

Jiří DYNDÁ
Petra STANKOVSKÁ
Slovanský ústav AV ČR
Prag (Češka)
dynda@slu.cas.cz
stankovska@slu.cas.cz

UDK: 272-282.7:003.349.1
27-242.5
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31745/s.74.4>
izvorni znanstveni članak
primljen: 24. svibnja 2023.
prihvaćen: 7. studenoga 2023.

THE EXTENT OF THE EARLY OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC TRANSLATION OF THE *PENTATEUCH* PRESERVED IN CROATIAN GLAGOLITIC BREVIAIRES AND MISSALS: THE *BOOK OF GENESIS* IN THE BREVIAIRES

The article focuses on particular problems that arose during work on a new edition of the Old Church Slavonic (OCS) Pentateuch preserved in Croatian Glagolitic breviaries and missals. It describes the peculiarities of the material in the Book of Genesis as attested in pre-15th century breviaries. The article provides specific examples of passages in which the Old Testament (OT) text of the Pentateuch was not included in the Slavonic Prophetologia, which contained the earliest preserved OCS translation of OT texts. These consist of (1) abridged OT genealogies that had to be shortened in the breviaries; (2) abridged non-Prophetologion passages included in breviaries in the shortened redaction; (3) unabridged non-Prophetologion passages for which a new, ad hoc translation was included in the breviaries. The article offers several examples of the breviary text as it will appear in the forthcoming edition. It presents the edition of the text with variant readings from all available manuscripts.

Keywords: Pentateuch; Croatian Glagolitic; breviaries; missals; Prophetologion translation

1. INTRODUCTION

Considerable portions of the Church Slavonic version of the Pentateuch have survived in the form of biblical pericopes in Croatian Glagolitic breviaries and missals (BAKMAZ, 2004: 140, 143-144). These literary monuments contain roughly 1,300 Old Testament (OT) verses. Since the beginning of the

20th century, various scholars (NAHTIGAL, 1902; VAJS, 1910; MICHAJLOV, 1912) have claimed that some parts of this Slavonic text are linguistically antiquated and may, to some extent, represent the earliest known version of the Old Church Slavonic (OCS) translation of the Bible, made by members of the Cyrillo-Methodian mission to Great Moravia (see also NAZOR, 1985; BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ, 1997; BAUEROVÁ, 2000; ČERMÁK, 2004; STANKOVSKÁ, 2016; STANKOVSKÁ, 2017). However, this hypothesis remains unproven, as the exact origin of the biblical text preserved in the Croatian Glagolitic tradition cannot be definitively determined, nor can it be said which parts may be considered evidence of the oldest surviving translation.

Only thorough, systematic textual examination and comparison of all the verses studied can yield reliable conclusions regarding the genuine origin of biblical translations in liturgical books (see STANKOVSKÁ 2016). To this end, the surviving text of the Pentateuch in all known variants must first be made available as a new critical edition. Thus, the goal of our current project¹ is to publish the parts of the Pentateuch preserved in Croatian Glagolitic breviaries and missals, as the actual form and origin of the source text for Pentateuch pericopes (or those of the *Old Testament* in general) in the breviaries and missals has only been speculated. The earliest Slavonic translation of the Prophetologion (the Old Testament Lectionary readings, Rus. *parimejnik*) is currently considered the source of most of the pericopes.² In preparing a comprehensive edition of the Pentateuch in the Croatian Glagolitic manuscript tradition, these old questions have re-emerged with a new vibrancy. Against this backdrop, to fill the gaps in our knowledge, the edition currently being prepared will include roughly 20 missals and 20 breviaries, as well as some text fragments from other documents.

In the 20th century, scholars distinguished two textual groups of breviaries and missals (PANTELIĆ, 1967: 69; TANDARIĆ, 1980: 137; ČERMÁK, 2003: 62–63; ŠIMIĆ, VELA, 2021: 125–126):

1. The *northern*, Krk-Istria group of texts (which is older; the earliest manuscripts date from the second half of the 13th century). It contains biblical texts translated into OCS from the Greek (based on the Prophe-

¹ *A Critical Edition of the Pentateuch in Croatian Glagolitic Medieval Sources*, project GA21-13600S, funded by the Czech Grant Agency.

² The critical edition of the oldest preserved OCS Prophetologion (RIBAROVA, HAUPTOVA 1998) was consulted.

tologion version, as was initially noted by Nahtigal³ and Michajlov⁴ with minimal redaction. Some non-Prophetologion portions of the text are translated from the Latin original.

2. The *southern*, Zadar-Krbava group (more recent; the earliest manuscripts date from the second half of the 14th century) contains biblical texts from the northern group, yet redacted according to Latin breviaries; some parts are translated from Latin, and the vocabulary has been greatly Croatised (BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ, 1997; CORIN, 1997).

Rather than reflecting two lines of development, this division reflects a single line in which the original translation from the Greek (the text of the Prophetologion), which is included in the breviaries and missals, was only later amended and redacted to be more in line with Latin texts. Some texts that did not appear in the northern group were additionally translated in the southern group.

One of the oldest breviaries used for the planned edition of the Pentateuch text is the 1396 *Breviary of Vid of Omišalj* (BrVO; Austrian National Library, Vienna, shelfmark Cod. Slav. 3⁵) from the northern group, supplemented by the *Vatican Illirico 5 breviary* from the southern group (BrVat₅; Bibl. Apostolica Vaticana, Rome, shelfmark Borg.-Illir. 5), as well as several other breviaries from both groups (see the list of manuscripts cited at the end of the article). Parts of the edition currently being prepared are included in this article to illustrate problems associated with the research.

2. A CASE STUDY

Contemporary scholarship on Croatian Glagolitic liturgical books can and should encompass research on all available manuscripts. The upcoming edition will allow this by considering variant readings from the entire attested corpus of Croatian Glagolitic breviaries and missals. To reach reasonable conclusions about the origins and scope of the Old Testament readings in the tra-

³ NAHTIGAL 1902.

⁴ MICHAJLOV 1912.

⁵ The published transliteration from Glagolitic into Latin script is used in this article (KAPPEL, JURIĆ KAPPEL, VELA, 2023). In some places, the extent of verses varies from those in the edition, as we have attempted to not only accurately identify the cited biblical verses, but also to note paraphrasings.

dition, scholars must work concurrently with an extensive catalogue of breviaries and missals (STANKOVSKÁ, 2016). The focus of this article, however, will be more specific. As a case study of these problems, we will show some of the peculiarities of the available material related to the Book of Genesis as attested in pre-15th century breviaries. This is mainly due to the fact that passages from Genesis in the breviaries have undergone numerous changes and adaptations. However, they provide excellent illustrations of the types of challenges encountered during work on this edition.

