ST. JEROME'S HOMILIES ON LUKE'S GOSPEL IN CROATIAN GLAGOLITIC BREVIARIES

Ana Mihaljević – Milan Mihaljević

Abstract: MIHALJEVIĆ, Ana – MIHALJEVIĆ, Milan. *St. Jerome's Homilies on Luke's Gospel in Croatian Glagolitic Breviaries.* Two St. Jerome's homilies on pericopes from the *Gospel according to Luke* occur in Croatian Glagolitic breviaries. The homily on L 11.4, which was read on the third Sunday in Lent, has been preserved in 19, and the homily on L 16.1, which was read on the eighth Sunday after Pentecost, in 22 breviaries. In some breviaries, the text is shorter and divided into lections differently than in others. In the paper, we will compare the texts from all breviaries, determine the differences between them, and describe the language of both homilies. We will also compare the Church Slavonic text with its Latin original, analyse the translation techniques, and try to determine when the text has been translated from Latin into Church Slavonic.

Keywords: *St. Jerome's homilies, Gospel according to Luke, Croatian Church Slavonic, Glagolitic breviaries, translation techniques*

Abstrakt: MIHALJEVIĆ, Ana – MIHALJEVIĆ, Milan. *Homílie sv. Hieronyma k Lukášovmu evanjeliu v chorvátskych hlaholských breviároch.* Dve homílie sv. Hieronyma k perikopám z Evanjelia podľa Lukáša sa vyskytujú v chorvátskych hlaholských breviároch. Homília L 11.4, ktorá bola čítaná na tretiu nedeľu počas pôstu, sa zachovala v 19 a homília k L 16.1, ktorá bola čítaná na ôsmu nedeľu po Turícach, v 22 breviároch. V niektorých breviároch je text kratší a rozdelený na čítania inak ako v ostatných. V štúdii porovnávame texty zo všetkých breviárov, určujeme rozdiely medzi nimi a popisujeme jazyk oboch homílií. Porovnávame tiež cirkevný slovanský text s jeho latinským originálom, analyzujeme prekladateľské techniky a snažíme sa určiť, kedy bol text preložený z latinčiny do cirkevnej slovančiny.

Kľúčové slová: *homílie sv. Hieronyma, Evanjelium podľa Lukáša, chorvátska cirkevná slovančina, hlaholské breviáre, prekladateľské techniky*

Introduction

St. Jerome has a special place in Croatian history and culture, and even more so in the Croatian Church Slavonic and Glagolitic heritage. For Croatian Glagolites, he was a Croat. They venerated him as the inventor of the Glagolitic script and as the translator of the Bible into the Croatian language. The earliest known source of this belief is the response of Innocent IV to the bishop Philip of Senj approving the Slavonic rite. Even though the belief had an obvious legendary origin it was widely preserved and lasted well into the modern period (cf. Verkholantsev 2014, 53). Some reflections of this legend appear even today.[1]

---

[1] For example Croatian daily newspaper *Večernji list* printed an article on February the 13th written by

Since St. Jerome died in the year 420, in the year 2020, the 1600th anniversary of his death, we will analyze the translations of his homilies on *Luke's Gospel* in the Croatian Glagolitic breviaries. In Croatian Glagolitic breviaries there are only two St. Jerome's homilies on *Luke's Gospel*. The first, which is a comment on Luke 11.14, was read on the third Sunday in Lent. It is originally St. Jerome's commentary on *Mathew's Gospel* (12.22-27).[2] It has been preserved in 19 breviaries, as shown in table 1.:[3]

L 11. 14	Vb_1	Vat_5	Pm	Pad	VO	Drag	Vb_3	Mosk	$Ber_{2/I}$
	118d–119d	87a–87c	85c–85d	124b–125b	185d–186d	71c–72b	112c–113c	85b–86a	116c–117c
Met	N_1	**Mav**	Vat_{19}	Vat_{10}	**Rom**	N_2	**Pt**	**Bar**	**Broz**
106d–107c	94b–94d	80a–80c	78c–78d	78d–79b	144r–144v	87a–87d	90c–91a	177a–177c	169a–169c

Table 1. Jerome's homilies on Luke 11.14 in Croatian Glagolitic breviaries

The second homily is a commentary on Luke 16.1. It was read on the eighth Sunday after Pentecost. The text is a part of the 6th chapter of St. Jerome's letter Nº 121a, addressed to Algasia. It has been preserved in 22 breviaries, as shown in table 2.

L 16.1	Vb_1	Vat_5	Vb_2	Pm	Pad	VO	Drag	Vb_3	Mosk	$Ber_{2/I}$	Met
	218c–219b	164b–164c	209b–210a	156c–157a	253b–253d	334d–335c	146c–147a	255d–256c	170c–171a	218c–219b	207d–208b
	N_1	**Mav**	Vat_{19}	**Brib**	Vat_{10}	**Rom**	**Dab**	N_2	**Pt**	**Bar**	**Broz**
	177c–178a	150b–150c	139b–139c	52b–52c	143c–143d	203r	64b–64c	181a–181c	157c–157d	262a–262c	254a–254c

Table 2. Jerome's homilies on Luke 16.1 in Croatian Glagolitic breviaries

However, in six of them the homily is wrongly ascribed to St. Gregory the Great (*Omiliê Grêgora papi*): Pm, Mosk, N_1, Rom, Brib, Dab. In Vat_{19} the Gospel pericope is falsely attributed to John instead of to Luke.

In this paper, we will compare the texts in all breviaries with one another, as well as with the Latin original and try to determine when these homilies were translated into Church Slavonic. We will also analyze the translation technique in order to determine how familiar the translator was with the Latin as well as the Church Slavonic language. We have chosen the text of Vb_1 as basic because it is the oldest, as well as the longest text preserved, and have compared it to the texts in other breviaries. All noted differences will be given in the critical apparatus.

Slobodan Prosperov Novak under the title: *Stvorio je glagoljicu kojom su pisali i puk i svećenici.* [He created the Glagolitic script, which was used by laymen and clergy.] (Prosperov Novak 2020, 30)

2 Cf. Hieronymus 1845, 79-80.

3 The list of sources with abbreviations will be given at the end of the paper.

Comparison of the Glagolitic texts

Although both texts in all codices are divided into three lessons, they differ in length. Nine breviaries have a shorter version of the first homily: in Rom the homily ends with the first sentence of the second lesson of Vb_1, in Vat_{19} one sentence before the end of the second lesson, in Pm, Vat_{10}, and Pt at the end of the second lesson, in Mav, Bar, and Broz after two sentences of the third lesson, and in Met in the middle of the third lesson.[4] Eleven breviaries have a shorter version of the second homily. Again, the shortest text is in Rom, after that in Vat_{19}, and then in Vat_{10}. In Rom the text comprises a little more than a half of the first lesson, in Vat_{19} it ends after the first sentence of the second lesson, in Vat_{10} it is one sentence longer than in Vat_{19}, while in Mav, Bar, and Broz it has two more sentences.[5] Pm and Pad contain the whole second lesson, in Met and Pt the text ends after the first sentence of the third lesson, while Brib does not have the last four sentences of the third lesson. In all the other breviaries the text is equally long as in Vb_1.

It was easy to see that the translation is the same in all of the codices. Textual differences between them are neither numerous nor significant. They are often restricted to a single source. Researchers traditionally divide Croatian Glagolitic liturgical codices into two groups (Tandarić 1993, 31-35). The codices of the northern (Krk-Istria) group are more conservative. They have preserved the older redaction from the 13th century, while the codices of the southern (Zadar-Krbava) group have the text of the younger redaction which was carried out in the 14th century. In the second group, we usually distinguish the subgroup that we call transitional and that consists mostly of texts from Vinodol and Gacka regions (Badurina Stipčević – Mihaljević – Šimić 2010). They usually have the younger variant of the text, but in some cases, they have preserved the older variant. Sometimes some of them have both variants. However, stemmatological relations between the preserved texts are very complicated, since the redactions are, as usual, mutually entangled.[6] We will illustrate this with three examples:

(1) Lat. *Tunc oblatus est Christi daemoniacus essens*
     tьgda *priveden'* bis(tь) i(su)su bêsni Vb_1 Pad VO Mav Vat_{19} / tagda *priveden'* bistь ka i(su)-su besni Vb_3 / i t'gda *prived(e)nь* bis(tь) k' i(su)su bêsni Met / tagda *privedenь* bi bês'ni Ber_2 tagda *prikazan'bê* bês'ni i(su)su · Pm / tagda *prikazanь* bis(tь) bêsni i(su)su · Vat_5 Drag / tagda *prikazanь* bê i(su)su bes'ni Rom Vat_{10} / tagda *prikazanь* i(su)su bis(tь) bês'ni Mosk / egda *prikazanь* bistь bêsni i(su)su N_1 / tьgda *prikazanь* bistь i(su)su bês'ni onь N_2 / tьgda *prik(a)-zanь* bis(tь) i(su)su Pt / tag'da *prikazanь* bist' bêsni i(su)su Bar Broz

(2) Lat. *opera Dei principii daemoniorum deputabant*
     dêla b(o)žiê · *dêla bêsnaê* mnêêhu Vb_1 Pad VO Rom / dêla božiê *dêla besnaê* mniêhu Vb_3 / dêla b(o)ž'ê *dala (!) besnaê* mnêêhu Met / dêla b(o)žiê · *d(ê)la bêsna* mniêhu Mav / dila b(o)žiê *dila bês'naê* mnahu Ber_2 / dêla b(o)žiê *dêla bêsna* mnêhu Bar Broz / mnêhu dela b(o)žiê *dela bês'na* Vat_{19}
     dêla b(o)žiê · *bêsnaê dêla* mnêahu Pm / dêla b(o)žiê *bêsnaê dêla* mnahu Drag / dêla b(o)žiê *bês'na dêla* m'nêhu Mosk / dêla b(o)žiê *bêsnaê dêla* mnêahu N_1 / dela božê *bês'na dela* m'nêhu Vat_{10} / dêla b(o)žiê *bês'na dela* m'nahu N_2 / d(ê)la b(o)žiê *besna d(ê)la* mn(êê)hu Pt / dêla b(o)žiê *bêsnaê* mnêahu Vat_5

---

4   With the sentence *sego r'di sudie v(a)mь bud(u)tь* (Lat. Ideo ipsi iudices vestri erunt.).
5   It is interesting to note that Mav, Bar, and Broz have in both cases equally long text, which is not surprising when we know that Mav was copied by young Blaž Baromić, who was later the editor of Bar, and that Broz is in fact only a slightly revised version of Bar.
6   Cf. Reinhart (1990, 204): »Da vom Abschreiben von mehr als einer Vorlage auszugehen ist, wie dies bei vielen ma. Hss. üblich war, kann kein 100%-iges Stemma erstellt werden«.

(3)   Lat. *super uno peccatore poenitentiam agente*
        o edinomь grêšnicê *tvoreĉem' pokoru* Vb_1 Pm Vb_2, Pad, VO / o ednomь grišnici *tvoreĉimь pokoru* Drag / o edinom' grêšnicê *tvoreĉêmь pokoru* Vb_3 / o edinomь gr(ê)šnicê *tvoreĉimь pokoru* N_1 / o ednomь gr(ê)šnici *tvoreĉ(e)mь pokoru* Mav / o edinomь grêšnicê *tvoreĉimь pokoru* Ber_2 N_2 / o ednomь grešnici *tvoreĉimь pokoru* Vat_{10} / o edinomь grêšnici *tvoreĉimь pokoru* Pt o ednomь grêšnici *tvoreĉemь pokoru* Bar Broz
        o edinomь grêšnicê *kaûĉem se* Vat_5 / o edinomь g'rêšnici *kaûĉem se* Mosk / o edinom' grišnici *kaûĉim se* Met
        o edinomь grêš'nice *kaûĉem' se tvoreĉimь pokoru* Dab / o edinomь g'reš'nice *kaûĉim' se tvoreĉimь pokoru* Brib

Therefore, it is not possible to divide the codices into three clearly distinct groups. As can be seen, sometimes the codices which are usually classified as southern, such as Pm and Drag, have the same reading as the northern group. Similarly, the younger codices from the northern group have sometimes the same reading as the representative codices of the southern group, for example Met. In spite of that, we can clearly distinguish the older redaction from the younger one. The older codices from Krk (Vb_1, Pad, Vb_2 and VO) have almost always the same reading, which we can consider to be older. The same is true for Vat_5, Mosk, and Pt, which are considered to be typical representatives of the southern group. N_1, Vat_{10}, Dab, Brib, and N_2, which are usually regarded as the members of the transitional group, behave as expected. Sometimes they have the older reading,[7] and sometimes both readings, as is the case with Dab and Brib in (3).

Since the *First Vrbnik Breviary* was written at the beginning of the 14th century, or perhaps even at the end of the 13th century, Jerome's homilies could not be translated later than that date. However, the texts of homilies in this breviary contain some errors which can best be explained if we assume that they have been copied from an older Glagolitic protograph. For example, the occurrence of *meždû* ***ioboû*** instead of *meždû* ***soboû*** (for Latin *inter se*) can best be explained by the misreading of the Glagolitic letter Ⱄ (*s*) from the protograph as Ⰹ (*i*). The same is true for the use of the word *ili* 'or' instead of *iže* 'which' in the sentence ***ili*** *prizivaniem' imene božiê izgonahu bêsi* (for Latin ***qui*** *ad invocationem Dei eiciebant daemones*), which is evidently the result of the misreading of Ⱇ (*ž*) as ⰎⰋ (*l*). This means that we have to assume that Jerome's homilies have been translated even earlier, most probably immediately after the Franciscan reform of liturgical books and the formation of the plenary missal and breviary in the mid-13th century. This is confirmed by the occurrence of two coordinated absolute datives in the second homily which do not correspond to Latin absolute ablative.[8] These two examples show that, at the time of translation, this construction was still part of the translator's active knowledge, while according to Johannes Reinhart (1993, 121) it was obsolete after the 13th century. The fact that they could not have been translated even earlier, is testified by the occurrence of the absolute instrumental in (13a), which started to replace the absolute dative as a translation equivalent of the Latin absolute ablative in that century.

