

Robert Dittmann

Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

## **Czech Reformational biblical translation: the case of pericopes in the Unity of the Brethren in the 1550s–1570s**

### **1. Introduction: the Bohemian Reformation and Czech language in the High Middle Ages**

The Bohemian Reformation is a specific phenomenon in the late medieval Europe<sup>1</sup>. For the first time in the Roman obedience, there asserted a split into Utraquists and minority Catholics, which makes Hussitism the first successfully established reform movement in the West [Šmahel 2001: 431]. The experience of the duality of two equal Christian faiths was legally confirmed by the Kutná Hora Treaty of 1485 – for the first time in European history [Válka 2005: 242], and primacy holds also Jiří of Poděbrady’s idea of an association of European Christian monarchs living one beside the other in peace. At the same time, the Hussite tradition “remained largely restricted to Czech-speaking areas” [Šmahel 2016: 9]. Therefore the Bohemian Reformation acquired very soon a nationalistic colouring, which reflected itself also in the language: soon after 1415, Czech was promoted among the radical Hussitic currents to the *lingua sacra*, the language of liturgy – an achievement utterly exceptional among living languages in the sphere of Roman obedience. Thus the efforts to eradicate Hussitism were perceived as attempts at “physical liquidation of the Czech ‘tongue’” and it was concluded that the “interests of the faith are identical with the interests of the Czech ‘tongue’”, as the period pamphlets put it [both quotes

---

1 This study is a result of the research funded by the Czech Science Foundation as the project GA ČR P401/12/G168 “History and Interpretation of the Bible” and carried out at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic in Prague. Transcription rules for Czech are taken over from the edition *Bible kralická šestidílná. Kompletní vydání s původními poznámkami* [2015], but we modify capitalization and punctuation (also, we do not add quotation marks in the transcription).

from Šmahel 2014: 79; the Old Czech word *jazyk* meant both ‘language’ and ‘nation’, see Šimek 2019].

The Czech language in the High Middle Ages had a unique position among Slavic tongues. Having reached the solely position of the only fully developed and unified standard living Slavonic language [Havránek 1936: 44], the Czech of the 14th and 15th centuries bequeathed us more than one hundred thousand words, gathered now in dictionaries of Old Czech, the total of almost thirty manuscripts of the complete Old Czech bibles and the Czech influence radiated abroad, especially into medieval Poland.

The pericopes had been a subject of disputes on Czech soil for a long time. Not only were they one of the problematic issues in Great Moravia in the 9th century, they appear also as the last direct evidence of the Slavic liturgy with eastern rite in the Jagić Glosses of the early 12th century. In them, the glossed passages correspond to pericopes of a compact part of the liturgical year. The Prague reform movement starting in the latter half of the 14th century is closely related to the reading of pericopes in Old Czech: already Matěj of Janov is said to have introduced reading of the epistle and gospel in Czech<sup>2</sup> and the demand of these two readings in the vernacular recurred in the Hussite claims and became one of the typical features of the Czech Utraquist mass. Indeed, an index of pericopes is generally the most typical appendix to Czech biblical manuscript translations, these indices are included in fifty-four manuscripts from the 15th century alone [Svobodová, Voleková (forthcoming)].

## 2. The Unity of the Brethren

Whereas the Hussitic radicalism gradually waned and faded away, one radical sectarian community emerging in the late 1450s separated from the mainstream Utraquism about a decade later: the Unity of the Brethren. This was the inheritor proper [Šmahel 2014: 84] of the radical Taborite ideas including the total orientation towards the Czech language in the mass. This community, repeatedly banned and prosecuted yet slowly growing in some respects and regions, remained illegal until the Letter of Majesty issued by Rudolph II in 1609 and would be prohibited again from the 1620s onwards. The Unity of the Brethren is the most suitable object for exploring confessional identity in the Bohemian Lands [cf. Vykypělová 2013: 240]. This is due to its separateness, vitality and autonomy. Unlike the Utraquists, the Unity “broke entirely from the Catholic Church, and in doing so became the first independent church in the European

---

2 HOLETON [1993: 158]; cf. HOLETON [2016] and DITTMANN [2018] on the general overview and further references.

Reformation” [Šmahel 2016: 12]. Dogmatically, the Unity was an original Czech product of the Reformation and till the end of its existence on the Bohemian soil, it protected carefully its peculiarity and independence in the disputes and contacts with other Reformational currents, Catholicism and Utraquism. It started as a national, Czech-oriented church, and although it succeeded in attracting some German-speaking believers and spread to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth or Upper Hungary, it retained for a relatively long time its basically Czech character. It was also a Bohemian church with the first exile experiences gained as a consequence to the 1547 estate uprising.

The Unity treasured its specificity by a number of tractates defending its teachings and attacking its opponents. Its uniqueness is also visible in a particular development of theology and book production. Actually, it not only completed the process of confessionalization first [Vykyřelová 2013: 240] but was also the only confession to issue its own complete confessionally clearly shaped translation of the New Testament and the whole Bible in the pre-1620 Czech lands. The Unity’s distinctiveness was reflected, among other things, in the language they used and its orthography. Despite being a small community, initially with sectarian features, it gradually attracted more and more believers, but even at the end of the 16th century it gained only about forty thousand adherents in Bohemia and Moravia. They were located prevailing in Moravia (an estimate of 24.000 believers), in Bohemia they counted only around 16.000. This makes less than 3% of the then population in Moravia and less than 1% in Bohemia [cf. Bůžek et al. 2010: 104; Just 2009: 11].

### 3. Pericopes in the Unity

Following the radical Hussitic currents, the Unity was totally oriented to the Czech language as Josef Macek [2001: 302] put it. It refused Latin in mass liturgy. In the first decades of its existence, the system of pericopes in the Unity was not stabilized and the preacher chose an arbitrary pericope or a motif for the sermon [Landová 2014: 122]. It was only Lukáš Pražský, the most important Brethren theologian, who at the beginning of the 16th century returned to the generally used system of pericopes of the Roman Church [Landová 2014: 123]. Both New Testaments, connected somehow to the Brethren and printed in Mladá Boleslav in 1518 and 1525 respectively, use this old system. Especially in the 1525 New Testament and pericopes attached to the print, Lukáš Pražský applied the principle of word-for-word translation and revived the outdated synthetic past tense called the imperfect, e.g. in a pericope from Da 14 we read imperfects *bieše, dáváchu, biechu, jdieše, sedíše*. This translation is based strictly on the Vulgate and is the most literal one among all 16th-century Czech

New Testaments. Lukáš includes several kinds of harsh Latinisms such as participle constructions, possessive and comparative genitives, subjunctive for Latin conjunctive in dependent clauses, historical present tense, and possessive pronouns distributed as in Latin.

