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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 Matthew's Gospel (12.22-27). It has been preserved in 19 breviaries, as shown in table 1.:  

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

| L 11.14 | Vb₁ | Vat₅ | Pm | Pad | VO | Drag | Vb₃ | Mosk | Ber₂/₁ |
|---------|-----|------|----|-----|----|------|-----|------|-------|
| 118d–119d | 87a–87c | 85c–85d | 124b–125b | 185d–186d | 71c–72b | 112c–113c | 85b–86a | 116c–117c |
| Met | N₁ | Mav | Vat₁₉ | Vat₁₀ | Rom | N₂ | Pt | Bar | Broz |
| 106d–107c | 94b–94d | 80a–80c | 78c–78d | 78d–79b | 144r–144v | 87a–87d | 90c–91a | 177a–177c | 169a–169c |

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.

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

| L 16.1 | Vb₁ | Vat₅ | Vb₂ | Pm | Pad | VO | Drag | Vb₃ | Mosk | Ber₂/₁ | Met |
|---------|-----|------|-----|----|-----|----|------|-----|------|-------|-----|
| 218c–219b | 164b–164c | 209b–210a | 253b–253d | 334d–335c | 146c–147a | 255d–256c | 170c–171a | 218c–219b | 207d–208b |
| N₁ | Mav | Vat₁₉ | Brib | Vat₁₀ | Rom | Dab | N₂ | Pt | Bar | Broz |
| 177c–178a | 150b–150c | 139b–139c | 52b–52c | 143c–143d | 203r | 64b–64c | 181a–181c | 157c–157d | 262a–262c | 254a–254c |

However, in six of them the homily is wrongly ascribed to St. Gregory the Great (Omiliê Grêgora papi): Pm, Mosk, N₁, Rom, Brib, Dab. In Vat₁₉ 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 Vb₁ 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.

---

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 Vb₁, in Vat₁₉ one sentence before the end of the second lesson, in Pm, Vat₁₀, 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 Vat₁₉, and then in Vat₁₀. In Rom the text comprises a little more than a half of the first lesson, in Vat₁₉ it ends after the first sentence of the second lesson, in Vat₁₀ it is one sentence longer than in Vat₁₀, 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 Vb₁.

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-Kriva) 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
tagda priveden'基站i(i)su bêšni Vb₁, Pad VO Mav Vat₁₉ / tagda priveden'基站 ka i(i)su-besni Vb₂ / i tagda prived(e)n'基站 k'i(i)su bêšni Met / tagda priveden'基站 bêšni Ber₂

tagda prikazan'基站 bêšni i(i)su Vat Drag / tagda prikazan'基站 bêšni i(i)su Rom Vat₁₀ / tagda prikazan'基站 i(i)su bêšni Mosk / tagda prikazan'基站 i(i)su bêšni N₁ / tagda prikazan'基站 i(i)su N₂ / tagda prikazan'基站 i(i)su Bar Broz

2. Lat. Opera Dei principii daemoniorum deputantab

dela b(o)zië · dela bêšnaē mnēhu Vb, Pad VO Rom / dela bozāë · dela bēšnaē mnēhu Vb, / dela b(o)zië dela (t) bēšnaē mnēhu Met / dela b(o)zië · d(e)la bēšnaē mnēhu Mav / dela b(o)ziē · dela bēšnaē mnēhu Ber₂ / dela b(o)zië · dela bēšnaē mnēhu Broz / mnēhu dela b(o)zië · dela bēšnaē Vat₁₀

dela b(o)zië · bēšnaē · dela mnēhu Vat₁₀ / dela b(o)zië · bēšnaē · dela mnēhu Drag / dela b(o)zië · bēšnaē · dela mnēhu Pt / dela b(o)zië · bēšnaē · dela mnēhu Vat₁₀

4 With the sentence sего r’ di sudie v(a)mь bud(u)ть (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«.
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 (Vb₁, Pad, Vb₂ and VO) have almost always the same reading, which we can consider to be older. The same is true for Vat₅, Mosk, and Pt, which are considered to be typical representatives of the southern group. N₁, Vat¹₀, Dab, Brib, and N₂, 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 ř (ž) from the protograph as ţ (ž). 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 řž (ž) as ţl (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 Reinhard (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, N₁, Vat¹₀ and N₂ 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’ pristavnik’ · ižegospodnimь 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

svršena suh

b. Lat. possessus a daemone

ot besa održimi

c. Lat. ut expulso daemone primum fidei lucem aspicient

da izgнanimь prežde bёsomь · slёpi svёt’ vidit’

d. Lat. sed cotidie completur in conversione credentium

to n(i)ne po vse dni v prёbivanje vёрних duh(o)v naet se

e. Lat. Omne regnum divisum in se desolabitur

vsako c(esa)rstvo samo v sebh razdёlaûĉei se zapustеt’

f. Lat. nec haberent in eo locum

i ne imeti vсуmь mёsta v nem’

g. Lat. quod recessio daemonum oboedientia sit in principem suum

êko ostupanje bёsov’ posluhomь 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)мь N, 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 breviers 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 mladih kojima je vjernost predlošku sadržajno i strukturo 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.]
In (8c), only Ber₂ follows the Latin word order faithfully, while some breviaries (Pm, Vat₅, Drag, N₁, 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 Vb₁, 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 est’ / hotel’ bim’ vidêti račun’ kogo est’ Vb₂ / hotel’ bim’ vidêti račun’ kogo (!) est’ VO / hotel’ bim’ vidêti račun’ kogo (t(а)ko es(tь) radostь anj(e)lomь b(o)žimь Mosk / taka estь r(a)d(o)st’ anj(e)lomь b(o)žimь Vat₁⁹

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 Ber₂ Pt / ne trêbuût’ delo pokore Vat₁₀ / ne trêbuût’ delo 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 hominem
mirь est’ č(lovê)k(o)mь / mirь č(lovê)k(o)mь estь · Vat₂ Drag / mirь č(lovê)k(o)mь e(stь) Mosk N₁ N₂

c. Lat. quis sit villicus iniquitatis
kto est’ pristavnik’ / k’to pristavnik’ e(stь) · Ber₂

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.
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):

\[(13)\]  
\[\text{a. Lat. expulso daemone} \]  
iz’gnanim’ prêžde bësom’  
\[\text{b. Lat. appropinquantibus Salvatori publicanis, et peccatoribus} \]  
približaûĉim 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 tîkuûĉe

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 · ć(lovê)ku imuçu dva s(i)na · i razdêl’šumu meždû ima dostoênie

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. ἄνθρωπος τις εἶχεν δύο νικός; 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: razdêlšumu 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 znamenié tvorašë 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 have* (*suĉe*), which is closer to the Latin original and also shows adjustment to the Latin original in younger breviaries.

