

THE CZECH NEW TESTAMENT OF 1533

Robert Dittmann

Institute of Czech Language and Theory of Communication, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague; dittmann@email.cz



Abstract: Der Beitrag beschäftigt sich mit dem Neuen Testament, das in Náměšť im Jahre 1533 gedruckt wurde, und zwar vor allem mit der Identifizierung der genauen lateinischen Vorlage, mit den Proben der Eigennamen und teilweise auch mit den Marginalien.

Keywords: New Testament 1533 – Erasmus – Optát – Gzel

0. The importance of the Czech New Testament (hereafter, NT) of 1533 may be summarized as follows.¹ It is the first Czech NT translation which quite radically and intentionally departs from the Vulgate tradition, it is closely connected to the first printed grammar of Czech in the same year,² it also radically and consciously opposes the archaic style of the preceding Czech translations, especially that of 1525, and – following Luther's *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* – attempts to introduce colloquial Czech into the Czech biblical style, thus forming a counterpart to Blahoslav's later and victorious attitudes.³ The dedication to Johanka of Boskovice (f. 2r), a former abbess of a nunnery in Brno, links the origination of this translation to

Old Czech psalters, often possessed or possibly ordered by noble females.⁴ Even though the intended second edition of this translation never appeared, the first edition influenced the subsequent Czech biblical tradition in various aspects, as is generally accepted,⁵ yet only in fewer cases textually proved.⁶ It is also the first Czech translation to place Acts after the Gospel of John,⁷ to show innovations in the title (*Nový testament*) as well as in the accompanying apparatus (e.g. translation of pope Leo X's letter addressed to Erasmus) and in explicitly explained new terminology. It also omits the usual Epistle to the Laodiceans. The usage of Roman letters for Czech appearing in chapter summaries also holds primacy.⁸ Indeed, it is the first Czech biblical

The present contribution originated thanks to the support of the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic project P406/10/0591 *EUROPA HUMANISTICA. Literární a jazyková recepce antických textů v českých zemích v letech 1470–1600.*

² Cf. KOUPIL, O., *Grammatykáři. Gramatografická a kulturní reflexe češtiny 1533–1672* [Grammarians. Grammatographical and cultural reflection of Czech 1533–1672] (2007), pp. 113–120. Both of the NT translators participated in the Náměšť grammar and its third author Václav Philomathes was also consulted during the translation process, cf. KYAS, V., *Snaha o zlidovění českého biblického jazyka v 16. století* [Efforts at popularizing of Czech biblical language in the 16th century] (1950), p. 69. The grammar was reprinted with minor changes several times and was the most influential printed description of Czech at least until the end of the century. One of its reeditions dates as late as 1643, more than one hundred years after the first issue.

³ Cf. KRÁLÍK, O., *Humanismus a počátky českého mluvnictví* [Humanism and beginnings of Czech grammatical studies]. In: Grund, A. – Kellner, A. – Kurz, J. (eds.), *Pocita Fr. Trávníčkovi a F. Wollmannovi* (1948), pp. 253–275.

⁴ Cf. VINTR, J., *Staročeský žalm – dvoustleté hledání srozumitelnosti a poetičnosti* [Old Czech psalm – a two-hundred-year search for understandability and poeticity]. *Listy filologické* 135 (2012, forthcoming).

⁵ VINTR, J., *České překlady z Erasma Rotterdamského* [Czech translations of Erasmus of Rotterdam] (1961), p. 68.

⁶ See especially KYAS, V., *Česká bible v dějinách národního písemnictví* [Czech bible in the history of national literature] (1997), pp. 167, 169, 182 etc. The non-Vulgate readings penetrating to the subsequent Czech tradition drew to some extent from the 1533 New Testament, beginning already with the second Severýn's Bible of 1537, i.e. four years later, which in its new readings follows from one third the NT of 1533, see KYAS (1950), p. 136. Other novelties in the Czech tradition like those introduced in the 1549 New testament just copied the 1533 language and solutions, see KYAS (1997), p. 167. The most famous Czech NT translation from the 16th century, Jan Blahoslav's version of 1564 and 1568, found its main Czech sources in Melantrich's New Testaments and the NT of 1533. And in his second edition, Blahoslav in his marginal notes respected the 1533 readings even more. The most widespread and indeed standard Czech bibles of the second half of the 16th century, Melantrich's bibles, quote the Náměšť grammar in their prefaces and respect some of its rules but they also contain some of the 1533 NT readings.

⁷ KYAS (1997), p. 152.

⁸ Cf. BOHATCOVÁ, M., *Erasmus Rotterdamský v českých tištěných překladech 16.–17. století* [Erasmus of Rotterdam in Czech translations from the 16th and 17th centuries]. *Časopis Národního muzea, řada historická* 155 (1986), p. 53.

translation to have accepted the incentives of the biblical humanism.⁹

1. The NT of 1533, entitled in one version NOWY TE|STAMENT WSSECEK GIZ NEYPOSLEZE A | PILNIE OD ERAZMA ROTERO=|dámského přehlédnutý [...], was published in 8° in Náměšť nad Oslavou in Moravia on 29th November by a printing amateur Matěj of Dvořiště. The *Knihopis*¹⁰ (No. 17099) lists the total of eleven surviving copies. As mentioned above, the inner structure is untraditional. The NT of 1533 reproduced the papal letter (in a Czech translation), followed by Introduction (f. 2r) and Apologia (f. 3v), after the biblical text a List of liturgical texts and Errata are placed. Further of interest is variation in the title¹¹ and beautiful typography.¹² The translators were Beneš Optát and Petr Gzel and they also made use of Václav Philomathes' grammatical rules.¹³

In this contribution, I would like to address the problem of the textual sources for the translation (2), show the proper nouns readings exemplified by three place names and trace their impact on the following tradition (3), mention the independence of marginal notes in this translation (4) and submit concluding remarks on the reasons of only partial successfulness of this edition (5).

