Vladislav KNOLL
Slovanský ústav AV ČR
Prag, Česká
knoll@slu.cas.cz

THE RENEWAL OF CZECH CHURCH SLAVONIC: JOSEF VAJS' *LITURGY* (1922)

This article provides a linguistic characterisation of Josef Vajs' work on developing and creating new norms in Church Slavonic (acr. CS) for the Croatian and Czech environments of the time. We attempt to follow Vajs' reflections on the nature of a liturgical language for the twentieth century, placing them in the context of the development of Croatian CS and the New CS used by Greek Catholic (Uniate) and Orthodox believers. Although our primary focus is Vajs' *Služebnik* 'Liturgy' of 1922, we provide brief linguistic comparisons of numerous period texts printed in the Croatian and Czech milieus. The article may thus also serve as a brief history of Croatian and Czech CS texts at the outset of the twentieth century. The analysis of the *Služebnik* shows that Josef Vajs' project of a new CS norm was an attempt to combine highly divergent linguistic elements referring to Czech, Slovak, and East Slavic. The Croatian CS base, which is primarily a transcription of Vajs' revised reedition of Dragutin Parčić's missal, includes selected features from the only original (Old) CS texts from the West Slavic area (*Kyiv Folia* and *Prague Fragments*) and explicit references to modern Czech and Slovak. The unionist aspect of this linguistic fusion lies in including features that seem to refer to the CS norm used by the Orthodox and Greek Catholic Churches.

Keywords: Church Slavonic, New Church Slavonic, Croatian Church Slavonic, Czech Church Slavonic, Glagolitic script, Josef Vajs

1. STAGES OF CZECH GLAGOLITIC WRITING

The history of Czech Glagolitic writing consists of three relatively short, mutually unrelated periods (PACNEROVÁ, 2008), each having some connection with the Croatian environment. The first period covers the very beginnings of Glagolitic culture (9th – 11th centuries)—these texts have been almost com-

pletely lost in the Czech lands, but are partially preserved in Croatian Glagolitic manuscripts.[1] The second period is the temporary return of the Glagolitic culture to Bohemia, connected with the activity of the Slavonic monastery in Prague (founded in 1348) during the reign of the Luxembourg dynasty.[2] The third period began with the authorisation of Slavonic liturgy in the Czechoslovak Republic in 1920.[3] The first highlight of this period was the publication of the *Služebnik* (ⰔⰎⰖⰅⰆⰤⰐⰉⰍⰟ/*Služebnikъ*) or *Ordo et Canon Missae* with a transcription of the *Missae e proprio Bohemiae* by Josef Vajs (1865–1959) in 1922 (hereafter VS), which was the first proposal for a new Czech norm of the Church Slavonic language (hereafter CS). To be able to understand the linguistic aspect of this work, it is necessary to study the circumstances of the role of Josef Vajs, a Czech priest, theologian, and Palaeo-Slavist, in the restoration of the CS language in Croatia and the adoption of the Latin script in the new Croatian norm of this language. To complete the picture, we will briefly introduce the context of the origin of the New Croatian CS and will attempt to offer a slightly different perspective.

2. CROATIAN CS: CRISIS AND RESTORATION

The history of the development of the traditional diatopic variability of the Church Slavonic language seemed to have reached its final phase in the 17th and, particularly, the 18th century with the adoption of the Kyiv and later St. Petersburg (Synodal)[4] orthographic and morphological norms[5] in the Ortho-

---

[1]   The First Life of St. Wenceslas, the abridged version of the Legend of St. Vitus and the Office in his honour (MAREŠ, 1979: 218–221). For an overview of the period, see recent publication VEPŘEK, 2022.

[2]   The monastery used Croatian Church Slavonic as its liturgical language; later, it also produced Glagolitic texts in Czech. No new Church Slavonic texts seem to have been created after 1419. The adaptation of the Glagolitic script to Czech was inspired by the Croatian environment. For details and editions of the Church Slavonic fragments from the monastery, see ČERMÁK, 2020.

[3]   For an overview of this period, see the overview by VEPŘEK, 2016.b and especially VEPŘEK, 2016.a: 22–25.

[4]   The term *Synodal* has been coined by TRUNTE (1998: 398-400) to denote the last phase of the development of CS among the East Slavs, based on the revision of biblical texts and CS grammars that began during the reign of Peter the Great in the early eighteenth century.

[5]   In accordance with the traditional concept of the Prague School, we define the term *norm* as a set of regularly, implicitly used linguistic devices, which can be identified in any variety

dox, Greek Catholic (Uniate), and Roman Catholic Church Slavonic traditions.[6] Let us mention some crucial dates in this process:

– 1619: Edition of Smotryc'kyj's *Grammar* in Vievis, which was gradually accepted by both Orthodox and Greek Catholic CS within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

– 1627: The Greek Catholic priests of Kyiv are asked by the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* in Rome to supervise the language of the Glagolitic missal which was being prepared by Rafael Leváković and eventually printed in 1631 (BABIČ, 2000: 36). Nevertheless, the Kyiv norm had no significant impact until the 1648 Breviary (BABIČ, 2000: 392).

– 1635: Printing of texts in the Kyiv norm of CS begins in Wallachia (KNOLL, 2020: 43).

– 1648: Moscow edition of Smotryc'kyj's *Grammar*, which marks the process of the fusion of the Kyiv and Muscovite norms, resulted in the formation and eventual stabilisation of (modern) Russian CS, or so-called Synodal CS (cf. TRUNTE, 1998: 351).

– 1648: The Užhorod Union accelerated the spread of the Kyiv and (later) Synodal models in the Church Slavonic tradition of Transcarpathia (the Kingdom of Hungary, cf. CLEMINSON, 1996: 18–20).

– 1715: The printing of texts modelled on the Kyiv norm begins in Moldavia.

---

and may contain variable elements (NEBESKÁ, 2017). CS, as a polycentric language that traditionally lacked a grammatical approach in education, created regional norms. These essentially relied on biblical texts (with linguistic features traceable to the original Old CS translations of Greek texts), which included some vernacular elements of the given region. The language of the new texts depended on the ability of the scribe to imitate the linguistic features of the available CS texts, and may incorporate further vernacular elements (cf. CORIN, 1993: 186; LUČIĆ, 2004: 83–84; ŽIVOV, 2017: 183–184). We do not use the terms *redaction* or *recension*, as these are not used consistently in Church Slavonic studies (KNOLL, 2019: 40-41). We can use the term *variety* if we wish to speak generally of a *delimitable sublanguage* ("abgrenzbare Subsprache", FELDER, 2016: 9) of Church Slavonic without emphasising the regular use of certain linguistic devices.

[6] We term this final phase of the development of Church Slavonic *New Church Slavonic* (KNOLL, 2019: 38–39, corresponding to Late Church Slavonic in MATHIESEN, 1984: 46–47), the beginning of which we see in the stabilisation of the language (through the grammatical approach) in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the spread of this new norm to other areas. Together with ČERMÁK (2008), we also include the two Roman Catholic norms—the Croatian and the Czech—in this phase.

– 1720: A decree of Tsar Peter the Great imposes the Synodal norm in Kyiv (within the Russian Empire).
– 1726: The Synodal norm is introduced within the Serbian community in the Habsburg Monarchy (SAVKOVIĆ, 2011: 93).
– 1739: Matej Karaman's Glagolitic-Cyrillic primer is printed, the orthography of which followed the Synodal norm (CARAMAN, 1739; BABIČ, 2000: 51).
– 1760s: In Bulgarian manuscripts, the characteristics of Church Slavonic manuscripts from the East Slavic[7] milieu prevail (HRISTOVA, 1982: 655).

The result of this long process was the convergence of the Church Slavonic norms.[8] The advantage of the Church Slavonic of the Kyiv and later Synodal norm was the availability of modern teaching manuals (grammars, dictionaries, primers),[9] which did not exist in other varieties[10] and which were spread and adapted in Southeastern Europe. In contrast to books made for other areas, those printed for the Croatian environment implemented orthographic and morphological features of the Kyiv and St. Petersburg norms to varying degrees. These books retained the Glagolitic script; after Levaković's breviary (1648), it was enriched with diacritical marks, which were developed in Karaman's prints to match Cyrillic script exactly.

Except for the Romanian-speaking milieu, which changed its liturgical language to Romanian in the first half of the 18th century, East New Church Slavonic remains the traditional liturgical language of Orthodox and Greek Catholic Christians to this day. Books printed in Glagolitic script under the influence of East New CS were mostly not accepted by the Croatian community. As Roman Catholics, the Croats were not as motivated by the denominational proximity to the East Slavic tradition as Orthodox or Greek Catholic believ-

---

[7] In our text, we use the term *Slavonic* to refer to a language of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition, but *Slavic* in the generic sense.

[8] Although the Greek Catholic and Old Believer norms are more variable, they are quite similar to the Synodal norm. In the following, we will use the term East New Church Slavonic as a common name for the norm(s) of Cyrillic and Glagolitic texts written in the 17th and 18th centuries, characterised by the linguistic features of the early modern East Church Slavonic traditions.

[9] In the Croatian context, Smotryc'kyj's *Grammar* was translated into Latin by Matej Sović in 1756 (BABIČ, 2000: 52–53).

[10] The 1717 manuscript primer by Gavril Venclović (ed. JOVANOVIĆ, STEFANOVIĆ, 2013) was an exception.

ers, and the new norm was alien to them. Thus, the last liturgical texts[11] printed by the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* for the Croats in an adaptation of the East New CS norm were the *Officia sanctorum* and two volumes of the *Breviarium Romanum* in 1791, realised by Petar Gocinić and Anton Juranić (cf. MUŽINA, 2019: 282). The successive lack of liturgical texts and the dysfunction of existing ones (LUKIĆ, PILJ-TOMIĆ, 2010: 77) provoked a crisis in the Croatian Glagolitic tradition. This crisis resulted in the conversion of some parishes to the Latin liturgical language or the creation of unauthorised[12] local translations of liturgical texts into a hybrid language or a local Croatian dialect.[13] The process of losing Glagolitic culture was facilitated by the mistrust of some clergy of non-Croatian origin towards Slavonic liturgy.

Simultaneously, the first Slavic studies scholars turned their attention towards the Glagolitic heritage of Croatia, beginning with DOBROVSKÝ (1807), which provides an overview of the Glagolitic tradition and provides some samples of texts that had been transcribed into Latin (more of which appeared in the second, so-called 'Hanka's edition': DOBROVSKÝ, HANKA, 1832). Texts of classical[14] Croatian CS (the "indigena redakcija" of HAMM, 1963: 66) were studied in detail by Pavel Josef Šafařík (for details, see HAUPTOVÁ, 2008). His *Památky hlaholského písemnictví* 'Monuments of Glagolitic Writing' (ŠAFAŘÍK, 1853) also included a chrestomathy of classical Croatian CS texts printed in rounded Glagolitic, whose printing letters were designed by the Slovak scholar himself. Šafařík soon persuaded the Haas

---

[11] Pavle Solarić's Slaveno-Serbian primer (SOLARIĆ, 1812), dedicates a section to Glagolitic script based on Matej Karaman's primer (CARAMAN, 1739).

[12] Pope Benedict XIV's bull of 15 August 1754 (*Ex pastorali munere*, FHLGR 39–40) even forbids the mixing of CS ("prisca lingua", "idioma Slavum litterale", "Slavo-Latinum idioma") with the vernacular ("Slavus vulgaris sermo").

[13] First, the additions to the Mass were created (called *žunte*); later, more complete texts appeared, known under the term *šćavet* cf. LUKIĆ, PILJ-TOMIĆ, 2010: 79; BOGOVIĆ, 2013: 213–216.

[14] In this text, "classical" is used in reference to Croatian CS to denote the period from the 12th century to roughly the mid-16th century, the period during which Croatian Glagolitic texts developed in interaction with the local vernacular. This period differs from the earlier period of Old Church Slavonic, as it does from the later period of New Croatian CS. This later period consists of two phases: the language of the 17th- and 18th-century Croatian Glagolitic printed books (by Rafael Leaković, Ivan Paštrić, Matija Karaman, Ivan Sović, Ivan P. Gocinić) was adapted to the East New CS norm to varying degrees, while the language of the books prepared by Dragutin Antun Parčić (and Vajs) and printed in the 19th and 20th centuries was based on a learned re-evaluation of the traditions of Old CS and "classical" Croatian CS.

printing house in Prague to produce the square (i.e. Croatian) Glagolitic letters (HAUPTOVÁ, 2008: 203). It was here that the Glagolitic works of Šafařík's Croatian friend Ivan Berčić were printed (mainly chrestomathies of classical Croatian CS texts). In his Glagolitic primer (BERČIĆ, 1860), Berčić makes the first modern proposal of a new CS norm for the Croats. Berčić attempts to reconstruct Croatian CS or earlier period(s), consciously including certain rather prominent features of Old CS into his language, as well as features of 14th- and 15th-century Croatian Glagolitic texts, as shown below. However, since his approach is mainly etymological, he retains the diacritics introduced by Metodij Terlec'kyj for Levaković's 1648 breviary (for a list of these diacritics, see BABIČ, 2000: 84–93). This proposal differs from the variable language of his main Glagolitic work, a collection of biblical fragments from Croatian Glagolitic books (BERČIĆ, 1864–1871).

Ivan Berčić was also supposed to be the key person in a team established by Bishop Josip Juraj Strossmayer to prepare new liturgical texts in Croatian CS after receiving permission from the Holy See (LUKIĆ, PILJ-TOMIĆ, 2010: 83). However, Berčić's death and the conquest of Rome by the Italian army caused considerable delay in the work. In 1878, the task of preparing the new Croatian CS missal was entrusted to Franciscan monk Dragutin Parčić (BLAŽEVIĆ KREZIĆ, 2016: 32), who had assisted Berčić in preparing his Glagolitic printed books. Parčić knew that the language of the Croatian Glagolitic codices was not within the range of Old Church Slavonic. However, in his attempt to bring the language of Croatian Glagolitic books closer to its previous stages (when it contained more Old CS elements), he consulted available Old CS handbooks, such as Miklošič's *Lexicon* and likely the grammars by Dobrovský,[15] Leskien (1871),[16] Miklošič[17] (LUKIĆ, BLAŽEVIĆ-KREZIĆ, 2015: 67, 69, 78), as well as existing editions of Old CS texts, particularly the *Codex Assemanius* (ZARADIJA KIŠ, ŽAGAR, 2014: 194). The fruit of Parčić's work was the publication of the Canon of the Mass (1881) and the complete Roman Missal (1893, reprinted in 1896 and possibly 1894; cf. BLAŽEVIĆ KREZIĆ, 2016: 60). While Parčić's own (unfinished) Church Slavonic Grammar remained in manuscript form (LUKIĆ, BLAŽEVIĆ-KREZIĆ, 2015: 75–79), he published a primer written by Ivan Broz (BROZ, 1894). Let us be specific and make a small comparison between the diachronic varieties of Croatian CS (see Table 1):

---

[15] DOBROVSKÝ, 1822.