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

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)\(^\text{14}\). The present participle is mostly translated by the active present participle, shown in (21).

(21) a. Lat. *tacentia*  
milsceĉa

b. Lat. *iudicantes*  
sudeĉe

---

\(^{14}\) Gadžijeva et al. 2014, 226-229, 247-250.
There are two exceptions to this rule. The first exception is the form *sciens* which is translated by the first active preterite participle: *vidēvъ*. 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 kъ o(t)cu

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

(23)  
Lat. *frater quoque invidens senior*  
brat’ ubo starēi zavidlivъ

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 sebě razdělůĉei se  
(b) Lat. *regnum contra se divisum*  
c(ēsa)rstvo razděleno protivu sebě

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*  
imat’ ūže miru priti skon’ čanie

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

\(^{15}\) Mihaljević 2020, 164.
auxiliary verb used to form future tense) and the infinitive of the verb *iměti* (*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*  
poĉto vs mnê nozožđe dêlo suĉe · ne tužđe imat’ stvar’ ·  
b. Lat. *nec haberent in eo locum, adversariae potestates, quarum inter se bellum, pax est hominum*  
ne iměti vćnut’ města v nem’ protivne vlasti · ihže mežđû ioboû (!) branie mir’ est’ 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 možet’ reĉi ot têles’ zdraviê  
b. Lat. *sin autem de apostolis dictum est*  
aĉe li že ot ap(usto)ļь reĉeno est’

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*  
êko otstupanie bêsov’ posluhom’ knezi ihь bilo bi  
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*  
ëko 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 poenitentiam agente*  
radosť est’ anj(e)(l(o)mь b(o)ožimь · o edinomь grêšnicê kauçem’ se  
b. Lat. *gaudium erit coram Angelis Dei super uno peccatore poenitentiam agente*  
radosť est’ anj(e)(l(o)mь b(o)ožimь · o edinomь grêšnicê tvorečem’ 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. 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 isčeli 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 aspicient, deinde in laudes Dei taentia prius ora laxentur*
    eže bo t'gda têlesno stvoreno est' ... da iz'gnanim' prêžde bêsom' · sêpi svêt' vîdit' · potom že na hvalu b(o)žiû mlьčeû 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 · 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 · bêš' bêšu nepriîtel' est' · i imat' ūže miru priti skon'ĉanie
    b. Lat. *Aliud est si membrorum quoque debilitates et spiritualium virtutum insignia daemonibus assignatis*

16 Cfr. Mihaljević 2019b.
The conjunction *si* 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*  
iţi 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’

d. Lat. *Si autem putatis, o scribæ 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 dêmûni · ot s(i)novs vaših 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 ar(usto)љь rečeno est’ · eže i veče razumêti imamь · si budut’ sudie ih’.
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 oikovoyikός Xenophilontis pulcherrimus liber est*
*otnûdêže i obaritelь ēko istočnik’ prèkrasnêi 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 dispensatorum, hoc enim oikovoyoς 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 dicet verbis*  
êže k’ m(i)l(o)s’r’diû 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 dicet verbis*  
g(lago)lahu že nêci ot uč(e)n(i)kь ego · iže dvoèhu se ot prîtče ëkože pëže k’ knižnikom’ i parišom’ g(lago)laše · êže k’ m(i)l(o)s’r’diû 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 ëko.

(41) Lat. *qui tanta signa faciebat esse filium Dei*  
êko tolika znameniè 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 ëkože, 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 primireniem’ male rëci več’še rastut’ · tako raznemireniem’ malim’ · več’ša raširati se

b. Lat. *Si autem putatis, o scribae et pharisae, quod recessio daemonum oboedientia sit in principem suum, ut homines ignorantes fraudulenta simulatione deludant*  
ače že mnite o knižnici i pariši · ëko ostupanje bësov’ posluhom’ knexi ihь bilo bi da  
č(lovè)ki naznamenuûćeë hîn’boû lîsti smametь

c. Lat. *ut in Oratione Dominica libera fronte poscatis*  
da v m(o)l(it)vi g(ospod)ni svobodnim’ obrazom’ vsprosite

d. Lat. *Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.*  
otpusti nam’ dl’gi naše · ëkože i mi otpuçaem’ dîlšnikom’ n(a)šimь

In (42b), the conjunction *quod* which introduces the declarative clause, typical for later stages of Latin, is translated by the conjunction ëko, 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
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 reće im’ · ot deseti dragam’ · i edina pogibša – i tako zatvorenog edga priloži
b. Lat. *Cumque minor facultatibus perditis, egere coepisset, et comedere siliquas*
i egda mњši s(i)nь pogubi dostoennie · poče ěsti korenię
c. Lat. *Cuius cum vellem scire rationem*
hotël 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*
hotël 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 mr tьtv’ bё i ožive · i zgibьl bё i obrёte se
(47) Lat. *quia sedebunt in duodecim solis*
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*
hotël 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.
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.\footnote{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.} 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.