### 3.1. Augusta's attempt at a new system of pericopes

Nevertheless, a departure from Lukáš's teachings in the Unity after his death in 1528 affected also the pericopes and their system. Whereas Lutherans never dared to leave the old system of pericopes, shared with the Roman Church [Landová 2014: 125], the Unity gradually started to test a new system. In the second half of the 1540s, a novel system based on the Apostolic Creed was given a try in some congregations. The initiator of this system was Bishop Jan Augusta, Lukáš's successor and pupil. He did not stop working on this system even during his long-term internment in the 1550s. In 1555 or soon after he finished his manuscript book *Register* [cf. Landová 2014: 124–129]. This unpreserved translation of pericopes was based quite literally on *Biblia Tigurina*, a Zurich Reformational translation of Leo Jud and his colleagues, published in 1543 and 1544. We think so because a later printed version of the pericopes, Augusta's *Summovník* (published around 1570), has this rather literal translation of the *Biblia Tigurina*, which Augusta provably used during his internment [cf. Dittmann 2017]. Let us give here only a few previously unnoticed illustrative examples of textual differences, i.e. textual pluses, minuses and different interpretations, excerpted from the printed version of the *Summovník* (shortened hereafter as Sum) agreeing with the *Tigurina* (shortened as Tig) in comparison with the *Clementine Vulgate* (Vg) and the *Netolický Bible* of 1549 (BiblNet). They are extracted from pericopes Mt 4:1–4; Lk 18:31–43; J 1:1–14; J 19:16–30, Tt 2:11–14; Heb 1:1–2:1.

a) Textual pluses include: Heb 1:3 Sum *zřetedlný obraz* (Tig *expressa imago*) – Vg *figura* (BiblNet *obrazem*); Heb 1:3 Sum *skrže sebe samého* (Tig *per semetipsum*) – Vg omitted (BiblNet omitted). Even bracketed translators' additions of the *Tigurina* are reflected in the *Summovník*: J 1:8.9 Sum *ale (poslán byl) aby* (Tig *sed [missus erat] ut*) – Vg *sed ut* (BiblNet *ale aby*). The translation is rather literal, therefore demonstrative pronouns are often copied such as in J 1:1 Sum *to Slovo* (Tig *illud verbum*) – Vg *verbum* (BiblNet *Slovo*); J 1:8 Sum *o tom světle* (Tig *de luce illa*) – Vg *de lumine* (BiblNet *o světle*); J 1:8.9 Sum *světlo to* (Tig *lux illa*) – Vg *lux* (BiblNet *světlo*).

b) Textual minuses include e.g. omissions of demonstratives such as J 1:9 Sum *na svět* (Tig *in mundum*) – Vg *in hunc mundum* (BiblNet *na tento svět*).

c) Different interpretations include: J 19:23 Sum *když ukřižovali Ježíše* (Tig *quum crucifixissent Iesum*) – Vg *cum crucifixissent eum* (BiblNet *když jsou jej ukřižovali*); Tt 2:11 Sum *spasitedlná* (Tig *salutifera*) – Vg *Salvatoris nostri* (BiblNet *spasitele našeho*); Tt 2:11 Sum *zasvítla se* (Tig *illuxit*, marginal note: *Al. [= Alii] apparuit*) – Vg *apparuit* (BiblNet *okázala se*); Tt 2:14 Sum *lid zvláštní* (Tig *populum peculiarem*) – Vg *populum acceptabilem* (BiblNet *lid vzácný*); Heb 1:12 Sum *svineš je* (Tig *circumvolves eos*) – Vg *mutabis eos* (BiblNet *změníš je*); Heb 2:1 Sum *kteréz jsou nám praveny* (Tig *quae dicta sunt nobis*) – Vg *quae audivimus* (BiblNet *což jsme slychali*). Even slight differences are transferred into the Summovník such as a shift in a grammatical category or a preposition: Heb 1:6 Sum *na okršlek zemí* (Tig *in orbem terrarum*) – Vg *in orbem terrae* (BiblNet *na okršlek země*); Heb 1:7 Sum *o anjelích* (Tig *de angelis*) – Vg *ad angelos* (BiblNet *k andělům*); Heb 1:11 Sum *zůstáváš* (Tig *permanes*) – Vg *permanebis* (BiblNet *zuostaneš*). In some cases, the difference lies in the participle versus finite verb competition: Mt 4:3 Sum *když pak přistoupil* (Tig *cumque accessisset*) – Vg *et accedens* (BiblNet *a přistúpiv*); Mt 4:4 Sum *slovem vycházejícím* (Tig *verbo egrediente*) – Vg *verbo, quod procedit* (BiblNet *slovem, kteréž pochází*); J 1:12 Sum *věřícím totiž* (Tig *credentibus scilicet*) – Vg *his qui credunt* (BiblNet *těm, kteříž věří*).

However, Augusta's translation of pericopes never gained any official approval of the Unity. The *Summovník* was printed as a private and personal initiative of Augusta and its printing was probably stopped, so that only a part of the work has been published [on details see Landová 2014: 122–146; Just 2017]. Nevertheless, its place in the history of pericopes on the Czech soil is quite important: for the first time, the Old Testament pericopes acquired primarily a non-Vulgate basis, despite mediated by a Latin humanistic translation of the *Tigurina*. Even though the Swiss translation was “admired for its pleasing style” [Gordon – Cameron 2016: 207], Augusta's Czech translation turned the opposite, due to disturbing and harsh Latinisms.

### 3.2. The undated *Registrum aneb Zpráva* [...] (probably 1557–1559)

Augusta's manuscript translation from 1555 was smuggled out of his internment to the other leaders of the Unity. After some corrections, the pericopes were printed probably between the years 1557–1559 under the title *Registrum aneb Zpráva* [...]<sup>3</sup>. The print itself, preserved incompletely, is undated. The editorial work and corrections were done by Bishop Jan Černý, whom two other bishops, Jan Blahoslav and Matěj Červenka, probably helped or were at

3 On the print and its background see Bařová [2013].

hand. In comparison with the printed *Summovník* the text displays modifications and inclines in some places to the Vulgate, since there appear agreements with the Czech tradition based on the Vulgate, e.g. the Netolický Bible of 1549 [cf. Landová 2012: 349]. Also, agreements with Brethren prints of the 1560s have been identified, namely with Blahoslav's New Testament (printed for the first time in 1564) and Červenka's Psalter (1562) [Landová 2014: 136]. Despite a deeper philological analysis has been missing, it may be safely stated that the text of the *Registrum aneb Zpráva* [...] is a textual mixture consisting of readings identical with the Vulgate and non-Vulgate tradition with some readings unparalleled in the preceding Czech translation tradition at all [cf. Landová 2012: 350]. The degree and translational and editorial strategy may vary as we shall demonstrate on two randomly selected examples from the New Testament pericopes.

