Vowel length in Čakavian texts from the fourteenth century

Willem Vermeer

[Note on the 2009 version. This article originated as a letter to Dragica Malić (September 1989) and appeared in Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 22, 1994, 467-491. The present version is identical to the printed text, but one or two insignificant typos have been corrected, the endnotes of the original (pp. 486-488) have been changed to footnotes, and the page numbers of the original edition have been added, as in the following example: “implied |468| by”, meaning that “implied” is the last word on p. 467 and “by” the first on p. 468.]

1. Double vowels

As is well-known, in many early Serbo-Croat texts written or printed in the Latin alphabet we find optional use of double letters in order to convey information about vowel length (cf. already Daničić 1872: 153). It is less well known that evidence of this practice can be found already in some of the earliest specimens of the tradition to have survived.

2. The “Red i zakon” of 1345

The earliest examples of the use of double vowels to render length are attested in what is probably the earliest Serbo-Croat text written in the Latin alphabet to have survived at all: the well-known “Red i zakon” of 1345. Dragica Malić’s transcription of this brief document (1977: 60-62) shows that there are six attestations in four different words, which means that vowel doubling occurs on average once every ten lines. Malić herself pays no attention to the possibility that length may have been intended, but it is evident that all six examples involve vowels that are usually long in Serbo-Croat:

– NApl fem duii (16, 20) ‘dvije’. In this form, length (or its reflex) is attested throughout Serbo-Croat, e.g. normative Neoštokavian (Vuk) dvȉje, South-East Čakavian (Vrgada), dvȋ/dvȅ (Jurišić 1966: 87, 1973: 52), Central Čakavian (Senj) dvȋ (Moguš 1966: 83), North-West Čakavian (Novi) dvȋ (Belić 1909: 230), (Omišalj) dvȅ (my material), (Orlec) dvȅ (Houtzagers 1985: 236), Kajkavian (Bednja) dvȅ (Jedvaj 1956: 309), etcetera.2

1 It goes without saying that the use of double vowels is not uncommon in cyrillic texts either. See Albijanić (1986) for a recent account of a text in the cyrillic tradition. 487

2 There is no generally accepted classification of Čakavian dialects. Here the tripartition I have proposed elsewhere (1982: 289-290) will be followed: A. North-West Čakavian, characterized by “neocircumflex” lengthening in such cases as gȉne, stȃrȉ, B. Central Čakavian, characterized by the absence of neocircum-
NApl fem *iche 'i koje' (16). Length is attested wherever the form itself is, e.g. Novi/Omišalj/Orlec/Senj, kē (Belić o.c.: 236; my material; Houtzagers o.c.: 100, 267; Moguš o.c.: 80); for Vrgada, length is implied 468 by Jurišić (1966: 86), cf. also Hektorović ché (1568/1953: 9a/Ribanje: 373, 11b/Ribanje: 484, 16a/Ribanje: 728, 17a/Ribanje: 775, 20a/Ribanje: 917, 20b/Ribanje: 956, etc.; Hektorović uses the acute or grave accents as an optional device for indicating vowel length, on which see further Mladenović 1968: 22-23).

Gpl pissaan 'pjesama' (44). As is well-known, in all of Serbo-Croat the vowel of the final stem syllable is consistently long in those plural genitives that have no ending (as well as those that end in -d), unless length is phonologically impossible in the position involved.

NAsg duuch 'duh' (55, 56). In Čakavian, length is general, e.g. Novi/Omišalj/Orlec/Vrgada, dȗh (Belić o.c.: 210, my material, Houtzagers o.c.: 236, Jurišić 1973: 51), cf. also the double vowel frequently attested in early texts, such as the celebrated “Bernardin Lectionary” of 1495: duuh (16, 162, 167, 190, 191, 193 2x, 194, etc., see the recent reprint by Josip Bratulić 1991), or Vrančić’s almost equally illustrious Dictionarium of a century later: Duuh (1595/1971: 100). As is well known, the short vowel of Neoštokavian (Vuk) dȕh is secondary, as it is in the case of other nouns in *-h (cf. Rešetar 1900: 68).

In each of these six attestations the evidence of living forms of Serbo-Croat overwhelmingly points to length. Since on the other hand the text contains no double vowels in forms where one would rather expect brevity, it is more realistic to suppose that the double vowels were written on purpose to render length than to attribute them to chance or whim.

Nevertheless it is evident that length most often remained unmarked, cf. the single vowel in che 'koje' (9, 20), i che 'i koje' (10), duch (54), and the plural genitives sestar 'sestara' (2, 15, 34), mys 'misā' (43), psalam 'psalama' (44), not to speak of many other examples in which it is reasonable to expect vowel length but in which a single vowel is written. We have to conclude that to the maker(s) of the “Red i zakon” doubling of vowels constituted an optional device for expressing length which was actually used in a small part of relevant cases.

flex (gȉne, st摅r) and at the same time by an “i/e-kavian” reflex of PSl. *ě according to Jakubinski’s law (mera vs. miriti), and C. South-East Čakavian, characterized by reflexes of PSl. *ě also found in adjacent Štokavian dialects (usually i, but in the case of Lastovo je). North-West Čakavian can be divided in turn into two subgroups on the basis of a few old isoglosses separating dialects spoken in Istria from those spoken elsewhere (the surroundings of Rijeka, the Hrvatsko Primorje, Krk, Cres/Lošinj). Central Čakavian does not yield a natural subclassification into a limited number of subgroups. South-East Čakavian is heterogeneous and can best be classified on the basis of geographical criteria. The varieties of Čakavian that are of most interest from the point of view of the present article are the following: non-Istrian North-West Čakavian (Orlec, Novi, Omišalj), Central Čakavian (Senj, Rab, Susak, Dugi Otok), the South-East Čakavian dialect of Stinatz/Stinjaki in the Burgenland (closely related to Central Čakavian), North Dalmatian South-East Čakavian (Vrgada), Central Dalmatian South-East Čakavian (Brusje on Hvar).

3 For practical reasons the “long” (f-like) s (f) of the editions of early texts will be replaced here by a normal s.
3. “Žića sv. otaca” (ŽSO)

The bulk of this article will be devoted to double vowels as used in a text which Vinko Premuda published in 1939 (111-220) under the title of “Žića sv. otaca” (henceforth: “ŽSO”). ŽSO is a lengthy text (134 folia) and counts among the oldest and linguistically most archaic specimens of Čakavian written in the Latin alphabet. Apart from a few brief remarks occasioned by the publication of the text (Premuda 1939: 107-110, Ivšić 1939: 243-251), the language of ŽSO attracted the attention of historical linguists only sporadically (e.g. Manojlović 1964) until a few years ago Dragica Malić embarked on a series of studies intended to illuminate thoroughly various aspects of it (Malić 1987, 1988, 1989). Here I would like to comment on Malić’s analysis of the use of double vowels.

According to Premuda (o.c.: 107), “naš pisac udvaja i samoglasnike i suglasnike za dužinu ili kratkost izgovora, ali često nepravilno, na pr. braate 12a”. He does not present the relevant material. Dragica Malić, in her study of the “Grafija i pravopis” of ŽSO (1989), compares examples culled from the manuscript with corresponding accented forms provided for her by the well-known dialectologist and onomastician Petar Šimunović (o.c.: 140n.) and concludes “da se udvojena slova u grajemima za samoglasnike javljaju i u dugim i u kratkim slogovima” and that hence “upotreba udvojenih slova (...) nije funkcionalno uvjetovana” (o.c.: 150-151).

