

UDK 811.163.42'344(091)  
811.163.42'282'15''(497.5 Senj)

Izvorni znanstveni rad  
Rukopis primljen 13. III. 2023.  
Prihvaćen za tisak 6. VII. 2023.  
<https://doi.org/10.31724/rihjj.49.2.2>

**Vera Blažević Krezić**

Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek  
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Lorenza Jägera 9, HR-31000 Osijek  
[orcid.org/0000-0001-6350-8061](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6350-8061)  
[vblazevic1@ffos.hr](mailto:vblazevic1@ffos.hr)

**Mirjana Crnić Novosel**

Institute for the Croatian Language  
Ulica Republike Austrije 16, HR-10000 Zagreb  
[orcid.org/0000-0002-6572-1824](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6572-1824)  
[mcrnic@ihj.hr](mailto:mcrnic@ihj.hr)

## ON THE PHONOLOGY OF NON-LITURGICAL EDITIONS OF THE GLAGOLITIC PRESS IN SENJ<sup>1</sup>

In this paper, focusing on three Croatian Glagolitic editions printed in Senj as examples, the authors attempt to form a clearer linguistic picture of the non-liturgical works printed at Senj's Glagolitic printing press, particularly in light of previously established conceptions of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Croatian literary language. Combining the vowel and consonant features of the Senj editions *Korizmenjak*, *Mirakuli*, and *Naručnik*, an effort was made to describe in detail the linguistic characteristics of the given level of description. At the same time, special attention was given to both Church Slavonic and vernacular (Čakavian) features. The analysis confirms that many of the described features are characteristic not only of the Čakavian of that time, but also of Croatian Church Slavonic. This indicates, on one hand, a tendency to preserve the literary tradition of the printed word, but on the other hand, also a confirmation of Čakavian phonological features.

### 1. Introduction

The Croatian Glagolitic book and its contribution to the system of literary-language conceptions in the early modern period is still an insufficiently researched

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to acknowledge the input of Alexander D. Hoyt, who translated the original Croatian version of this article into English.

philological topic. Thus far, it has been successfully affirmed by exhaustive research into the liturgical, generally literary language of Šimun Kožičić Benja and his printing press,<sup>2</sup> as well as by analyses of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Croatian Protestant corpus.<sup>3</sup> The linguistic studies conducted in connection with these projects were accompanied by valuable reprints of the original publications that composed the research corpus. Another by-product of the projects was an innovative method for the transliteration of 16<sup>th</sup> century Croatian Glagolitic (and Cyrillic) books into Latin script, one which served to affirm a balanced relationship between graphic conservatism on the one hand and readability on the other (cf. Žagar 2016: 38; Eterović 2016a: 703). We shall note that the above-mentioned research projects have also affirmed the often-neglected corpus of non-liturgical Glagolitic editions which enabled the rise of Croatian (Čakavian) vernacular expression,<sup>4</sup> the liberation of which certainly had the wind at its back due to the blossoming of European vernaculars linked to early movable-type printing, as well as the rise of Protestantism (Barbarić 2017: 42–45).

Since the Croatian Glagolitic press did not start with Šimun Kožičić Benja, nor with the Croatian Protestants, it is quite understandable that the corpus of the Glagolitic printing house in Senj (1494–1508) has finally been re-introduced to previous projects using tried and tested research methods. Consequently, this paper is the result of research carried out as part of a new institutional research project (*Investigations of the Languages and Scripts of Glagolitic Non-Liturgical Texts*) led by PhD Ivana Eterović, assistant professor at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. It seeks to shape a clearer linguistic picture of the Senj Glagolitic printing house, especially in light of already studied 16<sup>th</sup> century literary-language conceptions. The project particularly focuses on new research perspectives and tools offered by historical sociolinguistics, perceptual dialectology, and the digital humanities, as well as on the non-liturgical part of the selected corpus, on books that have not yet been re-published in the form of facsimile or transliterated editions: *Mirakuli Slavne*

<sup>2</sup> *Encyclopedia of Croatian Glagolism* (principal investigator: Academician Stjepan Damjanović; 2007–2013).

<sup>3</sup> *The language of the publications of the Croatian Protestant press in the context of the literary-language movements of the 16<sup>th</sup> century* (principal investigator: Academician Mateo Žagar; 2015–2019).

<sup>4</sup> Vernacular Čakavian was also increasingly represented in paraliturgical texts (lectionaries), as well as in primary liturgical books (missals, breviaries, ritual books).

*Deve Marije* [*Miracles of the Glorious Virgin Mary*] and *Naručnik plebanušev* [*Handbook for Curates*].

Every linguistic description – even one so heterogenous as this – must begin somewhere, namely, with the graphological and the phonological. Unifying the vowel and consonant features of three Senj editions – *Korizmenjak*<sup>5</sup>, *Mirakuli*<sup>6</sup>, and *Naručnik*<sup>7</sup> – we will attempt to determine the linguistic characteristics of a given level of description. We will focus our interest equally on Church Slavonic as well as on vernacular (Čakavian) features.

## 2. On the language of the editions – until now

The linguistic analysis of the Senj *Korizmenjak* has been carried out until now by Boris Kuzmić (2002: 87–101, 2008: 47–54), who points out that its language is a stylized version of the Čakavian variety spoken in the town of Senj, enriched with elements from Church Slavonic. He also describes it as a Čakavian–Church Slavonic amalgam (Damjanović 2008: 24–37; Eterović 2016b: 111), in which the Čakavian stratum prevails. Phonological and morphological Church Slavonic features are realized in a Biblical context, while translators may have reached for them with the intention of adding nuance to their literary language expression.

Moreover, in the very colophon of the last book printed at the Senj Glagolitic printing house, it is recorded that the “*Korizmenjak* [was] translated from the

<sup>5</sup> *Korizmenjak*, a Croatian translation of a collection of Lenten sermons by the Italian Franciscan friar Roberto Caracciolo of Lecce (1425–1495), was printed on 17 October 1508. A facsimile reprint of this book, titled *Senjski korizmenjak*, was published in 1981 (Fučić and Nazor), while a Latin-script transliteration, with introduction and glossary, was published in 2019 (arranged by Nazor).

<sup>6</sup> In the colophon of *Mirakuli Slavne Deve Marije* (1508) it states that the book was printed in the house of Silvestar Bedričić (Senj?, second half of the 15th cent. – Senj, before November 11, 1512). The book was published in *non-critical and poor* Latin transliteration by R. Strohal (1917) – and I. Berčić and I. Milčetić wrote about it. P. Popović discovered the original of the Senj translation – the Italian work *Miracoli della gloriosa Vergine Maria*, first printed in Vicenza in 1475 (Petrović 1975: 26, 1977: 86–87; Nazor 2014: 230).

