

## VARIATION AND NORM IN CROATIAN CHURCH SLAVONIC \*

Andrew R. CORIN, Claremont

### 0. Background.

In a recent monograph on the paleographic, orthographic and phonetic characteristics of the New York Missal (1991), I attempted to determine, to the extent possible on the basis of such evidence, the time and place of origin of the manuscript. As a methodological prerequisite to the task, I first analyzed a section of text from fourteen manuscripts of the Croatian Church Slavonic (CCS) Missale Plenum (MP), as well as the 1483 *editio princeps*, so as to determine the range of variation and rates of change for the features under study during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It was the investigation of these variable features which furnished me with dating and localizing criteria.

Of course, such a determination (i.e. of dating and localizing criteria) itself rests upon certain methodological prerequisites, as well as upon certain assumptions concerning the very nature of CCS. The primary methodological prerequisite is the adduction of *norms* of CCS, in distinction both to vernacular čakavian features of the periods under discussion, and to relic features of canonical OCS (or perhaps of intermediate stages between OCS and mature CCS<sup>1</sup>) which may have occurred sporadically in mature CCS texts, but which were not recognized by scribes (or translators) as features of the language (e.g. the adjectival form *ijuděici* Acts 2:14 BrVb<sub>1</sub>,<sup>2</sup> corrected to *ijuděisci* in the remaining

\* I am grateful to Henrik Birnbaum for reading an earlier draft of this paper and making a number of suggestions for its improvement. The research reported in this paper was supported by a grant from the United States Department of Education (Fulbright-Hays Faculty Research Abroad Program).

<sup>1</sup> For a definition of mature CCS see Corin 1991:29-31.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout the paper I use abbreviations for manuscripts which are customary in *Slovo*. Specifically: BrVb<sub>1</sub> – first (oldest) breviary from Vrbnik (cf. Vajs 1910); BrVb<sub>2</sub>

manuscripts, use of the letter "jor" as a space-filler at the end of lines by one of the scribes of BrVb<sub>1</sub>, use of the capital letter "Iže" in several mss. of the fourteenth century, etc.). It is, after all, only in contrast to norms of the language that we can recognize *vernacularisms*, i.e. non-CCS features introduced into a text for whatever reason (e.g. *ki* for *iže* and similar, *ezik'* for normative *êzik'*, *dari* for normative *daže*, etc.). It is also only in contrast to norms that we can distinguish *inherent variation*, i.e. features in which variation was an unavoidable or accepted feature in CCS texts throughout the mature period of the language (orthographic vocalization of *jer* in most environments, alternation of <ê><sup>3</sup> and <e> for original \**ě* in most environments, <žd>, <ĵ>, or a sequence of vowel letters for original \**dj*, etc.).

The assumptions which we must make explicit if we are to understand the sociolinguistic parameters of CCS concern the *attitude of scribes and translators* of mature CCS texts towards norms and variation. Specifically, we must make explicit our assumptions concerning the criteria which the medieval scribes applied in judging the appropriateness or range of applicability of various features, including what we might refer to as the "source of authority" for normative or proper CCS, as well as the texts which could or should be considered exemplary. The reason why I refer to *assumptions* concerning criteria for normativeness and sources of authority, rather than to the criteria and sources of authority themselves, is precisely that we are dealing here with attitudes of our medieval forebears, which we can approach only indirectly, and can determine only imprecisely. In my monograph on NYM and the CCS MP I dealt with these underlying assumptions in a fairly cursory manner, suggesting that the norms of CCS were most likely to be discovered in the biblical texts of the missal, i.e. the texts "closest to the altar," in Štefanić's oft-quoted formulation (1969:28).

In the present paper I would like to return to several of the conceptual underpinnings of a search for the normative nature of CCS, and especially to the concepts of variation and norm as they apply to the manuscript traditions. In a subsequent paper I will demonstrate the application of the conceptual framework on a selection of biblical texts (1 Samuel and the Acts of the Apostles)

– second breviary from Vrbnik (cf. Vajs 1910); BrVO – breviary of Vid from Omišalj (cf. Vajs 1910); BrN<sub>1</sub> – breviary from Novi (cf. Vajs 1910); BrN<sub>2</sub> – second breviary from Novi (cf. Vajs 1910 and edition); BrDr – breviary from Draguč (cf. Vajs 1910); BrVat<sub>5</sub> and BrVat<sub>10</sub> – breviaries from the Vatican Library (cf. Vajs 1910); BrMav – breviary of the priest Mavar (cf. Pantelić 1965); N – missal of Prince Novak (cf. Vajs 1948); Vat<sub>4</sub> and Vat<sub>8</sub> – missals from the Vatican Library (cf. Vajs 1948); MVb<sub>2</sub> – missal from Vrbnik; Oxf<sub>2</sub> – missal from the Bodleian Library; Hrv – missal of Prince Hrvoje (cf. edition).

<sup>3</sup> Angle brackets <> are used to indicate *spelling*, or *specific letters*, whereas other examples (individual sounds, morphemes, words or phrases), in which attention is not being drawn to the spelling, are rendered in italics.



from the manuscripts of the CCS breviary, and will compare the results to those obtained in my study of the CCS missal.<sup>4</sup>

The goal of the paper, then, is to expand upon the conceptual framework for understanding CCS as a normalized linguistic system. Since this requires us to address many of the same questions which have been discussed at length in connection with the Orthodox Slavic, and especially East Slavic, situation, I will draw heavily upon the conceptual frameworks developed within that long-standing (and often contentious) debate, though with the understanding that circumstances in medieval Croatia differed in a number of crucial respects from those found in any of the Orthodox Slavic ambiances.

### 1. Language of literature or literary language.

It is by now clear that CCS, just as is true of the other medieval Slavonic literacies, may be characterized as a language of literacy or literature, but certainly not as a literary (standard) language, as defined in most recent work.<sup>5</sup> In

<sup>4</sup> This project originally envisaged a monographic treatment of the language of the CCS breviary. Since the war in Croatia has cut short my research there, with little likelihood that it can soon be resumed, I have divided the work into a series of smaller units, some of which may be completed without further travel to Croatia.

<sup>5</sup> The specific terminological distinction between "language of literature or literacy" (Grickat's *jezik književnosti*, Issatschenko's *письменный язык*) and "literary" or "standard language" (*književni jezik*, *литературный язык*), has been applied, apparently independently, to the medieval Serbian (Grickat 1969) and East Slavic (Worth 1975:8) situations. The latter concept, based on the Prague-school model (*spisovný jazyk*) in Issatschenko's formulation (1958:42, 1975:5, 1978:127), has been applied to medieval Serbia (Grickat 1969) and Croatia (Rehder 1985, but see also the comments in Derossi 1978), but has been most broadly applied and developed in regard to the East Slavic situation (e.g. Worth 1975; Keipert, in fact, feels confident in stating that "This definition is always taken into account in the introductory sections of recent histories of the language...." 1985:217).

Damjanović (1984:13,177-8) cites Issatschenko's definition of "literary language", but it is clear that he uses the term in a different sense. Damjanović distinguishes between literary (*književni*) language and standard (*standardni*) language, the former differing from the latter in that it lacks the condition of "obligatory use throughout the entire national territory," ("obvezatnost na cijelom nacionalnom teritoriju" 178). Damjanović thus feels justified in speaking of a Croatian "literary language," but not "standard language" during the medieval period, as this language possessed the three other requisite features of a "literary language": normalization, functional polyvalency and stylistic differentiation. The condition of normalization was presumably fulfilled by the exogenous (consciously nurtured) norm of CCS together with the endogenous (intuitive) norm of the čakavian vernacular. The latter two conditions were fulfilled in that there were (indeed closely related) language varieties available to fulfill all perceived needs of the society, and the available linguistic styles were sufficiently variegated to fulfill these needs. Nevertheless, it must be noted that medieval Croatia met these three conditions only in the sense that this is true *for all societies at all times*, except for short

terms of this model, CCS at no time could be said to have been either functionally polyvalent or stylistically differentiated (certainly in the sense intended in Issatschenko's definition, and contrary to the assertion of Derossi 1978; see note

transitional periods when an older system is giving way to a newer one. In *all* societies, whether literate or not, there is at the least an endogenous, intuitive, communicative norm, containing sufficient stylistic differentiation to meet whatever needs are felt to exist. If we accept, then, that medieval Croatian (čakavian) literacy was both stylistically differentiated and functionally polyvalent, it would seem that the existence of CCS, as a *written style with its own clearly observable norm*, by itself qualifies medieval Croatian as a literary language, since it is only in this aspect (i.e. the existence of a normalized written form of the language) that medieval Croatia differed from a nonliterate society, or from one with some literacy but no normalization of the written form of the language.

The normalization, functional polyvalency, and stylistic differentiation of Issatschenko's (Prague School) definition are but aspects - symptoms, as it were - of a more general organization of communication in which a *single* norm is endowed with sufficient flexibility (i.e. means for stylistic variation) that *by itself* it suffices to satisfactorily meet all the needs of a society, including the occasional adaptation to new communicative needs. This unity or fusion of originally heterogeneous elements is the essence of the elastic stability (*pružná stabilita*) of the Prague School, and is captured insightfully by Mathesius's analogy of a developed literary language to a finely calibrated instrument which never betrays the intentions of well-trained user ("Kultivovaný jazyk spisovný je nástroj jemný a neselhávající" which "... nekřídí nikdy úmysly toho, kdo ho dovede užívat..."; cf. Mathesius 1932:14, 17).

Clearly the situation in medieval Croatia was a far different one. Instead of a *single* elastic norm, we have *two norms* or systems, which could mix, but never fuse. This is implicit, for example, in the many references in Damjanović (1984) and Hercigonja (1983) to the effect that in Medieval Croatia there were *two systems* (rather than one), which could *interact* (*interferiranje*) to form *hybrid* or *transitional* (*prelazni*) language varieties, *which were not themselves normalized!* (Hercigonja (1983:166, 398) explicitly denies normalization of the intermediate/hybrid varieties.) The non-synthesized nature of written language varieties in medieval Croatia is further implicit in Damjanović's correct and appropriate application of the principle (of W. D. Whitney, cited by Damjanović from Filipović 1971:92) that "... when the speakers of two languages, A and B, are brought together into one community, there takes place no amalgamation of their speech, into AB; but for a time the two maintain their own several identity, only as modified each by the admission of material from the other in accordance with the ordinary laws of mixture: we may call them A<sup>b</sup> and B<sup>a</sup>; and finally, one of these two prevails over the other, and becomes the speech of the whole community: this is still either A<sup>b</sup> or B<sup>a</sup>, and not AB." This is very much the situation which existed in written texts in pre-Renaissance Croatia, and seems to be the type of situation which Issatschenko's definition was designed to exclude.

It is further characteristic that the čakavian "literary language" was not defined on the basis of a neutral middle style, with marked high and low variants, but rather on the basis of two extreme styles, which could interact in a functional, but unregulated, manner. It is the fact that we are dealing with *two systems*, though *related, functionally differentiated*, and exhibiting (perhaps, see the discussion in § 2.2.2.1) the *continuum of intermediate variants* characteristic of some arguably diglossic situations (at least in a decadent stage, e.g. the so-called creole or post-creole continuum in Jamaica and elsewhere) that makes the diglossic solution proposed below attractive.



5). This is true even if it is taken as part of a larger linguistic structure encompassing itself, vernacular čakavian, and the "hybrid" written varieties. Furthermore, it clearly had no claim to universal validity in all spheres of verbal communication (Rehder 1985:183) in any political or cultural unit of medieval Croatia. Finally, the concepts of proper usage or prescriptive norm differed fundamentally, in a way which I will attempt to articulate below (§ 3), from the corresponding categories of modern literary languages.

And yet it remains none the less clear to all researchers that CCS was a recognizable cultural and linguistic institution of medieval Croatia, that it *did* serve as the vehicle of an unbroken literary tradition over the course of several centuries, and that it was subjected to processes of normalization and/or standardization, though we currently know very little about these processes.<sup>6</sup> It would seem, then, that we are faced with (at least) two basic questions in our search for the nature of CCS as a normalized linguistic system. The first would be: "What then is the relationship between language varieties in medieval Croatia, if we cannot speak of stylistic differentiation in the modern sense (§ 2)?" Secondly: "In what sense is CCS a normalized language variety, if we cannot speak of a prescriptive norm in the modern sense (§ 3)?"

## 2. The Relation Between Language Varieties in Medieval Croatia.

2.1.0. **Diglossia.** The most attractive recent suggestion concerning the East Slavic situation has been that the medieval Church Slavonic-vernacular dichotomy represents an instance of diglossia, as defined by Ferguson 1959 (cf. Uspenskij 1976, 1983, 1984; Hüttl-Folter 1978, 1985; also Issatschenko 1978:127, 1980:68 ff.<sup>7</sup>).<sup>8</sup> We must note, however the very considerable difficulties with the diglossic framework presented by Worth (1978). Some of these are

<sup>6</sup> Recent researchers have been unanimous on this point. All feel that CCS itself, if not also the other contemporary written or literary styles, was normalized (if not explicitly codified): cf. Damjanović 1984:15 and 185, where he also cites Hamm's earlier statement that "svaki je period znao - kao što su i spomenuti pisci znali - što *ide* u književnu normu kojom su se služili [i.e. the CCS norm, A.C.], a što ne *ide*" (Hamm 1963:56). Cf. also "... liturgijske knjige pokazuju da se crkvenoslavenska norma čuvala na određenoj razini vrlo pomno" (Tandarić 1978:117).

<sup>7</sup> In previous expositions (1974:passim, 1975:8, Issatschenko used the term "diglossia," but it is not clear whether or in what manner he related his usage to that of Ferguson. In none of this earlier work is Ferguson's seminal paper cited, though he was obviously aware of Uspenskij's, Hüttl-Folter's and Worth's work in which Ferguson is cited and discussed in detail.

