

AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY SLOVENE VERSION OF KOMENSKÝ'S ANIMAL ALHABET: SOME OBSERVATIONS

Henry Leeming

One of the treasures of the Narodna in Univerzitetna Knjižnica in Ljubljana is the trilingual dictionary, in two parts, Latin-German-Slovene and German-Slovene-Latin, compiled by Father Hippolytus of the Order of Friars Minor,¹ which for reasons that are not fully explained was returned by the printer and still remains in manuscript, with the exception of the title page and a few specimen pages which were set up in 1711.² A possible cause of its failure could have been Hippolytus' decision to revise his Slovene orthography, bringing it into line with that advocated by Adam Bohorič. This entailed such a plethora of corrections as to make the text a printer's nightmare. On the other hand Anton Slodnjak suspected the Jesuits of opposition to the original publication in view of a prejudiced and unfavorable assessment of the dictionary by Martin Naglič, a Jesuit grammar-school teacher, in 1776, when a later proposal for publication was rejected.

As one of a number of appendices to the dictionary Hippolytus included Latin, German and Slovene versions of one of the most popular and successful school textbooks of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, namely, Jan Amos Komenský's "Orbis sensualium pictus," a title frequently abbreviated to "Orbis pictus" or "The world in pictures."³ The first edition, published in Nuremberg in 1658, had parallel texts in Latin and German, enabling the classical language to be taught by the medium of the vernacular. The course consisted of a series of one hundred and fifty thematically arranged lessons designed to introduce the basic facts and vocabulary of each topic. One of the innovations in technique was the lavish use of illustrations, separate items in the woodcuts being numbered and identifiable by numbered words in the text. There are no illustrations in Hippolytus' manuscript, but this is not to say they would not have been incorporated in a printed version. In a preface to the 1658 edition Komenský himself emphasizes the advantages of his technique, claiming that the book provided an easier way to learn reading than anything known earlier. Of particular value, in his view, was the "symbolical alphabet" (*alphabetum symbolicum*) given at the start of the course, where each individual letter was accompanied by a picture of a living creature or natural phenomenon with which the sound could be associated. Simply by looking at the appropriate illustration the learner would recall the phonetic value of the letter.

Hippolytus' manuscript presents the Latin, German and Slovene texts in three parallel columns. There is the same division into 150 thematic lessons, preceded by the same invitation from the teacher to the pupil and the same animal alphabet (*vivum et vocale alphabetum*), and followed by the same postscript in which the teacher compliments his young charge on acquiring a basic knowledge of the languages studied, and encourages him to read more widely. The lay-out of the parallel texts and the existence of numerous versions in other languages suggest that we have here a rich field for comparative lexical and other linguistic studies. The present article will compare Hippolytus' Slovene with four other versions of the animal alphabet and assess their relative pedagogical efficiency.

In the preliminary meeting of teacher and pupil, the latter expresses his willingness to learn, whereupon he is told, "First of all you must learn the simple sounds of which human speech is constituted, sounds which animals can make, your tongue can imitate and your hand can paint. Then we shall go out into the world and inspect all things. Here you have

a living and vocal alphabet." The chosen exemplars for the twenty-four letters of the Latin alphabet were: crow (a), sheep (b), grasshopper (c), hoopoe (d), infant (e), wind (f), goose (g), breathing mouth (h), mouse (i), duck (k), wolf (l), bear (m), cat (n), carter (o), chicken (p), cuckoo (q), dog (r), snake (s), jay (t), owl (u), hare (w, phonetically [v]), frog (x), donkey (y), horse-fly (z).

The phonetic principle is one of a number of modes in use from the earliest times for naming the letters of the alphabet. Phonetic names occur in the classical Greek alphabet (*o mikron, o mega, ksi, psi*, etc.) beside the more frequent borrowed Semitic acronyms. We find certain phonetic names in the Old Church Slavonic alphabet (*i, ša, šta*) although most of the names are acronymic (*ažŭ, buky, vědě*, etc.) and some are borrowed (*jerŭ, buky, frŭtŭ*).⁴ The English alphabet largely follows the phonetic principle, with each vocalic letter named by the vowel or diphthong with which it is usually identified and each consonantal letter by the appropriate consonant, either preceded or followed by a vocalic element to make a pronounceable syllable. From the point of view of pedagogical efficiency the short phonetic names of English have the advantage that they can be learned by frequent and fairly rapid repetition. They easily fall into rhythmic patterns which small children can enjoy chanting. Mnemonic aids can be detected in the surviving version of the Old Church Slavonic alphabet, where certain sequences evince a logical pattern of thought which might have once characterized the whole. An example is the phrase *rŭci slovo tvrŭdo* for r-s-t; this could be understood as "say the word firmly."⁵ It seems possible that the so-called Alphabetic Prayer,⁶ an Old Church Slavonic poem whose lines begin with the letters of the alphabet in sequence, may also have served a pedagogical purpose.