First, the pericope J 6:1–14 is a fairly faithful copy of the mainstream Czech tradition as represented among other prints by the Netolický Bible of 1549, including literal and precise copying of its word order, whereas lexical differences are limited to substitution of the relative pronoun *který* for *jenž* only, attested four times. However, two places are especially noteworthy: for J 6:11 BiblNet *rozdával sedícím* (Vg *distribuit discumbentibus*), the *Registrum* reads *rozdal učedníkům. Učedníci pak sedícím* (cf. Sum *rozdělil učedníkuom, učedníci pak posazeným* and Tig *distribuit discipulis, discipuli vero discumbentibus*), reflecting thus a reading present in the Greek text (SCR διέδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις). It is possible that the *Registrum* took this reading over from the Melantrich Bible of 1556–1557 which for the first time in Czech tradition among whole bibles reads *rozdával učedníkuom, učedníci pak sedícím* (the Náměšť New Testament of 1533, based on Latin Erasmus' version, translates *rozdal učedníkom, učedníci pak stolicím* where *stolicím* renders Erasmus' *discumbentibus* [cf. Brown, ed. 2001: 68]). The Melantrich Bible of 1556–1557 may have served as the immediate model for the *Registrum* as it did later for Blahoslav's New Testament of 1564. The latter place is J 6:14 where the *Registrum* reads *Ježíš*, an equivalent present in the Sum, Vg and Tig, but the Netolický Bible and the Melantrich Bible of 1556–1557 both omit it. It is important to note that Blahoslav's New Testament translation differs in the respective passage to a small degree from the version in the Netolický Bible (BiblNet) and the Melantrich Bible of 1556–1557 (BiblMel2) and from *Registrum* and *Summovník*, namely by a more careful respecting the Greek version in the case of participles, cf. J 6:5 Reg, Sum, BiblNet *pozdvihl ... viděl* (Vg *sublevasset ... vidisset*, Tig *sustulisset ... vidisset*) – Blahoslav *pozdvih ... viděv* (SCR ἐπάρας ... θεασάμενος), or other



readings such as J 6:2 Reg *nad těmi, jenž nemocní byli*, Sum *nad těmi, kteříž nemocni byli*, BiblNet *nad těmi, kteříž nemocní byli* (Vg, Tig *super his qui infirmabantur*) – Blahoslav *nad nemocnými* (SCR ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενοῦντων).

On the contrary, a pericope from the beginning of the New Testament Mt 11:2–15 shows a higher resemblance in the *Registrum* to the *Summovník* version than the former pericope analysed above, cf. Mt 11:2 Reg *uslyšel v žaláři o skutcích Krystových, vyslav dva z učedníkův svých* – Sum *uslyšel v žaláři skutky Krystovy, poslav dva z učedníkův svých* – BiblNet, BiblMel2 *uslyšal v okovách skutky Krystovy, poslav dva učedníky svá*; Mt 11:3 Reg, Sum *přijíti má* (Tig *qui venturus est*, cf. SCR ὁ ἐρχόμενος) – BiblNet, BiblMel2 *přijíti máš* (Vg *venturus es*); Mt 11:3–4 Reg *čili jiného čekati máme? A odpověděv* (SCR ἀποκριθεὶς) *Ježíš, řekl jim: Jděte a zasse povězte Janovi* – Sum *kterýž přijíti má, čili jiného čekáme? A odpovídaje Ježíš, řekl jim: Jděte a zvěstujte zas Janovi* (Tig *qui venturus est, an alterum expectamus? Et respondens Iesus, dixit illis: Ite, & renunciate Ioanni*) – BiblNet *čtení svaté*, BiblMel2 *čili jiného čekáme? I odpovídaje Ježíš, řekl jim: Jduce pověztež Janovi* (Vg *an alium expectamus? Et respondens Jesus ait illis: Euntes renuntiate Joanni*), Mt 11:5 Reg *veselé poselství evanjelium* – Sum *veselé zvěstování evanjelium* (Tig *evangelii nuncium*, cf. SCR εὐαγγελίζονται) – BiblNet, BiblMel2 *evanjelium svaté* (Vg *evangelizantur*), Mt 11:12 Reg, Sum *chvátají* – BiblNet, BiblMel2 *uchvacujíť*, Mt 11:14 Reg, Sum *přijíti* – BiblNet *čtení svaté*, BiblMel2 *chcete-li rozuměti* etc. However, also in this pericope there occurs a strong relation to the Netolický and Melantrich Bible versions, since some of Augusta's literal translations must have sounded as improper Czech to the Brethren editors of the *Registrum*. Other readings are shared by *Summovník*, *Registrum* and Blahoslav's New Testaments of 1564 and 1568 (e.g. Mt 11:3 *čekati máme*, marginal note *čekáme*, cf. SCR προσδοκῶμεν; Mt 11:14 *přijíti*), although the latter's translations show rather obvious closeness to the Melantrich Bible tradition. In the pericope under examination a typical feature may be noticed in the *Registrum*, namely occurrence of a Czech past transgressive at a place where the Greek text displays a participle of the aorist (Mt 11:4 *odpověděv* cf. Blahoslav in, J 6:5 *pozdvih, viděv*). This would become the most typical feature of Blahoslav's revision of the traditional Czech New Testament text [Kyas et al. 1997: 180]. Whether the differences in editorial attitudes to J 6 and Mt 11 might indicate anything about the progress of Blahoslav's own translation of New Testament, only future scholarship may specify.

