

Original scientific article

UDK 811.163.42'42

930.2:003.074(497.5Lovran)''14/17''

DOI <https://doi.org/10.54130/zl.10.1.4>

Gordana Čupković

University of Zadar, Department of Croatian Studies  
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV. 2, HR-23000 Zadar  
gcupkov@unizd.hr

## SUBSCRIPTION FORMULAE EXPRESSION VARIANTS IN THE CROATIAN TEXTS OF THE LOVRAN NOTEBOOK

Subscription (*subscriptio*) as the medieval diplomatic corroboration formula appears mostly as a signature left by the participants in the legal act (cf. Brković 1995, Stipišić 1985). This paper will explore the expressions used by notaries to sign the Croatian texts of the Lovran Notebook (*Kvaderna*), namely the collection of scribal documents of the Lovran chapter, with entries dating from the 15<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> centuries (published in Viškanić 2002). A typology of subscription expressions is given, with particular emphasis on the distribution and function of the first person pronoun *ja*, phoric relations, and word order in the specific context of the conventional legal discourse.

Keywords: scribes, Croatian Glagolitic, medieval documents, deixis, pronouns, text syntax

### 1. Introduction

Corroboration is usually a conventional segment of the text of a charter<sup>1</sup>, containing testimonies on the validity of the document and the stamp (cf. Brković 1984/85). To enhance the trustworthiness of the document, it is supplemented by subscription (signature of the participants in the legal act, most often the scribe, followed by witnesses and ordering party/ruler), which nevertheless appears extremely rarely in medieval documents (cf. Brković 1984/1985). A certain symbol can be found instead of the signature (depending on the literacy of

---

<sup>1</sup> The main parts of the Latin charters: protocol (introduction), text or context (which can contain disposition, arenga, narration, promulgation, petition, oath, list of witnesses, sanction and corroboration) and eschatocol (cf. Brković 1984/85, Stipišić 1985).

the signatories), and signatures themselves are since the earliest era supplemented by different formulae.<sup>2</sup> From the transcription of Croatian people's rulers' documents, Brković (1995: 80) extracted rare examples that confirm subscription formulae (mostly missing in document transcriptions): in Trpimir's Charter from 852: *Signum manu meque ipso Tirpimira duce* (with attribution, with the ruler's signature), *signum manu* (without attribution or predication, with signatures of the witnesses) and *signum manu feci* (with predication, for the signature of the scribe priest Martin who wrote the entire document). In this, functional differentiation of the said formulae is introduced: the contracted formula for witnesses does not signify that they signed the documents by hand, note denoting the ruler (*manu meque ipso*) indicates that the sign of the cross was put by the ruler himself, rather than the scribe, while the expression *signum manu feci* indicates without the doubt the scribe's handwritten signature. The scribe could enter the sign of the cross on behalf of the ruler and witnesses, but no one could enter a signature on behalf of the scribe (cf. Brković 1995: 80–81), which would in any case contradict the definition of the scribe's function. Also in cases where the scribe's signature is absent (particularly frequently found in King Zvonimir's and King Stephen II's documents), their explicit statements that they had written the documents themselves can be found in the texts, which is equivalent to the signature (cf. Brković 1995: 82), i.e. this can be considered subscription "in a broader sense" (Brković 1995: 83).

In the transcriptions of the Croatian people's rulers' oldest documents, the scribe is regularly introduced by representative *ego* (1<sup>st</sup> person pronoun) and predication, accompanied by additional information: name and clerical or secular (court) function of educated scribes. The following clerical titles can be found: priest, deacon, bishop, and chaplain, while the scribe's action is named as scribe/dictating party, scribe/writing party, notary, chancellor.<sup>3</sup> Scribe formulae appear

<sup>2</sup> In rulers' signatures, the Carolingian and Merovingian traditions are distinguished. Merovingians signed documents by own hand, while Carolingians, initially due to rulers' illiteracy and later in order to preserve tradition, the ruler merely left a mark, and the scribe added the formula (cf. Brković 1995: 79–80), which strengthened the role of the scribe/notary and therefore, in time, offices took over the task of drafting documents, and the names of the rulers are increasingly rarely listed, e.g. they are completely omitted in the Lombardian scribal practice (cf. Brković 1995: 80).