Komenský's invention is, therefore, an elaboration of the phonetic principle already present in some systems of letter names. His syllables representing the various voices of nature sometimes coincide with Romance or German letter names: this chicken says "pi," the dog says "err." Transcriptions of animal cries here range from the almost universally accepted to the highly suspicious: on the one hand "kuk ku" for the cuckoo, an aural impression challenged as far as I know only by an amateur ornithologist in a story by P.G. Wodehouse who insisted the bird's call was in fact "wuckoo;" on the other hand "nau nau" for the cat, preferred to the much more popular "miaow," and "du du" for the hoopoe, instead of "hoo hoo hoo" or "hoo poo poo," the more widely accepted rendering of the bird's call, reflected in such names as Latin *upupa*, Serbo-Croat *pupavac*, Latvian *pupuķis*, Albanian *pupëz*, French *huppe*, English *hoopoe*.

Both of the apparent aberrations mentioned can be understood if we assume that the symbolical alphabet was the fruit of experience and experiment in a Czech-speaking environment. Here the palatalized *m* of "miaow" would be subjected to the same phonological or analogical influences that produce the pronunciation [mn'esto] instead of [m'esto], so that [m'aukat] became [mn'aukat]: "Kocka mňauka."⁷ In the second case the hoopoe's "du du" is justified not by its call, but by the Czech form of animal name and call-verb: "Dudek dudá."⁸

The seeds of the animal alphabet were already sown in Komenský's earlier pedagogical work, *Janua linguarum reserata* ("The gates of language thrown open"), published in 1631 at Leszno in Poland,⁹ where as a refugee from religious persecution he had become rector of the grammar school four years earlier. This encyclopedic work, covering a wide variety of topics in one hundred sections, numbering one thousand sentences, included the following statements repeated in the alphabet: "anser . . . gingrit, anas tetrinnit, cuculas cuculat, cornix cornicatur" (section XIV, sentence 160); "agnus balat" (XVI, 181); "canis . . . si irrites . . . ringitur" (XVI, 186-87); "ursus murmurat" (XVII, 194); "[lepus] . . .

dum capitur, vagit" (XVII, 204); "serpentis . . . sibilans anguis" (XVIII, 213). Nothing is said about the call of the hoopoe; information is confined to the bird's diet: "merops, upupa, . . . vermibus vescuntur" (XIV, 155).

The twenty-four pictures accompanying the letters of the alphabet include two human beings (infant (*e*) and carter (*o*)), the wind (*f*), and a face with open mouth (*h*). Komen-ský's earlier draft, entitled "Vestibuli et januae linguarum lucidarium," chose *vapor* 'steam' to illustrate the letter *h*. The woodcuts in the 1658 edition of the *Orbis Pictus* are a great technical improvement on those in the *Lucidarium*; in particular a clear distinction is drawn between the puffing face in the clouds (*f*) and the clearly open mouth (*h*). In the first case the wind is represented by firm lines radiating from a point; in the second, breath is indicated by six parallel dotted lines proceeding from the area between the nose and the lower lip. These are gains as far as clear and effective illustration is concerned. Not all the changes were equally positive. In three cases there is loss of precision: "auriga sistens equos clamat óóó"; "graculus volans clamat tae, tae"; "tabanus volitans dicit ds, ds, ds" (*Lucidarium*); "auriga clamat ó ó ó"; "graculus clamat tae, tae"; "tabanus dicit ds ds" (*Orbis Pictus*). Perhaps not much is lost by dropping the participles qualifying the flying jay or flitting horse-fly, but the detail 'when stopping his horses' does bring to an English mind, at least, the carter's cry of 'Whoa' or 'Whoa there.' The woodcut illustrating "Vapor halat háh háh" in the *Lucidarium* could be understood as breath made visible in cold weather, but is poorly drawn. The figure of the dog in the *Lucidarium*, though unclear, seems, with its lowered head, more in line with the author's intention to depict a growling dog than the illustration in *Orbis Pictus* which shows a barking animal. Another detail, to which my attention was drawn by Dr. Martin Prior of the University of Aberdeen, is that the hare is trapped by what appears to be a human arm in the *Lucidarium* but seems to be running free in the *Orbis Pictus*. The original illustration was, therefore, in line with the statement in *Janua linguarum reserata* quoted above.