Much as I admire Dragica Malić’s work, I find it impossible to accept this result. This has to do with the set of comparisons she used. The impression that the use of double vowels in ŽSO “nije funkcionalno uvjetovana” is caused by the fact that some of the examples as provided by Šimunović misleadingly have brevity where length is also reliably attested in Serbo-Croat and where therefore our text may very well reflect genuine length.

Unfortunately it is nowhere stated what type of prosodic system is reflected in Šimunović’s material. As far as I can see, the accentuation of the examples corresponds partly to the one found in standard Neoštokavian and partly to the system that constitutes Šimunović’s immediate linguistic background, viz. the variety of South-East Čakavian found on the island of Brač (opposite Split in Central Dalmatia), which is closely related to the better-known dialects spoken on the neighbouring island of Hvar.

As a matter of fact, however, there are no good reasons for thinking that the language in which ŽSO is written reflects Central Dalmatian insular Čakavian. Ivšić’s analysis (1939: 246-251), though brief and incomplete, shows unambiguously that the text must have originated “u zadaraskoj okolini” (o.c.: 250) or possibly even further to the north (e.g. Rab, Krk, Senj or Novi). The consistently i/e-kavian reflex of Proto-Slavic *ě (mera/miriti) would on its own suffice to undermine the possibility that the text originated somewhere in “purely” ikavian Central Dalmatia mi-ra/miriti, see Ivšić (1939: 246), cf. also Manojlović (1964: 97). Hence, if we want to investigate the problem whether or not the double vowels of ŽSO render length, we shall have to take the evidence of more northerly dialects into account.

In the remainder of this article I shall try to show that most of those double vowels that correspond to brevity in the Šimunović material (creating the impression that
vowel doubling as used in ŽSO is arbitrary) are in fact reliably attested with vowel length, so that there is no need to reject the idea that in the ŽSO, as in so many other early texts, double vowels serve as an optional means for rendering vowel length.

4. On presenting the evidence

Although Dragica Malić (henceforth: “DM”) adduces a generous proportion of the relevant material, the purpose and scope of her paper obviously excluded an exhaustive treatment (cf. Malić 1989: 130). Yet I think this happens to be one of those cases where a decision, if possible at all, has to take all the evidence into account. Therefore in section 5 all examples of double vowels offered by the text (including ij, which is equivalent to double i) will be adduced and compared with the evidence of living dialects along the following lines:

(A) The relevant form(s) is/are quoted, with exhaustive place references to the edition of ŽSO (Premuda 1939: 111-220). If place references are given without further comment, this is to be understood as meaning that DM gives exactly the same references in her discussion of double vowels (1989: 140, 150-151, 166-167). If she does not refer to all attestations of a given form (which happens often, in particular in the case of frequent forms), the remaining references will be given, preceded by the word “also”. Other discrepancies will also be signalled, unless they are too trivial to matter. Several of the discrepancies have to do with the fact that DM had access to the original manuscript, whereas my source is Premuda’s edition. In such cases the forms as given by DM evidently have more authority.

(B) Place references are followed by the corresponding accented forms as communicated by Petar Šimunović (abbreviated as “PŠ”) to Dragica Malić.

(C) Then the form(s) is/are discussed on the basis of the accentuation of corresponding forms as attested in living dialects. Which dialects are chosen depends on circumstances. The principal sources are the following (on the classification see note 2):

- Non-Istrian ekavian North-West Čakavian: Orlec (Cres) on the basis of Houtzagers (1985).
- I/e-kavian North-West Čakavian: (a) Novi Vinodolski (Hrvatsko Primorje) on the basis of Belić (1909); (b) Omišalj (Krk) on the basis of my own material (see also Vermeer 1980, 1984).
- Central Čakavian: (a) Senj (Hrvatsko Primorje) on the basis of Moguš (1966); (b) Rab on the basis of Kušar (1894).
- Central Dalmatian South-East Čakavian: Brusje (Hvar) on the basis of Dulčić and Dulčić (1985).
- Normative Neoštokavian on the basis of Vuk’s second dictionary (Karadžić 1852), Daničić’s accent studies (1925) and, in a few cases, the Academy Dictionary (abbreviated as “ARj”).
(D) In some cases attention is drawn to the evidence of early texts which render vowel length with some degree of consistency, in particular:

- Bartol Kašić (1575-1650), *Pjesni duhovne od pohvala Božijeh* (1617). Kašić was born on (Central Čakavian) Pag, but moved at an early age to Zadar and spent much of his life in Dubrovnik and Italy.


- The “Bernardin Lekcionary” (1495), henceforth abbreviated as “BL”. Bernardin, whose precise contribution to the text and the language of the Lekcionary remains to be clarified, appears to have had connections with Brač (the point is discussed by Bratulić in the introduction to the recent reprint, 1991: IX-X).⁴

- Petre Hektorović (1487-1572), *Ribanje i ribarsko prigovaranje i razlike stvari ine ...* (1568). Hektorović was born in Stari Grad on Hvar, where he spent most of his life. The references are organized as follows: Numbers preceded by the letter “R” refer to the corresponding line of *Ribanje i ribarsko prigovaranje* (2a-34b). The following abbreviations are used to refer to the “razlike stvari ine”: MP1: first letter to Mikša Pelegrinović (35a-37a); MP2: second letter to Mikša Pelegrinović (37a-37b); GL: letter to Gracioza Lovrinčeva (38b-42a); FH: epitaph of Frane Hektorović (42b-43a); HB: letter to Hieronim Bartučević (44a-45a); MV: letter to Mavro Vetranović (45b-48b).

(E) In order to avoid repetitive accumulations of references, enumerations of quoted forms will be folded as far as possible, along the lines of the following example: “NASg Novi/Omišalj/Orlec/Neoštokavian dȃn (210; mm; 227; Vuk), Vrgada dȃn (1973: 41), Brusje dȃn (435), cf. also Vrančić Daan (28).” This means that Novi, Omišalj, Orlec and standard Neoštokavian all have dȃn (according to Belić 1909: 210, my Omišalj material, Houtzagers 1985: 227, and Karadžić 1852 respectively), that Vrgada has dȃn according to Jurišić (1973: 41), that Brusje has dȃn according to Dulčić and Dulčić (1985: 435) and that Faust Vrančić gives Daan on p. 28 of the 1971 reprint of his *Dictionarium* of 1595.

(F) There are two types of examples in which ŽSO writes double vowels for other purposes than indicating length. These examples will be disregarded in the discussion. They are the following:

- A few biblical names in which double vowels are written in accordance with the Latin tradition, e.g. *abraam* (1a, 84b, 105a), *isaach* (34b).