Relation to the Latin original

Both texts of St. Jerome's homilies on Luke's Gospel have been translated from Latin into Croatian Church Slavonic very faithfully, mostly a literal word-for-word translation. To show the relationship between the original and the translation we will look at the first sentences of both

---

[7]   For example, N_1, Vat_{10} and N_2 have in (1) and (2) the younger, and in (3) the older reading.
[8]   See paragraph *Absolute ablative*.

homilies. The beginning of the first homily is cited in (1). In the example, there is only one word that has no formal correspondent in the translation (*essens*), and all the other words have been translated in the exact order and by their prototypical equivalent. The situation is the same in the second homily. The beginning of the second homily is given in (4). Here, it is also visible that the text follows the Latin original faithfully and that the word order of the translation is the same as in the original. Same as in the first homily, there is also one word that has not been translated (*iniquitatis)*.

(4)   Lat. *Quis sit villicus iniquitatis, qui Domini voce laudatus est.*
        kto est' pristavnik̕ · iže g(ospod)nimь gl(a)s(o)mь hvalit' se.

The tendency of faithful translation is visible in the rest of the texts as well. The translator translates the words and structures by their prototypical formal correspondent or equivalent. There are, however, some Latin constructions and forms that do not have a formal correspondent in Croatian Church Slavonic. If there is no formal correspondent, the translators cannot translate the text word for word, so it is interesting to see how the translators translate these features. The translation solutions can show the level of translator's knowledge of both Latin as the source language as well as Croatian Church Slavonic as the target language, but it also reflects the concept of translation from Latin to Croatian Church Slavonic.[9] The translation technique can also indicate the period when the text was translated.

Word order

Word order mostly follows the word order of the Latin original in all breviaries as we have seen in (1) and (4). The deviations from Latin word order from the first homily are given in (5):

(5)   a. Lat. *sunt perpetratae*
        svr̕šena sut'
        b. Lat. *possessus a daemone*
        ot bêsa odr̕žimi
        c. Lat. *ut expulso daemone primum fidei lucem aspiciant*
        da iz̕gnanim̕ prêžde bêsom̕ · slêpi svêt' vidit'
        d. Lat. *sed cotidie completur in conversione credentium*
        to n(i)ne po vse dni v prêbivanie vêrnihь duh(o)vno isplьnaet se
        e. Lat. *Omne regnum divisum in se desolabitur*
        vsako c(êsa)rstvo samo v sebê razdêlaûĉei se zapustêet'
        f. Lat. *nec haberent in eo locum*
        i ne imêti vьčnut' mêsta v nem̕
        g. Lat. *quod recessio daemonum oboedientia sit in principem suum*
        êko otstupanie bêsov̕ posluhom̕ knezi ihь bilo bi

In (5a), (5d), and (5g) the verb is moved to the end of the sentence, which is considered to be the prototypical verbal position in Latin. The scribes often move the verb that is not at the end of the Latin sentence to the end of the Croatian Church Slavonic sentence. That can happen for two reasons. Either the scribes are under the influence of previous sentences where the verb was in fact

---

9   On translating from Latin into Croatian Church Slavonic see Mihaljević 2018 and Tandarić 1993.

at the end of the sentence and therefore unconsciously move the verb to the end, or they consider this position to be stylistically better and closer to the Latin norms, and therefore move the verb deliberately.[10] A similar thing happened with the position of prepositional phrase and the past passive participle in (5b) and (5e).

In the second homily, there are even less aberrations from the Latin word order. They are given in (6):

(6)   a. Lat. *quod appropinquantibus Salvatori publicanis, et peccatoribus*
        eže približaûĉim se mitarom' i grêšnikom' k' sp(a)sitelû
        b. Lat. *Frater quoque invidens senior*
        brat' ubo starêi zavidliv'

In both examples, the translator moved the words so the nouns would be closer to their attribute.

In (7), some scribes changed the word order without any evident reason.

(7)   Lat. *Ideo ipsi iudices vestri erunt.*
        sego radi sudie vaši budut' / sego radi sudie budutь v(a)mь N_1 sudie vaši sego radi budutь Ber_2

Adjusting to Latin original

In younger breviaries, the tendency to adjust the text to the Latin original is visible.[11] That is the reason why the homilies in the younger breviaries follow the Latin original more closely. The adjustment mostly happens at word order level as seen in (8)

(8)   a. Lat. *insignia daemonibus assignatis*
        skazaût se znameniê / z'nameniê s'kazuût' se N_2
        b. Lat. *divisum in se*
        samo v sebê razdêlaûĉei se / razdêlaûĉe se samo v sebê Pm
        c. Lat. *qui cordis videbat occulta*

---

[10] On similar actions in other bravieries see paragraph *Adjusting to Latin norms*.

[11] »Danas je među istraživačima hrvatskoga glagoljaštva općeprihvaćena činjenica da se hrvatskoglagoljski misali i brevijari dijele na dvije skupine, sjevernu ili krčko-istarsku i južnu ili zadarsko-krbavsku skupinu. Kodeksi prve skupine čuvaju obično stariju redakciju prijevoda i arhaičnije jezično stanje, a tekst kodeksa južne skupine ovisan je o latinskome tekstu misala i brevijara.« (Badurina Stipčević – Mihaljević – Šimić 2012, 261)
[Today it is an accepted fact among the researchers of Croatian Church Slavonic that Glagolitic missals and breviaries can be divided into two groups – the northern or the Krk-Istria group, and the southern or the Zadar-Krbava group. The first usually reflects the older redaction of the translation and its language is more archaic, while the southern group depends on the Latin original more closely.]
While analyzing the translations of the texts of St. Thomas Aquinas Kovačević, Mihaljević, and Sudec state:
»U odnosu na latinski izvornik stariji su prijevodi slobodniji i manje doslovni od mlađih kojima je vjernost predlošku sadržajno i strukturno mnogo veća.« (Kovačević – Mihaljević – Sudec 2010, 420)
[The older translations are less literal and more freely translated in comparison to the Latin original then the younger translations which follow the content and structure of the Latin original more closely.]

iže taina sr(ь)d(ь)cь vêdêše · / iže sr(ь)d(ь)c' tainaê viĵaše · Pm iže sr(ьdь)cь taina viĵaše ·
Vat$_5$ ižo (!) sr(ьd)c(e)mь taina viêše Drag iže sr(ь)d(ь)cь taina vižaše · N$_1$ iže srdacь videše
taini · Ber$_2$ iže srcem taina vižd(a)še Pt

d. Lat. *sic erit gaudium in caelo*
taka radosť esť anĵ(e)l(o)mь b(o)žimь / t(a)ko es(tь) radostь anĵ(e)lomь b(o)žimь Mosk /
taka estь r(a)d(o)sť anĵ(e)l(o)mь b(o)žimь Vat$_{19}$

In (8c), only Ber$_2$ follows the Latin word order faithfully, while some breviaries (Pm, Vat$_5$, Drag,
N$_1$, Pt) move the verb to the end of the sentence and change the order of *taina* and *sr(ь)d(ь)cь*.

In (9), in the Vb$_1$ the verb *scire* is not translated. In most breviaries that verb is translated as
vidêti/viditi, but in Bar and Broz it is translated as *znati*:

(9)   Lat. *cuius cum vellem scire rationem*
        hotêl bim' račun' kogo esť / hotêľ bim' vidêti račun' Pm / hoteľ bimь vidêti računь kogo
        estь Vb$_2$ / hotêľ bim' vidêti račun' gogo (!) esť VO / hotel bimь računь viditi kto estь Vat$_5$
        Mosk / hoteľ bimь vidêti računь koga estь Drag / hotel bimь viditi računь kogo estь Vb$_3$
        Met / hotel bimь viditi računь Rom / hotel bimь vidêti računь N$_1$ / hotêl bimь viditi računь
        kogo e(stь) Mav / hotêl bimь viditi računь kogo estь Vat$_{19}$ / hotiľ bimь računь viditi k'to
        e(stь) Brib / hoteľ bimь viditi računь koga e(stь) Vat$_{10}$ / hoteľ bimь viditi račun' Dab /
        hotêľ bimь vidêti računь koga e(stь) / Ber$_2$ / hotêľ bimь vidêti računь kogo e(stь) N$_2$ /
        hot(ê)l bim' znati računь koga e(stь) Bar Broz

In (10), some breviaries have literally translated the Latin text, while most breviaries and the basic
breviary translate the meaning, thus aberrating from the original word order.

(10)   Lat. *qui non habent opus poenitentia*
        ne trêbuût' pokaêniê / ne imutь dêlo pokore Drag Ber$_2$ Pt / ne tribuûtь delo pokore Vat$_{10}$ /
        ne trêbuûtь dêlo pokore Bar Broz

Adjusting to Latin norms

In some cases, the scribe changed the original text which mirrors the Latin original adjusting it
to what he probably regarded as the Latin norm. Therefore, he moved the verb to the end of the
sentence, as seen in (11).

(11)   a. Lat. *qui tanta signa faciebat esse filium Dei*
        êko tolika znameniê tvoraše s(i)nь b(o)ži / s(i)nь b(o)ži tvor(a)še Met
        b. Lat. *pax est hominum*
        mir' esť č(lovê)k(o)m' / mirь č(lovê)k(o)mь estь · Vat$_5$ Drag / mirь č(lovê)k(o)mь e(stь)
        Mosk N$_1$ N$_2$
        c. Lat. *quis sit villicus iniquitatis*
        kto esť pristavnik' / k'to pristavnikь e(stь) · Ber$_2$

In (12), the scribe changes the order of the noun and the noun in the genitive, which could also be
considered by the scribe to be the norm in Latin.

(12)   Lat. *Domini voce*
        g(ospod)nimь gl(a)s(o)mь / gl(a)s(o)mь g(ospod)nimь Vat₅ Drag Mosk Ber₂ Pt Bar Broz.

Absolute ablative

One of the problems when translating from Latin into Croatian Church Slavonic is how to translate the absolute ablative.[12] In these texts, the absolute ablative is mostly translated by the corresponding Croatian Church Slavonic construction of absolute instrumental, shown in (13a) and absolute dative, shown in (13b):

(13)   a. Lat. *expulso daemone*
        iz'gnanim' prêžde bêsom'
        b. Lat. *appropinquantibus Salvatori publicanis, et peccatoribus*
        približaûčim se mitarom' i grêšnikom' k' sp(a)sitelû

In some examples, however, absolute ablative is translated by a finite sentence as in (14) or as a participle form in the nominative as in (15):

(14)   Lat. *Cumque minor facultatibus perditis, egere coepisset, et comedere siliquas*
        i egda mьnši s(i)nь pogubi dostoênie · poče êsti koreniê
(15)   Lat. *Tullio interpretante*
        starêi tlьkuûĉe

In the Croatian Church Slavonic text, there is one example of two coordinated absolute datives although the corresponding Latin text does not have the absolute ablative but the noun and participle in the genitive, shown in (16).

(16)   Lat. *Tertiam quoque parabolam proposuit hominis habentis duos filios, et dividentis inter eos substantiam.*
        tretu ubo pritču priloži · č(lovê)ku imuĉu dva s(i)na · i razdêl'šumu meždû ima dostoênie imêniê

The initial hypothesis was that the translator translates under the influence of the original *Gospel* text, however, neither in the Latin nor in the Greek version of the *Gospel* can we find the equivalent construction, since both texts have a finite sentence, as shown in (17).

(17)   Lat. *Homo quidam habuit duos filios*
        Gr. ἄνθρωπός τις εἶχεν δύο υἱούς; L 15.11

This shows that the absolute dative was still used in the period when the text was translated, i.e. before the 14th century since this construction became obsolete after that period.[13] In this example, the present participle form *dividentis* was translated by the first active preterite participle: *razdêl'šumu* in the example where the participle is coordinated with another participle translated by the present participle. The translator interpreted the verb *divido* as a verb denoting a short term

---

[12]   On the translation of the absolute ablative see Mihaljević 2019a.
[13]   Reinhart 1993, 121.

activity and therefore does not translate it with a verb denoting a process but rather denoting something completed.

Accusative with infinitive

Another problem while translating from Latin into Croatian Church Slavonic is the translation of the Latin accusative with the infinitive construction. In (18), the translator does not translate the infinitive *esse* and just translates *filium Dei* as nominative.

(18) Lat. *qui tanta signa faciebat esse filium Dei*
      êko tolika znameniê tvoraše s(i)nь b(o)ži

In (19), the translator translates the Latin construction that does not include the verb *esse.* The construction is translated faithfully, only the Latin genitive noun *principii* is translated as an accusative form of the noun *dêla* because of the different government of verbs in Latin and Croatian Church Slavonic.

(19) Lat. *Pharisei vero opera Dei principii daemoniorum deputabant*
       parisêi vistinu i knezi dêla b(o)žiê · dêla bêsnaê mnêêhu

In (20), in the *First Vrbnik Breviary,* the Latin infinitive of the verb *to be* (*esse*) is translated by the participle of the verb *to have* (*imuĉe*) while some breviaries translate the infinitive by the participle of the verb *to be* (*suĉe*), which is closer to the Latin original and also shows adjustment to the Latin original in younger bravieries.

(20) Lat. *ut confiteantur Spiritus sancti esse opus*
      da isp(o)vêdahu d(u)ha s(ve)ta · sie dêlo imuĉe / suĉe Vat_5 Drag Mosk N_1 Ber_2

In the texts, there are no examples of Latin constructions nominative with the infinitive and periphrastic conjugations active and passive, which can pose a challenge while translating from Latin into Croatian Church Slavonic.

Verbal forms

Most verbal forms are translated by their formal correspondent. There are, however, some forms in Latin that do not have an equivalent form in Croatian Church Slavonic. The participial forms are mostly translated by their formal correspondent since Croatian Church Slavonic has a very developed participial system (active and passive participial present, first and second active participial preterite, passive participial preterite)[14]. The present participle is mostly translated by the active present participle, shown in (21).

