

# Multilingualism

in Medieval and Early Modern Europe



## Abstracts

30 November 2022, Prague and online:  
[shorturl.at/dAFN4](https://shorturl.at/dAFN4)

The colloquium is organized within the research programme Strategy AV 21 –  
Anatomy of European Society, History, Tradition, Culture, Identity

**STRATEGY AV21**  
Top research in the public interest

**SLOVANSKÝ  
SÚSTAV**

**Czech Academy  
of Sciences**

**Bence Biró**

**Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest**

***An Analysis of a Multilingual Letter of a Wallachian Envoy to the Palatine of Hungary, 1610***

In the framework of the colloquium, I would like to introduce one letter written by a certain Armenian, Petrus Armenus (Grigoroglu Petros, *alias* Gregorovich). The document – a memoriale written otherwise in Hungarian, sent from Prague to Vienna – is kept today in Bytča, Slovakia (Štátny archív v Bytči, Oravský komposesorát–Thurzovská korespondencia i.č. 32., Petrus Armenus). Gregorovich - to my best knowledge - was born in Lemberg (now Lviv) and was an envoy/diplomat of Radu Șerban, voivode/overlord of Wallachia (1602-1610). Gregorovich was somewhat specialized in the relations between the Habsburgs and Wallachia, while coming from a Polish Armenian background. In this letter dated Prague, 10th February 1610, he writes about some Persian envoys already en route to the imperial court in Prague, but the main topic is to secure political refuge for Radu, the current voivode. This one political letter is an example of how Latin slowly became a ceremonial language of formulas in the Hungarian Kingdom and how Hungarian became a widely used language of politics while the country itself was a frontier. "*Inter arma silent Musae*" - not so true after all. Still, the main feature of the memoriale is the writer. His signature in Latin is followed by one in Armenian, a rarity of its time, especially before the mass immigration of Armenians to the wider region in and after 1672. The brief signature in Armenian is using Arabic and Turkish expressions.

**Ondřej Bláha**  
**Palacký University, Olomouc**

**Sloveso *muset* a jeho ekvivalenty v českých a polských kázáních z let 1500 až 1650**

Příspěvek se zabývá jednou z trvalých stop slovansko-německého bilingvismu ve vyjadřování modality a vůbec ve struktuře české a polské věty. Frekvenci a funkce slovesného germanismu *muset* (resp. *musieć*) v raně novověkých českých a polských kázáních autor sleduje na pozadí výskytu jiných prostředků k vyjadřování modality nutnosti, jako jsou modální predikativa, infinitivní věty se sponou aj. Výsledky své sondy autor interpretuje v širším areálovém kontextu: preferování slovesa *muset* jako dominantního prostředku vyjadřování modality nutnosti je jedním z projevů tendence k vyšší míře vyjadřování kategorie osoby (a k potlačování všech typů neosobního vyjadřování). Silnou tendenci k osobnímu vyjadřování větných obsahů, tj. k preferování verba finita jako univerzálního jádra věty, autor považuje za základní střeoevropský areálový rys, který byl už ve starší době v češtině přítomen ještě o něco výrazněji než v polštině.

**Constanța Burlacu**  
**University of Oxford**

***Multilingualism and the Rise of Romanian Language: 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> centuries***

This paper focuses on the aspect of multilingualism in written culture in the Romanian lands and, in particular, of the role and significance of religious books after the fall of Constantinople until the Counter-Reformation. It will argue that the rise of the Romanian language was an internal phenomenon, that reveals why and in which religious contexts Romanian language was used. This will be achieved through a multi-faceted approach using manuscript and printed materials. These sources will be analysed both in terms of material evidence, reflecting the particular time frame in which they were produced, and as important linguistic witnesses, revealing the complex textual tradition out of which they originated.

