Translations of Historical Writings Composed and Read in the Czech Lands up to the Hussite Revolution and Their Audience[1]

Marie Bláhová[2]

ABSTRACT

As with most of the Latin cultural circle countries, the oldest written texts, including the historical writings, in the Czech Lands were written in Latin. In Bohemia, the first translations of texts on historical topics into vernacular languages appear in the second half of the 13th century. It begins with loose adaptations of "common historical" topics, such as the life of Alexander the Great, in German and from the end of the 13th century also in Czech. In the first half of the 14th century we can find real translations of historical texts, not from Latin into vernacular language, but on the contrary from Czech into Latin and into German (Chronicle of so called Dalimil). Following are the German chronicles in verse, already translated from Latin. While the Latin translation was probably meant for a high-level laic, the German texts were written for the German monks living in the Bohemia, and perhaps for the Prague patricians. Further translations of historical texts were being written from the second half of the 14th century. Those are the translations of the official historical works from the Charles IV era into Czech, later also into German for the citizens of "incorporated lands of the Bohemian Crown". At the end of the 14th and at the beginning of the 15th century, even the "common" texts of Latin culture were translated into Czech, such as Peter Comestor's Historia scholastica, Martin of Opava's *Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum* or the German chronicle of Jacob Twinger of Königshofen. However, the readers were much more interested in pseudo-historical light literature. The translators were among the clergymen, but also laymen, and the translated texts were primarily meant for laic readers. In the 15th century, the Czech history was being translated also outside the Czech borders, mainly in Bavaria.

KEYWORDS

Translations; Historical Writings; Czech Lands; Middle Ages; Latin; Czech; German

Like most countries influenced by Latin culture, the oldest literary works in the Czech lands were written in the literary language, i.e. in Latin. Besides hagiographical legends, the oldest literary expressions include historical writings, chronicles and

1 This study was published as part of the Charles University program PROGRES Q09: History — The key to understanding the globalized world. It presents an extended version of the paper at "The XI Cardiff Conference on the Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages, The Medieval Translator: Medieval Translations & Their Readership" held in Vienna on April 15–18, 2017.

2 Marie Bláhová, Department of Auxiliary Historical Sciences and Archive Studies, Charles University, Nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38, Praha 1, Czech Republic, marie.blahova@ff.cuni.cz

OPEN ACCESS

annals. Clerics wrote these for their colleagues, who then read (and translated) them to high-status laity. It wasn't until the mid-13th century that lay people also began to take an interest in literary, mainly historical, works. Because they could not read the Latin texts well, these needed to be translated or written directly in the vernacular language. In this regard, however, one must clarify two questions: 1) What was historiography in the Middle Ages, or what was considered a historiographical text?, and 2) What exactly was a translation in the Middle Ages?

For medieval authors, readers and hearers, any narrative about the past was 'history', and only a few authors perceived history as 'true' or 'real events which occurred' — *historiae sunt res verae quae factae sunt*[3]– or retellings of such events, or such retellings written down.[4] Ancient and mediaeval historical epics and the biographies of heroes, especially saints, were also considered *history*.[5] Although the focus of the following discussion is on history as a true record of real events as far as possible, one cannot avoid writings which are on the border of, or even outside this definition, simply because these writings played the largest role in literary translations.

As for the second question — what is a translation? — one must assume that mediaeval translators did not always consistently keep to the shape of the text, often giving loose translations and sometimes just paraphrasing. They also often updated and corrected the texts for their audience, who were usually different from the audience the original text had in mind, and even just used the text as a template for creating a new work. As such, the border between a translation and the author's own written material is hard to determine.

At the same time, it must be borne in mind that, mainly as a result of social developments during the 13th century, two vernacular languages were used in the Czech lands: Czech and German. It was mainly the nobility who spoke Czech, although there was a trend in the second half of the 13th century for them to use German, sponsoring the translation of chivalric romance into German. Czech predominated in the Royal Court, although the Royal court's composition in terms of nationalities (and languages) varied according to the status of Czech rulers and the size of the land they ruled. Until the beginning of the Hussite Revolution, i.e. the end of the 1420s, the very highest social classes in most Royal towns were mainly German. German was also predominant in most monasteries of various orders: in particular the Premonstratensians, Cistercians, Franciscans, Dominicans and the military orders. The rural population were generally Czech, while in border regions which were settled over the course of the 13th century by foreigners, mainly Germans, German was predominant.[6]

3 Isidor de Seville, Etymologiae I, 44, 5. Similarly, e.g., John of Salisbury. Cf. J. O. WARD, *Some Principles of Rhetorical Historiography in the Twelfth Century*, in: E. BREISACH (ed.), Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography, Kalamazoo, Mi 1985 (= Studies in Medieval Culture XIX), p. 107.

4 Srv. H. W. GOETZ, *Die Gegenwart der Vergangenheit im früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Geschichtsbewußtsein*, in: Historische Zeitschrift, Bd. 255, 1992, p. 62.

5 Cf. W. FAULSTICH, *Medien und Öffentlichkeiten im Mittelalter. 800–1400*, Göttingen 1996 (= Die Geschichte der Medien 2), p. 33.

6 Cf. J. V. ŠIMÁK, *České dějiny I, 5. Středověká kolonizace v českých zemích*, Praha 1938; E. SCHWARZ, *Volkstumsgeschichte der Sudetenländer* I-II, München 1965, 1966.

OPEN ACCESS

THE BEGINNINGS OF TRANSLATIONS OF HISTORICALLY ORIENTED LITERATURE IN THE CZECH LANDS

Vernacular literature looking at history appeared in the Czech lands in the second half of the 13th century. It comprised German epics, composed by court poets of the Přemyslid kings in accordance with Western models adapted to the Czech environment through historical allusions and contemporary comments.[7] Some religious texts were also translated into Czech at this time, including some of the Bible.[8] At the end of the 13th century, the first translation of a large work was made into Czech. This was a translation of the *Romance of Alexander*, known in Czech as *Alexandreida*. The work was based on Walter of Châtillon's Latin text, *Alexandreis sive Gesta Alexandri Magni* from the end of the 1170s or early 1180s (approx. 1178/82). However, the unknown translator was also familiar with the German version of the Romance of Alexander, also entitled *Alexandreis*, written in over 30,000 verses by Bohemian-born Ulrich von Etzenbach (around 1250 — post-1300) at King Ottokar II of Bohemia's court,[9] the work extended in the German regions and still preserved in manuscripts in various Western European libraries.[10]

The Czech Alexandreis, however, is not a direct translation. The author applies ancient themes to the ideological and social circumstances in Bohemia at the turn of the 13th and 14th centuries, in particular expressing the endeavours of the Czech nobility and their ideas on the organisation of the state, as well as their status within it.[11]

From the start of the 14th century, further works were regularly transcribed into Czech,[12] especially hagiographical legends.[13] These, however, were not translations, but rather loose reworkings of material in Jacobus de Voragine's Golden Legend.

