ON THE PHONOLOGY OF NON-LITURGICAL EDITIONS OF THE GLAGOLITIC PRESS IN SENJ

In this paper, focussing 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 16th 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

---

1 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, as well as by analyses of the 16th century Croatian Protestant corpus. 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 16th 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, 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 16th 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

---


4 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*, *Mirakuli*, and *Naručnik* – 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

---

5 *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).


7 *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 14th 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). 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

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:

---

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

9 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:

10: *sa vsímb* (10), *sa svoimí* (75), *sa sínní* (105), *sa zlu* (138) (M); *sa vsakím* (36a), *sa svojimí* (98b), *sa slzami* (7a), *sa zlimí* (55a), *sa žutenicu* (89a) (K). It has also been confirmed before the initial vowel of the following word in several examples: *sa inimí* (38), *sa onu* (150) (M); *sa obrazom* (8a), *sa umišljen’jem* (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 *mnom* (42) and *mnu* (43) (M); *sa mnom* (91b) / *sa mnu* (38a) (K), but not before the variant with strong vocality – *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 cimítera* (40), *s procéšionom* (71), *s vaším* (139), *s tímb* (46) (M); *s križém* (96b), *s ljubavlju* (91b), *s Pilatom* (95a) (K); *s pravím* (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 svoím* (138), *s stoečimi* (49) (M); *s strane* (40r) (N); and before *š* and *ž*: *s ženu* (118) (M); *s šalcícam* (49a) (K). Before vowels, we have recorded the non-vocalized preposition *s* in the following examples: *s anj’elí* (76), *s ofertu* (93) (M); *s okómb* (94a), *s Isuhrstom* (70a) (K); *s ovím* (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 vocality (confirmed only in M): *k mani*.

---

10 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.

11 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 rimlanomь (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) Korentomь, 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 svojimь (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) učenikoma; before e only k: k Efesijemь (40b), k Evreomь (40b); before i more frequently ka: ka Isusu (93a), ka Irudu (95a), along with: k Isa ĵi (47a) (K); ka is(u)h rstu (41r), ka o(t)cu (41v) (N).

The independent preposition *vь > 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 božanstvěno (156), v crikavь (151), v pakalь (3) (M); v četrtihь (66a), v kapituli (1b), v zdravji (3a) (K); v damь (38r), v jevannelľ (13v) (N); as well as in the vocalized variant before the sonant v and the cluster vs-/-sv- regularly: va vse (126), va věki (157) (M); va vsakomь (56b), va vornь (31a) (K); va višnihь (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' vašе (139) (M)\(^{12}\); v vsakomь (83a) (K); v' vse (38r) (N). All other examples have a vocalized preposition: va dne (113), va toi (95) (M); va se (64b), va tomь (18b) as well as before mni: va mni (84a) (K) (cf. ka mni (87a) and sa mnu (38a), cited earlier); va n(i)hь (14v) (N).

\(^{12}\) In M, unvocalized *vь 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’ opomь (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); *važgati (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) / *mini (8a), *kadi (19b) (along with the rare *gdi), *cesarstvo (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); *vsi (61 – M; 23a – K; 10r – N). The rest are examples of vocalization of *jers in expected positions: *ća (54), *ta (90), *danь (74), *pakalь (3), *zalь (15), *konasь (67); and secondarily: *samь (62), *ogamь (10), *petatь (104) (M); *ća (85b); *kotalь (24b), *mrzalь (43a), *misalь (38b) (K); *danь (41v); *petatь (13v), *misalь/misalь (7v) (N).

The reflex of front nasal *q. 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 (è), the traditional orthographic sign for marking the pronunciation [ja] in the position of the front nasal: *èzikь (40) (M); *èzikь (86b) (K); *èziku (7r) (N). Examples with a after j, ć, ž occur along with examples with the reflex e – *roca (3) / *roce (41), *rocaše (36) / *ročeše (20) (M); *prieti (87a), *žaè (48a), *žajanь (8b), also *prieti (80a), *žeù (13a) (K); *početi (79b), *poče/počela (89b) more often than *počati: *roca (48b) (K); *ročetь (42r), *priêtь (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), 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: *delь* (150), *korenь* (8), *leto* (29), *mesto* (24), *susedi* (8), *verovatь* (154) (M); *besedu* (13b), *sredu* (73b), *tesna* (61b), *zdelu* (65a), *zvezdami* (15b) (K); *delь* (10v), *lenostь* (41r), *mesto* (13r), *telesnimь* (8v), *veruû* (38r) (N).

