

Saskia Pronk-Tiethoff

The language and authorship of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* (1752)

1. Introduction¹

In 1752, the book *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* was published. Although the work was published anonymously, Handrij Dučman attributes it to Měrcin Golian (1867: 554, 563–564). The reason for the attribution is not explained by Dučman and has never fully been investigated. In the present article, the language of the book *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* will be investigated as well as the question who the author of the book is. Before turning to the analysis of the language of the book, I shall sketch the context in which the book was written.

The first Upper Sorbian Catholic works appeared in print considerably later than the first Protestant works. Works by Catholic authors were published from the late 17th century onwards. As is well known, Jakub Ticin (1656–1693) and Jurij Hawštyn Swětlik (1650–1729) are the main authors of this early period of Catholic writing. Their native dialect of Wittichenau/Kulow and their orthographical choices greatly influenced the Catholic works of the early 18th century. In addition to this, in this period two consecutive deans of the St. Petri Cathedral (Martin Ferdinand Brückner von Brückenstein (dean from 1676 to 1700) and Matthäus Johann Josef Vitzki (dean from 1700 to 1713) were originally from Wittichenau, giving this dialect higher status in the chapter of canons. From 1713 onwards, the influential function of dean of St. Petri Cathedral was executed by deans from the region of Crostwitz/Chrósćicy. Johann Joseph Ignatz Freyschlag von Schmiedenthal from Crostwitz (dean from 1721 to 1743) was the first who actively tried to make his native dialect the basis of all Catholic writings. This led to a gradual shift in the dialectal basis of the Catholic standard language. The transition was completed by the middle of the century under the deanship of Jakob Johann Joseph Wosky von Bärenstamm (1743 to 1771) (Michałk 1980: 22–23). Another factor that might have contributed to the transition of the Catholic Upper Sorbian standard language from the dialect of Wittichenau to the dialect of Crostwitz was the fact that the Protestant and the Catholic Sorbs in the Oberlausitz grew closer after the end of the Counter Reformation. The Crostwitz dialect was (and is) closer to the Bautzen-based Protestant standard language and thus diminished the linguistic differences between the Protestant and the Catholic Upper Sorbian standard languages (Wölke 2005: 50).

Little is known about the life of Měrcin Golian. He was born on October 10th 1692 in Ostro/Wotrow. From 1719, he worked as a vicar and second chaplain at the Church of Our Lady on the Salzmarkt (now Kirchplatz) in Bautzen/Budyšin. He was appointed as parish priest in 1743 and chosen to be canon in the chapter of the St. Petri Cathedral in Bautzen in the same year. He died May 9th 1759, at the age of 66.

The *Nowy biografiski słownik* states that Golian was a “syn robočana”, and that he followed his theological education “w Čěskej” (J. Šořta 1984: 157). Although I have not found information corroborating these claims, it is only to be expected that Golian indeed studied in Bohemia. No Catholic theological college existed in Lusatia in those

¹ I wish to thank Sonja Wölkowa for her valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper.

days, so young men who had the opportunity went to Bohemia for their education (Jenč 1954: 191). It seems unlikely that he was the son of a labourer or a serf, particularly in the light of his education and clerical career. Hauptmann writes in the *Catalogus Cleri Lusatii* (dating from 1768) that he was a “benefactor magnus patriae, vulgando propriis sumptibus libellos serbicos [...]”.² According to this *Catalogus*, Golian gave the Sorbian congregation in Bautzen 1000 Taler. He was also engaged in the publishing of Sorbian Catholic writings. His contemporary, Michał Jan Wałda, wrote the following about Golian in one of his letters to Karl Gottlob von Anton (reproduced in *Lětopis* by Zeil 1969: 76): “[...] Auch hat der selige Herr Golian, Kanonikus und Pfarrer bei Unserer Lieben Frau auf dem Salzmarkte zu Budissin, ehedem verschiedene Bogen von Auslegungen, Zeremonien, Dialogen etc. zum Unterrichte der Jugend und des Volkes herausgegeben, die auch noch existieren. [...]” (letter dating from 27 July 1789).³ Research in the *Domstiftsarchiv St. Petri* and the *Sorbische Zentralbibliothek/Sorbisches Kulturarchiv* has not yielded additional information about the life and works of Měrcin Golian.

