Herman Seldeslachts* and Raf Van Rooy

"Every fox praises its own tail". Jan Blahoslav (1523–1571) on Slavic dialects

Summary: Jan Blahoslav (1523–1571) was one of the first – if not the first – to devote a separate chapter to the phenomenon of vernacular diatopic variation in his Czech grammar. His pioneering attempts at making sense of this issue have thus far remained understudied, especially outside of the Czech Republic. In this contribution, we open up this important text, largely written in Czech, to a wider audience by means of an annotated English translation. In addition, we frame his interest in dialectal variation in the intellectual trends of 16th-century language study, especially within the Protestant circles in which Blahoslav was active.

Keywords: Jan Blahoslav, Slavic dialects, history of linguistics, dialectology, Renaissance

1 Introduction

The present paper aims to disclose and contextualize Jan Blahoslav's (1523–1571) views on the concept of 'dialect' and the differentiation of Slavic varieties as they are expressed in his Czech grammar (*Grammatica česká*). Blahoslav's views on this theme have been largely neglected up till now, especially outside of Czech-speaking areas. Moreover, whereas most available publications focus on Blahoslav's own conceptions, the context in which he operated and the sources he con-

*Corresponding author: Herman Seldeslachts, PhD, professor at UCLouvain, UNamur, UCLouvain Institut des civilisations, arts et lettres (INCA), Louvain-la-Neuve,
E-Mail: herman.seldeslachts@uclouvain.be
Raf Van Rooy, PhD, Marie Skłodowska-Curie fellow at University of Oslo / postdoctoral fellow of the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) at University of Oslo, Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas Oslo, E-Mail: r.van.rooy@ifikk.uio.no

sulted have not yet received due attention, even though his ideas are of a broader interest. The present contribution intends to counter this research lacuna by sketching the historical and intellectual context in which he propagated his views and by translating and annotating the relevant chapter of Blahoslav's Czech grammar. Our discussion is preceded by a brief biographical sketch and a succinct summary of his grammar.

2 Jan Blahoslav: a biographical sketch[1]

Jan Blahoslav (sometimes Anglicized as *John Blahoslav*; Latinized *Ioannes Blahoslaus*)[2] was born in 1523 (February 20) in the Moravian town of Přerov (German Prerau), which later honored him with a statue. Not much is known about his childhood, but it is sure that his family was wealthy. In the 1530s, he received theological education from Jan Wolf, whom Blahoslav valued highly, in his hometown. There, Wolf was at the head of a school of the Unity of the Brethren (Czech: *Jednota bratrská*; Latin: *Unitas Fratrum*), of which Blahoslav later became a prominent member.[3] In 1540, upon Wolf's recommendation, he went to assist Martin Michalec by working on his estate in Prostějov (German Proßnitz, Moravia) for three years. Both Wolf and Michalec were not trained in the classical languages, so that Blahoslav only started to learn these tongues at the age of twenty, when he went to study in Goldberg (Silesia; now Złotoryja in Poland) with Valentin Friedland (1490–1556), called Tro(t)zendorf after his place of birth Troitschendorf (near Görlitz; today Trójca in Poland), a humanist renowned for his didactic qualities. There, he gained a thorough, near-native knowledge of Latin – the only language spoken at Trotzendorf's school – and a certain proficiency in Ancient Greek, which was indispensable for his Czech translations of the New Testament, published in 1564 and again in 1568.[4]

---

1 These notes are mainly based on the information provided in Brown (2013: esp. 13–27, 30 & 91–92), the most recent monograph on Blahoslav (the only one in English up till now). Brown's perspective is mainly theological. His exposé needs to be dealt with cautiously, since religious appreciation interferes with the representation of historical facts. For Blahoslav's biography, see also Bautz (1975) and Dittmann & Just (2016: 66–71), with many further references. Especially the latter has been used to complement and correct Brown's (2013) account.
2 Blahoslav also used the pen name Apteryx, from a Greek word meaning 'featherless' or 'wingless', referring to the last name of his mother, Bezperová (Crews 2008: 235). Other nicknames of his are Makarius and Blasius (Dittmann & Just 2016: 66).
3 For Blahoslav's role in this community, see Brock (1957: 258, 260, 278–279, 283 & 288).
4 On these translations and their linguistic make-up, see especially Dittmann & Just (2016: 211–248).

After one year, Blahoslav had already made much progress. In the summer of 1544, after a brief return to Moravia, he was sent to Wittenberg in order to continue his studies at the university there and to hear the preaching of Martin Luther (1483–1546) and the lectures of Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560), who were friends of Trotzendorf's (Laurie 1969 [1903]: 25). During his one-year stay, he heard many of Luther's sermons, which greatly influenced him. It was, however, Melanchthon who became his true example, since he combined "erudition and godliness" in his life's work (Brown 2013: 18). Afterwards, he returned to Michalec's estate in Prostějov, where he taught at a school of the Unity of the Brethren. In 1548–1549, he worked as an assistant to Bishop Jan Černý (1500/1510–1565) in Mladá Boleslav. In 1549, Černý advised him to study in Königsberg (East Prussia; today Kaliningrad in Russia); Blahoslav undertook the journey there but was forced to change his travel plans because of a plague outbreak in the city, sheltering in Gilgenburg (today Dąbrówno in Poland). In the fall of that same year, he moved to Basel to finish his studies and was hosted by the Czech humanist Sigismundus Gelenius (Zikmund Hrubý z Jelení; 1497–1554), who worked for the Froben publishing house and introduced Blahoslav into the Swiss humanist network. After a severe illness, Blahoslav decided to return to Prostějov in 1551, where he took up the administration of the school of the Brethren. In the same year, he met Václav Beneš Optát († 1559), who had co-authored along with Petr Gzel(l) and Václav Philomathes (Filomates) a Czech grammar, published in 1533 together with a New Testament translation (based on Erasmus' Latin version).[5] It is no coincidence that, also in 1551, Blahoslav read this grammar, which he started to annotate – an endeavor eventually developing into his Czech grammar (see Section 3). This has to be seen within the large-scale project of producing a high-quality Czech translation of the New Testament, based for the first time on the original Greek text, doubtlessly inspired by Protestant motives (even though vernacular renderings of the Latin Vulgate Bible had been produced ever since the 1300s).

In 1552, Blahoslav relocated to Mladá Boleslav (German Jungbunzlau), which became his operating base for the following five years, even though he made numerous travels for the cause of the Unity of the Brethren – he went on four missions to Vienna, for instance. In 1553, Blahoslav was appointed pastor by the Brethren, to whose annals (*Acta*) he also contributed greatly. From 1555 onwards, he devoted himself to the composition of hymnals and to music theory. In 1556,

---

5 For this grammar, see the recent edition in Optát et al. (2019). On their New Testament translation, see Dittmann & Just (2016: 12–21 & 122–143). On their and Blahoslav's views on Czech orthography, see Berger (2012: 263–264).

Blahoslav managed to personally acquaint himself with Melanchthon during a mission to Magdeburg. A year later, he became bishop of the Unity of the Brethren, a position he occupied until his death. In June 1558, he settled in Ivančice (German Eibenschütz, south of Brno in Moravia), which he helped turning into a true center of the Unity of the Brethren and where he successfully installed a printing press for the Brethren in 1562. This had to happen in secrecy, since – as of January 20, 1548 – Emperor Ferdinand I (1503–1564) had pronounced the activities of the Unity of the Brethren illegal as a result of a revolt in 1547. The press was remarkable not only for its elegant books but also for their stylistic and linguistic polishing. Apart from printing and writing, much of Blahoslav's time in Ivančice was spent on church administration.

The printing press produced Blahoslav's 1564 Czech translation of the New Testament, actually a thorough revision of the so-called Melantrich Bible in its 1556/1557 edition, a revision which he likely based on a bilingual edition of the text by Erasmus. Blahoslav used the 1565 bilingual version of Theodore Beza (1519–1605) when rewriting his translation for the second edition, which appeared in 1568.[6] According to Pečírková (1998: 1180), Blahoslav mainly relied on the Latin rather than the Greek text, claiming that "his knowledge of Greek was probably not as good as it is sometimes assumed" (cf. Gregor 1965: 564). This idea harks back to the 1930s, when it was popularized by the classicist Jaroslav Konopásek (1883–1934).[7] Yet, in recent times, it has been established that Blahoslav most certainly took the Greek text as his starting point (cf. e.g. his excessive usage of transgressives [gerunds] reflecting Greek participles), even though he made eager usage of existing Latin and Czech translations, both in print and in manuscript.[8] There is additional evidence that he had a mastery of the Greek language, as he was familiar with its dialects, to which he refers in his Czech grammar (see Section 5.2). Moreover, he occasionally cited Greek words and phrases throughout his work, which suggests that he knew the language.[9] Two main principles which guided his translation method were accuracy and transparency, even though his stylistic ideal of "sacred rhetoric" led him to sacrifice the latter to some extent for aesthetic reasons; the language should be worthy of God's message and not coincide with the speech of commoners, contrary to what Luther and his predecessors Beneš Optát and Petr Gzel(l) had believed and practiced. As a result, Blahoslav developed a rather conservative variety of Czech; however, this did not

---

6 On Blahoslav's translation, his technique, and his sources, see Dittmann & Just (2016: 74–77 & 211–248), with copious further references.

7 Dittmann & Just (2016: 213–214).

8 See especially Dittmann & Just (2016: 75–76 & 224–232).

9 Dittmann & Just (2016: 216).

keep his translation from becoming successful, not least because of his innovative method of drawing primarily on the original Greek text.[10] Most notably, the editors of the Kralice Bible revised and regularized his translation (in which they were guided by Blahoslav's grammar), before including it as the New Testament translation in their version of the Bible (Gregor 1965: 564; Dittmann & Just 2016: 211, 273–274). Blahoslav thus became the model of biblical Czech par excellence.

Having just finished his manuscript Czech grammar and before he could realize his plans to translate also the Old Testament into his native tongue, Jan Blahoslav died on November 24, 1571, aged 48, during visitation travels in Moravský Krumlov (German Mährisch Kromau, Southern Moravia). Though often plagued by sickness, he lived an active and productive life (Crews 2008: 260), and his legacy was immense. Apart from his grammar and Bible translations, Blahoslav left behind numerous works, both in manuscript and print, mainly relating to liturgy, hymnology, and the history of the Unity of the Brethren (see the overview in Dittmann & Just 2016: 68). He moreover contributed to training the translators of the Kralice Bible, who were the first to translate the entire Bible into Czech from the original languages.[11]

3 The *Grammatica česká*: the result of two decades' work (1551–1571)

Blahoslav composed his Czech grammar, which is mainly written in Czech, in view of the grand project of translating the entire Bible into his native vernacular, which he thought was now corrupted and needed to be purified, standardized, and elaborated so as to become an adequate and elegant medium for transmitting God's message.[12] This text also served as a guidebook for his pupils, who later translated the Old Testament into Czech (see Gregor 1965: 566; Brown 2013: 19–42, esp. 19–21 & 25; Dittmann & Just 2016: 75; Dittmann 2019: 117). As Blahoslav

---

10 Dittmann & Just (2016: 76–77, 211). On the conservatism of Blahoslav's Czech, see Pečírková (1998: 1181) and especially Dittmann & Just (2016: 232–235) and Dittmann (2019: 116–117).

11 On this high-quality and vastly influential translation and the men behind it, see Dittmann & Just (2016: 84–119 & 249–295).

12 Within this context, Blahoslav was aware of diaphasic diversity. The variety one speaks depends on the situation in which one is speaking. It is moreover said to correlate with one's natural disposition; a peaceful human being will, for instance, speak calmly and without any adornment (Gregor 1965: 566).

worked on his grammar during a time span of two decades, in which it grew organically as it were, the text became very extended (Brown 2013: 30). His *Grammatica česká* is not a grammar in the typical sense, but rather a collection of notes and meditations on the Czech language, written primarily in view of translating the Bible into Czech. He initially conceived it as a commentary on the 1533 grammar of Philomathes, Beneš Optát, and Gzel(l) (see Section 2), but later on he introduced individual chapters of diverging length treating different aspects of the Czech language.[13]

Since Blahoslav had a copy of the 1543 Nuremberg edition of the grammar of Philomathes, Beneš Optát, and Gzel(l), a copy of which was rediscovered only very recently, this served as the textual basis for his commentary.[14] Because of its complicated setup and Blahoslav's intended readership, his grammatical work never reached print and is only extant in one manuscript dating to ca. 1670, preserved at the *Moravská zemská knihovna* (Moravian Library) in Brno (shelf mark: Rkp 114).[15] Moreover, its frequent usage of Latin and – to a lesser extent – Ancient Greek also seems to have been rather unusual within the context of the Unity of the Brethren (Nübler 1992: 186–187). However, it corresponded perfectly to the humanist zeal with which he tried to realize his religious program (cf. Brock 1957: 260). The work has the following structure and contents, consisting of two main parts and seven books:[16]

I.   commentary on the grammar of Philomathes, Optát, and Gzel(l) (Čejka et al. 1991: 15–164);

II. notes on different aspects of the Czech language (Čejka et al. 1991: 165–383):
   i.   book 1 discusses questions regarding the translation of non-Czech texts (mainly the Bible) into Czech (Čejka et al. 1991: 171–220);[17]

---

13 Cf. Gregor (1965: 565), Nübler (1992: 186–187 & 192), and Section 4. Hüllen (2001: 215) underestimates Blahoslav's own input. Blahoslav was aware of the complex nature of his work (Nübler 1992: 187).

14 A digitization of the 1543 grammar can be consulted at <https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/moduly/mluvnice/digitalni-kopie-detail/NamGram1543/strana-A1r> (last accessed February 15, 2022).

15 The digitized manuscript can be consulted at <https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/moduly/mluvnice/digitalni-kopie-detail/BlahGram> (last accessed February 15, 2022).

16 This information is based on Nübler (1992), who — apart from reviewing the edition of Blahoslav's grammar by Čejka et al. (1991) — also offers a very useful German summary of the text (cf. esp. p. 187–191). For a discussion of Blahoslav's grammar in its cultural context, see Koupil (2015: 83–99).

17 There is an emphasis on the idiomatic features of Czech. This section also contains an attack against Germanisms and the imitation of Latin and Ancient Greek peculiarities in syntax and morphology (cf. also Gregor 1965: 566).

ii.   book 2 briefly takes into account the usage of metaphor and comparison in Czech (Čejka et al. 1991: 221–226);[18]

iii. book 3 deals with foreign words in Czech; he advises not to use too many of them (Čejka et al. 1991: 227–239);[19]

iv.   book 4 gives an overview of lexical and morphological doublets in written Czech (Čejka et al. 1991: 239–262);

v.   book 5 offers a discussion of phonological and morphological phenomena in Czech, which are approached in terms of *permutatio litterarum* modifications (Čejka et al. 1991: 263–281);[20]

vi.   book 6 is concerned with a diverging range of topics: elegance, proverbs, comparisons, aphorisms, neologisms, and dialectal features; it also contains critical remarks on the Czech of authors such as Jan Hus, Matěj Červenka, and Jan Augusta (Čejka et al. 1991: 283–361);

vii. book 7 comprises rules for the usage of synonyms and epithets, a discussion of Slavic dialects (see Section 5), and some brief prescriptive remarks on Czech pronunciation (Čejka et al. 1991: 363–380).