(50) Lat. *Et cur esset proposita, statim intulit*

\begin{verbatim}
i egda pololožena (!) bêše abie prinese û.
\end{verbatim}
N₂ – 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.
Vat₅ – Vatican breviary Illirico 5, 14th cen.
Vat₁₀ – Vatican breviary Illirico 10, 1485.
Vat₁₉ – Vatican breviary Vat. Slav 19, 1465.
Vb₁ – First Vrbnik breviary, 13th/14th cen.
Vb₂ – Second Vrbnik breviary, 14th cen.
Vb₃ – Third Vrbnik breviary, 15th cen.
VO – Breviary of Vid of Omišalj, 1396.
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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 (Vb₁, Pad, Vb₂ and VO), characterised by the older redaction, from the typical representatives of the southern, more innovative group (Vat5, Mosk, and Pt). The transitional group (N₁, Vat₁₀, Dab, Brib, and N₂) 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.
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Appendix / Prílohy

Texts

I. L 11.14 (BrVb₁, 118d–119d)

om(i)liê s(ve)t(a)go pr(o)zv(i)t(e)ra ·
tygdə priveden’i(bis(tь))i(su)su bőšni ·
slêpi · i(n) nêmi · i scel(i)27 ego ·
tako ékože28 prog(lago)la29 i prozrê31 ·
trì32 znamenìe vkupe33 v’ edinom’34 č(lovê)cê svr’šena36 sut37 ·
slêpi38 vidit39 · nêmi40 g(lago)lety41 ·
bêsni42 ot bêsa43

---

Texts are transliterated in accordance with recent publications of the Old Church Slavonic institute in Zagreb. We have transcribed the letter jat (;) as ê, the letter šta (q) as ĉ, the letter ju (/) as ŭ, and the jer letters štapić ([j]) and apostophe (’), 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); ŭ is [ju]. All the other letters are transparent.

18 Texts are transliterated in accordance with recent publications of the Old Church Slavonic institute in Zagreb. We have transcribed the letter jat (h) as ê, the letter šta (w) as č, the letter ju (β) as û, and the jer letters štapić ([j]) and apostophe (’), respectively. The letter ê 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.
održim izbavlaet se 44 45 eže bo 46 t'gda 47 tělesno 48 stvoreno est' 49 g(ospode)mь · to n(i)ne po vse dni 50 v prěbivanje 51 věrnihь 52 duh(o)tno 53 isplnaet se 54 55 ižgnanimь 56 prěžde 57 běšni 58 · slopi 59 svět' 60 vidit' 61 · 62 potom že 63 na 64 hvalu 65 b(o)žiû 66 mlčеća 67 usta 68 otvaraût 69 se · i hvalet' b(o)ga s priležaniemь 70 .

44 održim izbavlaet se | izb(a)vi se Pm Drag izbavi se Vat 5 , održim izb(a)vi se N 1 , održim izbavi se Pt add. sadé Vat 5 19
45 běšni ot běša održim izbavlaet se · | besni izb(a)vi vlaût se ot besa održim · Rom běšni ot besa održim iscelaet se · Met běšni izb(a)vi se ot besa · održim Mosk běšni održim izbavlaet se ot besa Vat 5 , běšni održim izbavlaet se · N 2
46 bo | om. Rom Mosk Vat 10 N 1 , t'gda | tagda Vat 5 , Drag Vb, Rom Vat, Ber, Bar Brozegda N 2 , tělesno | telesno Drag Vb, Rom Met Vat 10 , Ber 2 , N 2 , Pt telesnê N 1 , est' | om. Met
47 po vse dni | om. Vat 19 , om. po Ber 5 1
48 prěbivanje | prěbivanje Pm Vat 5 Vb, Rom Met Mosk Vat 10 , Vat 10 , Ber 2 , N 2 prebivanii N 1 , Bar Broz prebiv'nie 5 Mav prebiavâniemь 5 Pt
49 věrnihь | věrnihь Vb, Rom Met N 5 , Vat 5 , Ber, N 5 ver'n(i)hь Mav
duh(o)tno | d(u)h(o)vnê Pm N 5 , d(u)h(o)v(s)nê Rom Mosk duhovne Vat 10
50 isplnaet se | isplnit se Vat 5 , Vb, is'punaet' se Vat 10 is'plnit' se N 2
51 da | na Rom Ber, čtento drugo na Pt
52 ižgnanimь | izagnanimь Vat, Rom N 5 , Bar Broz izagnanimь Vb, izag'niemь Mosk izagnan(i)mь N 1 ižgnanimь 5 Mav izag'niemь 5 Vat, izagnanimь 5 Vat, izagnanie Ber 2 , prěžde | prije Pm prije Drag Vb, Met prěžde Rom Vat 10 , Ber 2 , prêe Mav prižde Pt priê Bar Broz
53 běšomь | besomь Vb, Met Ber 2 , Pt
54 slopi | slipi Drag Vb, Vat 10 , Ber 2
55 svět' | svetь Vb, om. Mos
56 vidit' | videtь Vat, Drag Ber 2
57 svět' vidit' | viditь · s(ve)tь Pt
58 že | om. Ber 5
59 na | nь Pm Rom Vat 10 , n' Met
60 hvalu | hv(a)li Drag
61 b(o)žiû | hv(a)li b(o)že N 1
62 mlčеća | mlčеća Pm Drag Pt mlčěćhь Vat 10
63 usta | ustь N 2
64 otvarataût | othvraût' Mos
65 s priležaniemь | s priležaniemь Mav s priležaniemь Bar Broz
I(su)ćь že vidēvь\textsuperscript{71} mišlenić\textsuperscript{72} ih'\textsuperscript{73} imь\textsuperscript{74} vsako\textsuperscript{75} c(ĕsa)rstvo samo v sebē razdēlaŭćei\textsuperscript{76} se\textsuperscript{77} zapustēt\textsuperscript{78} narodi\textsuperscript{79} že vzboēše se - i\textsuperscript{80} isp(o)vēdahu\textsuperscript{81}\textsuperscript{82}\textsuperscript{83} ēko\textsuperscript{84} tolika\textsuperscript{85} znameniē tvoraše s(i)nь b(o)ži\textsuperscript{86}\textsuperscript{87} parisē\textsuperscript{88} vistinu i knezi\textsuperscript{89} dēla\textsuperscript{90} b(o)žiē - dēla bēsnaē mnēhū ~\textsuperscript{91} im'že\textsuperscript{92} g(ospod)ь ne sl(o)vesem' nь mislem'\textsuperscript{93} otveća\textsuperscript{94} da eda\textsuperscript{95} da i\textsuperscript{96} tako svr'šil\textsuperscript{98} bi e\textsuperscript{99} vērovati\textsuperscript{100} vlastiū\textsuperscript{101} svoeū\textsuperscript{102}.