Let us now highlight some of these Genesis pericopes. Though the length and structure of the various liturgical readings varies among the breviaries, the documented text of the first five chapters of Genesis is textually unproblematic. These five chapters are divided into two liturgical readings: *sabbato ante septuagesimam* (Gn. 1:1–2:24) and *feriis (čtenie v proste dni; Gn. 2,25–5,31)*.⁶ The entire surviving text of the first five chapters is also attested in the Prophetologia, except for a few lines at the end of chapter 5 (Gn. 5:23–31) which were not included in the Prophetologia; as a result, these verses in BrVO, BrVb₂, BrVb₃, BrN₁, and BrBer₂ are a loose translation of the OT text.

Chapters six through eleven are also unproblematic, though the liturgical readings in several southern breviaries are organised differently (mainly to be read on *Dominica in sexagesima – Neděle přede mesopustomb*, but some verses between Gn. 6:22–11:32 are read as *čtenie v proste dni* in BrVat₅, BrDrag, BrMosk, BrN₁, BrN₂, and BrMav) than in the other Croatian Glagolitic breviaries we have dealt with. Nevertheless, the total length of the text remains the same, even though only a few breviaries include the entire text of Gn. 5:32 to 11:32 without interruption or gaps (BrVO, BrVb₂, BrVb₃, and BrN₁). The text likewise mostly adheres to the Prophetologion translation of the Old Testament (except for verses Gn. 10:2–5 and 11:11–32, which are only roughly translated in BrVO, BrVb₂, BrVb₃, and BrN₁).

Further complications arise from the beginning of Chapter 12 onwards. The liturgical readings are again occasionally organised differently than in the other breviaries. Usually, Gn. 12:1 constitutes the beginning of the reading on *Dominica in quinquagesima – Neděle mesopustna*. Yet some breviaries, e.g. BrVat₅, BrPm, BrDrag, BrMosk, BrN₁, and BrN₂, again include the additional *čtenie v proste dni*.

⁶ Some of the manuscripts begin the *čtenie v proste dni* with different verses: with Gn 1:27 (BrPm, BrDrag, BrMav), with Gn 1:29 (BrN₂), with Gn 2:10 (BrVat₅), or with Gn 2:11 (BrMosk). They also vary in the end of the reading: they conclude with Gn 3:24 (BrVat₅, BrDrag, BrMosk), Gn 2:3 (BrMav), Gn 2:10 (BrMav), or Gn 2:17 (BrPm).

Let us now concentrate on the appearance of loosely translated or paraphrased Genesis text. The synoptic perspective on the entire known manuscript tradition reveals that this phenomenon occurs routinely when a segment of biblical verse is not attested in the OCS Prophetologion translations. This is particularly true in Gn. 5:25–31; 8:1–3; 10:2–31; 11:10–32; 12:8–20; 13:1–10; 14:1–13; 14:21–25; 16:1–16; 17:20–27; 18:1–19; 19:1–28; 20:1–18; 21:3; 21:8–34; 22:19–24; 23:1–20; 24:1–67; 25:1–26:33; 28:1–4; 28:18–29:27; 30:9–13; 31:17–55; 39:1–23; 40:1–23; 41:1–57; 44:1–34; 45:17–28.

These instances of loosely translated, abbreviated, or paraphrased text can be usefully categorised into three heuristic groups based on the reason for their loose translation, abbreviation, or paraphrasing.

2.1. Abridged non-Prophetologion genealogies

The first group includes occasions when there was a need to shorten the Old Testament genealogies—the pedigree or ancestry of various individuals in the OT. This text was often omitted from the Prophetologion version, so there was a logical need to include a shortened version in the breviaries.

This is the case with e.g. Gn. 5:26–32. In an instructive comparison with the *Septuagint* (LXX) text below, we can see how the information on the number of years a person lived (verses 28–31) has been omitted, and it appears only at the end of the Croatian Church Slavonic text (Gn. 5:32 occurs only in BrVO 133c1–5 /ed. KAPPEL, JURÍĆ KAPPEL, VELA, 2023: 350/ in the beginning of the biblical reading for another day). For liturgical purposes, that information was simply redundant.

BrVO 132d27–133a12 (ed. KAPPEL;
JURÍĆ KAPPEL, VELA, 2023: 348–349):

Gn.

5:26 sa že matusalъ o(т)сѣ lamehovъ večje vsêh' biv' ših prêzde ego poži · i bêv' ših' po nem' daže i do nasъ ·

27 bisi bo vsêh' dni ego lét' ·900· i ·90· i ·9· сѣ bo bê osmi ot ргъvago č(lovê)ka · osmago že vêka obrazъ bê · têmže i množêe vsêh' poži ·

[28–31] lameh že s(i)нъ ego biv' ·100· i ·80· i ·8· rodi noê · ргi nemže bisi potopъ · o nemže poprêd' pouduče skažem' · ti že

LXX (ed. RAHLFS, 1952: 7–8):

Gn

5:26 καὶ ἔζησε Μαθουσάλα μετὰ τὸ γεννηθῆσαι αὐτὸν τὸν Λάμεχ δύο καὶ ὀκτακόσια ἔτη καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοῦς καὶ θυγατέρας.

27 καὶ ἐγένοντο πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι Μαθουσάλα, ἃς ἔζησεν, ἑννέα καὶ ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἑννακόσια ἔτη, καὶ ἀπέθανε.

28 Καὶ ἔζησε Λάμεχ ὀκτὼ καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἔτη καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱόν.

29 καὶ ἐπωνόμασε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Νῶε λέγων· οὗτος διαναπαύσει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λυπῶν τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ἧς κατηράσατο Κύριος ὁ Θεός.

30 καὶ ἔζησε Λάμεχ μετὰ τὸ γεννηῆσαι αὐτὸν τὸν Νῶε πεντακόσια καὶ ἐξήκοντα καὶ πέντε ἔτη καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας.

31 καὶ ἐγένοντο πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι Λάμεχ ἑπτακόσια καὶ πενήκοντα τρία ἔτη, καὶ ἀπέθανε.

32 Καὶ ἦν Νῶε ἐτῶν πεντακοσίων καὶ ἐγέννησε τρεῖς υἱοὺς, τὸν Σήμ, τὸν Χάμ, καὶ τὸν Ἰάφεθ.

Another example is the genealogy from Gn. 11:10–32, which is heavily abridged in BrVO, BrVb₂, BrVb₃, and BrN₁ since it was liturgically insignificant. It is completely omitted in other breviaries for the same reason.

2.2. Abridged non-Prophetologia passages

The second group includes abridged passages or verses that were omitted from the Prophetologia, yet had to be included in the breviaries. This may well be evidence that most of the breviary text passages were composed in accordance with the extent and vocabulary of the earliest Prophetologia (though not their liturgical structure), and the verses not included there were inserted after the fact in an abridged, ad hoc translation, most likely from the Latin. This can be seen in the example of Gn. 12:10–20: the Krk (northern) redaction—likely the original—has a shortened text (illustrated here by the BrVO reading, but also found in BrVb₁, BrVb₂, BrVb₃, BrPad, BrPt, BrRom, BrMav, BrMet, and BrBer₂), while the revised southern redaction of BrVat₅ includes a passage translated literally:⁷

⁷ The text of the Vulgate (FISCHER 1983 was used for our comparison) is provided here only for illustrative comparison with the text of BrVat₅, not as a direct translation model (which would be close to the *Vetus Latina* text).