2. Identification of the exact sources and models (*Vorlagen*) of the 1533 New Testament and their mutual relationship still represents an unresolved problem. We might divide our knowledge about the sources into three witness categories: the translators themselves (2.1), the secondary literature up to the present day (2.2) and finally newly found facts based on confrontation with the Amsterdam critical edition of Erasmus' NT (2.3).

2.1 The translators themselves admit that the main source for them was Erasmus' Latin translation as also frequent harsh Latinisms prove. The title page hints at this quite clearly, mentioning Erasmus' name. However, they also admit consultation of his *Annotations* and *Paraphrases*, and also – if possible – a Greek dictionary and a German translation or translations.¹⁴ A later variant in the title page

in some of the copies preserved states that the translators respected not only the Erasmian „Greek truth“, but also other numerous old translations. They mention also in the Apologia (f. 3b) that they consulted older Czech tradition. The translators obviously deviate from the Vulgate tradition, which was shown already by Kyas (1950) and may be supported by many other examples.¹⁵

2.2 The question arises which one of Erasmus' Latin versions served the translators as their source. From Erasmian five editions between 1516 and 1535, the first four have to be taken into account for the Czech NT of 1533. Obvious and very frequent differences may be found between the 1516 edition and the later ones, but since 1519, the Erasmian Latin text was much more solid and petrified. Still, some differences do occur and are reflected in the Czech version under examination. The only scholar to touch this question, as far as I know, was A. Adlof in 1893. In his short yet relatively well informed study he claims that the Náměšť translators made use of the 4th Erasmian edition of 1527.¹⁶ However, he does not support this claim by any textual evidence and apparently many readings of the 1527 edition do not correspond to the readings in the 1533 New Testament. Let us quote three examples here (see below for details). In Rom 7:3, the Czech *souzena bude* corresponds perfectly to *iudicabitur* of earlier Erasmian editions, whereas *slouti bude / nazvána bude* of the preceding Czech tradition matches the *vocabitur* of the Vulgate and later Erasmian text. The omission of the numeral *seven* in Ap 1:13 again corresponds to Erasmus 1519 and 1522, while the 1516 and 1527 editions do contain it. In 2 Cor 6:13, *zaslibuji* matches *polliceor*, on the contrary the 1527 Erasmian edition (*exigo*) and the Vulgate text differ.

Note. See the end of the article for a detailed explanation of the symbols used in the apparatus. A short overview of the most important symbols: A = Erasmus 1516, B = 1519, C = 1522, D = 1527; V = agreement among Vulgate editions followed in Nestle–Aland 27th ed., Wi = Wittenberg Vulgate 1529, W = Wordsworth–White; NT1513, NT1518, NT1525,

⁹ Older works do not bring anything substantial and focus primarily on the formal description or the background of the NT 1533, see BOHATCOVÁ, M., Die tschechischen gedruckten Bibeln des 15. bis 18. Jahrhunderts. In: Rothe, H. – Scholz, F. (eds.), *Kralitzer Bibel. Bd. 7: Kommentare* (1995), pp. 40–41; MÁNEK, J., *Bible v českých zemích* [Bible in the Czech lands] (1975), p. 27; MERELL, J., *Bible v českých zemích od nejstarších dob do současnosti* [Bible in the Czech lands from the oldest time till the present] (1956), p. 49; HREJSA, F., *Česká bible. K 350. výročí Bible kralické* [Czech bible. On the 350th anniversary of the Kralice bible] (1930), p. 20–23; ELSNER, J. T., *Versuch einer böhmischen Bibel-Geschichte [...]* (1765), p. 77, KLEJCH, V., Předmluva k laskavému čtenáři [Foreword to the kind reader] (1720), p. 39. On reception of Erasmus in the Czech lands see e.g. SVATOŠ, M. – SVATOŠ, M., *Živá tvář Erasma Rotterdamského* [Live heritage of Erasmus of Rotterdam] (1985), BOHATCOVÁ (1986), KOLÁR, J., Erasmovská recepcce v české literatuře předbělohorské doby [Erasmian reception in Czech literature prior to the Battle at the White Mountain]. In: Kolár, J., *Návraty bez konce. Studie k starší české literatuře* (1999), pp. 174–180, and JUST, J., Recepcce Erasmových biblických prací v Čechách a na Moravě do 60. let 16. století [Reception of Erasmus' biblical works in Bohemia and Moravia up to the 1560s] (forthcoming). The transcription of Czech follows guidelines suggested by VINTR, J., Zásady transkripce českých textů z barokní doby [Principles of transcription of Czech baroque texts]. *Listy filologické*, 3–4/121 (1998), pp. 341–346, but we keep capital letters and punctuation. The transcription of Latin is guided by KRÁLÍK, S., et al., *Otázky současné komeniologie* [Questions of present-day Comeniology] (1981), pp. 118–121.

¹⁰ See *Knihopis Digital*.

¹¹ KYAS (1950), p. 84.

¹² KYAS (1997), p. 152.

¹³ KYAS (1950), p. 69.

