· ·

CATHERINE MARY MACROBERT
Oxford
catherine.macrobert@lmh.ox.ac.uk

THE CONTRIBUTION OF JAGIĆ'S EDITION OF THE *SVETOSTEFANSKI HRISOVULJ* TO THE STUDY OF PROSODIC PHENOMENA IN 13TH-14TH CENTURY MSS WRITTEN IN "RAŠKI" ORTHOGRAPHY

Vatroslav Jagić's edition of the *Svetostefanski hrisovulj* differs in two important respects from that published, also in 1890, by Ljubomir Kovačević: it includes the diacritics used in the manuscript, and it reproduces a page of text, as well as the colophons. Although Jagić had at his disposal limited typographical means to represent diacritics, and followed the practice of the time by introducing modern word divisions, it can be seen from his reproductions that the main scribe of the *Svetostefanski hrisovulj* employed a distinctive diacritic as a marker of vocalic length and divided his text into prosodic words by means of spacing. Given these clues, it is possible to infer from Jagić's edition the distribution of diacritics in the manuscript and their implications for vocalic quantity, which he analysed in an article of 1891. More recently the publication of a photographic edition of the whole *hrisovulj* has not only confirmed Jagić's findings, but also enabled analysis of the prosodic segmentation indicated in the manuscript. Parallels to the scribal practice of the *Svetostefanski hrisovulj* are adduced from other manuscripts of the early 14th century.

Key Words: Vatroslav Jagić; Svetostefanski hrisovulj; diacritics; vocalic quantity; prosodic words.

In the year 1890 two editions of the *Svetostefanski hrisovulj*, issued by King Milutin in the early 14th century in favour of the Monastery of S. Stephen the Protomartyr at Banjska, appeared in print: one in Belgrade, the other in Vienna. The Belgrade edition was based on a copy of the document, and the editor, Ljubomir Kovačević, wisely did not attempt to include every palaeographical detail.[1] In preparing the Vienna edition Vatroslav Jagić had the opportunity to consult the original manuscript, on loan from Istanbul. This enabled him to check the transcription of the diacritics and titla and to indicate them in print.[2] He was also able to append a photograph of the first page of the text, as well as the colophons which were likewise reproduced in Kovačević's edition.

Comparison of the photographs with Jagić's printed version reveals that the latter deploys only two diacritic marks, whereas the manuscript has three. The *spiritus asper*, or *daseia*, is placed over word-initial vowels and over и w, occasionally a, when they occur after other vocalic letters internally. The *spiritus lenis*, or *psilē*, which varies in size and is sometimes little more than a dot, is used over the digraphic vowel letters оу ꙗ ѥ ю ы internally and finally, over и in final position after another vowel, and sometimes over double a or и. The third diacritic, which looks like an extended *daseia* with a tail rising towards the right, is found above internal and final vowels, single or occasionally double, which occur after consonants. There is thus some overlap in the distribution of the three diacritics, and their interpretation depends on linguistic as well as palaeographic considerations.

It is not entirely clear whether Jagić's edition reduces this threefold diacritic system to two in order to avoid problems of interpretation or simply because his publisher's typographical resources were limited. It was clear, however, both to Kovačević and to Jagić that the third diacritic marks vocalic length after a consonant. In his commentary Kovačević mentioned its use,[3] and a year later Jagić published a detailed analysis of its distribution in the manuscript.[4] Consequently, the attentive reader of Jagić's edition was in a position to work out which non-initial vocalic letters were marked for length in the *hrisovulj*, to check conclusions against the lists in Jagić's article, and to make allowance for the small number of misprints which Jagić noted.

More recently a photographic edition of the whole *hrisovulj* has made full verification possible.[5] In the discussion which follows, folio references are given as

---

1 Ljubomir KOVAČEVIĆ (ed.), "Svetostefanska hrisovulja", *Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije*, 1890., sv. 4, vi-viii, x-xi.
2 Vatroslav JAGIĆ (ed.), *Svetostefanski hrisovulj kralja Stefana Uroša II Milutina*, Zemaljska vlada za Bosnu i Hercegovinu – Holzhausen, Vienna, 1890., vi.
3 Lj. KOVAČEVIĆ, "Svetostefanska hrisovulja", xi-xii.
4 Vatroslav JAGIĆ, "Kritischer Anzeiger", *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 13, 1891., 259-266.
5 Đorđe TRIFUNOVIĆ (ed.), *Povelja kralja Milutina manastiru Banjska. Svetostefanska hrisovulja.*

