

ACCENTUATION IN A FEW DIALECTS OF THE ISLAND OF CRES

H.P. HOUTZAGERS

1. The number and nature of accentual oppositions in the čakavian dialects of Cres have always been problematic to field-workers. This is apparent from all publications from 1895 (Milčetić) onward. Some authors deal explicitly with tone and quantity in these dialects, but come up with unsatisfactory solutions. Others do not mention the problem, but judging from their inconsistent notations it is unlikely that they solved it.

In this paper I shall briefly summarize the opinions and implicit points of departure of various authors on the matter. After that, I shall present a few conclusions drawn on the basis of my own fieldwork in Orlec. Since 1980 I have been working at a description of the dialect of Orlec under the supervision of Professor F.H.H. Kortlandt of the University of Leyden. This description is planned to appear in 1983¹.

2.1. Milčetić (1895) was not certain "ima li čakavština dva ili tri naglaska" (p.97). In the notes which he made in the course of his work on the Quarnero Islands, however, he finds "sada 2, sada 3, katkada i sva 4 Vukova znaka" (p.98) and decides to replace every $\grave{}$ by $\`$ and every $\acute{}$ by $\hat{}$.

Since he admits that he does not remember "što mi je kada koji akcenat značio" (p.98), it seems that one can rely on his accentuation only as far as the place of the word stress is concerned.

2.2. From 1898 till 1949 Bortulin wrote six contributions on folklore and everyday life in Beli for the "Zbornik za Narodni život i Običaje". Beli is the largest village of the "Tramuntana", the northern part of the island (north of the town). Most of Bortulin's publications are in the local dialect, but only two are accented (1898 and 1903). In the text of 1903 the accentuation is more or less consistent. If this text is considered in isolation from the earlier one, it gives a clearer idea of the accentual system of a Cres dialect than all that has been published on the subject since. It was most surprising for me to find this text after my work in Orlec, because unlike all other publications it almost completely agrees with the accentuation that I found there (from my visits to Beli I got a strong impression that the accentual system in Beli is exactly the same as in Orlec).

Bortulin 1903 uses four symbols for indicating the accent: ` , ˘ , ˆ , and ˙ . The distribution of ˘ and ˙ is almost complementary: except for three instances, ˘ is used only in final syllables. Probably Bortulin's use of both ` and ˘ is due to the custom of his day to accent any dialect with Vuk's four signs, and does not indicate a tone distinction on short vowels.

Both ` and ˘ occur in cases where one expects a short vowel on historical grounds, ˆ where one expects a long falling vowel, ˙ where one expects either a long rising or a short vowel. Examples:

našli, jũtro, pustili, mãšit; glãvu (acc.sing.), *strãha, blãgo* "cattle", *judi* "people" (nom.plur.); *čũva, crãkvica; Crãsu* (loc.sing.), *Bãlon* (id.), *dãset, kjĩn* "wedge", *skopãl, govõre, prestrãšit*.

Examples as *Crãsu, govõre* and *prestrãšit* point to lengthening of short *e, o*, and *a* (not from a jer, cf. *mãšit*) in stressed non-final syllables. As we shall see later on (par.2.4. and 3.4.), these conditions for lengthening agree with Belič's rule for the dialect of Cres and with the state of affairs in Orlec. In Cres and Orlec the restriction "not from a jer" applies to *e*, because in the central part of the island a short jer is reflected *e* (the Tramuntana and the southern part have *a*), e.g. *mãšit* "read mass" (Orlec), cf. Bortulin's example *mãšit*.

The examples *kjĩn* and *skopãl* point to lengthening before tautosyllabic resonants, which has also taken place in Orlec (cf. par.3.5.).

There are three kinds of inconsistent or otherwise questionable notations in this text, some of which may of course be due to printer's errors:

- the accentuation of final syllables is sometimes doubtful: *poslã* (cf. *šcapã*), *pokazãl* (cf. *skopãl*).
- the expected lengthening is not indicated in the case of *gãda* (two occurrences). It is possible that this form is an exception to the rule.
- two of the three forms that are found with posttonic length occur also without it: *jũdĩ/jũdi* "people", (gen.plur.), *blãgõ/blãgo* "cattle", *prẽjã* "first, previously". There are no indications of pretonic length; according to my experience distinctive pretonic or posttonic length exists neither in Orlec nor in Beli.