<sup>8</sup> The diglossia formulation may be viewed as a formalization of certain other similar views as well, e.g. Picchio's "symbiose prolongée" (1967:1538) and Kovtun's (1971) vision of a functionally united whole in which Russian Church Slavonic and vernacular Russian could be seen as different aspects of a single stylistically differentiated Russian language.

equally applicable to the Slavonic-vernacular dichotomy of medieval Croatia, especially the lack of a long-standing (or, for that matter, *any*) grammatical tradition for H (High), and the *mutual* influence of H and L (Low) upon each other (rather than simply of H upon L).

Rehder, in a paper devoted specifically to the normative nature of CCS (1985), while sympathetic to some aspects of the diglossic framework, notes the further difficulty that the concurrent tradition of liturgical, scholarly and artistic literature in Latin, as well as renaissance – and (later) reformation-inspired vernacular literature in the liturgical sphere (lectionaries and similar) make it difficult to speak of complementarity in the distribution of the linguistic “styles” or variants. He also points to a lack of stability within CCS itself over a considerable period of time (cf. Ferguson 1959: 332-333 on stability as an attribute of High variants in diglossic situations).

2.1.1. In fact, these two particular objections may be partially, if not entirely, overcome. The apparent lack of stability within CCS may stem in part from a failure to distinguish between inherent variation within normative Church Slavonic, on the one hand, and genuine penetration of CCS by genuinely non-CCS features of the vernacular, on the other hand. If we realize that, for example, virtually any proportion of vocalization of *jer* occurred in otherwise normative CCS texts (e.g. lections of the missal), some of the apparent vacillation within CCS vanishes (defined out of existence, though justifiably so).<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> A failure to distinguish between penetration of CCS by non-normative vernacular features, on the one hand, and inherent variation within CCS, on the other, has characterized much, if not most, previous research. For example, in her otherwise well-motivated quantitative analysis of CCS-vernacular interaction, Nazor (1963:78 ff.) presents variation in graphic vocalization of *jer* and in the graphic continuants of \*ě alongside variation in the spelling of original intervocalic ž (<eže> vs. <ere>, <daže> vs. <dari>, etc.) as evidence of the preponderance of CCS or vernacular čakavian features in a text. However, it is clear that, at least in liturgical manuscripts, variation in the latter instance was *functionally* quite different from the former two. Virtually any proportion of vocalization of *jer* or retention of the spelling <ê> in etymological position was possible in the biblical lections of the missal, so that it is clear that writing <a> for etymological *jer* or <e> for etymological \*ě was not seen as a deviation from the norm of CCS. Examples of the type <ere>, <dari> were sufficiently rare, however, in the biblical lections that they must have been seen as vernacular features inappropriate in a normative CCS text. It is even less appropriate to equate graphic reflexes of *jer* and \*ě with variation in adjectival endings (-ago vs. -oga) or verbal endings (1 pl. -mī vs. -mo), or with variation of the type *īže* vs. *ki*, as evidence of the essentially CCS or vernacular nature of a text. Similar confusion is apparent in more recent work as well. Tandarić, for example, in his analysis of linguistic features of sequences (in manuscripts of the *missale plenum*) which “... mogu poslužiti kao razlikovni kriterij za pripadnost crkvenoslavenskom jeziku,” also discusses graphic reflexes of *jer* and \*ě, etc., alongside true CCS vs. vernacular pairs of the type 2 sg. -ši vs. -št, 3 sg. -tī vs. -ā, etc. (1978:121 ff.). Citing graphic reflexes of *jer* as evidence of CCS influence would be proper in a text which was clearly based on the vernacular, and in which “non-vocalized” spelling of a in place of etymological *jer*



2.1.2. The supposed lack of complementarity of the linguistic varieties or styles is also, in part, illusory. The appearance of essentially vernacular manuscripts containing biblical or other literary texts, if this took place in a Glagolitic milieu, might be taken as a sign of the impending breakdown of the diglossic situation, under the pressure of the budding Renaissance in the coastal regions. However, while such a breakdown may be assumed to have begun no later than the sixteenth century, and probably already in the fifteenth, it is neither necessary nor sufficient to explain the "competition" we observe between languages in similar contexts.

On the one hand, in a diglossic situation there is no reason why texts of similar content should not appear in both High and Low variants, as long as there is a *functional differentiation* between them. We should indeed be surprised to find a missal – that is, the plan and text of the liturgy – composed in the vernacular. However, a restatement of the biblical lections *for private study* in a style close to the vernacular, such as we find in the Lenten sermons copied by Broz Kolunić,<sup>10</sup> would not represent a departure from the diglossic framework.

On the other hand, the appearance of vernacular Latinic *lectionaries*, containing just biblical readings organized according to the customary schedule of the Church, and the apparent competition between CCS and Latin in the liturgy, did not result from functional differentiation within a unified Croatian literature. It is, of course, apparent that the vernacular lectionaries were used differently from CCS missals, so that we could indeed speak of a functional difference between them. However, we will understand the actual relationship of the lectionaries to the CCS missals (actually the lack of a synchronic relationship!), as well as the relationship of the Slavonic liturgy to the Latin liturgy, only by assuming that the first member of each pair originated *within an entirely different sociolinguistic context* from the second member. Rather than speaking of *competition* between CCS and vernacular čakavian in texts of biblical content, or between Latin and CCS in the liturgy, we must view late medieval-early Renaissance Croatia as containing two essentially distinct, though sometimes overlapping, sociolinguistic cultures. The first may be termed the Glagolitic

(i.e. <ʻ> or <ʼ>) would not be expected. However, in a text clearly based on CCS, though with an admixture of vernacular features, such variation (i.e. <a> vs. <ʻ> or <ʼ> for original *jer*) could have no functional significance, and could in no way distinguish the given text from any other CCS text in regard to its degree of adherence to CCS norms. Thus, Hercigonja's citation (1983:284) of *tagda* vs. *tʻgda*, in a colophon by the scribe Martinac in the Breviarium Novi II, as an example of alternation of CCS and čakavian features would be justified *only* if we could conclude that the language of the notation was based on vernacular čakavian, rather than on CCS (whereas the opposite seems to be the case). This is not to say that the degree of vocalization in a CCS text has no diagnostic value for evaluating the date when it was copied or the identity of the scribe.

<sup>10</sup> Published in Valjavac 1892.

complex (or Glagolitic sphere), with its CCS-vernacular diglossia. The second was the Latinic complex (or Latinic sphere), with its Latin-čakavian bilingualism (though perhaps more similar to Uspenskiĭ's functional diglossia, discussed below).<sup>11</sup>

The most obvious distinguishing feature of the two systems is script. Texts written in Glagolitic script as a rule originated within the Glagolitic complex. Conversely, the preserved vernacular lectionaries from the pre-Reformation period were invariably Latinic (Rešetar 1898a, Fućak 1975),<sup>12</sup> and may be considered to derive from the Latinic complex. An early attestation of vernacular čakavian in literary use, the so-called "Prayer of Šibenik" (cf. Milčetić and Milošević 1911, Malić 1973) also originated within the Latinic complex.

The second characteristic feature differentiating the Glagolitic and Latinic complexes is the language of the liturgy. In any given community, the liturgy was likely to be either regularly Slavonic, or regularly Latin, with relatively few exceptions. The common assumption is that the largest (originally Byzantine Dalmatian) cities maintained the Latin liturgy, while Slavonic-Glagolitic liturgy was essentially the domain of smaller or newer (Vrbnik, Novi, Roč, Hum, etc.) cultural centers, especially the originally Slavic communes (on the islands), and in the hinterland.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> For the sake of simplicity I leave out of account here the role of Italian literacy in fifteenth and sixteenth century Dalmatia, though this issue will have to be addressed in an eventual comprehensive treatment of the sociolinguistic structure of Croatia during these centuries.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Fućak 1975:200, though, on a possible 14th century Glagolitic lectionary housed in Paris. In fact, the references cited by Fućak describe *two* manuscripts of similar content, the cc. 11 (Martinof 1858:70-76) and 73 (Tadin 1954). Both, as best one can tell from the single page of facsimile text presented for each, are written in CCS (albeit fairly vernacularized in the case of the codex 73), and thus clearly fall within the Glagolitic complex. Neither can properly be characterized as a lectionary, any more than a plenary missal can be so characterized.

<sup>13</sup> This thesis is repeated often in older literature, especially in connection with the alleged material and cultural poverty of the Glagolite clergy, but in newer work as well (cf. Tandarić's assertion that "Slavensko bogoslužje – uz neznatne izuzetke – bilo je ograničeno na selo. Iznimke su jedna ili druga benediktinska opatija, poneki pavlinski samostan i provincija franjevačkih trećoredaca, vezana opet isključivo uz selo i uz predgrađe. Samo u nekim gradovima nalazimo izrazitiju glagoljašku djelatnost (Senj, Rijeka). Možemo, dakle, općenito govoriti o pismenosti i o liturgiji provincijske i periferne sredine, s razmjerno dosta skromnim socijalno-gospodarskim mogućnostima naručitelja, odnosno korisnika glagoljaške knjige, a to je selo i pretežno seosko svećenstvo." 1978:116. For a newer account of the socioeconomic position of the Glagolite clergy, however, cf. Hercigonja 1971, reprinted in Hercigonja 1983).

In fact, the complementarity in the practice of Slavonic and Latin liturgy (urban center vs. suburb and village, one specific city or town vs. another) was far from perfect. As the documents presented in Jelić (1906), Šurmin (1898), Fučić (1982), and elsewhere (cf. Šupuk 1957 concerning the situation in and around Šibenik) attest, there



Despite their visibility, however, the differences in script and language of the liturgy are but manifestations of a more general and much deeper division between two different *sociolinguistic cultures*. What is significant here is not the language or script of a particular text or social function. Rather, it is the *set of relationships between language varieties in the community*. This should be clear already from the table and accompanying commentary in Damjanović 1984:21:

	liturgy	literature	law
Latin	+	+	+
CCS	+	-	-
čakavian-CCS amalgam	-	+	-
čakavian	-	±	+

As Damjanović notes immediately beneath the table, "Latin served all those needs which a literary language was required to serve in the fifteenth century. The Croatian redaction of Church Slavonic, Croatian čakavian, and the čakavian-Church Slavonic amalgam "split up the task": they combined forces to satisfy those functions which Latin satisfied all by itself."<sup>14</sup> Within the Latinic complex, then, we may speak, at least at an early stage, of what Uspenskij has described as *functional diglossia* (functional complementarity between two language varieties which are not felt to be aspects of a single language by the populace; cf. Uspenskij 1976:96; we may refer to this as "impure" diglossia, or

was some Glagolitic activity connected even with the largest cultural centers of northern Dalmatia (Zadar, Šibenik, Senj, Nin). Entrance to the larger cities may have been gained in part through the monastic or related (Franciscan Tertiaries) orders. Zadar, for example, was a headquarters of both the Benedictines and the Third Order of St. Francis, both of which are known or thought to have fostered (or even spread, cf. Pantelić 1967:83-85) Glagolitic literacy (Pantelić 1971:325-7). The process was certainly accelerated when these cities came under the control of princes favorably disposed toward the Glagolitic literacy. Nevertheless, most of these attestations concern suburbs and possessions of the cities, rather than the urban centers themselves, and attestations from the centers tend to be later, rather than earlier (in general from the mid-15th century, though again there are exceptions, e.g. in Senj, Zadar). The overall situation in many areas was probably similar to that described by Bolonić for the island of Krk: "*Krčka je biskupija bila od pamtivijeka glagoljaška*, [emphasis in original, A.C.] izuzevši grad Krk (bez njegovog suburbija) gdje se služila misa i božanski oficij na latinskom jeziku ("in latino"), a po otoku na "ilirskom". ... – premda se kadgod i u njemu [i.e. in the town of Krk, A.C.] glagoljalo, ..." (Bolonić 1980:23-4).

<sup>14</sup> "Latinski opslužuje sve potrebe koje književni jezik u 15. stoljeću mora opsluživati. Hrvatska redakcija općeslavenskoga književnog jezika, hrvatskočakavski i čakavsko-crkvenoslavenski amalgam "podijelili su posao": oni zajedničkim snagama zadovoljavaju funkcije što ih latinski zadovoljava sam."

diglossia in an extended sense), or of *bilingualism* (coexistence of two or more distinct languages (whether or not related) in which it is not possible to speak of more-or-less complete functional complementarity). However, from the time when vernacular čakavian first appeared in literary use in the Latinic complex, in competition with Latin, it becomes possible to speak only of a bilingual situation. Since the languages in contact were certainly felt to be distinct (indeed they are not closely related), we expect and indeed find *relatively* little mixing of the two (i.e. čakavian and Latin) in written texts, except on the lexical/phrasological level (and except for Romance influences which had entered into vernacular čakavian). Perhaps more importantly, though, since within the Latinic complex vernacular čakavian entered into a functional relationship with Latin, and not with CCS, we do not expect to encounter mixed CCS-čakavian texts, and indeed do not find them.<sup>15</sup> Within the Glagolitic complex, in contrast, CCS entered into the type of relationship best described as “diglossia of identity” (cf. Uspenskij 1976:96; we may refer to this as “true diglossia”), in which two clearly distinguishable language varieties (at least to a linguist or a non-native observer), *identified as aspects of a single language in the minds of the populace*, enter into a functional unity. In such a situation, mixing of the two varieties in various spoken or written styles is common, and indeed expected. We must emphasize that a crucial (and, in a respect, perhaps *the* crucial) characteristic of a true diglossic situation is the perception of the *unity* of H and L (Uspenskij 1976:93, Hüttl-Folter 1978:112, 117, 120-123), such that speakers – even those unversed in H – may be largely unaware of any real difference between H and L, considering the former to be the “real language” or “correct usage”, and the latter simply “degenerate” or “ignorant” usage (Ferguson 1959:329-330, Uspenskij 1976:93, 1983:6, Hüttl-Folter 1978:110-111; cf. also Worth's conjecture that the medieval grammarians may have had “no idea that Church Slavonic was anything other than “their” language” 1983:8, where he cites also the identical view expressed by Kovtun 1971<sup>16</sup>). Similar attestations for Croatia are adduced by Tandarić (1978:124).<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Even in those situations in which a text had originated in the Glagolitic complex, and had contained an admixture of CCS elements, we do not expect to see these maintained when the text is adopted into the Latinic complex, since here the CCS elements can have no function (CCS not entering into a relationship with vernacular čakavian in this complex). It is thus quite in line with our expectations that CCS elements are rare in the Latinic lectionaries. Of those that are found, perhaps the most common is the 3 sg./pl. suffix *-t* of verbs. It is significant that Marulić writes this *-t* separately from the verb (cf. Hraste 1950:259-60), indicating that he had *reanalyzed this formant as something entirely different from its function in CCS*.