Religiously motivated lexemes can also be Ekavian – *vekomь* (135), *vernihь* (20), *va veki veka* (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), *vprime* (85) (M); *brigь* (98a), *ditcu* (49a), *pondiljak* (16b), *sviĉe* (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), *pobilga* (47) (M); *uĉinilь* (90b), *vidilo* (15b) (K); *m(î)slîb* (7v), *uĉinili* (10r) (N); adjectives: *lipь* (40), *nesriĉna* (86), *potribne* (138) (M); *grišanь* (85b), *poslidnji* (99a), *slipь* (60a) (K); *crikv(en)i* (8v), *potribna* (6v), *vridno* (10r) (N); adverbs: *gdi* (146) / *kadi* (26), *ondi* (52), *ovdi* (157) (M); *di* (45b) / *kadi* (55a),

[13] 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)\(^{14}\), zapovedь/zapovidь (21)\(^{15}\) (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); çrêvi (10v), dêlb (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), nosêĉa (10v), prêz (10r), Trêto (13r) (N); and in loanwords analogically (secondarily): dešperanь (15) / dišperani (16) i desperanь (11), dêvôtъ (39) / devôtъ (62) (M).

Jat also appears in positions of proto-Slavic *ê in the following examples (this was actually an indirect change: front nasal > e > jat): opêtь (74), proklêti (71), poçê (67), rêdovnica (48) (M); rêdovnikь (42r), svêto ģa (41v) (N); 3PL aorist: bišê (100), çinašê (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), evilênie (62) (M); ézikь (86b), ému (4b), éblka (11b) (K); ézici (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: dostoêni (65) (M); nas-toêti (39v) (N).

---

\(^{14}\) 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, imils and imila.

\(^{15}\) 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. *r' (*stj, *skj) in our texts is represented by the letter šta\(^{16}\) (for Čakavian, but also for CroCS, ć i šć)\(^{17}\): ditiĉ (77), mladiça (78), dopuĉen'e (78), iĉezn'u (98–99) (M); moleća (1a), čita (10a), utoćiĉê (12b), ćaromь (24b) (K); nišće (8r) / niĉe (8v), zaćiĉena (13r), svici (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):\(^{18}\) oslobojêmь (59), graênina (66), pogr'ena (77), meû (4)\(^{19}\), but vidêmь (78), videna (39), va videniû (28), as well as viehû (12), viu (27); svadû/svadu (97) (M); naree-ni (2b) / narêjëno (3a), roëšê (3a), tvr’ê (13b), tuimь (14b) (K); p(o)tvr’ûe se (6v), roën (7r), v potvreniû (13v), tvrja (42r), but vidëno (42r) (N). The consonant clusters *zdj and *zgj develop into Čakavian žj (Lukežić 2012: 43–44): mož’ène (144) (M); dažji dažjemь (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)ll’ê (94) (M); evanjëlië, anj’jeli (20a) (K); v jevandü (13v), anj(e)l’ska (38v) (N).

Consonant + ь/’/j/ + 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) – utešenie (24), videnie (106) (M); zdrav’e (15a), znan’e (2b), vesel’e (17a) – zdravie (5b), govorënie (1b), videnie (13b) (K); priložen’e (7r), ostavlenë (7v) – krçenie (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-

---

\(^{16}\) In the Croatian Church Slavonic language, the letter šta can be pronounced as č, šć, but also šć, as well as št (Gadžijejeva 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 15th c. on (Damjanović 2008: 69). This is confirmed in K, for example, by the two variants išćen (1a); in N, by the variants krčen(ć)/kršćeno (7r).

\(^{17}\) Šćakavism has also been confirmed in Štokavian dialects (Lisac 2003: 33; Lukežić 2012: 41–42).