<sup>7</sup> *Naručnik plebanušev* (1507, beginning with 30 May) refers to Bedričić as the vicar and archdeacon of Senj, in whose house and at whose expense the book was printed. The book is a translation of the Latin text *Manipulus curatorum*, which was written by Guido de Monte Roterio in the 14<sup>th</sup> cent. as a handbook for priests (Reinhart 1998: 185). Incidentally, this is the first book of the so-called second phase of the printing house in Senj, to which both *Mirakuli* and *Korizmenjak* also belong.

Latin language into Croatian” (according to Nazor 2019: VII).<sup>8</sup> However, until the more powerful injection of vernacular Čakavian into the Croatian literary language, even the Croatian Church Slavonic language was considered vernacular (Barbarić 2017: 45), and besides, it is considered to be the first Croatian literary language (Kovačević 2016: 219–236).

Considerably less has been written about the language of *Mirakuli* and *Naručnik* than about that of *Korizmenjak*. We know that *Mirakuli* was also a text that had been translated into Croatian, specifically into a Čakavian variety “founded upon the Ikavian-Ekavian dialect with minimal traces of Church Slavonic, like the other editions with non-liturgical content that were printed in Senj” (Crnić and Spicijarić Paškvan 2012: 15). Writing about the language of *Naručnik*, Johannes Reinhart describes its language as a Čakavian–Church Slavonic amalgam with a predominance of vernacular Čakavian (1998: 185–198).

### 3. Vowels<sup>9</sup>

**The vocalization of *jers*.** In the literature, Havlík’s rule on the loss or vocalization of *jers* in specific positions was stated long ago, although in Croatian Glagolitic texts, and even in the Croatian language in general (but also as a South Slavic phenomenon, cf. Gadžijeva et al. 2014: 80), deviations from this rule have been recorded (vocalization of weak *jers* in the first syllable of a word). The vocalization of weak *jers* in other syllables, not only the initial one, is characteristic of Čakavian speech, and is in fact a strong vowel feature of Čakavian in general (cf. Moguš 1966: 25; Lukežić 2012: 58–64). When it comes to the fate of the *jers* in prepositions and prefixes, in this investigation of the non-liturgical texts originating in the Senj printing house, we recorded the following data:

<sup>8</sup> The translators, correctors, typesetters, and printers of the printing house in Senj called their language *Croatian*, and referred to themselves as *Croats*.

<sup>9</sup> It is worth mentioning that the transliterations of *Mirakuli* and *Naručnik* in Latin script were carried out as part of the project *Investigations of the Languages and Scripts of Glagolitic Non-Liturgical Texts*, while the analysis of *Korizmenjak* was based on the recently completed Latin-script edition of the document prepared by Academician Anica Nazor (2019), but also on the original text, or rather, its facsimile (1981, 2019), which helped us record the letter *šta*, the soft *l* and *n* sounds, the letters *jer* and *jat*.

The preposition *sa* or *s/s'* is used depending on its environment, while the vocalization of *jer* is expected to occur before the clusters *vs-/sv-* and the consonants *s* and *z* (cf. Gadžijeva et al. 2014: 81; Damjanović 2008: 67–69), as confirmed by the following examples<sup>10</sup>: *sa vsimь* (10)<sup>11</sup>, *sa svoimi* (75), *sa sinmi* (105), *sa zlu* (138) (M); *sa vsakimь* (36a), *sa svojimi* (98b), *sa slzami* (7a), *sa zlimi* (55a), *sa žutenicu* (89a) (K). It has also been confirmed before the initial vowel of the following word in several examples: *sa inimi* (38), *sa onu* (150) (M); *sa obrazomь* (8a), *sa umišljen'jemь* (6b) (K); in parallel with more frequent examples with the preposition *s*. On the smaller sample from *Naručnik*, there is no confirmed example with a vocalized *jer* in that position. Particularly noteworthy is the use of the preposition *s/sa* with instrumental forms of the 1SG personal pronoun (*manu/mnu/mnom*), the analysis of which determined that the vocalized form *sa* is always used before *mnomь* (42) and *mnu* (43) (M); *sa mnom* (91b) / *sa mnu* (38a) (K), but not before the variant with strong vocalicity – *manu: s manu* (35) (M).

In addition to the confirmed examples with the preposition *sa*, the remaining cases exhibit the form *s* – before consonants: *s cimitera* (40), *s pročesionomь* (71), *s vašimь* (139), *s timь* (46) (M); *s križemь* (96b), *s ljubavlju* (91b), *s Pilatomь* (95a) (K); *s pravimь* (12v), *s toi* (7r), *s vami* (38v) (N). In only several examples was the preposition *s* recorded before a word with an initial *s*: *s svoimь* (138), *s stoečimi* (49) (M); *s strane* (40r) (N); and before *š* and *ž*: *s ženu* (118) (M); *s šalčicami* (49a) (K). Before vowels, we have recorded the non-vocalized preposition *s* in the following examples: *s anj'eli* (76), *s ofertu* (93) (M); *s okomь* (94a), *s Isuhrstomь* (70a) (K); *s ovimь* (6v) (N).

Usage of the preposition *k/ka* provides similar results. When it comes to the form of the DAT SG personal pronoun for 1SG, the *jers* in the prepositional expressions are vocalized if they are followed by a word with a reduced *jer*, e.g., *ka mni* (25) (M); *ka mni* (87a) (K), while the prepositional *jer* is reduced when followed by a word that carries strong vocalicity (confirmed only in M): *k mani*

<sup>10</sup> In this paper we cite examples from all three texts, using the following abbreviations in parentheses after certified examples: M for *Mirakuli*, K for *Korizmenjak*, N for *Naručnik*. Italic parentheses within the examples refer to doublets.

<sup>11</sup> Due to economy of work, these examples are not listed by frequency, nor are all the pages where such examples were found given in the parentheses. This, therefore, is by no means an indication of the final number of certified examples in the originals.

(2). In the N, we find the form *mani* (42r), occurring without a preposition, while no example of *mni* was confirmed.

