

**Zeitschrift für Sorabistik und vergleichende Minderheitenforschung**  
**Časopis za sorabistiku a přirunowace mjeńšinowe slědženje**  
**Casopis za sorabistiku a pšrownu juce mjeńšynowe slěženje**  
**Journal for Sorbian and Comparative Minority Studies**

Hanna Aleksiyevich

## Der lexikalische Einfluss des Tschechischen auf die Übersetzung des Neuen Testaments von Mikławš Jakubica (1548)

Dieser Beitrag ist den tschechischen lexikalischen Entlehnungen in der niedersorbischen Übersetzung des Neuen Testaments von 1548 gewidmet. M. Jakubica benutzte beim Übersetzen die tschechische Bibel, was das Lexikon des Denkmals erheblich beeinflusste. Das Hauptziel des Artikels ist die Untersuchung der lexikalischen Bohemismen, die von den Polonismen unterschieden werden müssen. Die Ergebnisse der Studie zeigen, dass der polnische lexikalische Einfluss minimal war, während der tschechische lexikalische Einfluss im Gegensatz dazu ziemlich stark in Erscheinung trat. M. Jakubica entlehnte tschechische Wörter aus einer Vielzahl von lexikalisch-semantic Gruppen, einschließlich Konjunktionen und Präpositionen. Mit Hilfe von Bohemismen bildete der Übersetzer eigene Wortschöpfungen.

## Czech Lexical Influence on Mikławš Jakubica's New Testament Translation (1548)

This article is devoted to Czech lexical borrowings in the Lower Sorbian translation of the New Testament of 1548. M. Jakubica used the Czech Bible for the translation, which significantly affected the lexical basis for this historical document. The main purpose of the article is to study lexical influences of Czech, which should be distinguished from the lexical influence of Polish. The results of the study show that Polish lexical influence was minimal, while the Czech lexical influence, by contrast, was quite strong. M. Jakubica borrowed Czech words from a variety of lexical-semantic groups, including conjunctions and prepositions. The translator created his own words by using loans from Czech.

Hanna Aleksiajevich

## Czech Lexical Influence on Mikławš Jakubica's New Testament Translation (1548)

### 1. Introduction

The first translation of the New Testament in Lower Sorbian by Mikławš Jakubica has been the object of several studies. Researchers have mainly been interested in its language. The translation was based on the Luther Bible, with the Czech Bible used as an auxiliary text ([KYAS 1964](#); [SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967](#): XIV–XXIV; [SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 2005](#): 25). Obviously, Jakubica wrote in his native Eastern Lower Sorbian dialect, by now dead. The translation also contains a considerable number of Bohemisms and Polonisms. Bohemisms were borrowed into the Lower Sorbian text from Czech sources, while lexical Polonisms penetrated from neighboring Polish dialects. The influence of the Polish language has been extensively researched. The Eastern Lower Sorbian dialect belongs to a transitional dialect, which bordered on the Western Polish dialects. For this reason, the language of the translation contains a number of phonetic and morphological features that are common to it and Polish, but alien to other Sorbian dialects ([SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967](#): XXXV–XXXVII; [STIEBER 1974](#)). Special attention has been paid to the influence of Upper Sorbian on the translation of the New Testament ([ŠEWC 1997](#): 39–49). Among other things, the localization of the dialect, its internal peculiarities and external influences, and even the translator's origins are discussed in the scientific literature ([MUKA 1909](#); [STIEBER 1974](#); [SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967](#): VII–XLIV; [ŠEWC 1997](#); [PETROVA 1969](#); [LEWASZKIEWICZ 1995](#): 20–22; [LEWASZKIEWICZ 2007](#); [LEWASZKIEWICZ 2017](#): 364–366; [TEICHMANN 1995](#); [TEICHMANN 2001](#); [TEICHMANN 2013](#); [TEICHMANN 2015](#)).

This article examines the Czech lexical influence on the New Testament. This problem has drawn the attention of researchers on several occasions. In 1862, Korla Awgust Jenč noted several Czech words that had been borrowed into the translation, explaining that scholars of that time “čěsku ryč na pomoc brali” ‘the Czech language was taken to help’<sup>1</sup> ([JENČ 1862](#): 49). A connection between the Lower Sorbian text and the Czech Bible was soon established. Hermann Lotze compared the translation with the Severin Bible (*Bible Severýnova*) of 1537 ([LOTZE 1867](#)), August Leskien showed coincidences with the Venetian Bible (*Benátská Bible*) of 1506 ([LESKIEN 1876](#)). Vladimír Kyas made a detailed comparison of the New Testament with several editions of Czech biblical texts and established that Jakubica used the edition of 1545 prepared by Jan Had on the basis of the Severin Bible of 1537 as a source ([KYAS 1964](#)). Similar conclusions were independently reached by Heinz Schuster-Šewc. This researcher also noted that the dependence on Had's edition is not absolute, there are enough places in the Lower Sorbian translation that do not coincide with it. Schuster-Šewc suggested that Jakubica also used other Czech sources and was generally well acquainted with the Czech biblical tradition ([SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967](#): XIV–XXIV).

As for the Czech linguistic influence, it extends first of all to the orthography and lexicon of the text ([SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967](#): XV–XXXII; [TEICHMANN 2001](#): 80–86). As Doris Teichmann has fittingly remarked about Jakubica: “Von der tschechischen Lexik und Orthographie ließ er sich – auf jeder Seite des sorbischen Neuen Testaments ablesbar

<sup>1</sup> All translations by H. A.

– inspirieren und oftmals stark beeinflussen” ‘He was inspired and often strongly influenced by Czech lexis and orthography, which can be seen on every page of the Sorbian New Testament’ (TEICHMANN 2013: 106). Although researchers have repeatedly pointed out the large number of Bohemisms in the translation, they have not been studied extensively. According to Tadeusz Lewaszkiewicz, “język przekładu nie został jeszcze dogłębnie opisany. Wydaje się, że najmniej wiemy o czeskich elementach językowych” ‘the language of the translation has not yet been described in depth. It seems that we know the least about Czech linguistic elements’ (LEWASZKIEWICZ 2007: 113).

Remarks on the Czech origin of some words can be found in the works of Schuster-Šewc (SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967: XVI–XXIII; ŠEWC 1997: 38–39). The researcher points out that Czech lexemes could be borrowed either unchanged or adapted according to Sorbian phonetics. He also noticed that the origin of some words cannot be precisely determined. For example, *rožda* used by Jakubica may be an old East Lower Sorbian dialect word or it could be borrowed from Cz. *vražda*. The translator could have adapted the Czech loanword by omitting the prothetic *v-* and replacing the reflex *-ra-* in the group *\*tort* with the reflex *-ro-* characteristic for the Sorbian languages (SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967: XVII). Information on the Czech origin of some words in the New Testament can also be found in the “Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache” (HEWS).

The issue of Czech influence was partly touched upon in an article by Teichmann. According to her, Jakubica did not have a good command of the Czech language and most likely used a manuscript rather than a printed edition of the Czech Bible. This is the only way to explain the numerous errors made by the translator (PETROVA 1969: 279, 281). In addition, the researcher noted several phonetic features indicating that the respective words were borrowed from Czech, such as the absence of prothetic *w-*, *h-* or *j-* (*osten*, *opona*, *orlica*, *obcowanie*), the absence of softening of consonants (*ctnost*, *cty* instead of *cći*, *cynitelow*, *Wottetcz*), the presence of the reflex *-ra-*, *-la-* in the groups *\*tort*, *\*tolt* instead of *-ro-*, *-lo-* (*kolikrat*, *dwakrat*, *se branić*, *wlastny*, *zlacany*; PETROVA 1969: 280–281).

In the last section of the article, the author considers the lexical features of the translation. Several words have been attributed “do słownictwa właściwego tylko Jakubicy” ‘to a vocabulary specific only to Jakubica’: *drjewsko*, *chlebić se*, *chybać*, *doba* in the sense of ‘measure’, *dokonały*, *garćeja*, *jarski*, *jary*, *jargi*, *lebka* (PETROVA 1969: 284). As our further analysis will show, *dokonały* and *lebka* are Bohemisms borrowed from the Czech text.

