

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 |496| 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 |471|” instead of “*ac-|471|centual”.]

1.1 The purpose of this contribution¹

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:

*V*Itéxe nárední = Bartuceuichiu moy,
*S*fím gliubchí i mední = chí znayú razúm tuóy:
*C*hoyinas sfih brání = u potribe nafce,
I brez çquárni hrání = chacho zláte caſce:
*C*hoyínas sfih chruní = po mnoga zlamenyá,
*C*hoyúmſmo pripuni = sfachóga poctényá:
*N*aydoh çtéč lípu ftuar = gdi múdrí gouoré,
*B*rez izminé niſctár = dugo ftát ne more.²

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 I am indebted to Adriaan Barentsen for his moral support at a critical stage of the preparation of the typescript.

² 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 466 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.³

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).⁴ 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 [467] 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, hrání, počtényá, múdrti*) 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 *Vltéxe, sfachóga* or *izminé*. 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 Fancev (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 [519] local dialect. An example: from the Split Lectiary 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 [468] 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.⁶
- (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*, *paftir*;
- *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. *Vuídro* 'u vidro'; in certain clusters and in syllable-final position *-v* usually appears as *f*, e.g. *sfe* 'sve', *sfoy* 'svoj', *plaf* 'plav', *spuštíf* 'spustiv', *nepráfdu* 'nepravdu';
- modern *š*, *ž*, and *č* appear as *fc/sc*, *x*, and *c* respectively, whereas Hektorović's *ç* is the counterpart of modern *c*, e.g. *slufcay* 'slušaj', *Znáfc* 'znaš', *potéxe* 'poteže', *cafce* 'čaše', *mrixíçu* 'mrižicu';
- modern *lj* /*lj*/ and *nj* /*nj*/ 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', *zlouoglití* 'zlovoljiti', *gliudem* 'ljudem', *gnimi* 'njimi', *gniega* 'njega';
- modern *k* appears as *ch*, e.g. *chacho* 'kako', *fcchodu* 'škodu', *sfachomu* 'svakomu', *chgnixniçi* 'knjižnici';
- modern *ć* appears as *ch* (in syllable-final position or before *i*) or *chi* (before other vowels than *i*), e.g. *pomóch* 'pomoć', *uechi* 'veći', *xefcchí* 'žešći', *urachiafce* 'vračaše', *frichiu* 'sriću';
- 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. **V***Itéxe*) will be quoted with ordinary capitals (e.g. *V**itéxe*).

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). 469
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. |470|

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

basic colour	attested possibilities	number of attestations	of which accented	percentage accented
a	a, A, á, à	6937	1289	19%
e	e, E, é, è	5330	678	13%
i	i, y, I, í, ì	7773	522	7%
o	o, O, ó, Ó, ò	5524	433	8%
u	u, U, ú, ù	3017	467	15%

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.

<i>stretch</i>	<i>total</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>í</i>	<i>ì</i>	<i>perc. í</i>
1-800	2576	2230	343	3	13%
801-1411	2195	2043	150	2	7%
801-1200	1415	1334	80	1	6%
1201-1411	780	709	70	1	9%
1412-f160a	3002	2978	24	0	0.8%

Table B: the case of *i*

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 *fi* 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), *fi* (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 *fi* 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 *fi* 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*, *prompfit*, *rifit*, *ſigna* in the Latin poem on p. 49r. Unless we are prepared to read these words as **ſítim*, *prompſít*, *rifít*, *ſígna*, 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 *fi*, with the *i* making up a distinct typographical element, is also used from time to time: Ns *ſín* ‘son’ (486), pr1s *profím* (332), Is *ſínçom* (746). This shows that there was a perfectly satisfactory way of printing the sequence *fi* if it was really considered necessary.

Finally, as seen by Wagner, if an acute accent is read in such instances of *fi* 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 *befidi* (130), NAp *befide* (543), NAp *fidine* (477), du *ſiromaha* (528), imperf2/3s *befiyáſce* (598), inf *ſifti* (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 *Ó*. It is attested only five times, always in the pronominal Ns *Ón* and in a limited stretch of the book (1207, 1317, 1386, 1402, 1462). Inside this stretch there are three attestations of *On* 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 *ón* (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 *bugarštice* (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 “Stvari ine” are significantly less abundantly accented than “Ribanje”.

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

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 ` i nima obično bileži duge slogove; znak ` mnogo je rjeđi 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), *nizdólu* (875), *zdól* (514), cf. also the acute accent on *-gor-* in *zgóra* (170, 343, 354, 384, 1165, c9), *zgóri* (454, 1620), *uzgóra* (387), *uzgóru* (838), *zgór* (1089, 1096), and absence of an accent symbol in *zgora* (d21), *Zdol* (f155).

(2) Aor3p *odlúicfe* (202). The same form is also attested with an acute: *odlúicfe* (839), cf. the acute accents in 1p *odlúicfmo* (735) and 1s *odlúicih* (43, read: **odlúicih*) 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-*: *mucáffci* (207, 865), *poledáffci* (1190), *uxgáffci* (417), *spuscchiáffci* (430), *popegliáffci* (1098), *poznáffci* (768), *pospáffci* (751), |474| *obráffci* (767, d17), *ueceráffci* (507), *stáffci* (723), *stáffci* (866), *stáffci* (1131), *Stáffci* (c12), *postáffci* (429, 1097), *uftáffci* (752), *priuézáffci* (724), *Puscchiáffci* (18), cf. also the acute in *potocíffci* (516), *Sfffcí* (66), *píffci* (756), *popíffci* (240), *bugaríffci* (688), *Cúffci* (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*: *slifcaufsci* (c115), *zadaffci* (d18), *furgaffci* (1081), *naspaffci* (508), *Staffci* (652), *staffci* (603), *ftaffci* (558), *stausci* (e29), *uftaffci* (208, 1082), *zazuaufsci* (c139), *pricházaffci* (1189); *priprauifsci* (20), *oftauifsci* (19), *Zábifsci* (833), *izgubifsci* (f10), *razbifsci* (f9), *sfarscifsci* (1619), *fuarscifsci* (689), *fcchiédifsci* (732), *narédifsci* (731), *puidifsci* (463, 1138), *Zacudifsci* (154), *scálifsci* (968), *nacinifsci* (1216), *pochlofnifsci* (757, read: **pochlonifsci*), *napifsci* (967), *pochripifsci* (293), *potarpifsci* (1620), *prichrifsci* (c197), *gouorifsci* (1215), *odgouorifsci* (464), *otuarifsci* (c198), *ochufifsci* (239), *obrátifsci* (294), *urátifsci* (a16), *uputifsci* (758), *Louifsci* (1129), *Poloxifsci* (647), *douozifsci* (1137), *pouozifsci* (515); *cuffci* (156), *Vzmachnufsci* (12), *potégnuffci* (1234), *oddahnuffci* (1025), *chlichnuffci* (c190), *primuchnuffci* (1233).

(4) Npm *Razúmnì* (377). Although this particular form is not otherwise attested, the same ending is better attested with an acute, cf. *druzí* (484), *múdrí* (7), *mudrí* (845, 971).

(5) Inf *uzàyti* (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 *náydimò* (113); aor1s *náydoh* (267), *fáydoh* (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), *poyti* (18, a1), pr3s *doyde* (c197), *doyde* (f70, possibly aorist), *proyde* (c106, c160, f111), *proyde* (f69, possibly aorist), imp2s *doydi* (685), aor1s *doydoh* (157, c142), *naydoh* (45, a12), *Naydoh* (7), *Naydóh* (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 *doydesc* (544), 1p *poydemo* (617), 3p *doydú* (e12, f101), *obaydú* (c105), *poydú* (e11), *poydu* (c137); aor1p *doydofmo* (867, 1467, 1641), *naydofmo* (868), *obaydofmo* (1097), *otaydofmo* (1098), *poydofmo* (499, 1194), *Poydofmo* (109, 763, 1082), *proydofmo* (1468), aor3p *doydofce* (866, 1072, 1102, 1524), *naydofce* (1134), *oydofce* (98), *poydofce* (1101, 1133, 1523), *Poydofce* (87).⁸

|475|

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

(7) Inf *razyagmìti* (619). This form is also attested with an acute: *razyagmíti* (617). The material contains two further examples of an acute accent on the *-i-* preceding the *-ti* or *-t* of the infinitive: *oftauít* (34), *prauít* (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 *prauít* and *oftauít* 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* (f90), *Obrochouát* (1026), *nádiyát* (1252), *dragouála* (524), *fapfouála* (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 Hektorović’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.

(1900: 33) already, in the dialect of Stari Grad on Hvar **a* has a long reflex (*o*, written as *õ* by Rešetar) in the infinitive and *l*-participle of (a)-stressed verbs, e.g. *pļivõt, pļivõla, kùcõt, kùcõli*. Later investigators have shown that this feature is widespread in the Čakavian dialects of Hvar and Brač, e.g. Brusje (Hvar) *grìjot, grìjo(l), grìjola, grìjolo* (Hraste 1926-27: 206), Brač *glèdo(t), glèdola, glèdolo* (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/Ozrinići *pāmtīt, gāzīt, kùpīt, gìnūt, umùknūt*. 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 *pāmtīt, pāmtīla, gāzīt, gāzīla, plākāt, kājāt, svētkovāt, komāndovāt* reported by Pešikan (1965: 72-76), cf. also *udārīt, udārīli, pozdrāvīćeš* (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 *izrèzāti, glèdāla, rèzāli, zadīmīti, stāvīli, pogìnūti, prekìnūla* (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) *Zatīm* (686). This form is much better attested with an acute: *zatīm* (1473), *Zatīm* (73, 83, 163, 243, 497, 755, 1081), cf. also the acute in *Is tīm* (415, e52) and numerous other attestations of the pronominal *Is* in *-im*, cf. *chīm* (134, 346, 784, 1228, 1406), *Chīm* (783), *Choyīm* (6, 85), *cīm* (895, a21), *Cīm* (114, 1274), *gnīm* (62, 135, 223, 232, 753, 773, 1147, 1606), *onīm* (726), *ouīm* (745), *sfīm* (727). Absence of any

⁹ The form ***ifduihnuuch* 'i (v)zdvignuh', which Dragica Malić (1989: 151) reads in the early Classical Čakavian text known as *Žića svetih 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 *ifduihuuch* (Malić 1997: 223). This makes no sense and has probably [520] to be read as **ifduihnuch*, which is actually the reading adopted by Vinko Premuda in his pioneering edition of the text (1939: 127).

accent 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), *fasfim* (e20), *sfoyim* (639), *tachouim* (c15), *taohouim* (f142, read: **tachouim*), *Yednim* (1166).

(9) Gs *buchliè* (813). The same ending carries a grave accent in two other examples: *Dobrotè* (1407), *stránè* (c45). Whereas *buchliè* happens to be attested only once, the catchword corresponding to *Dobrotè* has |477| an acute (*Dobroté*) and the Gs of *strana* is attested twice with an acute: *stráné* (825, e33). In other nouns the same ending is attested abundantly with an acute, cf. *barziné* (1230), *buché* (c32), *chgnigé* (1372), *choxé* (1671), *chriuiné* (589), *chuchié* (750, 1094), *diché* (e23), *druxiné* (1660), *drúxbé* (c192), *Galiyé* (1195), *Gospodé* (a6), *gniué* (c132), *goré* (610, 731, 1649, f13), *gospodé* (c150), *grihoté* (33), *hiné* (c134), *hixé* (1096, f96), *huáde* (1545), *ifiné* (567, c133), *izminé* (8), *lipoté* (34), *louiné* (1659, 1673), *lúché* (1072, 1134), *mayché* (714), *milofcchié* (c182), *miré* (870, 1062, c24, e42), *mochriné* (437, 456), *neueré* (932), *nezgodé* (c201), *pascé* (57), *práfdé* (1568), *pripraué* (754), *priscé* (181), *protiué* (389), *Ribé* (1647), *rapé* (1636), *razpraué* (1362), *ribé* (90), *riché* (277), *ríché* (854), *roté* (d13), *fabglicé* (541), *Sabglicé* (716), *Silé* (1266), *sfarhé* (f100, f114), *sárxbé* (1429), *fcchodé* (858, 1309), *filé* (22, d5), *fitofcchié* (1258), *frichié* (867), *fridé* (c179), *statiré* (1061), *strilé* (d6), *fúmgnié* (a52), *tminé* (f61), *tuardiné* (1175), *uiré* (1571, e41), *uodé* (185, 350), *Vodé* (303), *uoglié* (949, 970), *yié* (814), *zemglié* (1531, 1585). Attestations without an accent symbol are significantly less frequent: *befide* (1589), *Befide* (d12), *ciftochie* (1435), *dobrote* (d14), *dúfce* (f65), *mire* (f66), *priliche* (e24), *Sabglice* (716, 717), *fúmgnie* (961, 1394), *sumgnie* (286), *tafcchine* (1574), *uode* (425), *uoglie* (521, 1028, c69, c88, c162), *uruchine* (420).

(10) Gs comp *stàróga* (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 *stári* (1140), Dsm/n *Stáromu* (1656), Lsm/n *stárom* (a61, e60a), Npm *stári* (1298, 1366), Dp *stárim* (1246), Apm *stáre* (a4), Asf *stáru* (72).

