

# CONGRUENT DUAL IN THE CHAKAVIAN LEGAL TEXTS FROM 16<sup>th</sup> UNTIL 18<sup>th</sup> CENTURY

BORIS KUZMIĆ\*

Original scientific paper  
Izvorni znanstveni članak

UDK:  
81'282.8:340.141"15/17"

Primljeno: 9. studenoga  
2020.

## Abstract

*The author observes the relationship between plural and dual in the framework of a special type, which determines the specific type of grammatical number to call congruent (lat. Congruere – be congruous) dual. Linguistic analysis is conducted on the corpus of Chakavian legal texts from 16th until 18th century and shows: in expressions with the numerical quantifier “dva” the dual of masculines is kept until the 18th century exclusively in the nominative and accusative case; plural forms in the nominative and accusative are exceptionally rare, in other cases, until the 18th century, only plural forms are realized; the pronouns, adjectives, and passive participles, which make the attributes of the attributive syntagms, are merely dual, except in one example from the 16th century where the substitutive attribute gets a plural suffix. In expressions with the numerical quantifier “oba (dva)” the dual in the masculines preserves up to the 18th century in the nominative, genitive, accusative and instrumental. In other cases the plural forms are realized. The pronouns, adjectives and passive participles, which make the attributes in the nominative and accusative attributive syntagm, have the dual form.*

Keywords: *Dual; plural; Chakavian; law.*

## Introduction

Attributive syntagms as subjects or objects in a sentence together with numerical quantifiers, as well as a predicate that conforms to the preceding syntagm, determine a particular type of grammar number that we call congruent dual (Lat. *congruere*

\* dr. sc. Boris Kuzmić,  
red. prof., Sveučilište  
u Zagrebu, Filozofski  
fakultet, Odsjek za  
kroatistiku,  
bkuzmic@ffzg.hr

– be congruous). I take the term congruent dual from Žolobov's monograph *Symbolik und Historische Dynamik des slavischen Duals* (1998). The aforementioned term is almost unknown in Croatian Slavic literature, and in Russian literature it only appears in recent times. In the literature so far, the congruent dual has been studied within the bound dual, which in the methodological sense is wrong, given the position of noun words within the attributive syntagm (congruent dual) or their use solely in the related dual. The term congruent dual in the classification of dual types Žolobov introduces because the former Belić's dual classification (Belić, 1932), accepted by most Slavs, did not take into account the different use of dual with regard to different types of words.

Terminologically, here is the difference between a bound dual that is merely a morphological category, assembled of nouns and number quantifiers, in relation to a congruent dual in which quantifiers determine the form of the whole syntagm, and sometimes the predicate nominative. The established relationship shows that the congruent dual is an immanent syntactic category. Žolobov (1998: 38) warns that dual is based on two cores: the nominative core of the dual is the noun and the communicative-nominative core of the dual is the personal pronoun of 1st and 2nd person. The use of dual in other types of words – non-personal pronouns, adjectives, passive participles and verbs – is conditioned by congruence. In other words, dual in the nouns and personal pronouns of 1st and 2nd person can be used independently, of course, with a certain number quantifier, without the necessity of inclusion within the attributive syntagm. Dual in the non-personal pronouns, adjectives, passive participles and the verbs can not be used alone (except in the syndetic dual) because it is conditioned by congruence within the attributive syntagms. It is indisputable that in attributive syntagms most often comes the suffix agreement (morphological agreement), but that does not mean that the suffix disagreement establishes a special type of non-congruent relationship. And in one and the other case it is about congruence, with the difference that the subjects with the predicate will agree in the suffix or, in the other case, the morphological agreement will completely absent. For the adjective forms in the predicate nominative that do not agree in the suffix, Corbett (2000: 270) establishes a relationship between the syntactic (“*dva čovjeka su dobra*”) and the semantic agreement (“*dva čovjeka su dobri*”). It can be accepted that the syntactic agreement is assumed to be the suffix agreement, but it is a very

questionable semantic agreement, because both types include two subjects or objects. It might be more accurate to attributive syntagm “dva dobra brata” attribute the morphological mark of the dual which in fact means that the syntagm “dva čovjeka” of the second sentence is merely the morphological symbol of the dual. The study of congruent dual seems to be important in determining the morphological dual in the sentence structure, and thus shows whether the morphological dual forms are indeed understood by the duals or are merely the formal mark of the old dual dominated by plural forms. Another important issue is the study of dual-plural syntactic correlations in the time domain and particularly interesting cases in which individual members of attributive syntagm morphologically disagree, resulting in a different selection of two grammatical numbers.

## 16. Century Texts

The attributive syntagm, with the numerical quantifier 2, shows that the nouns of all three genders in the nominative and accusative case agree with the nouns, adjectives and passive participles in dual suffix:

...poslal *ta* dva *tovora* na lusku cestu dah za gombu...(MO, 15r), ...a za *ta* 2 *sića* vina da mi su ti redovnici obligani oficiati grob moi vsako nedilu...(L, 62), ...za svidočastvo ča est vnuri v gradu, poslasmu z meju nas dva *brata naša*, počtovanoga domina mihovila...(A, CCIV), ...ovo sam jure založil *najboli* dvi *seli ki* imam pod kenizu, čim sam dosle držal lijudi...(A, CCXVIII), ...snočka prijesmo *vaša* dva *lista* posla tefani sapčiči...(A, CCXXII), ...drugo selo Marko aleca *ke rečeni* dvi *seli* dajemo imenovanomu Jurju Zebiću...(A, CCLXXII), ...jure kontović, france kontović, odmita dva *beča bela*; zagovora pet dvadeseti grivan...(A, 27), ...jer su Turci dva *brata njegovu* pogubili zaradi službe i vernosti kući od Austrie...(MCK, CIC), ...budući se vzeli na deferenciju *ta* dva *muža* i budući preda se prizvali Matija Puhara i Matija Trunčiju...(V, II. 11), ...i ne moguć *ta* dva *muža* mej njimi deštrigat tako i daše prohod jednoj i drugoj strani...(V, II. 11), ...v kuće župana Frana Tananaja *zapisana* dva *kanta*, drugačeje dva kupa brajde v sele Pavla Zuba...(V, I. 11), ...ako *ta* dva *spuda* ne da je dužan 4 a od mihole da su bratja volni z vino...(S, 3-29), ...i budući na toj deferencije od strani Geržana Čohilja prižentani 4 svedoki, od Stepana tolikajše *prižentana* 2 *svedoka*, ki budući vsi ročeni, da ote nas sudac arbit naputit...(V, III. 2), ...hiže, štagal i *vrta velika* 2...(D, 109), ...Marko djak Pukšar, *celi seli* 2...(D, 106), ...Tomas Despotović drži *kmecki seli* 2...(D, 116).