4 Blahoslav's views contextualized: Protestant Europe and dialectal variation

Why did Blahoslav devote so much attention to the matter of Slavic diversity? Dialectal variation was a highly relevant problem in Protestant circles. Since Reformers were looking to translate the Bible into the vernacular tongues to spread the gospel to the common people, the question arose as to which variety of a language should be used in doing so. Before the processes of selection and standardization were initiated or completed, a language must have been perceived as being constituted by several cognate varieties within a continuum, along which there were continuities as well as ruptures, both across space and between differ-

---

18 Here, "Blahoslaus poeta" rather than "Blahoslaus grammaticus" is talking (Gregor 1965: 566).
19 In Nübler's (1992: 188) view, this contradicts with his usage of Latin. Blahoslav does not, however, merely introduce Latin words into Czech, but rather uses it as a grammatical metalanguage (cf. Gregor 1965: 569).
20 Blahoslav mentions *prosthesis*, *aphaeresis*, *epenthesis*, *syncope*, *paragoge*, *apocope*, *antistechon*, and *metathesis*. This is typical of early modern discourse on linguistic and dialectal variation and modification (see e.g. Van Hal 2010: 39–40) and also reminds of the Ancient Greek framework of pathology (see n. 237 below). Here, Blahoslav shows a predilection for the Central Bohemian dialect over his native Moravian (Nübler 1992: 190).

ent social classes and professions. Luther chose to adopt as well as adapt the "bureaucratic language of the Saxon court in Meissen [...] (*Meissner Kanzleisprache*)", a variety with a wide communicative reach and, first and foremost, considerable status (Gritsch 2003: 71).

What is especially important within this context, is the fact that we have explicit testimonies of both Luther's and Melanchthon's interest in dialectal variation. The latter's occupation with Ancient Greek and German dialect variation can already be noticed in his Greek grammar (entitled *Institutiones Graecae grammaticae*), which was first published in May 1518 and contains on the recto side of the title page the following information:

> Ampla[21] fuit regio quae Graeciae nomine quondam censa est. Itaque et omnis generis disciplinarum plurimos scriptores habuit. Fuit ergo et multiplex loquendi ratio aliis partibus. Ea loquendi proprietas διάλεκτος a Quintiliano nuncupatur. Discrepant dialecti cum grammaticis inflexionibus, transitu litterarum, varietate tonorum, tum filo orationis [...]. Qui sermo communis omnibus est, lingua communis dicitur, perinde ut apud nos est aliqua ratio loquendi communis Suevis, Boiis, Ubiis, singulis tamen sui sunt idiotismi. (Melanchthon 1518: a1v)

> Spacious was the region that was once known by the name 'Greece'. Therefore, it also had a great amount of writers of all kinds of disciplines. So there were also many diverse fashions of speaking in the different parts. This particular manner of speaking is called διάλεκτος by Quintilian. Dialects differ, on the one hand, by grammatical inflections, a change of letters, and a variety of accents, on the other hand, by the style of speech [...]. The speech that is common to all, is called the common language, just as in our country there is a certain fashion of speaking common to the Swabians, the Bavarians,[22] the Ubians;[23] yet, each of them has its own particularities.[24]

Melanchthon took into account the variation in his own contemporary speech, counterweighted by the existence of "a certain common fashion of speaking". He did not, however, further identify this common variety. His brief remark here, nevertheless, suggests an interest in the subject of regional variation within one and the same language.

---

21 From the 1520 edition onwards, "lata" is printed instead of "ampla" (see Melanchthon 1520: A1v). See also Botley (2010: 45–46).

22 The ethnonym *Boii* probably refers to the Bavarians, the geographic 'neighbors' of the *Swabii*, since *Boii* is an alternative name for Munich in the early modern period (see the *Orbis Latinus online* lexicon *s.v.* "Bavaria [...]"). Another possibility is that it signifies the German speakers of the Bohemian lands.

23 The ethnonym *Ubii* most likely refers to the people living in the area of Bonn and Cologne along the banks of the Rhine (cf. the *Orbis Latinus online* lexicon *s.v.* "Agrippina [...]").

24 All English translations in the present paper are our own. Latin quotes have been regularized.

Luther, in turn, discussed German variation during one of his well-known bilingual table talks, dating to the years 1530–1545. He did so when reflecting on the origins of *Anglia*, 'England'. The original version recorded by Anton Lauterbach (1502–1569)[25] reads as follows:

> Angliam credo partem esse Germaniae, quia linguam Saxonicam inferioris Germaniae habet. Arbitror olim Germanos eo translatos, sicut et hodie episcopus Coloniensis scribit se ducem Angemariae id est*, Angern, do itzt Brem und Hamburg liget*. Olim Britannia dicta postea Angera a populis eo invectis. Danica et Anglica linguae sunt Saxonicae, quae vere est Germanica; *die Oberlendische sprache ist nicht die rechte Teutzsche Sprache*, habet enim maximos hiatus et sonitus, sed Saxonica lingua est facillima, fere pressis labiis pronunciatur. Germania tot habet dialectos, ut in triginta miliaribus homines se mutuo non intelligant. Austri et Bavari nullas servant diphthongos, dicunt enim *e ur, fe ur, bro edt pro feuer, euer, brodt*.[26] Ita Francones unisona et crassa voce loquuntur, quod Saxones praecipue Antverpiensium linguam non intelligunt, habent enim varias affirmationes: *Jha, juiha, ju, joh, ha, iek*. (Luther 1919: 511)

> I believe that England is a part of Germany, because it has the Saxon language of Lower Germany. I think that the Germans were transferred there long ago, as for instance even today the bishop of Cologne writes that he is the Duke of Angemaria, i.e. Angern, where now Bremen and Hamburg lie. Once called Britain, it was later named Angera by the peoples that had migrated to it. The Danish and English language are Saxon, which is truly Germanic; the Oberland tongue[27] is not the genuine German language, for it has the most open and noisiest sounds, but the Saxon language is very smooth and is pronounced almost with pressed lips. Germany has so many dialects that people in thirty miles distance cannot understand each other. Austrians and Bavarians do not preserve any diphthongs, for they say *e-ur, fe-ur, bro-edt* instead of *feuer, euer, brodt*. Thus Franconians[28] speak with a smooth and thick voice, since the Saxons do not understand the language of especially the inhabitants of Antwerp, for they have various affirmative particles: *Jha, juiha, ju, joh, ha, iek*.[29]

---

25 Anton Lauterbach was a priest and Protestant reformer (see Lechner 2007). Since we know that he recorded this table talk, we may date it between the early 1530s, when he began taking notes, and 1545, the last year he wrote down a table talk (Kroker 1919: xli).

26 Not only is the sequence of the examples mixed up here, the contents of this phrase are unclear as well. This is probably due to both the oral character of the table talks and the fact that Lauterbach, the recorder of this talk, was not able to capture this conversation fully and correctly.

27 The *Oberlendische sprache* refers to the Upper German variety (see Tennant 1985: 55–56).

28 As Aurifaber's German translation suggests (in Luther 1566: 605r), *Francones* seems to refer to the Thuringians.

29 Luther's text in Aurifaber's (1566: 605r) German translation of this passage reads as follows: "Ich gleub Engelland sey ein stück Deudschslandes. Denn sie brauchen der Sechsischen Sprache, wie in Westphalen und Niderlande, wiewol sie sehr corrumpirt ist. Ich halte die Deudschen sind vor zeiten hinein transferirt und gesetzt. Wie noch heut zu tage der Bischoff zu Cöln schreibet sich Hertzog zu Engern, da jtzund Brem, Hamburg liegt. Etwa ists Britannia genant. Darnach Angera vom Volck, das hinein gefurt ist. Denische und Engelische Sprache ist Sechsisch, welche recht

In other table talks, the topic of dialects also appears to have been touched upon.[30]

We may conclude that dialectal variation was on the intellectual agenda in the 16th-century Reformist milieu in the eastern part of modern-day Germany – with *Lutherstadt* Wittenberg at its center. This is also of importance for the spread of the Latin term *dialectus* (see Section 6). Blahoslav himself mentions his conversations with Sigismundus Gelenius (1497–1554) about the Slavic dialects, which took place in Basel, when he was there in the years 1549–1550 (Truhlář 1886: 216; Schmaus 1956: 437 & 442; see also Section 2). Also, his many travels through Moravia and Bohemia enabled him to come into contact with different varieties of Czech (Gregor 1965: 565; Koupil 2015: 95). Blahoslav materialized this pursuit of his more extensively in his chapter on the Slavic dialects, which received increasing attention from Slavic scholars in the 1560s.[31]

---

deudsch ist. Die Oberlendische Sprach ist nicht die rechte deudsche Sprache. Nimpt den Mund vol und weit, und lautet hart. Aber die Sechsische Sprache geht fein leise und leicht abe. Deudschland hat mancherley Dialectos, art zu reden, also das die Leute in xxx. Meilen wegs einander nicht wol können verstehen. Die Osterreicher und Beiern verstehen die Düringen und Sachsen nicht, sonderlich die Niderlender. Ja, jutha, ju, ke, ha, solch verjahen ist mancherley [...]." We have preserved Aurifaber's original orthography. The punctuation has been slightly adapted.

30 See e.g. Luther (1916: 78–79): "Quamvis in Germanica lingua tot dialectos habes, ut se mutuo non intelligant. Helvetii fere nullam habent diphthongum. Suevi et Cherusci mutuo se non intelligunt. Omnes nationes respectu Saxonum sunt simplices." See also Luther (1913: 639–640): "Nullam certam linguam Germanice habeo, sed communem, ut me intelligere possint ex superiori et inferiori Germania. Ich rede nach der Sechsischen cantzley, quam imitantur omnes duces et reges Germaniae; alle reichstette, fürsten höfe schreiben nach der Sechsischen cantzeleien unser churfürsten. Ideo est communissima lingua Germaniae. Maximilianus imperator et elector Fridericus imperium ita ad certam linguam definierunt, haben also alle sprachen in eine getzogen. Marchionica lingua facilis est, vix labra moventur, et excellit Saxonicam." For the latter quote, see also Borst (1957–1963: 1067–1068).

31 See e.g. Hosius (1560: 158r–158v): "Sed nec apud Moravos, quorum tamen lingua propius ad Slavorum dialecton accedit, nec apud nos diu mos ille duravit; quod plus afferre detrimenti quam emolumenti visus est. Quamobrem et apud Moravos etiam illos qui catholicae sunt communionis, eadem qua apud nos est, hoc est, Latina lingua rem divinam facientes utuntur. Ac vix est ulla lingua sub sole, quae latius quam nostra pateat, cum plus etiam quam quartam Europae partem complecti videatur. Hac enim utuntur et Boemi, et Moravi, et Cassubi, et Russi, et Moschi, et unde nos originem duxisse putamus, Slavi, Suetii, Dalmatae, Boznenses, Croatae, Bulgari, Rasciani, Serbi, et aliae gentes nonnullae. Ceterum sic inter se nationes hae dialectis variant ut minus etiam Slavum, aut Dalmatam Polonus intelligat, quam Holandum aut Burgundum, Suevus aut Helveticus." See also Mączyński (1564:)(1v): "Quae nationes omnes unum et idem genus sermonis Slavonici agnoscunt, et dialectis tantum inter se variant." See also Section 6.2.

5 Blahoslav's chapter *De dialectis*: an annotated English translation

5.1 Spelling and editorial conventions

In order to make the text more readily accessible to readers familiar with modern Czech, Czech words are always cited in the modern orthography, a practice also adopted in the 1991 edition (= Čejka et al. 1991). Table 1 offers a list of the principal differences with the ancient spelling used in the manuscript of Blahoslav's grammar.

Table 1: Spelling in modern Czech vs. the manuscript of Blahoslav's grammar

Modern	Blahoslav
ej	ey
í	j
j	g
ou	au
š	ſſ
v	w

The conjunction *i* ('and') is written *y*.

We have generally followed the editorial practice of Čejka et al. (1991). Italics have been used for examples, which are translated between square brackets, and we have added underscore to signal the frequent code-switching to Latin. All Latin words and phrases are translated in the footnotes. References to the folio numbers of the original manuscript have been added between round brackets. The English translation sticks closely to the sometimes difficult Czech original, but elliptical phrases are supplemented between square brackets.

5.2 English translation of Blahoslav's *De dialectis*

(347r) <u>De dialectis</u>[32]

How one and the same language, in accordance with a different way of speaking, ought to be and should be divided into several can be judged and seen by almost anyone, especially by one who for whatever reason went out of his homeland to any neighboring countries. People definitely speak more beautifully at some places and uglier at others. Even though <u>suum cuique pulchrum</u>.[33] Every fox praises its own tail. It would be hard to find anyone who criticizes the way of speaking that he uses [himself].

It is, however, also good to know here the differences, lest anyone, frequently wandering from one country to another, should mix up speech so that afterwards he would not know how to speak correctly any dialect, as could not rarely be seen these years among our good friends.[34] Therefore, taking the Greek language as an example, I shall demonstrate [that] something similar [is the case] in our Czech speech.

The following dialects are the most noteworthy in our language.[35]

The first, and perhaps the most important, dialect (i.e. speech) is the Czech,[36] to which also belong the Moravians, and to a certain extent the Silesians.

(347v) The second dialect is the Slovak,[37] to which is connected the manner of speaking of the various Croats who [are to be found] from Hungary to Constantinople, from there to Venice in Italy, then also part of them [can be found] in Africa

---

32 "On the dialects".

33 Latin proverb: "to each person his own thing is beautiful", i.e. "everyone fancies what is his own".

34 As noted by Čejka et al. (1991: 368 n. 3086), Blahoslav seems to think first of all of Matěj Červenka (1521–1569) who was like him a priest and bishop of the Unity of the Brethren and whom he criticizes for using an impure language due to his having lived in Poland, Prussia and Moravia (see fol. 280v–281v).

35 With "our language", Blahoslav means Slavic in general.

36 The ethnonym and glottonym "Czech" is used somewhat equivocally. In a narrow sense, it denotes only the inhabitants of Bohemia and their language; in its larger use, it also includes the Moravians and their dialects. We have opted for the term Bohemian wherever it was necessary to distinguish the Czech proper and their speech from the Moravians and the Moravian dialects.

37 Since it was impossible to find a satisfactory way of rendering the ambiguous glottonym *slovenský*, we have opted for a pragmatic solution which consists in using "Slovak" as a default translation. As we will see, Blahoslav has rather confused ideas about the dialect he calls *slovenský*. When he mentions a close connection with Croatian, he may mean Slovene rather than Slovak (see n. 113 and 116 below).

across the Mediterranean Sea,[38] and they have different names according to the countries, such as Croats in Croatia, Bosnians in Bosnia, not a small country, Illyrians those who live in Illyria, who for the greatest part are called there Slavs = <u>Sclavi</u>.