BrVO 140b17–140c12 (ed. KAPPEL, JURÍČ KAPPEL, VELA, 2023: 363–364):

Gn

12:10–13 egda že⁸ bis(ťb) glady⁹ ve|li¹⁰ v z(e)mli hanan|êiscê¹¹ · vnide¹² av|ram¹³ v z(e)mlû eûpřt'sku¹⁴ | i uboêv¹⁵ se eda kako¹⁶ dob|roti¹⁷ radi sarini¹⁸ umore|ťb i · umisli sestru se|bê¹⁹ naricati û · sice že | i samoi^{ei20} lûbeči narica|ti se²¹ · êko da^{ne} umoret²² ee²³ ra|di · **14–20** hvalami²⁴ že ei suč|^{im}_[140c] mnogim²⁵ kь c(êsa)ru paraonu²⁶ · | êko krasna²⁷ est' · prived|e û žiti hote²⁸ š neû²⁹ c(êsa)rь | paraonь · sice že eûpřt'sci c(êsa)ri³⁰ nari(ča)hu se · sь že c(êsa)r' | paraonь · muku priem' ot b(og)a | ee radi · sь³¹ strahom' otpřsti û · ne prilêpi³² se ei³³ · | i k' svoemu ima imêniû b|ogatъstvo mnogo prida|vь³⁴ · tako³⁵ otpřsti ê čьst'no³⁶

⁸ egda že| egda Vb₂ Vb₃, k(a)da Mav;

⁹ bis(ťb) glady| bisi glady Vb₂, glady bis(ťb) Ber₂;

¹⁰ ve|li om. Vb₃ Pt;

¹¹ hananêiscê| hananêiscêi Vb₃, hananeiskoi Met Ber₂;

¹² vnide| viide Rom;

¹³ avram' | avraamъ Mav;

¹⁴ eûpřt'sku| eûpřt'aisku Ber₂ Pt;

¹⁵ uboêv| uboê Ber₂;

¹⁶ eda kako| eda kogda Ber₂;

¹⁷ dobroti| lêpoti Pad Met Rom Pt;

¹⁸ sarini| sarrini Mav Rom Pt sari ženi ego Ber₂;

¹⁹ sestru sebê| sebê sestru Vb₁, sestru sebi Pt;

²⁰ i samoi ei| ne samoi Ber₂;

²¹ naricati se| nareči se Ber₂;

²² umoret'| add. i Vb₂ Vb₃ Met Pt, add. ga Mav, umretъ Ber₂;

²³ ee| nee Ber₂;

²⁴ hvalami| hvalimê Vb₂ Vb₃ Pad, hvalimi Ber₂, hvalim êk(o) Pt;

²⁵ sučim' mnogim'| suči mnogimi Vb₁ Vb₂ BrVb₃ Pad Mav Ber₂ Pt;

²⁶ paraonu| paronu Met;

²⁷ krasna| lipa Ber₂;

²⁸ žiti hote| žiti hotê Ber₂, hote žiti Pt;

²⁹ š neû| s neû Vb₁;

³⁰ eûpřt'sci c(êsa)ri| c(êsa)ri eûpřt'aiski Ber₂ Pt;

³¹ sь| om. Ber₂;

³² prilêpi| prilêpiv Vb₂ Vb₃ Pad Met Mav Ber₂, prilipiv Pt;

³³ ei| nei Ber₂;

³⁴ bogatъstvo mnogo pridavь| bogatъstvo mnogo pridastъ Vb₃, bogatъstva mnoga prida Ber₂, bogatъstva mnogo pridavъ Pt;

³⁵ tako| i tako Vb₃, om. Ber₂;

³⁶ čьst'no| čьstnê Vb₁ Vb₂ Pt, častna Vb₃

BrVat₅ 69b18–69c28:**Gn**

12:10 bistъ³⁷ gladъ veli | v z(e)mli hananêiscêi³⁸ · i vnide avr|aamъ³⁹ v z(e)mlû eûpat-sku⁴⁰ · i sta|vb⁴¹ onê preodolêvaûcu⁴² gla|du v z(e)mli⁴³. **11** i⁴⁴ egda⁴⁵ blizъ b(ê)še⁴⁶ v|niti hote⁴⁷ v' eûpatъ reče sar'rê⁴⁸ ženê svoi⁴⁹ · poznahъ êk(o) lêpa | esi žena⁵⁰ **12** i⁵¹ egda⁵² uzret' te⁵³ eûpê|ane hotetъ⁵⁴ reči⁵⁵ žena mu⁵⁶ estъ | i ubiût' me · i⁵⁷ t(e)be ustavetъ⁵⁸ · **13** r'ci⁵⁹ | m(o)lû te êk(o)⁶⁰ sestra mi⁶¹ esi da⁶² dobro | mnê b(u)detъ⁶³ t(e)be r(a) di i živiti⁶⁴ || _[69c1] vačnetъ⁶⁵ d(u)ša moê v hv(a)lû⁶⁶ tvoû · | _[69c7] **14** i⁶⁷ egda⁶⁸ všalъ b(ê)

³⁷ bistъ| bi Oxf, i bis(тъ) Pm Vat₁₉ N₂ Bar, add. že Vat₁₀;

³⁸ hananêiscêi| haldêiscê N₁;

³⁹ avraamъ| abramъ Pm Vat₁₉ Bar, abraamъ Drag, avramъ N₁;

⁴⁰ eûpatsku| ejip(a)tsku Pm, eûp(a)tskuû Mosk, eûpataisku Vat₁₀;

⁴¹ stavъ| stranova Pm N₁ Bar, strava Drag, s'ta Mosk Vat₁₉ N₂;

⁴² preodolêvaûcu| add. že Pm;

⁴³ z(e)mli| add. toi Pm Mosk, add. onoi Vat₁₉ N₂;

⁴⁴ i| om. N₁;

⁴⁵ egda| kada Bar;

⁴⁶ b(ê)še| add. abramъ Pm, bê N₁;

⁴⁷ vniti hote| v'niti Oxf, hote vniti N₁ Vat₁₉, hotê v'niti N₂, vniti hotê Bar;

⁴⁸ sar'rê| sarê N₁, sar'ri Oxf, sari Bar;

⁴⁹ ženê svoi| ženi svoei Oxf Bar, ženê svoei N₂;

⁵⁰ lêpa esi žena| lipa žena esi Oxf, lêpa esi Mosk;

⁵¹ i| om. N₁ Vat₁₀;

⁵² egda| kada Bar;

⁵³ te| om. Vat₁₀;

⁵⁴ hotetъ| hote N₂;

⁵⁵ reči| add. êk(o) Oxf;