[16] LESKIEN, 1871.

[17] MIKLOŠIČ, 1875.

Table 1. (Croatian) CS graphemic variations in chronological order
Tablica 1. (Hrvatsko)crkvenoslavenske grafemske inačice u vremenskome slijedu

CS idiom / Common Slavic and Greek base of Old CS	Old CS / Miklošič's *Lexicon*	(classical) Croatian CS		Croatian Glagolitic texts with East New CS language features	New Croatian CS	
		Missal Borg. Ill. 4 (early 14th c.)	Torresani's primer (1527)	Karaman's primer (1739)	Berčić's primer (1860)	Parčić's missal (1893)
*tj	ⱋ	ⱋ	ⱋ	ⱋ	ⱋ	ⱋ
*skj	ⱋ	ⱋ	(ⱎ)ⱋ	ⱋ̈	ⱋ	ⱋ
*dj	ждⱐ	дждⱐ	0	дждⱐ	дждⱐ	дждⱐ
γ[18]	г	ⰃⰔ	ⰃⰔ	ⰳⰰ	ⰃⰔ	ⰃⰔ
*dz(ělo)	Ⰶ	Ⰼ	ⱜ	Ⰼ	Ⰼ	ⱜ
*-ъ-	ⱜ	г (´, ⰼ)	ⰼ	Ⰸ	ⱅ	ⰱ
*(prav)ь(dьn)-	ⱜ	0[19]	ⰼ	Ⰸ	ⱅ	Ⰸ
*vъz-	ⰲⱜⰈ-	ⰲⱜ(ⱅ)ⰼⱜ-	ⰲⱜⰼⱜ-	ⰲⰰⰈⰼⱜ-	ⰲⱜⰼⱜ-	ⰲⱜⰼⱜ-

---

18 We mean here the reflex of the Greek γ before front vowels in loanwords based on the Greek ἄγγελος, εὐαγγέλιον.

19 The lack of jer in a strong position is also a common, if not regular feature of Serbian CS.

	-ъ-	Ⰹ (ˊ, ⰵ)	ⰵ	ⰲ	Ⰹ	Ⰹ
*sьrdьce	срьдьце	ⰍⰐⰆⰐⰟⰣⰅ	ⰅⰊⰞⰠⰣⰅ	Ⰺ	ⰍⰐⰆⰐⰟⰣⰅ	ⰍⰐⰆⰐⰟⰣⰅ
*-ъ/-ъ	ъ — ъ	ˊ (Ⰹ)	Ⰹ	Ⰹ´ Ⰹ	Ⰹ – Ⰹ	Ⰹ
*ę	ⱔ	Ⰵ	Ⰵ (ⱑ)[20]	ⱑ	Ⰵ	Ⰵ
*ję(zykъ)	ⰰⱔ	ⱑ	ⱑ	ⱑ	Ⰵ	Ⰵ
*ě	ⱑ	ⱑ	ⱑ (Ⰵ)	ⱑ˙	ⱑ˙	ⱑ
*y	ⱏⰹ	Ⰲ	Ⰲ	ⱖ	ⱖ	Ⰲ
*j	ӣ	Ⰲ	Ⰲ	ⱖ̀	ⱖ̀	Ⰲ
*ja	ⰺⰰ	ⱑ	ⱑ	ⱑ	ⱑ	ⱑ
*V²ja	ⰺⰰ	ⱑ	ⱑ	ⱑ	ⱑ	ⱑ
*nja	Ⱀⰺⰰ	Ⱀⱑⰹ	Ⱀⱑⰹ	Ⱀⱑⱑ	Ⱀⱑⱑ	Ⱀⱑⰹ
*rja	Ⰶⰺⰰ	Ⰼⱑⰹ	Ⰼⱑⰹ	Ⰼⱑ	Ⰼⱑ	Ⰼⱑⰹ, Ⰼⰹ, Ⰼⱑ[22]

---

[20] The possible variation of з/ⰵ in Torresani's primer (TORRESANIS DE ASULA, 1527) is caused by ekavism.

[21] V here and elsewhere means 'vowel'.

[22] PARČIĆ, 1893: Lⰲa35 ⰿⱁⱃⱑ 'of the sea'; 198b9 ⱂⱁⰲⱅⱁⱃⱑⰵⱅ 'he repeats', 199b37 ⱁⰾⱅⰰⱃⱑ 'of the altar'.

- Old Church Slavonic as reconstructed in Miklošič's *Lexicon* (MIK-LOSICH, 1862–1865).

- Early classical Croatian CS, represented by the missal *Borg. Ill. 4* from the early 14ᵗʰ century (partial edition: VRANA, 1975, linguistic description VRANA, 1975: 32–44).

- Late classical Croatian CS, represented by Andrea Torresani's primer (TORRESANIS DE ASULA, 1527).

- East New CS, corresponding to Synodal CS, imitated by the Glagolitic-Cyrillic print of Matej Karaman's primer (CARAMAN, 1739).

- Draft of Berčić's primer (BERČIĆ, 1860).

- New Croatian CS according to Parčić's missal (PARČIĆ, 1893; detailed linguistic description: BLAŽEVIĆ KREZIĆ, 2016).

Even a peremptory glance at the table shows us that neither Berčić's nor Parčić's concept of New Church Slavonic is "an attempt to continue an interrupted tradition, but a peculiar, constructed return to the beginnings of the creation of the [Croatian] type" (ZARADIJA KIŠ, ŽAGAR 2014: 194 [author's translation])[23]. In comparison with early classical Croatian CS, Parčić regularises the use of *jer* (represented by the single grapheme Ⰹ, the *jer*-apostrophe ʼ is eliminated) in positions corresponding to Old Church Slavonic (actually, Common Slavic). A curious anomaly, representing a remnant of the East New CS period, is the *e*-vocalisation of *ь, which appears especially in the word *pravьdьn- in the missal text (e.g., PARČIĆ, 1893: XXXVa5, LIb9) and also in other places in the sung parts (LUKIĆ, BLAŽEVIĆ-KREZIĆ, 2015: 74–75). Berčić stays etymologically true. Of the typical features of Croatian CS, Parčić retains only the most common ones, which are also related to the limited traditional repertoire of square Glagolitic script (especially *ě/*ǫ > e/u). He eliminates both Čakavisms, whose position was the strongest in the late classical period (*ję > ja, *ь/*ъ > a, *dj > /j/), and the graphic distinction of *ь/*ъ, *i/*y/*j, *ě/*ja, *tj/*skj, introduced by Terlec'kyj and Levaković and retained by Berčić for etymological reasons. In the marking of the palatalisation of *l, *n*, *r, Parčić retains the traditional Croatian spelling (no marking except before *u); only in the case of *rja do we note a variation (cf. LUKIĆ, BLAŽEVIĆ-KREZIĆ, 2015: 73). The most important agreement between Old Church Slavonic (based on Bulgarian manuscripts), East New

---

[23] "pokušaj nastavljanja prekinute tradicije, nego svojevrstan, konstruiran, povratak u sam početak redakcijskoga formiranja." (ZARADIJA KIŠ, ŽAGAR, 2014: 194).

CS, and Parčić's CS based on the uninterrupted Croatian tradition is the preservation of the old reflexes of *tj/skj* – *dj: Ⱋ/ⱌ – ⰔⰕⱜ/ⰶⰄ. The difference between Parčić's CS and the East New CS promoted by M. Karaman is also the presence of East Slavic vocalisations and the extensive use of diacritics in the latter. These diacritics mark not only the different meanings of specific letters, but also the accents (spirits are not marked in Glagolitic).

3. JOSEF VAJS AND THE EVALUATION OF NEW GLAGOLITIC CS

In 1897, Josef Vajs visited the island of Krk, one of the traditional centres of Croatian Glagolitic culture; Vajs had studied theology in Rome and Slavic philology at the University of Prague. On Krk, he had the opportunity to contact the new bishop Anton Mahnič / Antun Mahnić, whom he visited at every opportunity in the following years (PECHUŠKA, 1935: 420; KURZ, 1948: 11–12). In 1898, Bishop Mahnič completed his study of the legal aspects and the actual state of Glagolitic liturgy in his diocese, concluding that priests had little knowledge of the liturgical language and that there was a general lack of liturgical books and teaching materials. These findings were confirmed by the First Synod of the Diocese of Krk in 1901 and by the *Rituum Congregatio* in 1902 (VAJS, 1903). As early as 1900, Bishop Mahnič informed Vajs of his intention to establish the *Old Church Slavonic Academy* (Cro. *Staroslavenska akademija*) to promote the knowledge of Church Slavonic, and asked Vajs to participate in this project (MILOVČIĆ, 1994–96: 293). The academy was founded on 18 February 1902 (BOZANIĆ, 1994–96: 318–319), and soon its own publishing house, *Kurykta*, was established.

Between 1902 and 1905, Josef Vajs was personally present on Krk. If we examine his bibliography from this period (KURZ, 1948: 17–18; PANTELIĆ, 1957), we can see three main avenues in his activity: preparing an edition of classical Croatian CS texts, preparing liturgical texts for practical use, and the study and promotion of Croatian Glagolitic liturgical song. As Dragutin Parčić died in 1902, the third edition of his missal was edited by Vajs and published in 1905 (PARČIĆ, 1905[3]). He later revised Broz's primer and published his version in 1909. It should be noted that the first edition of Vajs' *Abecedarium* (VAJS, 1909) is simply an Old Church Slavonic grammar written in Latin script. It does not, therefore, illustrate the language of the new liturgical texts. Nevertheless, he comments on the reading of Glagolitic script and provides a collection of pages selected from Croatian CS manuscripts from the classical

period (in phototype). The second edition of his *Abecedarium* (VAJS, 1917[2]) shows a different approach. Here, the forms of Old CS grammar are contrasted with the actual Croatian Glagolitic forms. The primer is supplemented by the *Ordo Missae* in Glagolitic script and a small Church Slavonic-Latin dictionary. The second edition of Vajs' primer (VAJS, 1917[2]) can thus be regarded as a true manual of the new liturgical language, or at least Vajs' opinion of what that language should be.

   With the third edition of Parčić's missal (prepared by Vajs) and Vajs' primer (PARČIĆ, 1905[3] and VAJS, 1909), the development of New Croatian Church Slavonic in the Glagolitic script practically ended. Let us, therefore, make a brief assessment. The Croatian CS created by Parčić is clearly distinct from the 17th- and 18th-century books influenced by East New Church Slavonic,[24] and represents a new variety of New CS. East New CS is the product of stabilising a long tradition, the last phase of which occurred in the East Slavic environment. New Croatian CS is based on an idealised classical form of Croatian CS, the norm of which is regulated according to the latest scholarly findings on (pre-Croatian) Old CS, as illustrated by Vajs' Latin-Glagolitic correspondences among CS forms in his *Abecedarium* (VAJS, 1917[2]). The most striking archaism of New Croatian Glagolitic CS is the retention of the Old CS/Common Slavic *jer* in both strong and weak positions, while contemporary East New CS retains weak *jer* practically only in the final position, where it serves a phonological function (palatalisation of the preceding consonant). In other positions, East New CS *jer* displays East Slavic vocalisation. The archaism of New Croatian Glagolitic CS as compared to East New CS is clearly apparent in nominal flexion. While the language of Parčić and Vajs retains the Old CS forms, and Vajs' *Abecedarium* generally lacks double forms, the East New CS norm has inherited numerous doublets of older and younger origin.[25] In verb flection, New Croatian CS naturally lacks the gender distinction in dual forms established by early modern grammarians (cf. VAJS, 1917[2]: XXV; KOZ′MIN″, 1903: 45; SZABÓ, 1894: 19). Apart from the use of a different script, an important difference is the number of letters. While square Glagolitic uses 30 letters (of which Ⱅ has only a numerical value), East New CS

---

[24] As reference works for this language, we will use the grammars KOZ′MIN″, 1903 from the Orthodox environment and SZABÓ, 1894 from the Greek Catholic environment.

[25] E.g., masculine *jo*-stems nom. pl. *koñi*/ⰍⰑⰐⰋ – acc. pl. *koñę*/ⰍⰑⰐⰦ – ins. pl. *koñi*/ⰍⰑⰐⰋ (VAJS, 1917[2]: XII) vs. nom. pl. па́стырїе, -и – acc. pl. па́стыри, -ей – ins. pl. па́стыри, -рми (KOZ′MIN″, 1903: 11); nom. pl. цари̍ (іе) – acc. pl. цари̍ (ей) – ins. pl. цари̍ (ьми) (SZABÓ, 1894: 38).

Cyrillic uses 43 (SZABÓ, 1894: 7) or 45 (KOZ′MIN″, 1903: 3–4) letters, including positional allographs. Parčić's missal, on the other hand, preserves the traditional Glagolitic ligatures, of which there were 45 according to Vajs' *Abecedarium*.[26]

The first criticism of New Croatian Glagolitic CS was voiced by renowned Slavic studies scholar Vatroslav Jagić, who was included in Strossmayer's team to prepare new liturgical texts in 1869 (LUKIĆ, PILJ-TOMIĆ, 2010: 83), but later became sceptical about the project, although he was open to supporting it (SLAVICKÝ, 2014: 48). Jagić's[27] main concern regards the archaic character of the language and the unclarified reading of several graphemes:

- Ⰹ: Should it be read in all (Common Slavic) positions, and if so, how?
- Ⱑ: Why are its two different readings (*ja and *ě) not marked by a diacritical mark as in the previous norm?
- Ⱓ: How should this letter be read, and should it always have the same phonological value (Jagić suggests the digraph ⱎⱅ)?
- Why is there a variation of Ⰹ/Ⰵ for *ь?