In Bortulin's text of 1898 (not completely accented²) there are many more examples of short

e, o, and a (not from a jer) in stressed non-final syllables. Moreover, ˘ occurs frequently in non-final syllables and the sign ˆ is used. Examples: *detètu* (p.267), *nègdere* (p.266; cf. *nègda* (1903:134)), *lârgo* "far" (p.266; cf. *lârgo* (1903:134)), *nevêru* (acc. sing.; p.267), *želî* (p.266).

In my opinion, the only way to get a more or less coherent picture is to isolate the text of 1903, and as we shall see this picture is probably quite close to the facts.

2.3. In 1909 Tentor published a description of the dialect of the town of Cres (his native dialect). On the accentual system he writes:

"In unserem Dialekte haben wir zwei fallende und einen steigenden Akzent. Die zwei fallenden entsprechen den štok. ..., während der dritte ein eigener ist, weil dieser steigende Akzent auf einer Mittellänge zu stehen kommt, den wir mit ˆ bezeichnen werden" (p.160).

He seems to refer to this "third accent" when he writes:

"... weil es schwer ist, in diesem Dialekte den Akzent (vielleicht besser seine Qualität) zu bestimmen, da man oft einen "farblosen" Akzent zu hören meint, den ich bald als steigend, bald als fallend gehört habe. Das wird wohl auch darum sein, weil in diesen Fällen eine Mittellänge ist und es daher schwer ist, den Akzent zu fixieren, da man gewöhnt ist, überall mit den vier štok. (Vukschen) Zeichen zu operieren" (p.159).

Later on, he speaks of "sogar vier Akzente (wenn auch nicht die Vuk'schen)" (p.204).

Tentor chooses for a "simplified" accentual notation:

"Während der Korrektur wurde, um die schwierige Bezeichnung unserer Betonung bei der schwachen Erforschung dieses Gebietes zu vereinfachen, alles auf ˘ und ˆ herabgesetzt" (p.204)³.

Yet he gives a few examples of his "third accent", such as *kráva*, *vrána*, *bôka* (gen.sing.), and the gen. plur. forms *vlás*, *rúk*, *gláv*, *dúš*, and *dán* (pp.160-161). These forms point in the same direction as Bortulin's material from Beli: the long rising vowels reflect partly old short vowels and partly old long rising ones. Pretonic and posttonic lengths have all been lost according to Tentor.

In all later publications it can be seen that the authors have found difficulty in deciding whether a vowel is rising or falling and, in most cases, if it is long or short. The accentual system is often called "unstable" (cf. Beliç 1909:176) or "confused" (cf. Hraste 1954:177).

2.4. Beliç (1909) sharply criticizes Tentor's "simplified" notation and especially the reason he had for it:

"jeżeli wszyscy się będą na to odwoływać- to jakim sposobem dojdzie się wogóle do dalszego materiału, do prawdziwego zbadania jakiego obszaru?" (p.176).

However reasonable Beliç's criticism may sound, his own account of the Cres facts - he visited the town himself - is not very illuminating either:

"Przekonałem się, że między ˆ a ˘ w gwarze tej niema takiej różnicy, jaka się znajduje w gwarach, które dobrze zachowują (np. winodolska) wszystkie trzy akcenty czakawskie, bo w obu akcentach głos opada i oba przedstawiają jakiś rodzaj ˘. Niekiedy zdaje się, że ˘, który powstał z ˆ, jest dłuższy i wyrazistszy od starego ˘, ale to nie jest pewną wskazówką, według której możnaby określić zachodzącą między nimi różnicę, bo ta różnica (większa lub mniejsza długość) zupełnie się gubi wobec tempa mowy i akcentu wyrazowego w zdaniu. Oto dlaczego Tentor nie mógł jej określić; a wobec tego gwarę tę zaliczyć trzeba do tych djalektów czakawskich, które mają tylko dwa akcenty: ˘ i ˘" (p.176).

Thus, although in the dialect we have only ˘ and ˘,

there seem to be two kinds of $\hat{}$, one of which originated from $\acute{}$.

Belić then observes that many of the originally short vowels have been lengthened and gives a rule which applies in all but a few cases: short *a* and *o*, and short *e* that did not originate from a jer are lengthened in stressed non-final syllables (p.177). About the result of this lengthening he states:

"Wzdłużenie, o którym się wyżej mówiło, nie przedstawia prawdziwego $\hat{}$. Często jest ten akcent tylko trochę dłuższy od zwykłego $\grave{}$, a często znów, w zależności od akcentu zdaniowego lub emfaticznego, jest podobny raczej do $\acute{}$ niż do $\hat{}$; niekiedy znów przedstawia tylko słabo akcentowaną długość czy półdługość" (p.178).