7 An overview is given by R. WOLKAN, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in Böhmen bis zum Ausgange des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, Prag 1894, pp. 172–209; H.-J. BEHR, *Literatur als Machtlegitimation. Studien zur Funktion der deutschsprachigen Dichtung am böhmischen Königshof im 13. Jahrhundert*, München 1989 (= Forschungen zur Geschichte der älteren deutschen Literatur, Bd. 9), passim; J. K. HOENSCH, *Přemysl Otakar II. von Böhmen. Der goldene König*, Graz — Wien — Köln 1989, pp. 192–195; M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila v kontextu latinské středověké historiografie a její pramenná hodnota. Historický komentář. Rejstřík* (= Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila 3), Praha 1995, pp. 125–128.

8 Cf. V. KYAS, *Česká bible v dějinách národního písemnictví*, Praha 1997, p. 32; J. VRAŠTIL, *České překlady biblické*, in: Český slovník bohovědný III, Praha 1926, p. 335.

9 Cf. L. VARCL (ed.), *Antika a česká kultura*, Praha 1978, pp. 55, 58; H.-J. BEHR, *Literatur*, pp. 143–175.

10 Cf. Handschriftencensus. Eine Bestandsaufnahme der handschriftlichen Überlieferung deutschsprachiger Texte des Mittelalters, http://www.handschriftencensus.de/werke/490, [2018-05-27].

11 Cf. J. HRABÁK (ed.), *Dějiny české literatury, I. Starší česká literatura*, Praha 1959, pp. 99–100.

12 Cf. M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Překlady „českých dějin" z doby vlády prvních Lucemburků do národních jazyků*, in: *Cesta k rozmanitosti aneb Kavárenský povaleč digitálním historikem středověku. Sborník příspěvků k životnímu jubileu PhDr. Zdeňka Uhlíře*, Praha 2016, pp. 65–77.

13 Cf. A. ŠKARKA, *Básnická legenda v literatuře českého středověku*, Praha 1959, pp. 11–13.

OPEN ACCESS

These were not the true lives of saints, but rather fantastical and exciting narratives with exotic features.[14]

Similar tendencies to the Old Czech Alexandreis are expressed in the only slightly younger Old Czech Chronicle of so called Dalimil, written originally in Czech.[15] These second retellings of Czech national history, written for the nobility and expressing their perspective on the history of their state and nation, in contrast to the oldest writing of this type, Cosmas's Chronicle of Bohemia, were translated into Latin in the second quater of the 14th century.[16] The wonderfully illuminated manuscript on which the translation was written was clearly designed for a high-born, high-status figure. Some think it may have been written for the heir to the Czech throne, the young Charles of Luxembourg, who after his seven-year stay in France did not yet speak Czech. [17] Unfortunately, only a fragment of this translation remains. But even this testifies to the fact that a large section of the chronicle was translated, and most likely the full text.[18]

In around the 1340s, the Chronicle of so called Dalimil was transcribed into Middle High German verse.[19] It appears to have been translated by a member of

14 Cf. J. HRABÁK (ed.), *Dějiny české literatury* I. pp. 98–99.

15 J. DAŇHELKA — K. HÁDEK — B. HAVRÁNEK et al. (eds.), *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila. Vydání textu a veškerého textového materiálu*, 1–2, Praha 1988.

16 Národní knihovna České republiky (National Library of the Czech Republic) purchased a fragment of the manuscript found by chance in October 2005, sign. XII. E. 17. A description and analysis including an attempt at its interpretation was given at the time by A. VIDMANOVÁ, *Nad pařížskými zlomky latinského Dalimila*, in: Slovo a smysl. Časopis pro mezioborová bohemistická studia. 3, 2006, pp. 25–67. Zdeněk Uhlíř looked in detail at these fragments of manuscript, also placing them within their historical context. See in particular Z. UHLÍŘ, *Nově objevený zlomek latinského překladu Kroniky tak řečeného Dalimila*, in: Knihovna 16, 2005, pp. 137–164.

17 Cf. A. VIDMANOVÁ, *Nad pařížskými zlomky* p. 65. Stated hypotheses are summarised by P. ČERNÝ, *Pařížský fragment kroniky tzv. Dalimila a jeho iluminátorská výzdoba*, Olomouc 2010, pp. 144–162.

18 Cf. Z. UHLÍŘ, *Nově objevený zlomek*, p. 143.

19 J. EMLER (ed.), *Di tutsch kronik von Behem lant wirt zcu rim wol bekant*, in: Prameny dějin českých / Fontes rerum Bohemicarum (further only FRB) III, Praha 1882, pp. 5–224; V. BROM (ed.), *Di tutsch kronik von Behem lant: die gereimte deutsche Übersetzung der Alttschechischen Dalimil-Chronik,* Brno 2009, pp. 102–585. Basic information on the manuscript and chronicle translation is given by A. TOMSA, *Rýmovaný německý překlad t. zv. kroniky Dalimilovy a poměr jeho k české předloze*, in: Časopis pro moderní filologii 4, 1915, pp. 35–48. An overview of research and analysis of this translation is given by Z. MASAŘÍK, *Zur Sprache der mittelhochdeutschen Dalimilchronik*, in: Brünner Beiträge zur Germanistik und Nordistik, Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity K 12, 1991, pp. 51–64. From relatively large newer literature it is necessary to draw attention to: P. HILSCH, *Di tutsch kronik von Behem lant. Der Verfasser der Dalimilübertragung und die deutschböhmische Identität*, in: K. HERBERS — H. H. KORTÜM — C. SERVATIUS (eds.), *Ex ipsis rerum documentis. Beiträge zur Mediävistik. Festschrift für H. Zimmermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, Sigmaringen 1991, pp. 103–115. To date and used language cf. V. BROM, *Zu einigen historisch-semantischen Spezifika des Spätmittelhochdeutschen in den böhmischen Ländern. Am Beispiel der gereimten deutschen Übersetzung der Alttschechsichen Reimchronik des sogenannten Dalimil*, in:

OPEN ACCESS

the Czech-German clergy living on the right bank of the Vltava, perhaps one of the knights at the Knights of the Cross with the Red Star monastery,[20] in order that his fellow knights, and also members of other orders with mainly German membership, could read it or rather hear. The translator may also have been aiming for members of the Prague patriciate as his readers.[21] Its verse form made it suitable to be read over shared meals, particularly within military orders whose members were not greatly literate and who would better absorb and remember verses when read to them.[22] It appears that this translation was not the only attempt at transcribing the Dalimil Chronicle into German, as suggested by two pairs of verses preserved by chance which clearly come from the Dalimil Chronicle, but which are different from the translation we know of.[23]

The only preserved manuscript[24] of the versed German translation of the Chronicle of so called Dalimil contains as an introduction other German versed text known as the (German) Versed Chronicles,[25] or the 'Abriss', or 'Outline'.[26] It contains a brief history of Bohemia from the first mythical princes to the start of the 1340s (1342). This is a translation of Latin texts, specifically a catalog of Czech rulers from the first, mythical, prince Přemysl the Ploughman to John of Bohemia (1310–1346),[27] and annalistic records mostly of well-known historiographic texts. We do not know who the arranger and translator of the chronicles is. From their content, one can surmise that he was likely from amongst the clergy. He may well also have been

Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity, R 9, 2004, pp. 199–235. Any relationship between the possibly contemporaneous translations (into Latin and into German) has not yet been determined. Cf. Z. UHLÍŘ, *Nově objevený zlomek*, p. 144.