Jagić sums up his criticism by stating: "The text composed by Dr. Parčić seems to me almost too learned for practical use" (JAGIĆ, 1894: 213).[28]

The Glagolitic texts edited by Josef Vajs did not solve these problems. On the contrary, Vajs' *Abecedarium* leaves some questions unanswered or suggests a different solution not considered in the printed texts. In explaining the pronunciation of the problematic graphemes, Vajs[29] refers to historical readings, thus making practical use even more complicated:

- Ⰹ: In many cases ("in pluribus casibus") it has become silent; where it is necessary, it should be read as /a/, although it can also be /e/ in old codices.
- Ⱑ: After consonants, it was pronounced ("proferebatur") /e/, /i/, /ije/, in the initial position, and after palatalised consonants *l, n, r*, it should be read /ja/. Contrary to the liturgical texts, Vajs prefers Karaman and Berčić's solution of �ⱑ, Ⱃⱑ, Ⰱⱑ for *lja, *nja, *rja (see VAJS, 1909: IX; VAJS, 1917²: IX).

---

[26] VAJS, 1909: VIII; VAJS, 1917²: VIII.

[27] JAGIĆ, 1894: 213–114.

[28] "Der von Dr. Parčić hergestellte Text sieht mir für einen praktischen Gebrauch beinahe zu gelehrt aus" JAGIĆ, 1894: 213.

[29] VAJS, 1909: IX–X; VAJS, 1917²: IX–X.

- Ⱋ: It should be read as in the Čakavian vernacular /ć/ or /šć/; if uncertain, pronounce as /št/.
- ь/ъ: It can change to *e/o* in closed syllables. Parčić's variation of Ⰻ/Ⰵ is preserved in liturgical texts. In the noun endings of the paradigms, ь in the Latin transcription (= Old CS) is sometimes transcribed as Ⰻ, sometimes as Ⰵ.[30]

The most important deviation from Old CS grammar and the most variable morphological chapter in Parčić-Vajs' norm is long adjective flection (and participles). The reconstructed Old CS paradigm—as also presented in the first edition of Vajs' *Abecedarium*—includes only the uncontracted forms. However, the new liturgical texts (both Croatian and East New CS) use mostly contracted forms.[31] In VAJS (1917)[2] a contracted paradigm of all forms in the same range as the East New CS norm is offered, as is the contracted form for the nominative and accusative singular masculine *dobrъi*/ⰄⰑⰔⰓⰟ Ⰱ Ⰰ 'good'. The Glagolitic spelling of the locative singular feminine *dobrěji*/ⰄⰑⰔⰓⰟ ⰂⰅ Ⰰ may be either uncontracted or contracted. In masculine and neuter dative singular, Vajs introduces the ending *-umu* as the primary form, while liturgical texts of all modern varieties use *-omu*.

4. THE ADOPTION OF LATIN SCRIPT IN CROATIAN NEW CHURCH SLAVONIC

The question of the adoption of Latin script in the Church Slavonic language arose not only in the Roman Catholic environment, but in the Greek Catholic environment as well. Since the establishment of the Greek Catholic Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the faithful or even priests with a Latin/Polish education may have had problems reading the Cyrillic alphabet fluently. In the first half of the twentieth century, something similar occurred in the Greek Catholic community of northeastern Hungary. This is illustrated by the fact that a collection of Greek Catholic liturgical CS texts

---

[30] VAJS, 1917[2]: XIII loc. pl. *kostъhъ*/ⰍⰑⰔⰕⰜⰘⰟ '(about) bones', but XV *materъhъ*/ⰏⰀⰕⰅⰓⰜⰈ Ⰰ ' (about) mothers'.

[31] Except nominative and accusative forms of all numbers and genitive-locative dual and instrumental singular feminine. SZABÓ (1894: 55) notes a separate uncontracted paradigm of the adjective ваⰾїй 'great'; otherwise, the long paradigm of adjectives is contracted in both SZABÓ (1894) and in KOZ′MIN″ (1903: 26–28).

published in Užhorod in 1917 (*Velīkij szbornīk*, PAPP 1917) was printed in Latin script and an adapted Hungarian orthography, while the 1906 edition was still in Cyrillic (Кєлики́н сво́рникъ, FIRCAKʺ, 1906).

In the Roman Catholic Church, since Pope Benedict XIV's 1754 bull *Ex pastorali munere* (FHLGR 39–41), only the use of the Glagolitic script (Lat. "*Hieronymiani characteres*") and the Church Slavonic language were permitted in liturgical books. This was confirmed by the decree of the *S. Rituum Congregatio* of 5 August 1898 (FHLGR 91–94, "*palaeoslavico idiomate*", "*characteribus glagoliticis*"). Due to difficulties in reading Glagolitic script (cf. TENTOR, 1913: 68), the publication of liturgical texts in Latin script began quite early, and this process was entirely in the hands of Josef Vajs. Before we examine the orthographic solutions of published Croatian CS texts, let us see how and why this was done. Among Vajs' solutions, we find two main approaches: the transliteration of Glagolitic text, which should not represent the exact pronunciation and whose main added value should be an international character[32] or scientific accuracy, and transcription, which should represent the exact way of pronouncing the text. Transliterated or transcribed texts are produced for different audiences whose interests determine the choice of presentation:

- For priests to use during mass (should be in Glagolitic; Latin script was not officially allowed before the First World War).
- For the scholarly public: Vajs used the Cyrillic alphabet in his *Old Testament* editions.
- For students (future priests) and the faithful, it is possible to use the Latin script to make the text more accessible to the reader.

Vajs' New CS texts in Latin script, intended mainly for the Croatian milieu, can be seen in Table 2:

Table 2. Vajs' New CS texts in Latin script
Tablica 2. Vajsovi latinični novocrkvenoslavenski tekstovi

Year	Title	Place of printing	Purpose
1904	*Toni missae*	Krk	manual of liturgical chant

---

[32] In his theoretical article, Vajs (1919: 114) states that the spelling <št>/<žd> should be read as *ć/đ* by Croats, *č/j* by Slovenes and *c/z* by Czechs.

1905	*Tri glagolske mise*	Krk/Prague	manual of liturgical chant
1907	*Vesperal*	Prague	for the use of the faithful[33]
1914	*Pěnije rimskago misala*	Rome	manual of liturgical chant
1920	*Slověnski psaltir*	Prague	»in usum glagolitarum«
1927	*Rimski misal slověnskim jezikom*	Rome	officially approved version of the Roman Missal in Latin script

The orthographic approach of Vajs' texts mentioned above is compared with the proposition by Ivan Danilo and Frane Bulić[34] regarding the Latin transcription of Croatian Church Slavonic texts (DANILO, BULIĆ, 1882), Parčić's Glagolitic Roman missal (PARČIĆ, 1893, preserved by Vajs in PARČIĆ, 1905³), Vajs' proposal in his *Abecedarium* (VAJS, 1909, preserved in the 2ⁿᵈ edition of the book), and Vajs' theoretical article published in *Sv. Cecilija* (VAJS, 1919.b) regarding the transliteration of Glagolitic liturgical texts (see Table 3).[35]

---

[33] "za porabu vjernika glagolskih crkva" (VAJS, 1903: III).

[34] DANILO, BULIĆ, 1882.

[35] N/A means that there is no example of the phenomenon in the source. A hyphen (–) indicates that the reflex is omitted; an asterisk (*) introduces a form that follows the rules illustrated in the source, although the exact form is missing.

Table 3. The use of specific graphemes to represent *jer*
Tablica 3. Uporaba specifičnih grafema za predstavljenje *jer*-ova

author/editor \ text — Common Slavic and Greek base of Old CS	Danilo and Bulić *Memoria* (1882)	Parčić *Missal* (1893)	Vajs *Toni missae* (1904)	Vajs *Vesperal* (1907)	Vajs *Abecedarium* (1909)	Vajs *Pěnije* (1914)	Vajs *Sv. Cecilija* (1919.b.)	Vajs *Psaltir* (1920)	Vajs *Missal* (1927)
*tj	ć	ⱌ	št	ć	št	št	št	ć	ć
*skj	šć	ⱌ	št	šć	št	št	št	št	šć
*dj	žd	ⰶⰴⱎⱍ	žd	đ/j	žd	žd	žd	đ	đ
γ	ǵ	ⰻⰱ	đ	ǵ	ǵ/j	đ	ǵ	ǵ	ǵ
*-ъ-	Ⰹ	I	'(a)	a	ъ	a	ъ	a	a
*-ь-	Ⰻ	I	'(a)	a	ъ	a	ъ	a	a
*-ъ/-ь	I/l	I	'	—	ъ/ь	ь	—	—	—
*ě	ê	Ⰱ	ê	ě	ě	ě	ě	ě	ě
*ja	ja	Ⰱ	ê	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja
*j	j	ⰲ	i	j	j	i	j	j	j

*-nije	*nije	[Glagolitic]	nie	nije	nije	nije	nije	nije	nje
*srьdьce	N/A	ѲᏏⅢⅢᏏᒐᏕⱸ	N/A	srdce	N/A	srdce	N/A	srdce	srdce
*pravьd-	N/A	ⅢᏏⰻⅢⅢᏏ-	N/A	praved-	N/A	praved-	N/A	praved-	praved-
*vъz-	N/A	ⱎⱑⰼⱑ-	v'z-	vz-/vaz-	N/A	vz-/vaz-	N/A	vz-/vaz-	vz-/vaz-

As we can see from the overview presented (v. Table 3), the use of specific graphs to represent *jer* (the "short stick" borrowed from Glagolitic in the proposal by Danilo and Bulić and apostrophe or Cyrillic letters in Vajs' texts) is typical of the theoretical works, but also of the very first liturgical text published by Vajs in Latin script. This text of the *Toni missae* is also the most faithful transliteration, not marking even the difference between the two readings of Ⱏ. In other texts intended for students or the faithful, Vajs resorts to the omission of *jer* in the weak position and the Croatian (Čakavian-Štokavian) *a*-vocalisation in the strong position. The variation in the prefixes *v(a)-/v(a) z-* remains. Curiously, Vajs occasionally uses the reflex *e* in place of *ъ, as in Parčić's missal. The decision on the reflexes of *tj/*skj/*dj and *γ is particularly complicated for Vajs. Both in his theoretical works as well as in his manuals of liturgical chant, he prefers the common CS forms *št/žd*, while in the *Vesperal*, *Psalter*, and *Missal*, he chooses the Croatian reflexes, oscillating between the Štokavian (<št> for *skj; <đ> for *dj) and the Čakavian (<šć> for *skj; <j> for *dj), in each case distinguishing between *tj and *skj. The variation of <đ> and <j> for *dj (e.g., *daj/dađ* 'to give', *prěje/prěđe* 'before') is criticised by Tentor.[36] For the Greek *γ, the spelling <đ> or <ġ> (or even the Čakavian <j>) is used. The use of <ġ> in VRM (VAJS, 1927) is likely due to an attempt to maintain the difference from *dj. The use of the letter <ě> for *ě in the older Croatian vernacular orthography does not provide a straightforward solution for the reading.

As mentioned above, the marking of the palatalisation of *l, n, r* was not entirely resolved in Glagolitic New CS. While the written Glagolitic tradition (except for the East New CS phase) did not mark palatalisation except before /u/ (and not always even there, see GADŽIEVA, 2008), Vajs preferred to retain this Old CS feature. In all his proposals, he offers a solution for marking the palatalisation of the above three consonants before vowels or *ъ. However, there are no two identical solutions (see Table 4):

---

[36]　TENTOR, 1914: 67.

Table 4. Marking of palatization in Vajs' Croatian CS texts

Tablica 4. Obilježavanje palatalizacije u Vajsovim hrvatskim crkvenoslavenskim tekstovima

Common Slavic base of Old CS \\ text	PARČIĆ 1905[3] (missal, prepared by Vajs)	Vesperal (1907)	Abece-darium (1909)	Pěnije (1914)	Sv. Cecilija (1919.b.)	Psaltir (1920)	Missal (1927)
*Vja	Ꙗ	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja
*ji	8	i	ji	i	n/a	i	i
*jeję	ꙖꙖ	jeje	jeję	jeje	jeje	jeje	jeje
*lja	Ⰾⰰ-ⰎⰰꙖ	lja	lja	lja	lja	lja	ļa
*l'e	Ⰾⰵ	lje	ľe	lje	lje	lje	ļe
*l'i	Ⰾⰻ	ļi	*ľi	li	ļi	ļi	ļi
*l'ь	Ⰾⰵ	ļ	ľь	l	ļ	ļ	ļ
*nja	Ⱀⰰ-ⰐⰰꙖ	nja	nja	nja	nja	nja	ńa
*n'e	Ⱀⰵ	nje	ńe	nje	nje	nje	ńe
*n'i	Ⱀⰻ	ńi	ńi	ńi	ńi	ńi	ńi
*n'ь	Ⱀⰵ	ń	ńь	ń	ń	ń	ń
*rja	Ⰱⰰ-ⰁⰰꙖ	rja	rja	ra	rja	rja	ra
*r'e	Ⰱⰵ	rje	ŕe	re	rje	rje	re
*r'i	Ⰱⰻ	ri	ŕi	ri	ŕi	ri	ri
*r'ь	Ⰱⰵ	r	ŕь	r	ŕ	r	r

Vajs vacillated between diacritical and digraphic solutions. Moreover, he could not decide on the necessity of and manner in which to mark the palatalised /r^j/, which has no support in any Croatian dialect (cf. LUKEŽIĆ, 2012: 52). In his review of Vajs' *Vesperal*, Tentor notes a variation in the marking of /r^j/ within the same text (*Cěsarja/Cěsara*, acc. sg. 'emperor').[37] One moti-

---

37 TENTOR, 1914: 67.

vation for marking a palatalised r would be the international use of the transcribed texts: in Slovene and Czech, there are reflexes of *rj different from /r/. Vajs' final decision, as printed in his *Roman Missal*, was to mark the palatalisation of *l, n* in all positions, while completely omitting the palatalised *r*.