<sup>3</sup> In Trpimir's Charter, it is "priest, chaplain Martin" (Brković 1995a: 1), and in Muncimir's, "deacon Firmin" in the function of "chaplain in Muncimir's court", who also states in the charter: "that after the delivery, executed the tasks related to the charter, and in addition, within own presentation, added a brief appreciation formula (*feliciter*)" (Brković 1995a: 2), as the scribe of King Krešimir's charter, Biograd's bishop Prestancije is listed (Brković 1995a: 2), the charter of an unknown Croatian viceroy from the 11<sup>th</sup> century was written by bishop Marko Grgur who, in addition to writing, has "confirmed, empowered and allowed that which was stated in the charter" and who added the conventional attribute of scribal modesty, "unworthy", to his name (Brković 1995a: 3). The scribe of Krešimir IV's charter 1066/67 states: *Ego Adam, abbas sancti Bartholomei, scripsi iussu regis, domini mi* (Brković 1995a: 3) and: *Et ego Adam monachus, Chroacie electus episcopus: iussu domini regis manu mea scripsi* (Brković 1995a: 3). The scribe of Krešimir IV's charter from 1069 introduces himself with his formal scribal function (*dictator*), stating the location where the document was drafted (Nin): *Ego Anastasius,*

without the *I* pronoun as an exception, and such expressions take on the notions of indirectness, namely paraphrasing the scribe's signature, accompanied by a formulaic expression mentioning *hand* as the scribe's metonymic attribution.<sup>4</sup>

The typical sign of the scribal signatures, namely the first person pronoun, can be viewed as a referential expression (as defined by Searle 1969)<sup>5</sup>, as a reference to a person which can be omitted in Croatian, or as an identification of the person (speaker). In addition to its pronounced indexicality and situational dependence (cf. Klajn 1985: 92), the use of the pronoun in the documents does not necessarily imply the collocutor, either imaginary or real. In legal discourse, this pronoun is also a performative (as defined in Austin 1962): by writing/uttering it, the scribe's function as a trustworthy subject of the legal act is established. The scribe's name as the other typical document signature mark is also a referential expression; personal names bear no connotation and therefore the meaning which can be ascribed to them out of context is largely limited (cf. Dožudić 2011). The exophoric reference to the objective world, or more precisely the person and their function in said world, is often accompanied by endophoric, textual deixis, typically expressed by the relative pronoun *koi* ('that'). This adjectival pronoun can replace both nouns (its antecedent can be a noun or a personal pronoun), as well as take on the role of a noun, which makes it similar to nominal relativizers (cf. Kordić 1995: 54).<sup>6</sup> In the literature, it is noted that, with the antecedent which

---

*huius cirographi dictator, Cruatensis episcopus et aule regis cancelarius, iussu et uoluntate predicti domini mei regis scripsi et confirmaui feliciter in ciuitate Nona* (Brković 1995a: 4). The scribe of the same ruler's charter from 1070 is also introduced as witness: *Ego Theodorus presbyter, et sacrario positus, iussu eiusdem regis domini mei hanc donationem litteris mandauit, et testis adfui* (Brković 1995a: 4), also in the document from 1072: *Et ego presbiter Michacio, capellanus, regis, scripsi et corroboravi* (Brković 1995a: 5). In Zvonimir's charter from 1078, the scribe and witness introduces himself with the modesty formula: *Et ego Theodorus, licet immeritus sacerdos, iussu domini mei regis prenominati Suinimir, qui et Demetrii, atque domini Gregorii, sui episcopi, scriptor huius decreti et testis sum ibidem* (Brković 1995a: 6), while the eponymous scribe in Stephen's charter from the same year is introduced as "chancellor": *Et ego Theodorus, cancellarius domini regis, cartam hanc scripsi et testis adfui* (Brković 1995a: 6), also in Zvonimir's charter from 1076/78: *Ego Theodorus, presbiter et ecclesie sancti Domnii et eiusdem regis cancellarius, scripsi et sum testis ibidem* (Brković 1995a: 6) and 1083: *Ego Theodorus, sacerdos et cancellarius eiusdem regis, iussione regali scripsi* (Brković 1995a: 7). Similar is the introduction by the charter scribe of King Stephen II in 1089: *Et ego Gregorius, cancellarius prefati regis, domini mei, hec iussu eius scripsi et testis adfui* (Brković 1995a: 8), also in the certificate by the same ruler from 1089/90: *Ego Johannes, capellanus eiusdem archiepiscopi de mandata prefati regis Stephani scripsi et testis adfui* (Brković 1995a: 8).