in this edition, i.e. starting from the first four blank folios of the manuscript. Jagić numbered only the folios which contain text, so his folio numbers can be derived by subtracting 4, e.g. f. 5r in the photographic edition = Jagić's f. 1r. It has to be said that it is not always clear even from the photographic edition whether diacritics used over initial а и ѡ and post-vocalic и ѡ, especially at line-end (indicated here by double ||), should be read as the *daseia* or as the third diacritic, e.g. й||скони or и'||скони 5r; though usually the differences among the three diacritics are plainly visible, e.g. ѩ||же, бан҄ска'.|| and корилѩ.|| 14v. Consequently only examples of the third diacritic in post-consonantal use, where it is unambiguously a marker of vocalic length, are taken into consideration.

A further complication is that this length marker is apparently an optional orthographical convention, which is not deployed on every presumptive long vowel. Fortunately it may be combined with or replaced by another conventional indication of vocalic length, the reduplication of vocalic letters,[6] and so instances of free variation between double vocalic letters, with or without diacritics, and single vocalic letters accompanied by the third diacritic provide a guarantee of its prosodic function. These are frequent in the genitive plural of nouns, e.g. прѣродительь' родительь' 11v, 82v and прѣродитель' родитель' 85v, хрисовоѵльь' 81r and хрисовоѵль' 91r, динарьь' and динарь' 57v, лаѕь' 23r and лаѕь'ь 76r, an unusual instance of two diacritics on this ending. The suggestion[7] that these spellings represent a different pronunciation from the genitive plural ending in single -ь without diacritic is difficult to reconcile with the free variation observable elsewhere between single vowel, double vowel and vowel plus diacritic: in root syllables and verbal endings, e.g. ва'лꙑй 22v, ваѡлꙑй 25v and валꙑй 31v, ѻѵѕи'ма 37r, ѻѵѕи'маѡ 50v-51r, ѻѵѕꙑймаа' 56v and оѵѕима 77r, косе' 50r and косе 50v, доносе' 74v and доносе 75r, ꙗви'се 6r and ꙗвꙑйсе 8r, спада' 22v and спадаѡ 27r, копа'

Knjiga prva, Fototipija izvornog rukopisa, Muzej u Prištini – Centar za očuvanje nasleđa Kosova i Metohije – JP *Službeni glasnik*, Belgrade – Priština, 2011.; Viktor SAVIĆ, "Izdanje Svetostefanske hrisovulje Vatroslava Jagića i Ljubomira Kovačevića", ibid., *Knjiga druga, Fototipija izdanja i prateće studije,* 173-176.

6   Radmila Vladimirovna BULATOVA, "Nadstročnye znaki v južnoslavjanskih rukopisjah XI-XIV vv.", *Metodičeskoe posobie po opisaniju slavjano-russkih rukopisej dlja Svodnogo kataloga rukopisej, hranjaščihsja v SSSR,* vyp. 1, Akademija nauk SSSR – Arheografičeskaja komissija – Institut slavjanovedenija i balkanistiki ANSSSR – Glavnoe arhivnoe upravlenie SSSR, gl. red. Lidija Petrovna ŽUKOVSKAJA, Moscow, 1973., 92; Pavle IVIĆ, Vera JERKOVIĆ, *Paleografski opis i pravopis Dečanskih hrisovulja,* Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu – Institut za južnoslovenske jezike, Novi Sad, 1982., 118-119.

7   J. NEDELJKOVIĆ, "Nastanak genitiva množine imenica u svetostefanskoj hrisovulji. Druga decenija XIV veka", *Arheografski prilozi*, 26-27, 2004-5., 155-160; see also Aleksandar MLADENOVIĆ, "Prilog tumačenju postanka genitivnog množinskog nastavka -a u jednom delu srpskog jezika", *Istorija srpskog jezika. Odabrani radovi*, Čigoja, Belgrade, 2008., 120-124.

47v and копаа́ 49v, йма́а́ and йма' 56v; in derivational suffixes, e.g. воз˸ни'кь and воз˸никомь 29v, сокал˵нйикь 49v, сокал˵никь 51v and сокал˵ни'кь 55v; and in case endings of adjectives, e.g. межоусоб˸наа́ 58r and мегюсобна' 75v.