In the other examples in all three texts, more frequent use of the preposition with reduced *jers* than with vocalized *jers* was confirmed before consonants, e.g., *k nemu* (1), *k židovinu* (152) (M); *k Bogu* (7a), *k materi* (6b) (K); *k rimlanomъ* (13r), *k tomu* (10r) (N). Before velars, both variants are confirmed in individual examples, but also in parallel: *k* (21) / *ka* (26) *kralici*, along with: *k kući* (148), *k hiži* (119) (M); *k* (4a) / *ka* (27a) *Korentomъ*, along with: *k križu* (88b), *k gospodinu* (17b), and *ka koncu* (39a), *ka Gospodu* (14b) (K). There is one isolated example of vocalized *k* before *s* in prepositional position: *ka svojimъ* (87b) (K). In the N, there are no confirmed examples with *k/ka* before velars.

The same is also confirmed in pre-vowel position: *ka* (4) / *k* (134) *onoi*, *ka/k* (93) *oltaru* (M); *k* (88b) / *ka* (93b) *Anni*, *k* (19b) / *ka* (51b) *otcu*, *k* (6a) / *ka* (83b) *učenikomъ*; before *e* only *k*: *k Efesijemъ* (40b), *k Evreomъ* (40b); before *i* more frequently *ka*: *ka Isusu* (93a), *ka Irudu* (95a), along with: *k Isaiji* (47a) (K); *ka is(u)h(rst)u* (41r), *ka o(t)cu* (41v) (N).

The independent preposition \**vb* > *va* (*v/v'*) occurs in non-liturgical editions of the Senj printing house many times in all of the above-mentioned variants – with reduced *jer* or vocalized, mainly according to the rules governing the retention or loss of the *jers* in Croatian Church Slavonic texts cited in the literature (cf. Gadžijeva et al. 2014: 81): before consonants: *v božanstvêno* (156), *v crikavъ* (151), *v pakalb* (3) (M); *v četrtihъ* (66a), *v kapituli* (1b), *v zdravji* (3a) (K); *v danъ* (38r), *v jevanъelû* (13v) (N); as well as in the vocalized variant before the sonant *v* and the cluster *vs-/sv-* regularly: *va vse* (126), *va vêki* (157) (M); *va vsakomъ* (56b), *va vomъ* (31a) (K); *va višnihъ* (41r), *Va vse* (38v) (N); in addition to isolated examples of an unvoiced *jer* before the sonant *v* (with an apostrophe in place of *jer*) – *v' vaše* (139) (M)<sup>12</sup>; *v vsakomъ* (83a) (K); *v' vse* (38r) (N). All other examples have a vocalized preposition: *va dne* (113), *va toi* (95) (M); *va se* (64b), *va tomъ* (18b) as well as before *mni*: *va mni* (84a) (K) (cf. *ka mni* (87a) and *sa mnu* (38a), cited earlier); *va n(i)hъ* (14v) (N).

<sup>12</sup> In M, unvoiced \**vb* was recorded exclusively without a *jer* sign, except a few examples with an apostrophe as a transliteration sign in place of an overscore in the original.

Pre-vocalic *va* is confirmed in the following examples: *va oganь* (31) (M); *va Apokalipsiji* (63b) (K); *va ime* (7v), *va uho* (39r) (N). Non-vocalized pre-vocalic *v* is confirmed independently or in parallel with *va* with the following examples: *v aeru* (56), *v onoi* (124) (M); *v almuštvo* (81b), *v istinu* (11b) (K); *V ime* (6v), *v usta* (13r) (N); at the same time, there are also examples of non-vocalized *v* appearing with an apostrophe in place of *jer* – *v' ednoi* (67), *v' edanь* (154), *v' inihь* (27) (M); *v' onomь* (41v) (N).

There are a few exceptional examples of *u* (< \**vь*): *u veliki* (14), *u stranahь* (89) (M); *u vsihь* (34b), *u svetomь* (23b) (K); *u smrtnom* (9v), *u ovihь* (39v) (N).

Prefixal \**vь*- is confirmed with a reduced *jer* in the initial syllable in the following examples: *vzelь* (130), *vnutarь* (43) (M); *vdovica* (65b), *vskrsi* (4b) (K); *vzeti* (11r), *vniti* (41v) (N).

The change \**vь*- > *va*- is confirmed in the initial syllable: *vazamši* (9), *vavede ga* (103) (M); *vazgati* (49b) (K); *vaspetь* (41v) (N).

The other examples of vocalization are in the initial, but also other syllables: *mani* (DAT SG personal pronoun for 1SG) (13), *kadi* (4) (along with the rare *gdi*), *vasь* (5); *pravadni* (88) (M); *mani* (6b) / *mni* (8a), *kadi* (19b) (along with the rare *gdi*), *cesarastvo* (94b) (K); *kadi* (41v), *mani* (42r), *božastvu* (7r) (N); along with the following examples of non-vocalized *v* in the initial syllable: *vsaki* (32 – M; 23a – K; 10r – N); *vsì* (61 – M; 23a – K; 10r – N). The rest are examples of vocalization of *jer*s in expected positions: *ča* (54), *ta* (90), *danь* (74), *pakalь* (3), *zalь* (15), *konacь* (67); and secondarily: *samь* (62), *oganь* (10), *petarь* (104) (M); *ča* (85b); *kotalь* (24b), *mrzalь* (43a), *misalь* (38b) (K); *danь* (41v); *petarь* (13v), *misalь/misal* (7v) (N).

**The reflex of front nasal \*ę.** General Čakavian feature – the reflex *a* in post-palatal position (Lukežić 2012: 130–131) – also present in the Croatian Church Slavonic language (cf. Gadžijeva et al. 2014: 78–79), was confirmed. Mainly written with *jat* (ě), the traditional orthographic sign for marking the pronunciation [ja] in the position of the front nasal: *ézikь* (40) (M); *ézikь* (86b) (K); *éziku* (7r) (N). Examples with *a* after *j*, *č*, *ž* occur along with examples with the reflex *e* – *poča* (3) / *poče* (41), *počaše* (36) / *počeše* (20) (M); *priěti* (87a), *žae* (48a), *žafanь* (8b), also *prieti* (80a), *žeu* (13a) (K); *početi* (79b), *poče/počela* (89b) more often than *počati*: *poča* (48b) (K); *početь* (42r), *priětь* (12v) (N).

**The reflex of *jat*.** In the non-liturgical editions printed in Senj, *jat* is realized in two forms – doublet phonations within the same system (*i*, *e* < \**ê*) – just as it exists in today’s local dialect of Senj (Miloš 2015: 190),<sup>13</sup> as well as in the other local varieties of the mid-Čakavian region (both on the islands and on the coast, as well as in the diaspora; cf. Lisac 2009: 95). And naturally, this variation follows the Meyer-Jakubinskij law, which was established in the 1920s (according to Lukežić 1990: 12).