\(^{18}\) “This Čakavian element was dominant in Senj up until the last fifty years” (Moguš 1966: 39).

\(^{19}\) 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),20 nor even in non-liturgical Glagolitic texts of the 15th century (Damjanović 2008: 73): krvû (17), bratie (88), milosrdiê (89), krs'têninь (91) (M); primalet'e (1a), ulbe (12a), oruđ'êmь (21b), but preüboðeinikь (12a) / preüboðeineici (57b) (K); vzete (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) / pojti (78), izaidê (81), poidê (34), but podê (80) (M); poiti (14a), najdu (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), vsemogûçi (5b), vsakomu (6b), but svêmu (14b) (K); vsa (7v), vsaki (13r), v(a) vsihь (38r), but also savь (7r), svaki (12r) (N).

The cluster -čt- is preserved under Church Slavonic orthographic influence (Malić 1993: 195–196; Lukežić 2012: 81; Moguš 1966: 40): počtene (12), nepočtêno (81), as well as in the verb čtiti/čtatí: pročtaviš (26), čtati (62), čte se (10) (M); počtovati (1a), počten'ê (14b) (K); čtacu (11r), počt(ov)vanoga (12r) (N). Unlike the above-mentioned words with the cluster -čt-, examples of the pronoun čto as što (i.e., its derivative) are indeed found: ništarь (22), ništare (75), and even the secondary change -št- to -šć-: niĉê (70)21 (M); ništarь (13a) as well as niĉe (30b) (K); niće (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): kloštarь (37), sakrištanь (67), kaštelь (139) (M); ištoriê (46b), tištamenta (23b), štumika (26a), kaštigь (29a), but va istoriêhь (27a) (K); meštarь (38v), oštie (40r) (N).

---

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

21 The cluster -šć- 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); biskupь (9r) (n).\(^{22}\)

The prefix pri- is realized as pr-, which is also a confirmed Čakavian feature (cf. Reinhart 1998: 190): prnesoše (38), prnesti (102), but also prinêsti (69) (M); prnese (15a), prnesenь (29a) (K); prnese (101), prnes (e) se (9v) (n).

In one instance, the substitution of final -m with the consonant -n\(^{23}\) is recorded: zač sanь strašlivь (26a), although usually samь (26a) (K).

Final -l is preserved, which is in accordance with tradition, but also significant for today’s dialect of Senj (Miloš 2015: 192): mogalь (84); pakalь (41); zalь (77) (M); popeль (6b); d’êvalь (12b); veselь (8a) (K); re’kal (7r); delь (7v), pav(a)lь (13r) (N).

The recording of assimilation is not consistent: uboštvo (1), trštvо (105)\(^{24}\), otkri (9), odgovori (95), o’kuplenie (17), rasrdív’si se (18), tadba (58), otpelati (93), o’ticite (20), lüpěškimь (107), but: odkri (1), svrhu (36), odpučen’ê (38), pod’kladaûĉi (82), Ot’govori (18) / otgovori (84), obsluževaše se (85) (M); zvrhь (2a), odgovara (2b), zgora (3a), slatko (3a), otpustilь (7a), almuštvo (9b), općênimь (3a), zgorine (18a), tršca (44a), teške (22b), but občenoga (10a), razširi se (3a), ubožstvo (3b), odkudь (5a), odpusti (6a), almužstvo/almužtvo (9b), odkupljen’ê (11a), bezkonaĉna (18a), otgovara (19b), tržca (21b) (K); ishodi (6v), općê(e)na (8r), bespamet’ûni (11r), gospocka (11r), zdola (12v), iscinemьe (14r), z’vrh (40r), but svrьhu (15r), obslužitelь (8r), bezpametnih (11v), osobstva (13r), nadhodi (40v) (N)\(^{25}\).

The notation of assimilation by voicedness (sandhi-position, prepositional phrases): z dušu i s telomь (15), is koga (43), iz grada (103), o’dь grêha (90), ot hižе (106) (M); z vrha (5a), is koga (6a), ot kuda (8a), od blaga (9a), z glasomь

---

\(^{22}\) Damjanović (2008: 79) reports on this phenomenon in the corpus of 15th-century non-liturgical Glagolitic texts.