20 As identified by author P. HILSCH, *Di tutsch kronik*, p. 115. Cf. also A. VIDMANOVÁ, *Nad pařížskými zlomky*, p. 59; with reservations V. BROM (ed.), *Di tutsch kronik*, pp. 18–19.

21 Cf. M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Překlady*, pp. 70–71.

22 A number of versed vernacular writings were produced for the Teutonic Order. See in particular U. ARNOLD, *Deutschordenshistoriographie im Deutschen Reich*, in: Die Rolle der Ritterorden in der mittelalterlichen Kultur, Toruń 1985, pp. 65–87; U. ARNOLD, *Geschichtsschreibung im Preußenland bis zum Anfang des 16. Jahrhunderts*, in: Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands 19, 1970, pp. 74–126; in brief M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Staročeská kronika*, p. 50n.

23 Cf. G. DUNPHY, *Merborts Chronicon: Eine mittelhochdeutsche Dalimilübersetzung bei Martin Opitz*, in: Euphorion, Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte 107,3, 2013, pp. 260.

24 Library of the Prague Metropolitan Chapter G 45, fol. 1r–6v.

25 J. EMLER (ed.), *Veršované letopisy*, in: FRB IV, pp. 231–237; V. BROM (ed.), *Di tutsch kronik*, pp. 84–101. On this source, see especially P. HILSCH, *Di tutsch Chronik*, pp. 109–111; V. BROM, *Der sog. „Abriss" und sein Verhältnis zur deutschen Reimübersetzung der Dalimil-Chronik*, in: Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity R 10, 2005, pp.137–149; J. ZOUHAR, *Im Schatten der deutschen Reimübertragung der Dalimil-Chronik- Versannalen (der so genannte „Abriss" aus dem 14. Jahrhundert). (Ein Beitrag zur mittelalterlichen deutschsprachigen Literatur in Böhmen)*, in: Listy filologické 130, 2007, 1–2, pp. 21–42.

26 Cf. V. BROM (ed.), *Di tutsch kronik*, p. 29.

27 J. EMLER (ed.), *Veršované letopisy*, FRB III, pp. 23 –237; V. BROM (ed.), *Di tutsch kronik*, pp. 84–88. For the catalogue of Czech rulers, see M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Středověké katalogy českých knížat a králů a jejich pramenná hodnota*, Średniowiecze polskie i powszechne 1, Katowice 1999, pp. 33–63.

a member of the Order of the Cross, and was undoubtedly a supporter of John of Bohemia.[28]

OPEN ACCESS

TRANSLATIONS OF HISTORICAL WRITINGS FROM THE REIGN OF CHARLES IV

Under the reign of Charles IV, translations of historic works even received official support. Encyclopaedias and dictionaries could be used for translations,[29] which were probably produced mainly for university students to help them improve their — usually poor — knowledge of Latin.[30] These contained not just translations of terms, but also a logically organised overview of knowledge at the time. The greatest works of lexicography were the Latin-Czech dictionaries of Bartoloměj of Chlumec, known as Claretus de Solencia, Klaret,[31] produced in the early 1360s. They included terminology from all known disciplines. History, which was not a separate discipline at the time, is only mentioned peripherally in the dictionary with regard to theology and church terminology (beside allegory, anagoge and tropology). The terms for these disciplines are literal translations from Greek. The Czech equivalents for *history* were the expressions *wydorzeczie* or *vidnost* (from *vídati*, *viděti* = to see).[32] In the section "Artes", *kronycze is given as the Czech equivalent to the Latin term cronographie*.[33]

In terms of historical and related writings, some of the most important translated works of Charles IV's era are the translations of the official historical records, Charles' autobiography[34] and the Bohemian Chronicle of Přibík Pulkava of Radenín.[35] Charles'

28 Suggested by insertions into the draft text. Cf. P. HILSCH, *Di tutsch kronik*, p. 111; J. ZOUHAR, *Im Schatten*, pp. 29–30.

29 Cf. Z. HLADKÁ, *České slovníkářství na cestě k jednojazyčnému výkladovému slovníku*, Naše řeč 88, 2005, nr. 3, pp. 140–159.

30 On the level of Latin in the Czech lands at this time, see A. VIDMANOVÁ, *Mistr Klaret a jeho spisy*, in: *Laborintus. Latinská literatura středověkých Čech*, Praha 1994, pp. 150–163.

31 V. FLAJŠHANS (ed.), *Klaret a jeho družina. 1. Slovníky veršované*, Praha 1926, *2. Texty glossované*, Praha 1928. On the authors name and identification see B. RYBA, *Nové jméno mistra Klareta*, in: Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk 1943, tř. filos.-hist.-filol. n. V, pp. 1–13; B. RYBA, *Klaretovo autorství Enigmatiku*, in: Listy filologické 64, 1937, pp. 266–267; F. M. BARTOŠ, *Claretus de Solencia a Petrus Clarificator*, in: Listy filologické 60, 1933, pp. 153–157; IDEM, *Ještě jednou o mistru Klaretovi*, Český časopis historický 2, 1943/44, pp. 143–147. Cf. also A. VIDMANOVÁ, *Prolegomena k latinským spisům Mistra Klareta*, in: Listy filologické 101, 1978, pp. 193–207; A. VIDMANOVÁ, *Mistr Klaret*, pp. 150–163; Z. HLADKÁ, *České slovníkářství*, pp. 141–143.

32 Klaret, Vokabulář, 329–330. Cf. V. FLAJŠHANS, *Klaret a jeho družina. I. Slovníky veršované*, Praha 1926, p. 18; Mg. Clareti de Solentia Glossarium, 47/2449, *ibidem*, p. 194.

33 Cf. Mg. Clareti de Solentia Glossarium 34/1629, p. 164.

34 J. EMLER (ed.), *Život císaře Karla IV.*, FRB III, pp. 369–395 (Czech text). To the age of both translations cf. V. KYAS, *Stáří dvou staročeských překladů Životopisu Karla IV.*, in: Listy filologické 93, 1970, pp. 271–275.