The length and linguistic character of the hrisovulj make it a valuable source of linguistic data. Its formulaic opening (ff. 5r-14v) and conclusion (78v-end) are written predominantly in Church Slavonic,[8] though with local features of pronunciation, such as the long final vowel in the genitive plural of nouns, e.g. снѣь' 85r as well as сн҃овьь' 55r, the pronominal forms сь' 9r, се' 15v and *passim*, сь'й 87r, та'же 88v, a long root vowel in the words ника'ко 9v, хра'м˵ 79v, ра'бь 84v, and length in both the definite and the indefinite forms of genitive singular masculine or neuter adjectives, e.g. добраа́го 13r нарѣна'го, рав˸на'го 12r, велика'го 12v, такова'го 85v, прославлю҅ю҅ща'го 91r and сѣдеща́а́, простираю҅ща́а́, вьꙃводеща' 9r, и'мо́у҅ща' 10r.

The large central section of the document (ff.14v-78v) which defines the estates of the monastery and regulates their use is written in a more vernacular type of language and therefore offers examples of vocalic length in words which are not usually found in Church Slavonic, such as гранича'не 15r, м˵гѣлови'к˵, шипови'кь 16v, гради'щоу 25v, хра'стиѥ́ 31r, польь'ꙃь 32v, врь'бо́у҅, бѣꙃови'кь 36r, ѡ҅зи'ме 49v, сла'дь 51v, and technical terms such as рь'ть 15v and мь'ть 50v, both of which occur more than once. The language of this section is also open to grammatical innovations. It offers examples of the pronominal form та'ꙃи 51v, the definite genitive singular masculine модро'га 17v and the genitive dual forms рѣкоу' 35v, липицоу' 40v. The contracted nominative and accusative forms of feminine adjectives are common, e.g. цр҃ков˸на' 54v, всака' 57v, рьжана', рьжаноу' 37v, and the prosodic difference between the feminine accusative endings of adjectives and of nouns is clearly marked, e.g. лй҅йтоу' стѣноу́ 38r, ѡ҅блоу' главоу́ 40r, ст҃огор˵скоу' мегю҅, доброу' водицоу҅ 46v, оу҅гьр˵скоу' гомы́лоу́ 43v. There are numerous instances of the genitive singular ending in -e' which was generalized from soft-stem feminine nouns and pronouns, such as волѥ' 52v, ко́у҅щѐ' 57v, прѣ̏че' 82r, наше' 11v, все' 12v, to the hard-stem type, e.g. воде' 17r, гомы́ле' 43r, рьібе' 56r, войске', работе' 58v, прѣке' цѣсте' 26v, ꙃле' рѣке' 47r, ꙃамѣне вол˸не' 81r, wне' 22v, те' 41r, йне' 78v and the consonantal declension цр҃кве' 48v. Vernacular personal forms of verbs are also well attested with length marking, mainly in the third person singular and plural present: ѡ́упада' 19r, ѡ҅брѣте' 38v, ꙃове' 39r, скаче' 43v, направлю҅' 53v, чини' 57v, нѣ' 74r, дрьꙃне' 93r; стаю҅' 15v, ѡ҅брѣтоу' 49r, ѡ҅рю҅' 50v, товаре' 56r. In two places length reflecting the retraction of accent from a pronoun to a preposition is indicated: ꙃа́а́ нѥ́ 15r, ꙃа' то 31r.

---

8   Milica GRKOVIĆ, "Osnivačka hrisovulja manastira Banjske", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku Matice srpske,* 50, 2007., 176.

Although there are instances where the third diacritic is used to indicate vocalic length for two syllables in the same word, e.g. о́ᲂɥ̇и'ма' 37r, гра'де' 50v, usually the length marker occurs only once over a word, e.g. хра'ний 52r, and examples of the same word in different cases imply that marking of grammatical endings may have been given priority over stems: гла'воᲂᲂ̇ 22r, гла'вѣ 26r but главе' 22r, стра'ноᲂ̇ 27v but стране' 45r.

A striking peculiarity should be noted in the long sub-section (ff. 59r-74r) which lists the members of the various *katuni* operating on the monastery's estates. Apart from introductory phrases such as катоᲂ̇нь шишатовˇцьь' 61r, катоᲂ̇нь бльгарˇски' 64r, катоᲂ̇нь смоᲂ̇дирогьь' 69v, there are hardly any length markers on the large numbers of personal names which make up this sub-section; the only exceptions are добри'нь 63v, станими'рь 69v, нѣгова'нь 70r, even though a glance at Kovačević's index of personal names[9] discovers other names formed in a similar way. This disparity in prosodic marking suggests that for the two scribes of the *hrisovulj*[10] writing syntactically organized text was different from reproducing a list. They registered vocalic quantity in phrases and clauses, either because they wrote from actual dictation or because they "heard" these pieces of text in their minds as they copied them, whereas the act of recording items from a list was perhaps a more simply visual process.