<sup>16</sup> Kovtun cites the specific cases of Nil Kurljatev and Dmitrij Gerasimov, who referred to separate Church Slavonic translations of the Psalms as being written in “Russian”, as well as similar assertions in earlier glossaries. Cf. also Uspenskij: “... тот язык, который впоследствии может называться не только «словенским» (или



We can conclude this section by noting that the Latinic and Glagolitic complexes were not so much two geographic regions as two sets of relationships, two separate sociolinguistic structures. They existed most often in separate locations (in complementary distribution, as it were), but could nevertheless intersect in some places and in the work of some individuals. It is in just such environments, in which the traditions and achievements of both literacies were known, and in the work of those individuals who had mastered, and even participated in, both systems of literacy, that we would expect especially intense stylistic (both linguistic and literary) experimentation and innovation. Thus the distinctness of

«славенским»), но также «рус(с)ким» и «славеноросс(ий)ским»» (1983:3-4; cf. also 10), despite this scholar's more general thesis that "этот язык был отчетливо противопоставлен русскому книжному языку..." (1983:4). We must note Issatschenko's admonition, though, that the perception of a sacral or elevated language as "ours" ("unsere," "eigene"), rather than foreign ("fremde"), in no way implies that the population as a *whole* considered it and the vernacular to be aspects of a single language: "auch wenn es stimmt, dass für einen Geistlichen das Kirchenslavische als eine Art "Variante" des gesprochenen Ostslavischen gelten konnte, kann diese Wertung für das Gross der "Sprachträger" nicht typisch gewesen sein. ..." (1980:69).

On the identity of "high" and "low" variants in diglossia cf. especially Uspenskij's statement that in the diglossic context "члену языкового коллектива свойственно воспринимать сосуществующие языковые системы как один язык [emphasis in original, A. C.], тогда как для внешнего наблюдателя (включая сюда и исследователя-лингвиста) естественно в этой ситуации видеть два разных языка [emphasis in original, A. C.]" (1983:6), as well as the similar statements in Uspenskij (1984:366, 382-3).

<sup>17</sup> One might ask: if CCS was considered within the Glagolitic complex as simply the most proper form of the native language, why would the feudal princes, in their legal acts, resort to the degenerate form of the language (i.e. the vernacular), when they had the ability to compose documents in the proper High form (CCS), and certainly wished to impart an appropriate level of dignity and authority to their documents. It may in part be the case that this stems from the imperative of clear, unambiguous communication in a document regulating specific privileges and obligations. However, the more crucial factor would seem to be the distinction between *affairs of this world* and matters involving *eternal truths and salvation*. For medieval Rus' through approximately the fourteenth century (the period of "diglossia of identity"), it has been argued (Uspenskij 1984: 368-370) that use of the language of the alter for profane ends would have been considered blasphemous, no less than use of the vernacular in a liturgical text or parody of the liturgical language would be. While it is clear that in Croatia the same severity did not attach to the distinction between the spheres of usage of CCS and the vernacular, it is reasonable to hypothesize that use of the elevated form of language would have been considered inappropriate in such paradigmatic documents of secular concerns as were the legal acts of the feudal rulers, or even in the secular or non-liturgical affairs of the church.

The language of legal documents presents an illustration of just how different the relationships within the Glagolitic and Latinic complexes were. Legal documents from the Latinic complex were written in Latin, while those from the Glagolitic complex were written in essentially vernacular čakavian as early as the beginning of the fourteenth century (cf. the documents from the year 1309 from the town of Novi in Šurmin 1898, though we have clear evidence for the existence of similar documents even in the thirteenth century).

the Glagolitic and Latinic complexes does not challenge the commonly-held view that the Glagolitic literary tradition paved the way, in both language and style, for the unquestionable artistic achievements of sixteenth-century Dalmatian and Ragusan vernacular literature. To the contrary, this scheme suggests just where and how this "passing of the baton" might have taken place. It would thus be not simply the experience of the preceding Glagolitic literature that set the stage for the čakavian and Ragusan štokavian literature of the sixteenth century, but the existence of communities and individuals which could synthesize the potentials of two literary systems to produce a qualitatively new product.

At the same time, though, the distinction of Glagolitic and Latinic complexes does force us to revise the view expressed in many, and especially recent, works to the effect that Croatian literature (and, by extension, literacy) of the periods in question represented an "organic whole consisting of texts written in Glagolitic, Latinic and Bosnian [i.e. Cyrillic, A.C.] script."<sup>18</sup> We must certainly accept the idea of an overall unity, in which literature in any script (Latinic, Glagolitic, or Cyrillic) or language (CCS, čakavian, or Latin) could influence or draw from that in any of the other contemporary scripts or languages. However, this was not a simple, global, unity, lacking internal structure. Rather, it was much more like a complex *organism*, consisting of the interaction of distinct internal *organs* or systems, each of which in turn possessed its own internal structure and functions.

2.1.3. With regard to the lack of a grammatical tradition (cf. Worth 1978 on East Slavic), I will argue below (§ 3) that the perception of the language as a normalized system, and the maintenance and transmission of specific norms, need not depend on grammars and lexicons – the tools of modern-day language standardization.

2.1.4. While diglossia will remain a useful framework for future discussions of the normative nature of CCS, attempts to apply it simplistically, by "checking off" each of Ferguson's features against circumstances in CCS, can only lead to misunderstanding. Ferguson's original characterization of diglossia as a composite of several typically co-occurring features was, as he stated, preliminary. So described, the phenomenon had intuitive validity, but it was not defined. Ferguson's features are thus useful in *identifying* a diglossic situation, but none individually uncovers for us the *essence* of the phenomenon. It remains for us to determine which are more and which less central to a proper definition

<sup>18</sup> "...posebno ističem: 1) Definitivno prevladavanje ... 'glagoljaškog kompleksa' u odnosu na našu srednjovjekovnu književnost koja je *organska cjelina* [italicized in original, A.C.] tekstova pisanih glagoljicom, latinicom i bosančicom." (Hercigonja 1983:292).



of the diglossic situation; similarly, it remains to be seen which are more and which less regularly associated with diglossia.<sup>19</sup>

A similar trap awaits those who would simplistically apply Issatschenko's four-point characterization of literary language. This is, as so aptly stated by Rehder (1985:183), a "pregnant synopsis (of) the results of all the relevant research, ..."; but it is not a definition. The four "cardinal characteristics" of a "true literary language" are indeed useful for purposes of orientation, but it must always be borne in mind that they are but corollaries – more or less obligatory – of a more general principle of social organization of communication.

In the following discussion, therefore, instead of attempting to apply a synthetic concept of "literary language" or "diglossia" to the as yet poorly studied facts of CCS, I will probe some of the more basic questions which, it may be argued, should precede any such formulation. The goal will not be to reach firm conclusions concerning the nature of CCS as a sociolinguistic entity. At the present time that would be patently impossible. Rather, I will attempt to pose those specific questions which will guide future research toward a non-dogmatic understanding of the CCS-vernacular relationship, drawing upon available evidence to illustrate a set of preliminary hypotheses.

**2.2.0. Two basic questions.** Regardless of our verdict concerning diglossia in medieval Croatia, it is certainly safe to conclude that in contradistinction to (most) modern literary languages the practice of Slavonic literacy in Croatia was characterized by a constant tension between two extreme or polar situations. At one pole stands "proper" or "traditional" CCS, while at the other pole we have vernacular čakavian. A crucial task for scholarship, then, would be to define, on the basis of data, the relationship and interaction between these two extremes.<sup>20</sup>

The key to this relation hinges, I believe, on the answers to two related, but nevertheless distinct, questions. The first (§ 2.2.1) concerns internal variegation within the CCS norm. That is, is it possible to adduce a single non-differentiated "monochromatic" (single-colored) CCS norm, within which any synonymy

<sup>19</sup> Perhaps the most coherent statement of the essence of diglossia, and its relation to bilingualism, is found in Uspenskij 1983:6 or 1984:365-7; cf. also 1976:93-4. For a recent survey of views on the nature of diglossia, including efforts to expand or revise Ferguson's original model and to apply the concept to the Slavic languages, see G. Thomas 1989.

<sup>20</sup> Very considerable effort has indeed been devoted in recent times to the interaction ("interferencija") between vernacular čakavian and CCS, the most obvious fruits of which being the volumes by Hercigonja (1983) and Damjanović (1984). In contrast, the emphasis in this paper is on the relationship between the extreme varieties which conditions the interaction which we observe in the "hybrid" language of the nonliturgical genres. In the following discussion, therefore, in an attempt to define the nature of one of the extreme varieties (CCS), examples of variation are taken from within the archetypical liturgical genres (missal and breviary), i.e. texts whose language can unquestionably be characterized as based on CCS.

mous means of expression are in free variation, and in which apparent vernacularisms invariably represent just that - intrusions of "foreign" linguistic elements into CCS texts? Or, should we speak of a "polychromatic" (multi-colored) norm, in which some, but not all, elements of traditional Church Slavonic vary with corresponding elements borrowed from the vernacular to form a system of linguistic styles and registers. A separate aspect of a variegated CCS norm would be aesthetically-motivated variation (this time in the longitudinal, rather than transversal dimension) between synonymous expressions of non-vernacular origin (e.g. avoidance of or preference for repetition of similar expressions in proximity; cf. § 2.2.1.1). Whether or not we posit a polychromatic (containing distinct styles and registers) norm for CCS, and regardless of whether we accept the existence of motivated longitudinal variation (between purely CCS non-vernacular elements), we also wish to determine whether there were differing regional norms (e.g. northern and southern). Lastly, we must bear in mind the possibility (suggested, though certainly not advocated, by some of the literature on Church Slavonic) that for certain periods at least there was in fact no explicitly recognized norm, but rather more-or-less successful (but invariably intuitive) imitation of the manner of liturgical books, or more-or-less successful copying of these same books.<sup>21</sup>

The second (§ 2.2.2) crucial question for the Slavonic-vernacular relationship concerns the discreteness of the two polar varieties. That is, are we dealing with two discrete entities - one being the exogenous norm of CCS (whether monochromatic or polychromatic, as described above), and the other the endogenous norm of the vernacular? Or, are we dealing rather with a single linguistic system outfitted, as it were, with both party clothes and work clothes (i.e. various *signifiants*), all of which fit the same individual (i.e. pattern of lexical and grammatical categories), and can therefore be interchanged either out of necessity or to achieve a particular effect.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Cf. note 30; also "It is generally accepted that the concept of normalization first came to the Eastern Slavs with the so-called "second South Slavic influence" in the late 14th and the 15th centuries" (Worth 1978:390; cf. also his remarks in 1984:232-3), though it is far from obvious that we may equate absence of normalization (in the sense of an organized program to enforce uniformity or correctness) with lack of recognized norms. For the Orthodox South Slavs a similar conclusion is perhaps suggested, though again not advocated, by Mathiesen's hypothesis of a period of tolerance or leniency toward orthographic variation or deviation prior to the Hesychast-inspired reforms (1984; see the discussion in § 3 below). Cf. also Picchio 1980:5.

<sup>22</sup> The distinctness (i.e. discreteness) of two linguistic systems does not, of course, prevent them from entering into a *functional unity* (i.e. "в плане функциональной соотнесенности", Uspenskij 1976:96, quoted also in Hüttl-Folter 1978:122), based on the complementarity of their spheres of usage. See also the similar formulation in Kovtun 1971:21-23.



It should be noted at the outset that the answer to neither of these questions is entirely obvious, and will likely rest on a preponderance of evidence, rather than on a proof pure and (perhaps) simple.

2.2.1.0. **Simple or variegated norm.** Variation is possible within a textual genre (both longitudinal and transversal), between the textual genres of a single manuscript type (e.g. between the lections and prayers of the missal), between different manuscript types (e.g. missal, breviary, psalter, homiliary), and between various recensions of a single text or manuscript (e.g. northern and southern). The first three types of variation may have a stylistic motivation, while the last may reflect either stylistic considerations (deriving from differing attitudes toward the text), or differing regional norms or practices. A polychromatic norm within CCS may be most conclusively demonstrated by motivating the distribution of synonymical expressions within or between texts which are "close to the altar" (i.e. within the liturgical genres of the missals and breviaries, in which we expect strictest adherence to norms). Preliminary data indicate that significant variation may occur within all four dimensions.

2.2.1.1. Several types of variation may be illustrated by the system of inceptive verbs, including main (lexical) verbs prefixed with *vs/z-*, as well as procedural (auxiliary) and main verbs in *-četi*. A possible instance of motivated longitudinal variation (i.e. between elements deriving from the same stylistic level) within a textual genre is presented by the use of inceptive verbs to indicate the future onset of a state. This may be indicated either by perfective present (simple future) of a verb prefixed with *vs/z-*, or by the present (simple future) of *\*vľčeti* + infinitive of a main verb, as in *Aće vshočete i poslušati v'čnete me, bl(a)gaê z(e)mlskaê snêste*,<sup>23</sup> *Si volueritis, et audieritis me, Bona terrae comedetis.* καὶ ἐὰν θέλητε καὶ εἰσακούσητέ μου τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς φάγεσθε Isaiah 1:19 in recension A<sup>24</sup> of the missal. Several mss. of recension B have *Aće v'shočete i v'sposlušate me*, indicating that there was a choice involved, in which attitudes toward repetition in proximity might be involved. We should note that while the avoidance or preference of repetition in proximity affects the aesthetic qualities of a text, it is not clear that these variants differed in their stylistic level or register (but see note 26, below).