Familiarity with the animals depicted is obviously desirable if the very sight of a picture is to bring to mind the phonetic value of a letter. In the ideal circumstances not only will the syllable echoing the animal voice agree with the learner's own perception, but also the relevant letter or syllable will be met in the animal's name and in the call-verb, that is the verb of utterance ascribed to the animal: "Cuculus cuculat kukku, kukku" (*Lucidarium*); "Cuculus cuculat kuk ku" (*Orbis Pictus*). In the worst case not only will the relevant letter be absent from name and from call-verb; it may not even be associated with the animal's voice, as generally perceived.

Between these extremes extends a range of possibilities which may be measured to form the basis of statistical tables of pedagogical efficiency, if it be admitted that repetition in a given formula of the relevant phonetic element is of help to the learner. For the present purpose a comparison will be made between Father Hippolytus' Slovene version and four others: Latin, German, English and Russian. These are arranged in TABLE I, each containing the name of the exemplar and the verb of utterance, referred to more simply as the call-verb. The syllables uttered by each voice and the corresponding capital and small letters are shown only in the Slovene column. Here minor differences between the Slovene and the other versions concern accents: only Slovene omits the accents on *háh háh*; the English text omits the accents on *bé é é, ú ú, vá*; the Slovene version omits the second *k* of *kuk ku*. The Russian version does not include either the syllables or the letters. Since this part of the material shows no substantial variation it is not taken into account for comparative purposes. None the less the aptness of the written expression of the animal's

TABLE I: THE TEXTS COMPARED

SLOVENE	LATIN
Vrana (kroka) krevka á á. A a.	Cornix cornicatur
Ovza bleja . bé é é. B b.	Agnus balat
Kobíliza fhkriple cí cí. C c.	Cicada stridet
(Upupa) dap klizhe du du. D d.	Upupa dicit
otrók jauka . é é é. E e.	Infans ejaculat
Vejtèr piha . fi fi. F f.	Ventus flat
Gus gaglá ga ga. G g.	Anser gingrit
Vufta dáhnejo . hah hah. H h.	Os halat
Mifh zvili . i i i. I i.	Mus mintrit
Raza kvaka kha kha. K k.	Anas terinnit
Vouk tuli . lu ulu. L l.	Lupus ululat
Medved mermrá , Mum mum. M m.	Ursus murmurat
Mazhka mevka , nau nau. N n.	Felis clamat
Vosnyk veka . ó ó ó. O o.	Auriga clamat
piszhe zevka . pi pi. P p.i	Pullus pipit
Kokovíza poje , ku ku. Q q.	Cuculus cuculat
Pàs rinzhy , err. R r.	Canis ringitur
Kazha shvishga i. S s.	Serpens sibilat
fhoya ali pfhoga fhraja tae tae. T t.	Graculus clamat
fova zhovíni ú ú V u.	Bubo ululat
Sajz weuka , vá W w	Lepus vagit
Shaba regljá coax X x.	Rana coaxat
Ofsèl rjove . y y y. Y y.	Asinus rudit
obád brezhzy ds ds . Z z.	Tabanus dicit

Note: words in parentheses here are partly deleted in the Slovene ms.

