

Izvorni naučni rad
UDK 821.163.42:003.349

Tanja KUŠTOVIĆ (Zagreb)
Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet
tkustovi@ffzg.hr

Vera BLAŽEVIĆ KREZIĆ (Osijek)
Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet
vblazevic1@fos.hr

**THE LITERARY LANGUAGE OF GRGUR BORISLAVIĆ
AND STIPAN KONZUL ISTRANIN (A STUDY OF VERB FORMS
IN THE FOUR *PASSIONS OF CHRIST* FROM *PARIS MISCELLANY
SLAVE 73* AND GLAGOLITIC *NEW TESTAMENT*)**

The paper compares simple and complex verb forms attested in the text of four *Passions of Christ* from two Glagolitic codices: *Paris miscellany Slave 73* (from the 14th century) and the first part of the Protestant *New Testament* (from the 16th century). Through examining the role of their co-authors and editors – Grgur Borislavić on one side and Stipan Konzul on the other side – the research explores the *author's conception* in understanding the literary language of a certain period, movement or territory, particularly in the early modern age. By conducting comparative linguistic analysis, the study identifies interesting variations at graphic/phonological, morphological, derivative, syntactic and lexical levels. These variations include the rejuvenation of the present tense paradigm, imperfective and imperative derivational variations, preservation of the participle system and traditional dual forms, and differences in the frequency of complex verb forms and lexical usage between the two codices. The discrepancies have shown, understandably so, that the older manuscript of *Paris miscellany* predominantly uses older linguistic patterns. Therefore, it would be more intriguing to examine possible coordinated linguistic renewals and innovations that were (possibly) the result of authors' choices. Those were attuned both to the purpose of manuscript or printed text, but also to the considerable distinction between linguistic entities they belonged to: Čakavian–Church Slavonic amalgam and Croatian vernacular language, respectively.

Key words: *Passions of Christ*, *Paris miscellany Slave 73*, *Grgur Borislavić*, *the Protestant Glagolitic New Testament*, *Stipan Konzul*, *verb forms*

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the Middle Ages, the Croatian Glagolites crafted an intricately layered literary language that combined (Old) Church Slavonic and Croatian elements. The complex idea of liturgical, in other words, polyfunctional literary language was foremost in their mind. When translating from foreign languages, they approached linguistic features in diverse ways based on a collection of variables, including the text's genre, manuscript type, intended readership and the author's attitude towards the text and its purpose. (Corin, 1993; Eterović, 2021)

The paper aims to compare the texts of the four *Passions of Christ*, which are believed to be the essence of the Gospel and have largely remained unchanged. (Šimić, 2014: 26) We find them equally represented in Glagolitic liturgical and non-liturgical translations and the Croatian Protestant translation of the Bible. Interestingly, within the context of the oldest Croatian literary language – Church Slavonic (Kovačević, 2016: 219–236), the biblical lessons are regarded as a model genre for Croatian Church Slavonic linguistic norm. (Corin, 1993; Gadžijeva et al., 2014) Over time, this paved the way for Croatisms, amalgamated Croatian-Church Slavonic in general, and the author's specific literary language conceptions later on (namely Kožičić's or Croatian Protestants').

The two Croatian Glagolites, Borislavić in the 14th century and the converted Stipan Konzul Istranin in the 16th century, modelled the *Passions* texts after the Croatian Church Slavonic tradition, thus bringing it on the doorstep of the vernacular language, whose qualities were initially, but not entirely, determined by their homeland.

To compare the language of *Paris miscellany Slave 73*, considered to be the most Croatinized biblical-liturgical text within the Croatian Glagolitic context of the 14th and 15th century (Kuštović, 2021b: 237), and the Protestant literary language concept, is by all means, a relevant and necessary task. The former was written in interdialectal Čakavian and was heavily influenced by the mother tongue of the Modruš-Ogulin region. On the other hand, the latter used the 'lower' linguistic variation as the starting point of its hybrid literary language, combining the features of Konzul's northwestern Istrian Čakavian, the 16th-century North Dalmatian elements, and older ones, template-media-

ted from the south. (Žagar, 2018: 213–224) Another valid reason for the research is that *Paris miscellany Slave 73* is still owed an extensive linguistic and textological analysis. The Croatian Science Foundation project on *The Language of the Croatian Protestant editions and the 16th century concept of the literary language*, led by Mateo Žagar, represented the Protestants, while a team of experts led by Vesna Badurina Stipčević gave a scientific interpretation of *Paris miscellany Slave 73* in the Croatian Science Foundation project on *Research of the Old Croatian Glagolitic Miscellany Heritage*.

Using the comparative analysis of verb forms – their formational variations (e.g. gNt1 *govoreći* : CPar. *govore*, gNt1 *noseći* : CPar. *nose*, gNt1 *pošadši* : CPar. *šadša*),¹ morphological features (gNt1 *hoćeš* : CPar. *hoćeši*, gNt1 *vlize* : CPar. *vlizetb*), syntactic and lexical variations (gNt1 *hoćete videti* : CPar. *uzrite*, gNt1 *da bi predal* : CPar. *da predastb*, gNt1 *biše rekal* : CPar. *reče*, gNt1 *zove* : CPar. *diše*, gNt1 *vlizućima* : CPar. *vhodećima*, gNt1 *sede* : CPar. *vzleže* etc.) – we are analysing the language of four *Passions of Christ* in *Paris miscellany Slave 73* and the Protestant Glagolitic *New Testament*. Our aim is to identify the proportion of the 'old' and 'new' linguistic elements, and perhaps determine the influence of the southern or northern tradition of Croatian Glagolitic liturgical codices (missals). Finally, we will look for signs of linguistic innovation and expertise by the author/translator.

2. ON THE LANGUAGE OF *PARIS MISCELLANY SLAVE 73* AND GLAGOLITIC *NEW TESTAMENT* – UNTIL NOW

The authors of four *Passions* of *Paris miscellany* (CPar., 14th century – 1375) and the Protestant Glagolitic *New Testament* (gNt1, 16th century – 1562) had certain linguistic principles guiding them, which can be singled out through a comparative analysis of the verb forms used in the linguistic monuments.

Paris miscellany is known for being the most Croatinized among the 14th-century Croatian Glagolitic manuscripts (miscellany), especially the *Psalter* and *Passions* parts. It belongs to the corpus of texts written in amalgamated Croatian (Čakavian)-Church Slavonic language (Damjanović, 2008; Eterović, 2016; Šimić, 2018). The text of its four *Passions* differs linguistically and textologically from those of the Croatian Glagolitic missals. Additionally, the adherence to the Latin original (*Vulgate*) necessitated the lexical innovation aimed at better comprehension of the text (Tandarić, 1993; Badurina Stipčević, 2023).² Due to its connection to the Lika and Šibenik regions, the

¹ CPar. stands for *Paris miscellany Slave 73*, while for the first part of Glagolitic *New Testament* we use gNt1.

² » Based on textological research, these Glagolitic *Passions* typically belong to the passions

text uses elements of the Modruš dialect (speech), native to Grgur Borislavić, which are skillfully combined with many general Čakavian features.

On the other hand, the Protestant literary language concept chooses the *lower* (Čakavian, vernacular) linguistic variation as its starting point (Kuštović, 2014; Eterović, 2014; Jembrih, 2020), although there is evidence of foreign (non-Slavic) and (Old, Croatian) Church Slavonic influence, as well as the influence of other Croatian dialects. That variation aimed to spread to wider Southern Slavic regions, spanning the territory from Slovenia to Constantinople (Žagar, 2019), and thus needed to be comprehensible and receptive.³ It contained the elements from Konzul's northwestern Istrian Čakavian, those from the 16th-century North Dalmatia, including older, more southern, template-mediated ones. Štokavian elements are perceptible, too (Žagar, 2018: 213–224; Žagar, 2019).