Later on, the issue of Czech borrowings was approached more fundamentally by Teichmann. The researcher divided them into three groups. The first group includes Sorbian words written according to the rules of Czech orthography: *prwny* (instead of *pirwny*), *vleknuc* (instead of *lěknuc*), *hlej* (instead of *lej*), *gmenowacz* (instead of *mjenować*), *wużytek* (instead of *wużytk*) etc. The second group includes “świadome zapożyczenia z czeskiego” ‘conscious borrowings from Czech’, which are represented by lexical Bohemisms (*branić*, *chlubić se*, *pokrytc*, *spaseny*, *šelma*, *wzacny*, etc.) and errors resulting from Jakubica’s misunderstanding of Czech words (*wirknuć* instead of Cz. *uřknouti*, *wiknuć* – Cz. *vyknouti*, *vsłowane* – Cz. *usilování*). The third group includes words transcribed from Czech texts, i. e. mechanically transferred from the original source without adaptation (*hrlo*, *zwasek*, *Orlicy*, *rauhanæ*, *zlatti*, etc.; cf. TEICHMANN 2001: 80–83).

## 2. Material and Methodology

The words for this analysis were selected from two sources: “Słownik z Jakubicoweho Noweho Zakonja” ([SL. JAK. 1](#); [SL. JAK. 2](#)), the card catalogues for which were collected by Leskien, organized by Michał Hórník, and prepared for printing by Arnošt Muka; and “Słownik dolnosorbskeje rěcy a jeje narěcow”, published by Muka ([MUKA 1911–1928](#)). We realize that it would be preferable to work directly with Jakubica's text and the editions of the Czech Bible. According to Roland Marti, the “Słownik z Jakubicoweho Noweho Zakonja” is not complete, many words are missing. The researcher studied borrowed lexemes and found that some words he discovered in the text were not included in the “Słownik” ([MARTI 1997](#): 70). It was not the purpose of this article to compile a complete list of Bohemisms that occur in the New Testament. We hope to conduct a larger study in the future using not only dictionaries but also texts.

In most cases, the selection was based on two criteria: 1) the word from Jakubica's translation must not occur in Upper and Lower Sorbian languages and their dialects; 2) the word must be similar to Czech and/or Polish words. The influence of Upper Sorbian on Jakubica's text has already been studied ([ŠEWC 1997](#): 39–49), so instances where a word from the translation is fixed in Czech and Upper Sorbian but absent in Polish and other Lower Sorbian dialects (e. g. *kuzłowaś, kuzłowaŋe, kuzlařstwo, kuzlař*) are ignored. In our opinion, this is an issue for a separate study. The main task of this paper is to identify Bohemisms and Polonisms. If it is possible to screen out Polonisms, the nature and intensity of the Czech lexical influence on the New Testament will be established.

As mentioned above, in the translation process Jakubica used not only the Severin Bible in the 1545 edition, but presumably also other Czech texts. For this reason, it was decided to work with dictionaries of Old Czech: “Slovník staročeský” by Jan Gebauer ([GEBAUER 1903–1904](#)), “Malý staročeský slovník” by Jaromír Bělič, Adolf Kamiš, Karel Kučera ([MALÝ STČ.](#)), “Staročeský slovník” ([STČS](#)), and “Elektronický slovník staré češtiny” ([ESSČ](#)). It is quite possible that Jakubica borrowed words from many Czech sources. The study also includes lexical material reflected in dictionaries of Old Polish: “Słownik staropolski” ([ŚLSTP](#)) and “Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku” ([ŚLP XVI](#)). Etymological dictionaries and other historical-lexicological works were used where appropriate, e. g., “Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache” by Schuster-Šewc ([HEWS](#)), “Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego” by Andrzej Bańkowski ([BAŃKOWSKI 2000](#)), “Bohemizmy w języku polskim: słownik” by Mieczysław Basaj and Janusz Siatkowski ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#)), and “Obcojęzyczne wpływy – zwłaszcza czeskie – na język Mikołaja Jakubicy” by Teichmann ([TEICHMANN 2001](#)).

The collected material was divided into three groups. The first includes words that count as Bohemisms. The second group is comprised of Polonisms. The third group includes words that can be considered both Bohemisms and Polonisms. The borrowings are analyzed as follows. For the selected lexemes from Jakubica's translation, the corresponding words from Czech and/or Polish are given. Upper and Lower Sorbian words may be cited for comparison. Words from one word family are grouped into one dictionary entry. The lexical material is often accompanied by comments.

### 3. Results

#### Group 1: Lexemes that were most likely borrowed from Czech and count as Bohemisms

In addition to Czech, some words also correspond to Polish words, but in Polish they count as Bohemisms:

*bedliwy* (SL JAK. 1: 93; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/22) – OCz. *bedlivý* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/32; MALÝ STČ.: 17)

*branješ se* (SL JAK. 1: 93), *obrana*, *obranc* (SL JAK. 2: 5), *brañaš*, *brañaš se* (MUKA 1911–1928: 1/70) – OCz. *brániti*, *brániti se* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/94), *obrana* (STČS 9: 131–135; MALÝ STČ.: 236), *obráncě* (STČS 9: 135–136; MALÝ STČ.: 236). Cf. OPol. *obrańca*, *obrańić* (SLSTP 5: 366), *obrana*, *branić* (BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006: 190), which count as Bohemisms, as indicated by the reflex *-ra-* instead of *-ro-* (*ibid.*). According to Teichmann, *branić*, *obrana*, *obran(e)c* in Jakubica's translation are Bohemisms (TEICHMANN 2001: 81). *Branješ se* can be considered a phonetic Bohemism, cf. USorb. *brónić* (*so*), LSorb. *broniś* (*se*) (HEWS: 70; PETROVA 1969: 281). Muka noted that the verb *brañaš* is iterativum-imperfectum to the verb *broniś* (MUKA 1911–1928: 1/70), so it may be a Lower Sorbian word, not a loanword. However, in the “Słownik z Jakubicoweho Noweho Zakonja” the verb *broniś* is not recorded, there is only *branješ se*, which is not found in the Sorbian languages except in Jakubica's translation. In addition, it is not entirely clear why Muka gave the form *braña(!)ś*. For example, Teichmann, who worked directly with the text, recorded the infinitive *branić* (TEICHMANN 2001: 81). Based on the above, we consider *branješ se* to be a phonetic Bohemism, meanwhile *obrana*, *obranc* count as lexical Bohemisms.

*bžeś*, *bžeňe* (SL JAK. 1: 93; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/107) – OCz. *bdieti*, *bděnie* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/31; MALÝ STČ.: 16)

*cčížadosćiwa* (SL JAK. 1: 93), *cčížadosćiwy* (MUKA 1911–1928: 1/116) – OCz. *čštížado-stivý* (ESSČ)

*chluba*, *chłubene*, *chlubiś se* (SL JAK. 1: 100; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/486), *pochlubiś*, *pochlubowas*, *pochlubjenje* (SL JAK. 2: 14), *pochlubiś*, *pochlubowaś*, *pochłubeňe* (MUKA 1911–1928: 2/108) – OCz. *chlúba*, *chlubiti se* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/538–539; MALÝ STČ.: 78), *chlubenie* (GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/538), *pochlubiti se*, *pochlubovati se* (STČS 18: 481; MALÝ STČ.: 323). Cf. OPol. *chluba*, *chluba*, *chlubić się*, *chlubić się* (SLSTP 1: 237) that replaced the original OPol. *chelpa*, *chelpić się*, *chelbić się* (SLSTP 1: 232–233). Forms with the combination *-lu-* (*-lu-*) appeared under the influence of the Czech language (BAŃKOWSKI 2000: 1/137; BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006: 35–36). Teichmann considers *chlubić se*, *chlubjenje*, *pochlubjenje* in Jakubica's translation as Bohemisms (TEICHMANN 2001: 81); *pochlubować* was borrowed from Czech (ŠEWC 1997: 38).

*chwalitelny*, *chwalitebny*, *chwalobnitelny* (SL JAK. 1: 100) – OCz. *chwalitebný*, *chwalitedlný* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/569; MALÝ STČ.: 81)

*ctnostny, ctnost* (SL JAK. 1: 94) – OCz. *čstnostny* (ESSČ), *čstnost, ctnost, čsnost, cnost* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/193; MALÝ STČ.: 37). The word was borrowed from Czech (PETROVA 1969: 280).

*djabeł, djablowski* (SL JAK. 1: 95; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/168) – OCz. *diábel, d'ábel* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/240; MALÝ STČ.: 43), *diáblowský* (ESSČ). Cf. OPol. *diabel, dyabel, diabol* (SLSTP 2: 50–51), *diabelski, dyabelski* (SLSTP 2: 50), *diabłow(y), dyabłow(y)* (SLSTP 2: 51). As for the lexeme *djabeł*, a phonetic influence of Czech or Polish can be admitted, cf. USorb., LSorb. *djaboł* (HEWS: 151). It is not entirely impossible that it is a dialect word (*ibid.*). *Djabłowski* is an obvious lexical Bohemism.

