

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-1-1944

### A History of the Cithara Sanctorum (Tranoscius)

Jaroslav Vaja

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_vajaj@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Vaja, Jaroslav, "A History of the Cithara Sanctorum (Tranoscius)" (1944). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 110.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/110>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

A HISTORY  
OF THE CITHARA SANCTORUM (TRANOSCIUS)  
(The Slovak Lutheran Hymnal of George Tranovský)

Introduction

---

I. Historical Background

II. A Thesis Presented to

The Faculty of Concordia Seminary

Department of Historical Theology

III. A Geographical Sketch of Slovakia

IV. The First Edition of the Cithara Sanctorum

---

Division of the Cithara Sanctorum into

Instructions for the Cantors

Original Text and Translations by Hymnists

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Divinity

---

by  
Jaroslav Vajda  
May 1944

Approved by: W. G. Palmer  
George Majors

FOREWORD

Outline

Luther's time the people sang  
the Bible inspired their songs.

--B'Abigne

Foreword

I. Historical Background	1
II. Slovak Hymnody before Tranovský	12
Slovak Hymn Writers of this Period	14
Slovak Hymnals before Tranovský	15
III. A Biographical Sketch of Tranovský	21
IV. The First Edition of the <u>Cithara Sanctorum</u>	54
Division and Contents of the Original Edition	59
Instructions for the Cantors	69
Original Hymns and Translations by Tranovský	74
V. Subsequent Editions of the <u>Cithara Sanctorum</u>	78
VI. The <u>Cithara Sanctorum</u> Today and Tomorrow	92
Bibliography	

The Franciscus carries on the tradition of historic Lutheranism (mainly, that it is the singing Church) by its outstanding contributions to the hymnody of the Christian Church. Unfortunately, however, many of these gems were not found their way into the hymnody of the English-speaking Church. Six of them may be found in our Lutheran Hymnal,<sup>1</sup> but the vast majority still remain to be translated into a language more widespread than the Slovak. Luther drew upon

1. W.G. Polack, The Handbook to the Lutheran Hymnal, p. 816, under "Slovak."

the rich treasury of Bohemian hymns via the translations of the Hainke pastor, Michael Heise, including at least twelve revised versions of them in his hymnal. FOREWORD These necessarily do not include the

"From Luther's time the people sang; the Bible inspired their songs."

--D'Aubigne

It is not an overstatement that next to the Bible itself probably no other book has had so profound and lasting an influence on Slovak Lutheranism since 1636 as George Tranovský's Cithara Sanctorum, the traditional hymnal of the Slovak Lutheran Church. Conceived in a period of acutely urgent spiritual need and born into a turbulent age, it has grown and stood as a bulwark and refuge of countless individual Slavonic Christians for more than three centuries against incessant batteries of Satan within and without the Church, against the undermining efforts of rationalism, the stultifying influence of doctrinal indifference, and the ruthless persecutions of the Jesuits; it has weathered every storm by reason of the single fact that it is firmly rooted in the indestructible Rock of Scripture.

The Tranoscius carries on the tradition of historic Lutheranism (namely, that it is the singing Church) by its outstanding contributions to the hymnody of the Christian Church. Unfortunately, however, many of these gems have not found their way into the hymnody of the English-speaking Church. Six of them may be found in our Lutheran Hymnal,<sup>1</sup> but the vast majority still remain to be translated into a language more widespread than the Slovak. Luther drew upon

---

1. W.G.Polack, The Handbook to the Lutheran Hymnal, p. 615, under "Slovak."

the rich treasury of Bohemian hymns via the translations of the Hussite pastor, Michael Weisse, including at least twelve revised versions of them in his hymnal of 1545.<sup>2</sup> These necessarily do not include the superbly constructed, doctrinally firm, and poetically authentic hymns of George Tranovský who lived from 1591 to 1637.

It is evident from the bibliography of this thesis that there are no English references available on the subject of the Cithara Sanctorum. This is in itself an indication of the ignorance on the part of the English-speaking world concerning this phase of Christian hymnody. Even Julian's exhaustive Dictionary fails to mention the Cithara! It was necessary, therefore, to work entirely with Slovak and Bohemian sources generally. These are naturally secondary sources, with the exception of the two editions of the Cithara which contain most of the original edition's hymns in more or less altered form. A first-hand study will have to be made in Central Europe where the various editions have been (or can be) collected and examined.

This then is the first definitive work on this subject in the English language. Its form is advisedly brief, so as to present a sort of skeleton on which may be hung the flesh of future research. Where a minor bone is wanting, there it may be assumed that its discovery has not been noted in the most recent sources available (1936).

---

2. Ludevít Haan, Cithara Sanctorum, její původce a tohoto spolupra-  
covníci, p. 10. John Julian, Dictionary of Hymnology, pp. 157; 414;  
703, 704; 1247.

The information obtained here in the writing was already in 1821, and the reformer of Vardubet and its vicinity was the well-known pupil of Luther, Leonard Stouček.

1. John P. Drabek, První slovenská kniha, 1545, p. 2.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CITHARA SANCTORUM (TRANOSCIUS)

(The Slovak Lutheran Hymnal of George Tranovský)

I. Historical Background.

The publication of the Cithara Sanctorum (1636) falls into the middle of the Thirty Years' War, a period of violent turbulence in Europe generally and especially in that part of Europe where the tinder box was ignited. The chief activity of the Cithara's compiler, George Tranovský, is contemporaneous with the first half of the Thirty Years' War. It is evident from these facts that an adequate appreciation of the Cithara's importance and influence can be obtained only upon a closer study of the political and religious conditions prevailing at that time.

This background is so vast, however, that only the briefest sketch will have to suffice as background for this treatise. A good place to set out in the religious narrative is the beginning of the Lutheran Reformation in 1517. If the Reformation required only fourteen days to spread throughout Germany, it took only a year or two to take root in Slovak lands. In Lubic already in 1520, the priest Thomas Preisner read Luther's 95 Theses from the pulpit to a large assembly of faithful. The Reformation claimed adherents in the mining towns already in 1521, and the reformer of Bardejov and its vicinity was the well-known pupil of Luther, Leonard Stoeckel.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. John P. Drobny, Evanj. slovenski martyri, p. 2.

Slovakia was prepared for the Reformation when it broke upon Europe. Hus's teaching was already widespread and had conditioned the people for such a Reformation as Luther's. Furthermore, German merchants travelling and doing business in Slovakia brought with them news of the new religious movement as well as books and particularly the Bible. In addition to this, there were many Slovak students in attendance at German universities. For example, from 1522-1564 approximately 200 Slovak students were studying at Wittenberg alone. When they came home they zealously spread Luther's teaching. The same took place among the Magyars (Hungarians), only that among them Calvinism was spread instead of Lutheranism.<sup>2</sup>

In the realm of politics, the decisive victory of the Turks over the Hungarians at Mohács in 1526 is a dividing point in central European history. During the reign of the weak and dissolute Louis (Ludwig) II (1516-1526), the prestige and power of the royal house disintegrated while that of the nobility grew, so that it was not uncommon to find many nobles at that time who were more wealthy and powerful than the king himself.<sup>3</sup> The reign of Louis is particularly noteworthy from the religious standpoint for this, that during that period the Protestant Reformation, beginning first in the German areas and towns, took firm root in Hungary.<sup>4</sup> But the Reformation did not proceed without opposition. The nobility, opposed to the king, also opposed the Reformation movement. The Church, too, allied itself with the Catholic nobility against the Reformation. Hence it is not surprising to find that already in 1523, under the instigation of

2. John Čajak, Dejepis Slovákov, p. 61.

3. Ibid., p. 59.

4. References to Hungary in this paper must be taken in the wide sense, including those nations surrounding Hungary proper which were included under Hungarian dominion during that period of European history. Most references to Slovakia are included in the term "Hungary."

archbishop Ladislav Zalkan of Ostrihom, the Reformation movement was officially declared punishable by death and confiscation of property; and on April 24, 1525, the government issued the well-known edict, "Lutherani comburantur." Meanwhile the Turks were on the march into Europe. By 1521 they had occupied Belgrade and began their victorious advance into Hungary. On August 29-30, 1526, the disorganized Hungarian feudal army of 20,000 troops under Louis II was completely overwhelmed at Mohács, Louis himself falling in battle. Louis' death was followed by a hot contest over the succession. Part of the nobility, hoping for German aid against the Turk, elected Frederick of Hapsburg, brother of Emperor Charles V. The national party, on the other hand, elected the viceroy of Transylvania, John Zápolya, as king. After a civil war lasting two years, Zápolya was defeated. He appealed to the Turks (Suleiman), who supported him vigorously. By the Peace of Nagyvárad the two kings recognized each other, each ruling part of the territory, Zápolya receiving Transylvania, the Turks retaining Hungary proper, and Ferdinand paying tribute for the western section. Zápolya became a vassal of the Turks, but Ferdinand continued the war against them, interrupted only by occasional truces. Of these three dominions, the Reformation thrived best under Turkish rule, for the Turks did not meddle in the faith of their subjects as long as they received the promised tribute regularly. Conditions were worse for those who lived in the territories not occupied by

---

5. Drobny, *op. cit.*, p. 4. In the Jesuit report of 1752, "Archiepiscopi compendio dati," the following statement is found: "Metropolitae auctore, aliisque episcopis Hungariae in Lutheri assectas feralem illam legem latam esse. Lutherani omnes de regno exstirpentur, et ubicumque reperti fuerint, non solum per ecclesiasticas, sed etiam per seculares personas libere capiantur et comburantur."

the Turks. Ferdinand and Zápolya needed help from outside in order to maintain their positions, and only the papacy could provide such aid; hence both parties sought to gain papal favor by persecuting the Protestants. These favors were especially needed by Zápolya. Nor did Ferdinand lag behind in this respect, issuing edicts in the spirit of "Lutherani comburantur." Both Zápolya and Ferdinand were abetted in their efforts against the Reformation by the bishops, naturally, but the sweep of the Reformation movement was irresistible.<sup>6</sup>

After Zápolya's death in 1540, the Turks recognized his infant son, John II (Sigismund) Zápolya. This led to a new clash with Ferdinand, who began an invasion of Eastern Hungary. Such a divided state as then existed in Hungary suited well the purposes of the Turk, who advanced anew into Hungary and invaded Budín in 1541. Two years later, in 1543, the Turks were in possession of Ostrihom, thus gaining dominion over the entire central part of Hungary (the great plain). There was no settlement by the Turks, but the territory was granted in military fiefs and subject to heavy taxation. Again, the chief threat to the Hungarian (Slovak) Lutherans did not come from the Turks, but from the opportunistic rulers and the fanatical bishops.

Transylvania under Zápolya was a vassal state of the Turks, but was left almost entirely free. The Transylvanians (even the nobility) soon accepted Calvinism, so that during the latter part of the 16th century the larger part of Hungary was either Lutheran or Calvinist. In 1560 religious toleration was established in Transylvania.

The Hapsburgs, on the other hand, held only a narrow strip of western and northern Hungary, and even for this they long paid tribute to the Turk. Warfare was incessant on this frontier. Blockhouses

---

6. Ibid., pp. 6,7.

erected during this period still stand in some places as memorials of the harrowing raids and sieges of the Turks. For 150 years the populace was subjected to the rapine of successive bands of Turks, Tartars, and mercenaries.<sup>7</sup> (The Hapsburgs employed Italian and Spanish mercenaries to defend their possessions, and these ravaged the country as much as did the Turks.) Ferdinand and his successors made a great mistake by governing their territory from Vienna or Prague with little reference to the traditional rights of the Hungarian nobility. This led to growing friction and later to serious conflict.

An effort was made by Sigismund Bathory, Prince of Transylvania (1581-1602), to unite with the Hapsburgs for a grand assault on the declining Turk power, but met with vigorous opposition on the part of the Transylvanian nobility.

The Counter-Reformation proper in Hungary begins under Hapsburg auspices about 1604. At the head of the movement to drive the Lutherans back into the Roman fold was the Jesuit Peter Pázmány (archbishop in 1616), brilliant, wily, methodical, and ruthless engineer of Catholic aims. Archbishop Martin Pethe, who preceeded Pázmány in the archbishopric of Ostrihom, already laid the groundwork for Pázmány's recatholization of Hungary.<sup>8</sup> Pethe succeeded in forcing several ordinances and decrees from Rudolph II<sup>9</sup> and Sigismund III, the Polish king, against the Lutherans, and in 1604 entered the purely Lutheran

7. Joseph Škultéty, "Život našich predkov v dobe Tranovského," *Tranovského Sborník*, p. 12 and *passim*. Škultéty gives a vivid detailed account of the trying conditions under Turkish domination in Slovakia.

8. *Drobný, op. cit.*, p. 10.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 12. E.g., Rudolph's edict of Nov. 11, 1603, that the Lutherans should turn over their churches to the Catholics was carried out methodically by the military subordinates of Rome. Their success was beyond expectation, so ruthless and complete was their execution of the order.

Spis̃ county with the intention of regaining it for the Roman Church.

It was during the reign of Rudolph II (1576-1608) that the Protestants in Hungary split into two groups, Lutheran and Calvinist. The Lutherans thus weakened were persecuted by the Catholic bishops, their pastors forbidden to baptize, evicted from their parsonages, and their churches and schools closed. In defense the Lutherans joined the nobility and accepted the leadership of Bočkay, to whose side practically all Slovakia flocked against Rudolph. Stephen Bočkay became Prince of Transylvania (1604-1606), and, after defeating the Hapsburgs, secured the Treaty of Vienna (1606), by which Protestantism was given equal status with Catholicism.<sup>10</sup>

The Treaty of Vienna was incorporated into the Hungarian statutes in 1608 at a council in Bratislava (Pressburg), and according to it the Lutherans were allowed to elect their own superiors (superintendents), thus sloughing off the yoke of Catholic ecclesiastical authority. The preponderance of Lutheran votes at the council is evident from the election to the Hungarian Palatinate of the Lutheran Stephen Illésházy, and after his death in 1609, of George Thurzo, the great champion and protector of Lutheran interests in Slovakia. During this period the Lutherans attained to power as never before, and hence it was only natural that at the Synod of Žilina (called by Palatine Thurzo in 1610) the greater part of Slovak Lutheranism was organized into independent church units on a firm organizational basis. After the Synod of Žilina, the Lutheran Church of Slovakia (Hungary) was supervised by three Slovak superintendents, whose duties consisted in visiting churches,

---

10. Michael Múdry-Šebík, Stručné dejiny Slovákov, pp. 52, 53.

removing differences, and in general strengthening the unity of the church.<sup>11</sup>

Following the Treaty of Vienna, the Roman Catholic Church changed its tactics in catholicizing Hungary. Since it achieved little success in the spiritual realm, it set about retrieving the nobility and the "dead wood" of the Lutheran Church. The archbishop of Ostrihom obtained a decree from the emperor which permitted him to replace with Catholic nobility, Lutheran lords indicted as rebels. No Lutheran was tolerated on royal property, and finally by imperial decree (January 28, 1613), the archbishop (Forgách) received authority to visit the churches. He was opposed in this attempt by the staunch Lutheran Palatine, Thurzo, but managed nevertheless to cause the Lutherans much discomfort by virtue of the imperial decree.<sup>12</sup>

Contemporaneously, Cardinal Pázmány made great strides in his program of recatholicizing Hungary. Pázmány was convinced that he could carry Catholicism forward chiefly in two ways: first, by gaining for the Catholic faith the influential aristocratic families on the assumption that by means of the lords he would in time also lead their subjects into the pale of the Church. This he succeeded in doing, so well in fact that he was able to gain the descendants of Stanislaw Thurzo for the Catholic Church! Secondly, Pázmány saw that he could best consolidate his gains only by means of a thoroughly trained clergy to displace the Lutheran pastors he hoped to dispose of in one way or other. Under his influence a Jesuit "gymnasium" was established in Trnava already in 1616, a seminary opened, and the famous Pázmáeum in Vienna founded in 1623. Pázmány realized that not only the clergy

---

11. Branislav Varsik, "Náboženské pomery na Slovensku v dobe Tranovského," Tranovského Sborník, p. 18.

12. Drobny, ibid., p. 12.

but also the laity (with emphasis on the nobility) was in need of thorough Catholic indoctrination. Particularly to supply the needs of the latter, Pázmány founded a Catholic university in Trnava in 1635 and placed its supervision into the hands of Jesuits.

Since the headquarters of the Catholic hierarchy after the occupation of Ostrihom by the Turks moved to Trnava, and since the heart of Hapsburgian Hungary was Slovakia (the eastern regions being predominantly Hungarian-Calvinist), the Counter-Reformation was felt chiefly by the Slovak lands and by Slovak Lutheranism. The bastions of Lutheranism begin to crumble early in the 17th century with the extinction of the male descendants of George Thurzo (whose son, Imrich, died in 1621), the catholicization of the descendants of Stanislav Thurzo by Pázmány, and finally also the family of Illésházy.

Thus the Lutheran nobility and gentry in Slovakia declined and conversely the number of Catholic nobility increased, with the result that Catholic power began to predominate at councils after the death of Stanislav Thurzo (1625), when the Palatinate was already in the hands of the zealous Catholic, Michael Eszterházy.

However, for a short interval before this last development there was a period of peace and respite during which the emigrant Tranovský came to Slovakia. It was the period of religious liberty granted to the Lutherans by the Treaty of Mikulov in 1622, a truce achieved as a result of the revolt of Gabriel Bethlen.<sup>13</sup> Gabriel Bethlen (Bethlen Gabor) was one of the greatest princes of Transylvania, and ruled the principality from 1613-1629. At the outbreak of the Thirty

---

13. Varsik, op. cit., pp. 20,21.

Years' War he openly sided with the enemies of the Hapsburgs and made Transylvania a vital factor in European politics.<sup>14</sup>

The Thirty Years' War is indirectly responsible for the emigration of George Tranovský to Slovakia where he published the Cithara Sanctorum. In the 16th century Slovak Lutheranism was almost entirely dependent on Bohemia for its religious literature, including its hymnals. And therefore, when the Slovaks embraced Lutheranism, they did not bother to translate the Bible into their own language.<sup>15</sup> They had been using Czech as their literary language since the 15th century, and when the Reformation came to them, they already had at their disposal a fine Czech translation of the Bible which they well understood. Not only the Bible, but also other religious books, such as hymnals, agendas, and collections of homilies (postils), were brought into Slovakia from Czech regions during the 16th and beginning of the 17th century. The Lutherans of Slovakia did, however, provide themselves with an edition of Luther's Catechism, but only because Czech Protestantism deviated from Luther's principles, which they preferred to retain unadulterated. In Bohemia, religious books were being published mainly by Bohemian Brethren and Utraquists of varying confessional stripe. And so an edition of Luther's Catechism appears in Bardejov in 1581, and in 1584 Fruno's Slovak-Latin Catechism. It is obvious from this that the concern for the retention of Luther's doctrine pure shifted from Bohemia to the Lutherans in Slovakia.

Following the Synod of Žilina there was a more determined effort on the part of the Slovak Lutheran Church to preserve its Lutheran

14. Encyclopedia of World History, ed. by Wm. L. Langer, p. 426. The historical framework of this chapter is derived from this comprehensive encyclopedia.

15. Varsik, op. cit., p. 18

identity. It subscribed to the Formula of Concord and to the Lutheran symbols in general. In 1613 a new translation of Luther's Catechism was issued by three superintendents. And zealous Elias Láni that same year proposed to publish an agenda, an intention frustrated only by his untimely death.

Full religious liberty was not indigenous to Slovakia at this time, for by the Majestätsbrief of Rudolph II in 1609 the Lutherans of Bohemia were also granted religious freedom. But this hopeful prospect for Lutheranism in Czechoslovak lands did not last long, for already in the twenties of the 17th century dangerous schisms appeared. In Bohemia there arose a religious unrest which in the Battle of White Mountain (Biela Hora), November 8, 1620, led to the complete disintegration of the Czech Lutherans. The blossom of the Czech Reformation was either exterminated or else it had to migrate to foreign lands, and a new constituency, usually of non-Czech derivation, came to power in Bohemia, determined to reestablish the authority of the Catholic Church.

