Ewa Woźniak

Uniwersytet Łódzki
University of Lodz
ORCID: 0000-0002-0784-6178

The Confessional Diversity of 16th-century Polish Religious Lexis: Recapitulation and Research Postulates

1. A summary of research to date

The diversity of Polish religious lexis, which varied depending on the denomination, was introduced as an issue into historical and linguistic discourse by Konrad Górski, a literary historian. At a scientific session of the Polish Academy of Sciences entitled *Odrodzenie w Polsce* (*Rebirth in Poland*) in October 1953, the scholar presented a paper entitled *Zagadnienie słownictwa reformacji polskiej* (*The Issue of the Polish Reformation Vocabulary*), which was later published in an expanded form in a post-symposium collected volume [Górski 1962]. Górski's article became an important reference point for subsequent contributions on the confessional determinants of vocabulary.[1] It can be counted among those texts that have gained a special status in scholarly circles, one I would not hesitate to call *myth-making*, because despite later studies that verified the theses formulated in it, the article continues to be treated as a priority source of knowledge about the relationship between lexis and religion in the 16th century.

Precisely because of the prominence of Górski's dissertation, it is worth saying a few words about this scholar's research tools and drawing attention to the circumstances that undoubtedly influenced the conclusions he formulated. The first issue concerns the scope and characteristics of the sources. They are heterogeneous, which underscores the cognitive value of the study;[2] but, on the other

---

1 See, for example, Iveta Rucka's statement: "Based on rich source material, K. Górski proved that Polish theological terminology was largely created by anti-Trinitarians" [Rucka 1999: 100].

2 See, for example, Izabela Winiarska's assessment: "The advantage of K. Górski's work, on the other hand, is the rich source materials, which consisted of various religious texts"[Winiarska 2004: 70].

hand, this also results in a common treatment of texts in which the choice of lexis is governed by different rules. I am thinking here primarily of translations of the Bible,[3] in which the philological adequacy of the Polish equivalent to the original is decisive,[4] but other factors, such as the Polish or even Czech translation tradition (which I only mention here, anticipating a discussion of Tomasz Lisowski's research later in the article), may also influence its choice. The status of Bible translations is undoubtedly different from catechisms, sermons or treatises of a religious polemical nature, which are also present in Górski's material. The second issue affecting the conclusions formulated in his study is the overrepresentation of Antitrinitarian writings, which is due to the fact that Górski had been researching them: in 1949 he published the study *Studia nad dziejami polskiej literatury antytrynitarskiej XVI wieku* (*Studies on the history of Polish Antitrinitarian literature of the 16th century*) [Górski 1949]. His range of sources, which can be reconstructed on the basis of the rather haphazardly compiled footnotes (the 1962 article lacks a list of sources) includes 13 works by seven authors associated with the Arian community. Among the most important are the works of Piotr of Goniądz (*O Trzech* and *O ponurzaniu*), Marcin Czechowic (*Rozsądek na wykład katechizmu księdza Gilowskiego* and *Rozmowy chrystyjańskie*), Wawrzyniec Krzyszkowski (*Rozmowy z Tryfonem Żydem*), Grzegorz Paweł of Brzeziny (*Wykład na pierwszą kapitułę Jana Świętego Ewangeliej*, *O różnicach teraźniejszych*, *Krótkie dowody, które dziecinny krzest zbijają*, *Rozdział Starego Testamentu od Nowego*), Szymon Budny (*O przedniejszych artykulech* oraz *O urzędzie miecza używającem*), Stanisław Wiśniowski (*Rozmowa o prawdziwej prawdziwego a jednego Boga Ojca znajomości*) and Tomasz Falkoniusz (*Sprawy i słowa Jezusa Krystusa*). Additionally, Górski uses a number of research papers: *Najstarsze synody arian polskich* and *Arianie polscy w świetle własnej poezji*. In comparison, Lutheran writings are represented by just three works by Erasmus Gliczner (*Odpór na odpowiedź kwestyj*, *Kronika żywota Jezusa Chrystusa*, *Agenda szafunku Wieczerzy Pańskiej*), Brencius' *Catechismus* translated by Eustachy Trepka (Königsberg 1556) and Jan

---

3   Górski cites examples from the Leopolita Bible, the Brest Bible and Simon Budny's New Testament published in 1574 in Łosk.

