

Remarks on variation in Classical Čakavian

Willem Vermeer

[Note on the 2009 version. This article originally appeared in *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 11, 1988, 621-646. Its purpose was to document some of the variation that can be observed in what I have called Classical Čakavian, meaning the Čakavian literary language that was in use in Venetian Dalmatia from the middle of the fourteenth century onwards.

This version is identical to the printed text with a few very minor exceptions. One or two obvious typos and minor infelicities have been tacitly corrected. In one case a clarifying remark has been added in square brackets. The endnotes (p. 642) have been changed to footnotes and the page numbers of the original edition have been added, as in the following example: “copied [623] as late”, meaning that “copied” is the last word on p. 622 and “as late” the first words on p. 623.]

1. Introduction.

Within Classical Čakavian a considerable amount of internal variation is found, as the following examples may illustrate:

- Although generally speaking Classical Čakavian has an ikavian reflex of Proto-Slavic *ě, some texts have *e* (often alongside *i*) in those words that are ekavian in accordance with “Jakubinskij’s rule”: *vera* alongside *vira*, *nevesta* alongside *nevista*, etcetera.
- The locative singular of masculine and neuter nouns ends in *-i* or *-u*, e.g. *potoci*, *misti* alongside *potoku*, *mistu*.
- The accusative plural of masculine nouns ends in *-i* or *-e*, e.g. *grisi* alongside *grihe*.
- The locative plural of *i*-stem nouns ends in *-eh* or *-ih*, e.g. *nemoćeh*, *rićeh* alongside (more frequent) *nemoćih*, *rićih*.
- The orthotonic dative singular of the personal pronoun meaning ‘I’ is *meni*, *mani* or *mni*.
- The genitive/accusative singular of the personal pronoun meaning ‘she’ is *njeje* or *nje*.
- The masculine nominative singular of the demonstrative pronouns that correspond to modern *ovaj* and *onaj* either are endingless or have the ending *-i*: *ov/on* alongside *ovi/oni*. In the same pronouns the initial *o-* is sometimes omitted after prepositions ending in a vowel, e.g. *na noj njivi* alongside (much more often) *na onoj njivi*.
- The nominative singular of the interrogative pronoun meaning ‘who’ is *tko* or *gdo*.
- The pronoun meaning ‘whose’ is *čigov* or *čiji*; it can also be avoided altogether in favour of the genitive singular of *tko/gdo*: *koga*. [622]
- The pronoun meaning ‘nothing’ is *nišće*, *ništar(e)* or (rarely) *ništor(e)*.

- The feminine dative/locative singular of the possessive pronouns *moj*, *tvoj* and *svoj* ends in *-ej* or *-oj*, e.g. *mojej* or *mojoj*.
- The masculine singular of the *l*-participle of verbs with an infinitive in *-iti* ends in *-il*, *-io*, *-i* or *-ija* (roughly in descending order of frequency), e.g. *bil*, *bio*, *bi*, *bija*.
- The present gerund ends in *-e* or *-ć/-ći/-će*, e.g. *hode*, *hodeć*, *hodeći*, *hodeće*.
- Most forms of the verb meaning ‘want’ may or may not contain a stem vowel *-o-*, e.g. aorist third person singular *hoti* or *hti*, imperfect third person singular *hotiše* or *htiše*. Some texts more or less consistently omit the initial *h-* before the stem vowel *-o-*: *oti*, *otiše*. In other texts omission of *h-* before *-t-* occurs, e.g. *tíše*, infinitive *titi*.

For some time now I have been studying Classical Čakavian texts in order to find out, first, what types of variation actually occurred and, second, what patterns if any can be observed in the attested variation. In this contribution I would like to give a few examples of the kinds of variation that can be observed and the kinds of patterns that arise.¹

2. The simple verb *iti*: results so far.

The use of *iti* in Classical Čakavian has been the subject of a separate study (forthcoming), the results of which can be summarized as follows:

- (1) In several early specimina of religious prose the verb *iti* is not attested at all: there are no examples in the *Zadarski Lekcionar* (Rešetar 1894: 1-95), in the *Život sv. Jerolima* as attested in the Zagreb Academy manuscript Ib127 (Jagić 1869: 226-236, corrections in Mladenović 1964-65) or the *Firentinski zbornik* (Verdiani 1973: 151-170), in the *Život sv. Šimuna* and the *Život sv. Vincenca* as attested in the *Firentinski zbornik* (Verdiani o.c.: 179-188, 193-206), and in the prose sections of the *Život sv. Katarine* (Jagić 1869: 218-224, corrections in Mladenović 1966a). No examples are found either in the *Psalmi Davidovi fra Luke Bračanina* (Karlić 1917: 1-129), which, though attested in a manuscript copied |623| as late as 1598, may be much older. The earliest attestations in dated specimina of religious prose are to be found in the *Bernardinov Lekcionar* of 1495 (Maretić 1885: 1-201; 13x), the *Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga* of 1513 (Hamm 1978: 67-212; 33x) and the *Život sv. Grgura pape* that has been transmitted in the same manuscript as the *Dijalozi* (Hamm o.c.: 1978: 215-223; 3x). In the absence of editions of the relevant texts it is impossible to be sure about exactly what happened after the early years of the 16th century.

¹ It is not often that Classical Čakavian has been treated as a more or less coherent unity (Glavan 1928-29 and Mladenović 1958 constitute notable exceptions). On the other hand individual texts have provided the subject of a number of important linguistic publications, in particular: Rešetar (1898a/b) on the lectionaries; Ružičić (1930-31) on Zoranić; Hraste (1950) and Skok (1950) on Marulić; Mladenović (1957, 1959, 1960, 1961-62, 1964, 1964-65, 1966a, 1966b, 1968) on Marulić, Hektorović and some of the *vitae*; Klaić (1968) on Lucić and Hektorović; Wagner (1970) on Hektorović; Malić (1973, 1977) on the *Šibenska molitva* and the *Red i zakon* respectively.

- (2) There is some slight evidence that *iti* made its appearance earlier in poetry than in prose. The only examples of the verb to appear in the *Život sv. Katarine* (1x) and the old section of Lucić's *Vrtal* (2x in the *Skazanje od nevoljnoga dne*, Kukuljević 1869: 279-311) occur in verse passages. Of the seven attestations to be found in Verdiani's *Firentinski zbornik* only two occur in prose, although verse makes up only a small part of the contents of the manuscript.
- (3) In later texts (among which religious prose is poorly represented) both the aorist and the present tense of *iti* are common forms, though not very frequent compared with the corresponding forms of related verbs, such as *pojti*, *hoditi* or *gre*. Hanibal Lucić (*Skladanja*, 1556, Franičević 1968: 25-148) seems to have avoided the aorist, which is in accordance with his deliberate practice of lending his language a Dubrovnik colouring. Petar Zoranić (*Planine*, 1536/1569, reprint 1952; Štefanić 1942: 23-190), on the other hand, seems to avoid the aorist *pojdoh*, using *idoh* instead, a pattern not found elsewhere.
- (4) The imperfect and the present gerund are very rare, both occurring only three times. On the other hand the aorist is the most frequent form, closely followed by the present tense. The study of parallel passages found in different manuscripts or different places of the same manuscript shows *pojti* to be equivalent or nearly equivalent to *iti*. All this taken together strongly suggests that in Classical Čakavian the verb *iti* was perfective, as it is nowadays in some living čakavian dialects, e.g. Omišalj. Martin Benetević was well aware of all this: in his *Hvarkinja* (Karlić 1916: 247-327) characters from Hvar have a verb *iti* which is clearly perfective, whereas the way his Dubrovčani and other neoštokavians use the same verb shows it to be imperfective.
- (5) Alongside the aorist and the present tense the infinitive is the only form of which more than a handful of examples are [624] attested. However, it is virtually restricted to a single type of context: verse-final position in popular religious poetry and Hektorović's *Ribanje* of 1556/1568. Apart from Hektorović and Baraković all major poets (Marulić, Lucić, Zoranić, and Karnarutić) avoid the infinitive *iti* altogether, despite the fact that the equivalent or near-equivalent infinitive *pojti* has the awkward property of rhyming with the closely related infinitives *dojti*, *ojti* and *projti* only. It is only with Baraković, at an advanced stage of the development of Classical Čakavian, that *iti* is no longer avoided within lines.
- (6) The imperative is rare (9 attestations), but occurs in several different kinds of texts.
- (7) The *l*-participle *išal* (always with initial *i*-) is widely attested in comedies from Hvar (Benetević's *Hvarkinja*, the anonymous *Komedija od Raskota*, Fancev 1932b: 101-123), but is very rare in other texts (6 examples). This suggests that it was a property of the spoken language (at least on Hvar) which was consciously avoided in writing.
- (8) There is a past gerund *šad*, which occurs once in Marulić's *Judita* and once in Karnarutić's *Piram i Tižba*, in all likelihood betraying Marulić's direct influence on the later poet.