\(^{23}\) In literary Čakavian of the 16th 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).

\(^{24}\) In the first two examples: assimilation and compression (cf. Malić 1993: 201).

\(^{25}\) Also, (non-assimilated) consonants on the boundaries of morphemes are preserved (scribal tradition): sr(d)ecemь (8), sudca (56), ditca (86) (M); srđceno (1a), sudče (8b), očê (24b), but srce (28a), oče (25a) (K); ditci (10r), srđcénimь (41v), but oca (7r), v srci (38r) (N).
(16b) (K); *pres tog*(a) (7r), *fkапъделъ* (14r), *z бурнѣ* (38r), but also *prez тибъ* (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 *kто* (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): *kади* (156), but also after assimilation according to voicedness such as gd-: gdi (146), nigdare (143), nigdire (146), nigdarъ (129) (M); kadi (103b), gdi (95b), nigdarъ (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):26 *iž ніь* (115), *š німь* (45) (M); *š negа* (18a), *ž negа* (21b) (K); *prež нібъ* (7r), *š nimi* (41r), but *pre<e>xь negа* (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); *drгчи* (17b) (K); *hinbeno* (12v) (N).

Dissimilation of consonants – in literary Čakavian of the 16th 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 *zlamеnъje* (40), but *znamеnię* (144) // *mнogo* (19), *mножаšтво* (71) (M); *zlamеnъ* (18b) / *zlаменіе* (20a), *zlamеnива* (23b), but *znamenue* (26b), *znameniva* (28a) // *mноzi* (2b), *tamnosti* (2b, 17a), *mнogo* (12b), *mножаство* (15a) (K); *zнамену* (12v), *znамениъ* (39r) // *umnoonзениъ* (13v) (N).

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

---

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

27 It is characteristic of Čakavian varieties that *k, g, h* occur instead of (correct) *c, z, s* (which are the result of the second palatization) before *е, e, i* in LOC SG and PL noun forms and before *i* in NOM PL noun forms (Gadžijevo et al. 2014: 83, 111). In *Žица святих отацъ* [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 15th 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 daksi (103), v koroniki (19) // va veliki (76), NOM PL klerici (94), kanovnici (101), LOC PL po svedocihь (58) // v tolicihiь (28), but also tolikihiь (43), INS PL s razboinici (66) (M); DAT SG k muci (29a), but also k muki (10b), LOC SG v’ Ekliziasti (58a), but also v’ Ekliziastiki (30b), po prilihi (23b), but also po prilihi (22b), ACC DU ruci i nozi (23b), NOM and VOC PL ezi (23b), grišnici (30a), bozi (41b, 63b), oružnici (21b), but also bogi (13a), teologi (66a), svedoki (16b), duhi (17a), uzroki (29b), mihi (2b), GEN PL mnogiь (53a), but also mnogiь (28a), LOC PL v grisihь (30a) // v mnozihь (56b), but also v drugihь (21b), INS PL gris (32a) // ubozimi (21b), z družimi (32b), but also duhi (6a), uzroki (31a) (K) (cf. Kuzmić 2002: 91–92); LOC SG po prilihi (41v) : po prilihi (10r), v muci (40v) : na muki (40r), NOM PL grci (6v), pr(a)v(o)vernici (41r) // druži dokturi (15r), mnozi (39v), but also niki dokturi (10v) (N).

There are also instances of Čakavian zi- (cf. Reinhart 1998: 190): izignali (65) (M); zignaь (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

---

28 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 *e 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 derv, 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 15th 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 sam; certain assimilation changes, e.g., in sandhi-position: f kanbdeło).

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


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 (čakavskim) obilježjima. Analizirane su značajke potvrdile da su mnoga obilježja svojstvena onodobnoj čakavšini, ali i hrvatskoj crkvenoslavenštinii što pokazuje čuvanje knjiške tradicije s jedne, tj. potvrdu čakavskih fonoloških odlika s druge strane.
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