Dr. sc. Ana Mihaljević

TRANSLATING FROM LATIN INTO CROATIAN CHURCH SLAVONIC

Abstract

The syntax of Croato-Glagolitic texts has been the object of scientific research less often than phonology and morphology. However, in the last decade syntax has been in the focus of interest of some scientific monographs and papers. This paper gives an overview of influence of Latin syntax on Croatian Church Slavonic syntax in the texts that have been translated from Latin to Croatian Church Slavonic. The author analyses examples of Latin influence on the corpus of texts translated from Latin and the range of that influence. She focuses on the analysis of prepositional phrases. She determines possible reasons why the translators have chosen to translate originally non-prepositional phrases as prepositional – it could be the influence of other examples in the text or it could be the result of the influence of a similar construction in Italian. Special attention is given to the translation of Latin prepositions ad and de. The paper also analyses other prepositional meanings and uses that are not equivalent in both languages.

Keywords: syntax, Latin, Croatian Church Slavonic, prepositional phrases, translational influences

Introduction

The topic of this paper is the Latin influence on the Croatian Church Slavonic syntax; it is one of the examples of how Latin grammatical structures can be reflected in other languages. In this paper, I will discuss the range of that influence and the type of language contact between those two languages and as an example of the influence. Special attention will be given to the case of prepositional phrases.

Latin was the official language of Croatia until 1847, therefore it was often in close contact to Croatian and Croatian Church Slavonic.[1] Croatian Church Slavonic is a literary language used in Croatia from the XI to the XVII c. It was written in the Glagolitic script and most of the texts written in this language were used in liturgy and in texts on religious topics.[2] It is a higher literary style within the Medieval Croatian diasystem, which consists of Croatian and Croatian Church Slavonic diglossia.[3] It has developed from the Old Church Slavonic language, which was created by Saints Cyril and Methodius for translating biblical and liturgical texts, literary texts and law and administrative texts.[4] Latin and Croatian Church Slavonic were two languages which had a similar status throughout the Middle Ages.[5] Both languages did not have native speakers, i.e. Latin had gradually lost its native speakers and finally had no native speakers at all. Latin was, depending on the territory on which it was used, modified according to the native language of the speakers. This is a similar phenomenon to the mixing of Old

---

[1] More about three languages in Croatian medieval period see Hercigonja 2006.
[2] More about Croatian Church Slavonic see Mihaljević 2009., Mihaljević-Reinhart 2005., Gadžijeva et al. 2014.
[3] Gadžijeva et al. 2014, 18.
[4] Gadžijeva et al. 2014
[5] Galabov 1973., Keipert 1987., 1996.

Church Slavonic with the native idioms of its speakers (Chakavian amalgam). Christian Latin was under a strong influence of Greek and Hebrew, the structures of which penetrated into Latin via Biblical texts. The situation was in Croatian Church Slavonic as the language was under the influence of Latin as well as Greek and Hebrew.

Methodology and corpus

The methodology depends on the description of the corpus elements and it is mainly descriptive, interpretative and contrastive, based on the so-called basic linguistic theory.[6] In addition, the principles of contact linguistics,[7] translation theory,[8] and theory of language contact through translation,[9] as well as the theory of processing of sentences and parsing called *syntax/syntactic/structural priming*, were consulted. The influence of priming is the phenomenon of facilitating sentence processing after the subject has been exposed to a sentence with a similar syntactic structure.[10]

The corpus of analyzed texts consists of a number of Croato-Glagolitic texts of different type and content for which it is known that they have been translated from Latin or have been composed following a Latin protograph. The corpus includes these apocryphal texts: *Vita Adae et Evae* (Life of *Adam and Eve*), *Evangelium Nicodemi* (*Nikodem's Gospel*), *Protoevangelium Jacobi* (Jakob's Protogospel); hagiographies: *Lectio s. Margaritae* (*Reading of St. Margaret*), *Tractatus de purgatorio sancti Patricii* (*Purgatory of Saint Patrick*), *Vita Mariae Magdalenae* (*The Life of Maria Magdalena*); books of the Bible: *Liber sapientiae (Wisdom of Solomon)*, *Ester (Esther)*, *Libri Machabaeorum Duo (Books of the Maccabees)*, and breviary office for St. Anthony of Padua. In addition to these complete texts, some prepositions have been additionally examined in the corpus of the Croatian Church Slavonic Dictionary of the Old Church Slavonic Institute.[11]

Latin Influence on Croatian Church Slavonic Syntax

When a translator translated from Latin into Church Slavonic he was translating from one literary language into another, none of which were his native languages.[12] Thus the translators were under the influence of the source language as well as their native language which, although similar to Croatian Church Slavonic, was not equal to it. There are several factors that determine the level and degree of influence[13]: the level of translators knowledge of both Latin and Croatian Church Slavonic, the degree to which translator distinguishes Croatian Church Slavonic from Croatian, the level of education in general, especially theological knowledge, translator's stylistic competence, his attitude towards the text and the act of translating and the level of standardness of the language and its prestige.[14] Croatian Church Slavonic was less standardized than Latin and therefore translators that translate to Croatian Church Slavonic