3. The simple verb *iti*: new evidence.

Since the time I wrote the article summarized in the preceding section, I have looked at a few additional texts:

(1) *Žića svetih otaca*. This lengthy text (134 folia), which was published by Premuda (1939: 111-218; corrections pp. 219-220), contains translations of sections of the Latin translation of the *Andrōn hagiōn biblos* (Ivšić 1939: 231 and passim). Ivšić (o.c. 250-251) rightly points out that the language of the *Žića svetih otaca* is related to that of the *Zadarski Lekcionar*. To my knowledge no complete analysis of the language of this important text has ever been attempted. In the *Žića svetih otaca* not a single example of *iti* occurs. This strengthens the impression that writers of early religious prose avoided the verb *iti*.

(2) *Vidinja Tondalova*. This prose text, which has been transmitted in Lucić's *Vrtal*, has been published by Daničić (1872: 111-118). [625] The text contains one attestation of *iti*: the aorist *ide* (111).² This is in accordance with the impression (based mainly on the *Bernardinov Lekcionar* and the *Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga*) that later religious prose admitted the use of *iti*, if on a limited scale.

(3) *Korčulanske crkvene pjesme*. This small collection consisting of two popular religious poems ("Da mi se svi ponizimo" and "U se vrime godišća") was published by Menčik (1881: 268-270 = 270-273), who puts the text in the fifteenth century, unfortunately without giving reasons (p. 267). In the poem "U se vrime godišća" the aorist of *iti* occurs in the line *tada oni idoše*, which appears twice (12, 27).

(4) *Rapska pjesmarica*. This collection consisting of four religious poems was copied in 1471 by one *matheus de pičicho de arbo* (in modern garb Mate or Matij Picić Rabljanin) and has been published by Fisković (1953: 41-67). The poems are the following:

- (a) Another version of "U se vrime godišća" (41-42, 69 heptasyllabic lines).
- (b) A brief (57 octosyllabic lines) poem beginning with the line "Plači srce i s očima" (42-43).
- (c) A translation of the "Dies irae" beginning with the line "Sudac strašan oće priti" (43-45; 60 octosyllabic lines).
- (d) A lengthy (998 octosyllabic lines) "Gospin plač" (45-67).

The poems of the *Rapska pjesmarica* contain several attestations of *iti*. Since, as we have seen, the collection was copied in 1471, these examples are the earliest attestations of *iti* to be linked with an exact date, preceding as they do by a quarter of a century the examples of *iti* in the first edition of the *Bernardinov Lekcionar*. They are the following:

² For practical reasons examples will be quoted in modernized form, irrespective of the way they are written in the sources.

- (A) In “U se vrime godišća” there is an aorist in the line *tad pastiri idoše* (48). This is reminiscent of the line *tada oni idoše* which occurs twice in the same poem as it is given by Menčik’s source.
- (B) “Plači srce i s očima” contains several attestations of the present tense of *iti*:
- (B1-2) Plači srce i s očima,
 pomisleći gdi smo ninja
 paki skoro kamo *ideš*,
 k[a]mo *ideš*, gdi li prideš
 ali gdo te tamo prime
 va no vrime ko ne mine (1-6.) |626|
- (B3) Od zemlje je; v zemlju *ide*
 kako naši oči vide. (21-22, the subject of *je* and *ide* is *tilo* ‘the body’.)
- (B4) Vse ostaviš: tamo *ideš*,
 gdi po delih tvojih primeš. (37-38.)
- (B5) Sudac strašan grihe vidi,
 oće pravdom da vse *ide*. (43-44.)³

(5) “A ti, divojko šegljiva”, a brief (40 octosyllabic lines) anonymous ballad of an erotic nature. The poem is referred to by Zoranić in his *Planine* of 1536, but its text is known only on the basis of a manuscript (JAZU Ia44) which must be relatively recent because it contains work by Baraković (1548-1628), Dinko Zlatarić (around 1558-1613) and Stijepko Đurđević (1579-1632). Fancev (1932a: 17) puts the manuscript around 1600. The poem contains two examples of the aorist *jidoše*: *oni jidoše na vodu* (15), *oni jidoše pospati* (34) (Fancev 1932a: 21n.).

(6) *Cantilena pro Sabatho*. This poem on the Crucifixion, which consists of some 140 octosyllabic lines, was discovered not long ago in a Latin manuscript of the Budapest National Library (Cod. Lat. 540/I, 91v) and was published by Vízkelety and Hadrovics (1984: 10, 13-14), who put it in the final decennia of the fourteenth century, which makes it one of the oldest extant specimina of octosyllabic verse (roughly contemporaneous with the well-known examples of such poetry in the *Pariški zbornik* and only slightly younger than the fragment attested in the *Misal kneza Novaka* of 1368). In the *Cantilena pro Sabatho* the verb *iti* is not attested.

(7) “Slavić”, a translation of “Philomena” by St. Bonaventura, which has been transmitted in the collection known as the *Hvarska pjesmarica* (text in Fancev 1933: 46-

³ Since these verses do not rhyme properly, they cannot be correct as they stand. The simplest emendation that restores rhyme would consist in interpreting *vidi* as a present gerund *vide* (a type of form that had become archaic by the fifteenth century at the very latest and that is bound to have been misunderstood from time to time). However, this does not render the passage completely normal, in particular because the Classical Čakavian way of expressing thoughts like ‘walk in justice’ uses the verb *hoditi*.

53). The poem is attributed by the manuscript (f. 112a) to Marko Marulić. It does not contain examples of *iti*.

The new evidence is perfectly in accordance with what we knew or suspected already. It strengthens the impression that *iti* first appeared in verse and only then became current in prose.

4. The prefixes *pri-* and *do-*: preliminaries.

In Classical Čakavian two equivalents of ‘come’ occur: *pri* and *do*. The reason for this duality is in principle quite straightforward: some čakavian dialects have *pri* and some have *do*; the isogloss separating *pri* from *do* cuts through the territory where Classical Čakavian was in active use, dividing it into two unequal parts, with *pri* being limited to the northwest. It is conceivable (but not certain) that in the past the isogloss had a more southern or southeastern course.

Since the number of attestations of both verbs is very large, it will not be possible to look at all individual instances. Moreover, in order to keep things manageable I have had to simplify the issue in two ways:

(1) In ikavian systems the prefix *pri-* can also reflect **prě-* ‘across’. Although attestations of a verb *pri* meaning ‘pass, cross, walk across’ do in fact occur from time to time, they make up only a tiny minority of the examples in the texts, as far as they occur at all. Since it is primarily general tendencies I am interested in, I have not tried to distinguish between the two verbs. By the way, in some texts we find a prefix *pre-* with the meaning ‘across’, e.g. *prejti* ‘cross’ (*Žića svetih otaca* 1a, 11a, 26a/b, 91b 2x; *Rapska pjesmarica*, “Sudac strašan ...”, line 54), *prehajati* (*Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga* 89), *prenesal* (*Zadarski Lekcionar* 81a), *prenesti* (Zoranić, *Planine*, Štefanić 1942: 42, 168).⁴

(2) There is a theoretical possibility that some texts reflect a semantic difference between *do* and *pri*, e.g. in the way that modern standard Serbo-Croat differentiates between *doći* ‘come’ and *prići* ‘approach’. If such differentiation exists, the only way of bringing it to light would be by carefully considering individual passages in individual texts, which would be a separate undertaking.