Handrij Dučman attributes *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* to Golian, stating that the work has, in all likelihood, been written by Golian: “drje wot Goliana”. He ascribes another ten works to the same author: “Hač runje Golian we swojich pismach swoje mjeno njemjenuje, móžemy jemu tola mjeńše spiski pod VI 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, a wjetšej pod IV 12 a 13 (?) mjenowanej připisować” (1869: 54). Dučman refers here to works mentioned in *Přehlad pismowstwa katholskich Serbow*, which he published two years earlier. The nine ‘smaller works’ in category VI (labelled *křesćanske rozwučenja*) are *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* and eight short religious dialogues (1867: 563–564).⁴ The ‘larger works’ are *Schula Jezufowa*, dating from 1747, and *Paćerjaca a khěrlušaca kniha* (1867: 554–555).⁵ *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* is bound in one volume together with Michał Jan Wałda’s *Wincza Jezufowa* (1747) and seven of the religious dialogues mentioned above. The *Serbska centralna biblioteka* has three copies of this book and the *Domstiftsarchiv St. Petri* in Bautzen possesses one copy. The latter two of the short dialogues mentioned above, 8) *Tón Kžefczijanski Spihel. To jo Krotke Rozrétzeņa ha*

² ‘Great benefactor of the motherland, who published Sorbian books at his own cost.’

³ Karl Gottlob von Anton reproduced this letter in his magazine *Lausizische Monatsschrift* (published in Görlitz in 1797).

⁴ Apart from 1) *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*, these works are: 2) *Posleňe Rozrétzeňo. Jenoho Khoroho ha swoju Zbóžnosť praje potaczoho Kžefczijana ze swojim Pfararom*; 3) *Krótke Rozrétzeňo. Běz jeném Luterskim Mandželškim z Měnom Pětér, ha z joho Khatolskej Mandželškej Hannu toho S. Spaltera [Psaltera] ha Rozarija dla*; 4) *Krótke Rozrétzeňo. Běz jeném Budeškim Birgarom, ha běz jeném malicžkim holtžeczom ha joho Maczeřu*; 5) *Kžefczijanske Rozrétzeňo. Běz jeném Duchownem Pafterom, ha joho kžefczijanskej Wowtžiczku, wot teje Hele, ha jeje wetněch helškich Matrow*; 6) *Krótke Rozrétzeňo. Běz dvěmaj Sudodomaj [Sudodomaj], jeném Katholškim z Měnom Pětér, ha jeném Luterskim z Měnom Měrtěn. Dež wonej wotem Mšche romadže wot Budešchna Domój džeštaj*; 7) *Tón Duchówné Burški Spihel*; 8) *Tón Kžefczijanski Spihel. To jo Krotke Rozrétzeņa ha Rozwutzeņa běz jeném Nanom, ha Séhnom wot teje praweje Kžefcijanskeje Wěré*; 9) *Spihel teje Wěcznosťe. To je Krotke Rozrétzeňo běz jeném Vromněm Nanom, ha joho pobožněm Séhnom wot teje Směrcze ha Suda Božoho, hako tež wot teje Hele, ha Něbějkoho Kraleftwa*.

⁵ The spelling of the title of this book, which has probably been lost, was adapted by Dučman to the orthographical norms of his day. The original title must have been *Paczeracza a khěrlušacza kniha*.

Rozwutżena bez jenem Nanom, ha Séhnom and 9) *Spihel teje Węcnoſcze* as well as *Paćerjaca a khěrłušaca kniha* have probably been lost.

Although Dučman claims that *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* has 166 pages, the copies in the *Serbska centralna bibliotheka* and the *Domstiftsarchiv St. Petri* have 150 pages. Both the pages and the quires are numbered; the numbering starts on page 9, quire A2 and runs to page 150, quire J5. The fact that the book starts with page 9 indicates that a preface to the book was either intended or written and subsequently lost, which would form the now missing pages 3 to 8. In all of the copies that are kept in Bautzen, the preface is absent.