There are two factors, peculiar to the Romanian region, which promote a rather incomplete and at times biased understanding of the emergence of written Romanian. First, scholars tend to analyse the first Romanian textual witnesses in isolation. What is now known as one country used to be three distinct states – the Principality of Moldavia, Wallachia, and Transylvania – at the crossroads of Latin, Greek, Slavonic, and Turkish traditions. These had completely different governing and ecclesiastical arrangements, which inevitably had an impact on the cultural production of the society. While Transylvania, divided hierarchically into Magyar-ruling, Saxon-trading, and Romanian-labour classes, had polycentric religious and government systems, Wallachia and Moldavia were centralised in terms of religious (the Orthodox Church), social (Romanian peasantry), and governing (feudal voivodship) configurations. It is precisely out of these dynamics that written/printed Romanian started to emerge, and it is within this context that these testimonies should be considered, that is, alongside Slavonic, Greek, Latin, German, Polish, Hungarian, and Czech materials – linguistic and textual realities which surrounded and crossed the Romanian territory.

Second, scholars attribute the introduction of written Romanian to the efforts of the Reformed Churches, which were proselytising among the Romanian Orthodox peoples. This assumption is based on the understanding that, in the sixteenth century, being Romanian meant being Orthodox, and being Orthodox meant using Church Slavonic in every religious and state-related circumstance. However, this view is less informed by medieval or early modern sources than by a later nationalisation of scholarship, which seeks to create a strong opposition between Orthodoxy and all other Christian creeds within the Romanian territory.

My approach to the phenomenon of multilingualism in the Romanian lands is to bring together historical data and material linguistic evidence and analyse these under the intention of understanding better the linguistic dynamics of the territory at a time of important cultural changes.

**Andrii Danylenko**

Pace University, New York

***The Peripatetic Multilingualism in Early Medieval Europe: Evidence from Islamic and West European Sources***

The concept of multilingualism is conceived today in different ways, e.g., through the so-called space and spatial analysis of multilingualism in an urban, diasporic-globalized context or realist social theory. However, most of the contemporary theories view multilingualism as a static, free-standing entity rather than a dynamic linguistic phenomenon dependent on socio-political relations in the respective speech communities.

The earliest Arabic-Muslim and West European sources show that multilingualism was not stable but, as we propose to call it, “peripatetic” as spread by itinerant merchants between the 6th to the 10th c. Languages, including Syriac spoken along other languages in New Orleans, according to Gregory of Tours (6th c.), were treated as a kind of “commodity” which was imported, together with papyrus and knowledge in different spheres, in particular in medicine, literature, philosophy, religion, by itinerary merchants (Vercauteren). The Jewish Catalan merchant-diplomat, Ibrāhīm Ibn Ya‘qūb, wrote in the 10th c. that the Germans, Magyars, the Pechenegs, the Khazars, and the Rus’ all spoke Slavic (*al-ṣaqlabiyyah*) since the Slavs, according to Pritsak, Golden, and Wexler, constituted a kind of corporation (or confederation), encompassing peripatetic merchants who belonged to more than one ethnicity. Based on Abū ‘Ubayd al-Bakrī (d. 1094), an Andalusian Muslim geographer and historian, Ibn Ya‘qūb also wrote that Slavic Bulgars (Bulgarians, *al-Bulqarūn*) were Christians familiar with different languages.

In early medieval Europe, the multilingualism was peripatetic (“itinerant”) inasmuch as the European peoples at that time did not necessarily organized their states along ethnic lines, but according to life-style and politico-military leadership (cf. the “proto-Hungarian” tribal unions consisted of nomadicized Ugrians, but with appreciable Turkic admixtures in Golden).

Robert Dittmann  
Charles University, Prague

Lenka Uličná

Palacký University, Olomouc

*The Prague Jewish Community and the So-Called Canaanite Glosses in Hebrew Writings of the 11<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup> Centuries*

*Pražská židovská komunita a fenomén tzv. kenaanských glos v hebrejském písemnictví 11.–13. století*

Příspěvek představí základní problémy a přínosy tzv. kenaanských glos, tj. slovanských (zejména západoslovanských a českých) slov a spojení v židovském písemnictví přemyslovských Čech. Poukáže na internacionalizaci pražské židovské komunity, na úroveň její učenosti ve srovnání s česko-latinským písemnictvím a na vícejazyčnost jako jeden z typických rysů židovských elit. Představí také aktuální stav bádání po roce 2015, kdy vyšla kolektivní monografie *Kenaanské glosy ve středověkých hebrejských rukopisech s vazbou na české země*, na níž se oba autoři podíleli.