5. *Pri-* versus *do-* in the language of religious prose.

In religious prose, differences between individual texts are very pronounced.

To begin with, some texts have *pri* only. The most spectacular example of this is the *Žića svetih otaca* (Premuda 1939: 111-220), which does not have a single example of *do-*, as against more than 250 attestations of *pri-*, distributed as follows: 236x *pri*, 3x *prihajati* (29a, 50a, 58a), 3x or 4x *prihoditi* (91b, 101b 2x and probably 67a), and 12x *pri-* in other verbs: 5x *prinesti* (9b, 57b, 628 58b, 61a, 88b), 2x a reflex of **prnesti*

⁴ Cf. also *pregaziti* (168); there are numerous attestations of *preminuti* in the *Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga*.

(58b, 74a)⁵, 3x *privesti* (73a, 81b, 97b), 1x *privoditi* (121a), 1x *pripeljati* (81b). The makers of the *Žića svetih otaca* act as if the prefix *do-* simply cannot be added to verbs of motion.

The *Žića svetih otaca* is not the only text in which *dojti* does not occur at all. However, these other texts are either relatively short, or they have examples of *do-* in other verbs of motion, which suggests that the absence of *dojti* may be accidental:

(1) *Vidinja Tondalova* (Daničić 1872: 111-118). 21 examples of *pri-*: 16x *priti*, 3x *prihoditi*, 1x *privesti*, 1x *priteći*; no attestations of *do-*.

(2) *Život sv. Jerolima* (Jagić 1869: 226-236, cf. Mladenović 1964-65; Verdiani 1973: 151-170). 17x *priti* in both versions (JAZU Ib127 and *Firentinski zbornik*); no examples of *dojti*; however, both versions have one attestation of *donesti* (alongside an example of *prinesti*) and in addition the *Firentinski zbornik* has once *dopeljati* (27r) in a passage where JAZU Ib127 has *pripeljati* (234).

(3) *Zadarski Lekcionar* (Rešetar 1894: 1-95). 225 instances of *pri-*: 171x *priti*, 21x *prihoditi* or *prihajati*, 4x *pripeljati* (7a, 43b, 75b, 79b), 7x *privesti* (10b, 13a, 21a, 30b, 45b, 111b 2x), 20x **prnesti* (15a 2x, 40a, 40b 3x, 45a, 59a 2x, 60b, 64b 2x, 69b, 75b, 77b, 79a, 101b 2x, 112b, 113a), 1x **prnašati* (70a), 1x **prnositi* (113b), on **pr-* see note 5. There is not a single attestation of *dojti*, but the prefix *do-* is found six times: 1x *dohoditi* (27a, Luke 22: 10), 1x *dohajati* (67b, Matthew 18: 7), 1x *donesti* (71a), 3x *donositi* (70b 2x, 71a). Note that the examples of *donesti/donositi* all occur closely together in a single passage (John 15: 2-5). There are no differences between the *Korčulanski odlomak* (Melich 1903: 49-61) and the *Zadarski Lekcionar*: we find 6x *priti* and twice an imperfective equivalent of *priti* in the sections the two manuscripts have in common.

In all other texts I have examined, the verb *dojti* occurs at least once. Usually, however, *priti* is much more frequent; the details differ from one text to the next:

(4) *Psalmi Davidovi fra Luke Bračanina* (Karlić 1917: 1-129). 80x *pri-* vs. 3x *do-*: 35x *priti*, 1x *prihoditi* (114), 1x *prihajati* (68), 10x *prinesti*, 1x *prinašati* (61), 29x *privesti*, 3x *privoditi* (all 39); 1x *dojti* (58); 2x *dovesti* (4, 51).

(5) *Život sv. Grgura pape* (Hamm 1978: 215-223). 17x *pri-* vs. |629| 2x *do-*, distributed as follows: 9x *priti*, 3x *prihoditi* (164v, 164v, 168r), 3x *privesti* (163v, 164r, 169r), 2x *pripeljati* (164r, 168r); 1x *dojti* (164v), 1x *donesti* (168v).

(6) *Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga* (Hamm 1978: 67-212). Over 300 attestations of *pri-*, distributed as follows: 232x *priti*, 39x *prihoditi*, 3x *prihajati*, 1x *prišastje* (56v), 6x or 7x

⁵ The sources usually write *-er-* or *-ar-*, cf. the following examples from the *Zadarski Lekcionar*: *Pernesitemi* (15a), *pernesose* (15a), *Parnesimi* (59a), *parnessosce* (101b). In combination with *-nesti* most (perhaps all) Čakavian dialects which use the prefix *pri-* to express the notion of ‘coming’ do not have *pri-*, but *pr-* or its reflex, e.g. Novi (Hrvatsko Primorje) *prnēsāl* (Belić 1909: 188), Omišalj (Krk) *prnēst* (Vermeer 1980: 463; judging by *prēst* ‘finger’ the sequence *-re-* is the regular reflex of syllabic *r* after *p*), Orlec (Cres) *prnēst* (Houtzagers 1985: 306), Susak *parnēst* (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 75).

prinesi (65v, 70, 70, 73, 81v, 124v, probably also 71v), 4x **prinesi* (28, 65v, 81v, 93v), 1x *prinositi* (40), 1x **prinositi* (58), 15x *pripeljati* (12v, 13, 13v, 30, 32v, 43, 60, 63, 71v, 82, 102, 111, 140v, 140v, 150v), 6x *privesti* (61, 74, 76v, 76v, 78, 139v); 90 instances of *do-*: 51x *dojti*, 17x *dohoditi*, 6x *dohajati*, 7x *donesti* (1v, 3v, 20, 38v, 96, 96v, 103v), 1x *donositi* (38), 3x *donašati* (69v, 70, 95v), 4x *dopeljati* (8v, 12v, 29v, 140v), 1x *dolitati* (40).

(7) *Bernardinov Lekcionar* (Maretić 1885: 1-201). 283x *priti*; 20x *pri-* in imperfective counterparts of *priti*, 4x *prišastje*, 9x *prinesi*, 1x *prinositi* (87a), 21x *privesti* (of which at least 2x **prě-*, both 102b), 1x *privoditi* (26b), 1x *privez-* (90a), 4x *priteći* (of which at least 1x **prě-*: 59b), 1x *prilaziti* (63b); 76x *dojti*; 2x *do-* in imperfective counterparts of *dojti*, 30x *donesti*, 5x *donositi*, 9x *dovesti*.

(8) *Život sv. Ivana Krstitelja*. The two extant versions differ somewhat, as was to be expected because the textual differences between them are considerable:

(8A) The old part of Lucić's *Vrtal* (255r-265r, Badalić 1957: 48-56, cf. the important corrections in Mladenović 1959: 118n). 31x *priti*, 1x *pripeljati* (255v), 3x *prišastje*; 1x *dojti*, 3x *dohoditi*. Several of the examples of *priti* occur in biblical passages which may not reflect the language the makers of the *vita* would have used themselves. On the other hand, the support for *do-* is rather weak: all four instances occur closely together in a single passage (f. 261v), which also has five attestations of *pri-*.

(8B) *Firentinski zbornik* (7r-20v, Verdiani 1973: 119-146): 38x *priti*, 6x *prišastje*; 10x *dojti*, 1x *dopeljati* (8r), 1x *donesti*; there are no examples of imperfectives. Of the ten instances of *dojti* two are found in passages where the corresponding passage in the *Vrtal* has *priti* (15v, 17v). Two attestations of *dojti* occur in verse (14r). The single instance of *dopeljati* corresponds to *pripeljati* in the *Vrtal*.

(9) *Život sv. Šimuna* (Verdiani 1973: 179-188). Not counting |630| the verse passages (which have 4x *priti* and 2x *dojti*) we find: 11x *priti*, 1x *pripeljati*, 1x *prinesi*; 1x *prišastje*; 6x *dojti*, 1x *dopeljati*.