5. THE RENEWAL OF CZECH CHURCH SLAVONIC

Unlike the Croatian environment, the Czech environment has a discontinuous tradition of using the Church Slavonic language. This is despite the fact that the Cyrillo-Methodian mission and its language were originally intended for use in the territory mainly within the borders of the present-day Czech Republic and Slovakia. Only one original text is believed to have survived from this period – the *Kyiv Folia* (among many editions, see MAREŠ, 1979: 49–60), which preserves an Old CS norm that differs slightly from the norm of the canonical manuscripts produced on the territory of the First Bulgarian Empire (cf. VEČERKA, 2010: 98–102). The natural development of the CS tradition on Czech territory formally ended in 1096/1097 with the expulsion of the Slavonic monks from the Sázava Monastery. Although many texts have been preserved in East Slavic or even Croatian manuscripts, only one original manuscript from this period has survived—the *Prague Glagolitic Fragments* (for many editions, see MAREŠ, 1979: 41–45). From the 12th–13th century (VEPŘEK, 2021), there is further evidence of the Church Slavonic tradition: the Vienna (Jagić's) and St Gregory's (Patera's) Glosses[38] in Latin script, representing a CS-Czech hybrid language,[39] and the Levín inscription in Cyrillic script (MAREŠ, 2000: 490–501). The analysis of these documents clearly shows that a specific Czech norm of Church Slavonic developed (VEČERKA, 2010: 116–121; VEPŘEK, 2022: 31–36).

The Church Slavonic revival of the 14th and 15th centuries in Czech territory (ČERMÁK, 2020) is not an extention of the local CS tradition, but a transfer of Croatian CS to a monastery in Prague (the Emmaus monastery, Cz. *Emauzy*). The consequence of this revival was the use of square Glagolitic

---

[38] Newer editions: VINTR, 1986 and SCHAEKEN, 1989; linguistic characterisation: VEČERKA, 2010: 118.

[39] For argumentation that the Southern Slavic linguistic features of the Vienna and St Gregory's glosses show that their author was likely a Czech person living somewhere in the Croatian lands, see HAMM, 1952.

script (within the walls of the same monastery in Prague) to write the Czech language as well. It was during these centuries that the Czech milieu became one of those with the longest tradition of translating the entire Bible (SČB 1981–2009) and of using liturgical texts in the vernacular (Czech).[40] The development of the original Czech religious tradition was slowed by re-Catholicisation (in the 17th and 18th centuries) as a result of the measures taken by the Habsburgs after the defeat of the revolt of the Bohemian estates in the first phase of the Thirty Years' War.

Interest in the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition within the context of the Roman Catholic environment of the Czech lands was once again rekindled in the wake of the Cyrillo-Methodian millennium in 1863, especially after it was noted that permission for CS liturgy promulgated by Clement VI in 1346 for one place in the kingdom ("*unum locum ... in dicto regno*", FHLGR 4) had never been revoked. This permission was conveyed to Velehrad in Moravia (HUDEC 2013: 31), and activities were invigorated by Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Grande Munus* (1880), which recognized Cyril and Methodius as relevant figures for the entire Catholic Church.

The question of the liturgical language was one of the key issues of the Catholic modernist movement, founded in 1895. Within the movement, there were discussions about whether to adopt Czech or Church Slavonic as the liturgical language. The latter option was more realistic because of the Croatian precedent (HUDEC 2013: 57–58), and it was presented through the publishing of two Church Slavonic liturgical texts transcribed from (printed) Croatian Glagolitic script into Latin script and accompanied by a Czech translation. These texts were published as supplements to *Nový život* (en. 'New Life'), a periodical published by Karel Dostál-Lutinov, one of the key figures of the movement, and edited by priest František Starý (1874–1961, cf. BATŮŠEK et al., 1996: 183) from Prostějov on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the encyclical *Grande Munus*.

The first supplement was *Staroslovanské povečerije* 'Old Slavonic Completorium' (PROSTĚJOV 1905), dedicated to the memory of Bishop Josip J. Strossmayer. As Starý writes,[41] it was copied from a 1791 breviary but correct-

---

[40]   While Roman liturgy had been used in translation since the early 15th century, Czech liturgy did not become established in the (neo-)Utraquist context until the late 16th century (HOLETON, 1995: 54–55). At the synods of 1610/1614, the Evangelical Church on the territory of present-day Slovakia accepted literary Czech as the liturgical language (KRAJČOVIČ, ŽIGO, 2006: 78).

[41]   STARÝ, 1905: 11–12.

ed using other sources. Starý also printed three pages of explanations of the Croatian Glagolitic script from Broz's *Mali azbukvar*. The pamphlet aimed to arouse the interest of the Czech clergy in CS liturgy. In the same year, issue 6 of *Nový život* (ODLADIL, 1905) ran a transcription of the Church Slavonic translation of the hymn *Veni, creator Spiritus* (*Pridi, Duše Stvoritelju*). This same issue of *Nový život* (p. 201) mentions that a certain number of copies of the supplement *Staroslovanské povečerije* was sent to Croatia.

In the following issue of *Nový život*, K. Dostál Lutinov[42] summarises the reasons for adopting Slavonic liturgy. In addition to the historical claim of the Czechs, he says that the use of Church Slavonic ("slovanský jazyk bohoslužebný") would build a bridge between the Slavic West and East, help promote mutual understanding between the Slavic languages, and strengthen people's trust in the Church, which was often seen as an enemy of national development. This appeal by Lutinov is commented on in detail by Václav Oliva,[43] who moderates enthusiasm by saying that Church Slavonic ("církevní slovanština") is only a semi-comprehensible language ("řečí polosrozumitelnou"), that the Church Slavonic translations are complicated, and that they should be corrected. He also notes that the clergy did not accept the *Staroslovanské povečerije*, and some priests returned it.

The second supplement to *Nový život*, published by František Starý in 1906, was the Church Slavonic text *Misa glagoljskaja v prazdnik svetuju Kurila i Metoda, arhijerěju i ispovědniku* (en. 'Glagolitic Mass for the Feast of Sts Cyril and Methodius, Archpriests, and Confessors'), transcribed from Croatian Glagolitic liturgical books.

As of 1907, Velehrad became the centre of unionist congresses, where Church Slavonic liturgy was celebrated according to the Eastern rite. At the Second Unionist Congress, the *Academia Velehradensis* was founded to promote the union of the Western and Eastern Churches, with special emphasis on the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition (ČSB 1912: 203). The issue of liturgical language intensified after the First World War and the establishment of an independent Czechoslovak Republic. The reform movement in the Czech Roman Catholic Church was led by the newly established association *Jednota československého duchovenstva* (en. 'Unity of the Czechoslovak Clergy'), which established a committee—one of whose members was Josef Vajs—to submit a proposal to Pope Benedict XV for the adoption of Czech and Church

---

[42] DOSTÁL LUTINOV, 1905.

[43] OLIVA 1905–1906: 563.

Slavonic as liturgical languages (HUDEC, 2013: 74). At that time, Josef Vajs prepared the liturgical text *Misi slavnije o bl. Marii děvě i za umršeje obět-nije* (en. 'Votive Masses for the Blessed Virgin Mary and for the Deceased'; see VAJS, 1919.a) for the Croats, the dedication of which he changed for the Czech environment as a sign of support for the adoption of CS.

On 21 May 1920, Pope Benedict XV's *Decretum S. Rituum Congregationis circa usum linguae vulgaris in S. liturgia in territorio ditionis Czecho*-Slova-cae[44] (Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites concerning the use of the vernacular in the Sacred Liturgy in the territory of the Czecho-Slovak domain) authorised the use of Church Slavonic[45] written in Glagolitic letters from rec-ognised and approved books[46] on the feast days of Sts Cyril and Methodius, Czech saints (Wenceslas, Ludmila, Procopius, John Nepomucenus) in Ve-lehrad in Moravia, as well as in places connected with the Czech CS tradi-tion (Sázava Monastery, Prague Slavonic Monastery), on the Holy Mountain (Svatá Hora) in Příbram, Stará Boleslav, and some other places in Prague. Josef Vajs reacted very quickly to the Pope's indult; as early as the May–June issue of C*yril* magazine, he offered the sung part of the Order of Mass (*Or-dinarium Missae*) in Church Slavonic in a Latin transcription and a curious language variety different from the transcriptions he had previously made for the Croatian public. Spelling errors (cf. SLAVICKÝ, 2014: 55–56), among the most obvious the form *grěluj* instead of *grěhy* 'sins' and the variation between Croatian CS and the newborn Czech CS norm of <i>/<y> for *y (*sinu* 'son' vs. *hvaly* 'praises'), <ä>/<e> for *ę (*raspet* 'crucified' vs. *sědäj* 'sitting') and

---

[44] The full text of the indult was published on the cover of the magazine *Cyril* 46, 1920, 5–6 and other Czech Roman Catholic Church periodicals. For a modern edition of the indult with bibliography and supplementary documents, see ČSS II.1: 235.

[45] It should be added that, as early as January, some of the Czech clergy dissatisfied with the Pope's position during discussions on Church reforms founded a new Czechoslovak Church independent of Rome and adopted Czech as its sole liturgical language. The unionist wing of the new church broke away to form a separate church entity in 1924, firstly as an eparchy under the jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church, only to form the autocephalous *Or-thodox Church of the Czech Lands and Slovakia* (Cz. *Pravoslavná církev v českých zemích a na Slovensku*).

[46] "*Benedictus Papa XV* […] *indulget* […] *V. Ut lingua veteroslavica characteribus glagolit-icis expressa (ex libris recognitis et approbatis), possit certis diebus in anno* […] *celebrari Missa cantata integra in locis et sancuariis insequentibus* […]". En. "Pope Benedict XV [...] indulges [...] V. that in the Old Slavonic language, expressed in Glagolitic characters (from revised and approved books), on certain days of the year [...] a complete sung Mass may be celebrated in the following places and sanctuaries [...].")

<o>/<e> for *ъ (*voskrse* 'he is resurrected', *večlověči se* 'he became a man') reveal that the text was composed very quickly.

Also, in a text published in the same issue of *Cyril* (VAJS, 1920.a), Vajs briefly explains his concept of a Church Slavonic norm for the Czech environment.[47] In his opinion, the use of the Croatian version of CS should be temporary, as it is based on the ideal form of 14th century texts and is therefore only suitable for use in the Slavonic monastery in Prague (Emauzy). In the Czech context, the liturgical language should correspond to the texts read by St Wenceslas and be modelled on the *Kyiv Folia* and the *Prague Fragments*. He added that the liturgical texts should be written in Glagolitic script, since all transcriptions (in Latin script) were unsatisfactory and could only be used for other, non-liturgical purposes.

Vajs supported these statements through a publication in July 1920—*Missae e proprio Bohemiae* (VAJS, 1920.b), in which he presented masses written according to the Croatian CS norm as found in Parčić's Glagolitic books for the Czech saints to be celebrated according to the papal indult (St John Nepomucenus, St Procopius, St Ludmila, St Wenceslas). This booklet should be seen as a supplement to PARČIĆ (1905);[3] it is the only printed Czech Glagolitic liturgical text for practical use. These two texts (VAJS, 1920.b and PARČIĆ, 1905[3]) were, at the time, the only approved liturgical texts usable in Czechoslovakia that fulfilled the condition of Pope Benedict XV's indult of 1920 regarding the use of Glagolitic script. In January 1921, Vajs added a mass in honour of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, again written in the new Czech CS Latin alphabet.

6. VAJS' PROPOSAL FOR A NEW CZECH NORM OF CHURCH SLAVONIC

Let us now examine Vajs' proposal for the new norm of Church Slavonic to be used in the Czech lands, as presented in VS, which is his main work in the context of developing this new norm. We will compare it with New Croatian CS (VAJS, 1927: hereinafter: VRM), the norm of CS from the Greek Catholic milieu (hereinafter: Greek Catholic CS)[48] as presented in the manuals printed

---

[47] VAJS, 1920.a: 52.

[48] We are aware of the variability of church books produced by different Greek Catholic centres. For our our purposes, we use only manuals associated with the Eparchy of Mukačevo, which became part of Czechoslovakia after the Second World War.

in Transcarpathia (grammar: SZABÓ, 1894; dictionary: KUBEK, 1906), and Vajs' reference texts: *Kyiv Folia* (hereinafter: KF, index verborum: SCHAEKEN, 1987: 241–248), the *Prague Fragments* (hereinafter PF, index verborum: VONDRÁK 1904: 105–110). There are also Czech, Slovak, and Carpathian East Slavic (hereinafter: CES, largest dictionary: KERČA, 2007)[49] linguistic contexts.

At first sight, one notices some striking features of the orthography that seem unusual to the Czech reader (cf. MAREŠ, 1971: 224):

– The letter <g> is identical to Croatian, but can also be considered an archaism. It corresponds to the Czech, Slovak, and Carpathian East Slavic /h/,[50] which likely did not exist at the time of the emergence of KF and PF (cf. ŠLOSAR, 2017).

– The letter <ġ> (transcription used in Croatian liturgical texts) used for the Greek *γ, corresponds to the older Czech and Slovak /j/ (*anjel* 'angel', *evanjelium* 'Gospel') and the modern Czech /ɟ/ or /g/ (*anděl, evangelium*); in Greek Catholic CS it is written as <г> (а̑гг҄елъ, є҆ѵаггє́лїє).

– Palatalisation of *l, r, n*. Palatalisation is marked in KF, PF, and Greek Catholic CS. Both modern Czech and Slovak include /ɲ/; *rj developed into /r̝/ <ř> *in Czech but is depalatalised in Slovak (as in Croatian); /ʎ/ is preserved in Slovak but missing in Czech. Carpathian East Slavic dialects include /ʎ/, /ɲ/, /rʲ/. More problematic than the issue of marking palatalisation was the manner in which it was executed: *lj is marked <lj>/<ļ>, *nj as <nj>/<ń> and *rj as <rj>/<ŕ> (the latter grapheme means /r:/ in Slovak).

– Lack of palatalisation of *d, t, n* at the end of words (VS 9 *pamät* 'memory', but Czech *paměť*/Slovak *pamät'*/CES память; VS 23 *pěsn* 'song', but Czech *píseň*/Slovak *pieseň*/CES пісня).