*długomysl, długomyslny* (SL JAK. 1: 95; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/169) – OCz. *dlúhomysl, dlúhomyslný* (ESSČ). Cf. OPol. *długomyślny* (SLSTP 2: 62), *długomyślność* (SLP XVI 5: 55–56). In Polish, these are probably also Bohemisms, as the words were sporadically attested in works dependent on Czech texts (Bible of Queen Sophia, *mammotreks*, Leopolda's Bible).

*dobrjecynjenje* (SL JAK. 1: 95), *dobřecyněnie* (MUKA 1911–1928: 1/175) – OCz. *dobré čiňenie* (ESSČ)

*dokaważ* (SL JAK. 1: 96; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/183) – OCz. *dokavadž, dokavadže, dokovadž, dokovadže* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/284–285). It belongs to the Bohemisms, cf. USorb. *dokelž*, LSorb. *dokulaž* (HEWS: 158).

*dokud, dokudź, dokusch, dokudsch* (SL JAK. 1: 96), *dokud, dokuź* (MUKA 1911–1928: 1/183) – OCz. *dokud, dokudź, dokudže* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/284–285). It is considered a Bohemism (HEWS: 158).

*dom(n)iś, domywasch, doměwaś, domnemy, doměwanje* (SL JAK. 1: 96), *domniś (domiś), domniwaś (domiwaś), doměwaś, domńemy, doměwańe* (MUKA 1911–1928: 1/187) – OCz. *domnieti, domńávati, domnievati sě, domńěný, domnievanie* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/293–294; MALÝ STČ.: 49). Cf. OPol. *domniemać (się), domnimać (się)* (SLSTP 2: 119–120).

*dosagnuś* (SL JAK. 1: 96) – OCz. *dosáhnúti* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/303; MALÝ STČ.: 51), cf. USorb. *dosahnyć* (TROFIMOWIČ 1974: 32), OPol. *dosięgnąć* (SLSTP 2: 142)

*douffanje* (SL JAK. 1: 96) – OCz. *doufanie* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/315–316; MALÝ STČ.: 53). Cf. OPol. *doufanie* (SLSTP 2: 220). It appeared in Old Polish religious texts under Czech influence (BAŃKOWSKI 2000: 1/310; BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006: 53).

*drak* (SL JAK. 1: 96; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/196) – OCz. *drak* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/325)

*groś* (SL JAK. 1: 98; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/333) – OCz. *groś, kroś* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/393–394; MALÝ STČ.: 62). Cf. OPol. *grosz* (SLSTP 2: 496–499), USorb., LSorb. *kroś* (HEWS: 682). The word was borrowed from Czech as early as the 14th century into Polish and East Slavic languages (BAŃKOWSKI 2000: 1/483; BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006:

64). It was probably already well known to the Sorbian languages in the 16th century. However, a Czech phonetic or graphical influence on the *groš* (instead of *kroš*) cannot be excluded.

*hadkaš, hadkanje, hadkawy* (SL JAK. 1: 99), *hadkaš, hadkaŋe, hadkawy* (MUKA 1911–1928: 1/347) – contamination OCz. *hádka* (ESSČ) and *hádati, hádanie, hádavý* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/397–398; MALÝ STČ.: 63). It is considered a Bohemism (HEWS: 257), cf. LSorb. *gadaš, gadaŋe* (MUKA 1911–1928: 1/238). OPol. *gadać się* is a semantic Bohemism (BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006: 60).

*hojny, hojnosť* (SL JAK. 1: 99; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/395) – OCz. *hojný* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/451; MALÝ STČ.: 69), *hojnost* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/451). Cf. OPol. *hojny* (SLP XVI 8: 357–360), which belongs to the Bohemisms (BAŃKOWSKI 2000: 1/529; BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006: 71).

*hudc* (SL JAK. 1: 99; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/423) – OCz. *hudec* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/515; MALÝ STČ.: 75)

*jizwa* (SL JAK. 1: 101; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/554) – OCz. *jiezva, jiezv* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 1/648; MALÝ STČ.: 89)

*kacerski, kacerstwo* (SL JAK. 1: 101; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/562) – OCz. *kacierský, kacierský, kacierský* (ESSČ), *kaciersstvo, kaciersstvo, kacersstvo, kacersstvo* (ESSČ), cf. USorb. *kecar*, LSorb. *kjacar* (HEWS: 509). OPol. *kacierz* (SLSTP 3: 216) is recognized as a Bohemism (BAŃKOWSKI 2000: 1/603; BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006: 82).

*koliko* (SL JAK. 1: 103) – OCz. *koliko, kolik* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 2/82; MALÝ STČ.: 100), cf. USorb., LSorb. *kelko* (HEWS: 512). In the New Testament the word was borrowed from Czech (HEWS: 602).

*kolikrat* (SL JAK. 1: 103), *pětkrat, petkrat* (SL JAK. 2: 13), *tříkrat, třikraty* (SL JAK. 2: 25), *welekrat* (SL JAK. 2: 33) – OCz. *kolikokrát, kolikkrát* (ESSČ; MALÝ STČ.: 100), *pětkrát(e)* (STČS 15: 157), *tříkrát, tříkráte* (ESSČ). *-krat* instead of USorb. *króc*, LSorb. *krot* (HEWS: 676–677). In this case, the reflex *-ra-* in the consonant group is observed instead of *-ro-*, characteristic of Sorbian languages (PETROVA 1969: 281).

*kotoryžto* (SL JAK. 1: 102), *kótoryžto* (MUKA 1911–1928: 1/687) – OCz. *kterýžto* (ESSČ)

*kral, kralowaš, kralowski, kralowy, kralowstwo* (SL JAK. 1: 102; MUKA 1911–1928: 1/694, 695) – OCz. *král* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 2/126), *kralovat, kralevari* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 2/127–128; MALÝ STČ.: 106), *královský, králevský* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 2/128; MALÝ STČ.: 106), *králový, králevý* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 2/129; MALÝ STČ.: 106), *králostvo, králestvo* (ESSČ; GEBAUER 1903–1904: 2/128–129; MALÝ STČ.: 106). It is an old Bohemism that penetrated the Sorbian languages in the 11th and 12th centuries: “dósta so w tutym času česka požconka *král* ‘rex, König’ do serbsčiny, štož swědči wo wulkim prestižu českeje kralowskeje wyšnosće w tehdyšimaj Łužicomaj. Čěski wuraz naruna při tym starše serbske *król/kroľ*” ‘at this time the Czech loanword *král* ‘rex, König’ entered the Sorbian language, indicating the high prestige of

Czech royalty in then Lusatia. The Czech word replaced the Old Sorbian *król/kroľ* ([SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 2005](#): 24), cf. USorb., LSorb. *kral* ([HEWS](#): 662–663). OPol. *kral*, *kralewski*, *kralować* are regarded as phonetic Bohemisms ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 104).

*lebka* ([ŚL. JAK. 1](#): 104), *lebka* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/780) – OCz. *lebka* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/213; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 118). Cf. OPol. (*lebka*) *lapka*, *lepka* ([ŚLSTP](#) 4: 110) belongs to the Bohemisms ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 132). Jakubica borrowed the word from Czech ([SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967](#): XVI).

*lewhart* ([ŚL. JAK. 1](#): 104) – OCz. *levhart*, *lebhart* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/240). Cf. OPol. *lewart*, *leward* ([ŚLSTP](#) 4: 26), which was borrowed from Czech ([BAŃKOWSKI 2000](#): 2/26; [BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 121–122).

*mistr* ([ŚL. JAK. 1](#): 105; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/903) – OCz. *mistr*, *místr*, *mistr̃*, *mist* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/370; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 138), cf. USorb. *mišter*, LSorb. *mejstar* ([HEWS](#): 912). OPol. *mistrz* ([ŚLSTP](#) 4: 287–288) is considered a Bohemism ([BAŃKOWSKI 2000](#): 2/192–193; [BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 159).

*mramor* ([ŚL. JAK. 1](#): 106; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/936) – OCz. *mramor* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/405), cf. USorb. *marmol*, LSorb. *marmor* ([HEWS](#): 888).

*nadarmo* ([ŚL. JAK. 1](#): 106; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/966) – OCz. *nadarmo* ([STČS](#) 1: 38–39; [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/445).

*nebo*, *neb* ([ŚL. JAK. 2](#): 4; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/1003) – OCz. *nebo*, *anebo*, *neb* ([STČS](#) 3: 390–396; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 168). Cf. OPol. *niebo*, *nebo* ([ŚLP XVI](#) 17: 142), which came from Czech ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 173).