⁵⁶ mu| emu Oxf Pm Drag Mosk Vat₁₀ N₂ Bar, emu emu N₁;

⁵⁷ i| a N₁ Vat₁₉ N₂ Bar;

⁵⁸ ustavetъ| os'tavetъ Mosk N₁ Vat₁₀ Bar;

⁵⁹ r'ci| r'cri (!) N₂;

⁶⁰ êk(o)| k(a)ko Vat₁₀;

⁶¹ mi| moê Mosk Vat₁₀;

⁶² da| om. Vat₁₀;

⁶³ mnê b(u)detъ| budetъ m'nê Vat₁₉ N₂ Bar, mnê bude Vat₁₀;

⁶⁴ živiti| žiti Pm Mosk N₁ N₂ Bar živa Vat₁₉;

⁶⁵ vačnetъ| b(u)detъ Mosk Vat₁₉ Vat₁₀ N₂;

⁶⁶ hv(a)lu N₂;

⁶⁷ i| om. N₁, Drag;

⁶⁸ egda| kada Vat₁₀ Bar;

še⁶⁹ avraamъ⁷⁰ v' eû|patъ⁷¹ · vidêvše⁷² eûpĉane že|nu ego êk(o) b(ê)še krasna⁷³ velmi · **15** i⁷⁴ vz|vêstiše⁷⁵ c(êsa)ru⁷⁶ paraonu i vshv(a) |liše û pred nimъ⁷⁷ · i poĉta bis(ъ) že|na siê⁷⁸ v domъ paraonovъ. **16** avra|amu⁷⁹ vistinu dobro⁸⁰ b(ê)še⁸¹ ee r(a)di⁸² · | **17** nakaza že g(ospod)ъ⁸³ paraona velmi⁸⁴ | ranami⁸⁵ i domъ ego · | **18** i⁸⁶ prizva paraonъ avraama⁸⁷ i r(e)|ĉe emu · ĉto ubo stvoru⁸⁸ mnê · i⁸⁹ | poĉto⁹⁰ ne r(e)ĉe mnê⁹¹ êk(o) lepa⁹² tvoê | siê bila bi · **19** poĉto û⁹³ gl(agola)ъ⁹⁴ esi⁹⁵ | sestru tvoû⁹⁶ · i⁹⁷ togo radi⁹⁸ azъ p|oêh⁹⁹

⁶⁹ všaъ b(ê)še| vnide N₁;

⁷⁰ avraamъ| abraamъ Drag, avramъ N₁ Vat₁₀, ab'ramъ Vat₁₉ Bar;

⁷¹ v' eûpatъ| v z(e)mlû eûpat's'ku Vat₁₉ N₂;

⁷² vidêvše| add. že Drag, vid(ê)še Mosk N₁ Vat₁₉;

⁷³ b(ê)še krasna| k'rasna e(stъ) Vat₁₉;

⁷⁴ i| om. N₁ Vat₁₉;

⁷⁵ vzvêstiše| add. Ū N₂;

⁷⁶ c(êsa)ru| om. Vat₁₉;

⁷⁷ vzvêstiše c(êsa)ru paraonu i vshv(a)|liše û pred nimъ| ishvališe c(êsa)ru paraonu Vat₁₀;

⁷⁸ siê| abramla Vat₁₉;

⁷⁹ avraamu| abraamu Drag, i avramu N₁, abramu že Vat₁₉, avramu Vat₁₀, add. že N₂, abramu Bar;

⁸⁰ dobro| dobrê Mosk;

⁸¹ b(ê)še| bê N₁;

⁸² r(a)di| ciĉъ Vat₁₀;

⁸³ g(ospod)ъ| add. b(og)ъ N₁ Vat₁₉ N₂;

⁸⁴ velmi| velikimi Drag Mosk Vat₁₀ N₂ Bar, om. Vat₁₉;

⁸⁵ ranami| add. vel'mi Vat₁₉;

⁸⁶ i| om. N₁;

⁸⁷ avraama| abraama Drag, avrama N₁, abrama Bar;

⁸⁸ stvoru| stvori Drag Mosk N₁ N₂ Bar;

⁸⁹ i| om. Drag Mosk N₁ N₂;

⁹⁰ poĉto| add. Ubo N₂;

⁹¹ mnê| om. N₂;

⁹² lepa| žena Drag Mosk N₁ N₂ Bar;

⁹³ û| om. BrN₂ BrBar;

⁹⁴ gl(agol)ъ| gov(o)r(i)ъ Bar;

⁹⁵ esi| si Drag N₁;

⁹⁶ tvoû| svoû Drag;

⁹⁷ i| om. Mosk N₁ N₂;

⁹⁸ radi| add. i Mosk;

⁹⁹ azъ poĉêhъ| pohodêh' N₁;

û v ženu sebê · n(i)ne ubo se žlena tvoê primi û¹⁰⁰ i idi **20** zap(o)v(ê)dê¹⁰¹ | paraony mužemь da otvedutь | avraama¹⁰² i ženu ego i vsa êže¹⁰³ | imêše¹⁰⁴ ·

Gn

12:10 facta est autem fames in terra descenditque Abram in Aegyptum ut peregrinaretur ibi praevaluerat enim fames in terra **11** cumque prope esset ut ingrederetur Aegyptum dixit Sarai uxori suae novi quod pulchra sis mulier **12** et quod cum viderint te Aegyptii dicturi sunt uxor ipsius est et interficient me et te reservabunt **13** dic ergo obsecro te quod soror mea sis ut bene sit mihi propter te et vivat anima mea ob gratiam tui **14** cum itaque ingressus esset Abram Aegyptum viderunt Aegyptii mulierem quod esset pulchra nimis **15** et nuntiaverunt principes Pharaoni et laudaverunt eam apud illum et sublata est mulier in domum Pharaonis **16** Abram vero bene usi sunt propter illam fueruntque ei oves et boves et asini et servi et famulae et asinae et camelî **17** flagellavit autem Dominus Pharaonem plagis maximis et domum eius propter Sarai uxorem Abram **18** vocavitque Pharao Abram et dixit ei quidnam est quod fecisti mihi quare non indicasti quod uxor tua esset **19** quam ob causam dixisti esse sororem tuam ut tollerem eam mihi in uxorem nunc igitur ecce coniux tua accipe eam et vade **20** praecepitque Pharao super Abram viris et deduxerunt eum et uxorem illius et omnia quae habebat

2.3. Unabridged non-Prophetologion passages

Next—of great interest—are the pericopes that were not included in the Prophetologia, but are rendered in a quite accurate translation in the breviaries, typically from the Latin, yet occasionally with some Greek ‘contaminations’, as will be described below.