2. The language of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*

On the basis of its contents, *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* can be divided in two parts: the first part, running from pages 9 to 79, is a “Wukwaduwaño” of the Bible and the Catholic faith, written in question-and-answer form. It provides answers to all sorts of questions a Catholic might have, e. g. *Smé mé winojczi ſo ſchitke naſche Rěchi ſpowědacž?*, *Schto wutži ta Czérkej wot toho Tžijczia?* or *Nejſtu da czi Swaczi teſch budžicz habé valněcz móhli?* Some parts of the book are clearly meant to arm the Catholic readers in religious discussions with people of other denominations, e. g. *Ka móže ta Romſka Khatolſka Czérkej ſwata bócz, dež wona tak wele budněch Wutžbow, na přeczto Bóhu, na přeczto Krěſtuſej, ha na přeczto joho ſwatomu Swowu wutži?*⁶ The six pages following this exegesis (pages 80 to 86) contain an essay with several prayers and a hymn “Raniſchi Kherluſch”. The remainder of the book, pages 87 to 150, comprises 4 religious dialogues between a father and a son, each of them subdivided in a number of smaller sections.⁷

The book can thus be divided in several parts and this division is also found in the language: the language in the first part up to page 79 differs significantly from that in the second part of the book. The differences concern the orthography, phonology, morphology as well as the lexicon. The disparities are such that the work appears to comprise texts from different authors. Below, I shall elaborate on the differences between the first part and the second part of the book. From the middle of page 25 to the middle of page 27 the text, which does not differ from the context with respect to content, is written in the language and orthography of the second part of the book. The language in the rest of the first 80 pages of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* appears to be more regular.

2.1. Orthography and phonology

Throughout the book the orthography is adopted inconsistently. Internal orthographical variation can be found on every page: *do teje Czérkwe* and *do teje Czérkwe* (both on page 99), *Khějži* and *Kejži* (page 106) and *Arcz-Jandžel* (page 96) versus *Ercz-Jandžel* (on page 97). This is not uncommon for older texts and results from the fact that in the middle of the 18th century, there was no uniform Upper Sorbian Catholic standard language. Because of the non-standardised orthography, it is sometimes difficult to distin-

⁶ These sentences are taken from pages 36, 59, 28 and 69 respectively.

⁷ These dialogues resemble the other religious dialogues that have been attributed to Golian with respect to content and length (for titles of these works, cf. fn. 3).

guish between orthographical and phonological features. These are therefore taken together in this section. Because the orthography in the book speaks to a large extent for itself, the following chart gives an overview only of those letters where a phonological explanation may be useful.

Vowels:

<u>Phoneme:</u>	<u>Grapheme:</u>
/ě/ (also /e/ after a soft consonant)	ě ⁸
/y/	é

Consonants:

<u>Phoneme:</u>	<u>Grapheme:</u>
/b ^j /	ǰ and b in part 1; b and bj in part 2
/č/	tž and cž
/k ^h /	kh
/l/	l and l in part 1; l in part 2
/s/	generally f, occasionally β and (as in German Fraktur) -s in Auslaut.
/š/	fch
/w/ (also <*l/)	w
/z/	z
/ž/	ž ⁹

The following orthographical and phonological differences can be observed between the first and the second part of the book:

- **Soft consonants:** In the first part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*, the graphemes <ǰ> and <l> are used to denote the soft consonants /b^j/ and /l^j/: *do Něbes, ǰeru, ǰez, derǰa, Wutroǰe* and *hale, bóli, Stale, dželicž, wele*. Since the palatalisation is not written consistently, the soft consonants /b^j/ and /l^j/ also occur as and <l> here. This use of <ǰ> and <l> to denote the soft consonants was introduced by Swětlik at the end of the 17th century (B. Šořta 1921: 15). The letter ǰ is absent in the second part of the work, where /b^j/ is generally rendered as and occasionally as <bj>: *zNěbeǰ, ǰeru, bez, derǰja, kwutroǰe*. Palatalisation can also be indicated by means of the vowel é, which represents the diphthong [je], e. g. in *zNěbeǰ, ǰeru*. The soft consonant /l^j/ is written as <l> in the second part of the book: *hale, bóli, Stale, dželicž, wele*. Here, l for /l^j/ does also occur, but only sporadically.¹⁰
- **ß:** The sibilant /s/ is usually written as f, except in Auslaut, where it is -s, e. g. *Krěřfus*. This orthographical rule was taken over from German Fraktur. The β can be written as an allograph for f in all positions in the word. The use of β in Anlaut occurs much more frequently in the first part of the book than in the second, e. g.