The attributive syntagms are equally realized by dual and plural suffixes, especially in the genitive and dative case:

...dano je za gombu od *tih 2 tovorov* da je odnesena ta marha iz Grobnika... (MO, 14r), ...da bude kuća moja *moim* dvim *hćeram* Kati i Margariti, a s tim obligom, kako e više pisano...(L, 37), ...a to e i toga vsega vsa suma od *tih* dvih *ograd* libar četirsto i osamdeset i pet...(L, 131), ...od *tih* dvih *ludi* edno e Gargur Lečić, koga obra Pero za svoga suca, drugi Marko Šintić, koga obra Lovru Rumanolić za svoga suca...(L, 173), ...ča pristoji *tem* dvem *bakonon*, a to z Gržetom Bilinićem, sinom oca Martina...(B), ...imejte od *onih* dvih *deli* refat i platit rečenomu vnuku...(V, I, 16).

Present, aorist and perfect forms of verbs in the predicate, with congruent forms of nouns, adjectives and pronouns in the dual are realized in the following examples:

...antol liskovc, mikloš mokovci *ta* dva *svidočista* da ne vazda to selce gradu vlinam pristojalo...(A, CCLVIII), ...dva obrusa, dva ručnika, dva *pehara srebrna ka budeta potezala* dvi grivni srebra, tri zdile olovene, dvanadešte pladnjev olovenih...(A, CCLXII), ...ostavljam mu *2 pehara, ka sta domaća, srebarna gašparu*...(A, 31), ...i da ne more bit ako *ne bi* ča veće *ona* dva *prijela* od toga blaga svoga oca...(V, I, 10), ...tako po ta način da sveh blag, ke *jesta ona* dva, skupa živući, *akvištala*, ima ga rečenih mat imiti tu prvu polovicu...(V, I, 2), ...dužni su tlakom od vsakoga cela sela vsaki dan *tlačnika* jednoga a kadi dva na selu *prebivata*, dužan je jedan dan, a drugi drugi dan na tlaku hoditi...(2x, D, 106, 108).

In the following example, the subject agrees with the predicate in the dual, but the pronoun which refers to the subject is in the plural:

...i ako *se ne bi mogla ona 2* kordat, da *njim* se oće dat od oficija tretoga za fsakem boljem načinom...(V, II, 11).

In the following examples, subjects are in the plural and predicate in the dual:

...i tako *mi* dva *zapovidasva* u kipu gospodina milostivoga ednoi i drugoi stranu...(A, 33), ...poli Jurja Cigula *esta 2 prehodilke ovčje* i edna koza ku e obećal...(C, 7).

In the first example, it does not keep the dual form “*vě*” but the plural form “*mi*”, and in the first person dual in the aorist the sigma is preserved and the suffix *-va*. In the following examples the subjects agree with the predicate in the dual, but with the dual forms exist the plural forms as well:

...da *ta* dva *sudca ordinana*, *ka budeta učinena* ili *ordinana* leto od leta, *imata* i *jesta dužna* svojem lete činit platit onoga leta svake angarie, štivre i dacie, ako ih *ne čine* platit, tako *imata* svojem platit, i paki činiti terat kako *budu* najbolje *znati*...(K, 63).

In the following example the subject is in a dual, attribute in a plural and predicates in the dual and plural:

...pravo kako hotjasmo v Siget priti *dojdosta* dva *pribega* od ove turske vojske, *koji povedaju* da su Moslavinu jur dovršili, samo što nije pokrivena...(LJ, I).

There are a large number of examples in which plural verb forms imply the plural of noun forms in the dual:

...i ča e v moi kući *esu* dva *karatela* i edan stol...(M, 232), ...još je kupleno to lito na marof gospodina m vola dva *guštaju ta* dva *vola*...(MO, 8v), ...va tom gradu *jesu junaka* dva za grabante...(2x, MO, 12r, 13v), ...dano je za prasce ki su bili učinjeni za gospodina m i pocrkali su i za *druga* dva *ka su poslana* gospodinu m dano je za *nje* l. 55...(MO, 18r), ...i vsi dobrovolno oblubiše, da ča *odluče ta* dva *človika* više *pisana*, da ima dati Elena Antonu...(L, 55), ...oblubiše stati na tom odlučanju, ča *ta* dva *muža odluče*...(L, 55), ...a *ostala* dva *dela ka ostaju*, da jima vsa obitel moja razdiliti meu sobu lubleno...(L, 82), ...kadi obadva kurentaše da naidu dva *človika*, *ka* im *rasude* sva ona, *ka* im *reku*, a to od dobar pokoinoga Ivana Škrivanića...(L, 173), ...da u pervih i svakih turskih glasih *jesu stali* dvi *vojvodi* u Jesenici i u Dabru...(R, 25), ...i s njimi *su izašli* dva *naša keršćanjka* po imenu Mavrović...(R, 45), ...da rečeni Brnac i Matij, da *ona* dva *prisegu* do svoje kušencije...(V, I. 10), ...tako sentencijujemo *ta* dva zgora *imenovana*, da *kurentaju* rečenoga župana za rečenoga janca...(V, II. 21), ...ča je na rečenu živinu špendal ove zime, ča *dobra* dva *čovika* od toga arta *obnajdu*, a koliko ča je bil prvo sentencijan rečeni Bartol Kadmen...(V, I. 14), ...dužni su od svakoga celoga sela vsaki dan *tlačnika* jednoga a kadi dva na selu *prebivaju* dužni su jedan jedan dan, a drugi drugi dan na tlaku hoditi...(D, 115), ...i *ta* dva *muža izibrana*, *budući* preda se *pozvali* Franka i Ivana da mantinaju do svoje kušencije, da *ote* pri tom *ostat* ča oni čine do njihove kušencije...(V, III. 14), ...da *ta* dva *mozite* suditi više ča im *reku*, i ako *se ne bi mogli ta* dva *suca* meu sobom akurdati, da *mozite* k sebi vzeti jednoga človika ili dva...(L, 173), ...da je *imejte ta 2 brata* z rečenu Barbaru i z Julku Verdežicu to blago meu sobu bratinski razdelit...(V, I. 6).