\textsuperscript{71} vidēvь | vidiv' Pm Vb, vidivь Rom Vat\textsubscript{10} Ber\textsubscript{2} videvь Mosk
\textsuperscript{72} mišleniē | mišleně Met mišlenie Vat\textsubscript{10}
\textsuperscript{73} reče | praecc. i Rom N\textsubscript{1} Vat\textsubscript{10} Ber\textsubscript{2} Bar Broz
\textsuperscript{74} imь | ] finis Rom nimbь - N\textsubscript{2}
\textsuperscript{75} vsako | vsako VO vs'ko Met vs(a)ko Mosk vs'koe Mav
\textsuperscript{76} razdēlaŭćei | razdēlaŭće Vat\textsubscript{19}
\textsuperscript{77} samo v sebē razdēlaŭće se | ] razdēlaŭće se samo v sebē Pad samo protivu sebē razdēlaŭće se Vat\textsubscript{19} Mosk N\textsubscript{1} samo protivu sebē razdēlaŭće se Drag Ber\textsubscript{19} samo v sebē razdēlaŭći se Vb sami (!) v sebē razdēlaŭć se Met samo protivu s(e)bē razdēlaŭće se N\textsubscript{1} samo v sebē razdēlaŭć' se Mav samo protivu sebi razdēlaŭće se Vat\textsubscript{15} samo protivu sebi razd(ē)laŭće se Pt samo protivu s(e)bē razdēlaŭće se Bar Broz
\textsuperscript{78} zapustēt' | zapustiē Drag Ber\textsubscript{2} z'pustētь Mav zapusteetь Vat\textsubscript{10} narodi | ] n'rodi Mav
\textsuperscript{81} i | ] om. Vat\textsubscript{10} isp(o)vēdahu | ] is'povedahu N\textsubscript{1} Pt
\textsuperscript{82} i | ] om. N, add. s(i)na božiē Vat\textsubscript{19}
\textsuperscript{83} i | ] om. Mav
\textsuperscript{84} ēko | ] zane Vat\textsubscript{19} ere Vat\textsubscript{10}
\textsuperscript{85} tolika | ] velika Pm Drag veliē N\textsubscript{1}
\textsuperscript{86} b(o)ži | ] božiē Vb, b(o)žiē Vat\textsubscript{10}
\textsuperscript{87} tvoraše s(i)nь b(o)žiē - ] s(i)nь b(o)žiē Met tvor'še s(i)nь b(o)žiē - Mav tvoraše - Vat\textsubscript{19}
\textsuperscript{88} parisiē | ] add. že Pm Vat\textsubscript{19} N\textsubscript{1} parisei Vb\textsubscript{3} parisei Met Mosk Vat\textsubscript{10} Ber\textsubscript{2} p(a)risei Pt
\textsuperscript{89} knezi | ] kneza N, add. ihiē mnēhu Vat\textsubscript{19}
\textsuperscript{90} dēla | ] dela Vat\textsubscript{19} Vat\textsubscript{10} dila Ber\textsubscript{2}
\textsuperscript{91} dēla bēsnaē mnēhēhu ~ ] bēsnaē dēla mnēahu . . Pm bēsnaē mnēahu - Vat\textsubscript{19} bēsnaē dēla mnēahu - Drag dēla bēsnaē mnēhū - Vb, dala (!) bēsnaē mnēhü - Met bēs'na dēla mnēhō - Mosk bēsnaē dēla mnēhü - N\textsubscript{1} d(ē) la bēsnaē mnēhū Vat\textsubscript{19} dela bēs'na dēla mnēhü Vat\textsubscript{15} dēla bēs'na dēla mnēhü Ber\textsubscript{2} bēs'na dēla dēla mnēhü N\textsubscript{1} bēsnaē d(ē)la mnēhēhu Pt dēla bēsnaē mnēhü - Bar Broz
\textsuperscript{92} im'že | ] ihže Vat\textsubscript{19} kēmyē Broz
\textsuperscript{93} nь | ] na Pad VO Vat, Drag Vb\textsubscript{3} Mosk N, Vat\textsubscript{19} Ber, N, Pt Bar Broz
\textsuperscript{94} mislem' | ] mislēmь Drag Ber\textsubscript{2} s'mis'lomь Mosk misliū Vat\textsubscript{10}
\textsuperscript{95} otveća | ] otveća N\textsubscript{1}
\textsuperscript{96} da eda | ] om. Met eda Bar Broz
\textsuperscript{97} i | ] om. Vat\textsubscript{10}
\textsuperscript{98} svršilь | ] svršili Vat\textsubscript{19} stvoril Met N\textsubscript{1}
\textsuperscript{99} e | ] i Vat\textsubscript{10}
\textsuperscript{100} vērovati | ] verovati Drag Vb\textsubscript{3} Mosk Vat\textsubscript{19} Ber, N, Ber\textsubscript{2} N\textsubscript{2} verov' ti Met verota (!) N\textsubscript{1} vērov' ti Mav verov(a)ti Pt
\textsuperscript{101} vlastiū | ] vľstiuē Mav
\textsuperscript{102} svoeū | ] ego Pm Vat, Drag N\textsubscript{1} Ber\textsubscript{2} Pt Bar Broz
iže taina sr(đ)d(ć)y vēđēše103, 104 aće105 sotona sotonu izgonil' bi106 · protivu107 sebē108 razdēlen'109 bil' bi · 110 kako111 stalo112 116 bi c(ć)rstvo ego.113

