Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis 129 supplementum (2012)
DOI 10.4467/20834624SL.12.021.0805

RENATA BURA
Jagiellonian University, Cracow
renata.bura@uj.edu.pl

THE LANGUAGE OF STUDENTS AT THE SORBIAN SEMINARY IN PRAGUE AND THE PRAGUE SERBOWKA

Keywords: Upper Sorbian language, Upper Sorbian lexis, Czech and Upper Sorbian language contact, borrowings

Abstract

The Sorbian Seminary came into being in Prague at the beginning of the 18th century to educate Catholic clergymen. In 1846, the students at the Seminary founded the Serbowka association and began to keep journals as well as produce the handwritten *Kwětki* almanac. These two sources were used as the basis for an analysis of the language – to be more precise, of the lexicon – used by the members of the association. Pful's dictionary, published in 1866, served as a point of reference for an analysis of the data collected.

The juxtaposition of the language material gathered in the study enables us to observe a great degree of conformity between the lexis used by the Serbowka members and the vocabulary recorded by Pful.

What is more, in the yearbooks of the Serbowka and in Pful's dictionary we can notice a large proportion of loanwords from the Czech language, both older and more recent. This is connected with the attitude at that time towards the renascent language. In the lexicon of the Serbowka members the proportion of bohemisms (or interference from the Czech language) is much greater, which is a result of direct and close contact with the Czech language.

Founded in the Prague district of Malá Strana at the beginning of the 18th century[1] on the initiative of the Šiman brothers, the Sorbian Seminary was intended for Sorbs studying theology. It was a boarding house that provided accommodation

[1] The year 1706 is the most frequently quoted date for the foundation of the Sorbian Seminary. It was then that the first house was erected on the land purchased by Jurij Šiman in 1704. ☞

for Sorbian pupils and students during their lower-secondary education and theological studies. The seminary was a church foundation and its principal goal was to educate future clergymen.

A significant breakthrough came in 1846 when the students founded the "Serbowka", an association that aimed to work collectively to promote the development of the Sorbian language and national consciousness. The main objective of the association was to rekindle interest in their homeland and mother tongue, as set out in the statute of the Serbowka (Musiat 2001: 58–61). The students followed the regulations laid out in the statute at weekly meetings, during which grammar presentations were delivered[2] and recitations were practised. Equally important was the reading of both Sorbian books and the students' own writing. The best contributions were published in the handwritten *Kwětki* almanac founded by the association. The head of the association, the so-called *starszy*, kept a journal (*Dnjownik*) in which he entered the minutes of the meetings as well as evaluations of the students' writing. At the end of the year, the association's journal and the *Kwětki* magazine were bound into one volume which became a yearbook and was, at the same time, considered an important achievement of the association.

The Serbowka yearbooks are not only a valuable source of information about the association's activities, but they also provide details about the contact with activists or writers from other Slavic countries, most notably Czech patriots such as Josef Dobrovský, Václav Hanka or Martin Hattala (Páta 1927). We also learn that both the students and the Serbowka members devoted a great deal of time to studying and translating Slavic literature, including Polish literature, as evidenced by the numerous entries, e.g. in the yearbook of 1852/53 we read: "Potym so pisaše a přełožowaše z pólšćiny." (p. 42) or "Kaž hewak so tež dźensa z pólšćiny přełožowaše (…)." (p. 46).

After the establishment of the Serbowka, the Sorbian Seminary became one of the major centres of Sorbian cultural, scientific and national life. The centre exerted considerable influence on the cultural and social life of Lusatia and it was at the centre that influential Sorbian activists and writers[3] received their education. The founders of the association, including Jakub Buk, Mikławš Cyž and Mikławš Jacsławk, played an important role in the social life of the renascent Lusatia (Markec 1996). The association also educated writers and activists who became known somewhat later, for example Jakub Bart-Ćišinski, Mikławš Andricki and Michał Hórnik. Many of them were members of another scientific and cultural association, the Maćica Serbska which was founded in 1847 in Budyšin (Bautzen), and worked actively within its main publication, *Časopis Maćicy Serbskeje*, i.e. a magazine published by the association. The graduates of the Sorbian Seminary in Prague and the members of the

However, the name of the Sorbian Seminary (Łužiski Seminar) came to be used only with respect to the second, larger house which was opened in 1728 (Jenč 1954: 194).

[2] In a report on the activity of the association in the period 1846–1871, Michał Hórnik (1872) and Jan Petr (1973) provide detailed descriptions of the lectures on Sorbian grammar and of the grammar discussed during meetings of Serbowka members.

[3] A complete register of the graduates of the Sorbian Seminary was published by Zdeněk Boháč (1966).

Serbowka included the previously mentioned Michał Hórnik, who was also at that time one of the editors of the Sorbian Language Dictionary published in 1866 by Křesćan Bohuwěr Pful, which codified the then standard language.

Graduates of the Sorbian Seminary in Prague played an important role in the cultural and social life of 19th-century Lusatia. However, most noteworthy is their contribution to the development of Sorbian writing as well as their work aimed at the codification of a uniform literary variety of Upper Sorbian.