35 J. EMLER, J. GEBAUER (eds.), *Přibíka z Radenína řečeného Pulkavy Kronika česká*, (also quoted as *Kronika Pulkavova*), FRB V, Praha 1893, pp. 3–207 (Latin text), pp. 211–326

OPEN ACCESS

autobiography was probably first translated into Czech while he was still alive. The translation is fairly loose. It has been preserved in four manuscripts, all from the 15th or early 16th century.[36] In the 15th century, Charles' autobiography was translated into Czech again, this time with slavish precision. It appears that this translation was not widely read, and is currently known from just one manuscript.[37] A third Czech translation of this work is also known from one manuscript from the first quarter of the 17th century, although as yet this has not received attention from researchers.[38]

The Bohemian Chronicle of Přibík Pulkava of Radenín, the third Czech state national chronicle, was probably also translated into Czech during Charles IV's lifetime. This tells of the history of the Czech nation and state from its mythical beginnings in the spirit of court ideology and propaganda in accordance with the ideas of Charles IV. In its widest reviews, the second and sixth,[39] it describes the history of the 'lands of the Bohemian Crown' up to the end of the 1320s. The Czech translation was made according to the final, sixth chronicle version. It goes up to the year 1330 and also contains the history of Brandenburg, which Charles IV acquired in 1373. The translator also took the second version of the chronicle into account, however. This covers the same period of time, however it does not contain Brandenburgica, but it does divide the text into chapters. According to explicit of the chronicle, the Czech translation should be made by its author himself.[40] This does not indicate the nature of the translation, however. It does not always correspond to the Latin text, sometimes even stating its opposite. It seems that the translator did not understand the Latin text properly, and furthermore had problems converting dates and names.[41] The in-

(Czech text). On this chronicle, its genesis and the nature of official historical records during Charles IV's era, see M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Přibíka Pulkavy z Radenína Kronika česká* in: M. BLÁHOVÁ — J. ERŠIL — J. ZACHOVÁ (eds.), *Kroniky doby Karla IV.*, pp. 572–580, 590–593; M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Offizielle Geschichtsschreibung in der mittelalterlichen böhmischen Ländern*, in: J. WENTA (ed.), *Die Geschichtsschreibung in Mitteleuropa*, Toruń 1999 (= Subsidia historiographica I), pp. 32–39; M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Die Hofgeschichtsschreibung am böhmischen Herrscherhof im Mittelalter*, in: R. SCHIEFFER — J. WENTA (eds.), *Die Hofgeschichtsschreibung im mittelalterlichen Europa*, Toruń 2006 (= Subsidia historiographica 3), pp. 65–67; M. BLÁHOVÁ — V. BOK, *Pulkava of Radenín, Přibík*, in: G. DUNPHY (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* (further only EMC), Leyden — Boston 2010, pp. 1246–1247.

36 Cf. M. SVOBODOVÁ, *Několik poznámek k obsahu a osudům znovunalezeného litoměřického rukopisu Pulkavovy kroniky*, in: Miscellanea 16, 1999–2000, Praha 2002, pp. 93–117; M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Literární činnost Karla IV.*, in: M. BLÁHOVÁ — J. ERŠIL — J. ZACHOVÁ (eds.), *Kroniky doby Karla IV.*, Praha 1987, pp. 562–263.

37 Moravský zemský archiv v Brně, G 10, č. 114. J. Emler and other authors after him considered this manuscript to be older because of its close similarity to the original, something later research has refuted. Cf. V. KYAS, *Stáří*, pp. 271, 275.

38 Národní knihovna ČR XIX A 50, fol. 134v-144r. Cf. A. RICHTEROVÁ, *Děčínské rukopisy ze sbírky Františka Martina Pelcla (1734–1801), nyní ve fondech Národní knihovny České republiky*, Praha 2007, p. 112.

39 On the genesis and reviews of Pulkava's chronicle, see M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Přibíka Pulkavy z Radenína Kronika česká*, pp. 573–577.

40 *Kronika Pulkavova*, p. 211.

41 Cf. M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Přibíka Pulkavy z Radenína Kronika česká*, pp. 576–577.

OPEN ACCESS

formation on the translator clearly just paraphrases the Latin text describing Přibík Pulkava of Radenín as the chronicle's author.[42] The chronicle's Czech translation was mainly used by Czech nobility. Its members acquired richly illuminated manuscripts of this work also in the 16th century.[43]

THE BLOOM OF TRANSLATIONS OF HISTORICAL WRITINGS DURING THE REIGN OF WENCESLAS IV

The 'Golden Era' for translations of historical (and pseudohistorical) writings into Czech, however, was during the rule of Charles' son and successor, Wenceslas IV. The university which Charles IV founded and supported, along with parish schools which now operated in every city, town and smaller town and where the university's graduates worked as teachers,[44] made an important contribution to promoting written culture and supporting readers of literary works. Now it was not just clergy, members of the Royal Court and the nobility who were able to read and be aware of literature, including historical writings, but also an audience within towns and cities. Although these people went to Latin schools, they preferred the vernacular language. It was for them that translations of Latin writings into Czech were made. But even the clergy often preferred Czech texts.

At about the end of the 14th century, the well-known and widespread biblical history textbook, *Historia scholastica*, by Petrus of Troyes, known as Comestor or Manducator (†1178), was translated into Czech.[45] The oldest version of the Czech translation has been preserved in the fragments of the Glagolitic manuscript written for Prague's Na Slovanech monastery (Emmaus), a Benedictine monastery in which the liturgy was run in Old Slavonic.[46] Further — a total of three are known — manuscripts are written in Latin script.[47] The oldest of these dates back to 1404. None, however, contain the text of the whole textbook, but complement each other. The translation keeps

42 *Kronika Pulkavova*, pp. 207, 211.

43 Cf. M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Přibíka Pulkavy z Radenína Kronika česká*, pp. 578–579.

44 Cf. M. SVATOŠ (ed.), *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy I, 1347/48–1622*, Praha 1995; F. ŠMAHEL, *Nižší školy na Podblanicku a Vltavsku do roku 1526*, in: Sborník vlastivědných prací z Podblanicka 19, 1978, pp. 133–171; M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Pražské školy předuniverzitního období*, in: Škola a město. Sborník příspěvků z konference „Škola a město", konané ve dnech 5.–6. října 1992, Documenta Pragensia XI, 1993, pp. 26–39.

45 Cf. M. SHERWOOD — P. SMITH, *Comestor*, in: G. DUNPHY (ed.), EMC 1, pp. 1200–1201.

46 Cf. L. PACNEROVÁ, *Úvod*, in: L. PACNEROVÁ (ed.), *Staročeský hlaholský Comestor*, Praha 2002 (= Práce Slovanského ústavu AV ČR, Nová řada 11), p. XXIII. Other old Czech texts were also written in Glagolitic, in particular the Bible, the Passional, perhaps even the Golden Legend. Overview by L. PACNEROVÁ, *Úvod*, s, XXXVI; A. VIDMANOVÁ, *K původní podobě a textové tradici staročeského pasionálu*, in: Listy filologické 108, 1895, pp. 16–45.