In the following examples, subjects are in a dual, attributes in the plural and dual and predicates in the plural:

...da ako *bi se ti* dva *suca ne mogli* akurdati meu sobu, *mozite* vazeti k sebi jošće ednoga tretoga...(L, 73), ...počtovan i oficij odluči da vsaki od njih najde po jednoga ili po dva *dobra muža*, *ki* takovu deferenciju meu njimi *ukvitaju*...(V,

II. 28), ...i *pojdosmo* na dan svetoga ivana hrstiteľa *mi* dva zgora *rečena* na lice zemle... (A, 33), ...i da ga oće platiti ča bude pravo i ča *odluče* 2 *dobra človika*, kih oni oblube... (L, 55), ...i tu špani i sudci *odlučiše* 2 *pristava rotna* po imeni jurai klinčić i jurai mrmonić *ki privzeše* k sebi dobra muža matija jakovčića... (A, CXC), ...dojde h begu dva *kalauza*, *ki mu se obećaše* učiniti brod k Bihću... (R, 29), ...da vsaki od njih imejte najti jednoga ili dva *dobra muža ki imaju* razvidet, jesu li rečene sestri dotane zadovoljno ili neje... (V, I. 15), ...hoćemo i odlučujemo kada *bi se* dva *brata psovali*, a treći bi bio meju *njini* tere ne bi hotio poviditi oni treći brat da plaća mucenig... (G).

We have the subject and predicate agreement in the plural in the following examples:

...dal sam dvim *mužem ki* te barilce do Ozlja *odnesoše* l. 4... (MO, 16r), ...pak puščam sad, ki e v Sobčevi drazi, *mojim* dvim *sinom* Marku i Mikuli, a z tim patom da mi *jimaju* davati polovicu intrade... (L, 118), ...i *priesmo mi* dva, ilija pet dukat, lovrek četire, podpunoma prez mankamenta... (A, 34).

In the attributive syntagm, with the number quantifier “oba (dva)”, noun and passive participle form agree on the dual suffix:

...za ku je rota v pravdah rečenoga gospodina vicebana obima gori *rečenima stranama* bila obnašasta, a od nijedne strane nedokončana... (A, CCLXXV).

In the following example, the attributive syntagm is in the dual, but the pronoun that refers to the object is in the plural:

...da oće popelati za sobom oba dva zgora *rečena* i tu *ih* potvrdi petar daroić ki e strana suprotivna... (A, CLXXIV).

The attributive syntagms are equally realized by dual and plural suffixes:

...*tim* obim više *pisanim* Matii rečeni daje i zajimle te pinezi čineći ov pat... (L, 117), ...razumejući počtovani svet tužbu i termen dekretan do obih *sadanjih pravad* i da ni kunparil odgovarat sentencijaše rečenega Jakova... (V, II. 25).

In the following examples, the subjects agree with the predicate in the dual:

...a za tu ogradu Grgur rečeni daje Jakovu, brato svomu, vola svoga i tolikoe ovac svojih, ke esu z intradu nihovu, kako *bista* od akurda *ona* oba: Jakov i Grgur... (L, 102), ...a ta vinograd kupi od frana božarniča z rike i od nega žene margarite kadi *bista* obadva nazoči *kuntenta* a ta isti vinograd je u kunfinu bakarskomu... (A, CCLXI), ...štalom da je tako voljan knez Gabriel v njoj

konje držati, kako i knez Gašpar, do tih dob, dokle onakoju drugu oba skupa *načinita*... (A, CCLXII).

In the following examples, the plural verb forms imply the plural of noun forms in the dual:

...i opet na to vere daše, da *će ta* obadva v kaptol *pojti* i da *će dati* jedan drugomu mentovani list, da nigdar *neće* jedan drugoga za veće *iskati*... (A, CCLXII), ...rečeni Paval i svojim sinom Ivanom ekzaminana pod svoju kušenciju, *ka* oba dva *rekoše*, da dobro *znaju* da je Franko plaćen do beča i soldina od Ivana zgora imenovanoga... (V, I, 7).

Finally, subjects agree with the predicate in the plural in the following examples:

...Žuvan Ragužinić i Antona, sestra negova, a žena pokoinoga Gašpara Domjanića z Lubenic, *ti* oba više *pisani* dobrovolno *prodaju* vse svoje pravi ... (L, 36), ...*budući* Antić rečeni i Jivan rečeni obadva po svojoj dobri voli *oblubili* postaviti se v kumpromes po zakonu bnetačkom i *ti* obadava *budući se vrgli se* doli oda vse pravde, ke je do sada tekla meju nimi, i *postavljaju se* meje dobri ljudi, kih oberu edna i druga stran... (L, 77), ...kadi obadva *kuntentaše*, da *naidu* dva človika, ka *im* rasude sva ona, ka *im* reku, a to od dobar pokoinoga Ivana Škrivanića... (L, 173).

Belić (1950: 86) claims that since the 16th century dual verb forms were completely abandoned but, if used after that time, they are certainly of a literary origin. The question is whether the dual verb forms are to be proclaimed as literary elements or stylistic elements of a given legal act or their use in the Chakavian legal texts of the 16th century was quite common. Glavan (1927–1928: 129) has come to valuable results in the language of Old Chakavian writers in the 16th century in terms of keeping or losing dual in verb forms. The dual verb form has never been preserved and it is sporadically preserved solely in the folk literature which has the characteristics of a larger antique. However, the use of dual verb forms is inconsistent, because where it has the most, for example in the folk poem “Marko Kraljević i brat mu Andrijaš”, parallel exist dual and plural verb forms. The aforementioned phenomenon suggests that the old dual forms remain dual only in the form of the plural meaning. The use of dual verb forms during the 16th century was, therefore, not common: their role is in the stylization of the linguistic expression.

## 17. Century Texts

The attributive syntagms, with the numerical quantifier 2, show that the dual is preserved only in the masculine nouns which correspond to the same grammar number with the pronouns and adjectives:

...da imaju dati moji sini u pomoć crikvi Svetoga duha, ka će se graditi na varh Borovice u jistomu selu i dva *druga* drugo godišće *tolara* jistoj crikvi... (S, 158), ...ostavi Gospi pri fratri na braski oltar 2 *prstena srebrna*... (S, 197), ...ostavljam velikoj braščini dva *parstena srebrna* libar 50... (S, 204), ...i pod njom dva *porta dobra* za brode male i velike... (MCK 2, CXXXI), ...i onako spravivši od rečenoga biršaga sebi treti del uzeti, a *druga* dva *dela* za gospodina generala i tako do najmanjega biršaga ima obderžano biti... (MCK 2, CCXXXIV), ...najprvo ponjavi nove 4, *raknića nova* 2, suknja zarzena nova 1, suknje plave 2... (R).

In the following examples attributive syntagms are in the dual, but the pronouns they refer to, are in the plural:

...ostavljan *moja vlastita* dva *kotla* od rakije, veliki i mali, *koje* kupih mojimi vlastitimi pinezi, ostavljan *jih* popu Juri Šemića s ovin obligon da jima oni treti dil ki gredu kotle ča bude u *njih* kuhati... (S, 218), ...kadi *mi* dva *brata*, a sini pokoinoga Ivana Matešića iz Silbe, kadi mi obadva prodavimo našu kuću... (L, 498), ...kasivam doli *motiki* 2, *ke* bih razbil... (V, 9), ...ki budu za svedočastvo na vom mojem urdini poslidnjem Mikulu Kragulja i njega dva *sina* popa Šimuna i žakna Mikulu, pred *kimi* bi puplikan... (V, 9).