3. THE CORPUS

The language of the *Passions of Christ* is considered to be the starting point for the interpretation of conservative biblical and liturgical language. It is an exemplary text for the attestation of the Croatian Church Slavonic norm. It will be interesting to observe how these linguistic patterns behave within the framework of two codices having different purposes, one being miscellany and the other a vernacular translation of the Bible. Besides, *Paris miscellany* is a medieval codex of manuscript provenance,⁴ while the Protestant *New Testament* is an early modern age printed matter.⁵ To analyse the language patterns, a comparative analysis of isolated simple and complex verb forms has been carried out on the selected corpus of the four *Passions* from these two linguistic monuments. Comments are presented at different linguistic and

texts that are preserved in the southern redaction of Croatian Glagolitic missals. However, in the process of the expert editing of the original Latin text, there were numerous repairs and changes made. The editors strictly followed the Latin text, which included consistent lexical innovations as well as the replacement of lesser-known words with more familiar ones. The Croatian Glagolitic texts of *Passions of Christ* in *Paris miscellany* inherit the Old Church Slavonic tradition and are also a link to the younger literary monuments written in the vernacular.« (Badurina Stipčević, 2023: 184)

³ » Although diversity brought about some uncertainty, the primary goal was to ensure that the text remained comprehensible. This was achieved through careful selection of lexicon. Additionally, traditional graphic solutions that are commonly found in Church Slavonic books were used to maintain a straightforward attitude towards tradition. The lack of strict adherence to available templates, even within the series of Urach editions, emphasised the communicative value of the book, which mattered the most.« (Žagar, 2020: 15)

⁴ The so-called *Liber horarum*, the oldest example of the earlier development phase of Croatian Glagolitic miscellany (Badurina Stipčević, 2023: 181–182).

⁵ The first printed book of one part of the Bible in Croatian language (cf. Jambreč, 2007: 65).

stylistic levels. The analysed text samples are presented in tabular form, with clearly indicated number of pages along which they are spread. Abbreviations are used to mark originals.

Table 1 Linguistic corpus analysis
(*Paris miscellany Slave 73*, 14th c., and *Glagolitic New Testament*, first part, 16th c.)

<i>Paris miscellany Slave 73</i> , 1375 CPar.	<i>New Testament</i> , first part, 1562 gNt1
The Passion According to Matthew: f. 238r–246v	The Passion According to Matthew: 39A–44B
The Passion According to Mark: f. 246v–253v	The Passion According to Mark: 68B–73A
The Passion According to Luke: f. 253v–260v	The Passion According to Luke: 116B–121A
The Passion According to John: f. 260v–266r	The Passion According to John: 153B–157A

4. SIMPLE VERB FORMS

4.1 The Present Tense

It is interesting to observe the graphic relation in 1 Sg. Pres. of the verb ‘to be’ – *biti* in gNt1 and CPar. While the Protestant *Testament* regularly records the form with vocalised secondary semivowel (/je/sam), in *Paris miscellany* in that same place (and at the end of the word), we find the letter *jer*: apostrophe or wand-like sign, the latter being more frequent. In any case, these are graphic / graphematic variations (cf. Ceković, Sanković and Žagar, 2010: 140; Galić, 2014: 96). An example from *The Passion According to Matthew* – gNt1 *sam trpila* (42B) : CPar. *mučena es̃m'* (243v), just like those from *The Passion According to John* – gNt1 *sam govoril* (154B) : CPar. *g(o) v(o)ril̃ es̃m'* (262r); gNt1 *sam roen* (155A) : CPar. *rojen' es(a)m̃b* (263r) – also confirm the frequent occurrence of unstressed durative present forms of *biti* in 1 and 2 Sg. Pres. in gNt1 (which is comparable to *Artikuli*, Kuštović, 2017: 97). However, it is not insignificant that in those examples, the enclitic forms of *biti* are in anteposition (in gNt1). There is also the example: gNt1 *Jeda li sam ja Ijudej'*? (155A) : CPar. *es̃m* (263r).

In the observed texts, the 1 Sg. punctual present form of *biti* has the older grammar morpheme *-u* (*budu*), but there is also a *newer* form ending in *-e/m* (*budem*, 40A) found in one place in younger gNt1, as opposed to the older form *budu* (239v) in CPar. While Fancev identifies the form *budem* as regular in Protestant works, (1916b: 47; cf. also Kapetanović, 2011: 100),⁶ Kušćović does not find the 1 Sg forms of that present in *Artikuli* at all (neither ending in *-u*, nor *-e/m*, 2017: 98). The opposition of different grammatical morphemes (*-u* : *-m*) is interpreted as morphological difference or variant (cf. Ceković, Sanković and Žagar, 2010: 140). In Croatian Glagolitic non-liturgical texts those doublets date back to 15th century in *all verb forms* (cf. Damjanović, 2008: 115). The verbs *htěti* / *h(o)titi*, *moći* enjoy a different position since grammatical morpheme *-u* in 1 Sg. Pres. also exists in today's Croatian standard language.

In both texts, the rest of the verbs mostly have the ending *-u* in 1 Sg. Pres. The exceptions are the verbs *znam* (41B), *celuem* (40B) with the *-m* ending in gNt1, and the example *izvedem* (155A) as a lexical distinction from *sv(ě)dokuū* (263r) found in CPar., or *vodim* (155B) to *izvoĵū* (263v) from CPar. In gNt1, we find duality, but only in two verbs – *pustiti*: *pušću* (42B) / *pustim* (43A) (*The Passion According to Matthew*), that is, *pušću* (155A) / *puščam* (155A) (*The Passion According to John*); *ne nahoju* (155A) / *ne nahajam* (155B) (*The Passion According to John*). The only example of accordance in the choice of a newer ending *-m* is the verb *Zaklinam* (41B, 241v) (cf. Damjanović, 2008: 115), found in both sources.

There are also some interesting lexical variants, such as gNt1 *pridu* (40A) : CPar. *gremb* (239v) (athematic verbs ending *-mb*, cf. Fancev, 1916b: 46), or gNt1 *znam* (41B) : CPar. *věmb* (242r). They demonstrate the choice of older, traditional lexicon in CPar.⁷

2 Sg. Pres. of *biti* has mainly corresponding (un)stressed forms (*jesi* / *si*), the unstressed forms having a slight advantage in anteposition (e.g. before past participle) in gNt1, but also in postposition. They sometimes occur in CPar.,⁸ too. Incidentally, in *Artikuli*, Kušćović (2017: 97) confirmed the predominance of unstressed forms in 1 and 2 Sg. Pres., while stressed forms prevail in 1 Pl. and 3 Sg. and Pl. (almost three times as many).

⁶ Since morphological duality (*-u* : *-m*) also occurs in the 16th century Latin Croatian texts, it is not necessarily regarded as the Old Church Slavonic element (cf. Ceković, Sanković and Žagar, 2010: 140; according to Vončina, 1967). In fact, it appears in all periods of Čakavian Croatian literary language, but also in Štokavian literary language. (Kušćović, 2021a: 402).

⁷ See also: gNt1 *govoriš* (41B) : CPar. *diši* (242r); gNt1 *pitaš* (154B) : CPar. *vprašaji* (262r); gNt1 *uhite* (39A) : CPar. *ěmut'* (238r); gNt1 *pelaju* (154B) : CPar. *privedoše* (216v).

⁸ Cf. gNt1, CPar. *si rekal* (41B, 242r); potom gNt1 *jesi rekal* (40A) : CPar. *rekal' si* (239r); gNt1 *si dal* (154A) : CPar. *dal' esi* (261r); gNt1 *si učinil* (155A) : CPar. *esi stvoril* (263r).

All the other verbs indicate the fundamental morphological difference between the two sources of analysed texts, namely, gNt1 has grammatical morpheme *-š* and CPar older *-ši*: gNt1 *odgovaraš* (41B) : CPar. *otgovaraeši* (241v); gNt1 *rečeš* (41B) : CPar. *rečeši* (241v); gNt1 *pustiš* (156A) : CPar. *pustiši* (264r).

Several lexical variants, such as gNt1 *govoriš* (41B) : CPar. *diši* (242r); gNt1 *pitaš* (154B) : CPar. *vprašaši* (262r) are intriguing, too.