This interpretation may find some support in the *chrysobullion* issued by King Stefan Dušan to the monastery of Christ Pantocrator at Dečani in the 1340s.[11] The scribe of this document was familiar with the length marker and employed it in much the same way as did the scribes of the *Svetostefanski hrisovulj*, although more sparsely: on genitive plural endings, e.g. до кр̃тьь' 22r, посрѣ̃ нивь' 53v, дльгихь лоукь' 55v, стᲂ̇ихь врачевь' 69v, родитель' и прѣродитель' 74v, on root vowels, e.g. при'ти 74r, се' 8r and passim, та'ко 71v, on personal endings of verbs, e.g. прида' 10r, спада' 32v, оупада' 52r, йма' 72v. But his use of this diacritic is inconspicuous because the bulk of his lengthy text is devoted to lists of personal names: among their hundreds, only a handful are marked for vocalic length: ра'да 40r, гра'да 52r, ра'шь 52v, бра'та 70v.

Thus the length marker in the *Svetostefanski hrisovulj* is not an isolated phenomenon, and further parallels have been reported in Serbian manuscripts of the late 13th and early 14th centuries. R. V. Bulatova characterized what she called the "inverted" *kamara* as a quantitative marker, distinguishable from a spiritus by its distribution and found earlier than the *kentēma*, the double grave accent, on gen-

---

9   Lj. KOVAČEVIĆ, "Svetostefanska hrisovulja", 20-23.

10   Đ. TRIFUNOVIĆ, *Povelja kralja Milutina*, knj.2, 143.

11   Pavle IVIĆ, Milica GRKOVIĆ (ed.), *Dečanske hrisovulje*, Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu – Institut za lingvistiku, Novi Sad, 1976.

itive plural nominal endings.[12] She noted its presence in a manuscript, dated 1263, of the *Hexameron* of John the Exarch, where it appears over double or contract vowels in adjectival endings and imperfect tense forms, and occasionally over initial or post-vocalic а ꙗ ѥ.[13] She also described its more developed use in the *Raška kormčaja*, dated 1305, a manuscript of the *Nomokanon*, where it is deployed over contract and other post-consonantal vowels, e.g. сь' се' ть' кто' та'ко and genitive plural endings.[14]

In a posthumously published monograph V. M. Zagrebin proposed *kremastē*,[15] a term borrowed from Byzantine ecphonetic musical notation, to designate a marker similar in form and function to the third diacritic of the *hrisovulj*. He identified at least three manuscripts from the 13th to 14th centuries in which this diacritic is the only length marker;[16] it continues to be used in his later 14th-century sources together with other diacritics indicating length. The picture which emerges from Zagrebin's analysis is very similar to that in the *hrisovulj*, though limited by the fact that his material is in Church Slavonic: his examples include contract adjectival endings, long vowels in the root syllables of nouns, adjectives, pronouns, verbs and adverbs, verbal endings, especially aorist forms, the genitive plural endings of nouns and combinations of preposition and pronoun.[17]

A striking analogue to the diacritic system in the *Svetostefanski hrisovulj* is to be found in an early 14th-century Serbian Church Slavonic Psalter, Peć 68.[18] In particular the use of the third diacritic in this manuscript strongly resembles its distribution in the *hrisovulj*. It may occur over single or double vocalic letters, e.g. вьꙁьа'лˮчю̇ 28r and вьꙁаа'лˮчють 38v, especially in genitive plural forms, e.g. вѣкьь' 34r and вѣкь' 64v, грѣшˮникьь' 8r and грѣшˮникь' 101r, грѣхь' 8v, грѣхьь' 29v and грѣховьь' 21r, сн͠ь' 45r, сн͠овьь' 62r and сн͠овь' 115v, силль' 20r and

---

[12] R. V. BULATOVA, "Nadstročnye znaki", 80-81.

[13] Ibid., 94-95; Radmila Vladimirovna BULATOVA, "K izučeniju sistem nadstročnyh znakov v drevneserbskih rukopisjah", *Zbornik Vladimira Mošina,* Savez bibliotečkih radnika Srbije, red. Dimitrije BOGDANOVIĆ, Biljana JOVANOVIĆ-STIPČEVIĆ, Đorđe TRIFUNOVIĆ, Belgrade, 1977., 116.

