

Kopecký, Milan

**A contribution to the problem of the humanistic dialogue in Bohemia
with respect to the technique of translation**

*Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. E, Řada
archeologicko-klasická. 1961, vol. 10, iss. E6, pp. [207]-216*

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/108991>

Access Date: 30. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

MILAN KOPECKÝ

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE HUMANISTIC
DIALOGUE IN BOHEMIA WITH RESPECT TO THE TECHNIQUE
OF TRANSLATION

A favourite genre in European literature at the time of the Renaissance was the dialogue. It was as early as in the Middle Ages that this form was adopted. Dialogues were then composed after the fashion of Plato and Cicero, and also the theological dialogue inspired by Aurelius Augustine was popular at that time. The humanistic dialogue gives its medieval predecessor new contents, which results by and by also in the change of the form. As a rule, both or all the partakers of the dialogue are equally important, formulating their views briefly and to the point. One of the authors representing a kind of starting point of the humanistic dialogue was Lukian. This writer approached humanism and reformation very near in that he attacked the old-fashioned views of the society. The biting satire of his dialogues enabled him to express very effectively ideas and suggestions aiming at social reforms. There is no doubt that those Czech writers of the 16th century who either translated the Lukianic (or pseudo-Lukianic) dialogues, adapting them to the local use, or exploited the form of these dialogues when compiling similar writings of their own, were familiar with this fact.¹ One of them is also the printer, editor, and writer Mikuláš Konáč of Hodiškov († 1546),² living in Prague, who translated five humanistic dialogues (two by Lukian, one pseudo-Lukianic, one by Stanislaides, and finally one by Beroaldus), and besides wrote two dialogues of his own. In the present contribution I shall deal with that work of his which has so far not been subjected to analysis and evaluation by literary historians, i. e. his translation of the dialogue by Beroaldus; while doing so I shall treat briefly the problem of humanistic translations in general.

*

Philip Beroaldus the senior (1453—1505)³ was professor in Bologna and made his name partly by editing the works of ancient writers (mainly Plinius), and partly as a man who introduced Boccaccio to readers in Central Europe. From Decameron he translated into Latin three novelle, entitled as a rule *Historia Gisippi et Titi*,⁴ *Historia*

de Galeo Cymone,⁵ and Carmen de duobus amantibus.⁶ Two of these did as models for Konáč's translations: in 1507 he translated Carmen... (the translation of his „chronicle“ about Gviškard and Sigismunda has not survived), and in 1509 he published in Czech translation „Historia de Galeo Cymone“, entitled „Kronika o Cimonovi hlúpém, skrze milost přemisterně vycvičeném“ (A Chronicle about Cymonus the Stupid, but made unusually clever through love). This alone serves as a testimony of high esteem in which Konáč held Beroaldus and which he also expressed in his introduction (written in prose) to the translation of the Chronicle by Sylvius, published in 1510. Now, having approached at the outset of his literary career Beroaldus's Boccaccian adaptations, some twenty years later he made up his mind to translate and publish an original Beroaldus's dialogue, entitled *Declamatio ebriosi, scortatoris et aleatoris*.⁷ Konáč's translation appeared in print in 1527, bearing a long descriptive title: *Philipa Beroalda Bononského proti frejíróm, vožralcóm, kostkářóm a vrhcábničkóm řeč příkladná, kterouž se hanebnosti freje, vožralství a her kostečných tak užitečně a potřebně jako duvodně a důvtipně oznamují* (By Philip Beroaldus Bononiensis exemplary address, levelled at rakes, gluttons, gamblers playing dice and draughts, in which the disgracefulness of unlawful love-making, gluttony and gambling is presented both for the sake of necessary instruction and of witty argumentation).⁸

The outline of the dialogue is a simple one: The father of three sons, of which one was a drunkard, the second dice player, and the third ruffian, decided on his deathbed that his most disgraceful son should forfeit his right of inheritance. When the father died, the brothers could not agree as to which of them should be considered unworthy of the bequest. They finally resolved to consult a judge in the matter. The latter ordered them to accuse one another so as to make it possible for him to decide which of them was the most immoral one. Thus the introduction makes us familiar with the principle of the dispute. Next comes the speech of the drunkard, succeeded by the joint speeches of the ruffian and of the dice player in their turns, both these deliveries having essentially the same structure: they comprise an accusation of the opponent, the defence of the speaker, and *captatio benevolentiae* appeal to the judges. As to style, the speeches make use of gradation, and contain a number of quotations, among which those of classical writers positively outnumber references to Christian literature. This feature gives the dialogue a character distinctly different from medieval disputes. But there is another difference between the two types: There is no epilogue to Beroaldus's tale. The reader is not told what verdict the judges have passed.⁹ In spite of it, one must point out that the work is supposed to be finished. The writer himself evidently takes this point of view. The reason why the story has no epilogue after the fashion of medieval writers is to be seen in the author's adherence to the poetic style of the Renaissance.