¹⁴ Cf. f. 3v: *Při vykládání pak / nic sami v sobě nezakládajíce / a žádné práce nelitující: v latinské řeči / nejpriz a nejvyšš větší Annotací Erazmovy / a jeho Parafrazí: v české pak všechny známé vykladače sme vyhledávali: při tom i Řeckého jazyku pokudž nám možné bylo podlé dykcionáře / ano i německých vykladačů šetřili...*

¹⁵ The 1533 New Testament does, for instance, not contain a longer addition in Matthew 7:21, where the Vulgate has *ipse intrabit in regnum caelorum* (cf. other Czech NTs: 1513 *tenť vejde do království nebeského* and similarly 1518, 1525 and 1527) and on the contrary has the addition in Mark 6:11 *Amen pavím vám: Snesitelnější bude Sodomě neb Gomoře v den soudný / nežli městu tomu*.

¹⁶ ADLOF, A., *O Bibli Kralické. Několik slov na oslavu tristaletého jubilea tohoto předního odkazu našich otců* [On the Kralice bible. Some words on the occasion of the 300th anniversary celebration of this foremost heritage of our fathers] (1893), p. 8.

NT1527 = Czech New Testament editions of 1513, 1518 etc.; BiblBen = Czech Bible 1506; BiblSev1 = Czech Bible 1529.

Rom 7:3 *za cizoložnici souzena bude* (*iudicabitur* A B C | *vocabitur* D V S W | *slouti bude* BiblSev1 | *nazvána bude* NT1527, NT1525 | *slúti bude* NT1513, NT1518, BiblBen)

Ap 1:13 *u prostřed svícňův* (*in medio candelaborum* B C | *in medio septem candelaborum* A D | *in medio septem candelaborum* V S | *u prostřed sedmi svícňův* NT1513, NT1518, NT1525, (-*nuo*) NT1527)

2 Cor 6:13 *Tůž pak odplatu / jakožto synom zaslubují* (*Eandem autem remunerationem vt filiis polliceor* A B C | *Eandem autem remunerationem vt a filiis exigo* D | *eandem autem habentes remunerationem, tamquam filiis dico, dilatamini et vos* V (- Wi) | *cum autem habeatis rursus consolationem* Wi | *tůž odplatu míti budete jakožto synom pravím* NT1513 | *Tůž pak majíce odplatu jako synom pravím* NT1525 | *tůž majíce odplatu jakožto synom) pravím* NT1518)

2.2.1 As is known about Luther's translation, he exploited the second Erasmus' edition of 1519 (namely its Greek text). Luther's translation did not serve as an important source for the Czech version, judging from deviations of the 1533 NT from the German version on those places where Erasmus 1519 and 1522 differ (see 2.3.1), e.g. in Acts 1:13 Luther 1522 and 1530 read *Judas Jacobi son*, while the Czech NT of 1533 has *Júdas Jakubů bratr*, corresponding to Erasmus 1522 and 1527 (*Judas Iacobi frater* C D) and deviating from other editions (*Judas Iacobi filius* A B | *Judas Iacobi* V S W | *Judas Jakubuov* NZ1527 | *Judas Jakubuov* NZ1518).¹⁷

2.3 After exhaustively comparing variants in the New Testament books from John to 2 Thessalonians in Erasmus' first four editions, my conclusion is that the translators utilized the 1522 edition (= C). There is, however, no distinct reading of the 1522 edition in my excerpts to match the Czech 1533 edition, so elimination of other editions had to be undertaken, taking into consideration also Latin Vulgate and Czech tradition, Erasmus' Annotations and Paraphrases, Luther's translation and Stapulensis' commentaries, which however were only minor sources for the Czech translation. Therefore, I will mostly limit myself in this section only to comparison of Erasmusian readings, Vulgate readings collected in Nestle-Aland (27th ed.) and Czech tradition.

2.3.1 The following examples show that C or D, not A or B editions served as sources of the 1533 NT readings (see also 2.2.1 above). In all cases, the preceding Czech tradition, based on the Vulgate, is different.

1 Cor 6:19 *tělo vaše* (*corpus vestrum* C D | *corpora vestra* A B | *membra vestra* V S W | *udové vaši* BiblBen, NT1518, NT1525, NT1527, BiblSev1 | *udové vaší* NT1513)

2 Cor 2:17 *řeč Boží* (*sermonem* C D | *verbum* A B V S W | *slovo Boží* BiblSev1 | *slovem božím* NT1525, NT1527 | *slovo boží* NT1518 | *slovo božie* BiblBen | *slovo boží* NT1513)

Ga 6:17 *žádný mi obtížnosti nečín* (*ne quis mihi molestias exhibeat* C D | *ne quis mihi labores exhibeat* A B | *nemo mihi molestus sit* V S W | *žádný mi zámutku nečín* BiblBen, NT1518, NT1527, BiblSev1 | *žádný mi truchliv nebývají* NT1525 | *žádný mi zámutku nečín* NT1513)

Acts 8:14 *že by Samarya přijala řeč Boží* (*quod recepisset Samaria sermonem Dei* C D | *quod recepisset Samaria verbum dei* A B | *quia recepit Samaria verbum Dei* S W | *quod (quia* G Co D) *recepisset Samaria verbum Dei* V | *že by Samaří přijala slovo Boží* BiblSev1 | *že by Samaří přijala slovo božie* BiblBen, NT1527 | *že by Samaří přijala slovo boží* NT1513 | *že by Samaria přijala slovo boží* (-*ie* NT1525) NT1518, NT1525)

John 3:36 *Kdož věří synu* (*Qui credit filio* C D | *Qui credit in filium* A B | *Qui credit in Filium* V S W | *Kto věří v syna* BiblBen, BiblSev1, NT1513 | *ktož věří v syna* NT1525, NT1527 | *ktoť věří v syna* NT1518)