(11) NAsn *Chò* (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 *razdiliti* (916). This form is attested once without an accent mark: *razdiliti* (561). Compare also the acute in *oddiliti* (569), *l-pfs razdílila* (529), *aor1p razdílfmo* (1193), *nadlílfmo* (173). Absence of any accent mark is more frequent, cf. inf *diliti* (1310), *Diliti* (c118), pr3s *dili* (a27, d40), aor2/3s *nadili* (c9, e18), *udili* (c166), aor1p *dilifmo* (1666), aor3p *dilifce* (77, 172), *nadilifce* (a21), *l-pms razdilio* (574), *nadilil* (e48), *l-pfs dilila* (525), gpt *razdilif* (526). |478|

(13) Pr3s *tirà* (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), *odnáscá* (1527), *búccá* (62), *napadá* (f77), *obádá* (1156), *obládá* (1611), *odchládá* (1155), *gledá* (863), *pogledá*

(c111), *Vgledá* (452), *ufpredá* (c112), *dogodá* (1030), *bigá* (1391), *scmigá* (1392), *chuhá* (445, 449, 1241), *dúhá* (446), *odurachiá* (1353), *stráchiá* (1354), *pripráfgliá* (f121), *oftáugliá* (f122), *pricigniá* (1399, read: **pricigniá*), *razcigniá* (1400), *imá* (337, 396, 401, 421, 919, 1004, 1012, 1410, f129), *nimá* (846, 1023), *otimá* (927), *poyimá* (402), *uyimá* (205), *uazimá* (206, 1409), *núma* (375, 377, 1049), *zná* (68, 486, 788, a47, c78, e54, f111), *zná* (doubtful) (475), *Zná* (1522), *stará* (814, 987, 1532), *igrá* (1036), *prostirá* (e49), *izuirá* (e50), *pohuatá* (1059), *hitá* (e3), *prolitá* (902), *splitá* (f30), *posartá* (1228), *biuá* (959, 1420), *pribiuá* (1481), *dobiuá* (960), *odiuá* (1419), *pochriuá* (1482), *prizriuá* (f108), *profiuá* (436), *búuá* (50, 340, 435), *zachríuá* (339), *nazíuá* (49), *mnoxá* (1048, f76), *prigáyá* (c158), *sláyá* (35), *poráyá* (36), *sfíyá* (1136), *syá* (803). Absence of an accent symbol is less frequent, cf. *uprásca* (876), *protiča* (804), *pala* (384, read: **pada*), *zapada* (1066), *fpouida* (c54), *uyida* (1039), *docecha* (547), *pourachia* (903), *stráchia* (904), *stauglia* (1323), *oftáuglia* (1324), *ima* (308, 802, 928, 1006, 1257, 1372, c18, f125), *nima* (d46), *uazima* (376, a27), *zna* (a25, f17, f69), *stupa* (1374), *pristupa* (1373), *zamira* (321), *ozira* (1392), *proftira* (322, read: **proftira*), *zabíua* (f62), *zahuagliua* (1499), *pochriua* (1500), *obfíua* (f61), *razbiua* (1081), *fya* (1664), *podbíya* (1432), *tríya* (1431).¹⁰

(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 *nàypriya* (1082). The same morpheme is once attested with an acute: *náybogle* (1021). In the overwhelming majority of cases, however, no accent mark is present, cf. *naybogli* (1440), *naybogle* (522, 950, 1027, 1187, 1471, a54), *naybogliu* (e10), *Nayboglega* (1381), and also *naybarxé* (891, 902), *naychorifstniyu* (1356), *naygore* (1039), *naylipglié* (887), *naylipgliú* (164), *naylifce* (441, 503, 1267, 1451), *Naylifce* (1291), *naymagni* (331, e40), *naymagniu* (1181, a43), *nayobicniyu* (1355), *nayparui* (a35), *nayparuo* (a6), *nayslaye* (432, f46), *naystariye* (883), *nayuechi* (a51), *nayuechie* (1031, f120), *nayuechié* (889), *Nayuechie* (1399), *Nayuechiu* (802), *nayuífce* (442, 1153), *nayurucbié* (749, read: **nayuruchié*), *nayyacé* (895). |479|

¹⁰ 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: *pricá* (1657), *Pocá* (1649), *PRigodá* (a1), *pochimá* (845), *uxiná* (496), *odpafá* (660), *poctouá* (1145), *zuá* (1141), *yá* (738); absence of an accent mark is attested in *pouida* (1147), *posla* (1161), *Pozna* (1139), *upífa* (a15), *poschita* (1192), *zamota* (392), *umota* (102), *fta* (203), *ofta* (128, 1620), *daroua* (824, c11), *zaya* (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).

(16) *Gospodâr* (1139). This form is better attested with an acute: *Gospodâr* (856, 1205), *Cospodâr* (291, read: **Gospodâr*), cf. also the other case forms Gs *Gospodára* (114, 246), DLs *Gospodáru* (222, 590, 591, 684). Absence of an accent mark is attested once: *Gospodaróm* (1325).

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

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

(19) Gpr *budûch* (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), *ifcchiúch* (f54), *Laxúch* (1461), *maxúch* (1043), *gledayúch* (f73), *cehayúch* (c122), *Nuchayúch* (c135), *znayúch* (904, c121), *poftayúch* (965), *od-piuyúch* (966), *poyúch* (1222), *minuyúch* (1070), *obsluxuyúch* (1360). Absence of an accent symbol is however more frequent: *placuch* (d44), *bgliuduch* (f132), *moguch* (24), *techuch* (1167), *chaxuch* (1044), *Cháxuch* (1400), *pritéxuch* (402), *podnáfcayuch* (1592), *slifcayuch* (1232, f74), *buçayuch* (88), *gledayuch* (502), *hayuch* (c60), *prâfcchiayuch* (446), *fpufcchiayuch* (87), *prâfcchiayuch* (1591), *uprâfgliayuch* (1587), *poftupayuch* (1231), *dáyuch* (1588), *Pitayuch* ‘feed’ (1581), *Pitáyuch* ‘ask’ (f51), *ftayuch* (903), *poftayuch* (501), *poyuch* (697), *poduichuyuch* (1069), *obuchuyuch* (1582), *odchupuyuch* (1581). The closely related ending *-uçi* 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. *pridifcúchi* (447), *budúchi* (347, a44), *pechúchi* (1074), *techúchi* (70), *ifcchiúchi* (c42), *mechiúchi* (1123), *napirúchi* (694, 1067), *slifcayúchi* (a58), *gledayúchi* (233), *fpurâugliayúchi* (c39), *pyúchi* (1238), *chlichuyúchi* (583) vs. *schácuchi* (1639), *primicuchi* (448), *poticuchi* (188, 234, 633), *mâfcuchi* (1640), *buduchi* (123), *xeliuchi* (a18), *zacigniuchi* (695), *chunuchi* (f18), *Proftiruchi* (1071), *dayuchi* (c171), *ufayuchi* (a36), *nuchayuchi* (c40), *urachiayuchi* (332), *primayuchi* (1583), *ftayuchi* (331), *poháyayuchi* (1584), *dáyuchi* (242), *xeliyuchi* (c41), *poyuchi* (241), *chlichuyuchi* (678), *ctuyuchi* (c172).

(20) Pr3s *nî* (1372). In this form the acute accent is much more common: *nî* (33, 44, 389, 424, 460, 864, 1243, 1321, 1325, f43), *Nî* |480| (1339). Absence of any accent symbol is even more frequent: *ni* (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 *nís* (739), 3p *nifu* (707) vs. *nifam* (c89), *nifám* (a29), *Nifam* (218), *nifi* (1253, a40), *nifu* (786, f55, f59), *Nifu* (707, 708, c179).

(21) Gs *Dobrotè* (1407). See (9).

(22) Nsm comp *pràui* (1420). This case is related to that of *ftârôga* (see (10)). The same form has four times an acute: *práui* (255, 1667, c20, f1), cf. also the acute of Nsn *práuó* (1286), Gsm/n *práuóga* (366), Ism/n *práuim* (c32), Gs fem *práué* (a6), DLs fem *práuóy* (c54), Is fem *práuóm* (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 *zagrúbi* (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: *cinéch* (1417). In the ending the acute is frequent: *slifcéch* (1414), *fidéch* (1509), *befidéch* (1510), *Vidéch* (f45), *Hodéch* (1016), *zahodéch* (506), *dohodéch* (f149), *prohodéch* (505, 1629), *Yizdéch* (c193), *Misléch* (c11), *mišléch* (203), *Mnéch* (f40), *tarpéch* (1014), *fpéch* (c135), *gouoréch* (352, 361), *Gouoréch* (226, 1281), *noféch* (492), *Noséch* (71), *Noféch* (754), *zanoséch* (f98), *ctéch* (f43), *çtéch* (7, read: **ctéch*), *htéch* (41, 692, 860, 1055, 1239), *ftéch* (c136), *darxéch* (511), *boyéch* (1108), *uozéch* (60, 1134), *uozéchi* (78, read: **uozéch*), *barzéch* (696). Absence of an accent symbol is much less frequent: *gliúbech* (1593), *yácech* (f95), *scchiédech* (f51), *Videch* (21, 201), *uuhlech* (1043), *stech* (252), *prauech* (1109), *téxech* (850), *darxech* (697), *táyech* (1632).

(25) *Cèfto* (1454). The same form is better attested with an acute accent: *céfto* (1392), *Céfto* (446, f92), cf. also the acute in NApn *céfta* (990). Absence of an accent mark is also common, cf. *cefto* (1239, 1684), *Cefto* (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. |481|

(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: *yá* (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), *Yá* (115, 137, 360, 1013, 1683). Absence of an accent mark is significantly less common: *ya* (76, 139, 143, 153, 223, 255, 263, 560, 821, 1375, 1651, a42, c83, f7, f25, f42, f144, f155), *Ya* (785, 1619, c7).

(28) Imp2p *náftòyte* (1656). This form is not otherwise attested. Imperatives ending in a vowel plus -j occasionally carry an acute, cf. 2s *Pufcchiáy* (714), *htíy* (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. *chufcay* (412, 423), *slufcay* (412), *day* (15, 75, 213, 889, 1160, 1246, 1264, 1317, a25, c123), *Day* (d19), *riday* (1615), *chay* (1547), *Pufcchiay* (713 twice), *špraugliay* (c118), *imay* (d19), *znay* (133, 290, 456, 859, 1213, 1643), *Znay* (348), *Saznay* (1269), *cháray* (1443), *zamiray* (c147), *razbíray* (702, 703), *poftay* (76), *cuuay* (1245), *Cúuay* (1020), *poháyay* (1263), *Proliy* (425), *uoliy* (1457), *htiy* (398, d21), *Htiy* (949), *uiy* (c121), *pouiy* (119), *iyi* (1670), *poy* ‘go’ (75, 1052), *Poy* ‘go’ (405), *zbroy* (144), *ftoy* (1051, c163), *naftoy* (1289, 1327, 1337), *náftoy* (1247, d41), *duoy* (c81), *cuy* (256, 1271), *Cuy* (1265), *izchufcuy* (1335), *nasliduy* (1269), *napriduy* (c174), *izifchuy* (455, 1336), *ufiluy* (c173), *daruy* (137), *ueruy* (418), *Veruy* (1034), *uiruy* (1390), *miruy* (1270), *opfuy* (1272), *poctuy* (194), *Pametuy* (852), *chazuy* (264, 897), 1p *daymo*

(1574), *Htiymo* (1577), *Naftoymo* (1433), *Miluymo* (1260), 2p *poslufcayte* (324), *dayte* (809), *znayte* (323), *cuyte* (1654).

(29) NAp *ftuàri* (a12). This form is much better attested with an acute: NAp *stuári* (21, 1578, f99), NAp *ftuári* (196, 826, 1176, 1323, 1382, a55, f115), NAp *Stuári* (956), cf. also the acute in other forms of the same word: Ns *stuár* (a14, c95), Ns *ftuár* (295, 915, 928, 1568, 1682, a6, a37, c67, f34), Gs *ftuári* (944), Gs or NAp *ftuári* (1297), Gp *ftuári* (f127), Gp *ftuári* (729), Ip *ftuári* (1184). Attestations without an accent symbol are somewhat less numerous, cf. Ns *stuar* (449, 1301, a18, a27), *ftuar* (7, 11, 292, 399, 412, c161, f7, f63), Gs or NAp *stuari* (a49), NAp *stuari* (153, 808, e25), NAp *ftuari* (a41, a52, f154), Gp *ftuari* (a22). |482|

(30) L-pms *poznâl* (a45). This form is not otherwise attested. Roughly similar forms provided with an acute are not unknown, e.g. *poslâl* (1667), *uftâl* (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), *fabgliçóm* (641, 651), *fînçóm* (187), *befidóm* (1500), *Voyeuodóm* (657), *praudóm* (a7), *chgnigóm* (f153), *dichóm* (781), *Vladichóm* (a17), *richóm* (303, 395), *rúchóm* (1282), *xeglióm* (e45), *uoglióm* (135), *pomgnióm* (a58), *pómgnióm* (f126), *nepómgnióm* (858), *huálóm* (782, 1180, c22, c88), *sfilóm* (1204), *argutlóm* (163), *ranóm* (d16), *Licminóm* (58), *iftinóm* (266, a43), *druxinóm* (520, 611, 657), *ueróm* (715), *goróm* (1223), *zoróm* (1224), *lipotóm* (513), *rotóm* (f18), *dobrotóm* (779), *gláuóm* (845), *molituóm* (c157), *Mrixóm* (90), *Gospoyóm* (a17). Absence of an accent symbol is less frequent, cf. *druxbom* (e21), *dúfcom* (1611), *fcibiçom* (c193), *dusciçom* (561), *Chupiçom* (818), *mrixariçom* (a2), *fînçom* (746), *befidom* (c44), *chgnigom* (a19), *odichiom* (f154), *pomgniom* (c163), *pómgniom* (206), *Liuiom* (a17), *gorcinom* (c103), *druxinom* (640), *gorom* (609).