The language, and more specifically the lexicon, of graduates of the Sorbian Seminary in Prague will be analysed using data collected from the handwritten *Kwětki* magazine as well as from the yearbooks of the Serbowka association.[4] Ten yearbooks were examined: 1852/53, 1854/55-I, 1855/56, 1861/62, 1862/63, 1865/66, 1866/67-I, 1866/67-II, 1867/68-I and 1867/68-II. Each volume consists of three parts: the association's statute ("S"), Serbowka journals ("D") and the *Kwětki* magazine ("K"). To ensure that the data was correctly analysed, the lexis collected will then be compared with the 1866 edition of Pful's dictionary ("Pf.") which codified the then standard language. Furthermore, the analysis will take into account the results of the research carried out by Stone (1971) and Jentsch (1999).

What is immediately obvious in the language material[5] is the linguistic terminology. This fact is particularly noticeable in the Upper Sorbian grammar lectures given by the Serbowka. However, the lexis collected is quite diversified, with the most frequent being Sorbian terms which in many cases were Czech (less frequently Polish) loanwords or calques, e.g. ***ryčnica*** 'grammar' (S1852/53: 8)[6] – cf. Czech *mluvnice,*[7] Pf. likewise; ***wěcownik*** 'noun' (D1852/53: 29) – cf. Polish *rzeczownik*, Pf. *wěcownik* / *wěcnik*; ***skłonjowanje*** 'declension' (D1852/53: 29) – cf. Czech *skloňování*, Pf. likewise; ***syčawka*** 'sybilant' (D1852/53: 31) – cf. Czech *sykavka*, Pf. *syčawa* / *syčawka*; ***časowanje*** 'conjugation' (D1852/53: 41) – cf. Czech *časování*, Pf. likewise; ***předłožka*** 'preposition' (D1852/53: 47) – cf. Czech *předložka*, Pf. likewise; ***přidawnik*** 'adjective' (D1852/53: 31) – cf. Czech *přídavný* (*přídavné jméno* 'adjective'), Pf. likewise; ***přirostk*** 'suffix' (D1852/53: 32) – cf. Polish *przyrostek*, cf. Pf. *přiwješk* / *přiražka* / *přitwork*, but *přirostk* meaning 'compound'; ***składba*** 'syntax' (D1855/56: 13) – cf. Czech *skladba*, Pf. *składnja* (Polish *składnia*); ***słowjeso*** 'verb' (D1852/53: 39) – cf. Czech *sloveso,* Pf. likewise; ***ród*** 'gender' (D1861/62: 9) – cf. Czech *rod*, Pf. likewise; ***ličbnik*** 'numeral' (D1861/62: 12) – cf. Polish *liczebnik*, Pf. likewise; ***přizwuk*** / ***nazwuk*** / ***nazynk*** 'accent' (D1852/53: 44 / D1861/62: 9 / D1867/68-I: 39) – cf. Czech *přízvuk* / *názvuk*, Pf. *přizuk* / *přizynk* / *přihłós*.

---

[4] Photocopies of the magazine in the library of the Sorbian Instutute in Budyšin, registered under Z 510 as "Serbowka/Kwětki", were used.

[5] Only a proportion of the data, i.e. about two-thirds of the examples, is presented in this article.

[6] The lexical material is presented in the original spelling; by way of example one source of the word is provided (most frequently the first recorded occurrence). The parentheses contain the following information: part of the yearbook (e.g. D – journal), year (and possibly the volume number) and after the colon the page or the paragraph number (in the case of unnumbered pages of the statute).

[7] In most cases, the Czech examples are derived from Jungmann's dictionary (1835–1839), but their modern spelling is used.

Among the linguistic terms domestic forms were also found, e.g.: ***krknik*** 'guttural consonant' (D1852/53: 31) – cf. *krk* 'throat', Pf. likewise; ***hubnik*** 'labial consonant' (K1854/55: 5) – cf. *huba* 'mouth, lips', Pf. likewise; ***jednota*** 'singular' (D1852/53: 32) – cf. Pf. *jenota* / *jednota*; ***mnohota*** 'plural' (D1852/53: 32) – cf. Pf. likewise; ***dwojota*** 'dual' (D1852/53: 32) – cf. Pf. likewise; ***dźasnik*** 'alveolar consonant; palatal' (K1854/55: 5) – cf. *dźasna* 'gums', Pf. likewise; ***zubnik*** 'dental consonant' (K1854/55: 5) – cf. *zuby* 'teeth', Pf. likewise; ***přisłowjesnik*** 'adverb' (D1854/55: 29) – cf. Czech loanword *słowjeso* 'verb', Pf. likewise; ***wjazawa*** 'conjunction' (D1854/55: 29) – cf. *wjazać* 'bind, join', Pf. likewise; ***złóžka*** 'syllable' (D1852/53: 49) – cf. *złožeć* 'fold', Pf. *złóžk*; ***měsćak*** 'locative' (D1965/66: 20) – cf. *město* 'place', Pf. likewise.

The lexis noted above shows a high degree of conformity with the linguistic terminology codified in Pful's dictionary. This results from the fact that the Serbowka association organised regular lectures on Upper Sorbian spelling and grammar, based, amongst other sources, on the 1848 Pful's grammar (Hórnik 1872: 35) and indeed many of the above terms were used by Pful for the first time in that book (Stone 1971: 62–75), e.g. *wěcownik*, *skłonjowanje, syčawka, krknik, jednota, mnohota, dwojota, časowanje, hubnik, dźasnik, zubnik, předłožka, přidawnik, přisłowjesnik, přirostk, słowjeso* and *ród*.