2.3.2 We may also supply an example showing that Erasmus' A or C, not B or D edition was the source text:

1 Cor 11:26 *smrt páně zvěstujete* (*mortem domini annunciatís* A C | *mortem domini annunciate* B | *mortem Domini annuntiabitís* V (*annunciatis* is only in modern editions S W) | *zvěstovati budete* BiblBen, NT1513, NT1518, NT1525, NT1527, BiblSev1)

2.3.3 The Náměšť translators relate to us (f. 3b) that if possible they even consulted the Greek text with the help of a Greek dictionary, but their main foreign source was undoubtedly the Latin text of Erasmus. There is indeed clear evidence that the Greek Erasmusian text was not considered to a high degree or compared to the Latin Erasmusian text as those places show on which the Greek and the Latin Erasmusian texts differ from each other (the NT 1533 agrees with the Latin Erasmusian version and in Acts 4:12 and Ap 1:11 also with the Vulgate tradition). The Romans 5:12 is especially interesting because it is the only place in which Jan Blahoslav in his edition of the New Testament quotes explicitly Erasmus (and translates his Greek text). The Latin and the Greek of Erasmus at this particular place remained paradoxically different in all of his editions.¹⁸

Acts 4:12 *pod nebem* (*sub coelo* A B C D | *υ πο. το.υ ουρανο.υ* D | *omittit* A B C | *sub caelo* V S W | *pod nebem* NT1513, NT1518, NT1525, NT1527, BiblSev1 | Luther 1534 *omittit*)

Rom 5:12 *pokad sme všickni shřešili* (*quatenus omnes peccauimus* B C D | *in eo quod omnes peccauimus* A | *in quo omnes peccaverunt* V S W (*omittit* Wi) | *ημμερτων* A B C D E | *neb jsou všickni v jednom člověku shřešili* NT1513, NT1518 | *v němž všichni shřešili jsou* NT1527 | *v němž všichni shřešili jsou* NT1525)

Also in Apocalypse 1:11, Erasmus' Latin editions A-D contain the numeral seven (*septem*), while his Greek text in all of these editions misses the corresponding *ε πτω..*

2.3.4 Already B. Souček¹⁹ noticed that the 1533 NT contained traditional, Vulgate readings in the Apocalypse.

¹⁷ Also Czech bibles of 1506 and 1529 and the NT of 1513 support the reading of 1533, cf. *Júdas bratr Jakubuov* BiblBen, BiblSev1 | *Judas bratr Jakubuov* NT1513.

¹⁸ BROWN, A. J. (ed.), *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami recognita et adnotatione critica instructa notisque illustrata. Ordinis sexti tomus tertius* (2004), p. 71.

¹⁹ SOUČEK, B., *Česká Apokalypsa v husitství. Z dějin textu Zjevení Janova – od Konstantina ke Komenskému. Úvodem k vydání Nového zákona Tábořského* (1967), p. 164.

These readings make identification of Erasmian source more difficult as they sometimes agree with earlier Erasmus' versions, while his later editions prefer a reading not included in the 1533 NT.

Rom 15:16 *Jezu Krysta (Iesu C D | omittit A B | Christi Iesu W S V | krysta Ježíše NT1513, (j-) NT1525, absent sheet in a copy in NT1518 | Krysta Ježíše BiblBen, NT1527 | Krista Ježíše BiblSev1)*

2.3.5 In other cases deviating from Erasmus' 1522 Latin edition, the Annotations submit explanation, e.g. in Philippians 2:20 the Annotations explain: *Graece sic est τὰ περι. ὑ μῶν μεριμνη,σει, id est „res vestras curabit”...*, which supports the plural *věci vaše* in the 1533 NT.

Philippians 2:20 *ješto by se vlastně o věci vaše staral (qui germane res vestras curaturus sit A B D | qui germane res vestram (!) curaturus sit C | kterýž by čistú žádostí měl o vás péči NT1525, NT1527 | ješto by čistú žádostí měl péči o vás BiblBen, NT1513, (jměl) NT1518 | kterýž by čistou žádostí měl péči o vás BiblSev1)*

Indeed, we have more proofs for the translators' using Annotations and Paraphrases for they refer to them directly in the marginal notes. Such references are of great value, although they appear very rarely, actually only five times in the whole New Testament, and these references are inserted in only three marginal notes (out of the total number of 160 philological marginal notes in the whole translation). The places are Matthew 26:7 (Annotations), Philippians 4:3 (Annotations and Paraphrase) and Hebrews 6 in the summary (Annotations and Paraphrase). In the marginal note to Philippians 4:4, the only explicit reference in the translation (apart from the Preface) to Stapulensis appears. In the Náměšť grammar of the same year and in the work called *Isagogicon* published in Náměšť just two years later, in 1535, there are some more references to Erasmus' works and Stapulensis.²⁰