---

[6] This metodological framework was for the first time used on the Croatian Church Slavonic in Kovačević 2016.
[7] E. g. Thomason and Kaufman 1988., Bauer 1958., Thomason 2001, 2010, Johanson 2002., Catford 1965, Heine and Kuteva 2005., Sankoff 2001.
[8] E. g. Kranich 2014., Nida and Taber 2003., Malamatidou 2013., Laviosa 2003., Frawley 1984.
[9] E. g. Ivir 1990., Baumgarten and Ozcezin 2008, McLaughlin 2009., 2011., Danchev 1984., Gianollo 2011., Kranich 2014., Malmatidou 2016.
[10] Ferreira-Bock 2006., Bock, 1986.
[11] RCJHR 2000. and 2014.
[12] Matějka 1968, 274.
[13] Thomason 2010.
[14] Kranich 2014, 105, Malamatidou 2013, 414, Nida and Taber 2003, 101.

were often under the influence of other languages. Latin was also the more prestigious language and that fact also deepened its influence. The fact that is the most important is the translator's consciousness of the difference between word-for-word translation and free translation and the translator's attitude towards the translation.[15] Most translators translate fairly literal but the word-for-word translation is especially visible in translations of Biblical texts. Translators feel that these texts transfer religious truths and should not be changed by translation.[16] Translation as the place of contact between two languages has long been neglected.[17]

The range of influence[18]

The Latin participle is most often translated by the Croatian Church Slavonic participle due to the very developed participle system in Croatian Church Slavonic.[19] The participle is more often translated by a participle then by a relative or other dependent clauses to be formally close to the original as the translators usually like to choose the translational equivalent which is the closest to the original although today relative clauses are the translational equivalent of participles and in Croatian Church Slavonic texts they occur very often. The present participle is most often translated by the active present participle but is often translated by the first active present participle, especially when talking about an action the duration of which is perceived as short, when the action directly precedes the action of the main verb or when dealing with verbs which have a prototype finished meaning. The passive participle is most often translated by the first active past participle or by the passive past participle. The first active past participle is the most common translational equivalent while translating the participle of deponent verbs because of its active meaning. The greatest challenge for the translator while translating the participle is how to translate the future participle which has no formal correspondent in Croatian Church Slavonic. Thus different structures mostly close to the expression of the future occur in translations of such constructions. This participle also occurs as a part of the construction of the periphrastic active conjugation which is often translated very similarly as an independent future participle often with the addition of the verb *biti* (eng. *to be*) in order to render the original Latin structure as fatefully as possible.

Periphrastic active conjugation rarely occurs in the analyzed corpus. As this is a construction having relatively low occurrence there are no common ways in which it is translated. As the translators sometimes try to imitate the structure of the construction, the verb *biti* (eng. *to be*) often appears as one of the constituent elements in the translation. Often the forms of the verbs *hotêti* (eng. *to want*) and *imêti* (eng. *to have*) appear, which are also used for translating the future participle. With verbs *biti*, *hotêti* and *imêti* the infinitive or participle of verbs often occur in translations. Sometimes the construction is also translated by finite forms.

The imitation of the original structure can be seen very often in the translation of ablative absolute which is mostly translated by Croatian Church Slavonic absolute constructions in the dative or the instrumental, which occur in translations because the translators consider them to be the translational equivalents of the ablative. While translating

---

[15] Kranich 2014, 105.
[16] On translating Bible into Old Church Slavonic see Horálek 1968., Grünenthal 1909., Matějka 1971., Grickat 1972, 18, Badurina Stipčević 2009, 51.
[17] McLaughlin 2011b, 6.
[18] For more detail analysis see Mihaljević 2018.
[19] Eterović and Vela 2013.

ablative absolute, absolute constructions occur much more often than dependent clauses which are the translational equivalents of this construction in modern Croatian. While translating the ablative absolute the word order of the original is mirrored closely. The Latin participle as a part of that construction is translated by the present or past participle. The present participle is often translated by the past participle of perfective verbs when dealing with prefixed verbs and verbs which are considered as momentary by the translator.

Gerund and gerundive are two forms having no formal correspondent in Croatian Church Slavonic. Thus they are translated in various ways. The most common way of translating the gerund and the gerundive which replaces the gerund is by means of a verbal noun. Less often while translating the gerund and gerundive the participles, mostly passive, occur and they are mostly in the instrumental. In some examples, it is obvious that the translators did not understand the original meaning of the gerund and the sentence in the translation is unintelligible because of the translator's wish to imitate the original structure.

Periphrastic passive conjugation is a Latin construction the translation of which presents a challenge for translators. As the gerundive occurs in the construction which doesn't have a formal correspondent in Croatian Church Slavonic, translators translate this construction in different ways. Some translators imitate the structure of the original fatefully while others deviate from the original trying to convey the Latin debitative meaning as fatefully as they can. Some translators use the constructions consisting of the dative, the infinitive, and the verb *biti* (eng. *to be*) which exists in Croatian Church Slavonic and is close to the Latin construction in meaning as well as in structure. Other translators try to translate the gerundive which is a part of the Latin construction literally and instead of using constructions with the infinitive translate such constructions with passive participles and use sometimes passive present participle and sometimes passive past participle. Thus, under the influence of Latin the constructions with the passive present participle with the verb *biti* or passive past participle with the verb *biti* are used. In order to stress the debitativeness, some translators translate the forms of the verb *biti* with the imperative. In some examples, the translators deviate from the Latin structure trying to emphasize the debitative meaning using the imperative. The debitative meaning of the periphrastic passive conjugation is expressed by the forms of the verbs *imêti, htêti, moĉi* or *trebati*. Due to the attempt to translate the gerundive fatefully verbal nouns or nouns having meanings similar to that of verbs from which the gerundive is derived occur in translations. This is the most common way of translating the gerund. Sometimes the periphrastic passive conjugation is translated by the finite verb and the translation transmits neither the structure nor the meaning of the original.