This leaves us with either a third $\hat{}$ or something between $\grave{}$, $\hat{}$, and $\acute{}$.

In Orlec⁴, according to Belić, "tego wzdłużania jest o wiele mniej. Zapisałem w nim: *hòdeč, jãšmika, po lðkvah ...*" (p.178). He gives about 20 word forms, all of them with *a*, *o*, and *e* (not from a jer) in stressed non-final syllables and all of them marked with $\grave{}$ ⁵.

2.5. Ivšić's account of what he heard in Cres is rather different (1911:141):

"...sam...opažao neki "poludugi" akcenat, koji dolazi često i mjesto akcenta $\hat{}$ i $\grave{}$, na pr.: *vrāta* (mj. *vrāta*), *crēkva* (mj. *crēkva*), *glāvu* (mj. *glāvu*), *tēlo* (mj. *tēlo*), *sīla* (mj. *sīla*), *mōre* (mj. *mōre* ili *mōre*), *Bōga* (mj. *Bōga*), *dōma* (mj. *dōma*), *pōčel* (mj. *pōčeo*) i dr."

It is surprising that he continues: "To se moje opažanje slaže u glavnom s onim, što je *A. Belić ... rekao...*" (original italics). It is true that both Tentor and Belić mention some kind of "poludugi akcenat", but Ivšić does not even give any

restriction as to where it may occur. From his examples - he gives no example of a word where he did *not* hear a "poludugi akcenat" - one gets the impression that Ivšić found it difficult to distinguish tones and quantities in Cres and tended to hear every stressed vowel as "half-long". 2.6. Hraste, who was on the island in 1952 and visited all villages and the town within thirteen days, reports to have found a "troakcenatski sistem ($\hat{\hat{\hat{}}}$)" (1954:177). However, in addition he uses the symbol $\hat{}$, the status of which in the system remains unclear. His examples, which are few and sometimes inconsistent, yield only two conclusions: first, that Hraste did not solve the problem, and second, that there seem to be a lot of lengthened vowels, which was not new.

In Hraste's later publication "Izvjestaj o dijalektološkom istraživanju u Lubenicama na otoku Cresu..." (1956), the only thing he tells about Lubenice is that he has been there.

2.7. Hamm, Hraste and Guberina (1956) give a brief survey of the dialects of Cres and Lošinj and of the differences between them (pp.44-51). Although it contains a few interesting observations, the accentuation is unreliable. The authors obviously made an effort to distinguish between short, long rising, and long falling vowels, but in case of doubt marked every long vowel with $\hat{}$, e.g. *hodīl je do Bēloga do Crēsa* (p.46)⁶.

Apparently Hraste's earlier statement (1954:177) "Dužine ispred i iza akcenta posve su se izgubile" does not preclude such forms as *kēbāl* "tub" (gen. plur.; attested in Orlec) and *pojūbīt* "kiss" (attested at several places).

2.8. The distinction between long rising and long falling vowels was also a problem to the authors of "Toponimika zapadne Istre, Cresa i Lošinja" (Jurišić (Ed.) 1956), who often disagree in this respect:

"Vrlo je česta pojava, da isti ispitanik istu riječ izgovara sad s jednom intonacijom i kvantitetom, sad s drugom. Kao negativan faktor mora se još uzeti u račun i osobni ugođaj istraživačev. Tako na pr. Žuklić u govorima otoka Lošinja (i Cresa i Suska) i Jelenović u nekim istarskim govorima bilježe silaznu intonaciju na riječima, na kojima sam ja bilježio čakavski akut. Možda to znači ili da sam je udešen, recimo, na hiperakutizam ili oni na hipoakutizam" (p.170).

In Jurišić's other publication of 1956 "Opažanja..." only the informants are held responsible for inconsistencies:

"Nedosljednosti i protuslovlja akcenatske, fonetičke i morfološke naravi potječu od različitog izgovora pojedinih ispitanika u istome mjestu" (p.396).

In my opinion the explanation in "Toponimika...", which takes into account the predispositions of the field-worker, is much more plausible.

3.1. In 1980 I spent three months on the island gathering dialect material from Orlec. The local people were most cooperative and I am particularly grateful to my two main informants, Gašpica Deželić and Franica Benvin, for their time and patience. The material consists of approximately sixty hours of tape-recorded conversation. Both main informants are about seventy years old.