3. Let us now mention the untraditional forms of proper nouns.²¹ In the preface, the translators announce they do not respect the traditional, from the Vulgate adapted Czech forms *Ježíš, Jeruzalém, Mojžíš, Kafarnaum* etc. They overtake Erasmus' forms instead and read *Jézus, Jerozolím, Mozes, Kapernaum* etc. These readings must have been felt as very daring and suspicious because the traditionally adapted forms had existed for centuries. Jan Blahoslav comments on this novelty later in his grammar with irony.²² The Czech traditional forms tended to be very stable as usually proper nouns do. Even the Kralice bible translators did not dare

change them to Hebraized forms and they kept them in the old way where possible, as they admit in one of their prefaces. There are, however, some new readings first occurring in the 1533 NT which did find its way into the following Czech tradition. Let us show here three examples of New Testament place names shifts, namely *Magedan/Magdala, Betania/Betabara* and *Cauda/Clauda*. The table below presents an overview of these readings introduced into the Czech translation tradition by the 1533 New Testament. From the Czech biblical prints, all printed editions of the Bible and all 16th century editions of NT prior to the 1533 NT were taken into consideration for the comparison. As for the prints following 1533, all 16th century Czech editions of the Bible were examined and selected representatives of NTs. For Vulgate text readings contemporary with the 1533 NT, see the table further below. Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples' commentary might have been supportive for the Náměšť translators e.g. for Matthew 15:39 (cf. *in fines Magedan... sive in fines Magdala, ut nunc Graece legit*)²³ and John 1:28 (*factae sunt in Bathabara /etiamsi aliqui codices Graeci habeant in Bethania/ ... qui locus est trans Iordanem... Ex quo intelligitur, perperam legi ... Bethaniam: quod etiam ex Hieronymo deprehendi potest....*)²⁴ Similarly, Erasmus' Annotations mostly comment extensively on the discrepancy between the Vulgate and Greek texts,²⁵ e.g. in case of *Bethania* and *Bethabara* Erasmus comments that „*in vetustioribus et emendationibus exemplaribus non legi 'Bethaniam', sed 'Betahabaran'...*”²⁶

The table shows that the proper noun readings *Magdala, Betabara* and *Klauda* first appeared in the Czech tradition in the 1533 NT and occurred in the subsequent translations. The second table below submits an overview of readings of chronologically ordered Latin Bible texts from 1515 to 1532, all of which are Vulgate texts, some corrected according to Greek.

As the data collected in the table show, the progressive readings (*Bethabara, Clauda*) asserted themselves in (corrected) Vulgates only from 1529 onwards, the reading *Magedan* being still the prevailing one in these editions. At the latest by the 1530s, awareness that the reading *Bethania* is corrupted was well known in Catholic circles as attested by a note relating to John 1:28 by cardinal Cajetan in the *Evangelia cum commentariis* (1532).²⁷ The Wittenberg Vulgate is the only one from the editions examined to contain the readings shared with Erasmus, Luther and the 1533 Czech New Testament.²⁸

²⁰ For the Náměšť grammar of 1533, see the digitized version available in the *Vokabulář webový*. In the *Isagogicon*, which is quoted also from the *Vokabulář webový*, see e.g. F3v, F4r (the form *Stapulenský* appears here and in the grammar, whereas *Štapulenský* is the preferred form in Blahoslav's grammar quoting the Náměšť one, see ČEJKA, M. – ŠLOSAR, D. – NECHUTOVÁ, J. (eds.), *Gramatika česká Jana Blahoslava* [Jan Blahoslav's Czech grammar] (1991), f. 52b, 54b, 55b–56a.

²¹ For place names in the NT 1533, see my article DITTMANN, R., Toponymie v náměšťském Novém zákoně (1533). *Acta onomastica* 52 (2011), pp. 31–45.

²² ČEJKA – ŠLOSAR – NECHUTOVÁ (1991), p. 160–161, f. 157a–158b.

²³ STAPULENSIS, I. F., *Commentarii in ianitorii in quatuor Evangelia* [...] *Jacobo Fabro Stapulensi auctore* (1523), p. 69.

²⁴ STAPULENSIS (1523), p. 288.

²⁵ See HOVINGH, P. (ed.), *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami recognita et adnotatione critica instrvcta notisque illvstrata. Ordinis sexti tomvs qvintvs* (2000), p. 244, for Matt 15:39.

²⁶ HOVINGH, P. (ed.), *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami recognita et adnotatione critica instrvcta notisque illvstrata. Ordinis sexti tomvs sextvs* (2003), p. 58. See *ibid.*, p. 340, for Acts 27:16.

²⁷ *Haec in Bethania. pro, in Bethabara, facta sunt... Errore scriptorum apud Latinos & apud multos Graecos codices, mutatum est nomen Bethabara in Bethania* (f. 178r).

²⁸ In many other cases, however, the Czech NT departs from the Wittenberg Vulgate, see e.g. John 1:7 *Wi erat* - NT 1533, Erasmus A-D *om. (cui nomen Ioannes)*, John 1:8 *Wi sed ut testimonium perhiberet de lumine* - Erasmus B-D *sed missus erat, vt testaretur de luce* [missus erat was set in a smaller type in B] - NT 1533 *ale poslán byl / aby svědčil o světle*.

Acts 27:16		Bethania / Bethabara		John 1:28		Magdala / Magedan		Matt 15:39		Verset	
Kauda / Klauda	kauda			betany				M/magedan		Czech Bibles 1488, 1489	
	Kauda			Betany				Magedan		Czech Bible 1506	
	Kauda			Betany				Magedan		Czech Bible 1529	
	Klaudya (!)			Betany				Magedan		Czech NT 1513	
	Kauda			Betany				do krajim Macedonských (!)		Czech NT 1518	
	kauda			betany				do končim magedonských		Czech NT 1525	
	kauda			Betany				do končim Magedanských		Czech NT 1527	
	Cluada	Bethabara				Magdala				Erasmus Latin NT 1522	
	Klau/da	Bhqabara, /				magdala				Easmus Greek NT 1522	
	Clauden	Bethabara				Magdala				Luther's NT 1522	
	Clauda	Betharaba (!)				Magdala				Luther's Bibel 1534	
	Klauda	Betabara				Magdala				Czech NT 1533	
	Klauda	Betabaře				Magdala				Czech Bibles 1537, 1540	
	Klauda	Bethabaře				Magdala				Czech Bible 1549	
	Klauda	Bethabaře				Magdala				Czech Bible 1556/7, 1570	
	Klauda	Bethabaře				Magdala				Czech Bible 1577	
	Klauda	Bethabara				Magdala				Veleslavín's Czech Bible 1613	
	Klauda	Betabaře				Magdala				Blahoslav's NT 1564, 1568	
	Klauda	Betabaře				Magdala				Kralice Bible 1579-1594	
	Klauda	Betabaře				Magdala				Kralice Bible 1613	
	Cauda	Bethania				Magdala		Magedan		Sixto-Clementine Vulgate	
	Kau/da	Bhqani,a				Magdala		Magada,n		BNT, GNT	