⁸ Phonetically, the value of the letter <ě> was [je]. Throughout the book, it corresponds to modern standard Upper Sorbian é, e.g. *wěru, Klěb*, and to e after a soft (palatal) consonant, e.g. *zNěbeǰ*.

⁹ In this article, I will reproduce <ž> and <ž> as z and ž respectively.

¹⁰ I counted less than ten words with l after page 79.

βwoju, βwužicz, βobu, βwaczi in the first part against, for example, *fwojomu, fameje, fwatech, febi* in the second part. Here, the letter <β> is only occasionally written in initial position and seems to be restricted to a limited number of words, most notably the reflexive pronoun *βo /so/*.

- **Spelling of ‘the same’:** In the first part of the book, the frequently occurring word ‘the same’ is consistently written as one word: *tejβamej, taβama, tuβamu*, whereas the word is written as two separate words in the second part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*: *teje fameje; tej famej*. As can be seen in the examples cited above, the two members of the word are inflected.
- **The cluster *sr’:** The result of the assibilation of the cluster *sr’ was usually written as <šcz> in Upper Sorbian texts from the 18th century. In *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* however, the affricate is written as <lcz>. This suggests that assimilation from /sč/ to /sc’/ had taken place. Wölke explains this assimilation – that is found in a number of Catholic works from the second part of the 18th century – as “Annäherung an den evangelischen Usus” (2005: 53). The assimilation might also have been caused by influence from the Catholic dialect of Radibor/Radwor, which shows features of the dialect of Bautzen (ibidem and cf. SSA 13: 147 ff.). In the first part of the book, after the affricate <lcz> palatalisation is often indicated by means of <i>: *tžefczuwać, Tžifcziu, roščie, fczie, wěščie, lubofcziu, Džěfcziu*. In the second part of the book, palatalisation in this position is never indicated: *tžefczuwać, Tžifcza, fczie, wěščie, Lubofcze, Nutnofczu*.
- **Palatalisation by means of i:** In the first part of the book, apart from the cases mentioned above, *i* is used to indicate palatalisation in other forms as well, e. g. *tžio, Swědomiu*. In those words in the second part of the book where palatalisation is indicated, this is done with *j*: *tžjo, Tžjoch, Swedomjo*. This difference between the use of *i* and *j* is only orthographical. The masculine personal forms *tžio* and *tžjo* ‘three’ are phonologically identical and correspond to modern Upper Sorbian *třo*.
- **Labialised y:** In dialectal Sorbian, the vowel *y* has a labialized reflex after the labial consonants *m, b, p* and *w*. The relative chronology of the different stages of this development is described in great detail by Michałk (1964). The development started with the change of *y* to *u* after the labial *w* in anlaut, which took place in the entire Sorbian speech area. At a later stage the labialisation affected *y* after initial *w* < *l and after *m, b* and *p*. The vowel *y* became *u* in the dialects spoken around Hoyerswerda/Wojerecy (and in the larger part of the Lower Sorbian speech area), whereas *y* became *ó* in the rest of the Upper Sorbian speech area (Michałk 1964: 129–163; cf. also SSA 13 and 14). In the western Upper Sorbian dialects, /y/ after a labial consonant is thus principally reflected as *ó*. According to Schaarschmidt, this labialisation started as a “systematic development in the Catholic dialects” and spread from there to the dialect of Bautzen in the 18th century (1997: 127). Michałk suggests that in Ticin’s language, the labialisation of *y* affected root morphemes but not the endings (1964: 150).

In *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*, the phoneme /y/ after a labial consonant *w, m, b* or *p* is written as <é> as well as <ó>. <é>, which denotes /y/, i.e. the original, non-labialised, reflex, is more frequent. The use of <ó> in the second part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* is mainly restricted to root morphemes, whereas in the first part, the grapheme <ó> occurs frequently in endings as well: *krěstuβowó, wupóch*.