3.2. From the beginning the accentual system of the dialect was puzzling. The only thing which was

clear from the start was the existence of a quantitative opposition: some vowels were decidedly short, others were not and therefore I considered them long. The trouble with these long vowels was that they varied considerably in length: from "almost short" to decidedly long. It was not clear whether this was due to free variation or to some kind of tonal or quantitative opposition, or even a combination of the two. This stage of the work was most instructive because it showed how very difficult it is not to allow one's perception of the acoustic facts to be influenced by what one expects to hear on historical grounds. For example, since many originally short vowels were lengthened in the dialect, one tends to attach greater importance to differences between the results of this lengthening and the originally long vowels than to the differences between the attestations of one and the same word form.

In order to determine whether long vowels showed any opposition among themselves, it was necessary first to delimit the dispersion field of each vowel phoneme separately. To that end I assembled a special tape from the original recordings: this tape consisted of sequences of different realizations of one word form at a time, e.g. thirty realizations of *ofce* "sheep", then thirty realizations of *nosi* "he/she carries", and so on.

This turned out to be very illuminating and led to the following conclusions: 1. The long vowels show much free variation with respect to duration, but not to such an extent that they can be confused with the phonologically short vowels. 2. The dialect has tones: long vowels can be falling or rising

marked $\hat{\ }$ and $\tilde{\ }$). The phonetic characteristic of a falling vowel is the contrast between its beginning and the remainder of its course: soon after the beginning the pitch and loudness drop to a lower level. The characteristic of a rising vowel is the absence of this contrast: the same level of pitch and loudness for the whole duration of the vowel⁷. Of course these "levels of pitch and loudness" depend on other variables as well and the actual acoustic forms of the features "rising" and "falling" vary greatly according to the intonation of the sentence.

3.3. The vowel system is as follows:

stressed		unstressed	
ũ ũ ũ	ĩ ĩ ĩ	u	i
õ õ õ	ě ě ě	o	e
ã ã ã		a	

õ, ô, ě, and ê have non-distinctive diphthongized variants.

3.4. There are two rules according to which originally short vowels have changed into long rising ones⁸:

1. Lengthening of short *a*, *o*, and *e* (not from a jer) in stressed non-final syllables. Examples: *brãta* (gen.sing. of *brăt*), *Crãsa* (gen.sing. of *Crës*), *uskõda* (gen.sing. of *uskõt* "doorstep"), *krãva*, *nõsi*, *dãlat*. Cf. *měška* with short *e* from a jer.
2. Lengthening of short vowels (*e* from a jer only in a few cases) followed by tautosyllabic *m*, *n*, *l*, *r*, *j*. Examples: *osehnũl* "dry out" (l-participle masc.); cf. fem.: *osehnũla*), *sĩr* (cf. gen.sing.: *sĩra*), *škõj*, *imẽl* (cf. fem.: *imẽla* because of rule 1), *kopãl* (cf. fem.: *kopãla* because of rule 1). With *e* from a jer: *pẽlni*, *vezẽn* "Easter", *kebẽl* "tub",

but: *tẽnki*, *sẽnce* "sun".

3.5. There are exception to both rules:

Rule 1:

- a. Comparatives formed with *-j-*: *bõji*, *mlãji*, *vẽci*.
- b. Infinitive stems of the type *lãjat*, *sẽnjat*, *vẽnjat*.
- c. The plural present endings: *-ẽmo*, *-ẽte*, *-ẽju*, e.g. *pletẽte*, *bodẽmo*, *recẽju*.
- d. A few isolated cases, e.g.: *põčnen/põšnen* "begin", and the other forms of this verb, e.g. *põšnela* (cf. *põbrala*); *ãjar* "sky, air"; *nadẽnen* "stuff".

Rule 2:

The exceptions are very few. Up to now only the following have been found:

- a. The ending *-ẽn* of the first person singular present, e.g. *pletẽn*, *bodẽn*.
- b. The adverb *fãjn* "considerably, rather well" and the adjective *fãjnski* "rather good, rather big".

University of Leyden

NOTES

¹ The idea to write a dialect grammar of Orlec came from Kortlandt and from W.R. Vermeer (also of Leyden). I am indebted to both Kortlandt and Vermeer for what I learned from them during the past few years. The work was made financially possible by a three years' subvention from the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO).