Acts 27:16		Bethania / Bethabara		John 1:28		Magdala / Magedan		Matt 15:39		Verset	
Kauda / Klauda	cauda			bethania				magedan		Sacon's Bible 1515	
	cauda			bethania				magedan		Vulgate in Polyglotta Complutensis	
	cauda			bethania				magedan		Osiander's Bible (1522)	
	Clauda	Bethabara		Bethania				Magedan		Bible of Petreus (1527)	
	Cauda	Bethabara		Bethania				magedan		Vulgate in Erasmus 1527	
	cauda	Bethabara		bethania				magedan		Biblia cum concordantiis (1527)	
	Clauda	Bethabara						Magedan		Bible of Rudelius (1529)	
	Clauda	Bethabara				Mgdala		Magedan (marg. Grae. magdala.)		Wittenberg Vulgate 1529	
	Clauda	Bethabara						Magedan (marg. Grae. magdala.)		<i>Biblia integra</i> Vulgate (1529)	
	Clauda	Bethabara						Magedan [n]		<i>Textus biblie</i> Vulgate (1529)	
	clauda	bethabara						magedan		Bible of Larridius (1530)	
	Clauda	Beth-abara						Magedan (marg. Magdala)		Bible of 1532	

4. The independence of the NT of 1533 compared to the preceding Czech tradition is apparent not only in the text proper and formal structure, but also in the marginal notes. Notes on the margins giving an alternative translation, frequently taken from the previous tradition, first appeared in Czech printed translations in 1525. From the total of 160 philological marginal notes (i.e. leaving aside references to other biblical places etc.) in the NT of 1533, probably only a very small number draws from the preceding translations: e.g. from 112 marginal notes in the range from Matthew to 2 Corinthians, only five correspond to the 1527 NT. For a comparison let us remind that out of 120 Blahoslav's 1568 New Testament marginal notes followed by Kvas (1950: 160), about 30 % match the previous Czech tradition.

5. To conclude, the Czech New Testament translation of 1533 was only partially successful. Its main contribution to the Czech biblical tradition lies in absorption to a high degree of the foreign biblical humanism with a clear preference of a non-Vulgate source and refreshing the Czech biblical style by introduction of colloquial forms. On the other hand, some of its innovations like several untraditional proper noun readings as well as some harsh Latinisms²⁹ probably prevented the translation from wider acceptance, even in Optát's own church environment.³⁰ During the recatholization period, the translation was put on the list of prohibited books. In contrast to the Náměšť grammar of Czech, the Náměšť New Testament was never republished, yet its influence on the subsequent Czech tradition is doubtless. It is a task for the future research to determine and precisely describe all fields of its impact.

Abbreviations

- A** = Erasmus 1516 (first ed.), see Brown (2001, 2004).
B = Erasmus 1519 (second ed.), see Brown (2001, 2004).
BNT = *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Nestle–Aland 27. vyd., cit. dle *BibleWorks 7.0.012g*.
C = Erasmus 1522 (third ed.), see Brown (2001, 2004).
Co = Polyglotta Complutensis NT, see Nestle–Aland 27th ed.
D = Erasmus 1527 (fourth ed.), see Brown (2001, 2004).
E = Erasmus 1535 (fifth ed.), see Brown (2001, 2004).
G = Gutenberg's Bible of ca 1452/54, see Nestle–Aland 27th ed.
GNT = *Greek New Testament*, 4th ed., cit. dle *BibleWorks 7.0.012g*.
S = Sixta, see Nestle–Aland 27th ed.
V = agreement among Vulgate editions followed in Nestle–Aland 27th ed.
W = Wordsworth–White, see Nestle–Aland 27th ed.
Wi = Wittenberg Vulgate, see Nestle–Aland 27th ed.

Editions listed chronologically

- [1488] **Czech Bible of 1488** = [*Bible pražská*]. Městská knihovna v Praze, sign. H 417. Available on-line from URL: <http://www.manuscriptorium.com>, cited on 20th May 2012. Knihopis I, 2.
 [1489] **Czech Bible of 1489** = [*Bible kutnohorská*]. České muzeum stříbra v Kutné Hoře, sign. ST 1. Available

on-line from URL: <http://www.manuscriptorium.com>. Cited on 10th May 2012. Knihopis URB_X.