The largest number of examples shows that the nouns of all three genders morphologically agree with the nouns, adjectives and passive participle in the plural suffix:

...i ta klečći stavivši ruku na propelo med dvimi *sviĉami goruĉemi* priseć ima osam dan po Miholje... (T, 7r), ...Kazljani imejte imenovat dveh *dostojneh*, i Gospoščina na svoju volju oće zibrat jednoga od *teh* kega imej poslat pred ordinarija... (M, 264), ...imejte se deržat va jednom turne v grade pod dvimi *kljuci*, od *keh* imej deržat jednoga Gospodščina, a drugoga grad... (M, 264), ...u manjkanju plovana Kastiljani hote proponit dveh *dostojneh sođet*... (K 1, 155), ...a *drugim* dvim *mladim pastirom* dati se mora vsakomu glav 6 blaga... (G, 3v), ...ča se nahodi nobili i štabili u smrti i u životu izvam *onih* dvih *kusov* zemalj ča sam ostavi za dušu moju i mojih mrtvih... (S, 30), ...ostavljam *one* dvi *podvornice* u Jivinju, *ke* je Grga Pirijin zet posadija... (S, 34), ...ostavi sve njegovo štabilo i mobilo *njegovim* 2 *sinom* Ivi i Mihi, *ki sini* učini ridi i komesariji... (S, 198), ...a sada ostavljan *mojin* dvin *unukon* Grgi i Mati... (S, 83),



...da udilje donesu polovicu pinez, koliko za tratnju od *naših* dvih *pogrebov* koliko ča se odviše bi se štimalo...(S, 215).

The subject and predicate syntactic agreement in the following examples is shown:

...koliko *bi štimana* dva *dela* libar 56 za me i moga oca i moe matere...(L, 482), ...da *bi* vam *ta rečena* dva *brata* polag pravice *priporučena* i za veće verovanje ovoga našega lista našimi pečati pod pečatismo...(MCK 2, XIX), ...i poštovani muži odlučiše da *ona* dva *zgora pisana* da *platita* vsaki poštovanim mužem libar šest...(DB), ...pušćam Ivanu, sinu Ivana Feretića, brajdi ke se zovu Bevena i dva *reda* li *ka sta* pod Bevenu...(V, 13), ...a na godišće da *se činita* dva *obeda*...(V, 29), ...to da *ona* dva *razdilita* ale *se* mej sobu *akomodata* da jednomu gore pride, a drugomu dole...(C, 23).

The predicate nominatives in the following examples show that the nominal part of the predicate is in the dual and the verbal one in the plural:

...*ta druga* dva *prsta* u desnoj ruci *ka su* doli *pognuta* jedan ta veći perst pomisli ta blažena duša ča je zatajana človičastvom...(P, 29a), ...da im *sude* dva *suca*, a to Fantić, drugi Anton Godinić, ako *bi se ne mogla* akurdati, da *naidu* tretoga...(L, 473), ...i va toi zemli *esu* 2 *tarnulića*, *ka su* *plaćena*...(L, 494).

In the following example, the attributive syntagm is in the dual, except the pronoun “mi”, which always appears in the Croatian chakavian texts in plural, and the verb forms are divided into the grammatical number of dual and plural:

...kako *smo mi* dva gori *imenovana bratinca* pervo vrime *bila* *prodala* vsaki svoj del od *naju* materinstva...(SC).

The attributive syntagms in the dual morphologically disagree with the predicate in the plural in the following examples:

...ostavljam da dvor koga *su moja* dva *dila*, da ga moji sini *razdile*...(S, 209), ...da im *ta* dva *suca sude* i *načine* sve njihove deferencie, ke su meju nimi...(L, 201), ...i *ta* dva *jista učiniše* penu meju sobom...(L, 261), ...da *ta* dva *brata dile* na pol...(L, 271), ...kadi *ta* dva *štimaše* to tarsje libar 62...(L, 273), ...da *ta* dva *sude* vse deferencie ke bude meju tom eredju...(L, 300), ...ča *ta* dva *suca učine* da plati on ki bi se opogovoril...(L, 300), ...a *ta* dva *brata razdiliše* to tarsje meju sobom...(L, 302), ...i *ta* dva *človika* da *rasude* tu deferenciju ka e bila meju nimi...(L, 303).

In the following examples, the pronouns in the attributive syntagms are in the dual, the verbs in the predicate in plural, and the pronouns that refer to subjects more often in plural rather than dual:

...i kada *ta* dva *suca* *spendaju* tih dukat 5 tako, ako bi *njim* potreba, a *njim* ima dat drugeh d. 5... (K, 79), ...a *ta* dva *suca* da *budu obligani* zdat dobar i prav račun kamo *spendaju* ti pinezi... (K, 79), ...vinur *ta* dva *suca* *nisu dužni* zvat ga ili čekat ga ka takovomu sudu... (K 1, 155), ...pošli *su* dva *starca bakarska*, dva *grobniška* i nekuliko ljudi i male dice, koji *budu pametili*, kadi su križi i mejaši meju *njima*... (GTB, 197), ...da jim mozi ova jista crikva vazeti 2 *kusa* zemlje *najbolja*, *ka se nahode*, mada *ih* ne mozi svorcati... (S, 193), ...ča učine *ta suca* dva i ako se *ta* dva *ne bi se mogli* akurdati, da *oni naidu* tretoga k sebi, koga *nim* bude drago... (L, 261), ...a *ona* dva, *ka stoe* s materju sve ča bi se napritka učinili da *im* bude libero franko *nim* dvim... (L, 418), ...ako *bi se ne mogli* *ta* dva *suca* akurdati, da *naidu* tretoga koga *nim* drago... (L, 474), ...da naidemo dva *suca*, *ka* nam *rasude* naše deferencie, ke *im* se reku... (L, 485), ...kako mi znamo dva *brata Vlatkovića* Ivana i Mihua, da *oni* nigdar *nisu bili* nevernici od gradov hercegove svitlosti, *nisu izdali* grada, vojske nit čete, nego znamo da *jesu* spored s nami na svakomu viteškomu dugovanju pošteno se *ponašali*... od rata *nisu vmanjkali* v potrebi svoga života... (MCK 2, XIX), ...*ova* dva pišice ili na paripu *moraju* služiti kamo *im* se zapovi... (B, 324), ...*ova* dva gori *pisana*, kamo *im* se zapovi, *moraju* pojti... (B, 325).