**Jürgen Fuchsbauer**  
**Innsbruck University**

*Multilingualism and Translations in the Hesychast Centre of Paroria*

The monastery of Paroria founded by Gregory the Sinaite in the Byzantine-Bulgarian borderlands around 1330 was, as is proven by inscriptions in manuscripts written there, a polyethnic centre of hesychasts. Its inhabitants, who were speakers of Greek, Bulgarian, Serbian, and Romance dialects, apparently created translations from Greek to Slavonic in collective work. The results differ significantly from the verbatim translations common in 14<sup>th</sup> century Bulgaria. In my paper I shall analyse the approach of the multilingual hesychasts of Paroria and compare it to Western European “teamwork translations”, such as Hilduin of St. Denis’s Latin version of writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.

Ondřej Fúsik  
Charles University, Prague

*The book Exodus in the Old English Heptateuch concerning the Translations of Female References*

The paper follows the previous research conducted for the book Genesis of the Old English Heptateuch. The previous research focused on the referencing of the Old Testament female characters in the Latin text of Vulgate and compared them to their translational equivalents in Old English in three manuscripts *London, British Library, Cotton Claudius B. iv (B)*, *Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 509 (L)*, and *Cambridge, University Library, Ii I.33 (C)*. The current paper continues in the given methodology (with the exclusion of MSS C as its text only 24 chapters of the translation of Genesis), however, this time for the book of Exodus and compares the results to the findings for the book of Genesis. The main contribution of the paper is that it sees whether there is the same tendency of the manuscript (B) a (L) to shift the focus from the female characters to male characters in some instances for the book Exodus as proved for some instances in the book Genesis by the aforesaid research. It attempts to answer the question in what instances this shift occurs and what might be the motivation of the translator/the scribe for such a shift.

**Katarzyna Jasińska**  
**Polish Academy of Sciences**

**Kateřina Voleková**

**Czech Academy of Sciences**

*Latinský slovník Cornutus s vernakulárními glosami v českých zemích*

*Latin Dictionary Cornutus with the vernacular glosses in the Czech Lands*

Latinský slovník *Cornutus*, veršovaná příručka, kterou sepsal na začátku 13. století Jan z Garlandie v Anglii a kterou následně doplnil Otto von Lünenburg, byla užívaná ve středověké nižší škole. Ve 14. a 15. století *Cornutus* byl rozšířen i v českých zemích. Stejně jako v západní Evropě, tak i ve střeoevropském prostoru opatrovali uživatelé *Cornuta* vernakulárními glosami. V našem příspěvku se zaměříme na nejmladší rukopis s českými glosami, který si opsal v roce 1478 Kříž z Telče, kněz, učitel, písař a sběratel. Český text z tohoto rukopisu srovnáme s ostatními čtyřmi rukopisy s českými glosami a přihlédneme k tradici *Cornuta* v Polsku.

Vladislav Knoll  
Czech Academy of Sciences

*Coexistence of different language codes in Cyrillic manuscripts and early prints*

The main theme of the paper is the classification of types of multilingualism in the manuscripts and early prints (up to 1700) dominantly written in Cyrillic. Nevertheless, I do not focus just on the coexistence of different *languages*, but also to different *varieties* belonging to a diasystem of concrete speech communities. As the question of combination of different varieties within one manuscript or print is linked to the competence of the scribe/author or the reader, I have tried to adopt the sociolinguistic term of (*language*) *codes*. Adopting the classification by Ulrich Ammon (2004), I distinguish the great (languages of different IE groups), medium (languages of the same IE group) and small (close varieties) linguistic distances adding the dimension of the script.

Even if examples from different regions are mentioned, the main geographical focus are the Romanian Speaking Lands and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The literary and partly administrative language of the latter, Ruthenian, became the first Slavic language treated to be in opposition to the cultural language (Church Slavonic) within the Church Slavonic Cultural Area. This case inspired some of the texts containing both Romanian and Church Slavonic element. The language situation of the Romanian Speaking Lands is also interesting from the perspective of the mutual coexistence of different written Slavonic varieties and the difference between the passive and active language competences of the scribes.