47 The genesis of the text is provided by L. PACNEROVÁ, *Úvod*, pp. XXIII, XXIX. A description of the manuscripts is given by J. V. NOVÁK, *Úvod*, in: J. V. NOVÁK (ed.), *Petra Comestora Historia scholastica*, Praha 1910, pp. VII–XIII. J. V. Novák, however, did not know of the Glagolitic text's relationship to the manuscripts written in Latin script which was identified through further discoveries of Glagolitic fragments.

OPEN ACCESS

to the original, with nothing left out or added. He created new words for terms which did not have a Czech equivalent, most of these again being a literal transcript (e.g. 'vidopis', "a description of what has been seen", for *historia*).[48] There are some sections which the translator appears not to have understood properly, meaning there are numerous errors in the translation. In later copies, some errors are corrected, likely in accordance with the Latin original.[49] These younger transcripts were amended in various ways, with some parts of the text being left out, or in turn being supplemented. The translator of the School History was from the clergy, perhaps even one of the Slavic monks at the Emmaus monastery. It is possible that the translation was made along with the Old Czech translation of the Bible.[50] Besides the clergy, the laity were also interested in the Czech version of Comestor's manuscript. The oldest preserved manuscript mentioned was made in 1404, allegedly 'in memory of Mr. Laut (?), the highest Burgrave of Prague'.[51]

Likely because of his interest in foreign locations, especially Rome[52], the era of Charles IV likely led to the production of the Old Czech version of Gesta Romanorum in the second half of the 14th century. This was a collection of exempla whose tales were set in Rome and whose main characters were Roman rulers, although mostly mythical.[53] The Old Czech version is one of the oldest versions of Gesta Romanorum in Europe written in a vernacular language.[54] The translation was made in accordance with the Latin wording, word-for-word in places.[55] Its tales were used by preachers as exempla for preaching, but they were also used in lay literature and folk poetry.[56]

Under Wenceslas IV, however, the main centre of Czech intellectual life, in addition to the university, was the Royal Court. The nobility residing at the court, es-

48 Cf. J. V. NOVÁK, *Úvod*, p. XV.

49 Cf. J. V. NOVÁK, *Úvod*, pp. XIV–XV.

50 Cf. V. KYAS, *Úvod*, in: V. KYAS (ed.), *Staročeská bible drážďanská a olomoucká. Kritické vydání nejstaršího českého překladu bible ze 14. století*, I, Praha 1981, pp. 11–14; V. KYAS, *Česká bible*, p. 27; V. KYAS, *Vznik staročeského biblického překladu*, in: Mezinárodní vědecká konference Doba Karla IV. v dějinách národů ČSSR. Materiály ze sekce jazyka a literatury, Praha 1981, pp. 48–54; J. VRAŠTIL, *České překlady*, p. 335; J. VAŠICA, *Eseje a studie ze starší české literatury*, Opava 2001, pp. 149–150.

51 Cf. J. B. NOVÁK, *Úvod*, p. VII. Apparently there is meant Filip Laut (Loukota) of Dědice, who appears between 1396–1412 as the hunter on Křivoklát, also the highest hunter, and burgrave at the castle of Týřov. The highest burgrave in the years 1403–1407 was Jan Krušina of Lichtenberg. Cf. F. PALACKÝ, *Přehled současný nejvyšších důstojníků a úředníků*, ed. Jaroslav Charvát, in: Dílo Františka Palackého I, Praha 1941, pp. 344, 347; V. V. TOMEK, *Dějepis města Prahy* V, 2 ed. Praha 1905, p. 47; A. SEDLÁČEK, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze Království českého, 8. Rakovnicko a Slánsko*, Praha 1891, pp. 22, 65.

52 Cf. H. PROCHÁZKOVÁ, *Die Entstehung der tschechischen, polnischen und russischen Gesta Romanorum*, in: Zeitschrift für Slavistik 11, 1966, pp. 1–24.

53 J. V. NOVÁK (ed.), *Staročeská Gesta Romanorum*, Praha 1895. Cf. also J. HRABÁK (ed.), *Dějiny české literatury* I, p. 137; M. ŠVÁB, *Příběhy římské — Gesta Romanorum v literárním vývoji*, in: Příběhy římské (Staročeská Gesta Romanorum), Praha 1967, pp. 7–17.

54 Cf. M. ŠVÁB, *Příběhy římské*, pp. 12–13.

55 Cf. J. V. NOVÁK, *Staročeská gesta Romanorum*, p. XX.

56 Cf. J. V. NOVÁK, *Úvod*, p. XII.

OPEN ACCESS

pecially noble ladies, were interested in educational and other literature in Czech. German chivalric epics were produced in Czech in the second half of the 14th century, probably for the Royal Court and the courts of the nobility. Although these were usually modelled on historical figures and have real historical settings, they are fantastic tales made to entertain court society.[57] They are entirely unrelated to historic facts. The texts spread to the widest social classes as fictional narratives, where they were perceived as entertainment literature.

Similarly, the subjects of ancient history known in the Middle Ages from Latin texts, such as the history of the Trojan War and the tales of Alexander the Great, were transferred to a fictional level, interwoven with fantastic tales and became fiction for entertainment. The stories of Alexander the Great in particular met this fate. While the versed Alexandreis from the end of the 13th century kept to the original material to a certain extent and presented Alexander as a historical figure, albeit with the character and virtues of a mediaeval ruler, the prosaic stories of Alexander the Great from the second half of the 14th century now represented Alexander purely as a hero starring in fantastic adventures.[58]

Also in the second half of the 14th century, Guido delle Collone's *Historia destruccionis Troiae* was first translated into Czech. We do not know who translated it. He translated it fairly loosely, attempting to capture the essence of the Latin text, but moving it onto a new level: he was not describing the life and fall of Troy, but the demise of (any) wealthy town destroyed for the sins of its population.[59] Although 'this chronicle does not state the time or year from the creation of the world that the conquering and destruction of the city of Troy occurred,'[60] the History of the Destruction of Troy was perceived as a work of history. The history of Troy was very popular in mediaeval Bohemia, and was well-known throughout a wide cross-section of society. The fall of Troy for the sins of its population was a topic for preachers, and the Trojan War was a popular theme for decorations on the walls of buildings.[61] — Master Jan Hus complained at the beginning of the 15th century that people painted 'Trojan battles' and other profane topics on their walls instead of the Passion of Christ or the Virgin Mary. — In the 1470s, the History of the Fall of Troy — Trojan Chronicle was the first work printed in Czech, and perhaps the first printed work in Bohemia.[62]

We do not know who the translators of most of these works are. There are some exceptions, however, where the translator has given his name on the translated text.

57 Cf. E. PETRŮ, *Rytířský epos a jeho proměny*, in: E. PETRŮ — D. MAREČKOVÁ (eds.), *Rytířské srdce majíce. Česká epika 14. století*, Praha 1984, pp. 7–22.