Under the influence of the Latin protograph the sentences having the construction accusative with the infinitive occur.[20] While translating that construction the translators try to copy the structure of the original as fatefully as they can and they translate the accusative with the accusative and the infinitive with the infinitive. Sometimes such sentences are translated by declarative sentences with *da* and *êko* or, with the verbs of perception, by the accusative participle. Another problem is presented by the infinitives which do not have a formal correspondent in Church Slavonic such as passive infinitives and future and past infinitives. The passive present infinitive is translated by the active present infinitive in which the

---

[20] On the usage of infinitive see Vela 2018.

accusative becomes the object. Thus, the meaning of the Latin construction is fatefully translated but its structure is changed as the accusative is no longer the subject but the object of the infinitive. The future infinitive is translated either by the combination of the infinitive and the present participle which imitates the Latin structure or by the infinitive and the participle of the verb *imêti*. The infinitive perfect active is translated by the past participle. The infinitive of the passive perfect, as it consists of the past participle, is translated by the participle. The construction accusative with the infinitive can be translated by the accusative and accusative participle. Sometimes the construction accusative with the infinitive is translated by declarative sentences with the conjunctions *da* and *êko*.

Nominative with the infinitive occurs rarely and there is no unified way of translating it. This construction is sometimes translated literally, and the main verb is translated with the reflexive pronoun. Future infinitive, as well as the accusative with the infinitive, is translated by the infinitive with the participle present of the verb *imêti* (eng. *to have*). The nominative with the infinitive is also translated by the declarative sentence and there are also some examples of inconsistent translations.

While translating dependent clauses, the greatest problem is the translation of verbal forms as in Latin some types of dependent clauses occur with the conjunctive which is sometimes used according to the rules of the sequence of tenses and sometimes absolutely. As in Croatian Church Slavonic, conjunctive forms do not exist; the translators are often at a loss how to translate them. The forms of the conjunctive present are most often translated by the indicative, but sometimes they occur with the conjunction *da* to stress the difference from the indicative. The past conjunctives are sometimes translated by the conditional. In most sentences, such a translation is due to the Latin influence as we are dealing with the sentences which do not express potential or wish characteristically expressed by the conditional. The problem in translating is also the difference in the usage of certain conjunctions in Latin and in Croatian Church Slavonic. In Latin, conjunctions *cum* and *ut* occur very often and they are conjunctions of different sentence types. Under the influence of Latin and the prototype usage of conjunctions, one type of dependent sentences is often translated by another type. Moreover, in Croatian Church Slavonic under the influence of Latin, some conjunctions broaden their meaning and usage. Sometimes Latin also influences the decision of the translator which of the synonymous conjunctions he will use as he tends to translate different Latin conjunctions by different Croatian Church Slavonic conjunctions.

Under the influence of Latin sentences, which are in Latin introduced by the originally conditional conjunction *si*, the sentences are translated by the conditional conjunction *aĉe*. Due to the originally causal meaning, the conjunction *quia* used in the explicative sentences that are one of the characteristics of Latin Biblical texts instead of accusative with infinitive[21] construction is mostly translated by conjunctions *êko* and *ere*, which are causal conjunctions in Croatian Church Slavonic. Rarely under the influence of the Latin original is the conjunction *quod* translated by a relative pronoun. The conjunctions *quomodo* and *qualiter* occur as conjunctions of explicative sentences due to their original meaning translated by the adverb *kako*.

---

[21] Cuzzolin 1994., 2013a, 2013b.

Latin temporal sentences with almost all conjunctions are most often translated by temporal sentences with conjunctions *kada* or *egda*. In translation, the temporal sentences appear as translational equivalents of other Latin clausal types especially when introduced by the conjunction *cum*, which the translator interprets as temporal conjunction due to its prototype sentence meaning.

Causal sentences are most often translated into Croatian Church Slavonic by sentences introduced by the conjunction *êko* regardless of which conjunction appeared in the Latin sentence. Often the conjunction *ere* appears as the translation of the conjunction *quia*. Sometimes the conjunctions *zane* and Chakavian *začь* appear as translations of the Latin causal conjunction. The conjunction *cum* in the causal meaning is often translated temporally because of its prototype temporal meaning. Sometimes the choice of the conjunction in Latin influences the translation.[22]

While translating Latin concessive sentences the structure of the Latin conjunction is mostly fatefully imitated. Thus, the translational equivalents of the conjunctions *etiamsi* and *etsi* are differentiated as the calques *takožde aĉe* and *oĉe aĉe* are used as translations of *etiamsi* as opposed to *aĉe/ako i* which is used as typical concessive conjunction and the equivalent of the conjunction *etsi* with which it corresponds formally. The concessive conjunction *cum* is often mistranslated as temporal conjunction as the translators understand it in its prototype temporal meaning. Concessive conjunction *licet* is not identified as conjunction and is translated by a verb.