Another co-editor of the *Registrum*, Matěj Červenka, published in 1562 a translation of the Psalter. Agreements with this translation have been found in the *Registrum* [Landová 2014: 136]. Let us add here some more examples:

as a matter of fact, Psalm 1 in the *Registrum* shows in our view a number of agreements which are singular for these two translations, among them *v snátku posměvačův, u stoku, se zvede, roznáší, neostojí, v zboru svatých, stezka bezbožníkův*, on the contrary the translation departs significantly from the *Summovník* and also shows disagreement with the Melantrich tradition. Probable Červenka's presence and Blahoslav's absence in redaction of this psalm may be suggested from translations such as *šťastně se zvede* (Ps 1), *psové* and *zprobodali* (both Ps 22), readings criticized explicitly in Blahoslav's grammar [Čejka, Šlosar, Nechutová, eds. 1991: fols. 334a, 337a]. In comparison with the *Registrum*, Červenka prefers the lexeme *Hospodin* for earlier *Pán*, otherwise the translation in most verses of Psalm 1 literally agrees with the *Registrum*:

Sum: Blahoslavený jest ten muž, kterýž ani v radu bezbožných všel, ani na cestě hříšníkův stál, ani v stolicech posměvačův seděl. Ale v zákoně Páně vůle jeho jest. A v zákoně jeho přemyšlovati bude dnem i nocí. Tenť bude tak jako strom štípený podlé potočných vod, kterýž ovotce své vydává časem svým; jehožto list nespadá, a cožkoli vydal by, k prospěchu přijde. Ne tak bezbožní jsou, ale tak jako plévy, kteréž rozptyluje vítr. Tou příčinou nevyvstanou bezbožní na soudu ani hříšníci v zástupu spravedlivých. Nebo zná cestu spravedlivých, cesta pak bezbožných zahyne.

Reg and Červenka<sup>4</sup>: Blahoslavený *jest ten* muž (ČER Blahoslavený muž), kterýž neodšel po radě bezbožníkův a na cestě hříšníkův nestál (ČER neustrnul) a v snátku posměvačův se neusadil. Ale v zákoně Páně jest vůle jeho (ČER Ale v zákoně Hospodina líbost má) a v zákoně jeho přemejšleti bude dnem i nocí (ČER dnem i nocí přemejšlí). Ten bude (ČER Tenť jest) jako dřevo, kteréž štípeno jest u stoku řek, ješto ovoce své vydává časem svým, jehožto list nespadá, a všecko, cožkoli činiti bude, šťastně se zvede. Ne tak bezbožní, ale *budout'* (ČER *jsút'*) jakožto prach, kterýž roznáší vítr. Protož neostojí bezbožní v soudu ani hříšníci v zboru svatých. Neboť zná Pán (ČER Hospodin) cestu spravedlivých, a stezka bezbožníkův zahyne.

There are several more passages from Psalms among the pericopes in the *Registrum*, among them Ps 22:2–23; 41:1–14; 91:1–16; 109:1–31; 110:1–6; 119:86–120, this selection being excerpted by us from a list compiled by T. Landová<sup>5</sup>. All these psalms are also included in Augusta's *Summovník*

4 We neglect purely orthographical and small phonetical and phonological changes such as *uo/ů* interchanges.

5 Landová [2014: 350–360]. Augusta's *Summovník* contains of this selection the following pericopes: Ps 22, 41, 91, 110, 119 (the latter with a different length).



(the Ps 119 pericope differs in length). Also among these pericopes we find numerous obvious singular agreements between the *Registrum* and Červenka's *Psalter*, whereas the *Summovník* chooses a different translation. Among such examples we may list *rozdírají usta svá* (Ps 22:8), *ukřívují* (Ps 22:8), *zčechře* (Ps 41:4), *zlé mi vinšují* (Ps 41:6), *kdy aspoň umře* (Ps 41:6, cf. Sum *když pak umře*), *bublí proti mně* (Ps 41:8), *červík ... utržka lidská a povrhel* (Ps 22:7; Červenka reads *outržka*), *od moru nejlitějšího* (Ps 91:3), *pod křídly jeho doufání míti budeš* (Ps 91:4), *náhlého zhoubce poledního* (Ps 91:6; cf. Sum: *zhoubce poledního*), *vysvobodím jej, ochráním a zastru jej* (Ps 91:14), *nebude ... toho žel* (Ps 110:4), *naplní těly zbitých* (Ps 110:6), *rtom ... ustom ... soudom* (Ps 119:103.108), *kochání míti budu* (Ps 119:117), and there occurs a high degree of agreement in some verses such as Ps 41:7 *Přijde-li kdo z nich, aby mne navštívil, neupřímě mluví v srdci svém, nahromáždil sobě hříchův, a vyjda ven, toliko pomluvy strojí* (*Registrum*), where Červenka's version does not differ lexically from the *Registrum* at all<sup>6</sup>, and similarly in Ps 91:14-16 the *Registrum* version – apart from the conjunction *a* and a non-independent particle *-ť* – is lexically fully identical with Červenka whereas Augusta's *Summovník* again deviates considerably. As a result, we may conclude that there can be no doubt about a strong mutual relation between the *Registrum* and Červenka's *Psalter* in most of the psalms mentioned, with one exception: the translations of Ps 109:1–31 in the *Registrum* and Červenka differ remarkably. This fully confirms previous findings of Eliška Baťová who searched out the textual source for this psalm in a previous writing by Augusta dated to the first half of the 1540s [Baťová 2013: 209]. At the same time, the translation of Ps 109 displays more elegant Czech than Červenka's *Psalter*, since there do not appear such marked renderings as *rozčesla* and *obežvali* present in the latter's version. If the dating of the *Registrum* to the years of 1557–1559 is correct, one may conclude that at least parts of Červenka's *Psalter* must have been in preparation or in manuscript already by then or that Červenka's editorial alterations were to be largely accepted in his later published *Psalter*, whereas the *Summovník* translation was not used as the textual basis for the *Registrum* in these passages. This conclusion is in line with Eliška Baťová's [2013: 209] analysis of Psalms 16 and 26: she found out that readings identical with Červenka's *Psalter* prevail, but there are also readings shared with the Melantrich Bible and some readings are unique, and some of the latter would emerge again in Štefan's postil of 1575. The *Registrum* shares the numbering of psalms with the Vulgate tradition [Baťová 2013: 209].