The impact of the catastrophe at White Mountain was felt very strongly among the Lutherans of Slovakia who were heretofore supplied with religious books from Bohemian lands. No longer could they expect the former flood of books from Bohemia, the last books being brought from there by Czech emigrants in the third decade of the 17th century. In the course of time the old books were lost and gradually a need was felt for new ones. When, after three exiles, George Tranovský reached more peaceful Slovakia, he at once set himself to the task of filling this void.

In the post-White Mountain period, then, Slovakia was obliged to carry on that function which was performed in the pre-White Mountain period in Bohemian lands: namely, to publish religious

books for both Bohemian and Slovak Lutherans.<sup>16</sup>

It was into this period that Tranovský's hymnal makes its entry. Truly, "the publication of this collection of hymns is a real landmark in the internal life of Slovak Lutheranism."<sup>17</sup>

16. Ibid., pp. 18-20

17. Ibid., p. 21.

... kinds of hymns were in use in Slovakia.  
 ... there is  
 disagreement between the Tranovský scholar, Lubomír Haas,<sup>1</sup> and  
 the Tranovský scholar, John Moore.<sup>2</sup> Haas asserts that the Slovak  
 Lutherans before Tranovský used Hussite hymns, which he identifies  
 with the Brothers Hymns.<sup>3</sup> Haas points to a citation in a Brethren  
 hymnal of 1813 which states that the hymnal was intended also for those  
 who understood Czech, e.g., the Slovaks.<sup>4</sup> He adds still another  
 reason for his contention by pointing out various Hussite hymns found in  
 many of the hymns. But this was just as true, says Buravský, of  
 Buravský's hymnal of 1878.<sup>5</sup>

Moore takes issue with Haas's contention that Slovaks before  
 Tranovský used Hussite hymns, by saying that other Brethren in  
 Poland and Silesia are referred to by the citation, "others, who under-  
 stand the Czech tongue."<sup>6</sup> He further brushes aside as impractical the  
 notion that Haas's Brethren hymnal was used in Slovakia, arguing  
 that the Slovak people would not be apt to follow a service as liturgical  
 as that. And then too, says Moore, the Brethren hymns were much too

1. Lubomír Haas, op. cit., pp. 18-20.

2. John Moore, Historie evangelického křesťanstva v Slovensku a Historie  
 křesťanstva.

3. Dr. John P. Buravský, "Husovské náboženské písně před  
 Slováky před Tranovským křesťanstvím," Tranovské dějiny, footnote,  
 p. 23.

4. Haas, op. cit., p. 18.

5. Buravský, op. cit., footnote, p. 23. This is just one instance  
 of Haas's general unreliability. His study of Tranovský and the  
 Brethren is replete with haphazard conclusions, as further evidence will indicate.

## II. Slovak Hymnody before Tranovský

Before Tranovský two kinds of hymnals were in use in Slovakia: printed and manuscript hymnals. Concerning the former there is disagreement between the Tranovský historian, Ludevít Haan,<sup>1</sup> and the Tranovský scholar, John Mocko.<sup>2</sup> Haan asserts that the Slovak Lutherans before Tranovský used Hussite hymnals, which he identifies with the Brethren hymnals.<sup>3</sup> Haan points to a notation in a Brethren hymnal of 1618 which states that the hymnal was intended also for those who understood Czech, e.g., the Slovaks.<sup>4</sup> He adduces still another reason for his contention by pointing out various Slovakisms found in many of the hymns. But this was just as true, says Ďurovič, of Kunvaldský's hymnal of 1572.<sup>5</sup>

Mocko takes issue with Haan's contention that Slovaks before Tranovský used Hussite hymnals, by saying that other Brethren in Poland and Silesia are referred to by the notation, "others, who understand the Czech tongue." He further brushes aside as impractical the notion that Závorka's Lutheran hymnal was used in Slovakia, arguing that the Slovak people would not be apt to follow a service as liturgical as that. And then too, avers Mocko, the Brethren hymnals were much too

1. Ludevít Haan, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-20.

2. John Mocko, Historia posvítnej piesne slovenskej a historia kancionálu.

3. Dr. John P. Ďurovič, "Najstaršia rukopisná sbierka piesní na Slovensku pred Tranovského kancionálu," Tranovského Sborník, footnote, p. 23.

4. Haan, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

5. Ďurovič, *op. cit.*, footnote, p. 24. This is just one instance of Haan's general unreliability. His study of Tranovský and the Cithara is replete with haphazard scholarship, as further evidence will indicate.

expensive for the Slovaks. They would sooner have used the Calixtine hymnals which were of smaller format, without notes, less expensive, and published more frequently. Mocko also notes the lack of references to these hymnals in the reports of congregational visitors.<sup>6</sup>

Đurovič, in his article in the Tranovského Sborník,<sup>7</sup> meets these arguments by stating that it can be definitely asserted that the Old-Czech hymnals were used by the Slovaks before Tranovský. And, in addition to these, the hymnals of the Brethren, Calixtines, and Lutherans as well. Furthermore, the Brethren published smaller hymnals. As for the amount of liturgy in some hymnals being prohibitive to Slovak use, Đurovič says that the Bohemian agenda used throughout Slovakia contains a large proportion of liturgy. There is sufficient evidence that the hymnals of the Brethren were used. Mocko himself testifies to this unwittingly when he refers to the "Pickarden Gesangbuechlein" used at Slovak services in Štiavnica, whereas Luther's hymnal was used at the German services.<sup>8</sup>

But the Slovaks did not only use hymnals printed outside Moravia. They also composed new hymns of their own and compiled hymnals in Slovakia. Particularly the hymns of Luther made their way into Slovakia and were translated into Slovak only in Slovakia. Then there are hymns found in Slovak hymnals which are not found in Czech hymnals. In fact, the translation of "Ein' Feste Burg" came to Moravia via Slovakia. Tranovský in his Foreword to the Cithara mentions five versions of Luther's battle hymn which existed before his time.<sup>9</sup>

6. Mocko, op. cit., p. 47.

7. Đurovič, op. cit., pp. 25, 26.

8. Mocko, ibid.

9. Đurovič, op. cit., footnote, pp. 26, 27.

According to Mocko, there is a twofold reason for the paucity of Slovak hymnals before the Battle of White Mountain: 1) Czech hymnals were available to the Slovaks and there was no need for them to duplicate the work of the Czech hymnodists. This, however, does not justify the lack of activity in this field. 2) The chief reason is that there was a dearth of Slovak hymnwriters who were capable of producing hymns in the Slovak language, so bound up was Slovak literature in Latin. Only after the Battle of White Mountain, when numerous scholars emigrated from Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia to Slovakia, did Slovak hymnody develop.<sup>10</sup>

#### Slovak Hymn Writers of This Period.<sup>11</sup>

Mocko lists several hymn writers of this period whose hymns can be definitely traced to their source:

1. George Bánovský (d. 1561).
2. Andrew Cengler (ca. 1588).
3. John Prúno Fraštacký (ca. 1576).
4. Elias Láni (1570-1618). Of all the pre-Tranovský hymn writers, Láni is the only one who possessed an authentic poetic gift and a facile command of the Slovak language. His hymns show that he knew how to meet the needs of the Church and the demands of divine worship. Nine of his hymns are preserved in Pribiš's Catechism.<sup>12</sup>
5. Daniel Pribiš (ca. 1600). Pribiš's Catechism of 1634 is an important source in determining Slovak hymnody before Tranovský. Pribiš added a supplement of 113 hymns to his translation of Luther's Catechism, the majority of which has been taken over into the Tranoscius. Of authors

10. Mocko, op. cit., pp. 36,37.

11. Ibid., pp. 37-47.

12. Ibid., pp. 38,39.

who can be identified, there are eight hymns by Láni, seven by Pribiš, one by Cengler, and in addition to these, about 60 Old-Czech hymns; the remainder seem to be of Slovak origin.<sup>13</sup> Mocko himself admits that this study is incomplete.

Pribiš's own contributions to the Catechism supplement are of dubious quality. As evidence for this, Mocko cites the fact that not one of Pribiš's seven hymns is included in the Cithara (1636).<sup>14</sup> This was not because Trnovský rejected the hymns, but because the Cithara was already in proof when Pribiš's Catechism appeared and Trnovský had no opportunity to insert any of Pribiš's hymns at the time.<sup>15</sup> The 1653 edition included all seven, but later they were dropped, and in the edition current when Mocko wrote his study of the Cithara, in 1909, there were only three included in the Tranoscius.

Pribiš's supplement is noteworthy also for this reason, that he altered many of the Czech expressions in various hymns in favor of their Slovak equivalent. The same sort of alterations were made by later editors of the Tranoscius.<sup>16</sup>

6. Anna Cobořová (ca. 1600). Presumed by Mocko to be the wife of Stanislav Thurzo.<sup>17</sup>

7. Michael Křišpín (d. 1639).

8. John Silván (d. 1572).

9. Vavrinec Benedikti (1555-1615).

all these 71 pages consist of hymns. They include a section of Slovak Hymnals before Trnovský.<sup>18</sup>

1. The supplement to Pribiš's Catechism of 1634 is the latest

13. cf. Ibid., pp. 43,44, where Mocko lists 41 of the latter.

14. Ibid., p. 45

15. Durovič, op. cit., p. 28.

16. Mocko, ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. Durovič, op. cit., pp. 28-42.

collection of Slovak hymns before the Cithara Sanctorum (1636). Hymns are added only as a supplement. Tranovský, as stated before, did not use this hymnal as basis for his own because his hymnal was already completed at this time. (Tranovský signed the foreword to his Cithara December, 1635). Later editions of the Tranoscius do draw upon Pribiš, though.

2. Older than Pribiš's supplement is the hymn collection of John Prúno Frašacký.<sup>19</sup> Prúno's chief purpose was to present the first Slovak translation of Luther's Small Catechism, a number of hymns being included incidentally. The exact hymns are not known, since the collection is not available. It is hardly possible, though, that this collection was considered by Tranovský in compiling the Cithara, since it was quite antiquated by 1635 (having been published in 1584),<sup>20</sup> and since it was printed and used in a different country.<sup>21</sup>

3. The third and oldest collection is found in the Bystrica (Bystrická-adj.) Agenda. This is really the Czech Agenda of 1571 and 1581, consisting of fourteen chapters. To each chapter there are added appropriate hymns, written in order to save the pastor the trouble of having to hunt out hymns from larger collections. These fourteen chapters are not the BA. There is a supplementary manuscript of 71 pages which Ďurovič has termed the Bystrica Agenda. This supplement is dated 1585. The entire ms. is inscribed in the same orthography. Nor do all these 71 pages consist of hymns. They include a section of formulae for various functions, e.g., Baptism, etc., evidently meant to be supplementary to the larger (Czech) Agenda. Also included in these 71 pages is a translation of Luther's Catechism. Following

19. Ibid., p. 29. Quoted by Moeko from Tablic.

20. Ibid., footnote no. 39, pp. 31, 32.

21. Ibid., p. 29. I have not been able to determine the place of publication of Prúno's Catechism.

this at the end of the ms. are 42 pages of hymns. This is the oldest known ms. of Slovak hymns before Tranovský, many of which have found their way into the Tranoscius.<sup>22</sup>

The following is a list of the hymns included in the BA:

- 1) "Nagswategssij Bože wssemouczy." The same introit as the present "Nejsvětější" which Mocko wrongly ascribes to Tranovský.<sup>23</sup> Nor is this a translation of the Latin introit "Veni Sancte Spiritus," as Mocko wrongly states.<sup>24</sup> CS: p. 1; TE: 1; TA: 1.<sup>25</sup>
- 2) "O Všemohoucí Bože náš." TE: 697, first five stanzas are in BA. CS: p. 489, stanzas 11-16 added by Tranovský.
- 3) "Otcze náš nebeský." Melody included. TE: 663; CS: p. 473.
- 4) "Pane Bože smiluj se, O Kriste smiluj se." A litany. CS: p. 469, including melody. TE: 661.
- 5) "Conterre Domine." Old medieval hymn.
- 6) "Ne reminisceris Domine."
- 7) "Da pacem Domine."
- 8) (Chorus) "Serva Deus verbum tuum: Zdrž nás Pane pry svém Slovu." Three stanzas. Tranovský has a different translation of this hymn: "Chraň nás Pane při slovu tvém" (CS: p. 351; TE: 435). Of Tranovský's hymn in the CS, the first three stanzas are a translation of Luther's hymn; the fourth and fifth stanzas are a translation of Justus Jonas' stanzas, nonexistent at the time of the BA but translated later.
- 9) "Domine rex Deus Abraham--Pane králi všech národov." Taken over into the CS just as found in the BA. CS: p. 435; TE: 783; TA: ---.

22. Ibid., pp. 30-32, passim.

23. Mocko, op. cit., pp. 86, 87.

24. Ibid.

25. CS in this section refers to the first ed. of the Cithara Sanctorum (1636); TE, for Tranoscus, Budapest ed., 1930; TA--latest American ed., 1928. Where TA is not listed after TE, the hymn number is identical.

26. From Mocko's Příspěvek k dějinám hudebního Tranovského, Cirkusové listy, IV (1890).

27. Cf. foregoing footnote for dates of publication.

Here follow three short hymns which Ďurovič does not include in the list because they are evidently excerpts from some longer hymn.<sup>26</sup>

10) "Pane Bože budíž chvála." Three stanzas. Taken over exactly into the CS: p. 482. TE: 843, slightly altered.

11) "Požehnej nás Bože Otče." TE: 335. CS does not include it. Appeared first in the 1653 ed. of the Tranoscius.<sup>27</sup>

12) "Nuž křestiané všickni spolu." Not found in TE nor in other Bohemian hymnals available to Ďurovič.<sup>28</sup>

13) "Otče náš jenž v nebi bydlíš." CS: p. 485; TE: 484 (slightly altered). A translation of Luther's "Vater unser in Himmelreich." Dated as Old-Czech hymn from 1559 (Mocko).

14) "Modlme se Otci svému." CS: p. 383; TE 481 (slightly altered). Jireček dates it 1559.<sup>29</sup>

15) "Tuto swatu Episstolu." CS: p. 229; TE: 338 (slightly altered). Jireček dates it 1559. Author: Tábořský.

16) "Buď tobě chvála Otče náš." CS p. 225; TE: 328 (slightly altered). Jireček dates it 1559. Neither Tábořský nor Tranovský is author as listed in some editions.

17) "My všickni věříme v jednoho Boha." Found in two translations in CS: pp. 221 and 222; TE: 303, 304; TA: 303. The hymns are reversed in the TE today. One is Luther's "Wir glauben all' an einen Gott," and the other is directly translated from the Latin original by Ennodius of the sixth century. Luther used the same original. Jireček dates it 1559; Mocko, 1576. Mocko's date is preferable because his research is more recent.<sup>30</sup>

26. Ďurovič, op. cit., p. 35

27. Ibid., p. 36.

28. Ibid., pp. 36, 37.

29. Ďurovič derives his data from Jireček's Hymnologia Bohemica, 1878, and from Mocko's Príspevok k dejinám kancionála Tranovského, Cirkevné Listy, IV (1890).

30. Cp. foregoing footnote for dates of publication.

- 18) "Věřmež v Boha Otce, všeho Stvořitele." CS: p. 283; TE: 310; TA: 309. Jireček: 1522.<sup>31</sup>
- 19) "Podiekujež nyní Pánu Bohu na vysosti." CS: p. 230; TE: 349; TA: ----. Adapted from the Old-Czech version. Mocko: 1576; Jireček; 1531.
- 20) "Zachovaj nás pry svém Slovu." CS: p. 231; TE: 350. Jireček: 1582; Mocko: 1576. Resembles Luther's "Erhalt uns Herr bei deinem Wort" (EA: 8) and Hruškovič's "Chrání mne Pane při svém slovu." (TE: 434).
- 21) "Děkujemeť obrance náš." CS: p. 503; TE: 738. Dřevínek and Mocko date it 1561. Slightly altered.
- 22) "Dej nám pokoj, Hospodine." Four stanzas. CS: p. 453, plus fifth stanza; TE: 810, plus fifth stanza. Mocko dates it 1620, but it is already found in earlier hymnals.<sup>32</sup>
- 23) "Milosrdný Bože náš, z Nebe visokého." Three stanzas. TE: 330, five stanzas. Not included in CS; included in the Tranoscius for the first time in 1684.
- 24) "Budijss chwala Bože Otče tobe." Four stanzas. Sung before sermon. Not in TE.
- 25) "Recě tohoto swatého Čtenij." Four stanzas. Not in CS or in TE. Originally Slovak. Appears for the first time in 1686 Liturgia ed. of the 1686 Liturgia.
- 26) "Milý Pane děj hodně slyšeti." TE: 331.
- 27) "Otče náš, milý Pane." CS: p. 224; TE: 332. 1529.
- After this follows another formula copulandi. Then follow the funeral hymns:
- 28) "Smiluj se nade mnou Bože můj." Not in TE. Originated in Slovakia.
- 29) "Z hlubokosti volám k tobe." First translation in Slovakia

31. Where only Jireček is cited, there Mocko agrees, according to Ďurovič's essay.

32. Ďurovič, op. cit., p. 39

of Luther's hymn: "Aus tiefer Not..." CS: p. 408, TE: 545, an entirely different hymn, is Tranovský's translation of Luther's hymn.

30) "Človek hríšný v svetie." TE: 913 (slightly altered). Author: Andrew Cengler. Only hymn translated from the Hungarian. Not found in CS. First included in Tranoscius of 1653. Not found in Czech hymnals.

31) "Darenné svetské utiešenie." CS: p. 302; TE: 943. Author: Rachtaba. Published first time, 1522.

32) "Svett by také rad spasen byl." Jireček: 1559. Not in CS or in TE.

33) "Smiluj se Bože nad nami." TE: 397, for first time in 1653 ed. Probably a first translation on Slovak soil of Luther's "Es woll uns Gott genädig sein." TA does not have it.

34) "Taktot volá sám Syn Boží." CS: p. 410; TE: 596. Jireček: 1559. Translated by Urban Němec from the German Anabaptist hymn; revised by John Roh. Original by Hans Witzstädt.

35) "O smrti ukrutná." CS: p. 314; TE: 945. Composed in Lutheran circles.

36) "Bože Otče, buď při nás." TE: 279; TA:----. Luther's hymn. CS does not include it. Appears for first time in 1696 Levoča ed. of the Tranoscius.

Three funeral antiphons conclude the supplement of hymns. Sixteen of these (nineteen, if the antiphons are included) are of Slovak Lutheran origin. Most of the remainder are of Hussite or later Reformation origin.<sup>33</sup> This, says Ďurovič, is the treasure from which Tranovský gleaned.

33. Ďurovič lists these hymns, op. cit., p. 42.

1. John Macko, Život Jurja Tranovského.

No. 191d., p. 3.

2. The title of this funeral address by Lockmann is "Vale Tranoscius." Macko, ibid., p. 4.

3. Macko, ibid.

### III. A Biographical Sketch of Tranovský.

The most complete biographical notes on the life of George Tranovský are left to us in Mocko's biography of the compiler of the Cithara Sanctorum.<sup>1</sup> When this work appeared there was very little authoritative information to be found concerning Tranovský, and this for several reasons: 1) the Thirty Years' War obliterated many of the memorials of the hymn writer. Then, 2) the severe ten-year persecution of the Lutheran Church under Leopold I (1670-1680) wiped out many sources with a vengeance. 3) The entire century following was not particularly conducive to research in this field, for it was a period of great distress and humiliation. Finally, 4) when the long awaited period of religious freedom dawned for the Lutheran Church in Slovakia, rationalism was inclined to malign rather than extol the work of the orthodox church fathers.<sup>2</sup>

Of the few original extant sources, the oldest biographical sketch of Tranovský is the collection of personalia read at the funeral of Tranovský in the church of Sv. Mikuláš by John Lochmann, the German pastor of Lupčianska.<sup>3</sup> This, of all the biographies, is the only reliable source for objective data on Tranovský's life. Later biographers, beginning with Bohuslav Tablic, fail to glean even this information.<sup>4</sup>

Haan's treatise on Tranovský and the Cithara of 1873, is based on Tablic, hence shares its failings, but nevertheless serves the purpose of opening vistas for succeeding historians and biographers.