In the second part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*, forms of the *l*-participle of the verb ‘to be’ are written consistently with <ó> or <o> in the root: *bów, bow, bówa,*

bowa. In the first part of the book, next to these more regular forms with <ó>/<o>, forms with <é> also occur, for example *béwa*.

- **Intervocalic /w'/:** In the Catholic dialect area, the development of /w'/ to /j/ is likely to have been completed in the early 18th century. The development must have started in the 16th century already: in the late 16th-century Catholic songbook by Gregorius, two forms of *-eji* < *-ewi are found, but the work predominantly has *w'* (Wölkowa 2007: 20). A century later, Swětlik likewise writes <w'>: *prawiczé, prawíjch* (examples taken from B. Šolta 1921: 22, 26). In *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*, the change from *w' > j* is attested in most positions in the word. Whereas the change appears to be completed in the language of the second part, e. g. *praji* 'he says', *praje* 'truly', *Spojedź*, in the first part forms with /w'/ are also attested: *praji*, but *prawé, spowědacž, spowědali*. The latter distribution corresponds to the situation in the modern Upper Sorbian standard language, which has *prajić*, but *prawje* and *spowědać*. This change of /w'/ to /j/ occurred in inlaut before unstressed *e* < *ě. According to the *Sorbischer Sprachatlas*, this change appears to have been obligatory in most dialects of Upper Sorbian (SSA 13: 211).
- **/w/ before labial consonants:** In the first part of the book, *w* (<*l) before a labial consonant, i.e. in the rare sequences *wm, wp, wb*, has in some words been dropped: *Jamóžné* and *Stóp*, but *žawbuwané*. The first two words appear as *Jawmožna* and *Stowpej* in the second part of the book.
- ***-ba:** The language of the second part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* reflects a development from *-ba to -wa, in words where the previous syllable contains *wu*: *wuźwa; Zařwuźwe, Swuźwa*. In the language of the first part, this development is absent: *wuźba, wuźbě, Zařwuźbow, Swuźbě*.
- **The verb *pžincž*:** The infinitive of the verb *pžincž* is written with final <-cz> in the first part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*, whereas the word has the infinitive *pžindž* in the second part.
- **h before and after consonants:** As is well known, *g developed into /h/ in Upper Sorbian. The phoneme /h/ was retained in prevocalic position and dropped elsewhere. In written Upper Sorbian, the loss of /h/ is reflected in the literature from the beginning of the 17th century onwards (Schaarschmidt 1997: 131–132). In *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*, *h* is not regularly written before consonants. In the second part of the book, *h* is almost always absent in this position: *mów, mowé, wumow, czanew, horeczeniēni, pžibowstwo*.¹¹ However, in the first part of the book <h> before a consonant is written much more often (albeit inconsistently): *mohwé, wumohw, czahnéwé, czahnécž, pžibohwstwo, dosahliwa*. Similarly, we find *pomhaw* in the first part, with *h* preserved after a consonant, as opposed to *pomaw* in the second part.
- **fch in two lexemes:** The very frequent word *teřch* – as it is spelled in the first part – is written *tež* in the second part. The same goes for *fchto*, which is usually spelled *žto* in the latter part of the book.
- **Loanwords:** Some words that were borrowed from German are written differently in the two parts of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*. The words *Vermuwaño, Strafě, Schtucka* from the first part of the book are written as *Virmuwaño, Schtrafě, and Stuczka* in the second part. These spellings are consistent to such an extent that these differences cannot be put down to mere internal variation in spelling.

¹¹ Occasionally, a non-etymological *h* is written in the 1st singular of the verb *hicž*: *hdu* and *dhu*.

2.2. Morphology

- **Shortening of -oho, -omu:** The masculine and neuter endings of the Gsg. and the Dsg. of adjectives and pronouns end in the Catholic standard language in *-oho* and *-omu*, respectively. In the language of the second part of the book, the ending *-omu* is sometimes shortened to *-om*. This shortening always occurs in the ordinals and is optional in the pronouns: *Prěnom*, *Kdruhom*, *Tžeczom* (also *Tžeczom*),¹² *kSchtwortom*, *kjenom* (also *kjenomu*), *kmojom* (also *kmojomu*), *knajmenfchom*, *kfwojom* (also *kfwojomu*). In the first part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*, the shortening does not occur: *kPrěnomu*, *kDruhomu*, *kTžetzomu*.
- **Feminine Isg. of adjectives and pronouns:** In the first part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*, the feminine Isg. ending of adjectives and pronouns is *-eju*, e. g. *zBožēju Pomoczju*, *zteju Ruku*, *zherbneju Nadu*. In the second part, the feminine ending of the Isg. of adjectives and pronouns appears only with the shortened and less archaic ending *-ej*, e. g. *zwulkej Zrudobu*.¹³