(32) Nsn *tò* (a49). This form is much better attested with an acute accent: *tó* (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), *huyá* (f64), *iná* (416), *naybogliá* (961), *funcená* (436), *tretá* (a34), *uelá* (1613, e2), *yacá* (896).

(34) PPP Nsn sim *huàglieno* (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 *huáglienyá* (1413), and the past pass part of *pohvaliti*: Nsf sim *pohuágliena* (a14), Npm sim *pohuáglieni* (934), Nsn sim *pohuáglieno* (478), Nsn P[o]*huáglieno* (e2, probably comp); absence of an accent mark is found in Isf comp *pohuaaglienom* (a17). |483|

(35) Pr3p *chiè* (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: *néchie* (845), *Nechie* (1348).

(36) Gsm/n *tuòga* (c38). This and similar forms are better attested with an acute, cf. *móga* (1604, a20, e14), *tuóga* (589, 1397), *sfóga* (631). Absence of an accent mark is attested in *moga* (e45), *tuoga* (a40, e7, f152), *sfoga* (1640, f2).

(37) Gs *fránè* (c45). See (9).

(38) Gerpr *molèchi* (c59). The same form is better attested with an acute, cf. *moléchi* (1590, f49), and occurs once without an accent mark: *molechi* (c99). In the ending the acute is very frequent, cf. *zarcéchi* (307), *tíféchi* (1589), *ucéchi* (1056, 1587), *gladéchi* (1389, 1404), *fidéchi* (188), *uidéchi* (1642, c7), *hodéchi* (1555), *ohodéchi* (510), *dohodéchi* (771), *prohodéchi* (339, 499), *brodéchi* (77), *cudéchi* (1135), *uefeléchi* (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), *gouoréchi* (297, 379, 500, 835, 876), *Gouoréchi* (843), *zoréchi* (324), *noféchi* (842), *podnoféchi* (1459), *ctéchi* (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), *naftoyéchi* (f47), *uo-zéchi* (509, 836, 875, 969, 1136, 1624). Absence of an accent mark is less common, cf. *múcechi* (833), *bdechi* (23), *çidechi* (380), *çídechi* (340), *prohodechi* (1100), *brodechi* (a58), *cudechi* (c48), *trúdechi* (24), *xalechi* (f11), *huálechi* (1403), *mislechi* (c47), *sfitlechi* (1665), *cinechi* (c110, f12), *linechi* (1079), *morechi* (c60), *gouorechi* (f93), *chrátechi* (1588), *Ctechi* (f158), *htechi* (c160), *xiuechi* (1311), *naftoyechi* (1586), *slúfechi* (816, read: *slúxechi), *uozechi* (1080), *puzechi* (110), *púzechi* (1623).

(39) Ip *uràti* (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. *gliúbé* (1542), *pogriscé* (f104), *uzuifcé* (f103), *oducé* (f90), *mucé* (a34, f89), *nasfadé* (1010), *fádé* (165, c73), *sfidé* (f105), *pofidé* (32), 484 *uidé* (31, 305, 1485, 1572, f106), *nenauidé* (1590), *zapouidé* (306), *hodé* (c32, f117), *nahodé* (c31), *shodé* (857, c202), *brodé* (616), *nauodé* (f118), *udé* (c187), *cudé* (789, 1227), *zacudé* (1308), *prudé* (c188), *xúdé* (958), *neuoglié* (a34), *hualé* (e26), *hráné* (202), *ciné* (374, 1341, 1577), *hiné* (1298), *progoné* (1434), *zuoné* (1496), *uáré* (1566), *miré* (1572), *zamiré* (1306), *gouoré* (7, 356, 377, 985, c117), *razgouoré* (319), *chosé* (14), *nofé* (c187), *donosé* (13), *traté* (74), *praué* (1361), *opraué* (1506), *fpraué* (53), *izpraué* (c184), *staué* (54, 753), *ftaué* (300), *oftaué* (1505), *loué* (741), *darxé* (a47), *sluxé* (311), *slúxé* (811), *druxé* (312), *broyé* (1381, 1595), *naftoyé* (975), *stoyé* (1596). Absence of an accent symbol is much less common, cf. *zgarbe* (f81), *ofcchiarbe* (f82), *strafce* (58), *blide* (f75), *uide* (1002), *dohode* (186, 426), *uzprohode* (f29), *cude* (32), *trúde* (1299), *fcine* (a52), *chupe* ‘collect’ (f88), *chofe* (c188), *nofe* (d27), *chiúte* (f83), *fmúte* (f84), *protiue* (f120), *darfe* (a52, read: *darxe), *goye* (f88), *naftoye* (c149).

(42) 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 *naybarxé* (902), *yacé* (1067), *ceſchié* (1498), *Vridniyé* (1247); note that absence of an accent mark is much more frequent, cf. *uiſce* (697, 1180), *Viſce* (1096, 1180), *nayuiſce* (1153), *ceſcchie* (1128), *nayuechie* (f120), *Nayuechie* (1399), *daglie* (1125), *boglie* (161, 766, 969, 1071, 1474, 1633, c87, c190, c194), *nayboglie* (522, a54), *lipiglie* (162, read: **lipiglie*), *farcenie* (c123), *magnie* (24), *Snaxnie* (c191), *gore* (f74), *naygore* (1039), *blixe* (409), *nixe* (697), *nayslaye* (f46).¹¹

(43) 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 *da* (491, e51).

(44) 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).

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

(46) Pr3p *ſtèpgliayú* (f91). This is the only attestation of this verb.

(47) 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 -u: *zamicú* (444), |485| *oticú* (f87), *doticú* (354), *ifticú* (353, 443), *pridiſcú* (1073), *pífcú* (15), *dádú* (811), *napádú* (579), *grédú* (984), *pridú* (c179), *yidú* (1241), *yídú* (1262), *budú* (10, 33, 917, 1479, 1486, 1574, a23, f73), *dobudú* (f38), *obaydú* (c105), *doydú* (e12, f101), *poydú* (e11), *mogú* (287, 374), *pechú* (192), *techú* (462), *chogliú* (1369, c104), *zouú* (336, 411), *uzmaxú* (1389), *potéxú* (772), *uéxú* (771), *doſtixú* (299), *poduixú* (300), *slácayú* (943), *dayú* (e37), *uládayú* (1614), *padayú* (55), *pouidayú* (1447), *pomágayú* (346), *hayú* (196), *ſtèpgliayú* (f91), *naslagniayú* (f92), *imayú* (955, 990, 1224), *uxinayú* (1475), *znayú* (2, 956, 1599), *poznayú* (370, 984), *potipayú* (f97), *ſtarayú* (989, f116), *príſtayú* (345), *uſtayú* (d33), *pliuayú* (56), *umiyú* (981, 1483), *riyú* (165, 982), *profiyú* (1484), *poyú* (d23), *cuyú* (1365), *zacuyú* (583), *izblaguyú* (282), *uzmiluyú* (f106), *zlamenuyú* (281), *ſfituyú* (c183), *putuyú* (1223, c176). Absence of an accent symbol is attested in the following examples: *locu* (426), *pridadu* (e12), *idu* (c180), *budu* (974), *poydu* (c137), *diu* (476, c73), *uapiu* (d5), *riu* (c74), *iztégnu* (152), *pocinu* (f92), *uarnu* (c175), *cháxu* (1390), *duixu* (1153), *uznaſcayu* (c22), *padayu* (439, f82), *ugágniayu* (1056), *uogniayu* (f81), *imayu* (1478, f115), *nimayu* (1002), *znayu* (1055, 1223, f152), *poznayu* (1448, d34, e38), *obſtupayu* (147), *hitayu* (148), *pitayu* (1001), *motayu* (f98), *dariuayu* (a22), *dobúayu* (983), *diyú* (e33), *umiyú* (a41), *dariyu* (e34), *fiyu* (c74), *potribuyu* (c184), *cuyu* (e16, e25, f152), *zaduſcuyu* (f86), *uzpriporucuyu* (c151), *napriduyu* (c175), *luduyu* (f105), *Schrachiuyu* (c92), *zalipliuyu* (1366), *minuyu* (144), *ctuyu* (e26), *poctuyu* (d36), *chazuyu* (e15), *prichazuyu* (d35), *opuzuyu* (f85).

¹¹ These lists are not exhaustive.

(48) Gerpr *zelèch* (f92). See (24).

(49) Negated pr3s *nèchie* (f133). The same form is much more frequent with an acute accent: *néchie* (16, 105, 189, 203, 457, 1019, 1171, 1360, 1439, 1562, 1566, c174, f98), *Néchie* (254, 307, 415), cf. also the acute accent in 1s *néchiu* (201, 473, 882, 1008), *Néchiu* (a29), 2s *néch* (422, 1673), 3p *néchie* (845). Absence of an accent mark is less frequent: 1s *nechiu* (c155, c199), 2s *nechiefc* (429, 1460), 3s *nechie* (f131), 3p *Nechie* (1348).

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: |486|

- 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.

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

Table D: accent symbols on *a* |487|

	Gs <i>-e</i>	<i>-eć</i>	<i>-eći</i>	3p <i>-e</i>	3p <i>će</i>	<i>neć-</i>	<i>često</i>	<i>-reš-</i>
grave	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
acute	83	38	71	70	14	24	4	4
bare	20	11	27	20	3 (+2)	6	4	0

Table E: accent symbols on *e*

	<i>zdola</i>	<i>ko</i>	Is <i>-om</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>tvoga</i>	<i>dojde</i>	<i>stoj(te)</i>	<i>-uć</i>	<i>-ući</i>	3p <i>-u</i>
grave	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
acute	13	13	41	11	6	3	2	17	14	79
bare	1	6	16	42	6	44	12	27	23	54

Table F: accent symbols on *o* and *u*

The case of *i* differs from that of the other vowels in that, as we have seen, the frequency of accented *í* is different in different sections of the original text (see Table G).

	<i>zatim</i>	Is <i>-im</i>	3s <i>ni</i>	<i>ni-</i>	<i>-ivši</i>	<i>dili-</i>	<i>-iti</i>
grave	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
acute	6/1/2	16/5/2	5/5/1	4/0/0	5/0/0	3/1/0	3
bare	2/6/7	5/7/20	3/4/14	4/1/6	17/11/8	6/2/9	> 300

Table G: accent symbols on *i*

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 vyražennosti” 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), *zátofe* (1550), *Záto* (256, 473, 487, 1535, 1569), *Zátoga* (1607), *Zátofe* (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 reçito* (553), *Teretomi* (598 = b8, 609, 667), *Teretomu* (650, 675), *Nechatoyih* (617), *Zagnimtomimi* (633), *Staffcitomi* (652), *Odmelnito* (658), *Vechtomiye* (671), *Choyimtoye* (681). Note that these examples, though quite numerous, are limited to the *bugarštice* and may be foreign to Hektorovič'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 tó haye* (284), *yermife ciní tó* (733), *A tó (ca mogu znat) = yofc uechie cigniáfce* (861), *nemoy tó dati* (1057), *uiy uchóm stányu = naydemfe tó znayúich* (c121), *A tó nastoyéchi* (f47) vs. *Dami farçu pochoy = to uechi poráyá* (36), *Da paruo to biſce ſtraxiçe razredio* (612), *Daltiye to ime* (c13), *ſfi chi to cuyu* (f152), *A uſci ſcuſcgniati = to gore ſliſcayuch* (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), *ató* (a17, a58), *atò* (a49). Here it is likely that *a* is to be regarded as proclitic and *to* as orthotonic, [489] 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 çichia potrib = neg zarad gliúbauí* (1668). Unfortunately here are no parallel examples with which it can be compared.

	<i>zato</i>	<i>teretomi</i>	#to#	<i>toje</i>	<i>ato, nato</i>	enclitic	orthotonic
accented	0	0	6	1	4	0	11
bare	16	17	5	2	1	33	8

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 Hektorovič'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), *dárom* (1264), Is *darom* (e48), Np *dári* (1365), Gp *darof* (a23), *dári* (1314), Ap *dáre* (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). |490|

(3) The stem vowel of the noun *grad* (20/3): Ns *grád* (28, 258, c3), Gs *gráda* (172, 596), *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 *huála* (240, 593, 1501, e43), Gs *huále* (1545), Gs *huáli* (sic, 1518), As *huálu* (1317, 1615, a25, c12, e37), Is *huálóm* (782, 1180, c22, c88), NAp *huále* (294, 476), *Huale* (c171).