Beroaldus's „*Declamatio*“ belongs to those humanistic dialogues whose object

is to confront individual views. In our dialogue there appear three people, each of them expanding and defending his morals, his attitude to human society. They are no more people fettered with one universal system of morality, submitting to it with resignation. It is just humanism which comes forward with its proclamation of human right to individual morality, rejecting the traditional moral categories and acknowledging at the same time human reason as the only reliable determinant of criteria for building up individual morality. In this respect it is characteristic how often the brothers appeal in their arguments just to reason condemning anything that may wilfully blunt it. Even though this humanistic stressing of the intellectual aspect was just an ore that had to wait for the rationalists of the era of Enlightenment to turn it to metal, yet, it doubtlessly was a factor that strongly contributed to the process of corroding the universal medieval morality and ideology.

The emphasis put by the Renaissance on the right of the individual to think freely for himself and to act upon it is closely connected in our work with the fact that there is no „summing up epilogue“ to the tale. The individualism of the Renaissance declined generalizing solutions, speaking in favour of some fixed system of morality and imposing it on the individual and his own moral attitude. Thus the situation is different from that we encounter in medieval disputes where controversies had to be solved in the end in the spirit of one universal moral view of life and where the ultimate solution was always predetermined either directly or indirectly.

It is in Konáč's own work that we can find among his dialogues an analogical case with an example from Beroaldus. I have in mind the second part of his work published in 1509 and entitled as follows: „Že se múdřý ženiti nemá — Teofrastus mudřec, a že řídkokterá poctivá jest žena — Sekundus, též mudřec. S některými užitečnými výklady.“ (A wise man should never marry — by Theophrastus the sage, and Hardly any woman is honest — by Secundus, also a sage. Supplemented with a few useful comments.)¹⁰ Here Konáč acquaints the reader according to the 70th and 71st chapters of the 11th book of the work *Speculum historiale*, whose author is Vincentius Bellovacensis¹¹, with a comparatively wide-spread mediaval story about Secundus the philosopher.¹² Secundus, subsequent to his bitter experience which brought him to the very margin of the Oedipus complex, resolved upon a lifelong silence. Emperor Hadrian wants to have him executed, because Secundus declines to speak to him. Notwithstanding, he orders the hangman not to carry out the execution and bring Secundus to him should the latter refuse to speak even in the place of execution. This having taken place, the Emperor gives Secundus a number of questions (what is the world, the sea, god, the sun, the moon, the earth, man, beauty, woman etc.), which Secundus answers in a witty manner by writing. After Secundus's lapidary answer to the question „Co člověku ustati nedopouští?“ („What does not permit man to stop?“), the short work comes to an end. Thus there is no epilogue, summing up Secundus's views or at least giving the reader an explanation of the Emperor's order to have Secundus executed and of its subsequent countermanding.

The fact that Konáč the translator selected just Beroaldus's dialogue is worth giving consideration. No doubt he was able to justify this choice both as a humanist and as a strict moralist of his time. We can discern this double attitude in the introduction to his translation. By quotations partly from the Holy Scriptures (chiefly

the Old Testament) and partly from ancient classical writers (Vergilius, Propertius) he condemns the three „vices“ whose personifications and defenders are the three brothers in the text of the dialogue. But Konáč's introduction testifies not only in favour of his humanistic and Christian attitude, but gives an expression to his patriotism, as well. He complains to his readers of the disastrous spread of these three „vices“ among the Czechs.¹³ In this way Konáč found an organic place for his translation of Beroaldus's dialogue in public life of his own time, finding in it adequate answers to contemporary moral problems. For this reason we see in Konáč's printed material a contribution treating the problems of the morals of Czech society in the 1st half of the 16th century, a contribution that has hitherto not been given attention on the part of literary historians.¹⁴

*

Now we have to undertake a comparison of Konáč's translation with the original. When doing so we come to the conclusion that his translation does justice, upon the whole, to the author's ideas, not inserting in the text anything of his own; only in some places he leaves a portion of the text untranslated. Thus, for example, he omits Beroaldus's introduction entitled: *Ad venerabilem et eruditum Sigismundum Gossingerum, ecclesiae Vratislaviensis canonicum, Philippi Beroaldi Bononiensis epistola*. Of this introductory friendly approach addressed by the author to Sigismund Konáč did not insert anything either in his translator's introduction or epilogue to the dialogue, which induces us to come to the conclusion that quotations from Latin writers, both in the introduction and in the epilogue, were of his own choice.