When it comes to graphic variants, we notice the stressed form of 3 Sg. Pres. *biti* which gNt1 records as *je(st)* (16x) i *jest* (4x) in *The Passion According to Matthew* (and *John*), while in *Paris miscellany* there prevail the forms with wand-like *jer* sign at the end of the word: *estb* (17x). There are also examples with apostrophe: *est'* (3x), but not a single example of *đerv* used instead of the initial preiterated *e*.

The verb forms of *biti* used in the perfect tense and other constructions demonstrate the predominance of stressed forms of 3 Sg. in gNt1 (5x in the contracted form) and unstressed ones in CPar. (3x, where contraction is not denoted by a *titlo*), which are non-existent in *The Passion According to Matthew* from gNt1. In *The Passion According to John* we also observe the predominance of such stressed forms of the present of *biti* in gNt1, or unstressed in CPar. The only exceptions are the examples of negated form of auxiliary *biti*.⁹

The syntactic changing of the present form *biti* (gNt1) and the imperfect or the aorist of the same verb (CPar.), is evident in passive constructions: e.g. gNt1 *je(st) osužen* (42A) : CPar. *osužen' biše* (242v); gNt1 *rečeno je(st)* (42B) : CPar. *rečena b(i)si* (243r).

In 3 Sg. Pres. of *htěti* / *h(o)titi*, just like in all other verbs,¹⁰ we register the basic morphological difference: the younger grammatical morpheme *-e* from gNt1 as opposed to the older *-e/tb* / *-e/t'* from CPar. The elimination of final *-t* is quite intrinsic to the 16th century Croatian language (Ceković, Sanković and Žagar, 2010: 141). For example, gNt1 *izdati hoće* (39B) : CPar. *prêdati hočetb* (239r); gNt1 *govori* (39B) : CPar. *g(o)v(o)rit'* (238v); gNt1 *omače* (39B) : CPar. *omačetb* (239r); gNt1 *grede* (39B) : CPar. *gredetb* (248r); gNt1 *da se propne* (156A) : CPar. *da propnet' se* (259r).

⁹ E.g. gNt1 *učinila je(st)* (39A) : CPar. *sbdělala e(stb)* (247r); gNt1 *je(st) oslobodil* (43B) : CPar. *e stvorilb* (245r); gNt1 *uskrsnul je(st)* (44B) : CPar. *v'stal' se e* (246v); gNt1 *je(st) dal* (154A) : CPar. *dalb e(stb)* (261v); gNt1 *je(st) dobro* (154A) : CPar. *dostoino e* (261v); gNt1 *ni* (155A) : CPar. *něstb* (263r); gNt1 *ni od sude* (155A) : CPar. *něstb otsudu* (263r).

¹⁰ *-e* / *-i* / *-a* (that is, the ending without final *-t*), cf. Kuštović (2017: 100). Some exceptions are also present in gNt1 (e.g. *izajdet* and others), cf. also Fancev (1916b: 41–42).

Other syntactic variants may be of interest, e.g. *da* + *present tense* vs. *infinitive*: gNt1 *davaše da pie* (44A) : CPar. *daše piti* (244v).

The corresponding 3 Sg. Pres. forms in gNt1 and CPar. show the omission of the final present *-tb* / *-t'*¹¹ – *Prvo nego peteh zapoe* (42A; 242v); *ne more* (40B, 43B; 249r) – in some rare examples found in *Paris miscellany*. There is also the example: gNt1 *da se pismo izbude* (156B) : CPar. *da se svr'še pisma* (265v), demonstrating that 3 Pl. Pres. in CPar. was recorded without the final *-t*.

Lexical differences include: gNt1 *zna* (157A) : CPar. *vêstb* (265v).

During her research of *The Passion According to Mark* from *Paris miscellany*, Vesna Badurina Stipčević recorded a morphological innovation from the spoken language (2004: 11; cf. 2014). That innovation, appearing in the currently analysed texts as well, is a grammatical morpheme *-mo* in 1 Pl. Pres., e.g. gNt1 *potrebujemo* (41B) : CPar. *potrêbuemo* (242r); gNt1, CPar. *imamo* (155B; 243v–244r); gNt1, CPar. *mečimo* (156B; 265r).

Even though the *Passions* are texts less prone to linguistic changes, Marinka Šimić (2000: 67–69) registers those substitutes / dualities as being almost regular in the 15th century Croatian Glagolitic non-liturgical texts (cf. Damjanović, 2008: 115–116). Only rarely are they found in the liturgical monuments of the golden age of Croatian Glagolitism: for instance, there are only three examples of the Old Croatian ending *-mb* / *-m'* in 1 Sg. Pres. (*pred'idemь* in Missal of Senj; *ne znam'* First Oxford Missal, *ne z'namь* Hrvoje's Missal), and a single example of the ending *-mo* in 1 Pl. Pres. (*vidimo* Copenhagen Missal).

The lack of morphological differences in 2 Pl. – the prevalence of grammatical morpheme *-te*, e.g. gNt1, CPar. *vnidete* (40B; 249r); gNt1, CPar. *vêruete* (157A; 265v) – makes certain lexical and syntactic variants more prominent: gNt1 *znate* (39A, 44B) : CPar. *vêste* (238r); gNt1 *hoćete videti* (41B) : CPar. *uzrite* (242r); gNt1 *bud(e)te videli* (43A) : CPar. *uzrite* (244r). The last two examples show the use of Future I and Future II in gNt1 as opposed to the present form of the finite verb in CPar.

In 3 Pl. Pres. of the Protestant *New Testament* we observe repeated omission of the final grammatical morpheme *-tb* / *-t'*, which is, in turn, consistently recorded in *The Passion According to Matthew* and *The Passion According to John* from *Paris miscellany*, e.g. gNt1 *prose* (42B) : CPar. *isproset'* (243v); gNt1 *ukradu* (44B) : CPar. *ukradutb* (246v). There are only occasional examples demonstrating the absence of the final *-t* even in CPar. (*govore*, 42B; 243r), but also one confirmation of keeping the final *-t* in gNt1: gNt1 *rastekut se* (40A) : CPar. *razdiluet' se* (239v) (cf. Kuštović, 2021a: 403).

¹¹ It sporadically appears in gNt1 as well (cf. Kuštović, 2021a: 403).

There are several interesting lexical and syntactic variants, such as: gNt1 *uhite* (39A) : CPar. *êmut'* (238r); gNt1 *Pelaju* (154B) : CPar. *privedošē* (261v); and gNt1 *prave* (43A) : CPar. *rêše* (240r); gNt1 *slišaju* (43B) : CPar. *slišēce* (245v); gNt1 *bi predali* (41A) : CPar. *prêdadetb* (241v); gNt1 *hote se ispuniti* (41A) : CPar. *ispl'net se* (241r); gNt1 *da budu blagovati* (154B) : CPar. *da jîdet'* (262v).

Special – non-iotated – form *hote* (instead of *hoče*) for 3 Pl. of *htêti* / *h(o)titi* appears in all Protestant texts (Kuštović, 2017: 99), but also in Čakavian, Kajkavian, Štokavian and three-dialectal (hybrid) 16th century Croatian literary language. In gNt1 it denotes the future construction (the present of *htêti* and infinitive) as opposed to the present of finite verb (with future meaning) in CPar., e.g. gNt1 *videti hote* (157A) : CPar. *Uzret'* (266r).

In gNt1, the verb *dati* has 3 Pl. Pres. ending in *-d/u* (*dadu*, 42A).

4.2. The Aorist

In both codices the aorist is mainly formed from finite verbs, although the examples formed from non-finite verbs are not uncommon (cf. Kuštović, 2017; 2021a). There are ample confirmations for 3 Sg. and 3 Pl., e.g. gNt1 *zataja* (41B) : CPar. *zatai* (242r); gNt1 *isprosi* (44A) : CPar. *prosi* (246r, 253v, 260v); gNt1 *Odgovori* (154B, 155A, 156A, 6x) : CPar. *Ot'govori* (262r, 263r, 265r); gNt1 *dozva* (155A) : CPar. *zazva* (262v) etc.; gNt1 *povedošē* (41A) : CPar. *vedošē* (251r); gNt1 *svukoše* (43A) : CPar. *svl'koše* (244v); gNt1 *povedošē* (154A) : CPar. *privedošē* (252r); gNt1 *prikloniše* (156B) : CPar. *prinesošē* (265v) etc.