2.3. Lexicon

- **htó:** The interrogative pronoun ‘who’ has the forms *htó* and *chtó* in the first part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* and the form *hdó* in the second part. The interrogative pronoun is reconstructed as PSl. **kъto*. It became **xto* in Sorbian after *ъ* was dropped (SSA 10: 223). In the 18th century, the form *chto* is found mainly in the protestant dialect area. In the 17th century, the dialect of Wittichenau had the form *hdo*; this is the form that is found in the writings of Ticin and Swětlik (Michałk 1968: 47). Today, the corresponding forms *dɔ* and *dó* are found only in the dialects spoken around Hoyerswerda (SSA 10: 223). In the mid-18th century the form *štó* started to appear.
- **hižno:** The word *hižno* ‘already’, as written in the first part of the book, appears as *hižon* in the second part. This can be attributed to different dialect areas. Nowadays, according to the *Sorbischer Sprachatlas*, *hižom* and *h'ížon* are found south of Bautzen, whereas the forms *hyžno*, *h'ížnok* are found in the transition dialect spoken to the north of Hoyerswerda (Faßke a.o. 1986: 283).
- **jewach:** The word ‘otherwise, else’ appears in the first part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* as *jewach* and in the second part as *hewach*. The difference between the two forms is dialectal. According to the *Sorbischer Sprachatlas*, the modern-day form *ĵeŷak* is found around Wittichenau, whereas in Crostwitz *h'eŷak* is attested (Faßke a.o. 1986: 273). Throughout the book, *hinak*, which nowadays has the form *ĵinak* around Wittichenau, is written with *h-* (cf. Faßke a.o. 1986: 245).
- **Loanwords:** The first and the second part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* reflect a different stock of German loanwords: In the first part of the work, for example the following words occur: *regiruwacz*, *Porté*, *Rěchtař* and the expression *bewfcheje Valè* ‘without fault’, whereas the second part has the equivalents /knježić/, e. g. *kneža* (3rd pl.), *Duře*, *Sudnik* and *bewfchoho Bracha*.¹⁴

¹² Throughout the book, palatalisation is not consistently indicated. The use of <ž>, <řn>, <ň>, <ř> and <w> seems to be to a certain extent optional.

¹³ I wish to thank Sonja Wölkowa for pointing this out to me.

¹⁴ The words *Brach* and *Duře* occur occasionally in the first part, but are less frequent than *Vala* and *Porté*.

- **Bible verses:** In the whole book, the most common way of referring to verses in the Bible is as follows: [name of Bible book] *na* [chapter] *v.* [verse]: e. g. *S. Matth. na 19. v. 17., 1. ktem Corint. na 13. v. 2.* In the first part of the book, the lines in the Bible are sometimes indicated with *na Rjadku* or *na Rjatku*: *pola S. Jakuba na 5. Stale na 16. Rjadku, ktem Ephefkim na 5. Stale na 32. Rjatku.* In the second part of the book this does not occur.

3. Conclusion

As can be observed from the above, the two parts of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* show considerable linguistic dissimilarity. The two parts of the book are written in two linguistic variants. The difference between these two variants must be either of historical or of dialectal origin. In my view, one can rule out the possibility that the book was written by one and the same author and that the contrast between the two parts was caused by, for example, editorial influence.