While translating conditional sentences the translators try to imitate Latin structure and do not focus on stating clearly the level of the realizability of each condition. Thus, the translators mostly do not differentiate between real and potential sentences as in potential sentences conjunctives occur which are prototypically translated by indicative forms. In unreal conditional sentences, the conditional appears as a means of translating the Lain conjunctive imperfect and pluperfect. The conjunction *si* is systematically translated either by the conjunction *aĉe* or by a more recent conjunction *ako*. The conjunction *nisi* is under the influence of Latin translated by the conjunction *aĉe* which is directly preceded by the negation but does not negate the predicate, which would be a prototype way of negating the whole sentence.

The influence of Latin is seen in some translated relative sentences in which relative binding occurs with pronouns *ki, ka, ko* at the beginning of the sentence.

The Latin negation is mostly translated into Croatian Church Slavonic by the general negation *ne*.[23] Negations *nec* and *neque*, which mostly introduce a coordinated negated sentence or a negated constituent, are mostly under the influence of Latin translated by the negation *ni*. In Croatian Church Slavonic, following the Latin model, mostly there is no negative concord with adverbs and pronouns. In Latin, the position of the negation is different from that in Croatian Church Slavonic. The negation *non* in Latin tends to be in front of the finite verb, while the negations *nec* and *neque* stand in front of the whole sentence part which is negated. Unlike Latin, in Croatian Church Slavonic translations the negation is mostly

---

[22] Mihaljević 2014, 244.
[23] Kovačević 2016.

placed in front of the finite verb. Still, under the influence of Latin, some sentences in which a language constituent is placed between the negation and the finite verb occur.

In most texts word order mostly follows the word order of the original. This is especially true for Biblical texts which have very few deviations from the original word order. Latin word order in which the verb occurs at the end of the sentence is often mirrored. It is interesting to note that the verb occurs at the end of the sentence even in some examples in which in Latin it occurs in front of another constituent. In such cases, we can see the tendency of the translator to unify the style of the whole document. In some cases, in the translation, the verb appears before the object or adverbial phrase and sometimes before the subject. This is probably caused by the unconscious influence of the mother tongue but also maybe by topicalization of a particular sentence element. While translating the nominal phrase, the adjectives occur mainly after the noun they refer to even when they do not occur in that position in Latin. However, there are numerous deviations from this tendency. The order of the noun and the causal and final preposition *radi* is always reversed.

Translating prepositional phrases[24]

When learning another language, the learner usually first learns the most prototype meanings of each preposition. This is an example of how prepositions with accusative are taught in one of the Croatian Latin textbooks *Hereditas Linguae Latinae*:[25]

ante pred, **apud** kod, **ad** k (na, do, za), **adversus** nasuprot, **circum (circa)** oko, **citra (cis)** s ove strane, **erga** prema, **contra** protiv, **inter** među, **extra** izvan, **infra** ispod, **intra** unutar, **iuxta** uz, **ob** zbog, **penes** u vlasti, **pone** iza, **post** poslije (nakon), **praeter** mimo (osim), **prope** blizu, **propter** zbog, **per** kroz, **secundum** uzduž, **supra** iznad, **versus** prema, **ultra** s one strane, **trans** preko.

It is visible that for most Latin prepositions only one prototype meaning is given. However, in two languages prepositions often have several meanings that do not overlap. In the following examples, some differences between Latin and modern Croatian preposition usage are shown. In the examples, it is visible that one Latin preposition can have different equivalents in Croatian.

Latin	Croatian
per provinciam	*kroz* provinciju
per totam vitam	*za* čitavoga života / *tijekom* čitavoga života
per iocum	*u* šali
per legatos	*po* poslanicima
per vim	*silom* (instrumental without preposition)

In translations from Latin into Croatian Church Slavonic, most of the prepositions have been translated by their prototype translational equivalents. Thus, in Croatian Church Slavonic translations, some Croatian Church Slavonic prepositions are used in meanings which are not prototypical for them. The most common case of Latin influence on the syntax of prepositional

---

[24] This research is based on unpublished Ph.D. thesis Mihaljević 2018.
[25] Milanović 2014, 82.

phrases are the translations of the Latin preposition *de* by the preposition *ot* when introducing the topic of conversation or a literary work: *meministi ex evangelio de Maria illa famosissima peccatrice* (De s. Maria Magdalena): *spominaš' li se ča v' ev(a)nĵ(e)li govorit' se · otъ lakomuûĉee greš'nice* (CŽg113r), *de praefatione tantum dixisse sufficiat* (2Mach 2,33): *ot prêdьg(lago)laniê · toliko rekše dovolьstvui* (BrVO 424cd), *De his qui in aliquibus rebus delinquunt* (Reg. s. Benedicti): *otъ tihь ki vola kolko malo zgriše* (RegBen 30r).