- Numerous cases where the sequence *uu* has to be read as *vu*, *uv* or *v* (cf. Malić 1989: 147-148), e.g. *glauu* (20a, 49b, 96b, 115a, 119a)/*hlauu* (21a, 24a)/*gllauu* (103b) ‘glavu’, *ouu* (3a, 17b 19b, 31a, 42a, 45b, 46a, 48a, 52a, 70a, 76a, 85b,

---

⁴ As for the earlier edition by Maretić (1885), although it uses modernized orthography, it italicizes letters that correspond to double letters in the original, thereby retaining in principle all information that is relevant for our problem. Comparison with the reprint shows that the indications in Maretić’s edition are generally speaking very accurate.
105b, 112b, 115a, 116a, 120b, 122a) ‘ovu’; čuuay (99a, 113b) ‘čuvaj’, suuena (49b) ‘(i)zuvena’; prauo (47a) ‘prvo’, duua (108b) ‘dva’.

5. The evidence from ŽSO

(1) NAsg daan ‘dan’ (59b, 65a, 72b, 73b, 79b, 80a, 83b, 99b, 101b, 102b, 116b, 120b, 123a, 126b; not DM), Gpl daan (10a, 12b, 19a, also: 53a, 67b, 74a, 76a 2x, 89a, 114b 2x, 126a; PŠ: dȃn). Both forms have length wherever they are attested, e.g. Novi dȃn/dán (209-210), Omišalj dȃn/dȃn (mm), Orlec dȃn/dãn (227), Vrgada d̄an/dūn (1973: 41), Brusje dȏn/dõn (435).

(2) NApl or Ipl dniij ‘dan’ (101b: dniij nidilyni ‘in diebus festis’; PŠ: dȃn). If this is a NApl, length can be compared with the one attested in Omišalj/Rab/Neoštokavian dȍn (31; mm; Vuk), which occurs alongside the brevity found in such examples as Orlec/Neoštokavian dȍn (84; Vuk), cf. also BL Dnij (5, 12, etc.)/dniij (9, 15, 16), Hektorović dni (3a/R43, 21a/R976, 28a/R1354, 34b/R1684). If, on the other hand, it is an Ipl, we are faced with the problem that this particular word (which may present irregularities) is poorly attested in this particular form. As for the ending, it is reliably attested both long and short, depending on dialect. We find brevity in North-West Čakavian, e.g. Novi čȁsi, vlȃsi, krovȉ/kȑovi, etc. (208w221), Omišalj (e.g. zūbȉ, čȅšji, mm), and Orlec, e.g. rozȉ (83). Elsewhere the ending is usually long as it has survived at all, e.g. Rab dni, zubi (31), Posavian Štokavian (Magića Mala) zubȉ (Ivšić 1913a: 232, for more examples and discussion see o.c.: 231w232 and 253w254), cf. also BL gliudij (17, 185), synij (41, 155), chognij ‘konjima’ (49), chollij (49), bozij (52), vlassij (64), glasij (100), zubij (145), vstij ‘ustima’ (159), vrati (163), redi (196), etc., and the attestations from early texts by Vrančić, Budinić and others adduced by Daničić (1872: 211, 217).

(3) NAsg duuh ‘duh’ (63a, 89a, 97a, also: 97b, 106b; PŠ: dûh/dûh), Gsg duuha (66b; PŠ: dûha/dûha), Isg duuhom (92a; not DM), Gpl duuhof (66b; not DM). For the NAsg I refer to the examples given in section 2 to illustrate the double vowel in duuch in the “Red i zakon” (section 1). For the oblique cases cf. Orlec/Omišalj Npl duši (236; mm), Vrgada Gsg dûha, Npl Dûsi (1973: 51), BL Gsg duuha (163), Vsg. duuše (198). In some dialects the accent paradigm to which duh belongs retains the length of the NAsg throughout, e.g. Novi Gsg vlȁsa, Isg vlȁsōn, Gpl vlȁsȋh/vlȁsȋh (209), Omišalj Gsg gȑadȁ, Isg grȁđom, Gsp grȁđi/grȁđi (mm), Orlec Gsg gȗža, Isg gȗžem, Gpl gȗži (302), Senj Gsg sȉna, Isg sȉnon, Gpl sȉni (65). In other dialects the stem vowel is consistently shortened in the oblique cases of the plural, e.g. Vrgada Nsg sȉn, Gsp sȉna, but Gpl sȉnov, DILpl sinȋn (1966: 74-75), cf. also Gsl Duhȍv, DILpl Dusȋn (1973: 51). It follows that the system of vowel quantities as rendered in ŽSO, if reliably reflected in the Gpl duuhof, cannot be identified with that found in Vrgada, which is quite widespread in Central and South Čakavian dialects.

(4) Nsg muus ‘muž’ (69b, 73a; PŠ: mȗž), Gsg muusa (73a; not DM), Vsg muusu (78b; not DM), Isg muussem (105b; not DM), Npl muussi (105a; not DM), Gpl muussi (95b; not DM). Ipl s-muussi (79a; PŠ: s/z mȗž). This noun generally belongs to the same acccentual paradigm as duh, cf. in this connection the consistent length in Omišalj mȗž,
Gsg může, Isg můžem, Npl můži, Gpl můži, Ipl můží (mm). As in the case of the Gpl duuhof, the double vowels in the Gpl and Ipl of muus suggest that the accentual system reflected in the ŽSO had length in the oblique plural cases, unlike the system attested in Vrgada, where we find DIIpl mužin (1973: 126).

(5) NAsg luuch ‘luk’ (‘bow’) (39a; PŠ: lȗk). This word is rather uncommon in living forms of Serbo-Croat. Since the object it refers to has not been in general use for some time, the best attestations are those where it has undergone shift of meaning, e.g. as in Vuk’s lȕk, which is glossed as follows: “(1) bei der Pistole und Flinte, die Feder, elater. (2) (u Dubr.) kolač (kao mjesec) koji se o božiću daje služiteljima i kad ko što donese sa sela.” In Brusje, the word lȗk (Npl lȗci) refers to one of the components of sedlo ‘saddle’ (524, 651). In early texts length is common, e.g. BL luuch (159), Vrančić Luuk (9), Kašić lȗk (22, 151)/Lȗk (121, 122), cf. also Belostenec Lȗk (1740/1972: II205).

(6) NAsg meed ‘med’ (60b; PŠ: mȇd). In this form length is general, e.g. Novi/Omišalj/Senj/Vrgada/Neoštokavian mȇd (209; mm; 67; 1973: 117; Vuk), Orlec mȅt (296), cf. also BL meed (3a), Hektorović mȅd (45a/HB50), Vrančić Mȇed (60, 120).

(7) NAsg noos ‘nož’ (76b; not DM). Length, though rather mysterious from the standpoint of historical accentology, is virtually general in this word, e.g. Novi nȇž (214), Orlec nȇš (308), Senj/Vrgada nȇš (67; 1973: 135), Omišalj/Neoštokavian nȇž (mm; Vuk), cf. also Hektorović nóx (29a/R1406), Vrančić Nȇox (24). As far as I know, brevity is found here and there in Kajkavian, e.g. Bednja nȅž (Jedvaj 1956: 297).