In the following examples, the pronouns in the attributive syntagms, the verbs in the predicate as well as the pronouns that refer to the subjects, are in the plural:

...kade dva *suca*, *ki ote bit učinjeni*, jedan oće bit zibran od Gospoščini, a drugi od komuna... (M, 260), ...kade dva *suca*, od *keh* jedan oće bit zibran od Gospoščini, a drugi od komuna, *ote moći* sudit va pravdah civilih, to je to od blag i pretenžijoni drugeh, v kriminali manjeh kaštigat *mogu* na penu od l 50... (M, 261), ...ma pero dva *svetnika suca* *nisu obligani* zvat ga ni čekat na takov sud... (M, 261), ...kade dva *suca*, od *keh* imij jednoga zibrat Gospoščina, a drugoga komun, *ote sudit* i *imaju* sud va pravdah civilih... (M, 263), ...tako da *ti* dva *suca* *nisu dužni* zvat ili čekat ga na takov sud... (M, 264), ...kad dva *suca*, od *keh* jedan je zibran od gospoščini a drugi od grada *hote imat* sud mirni i nesu-protivni u diferencijah civilih... (M, 155).

It is a very rare example in which the subject agrees with the predicate in plural but the pronoun referring to the subject has the dual form:

...kadi *mi* dvi kako *činismo* pisati edan kumpromes, da *mi* dvi *kuntentismo* i *umismo se* i *vargosmo se* doli od pravde, ka e bila meju *nama*... (L, 555).

This is the oldest confirmation of the personal pronoun “mi” in the instrumental dual in the fully researched corpus of Chakavian legal texts. Belić (1950: 173) for the dative-instrumental form “nama” gives some examples in Stokavian written monuments since the 14th century but only in the 17th century mentioned form comes into the locative case. The largest number of examples shows the subject and predicate syntactic agreement in the plural suffix:

...ostavi *njegovim* dvim *sinom* Antonu i Juri da *razdile* na po, kako prava braća po smrti njegove žene...(S, 16), ...a po smrti materinoj onu polovicu meju *njih* dvih, Jadru i Mikulu i da *govore* jednu misu za pokojnu Baricu...(S, 110), ...momu sinu Grgi i momu unuku Anti, da *oni* dva *dile* na po...(S, 113), ...ostavi sve njegovo štabilo i mobilo i ča e na gosposkomu *njegovim* dvim *sinom* Antonu i Šimunu, da *razdile* sve na po kako prava...(S, 185), ...ki bi se porekal od njih, ča *mi* dva *sudimo*, da plati dukat 25...(L, 272), ...*mi* dva *urđinasmo* od onih dobar pokoinoga Ivana da da Martin Škarpuna od onih pinez...(L, 274), ...i *mi* se dva *akurdasmo* meju *nami*...(L, 334), ...puščam *moim* dvim *hćeram* Mari i Antoni...a to za ljubav božju i za službu ku *su* mi *činile*, a da *su* mi *obnigane* govoriti sveti luzarij...od sih moih dobar da *budu imile* tretu del, ostalo da *dile* sakomu svoi del...(L, 424).

The attributive syntagms, with the number quantifier “oba (dva)”, shows the affinity of the dual in the following example:

...budući na pol pusto, u gore Nove Kranjca varhu obadva *naju dela* toga tersja za k. pet...(SC).

Here, the genitive dual form (“naju”) of personal pronoun shows the possession category instead of the possessive pronoun “naša”. The attributive syntagms in the following examples show the plural forms:

...puščam *mojim sestram* obem jednako...(M, 39), ...tolikajer od obedvih *slavnih orsagov* Korotana i Kranja...(MCK 2, CLXVII).

In the following examples the predicates agree with subjects in the dual, but the auxiliary verb “biti” in the predicate nominative stands in the plural:

...i ja pop Juraj Nošković učinih ovo pismo kadi *bihomo* oba nazoči *kuntenta* i pred svedoki kako zgora...(N, 18-19), ...ki štimaše tu zemlu libar 20, soldini 5, *bi štimana* oba *dela*...(L, 562), ...i da *imata* imit put oba *ona druga dela* prik njega...(D, 20), ...i da *imata* činit obadva vrata, ako budu potrebni...(D, 20), ...i tako *kuntentasta* oba na preženti pred svedoci rečenimi i cetera...(2x, GV, 2, 9).

The dual verb forms in the Chakavian legal texts of the 17th century also found Strohal (1913: 132-134) in the notary book of the Vrbnik by notary Ivan Stašić, quoting the dual forms in the present, the aorist, the imperfect and the imperative of the verb. The nouns and adjectives in the attributive syntagms are in the dual but, the pronouns that refer to the subjects, as well as the predicates, are in the plural:

...ako li joj *budu* oba *dobra*, da *jin* ostavi pojednako Tomi i Mikuli a to da je *slišaju*...(S, 130), ...kadi *mi* obadva *brata kuntentasma* dati kuću tu našei materi...(L, 498), ...kadi obadva *brata* Petra i Filipa Vukasoviće od komuna *bandižali su* i zato da takova skrovita vića...(MCK 3, LIV).

Finally, in most examples we have the subject and predicate syntactic agreement:

...drugo pred Ivanom žaknom Jurčićem, kadi *bihu kuntenti* obadva...(N, 17), ...pušćam obim *popom*, *ki služe* u Zlarinu, vina po 1 barilo do lita...(S, 179), ...kadi se obadva dobrovolno *kuntentaše* i *obraše* za svojih sudac Matija Baričevića, drugoga Martina Stuparića...(L, 201), ...*budući* oba aparzento, kadi *se arkurdasmo* za ta dobra zgora rečena za libar 200 i 90...(L, 204), ...*budući* oba aparzento, kada *mi rekoše* da ga rekopjam...(L, 257), ...kadi *biše* obadva aparzento i *obraše* za svojih sudac albitrih, *ki jim* rasude računi od ograde...(L, 261), ...*budući* obadva aparzento, kadi *mi rekoše*, da *im* pišem prominu od njihovih dobar...(L, 278), ...*budući* obadva aparzento, kadi *otiše* da *im* se učini edan škrit...(L, 281), ...*budući* obadva aparzento, kadi obadva *kuntentaše*, da *učine* mir meju sobom, i tako *učiniše* i *umiriše se* dobrovolno i prosti jedan drugomu, i tako *kuntentaše* obadva, da *vargu* kvarelu doli i *mole* pravdu da bude milostiva, i tako *kuntentaše* obadva da *naidu* dva človika...(L, 303), ...obidvih činim za *moih prokaraduri jeneralih*, da *oni mozite* viditi, učiniti, pravdati se prid saku pravdu za vse moe deferencie, ke su i ke budu, i da *oni mozite* učiniti družih prokaraduri...(L, 330).