– The stem vowel of the verb *hvaliti* (9/4): inf *huáľiti* (846), inf *huáľit* (1313), aor1p *huáľifmo* (759), gpr *huálechi* (1403), aor2/3s *Pohuáli* (1149), aor1p *prihuáľifmo* (844), aor1s *zahuálih* (686), aor3p *zahuáľifce* (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 *pláuĩ* (1106, 1185), DLs *pláuĩ* (745, 1123), Is *pláfyu* (1098), Is *Plauyu* (837), NAp *pláuĩ* (771).

(6) The stem vowel of the pronoun *sam* (34/12): Nsm *Sám* (522, 856, 890), *sám* (392, a40), *fám* (188, 225, 886, 951, 1308, 1385, 1400, 1635, a25, c11, f28), *fam* (207, 283, 664, d43, e21), Nsn/Adv *fámo* (257 420, 464, 1131, 1342), *Sámo* (c183), *Sá[m]o* (a9), *Samo* (1653), Gsm/n *famoga* (94, 1465, 1552, 1594), GAsm *fáma* (911), Nsf *Sáma* (385), *fáma* (c93), Gsf *famé* (277), Asf *famu* (1641), Npm *fámi* (164, 180, 312, 509, 800, 993, 1104, e27), *fami* (f82).

(7) The prefix *za-* in *zabiti* and *zaviditi* (12/2): inf *zábiti* (d19), *zabiti* (f64), *l-pmp zábili* (816), *pozábili* (176), gpt *Zábif* (1279), gpt *Zábifci* (833), pr2s *zabudefc* (c163), pr3s *zábude* (1244, 1402), aor2/3s *zábi* (209), aor3p *pozábifce* (872), Verbal Noun Gs *zábitya* (576), inf *záuidit* (c41), imperf3s *záuiyafce* (1489).¹³

(8) The *-a-* in the endings of the present tense of *ā*-verbs:

– 1s (19/7): *dám* (453, a42, c12), *Vfám* (c33), *napráfgliám* (27), *oftaugliám* (28, 599), *imám* (a37), *Imám* (1654), *znám* (159, 601, 601, |491| 806, 944, c162, f38, f42), *prictiuám* (e21), *prixiuám* (e22); *narúcam* (543), *Plachiam* (c159), *oftaugliam* (b9), *znam* (263, b11, b11, c106).

– 2s (21/5): *dáfc* (120, c59), *imáfc* (487, 1285, 1343, a28, c71), *nimáfc* (1053), *znáfc* (119, 403, 462, 890, 941, 1670, 1672, c66, c67), *Znáfc* (141, 411, 420), *izaznáfc* (a36), *pitáfc* (c68); *chufcafc* (418), *zádafc* (1294), *imafc* (1344), *znafc* (c87), *poznafc* (a37).

– 3s (90/35), see section 4.1 (13-14) and Table D.

– 1p (2/0): *númámo* (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): *dáf* (755, c140), *prigledáf* (409), *Dáf* (d4), *izabráf* (1187), *Veceráf* (1076, 1510), *poftáf* (365, 497, 686, 1188, 1196), *uftáf* (293), *Vjtáf* (316, 469), *putouáf* (962); *staf* (305, f41), *Oftaf* (1001), *Scházaaf* (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 *tégom* (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 *uitézu* (184), *Vitézu* (a42), Vs *Vitéxe* (549, 677, 1667), *Vitéxe* (1), *Vitéfe* (e6, read: **Vitéxe*), Np *Vitézi* (535, 1519), Gp *Vitézí* (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 *pozābīt*, *l-part pozābīla*, pr1s *pozābīm*, my material), Orbanici in Istria (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 *zōbīt*, pr1s *zōbin* (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 *iztézáfce* (1110), pr3s *potéxe* (422), pr3p *potéxú* (772), gpr *pritéxuch* (402); inf *uézati* (662), pr3p *uéxú* (771), gpt *priuézáfci* (724), pass part *uézán* (58), *fauézán* (27, 128), *obézan* (156), *obézani* (a11); inf *téxati* (c137), pr3s *téxi* (1093), gpr *téxech* (850); inf *fcchiéditi* (189), gpr *fcchiédech* (f51), gpt *fcchiédifci* (732); aor1s *narédih* (1506), gpt *narédifci* (731); pr3s *hlépi* (1024), imp2s *hlépi* (1297); l-pms *naréscio* (a7), pass part *naréscen* (c52), *naréscene* (776), *naréscene* (d38), *uréscen* (783); inf *fpoménuti* (c161), aor3p *fpoménuſce* (1066), pr3s *fpoméne* (c101), imp2s *fpoméni* (1244), imp1p *fpoméximo* (1416); aor3p *chrénufce* (869), pr3s *chréne* (307, 1599), imp2s *chréni* (224); aor3p *natégnufce* (870), gpt *potégnuffci* (1234), l-pfs *uztégnula* (602) pr3p *iztégnu* (152), vs. pr3s *ſtexe* (e5), *obezán* (e17), inf *texati* (1627). |492|

(4) The adverb *opet* (8/0): *opét* (87, 354, 493, 526, 926, 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 *ſfíta* (347), *ſfíta* (775, 901, c118), DLs *ſfítu* (478, 929, 950, 1315, 1539, a51, c55), Ls *ſfítí* (c156).

(2) The stem syllable of the noun *rika* (9/6, 1/1, 0/0): Ns *rícha* (318, 348), Gs *ríché* (854), *riché* (277), DLs *ríçi* (315), *ríçi* (267), As *ríchu* (273), *Ríchu* (325), Is *richóm* (303, 395), NAp *ríche* (345, 353, 400), *riche* (462), *Riche* (1230), Ip *ríchami* (342), *richami* (444).

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

(4) The stem vowel of the adjective *lip* (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); *lip* (c44), *Lipa* (c55), *lipo* (525, 1204, 1625, c140), *lipu* (1007, 1093), *Lipu* (1004).

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

(6) The Gp ending *-i* (4/1, 1/3, 0/7): *pifní* (1232), *dinárí* (730), *ſtuárí* (729), *prozorí* (151), *Vitézí* (166); *rici* (214), *gliúdi* (1522, 1612), *dni* (1658), *limúni* (1192), *dári* (1314), *ſtuári* (f127), *ſtuari* (a22), *zuirí* (1041), *uſti* (c49, e50).

(7) The *-i* in the adjectival Ip ending *-imi* (0/2, 2/6, 0/7): *ifchargnúmi* (1270), *dobrími* (1256) vs. *drágimi* (1202), *mnogimi* (c1), *Moriſcchimi* (831), *uiſcchimi* (1152), *nebeſchimi* (978), *oſtalími* (a51, c131), *zlimi* (1254), *obráními* (c129), *guozdeními* (a11), *uerními* (c132), *dobrími* (c2), *múdrimi* (804), *biftrími* (443), *barzími* (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: *sfími* (803, 1116, 1184, a51, e38, e40), *chimi* (268, 1118), *Chimi* (c9, [493] c10), *tachimi* (1479), *nichimi* (a2), *gnimi* (30, 174, 269, 580, 997, 1113, 1154, 1164, 1366, 1481, 1576, a34), *onimi* (a3), *timi* (341, 977, 1115, 1575), *ouimi* (461), *choyimi* (a22, f149), *moyimi* (92, a2, e39), *tuoyimi* (e40).

(8) The *-i-* in the adjectival Is and Dp endings *-im* (3/5, 2/5, 1/18): *Sarbfchím* (519), *uefelím* (a18), *oholím* (1310), *perením* (639), *sfétím* (780), *druzím* (1409) vs. *Mládím* (f111), *pridragim* (c154), *sfachim* (1450), *fuachim* (c97), *gliubchim* (f141), *tefcchím* (c98), *neumichim* (1588), *tihim* (606), *prístalim* (1376), *farčenim* (f141), *umiglienim* (1309), *uichofgnim* (a11), *ifcharginim* (c25), *inim* (a53, e16), *iftinim* (e15), *razúmnim* (794), *doftoynim* (f139), *ftárim* (1246), *dobrim* (d40), *útim* (641), *práuim* (c32), *ftariyim* (314), *túyim* (1328), *Boxyim* (c154), *Mnozim* (669), *druzim* (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 *-ih* (0/4, 0/12, 0/15): *mládih* (1320), *sfachih* (168), *golih* (1582), *oholih* (947), *pitomih* (1043), *bludnih* (1587), *Vmiglienih* (948), *ifcharginih* (1350), *inih* (1381), *ufilnih* (1592), *Xalofnih* (1589), *dobrih* (1042), *múdrih* (41), *priyátih* (c152), *Priprostih* (1587), *mínútih* (17), *Minútih* (e18), *Martuih* (1585), *ftariyih* (272), *diuyih* (1041), *drázih* (d42), *mnozh* (1654, a8), *druzih* (912, 1275, 1385, a38, a55, a57, c101), *Druzih* (976). Among the pronouns there are no attestations of length either (0/15, 0/28, 0/49): *sfih* (3, 5, 485, 1033, 1212, 1222, 1265, 1330, 1410, 1522, 1536, 1591, a22, d23), *Sfih* (1612, c140, d20, d42), *chih* (1448, 1519, 1546, 1573, 1578, a26, c136, c152), *Chih* (23, 1116), *gnih* (271, 276, 818, 994, 1091, 1150, 1155, 1202, 1304, 1380, 1480, 1521, 1525, 1599, 1624, a55, a57, c36, f40, f112, f127), *onih* (1590, a23, d20), *ouih* (17, e18), *Chachouih* (994), *yih* (147, 148, 219, 617, 619, 815, 984, 1105, 1108, 1111, 1172, 1214, 1242, 1324, 1521, 1527, 1577, 1586, 1599, a49, c116, c182, e25, f106), *gih* (1107, f106, read: *yih), *sfoyih* (40), *choyih* (797, 1520, c31), *Choyih* (1220, e36), *moyih* (39), *tuoyih* (1252, c49, c61, d42).

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

– 1s (9/6, 5/1, 3/22): *dím* (135, 385, 1103, c159, c167), *Dím* (249, 373), *uidím* (a4), *hualím* (1375), *Molím* (1008), *fmislím* (1213), *mním* (774, 785), *profím* (332), *uím* (136, 1013), *prauím* (26); *dim* (250, a57, f119), *xelim* (a60, c97), *molim* (545, c95), *molin* (sic, a25), *uolim* (1309, c96), *fmislím* (f41), *unim* (360, a5, a32), *mnim* (254), *ozrim* [494] (c105), *chiutim* (c103), *uim* (721, a47, c117, e3, f7, f38), *Vim* (c186), *pouim* (a56), *zbroyim* (c117, f41), *ftoyim* (253, f42).

– 2s (1/4, 2/11, 0/10): *dobauífc* (1250), *ftauífc* (417), *oftauífc* (1247); *uidífc* (601, b11, c85, f142), *prohodífc* (f4), *prouodífc* (f3), *pocudífc* (a29), *uelífc* (266), *xelífc* (265), *molífc* (c126), *Vmífc* (945), *mnífc* (1292), *gouorífc* (1053), *progouorífc* (c45), *zatuorífc* (c46), *otuorífc* (1054), *nofífc* (f3), *uífc* (909, 1291), *proslauífc* (1249), *naprauífc* (1248), *pouífc* (910).

– 3s (32/20, 27/66, 1/96): *izgubí* (987), *naucí* (1384), *dí* (1383), *uuridí* (1463), *fidí* (1178), *slobodí* (342), *hodí* (335), *nahodí* (939), *obhodí* (336), *dohodí* (343), *uzhodí*