Apart from single terms, we can find, especially in the Serbowka journals, descriptions that include parts of the grammar lectures, e.g. *přemjeny samo- a sobuzynkow: 1. zamjenjenje, 2. přisuwanje, 3. wusuwanje, 4. přesmykowanje* (D1855/56: 21); *přestrojowanje t. j. přeskakowanje sobuzynkow jeneje družiny (pr. krkniki) do druheje, přez druhi stroj tworeneje (pr. do syčawkow), pr. ćahać = ćazać* (…) *přesmykowanje t. j. nastopowanje zynkow z swojeho rjadu, a to stanje so najbóle pola sobuzynkow* (…) (D1861/62: 8- 9); *wotwodźowanje składnja, skłonjowanje wěcownikow, stupnjowanje přidawnikow, časowanje słowjesow* (K1861/62: 142); *přehłosowanje naspjetne a postupne* (D1855/56: 15); *dlejšenje krótkich (wosebje w češt.)* and *přemjenjenje lohkich, předraženje* (D1855/56: 16). The examples above and the terms used may reflect the Czech influence on the language as well as the manner in which the Upper Sorbian grammar lectures were organised by the Serbowka members.[8]

The data was taken from ten yearbooks in the period 1852–1868 (seven yearbooks were published prior to the publication of Pful's dictionary and three yearbooks were published subsequently), which means that the analysis highlights the development of the lexicon over a period of 16 years, allowing certain observations to be made. Firstly, it can be seen that some of the terms had been adapted to a considerable extent, as evidenced by such derivatives as: *nazynk* > *nazynkować* (D1852/53: 35), *přizwuk* > *přizwučny* (D1852/53: 77), *ryčespyt* > *ryčespytny* (D1854/55: 13), *prawopis* > *prawopisny* (D1861/62: 3), *ryčnica* > *ryčniscy* (D1852/53: 29), *ryčniski* (D1854/55: 11) – cf. Pf. notes *ryčnica,* but *ryčniscy, ryčniski* meaning 'advocate-like manner, advocate (adj.)' from *ryčnik* 'spokesman, advocate', *časowanje* > *časownosć, časowanski* ("časowanske koncowki"), (K1861/62: 29) – cf. Pf. no occurrence of *časownosć*.

[8] The influence of linguists and Czech grammars on the arrangement and content of Upper Sorbian grammars created at the Sorbian Seminary and in connection with the Prague Serbowka association was described by Jan Petr (1973).

On the other hand, it can be observed that there was some instability in the usage of linguistic terminology. Various terms were used, often by the same author in one article, interchangeably, e.g. *samozynki, sobuzynki* (German calques *Selbstlaut, Mitlaut*) and *hłóski, suhłóski* (K1862/63: 30) – cf. Pf. *samozynk, sobuzynk* and *sobuhłósnik* / *suhłósnik, hłósnik* (Czech *souhláska, hláska*); *sylba* (D1965/66: 27) and *złóžka* (s. 31); *hłósnik* (D1965/66: 31), but *konsonant* (p. 32).

A certain trend can be observed in the lexis recorded over the period of ten or so years. Namely, at the beginning of this period Sorbian terms prevailed, whereas later, Latin terms were used with increasing frequency. Initially, these were explanations of Sorbian terms, e.g. *dwojowanje (reduplicatio, geminatio)* (D1965/66: 27), *přidawki zwukopłodne (foneticke) a zmysłopłodne (geneticke)* (K1965/66: 170), *přidawki wuznamne (suffixa thematica), přidawki wohibowace (suffixa flexiorum)* (K1965/66: 171), *přičinite słowjesa (causativa), žadawe a počinace słowjesa (v. desiterativa, inchoativa)* (K1965/66: 177), but they could also be the only terms given, e.g. *instrumental* (D1965/66: 25), *particium, gerundium, transgressivum, infinitiva, nomina* (K1965/66: 171).

A clear turning point in the use of linguistic terminology can be seen in D1866/67-I, in which Latin names for cases are used, e.g. *genitiw* (p. 15), *lokatiw, instrumental* (p. 16) as well as for parts of speech: *pronomina* (p. 17), *adjektiwa: komparatiwa, superlatiwa* (p. 19), *participia, transgresiwy* (p. 26). Also in the second volume of 1866/67, which contains Sorbian syntax as described by Róla (*Serbska składba M. Róli*), the clear dominance of Latin terminology can be observed. Sorbian terms sometimes occur as parenthetical explanations, e.g. *infinitivus (njewobmjeznik)* or *subjektum (podmjet)* (p. 166).

Similar results and conclusions are reported by Śliwa (2002), who analysed 19th-century Sorbian linguistic terminology in linguistic texts published in *Časopis Maćicy Serbskeje* in the period 1848–1878. As the research conducted by Śliwa (2002: 296) reveals, after 1860 the use of Latin terms was on the increase.

Regular contact with the Czech language, and a positive attitude towards the enrichment of the lexicon of the Sorbian language with borrowings from other Slavic languages, are the reason why a substantial portion of the data collected included borrowings from the Czech language. There were both older and more recent loanwords. Pful's dictionary, in which the author categorises a given unit as a bohemism (or not) provided the criterion for deciding whether a given word was a representative of the former or the latter group. The derivatives found also testify to earlier borrowings of a given word. The older bohemisms, apart from the previously mentioned linguistic terms, include e.g. ***doslědnje*** 'consistently' (K1854/55-I: 2) – cf. Czech *důsledný*, Pf. *doslědny*; ***wótčina*** / ***wótčinc*** / ***wótčinstwo*** 'homeland; patriot; patriotism' (D1852/53: 45 / S1852/53: 5 / D1865/66: 35) – cf. Czech *otčina*, Pf. likewise; ***baseń*** / ***basnistwo*** / ***basnjenje*** / ***basnić*** / ***basnjeŕ*** 'poem; poetry; to write poems; poet' (D1861/62: 6 / D1852/53: 50 / D1867/68-I: 39 / K1855/56: 182 / K1862/63: 177) – cf. Czech *báseň, básnictví, básniti, básník*, Pf. likewise; ***jazyk*** 'language' (K1861/62: 30) – cf. Czech *jazyk* (semantic loanword), Pf. likewise; ***jednotliwy*** 'particular, individual' (D1852/53: 20) – cf. Czech *jednotlivý*, Pf. *jenotliwy*; ***zajimawy***