(21) a. Lat. *tacentia*
      mlьčeĉa
      b. Lat. *iudicantes*
      sudeĉe

---

[14] Gadžijeva et al. 2014, 226-229, 247-250.

> c. Lat. *dicentes*
> g(lago)lûĉe
> d. Lat. *super uno peccatore poenitentiam agente*
> o edinomʼ grêšnicê kaûĉemʼ se
> e. Lat. *super uno peccatore poenitentiam agente*
> o edinomь grêšnicê tvoreĉemʼ pokoru
> f. Lat. *Quae est ergo parabola ad clementiam discipulos cohortantis?*
> êže estʼ pritʼča · kʼ m(i)l(o)srʼdiû ap(usto)li prizivaûĉe
> g. Lat. *homines ignorantes fraudulenta simulatione deludant*
> č(lovê)ki naznamenuûĉee hinʼboû lьsti smametь

There are two exceptions to this rule. The first exception is the form *sciens* which is translated by the first active preterite participle: *vidêvъ*. The forms *videns, sciens, audiens* are often translated in this way in Croatian Church Slavonic texts, probably due to the fact that they have the meaning similar to the English present perfect.[15] The second exception is cited in (16).

The perfect participle of the deponent verb in (22) is also translated by the first active preterite participle, which is the prototypical translation of this participle of deponent verbs.

(22)   Lat. *reversus ad patrem*
        vrativ se kь o(t)cu

The Latin word *invidens*, which can be both participle and adjective, is translated by the adjective *zavidliv*ʼ in (23).

(23)   Lat. *frater quoque invidens senior*
        bratʼ ubo starêi zavidlivʼ

There is one passive participle that has been translated by active participle of the reflexive verb in (24a). The same word is translated by its typical correspondent, a passive participle in (24b).

(24)   a. Lat. *divisum in se*
           samo v sebê razdêlaûĉei se
        b. Lat. *regnum contra se divisum*
           c(êsa)rstvo razdêleno protivu sebê

The Latin present infinitive is translated by the corresponding form of the present infinitive, but the translation of the perfect infinitive can present a problem for the translator, since there is no corresponding form in Croatian Church Slavonic. In (25), the perfect infinitive is translated by the present infinitive.

(25)   Lat. *debet iam mundi venisse consummatio*
        imatʼ ûže miru priti skončanie

The potential form of conjunctive present in (26a) is translated by the indicative present, while the conjunctive imperfect with irreal meaning is translated by the present of the verb *včeti* (an

---

auxiliary verb used to form future tense) and the infinitive of the verb *imêti* ('to have') in (26b). In the sentence (26a), the present participle of the verb *to be* (*suĉe*) is added.

(26)   a. Lat. *quare in me idem opus non eadem habeat et causam*
          počto vь mnê onožde dêlo suĉe · ne tužde imať stvar' ·
          b. Lat. *nec haberent in eo locum, adversariae potestates, quarum inter se bellum, pax est hominum*
          ne imêti vьčnuť mêsta v nem' protivne vlasti · ihže meždû ioboû (!) branie mir' esť č(lovê)-k(o)m' ·

Prepositional phrases

Most Latin prepositions are translated by their prototypical equivalents: *adversus* and *contra* by the preposition *protivu*, *inter* by *meždu/meždû*, *ex* and *a* by *ot*, *cum* by *s*. Prepositional phrases with *a* and *ad* are sometimes translated as nominal phrases without the preposition.

    One of the most well-known examples of the Latin and Italian influence on Croatian Church Slavonic and the older stages of Croatian as well as the Chakavian dialect is the occurrence of the preposition *otь* for introducing the topic of the speech. This phenomenon is shown in (26).

(26)   a. Lat. *quid potestis dicere de corporum sanitatibus*
          čto možeť reĉi ot têles' zdraviê
          b. Lat. *sin autem de apostolis dictum est*
          aĉe li že ot ap(usto)lь rečeno esť

The preposition *in* is mostly translated by its typical equivalents *vь* and *na*. The exception to this general rule is the occurrence of this preposition in the sentences where the expulsion of the demons is described. In these cases, this preposition is translated by the preposition *otь* in (27a), by the preposition *o* in (27b) or without the preposition in (27b) and (27c)

(27)   a. Lat. *Quod si expulsio daemonum inquit, in filiis vestris, Deo, non daemonibus deputatur*
          čto bo aĉe izgonû dêmuni · ot s(i)novь vašihь b(o)g(o)m' · a ne dêmunom' · skazaet se
          b. Lat. *et si ego in Beelzebul eicio daemones, filii vestri in quo eiciunt?*
          aĉe azь bel'zebulom' izgonû bêsi · a s(i)nove vaši o kom' izgonet'
          c. Lat. *quod recessio daemonum oboedientia sit in principem suum*
          êko otstupanie bêsov' posluhom' knezi ihь bilo bi

In the first homily, the preposition *ad* is mostly not translated. In the second homily, it is translated mostly by its prototypical equivalent *kь*.

    The preposition *super* is in the second homily translated by the preposition *o* shown in (28). In the (28b), the preposition *coram* is not translated. In (28a), *in caelo* is not translated but instead of it the translator gives the translation of the corresponding part in (28b).

(28)   a. Lat. *sic erit gaudium in caelo super uno peccatore poentitentiam agente*
          radosť esť anĵ(e)l(o)mь b(o)žimь · o edinom' grêšnicê kaûĉem' se
          b. Lat. *gaudium erit coram Angelis Dei super uno peccatore poentitentiam agente*
          radosť esť anĵ(e)l(o)mь b(o)žimь · o edinomь grêšnicê tvoreĉem' pokoru

Dependent clauses

While translating dependent sentences from Latin into Croatian Church Slavonic, the translators usually tried to translate the sentences without changing their structure.[16] That is, however, not always possible, and the two biggest problems are how to translate the conjunctive, which has no formal equivalent in Croatian Church Slavonic and how to translate certain conjunctions the meanings of which do not correspond with that of conjunctions in Croatian Church Slavonic.

The consecutive conjunction *ut* is translated by *êkože* in (29), which is more often used in comparative clauses as a typical equivalent of the comparative *ut,* probably because of the Latin *ita* that also often appears in comparative clauses. The conjunctive imperfect, which is sometimes translated by conditional in dependent clauses, is translated as aorist:

(29)   Lat. *et curavit eum, ita ut loqueretur et videret*
         i iscêli ego · tako êkože prog(lago)la i prozrê

In (30a), the conjunctive present is translated as the indicative present and in (30b) as the imperfect. The conjunction *ut* is translated as *da*, which is a typical consecutive conjunction.

(30)   a. Lat. *Quod et tunc quidem carnaliter factum est … ut expulso daemone primum fidei lucem aspiciant, deinde in laudes Dei tacentia prius ora laxentur*
         eže bo t'gda têlesno stvoreno est' ... da iz'gnanim' prêžde bêsom' · slêpi svêt' vidit' · potom že na hvalu b(o)žiû ml'čeĉa usta otvaraût se · i hvalet' b(og)a s priležaniem'.
         b. Lat. *Si exorcistas ... interrogatione prudenti, ut confiteantur Spiritus sancti esse opus.*
         iže stêšnaše v' uprošeni mudrost' · da isp(o)vêdahu d(u)ha s(ve)ta · sie dêlo imuĉe

Conjunctive imperfect in the final sentence is translated by conditional in (31a), and as present in (31b). In (31a) the conjunction *ut* is translated by its prototypical correspondent *da*. In (31b) the conjunction *ut* is translated as *da eda da*.

(31) a. Lat. *Quibus Dominus non ad dicta sed ad cogitata respondit, ut vel sic compellerentur credere potentiae eius*
         im'že g(ospod)ь ne sl(o)vesem' nь mislem' otveĉa · da eda da i tako svr'šil' bi e vêrovati vlastiû svoeû
         b. Lat. *quod appropinquantibus Salvatori publicanis, et peccatoribus, ut audirent eum*
         eže približaûĉim se mitarom' i grêšnikom' k' sp(a)sitelû · da poslušaût' ego

Real conditional clauses are mostly translated faithfully: indicative forms are mostly translated by their formal correspondent and the conjunction *si* is translated by the prototypical conditional conjunction *aĉe*, shown in (32)

(32)   a. Lat. *Si ergo sathanas pugnat contra se, et daemon inimicus est daemonis, debet iam mundi venisse consummatio*
         aĉe ubo sotona borit se protivu sebê · bês' bêsu neprietel' est' · i imat' ûže miru priti skončanie
         b. Lat. *Aliud est si membrorum quoque debilitates et spiritualium virtutum insignia daemonibus assignatis*

---

16   Cf. Mihaljević 2019b.

ino bo est' ače vь têlesnih' udêh' slabosti s'vsêma skazaût se znameniê

c. Lat. *et si ego in Beelzebul eicio daemones*
ače azь bel'zebulom' izgonû bêsi

d. Lat. *Si autem putatis, o scribae et pharisae*
ače že mnite o knižnici i parisêi

e. Lat. *Quod si expulsio daemonum inquit, in filiis vestris, Deo, non daemonibus deputatur*
čto bo ače izgonû dêmuni · ot s(i)novь vašihь b(o)g(o)m' · a ne dêmunom' · skazaet se

f. Lat. *Sin autem de apostolis dictum est, quod et magis intelligere debemus, ipsi erunt iudices eorum*
ače li že ot ap(usto)lь rečeno est' · eže i veče razumêti imamь · si budut' sudie ih'.

The conjunction *sin* is translated by typical conditional conjunction *ače* with the addition of the particle *li* in (32f).

In (33), the conditional clause is not translated literally.

(33)   Lat. *Si exorcistas, qui ad invocationem Dei eiciebant daemones, coarcat interrogatione prudenti*
ili prizivaniem' imene božiê izgonahu bêsi · iže stêšnaše v' uprošeni mudrost'

In (34), the translator translates the indicative forms in a real conditional sentence by conditional forms as if the sentence was potential. This happens probably because the translator wants to highlight the fact that he believes that the meaning of the sentence should only be a possibility and not a fact.

(34)   Lat. *Si sathanas sathanam eicit, adversus se divisus est.*
ače sotona sotonu izgonil' bi · protivu sebê razdêlen' bil' bi.

Relative clauses are mostly translated faithfully and the relative pronoun is mostly translated by the Croatian Church Slavonic relative pronoun *iže* in (35).

(35)   a. Lat. *Quod et tunc quidem carnaliter factum est*
eže bo t'gda têlesno stvoreno est'
b. Lat. *Quibus Dominus non ad dicta sed ad cogitata respondit*
im'že g(ospod)ь ne sl(o)vesem' nь mislem' otveča
c. Lat. *quarum inter se bellum, pax est hominum*
ihže meždû ioboû (!) branie mir' est' č(lovê)k(o)m'
d. Lat. *quas Dominus perpetravit.*
êže g(ospod)ь stvori
e. Lat. *Si exorcistas, qui ad invocationem Dei eiciebant daemones, coarcat interrogatione prudenti*
ili prizivaniem' imene božiê izgonahu bêsi · iže stêšnaše v' uprošeni mudrost'
f. Lat. *qui Domini voce laudatus est*
iže g(ospod)nimь gl(a)s(o)mь hvalit' se
g. Lat. *quae inventa pastoris humeris reportata est*
êže obrêtena pastirevom' ramomь prinesena est'
h. Lat. *qui non habent opus poenitentia*
iže ne trêbuût' pokaêniê

i. Lat. *qui nolebant recipere poenitentiam peccatorum, et Publicanorum salutem*
iže hotêhu priêti pokaênie

j. Lat. *qua parabola ad clementiam discipulos hortaretur*
êže k' m(i)l(o)sr'diû uč(e)n(i)k(o)mь ishoždaše · i drugimi sl(o)v(e)si

k. Lat. *qui non gubernationem villae, sed dispensationem universae domus ... significat*
iže ne udr'žaniem' sela · nь obaritelь vsego domu ... znamenuet se

l. Lat. *quae dominus possidet*
êže g(ospod)ь udrьžit'

m. Lat. *quod appropinquantibus Salvatori publicanis, et peccatoribus ... murmurabant Pharisaei et Scribaae*
eže približaûĉim se mitarom' i grêšnikom' k' sp(a)sitelû ... r'ptahu parisêi i knižnici g(lago)-lûĉe

n. Lat. *qui cordis videbat occulta*
iže taina sr(ь)d(ь)cь vêdêše · / iže sr(ь)d(ь)c' tainaê viĵaše · Pm iže sr(ьдь)cь taina viĵaše · Vat₅ ižo (!) sr(ьd)c(e)mь taina viêše Drag iže sr(ь)d(ь)cь taina viždaše · N₁ iže srdacь videše taini · Ber₂ iže srcem taina vižd(a)še Pt

o. Lat. *Sin autem de apostolis dictum est, quod et magis intelligere debemus*
aĉe li že ot ap(usto)lь rečeno est' · eže i veĉe razumêti imamь ·

In (35i), the original structure of the sentence is changed. The negative verb *nolebant* is translated by the positive verb *hotêhu*. This is probably a consequence of the translator not understanding the original. He probably believed that the penitence (*poenitentiam*) of the sinners (*peccatorum*) is something that should be excepted.

The relative pronoun used at the beginning of the sentence (36) is translated by the personal pronoun *on* ('he').

(36)   Lat. *Qui locutus est eis parabolam*
        on že reče imь pritču

There are two examples of the conjunction *unde* given in (37) translated as *otnûdêže*. From (37b) it is visible that the Xenophon's work *Oeconomicus* was not known to the Croatian Glagolites who misinterpreted the word *liber* meaning 'book' as the homonymic adjective *liber* meaning 'free'. The Glagolites translated the name Xenophon as *istočnik'* equivalent of the Latin word *fons*.