In my paper, I will show the arrangement of the texts in different language codes and discuss the reason of such an arrangement and the use of different language codes.

Světlana Müllerová  
Charles University, Prague

***From 'land free of charge' to 'spiritual spotlessness': Some notes on the borrowing process behind Old Norse borrowings in English***

When the incoming Vikings decide to cease being Vikings and give up raiding for farming and local wives, a new era could be said to begin in England, which is to last for centuries: A period of bilingualism and mutual linguistic influence, the most apparent effect of which are the lexical borrowings from Old Norse.

One such borrowing, adjective *sker* can be in Old English traced within the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* only to legal notes on land giving. Its occurrences are highly formulaic and the borrowed adjective is without exception accompanied by the native synonym *sacleas*. Collectively with the noun *land*, the phrase thus denotes land given free of charge.

It is therefore first attested in a very specialized meaning, which is not unexpected for a transferred lexeme. However, when one compares the meaning of the borrowing with its Old Norse source *skírr*, signifying (spiritual) cleanness, it becomes apparent that the borrowing is attested in a different sense. This involved sense shift perhaps helps further reveal a layer of Old Norse borrowings marked rather by utility than prestige associated with the language of the conquerors.

By the Middle English period, the borrowing *sker* has developed a sense set similar to its Old Norse source. The prolonged exposure to the source during the period of the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact could thus be seen as guiding the lexeme's development in the receiving language, gradually levelling previous differences.

Dragoş Gh. Năstăsoiu  
New Europe College, Bucharest

***Slavonic-Latin Encounters in Late-medieval Transylvania: The Evidence of Church Inscriptions***

During the Late Middle Ages, the southern and southwestern areas of the *Voivodate* of Transylvania and the Kingdom of Hungary, respectively, represented the meeting point of two cultural traditions: the Catholic and Latin culture of Western and Central Europe met there the culture of the East, which was Orthodox and – in this particular case – Byzantine-Slavic. Medieval Transylvania served thus as a contact zone of several ethnic, confessional, and linguistic groups, each of them bringing into play their own cultural and religious traditions. Under the Hungarians' Latin rule, Orthodox Romanians (*Vlachs*) lived together with Catholic Hungarians, Szeklers, and Saxons, and they disposed of various languages, which they mastered in different degrees. For instance, depending on the context, Romanians spoke Romanian among themselves, used Old Slavonic in church and writing, resorted to Latin in their relations with the administration officials, and made use occasionally of Hungarian or German in their daily interactions with the other dominant groups.

This long-lasting *conviventia* and coexistence of several languages typical for the multicultural society of 14<sup>th</sup>- and 15<sup>th</sup>-century Transylvania have left sometimes deep and meaningful traces in the epigraphic material coming from the monumental art of the region. Subsequently, the present paper proposes to examine a corpus of inscriptions located in a number of Transylvanian medieval churches, that display various instances of language mixing (e.g., Old Slavonic, Latin, and occasionally Greek). The presence of more than one language in the monumental inscriptions of late-medieval Transylvania was most often than not a deliberate and socially-meaningful act. By scrutinizing this phenomenon, one can better understand the social dynamics of a multicultural medieval society, of which linguistic contact was one but meaningful type of interaction.

According to the classification derived from sociolinguistics and applied to epigraphy by scholars such as Linda Safran, Martti Leiwo, or Barbara Zeitler, various ***types of language mixing*** occurred in the epigraphic material of late-medieval Transylvania. Subsequently, there are cases of: (a) ***intra-sentential language*** (and even alphabet) ***mixing***, such as the Latin and Greek interruptions of the Slavonic and Latin inscriptions, respectively, of the churches in Crişcior and Dârlos; (b) ***intra-monumental language mixing***, as it happens in the churches of Abrud, Chimindia, and Orman, where a minority of inscriptions are rendered in Slavonic, a language different than the Latin that is extensively used throughout (at the opposite end, stands the church in Ribiţa, where an isolated Latin inscription possibly occurred on the background of predominantly Slavonic inscriptions); or (c) ***bilingual monuments***, such as the inscriptions in Prislop, Remetea, and Sântămăria-Orlea, where both Latin and Slavonic are equally used within these churches, which served regularly more than one speech (or even confessional) community.