The appearance of plural forms in gNt1 can clearly be interpreted as morphosyntactic variant, while *Paris miscellany* still records dual forms in those places: gNt1 *doidošē dva kriva svidoka i rekoše* (41B) : CPar. *pristupista dva kriva svêdoka i rêsta* (241v); gNt1 *vazeše* (157A) : CPar. *priêsta* (266r); gNt1 *zaviše* (157A) : CPar. *obvista* (266r); gNt1 *postaviše* (157A) : CPar. *položista* (266r). The preservation of dual forms which express the meaning of duality is a part of the Croatian Glagolitic book norm of the 15th and 16th century (Ceković and Eterović, 2015: 134; Blažević Krezić, 2020: 63).

The *older* form of the aorist prevails in *Paris miscellany*, while the Glagolitic *New Testament* records the *newer* aorist in the same place – gNt1 *rekoh* (154A) : CPar. *rêh'* (261r); gNt1 *rekoše* (40A, 41B, 42A, 43A, 6x) : CPar. *rêše* (242vx2, 243r, 244rx2); gNt1 *rekoše* (154A, 154B, 155A, 156B, 5x) : CPar. *rêše* (261r, 262vx2, 263r, 265r); gNt1 *rekoše* (41B, 3 Pl.) : CPar. *rêsta* (241v) (3rd person dual) (cf. Damjanović, 2008: 120). The bookish aorist for 3 Sg. Pres. of *biti* is found only in *Paris miscellany* – gNt1 *bi učinjeno* (41A) : CPar. *stvoreno b(i)si* (241r).

Lexical variants that can be singled out are: gNt1 *uhitiše* (41A) : CPar. *ěše* (241r); gNt1 *upita* (154A, 154B) : CPar. *v'/'prosi* (261r); *Odgovori* (154A) : CPar. *Otveća* (261r). Other interesting syntactic variants definitely include the participle *budući*, with a noun in nominative case, from gNt1 (with temporal meaning) as opposed to a time clause with the aorist form of *biti* in CPar.: gNt1 *I budući ISUS u Betanii u domu Simuna gubavca* (39A) : CPar. *I gda bē i(su)sъ v' bētanii v domu simuna gubavoga* (238r) (cf. Eterović, 2019: 82). There is also the indeclinable participle *budući* with passive participle in gNt1 (temporal meaning) as opposed to the time clause with the aorist form of *biti*: gNt1 *I budući večer učinjen* (39B); *I budući večer učinjen* (44B) : CPar. *I gda večerъ bi; I g'da večerъ stvorenyъ bi* (239r, 246r) (cf. Eterović, 2019: 87–89).¹² Furthermore, in gNt1 we record the partnership of the indeclinable participle *buduć(i)* and *l*-participle, in the place where *Paris miscellany* uses the time clause with the aorist form of the verb – from *The Passion According to Matthew*: gNt1 *i jošće budući mnozi krivi svidoci pristupili* (41A) : CPar. *Gda mnozi svidoci pristupiše* (241v); from *The Passion According to John*: gNt1 *I ovo budući rekal, jedan od slug* (154B) : CPar. *I se g'da reče : edanъ ot okolo stoečih' slug'* (262r); gNt1 *budući rekal* (155A) : CPar. *gda (...) r(e)če* (263r) (cf. Eterović, 2019: 85–86). The active past participle in gNt1 is replaced by the aorist in CPar., as the syntactic (also graphic and lexical) variant – *The Passion According to Matthew*: gNt1 *vzdavši* (40A) : CPar. *v'zda* (239v); gNt1 *I videvši ga Biskupi, i sluge, vapiěhu govoreći* (155B) : CPar. *I gda uzreše ego arhierēi i farisēi : vьp'ěhu govoreče* (263v).

Different solutions can also be found. In the *participle + aorist* construction, for example, the participle from *Paris miscellany* is in *Glagolitic New Testament* replaced by the finite verb form (e.g. the aorist, cf. Šimić, 2000: 72): gNt1 *a boinici spletoše krunu od trnja postaviše na glavu njegovu* (155B) : CPar. *a vitezi spletše věnъcb ot trniē : v'zložīše na gl(a)vu ego*¹³ (263v). Conversely, the participle of the main sentence is found in gNt1, and the aorist in CPar.: gNt1 *i kada ga svukoše, ogarnuvše ga plašćem črvlenim* (43A) : CPar. *I syl'kše ego plačem' čr'lenim' obl'koše ga* (244r).

In *The Passion According to John* from gNt1 we record *participle + aorist* construction, while *Paris miscellany* uses the aorist of a time clause in place of the participle: gNt1 *A Ijuda vazamši Dvorane i ot Biskupov i Fariseov sluge, pride onde s lanternami* (153B) : CPar. *I ūda bo gda priēty družbu i arhierēi i parisēi sluge pride tamo s' svēt(i)lniki* (261r).

¹² Cf. also the construction with adjective: gNt1 *da jest on *lastac rekal ošće živ budući* (44B) : CPar. *reče oče gda živ' bēše* (246v) (Eterović, 2019: 90).

¹³ Or, for example, the aorist in the time clauses: gNt1 *I kad ga popljuvaše vazeše trst* (43A) : CPar. *I plūūče na nъ v'zeše tr'stъ* (244v).

Syntactic variants include the shifting of the pluperfect in gNt1, or the aorist in CPar., e.g. 3 Sg. – gNt1 *biše rekal* (42A) : CPar. *r(e)če* (240v).

The perfective construction from gNt1 is juxtaposed to the aorist in CPar. (it is syntactic, or occasional lexical variant) – from *The Passion According to Matthew*: gNt1 *učinila je(st)* (39A) : CPar. *stvari* (238v); gNt1 *je(st) učinila* (39B) : CPar. *stvari* (238v); gNt1 *se je(st) približalo* (40B) : CPar. *približi se* (240v); gNt1 *je(st) rekal* (41B) : CPar. *reče* (238v); gNt1 *sagrišil jesam* (42A) : CPar. *sbgrêših'* (242v). From *The Passion According to John* – gNt1 *sam (...)* *govoril* (154B) : CPar. *govorih'* (262r); gNt1 *sam (...)* *rekal* (154B) : CPar. *g(o)v(o)rih'* (262r); gNt1 *sam (...)* *učil* (154B) : CPar. *učih'* (262r); gNt1 *sam (...)* *rekal* (154B) : CPar. *rekohb* (262r); gNt1 *Nisam li te ja vidil* (154B) : CPar. *Ne li ê vidêh' te* (260v); gNt1 *su me slišali* (154B) : CPar. *slišaše* (262r); gNt1 *je(st) prêdal* (155B) : CPar. *prêda* (265v); gNt1 *je(st) on rekal* (156A) : CPar. *reče* (262r); gNt1 *su proboli* (157A) : CPar. *probodoše* (266r).

However, there are reverse examples where we find the aorist in gNt1 and the perfect in CPar. – from *The Passion According to Matthew*: gNt1 *opsova* (41B) : CPar. *p'soval' est'* (242r); gNt1 *se isplni* (42B) : CPar. *ispl'nilo se e(stb)* (243r).

The punctual present of the verb *biti* next to the noun in gNt1 (*bude potriba*, 40A) is opposed to the aorist in CPar. (*prigodi se* 240r).

4.3. The Imperfect

It occurs more often in gNt1 than in CPar., and is mostly formed from non-finite verbs. The syntactic variant involves the appearance of active present participle in gNt1, and the imperfect in CPar. – gNt1 *sideêi* (42B) : CPar. *sêdêše* (241v); or the imperfect in gNt1 and the aorist in CPar. – gNt1 *se zoviše* (39B) : CPar. *se di* (238v); gNt1 *izdavaše* (40B) : CPar. *prêda* (240v); gNt1 *pucaše* (44A) : CPar. *raspade se* (245v); gNt1 *biêhu* (41B) : CPar. *biše* (242r); and lastly, the conditional (gNt1) and the imperfect (CPar.) – gNt1 *bi hotili* (42B) : CPar. *hotêhu* (243v).