(37)   a. Lat. *unde et a villa villicus nomen accepit*
        otnûdêže ot sela ime priêt'· obaritelь
        b. Lat. *Unde, et οἰκονομικός Xenophontis pulcherrimus liber est*
        otnûdêže i obaritelь êko istočnik' prêkrasnêi svobodn' est'

There is one example of the relative clause with consecutive meaning given in (38). In this case the conjunctive present is translated by indicative imperfect and the conjunction *qui* has not been translated.

(38)   Lat. *Homo quidam erat dives, qui habeat villicum sive dispensatorem, hoc enim οἰκονόμος significat.*
        č(lovê)kь eter' b(o)gat' imêše pristavnika ili spьn'žatura se že ime znamenuet'

In (39), the first conjunctive imperfect is translated as imperfect and the second is not translated.

(39)   Lat. *qua parabola ad clementiam discipulos hortaretur, et aliis diceret verbis*
         êže kʼ m(i)l(o)srʼdiû uč(e)n(i)k(o)mь ishoždaše · i drugimi sl(o)v(e)si

This example is from the sentence that the translator probably did not understand as he considerably aberrates from the original in order to make the sentence as understandable as possible. This sentence is given in (40)

(40)   Lat. *Dicebat autem, inquit, et ad discipulos suos haud dubium, quin parabolam, sicut prius ad Scribas, et Pharisaeos: qua parabola ad clementiam discipulos hortaretur, et aliis diceret verbis*
         g(lago)lahu že nêci ot uč(e)n(i)kь ego · iže dvoêhu se ot pritče êkože prêžde kʼ knižnikomʼ i parisêomʼ g(lago)laše · êže kʼ m(i)l(o)srʼdiû uč(e)n(i)k(o)mь ishoždaše · i drugimi sl(o)v(e)si

There is one example in which the relative pronoun *qui* was translated by *êko*.

(41)   Lat. *qui tanta signa faciebat esse filium Dei*
         êko tolika znameniê tvoraše s(i)nь b(o)ži

The examples of comparative clauses are given in (42). In (42a) the translator did not translate the word *quomodo* by its formal correspondent, but chooses the typical comparative conjunction *êkože*, thereby showing that he understands the sentence well. The word *sic* is translated by its prototypical equivalent *tako*. In (42b) and (42c) the comparative conjunction *ut* is translated by the conjunction *da*, which shows that the translator recognised the type of the sentence. The conjunctive present in (42c) is translated by the present. The comparative clause in (42d) is from the *Our Father* prayer.

(42)   a. Lat. *sed quomodo concordia parva res crescunt, sic discordia maxime dilabuntur*
         êkože primireniemʼ male rêči večše rastutʼ · tako raznemireniemʼ malimʼ · večša raširaût se
         b. Lat. *Si autem putatis, o scribae et pharisae, quod recessio daemonum oboedientia sit in principem suum, ut homines ignorantes fraudulenta simulatione deludant*
         aĉe že mnite o knižnici i parisêi · êko otstupanie bêsovʼ posluhomʼ knezi ihь bilo bi da č(lovê)ki naznamenuûĉee hinʼboû lьsti smametь
         c. Lat. *ut in Oratione Dominica libera fronte poscatis*
         da v m(o)l(it)vi g(ospod)ni svobodnimʼ obrazomʼ vsprosite
         d. Lat. *Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.*
         otpusti namʼ dlʼgi naše · êkože i mi otpuĉaemʼ dlьžnikomʼ n(a)šimь

In (42b), the conjunction *quod* which introduces the declarative clause, typical for later stages of Latin, is translated by the conjunction *êko*, which is often an equivalent of the Latin *quia* and *quod*. The conjunctive present, not typical in these clauses, but used for expressing possibility, is translated by the conditional.

Temporal conjunction *dum* is translated with the prototypical temporal conjunction *egda* in (43), which is usually an equivalent of temporal *cum*

(43) Lat. *dum illi expulsionem daemonum Deo assignant*
egda onêhь izьgnanie bêsi znamenuet

The same Croatian Church Slavonic conjunction appears as a translation of *cum* in (44). The conjunctive pluperfect is translated by the aorist in (44a) and (44b), and the conjunctive imperfect by the conditional in (44c).

(44) a. Lat. *Aliam quoque parabolam decem drachmarum uniusque perditae, et repertae cum proposuisset*
drugu pritču reče im' · ot deseti dragam' · i edina pogibšaê · i tako zatvoreno egda priloži
b. Lat. *Cumque minor facultatibus perditis, egere coepisset, et comedere siliquas*
i egda mьnši s(i)nь pogubi dostoênie · poče êsti koreniê
c. Lat. *Cuius cum vellem scire rationem*
hotêl bim' račun' kogo est';

The conjunctive forms are translated by a corresponding indicative form. In (45) the conjunction *cum* has not been translated and the conjunctive imperfect is translated by the conditional, which is not typical for such clauses:

(45) Lat. *cuius cum vellem scire rationem*
hotêl bim' račun' kogo est'.

The causal conjunction *quia* is translated either by the causal conjunction *zane* as in (46) or by the conjunction *êko* as in (47), which can have different meanings including the causal meaning. The causal *quod* in (48) is translated by the typical causal conjunction *eže*. In that case the conjunctive perfect is translated with the imperfect.

(46) Lat. *quia frater eius mortuus fuerat, et revixit*
zane brat' ego mrьtv' bê i ožive · i zgibьl' bê i obrête se
(47) Lat. *quia sedebunt in duodecim soliis*
êko sedut' na dvoû na îte prêstolu.
(48) Lat. *patris voce correptus est, quod laetari debuerit, et gaudere*
očimь gl(a)s(o)mь karaet se · eže veseliti se imêše i radovati

Conjunctive forms in dependent questions in (49) are translated by the indicative present and their conjunctions are translated by their prototypical equivalents: *quis* as *kto* in (49a) and *de quo* as *ot kogo* in (49b).

(49) a. Lat. *quis sit villicus iniquitatis*
kto est' pristavnik'
b. Lat. *cum vellem scire rationem, et de quo fonte processerit*
hotêl bim' račun' kogo est' · i ot kogo istočnika ishodit'

There is one sentence translated with the conjunction *egda* that the translator probably did not understand, quoted as (50). He translates the conjunction *cur* as the temporal conjunction *egda* as if it were the conjunction *cum*. This is maybe due to the illegible handwriting of the Latin protograph.

(50) Lat. *Et cur esset proposita, statim intulit*
        i egda pololožena (!) bêše abie prinese û.

Conclusion

There are two St. Jerome's homilies on *Luke's Gospel* in Croatian Glagolitic breviaries: the homily on L 11.4 for the third Sunday in Lent and the homily on L 16.1 for the eighth Sunday after Pentecost. The first homily has been preserved in 19 and the latter in 22 breviaries. The texts differ in length and are differently divided into lessons. Both Jerome's homilies on *Luke's Gospel* were faithfully translated from Latin into Croatian Church Slavonic. The translation is mostly very faithful. There are some exceptions to that general rule. Texts sometimes differ in word order. These differences are mostly the result of some scribes' tendencies to either adjust the text to the Latin original or to what they consider to be the Latin norm. Younger texts adjust to the Latin original more often, so they follow the original even more closely.[17] The analysis of the translation technique shows that the translator mostly translates the Latin text following the usual translation norms. By translating the forms and constructions that have no formal correspondent in Croatian Church Slavonic, the translator shows that he knows the most common means of translating these features. In the second homily, there are some parts that the translator probably did not understand, such as (37b), (40), and (50). These cases show the translators' tendency to aberrate from the original in order to make the text more understandable.

   Due to the facts: 1. that in the texts the construction of absolute dative, that was obsolete after the 13th century, is attested, 2. that the oldest breviary in which the texts have been preserved is from the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th century, 3. that the errors in the oldest breviary attest that it was copied from an earlier Glagolitic protograph, we can conclude that the texts have been translated at the latest in the mid-13th century.

Sources

Bar – Baromić's breviary (printed), 1493.
Ber$_2$ – Second Beram (Ljubljana) breviary, 15th cen.
Brib – Bribir breviary, 1470.
Broz – Brozić's breviary (printed), 1561.
Dab – Dabar breviary, 1486.
Drag – Draguć breviary, 1407.
Mav – Priest Mavar's breviary, 1460.
Met – Breviary of the Metropolitan library, 1442.
Mosk – Moscow breviary, 1442–1443.
N$_1$ – First Novi breviary, 1459.

---

[17] One might think that this happens due to the fact that younger generations acquire different grammatical patterns than older generations, which is a known fact in bilingual communities visible when analyzing the grammar of children of bilingual parents (for example Lightfoot 1979, Bowern 2008) and that the grammar change proceeds via the stage of internal bilingualism (Kroch 1989, Fuß and Trips 2004), but since both Latin and Croatian Church Slavonic were not spoken vernacular languages (CCS has never been a spoken language and Latin was in this period considered to be only a language of Church, science, and art), we cannot apply the same model to this situation. This situation is more probably the result of different cultural circumstances.

N$_2$ – Second Novi breviary, 1495.
Pad – Padua breviary, 14th cen.
Pm – Pašman breviary, 14th cen.
Pt – The first edition of the breviary (printed), 1491.
Rom – Rome breviary *D-215*, 15th cen.
Vat$_5$ – Vatican breviary *Illirico 5*, 14th cen.
Vat$_{10}$ – Vatican breviary *Illirico 10*, 1485.
Vat$_{19}$ – Vatican breviary *Vat. Slav 19*, 1465.
Vb$_1$ – First Vrbnik breviary, 13th/14th cen.
Vb$_2$ – Second Vrbnik breviary, 14th cen.
Vb$_3$ – Third Vrbnik breviary, 15th cen.
VO – Breviary of Vid of Omišalj, 1396.

REFERENCES

Badurina Stipčević, Vesna – Mihaljević, Milan – Šimić, Marinka. 2012. Mjesto Dabarskoga brevijara među hrvatskoglagoljskim liturgijskim kodeksima. In. Gračanin, Hrvoje – Holjevac, Željko (eds.). *Gacka u srednjem vijeku*. Zagreb, 255-282.

Bowern, Claire. 2008. Syntactic Change and Syntactic Borrowing in Generative Grammar. In. Ferraresi, Gisella – Goldbach, Maria (eds.). Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction. Amsterdam – Philadelphia, 187-216.

Fuß, Eric – Trips, Carola. 2004. Introduction. In: Diachronic Clues in Synchronic Grammar. Amsterdam – Philadelphia, 1-30.

Gadžijeva, Sofija et al. 2014. Hrvatski crkvenoslavenski jezik. Zagreb.

Hieronymus 1845. S. Hieronymi Opera omnia. t. 7. Paris.

Kovačević, Ana – Mihaljević, Milan – Sudec, Sandra. 2010. Hrvatski crkvenoslavenski prijevod tekstova sv. Tome Akvinskoga. In Slovo 60, 359-476.

Kroch, Anthony. 1989. Reflexes of Grammar in Patterns of Language Change. In: Language Variation and Change 1, 199-244.

Lightfoot, David W. 1979. Principles of diachronic syntax. Cambridge – New York.

Mihaljević, Ana. 2018. Sintaksa hrvatskoglagoljskih tekstova prevedenih s latinskoga. Dissertation. University of Zagreb. Zagreb.

Mihaljević, Ana. 2019a. Prevođenje latinskoga ablativa apsolutnoga u hrvatskoglagoljskim tekstovima. In Fluminensia 31/1, 103-123.

Mihaljević, Ana. 2019b. Latinski utjecaji na sintaksu zavisnosloženih rečenica u hrvatskoglagoljskim tekstovima. In Rasprave 45/2, 571-600.

Mihaljević, Ana. 2020. Služba u čast sv. Tomi Becketu u hrvatskoglagoljskim brevijarima. In Slovo 70, 155-190.

Prosperov Novak, Slobodan. 2020. Sveti Jeronim. In Večernji list, the 13th of February 2020, 30-31.

Reinhart, Johannes. 1990. Eine Redaktion des kirchenslavischen Bibeltextes im Kroatien des 12. Jahrhunderts. In Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch 36, 193-241.

Reinhart, Johannes. 1993. Untersuchungen zur Syntax des Kroatisch-Kirchenslavischen. Das glagolitische Missale romanum. Habilitation thesis. University of Vienna. Vienna.

Tandarić, Josip Leonard. 1993. Hrvatskoglagoljska liturgijska književnost. Zagreb.

Verkholantsev, Julia. 2014. The Slavic Letters of St. Jerome. DeKalb.