[14] Vladimir MOŠIN, *Paleografski album na južnoslovenskoto kirilsko pismo,* Skopje, 1966., No. 70; R. V. BULATOVA, "Nadstročnye znaki", 95-96; R. V. BULATOVA, "K izučeniju sistem nadstročnyh znakov", 116. The term is also used by Viktor SAVIĆ, "Služabnik iz vremena Srpskog carstva. Nadredni znaci u rukopisu Narodne biblioteke Srbije Rs 694", *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor,* 67, 2001., 87-97.

[15] Vjačeslav Mihajlovič ZAGREBIN, "Prosodičeskie nadstročnye znaki v srednevekovyh serbskih rukopisjah: periodizacija ih upotreblenija, forma i funkcii, genezis", Idem, *Issledovanija pamjatnikov južnoslavjanskoj i drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti,* Al'jans-Arheo, Moscow – St Petersburg, 2006., 28.

[16] Ibid., 33.

[17] Ibid., 57-73.

[18] Catherine Mary MACROBERT, "Two for the Price of One: the Psalter MS Peć 68", *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, New Series, 22, 1989., 1-33.

силь' 20v, слъд҄ьь' 11r and, remarkably, сль'д҄ьь' 131v. It is found over vowels in roots and suffixes, e.g. беѕа'конию̈ 12v and passim, оу'довӹ 22v, ѿи'мет҇се 60r and ѿи'ми 147v, хва'лите 132r, въд҄лю̈бѝ 145r, грѣш҇ни'ча 120r. It marks length in both definite and indefinite forms of genitive singular masculine or neuter adjectives and participles, e.g. нища'го 6r, правед҇на'го 7r, велика'го 24v, такова'го 53v, праѕн҇оӱю̈ща'го 14v, иѕ҇гонеща'го 17r, and м҇нога' 6v, сотонин҇ска' 95r, слад҇чайша' 174r, просещаа' 7r, б҇деща', спеща' 57r, йсповѣдаю̈ща' 94v, соӱща' 123r, дрьд҄аю̈ща' 147v, створ҇ща' 22r, йсхӹтив҇ша' 123v, носимаа' 123v. The traditional language of the Psalter precludes new forms of the genitive singular feminine in -e'; but the third diacritic is found in feminine adjectives, e.g. всака' 43v, нощ҇на' 89v, in the genitive dual роӱкоу' 141v, and in present tense verbal endings, e.g. иѕ҄бави'ть 26v, настави'т҇ 39r, с҇храни'ть 149v, вьсила'мо 126v, пож҇ню'ть 152r, as well as in aorist and imperfect, e.g. с҇бра' 13v, роди' 29v, настави'ста 15v, с҇мѣри'ше се 117v, помина'х҇ 42v, ѡ̈б҇нища'ше 1r, слӹша'хомь 25r, ѡ̈браща'хоӱ се 71r. Like the *hrisovulj*, Peć 68 contains repeated instances of the demonstrative ce' 8r, and it furnishes several examples of length under accentual retraction from pronoun to preposition, e.g. д҄а' се 26r, на' нь 43r, на' нӹ 46r, на' те 57v. It also offers evidence of an unexpected long vowel in ка'ко 61v, 62v, 122v and та'ко 3r, 24v, 25r, 40v.

In addition, the material from Peć 68 provides parallels for a feature which is visible only in the photographic edition of the *hrisovulj*, a semi-circular form of the third diacritic which is sometimes used over the digraph oy in certain grammatical endings, e.g. accusative singular feminine великоў 10r, тоў 54v, ѡ̈брамов҇скоў главоў 17v, саш҇коў рѣкоў 20r, страшноў стѣноў 20v, дро́угоў главицоў 23r, оў брѣсть ниѕ҇вол҇скоў 38r, дро́угоў гомы̆лоў 41r-v, and genitive dual потокоў 36r, рѣкоў 37r. Peć 68 mirrors this practice, e.g. accusative дш҇оў а̇л҇чю̈щоў 117r, д҄емлю̈ плодовитоў 118v, dual роўкоў 160v, though it also employs the semi-circular variant in other contexts: слоўха 128v, поўть 47r and in five other places, as well as поу'ти 135v, соўдить 127r, въд҄лю̈бий 135r, помогоўть 146r.