2.3.1 Specific aspects of this are apparent in the example of Gn 17, the OCS text of which shows some indisputable lexical and syntactic features of Latin. Gn 17:22: *i egda že iskon'čano bis(tb) slovo g(lago)lúčago* (BrVO 142c19–20, ed. KAPPEL, JURÍČ KAPPEL, VELA, 2023: 368) is clearly based on the Latin, *cumque finitus esset sermo loquentis*, as compared to the Greek Septuagint version: *συνετέλεσε δὲ λαλῶν*. The same can reasonably be said of Gn 17:27: *i vsi muži domu ego · êkože vspitênici · tako i kuplenici · i tuždez(e) ml'ci* (BrVO 142d18–21, ed. KAPPEL, JURÍČ KAPPEL, VELA, 2023: 368), the brevity of which corresponds to the Latin *et omnes viri domus illius tam vernaculi quam empticii et alienigenae*, as opposed to the Greek *καὶ πάντες*

¹⁰⁰ û| om. v;

¹⁰¹ zap(o)v(ê)dê| i zap(o)v(ê)dê Drag N₁ N₂ Bar;

¹⁰² avraama| abraama Drag, avrama N₁, abrama Bar;

¹⁰³ êže| ka Bar;

¹⁰⁴ i vsa êže imêše| om. N₁

οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ οἰκογενεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀργυρώνητοι ἐξ ἀλλογενῶν ἔθνῶν, particularly the correspondence *kuplenici · i tuždez(e)ml'ci* ~ *empticii et alienigenae* (×¹⁰⁵ οἱ ἀργυρώνητοι ἐξ ἀλλογενῶν ἔθνῶν).

2.3.2 The second example is Gn 17:15, which was omitted from the oldest Prophetologia (*Grigorovičianum* and *Zacharianum*) and is attested only in the *Prophetologion Lobkovianum* (fol. 159v18–19). In Lobk, it obviously corresponds to the Greek Septuagint (οὐ κληθήσεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς = не наречется имя еи); in BrVO 142b17–20 (ed. KAPPEL, JURÍĆ KAPPEL, VELA, 2023C: 367), it is clearly translated according to the Latin (*non vocabis Sarai = ne vzoveši sara*).

LXX	Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραάμ· Σάρα ἡ γυνή σου οὐ κληθήσεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Σάρα, ἀλλὰ Σάρρα ἔσται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς.
Lobk	ре<че> ꙗ̅ꙗ̅ бѣ̅ авраамовъ · сара жена твоѣа не наричетса имя еи сара нь саръра
Vulgata	dixit quoque Deus ad Abraham Sarai uxorem tuam <u>non vocabis Sarai</u> sed Sarram
BrVO 142b17–20	reče že vistinu ¹⁰⁶ g(ospod)ь b(og)ь ¹⁰⁷ кь avraamu ¹⁰⁸ · sari ženi tv oee <u>ne vzoveši</u> ¹⁰⁹ sara · na sar'ra ·

2.3.3 On the other hand, some passages are undoubtedly rendered according to the Latin, but with some Greek features, mainly in their anthroponomy, which had to correspond with the remainder of the biblical text. For example, Nahor's son Bethuel (who appears in Gn 25:20 and 28:2) is rendered *vatuil* in BrVO 146c6 and 166c16–17 (cf. RCJHR 2000: 274) according to the Greek Βαθουηλ (*vathuil*), and not according to the Latin version *Bathuel*, although the verses in Gn 28:1–4 are undoubtedly translated from the Latin version, e.g. *ženi tebê ot roda hananêiska* ~ *conjugem de genere Chanaan* (× γυνάικα ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Χανααν); *ny idi* ~ *sed vade* (× ἀναστὰς ἀπόδραθι); *valama uica tvoego* ~ *Laban avunculi tui* (× Λαβαν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τῆς μητρός σου).¹¹⁰ The same may legitimately be said of Abraham's name, which was usually

¹⁰⁵ Symbol × means '(and) not'.

¹⁰⁶ reče že vistinu| i r(e)če Vat, Pm Drag, i reče vistinu Vb₃, r(e)če vistinu N₂;

¹⁰⁷ b(og)ь| om. Vat, Pm Drag;

¹⁰⁸ avraamu| abramu Pm, abraamuDrag N₁;

¹⁰⁹ vzoveši| add. veče Vb₃

¹¹⁰ Some interesting examples of possible Greek contaminations in those verses are *prizvanъ že* ~ προσκαλεσάμενος δὲ (× *vocavit itaque*); *avraama dêda tvoego* ~ Αβρααμ τοῦ πατρός μου (× *Abrahae*).

rendered consistently as *avraam* (cf. RCJHR 2000: 14–15) throughout the breviary, even in those non-Prophetologion passages that were clearly translated from the Latin (with some variant exceptions in e.g. BrMosk, BrOxf, BrBar, BrOM, BrDrag and BrVat₁₉, where it is occasionally rendered as *abram* or *abraam*). Personal names were clearly subject to the forced unification of onoma throughout the entire breviary manuscript tradition.

2.3.4 We may, however, usefully compare the previous example with some instances where the non-Prophetologion verse translation and the toponymy correspond only to the Latin, such as in e.g. Gn 13:3, where toponyms such as Bethel (N. sg. *betelb*; cf. *vetilb*, *vetelb* RCJHR 2000: 312) and Ai (L. sg. *aemb*; without lemma in RCJHR) are rendered according to the Latin *Bethel* and *Hai*, rather than the Septuagint Greek Βαιθηλ and Αγγαι. This is likely because the toponyms in question were mostly unique within the biblical tradition and did not appear in the Prophetologia; consequently, there was no need to unify them with the Greek variant. The primary text here is taken from the BrVat₅ 69d2–6, since—as is apparent in the comparison below—BrVO 140c12–19 (ed. KAPPEL, JURÍĆ KAPPEL, VELA, 2023: 364) contains only a paraphrased and condensed version of the verses Gn 13:1–10, without toponyms:

LXX	καὶ ἐπορεύθη ὅθεν ἦλθεν, εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ἕως Βαιθηλ, ἕως τοῦ τόπου, οὗ ἦν ἡ σκηνὴ αὐτοῦ τὸ πρότερον, ἀνὰ μέσον Βαιθηλ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Αγγαι
Vulgata	Reversusque est per iter, quo venerat, a meridie in <u>Bethel</u> , usque ad locum ubi prius fixerat tabernaculum inter <u>Bethel</u> et <u>Hai</u>
BrVat₅ 69d2–6	ἰ vzvratl se ¹¹¹ opetb ¹¹² ot nudb ἰ pride ¹¹³ ot ¹¹⁴ polu d(ɔ)ne v <u>be telb</u> daže k mēstu · idēže stvorilb b(ē)še ¹¹⁵ krovb pŕēžde ¹¹⁶ meždu ¹¹⁷ <u>betelom̃</u> ¹¹⁸ ἰ <u>aemb</u>

¹¹¹ vzvratl se| vzvratlše se Drag, vrtat se abramb Bar;

¹¹² opetb| vaspetb Bar;

¹¹³ pride| pridb Mosk;

¹¹⁴ ot| o N₂;

¹¹⁵ b(ē)še| bē N₁;

¹¹⁶ prije Drag, prie Mosk Bar;

¹¹⁷ meū Drag Mosk N₁ N₂ Bar;

¹¹⁸ bitelom̃ Bar;

BrVO 140c12–19 ključī¹¹⁹ bo se¹²⁰ ima v'z|vratiti¹²¹ v hananêû · | (v) hananêi že
kotorau|čem se¹²² pastuhom¹²³ avr|amovom¹²⁴ · i lotom¹²⁴ · izvoll|i
se avramu¹²⁵ i lotu · me|ždû¹²⁶ soboû seloma | razlučiti

The upcoming edition of the text of the Pentateuch from the Croatian Glagolitic breviaries and missals will attempt to take into account all variant readings of the passages in question, whether they are paraphrasings, abridgements, or complete (albeit sometimes loose) translations.