SUMMARY: ST. JEROME›S HOMILIES ON LUKE'S GOSPEL IN CROATIAN GLAGOLITIC BREVIARIES. The aim of this study is to analyse the translations of Jerome's homilies on L 11.4 and L 16.1 in Croatian Glagolitic breviaries. The first homily has been preserved in 19 breviaries, and the second in 22 breviaries. Nine breviaries have a shorter version of the first homily and eleven breviaries have a shorter version of the second homily. The translation is the same in all codices. Textual differences between the breviaries are neither numerous nor significant. Stemmatological relations between the preserved texts are very complicated, since the redactions are mutually entangled. We can distinguish the northern group of codices from Krk (Vb$_1$, Pad, Vb$_2$ and VO), characterised by the older redaction, from the typical representatives of the southern, more innovative group (Vat$_5$, Mosk, and Pt). The transitional group (N$_1$, Vat$_{10}$, Dab, Brib, and N$_2$) sometimes has the older reading, sometimes the younger, and sometimes both readings. The errors in the oldest preserved text, from *First Vrbnik Breviary* (beginning of the 14th century), show that the texts have been copied from an older Glagolitic protograph. Both texts of St. Jerome's homilies on Luke's Gospel have been translated from Latin into Croatian Church Slavonic very faithfully. The homilies in younger breviaries follow the Latin original more closely. In some cases, the scribe had changed the original text, which mirrors the Latin original adjusting it to what he probably regarded as the Latin norm. The analysis of the translation technique shows that the translator mostly translated the Latin text following the usual translation norms. By translating the forms and constructions that have no formal correspondent in Croatian Church Slavonic, the translator showed that he was familiar with the most common means of translating these features. In the second homily, there are some parts that the translator probably did not understand. These cases show the translator's tendency to aberrate from the original in order to make the text more understandable. Due to the facts: 1. that in the texts the construction of absolute dative, which was obsolete after the 13th century, is attested, 2. that the oldest breviary in which the texts have been preserved is from the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th century, 3. that the errors in that breviary attest that it has been copied from an earlier Glagolitic protograph, we can conclude that the texts have been translated at the latest in mid-13th century, most probably immediately after the reform of liturgical books and the formation of the plenary missal and breviary.

research associate Ana Mihaljević, PhD
Old Church Slavonic Institute
Demetrova 11
10000 Zagreb
Croatia
amihaljevic@stin.hr

senior researcher Milan Mihaljević, PhD
Old Church Slavonic Institute
Demetrova 11
10000 Zagreb
Croatia
mihalj@stin.hr

Appendix / Prílohy

Texts[18]

I. L 11.14 (BrVb₁ 118d–119d)

[118d] om(i)liê s(ve)t(a)go[19] er(o)nima pr(o)zv(i)t(e)ra[20] ·[21] tьgda[22] priveden' bis(tь) i(su)su bêsni ·[23] slêpi[24] · i[25] nêmi[26] · i iscêli[27] ego[28] · tako êkože[29] prog(lago)la[30] i prozrê[31] · tri[32] znameniê vkupь[33] v' edinom'[34] č(lovê)cê[35] svr'šena[36] sut'[37] · slêpi[38] vidit'[39] · nêmi[40] g(lago)letь[41] · bêsni[42] ot bêsa[43]

---

[18] Texts are transliterated in accordance with recent publications of the Old Church Slavonic institute in Zagreb. We have transcribed the letter *jat* (Ѣ) as ê, the letter *šta* (Ⱋ) as ĉ, the letter *ju* (Ю) as û, and the *jer* letters *štapić* (Ⲓ) and *apostophe* (ʼ) as ь and ' respectively. The letter ĉ has most often the value of *[ć]*, but it can also represent the groups *[šć]*, *[šč]* or *[št]*; ê has the value of *[ě]* or *[ja]* (after a vowel); û is *[ju]*. All the other letters are transparent.

[19] s(ve)t(a)go] *om.* Vat₁₀

[20] pr(o)zv(i)t(e)ra] pr(e)zbit(e)ra Drag

[21] om(i)liê s(ve)t(a)go er(o)nima pr(o)zv(i)t(e)ra ·] eronima proz(vitera) Rom eronima N₁ eronima prozvi(tera) Ber₂ eron(i)ma prozv(itera) Bar Broz

[22] tьgda] tagda Mav Vat₁₉

[23] tьgda priveden' bis(tь) i(su)su bêsni ·] tagda prikazan' bê bês'ni i(su)su · Pm tagda prikazanь bis(tь) bêsni i(su)su · Vat₅ Drag tagda priveden' bistь ka i(su)su besni Vb₃ tagda prikazanь bê i(su)su bes'ni Rom Vat₁₀ i t'gda prived(e)nь bis(tь) k' i(su)su bêsni Met tagda prikazanь i(su)su bis(tь) bês'ni Mosk egda prikazanь bistь bêsni i(su)su N₁ tagda privedenь bi bês'ni Ber₂ tьgda prikazanь bistь i(su)su bês'ni onь N₂ tьgda prik(a)zanь bis(tь) i(su)su Pt tag'da prikazanь bist' bêsni i(su)su Bar Broz

[24] slêpi] slipi Drag Ber₂ Pt *praec.* i Vb₃ i slipi Rom Vat₁₀ i slêpi Met Mosk N₂ slêpь Bar Broz

[25] · i] *om.* Vat₁₉

[26] nêmi] nimi Pm Rom Ber₂ Pt i nimi i gluhi Vat₁₀ nimь Bar nemь Broz

[27] iscêli] isceli Vb₃ Met Vat₁₀ Ber₂ Pt

[28] ego] *add.* v' tь čas' Met i N₁

[29] êkože] êko Pm Drag Rom Mosk N₁ N₂ êk(o) Vat₅ Pt Bar Broz k(ako) Mav *om.* Vat₁₀ Ber₂

[30] prog(lago)la] *add.* nimi Pm Drag g(lago)la Rom Mosk Vat₁₀ Vat₁₉ progovori Mav progov(o)ri Broz

[31] prozrê] prozri Drag Vb₃ Rom Met Ber₂ Pt prozre Vat₁₀

[32] Tri] vêri Rom *add.* ubo Vat₁₀

[33] vkupь] kupno vkup Pad Vb₃ Met vkorь (!) Ber₂

[34] edinom'] eď'nomь Mosk ednomь N₂ Bar Broz

[35] č(lovê)cê] č(lovê)ci Pm Drag Vb₃ Met Mav Ber₂ Pt Bar Broz

[36] svr'šena] s'tvorena Vat₁₀ Pt

[37] svr'šena sut'] s'tvori N₂

[38] slêpi] slipi Vat₅ Drag Rom Met Vat₁₀ Ber₂ Bar Broz

[39] vidit'] videtь Drag Rom Mos

[40] nêmi] nimi Drag Vat₁₀ Ber₂ Pt Bar Broz

[41] g(lago)letь] g(lago)lûtь Rom Mosk govoritь Mav gov(o)ret Broz

[42] bêsni] besni Vb₃ Pt

[43] bêsa] besa Vat₁₉ Pt

odr'žimi izbavlaet se[44] ·[45] eže bo[46] t'gda[47] têlesno[48] stvoreno est'[49] g(ospode)mь · to n(i)ne po vse dni[50] v prêbivanie[51] vêrnihь[52] duh(o)vno[53] isplьnaet se[54] ~ **119a** da[55] iz'gnanim'[56] prêžde[57] bêsom'[58] · slêpi[59] svêt'[60] vidit'[61] ·[62] potom že[63] na[64] hvalu[65] b(o)žiû[66] mlьčeĉa[67] usta[68] otvaraût[69] se · i hvalet' b(og)a s priležaniem'[70] ·

---

[44] odr'žimi izbavlaet se] izb(a)vi se Pm Drag izbavi se Vat[5] održimi izb(a)vi se N[1] održimi izbavi se Pt *add.* sadê Vat[19]

[45] bêsni ot bêsa odr'žimi izbavlaet se ·] besni izb(a)vlaût se ot besa od'ržimi · Rom bêsni ot besa održimi iscelaet se · Met bêsni izb(a)vi se ot besa · održimi Mosk bes'ni održimi iz'bavlaet se ot besa Vat[10] bês'ni odr'žimi ot bêsa iz'bavlaet' se · N[2]

[46] bo] *om.* Rom Mosk Vat[10] N[2]

[47] t'gda] tagda Vat[5] Drag Vb[3] Rom Vat[10] Ber[2] Bar Broz egda N[2]

[48] têlesno] telesno Drag Vb[3] Rom Met Vat[10] Ber[2] N[2] Pt telesnê N[1]

[49] est'] *om.* Met

[50] po vse dni] *om.* Vat[19] *om.* po Ber[2]

[51] prêbivanie] prebivanie Pm Vat[5] Vb[3] Rom Met Mosk Vat[19] Vat[10] Ber[2] N[2] prebivanii N[1] Bar Broz prebiv'nie Mav prebivaniemь Pt

[52] vêrnihь] vernihь Vb[3] Rom Met N[1] Vat[19] Ber[2] N[2] ver'n(i)hь Mav

[53] duh(o)vno] d(u)h(o)vnê Pm N[1] d(u)h(o)v(ь)nь Rom Mosk duhovne Vat[10]

[54] isplьnaet se] isplnit se Vat[5] Vb[3] is'punaet' se Vat[10] is'plnit' se N[2]

[55] da] na Rom Ber[2] čteno drugo naPt

[56] iz'gnanim'] izagnanimь Vat[5] Rom N[2] Bar Broz izagnanim' Vb[3] izag'naniemь Mosk izagnan(i)m' N[1] iz'gn'nimь Mav izag'nanimь Vat[19] izignanimь Vat[10] izagnanie Ber[2]

[57] prêžde] prije Pm prie Drag Vb[3] Met prežde Rom Vat[10] Ber[2] prêe Mav prižde Pt priê Bar Broz

[58] bêsom'] besom' Vb[3] Met Ber[2] Pt

[59] slêpi] slipi Drag Vb[3] Vat[10] Ber[2]

[60] svêt'] svet' Vb[3] *om.* Mos

[61] vidit'] videtь Vat[5] Drag Ber[2]

[62] svêt' vidit' ·] viditь · s(vê)tь Pt

[63] že] *om.* Ber[2]

[64] na] nь Pm Rom Vat[10] n' Met

[65] hvalu] hv(a)li Drag

[66] hvalu b(o)žiû] hv(a)li b(o)žie N[1]

[67] mlьčeĉa] ml'čeĉaê Pm Drag Pt mlčeĉihь Vat[10]

[68] usta] ustь N[2]

[69] otvaraût] otvrzaûť Mos

[70] s priležaniem'] s prilež'niemь Mav s prilêžaniemь Bar Broz

I(su)sь že vidêvъ[71] mišleniê[72] ih' · reče[73] imъ ·[74] vsako[75] c(êsa)rstvo samo v sebê razdêlaûĉei[76] se[77] zapustêet'[78] · narodi[79] že vzboêše se · i[80] isp(o)vêdahu[81] i[82] ·[83] êko[84] tolika[85] znameniê tvoraše s(i)nъ b(o)ži[86] ·[87] parisêi[88] vistinu i knezi[89] dêla[90] b(o)žiê · dêla bêsnaê mnêêhu ~[91] im'že[92] g(ospod)ь ne sl(o)vesem' nъ[93] mislem'[94] otvеĉa[95] · da eda[96] da i[97] tako svr'šil'[98] bi e[99] vêrovati[100] vlastiû[101] svoeû[102]

---

71 vidêvъ] vidiv' Pm Vb₃ vidivъ Rom Vat₁₀ Ber₂ videvъ Mosk

72 mišleniê] mišlenê Met mišlenie Vat₁₀

73 reče] *praec.* i Rom N₁ Vat₁₀ Ber₂ Bar Broz

74 imъ ·] *finis* Rom nimъ · N₂

75 vsako] vsьko VO vs'ko Met vs(a)ko Mosk vs'koe Mav

76 razdêlaûĉei] razdêlaûĉe Vat₁₉

77 samo v sebê razdêlaûĉei se] razdêlaûĉe se samo v sebê Pm samo v sebê razdêl se Pad samo protivu sebê razdêlaûĉe se Vat₅ Mosk N₂ samo protivu sebê razdêlaûĉei se Drag Ber₂ samo v sebi razdilaûĉi se Vb₃ sami (!) v sebi razdêlaûĉ se Met samo protivu s(e)bê razdêlaûĉei se N₁ samo v sebê razdêlaûĉ' se Mav samo protivь sebi razdêlaûĉe se Vat₁₀ samo protivu sebi razd(ê)laûĉei se Pt samo protivu s(e)bê razdêlaûĉe se Bar Broz

78 zapustêet'] zapustietь Drag Ber₂ z'pustêetь Mav zapusteetь Vat₁₀

79 narodi] n'rodi Mav

80 i] *om.* Vat₁₀

81 isp(o)vêdahu] is'povedahu N₂ Pt

82 i] *om.* N₁ *add.* s(i)na božiê Vat₁₉

83 i isp(o)vêdahu i ·] *om.* Mav

84 êko] zane Vat₁₉ ere Vat₁₀

85 tolika] velika Pm Drag veliê N₁

86 b(o)ži] božji Vb₃ b(o)žii Vat₁₀

87 tvoraše s(i)nъ b(o)ži ·] s(i)nъ b(o)ži tvor(a)še Met tvor'še s(i)nъ b(o)ži · Mav tvoraše · Vat₁₉

88 parisêi] *add.* že Pm Vat₁₉ N₂ pariseĵi Vb₃ parisei Met Mosk Vat₁₀ Ber₂ p(a)risei Pt

89 knezi] kneza N₁ *add.* ihъ mnêhu Vat₁₉

90 dêla] dela Vat₁₉ Vat₁₀ dila Ber₂

91 dêla bêsnaê mnêêhu ~] bêsnaê dêla mnêahu ∴ Pm bêsnaê mnêahu · Vat₅ bêsnaê dêla mnahu · Drag dêla besnaê mnêêhu · Vb₃ dala (!) besnaê mnêêhu · Met bês'na dêla m'nêhu · Mosk bêsnaê dêla mnêahu · N₁ d(ê)la bêsna mniêhu Mav dela bês'na Vat₁₉ bês'na dela m'nêhu Vat₁₀ dila bês'naê mnahu Ber₂ bês'na dela m'nahu N₂ besna d(ê)la mn(êê)hu Pt dêla bêsna mnêhu · Bar Broz

92 im'že] ihže Vat₁₉ kêmъ Broz

93 nъ] na Pad VO Vat₅ Drag Vb₃ Mosk N₁ Vat₁₉ Ber₂ N₂ Pt Bar Broz

94 mislem'] mislêmъ Drag Ber₂ s'mis'lomъ Mosk misliû Vat₁₀

95 otvеĉa] otvêĉa N₁

96 da eda] *om.* Met eda Bar Broz

97 i] *om.* Vat₅

98 svr'šil'] svršili Vat₅ stvoril Met N₁

99 e] i Vat₁₀

100 vêrovati] verovati Drag Vb₃ Mosk Vat₁₀ Ber₂ N₂ verov'ti Met verota (!) N₁ vêrov'ti Mav verov(a)ti Pt

101 vlastiû] vl'stiû Mav

102 svoeû] ego Pm Vat₅ Drag N₁ Ber₂ Pt Bar Broz

· iže taina sr(ь)d(ь)cь vêdêše[103] ·[104] aĉe[105] sotona sotonu izgoniľ bi[106] · protivu[107] sebê[108] razdêlen'[109] biľ bi ·[110] kako[111] stalo[112] **119b** bi c(êsa)rstvo ego ·[113]