GERMAN	ENGLISH	RUSSIAN
die Krähe krächzet	The Crow cryeth	ворона кракаетъ
das Schaf blöket	The Lamb blaiteth	овца блтаетъ
der Heuschreck zitzschert	The Grasshopper chirpeth	кузнечикъ цикаетъ
der Wiedhopf ruft	The Whooppoo saith	удотъ глаголетъ
das Kind wemmet	The Infant cryeth	младенецъ плачетъ
der Wind wehet	The wind bloweth	вѣтръ дуетъ
die Gans gackert	The Goose gaggleth	гусь гогочетъ
der Mund hauchet	The Mouth breatheth out	уста дишутъ
die Maus pfipfert	The Mouse chirpeth	мышь пищитъ
die Ente schnackert	The Duck quacketh	утка квакаетъ
der Wolf heulet	The Woolf howleth	волкъ воетъ
der Bär brummet	The Bear grumbleth	медвѣдь мурчитъ
die Katze mauzet	The Cat cryeth	кошка мяучитъ
der Fuhrmann ruft	The Carter cryeth	извочки кричитъ
das Küchlein piepet	The Chicken peepeth	цыпленок пикаетъ
der Kuckuck kucketh	The Cuckow singeth Cuckow	кокушка кокуетъ
der Hund marret	The Dog grinneth	песъ ворчитъ
die Schlang zischet	The Serpent hisseth	змия сипитъ
die Häher schreiet	The Jay cryeth	сося кричитъ
die Eule uuheth	The Owl hooteth	сова торлыче ^T
der Hase quäket	The Hare squeaketh	заецъ увякаетъ
der Frosch quaket	The Frog crofalketh	лягушка квакает ^T
der Esel iahet	The Asse brayeth	осель ржетъ
die Breme summet	The Breeze or Horseflie sayeth	ободъ пищитъ

voice is commented on in TABLE II below, positively (+), doubtfully (?), or negatively (-).

Since the identification of pedagogically useful and relevant phonetic features is to some extent a matter of personal judgment, a complete list of those suggested is given below; here, "A" refers to the animal names, "B" to the call-verbs. Colleagues who disagree with some particular assessment are invited to make their own judgments and modify the statistical tables accordingly. The data from this analysis are summarized on TABLE II.

The Latin version

duplications: A. *cuculus*; B. *gingrit*, *ululat*, *murmurat*, *pipit*, *cuculat*, *ululat*;
single elements: A. *cicada*, *lupus*, *pullus*, *serpens*, *bufo*; B. *balat*, *dicit*, *ejaculat*,
flat, *halat*, *mintrit*, *ringitur*, *sibilat*, *vagit*, *coaxat*;
doubtful cases: A. *serpens*; B. *cornicatur*, *mintrit*, *clamar*.

The German version

triplications: A. *Kuckuck*;
duplications: B. *wemmert*, *piepet*, *kuckert*, *uhuhet*;
single elements: A. *Gans*; B. *blo?ket*, *zitzschert*, *gackert*, *hauchet*, *pfipfert*, *iahet*,
summet;
doubtful cases: A. *Wiedhopf*, *Wolf*; B. *schnackert*, *heu/et*, *brummet*, *marret*,
quäket.

The English version

duplications: A. *cuckow*; B. *gaggleth*, *quacketh*, *peepeth*, *singeth cuckow*;
single elements: A. *goose*, *serpent*; B. *blaiteth*, *chirpeth*,¹¹ *grinneth*, *hisseth*,
hooteth;
doubtful cases: A. *duck*, *woolf*, *breeze*; B. *how/eth*, *grumbleth*, *brayeth*.

*The Russian version*¹²

duplications: A. *kokuška*; B. *gogočet*, *kvakaet*, *kokuet*;
single elements: A. *uđot*,¹³ *gus'*, *medvėd'*, *izvočik*; B. *krakaet*, *blėet*, *cikaet*,
murčit, *pikaet*, *sipit*, *uvjakaet*;
doubtful cases: A. *utka*, *volk*, *cyplenok*; B. *krakaet*, *pyščėt*, *vorčit*.

*The Slovene version*¹⁴

duplications: A. *kokoviza*; B. *gagla*, *qvaka*, *mermra*;
single elements: A. *vrana*, *dap*, *gus*, *mish*, *medved*, *vosnyk*, *piszhe*; B. *bleja*,
dahnejo, *zvili*, *tuli*, *rinzhy*, *weuka*;
doubtful cases: A. *vrana*, *kobiliza*; B. *krekva*, *zvili*.