(341, 344, 457), *plodí* (895), *potuárdí* (490), *pogárdí* (489), *udí* (1399), *prudí* (940), *trúdí* (744), *yizdí* (229), *xelí* (204, 1319), *gúli* (1411), *brání* (3), *hrání* (4), *ciní* (37, 357, 400, 733, 1038, 1315, 1382), *mní* (357, 908, 1210), *zuoní* (1374), *Zuoní* (1044), *sní* (992), *Napuní* (419), *fpuní* (224), *chruní* (5), *chupí* ‘collect, gather’ (73), *fchupí* (437), *uarí* (1183), *nosí* (310), *prosí* (302), *raztratí* (1240), *plátí* (228), *ctí* (1220), *uartí* (1128), *slauí* (766, 788, 1204), *ftauí* (1048), *dáuí* (1124), *louí* (72), *bixí* (152), *uzdarxí* (890), *boyí* (285), *priftoyi* (1388) vs. *gliubi* (1600), *gliúbi* (1543), *zagrúbi* (1544), *dici* (e52), *izfchoci* (f9), *toci* (f10), *plafci* (1128), *uci* (1441), *muci* (1383, 1442), *di* (1597, 1603), *blidi* (1023), *slidi* (c144, c178, f136), *fidi* (962, 1384), *uidi* (129, 588, 961, 1177, 1429, 1464, c136, c143, c177), *nenauidi* (1364, 1430), *slídi* (1024, 1363), *zgodí* (1292, 1421), *hodi* (1258, 1377, 1394, 1531, d10, f69), *nahodi* (432, 458, 953, 1257, 1378, 1393, 1427, 1438, a51, f43), *iznahodi* (899), *fcchodi* (940, 1428), *nadhodi* (896), *dohodi* (954, 1264), *pohodi* (1263), *prohodi* (893), *Prohodi* (903), *uzhodi* (c194), *porodi* (1532), *uodi* (f44, f70), *douodi* (1437), *prouodi* (1354), *prudi* (849, 1400), *trúdi* (850, 1036), *optichi* (1342), *Huali* (e30), *Veli* (1551), *xeli* (c144), *dili* (a27, d40), *misli* (1456), *umi* (1385), *rani* (1039), *obráni* (928, 1040, c201), *hráni* (1162), *dohráni* (c100, c202), *shráni* (927, c130), *uhráni* (f24), *cini* (434, 923, 1442, 1550, c145), *ucini* (f15), *razcini* (f31), *lini* (c135), *promini* (1037), *mni* (1316, 1441, a28, a39, a56, c50), *Mni* (1200), *uchloni* (924, c128), *zuoni* (790), *uzbifni* (1268), *napuni* (c186), *fpuni* (c100), *chruni* (c185), *hlépi* (1024), *zastúpi* (438), *priuari* (302, f128), *uári* (1324), *zami* (c142), *razmiri* (c141), *tiri* (1042), *obori* (1619), *domori* (f157), *gouori* (864, 942), *razgouori* (f158), *stuori* (453), *ofctri* (1406), *pochofi* (c120), *nofi* (301, 1191, 1198, 1407), *zanofi* (1530), *odnofi* (a55), *profi* (1529), *ifprofi* (1408), *plati* (e44), *potrati* (200), *priurati* (f20), *pouráti* (199, f19), *cti* (f4), *ociti* (f124), *Hiti* (f123), *poschiti* (1334, 1376), *ceftiti* (1333), *otústi* |495| (1340), *grufti* (251), *zapústi* (1339), *grústi* (1658), *dobauí* (f13), *slauí* (c53), *proslauí* (c88), *prauí* (482, 746, c87), *priprauí* (1541, f123), *ftauí* (f14), *poftauí* (d25), *obyauí* (f124), *pouí* (257), *gotouí* (450), *lexi* (1094), *téxi* (1093), *priloxi* (c102), *darxi* (1237), *tuxi* (f79), *dotúxi* (f80), *boyi* (1330), *posfoyi* (c129), *goyi* (1387), *broyi* (a51), *odbroyi* (c130), *stoyi* (183, 286), *ftoyi* (1170, 1329, c120, f129), *priftoyi* (184, f130), *izgazi* (f24), *uzuozí* (c196).¹⁴

– 1p (2/2, 1/3, 0/5): *uidímo* (936), *fchrátímo* (111), *pozdrauímo* (659); *dicímo* (a1), *uidímo* (296, 1262, 1415, 1570), *nahodímo* (1536), *xelímo* (994), *obesélímo* (114)¹⁵, *Mnímo* (1483), *uzpómnímo* (935).

¹⁴ Here again the figures should not be regarded as exact because as in the case of the pr3s in -a it is not always possible to separate presents from aorists.

¹⁵ Wagner (1970: 27) regards this example as a mistake instead of **obesélímo*. Although no argumentation is provided, I am inclined to agree with this. On the one hand the -i- 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. *uefel* (136, 687, 696, 959, 1139, 1207, a12), *Vefel* (590), *uefela* (590), *uefelo* (63, 70, 259, 685, 1468), *Vefelo* (693, 1656), *uefelím* (a18), *uefeli* (830, 984), *Neuefel* (1011), *Neuefelo* (f72), inf *uefeliti* (115), pr2p *uefelíte* (241), imp2s *uefeli* (d11), imp2p *uefelíte* (194), gps *uefeléchi* (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 *xitách* (1278, read: **xítach*), Gs *finá* (166, read: **fína*), *mirá* (1023, read: **míra*), *putá* (a16, read: **púta*), DLs *darú* (c164, read: **dáru*), As *gustírnu* (1087, read: **gustírnu*), Ns

– 2p (3/2, 0/0, 0/4): *fidíte* (326), *uefelíte* (241), *ciníte* (242); *gliúbite* (1597), *nato-cite* (219), *uidite* (325), *umite* (1494), *uite* (1493), *obslúxite* (1598).

(11) The *-i-* in past gerunds in *-iv* (2/4, 0/9, 0/4): *obazríf* (243), *špuštíf* (84); *Zábif* (1279), *naucif* (1359), *odlucif* (f53), *Vzbúdif* (1224), *razdilif* (526), *Pochlonif* (1499), *urátif* (880, 1195), *puštif* (1229, c189), *šprauif* (1133), *uprauif* (408), *stauif* (1261), *poštauif* (407), *Stauif* (450), *priloxif* (a43), *Priloxif* (1379).

4.5 Examples of *ó*

(1) 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, 1665), *moru* (376).

(2) 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 **ō* 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 |496| 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), *šchóch* (f112), *šmóch* (1130), *znóy* (51), *znoy* (1472, c60, f59), *zuón* (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), *nóch* (435, 906, 908,

stároft (c108, read: **staróft*), Gs *šceftogá* (f160a, read: **šceftóga*), pr1s *nifám* (a29, read: **nifam*), pr2s *zádařc* (1294, read: **zadářc*), pr3s *pridé* (c139, read: **príde*), gps *Pítáyuch* 'ask' (f51, read: **Pítayuch* or **Pítayúch*), aor1s *Naydóh* (212, read: **Náydoh*), |521| l-part fs *bilá* (a44, read: **bíla*), l-part ns *zbiłó* 'turn into reality' (1514, read: **zbiłó*), *chíté* 'ki te' (c185, read: **chíte*), imperf3p *slúxahú* (271, read: **slúxáhu*, also Wagner).

1620), *pomóch* (38, 1416, c123, c153), *chripóft* (975, 1224, 1355), *Chripóft* (1361), *milóft* (1334, a47, c57), *ſchupóft* (1363), *ſtaróft* (159, f70, f113, f136), *uridnóft* (a17, c78) vs. *chripoft* (d24), *Chripoft* (1481), *miloft* (1144, 1613, c100), *mladoft* (f69), *mudroft* (e53), *ſfitloft* (f61), *slaboft* (f76), *sladchoft* (1232), *stároft* (c108), *ſtaroft* (f80), *Tihoft* (c23), *uridnoft* (f157), *xaloft* (d18).¹⁶ Other forms of these and similar nouns never carry an acute, despite being quite frequent, e.g. Gs *choſti* (1107), *nochi* (253, f58), *foli* (73), DLs *nochi* (934), Is *mochyu* (433, a54, f49), *nochyu* (434, f50), NAp *mochi* (c91), *nemochi* (f88); Gs *chripoſti* (799, 1378, 1419, 1490), *milofti* (1312, c14), *Milofti* (f48), *mladoſti* (c26, d46), *sladchoſti* (375), *ſtaroſti* (1320), *Staroſti* (932), *xaloſti* (d45), DLs *milofti* (592, 1502, c166), *mladoſti* (f103), *radoſti* (e52), *ſfitloſti* (1420), *ſtaroſti* (f104), *uridnoſti* (1501), Vs *Chripoſti* (f5), *mladoſti* (d1), *Tihoſti* (d15), Is *chripoſtyu* (937, a7), *hárhoſtyu* (f140), *miloftyu* (c15, e48), *ſfitloſtyu* (e47), *uridnoſtyu* (c16), NAp *chripoſti* (14, 483, 1412, 1433, 1518, a26, c165, c188, e36), *dragoſti* (c25), *hrabroſti* (1525), *milofti* (a27, c80), *pfoſti* (1258), *radoſti* (1526, f56), *slaboſti* (c91), *tamnoſti* (1411), *xaloſti* (f55), Ip *chripoſti* (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), *nepochoy* (1462, d8), *ſtól* (1063), *záchón* (1373), *záchón* (1359, 1544), *záslóu* (747, read: |497| *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), Ls *ſtoli* (74), Is *ſtolóm* (1267), Gs *zachona* (1570), Np *záchoni* (1545), *Záchoni* (1595), Ap *zachone* (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), *pochlon* (e12), *razgouor* (30, e17, f40), *Razgouor* (242). 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), *ſmíhóm* (1406), *ſtolóm* (1267), *úmóm* (485, 1284, f103), *chipóm* (f98), *Gospodaróm* (1325), *miróm* (960, 1377), *Sulétóm* (722), *xíuotóm* (780); *zlóm* (1353, f81), *putóm* (56), *Gospodſtuóm* (a7), *umiglienſtuóm* (a7), *blagodarſtuóm* (a7) vs. *xdribom* (1166), *miſeçom* (828), *obidom* (1132), *ſtidom* (c43), *trudom* (15), *trúdom* (f94), *tégom* (c60), *Tégom* (820), *ſtráhom* (1108), *yunachom* (606),

¹⁶ Cf. also the length in *mnòx* (1573).

¹⁷ This list is not exhaustive.

ribgniáhom (1179), *Obláhom* (438), *tíhom* (1225), *ſcchitchom* (639), *pobuchom* (88), *múchom* ‘moan’ (606), *chruhom* (494), *razúmom* (1333, 1374, 1613), *ſtánom* (1387), *nacinom* (e15), *nácinom* (519, a11), *Pelinom* (d37), *pochlonom* (f139), *répom* (1127), *chipom* (f143), *darom* (e48), *peharom* (868), *dárom* (1264), *glafom* (e26), *gláfom* (d5), *dneuom* (434, f50), *pochrouom* (170, 745, 1183); *blágom* (1419), *dílom* (1450), *tilom* (1610), *imenom* (c15), *brimenom* (c98), *urimenom* (c97), *zlátom* (234, 832), *Zlátom* (1203, d38).

For the correlating soft ending *-em* the evidence is comparable (2/13): *Líćém* (920), *listyém* (1156) vs. *putem* ‘road’ (c32), *uiñem* (1474), *ſarćem* (a18), *pogliem* (229), *oblícyem* (1376), *Vlyem* (1063), |498| *ſchladanyem* (f142), *piſányem* (f141), *uminyem* (a7), *Vminyem* (118), *chopyem* (641), *oſctaryem* (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 accent marks), 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. NAs *ribanyé* (a43), *znanyé* (a43), *radouanyé* (a30), *bityé* (1279), *xityé* (f72), *ſpoménutyé* (1454), *ſdrauyé* (f57), Gs *Milofardyá* (1579), *Schoncányá* (1678), *poctényá* (6), *umínyá* (777), DLs *ufányú* (c122), *mogliényú* (c147), *xiuinyú* (13, 1485, c27), *ſatyú* (492), *bityú* (f134), NAp *ſchládanyá* (f53), *Chiuchienyá* (f84), *zlamenyá* (5), *pityá* (943).¹⁸ Nouns of this type have long endings in much of Dalmatian Čakavian, e.g. Vrgada (Jurišić 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* (< *ā*) 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 [499] because of their small number: Ns *diffctuo* (1435), *mnoftctuo* (1031), *ubofctuo* (1032), Gs *Bogogliubftua* (c20), *umiglienftua* (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 trūdā*, *živòt -votā*, *putò -ā* (Dulčić/Dulčić 1985), Brač/Hvar/Vis *trūd trūdā*, *smīh smīhā*, *stōl stolā*, *gospodōr gospodōrā*, *živòt životā*, *zlò*, *putò* (Hraste/Šimunović/Olesch 1979), Vrgada *trūd trūdā*, *smīh smīhā*, *stō stolā*, *gospod°ār gospod°ārā*, *živòt životā*, *zlò*, *licè* (Jurišić 1973).¹⁹ And although *mīr* is (c)-stressed in Brač/Hvar/Vis (*mīr mīra*) and Vrgada (*mīr -a*), it is (b)-stressed in the system described by Daničić (1925: 22).²⁰

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 kvantiteta 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 decried.

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: *mīr*, opposed to *m̄r* (i.e., in conventional notation, *mīr*) 'wall' (1981b: 273). If correct, this would imply that *mīr* '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 *mìsec -a*, *obìd obìda*, *têg -a*, *strôh* (given s.v. *strôšâc*; the falling tone implies (c)-stress), *pòbuk -a*, *krùh -a*, *stôn -a*, *pelîn -lîna*, *glôs -a*, Gs *dnèva* (implying a stem-stressed Is), *pokrôv -krôva*, *blôgo -a*, *tîlo -a*, *brîme brîmena*, Brač/Hvar/Vis *mìsec -*, *obìd obìda*, *stîd -*, *têg -*, *strôh -*, *òblok -*, *pòbuk -²¹*, *krùh -*, *râzum -*, *stôn -*, *pelîn pelîna*, *dôr -*, *glôs -*, Gs *dnèva* (implying stem stress in the Is), *pokrôv pokrôva*, *blôgo*, *dîlo*, *tîlo*, *îme îmena*, *brîme brîmena*, *vrîme vrîmena*, *zlôto*, Vrgada *mîsêc mîsêca*, *obîd -a*, *stîd -a*, *strôâh -a*, *òblôâk -a*, *pòbuk -a*, *krùh krùva*, *râzûm -a*, *stôân -a*, *nôâçîn* or *nôâçîn*, Gs *nôâçîna*, *pelîn pelîna*, *dôâr -a*, *glôâs -a*, Is *dnêvon* (s.v. *dôân*), *pokrôv pokrôva*, *blôgo -a*, *dîlo -a*, *tîlo tîla*, *îme -ena*, *brîme -ena*, *vrîme vrîmena*, *zlôato zlôata*. The noun *junak* always has (b)-stress: Brusje *junôk -nôkâ*, Brač/Hvar/Vis *junôk junôkâ*, Vrgada *junôâk -ôâkâ*.