6 Augusta's *Summovník* reads differently: *A kdožkoli z nich přišel mne navštívit, marné věci mluvil, srdcem křivé věci sobě zbíral, vejda ven, vypravoval je.*

Other Old Testament pericopes – the sample for the purpose of analysis in this article included Is 7:10–16, Is 11:1–10, Is 60:1–14 and Mal 3:1–5 – show approximation in the *Registrum* to the Vulgate readings in some cases [cf. Landová 2012: 349]. For instance in Is 7:14 the *Summovník* reads *nazoveš ... Immanu El* (Tig *vocabis ... Immanu El*) whereas the *Registrum* reads *dáno bude jméno Emanuel* (Vg *vocabitur nomen ... Emmanuel*), in Is 60:1 it adds *Jerusaléme* in agreement with the Vulgate whereas the *Summovník* and *Tigurina* omit it, in Is 60:7 it returns to the Vulgate proper noun reading by the form *Nabajotšítí* (Vg *Nabaioth*) whereas the *Summovník* reads *Nebaiot* in agreement with the *Tigurina* (*Nebaioth*)<sup>7</sup>. On the other hand, there occur also departures from the Vulgate, hinted at already by Eliška Bařová [2013], and approximations to the Hebrew text, mediated by a Latin translation, which is reflected in proper nouns, for example Is 11:1 *Izay* (Sum *Jesse*, Vg and Tig *Jesse*, BiblMel2 *Jesse*, but the Hebrew text reads *Jišaj*), and other readings such as Is 60:7 *dům slávy* (Sum *duom velebnosti*, Tig *domum magnificentiae*, in margine *gloriae*, Vg *domum maiestatis*, BiblMel2 *duom velebnosti*). Such a reading (*domum gloriae*) occurs not only in the margin of the *Biblia Tigurina* but unsurprisingly in some of the sources for its marginalia [cf. Gordon, Cameron 2016: 206], namely in Sebastian Münster's translation of Old Testament, issued in 1534–1535, and Pagninus' translation, which appeared for the first time in 1528. The latter occurred also in Stephanus' edition of 1556–1557, both editions could have been at Blahoslav's disposal [cf. Dittmann 2012: 106, 108; Just 2007: 120–122]. The relation between the *Summovník* and the *Registrum* may be supported by interchange of the marginal note (*dítě, kteréž prsí požívá*) and the main text (*ssanec*) of the *Summovník* in the *Registrum* which reads only *dítě, kteréž prsí požívá* (Is 11:8; cf. BiblMel2 *dítě od prsí*, Vg *infans ab ubere*). A deeper and more systematic analysis of the *Registrum* still remains, however, a desideratum for a future elaborate research.

### 3.3. Blahoslav's *Evanjelia* of 1571 and Štefan's postil of 1575

The debates in the Unity of the Brethren about pericopes did not cease after 1559. A new compromise between the old system of pericopes and Augusta's innovative suggestion as realized in the *Summovník* and accepted with some modifications by the *Registrum* was assembled in the early 1560s by Bishop Jan Černý, whose version was corrected by bishops Matěj Červenka and Jan Blahoslav. The print was issued in 1563 yet regrettably no surviving copies have been discovered [cf. Landová 2014: 133–142]. However, we may suppose

<sup>7</sup> For examples from Isaiah see Dittmann [2018: 131–132, 2017: 66–68].

that the Old Testament textual version of this print was taken over by two later prints of the 1570s which include pericopal readings: Blahoslav's *Evanjelia* (1571) and Štefan's postil (1575). In New Testament pericopes these prints of the 1570s unsurprisingly utilized the latest Brethren approved translation of Jan Blahoslav's New Testament of 1568. In the Old Testament, however, there was none such a new complete translation, since Červenka's *Psalter* (1562) was probably a merely private initiative [Just 2016: 64] and its language was sternly criticized by Blahoslav. It has been shown that the Old Testament pericopes of the *Evanjelia* (1571) and Štefan's postil (1575) share the identical translation, which displays a certain degree of non-Vulgate readings [Dittmann 2012: 177–178], namely in the case of pericopes Is 9:2–7, Is 11:1–10, Mi 5:2–4. Here we may add that also in the case of the only remaining Old Testament pericope in the *Evanjelia* present in Štefan's postil, namely Is 59:20–60:14, the translation there takes over the version of the *Evanjelia* completely, with only minute differences: Is 59:21 and 60:9 *Evanjelia s nimi* versus Štefan's postil *s nimi*, Is 60:6.10.12 *neb – nebo* and vice versa, Is 60:6 *velbloudův – velbloudů*, Is 60:6 *přijdou – přijdou*, Is 60:11 *nebudou' – nebudou*. We showed elsewhere [Dittmann 2016: 250–254] that in Štefan's postil there emerge numerous non-Vulgate readings alongside the Vulgate-based ones and that some readings penetrated into following Brethren prints such as the Kralice Psalter of 1579 and the Six-Volume Kralice Bible.

Now we may add comparisons of the recently identified *Registrum* (1557–59) and Štefan's postil (1575), which will be based on randomly selected passages Gn 2:18–24, 4:1–16, 2S 7:1–17, Ps 1:1–6, 91:1–16; 110:1–7, Mal 3:1–5, of which none is included in the *Evanjelia*, and furthermore Is 59:20–60:14, Mi 5:2–4, present also in the *Evanjelia*.

Let us start with the passages present also in the *Evanjelia*. Since we concluded above that the *Evanjelia* version was fully taken over by Štefan's postil, the statements concerning textual relationships between the *Registrum* and Štefan's postil will be valid also for relationships between the *Registrum* and the *Evanjelia*. First, it is important to confirm Eliška Baťová's [2014: 244] findings that the textual version of the *Registrum* (Reg) is clearly reflected in the *Evanjelia* (and therefore Štefan's postil, we may add, as well). She compared pericopes Is 9:2–7, Is 11:1–10, Is 52:1–10, Is 59:20–60:14, Is 66:5–14, Mi 5:2–4 from *Evanjelia* with the *Registrum* and concluded that the *Evanjelia* show a high degree of textual agreement, some parts of the *Registrum* being taken over literally, others being, however, significantly modified.

Indeed, a comparison of the beginning of the pericope of Is 60:1–14 from the *Registrum* and the corresponding versets of Štefan's postil undoubtedly shows

a direct dependence of the latter on the *Registrum* [cf. Baťová 2014: 244]. Differences in the *Registrum* are typed in italics, disrespected are two word order changes commented below:

Reg: Povstaniž *tehdy* a zastkvějž se, ó Jeruzaléme, neb' jest přišlo světlo tvé a sláva Páně vzešla jest nad tebou. Neb aj, tmy přikryjí zemi a mrákota lidí, ale nad tebou' vzejde *Pán* a sláva jeho ukáže se na tobě. Pohané budou choditi v světle tvém a králové v blesku nad tebou vzešlém. Pozdvíhniž očí svých vůkol sebe a popatř. Tito všickni hromadně k tobě poberou se a synové tvoji zdaleka přijdou. Dcery pak tvé po boku tvém vychovány budou.

ŠtefPost: Povstaniž tedy a zastkvěj se, ó Jeruzaléme, neb' jest přišlo světlo tvé a sláva Páně vzešla jest nad tebou. Neb aj, tmy přikryjí zemi a mrákota lidí, ale nad tebou vzejde' Hospodin a sláva jeho se ukáže na tobě. Pohané budou choditi v světle tvém a králové v blesku nad tebou vzešlém. Pozdvihniž očí svých vůkol sebe a popatř, tito všickni k tobě hromadně poberou se a synové tvoji zdaleka přijdou; dcery pak tvé po boku tvém vychovány budou.