<sup>4</sup> E.g. the signature of "notary" in Krešimir's charter 1071: *per manu Johannis diaconi et domini regis notarii coram comuni curia* (Brković 1995a: 5) or in the misattributed Zvonimir's charter, which has been established to be closer in form to Bosnia-Hum Latin documents: *Per manum Gregorii notarii* (Brković 1995a: 5).

<sup>5</sup> The example of document signing is emphasized by Searle as borderline or disputable in terms of referentiality.

<sup>6</sup> "Pronoun *koi* in the role of relativizer expresses its identification with the antecedent, and is in agreement with it in terms of gender and number" (Kordić 1995: 60), and in the role of attribute can equally denote restrictiveness and non-restrictiveness (cf. Kordić 1995).

is a personal name or pronoun, due to the dependence on the word to which it refers, a relative sentence bears non-restrictive meaning (cf. Kordić 1995: 64–65). Relativizer *koji*, as the “prototypical conjunction of non-articulated postmodification clauses”, is presented by Belaj and Tanacković Faletar (2020: 319) as the conjunction which “profiles specific objectivized referents” (2020: 321), which makes it opposite to the impersonal expression. They particularly emphasize that the relative subclause is non-restrictive as the postmodifier of first and second person pronouns, which represent background elements of the communication process. The speaker and the hearer as background elements function also as the variant (cf. Belaj and Tanacković Faletar 2020: 322), and the non-restrictive determination by the relative clause serves also as a focus on the person being referred to (replaced).

It is noted in the literature that the number of relative clauses in older literacy is increased due to the translation of Latin, mostly participle phrases (cf. Štrkalj Despot 2007). Dmitriev (1966) has shown that a significant frequency of relative clause is a feature of Croatian, citing data that indicate that Croatian translations from Russian contain three times as many relative clauses than the Russian original. The relative pronoun which would additionally indicate the scribe as the antecedent is not found in the oldest Latin documents, while it is used in Croatian texts to explicate the subject of the predication of writing, which is in Latin expressed by the perfect tense *scripsi* or by existential present *scriptor sum*, thereby achieving the partly redundant function of double reference: simultaneous indication by name and personal pronoun and indication by relativizer, which, in addition to being a recognizable formulaic scribe signature, takes on the function of enhanced identification and therefore enhance trustworthiness of the written and performed legal act.<sup>7</sup>

Syntactic and semantic features of formulaic signatures shall be considered using the examples of versions of signatures by the scribes of Croatian texts of the Lovran notebook, a collection of notarial documents of the Lovran chapter, with entries dated from the 15<sup>th</sup> to the 18<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>8</sup> consisting of regulations and resolutions, the notebook (in the stricter meaning of “book of income and expenditure”, Viškanić 2002: 334), inventory (“list of duties and rights of the chapter with respect to individual churches, altars, confraternity”, Viškanić 2002: 341), lease contract, settlements and registry books (of baptisms and weddings), testa-

<sup>7</sup> A kind of opposite to such a role is the role of relativizer in titling when the pronoun *koji* appears without the antecedent, thereby gaining the function of nominal phrase in emphasizing the indeterminate, as comprehensive as possible and general reference (cf. Čupković 2023).