- 
1. John Mocko, Život Juru Tranovského.
  2. Ibid., p. 3.
  3. The title of this funeral address by Lochmann is "Vale Tranovskianum." Mocko, ibid., p. 4.
  4. Mocko, ibid.

Lochmann and his successors in Tranovský biography stress his pedagogical and pastoral activity, whereas the emphasis, says Mocko, ought to be placed on his greater contribution to those three great Slavonic families which benefited by his masterpiece, the Cithara Sanctorum. His influence in this respect extended far beyond the limits of his parish and his lifetime, namely, to the Slovak Lutherans in general, then to Bohemia and Poland (including Silesia). In Bohemia the Tranoscius was eventually replaced by Leška's Zpěvník, and in Silesia the Polish hymnal was introduced in 1865.<sup>5</sup>

#### The Ancestry and Birth of George Tranovský.

Trzanovice, a village near Tešín in the principality of Silesia, was the home of Tranovský's forbears for many generations. There they lived as farmers. And there Adam Tranovský, George's great-grandfather was born about 1520. An industrious, wise, and pious man, he attained to the highly respected office of justice of the peace of the village. A love of hymnody is displayed already in the old patriarch, who is said to have concluded his daily toils by singing the hymns of the Church, and accompanying himself on the harp. Adam Tranovský was still living in 1623 (103 years old), and was privileged to see the children of his greatgrandson, George.

It was Adam Tranovský who first began to use the family name "Tranovský" deriving it from his native village, Trzanovice. This name he bequeathed to his descendants.

Adam's grandson, Valentin, the father of George, had an older brother, who, according to custom, remained on the homestead, while

---

5. Ibid., p. 5.

the younger son was sent away to learn some trade. Valentin became a skilled boiler-maker, or still manufacturer, and this was one reason why he settled near the town of Tešín, next door to the local brewery. Valentin must have had a good reputation in his trade, for according to guild regulations at that time, only a citizen could be accepted as master in the guild, and for a stranger in the town to attain that position attests to the eminence of the Tranovský family, and especially to that of Valentin. It was there that Valentin married Hedvik, whose family name has not been preserved, and their union was blessed with several sons and three daughters. When Valentin died, only George and his three sisters survived, the identity of the latter being lost through marriage.

Our hymn-writer was born April 9, 1591, in Tešín, and was baptized George. The records of his birth and baptism are no longer extant. All congregational records in Tešín were destroyed by the Jesuits during the Thirty Years' War. In his autobiographical poem, "Coronis ad posteritatem," Tranovský has left us the date of his birth. He liked to look back to the day of his birth and baptism; the first he considered fortunate, the second more so, as we know from his hymn, "Duch můj velebí" (Tran. # 862, st. 13).

Tranovský is therefore by birth a Pole. In Tešín, Polish was the colloquial speech, but the literary and liturgical language was Czech. Early in his youth Tranovský appropriated the Czech language, and worked in it throughout his lifetime. As a student he chose the latinized form of his name, Tranoscius, as was the custom of learned men in those days. In Wittenberg later he is registered as Tranosci.

#### Parental Training.

We may assume that Tranovský enjoyed the training of pious, God-

fearing parents. The life and talents of Tranovský bear witness to this supposition. Already in his parental home he took an especial interest in song and prayer. Hearing his greatgrandfather sing the old hymns no doubt left a deep impression on the young Tranovský, for he mentions the fact in his "Coronis." We may furthermore conclude that George acquired this love for prayer and song during the years he spent with his parents, since it is unusual for a youth away in school to pick up these things.

The same holds for his knowledge and love of the Old-Czech hymns. It is improbable that he would have acquired an affection for them in his days at the foreign schools.

George's parental training was supplemented by the school in Tešín, to which his parents sent him early, for they were determined to give him a good education. Young George prospered so well in his studies that when he had just passed his twelfth year, in 1603, he was qualified to enter the "gymnasium."

Not only the home and school were influential in molding the deeply religious character of the young Tranovský, but also the church which the pupils in the school were obliged to attend. We are told that in school afterwards the pupils were quizzed on the sermon preached on the previous Sunday.<sup>6</sup>

#### Tranovský in Foreign Schools.

Tranovský's parents cherished the hope that their son would enter the ministerial profession. And therefore, when at the age of twelve he had completed his schooling in Tešín, they sought a "gymnasium" with a high reputation for him to attend. They did not choose the

---

6. Ibid., p. 9.

closer one located in Vratislava, but the more prominent one in Guben. They must have been well-to-do to send him away such a distance, for George could hardly have supported himself at so young an age.

Unfortunately, the Thirty Years' War destroyed also the records of the Guben "gymnasium," and it is impossible to state definitely which class Tranovský entered and how long he remained there. Circumstances, however, seem to indicate that he entered "secunda" in the Fall of 1603. Latin was stressed very strongly in the curricula of those days, and since Tranovský was especially facile in that language, we conclude that he must have advanced rapidly.

Tranovský was in Gubin scarcely more than a year. His desire for more advanced education led him to the renowned "lyceum" in Kolberg on the Baltic Sea. There, as in other "gymnasia" in Germany, Sturm's educational system was in vogue, according to which, in addition to the study of the Bible and the confessional writings, great stress was placed on Latin. The climax of education was considered to be the reading and writing of Latin. The highest class was "prima," whose course lasted six semesters, although it was not unusual for gifted and industrious students to finish the course in a shorter length of time. To Kolberg, then, Tranovský came in the Fall of 1605 and remained until the Spring of 1607. Here too the records were destroyed and it is impossible to determine the length of Tranovský's stay. It is quite sure, however, that at Kolberg was laid the foundation of Tranovský's classical knowledge of Latin. His Latin prose and verse echo the Roman classicists, especially that of Horace, whose style was copied by Tranovský. That Tranovský did not neglect his talents is evident from the fact that already at the age of 16 his professors regarded him sufficiently prepared to enter upon his academic studies.

Students generally proceeded from Kolberg to Wittenberg, and Tranovský followed the precedent.

During Luther's time Wittenberg was regarded as the citadel of pure Lutheran doctrine. But after Luther's death, the Melancthonian principles of the Philipists prevailed. However, when the Formula of Concord was adopted in 1580, Wittenberg once again returned to the former purer teaching. At the fore of the faculty stood such men as Leonhard Hutter.

Small wonder then that students desiring to prepare for the Lutheran ministry should flock to Wittenberg as they did from near and far. George Tranovský came to Wittenberg in the beginning of April, 1607, and matriculated on April 13, 1607. He is entered in the register as "Georgius Tranosci, Teschiniensis Silesius."

Unfortunately, Mocko finds no additional data concerning Tranovský's stay in Wittenberg, and without creditable information it is hard to surmise his development there. But it is clearly evident from Tranovský's writings that the orthodox doctrines which he learned at the feet of such great men as Hutter, left their indelible mark on his confessional conviction.

Mocko traces one of Tranovský's beloved hymns to his youth at Wittenberg, the hymn, "Ježíši darce milosti" (Tran. # 502), over which in his Cithara he placed the distich:

Omnes Auctoris prima isthaec, praeiit odas:  
Qua juvenis Christum, saepe colebat ovans.

This hymn reveals Tranovský as a consecrated youth dedicating his life to the ministry of the Gospel. It reveals also the fact that he continued to develop his love and appreciation of the old Czech hymns even in the foreign surroundings of Wittenberg.

During this period of his academic studies Tranovský composed not only Czech but Latin odes as well.

There is no definite information as to the duration of Tranovský's stay in Wittenberg, but circumstances seem to indicate that he was there for five years, i.e., from April 13, 1607 until the conclusion of the winter semester in 1612.

Upon completing his studies, he probably travelled through Silesia on his way to Prague, on the way visiting friends and patrons. It seems that his wife came from lower Silesia. Spending a little time in his home town, he set out for Bohemia.

Bohemia at this time was an attractive country for Lutherans. The majority of its inhabitants was Protestant, and what is more, the Protestants enjoyed the free exercise of religion by virtue of the Royal Charter (Majestátsbrief) of Rudolph II (1609). The news of this good fortune was spread far and wide, to the exceeding joy of Lutherans everywhere. But in a wider sense, Bohemia was an attractive place for Tranovský, because under the crown of St. Václav, it was united with Silesia, the native land of Tranovský, and just at that time the religious and political interests of the two countries were united. Furthermore, Bohemia was the source of the beloved Czech hymns which Tranovský treasured so dearly from his youth. Going, therefore, from Tešín to Bohemia via Moravia, Tranovský finally came to "Golden Prague" where he began his professional life.<sup>7</sup>

#### Tranovský in the Teaching Profession.

In Prague, Tranovský accepted the position as "colleague" on the teaching staff of the "gymnasium" near the church of Sv. Mikuláš (St. Michael). He probably began his activity in Prague in the Fall of 1612, according to Močko.<sup>8</sup> Here there is some disagreement with Ferd.

7. Ibid., pp. 16,17.

8. Ibid. p. 21

Hrejša, who in his more critical study of Tránovský on Bohemian soil, proposes the date of Tránovský's advent into Prague at the beginning of the 1611-1612 school term, i.e., the Fall of 1611.<sup>9</sup> The position which Tránovský held seems to have been a sort of fellowship.

But Tránovský did not remain in Prague very long. His unrelenting orthodoxy chafed under the mediating trends among the Protestants in Prague. In order to obtain the sanction of legality in the empire, it was necessary for the Lutheran Calixtines and the Bohemian Brethren to present a confession of faith. The Augsburg Confession was already recognized in the empire since the Peace of Augsburg in 1555, but the Union of Brethren would not accept its position, since it did not agree with their doctrines. After much negotiation both parties agreed on the Bohemian Confession, a document which avoided the differences in doctrine in order not to offend either party. Both parties seem to have adopted the Confession only to get legal recognition, and almost immediately thereafter each faction began to seek its own interests at the expense of the other. The consistory which regulated Protestant matters in the country became packed with Calvinists who took advantage of the split ranks and began to introduce Calvinist errors surreptitiously. Under such a lax and divided system Lutheranism naturally suffered most, since it had the most definite confession and was in danger of suffering the greatest losses by compromise.

Tránovský, a strict adherent of the Augsburg Confession, could not tolerate such contrary doctrinal developments. Furthermore, being of a quiet nature, he was greatly distressed by the polemics between the Protestant factions. It was the last straw when the Calvinistic

---

9. Dr. Ferd. Hrejša, "Jiří Tránovský v Čechách," Tránovského Sborník, p. 45.

errors gained the ascendancy among the Protestants of Prague. Only then did Tranovský himself enter the field of polemics, purely out of defense and without malice.<sup>10</sup>

Tranovský decided to leave the polemical stage in Prague for the more favorable religious conditions in Moravia. The domain of the Prague consistory did not extend as far as Moravia, and furthermore, in Moravia the religious life founded on the Lutheran confessions flowed on a freer current. It was in Moravia that the first hymnals of a Lutheran character appeared, that of Jakub (James) Kunvaldský in 1572, and Tobias Závorka's in 1602. In 1592, Zámoský's "Evangelical Postil" (Postilla evanjelitská) was published, a comprehensive work which was still being used, after many editions at the time of Mocko.<sup>11</sup>

Tranovský accepted the call to teach in the school of Holešov, a little town in Moravia near the border of Hungary. This was in the Fall of 1613. There are no accounts of Tranovský's stay in Holešov, but he must not have been there very long, for already in 1615 we find him in Medziriečie where he began his memorable ministry.

Tranovský's learning and industry as teacher in Holešov made a favorable impression on the very influential lord, Detrich of Žerotín, who had him called as rector (teacher) to the Medziriečie school and became his special patron.

In Medziriečie, Tranovský distinguished himself not only as a teacher in the school but also as a leader of the local singing society. These societies originated shortly after the Hussite Wars in Bohemia and Moravia, and were organized by learned men who united

10. Mocko, op. cit., pp. 16-23, passim.

11. Ibid., p. 25.

in order to spread piety, discipline, and order among the people. In smaller towns these "literary" societies consisted of any one who could read, later even including those who could not read but could retain membership by paying dues for candle expenses. The chief functions of the "literari" were to lead a pious and God-fearing life, to take part in the singing of the common service and at funerals, and to take care of poor and/or ill fellow-members. The constitutions of these societies reveal how deeply the Gospel of Christ had penetrated all phases of their life. The second paragraph of the extant constitution in Starčí reads:

The singing should be sacred, based on the foundation of God's Word, i. e., such hymns are to be sung which harmonize in every respect with the true divine teaching given by God, comprehended in the Scriptures of the prophets and apostles, summarized in the three ecumenical creeds...concluded by the bishops, the Augsburg Confession of 1530, Luther's Small and Large Catechism, and the Apology..... Hymns contrary to this firm foundation, idolatrous and blasphemous, are not to be sung at all, nor introduced into the church, and no one shall in any manner be required against his conscience to sing them in order to fulfill the desire, advice, or recommendation of any one.<sup>12</sup>

Such a singing society was organized in Medziriečie already in 1540 and had grown remarkably by the time Tranovský arrived there. Tranovský himself is said to have had a pleasant, melodious voice, and took a particular delight in singing. In addition he possessed an eminent knowledge of music as the melodies composed and harmonized by him reveal. The society gave Tranovský an excellent opportunity to exercise these talents and to provide the group with songs.

Tranovský's position as teacher in Medziriečie provided him with sufficient income to establish a family, and so in 1615 he married Anna Polani of Polansdorf, of whom little is known biographically.

---

12. Ibid., p. 28. From this it is evident that in Moravia the symbols were held in higher esteem and Luther's teachings more deeply rooted than in Bohemia.

His learning and zeal in the performance of his office soon earned for Tranovský the admiration and respect of the congregation as well as the favor of Lord Detrich of Žerotín, who had taken a great liking to Tranovský and before long gave proof of it.

On October 2, 1613, Pastor Daniel Hrabovský took to wife the widow of Matthew Kapsander, pastor of Holešov, who had taken his own life on December 20, 1613. The finer details of the case are unknown; but the prevalent strictness of morals would not tolerate the marriage of a pastor with the widow of a suicide. The offense to the community led the landlord, whose prerogative it was to dismiss the offending pastor (October 16), to call the teacher George Tranovský, to fill the vacated pastorate. These are the peculiar attendant circumstances which brought Tranovský into the pastoral ministry.

Tranovský was not ordained pastor at this time, but he held his first service already on the 26th of October of that year, so it must have been with considerable haste that he was inaugurated into his work.

As pastor in Medziriečie Tranovský enjoyed a moderate living standard, and his first years in the ministry were spent in comparative peace and quiet. Only in 1617, when they were expecting their first-born, did the clouds of tragedy seem to hover over the Tranovský household. The daughter for whom they waited in such anxiety was named Mary. This respite from tribulation, however, was destined to be short-lived.

Events before the Catastrophe of White Mountain (Biela Hora)

When Ferdinand II, who had already quashed the Lutheran Church in Styria, ascended the Bohemian throne, the prospects for Bohemian

Lutheranism grew darker than ever. Statutes were displaced by the whims and aims of Ferdinand. The incident of the congregations at Brumov and Hrob proved to be the last drop falling into an already brimming cup. The church at Brumov was closed at the command of the government, and the merciless treatment of the Lutherans at Hrob exceeded any previous outrage against the Royal Charter (Majestäts-brief) of Rudolph. The Lutherans at Hrob were compelled to attend the Catholic church, in fact they had to sign commitments promising to be obedient to the Roman Church in the future. Finally the church in Hrob was demolished by the Counter-Reformationists. This act convinced the Lutheran party that the religious question would have to be settled with the sword.<sup>13</sup>

The spark that set off the explosion was the defenestration which took place May 23, 1618, when the governors Slavata and Martinic and the secretary Fabricius were thrown from the window of the governor's office in the Castle of Prague as the ringleaders of the perpetrated violations of the Royal Charter. The result of the defenestration was the organization of a temporary government and the removal from the throne of Ferdinand II (August 19, 1618) at the general council of all the Bohemian lands. Unfortunately, however, the "freedom" party lacked leaders who would have carried the initiated action to a successful conclusion. It was a misfortune for the Protestants and for the Lutheran cause that they selected the incapable 23-year-old Frederick (Winter King) to the Bohemian throne. Furthermore, the hopes that Protestant Germany would come to their aid were also frustrated. At every turn the Protestants met with failure. On the other hand, in

---

13. Ibid., p. 31.

the camp of the opposition (Catholic) there was unity of purpose: to destroy the religious liberty of the Lutherans or to destroy the Church itself and remove such laws as insured its existence.

The rebellion spread to Moravia, where each party tried to keep the upper hand. A bloody battle was waged on August 7, 1619, at Vyskovič in Moravia between the insurgents and the imperial forces. The tide of warfare was rapidly rising to engulf even the huddling parish of Tranovský.

The religious developments attendant upon Frederick's election also touched Tranovský. By virtue of the election of the Calvinist Frederick, the Brethren nobility increased in favor and influence, and along with it belligerent Calvinism which jeopardized the security of the Lutheran confessions. Tranovský lifted his voice against this threat by beginning a new translation of the Augsburg Confession in 1619 and upon its completion having it published in 1620 in Olomouc. The Czech translation of the A. C. had appeared in Bohemia already in 1544, but it needed many corrections. When Tranovský proposed the strict A. C. against the mediating Czech Confession, he was pointing to the unnatural and disastrous union of Lutheranism with aggressive Calvinism. Alas, Tranovský's heroic effort came too late to stem the tide. It did, however, serve to give those who remained loyal to the A. C. a dependable norm of faith.

The year 1620 was one of great tribulation and suffering for Tranovský. In order to quell the insurrection, the government in Vienna concluded pacts with Germany, Spain, Italy, and Poland, to aid in the suppression of the disturbance. The Polish king, Sigismund III, substantiated his promise to help Ferdinand II by sending 4,000 cossacks to Moravia. At Shrovetide in Medziričie, just as the noble

Žerotín family was celebrating a wedding, the cossacks swooped down upon the party, looted the guests and the castle, and carried off some prominent guests, incidentally brutally murdering two Lutheran pastors in the vicinity.<sup>14</sup>

But this was only a prologue to the catastrophe of White Mountain on November 8, 1620, when the insurgents led by Frederick were decisively defeated in the one-hour battle. The imperial army scattered over the entire countryside, plundering and pillaging the populace. By the end of November of that year one part of the imperial forces had entered Valasko and had destroyed Holešov, Bystrica, and other surrounding cities and villages. The Valasi (inhabitants of Valasko) in utter desperation stood with their backs to the wall and defended themselves savagely. Valasko was caught between both raging parties. Medziriečie in the meantime was temporarily spared these misfortunes. It was a fenced city and could protect itself against smaller attacking forces. But the evil which they dreaded came sooner than they had anticipated.

#### Days of Affliction in Medziriečie from 1621-1625.

With the new year (1621) a new period of trials and visitation began for Tranovský and his Medziriečie congregation. The newly elected city officials were soon forced to bow to the pressure of the growing imperial force. Meanwhile the Valasi were becoming more vengeful in avenging the lawlessness perpetrated on them. They made several lightning sorties into the outlying towns and strengthened themselves sufficiently to be able to control Medziriečie for two months. Eventually they were no better than the enemy whom they were fighting.