The third dialect is the Polish speech, to which can almost be reckoned the Silesian [speech] (although those who are nearer to the Czechs or the Moravians speak more like the Czechs than like the Poles).[39]

Then [there is] the Ruthenian [speech],[40] the Mazovian[41] and the Muscovite,[42] and [the speech] of some part of the Tatars.[43]

---

38 Ivan Franko (1984: 24) notes that this might reflect the popular idea – rooted in a false etymology: *Vandali / Wandali = Wenden* i.e. 'Slavs' – that the Vandals who founded a short-lived kingdom in North Africa in the 5th century were a Slavic people. On this equation, see esp. Steinacher (2002; 2004; 2005) who interestingly mentions (2004: 340; 2005: 289–290) that the Czech polymath and bishop of Olomouc Johannes Dubravius (1486–1553) stated in his *Historia regni Boiemiae* (Dubravius 1552: IIv–IIIr) that the Vandals who migrated to Gaul, Spain, and Africa had been Slavs. Blahoslav may well have been familiar with Dubravius' *Bohemian History*, first published in Prostějov in 1552. Around the same time, however, the Protestant humanist Conrad Gessner (1555: 52v–53v), in his language catalogue *Mithridates*, rightly stressed the Vandals' Germanic ethnicity (although he also thought they used the Polish language). Yet, as Gessner also knew (cf. 1555: 52r: the Slavic language can be heard at the Mamluk Court in Egypt), Slavs have really been present in Africa. Their vicissitudes have been extensively treated by the well-known Slavophile Russian philologist and historian Vladimir Lamanskii (1859: 192–221) who especially mentions the exploits of the Adriatic Slavs in this respect (and it is interesting to note that Blahoslav also seems to link the African Slavs to the Croats). See also Phillips (1985: 78) on the predominance of Slavs among slaves in Islamic Spain.

39 The author means the Silesian and so-called Lach dialects, transitional between Czech and Polish, some closer to the former, others to the latter. On the status of these dialects and their perception by Czech speakers until the end of the 18th century, see Malicki (2007; on Blahoslav, see esp. p. 307–308). Nearly a century ago, the renowned Dutch Slavicist N. van Wijk (1928) presented an enlightening survey of these transitional dialects and put forth some hypotheses about their origin and development. For a very interesting overview of the volatile sociolinguistic situation of the area over the centuries up to the present day, see Kamusella (2003).

40 By *ruský*, Blahoslav does not mean (Great) Russian (which he calls "Muscovite"), but the speech of the western East Slavic populations (historically also known as "Ruthenians") who were then part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and later developed into the Belorussian, Ukrainian, and Rusyn nations.

41 The dialect of Mazovia (north-eastern Poland), which was only incorporated into the Kingdom of Poland in 1526.

42 I.e. (Great) Russian.

43 Russia had only recently shaken off the Tatar yoke and Ivan the Terrible had conquered the Tatar khanates of Kazan and Astrakhan in 1552 and 1556 respectively. Part of the Tatar population was subsequently Christianized and Russified. Yet Blahoslav may rather think of the so-called Lip-

As to [the question of] which, then, of these speeches or dialects might be the most original, there is no need to speculate much nor to investigate this too thoroughly. For such matters are full of uncertainties and doubts. Likewise, which of those speeches might be the noblest and most elegant or most beautiful and anyway the richest = quae dialectus, et suavissima et excultissima,[44] who will make about this [question] a correct statement that all [people] (348r) would accept? Quamvis parum abest quin inter omnes constet, Boëmicam dialectum excultissimam tum elegantissimam esse.[45] And to me too it seems that the Czech speech is the most polished as well as the most pleasant. But while leaving to everyone their free judgment on this matter, for an understanding of the differences between these dialects, I shall discuss the properties and manner[46] of each of them in particular and illustrate them with well-known examples.

<div align="center">

Bohemica dialectus[47]

</div>

On the different ways of speaking Czech correctly, I have already written much heretofore. Here I shall add some short remarks.

I think that the Czech speech is also more beautiful than the other parts of the language,[48] because it is easy-going and smooth, [making it] easy for the body parts designed by God for talking to utter the words one after the other, without requiring any drawing askance of the mouth in this or that direction, like the French [tongue] quamvis locis ubi Latini *u* pronunciant, *utilitatem, usum* etc.,[49] nor any hissing or sizzling sound as in the Italian *siegnor*,[50] *sie* etc. (348v) In any case, it does not use the ugly [way of] speaking through the nose. For the Poles spoil their speech a lot with some kind of mumble that sounds unpleasant to us.[51] Nor [does it use] the too frequent repetition of the same letter, which causes unsmoothness. As do the Ruthenians [who], not having the right sound of the double

---

ka Tatars who settled in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the 14th century and abandoned their original language to adopt Belorussian or Polish.

44 "which dialect is the sweetest as well as the most elegant".

45 "Although nearly all people agree that the Czech dialect is the most polished and most elegant".

46 I.e. the particular form.

47 "The Czech dialect".

48 I.e. the other Slavic 'dialects'.

49 "wherever the Latins pronounce *u*, as in *utilitatem* ['utility'], *usum* ['usage'] etc." Blahoslav seems to have in mind the French high front rounded vowel [y] which is notably difficult for Czech speakers to pronounce.

50 I.e. Italian *signor(e)*.

51 Blahoslav here alludes to the Polish nasal vowels *ą* and *ę*.

letter *ff*, use everywhere a simple *ſ*,[52] and not having the letter *ř*, they only put the simple *r*.[53] As do <u>item</u>[54] the Mazovians, who disfigure their speech by the frequent occurrence of *z*, while not having *ž*.[55] Indeed, the German language too, for its frequent use of the letter *r*, seems somehow harsh to us. Likewise, neither by some kind of fast pronunciation (i.e. quickly, like the Italians) nor by a division of the clausula[56] and by a protraction of the end part, like some Croats [do who] <u>decursum verborum veluti Iudaico quodam sono facientes indecorum admittunt</u>.[57]

The Moravians, though they speak the Czech language, do not pronounce certain words as nicely and appropriately.[58] Thus, simple peasants, especially in Hanakia,[59] open their mouths widely and, stuffing their mouths full of (349r) the sound of a certain letter, talk somewhat clumsily: *klouče* [= *klíče* 'keys'], *pacholejk* [= *pacholík* 'boy'], *čejstej mouž* [= *čistý muž* 'a pure[60] man'], *boudemyťou vas zejtra* [= *budeme u vás zítra* 'we shall be at your home tomorrow'] etc.[61] At some places they shorten too much, not preserving the diphthongs, and at other places they

---

52 This is a curious affirmation given that the East Slavic languages actually do have the palatal sibilant *š* (represented by *ff* in the old Czech orthography). Although there are instances where an East Slavic *s* corresponds to a Czech *š*, it is very doubtful that Blahoslav was aware of this. The fact that he mistakes a Ruthenian ("Ukrainian") text for a Slovak one (see below) shows that he was poorly informed about this language. For the translation of *Rusové* as 'Ruthenians', see n. 40 above.

53 No Slavic language other than Czech (and Old Polish) possesses the palatal trill *ř*.

54 "likewise".

55 In the Mazovian dialects of Polish *ż* and *z* merged into *z* (and *sz*, *cz*, *dż* merged with *s*, *c*, *dz* into *s*, *c*, *dz*), a phenomenon known in Polish as *mazurzenie*.

56 *Clausula* (also *clausulum* in Medieval Latin) denotes "[t]he end of a periodic sentence with particular regard to its rhythm" (*OLD*, p. 335).

57 "admit an outflow of words that they render unpleasant by some kind of Jewish sound". This rather enigmatic statement is interpreted as follows in Čejka et al. (1991: 370 n. 3103), in our English translation: "Most probably Blahoslav has here in mind the melodic accent connected to the quantity of the vowels, the strangeness of which struck his ear mainly at the end of the different clauses of the sentence, especially in the speech of the speakers of certain Croat dialects. Likewise he points to an accelerated speech tempo and a marked separation of the clauses (*kola*)".

58 Blahoslav's treatment of the Moravian dialect is discussed by Bartoš (1895: III–VI), and more recently by Gregor (1969), who considers Blahoslav the founder of Moravian historical dialectology (p. 80).

59 The Haná region in Central Moravia, where the very characteristic Hanák dialects (on which see Stieber 1965: 74–79 and esp. 81–83) are still partly spoken today.

60 Or "clean".

61 On the probable existence of wide diphthongs (in the process of becoming *é* and *ó*) in the Hanák dialects in Blahoslav's time, see Bartoš (1895: V–VII, 22) and Gregor (1969: 76–77). In a few cases (*čejstej*, *boudemyťou vas*), Blahoslav may have mistaken Hanakian short *ê* and *ô* (from *i* and *u*) for diphthongs (see Šlosar 1962: 92).

add letters or syllables. At some places, they prolong one letter; thus, in Stráž-nice[62] and environs, where they say *budú* [= *budu* 'I shall be'], *súd* [= *sud* 'barrel'], *na súdu* [= *na sudu* 'on barrel'] *klouče* '*klíče*' ['keys'], *u súsedovích* '*u sousedů*' ['at the neighbours'], *Janovích, Vavrovích, Ondrovích* [= *u Janů, Vávrů, Ondrů* 'at John's, Larry's, Andrew's place'] etc. *Abychom ťa poznali* [= *Abychom tě poznali* 'So that we may know you'], *bychom sa radovali* [= *bychom se radovali* 'we would have rejoiced'], *jedné sa varujma tých věcí* [= *jen se varujme tých věcí* 'let's just beware of those things'], *sebrali sa na nás zlí lude* [= *sebrali se na nás zlí lidé* 'evil people have united against us']. Around Těšín[63] they say *I vedť já nemám než tu jedinú dcéru* ['And, you know, I have but this one daughter']. This word *ved*, *věď* is very often used by many Moravians. <u>Est particula expletiva, idem valet quod Germanicum *doch, hab ich doch* etc.</u>[64]

<u>Item</u>,[65] certain things are called in Moravia by wholly different names than in Bohemia, which it is good to know. Thus, the Moravians say *sveřepý semenec* ['wild hemp seed'], but the Bohemians *ozimý [semenec]*.[66] The Moravians call pistillate hemp[67] *hlavatice*; the Bohemians say *hlavatice* for *přísada* ['cabbage head']. The Bohemians say with a nice word *hlemejžď*[68] ['snail'], the Moravians unpleasantly (349v) *slimák*. *Podletí* [means] springtime; the Moravians [say] *vesno*, *z vesna*, <u>inepta vox</u>.[69] In Bohemian [they say] *hlavatice* ['cabbage head'], in Moravian *přísada*; the former is better. Thus, too, certain silly[70] Moravians say *košťál* and *hloub* or *hloubi*. The Moravians do not know what *pařez* ['tree stump'] is, but say

---

[62] A town in southern Moravia.

[63] A town in Silesia (German *Teschen*, Polish *Cieszyn*), now divided between Poland and the Czech Republic.

[64] "It is an expletive particle with the same meaning as the German *doch* as in *hab ich doch* ['I have after all'] etc." This particle (Mod. Czech *vid*), which exists also in Russian (ведь, Old Russian вѣдѣ), comes from the 1st p. sing. **vědě* 'I know' (cf. Potebnya 1877: 11–12; Fasmer 1986–1987: I, 284–285; Machek 1968: 688; Rejzek 2001: 710; Anikin 2012: 174–175).

[65] "Likewise".

[66] Literally 'winter seed'.

[67] I.e. female hemp.

[68] The modern standard language kept the non-diphthongized form *hlemýžď*, but *hlemejžď* still exists in the spoken language.

[69] "an inappropriate word". Moravian *vesno* is a secondary neuter form (after *léto* 'summer') for *vesna* (cf. Polish *wiosna*, Russ. весна) which is the Common Slavic word for 'springtime', akin to e.g. Lithuanian *vasarà* 'summer' and Latin *vēr* 'springtime'; Mod. Czech *vesna* is a bookish loan from Russian (cf. Machek 1968: 685; Rejzek 2001: 707).

[70] The adjective *hloupý* 'silly', 'stupid' probably suggested itself because of its similarity to the reprobated word *hloub* or *hloubi*.

peň[71] instead, <u>inepte</u>.[72] For *kroupy třaslem*[73] *proprchly* ['a hailstorm swept through the fields'], the Moravians say *meslem*, <u>vox est defectiva</u>.[74] The Bohemians [say] *pět grošů* ['five groschen'], the Moravians *pět groší*.[75] [Bohemian] *koláčů:*[76] [Moravian] *koláči*. But both Bohemians and Moravians say *pět holubů* ['five pigeons']. [They say] *klíče* ['keys'] in Bohemian. Many Moravians say it also like that, but around Hulín[77] [they say] *klouče*, and there, nearer to Strážnice, *klúče*. The Bohemians say *nyní* ['now'], the Moravians *včilí* ['at the moment']; *nyničky*, *včiličky*, although the Pilseners[78] [say] somewhat better *večán*. Instead of *včilí*, in Strážnice speech [they say] *včilé*. In Bohemian, they say *pupen* ['bud', 'sprout'], in Moravian *pupenec*.[79] The Bohemians say *jilm* ['elm tree'], the Moravians *břest*.[80] *Máŕa* ['Mary'] is an Old Czech word, the Moravians [still] use it: *Svaté Máŕi synu* ['Son of Holy Mary!'] etc. Also, the Moravians say for 'oil cake' *záboj*.[81] A large unglazed vessel in which one keeps milk is called *látka*[82] by the Moravians; (350r) *přinesli nám látku koblihů* ['they brought us a pot of doughnuts']. For *potkal sem se s ním* ['I met him'], the Moravians [say] *postřetl sem ho*.[83] The Bohemians [say] *snažně* = 'valiantly', 'truly', 'courageously', etc.; the Moravians, <u>inepte</u>[84] lengthening the *á*, say *snážně* = <u>celeriter</u>,[85] 'hastily', 'rapidly'. The Bohemians [say] *teď*['now']; the Moravians *toť*, *toťka*, *toťky*, *totejky* etc.; <u>omnia ineptissima</u>.[86] *Pněl na kříži* ['He

---

71 The Moravian word is the older one and is found in other Slavic languages, e.g. Slovak *peň* 'tree stump', Polish *pień* 'trunk', *pniak* 'tree stump', Russ. пень 'tree stump'; as for *pařez* (cf. also Slovak *parez*), this is a derivative of *pořezati* 'to cut, to saw (up)' (cf. Machek 1968: 435; Rejzek 2001: 450).

72 "inappropriately".

73 Instrumental singular case of *třaslo*, which seems to be a variant of *tráslo* (mod. *třslo*) 'strip (of land)', on which see Machek (1968: 658).

74 "The word is defective", i.e. it only occurs in the instrumental case with an adverbial meaning. On this Moravian word *meslo* 'plot of land, (land) strip', see Machek (1968: 360–361).

75 Groschen was a silver coin used in Bohemia and other parts of the Holy Roman Empire.

76 Genitive plural of *koláč* 'cake', 'pie'.

77 A town in south-eastern Moravia.

78 I.e. the inhabitants of Pilsen (Plzeň) in Bohemia.

79 This was originally a diminutive form of *pupen*.

80 This tree name has correspondents in other Slavic languages and is cognate with English *bright* (cf. Schall 1964: 125–126; Machek 1968: 72; Trubachëv 1974: 199–200; Fasmer 1986–1987: I, 156; Derksen 2008: 37–38; Anikin 2009: 125–126).

81 On this word, see Anon. (1918: 250–251) and Machek (1968: 707).

82 On this Moravian word for 'milk vessel' and its Slavic cognates, see Machek (1968: 322) and Fasmer (1986–1987: II, 465).