<sup>8</sup> Entries were made using Croatian and the Glagolitic script, as well as the Latin script and Italian (cf. description in: Viškanić 2002: 20). Holjevac and Vlastelić (2014) gave a selective overview of linguistic features of Croatian texts, particularly emphasizing the characteristic of the liturgical Čakavian dialect, but also general features of the Čakavian literary language. Kovačević and Turkalj (2014) give observations on the syntax of Croatian texts, with particular focus on declension and verb forms, negation, the position of attributes in nominal phrases and expression of possession.

ments and other entries (cf. Viškanić 2002: 21). The authors of the Croatian texts are educated Glagolitic priests who entered their names in the notarial documents as notaries and priests,<sup>9</sup> and often as witnesses to the legal act, thereby following the tradition of writing medieval charters.<sup>10</sup>

## 2. Examples

Considering the use of the coreferential deictic expressions, I will classify the examples of scribe signatures into two groups: examples with double reference and examples of indication by a single deixis. Within each group, it is possible to single out two subgroups considering the explication of the writing predication: the examples of direct indication of the scribe's profession and the examples of indirect indication of the scribe's actions.

### 2.1. Examples with double reference

In this group of examples, the scribe makes a self-reference by name and the first person pronoun and relative pronoun. Along with the name, the clerical title (*pop*, *pre*) and clerical and/or secular functions (canon, notary, chancellor) are given.

#### 2.1.1. Examples of direct reference to the scribe's actions

In direct indication of the scribe's actions, the finite verb is more often used: *zapisah* ('I have written'), with only one instance where an infinite verb is used: *pisah* ('I have been writing'). The use of finite verb (expressing finite and totive meaning) and the expression of completeness and momentariness of the actions enhances the meaning of determination.

- (1) *i ja pre mikula dižić ki to pisah* (81b [115])<sup>11</sup> /and I, priest Mikula Dižić, who wrote it/
- (2) *i ja pop marko kremčić ki to zapisah* (80b [57]) /and I, priest Marko Kremčić, who wrote it down/
- (3) *i ja pre mate orbanić kanovnik | lovranski ki to zapisah* (82a [49]) /and I, priest Mate Orbanić, canon of Lovran, who wrote it down/
- (4) *i ja pop marko kremac nodar i kancelir grada lovrana ki to zapisah* (77a [113]) /and I, priest Marko Kremac, notary and chancellor of the city of Lovran, who wrote it down/
- (5) *i ja pop mikula komar ki pisah ta škrit kako zgora* (72a [77]) /and I, the priest Mikula Komar, who wrote that document as stated above/

<sup>9</sup> Regarding the notebook's scribes, cf. Viškanić 2002: 322–323.

<sup>10</sup> In addition to notary documents, Glagolitic scribes in Early Modern Times had a preference for including their names as particular notes of attribution or even authorship in the booklets of different contents, with the *I*-expression often being multiplied from the legal discourse (cf. Čupković 2020).

<sup>11</sup> Transliteration and page number markings according to Viškanić 2002. Corrections to Viškanić's transliteration are made in the footnotes.

(6) *i ja pop marko kremac ki to zapisah | prošen edne i druge strani i pred svedoki više | pisanimi* (78a [71]) / and I, the priest Marko Kremac, who wrote it down, was asked by both sides and in front of the witnesses who are signed above/

(7) *i ja pop marko kremac nodar i kancelar grada lovrana ki to zapisah pred svedoki više pisanimi* (82b [81]) /and I, priest Marko Kremac, notary and chancellor of the city of Lovran, who wrote it down in front of the above-signed witnesses/

(8) *ja pop mikula komar nodar očit ki to zapisah pred svedoki kako zgora* (75b [87-88]) /I, the priest Mikula Komar, notary public, wrote it down in front of the witnesses as stated above/

(9) *i ja pop marko kremac nodar i kancelar grada lovrana ki to zapisah po ukaze g(ospo)-d(i)na plvana<sup>12</sup> i redovniki kapitula lovranskoga* (74a [91]) /and I, the priest Marko Krmac, notary and chancellor of the city of Lovran, who wrote it down on the order of the parish priest and to the monk of the parish of Lovran/

(10) *i ja pop marko kremčić nodar i kancelar grada | lovrana ki to | zapisah pravo moju ruku kako se više udrži* (80a [53]) / and I, priest Marko Kremčić, notary and chancellor of the city of Lovran, who wrote it correctly with my own hand as stated above/

(11) *i ja pop marko kremac nodar i kancelar i kanonik kapitula lovranskoga ki to zapisah moju ruku po ukazu plvana<sup>13</sup> i redovniki lovranskih* (15a [61-62]) /and I, priest Marko Kremac, notary and chancellor and canon of the parish of Lovran, who wrote it down with my own hand on the order of the parish priest and monks of Lovran/