(10) *Život sv. Katarine* (Jagić 1869: 218-224, cf. Mladenović 1966a). 8x *priti*, 1x *prihoditi*, 4x *privesti*; 1x *prišašće*; 2x *dojti*, 1x *dovesti*.

(11) *Istorija svetoga Dujma i Staša* (Morović 1977: 19-37 = 269-298). 7x *priti*, 2x *prihoditi*, 1x *prinesi*; 3x *prinesenje*; 7x *dojti*, 2x *dovesti*, 4x *donesti*. Several instances of the prefix *pri-* in this text reflect **prě-*, e.g. all three instances of *prinesenje* and the verb *prihoditi* in the following quotation: "(...) mnozi po kripčini njegovu idolsku službu ohojahu i na istinu vire krstjanske *prihojahu*" (27 = 281). [In this example *pri-* pretty obviously means 'across'. WV 2009.]

It is only in four cases that *do-* clearly predominates:

(12) The homiletic texts of the *Firentinski zbornik* (Verdiani 1973). The five texts that make up this collection contain 95 attestations of *dojti* and 16 instances of *do-* with other verbs of motion. The only examples of *priti* which do not occur in straight biblical quotations are found in the final text, which is also by far the longest; since all

four other texts have occasional examples of *pri-* in other verbs of motion (6 attestations in all) I assume that in their case the absence of *pri-* is accidental.

(12a) Untitled text on the importance of prayer (52r-61v; 209-219). 1x *pripeljati* (60r); 6x *dojti*. The single instance of *pri-* (53r) is a mistake instead of **prijati*, as its Latin equivalent *accipitis* shows.

(12b) “Tumačenje mnogo lipo i devot[o] svrh Pater Noster-a” (61v-74v; 223-238). 2x *pri-* (both times in a quotation from the Lord’s Prayer: *pridi cesarastvo tvoje*), 1x *prišastje*, 1x *priletiti*, 1x *priteći*; 24x *dojti*, 2x *dohoditi* (65r, 66r).

(12c) “Tumačenje mnogo lipo i devoto svrhu Ave Marije/Zdrave Marije” (75r-77v; 243-246). No examples of *pri-*, 1x *prinesti*, 1x *pripeljati*; 6x *dojti* (five of which occur closely together in a single passage), 1x *donesti*, 1x *dopeljati*.

(12d) “Mirakul mnogo lip koji učini blažena Gospe” (77v-83r; 249-255). No examples of *pri-*, 2x *prišastje*, 1x *privesti* (80v in fine, the same sentence has an example of the synonym or near-synonym *dopeljati*); 2x *dojti*, 2x *dopeljati*.

(12e) “Mного lipo i devoto govorenje svrhu muke gospodina |631| Isukrsta slatkoga” (83r-120v; 259-301). 14x *pri-* (not counting *prišastje*) against 65x *do-*, distributed as follows: 8x *pri-* (88r, 88v, 89v 2x, 91v, 100v, 107r, 113r), 1x *prihoditi*, 4x *pripeljati* (104r 2x, 108r, 108v), 1x *privesti* (115r), 1x *prinesti* (111v), 1x *prišastje*; 58x *dojti* (including *dayde*, 89v, which is a scribal error for **doyde*), 3x *donesti*, 4x *dopeljati* (not counting an example in verse, 84r-260).

(13) *Život svetoga Ivana biskupa Trogirskoga* (Ivanišević 1977: 69-86/301-335). 4x *pri-* vs. 22x *do-*: 3x *pri-*, 1x *priteći*; 15x *dojti*, 2x *dovesti*, 3x *donesti*, 1x *donesenje*, 1x *doteći*.

(14) *Život svetoga Vincenca* (Verdiani 1973). 1x *pri-* (50v, immediately followed by a form of *dojti*), 4x *pripeljati*; 19x *dojti*, 3x *dopeljati*.

(15) The *Oficij bl. d. Marije* of the *Marulićev molitvenik*. (Fancev 1934: 79-101, cf. also pp. CI-CII, CX and Fancev 1933: 12-13). Not counting verse passages there are 4 instances of *pri-* as against 32 of *do-*, distributed as follows: 1x *pri-*, 2x *priteći*, 1x *pribigovati*; 20x *dojti*, 1x *dohoditi* (146), 9x *dovesti*, 1x *donesti* (89), 1x *dotečenje* (213). There are three instances each of *pri-* and *dojti* in verse passages. The verb *dojti* is probably overrepresented: 14 of its attestations are found in the sentence *I vapaj moj k tebi dođi*, which is repeated again and again in the *Oficij*. However, even if we count these sentences as a single attestation, *do-* still predominates. The prose translation of the Penitential Psalms which is appended to the *Oficij* (102-105) is too short to add significantly to the picture: it contains one attestation each of *pri-*, *pribignuti*, *dojti* and *dovesti*.

Complete absence of *pri-* is not attested anywhere in the specimina of religious prose I have examined.⁶

⁶ Unfortunately there are no relevant examples in the oldest text: the *Red i zakon*.

6. *Pri-* and *do-* in anonymous verse: preliminary results.

The earliest example of *dojti* in verse occurs in the *Cantilena pro Sabatho*, which, it should be recalled, has been transmitted in a manuscript that must be dated to the final decennia of the fourteenth century. A few lines later there is an example of *priti*:

Tamo su se [vsi] skupili, ki su bogu ugodili.
 Kada tamo mi *dojdosmo*, apostole vse najdosm[o]. |632|
 Jednim glasom vsi plakahu, žalostju se ra[z]derahu:
 “Gospodina izgubismo, gospodinu vsi zgrišismo.”
 Petar skube sidu bradu: “Ja pokrivlah u sem gradu.
 Ojme, ča ću učiniti? Prid gospoju ne smim *priti*.
 Zgriših majci, zgriših sinu. Žalostan ću riti vinu.” (46-52.)

This passage is typical of verse throughout the tradition: *dojti* and *priti* are used side by side. Note that the form *dojdosmo* could easily have been avoided, had the author felt the slightest inclination to do so: **pridosmo* would have rhymed just as well. It is definitely not the case that the use of *dojti* is forced on the language of poetry by the requirements of versification.

Unfortunately very little extant verse is contemporaneous with such prose texts as the *Korčulanski odlomak*, the *Žića svetih otaca* or the *Zadarski Lekcionar*. Much of it may contain very ancient material, but has been transmitted in relatively recent manuscripts. Therefore it is impossible to determine whether the *Cantilena pro Sabatho* is representative.⁷

The version of “U se vrime godišća” which has been transmitted as one of the *Korčulanske crkvene pjesme* (Menčík 1881: 268-270 = 270-273) contains three attestations of *pridoše* (13, 24, 31) and one of *privosti* (18), but the aorist *doleti* (29) proves that the author had no qualms about using *do-*.

In the *Skazanje od nevoljnoga dne*, which has been transmitted in the old part of Lucić’s *Vrtal* (Kukuljević 1869: 279-311) the prefix *do-* even predominates: there are only four instances of *pri-*, all of them in the verb *priti* (112, 435, 545, 734) as against eight attestations of *do-*, distributed as follows: 6x *dojti* (33, 38, 915, 993, 995, 1057), 1x *dovesti* (253), 1x *donositi* (393). What is even more important, all but one of the attestations of *priti* cannot be replaced with the corresponding form of *dojti* without ruining a rhyme (the exception is 112), whereas only a single instance of *do-* (1057) cannot be replaced with *pri-*.

So far the *Rapska pjesmarica* of 1471 is the only verse text I have found that seems to avoid *do-* wherever possible. There are the following attestations:

- (a) “U se vrime godišća”: 1x *priti* (51); no examples of *dojti*.
- (b) “Plači srce i s očima”: 2x *priti* (4, 45); 1x *dojti*: *dojde* (26), rhyming with *mimo ide* (25).
- (c) “Sudac strašan oće priti”: 3x *priti* (1, 4, 34) 1x *dojti*: *dojdu* (45), rhyming with *pojdu* (43). |633|

⁷ There are no relevant examples in the *Šibenska molitva*.