*njemluwnjatko*, *njemluwnjaty* ([ŚL. JAK. 2](#): 4) – OCz. *nemluvnátko* ([STČS](#) 4: 546; [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/564; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 181), cf. USorb. *mołwić*, LSorb. *mołwić* ([HEWS](#): 944–945).

*njeporušite(d)lny* ([ŚL. JAK. 2](#): 4) – OCz. *neporušitelny*, *neporušitedlny* ([STČS](#) 5: 628; [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/586–587).

*njeposkwrnjeny*, *njeposkwrnjony* ([ŚL. JAK. 2](#): 4), *poskwrnjenje*, *poskwrnowaś* ([ŚL. JAK. 2](#): 14) – OCz. *neposkvrněny*, *nepoškvrněny* ([STČS](#) 5: 631–632; [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/587; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 189), *poskvrněnie*, *poškvrněnie* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 341), *poskvrňovati*, *poškvrňovati* ([STČS](#) 19: 763; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 341). Teichmann regards (*nje*)*poskwrnjeny*, *poskwrnjenje* in Jakubica's text as Bohemisms ([TEICHMANN 2001](#): 81).

*njeprawedlnosć*, *njeprawednosć* ([ŚL. JAK. 2](#): 4) – OCz. *nepravedlnost*, *nepravednost* ([STČS](#) 5: 644; [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/590; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 190). Cf. OPol. *nieprawiedlnosć* ([ŚLSTP](#) 5: 218) belongs to the Bohemisms ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 176).

*njesnesitelný* ([ŚL. JAK. 2](#): 4) – OCz. *nesnesitelný*, *nesnesitedlný* ([STČS](#) 5: 741; [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/617; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 198).

*njesprawedliwy, njesprawedlnosć* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 4–5), *osprawedlenjeny* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 5) – OCz. *nespravedlivý* ([STČS 5](#): 746–747; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 199), *nespravedlnost, nespravednost* ([STČS 5](#): 747–748; [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/619; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 199), *ospravedlněný* ([STČS 12](#): 670). Cf. OPol. *sprawiedliwy* ([SŁSTP 8](#): 368–370), *sprawiedlnosć, sprawiednosć* ([SŁSTP 8](#): 370), which came from Czech ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 335). In Jakubica's translation *sprawedlnosć* is regarded as a Bohemism ([ŠEWC 1997](#): 38).

*njestydosć, njestydatosć* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 5) – OCz. *nestydatost* ([STČS 6](#): 770)

*njeustawiczny* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 5) – OCz. *neustavičný* ([STČS 6](#): 830–832; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 205). Cf. OPol. *ustawiczny* ([SŁSTP 9](#): 464–465), which was borrowed into Polish from Czech ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 416).

*njewuchylŋy* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 4), *ńewuchylŋy* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/1059) – OCz. *neúchylný* ([STČS 6](#): 813)

*njezbedny* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 5), *ńezbedny* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/1060) – OCz. *nesbedný, nezbedný* ([STČS 5](#): 701–702; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 195). OPol. *niezbedny* ([SŁSTP 5](#): 261) is considered a Bohemism ([BAŃKOWSKI 2000](#): 2/314; [BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 180–181).

*nowowěrc* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 4; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/1018) – OCz. *novověrec, novověřec* ([STČS 7](#): 987–988)

*pirworožony, pirworoženje* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 6), *pirworožony, pirworožeńe* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/50) – OCz. *prvorozený, prvorozenie* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 374). Cf. OPol. (*pierworodzony*) *pirworodzony, pirworodzony* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 108), (*pierworodzenie*) *pirworodzenie* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 107) were documented only in the Bible of Queen Sophia, probably under Czech influence. OPol. (*pierworodzieniec*) *pirworodzieniec, pirzworodzieniec* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 107) is regarded as a Bohemism ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 222).

*plawc* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 14; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/65) – OCz. *plavec* ([STČS 16](#): 232; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 304), cf. USorb. *pluwar* ([TROFIMOWIČ 1974](#): 174), LSorb. *pluwař, plějař* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/70, 76). OPol. *plawca* has been attested only in the Bible of Queen Sophia ([SŁSTP 6](#): 166), apparently a Bohemism.

*pochybowaś, pochybowanje, pochybowac* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 14), *pochybowaś, pochybowanie, pochybowac* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/109) – OCz. *pochybiti, pochybovati* ([STČS 18](#): 493–494), *pochybování* ([STČS 18](#): 494–495). Cf. OPol. *pochybieńe, pochybować, pochybujący* ([SŁSTP](#): 205), Czech textual influence can be admitted ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 235–236).

*pognutedlŋy* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 14), *njepognutedlŋy, njegnutitedlŋy, njepognutelŋy, njepohnutedlŋy* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 4) – OCz. *pohnutedlný* ([STČS 17](#): 451–452), *nepohnutedlný* ([STČS 5](#): 615; [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/583; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 187)

*pokrytc, pokrytstwo* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 14; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/115) – OCz. *pokrytec* ([STČS 18](#): 547–548), *pokrytstvo* ([STČS 18](#): 550; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 327). Cf. OPol. *pokryciec, pokryctwo, pokrycstwo* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 331), which were borrowed from Czech ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#):

246–247). Teichmann recognizes *pokrytc*, *pokrystwo*, *pokrystw* in Jakubica's New Testament as Bohemisms (TEICHMANN 2001: 81).

*ponjewaž* (SL JAK. 2: 14) – OCz. *poňa(va)dž*, *poňu(va)dž*, *poněž* (STČS 19: 642–644; MALÝ STČ.: 333). Cf. OPol. *ponieważ* (SLP XVI 27: 212–217), which is considered a Bohemism (BAŃKOWSKI 2000: 2/696–697; BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006: 249–250).

*porušený*, *porušitedlný*, *porušitelność* (SL JAK. 2: 14) – OCz. *porušený* (STČS 19: 725–726; MALÝ STČ.: 339), *porušitedlný* (STČS 19: 727; MALÝ STČ.: 339), *porušitedlnost* (STČS 19: 726; MALÝ STČ.: 339)

*prawdom(u)luwny* (SL JAK. 2: 14) – OCz. *pravdomluwný* (STČS 21: 1087), cf. USorb. *mołwić*, LSorb. *mołwić* (HEWS: 944–945), OPol. *prawdomowny* (SLP XVI 30: 91)

*prawedliwy*, *prawedlnosć* (SL JAK. 2: 14) – OCz. *pravedlivý* (STČS 21: 1092; MALÝ STČ.: 361), *pravedlnost* (STČS 21: 1093; MALÝ STČ.: 361)

*prazdny* (SL JAK. 2: 14), *wyprazdniś*, *wyprazdnjeny* (SL JAK. 2: 34) – OCz. *prázdný* (STČS 22: 3–8; MALÝ STČ.: 362), *vyprázdniti* (MALÝ STČ.: 595), *vypráždňený*, *vypráždňeny* (ESSČ), cf. USorb. *próz(d)ny*, LSorb. *prozny* (HEWS: 1162–1163). OPol. *pražen*, *prazen*, *pražny* (SLP XVI 30: 494–503) are phonetic Bohemisms due to the reflex *-ra-* instead of *-ro-*, OPol. *wypraznieni* is considered a lexical Bohemism (BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006: 268–269).

*predzwedel*, *predzwenjenje* (SL JAK. 2: 14), *prezwedel*, *prezwedenje* (SL JAK. 2: 14) – OCz. *před(v)zvěděti*, *před(v)zvědati* (STČS 25: 362–363), *před(v)zvěděnie* (STČS 25: 363), *před(v)zvěděti* (STČS 26: 525–526; MALÝ STČ.: 392)

*pro* (SL JAK. 2: 15) – OCz. *pro* (STČS 22: 25–29; MALÝ STČ.: 363), cf. USorb. *pře*, LSorb. *pše* (HEWS: 1169)

*prorok*, *prorokarka*, *prorocki*, *prorokski*, *prorokstwo*, *prorokowaś*, *prorokowanje* (SL JAK. 2: 15), *prorok*, *prorokařka*, *prorocki*, *prorokski*, *prorokstwo*, *prorokowaś*, *prorokowaŋe* (MUKA 1911–1928: 2/188–189) – OCz. *prorok* (STČS 23: 138–139; MALÝ STČ.: 368), *proročny*, *proročský*, *proročí*, *proročny* (STČS 23: 135–137; MALÝ STČ.: 368), *proročstvie* (STČS 23: 137–138; MALÝ STČ.: 368), *porokovati* (STČS 23: 140–141), *prorokovanie* (STČS 23: 139–140; MALÝ STČ.: 368), cf. USorb. *profeta*, LSorb. *profet* (HEWS: 1159). OPol. *prorok* (SLSTP 7: 58–60) was borrowed from Czech (BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006: 273) or Old Russian (BAŃKOWSKI 2000: 2/785–786). According to Schuster-Šewc and Teichmann these words are Bohemisms in Jakubica's New Testament (HEWS: 1160; TEICHMANN 2001: 81). *Prorokarka*, *prorokstwo* are probably neologisms.