58 Cf. J. HRABÁK (ed.), Dějiny české literatury I, pp. 137–138.

59 Cf., L. VARCL (ed.), *Antika*, p. 73.

60 Cf. Historia destructionis Troiae (Trojánská kronika), Národní knihovna České republiky, sign. 39. F. 30, fol. 95v.

61 Cf. A. MOLNÁR, *Mistr Jan Hus, Výklady / Magistri Johannis Hus Opera Omnia, Tomus I, Expositiones Bohemicae*, Praha 1975, chapter. 35 H, p. 138; L. VARCL (ed.), *Antika*, pp. 73–74.

62 Dated 1468. Cf. *Knihopis československých tisků od doby nejstarší až do konce CXVIII. století, I. Prvotisky (do 1500)*, Praha 1925, nr. 7, p. 25. On dating, see E. URBÁNKOVÁ, *Nejstarší prvotisky českého původu*, in: F. ŠMAHEL (ed.), *Knihtisk a kniha v českých zemích od husitství do Bílé hory*, Praha 1970, pp. 15–59, mainly pp. 30–39; P. VOIT, *Encyklopedie knihy*, Praha 2006, pp. 501–503.

OPEN ACCESS

In the second half of the 1390s or the early 15th century, the well-travelled knight, Beneš of Hořovice († winter 1422/23)[63], then Burgrave at the castle of Rabštejn in West Bohemia,[64] wrote a universal chronicle from the birth of Christ in accordance with the Martinian Chronicle, which in its imperial section is a Czech translation of the German chronicle of Jakob Twinger of Königshofen.[65] Beneš of Hořovice translated the papal section from Latin according to the papal section of Martin of Opava's Chronicle of Popes and Emperors.[66] In 1488, Beneš of Hořovice's chronicle was published with the name 'Martimiani'.[67]

Another translator who has not remained anonymous and who proclaimed authorship of his translation and writing work was Master Laurentius (Vavřinec) of Březová,[68] 'servant to King Wenceslas',[69] later author of the most important historical writings on the Hussite Revolution, the Hussite Chronicles and Song of Victory at Domažlice.[70] Laurentius of Březová was a member of the lower nobility who acquired a master's title at the artistic faculty at Prague University and registered for Law, but clearly did not complete his studies. He took up and rotated a number of ecclesiastical beneficies over time, but left his deputies to perform their duties. He resided in Prague, where he in the course of time owned several houses. Probably due to family contacts, he got to the Royal Court, where he in all likelihood worked in the offices. He also maintained permanent contacts with the university. After the Hussite Revolution broke out and after the death of Wenceslas IV, he worked as a city clerk in Prague New Town, where he probably died in 1437 or shortly thereafter.

63 He travelled to Santiago de Compostela in 1492, which he later commemorated by the use of the name 'overseas knight'. For this journey, see B. BAĎURA, *Styky mezi českým královstvím a Španělskem ve středověku*, in: Táborský archiv 7, 1995–1996, pp. 5–87.

64 Beneš of Hořovice's career is examined by V. Bok, *Zur Rezeption der Weltchronik Jakob Twingers von Königshofen in Böhmen*, in: D. FLIEGER — V. BOK (eds.), *Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters in Böhmen und über Böhmen*, Wien 2001, pp. 269–284. Cf. also J. DOBROVSKÝ, *Nachrichten von Beneš von Horzowitz und seiner Chronik*, in: Literarisches Magazin von Böhmen und Mähren, II, 1796, pp. 146–154; A. SEDLÁČEK, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze Království českého*, 6, Praha 1889, p. 183; 13, Praha 1905, p. 139; 14, Praha 1924, p. 154; M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Beneš z Hořovic*, in: P. VOŠAHLÍKOVÁ (ed.), *Biografický slovník českých zemí I*, Praha 2006, p. 400; Eadem, *Beneš of Hořovice*, in: G. DUNPHY (ed.), EMC 1, pp. 166–167.

65 Cf. A. MATTHEWS, *Twinger, Jakob, von Könighofen*, in: G. DUNPHY (ed.), EMC 2, pp. 1456–1457.

66 Cf. A.-D. VON DEN BRINCKEN, *Martin of Opava*, in: G. DUNPHY (ed.), EMC 2, pp. 1085–1088.

67 *Knihopis*, nr. 22, p. 30–31.

68 Cf. M. BLÁHOVÁ, *M. Vavřinec z Březové a jeho dílo*, in: M. BLÁHOVÁ — F. HEŘMANSKÝ — J. B. ČAPEK (eds.), *Vavřinec z Březové, Husitská kronika. Píseň o vítězství u Domažlic*, Praha 1979, pp. 305–316, 380–389; BLÁHOVÁ, *Laurentius of Březová*, in: G. DUNPHY (ed.), EMC 2, pp. 1000–1001.; P. ČORNEJ, *Rozhled, názory a postoje husitské inteligence v zrcadle dějepisectví 15. století*, Praha 1986, pp. 20–29, 174–178.

69 He referred to himself thus in the forward to the Czech translation of Mandeville's travel memoir and the World Chronicle. Cf. K. J. ERBEN (ed.), *Výbor z literatury české* II, Praha 1969, p. 588; Národní knihovna České republiky XVII F 47, fol. 1r.

70 Ed. Vavřince z Březové Kronika husitská, ed. J. GOLL, FRB V, Praha 1893, pp. 327–541; *Vavřinec z Březové, Píseň o vítězství u Domažlic*, edd. K. HRDINA — B. RYBA, transl. J. B. ČAPEK, Praha 1951; M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Laurentius of Březová*, in: G. DUNPHY (ed.), EMC 2, pp. 1000–1001.

OPEN ACCESS

At the Court, he proved himself in particular as a translator of Latin and German literary and official texts into Czech.[71] He won a certain renown through this activity, not just as a translator, but also a distorter of the truth.[72] Laurentius of Březová gave the court audience access to a number of popular writings of the time. He translated *Somniarium Slaidae*, the Latin version of Arab Achmet ben Sirin's († 728/9)[73] book of dreams, very well-known in the Middle Ages, which was made in the second half of the 12th century by the official translator at the Constantinople Court, Leo Tuscus.[74] Laurentius of Březová dedicated the dream book to King Wenceslas.[75] The fact that Laurentius foreward was dedicated to the ruler did not mean that his dedication was just mechanically copied. — Laurentius of Březová attached his own forward to the translated text in which he pondered the question of whether to believe dreams, amongst other matters.[76]

Another work translated by Laurentius of Březová is one of the most widespread mediaeval travel memoirs, the fantastical work by the alleged John Mandeville. He translated it into Czech from the German translation by canon of Metz Otto von Diemeringen († 1398). Laurentius of Březová also translated Otto's forward, in which Otto was listed as the translator into German, and he also added his own, in which he stated that he 'translated this book from the German tongue into Czech.'[77]