An important orthographic marker that indicates Czech and Slovak spelling is the distinction between <i>/<y> according to Czech/Slovak rules, i.e. including positions after velars. This corresponds to Old and Czech Church Slavonic, as well as to CES, which distinguishes between *i and *y in all

---

[49] We have chosen a neutral term for the East Slavic dialects spoken in Transcarpathia and eastern Slovakia, traditionally classified as Carpathian dialects of Ukrainian. However, there is currently a recognised standard language based on this language in Slovakia (Russyn).

[50] Greek Catholic г is also read as /h/ in the East Slavic context. Incidentally, this is a Cyrillic letter borrowed into Czech in the early fifteenth century, when it was written in Glagolitic (ČERMÁK, 2020: 107).

these positions in pronunciation. Greek Catholic CS writes ки/ги/хи. The only strange form is the instrumental plural *dĕlately* 'workers' (VS 31), where we would expect *i as it is a *jo*-stem (cf. VS 41 acc. sg. *dĕlatelja*). However, this may be a typographical error.

The PF are specific in that they go further than KF in incorporating West Slavic features (though not always regularly). Nevertheless, these specific features are taken into account in VS, but common (Old and New) Church Slavonic forms are used:

- PF 1v26 ⰟⰕⰟ ⰈⰅⰏⰔⰡ/*otъ zemję* 'from the land', cf. Czech *zemĕ*, Slovak *zem*, but VS 46 *zemlja,* VRM XXXVII *zemļa*, Greek Catholic CS земла, cf. CES земля.
- PF 1r16, 1v13–14 v forms of ⰏⰑⰄⰎⰋⰕⰂⰀ/*modlitva* 'prayer'[51] (cf. Czech/Slovak *modlitba*, but VS 47 *molitva*, cf. VRM 25 *molitva*, Greek Catholic CS моли́тва, cf. CES молитва.
- PF 1v5,8 ⰂⰞⰋ/*vši* 'all', 1r17 ⰂⰞⰡⱈ'/*všĕx*', cf. Czech *vše*/Slovak *všetko*/ CES вшитко, but VS nom. sg. neut. *vse*, but also nom. pl. neut. *vsja*, cf. VRM XXIV *vse*, VII *vsa*, Greek Catholic CS (SZABÓ, 1894: 52) все́ – вса́.

Common to (New) Croatian CS, (New) Czech CS, and both Czech and Slovak are the syllabic consonants: VS 36 *vrhu* 'on' – 35 *dlgy* 'guilts', cf. VRM XXIII *vrhu* – XXXI *dlgi*, cf. Czech/Slovak *vrch* 'hill' – Czech *dluhy*/ Slovak *dlhy* 'debts' (but both *vlk* 'wolf'). Both Greek Catholic CS and CES (and Eastern Slovak dialects) use the vocalisation верхъ – до́лгы, cf. CES *верьх – довгы*. In contrast to Greek Catholic CS, both Croatian and Czech CS retain *ĕ in all etymological positions, e.g. VS 36/VRM XXI *prĕd*, vs. Greek Catholic CS предъ. The grapheme *ĕ* is used in Czech, but it appears only after labials and dentals *d, t, n*.

The most important regular feature of both KF and PF that distinguishes them from all other Church Slavonic texts and varieties are the specific West Slavic reflexes of *tj, *skj, and *dj: *c* (KF 6v15 ⰒⰑⰏⰑⰜⰟ/*pomocь* 'help', PF 1v15 ⰜⰂⰀⰎⰅⰜⰋⰏⰟ/*xvaljęcimъ* 'to the praising ones'), *šč* (KF 5r15–16 ⰑⰝⰋⰜⰌⰅⰐⰋⰅ/*očiščenie* 'purification', PF 2v21 ⰐⰀ ⰔⰆⰄⰋⰞⰝⰋ/*na sudišči* 'in court') and *z* (e.g., KF 3r10 ⰄⰀⰈⰟ/*dazь* 'give!', PF 1v16–17 ⰓⰑⰈⰟⰔⰕⰂⰑ/ *rozъstvo* 'birth'; VONDRÁK, 1904: 65; SCHAEKEN, 1987: 90 and 94). The reflexes <c> and <šč> are also preserved in VS (e.g., 41 *pomoc*; 22 *očišceni-*

---

[51] See also PF 2b10 ⰋⰔⰅⰎⰅⰐⰟ/*iselenъ* 'banished' and variation of 1a12 ⰔⰂⰡⰕⰋⰎ'ⰐⰀ/*svĕtil'na* 1b9–10 ⰔⰂⰡⰕⰋⰄⰎⰟⰐⰀ/*svĕtidlъna* 'exaposteilarion'.

je). The reflex /c/ corresponds to both the Czech and Slovak standard (*ротос*), while CES has /č/ (*помуч*). The reflex *šč* is absent in standard languages, which have /ʃc/ (Czech *očištění*, Slovak *ešte*). Nevertheless, /ʃtʃ/ is widespread in Czech (ČJA 5: 270), Slovak (ASJ 1: 301), and CES dialects (*очищеня*), including the local liturgical pronunciation of Greek Catholic CS (ŠTEC, 2005: 102). It is also similar to Vajs' Čakavian patterned transcription of the Glagolitic Ⱋ (e.g., VRM XL *očišćenje*). The reflex of *dj differs in Czech (and Sorbian, Slovincian dialect of Kashubian), where it corresponds to KF and PF Ⰶ/*z*, and in Slovak, which shares the reflex /dz/ with Polish. VS uses both <z> and <dz>. While <z> is dominant, the reflex <dz> is used in only three words: *medzu* 'between' (9×, Slovak *medzi*), *nudza* 'need' (VS 40, Slovak *núdza*), and *vodz* 'duke' (as gen. sg. *vodza* VS 47, here the closest Slovak word with this reflex is *vôdzka* 'leash'). Greek Catholic CS shares the same reflex with New Croatian Glagolitic CS in all these cases: ц/Ⱋ and жд/ⰅⰞⰜ; Vajs' Croatian transcriptions use the Croatian reflexes.

While the *Kyiv Folia* still illustrate Common Slavic vocalism, which preserves nasal vowels, PF reflects Proto-Czech denasalisation. For *ǫ, there is *u* (1r10 ⰱⱆⰴⰵⱅⱔ/budetъ 'it will be', 1r29 ⱄⰾⰰⰲⱁⱓ/slavoju 'with glory', etc.), which is a common feature of VS, New Croatian CS, and Greek Catholic CS;[52] it also roughly corresponds to the pronunciation in Croatian, CES, Slovak (*u/ú*), and Czech (*u/ou*). The situation with the reflexes for *ę is more complicated. In Proto-Czech, a sound like */æ/ is assumed, which seems close to the standard Slovak phoneme written as <ä> (REJZEK 2021: 117–119). In PF, we still have ⰵ in most places. After ш, the letter ⰴ appears (four times) only in the third person plural aorist ending (MAREŠ, 2000: 348). In one case, the spelling is ⰲⰴ (2r20; VONDRÁK, 1904: 65). In the Czech and Záhorie dialects of Slovak, the original */æ/ developed into /a/ before hard consonants except *k, while in other cases it merged with *ě. In standard Slovak—in short—the inclusion of <ä> (or its long variant <ia>) in spelling was retained only after labials (for details, see KRAJČOVIČ, 1988: 33, 52–53).

In the first version of Vajs' New Czech CS, as published in *Cyril* (VAJS, 1920.a; VAJS, 1921), the author seems to have wanted to write <ä> in place of *ę in all positions (e.g., *byšä* 'they were'). In VS, however, we find a strict positional distribution that corresponds neither to Czech nor to Slovak, but roughly to the distribution of ꙗ/ⱑ − ⱔ in Greek Catholic (and Orthodox) CS:

---

[52] In fact, it is a common feature of all CS varieties except the Southeastern (originally Bulgarian-Macedonian) tradition.

– After hard consonants (also after <c>), *ę is written as <ä>, which corresponds to the Slovak spelling only in the postlabial position (e.g., VS 15 *svät*, Slovak *svätý* 'Saint; Sanctus'), but always to the Greek Catholic CS ѧ written /ja/, thus, e.g., свѧ́тъ, CES *святый*, but also VS 9 *tä* 'you' – *sä* (reflexive pronoun) as Greek Catholic CS тѧ – сѧ. The use of <ä> after <c> is common in VS, as this consonant corresponds to both *c and *tj, and Vajs retains the archaic flexion of *ja*-stems (VS 13 *roditelnicä* 'of mother'). In East New CS, however, the combination *cę is very rare, since the corresponding forms of *ja*-stems (gen. sg. and nom.–acc.–voc. pl.) prefer the new ending -и (SZABÓ, 1894: 41). The cluster *cę can practically only be found in the word *cęta, written цѧ́ть (KUBEK, 1906: 268) – цѧ́та 'coin' (BONČEV, 2012: 326).

– After <j>, <ž>, <š>, <č>, <lj> the *ę is written <a>. In most cases, this corresponds to Greek Catholic Orthodox CS: VS 42 *jazyk* 'language' – ѧзы́къ 'language'/ꙗзы́къ 'people, pagan people', VS 41 *žatva* 'harvest' – жа́тва, VS 39 *byša* 'they were' – бы́ша, VS 41 *čado* 'child' – ча́до. In the case of *lę, Vajs' norm and East New CS differ (VS 3 *glagolja* 'speaking' – глаго́лѧ).

As mentioned above, the New Croatian CS of Parčić – Vajs always has Ⰵ/*e* in these positions. Čakavian-influenced Croatian CS contains the form corresponding to the pronunciation /jazik/.

In strong positions, both *jers* are vocalised to *e in Czech and West and East Slovak. Although PF does not yet reflect the vocalisation of *jers*, there is a tendency for *ь/*ъ to merge (into ə). In Central and Standard Slovak, we find the reflexes *e, *o, or *a for both *jers*, while the originally dominant evolution seems to have been *ь > *ʲe *ъ > *o (KRAJČOVIČ, 1988: 28–29). This development corresponds to East Slavic and East New CS; it is also the solution Vajs chooses Vajs for VS:

– *ь > e, e.g., VS 4 *dnes* 'today' (as in Czech and Slovak) – Greek Catholic CS дне́сь, VS 34 *palec* 'finger' (as in Czech and Slovak, CES *палець*) – Greek Catholic CS па́лець. Let us recall that this reflex occurs in some cases in the Croatian CS of Parčić – Vajs (VM 340 *dnes*, but VM XXIV *palac*).

– *ъ > *o, *vopiti* 'to cry' (Greek Catholic CS вопи́ти), *vovede* 'he led inside' (cf. FIRCAK″, 1906: 340 воведо́ста 'you two led inside', Slovak *voviesť* 'to lead inside'), *tokmo* 'only' (Greek Catholic CS то́кмѡ), *so* 'with' (Greek Catholic CS co, Slovak *so*), *vo* 'in' (Greek Catholic CS

ⰱⱁ, Slovak *vo*), gen. pl. *zol* 'of bad things' (FIRCAK″, 1906: 578 ꙃѡ́лъ, but Slovak *ziel*). The only exception to this rule is the lexeme *crkev* (VS 42, cf. VRM 619 *crkav*), whose form corresponds to Czech *církev*, Slovak *cirkev* (cf. Greek Catholic CS цє́рковь, CES *церков*).

New Glagolitic liturgical texts write *jers* in both strong and weak positions. In the versions written in Latin script, the weak *jers* are generally omitted in the root and final positions, except for the word *mezda* 'pay' (VS 41, but Czech/Slovak *mzda*, and Greek Catholic CS мздà, VRM once on p. 9 *mzda*, but otherwise 9× *mazda*). An epenthetic *jer* is placed in the lexeme *ogeń* 'fire' (Czech/Slovak *oheň*, VRM 12 *ogań*, but East New CS ѻ́гнь). The situation is more complicated with prefixes. In general, there is variation among *voz-/vz-, vos-/vs-, vo-/v-, so-/s-*, as in Latin script Croatian CS and, less often, East New CS. However, the distribution of the vocalisation is different from that in Cyrillic CS. Let us take the variation *voz/vz-* as an example:

- Always *voz-* as in East New CS: VS 6 *vozdvig* 'having risen', VS 4 *vozveselät sä* 'they will rejoice', VS 8 *vozved* 'having led up', VS 32 *vozljubljenago* 'of the beloved', VS 41 *vozvratit sä* 'he will return', VS 44 *vozglagoljet* 'he will utter', VS 45 *vozveliči* 'he will praise', VS 42 *voznenavidit* 'he will feel hatred', VS 48 *voždeljenije* 'desire'/47 *voždeljajte* 'desire!', VS 22 *vozpěvajemo* 'let us sing praise' (but also 23 *vospěvajemo*), VS 25 *vozhozaše* 'he went up' (but also VS 4 *voshodä*).
- Variations of *voz-/vz-* in various forms: VS 5 *vozmet* 'he will take' (East New CS во́зметъ) / VS 5 *vzem* 'having taken' (East New CS взе́мъ), VS 27 *vozšed* 'having come up' / VS 7 *vzide* 'he came up'.
- Variations of *voz-/vz-* in the same forms (East New CS always воз-): VS 10 *voznesenija* / VS 33 *vznesenije* 'exaltation', VS 32 *vozdav* / VS 32 *vzdav* 'having given', VS 40 *vozradujut sä/vzradujut sä* 'they will rejoice'.
- Only *vz-* (as in East New CS, the verbs appear only once): VS 45 *vziska* 'he wished', VS 46 *prěvzide* 'he surpassed'.

The clusters *sьd/*sъd are transcribed as <sd> in *sde* 'here' (VS 5; VRM 33; East New CS ꙁдѣ̀, Czech *zde*), *sdělaj* 'prepare' (VS 44; VRM 59; East New CS содѣ́лай), but as <zd> in *zdravije* 'health' (VS 42; VRM 69 *zdravje* / VRM 134 *sdravje*, East New CS ꙁдра́вїє, Czech *zdraví,* Slovak *zdravie*).