83 The Bohemian phrase looks like a *calque* of the German *ich habe mich mit ihm getroffen*, while Moravian kept on using the original Slavic verb for 'to meet'.

84 "inappropriately".

85 "quickly".

86 "all of them highly inappropriate".

hung on the cross'] [said] the ancient Bohemians, from *pně*, *peň* ['tree stump'],[87] the Moravians say <u>inepte</u>[88] *strměl*, *strmí nůž v stěně* ['a knife is stuck in the wall'], from *strví*,[89] *ostrev* ['tree stump']. The Bohemian says *vážiti vodu*, *navážiti vodu* ['to draw water']; the Moravian [says] *tahnouti vodu*; the Bohemian [expression] is better.[90]

But one also ought to know that even in Moravia [people] speak very heterogeneously.[91] Around Meziříčí[92] they speak in one way, in Prostějov[93] and environs in another way, then in Bystřice and in Třebíč[94] in yet another way. Still in another way around Brno and Znojmo.[95] Differently in Strážnice and in Brod.[96] Or as some are nearer to the Silesians, others to the Slovaks, and others to the Bohemians, so they also imitate them in certain words and ways [of speaking], having often and much to do with them as they are neighbors.

Indeed, the Bohemians too differ in many ways from each other in speech. In Prague and here around Nymburk[97] and in Boleslav[98] is, I think, the most beautiful and most (350v) correct Bohemian speech, indeed also in Hradec Králové[99] and almost in Litomyšl[100] too. They speak differently right next in Litoměřice[101]

---

87 Blahoslav's derivation from *peň* (gen. sing. and nom./acc. plur. *pně*) is only a folk etymology. The Old Czech verb *pieti*, transformed into *pnieti* after the present *pnu*, corresponds to Old Church Slavonic *pęti* (1sg. pres. *pьnǫ*) 'to stretch out' (especially in compounds, e.g. *raspęti* 'to crucify'); see Machek (1968: 464–465).

88 "inappropriately".

89 This seems to be a hypothetical older form of *strmí*; this reconstruction allows the author to establish between *strměl* / *strmí* and *ostrev* a relationship analogous to that between *pněl* and *peň*.

90 Gregor (1969: 80) notes that some of the words quoted by Blahoslav (e.g. *slimák*, *přísada*, *pupenec*) are still in use in Moravia, while others seem to have left no trace (e.g. *nyníčky*, *záboj*).

91 This is still true today: "Many Czecho-Moravian scholars agree that Moravian is still marked by three sharply defined and largely heterogeneous dialects: Central Moravian (called Hanák), Lach and East Moravian" (Cummius 1993: 153).

92 Velké Meziříčí (German *Großmeseritsch*) is a town in south-western Moravia.

93 A town in the Haná region where, as was noted above, Blahoslav had studied and taught (German *Proßnitz*).

94 Bystřice nad Pernštejnem (German *Bistritz ob Pernstein*) and Třebíč (German *Trebitsch*) are towns in south-western Moravia.

95 A town in southern Moravia (German *Znaim*).

96 Uherský Brod (German *Ungarisch Brod*), a town in south-eastern Moravia.

97 A town in Central Bohemia (German *Nimburg*).

98 Stará and Mladá Boleslav are towns in Central Bohemia (German *Altbunzlau* and *Jungbunzlau*). Blahoslav had lived for a short time in Mladá Boleslav in 1548–1549.

99 A town in eastern Bohemia (German *Königgrätz*), known in modern history for the battle of Königgrätz of 1866.

100 A town in eastern Bohemia (German *Leitomischl*).

101 A town in north-western Bohemia (German *Leitmeritz*).

and there in the Říp area,[102] and again differently in the Pilsen region. This has sufficiently been dealt with heretofore at its place when the opportunity presented itself.

<div align="center">

The Slovak [*slovenský*][103] <u>dialectus</u>
</div>

Some people hold that the term Slovak speech [*slovenská řeč*] <u>est generale</u>,[104] global, including all the already mentioned variants and dialects, and they accordingly divide the Slovak speech [*slovenská řeč*][105] into Bohemians, Poles, Croats, Ruthenians[106] etc. Others want to include those languages in the term Bulgarian speech.[107] And [still] others try to find [still] other terms for this. Philipp Melanchthon called the Czechs and Slovaks <u>Heneti</u>.[108] I for one, although I would not dispute this, nor resolutely affirm that the Slavonic speech is (351r) the origin and source of other dialects of our language [which is] widely spread over distant lands, I shall, however, simply say what I hold to be nearest to the truth, without in any way criticizing other opinions and viewpoints on this matter. So much, though, I shall say: that we do not have a word so as to include all the dialects and all the different varieties of our language. The Germans have. Be it Saxon, Austrian, Bavarian, Swabian, Swiss, Netherlandish, Markish[109] speech, all of them are parts of one language that is called the German language, and hence they[110] are all called Germans or the German people. And therefore, Germans in whatever country you want are still just Germans.

102　The Říp (German *Sankt Georgsberg*) is a mountain in north-western Bohemia.

103　Although Latin *dialectus* is a feminine noun (cf. *Bohemica dialectus* above), Blahoslav uses it with the masculine form of Czech adjectives (*slovenský dialectus*) as if it were a masculine Czech word.

104　"is generic".

105　The confusion stems from the fact that the adjective *slovenský*, which commonly means 'Slovak' in Czech, originally meant 'Slav(on)ic' in general.

106　For Blahoslav's use of *ruský*, see n. 40 above.

107　Presumably because Old Church Slavonic, the oldest Slavonic literary language, had its origin in Bulgaria (cf. also Franko 1984: 24).

108　*Heneti* is a Latinization of the Greek ethnonym Ἐνετοί (*Henetoi*), the Latin equivalent of which is *Veneti* (or *Venetae*), a name used by Latin authors such as Tacitus and Pliny to denote an ethnic group generally identified as the ancestors of the Slavs, and later continued in German as *Wenden* and *Winden*. Melanchthon linked these *Heneti*/*Veneti* to the homonymous people that in antiquity inhabited the northern Adriatic region of Italy and who gave their name to the city of Venice. According to an ancient tradition, the Adriatic *Veneti* descended from the Paphlagonian *Eneti*, allies of the Trojans, who were said to have migrated from Asia Minor to Italy after the fall of Troy.

109　I.e. of the March of Brandenburg.

110　I.e. the speakers of any of these dialects.

But for the people of our language it is different. For the Slovaks live in Slovakia, the Croats in Croatia, the Bohemians[111] in Bohemia, the Poles in Poland etc. And whoever among them come to another country have their particular name, <u>speciale non generale uti Germani,</u>[112] whether they are in Italy, in Hungary, in Germany, they still remain [Bohemians] and are called Bohemians, and Poles [and Slovaks] are still Poles or Slovaks. A German, however, from whatever land he be, is only called a German, even though he cannot very well converse with another German coming from another country.

This Slovak [*slovenský*] dialect, then, what it might be like, whereby it might be different from other dialects, I do not think to have much to write about that, neither do I know what profit would come from that.

Those who talked with them may judge and observe this:

I. That this dialect is not easy[113] to understand for us Bohemians, nor for the Poles indeed. It has its artistic twists and cadences in speech, <u>in pronuntiatione,</u>[114] which are not at all similar to those Slovaks who live in Hungary at the border with Moravia, and yet are not too rude.

II. <u>Non est inexculta dialectus.</u>[115] It is said that they also have their own grammar,[116] though I have not seen it. However, they do have many metaphors and various other figures. And there exists in this language a multitude of songs and poems or (352r) rhymes.[117] What these are like, can be somewhat understood from this one little secular song of them.

---

111 Or "Czechs".

112 "specific, not generic like 'Germans'".

113 According to Čejka et al. (1991: 371 n. 3123), *nesnadný* ('uneasy', 'not easy') might be an error (haplography) for *nenesnadný* 'not uneasy', or else Blahoslav might have had some hearsay knowledge of the Church Slavonic written language with its complex style. But the context rather suggests that the Slovene (Slovenian) language is meant here: it is said to be a spoken and written language difficult to understand for Czechs and Poles (which is not the case for Slovak) and distinct from Slovak as spoken in Hungary and near the border with Moravia (i.e. present-day Slovakia). Cf. further n. 116 below.

114 "in pronunciation".

115 "It is not an unpolished dialect".

116 According to Čejka et al. (1991: 372 n. 3126), this could be a reference to the manual by the Slovene Protestant priest Primož Trubar (1508[?]–1586): *Abecedarium und der klein Catechismus in der windischen Sprach* (Tübingen, 1551). The adjective *slovenský* would thus also refer to the Slovenes (where Modern Czech has *slovinský*); cf. also n. 37 and 113 above.

117 Ivan Franko (1984: 24) suspects here a reference to the Croatian ("Illyrian") literature that had been blossoming in Dalmatia since the 15th century under the influence of the Italian Renaissance (cf. fol. 347v on the link between the Slovaks and Croats and the fact that part of the latter are called "Illyrians" or "Slavs").

A Slovak song[118] brought by Nicodemus of Vacetin[119] from Venice[120] where there are abundantly Slovaks[121] or Croats[122]

> Danube, Danube, why do you flow so troubled?
> On Danube's bank there stand three hosts:
> The first host is Turkish,
> The second host is Tatar,
> The third host is Wallachian.
> In the Turkish host they fight with sabers,
> In the Tatar host they shoot with arrows,
> In the Wallachian host there is Stephen the Voivode.[123]
> In Stephen's host a girl is weeping.
> And weeping she spoke to Stephen the Voivode:
> "Voivode Stephen, either take me or let me go!"
> Look what Stephen the Voivode says:
> "Pretty maiden, to take you, girl,
> you are not my equal, to let you go, you are too dear to me."
> What then said the girl? "Let me go, Stephen!
> I shall dive into the Danube, into the deep Danube.
> And he who will come and swim after me, his I will be."

---

118 In actual fact, the language of the folk song is Ruthenian/Ukrainian (more precisely a Galician dialect, according to Ivan Franko 1984: 26–27). The confusion stems perhaps from the fact that in the Carpathian region the interaction between East Slavic Ruthenians and Slovaks resulted in the emergence of mixed or transitional dialects (such an interpretation, albeit with nationalistic overtones, had already been proposed in 1856 by Vasylyi Kovals'kyi, a Ruthenian of Galicia, and in 1907 by the Ukrainian historian Stepan Tomašivs'kyi, whose theories are discussed by Franko 1984: 32–38). Nandriş (1924: 5) incorrectly states that Blahoslav quotes this folk song "comme modèle du dialecte russe – c'est-à-dire petit-russe et non pas moscovite".

119 A member of the Unity of the Brethren and friend of Blahoslav (see Gindely 1858: 46–50; Jireček 1876: 302; Franko 1984: 39–40; Čejka et al. 1991: 16 n. 6).

120 *Benátky* is the Czech name of Venice, but it is also a common place name in Bohemia and Moravia. Stepan Tomašivs'kyi fancifully identified Benátky with a Carpatho-Ruthenian village (see Franko 1984: 35, 37, 514).

121 Are these "Slovaks" in reality Slovenes (cf. n. 37 and 116 above on the ambiguity of the term *slovenský*)? Slovene and Croatian Protestants were well represented in neighboring Venice in the 16th century.

122 Our translation takes into account the reconstruction of the original text and the commentary by the great Ukrainian poet, polymath and activist Ivan Franko (1856–1916): see Franko (1984, especially "Стефан–воєвода", p. 17–56 and 510–517). Earlier the ballad had already been thoroughly studied and commented by A. A. Potebnya (1877), whose approach is partly criticized by Franko. A (rather free) French translation is given by Nandriş (1924: 5–6); his summarizing comments (Nandriş 1924: 6–7) are based on Potebnya's work.

123 Stephen III (1433–1504), voivode of Moldavia from 1457 to 1504, also known as Stephen the Great (Ştefan cel Mare), was held in high esteem because of his fierce resistance against the Ottoman Turks and the Poles. He was canonized by the Romanian Orthodox Church in 1992.

Nobody came swimming after the pretty girl.
After the pretty girl came swimming Stephen the Voivode
and he seized the girl and took her by the hand:[124]
"My girl my soul, my darling you will be."
AMEN

[There is] another song, similar to this one, which I have heard in Basel, at Gelenius' home, from Croatian people.[125] It contains these words: *pryliko andelska koia me prychyny*. *Prýlika*, that is 'an adorned, embellished likeness,[126] i.e. made alike', that is 'O angelic image'. That is 'you are beautiful like an angel'. *Koia*, 'cui, to which, to whom'.[127] *Me*, 'me ipsum, ego'.[128] *Prychyny*, 'I tend to', 'I am inclined' = 'quam ego diligo'.[129]

Observ[atio][130]

Where the Bohemians have *ř*, the Slovaks have *r*.[131] Like: *vařiti* ['to cook'], *kořiti* ['to humiliate'], *koření* ['spice'], *kořeniti* ['to spice']; they say: *variti repu s korením* ['to cook beets with spices'] etc. And again in turn, where the Bohemians pronounce *r*, there they [say] *ř*, like *Mařia Panna* ['the Virgin Mary']. Item,[132] instead of the Bohemian simple *s* with letters forming a *zřek*[133] or syllable *be*, *ne*, *me*,

---

124 Blahoslav's version *zabil ji u ručku*, which he understands as "took (*ujal*) her by the hand" seems to be due to a misunderstanding of *za bilu ji ručku* or *za biluju ručku* "by her white hand" (thus Franko 1984: 55).

125 On a study trip to Basel at the turn of 1549–1550, Blahoslav met Sigismund Gelenius (Zikmund Hrubý z Jelení) who maintained lively contacts with other Slavic speakers, especially Southern Slavs. The influence of different Slavic languages is perceptible in Gelenius' work *Lexicum symphonum quo quatuor linguarum Europae familiarium, Graecae scilicet, Latinae, Germanicae ac Sclavinicae concordia consonantiaque indicatur* (Basel: Froben, 1537). See Čejka et al. (1991: 372 n. 3132) and see below, n. 148.

126 The Czech text has *podobnost ulíčená*, *přilíčená*, where the verbs *ulíčiti*, *přilíčiti*, which normally mean 'adorn', 'make up', should perhaps be taken in the sense 'made similar' (as indicated by the gloss *připodobněná*); they have apparently been chosen in order to clarify the etymology of the word *prýlika*.

127 The interpretation of *koja* – which is in fact a feminine nominative – as a dative was probably suggested by its vague formal resemblance to Latin *cui* (dative singular of the relative pronoun).

128 "myself, I". Hradil & Jireček (1857) mistakenly read the feminine accusative *ipsam* for the masculine *ipsum*.

129 "that I love". The Croatian verse – *priliko and'eoska koja me prihini* in modern spelling – actually means "O angelic figure that beguiles me". Blahoslav seems to have been led astray by the superficial resemblance of *prychyni* (= *prihini*) with the Czech verb *přichylovati se* ['to tend to', 'to be inclined'].

130 "Observation", "Note".

131 This had already been mentioned at the end of fol. 151a.

132 "Likewise".

133 *Zřek* is an old word for 'syllable'.

te etc., they have the one with a dot[134] just like the Poles: *nje*,[135] 'nemáš' ['you haven't'], *Běno*, '*Beneš*' ['Benedict']. (353r) And again <u>contra</u>[136] where we have *mě*, *ně* etc., they [have] *ne*, *me*; for instance, we say *Němec [běží]*, they *Nemec beží* ['the German is running'] etc.