(8) NAsg suud ‘sud’ (‘judgment’) (6a; DM reads suud ba ‘sudba’; PŠ: sudbȇ). If the reading of the edition is correct, the form corresponds to one in which length is general, e.g. Novi súd (214), Orlec sũt (361), Senj/Vrgada súde (139; 1973: 200), Neoštokavian sȗd (Vuk), cf. also Vrančić Szuud (9, 33, 71), Kašić sȗd (3, 7, 21, etc.). If, however, DM’s reading is correct we are faced with the problem that the noun sudba has always been a word of the written language poorly attested in living forms of Serbo-Croat. The ARj gives brevity (sûdba), adding explicitly that this is an actually attested accentuation (“s takvim se akc. govori”). This is in accordance with the rule that in the systems underlying the Neoštokavian norm the addition of the suffix -ba causes any underlying long root vowel to be shortened. This rule, though widespread, is not however completely general, as witness the length attested in Prćanj and Ozninći (Zeta/Lovćen Štokavian) drȗžba, slȗžba (Rešetar 1900: 92), cf. also Hektorović drȗxba (6b/R231), Gsg drȗxbé (42a/GL192), Asg drȗxbu (15b/R690, 39a/GL40), Lsg drȗxbi (7a/R267), Asg slȗxbu (15b/R691, 46b). Moreover, other derivations of the root sud- usually presuppose (b)-stress and hence obligatory retention of length, as in Vuk’s |475| sȗdac, sȗditi, sȗdni, sȗdni, sȗdnica, sȗdna. So length in sudba, even if not actually attested, would not be surprising.

(9) NAsg puut ‘put’ (‘road, way, path’) (11a; not DM). Length is general in this form, e.g. Novi pȗt (214), Orlec/Senj/Vrgada pȗt (338; 67; 1973: 176), Omišalj/Neoštokavian pȗt (mm; Vuk).

(10) Gpl paas ‘pas’ (in the sense of ‘dog’) (124a; PŠ: pȃs). Regular length in the Gpl.
(11) Vsg *braate* ‘brate’ (13b, 36b, also: 12a; PŠ: *brâte*). As is well-known, the stem vowel of *brat* is generally short except, trivially, in the Gpl and, even more trivially, in those cases where secondary developments have introduced length. The fact that the form *braate* occurs three times makes the assumption of a scribal error unattractive. As a matter of fact the form may very well be authentic. Lengthening in the Vsg of (a)-stressed nouns with a monosyllabic stem is attested in several living Čakavian dialects. For Stinatz (southern Burgenland ikavian) Neweklowsky gives *brȁto* (< *bȁbo*) and *dȋde*, both with lengthening of the stem vowel, as the Vsg of *bába* (< *bȁba*) and *dȋda* respectively (1989: 29, 40, cf. already 1973: 161; I have normalized the transcription; the long vowel in Nsg *dȋda* is the outcome of an internal innovation which ikavian Stinatz shares with numerous Central Čakavian dialects and is not relevant to the present discussion). In Novi I have repeatedly heard the Vsg *bȃbo* ‘grandmother’, with a long falling accent opposed to the short stressed vowel of the Nsg *bȁba*; in Omišalj the Vsg of *dȋde* ‘grandfather’ is always *dȇde*, with lengthening of the stem vowel (mm).

(12) Dsg *chopatuu* ‘k opatu’ (9a, ispravci; PŠ: *k opȁtu*). This ending is always short in living forms of Serbo-Croat. One is however reminded of the length in the Lsg ending *-u* attested in Ozalj (Kajkavian) *na gnojȗ*, *na plotȗ* (Težak 1981: 255) and similar forms elsewhere in Kajkavian. Since the length in these forms is not due to a specifically Kajkavian innovation, it is conceivable that a Lsg ending in long *-u* existed in the past in some Čakavian dialects and that length may have spread to the Dsg. However, a single attestation in a single manuscript is evidently insufficient for far-reaching conclusions and it is equally possible that we are dealing with a scribal error.

(13) NAsg *saachon* ‘zakon’ (27b, cf. the facsimile of the page at the end of the edition; DM mistakenly gives 27a; PŠ: *zȁkòn*). Length is general in those dialects that have retained distinctive length in the relevant position, e.g. Novi *zȁkòn* (213), Omišalj *zȁkòn* (mm), Vrgada *zȁkòn* (1973: 238), Neoštokavian *zàkon* (Vuk), etc., cf. also Hektorović *záchòn* (28b/R1359, 32a/R1544), Kašić Zàkon (5, 7).

(14) Gpl *deel* ‘djelo’ (40b; PŠ: *dĕl*). Regular length in the Gpl.

(15) Gpl *leet* ‘ljeto’ (41a; PŠ: *lȇt*). Regular length in the Gpl.

(16) NApl *seene* ‘žene’ (91b; PŠ: *ženȅ*). The vowel in the first syllable of this form is generally short as in Vrgada *ženȅ* (1973: 246). In those cases where it is long, this is usually due to a secondary development traditionally referred to as “kanovačko duljenje”, i.e. regular lengthening of all originally pretonic long vowels, usually in connection with a retraction of the stress (*ženȅ > ženȅ or žéne*). Although it is not excluded beforehand that the system that underlies the accentuation of the ŽSO had carried through “kanovačko duljenje”, the form *seene* is isolated and it is more likely that we are dealing with a scribal error.

5 The form *braate* also reminds one of the “hypocoristic” derivation *brâte* (Gsg -eta), which is attested in Brusje (410).
(17) Nsg *duussa* ‘duša’ (73b; not DM), Asg *f-duussu* (106a; PŠ: *v dùšu*), Gpl *duus* (50b, 86b; PŠ: *dùš*). The Gpl has length as a consequence of the general rule about quantity in the endingless Gpl. In the Nsg and Asg of this word length is also general, e.g. Omišalj/Vrgada/Brusje Nsg *dùšã*, Asg *dùšu* (mm; 1973: 52; 440), Neoštokavian Nsg *dùša*, Asg *dùšu* (Vuk).

(18) Gpl *mijs* ‘misa’ (38a; PŠ: *mìš*). Regular length in the Gpl.

(19) Gpl ending -i: *rukij* ‘ruka’ (105b; PŠ: *rûkî*), *mislij* ‘misao’ (133b; PŠ: *mišlî*). This ending is long wherever it is attested, e.g. Omišalj *noči*, stvâri (mm), Senj bolestî, kostî (71), etc. By the way, the form *rukij* is very odd and I doubt whether it is reliably attested at all elsewhere (in most attested forms of Čakavian the Gpl of *ruka* is endingless or continues the GLdu. in -u: *ruk* or *ruki*). It could be a mistake.

(20) Ipl ending -i: *ričij* ‘riječ’ (81a; PŠ: *ričî*). In the i-stems, this ending is of analogical origin. We have seen earlier (in discussing the form *dnij*) that it is reliably attested with length, cf. also BL *nemochi* (52), *pameti* (204).

(21) Lsg *fpameti* ‘u pameti’ (18a; according to DM two a’s are written on top of one another; Premuda appears to have read an indication of nasality: *f-pa[n]meti*; PŠ: *v pȁmeti*). In this case, length would be very surprising. Brevity is consistent in living forms of Serbo-Croat, cf. Novi Gsg *pameti* (230), Omišalj/Vrgada/Neoštokavian *pâmēt* (mm; 1973: 147; Vuk), Senj *pâmet* (71), etc. Lengthening caused by the addition of a preposition (e.g. *pâmēt* vs. **v *pâmēti*) would have parallels in Kajkavian, where it seems to have resulted from an analogical extension of a localized innovation (for discussion see Vermeer 1987: 276, 294-296). In Čakavian, a rather similar phenomenon is limited to those cases where the form following the preposition starts in a vowel (see further below sub 47). However, it is not obvious that two identical vowels written on top of each other have to be interpreted as graphemically equivalent to a sequence of two vowels. There is only a single other example of the same practice (see below sub 26).