In our sources, *jat* is realized in principle according to the above-mentioned law (which states that this unit of the phonological system adapts its articulation to the phonological environment, but depending on the combination of consonants and vowels that follow after *ê*), but we also see reflexes of *jat* that do not follow the law. According to the tracking of *jat* within the Meyer-Jakubinskij law and its reflections that do not follow the law, we conclude that, in the non-liturgical editions printed in Senj, the following reflexes of *jat* are realized:

a) Ekavian: *delb* (150), *korenb* (8), *leto* (29), *mesto* (24), *susedi* (8), *verovatb* (154) (M); *besedu* (13b), *sredu* (73b), *tesna* (61b), *zdelu* (65a), *zvezdami* (15b) (K); *delb* (10v), *lenostb* (41r), *mesto* (13r), *telesnimb* (8v), *veruû* (38r) (N).

Religiously motivated lexemes can also be Ekavian – *vekomь* (135), *vernihь* (20), *va veki vekь* (39) (all confirmed also in variants with *ê*) (M); *Deva* (94a), *večni* (15a), *vernostь* (63b) (K); *nevernikь* (8r), *pravovernikь* (8r), *vera* (11r), *zavet* (9r) (N).

b) Ikavian: – nouns: *človikь* (7), *grihь* (44), *ispovidь* (107), *ričь* (149), *vriime* (85) (M); *brigь* (98a), *ditcu* (49a), *pondiljak* (16b), *sviče* (55a) (K); *crikve* (7v), *dite* (9v), *griha* (8v), *kripostь* (7r), *potribe* (7v) (N); regularly in the infinitive: *sagrišiti* (45), *umriti* (72) (M); *imiti* (71a), *živiti* (14b) (K); *trpiti* (14r), *viditi* (12r) (N); *l*-participles: *dili* (53), *pobigla* (47) (M); *učinilь* (90b), *vidilo* (15b) (K); *m(i)slilь* (7v), *učinili* (10r) (N); adjectives: *lipь* (40), *nesrična* (86), *potribne* (138) (M); *grišanь* (85b), *poslidnji* (99a), *slipь* (60a) (K); *crikv(e)ni* (8v), *potribna* (6v), *vridno* (10r) (N); adverbs: *gdi* (146) / *kadi* (26), *ondi* (52), *ovdi* (157) (M); *di* (45b) / *kadi* (55a),

<sup>13</sup> The Senj vernacular is categorized as a local variety which is part of the Ikavian-Ekavian dialect of the Čakavian dialect group. Based on its characteristic features, it is considered to be a marginal subdialect of Ikavian-Ekavian (Lukežić 1990: 111–117).



*gori* (43a), *nigdi* (61b) (K); *gdi* (7v), *ovdi* (8v) (N); numbers: *dvi* (7) (M); *obidvi* (37a) (K); *dvi* (11v) (N).

c) *i* and *e* (< \*ê) in the same examples – e.g., *vidilь* (103) / *videlь* (120), *imilь* (94) / *imelь* (90) / *imêlь* (112)<sup>14</sup>, *zapovedь/zapovidь* (21)<sup>15</sup> (M); *videti* (76a) / *viditi* (94a), *zapovedi* (25a) / *zapovidi* (27b) (K); *imiti* (8r) / *imêti* (42r) // *imeli* (11v) / *imêli* (11v) (N).

In addition, the sources include examples in which the grapheme *jat* appears more frequently in the position of proto-Slavic *jat* (a typical characteristic of Croatian Glagolitic texts, cf. Gadžijeva et al. 2014: 71): *cêlь* (40), *cvêtь* (40), *dêva* (16), *htê* (47) (M); *besêdi* (13a), *srêdu* (73b), *vêrovati* (14b), *zdêlu* (56b) (K); *črêvi* (10v), *dêlь* (41v), *krêposti* (13r), *têla* (10v) (N).

However, it has also been verified in the position of original *e* and *i* – secondarily along with parallel examples with *e/i*: *amênь* (157), *nêgo* (80), *plêmênitь* (74), *vêliku* (109), *zêmlû* (75) (M); *nê* (12r), *nosêca* (10v), *prêz* (10r), *Trêto* (13r) (N); and in loanwords analogically (secondarily): *dešpêranь* (15) / *dišperani* (16) i *dešperanь* (11), *dêvotь* (39) / *devotь* (62) (M).

*Jat* also appears in positions of proto-Slavic \**ę* in the following examples (this was actually an indirect change: front nasal > e > *jat*): *opêtь* (74), *proklêti* (71), *počê* (67), *rêdovnica* (48) (M); *rêdovnikь* (42r), *svêtoga* (41v) (N); 3PL aorist: *bišê* (100), *činašê* (73), *mišlašê* (33), *otidošê* (69), *plakašê* (35) (M); *imišê* (41v) (N); GEN SG and NOM/ACC/VOC PL *ja*-base nouns: *grišnicê* (35) (M); ACC SG personal pronouns: *mê* (32), *tê* (99) (M); *sê* (42r) (N).

*Jat* in the non-liturgical texts published in Senj also functions as an orthographic notation to mark the pronunciation [ja]: in the beginning of a word: *ê* (with confirmed *ja*: *ja esamь* 147): *ê* (99), *êvi se* (14), *êvlênie* (62) (M); *êzikь* (86b), *êmu* (4b), *êblka* (11b) (K); *êzici* (40r), *êvi* (41r) (N); and at the end after a vowel *gospoê* (75), *mariê* (42), *moê* (69), *raê* (72) (M); *žaê* (48a) (K); *likariê* (12r), *obrezaniê* (12r) (N); as well as in an internal syllable after a vowel: *dostoên* (65) (M); *nas-toêti* (39v) (N).

<sup>14</sup> A more frequent form is that with the reflection *i* in the masculine as well as the feminine *l*-participle forms of the verb *imiti/imêti*: respectively, *imilь* and *imila*.

<sup>15</sup> In M and K, the Ikavian variant is more common, but N has only the Ikavian form: *zapovidь* (42r), *zapovidi* (42r). *Zapovid* is used in the local dialect of Senj (cf. Moguš 2002: 173).