'interesting' (D1852/53: 44) – cf. Czech *zajimavý*, Pf. likewise; ***narodny*** 'national' (D1852/53: 52) – cf. Czech *národní* (the adjective was derived from the word *narod* which is a semantic loanword from the Czech *národ* 'nation'), Pf. likewise; ***železniski*** 'railway' (D1854/55-I: 21) – cf. Czech *železnice*; Pf. likewise; ***předsyda*** 'president' (D1867/68-I: 17) – cf. Czech *předseda*, Pf. likewise; ***přirodospyt*** 'natural science' (D1854/55-I: 30) – cf. Czech *přírodozpyt*, Pf. likewise; ***zemjepis*** 'geography' (K1862/63: 179) – cf. Czech *zeměpis*, Pf. likewise; ***ryčespyt*** / ***jazykospyt*** 'philology; linguistics' (D1854/55-I: 30 / K1862/63: 177) – cf. the loanword and the calque of the Czech *jazykozpyt*, Pf. no occurence of *jazykospyt*; ***pokład*** / ***pokładnica*** / ***pokładnik*** 'treasure; cash register; cashier, treasurer' (K1854/55-I: 2 / D1854/55-I: 23 / D1867/68-I: 15) – cf. Czech *poklad, pokladnice, pokladník*, Pf. likewise; ***živjenjopis*** 'CV' (D1867/68-I: 39) – cf. Czech *životopis*, Pf. likewise; ***čitanka*** 'reading matter' (D1865/66: 12) – cf. Czech *čitanka*, Pf. likewise; ***narodopisny*** 'ethnographic' (D1854/55-I: 24) – cf. Czech *národopisný*, Pf. likewise; ***starožitnosć*** / ***starožitnik*** 'antiquity; antiquity researcher' (D1861/62: 4 / K1862/63: 156) – cf. Czech *starožitnost* / *starožitník*, Pf. likewise; ***rakuski*** 'Austrian' (K1861/62: 31) – cf. Czech *rakouský*, Pf. likewise; ***wumjełscy*** 'artistically' (D1852/53: 48) – cf. Czech *umělecky*, Pf. *wumjełc, wumjełski* and *wumjełstwo* as a synonym of the word *khumšt*.

Many bohemisms occurred in lieu of earlier borrowings from German or words borrowed through German, e.g. ***pismowstwo*** 'literature' (S1852/53: 10) – cf. Czech *písemnictví*, Pf. likewise – instead of *literatura*; ***naryč*** 'dialect' (D1852/53: 20) – cf. Czech *nářečí*, Pf. likewise – instead of *dialekt*; ***wosud*** 'fate' (D1854/55-I: 24) – cf. Czech *osud*, Pf. likewise – instead of *lós*; ***uniwersita*** 'university' (D1852/53: 20) – cf. Czech *universita*, Pf. likewise – instead of *uniwersyteta* (German *Universität*); ***mócnarstwo*** 'monarchy' (K1854/55-I: 65) – cf. Czech *mocnářství*, Pf. likewise *mócnařstwo* – instead of *monarchija*; ***wobraz*** 'picture' (K1854/55-I: 2) – cf. Czech and Polish *obraz*, Pf. likewise – instead of *bjelda*; ***dźiwadło*** 'theatre' (D1867/68-I: 37) – cf. Czech *divadlo*, Pf. likewise – instead of *teatr*; ***radnica*** 'town hall' (K1862/63: 157) – cf. Czech *radnice*, Pf. likewise – instead of *radna khejža* / *kejža* / *chejža* (from the German *Rathaus*); ***žiwjel*** / ***žiwjoł*** 'element' (K1854/55-I: 3) – cf. Czech *živel* and Polish *żywioł*, Pf. likewise – instead of *element*; ***lisćina*** 'document' (K1862/63: 158) – cf. Czech *listina*, Pf. likewise – instead of *dokument*; ***prózdniny*** / ***prózdninski*** 'holidays' (D1852/53: 52 / S1861/6: §7) – cf. Czech *prázdniny*, Pf. *prózniny,* no adjective *prózdninski* – instead of *ferije* (German *Ferien*); ***twórba*** 'form' (K1861/62: 29) – cf. Czech *tvorba*, Pf. likewise – instead of *forma*; ***pomjatnik*** 'dairy; commemorative book' (K1855/56: 182) – cf. *památník*, Pf. likewise – instead of *album*.