As regards their morphology, the most striking difference between VS and East New CS is the presence of newer forms in the latter and the *ja*-stem paradigm mentioned above. The consistent distribution of *ę > a after soft con-

sonants leads to homography between the nominative singular with the genitive singular and the form of the nominative-accusative-vocative plural (e.g., VS 37 *duša moja* 'my soul', VS 45 *želanije duša jego* 'the desire of my soul'; VS 46 *so starějšinami zemlja* 'with the rulers of the land' vs. VS *plna sut nebesa i zemlja* 'the heavens and the land are full'). This is the same problem that existed in Church Slavonic on East Slavic soil before standardisation (EVANGELION, 1690, Matthew 2:20 gen. sg. и҆щꙋщїи дш҃а 'searching the soul', 12,40 въ срⷣци землѧ̀ 'in the heart of the land'). Analogously, the form *naša* 'our' can refer to both the nominative singular and the nominative-accusative-vocative plural (VS 24 *naša glasy* 'our voices' vs. VS 3 *pomoc naša* 'our help').

Adjectives generally have contracted forms, as in New Croatian CS (i.e., also -*ago*, -*omu* as in East New CS). There are uncontracted forms of the locative singular: the form *svätějem* '(about) the saint' appears three times (VS 13, 24, 26), *prěsvätějem* '(about) the very saint' appears once, *vo svätěji i čestněji rucě* 'in the holy and honourable hand' appears twice (both VS 32), while the dative plural *čadom božijem* 'to God's children' appears once. There is also a contracted form for *na gore svätěj* 'on the holy mountain' (VS 42). As already mentioned, in Greek Catholic CS, uncontracted forms are fully preserved in the paradigms of the adjectives ве́лїй 'great', бо́жїй 'God's' (but dat. pl. бж҃їимъ; SZABÓ, 1894: 56–57).

The most curious feature of Vajs' morphology is the use of the ending -*mo* in the first person plural of the present/future indicative (e.g. VS 4 *molimo* 'we pray', VS 5 *hvalimo* 'we praise', VS 8 *prinosimo* 'we bring', etc.), imperative (VS 5 *pomolimo sä* 'let us pray'), and aorist indicative (VS 44 *ostavihomo* 'we left', VS 48 *prijahomo* 'we accepted', besides VS 38 *prijahom*, VS 39 *viděhom* 'we saw'). The text of the *Ordinarium* in *Cyril*[53] attests the ending -*mo* in the present tense (*hvalimo* 'we praise', *klanjajemo se* 'we kneel', etc.), but -*m* in the imperative (*pomolim sä* 'let us pray'). In addition to the Croatian vernacular form, the ending -*mo* also appears in late classical Croatian CS texts such as Torresani's CS primer (TORRESANIS DE ASULA, 1527: 1r ⰰⱂⱂⰻⱑⱞⱁⱞⰺⰾⰻⰸ) and the Missal of 1631 (BABIČ, 2000: 317). However, such forms are found neither in New Croatian Glagolitic CS texts nor their Latin versions. It should be added that the first person plural ending -*mo* in the present indicative and imperative is also present in Central Slovak, specifically in the Gemer dialects (ASJ 2: 218 and 227–228). According to Mareš,[54] the rea-

---

[53] VAJS, 1920.a.
[54] MAREŠ, 1971: 224.

son for *-mo* is an attempt to make a clear distinction between the plural and the singular. This issue would be most important for athematic verbs, but there are no examples of the first person plural of an athematic verb in VS. According to Vajs' *Abecedarium* (VAJS, 1917[2]: XXXV–XXXVI), the first person singular and plural of the present indicative of athematic verbs are not distinguished in Glagolitic script (e.g., ⰞⰐⰰⰏⰋ 'I/we give'). In East New CS, this distinction does exist (да́мъ/да́мы, SZABÓ, 1894: 95).

Having completed this overview, let us observe spelling differences between VS and related texts that precede it (Table 5):

Table 5. Spelling differences between VS and other New CS liturgical texts
Tablica 5. Razlike u slovkanju između VS i drugih novocrkvenih liturgijskih tekstova

Common Slavic base of Old CS \ text	Missae (1920)	Starý (1905/6)	Misi slavnije (1919)	Psaltir (1920)	Cyril (1920/21)	VS (1922)
*tj	Ⱋ	št	št	ć	c	**c**
*št	Ⱋ	št	št	št	šč	**šč**
*dj	ⰆⰄⰠ	žd	žd	đ	z	**z/dz**
γ'	ⰳⰵ	gj	ġ	ġ	N/A	**ġ**
*ch	ⱈ	h	h	h	h	**h**
*ę	ⰵ	e	e	e	ä (e)	**ä, a**
*ję	ⰵ	je	je	je	ja	**ja**
*y	Ⱏ	i	i	i	y/i	**y**
*-ь-	Ⰹ	ə	ı	a	e	**e**
*-ъ-	Ⰹ	ə	ı	a	o (e)	**o (e)**
*-ъ/-ь	Ⰹ	—	—	ь	—	**—**
*pravьd(ьn)-	ⰒⰓⰰⰂⰵⰄⰠ-	praved-	praved-	praved-	N/A	**praved-**
*sьrdьce	ⱄⰠⰓⰄⱌⰵ	srdce	srdce	srdce	*srdce	**srdce**
*vъz-	ⰂⰟⰈ-	vz-/vəz-	vz-/vız-	vz-/vaz-	voz-	**vz-/voz-**
1PL -mъ	ⰏⰟ	-m	-m	-m	-mo (-m)	**-mo**

This table clearly shows the change in Vajs' approach. *Misi slavnije*, the first text intended for the Czech environment, presents an international transliteration that retains the common CS reflexes *št/žd* without resolving the issue of *jer* vocalisations. We then see a contrast between the Croatian spelling in the 1920 *Psalter* and the specific texts for the Czech (or rather Czechoslovak) milieu as presented in preliminary form in *Cyril,* and in definitive form (albeit with some unresolved issues) in VS of 1922.

The treatment of palatalisation and jotation generally shows similar variation as in texts addressed to the Croatian milieu (Table 6):

Table 6. Marking of palatalisation and jotation in VS and other New CS liturgical texts
Tablica 6. Bilježenje palatalizacije i jotacije u VS i drugim novocrkvenim liturgijskim tekstovima

	Missae (1920)	Starý (1905/6)	*Misi slavnije* (1919)	*Psaltir* (1920)	*Cyril* (1920/21)	**VS (1922)**
*ě	Ⱑ	ě	ě	ě	ě	**ě**
*ja	Ⱑ	ja	ja	ja	ja	**ja**
*jejǫ	ⰅⰅ	jeje	jeje	jeje	jeja	**jeja**
*vьsja	ⰞⰉⰌⰘ	vsa	vsa	vsa	vsja	**vsja**
*lja	Ⰾ�Ⱑ	lja	lja	lja	lja	**lja**
*l'e	ⰎⰅ	lje	lje	lje	lje	**lje**
*l'i	ⰎⰋ	lji	ļi	ļi	li	**ļi**
*l'ь	ⰎⰊ	lj	ļ (l)	ļ	N/A	**ļ**
*nja	ⰐⰑ	nja	nja	nja	nja	**nja**
*n'e	ⰐⰅ	nje	nje	nje	N/A	**nje**
*n'i	ⰐⰋ	nji	ńi	ńi	N/A	**nji**
*n'ь	ⰐⰊ	nj	ń	ń	N/A	**ń**
*rja	ⰓⰘ	N/A	ra	rja	N/A	**rja**
*r'e	ⰓⰅ	rje	rje	rje	rje	**rje**
*r'i	ⰓⰋ	rji	ri	ri	N/A	**ŕi**
*r'ь	ⰓⰊ	r	r	r	N/A	**ŕ**

7. JOSEF VAJS' PROJECT AND HIS SUCCESSORS

As Mareš notes,[55] Vajs' proposal for a new Czech CS was too academic and too far-removed from contemporary Czech, so the Croatian version actually remained in use.[56] This can be seen in Vajs' revision of the text of the *Ordinarium Missae* used for music by Josef Bohuslav Foerster. This transcription was declared by Vajs (FOERSTER 1929: 2) to be the official transcription approved for the Missal. The transcription corresponds roughly to Vajs' *Roman Missal* (*ć – šć – đ, a*-vocalisation); however, the <nj>/<lj>/<rj> clusters are preferred to mark palatalisation. Despite this, there are some features of the previous New Czech CS, specifically in using the first person plural ending -*mo*. Phonological infiltrations may be considered typographical errors (7 *vozdajemo* 'we repay', 18 *den* 'day', otherwise always <a> in this position). The most significant idiosyncrasy of this version is the presence of Vajs' explanations for Czech singers as to how to read Croatian orthography. After trying to explain the reading of <ć> ("soft *c*") and <đ> ("Slovak *dz*"), he suggests reading /ts/ and /dz/ instead. Curiously, he stresses the hard reading of the <di>, <ti>, <ni> clusters, which are palatalised in both Czech and Slovak (but not in CES). For <ě>, he rejects the Czech reading /je/ but suggests the reading /e:/. The letter <h> should be read as /x/, and the difference between <l> and <lj> should be pronounced. Apart from Foerster, Vajs' *Ordinarium* has been set to music several times; Slavický mentions other Glagolitic masses by Karel Douša, Antonín Janda, and Leoš Janáček, the latter being the best known.[57] The text of these masses was originally taken from the preliminary Czechoslovak version of *Cyril* from 1920, which contained typographical errors.

The CS text of Douša's score (DOUŠA, s. a.) slightly simplifies the orthography (y > <i>, ě > <e>) and removes some errors (*grěluj > grehi*) and the first person plural ending -*mo*. Other forms partly retain the former Czechoslovak version (3 *sedäj* 'sitting', 5 *raspät* 'crucified', *c/z* for *tj/dj, e/o* for *ь/*ъ), which is randomly Croatised (*svet* 'sanctus', 6 *crkav* 'church'). The missing diacritics are sometimes unintentional (5 *zivim* 'to the living', 6 *krscenije* 'baptism').

---

[55] MAREŠ, 1971: 225.

[56] It may be interesting to note a fairly recent experience. During the feast of St Wenceslas in 2018, I attended a Mass in Stará Boleslav that was declared to be in Old Church Slavonic. The liturgy that was celebrated and the text that was given to the faithful was actually Vajs' Mass (the first version of which appeared in *Missae ex proprio Bohemiae* in 1920), written in the Croatian norm of the Church Slavonic language in the orthography of Vajs' 1927 *Roman Missal*.

[57] SLAVICKÝ, 2013: 266.

Janáček's version, completed in 1926, also put the 1920 *Cyril* text to music, this time retaining the form *grěluj* (instead of *grěhy*, JANÁČEK 2011: 188–189). The famous Czech composer was very concerned about the quality of the text, and asked another famous Czech Slavic studies scholar, Miloš Weingart, to revise it. Professor Weingart had an entirely different opinion about the language used (JANÁČEK, 2011: XIV–XV and 188–189; for more details, see VEČERKA, 1957: 71–72) and wanted to change the language to Old Church Slavonic. However, this was not possible, mainly due to the impossibility of adjusting the score in the case of the addition of weak *jers*. Weingart's version (JANÁČEK, 2011: 188–189) was thus only partially archaised—only strong *jers* were retained. Most of the features of Vajs' Czechoslovak CS were removed: the Czech reflexes *c/z* for *tj/*dj were replaced by *št/žd*, the first person plural ending *-mo* was shortened to *-m*. Oddly, the reflex <o> was added for *ъ. For *ę, the original <ä> was replaced with <ę>, which may be less clear to non-philologists. Otherwise, the orthography has been adapted for the Czech reader (<ch> instead of <h>, diacritics instead of <lj>, <nj>, <rj>). Večerka's revision,[58] apart from correcting some typos, generally only replaced <ę> with the "Croatian CS" <e>. The recommendation of the hard pronunciation of <di>, <ti>, <ni> has also been retained in modern editions of Janáček's Glagolitic Mass (JANÁČEK, 2011: 190) and is thus sung to this day.[59]

In 1933, Vajs published a booklet in Prague containing Church Slavonic texts and the scores of two *Ordinaria Missae* (Sunday and feast day masses) together with sung masses dedicated to saints connected with the Czech lands (St. John Nepomucenus, St. Procopius, Sts. Cyril and Methodius, St. Ludmila and St. Wenceslas) mentioned in the papal indult of 1920. The Church Slavonic spelling is entirely in accordance with Vajs' *Roman Missal* (VAJS, 1927), without any explanation of the reading of typically Croatian graphemes (e.g., <ć>, <đ>). The work thus seems to be a supplement to the already known CS version of the *Roman Missal* adapted for the Czech Roman Catholic Church.[60] This shows that Vajs himself abandoned his own proposal for a new Czech CS norm in favour of Croatian CS, which was eventually used in the Czech milieu (VEPŘEK, 2016.a: 25).

---

[58] VEČERKA, 1957: 74–75; and JANÁČEK, 2011 – in the score.

[59] We are grateful to organist Kateřina Chroboková (artistic name: Katta) for confirming this information.

[60] The Masses of St. Ludmila and St. Procopius are completely missing from Vajs' Roman Missal.

Finally, Vajs' successors may be mentioned. On Czech soil, this was Vojtěch Tkadlčík, who proposed his first version of the Missal in 1963 and his final, biscriptural (round Glagolitic – Latin script) version in 1992. Tkadlčík's proposal for a new Czech CS differs significantly from Vajs' (details and linguistic analysis: VEPŘEK, 2016.a). Vajs' successors in Croatia were Josip Leonard Tandarić, whose *Missal*, modernising Vajs' version, appeared in 1980, and finally, Milan Mihaljević, whose *Vesperal* (1999) attempted a return to its Čakavian roots. In any case, the clear result of Vajs' work is his contribution to the existence of two Roman Catholic norms of New Church Slavonic.

8. CONCLUSION

In general, it can be said that Vajs' proposal of a new norm of CS for the Czech environment was unsuccessful. It was not officially approved, and was even abandoned by the author himself later in his life. Nevertheless, it represents an interesting attempt to join the tradition of surviving Central European CS texts, inspired by modern Czech and Slovak and with a clear unionist aspiration apparent in its shared features with East New CS. This norm should, therefore, actually be called Czechoslovak CS, as it refers to the different linguistic and cultural traditions within the Czechoslovak state. Nevertheless, the language proposal was clearly based on Vajs' experience editing New Croatian CS texts. It is actually an adaptation of New Croatian CS, also for legal reasons (transcription of approved Glagolitic texts). Its main problem was its orthography, which was too dependent on the Croatian norm and unusual and foreign in the Czechoslovak environment. The attempt to unite highly divergent traditions into a single norm may have deepened its unfamiliarity for both the clergy and the lay population.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CES = Carpathian East Slavic
CS = Church Slavonic
KF = *Kyiv Folia*
PF = *Prague Fragments*
VRM = VAJS 1927
VS = VAJS 1922.