The versions differ only in minute details in vowel quantity (*pozdvíhniž/ pozdvihniž, tvoji/tvoji*), varying forms (such as *tehdy/tedy*), emphatic particles *-ž, -ť* and two slight word order shifts (*ukáže se > se ukáže, hromadně k tobě > k tobě hromadně*). There appears one terminological substitution *Pán > Hospodin*, but the two versions represent certainly one translation basis. In other parts of this pericope, however, the translation of the *Registrum* was deeply revised [cf. Baťová 2014: 244]<sup>8</sup>, with some readings in line with the Vulgate (e.g. Is 60:6 *nesouce ... vzdávajíce*) and others with non-Vulgate sources (e.g. Is 60:9 *lodí tarsenské*) [Dittmann 2018: 132]. Since we do not possess the 1563 edition, we cannot determine with certainty whether the textual modification in the 1570s simply equals to the 1563 version – a possibility supported by the system of pericopes in Štefan's postil [Baťová 2012: 42] – or represents another revision [cf. Baťová 2014: 244].

On the contrary, the pericopal passages from Gn 2 (Gn 2:1–25 in Reg, Gn 2:18–24 in ŠtefPost), Gn 4:1–16 and 2S 7:1–17 in Štefan's postil are translated anew and independently, with new readings departing from the Vulgate to the non-Vulgate tradition such as Gn 2:18 Reg *učinmež* (Vg *faciamus*) – ŠtefPost *učiním*, Gn 2:20 *Adam* (Vg *Adam*) – *člověk*, Gn 2:21 *na Adama* (Vg *in*

8 We thus confirm Eliška Baťová's [2014: 244] findings on a close relationship between *Registrum* and Blahoslav's *Evanjelia* in some passages, since the *Evanjelia* and Štefan's postil have virtually identical text. Baťová suggests that the differences may have been consequences of Jan Blahoslav's own revision.

*Adam*) – *na člověka*. The same direction is followed by shifts in Gn 4:8 *vyjděma ven* – omitted, Gn 4:16 *vyhnaný na zemi* (Vg *profugus in terra*) – *v zemi Nod*, and 2S 7:2 omission as in the Vulgate – *král*.

Moreover, it seems that in Psalms the version preserved in Štefan's postil goes back generally to the *Registrum* version, and it certainly does not take over the version of Červenka's *Psalter* mechanically as one might expect, cf. Ps 91:4 Reg, ŠtefPost *křídly svými přikryje tě* versus Červenka *brky svejmi přikryje tě*, Ps 91:13 *po lvu* versus *po štíru ksenčím*, Ps 110:2 *panuj(ž)* versus *aby panoval*, Ps 110:3 *ve dni vítězství tvého* /Reg *vítěství*/ versus *ve dni vítězného tažení tvého*, Ps 110:6 *souditi bude* versus *soudy pomst svých uvede*), even though some readings are closer to the latter. These comprise, for example, Ps 110:1 *na pravici* and *nepodložím* (Reg *po pravici*, *nepoložím*), Ps 110:6 *povýší* (Červenka *povejší*; Reg *pozdvihne*), in Ps 1:2 *přemejšlí* (a form criticized by Blahoslav, whereas another such form *zvede* is substituted by *povede*, a lexeme recommended by him). Mutual dependence of the three texts is further proved by the marginal reading *potře* in Štefan's postil in Ps 110:6, which is attested in both *Registrum* and Červenka. There appear, however, no returns to the version recorded in the *Summovník* in Ps 110, whereas there are possible cases of inspiration by and/or restoration of the *Summovník* readings in Ps 1, cf. Ps 1:1 Sum *v stolicech*, ŠtefPost *na stolici* – Reg, Červenka *v snátku*; Ps 1:4 Sum *plěvy*, ŠtefPost *plevy* – Reg, Červenka *prach*; Ps 1:5 *spravedlivých – svatých*). It is nevertheless apparent that reception of Červenka's translation was rather reserved in the Unity in comparison with the warm welcome enjoyed by Blahoslav's New Testament translation, republished in 1568 and included after revisions and expanding of the apparatus into the Six-Volume Kralice Bible, the climax of the Czech Reformational biblical humanism.

#### 4. Conclusions

In line with the heritage of the radical Hussitism, the development of theology in the Unity of the Brethren was much more rapid than in moderate conservative religious currents. The same holds true also for liturgy and pericopal readings. The free choice of pericopes in the first decades was brought back into line by Bishop Lukáš. At the same time, he insisted on a very literal translation from the Vulgate, the most literal one among contemporary Czech translations. In this respect as in other fields, the Unity showed to be the true heir to Czech Hussitism, for literalism was a typical feature of the third redaction of the Old Czech Bible, connected to Prague university circles close to Jan Hus around 1410 [cf. Kvas et al. 1997: 100].

Lukáš's system, returning to the traditional set of pericopes, was complemented and challenged during the 16th century by an unofficial translation in the *Summovník* (printed partially possibly around 1570) by Lukáš's successor, Bishop Jan Augusta. He prepared an entirely new system consisting of translations made from the *Biblia Tigurina*, a Zurich Reformational version. Augusta's translation of pericopes, independent of the Vulgate tradition, was after corrections of other bishops printed as *Registrum aneb Zpráva* [...]. This undated print, most likely from the span of 1557–1559, displays agreements with the *Summovník*, Červenka's *Psalter*, Blahoslav's New Testament and the Czech Vulgate-based tradition as represented e.g. by Netolický and Melantrich Bibles. As a result, it displays some approximations to the Vulgate in comparison with the *Summovník*. It seems that Jan Blahoslav and his colleagues intentionally eliminated extremities of Augusta's translation including some harsh Latinisms, they combined the Vulgate and non-Vulgate tradition and attempted to balance out the literal and loose translation principles. However, the debate in the Unity about pericopes would be continued in the following years. The few pericopes present in Blahoslav's *Evanjelia* (1571) are identical with pericopes in Štefan's postil (1575). In this postil, some Old Testament verses show a high degree of resemblance to the *Registrum* whereas a strong inclination to the Vulgate was weakened and many new non-Vulgate readings shared with the Hebrew text were introduced. It is not excluded that the modifications occurring in comparison with the *Registrum* appeared already in a print of 1563, yet no preserved copies of this edition prevent us from determining the precise successiveness and from accomplishing reconstruction of textual dependence fully. In this study, due to the amount of material, we limited ourselves intentionally to textual probes only. For a fuller account, a more systematic and elaborate analysis will have to be undertaken in the future.