*prospech* (SL JAK. 2: 15) – OCz. *prospěch* (STČS 23: 156–157; MALÝ STČ.: 369)

*přibuzny* (SL JAK. 2: 15), *pšibuzny* (MUKA 1911–1928: 2/245) – OCz. *přibuzný*, *přívuzný* (ESSČ; MALÝ STČ.: 409)

*ranhaś, ranhanje* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 17), *rauhać, rauhanje* ([TEICHMANN 2001](#): 81) – OCz. *rúhati, rúhanie* ([ESSČ](#)). Teichmann considers them Bohemisms ([TEICHMANN 2001](#): 81).

*rozbroj* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 17; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/326) – OCz. *rozbroj* ([ESSČ](#))

*rozptylenje, rozptaleny* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 17) – OCz. *rozptyľenie, rozptyľený* ([ESSČ](#))

*štyr* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 23; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/675) – OCz. *ščúr, ščír* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 498). The word was borrowed from Czech ([SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967](#): XVI; [TEICHMANN 2001](#): 82).

*welebiś, welebnosć, welebný* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 33), *zwelebil* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 39), *welebiś, zwelebiś, welebný, welebnosć* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/864–865) – OCz. *velebiti, velbiti, velebný, velebnosť* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 561), *zvelebiti* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 679). OPol. *wielebić* ([SLSTP](#) 10: 154), *wielebný* ([SLSTP](#) 10: 156–158), *wielebnosć* ([SLSTP](#) 10: 155–156) are regarded as Bohemisms ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 487). In Jakubica's New Testament these forms were borrowed from Czech texts ([TEICHMANN 2001](#): 82; [BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 487).

*wespolek* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 33) – OCz. *vspolek* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 579). Cf. OPol. *wespolek* ([SLSTP](#) 10: 86), which belongs to the Bohemisms ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 426–427).

*widitedlny* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 33), *njewiditedlny* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 5) – OCz. *viditedlný* ([ESSČ](#)), *neviditedlný* ([STČS](#) 6: 860; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 207)

*wlastny* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 33) – OCz. *vlastní, vlastný* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 570). Cf. OPol. *własny* ([SLSTP](#) 10: 249–251), which is considered a phonetic Bohemism ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 442–443). Jakubica also borrowed the word from Czech ([PETROVA 1969](#): 280).

*wobluda* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 33), *wobluda* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/902) – OCz. *oblud, obluda* ([STČS](#) 8: 68–69; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 230). The word is regarded as a Bohemism ([HEWS](#): 1629; [BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 188–189).

*wotpjerac* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 33), *wótpjerac* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/950) – OCz. *otpierač* ([STČS](#) 13: 910)

*wšetačnje, wšetečnosć* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 34), *wšetecnosć, wšetacnosć, wšetacny* ([TEICHMANN 2001](#): 82) – OCz. *všetečný, včetečně, všetečnost* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 582). OPol. *wszeteczny* was borrowed from Czech ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 450–451). In Jakubica's translation these words are also Bohemisms ([SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967](#): XVII; [TEICHMANN 2001](#): 82).

*wupelny, wupelnosć* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 30; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/985) – OCz. *úplný* ([ESSČ](#)). Cf. OPol. *upelny, upelnie* ([SLSTP](#) 9: 409), which are regarded as Bohemisms ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 412).

*zły drug* 'a villain' ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 37; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/210) – OCz. *zlodruh* 'a villain, a scoundrel' ([ESSČ](#))

*zrižiś, zriženje, zridnje, zrižony* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 38), *zrižiś, zrižeńe, zridńe* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/1111), *njezriženje* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 5), *ńezrižeńe* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/1062) – OCz. *zřiediti*

([MALÝ STČ.](#): 674), *zřiezený* ([ESSČ](#); [MALÝ STČ.](#): 674), *nezřiezenie* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 212), cf. USorb. *rjad*, LSorb. *rěd* ([HEWS](#): 1218), LSorb. *zrědny* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/1111)

*žělnik* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 40), *žělnik* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/1185) – OCz. *dělník* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/223–224; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 41). OPol. *dzielnik* ([SLSTP 2](#): 289–290) was borrowed from Czech ([BASAJ/SIATKOWSKI 2006](#): 55). In Jakubica's New Testament it is regarded as a Bohemism ([SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967](#): XVII; [ŠEWC 1997](#): 38).

## Group 2: Lexemes that can be considered as possible Polonisms

The Polish influence on the translation was the subject of a separate study. The reason is mainly the transitional character of the dialect used by Jakubica. First of all, phonetic and grammatical features common to the East Lower Sorbian dialect and the Polish language were noted. Less attention was paid to lexical coincidences. Schuster-Šewc listed the following potential Polonisms: *drwi*, *gnat*, *chrobry*, *panic*, *polick*, *ponukać* (*ponukagucy*), *robota*, *rožina*, *serce*, *słońce*, *wotworić*, *zdrowy*, *žeby* ([SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967](#): XXXVIII). It is worth noting that most of them are found not only in Polish but also in Czech, e. g., OCz. *dřvi* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/344–345; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 57), *hnát* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/435; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 67), *panic* ([STČS 15](#): 47–48; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 294), *poliček* ([STČS 18](#): 579–580), *ponúkati* ([STČS 19](#): 656–657; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 334), *ponúkajúci* ([STČS 19](#): 655), *robota* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 416), *rodina* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 417), *otvoriť* ([STČS 14](#): 1037–1038; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 289), *že by* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 686). Only for *chrobry*, *serce*, *zdrowy*, cf. OCz. *chrabrý* ([GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/550), *srdce* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 472), *sdravý*, *zdravý* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 439) is it possible to exclude the Czech influence. The following list includes both previously identified Polonisms and new ones discovered during our study.

*chrobry*, *chrobrosć* ([SL. JAK. 1](#): 99; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/500) – OPol. *chrobry* ([SLSTP 1](#): 253), cf. USorb., LSorb. *chrobŕy*, USorb. *chrobłosć* ([HEWS](#): 402–403)

*dowor* ([SL. JAK. 1](#): 96; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/194) – OPol. *dowora* ([SLP XVI 5](#): 545). Schuster-Šewc considered the word to be Sorbian in origin and compared it with the Polish one ([HEWS](#): 163–164).

*serce*, *sercny* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 21; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/403) – OPol. *serce*, *sierce* ([SLSTP 8](#): 150–154). In the Sorbian languages, Proto-Slavic *\*sъrdьce* was superseded by USorb. *wutroba*, LSorb. *wutšoba*; in the East Lower Sorbian dialect the former lasted longer due to its proximity to the Polish language ([HEWS](#): 1284–1285).

*wartko* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 25; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/843) – OPol. *wartko* ([SLSTP 10](#): 46). Schuster-Šewc compared this Lower Sorbian word with the Polish one, but did not draw any further conclusions ([HEWS](#): 1583).

*zapalisty* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 35; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/1030) – Pol. *zapalisty* ([SJP 8](#): 203), cf. USorb. *zapality* ([TROFIMOWIČ 1974](#): 425)

*zdrowy*, *zdrowosć*, *zdrowje*, *zdrowišer* ([SL. JAK. 2](#): 37), *zdrowy*, *zdrowosć*, *zdrowe*, *zdrowišer* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/1066) – OPol. *zdrowy* ([SLSTP 11](#): 298–301), *zdrowosć* ([SLSTP](#)

11: 298), *zdrowie* ([SŁSTP](#) 11: 296–298). Cf. USorb., LSorb. *strowy*, *strowosć* ([HEWS](#): 1365–1366).

### Group 3: Lexemes that can be equally attributed to both Bohemisms and Polishisms

In this case, we assume that it is impossible to determine exactly whether the words in Jakubica's translation were borrowed from Czech or Polish since they are well known and common in both languages.

*cesarstwo* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 93; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/125) – OCz. *ciesarstvo*, *ciesarstvo*, *ciesarstvie*, *ciesarstvie* ([ESSČ](#)), OPol. *cesarstwo* ([SŁSTP](#) 1: 220). Schuster-Šewc suggested that the word is a dialectism ([HEWS](#): 95).