Ne možeť[114] graď i c(êsa)rstvo razdêleno[115] protivu sebê[116] stoêti[117] · êkože[118] primireniem'[119] male rêči[120] večše[121] rastuť[122] · tako[123] raznemireniem'[124] malim' ·[125] večša[126] raširaût se[127] ~ aĉe[128] ubo sotona[129] borit se protivu sebê[130] · bês' bêsu[131] npriêteľ esť · i[132] imať ûže[133] miru[134] priti skončanie[135] · i ne imêti[136] vьčnuť[137] mêsta[138] v nem' protivne[139] vlasti · ihže[140] meždû[141] ioboû (!)[142]

---

[103] vêdêše] vidiše Vb₃ viêše Bar

[104] iže taina sr(ь)d(ь)cь vêdêše ·] iže sr(ь)d(ь)c' tainaê vijaše · Pm iže sr(ьdь)cь taina vijaše · Vat₅ ižo (!) sr(ьd)-c(e)mь taina viêše Drag iže taina srdacь viêše Met taina sr'dacь vidêše Mosk iže sr(ь)d(ь)cь taina viždaše · N₁ ki taina sr'd(ь)cь vid(ê)še Mav *finis* Vat₁₉ ki taina srdacь vidêše Vat₁₀ iže srdacь vidêše taini · Ber₂ iže taina sr(ьd)ca viêše N₂ iže srcem taina vižd(a)še Pt ki taina sьrd(ь)cь viêše Broz

[105] aĉe] čti ako Mav ako Vat₁₀ Broz

[106] izgoniľ bi] izьgnaľ bi VO

[107] protivu] *praec.* i Vb₃ proti Vat₁₀

[108] sebê] sebi Pm Drag Vb₃ Met Pt sebe Vat₁₀ Ber₂

[109] razdêlen'] razdilenь Pm Vb₃ razdelen' Met r'zdêlenь Mav razdrušenь Vat₁₀ raz'delenь Ber₂ razdilen Pt

[110] protivu sebê razdêlen' biľ bi ·] *om.* Mos

[111] kako] *praec.* to Vb₃ k(ako) Mav

[112] stalo] ostalo Ber₂ N₂

[113] *finis* Pm Vat₁₀ Pt

[114] Ne možeť] ne moreть Mav

[115] razdêleno] razdelêno Ber₂

[116] sebê] sebi Drag Vb₃ Met sêbê Ber₂

[117] stoêti] stati Mav Bar Broz

[118] êkože] êko N₁ kako Broz

[119] primireniem'] premereniemь Mosk premêreniemь N₁ primereniemь Ber₂

[120] male rêči] malo riči Drag male riči Vb₃ Ber₂ Bar Broz maže (!) riči Met male reči Mosk male riče Mav

[121] večše] vekša Vat₅ Drag Mosk N₁ N₂ vekše Mav Ber₂ Bar Broz

[122] rastuť] rastoiť (!) Met rastoiьь (!) Mav

[123] tako] k(a)ko Ber₂

[124] raznemireniem'] razmireniem Pad Drag Vb₃ Met Bar Broz razumêniemь Vat₅ r'zmêreniemь Mav raz'mireniemь Ber₂

[125] raznemireniem' malim' ·] raz'vê malihь Mosk razmêreniemь malêmь N₁ raz'vê malimь N₂

[126] večša] vekša Vat₅ Drag Mosk N₁ Mav Ber₂ N₂ Bar Broz

[127] raširaût se] rašširaût se Pad Vb₃ N₁ rasьširaût se Vat₅ razširaût se Met Mosk Bar Broz raz'širaûť se Mav N₂ raz'miraûť se Ber₂

[128] aĉe] ako Mav Broz

[129] sotona] *praec.* i Mos

[130] sebê] sebi Drag Vb₃ Met

[131] bês' bêsu] besi besu Met besь besu Ber₂ bêsьu (!)N₂

[132] i] *om.* Drag Mos

[133] ûže] *om.* VO ûre Mav Broz

[134] miru] meru (!) Mos

[135] skončanie] skončaniê Vat₅

[136] ne imêti] ne mêti VO ne imiti Drag ne meti Vb₃ ne imuť i (!) Met ne imeti Mosk ne imati Ber₂

[137] vьčnuť] vačnutь Vat₅ Vb₃ Mosk N₁ Ber₂ N₂

[138] mêsta] *om.* VO mesta Vb₃ Met Mav Ber₂ N₂

[139] protivne] protivnê Vat₅ protivnie Met N₁ N₂ Bar Broz

[140] ihže] kihь Mav kêhь Broz

[141] meždû] meû Vat₅ Drag Vb₃ Met Mosk N₁ Mav Ber₂ Bar Broz

[142] ioboû (!)] soboû Pad VO Vat₅ Drag Vb₃ Met Mosk N₁ Mav Ber₂ N₂ Bar Broz

branie[143] mir' est' č(lovê)k(o)m' ·[144] aĉe že[145] mnite o knižnici i parisêi[146] · êko otstupanie[147] bêsov'[148] posluhom'[149] knezi[150] ihь[151] bilo bi da č(lovê)ki[152] naznamenuûĉee[153] hin'boû[154] lьsti[155] smametь[156] · čto možet'[157] reĉi ot têl[119c]es'[158] zdraviê · êže[159] g(ospod)ь stvori ~ ino bo[160] est' aĉe vь[161] têlesnih'[162] udêh'[163] slabosti s'vsêma[164] skazaût[165] se znameniê ·[166] aĉe azь bel'zebulom'[167] izgonû[168] bêsi[169] · a[170] s(i)nove vaši o kom'[171] izgonet' · sego radi sudie[172] vaši[173] budut'[174] sinovь iûdêiskih'[175] ·[176] eže est'[177] ik'šor'čište[178] · lûdi onêh'[179] ot zakona znamenuet'[180] · ili[181] ap(usto)li[182] ot nih'[183] plemene roždenih'[184]

---

[143] branie] braniemь Vat₅ Mosk Bar Broz

[144] mir' est' č(lovê)k(o)m' ·] mirь č(lovê)k(o)mь estь · Vat₅ Drag mirь č(lovê)k(o)mь e(stь) Mosk N₁ N₂ *finis* Mav Bar Broz

[145] aĉe že] aĉe li Mos

[146] parisêi] parisei Vb₃ Met Mosk Ber₂

[147] otstupanie] otstunie (!) VO

[148] bêsov'] besov' Vb₃ Met Ber₂

[149] posluhom'] poslušahomь N₁

[150] knezi] kneza Pad VO Vat₅ Drag Vb₃ Met Mosk N₁ Ber₂ N₂

[151] ihь] *om.* Mos

[152] č(lovê)ki] č(lovê)ka Vat₅ Mosk N₂ č(lovê)ke Drag

[153] naznamenuûĉee] ne znaûĉee Pad VO Drag Vb₃ N₁ Ber₂ ne znaûĉe Vat₅ Met ne z'naûĉi N₂

[154] hin'boû] hin'bo (!) Drag

[155] lьsti] lasti Vat₅ Drag Vb₃ Met Mosk lasьti Ber₂ las'ti N₂

[156] smametь] smutet' Vb₃

[157] možet'] možete Pad VO Vat₅ Drag Vb₃ Met N₁ Ber₂

[158] têles'] telesь Drag Vb₃ Met Mosk Ber₂ N₂ tel(e)s' N₁

[159] êže] eže Met

[160] ino bo] ibo Mosk N₂

[161] vь] *om.* N₂

[162] têlesnih'] telesnihь Drag Vb₃ Met Mosk Ber₂ N₂ telesnêhь N₁

[163] udêh'] udehь Vat₅ N₁ Ber₂ udihь Drag

[164] s'vsêma] savsêma Vat₅ N₂ savsima Drag Vb₃ Ber₂ s'vsima Met sav'sema Mos

[165] skazaût] skazuût' Drag Mosk N₁ Ber₂

[166] skazaût se znameniê ·] z'nameniê s'kazuût' se N₂

[167] bel'zebulom'] belzebubomь N₁

[168] izgonû] izgonu Mosk Ber₂

[169] bêsi] besi Met Ber₂

[170] a] i Ber₂

[171] o kom'] kimь Vat₅ Drag N₂

[172] sudie] *praec.* si Vat₅ Drag N₁ N₂

[173] vaši] vam' Vb₃ v(a)mь Met Mosk vamь N₂

[174] *finis* Met

[175] iûdêiskih'] iûdeiskihь Vb₃

[176] sego radi sudie vaši budut' sinovь iûdêiskih' ·] sego radi sudie budutь v(a)mь s(i)nov› iûdêiskih› · N₁ sudie vaši sego radi budutь · sinovь iûdeiskihь · Ber₂

[177] est'] *om.* Ber₂ sutь N₂

[178] ik'šor'čište] ik'šor'ciste Pad Vat₅ N₁ Ber₂ ik'šur'ciste Drag ikšorčista Vb₃ ekšor'čis'te Mosk ekšor'cis'te N₂

[179] onêh'] onihь Vat₅ Drag Ber₂

[180] znamenuet'] zn(a)menûetь N₁

[181] ili] *om.* N₂

[182] ap(usto)li] ap(usto)le Vat₅ Drag Mosk N₁ N₂

[183] ot nih'] ot nihže N₁ ot onihь Ber₂ onihь N₂

[184] roždenih'] roĵenihь Vat₅ Mosk roenihь Drag Vb₃ N₁ roĵ(e)nihь Ber₂

· ili[185] prizivaniem'[186] imene božiê izgonahu bêsi[187] · iže stêšnaše[188] v'[189] uprošeni[190] mudrost'[191] ·[192] da isp(o)vêdahu[193] d(u)ha[194] s(ve)ta · sie[195] dêlo[196] imuče[197] ~[198] čto bo ače izgonû dêmuni[199] · ot s(i)novъ vašihъ b(o)g(o)m' · a ne dêmunom'[200] · skazaet[201] se · počto vъ[202] mnê onožde[203] dêlo[204] suče[205] · ne tužde[206] imat' stvar' · onizde[207] ubo sami sudie vam'[208] budut' · ne vlastiû · nъ[209] večšinoû[210] · egda onêhъ[211] izъgnanie[212] bêsi[213] znamenuet vi[214] belzebula[215] kneza bêsovъ[216] ~ ače li že ot ap(usto)

---

[185] ili] iže Pad VO Vat$_5$ Drag Vb$_3$ Mosk Ber$_2$ N$_2$

[186] prizivaniem'] prizvaniemь Vat$_5$

[187] bêsi] besi Vb$_3$

[188] stêšnaše] i stišnaše Drag *add.* e Mosk i stêšnaše e N$_1$ steš'naše Ber$_2$ s'teš'nahu e N$_2$

[189] v'] va Drag Vb$_3$ Mosk Ber$_2$

[190] uprošeni] oprošeni (!) Mosk uprošenii N$_1$ Ber$_2$

[191] mudrost'] mudromь Vat$_5$ Drag Mosk N$_1$

[192] v' uprošeni mudrost' ·] v'prošeniemь muď ros'ti N$_2$

[193] isp(o)vêdahu] is'povedahu Ber$_2$ N$_2$

[194] d(u)ha] d(u)hь Drag *om.* Mos

[195] sie] *praec.* i Ber$_2$

[196] dêlo] delo Mosk Ber$_2$

[197] imuče] suče Vat$_5$ Drag Mosk N$_1$ Ber$_2$

[198] d(u)ha s(ve)ta · sie dêlo imuče ~] s(ve)to sie delo suče · N$_2$

[199] izgonû dêmuni] izgonu dimuni Drag izgonû demuni Ber$_2$

[200] dêmunom'] dimunomь Drag demunomь Mosk edinomь Ber$_2$

[201] skazaet] skazueť Drag Mosk N$_1$ Ber$_2$ N$_2$

[202] vъ] va Drag Vb$_3$ Mosk Ber$_2$ N$_2$

[203] onožde] onoe Drag Vb$_3$ ono Mos

[204] dêlo] delo Ber$_2$ N$_2$

[205] suče] sučee Mos

[206] ne tužde] ne tue Vat$_5$ Drag onoe Mosk onuž'de N$_2$

[207] onizde] oniĵe Vat$_5$ onie Drag oni že Mosk Ber$_2$ N$_2$

[208] vam'] v(aš)i N$_1$

[209] nъ] na Vat$_5$ Drag Vb$_3$ Mosk N$_1$ Ber$_2$ N$_2$

[210] večšinoû] vekšinoû Vat$_5$ Drag Mosk N$_1$ Ber$_2$ N$_2$

[211] onêhъ] onihъ Vat$_5$ Drag Vb$_3$ Ber$_2$

[212] izъgnanie] izagnanie Vb$_3$ Mosk N$_1$ Ber$_2$ N$_2$

[213] bêsi] besi Vb$_3$

[214] vi] ti Drag *om.* Mos

[215] belzebula] velzebula Mosk belzebuba N$_1$

[216] bêsovъ] besov' Vb$_3$ Ber$_2$

lь[217] rečeno estʼ · eže[218] i veĉe[219] razumêti[220] imamь[221] · **119d** si budutʼ sudie ihʼ · êko sedutʼ[222] na dvoû na îte[223] prêstolu[224] · sudeĉe[225] ·bî·[226] kolênoma[227] iz(drai)l(e)voma[228] ~

Latin:

Tunc oblatus est Christi daemoniacus essens, caecus et mutus. Et curavit eum, ita ut loqueretur et videret. Tria signa simul in uno homine sunt perpetrata. Caecus videt, mutus loquitur, possessus a daemone liberatur. Quod et tunc quidem carnaliter factum est, sed cotidie completur in conversione credentium ut expulso daemone primum fidei lucem aspiciant, deinde in laudes Dei tacentia prius ora laxentur.