---

14. Ibid., pp. 34,36

Tranovský foresaw the ruthless retaliation which would follow these brutal outbursts of vengeance. And so it happened. On February 28, 1621, the emperor's "furýi" (a sort of advance guard) arrived in Medziriečie to procure quarters and food for the imperial army. One of them was killed by the rebels, and the Medziriečians had to pay dearly in cash to redeem the guilty party. On March 6, in the wake of the "furýi," the imperial army marched into Medziriečie, and the insurgents, seeing the army, deserted the city. The townspeople, being left without protection, also left the town in great numbers, seeking shelter in the mountains and in Silesia. Among the first to flee was Detrich of Žerotín, who, because of his official rank in the city and army, was in especial danger of death, should the imperial forces have caught him. Only four or five individuals remained in the city, the rest scattering as far as Tešín.

When the congregation disbanded, Tranovský too, with his expectant wife and their approximately four-year-old daughter Mary, left the town and all their possessions, and went to Tešín, Tranovský's native village. There, where Tranovský was born, Tranovský's wife gave birth to their second child, a boy, who was named Constantine, after the first Christian emperor, of whom Tranovský said: "Constantine overcame everything evil in the sign of the cross." The exile was gladdened by another happy occasion, namely the thirtieth birthday of Tranovský. In his "Coronis," Tranovský left us the date of his birth in a distich, the only extant record of that event.<sup>15</sup>

On the 24th of April the Medziriečians began to return to their homes. Doubtless Tranovský and his increased family also returned at

---

15. "Nona Dies aprilis erat, trigesima Vt aestas,  
Enituit nobis, In patrio orbe soli."

that time. Up to that time the occupying army consisted of Germans; they were replaced by the milder Spanish contingent. This encouraged the populace to return.

It is obvious that the citizenry beginning anew with nothing, was soon impoverished. Everything had been picked clean by the occupying armies, and many homes had been destroyed. The spiritual losses were much greater. The distress and suffering had dulled the consciences of the people, and some of them even joined the brigandish Valasi and became rich through plunder. Tranovský was faced with an enormous post-war reconstruction task in his parish. With each passing day the toll of misfortune and persecution grew. Throughout Bohemia and Moravia executions were rife. It was during this period that Tranovský composed his hymn, "Ach Bože k jakému věku," basing it on the words of Polycarp: "Bone Deus, in qua nos reservasti tempora!" He encourages the Church to steadfastness, telling it why the world hates it, and raises a prayer at the end asking God, if the sins of the flock must be punished, to do so Himself, and not give them over into the hands of the enemy.

The beleaguered Protestants were ready to grasp at any straw of hope, and hence they looked to Gabriel Bethlen for deliverance. In the summer of 1621, he was setting forth on a military expedition into Moravia to meet Margrave John George of Jägerndorf and his army of 12,000 men in the district of Trenčín. Bethlen came to Medziriečie, where he intended to spend the night, but a sudden storm rose and his men had to hurriedly harvest the crop, of which a great portion was lost, thus bringing greater distress to the populace. Eventually Margrave John George joined Bethlen, and they, together with Count Matthias of Thurn advanced on Moravia with 50,000 men, only to be

defeated by Albrecht von Waldstein on October 18, 1621 at Kromeríž. Bethlen had to conclude a truce with the emperor at Mikulov, thus bringing the hopes founded on him by the Lutherans to naught. The emperor, out of danger now as far as Bethlen was concerned, proceeded to root out the Lutherans by expelling the pastors of Prague and all places under imperial jurisdiction on threat of death.

The only relief for the Medziriečians in these developments was the removal from the city of the Spaniards by Margrave John George. But it is doubtful if conditions were any more pleasant under the occupation of George's army from December 4 until February 20, 1622.

#### The Calm before the Storm.

The year 1622 was the calm before the storm. The emperor's army was occupied in Germany and that portion of it which remained in Bohemia and Moravia was insufficient to wipe out Protestantism as the Jesuits would have desired. Lutheranism was deeply imbedded, and its extirpation was no easy matter. Brute force was required.

Nevertheless the government determinedly advanced toward its goal. On May 4, 1622, a general amnesty was issued for all who had participated in the rebellion against the emperor, sparing the lives of the insurgents, and fining them only on their property. Naturally, the Lutheran nobility were bankrupted, and they were replaced by freelancers who bought up confiscated livestock and property at low prices. This indirect blow to the Lutheran cause was keenly felt.

The Catholic action had tried its methods on the Anabaptists, but saw that exiling good workers would not improve the lot of the country economically; so they decided to proceed in a different manner with the Lutherans, weakening them into becoming receptive to

the Catholic faith by depriving them of their earthly goods, and by driving out the recalcitrants.

Tranovský spent the year 1622 in peace, if we can imagine some sort of peace in those days. Most Czech historians place Tranovský's departure from Medziriečie into this year, but Mocko argues that it is improbable that Tranovský anticipated leaving Medziriečie, for he registered a deed for a piece of property given to him by his parishioners and neighbors on February 4, 1622, which he would hardly have done had he thought he was in danger of soon being banished.<sup>16</sup> Tragedy was not absent altogether that year, however, for Constantine Tranovský died at the age of one year.

Events were rapidly approaching a crisis for Tranovský. In 1623, his enemies had found Judases in the city whom they used against him. Their aim was to get Tranovský out of Medziriečie, for as long as he remained, their efforts to recatholicize the city were made difficult. But Tranovský was not a hireling, and he would not for his own personal safety desert his flock. His hymn, "V úzkosti a zarmaucení," written at this time, depicts the sort of tribulation his congregation had to endure and the imminence of the eruption.<sup>17</sup> The conditions obtaining in 1623 were particularly conducive to such a crisis.

#### The Storm in Medziriečie; Tranovský in Bondage.

A second star of hope rose on the horizon for the Czech-Moravian Lutherans in 1623. Bethlen, Thurn, and Margrave John George of Jägerndorf did not give up after the Battle of Mikulov, but were planning a new war with the emperor. To that end they sought the help of the

16. Mocko, *op. cit.*, p. 43

17. Mocko prints the hymn in full, *ibid.*, pp. 46,47. This hymn was censored from the hymnal by the Jesuits in 1768.

Turk and the commitments of such European powers as England and Holland. Their plans called for Mansfeld to attack from northern Germany into Silesia and Moravia, and Bethlen and Thurn into Moravia and Austria. Bethlen actually did attack Moravia and got as far as Olmouc and Erno. The imperial army facing him was led by Karaffa de Montenegro, but being weak, had to take refuge in Hodonín, which Bethlen surrounded and besieged. But Bethlen, disappointed in his reliance on the Turk and his own foreign allies, could not exploit the exigency of the imperials. A false report that Tilly was approaching with 40,000 men led him to conclude a truce on November 20, which lasted until 1624. The populace of Moravia, and particularly of Medziriečie, suffered

The beleaguered imperial army at Hodonín was rescued by Count Christopher Dohna (called Donín by the Czechs) and his Silesian cavalry and infantry. On October 31, 1624, he approached Medziriečie, and soon thereafter entered the city. For the second time the Medziriečians lost their livestock to a plundering army. Furthermore, in December of that year, 12,000 Polish troops entered Moravia, settling in the vicinity of Medziriečie and living off the land. Huge taxes laid on the populace further impoverished the community.

Detrich of Žerotín gave the order not to let the enemy enter the city, and then himself fled. Tranovský was thus left entirely without protection and was taken captive on the accusation that he was responsible for obstructing the entry of the enemy into Medziriečie. It was quite common in those days for pastors to be accused of leading insurrections. Nothing, however, could have been farther from the truth in Tranovský's case. Nevertheless, he bore the calumny and abuse patiently, as one would expect a man of mild nature to do. He refers to his suffering as "a humiliation," and aptly so, for it

was the intention of the enemy to lower the pastors in the eyes of their community. This particular period evoked from Tranovský the profound hymn, "Proč tak truchlíš, proč se tak svíráš." This, and the hymn, "Rozhněval se můj milý Pán," is one of the very few hymns in which Tranovský emphasizes his personal griefs.<sup>18</sup>

It is not known how long Tranovský was imprisoned, but it could not have been very long, for already the next year he was again performing his pastoral duties.

#### Tranovský's Hardships in 1624

The populace of Moravia, and particularly of Medziriečie, suffered great losses in 1623. Moravia was ravished by Bethlen's Turkish allies on the one hand, and on the other by the emperor's Polish army. Needless to say, the cost of living rose tremendously. The famine was followed by pestilence which lasted from about Easter until the end of September. Some 2,000 persons perished as a result of the pestilence in Medziriečie alone during that period. Tranovský buried almost half his congregation. A collect superscribed: "Spoken in the congregation of Medziriečie during the pestilence, 1624," bears witness to the fact that Tranovský was released from his bondage at this time.

Over and above all the foregoing disasters, a fatal religious blow was dealt the Lutheran Church in 1624. Emperor Fredrick II, having made peace with Bethlen, was free to devote his attention to the extirpation of the Lutheran Church. In August, 1624, an imperial mandate was issued commanding all the Lutheran clergy to leave the country and the people to return to the Roman Catholic faith within six weeks. The enemies of the Lutherans fraudently kept the mandate

---

18. Mocko gives an analysis of this hymn, op. cit., p. 50.

a secret until the day before the time limit. The eviction of the pastors was not entirely successful, though, for many fled into the mountains and continued to serve their people secretly. But in July, 1625, a new imperial edict decreed punishment to all who would shelter the Lutheran pastors and a reward to those who would betray their hiding-places. The flocks suffered much by this withdrawal of the shepherds.

In Moravia it seems the removal of the pastors was not quite so thorough. At any rate, many pastors were permitted to remain in their stations and in office. This was true of Tranovský who stayed in Medziriečie and doubtless performed his office until the end of September, 1625. Why the mandate was not enforced in Tranovský's case in August, 1624, by the regiments of infantry sent to Medziriečie from Nassau for that purpose is not sufficiently clear because of the lack of historical detail.<sup>19</sup>

#### Last Days of Tranovský in Medziriečie.

Tranovský thus remained in Medziriečie for more than a year after the issuing of the mandate, determined to utilize every moment at his disposal in caring for the needs of his flock. Available records show that his last official act was a marriage ceremony on September 20, 1625; so it is improbable that he left Medziriečie before that time.

In 1625, two regiments of cavalry came to Medziriečie and were quartered there for ten months. Tranovský knew that his ultimate expulsion was imminent. During his last days with the Medziriečie congregation, he poured out his grief in the classic hymn, "Rozhněval se můj milý Pán" (Tranoscius, # 591), above which he placed the inscription: "Composed in particular sorrow, 1625."<sup>20</sup> With this

19. Mocko, op. cit., p. 53.

20. For an analysis of this hymn, cf. op. cit., pp. 56,57.

hymn Tranovský concluded his ten-year period of service among the Medziriečians, a period rich in blessing for himself and for posterity, for out of it came some of his most beautiful hymns.<sup>21</sup>

Tranovský in Silesia from the End of 1625 to the End of 1627.

Tranovský began his second exile with his wife and infant son, Samuel, who was born in Medziriečie about 1624; their first three children died that same year. The day of their departure is not certain, but they probably reached Tranovský's native home some time in October, 1625. There in Silesia were great numbers of Lutheran exiles from Bohemia and Moravia, among them many influential and prominent Lutherans, including the zealous champion of Lutheranism, Baron John Szúnyogh of Jesenice, who later called Tranovský as court preacher to his castle in Bielsko.

The Szúnyogh family for generations had actively spread Lutheranism, either through their printery or through their influential status in the country. John Szúnyogh's second marriage was to Anna, the daughter of the deceased Palatine George Thurzo, one of the most influential Lutheran families in Hungary. Tranovský's connection with this family was providential. The fact that he was court preacher at Bielsko prepared his advent into Slovakia, where the Lutheran Church was waiting for his blessed work.

There is no reliable report as to the time of Tranovský's arrival at Bielsko. Lochmann, in the "Personalia" says Tranovský

---

21. Mocko mentions several hymns coming from this period, e.g., "V den saužení, když od nikud" (T: 460), "Mocný Bože pohled na nás" (T: 1001), "Bože smutných potěšení" (T: 1000), and "Již poslední časové konečně nastaly" (T: 984).

taught there for about three years. Tranovský had to leave Bielsko at the end of 1627, so his arrival ought to be placed toward the end of 1625. Thus his stay lasted little more than two years. Lochmann's dates must be taken roundly.<sup>22</sup>

Tranovský began at Bielsko as a court preacher, but soon served as pastor also to the townfolk, whose pastor was forced to leave the country. There he officiated most likely in German, for the congregation in Bielsko is German to this day.<sup>23</sup> During this time the friendship between the Tranovský and the Szúnyogh family grew into a strong bond.

There a fifth child was born, who was named David, after the great Psalmist.

It was in 1626 also that Tranovský designed his coat of arms.

Through the following events, John Szúnyogh shared the fate of Tranovský, including his exile. The lives of both were threatened, and so they left before they were forced to. This must have been soon after the occupation of upper Silesia by Waldstein, which took place in the Fall of 1627. Hence the departure from Bielsko may be placed in the last months of the year.

Tranovský in Hungary (Slovakia) at the Orava Castle.

The flight of Tranovský from Bielsko occurred at a most opportune time, when his gifts and spiritual powers were most needed by the Slovak nation.

Tranovský did not go directly to the Orava Castle, but stopped off first at Szúnyogh's Budatín Castle. There he found a much-

22. Mocko, *op. cit.*, pp. 63, 68.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 63.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 70.

taught there for about three years. Tranovský had to leave Bielsko at the end of 1627, so his arrival ought to be placed toward the end of 1625. Thus his stay lasted little more than two years. Lochmann's dates must be taken roundly.<sup>22</sup>

Tranovský began at Bielsko as a court preacher, but soon served as pastor also to the townfolk, whose pastor was forced to leave the country. There he officiated most likely in German, for the congregation in Bielsko is German to this day.<sup>23</sup> During this time the friendship between the Tranovský and the Szúnogh family grew into a strong bond.

There a fifth child was born, who was named David, after the great Psalmist.

It was in 1626 also that Tranovský designed his coat of arms.

Through the following events, John Szúnogh shared the fate of Tranovský, including his exile. The lives of both were threatened, and so they left before they were forced to. This must have been soon after the occupation of upper Silesia by Waldstein, which took place in the fall of 1627. Hence the departure from Bielsko may be placed in the last months of the year.

Tranovský in Hungary (Slovakia) at the Orava Castle.

The flight of Tranovský from Bielsko occurred at a most opportune time, when his gifts and spiritual powers were most needed by the Slovak nation.

Tranovský did not go directly to the Orava Castle, but stopped off first at Szúnogh's Budatín Castle. There he found a much-

22. Mocko, op. cit., pp. 63, 68.

23. Ibid., p. 63.

24. Ibid., p. 70.

Tranovský's Latin hymns, of which 150 are included in this work, are divided into three groups: 1) Hymns for the entire church year, from Advent to Trinity Sunday (## 1-46); 2) Hymns concerning the Law, faith, Lord's Prayer, Lord's Supper, morning and evening hymns, after meals, etc. (## 47-82); and 3) general hymns (## 83-150).

It is noteworthy that the book is dedicated to Prince Karl Bedrich (Frederick) of Muensterberg and Olešnice, to Count Caspar Illésházy, and to Baron John Szúnyogh. In the dedication Tranovský justifies his use of rhyme in the Latin hymns by saying that there is no reason why Latin hymns should not be rhymed as are hymns in other languages. The dedication of the hymns gives the date 1628.<sup>25</sup>

To this collection of odes and hymns Tranovský appended his poem, "Coronis ad posteritatem," which for the scarcity of primary sources has become an all-important biographical source for historians. And at the conclusion of the work there are twenty metrical patterns according to which Tranovský composed his odes. They attest to his great facility in handling classical metres.

These hymns and odes were intended by Tranovský for use in congregational worship. This is confirmed by the inclusion of twenty harmonized melodies (in four parts) composed by Tranovský himself. There is a melody for each metrical pattern. It is not strange that Tranovský should have provided congregations with Latin hymns, for even so late in the Middle Ages Latin hymns were still sung in Lutheran churches, and especially in those localities where Germans were more numerous. This work of Tranovský earned for him a high respect among learned people, and was received with delight by the general public.

---

25. *Ibid.*, p. 71. "ex Pathmo mea Sarmatica, anno eCCLesIae Christi sVb CrVce, In spe VIVa, MILItantIs."

In the solitude of the Orava Castle, free from the plots and persecution of his enemies, Tranovský could devote more attention also to his family. At this time three sons were living and no doubt also a daughter probably named Susan. The youngest son, born most likely in Orava, was named Timothy. Tranovský liked to give his children Biblical names, choosing such as would give the children an ideal. He strove to rear his sons as men who would serve to edify the Church. He is said to have given them this advice: "Grow, my beloved ones, my hearts, grow up holy. And may the Holy Trinity grant you a long life, that by your toil the Church may grow. That be the aim of our family!"<sup>26</sup>

Several of Tranovský's hymns were written especially for his children, e.g., "Krásny byl Absolon" (Tranoscius, # 620) and "Slyš ó věrná duše! Kterak Daniel píše" (Tran., # 638).

During their stay at the Orava Castle, the Tranovský family was blessed with the birth of two daughters.

Tranovský in Sv. Mikuláš of Liptov.

The short time Tranovský spent at the Orava Castle was sufficient for him to become well-known and sought after in Slovakia. After the death of Tobias Benedict, pastor of Sv. Mikuláš, the patrons of the Mikuláš-Okolično parish, with the consent of the lord of Orava Castle, extended the call to Tranovský in 1631. On January 22, 1632, Tranovský was received into the Liptov conference as "senior." At the same conference he was honored with the judgeship of the consistory. Everywhere where Tranovský labored, he immediately won the good will of his parishioners and colleagues.

---

26. Ibid., p. 73.

In Sv. Mikuláš we come to the climax of Tranovský's career, for there he produced his two great works, the Phiala Odoramentorum and the Cithara Sanctorum. These books were particularly welcome at that time for the Slovak Lutheran Church did not as yet have its own agenda or hymnal.

It is strange that for 25 years after the Synod of Žilina (1610) nothing was done to produce an agenda or hymnal for the Slovak Church. The result of such negligence was a prevalent diversity in the order of service and official administration of the various congregations. The reasons for this neglect was not a lack of learned men -- for the Slovak Lutheran Church had learned men to spare, some of them being obliged to seek employment in foreign lands. But they lacked facility in handling the Slovak literary language. Pribiš's Catechism of 1634 is a good example of the woeful inadequacy of expression in the Slovak language at that time.<sup>27</sup> As was mentioned before, Latin predominated most peculiarly in the very Church which stressed the use of the colloquial in its services. Pázmány took advantage of this Lutheran handicap by writing his tracts in Slovak, which the people could understand and appreciate, while the Lutherans replied in Latin.

The immigration of numerous exiles from Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia did, however, serve to ameliorate these conditions. Foremost of these beneficial exiles was George Tranovský. As a hymnodist and prayer Tranovský is unsurpassed to this day, says Mocko.<sup>28</sup> That his contributions to the sacred literature of the Slovak Lutheran Church are monumental is beyond question. Only the early death of Tranovský prevented him from leaving a still greater heritage.

27. Ibid., p. 76

28. Ibid., 78.

His first great work in Sv. Mikuláš was the Phiala Odoramentorum. Its title reads (according to the 1736 edition):

Phiala odoramentorum. Apoc. 5, 8. Christian prayers for morning and evening, for public and private worship, for special occasions and otherwise, for all needs, spiritual and physical, which can be used profitably by the ministers of the Church as well as by the general public. Written and published by Pastor George Tranovský.<sup>29</sup>

Biographers are not agreed as to the date of its publication; some say 1531, others, 1535. The exact date will be ascertained only when older editions are discovered. Beginning in 1653, these prayers were added to the hymnal. Ordinarily, however, the Phiala is not included in the hymnal because it was originally intended as an agenda for public worship rather than as a devotional book for private use.