A possible instance of transversal variation (i.e. between elements of different stylistic levels) within a single textual genre is presented by the parallel use of *načeti* and *početi* as inceptive modal verbs for voluntary actions (e.g. *I*

<sup>23</sup> In this and subsequent citations of CCS passages word division has been modernized. In CCS orthography clitics are written together with their "hosts".

<sup>24</sup> In most instances I refer to the so-called northern version of both the missal and breviary lections as recension A, and to the so-called southern version as recension B. This corresponds to the usage established for the breviary by Hamm (1953), and is preferable to the geographical designations, in that the latter introduce a prejudice into discussion of the nature of the two recensions.

*načeti ijuna v'hoditi v' grad'* Jonah 3:4, recension A of the missal, *Et coepit Ionah introire in civitatem*, καὶ ἤρξατο Ἰωνᾶς τοῦ εἰσελεθεῖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, vs. *I poče...* in recension B). Both variants occur in missal and breviary lections, and may be considered to fall within the CCS norm(s). However, only the former appears in canonical OCS manuscripts, while the latter corresponds to vernacular usage, indicating that *početi* may have been infiltrating from the vernacular.<sup>25</sup> We may further note that *načeti* is clearly predominant in the missal, while the very limited data at my disposal suggest that there may be more of a balance between the two forms in the breviary. These facts in combination suggest that *početi* may indeed have had a less formal flavor.<sup>26</sup>

We also encounter parallel use of *začeti* and *početi* in the sense of *concipere* συλλαμβάνειν. In Hrv we have *Se počneši v' črêvê* Luke 1:31, but *i ta začety s(i)ny v starosti svoei* Luke 1:36 and *priže nere začet' se v črêvê* Luke 2:21. The first two examples both occur in direct quotations of the angel who visited Mary. No motivation can be discerned from these three examples.

Another case of probably transversal variation involves the synonyms *svêdêtel'* vs. *svêdok'*. In both the missal and the breviary, the first is characteristic of recension A, the second of recension B (cf. § 2.2.1.4., below), though *svêdêtel'* occasionally occurs in texts of recension B as well. *svêdok'* is clearly borrowed from the vernacular, but appears almost regularly in lections of the so-called southern (recension B) missals, and must be admitted to fall within the CCS norm(s). Though its relation to the more traditional synonym is not entirely clear, it was most probably seen as "closer to the people".

A somewhat different situation is presented by instances of obvious vernacularisms introduced into some, but not all, similar manuscripts in a spe-

<sup>25</sup> Cf. ČAV. The distribution of Church Slavonic attestations of *početi/počinati* indicates, however, that the matter is far from simple. Attestations in ČAV indicate that use of *početi/počinati* in any meaning is limited primarily to texts of Croatian origin (G1–3 attestations cited, though many others are available in CCS manuscripts), and to East Slavic texts of presumed Czech origin (VencNik – 5 attestations, Bes – 18 attestations), though it is also attested twice in the Ostromir Gospel, and once each in the calendars of Slepč and Mak (ČAV Vol. 3:231, 235). Use of *početi* in Croatian Slavonic texts may itself, then, stem at least originally from a West Slavic source.

<sup>26</sup> Hercigonja (1983, especially the essay "Iz radova na istraživanju stilematike i sintakse glagoljaške neliturgijske proze 15. stoljeća") cites examples of alternation between synonymous CCS and vernacular elements in order to avoid repetition as one of the most visible stylistic devices in nonliturgical Glagolitic literature. The primary difference between the examples cited in that work (aside from their greater variety: Hercigonja cites examples of orthographic, morphological and lexical alternations) and those cited here is in the "polarity" of the stylistic relation. In the nonliturgical texts a neutral čakavian variant is alternating with a marked CCS variant (A<sup>b</sup>). In CCS, in contrast, we can speak only of a neutral CCS variant alternating with a marked čakavian variant (B<sup>a</sup>), unless of course both variants are from the nonvernacular CCS level, as in the alternations discussed in the previous paragraph.



cific textual location. A striking example is the appearance of the 1pl. verbal desinence *-mo* in quoting the speech of persons of humble origin in recension B of the breviary (see § 2.2.1.3, below). It remains to be determined whether we should view this group of mss. as having a more variegated norm than recension A, or whether these forms were perceived as being taken from outside the norm.

We can, then, tentatively cite some instances, albeit few and in general requiring further study, of stylistic (more precisely, motivated) variation within a single CCS textual genre. Whether or not we can speak of a *system* of stylistic variation remains to be explored. The instances presented above do point out one major difficulty and methodological trap which will have to be avoided. Specifically, in such isolated pairs of synonyms, it is not immediately clear whether both are being *used* by the scribes, or whether one is simply an older form slowly being supplanted by a newer one. Differing degrees of conservatism may suggest, but certainly do not prove, motivated stylistic variation.

2.2.1.2. Variation between the textual genres of a single type of liturgical book also remains to be properly demonstrated. In my study of the New York Missal (1991:33) I asserted that we can observe three degrees of conservatism – greatest in the biblical lections, slightly less in the remaining prayers and liturgical texts, and much less in the rubrics. The distinction between the rubrics and the remaining texts was obvious, so much so that it is much easier to view the former as essentially vernacular texts with an occasional admixture of Slavonicisms (generally of a terminological nature), than as a “style” of CCS. I did not quantitatively demonstrate the purported gap between the biblical and remaining liturgical texts. Tandarić, in contrast, stated that he found no quantitative difference between the language of the ritual texts and other liturgical texts (including biblical lections) of the missal (1983), but he too adduced no statistics in support of his claim. A solution to the issue will depend on future research.

2.2.1.3. If there is indeed a gradation in the degree of conservatism of the constituent texts of the missal, we would expect an analogous differentiation to occur also within the breviary, as well as in other books of mixed content. Moreover, we might expect the texts of the breviary, taken either as a whole or by individual constituent textual type, to be less conservative and subject to more individual variation than those of the missal, given the less ceremonial nature of the book. My own work to date *suggests* that this is precisely the case.

The most striking contrast between the missal and the breviary is an apparent difference in the attitude of the scribes toward their books. Most broadly, this could be described as a freer, more tolerant, more individualistic, and less pedantic approach to the breviary. While the language of the lections in some of the plenary breviaries seems to rival that of the missals in its overall conservatism, and the rubrics in any of the liturgical books may be rendered in a virtually vernacular register, nevertheless an all-around distinction is easy to detect. First, the lengths of individual readings, as well as the overall quantity of text from

the individual biblical books, varies greatly from one breviary to the next, in contrast to the greater uniformity of the missal lections. Second, apocryphal texts were occasionally included in the breviaries, and even allowed to remain through successive copyings, which would have been unthinkable in a missal (I leave out of account the mss. with a combination of missal and breviary texts). Third, only one of the missals (Hrv) is consciously vernacularized (though Oxf<sub>1</sub> contains a number of unique syntactic divergences of a simplifying nature). Among the breviaries, in contrast, we not only have such drastic examples of vernacularization as BrVat<sub>10</sub>, and also BrMav (in its lexical makeup), but certain features which would represent rare vernacularisms in the lections of the missal appear to be a characteristic (though far from regular or even common) feature of recension B of the breviary. In BrDr and BrVat<sub>5</sub>, for example (the typical manuscripts of recension B in Acts and 1 Samuel), we can read *ne si li vsi iže gl(agol)jut' galilêi sut', i kako mi slišahomo edin' každo ezik n(a)š' v nemže rojeni es'mo, ... slišasmo e g(lago)ljuće...* (Acts 2:7-8, 11: BrDr110d 11-14 and 23) and *Ne si li vsi ki g(lago)ljut' galilêi sut', I kako mi slišahomo ed(i)n' každo êz(i)k' n(a)š' v nemže rojeni es(a)m', ... slišasmo e g(lago)ljuće ...* (BrVat<sub>5</sub> 123a 25-28 and 35). In the missal lections occurrences of the vernacular 1pl. desinence *-mo* are rare indeed, yet here we encounter it five times in two manuscripts in a single lection, indicating that it is a feature of recension B of this lection. In the same two renditions of this passage we also encounter an instance of *ki* for *iže* (in the lections of the missal common in Hrv, but otherwise rare) and *ezik'* for *êzik'* (*êzik'* is clearly normative in the missal: 71 occurrences in my comparative corpus vs. 4 of *ezik'*, 3 of which occur in the intentionally vernacularized Hrv). What is particularly striking about this conglomeration of vernacularisms is that it seems to be directly related to a specific stylistic function: the passage in question represents the direct speech of *the masses* (albeit of religious men) of Jerusalem! The probably intentional admixture of vernacularisms in just such an environment serves to distinguish this direct speech from the more common case of direct speech of Christian personalities or elevated non-Christians (princes, priests), angels and God. Not only, then, does this passage provide a hint that recension B of the breviary permitted vernacularisms which in the missal occur but rarely, and generally in isolation; it also suggests that the breviary may sanction a type of stylistic variation (differentiating the direct speech of two classes of people) which I have not noted in my (albeit limited) corpus of missal lections.

In fact, within my corpus containing Acts 1-3,21 and 1 Samuel 1-3,21 I noted the following numbers of instances of some of the more obvious and striking vernacularisms: 1) *k-* words for expected relative *j-* words (BrVat<sub>5</sub>: five examples – all of *ki* for *iže*; BrDr: two examples – *g'dê* for *idêže* and *koliko* for *eliko*); 2) *r* for *ž* in the original particle *že* (BrVat<sub>5</sub>: three examples – twice *dari* for *daže* and once *nere* for *neže*; BrDr: eight examples – six of *dari* for *daže*, once



nera for *neže* and once *nikolikore* for *nikolikože*); 3) *ezik'* for *êzik'* once in each manuscript; 4) *kčer-* for *dečer-* (twice in BrVat<sub>5</sub> and once in BrDr); 5) interrogative adverb *zač'* (twice in BrVat<sub>5</sub> and four times in BrDr); 6) 1pl. verbal desinence *-mo* (twice in BrVat<sub>5</sub> and three times in BrDr). We may contrast this situation to that in the codices Vat<sub>8</sub> and N (Novak's missal) – representative manuscripts of recension B of the missal which are considered to present a fairly innovative situation for the time in which they were written. In the lections within my comparative corpus (about twice the size of the breviary corpus), of the same six categories of vernacularisms noted above, we find in each manuscript but a single example (and lexicalized at that) of the *ž > r* change (*izreni* for *iždeni*, 1GA).

A similar example occurs in 1 Samuel 1:8. Where recension A has *Ir(e)če ei elikan' m(u)ž' ee, An'no poč'to plačeši, i poč'to ne êsi, ...* (BrN<sub>2</sub>) *Anna cur fles et quare non comedis*, BrDr at this location has *An'no počto plačeši i zač' ne jiši ...* (similar in BrVat<sub>5</sub>). Once again, the presence of these lexical vernacularisms clearly seems to be conditioned by the direct speech of a person of humble origin.

Differences in the text of various stemmatological branches can obviously arise from purely redactional differences with no deeper linguistic significance, or from differences in the source text (translation from Greek vs. Vulgate, or translation from Greek vs. a later version of the same corrected against the Vulgate). In the cases just cited, however, it is clear that the differences (at least between redactions A and B of the breviary, but perhaps between the missal and breviary in general) are conditioned not by a different source, but by the attitude of an editor toward the language of his text.

Other apparent differences between the language of the missal and breviary may be cited (some are addressed in on-going research on the language of the breviary lections), but would serve only to reinforce the impression of a greater freedom or tolerance for vernacular features in the breviary, as well as of a more innovative state in features of inherent variation. It is important to note that none of the individual differences cited here between the missal and the breviary are by themselves crucial. Some, in fact, may be shown to be spurious by future research. What is striking is rather the *conglomeration* of small numbers of each, especially in recension B of the breviary, as opposed to their virtually total absence in any manuscript of the missal (Hrv excluded). It is this *collective* effect of small numbers of each type of vernacularism which seems strikingly to differentiate the missal and breviary lections.

The implications of this greater freedom in the breviary for the task of defining the norms of CCS are far from clear. In BrVat<sub>5</sub> and BrDr all of the cited vernacularisms are exceptional, rather than normal, features. Furthermore, we must recall that this vernacularizing tendency is manifested primarily in the so-called southern recension (B), while the representative mss. of recension A (e.g.

BrVb<sub>1</sub>, BrVb<sub>2</sub>, BrN<sub>1</sub>, BrN<sub>2</sub>, BrVO, at least in the texts of my corpus) present a more conservative situation. It is thus far from clear that such differences will require us to define the norms of CCS differently for the missal and breviary. What this survey does suggest is simply that we must *seriously consider* the possibility of a variegated norm for CCS, with regard to both the specific norms and the degree of freedom or stylistic variation available for a given manuscript or textual genre.

2.2.1.4. The fourth possible dimension for variegation in the CCS norm (perhaps deriving from various regional norms) is that presented by differences between the stemmatological branches of a single textual type or liturgical book. As we have already noted, for both the missal and breviary it is generally agreed that we can identify two different groups of manuscripts - one usually referred to at present as a more northern (A), the other as a more southern (B) group (on the breviary cf. Vajs 1903:65, Hamm 1953:17, Ribarova 1987<sup>27</sup>; on the missal cf. Pantelić 1967:68-71, Corin 1991:18, 23-4). In both cases it has been suggested that the southern group (B) is characterized by "younger" (i.e. more innovative or vernacularized) features.<sup>28</sup> Examples of this variation have been noted above.