The later borrowings from Czech, which in Pful's dictionary were most frequently marked with the abbreviation Č., include *inter alia* ***maćeršćina*** 'mother tongue' (K1854/55-I: 1) – cf. Czech *mateřština*, Pf. *maćerčina* / *maćerščina* (earlier: *maćerna ryč* from the German *Muttersprache*); ***prěnjotny*** 'primeval' (D1852/53: 24) – cf. Czech *prvotný*, Pf. likewise; ***doraz*** 'pressure' (D1852/53: 32) – cf. Czech *doraz*, Pf. likewise; ***znamenity*** 'exceptional, eminent' (D1852/53: 38) – cf. Czech *znamenitý*, Pf. *znamjenity*; ***zapal*** 'gusto, enthusiasm' (D1852/53: 43) – cf. Czech *zápal*, Pf. likewise; ***raz*** 'character' (D1852/53: 50) – cf. Czech *raz*, Pf. likewise; ***poznamka*** 'comment, remark'

(K1852/53: 6) – cf. Czech *poznámka*, Pf. likewise; ***časoměra*** / ***časoměrny*** 'vowel length, prosody; prosodic' (K1854/55-I: 3 / K1852/53: 77) – cf. Czech *časoměra* / *časomíra*, Pf. likewise; ***runowaha*** 'balance' (K1854/55-I: 6) – cf. Czech *rownováha* (also Polish *równowaga*), Pf. likewise; ***bytnosć*** 'existence' (K1854/55-I: 65) – cf. Czech *bytnost*, Pf. likewise; ***podoba*** 'form' (K1854/55-I: 65) – cf. Czech *podoba*, Pf. likewise; ***dokład*** 'evidence, argument' (K1862/63: 83) – cf. Czech *doklad*, Pf. likewise; ***zastawka*** 'stoppage, interval' (D1865/66: 30) – cf. Czech *zastávka*, Pf. likewise *zastawa* / *zastawka*; ***wliw*** / ***wzliw*** 'influence' (D1867/68-I: 31 / K1862/63: 175) – cf. Czech *vliv,*[9] Pf. likewise; ***pohosćinstwo*** 'hospitality' (K1861/62: 160) – cf. Czech *pohostinství*, Pf. likewise.

Because of the regular contact with the Czech language, many more Czech loanwords were reported in the data collected than in Pful's dictionary. In most cases, however, they were single occurrences, e.g. ***sloh*** 'style' (D1851/52: 43) – cf. Czech *sloh*; ***wujew*** 'expression' (D1852/53: 37) – cf. Czech *výjev*; ***ważeny*** 'dear' (D1861/62: 2) – cf. Czech *vážený*, Pf. *česćomny*; ***pokrok*** 'progress' (K1862/63: 184) – cf. Czech *pokrok*; ***shotoweny*** 'completed' (K1861/62: 144) – cf. Czech *zhotovený*; ***wpad*** 'intrusion, attack' (K1861/62: 151) – cf. Czech *vpád*; ***sučasny*** 'simultaneous' (K1861/62: 137 several occurrences were found) – cf. Czech *současný*, Pf. *jenočasny*; ***sučasnosć*** 'simultaneity' (K1861/62: 143) – cf. Czech *současnost*, Pf. *jenočasnistwo*; ***wotkhilka*** 'aberrance, deviation' (D1865/66: 31) – cf. Czech *odchýlka*; ***pozornosć*** 'attention' (K1861/62: 152) – cf. Czech *pozornost*; ***pramjeń*** 'source' (K1862/63: 172) – cf. Czech *prámen*; ***zjew*** 'phenomenon' (K1862/63: 84) – cf. Czech *zjev*, Pf. *zjewba*; ***cuzina*** 'foreign country' (K1861/62: 151) – cf. Czech *cizina*; ***cuzonarodny*** 'foreign, alien' (K1861/62: 132) – cf. Czech *cizonárodní*, Pf. *cuzokrajny* / *cuzozeński*; ***cuzozemcojo*** 'foreigners' (K1861/62: 142) – cf. Czech *cizozemci*; Pf. notes only the adjective *cuzozeński*, however, for the above meaning it provides *cuzokrajan* / *wukrajnik*; ***starobyłosć*** 'old times' (K1861/62: 158) – cf. Czech *starobylost*, Pf. *předčas* / *starožitnosć* / *zastarstwo*.

A comparison of this part of the lexicon with the vocabulary found in Pful's dictionary shows that the use of bohemisms resulted not only from the need to fill a gap in the lexical resources of the Upper Sorbian language (cf. *sloh*), but also from language interference (cf. *ważeny*). In the data collected there are many cases which confirm the existence of the latter phenomenon. Frequently it is the influence of the Czech pronunciation and this applies to adjectival endings of foreign origin, where, instead of the ending *-ski,* the ending *-cki* is used, e.g. *authenticki, kriticki* (K1962/63: 165) – cf. Czech *autentický, kritický*; nouns ending in *-stwo* (under the Czech influence: *-ctwo*), e.g. *basnictwo* (K1862/63:185) – cf. Czech *básnictví* as well as feminine nouns ending in *-osć* (under the Czech influence: *-ost*), e.g. *zawjazanost* (D1861/62: §17), *passivum (ćěrpnost)* (D1861/62: 13) – cf. Czech *zavazanost, trpnost*. What is more, single occurrences of spelling changes were noted, also a result of the Czech pronunciation, e.g. *přibuznosć* (K1861/62: 142) – cf. Czech *příbuznost*, Pf. *přiwuznosć*; *wzajemny*

[9] The Czech *vliv* replaced the older *vplyv* (Holub, Lyer 1967) which is a borrowing from Polish, cf. Polish *wpływ* (cf. Holub, Kopečný 1952; Jungmann 1835–39). The Polish *wpływ* has been used since the 18th century and it is a calque of the German *Einfluß* (Boryś 2005).