<div align="center">The Polish dialect</div>

On Polish speech I do not need to expatiate either; we have the Poles as neighbors and in Bohemia and Moravia you can see quite a few of them. Especially now in the monasteries, where you can almost hear more Poles preach and say mass than Bohemians or Moravians,[137] for the Bohemians, for all their busy occupations, are not much used anymore to concern themselves with religion.

Let me say only this much about the Poles that for the last twenty years they have been expanding their speech so much, having published in their language a great number of books, among them the Holy Scriptures (which has been better taken care of than in Czech), that there is room for astonishment.[138] Yes, the Czechs have (353v) reason to be ashamed that they have so hideously neglected this matter, so horribly; having fallen so far from the famous diligence and bravery of their ancestors, they are left with idlers and sluggards.

Finally, I would like to add the following. If I made mention <u>de dialectis</u>,[139] the reason was not that I should perhaps deem it fitting and necessary for any one person to learn two or three dialects.

It has been observed with quite prudent and learned people that they could not speak well in one or the other way, i.e. neither Polish nor Czech, or neither Moravian nor Slovak.[140] Or that, when speaking Czech, sometimes a Polish word

---

134 The diacritical sign (*háček*, caron) indicating palatalization (e.g. *ně* = *nje*) originally had the form of a dot (cf. Berger 2012: 260).

135 I.e. Polish *nie masz*.

136 "contrariwise", "on the contrary".

137 In the 16th century, the Czech Catholic minority and the Polish Catholic majority developed a lively cooperation. There was significant mutual fluctuation, but the main movement was from Poland to the Czech lands, especially to Silesia and Moravia. In this movement, the Catholic clergy predominated over the laity. This was due to a shortage of Catholic priests in the Czech lands and a surplus of them in Poland. See Čejka et al. (1991: 373 n. 3138).

138 From the middle of the 16th century, mainly through the efforts of the poets Mikołaj Rej (1505– 1589) – a proud Lutheran – and Jan Kochanowski (1530–1584), Polish literature began to flourish. This was also the time when the Czech Bible was replaced in Poland by the first Polish Bible (1561) of Jan Leopolita (John of Lemberg), which was, however, still based on the Czech Bibles of Pavel Severín and Jiří Melantrich. See Čejka et al. (1991: 373 n. 3139).

139 "of the dialects".

140 Čejka et al. (1991: 373 n. 3142) refer to the case of Matěj Červenka (cf. n. 34 above), whom Blahoslav characterizes on fol. 281r.

comes to someone's mind, [a] nice [word] in the opinion of the Poles, and <u>significans</u>[141] in their language, and he then utters it instead of a more common Czech one, almost before realizing it or reflecting upon it. Like the Polish word *pravdivě* ['truly', 'truthfully'],[142] which certain Polonized Czechs often use.[143] *Pravdivě pověděl*, i.e. (354r) 'he told truthfully', i.e. he speaks correctly [*právě praví*], that is 'he told the truth [*pravdu pověděl*]'. Our <u>adverbium</u>[144] *právě* ['rightly'] includes <u>dexteritatem et veracitatem</u>.[145] However, any Czech can immediately understand the Polish word. Therefore I do not blame too much those who, having become accustomed to it, habitually use it.

But still I consider it a useful thing for someone who knows well <u>unam dialectum</u>,[146] one variant of speech, such as Czech or Polish, therefore also to pay attention, now and then, to other dialects, and also in part to understand them, rather than to use them much in speaking.

As an example of this I might mention an illustrious and very learned man, Sir Sigismund Gelenius: we who heard him know how very well he spoke Czech, and his *Lexicon symphonum*, printed in Basel, testifies to how [well] he understood other dialects of our speech and could judge their <u>harmoniam</u>[147] with other languages.[148] Indeed, he who, being a good Czech, understands also other dialects, will better recognize and understand for many words their <u>origines, derivationes, significationum fontes et mutationes</u>[149] and their origins and derivations, their properties and the (354v) different modifications of these properties. And in this way, a Czech will be much superior and erudite than he would be otherwise, if he did not have this [knowledge]. I shall show this with some examples for clarification.

That the word *bohatý* ['rich', 'wealthy'], Polish *bogaty*, has its origin from the word *Bůh* ['God'] is easier to recognize from the Polish than from the Czech dialect: <u>quasi Dei particeps</u>.[150] Hence *zboží* ['goods'], *zbožnění* ['deification', 'diviniza-

---

141 "meaning (something)", "meaningful".

142 Polish *prawdziwie*.

143 The adjective *pravdivý* occurs in Červenka's *Psalter* (*Psalm* 31), see fol. 337v, where Blahoslav brands it as Polish.

144 "adverb".

145 "[the idea of] righthandedness and truthfulness". Like English *right*, Czech *pravý* (adverb *právě*) means both 'right hand' and 'just', 'correct'.

146 "one dialect".

147 "harmony", "agreement".

148 On this work, see n. 125 above. Blahoslav apparently thinks of the later edition Λεξικὸν σύμφωνον *Sig. Gelenii iam duplo auctius*, Basel: Winter, 1544.

149 "their origins, their derivations, the sources of their meanings, and their changes".

150 "as it were 'partaking in God'".

tion'], *zbožný* ['rich';[151] 'devout', 'pious'], *pobožný* ['devout', 'pious']. The Slovaks say *Boh. Bohom nezbrehujtě*, that is 'Don't reject God'. The Germans [say] *Gott*, from goodness.[152] We, then, say *Bůh*, from *bohatství* ['wealth', 'riches'], for he alone is rich and enriching (*Ephes*. 1),[153] abundantia, omni sufficientia divitiae.[154] *Bohatý*, that is to say 'endowed by God'. Hence *zboží*,[155] which the Poles apply, it seems, only to grain and crops. *Má věle zboží*,[156] i.e. 'he has got plenty of grain'. – The Slovaks say *můj lubý Vaniš* ['my dear Vaniš'[157]], the Czechs *můj milý Václav* ['my dear Václav].

(355r) On account of the dialects, it will not be inappropriate if I add something de derivationibus vocabulorum.[158]

Now, these are diverse and originate from different[159] languages or also dialects or realities etc.

The word *kostel* ['church'] some say is descended from *postel* ['bed'], i.e. of all the dead the common receptaculum adeoque veluti lectus mortuorum.[160] Or from *kostí* ['bones', genitive plural], since there are many of them at these places; therefore one says *kostel*, as if [it were] *kostitel*,[161] or *kostí postel* ['bed of bones'].[162] The Poles say *kostěl*.[163]

Claustrum, *klášter* ['monastery', 'cloister'], from 'to close', a claudendo.[164]

---

151 Only in the older language.

152 The author obviously imagines an etymological connection between *Gott* and *gut*.

153 See *Ephesians* 1.7–8.

154 "abundance, riches sufficient to cover all needs".

155 Czech transposition of Polish *zbože* 'corn', 'grain', 'cereal'.

156 In Polish orthography: *Ma wiele zboże*.

157 *Vaniš* is a hypocoristic form of *Václav*.

158 "on word derivations".

159 The manuscript has *rozdílných* (thus Čejka et al. 1991), not *rozličných* as printed in Hradil & Jireček (1857).

160 "receptacle, and thereby so to say the bed of the dead".

161 This is meant as a reconstructed intermediate form.

162 The word *kostel* actually comes, probably through Old High German *kastel*, from Latin *castellum* (see Fasmer 1986–1987: II, 347; Machek 1968: 281; Rejzek 2001: 304).

163 In Polish orthography *kościół*. The Polish word was borrowed from Czech (see Machek 1968: 281; Rejzek 2001: 304).

164 Blahoslav's etymology is essentially correct: Czech *klášter* ultimately comes, through Middle High German *klōster*, from Latin *claustrum*, a derivative of *claudere* 'to close' (see Machek 1968: 252; Rejzek 2001: 274).

Církev ['Church'],[165] Erithacus[166] wrote that this word came from the Greek word κύριος ['the Lord']. The Germans say *Kirchen*.[167] The Czechs changed the *k* into a *c*.[168] κυριακή, 'church', 'house of the Lord'. Hence *církvička*, a small church. *Cirkvice*, *Cerekvice*, a certain village is called thus.[169] *Kerchov*, *Kirchhof*, 'church-yard'.[170]

Křesťan ['Christian'] <u>dicitur</u>[171] not originally from *křest* ['christening', 'baptism'], but from *Kryst* ['Christ'], <u>a Christo enim descendit Christianus</u>,[172] and from *Kryst* comes *křest*. (Like some Calixtine Pseudo-evangelicals[173] (355v), that [fellow] Kúžel[174] and his ilk, rising up vigorously in their sermons, used to address their audience solemnly, in a forceful pronunciation, with that noble word *Krystyány*, with great exuberance, being puffed up by the mind of their flesh,[175] not knowing how they should behave.) Now, *křtíti* ['to baptize', 'to christen'] is *okrystiti* ['to

---

165 As Blahoslav remarks earlier in his work (fol. 184r–184v), *církev* refers to the Church as a community or institution, although some Utraquists also used it in the sense of *kostel*, the church building.

166 *Erithacus* is the Latinized name of Matěj Červenka. *Červenka* means 'robin' (from *červený* 'red'); Latin *erithacus* (from Greek ἐρίθακος) denotes a bird generally identified with the robin-red-breast.

167 It is not clear why Blahoslav writes the plural form. In older German, *Kirchen* could also be a genitive or dative singular of *Kirche*.

168 The letter *c* in Czech represents the affricate [ts]. Erithacus' etymology is basically correct: the Slavic word for 'church' is a Greek loanword, likely borrowed through Germanic.

169 In the right margin is added in pencil "Spectat D[omi]ni Comiti [*sic*] de Gassen de Silesia" ("This refers to [the village] of the lord Count of Jasień in Silesia"). Jasień (German *Gassen*) is now in Poland, in the Voivodeship of Lubusz. Therefore, according to Čejka et al. (1991: 375 n. 3163), the village of Cerekwica (German *Zirkwitz*) north of Wrocław (Breslau) is most probably meant here, although the name is very widespread: Cirkvice, Cerekvice formerly designated the towns of Dolní ['Lower'] and Horní ['Upper'] Cerekev (near Jihlava / Iglau); there are several villages named Cirkvice (near Kutná Hora / Kuttenberg, Kouřim / Kaur(z)im and Litoměřice / Leitmeritz) and Cerekvice (near Hořice / Horschitz and Litomyšl / Leitomischl).

170 *Kerchov* (also *krchov*, *kirchov*, or *kirkov*), which Blahoslav correctly derives from German *Kirchhof*, is an Old Czech word for 'graveyard' (see Machek 1968: 293). The modern standard language uses *hřbitov*, which also comes from German (*Friedhof*, influenced by *(po)hřbít(i)* 'to bury'; see Machek 1968: 187 and Rejzek 2001: 216).

171 "is said".

172 "for from *Christ* comes *Christian*". Cf. Augustine, *Sermones de Scripturis*, LXXVI, 1: "a Christo Christianus vocatur", "the Christian is named after Christ".

173 I.e. Neo-Utraquists.

174 Probably a scribal error for *Kúzel* (= *Kunzel*); apparently Blahoslav refers to Jan Künzel, a Neo-Utraquist canon who preached in the Moravian town of Olomouc (Olmütz) in the years 1555–1556. See Čejka et al. (1991: 375 n. 3167).

175 See *Colossians* 2.18.

Christianize'].[176] The ancients said *křesťana udělati* ['to make Christian']. *Okřtěno* ['Christened'] = 'made Christ's', <u>Christum induistis</u>, "you have clothed yourselves with Christ",[177] "you are consecrated to Christ".

Tejden,[178] '<u>septimana</u>', 'week'. *Několik nedělí* or *téhodnů*[179] ['several weeks']. *Tejden*, that is *tejž*[180] *den* ['the same day'], i.e. 'such a day as was before six days or that comes after six days'. *Od téhodne* ['For a week'], 'since the same day that it is now', *čekám na tě* ['I have been waiting for you'].[181]

Oplatek, oblátek ['host'], <u>oblacio</u>,[182] <u>quia offerri dicitur hostia in missa</u>.[183] <u>Ab offerrendo</u>[184] <u>itaque derivatur</u>.[185] Similarly, *koleda* ['New Year holiday'; 'carol'], <u>dies colenda, collecta</u>.[186] Then a song that the students sing on that day is also called *koleda*. And since some of these songs are idle fables about supposed saints and doubtful <u>historiis</u>,[187] this word has turned into a saying, so that idle talk and gossip are (356r) called *koleda* or blabber. *Hrany, strany hraniti* ['to cut off the edges, the ends'], carpenters know what that is, = <u>ligni vel trabis rotundae partes quadrare</u>.[188] *Tříhraný* ['three-edged', 'three-sided'], *čtyřhraný* ['four-edged', 'four-sided, square'], *pětihrané dřevo* ['a five-edged piece of wood']. *Hrany zvoniti*

---

176 The verb *okrystiti* was invented by Blahoslav in order to explain the etymology of *křtíti*.

177 See *Galatians* 3.27 in the Vulgate version (our emphasis): "quicumque enim in Christo baptizati estis *Christum induistis*", "for you all who were baptized into Christ *have clothed yourselves with Christ*".

178 The modern standard language kept the non-diphthongized form *týden*, though *tejden* is still used in the colloquial language.

179 *Nedělí* and *téhodnů* are the plural genitives of the synonyms *neděle* and *tejden* respectively.

180 The modern standard language kept the non-diphthongized form *týž*, but *tejž* is still colloquial.

181 This etymological explanation is correct.

182 "offering" (= *oblatio*).

183 "because the host is said to be offered in the mass".

184 *Sic* in the manuscript for *offerendo*.

185 "It is therefore derived from *offerre* ['to offer']". This etymology is essentially correct. Czech *oplatek* with its *p* requires an Old Bavarian intermediary: **oplâta*, from Latin *oblata* (see Fasmer 1986–1987: III, 145; Machek 1968: 416; Rejzek 2001: 429–430).

186 "A day to be worshipped, a chosen day". Blahoslav appears to admit a double etymology for *koleda* (*colenda* and *collecta*). The association of *koleda* with *colenda* is already found in the Latin-Czech glossary (*Glossarius*) of the 14th-century encyclopedist Claretus (Bartoloměj of Chlumec alias Magister Bohemarius Bartholomeus de Solencia), 7, 8 [*De festis*], 2395 (consultable online: http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/slavica/bohemica/klaret/frame.htm; last accessed February 15, 2022). In actual fact, it is an old borrowing from Latin *Kalendae* ['first day of the month'] (see Fasmer 1986–1987: II, 299–300; Machek 1968: 268; Trubachëv 1983: 134–135; Rejzek 2001: 285; Boček 2009: 38–39; 2010: 52–55). Blahoslav is right, however, about the semantic evolution of the word.

187 "stories".

188 "to square the sides of a piece of wood or of a log that is round".

['to sound the death knell'] [is] a custom for a deceased person, for the female sex two [bells], for the male three.