- (d) Picić's *Plač*: 20x *pri-*: 15x *priti* (14, 27, 29, 158, 382, 441, 455, 494, 504, 617, 671, 710, 751, 853, 993), 1x *prihojati* (804), 4x *privesti* (207, 664, 982, 985); 2x *dojti*: *dojti* (69), rhyming with *pojti*; *dojde* (668) rhyming with *projde*).

The four examples of *dojti* cannot be replaced with corresponding forms of *priti* without ruining a rhyme. It is important to note that the language of the *Rapska pjesmarica* is unusual in that it seems to be close to the tradition represented by the *Žića svetih otaca* and the *Zadarski Lekcionar*, as the following examples may illustrate:

- (1) There are numerous cases of $e < *ě$ in words where i/e-kavian dialects have e according to Jakubinskij's rule. What I have in mind here is not so much examples like *telo* (III: 56, IV: 124, 856, 908, 910) alongside *tilo* (II: 19, 23, 27, IV: 174, 402, 517, 889) and *vera* (IV: 490, 623), cf. *veran* (IV: 796), *nevernik* (IV: 832), because in these words e is quite usual in all of Classical Čakavian (nicely betraying, by the way, the i/e-kavian origin of the Classical Čakavian tradition), as *bel* (IV: 120), *delo* (II: 38, 42, III: 57) alongside *dilo* (II: 28), *koleno* (IV: 139), *mesto* (III: 51, IV: 224, 455, 552) alongside *misto* (IV: 497, 568, 588), and *zvezda* (I: 31, IV: 42).
- (2) The dative singular of the first person singular personal pronoun is usually *mani* (IV: 65, 227, 584, 590, 621, 724, 795, 890), alongside a few examples of *meni* (IV: 412, rhyming with *rameni*; IV: 872).
- (3) Alongside *mnog-* (IV: 647, 653) there are attestations of *vnog-* (IV: 462, 476).
- (4) We find the ending *-ej* (rather than *-oj*) in the dative singular *mojej* (IV: 91), *tvojej* (IV: 345) alongside *tvojoj* (IV: 178, 528), *svojej* (IV: 941). Since *svojej* has to rhyme with the imperative *spokoj*, it is likely that the original text had **svojoj* and that the ending *-ej* is to be attributed to the scribe. In this connection it has to be remarked that of the reflexes of $*ě$ mentioned above (1) it is only ikavian forms that are protected by rhyme: *tilo* (II: 19, rhyming with *gnilo*), *misti* (IV: 497, rhyming with *vlisti*), perhaps also *tilu* (IV: 889, rhyming, if not perfectly, with *sinu*), not to speak of *tila* and *dila* (II: 27-28), which support each other. The pattern is reminiscent of what we find in the *Cantilena pro Sabatho* (Vízkelety and Hadrovics 1984: 32): a purely ikavian text |634| seems to have been forced into the mould of the i/e-kavian language of which the *Žića svetih otaca* is the most extreme representative. This is all the less surprising if one realizes that the Rab dialect is i/e-kavian, too.
- (5) In the stem *hot-* the initial *h-* is usually omitted (III: 1, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, IV: 78, 381, 382, 624, 703, 710, 742, 837), but sometimes retained (IV: 4, 68, 72, 109, 390).

7. *Pri-* and *do-* in secular literature.

In the language of the writers of classical secular literature *dojti* clearly predominates:

- (1) Marko Marulić (Split, 1450-1524). In *Judita* (written in 1501, first printed in 1521) we find 23 attestations of *pri-* and 34 of *do-*, distributed as follows: 17x *priti* (1x in the "Posveta", 1x in the summary headed "Istorija sva na kratko", 2x in the table of contents headed "Ča se u kom libru uzdrži", IV: 129b, IV: 202b, V: 274b, VI: 217b; II:

29, II: 201, II: 240, III: 171, III: 295, VI: 120, VI: 340, VI: 414, VI: 423), 3x *pribignuti* (VI: 177b; IV: 272, V: 18), 1x *pribižati* (III: 314), 1x *priteći* (II: 270), 1x *prinositi* (VI: 168); 24x *dojti* (1x in the “Posveta”, 1x in “Istorija sva na kratko”, III: 32b, VI: 145b; I: 151, I: 279, II: 5, II: 117, II: 204, III: 37, III: 138, III: 247, III: 354, IV: 201, IV: 240, IV: 280, IV: 319, V: 37, V: 80, V: 331, VI: 52, VI: 117, VI: 291, VI: 339), 3x *dohoditi* (V: 147b; II: 109, V: 28), 3x *donesti/doniti* (VI: 195b; II: 237, V: 18), 2x *donositi* (II: 93, V: 172), 1x *dovesti* (III: 42b), 1x *doteći* (VI: 122). In the prose of *Judita pri-* and *do-* occur in roughly equal proportions (9/7), whereas in verse *do-* is twice as common as *pri-* (14/7), a fact that is not explicable purely on the basis of the requirements of versification: of the 9 attestations of *pri-* only two (III: 171 and VI: 423) cannot be replaced by corresponding forms of *dojti*, whereas of the 20 instances of *dojti* only 5 are protected by rhyme (III: 354, IV: 280, IV: 319, VI: 117, VI: 339). In *Suzana* (written at an unknown date after the composition of *Judita* and transmitted in Lucić’s *Vrtal*) *pri-* is only attested twice, contrasting with 16 instances of *do-*, distributed as follows: 1x *pri-* (196, rhyming as follows: *odide/pride/poside/izide*), 1x *privesti* (780: *privedi nas u raj*); 9x *dojti* (212, 227, 318, 331, 375, 380, 414, 572, 746), |635| 1x *dohajati* (137), 1x *dohoditi* (145), 1x *dopusti* (20), 2x *donesti* (218, 222), 1x *dovoditi* (471), 1x *dopeljati* (592). In the two letters to Katarina Obirić (Fancev 1938: 188-192, cf. the corrections in Mladenović 1960) the number of examples is very small, but both verbs are represented: there is one case of *pri-* in a passage that is full of biblical reminiscences (2a); *dojti* and *donesti* occur once each (7b; 9b).

(2) Hanibal Lucić (Hvar, 1485-1553): *Skladanja izvarsnih pisan razlicih*, first printed in 1556 (Franičević 1968: 25-148). 8x *pri-* versus 51x *do-*. All eight attestations of *pri-* involve *pri-*; it is remarkable that in all these cases replacement with a suitable form of *dojti* would have had awkward or unacceptable consequences: in six cases rhymes would be ruined (“Tolika obide”: 20, “Ka god je vridna stvar”: 11, “U vrime ko čisto”: 69, *Robinja*: 786, “Nadgrobnica Petra Golubinića”: 11, “Pariž Eleni”: 397); the same line of the “Nadgrobnica Petra Golubinića” (11) contains a second example which is used together with the other example to create a rhetorical effect:

Da 'vo još nitkore ne *pride* ni će *prit*
Na ov svit, tko more i će moć ne umrit.

In *Pariž Eleni* (20), on the other hand, the use of *prit* serves to avoid a repetition which would have been awkward:

Kako bo k tebi *doć* more me pisanje,
Da ću *prit* i sam moć dala mi s' ufanje
Ko, molim, anjelska tva lipost ispuni
Za da se nebeska uredba napuni.

The 51 instances of *do-* are distributed as follows: 42x *dojti*, 3x *donesti/doniti*, 1x *donositi*, 1x *donašati*, 2x *dovesti*, 1x *dolisti*, 1x *doletiti*.