TABLE II: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

LETTER	SYMBOL	NAME					CALL VERB					APTFNESS
		L	G	E	R	S	L	G	E	R	S	
A	crow	–	–	–	–	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	–	–	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	+
B	sheep	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	1	1	1	+
C	grasshopper	1	–	–	–	$\frac{1}{2}$	–	1	1	1	–	+
D	hoopoe	–	$\frac{1}{2}$	–	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–
E	infant	–	–	–	–	–	1	2	–	–	–	+
F	wind	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	?
G	goose	–	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	+
H	mouth	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	–	1	+
I	mouse	–	–	–	–	1	1	1	–	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	+
K	duck	–	–	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	–	–	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	2	2	+
L	wolf	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	–	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	–	1	?
M	bear	–	–	–	1	1	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	?
N	cat	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	?
O	carter	–	–	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	+
P	chicken	1	–	–	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	2	2	1	–	+
Q	cuckoo	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	–	+
R	dog	–	–	–	–	–	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	+
S	snake	1	–	1	–	–	1	–	1	1	–	+
T	jay	–	–	–	–	–	$\frac{1}{2}$	–	–	–	–	?
U	owl	1	–	–	–	–	2	2	1	–	–	+
V	hare	–	–	–	–	–	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	–	1	1	?
X	frog	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	?
Y	donkey	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	–	–	+
Z	horse-fly	–	–	$\frac{1}{2}$	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	+

The numerals used show the occurrence of 3, 2 or 1 relevant phonetic elements in firstly the NAME and secondly the CALL VERB. Inflectional or weak position and similar cases of uncertain pedagogical value are assigned $\frac{1}{2}$. For sources, see footnote 3.

The totals for each version are set out on TABLE III:

TABLE III. TOTALS OF RELEVANT PHONETIC ELEMENTS

	NAMES					CALL-VERBS				
	L	G	E	R	S	L	G	E	R	S
triplications (3)	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
duplications (2)	1	—	1	1	1	6	4	4	3	3
singles (1)	5	1	2	4	7	10	7	5	6	6
uncertain ($\frac{1}{2}$)	1	2	3	3	2	3	5	3	3	2

If we allot two points to each certain and one to each uncertain relevant phonetic element, the picture emerges that is displayed in TABLE IV:

TABLE IV. ELEMENT TOTALS MULTIPLIED AND DOUBLED

	NAMES					CALL-VERBS				
	L	G	E	R	S	L	G	E	R	S
3:	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2:	4	—	4	4	4	24	16	16	12	12
1:	10	2	4	8	14	20	14	10	12	12
$\frac{1}{2}$:	1	2	3	3	2	3	5	3	3	2
TOT:	15	10	11	15	20	47	35	29	27	26

Giving the overall result shown in TABLE V:

TABLE V. OVERALL TOTAL FOR EACH LANGUAGE

Latin version	15 + 47	=	62
German version	10 + 35	=	45
English version	11 + 29	=	39
Russian version	15 + 27	=	42
Slovene version	20 + 26	=	46

We conclude therefore that Father Hippolytus’ version of the animal alphabet attained a degree of pedagogical efficiency surpassed only by Komenskýs Latin version.

EDITORS' NOTE: We regret the inconvenience to this article's readers, and the imposition on its author, occasioned by the use in the text of *ĩ* and *ũ*, respectively, for the soft and hard jers, and for the expedients explained in notes 12 and 14 below. Modifications in the printing system made this necessary.