The evidence is contradictory in the case of four nouns: Brusje *ždrîb -a*, *pehôr -hôrâ*, *rêp rêpâ*, Brač/Hvar/Vis *kîp kîpâ*, *ždrîb ždrîbâ* (explicitly limited to Brač), *pehôr pehâra*, *rêp rêpâ*, Vrgada *kîp -a*, *ždrîb -a*, *pehôâr -ôârâ*, *rêp -a*.

Seven nouns are not attested in any of the three Dalmatian dialect dictionaries: *um*, *Sulet*, *ribnjak*, *tik*, *šćitak*, *muk*, *poklon*, so we have to look further afield. For the purposes of this article attention will be limited to the Vuk/Daničić system, where the noun *um* is (b)-stressed (*ûm úma*), whereas *ribnjak*, *tik* and *poklon* are not: *rîbnjâk*, *tîjek -*, |500| *pòklôn*. This leaves three unattested nouns. The noun *šćitak* is a diminutive of a (b)-stressed noun (*štît štîta*) 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*, *kip*, *gospodar*, *život*, *zlo*, *puto*, *ždrib*, *junak*, *šćitak*, *rep* (19 attestations: 12/7), and on the stem in *mir*, *misec*, *obid*, *stid*, *teg*, *strah*, *ribnjak*, *oblak*, *tik*, *pobuk*, *muk*, *kruh*, *razum*, *stan*, *načîn*, *pelîn*, *poklon*, *dar*, *pehar*, *glas*, *dnev-*, *pokrov*, *blago*, *dilo*, *tîlo*, *ime*, *brime*, *vrime*, *zlato* (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-

wrong here: |522| elsewhere, ‘wall’ is given with a rising and ‘peace’ with a falling tone, see, e.g., Hraste e.a. (1979: XXIV, 547).

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 *pòbukon* 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 mîra*).

(5) The adjectival ending *-oga* (30/14): *drugóga* (48), *yáchóga* (c136), *yunacchóga* (235), *Bráčchóga* (720), *tanchóga* (55), *gliudfchóga* (1413), *nebefchóga* (c125), *Nebefchóga* (f1), *morfchóga* (56, 1511), *zalóga* (1260), *uelóga* (1110), *umárlóga* (1454), *lacnóga* (1581), *xédnóga* (1582), *perenóga* (238), *Difnóga* (596), *duhofnóga* (1580), *telemnóga* (1579), *izuarfnóga* (819), *smartnóga* (924), *Slaunóga* (a1), *lounóga* (171), *staróga* (1219), *stàróga* (820), *múdróga* (1322), *sfétóga* (786), *scéstóga* (e4), *práuóga* (366), *nouóga* (172); *sfemogoga* (e46), *drugoga* (110), *yunacchoga* (608), *Nebefchoga* (f54), *ribarfchoga* (a20), *tihoga* (559), *Tihoga* (563), *fedmoga* (a61), *perenoga* (237), *difnoga* (b6), *smartnoga* (a33), *dobroga* (848, 1259), *zúoga* (980, read: **xúoga*). The acute accent on *-ga* in *scestogá* (f160a) is best regarded as a displaced accent mark instead of **scéstóga* (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); |501|
- *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): *famoga* (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): *uicgniéga* (f110), *mlayéga* (250), *ftariyéga* (249) vs. *Naybogliega* (1381), *magniega* (215), *ifchargniega* (1594), *tretyega* (530), *Boxyega* (c18). There is a single case of an acute accent in a pronoun: *naſcéga* (1680), cf. absence of an accent symbol in the following attestations: *naſcega* (a50, f160a), *sfega* (452, 1147, 1541, 1593, c69, f109, f118), *Sfega* (f71, uncertain), *gniega* (27, 115, 679, 774, 1180, 1207, 1359, 1430, 1542, 1552, 1602, 1606), *Gniega* (c170, f49), *tega* (451), *sfoyega* (596), *moyega* (562, 1148), *suoyega* (b6), *tuoyega* (c17).

(6) The adjectival DLs ending *-omu* (8/4): *drugómu* (1557), *yunáčchómu* (644), *ribafchómu* (a37, read: **ribarfchómu*), *tihómu* (837), *uelómu* (1038), *recenómu* (a21), *yednómu* (1318), *Stàrómu* (1656); *drugomu* (979, 1326), *cudnomu* (1486), *Izuarfnomu* (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): *sfachómu* (f107), *sfachomu* (26, 219, 260, 1037, 1050, 1246, 1316, 1380, 1540, f80), *Sfachomu* (911);
- *taki*: no examples;
- *moj/tvoj/svoj* (7/4): *mómu* (25, 197), *tuómu* (367, c47, c48), *sfómu* (1012, 1558), *sfomu* (385, 756, f147), *tuomu* (f148);
- *ovi* (0/6): *ouomu* (198, 929, 1315, 1539, a1, f108);
- *niki* (0/3): *nichomu* (1325, f37), *Nichomu* (1334);
- *sam*: no examples; |502|
- *jedan* (0/2): *Yednomu* (1557), *yednomu* (96);
- *oni* (0/4): *onomu* (1264, a37, a42, a44);
- *taj* (0/15): *tomu* (32, 198, 368, 386, 389, 901, 930, 1011, 1095, 1289, 1317, 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), *sfemu* (368, 687, 768, 844, 1317, 1602, a44, a59, c56), *gniemu* (116, 255, 484, 487, 557, 661, 665, 686, 767, 843, 1601, 1605, 1608, a27, a27, c168), *Gniemu* (731), *femu* (c55), *temu* (f30), *sfojemu* (644).

4.6 Examples of *ú*

(1) The stem syllable of the noun *ljudi* (14/7): Np *gliúdi* (74, 1227, 1477, c22), *Gliúdi* (797, 1308), *gliudi* (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 parallelism with *vitez*.

(4) The stem syllable of the noun *duša* (11/3): Ns *dúšca* (1610), Gs *dúšce* (f65), NAp *dúšce* (1566), *Dúšce* (1540), As *dúšcu* (927, 1344, 1368, c124, e20), As *Dúšcu* (f128), Is *dúšcom* (1611); DLs *dušci* (1578), As *dušcu* (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 *druxe* (132).
- The noun *družba* (5/3): Ns *drúxba* (231), Gs *drúxbé* (c192), DLs *drúxbi* (267), As *drúxbu* (690), *Drúxbu* (c40) vs. Ns *druxba* (798), As *druxbu* (1088), Is *druxbom* (e21).
- The verb *družiti* (4/1): inf *zdrúxiti* (f160), aor1p *šdrúxifmo* (1132), l-pfs *sdrúxila* (a17), ppp *šdrúxeni* (a5), vs. pr3p *druxé* (312). |503|

Other derivations from the same root never carry an acute, e.g. the frequent noun *družina* (0/16) and the adjective *družben* (with its derivative noun *družbenik*), Ns *družina* (275, 588, 590, 602, 603, e29), Gs *družiné* (1660), DLs *družini* (856), As *družinu* (830), Is *družinóm* (520, 611, 657), *družinom* (640), Vs *družino* (532, 619, 666); *družbene* (691), Np *družbeniči* (d27).

(6) The root *ljub-* in several types of cases:

- The stem syllable of the feminine noun *ljubav* (9/8): Ns *gliúbáf* (1143, 1323), *Gliúbaf* (e5), Gs *gliúbauí* (264, 766, 1668, c19, c125), Is *gliúbafyu* (a5) vs. Ns *gliubaf* (a6, d31, f60), *Gliubaf* (f150), Gs *gliubauí* (d26, f153), DLs *gliubauí* (c54, e43).
- The stem syllable of the verb *ljubiti* (14/5): inf *gliúbiti* (1418, 1444, 1606), *gliúbit* (1603), aor2/3s *Pogliúbi* (1145), pr3s *gliúbi* (1543), pr2p *gliúbite* (1597), pr3p *gliúbé* (1542), imp2s *gliúbi* (1450), imp1p *gliúbimo* (1261), imp1p *Gliúbimo* (1259), gpr *gliúbech* (1593), ppp *gliúbglien* (1604), *gliúbglieni* (a10); inf *gliubit* (40), l-pms *obgliubio* (571, 572), pr3s *gliubi* (1600), imp1p *gliubimo* (1607).

Several other derivations from the same root never carry an acute, in particular the adjective *ljubak* (0/7): *gliubach* (1327), *gliubcha* (1538), *gliubchí* (2), *gliubchim* (f141), *gliubcho* (958, e24), *Gliubcho* (f58).

(7) The root *slug-/služ-* in several types of cases, in particular:

- The stem vowel of the noun *sluga* (4/1): Ns *slúga* (232, 1420), NAP *slúge* (680), Dp *slúgam* (c151) vs. Dp *slugam* (c154).
- The stem vowel of the noun *služba* (2/1): As *slúxbu* (691, f50), As *sluxbu* (242).
- The stem vowel of the verb *služiti* (13/2): inf *slúxiti* (134, 767, 1326), aor3p *slúxifce* (817), pr1s *slúxu* (718), pr2p *obslúxite* (1598), pr3p *slúxé* (811), imp2s *obslúxi* (1548), imp1p *slúximo* (1608), gpr *slúfexhi* (816, read: **slúxechi*), imperf3p *slúxáhu* (a3), *slúxahú* (271), ppp *slúxeni* (a3) vs. inf *fluxiti* (116), pr3p *sluxé* (311).

(8) The root *trud-* in several types of cases, in particular:

- The stem vowel of the noun *trud* (9/3): Ns *trúd* (35, 518, e44), Gs *trúda* (f51, f60, f86), DLs *trúdu* (446), Is *trúdóm* (211), *trúdom* (f94) vs. Ns *trud* (a35), Gs *truda* (86), Is *trudom* (15).
- The stem vowel of the verb *truditi* (9/1): aor3p *trúdifce* (1186), l-pms *utrúdio* (1120), pr3s *trúdí* (744), *trúdi* (850, 1036), pr3p *trúde* |504| (1299), imp2s *trúdi* (1304, c168), gpr *trúdechi* (24) vs. aor3p *utrudifce* (82).

(9) The stem vowel of the neuter noun *sunce* (4/9): Ns *fúnçe* (506, 749), *Súnçe* (498), Gs *fúnça* (233) vs. Ns *funçe* (427, 1066, 1619, 1664), *Sunçe* (430), Gs *funça* (400, 1002), *funza* (f32, read: **funça*), DLs *funçu* (1053).

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

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

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 |505| 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.

	pr3s <i>-a</i>	pr2s <i>-aš</i>	Gs <i>-e</i>	pr3p <i>-e</i>	gps <i>-eć</i>	gps <i>-eći</i>	adj <i>-oga</i>	pr3p <i>-u</i>	gps <i>-uć</i>	gps <i>-ući</i>	pr3s <i>-i-</i>
acc.	90	21	86	86	40	72	30	80	18	14	32
unm.	35	5	20	25	11	27	14	54	27	23	20
att.	125	26	106	111	51	99	44	134	45	37	52
perc.	72%	81%	81%	77%	78%	73%	68%	60%	40%	38%	61%

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. |506|

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

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.

	pr1s <i>-am</i>	adj Is/Dp <i>-im</i>	pr1s <i>-im</i>	Is <i>-om</i>
reference	4.2 (8)	4.4 (8)	4.4 (10)	3.1 (31)
accented	19	3/2/1	9/5/3	42
unmarked	7	5/5/18	6/1/22	16
attestations	26	8/7/19	15/6/25	58
percentage marked	73%	37%/28%/5%	60%/83%/12%	72%

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, |507| 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. Ip *-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 *í* 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 *-uć* and *-ući* 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. *Chabál* (1467), *ftól* (1063), *mál* (513, 1339, c157), *zál* (932) vs. |508| *uartal* (1087), *pořal* (c151, f31), *izgibil* (1422), *mifal* (1383, f30, f123), *mal* (1631, c89, f43), *mil* (780, 1337, c52, e7), *priřtal* (c43), *ueřel* (136, 687, 696, 959, 1139, 1207, a12), *Veřel* (590), *Neueřel* (1011).

Monosyllabic forms (*stol*, *mal*, *zal*, *mil*) will be assumed to have been stressed. As for the other examples, cf. Brusje *Kabôl*, *vârtal*, *posôl*, *vêselo*, Brač/Hvar/Vis *Kabôl*, *vârtal*, *posôl*, *mîsal*, *vêsel*, Vrgada *Kab^oã*, *vř^oã*, *pos^oã*, *mîs^oã*, *vêšê*. 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 *pogîbil*, which has the same morphological structure; for *pristal* cf. Vuk/Daničić *prîstao*, pointing to stress on the final syllable.