(3) Petre Hektorović (Stari Grad on Hvar, 1487-1572): *Ribanje i ribarsko prigovaranje i razlike stvari ine* (written between 1550 and 1556, first printed in 1568, cf. reprint 1953; Žepić 1874: 3-75). There are only three attestations of *pri-*, as in Lucić limited

to the verb *pri*ti (1605, GL 2x), contrasting with 52x *do-* in the following verbs: 30x *doj*ti (79, 157, 167, 224, 277, 544, 685, 866, 867, 955, 962, 1072, 1102, 1301, 1467, 1469, 1524, 1641, MP1 3x, GL 4x, HB 1x, MV 4x), 8x *dohod*iti (186, 343, 426, 771, 954, 1264, 1684, MV 1x). 6x *donest*i/*donit*i (313, 363, 493, 742, 825, 1185), 1x *donos*iti (13), 4x *dovest*i (61, 1616, MP1 1x, MV 1x), 1x *dovod*iti [636] (1437), 1x *dovoz*iti (1137), 1x *doj*drismo (163), 1x *dobeg*la (sic, 705, in one of the two famous *bugarš*tice). I have not included *dote*ći, which in Hektorović seems to mean “obtain”.⁸

(4) Petar Zoranić (Nin and/or Zadar, born probably in 1508, year of death unknown). In the prose of *Planine* (written in 1536, first printed in 1569; Štefanić 1942: 23-190) *do-* is much more frequent than *pri-*: 28x *pri*ti, 1x *prinest*i (111), 1x *privest*i (94), 3x *prilet*iti (91 2x, 184), 1x *pripliv*ati (42); all attestations of *pri*broditi ‘ferry across’ (42, 43, 161, 167) and at least one of *pri*ti (175) contain the reflex of **prě-*. There are some 85 instances of *do-*: 65x *doj*ti, 4x *dohod*iti (117, 153, 176, 190), 1x *došast*je (177), 1x *donit*i (86), 3x *donaš*ati (97, 110, 169), 11x *dovest*i (30, 44, 55, 88 2x, 94 2x, 107, 173, 175, 176). The distribution of *pri-* and *do-* in verse also points to a predilection for *do-*. True, *pri*ti occurs six times, but as many as four of these attestations are motivated by rhyme (130, 132, 135, 183). On the other hand, of the four examples of *doj*ti there is only one that is motivated by rhyme (77) and there is one attestation each of *dohod*iti (64), *donit*i (146), *dovest*i (147).

(5) Barne Karnarutić (Zadar, born probably between 1515 and 1520, died 1573).

(a) *Vazetje Sigeta grada* (written between 1566 and 1573, printed in 1584; Matić 1968: 9-39): 4x *pri*ti (46, 364, 832, 1004); 22x *doj*ti, 1x *dohod*iti (271). Two of the examples of *pri*ti (46, 364) can be replaced with corresponding forms of *doj*ti without damaging the rhyme.

(b) *Izvršita ljubav i napokom nemila i nesrićna smart Pirama i Tižbe* (date of composition unknown, printed in 1586, Moguš 1976: 99-135). 9x or 10x *pri-*, distributed as follows: 7x *pri*ti, 1x *pri*haja (12), 1x *prini*ti (900), 1x *pri*bignuti (1218; this could be an attestation of **prě-*); 18x *do-*: 14x *doj*ti, 1x *dohod*iti (688), 1x *donit*i (897), 1x *dovest*i (586). Three or four of the attestations of *pri*ti (258, 1151, 1177, probably also 1094) can be easily replaced with corresponding forms of *doj*ti.

(6) Juraj Baraković (Zadar, 1548-1628). Since I have not yet managed to examine all of Baraković’s writings, attention will be limited to the first eleven books of his principal work: *Vila Slovinka* (date of composition unknown, first printed in 1614, Budmani and Valjavac 1889: 1-246; the first eleven books correspond to pp. [637] 1-169 of the edition). I have found 38 instances of *pri*ti; in more than half of the cases replacement with a corresponding form of *doj*ti would not have ruined a rhyme (4, 23,

⁸ Numbers refer to the corresponding verses of *Ribanje i ribarsko prigovaranje*. Abbreviations refer to the “razlike stvari ine”, as follows: MP1: first letter to Mikša Pelegrinović (35a-37a, Žepić 53-55); MP2: second letter to Mikša Pelegrinović (37a-37b); GL: letter to Gracioza Lovrinčeva (38b-42a, Žepić 55-61); FH: epitaph of Frane Hektorović (42b-43a, Žepić 61-62); HB: letter to Hieronim Bartučević (44a-45a, Žepić 63-64); MV: letter to Mavro Vetranović (45b-48b, Žepić 65-69).

39, 41, 42, 46 2x, 50, 82, 100 2x, 106, 120, 121, 123, 125, 135, 136, 137, 158 2x, 159 2x); other examples of *pri-* are rare: 1x *prihoditi* (151, the sense is ‘approach’), 1x *prinesti* (134), 1x *privoditi* (19), 1x *pripeljati* (91). There are several likely examples of **prě-*, e.g. the attestation of *privez-* in the following passage:

Od zore do noći ni sedi ni lezi,
potežuć sve moći putnike uprezi,
i baše i bezi i Turci ostali
prik vode *privezi*, da se car ne hvali. (48)⁹

There are fifty attestations of *do-* (not counting 1x *došastje*), ten of which involve *dojti* (11, 17, 23, 47, 53, 109, 132, 143, 145, 155); in all but one of these cases (155) replacement with a corresponding form of *pri-* would yield acceptable verse. Further examples of *do-*: 1x *došastje*, 12x *dohoditi*, 15x *donesti/doniti*, 4x *donositi*, 2x *dovesti*, 2x *dovoditi*, 1x *dopeljati*, 2x *dovez-*, 1x *dobignuti*, 1x *doletiti*.

(7) In the prose comedies from Hvar *pri-* is hardly used. Martin Benetević’s *Hvarkinja* (Karlić 1916: 250-327) does not contain a single instance of *pri-*, as against more than a hundred attestations of *do-*: 85x *dojti*, 8x *donesti*, 9x *dovesti*, 5x *dopeljati*, 1x *dobignuti*. In the anonymous *Komedija od Raskota* (Fancev 1932b: 101-123) there are four instances of *pri-* (2a, 9b, 13b, 27b) as against 46 attestations of *dojti* and one each of *dohojati* and *doniti*.

In the brief *Valentiano Vocabulary* of 1527 (Petr 1973: 47-52 = 52-53; also in Putanec 1979: 112-127 = 128-129) we find three or four attestations of *pri-* and one of *dojti*: inf. *pri-* (3va, 3x), probably a form of the *l*-participle (4rb; the text is corrupt); *l*-participle *došlo* (4ra).

8. Some patterns.

(1) There are certain parallels between the textual distribution of *iti* and that of *do-*. The parallels are clearest in the case of the longest texts. The *Žića svetih otaca*, the *Zadarski Lekcionar* and the *Psalmi Davidovi fra Luke Bračanina*, in which *iti* does not occur, admit *do-* either not at all (*Žića svetih otaca*) or very sparingly (*Zadarski Lekcionar*: 6x *do-* vs. 225x *pri-*; *Psalmi Davidovi*: 3x *do-* vs. 80x *pri-*). The *Bernardinov Lekcionar* and the *Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga*, on the other hand, readily admit both *iti* and *do-*. The other texts are too short to be useful because *iti* is not very frequent even in those texts where it is not completely avoided: in the *Bernardinov Lekcionar* the verb appears on average every fifteen pages; in the *Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga* we find it every four or five pages; consequently the absence of *iti* from a fourteen-page saint’s life like the *Život sv. Vincenca* (in which *do-* predominates) does not mean that its author would not have used it, had the occasion arisen. The presence of *iti* in the *Vidinja Tondalova*, which seems to avoid *do-*, deviates from the general pattern.

⁹ Cf. also *priticati put* (9) and the expression *priteći rič* (117, 119) ‘interrupt’.

(2) In the miscellanies the distribution of *pri-* and *do-* can be quite different in different texts. This is what one expects if one assumes that miscellanies contain material written in different periods by different people, but it creates difficulties for those who like to attribute all texts of a given miscellany to a single author, as has been done most notably in the case of the *Firentinski zbornik*. There are two important cases:

(a) The *Firentinski zbornik* contains one text that is extremely sparing in its use of *do-* (*Život sv. Jerolima*), but also texts that almost seem to avoid *pri-* (*Život sv. Vincenca*, the homiletic texts). It is striking that all texts that appear both in the *Firentinski zbornik* and in other sources have more instances of *do-* in the *Firentinski zbornik* than elsewhere: the *Život sv. Jerolima* has once *dopeljati* in a passage where JAZU Ib127 has *pripeljati*; the *Život sv. Ivana Krstitelja* has two examples of *dojti* in passages where Lucić's *Vrtal* has *priiti*. In those sections of the *Život sv. Ivana Krstitelja* that are found in the *Firentinski zbornik* only, *do-* is much more frequent than in the sections that are common to both manuscripts.