(K1861/62: 142) – cf. Czech *vzájemný*, Pf. *wzajomny*; *rozmłowjenje* (K1952/53: 10), *rozmłówa* (K1865/66: 25) – cf. Czech *rozmluvení, rozmluva*, Pf. *rozmołwa*; *wzdaleny* (K1861/62: 158) – cf. Czech *vzdálený*; Pf. *zdaleność*.

The interference also concerned the form of a given word, especially in the case of similar units, e.g. ***powěra*** 'superstition' (K1862/63: 86) – cf. Czech *pověra*; Pf. *přiwěra*; ***zastawjeničko*** 'serenade' (D1854/55-I: 20) – cf. Czech *zastaveníčko*, Pf. *zastaničko, pozastańčko*; ***porjekadło*** 'saying' (D1852/53: 52) – cf. Czech *pořekadlo*, Pf. *poryčadło*; ***stanowišće*** 'position' (K1867/68-II: 187) – cf. Czech *stanoviště*; Pf. *stejišćo*; ***přednoška*** 'lecture' (D1852/53: 50) – cf. Czech *přednáška*, Pf. *přednošk*. Sometimes language calques could be seen, e.g. ***stawiznospyt*** 'study of history' (K1866/67-I: 159) – cf. Czech *dějezpyt*, Pf. *stawiznańſtwo*; ***rozryčowanje*** 'talk, talking' (K1867/68-I: 23) – cf. Czech *rozmluvení*, Pf. *rozryč*; ***stawiznospytnik*** 'historian' (K1866/67-I: 155) – cf. Czech *dějezpytec*, Pf. *stawiznań*. Such attempts were not always successful, e.g. ***ryčespytań*** 'linguist' (K1854/55-I: 2) – cf. Czech *jazykozpytec*, Pf. *ryčespytnik*. Of importance also was the fact that the then contemporary lexis was still unusually unstable.

Instances were also noted where, under the Czech influence, the editors of both the Serbowka journals and *Kwětki* introduced neologisms that drew on Upper Sorbian models of word formation, e.g. ***lětopisań*** 'chronicler' (K1861/62: 158) – cf. Czech *letopisec*, *letopisník*, *letopisák*; Pf. *lětnikań*; ***zemjepisań*** 'geographer' (K1861/62: 157) – cf. Czech *zeměpisec*, Pf. *zemjepis*. These two nouns were created in a similar manner to *časopisań, knihipisań, stawiznopisań* and *swětopisań*.

The authors intentionally introduced new lexis which was to be yet established, as reflected by the explanations and definitions provided. Most frequently, these were parenthetical explanations. In the case of linguistic terms, a Latin (less frequently German) counterpart was provided, e.g. *přizwuk (accent)* (K1854/55-I: 3), *syčawki (spirantes)* (K1854/55-I: 7), *něme (mutae)* (K1854/55-I: 7), *zwukowanje (lautlehre)* (K1855/56: 184), *nasłowo (spiritus im anlauf)* (D1855/56: 17), *wo podružnych (sekundarnych)* (D1855/56: 21). Sometimes the parentheses included more elaborate explanations, e.g. *dwojicy (gruppen von zwei consonanten)* (K1854/55-I: 7); *časoměra (quantita abo rozeznawanje časoweho traća dołhich a krótkich samozynkow)* (K1854/55-I: 3). Other vocabulary items were explained either through the use of Sorbian synonyms, e.g. *z mjedźe (z kowa)* (K1862/63: 87), *hrudź (wutrobno, brósť)* (K1862/63: 87); *na wobzoru (njebjesach)* (K1852/53: 35), *nazynkować (dozynkować = wukončić)* (D1852/53: 35), or, decidedly more frequently, through the use of equivalents from foreign languages, mainly German, e.g. *zapokazany (instalowany)* (D1854/55-I: 20), *poćahi (verhältnisse)* (D1861/62: 13), *přepuśćił (überlassen)* (K1861/62: 143), *zkaženych (verkrüpelt)* (K1861/62: 143), *wotrěknyć (absprechen)* (K1861/62: 155), *kolpišće (t.j. turnierplatz)* (D1865/66: 13), *słóncowrót (solstitium)* (K1862/63: 83), *předběžne (vorläufig)* (K1861/62: 133), *w času stawiznownje wobswetlěnym (historisch beleuchtet)* (K1861/62: 133), *Słowjenjo prěnjotni a prawi (echt, rein)* (K1861/62: 133), *wićezojo (victores)* (K1861/62: 145), *hwězdno (sternbild)* (D1867/68-I: 25), *wuznaki (symbole)* (K1862/63: 76), *připiski (glossy)* (K1862/63: 81), *pisowny skład (stil)* (D1865/66: 17), *napisy (epigrammy)* (D1852/53: 26), *smužcy (papirstreifen)* (K1862/63: 157), *zesylnjenje*

(intensiwnosć) (K1965/66: 178). Sometimes the parentheses also included Slavic counterparts, e.g. *wutk (p. wątek, č. látka)* (D1852/53: 27).

Many of the words introduced were bohemisms. They were quite frequently borrowings which were not recorded in Pful's dictionary, e.g. *načołnistwo (direktorat)* (K 1861/62: 83) – cf. Czech *náčelnictví* / *náčelnictvo*; *w Rěznje (Regensburg)* (K1862/63: 172) – cf. Czech *Řezno*; *padźełaćeŕ (falsarius)* (K1862/63: 185) – cf. Czech *padělatel*; *zwosobjenje (personifikacia)* / *zwosobjeny (wćěleny, personificirwany)* (K 1862/63: 83–84) – cf. Czech *zosobnění, zosobniti*, or alternatvely words recorded in Pful's dictionary, however, with a new meaning, e.g. *hudźbnik (musikdirector)* – (K 1867/68-I: 18) – cf. Czech *hudebník*.