## 18. Century Texts

The attributive syntagms, with the numerical quantifier 2, show that the masculine nouns morphologically agree with the pronouns and adjectives in the dual suffix:

...dadoh dva *haljka cirna* libar 28...(S, 226), ...ki je meni odgovoril da ima dva *lista njihova* u rukuh da će ih pokazat...(MCK 3, CLXXXVII), ...došal je vojvoda lalić, Milanez, Pere i Bolfačić Homolići, dva *neputa Lalićeva*, Jure

Demeli...(MCK 3, CLXXXVII), ...daje u prominu Anton Jurju *njega 2 dela* mošuni i dva dela verta...(C, 34).

The use of plural forms in the attributive syntagms in these examples:

...neka je onda sve *mojim* dvima *sestram*...(KT, 7), ...neka mogu oni koji su potrební u *onimi* dvimi *prvimi* *miseci* stignuti žitak s ribanjem...(I).

Subjects in the dual morphologically disagree with the predicate in the plural in the following examples:

...da dva *Vukasovića*, gosp. Filip i Anton, *jesu* sol *apaltali* i da *su oni krivi* tomu, nač sam mu ja odgovoril...(MCK 3, CLXXXVII), ...kako *imajući mi* dva *brata razdilna* jednu skupnu postat tersja na gornom pod Slapnom pristojećim...(F), ...*mi* dva *brata uzamši* na se vas terh sve svoje bližnje i daljne rodbine, *prodasmo* spomenutu postat tersja sa svim gori specificiranim zakonom...(F).

Subjects morphologically agree with the predicates in the plural in the following examples:

...vrativši se i *bodeći mi* dva vojvodi Peri de Vukasoviću u kuću...(MCK 3, CLXXXVII), ...kako mi je to povidano od *mojih* dvih *sini*, *ki se jesu zaperli* u rečenu kuću za obranbu...(MCK 3, CLXXXVII), ...i reče rečeni da pušća za svoga prokadura k *onim* dvim, *ki su* na mojem tištamenti, gospodina plovana popa...(C, 33).

In the Chakavian legal the 18th century texts there is no longer used dual verb forms.

In the attributive syntagms, with the number quantifier “oba(dva)”, as in the predicate, the plural is realized and the dual form is preserved only in the masculine noun:

...na instanciju od *zgora rečeneh stran* obeh su prišli na današnji dan ovo povideti...(K, 157), ...Martin Kukuljan od let okolo osamdeset, Martin Trahlič od let okolo sedamnaest *koji* oba dva *budući* danas u dužnoste njihove konšijencije na lice zemlje skazati mesto...(K, 157), ...pušćam Ivanu Uraviću, sinu Mikulinu i Juriću i Ivanu, ča su *sini* p. Ivana Uravića, *moje stani* oba dva...(C, 33), ...da *imaju* davat oba *zeta* i sin svaki materi po jedan mih mosta...(C, 43).

## Conclusion

Based on the presented material, the following conclusions can be made regarding the relation between the plural and the dual syntagmatic expressions with some quantifiers of numbers:

a) syntagmatic expression + number quantifier 2

The dual of masculines is kept until the 18th century exclusively in the nominative and accusative case. Plural forms in the nominative and accusative are exceptionally rare (I find only one example in the 17th century). In other cases, until the 18th century, only plural forms are realized.

The pronouns, adjectives, and passive participles, which make the attributes of the attributive syntagms, are merely dual, except in one example from the 16th century where the substitutive attribute gets a plural suffix. The pronouns, adjectives and passive participles, which make the attributes, in other cases of the attributive syntagms get a plural suffix.

Swaying between dual and plural is most easily expressed in the relative pronouns that refer to a subject or object. Dual forms are used when they agree with the the dual present suffix (for example “*dva pristava ka budeta*”), the perfect (for example “*dva malina ka sta bila*”), the conditional (for example “*dva pristava ka bi bila očita*”) or the future (for example “*dva pehara ka budeta potezala*”). The dual forms of personal pronouns are used when the relative pronoun is part of the predicate nominative (for example “*dva dela ka su bila stavljena, dva prsta ka su pognuta, dva tarnulića ka su plaćena*”). Finally, the dual form of the pronoun is realized along with the plural present tense form (for example “*dva človika ka im rasude, dva dela ka ostaju, dva kusa ka se nahode*”). The plural forms are used when they agree with a plural perfect tense suffix (for example “*dva župana ki su bili*”) or aorist (for example “*dva pristava ki privzeše*”). The plural forms of relative pronouns are often used along with the present tense forms (for example “*2 malina ki su na švici, 2 vratara ki varoš zapiraju*”). The research shows that the authors of Chakavian legal texts in the given context equally used dual and plural forms of relative pronouns.

When pronouns refer to the previous subject or object and are not part of the attributive syntagm, then only plural forms are used (the dual form is only found in two examples from the 17th century).

The dual in the neuters is kept in the 16th century exclusively in the nominative and accusative case. In other cases, only plural forms are realized. Since the 17th century the plural forms are dominant in the nominative and accusative case.

The dual in the feminines is kept until the 17th century exclusively in the nominative and accusative case. In other cases, only plural forms are realized.

The dual in simple verb forms is realized in present, aorist, imperfect and imperative. The dual and plural forms of the present tense coexist to the 17th century, but the plural has become the dominant number since the 16th century. In the imperative, the plural forms are manifested only. The verbal adverbs regular use plural forms.

The dual in complex verb forms is realized in perfect, conditional and future. Since the 17th century, only a plural form is realized in perfect tense. In conditional dual forms coexist with plural one until the 17th century. Since the 16th century dominance was taken over by plural forms. I find only two examples of future tense – the first one is noted from the 16th century (dual) and the second one from the 17th century (plural). Exclusively plural forms in the future and the pluperfect are realized.

The dual is preserved in the predicate nominative until the 17th century. The plural forms coexist with dual until the 17th century and after that they become dominant. Exclusively plural forms are found in the 18th century. It is interesting to note that the plural forms in the predicate nominative morphologically disagree with dual subjects.

b) the syntagmatic expression + the numerical quantifier “oba (dva)”

The dual in the masculines preserves up to the 18th century in the nominative, genitive, accusative and instrumental. In other cases the plural forms are realized.

The pronouns, adjectives and passive participles, which make the attributes in the nominative and accusative attributive syntagm, have the dual form, except in two examples from the 17th and 18th centuries where attributes get a plural suffix. The pronouns, adjectives and passive participles, which make the attributes, in all other cases of the attribute syntagms, get equally dual and plural forms.