Apart from the paraphrased and abridged passages, another major challenge for our edition is the difference in the structure of the liturgical readings in the individual surviving breviaries. The organization of each breviary takes into account the exact day on which the biblical verses are to be read. We have already mentioned that the verses read in most manuscripts on holy days of the liturgical year (for example, *Sabbato ante septuagesimam*, *Dominica in sexagesima*, and *Dominica in quinquagesima*) were designed in some breviaries to be read simply *v proste dni* (that is, *feriis*) after certain Sundays. This is the case, for example, with the verses Gn 15:7–17:22 in BrVat₅, BrPm, and BrDrag, which are to be read *v proste dni* (additionally, in BrDrag, fol 60b35–d32, verses 17:1–22 are to be read *v utori*). On the other hand, BrN₁ includes verses Gn 17:17–22:10 in the *čtenie v proste dni* (BrN₁ 73c35–75c12), while BrN₂ includes verses Gn. 13:13–25:10 in this liturgical reading (with many verses omitted; see BrN₂ 67d33–70a23). The new edition will have take this into account.

An intriguing example of this is the BrMosk manuscript. It begins *čtenie v proste dni* on fol. 66c26–35 with verses Gn 15:1–6, in a redaction similar to that of the BrVat₅ manuscript (with verses 1–3 considerably shortened; see also the BrVO redaction cited below). But then, at fol. 66c35, the scribe returns to verse Gn 13:17, which continues with a completely new translation (from the Latin and with a largely Croatised vocabulary), which continues through

¹¹⁹ ključī| priključī Mav;

¹²⁰ ključī bo se| i priključī se Vb₃;

¹²¹ v'zvratiti| vratiti Met Ber₂;

¹²² kotorajučem se| hotorajučem se Vb₂, kotorajučim se Vb₃ Pt, k'rajučim se Met, pasučimъ Ber₂;

¹²³ pastuhom'| p(a)st(i)rom' Met Ber₂ Pt;

¹²⁴ avramovom' · i lotom'| lotovom' i avramovom' Vb₁; avramovomъ i lotovomъ Vb₂ Vb₃ Pad, avramov(o) mъ i lotovimъ Met Mav, avramovimъ i lotovimъ Ber₂, avraamovimъ i lotovomъ Pt;

¹²⁵ avramu| Avraamu Pt;

¹²⁶ meždju| meû Vb₂ Vb₃ Met Ber₂ Pt

to verse Gn 20:7 (BrMosk 70a23). This translation does not consider the antiquated Prophetologion translations, nor any existing breviary translation. In the BrMosk manuscript, therefore, verses Gn 15:1–6 are read twice in two different translations (in the left column, one can also see the transition from Gn 15:6 to Gn 13:17):

BrMosk 66c26–37:

15:1–3 *Avraamu že va vremena ona tu-žeču i plačuču bečediê rad-i* **4** bis(тб) k n(e)mu sl(o)vo g(o-spodь)ne utešae i v' s(ь)nê reki · Iže izidetъ is' te-
30 bê ta nas' lédit' te · **5** I vazv-a i v(a)nъ r(e)ki v'zri na n(e)bo i č'ti z'-
vez'di · ače možeši e iz'čis't-
i po m'nožas'tvu ihъ b(u)detъ seme t'voe · **6** I verova avraamъ b(og)u i
35 v'meni se v' pr(a)vdu · I r(e)če emu (**13:17**) V'-
stani i proidi z(e)mlju dl'gineju ee ejuž-
e damъ t(e)bê · (**13:18**) Ganut' že avraamъ imenie ||

BrMosk 67a34–67b17:

15:1 Ova že reč(e)naê mimošad'š-
35 e s'tvorena bê r(ê)čъ g(ospodь)na k avra-
aamu očito gl(agol)juči · Ne hotei se
boêti avraame · azъ začit(i)- ||
1 t(e)lъ t'voi es(a)mъ · i maz'da t'voê m'no-
ga vel'mi · **2** I r(e)če abraamъ g(ospod)i b(ož)e
č'to daši m'nê · Na azъ poudu b-
ez'čeda a s(i)nъ naređ'b(e)n(i)ka hiže m-
5 oee onъ z' damas'ka eliazarъ · **3** I pr-
ir(e)če ab'raamъ mani bo nêsi dalъ
sême i se s'luga moi os'tali b-
udetъ moi · **4** I tudie s'tv(o)rena bê r-
ečъ g(ospodь)na k n(e)mu gl(agol)juči · Ne b(u)
de onъ n-
10 as'led'nikъ t'voi da ki izide ot
ledai t'voihъ nega imeti b(u)de-
ši nas'led'nika **5** [*beginning om.*] k'to možeť is'-
čis'ti z'vêz'di n(e)b(e)skie i t'voe se-
me iz'č(is')teno budetъ · I r(e)če emu
15 t(a)ko b(u)detъ seme t'voe · **6** Vêrova
avraamъ b(og)u i v'meni se emu v' pra-
v'du · [...]

We may also usefully compare it with the redaction of the BrVO and other breviaries (BrVb₁, BrVb₃, BrVat₅, BrN₁, BrN₂, BrBer₂) and with the same “basic” text from BrMosk (included in the variant readings below):

BrVO 141b22–c9 (ed. KAPPEL, JURÍČ KAPPEL, VELA, 2023: 365–366):

Gn 15:1–3 *avramu*¹²⁷ *že vъ vrêmen-*
*a*¹²⁸ *ta*¹²⁹ *tužeču i pla-*
*čuču*¹³⁰ *bečediê*¹³¹ *ra-*

¹²⁷ avramu| avraamu Vat₅ N₂, abramu N₁;

¹²⁸ vrimena Vat₅ N₁ N₂;

¹²⁹ ta| ona Vat₅ Mosk N₁ N₂;

¹³⁰ i plačuču| add. Se Vb₃, om. N₂;

¹³¹ bečediê| add. svoego Vb₃;

- 25 di · bis(tb)¹³² slovo g(ospod)ne
 k nemu¹³³ utêšae i · i¹³⁴ vi-
 dēniem¹³⁵ vь snē reki emu¹³⁶ · ||
- 1 4 iže izidet¹³⁷ is tebe · tь
 naslêditь te · 5 izvedь¹³⁸
 že i¹³⁹ · vьn¹⁴⁰ g(lago)la emu¹⁴¹ · vьzri¹⁴²
 na n(e)bo i čti zvêzdi¹⁴³ ače
- 5 možeši ičisti e¹⁴⁴ · po mno-
 žьstvu ubo¹⁴⁵ ih¹⁴⁶ budet'
 sême tvoe · 6 i¹⁴⁷ vêrova av-
 ram¹⁴⁸ b(og)u · i vmêni se emu¹⁴⁹ v'
 pravdu · [...]