## 4. Consonantism

PSl. *\*t'* (*\*stj*, *\*skj*) in our texts is represented by the letter *šta*<sup>16</sup> (for Čakavian, but also for CroCS, *ć* i *šć*)<sup>17</sup>: *ditić* (77), *mladića* (78), *dopučen'e* (78), *ičêzn'u* (98–99) (M); *moleća* (1a), *čita* (10a), *utočićê* (12b), *čapomъ* (24b) (K); *nišće* (8r) / *niče* (8v), *začićena* (13r), *sviču* (13r) (N).

The reflection of PSl. *\*d'* in the analyzed Senj editions is the inherently **Čakavian j** (printed with *đerv* or with some other way of marking the sound *j*, or even by the absence of a graphic marker, i.e., by marking the neighboring vowels):<sup>18</sup> *osloboŕenъ* (59), *graênina* (66), *pogr'ena* (77), *meû* (4)<sup>19</sup>, but *vidênъ* (78), *videna* (39), *va videniû* (28), as well as *viêhu* (12), *viû* (27); *svadû/svadu* (97) (M); *nareeni* (2b) / *narêjeeno* (3a), *roêšê* (3a), *tvr'e* (13b), *tuimъ* (14b) (K); *p(o)tvr'ûe se* (6v), *roeni* (7r), *v pot'vrëniû* (13v), *tvrja* (42r), but *vidêno* (42r) (N). The consonant clusters *\*zđj* and *\*zgj* develop into Čakavian *žj* (Lukežić 2012: 43–44): *mož'êne* (144) (M); *dažji dažjemъ* (36b) (K).

There are occurrences of the traditional positions of *đerv*. In our texts, mainly *đerv* appears in this position, rather than some other means of denoting the sound *j*: *anj(e)lb* (88), *e(van)j(e)l(')ê* (94) (M); *evan'jeliê*, *an'jeli* (20a) (K); *v jëvan'elû* (13v), *anj(e)l'ska* (38v) (N).

**Consonant + *ьl'* + *lj* + vowel** clusters. Alternation between the *jer* sign and the grapheme *i* in a given sequence was found in the analyzed corpus: *utišen'e* (100), *viden'ê* (94) – *utešenje* (24), *videnie* (106) (M); *zdrav'e* (15a), *znan'e* (2b), *vesel'e* (17a) – *zdravie* (5b), *govorênie* (1b), *videnie* (13b) (K); *priložen'e* (7r), *ostavlenъe* (7v) – *krčenie* (9r), *spasenie* (9r) (N). Damjanović (2008: 55–56) notes that, in canonical Old Church Slavonic texts, such use of the grapheme *i* indicated a conservative way of writing, while the use of *jer* was a newer style, closer to flu-

<sup>16</sup> In the Croatian Church Slavonic language, the letter *šta* can be pronounced as *ć*, *šć*, but also *šč*, as well as *št* (Gadžijeva et al. 2014: 66–67). In liturgical texts, letter *šta* is rarely substituted by the letters *š(')ć* for the phonetic sequence *šć*, although this substitution does appear in non-liturgical texts, especially from the 15<sup>th</sup> c. on (Damjanović 2008: 69). This is confirmed in K, for example, by the two variants *iščeliče* (1a); in N, by the variants *krčeni(i)ê/krš'čeno* (7r).

<sup>17</sup> Šćakavism has also been confirmed in Štokavian dialects (Lisac 2003: 33; Lukežić 2012: 41–42).

<sup>18</sup> “This Čakavian element was dominant in Senj up until the last fifty years” (Moguš 1966: 39).

<sup>19</sup> In the Senj local dialect, *meû* has been replaced in recent time by *med*, by analogy according to the other locative prepositions with final *-d* (*od*, *nad*, *pod*) (cf. Moguš 1966: 39).

ent pronunciation. This graphical duality of the iotative element also appears in medieval Croatian Glagolitic texts.

Our texts confirm the **absence of secondary iotation**, which even in literary Čakavian did not occur (Malić 1993: 190, 196; Kuzmić 2002: 91; Kapetanović 2011: 92),<sup>20</sup> nor even in non-liturgical Glagolitic texts of the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Damjanović 2008: 73): *krvû* (17), *bratie* (88), *milosrdiê* (89), *krs'têninb* (91) (M); *primalet'e* (1a), *ulbe* (12a), *orud'emь* (21b), but *prelûbodeinikь* (12a) / *preûbodeinici* (57b) (K); *vzetьbe* (7v), *sol'û* (13r), *uliê* (13r), *kripostû* (41r) (N). In the case of the prefixed verb *iti*, the consonant cluster *-jt-/-jd-* does not undergo metathesis and iotation (Lukežić 2012: 227): *poiti* (2) / *poĳti* (78), *izaidê* (81), *poidê* (34), but *podê* (80) (M); *poiti* (14a), *naĳdu* (12b) (K); *poid(i)te* (6v), *naiti* (12r) (N).

While in today's local dialect of Senj, metathesis of the cluster *vs-* does occur (cf. Kuzmić 2008: 51; Lukežić 2012: 90–91), this has not been found in our texts, except in a few examples such as the following: *vsako* (1), *vsi* (83) (M); *vse* (1a), *vsemoguĳi* (5b), *vsakomu* (6b), but *svêmu* (14b) (K); *vsa* (7v), *vsaki* (13r), *v(a) vsihь* (38r), but also *savь* (7r), *svaki* (12r) (N).

The cluster *-ĉt-* is preserved under Church Slavonic orthographic influence (Malić 1993: 195–196; Lukežić 2012: 81; Moguš 1966: 40): *poĉtene* (12), *nepoĉtêno* (81), as well as in the verb *ĉtiti/ĉtati*: *proĉtavši* (26), *ĉtati* (62), *ĉte se* (10) (M); *poĉtovati* (1a), *poĉten'ê* (14b) (K); *ĉtacu* (11r), *poĉt(o)vanoga* (12r) (N). Unlike the above-mentioned words with the cluster *-ĉt-*, examples of the pronoun *ĉto* as *što* (i.e., its derivative) are indeed found: *ništaryь* (22), *ništare* (75), and even the secondary change *-št-* to *-šć-*: *niĉê* (70)<sup>21</sup> (M); *ništaryь* (13a) as well as *niĉe* (30b) (K); *niĉe* (10r) (N).

Moreover, the cluster *-št-* appears as a reflection of the cluster *-st-* in foreign words (as it does in today's Senj dialect, as well): *kloštaryь* (37), *sakrištanyь* (67), *kaštelyь* (139) (M); *ištoriê* (46b), *tištamenta* (23b), *štumika* (26a), *kaštigь* (29a), but *va istoriêhь* (27a) (K); *meštaryь* (38v), *oštie* (40r) (N).