2.2.2.0. **Discreteness or unity of CCS and the Vernacular.** The issue of a simple or variegated norm is of course intimately linked to the question of the discreteness of CCS and the vernacular. If, for example, linguistic differences between CCS textual or manuscript genres cannot be shown to be categorical (i.e. if we can state no more than a general quantitative tendency for one textual type to contain more or less vernacular features than another), then it is probably wrong to speak of discrete styles of CCS, distinguished by specific identifiable features or clusters of features (e.g. distinct missal vs. breviary styles, or lection vs. psalm/prayer styles). But since the typical dimension of variation within CCS texts is between Church Slavonic and vernacular variants, can we then speak of any firm dividing line between CCS and vernacular at all? In other words, if CCS is defined as having a monochromatic or non-variegated norm, but the textual genres nevertheless contain various admixtures of vernacular elements, can we determine the proportion of admixture at which a CCS text with vernacular admixture becomes instead an essentially vernacular text with a CCS admixture (B<sup>a</sup> instead of A<sup>b</sup>)? Alternatively, if we define a variegated CCS

<sup>27</sup> The significance of the stemmatological breakdown of missal and breviary lections is still far from clear. For the text of *Jonah* in the breviaries, for example, Ribarova notes that the text in BrDr agrees with that in BrVb<sub>2</sub>, while for *1 Samuel* and *Acts* in the versions in these two manuscripts represent archetypical examples of the opposite stemmatological branches. Furthermore, Ribarova notes that the text of *Jonah* in the missals differs from both of the versions represented in the breviaries!

<sup>28</sup> In fact, Pantelić describes the southern recension of the missal as containing more familiar words and clearer diction, but older sentence construction (1967:71 "poznatijim riječima, jasnijom dikcijom, ali starijom rečeničnom konstrukcijom").



norm, but again with only quantitative (nondiscrete, pertaining to the *proportion* of certain features found in texts or the *likelihood* of their being found), rather than categorical (specific linguistic features being *allowed* in one style but *prohibited* in another), distinctions between the various CCS styles, it is still unclear how broadly the norm should be defined (i.e. how great an admixture of vernacular features a particular style must contain before we declare it to be outside the boundaries of CCS).<sup>29</sup>

Here again, what seems to be but a single question really breaks down into two. At the inductive level, we wish to determine whether we have a limited number of distinguishable linguistic styles in written texts (or even just two essentially categorically opposed styles – CCS and vernacular), or whether any degree or proportion of mixing of CCS and vernacular elements is in principle possible, as has been explicitly suggested by some scholars for East Slavic (in other words, whether we have a continuum of variation between CCS and the vernacular; § 2.2.2.1). At the level of hypothetical modeling, though, we must further decide whether and to what extent CCS and the čakavian vernaculars represent distinct, *different* linguistic systems, or whether, and to what extent, we are free to view them merely as alternate sets of surface (i.e. phonological) manifestations of essentially identical linguistic categories (except in cases of syncretism; § 2.2.2.2).

**2.2.2.1. Continuum vs. abruptness.** This has been a key issue for each of the national or regional varieties of Church Slavonic, and views have tended to develop along parallel lines.

Some (primarily earlier) authors tended to see medieval Slavonic texts as constituting a continuum, being closer to “pure” Church Slavonic as they got closer to the altar, and closer to the vernacular as they approached worldly top-

<sup>29</sup> Essentially the same question was posed by Nazor (1963) in regard to the language of the (nonliturgical) miscellanies. The criterion applied in that paper for deciding on the linguistic base (CCS or čakavian) was a simple preponderance of CCS or vernacular variants for the diacritic features identified by the author. Here I would like to suggest that the issue is somewhat more complex. For medieval Rus' Uspenskij has suggested that *all* those textual styles which do not proscribe mixing of vernacular and normative Slavonic features, even those in which Church Slavonic features clearly predominate, must have been perceived by contemporaries as falling within the sphere of the nonliturgical (i. e. vernacular) language (see the discussion in § 3 and notes 47, 48). While I would not apply this proposal, at least in its pure form, to the Croatian situation, we must nevertheless bear in mind that the linguistic basis (A<sup>b</sup> or B<sup>a</sup>) of a text is determined by the *perception* of the author/translator/scribe/editor, and the proportion of CCS and vernacular variants will reflect this perception only indirectly. This is not to say that we have no diagnostic tools available to investigate the contemporary (medieval) perception of the linguistic base of texts. As noted above, the “polarity” of stylistic variation (unmarked CCS vs. marked (motivated) vernacular variant or *vice versa*) reflects this perception much more directly than the relative proportion of CCS and vernacular variants.

ics, (especially in those which absolutely demanded total comprehensibility on the part of readers, i.e. legal documents, apart from *incipits* and terminological formulae; cf. Ivić 1971:121). We have already cited Štefanić in this regard. Among scholars of East Slavic, the remarks of L. Thomas are typical of this view. In his opinion, "Every degree of compromise between the two extremes [i.e. vernacular and Church Slavonic, A. C.] was possible" (1969:xvii); further, "As can be seen from the above examples, a great range of variability in the mixture of East Slavic and Old Church Slavonic was possible. The relative preponderance of one or the other depended very much on *what was being talked about* (1969:xix; emphasis in the original)." Nevertheless, the same scholars who accept essentially infinite variation between the vernacular and Church Slavonic still sense a certain separateness or differentness of the two extreme varieties, though these varieties might, in the perception of contemporary users, have represented a functional or linguistic unity. With regard to CCS itself, Štefanić spoke of a *consciousness* on the part of the Glagoljaši that the literary language was Church Slavonic, and that they therefore *attempted, with greater or lesser success*, to imitate the language of the ecclesiastical books, which often resulted in a mixture of old and new phonetic, morphological and lexical features.<sup>30</sup> This would seem to imply an uncontrolled, and therefore infinitely variable, mixture of Slavonic and vernacular elements, but at the same time a recognition of the existence of a normative entity (though with no implication of a simultaneous recognition of the independent nature of the vernacular).

Recent researchers of Croatian and the other Slavonic literacies have tended to be more explicit in positing the discrete nature of the Slavonic vs. vernacular distinction, with regard to both the observed degree of mixing of Slavonic and vernacular elements, and the underlying polarity which gives rise to the mixing. Thus, on the one hand, it is pointed out that there are really very few texts from these milieus which could be said to contain a more-or-less even blend of Slavonic and vernacular features. To the contrary, most are either overwhelmingly vernacular, though containing an admixture of Slavonic elements, or overwhelmingly Slavonic, with an admixture of vernacular (or more generally non-Slavonic) elements.<sup>31</sup> Most of these authors also point to a concomitant complementarity between the two types of texts, with one type or the other reserved for any specific genre or textual type (cf. Rehder 1985:187, Hüttl--Folter 1978:110, but qualified in 1985:207). On the other hand, it is noted (cf.

<sup>30</sup> "Ipak je još dugo kod glagoljaša vladala svijest da je književni jezik crkvenoslavenski jezik pa su se mnogi trsili – s većim ili manjim uspjehom – da imitiraju jezik crkvenih knjiga, a od toga je često nastala mješavina stare i nove fonetike, morfologije i leksika" (1969:27-8).

<sup>31</sup> For CCS cf. Rehder 1985, and Tandarić 1983 (though he does admit the existence of some transitional texts: cf. p. 82). This generalization should also be balanced against the gradation in Slavonic vs. vernacular elements in texts from miscellanies noted by Nazor 1963.



especially Hercigonja 1983 and Damjanović 1984) that there are *two normative* (though in various senses) *polar varieties* (CCS and vernacular čakavian), which however can be *mixed in an unregulated way*. Thus at one conceptual level we have discontinuity, while in practice essentially infinite variation between the two extremes remains at least possible.

Though such an approach, based on discontinuity (at least at a certain level of abstraction) and some degree of complementarity, but with no limit *in principle* on the amount of mixing possible in texts, seems to be most easily applicable to Croatian Glagolitic literacy, it is clear that we are still only beginning to understand the factors which governed the interaction of CCS and čakavian features in written texts. For example, no matter how convincing our arguments in favor of a dualistic paradigm such as that just presented, we can still with justification distinguish three types of texts: (virtually) pure CCS, (virtually) pure čakavian, and mixed texts. This fact must be encompassed in a comprehensive account of Glagolitic literacy. As a second example, we still have only a rudimentary understanding of the *degree* of mixing in various texts or mss. (the issue posed in Nazor 1963) and the *motivation* for mixing (cf. the preliminary study in Hercigonja 1983).

It must be borne in mind that the evidence of inherent variation cannot be taken as supporting either a continuum or an abrupt dichotomy between CCS and the vernacular. Whether a manuscript (or text within a manuscript) which is clearly based on CCS contains a high or low percentage of vocalized *jers* does not by itself affect the manuscript's position relative to the two extremes. Some missals, for example, with a high proportion of vocalization, and/or low proportion of retention of <ê> for \*ê, or of <žd> for \*dj, nevertheless show virtually no flagrant vernacularisms in their liturgical texts. It is certain that differences with respect to features of inherent variation have led some researchers to see a more even continuum between Slavonic and the vernacular than actually exists.

2.2.2.2. **Alternate manifestation vs. different system.** The discreteness of Slavonic and the vernacular depends on more than the presence or absence of an *observable continuum of variation* between the two in written texts, or on their role as *abstract polar extremes* with respect to which a choice of written variants is based. Even accepting that there are few or no texts with a more or less equal mixture of Slavonic and vernacular features, the intentional use of some vernacular features in predominantly Slavonic texts (or vice versa) in order to achieve some specific and stylistic effect (such as Kandaurova's "representatives of the people," "представители народа" 1968:75, Hüttl-Folter's "actualization of historical reality" 1985:208, or simply in order to avoid undesirable repetition Hercigonja 1983), does indeed suggest a certain validity for the non-discrete view, in that Slavonic and vernacular *variants* would be interacting within a unified (if very limited) grammatical or lexical sub-system. This is approximately the situation suggested by Uspenskij (1976) for East Slavic in the

period preceding the second South Slavic influence. Accidental variation (i.e. stemming purely from differences in education or care in the preparation of various types of texts) cannot, however, be taken as evidence for nondiscreteness.

There is yet another, and indeed crucial, factor which must be considered in assessing the discreteness or unity of CCS and the vernacular. In discussions of East Slavic, it is customary to speak of functional and linguistic unity in the period preceding the second South Slavic influence, but of functional unity and linguistic distinctness in the subsequent period. The assertion of distinctness or discreteness of the two polar varieties in the later period seems to be based on the growing quantitative and qualitative gap between East Slavic dialects and Church Slavonic, to the extent that Slavonic became unintelligible to the untrained listener or reader. For Croatia I will formulate this question of *linguistic distinctness* in a different manner. Since it is only among trained writers (scribes, translators, original authors) that the issue of identity or discreteness would be likely to arise, the mere agglomeration of lexical or morphological differences would be unlikely to cause a change in perception, if the *patterns* of the language (morphological, syntactic and lexical systems) remained more or less the same. The basic issue thus would be whether and to what extent there was a direct mapping between any CCS text or expression and a corresponding vernacular text or expression (excluding, of course, those lexical/semantic spheres in which similar content could not be expressed in the two varieties), and vice versa, except in cases of syncretism of categories. The greater the extent to which we can give an affirmative answer, the greater the extent to which interaction and blending of CCS and vernacular elements was possible, and the easier it would have been for contemporary *literate* speakers of čakavian (literate in CCS, of course) to see CCS and the vernacular as aspects of a single linguistic entity, i.e. to see CCS as simply the "proper" or "genuine" form of their language, despite superficial divergence.

On the level of phonology, it is certainly far from clear that we can speak of distinct CCS and vernacular systems (in fact, in the diglossic framework we do not even expect distinct phonologies). In most respects, CCS phonology had fallen together with that of the vernacular no later than the fourteenth century, and probably earlier. This is especially true of the system of distinctive features and the inventory of segmental phonemes. Mature CCS, to be sure, had a marginally larger inventory of phonemes (i.e. /f/ and possibly /l/, which was disappearing from vernacular čakavian in the fifteenth century), but this represents no more than "filling in" accidental gaps in the inventory, and does not reflect a difference either in the feature system itself, or in the more general rules by which the features were distributed (e.g. basic rules of syllable structure, lack of final devoicing, and such neutralizations as voicing assimilation and assimi-



lation for place of articulation of the type *bez+čedie* → *beščedie* and simplification of geminate clusters).<sup>32</sup> This is not to say that there were no differences in the distribution of phonemes or features in the two polar varieties. While some phonological changes or processes typical for čakavian seem to have originated after the fifteenth century (probably the raising of long vowels and the change of word-final  $m > n$ ), and others seem to have ceased to be productive processes by this time (intervocalic  $\check{z} > r$ ) we can point to some which are likely to have been active, productive phonological processes in at least part of the territory of Glagolitic literacy during the fourteenth and/or fifteenth centuries (e.g. syllable-final  $l > o$ ,  $l > u$ ,  $\check{c}r > cr$ ) and which were not reflected in CCS. Still, these are marginal phenomena, which during the centuries in question represented a recent layer of innovations, most of which were probably not yet generalized throughout the entire area of Glagolitic literacy.<sup>33</sup> They are insignificant when contrasted with the more fundamental areas of agreement mentioned above, including the essential identity of the distinctive feature system, phonemic inventory and *most* rules of distribution. Perhaps it is worth adding that we surely have no reason to suspect that the "phonological universe" was broken down differently in any dimension in the two polar varieties (e.g. voicing as a feature of one variety, but tenseness in the other; syllable-based rhythm in one variety, but stress-based rhythm in the other, etc.).

Since we cannot speak of fundamental, or at least widespread, differences between CCS and čakavian phonology, the question of isomorphism between the systems or categories of meaningful elements is crucial. Here we are not particularly interested in such arbitrary differences as 1pl. *-m* in one variety but *-mo* in the other, *miš* as a feminine noun in one variety but masculine in the other, and similar. Such differences have no significance for the systems of the language. We would be somewhat more interested in a difference in the number of declensional classes, as this would involve a *system* of forms, though still not touch upon any semantic categories.<sup>34</sup> Another and yet more significant type of syncretism involves the loss of overt expression of a morphological or syntac-

<sup>32</sup> CCS texts occasionally contain "etymological" spellings of the type *Razsêcête* (3 Reg 3,25, MVb<sub>2</sub>), but it is clear from the preponderance of counterexamples of the type *Ras'sêcête* (Vat<sub>4</sub>) and *rasêcite* (Oxf<sub>2</sub>) that the neutralizations were observed in reading CCS texts. The artificial nature of CCS spellings which fail to reflect these processes is pointed out by such hypercorrect spellings as <iz'žnego> for [ižn'ego] = "iz + nego", or <raz'zor't> for [razor] for the participial form razor't. Cf. Režić 1981 on this question.