This is just one small example of a problem beyond simple reading or spelling variations. These and other matters will be considered and thoroughly assessed during the preparation of the planned edition.

3. CONCLUSIONS

From the examples provided above, we may conclude that the state of the readings from the Pentateuch within the Croatian Glagolitic breviares is in accordance with already known:

¹³² bis(tb)| bisi Vb₁ Vb₂, add. k n(e)mu Vat₅ Mosk N₁ N₂, i bistь Ber₂;

¹³³ k nemu| om. Vat₅ Mosk N₁ N₂;

¹³⁴ i| add. g(lago)le Ber₂;

¹³⁵ vidēniem'| om. Vat₅ N₁ N₂;

¹³⁶ emu| k nemu Vb₁, om. Vat₅ Mosk N₁ N₂;

¹³⁷ izidet'| om. Vb₂ Vb₃;

¹³⁸ izvedь| izvede Vb₃;

¹³⁹ izvedь že i| i vazva i Vat₅ Mosk N₂, vazva i N₁;

¹⁴⁰ vьn'| add. i Vb₃ Ber₂;

¹⁴¹ gl(agol)a emu| r(e)ki Vat₅ Mosk N₁ N₂;

¹⁴² vьzri| zri Vat₅;

¹⁴³ zvêzdi| add. n(e)b(e)skie Ber₂;

¹⁴⁴ možeši ičisti e| možeši ičisti Mosk, is'čis'ti možeši e N₂, možeši e isčisti Ber₂;

¹⁴⁵ ubo| bo Vb₂ Vat₅ Vb₃ N₂ Ber₂, om. Mosk N₁;

¹⁴⁶ ih'| add. e(stь) tako BrBer₂;

¹⁴⁷ i| om. BrN₁;

¹⁴⁸ avram'| avraamь Vat₅ Mosk, abram' N₁, abraamь N₂;

¹⁴⁹ emu| om. Mosk

1. The verses of the Pentateuch not included in the old translation in the earliest Slavonic Prophetologia had to be retranslated when included in the Croatian Glagolitic breviaries. This new translation was based on the Latin text of the Pentateuch. Greek syntactic or lexical features are occasionally apparent, but these instances are rare.

2. In providing the new translations, the scribes often resorted to paraphrased or abbreviated readings of the verses in question. Often, whole verses were omitted, significantly shortened, or rephrased.

3. The readings for particular liturgical days were often structured differently in each surviving breviary or group of breviaries; this led to marked differences between manuscripts and their structure.

Our planned edition will record all these peculiarities and make them evident for further study. The basic idea of the edition is to publish the text of the Pentateuch from the Croatian Glagolitic breviaries and missals to the fullest extent possible. This approach will allow for more extensive research into this tradition, vocabulary, and other linguistic devices. Since those paraphrased, abridged, or repeated passages of the biblical text will also be included, the edition will provide future scholars with detailed, accurate material for further research.

SOURCES

- BrBar = *Brevijar Blaža Baromića* (Breviary of Blaž Baromić), 1493, paper, printed, Venice.
- BrBer₂ = *Drugi ljubljanski (Beramski) brevijar* (Second Ljubljana [Beram] breviary), 15th c., parchment, Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana, shelfmark Ms 163.
- BrDab = *Dabarski brevijar* (Dabar breviary), 1486, parchment, Arhiv HAZU, Zagreb, shelfmark IIIc21.
- BrDrag = *Dragučki brevijar* (Draguč breviary), 1407, parchment, Arhiv HAZU, Zagreb, shelfmark IIIb25.
- BrMav = *Brevijar popa Mavra* (Breviary of priest Mavro), 1460, parchment, NSK, Zagreb, shelfmark R 7822.
- BrMet = *Brevijar Metropolitanske knjižnice* (Metropolitan breviary), 1442, parchment, Zagreb, Metropolitan Library, shelfmark, Mr161.
- BrMosk = *Moskovski brevijar* (Moscow breviary), 1442–43, parchment, Rossiyskaya gosudarstvennaya biblioteka, Moscow, Zbirka Sevastyanov, shelfmark Fond 270, 51.

- BrN₁ = *Prvi novljanski brevijar* (First Novi breviary), 1459, parchment, parish library, Novi Vinodolski.
- BrN₂ = *Drugi novljanski brevijar* (Second Novi breviary), 1495, parchment, parish library, Novi Vinodolski.
- BrOxf = *Oksfordski brevijar* (Oxford breviary), 14th c., parchment, Bodleian Library, Oxford, shelfmark MS. Canon. Liturg. 172.
- BrPad = *Padovanski brevijar* (Padua breviary), middle of the 14th c., parchment, *Biblioteca Universitaria Padua*, shelfmark MS 2282.
- BrPm = *Pašmanski brevijar* (Pašman breviary), late 14th and 15th centuries, parchment, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Zagreb, shelfmark III b 10.
- BrPt = *Prvotisak brevijara* (Breviary incunabula), 1491, paper, *Biblioteca nazionale Marciana*, Venice, shelfmark Breviario glagolitico inc. 1235.
- BrRom = *Rimski brevijar* (Roman breviary), 15th c., parchment, *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, Rome, shelfmark Cap. S. Pietro D215.
- BrVat₅ = *Vatikanski brevijar Illirico 5* (Vatican breviary Illirico 5), middle of the 14th c., parchment, *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, Rome, shelfmark Borg. Illir. 5.
- BrVat₁₀ = *Vatikanski brevijar Illirico 10* (Vatican breviary Illirico 10), 1485, parchment, *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, Rome, shelfmark Borg. Illir. 10.
- BrVat₁₉ = *Vatikanski brevijar Vat. Slav. 19* (Vatican breviary Vat. Slav. 19), r. 1465, parchment, *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, Rome, shelfmark Vat. Slav. 19.
- BrVO = *Brevijar Vida Omišljanina* (Breviary of Vid of Omišalj), r. 1396, parchment, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, shelfmark Cod. Slav. 3. (transliteration in Latin script: KAPPEL; JURIĆ KAPPEL; VELA 2023)
- BrVb₁ = *Prvi vrbnički brevijar* (First Vrbnik breviary), 14th c., parchment, parish library, Vrbnik.
- BrVb₂ = *Drugi vrbnički brevijar* (Second Vrbnik breviary), 1400s (first half), parchment, parish library, Vrbnik.
- BrVb₃ = *Treći vrbnički brevijar* (Third Vrbnik breviary), 15th c., parchment, parish library, Vrbnik.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ, V. 1997. Mladi hrvatskoglagojski biblijski prijevodi. S. Damjanović (ed.). *Prvi hrvatski slavistički kongres. Zbornik radova 1*, Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo, 521–526.
- BAKMAZ, I. 2004. Biblijska čitanja u hrvatskoglagojskim brevijarima. *Glagoljica i hrvatski glagolizam*. Zbornik radova s međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa povodom 100. obljetnice Staroslavenske akademije i 50. obljetnice Staroslavenskog instituta. Dürriegl, Marija-Ana, Milan Mihaljević i Franjo Velčić (ur.) Zagreb – Krk: Staroslavenski institut – Krčka biskupija. 2004. 139–148.