- [1506] **BiblBen, Czech Bible of 1506** = *Bibli Česká...* Vědecká knihovna v Olomouci (hereafter, VKOL), sign. II 32058. Knihopis 1097.
 [1513] **Czech NT of 1513** = *Nový zákon*. Národní knihovna, sign. 54.C.8.
 [1514–17] **Polyglotta Complutensis** = *Vetus Testamentum multiplici lingua...* Facsimile edition. Roma: Gregoriana, 1983–84.
 [1515] **Sacon's bible** = *Biblia cum concordantiis et novi testamenti et sacrorum canonum...* [s. l.], 1515. Available on-line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited on 20th May 2012.
 [1516] **Erasmus 1516** = HOLECZEK, H. (ed.), *Erasmus von Rotterdam. Novum Instrumentum. Basel 1516. Faksimile–Neudruck mit einer historischen, textkritischen und bibliographischen Einleitung von Heinz Holeczek* (1986). Stuttgart Bad–Cannstatt, frommann–holzboog.
 [1517] **Stapulensis** = *Epistole divi Pauli apostoli: cum commentariis...* Available on-line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited on 20th May 2012.
 [1518] **Czech NT of 1518** = *Zákon Nový...* Strahovská knihovna, sign. DR IV 19. Knihopis 17096.
 [1522] **Luther's NT of 1522** = *Das Neue Testament Deutsch...* (cited on 10th April 2012 according to the 1918 reprint of the September 1522 Luther NT, available on-line from URL: <http://bibles-online.net/luther>).
 [1522] **Osiander's Bible** = *Biblia Sacra utriusque testamenti...* Available on-line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited on 20th May 2012.
 [1523] **Stapulensis** = *Commentarii iniquitatis in quatuor Evangelia...* Available on-line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited on 20th May 2012.
 [1525] **Czech NT of 1525** = *Nový Zákon...* Strahovská knihovna, sign. DR IV 17. Knihopis 17097.
 [1527] **Biblia cum concordantiis** = *Biblia. Biblia cum concordantiis veteris et novi testamenti...* Lyon, Mareschal. VKOL, sign. III 236.
 [1527] **Czech NT of 1527** = *Nový zákon...* VKOL, sign. 32.108. Knihopis 17098.
 [1527] **Petreius' Bible** = *Biblia sacra utriusque Testamenti*. Norembergae: per Ioan. Petreium. Available on-line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited on 20th May 2012.
 [1527] **Rudelius' Bible** = *Biblia sacra utriusque testamenti...* Coloniae, Petrus Quentel. Available on-line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited on 20th May 2012.
 [1529] **Biblia integra** = *Biblia integra veteris et novi testamenti*. Coloniae, [Quentel]. Available on-line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited on 20th May 2012.
 [1529] **BiblSev1, Czech Bible of 1529** = *Bibli Česká...* VKOL, sign. III 32051. Knihopis 1098.

²⁹ Cf. KYAS (1997), p. 155–156.

³⁰ SOUČEK (1967), p. 163.