However, Latin influence can be seen in the use of the preposition *ot* in cases in which Croatian Church Slavonic would typically use some other preposition, e.g. the use of that prepositions in expressions meaning 'connected with': *Igitur de Heliodoro, et aerarii custodia ita res se habet. –2Mach 3,40: ibo ot eliodora i mêdenьnika · straže taka veĉ' se imatъ–* BrVO 426d, *de pecuniis vero regi promissis, nihil agebat – 2Mach 4,27: ot pênêz že c(êsa)ru obeĉanihь ničtože dêêše –* BrVO 428b, *quid de eo disponat –* Vita Adae et Evae: *čto od nega b(og)ъ delaetъ –* CŽg 40r, *de populo age quod tibi placet –* Est 3,11: *ot pl'ka tvori eže t(e)bê ugod'no e(stь) –* BrN₂ 236d, *Et cogitavit de altari holocaustrum quod profanatum erat, quid de eo faceret – 1Mach 4,44: i pomisli ot oltara · olokavti že poskvrnenь rêše čto ot nego stvorili bi –* BrVO 418a.

When expressing that someone comes from a certain tribe or family, the preposition *de* is also translated as *ot* instead of *iz*: *Simon autem de tribu Benjamin – 2Mach 3,4: simon že ot kolêne veniêminova –* BrVO 424d, *qui erat de stirpe Agag – Est 3,1: iže biše ot kolene agagova –* BrN₂ 236bc.

The preposition *ot* is used as an equivalent of Latin *de* when expressing cause, source or material: *dominus illum de superba iustitia redarguit –* De s. Maria Magdalena: *g(ospod)ъ že simuna ot' oholstva pokara –* CŽg 106, *quod feci de lapide –* Lectio s. Margaritae: *ot kamene ku učinih' –* COxf 28a. Preposition *de* is also translated by preposition *ot* in spacial meanings instead of Croatian Church Slavonic prepositions *s* and *iz*: *de naribus eius ignis et fumus exiebat –* Lectio s. Margaritae: *ot noz'dar' nega k(a)ko ogan' i dim' ishoêše –* COxf 26a. The other frequent example of Latin influence in translating prepositions is the translation of the preposition *ad* by the preposition *k* when introducing the recipient of the message: *dixit Adam ad Evam –* Vita Adae et Evae: *reče adam' k' euze –* CŽg 39r, *dixit ad eum –* De s. Maria Magdalena: *k' n(e)mu m(a)riê r(e)če –* CIvan 120v, *dixitque ad eam rex – Est 5,3: r(e)če že k' nei c(êsa)rь –* BrN₂ 237c.

The preposition *k* occurs as a translational equivalent of the preposition *ad* also in other non-spacial meanings as is the expression of intention. Preposition *ad* is often translated as *k* in the phrases where *ad* appears with the gerund(ive) in intentional meaning or in the meaning of purpose: *Reliquit autem et praepositos ad affligendam gentem – 2Mach 5,22: ostavi že nastavniki ka umučeniû lûda –* BrVO 430cd, *et dedit nobis omnem arborem fructiferam ad edendum –* Vita Adae et Evae: *i da nam' vsakoe drevo ploovitoe k êdeniû –* CŽg 37 – 37v, *Dimittite, et dimittetur vobis, ad agnoscendum pertinet –* Hom. s. Augustini episcopi: *dadite i dast' se vam' · k' pristoêniû bl(a)godêti pristoit' eže –* BrVO 347b – 347c.

These features sometimes occur even in cases when *de* and *ad* do not appear in Latin. They have probably spread due to Italian influence. These are some of the examples of the usage of preposition *ot*: *Et illud, quod dicitur in Psalmo –* Hom. s. Hieronymi presb.: *ono ot' negože gl(agol)et se v psalmê –* BrVO 171d; *Cum dicit propheta domino –* Reg. s. Benedicti: *ot česa i pr(o)r(o)kъ pravi g(ospod)u –* RegBen 14v. These are some of the examples of the

usage of preposition *k*: cui vir ait – De s. Maria Magdalena: **k** *nei mužь otveĉavь i reče* – CŽg 109r; *Et dixit prefecto* – Lectio s. Margaritae: *potom' r(e)če* **k'** *kralû* – COxf 25c.

Under the influence of Latin, some other prepositions also broaden their meaning. Croatian Church Slavonic preposition *pro* originally had spatial meaning or denoted means or helper.[26] It is not a loan word from Latin. Latin preposition *pro* usually means 'on behalf of; before; in front/instead of; for; about; according to; as, like'. Under the influence of Latin, translators use Croatian Church Slavonic preposition *pro* as an equivalent for Latin *pro*. In some cases the sentence structure is changed to keep the original meaning of Croatian Church Slavonic *pro*: *factus felix* **pro** *miseris* – Hymn.: **pro** *niĉь stvori se čьstanь* – BrN$_2$ 489b. In other cases the translator just uses preposition *pro* as an equivalent to Latin *pro*: *Deo* **pro** *peccato servire noluit* – In conceptione BMV: **pro** *grêhi s'voe b(og)u služiti ne hotê* – BrN$_2$ 388c.[27]

Latin preposition *cum* is mostly translated as *sь* (eng. *with*). But sometimes it is translated as *kada/egda* (eng. *when*) because of the fact that translators sometimes do not differentiate conjunction *cum* from the preposition *cum*: **cum** *magno fletu* – Vita Adae et Evae: **kada** *stvoren' bê plačь* – CŽg 41r, *Sacerdotes autem ante altare* **cum** *stolis sacerdotalibus jactaverunt se* – 2Mach 3,15: *erêi že prêd' oltaremь* **egda** *metaše se* – BrVO 425c.