Tranovský meant this work to be only a temporary sort of agenda until a more adequate one could be composed. But this dream was not realized until 1754!<sup>30</sup> Before Tranovský, pastors themselves either composed or copied prayers, collects, and other parts of the liturgy. Hence the Phiala performed a great service in filling the acute need. The Phiala may be regarded as a forerunner of an agenda. Tranovský himself would no doubt have returned to such a project after the publication of the Cithara, had his work not been cut short by his untimely death. Mocko regards Tranovský's prayers as found in the Phiala as genuine pearls in comparison with other prayers. He says: "They do not contain superfluous words or sentences, but every word and sentence proposes a new thought, stressing the humility of true prayer and trust in the grace of God..."<sup>31</sup>

Scarcely had Tranovský completed this one important work than he set himself to the still more important production of the hymnal.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid., p. 79.

31. Ibid., pp. 79-80.

Until 1636, the Slovak Church did not have its own hymnal, but for a century had to rely on Bohemian printed hymnals or manuscript hymnals, some of which contained Slovak hymns. After the White Mountain disaster, no more hymnals were forthcoming from Bohemia. Tranovský's enterprise therefore had the whole-hearted encouragement of his fellow pastors and the Lutheran laity. In fact, they rather looked upon this work as his particular destiny.

Their anticipation was not unrewarded, for the Cithara Sanctorum, containing 412 hymns appeared in 1636, published by Vavrinec Brewer in Levoča. It was acclaimed by Lutherans near and far. More than many another work, it laid the foundation for a subsequent abundance of sacred literature of a high quality. It stood head and shoulders above the greater part of the sacred literature of that day. In its wake followed such able hymnwriters as Adam Plintovič, Jeremiah Lednický, John Blasius, Matthew Bodo, and Samuel Hraškovie.

Tranovský dedicated his Cithara to John Szúnyogh of Jesenice as a token of appreciation for the many benevolences received from his faithful patron.<sup>32</sup>

#### Last Days of Tranovský.

Hardly had the hymnal been published, when Tranovský was stricken (toward the end of September, 1636) and was permanently confined to the sickbed. He suffered a long and excruciating illness. When his friend Lochmann visited him, and asked him whether he felt any relief from his pain, Tranovský answered: "Ego ad utrumque sum paratus, sive Deus me vult vivere, sive mori." Tranovský's

---

32. Mocko gets this information from Haan, p. 29, since the copy of the first edition in Mocko's possession did not contain the first pages of the Cithara.

entire life bore witness to his strong faith. His fatal illness lasted eight months, during which time Tranovský partook of the Sacrament four times.

Tranovský breathed his last in the forenoon of May 29, 1637, between 11 and 12 o'clock. He was survived by his wife and five children, the oldest of which was Samuel, who was only thirteen at the time. Tranovský died at the age of 46 years, 1 month, and 22 days.

The funeral services were held on Tuesday after Trinity Sunday. A great number of eminent people was among the many friends paying their last homage to the man of God. At the home, Melichár Smrtník, the pastor from Bodic, preached on the text, Psalm 75, 9, on the subject: "Of the cup of the Lord which God gives people on earth to drink."

From there the remains were taken to the church of Sv. Mikuláš, where John Lochmann, the German pastor from Lubčianska preached on I Samuel 25, 1, "Of the death and burial of Samuel the prophet and judge of the Israelites." Following the sermon, Lochmann read the "Personalia." Tranovský was buried in the church of Sv. Mikuláš, now Catholic. The exact place of the interment is not marked. There is an unsubstantiated rumor that the remains of Tranovský were removed when the Catholics took over the church, but such knowledge would certainly have been transmitted to us if it had any foundation.<sup>33</sup>

#### The Relationship of Tranovský to Comenius (1592-1670)

Some historians try to find a relationship between Tranovský and his renowned contemporary, John Amos Komenský (Comenius). But evidence adduced to support this contention is very dubious. That they may have

---

33. Ibid. pp. 83-87, passim.

met is probable; but that Tranovský was assisted by Comenius in compiling the Cithara is hardly probable when the Cithara of 1636 and Comenius' Amsterdam hymnal of 1659 are compared. Tranovský's hymnal was already in its fourth edition at that time, and Comenius could very well have gleaned from the Cithara, but he did not. Except for the one translation from the German, "Kristus Pán jest můj život," (Graff--Tranovský), he accepted none. Nor did he publish the incomparable Tranovský translations, "Hrad Přepevný jest Pán Bůh náš" (Ein feste Burg) and "Bohu buď sláva na nebi" (Allein Gott in der Höh' sei Ehr'), but included in their stead later inferior translations. The relationship between Tranovský and Comenius thus remains little more than a myth.<sup>34</sup>

#### Tranovský's Family Life and His Posterity.

Nothing definite is known of Tranovský's relationship with his wife except for Lochmann's statement that they lived in harmony and peace, bound by the bond of sincere love. Lochmann, being a personal friend of Tranovský, was in a position to know, and would not have whitewashed the situation in his "Personalia" had it been otherwise, for such was not the custom in those days (Mocko).<sup>35</sup> But after more than 170 years, Bohuslav Tablic perpetuated a flimsy anecdote which made Tranovský's wife appear to be a cantankerous woman, not speaking to her husband for a week at a time. This anecdote has never been authenticated and is probably false.

Tranovský's marriage was blessed with five sons and four daughters, of whom Constantine, Elias, Mary, and another daughter preceeded their

34. Ibid., pp. 88-89.

35. Ibid., p. 89.

36. Ibid., p. 92.

father to the grave. Surviving Tranovský was his wife, three sons, and two daughters (Samuel, the oldest, aged thirteen; David, and Timothy; the daughters' names are unknown, one of them probably being Susan). Tranovský trained his children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and wished to see his sons in the service of the Church. This desire was fulfilled only in Samuel. The other two sons probably died in early youth, for we find no record of them.

Where Samuel studied is not known, but he was called as deacon to Sv. Mikuláš in 1653 and was ordained as minister at that time. At that time he was 29 years old. He was not deacon for long, for on January 20, 1655, he was received into the Liptov conference (brotherhood). It was in that year that he translated the hymn, "Ach juž Bože, viš jak mnohé." He was called to Banská Bystrica in 1658, when his brother-in-law, the pastor there, had died; but Samuel did not accept the call.

Samuel followed in the footsteps of his father. He too had to drink deeply of the cup of suffering. The severe ten-year persecution under Leopold I caught Samuel Tranovský in its clutches. In 1672 his church was taken away by the Catholics and he was evicted from the parsonage. The Jesuits took him captive and deprived him of his office. To add to his misery, his son, John, returning from a foreign "gymnasium," fell prey to the Jesuits with their intimidations and promises. He was sent to Vienna where he was trained at the Páz-máneum, emerging a rabid Catholic.

In September, 1673, Samuel was summoned to a special court in Bratislava and faced with the alternative of leaving the country forever, or of remaining and giving up his ministerial duties. Samuel accepted the latter, probably because he lacked the means to leave, according to Mocko.<sup>36</sup>

---

36. Ibid., p. 92.

For a short while under the insurrection of Imrich Tököly in 1678 the Jesuits were forced to relax their hold on their territories and possessions, including the Sv. Mikuláš parish. Samuel Tranovský was immediately reinstated as pastor.

Meanwhile his apostate son, John, had finished his studies at the Pázmáneum in Vienna. He immediately volunteered to enter Counter-Reformation activity, going so far as to try to get his father to become a Catholic. When he failed in this, he wanted to evict his father from the parish where he had been reinstated. But he met an Absalom's end. On June 8, 1680, one section of Tököly's army came to Orava and captured John Tranovský and beheaded him in Dolný Kubín.

The Jesuits in their writings tendentially affirm that John was the son of George Tranovský, in order to defame the great hymnodist. But there is no truth in this statement, for George Tranovský never had a son named John, and having died in 1637, he could not have left a son who would have completed his studies at the "gymnasium" some time in 1672 or 1673. Haan ascribes the apostasy to Samuel Tranovský, following the Jesuit lead no doubt, but this is without foundation; for after the reoccupation of Sv. Mikuláš, Samuel performed his congregational duties until the day of his death at the end of 1684 or the beginning of 1685.

Whether Samuel Tranovský had any other sons besides John is not known to Moeko. After him Tranovský's family is no longer mentioned.<sup>37</sup>

37. Ibid., 92-93, passim.

1. Moeko, Historie, pp. 43-44.

2. Ibid., p. 43, freely translated.

3. Moeko lists these songs, op. cit., p. 50.

2) Furthermore, the Slovak fathers desired more hymns by Luther in their hymnal than the Czech hymnals offered. According to Mosko, the Czech IV. The First Edition of the Cithara Sanctorum.

3) Tranovský also had in mind the immediate needs of his scattered parish in publishing the Cithara. The flock and the very callous world. With the burial of Czech Protestantism at White Mountain in 1620, Bohemian liturgical and hymnodal sources were dried up for the Slovak Lutherans. The last Brethren hymnal was printed in Bohemia in 1618, and the last Lutheran hymnal in 1620. The Slovak Lutherans were thus left without a new edition of the hymnal for sixteen years!

Mosko advances four reasons which led Tranovský to publish a separate hymnal for the Slovak Lutherans.<sup>1</sup> 1) After the Synod of Žilina, Slovak Lutheranism was not satisfied with Czech hymnody growing out of a theology based on the compromising Czech Confession of 1575. Tranovský names this one of the chief reasons for his publication of the Cithara:

There were other reasons also, and quite substantial, which have led to the publication of a hymnal. First of all, many pastors, together with me, believe that the Church should be concerned that its singing be as pure and as pious as the Word and Sacraments from which it is derived; for as a harp...or other musical instrument, when it is not well-tuned, only screeches and disturbs a person, so also such singing as does not agree with the the Word of God offends the theological conscience.<sup>2</sup>

Incidentally, despite Tranovský's scrupulousness in extracting all such errors from his hymnal, two Calvinistic errors were overlooked in hymns taken over from Czech hymnals, a number so small as to be marveled at.<sup>3</sup>

1. Mosko, Historia, pp. 49-51.

2. Ibid., p. 49, freely translated.

3. Mosko lists these slips, op. cit., p. 50.

2) Furthermore, the Slovak fathers desired more hymns by Luther in their hymnal than the Czech hymnals offered. According to Moko, the Czechs were less concerned than the Slovaks about German hymns.<sup>4</sup>

3) Tranovský also had in mind the immediate needs of his scattered parish in publishing the Cithara. His flock and the many exiles residing in the country were often obliged to hold private services in their homes, and hence they especially needed an orthodox hymnal.

4) In addition to this, Tranovský was encouraged from all sides by pastors and noblemen, who despised the "Babylonian babble" and loved the purity of the Word, to publish such a hymnal, since they regarded Tranovský as the man chosen to fulfill this particular destiny.

#### The First Edition Proper.

Two dates are found for the publication of the first edition of the Cithara, 1635 and 1636. The reason for the disagreement is the fact that there is not a single complete copy of that first edition available today. The first ed. appeared early in 1636, but no doubt had as date of publication on its title page the year 1635. On December 1, 1635, Tranovský wrote the foreword to the first ed. At that time the book must already have been printed, for on the basis of proofs at hand Tranovský refers to typographical errors in his foreword.

The first ed. (8vo) has at the beginning XXXII unnumbered pages, followed by 700 numbered pages, plus 36 unnumbered pages. The first leaf was the title page, the second (or beginning at the bottom of the first) no doubt contained the dedication. The foreword begins with the third page and runs from V-XXXVIII of the unnumbered pages. On

4. Ibid., p. 50.

pp. XXIX-XXXI are the Errata, and on the second of the first two sheets has a woodcut depicting the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the apostles. The numbered pp. from 1-700 contain the hymns and instructions for the cantors. The last 36 unnumbered pp. comprise in the following order: a list of hymns suitable for the non-festival Sundays after Trinity Sunday (6 pp.), salutatory poems (10 pp.), an index (18 pp.), colophon (35th p.), and one blank page.

When Tranovský wrote the foreword, he must have had before him at least the 700 numbered pages.

The first edition had 402 hymns (360 hymns for the church year and 42 additional vesper hymns). Mocko notes 414 hymns, but this is because he divides certain hymns, which Tranovský counted singly, into several hymns.<sup>5</sup>

The first edition was published in Levoča by Vavrínek Brewer and is supplied with notes (music).<sup>6</sup>

#### Title Page of the First Edition.

According to the second ed., whose title page at least is a reprint of the first ed., the title reads as follows (freely translated):

Old and new spiritual songs which the Christian Church can use with much benefit during the Seasons and on Festivals as well as in all its general and particular needs, to which are added hymns of Dr. M. Luther, all translated from German into our Slovak (language).  
By Pastor George Tranovský, minister of the Lord in the Church of Sv. Mikuláš in Liptov. Printed in Levoča, 1636.  
In addition to the foreward and index, containing 700 numbered pages.<sup>7</sup>

5. John Čaplovič, "Vydania Tránovského kancionála," Tránovského Sborník, p. 180.

6. Op. cit., pp. 180-181 contain the foregoing information, which is more recent and more complete than Mocko's.

7. Mocko, op. cit., p. 53.

Tranovský's Foreword to the Cithara.

Except for the first point and the beginning of the second, Mocko reprints the foreword to the first ed. in full.<sup>8</sup> No complete copy of the first ed. was available to Mocko. His copy of the original ed. lacked three pp., the 1653 ed., 2 pp., and Horčička's 1684 ed. lacks one page. Mocko gives the foreword according to the last ed..<sup>9</sup>

According to Ludevít Haan, the missing pp. of the foreword contain the following points:<sup>10</sup>

Why we Christians frequently and gladly ought to sing the honor and praise of the Lord God. To this end two reasons ought to prompt us:

- I. ipsa hominis formatio mirabilis (i.e., because God has created man in his own image and has made capable of rendering praise to His name).
- II. Voluntas dei invariabilis (i.e., that God finally desires that men would thus glorify Him).

Mocko then continues with the second point from Horčička's ed., which is followed by the last two points:<sup>11</sup>

- III. Praxis ecclesiae, in eaque Sanctorum omnium, laudabilis (i.e., a praiseworthy practice and one worth following, or the zeal of God's Church and all its members from the beginning of the world until now).
- IV. Utilitas cantionum sacrarum inestimabilis (i.e., the inestimable value or usefulness of spiritual song).

There is also a second section to the foreword which speaks of the type of hymns and the order of and reason their publication.

The following is a resumé of the rather lengthy section.<sup>12</sup>

- I.a. The hymns are of such a kind as to find ready acceptance with the devout reader. To the old hymns are added not a few new ones, particularly translations of German hymns prepared especially for this edition.

---

8. Ibid., pp. 53-59.

9. Ibid., p. 53.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid., p. 54.

12. Ibid., pp. 55-58.

Tranovský found only four Slovak translations of Luther's hymns, and therefore he translated all the rest which were admittedly Luther's and added them to these four.

Tranovský did not exclude all longer hymns from the hymnal, for one reason, because they are occasionally useful in places where people have to travel long distances to church. Secondly, because these hymns are cherished by many pious people for their antiquity and for the thoughts contained in them. For such and similar reasons some hymns of inferior quality were included. The Christian is advised to select those hymns which suit his particular tastes.

- b. Tranovský was concerned also that all the hymns harmonize with their melodies, i.e., that the syllables match the number of feet in the melody.
- c. Tranovský saw to it further that all the words had a clear meaning. Some foreign words, such as, "Hallelujah" and "Kyrie eleison" were necessarily retained. Foreign and unknown phrases, advises Tranovský, are to be kindly tolerated and learned.
- d. Since some might take exception to certain alterations, Tranovský gives two reasons for making them: 1) Because of the diversion in the hymnals extant at that time, especially in the ms. editions, Tranovský had to select what he thought to be the best version, knowing that his choice would not be agreeable to everyone. He says that such a chaos must exist until there is a single well-edited and ordered hymnal which is generally accepted and used. 2) Other phrases had to be altered because they were clear misstatements of Scriptural expression.

II. Tranovský retained the old order of hymns. Part One of the hymnal is comprised of hymns for the festival part of the church year. Part Two contains the "officia" and hymns for the non-festival part of the church year. On saints' days and minor festivals, the Sunday "officia" and appropriate hymns might be sung. To this section Tranovský added the funeral hymns. In Part Three are included hymns concerning the Holy Christian Church and general hymns suitable for any occasion. Finally, according to the old order, Tranovský added vesper hymns, psalms, etc., following Luther's model in the psalms.

III. No personal ambition or vanity prompted this edition of the hymnal. For that reason the more than 150 hymns (and translations) by Tranovský are included anonymously. (The reasons for publishing the hymnal have been given previously.)

Here follows the body of the Cithara Sanctorum, the 400-odd

hymns.

## Division and Contents of the Original Edition. 16

## PART ONE.

- I. Antiphons which are sung instead of the introit Sundays and holidays (festival days) throughout the year.
1. Nejsvětější Bože všemohoucí
  2. Ó Ježíši
  3. Přijdiž (prosíme) ó Sv. Duše
- II. Advent hymns.
4. Hospodine Otče žádoucí
  5. Veríme v jednoho Boha
  6. Vesole zpívejme
  7. Poslán jest Archanjel k M. P.
  8. Bůh Otec, Syn i Duch Svátý
  9. Všickni věrní křesťané
  10. Moc Boží divná
  11. Přijď pohanů spasení
  12. Pán B. všemohoucí z nestíhlé
  13. Jakož o tom proroci
  14. Divná se milost stala
  15. Tyrdošijní židé
  16. Vítej, Jezu Kriste, z nebeské
  17. Až Panna jest pozdravena
  18. O Bože náš, Trojice nejsvět.
  19. Rosu dejte, o nebesá
- III. Christmas hymns.
20. Hospodine studnice dobroty
  21. Sláva buď Bohu na nebi
  22. Veríme srdečně, v jednoho
  23. Syn Boží se nám narodil
  24. Kristus Syn Boží narodil se
  25. Nastal nám den veselý, z rodu
  26. Již slunce z hvězdy vyšlo
  27. Pochválen buď Jezu Kr.
  28. Na Boží narození
  29. S nebe přisedše anjelé
  30. Prozpíváme píseň novou
  31. Nastal (jest) nám den veselý
  32. Zvěstujem vám radost
  33. Z výsosti nebeské jdu k vám
  34. Zpívejmež všickni vesele
  35. Slyšte pobozní novinu
  36. V radostném plesání
  37. Podle slov Izaiáše
  38. Veselým hlasem zpívejme
  39. Nastal nám čas velmi veselý
  40. Narodil se Kr. Pán, veselme se
  41. Dítě se nám narodilo

42. Kdo děťátko chce mítí
43. Znamenejme křesťané
44. Prorokovali proroci
45. Pochválen buď z novýmlyvné

IV. New Year and Circumcision of the Lord.

46. Rok starý miji v té době
47. Vzdejmež čest Panu Bohu
48. Rok nový zase k nám přišel

V. Of the Life and Ministry of Christ.

49. Prozpěvujmež s radostí, o Páne
50. Otce nebeského Syn jednoroz.
51. Cesta k nebi nová, živá
52. Stvořitel nebe i země

VI. Lenten hymns.

53. Hospodine Otče žádoucí
54. Věrmež v Boha jednoho
55. Kristus příklad pokory
56. Všemohoucí Stvořiteli
57. Ó Spasiteli Ježíši, kterýž
58. Kriste pro naše spasení
59. Jestit psáno davnym rokem
60. Když přišla smrti hodina
61. Umučení našeho P. J. Krista
62. Ježíš Kristus Boží člověk
63. O velika milost Syna Božího
64. Když Pan Ježíš na kříži pnel
65. Pohled na Pana Ježíše
66. Lidské pokolení měj vždy
67. Jenž si trpel za nas
68. Poděkujmež Kristu Panu
69. Chvála tobě, Kriste, kterýž
70. Zdrav buď krali nebesky
71. Nebesky Pan, aby dokázal
72. Když byl Pan Ježíš pochován

Lamentations to be sung on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of Holy Week at vespers.