REFERENCES

1. In its Slovene form, Hipolit [= Janez Adam Gaiger of Novo Mesto, 1667-1722], see Rado Lencek, *The Structure and History of the Slovene Language* (Columbus OH, 1982) 255, 316-18, 322; Anton Slodnjak, *Slovensko slovstvo* (Ljubljana, 1968) 48-49; Stanko Janez and Miroslav Ravbar, *Pregled slovenske književnosti* (Maribor 1966) 61.
2. The printed title page reads as follows: "Dictionarium trilingue ex tribus nobilissimis Europae linguis compositum in anteriori parte Latino-Germanico-Sclavonicum, in posteriori parte Germanico-Sclavonico-Latinum, nunc primo in lucem editum, a plurimis Sclavonicae linguae avidis, dudum desideratum, omnibus quidem dictarum linguarum amatoribus perutile, specialiter tamen sclavonicorum Verbi Divini Praeconum commoditati & utilitati dedicatum. Calamo, et opera R. P. Hippolyti Rudolphswertensis, Ordinis Minorum Capuccinorum Provinciae Styriae Concionatoris, & quondam SS. Theologiae Lectoris concinnatum. Permissu Superiorum, & Privilegio Sacrae Caesariae Majestatis. Labaci, Formis Joannis Georgij Mayr, Incl. Prov. Carniol. Typogr."—A manuscript draft, dated MDCCXI, differs in some respects. Here the title is: "Dictionarium trilingue Latino-Germanicum et Germanico-Sclavonicum. In posteriori parte Germanico-Latinum. Opus (nunquam hucusque) *nunc primo in lucem* editum, (ab omnib) a plurimis tamen sclavonicae linguae (peritis) *Avidis* dudum desideratum . . ."; here, deletions are shown in parentheses, and italicized words are written above or beside the text, and are therefore alterations to the original draft. Other variations from the printed title page are insignificant.
3. The editions referred to here are the following. In Latin and German: *Orbis sensualium pictus. Die sichtbare Welt. Nuremberg, 1659*, reprinted in Jan Amos Komenský [Joannes Amos Comenius], *Opera omnia* XVII (Prague, 1970) 53-271, especially 70-71; in English: *Orbis sensualium pictus, facsimile of the third London edition 1672*, intr. James Bowen (Sydney: Sydney UP, 1967) especially 4-5; in Russian: *Bibliotheca Academiae Lugduno-Batavae Msc. LTK 584*, ed. Harm Klueting (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1978) especially 2-3.
4. H. Leeming, "The Slavonic letter-name *jer*," *Rocznik slawistyczny* 28 (1967) 31-35; H. Leeming, "Origins of Slavonic literacy: the lexical evidence," *Slavonic and East European Review* 49 (1971) 327-38.
5. Cf. also *našũ onũ pokoi* for n-o-p, and the possible reconstruction *dobro jestũ *živěti *zemi* for d-e-ž-z, "it is good to live on the earth."
6. "Azbučna molitva." P. Dinekov et al., eds., *Kirilo-Metodievska Enciklopedija* I (Sofia, 1985) 49-54; K. Kuev, *Azbučnata molitva v slavjanskite literaturi* (Sofia, 1974).
7. J.A. Comenius, *Orbis Pictus. Die Welt in Bildungen. Swět w obrazých. Świat w obrazach. Le monde en tableaux* (Hradec Kralový, 1833).
8. Comenius, *Orbis Pictus*.
9. Later included in J.A. Comenii *Opera didactica omnia* I (Amsterdam, 1657), reprinted by the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Prague, 1957. A similar title had been used by William Bathe, an Irish Jesuit who published at Salamanca in 1611 his own course of Latin through Spanish in parallel texts as *Janua linguarum*. His course consisted of twelve 'centuries,' or thematic sections, each containing one hundred numbered sentences, with an appendix devoted to difficult words, in which the different meanings of pairs of Latin homophones were explained with examples. Bathe's work was intended for grammar-school pupils and therefore contained nothing like Komenský's symbolical alphabet.
10. See Komenský, *Opera omnia*, 35-52, especially 46-47; also G. Turnbull, "An incomplete *Orbis Pictus* of Comenius printed in 1653," *Archiv Komenského* (1957) 1: 35-54. Turnbull comments: "The cuts in the *Alphabetica*" [i.e., the illustrated animal alphabet, so entitled in the *Lucidarium*] "are different" [sc. from *Orbis Pictus*] "except for *Ventus* and *Felis* (which are very little different), *Anas* (which is not very different), and *Anser* and *Lupus* (where there is no

apparent difference). There are some differences in wording, but they are all slight and unimportant, except perhaps the substitution of *Os* for *Vapor*, which is an improvement."

11. Presuming an Italianate pronunciation of the syllable *ci*.
12. Here, a standard transliteration is used, but with the final jers omitted.
13. In standard spelling this would be *udod* with duplication.
14. Note that the word *mish* is spelled with a "long s" in the original, cf. Table I.

POVZETEK

PREVOD ŽIVALSKÉ ABECEDY KOMENSKÉHO IZ 18. STOLETÍ: NEKÁJ OPAŽANÍ

Hipolitov neobjavljeni Dictionarium trilingue, ki je shranjen v Narodni in univerzitetni knjižnici v Ljubljani, ima več dodatkov. Eden izmed njih je latinsko-nemško-slovenski prevod "Orbis sensualium pictus" Komenského, ki je bil učni pripomoček za poučevanje abecede. Članek vsebuje ta tri besedila, kakor tudi angleški in ruski prevod. Po prikazu zgodovinskega okvira preide avtor k primerjalni analizi 'učne učinkovitosti' besedil v teh petih jezikih na podlagi sorodnosti med jezikovnim gradivom mnemotehniko za vsako črko in glasom, ki ga ta črka zaznamuje. Po učinkovitosti slovenski prevod zaostaja le za latinskim.