In examples in which end stress is certain or plausible (*Kabal*, *posal*, *stol*, *mal*, *zal*, *pristal*), length is indicated in half of the cases (6/6), whereas among those words that are likely to have had non-final stress (*vartal*, *misal*, *vesel/nevesel*) 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 underlyingly 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 underlying 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): *dâl* (739), *Nahitâl* (741), *pâl* (c158), *poslâl* (1667), *poznâl* (a45), *slifcâl* (a38), *uftâl* (514), *uzbúyâl* (1340), *fpiuâl* (a54), vs. *Dal* (c13, c17, c43), *imal* (c90), *ifpifal* (a54), *pifal* (a44), *radoual* (a29), *filoual* (386), *Tiral* (f26). In *dal* it is reasonable to expect underlying length; in *pal*, *poslal*, *poznal*, *ustal*, *uzbujal*, *imal*, *ispisal*, and *pisal* one expects final stress and hence lengthening; in *nahital*, *slišal*, *spival*, *radoval*, *siloval*, and *tiral* one expects non-final stress and hence no accent marks, unless the vowel is underlyingly long. Since *Nahitâl* and *slifcâl* display an acute accent, we have to conclude that these forms had underlying length, which strikes one as surprising at first sight, but is actually quite in line with the evidence provided by the accent marks in *pohitâli* (629) and infinitives like *pogledâti* (235), which also point to underlying length (see section 3.1 (6)). We have to conclude |509| 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 Hektorović's immediate linguistic background, where *-a-* < **a* is always reflected as *-o-* in the masculine singular of the *l*-participle, cf. *prô(l)*, *grjô(l)* (both with underlying length, cf. *prôla*, *prôlo*, *grjôla*, *grjôlo*), *čuvô(l)* (with underlying brevity, cf. *čuvâla*, *čuvâlo*), 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 exceptional (1/17): *muchâl* (797), *dotechal* (1355), *mogal* (a6, a46), *odrechal* (250), *Pomarchal* (d45), *poscal* (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 *trésal(l)*, *strīga(l)* (Hraste 1926-27: 202).²³

(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): *bīl* (773, 783, 1140), *chúpīl* (760), *čtīl* (774: read: **ctīl*), *hodīl* (759, 779), *htīl* (760), *imīl* (740) vs. *bil* (460, 764, 780, 794, 906, 1682, e8, e13), *Bil* (1667), *bugaril* (a54), *chiutil* (f144), *dīcil* (784), *gouoril* (459, 1046, f27), *htil* (373, 739, 1045, 1055, c51), *imil* (793), *mnil* (f28), *nadilil* (e48), *ochrilil* (e47), *ostauil* (e8), *oftauil* (1254), *otuuril* (460), *Plátīl* (247), *poftauil* (1253), *pozlouogilil* (a24), *priprauil* (c119), *sloxil* (f156), *fril* (1139), *ftauil* (a42), *uidil* (401, e39), *umil* (480, a54), *zapouidil* (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): *cūl* (774), *pocél* (a35) vs. *Cul* (283, 1487), *cul* (467), *fel* (960).²⁴

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 *ô* reflecting stressed **a* and *a* reflecting posttonic **a*: *dlôn*, *krôj*, *rôžôń*, *pakôl*, *badôń*, *kabôl*, *jūbôv*, *nôrôv*, *jedôn*, vs. *Pëtar*, *vârtal*, *čâval*, *jâval*, *Pâval*. In the case of underlying length we find *o* even in posttonic position, e.g. *ðblok* Gs *ðbloka*, *řibor* | 510 | Gs *řibora*, Gp *móčok*, *prósoc*, *dòloc* (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

²³ I wonder if the acute accent in *muchál* is not due to analogical introduction of the length found in the inf **mūknūti*, cf. *razbignūti* (585) and the discussion in section 3.1 (7).

²⁴ Note that there is not a single case of length if *-o* appears instead of *-l*, cf. *pricao* (662), *otafcao* (640), *chufcao* (653), *pridao* (681), *pomagnchao* (a24), *poslao* (682), *poznao* (a49), *razigrao* (632), *Oftao* (568), *razggniuao* (679), *darouao* (a7), *dozuao* (680); *bio* (610, 1645, a43), *zagubio* (564, 589), *obgliubio* (571, 572), *dicio* (c62), *naréfcio* (a7), *grifcio* (1630), *razredio* (612), *uidio* (92, 604, 929, 1200, 1629, 1646, a49), *odio* (1199), *pogardio* (1308), *utrúdio* (1120), *xelio* (a28, a60), *razdilio* (574), *izmislio* (a40), *imio* (122, c61), *umio* (654, f156), *cinio* (880), *proçinio* (930), *mnio* (91), *Pochlopio* (639), *popio* (626), *přiftupio* (661), *bugario* (b2), *přiuario* (672), *Vdrio* (608), *Smirio* (646), *gouorio* (371, 1307), *htio* (879), *hotio* (372), *upuftio* (643), *řprauio* (627), *poftauio* (669), *sloxio* (a40), *tuxio* (121), *broyio* (f155), *zbroyio* (1119); *odueo* (664); *zacuo* (678), *Padnuo* (611), *zaginuo* (636), *izuarnuo* (648).

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), *Chray* (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 *hotēl*) 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 |511|

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 *čīn* (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 *čīni*, l-pns *čīnèlo*, inf *učīnīt*, pr3s *učīni*, imp2s *učīnī*, l-pms *učīnē*, l-pfs *učīnēla*, PPP *učīnenō* vs. *načīnīt*, pr3s *načīni*, imp2s *načīnī/načīni*, l-pfs *načīnīla*, PPP *načīnen* (Vermeer 1980: 461).²⁶

In Hektorović, the stem vowel of *činiti* ordinarily does not carry an acute accent, cf. inf *ciniti* (946, 950, 1305, 1434), *cinit* (834, 1384), *razciniti* (859), *uciniti* (545, 1458, a22), *ucinit* (1343), l-pms *cinio* (880), l-pmp *cinili* (520), gpt *naciniŕfci* (1216), aor1s *Cinih* (53, 1185), *ucinih* (c83), aor2/3s *cini* (1159), *ucini* (d3), *Vciní* (292), aor1p *uciniŕmo* (749), aor3p *cinifce* (1644), *uciniŕce* (1188, 1663), imperf2/3s *cigniŕfce* (861), imperf3p *cigniahu* (1212), pr3s *ciní* (37, 357, 400, 733, 1038, 1315, 1382), *cini* (434, 923, 1442, 1550, c145), *cin[í]* (1209), *razcini* (f31), *ucini* (f15), pr2p *ciníte* (242), pr3p *ciné* (374, 1341, 1577), gpr *cinéchi* (1015, 1069, 1460, 1556, 1585, f50), *cinechi* (c110, f12), *cinéch* (1417), *cinèch* (1451). |512|

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), *Cin* (1059), *Vcin* (1286), 1p *cinmo* (1579), *Vcínmo* (221), 2p *Cínite* (1598).
- More surprisingly, there is also an attestation of length in an imperative in *-i*: 2s *cíni* (279), cf. *cini* (488, 1297), *Cini* (1332), *ucini* (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.²⁷ Moreover, most of them involve acute accents that belong on an adjacent syllable, e.g. Gs *putá* (a16) instead of **púta* (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 *náčīni* 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), *cinìt'* (111, 112), *cinìt'* (149), *Cinìt'* (92), aor3p *cinifce* (35, 100), *cinifce* (116, 148, 155), *čnifce* (sic) (67), l-pms *cinìl* (sic) (59), *cinnío* (162), (42, 162), l-pfs *cinilla* (13, 143), l-pmp *cinilli* (17), *Cinilli* (78), pr1s *cinijm* (74, 133), pr3s *cinij* (94, 104, 126), *cinij* (2, 14, 30, 41, 44, 94, 117, 118, 136), *Cinij* (62), pr3p *ciné* (51, 61, 128), gpr *cinécch'* (162), *cinécchi* (44, 124), imperf3p *cignáhu* (127); inf *ucinitti* (93), *ucinìt'* (59, 67, 93, 114), *Vcinìt'* (5), *Vcinìt'* (149), aor1s *ucinih* (69, 127), *ucinih* (165), aor2/3s *uccini* (89), *uccini* (12, 57, 160), *Vccini* (57, 158), l-pms *ucinil* (130), *ucinío* (18, 29, 59, 130, 142, 159), *Vcinío* (26, 144), gpt *ucivfci* (59), *Vcivfci* (151).

Length is also absent (in contradistinction to what we find in Hektorović's system) in all attestations of the imperative if it is endingless, cf. imp2s *cin'* (70), *cin'* (16), *Cin'* (50, 116, 129), *ucin'* (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 *cinítte* (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 **čínú*, aor2/3s **čini*.²⁹

End-stressed forms, on the other hand, must have had a short vowel in the stem, e.g. aor1s **činìxъ*, in the same way that the Vuk/Daničić system opposes *As rúku* to DILp *rùkama*. 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 *rùkama* such examples as Omišalj Lp *stupìh* (opposed to NAp *stûpi*, my material; the dialect lacks a tonal contrast), Vrgada Gp *sinôv*, DILp *sinîn* opposed to Ns *sîn*, Gs *sîna* (Jurišić 1966: 74-75).

It follows that Hektorović's *cigniu* 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/Daničić aor2/3s *ũčĩ*.

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 *ĩ* 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 *-ō*.

(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: **Sulět*, Gs **Sulētà*.

University of Leiden

Appendix

This Appendix contains the text of Hektorović's two prose letters to Mikša Pelegrinović, in order to enable the reader to follow the system of references (for which see further section 1.4). |515|

- [a0] OVO PISCE PETRE HECTOROVICH HVARANIN, POCTOVANOMV
GOSPODINV MICHSCI PELEGRINOVICHIV, VLASTELINV HVARSCHOMV,
CHANCILIRV ZADARSCHOMV.
- [a1] PRigodámife po ouomu napochongniem ufcharfenyu Pelegrínouichiu mili
poyti do onoga Slaunóga Gráda (choyimfe sfi dicimo) Dubrounicha,
- [a2] fnichimi rodyáçi i fpriategli moyimi, u ormánu brigentinu, fyednóm mrixari-
çom pod zapouid nafcu,
- [a3] gdi nas bifce duádefét po broyu, meu onimi choyi slúxáhu i chí slúxeni bihu,
lifce prifidáč, namirnichóf i priatégl,
- [a4] Na chí pút ueleme podtachnú xeglia da uidím i ftaré priateglie i noue,
nauaftito niché nigdar paruo neuidine,
- [a5] I dofcadfcí tamo priyati bifmo i sdrúxeni fuelichom gliúbafyu choyuti neumim
ifpifati ni mogu,
- [a6] i prem dabih mogal bilabi ftuár uele duga pobráyati gliubaf imilofcchíu choyu
priyáfmó nayparuo od oné prisfitlé i práué Gofpodé
- [a7] (Choyu chachoye Bog miloftiui Gofpodftuóm darouao, tachoyuye pamétyu i
uminyem i umiglienftuóm i blagodárftuóm i praudóm i chripoftyu naréfcio)
- [a8] i potóm choyufmo imali od priatégl mnozih,
- [a9] Sámo ti³⁰ nayedno gouoru, ne lifto u Grádu da uafdi u darxauí i chotáru
gniegouu gdigodífmó dofci (a profcligafmo i uidili dofti)
- [a10] uafdífmó bili po cudnouati nácin uidíni gliúbglieni i obilno obdarouáni,
- [a11] tacho dagimfmó³¹ oftali sfim uechie nego guozdenimi uerugami uichofgnim
nácinom obézani,
- [a12] Vchóm Grádu meu ftuári iné naydohfe uefel nemalo,
- [a13] chada uidih daye i ondi poznáno ime tuoye yere ífpitouán bih dofti za tebe,
- [a14] I uelemi pohuágliena bi Iyubcha tuoya, chachono ftuár zamirita i izuarfna,
- [a15] choyúno ti nichad u pridgniá urimena sloxi náredno i upífa,
- [a16] Schóga putá nachon duádefet i pét dán urátiffcife domóm, pouidán mi bi
yedan glas uele drág i ugodan,
- [a17] ató dafeye tuoya uridnóft sdrúxila f Gofpoyóm Liuiom Vladichóm narednóm
plemenitóm i pohuaglienom,
- [a18] Zachu stuar tífe raduyu fa sfim farçem i uefelím, xeliuchiuam dug xiuot,
fchladan, miran, ceftit i dobar, |516|
- [a19] I za Zlamenye od toga fcagliuti fouóm chgnigom pripifano
- [a20] (izuan onoga ribanya móga i ribarfchoga prigouaranya)
- [a21] ono cím mene u recenómu Grádu Dubrounichu i potom u nafcemu, na
zaurachienyu nadilifce,
- [a22] hotéchi tebe od sfih ftuari choyimi mene dariuayu dilnicha uciniti,
- [a23] Toytichie biti na mifto onih darof choyífe budú priategliem na pir pofilati,