Iesus autem sciens cogitationes eorum, dixit eis. Omne regnum divisum in se desolabitur. Turbe stupebant et confitebantur eum, qui tanta signa faciebat esse filium Dei. Pharisei vero opera Dei principii daemoniorum deputabant. Quibus Dominus non ad dicta sed ad cogitata respondit, ut vel sic compellerentur credere potentiae eius qui cordis videbat occulta. Si sathanas sathanam eicit, adversus se divisus est. Quomodo ergo stabit regnum eius.

Non potest civitas et regnum contra se divisum stare, sed quomodo concordia parva res crescunt, sic discordia maxime dilabuntur. Si ergo sathanas pugnat contra se, et daemon inimicus est daemonis, debet iam mundi venisse consummatio, nec haberent in eo locum, adversariae potestates, quarum inter se bellum, pax est hominum. Si autem putatis, o scribae et pharisae, quod recessio daemonum oboedientia sit in principem suum, ut homines ignorantes fraudulenta simulatione deludant, quid potestis dicere de corporum sanitatibus, quas Dominus perpetravit. Aliud est si membrorum quoque debilitates et spiritualium virtutum insignia daemonibus assignatis. Et si ego in Beelzebul eicio daemones, filii vestri in quo eiciunt? Ideo ipsi iudices vestri erunt. Filios Iudaeorum, vel exorcistas gentis illius, ex more significat, vel apostolos, ex eorum stirpe generatos. Si exorcistas, qui ad invocationem Dei eiciebant daemones, coarcat interrogatione prudenti, ut confiteantur Spiritus sancti esse opus. Quod si expulsio daemonum inquit, in filiis vestris, Deo, non daemonibus deputatur: quare in me idem opus non eadem habeat et causam? Ergo ipsi iudices vestri erunt, non potestate, sed comparatione: dum illi expulsionem daemonum Deo assignant, vos Beelzebub principi daemoniorum. Sin autem de apostolis dictum est, quod et magis intelligere debemus, ipsi erunt iudices eorum: quia sedebunt in duodecim soliis, iiudicantes duodecim tribus Israel.

---

[217] ot ap(usto)lь] ot ap(usto)l(o)vь Drag

[218] eže] iže Ber₂

[219] i veĉe] vekʼše Mosk N₂ veĉe N₁

[220] razumêti] razumiti Vb₃ Ber₂ razumêvati Mos

[221] imamь] imamo Vat₅ Drag Mosk N₂

[222] sedutʼ] suditь (!) Mosk sêdutь N₁

[223] na dvoû na îte] na dvoû na desete Pad na dvêû na sete VO na dvêû na deste Vat₅ Mosk N₁ na dʼvoû na deste Drag na dvoû na dêsete Vb₃ na dviû na desete Ber₂ na ·bï· N₂

[224] prêstolu] prêstolû Drag prestolu Vb₃ Mosk Ber₂ N₂

[225] sudeĉe] sudêĉe Vb₃

[226] ·bî·] obêma na desete Pad obêma na dete (!) VO dvêma na deste Vat₅ ·bï· Drag N₂ obima na desete Vb₃ obema na desʼte Mosk bï·te N₁ dvima na desete Ber₂

[227] kolênoma] kolêma (!) VO kolenoma Vb₃ Mosk N₁ Ber₂ N₂

[228] iz(drai)l(e)voma] iz(drai)l(e)vima Vat₅ Drag Mosk Ber₂

II. L 16.1 (BrVb$_1$ 211d–212b)

211d om(iliê) s(veta)go[229] er(o)n(i)m(a)[230] prozv(i)t(e)ra ·[231] Raspačatelno estʼ ·[232] kto estʼ[233] pristavnikʼ ·[234] iže[235] g(ospod)nimь gl(a)s(o)mь[236] hvalitʼ se · hotêl bimʼ računʼ kogo estʼ[237] · i ot kogo[238] istočnika ishoditʼ[239] prêobratiti[240] kn(i)gi[241] ev'nĵ(e)ľskie · i meždû[242] drugimi[243] obrêtaet[244] se[245] ·[246] eže[247] približaûĉim[248] se mitaromʼ[249] i grêšnikomʼ[250] kʼ sp(a)sitelû · da[251] poslušaûtʼ ego · rʼptahu[252] parisêi[253] i knižnici[254] g(lago)lûĉe[255] · počto[256] **212a** sa[257] grêšniki[258] priemletʼ · i êstʼ[259] s nimi[260] · on[261] že

---

[229] s(veta)go] *om.* Vat$_{10}$

[230] er(o)n(i)m(a)] er(o)lima Pt

[231] om(iliê) s(veta)go er(o)n(i)m(a) prozv(i)t(e)ra ·] *om.* Pm gr(ê)g(o)ra p(a)p(i) Rom om(iliê) s(veta)go grgura papi · Mosk o(miliê) s(veta)go gr(ê)gora p(a)p(i) · N$_1$ o(miliê) s(vetag)o gr(ê)g(o)ra p(a)p(i) · Brib om(i)l(iê) s(ve)t(a)go gr(ê)g(o)ra papi · čtê pra(vo) Dab om(i)liê s(veta)go eronima N$_2$

[232] Raspačatelno estʼ ·] Raspačanie sice priloži · Vat$_5$ Mosk Brib Raspačenice pripoložilъ estъ Drag Pt *add.* vidêti Vat$_{19}$ Rasʼpačanie pripoložilъ e(stъ) Vat$_{10}$ Bar Broz Raspačanice pripoložilъ estъ Ber$_2$

[233] kto estʼ] *om.* N$_1$ gdo e(stъ) Mav

[234] kto estʼ pristavnikʼ ·] kʼto pristavnikъ e(stъ) · Ber$_2$ kto e(s)t(ъ) protivъnikъ Pt *add.* nepr(a)vdni Bar Broz

[235] iže] ki Pm Vat$_5$ Mav Vat$_{10}$ Pt *om.* Bar

[236] g(ospod)nimь gl(a)s(o)mь] gl(a)s(o)mь g(ospod)nimь Vat$_5$ Drag Mosk Ber$_2$ Pt Bar Broz

[237] hotêl bimʼ računʼ kogo estʼ] hotêlʼ bimʼ vidêti računʼ Pm hoteľ bimъ vidêti računь kogo estъ Vb$_2$ hotêľ bimʼ vidêti računʼ gogo (!) estʼ VO hotel bimъ računь viditi kto estъ Vat$_5$ Mosk hoteľ bimъ vidêti računь koga estъ Drag hotel bimъ viditi računь kogo estъ Vb$_3$ Met hotêl bimъ viditi računь Rom hotêl bimъ vidêti računь N$_1$ hotêl bimъ viditi računь kogo e(stъ) Mav hotêl bimъ viditi računь kogo estъ Vat$_{19}$ hotiľ bimъ računь viditi kʼto e(stъ) Brib hoteľ bimъ viditi računъ koga e(stъ) Vat$_{10}$ hoteľ bimʼ viditi računʼ Dab hotêľ bimъ vidêti računь koga e(stъ) Ber$_2$ hotêľ bimъ vidêti računь kogo e(stъ) N$_2$ hotil bimъ računь koga e(s)t(ъ) Pt hot(ê)l bimʼ znati računь koga e(stъ) Bar Broz

[238] i ot kogo] ot koga Pm Vat$_5$ Drag Rom Mosk N$_1$ Brib Dab Ber$_2$ i ot koga Vat$_{10}$ Pt Bar Broz

[239] ishoditʼ] ishoditi Vat$_5$ Mosk

[240] prêobratiti] prêobratihʼ Pm preobratiti Vat$_5$ Rom Met Mosk N$_1$ Mav Vat$_{10}$ N$_2$ Pt Bar preobraziti Vat$_{19}$ preobrati Brib priobratiti Ber$_2$

[241] kn(i)gi] *praec.* sie VO kʼnige Brib knige Dab

[242] meždû] meû Vb$_2$ Vat$_5$ Drag Vb$_3$ Rom Met Mosk N$_1$ Mav Vat$_{19}$ Brib Vat$_{10}$ Ber$_2$ N$_2$ Pt

[243] hotêl bimʼ … drugimi] *illegibile* Pad

[244] obrêtaet] obrêta Drag N$_1$ Ber$_2$ obretaet Vb$_3$ Met Brib N$_2$ obretae Rom obʼretaûtʼ Mos

[245] drugimi obrêtaet se] druzimi obrêtaemь Vat$_{19}$

[246] i meždû drugimi obrêtaet se ·] i meĵû drugimʼ obrêtʼ · Pm i meû druzimi nьhodi se Vat$_{10}$ i me (!) drugimi obretь Dab i meû druzimi obrêtaet se · Bar Broz

[247] eže] ča Vat$_{10}$

[248] približaûĉim] približaûĉem Pad

[249] mitaromʼ] mitaremʼ Pm Pad Vb$_2$ Vat$_5$ Mosk N$_1$ Brib Dab N$_2$ Pt mitʼremь Mav

[250] grêšnikomʼ] grišnikomь Drag Vb$_3$ Met grešnikomь Rom Brib Vat$_{10}$

[251] da] dʼ Mav

[252] rʼptahu] *add.* že Pm Vb$_2$ Vat$_5$ Vb$_3$ Met Mosk Brib *praec.* i N$_1$ Vat$_{19}$ Bar Broz

[253] parisêi] farisêi Pm pariseĵi Vb$_3$ parisei Rom Met Dab pʼrisêi Mav

[254] parisêi i knižnici] farizei i pisci Drag parisei i grêšnici Vat$_{10}$ parisêi i pisci Pt Bar Broz

[255] g(lago)lûĉe] govoreĉe Mav *om.* Brib g(lago)lûĉê Bar gov(o)reĉê Broz

[256] počto] <p>očto VO

[257] sa] sь Pad VO s N$_2$

[258] grêšniki] grešniki Vb$_3$ Vat$_{10}$ Dab grêšnike Rom grišniki Met grišnike Mos

[259] êstʼ] ĵistъ Drag ĵi Vat$_{10}$

[260] s nimi] š nimi Pm Vb$_2$ VO Vat$_5$ Drag Vb$_3$ Rom Met Mav Vat$_{10}$ Pt Bar Broz šʼ nimi Mosk N$_1$ Vat$_{19}$ Brib Dab Ber$_2$ N$_2$

[261] on] *praec.* ·čt(enie) · Pad <o>n VO

I[298] drugu pritču reče im'[299] · ot deseti[300] dragam' · i edina pogibšaê ·[301] i tako zatvoreno[302] egda[303] priloži[304] podob'stvo ee · bez'[305] isplъneniê[306] ~ tako[307] g(lago)lû[308] vam' radost' est'[309] anĵ(e)l(o)- mъ b(o)žimъ[310] · o edinomъ[311] grêšnicê[312] tvorećem'[313] pokoru ·[314] tretu[315] ubo[316] pritču priloži[317] · č(lovê)ku imuću dva s(i)na[318] · i razdêl'šumu[319] meždû[320] ima[321] dostoênie imêniê[322] ·[323] i[324] egda[325] mьnši[326] s(i)nъ[327] pogubi dostoênie[328] · poče[329] êsti[330] koreniê[331] svin'û[332] piću · i[333] vrativ se kъ o(t)-

---

Bar Broz

[298] I] *om.* Vat₅ Mosk Brib Dab

[299] im'] *om.* Vat₁₀

[300] deseti] ·î· Pm ·ï· Vat₅ Drag Mosk N₁ Mav Vat₁₉ Brib Vat₁₀ Dab Ber₂ Pt Bar Broz deset' Vb₃ desetъ Met ·ï·ti N₂

[301] i edina pogibšaê ·] i edinu pogibšuû · Vat₅ i edina pogibšiê Drag Pt i eďnu pogib'šuû Mosk i a· pogibšaê Mavi edina ot nihъ pogibšaê Brib i edna pogibšiê Bar Broz

[302] zatvoreno] zatvorena VO zatvorenê N₁ *add.* e(stъ) Vat₁₉ Dab

[303] egda] *om.* N₁ k'da Mav kada Vat₁₀ Broz

[304] priloži] *om.* Vat₁₀

[305] bez'] brezъ Drag prez' Vb₃ be Met brez' Ber₂

[306] *finis* Vat₁₉

[307] tako] <t>ako VO

[308] g(lago)lû] govoru Mav gov(o)ru Broz

[309] est'] budetъ Vat₅ *om.* Drag b(u)detъ Mos

[310] b(o)žimъ] božjimь Vb₃ b(o)žiimъ N₂

[311] o edinomъ] o dinomъ (!) VO

[312] o edinomъ grêšnicê] o ednomъ grišnici Drag o edinom' grišnici Met o edinomъ g'rêšnici Mosk o ednomъ gr(ê)šnici Mav o edinomъ g'reš'nice Brib o ednomъ grešnici Vat₁₀ o edinomъ grêš'nice Dab o edinomъ grêšnici Pt o ednomъ grêšnici Bar Broz

[313] tvorećem'] tvorećêmь Vb₃ tvorećimъ Drag N₁ Ber₂ N₂

[314] tvorećem' pokoru ·] *add.* t(i) že g(ospod)i ∴ čte(nie) ∴ Pm kaûćem se Vat₅ Mosk kaûčim se Met kaûčim' se tvorećimъ pokoru · Brib tvorećimъ pokoru *finis* Vat₁₀ kaûćem' se tvorećimъ pokoru Dab

[315] tretu] <t>retu VO *praec.* č(ten)i(e) i Met

[316] ubo] *om.* Vat₅ Met Mosk

[317] priloži] priložu Brib

[318] imuću dva s(i)na] imućumu ·b· s(i)na Pm imuću dva s(i)ni Pad imućumu ď'va s(i)ni Vat₅ Mosk Brib imuću dva sini Vb₃ imućumu ·b· s(i)ni N₁ imuću ·b· s(i)na Mav Dab Ber₂ N₂ Pt Bar Broz

[319] razdêl'šumu] razdêlivšumu Vat₅ Mosk Bar Broz razdelšumu Vb₃ r'zdêl'šumu Mav