REFERENCES

ASJ = ŠTOLC, J. (ed.). 1968–1978. *Atlas slovenského jazyka 1–2*. Bratislava: Veda.

BABIČ, V. 2000. *Vpliv vzhodne cerkvene slovanščine na hrvaške glagolske tekste v 17. in 18. stoletju*. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.

BATŮŠEK, S. 1996. *Katolická moderna: Karel Dostál-Lutinov a jeho přátelé a spolupracovníci*. Třebíč: Arca JiMfa.

BERČIĆ, I. 1860. *Bukvar staroslovenskoga jezika: glagolskimi pismeni: za čitanje crkvenih knjig.* U Pragu: Bogumil Haas.

BERČIĆ, I. 1864–1871. *Ulomci svetoga pisma obojega uvjeta staroslovenskim jezikom.* Dio I–V. Prag: Bogumil Haas.

BLAŽEVIĆ KREZIĆ, V. 2016. *Jezik Misala Dragutina Antuna Parčića.* doktorski rad. Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu.

BOGOVIĆ, M. 2013. Staroslavenska liturgija u biskupijama senjskoj i modruškoj u 19. stoljeću i Parčićev misal. *Riječki teološki časopis 1, 2:* 209–225.

BONČEV 2012 = БОНЧЕВ, А. 2002–2012. *Речник на църковнославянския език. I–II.* София: Национална библиотека «Св. Св. Кирил и Методий». [BONČEV, A. 2002–2012. *Rečnik na c″rkovnoslavânskiâ ezik.* I–II. Sofiâ: Nacionalna biblioteka «Sv. Sv. Kiril i Metodij».]

BOZANIĆ, A. 1994–1996. Staroslavenska akademija u programima biskupa Antuna Mahnića. Staroslavenska akademija i njezino značenje. *Slovo 44–46, 1996–1996, Prilozi:* 312–321.

BREVIARIUM 1791 = *Breviarium romanum slavonico idiomate. Pars hiemalis. Pars æstiva.* Romæ: Congregatio de propaganda fide. URL: https://glagoljica.hr/?knjige=i&id=554016; https://glagoljica.hr/?knjige=i&id=15296 (27. 9. 2023).

BROZ, I. 1894. *Mali azbukvar za pravilno i jednolično čitanje glagoljice u novih crkvenih knjigah po hrvatskoj recenziji.* Romae: Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.

CARAMAN, M. 1739. ⰁⰟⰍⰂⰀⰓⰜ ⰔⰎⰀⰂⰅⰐⰔⰍⰋⰊ ⰒⰋⰔⰏⰅⰐ�67 ⰂⰅⰎⰋⰝⰀⰋⰤⰀⰃⰑ ⰖⰝⰋⰕⰅⰎⰨ 67 · ⰊⰅⰓⰑⰐⰋⰏⰀ ⰔⰕⰓⰋⰄⰑⰐⰔⰍⰀⰃⰑ ⰐⰀⰒⰅⰝⰀⰕⰀⰐⰟ · ⰂⰟ ⰓⰋⰏⰧ: ⰕⰋⰒⰑⰏⰨ ⰔⰂⰧⰕⰀⰃⰑ ⰔⰑⰁⰑⰓⰀ ⰑⰕ ⰓⰀⰸⰏⰐⰑⰆⰅⰐⰊⰭ ⰂⰧⰓⰋ [*Bukvarь slavenskij pismeny veličajšago učitelê b. Ieronima Stridonskago napečatanь.* Vь Rimê: tipomь svêtago sobora ot razmnoženiê vêri] Ⰱⱆⰽⰲⰰⱃⱐ ⱄⰾⰰⰲⰵⱀⱄⰽⰹ́ⰹ. Ⰲⱏ Ⱃⰹⰿⱑ: Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.] [CARAMAN, M. 1753². Bukvar′ slavenskìj. V″ Rimě: Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.]

CORIN, A. R. 1993. Variation and norm in Croatian Church Slavonic. *Slovo* 41-42-43, 155–196.

ČERMÁK, V. 2008. K pojetí nové církevní slovanštiny v areálu Slavia orthodoxa a Slavia latina. *Slavia 77, 1–3:* 29–39.

ČERMÁK, V. 2020. *Hlaholské písemnictví v Čechách doby lucemburské.* Praha: Slovanský ústav AV ČR.

Český a staroslovanský jazyk v liturgii. 1920, *Cyril 46, 5–6*: 49–51.

ČJA = BALHAR, J. (ed.). 1992–2001. *Český jazykový atlas* 1–5. Praha: Academia.

ČSB 1912 = J. Tumpach; A. Podlaha; V. Kotrba. *Český slovník bohovědný 1*. Praha: Cyrillo-Methodějská knihtiskárna a nakladatelství V. Kotrba.

ČSS II.1 = P. Helan; J. Šebek (eds.). *Československo a Svatý stolec II/1. Kongregace pro mimořádné církevní záležitosti (1919-1925). Výběrová edice dokumentů*. Praha: Masarykův ústav a Archiv Akademie věd ČR.

DANILO, I.; BULIĆ, F. 1882. *Memoria sulla conversione dell'alfabeto glagolito nel latino pei libri liturgici slavi di rito romano*. Zara: Vitaliani & Janković.

DOBROVSKÝ, J. 1822. *Institutiones linguae slavicae dialecti veteris , quae quum apud Russos, Serbos aliosque ritus Graeci, tum apud Dalmatas Glagolitas ritus Latini Slavos in libris sacris obtinet*. Vindobonae: Antonius Schmid.

DOBROVSKÝ, J. 1807. *Glagolitica: ueber die glagolitische Literatur: das Alter der Bukwitza: ihr Muster, nach welchem sie gebildet worden: den Ursprung der Römisch-Slawischen Liturgie: die Beschaffenheit der dalmatischen Uebersetzung, die man dem Hieronymus zuschrieb u.s.w.: ein Anhang zum Slavin*. Prag: [s.n.].

DOBROVSKÝ, J.; W. HANKA. 1832. *Dobrowsky's Glagolitica*. Prag: Cajetan von Mayregg.

DOSTÁL-LUTINOV, K. 1905. Chceme hlaholit! *Nový život 10, 7:* 209–210.

DOUŠA, K. s.a. *Misa glagoljskaja: pro smíšený sbor: op. 21*. Praha: V. Kotrba.

Evangelion 1690 = Єѵангєліон си́рѣчъ Блгові́стїє вго́дхно́ве́нныхъ єва́нгєлистъ. 1690. Въ Лвові́: иждиве́нїєм Бра́тства Лвовско̂ [Evangelion sireč″ Blgověstïe bgodhnovennyx' evangelist″. 1690. V″ Lvově: iždivenïem Bratstva Lvovskog]

FHLGR = JELIĆ, L. (ed.). 1906. *Fontes historici liturgiae glagolito-romanae a XIII ad XIX saeculum*. Veglae: Kurykta.

FIRCAK″ 1906: **ФИРЦАКЪ, I.** (ed.) 1906. Великіи сборникъ благопотре́бныхъ цєрко́вныхъ чи́новъ и слꙋ́жбъ. Ꙋнгваръ: Ꙋнїо. [FIRCAK″, I. (ed.) 1906. *Velikii sbornik″ blagopotrébnyh″ cerkovnyh″ činov″ i služb″*. Ungvar″: Unio].

FOERSTER, J. B. 1929. *Glagolská mše*. S.l.: Kotrba.

GADŽIEVA 2008 = ГАДЖИЕВА, С. 2008. К изучению орфографии Лобковицовой псалтыри 1359 года: эволюция отношения писца к принципам записи звукосочетаний lu, ĺu, nu, ńu. *Slovo 58*: 219–266. [GADŽIEVA, S. 1994. K izučeniû orfografii Lobkovicovoj psaltyri 1359 goda: èvolûciâ otnošeniâ pisca k principal zapisi zvokosopčetanij lu, ĺu, nu, ńu. *Slovo 58: 219–266*]

HAMM, J. 1952. Glose u Radonovoj bibliji. *Slovo 1*: 19–33.

HAMM, J. 1963. Hrvatski tip crkvenoslavenskog jezika. *Slovo 13:* 43–67.

HAUPTOVÁ, Z. 2008. P. J. Šafařík a hlaholice. *Slovo 56–57*: 197–208.

HOLETON, D. R. 1995. The Evolution of Utraquist Liturgy: A Precursor of Western Liturgical Reform. *Studia Liturgica 25*: 51–57.

HRISTOVA 1982 = ХРИСТОВА, Б. et al. 1982. *Български ръкописи от XI до XVIII век запазени в България. Своден каталог. Том 1*. София: Народна библиотека «Кирил и Методий». [HRISTOVA, B. et al. 1982. *B″lgarski r″kopisi ot XI do XVIII vek zapazeni v B″lgariâ. Svoden katalog. Tom 1*. Sofiâ: Narodna biblioteka «Kiril i Metodij».]

HUDEC, P. 2013: *Svátost jednoty: historie slavení slovanské liturgie na Velehradě*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci. Rigorózní práce.

JAGIĆ, V. 1894. Missale Romanum slavonico idiomate ex decreto sacrosancti concilii tridentini restitutum. *Archiv für Slavische Philologie 16: 210–216*.

JANÁČEK, L. 2011. *Glagolská mše: souborné kritické vydání [hudebnina]*. Praha: Bärenreiter.

JOVANOVIĆ, T.; STEFANOVIĆ, D. E. (ed.). 2013. *Venclovićev sentandrejski bukvar: 1717. Fototipsko izd. sa raščitanim tekstom i savremenim prevodom*. Budimpešta: Radionica »Venclović«.

KERČA 2007 = КЕРЧА, И. 2007. *Словник русинсько-руськый I–II*. Ужгород: Полі-Прінт. [KERČA, I. 2007. *Slovnik rusins'ko-rus'kyj I–II*. Užgorod: PolìPrìnt.]

KNOLL, V. 2019. *Církevní slovanština v pozdním středověku*. Praha: Slovanský ústav AV ČR.

KNOLL 2020 = КНОЛЛ, В. 2020. Вопросы развития славянского книжного языка в Валахии (XV–XVII вв.). In: А.-М. Тотоманова; Т. Славова. *Седми международен колоквиум по старобългаристика*. София: Университетско издательство «Св. Климент Охридски» 2020, 33–47. [KNOLL, V. 2020. Voprosy razvitiâ slavânskogo knižnogo âzyka v Valahii (HV–HVII vv.). In: A.-M. Totomanova; T. Slavova. *Sedmi meždunaroden kolokvium po starob"lgaristika*. Sofiâ: Universitetsko izdatelstvo «Sv. Kliment Ohridski» 2020, 33–47.]

KOZ′MIN″ 1903 = КОЗЬМИНЪ, К. 1903. *Грамматика церковно-славянского языка новаго періода*. Москва: синодальная типографія. [KOZ′MINЪ, K. 1903. *Grammatika cerkovno-slavânskogo âzyka novago perìoda*. Moskva: sinodal′naâ tipografiâ.]

KRAJČOVIČ, R. 1988. *Vývin slovenského jazyka a dialektológia*. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.

KRAJČOVIČ, R.; ŽIGO, P. 2006. *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského.

KUBEK, E. 1906. *Ó-szláv, magyar-, ruthén, (orosz) német szótár a szentirás olvásásához*. Ungvár: Unio.

KURZ, J. 1948: Život a dílo Josefa Vajse. J. Kurz (ed.). *Slovanské studie*. Praha: Vyšehrad, 11–36.

LEO PP. XIII. 1880. *Littera encyclica Grande munus*. Romae apud sanctum Petrum. URL: https://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/la/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_30091880_grande-munus.html (18. 4. 2023).

LESKIEN, A. 1871. *Handbuch der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache: Grammatik, Texte, Glossar*. Weimar: Böhlau.

LUČIĆ, V. 2002. Doprinos Josipa Leonarda Tandarića istraživanju glagoljaštva. M. A. Duerrigl; M. Mihaljević; F. Velčić (ed.). Glagoljica i hrvatski glagolizam: zbornik radova s međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa povodom 100. obljetnice Staroslavenske akademije i 50. obljetnice Staroslavenskog instituta (Zagreb-Krk, 2.-6. listopada 2002.). Zagreb: Staroslavenski institut; Krk: Krčka biskupija, 81–89.

LUKEŽIĆ, I. 2012. *Zajednička povijest hrvatskih narječja. 1., Fonologija*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.

LUKIĆ, M.; BLAŽEVIĆ-KREZIĆ, V. 2015. Parčićeva koncepcija obnove staroslavenskih liturgijskih knjiga u XIX stoljeću. *Lingua Montenegrina 8, 15:* 53–85.

LUKIĆ, M.; M. PILJ–TOMIĆ. 2010. Staroslavenske liturgijske knjige na hrvatskom nacionalnom prostoru u XIX. stoljeću. *Lingua Montenegrina, 3, 6:* 75–107.

MAREŠ, F. V. 1971. Vajsova česká redakce nové církevní slovanštiny. B. Havránek (ed.). *Studia Palaeoslovenica*. Praha: Academia, 221–225.

MAREŠ, F. V. 1979. *An anthology of Church Slavonic texts of Western (Czech) origin: with an outline of Czech-Church Slavonic language and literature and with a selected bibliography.* München: Wilhelm Fin.

MAREŠ, F. V. 2000. *Cyrilometodějská tradice a slavistika.* Praha: Torst.

MATHIESEN, R. 1984. The Church Slavonic Language Question: An Overview (IX–XX Centuries). R. Picchio; H. Goldblatt (eds.), *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question I.* New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, 45–65.

MIHALJEVIĆ, M. 1999. *Vesperal.* Vrbnik: župni ured.

MIKLOSICH, F. 1862–1865. *Lexicon paleoslovenico-graeco-latinum: emendatum aucutm.* Vindobonae: Guilelmus Branmüller.

MIKLOSICH, F. 1875. *Beiträge zur altslovenischen Grammatik.* Wien: K. Gerold.