In the earlier discussion, we have mentioned the preservation of duality in the 16th century Croatian texts, even though it is frequently abandoned when it comes to noun or pronominal adjective – verb agreement (cf. Blažević Krezić, 2020: 73). While in *Paris miscellany* the example demonstrates the keeping of both the dual aorist form of *biti* from the passive construction following the numeral quantifier *two* and dual noun, the Glagolitic *New Testament* records the imperfective plural form of *biti*: gNt1 *Tada propeta behu š njim dva razboinika* (43B) : CPar. *Tada raspeta bista š' nim' dva razboinika* (245r). Later, with the loss of the numeral quantifier *two* in anaphoric duality,

gNt1 loses even the dual forms of nominal, pronominal adjective and participle forms: gNt1 *Takoe i razbojnici koi š nim propeti bihu oponašahomu* (43B) : CPar. *Tofe i razbojnika ka raspeta bêhota š nim' oponoŝahota emu* (245r).

Derivational variants include the examples from *The Passion According to Matthew* – gNt1 *sideh* (41A) : CPar. *sijah'* (241r) and gNt1 *sidiše* (41B) : CPar. *sijaše* (242r), as well as those from *The Passion According to John* – gNt1 *imiêše umriti* (155A) : CPar. *imêše umrêti* (262v), where, once in CPar. and another time in gNt1, we witness the imperfective formation using the suffix *-ija-* (along with *-a-*, *-ja-*), rather than *-i-* (or *-e-*, towards **-ê-*) (cf. Fancev, 1916b: 47–49). According to Fancev, the latter is typical for the Glagolitic *New Testament*, while the formation by suffix *-ja-* is more frequent in the Cyrillic *New Testament*. Additionally, when it comes to type 3 verbs (e.g. *sideh* / *sedih* / *sidih* : *sijah*; *imih* : *imijah*), Fancev (1916b: 49) refers to Rešetar's findings, pointing out that the suffix *-ija-* in those examples is not the reflection of the Old Church Croatian influence, but a so-called *neologism of Croatian or Serbian language*.

The verb *moči* records imperfective forms with non-palatalised base: gNt1, CPar. *Mogaše* (39A, 238r) (*mogaše* < *možaše*), most likely under the influence of the aorist paradigm. Such examples are common in Glagolitic non-liturgical miscellanies (cf. Damjanović, 2008: 123) and in Latin Croatian texts (Malić, 1997: 547), but are also found in *Hrvoje's Missal* (cf. Galić, 2014: 107).

4.3. The Infinitive

Along with the corresponding forms such as: gNt1, CPar. *mogaše se prodati* (39A, 238r); *dati* (39A, 238r); *govoriti* (39B, 250v), *iskaše pustiti* (156A, 264r); we also find variants, to name a few lexical ones: gNt1 *blagovati* (39B) : CPar. *êsti* (238v); gNt1 *ne more minuti* (40B) : CPar. *ne more mimoiti* (240v); gNt1 *uhititi* (41A) : CPar. *êti* (249v); gNt1 *zaklinati* (42A) : CPar. *otricati* (242v); gNt1 *rotiti* (42A) : CPar. *kleti* (242v); gNt1 *osloboditi* (44A) : CPar. *izbaviti* (245v); gNt1 *ni slobodno (...) umoriti* (155A) : CPar. *ne dostoiť ubiti* (262v); gNt1 *imam (...) osloboditi* (155B) : CPar. *imam' pustiti* (264r).

Among syntactic variants we observe the use of *da* + *present tense* construction, or the *infinitive*: gNt1 *davaše da pie* (44A) : CPar. *daêše piti* (253r); gNt1 *zapovi da mu se da* (44A) : CPar. *p(o)v(e)lê vratiti* (246r); gNt1 *pustite (...) da otidu* (154A) : CPar. *pustite (...) otiti* (261r).

The infinitive is a part of the future tense constructions: gNt1 *hoće-te imeti* (39A) : CPar. *imêti budete* (238v); gNt1 *nećete imeti* (39A) : CPar. *ne imêti budete* (238v); gNt1 *se bude pripovidati* (39B) : CPar. *prop(o)v(ê)*

děno budet' (238v); gNt1, CPar. *hoćete dati* (39B; 238v); gNt1 *hoću učiniti* (39B, 43A) : CPar. *stvoru*¹⁴(244r); gNt1 *hoću uskrsnuti* (44B) : CPar. *vstanu*¹⁵ (246v); gNt1 *hoće izdati* (39B) : CPar. *predastъ* (239r); gNt1 *hote se ispuniti* (41A) : CPar. *ispl'net se* (241r); gNt1 *hoćeš zataiti* (40A) : CPar. *ot'vr'žeši se* (239v–240r); gNt1 *hoćeš zatajati* (42A) : CPar. *se otvržeši* (242v); gNt1 *izdati hoće* (39B) : CPar. *prêdati hoćetъ* (239r); gNt1 *budem piti* (40A) : CPar. *budu piti* (239v); gNt1 *budeš videti* (42A) : CPar. *vidiši* (242v); gNt1 *hoćete zmetnju imati* (40A) : CPar. *sъblaznite se* (239v); gNt1 *hoćete videti* (41B) : CPar. *uzrite* (242r); gNt1 *verovati hoćemo* (43B) : CPar. *vêruemo* (245r); gNt1 *da budu blagovati* (154B) : CPar. *da jîdet'* (262v); gNt1 *hoću propeti* (156A) : CPar. *propnu* (264v); gNt1 *videti hote* (157A) : CPar. *Uzret'* (266r).

The future tense is expressed by construction *hoću* or *budu* + *infinitive* (Fancev, 1916b: 97, cf. Gadžijeva et al., 2014: 255). The future simple form made from the infinitive and the punctual present of *biti* (*piti budu*, *budeši služiti* etc.) is the Čakavian dialect feature, a vernacular trait that penetrated the Croatian Church Slavonic as well. As a result, we also find it in *Paris miscellany*.

Besides, *Paris miscellany* records the older way of expressing the future tense by the present form of the finite verb, while gNt1, in the same place, uses the construction *hoću* + *infinitive*: 1 Sg. gNt1 *hoću učiniti* (39B, 43A) : CPar. *stvoru* (239r, 244r) ; gNt1 *hoću uskrsnuti* (44B) : CPar. *vstanu* (246v); gNt1 *hoću propeti* (156A) : CPar. *propnu* (246v); 2 Sg. gNt1 *hoćeš zataiti* (40A) : CPar. *ot'vr'žeši se* (239v–240r); gNt1 *hoćeš zatajati* (42A) : CPar. *se otvržeši* (242v); 3 Sg. gNt1 *hoće izdati* (39B) : CPar. *predastъ* (239r); 1 Pl. gNt1 *verovati hoćemo* (43B) : CPar. *vêruemo* (245r); 3 Pl. gNt1 *hote se ispuniti* (41A, a non-iotated form of the auxiliary) : CPar. *ispl'net se* (266r); gNt1 *videti hote* (157A, a non-iotated form of the auxiliary) : CPar. *Uzret'* (266r). The same goes for the construction *punctual present* of *biti* + *infinitive* in gNt1, where in CPar. there is the present form of the verb: 2 Sg. gNt1 *budeš videti* (42A) : CPar. *vidiši* (242v), or from *The Passion According to John*: gNt1 *da budu blagovati* (154B) : CPar. *da jîdet'* (262v) (for 3 Pl.).

The infinitive construction in CPar. stands opposite to the present form in gNt1: gNt1 *što se vam vidi* (41B) : CPar. *Čto vamъ e viditi* (242r).

¹⁴ Lexical and syntactic variants (future simple : the present of the finite verb).

¹⁵ The same as the aforementioned.