Třtina ['reed'] no doubt has its name from 'shaking',[189] <u>a tremendo</u>.[190]

Orodovati ['to pray', 'to plead', 'to intercede'] seems to come from Latin *orare* ['to pray', 'to plead']. *Orodovati*, *orovati*.[191] *Oroduj za nás*, <u>ora pro nobis</u>.[192] Hence *orodovník náš* ['our mediator'], <u>intercessor</u>.[193] Perhaps the people heard it in the litanies and so took the habit of using this word.

Pahrbek ['hillock'], *pahorek* ['hillock']. The first tells that it is a mountain or hill lying on top of another mountain.[194] And the second that it is the top of some mountain, <u>ipsa scilicet cacumina montium, vel extremitates</u>.[195] Some [people] take one for the other <u>velut synonyma</u>.[196] *Na pahrbcích hor*, 'in collibus mon-tium'.[197] A *parojek* ['after-swarm'] is when another swarm comes from the swarm that came out this year = when the swarm of this year brings forth or sends out another swarm, as if a child born this year gave birth to another child.

Podstata ['footing'] and *základ* ['foundations'] (356v) <u>differunt</u>.[198] The footing [*podstata*] is that on which the foundations [*základ*] are placed, while on the foundations [*základ*] the house is built. <u>Dicimus</u>:[199] That house has good foundations (i.e. *grunty* ['groundings'], or in German *krumfešty*[200]).

Doba ['(fitting) manner', 'opportunity', 'right moment', 'time'[201]]. *Pravě tvá doba* ['[It's] just your fit'], i.e. 'it suits you well'. <u>Podoba</u> per contemptum, ac si di-

---

189 In Czech *od třesení se*.

190 There is no etymological connection between *třtina* (older *trstina*, a derivative of Old Czech *tresť*, OCS *trъstь*, see Fasmer 1986–1987: III, 106; Machek 1968: 659) and the verb 'to shake' (Cz. *třást* [*i*] [*se*], OCS *tręsti*).

191 The verb *orovati* is meant as a hypothetical intermediate form. In actual fact, *orodovati* has no etymological connection with *orare*, but its meaning has been influenced by the Latin verb (see Machek 1968: 417; Rejzek 2001: 432).

192 "pray for us".

193 "intercessor", "mediator".

194 Blahoslav seems to interpret these words as etymologically meaning '[lying] on top of a hill (*hrb* 'hunch', 'hump') / a mountain (*hora*)'. On such nominal compounds with the prefix *pa-*, see Westh Neuhard (1959); Machek (1968: 424); Vaillant (1974: 757–759); Rejzek (2006); Le Feuvre (2011); Matasović (2014: 174–175).

195 "viz. the very peaks of the mountains or their summits".

196 "as synonyms".

197 "on the hills of the mountains".

198 "differ".

199 "We say".

200 Also *gruntfešty* and other variants, an obvious loan from German *Grundfesten* 'foundations'.

201 In the modern language *doba* normally means 'time', 'period'.

<u>ceres *netrefa*</u>,[202] and like Moravian *čuridlo* ['looby']. The ancients used to say – <u>nunc non est in usu</u>[203] – *nádobný, nádobná* 'nice', 'comely', 'fit'. The Poles still use it.[204]

Ratolesti, '<u>rami</u>'.[205] The Prussians[206] [say] *letorosti*. That is to say the small off-shoots that grew in the year (every year), during the year.[207]

Zváti, obilí zváti ['to winnow the grain']. *Zváti na svadbu* ['to invite to a wedding'], *pozvaný* ['invited']. The Poles [say] *vezvany*[208] = '<u>citatus</u>'[209] *k hodům* ['to a feast'], *k soudu* ['to court'] etc.[210]

The Czechs [say] *mnedle* = 'for me'.[211] But it has already almost become a habit to omit the letter *n*. For one says as well as writes *medle*. The Poles [say] *dla jeho* ['for him'],[212] *dla tego* ['for that (one)'], *dla Pana* ['for the Lord'],[213] *dla jinších* ['for others'].[214]

Bydlí ['he resides'], *bydleti, bydliti*, '<u>habitare</u>'.[215] The Poles [say] *bydło* for 'cattle', *bydle*[216] for 'animal', *bydlętu* for 'of an animal'.[217] *Bydlo míti* = '<u>habitationem habere</u>',[218] *bydlo míti*[219] = 'to have beasts or cattle'.

---

202 "*Podoba* ['something fitting'], contemptuously, as if you said *netrefa* ['misfit', 'mishap']".

203 "today it is not in use anymore".

204 Polish *nadobny* 'pretty', 'nice'.

205 "branches".

206 It is not clear who these "Prussians" are. According to Čejka et al. (1991: 376 n. 1187), Blahoslav means the speakers of the Lach dialects in Prussian Silesia (in the Hlučín / Hultschin and Racibórz / Ratibor areas). This is, however, an anachronism, as these territories became only part of Prussia as a result of the partition of Silesia in 1742.

207 The etymology as given by Blahoslav is essentially correct. *Letorost* is indeed the older form of the word, which is a compound of *lěto 'summer', 'year' (Czech *léto*) and a derivative of the verb 'to grow' (Czech *růst*[*i*]; see Fasmer 1986–1987: II, 489; Trubachëv 1988: 13; Rejzek 2001: 528), literally meaning 'summer growth' (*lěto* should be taken in its primary meaning 'summer', not 'year' as assumed by Blahoslav and Rejzek).

208 *wezwany* in Blahoslav's (and Polish) spelling.

209 "invited", "summoned".

210 *Zváti* 'to winnow', which comes from *jъz-vějati 'to blow out', is a wholly different word from the homophonous *zváti* 'to call', 'to invite'.

211 In Old Czech *dle* 'for', 'because of', 'according to' functioned as a postposition governing the genitive.

212 Correct would be *dla niego*.

213 *Púna* in Čejka et al. (1991) must be a misprint.

214 In Polish spelling *dla inszych*.

215 "to live (somewhere)", "to reside", "to dwell".

216 I.e. *bydlę*.

217 *Bydlętu* (Modern Polish *bydlęciu*) is the genitive of *bydlę*.

218 "to have a residence".

219 I.e. Polish *bydło mieć*. The author wants to make clear that the same expression has a different meaning in Czech and Polish.

Orloj ['clock'] = *hodiny bicí* = *bijecí*[220] ['striking clock']. *Půl orla* ['half an eagle'] (357r) is called that which strikes till twelve. *Celý orel* ['a whole eagle'], that which strikes till 24.[221] Thus they used to say formerly; now you can but seldom hear it. I think that the ancients took it from the Latin *horologium*, like the Latins [took it] from the Greek ὧρα[222] 'time'.

κατὰ οἶκον,[223] περὶ τοὺς οἴκους,[224] <u>domatim</u>,[225] i.e. *po domích*[226] ['from house to house'] the apostles went around and admonished the people etc. Hence *parœcia*, *parochia* 'parish', *parochus* 'parish priest'. *Žebráci chodí po domích podlé řadu* ['The beggars[227] go house to house'].

6 The term and concept of 'dialect' in Blahoslav's work[228]

The remainder of this paper aims to offer a brief commentary on Blahoslav's usage of the term *dialect*, on his conception of 'dialect(s)', and on his position within the early modern history of language studies (cf. Petr 1985). Specific information regarding his views on the Slavic 'dialects' and their linguistic particularities will not be discussed at length here, as this has been largely treated in the footnotes accompanying our English translation (see also Skutil [1973]).

---

220 The adjective *bicí* is etymologized by means of *bijecí*, present participle of *bíti* 'to beat', 'to hit', 'to strike'.

221 Even though Blahoslav recognizes the correct etymology of *orloj* (Latin *horologium*, from Greek ὡρολόγιον), he also seems to admit a connection with *orel* 'eagle'. As clocks were commonly decorated with the image of an eagle (as was the case with Prague's impressive astronomic clock built in 1410 by Nicholas of Kadaň), we are probably dealing with a metonymic usage.

222 The correct accentuation would be: ὥρα.

223 *Acts of the Apostles* 2.46 & 5.42.

224 The correct reading is κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους (*Acts of the Apostles* 8.3); cf. also 20.20 (κατ' οἴκους).

225 "from house to house".

226 Misprinted *po dobních* in Čejka et al. (1991).

227 Or, possibly, "the mendicant friars".

228 We will refer in this section to the folia of the manuscript, when citing specific passages.

6.1 Blahoslav, an early adopter of a fashionable metalinguistic term

Blahoslav's Czech grammar is an early instance of a vernacular adoption of the term *dialect*, spelled *dyalektus* in the manuscript. Since it took him two decades to finish his grammar and the main discussion of dialects in Slavic only figures in the seventh and last book, it seems plausible to date the appearance of the term in Czech to the last years of his life: ca. 1565–1571. In adopting the term in Czech, Blahoslav is remarkably early, even though his introduction and usage of the term in Czech seem to have remained isolated. For comparison, it may be useful to recall the earliest attestations of the term in Western European languages: Spanish (1540), Italian (1544), French (1550), English (1566), Dutch (1614), and German (1634).[229] In most Slavic varieties, the term first appeared only much later, although, in Ruthenian, it was already being used in print by 1653.[230] (Neo-)Latin functioned as the main donor language, although acquaintance with the Greek term διάλεκτος as well as the example of other vernacular languages doubtlessly stimulated borrowing in certain cases. Whereas the Greek term was obviously coined in antiquity, Latinized *dialectus* was principally an innovation of the last decades of the 15th century and the first decades of the 16th.

As far as Blahoslav is concerned, it seems highly likely that he borrowed Czech *dyalektus* from Latin *dialectus*, since he uses this form in chapter and paragraph titles (e.g. *De dialectis* & *Boemica dialectus*) and preserves the Latinate ending *-us* in the borrowed form. The introduction of <k> into the Czech term is certainly due to Czech orthography, in which <c> renders the affricate [ts], rather than to influence from Ancient Greek spelling. Blahoslav moreover adapted the term to the Czech declension system by incorporating it as a masculine noun (cf. also the gender of the term in modern French, Italian, Spanish, and German), even though he was clearly aware of the original feminine gender (cf. his Latin usage of the term). The fact that Blahoslav mastered Latin and was acquainted with Ancient Greek was an indispensable prerequisite for borrowing the term *dia-*

---

229 See Van Rooy (2019) for the information in this sentence and the remainder of this paragraph. Within this regard, one has to keep in mind that the term *dialect* and its equivalents were not necessarily always used in 16th-century discourse on the internal variation of a language. Cf. e.g. Seldeslachts (2013) for the case of the Brabantian scholar Antonius Sexagius and his 1576 *De orthographia linguae Belgicae.*

230 The term occurs in Berynda (1653: + Br). We owe this information to Tomasz Kamusella (personal communication from March 10, 2020).

lectus.[231] It is also possible that he knew it from Melanchthon's Greek grammar, in which Greek dialectal variation has a physically prominent place, since it is already discussed on the verso side of the title page.[232] He may also have heard the term during one of Luther's table talks when studying in Wittenberg (see Section 2). Blahoslav's proposal did not persist in modern Czech, in which *dialekt* became the established form.

6.2 'Language' and 'dialect' according to Blahoslav

Blahoslav did not use the terminological and conceptual pair 'language' and 'dialect' in the modern sense (cf. Petr 1985; Koupil 2015: 95). Whereas he refrains from formulating criteria to distinguish between a 'language' and a 'dialect', it is abundantly clear that he has a rather broad conception of both entities. He sees no difficulties in extrapolating the idea that a 'language has different dialects subsumed under it' from the relatively confined geographical space of Greece to the vast territories in which varieties of Slavic were spoken. He thus presupposes the existence of one Slavic 'language' with many 'dialects' subsumed under it, assuming something similar for Germanic (cf. *infra*). This broad interpretation of what a 'language' and what a 'dialect' is, has parallels in the Slavic context. Stanislaus Hosius (1504–1579), a Polish Roman Catholic cardinal, and the Protestant humanist Jan Mączyński (ca. 1520–ca. 1587), two contemporaries of Blahoslav from the Slavic-speaking sphere, had a similarly broad conception of a Slavic 'language' and its 'dialects', when commenting on Slavic diversity. In his Latin-Polish dictionary of 1564, for instance, Mączyński briefly compared Slavic and Greek variation:

---

231 E.g. in the case of Georgius Haloinus (Joris van Halewijn/Halewyn; ca. 1470–1536/1537), a Flemish humanist who attacked Latin *grammatica* and preferred to follow the 'Classical' authors' *consuetudo*, a lack of knowledge of Ancient Greek seems to have hampered the Latinization of διάλεκτος, which would have been appropriate, since he extensively discusses dialectal variation in his 1533 *Restauratio linguae Latinae*, edited by Matheeussen (1978).

232 See Section 4 above. Melanchthon still hesitates between a Latin transcription of the original Greek term and a full-fledged Latinization; compare "Discrepant *dialecti* cum grammaticis inflexionibus, transitu litterarum, varietate tonorum, tum filo orationis [...]" (1518: a1v, our emphasis) with "Si lubet, huc pro varietate *dialecton* [*transcription of Greek* διαλέκτων] collige litterarum passiones, quibus mutatis saepe et prosodiae mutantur [...]" (1518: b4r-b4v, our emphasis).

> Dialectos Graeci vocant linguarum species, Vlasność yęzyków yáko w nászim yęzyku Sla-
> wáckim ynáczey mowi Polak ynáczey Ruśyn, ynáczey Czech ynaczey Ilyrak, á wzdy[233] yed-
> nak yeden yęzyk yest. Tylko ysz każda ziemiá ma swę wlasność, y tákże też w Greckim yęzy-
> ku bylo. (Mączyński 1564: s.v. dialectus)[234]

> The Greeks call 'dialects' species of languages, A property of languages, like in our Slavic
> language, the Pole speaks differently, the Ruthenian differently, the Czech differently, the
> Illyrian differently, but it is nevertheless still one language. Only does every region have its
> own property, and likewise it was in the Greek language.

Projecting the 'language' – 'dialect' distinction on the level of 'the Slavic lan-
guage' and its 'dialects' did not, by the way, keep Blahoslav from noticing varia-
tion within individual Slavic 'dialects', even though he does not design a separate
concept for this type of linguistic entity. Instead, he simply states the existence of
such lower-level differences, as, for instance, regarding his native tongue Czech:
"The Moravians, though they speak the Czech language, do not pronounce cer-
tain words as nicely and appropriately" (fol. 348v).

It can be noted too that Blahoslav reflects on glottonymic matters to a certain
extent (see fol. 350v–351r). He reports different uses of the phrase *slovenská řeč*
and adopts a comparative perspective. Even though he claims that he does not
want to take part in this discussion, he does add that for Slavic tongues there is
no word covering all dialects of the language, which is very much unlike the Ger-
man situation. After all, the label 'German language' includes all varieties of Ger-
man. The Germans have, in other words, come up with an integrative term,
whereas in Slavic areas a 'separatist' terminological usage is common. A Bohe-
mian is a Bohemian and a Pole is a Pole – they are not called Slavs – , whereas
both a Bavarian and a Dutchman are Germans, Blahoslav argues. In this matter,
he senses intuitively that metalinguistic terminology often has a political dimen-
sion, granting distinct labels to languages of separate states but referring to areas
he perceives as politically unified with one and the same label.