Besides, Konáč omits — with a single exception¹⁵ — Beroaldus's designations of thematic units (e. g. *Argumentum. Ebriosus contra scortatorem et aleatorem*), some of his remarks addressed to the reader (e. g. towards the end of *Argumentum: Lector, attende laetaberis*)¹⁶, and all his marginal remarks, which give, for the most part, the names of the sources upon which Beroaldus draws (Beroaldus's text is more lucid and better arranged than that of this translator, this being specially true about its division into paragraphs, which has neither been adopted by Konáč). On the top of it, portions of the actual text have been dropped in several places. Cf. for instance: *Melius est nomen bonum quam divitiae multae. Praeterea quid utilius, quid dulcius, quid beatius quam opulentum patrimonium, quam divitiae luculentae, quarum causa impiger extremos currit mercator ad Indos, propter quas vita mortalium facta est laboriosa et irrequieta* (Beroaldus). || Lepšíř jest jméno dobré nežli bohatství mnohé. Také užitečnějšího, utěšenějšího, co šťastnějšího jest nežli bohaté dědictví, nežli zboží hojně, pro kteréžto život lidský učiněn jest pracovitý a neupokožený (Konáč).¹⁷ The translator also omitted the author's references to sources, considering evidently accuracy of this kind unnecessary for this readers: *Quippe in canonicis scripturis (ut docet divus Augusti. et in Decretis XXXII. Q. IIII proditum est) . . .*

(Beroaldus). || Ješto v svatých písmích, jakož svatý Augustin praví... (Konáč).¹⁸

Apart from these and similar omissions Konáč's translation of the original text is a true one. There are, of course, a few minor lexical deviation (e. g. in Ber. iudices, in Kon. páni milí),¹⁹ or superfluous specifications (Ber. Alea res damnosa est ac turpis // Kon. Kostky a vrhcáby sú věc škodná a mrzutá;²⁰ Ber. Germani // Kon. Germánové Němci),²¹ or on the contrary less accurate rendering (Ber. apostoli Pauli // Kon. apoštola;²² Ber. ut inquit Cor. Tacitus // Kon. jakož praví Cornelius).²³

Finally, a comparative study of the two texts makes us curious as to Konáč's knowledge of Greek. Beroaldus namely resorts to Greek in three places, while Konáč reproduces only the Latin text.

Evidence: Stoicorum dogma, quo callide magis quam vere tradit, *ἴσα τὰ ἀμαρτήματα εἶναι*, id est peccata paria esse quotidie refellit vita, sensus communis impugnat, vitia nostra redarguunt... (Ber.) || Stoitských náučení jest, kteréž se neměně chytře jako právě pokládá a neslušnost¹ déle jedny od druhých velmi důvodně kazí... (Kon.)²⁴ — Subrisimus pauloante iudices audientes fratrem incontinentes atque intemperantes appellantes eos qui Aphrodisia colunt, indigentque rebus veneriis, citantemque Aristotelis testimonium: ex problematis tanquam Aristoteles solos ἀκολάστους και ἀκρατεῖς, i. intemperantes et incontinentes homines venerios, mulierariosque appellandos esse censeat (Ber.) // Pouškrnuli sme se málo prve soudce slyševše, že bratr nezdržlivými a neřádnými jmenoval ty, kteříž nevěstky milují a na freje se takové vydávají, a přísloví Aristotelesovo přivodil, jako by sám Arestoteles nezdržlivými frejře a ženkeje nazýval (Kon.).²⁵ — Ita est, iudices, nec inficias imus: Nam eius tantum est, qui se impeccabilem (et ut graeci dicunt ἀναμάτητον) ostendere velit: probra et criminationes omnis sigillatim diluere atque refellere (Ber.). // Takt jest, súdce, aniž bez viny budme, nebť tomu toliko to náleží, ktož by se nevinným ukázati chtěl, mrzkosti a hanebnosti všechny shladiti (Kon.).²⁶