Therefore, I think that the book must have been written by two different authors. Handrij Dučman, however, attributes this whole book to Měrcin Golian (cf. §1). The second part of the book is written in the same language and orthography as the short religious dialogues that are bound in the same cover as *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* and Wałda's *Wincza Jezufowa* (cf. fn. 4).¹⁵ These dialogues have not been the subject of this article, but the inventory of characters in the second part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* corresponds to that in the dialogues; the same graphemes are used throughout to denote the same phonemes. Because of the similarities between the second part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* and the short religious dialogues, not only in language and orthography, but also in style, choice of words and subject matter, there can be no doubt that these texts have indeed been written by the same author. The language of another work, *Schula Jezufowa*, also attributed to Golian, seems to be the same, though no thorough investigation of this work has been made. About this bulky work, Dučman remarks that the "spisowar je najskerje Golian".

The first part of the book *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* is written in a way that deviates from any of the other works ascribed to Golian. The two parts of the book also reflect forms that can be attributed to different dialect areas. In the language of the first part, traces of the dialect of Wittichenau, which was the basis of the Catholic standard language before ca. 1750, appear to be more frequent than in the second part. Examples of this are the words *hižno* and *jewach*. It must be noted, however, that neither of the parts is written consistently in the dialect of Wittichenau. The first part of the book seems to be phonologically and morphologically more archaic. However, it is not impossible that the archaic forms in the first part reflect a different dialect which preserved archaic elements. Apparent archaic features of the first part include the partial preservation of intervocalic /w'/ and the partial preservation of /h/.

Because of the similarities between the second part of the book and the other works attributed to Měrcin Golian, I consider the second part of the book to be a work by

¹⁵ The only difference between the language of the second part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* and the dialogues mentioned in fn. 3 is the word 'bitter', occurring frequently in the expression 'bitter suffering and death'. In the book, the word has the form *hirka*, with unexplained *i*, e.g. *hirku Matru ha Smercž* (page 114), whereas the dialogues have *hórki*, e.g. *hórkeje Matrě ha Smercže* (*Krótkje Rozrěžeño. Běz jeném Luterskim Mandželškim*: 9).

Golian. In view of the substantial differences as described above, the first part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* must have been written by another author. It is unlikely that the same author wrote both parts of the book and was able to adopt the different rules for spelling and grammar so consistently.

The most persuasive explanation of the differences between the two parts of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* is that the author of the second part of the book possessed another, older manuscript of another author, which he added to his own work. The fact that the first part of the work shows more archaic traces supports this solution. Furthermore, two pages in the first part (the middle of page 25 to the middle of page 27) are written or rewritten in the system of the second part of the book. I think the first part of *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* must be dated to the (middle of the) first half of the 18th century; it was probably written later than Swětlik's translation of the Bible, but earlier than the texts by Wałda and those attributed to Golian.¹⁶

It is possible that in the preface to the book, which might have been lost or never have been written, something would have been said about the compilation of the work. It is unlikely that the authors' names would have been revealed there however, given the motto on the back of the title page:

“Něprafskej jo mój Kžeszcijanski Czwojetže, hdó jo tu te Knifchki pifaw, ha czifchczecz daw, hacž jo wón wofoko wutžené bów habé nicz; Hale ta Lubofcz ktej Wěrnofczi dérbi tebe ktomu lazuwaņu wěfcz. Praji tón Pobožné Domařch Kempenski L. 1 Cap. 5.”.

Notice that here in this citation of Thomas à Kempis, the word *hdó* ‘who’ is written in the way of the second part of the book, rather than in the way of the first part.

We know about Golian that he was active as a writer and dedicated himself through the spoken and the written word to the development of the Sorbian Catholics. Dučman remarks about him that “hišće we wysokej starobje skutkowaše wón we pismje za swój serbski lud, kotremuž běše čas swojeho žiwjenja služil” (1869: 54). The most probable conclusion is that Golian was indeed responsible for the production of the works attributed to him. In *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel*, he added his religious dialogues, which were after all his speciality, to the work of another Catholic writer, the identity of whom remains to be discovered.

Bibliography

Dučman, H.

1867 “Přehlad pismowstwa katholskich Serbow”, *Časopis Maćicy Serbskeje* 20, 543–586.

1869 *Pismowstwo katholskich Serbow*, Budyšin.

Faßke, H. a.o. (ed.)