² Unfortunately the editor of the *Zbornik za Narodni Život i Običaje* 1898, Dr. Ant. Radič, had his own opinion about the correctness of Bortulin's accentuation: "... za naglas držim, da je sabirač dobro zabilježilo samo naglašeni slog, a nije i vrst naglasa. Na kraju riječi biležili svagda ` , a ja sam to mijeňao u ` . Mnoge sam naglase izostavio" (p.265, note 2). Of course it is not impossible that other things were changed as well.

³ In Tentor's later works too (1925-26 and 1950) only these two symbols are used.

- ⁴ In Belić's text this place-name is accented *Orlěc*, which may be a printer's error. As far as I know, the stress is consistently on the first syllable: *Ůrlec* (Orlec), *Ůrlac* (Beli).
- ⁵ I have attested all these forms with long rising vowels: *hōdeč*, *jāšmika*, *po lōkvah*, etc.
- ⁶ The word *do* also means "from". The indication of a falling vowel in *Crěsa* is probably incorrect: in Orlec and Beli I found nom./acc. *Crēs* and gen. *Crěsa* with a long rising e due to lengthening (cf. Bortulin 1903:134 *Crěsu*). The accentuation *Crěsa* could have something to do with the sentence intonation.
- ⁷ As is evident from this description, the rising tone in this dialect is phonetically different from the so-called "čakavian acute", which is often considered to be typical of čakavian dialects that have a tone opposition. The characteristic of the "čakavian acute" is a sudden "jump" to a higher level of pitch and loudness (cf. Ivšić 1911:147). If the rising tone in the town of Cres is similar to that in Orlec - which is possible in view of the fact that I heard precisely the same tone in Beli as in Orlec - it can be understood why Tentor spoke of a "'farblosen" Akzent, den ich bald als steigend, bald als fallend gehört habe" (1909:159). Since this rising tone has no clear characteristic of its own (in contradistinction to the "čakavian acute") except its not being falling, it cannot always easily be identified as one and the same tone under all kinds of intonational circumstances.
- ⁸ Exactly the same lengthenings took place in Susak and even the exceptions agree to a considerable extent (cf. Vermeer 1975:153).

REFERENCES

- Belić, A.
1909 "Mate Tentor. Der čakavishe Dialekt der Stadt Cres (Cherso)", *Rocznik sławistyczny* 2, 174-185.
- Bortulin/Bartulin, A.
1898 "Cres. Vjerovaňa", *Zbornik za Narodni Život i Običaje Južnih Slavena* 3, 265-275.
- Bortulin/Bartulin, A.
1903 "Ukopano blago. Vjerovaňa na otoku Cresu", *ZbNŽO* 8, 134-135.
- Hamm, J., M. Hraste and P. Guberina
1956 "Govor otoka Suska", *Hrvatski Dijalektološki Zbornik* 1, 7-213.
- Hraste, M.
1954 "Ispitivanje akcenatskog sistema na Cresu", *Ljetopis JAZU* 59, 175-177.
- Hraste, M.
1956 "Izvještaj o dijalektološkom istraživanju u

- Lubenicama na otoku Cresu, na otocima Unije, Male i Velike Srakane, na Susku, Rabu i Pagu", *Ljetopis JAZU* 61, 386-388.
- Ivšić, S.
1911 "Prilog za slavenski akcenat", *Rad JAZU* 187, 133-207.
- Jurišić, Bl. (Ed.)
1956 "Toponimika zapadne Istre, Cresa i Lošinja", *Anali Leksikografskog zavoda FNRJ* 3, 5-181.
- Jurišić, Bl.
1956 "Opažanja o govornim osobinama zapadne Istre s otocima", *Ljetopis JAZU* 61, 396-407.
- Milčetić, I.
1895 "Čakavština Kvarnerskih otoka", *Rad JAZU* 121, 92-131.
- Tentor, M.
1909 "Der čakavishe Dialekt der Stadt Cres (Cherso)", *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 30, 146-204.
- Tentor, M.
1925-1926 "Prilog Bernekerovu rječniku", *Južnoslovenski Filolog* 5, 202-214.
- Tentor, M.
1950 "Leksička slaganja creskoga narječja i slovenskoga jezika protiv Vukova jezika", *Razprave Slovenske Akademije* 1, 69-92.
- Vermeer, W.R.
1975 "Problems in the synchronic and diachronic phonology of Susak Čakavian", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 18/2, 139-159.