<sup>20</sup> The second iotation was carried out in the 20<sup>th</sup> c. in all dialect groups mainly with the same reflections as in the first iotation (Lukežić 2012: 197–198).

<sup>21</sup> The cluster *-št-* is in this case additionally palatalized (cf. Lukežić 2012: 81).

Similarly, the cluster **-sk-** changes to **-šk-**: *škapulati* (96) (M); *škoda* (41a), *škorpie* (25a), but *biskupi* (17b) (K); *biskupъ* (9r) (N).<sup>22</sup>

The prefix **pri-** is realized as **pr-**, which is also a confirmed Čakavian feature (cf. Reinhart 1998: 190): *prnesošē* (38), *prnesti* (102), but also *prinēsti* (69) (M); *prnese* (15a), *prnesenъ* (29a) (K); *prnes(e) se* (9v) (N).

In one instance, the **substitution of final -m with the consonant -n**<sup>23</sup> is recorded: *zač sanъ strašlivъ* (26a), although usually *samъ* (26a) (K).

**Final -l** is preserved, which is in accordance with tradition, but also significant for today's dialect of Senj (Miloš 2015: 192): *mogalb* (84); *pakalb* (41); *zalb* (77) (M); *popelb* (6b); *d'êvalb* (12b); *veselb* (8a) (K); *re'kal* (7r); *delb* (7v), *pav(a)lb* (13r) (N).

**The recording of assimilation** is not consistent: *uboštvo* (1), *trštvo* (105)<sup>24</sup>, *otkri* (9), *odgovori* (95), *ot'kuplenie* (17), *rasrdiv'si se* (18), *tadba* (58), *otpelati* (93), *ot'sicite* (20), *lupêškimbъ* (107), but: *odkri* (1), *svrhu* (36), *odpučen'ê* (38), *pod'kladaûçi* (82), *Ot'govori* (18) / *otgovori* (84), *obsluževaše se* (85) (M); *zvrhbъ* (2a), *odgovara* (2b), *zgora* (3a), *slatko* (7a), *otпустиbъ* (7a), *almuštvo* (9b), *opčēnimъ* (13a), *zgorine* (18a), *tršca* (44a), *teške* (22b), but *občēnoga* (10a), *razširi se* (3a), *ubožstvo* (3b), *odkudъ* (5a), *odpusti* (6a), *almuštvo/almuštvo* (9b), *odkupljen'ê* (11a), *bezkonačna* (18a), *odgovara* (19b), *tržca* (21b) (K); *ishodi* (6v), *opъč(e)na* (8r), *bespamei'bnj* (11r), *gospocka* (11r), *zdola* (12v), *iscinenbe* (14r), *z'vrh* (40r), but *svrъhu* (15r), *obslužitelbъ* (8r), *bezpametnih* (11v), *osobstva* (13r), *nadhodi* (40v) (N).<sup>25</sup>

**The notation of assimilation by voicedness** (sandhi-position, prepositional phrases): *z dušu i s telombъ* (15), *is koga* (43), *iz grada* (103), *odb grêha* (90), *ot hiže* (106) (M); *z vrha* (5a), *is koga* (6a), *ot kuda* (8a), *od blaga* (9a), *z glasombъ*

<sup>22</sup> Damjanović (2008: 79) reports on this phenomenon in the corpus of 15<sup>th</sup>-century non-liturgical Glagolitic texts.

<sup>23</sup> In literary Čakavian of the 16<sup>th</sup> c., the transition of final *-m* to *-n* is sporadic and is not an essential feature (Kapetanović 2011: 92), but it is a regular feature of today's Senj vernacular (cf. Lukežić 2012: 226; Kuzmić 2008: 50; Miloš 2015: 192).

<sup>24</sup> In the first two examples: assimilation and compression (cf. Malić 1993: 201).

<sup>25</sup> Also, (non-assimilated) consonants on the boundaries of morphemes are preserved (scribal tradition): *sr(d)cemъ* (8), *sudca* (56), *ditca* (86) (M); *srdčeno* (1a), *sudče* (8b), *otče* (24b), but *srce* (28a), *oče* (25a) (K); *diuci* (10r), *srdčenimbъ* (41v), but *oca* (7r), *v srci* (38r) (N).

(16b) (K); *pres tog(a)* (7r), *fkanьdelb* (14r), *z burnê* (38r), but also *prez tihb* (13r) (N).

The cluster **-kt-** is transformed into the sequence of voiced obstruents **-gd-**: *gdo* (5) (M); K mainly has *gdo* (92a), with only one instance of *kto* (77b). The analyzed segment of N has one example with metathesis: *tko* (6v), along with prevailing *gdo* (7r), *nigdo* (8v).

The initial cluster **kd-** is realized with a retained and vocalized *jer* (a Čakavian feature): *kadi* (156), but also after assimilation according to voicedness such as *gd-*: *gdi* (146), *nigdare* (143), *nigdire* (146), *nigdarь* (129) (M); *kadi* (103b), *gdi* (95b), *nigdarь* (53a), *nigdare* (84b) (K); *kadi* (42r), *nigd(a)r* (11r), *gdi* (41v) (N).

**The recording of assimilation according to place of formation** (sandhi-position, even today in the local dialect of Senj):<sup>26</sup> *iž nihь* (115), *š nimь* (45) (M); *š nega* (18a), *ž nega* (21b) (K); *prež nihь* (7r), *š nimi* (41r), but *pr<e>zь nega* (8r) (N). Assimilation according to the place of formation also occurs at the boundary between the root and the suffix: *današnega* (57) (M). Exceptions to the carrying out of assimilation according to the place of formation: *hinbami* (21) (M); *hinbe* (9b), *hinbeni* (25a); *drhъi* (17b) (K); *hinbeno* (12v) (N).

**Dissimilation of consonants** – in literary Čakavian of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, many examples confirm the change *zn > zl*, but very few confirm *mn > vn* or *ml* (Kapetanović 2011: 92), and this is what our sources show, as well. Only in N is the otherwise prevailing cluster *zl-* a rarity: *za zlamen'je* (40), but *znameniê* (144) // *mnogo* (19), *množaštvo* (71) (M); *zlamen'e* (18b) / *zlamenie* (20a), *zlameniva* (23b), but *znamenue* (26b), *znameniva* (28a) // *mnozi* (2b), *tamnosti* (2b, 17a), *mnogo* (12b), *množastvo* (15a) (K); *z'nameniva* (12v), *znameniemь* (39r) // *umnoženî* (13v) (N).