Ne možet'114 grad' i c(ć)rstvo razdēleno115 protivu sebē116 stoēti117 · ēkože118 primireniem119 male rēči120 več'še121 rastut'122 · tako123 raznemireniem124 malim'125 več'še126 raširāut se127 ~ aće128 ubo sotona129 borit se protivu sebē130 · bēš' bēsu131 nepriētel' est' · i 132 imat' ūže133 miru134 priti skončani135 · i ne imēti136 včnut'137 mēsta138 v nem' protivne139 vlašti · ihže140 meždū141 ioboū (!)142

103 vēđēše | vidiše Vb, viēše Bar
104 iže taina sr(đ)d(ć)y vēđēše · iže sr(đ)d(ć)y c(ć)y taina vijaše · Pm iže sr(đ)d(ć)y c(ć)y taina vijaše · Vat, izo (!) sr(đ)d(ć)y c(ć)y taina vijaše · N, ižo (!) sr(đ)d(ć)y c(ć)y taina vijaše 
105 aće | čti ako Mak ako Vat, Broz
106 izgonil' bi | izognan' bi VO
107 protivu | praec. i Vb, proti Vat
108 sebē | sebi Pm Drag Vb, Met Pt sebe Vat, Ber
109 razdēleni | razdēlen' Pm Vb, razdēlen Met r'zdēlen' Met razdēlen' Vat, razdēlen Ber, razdēlen Pt
110 protivu sebē razdēlen' bi | J om. Mos
111 kako | praec. to Vb, k(ako) Mak
112 stalo | ostalo Ber, N
113 finis Pm Vat, Pt
114 Ne možet' | Ne moreť Vat
115 razdēleno | razdēleno Ber
116 sebē | sebi Drag Vb, Met sebē Ber
117 stoēti | stati Mak Bar Broz
118 ēkože | ēko N, kako Broz
119 primireniem | primireniem Mosk premēreniem N, primireniem Ber
120 male rēči | male reči Drag male reči Vb, Ber, Bar Broz, maže (!) riči Met male reči Mosk male riče Mak
121 več'še | več'se Vat, Drag Mosk N, več'se Mak, Belize Broz
122 rastut' | rastoit' (!) Metastoit' (!) Mak
123 tako | k(ako) Ber
124 raznemireniem | razmireniem Pad Drag Vb, Met Bar Broz razumēnīem Vat, rzmēnīem Mak razmireniem Ber
125 raznemireniem malim | razvē malih Mosk razmireniem malēm N, raz'vē malēm N
126 več'še | več'se Vat, Drag Mosk N, več'se Mak, Belize Broz
127 raširāut se | rašir preempt' se Pad Vb, N, rašir preempt se Vat, rašir preempt se Mak Mosk Bar Broz, rašir preempt se Mak N, rašir preempt' se Mak, Belize Broz
128 aće | ako Mak Broz
129 sotona | praec. i Mos
130 sebē | sebi Drag Vb, Met
131 bēš' bēsu | besu Met bēš' besu Ber, bēš' (!)N
132 i | om. Drag Mos
133 ūže | om. VO ūre Mak Broz
134 miru | meru (!) Mos
135 skončani | skončani Vat
136 ne imēti | ne mēti VO ne imeti Drag ne meti Vb, ne imēt' i (!) Met ne imeti Mosk ne imati Ber
137 včnut' | včnut' Vat, Vb, Mosk N, Ber, N
138 mēsta | om. VO mesta Vb, Met Mak N, Ber
139 protivnē | protivnī Mak, protivnie Met N, Belize Bar Broz
140 ihže | kihvb Mak kēhvb Broz
141 meždū | meu Vat, Drag Vb, Met Mosk N, Mak Broz, Bar Broz
142 ioboū (!) | sobou Pad VO Vat, Drag Vb, Met Mosk N, Mak Ber, N, Belize Broz
braně⁴³ mir’ est’ č(lově)k(o)m’.¹⁴⁴ ače že¹⁴² mníte o knižnici i parisei¹⁴⁶. čko ostupan⁴⁷ běsov¹⁴⁸ posluhom¹⁴⁹ knězj¹⁵⁰ ihb¹⁵¹ bilo bi da č(lově)k¹⁵² naznámenuč¹⁵³ hîn’boû¹⁵⁴ lîstî¹⁵⁵ smametî⁵⁶. čto možet¹⁵⁷ reči ot têl¹⁵⁸ ež¹⁵⁹ g(ospod)j stvori ~ ino bo¹⁶⁰ est’ ače vř¹⁶¹ têlesníh¹⁶² udêh¹⁶³ slabosti s’vsêma¹⁶⁴ skazaût¹⁶⁵ se znâmenê¹⁶⁶ ače ažь bě chevyloµ¹⁶⁷ izgonû¹⁶⁸ běsi¹⁶⁹. a¹¹⁰ s(i)nove vaši o koµ’¹⁷¹ izgonet’ · sego radi sudie¹⁷² vaši¹⁷³ budut¹⁷⁴ sinovь iûdeiskih¹⁷⁵.¹⁷⁶ ež est’¹⁷⁷ ikšor’čiste¹⁷⁸. lûdi onêh¹⁷⁹ ot zakona znâmenuet¹⁸⁰. ilî¹⁸¹ ap(usto)li¹⁸² ot nih¹⁸³ plemene roždenih¹⁸⁴