The historical work, Laurentius of Březová's World Chronicle, was not a simple translation, but a loose interpretation of universal history according to the most well-known mediaeval universal Chronicles. Laurentius of Březová did not finish his World Chronicle. He covered the period from the creation of the world until the prophet Daniel in accordance with Petrus Comestor's *Historia scholastica*, and the period from year 3 to year 678 in accordance with Martin of Opava's Chronicle of Popes and Emperors. It is said that Laurentius of Březová wrote the World Chronicle at the request of royal chamberlain, Jan of Eisenberk.[78] In contrast to Beneš of Hořovice's World Chronicle, Laurentius work, again likely meant for the court, was not particu-

71 In addition to translations of several literary writings, he translated also the privileges of the New Town of Prague into Czech. Cf. F. PALACKÝ (ed.), *Staří letopisové čeští od roku 1378 do 1527 čili pokračování v kronikách Přibíka Pulkavy a Beneše z Hořovic z rukopisů starých vydané*, in: J. CHARVÁT (ed.), *Dílo Františka Palackého II*, Praha 1941, pp. 98–99.

72 Cf. *O zajetí Sigmunda Korybuta v Praze dne 17. dubna 1427*, in: K. J. ERBEN (ed.), *Výbor z literatury* II, col. 314, l. 18–21.

73 According to M.-T. d'ALVERNY, *Translations and Translators*, in: *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Toronto 1991, p. 438, 'Achmet' was a Byzantine compilation thus named in honour of the Arab dream interpretations.

74 On the forward, C. H. HASKINS, *Leo Tuscus*, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 24, Nr. 1, 1924, pp. 43–47; M.-T. D'ALVERNY, *Translations and Translators*, p. 438.

75 Č. ZÍBRT (ed.), *Vavřince z Březové Snář velmi pěkný*, Praha 1908; dedication ibidem, pp. 4–5. On this work of Vavřinec of Březová cf. F. V. VYKOUKAL, *O snech a výkladech snů*, Praha 1898; F. KRAJNÍK — J. KOLÁŘOVÁ, *Prolegomena k české středověké verzi Achmetova Osqeirokritikon, její pražské latinské předloze a řeckému originálu*, in: Listy filologické 135/3–4, 2012, pp. 287–331.

76 Cf. Moravská zemská knihovna (Moravian Library). sign. MK 14, fol. 1r.

77 Cf. K. J. ERBEN, *Výbor* II., col. 587–588.

78 Národní knihovna ČR, sign. XVII F 47, fol. 1. 1r.

OPEN ACCESS

larly widely read. One manuscript of the text has been preserved, and this is likely an autograph of the chronicle.

Other translations of historic, or rather pseudohistoric works, were made within the Court. On the orders of Wenceslas IV's mintmaster, Petr Zmrzlík of Svojšín, Guido delle Colonne's *Historia destruccionis Troiae* was again translated into Czech in 1411. This translation was looser than the older Czech version, and furthermore was not so popular. Only a fragment of his text has been preserved.[79]

The subsequent period, the period of the Hussite Revolution, when literature of various types were used for propaganda purposes in support of and in opposition to the revolution, represents a separate chapter in terms of vernacular texts and translations.

TRANSLATIONS OF THE CZECH HISTORICAL WRITINGS OUTSIDE OF BOHEMIA

In the meantime, the coexistence between the heart of the Czech state, Bohemia and Moravia, and so-called incorporated lands of the Bohemian Crown led to a situation, when the incorporated lands representatives started to identify with the Czech state and begun to look for common past. While the Silesian intellectuals conceived the common Czech-Silesian history,[80] for the German inhabitants of Lusatia, mainly for the burghers of Zittau, both tracts, Charles' autobiography and Přibík Pulkava's Chronicle of Bohemia, as well as catalog of the Czech rulers were translated into German.[81] We do not know exactly when these translations were taken. Only one manuscript, currently missing, from the second half of the 15th century, survived into the modern era. The text of Pulkava's chronicle it contained corresponded to the fifth review of the chronicle, reaching only up to 1307.[82]

Nevertheless, the Hussite revolution provoked an interest in Bohemia and in the Czech history in the neighbouring countries. The interest in a country "where live the worst people of our times", who refused obedience to the Roman Church, who trampled on their father's faith, who murdered Christ's servants, who disrupted the temples of the Saints and who live without faith, without good manners, in heist, adultery and all possible immorality, undefeated by the most powerful kings, countless nations, the most experienced generals or perfectly armed armies,[83] this interest was

79 Cf. L. VARCL (ed.), *Antika*, p. 72.

80 Cf. M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Společné dějiny? Slezská redakce anonymní „české kroniky" 15. století*, in: *Slezsko — země Koruny české. Historie a kultura 1300–1740*, Díl A, Praha 2008, pp. 233–243.

81 We do not know when these translations were made. The only manuscript containing both writings, City Library Wrocław, sign. R 304, fol. 160r–259r), was made in Zittau in the second half of the 15th century. It has been missing since the Second World War.

82 A detailed description of the manuscript is given by J. EMLER, *O rukopise knihovny městské ve Vratislavi, kde jest překlad německý kroniky Pulkavovy života Karla IV. Přednáška v KČSN 8. října 1877*, in: Zprávy o zasedání královské české společnosti nauk v Praze, Vol. 1877, Praha 1878, pp. 359–367. According to the letters, Josef Emler placed the copy of Charles' autobiography and the preceding Chronicle of Přibík Puklava of Radenín at the end of the third or beginning of the fourth quarter of the 15th century (Ibidem, p. 359).

83 Cf. *Enea Silvio, Historia Bohemica / Historie česká*, in: D. MARTÍNKOVÁ — A. HADRAVOVÁ —

OPEN ACCESS

expressed mainly in Bavaria. At the same time, it was inspired by the Bavarian monastic humanism,[84] and also by the humanistically oriented laic intellectual circles. The interest in the Czech history was being satisfied not only through the historical documents about contemporary revolutionary events, which was the domain of an Augustinian Friar Andreas from the St Mang's monastery in Regensburg,[85] but also through the translations of the Czech retrospective nation and state history. The national chronicles from the John of Bohemia's and Charles IV`s era played an important role.

Before the middle of the 15th century, the Chronicle of so called Dalimil was again translated into German, this time in the prosaic form as *Die pehemische Cronica dewcz*.[86] This translation is substantially more accurate than the late version in verse, where the translator would translate the Czech verses into German prose. The translation exists in two language mutations, the older one, High German, was written in Bavaria, probably in the Regensburg Benedictine Saint Emmeram's Abbey and can be found in the Abbey's manuscript from 1444 and in its later copy, which was procured also by one of the Saint Emmeram's Abbey's monks in the first third of the 16th century.[87] The copy, but also the fact that the text got outside the abbey's walls to a region with different dialects, is evidence that the interest in the Czech history was no random hobby of some monk, even someone from Czech lands living in Bavarian monasteries.[88] The younger version of this translation preserved in a folder of diplomatic and historic texts from the end of the 15th century stored in the University Library of Leipzig.[89] This translation contains mostly Central German elements. In contrast to the translation in verse, this version contains an introduction, which is a loose paraphrasis of the Czech text, but the main ideas of the original introduction

J. MÁTL (eds.), intr. F. ŠMAHEL, Praha 1998, p. 2; J. HEJNIC. H. ROTHE (eds.), Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, Historia Bohemica, I, Köln - Weimar - Wien 2005, pp. 6, 8.