(12) *i ja pop marko kremac nodar i kancelar i kanonik kapitula lovranskoga ki to zapisah moju ruku po ukazu plovana i redovniku lovranskih* (15b [65]) / and I, priest Marko Kremac, notary and chancellor and canon of the parish of Lovran, who wrote it down with my own hand on the order of the parish priest and monks of Lovran/

(13) *i ja pop marko kremac nodar i kancelar grada lovrana to zapisah... moju ruku pred svedoki više pisanimi* (14a [75]) / and I, priest Marko Kremac, notary and chancellor of the city of Lovran, wrote it down... with my own hand in front of the above-mentioned witnesses/

A typical formula is the introduction of the scribe as the subject, the agent of writing:

[ja]<sub>i</sub> [svećenik]<sub>i</sub>, [ime i prezime]<sub>i</sub> [koji]<sub>i</sub>,, to zapisah

[I]<sub>i</sub> [priest]<sub>i</sub>, [first and last name]<sub>i</sub> [who]<sub>i</sub>,, have written it

The said formula consists of four coreferential expressions. First and last names and the personal pronoun are coreferential in all semantic features, while the relative pronoun and the denotation of priesthood reflect the function of variance: the speaker is identified more precisely by his calling as a priest and the role of the scribe. The relative pronoun *koji* in this context (considering that it introduces a known conventional predication of writing for a scribe) also replaces the entire person and its superordinate antecedent is a personal pronoun *ja* ('I') and is therefore non-restrictive. By the pronoun *koji*, the utterance branches off, emphasizing two functions: representation (introducing the person in all relevant functions) and declarative nature (introducing the person and their simultaneous establishment as a trustworthy agent in the legal act). Inserting the relativizer

<sup>12</sup> *pl(o)vana*

<sup>13</sup> *pl(o)vana*

*koji* achieves the shift from the function of statement towards the function of establishing reality by utterance, where the sequencing of coreferential expression is the means to verify and establish that which is written. This basic formula is expanded by other syntagms which additionally attribute the function of scribe as notary and chancellor (an employee of the secular notary office) and list the formal circumstances of the legal act (written in front of witnesses, according to a specific order or request). By these extensions, one remains within the declarative function, i.e. does not progress into narration. The extensions metatextually indicate both the document (*škrit*)<sup>14</sup> and the manner in which it was written (*kako zgora* ‘as above’, *zapisah moju ruku* ‘I have written by my own hand’), thereby attributing the very act of writing (*zapisah pravo* ‘I have written correctly’). Such extensions do not bear new information, but rather confirm (and enhance) the truthfulness and legal validity of the writing.

### 2.1.2. Example of indirect reference to the scribe’s actions

There is only one example of an indirect indication of the scribe’s actions with two deictics, and this expression superficially denotes the witnessing of a legal event, expressed by existential (*bih* – ‘I was’).

(14) *ja pop fran kačel ki pri tom bih* (20a [309]) /I, priest Fran Kačel, who was present at that act/

The formula *ja* + coreferential relative pronoun in the said example has the mark of the signature of the scribe without the explicit statement of the writing predication.

## 2.2. Examples of reference by a single deictic

In this group of examples, the scribe refers to self, besides by name, by first person pronoun only.

### 2.2.1. Examples of direct reference to the scribe’s actions

The scribe’s actions are referred to directly by infinitive verb (*pisah* – ‘I have written’) and in one instance by finite verb (*napisah* – ‘I have been writing’) and in yet another by a loan word (*notah* – ‘I have written down’)<sup>15</sup> which can be considered as finite verb.

(15) *učini račun z manu plovonom popom gašparom bekaričem (...)* *ja plovon više pisano pisah | pod ta milezin... plaća* (72b [181-182]) /make an account with me, the pastor priest Gašpar Bekarič (...) I, the pastor, wrote the above mentioned year... salary/

(16) *ja pop anton macrič, plovon lovranski va to vreme, na prošnju toga suca mateja i z volu rečenoga kapitulani redovnika zgora imenovanih pred svedoki pisah i se podpisah* (7a [95-96]) /I, the priest Anton Macrič, the parish priest of Lovran at that time, at the request of

<sup>14</sup> *Škrit* ‘document, letter, legal enactment’, derived from Italian *scritto* ‘note’ (Spicijarić Paškvan 2014: 125).