**The Second Palatalization** is mainly carried out – although inconsistently – and is more often absent in words of foreign origin.<sup>27</sup> Moguš (1966: 39) notes

<sup>26</sup> So-called contact assimilation is a common phenomenon in the other Croatian dialect groups, as well, not only in Čakavian.

<sup>27</sup> It is characteristic of Čakavian varieties that *k, g, h* occur instead of (correct) *c, z, s* (which are the result of the second palatalization) before *ê, e, i* in LOC SG and PL noun forms and before *i* in NOM PL noun forms (Gadžijeva et al. 2014: 83, 111). In *Žića svetih otaca* [Lives of the Holy Fathers], Malić (1993: 183) also finds an inconsistent second palatalization. This is a case of the interference of vernacular forms without palatalization and literary forms (probably under Church Slavonic influence) with palatalization.

that palatalized forms are mainly “older relics”. Nonetheless, in our texts, the palatalized examples are more numerous, although in terms of frequency, the non-palatalized forms are not insignificant, either, while a similar predominance in the non-liturgical Glagolitic corpus of the 15<sup>th</sup> century was confirmed by Damjanović (2008: 75): DAT SG *rici* (87), *buci* (106), but also *slugi* (102), LOC SG *v ruci* (52, 75) // *va veleci/velici* (52, 59), but also *daski* (103), *v koroniki* (19) // *va veliki* (76), NOM PL *klerici* (94), *kanovnici* (101), LOC PL *po svedocihь* (58) // *v tolicihь* (28), but also *tolikihь* (43), INS PL<sup>28</sup> *s razboinici* (66) (M); DAT SG *k mucu* (29a), but also *k muki* (10b), LOC SG *v' Eklizijastici* (58a), but also *v' Eklizijastiki* (30b), *po prilici* (23b), but also *po priliki* (22b), ACC DU *ruci i nozi* (23b), NOM and VOC PL *ézici* (23b), *grišnici* (30a), *bozi* (41b, 63b), *oružnici* (21b), but also *bogi* (13a), *teologi* (66a), *svedoki* (16b), *duhi* (17a), *uzroki* (29b), *mih* (2b), GEN PL *mnozihь* (53a), but also *mnogihь* (28a), LOC PL *v grisihь* (30a) // *v mnozihь* (56b), but also *v drugihь* (21b), INS PL *grisi* (32a) // *ubozimi* (21b), *z družimi* (32b), but also *duhi* (6a), *uzroki* (31a) (K) (cf. Kuzmić 2002: 91–92); LOC SG *po prilici* (41v) : *po pril(i)ki* (10r), *v m(u)ci* (40v) : *na muki* (40r), NOM PL *grci* (6v), *pr(a)v(o)vernici* (41r) // *druzi dokturi* (15r), *mnozi* (39v), but also *niki dokturi* (10v) (N).

There are also instances of Čakavian *zi-* (cf. Reinhart 1998: 190): *izignali* (65) (M); *zignanь* (10a) (K).

## 5. In conclusion

A look into the graphological and phonological features of the non-liturgical editions of the Glagolitic printing house in Senj, especially *Mirakuli* and *Naručnik*, whose content has not yet undergone much philological analysis – that is, if we exclude a few isolated studies such as the one by Johannes Reinhart (1998) – certainly brings us back to the gates of an amalgamated Croatian (Čakavian)-Church Slavonic language (especially if Croatian Church Slavonic graphological features are taken into account), but mainly to vernacular Čakavian, specifically

<sup>28</sup> On completed palatalization in contexts where there is no reason for it, e.g., in the INS PL or ACC PL forms of masculine (*o*-stem) nouns, see Gadžijeva et al. (2014: 111).

the local Čakavian variety of Senj (if certain phonological features are taken into account).

Many features are equally characteristic of the Čakavian of that time and of Croatian Church Slavonic, although even in such precarious circumstances, recognizable Čakavian peculiarities emerge, such as the occurrence of the vocalization of *jers* (in prepositions and prefixes, and especially in initial and other syllables – the so-called Čakavian vocality); the reflection of front nasal \**ǣ* as *a* (but also *e*) after *j*, *č*, *ž*; šćakavism (recorded with the letter *šta*, but also with the sequence *š(̣)ć*); attestation of the iotation of the dental /d/ with Čakavian (but also Croatian Church Slavonic) /j/, often represented by the letter *đerv*, especially when adapting the softened /g/ in loanwords from classical languages. We should mention that the Čakavian reflection of *žj* was also confirmed for the clusters /\*zdj/ and /\*zgj/. The inconsistent implementation of the second palatalization, but also the absence of secondary iotation, show in their dynamics a reliance on the situation witnessed in the non-liturgical amalgamated Glagolitic texts of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, but also in the literary Čakavian language of the time, while the quite consistent appearance of certain consonants and consonant clusters (e.g., *vs-*, *čt-*, but also *pt-*, *čr-*, *čl-*) indicate on one hand the preservation of the literary (scribal) tradition (as well as, e.g., the notation of the old grapheme *jat* or the preservation of the *jer* signs), but on the other hand, the confirmation of Čakavian phonological features – e.g., the prefix *pri-* attested as *pr-*, Čakavian *zi-* etc.

Some vernacular features, although inconsistently attested, are also interesting indicators, comparable to those of today's Senj vernacular (e.g., the notation of *sanb*; certain assimilation changes, e.g., in sandhi-position: *fkanьdelb*).

The language of speech could never be equated with the literary language, and so it was – to put it simply – until the twentieth century and the emergence of true dialect literature. The realization of *jat*, i.e., its reflections, however, most certainly points to the Ikavian-Ekavian Čakavian region, although there are also some (expected) deviations that do not differ significantly from forms typically found in the spoken vernacular of Senj.