Photographs in palaeographic albums reveal yet other manuscripts which seem to resemble the *hrisovulj* in their choice and use of diacritics, particularly the Zoiss Gospel fragment in Ljubljana[19] and the *Hilandarska povelja* of King Milutin, dated 1302.[20] It would of course be pertinent to examine the repertoire and distribution of diacritics in the manuscripts which A. A. Turilov attributes to the

---

[19] Vladimir MOŠIN, *Ćirilski rukopisi u Povijesnom muzeju Hrvatske: Kopitareva zbirka slovenskih rukopisa i Cojsov ćirilski odlomak u Ljubljani. Paleografski album,* Narodna biblioteka SR Srbije – Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1971., Nos. 12-14.

[20] V. MOŠIN, *Paleografski album*, No. 61.

scribe of the *Svetostefanski hrisovulj*,[21] especially the Gospel written by Radoslav for Milutin in 1316,[22] though it should be noted that this identification has been questioned.[23]

There is another similarity between the *hrisovulj* and Peć 68 which may be detected from photographs of individual folios but can be fully appreciated only if the complete text is available, either in reproduction or in manuscript. Jagić and Kovačević both followed the convention of their time by imposing modern word divisions, but it can be seen from the photographs which accompany Jagić's edition, and confirmed from the photographic edition of 2011, that the scribes of the *hrisovulj* tended to divide the text into prosodic words, i.e. units with single stresses. So on the one hand enclitics – monosyllabic conjunctions and prepositions, pronouns and auxiliary verbs – are combined with adjacent stressed items, while words which have their own stresses are often marked off by space before and afterwards. In the following examples, items which would be treated as separate words in modern editions but are written continuously in the *hrisovulj* are linked by +: а̇нг҃льскаа̇ и̇+ар˵ханг҃льска' 5r; ꙗ̇ко+да+и̇||м˵+се не+оу̇змоу' развѣ+не||вѣре' 31r; и̇+до+гдѣ+се не||ѡ̇брѣтоу' татиє̇ 49r; к˵то||ли+га+кꙑ̇є прѣж̑е поу̇сти||ти да+ꙑ̇є проклеть 58r. On the other hand the constituent parts of compound words are sometimes separated by a perceptible space, here indicated by single |, e.g. а̇р˵хи|є̇п̑п̑и̇и̇ 14r, надь+сѣ||но|кось 17r, и̇+живо|твореща'го 85v, чл҃вко|любиє̇ 90v. This spacing seems to imply the presence of two stresses, perhaps main and secondary stress, on compound words.

The same practices are well attested in Peć 68. Although the presentational conventions of the Psalter and the interventions of a corrector complicate the interpretation of layout in this manuscript,[24] there are numerous clear examples of clitics written continuously with stressed words, e.g. не+на+лоу̇к˵+бо мой оу̇пваю 16v; и̇+да+д̑а̑+ми+се сл҃б̑ 94v; или+к˵то+сь+м˵ною станеть 98r; не+и̇мам˵+бо+ти нич˵то добра при||нести 178r; ꙗ̇ко+не+оу̇крѣплꙗ̇є̇т˵+се сил˵нь+моу̇||жь 185ᵛ.[25] Conversely space is used to mark off the constituents of compounds, e.g. скоро|пис˵ца 18r, чл҃вко|любиꙗ̇ 21v, ꙃаконо|прѣстоу̇п˵ници 83v.[26]

---

[21] Anatolij Arkad'evič TURILOV, "Zametki o serbskih gramotah XIV-XV vv., napisannyh knižnym pis'-mom: problemy piscov, podlinnosti i datirovki aktov", Idem, *Ot Kirilla Filosofa do Konstantina Kosteneckogo i Vasilija Sofijanina*. Indrik, Moscow, 2011., 384, 396-398.

[22] V. MOŠIN, *Paleografski albom*, No. 72; D. BOGDANOVIĆ, *Katalog ćirilskih rukopisa*, No. 35.

[23] Đ. TRIFUNOVIĆ, *Povelja kralja Milutina*, knj. 2, 143.

[24] Catherine Mary MACROBERT, "The Linguistic Basis of Textual Segmentation in Serbian Church Slavonic Sources of the 14th-15th centuries", *Oxford University Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics* 7 (https://www.ling-phil.ox.ac.uk/research/publications), ed. Ina J. HART-MANN, Andreas WILLI, 2002., 211-214.