After comparing these three extracts one may justly suppose that Konáč did not know Greek. The possibility that Konáč the humanist should be ignorant of Greek is nothing to be wondered at, neither does it imply a paradox. The humanists of his time knew Greek writers from Latin translations and adaptations and from the works of their Latin imitators (Greek cynics they knew from Seneca and so on) but not from their original works. The knowledge of Greek was in our country quite exeptional in the first decades of 16th century. In fact, the first to impart instruction in Greek, both in the Prague University and in a private school, was Matouš Kolín of Chotěřina and he started this activity in the early forties of the 16th century²⁷. He had a forerunner, a talented master of arts Václav Písecký, who in the beginning of century became an ardent admirer of this language, but in order to acquire some knowledge thereof he had to undertake a journey to Italy²⁸. If there had been at that time any real experts in Greek in our country, Řehoř Hrubý would not have sent his son Sigismund along with Písecký to Italy. An objective evidence of spreading interest in Greek is Písecký's translation of the speech of Isokrates adressed to Demonik, this work appearing in print in 1512.

To be sure, an objection may be raised: the quoted three extracts have Latin explanations attached to them, and Konáč may have, therefore, considered a direct translation from Greek as superfluous. This possibility is not altogether excluded, but one must admit that humanists

usually behaved differently in similar situations. They either left the text in question in its original Greek form, thereupon translating it into their native tongues, or else they offered the reader the translation, only making reference to the Greek original. This was, for example, the method of Blahoslav, who, to be sure, wrote a few decades later, at a time when the knowledge of Greek was no more so exceptional in the country. In his work — and quite specially in his grammar — we meet comparatively often with Greek words and quotations. It seems that Blahoslav, when getting in touch with humanism in Germany, especially during his studies in Basel, acquired a through knowledge of Greek.

I have dealt somewhat more extensively with Konáč's treatment of Beroaldus's dialogue when he was translating it, so as to be able to approach a wider item — the question what sort of a translator Konáč was in general, since he is considered to be along with Řehoř Hrubý of Jelení the most prominent translator of his time, i. e. the early half of the 16th century. A correct answer to this question is of some importance, because it has been generally accepted by the history of literature that the humanistic translation in Bohemia was the free type translation, aiming first of all at the interpretation of ideas conveyed by the original text.

First we have to consider the question whether Konáč was acquainted with the theory of translation. I think it probable, because, when finishing his translation of the Chronicle by Sylvius, he reminds the reader of Aurelius Augustine and of Jeronym, whose example he admits to have followed²⁹. This, of course, concerns more or less exclusively the Bohemian Chronicle, in which his adaptations aim at weakening the anti-Husite tendency of work. In most of his translations from Latin, however, Konáč tried his best to give the truest reproduction of the original. He was all the more free to do so, as he expressed his own views in the introductions or epilogues. Here he usually also recapitulates the contents of the work, drawing from them conclusions beneficial for national, moral, and social life of his Czech readers; in the case of Sylvius's Chronicle he even attempts something like a brief philosophy of the Czech history. In this way he allots these foreign works a part to be played in Czech literary production, endeavouring to find answers in them to social problems of his time. Konáč was sure to follow attentively such problems, and he was even selecting deliberately foreign material for his translations to be able to face just these problems. Thus he looked upon his work as a translator from the social point of view, wishing to impart to his translations a social and didactic function. We must see in his careful selection of suitable material for his translatory work a meritorious act of a man of culture who wanted to do a good turn to his contemporaries. There are two expressions of his that testify in favour of this attitude. The first is his introduction to the pseudo-Lukianic dialogue of Charon with Palinur (1507), in which Konáč, going in the footsteps of Všehrd, attempts a new defence of literary production in the Czech language. To this standpoint, expressed at the outset of his literary activity, Konáč remained true all his life long, as we can see from his dedicati^on from the biblical play Judith, written towards the end of his

literary career. The second instance of his owning up to a program is perhaps even more significant than the first, as it contains views hitherto unexpressed in our country. It is Konáč's supplement to the translation of the story of Cymon, published in 1509. In this passage he proclaims the right of translating into Czech the Renaissance chronicles (specially love stories). He did justice to this proclamation by producing a number of translations, and it is possible that this attitude of his influenced also other translators of the 16th century. This supposition cannot be based on save evidence as yet, nevertheless, we may say that the introduction to the tale about Dionides, appearing in print in 1592 and 1603 and containing the nucleus of Konáč's introduction to the dialogue of Charon with Palinur speaks in favour of Konáč's initiative in Czech literature in the Renaissance era.