(22) NAsg msc *bosgij* ‘božji’ (6a; according to DM also 26a, where the edition reads *bosgy*; PŠ: *bôžji*). This ending is long wherever it is attested, e.g. Omišalj/Vrgada/Neoštokavian *bôžjî* (mm; 1973: 27; Vuk).

(23) Nsg msc *saam* ‘sam’ (4a, 6b, also: 123b; PŠ: *s âm*), *sa am* (sic, 91a; not DM). In this pronoun length is general: Novi/Omišalj/Senj/Neoštokavian *sâm* (237; mm; 138; Vuk), Orlec *sân* (105), Vrgada *sâm* (1973: 186), etc.

(24) Nsg *uaas* ‘vaš’ (76a; not DM). In this form, brevity is next to general, e.g. Omišalj/Orlec/Vrgada *vâš* (mm; 388; 1973: 229), cf. also Neoštokavian *nâš* (Vuk), Kajkavian (Bednja) *nôš* (Jedvaj 1956: 307). However, the form could be a reflection of an accentual phenomenon that is very widespread in Central Čakavian dialects, although its rise has not been satisfactorily explained: long vowels corresponding to stressed short vowels in closed final syllables. The problem of the rise of this phenomenon has not yet been properly investigated. In many relevant dialects it is not regular. Senj, to give an example, has length in *nâš/vâš* (82) and in part of those msc nouns that con-
tain a “nepostojano a”, e.g. *dobićak, petak, etc. (67), but elsewhere we find brevity, even in some msc nouns with a “nepostojano a”, e.g. *otac, prasac, etc. (66). If Ivšić is correct in assuming that ŽSO was written “u zadarskoj okolini” (as is likely), there is a distinct possibility that the accentual system of its authors reflects a system with lengthening as in Senj: according to Pavle Ivić such systems can be found nowadays quite close to Zadar on the islands of Ugljan (Preko) and Pašman, and, somewhat further to the north, on Pag and Rab (not to speak of dialects spoken in the interior around Otočac and Brinje and dialects the present position of which is the outcome of migrations from the interior: Dubašnica on |478| Krk, Mune in Istria, most Central Čakavian dialects of the Burgenland; for further details and references see Ivić 1964: 127). However, given the fact that uaas is the only potential attestation of this phenomenon in the ŽSO, the assumption of a scribal error offers a plausible alternative explanation.

(25) NAsg caa ‘ća’ (22b; PŠ: čā/čē). The vowel in this word is usually short, e.g. Novi/Senj čā (236; 80), Rab čā/cā (35), Omišalj/Orlec čē (mm; 99), Susak čē/cē (mm). However, length is not unknown: for Novi, Belić gives čā alongside čē (236), adding that it is used “pri otděl’nom upotreblenii”. It was Mate Hraste, in his section of the description of the dialect of Susak, who first pointed out that čā with brevity and čē (or čē) with length have to be regarded as two different words; he notes that the long alternant is used “samo u značenju neodreñene zamjenice ‘nešto’”, and gives the following examples: Jimaš čō za prodāt? ‘Do you have something to sell?’, sū ti čō riěkli ‘did they tell you anything?’, sī čō tāmo vīdīl? ‘did you see anything there?’ (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 117, cf. also the examples given by Hamm in the dictionary, o.c.: 155). Hraste’s observation is correct; I have come across similar examples in the dialect, e.g. ako se nīma čō f kūči ‘if there is nothing in the house’, nī bīlo čō pojīst ‘there was nothing to eat’. Subsequently, the phenomenon has turned out to be quite common. In his description of the Dugi Otok dialects, Finka characterizes čē as a “neodreñena zamjenica”, notes that its use is quite widespread and gives the following examples: jesī čē vīdī ‘have you seen anything/something?’, āko čē dōbijěš, dōsē dōma ‘if you receive anything bring (it) home’, nī čē ‘there is nothing (to be done)’, nī čē za obed ‘there is nothing for lunch’ (Finka 1977: 126). For Orlec Houtzagers observes that čē is “used with an existential meaning, e.g. nēčē bīt čē kupīt ‘there won’t be anything to buy’” (99). I have come across similar examples in Omišalj, e.g. čēte jōš čē? ‘do you want some more?’, ovakō čē ‘something like this’, nī imēla čē jīst ‘she had nothing to eat’. The single example in ŽSO occurs in a comparable construction and hence may very well reliably reflect length: a-neye biti caa (normalized: a neće biti ča) ‘and there will not be anything’. As for Hektorović, he has four examples of length in čā; in three of the examples the value ‘something/anything’ is obvious: tcho čā nī má u sebi ‘who does not have something (or: anything) in him/herself’ (9b/R377), Chad čā

6 In the quotations from Hamm, Hraste and Guberina (1956) the transcription has been simplified; in both the Hamm/Hraste/Guberina examples and my own material, čō denotes a mid monophthong which in Susak is the regular reflex of long stressed *ād and which in the description is usually transcribed as ă.
nepristalo = ciné neumichi ‘when incompetent people do something all the time’ (28a/R1341), Da cá neuchrede = tcho ... ‘(...) that somebody does not steal something ...’ (32a/R1561). In the fourth example a reading as ‘something’ is likely, but ‘what’ is not excluded: Niyedan nesnašce = cá cinít ni rechi ‘nobody knew anything to do or say’, or: ‘nobody knew what to do or say’ (18a/R834). The chances are that the differentiation of ča ‘what’ vs. čȃ/čã ‘something’ as attested in modern Čakavian dialects from Dugi Otok to Omišalj was found in Hektorović’s home dialect as well.7

(26) NAdu msc dVaa ‘dva’ (sic, 107b; according to DM the two a’s are written on top of one another; the edition reads dV[u]a; PŠ: dvȃ). In this form, length is general, e.g. Novi/Omišalj/Orlac/Senj/Neoštokavian dvȃ (237; mm; 236; 82, 121; Vuk), Vrgada dvȃ (1973: 52), etc. However, it is not certain that two identical vowels written one on top of the other are the same thing as a sequence of two identical vowels (cf. above sub 21).

(27) NApl trij ‘tri’ (76b; PŠ: trȋ). In this form, length is general, cf. Novi/Omišalj/Orlac/Senj/Vrgada/Neoštokavian trȋ (237; mm; 382; 82; 1973: 219; Vuk), etc.

(28) i-present 2sg nenavidijś ‘nenavidiš’ (3a, ispravci; according to DM 2x; PŠ: nenan-

vidȋ), sidijś ‘sjediš’ (96a; PŠ: sidȋ). This ending is invariably long.

(29) i-present 3sg spij ‘spava’ (15b; PŠ: spȋ). This ending is invariably long.

(30) Originally athematic present 2sg daas ‘daš’ (71a; not DM), 3sg daa ‘da’ (92b, also: 62b; I do not agree with DM that the example 92b is an aorist; PŠ: dȃ). In these forms length is universal, cf. Novi dáš, dȃ, (252), Omišalj/Neoštokavian dáš, dȃ, (mm; 105), Orlec dȃš, dȃ, (227), etcetera.

