

Hrvatskoglagojski tekst *Makabejskih knjiga* proučen je u ovoj monografiji na više filoloških razina: književnopovijesnoj, tekstološkoj i jezičnostilskoj, na temelju čega je zaključeno da on predstavlja izvoran prevoditeljski rad. Knjiga Vesne Badurine Stipčević *Hrvatskoglagojske Makabejske knjige* vrijedna je i nezaobilazna studija za istraživanje hrvatskoglagojske baštine, posebice Biblije, koja se, kao što je poznato, nije očuvala kao cjelovita knjiga.

MARINKA ŠIMIĆ

Ana MIHALJEVIĆ, *Hrvatskoglagojski tekstovi prevedeni s latinskoga*. Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, Staroslavenski institut, Zagreb 2020, 483 p.

Ana Mihaljević's *Hrvatskoglagojski tekstovi prevedeni s latinskoga* (*Croatian glagolitic texts translated from Latin*, with the subtitle *Sintaktička analiza / Syntactical analysis*) is a revised version of the author's doctoral dissertation. It explores some aspects of linguistic influence and translation in Mediaeval Croatian literature, with an emphasis on syntax. In addition to linguistic data, it contains an extensive theoretical overview of topics such as languages in contact, interaction and interference between languages, translation as a stimulus for linguistic change, formal and functional equivalence in translations, etc. The study focuses on the relationship between Latin, Croatian Church Slavonic, and the spoken Croatian dialect of the examined time period. Latin and Croatian Church Slavonic have some features in common, e.g., their status as literary and written languages and, in the case of biblical translations, the influence they experience from Hebrew and Greek. While the two languages also share many similarities in terms of their structure, the author pays special attention to the grammatical asymmetry between them (features of the source language without a formal equivalent in the target language, such as the conjunctive, infinitive constructions with accusative and nominative, the ablative absolute, periphrastic conjugation, gerunds, etc.). The work has been undertaken using the methods of corpus-based translation studies, and takes a descriptive approach to the analysis of several texts translated from Latin into Croatian Church Slavonic.

The corpus consists of texts of various genres: apocrypha (*Vita Adae et Evae, Evangelium Nicodemi, Protoevangelium Iacobi*); hagiographies (*Lectio s. Margaritae, De s. Patricio, De s. Maria Magdalena*); liturgical texts (offi-

ces from the breviary *S. Antonii de Padua* and *Lectio in festo s. Thomae episc. et mart.*); biblical books (*Esther*, *Libri Machabaeorum Duo*); parts of several homilies, *Regula s. Benedicti*, and some others. The list of linguistic features analysed is extensive; it includes not only the aforementioned constructions, which were a challenge for the translators, but also numerous means of expression in general use, such as prepositions and conjunctions, participles, various types of subordinate clauses, negation, and word order.

In the chapter on prepositional clauses (pp. 56–168), 37 Latin prepositions and their Slavonic counterparts are described. The overall picture is not surprising: there is exact correspondence between the two languages in most examples, but sometimes the translation reveals a tendency towards variation. The most interesting examples, however, are cases of Latin syntactical influence. The author finds three types of influence: 1. expanding the semantic range of spatial and temporal prepositions, such as *отъ* (< *de*), *къ* (< *ad*), and *egda / kada* (< *cum*), in non-spatial, respectively non-temporal phrases; 2. the occasional use of “false friends” – the Croatian *pro* for the Latin *pro* (instead of the more appropriate translation with *za*); 3. changes in word order.

The next chapter deals with the translation of participles (pp. 169–188). Both languages use participles extensively and it is possible for the translation to be faithful, often literal. However, the two systems are not identical; there are five participles in Slavonic as compared to only three in Latin, and there are differences in their usage. Most of the Latin participles in the corpus were translated in accordance with Slavonic participles, but other possibilities also include relative or temporal clauses, infinitive constructions (denoting future tense), and finite verb forms in main clauses.

Four more chapters discuss participial constructions, specifically active and passive periphrastic conjugation, gerunds and gerundives, and the ablative absolute (pp. 189–234). Some of these constructions are rarely used in the analysed texts, and translation methods vary as they have no exact match in Croatian Church Slavonic. Particular attention is paid to the rendering of the Latin ablative absolute. On the one hand, there is an adequate corresponding construction in Slavonic – the dative absolute, which originated in the earliest period of Old Church Slavonic. Its meanings and usage are very similar to the Latin absolute construction, and it is thus one of the most common methods used to translate it. On the other hand, there is no ablative case in Slavonic, which facilitates alternative solutions in the translated texts (such as subordinate clauses, prepositional phrases, etc.) and syntactical influence from Latin. This is the case in examples where instrumental absolute constructions cor-

respond to the ablative absolute (cf. pp. 199–202). Instrumental is the usual match for most of the meanings of the Latin ablative, but its use in absolute phrases is undoubtedly due to the influence of the source language. In the conclusion of this chapter (pp. 212–214), the author underlines the tendency of Croatian Slavonic translations to remain faithful to their Latin sources in terms of the use of absolute constructions. However, two interesting aspects of this topic should be discussed further: a comparison with dative absolute constructions in Old Church Slavonic, and a more extensive commentary on syntactical synonymy in general. Slavonic translators were able to choose from among various means of expression to render the same meaning, and their choices are indicative both of their individual styles and of general tendencies in linguistic development.