The history of Czech literature should not fail to give proper consideration to our humanistic translations even today. There is ahead of us also the task to compare with the originals those Czech translations from medieval and humanistic Latin literature, originating in our country from the early stage of Husitism down to the Battle of the White Hill, so that we may be able to get squared up with the problem of the technique of humanistic translation.

*

Returning after this digression to Konáč's translation of Beroaldus's dialogue we may sum up as follows: By effecting this translation Konáč introduced in Czech literature an interesting piece of material, which, assuming the form of a humanistic dispute, attacks the hitherto prevailing „supratemporal“ morality, proclaiming, at the same time, man's right to assume an individual attitude of his own in matters of morality. In this way his literary enterprise acquires a significance not only in the history of literature, but also in the history of culture in general, this being clear partly from his argumentation in the introduction and the epilogue, and partly from a number of remarkable concrete details, such as e. g. his description of dice playing. Thus Konáč's writing was a real contribution to Czech literature of the first half of the 16th century. As to Konáč's own literary progress, we find an interesting piece of information in the fact that his first translations of Lucianic dialogues³⁰ paved the way to his own later literary production along this line,³¹ whereupon he seems to have passed over to the task of translating the dialogue by Beroaldus. All these dialogues served Konáč as means, enabling him to react on the contemporary situation, which reflected the political restlessness of the rule of the Jagellons, who were not strong enough to check the struggle of the nobility with the middle classes with the object to secure strong positions in the political and economic life. The good citizen and moralizing Utraquist Konáč is convinced of a close connection between the decline of morality and the decline of political prestige of the middle class. This conviction hinders him in seeing the outlines of the class struggle

sharply and induces him to weaken the social discrepancies in his writings. This circumstance is in my opinion a characteristic feature in him as a typical member of the Utraquist burgesses, which have gradually abandoned the idea of class struggle and desire to attain political tranquility.

Konáč's significance as a translator and writer of dialogues becomes more pronounced when compared with the corresponding situation in Germany, where literary dialogues — specially due to the influence of Lukian — were written in Latin for a long time. Unfortunately Konáč was not succeeded in the original Czech production of dialogues by any more outstanding follower, and this form of literature, therefore, did not develop to the same extent in our country as it did later in Germany, where we can trace even the influence of popular play on these dialogues³².

NOTES

¹ Some of these works have already attracted the attention of historians of literature. Cf. e. g. *Josef Truhlář*, *Počátky humanismu v Čechách* (The beginnings of humanism in Bohemia, Prague 1892), and *Humanismus a humanisté v Čechách za krále Vladislava II.* (Humanism and the humanists in Bohemia in the rule of Vladislav II, Prague 1894), *Arne Novák*, *Lukianovy ohlasy v literatuře české* (Echoes of Lukian in the Czech literature, LF 37/1910, pp. 431—447) the article by *St. Vrtel—Wierczyński*, *Palinur und Charon polnisch und tschechisch* (Slavische Rundschau X/1938, pp. 123—127) and others.

² He translated chiefly from Latin and from German. His summit work is the allegory „*Kniha o hořekování a nařikání Spravedlivosti, královny a paní všech etností*“ (Book about the wailings and lamentations of Justice, Queen and Mistress of all virtues, published post mortem in 1547), the model for this work having been *Speculum vite humane* by Roderigo Sanchez de Arevalo. As to Konáč, cf. of older contributions a study by *Měrka* in *ČMF* IV/1915 (pp. 1—13, 117—123, 215—221) and *Tobolka's* Supplement to the 4th Volume of *Monumenta Bohemiae typographica* (Prague 1927), of the more recent contributions *my* articles *Několik poznámek o Konáčově hře Judith — Příspěvky k dějinám starší české literatury* (A few comments on Konáč's play Judith — Contributions to the history of older Czech literature), pp. 167—184, Prague 1958, and *Konáčova dramatisace sujetu z Boccaccia — Sborník Franku Wollmanovi k sedmdesátinám* (Konáč's dramatization of a theme from Boccaccio — Dedicated to Prof. Wollman on the occasion of his 70th birthday), pp. 563—571, Prague 1958.