*clowjecenstwo* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 94), *clowceenstwo* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/128) – OCz. *člověčenstvie* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/182–183; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 36), OPol. *człowieczeństwo* ([SŁSTP](#) 1: 387–388)

*cožkoliwek* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 94), *cožkoliwek* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/134) – OCz. *cožkolivěk* ([ESSČ](#)), OPol. *cožkolwiek* ([SŁP XVI](#) 3: 692)

*cudnje*, *cudnosć* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 94), *cudnie*, *cudnosć* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/137) – OCz. *cudny*, *cidny* ([GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/147), OPol. *cudny*, *czudny* ([SŁSTP](#) 1: 335), *cudność*, *czudność* ([SŁSTP](#) 1: 334–335)

*cuzožeńc* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 93; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/139) – OCz. *cuzozemec* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/150; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 32), OPol. *cudzoziemiec* ([SŁSTP](#) 1: 336–337)

*cynitel* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 94), *cynišel* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/147) – OCz. *činitel* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/176; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 35), OPol. *czyniciel* ([SŁP XVI](#) 4: 291). The word was borrowed from Czech according to [PETROVA \(1969: 280\)](#).

*długosć* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 95; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/169) – OCz. *dlúhost* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/259; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 45), OPol. *długość* ([SŁSTP](#) 2: 62)

*dokonały*, *dokonałosć* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 96; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/183) – OCz. *dokonały*, OCz. *dokonalost* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/286), OPol. *dokonały* ([SŁSTP](#) 2: 119), cf. USorb. *dokonjanosć* ([TROFIMOWIČ 1974](#): 29)

*dokonaś* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 95; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/183), *dokonanje* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 95), *dokonańe* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/183) – OCz. *dokonati*, *dokonanie* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/286; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 48), OPol. *dokonać* ([SŁSTP](#) 2: 114–119), *dokonanie* ([SŁSTP](#) 2: 119–120)

*doścignuś* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 95; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/192) – OCz. *dostihnúti* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/309; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 52), OPol. *doścignąć* ([SŁP XVI](#) 6: 481)

*dostatečný, dostatečnost, dostatnosť* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 96), *dostatnosť* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/193) – OCz. *dostatečný* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/307), *dostatečnost* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/307; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 52), *dostatnost* ([ESSČ](#)), OPol. *dostateczny* ([SŁSTP 2](#): 147–148), *dostateczność* ([SŁSTP 2](#): 147)

*jednostajny* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 101; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/541) – OCz. *jednostajný* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/619–620), OPol. *jednostajny, jenostajny* ([SŁSTP 3](#): 153–154)

*jesli* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 100–101; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/546) – OCz. *jestli* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/635), OPol. (*jeśli*) *jesli, jestli* ([SŁSTP 3](#): 193–194), cf. USorb. *jeli*, LSorb. *joli až* ([HEWS](#): 444–445)

*jisty* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 101; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/554) – OCz. *jistý* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 1/655–656; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 89), OPol. *isty* ([SŁSTP 3](#): 46–49), cf. USorb., LSorb. *wěsty* ([HEWS](#): 1591–1592)

*kam* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 101; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/570) – OCz. *kamo, kam* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/15–16; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 92), OPol. *kam, kamo* ([SŁSTP 3](#): 229, 233)

*kótwa* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 102; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/687) – OCz. *kotva, kotev* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/116; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 105), OPol. *kotew* or *kotwa* ([SŁSTP 3](#): 364), *kotew, kotwa, kotwia* ([SŁP XVI](#) 11: 78), cf. USorb. *kótwica*, LSorb. *kotwica* ([HEWS](#): 648–649)

*kupectwo* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 103; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/745) – OCz. *kupečstvo, kupečstvie* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/179; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 113), OPol. *kupiectwo* ([SŁSTP 3](#): 467), cf. USorb. *kupcowstwo, kupstwo*, LSorb. *kupstwo* ([HEWS](#): 730; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/748)

*maśc* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 106; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/86) – OCz. *mast* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/320), OPol. *maść* ([SŁSTP 4](#): 167–168), probably a borrowing from Czech in Jakubica's translation ([HEWS](#): 891)

*měškaš, poměškaš* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 106; [SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 14; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/889) – OCz. *meškati* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/344; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 134), *pomeškati* ([STČS](#) 18: 614–615; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 331), OPol. *mieszkać (się), mięszkać* ([SŁSTP 4](#): 239–242), *po-mieszkać* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 369). Schuster-Sewc considered the forms to be Bohemisms ([HEWS](#): 926).

*miłowaś, miłowanje, miłowany* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 106), *miłowaś, miłowańe, miłowany* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/901) – OCz. *milovati, milování* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/364), *mi-lovaný* ([ESSČ](#)), OPol. *miłować, miłowanie* ([SŁSTP 4](#): 265–269), *miłowan, miłowany* ([SŁP XVI](#) 14: 249–250)

*mstítel* ([SŁ. JAK. 1](#): 106; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/941) – OCz. *mstítel* ([ESSČ](#); [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/412), OPol. *mściciel* ([SŁSTP 4](#): 362)

*njenawistny* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 4), *ńenawistny* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 1/1044) – OCz. *nenávistný* ([STČS 4](#): 572–573; [GEBAUER 1903–1904](#): 2/573; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 182), OPol. *nienawistny*, *nienawisny* ([SŁSTP 5](#): 205)

*panowaś, panic, panownik* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 13; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/16–17) – OCz. *panovati* ([STČS 15](#): 55–57; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 294), *panic* ([STČS 15](#): 47–48; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 294), *panovník* ([STČS 15](#): 57–58), OPol. *panować* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 31–32), (*panicz*) *panic* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 26–27), *panownik* ([SŁP XVI](#) 23: 187–188)

*pjekło, pjekelski* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 6, 14), *pekło, pekelski* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/39), *pjekło, pjekelski, pjekelny* ([TEICHMANN 2001](#): 81) – OCz. *peklo* ([STČS 15](#): 125–126; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 298), *Pekelský* anthroponym ([STČS 15](#): 125), *p(e)kelný, p(e)kelní* ([STČS 15](#): 124–125; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 302), OPol. *piekło, piekiel, pkiel* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 89–90), *piekelski* ([SŁP XVI](#) 24: 57), *piekielny, pkielni, pkielny* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 88–89), cf. USorb. *pjekło*, LSorb. *pjakło* ([HEWS](#): 1076). Teichmann recognizes the words as Bohemisms ([TEICHMANN 2001](#): 81). It is obviously a semantic influence of Czech or Polish.

*pocestny, pocestność* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 14), *pócestny, pócestność* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/87) – OCz. *počestný* ([STČS 16](#): 311–312; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 309), *počestnost* ([STČS 16](#): 310–311; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 309), OPol. *poczesny, poczesny* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 214–215), *poczesność, poczestność* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 214)

*posłuchac* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 8; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/146) – OCz. *posluchač* ([STČS 19](#): 775–776; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 342), OPol. *posłuchacz* ([SŁP XVI](#) 28: 34), cf. LSorb. *posłuchař* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/146)

*powinjen, powinność* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 14) – OCz. *povinen býti* ([STČS 20](#): 953–954), *povinnost* ([STČS 20](#): 952–953), OPol. *powinien* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 522), *powinność* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 522)

*pozwaś* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 14), *pózwaś* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/168) – OCz. *pozvati* ([STČS 21](#): 1022–1024; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 358), OPol. *pozwać* ([SŁSTP 6](#): 548–551)

*rozkoś, rozkośnik* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 17; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/332) – OCz. *rozkoš* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 422), *rozkośnik* ([ESSČ](#)), OPol. *rozkosz* ([SŁSTP 7](#): 530–531), *rozkosznik* ([SŁSTP 7](#): 531)

*rozlicny* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 16; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/333) – OCz. *rozličný* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 423), OPol. *rozliczny* ([SŁSTP 7](#): 535–536). It is considered a Bohemism ([HEWS](#): 1241).