Swaying between dual and plural is most easily expressed in relative pronouns that refer to a subject or object. The dual forms are used when they are

agree with the dual imperfect suffix (for example “ka oba dobro nastojahota”), but they are more often realized with plural aorist forms (for example “ka oba dva rekoše”) and imperfect (for example “ka bihu oba aparzento”). The plural forms are used when they agree with the verb adverb suffix (for example “ki oba sideći”) or plural present suffix (for example “ki oba služe”). The research shows that the authors of Chakavian legal texts in this context more often used dual forms until the 17th century, and only the plural since the 17th century.

When pronouns refer to the previous subject or object and are not part of the attributive syntagm, then only plural forms are used.

The dual in the neuters is preserved in the 18th century in the nominative, genitive, accusative and locative case. The researched corpus does not offer examples of plural forms.

The dual in the feminines is preserved until the 17th century in all cases except locative and instrumental case. Since the 17th century the plural forms are dominant in the nominative and accusative of attributive syntagm. The dual in simple verb forms is realized in present, aorist and imperfect. The dual and plural present forms coexist to the 17th century, and the plural has become the dominant number since the 16th century. In aorist the dual coexist with the plural until the 17th century, but it is already a dominant plural since the 16th century. Only the plural is represented in the imperfect. The imperative and verb adverbs regularly carry out plural forms. The dual in complex verb forms is achieved only in perfect in two examples from the 16th century, and only plural forms are found from the 16th and 17th centuries. Until the 17th century dual in the predicate nominative is kept. It is interesting to note that plural forms are exceptionally rare – I have only one example from the 17th century. In relation to the situation in the predicate nominative with the numerical quantifier 2, here the dual more consistently is used.

## Researched documents

### *16. century texts*

- A – Acta Croatica, in: Kukuljević-Sakcinski, I. 1863.
- B – Brte Gržinić Tkalac and Grže Bilinić Ličanin exchange their lands (3. 1. 1599.), in: Strohal, R. 1910.



- C – Croatian glagolitic documents (1516-1598), in: Strohal, R. 1926.
- D – Dubovac feudal law (1579. and 1581.), in: Lopašić, R. 1894.
- G – The Matricula of the Grohote brotherhood (26. 12. 1561.), in: Bezić-Božanić, N. 1996.
- K – Kastav law (15. 12. 1546.), in: Rački, F. et al., 1890.
- L – Glagolitic Lošinj protocols of the notaries of Mikula Krstinić and Ivan Božičević (1564-1600), in: Košuta, L. 1988
- LJ – Five Croatian charters from the Ljubljana Archive (1562.), in: Ivić, A. 1917.
- M – Matija Baromić's testament (20. 11. 1527.), in: Štefanić, V. 1955.
- MO – Marko Oršić's accounts (1593.), in: Margetić, L. 1980.
- MCK – Monuments of the Croatian Krajina 1, in: Lopašić, R. 1884.
- R – Reports on the movements of the Turkish Army along the Croatian border (1545. –1599.), in: Bojničić, I. 1914.
- S – Notary Salom Salomić takes notes in the notary book (1596. – 1598.), in: Margetić, L. and M. Moguš 1991.
- V – Decisions of the Veprinac Court (1589. – 1591.), in: Strohal, R. 1914.

### *17. century texts*

- B – Bosiljevo feudal law (1650.), in: Lopašić, R. 1894.
- C – Croatian glagolitic charters (1704. – 1781.), in: Strohal, R. 1926.
- D – Dobrinj notary reports (1603. – 1641.), in: Strohal, R. 1910.a
- DB – Dispute between people of Drivenik and Biograd (1. 5. 1606.), in: Strohal, R. 1910.
- G – Grobnik feudal law (18. 7. 1640.), in: Lopašić, R. 1894
- GTB – Boundary arrangements between Grobnik, Trsat and Bakar (1667.), in: Lopašić, R. 1894.
- GV – Gržan Valjković's glagolitic notary book (1615. – 1619. ), in: Strohal, R. 1912.
- K – Kastav law (24. 9. 1651.), in: Rački, F. i dr. 1890.
- K 1 – Kastav law (19. 12. 1661.), in: Laginja, M. 1873.
- M – Mošćenice law (1637.), in: Šepić, A. 1957.
- MCK 2 – Monuments of the Croatian Krajina 2, in: Lopašić, R. 1885.

- MCK 3 – Monuments of the Croatian Krajina 3, in: Lopašić, R. 1889.
- N – Priest Juraj Nošković rents out his vineyard (1. 2. 1630.), in: Margetić, L. i M. Moguš 1991.
- P – Chapter of a perjury in Senj statute (1608.), in: Mažuranić, I. 1854.
- R – Ivan Rubinić gives a dowry to his daughter Lucija and son-in-law Matija Tkalčić (5. 11. 1620.), in: Strohal, R. 1911.
- S – Šibenik glagolitic monuments (1637. – 1683.), in: Šupuk, A. 1957.
- SC – Stanko and Ivo Švabić's charter (7. 4. 1680.), in: Strohal, R. 1907.
- T – Trsat law (1640.), in: Margetić, L. i M. Moguš 1991.
- V – Vrbnik notary reports (1644. and 1645.), in: Strohal, R. 1910.b

### **18. century texts**

- C – Croatian glagolitic charters (1704, – 1781.), in: Strohal, R. 1926.
- F – Ivo Fugljari's charter (1716.), in: Strohal, R. 1907.
- I – Fisherman disputes of Iž people (15. 2. 1781.), in: Cvitanović, A. 1998.
- K – Kastav law (15. 7. 1779.), in: Laginja, M. 1874.
- KT – Kaštela testaments (1788. – 1800.), in: Kužić, K. 2004.
- MCK 3 – Monuments of the Croatian Krajina 3, in: Lopašić, R. 1889.
- S – Šibenik glagolitic monuments (1700. – 1774.), in: Šupuk, A. 1957.

### **Researched documents are printed in:**

- Bezić-Božanić, N. (1996) "Bratovština i bratimi Grohota godine 1561.", *Čakavska rič*, 1-2, 111-118.
- Bojničić, I. (1914) "Izvješća o kretnjama turske vojske uz hrvatsku granicu u drugoj polovici XVI. vijeka", *Vjesnik Kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskega zemaljskog arkiva*, 16, 60-101.
- Cvitanović, A. (1998) *Ižani u ribarskim sporovima od 1501. do 1781. godine*, Zadar.
- Ivić, A. (1917) "Pet hrvatskih listina iz ljubljanskog arhiva", *Vjesnik Kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskega zemaljskog arkiva*, 19, 334-335.
- Košuta, L. (1988) "Glagoljski lošinjski protokoli notara Mikule Krstinića i Ivana Božičevića (1564. – 1636.)", *Radovi Staroslavenskog zavoda*, 9, 1-291.