84 On the Bavarian monastery humanism cf. F. MACHILEK, *Klosterhumanismus in Nürnberg um 1500*, in: Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg 64, 1997, pp. 10–45; A. SCHMID, *Bayerischer Klosterhumanismus. Das Benediktinerkloster Oberalteich*, in: F. J. FELTEN — A. KEHNEL — S. Weinfurter (eds.), Institution und Charisma. Festschrift für Gert Melville zum 65. Geburtstag, Köln — Weimar — Wien 2005, pp. 171–181.

85 Cf. B. STUDT, *Andreas of Regensburg*, in: EMC 1, pp. 39–40.

86 Edited by J. EMLER, *Die pehemische Cronica dewcz*, FRB III, s. 257–297. There was no work elaborating this version any further, cf. Z. MASAŘÍK, *Zur Sprache*, s. 51n.; MM, *Pehemische Cronica dewcz*, in: W. ASCHNITZ (ed.), *Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon. Das Mittelalter. Autoren und Werke nach Themenkreisen und Gattungen, Band 3: Reiseberichte und Geschichtsdichtung*, Berlin — Boston 2012, sl. 365n.

87 Presently, both Saint Emmeram's manuscripts are stored in the State Library of Bavaria, signatures cgm 3967, fol. 104ra–146ra, and cgm 3968, fol. 2^{r}–71. Cf. K. SCHNEIDER, *Die deutschen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München: Die mittelalterlichen Handschriften aus Cgm 888–4000*. — Editio altera — Wiesbaden 1991, s. 488–491.

88 The most famous of them is probably Friar Nicholas Glasberger, but it is clear from his narrative that he was not the only one of the Czech lands to go to the monastery in Bavaria.

89 Universitätsbiblilothek Leipzig, Ms. 1328, fol. 135^{r}–210^{v}. Cf. F. PENSEL, *Verzeichnis der deutschen mittelalterlichen Handschriften in der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig*, zum Druck gebracht von I. Stahl, Berlin 1998 (= Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, Bd. 70; Verzeichnis altdeutscher Handschriften, Bd, 3), pp. 181–182.

OPEN ACCESS

and the rhetoric topoi are preserved.[90] The translation in the Leipzig manuscript is divided into 70 chapters, in the Saint Emmeram's into 69 chapters. The end contains the story of Plichta of Žerotín's heroic conducts, which was additionally written for the Chronicle of Dalimil.[91]

There was another German translation of the Chronicle of Pulkava from Radenin in the Nuremberg humanists circle surrounding Hartmann Schedel (1410–1514), a physician and a bibliophile.[92] It was probably written in accordance with the fifth review manuscript with an appendix covering Czech history up to 1310, which was procured by Hartmann Schedel, who bound the book together with the Enea Silvio Piccolomini's Czech history.[93] The manuscript, in which the German translation of the Pulkava's chronicle is preserved, was likely made in Nuremberg in the second half of the 15th century.[94]

CONCLUSION

The first translations, or at least production of writings on historical topics in vernacular languages, were seen in Bohemia within the Royal Court, and a little later also in the courts of the nobility, in the second half of the 13th century. They began as loose writings of 'general history' topics such as the life of Alexander of Macedon in German, then from the end of the 13th century also in Czech. The first true translations of historic writings can be seen from the first half of the 14th century. However, in the Czech lands translations of historical texts do not begin with translations from Latin into a vernacular language, but rather with translations of vernacular Czech histories from Czech into Latin, then a little later also from Czech into German (Latin and German translations of the Old Bohemian Chronicle of the so-called Dalimil; the German Versed Chronicles). The Latin texts must have been read by high-status laity educated in Latin. The German texts were likely aimed at the clergy, specifically German religious living in Bohemia, mainly in Prague, and perhaps also the Prague patriciate.

Other translations of historic texts come from the second half of the 14th century. These are now translations of Latin writings, official historical works from the era of Charles IV, into Czech and perhaps also into German, although German translations made for citizens of so-called incorporated lands of the Bohemian Crown may have come later. Czech translations of national histories were now meant to be read by

90 Cf. *Die pehemische cronica*, p. 257.

91 Cf. *Die pehemische cronica*, p. 297; *Staročeská kronika*, in: Doplněk 4, p. 576.

92 Cf. V. BOK, *Pulkava, Přibík, von Radenín*, in: C. STÖLLINGER-LÖSER (ed.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, Bd. 11, Lief. 4, Berlin — New York 2004, col. 1284.

93 Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 476. Cf. M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Hartmann Schedel a české dějiny*, in: Cestou dějin 1, 2. K poctě prof. PhDr. Svatavy Rakové, CSc. (red. Eva Semotanová). Praha 2007, II, pp. 23–42; Eadem, *Překlady „českých dějin"*, p. 74.

94 Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, cgm 1112, fol. 53r–169v. The manuscript's binding contains, amongst other things, a strip of document on the sale of a garden in Nuremberg from the second half of the 15th century. Cf. K. SCHNEIDER, *Die deutschen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München: Die mittelalterlichen Handschriften aus Cgm 888–4000* — Editio altera — Wiesbaden, 1991, pp. 83–84.

OPEN ACCESS

the laity, Czech nobility, and perhaps also educated Czech-speaking burghers. At the end of the 14th and beginning of the 15th century, universal histories were also translated into Czech. In particular, these included Petrus Comestor's *Historia scholastica*, whose translation was probably originally aimed at the religious, most likely Benedictines, and specifically monks at the Na Slovanech monastery, but soon spread to the educated laity. At the same time, the papal section of Martin of Opava's Chronicle of Popes and Emperors, and Jakob Twinger of Königshofen's German Chronicle were translated. They were translated by the lower nobleman — layman, and were aimed at readers from their own social class. In fact, however, they were read by a much wider section of society simply because the manuscript was printed at the end of the 15th century.

The nobility and burghers, however, were much more interested in literature for entertainment, whose tales were set in the past but were far from historical reality. The nobility and burghers wanted fantastic tales, exciting narratives, exotic subjects and legends.

The quality of the translations varied. For some translations, it is clear that the translator did not always understand the base text properly, and there were problems with difficult text being mechanically transcribed without ensuring it made sense, or such sections being left out. Sometimes, however, the transcribers who wrote the text were not afraid to refer to the original and correct questionable sections.