4.5. The Imperative

The formation of imperative mood in the observed texts corresponds to its formation in Croatian Church Slavonic language. The differences in the two analysed codices come down to:

- different use of lexemes: gNt1 *poidite* (39B) : CPar. *idite* (238v), gNt1 *vazmite* (40A) : CPar. *primit* (239r), gNt1 *blaguie* (40A) : CPar. *ſij'te* (239v), gNt1 *počekaite* (40B) : CPar. *potrpête* (240r), gNt1 *držite* (40B) : CPar. *êmite* (240v), gNt1 *oslobodi* (43B) : CPar. *sp(a)si* (245r), gNt1 *upitai* (154B) : CPar. *vprosi* (262r)
- different formations, where gNt1 has the Croatian and CPar. (Old) Church Slavonic one: gNt1 *recite* (39B) : CPar. *r'cête* (238v); in the example from gNt1 *da se propne* (43A) : CPar. *da se propnetъ* (244r), in CPar. we find the (Old) Church Slavonic present tense form
- different use of particles *neka* and *da*, where gNt1 has a particle *neka*, and CPar. a particle *da*: gNt1 *neka on oslobodi* (43B) : CPar. *da izb(a) vitъ* (245r).

4.6. Participles

In our codices all participles appear except present passive participle.

Active present participle.

- 1) Whereas in gNt1 we find the active present participle, in CPar. there is the active past participle form: gNt1 *budući jutro* (42A) : CPar. *jutru bivšu* (242v), gNt1 *vedeč* (39A) : CPar. *vidêvše* (238r), gNt1 *znajući* (39A) : CPar. *razumêvъ* (238r), gNt1 *stavljajući* (39A) : CPar. *v'zliêvši* (238v). The examples also show the different use of lexemes in these two written monuments.
- 2) There is a number of examples where both codices use the participle in question, but its derivational form differs: gNt1 has the ending *–eči* (< *êči*), whereas CPar. has the ending *–e* (< *ê*) : gNt1 *noseči* (156A, 157A) : CPar. *nose* (264v, 266r); gNt1 *stoeči* (154B) : CPar. *stoe* (262r), gNt1 *govoreči* (40A, 40B, 41B, 43A, 43B, 154B) : CPar. *govore* (239v, 240r, 245v, 249r, 253r, 256r). The last example displays the superior use of endings *–eči* in gNt1, as opposed to CPar. Here, we should mention that the replacement of the form *govoreči* with *govore* is not the only substitution. It is also replaced by: *govoreču* (45B, 240v), *govoreče* (41B, 43B, 44A, 44B, 155A, 156A; 242r, 246v, 250r, 252v, 257v, 263v).

- 3) The examples where in CPar. we have a subordinate clause, but a participle in gNt1: gNt1 *budući* (39A): CPar. *g'da bê* (238r), gNt *budući rekal* (154B): CPar. *g'da reče* (262r) although such differences in use are not often.
- 4) The examples where CPar. has an inflected form, unlike gNt1: gNt1 *blagujući* (39B) : CPar. *êdučimь* (239r), gNt1 *večerajući* (40A) : CPar. *věčerajučim'* (239r), gNt1 *speći* (40B) : CPar. *spečihь* (240r).

Active past participle

The differences between the codices involve different formation: in gNt1 with ending *-vši*, in CPar. with ending *-v'*: gNt1 *odgovorivši* (39B, 40A) : CPar. *otgovoriv'* (239r, 251r), gNt1 *odgovorivši* (43A) : CPar. *otvečav'* (244r), gNt1 *predavši* (42A) : CPar. *predav'* (242v), gNt1 *odgovorivši* (42B) : CPar. *otg(o)v(o)riv'* (243v). We also find the older forms with ending *-ši* in gNt1, while CPar., in the same place, has the inflected form with the ending *-e*: gNt1 *rekši* (40A) : CPar. *rekše* (239v). The older forms are also found in the examples: gNt1 *vrgši* (42A) : CPar. *povrg'* (242v), gNt1 *potekši* (44a) : CPar. *tek'* (253r).

The *l*-participle appears in the text on the complex tenses formation,¹⁶ but we also find the past passive participle, e.g. gNt1 *napisan* (43B): CPar. *pisanь* (245r).

5. COMPLEX VERB FORMS

Speaking of complex verb forms, in the analysed text we find the perfect tense, the pluperfect tense, the conditional, the future simple and the future perfect.

To express past actions the aorist and the imperfect are used much more frequently than the perfect and the pluperfect.

5.1. The Perfect Tense

In both texts the perfect tense is formed by auxiliary *biti* and *l*-participle, with auxiliary appearing in both stressed and unstressed forms. The distinctions between two analysed monuments are noticeable on several levels.

1. There is a varied choice of lexemes, but also of the stressed / unstressed forms of *biti*: gNt1 *učinila je(st)* (39A) : CPar. *śbdělala e(stь)* (238v);

¹⁶ See the chapter on the complex tenses.

- gNt1 *jesi rekal* (40A) : CPar. *rekal' si* (239r), gNt1 *si došal* (41A) : CPar. *esi prišalb* (241r), gNt1 *sam trpila* (42B) : CPar. *mučena esəm'* (243v), gNt1 *je(st) učinil* (43A) : CPar. *e stvoril'* (244r), gNt1 *je(st) oslobodil* (43B) : CPar. *e stvorilb* (244r), gNt1 *si učinil* (155A) : CPar. *esi stvoril* (263r). It is clear that the stressed form of auxiliary *biti* is more repeatedly used in *The New Testament* than in *Paris miscellany*.
2. The use of verb tenses is different, that is, gNt1 uses the perfect tense, whereas CPar. uses the aorist: gNt1 *je(st) učinila* (39B) : CPar. *stvorri* (238v), gNt1 *je(st) rekal* (41B) : CPar. *reče* (238v), gNt1 *se je(st) približalo* (40B) : CPar. *približi se* (256v), gNt1 *celoval je(st)* (40B) : CPar. *celova* (241r), gNt1 *ufal je(st)* (43B) : CPar. *upva* (245r), gNt1 *sam rekal* (154B) : CPar. *rekohb* (262r), gNt1 *sam učil* (154B) : CPar. *učih'* (262r), gNt1 *su rekli* (155A) : CPar. *rěše* (262v), gNt1 *su proboli* (157A) : CPar. *probodoše* (266r). It is evident that in gNt1 we have the perfect, while CPar. uses the aorist (not always, naturally, as seen from the given examples).

5.2. The Pluperfect Tense

The pluperfect is rarely used in either of these two written monuments. It is formed from the imperfect or the aorist of auxiliary *biti* and *l*-participle. The distinctions in usage are mainly phonological and refer to a different realisation of *jat* (*bê* : *bi*), which is kept in CPar., but is realised as *i* in gNt1. As is the case with the perfect tense, we repeatedly find the different choice of lexemes between the monuments: gNt1 *se bihu skupili* (41A) : CPar. *sъbrali se bêhu* (241v), gNt1 *bihu usnula* (44A) : CPar. *usnuli bêhu* (245v), gNt1 *bihu naslidovale* (44A) : CPar. *slêdile bêhu* (246r), gNt1 *bi se borili* (115A) : CPar. *dorvali bi* (263r). There is also the different use of verb tenses, that is, the situation where gNt1 uses the pluperfect and CPar. the aorist: gNt1 *biše rekal* (42A) : CPar. *r(e)če* (240v), gNt1 *bêše*¹⁷ *rekal* (154A) : CPar. *r(e)če* (263r).

5.3. Future I

In the researched codices future I was formed by auxiliaries *hotêti* and *biti* and the infinitive form of the verb, while other auxiliaries (*načêti*, *imêti*) are absent. Future I examples can be grouped as follows:

¹⁷ This example shows that the replacement of *jat* by *i* is not carried out consistently in gNt1.