- 
- Kukuljević-Sakcinski, I. (1863) “Acta croatica: Listine hrvatske”, *Monumenta historica Slavorum meridionalium*, 1, 1-339.
  - Kužić, K. (2004) “Leksik i grafija u oporukama iz Kaštela na prijelazu iz 18. u 19. stoljeće”, *Čakavska rič*, 2, 203-252.
  - Laginja, M. (1873) “Zakon grada Kastva od leta 1400”, *Pravo*, 9, 281-288.
  - Laginja, M. (1874) “Zakon grada Kastva od leta 1400”, *Pravo*, 10, 315-317.
  - Lopašić, R. (1884) “Spomenici Hrvatske krajine I., od godine 1479. do 1610.”, *Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum meridionalium*, 15, 1-390.
  - Lopašić, R. (1885) “Spomenici Hrvatske krajine II., od godine 1610. do 1693.”, *Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum meridionalium*, 16, 1-435.
  - Lopašić, R. (1889) “Spomenici Hrvatske krajine III., od godine 1693. do 1780. i u dodatku od g. 1531. do 1730.”, *Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum meridionalium*, 20, 1-519.
  - Lopašić, R. (1894) “Urbaria lingua croatica conscripta: Hrvatski urbari”, *Monumenta historico-juridica Slavorum meridionalium*, 5, 1-484.
  - Margetić, L. (1980) *Iz vinodolske prošlosti: Pravni izvori i rasprave*, Rijeka.
  - Margetić, L. i M. Moguš (1991) *Zakon trsatski*, Rijeka.
  - Mažuranić, I. (1854) “Statut grada Senja od godine 1388.”, *Arhiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku*, 3, 141-170.
  - Rački, F. et. al. (1890) “Statuta lingua croatica conscripta. Hrvatski pisani zakoni: Vinodolski, Poljički, Vrbanski a donekle i svega krčkoga otoka, Kastavski, Veprinački i Trsatski”, *Monumenta historico-juridica Slavorum meridionalium*, 4/1, 1-265.
  - Strohal, R. (1907) “Nekoliko starih listina iz karlovačkoga kotara”, *Vjesnik Kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskoga zemaljskoga arkiva*, 9, 148-160.
  - Strohal, R. (1910) “Nekoliko neštampanih glagolskih listina”, *Vjesnik Kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskoga zemaljskoga arkiva*, 12, 61-78.
  - Strohal, R. (1910a) “Zapisnici notara dobrinjskih od god. 1603. – 1641.”, *Vjesnik Kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskoga zemaljskoga arkiva*, 12, 107-121.
  - Strohal, R. (1910b) “Zapisnici vrbničkoga notara (bilježnika) iz godine 1644. i 1645.”, *Vjesnik Kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskoga zemaljskoga arkiva*, 12, 147-162.

- Strohal, R. (1911) “Neke glagolske dosada neštampane listine”, *Vjesnik Kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskoga zemaljskoga arkiva*, 13, 15-34.
- Strohal, R. (1912) “Nekoliko riječi o glagolskoj notarskoj knjizi (protokolu) Gržana Valjkovića”, *Vjesnik Kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskoga zemaljskoga arkiva*, 14, 178-185.
- Strohal, R. (1914) “Odluke veprinačkoga suda od god. 1589. – 1591.”, *Vjesnik Kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskoga zemaljskog arkiva*, 16, 117-154.
- Strohal, R. (1926) “Još nekoliko hrvatskih glagolskih isprava”, *Vjesnik Kr. državnog arkiva u Zagrebu*, 2, 178-207.
- Šepić, A. (1957) “Zakon kaštela Mošćenic, prijepisi njegovi, tekst i jezik”, *Rad JAZU*, 315, 233-285.
- Štefanić, V. (1955) “Oporuka Matija Baromića od g. 1527”, *Radovi Staroslavenskoga instituta*, 2, 231-234.
- Šupuk, A. (1957) *Šibenski glagoljski spomenici*, Zagreb.

## References

- Belić, A. (1932) *O dvojini u slovenskim jezicima*, Beograd.
- Belić, A. (1950) *Istorija srpskohrvatskog jezika*, knj. II, sv. 1: *Reči sa deklinacijom*, Beograd.
- Corbett, G. G. (2000) *Number*, Cambridge.
- Glavan, V. (1927–1928) “Kongruencija u jeziku starih čakavskih pisaca”, *Južnoslovenski filolog*, 7, 111-159.
- Strohal, R. (1913) “Dijalekat grada Vrbnika na otoku Krku u prošlim vijekovima upoređen sa današnjim”, *Rad JAZU*, 199, 67-152.
- Šepić, A. (1953) “Jezik hrvatskih općinskih statuta istarskih i primorskih: Prilog historičkoj gramatici hrvatskog jezika”, *Rad JAZU*, 295, 5-40.
- Žolobov, O. F. (1998) *Symbolik und historische Dynamic des slavischen Duals = Simvolika i istoričeskaja dinamika slavjanskogo dvojstvennogo čisla*, Frankfurt am Main.

## KONGRUENTNA (SROČNA) DVOJINA U ČAKAVSKIM PRAVNIM TEKSTOVIMA OD 16. DO 18. STOLJEĆA

*Autor uočava odnos množine i dvojine u okviru posebne vrste, koja određuje određenu vrstu gramatičkoga broja koji će se nazvati kongruentnom (lat. congruere – podudarati se) ili sročnom dvojinom. Jezikoslovna raščlamba provodi se na građi čakavskih pravnih tekstova od 16. do 18. stoljeća i pokazuje: u izrazima s brojevnim kvantifikatorom „dva“ dvojina u imenica muškoga roda čuva se do 18. stoljeća isključivo u nominativu i akuzativu; oblici množine u nominativu i akuzativu iznimno su rijetki, u ostalim se slučajevima do 18. stoljeća ostvaruju samo oblici množine; zamjenice, pridjevi i pasivni participi, koji čine attribute atributnih sintagmi, samo su dvojinjski, osim u jednom primjeru iz 16. stoljeća, gdje supstitutivni atribut dobiva množinski nastavak. U izrazima s brojevnim kvantifikatorom „oba (dva)“ dvojina u imenica muškoga roda čuva se do 18. stoljeća u nominativu, genitivu, akuzativu i instrumentalu. U ostalim se slučajevima ostvaruju oblici množine. Zamjenice, pridjevi i pasivni participi koji čine attribute u nominativnoj i akuzativnoj atributnoj sintagmi imaju dvojinjski oblik.*

Ključne riječi: *dvojina; množina; čakavština; pravo.*