This use of spacing in early Cyrillic and Glagolitic manuscripts to indicate the prosodic segmentation of the text, in addition to the standard methods of marking syntactic and thematic structure by means of points, paragraphing, *litterae notabiliores* and rubrication, is a phenomenon which deserves further investigation. It is more widespread, both temporally and geographically,[27] than the diacritic length marker discussed above, and its occurrence on the western periphery of the area where Cyrillic was in use raises the possibility of Latin influence. Whatever its origin, it shows that in the early 14th century scribes had at their command an effective way to represent potential or actual features of oral presentation in texts as diverse as the *Svetostefanski hrisovulj* and the Peć Psalter.

Thus Jagić's commendation of the "so hübsche orthographische Rezultate bezüglich der Anwendung von Zeichen auf Grund unseres Chrysobullions"[28] was well founded. The *Svetostefanski hrisovulj* has indeed much to offer for the study of orthography and, by implication, of prosody. It contains a wide range of data on vocalic length, both in Serbian Church Slavonic and in the vernacular. It also bears ample witness to the practice of dividing the written text into prosodic words. These peculiarities could already be discerned on the basis of Jagić's edition of 1890, with the help of the photographs which he prudently included. His edition of the *hrisovulj* and his article of 1891 are typical examples of his attention to detail and his sound judgement as an editor and a philologist.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1/ Dimitrije BOGDANOVIĆ, *Katalog ćirilskih rukopisa manastira Hilandara. Paleografski album,* Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti – Narodna biblioteka SR Srbije, Belgrade, 1978.

2/ Radmila Vladimirovna BULATOVA, "Nadstročnye znaki v južnoslavjanskih rukopisjah XI-XIV vv.", *Metodičeskoe posobie po opisaniju slavjano-russkih rukopisej dlja Svodnogo kataloga rukopisej, hranjaščihsja v SSSR,* vyp. 1, Akademija nauk SSSR – Arheografičeskaja komissija – Institut slavjanovedenija i balkanistiki ANSSSR – Glavnoe arhivnoe upravlenie SSSR, gl. red. Lidija Petrovna ŽUKOVSKAJA, Moscow, 1973., 76-114.

---

[25] Ibid., 215-219.
[26] Ibid., 216, 219-220.
[27] Ibid., 207-210.
[28] V. JAGIĆ, "Kritischer Anzeiger", 234.

3/ Radmila Vladimirovna BULATOVA, "K izučeniju sistem nadstročnyh znakov v drevneserbskih rukopisjah", *Zbornik Vladimira Mošina*, Savez bibliotečkih radnika Srbije, red. Dimitrije BOGDANOVIĆ, Biljana JOVANOVIĆ-STIPČEVIĆ, Đorđe TRIFUNOVIĆ, Belgrade, 1977., 113-116.

4/ Milica GRKOVIĆ, "Osnivačka hrisovulja manastira Banjske", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku Matice srpske*, 50, 2007., 175-179.

5/ Pavle IVIĆ, Milica GRKOVIĆ, (ed.), *Dečanske hrisovulje*, Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu – Institut za lingvistiku, Novi Sad, 1976.

6/ Pavle IVIĆ, Vera JERKOVIĆ, *Paleografski opis i pravopis Dečanskih hrisovulja*, Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu – Institut za južnoslovenske jezike, Novi Sad, 1982.

7/ Vatroslav JAGIĆ, (ed.), *Svetostefanski hrisovulj kralja Stefana Uroša II Milutina*, Zemaljska vlada za Bosnu i Hercegovinu – Holzhausen, Vienna, 1890.

8/ Vatroslav JAGIĆ, "Kritischer Anzeiger", *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 13, 1891., 253-71.

9/ Ljubomir KOVAČEVIĆ, (ed.), "Svetostefanska hrisovulja", *Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije*, 1890., sv. 4, 1-22.

10/ Catherine Mary MACROBERT, "Two for the Price of One: the Psalter MS Peć 68", *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, New Series, 22, 1989., 1-33.

11/ Catherine Mary MACROBERT, "The Linguistic Basis of Textual Segmentation in Serbian Church Slavonic Sources of the 14th-15th centuries", *Oxford University Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics* 7 (https://www.ling-phil.ox.ac.uk/research/publications), ed. Ina J. HARTMANN, Andreas WILLI, 2002., 207-224.

12/ Aleksandar MLADENOVIĆ, "Prilog tumačenju postanka genitivnog množinskog nastavka -a u jednom delu srpskog jezika", *Istorija srpskog jezika. Odabrani radovi,* Čigoja, Belgrade, 2008., 102-135, esp. 122.