<sup>15</sup> Derived from Italian *notare* ‘to mark, to write down’ (cf. Spicijarić Paškvan 2014: 124).

that judge Matej and with the will of the said parishioners and monks named above, wrote and signed in front of witnesses/

(17) *proseć mene nodara | ja matej dižić nodar | buduć prošēn pisah (...) to zgora pisano be vse plačeno*<sup>16</sup> | *i dobrovolno kuntentano* (9b [103]) / begging me, a notary... I, Matej Dižić, a notary, since I was asked, I wrote (...) what was written above was all paid for and voluntarily satisfied/

(18) *storeno v lovrane v hiši prebivanja mane plovana niže pisanoga (...) 10b [107-108] i ja pop anton mavrić plovān va to vreme v lovrane zaedno z gora rečenemi redovnici pisah i vsaki svoju navlastitu ruku se podpisahu* (10a [103-104]) /created in Lovran in the house of residence of me, the undersigned pastor (...) and I, priest Anton Mavrić, pastor at that time in Lovran, together with the above-mentioned monks, wrote and each signed with his own hand/

(19) *ja dijakon toma hamza kanonik | redan od više rečenoga kapitula više rečenu pogodbu | tako kako se više obderži notah, autentikah, publikah za večno verovanje | ruku vlašću se napisah*. (11a [117]) /I, deacon Toma Hamza, a canon of the above-mentioned parish, recorded the above-mentioned agreement as stated above, authenticated it, made known for eternal belief, signed it with my own hand/

This is the typical formula for introducing the subject/scribe:

[ja]<sub>i</sub> [crkvena/svjetovna funkcija]<sub>i</sub>, [ime i prezime]<sub>i</sub> pisah

[I]<sub>i</sub> [clerical/secular function]<sub>i</sub>, [first and last name]<sub>i</sub> have been writing

The word order is not fixed: the clerical function can appear before and after the name, while the secular note of the secular scribe (notary) comes after the name. The pronoun *ja* has a pronounced role of presentative, while the rest of the utterance has the features of a statement on writing, developed to such an extent that it becomes a narration and the utterance, therefore, although implicitly connected to the single expressed subject, is not conventionally closed off in a single declarative function. The very act of writing the document is not attributed. An additional formulaic phrase *svoju / vlašću ruku* ‘by own hand’ attributes the signing of the document (*se podpisahu, se napisah*) by the scribe and by other witnesses.

### 2.2.2. Example of indirect reference to the scribe’s actions

Scribe’s action is implied by signatory formulae, and indirectly implied by other actions listed in the text as performed by the scribe of the document.

Although lacking the explicit writing predication, the examples (20) – (21) indirectly refer to writing by scribe’s attribute (*pisani*, ‘signed’) or by elliptic expressions: formulaic nominal phrase (*ruku vlastitu*, ‘by own hand’, without expressing action) and by naming the document (*škrit*, without naming the action performed in relation to the said document).

(20) *ja niže pisani plovān (...) pop gaspar*<sup>17</sup> *bekarić plovān* (7b [233-234]) /I, the undersigned pastor (...) priest gašpar bekarić pastor/

<sup>16</sup> *plačeno*

<sup>17</sup> *gašpar*



(21) *i ja pop ivan hamza postavljeni pravadnik od ovoga častnoga kapitula ovo leto ki pogovorivši se i jednodušno odlučivši i skupno potverdivši ovi zdola pisani kapituli postavivši penu meju sobu libru jednu ča je meju kanonici ki kodir bi falil na isteh kapituleh. pop ivan hamza ruku vlastitu po zapovedi više pisanih.* (21a [243]) /and I, the priest Ivan Hamza, appointed righteous of this venerable parish this year, who having agreed and unanimously decided and together confirmed these chapters written below, set the punishment among themselves by one book, which is among the canons, whoever would sin against the same chapters. Priest Ivan Hamza with his own hand according to the command of the above mentioned./