6.3 To the Greek roots of Blahoslav's account

Blahoslav's interpretation of 'dialect' is partly determined by his views on the
Ancient Greek context of linguistic diversity, to which he alludes in passing at the

---

233 The form "wzdy" should be "wżdy", but the dot above the <z> does not appear in the original
text.
234 See also n. 31 above for other relevant passages in Hosius' and Mączyński's work.

beginning of his chapter on the Slavic 'dialects' (fol. 347r). Even more, the fact that the Greek language has dialects constituted the primary incentive for Blahoslav to discuss Slavic variation: "Therefore, taking the Greek language as an example, I shall demonstrate [that] something similar [is the case] in our Czech speech." The discourse in his remarks on the 'dialects' in Slavic is indeed partly modelled on treatises on the Greek dialects available to 16th-century scholars. These include most notably a number of writings by John the Grammarian, pseudo-Plutarch (then considered to be an original work of this author), and Gregory of Corinth, which were widely available in Europe, usually in Latin translation (see the appendix to Trovato 1984). In addition, there were writings on the Greek dialects by Petrus Antesignanus (ca. 1524/1525–1561) and Martin Ruland the Elder (1532–1602) that circulated widely in Protestant circles.[235] In particular, Greek influence seems to emerge from the title *De dialectis* ('On the dialects'), usually used for treatises on the Greek dialects, and from the fact that the Slavic tongues are treated per 'dialect', as in the Greek treatises, and not, for instance, per linguistic feature or part of speech.

The wandering perceiver of the dialects whom Blahoslav describes might reminisce the traveling poet Homer, who elegantly mixed Greek dialects in his speech according to 'Plutarch'. Blahoslav, however, expressed the hope that his remarks on the Slavic dialects might prevent speakers precisely from intermingling different dialects in their speech, a fallacy he noticed even among his good friends. One should keep one's native dialect pure, seems to be the guideline. Blahoslav began his chapter on the Slavic dialects with an enumeration of the different varieties and accorded evaluative labels to individual dialects, a practice frequently found in descriptions of Greek dialects as well.[236]

The method Blahoslav follows in outlining the linguistic properties of individual Slavic 'dialects' is likely to be also partly inspired by Greek tradition: formulation of a general rule, followed by extensive exemplification. Like with the Greek dialects, the general rule concerns either a modification of the word, usually a letter mutation or modification, or the use of different words to express one and the same meaning, or the diverging semantics of one and the same word.[237] General rules are, however, rare in Blahoslav's account, when compared to Greek

---

235 See Antesignanus (1554), with many reprints, and Ruland (1556).

236 See e.g. Canini (1555: a3v–a4r) and Section 6.4.

237 Some pathological terminology seems to be present in Blahoslav's work: see n. 20. On the Greek tradition of pathology, a framework according to which there are different ways in which words can undergo "modifications" (πάθη), mainly letter changes, and therefore naturally relevant to the study of dialects, see e.g. Wackernagel (1979 [1876]); Siebenborn (1976: 150); Lallot (1995: esp. 118).

treatises, and exemplification constitutes the lion's share of the chapter. This is probably caused by the fact that Blahoslav could not rely on a long tradition in describing variation among Slavic tongues. In fact, he drew attention to a particular circumstance of early modern awareness of dialectal variation; whereas dialect speakers are ubiquitous in present-day society through mass media (television, radio, internet), in early modern times this was a phenomenon primarily obvious to people with the opportunity to travel frequently, including Blahoslav himself.

6.4 'Every fox likes its own tail': Blahoslav's attitude towards varieties of Slavic

Blahoslav's work poses a major paradox. He strikes his reader with an apparently objective and exceptional observation on the sentiments speakers have about their native variety: "Every fox praises its own tail" (fol. 347r). This is, however, preceded by the maxim that "[p]eople definitely speak more beautifully at some places and uglier at others". Some sentences later already, his Czech patriotism seduced him to label it the "first, and perhaps the most important, dialect". After pointing out once again that no variety can be labeled "the noblest and most elegant or most beautiful and anyway the richest" (fol. 347v) to everybody's consent, he immediately adds that in his view Czech deserves the highest crown, but leaving everybody free to judge the issue. That is not the main point of interest, though, Blahoslav is quick to claim. Instead, he will concentrate on the linguistic features of each dialect, although his evaluative approach surfaces in the remainder of his chapter on the dialects too. This is especially obvious when he describes specific linguistic particularities of Moravian, in his eyes a variety of Czech inferior to Bohemian. One of his favorite Latin terms in labeling Moravian features is 'inadequate' (*ineptus*; frequently on fol. 349v–350r).[238] This is highly remarkable, since Blahoslav originated from Hanakia and therefore was a native speaker of a variety of Moravian. Perhaps he suffered from an inferiority complex, being filled with admiration for the language of Prague, a phenomenon Einar Haugen (1972) has quite aptly called schizoglossia. As suggested in the previous section, Blahoslav might have been inspired for this evaluative approach by Greek scholarship, even though it is natural for speakers to adopt specific attitudes towards language varieties, especially with regard to speakers of language varieties with whom one has regular contact.

---

238 On evaluative attitudes towards dialects in general, see Edwards (2009: esp. 63–71).

How exceptional is it that Blahoslav adopted – initially, at least – such an objective perspective on speakers' sentiments about their native variety? His testimony is relatively early, especially for the Slavic sphere, but he is certainly not the first scholar propounding this idea. This honor seems to go to the Tuscan poet Dante Alighieri, who noticed around 1305 already that many people consider their own vernacular variety to be the best in his *On vernacular eloquence*.[239] In the Catholic sphere, a similar view is expressed by, among others, Charles de Bovelles (ca. 1479–after 1566) in his book on vernacular tongues and their differences of 1533.[240] In Protestant areas, however, Blahoslav appears to have been one of the first scholars to acknowledge this.

6.5 The etymological use of knowing dialects

Despite the fact that Blahoslav does not seem to have had high regards of attempts at retrieving the oldest or most original form of a language (see fol. 347v), he still emphasized and at the same time tried to demonstrate the etymological use of knowing different dialects. This idea is developed in the last part of his chapter on the dialects, where he initially deplored the intermingling of words of different Slavic varieties he perceived in the speech of his acquaintances (fol. 353v–354r). He was, however, quick to add that it is useful for a Czech to know different dialects in Slavic, but not so as to use them in speaking. As a matter of fact, "he who, being a good Czech, understands also other dialects, will better recognize and understand for many words their *origins, derivations, and the sources and changes of their meanings* [...], their properties and the different modifications of these properties" (fol. 354r–v). This observation is followed by a list of examples demonstrating that the origin of certain words is more easily perceivable from other varieties of Slavic such as Polish.

Blahoslav thus provides a very early example of a scholar pointing out the etymological use of related dialects. It is unclear whence he derived his inspira-

---

239 See e.g. *De vulgari eloquentia* 1.13.1, where he discusses Tuscan.

240 See Bovelles (1533: 45): "Nam sicuti diximus de Gallis, ita et de Germanis accidit, ut in Germania suus cuique populo placeat sermo, suusve loquendi modus, sit cuilibet et rectus et bellus". See e.g. also the work of the Italian Jesuit Girolamo Germano (1622: 7–8): "Il giudicio di questo appartiene all'orecchie, di cui il giudicio è superbissimo, come dice Marco Tullio nel suo Oratore, perche l'orecchia è quella, che dà la sentenzia delli vocaboli, quale sia il più soave; se la passione non impedisce; poiche ogn'uno pretende che la lingua sua natia et la sua pronuntia sia la più bella di tutte".

tion, but it seems that ideas about the usefulness of knowing dialects were circulating in Protestant circles in the 1560s. The humanist Conrad Gessner (1516–1565), for instance, saw a grammatical use for dialects, as he believed that in order to teach German orthography, morphology, and syntax in a correct manner, one needs to know and compare the various dialects of the different regions – apart from being well-versed in the three sacred languages.[241]

Another notable aspect of Blahoslav's etymological praxis is his usage of reconstructing hypothetical forms – forms which we would mark with an asterisk today. He thus offers an extremely early example of this method, which was rare in the early modern period.[242] The etymology of *kostel*, 'church', is explained by Blahoslav by means of this procedure. It is analyzed as a composition of two words, *kosti*, 'of bones' (a genitive plural), and *postel*, 'bed', which was subsequently shortened to the hypothetical intermediate form **kostitel*. This, in turn, was simplified to *kostel*.

7 Conclusion

Jan Blahoslav showed an exceptional enthusiasm in discussing variation in the Slavic family of languages, which we have tried to open up for a larger audience through our annotated English translation of the chapter 'On the dialects' of his Czech grammar. Even though his work did not enjoy a wide readership, it constitutes an interesting episode in the history of linguistics in general and that of dialect studies in particular. Our contextual outline has shown that Blahoslav picked up several important ideas that were being developed in Protestant humanist circles in Western Europe. He was the first to extensively reflect on Slavic variation, for which he was doubtlessly inspired by his acquaintance with the language and scholarship of the Ancient Greeks. In order to speak about Slavic variation, he had to introduce the necessary metalinguistic terminology, *dialect*, thus providing an early instance – though isolated for Czech – of a vernacularization of the word διάλεκτος through Neo-Latin *dialectus*. Terminological adoption went hand in hand with conceptual adaptation, as Blahoslav gave the distinction between 'language' and 'dialect' a very broad application, like several other

---

241 See Gessner (1561: *6v–*7r).
242 See Van Hal (2010: 363) for another example from a 1643 work by Claude de Saumaise, who reconstructed the numeral 'one' (*iok*) for 'Scythian', the alleged protolanguage of a group of languages today known as Indo-European. In this case, it does not concern an intermediate form as with Blahoslav, but a reconstructed original form.

scholars from Slavic lands. He understood the concept of 'language' to cover the entire group of Slavic (and also Germanic) varieties, the main members of which he designated as 'dialects'. Blahoslav's travels stimulated his ear for regional variation, and he gave often detailed and at least as often confusing descriptions of linguistic features of different Slavic varieties. He moreover pointed out, just like a number of his Protestant contemporaries, that knowing different dialects has its advantages and offers insight into the origin of words. At the same time, he was aware that this entails the danger of mixing elements from other dialects into one's native dialect. In his etymological discussions, he sometimes offered reconstructions of intermediate forms, thus giving a very early example of this praxis. Finally, Blahoslav is exceptional in objectively affirming that speakers value their native dialect the highest, although this did not prevent him from promoting Czech as the zenith of the Slavic linguistic spectrum. He was, in the end, one of those foxes that praise their own tail.

References

Primary sources

Antesignanus, Petrus. 1554. De dialectis appendix [Appendix on the dialects]. In Nicolaus Clenardus, *Institutiones linguae Graecae*, 11–16. Lyon: Matthieu Bonhomme.

Berynda, Pamva. 1653. *Leksikon" slavenorōsskii al'bo Imen" tl"kovaniie*. Orsha: Kuteinskii Monastyr' .

Bovelles, Charles de. 1533. *Liber de differentia vulgarium linguarum et Gallici sermonis varietate* [Book on the difference of vulgar tongues and the variety of French speech]. Paris: Robert Estienne.

Canini, Angelo. 1555. *Ἑλληνισμός* [Hellenism]. Paris: Guillaume Morel.

Čejka, Mirek, Dušan Šlosar & Jana Nechutová (eds.). 1991. *Gramatika česká Jana Blahoslava* [The Czech grammar of Jan Blahoslav]. Brno: Masarykova Univerzita.

Dubravius, Jan. 1552. *Historiae Regni Boiemiae, de rebus memoria dignis, in illa gestis, ab initio Boiemorum, qui ex Illyria venientes, eandem Boiemiam, in medio propemodum superioris Germaniae sitam, occupauerunt. Libri XXXIII* [History of the Bohemian Kingdom: on the memorable events that happened there, from the beginning of the Bohemians who, coming from Illyria, occupied Bohemia, situated almost in the middle of Upper Germany, in 33 books]. Prostějov: Jan Günther.

Germano, Girolamo. 1622. *Vocabolario italiano et greco, nel quale si contiene come le voci italiane si dicano in greco volgare*. Rome: Heirs of Bartolomeo Zannetti.

Gessner, Conrad. 1555. *Mithridates. De differentiis linguarum tum veterum tum quae hodie apud diversas nationes in toto orbe terrarum in usu sunt, Conradi Gesneri Tigurini observationes* [Mithridates. Observations of Conrad Gessner from Zürich on the differences of tongues, both ancient and those that are today in use among diverse nations in the entire world]. Zürich: Christoph Froschauer.

Gessner, Conrad. 1561. Ad lectorem praefatio super hoc dictionario Germanicolatino [Preface to the reader on this German-Latin dictionary]. In Josua Maaler, *Die Teütsch spraach | Dictionarium Germanicolatinum novum*, *3r–*7v. Zürich: Christoph Froschauer.

Hosius, Stanislaus. 1560. *De expresso Dei verbo* [On the express word of God]. Paris: Jean Foucher.

Hradil, Ignác & Josef Jireček (eds.). 1857. *Jana Blahoslawa Grammatika Česká dokonaná l. 1571* [Jan Blahoslav's Czech grammar finished in the year 1571]. Vienna: L. Grunda.

Luther, Martin. 1566. *Tischreden oder colloquia doct. Mart. Luthers, so er in vielen Jaren, gegen gelarten Leuten, auch frembden Gesten, und seinen Tischgesellen gefüret. Nach den Heubtstücken unserer Christlichen Lere, zusammen getragen*, ed. Johannes Aurifaber. Eisleben: Urban Gaubisch.

Luther, Martin. 1916. *Werke. Tischreden, 1531–1546 (D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe 2), vol. 4: Tischreden aus den Jahren 1538–1540*, ed. Ernst Kroker. Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger.

Luther, Martin. 1919. *D. Martin Luthers Tischreden 1531–46 (D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe 2), vol. 5: Tischreden aus den Jahren 1540–1544*, ed. Ernst Kroker. Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger.

Mączyński, Jan. 1564. *Lexicon Latinopolonicum* [Latin-Polish lexicon]. Königsberg: Johann Daubmann.

Matheeussen, Constantinus (ed.). 1978. *Georgii Haloini Cominiique domini De restauratione linguae Latinae libri III* [Three books on the restoration of the Latin language by George, Lord of Halluin and Comines] (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana). Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

Melanchthon, Philipp. 1518. *Institutiones Graecae grammaticae* [Principles of Greek grammar]. Haguenau: Academia Anshelmiana.

Melanchthon, Philipp. 1520. *Integrae Graecae grammatices institutiones* [Complete principles of Greek grammar], 2nd edn. Haguenau: Thomas Anshelm.

Optát, Beneš, Petr Gzel, and Václav Philomathes. 2019. *Gramatika česká (1533)*. Edited by Ondřej Koupil. Praha: Akropolis.

Ruland, Martin. 1556. *De lingua Graeca eiusque dialectis omnibus libri V* [Five books on the Greek language and all its dialects]. Zürich: Andreas & Jacob Gessner.

Secondary sources

Anikin, Aleksandr Evgen'evich. 2009. *Russkii etimologicheskii slovar'* [Russian etymological dictionary]. Vyp. 3 (be – boldykhat'). Moscow: Rukopisnye pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi.

Anikin, Aleksandr Evgen'evich. 2012. *Russkii etimologicheskii slovar'* [Russian etymological dictionary]. Vyp. 6 (val I – vershok IV). Moscow: Rukopisnye pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi.