13/ Vladimir MOŠIN, *Paleografski albom na južnoslovenskoto kirilsko pismo*, Skopje, 1966.

14/ Vladimir MOŠIN, *Ćirilski rukopisi u Povijesnom muzeju Hrvatske: Kopitareva zbirka slovenskih rukopisa i Cojsov ćirilski odlomak u Ljubljani. Paleografski album*, Narodna biblioteka SR Srbije – Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1971.

15/ J. NEDELJKOVIĆ, "Nastanak genitiva množine imenica u svetostefanskoj hrisovulji. Druga decenija XIV veka", *Arheografski prilozi*, 26-27, 2004-5., 155-160.

16/ Viktor SAVIĆ,"Službenik iz vremena Srpskog carstva. Nadredni znaci u rukopisu Narodne biblioteke Srbije Rs 694", *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor*, 67, 2001., 87-97.

17/ Viktor SAVIĆ,"Izdanje Svetostefanske hrisovulje Vatroslava Jagića i Ljubomira Kovačevića", *Povelja kralja Milutina manastiru Banjska. Svetostefanska hrisovulja. Knjiga druga, Fototipija izdanja i prateće studije,* Muzej u Prištini – Cen-

tar za očuvanje nasleđa Kosova i Metohije – JP *Službeni glasnik*, ed. Đorđe TRIFUNOVIĆ, Belgrade – Priština, 2011, 173-178.

18/ Đorđe TRIFUNOVIĆ, (ed.), *Povelja kralja Milutina manastiru Banjska. Svetostefanska hrisovulja. Knjiga prva, Fototipija izvornog rukopisa. Knjiga druga, Fototipija izdanja i prateće studije,* Muzej u Prištini – Centar za očuvanje nasleđa Kosova i Metohije – JP *Službeni glasnik*, Belgrade – Priština, 2011.

19/ Anatolij Arkaďevič TURILOV,"Zametki o serbskih gramotah XIV-XV vv., napisannyh knižnym pis'mom: problemy piscov, podlinnosti i datirovki aktov", Idem, *Ot Kirilla Filosofa do Konstantina Kosteneckogo i Vasilija Sofijanina*. Indrik, Moscow, 2011., 381-404.

20/ Vjačeslav Mihajlovič ZAGREBIN,"Prosodičeskie nadstročnye znaki v srednevekovyh serbskih rukopisjah: periodizacija ih upotreblenija, forma i funkcii, genezis", Idem, *Issledovanija pamjatnikov južnoslavjanskoj i drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti,* Al'jans-Arheo, Moscow – St Petersburg, 2006., 27-100.

SAŽETAK

**DOPRINOS JAGIĆEVA IZDANJA *SVETOSTEFANSKOGA HRISOVULJA*
ISTRAŽIVANJU PROZODIJSKIH POJAVA U RUKOPISIMA 13.-14. STOLJEĆA
RAŠKOGA PRAVOPISA**

Izdanje 'Svetostefanski hrisovulj' Vatroslava Jagića u dva se bitna elementa razlikuje od onoga što ga je, također 1890., objavio Ljubomir Kovačević: sadrži dijakritičke znakove upotrijebljene u rukopisu i reproducira stranicu teksta, kao i kolofone. Iako je Jagić raspolagao ograničenim tipografskim sredstvima za predstavljanje dijakritičkih znakova, te je slijedio tadašnju praksu uvodeći suvremenu podjelu riječi, iz njegovih se reprodukcija vidi da je glavni prepisivač Svetostefanskog hrisovulja koristio osebujni dijakritički znak kao oznaku vokalne duljine i razmakom podijelio svoj tekst na prozodijske riječi. S obzirom na te naznake, moguće je iz Jagićeva izdanja zaključiti o distribuciji dijakritika u rukopisu i njihovim implikacijama na vokalnu kvantitetu, što je on analizirao u članku iz 1891. U novije vrijeme objavljivanje fotografskog izdanja cijelog hrisovulja nije samo potvrdilo Jagićeva saznanja, vec je i omogućilo analizu prozodijske segmentacije naznačene u rukopisu. Paralele s pisarskom praksom Svetostefanskog hrisovulja navode se iz drugih rukopisa s početka 14. stoljeća.

Ključne riječi: Vatroslav Jagić; Svetostefanski hrisovulj; dijakritika; vokalni kvantitet; prozodijske riječi.