(22) *i ja pop ivan cotić kanonik lovranski škrit više* (20b [113]) /and I, the priest Ivan Cotić, canon of Lovran, upper scripture/

In the examples (23) – (31), the scribes make a reference to self by the first person pronoun, the clerical title, and own name, but not as the performer of the scribe's action, but as the performer of different subject actions which also imply scribe's action in this particular context. Typically, these are the entries related to a baptism or a wedding: it is presumed that the person entered in the register as the person performing the baptism or wedding with the first person pronoun deixis is also the person writing the entry. A somewhat looser connection with the scribe's action appears in the examples of indicating different subject actions (23) – (25), for which the *I*-formula and the clerical title and personal name remain as writing reference.

(23) *ja pop anton mavrić posudih* (19b [169]) /I, the priest Anton Mavrić, borrowed it/

(24) *v hiši mane plovana antona mavrića kade priah ja rečeni plovani* (68a [171]) /in the house of my pastor, Anton Mavrić, where I received it. I the said pastor/

(25) *i ja pop anton mavrić plovani va to vreme zaedno z redovnici* (JV3 [237]) /and I, priest Anton Mavrić, pastor at that time together with the monks/

(26) *kerstih ja pop mihovil čeh* (56a [265]) – 2x<sup>18</sup> /baptized by me, priest Mihovil Čeh/

(27) *kerstih ja pop mihovil češić* (57a [269, 271]) – 4x; 273-3x; 275-4x; 277-4x / baptized by me, priest Mihovil Češić/

(28) *kerstih ja pop ivan cigančić* (59a [279]) – 4x; 281 – 4x; 283-4x, 285-1; 287-5x; 289-5x, 291-4x, 293-4x; 295-3x, 297-4x, 299-4x; 301-2x /baptized by me, priest Ivan Cigančić/

(29) *kerstih ja pop ivan cigančić kanonik lovranski* (60b [285]) – 2x, 61a-1x /baptized by me, priest Ivan Cigančić, canon of Lovran/

(30) *kerstih ja pop anton franković* (60b [285]) /baptized by me, priest Anton Franković/

(31) *ja pop ivan cigančić kerstih* (63b [295]) /I, priest Ivan Cigančić, baptized/

(32) *ja pop ivan cigančić* (62b [293]) /I, priest Ivan Cigančić/, marriage record

In baptism records, the established word order or scribal autoreferentiality is disrupted: there are significantly more instances where the verb (*kerstih* – 'I have baptized') appears at the beginning before the *I*-formula. In addition to the listed examples, there are many baptism records with the omitted first person pronoun, with only the expression *kerstih* repeated, and these examples are in fact the scribe's indirect signatures, but the scribe's intention for specific self-reference is not evident in them. Outside of registries, the presumed scribe is the

<sup>18</sup> Number of appearances on the same page.

subject of actions (loaning, example (23)) or the object of the legal act to which they bear witness (something is given or donated to him, examples (24) i (25)).

### 3. Concluding remarks

An almost equal number of different examples of reference by a single deictic and by two deictics testifies to the preservation of the traditional practice, but also to the establishment and good keeping of the new practice of double reference. Moreover, the new practice is shown to be more formalized than the old single-deictic practice, where the utterance can easily move from a declarative (presented by the first person pronoun) into representative (assertive), and with different expansion of the utterance instead of sequencing of the statements, the utterance can turn into a narration. Predication is also different, by which writing is explicitly denoted: the deictic *koji* is typically accompanied by a finite verb (*zapisah*), while utterances that are only connected to the first person pronoun typically contain an infinitive verb (*pisah*). There are significantly more examples of indirect single-deictic reference to the scribe's action, which also testifies to a looser connection of formal segments of such utterances, which can also be elliptical.

Double-deictic examples, although diverging in two utterances, are shown as more conventional and more closed off, precisely due to their pleonastic nature: they are difficult to develop into narration or to adapt to the discourse by changing expressions. They provide an additional focus or keep in the foreground the *I*-form of introducing the scribe and his actions, in which variance can be implicit (in the sense of parallel existence of other functions which the document scribe can also assume: the function of a witness, an authorizing party etc., as well as in the sense of parallel existence of other participant in the communication: on one hand, other current participants in the legal act: donators, ordering parties etc., and on the other, the imagined users of the document).