73. O přežalostném pádu Adama
74. Kristus Syn Boží vteleny
75. Poslouchejte žaloby nebeského Otce

VII. Resurrection hymns.

76. Bože Otče, vzkřísils mouné
77. Sláva Bohu na vysosti
78. Věrime v všemohoucího
79. Bůh naš všemohoucí
80. Utěšený nam den nastal
81. Vstalt jest této chvíle

82. Vzkříšení Spasitele svého  
 83. Nuž velikonoční chválu  
 84. Kristus Pán jat byl od smrti  
 85. Zpívejmež vsickni vesele  
 86. Třetího dne vstal Stvořitel  
 87. Jezu Kriste Vykupiteli  
 88. Ke cti Krista Spasitele  
 89. Radujme se vsickni nyní  
 90. Leto chvíle této  
 91. Kristus Ježíš Nazaretský  
 92. Ježíš Kristus Spasitel náš  
 93. Den vzkříšení Jezu Krista
- VIII. Ascension hymns.
94. Bože, smiluj se nad nami  
 95. Sláva Bohu na nebi  
 96. Věříme z srdce upřímného  
 97. Vstoupil jest Kristus na nebe  
 98. Bože Otce z veliké milosti  
 99. Až Pán kraluje Božskou cest  
 100. Vstoupil na nebe rek pravý
- IX. Pentecost hymns.
101. Bože, k svým hříchům se  
 102. O buď sláva na vysosti  
 103. Věříme vsickni v B. jednoho  
 104. Dnešního dne spěnilo se  
 105. Navštív nás, Duchu Svatej  
 106. Jak čerstvých vod jelen žádá  
 107. Duch Sv. když na Jordane  
 108. Přijďiz Duse Sv. napln nás  
 109. Požádejmež Ducha Svateho  
 110. Duch Pane svou přesvatou  
 111. Poprosmež Ducha Svateho
- X. Trinity hymns.
112. Chválen buď večně Hospodin  
 113. Každý duch chváliz Pana  
 114. Pochváľmež Boha naseho
115. Veríme v Boha jednoho, Otce  
 116. Činimo PART TWO.  
 117. Chváľmež Pana svateho  
 118. Práv Boha svateho
- I. Office hymns for the general Sundays.
115. Hospodine všemohoucí  
 116. Známe to, Pane Bože náš  
 117. A na zemi buďiz lidem  
 118. Bohu buď sláva na nebi  
 119. Věříme v Boha jednoho  
 120. My vsickni věříme. (Luther's hymn.)  
 121. My vsickni věříme. (Ancient hymn.)
- VIII. Of the apostles and martyrs.
122. Hospodine, vždycky nový

160. Na zemi pokoj vždy budí  
 161. Vermež v Boha Otce, všeho  
 162. V moci, v moudrosti dobrého  
 163. Sváté apóstoly Pane věrné  
 164. Pamatujmež na svate  
 165. Kdo se líbí Bohu jsa živ

IX. Marriage hymns.

166. Šťastnýť jest muž bohobojný  
 167. Buď chválen, Otce nebesky

X. Funeral hymns.

168. Jistota smrti a pádu  
 169. U prostřed věku svého  
 170. Až, již čas odjítí meho  
 171. Srdečně žádám sobě  
 172. Toť já zde bídný červíček  
 173. O daremné světské ytesení  
 174. Všem sluší znati boh  
 175. Neplacetez mnoho, přátelé  
 176. Rozvazujmež již, křestané  
 177. Vímť já, že můj Vykupitel  
 178. Vazmež život smrtedlnosti  
 179. Zpomínejmež všiokni věrní  
 180. Jak rozličným způsobem  
 181. O smrti ukrutna, ach, jak  
 182. Jdu pryč vesele, v pokoji  
 183. Křestané na toto tělo bedlivě  
 184. Rozzehnejme se s tím tělem

PART THREE.

I. Of the Holy Christian Church.

185. Církev pravou poznávám  
 186. Církev jest Panna mne  
 187. Bohu milemu, Otci nebeskému  
 188. Při vodách tvých, o, Babylon

II. For deliverance in temptation and persecution.

189. Ach, Bože k jakému věku  
 190. Věčný Králi, Pane nás  
 191. Křestané pravdy B. praví  
 192. Již sluší srdce svého  
 193. V uzlosti a zarmoučení  
 194. V den soužení, když odnikud  
 195. Ach, Bože pohled s vysosti  
 196. Blázniví ústy říkají  
 197. Jestliť Báh s nami nebude  
 198. Hrad prepevný

199. Chráň nás, Pane, při slovu  
 200. Byť Boha s námi nebylo  
 201. Mocný Bože, pohleď na nás  
 202. Hospodine, ty jsi Bůh náš  
 203. Bože smutných potěšení  
 204. Proč tak truchlíš, proč se tak

III. Of God and His nature, and some of the chief articles of Christian faith derived therefrom.

205. Evanjelium věčného úprim.  
 206. Znejmež krátkou summu  
 207. Tatoť jsou nám přikazání  
 208. Človeče, chceš-li dojíti spasení

Of Christ the Lord, His person and office.

209. Pána Ježíše v pravosti znáti  
 210. Jezu Kriste, tys zajisté

Of the justification of man.

211. Přišlo k nám padlým spasení  
 212. Radujte se, o křesťané

Of the election to eternal life.

213. Znejmež, o, křesťané věrní

Of the value (effectiveness) of prayer.

214. Nuž všickni spolu zdvihnou  
 215. Modlmež se Otci svému  
 216. Otče náš jenž v nebi bydlíš  
 217. Bože Otče náš, kterýž v nebi

Of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism.

218. Kristus Pán náš k Jordánu

Of repentance and the forgiveness of sins.

219. Syn marnotratný nazván  
 220. Otče nebesky, rač pomoc dáti  
 221. Probudmež se, křesťané  
 222. O, milosrdný Bože náš  
 223. Ježíši věčný Bože, všecko má  
 224. O, Králi nebeské slávy

Seven penitential psalms of David.

225. Pane, v prchlivosti své  
 226. Aj blahoslavený, kterémuž  
 227. Bože, v své prchlivosti  
 228. Smiluj se nade mnou, Pane  
 229. O, Bože, mou modlitbu slyš

230. Z hlubokosti volám k tobě  
231. Hospodine, v mém pokání

VI. Of crosses.

232. Taktot volá sám Syn Boží  
233. Jakž Báh račí tak já choi

IV. The Christian life.

234. Pamatuj, člověče, proč tě  
235. Až blahoslavený člověk  
236. Pan Jezis původce spasení  
237. Jak jest líbezna a Bohu  
238. Krasný byl Absolon  
239. Litostivý jest milý Syn Boží  
240. Duch můj milost cití  
241. Chrámové Ducha svatého  
242. Slyšmež z ust Pana naseho

V. Supplicatory hymns for all daily needs.

243. Poprosmež Spasitele  
244. Stvoriteli večny, myt k tobě  
245. Pane, Krali vsech narodů  
246. O, Bože Abrahamů i vsech  
247. Bože večný sám pro sebe  
248. Vsemohoucí náš Bože  
249. Hospodine vsemohoucí v moci  
250. O, jak hrozna trápení  
251. Odvrat, o, Bože, hnev svůj  
252. Když sme v největším trápení  
253. Slušeloť by nám to znáti  
254. Vsemohoucí Bože, v nynejší  
255. O, Kriste, kníže pokoje, jenž  
256. Vsemohoucí věků Krali  
257. Dej nám pokoj Hospodine  
258. Dej pokoj Hospodine za těchto  
259. Nezpomínejž nám Pane Bože  
260. Smiluj se nad námi náš milý  
261. Ukrotiž se hnevivost tva  
262. Odpust všech nás zlosti  
263. Odpolu životem našim  
264. Zname, to Pane milý  
265. Odvrat suchý přilísne  
266. Zastav deště, ó Pane  
267. O, poprej nám pokoje  
268. Otče, pro svou dobrotu  
269. O, vzdal morovou ranu  
270. O nynejší zlý čas  
271. Rač nám dešť dati  
272. Zastav deště zas  
273. Oroduj za nás  
274. Pro svou dobrotu  
275. Odvrat mor od nás  
276. Pane smiluj se, Kriste smiluj

277. Pane Bože smiluj se, o, Kriste  
278. Otče náš nebesky, tebet

VI. Of God's goodnesses.

279. Probud se v mysli věrný  
280. Chváliž Pána již nyní  
281. Proč se tak rmoutis, duše má  
282. Pane Bože, buď chvála  
283. Nuž chvála má duše Pána  
284. Chváľmež Bohu ó křesťané  
285. Chváľtež nejmoonejšího

VII. Morning hymns.

286. O, všemohoucí Bože náš  
287. Dekujmež Pánu Bohu  
288. Z celého srdce svého  
289. Otče světél dekujeme, žes  
290. Díky Bohu vzdejme, Králi  
291. Minula noční hodina  
292. Hospodine uslyš hlas můj  
293. Až vstávající rano z svého  
294. Otče, Bože všemohoucí  
295. Dekujit, milý Pane, z daru

Evening hymns.

296. Děkujemež, obrance náš  
297. Kriste, jenž jsi světlo i den  
298. Vždycky se sluší modlití  
299. Z opatrování dobrého  
300. Pod večer tva čeládka  
301. Kriste, světlo všech temnosti  
302. Při skonání dne toho, za  
303. Na lože jdouce, tebet se  
304. Již se přiblížil čas noční  
305. Pochváľmež Pána Boha

VIII. Hymns before and after meals.

306. Otče náš všemohoucí  
307. Ježíši, Králi anjelský  
308. Vzdejmež čest Bohu svému  
309. Tobet sluší díkůčinění  
310. Chváľtež Pána, neboť jest  
311. Vzdejmež chválu dekování  
312. Chváľtež již Pána, neboť jest  
313. Budiz slavně veleben  
314. Slava buď tobe, Bože náš  
315. Nuž chválu vzdejme Bohu  
316. Příkladem Pána Ježíše  
317. Vzdejmež Bohu slusnou čest

## IX. General hymns.

318. Bůh Otče budiz s námi  
 319. Budiz nám Bůh milostivý  
 320. Slyšis Otče nejmilejší  
 321. Kriste Králi milostivý  
 322. Velmi miluji tě Pane  
 323. Ježíš Kristus ont jest má  
 324. Jak pekne svítí dennice  
 325. Ježíši jak jest presladká  
 326. Má duše jest Pana toho  
 327. Duch můj velebí Pana svého  
 328. Volám k tobe Jezukriste  
 329. Rozhneval se můj milý Pán  
 330. Jezu prispej k spomození  
 331. Ac jest mé srdce smutné  
 332. Takliž já predeee v úzkosti  
 333. Ac mne Pán Bůh ráci trestati  
 334. Vzhůru mé srdce nezoufej  
 335. Úzkosti na srdce mé vali se  
 336. Pán Bůh jest síla má  
 337. Všemohoucí věčný Bože  
 338. Pán Bůh jest má síla i doufání  
 339. I proč se tak rmutis  
 340. Má duše se nespoustej  
 341. V tebeť jsem, ó Bože doufal  
 342. Ježíši darce milosti  
 343. Bůh ohněm svate svetlosti  
 344. Dobroty lasky plny  
 345. Ó, Jezukriste Pane B. Synu  
 346. Pane Kriste, Bože věčný  
 347. Všickni lidé, kteříž spíte  
 348. U tebeť jest darů dosti  
 349. Byl člověk velmi bohaty  
 350. Ó, Bože můj milostivý na lid  
 351. Ve jménu Pane na cestu se

## X. Of the four last things.

352. Slušit na to každý čas  
 353. Kdo chce v dobré nadeji  
 354. Člověk hříšný v svete  
 355. Rozpomen se lidé na to  
 356. Kdyz přijde má hodina  
 357. Pane prispej k mé pomoci  
 358. Jezu Kriste milostivý  
 359. Pane Bože věčný Otče  
 360. Již poslední časove  
 361. Již nastava ten čas právě  
 362. Blížít se již věčné leto  
 363. Slyštež z učení Božího  
 364. Bychom sobě zpomínali  
 365. Když Pán Ježíš přijde k soudu  
 366. Byt lidé zlí a nedbali  
 367. Kriste, poprej milosti  
 368. Procítte hlas k nám sváj

369. Vzhůru srdce, křesťané  
 370. Kristus Pán jest můj život  
 371. Když s milými ucedlníky

A Supplement of Psalms from the Old and New Testament for vespers.

Versicles with which the vespers are begun:

Pane Bože, ku pomoci naší pohleď  
 O, Pane, aby nam spomohl, pospěš  
 Sláva Otci i Synu, etc.

Toni psalmerum communes octo. Toni peregrini tres.

Advent psalms.

372. Oslavujte Hospodina. Ps. 118.  
 373. Chyďte Hospodina. Ps. 117.  
 374. Pozehnaný Pán Bžh. Luke 1.  
 375. Mocný nebes Stvořiteli. Hyman.

Versicles for Christmas and Easter matins.

Pomoc naše budíž ve jménu Páně  
 Pane, rty naše otevři  
 Pane Bože, ku pomoci naší pohleď

Juvitatorium, cum psal. 95. Venite exultemus.

376. Kristus Syn Boží Mesiáš  
 377. Podtež vsickni klanejme se

Christmas psalms.

378. Proč se bouří národové. Ps. 2.  
 379. Nebesa vypravují slávu. Ps. 19.  
 380. Vyneslo srdce me slovo. Ps. 45.  
 381. Nyní propustiz služeb. Luke 2.  
 382. Služit Pána slavne ctíťi  
 383. Proc bouříš Herode slyse

Lenten psalms.

384. Bože můj, Bože můj. Ps. 22.  
 385. Když volám vyslyš. Ps. 4.  
 386. Bože, prispej, aby mne. Ps. 70.  
 387. Kristovo umučení na kříži.

Easter psalms.

388. Blahoslavený muž. Ps. 1.  
 389. Hospodine, což jsou. Ps. 3.  
 390. Ostříhej mne, Bože. Ps. 16.  
 391. Život svatých nejsvětější..

## Ascension psalms.

392. Všickni národové. Ps. 47.  
 393. Hospodin kraluje. Ps. 97.  
 394. Svátek dnesní velmi slavný.

## Pentecost psalms.

395. Smiluj se nade mnou. Ps. 51.  
 396. Pokřikujtež Hosp. Ps. 100.  
 397. Stvořiteli Duše Svaty

## General psalms.

398. Řekl Pán Pánu mému. Ps. 110.  
 399. Chvaliti tě budu. Ps. 111.  
 400. Chvalte služebníci. Ps. 113.  
 401. Zpívejmež Bohu. Rev.  
 402. Spasení jest od. Rev.  
 403. Chvalte Boha. Rev.  
 404. Kdožkoli chce spasen býti  
 405. Jenž jsi Bžh jeden v Trojici  
 406. Velebí duše má. Luke 2.  
 407. Velebí Pána duše má  
 408. Pochvalmež my Boha nyní  
 409. Dobrořecmež Panu Bohu  
 410. O, Jezu Kriste Spasiteli náš  
 411. Jestlize mnohé dobré věci  
 412. Hospodin ráčí sám pastyr  
 413. Tě Boha chválíme  
 414. Tě Boha všickni chválíme

After the hymns there follow the "Versicles which are occasionally used before the reading of the collect." In present-day hymnals they are inserted into their respective divisions.

Then come the instructions for the cantors, of which the following is a resumé: <sup>14</sup>

"Necessary Instructions for the Cantors."

The cantor has four chief duties:

- I. He is to know the order of service, what is to be sung and when.

E.g.,

14. Mocko, op. cit., pp. 67-70.

- II. A. At the main morning service and at festival services, the following are to be sung:
1. Introit.
  2. Kyrie, or a hymn invoking the mercy of God.
  3. Gloria, or Et in Terra.
  4. After the Epistle lesson a hymn de tempore.
  5. After the Gospel always the Credo or a hymn embodying the Creed.
  6. After the sermon a hymn, at festivals or memorial services an appropriate stanza (de tempore).
  7. After the Benediction an appropriate stanza or a hymn for peace. The officia and the hymns of the First and Second Part are fitting at this point also.
- For variety's sake, the general Et in Terra, Credo, and Magnificat, etc., may be substituted for the above. These can be sung according to the common melody, the meter being jambicum dimetron. From the Festival of Purification until Lent the common Officium is sung, hymns treating the life and works of Christ, or precatory hymns, especially litanies.
- III. B. At vespers:
1. After the invocation a psalm is sung.
  2. A hymnus (sic), or in smaller congregations a vesper hymn, particularly for the general Sundays after Trinity.
  3. Versicle and Magnificat.
  4. Benedicamus, or at seasonal services a versicle de tempore.
  5. An evening hymn, or a stanza from one.

- II. The second duty of the cantor is to be well acquainted with the hymns of the Church. For that reason:
- A. He should own his own hymnal.
  - B. He should practice the church hymns diligently for himself as well as teach them to the youth entrusted to his care; himself, so that he might know how to select appropriate hymns for the various services, and the youth, in order to have more dependable assistance, especially at the morning service.
  - C. He is to watch the correct old notes. By neglecting this, many false notes have crept into the people's singing, errors which are almost impossible to correct. Nor is he to cause irritation among certain people by improving on the old melodies.
  - D. As far as he is able, he is to remember to sing from the hymnal and not from memory (especially in church). For one reason, that he may not err and thus give offense, as some have been known to make mistakes even in reciting the Lord's Prayer; secondly, to encourage a unified custom by giving a good example to those who see him; and finally, to instruct the people. Should the "vulgus" not be able to learn a certain hymn, rather let it go at that and choose one more readily learned.
- III. The third duty of the cantor is to select appropriate hymns. Not anything should be sung, but such hymns as fit the season and the word to be expounded. From Advent to Trinity Sunday it is best to follow the sequence of the season; from Trinity, however, to Advent, the hymns should fit the Gospel lessons. Discretion should guide the cantor at all times. After the Epistle lesson a long hymn is preferable (for the people are often still gathering for worship), whereas the shorter hymn may be used after the sermon.

IV. The last duty of the cantor is to lead the choir and the entire congregation in singing.

A. He is to watch that he does not lead too rapidly nor lag behind by drawing out the words.

B. He should avoid coloratura and needless frills, for these beset the sense of what he is singing.

C. He should take care to clearly enunciate his words and add nothing to the syllables by affectation; nor is he to omit anything. For that reason, he should note the Errata Typographica and correct them in ample time.

D. He should keep the choir synchronized with the congregation's singing.

After these instructions follows a list of hymns appropriate for the general Sundays after Trinity. At the end of this list we find the following notation!

If before the sermon the hymn, "Pane, bohatce skoupeho," cannot be sung in entirety or in part, and there be need for brevity, then the first and last stanzas of the hymn may be sung on the first Sunday after Trinity, the second and last stanzas on the second Sunday, etc., etc.

Si tibi quid melius, Flatu inspirante Sacrato  
Inciderit, non te persequar; imo sequar.<sup>15</sup>

Then follow the various salutatory verses written on the occasion of the first edition.<sup>16</sup>

#### The Denotation of Tranovský's Hymns.

The many congratulatory messages and verses indicate the popular and enthusiastic reception of the first edition of the Cithara Sanctorum.

15. Ibid., p. 69.

16. Mocko reprints them, op. cit., pp. 70-76.

But not even this affected Tranovský's modesty. Lest he be motivated by pride or ambition, Tranovský did not even indicate which hymns were of his own composition. And so his hymns were published without identification until 1784, for nearly a century. They were first investigated by Daniel Krman and the publisher Václav Kleych, whose research, though brief, is notable. The incentive for their investigation was the occasion of the bicentennial commemoration of the Reformation. For this occasion, Kleych prepared a new hymnal for the Czech exiles which included almost all of Tranovský's hymns. For this work, Superintendent Daniel Krman was asked to furnish a foreword and as much information as was available concerning Tranovský's original hymns and translations. Krman drew upon an eighty-year-old tradition for his data, much of which was of course erroneous.