- [1529] **Wittenberg Vulgate** = *Pentateuchus. Liber Iosue...* Wittenbergae, Hermann Böhlaus. Quoted according to Nestle–Aland 27th ed.
- [1529] **Textus biblie** = *Textus biblie. Hoc in opere...* Lyon, Crespin. Available on–line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited on 20th May 2012.
- [1530] **Lariudius' Bible** = *Biblia juxta divi Hieronymi...* Coloniae, ex officina Eucharii Cervicorni..
- [1530] **Luther's NT** – available on–line from URL: <http://bibles-online.net/1530/>, cited on 10th June 2012.
- [1532] **Bible of 1532** = *Biblia. Breves in eadem...* Paris, Robert Estienne. Available on–line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited on 20th May 2012.
- [1532] **Cajetan's commentary** = *Evangelia cum commentariis...* [s. 1.], apud Iod. Badium Ascensium & Ioan. Parvum & Ioannem Roigny, 1532. Available on–line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited on 20th May 2012.
- [1533] **Czech NT of 1533** = *Nový testament...* VKOL 32.197. Knihopis 17099.
- [1534] **Luther's Bible** = *Biblia das ist die gantze Heilige Schrift Deudsch.* Národní knihovna, sign. XXVI.D.17.
- [1537] **Czech Bible of 1537** = *Bibli Česká...* VKOL, sign. III 32053 and III 640.070. Knihopis 1099.
- [1540] **Czech Bible of 1540** = *Bibli Česká...* Available on–line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited on 20th May 2012. Knihopis 1100.
- [1549] **Czech Bible of 1549** = *Bibli Česká...* VKOL, sign. III 32.712. Knihopis 1101.
- [1556/7] **Czech Bible of 1556–7** = *Bibli Česká...* VKOL, sign. III 32.296. Knihopis 1102.
- [1564] **Blahoslav's NT of 1564** = *Nový Zákon...* VKOL, sign. 32.653. Knihopis 17110.
- [1568] **Blahoslav's NT of 1568** = *Nový Zákon...* Quoted according to Konopásek (1931). Knihopis 17112.
- [1570] **Czech Bible of 1570** = *Bibli Česká...* Moravská zemská knihovna, sign. ST4-0009.880,A. Knihopis 1104.
- [1577] **Czech Bible of 1577** = *Bibli Česká...* VKOL, sign. III 220903. Knihopis 1105.
- [1579–94] **Kralice Bible** = *Bibli české díl první ... šestý.* VKOL, sign. II 32.377. Knihopis 1107.
- [1592] **Sixto–Clementine Vulgate** – quoted according to *Vulsearch*.
- [1613] **Kralice Bible** = *Bibli svatá...* VKOL, sign. II 32.073. Knihopis 1110.
- [1613] **Veleslavín's Bible** = *Bibli Česká...* MZK, sign. ST4-0096.337. Knihopis 1106.
- to comply with displaying and preserving the copyright, if they also distribute any derived publications.
- BOHATCOVÁ, M., Die tschechischen gedruckten Bibeln des 15. bis 18. Jahrhunderts. In: Rothe, H. – Scholz, F. (eds.), *Kralitzer Bibel. Bd. 7: Kommentare* (1995). Paderborn – München – Wien – Zürich, Ferdinand Schöningh, pp. 1–182.
- BOHATCOVÁ, M., Erasmus Rotterdamský v českých tištěných překladech 16.–17. století. *Časopis Národního muzea, řada historická 155* (1986), pp. 37–58.
- BROWN, A. J. (ed.), *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami recognita et adnotatione critica instrvcta notisque illvstrata. Ordinis sexti tomvs secvndvs* (2001). Amsterdam, Elsevier.
- BROWN, A. J. (ed.), *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami recognita et adnotatione critica instrvcta notisque illvstrata. Ordinis sexti tomvs tertivs* (2004). Amsterdam, Elsevier.
- ČEJKA, M. – ŠLOSAR, D. – NECHUTOVÁ, J. (eds.), *Gramatika česká Jana Blahoslava* (1991). Brno, Masarykova univerzita.
- DITTMANN, R. Toponymie v náměšťském Novém zákoně (1533). *Acta onomastica 52* (2011), pp. 31–45.
- ELSNER, J. T., *Versuch einer böhmischen Bibel–Geschichte [...]* (1765). Halle, gedruckt im Waisenhaus. Available on–line from URL: <http://www.books.google.com>, cited 20th May 2012.
- HOVINGH, P. (ed.), *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami recognita et adnotatione critica instrvcta notisque illvstrata. Ordinis sexti tomvs qvintvs* (2000). Amsterdam, Elsevier.
- HOVINGH, P. (ed.), *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami recognita et adnotatione critica instrvcta notisque illvstrata. Ordinis sexti tomvs sextvs* (2003). Amsterdam, Elsevier.
- HREJSA, F., *Česká bible. K 350. výročí Bible kralické* (1930). Praha, YMCA.
- JUST, J., Recepce Erasmových biblických prací v Čechách a na Moravě do 60. let 16. století. Presented at the conference *Erasmovo dílo v minulosti a současnosti evropského myšlení*, Olomouc, June 1–3, 2011. Forthcoming.
- KLEJCH, V., Předmluva k laskavému čtenáři (1720). In: *Nový Zákon...* (Moravská zemská knihovna, sign. ST1-0025.254; Knihopis 17121), pp. 11–47. *Knihopis Digital*. Available on–line from URL: <http://www.knihopis.org>. Cited on 20th June 2012.
- KOLÁR, J. Erasmovská recepce v české literatuře předbělohorské doby. In: Kolár, J., *Návraty bez konce. Studie k starší české literatuře* (1999). Ed. L. Jiroušková. Brno, Atlantis, pp. 174–180.
- KONOPÁSEK, J. (ed.), *Blahoslavův Nový zákon z roku 1568* (1931). Praha, Neuber, Pour a spol.
- KOUPIL, O., *Grammatykáři. Gramatografická a kulturní reflexe češtiny 1533–1672* (2007). Praha, Karolinum.
- KRÁLÍK, O., Humanismus a počátky českého mluvnictví. In: Grund, A. – Kellner, A. – Kurz, J. (eds.), *Poceta Fr. Trávníčkovi a F. Wollmannovi* (1948). Brno, seminář pro slovanskou filologii při filosofické fakultě Masarykovy university v Brně nákladem Komenia, pp. 253–275.

Bibliography

ADLOF, A., *O Bibli Kralické. Několik slov na oslavu třistaletého jubilea tohoto předního odkazu našich otců* (1893). Královské Vinohrady, František Horálek.

BibleWorks 7.0.012g. 2006. Fonts: BWHEBB, BWHEBL, BWTRANSH [Hebrew]; BWGRKL, BWGRKN, and BWGRKI [Greek] Postscript® Type 1 and TrueTypeT fonts Copyright © 1994–2006 BibleWorks, LLC. All rights reserved. These Biblical Greek and Hebrew fonts are used with permission and are from BibleWorks, software for Biblical exegesis and research. I ask others

- KYAS, V., *Česká bible v dějinách národního písemnictví* (1997). Praha, Vyšehrad.
- KYAS, V., *Snaha o zlidovění českého biblického jazyka v 16. století* (1950). Brno, FF UJEP (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation).
- MÁNEK, J., *Bible v českých zemích* (1975). Praha, Ústřední církevní nakladatelství.
- MERELL, J., *Bible v českých zemích od nejstarších dob do současnosti* (1956). Praha, Česká katolická charita.
- NESTLE–ALAND, *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine...* (2005). 27th ed. Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- SOUČEK, B., *Česká Apokalypsa v husitství. Z dějin textu Zjevení Janova – od Konstantina ke Komenskému. Úvodem k vydání Nového zákona Táborského* (1967). Praha, Synodní rada Českobratrské církve evangelické v Ústředním církevním nakladatelství.
- SVATOŠ, M. – SVATOŠ, M., *Živá tvář Erasma Rotterdamského* (1985). Praha, Vyšehrad.
- VINTR, J., *České překlady z Erasma Rotterdamského* (1961). Brno, FF UJEP (unpublished M.A. thesis).
- VINTR, J., Staročeský žalm – dvousetleté hledání srozumitelnosti a poetičnosti. *Listy filologické* 135 (2012, forthcoming).
- VINTR, J., Zásady transkripce českých textů z barokní doby. *Listy filologické* 3–4/121 (1998), pp. 341–346.
- Vokabulář webový*. Available on–line from URL: <http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz>. Cited on 20th June 2012.
- Vulsearch 4.1.6*. 2000–2007. Available on–line from URL: <http://www.vulsearch.sf.net>. Cited on 20th June 2012.