1. the examples which are the same in both texts: *hoćete dati* (39B, 238v), *budu piti* (40A, 239v)
2. the examples where gNt1 uses the aforementioned formation of the future I by the auxiliary and the infinitive, whereas CPar. uses the present tense functioning as the future I:
 - a) auxiliary *hotêti*: gNt1 *hoću učiniti* (39B) : CPar. *stvoru* (239r), gNt1 *hoće izdati* (39B) : CPar. *predastb* (239r), gNt1 *hoćete zmetnju imati* (40A) : CPar. *sъblaznite se* (239v), gNt1 *hoćeš zatiti* (40A) : CPar. *ot'vr'žeši se* (239v–240r), gNt1 *hoću učiniti* (43A) : CPar. *stvoru* (244r), gNt1 *hoćete videti* (41B) : CPar. *uzrite* (242r), gNt1 *verovati hoćemo* (43B) : CPar. *vêruemo* (245r), gNt1 *hoću propeti* (156A) : CPar. *propnu* (246v). Let us also add the examples that use the non-io-tated form of the verb *hotêti*: gNt1 *hote se ispuniti* (41A) : CPar. *ispl'net se* (266r), gNt1 *videti hote* (157A) : CPar. *uzret'* (266r)
 - b) auxiliary *biti*: gNt1 *budu blagovati* (154B) : CPar. *ĵidet'* (262v), gNt1 *budeš videti* (42A) : CPar. *vidiši* (242v)
 - c) different endings for the present tense when referring to *Croatian* ending in gNt1 : (*Croatian*) Church Slavonic ending in CPar.: gNt1 *izdati hoće* (39B) : CPar. *prêdati hoćetb* (239r), gNt1 *budem piti* (40A) : CPar. *budu piti* (239v)
 - d) different use of auxiliaries: gNt1 *hoćete imeti* (39A) : CPar. *imêti budete* (238v), gNt1 *nećete imeti* (39A) : CPar. *ne imêti budete* (238v).

The future II is found in one example which is in CPar. replaced by the future I, in other words, by the present form of the verb: gNt1 *bud(e)te videli* (43A) : CPar. *uzrite* (242r).

5.4. The Conditional

It is formed from the *l*-participle and the aorist of the auxiliary *biti*. The analysed texts demonstrate the different use of lexemes: gNt1 *bi dal* (41A) : CPar. *pristavil bi* (241r); that is, the same use of lexemes but different word order: gNt1 *ne bi ti imel* (155B) : CPar. *ne imêl' bi* (264r); the different use of verb forms, in other words, where gNt1 has the conditional, CPar. has the imperfect: gNt1 *bi bilo* (39B) : CPar. *biše* (239r), gNt1 *bi hotili* (42B) : CPar. *hotêhu* (243v) or the present: gNt1 *da bi ne ostala* (156B) : CPar. *da ne ostanut'* (265v), gNt1 *da bi im se (...) prebile* (156B) : CPar. *da prebiût' ih'* (265v), gNt1 *da bi vazel* (157A) : CPar. *da vьz'metb* (266r).

6. IN CONCLUSION

The comparative analysis of the simple and complex verb forms represented in four *Passions of Christ* of the two Glagolitic monuments – the manuscript of *Paris miscellany* (14th century) and the first part of the printed Protestant *New Testament* (16th century) – has demonstrated their discernible differences on graphic/phonological, morphological, derivative, syntactic and lexical stylistic level. First, there is the so-called *rejuvenation* of the present tense paradigm, which is, to some extent, present in CPar. (in 1 Sg. and 1 Pl., for instance), but all the more so in the younger gNt1. The rejuvenation in question is evident primarily in the relationship between grammatical morphemes *-u* : *-m* (for 1 Sg.), then in the use of endings *-š* : *-ši* (for 2 Sg.), followed by the appearance of endings *-mo* for 1 Pl., and finally in the loss of the final *-t* for 3 Sg. and Pl. Another interesting feature is the parallel use of *older* and *newer* aorists, the latter being more regularly used in the younger monument: gNt1 *rekoh* (154A) : CPar. *rêh'* (261r), along with the variation of imperfective derivative forms: gNt1 *sideh* (41A) : CPar. *sijah'* (241r) and gNt1 *imiêše umriti* (155A) : CPar. *imêše umrêti* (262v). In the imperative mood, the derivational differences involve the particle usage in 3 Sg. Both codices use the particle *da*, but gNt1 also has the particle *neka*. Furthermore, the five-participle system is reduced to four, with the passive present participle no longer appearing in the texts from this period. The term 'participles' is still used rather than verbal adjectives, active and passive, or verbal adverbs, present and past, as declensible participle forms are present in the analysed texts. Speaking of active present participle forms, it is evident, not uncommonly so, that CPar. uses older forms more often than gNt1.

Significantly, the verb forms of both codices preserve duality which is only occasionally substituted by plural forms in the younger gNt1 (for expressing the meaning of duality). Speaking of simple past verb forms, or simple forms in general, we can single out the frequent replacement of the aorist from CPar. by the imperfect in gNt1, along with plenty of other syntactic and lexical variants, especially those regarding the older lexicon of *Paris miscellany*: e.g. gNt1 *uhitiše* (41A) : CPar. *êše* (241r); gNt1 *pitaš* (154B) : CPar. *vprašaši* (262r); gNt1 *pelaju* (154B) : CPar. *privedošê* (242v) etc.

The complex verb forms analysis has identified pronounced vocabulary differences between two analysed codices. A closer study of the lexicon reveals the higher usage of older lexemes in CPar. than in gNt1 (e.g. gNt1: *blaguite, počekaite, držite, upitai* : CPar. *ĵij'te, potrpête, êmite, vprosi* etc.). Complex verb tenses are not always equivalent; they are found in the texts, but it is clear that the authors preferred expressing the past by using the aorist or

the imperfect, rather than the perfect or the imperfect. In future I, we no longer find the auxiliaries previously existing in Croatian Church Slavonic, but the verbs *biti* and *htjeti* remain in their entirety. Here, to express future I, CPar. more often uses the present verb form.

The conditional is used in both codices, but is more prevalent in younger gNt1, whereas CPar. uses the imperfect or the present instead.

Sources

- CPar. = *Paris miscellany Slave 73 (Pariški zbornik)*, 1375, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, sign. *Slave 73*.
- gNt1 = Dalmatin, Antun; Konzul, Stipan. 1562. *New Testament, first part (Novi testament: I. dio)*. Tübingen. (Latinički prijepis glagoljskog izvornika. 2013. Ur. D. Matak. Zagreb: Adventističko teološko visoko učilište – Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu – Školska knjiga.)

References

- Badurina-Stipčević, V. (2004). »Muka Kristova po Marku u hrvatskoglagoljskom Pariškom zborniku Slave 73«. *Filologija*, No. 42, pp. 1–21.
- Badurina Stipčević, V. (2014). »Muka Kristova po Marku u hrvatskoglagoljskom Pariškom zborniku Slave 73«, in Zaradija Kiš, A. & Žagar, M. (eds.) *Glagoljaška Muka Kristova: odabrane kulturološko-filološke studije*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada; Državni arhiv u Pazinu; Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, pp. 139–171.
- Badurina Stipčević, V. (2023). »Pariški zbornik Slave 73 (1375.) u kontekstu hrvatskoglagoljske benediktinske baštine«. *Crkva u svijetu*, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 179–190.
- Blažević Krezić, V. (2020). »Dvojina u biblijskim tekstovima hrvatskih protestantskih knjiga«. *Croatica: časopis za hrvatski jezik, književnost i kulturu*, Vol. 44, No. 64, pp. 55–80.
- Ceković, B. & Eterović, I. (2015). »Dvojina u *Misalu hruackome Šimuna Kožičića Benje*«, in Žagar, M. (ed.) *Jezik Misala hruackoga: Studije o jeziku Misala Šimuna Kožičića Benje (1531.)*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, pp. 133–150.
- Ceković, B., Sanković, I. & Žagar, M. (2010). »Jezik Misala hruackoga Šimuna Kožičića Benje: glagolski oblici«. *Slovo*, No. 60, pp. 133–166.
- Corin, A. R. (1993). »Variation and norm in Croatian Church Slavonic«. *Slovo*, No. 41/42, pp. 155–196.