(b) Lucić's *Vrtal*. In the *Vidinja Tondalova* and the *Život sv. Ivana Krstitelja pri-* predominates (21/0 and 32/4 respectively). The *Život sv. Ivana Trogirskoga*, on the other hand, *pri-* is rare: 4/22.

(3) There is a clear difference between writers from Hvar and from Zadar as to the use of *pri-*. *Priiti* is the only compound with *pri-* that occurs in Lucić's and Hektorović's works, where it is [639] apparently limited to cases in which *dojti* would have been impossible for reasons of rhyme or would have been otherwise unacceptable; Benetević's *Hvarkinja* is the only text of any length that does not contain a single instance of *pri-*. Zoranić, Karnarutić and Baraković, on the other hand, though clearly preferring *do-*, do not avoid *pri-* as consistently as writers from Hvar do. It is reasonable to assume that this is connected with the fact that Zadar is much closer to the isogloss than Hvar.

(4) In geographical terms the appearance of *do-* and its final victory over *pri-* can be translated as a shift in the "dialectal basis" of Classical Čakavian: early texts (in particular the *Žića svetih otaca*, the *Zadarski Lekcionar* and the language of the scribes of the *Rapska pjesmarica*) seem to have been closer to the dialects spoken in the Quarnero area (in particular the i/e-kavian dialects of Krk, Rab and the Hrvatsko Primorje), whereas later texts reflect the types of Čakavian spoken in Dalmatia. We find a similar pattern in several other types of variation:

(a) The replacement of the locative singular *-i* (*potoci*, *misti*) with *-u* (*potoku*, *mistu*). In the dialects a locative singular ending reflecting **-ě* is common to the north and northeast of a line running from Susak to Novi. Elsewhere it is completely unknown.

(b) A more or less consistently i/e-kavian reflex of the **ě* is limited to the earliest texts. The *Žića svetih otaca* is as consistently i/e-kavian as any modern spoken dialect; several other early texts which are not consistently i/e-kavian come close nevertheless, e.g. the *Zadarski Lekcionar* or the *Rapska pjesmarica*. To my know-

ledge the most recent text to reflect clearly an i/e-kavian system is the *Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga* of 1513.

- (c) Absence of *h-* in *oće* is normal in a number of older texts (*Žića svetih otaca, Zadarski Lekcionar, Rapska pjesmarica*), but uncommon later.

9. Entering: *ulisti/vlisti* versus *uniti/vniti*

Not all variation found in Classical Čakavian displays the same patterns as the choice between *pri-* and *do-*. As an example I would like to discuss very briefly the equivalent of modern Serbo-Croat *ući* ‘enter’. The normal equivalent is not a compound of *iti*, |640| but of *listi*: *ulisti* or *vlisti*. The verb *ulisti/vlisti* is ubiquitous throughout Classical Čakavian and it would be pointless to list examples.

There is, however, a rare synonym of *ulisti/vlisti* which is restricted to a few texts: *uniti/vniti*.

It is only in the *Žića svetih otaca* that *vniti* is the most frequent equivalent of ‘enter’. I have found 25 examples (14b, 15b, 18a, 24a, 34b, 46b 3x, 47b, 49b, 63b, 64a, 66a 2x, 67a, 68b, 73a, 100a 2x, 103a, 107b, 110a, 111a, 119a, 130b), not counting two quite unique forms that look like imperfects of derived imperfectives of *vniti*, built on a stem **vnid-*: *fniyeuase* (15a, /vnijevaše/); *fniyase* (18b, /vnijaše/). But the normal Classical Čakavian form *vlisti* is by no means avoided: there are at least nine examples (47a, 47b, 53a, 61a 2x, 63a, 77b, 78b, 113b).

In the *Zadarski Lekcionar* the verb *uniti/vniti* occurs twice. The two attestations occur closely together in two very similar passages (Luke 22, 40 and 46 respectively): *Molite da ne unvidete u napast* ‘Pray that ye enter not into temptation’ and *Ustanite i molite, da ne unidete u napast* ‘rise and pray, lest ye enter into temptation’. There are 41 attestations of *ulisti* (9b, 13a, 15a, 19a, 20a, 26b, 27a, 33a, 41a, 41b, 42a 2x, 46b 2x, 48b, 49b, 51a 2x, 52b, 54b, 57a, 57b, 58a, 59a, 60a, 60b, 61a, 63b, 64a 2x, 67a, 67b 2x, 74a 2x, 75b, 84a, 88a 2x, 92a, 112a), not counting 9 examples of *ulaziti* (16a, 41a, 46a, 54b 2x, 84a, 89a, 108a 2x). On the basis of these examples one might be inclined to think that *uniti/vniti* is obligatory in the expression *uniti/vniti u napast*, but it is not even that, cf. the corresponding passage as related by Matthew (26: 41): *Bdite i molite se, da ne ulizete u napast*. ‘Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation’.

Otherwise the verb *uniti/vniti* is attested only in Marulić’s *Judita*, not counting a passage that is probably dependent on *Judita* and an indirect attestation in a poem that may very well be by Marulić. In the third Book of *Judita* there are two examples of the present tense *unide* (29, 120) and one of the aorist, which is also *unide* (173). In the fifth Book there is an example of the past gerund *unid*, a form that is quite unique (the *Žića svetih otaca* has *vnišad* or – once – *vnišadši*, 47b, 66a, 73a, 103a, 111a, 130v) and looks as if it was made up by Marulić for the occasion: |641|

Postilja je bila na sridu komori,
mehka, čista, bila, s pisani zastori.
Na njoj se obori Oloferne *unid*,
zaspa većma gori nego morski medvid;

speći ga tako vid Judit, Abri svojoj
 “Poj polako naprid,” reče, “na vratih stoj!” (V: 195-200).

Karnarutić has one example of *unide* in *Piram i Tižba*, rhyming as follows: *pride/izide/obide/unide* (1079). One is immediately reminded of Karnarutić’s use of the form *šad* in the same poem.

Alongside these examples there is an indirect attestation of *uniti/vniti* in the poem “Slavić” (Fancev 1933: 46-53). In the second part of the fifty-second strophe we find the present tense *ulize* rhyming with *vide en slide* as follows:

Ki kada te na oltar vide
 milost tvoja k njim *ulize*,
 dobrovoljno tebe slide,
 ča ti veliš, čineć toj.

It is obvious that *ulize* cannot be correct and Fancev rightly points out in a footnote (52) that the original text must have had **unide*. To some extent the presence of *uniti* in “Slavić” confirms the attribution of the poem to Marulić. However, in several respects its language differs from that of those texts we know to be authentic:

- (1) The poem contains ijekavian forms: *rieč* (28), *vrieme* 8x (6 2x, 7, 10 2x, 33, 58 2x). This is quite unlike anything in Classical Čakavian.
- (2) The forms *tuko* (47) and *tuke* (53) ‘toliko’, ‘tolike’ have no parallels in Marulić. Use of the equivalent forms *toko* and *toke* (which are usual in Marulić) would not have made any difference to the rhyme. Otherwise the use of forms like *tuko* (as opposed to *toliko* or *toko*) seems to be limited to texts with a northern background (including Zadar).

The textual distribution of *vniti/uniti* is quite different from that of, say, *pri-*: it is frequent in the most archaic Classical Čakavian text (*Žića svetih otaca*), is on its way to extinction in the *Zadarski Lekcionar*, but was resurrected by Marulić, whose love of slightly off-beat language lies at the origin of so many of the striking effects of *Judita*.