The pericopal translation in the *Summovník* and *Registrum* both occupy an important place in the history of Czech pericopes since they represent the two Czech earliest preserved translations of parts of the Old Testament with numerous non-Vulgate readings, thus meeting to various degrees the imperative of the *hebraica veritas* principle, albeit mediated by humanistic Latin. Some New Testament parts of the *Registrum*, however, may have originated by direct consultation of the Greek versions. In this respect, the Unity proved much more courageous and independent of the preceding tradition than the Czech-speaking Utraquists who basically – at least judging from biblical translations produced massively – remained on the soil of the Vulgate for the whole time of their existence.



## Bibliography

### *Old prints and electronic editions*

- BiblMel2 – Melantrich’s Bible of 1556–1557 = *Bibli česká* [...], Prague, 1556–1557. (*Knihopis*, No. 1102. Olomouc, Scientific Library, III 32.296.)
- BiblNet – Netolický’s Bible = *Bibli česká* [...], Prague, 1549. (*Knihopis*, No. 1101. Prague, National Library of the Czech Republic, 54 A 3.)
- Blahoslav’s *Evanjelia* – *Evanjelia aneb čtení svatá, kteráž slovou pašije* [...] [Ivančice], 1571. (*Knihopis*, No. 2264. Prague, Library of the National Museum of the Czech Republic, 24 B 1.)
- Blahoslav’s New Testament 1564 – *Nový zákon* [...] [Ivančice] 1564. (*Knihopis*, No. 17110. Olomouc, Scientific Library, 32.653.)
- Blahoslav’s New Testament 1568 – *Nový zákon* [...] [Ivančice] 1568. (*Knihopis*, No. 17112a. Prague, National Library of the Czech Republic, 54 S 873.)
- ČER – Červenka’s *Psalter* = [Červenka, Matěj] [*Žaltář svatýho Davida, proroka a krále velikýho*] [Olomouc, 1562]. (*Knihopis*, No. 17555. Olomouc, Scientific Library, 32.676.)
- Lukáš’s New Testament of 1525 – *Nový zákon* [...], Mladá Boleslav, 1525. (*Knihopis*, No. 17097. Prague, Library of the Royal Canonry of Praemonstratensians at Strahov, DR IV 17.)
- Münster’s translation of 1534–1535 – [...] *Hebraica biblia, Latina planeque nova Sebast. Munsteri tralatione* [...], Basel, 1534–1535. (Olomouc, Scientific Library, II 261.)
- Pagninus – *Biblia sacra* [...], Coloniae, 1541. (VD16 B 2616. Olomouc, Scientific Library, II 82.)
- Reg – *Registrum* = [*Registrum aneb Zpráva* [...]], [s. l., s. a.]. (*Knihopis*, No. 14768. Prague, National Library of the Czech Republic, 54 B 81.)
- SCR – *Textus receptus* = edition based on F.H.A. Scrivener’s text, quoted according to *BibleWorks* 9.0.12.718, 2013.
- ŠtefPost – Štefan’s postil = [Štefan, Ondřej] [*Výklad řeči Božích* [...], [Ivančice], 1575. (*Knihopis*, No. 15953. Prague, Library of the National Museum of the Czech Republic, 35 C 1.)
- Stephanus’ Bible of 1556–1557 – *Biblia utriusque Testamenti* [...], [Geneva], 1556–1557. (GLN 15–16, No. 2021. Brno, Moravian Library, ST4-0050.151Vet.; ST4-0050.151,Nov.)
- Sum – *Summovník* = [Augusta, Jan] [*První díl knih služby slova Božího*] [Prague, 1570]. (*Knihopis*, No. 4055. Prague, National Library of the Czech Republic, 54 B 5.)
- Tig – *Biblia Tigurina* = *Biblia sacrosancta* [...], Tiguri, 1543. (VD16 B 2619. Olomouc, Scientific Library, III 8.)

Vg – *Vulgata Clementina = Biblia sacra* [...], quoted according to *BibleWorks* 9.0.12.718, 2013.

#### *Secondary literature*

Baťová Eliška (2012), *Koncepce liturgického roku v hymnologické činnosti Jana Augusty*, “Hudební věda”, vol. 49, No. 1–2, pp. 33–44.

Baťová Eliška (2013), *Augustovo “Registrum aneb Zpráva, co se kdy a o čem čísti má” a jeho kontext: nové pohledy*, in: *O felix Bohemia! Studie k dějinám české reformace*, ed. Petr Hlaváček, Univerzita Karlova v Praze – Filosofie, Praha, pp. 195–213.

Baťová Eliška (2014), *Tisk Blahoslavových “Evanjelií” v kontextu bratrské liturgie a sakrální rétoriky*, in: *Amica, Sponsa, Mater: Bible v čase reformace*, ed. Ota Halama, Kalich, Praha, pp. 241–260.

Baťová Eliška (2016), *Prolegomena k interpretaci a dataci nově objeveného Augustova “Summovníku”*, “Clavibus unitis”, vol. 5, pp. 1–16.

*Bible kralická šestidílná. Kompletní vydání s původními poznámkami* (2015), Česká biblická společnost, Praha.

*BibleWorks* 9.0.12.718 (2013). Fonts: BWGRKL, BWGRKN, and BWGRKI [Greek] PostScript® Type 1 and TrueType fonts. Copyright ©1994–2015 BibleWorks, LLC. All rights reserved. These Biblical Greek and Hebrew fonts are used with permission and are from BibleWorks (www.bibleworks.com). I ask other to comply with displaying and preserving the copyright, if they also distribute any derived publications.

Brown Andrew J. (ed.) (2001), *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami. Recognita et adnotatione critica instructa notisque illustrata. Ordinis sexti tomus secundus*, Elsevier, Amsterdam et al.

Bůžek Václav et al. (2010), *Společnost českých zemí v raném novověku. Struktury, identity, konflikty*, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, Praha.

Čejka Mirek, Šlosar Dušan, Nechutová Jana (eds.) (1991), *Gramatika česká Jana Blahoslava*, Masarykova univerzita, Brno.

Dittmann Robert (2012), *Dynamika textu Kralické bible v české překladatelské tradici*, Refugium Velehrad-Roma, Olomouc.

Dittmann Robert (2016), *The Kralice Bible (1579–1593/1594) and Its Later Editions*, in: Dittmann Robert, Just Jiří, *Biblical Humanism in Bohemia and Moravia in the 16th Century*, Brepols, Turnhout, pp. 249–295.