*rozmagali se* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 16), *rozмагаś se* ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/333) – OCz. *rozmáhati se* ([ESSČ](#)), OPol. *rozmagać się* ([SŁSTP 7](#): 538–539)

*swětski* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 21; [MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/585) – OCz. *světský, svěcký* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 492), OPol. *świecki, świecki, świetski* ([SŁSTP 8](#): 60–62), cf. USorb., LSorb. *světny* ([HEWS](#): 1387)

*trestaś, trestanje* ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 24) – OCz. *tres(k)tati*, OCz. *tres(k)tanie* ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 516), OPol. *treskać, (tresktanie) tręsktanie* ([SŁSTP 9](#): 184). The word was borrowed from Czech ([SCHUSTER-ŠEWC 1967](#): XVI; [ŠEWC 1997](#): 38; [TEICHMANN 2001](#): 82).

wedla ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 33) – OCz. vedlé ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 560), OPol. wedle ([SŁSTP](#) 10: 68)

welblaud ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 33), wjelblud, welbludowy ([TEICHMANN 2001](#): 82) – OCz. velblúd, velblúdový ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 560–561), OPol. wielbłąd ([SŁSTP](#) 10: 150–151), wielbłądowy ([SŁSTP](#) 10: 151), cf. USorb. wjelblud, which was borrowed from Czech ([HEWS](#): 1611). In Jakubica's translation the words are considered to be Bohemisms ([TEICHMANN 2001](#): 82).

wonny ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 33), wónny ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/922) – OCz. vonný ([ESSČ](#)), OPol. wonny ([SŁSTP](#) 10: 300). According to Schuster-Sewc, it is a Bohemism in Jakubica's New Testament ([HEWS](#): 1653).

woźralc, woźralstwo ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 34), wóźralc, wóźralstwo ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/969) – OCz. ožralec ([STČS](#) 14: 1080; [MALÝ STČ.](#): 291), ožralstvie, ožralstwo ([STČS](#) 14: 1080), OPol. ožralec ([SŁP XVI](#) 22: 468), ožralstwo ([SŁP XVI](#) 22: 468–469), cf. USorb. woźrawstwo ([TROFIMOWIČ 1974](#): 384)

wyborny ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 34) – OCz. výborný ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 584), OPol. wyborny ([SŁSTP](#) 10: 432–433), cf. USorb. wubérny ([TROFIMOWIČ 1974](#): 386)

zasługa ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 38), zasluga ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/1042) – OCz. zásluh, zásluha ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 637), OPol. zasługa ([SŁSTP](#) 11: 190–191), cf. USorb., LSorb. zashužba ([HEWS](#): 1737)

zatracyś, zatracenje ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 39), zatracyś, zatracenje ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/1050) – OCz. zatratiti, zatracenie ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 640–641), OPol. zatracić ([SŁSTP](#) 11: 221–222), zatracenie ([SŁSTP](#) 11: 220). According to Teichmann, the words in Jakubica's translation were borrowed from the Czech text ([TEICHMANN 2001](#): 82).

zjisk, zjiskaś ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 39) – OCz. zisk, ziskovati ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 655), OPol. zysk ([SŁSTP](#) 11: 521–523), zyskać ([SŁSTP](#) 11: 523–525)

złocync ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 37), złocyńc ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/1089) – OCz. zločinec ([ESSČ](#)), zločincě ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 660), OPol. złoczyńca ([SŁSTP](#) 11: 393)

zprawa, zprawowaś, zprawc ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 22), sprawa, sprawowaś, sprawc ([MUKA 1911–1928](#): 2/500) – OCz. správa, spravovati, správce ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 470, 471), zpráva, zpravovati, zprávce ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 670), OPol. sprawa ([SŁSTP](#) 8: 361–362), sprawować ([SŁSTP](#) 8: 372), sprawca ([SŁSTP](#) 8: 362)

zwykle ([SŁ. JAK. 2](#): 39) – OCz. zvyklý ([MALÝ STČ.](#): 682), OPol. zwykły ([SŁSTP](#) 11: 521).

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1 Bohemisms

The first group includes loanwords whose Czech origin is quite convincing. As a rule, these words had correspondences in Czech, but not in Polish. If there were corresponding

words in Polish, they belonged to the Bohemisms. The probability that these Bohemisms could have entered Jakubica's translation through Polish dialects is extremely low. Most Bohemisms were borrowed into Old Polish written texts, only some of them were later assimilated into the common Polish language.

By their nature, the Bohemisms found in the New Testament are 'ephemeral', i. e., they do not occur in the Sorbian languages apart from in this work. Exceptions are *groš*, as well as *kral*, *kralowaš*, *kralowski*, *kralowy*, *kralowstwo*. These words were borrowed from Czech in an earlier period, so Jakubica was probably familiar with them.

This paper has focused on the study of lexical Bohemisms, but several phonetic Bohemisms have also been found: *branješ se*, *djabel*, *prazdny*.

## 4.2 Polonisms

The second group is represented by a small number of words that were presumably borrowed from Polish. The influence of the Czech language is excluded. It should be noted that there is no complete certainty that the words listed were borrowed. Some of them may count as dialectisms (*dowor*, *wartko*, *zapalisty*) or archaisms (*serce*, *sercny*). The derivatives *zdrowość*, *chrobrosć* could have been formed independently. According to this point of view, the lexical influence of Polish on the translation was minimal.

## 4.3 Uncertain cases

The third group consists of loanwords that can be classified as both Bohemisms and Polonisms. These words do not occur in the Sorbian languages, but are widespread in Czech and Polish. Thus, in Jakubica's text, Bohemisms are represented by a large group, while Polonisms are very rare and their Polish origin is doubtful. Polish phonetic and grammatical influence on the work cannot be denied, but lexical influence remains unlikely. In our opinion, the borrowings from the third group appeared in the translation thanks to the Czech language. There is no reason to consider them as Polonisms. Consequently, the words from the first and third groups count as the Bohemisms.

Despite the fact that Jakubica's translation is a significant work of religious literature, the translator borrowed not only religious vocabulary (*djabel*, *djabłowski*, *kacerski*, *kacerstwo*, *nowowěrc*, *pjekło*, *pjekelski*, *pokrytc*, *pokrytstwo*, *prorok*, *prorokowaš*, *prorokowanje*, *rozkošnik*, *trestaš*, *trestanje*, *wožralc*, *wožralstwo*), but also words from other lexical-semantic groups, e. g. names of animals and mythical creatures (*drak*, *lewhart*, *welblaud*, *welbludowy*, *štyr*) or names of social and political realities (*cesařstwo*, *clowjecenstwo*, *cuzozemc*, *kral*, *kralowaš*, *kralowski*, *kralowy*, *kralowstwo*, *mistr*, *panowaš*, *panic*, *panownik*, *swětski*, *złocync*). In particular, the translation contains a substantial body of vocabulary that characterizes human intellectual activity and emotional-psychological states (*bedliwy*, *cćizadosćiwa*, *ctnostny*, *ctnost*, *dokonały*, *dokonałość*, *dosagnuś*, *douffanje*, *miłowaš*, *miłowanje*, *miłowany*, *njenawistny*, *njeprawedlnosć*, *njestydatosć*, *pocestny*, *pocestnosć*, *pochybowaš*, *pochybowanje*, *pochybowac*, *wyborny*, etc.). Words that are not usually included in lexical-semantic groups were also borrowed, such as conjunctions (*dokawaž*, *dokud*, *dokudź*, *jesli*, *kotoryžto*, *nebo*, *neb*, *ponjewaž*), prepositions (*wedla*, *pro*), numerals (*kolikrat*, *pětkrat*, *petkrat*, *tříkrat*, *tříkraty*, *welekrat*) and adverbs (*nadarmo*, *wespolek*, *zwykle*).

#### 4.4 Source languages

As far as their origin is concerned, Bohemisms from the New Testament are mostly derived from Proto-Slavic bases. Only a small number of words were adopted from Western European languages through Czech mediation: *cesařstwo* (< L. *Caesar*), *djabel*, *djabłowski* (< L. *diabolus*, Gr. διάβολος), *drak* (< L. *dracō*, Gr. δράκων), *groš* (< L. *grossus*), *kacerski*, *kacerstwo* (< OG. or MHG. *katzer*, *kether* < L. *cathari*, Gr. καθάρως), *kral* (< OHG. *Kar(a)l*), *lewhart* (< MHG. *lewehart*, *lēbhart*, *lēbart(e)*, *lēparte* < L. *leopardus*), *mistr* (< L. *magister*), *mramor* (< L. *marmor*, Gr. μάρμαρον). The general trend, however, is that in the 14th–16th centuries Czech was most often the intermediary language. Thanks to the Czech language, words were borrowed into other Slavic languages from Latin (and Greek), German, Hungarian, and Romance languages. Jakubica's translation shows a different picture: first of all, the translator borrowed vocabulary of Slavic origin. Probably, Jakubica tried to enrich his translation with Bohemisms, which were easily integrated into the Lower Sorbian text and looked like native words.