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 pouidafcemi do nicholicho urimena potóm, dafife pozlouoglil yeretiye parui plód pomagnchao,
- [a25] Nemoy molinte, da na sfém day huálu Bogu, Choyi lám i yedini, zna canamye za boglie,
- [a26] i chinam dáye mnoge púte po chih moremo chripofsti od uftarpinyá pochazati,
- [a27] Choyi nam dili milofsti i dáye ono caye drago gniemu, i uazima opét (chachono stvar sfoyu) chadaye gniemu ugodno,
- [a28] Buditi dofti poznati da imáfc uireniçu plodnu, cafi (tachofe meni mni) uele xelio,
- [a29] Néchiu dafé pocudifc datife nífam pria radoual nego fada,
- [a30] yedno zác i pozdno radouanyé nie nigdár pohuyeno,
- [a31] drugo zafcto i nemogoh, yere fyutradán chachofe uárnuh fputa onoga doydemi yedna cudnouata nemóh
- [a32] choyuti neumim izrechi, i choyami omrazi xiuot mój,
- [a33] Zatóm drugá choyáme douede do fmartnoga meyasca, tacho dami yedua u ftaru chipu neuoglnu dufcu oftai,
- [a34] za gnimi tretá i cetúarta (choyemi ne tribuye pobrayati) tacho da ouo scéfti miféc³² tece da me mucé i neuoglié
- [a35] i maloye dán da famfe pocél duizati fodra i pomalo poftupati, u chomu stányu nay parui trud priyáh tebi ouo pifati,
- [a36] ufayuchi chada izaznáfc iftinu od mene, da michiefc sfe priyáti za dobro,
- [a37] Azafcto imám fúmgniu nemalu datichie u onomu ribafchómu³³ prigouaranyu yedna ftuár biti neugodna dochleyoy uzroch nepoznáfc,
- [a38] Ató yerefi (moxebiti) i od družih slifcál bugarfchiçe one choyéfu moyi ribári bugarili, i onu iftu pifan choyu obadua zayedno pripiuasce,
- [a39] immimife damichiefc rechi ufebi,
- [a40] Zafcto nifi sám od tuoga uma choyegodi bugarfchine i pifan izmislio i sloxio, |517|
- [a41] negofi pofcal one ftuari che i druži umiyu pouidati?
- [a42] zatoti dám znati, Dafam ya uelichu pómgniu ftauil ifpifati Izuarfnomu Vitézu onomu
- [a43] i dati na znanyé sfe ribanyé moye i uas pút moy práuóm iftinóm onacho chachofye bio, ne priloxif yednu ric naymagniu,
- [a44] Yerfe inácho nie priftoyalo ni onomu chomu pifáh, ni meni choyifam pifal, budúchimi drága bilá uafda iftina usfemu,
- [a45] I tolicho uechie, Zafcto tchogodibi ctéchi poznàl dafu rici nouo sloxene i izmifcgliene
- [a46] mogalbi potóm uerouati i darxati daye i sfe oftáló ono slaxòm sloxeno i izmifcglieno,
- [a47] Zatim yofcchie uim da zná tuoya milóft, Chachono Latini darxé (prauo i

³² Read: *miféc.

³³ Read: *ribarfchómu.

- doftoyno) Hiftoriu za ric iftinnu,
 [a48] yereyoy ftauglieno yeft ime od one rici choyáfe zoue Hifter, ca zlamenuye
 uidinye ali poznanye,
 [a49] atò zác nitchor ini nepifce tey stuari nego tchoyihye uidio i poznao,
 [a50] Tachoti i mi i sfe ftrane nafcega yezicha
 [a51] (choyife meu sfimi oftalimi na sfitu nayuechi broyi i nahodi)
 [a52] darfe³⁴ i fçine bugarfçchiçe za ftuari iftinne, brez fúmgnié sfache, a ne za laxne
 chachofu pripouifti niche i pífni mnoge,
 [a53] Zato ouo budi odgouor moy i tebi i sfim inim,
 [a54] choyifam fa sfóm mochyu (chachofam umil nayboglie) ifpifal sfe ono caye
 Pafchoy i Nichola bugaril i fpiuál,
 [a55] Choye ftuári alifufe oni od družih naucili ali druži od gnih, toy meni nifctore
 ni daye ni odnofi,
 [a56] I achochiefc dati pouim ono cafe meni mni
 [a57] dimti daye uechie prilicno ch iftini dafufe oni od družih naucili nego druži od
 gnih,
 [a58] ató yerefu oni ribari i gliudi od mora, choyi brodechife nigda fouim anigda
 fonim, nifctofu od ouoga a nifcto od onoga slifcali, i fpomgnióm slifcayúchi
 naucili,
 [a59] I nómi³⁵ neoftaye da rechu za fada, nego datife u sfemu priporucuyem,
 [a60] i da xelim sfachi tuoy napridach i poctenye i caft chachofam xelio uafda chrát,
 [a61] Vftáróm Huáru na duádefét dán mifeça octobra fedmoga godifcchia od
 fpaſenya, uarhu tifuchia pét fát i petdefét. |518|
- [b0] PETRE HECTOROVICH ISTOMV GOSPODINV MICHSCI PELEGRINOVICHIV.³⁶
 [b1] EVoti fçagliu Chripoftni i náredni Gofpodine Michſca, oni Sarbfchi nácin³⁷
 (oudi zlólu³⁸ upifán)
 [b2] Choyimye Pafchoy i Nichola sfachi po febi bugarfçchiçu 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 digliafce* (b5, this could also be a normal instance of a word space after a verbal prefix), *fiue rine* (b9), *uidifc lime* (b11), *deuoy cha* (b13, twice, b14), *giz 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: *radofaue* (b5), *radofaf* (b7), *fiuerina* (b6), *fiuerin* (b7), *fiuerine* (b9), *dunaya* (b15);
- the unique spelling *suoyega* (b6), with *u*, as opposed to the normal spelling with *-f-*, (e.g. *sfoyega* 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.

- [b3] I tochoýe nácin od oné pífni I chlice Deuoycha: Choyufu obadua zayeduo³⁹
pripiali.
[b4] BVGARSCCHIÇA.
[b5] Chadamife radofaue uoyeuoda od digliafce,
[b6] Od fuoyega grada difnoga fiuerina
[b7] Ceftomife radofaf na fiuerin obzirafce,
[b8] Teretomi ouacho bellu gradu befiyafce
[b9] Ouomite oftaugliam belli gradu⁴⁰ fiue rine
[b10] Moy difni gráde
[b11] Neznam uechie uiyulite, neznam uechie, uidifc lime
[b12] PISAN.
[b13] Ichlice deuoy cha, Pochlice deuoy cha
[b14] Yofc clice⁴¹ deuoy cha mladami tere giz daua,
[b15] Mlada te re giz daua, fabrig bel la deuoycha dunaya.

|523| References

- Belić, A.
1909 "Zamětki po čakavskim govoram", *IORJaS* 14/2, 181-266.
Berk, Ch. A. van den
1969 "Nekoliko opaski o kvantitetu i akcentu u starom Dubrovniku", in: Ravlić (1969), 299-310.
Bujas, R. (ed.)
1951 *Ribanje i ribarsko prigovaranje*, Petar Hektorović. Zagreb.
Ćupić, Dr.
1977 *Govor Bjelopavlića*. Beograd (= *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 23).
Daničić, Đ.
1925 *Srpski akcenti*. Beograd-Zemun (= *Posebna izdanja SKA* 58, *Filosofski i filološki spisi* 16).
|524|
Dulčić, J. and P. Dulčić
1985 *Rječnik bruškoga govora*. Zagreb (= *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 7/2).
Fancev, Fr.
1907 "Beiträge zur serbokroatischen Dialektologie: Der kaj-Dialekt von Virje, mit Berücksichtigung der Dialekte Podravina's (Koprivnica-Pitomača)", *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 29, 305-389.
Franičević, M. (ed.)
1968 *Hanibal Lucić. Petar Hektorović*. Zagreb (= *Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti* 7).
Grčić, M.
1988 *Petar Hektorović: Ribanje i ribarsko prigovaranje. Hanibal Lucić: Robinja. Izvornik i prijevod*. Zagreb.
Hamm, J., M. Hraste and P. Guberina
1956 "Govor otoka Suska", *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1, 7-213.

³⁹ Read: *zayedno.

⁴⁰ Read: *grade. The printed form *gradu* looks like a mistake under the influence of the previous line, which contains the *Ds gradu*. The parallel passage in 599 has *gráde* and so has the *Vs* in the next line (b10).

⁴¹ Read: *chlice.

- Hektorović, P.
1568 *Ribanye i ribarscho prigouaranye i razliche stuari ine sloxene po Petretu Hectorouichiu huaraninu*. Venetia.
1953 Photographic reprint of Hektorović (1568). Zagreb.
- Hraste, M.
1926-27 "Crtice o bruškom dialektu", *Južnoslovenski filolog* 6, 180-214.
1935 "Čakavski dijalekat ostrva Hvara", *Južnoslovenski filolog* 14, 1-55.
1940 "Čakavski dijalekat ostrva Brača", *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 10, 1-65.
- Hraste, M., P. Šimunović and R. Olesch
1979 *Čakavisch-deutsches Lexikon* 1. Köln/Wien (= *Slavistische Forschungen* 25/1).
- Ivić, P.
1957 "Izveštaj o terenskom dijalektološkom radu u severnoj Hrvatskoj i južnoj Dalmaciji u leto 1957 godine", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 2, 401-407.
1961 "Prilozi poznavanju dijalekatske slike zapadne Hrvatske", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 6, 191-211. Ivić, P. et al. (eds.)
1981 *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih Opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*. Sarajevo (= *Posebna izdanja ANUBiH* 55).
- Ivšić, Stj.
1937 "Osnovna hrvatska kajkavska akcentuacija u Pergošića (1574)", in: *Zbornik lingvističkih i filoloških rasprava A. Beliću o 40-godišnjici njegova naučnog rada*, 183-195. Beograd.
- Jurišić, Bl.
1966 *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade I. Uvod*. Zagreb.
1973 *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade II. Rječnik*. Zagreb. |525|
- Kalsbeek, J.
1998 (forthc.) *The Čakavian dialect of Orbanići near Žminj in Istria*, Amsterdam/Atlanta.
- Kašić, B.
1617 *Piesni duhovnae od pohvalaa boxyieh*. U Rimu.
1978 Photographic reprint of Kašić (1617). München.
- Klaić, Br.
1968 "Jezik Hanibala Lucića i Petra Hektorovića. Prilog historijskoj gramatici hrvatskog jezika", in: Franičević (1968), 267-324.
- Kortlandt, F.H.H.
1975 *Slavic Accentuation*. Lisse.
- Kušar, M.
1895 "Lumbaradsko narječje", *Nastavni vjesnik* 3, 323-338.
- Lončarić, M.
1977 "Jagnjedovački govor (s osvrtom na pitanje kajkavskoga podravskog dijalekta)", *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 4, 179-262.
- Malić, Dr.
1989 "Grafija i pravopis hrvatskog latiničkog rukopisa 14. stoljeća 'Žića sv. otaca'", *Rasprave ZJ* 15, 129-177.
1997 *Žića svetih otaca. Hrvatska srednjovjekovna proza*. Zagreb.
- Maretić, T.
1889 *Istorija hrvatskoga pravopisa latinskijem slovima*. Zagreb (= *Djela JAZU* 9).
- Mladenović, A.
1968 *Jezik Petra Hektorovića*. Novi Sad.
- Moskovljević, M.
1950 "Govor ostrva Korčule", *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 11, 153-222.
- Pešikan, M.
1965 *Starocrnogorski srednjokatunski i lješanski govori*, Beograd (= *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 15).

- Petrović, Dr.
1974 "O nekim osobinama akcenatskog sistema u govorima Luštica i Krtola", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 17/2, 119-124.
- Premuda, V.
1939 "Starohrvatski latinički rukopis 'Žića sv. otaca'", *Starine JAZU* 40, 103-220.
- Ravlić, J. (ed.)
1969 *Marin Držić. Zbornik radova* (= *Zbornik radova o Marinu Držiću*), Zagreb.
- Rešetar, M.
1898a "Primorski lekcionari XV. vijeka", *Rad JAZU* 134, 80-160.
1898b "Primorski lekcionari XV. vijeka (Konac)", *Rad JAZU* 136, 97-199.
1900 *Die serbokroatische Betonung südwestlicher Mundarten*. Wien (= *Schriften der Balkancommission* 1).
1927 "Kvantitet u djelima Marina Držića", *Rad JAZU* 233, 145-196.
- Šimunović, P.
1977 "Čakavština srednjodalmatinskih otoka", *Čakavska rič* 7/1, 5-63.
1981a "Komiža (OLA 42)", in: P. Ivić et al. (eds.), 259-265. |526|
1981b "Vrbanj (OLA 44)", in: P. Ivić et al. (eds.), 272-274.
- Stang, Chr. S.
1957 *Slavonic Accentuation*. Oslo.
- Steinhauer, H.
1973 *Čakavian studies*. The Hague/Paris.
- Vermeer, W.
1979 "Innovations in the kajkavian dialect of Bednja", in: Jan M. Meijer (ed.), *Dutch Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists*. Lisse, 347-381.
1980 "Die Konjugation in der nordwestčakavischen Mundart Omišalj", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 1, 439-472.
1984 "On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: the quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and related issues", *Folia Linguistica Historica* 5/2, 331-395.
1994 "Vowel length in Čakavian texts from the fourteenth century", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 22, 467-491.
1996 "The twofold origin of Classical Čakavian", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 23, 255-318.
- Vončina, J. (ed.)
1986 *Djela Petra Hektorovića*. Zagreb (= *Stari pisci hrvatski* 39).
- Wagner, Zd.
1970 *Ze studiów nad językiem Petra Hektorowicia*. Wrocław/Warszawa/Kraków.
- Zaliznjak, A.A.
1990 'Merilo pravednoe' XIV veka kak akcentologičeskij istočnik. München (= *Slavistische Beiträge* 266).