---

¹⁴³ braně | branemь Vat, Mosk Bar Broz  
¹⁴⁴ mir’ est’ č(lově)k(o)m’ · mirь č(lově)k(o)mь estь · Vat, Drag mirь č(lově)k(o)mь e(stь) Mosk N¹ N² finis  
¹⁴⁵ May Bar Broz  
¹⁴⁶ ače že | ače li Mos  
¹⁴⁷ parisei | parisei Vb, Met Mosk Ber  
¹⁴⁸ ostupanıe | ostunie (!) VO  
¹⁴⁹ běsov’ | besov’ Vb, Met Ber  
¹⁵⁰ posluhom’ | poslušahomb N¹  
¹⁵¹ knězi | kněza Pad VO Vat, Drag Vb, Met Mosk N¹ Ber N²  
¹⁵² ihb | om. Mos  
¹⁵³ č(lově)ki | č(lově)ka Vat, Mosk N¹ č(lově)ke Drag  
¹⁵⁴ naznámenučıe | ne znâuce Pad VO Drag Vb N¹ Ber N² ne znauče Vat, Met ne z’naucí N²  
¹⁵⁵ hîn’boû | hin’bou (!) Drag  
¹⁵⁶ listi | lasti Vat, Drag Vb, Met Mosk lasíti Ber laš’ti N¹  
¹⁵⁷ smametî | smute’t’ Vb  
¹⁵⁸ možet’ | možete Pad VO Vat, Drag Vb, Met N¹ Ber  
¹⁵⁹ têles’ | teless Drag Vb, Met Mosk Ber N² tel(e)s’ N¹  
¹⁶⁰ ežê | eže Met  
¹⁶¹ ino bo | ibo Mos N¹  
¹⁶² vbi | om. N¹  
¹⁶³ têlesníh’ | telesníh Drag Vb, Met Mosk Ber N¹ telesníh’ N¹  
¹⁶⁴ udêh’ | udehь Vat N¹ Ber N² udihь Drag  
¹⁶⁵ s’vsêma | savsíma Drag Vb Ber s’vsima Met savšema Mos  
¹⁶⁶ skazaût | skazuût’ Drag Mosk N¹ Ber  
¹⁶⁷ skazaût se znâmenê | z’namenê s’kazuût’ se N¹  
¹⁶⁸ bě chevyloµ’ | bel’estöbolom’ belzebubomь N¹  
¹⁶⁹ izgonû | izgonu Mosk Ber N²  
¹⁷¹ běsi | besi Met Ber  
¹⁷² a | i Ber  
¹⁷³ o koµ’ | kûmь Vat, Drag N¹  
¹⁷⁴ sudie | preac. si Vat, Drag N¹ N²  
¹⁷⁵ vaši | vami Vb, v(a)mt Met Mosk vamь N²  
¹⁷⁶ finis | Met  
¹⁷⁷ iûdeiskih’ | iûdeiskih Drag Vb  
¹⁷⁸ sего radi sudie vaši budut’ sinovь iûdeiskih’ · sего radi sudie budut’ v(a)mt s(i)novь iûdeiskih’ · N¹ sudie  
¹⁷⁹ vaši sего radi budut’ sinovь iûdeiskih’ · Ber  
¹⁸⁰ est’ | om. Ber, sutь N²  
¹⁸¹ iksor’čiste | iksor’čiste Pad Vat, N¹ Ber N² iksor’čiste Drag iksor’čiste Vb ekšor’čis’tê Mosk ekšor’čis’tê N²  
¹⁸² onêh’ | onihь Vat, Drag Ber  
¹⁸³ znâmenetu | zn(a)menetь N¹  
¹⁸⁴ roždenih’ | rojenihь Vat, Mosk roenihь Drag Vb N¹ roj(e)nihь Ber N²
ili prizivaniem' imene božiće izgonahu bēši, iže stěšnaše uprošenim mudrost' da isp(o)vêdahu d(u)ha s(ve)ta · sie delo imuće ~ ďto bo ače izgonu démuni ot s(i)-novs važiih b(o)g(o)m' · a ne démumom' skazaet se · počto v'o mně onožde démle suče, ne tužde imat' stvar' · onižde ubo sami sudie vam' budut' · ne vlastiř · ne večšinou · egda oněhь izgnanii běši znamenuet vi belzebula kneza běsovь ~ ače li že ot ap(usto)
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, possessor a daemone liberatur. Quod et tunc quidem carnaliter factum est, sed cotidie completur in conversione credentium ut expulso daemone primum fidei lucem aspicient, 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 consummationem simul perpetuam. Ubi est spiritus sanctus inargomentus? 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 habeas 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, iudicantes duodecim tribus Israel.

---

217 ot ap(u)st(o)ls ot ap(u)st(o)ls(o)vь Drag
218 eže iže Drag
219 i veće Mosk N, veće N
220 razuměti razuměvati Vб Mosk
221 imamь imamo Vat, Drag Mosk N
222 sedutь sudutь (!) Mosk sêdutь N
223 na dvoû na šte Pad na dvêû na sete VO na dvêû na deste Vаt, Mosk N, na d’voû na deste Drag na dvoû na dêsete Vb, na dvîû na deste Ber, na -bî- N
224 prêstolu | prêstolu Drag prestolu Vб Mosk Ber, N
225 sudeĉe | sudêĉe Vb
226 -bî- obêma na desete Pad obêma na dete (!) VO dvêû na deste Vаt, -bî- Drag N, obîma na desete Vb, obêma na desete Mosk bî-te N, dvima na desete Ber
227 kolênomea kolêma (!) VO kolenoma Vб Mosk N, Ber, N
228 iz(drai)(e)voma iz(drai)(e)voma Vаt, Drag Mosk Ber
II. 16.1 (BrVb 211d–212b)