<sup>33</sup> As an analogy, we would not want to make far-reaching conclusions concerning the distinctness of the phonological systems of two native speakers of English, one of whom lacked the *r* phoneme in syllable-final position and exhibited a greater degree of vowel raising or diphthongization.

<sup>34</sup> J. Vince-Marinac (1987), however, argues that for mature CCS we can speak only of a main declension (type *rab, glas, žena, selo*), as well as one secondary class (type *kost*), though this limited system contains some remnants of the older declensional

tic category, though not of the category itself (e.g. loss of relative *j*-words in favor of originally interrogative *k*-words). Of primary significance, however, are differences in the number and nature of morphological or syntactic (i.e. meaningful) categories. Such a difference, for example, would result *hypothetically* from the loss of the aorist and imperfective in the vernacular, but only if this resulted not only in a reduction in the means for expressing past tense, but also in the loss or reinterpretation of some semantic distinction (e.g. the category of "witnessed action" expressed by the štokavian aorist/imperfect : perfect distinction, or an aspectual distinction expressed by the imperfect : aorist opposition) which continues to live on unchanged in CCS.<sup>35</sup>

Similarly, in the area of lexical relations, we must ask to what extent we are dealing with simple replacement of one phonological shape or inflectional pattern of a lexeme (*glagolati*; *otrok*-/otročē-; *jeter*-, *jedin*-) with another (*govoriti*; *di/ete*-; *jed{a}n*-), and to what extent (if any) corresponding CCS and vernacular lexemes have become semantically differentiated with respect to one another.

Clearly, this is but a sample of the formal or meaningful differences between CCS and vernacular čakavian which might be explored, and not all will fall neatly into the gradation just introduced (e.g. CCS dative absolute or perfective present as a future tense form vs. the absence of these means in the vernacular). The point of these examples is to demonstrate that there is a very considerable gradation in the significance of CCS-vernacular differences, and that this fact, even more than the *quantity* of differences, must be taken into account in judging the discreteness or unity of the two varieties. Before the question of discreteness can be settled, then, it will have to be decided whether the underlying grammatical systems of CCS and the vernacular differ in a nontrivial way; i.e. whether the various grammatical categories of the two language varieties follow different *patterns* in enough areas to warrant speaking of qualitatively distinct linguistic systems.

To summarize the results of this section, both basic questions of variation – that of differentiation within CCS, and that of the discreteness of CCS and the

classes. She also feels that the category of animacy in CCS had fallen together with that of the vernacular (expressed overtly among masculine nouns in the singular), though again inconsistently in some CCS texts.

<sup>35</sup> I refer to this as a hypothetical example, since both the aorist and imperfect apparently remained productive in čakavian at least through the end of the fifteenth century. That they were not yet marginalized, and retained their original range of relationships with other verbal forms, is demonstrated by the priest Martinac's free usage of the imperfect for actions beginning in the past but continuing into the present (cf. Stevanović 1974:660-1 on this usage in štokavian) in his colophon to the *Breviarium Novi II* (cf. the facsimile edition, folia 267a-d). Though this colophon clearly has more CCS than vernacular features, we must assume that he took this particular usage from the vernacular.



vernacular – can be answered only on the basis of descriptive studies which have yet to be undertaken.<sup>36</sup> Nevertheless, given the *appearance* that the phonological and grammatical *patterns* of CCS and the vernacular differed little (as well as for reasons explained in § 3.2, below), I would suggest as a working hypothesis that CCS and the vernacular in the 14th and 15th centuries likely represented both a functional and linguistic unity (as is often suggested for East Slavic through the 14th century), and that CCS texts (though not necessarily the CCS norm) contained at least minimal stylistic variegation in all expected dimensions, i.e. within at least some individual textual genres, between the textual genres of a single manuscript type (e.g. lection vs. prayer in the missal or breviary), between the missal and breviary as wholes, and between the so-called northern (A) and southern (B) recensions of both missal and breviary.<sup>37</sup>

### 3.0. The Source of Authority in CCS.

In modern (European) literary languages propriety is enforced through specific institutions. The norm of a literary language is abstracted away from the texts or contexts in which it is manifested, and is presented “crystallized” in the form of *rules* in grammars and lexicons. The prescriptive norm is also the subject of scholarly research and occasionally of public comment or even public intervention (as in recent attempts to rid the English language of sexist elements).

We have every reason to believe that the same means for transmission of the linguistic norm was not available to the medieval Glagolite community. Most obviously, we have no record of any medieval treatises on the nature, background and norms of CCS. Neither have we any evidence for schools in which the CCS norms would have been taught overtly in a systematic manner.<sup>38</sup> In fact, if we wish to understand the nature of linguistic authority in Croatia, it will be well to begin by drawing an analogy to the situation among the Orthodox Slavs.

<sup>36</sup> This is not, of course, to say that no such studies exist, as the references in this paper should amply demonstrate. We must also distinguish studies of the type suggested here (i.e. of the *differences* between CCS and vernacular čakavian) from studies of the *interaction* between CCS and čakavian in written texts (cf. note 20). While the two questions obviously bear crucially upon one another, they are nonetheless essentially distinct.

<sup>37</sup> Once again, we must distinguish between stylistic variation within texts based on CCS but with a vernacular admixture (B<sup>a</sup>), from that in texts which were based on the vernacular, but contained a CCS admixture (A<sup>b</sup>). It would seem to be primarily the latter which was demonstrated by Hercigonja (1983).

<sup>38</sup> One must assume that Picchio's reference to “Dalmatian Glagolitic Schools” (1980:27) concerns schools of activity or thought, rather than schools in the pedagogic sense. Of course, it is not the *existence* of schools for the training of scribes that we wish to deny, but simply that we have any *positive evidence* for their existence.

Medieval Serbia, Bulgaria and Russia did indeed give rise to a series (tradition might be too strong a word) of grammatical or pseudo-grammatical treatises. The two earliest which deal in any detail with linguistic facts (thus leaving aside Hrabr's short treatise) are the "Eight Parts of Speech" and Constantine of Kosteneč's 15th-century "Skazanie," both of which seem to have arisen in Serbia (Cf. Worth 1983, Jagić 1968, Goldblatt 1984, 1987). However, it requires no more than a cursory examination of these texts to realize three basic facts. First, they reveal in most cases a remarkably superficial and often erroneous conception of the structure of the Church Slavonic language, in some instances to the extent of seeming utterly ridiculous or absurd to a modern specialist (cf. Worth 1978, 1983, Jagić 1968). Second, the linguistic system presented in the earlier treatises is in many respects not Slavonic at all, but rather Greek!<sup>39</sup> In other words, to the extent that they discuss actual linguistic or orthographic topics, what these treatises really attempt to show is how universal categories (those of Greek, of course) are properly expressed in Slavonic. More importantly, though, Constantine's work, with its emphasis on orthographic and diacritic detail, attempts to show how certain external attributes of Greek texts (breathing marks, letter pairs such as <ο> and <ω>, etc.), which were viewed in the Slavonic milieu as essential attributes of the original texts, are to be maintained in Slavonic translations, as well as in original Slavonic compositions. Third, a great majority of important grammatical topics, including significant differences between Church Slavonic and the vernaculars, as well as between the Slavic and Greek grammatical patterns, are not discussed at all.

In Bulgaria and Serbia, in which the grammatical traditions originated, their deficiency was not only one of quality, but of quantity as well. Very few such texts have come down to us in which the language is discussed explicitly. Constantine of Kosteneč, the most expansive of the grammarians, in fact explicitly lamented that *not even* his Slavonic source of inspiration, Euthymius of Trnovo, had committed his teachings to writing ("нѣ ни тѣ потыщасе съписати оутврѣженіе симъ" Jagić 1968:82, 103). V. Ćorović in fact spoke of Constantine's grammatical-orthographic program as the first in the Slavonic world.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>39</sup> On the motivation for this Greek perspective on grammatical structure see the works cited in notes 41 and 42 (concerning the situation in the fourteenth century and later), but also Uspenskij (1983:18-23) on a similar conception of Greek-Church Slavonic identity in Russia even in earlier centuries.

<sup>40</sup> "U njoj [i.e. the Resava school, A.C.] je K. izradio gramatičko-pravopisni program, prvi u celoj staroj slovenskoj književnosti" (1925:369). Similarly, Mladenov, in his history of the Bulgarian language, mentions only the works by Ioan Exarch, Hrabr, and Constantine of Kosteneč in which medieval Bulgarian Slavonic literacy is discussed (1979:37-8).



While it would be unjust to condemn the works of the medieval “grammarians” for failing to be something which their authors had not intended them to be,<sup>41</sup> it should nevertheless be clear that the grammatical treatises which originated in the Orthodox Slavic lands could not possibly serve as the primary source of authority on the norms of, and acceptable variation within, the several national or regional varieties of Slavonic. Rather, *it was only in the example of the texts themselves, and specifically in the example of the most authoritative texts*, that the scribes, translators, and original authors – masters and neophytes alike – found a model and reference.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, the only external authority on linguistic matters available to these people would have been found in the language and practices of the prestige culture (i.e. Greek).

In fact, it is the two striking structural characteristics of the grammatical treatises – their Greek linguistic system and their emphasis on orthographic and diacritic detail – which provide us with a key to the true nature of linguistic normalization in the Orthodox Slavonic world. A primary motivation (if not the primary motivation) for the discussion of language in this context must have been the *efficient transmission of texts*, and especially of sacred texts, both from one generation of manuscripts to the next, and from one sacred language (Greek) to the next (Slavonic).<sup>43</sup> The treatises thus deal with two sets of problems, which together represented the overriding concern of the Slavonic scribes and translators. The first would be: how to maintain the integrity of a text, *with all of its external trappings*, when translating from Greek into Slavonic. Second, since the gradual corruption of texts is an inevitable concomitant feature of the process of copying, how can one limit the rate of this degradation, and when necessary recover the original form of texts which have been corrupted over the course of several generations of copying. The link between these two concerns would be the assumption that a Slavonic text in which certain attributes of corresponding or comparable Greek texts (say, breathing marks or letter pairs) were not maintained, must at some earlier time have been in agreement with the Greek texts.

<sup>41</sup> The ideological goals of Constantine's work, in the context of the Hesychast-inspired *ispravlenie knjig*, have been addressed in a series of recent works; cf. Goldblatt 1984, 1987, Picchio 1975, 1980, Mathiesen 1984.

<sup>42</sup> On the concept of Church Slavonic norms based on exemplification, rather than codification (i.e., formulated as rules), see also Mathiesen 1984:52, 55; Picchio 1967 1533-4, 1982:370-1, 373 (“de jure” vs. “de facto” norms). In fact, this approach based on imitation, rather than analysis, is connected to more fundamental aspects of the medieval Orthodox, and especially Hesychast, ideology; cf. Mathiesen 1984, Goldblatt 1984, 1987, Picchio 1975, 1980:22-5.

<sup>43</sup> The third chapter of Constantine's treatise contains an emotional plea to his readers concerning the damage wrought by linguistic (actually orthographic) degradation upon the integrity of the word of God (cf. Jagić 1968:106-8). In fact, this theme is announced already in the title of Constantine's work: *skazanie izbjavljenno o pismeneh, kako drzhati se, da ne prëlōženiem sih rastlêvajutse bžstvnaa pisania* (Jagić 1968:99). Cf. also Ivić 1971:112, 114-5, as well as the references in notes 41 and 42.

The process of textual revision, then, would represent an attempt to restore the original purity of a text by reference to two distinct sources. The first would be the most authoritative available Slavonic texts (i.e. those which might be perceived as containing a clue to the original nature and distribution of such lost or corrupted distinctions or features). From this source would derive attempts to regulate such purely Slavonic features as the use of the front and back *jer* (in Serbia more properly the reintroduction and regulation of the use of the back *jer*), or the use of the letters for the original nasal vowels. We might refer to this domestic source of authority as the *venerable texts*, i.e. those retaining clues to the original purity (in the eyes of the grammarian, at least!). The second authoritative source was the language and values of universal (i.e. Greek) culture. From this source stem the seemingly ludicrous attempts to normalize the use of Greek breathing marks in Slavonic texts. The regulation of letter pairs (*antistoecha*: cf. Goldblatt 1984:75-77, Mathiesen 1984:59-62) for the sounds *i*, *o*, and perhaps also *u*, which already had a long Slavonic tradition, had both Slavonic and Greek sources.<sup>44</sup>

3.1. If we return now to the situation in Croatia, we will see that it is in most respects analogous to that in the Orthodox East, despite the differences in liturgy, cultural orientation (toward a different prestige language and culture), and sociolinguistic context (with CCS in competition with both Latin and more-or-less vernacular čakavian in texts of similar content).

To be sure, we have no treatises from the mature period of CCS or earlier containing explicit reference to the language as a regulated cultural institution. Nevertheless, it is beyond any doubt that the language was intentionally regulated,<sup>45</sup> and it is also safe to assume that a (if not *the*) primary concern of scribes must have been the efficient transmission of texts both into and within CCS, just as in the East, all the more so because of the relative paucity of original CCS texts and textual genres (in relation to the situation in the Orthodox Slavonic lands), as well as the more pronounced liturgical orientation of the language. Just as in the East, then, we have one domestic source of authority (the most authoritative texts themselves), and one external source, in the language

<sup>44</sup> The concept of the dual source of authority for medieval Slavonic literacy is present as early as Jagić 1968:87 (reprinted from the 1896 edition); cf. also Ivić 1971:114, Goldblatt 1984:70, 80-85, 1987:22-23; Picchio 1984:11.