- BAUEROVÁ, H. 2000. K parimejním a mimoparimejním charvátskohlaholským breviárním textům prorockých knih. *Cyrrillomethodiana. Sborník k uctění památky Mons. prof. ThDr. Vojtěcha Tkadlčíka*, Olomouc: Euroslavica, 69–80.
- CORIN, A. R. 1997. O reformama hrvatskoglagoljskih liturgijskih knjiga u 13. stoljeću. S. Damjanović (ed.). *Prvi hrvatski slavistički kongres. Zbornik radova 1*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo, 527–538.
- ČERMÁK, V. 2003. Význam charvátskohlaholských pramenů pro výzkum slovanského překladu starozákonních knih. *Česká slavistika 2003: České přednášky pro XIII. mezinárodní kongres slavistů, Ljubljana 15. – 21. 8. 2003*. Praha: Pavel Mervart, 59–69.
- ČERMÁK, V. 2004. Historický přehled zkoumání starozákonních perikop charvátskohlaholských breviářů. M.-A. Dürigl, M. Milan Mihaljević, F. Velčić (eds.). *Glagoljica i hrvatski glagolizam. Zbornik radova s međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa povodom 100. obljetnice Staroslavenske akademije i 50. obljetnice Staroslavenskog instituta (Zagreb – Krk 2.–6. listopada 2002.)*. Zagreb – Krk: Staroslavenski institut – Krčka biskupija, 149–155.
- FISCHER, B. (Hrsg.). 1983. *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- G. KAPPEL, J. JURIC KAPPEL, J. VELA (ed.). 2023. *Brevijar Vida Omišljanina (1396.) – preslovljeni tekst / transliteracija*. Zagreb: Staroslavenski institut.
- MICHAJLOV, A. V. 1912. *Opyt izučenja teksta knigi Bytija proroka Moiseja v drevne-slavjanskom perevode*. Varšava: Tipografija Varšavskogo Učebnago Okruga.
- NAHTIGAL, R. 1902. Neskol'ko zametok o sledah drevne-slavjanskogo parimejnika v horvatsko-glagoličeskoj literature. *Drevnosti: Trudy Slavjanskoj komisii Moskovskogo arheologičeskogo obščestva, tom 3*, Moskva, 175–213.
- NAZOR, A. 1985. "The Old Testament in Croato-Glagolitic Manuscript Translation." *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division D, Vol. 1*, 69–75.
- PANTELIĆ, M. 1967. Prvotisak glagoljskog misala iz 1483. prema misalu kneza Novaka iz 1368. *Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta* 6. 5–108.
- RAHLFS, A. (ed.). 1952. *Septuaginta id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Vol. I: Leges et historiae*. London – Stuttgart: United Bible Societies – Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt.
- RIBAROVA, Z.; HAUPTOVA, Z. 1998. *Grigorovičev parimejnik. Tekst so kritički aparat*. Skopje: MANU.
- STANKOVSKA, P. 2016. K problematice zkoumání textové tradice starozákonních textů v chorvátskohlaholských památkách vzniklých do 15. století. T. Kuštović, M. Žagar (eds.). *Meandrima hrvatskoga glagoljaštva: zbornik posvećen akademiku Stjepanu Damjanoviću o 70. rođendanu*, Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 491–506.
- STANKOVSKA, P. 2017. Některé faktory důležité pro posuzování slovní zásoby v chorvátskohlaholských breviářích. *Filologija: časopis Razreda za filološke znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 68: 193–221. <https://doi.org/10.21857/yvjrdcq4vy>.
- ŠIMIĆ, A.; J. VELA. 2021. From Little Chapters to the Big Questions: How Were the Croatian Glagolitic Breviaries and Missals Compiled? *Slovo* 71: 121–168. <https://doi.org/10.31745/s.71.6>.

- TANDARIĆ, J. 1980. Osobine krćkih glagoljskih liturgijskih kodeksa. *Croatica Christiana periodica* 4(6). 136–140. [Reprinted as: TANDARIĆ, J. L. 1993. *Hrvatsko glagoljska liturgijska knjiŹevnost. Rasprave i prinosi*. Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost u suizdanju s Provincijalom franjevacá trećoredaca. 31–35.]
- VAJS, J. 1910. *Nejstarši breviár hrvatsko-hlaholský (prvý breviár vrbnický)*. Praha: Královská česká společnost nauk.

S a Ź e t a k

Jiří DYNDÁ, Petra STANKOVSKÁ

OPSEG RANOGA STAROSLAVENSKOG PRIJEVODA *PETOKNJIŹJA* SAČUVANOGA U HRVATSKOGLAGOLJSKIM BREVIJARIMA I MISALIMA: *KNJIGA POSTANKA* U BREVIJARIMA

Članak se usredotočuje na pojedine probleme s kojima se treba suoćiti pri radu na kritičkome izdanju crkvenoslavenskoga teksta *PetoknjiŹja* sačuvanoga u hrvatskoglagoljskim brevijarima i misalima. Cilj je rada na primjeru teksta *Knjige postanka* koji se nalazi u hrvatskoglagoljskim brevijarima 14. i 15. stoljeća pokazati problematiku prepoznavanja i obrade pojedinaćnih inaćica starozavjetnoga prijevoda. U članku se posebno navode i primjeri odlomaka teksta *Knjige postanka* koji nisu potvrćeni u staroslavenskom parimejniku – liturgijskoj knjizi koja je sačuvana najraniji staroslavenski prijevod starozavjetnih tekstova. Navedene su tri vrste tekstova: (1) skraćena brevijarska inaćica starozavjetnoga rodoslovlja; (2) skraćeni, odnosno parafrazirani, neparimejni odlomci; (3) neskraćeni neparimejni odlomci, to jest odlomci koji su potvrćeni u brevijaru u novome prijevodu s latinskoga. Odlomci su izdani s inaćicama iz svih dostupnih rukopisa.

Ključne rijeći: *PetoknjiŹje*; hrvatska glagoljica; brevijari; misali; parimejnik

Jiří DYNDÁ
Petra STANKOVSKÁ
Slovanský ústav Akademie věd ČR, v.v.i.
Praha (Česká republika)
dynda@slu.cas.cz
stankovska@slu.cas.cz