Dittmann Robert (2017), *Textologie perikop Augustova Summovníku*, “Studie a texty Evangelické teologické fakulty”, vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 57–80.

Dittmann Robert (2018), *Slawische Sprachen in der eucharistischen Liturgie in den böhmischen Ländern bis 1621*, in: *Linguistik als diskursive Schnittstelle zwi-*

- schen Recht, Politik und Konflikt*, ed. Martin Henzelmann, Dr. Kovač, Hamburg, pp. 103–140.
- GLN 15–16 = *Bibliography of Books Published in the 15th and 16th Centuries in the Cities of Geneva, Lausanne and Neuchâtel*, see also <http://www.ville-ge.ch/mus-info/bd/bge/gln/> [retrieved on 17th February 2018].
- Gordon Bruce, Cameron Euan (2016), *Latin Bibles in the Early Modern Period*, in: *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. Volume 3. From 1450 to 1750*, ed. Euan Cameron, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 187–216.
- Havránek, Bohuslav (1936), *Vývoj spisovného jazyka českého*, in: *Československá vlastivěda. Řada II. Spisovný jazyk český a slovenský*, ed. Oldřich Hujer, Sfinx – Bohumil Janda, Praha, pp. 1–144.
- Holeton David R. (1993), *The Evolution of Utraquist Liturgy: A Precursor of Western Liturgical Reform*, “Religio”, vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 155–164.
- Holeton David R. (2016), *Liturgical Life during the Bohemian Reformation*, in: *From Hus to Luther. Visual Culture in the Bohemian Reformation (1380–1620)*, eds. Kateřina Horníčková, Michal Šroněk, Brepols, Turnhout, pp. 121–142.
- Just Jiří (2007), *Biblický humanismus Jana Blahoslava*, Praha [unpublished Th.D. dissertation].
- Just Jiří (2009), *9. 7. 1609. Rudolfův Majestát. Světla a stíny náboženské svobody*, Praha.
- Just Jiří (2016), *The Psalter of Matěj Červenka (1562)*, in: Dittmann Robert, Just Jiří, *Biblical Humanism in Bohemia and Moravia in the 16th Century*, Brepols, Turnhout, pp. 60–65.
- Just Jiří (2017), *Summovník Jana Augusty a jeho dochování. Příspěvek k tématu bratrské knižní kultury a k možností jejího dalšího výzkumu*, “Studie a texty Evangelické teologické fakulty”, vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 41–56.
- Knihopis = KPS – Databáze Knihopis*, available on-line at <http://www.knihopis.cz/> [retrieved on 17th February 2018].
- Kyas Vladimír et al. (1997), *Česká bible v dějinách národního písemnictví*, Vyšehrad – Křesťanská akademie, Praha – Řím.
- Landová Tabita (2012), *Lekcionář Jana Augusty a jeho role v bratrském sporu o perikopy*, “Listy filologické”, vol. 135, No. 3–4, pp. 333–365.
- Landová Tabita (2014), *Liturgie Jednoty bratrské (1457–1620)*, Pavel Mervart, Červený Kostelec.
- Macek Josef (2001), *Víra a zbožnost jagellonského věku*, Argo, Praha.
- Šimek Štěpán (2019), *Jazyk* [entry], in: *Elektronický slovník staré češtiny*, Oddělení vývoje jazyka Ústavu pro jazyk český AV ČR, v. v. i., Praha, available on-line at <http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/> [retrieved on 5th February 2019].

- Šmahel František (2001), *Husitské Čechy. Struktury, procesy, ideje*, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, Praha.
- Šmahel František (2014), *The Divided Nation*, in: *Between Lipany and White Mountain. Essays in Late Medieval and Early Modern Bohemian History in Modern Czech Scholarship*, ed. James R. Palmitessa, Brill, Leiden, pp. 63–93.
- Šmahel František (2016), *Was There a Bohemian Reformation?*, in: *From Hus to Luther. Visual Culture in the Bohemian Reformation (1380–1620)*, eds. Kateřina Horníčková, Michal Šroněk, Brepols, Turnhout, pp. 7–16.
- Svobodová Andrea, Voleková Kateřina (forthcoming), *Nebiblické texty v staročeských překladech Bible*, in: *Husitské re-formace. Proměna kulturního kódu v 15. století*, eds. Pavlína Cermanová, Pavel Soukup, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, Praha.
- Válka Josef (2005), *Tolerance či koexistence? (K povaze soužití různých náboženských vyznání v českých zemích v 15. až 17. století)*, in: *Husitství na Moravě. Náboženská snášlivost. Jan Amos Komenský*, ed. Josef Válka, Matice moravská, Brno, pp. 237–248.
- VD16 = *Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts*. See also <https://www.bsb-muenchen.de/sammlungen/historische-drucke/recherche/vd-16/> [retrieved on 17th February 2018].
- Vykypělová Taťána (2013), *Wege zum Neutschechischen. Studien zur Geschichte der tschechischen Schriftsprache*, Dr. Kovač, Hamburg.

Robert Dittmann

**Czech Reformational biblical translation: the case of pericopes in the Unity of the Brethren in the 1550s–1570s**

The pericopes in vernacular languages were one of the achievements of the European Reformation. In Bohemian Lands, the pericopes were read in Czech already soon after 1415, namely as a feature of the Hussite movement. Fully Bohemicised liturgy, thus promoting Czech as the first vernacular within the Roman obedience to holy languages, was adopted by the Unity of the Brethren. The development of pericopes within the Unity was dynamic and noteworthy. The study describes and by textual probes illustrates the development of pericopes in the Unity after the reform of Lukas of Prague, which is tightly connected to the most literal Czech biblical translation in the 16th century, published in 1525. In the 1540s, the bishop Jan Augusta attempted at a reform of the pericopal system and in his *Summovník* he translated pericopes rather literally from *Biblia Tigurina*. His translation was modified by other Brethren bishops and printed in 1557–1559. A new revised version came out in 1563 but no copy has survived. In 1571

Blahoslav's *Evanjelia* and in 1575 Štefan's *Postil* were published, both including pericopes. The study explores in detail the mutual textual relations of these prints.

**KEYWORDS:** Pericopes; Middle Czech; biblical translation; Jan Augusta.

**dr Robert Dittmann** – absolwent Uniwersytetu Palackiego w Ołomuńcu w Republice Czeskiej (Palacký University in Olomouc, Czech Republic), obecnie wykładowca Uniwersytetu Karola (Charles University) i pracownik badawczy Czeskiej Akademii Nauk w Pradze (Czech Academy of Sciences); zainteresowania naukowe: historia języka czeskiego, przekłady Biblii, onomastyka.