Preposition *ex* is sometimes translated as *iz* (eng. from) in cases where it should be *ot/od*: *et nisi naceretur redemptor mundi non nasceretur* **ex** *ea* – In octava conceptione BMV: *i ako nezačevši rodila se bi v(ê)ka iskupit(e)lь* **iz'** *nee ne rodil' se bi* – CPar 151rv.

The position of prepositions often mirrors that in Latin. Some Croatian Church Slavonic postpositions or words that are more frequently used as postpositions than prepositions are used as prepositions: **propter** *dissensionem et plagam quam fecit in terra, ut tolleret legitima, quae erant a primis diebus* – 1Mach 3,29: **radi** *malo vladanii · i êzvu ûže stvori v z(e)mli · da vzel bi bezakon' naê* (sic!) *· êže b(êh)u ot prvihь dni* – BrVO 415b: *Et* **propter** *te eiectus sum in terram* – Vita Adae et Evae: *i* **ciĉa** *vas' iz'vržen' esam' na zemlû* – CŽg 33r, *Quoniam* **propter** *te expulsus sum et alienatus de gloria mea* – Vita Adae et Evae: *zač'* **ciĉa** *vas' spuen' esam' od' slavi moee* – CŽg 32v – 33r; *Qui* **pro** *nobis natus, tulit esse tuus* – Hymn.: *iže* **s'kozi** *n(a)sь rači biti s(i)nь t'voi* – CKlim 1v; *ne, si quod pluribus profuturum accepisti celaveris,* **pro** *talento abscondito reprehensibilis iudiceris* – In s. Francisci: *da ne aĉe nêčto mnozêmь prospêšno priêlь esi brêženimь* **skozê** *talanatь sk'rvenь pokaranь suditi se vačneši* – BrVat$_6$ 189b.

Conclusion

Taking all the above into consideration we can conclude that the syntax of Croato-Glagolitic texts translated from Latin is under the considerable influence of Latin syntax. Biblical texts follow the original text fatefully, but even other texts mostly follow the original fatefully and try to mirror its structure. It is obvious that the translators have the awareness on which are the prototype ways of translating certain language features. This is probably due to the way Latin was taught and learned at the time. In order to remain faithful to the Latin protograph sometimes the translators disregard the meaning of the text and produce unintelligible sentences. Most of the prepositions have been translated by their prototype translational equivalents. Under the influence of Latin, some Croatian Church Slavonic

---

[26] Gadžijeva et al. 2014, 277.

[27] In other translation, preposition *pro* is translated by the preposition *za*: *za grêhi svoe b(og)u služiti ne hoĉetь* – BrLab$_1$ 12a.

prepositions are used in meanings which are not prototypical. Most common translational equivalents of Latin prepositions are given in the following table.

Latin preposition	Croatian Church Slavonic translation equivalent
de	• *ot* (all meanings – including topic introduction) • *iz* (separating from the localizator) • *s* (separating from the localizator with nouns *nebo* and *put*) • noun phrase without preposition or with other prepositions
ad	• *k/ka* (location, purpuse, with speech verbs) • *na* (local with nouns *caelum* and *flumen*, final) • noun phrase without preposition or with other prepositions
usque ad *usque in* *usque*	• *daže do / dari do* • *do* • *daže k'* • *daže v* • *do*
in	• *v* (all meanings) • *meû* (local) • *na* (with noun *nebo* and metaphorical) • noun phrase without preposition
post	• *po* • *potom po* • *za*
propter	• *skvozê* • *radi* • *za* • *ciĉa*
super	• *na* • *nad* (hyperonimy) • *vrhu* • *više* • *pače* (metaphoric) • noun phrase without preposition or with other prepositions
ante	• *pred/prêd* • *prêžde*
contra	• *protivu* • *suprotivu*
pro	• *za* • *radi* • *skvozê* • *ciĉa* • *pro* • noun phrase without preposition or with other prepositions
cum	• *s* • noun phrase without preposition or with other prepositions
a	• *ot* • instrumental without preposition (doer of the action expressed by the passive)

	• nominative (doer of the action expressed by the passive which is translated by the active) • noun phrase with other prepositions
adversus/adversum	• *protivu* • *na*
e/ex	• *iz* (origin – from a single person, local) • *ot* (origin – belonging to a family, separating from a group of people)
coram	• *prêd*
apud	• *u* • *k* (with the verbs of movement) • noun phrase without preposition or with other prepositions
inter	• *meû* • *v*
per	• *po* (all meanings) • *skvozê* (local and metaphorical meaning) • *v* (local) • *na* (local and temporal) • *pro* (means and helper) • *črêz* (local and temporal) • *radi* (causal) • noun phrase without preposition (instrumental) or with other prepositions
obviam	• *v srêtnie* • *protivu*
prope	• *blizъ*
sine	• *bez*
absque	• *bez*
trans	• *prêk* • *črês'*
extra	• *izvan* • *iz* • *van* • *pri* • *razvie*
secundum	• *po* • noun phrase with other prepositions
intra	• *v* • *vnutarъ v* • *vnutarъ* • *meû*
sub	• *pod* • *v*
causa	• *radi* • *za*
gratia	• *radi* • *ciĉ*
circa	• *okolo* (local) • *okrst* (local) • *blizu* (temporal) • *pri* (temporal and local)

	• *poli* (temporal and local) • *premo* (local)
ob	• *radi* • *za* • *skozê*
erga	• *suprotiv* • *prema*
prae	• *za* • *pače* • *ot*
iuxta	• *pri* • *poli* • *bliz* • *vkrai/vskrai*
praeter	• *kromê* • *razvê*
infra	• *meû*
ultra	• *prêk*
supra	• *nad* • *na* • *vrhu*

When analyzing the texts translated from Latin in the premodern and early modern period it is visible that the knowledge of Latin is useful and required when analyzing the structure of other languages.