MILOVČIĆ, I. 1994–1996. Značenje Staroslavenske akademije u Krku u očuvanju i promicanju glagoljaštva. Staroslavenska akademija i njezino značenje. *Slovo* 44–46, *Prilozi*: 287–299.

MUŽINA, J. 2019. Tristota obljetnica rođenja o. fra Antona Juranića (1719. – 1799.). *Krčki zbornik 75*: 279–284.

NEBESKÁ, I. 2017. Jazyková norma. P. Karlík; M. Nekula; J. Pleskalová (eds.), *CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny.* URL: https://www.czechency.org/slovnik/JAZYKOVÁ NORMA (4. 12. 2024)

OFFICIA 1791 = *Officia sanctorum slavonico idiomate recitanda de præcepto ex indulto apostolico in aliquibus locis.* Romae: Congregatio de propaganda fide. URL: https://glagoljica.hr/?knjige=i&id=15290 (27. 09. 2023).

ODLADIL, F. 1905. Piesəň svetomu Duhu. *Nový život 10, 6:* 177.

OLIVA, V. 1905–1906. O národním jazyce při bohoslužbě. *Rádce duchovní 13*: 557–564.

PACNEROVÁ, L. 2008. Osudy slovanské liturgie v zemích Koruny české. *Varia Slavica : Sborník příspěvků k 80. narozeninám Radoslava Večerky.* Praha: NLN, 165–170.

PANTELIĆ, M. 1957. Bibliografija izvornih radova J. Vajsa s područja hrvatske glagoljske književnosti. *Slovo 6–8*: 10–22.

PAPP, A. (ed.). 1917. *Velīkij szbornīk blahopotrebnōch cerkovnōch csīnov ī szluzsb.* Ungvár: Unio.

PARČIĆ, D. A. (ed.). 1881. *Ordo et canon missae cum orationibus ante et post missam iuxta Missale Romanum.* Romae: ex typographia polyglotta.

PARČIĆ, D. A. (ed.). 1893. ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ • Ⰹⰰ • Ⱃ • ⰆⰒⰡⰡⰡⰡ ⰡⰡⰡⰡ *VIII* ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ [Rimьski misalь slavênskimь ezikomь prêsv. G. N. Urbana papi VIII povelêniemь] *Missale Romanum Slavonico idiomate ex decreto sacrosancti concilii Tridentini restitutum s. Pii V ponitificis maximi jussu editum Clementis VIII, Urbani VIII et Leonis XIII auctoritate recognitum.* Romae: Ex typographia polyglotta s. Congr. de propaganda fide.

PARČIĆ, D. A. 1905[3]. . ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ • Ⰹⰰ • Ⱃ • ⰆⰒⰡⰡⰡⰡ ⰡⰡⰡⰡ *VIII* ⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡⰡ [Rimьski misalь slavênskimь ezikomь prêsv. G. N. Urbana papi VIII povelêniemь] . *Missale Romanum Slavonico idiomate ex decreto sacrosancti concilii Tridentini restitutum s. Pii V ponitificis maximi jussu editum Clementis VIII, Urbani VIII, Leonis XIII et Pii X. auctoritate recognitum.* Romae: Ex typographia polyglotta s. Congr. de propaganda fide.

PECHUŠKA, F. 1935. Život a dílo univ. Prof. dra Josefa Vajse. *Časopis katolického duchovenstva 76, 5:* 417–443.

REJZEK, J. 2021. *Zrození češtiny: jazyková situace a jazykový vývoj v českých zemích mezi 6. a 11. stoletím*. Praha: NLN.

ŠAFAŘÍK, P. J. (ed.). 1853. *Památky hlaholského písemnictví*. Praha: [s.n.].

SAVKOVIĆ 2011 = САВКОВИЋ, Нада: *Књижевно-историјске основе о српској књижевности у XVIII столећу.* Нови Сад 2011. [SAVKOVIĆ, Nada: *Književno-istorijske osnove o srpskoj književnosti u XVIII stoleću.* Novi Sad 2011].

SČB 1981–2009 = V. Kyas; J. Pečírková (eds.). *Staročeská bible drážďanská a olomoucká s částmi Proroků rožmberských a Bible litoměřicko-třeboňské: kritické vydání nejstaršího českého překladu bible ze 14. století. I–V.* Praha: Academia.

SCHAEKEN, J. 1987. *Die kiever Blätter*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

SCHAEKEN, J. 1989. Die tschechisch-kirchenslavischen Patera-Glossen (St. Gregor-Glossen, Prager Glossen). *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 35*: 151–191.

SLAVICKÝ, T. 2013. Traženje zajedničkoga kulturnog identiteta na početku 20. stoljeća: Josef Vajs i pokret za obnovu glagoljaškoga pjevanja u Hrvatskoj i Češkoj. *Arti musices: hrvatski muzikološki zbornik 44, 2*: 257–270.

SLAVICKÝ, T. 2014. Ritus romanus slavonico idiomate. Cyrilometodějská tradice v konceptu Josefa Vajse a obnova staroslověnské liturgie v českých zemích na počátku 20. Století. *Slavica Litteraria 17, 1:* 41–59.

SOLARIĆ 1812 = СОЛАРИЧЪ, П. 1812. Бȣквáрь славéнскїй трїáзвȣчный или пéрвое рȣковóдство къ познáнїю книѓъ и писáнїй, во ỳпотреблéнїе Славено-Сéрбвъ. Въ Млéткахъ: Печáтна Паны Ѳеодóсїа. [SOLARIČ″, P. 1812. Bukvár′ slavénskïj trïazbučnyj ili pervoe rukovodstvo k″ poznaniju knig″ i pisanïj, vo upotreblenïe Slaveno-Serbov″. V″ Mletkah″: Pečatnja Pany Ḟeodosïa.] URL: http://digital.bms.rs/ebiblioteka/publications/view/4815 (27. 9. 2023)

ŠLOSAR, D. 2017. Pračeština. P. Karlík, M. Nekula, J. Pleskalová (eds.). *CzechEncy – Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny.* URL: https://www.czechency.org/slovnik/PRAČEŠTINA (18. 4. 2023)

STARÝ, F. (ed.). 1905. *Staroslovanské povečerije*. V Prostějově: Nový život.

STARÝ, F. (ed.). 1906. *Misa glagoljskaja v prazdnik svetuju Kurila i Metoda, arhijerěju i ispovědniku, 5. ijulěja*. V Prostějově: Nový život.

ŠTEC, M. 2005. *Cirkevná slovančina*. Prešov: Prešovská univerzita.

SZABÓ, E. 1894. *Egyházi-szláv nyelvtan.* Ungvár: Jäger.

TAKAHASHI, H. 2004. Language Norms. Sprachnorm. Ammon, U. et al. (ed.). *Sociolinguistics. Soziolinguistik. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society. Volume 1. (HSK 3.1).* Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 172–179.

TANDARIĆ, J. L. 1980. *Čin misi s izbranimi misami.* V Zagrebě: Kršćanska sadašnjost.

TENTOR, M. 1914. Vajsov Vesperal. *Vjesnik Staroslavenske akademije u Krku za godinu 1913. 2:* 64–68.

TORRESANIS DE ASULA, A. (ed.). 1527. [Introductorium Croatice]. Venetiis. [edition: Bratulić, J. (prir.). 1983. *Prva hrvatskoglagoljska početnica 1527*. Josip Bratulić (priredio i pogovor napisao). Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske, Školska knjiga.]

TRUNTE, N. H. 1998. Славéнскїй ѩзы́къ. *Ein praktisches Lehrbuch des Kirchenslavischen in 30 Lektionen. Band 2. Mittel- und Neukirchenslavisch.* München: Sagner.

VAJS, J. 1903. Staroslovanská liturgie v XX. věku. *Časopis katolického duchovenstva 44, 4:* 225–229.

VAJS, J. 1904. *Toni missae a celebrante et SS. ministris canendi.* Veglae: Kurykta.

VAJS, J. 1905. *Tri glagolske mise.* Krk: Kurykta; Prag: kod Belskoga.

VAJS, J. 1907. *Vesperal rimsko-slověnski.* Krk: Staroslověnska Akademija, Prag: Alojzij Wiesner.

VAJS, J. 1909. *Abecedarium palaeoslovenicum in usum glagolitarum.* Veglae: Academia Palaeoslavica Veglensis.

VAJS, J. 1914. *Pěnije rimskago misala.* Vъ Rimě: tipi vatikanskimi.

VAJS, J. 1917². *Abecedarium palaeoslovenicum in usum glagolitarum.* Veglae: Academia Palaeoslavica Veglensis.

VAJS, J. 1919.a. *Missae solemnes nec non de Beata et de requiem votivae e Missali Romano Slavonico.* Pragae: sumptibus Academiae Velehradensis.

VAJS, J. 1919.b. Kako ćemo prepisivati glagolske tekstove za liturgičku porabu. *Sveta Cecilija 13, 5:* 113–114.

VAJS, J. 1920. *Slověnski psaltir. Psalterii palaeoslovenici quinquagena prima.* Pragae Bohemorum: typis editum manuscripti instar.

VAJS, J. 1920.a. Staroslovanské texty v liturgii. *Cyril 46, 5–6*: 51–55.

VAJS, J. 1920.b. *Missae e proprio Bohemiae*. Pragae: Politika.

VAJS, J. 1921. Mše ke cti svatých Patronů jazykem staroslovanským. *Cyril 47, 1*: 7.

VAJS, J. 1922. ⱄⰾⱆⰶⰵⰱⱀⰻⰽⱏ [Služebnikʹ]. *Čin i pravilo mši Misala rimskago slověnskym jazykom i mša svätcem vlašča češskago – Ordo et Canon Missae e missali romano slavonico cum missis sanctorum e proprio Bohemiae.* Praga: Politika.

VAJS, J. 1927. *Rimski misal slověnskim jezikom.* Romae: Typis polyglottis Vaticanis.

VAJS, J. 1933. *Liturgické mešní zpěvy staroslovanské na svátky svatých patronů českých.* Praha: Vinice Páně.

VEČERKA, R. 1957. K historii textu Janáčkovy Hlaholské mše. *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. F, Řada uměnovědná 6, F1:* 64–76.

VEČERKA, R. 2010. *Staroslověnská etapa českého písemnictví.* Praha: NLN.

VEPŘEK, M. 2016.a. *Hlaholský misál Vojtěcha Tkadlčíka.* Olomouc: nakladatelství Centra Aletti Refugium Velehrad – Roma.

VEPŘEK, M. 2016.b. Slovanská bohoslužba v české římskokatolické církvi v současnosti jako cyrilometodějské dědictví. *Konštantínove listy 9, 1*: 192–198.

VEPŘEK, M. 2021. Za horizont českocírkevněslovanského období. B. Vykypěl et al. (ed.). *Staroslověnské dědictví ve staré češtině*. Praha: NLN, 218–231.

VEPŘEK, M. 2022. *Czech Church Slavonic in the tenth and eleventh centuries.* München: Lincom.

VINTR, J. 1986. Die tschechisch-kirchenslavischen Glossen des 12. Jahrhunderts in der Bibel Sign. 1190 der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (sog. Jagić-Glossen). *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 32*: 77–113.

VONDRÁK, V. 1904. *O původu Kijevských listů a Pražských zlomků a o bohemismech v starších církevněslovanských památkách vůbec.* V Praze: Nákladem jubilejního fondu Král. České Společnosti Náuk.

VRANA, J. 1975. *Najstariji hrvatski glagoljski evanđelistar.* Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti.

ZARADIJA KIŠ, A.; M. ŽAGAR. 2014. Muka po Mateju u Parčićevu misalu: kulturološke i jezične odrednice. A. Zaradija Kiš; M. Žagar. (ur.). *Glagoljaška Muka Kristova: odabrane kulturološko-filološke studije.* Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada; Pazin: Državni arhiv u Pazinu, 173–211.

ŽIVOV 2017 = ЖИВОВ В. М. 2017. *История языка русской письменности. I–II.* Москва: Университет Дмитрия Пожарского. [*Istoriâ âzyka russkoj pis'mennosti. I–II. Moskva: Universitet Dmitriâ Požarskogo.*]

Sažetak

Vladislav KNOLL

OBNOVA ČEŠKOGA CRKVENOSLAVENSKOGA: LITURGIJA JOSEFA VAJSA (1922.)

U ovome se članku donosi opis lingvistričkoga rada Josefa Vajsa na razvoju i stvaranju novih inačica crkvenoslavenskoga za hrvatsku i čehoslovačku sredinu. Nastojimo pratiti promišljanja Josefa Vajsa o karakteru liturgijskoga jezika u dvadesetome stoljeću i smjestiti ga u kontekst razvoja hrvatskoga crkvenoslavenskog i novocrkvenoslavenskih idioma. Iako se usredotočujemo na glavno djelo Josefa Vajsa, posvećeno uspostavi nove češke ili čehoslovačke inačice crkvenoslavenskoga u njegovu *Služebniku* iz 1922., donosimo kratke jezične usporedbe brojnih tekstova toga razdoblja tiskanih i u hrvatskoj i u češkoj sredini. Stoga rad može poslužiti i kao kratka povijest hrvatskih i čeških crkvenoslavenskih tekstova na početku 20. stoljeća. Analiza njegova praškog *Služebnika* pokazuje da je Josef Vajs u tom tekstu pokušao spojiti vrlo različite jezične elemente: jezična je osnova teksta hrvatski novocrkvenoslavenski jezik Vajsova prerađenog izdanja *Rimskoga misala* Dragutina Parčića, a njoj su pridružene odabrane značajke (staro)crkvenoslavenskih tekstova sa zapadnoslavenskoga prostora (*Kijevski* i *Praški fragmenti*) i obilježja crkvenoslavenskoga jezika koji su koristili pravoslavni i grkokatolički vjernici u Zakarpatju (unijatski aspekt jezika Vajsova *Služebnika*), te jasne referencije na suvremeni češki i slovački.

Ključne riječi: crkvenoslavenski, novocrkvenoslavenski, hrvatski crkvenoslavenski, češki crkvenoslavenski, glagoljica, Josef Vajs

Vladislav KNOLL
Slovanský ústav Akademie věd ČR, v.v.i.
Praha (Česká republika)
knoll@slu.cas.cz