- Damjanović, S. (2008). *Jezik hrvatskih glagoljaša*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Eterović, I. (2014). *Sintaktička svojstva participa u jeziku hrvatskoglagoljskih misala* (doctoral dissertation in typescript). Rijeka: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci.
- Eterović, I. (2016). »O jeziku hrvatskoglagoljskih zbornika neliturgijskoga sadržaja: perspektive novih istraživanja«, in Kušćović, T. & Žagar, M. (eds.) *Meandrima hrvatskoga glagoljaštva: Zbornik posvećen akademiku Stjepanu Damjanoviću o 70. rođendanu*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, pp. 109–118.
- Eterović, I. (2019). »Nesklonjivi particip buduć(i) u nebiblijskim izdanjima hrvatskih protestanata«. *Čakavska rič: polugodišnjak za proučavanje čakavske riječi*, Vol. XLVII, No. 1–2, pp. 81–95.
- Eterović, I. (2021). »Kojim su jezikom pisana izdanja hrvatskih protestanata? Prilog određenju -izama«. *Biblijski pogledi*, Vol. 29, No. 1–2, pp. 56–79.
- Fancev, F. (1916a). »Jezik hrvatskih protestantskih pisaca 16. vijeka. Prilog historičkoj gramatici jezika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga«. *Rad JAZU*, No. 212, pp. 147–225.
- Fancev, F. (1916b). »Jezik hrvatskih protestantskih pisaca 16. vijeka. Prilog historičkoj gramatici jezika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga«. *Rad JAZU*, No. 214, pp. 1–112.
- Gadžijeva, S. et al. = Kovačević, A., Mihaljević, M., Požar, S., Reinhart, J., Šimić, M. & Vince, J. (2014). *Hrvatski crkvenoslavenski jezik*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, Staroslavenski institut.
- Galić, J. (2014). »Jednostavni glagolski oblici u Hrvojevu misalu«. *Slovo*, No. 64, pp. 79–152.
- Hercigonja, E. (1975). *Srednjovjekovna književnost. Povijest hrvatske književnosti 2*. Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber.
- Jambrek, S. (2007). »Biblija u Hrvata: Prevođenje, tiskanje i širenje Biblije u kontekstu naviještanja evanđelja«. *Kairos: Evanđeoski teološki časopis*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 61–90.
- Jembrih, A. (2020). »Urach – južnoslavenski prevoditeljski i izdavački projekt u doba reformacije«. *SCN*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 72–84.
- Kapetanović, A. (2011). »Čakavski hrvatski književni jezik«, in Bičanić, A. (ed.) *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika – 2. knjiga: 16. stoljeće*. Zagreb: Croatica, pp. 77–123.
- Kovačević, A. (2016). »O prvom hrvatskom književnom jeziku«, in Kušćović, T. & Žagar, M. (eds.) *Meandrima hrvatskoga glagoljaštva: Zbornik posvećen akademiku Stjepanu Damjanoviću o 70. rođendanu*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, pp. 219–236.

- Kuštović, T. (2014). »Jezik hrvatskog protestantskog ćirilickog Novog zavjeta (1563.) prema hrvatskoglagoljskoj tradiciji«. *Filologija*, No. 62, pp. 115–129.
- Kuštović, T. (2017). »Glagolski oblici u izdanju *Artikuli ili deli prave stare krstianske vere* (1562.)«. *Slovo*, No. 67, pp. 91–112.
- Kuštović, T. (2021a). »Jezično jedinstvo i stilska razvedenost hrvatskih protestantskih tekstova 16. stoljeća«, in Bońkowski, R.; Lukić, M.; Mićanović, K.; Pycia-Košćak, P. & Zubčić, S. (eds.) *Peryferie w języku chorwackim, kulturze i społeczeństwie/ Periferno u hrvatskom jeziku, kulturi i društvu. Svezak 2*. Katowice; Zagreb; Osijek; Rijeka: Wydział Humanistyczny Uniwersytetu Śląskiego; Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu; Sveučilište u Osijeku; Sveučilište u Rijeci, pp. 398–410.
- Kuštović, T. (2021b). »Pariški zbornik slave 73 (1375) i Hvalov zbornik (1404) u suodnosu«. *Društvene i humanističke studije*, Vol. 3, No. 16, pp. 231–246.
- Malić, D. (1997). *Žića svetih otaca*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska; Institut za hrvatski jezik.
- Šimić, M. (2000). »Jezik Muke po Mateju u hrvatskoglagoljskim misalima«. *Slovo*, No. 50, pp. 5–117.
- Šimić, M. (2014). »Jezična studija – Akademijin brevijar«, in Badurina Stipčević, V. (ed.) *Akademijin brevijar HAZU III c 12. Hrvatskoglagoljski rukopis s konca 14. stoljeća*. Zagreb: Staroslavenski institut, pp. 11–108.
- Šimić, M. (2018). »O jeziku Pariškoga zbornika Code Slave 73 (Na tekstu psaltira i kantika)«. *Fluminensia*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 153–185.
- Tandarić, J. L. (1993). »Ordo Missae u pariškom zborniku Slave 73«, in Bašić, P. (ed.) *Hrvatskoglagoljska liturgijska književnost*. Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, pp. 110–131.
- Vončina, J. (1967). »Dubletsko prvo lice singulara prezenta u hrvatskih pjesnika 15. i 16. stoljeća«. *Radovi Zavoda za slavensku filologiju*, No. 9, pp. 43–61.
- Žagar, M. (2018). »Elementi leksičkog odabiranja u izdanjima hrvatskih protestanata (Urach, 1561–1564): kontekst i metodološke pretpostavke«, in Botica, S. et al. (eds.) *Hrvatski prilozi 16. međunarodnom slavističkom kongresu*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo, pp. 213–224.
- Žagar, M. (2019). »Tipologija jezičnih razlika među novozavjetnim tekstovima hrvatskih protestanata«, in Matulić, B. & Lupis, V. (eds.) *Verba volant – scripta manent. Zbornik u čast akademika Stjepana Krasića*. Split: Sveučilište u Splitu, pp. 845–864.
- Žagar, M. (2020). »Tipologija jezičnih razlika među novozavjetnim tekstovima hrvatskih protestanata«. *Biblijski pogledi*, Vol. 28, No. 1–2, pp. 3–23.

**KNJIŽEVNI JEZIK GRGURA BORISLAVIĆA I STIPANA
KONZULA ISTRANINA (STUDIJA GLAGOLSKIH OBLIKA
U ČETIRIMA *MUKAMA PARIŠKOGA ZBORNIKA SLAVE 73*
I GLAGOLJSKOGA *NOVOG TESTAMENTA*)**

Rad je utemeljen na usporednoj analizi jednostavnih i složenih glagolskih oblika zasvjedočenih u tekstu četiriju *Muka Kristovih* iz dvaju hrvatskoglagoljskih kodeksa: *Pariškoga zbornika Slave 73* (14. st.) i prvoga dijela protestantskoga *Novog testamenta* (16. st.). Svraćajući pozornost na ulogu (su)pisaca i redaktora spomenutih kodeksa – Grgura Borislavića s jedne i Stipana Konzula s druge strane – istraživanjem se propituje važnost *autorske koncepcije* za razumijevanje književnoga jezika određene epohe, pokreta ili teritorija, posebice u ranonovovjekovnim prilikama. Usporedna jezična analiza glagolskih oblika u spomenutim tekstovima ukazuje na postojanje zanimljivih varijanata grafijsko-fonološke, morfološke, tvorbene, sintaktičke i leksičko-stilske razine: od pomlađivanja prezentske paradigme, preko imperfekatskih i imperativnih tvorbenih varijanata, očuvanosti participskoga sustava i tradicijske dvojine, sve do učestalosti uporabe složenih glagolskih oblika i zamjetnih leksičkih razlika među kodeksima. Nejednakosti su pokazale, što je razumljivo, prevagu starijih jezičnih obrazaca u jednako tako starijem (i rukopisnom) *Pariškom zborniku*, zbog čega se zanimljivijima mogu učiniti eventualna usklađena jezična *pomlađivanja* i *inoviranja*, koja su rezultat autorskih odabira usklađenih s namjenom rukopisa, odnosno tiskopisa, a u krajnjoj liniji i s nama nezanemarivom distinkcijom jezičnih entiteta kojima pripadaju: hrvatsko-staroslavenskom, odnosno narodnom hrvatskom.

Ključne riječi: *Muke Kristove*, *Pariški zbornik*, Grgur Borislavić, protestantski glagoljski *Novi testament*, Stipan Konzul, glagoljski oblici