Leiden University

References

- Badalić, Josip
 1957 “Marulićevi hrvatski autografi u arhivu Jugoslavenske akademije”, *Filologija* 1, 37-57.
- Belić, Aleksandar
 1909 “Zamětki po čakavskim govoram”, *Izvěstija Otdělenija ruskago jazyka i slovesnosti* 14/2, 181-266.
- Budmani, P. and M. Valjavac
 1889 *Djela Jurja Barakovića*, Zagreb (= *Stari pisci hrvatski* 17).
- Daničić, Đuro
 1872 “Tondal”, *Starine JAZU* 4, 110-118.
- Fancev, Franjo
 1932a “Građa za povijest hrvatske crkvene drame”, *Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 11, 11-38.

- 1932b "Komediya od Raskota': Jelšanska seljačka komediya iz kraja 16 stoljeća", *Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 11, 95-123.
- 1933 "Nova poezija Splitsanina Marka Marulića. Prilog za reviziju bibliografije njegovih hrvatskih dijela", *Rad JAZU* 245, 1-72.
- 1934 *Vatikanski hrvatski molitvenik i Dubrovački psaltir, dva latinicom pisana spomenika hrvatske proze 14 i 15 vijeka*, Zagreb (= *Djela JAZU* 31).
- 1938 "Dvije poslanice Marka Pecinića (Marulića) benediktinki Katarini Obirtića", *Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 13, 187-192.
- Fisković, Cvito
1953 "Rapska pjesmarica iz druge polovice XV. stoljeća", *Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 24, 25-71.
- Franičević, Marin
1968 *Hanibal Lucić, Petar Hektorović*, Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska/Zora (= *Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti* 7).
- Glavan, Vjenceslav
1928-29 "Kongruencija u jeziku starih čakavskih pisaca", *Južnoslovenski filolog* 7, 111-159.
- Gligo, Vedran and Hrvoje Morović
1977 *Legende i kronike*, Split: Čakavski sabor (= *Splitski književni krug: svjedočanstva* 2).
- Hamm, Josip
1978 *Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga u prijevodu iz godine 1513.*, Zagreb (= *Stari pisci hrvatski* 38).
- Hamm, Josip, Mate Hraste and Petar Guberina
1956 "Govor otoka Suska", *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1, 7-213.
- Houtzagers, H.P.
1985 *The Čakavian Dialect of Orlec on the Island of Cres*, Amsterdam: Rodopi (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 5).
- Hraste, Mate
1950 "Crstice o Marulićevoj čakavštini", in: J. Badalić and Nikola Majnarić (eds.), *Zbornik u proslavu petstogodišnjice rođenja Marka Marulića*, Zagreb (= *Djela JAZU* 39), 245-277.
- Ivanišević, Milan
1977 "Život svetoga Ivana Trogirskoga", in: Gligo & Morović (1977), 59-121.
- Ivšić, Stjepan
1939 "Nekoliko napomena uz starohrvatski tekst 'Žića sv. otaca'", *Starine JAZU* 40, 225-251.
- Jagić, V.
1869 "Ogledi stare hrvatske proze", *Starine JAZU* 1, 216-236.
- Karlić, Petar
1916 "Martin Benetević: Hvarinja", *Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 8, 247-327.
1917 *Psalmi Davidovi fra Luke Bračanina*. Zagreb (= *Djela JAZU* 27).
- Klaić, Bratoljub
1968 "Jezik Hanibala Lucića i Petra Hektorovića: prilog historijskoj gramatici hrvatskog jezika", in: Franičević (1968), 267-324.
- Kukuljević Sakcinski, Ivan
1869 *Pjesme Marka Marulića*, Zagreb: JAZU (= *Stari pisci hrvatski* 1).
- Malić, Dragica
1973 "Šibenska molitva (filološka monografija)", *Rasprave Instituta za jezik* 2, 81-190.
1977 "Red i zakon' zadarskih dominikanki iz 1345. godine (Prikaz jezika najstarijega hrvatskog latiničkog spomenika)", *Rasprave Instituta za jezik* 3, 59-128.
- Maretić, T.
1885 *Lekcionarij Bernardina Splitsanina po prvom izdanju od god. 1495.*, Zagreb (= *Djela JAZU* 5).
- Matić, T.
1968 "Karnarutićevo Vazetje Sigeta grada", *Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 29, 5-39.

- Melich János
1903 "Misekönyv a XIV. századból", *Magyar könyvszemle* 9, 36-64.
- Menčík, F.
1881 "Zwei dalmatinische Kirchenlieder", *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 5, 267-274.
- Mladenović, Aleksandar
1957 "Fonetske i morfološke osobine Marulićevog jezika", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 2, 89-144.
1958 "Konsonantska grupa čr- u čakavskim spomenicima Dalmacije XV i XVI veka", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 3, 127-138.
1959 "Grafija i jezik dalmatinskih čakavskih rukopisa u arhivu Jugoslavenske akademije", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 4, 117-150.
1960 "O jeziku Marulićevih poslanica", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 5, 129-142.
1961-62 "Prilog proučavanju čakavskih rukopisa iz Dalmacije: grafija i ortografija Suzane", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 4-5, 211-216.
1964 "Prilog proučavanju čakavskih rukopisa iz Dalmacije (II): grafija i ortografija 'Života sv. Jeronima'", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 7, 103-107.
1964-65 "Jezik 'Života svetog Jeronima'", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 8, 129-158.
1966a "Prilog proučavanju čakavskih rukopisa iz Dalmacije (III): grafija i ortografija 'Života sv. Katarine'", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 7, 103-107.
1966b "Osobine jezika 'Života sv. Katarine'", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 9, 127-156.
1968 *Jezik Petra Hektorovića*, Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Moguš, Milan
1976 "Karnarutićevi stihovi o Piramu i Tižbi", *Čakavska Rič* 6/1, 99-135.
- Morović, Hrvoje
1977 "Istorija svetoga Dujma i Staša", in: Gligo and Morović (1977), 13-57.
- Petr, Jan
1973 "Italsko-čakavská jazyková příručka z r. 1527", *Slavia* 42/1, 44-67.
- Premuda, Vinko
1939 "Starohrvatski latinički rukopis 'Žića sv. otaca'", *Starine JAZU*, 40, 103-220.
- Putanec, Valentin
1979 "Talijansko-hrvatski i hrvatsko-talijanski rječnik Petra Lupisa Valentiana (Ankona, 1527)", *Filologija* 9, 101-138.
- Rešetar, M.
1894 *Zadarski i Ranjinin lekcionar*, Zagreb (= *Djela JAZU* 13),
1898a/b "Primorski lekcionari XV. vijeka", (a) *Rad JAZU* 134, 80-160, (b) *Rad JAZU* 136, 97-199.
- Ružičić, G.S.
1930-31 "Jezik Petra Zoranića", *Južnoslovenski filolog* 9, 1930, 1-91; 10, 1931, 1-91.
- Skok, Petar
1950 "O stilu Marulićeve Judite", in: J. Badalić and Nikola Majnarić (eds.), *Zbornik u proslavu petstogodišnjice rođenja Marka Marulića*, Zagreb (= *Djela JAZU* 39), 165-241.
- Štefanić, Vjekoslav
1942 *Petar Zoranić: Planine*, Zagreb: Hrvatski izdavački bibliografski zavod.
- Verdiani, Carlo
1973 *O Marulićevu autorstvu Firentinskoga hrvatskog zbornika iz XV stoljeća*, Split: Čakavski sabor/Katedra za književnost i kulturu.
- Vermeer, Willem
1980 "Die Konjugation in der nordwestčakavischen Mundart Omišalj", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 1, 439-472.

- forthc. "Glagol *iti* u južnočakavskom književnom jeziku Mletačke Dalmacije", to appear in *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku*.
- Vízkelety, A. and L. Hadrovics
1984 "Ein altkroatisches Passionslied aus dem 14. Jahrhundert", *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 30, 3-37.
- Wagner, Zdzisław
1970 *Ze studjów nad językiem Petra Hektorowicia*, Wrocław etc. (= *Prace Komisji słowianoznawstwa* 22).
- Žepić, Seb.
1874 *Pjesme Petra Hektorovića i Hanibala Lucića*, Zagreb: JAZU (= *Stari pisci hrvatski* 6).