#### 4.5 Author's neologisms

Among the borrowed vocabulary, there are examples of neologisms original to the author. Jakubica not only borrowed ready-made words, but used them to create his own. For example, *prorok*, *prorokowaś*, *prorokowanje* derive from OCz. *prorok*, *porokovati*, *porokování*. Other derivatives *prorokarka*, *prorocki*, *prorokski*, *prorokstwo* should be attributed to the author's neologisms, since such derivatives are not recorded in the dictionaries of Old Czech. Examples of authorial word creation include *chwalobnitelny*, *hadkaś*, *hadkanje*, *hadkawy*, *njestydość*, *njegnūtitedlŋy*, *pochlubjenje*, *pochybowac*, *wupel-nosć*, *zridnje*.

### 5. Conclusion

Researchers studying the Lower Sorbian translation of the New Testament should take into account the Czech influence on this text. It is known that Jakubica used the Czech Bible in the course of his work. It has already been established that the translator turned to the Severin Bible published in 1545 by Had, but it is possible that Jakubica also used other Czech biblical texts. As a result, the translation contains a significant number of Bohemisms.

The main objective of our article was to study the influence of the Czech language on the lexicon of the New Testament. Since researchers have also noted borrowings from Upper Sorbian and Polish, it was necessary to separate them from the Bohemisms. Initially, we excluded words that could have been borrowed from Upper Sorbian. The remaining words were divided into three groups: 1) Bohemisms; 2) Polonisms; 3) lexemes common to the Czech and Polish languages, which can equally be considered Bohemisms or Polonisms. Based on the results of the study, it was found that there are very few lexical Polonisms in the text, often their Polish origin is doubtful. Bohemisms, in contrast, are represented by a large group, and there was usually no doubt about their origin. Taking this into account, it was concluded that the borrowings from the third group should also be attributed to Bohemisms. Thus, the lexical influence of the Czech language on the text was quite strong. Bohemisms represent various lexical-semantic groups, including conjunctions, prepositions, numerals, and adverbs. First of all, Czech lexemes, which go back

to Proto-Slavic bases, were borrowed, which made it easy to integrate them into the Lower Sorbian text. The translator was inventive in borrowing Bohemisms, often using them to create his own words.

In conclusion, we would like to emphasize that Jakubica's New Testament is a very valuable written document for all Slavists, especially for historians of Slavic languages. We sincerely hope that in the near future a dictionary of Jakubica's language will be prepared and published in accordance with the latest achievements of linguistics.

### Abbreviations

Cz. – Czech, Gr. – Greek, L. – Latin, LSorb. – Lower Sorbian, MHG. – Middle High German, OCz. – Old Czech, OG. – Old German, OHG. – Old High German, OPol. – Old Polish, Pol. – Polish, USorb – Upper Sorbian

### Sources

- ESSČ – Elektronický slovník staré češtiny. Praha. <http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz> [01.01. 2025].
- GEBAUER, Jan 1903–1904: Slovník staročeský. 2 vols. Praha.
- HEWS – SCHUSTER-ŠEWC, Heinz 1978–1989: Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache. 24 issues. Bautzen.
- MALÝ STČ. – BĚLIČ, Jaromír; KAMIŠ, Adolf; KUČERA, Karel 1979: Malý staročeský slovník. Praha.
- MUKA, Arnošt 1911–1928: Słownik dolnoserbskeje rěcy a jeje narěcow (Slovar' nižnelužickogo jazyka i ego narečij). 2 vols. Petrograd-Praha.
- SJP – KARŁOWICZ, Jan et al. (eds.) 1900–1927: Słownik języka polskiego. 8 vols. Warszawa.
- SŁ. JAK. 1 – MUKA, Ernst 1898: Słownik z Jakubicoweho Noweho Zakonja. Po wupiskach prof. A. Leskiena a zarjadowanju M. Hórnika znova přehladał a wudał dr. Ernst Muka, in: Časopis Mačicy serbskeje 51, p. 88–108.
- SŁ. JAK. 2 – MUKA, Ernst 1899: Słownik z Jakubicoweho Noweho Zakonja. Po wupiskach prof. A. Leskiena a zarjadowanju M. Hórnika znova přehladał a wudał dr. Ernst Muka, in: Časopis Mačicy serbskeje 52, p. 3–42.
- SŁP XVI – BĄK, Stanisław et al. (eds.) 1966–2012: Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku. 36 vols. Wrocław etc.
- SŁSTP – URBĄNCZYK, Stanisław et al. (eds.) 1953–2002: Słownik staropolski. 11 vols. Wrocław etc.
- STČS – HAVRÁNEK, Bohuslav et al. (eds.) 1968–2008: Staročeský slovník. 26 issues. Praha.

### References

- BAŃKOWSKI, Andrzej 2000: Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego. 2 vols. Warszawa.
- BASAJ, Mieczysław; SIATKOWSKI, Janusz 2006: Bohemizmy w języku polskim: słownik. Warszawa.
- JENČ, Korla Awgust 1862: Najstaršej serbskaj rukopisaj, in: Časopis Mačicy Serbskeje XV, p. 46–50.

- KYAS, Vladimír 1964: Česká předloha nejstarší lužickosrbské jazykové památky, in: *Slavia* 33, p. 369–374.
- LESKIEN, August 1876: Das sorbische Neue Testament von 1548, in: *Archiv für slavische Philologie* I, p. 161–249.
- LEWASZKIEWICZ, Tadeusz 1995: Łużyckie przekłady Biblii. Przewodnik bibliograficzny. Warszawa.
- LEWASZKIEWICZ, Tadeusz 2007: Sporne problemy języka dolnołużyckiego przekładu Nowego Testamentu Jakubicy (1548), in: RUDNIK-KARWATOWA, Zofia (ed.), *Z polskich studiów slawistycznych. Seria XI: Językoznawstwo: prace na XIV Międzynarodowy Kongres Slawistów w Ochrydzie, 2008*. Warszawa, p. 111–118.
- LEWASZKIEWICZ, Tadeusz 2017: Czesko-łużyckie kontakty językowe od X/XI do XXI wieku, in: *Bohemistyka* 4, p. 359–382.
- LOTZE, Hermann 1867: Der Brief des Jakobus. In wendischer Übersetzung aus der Berliner Handschrift vom Jahre 1548 zum ersten Male mitgetheilt von Hermann Lotze. Leipzig.
- MARTI, Roland 1997: Słowa nimskego pochada w přednem serbskem pśełożku Nowego testamenta, in: *Lětopis* 44/1, p. 67–83.
- MUKA, Ernst 1909: Mikławš Jakubica a jeho podrěč, in: *Časopis Maćicy serbskeje* LXII, p. 97–111.
- PETROVA, Doris 1969: Najstarszy zabytek języka łużyckiego, in: *Prace Filologiczne* 19, p. 276–284.
- SCHUSTER-ŠEWC, Heinz 1967: Das Niedersorbische Testament des Miklawuš Jakubica 1548. Berlin.
- SCHUSTER-ŠEWC, Heinz 2005: Wo prašenju serbsko-českich rěčnych počahow, in: *Lětopis* 52/1, p. 20–28.
- ŠEWC, Hinc 1997: Mikławša Jakubicowu přeložk Noweho zakonja do serbšćiny z lěta 1548. Pospyt noweho hladanja na wosobinu přeložowarja a jeho rěč, in: *Lětopis* 44/2, p. 31–52.
- STIEBER, Zdzisław 1974: Dyspalatalizacja \*e ≥ o i \*ě ≥ a w dawnych dialektach pogranicznych łużycko-polskich, in: *Świat językowy Słowian*. Warszawa, p. 216–221.
- TEICHMANN, Doris 1995: Die Reformation im östlichen Teil des ehemaligen Markgrafthums Niederlausitz und im benachbarten Niederschlesien. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Übersetzung des Lutherschen Neuen Testaments durch Mikławš Jakubica 1548, in: *Lětopis* 42/1, p. 59–82.
- TEICHMANN, Doris 2001: Obcojęzyczne wpływy – zwłaszcza czeskie – na język Mikołaja Jakubicy, in: JAWORSKI, Tomasz; PYŻEWICZ, Wiesław (eds.), *Nowy Testament w dziejach i kulturze Europy. 450. rocznica przekładu Nowego Testamentu przez Mikołaja Jakubicę na język dolnołużycki*. Zielona Góra, p. 75–88.
- TEICHMANN, Doris 2013: Das sorbische Neue Testament von 1548, in: *Niederlausitzer Studien* 39, p. 95–110.
- TEICHMANN, Doris 2015: Die Jakubica-Handschrift von 1548, in: *Lětopis* 62/1, p. 120–127.
- TROFIMOWIČ, Konstantin 1974: Hornjoserbsko-ruski słownik. Budyšin-Moskwa.