Václav Kleych was very helpful also in providing us with information concerning the various editions of the Cithara up to 1711 as well as attempting to denote the more than 150 original hymns and translations by Tranovský. Not even Kleych's data are entirely reliable, for he repeats many of Krman's erroneous findings. (Mocko)<sup>17</sup> Mocko lists 17 hymns which are definitely known not to have been written or translated by Tranovský, but erroneously ascribed to him.<sup>18</sup> After this Mocko discusses briefly the hymns of Tranovský, original and translations. The latest research on this subject was done by R. whose results are given in Tranovského Sborník, and whose information provides the basis for the following section of this chapter.<sup>19</sup>

17. Ibid., p. 76.

18. Ibid., pp. 77-81.

19. "Soznam Tranovského piesní v Tranosciu a Zpěvníku," pp. 173-177.

20

Original Hymns and Translations by Tranovský.

1. Ó, Ježíši (T)
2. Věříme v jednoho Boha (T)
3. Mocný nebes stvořiteli (Ambrosius)
4. Ó, Bože náš, Trojice nejsvětější (T)
5. Přijď, pohanů spaseň (Luther-Ambrosius)
6. Rosu dejte, ó, nebesa (T)
7. Tvrdosíjní Žide (T)
8. Sláva buď Bohu na nebi (T) Sb
9. Věříme srdečně (T)
10. Dítě se nám narodilo (Dresdensis)
11. Kdo dítětko chce mítí (T)
12. Pochválen buď, Jezu Kriste (Luther)
13. Pochválen buď z nevymluvné lásky (T)
14. Podle slov Izaiáše (T)
15. Proč bouříš, Herode (Luther)
16. Prozpěvujme píseň novou (Ambrosius)
17. Služít Pana slavně ctíti (Luther)
18. Slyšte, pobožní, novinu (T)
19. V radostném plesání (B. W. Dražd.)
20. S nebe přišedše anjelé (Luther)
21. S výsosti nebeské jdu k vám (Luther)
22. Rok starý miší v te době (Steuerlein)
23. Vzdějmež čest Panu Bohu (Eberus)
24. Otce nebeského Syn (T)
25. Prozpěvujmež s radostí (T)
26. Jenž si trpěl za nás (T)
27. Když Pan Ježíš na kríži pšel (Schmuk)
28. Když přišla smrti hodina (T)
29. Pohled na Pana Ježíše (T)
30. Sláva Bohu na výsosti (T)
31. Ježíš Kristus Spasitel náš (Luther)
32. Kristus Pan jat byl od smrti (Luther)
33. Zpívejmež všickni vesele (T)
34. Bože, smiluj se nad námi (T)
35. Sláva Bohu na nebi (T)
36. Věříme z srdce upřímného (T)
37. Ať, Pan kraluje (T)
38. Vstoupil na nebe rek pravý (Sb: ?; M: 87,6 Latin?)
39. Bože, k svým hříchům se zname (T)
40. Ó, buď sláva na výsosti (T)
41. Věříme všickni v Boha jednoho (T)
42. Jak čerstvých vod jelen žadá (T)
43. Požádejmež Duchu Svätého (Luther)
44. Stvořiteli Duchu Svätý (Ambrosius-Luther)
45. Chválen buď věčně Hospodin (T)
46. Jenž jsi Báh jeden v Trojici (Ambrosius-Luther)
47. Pochváľmež Boha našeho (T)
48. Hospodine, vždycky mocny (T)

20. Designation of hymns is as follows: (T)--Tranovský original; Sb--listed by R. in Sborník but not by Mooko; Sb: ?--listed as doubtful by R. in Sborník; M: p.--a divergent opinion by Mooko with ref. to p. and no. in the Historia.

49. Kyrie eleyson, ó, Bože (T)
50. Známe to, Pane Bože náš (T)
51. Otče Stvořiteli všeho (T)
52. Bohu buď sláva na nebi (Decius)
53. Sláva Bohu na vysosti buď (T)
54. Veríme v Boha jednoho (T)
55. Veríme v Boha jednoho (T) (A different hymn)
56. Před Božím stojí trůnem (Helmbold)
57. Boha Otce nestihlého (T)
58. Majíce památku nyní (T)
59. Velebí Pana duše má (T)
60. Pamatujmež na svatých skonání (T)
61. Pane, bohatec skoupého (T)
62. Kristus Pán náš k Jordánu šel (Sb:T)(M:83,22--Luther)
63. Hosanna, sláva, moc (T) Sb
64. Izaiáš prorok svědčí (Luther)
65. Vyslyš prosby naše (T) Sb
66. Aj, divná moudrost, dobrota (T)
67. Beránku Boží tichý (Sb:?) (M:German tr., 85,6)
68. Ježíš Kristus náš Spasitel (Sb:?) (M:Luther, 82,9)
69. Kristus Ježíš, Bůh a člověk pravý (T)
70. Bohu buď chvála, čest (Luther)
71. Šťastný jest muž bohabojný (Luther)
72. Budiž nám Bůh milostivý (Luther)
73. Evánjelium věčného (T)
74. Znejmež krátkou summu všeho (T)
75. Člověče, chcešli dojiti (Luther)
76. Tatot jsou nám přikazání (Luther)
77. Církev jest panna (Luther)
78. Církev pravou poznáváti (T)
79. Při vodách tvých, ó, Babylon! (Dachstein)
80. Ach, Bože, k jakému věku (T)
81. Blaznivi ústy říkají (Luther)
82. Byť Boha s námi nebylo (Luther)
83. Chraň nás, Pane, při Slovu svém (Luther)
84. Jestliž Bůh s námi nebude (Jonas)
85. Jestliže mnohé dobré věci (T)
86. Hrad přepevný (Luther)
87. Proč tak truchlíš (T)
88. V den soužení (T)
89. Jak pěkně svítí dennice (Nikolai)
90. Ježíši, jak jest přeslodka (St. Bernard)
91. Má duše jest (T)
92. Pana Ježíše v pravosti (T)
93. Přišlot k nám padlým spasení (Speratus)
94. Radujtež se, ó, křesťane! (Luther)
95. Znejmež, ó, křesťane věrní! (Luther)
96. Bože, Otče náš (T)
97. Ježíši, dárce milosti (T)
98. Probudmež se, křesťane (T)
99. Aj, blahoslavený (T)
100. Bože, v své prechlivosti (T)
101. Smiluj se nade mnou (Hegenwald)
102. Ó, Bože, mou modlitbu slyš (T)
103. Z hlubokosti volám k tobě (Luther)
104. Hospodine, v mém pokání (T)

105. Uzkošti na srdce mé (T)
106. Rozhneval se můj milý Pán (T)
107. V tebeť jsem, o můj Bože, doufal (Reusner)
108. Vzhřu, mé srdce, nezoufej (Sb:?) (M: German tr., 86, 21)
109. Ochráně Ducha Svätého (T)
110. Duch můj bolesti cítí (T) (Luther)
111. Krásný byl Absolon (T)
112. Pán Ježíš, působce spasení (T)
113. Slyšmež z úst Pána našeho (T) Sb
114. Slyš, o, věrná duše (T) Sb which are not Transovský's
115. Zname to, Pane milý (T) Sb
116. Odvrát suchou přilísne (T) Sb (pp. 33 and 37, 38):
117. Zastav deště, o Pane (T) Sb
118. Ó, popřej nám pokoje (T) Sb the an inbreit, and "Sad
119. Otče, pro tvou dobrotu (T) Sb
120. Ó, vzdal morovou ránu (T) Sb
121. Dekujit, milý Pane (Koldross)
122. Otče svetel, dekujemeť (T) Sb, Hocke adds the
123. Z celého srdce svého (Matthesius)
124. Chvaltež již Pána (Selnecker)
125. Chvalmež Pána (Weiss)
126. Nuž chválu vzdejme Bohu (Selnecker)
127. Příkladem Pána Ježíše (T)
128. Vzdejmež Bohu slusnou cest (T)
129. Při skonání dne toho (T)
130. I proč se tak raoutíš (Sadisius)
131. Když jsme v největším soužení (Eberus)
132. Odvrát, o, Bože! (Sb:?) (M: Latin tr. ---87, 7)
133. Ó, Kriste, kníže pokoje (Helmbold)
134. Vsemohoucí Bože (T)
135. Chvalmež Boha, o, křesťané (T) neglected also the
136. Chvaltež nejmoocnějšího (T)
137. Nuž chval, má duše (Poliander) Transovský's. 30
138. Proč se tak raoutíš (T) Sb
139. Duch můj velebí Pána (T)
140. Má duše, se nespouštěj (Helmbold)
141. Volám k tobě, Jezu Kriste (Speratus)
142. Ve jménu Páně na cestu se dávám (T)
143. Aj, již čas odjítí mého (T)
144. Idu pryč vesele v pokoji (Luther)
145. Jezu Kriste milostivý (Eberus)
146. Ježíš Kristus, onť jest má naděje (T)
147. Jistota smrti a pádu (T)
148. Křesťané, na toto telo (T) Sb
149. Neplačtež mnoho (T)
150. Pane Bože věčný Otče (Sb:?) (M: German tr. ---86, 26)
151. Srdečně žádám sobě (Knolius)
152. Teď já zde bídný červíček (Mueller)
153. Velmi miluji tě, Pane (Schalzig)
154. Vímť já, že můj Vykupitel (T)
155. Blížít se již věčné léto (T)
156. Již nastává ten čas právě (Sb:?) (M: Ringwaldt)
157. Již poslední časové (T)
158. Když ráno Ježíš přijde k soudu (T) (M: Old-Czech rev.)
159. Byť lidé zlí a nedbalí (T)

160. Když s milými učedlníky (T)  
 161. Kriste, popřej milosti (Nikolai)  
 162. Kristus Pan jest můj život (Graff)  
 163. Procítte hlas k nám syďj mnozí (Nikolai)  
 164. Vzhůru srdce, křesťané milí (T)  
 165. Ach, Bože, pohled s výsosti (Luther)  
 166. Bože, smutných potěšení (T)  
 167. Mocny Bože, pohled na nás (T)

The Sborník includes two other hymns which are not Tranovský's for they are already found in the BA (Sborník, pp. 32 and 37,38): "Nejsvětější" (Sborník, p. 173) which is really an introit, and "Buď tobě chvála, Otče náš" (Sborník, p. 174).

Omitting those hymns noted above only as (T)Sb, Mocko adds the following as Tranovský's hymns:

- U prostřed věku svého (82,12)  
 Znamenejme křesťané dobrodiní (87,9)  
 Veríme všemohoucího Otce (88,17)  
 Hospodine, ty si Bůh náš (88,36)  
 V úzkosti a zarmocení (90,72)  
 Tě Boha všickni chválíme (90,1)  
 Srdcem, ústy nábožně (91,6)  
 Veríme všickni v Boha (91,9)

We may assume that R. in the Sborník investigated also the foregoing hymns and did not adjudge them to be Tranovský's. So I have omitted them from the list above.

Third Edition: Published in Transilvania by Barthelemy Tarkenton, the printing establishment of Gacek called. It says the date of publication was 1847. Three new hymns are added, containing 417 hymns in all. Gacek Tarkenton was probably the editor.

Fourth Edition: Transilvania Brewer, 1848. Includes the Gacek's Latin cantors' instructions and Latin translation. Many hymns are supplied with notes and the strophes are numbered. 43 new

hymns, total, 451. This is the first ed. to which prayers are added.

Editor unknown.

### Fig. V. Subsequent Editions of the Cithara Sanctorum.

1659. Also in contrast to foregoing ed. which were printed 8vo. Very Mocko in tracing the editions of the Cithara did not go beyond similar to first Francis ed., except that some hymns are appended to the period of rationalism and the "reforms" of the Cithara undertaken by M. Institoris-Mossóczy and O. Plachý, a century and a half after the first edition. Rizner in his Bibliography noted little more than he found in Mocko. The research of John Čaplovič is the most recent and obviously the most complete. It forms the basis for this chapter.<sup>1</sup>

The first edition has been discussed in detail in the foregoing chapter, so we shall proceed with the second.

#### Seventh Further Editions of the XVII Century.

Second Edition: Appeared shortly after Tranovský's death. Published again by Vavrínek Brewer in Levoča. Title page has date, 1638, the colophon has 1639, indicating the date of completed printing. This ed. is an unaltered reprint of the first ed., except that the foreword, instructions to the cantors, the Latin salutatory verses, and the melodies are omitted.

Third Edition: Published in Trenčín by Dorothy Vokálova, the printing establishment of Czech exiles. Kleych says the date of publication was 1647. Three new hymns are added, containing 417 hymns in all. John Malatides was probably the editor.

Fourth Edition: Vavrínek Brewer, in Levoča, 1653. Includes the foreword, lacks cantors' instructions and Latin salutations. Many hymns are supplied with notes and the strophes are numbered. 53 new

1. John Čaplovič, op. cit., pp. 178-208.

2. Čaplovič lists the new hymns added to this ed., op. cit., p. 185.

hymns; total, 461. This is the first ed. to which prayers are added.

Editor unknown.

Fifth Edition: (second Trenčín ed.) Trenčín, Nicodemus Čížka, 1659. 12mo in contrast to foregoing ed. which were printed 8vo. Very similar to first Trenčín ed., except that Luther's name is appended to some of his hymns. Edited without notes. 417 hymns as in Third Edition (1st Trenčín ed.).

Sixth Edition: Levoča, 1674. Without notes. Total of 562 hymns. To the original 414 hymns the unknown editor added 40 of the 47 hymns added to the Fourth Edition, as well as 103 new Czechoslovak hymns and Latin hymns.<sup>2</sup> This is a marked advance in Cithara editions. The editor may have been Samuel Tranovský or Jeremiah Lednický, both of whose hymns appear for the first time in this ed.

Seventh Edition: Levoča, Samuel Brewer, 1680. No copies extant. Kleych is quoted as source.

Eighth Edition: (listed as "fourth edition" on title page) Levoča, 1684. Ed. with notes. This important ed. was edited by Daniel Horčička--Sinapius, Slovak pastor of Levoča. It is noteworthy for this that Horčička removed the psalmodic addition (vespers) at the end of the hymnal and reclassified both the psalms and the rest of the hymns in the general form in which they are found today. 58 new hymns were added, plus two which are not found in the Cithara today.

Ninth Edition: Entirely unknown. Mentioned only by the Hungarian bibliographer, Szabó Károly. Levoča, Samuel Brewer, 1693. It is supposed to have only 67 pp.! 12mo.

Tenth Edition: Last ed. of the XVII century. Levoča, Samuel Brewer, 1696. The tenth ed. if we count Szabó's of 1693. Ed. with notes. Tranovský's foreword and instructions to the cantors omitted; several

2. Čaplovič lists the new hymns added to this ed., op. cit., p. 185.

additions. 54 new hymns. Editor of this ed. unknown; Mocko takes him to be Michael Láni, the probable author of the prayers added to this ed. as the "Fifth Part." Nearly all later editions are dependent on this one.

Editions from the Beginning of the XVIII Century until the Edict of Toleration.

It is surprising that the first decade of this century produced not a single ed. of the Cithara. The editions of the Tranoscius during the first half of this century follow an interesting course, first they are published in Slovakia, then for a long time in Germany, then they return to Slovakia via Vienna.

Eleventh Edition: (Mocko lists this as the tenth ed.) Kleych says it was published by successors of Samuel Brewer in 1711. The title page of the prayers has the date, 1713. Place of printing unknown. Ed. without notes. 667 hymns, of which 646 are Czechoslovak and 21 Latin.

Twelfth Edition: (Mocko: eleventh) in Louben (?), Germany, 1728. Ed. without notes. A supplement of prayers is added for the first time to this ed.; they cover 144 pp. and are dated 1727. 812 hymns, 131 added to this ed. as a Supplement (Přidavek).

Thirteenth Edition: Louben, 1734 (Prayer supplement dated 1733). Enlarged by 10 hymns.

There is an unidentified ed., slightly different from the 1728 and 1734 eds., found in the Matica library. It may be a new ed. (1728-34) or just a revised 1734 ed.

Fourteenth Edition: (Fifteenth, if the above ed. is counted as a separate ed.) 1736, Leipzig. Only this ed. has Tranovský's prayers appended to it. The compiler of this ed. included the hymns of the 1728 supplement under their proper headings and arranged the hymns

throughout the hymnal according to alphabetical sequence. 32 new hymns, as well as 13 hymns, listed by Mocko. The editors had to

Fifteenth Edition: Louben, 1741. Samuel Hruškovíc, editor.

(Title page of prayers -- Phiala Sanctorum -- dated 1743) Mocko says that Hruškovíc omitted 24 hymns from this ed. which are found in the eds. from 1653-1736, but that in his very next ed. he included them again and added 190 hymns thereto. The number of prayers is also increased.

Sixteenth Edition: (noted on the title p. as the "second edition") 1745, Louben. Hruškovíc appended an additional 13 hymns, making the total 998. The Jesuit censorship of 1768 made only one alteration in this arrangement of the Githara, otherwise the enumeration and arrangement -- except for minor changes -- has remained throughout the following eds.

Mocko concludes his study of the editions at this point and discusses the random editions of 1768, 1787, and 1788 in addition. Mocko, deriving his information from Haan, mentions another edition besides the Louben ed. of 1745, that of Thomas Trattner in Vienna and J. M. Landerer in Bratislava in 1745. Mocko says they are reprints of the Louben ed., but this is hard to verify. He also mentions an ed. allegedly printed in Dražďanoch in 1748, copies of which are unavailable. Rizner mentions a certain Bratislava ed. of 1764, but gives no verification. All four of these eds. are dubitable, even though a gap of nearly a quarter of a century remains without an ed. of the Githara.<sup>3</sup>

Seventeenth Edition: Bratislava, 1768, especially noteworthy for the fact that it was altered by Jesuit censorship. The heading of one

3. Op. Cit., p. 192.

section, "Of the Opposition and Temptations to the Church," had to be removed, as well as 12 hymns, listed by Mocko.<sup>4</sup> The editors had to supplant these hymns with others of the same length, but which are necessarily not inserted in alphabetical order. Two of these later fell into their proper places (## 422, 423) and of the remainder three are now to be found under ## 999-1001.

This edition might be classified under two heads: (1) One version has on its title page the following inscription -- "Third Edition, containing 998 hymns," and is dated 1768. This edition contains all the hymns of the 1745 ed., also those which the censorship later banned. (2) The second version has instead of the simple dateline -- "In Pressburg (Bratislava), available at Susan Kempf and John Fred. Franck, publishers, 1768." In both editions the Phiala Sanctorum is dated 1768. The inscription "Third Edition" is noteworthy because it would seem to corroborate the idea that between the "Second Edition" of Louben (1745) and this one (or these), no new editions intervened.

Eighteenth Edition: This last ed. before the Edict of Toleration was published by Landerer's publishing firm in Bratislava, 1775. The edition is not numbered on the title page. 998 hymns. Phiala Sanctorum appended.

The exact number of editions from the beginning of the XVIII century up to the Edict of Toleration is difficult to determine. Various sources would indicate the existence of 14 editions during this period, but some of these have to be certified.

#### Editions of the First Half-Century after the Edict of Toleration.

The Edict of Toleration of 1781 issued by Emperor Joseph II, son of Maria Theresa, was an important event in the history of the Lutheran

4. Historia posvátnej piesne..., II, p. 15.

Church of Slovakia. It permitted the confession of Protestantism, the building of Lutheran churches where there were at least 100 Lutheran families, and the privilege of calling pastors and teachers.<sup>5</sup> Nor was this Edict without effect as far as the Tranoscius was concerned. It did not come at the most favorable time, for rationalism, which dominated religious thought at the time, was not very fertile soil for the composition of hymns. The activity in relation to the Tranoscius was more deformatory than reformatory. The entire first half century after the Edict is characterized by attempts to "correct" the Cithara. Furthermore, in order to make the hymnal more complete, supplements were added, which additions, however, always remained distinct from the closed body of the hymnal of 998 (or 1001) hymns. This period is marked by an abundance of new editions.