The authors also used other methods of introducing new lexis. Sometimes the explanations were recorded in the margins, e.g. *wuhra* (K1861/62:174) – in the margin: *wuhrać (č. vyhrati) = dobyć*; *swe* (K1861/62: 173), *twu* (K1861/62: 176) – in the margin: *swe = swoje, twu = twoju*, sometimes they were incorporated directly into the text, e.g. *mythologia aby bajesłowo* (K1861/62: 152), *słowospyt abo etymologia* (K1965/66: 169), and sometimes they were written above a given word, e.g. *antiquitäty* above: *archaismy* (D1865/66: 9), *nazynkowace "č"* above: *spočatkomne* (D1852/53: 27).

In the case of literary terms which were introduced there were no explanations, e.g. ***předspěv***[10] 'prelude' (K1852/53: 3) – cf. Czech *předzpěv*, ***znjelka*** 'sonnet' (K1852/53: 52) – cf. Czech *znělka*, ***historicka nowelka*** 'historical short story' (K1867/68-I: 53) – cf. Czech *historická novelka*.

In the language of the students at the Sorbian Seminary we can see a large proportion of Europeisms or, more broadly, internationalisms which were then in use and which, for purist reasons, were not recorded in Pful's dictionary. Later dictionaries authored by Rězak (1920) and Kral (1927) (cf. Stone 1971) also failed to record such words. However, the terms could be found in lexicographical works published after World War II, that is from Jakubaš's dictionary (1954) onwards.

In the data collected adjectives predominated, e.g. *historicki, aestheticki, mythologicki* (K1962/63: 163), *authenticki, kriticki* (K1962/63: 165), *filosoficki* (D1867/68-I: 29), *politicki, klasicki* (D1867/68-I: 38), *etymologicki* (K1861/62: 154). It seems, however, that this was foreign lexis which had gained currency, most probably through the Czech language, as evidenced by the use of the suffix *-icki* instead of the Sorbian *-iski*, cf. Czech *politický* and Upper Sorbian *politiski*. Instead of the above, Pful offers either neologisms, e.g. *porjany* 'aesthetic' (today *estetiski*), *złotočasny* 'classic' (today *klasiski*), *mudrostniski* 'philosophical' (cf. *mudrostnik* 'philosopher'; today *filozofiski*), *słoworodny* (cf. *słoworod* 'etymology', *słoworodnik* 'etymologist'; today *etymologiski*) or adjectives formed from words which had already, to some extent, become established in the language, e.g. *stawisny* 'historical' (cf. *stawizny* 'history'; today *stawizniski* or *historiski*), *bajski* / *basniski* (cf. *baja* 'myth'; *basnik* 'mythologist'; today *mytiski*), *statniski* 'political' (cf. *statnistwo* 'politics'; today *politiski*), *woprawdźity* / *woprawdźiwy* 'authentic' (cf. *woprawdźitosć* 'fact'; today *awtentiski*), *rozrisny* / *sudźbański* 'critical' (cf. *rozris, sudźba* 'criticism'; today *kritiski*).

[10] Original spelling; throughout the text the author uses the Czech *v* instead of the Sorbian *w*.

Less frequent were nouns, e.g. *belletristika* (D1854/55-I: 13) – cf. Pf. no occurrences, one occurrence of *archiwař* (D1861/62: 14) – cf. Pf. *listnicař* (cf. *listno*, 'paper, sheet' and *spisownik* from *spisownja* 'archive', a Czech loanword (cf. Czech *spisovna*).

Occasionally the authors used internationalisms and loanwords, mainly Czech which had become established in Upper Sorbian, interchangeably. Accordingly, we can find words used in parallel, e.g. *theolog* (D1854/55-I: 21) and *bohosłowc* (D1852/53: 19) – cf. Czech *bohoslovec*, Pf. likewise; *historija* (D1852/53: 44) and *stawizny* (S1852/53: 10) – cf. German *Geschichte* (*geschehen – stać so*), Pf. *stawizny, dźejepis* (cf. Czech *dějepis*); *bibliothekař* (S1852/53: 8) and *knihownik* (K1855/56: 181) – cf. Czech *knihovník*, Pf. likewise; *mythologija* (K1862/63: 179) and *bajosłowo* / *bajstwo* (K1862/63: 177 / K1862/63: 179); *muzika* (K1861/62: 83) and *hudźba* (K1861/62: 82) – cf. Czech *hudba*, Pf. likewise; *prosodija* (K1862/63: 176) and *časoměra* (K1854/55-I: 3) – cf. Czech *časoměra* / *časomíra*; Pf. likewise.