³ He is called „senior“ in contrast to Philip Beroaldus the junior (1472—1518), the author of a commentary to the first five Annals by Tacitus.

⁴ *Varia Philippi Beroaldi opuscula*, fol. 28b—34a.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, fol. 34a—37a.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, fol. 73b—79a.

⁷ Dialogue comes from 1499. *Op. cit.*, fol. 139a—146a.

⁸ The Library of the National Museum, sign. 32 D 18 appendix. A report on Konáč's translation was published by *Č. Zibrť* (*Dodatky a opravy k biografím starších spisovatelů českých a k starší české bibliografii* 13. — *ČČM* 1905, pp. 434—435), who also quoted from the work several extracts (some of them inaccurately).

⁹ Of course, also some medieval disputes (e. g. our *Podkoní a žák* — The groom and the student) are without a summerizing epilogue. For the most part, however, such writings had epilogues, the solution of the problems being predetermined.

¹⁰ MBT V, Prague 1928 (edit. Zd. Tobolka).

¹¹ *Reinhold Trautmann*, Über einige unbekannte Prager Drucke des Mikuláš Konáč aus den Jahren 1507—1511, p. 10. Berlin 1925.

¹² In Konáč's work we shall meet with this tale (somewhat expanded) once more, i. e. in his translation of Burley's *The Lives*, from 1514.

¹³ Cf. quotation: Ty tak příliš ohavné a duši i tělu nájškodlivější stydkosti z přílišného obyčeje jednáč ve etnosti sú obráceny, ješto bez nich žádný téměř kvas, žádné veselé a žádná kratochvil býti nemuože. Ano také i ženy bez ožralství, freje a kostek neb karet řídko již kvasí, a kteráž nájšvobodnější rufka jest, nájšvzácnější bývá. (Those so excessively abominable, both for soul and body very harmful shamelessnesses have even been turned to virtues, owing to their exceeding popularity, for no feast, no merriment and enjoyment can to without them. Yes, even women seldom get into high spirits without debauchery, flirt, dice or cards, and such a one as is most unconstrained in her behaviour enjoys the highest esteem.) In a similar way Konáč protests in his title strophe and in the epilogue.

¹⁴ Cf. e. g. *Nesmrtelný národ* (The immortal nation) by *Krofta* (Prague, 1940), specially the chapter *Mravnost předbělohorská* (Morality before the Battle of the White Hill), pp. 344—429.

¹⁵ Ber.: Scortatoris et aleatoris recriminatio adversus ebriosum. // Kon.: Ruffiána a kostkáře odpověď. (The answer of the ruffian and of the dice player.)

¹⁶ Beroaldus did not make any effort in his tractate to observe literary convention, as far as the circumstances of the plot (specially the scene of action) were concerned. All the time he has in his mind the reader or the listener, as we can surmise from the following remarks: *Quis haec audiens, quis haec legens non repente temulentiam fugiat ac excretur* (Ber. 146a). — Translator: *Kto toto slyše, kto toto čta rychle se vožralství varovati nebude a v ošklivosti jeho mieti...* (He who hears or reads and does not quickly get rid of his drunkenness nor feels aversion from it...).

¹⁷ English translation: Better is a good name than plentiful wealth. What more useful, more comforting, and happier can there be than rich inheritance and abundant property, which make human life laborious and restless.

¹⁸ Since in the Holy Scriptures, as St. Augustine says...

¹⁹ Dear sirs.

²⁰ Dice and draughts is a harmful and molesting thing.

²¹ The Teutonic Germans.

²² Of the apostle.

²³ As Cornelius says.

²⁴ Being the doctrine of the stoics, which finds just as clever as true an interpretation, and justly makes different improPERTIES destroy one another...

²⁵ We could not help objecting somewhat when hearing the judge a while ago as he commented upon our brother calling indulgent and vile those who love harlots and seek such amorous adventures and quoted a sentence from Aristoteles. As if it had been Aristoteles himself who called rakes and libertines indulgent.

²⁶ So it be, judges, as we are not void of shortcomings, for only he who wants to prove his innocence can wipe out all infamies and ignominies.