Bibliography

1. Badurina Stipčević, V. 2009. Knjige o Makabejcima u hrvatskoglagoljskoj književnosti: Druga knjiga o Makabejcima u hrvatskoglagoljskim brevijarima, *Slovo*, 59, 1-75.
2. Bauer 1958. = Bauer, J.: *Vliv řečtiny a latiny na vývoj syntaktické stavby slovanských jazyků. Československé přednášky pro IV. Mezinárodní sjezd slavistů v Moskvě*. Praha.
3. Baumgarten and Ozcezin 2008. = Baumgarten, N.; Ozcezin, D.: Linguistic variation through language contact in translation. In: Siemund, P./Kintana, N. (edd.) *Language Contact and Contact Languages*. Studies on Multilingualism 7. Hamburg, 293-316.
4. Bock 1986. = Bock, J. K.: Syntactic persistence in language production. *Cognitive Psychology 18*, 355-387.
5. Catford 1965. = Catford, J. C.: *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford.
6. Cuzzolin 1994. = Cuzzolin, P.: *Sull' origine della costruzione dicere quod. Aspetti sintattici e semantici.* Firenze.
7. Cuzzolin 2013.a = Cuzzolin, P.: Some remarks on *quia* as a subordinator after verbs of saying and thinking. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 12(1), 51-69.
8. Cuzzolin 2013.b = Cuzzolin, P.: The Latin construction *dicere quod* revisited. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia 18*, 1, 23-38.
9. Danchev 1984. = Danchev, A.: Translation and Syntactic Change. In: Fisiak, J. (ed.): *Historical Syntax*. Berlin, 47-60.

10. Eterović and Vela 2013. = Eterović, I., Vela, J.: Sintaktičke funkcije participa u *Misalu hruackome* Šimuna Kožičića Benje. *Slovo 63,* 1-22.

11. Ferreira and Bock 2006. = Ferreira, V. S., Bock, J. K.: The functions of structural priming. *Language and Cognitive Processes.* 21, 1011-1029.

12. Frawley 1984. = Frawley, W.: *Translation: literary, linguistic, and philosophical perspectives*. Delaware.

13. Galabov 1973. = Galabov, I.: *Das Altbulgarische und das Latein im europ ischen Mittelalter: zur Problematik der bernationalen Kultursprachen; Antrittsvorlesung gehalten am 14. Dez. 1971 an d. Univ. Salzburg*. Salzburg.

14. Gadžijeva et al. 2014. = Gadžijeva, S., Kovačević, A., Mihaljević, M., Požar, S.; Reinhart, J., Šimić, M., Vince, J.: *Hrvatski crkvenoslavenski jezik*. Zagreb.

15. Gianollo 2011. = Gianollo, C.: Native syntax and translation effects: adnominal arguments in the Greek and Latin New Testament. In: Welo, E. (ed.) *Indo-European syntax and pragmatics: contrastive approaches*. Oslo Studies in Language 3 (3), 75-101.

16. Grickat 1972. = Grickat, I.: *Aktualni jezički i tekstološki problemi u starim srpskim ćirilskim spomenicima.* Beograd.

17. Grünenthal, O. 1909. *Die Übersetzungstechnik der altkirchenslavischen Evangelienübersetzung.* Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.

18. Heine and Kuteva 2005. = Heine, B., Kuteva, T.: *Language contact and grammatical change. (Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact)*. Cambridge.

19. Hercigonja 2006. = Hercigonja, E.: *Tropismena i trojezična kultura hrvatskoga srednjovjekovlja*. Zagreb.

20. Horálek, K. 1968. Zur Frage der lateinischen Einflüsse in der altkirchenslavischen Bibelübersetzung. u Zagiba, F. (ur.) *Cyrillo-Methodianische Fragen. Slavische Philologie und Altertumskunde*, 29-42.

21. Ivir 1990. = Ivir, V.: Languages in contact through translation. In: Filipović, R./Bratanić, M. (edd.) *Languages in contact: proceedings of the Symposium.* Zagreb, 88-92.

22. Johanson 2002. = Johanson, L.: Contact-induced linguistic change in a code-copying framework. In: Jones, M. C./Esch, E. (edd.) *Languge change: The interplay of internal, external and extra-linguistic factors (Contributions to the Sociology of Language)*. Berlin, 285-313.

23. Keipert 1987. = Keipert, H.: Kirchenslavisch und Latein. Über die Vergleichbarkeit zweier mittelalterlicher Kultursprachen. In: Birkfellner, G. (ed.) *Sprache und Literatur Altrußlands.* Aschendorff Münster.