In the analysed data only a few occurrences of Germanisms were reported; they included both lexical loanwords, e.g. *tinta* 'ink' (K1862/63: 160) – cf. German *Tinte*, Pf. *čornidło*; *tafla* 'board' (D1855/56: 11) – cf. German *Tafeln* and calques of German words, e.g. *dźělbraće* 'participation, the act of participation' (D1854/55-I: 9) – cf. German *Teilnahme*, Pf. likewise; *tudybyće* 'being, existence' (D1855/56: 26) – cf. German *Dasein*, Pf. no occurrences; *sobuwolić* 'to vote' (S1852/53: 11) – cf. German *mitwählen*, Pf. *hłosować*. However, the above examples were few and far between, as opposed to familiar words which had already gained currency, cf. *prawo a winwatosć sobuwolić* (S1852/53: 11) and *prawo a winwatosć hłosowanja* (S1861/62: &13); *na taflu pisać* (D1855/56: 11) and *na tabulu pisać* (D1852/53: 23).

An analysis of the language of the graduates of the Sorbian Seminary in Prague, based on the lexis found in the handwritten magazine *Kwětki* and the journals of the Serbowka association and its comparison with the lexis recorded in Pful's dictionary, allows us to examine the relation between usage and the then standard Upper Sorbian. At the same time, it, in some way, provides an answer to the question concerning the extent to which this dictionary reflected the lexis of the first few decades of the Sorbian national renaissance. The juxtaposition of the data collected shows a great degree of conformity between the vocabulary used by the members of the Serbowka association and that recorded by Pful. This fact is actually to be expected, if we remember that certain graduates (e.g. Michał Hórnik) participated in the work to codify Upper Sorbian. To confirm this assertion, we can provide one significant example. In the yearbook of 1855/56 (p. 182) Michał Hórnik suggests that instead of the word *dźenik*, which in his view means 'little day', the word *dnjownik* should be used ("Skónčnje prošu, zo by so město "Dźenik" t. r. mały dźeń přichodnje "Dnjownik" pisało") and this was most probably due to him that Pful's dictionary recorded the word *dnjownik* rather than *dźenik*. It should be added, however, that the influence of usage was also strong and even though the yearbook of 1867/68-I had as its title *Dnjownik*, the word *dźenik* was used many times (pp. 18, 21, 37). In modern Upper Sorbian the word *dnjownik* is considered old-fashioned, while the word *dźenik* is commonly used.

In the yearbooks of the Serbowka and in Pful's dictionary we can notice a large proportion of loanwords from the Czech language, both older and more recent.

This is connected with the attitude at that time towards the renascent language. In fact, Upper Sorbian linguists and purists alike permitted the influence of other Slavic languages. In their view, the term 'foreign' meant 'German', hence Germanisms were removed from the language and replaced by, amongst other forms, loanwords from Slavic languages. Upper Sorbian language purism was clearly of a Slavic nature.

In the lexicon of the members of the Serbowka the proportion of bohemisms (or interference from the Czech language) is much greater, which is a result of direct and close contact with the Czech language. Of importance also is the fact that Sorbian writers and national activists were influenced by the cultural and political atmosphere of Prague as well as by the dominant Slavophile sentiment. They were thus more open to the adoption of Slavisms.

Bibliography

Boháč Z. 1966. Die Matrikel der Zöglinge des „Wendisches Seminars" in Prag 1728–1922. – *Lětopis* Rjad B: 166–228.

Boryś W. 2005. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków.

Holub J., Kopečný F. 1952. *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha.

Holub J., Lyer S. 1967. *Stručný etymologický slovník jazyka českého se zvláštním zřetelem k slovům kulturním a cizím*. Praha.

Hórnik M. 1872. „Serbowka" w Prazy wot lěta 1846–1871. – *Časopis Maćicy Serbskeje*: 29–50.

Jakubaš F. 1954. *Hornjoserbsko-němski słownik. Obersorbisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Budyšin/Bautzen.

Jenč R. 1954. *Stawizny serbskeho pismowstwa*. Budyšin/Bautzen.

Jentsch H. 1999. *Die Entwicklung der Lexik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache vom 18. Jahrhundert bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Budyšin/Bautzen.

Jungmann J. 1835–1839. *Slovník česko-německý*. [vol. I-V]. Praha. [ed. 1989–1990].

Kral J. 1927. *Serbsko-němski słownik hornjołužiskeje rěče*. Budyšin/Bautzen. [ed. 1986].

Markec J. 1996. Założerjo Praskeje „Serbowki". – Siatkowska E. et al. (eds.) *Sprawy łużyckie w ich słowiańskich kontekstach*. Warszawa: 71–82.

Musiat S. 2001. *Sorbische/wendische Vereine 1716–1937*. Budyšin/Bautzen.

Páta J. 1927. Ze stawiznow Pražskeje „Serbowki". – *Časopis Maćicy Serbskeje*: 47–54.

Petr J. 1973. Jazyková teorie a praxe v pražské Serbowce. – *Studia Slavica Pragensia*: 55–72.

Pful K. B. 1848. Hornołužiski Serbski Prawopis z krótkim ryčničnym přehladom. – *Časopis Maćicy Serbskeje*: 65–127.

Pful K.B. 1866. *Łužiski serbski słownik*. Budyšin/Bautzen. [ed. 1968].

Rězak F. 1920. *Němsko-serbski wšowědny słownik hornjołužiskeje rěče. Deutsch-wendisches Wörterbuch der oberlausitzer Sprache*. Budyšin/Bautzen.

Stone G. 1971. Lexical changes in the Upper Sorbian literary language during and following the National Awakening. – *Lětopis* Rjad A: 1–127.

Śliwa T. 2002. Łużycka terminologia językoznawcza w XIX wieku – słownictwo rodzime w konkurencji z terminami łacińskimi. – Motornyj W. et al. (eds.) *Prašenja sorabistiki*. Lwiw, Budyšin/Bautzen: 295–308.