(31) Originally athematic present 2sg gijs ‘jiš’ (7a, 38a; PŠ: jȋš), snijs (10a; PŠ: snȋš). In this form the vowel is always long, e.g. Novi jȋš (252), Omišalj jȋš (mm), Orlec jȅš (259), Neoštokavian jȅš/jȅš (98).

(32) Originally athematic present 2sg uĳs ‘viš’ (101a; not DM). All available attestations (which are not numerous) have length, e.g. Novi povȋš (253), Orlec povȋš (388).

(33) Originally athematic present 3sg dij ‘dicit’ (3b; PŠ: dȋ). This verb has become rare in living dialects, but cf. Orlec/Kastavština dȅ (229; Moguš and Pavešić 1957: 386). Length is also attested in early texts, e.g. BL dij (8, 34, 115, 117, 119, 147, 158), cf. the form dii quoted from Budinić by Daničić (1872: 185). |480|

(34) Originally athematic present 3pl suu ‘jesu’ (110b; PŠ: sȗ)/suut (2b, 6a 2x, 6b, 15a, 23a, also: 24b, 29a, 30b, 33b, 35b 2x, 38b; PŠ: sȗt), nisuut (1a; not DM). These

7 Unfortunately, the evidence of the modern Hvar/Brač dialects is confusing. What is clear is that both a short and a long alternant of ča occur. What is also clear is that the long alternant is chosen if the word ‘what’ constitutes a complete sentence on its own, e.g. Brusje Čo? vs. Ča govȇriš? (425). The same holds for long dȋ vs. short dȋ ‘where’ in Brusje (432). However, the examples given in the Hraste/Simunović dictionary, if representative, show that the long alternant is not limited to one-word sentences and can occur in longer sentences in the meaning ‘something’.
forms, if stressed, generally have length in the North-West Čakavian dialect area, e.g. Novi sú/nísú (252), Omišalj sú/nísú (mm), Orlec sú/nísú/nesú (162-163, 210-211), cf. also Dobrniština sú (Jelenović 1962: 231) vs. nísú (o.c.: 221, 222 2x, 223, 225 3x, etc.). Outside North-West Čakavian, length is not completely unknown, e.g. Bjelo-
pavlići (Zeta/Lovćen Štokavian) jesú (Čupić 1977: 91), but brevity is much more widely attested, e.g. Senj sȕ/jesȕ (101), Rab sȕ/jesȕ/nísȕ (41), Posavian Štokavian jèsu/jesú (Ivić 1913b: 88). In many South-East Čakavian dialects of Dalmatia length and brevity alternate as in Vrgada jesũ vs. nísȕ (1973: 24), Brusje jesú vs. nísũ (Hraste 1926-1927: 207, cf. also Hraste 1935: 47 and the Hraste/Šimunović dictionary, 51, 667). BL has at least five attestations of length: yessuu (13, 36, 171, 196)/iesuu (162).

(35) l-participle msc sg daal ‘dao’ (47b; PŠ: dȃl), spaal ‘spavao’ (31a; PŠ: spȃl). In these forms, length is virtually general, because monosyllabic mobile forms regularly have a long stem vowel (cf. mȗž, dȃn). Even if this were not the case, one would expect length because most Čakavian dialects have carried through lengthening of vowels followed by syllable-final -l. Examples: Novi/Orlec dȃl (252; 227), Novi/Orlec/Senj spȃl (252; 355; 103). Kajkavian, where syllable-final -l did not cause lengthening of preceding short vowels, also has length, e.g. Bednja dȃol (Jedvaj 1956: 317), Ozalj spȃl (Težak 1981: 290).

(36) Aorist 3sg saçaa ‘zače’ (from začeti) (47a; PŠ: zȁča). In those privileged systems where both posttonic length and the aorist have been retained the vowel is most often long as in Daničić’s zȕpočě (111), cf. also Pljevlje (Montenegro Neoštokavian) počě (sic, Ružičić 1927: 166). Unfortunately, living use of the aorist is poorly attested in those Čakavian dialects that have retained posttonic length. The Vrgada examples given by Jurišić (1966: 91) consistently have a short final vowel: ħòstade, īzvrne, dȕpa, nȅdopa, ďòstav, nȅrazbi, ěđa, prććuri, pròdrěžďi, nȅdāvi, ěđe, nȅdese, pȕsra, nȅ nakȗsa, nȅ naliza, nȅ učini, učini, ďosta. However, in the light of the information given by Jurišić these forms do not inspire confidence: (a) in the dialect the use of the aorist is limited to “živo pripovijedanje”, (b) the forms for the different persons and numbers tend to be used indiscriminately (ōnda pȕkoše nogȁ; ďòndȕd mà, etc.), (c) there is considerable uncertainty about the formation (ōstade alongside ďosta, pȍsrhu with the personal ending of the imperfect alongside |481| ďostašē with the original aorist ending), (d) wildly innovating forms occur (e.g. dȕpa from dopasti), (e) initial stress has been generalized far beyond its original limits (cf. forms like ďostašē), etc. On the other hand the length implied by the double vowel of saçaa is supported not only by Neoštokavian, but also by forms in Hektorović: pricégă ‘poče ga’ (o.c.: 18b/R847), pòcăse ‘poče se’ (o.c.: 34a/R1649), pricá ‘poče’ (o.c.: 34a/R1657), cf. also the attestations from Vrančić adduced by Daničić (1872: 180-181).

(37) Aorist 2/3sg bij ‘bi’ (7b, 8a, 17b, 96b, 125b, in the edition also: 1a 2x; PŠ: bȁ). If the form bij serves as an aorist (rather than as the auxiliary verb for the formation of the conditional) the vowel is often long, e.g. normative Neoštokavian/Uskoci (Montenegro Neoštokavian)/Ozrinići (Zeta/Lovćen)/Gornje Cuce (Zeta/Lovćen) bij (Daničić 101, by implication; Stanić 1965: 206; Rešetar 1900: 165; Pešikan 1965: 74, 77,
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171), cf. also BL bij (nearly every page), Hektorović bí (9a/R359, 25b/R1219), Kašić bij (4 4x, 6, 10 2x, etc.)/ bí (12).

(38) Aorist 1sg isduihnuć ‘i uzdignuh’ (19a; only DM; the edition reads i-sduihnuh; PŠ: i zdvignuh). Here again, discussion is made difficult by the virtually complete absence of the aorist in Čakavian dialects that have retained posttonic length. Normative Neoštokavian has brevity, e.g. gënuh (122). However, it is a familiar fact that length is also widespread, in particular in the dialects of Montenegro, cf. Uskoci (Montenegrin Neoštokavian) dipnug and many similar examples (Stanić 1974: 252), Ozrinići (Zeta/Lovćen Štokavian) poğinuh (Rešetar 1900: 163), Piperi (Zeta/Lovćen Štokavian) dîgnu(h) (Stevanović 1940: 157). Now it happens to be the case that North-West Čakavian dialects resemble Montenegrine in that the u of the formative element -nu- is long in (a)-stressed verbs, cf. Novi gînüt, gînuła (242), Omišalj dvîgnüt, počînüt, počînuła, počînuli (mm, cf. Vermeer 1980: 461), Kastavština smîknûlî, podrînût, načûknûlā, fîknûla, stînût, etc. (Moguš and Pavešić 1957: 12, 14, 104, 301); the same length is indirectly attested by the neocircumflex found in the infinitive and the supine in the Kajkavian dialect of Bednja: dêignutî, dêignut (Jedvaj 1956: 313). Hence it is likely that before the general loss of the aorist in North-West Čakavian the aorist of (a)-stressed verbs in -nuti also had length, e.g. *dvîgnuh.