Commentary on non-finite verb forms continues with a chapter on infinitive constructions (pp. 235–252), which are a very interesting subject of syntactical analysis as each element in the construction has its own peculiarities. The infinitive depends on a *verbum regens*, and its subject is often different from the subject of the main clause. In the book, two groups of infinitive constructions are taken into consideration depending on the case of the infinitive's subject (accusative or nominative). Within each group (*acc. c. inf.* and *nom. c. inf.*), the author describes the structure of the construction and comments on the meaning and government of the *verba regentia*, translation methods, and the degree of syntactical influence. Although the description of the examples is exhaustive, some issues remain unaddressed. One of these is the issue of the relationship between *acc. c. infinitivo* and *acc. c. participio* (cf. p. 245) in both Latin and in the translations. It seems that the translations in the corpus follow their Latin sources, but more extensive theoretical grounds could be given for including the participial constructions among the infinitives. Another issue of syntactical competition that deserves attention is the semantic difference between subordinate clauses with *da* and *êko* in Croatian Church Slavonic (cf. p. 246). These cases of synonymy and variation have their roots in Old Church Slavonic; they are not only the result of Latin syntactical influence, but are also part of the earliest Slavonic literary norm. Ana Mihaljević makes some connections with Old Church Slavonic while discussing a few examples of *dativus cum infinitivo* (only six cases are reported, cf. p. 247). Here, the dative subject of the infinitive is the indirect object of the governing verb. She concludes that the Croatian translators usually strove to faithfully translate Latin infinitive constructions, only rarely digressing from their sources.

Almost the entire second half of the book is dedicated to various types of subordinate clauses. These present translators with various challenges, and shed light on the syntax of Slavonic conjunctions, moods, and tenses.

Indirect questions (pp. 253–265) are regarded as a subdivision of objective clauses. They are divided into eight groups according to the connecting question words used in Latin. In some cases, conjunctive was used in the Latin sentences (*coniunct. praes., impf., plpf.*); as a result, the use of conditional is more frequent in the Croatian Church Slavonic translations, another example of syntactical influence from the source language. The next group of sentences are closely related to indirect questions (and yet another type of objective clause) – explicative clauses (*izrične rečenice*, pp. 266–276). In Latin, the same meaning can be expressed by infinitive constructions (declarative infinitives) governed by verbs of saying and thinking. This functional synonymity is mentioned, but not explored further in the book. The examples of *accusativus cum infinivo* in the previous chapters suggest that declarative infinitives were not commonly used in the texts in question.

Final clauses (pp. 277–292) also allow different approaches in translation, and are indicative of translators' style and preferences. Most of the examples are of *ut*-sentences, translated with the usual *da*-verbs. Some of the other Slavonic counterparts, such as participles and infinitives, which also denote purpose and intention, reveal similarities in the meaning of non-finite and finite verbal forms not only in Croatian Church Slavonic, but also in the earliest period of Slavonic literacy. Competition between *da*-verbs and infinitives, which is a distinctive feature of the South Slavic languages, is most apparent in final subordinate clauses.

Sentences of indirect request and demand (*zahtjevne rečenice*, pp. 293–300) are also classified as a subdivision of objective clauses. Their *verba regentia* mean 'ask', 'order', 'demand', etc., and in Latin they are either *ut*-clauses or infinitives (*acc. c. inf.*). The translations do not differ from the previous types; they prefer *da*-sentences and infinitives, and sometimes use the conditional to comply with the Latin imperfective conjunctive.

Adverbial clauses are the next large group of sentences discussed in the book: temporal (pp. 301–333), causal (334–346), concessive (347–355), resultative (356–359), conditional (360–373), and comparative clauses (374–387). Usually, translators follow their sources faithfully, and are consistent in rendering the Latin conjunctions (the most frequent and polysemantic Slavonic parallels being *da* and *êko*). In some examples, the Croatian Church Slavonic diverges from the Latin text, such as in the use of *dativus absolutus*

as a temporal clause; this is regarded as a linguistic feature used to date translations to the 13th century, as this syntactic construction had fallen out of use in Croatian by the 14th century (p. 309).

The translation of relative clauses (pp. 388–403) follows the same pattern; the Slavonic texts use corresponding relative conjunctions and the conditional (under the influence of the Latin *coniunctivus imperfecti*), and there is occasional syntactical synonymity, which mirrors the Latin grammatical structure (e.g. the possibility of rendering a relative clause with a participle). The examples also give us the opportunity to observe how the Old Church Slavonic relative pronoun *īže* (used only in biblical translations from the corpus) is replaced by the interrogative pronouns *ki*, *ča*, etc. (pp. 392–395).

The next syntactical topic in the book is negation (pp. 404–437). The thorough analysis includes a theoretical introduction and special attention to double negation (negative concord) and word order. According to the author's observations, Latin influence can be traced in the lack of negative concord in cases where it is optional in Slavonic, but not in word order (esp. the position of negative words within a sentence).

The last chapter is dedicated to word order (pp. 438–450). As this topic is large and complex, Ana mihaljević investigates only some general aspects and trends, outlining cases of syntactical influence and discrepancy. She provides numerous examples, focusing her attention on the position of the predicate in the sentence, the object and the subject in respect to the verb, the order of nouns and their modifiers, etc. She concludes that, overall, word order in the translated texts corresponds to the sources. Some Latin influence is observed in the frequent position of verbs at the end of sentences; however, the Slavonic texts are more independent in their preference towards the postposition of adjectives and other modifiers.

The conclusion (pp. 451–460) summarizes the entire study and provides an excellent overview of the main problems and results presented in the book. The descriptive approach, which provides numerous examples from the corpus, is supported by theoretical commentaries throughout the exposition. Additional comparison with Old Church Slavonic and other Croatian Glagolitic texts would provide an even better understanding of the linguistic processes attested in the study. As a whole, this is a valuable analysis of the syntax of Croatian translations from Latin, and can be used as a work of reference for further research.

ANETA DIMITROVA