om iličj s(veta)go 229 er(o)n(i)m(a) 230 prozv(i)t(e)ra 231 Raspačatelnost’ 232 kto est’ 233 pristavnik’ 234 iže 235 g(ospod)nîmî gl(a)s(o)mb 238 hvalit’ se · hotel’ bim’ račun’ kogo est’ 237 i ot kogo 238 istočnika ishodit’ 239 preobratit’i 240 kn(i)gi 241 ev’nje(i)iskie · i meždu 242 drugimi 243 obrětaet 244 se 245 · eže 247 približačić 248 se mitarom’ 249 i gršenikom’ 250 k’ sp(a)itel’i · da’ 251 posluša’t’ ego · r’ptahu 252 parisiє 253 i knižnici 254 g(lago)lûče 255 · počto 256 212a sa’ 257 gršeniker 258 priemlet’ · i est’ 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 iličj s(veta)go er(o)n(i)m(a) prozv(i)t(e)ra 232 ] om. Pm gð(e)g(o)ra p(a)(p)i Rom om iličj s(veta)go gurgura papi · Mosk o(milić) s(veta)go gð(e)gora p(a)(p)i · Nj o(milić) s(veta)go gð(e)g(o)ra p(a)(p)i · Brib om(i)l(ić) s(ve)t(a)go g(ospod)nimь g(lo)g(o)da papi · čt(enie) · Pad <o>n VVb
232 Raspačatelnost’ est’ · ] Raspačanje sice priloži · Vat, Mosk Brib Raspačenice pripoložil’ estь Drag Pt add.
videti Vat 19 Raspačanje pripoložil’ estь Vat 10 Bar Broz Raspačenice pripoložil’ estь Ber 5
to est’ ] om. Ng, gdo (stva) Mav
233 kto pristavnik’ · ] k’to pristavnik’ e(stva) · Ber 5 kto e(st)(ь) protivnik’ Pt add. nep(а)vdni Bar Broz
234 iže ] ki Pm Vat, Vat 10 om. Bar
235 g(ospod)nîmî g(a)s(o)mb ] gl(a)s(o)mь g(ospod)nîmî Vat, Drag Mosk Ber, Pt Bar Broz
236 hotel’ bim’ račun’ kogo estь ] hotěl’ bim’ viděti račun’ Pm hotel’ bim’ viděti račun’ kogo estь Vb, hotel’ bim’ viděti račun’ g(o) 237 (!) estь VO hotel’ bim’ viděti račun’ viditi kto estь Vat, Mosk hotel’ bim’ viděti račun’ kogo estь Drag hotel’ bim’ viditi račun’ kogo estь Vat, Met hotel’ bim’ viditi račun’ Rom hotel’ bim’ viděti račun’ Nj, hotel’ bim’ viditi račun’ kogo e(stva) 238 Mav hotel’ bim’ viditi račun’ kogo estь Vat, hotěl’ bim’ viditi kato e(stva) 239 Brib hotel’ bim’ viditi račun’ kogo e(stva) Vat, Vat 10 hotel’ bim’ viditi račun’ Drag hotel’ bim’ viděti račun’ kogo e(stva) Vat, Ber, hotel’ bim’ viděti račun’ kogo e(stva) Vb, hotel’ bim’ viděti račun’ kogo e(stva) Vb 240 (s)–(t)(ь) Pt hot(е)l’ bim’ zнати račun’ e(stva) Vat
238 i ot kogo 241 ot kogo Pm Vat, Drag Rom Mosk Nj, Brib Dab Ber 5 i ot kogo Vat 10, Pt Bar Broz
239 ishodit’ ] ishoditi Vat, Mosk
240 preobratiti 241 preobratiti Pm preobratiti Vat, Rom Met Mosk Nj, MAV Vat 10 Nj, Pt Bar preobraziti Vat 19 preobratiti Brib priobratiti Ber 5
241 kn(i)gi ] praec. sie VO k’nige Brib knige Dab
242 meždu 243 mežu Vb, Vat, Drag Vb, Rom Met Mosk Nj, MAV Vat 19 Brib Vat 19 Ber 5, Pt
243 hotel’ bim’ 244 ili (g)brimi · drugimi ] illegible Pad
245 obrětaet 246 obrěta Drag Nj, Ber 5, obrētaet Vb, Met Brib Nj, obrētae Rom obrētait’ Mos
247 drugimi obrětaet se ] družimi obrětaeae Vat 19
248 i meždu drugimi obrětaet se · ] i mejui drugimu obrě’t’ · Pm i mež druizmi nǐhodi se Vat 10 i me (!) drugimi obrēte Dab in mejui druzimi obrětaet se · Bar Broz
eže ] ča Vat 10
249 približačić ] približačić Pad
250 mitarom’ ] mitarem’ Pm Pad Vb, Vat, Mosk Nj, Brib Dab Nj, Pt mit’emь Vat
251 grešnikom’ ] grišnikom’ Drag Vb 5 Met grešnikom’ Rom Brib Vat 10
252 da ] d’ Mav
253 r’ptahu 254 add. ze Pm Vb, Vat, Vb, Met Mosk Brib praec. i Nj, Vat 10, Bar Broz
254 parisiє ] farisię Pm parizei Vb, pariei Rom Met Dab přišei Mos
255 parisię i knižnici ] farizei i pisci Drag parisię i grešnici Vat 10, parisię i pisci Pt Bar Broz
256 g(lago)lûče ] govoreće MAV om. Brib g(lago)lûče Bar govor(е)reće Broz
257 počto ] <p>očto VO
258 sa ] sъ Pad VO s” Nj
259 grešniki ] grešniki Vb 10, Dab grešnike Rom grišniki Met grišniki Mos
260 est’ ] jista Drag ji Vat 10
261 s nimi ] s nimi Pm Vb, VO Vat 10, Drag Vb, Rom Met Vat 10, Bar Broz s” nimi Mosk Nj, Vat 19, Brib Dab Ber, Nj
262 on ] praec. čt(enie) · Pad <o>n VO
reče imy pritču ot sto ovac i něka edina pogibšie. čže obrětena pastirevom ramomoğ prinesena est' i egda pololožena (!) běše abe prinesene pr(a)vdnicêhь Brib veče nego i z pravdnihь Vat
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290

večer neže o pr(a)vdnicihь Bar večer než o pr(a)vdnicêhь Mosk večer než o pr(a)vdnicêhь N

291

iže dêlo pokore Vat

292

vam' Mosk nika ot nihь Drag Brib nêka edna Mav nika edna ot nihь Pt

293

iže m Avet deri ot nihь Vat

294

vam' Met govoru Mav Broz

295

g(lago)lû bo prizivaetь drugi svoe i raduet se o nei Vat

296

g(lago)lû prnese Met Mav Brib

297

k'ûĉim Vat

298

vam' Mosk nika ot nihь Drag Vat

299

k'ûĉim' Mav kada Vat Broz
I. Bar Broz

1. om. Vat, Mosk Brib Dab

2. om. Vat, N

3. ov. im. Vat

4. ot deseti dragami i edina pogibša, i tako zatvoreno egda priloži podobstvo ee bez isplnjeni... ~ tako g(lago)lu... vam radost est... anj(c)l(o)-

5. v bo(o)žim... o edinom... gršnici... tvořenem... pokoru... tretu ubo pritcu priloži... č(love)ku imiuša dva s(i)na... i razděšum... mežd... ima... dostoenie imeni... i... i egda...