<sup>45</sup> On this conclusion recent scholarship seems to be in agreement. Cf. Tandarić's assertion that "Uprkos tome [i.e. the lack of grammars or discussions of the language, A.C.], liturgijske knjige pokazuju da se crkvenoslavenska norma čuvala na određenoj razini vrlo pomno," (1978:117) or Damjanović's to the effect that "Jedan i drugi [i.e. Latin and CCS, A.C.] čvrsto su normirani; oni koji se njima služe dobro znaju što se može, a što ne upotrijebiti, poznaju njihovu normu," (1984:15) while later in the same work (1984:185) he cites also Hamm's (1963) similar statement that the scribes of liturgical texts were well aware of "... što ide u književnu normu kojom su se služili, a što ne ide."



and values of the prestige (Latin) culture. Just as in the East, we can trace at least some of the effects of this dual source of authority. On the one hand we have the results of early efforts (probably dating from the middle of the thirteenth century, cf. Vajs 1903, Mareš 1985) to regulate the use of certain letters following the loss of phonological distinctions (e.g. <ı> : <a> for original *jer*, with <a> used in the monosyllabic forms *ta* (masc.) *sa* (masc.) *na* (conj.), and <ı> elsewhere; probably also the spelling of biblical names with <ê> rather than <e> in the stem-final syllable, as in *ijudêi-*, *moisêi-*, *galilêi-*, etc.). On the other hand, contemporary Latin texts had, to be sure, no diacritic "entourage" comparable to that of Greek. Nevertheless, we see clear evidence of an attempt to retain aspects of the Latin texts which were in fact foreign to traditional Church Slavonic (either in general, or in specific textual locuses). Typical examples include *vidit se* for Latin *videtur* (*stvari eže tebê dobro vidit se* 1 Samuel 1:23, *Fac quod bonum tibi videtur*,  $\rho\acute{o}\epsilon\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{o}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ ); *ot* + Gen. for expected *o* + Loc. (likely supported by čakavian usage,<sup>46</sup> but also by Latin *de* + ablative: *David bo glagolet ot nego* Acts 2:25 recension B of the breviary vs. *d(a)v(i)dъ bo g(lago)ljetъ o njemъ* Apostolus šišatovacensis (cf. Stefanović 1989), similar in recension A of the CCS breviary, but surprisingly *David enim dicit in eum*,  $\Delta\alpha\upsilon\iota\delta\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$ ); accusative subject of a subordinate participial clause or predicate adjective (though Greek also has similar constructions): *vêra tvoê spasenu te stvari* Luke 7:50, recension A of the CCS *Missale Plenum*, *Fides tua te salvam fecit*,  $\text{Ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε}$ ; cf. *vêra tvoja sp(a)setъ te* (Vukan), *vêra tvoê sp(a)setъ te* (Miroslav), *vêra tvoja sp(a)setъ te* (Banici).

3.2. The unwritten nature of the CCS norm inevitably conditioned contemporary attitudes toward variation within the language. Specifically, in the absence of an abstracted, synthesized codification of the norm, and given the axiomatic need to maintain the integrity of texts, at least one genre, more or less broadly defined, must have been set aside as "sacrosanct" or "exemplary" – i.e. exempt from any infiltration of vernacular or other features not felt to be properly a part of CCS. This exemplary genre would be felt to be the proper object of more rigorous control than that applied to other texts, and not only in the original process of composition or translation, but in copying as well. The freedom to depart from the norm in other genres would be based on the documentation and stabilization of that norm in the exemplary genre.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>46</sup> Rešetar (1898b:188) considered such instances in the vernacular lectionaries an Italian influence.

<sup>47</sup> A similar conclusion is implicit in Uspenskij's treatment of medieval East Slavic diglossia. It should be noted that Church Slavonic, as defined by him (i.e. limited to those genres or texts in which vernacularisms do not occur, except as sporadic "errors"; cf. 1976:94, 1984:373), is essentially comparable to my exemplary genre. His conclusion that Church Slavonic is in principle immune to influences from the vernacular (in the period preceding the second South Slavic influence) is therefore analogous to my assertion that

As to the question of which texts would enter into the exemplary genre, and how broadly that genre should be defined, we can reach some preliminary, but by no means final, solutions at the present time. Evidence presented above from the lections of the breviary, including features which are virtually absent from the lections of the missal, suggests that the breviary was not, at least universally, perceived to be an exemplary manuscript genre. It would seem, then, that it is the missal, and especially the lections of the missal, which represented the exemplary genre of Croatian Church Slavonic literacy. We must reiterate the qualification, though, that it remains to be conclusively demonstrated that the remaining liturgical texts of the missal differ significantly from the lections in their language. Assuming a significant difference to exist, though, it would be the lections of the missal which represent in its purest possible form the norm of CCS, and thus should be taken as the basis for any synthetic description of CCS, or at least for the simplest possible description of the language.

One crucial corollary of defining the norms of CCS with reference to an exemplary textual genre (viz. the lections of the missal) concerns the interplay of CCS and vernacular elements which we have noted in the breviary. These vernacular forms must have been *perceived as deriving from outside the norm of CCS*, rather than from a stylistic layer within CCS in the strictest sense. This being said, there is no reason to deny the existence of styles or registers in which CCS would blend with specific vernacular (or, more generally, non-CCS) elements. These other ("impure") language varieties, however, would have a status different from that of exemplary CCS (i.e. CCS *sensu stricto*), would be less strictly controlled, and would therefore be more tolerant of variation deriving from individual proclivities and sensitivities. To the extent that certain consistent patterns of usage can be determined in the non-exemplary styles (genres),

there must be an exemplary genre in which importation of vernacularisms is in principle forbidden. The concept of an exemplary genre or set of genres is also probably implicit in Worth's assertion that Slavonic biblical and ecclesiastical texts were imported to Russia "as well- established forms, *with well-established functional styles ... (which) ... were very nearly immune to penetration by East Slavic elements ...*" (1984:244; emphasis mine, A.C.).

Picchio's "Liturgical (Church) Slavonic" vs. "Orthodox Slavonic" (1980:22, 32-3; 1982: 371-2) and Mathiesen's "Church Slavonic" vs. "Hybrid Slavonic" 1984: 47-8, 55) also represent similar concepts. The primary difference between them and my own formulation of the exemplary genre of CCS concerns the range of texts which are assumed to enter into the exemplary genre: I assume a narrower range.

The principle that a text or genre which establishes a linguistic norm must itself be largely exempt from stylistically-motivated deviations from that norm is invoked also by Kovtunova (1969:158-9 and *passim*) in her discussion of the development of word order in standard Russian. It is this principle which explains why the prose of Karamzin, in its role of *establishing* the norms of standard Russian, contains relatively few deviations from neutral word order.



we may prefer to speak of an “*usus*” or “*usus scribendi*”, rather than “norm”, the latter term being reserved for the standard of exemplary CCS.

We are thus forced to conclude (albeit tentatively) that CCS and the vernacular together functioned as a unique linguistic and sociolinguistic system, in which *elements of both subsystems could interact*, rather than being able only to be “borrowed” from one into the other. The situation would thus indeed be analogous to Uspenskij's diglossia of identity (“по принципу тождества”), rather than his diglossia of opposition, or functional diglossia (“по принципу противопоставления”, “в плане функциональной соотнесенности” 1976:96).<sup>48</sup> Exemplary CCS would also be analogous to Picchio's “Liturgical Slavonic” (as opposed to “Orthodox Slavonic”) or Mathiesen's “Church Slavonic” (as opposed to “Hybrid Slavonic”; see note 47), though it would most probably be drawn from a narrower range of genres or textual types.

It is thus its role as an exemplary genre which explains why the language of the missal, and specifically of the lections of the missal, remained so impervious to infiltration of vernacular features which had not been sanctioned by a conscious agreement in connection with some general textual revision process (vocalization, *ijudêi*, etc. in the mid-13th century) or the editing of a specific recension of one or both of the main liturgical books (*svêdêtel'* - *svêdok'*, probably also mid-13th century). Such an approach is nevertheless not without problems. One of the most important is that we have one manuscript of the missal (Hrv) which is intentionally vernacularized. Rather than abandon the concept of exemplary genre or its scope of application, it is preferable to see Hrv precisely as an exceptional case. There can be no doubt, after all, that this manuscript is unique among CCS liturgical manuscripts not only in its language, but also in ornament. With regard to the circumstances of its origin, it may actually be said to fall outside the typical cultural sphere of Glagolitic activity (esp. its connection to the Bosnian Hrvoje and the city of Split). It is not inconceivable that the ornamental exuberance of the manuscript was intended in part to legitimize it in light of its linguistic heterodoxy.

Another problem concerns the more extreme vernacularization which we observe in some breviaries (BrVat<sub>10</sub>, BrMav). Are we to group the language of these manuscripts together with that of the more typical (i.e. conservative) manuscripts of recension B, not to mention those of recension A? It may well turn out that the only CCS variety which allows a relatively simple delimitation is the exemplary style of the missal lections.

<sup>48</sup> This is not to say that I agree with Uspenskij's characterization of all nonexemplary genres as falling essentially within the realm of the vernacular, rather than Church Slavonic. It requires far less straining of the concept of vernacular Russian (or čakavian) to speak of Slavonic texts linguistically close to, but nevertheless outside of, the exemplary genres, than to speak of essentially vernacular texts, but with such a strong admixture of Slavonic elements that they seem much closer to true Church Slavonic than to the vernacular.

#### 4. Conclusion.

The definition of an exemplary genre has one further implication for the definition of CCS as a normative system. Since importation of vernacular čakavian features (that is, features so identified in the minds of users) was in principle prohibited, we would probably want to define the norm of the exemplary genre as monochromatic or nearly so, at least in regards to variation in this transversal direction. Our decision must depend on the status of such alternations as *svêdêtel'stvo* vs. *svêdoč'stvo*. Because of its fairly widespread appearance in at least the B recension of missal lections, we assume that the latter variant was not identified as an importation from the vernacular in the minds of users. However, if it was identified as an "original" CCS form but nevertheless in some sense "less formal" than *svêdêtel'stvo*, it is difficult for us to speak of an absolutely monochromatic norm. If, however, the two variants had come to be seen as stylistically identical, they do not contradict the idea of a monochromatic norm for the exemplary genre.

Though the norm of the exemplary genre was probably monochromatic or nearly so, there is no reason for us not to define CCS itself more broadly, so as to include the exemplary genre as well as other genres in which deviations from the CCS norm *sensu stricto* (i.e. that of the exemplary genre) would be acceptable or even desirable. In this case we could speak of a monochromatic *norm* for the exemplary genre of CCS, but a polychromatic *usus* for CCS defined more generally.

Finally, there is the question of just how the exemplary genre should be delimited. In this paper I have assumed that it comprises just the lections of the missal. Tandarić (1978:122-123) applied a concept similar to the exemplary genre to biblical and liturgical texts in general.<sup>49</sup> Other combinations are also possible. Clearly, a final determination will have to await the results of much future research.

<sup>49</sup> "...na kakvoj je građi naš glagoljaš naučio staroslavenski jezik? Najsigurniji odgovor...jest: naš se prevodilac u svom radu oslanjao na poznate mu biblijske i uopće liturgijske tekstove."



### References

- Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam. Nova editio. Logicis partitionibus aliisque subsidiis ornata a Alberto Colunga, O.P. et Laurentio Turrado. Quinta editio.* Madrid: Biblioteca de autores cristianos, 1977.
- BIRNBAUM, H. and M. S. FLIER, ed.  
1984: *Medieval Russian Culture*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London. (California Slavic Studies vol. 12)
- BOLONIĆ, M.  
1980: *Otok Krk: kolijevka glagoljice*. Zagreb.
- CORIN, A.  
1991: *The New York Missal: A Paleographic and Phonetic Analysis*. Columbus, Ohio.
- ĆOROVIĆ, V.  
1928: "Konstantin Filozof" in *Narodna enciklopedija srpsko-hrvatsko-slovenačka*. Zagreb, 1925-1929. II. knjiga. I-M, 369.
- DAMJANOVIĆ, S.  
1984: *Tragom jezika hrvatskih glagoljaša*. Zagreb.
- DEROSI, J.  
1978: "O normiranosti hrvatskoga književnog jezika u srednjem vijeku", *Filologija* 8: 81-87.
- DOGRAMADŽIEVA, E. and B. RAJKOV, ed.  
1981: *Банишко евангелие. Среднобългарски паметник от XIII век*. Sofia. (Banici)
- FERGUSON, C. A.  
1959: "Diglossia", *Word* 15: 325-40.
- FILIPOVIĆ, R.  
1971: *Kontakti jezika u teoriji i praksi: prinosi metodici nastave živih stranih jezika*. Zagreb.
- FUČIĆ, B.  
1982: *Glagoljski natpisi*. Zagreb.
- FUČAK, J.  
1975: *Šest stoljeća hrvatskoga lekcionara u sklopu jedanaest stoljeća hrvatskoga glagoljaštva*. Zagreb.
- GOLDBLATT, H.  
1984: "The Church Slavonic Language Question in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries: Constantine Kostenečki's *Skazanie izjavljénno o písmenex*", in Picchio and Goldblatt 1984, 67-98.