(39) Aorist 3sg staa ‘staja’ (from stajati) (70b). I know of no attestations of this form in living dialects. This does not matter, however, because a contraction has taken place in it (< *stoja), so that length is the only thing one can reasonably expect, cf. the outcome of the contraction in Novi inf. stát (197, 249), Omišalj inf. stāt, l-participle stāla, stāli (mm), Orlec stāt (357), Vrgada stāti (1973: 198), cf. also Hektorović inf. stāti (29b/R1415)/stât (2a/R8, 34b/R1672), Kašić inf. stāti (5, 75, 106, etc.), l-participle stāli (94).

(40) It is not immediately clear how we are to interpret the form sdaat (slauu) (18a; PŠ: zdât), which translates a Latin present participle ‘(gratias) agens’; I think it probably reflects an aorist *zda < *vzda. It is difficult to find reliable examples of the aorist (-)da because those dialects that have retained the aorist as a living category tend to prefer the reduplicated form of the root, the accentuation of which is not relevant for our purpose, e.g. Neoštokavian dûde, prôdâde (105-106). However, most attestations have length, e.g. normative Neoštokavian/Imotska krajina-Bekija/Dubrovnik dâ (ARj; Šimundić 1971: 150; Budmani according to Rešetar in Daničić 1925: 105n.), cf. also BL vsdâa (slauu) ‘uzda slavu’ (23, daa (44, 53, 76, 128, 169), prîdaa (163), Hektorović dá (7b/R294), podâ (32b/R1577), zadâ (42b; the grave accent is an infrequent typographical variant of the acute and denotes the same thing, see Mladenović 1968: 22), Kašić dá (25, 92, 97 2x). Daničić is not sure about the correctness of his own dâ (105), judging by the fact that he adds “ako se ne varam” (cf. also his similar remark in 1872: 181, with attestations of length from early texts). Daničić’s uncertainty is undoubtedly to be explained by the predominance of aorists of the type dade in the types of Serbo-Croat he knew best. As far as I know, brevity is common in Montenegrin dialects, no doubt connected with the spread of (a)-stress and the growing confusion among the accent types in the area (see Rešetar 1900: 164-166 on Ozrinići), cf.
Uskoci izda, pròda, etc. (Stanić 1965: 202), Piva/Drobnjak prìda, sàzda (Vuković 1940: 334).

(42) Imperfect 1sg bijh ‘bje’ (81a, 112b; DM also: 126b; PŠ: bȉh). Neoštokavian bjȅh (104) would lead one to expect brevity here. However, length is abundantly attested in several early Čakavian texts, cf. BL 1sg bijh (many examples, e.g. eleven on p. 30, three on p. 169), 2/3sg bijsce/bijse/bijsec (nearly every page), 1pl bijhomo (166), 2pl bijhote (47)\(^8\), 3pl bijhu (many examples, e.g. four on pp. 48-49, three on p. 169), Kašić 2/3sg bijsce (10 2x, 51, 52, 67, 73, 111, 124, 137, 148, 160), 3 pl bijhu (65, 93, 127 2x).

(43) In two examples we find a double vowel in a verbal prefix: doo pustil ‘dopustio’ (sic, 57a; only DM; the edition reads do pustil, sic; |483| PŠ: dopūstȋl); [i[o] ocisti(ti) ‘i očisti(ti)’ (28a; not DM). Lengthening of a short vowel in a verbal prefix would be without serious parallels.

(44) chacho[o] ‘kako’ (12b; not DM). In this form, length would be without serious parallels.

(45) s[u]protif ‘suprotiv’ (106b/107a; DM: suprotif; PŠ: supròtit). As far as I know, this form is generally attested with brevity, e.g. Vrgada sùprotiva (1973: 201), ARj nasùprot. More often, however, the form is not accented at all, as in the case of Vuk’s suprot and suproč, expressing the fact that it is proclitic, in which case brevity is predictable by general rule and hence uninformative. It is worthy of note that the prefix su- is frequently long, e.g. sùgreb, sušed, sušret (Vuk).

(46) alij ‘ali’ (3a, 25a, 33b, also: 6a, 7a 2x, 13b, 22a; PŠ: âli). To the best of my knowledge, length is not reliably attested in this form. (The single attestation of alij in BM: 58b obviously has a very limited value.) The large number of attestations in ŽSO virtually precludes a scribal error.

(47) There are several attestations of a double vowel in nouns or demonstrative pronouns beginning in a vowel which are preceded by a non-syllabic preposition: se eretici (3b) ‘sa hereticima’, so offçami (62a) ‘s ovcama’, cho opatu (20a, 34a; cf. the facsimile of this page given by Malić 1989: 152-153) ‘k opatu’, so odrfenof glauof (49a) ‘s otkrivenom glavom’, co olltaru (56a) ‘k oltaru’, fu usteh (88a, cf. the facsimile) ‘u ustima’, su umillenyem (55b) ‘s umiljenjem’, cho onoy (66a) ‘k onoj’, so onih (74a) ‘s onih’, cho onomu (74b) ‘k onome’. Lengthening of initial vowels under the influence of a preceding non-syllabic preposition is not uncommon in certain living North-West Čakavian dialects. It was first noticed, I think, by Belić in Novi: onȁ (etcetera, always with brevity in the initial syllable) vs. k ónomu (235, 198), ôko vs. vôko (220). The alternation is quite common in Omišalj, e.g. ofcȃ vs. k ófcȃm, ôko vs. v ôko, v ôku, s ôčȃ, orȗži ‘rice’ vs. s ôrtȁm, utȅrek vs. v utȅrek, ûsta, ûstih vs. v ûsta, v ûstih, ôv vs. Isg s ôvȗm, s ôvȗm, Gsg onȍgȁ vs. Isg s ônȗm, etc. (mm, cf. Vermeer 1980: 471). Judging by the evidence of accident folklore texts the phenomenon probably also occurs

\(^8\) P. 47 has been printed as p. 46 because in the reprint, the pages 46 and 47 have been reversed.
elsewhere in North-West Čakavian, e.g. Dobrinjština (Krk) s ūskȗn vs. uskȳ, uskȗ, uskȣ (Jelenović 1962: 228, 223, 225, 226), s osȗžicȗn vs. osȗžicu, osȗžice (o.c. 226), cf. also the unusual (prepretonic) length in s ūvakȣvȗn (o.c. 223), Kastavština (near Rijeka) v ūg蟾 vs. ogȃnj (Moguš and Pavešić 1957: 385), cf. also the length in z ūbȅdȗn (o.c.: 14).

(48) Gpl su-ust ‘iz usta’ (59a, 88a 2x, cf. the facsimile of this page at the end of the edition; PŠ: z ūst). This can reflect either general length in the Gpl or lengthening caused by the addition of prepositions of the kind discussed in the preceding paragraph, cf. also Omišalj z ūst (mm).