## References

- BARBARIĆ, VUK-TADIJA. 2017. *Nastajanje i jezično oblikovanje hrvatskih lekcionara*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- CRNIĆ, MIRJANA; SPICIJARIĆ PAŠKVAN, NINA. 2012. Talijanizmi u *Mirakulima slavne D(è)ve Marie* (Senj, 15. lipnja 1508.). *Peti hrvatski slavistički kongres: zbornik radova s Međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa. Knj. 1*. Ur. Turk, Marija; Srdoč-Konestra, Ines. Filozofski fakultet. Rijeka. 15–23.
- DAMJANOVIĆ, STJEPAN. 2008. *Jezik hrvatskih glagoljaša*. Matica hrvatska. Zagreb.
- ETEROVIĆ, IVANA. 2016a. Napomena priređivača. *Misal hruački Šimuna Kožičića Benje: Latinička transliteracija glagoljskog izvornika s usporedbom jezičnih oblika prema drugim glagoljskim tiskanim misalima XV. i XVI. stoljeća*. Ur. Ceković, Blanka; Eterović, Ivana; Kuštović, Tanja; Žagar, Mateo. Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica Zagreb – Sveučilišna knjižnica Rijeka. Zagreb – Rijeka. 699–703.
- ETEROVIĆ, IVANA. 2016b. O jeziku hrvatskoglagoljskih zbornika neliturgijskoga sadržaja: perspektive novih istraživanja. *Meandrima hrvatskoga glagoljaštva. Zbornik posvećen akademiku Stjepanu Damjanoviću o 70. rođendanu*. Ur. Kuštović, Tanja; Žagar, Mateo. Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada. Zagreb. 109–118.
- GADŽIJEVA, SOFIJA i dr. 2014. *Hrvatski crkvenoslavenski jezik*. Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada – Staroslavenski institut. Zagreb.
- KAPETANOVIĆ, AMIR. 2011. Čakavski hrvatski književni jezik. *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika – 2. knjiga: 16. stoljeće*. Ur. Bičanić, Ante. Croatica. Zagreb. 77–123.
- Korizmenjak, Senj 1508. Latinična transkripcija glagoljskoga teksta (s uvodom i rječnikom)*. 2019. Ur. Nazor, Anica. Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica u Zagrebu – Grad Senj. Zagreb – Senj.
- Korizmenjak, Senj 1508. Pretisak*. 1981. Ur. Fučić, Branko; Nazor, Anica. Senjsko muzejsko društvo. Senj.
- KOVAČEVIĆ, ANA. 2016. O prvom hrvatskom književnom jeziku. *Meandrima hrvatskoga glagoljaštva. Zbornik posvećen akademiku Stjepanu Damjanoviću o 70. rođendanu*. Ur. Kuštović, Tanja; Žagar, Mateo. Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada. Zagreb. 219–236.
- KUZMIĆ, BORIS. 2002. Jezična obilježja *Senjskog korizmenjaka* (1508). *Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 28/1. 87–101.
- KUZMIĆ, BORIS. 2008. Senjski govor nekad i danas na primjeru *Korizmenjaka* (1508.). *Senjski zbornik* 35/1. 47–54.
- LISAC, JOSIP. 2003. *Hrvatska dijalektogija 1. Hrvatski dijalekti i govori štokavskog narječja i hrvatski govori torlačkog narječja*. Golden marketing — Tehnička knjiga. Zagreb.



- LISAC, JOSIP. 2009. *Hrvatska dijalektogija 2. Čakavsko narječje*. Golden marketing — Tehnička knjiga. Zagreb.
- LUKEŽIĆ, IVA. 1990. *Čakavski ikavsko-ekavski dijalekt*. Izdavački centar Rijeka. Rijeka.
- LUKEŽIĆ, IVA. 2012. *Zajednička povijest hrvatskih narječja 1. Fonologija*. Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada – Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci – Katedra Čakavskoga sabora Grobnišćine. Zagreb – Rijeka – Čavle.
- MALIĆ, DRAGICA. 1993. Konsonantizam *Žića svetih otaca*. *Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 19/1. 179–212.
- MILOŠ, IRENA. 2015. Fonološki opis govora Senja. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 19. 189–197.
- MOGUŠ, MILAN. 1966. Današnji senjski govor. *Senjski zbornik* 2/1. 5–152.
- MOGUŠ, MILAN. 2002. *Senjski rječnik*. Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Matica hrvatska Senj. Zagreb – Senj.
- NAZOR, ANICA. 2014. O glagoljskoj tiskari u Senju i njezinim izdanjima (1494.–1508.). *Senjski zbornik* 41/1. 211–244.
- PETROVIĆ, IVANKA. 1975. Literatura u kojoj je svatko primao i davao (uz zbirku *Mirakuli slavne deve Marie*, Senj, 1507./1508. god.). *Senjski zbornik* 6/1. 23–30.
- PETROVIĆ, IVANKA. 1977. Marijini mirakuli u hrvatskim glagoljskim zbirkama i njihovi evropski izvori. *Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta* 8/8. 3–243.
- REINHART, JOHANNES. 1998. O jeziku *Naručnika plebanuševa* 1507. *Senjski glagoljaški krug 1248.-1508. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenoga skupa održanog u Zagrebu 21. i 22. studenog 1994. godine u povodu 500. obljetnice senjskog glagoljskog Misala iz 1494.* Ur. Moguš, Milan. Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti. Zagreb. 185–198.
- ŽAGAR, MATEO. 2016. Uvodna riječ. *Ofičje Blažene Djeve Marije i Petnaest molitava Svete Bridžide. Venecija 1512. (latinički prijepis ćiriličkog izvornika)*. Priređivači Žagar, Mateo; Ferenčak, Ivan. Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada. Zagreb. 5–49.

## Iz fonologije neliturgijskih izdanja senjske glagoljske tiskare

### Sažetak

U ovome se radu na primjeru triju senjskih izdanja želi uobličiti jasnija jezična slika neliturgijskih djela tiskanih u senjskoj glagoljskoj tiskari, posebice u svjetlu već zacrtanih 16-stoljetnih književnojezičnih koncepcija. Objedinjujući vokalske i konsonantske značajke senjskih izdanja *Korizmenjaka*, *Mirakula* i *Naručnika* nastojalo se proniknuti u jezične karakteristike zadane razine opisa. Pritom se posebna pozornost posvetila

kako crkvenoslavenskim tako i vernakularnim (ćakavskim) obilježjima. Analizirane su značajke potvrdile da su mnoga obilježja svojstvena onodobnoj ćakavštini, ali i hrvatskoj crkvenoslavenštini što pokazuje čuvanje knjiške tradicije s jedne, tj. potvrdu ćakavskih fonoloških odlika s druge strane.

**Keywords:** non-liturgical Glagolitic editions, 16<sup>th</sup> century, Senj, Croatian Church Slavonic, Ćakavian

**Ključne riječi:** neliturgijska glagoljska izdanja, 16. stoljeće, Senj, hrvatski crkvenoslavenski, ćakavština