The above classification of scribal signatures of the Lovran notebook confirms that this material is a source of valuable data for the history of the Croatian literary language and, at the same time, encourages exploration and consideration of the above observations regarding the scribal formulae, also within a broader context of Glagolitic legal documents.

### References

1. Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
2. Belaj, Branimir; Goran Tanacković Faletar. 2020. *Kognitivna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika. Knjiga treća. Sintaksa složene rečenice*. Zagreb: Disput.
3. Brković, Milko. 1984/1985. "Diplomatičke formule latinskih povelja bosansko-humskih vladara i velmoža od XII do XV stoljeća". *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru*, 24/11, pp. 133–148.

4. Brković, Milko. 1995a. "Supskripcija i aprekacija u dokumentima hrvatskih narodnih vladara". *Croatica Christiana periodica*, 19/35, pp. 79–84.
5. Brković, Milko. 1995b. "Pisari isprava hrvatskih narodnih vladara". *Croatica Christiana periodica*, 19/36, pp. 1–10.
6. Čupković, Gordana. 2020. "The price of Anton Franki's book". *Fluminensia*, 32/2, pp. 33–46.
7. Čupković, Gordana. 2023. "Free Relative Clauses in Croatian Glagolitic Folk Medicine Books". *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 68/4, pp. 571–588.
8. Дмитриев, Петр Андреевич. 1966. *Очерки по синтаксису сербохорватского языка*. Ленинград: ГЛЮ.
9. Dožudić, Dušan. 2011. *Kontekstualna uvjetovanost referencije singularnih termina*. Doctoral thesis. Zagreb: Hrvatski studiji.
10. Holjevac, Sanja; Anastazija Vlastelić. 2014. "Kvaderna kapitula lovranskoga kao izvor za istraživanje hrvatske jezične povijesti". *Zbornik Lovranščine*, 3, pp. 77–98.
11. Klajn, Ivan. 1985. *O funkciji i prirodi zamenica*. Beograd: Institut za srpskohrvatski jezik.
12. Kordić, Snježana. 1995. *Relativna rečenica*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo.
13. Kovačević, Ana; Lucija Turkalj. 2014. "Zapažanja o sintaksi Kvaderne kapitula lovranskoga". *Zbornik Lovranščine*, 3, pp. 99–112.
14. Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
15. Spicijarić Paškvan, Nina. 2014. "Talijanizmi u Kvaderni kapitula lovranskoga". *Zbornik Lovranščine*, 3, pp. 113–136.
16. Stipišić, Jakov. 1985. *Pomoćne povijesne znanosti u teoriji i praksi: latinska paleografija, opća diplomatika, kronologija, rječnik kratica*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
17. Štrkalj Despot, Kristina. 2007. "Sintaktička funkcija participa u hrvatskom jeziku 15./16. stoljeća". *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 33, pp. 413–429.
18. Viškanić, Damir. 2002. *Quaderna capituli Lovranensis. Kvaderna kapitula Lovranskog*. Lovran – Rijeka: Katedra Čakavskog sabora Opatija – Adamić.

## Sažetak

# IZRAZNE VARIJANTE FORMULA SUPSKRIPCIJE U HRVATSKIM TEKSTOVIMA LOVRANSKE KVADERNE

Supskripcija (*subscriptio*) kao srednjovjekovna diplomatska formula koro- boracije ostvaruje se uglavnom u obliku potpisa koje su ostavljali sudionici pravnoga čina (usp. Brković 1995, Stipišić 1985). U ovom radu proučit ćemo izraze kojima su se potpisivali pisari u hrvatskim tekstovima lovranske Kvaderne (knjižice), zbirke notarskih isprava lovranskoga kapitula s upisima datiranim od 15. do 18. st. (objavljena u Viškanić 2002). Daje se tipologija izraza supskripcije s posebnim naglaskom na distribuciju i funkciju zamjenice *ja*, forične odnose i red riječi u specifičnom kontekstu konvencionalnoga, pravnoga diskursa.

Ključne riječi: pisari, glagoljaštvo, srednjovjekovne isprave, deiksa, zamjenice, sintaksa teksta