²⁷ Cf. *Z. Winter*, Děje vysokých škol pražských od secessí cizích národů po dobu bitvy bělohorské (The history of the Prague university from the departure of foreign nations down to the Battle of the White Hill), p. 37, Prague 1897; likewise *Ferd. Menčík*, Matouš Kollin z Chotěřiny (Matouš Kollin of Chotěřina), ČČM 1884, p. 209.

²⁸ Cf. *Jaroslav Ludvíkovský*, Václav Písecký a náš národní humanismus (and our national)

humanism). Sborník Stosedmdesát let pisceckého gymnasia 1778—1948 (Almanach of the 170 year anniversary of the grammar school at Pisek), pp. 132—144, Pisek 1948.

²⁹ The humanistic translators adhered mostly to the theories of Horatius and St. Jeronym as we can see from Všeherd's introduction to the translation of the work „Knihy o napravení padlého“ (Books on the improvement of those who have fallen). Cf. *Jiří Levý*, *České teorie překladu* (Czech theories concerning translation), pp. 23—24, Prague 1957.

³⁰ The pseudo-Lukianic dialogue of Charon with Palinurus (1507) and Lukian's dialogues between Terpsion and Pluto (1507), and between Alexander, Hannibal, and Scipio (1509).

³¹ Two dialogues from 1511 and 1515.

³² Cf. *Gottfried Niemann*, *Die Dialogliteratur der Reformationszeit nach ihrer Entstehung und Entwicklung* (Leipzig 1905), § 7, pp. 56—72.

K PROBLEMATICE HUMANISTICKÉHO DIALOGU V ČECHÁCH SE ZŘETELEM K PŘEKLADATELSKÉ TECHNICE

V článku autor rozebírá a hodnotí dosud blíže neprozkoumaný český spis z r. 1527 nazvaný *Philipa Beroalda Bononského proti frejřím, vožralcóm, kostcákám a vrehcábníkóm řeč příkladná* kteráž se hanebnosti freje, vožralství a her kostečných tak užitečně a potřebně jako duvodně a důvtipně oznamují. Jde o překlad mravoučného dialogu Filipa Beroalda staršího od pražského tiskaře a spisovatele Mikuláše Konáče z Hodiškova. Autor si všímá zejména kompozice a jazyka spisu: vysvětluje, proč dílo nemá závěr, a srovnává překlad s předlohou. Od zjištění, že Konáč neznal řecky, přechází k otázce o rozšířenosti znalosti řečtiny v první polovině 16. století v Čechách. Řeší také otázku, jaký vztah měl Konáč k překladatelským teoriím a oč usiloval v překladatelské praxi. V souvislosti s tím je významné zejména to, že Konáč už r. 1509 teoreticky obhajoval renesanční zábavnou literaturu. Překladem Beroaldova dialogu uvedl Konáč do české literatury zajímavou látku, která formou humanistického sporu útočí na apriorní „nadhčasovou“ morálku. V předmluvě (i v doslovu) k svému překladu odpověděl Konáč na aktuální otázky své doby a vyjádřil svůj názor na některé mravní problémy.

К ПРОБЛЕМАТИКЕ ГУМАНИСТИЧЕСКОГО ДИАЛОГА В ЧЕХИИ С ТОЧКИ ЗРЕНИЯ ТЕХНИКИ ПЕРЕВОДА

Настоящая статья посвящена анализу чешского перевода латинского правоучительного диалога Филиппа Бераальда старшего, изучением которого истории чешской литературы до сих пор не занимались. Диалог перевел в 1527 г. Николай Конач из Годишкова, выдающийся чешский книгопечатник и писатель первой половины XVI века. Автор обращает внимание прежде всего на композицию и язык диалога. Он объясняет, почему в произведении отсутствует заключение, и исследует отношение перевода к подлиннику. Делая вывод, что Конач не знал греческого языка, автор переходит к вопросу о распространенности знаний греческого языка в областях чешской короны в первой половине XVI-го века. Автор решает также вопрос, каково было отношение Конача к теориям перевода и какую цель он преследовал в своей переводческой деятельности. В связи с тем важно учитывать именно то обстоятельство, что уже в 1509 г. Конач теоретически обосновал светскую литературу эпохи Возрождения. Переводом диалога Бераальда Конач ввел в чешскую литературу замечательный сюжет, который в форме гуманистического диспута нападает на априорную „сверхвременную“ мораль. В предисловии (как и в послесловии) к своему переводу Конач ответил на злободневные вопросы своей эпохи и высказал свой взгляд на некоторые нравственные проблемы.