6. mnyši... s(i)na... pogubi dostoenie... poče... čest... koreni... svin'... piču... vrati... o(t)-
cu\textsuperscript{334} priét\textsuperscript{335} bis(tь)\textsuperscript{336} o(t)cem' \textsuperscript{337} brat\textsuperscript{338} ubo starči zavidliv\textsuperscript{340} očimь gl(a)s(o)mь karaet se \textsuperscript{342} eže veseliti se imeše i radovati zane brat' ego mrtvь\textsuperscript{344} bé i ožive i zgibьl' bе i obrěte se \textsuperscript{346} čt(enie) \textsuperscript{351} tri i pritčе protivu parisėom' i knižnikom' g(lago)- lalь \textsuperscript{357} est\textsuperscript{358} i že hotěhu priěti pokaēnie \textsuperscript{361} g(lago)lahu \textsuperscript{363} nêci ot uč(e)n(i)kь ego.
iže dvoehu se ot pritče ekože pržde 367 k’368 knižnikom’ i parisom’369 g(lago)laše · 370 eže371 k’ m(i)-l(o)sr’diu uč(e)n(i)k(o)mь372 išoždaše373 i drugimi sl(o)v(e)si – otpućaite374 i375 otpuštij376 se vam’ da v m(o)l(i)vi vi377 g(ospod)i svobodним’ obrazom’378 vsprosite379 i otpuštij380 nam’381 d’gli naše382 ekože i383 mi otpućaem’384 dlžnikom’ n(a)šimь · eže385 est’ pritča · k’ m(i)l(o)sr’diu386 ap(usto)li prizivajuće387 ·388 č(lovê)kь389 e ter’ b(o)gat’390 imēše391 pristavnika ili spņžatura392 se’393 že394 ime395 znamenuet’396 pristavnik’ · eko vlaće397 vsi udržateleurs398 est’ · otnúdeže399 ot sela ime priět’400 · obariteles401 tako srebru402 eko403 žitomi i vsěm’404 eže g(ospod)405 udržiť spņžaturь406 est’

---

367 ekože pržde | eže prje Vat, Mosk ekože prije Drag ekože prije Vb, eže se pržđe Brib eko(o)že prije Dab
368 k’ | ka Mos
369 parisom’ | parisom’ (!) VO pariseomь Mosk Dab
370 k’ knižnikom’ i parisom’ g(lago)laše · | k piscemь i farizeomь gl(agola)še Drag k’ knižnikom’ g(lago)laše i parisomь Vb,
371 eže | eko(o)že Vat, Mosk
372 uč(e)n(i)k(o)mь | učenikь Vb,
373 išoždaše | išoše Vat, Drag Vb, N, Brib, Dab Ber2 is’hojaše Mosk
374 otpućaie | co’tpućaite VO
375 i | da Vat, Mosk om. Drag N, Dab Ber,
376 otpuštij | otputstit () Vb, otputesti () Brib
377 da v m(o)l(i)vi | v m(i)l(o)stij Vat, Mosk Vb, Dab N, Bribi
378 otputij nam’ | i otputiti v(a)mnь Drag Ber, i otputiti v(a)mnь Dab
379 naše | v(a)še Ber,
380 i | om. N, Dab
381 otpućaem’ | otpućemo Vat, otpućamo Dab
382 eže | č(e)že VO ekože Mosk eko(o)že Drag
383 k’ m(i)l(o)sr’diu | om. Vat, Mosk N, Brib Dab
384 ap(usto)li prizivajuće | ap(usto)li prizivaući Vb, Vb, Vb, N, ap(usto)le prizivaući Vat, Drag Mosk Dab, Brib
385 Ber, ap(usto)li prizivau N2
386 finis | Brib
387 č(lovê)kь | č(e)ž(lovê)ka VO
388 b(o)gat’ | om. Vb, Vb, pracc. bë Vat, Mosk
389 imēše | pracc. iže Vat, Mosk imiše Drag Vb, imë N1
390 spņžatura | spņžatura Drag Vb, Mosk N1, Dab Ber N2
391 se | sie Mosk
392 že | om. Vat, Mosk
393 ime | om. N1
394 znamenuet’ | znamenutь (!) Drag
395 vlaće | vlaća ee Dab
396 udržatele | udržitelь Drag udržitеле (!)Ber,
397 otnúdeže | otkudë Vat, Mosk N1, otkudi Drag otnúdeže Vb, otkudu Dab Ber2, otnudeže N2
398 priět’ | priěti Dab
399 obaritele | obarovatele Vb, Vb,
400 srebru | srebra N1
401 eko | č(e)že Vat, N, Dab ekože Drag Mosk Ber2
402 vsěm’ | všemь Drag Vb, všemь Dab
403 g(ospod) | om. Vat, Mosk N1, Dab
404 spņžaturь | spanžaturь Drag Dab Ber, N, spanžatūrь Vb, Mosk spanžaturь N1
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 oviwm, 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. Tertia parabolam proposuit hominis habentis duos filios, et dividendis 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 inventus est. Has tres parabolas contra Pharisaeos, et Scribas locutus est, qui nolebant recipere poenitentiam peccatorum, et Publicanorum salvum. 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, sic et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris. Quae est ergo parabola ad clementiam discipulos cohortantis? Homo quidam erat dives, qui habeat villicum sive dispensatorem, hoc enim oikonomouς significat. Villicus autem proprie villae gubernator est, unde et a villa villicus nomen accepit. Oikonomos autem tam pecuniae, quam frugum, et omnium quae dominus possidet, dispensator est. Unde, et oikonomos Xenophontis pulcherrimus liber est, qui non gubernationem villae, sed dispensationem universae domus (Tullio interpretante) significat.