Anonymus. 1918. In *Naše řeč* 2 (8). 250–251. http://nase-rec.ujc.cas.cz/archiv.php?art=393 (accessed February 15, 2022).

Bartoš, František. 1895. *Dialektologie moravská* [Moravian dialectology], vol. 2: *Nářečí hanácké a české* [Hanák and Czech dialects]. Brno: Matice moravská.

Bautz, Friedrich Wilhelm. 1975. Blahoslav, Jan. In Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz (ed.), *Biographisch-bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol. 1, 607–608. Hamm: Traugott Bautz.

Berger, Tilman. 2012. Religion and diacritics: The case of Czech orthography. In S. Baddeley & A. Voeste (eds.), *Orthographies in early modern Europe*, 255–268. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Boček, Vít. 2009. *Studie k nejstarším romanismům ve slovanských jazycích* [Studies on the oldest Romance borrowings in the Slavic languages]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita. Filozofická fakulta Ústav jazykovědy a baltistiky / Srovnávací indoevropská jazykověda.

Boček, Vít. 2010. *Studie k nejstarším romanismům ve slovanských jazycích* [Studies on the oldest Romance borrowings in the Slavic languages] (= Studia Etymologica Brunensia 9). Prague: Lidové noviny.

Borst, Arno. 1957–1963. *Der Turmbau von Babel. Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*. Stuttgart: Hiersemann.

Botley, Paul. 2010. *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396–1529. Grammars, lexica, and classroom texts* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society held at Philadelphia for promoting useful knowledge 100.2). Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

Brock, Peter. 1957. *The political and social doctrines of the Unity of Czech Brethren in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries* (= Slavistic printings and reprintings 11). The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Brown, Marshall T. 2013. *John Blahoslav – Sixteenth-century Moravian reformer. Transforming the Czech nation by the Word of God* (= Christian contributions to European identity 2). Bonn: Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft.

Crews, C. Daniel. 2008. *Faith, love, hope. A history of the Unitas Fratrum*. Winston-Salem: Moravian Archives.

Cummius, George. 1993. Common colloquial Czech. In Eva Eckert (ed.), *Varieties of Czech. Studies in Czech sociolinguistics*, 153–179. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.

Derksen, Rick. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon* (= Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series 4). Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Dittmann, Robert & Jiří Just. 2016. *Biblical humanism in Bohemia and Moravia in the 16th century* (= Europa Humanistica. Répertoires et inventaires 3). Turnhout: Brepols.

Dittmann, Robert. 2019. The Czech language in confessional clashes of the 16th century. In Mikko Kauko, Miika Norro, Kirsi-Maria Nummila, Tanja Toropainen & Tuomo Fonsén (eds.), *Languages in the Lutheran Reformation. Textual networks and the spread of ideas*, 105–128. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Edwards, John. 2009. *Language and identity. An introduction* (= Key topics in sociolinguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fasmer, Maks [= Vasmer, Max]. 1986–1987. *Etimologicheskii slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Russian etymological dictionary], I–IV. *Perevod s nemetskogo i dopolneniya chlena-korrespondenta AN SSSR O. N. Trubachëva*. Moscow: Progress.

Franko, Ivan. 1984. *Zibrannya tvoriv u 50-ty tomakh (1976–1986)* [Selected works in 50 volumes], vol. 42: *Fol'klorystychni praci* [Folkloristic works]. Kiev: Naukova dumka. [The section on Blahoslav and the ballad of Stephen the Voivode was written in 1907–1908.]

Gindely, Antonín. 1858. *Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder*. Prague: Carl Bellmann.

Gregor, Alois. 1965. Jan Blahoslav als tschechischer Philologe. In *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 10 (4). 563–569.

Gregor, Alois. 1969. K moravské historické dialektologii [On Moravian historical dialectology]. In *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity* 18 (A17). 73–80.

Gritsch, Eric W. 2003. Luther as Bible translator. In Donald K. McKim (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Martin Luther*, 62–72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haugen, Einar. 1972. Schizoglossia and the linguistic norm. In Evelyn Scherabon Firchow, Kaaren Grimstad, Nils Hasselmo & Wayne A. O'Neil (eds.), *Studies by Einar Haugen: Presented on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday – April 19, 1971* (= Janua Linguarum: Studia

Memoriae Nicolai van Wijk Dedicata. Series Maior 49), 441–445. The Hague & Paris: Mouton.

Hüllen, Werner. 2001. Reflections on language in the Renaissance. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals. An international handbook* (= Handbooks of linguistics and communication science 20), vol. 1, 210–222. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Jireček, Josef. 1876. *Rukověť k dějinám literatury české do konce XVIII. věku v spůsobě slovníka životopisného a knihoslovného*, vol. II. Prague: B. Tempský.

Joseph, John Earl. 1987. *Eloquence and power. The rise of language standards and standard languages* (= Open linguistics series). London: Frances Pinter.

Kamusella, Tomasz. 2003. *The Szlonzoks and their language. Between Germany, Poland and Szlonzokian nationalism*. San Domenico di Fiesole: European University Institute (Badia Fiesolana).

Koupil, Ondřej. 2015. *Grammatykáři: Gramatografická a kulturní reflexe češtiny 1533–1672*. Praga: Karolinum.

Kroker, Ernst. 1919. Einleitungen. In Ernst Kroker (ed.), *D. Martin Luthers Tischreden. 1531–46* (D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe 2), vol. 5: *Tischreden aus den Jahren 1540–1544*, xi–xliv. Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger.

Lallot, Jean. 1995. Analogie et pathologie dans la grammaire alexandrine. In *Lalies* 15. 109–123.

Lamanskii, Vladimir Ivanovich. 1859. *O slavyanakh v Maloi Azii, v Afrike i v Ispanii* [The Slavs in Asia Minor, Africa, and Spain]. Saint-Petersburg: Imperatorskaya akademiya nauk.

Laurie, Simon S. 1969. *Studies in the history of education opinion from the Renaissance*. New York: A. M. Kelley. [Original publication: Laurie, Simon S. 1903. *Studies in the history of education opinion from the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.]

Lechner, Walter. 2007. Lauterbach (Lawterbach, Luterbach, Lautenbach, Lawtirbach), Anton. In Institut für Sächsische Geschichte und Volkskunde & Martina Schattkowsky (eds.), *Sächsische Biografie*. http://saebi.isgv.de/biografie/Anton_Lauterbach_(1502-1569) (accessed February 15, 2022).

Le Feuvre, Claire. 2011. L'allongement des prépositions en composition (préfixes) en baltique et slave. In D. Petit, C. Le Feuvre & H. Menantaud (eds.), *Langues baltiques, langues slaves*, 195–227. Paris: CNRS Éditions.

Machek, Václav. 1968. *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého* [Etymological dictionary of the Czech language], druhé, opravené a doplněné vydání. [Prague]: Československá akademie věd.

Malicki, Jarosław. 2007. Vztah Slezsko-česká jazyková pospolitost ve vývoji jazykového vědomí Čechů a Moravanů do konce 18. století [The relation between Silesia and the Czech-speaking community in the development of linguistic consciousness of Czechs and Moravians until the end of 18th century]. In *Listy filologické* 130. 295–310.

Matasović, Ranko. 2014. *Slavic nominal word-formation. Proto-Indo-European origins and historical development*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Nandriş, Gr[igore]. 1924. Les rapports entre la Moldavie et l'Ukraine d'après le folklore ukrainien. In *Mélanges de l'École roumaine en France* 1. 1–36.

Nübler, Norbert. 1992. Review of Čejka et al. (1991). In *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie* 21. 186–192.

OLD = P. G. W. Glare (ed.). 2012. *Oxford Latin dictionary*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Orbis Latinus online. http://www.columbia.edu/acis/ets/Graesse/contents.html (accessed February 15, 2022).

Pečírková, Jaroslava. 1998. Czech translations of the Bible. In Jože Krašovec (ed.), *The interpretation of the Bible. The international symposium in Slovenia*, 1167–1200. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Petr, Jan. 1985. K pojetí nářečí a nářečních jevů v Blahoslavově mluvnici [On the concept of dialect and dialect phenomena in Blahoslav's grammar]. In Jaroslav Porák (ed.), *Starší české, slovenské a slovanské mluvnice* (Práce z dějin slavistiky 10), 83–100. Prague: Univerzita Karlova.

Phillips, William D. 1985. *Slavery from Roman times to the early transatlantic trade*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Potebnya, Aleksandr Afanas'evich [Oleksandr Opanasovych]. 1877. *Malorusskaya narodnaya pěsnya po spisku XVI věka. Tekst" i priměchaniya* [An Old Russian folk song after a copy of the 16th century. Text and annotations]. Voronezh: V. I. Isaev.

Rejzek, Jiří. 2001. *Český etymologický slovník* [Czech etymological dictionary]. Voznice: Leda.

Rejzek, Jiří. 2016. K významu prefixu *pa-* v praslovanštině. In I. Janyšková & H. Karlíková (eds.), *Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní vědecké konference* Etymologické symposion Brno 2005 (= *Studia etymologica Brunensia* 3), 337–343. Prague: Lidové noviny.

Schall, Hermann. 1964. Baltische Dialekte im Namengut Nordwestslawiens. In *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 79*. 123–170.

Schmaus, Alois. 1956. Sigismundus Gelenius und sein *Lexicon Symphonum* (1537). In Margarete Woltner & Herbert Bräuer (eds.), *Festschrift für Max Vasmer zum 70. Geburtstag am 28. Februar 1956* (= Veröffentlichungen der Abteilung für Slavische Sprachen und Literaturen des Osteuropa-Instituts [Slavisches Seminar] an der Freien Universität Berlin, 9), 434–443. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Seldeslachts, Herman. 2013. Sexagius' *De orthographia linguae Belgicae* (1576). Een goudmijn voor taalhistorici en dialectologen [Sexagius' *De orthographia linguae Belgicae* (1576). A goldmine for language historians and dialectologists]. In Toon Van Hal, Lambert Isebaert & Pierre Swiggers (eds.), *De Tuin der Talen. Taalstudie en taalcultuur in de Lage Landen, 1450–1750* (= Orbis Linguarum. Studies op het gebied van de taalbeschrijving, de taalfilosofie, en de taal- en cultuurgeschiedenis 3), 279–309. Leuven, Paris & Walpole: Peeters.

Siebenborn, Elmar. 1976. *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien. Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik*. Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner.

Skutil, Jan. [1973]. Slovanské jazyky a česká nářečí v Blahoslavově Gramatice [The Slavic languages and the Czech dialect in Blahoslav's Grammar]. In Svatopluk Bimka & Pavel Floss (eds.), *Jan Blahoslav, předchůdce J. A. Komenského: 1571–1971. Sborník studií k čtyřstému výročí úmrtí Jana Blahoslava*, 154–157. Uherský Brod: Muzeum Jana Amose Komenského.

Šlosar, Dušan. 1962. Příspěvek k poznání české kvantity v 16. století [Contribution to the knowledge of Czech quantity in the 16th century]. In *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity* A 10. 91–97.

Steinacher, Roland. 2002. *Studien zur vandalischen Geschichte: Die Gleichsetzung der Ethnonyme Wenden, Slawen und Vandalen vom Mittelalter bis ins 18. Jahrhundert*. Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophie aus der Studienrichtung Geschichte eigereicht an der Geistes- und Kulturwissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Wien. Vienna.

Steinacher, Roland. 2004. Wenden, Slawen, Vandalen. Eine frühmittelalterliche pseudologische Gleichsetzung und ihre Nachwirkungen. In Walter Pohl (ed.), *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen. Von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters* (= Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Klasse, Band 8), 329–353. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Steinacher, Roland. 2005. Vandalen im frühneuzeitlichen Ostseeraum. Beobachtungen zur Re-zeption antiker ethnischer Identitäten im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert. In Karl Strobel (ed.), *Die Geschichte der Antike aktuell: Methoden, Ergebnisse und Rezeption. Akten des 9. gesamt-österreichischen Althistorikertages 2002 und der V. Internationalen Table Ronde zur Geschichte der Alpen-Adria-Region in der Antike (Klagenfurt, 14.11–17.11.2002)* (= Alter-tumswissenschaftliche Studien Klagenfurt, 2), 279–297. Klagenfurt: Mohorjeva Hermagoras.

Stieber, Zdzisław. 1965. *Zarys dialektologii języków zachodniosłowiańskich z wyborem tekstów gwarowych* [Outline of West Slavic dialectology. With a selection of dialect texts]. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Tennant, Elaine C. 1985. *The Habsburg chancery language in perspective* (University of California publications in modern philology 114). Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of Cali-fornia Press.

Trovato, Paolo. 1984. 'Dialetto' e sinonimi ('idioma', 'proprietà', 'lingua') nella terminologia lin-guistica quattro- e cinquecentesca (con un'appendice sulla tradizione a stampa dei tratta-telli dialettologici bizantini). In *Rivista di letteratura italiana* 2. 205–236.

Trubachëv, Oleg N. (ed.). 1974. *Etimologicheskii slovar' slavianskikh iazykov. Praslavianskii lek-sicheskii fond* [Etymological dictionary of the Slavic languages. Proto-Slavic lexical stock], 1. vol. 1. Moscow: Nauka.

Trubachëv, Oleg N. (ed.). 1983. *Etimologicheskii slovar' slavianskikh iazykov. Praslavianskii lek-sicheskii fond* [Etymological dictionary of the Slavic languages. Proto-Slavic lexical stock], vol. 10. Moscow: Nauka.

Trubachëv, Oleg N. (ed.). 1988. *Etimologicheskii slovar' slavianskikh iazykov. Praslavianskii lek-sicheskii fond* [Etymological dictionary of the Slavic languages. Proto-Slavic lexical stock], vol 15. Moscow: Nauka.

Truhlář, Josef. 1886. Sigismundus Gelenius, jeho život a působení vědecké [Sigismund Gelenius and his scientific achievement]. In *Časopis musea království českého* 60 (1). 27–47 & 60 (2–3). 210–224.

Vaillant, André. 1974. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, vol. 4: *La formation des noms*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Van Hal, Toon. 2010. *"Moedertalen en taalmoeders". Het vroegmoderne taalvergelijkende on-derzoek in de Lage Landen* ["Mother languages and language mothers". Early modern com-parative-linguistic study in the Low Countries] (= Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten. Nieuwe Reeks 20). Brussel: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten.

Van Rooy, Raf. 2019. *Διάλεκτος, dialectus, dialect.* A word's curious journey from Ancient Greek to (Neo-)Latin and beyond. In *Latomus. Revue d'Études Latines* 78. 733–770.

van Wijk, Nikolaas. 1928. Die čechisch-polnischen Übergangsdialekte und die ältern Beziehun-gen des polnischen Sprachgebietes zum čechisch-slovakischen. In *Mededeelingen der Ko-ninklijke Akademie der Wetenschappen*, Afdeeling Letterkunde, deel 65, serie A. Amster-dam: Koninklijke Akademie der Wetenschappen.

Wackernagel, Jacob. 1979 [1876]. De pathologiae veterum initiis [Principles of ancient pathol-ogy]. In Bernhard Forssman (ed.), *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 3, 1427–1486. Göttingen: Vanden-hoeck & Ruprecht.

Westh Neuhard, Else. 1959. Le préfixe *pa-* et son développement en tchèque. In *Scando-Slavica* 5. 52–63.