1986 *Sorbischer Sprachatlas 10: Terminologie der Sachgebiete Haus und Hof sowie Verschiedenes. Mit Registern zu den Bänden 1–10*, Bautzen

1990 *Sorbischer Sprachatlas 13: Synchronische Phonologie*, Bautzen

1993 *Sorbischer Sprachatlas 14: Historische Phonologie*, Bautzen

¹⁶ I have not made a thorough investigation of Wałda's works, but *Wincza Jezufowa* seems linguistically similar to the works attributed to Golian.

Golian, M.

- A. *Posleñe Rozrétzeño. Jenoho Khoroho ha swoju Zbóžnosť praje potaczoho Kžefczijana ze swojim Pfarařom.* (s.n, s.l, s.d), SCB, signature 41 8°641
 - B. *Krótke Rozrétzeño. Běz jeném Luterskim Mandželškim z Měnom Pětér, ha z joho Khatolskej Mandželškej Hannu toho S. Spaltera ha Rozarija dla.* (s.n, s.l, s.d), SCB, signature 41 8°641
 - C. *Krótke Rozrétzeño. Běz jenem Luterskim Pfarařom, ha běz jenem Pijetifarskim habo Herrnhuczkim Bratrom, ha Kmotrom, hako tež zjenez Khatolskej Kmotru, ha zjenem Luterskim Kmotrom pzi jenech Kcziřnach.* (s.n, s.l, s.d), SCB, signature 41 8°641
 - D. *Krótke Rozrétzeño. Běz jeném Budeškim Birgařom, ha běz jenem maliczkim holtžeczom ha joho Macžeřu* (s.n, s.l, s.d), SCB, signature 41 8°641
 - E. *Kžefczijanske Rozrétzeño. Běz jeném Duchownem Pašterom, ha joho kžefczijanskej Wowtžiczku, wot teje Hele, ha jeje wetžněch helškich Matrow* (s.n, s.l, s.d), SCB, signature 41 8°641
 - F. *Krótke Rozrétzeño. Běz dvěmaj Sudodomaj, jeném Khatolskim z Měnom Pětér, ha jeném Luterskim z Měnom Měrtén. Dež wonej wotem Mšche romadž wot Budešchna Domój džefchtaj.* (s.n, s.l), SCB, signature 41 8°641
- 1747 *Schula Jezufowa* (no mention of author and place of publishing)
 1752 *Tón Prawé Khatolski Spihel* (s.n, s.l), SCB, signature 41 8°641

Hauptmann, J. J. A.

- 1768 *Catalogus Cleri Lusatii*, Domstiftsarchiv St. Petri, Bautzen, signature 6281

Jenč, R.

- 1954 *Stawizny serbskeho pismowstwa*. [Part 1], Bautzen

Michałk, F.

- 1964 “Labiowelarizacija wokalow y a e wšelakeho pochada po labialnych konsonantach w serbskich dialektach”, *Lětopis A* 11/2, 129–163
- 1968 “Kulowski dialekt džensa a před 300 lětami: přinošk k serbskej historiskej dialektologiji”, *Sorabistiske přinoški k VI. mjezynarodnemu kongresej slawistow w Praze 1968*, Bautzen, 37–64
- 1980 “Jurij Hawštyň Swětlik a serbska spisowna rěč za katolikow”, *Lětopis A* 27/1, 10–25

Schaarschmidt, G.

- 1997 *The Historical Phonology of the Upper and Lower Sorbian Languages*, Heidelberg

Šořta, B.

- 1921 “Přeni hornjoserbski přeložk biblije wot J. H. Swětlika”, *Časopis Maćicy Serbskeje* 74, 3–34

Šořta, J. a.o. (ed.)

- 1984 *Nowy biografiski słownik k stawiznam a kulturje Serbow*, Budyšin

Wařda, M. J.

- 1747 *Wincza Jezufowa* (s.n, s.l), SCB, signature 41 8°641

Wólkowa, S. = Wólke, S.

- 2005 *Geschichte der sorbischen Grammatikschreibung*, Bautzen
- 2007 *Gregoriusowe kěrlušowe knižki a jich pozicija mjez najstaršimi hornjoserbskimi rěčnymi pomnikami* (Mały rjad Serbskeho instituta 10), Bautzen

Zeil, W.

- 1969 “Der Briefwechsel Michał Jan Wařdas und Jan Bjedrich Frycos mit Karl Gottlob von Anton”, *Lětopis A* 16, 74–80