GOSPODINV MICHSCI PELEGRINOVICHIV.36
EVoti šcagliu Chripoštni i náredni Gošpodine Michšca, oni Sarbšči nácin37 (oudi zlólu38 upišán)

Choyimye Paľchoy i Nichola sfachi po febi bugarščiçu bugario,

34 Read: *darxe.
35 Read: *Inómi.
36 This brief letter is in several ways atypical: (1) Much of it (more specifically: b5-11, 13-15) consists of text the printers have done their best to align with the notes of the melody under which it is printed. As a consequence the text contains some unusual cases of word spacing within words: od digliafé (b5, this could also be a normal instance of a word space after a verbal prefix), fiue rine (b9), uidíc líme (b11), deuoy cha (b13, twice, b14), gis daua (b14, b15), te re (b15), bel la (b15). (2) In other respects, too, these lines are very unusual, note in particular:
- the uniquely low proportion of vowels provided with an accent symbol (see section 2.3, Table C);
- the use of double ll in the adjective meaning ‘white’: bellu (b8), belli, (b9), bel la (b15); these are the only double consonants in the entire book (Mladenović 1968: 12);
- the consistent absence of capitals as the initial letter of names: radofawe (b5), radofaf (b7), fiuerina (b6), fiuerint (b7), fiuerine (b9), dunaya (b15);
- the unique spelling sufyeça (b6), with u, as opposed to the normal spelling with -f, (e.g. sufyeça in the parallel passage, 596), which is attested 46 times.
37 It looks as if there are two acute accents on the á.
38 Read: *zdólu.
[b4] BVGARSCCHIÇA.
[b5] Chadamiñe radosfaue uoyeuoada od digliaφce,
[b6] Od fuoyega gradu difnoga fiuerina
[b7] Ceftomíufe radosaf na fiuerer obziraφce,
[b8] Teretomi ouacho bellu gradu beφiyaφce
[b9] Ouomite oφtaugliam belli gradu40 fiue rine
[b10] Moy difnì gráde
[b11] Neznam uechie uiyulite, neznam uechie, uidiφc lime
[b12] PISAN.
[b13] Ichlice deuoy cha, Pochlice deuoy cha
[b14] Yoφc clíce41 deuoy cha mladami tere giz dawa,
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