(1) First ed. of this period: 1786, Vienna, John Tomáš of Trattner. 998 hymns. Prayers (Phiala Sanctorum) are appended to this ed. with dateline.

(2) This ed. and the next are replete with "corrections." This, first, appeared as a "New Edition, containing 1025 hymns, diligently examined and corrected by Michael Institoris Mossóczy. In Pressburg (Bratislava) Karl Gottlieb Lippert, publisher, 1787." Institoris extended his "corrective" activity even to the prayers (Phiala Sanctorum), concerning which he says that "in the place of various flimsy (prayers) which are omitted others more excellent and more ardent have been substituted."<sup>6</sup>

(3) The next ed., published by Andrew Plachý, follows in the "corrective" trend. Baňska Bystrica, printed by J. Tuzler, 1788.

5. Múdry-Šebík, op. cit., p. 63.

6. Čaplovič, op. cit., p. 195.

To this ed. were added prayers different from the Phiala Sanctorum.

This same ed. appeared a second time as "a new edition, unaltered, corrected, and containing the Louben hymns and prayers, in all 1012 hymns. Printed in Baňska Bystrica by John Joseph Tumlér, 1791." The Latin name of the hymnal, Cithara Sanctorum, is omitted from the title. There is a foreword by Plachý dated 1788.

(4) In Bratislava in 1790, two eds. appeared, but neither conforms to the ed. of Imstitoris, both revert to the Louben text. The first appeared in Pressburg (Bratislava), at John Michael Landerer's, 1790. 998 hymns and Phiala Sanctorum.

(5) The second also contains 998 hymns, was published in Pressburg by Karl Gottlieb Lippert and Samuel Gottlieb Rosenkrantz, 1790. Really contains 1001 hymns, for to the 998 hymns were added three hymns by Tranovský found today under the numbers from 998-1001, but omitted by Jesuit censorship from the ed. of 1768. Phiala Sanctorum added.

(6) First ed. published by Trattner's printing firm in Piešťany, which alone issued the Tranoscius almost twenty times during the course of three-quarters of a century. 1791.

(7) M. Trattner, 1797. A supplement of 16 pp. containing 13 hymns (999-1011) added. The same hymns appear under the same numbers today. 1011 hymns.

(8) Gašpar Fejéropataky of Sv. Mikuláš in Liptov published this ed. via Trattner's house in 1822.

(9) 1822-23: entitled "24th ed."

(10) 1825: "25th ed." How Fejéropataky came upon this number of editions, which editions he counted and which not (for by this time

(11) Bratislava, 1831.

1831-32: D. 187.

1833.

the number of editions was twice as large), is indeterminable at this time.<sup>7</sup>

(11) 1827: "26th ed." Incribed as "First ed. with new supplement." According to the Louben ed., free of typographical errors, and containing 1011 old hymns." This ed. contains 1027 hymns, 16 of which are included in the supplement; but these 16 hymns are found in former eds., so the foreword is not entirely reliable.<sup>8</sup>

(12) 1828: Again inscribed as "First ed. with new supplement, according to the Louben ed., free of typographical errors, and containing 1018 old hymns. 18 new hymns in the supplement." 1031 hymns.

(13) P.J.M. Trattner and Stephen Károlyi, 1830, Pešť. "26th ed." with Supplement.

(14) Contemporaneously with these editions of Trattner, the Tranoscius was published in Bratislava and in Baňská Bystrica, 1796, Bratislava, Landerer.

(15) In Pressburg (Bratislava), printed in Pešť at John Michael Landerer's. 1799-1800. 1011 hymns.

(16) Bratislava, 1801, Joseph Packo, publisher.

(17) Baňská Bystrica. "Fifth ed., containing 1006 old hymns and 30 new ones. John Šteffáni, 1802." This "fifth ed." is to be connected with the "third ed." of 1768.

This ed. is noteworthy because here for the first time the independent "Supplement of new penitential (pronikavých) hymns and some old hymns" is added to the body of the hymnal after the Phiala Sanctorum. The Supplement contains 38 hymns, their compiler being entirely unknown.

(18) Bratislava, 1803.

(19) Bratislava, 1804.

7. Op. cit., p. 197.

8. Ibid.

(20) Landerer's ed. of 1800 appeared again as a "New edition according to the Louben edition, containing 998 hymns." Bratislava, Michael Landerer, 1805. Actually it contains 1011 hymns, just as # (15) above.

(21) Bratislava, 1808.

(22) Bratislava, 1811.

(23) Bratislava, 1812. Issued as "New ed. acc. to Louben, 998 hymns." Karl Kaspar Snižka. Once again this ed. really contains 1011 hymns (i.e., 998 plus 3 plus 10).

(24) Bratislava, 1814. Snižka.

(25) Bratislava and Pešť, Landerer, 1816. 1011 hymns. Besides the Phiala Sanctorum there is another supplement, a third one, already mentioned in Trattner's editions, and here probably published for the first time.

(26) The complete "Supplement of penitential (pronikavých) hymns and certain old hymns" as we have it today was added to Tranovský's hymnal (following the Phiala) for the first time in 1818. Bratislava, Simon Peter Weber and Son. The title page misprints the number of hymns, having 160 instead of 116. The 38 hymns of the 1800 ed. are found here. Generally after this, the Supplement was included.

(27) Bratislava, Snižka, 1821. without Weber's Supplement (cf. # 26).

(28) Bratislava, Snižka, 1823. Also without Weber's Supplement.

(29) Weber's ed. with the Supplement appeared once more, 1827, S. Ludwig Weber, Bratislava. The Supplement in this ed. has three hymns less (113), since three duplicated hymns in the 1818 ed. were omitted from this ed.

(30) Budín ("New Budín Ed.") Anna Landerer, 1830. Contains the Phiala Sanctorum and Weber's Supplement.

(31) Last Bratislava Ed. Ludwig Landerer, 1831. Phiala and Weber's Supplement. After this last Bratislava ed., for six decades the Tranoscius was published only in Pešt and twice in Budín.

There may have been a few more editions in this period which are not identified or discovered as yet.<sup>9</sup>

#### Last Period since 1832.

The first three decades of this period round out the Trattner-Károlyi editions, to which are added only two new editions in Budín.

(1) A revised ed. of Anna Landerer's was issued under the title: "Second enlarged ed. with Supplement, containing 1036 hymns." Budín. John Gyurian and Martin Bagó. 1836.

(2) This same ed. appeared the second time by the same printers in 1841. The Supplement in this and the foregoing ed. contains 111 hymns.

#### J. M. Trattner and Stephen Károlyi Editions (13).

(1) 1832, Pešt. "29th Pešt ed." (the "28th" being that of 1830). The same year the addenda, Phiala Sanctorum and Supplement, were printed with the hymnal.

(2) 1834, "30th Pešt ed."

(3) 1836, "31st Pešt ed."

(4) 1838, "32nd Pešt ed."

(5) 1840, "33rd Pešt ed."

(6) 1841, "34th Pešt ed."

(7) 1848, "35th Pešt ed."

---

9. Op. cit., p. 203.

- (8) 1849, "36th Pešt ed."
- (9) 1853, "37th Pešt ed."
- (10) 1856, "38th Pešt ed."
- (11) 1858, "39th Pešt ed."
- (12) 1861, "40th Pešt ed."
- (13) 1863, "41st Pešt ed."

By this time the Trattner-Károlyi publishers of Pešt had a virtual monopoly on the Tranoscius. Alois Bučánsky of Budapest sought the monopoly on this printing, and he continued to publish the Tranoscius after Károlyi's death in 1863.

Bučánsky Editions (Budapest) (15-17).

- (1) 1864, "42nd Pešt ed." Phiala and Supplement included. Published with two kinds of title page, (a) one color, and (b) bi-colored, black and red.
- (2) Another ed. such as the foregoing appeared in 1868. Also inscribed on title page as "42nd Pešt ed."
- (3) 1871, also a "42 Pešt ed."
- (4) 1876, "43rd Pešt ed."
- (5) 1879, also "43rd Pešt ed." Edited by Rózsa.
- (6) 1891, also "43rd Pešt ed." Ed. by Rózsa.
- (7) 1892, Bučánsky-Rózsa ed. (uncertain)
- (8) 1899, Bučánsky-Rózsa ed. (uncertain)
- (9) The Bučánsky eds. were continued by the firm of Koloman Rózsa and his wife. This firm published the "44th Pešt ed." in 1896.
- (10) Same ed. again in 1897.
- (11) 1899, "45th Pešt ed."
- (12) 1902.
- (13) 1904
- (14) 1906

correct (15) 1910. which had dragged through many editions, and in some Altogether this firm published 15 eds., or 17 if the two bi-colored eds. are enumerated as separate eds.

All the foregoing eds. were printed for profit since the book was evidently a money-making proposition. It was for this reason the Bučánsky sought the monopoly for the publication of the Cithara. In order to preserve the careful publication of the hymnal and in order to introduce some improvements, the Lutheran Church of Slovakia began to print the Tranoscius at Victor Hornyánszky's in Budapest, at first under the supervision of G. Szeberényi and then under bishop B. Baltík. (Date uncertain) Either beginning with this ed. or the next, the Tranoscius was printed in Trnava.

#### Hornyánszky Editions (13).

- (1) 1870-71. Two-column ed.
- (2) 1874. Two column ed.
- (3) 1882. Single column ed.
- (4) 1882. Double column ed.
- (5) 1886. Single column ed.
- (6) 1886. Double column ed.
- (7) 1890. Single column ed.
- (8) 1890. Double column ed.
- (9) 1894. Double column ed., so all succeeding eds.
- (10) 1907.
- (11) 1908.
- (12) 1912.
- (13) 1914

#### John Bežo and Co., in Senica, Slovakia (12).

This group of eds. marks a definite advance in the development of the Tranoscius. John Bežo thoroughly inspected the hymnal and

corrected errors which had dragged through many editions, and in some hymns corrected entire lines to produce a clearer and more faithful text.

- (1) 1890.
- (2) 1896.
- (3) 1900.
- (4) 1903.
- (5) 1905.
- (6) 1908.
- (7) 1912.
- (8) ----- (Date uncertain) Either beginning with this ed. or the next, the Franciscus was printed in Trnava.
- (9) 1918.
- (10) 1926. By G. A. Bežo.
- (11) 1928.
- (12) 1930.

**Mocko's 1895 Edition (1).**

This is the most critical ed. to date, printed in Ružomberok in 1895, by K. Salva, with an extensive historical foreword by the Tranovský scholar, John Mocko.

**Koloman Liptsey Budapest Editions (4).**

Koloman Liptsey succeeded Hornyánszky-Rózsa as publisher.

- (1) "55th ed." This is the first ed. printed in Latin type. 1917. Edited by John Bázlik.
- (2) 1923. No ed. number mentioned.
- (3) 1926, "57th ed."
- (4) 1930.

American Editions (2).

(1) Akron, 1918. From these American eds. there are omitted a goodly number of hymns hardly ever used, yet each hymn retains its old number despite the omitted hymns, so that both American and European eds. could be used in the same church without confusion.

(2) Pittsburg, 1928. *and within Slovakia in 1925 to have been between 140,000 and 150,000, and the number outside Slovakia, 100-120,000. These figures are merely estimates.*

Békešőaba Editions with Foreword by L. Ž. Szeberényi (2).

(1) 1923. *accurate statistics are unavailable.*

(2) 1925. *wherever Slovak Lutherans emigrated, they carried with them the "Kralická" Bible.*

Spolok Transcius, (1) Edition.

1932, Sv. Mikuláš in Liptov. Latin type and having the newest supplement of Slovak (and some Bohemian) new hymns.

During the last century (1832-1932) 65 (or 67) eds. can be enumerated. There may be others which have not yet been discovered or tabulated. All in all, since the first edition the Cithara Sanctorum has gone through at least 113 editions in three centuries.

According to Hada's statistics, ca. 1930 the Transcius was to be found in the following countries: Hungary (ca. 70,000 Slovak Lutherans), Yugoslavia (ca. 32,000), Rumania (ca. 9,500), Bulgaria (ca. 1,500), France (ca. 4,000), Austria (ca. 20-100 families), and other smaller scattered groups in Europe.<sup>1</sup>

In America there are some 100,000 Slovak Lutherans of which perhaps 67,000 are organized. The Slovak Ev. Lutheran Church

1. Transcius and Slovaks, Transylvanian Herald, p. 279.  
2. *ibid.* pp. 282-284.

(and the Synodical Conference), comprises the largest organized church body using the Tranoscius predominantly. This group has published two

VI. The Cithara Sanctorum Today and Tomorrow. 1918, and the

Fully one-half of Slovak Lutheranism today exists outside the geographical boundaries of Slovakia. Miloš Hodža estimates the number of Slovak Lutherans within Slovakia in 1935 to have been between 340,000 and 350,000, and the number outside Slovakia, 300-350,000.<sup>1</sup> These figures are merely estimates, though, since accurate statistics are unavailable.

Wherever Slovak Lutherans emigrated, they carried with them the "Kralická" Bible and their hymnals, in this case, the Cithara Sanctorum. This is not to be marveled at, for besides being singing Lutherans, the Slovaks are by nature a singing people. At the time when great numbers of Slovaks emigrated from Slovakia, the rationalistic Zpěvník had not as yet taken hold (being published in the 1840's), and so the Tranoscius is predominant in Slovak Lutheran libraries. In America, for example, the ratio is about 3:2 in favor of the Tranoscius. In Austria the greater majority use the Cithara.

According to Hodža's statistics, ca. 1930 the Tranoscius was to be found in the following countries: Hungary (ca. 70,000 Slovak Lutherans), Jugoslavia (ca. 62,000), Rumania (ca. 9,500), Bulgaria (ca. 1,500), France (ca. 4,000), Austria (ca. 80-100 families), and other smaller scattered groups in Europe.<sup>2</sup>

In America there are some 100,000 Slovak Lutherans of which perhaps 50,000 are organized. The Slovak Ev. Lutheran Church

1. "Tranoscius mimo Slovenska," Tranovského Sborník, p. 279.

2. Op. cit., pp. 282-284.

(of the Synodical Conference), comprises the largest organized church body using the Tranoscius predominantly. This group has published two revised versions of the Cithara, one in Akron, Ohio, in 1918, and the second in Pittsburgh, Pa., in 1928.

A second American group, consisting of 8 congregations (1936) "The Conference of Slovak Lutheran Pastors," used the European eds. of the Cithara. The group is now dispersed.

29 congregations of the United Lutheran Synod (Slovak), "Zion," use the Tranoscius.

In Canada there are several small groups using the Tranoscius.

The number of Slovak Lutherans in South America is also growing with recent immigration, and with their increase the number of copies of the Tranoscius also increases.

Altogether, Hodža estimates that throughout the world some 365 congregations numbering some 400,000 Slovaks use approximately 120,000 copies of the Cithara Sanctorum.<sup>3</sup>

All the foregoing figures are variable and not of most recent date. Since their publication the Catholic Church has gained tremendously in influence and power in Slovakia as a result of the War, and this has doubtless had a pronounced effect on the religious life of the Lutherans in Slovakia. Reports have been very sporadic and meager in recent years, and publications of the Slovak Lutherans have virtually ceased. What the prospects for Lutheranism and relatively for the Tranoscius in Slovakia are would be difficult to surmise. The Cithara has weathered fiercer storms in the past and has always emerged victorious. It will

---

3. Op. cit., p. 288

certainly once again prove a trustworthy refuge and consolation in the present distress.

In America the outlook for the Cithara seems to be closely connected with the future of the Slovak language as a medium of communication between pastor and congregation. As the transition to English progresses apace, so must the use of the Cithara wane in proportion. Unless more of its hymns are translated into English and find their way into English hymnals, and soon, a richly abundant spiritual heritage may be forever lost to the Lutheran Church in particular and to the Christian Church in general. A good rendition of the gems of Slovak hymnody is then the next important project for those to undertake who are capable of doing so. Only thus will the masterful compositions of George Trnovský enter upon a greater field of service.

1897. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1897.

1898. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1898.

1899. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1899.

1900. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1900.

1901. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1901.

1902. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1902.

1903. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1903.

1904. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1904.

1905. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1905.

1906. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1906.

1907. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1907.

1908. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1908.

1909. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1909.

1910. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1910.

1911. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1911.

1912. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1912.

1913. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1913.

1914. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1914.

1915. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1915.

1916. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1916.

1917. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1917.

1918. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1918.

1919. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1919.

1920. Die Cithara als Kircheninstrument. Leipzig, 1920.

KOVIČEK, J., "Tranoscius v Amerike (N.A.A.)" 222-224.

LEŽIŠEK, JOSEF, BIBLIOGRAPHY na Slovenské a československé

úsvetové a kultúrne vzťahy, 27-290

- ČAJAK, J., Dejepis Slovákov, Pittsburgh, Pa., Národné Noviny, 1914.
- Cithara Sanctorum, ed. by John Bázlik, Budapest, Koloman Liptsey, 1930.
- Cithara Sanctorum, (Tranoscius), Pittsburgh, Pa. Slovak Ev. Lutheran Synod, 1928.
- DROBNÝ, JOHN P., Ev. Slov. Martyri, Sv. Mikuláš in Liptov, Slovakia, Spolok Transcius, 1929.
- Encyclopedia of World History, Wm. L. Langer, New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1940. 241-243; 308-309; 322-323; 409-410; 424-426.
- HAAN, LUDEVIT, Cithara Sanctorum, její historia, její původce a tohoto spolupracovníci, Pest, Victor Hornansky, 1873.
- JULIAN, JOHN, Dictionary of Hymnology, Second Edition Reprint, London, 1925, 153-160.
- LOUBAL, FR., Reformace a Protireformace v Československu, Prague, Czechoslovakia, Ant. Svěcený, 1927.
- MOCKO, JOHN, Historia posvátnej piesne slovenskej a historia kancionálu, Sv. Mikuláš in Liptov, Slovakia, Spolok Transcius, 1909.
- MOCKO, JOHN, Život Juru Tranovského, Senica, Slovakia, John Bežo Co., 1891.
- MÚDRY-ŠEBÍK, MICHAEL, Stručné Dejiny Slovákov, Pittsburgh, Pa., National Union of Slovak Lutherans, 1940.
- POLACK, W. G., Handbook to the Lutheran Hymnal, St. Louis, Mo., Concordia Publishing House, 1942.
- Tranovského Sborník, ed. by Samuel S. Osuský, Sv. Mikuláš in Liptov, Slovakia, Spolok Transcius, 1936.
- BOBEK, W., "Tristoročná 'Cithara Sanctorum,'" 217-220.
- ČAPLOVIČ, JOHN, "Vydania Třanovského kancionála," 178-208.
- ĐUROVIČ, JOHN P., "Najstaršia rukopisná sbierka piesní na Slovensku pred Tranovského kancionálom," 23-42.
- HODŽA, MILOŠ, "Tranoscius mimo Slovenska," 279-288.
- HREJSA, FERD., "Jiří Třanovský v Čechách," 43-54.

- KOVÁČIK, J., "Tranoscius v Amerike (U.S.A.)," 289-294.
- LUKÁŠEK, JOSEPH, "Jiří Tránovský na Moravě a československá církevní a kulturní vzájemnost," 87-100
- MOCKO, JOHN, "Tránovský na Morave a v Sliezku," 55-86.
- MOCKO, JOHN, "Tránovský na Slovensku," 136-156.
- R., "Soznam Tránovského piesní v Tranosciu a Zpěvníku," 173-177.
- ŠKULTÉTY, JOSEPH, "Život našich predkov v dobe Tránovského," 12-17.
- VARSÍK, BRANISLAV, "Náboženské pomery na Slovensku v dobe Tránovského," 18-22.
- VLČEK, JAROSLAV, Dejiny literatúry slovenskej, Third Edition, Turčiansky Sv. Martin, Matica Slovenská, 1933.