- 1987: *Orthography and Orthodoxy: Constantine Kostenečki's Treatise on the Letters (Skazanie izjavlenno o pismenex)*. Florence.
- GRABAR, B., A. NAZOR, M. PANTELIĆ, ed.  
 1973: *Missale Hervoiae Ducis Spalatensis Croatico-Glagoliticum*. Ed. Biserka Grabar, Anica Nazor, Marija Pantelić. Editor in Chief Vjekoslav Štefanić. Zagreb: Staroslavenski zavod; Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga; Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt. (Hrv)
- Greek New Testament*. On-line version by Linguist's Software, Inc. 1991.  
*Greek Old Testament (Septuagint)*. On-line version by Linguist's Software, Inc. 1991.
- GRICKAT, I.  
 1969: "Jezik književnosti i književni jezik", *Južnoslovenski filolog* 28, 1-2, pp. 1-36.
- HAMM, J.  
 1953: "Varijante u prijepisima hrvatskih glagoljaša", *Slovo* 2, 13-36.  
 1963: "Hrvatski tip staroslavenskog jezika", *Slovo* 13, 43-68.
- HERCIGONJA, E.  
 1971: "Društveni i gospodarski okviri hrvatskog glagoljaštva od 12. do polovine 16. stoljeća", *Croatica Godište* II, Svezak 2, 7-100.  
 1983: *Nad iskonom hrvatske knjige*. Zagreb.
- HRASTE, M.  
 1950: "Crtime o Marulićevoj čakavštini", in *Zbornik u proslavu petstogodišnjice rođenja Marka Marulića, 1450-1950*. Zagreb, pp. 243-277. (Djela JAZU. Knjiga 40.)
- HÜTTL-FOLTER, G.  
 1978: "Диглоссия в древней Руси", *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 24: 108-23.  
 1985: "The Lexical Heritage from the Old Russian Chronicles and the Formation of Literary Russian", in Stone and Worth 1985.
- ISSATSCHENKO, (=Isačenko) A. V.  
 1958: "Какова специфика литературного двуязычия в истории славянских народов", in "Материалы к IV Международному съезду славистов", *Вопросы языкознания* 1958, 3, p. 42-5.  
 1974: "Vorgeschichte und Entstehung der modernen russischen Schriftsprache", *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 37, 235-274.  
 1975: *Mythen und Tatsachen über die Entstehung der russischen Literatursprache*, Vienna (= Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 298. Band, 5. Abhandlung.  
 1978: "Когда сформировался русский литературный язык?", *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 24, 124-136.  
 1980: *Geschichte der russischen Sprache*. I. Band. *Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Heidelberg.



Ivić, P.

1971: *Srpski narod i njegov jezik*. Belgrade.

Jagič, V., ed.

1968: *Codex slovenicus rerum grammaticarum. Рассуждения южнославянской и русской старины о церковно-славянском языке*. Berlin, 1896. (Reprinted Munich, 1968 = *Slavische Propyläen* 25.)

Jelić, L.

1906: *Fontes historici liturgiae glagolito-romanae a XIII ad XIX saeculum*. Krk (Veglae).

Kandaurova, T. N.

1968: "Полногласная и неполногласная лексика в прямой речи летописи", *Памятники древнерусской письменности. Язык и тектология*. Moscow, 72-94.

Кеиперт, Н.

1985: "Old and New Problems of the Russian Literary Language (Arguments for a New Kind of Russian Linguistic History)", in Stone and Worth 1985, 215-224.

Kovtun, L. S.

1971: "Русские книжники XVI столетия о литературном языке своего времени", *Русский язык. Источники для его изучения*. Moscow.

Kovtunova, I. I.

1969: *Порядок слов в русском литературном языке XVIII - первой трети XIX в. Пути становления современной нормы*. Moscow.

Malić, D.

1973: "Šibenska molitva (filološka monografija)", *Rasprave Instituta za jezik* II, 81-190.

Mareš, F. W.

1985: "A Basic Reform of the Orthography at the Early Period of Croatian-Glagolitic Church Slavonic", in Stone and Worth 1985, 177-181.

MartinoF, P.

1858: *Les manuscrits slaves de la Bibliothèque impériale de Paris*. Paris.

Mathesius, V.

1932: "O požadavku stability ve spisovném jazyce", in Boh. Havránek and Miloš Weingart, ed., *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura*. Prague.

Mathiesen, R.

1984: "The Church Slavonic Language Question: An Overview (IX-XX Centuries)", in Picchio and Goldblatt 1984, 45-65.

Milčetić, I. and J. Milošević

1911: "Šibenska molitva. (XIV. vijek.)" in Milčetić, Ivan, *Hrvatska glagoljska bibliografija. I. Dio. Opisi rukopisa*. Zagreb, 1911, pp. 572-594.

Mladenov, S.

1979: *История на българския език*. Sofia. (Translation of 1929 German edition.)

NAZOR, A.

1963: "Jezični kriteriji pri određivanju donje granice crkvenoslavenskog jezika u hrvatskoglagoljskim tekstovima", *Slovo* 13, 68-86.

PANTELIĆ, M.

1965: "Glagoljski brevijar popa Mavra iz godine 1460.", *Slovo* 15-16, 94-149.

1967: "Prvotisak glagoljskog misala iz 1483. prema misalu kneza Novaka iz 1368.", *Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta* 6, 5-108.

1971: "Odras sredine u hrvatskoglagoljskim liturgijskim kodeksima 14. i 15. stoljeća", *Slovo* 21, 324-332.

PANTELIĆ, M. and A. NAZOR, ed.

1977: *Breviarium Novi II. Vollständige, verkleinerte Faksimile-Ausgabe der kroatisch-glagolitischen Handschrift aus dem Besitz des Archivs der Pfarre Novi Vinodol*. Kommentar Marija Pantelić - Anica Nazor. Graz.

PICCHIO, R

1967: "Slave ecclésiastique, slavons et rédactions", *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday, 11 October 1966*. Volume II. 1527-1544.

1975: "On Russian Humanism: the Philological Revival", *Slavia* 44, issue 2, pp. 161-171.

1980: "Church Slavonic", in Schenker and Stankiewicz 1980, 1-33.

1982: "On Church Slavonic Isonorms", *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 25-26, 367-378.

1984: "Guidelines for a Comparative Study of the Language Question among the Slavs", in Picchio and Goldblatt 1984, 1-42.

PICCHIO, R and H. GOLDBLATT

1984: *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question. Volume I. Church Slavonic - South Slavic - West Slavic*. New Haven.

REHDER, P.

1985: "The Concept of the Norm and the Literary Language Among the Glagoljaši", in Stone and Worth 1985, 183-191.

REŠETAR, M.

1898a: "Primorski lekcionari XV. vijeka", *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 134. (Razredi filologijsko-historijski i filozofijsko-juridički 49, 50.)

1898b: "Primorski lekcionari XV. vijeka. (Konac).", *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 136. (Razredi filologijsko-historijski i filozofijsko-juridički 50.)

REŽIĆ, K.

1981: "Problemi normalizacije hrvatskokrkvenoslavenskih složenica s početnim bez-, vz-, iz-, niz- and raz-", *Slovo* 31, 51-57.

RIBAROVA, Z.

1987: "Knjiga proroka Jone", *Slovo* 37, 123-159.



RODIĆ, N. and G. JOVANOVIĆ, ed.

1986: *Miroslavljevo jevanđelje. Kričičko izdanje*. Belgrade. (Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti. Institut za srpskohrvatski jezik. Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda. I odeljenje - Knjiga XXXIII.) (*Miroslav*)

SCHENKER, A. M. and E. STANKIEWICZ, ed.

1980: *The Slavic Literary Languages: Formation and Development*. New Haven. *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae*. Prague: Československá akademie věd. Slovansk'y ústav, 1958-. (ČAV)

STEFANOVIĆ, D. E., ed.

1989: *Apostolus šišatovacensis anni 1324*. Vienna. (AŠ)

STEVANOVIĆ, M.

1974: *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik. (Gramatički sistemi i književnojezička norma)*. II. *Sintaksa. Drugo izdanje*. Belgrade.

STONE, G. and D. WORTH, ed.

1985: *The Formation of the Slavonic Literary Languages. Proceedings of a Conference Held in Memory of Robert Auty and Anne Pennington at Oxford 6-11 July 1981*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc. (UCLA Slavic Studies Vol. 11).

ŠTEFANIĆ, V., ed.

1969: *Hrvatska književnost srednjega vijeka*, Zagreb.

ŠUPUK, A.

1957: *Šibenski glagoljski spomenici*. Zagreb.

ŠURMIN, D.

1898: *Hrvatski spomenici*. Sveska I. (*od godine 1100-1499*). Zagreb.

TADIN, M.

1954: "Recueil glagolitique croate de 1375", *Revue des études slaves* 31, 21-32.

TANDARIĆ, J.

1978: "Staroslavenski jezik hrvatskih glagoljaša", in *Prilozi*. Zagreb, pp. 115-124. (VIII međunarodni slavistički kongres. Zagreb, Ljubljana, 3-9. IX 1978.)

1983: "Crkvenoslavenska jezična norma u hrvatskoglagoljskom ritualu", *Slovo* 32-33, 53-83.

THOMAS, G.

1989: "The Role of Diglossia in the Development of the Slavonic Literary Languages", *Slavistična revija* 37 (273-282).

THOMAS, L. L.

1969: Introduction to Vinogradov 1969.

USPENSKIJ, B. A.

1976: "К вопросу о семантических взаимоотношениях системно противопоставленных церковнославянских и русских форм в истории русского языка", *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch*, 22: 92-100.

- 1983: *Языковая ситуация киевской Руси и ее значение для истории русского литературного языка*. Moscow.
- 1984: "The Language Situation and Linguistic Consciousness in Muscovite Rus': the Perception of Church Slavic and Russian" in Birnbaum and Flier, 1984, 365-385.
- VAJS, J.
- 1903: *Liber Iob. Ex breviario noviano II. transscriptum variis lectionibus aliorum codicum ornavit*. Veglae. (Glagolitica. Publicationes Palaeoslavicae academiae veglensis. Fasciculus 2.)
- 1910: *Nejstarši breviář hrvatsko-hlaholský (Prvý breviář vrbnický)*. Prague: Nákladem Král. české společnosti nauk.
- 1948: *Najstariji hrvatskoglagoljski misal, s bibliografskim opisima svih hrvatskoglagoljskih misala*. Zagreb: JAZU.
- VALJAVAC, M.
- 1892: *Koluničev zbornik. Hrvatski glagolski rukopis od godine 1486*. Zagreb. (Djela JAZU. Knjiga XII.)
- VINCE-MARINAC, J.
- 1987: "Iz morfologije crkvenoslavenskog jezika hrvatske redakcije", *Slovo* 37, 117-122.
- VINOGRADOV, V. V.
- 1969: *The History of the Russian Literary Language from the Seventeenth Century to the Nineteenth. A Condensed Adaptation into English with an Introduction by Lawrence L. Thomas*. Madison, Milwaukee, and London: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- VRANA, J., ed.
- 1967: *Vukanovo evandjelje*. Beograd: Naučno delo. (Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti. Posebna izdanja. Knjiga CDIV. Odeljenje literature i jezika, knjiga 18) (*Vukan*)
- WHITNEY, W. D.
- 1981: "On Mixture in Language", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 12, 5-26.
- WORTH, D. S.
- 1975: "Was there a 'Literary Language' in Kievan Rus'", *The Russian Review* 34, 1-9.
- 1978: "On Diglossia in Medieval Russia", *Die Welt der Slaven* 23, 371-93.
- 1983: *The Origins of Russian Grammar: Notes on the State of Russian Philology Before the Advent of Printed Grammars*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- 1984: "Toward a Social History of Russian", in Birnbaum and Flier 1984, 227-246.
- 1985: "Vernacular and Slavonic in Kievan Rus'", in Stone and Worth 1985, 233-241.



### Summary

On the basis of A. Issatschenko's definition of "literary language" and P. Rehder's recent explication of that definition with reference to medieval Croatia, the author concludes that Croatian Church Slavonic (CCS), neither by itself nor as part of a functional unity including also the čakavian dialect, texts composed in that dialect, and mixed čakavian-CCS texts, could be characterized as a literary language. Medieval Croatian literacy was based on the coexistence of two independent sociolinguistic systems. One was the "Latinic complex", based on Latin-čakavian bilingualism. Its most visible characteristics were the Latinic script and Latin liturgy. The second was the "Glagolitic complex", based on CCS-čakavian diglossia. The most visible features of this complex were the Glagolitic script and Slavonic liturgy. Croatian diglossia was probably of the type in which the High and Low variants represent not only a functional, but also a linguistic unity. In the absence of explicit codification (grammatical-orthographical manuals and/or polemics concerning the linguistic norm), the norm was established and maintained through the example of the most authoritative texts. In such a situation, one genre (or group of genres) had to be set apart as an exemplary genre, in which infiltration of non-normative elements was not allowed. Stylistically motivated deviation from the norm in other genres would be conditioned by the establishment and documentation of the norm in the exemplary genre. The author suggests as a working hypothesis that the exemplary genre of CCS consisted of the biblical lections (i.e. lectionary) of the missal.

## Sažetak

## VARIJACIJA I NORMA U HRVATSKOM CRKVENOSLAVENSKOM

Na temelju Isačenkove definicije književnoga jezika i Rehderova nedavna objašnjenja definicije u odnosu na srednjovjekovnu Hrvatsku, autor zaključuje da hrvatski crkvenoslavenski (HC), ni samostalno ni kao dio funkcionalnoga jedinstva koje uključuje i čakavski dijalekt, ne može biti određen kao književni jezik. Srednjovjekovna hrvatska književnost temeljila se na supostojanju dvaju neovisnih sociolingvističkih sustava. Jedan je bio "latinski kompleks", koji se temeljio na latinsko-čakavskoj dvojezičnosti (bilingvizmu). Njegovo najočitije svojstvo bilo je latinica i latinska liturgija. Drugi je "glagoljski kompleks", koji se temelji na HC-čakavskoj diglosiji. Najočitiya svojstva toga kompleksa bila su glagoljica i slavenska liturgija. Hrvatska diglosija vjerojatno je takva u kojoj visoka i niska varijanta pokazuju ne samo funkcionalno već i lingvističko jedinstvo. U nedostatku eksplicitne kodifikacije (gramatičko-ortografski priručnik i/ili polemike o lingvističkoj normi) norma je uspostavljena i održavana na primjeru najautoritativnijih tekstova. U tom slučaju, jedan žanr (ili skupina žanrova) morao se istaknuti kao primjerni žanr u kojem infiltracija nenormativnih elemenata nije dopuštena. Stilistički motivirano odstupanje od norme u drugim žanrovima bilo bi uvjetovano uspostavom dokumentacije norme u primjernom žanru. Autor predlaže radnu hipotezu da se primjerni žanr HC sastojao od biblijskih lekcija (tj. lekcionara) iz misala.

Izvorni znanstveni članak

Primljeno: 31. kolovoza 1992.

Autor: Andrew R. Corin

*University of California, Claremont*