[320] meždû] meû Pm Vb₂ Vb₃ Met Dab Pt *om.* Vat₅ Drag Mosk Brib Ber₂

[321] meždû ima] meû nima N₁ Mav meû imi Bar Broz

[322] imêniê] imênê Vb₂ imênie Drag imeniê Vb₃ Met Mav Dab N₂ Pt

[323] dostoênie imêniê ·] im(ê)niê dostoêniê · Vat₅ imeniê dostoêniê Mosk im(ê)nie dostoêniê Bar Broz

[324] i] *om.* N₁

[325] egda] k'da Mav kada Pt Bar Broz

[326] mьnši] man'ši Pm Drag Vb₃ Met N₁ Brib Dab Ber₂ N₂ Pt Bar Broz mani Vat₅ Mosk m'nši Mav

[327] s(i)nъ] *om.* Ber₂

[328] dostoênie] imeniê Met N₁ *add.* imeniê Dab

[329] poče] počnetъ N₁

[330] êsti] ĵisti Drag Met Pt Bar Broz ĵêsti Ber₂

[331] koreniê] korenie Drag Ber₂

[332] svin'û] svin'skuû Pm Vat₅ Mosk svin'nu Drag s'vinsku N₁ Brib svin'sku Ber₂ Bar Broz

[333] i] *om.* VO N₁

cu[334] priêt'[335] bis(tь)[336] o(t)cem' ·[337] brat'[338] ubo starêi[339] zavidliv'[340] · očimь[341] gl(a)s(o)mь karaet se[342] · eže veseliti se imêše[343] i[344] radovati · zane brat' ego mrьtv'[345] bê[346] i ožive[347] · i zgibьl'[348] **212b** bê i obrête[349] se ~[350] čt(enie) ~[351] Sie[352] tri[353] pritče[354] protivu[355] parisêom' i knižnikom'[356] g(lago)-lalь[357] est'[358] · iže[359] hotêhu[360] priêti pokaênie[361] ·[362] g(lago)lahu[363] že[364] nêci[365] ot uč(e)n(i)kь[366] ego ·

---

[334] vrativ se kь o(t)cu] vrati se ka ocu Vat₅ vrati se kь o(t)cu Drag vrati se ka o(t)cu Vb₃ Mosk vrati se k' o(t)-cu Met Ber₂ vratit se ka ocu Pt

[335] priêt'] *praec.* i Vb₃ Met

[336] bis(tь)] bisi Pad Vb₂ VO

[337] *finis* Mav Bar Broz

[338] brat'] *praec.* i Vat₅ Mos

[339] starêi] stariji Vb₃ starii Met Pt s'tar'i Brib star'i Dab

[340] zavidliv'] *add.* bivь Met N₂ zaviťliv (!)N₁

[341] očimь] otčimь Vb₂ Vb₃

[342] karaet se] karaet' že se Brib

[343] se imêše] se imiše Drag Vb₃ Met Pt imêše se Mosk imeše Brib

[344] i] *om.* Vb₃

[345] mrьtv'] mrtavь Vb₃ Met Brib Dab Pt

[346] bê] bistь Drag Ber₂ bêvь Brib bêše Dab *om.* N₂

[347] ožive] oživê Drag N₂ Pt oživi Met

[348] zgibьl'] zgibalь Pm Met

[349] obrête] obrete Vb₃ Met N₂

[350] i zgibьl' bê i obrête se ~] pogibь i obrêtenь estь ~ Vat₅ Drag N₁ i zgibalь Vb₃ N₂ *finis* Pm Pad pogibь i ob'retenь es(tь) Mosk pogibь i ob'retenь e(stь) Brib Dab pogibe i obrêtenь e(stь) · Ber₂ pogibь i obretenь estь Pt

[351] ~ čt(enie) ~] *om.* Vb₃ Met N₂ Pt · čti · N₁

[352] Sie] Se Vat₅ Mosk

[353] tri] ·v· Dab

[354] pritče] *add.* g(ospod)ь Vb₃

[355] protivu] *om.* Vat₅ Mosk pritivu (!) Ber₂

[356] parisêom' i knižnikom'] farizêemь i piscemь Drag parisêomь i knižnikomь Vb₃ Met Mosk Dab parisêomь i piscemь Pt

[357] g(lago)lalь] govorilь Brib

[358] est'] *add.* g(ospod)ь Vb₂ Met

[359] iže] ki Pt

[360] hotêhu] hotihu Drag Vb₃ Met Pt hotehu Brib Dab

[361] priêti pokaênie] *add.* grêhovь · i mitari sp(a)senie Vb₂ VO Vat₅ Mosk Brib Ber₂ N₂ priêti pokaêniê grihovь i mitari sp(a)senie Drag priêti pokaêniê grihovь i mitari spasenie Vb₃ Met pokaêniê priêti gr(ê)šniki i mit(a)ri sp(a)s(e)nie N₁ priêti pokaranie g'rêhov' i mitari s'p(a)sênie Dab priêti pokaêniê grihovь i m(i)-t(a)ri sp(a)senie Pt

[362] *finis* Met Pt

[363] g(lago)lahu] <g>(lago)lahu VO

[364] že] *om.* Vat₅ Mosk

[365] nêci] nici Drag Brib

[366] ot uč(e)n(i)kь] k' uč(e)n(i)komь Vat₅ Drag Brib Dab Ber₂ ka uč(e)n(i)komь Mosk uč(e)n(i)k(o)mь N₁ kь uč(e)n(i)kь N₂

iže dvoêhu se ot pritče êkože prêžde[367] k'[368] knižnikom' i parisêom'[369] g(lago)laše ·[370] êže[371] k' m(i)-l(o)sr'diû uč(e)n(i)k(o)mъ[372] ishoždaše[373] · i drugimi sl(o)v(e)si ~ otpučaite[374] · i[375] otpustit[376] se vam' · da v m(o)l(it)vi[377] g(ospod)ni svobodnim' obrazom'[378] vsprosite[379] · otpusti[380] nam'[381] dl'gi naše[382] · êkože i[383] mi otpučaem'[384] dlъžnikom' n(a)šimъ · êže[385] est' pritča · k' m(i)l(o)sr'diû[386] ap(usto)li prizivaûĉe[387] ·[388] č(lovê)kъ[389] eter' b(o)gat'[390] imêše[391] pristavnika ili spъn'žatura[392] se[393] že[394] ime[395] znamenuet'[396] pristavnik' · êko vlačee[397] vsi udr'žatelь[398] est' · otnûdêže[399] ot sela ime priêt'[400] · obaritelь[401] tako srebru[402] êko[403] žitom' i vsêm'[404] êže g(ospod)ъ[405] udrъžit' spъnžatur'[406] est'

---

[367] êkože prêžde] êže prêje Vat₅ Mosk êkože prije Drag êkože prie Vb₃ êže se preždê Brib êk(o)že prije Dab

[368] k'] ka Mos

[369] parisêom'] parisêm' (!) VO pariseomь Mosk Dab

[370] k' knižnikom' i parisêom' g(lago)laše ·] k piscemь i farizeomь gl(agola)še Drag k' knižnikom' g(lago)laše i pariseomь Vb₃

[371] êže] êk(o)že Vat₅ Mos

[372] uč(e)n(i)k(o)mъ] učenikь Vb₃

[373] ishoždaše] ishoêše Vat₅ Drag Vb₃ N₁ Brib Dab Ber₂ is'hoĵaše Mos

[374] otpučaite] <o>tpučaite VO

[375] i] da Vat₅ Mosk om. Drag N₁ Dab Ber₂

[376] otpustit] otpustitit (!) Vb₂ otpustesť (!) Brib

[377] da v m(o)l(it)vi] v m(i)l(o)sti Drag Mosk va milosti N₁ da v' m(i)l(o)sti Brib Dab Ber₂ v' m(i)listi (!) N₂

[378] obrazom'] om. Vat₅ Mos

[379] vsprosite] vprosite Drag Ber₂ v'sprositi e Dab

[380] otpusti] otpustiti VO otpustitь Vat₅ Mosk N₁ Bribi

[381] otpusti nam'] i otpustitь v(a)mь Drag Ber₂ i otpustiti v(a)mь Dab

[382] naše] v(a)še Ber₂

[383] i] om. N₁ Dab

[384] otpučaem'] otpučaemo Vat₅ otpučamo Dab

[385] êže] <ê>že VO êkože Mosk êk(o)že Dab

[386] k' m(i)l(o)sr'diû] om. Vat₅ Mosk N₁ Brib Dab

[387] ap(usto)li prizivaûĉe] ap(usto)li prizivaûĉi Vb₂ VO Vb₃ N₁ ap(usto)le prizivaûĉi Vat₅ Drag Mosk Brib Dab Ber₂ ap(usto)li prizivaû N₂

[388] finis Brib

[389] č(lovê)kъ] <č>(lovê)kъ VO

[390] b(o)gat'] om. Vb₂ Vb₃ praec. bê Vat₅ Mos

[391] imêše] praec. iže Vat₅ Mosk imiše Drag Vb₃ imê N₁

[392] spъn'žatura] spanžatura Drag Vb₃ Mosk N₁ Dab Ber₂ N₂

[393] se] sie Mos

[394] že] om. Vat₅ Mosk

[395] ime] om. N₁

[396] znamenueť] znamenutь (!) Drag

[397] vlačee] vlača ee Dab

[398] udr'žatelь] udr'žiteľ Drag udržitelь N₁ Dab udržilelь (!)Ber₂

[399] otnûdêže] otkudê Vat₅ Mosk N₁ otkudi Drag otnûdêže Vb₃ otkudu Dab Ber₂ otnudeže N₂

[400] priêt'] priêti Dab

[401] obaritelь] obarovatelь Vb₂ Vb₃

[402] srebru] srebra N₁

[403] êko] êk(o)že Vat₅ N₁ Dab êkože Drag Mosk Ber₂

[404] vsêm'] vsimь Drag Vb₃ vsemь Dab

[405] g(ospod)ь] om. Vat₅ Mosk N₁ Dab

[406] spъnžatur'] span'žaturь Drag Dab Ber₂ N₂ spanžaturь Vb₃ Mosk s'panžaturъ N₁

· otnûdêže i[407] obaritelь[408] êko istočnikʼ prêkrasnêi[409] svobodn’[410] estʼ · iže ne udrʼžaniemʼ sela · nь[411] obaritelь[412] vsego[413] domu starêi[414] tlькuûĉe[415] znamenuet se[416] .[417]

Latin:

Alteram de Evangelio Lucae quaestiunculam proposuisti: quis sit villicus iniquitatis, qui Domini voce laudatus est. Cuius cum vellem scire rationem, et de quo fonte processerit, revolvi volumen Evangelicum, et inter caetera reperi, quod appropinquantibus Salvatori publicanis, et peccatoribus, ut audirent eum, murmurabant Pharisaei et Scribae, dicentes: Quare iste peccatores suscipit, et comedit cum eis? Qui locutus est eis parabolam centum ovium, et unius perditae, quae inventa pastoris humeris reportata est. Et cur esset proposita, statim intulit: Dico vobis, sic erit gaudium in caelo super uno peccatore poenitentiam agente, magis quam super nonaginta novem iustis, qui non habent opus poenitentia. Aliam quoque parabolam decem drachmarum uniusque perditae, et repertae cum proposuisset, simili eam fine complevit. Sic dico vobis, gaudium erit coram Angelis Dei super uno peccatore poenitentiam agente. Tertiam quoque parabolam proposuit hominis habentis duos filios, et dividentis inter eos substantiam. Cumque minor facultatibus perditis, egere coepisset, et comedere siliquas, porcorum cibum, reversus ad patrem, susceptus ab eo est. Frater quoque invidens senior, patris voce correptus est, quod laetari debuerit, et gaudere, quia frater eius mortuus fuerat, et revixit: perditus erat, et inventus est. Has tres parabolas contra Pharisaeos, et Scribas locutus est, qui nolebant recipere poenitentiam peccatorum, et Publicanorum salutem. Dicebat autem, inquit, et ad discipulos suos haud dubium, quin parabolam, sicut prius ad Scribas, et Pharisaeos: qua parabola ad clementiam discipulos hortaretur, et aliis diceret verbis: Dimitte, et dimittetur vobis; ut in Oratione Dominica libera fronte poscatis, Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris. Quae est ergo parabola ad clementiam discipulos cohortantis? Homo quidam erat dives, qui habeat villicum sive dispensatorem, hoc enim οἰκονόμος significat. Villicus autem proprie villae gubernator est, unde et a villa villicus nomen accepit. Οἰκονόμος autem tam pecuniae, quam frugum, et omnium quae dominus possidet, dispensator est. Unde, et οἰκονομικός Xenophontis pulcherrimus liber est, qui non gubernationem villae, sed dispensationem universae domus (Tullio interpretante) significat.

---

[407] otnûdêže i] otkudê Vat₅ Mosk N₁ Dab otkudu Drag otnudeže i Vb₃ N₂ otkudu i Ber₂

[408] obaritelь] obariterь (!) Vb₂

[409] prêkrasnêi] prikrasnêi Vb₂ prêkrasnêji Vb₃ prekʼrasʼnêi Mosk prekrasnêi N₂

[410] svobodn’] svobodьnь Vb₂ svobodьn’ VO svobodan’ Vat₅ svobodanь Drag Vb₃ Mosk N₁ Dab Ber₂ N₂

[411] nь] na VO Vat₅ Drag Vb₃ Mosk N₁ Dab Ber₂ N₂

[412] obaritelь] redit(e)lь Drag reditelь Ber₂ obatelь (!) N₂

[413] vsego] vsemu Ber₂

[414] starêi] starii Drag i starêji Vb₃ s’tarei Dab

[415] tlькuûĉe] tl’kuĉe Drag

[416] znamenuet se] znamenuût’ se VO zn(a)m(e)nuetь N₁

[417] tlькuûĉe znamenuet se ·] t’lькuet’ se · N₂