6. Discussion

In the preceding section, some 140 attestations of double vowels were discussed and compared with the indications about quantity as provided by living forms of Serbo-Croat and/or early texts.

In the vast majority of cases (some 120 attestations, give or take a few uncertain readings), length proved to be either general or at least reliably attested. The assumption that double vowels render length accounts comfortably for the following forms: NAsg daan (14x), Gpl daan (12x), NApI l m n i (5x), Gsg d u u h a, Isg d u u h o v, Gpl d u u h o v, Nsg m u u s (2x), Gsg m u u s a, Vsg m u u s u, Isg m u u s e m, Npl m u u s s i, Gpl m u u s s i, Ipl s-m u u s s i, NAsg l u u c h, NAsg m e e d, NAsg n o o s, NAsg p u u t, Gpl p a a s, NAsg s a a c h o n, Gpl d e e l, Gpl su-ust (3x), Nsg d u u s s a, Asg f-duussu, Gpl d u u s (2x), Gpl m i j s, Gpl r u k i j, Gpl m i s j i, Ipl r ič j i, NAsg m s c b o g j i (possibly 2x), Nsg m sc s a a m (4x), NAsg c a a, NAdu m sc d V a a (DM’s reading), NApI t r i j, pres 2sg n e n a v i d i j š (possibly 2x), pres 2sg s i d i j s, pres 3sg s p i j s, pres 2sg d a a s, pres 3sg d a a (2x), pres 2sg g i j s (2x), pres 2sg s n i j s, pres 2sg u i j s, pres 3sg d i j, pres 3pl s u u / s u u (13x)/n i su u t, l-participle msc s g d a a l, l-participle msc s g s p a a l, aor 2/3sg s a ç a a, aor 2/3sg b i j (6x), aor 2/3sg or pres 3sg s d a a t, imperf. 1sg b i j h (2x or 3x), vowel lengthening caused by a non-syllabic preposition (so o f č a m i, c h o o n o y, etc., 11x, not counting the three attestations of su-ust).

In the Vsg b r a a t e (3x) the fact that length is not attested may be an accident, because structurally quite similar forms (the Vsg of monosyllabic (a)-stressed ded/did and b a b a) normally undergo lengthening in several Čakavian dialects (Novi, Omišalj, Stinatz).

In a number of isolated examples (involving 8 attestations) the double vowel is difficult to evaluate: on the one hand every single example may be a scribal error, but on the other it is quite conceivable that in each case actually occurring length was rendered:

– If Premuda is right in reading suud in 6a, the form offers no problems; if however DM is right in reading suud ba, the form is not paralleled by attestations of length in living material. It may nevertheless reflect length because the noun sud is generally (b)-stressed in Serbo-Croat and because one expects retention of length in derivations from (b)-stressed stems.
– In the aor 1sg *isduihnuuch* length may have been correctly written, judging by on
the one hand well-attested parallels in Štokavian dialects and on the other the
length in the infinitive and other forms as attested in North-West Čakavian (No-
vi/Omišalj/Kastavština) and indirectly (as neocircumflex) in Kajkavian (Bednja).
– Even if the aor 3sg *staa* happens not to be attested it would be unrealistic to ex-
pect anything else than length.
– The double vowel in *s[u]protif*, though not attested in this very word (which is
usually clitic), is reminiscent of the length of the prefix *su-* as found in words like
*sújed*.
– In the Dsg ending *chopatuu* certain Kajkavian forms show that length is not com-
pletely out of the question.
– The double vowel in NApI *seene*, if it really renders length, would imply that the
accentual system reflected in ŽSO had undergone “kanovačko duljenje”.
– If DM is right in reading a double vowel in Lsg *fpameti* (which is questionable),
we are faced with a type of length that has no parallels outside Kajkavian, where
however it is the consequence of a clearly local innovation without bearing on
Čakavian.
– The double vowel of Nsg *uaas* might reflect the length found in Senj vāš and simi-
lar Central Čakavian dialects (and Stinatz).

Finally, in the following examples (11 attestations), double vowels do not correspond
to length in any reliably attested living material: *doo pustil, i[o] ocisti(ti), chacho[o],
ali (8x)*. The double vowels of *dopustil* and *očistići* occur in contexts indicating scribal
confusion and there is no reason to take them very seriously; similarly the isolated
example *kako* can be attributed to scribal error. This is excluded in the case of *ali*,
which constitutes the only genuine counterexample to the assumption that double
vowels render length in the ŽSO.

We have to conclude that some nine tenths of the attestations of a double vowel in
ŽSO correspond to attested or expected length in North-West or Central Čakavian dia-
lects. Since in actually occurring forms of Serbo-Croat considerably less than half of
all vowels are long, this shows that the double vowels of ŽSO are not a random phe-
nomenon. Most forms Vinko Premuda and Dragica Malić have regarded as counter-
examples can be explained on the basis of actually attested length. Apart from the
form *ali* all remaining exceptions are isolated and can be explained as scribal
errors, in particular if one takes into account the fact that ŽSO “obiluje pisarskim
pogreškama, od kojih su mnoge mogle poteći samo iz nerazumijevanja predloška”

---

9 The textual frequency of syllables containing a long vowel is unlikely anywhere to be over 40%. If one
counts the number of long vowels (including diphthongs, cases of “half” length and cases in which length
is positionally conditioned) in the first hundred syllables of a number of dialect texts of different back-
grounds one gets the following results: (1) Orlec (“Da su bile dve sestri”, Houtzagers 1985: 200): 17.
(Malić 1989: 129). In view of these facts I think it is better to assume that ŽSO reflects the tradition of writing double vowels as an optional device for expressing vowel length than to attribute them to chance.

If the indications about quantity reflected in the double vowels of ŽSO are taken seriously, one may wonder if they point to identifiable accentual systems which are actually attested.

Unfortunately the majority of long vowels as reflected in ŽSO are either common Serbo-Croat (and hence contain no information about dialectological background) or attested in single examples (and hence explicable in terms of scribal errors).

In the case of two types of length, attested parallels seem to point to the North-West Čakavian dialect area:

- Pres 3pl suu/suut/nisuut is general in North-West Čakavian and of rather limited distribution elsewhere (primarily Dalmatia, where however the form nisu always seems to have brevity).
- Lengthening after non-syllabic prepositions (so offčami, cho onoy) has so far been found only in North-West Čakavian.

However, it would be rash to conclude from this that the dialect of the ŽSO can be identified with North-West Čakavian i/e-kavian as continued by the modern dialects of Novi, Omišalj or Vrbnik: the length in suu(t) is not completely unknown elsewhere (cf. also Czech jsou) and the length in cases like ovcami, though so far attested as a living phenomenon only in North-West Čakavian dialects, has also been found in early texts that have no obvious link with the North-West Čakavian area, e.g. the “Ranjina Lectionary” (Rešetar 1898a: 103). It is interesting to note in this context that several features of the language of ŽSO are not characteristic of North-West Čakavian at all, e.g. the frequent genitive plural ending -ov/-ev.
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BL The “Bernardin Lekcionary” (1495)
DM Dragica Malić
mm my material
PŠ Petar Šimunović
ŽSO Žića svetih otaca