

## SUMMARY

---

### **Croatian Glagolitic primers (from 15th to 19th century) as a source of information about linguistic processes.**

Despite the key role which Glagolitic primers had played in preserving the tradition of Church-Slavonic liturgy, language and literature in Croatia, they remained outside of the main scope of studies considering the Croatian Church-Slavonic language and Glagolitic script. These booklets were most commonly treated as trial prints for bigger works such as missals and breviaries and were thus overshadowed by them. Most of the studies on their subject were limited to a bibliographical description and short sketches about their linguistic features. The few exceptions were the comparative works considering their graphic system or orthography that focused on publications from certain periods such as early printing or East Slavic influence on the Glagolitic liturgical books, but never on the whole phenomenon of Glagolitic primers. In Polish works concerning the Glagolitic script and Church-Slavonic language the primers were only seldomly noticed.

The main purpose of this work is thus three-fold: 1) providing the Polish reader with an insight into the Croatian Glagolitic primers in their historical, cultural and linguistic context; 2) ascertaining whether, despite their meagre volume, such texts may be considered as a valuable source of information concerning the changes in Glagolitic script and Croatian-Church-Slavonic language; 3) considering if the findings of other researchers based on different texts are mirrored in the Glagolitic primers.

The author's work consists of two main parts: the descriptive, whose role is to organise the known information about the Glagolitic script and primers, and the comparative-analytical, which consists of comparison and analysis of material taken from Glagolitic primers.

The Glagolitic primers analysed and compared in this dissertation are: the (so called) *Primers* of George of Slavonja (15<sup>th</sup> century), A. Torresano's (1527), Š. Kožičić's *Psaltir* (1530?), S. Konzul's and A. Dalmatin's *Tabla za Dicu* (1561), R. Levaković's *Azbukividnjak* (1629), *Bukvars* of M. Karaman (1753 – 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), A. Juranić (1763), I. Berčić (1863) and in some aspects D. A. Parčić's *Mali Azbukvar* (1894).

The examination is conducted on two main planes: graphical and linguistical.

The former begins with a comparison of Glagolitic alphabets written or printed in the primers with reconstructed original alphabet as well as the abecedaries from Bamberg and Roč, followed by an analysis of numeral values of the Glagolitic letters in different books. The author then analyses the diacritic markings added to Glagolitic letters and the reasons of doing so, as well as questions the qualification of three dots added above the *šć* as a diacritic marking instead of a ligature. This part is followed by a comparison of ligatures used in text of the Glagolitic primers with the tables explaining their meaning printed in the booklets from 17<sup>th</sup> to late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The author also screened the text for ligatures that were used repeatedly in certain roots, prefixes and suffixes trying to discover patterns of possible traditional ways of writing certain words (such as words with *-mil-* and *-mol-* roots). The last part of the chapter provides a frequency analysis of Glagolitic ligatures written or printed in the primers, depicting changes in both overall ratio of the used ligatures as well as distinct types (horizontal, vertical, three-part).

On the latter plane, the study centres on the influence of linguistic processes typical for Croatian dialects (primarily chakavian) and extralinguistic factors (such as the East-Slavic influence in the prints by Congregatio de propaganda Fidae) on the textual form of Glagolitic primers. The processes examined are mostly phonetic such as *ekavian* and *ikavian* reflections of Proto-Slavonic *jat'*, different realisations of *jers*, *l* and *r* sonants, specific products of iotation processes as well as metatheses in *\*olt-* *\*ort-*, *\*-telt-*, *\*-tert-*, *\*-olt-*, *\*-tort-* consonant groups and other. The author follows how these phonological changes were shown in Glagolitic writing and tries to fathom the implications of certain ways of writing. Subsequently, he examines the use of interrogative-relative pronouns identified as typical of Croatian dialects such as *što*, *ča*, *kaj* and *ki* and considers the relation of a certain text's function with the usage of said pronouns. In the final part of the analysis, borrowings from non-Slavonic languages and proper names, present in the primers, are examined with special attention paid to the extra-linguistic factors leading to them being written down or printed in a particular manner.