24. Keipert 1996. = Keipert, H.: Das Lateinische in der Geschichte der russischen Sprache. In: Horst Munske, H./Kirkness, A. (edd.) *Eurolatein.* Tübingen.

25. Kovačević 2016. = Kovačević, A.: *Negacija od čestice do teksta: Usporedna i povijesna raščlamba negacije u hrvatskoglagoljskoj pismenosti*. Zagreb.

26. Kranich 2014. = Kranich, S.: Translations as a Locus of Language Contact. In: House, J. (ed.) *Translation: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Hamburg.

27. Laviosa 2003. = Laviosa, S.: Corpora and Translation Studies. In: Granger, S./Lerot, J., Petch-Tyson, S. (edd.) *Corpus-based Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam – New York, 45-54

28. Malamatidou 2016. = Malamatidou, S.: Understanding Translation as a Site of Language Contact: The Potential of the Code-Copying Framework as a Descriptive Mechanism in Translation Studies. *Target*, vol 28, no. 3, 399-423.

29. Matějka, L. 1968. On Translating from Latin into Church Slavonic. *American Contributions to the Sixth International Congress of Slavists.* The Hague / Paris: Mouton, 247-274.

30. Matějka, L. 1971. K syntaxi církveněslovanských překladů z latiny. *Studia Palaeoslovenica.* Praha, 227-236.

31. McLaughlin 2009. = McLaughlin, M.: *The Linguistics of Translated Texts: The Language of Translation as the Third Code* (http://www.princeton.edu /~piirs/programs/PTIC/Docs/Mairi%20McLaughlin%20Spring%2009.pdf, Access 17th March 2017.)

32. McLaughlin 2011. = McLaughlin, M.: *Tradurre/Tradire: Translation as a Cause of Linguistic Change from Manuscripts to the Digital Age*. (https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4rc5w95r, Access 20th March 20179.)

33. Mihaljević 2009. = Mihaljević, M.: Hrvatski crkvenoslavenski jezik. In: Damjanović, S. (ed.) *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika, 1. knjiga: srednji vijek.* Zagreb, 283-351.

34. Mihaljević and Reinhart 2005. = Mihaljević, M.; Reinhart, J.: The Croatian Redaction: Language and Literature. *Incontri linguistici 28*. Pisa – Roma, 31-83.

35. Mihaljevic 2018. = Mihaljević, A.: Sintaksa hrvatskoglagoljskih tekstova prevedenih s latinskoga. PhD thesis, University of Zagreb.

36. Mihaljević 2014. = Mihaljević, A.: Hrvatskoglagoljski život Marije Magdalene. *Ricerche slavistiche 12* (58), 213-293.

37. Milanović 2014. = Milanović, Z.: *Hereditas Linguae Latinae* – radna bilježnica. Zagreb.

38. Nida and Taber 2003. = Nida, E. A.; Taber, C. R.: *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Leiden – Boston.

39. RCJHR 2000. = *Rječnik crkvenoslavenskoga jezika hrvatske redakcije. I. sv. A – vrêdь*. Zagreb.

40. RCJHR 2014. = *Rječnik crkvenoslavenskog jezika hrvatske redakcije. II. sv. vrêdьnь – zapovêdnica*. Zagreb.

41. Sankoff 2001. = Sankoff, G.: Linguistic outcomes of language contact. In: Trudgill, P./Chambers, J./Schilling-Estes, N. (edd.) *Handbook of Sociolinguistics.* Oxford, 638-668.

42. Thomason 2001. = Thomason, S.: *Language contact*. Edinburgh.

43. Thomason 2010. = Thomason, S.: Contact explanations in linguistic. In: Hickey, R. (ed.) *The hadbook of langage contact,* New Jersey.

44. Thomason and Kaufman 1988. = Thomason, S.; Kaufman, T.: *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics.* Los Angeles.

45. Vela 2018. = Vela, J.: *Sintaksa infinitiva i supina u hrvatskome crkvenoslavenskom*. PhD thesis, University of Rijeka.

PREVOĐENJE S LATINSKOGA NA HRVATSKI CRKVENOSLAVENSKI

Sažetak

Sintaksa hrvatskoglagoljskih tekstova znatno je rjeđe bila predmetom znanstvenih istraživanja nego morfologija i fonologija. Međutim, u posljednjemu desetljeću sve je češće predmetom istraživanja te je sve više znanstvenih monografija i članaka u kojima se neke od sintaktičkih značajka istražuju. U radu se analiziraju primjeri latinskoga utjecaja na korpus tekstova prevedenih s latinskoga na hrvatski crkvenoslavenski te se analizira doseg toga utjecaja. Kao primjer su utjecaja latinskoga detaljnije analizirani prijedložni izrazi. Utvrđuju se razlozi zbog kojih su prevoditelji odlučiti prevesti izvorno neprijedložne izraze prijedložnima, kao što su utjecaj drugih primjera u tekstu ili utjecaj sličnih konstrukcija u talijanskome. Posebna je pozornost posvećena prevođenju latinskih prijedloga ad i de. U radu se analiziraju i prijedložna značenja i uporaba prijedloga koja nije istovjetna u dvama jezicima.

Ključne riječi: *sintaksa, latinski, hrvatski crkvenoslavenski, prijedložni izrazi, prijevodni utjecaji*