The main conclusion of the study is that despite being small in volume the Glagolitic primers are a valuable source of information about changes in writing system as well as linguistic and extra-linguistic influences with two reservations: that as any other source they should be considered within a certain context and that due to their size they are better fit as

a source for corroborating conclusions based on a larger material than drawing conclusions that could be extrapolated to other texts.

On the graphic plane, an outside intervention into the structure of the Glagolitic alphabet is clearly visible in Karaman's *Bukvar*, as its redactors decided to equalize Glagolitic and Cyrillic script. This process, however, was not fully complete as some letters in both alphabets remained without an equivalent in the other and the numeral values of the letters remained diverse.

The analysis of diacritic markings shows a need for reconsidering whether some of them should be considered as diacritics or ligatures, and a need for inclusion of the former in the system of transliteration. Examination of ligatures proves that they should not be omitted (as they happened to be in the past) in examining Glagolitic texts as they are a considerable part of them (in primers they make up to 8,6% of all signs in the text).

The frequency of ligatures of all types drops steadily from older to newer primers (apart from that of Levaković), so does the number of three-part ligatures, while the ratio of vertical to horizontal ones rises as does the number of ligatures in the explanatory tables.

Further, certain words written with particular ligatures found in the *Codex Zographensis* on the one hand, and primers of Torresano and Kožičić on the other, suggest the existence of a certain mode of writing (if not a graphical tradition) that should be further explored by comparative studies of other Glagolitic texts. The author also postulates creating an unambiguous typology of Glagolitic ligatures and creating computer fonts containing at least the most common ligatures identified by I. Bakmaz.

On the linguistic plane, chakavian dialect's influence is clearly visible in the primers from 15<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> century, as is a complete lack of chakavian characteristics in Karaman's and Berčić's editions. The reappearance of such features in Juranić's *Bukvar* proves that part of its texts was based on Levaković's *Azbukividnjak*. Kajkavian and any shtokavian characteristics can, surprisingly, only be found in *Tabla za Dicu*.

The most prominent chakavian features in the primers can be connected to chakavian strong vocality which influenced the development of *jers* as well as *ǰ* and *ȝ* sonants. Tracing the former also allows for distinguishing between primers belonging to the Croatian redaction and those that underwent East Slavonic influence. Furthermore, it helps to identify

*Azbukividnjak* as transitional and indicates that A. Juranić utilized both Levaković's and Karaman's editions in creating his own.

Another visible feature of Croatian redaction are different products of iotation of consonant groups *\*ske*, *\*skj*, *\*stj* and *\*tj*, *\*ktj*, *\*gtj*, which were noted as *šč* or *č* accordingly, while in the Old-Church-Slavonic and Russian-Church-Slavonic all of them gave respectively *št* and *šč*. This differentiation was continued even in the Glagolitic part of Karaman's *Bukvar*, thus making it probably the only Croatian-Church-Slavonic feature prominent during the East Slavonic influence only to be removed by I. Berčić.

The author also postulates reevaluating the features considered as most important and typical to the Croatian redaction of the Church Slavonic language, as noticing some of them (e. g. *\*ǫ>u*) yields no fruit in determining a particular redaction while others (e. g. *\*ę>'a* when preceded by *č*, *ž*, *š*, *j*, alternating with *\*ę>e*) allows for pinpointing the examined text to a particular region and dialect. Also the distribution of ikavian and ekavian realisations of *jat* should be further examined, due to their insufficient explanation provided by the Jakubinski-Meyer principle and the well established idea that *ê* was pronounced as *e*. Lastly the author postulates a change in approach to Havlík's law, due to many anomalies in the so called vocalisation of *jers* noticed in the primers.

The author also suggests a possibility of didactical use of the primers' texts in teaching students of Slavonic philology (especially Croatian) and facilitating the learning of Slavonic alphabets by utilizing the syllabic tables provided in the booklets.

Despite the manifold aspects considered in this dissertation its subject cannot be considered exhausted. Due to the perspective adopted in this work its focus remains on the Glagolitic script and its function as a means of writing the language (or more exactly languages) used in the primers. A full linguistic description of such idioms would also require examining other planes such as morphology, syntax and lexis in a broader comparative context. Nevertheless, such a study is not necessary to answer the main question of this dissertation, therefore it is left for further research.