4   This was Stanisław Murzynowski's motivation, who was the first to translate the Greek μετάνοια using the noun *upamiętanie* (*commemoration*). In the commentary accompanying the translation of the Gospel of Matthew, the translator himself explained that this is an equivalent that better conveys the meaning of the Greek original than *pokuta* (*atonement*, *penance*)*,* which appears in the Vulgate translations as the equivalent of Latin *poenitentia*. Nonetheless, Winiarska-Górska, in a comprehensive dissertation on Murzynowski's translation interprets this lexical choice as motivated by a formative goal – to build an evangelical faith community around the Bible being the sole source of faith [Winiarska-Górska 2017: 147].

Sandecki's (Malecki) *Ewangeliarz* (ed. J. Janow, Krakow 1947). The Calvinist denomination is represented by nine publications by seven authors: Marcin Krowicki (and his work *Obrona nauki prawdziwej*),[5] Stanisław Sarnicki (*O uznaniu Pana Boga wszechmogącego* and *Colloquium Piotrkowskie*), Mikołaj Rej (*Postylla* and *Apocalypsis*), Grzegorz of Żarnowiec (*Clypeus albo Tarcz Duchowna*), Szymon Zacjus (*Akta to jest sprawy zboru krześcijańskiego wileńskiego*), Grzegorz Orszak (no title provided), Stanisław Chrząstowski (no title provided). When it comes to Catholics, Górski cites Wujek's *Postilla*, Skargas' sermons, Stanisław Orzechowski (*Rozmowa albo Dyjalog około egzekucyjej polskiej Korony*), Marcin Kromer (*Rozmowy dworzanina z mnichem*), Marcin Łaszcz (*Wieczerza ewangelicka*), and examples from the Leopolita Bible. It can be seen here that the proportions of authors and writings representing different Reformation factions do not correspond to the rank of these confessions, their importance in the Republic, or the number of adherents. The criteria for the selection of sources were not objective, but determined by the subjective interests of the scholar. It is obvious that one cannot hold this against the pioneer of Polish Reformation vocabulary research, who repeatedly emphasizes that his study is meant to serve merely as an outline and called for a monographic treatment of the subject [Górski 1962: 233, 269].

Nevertheless, it is essential to realize that Górski's article carries an important thesis: "Reformation terminology […] by imposing new meanings on old words and by eliminating words that were settled but raised ideological objections, accomplished a kind of linguistic revolution" [Górski 1962: 233]. The author proves this claim by interpreting the examples accordingly, even though they often seem to contradict his general thesis. About the word *kościół* (*church*), for example, he says that "in the consciousness of the supporters of the Reformation, the word became unpleasantly associated with the Roman Church, and therefore 'anti-Christian,'" so they began to look for a word "that would make it possible to separate the truly Christian community from the corrupt one" [Górski 1962: 252]. Meanwhile, the material presented reveals the opposite: the Calvinist Szymon Zacjusz "does not hesitate to use the word *church*" [Górski 1962: 253], "'The Brest Bible' still shows the immense power of the word *church*" [Górski 1962: 254], in Rej's *Apocalypsis* we do find *zbor* or *zbior* [Protestant church or community] more often than in the *Postilla*, but "usually in an explanatory combination with the word *church*," resulting in an overall "absolute predominance of *church*" [Górski 1962: 255], even the writing practice of the Arian Grzegorz Paweł proves that "the elimination of *kościół* in favor of *zbor* was very reluctant" [Górski 1962: 255].

---

5   Górski cites the 1580 edition of the *Obrony nauki prawdziwej*, when Marcin Krowicki was still a Calvinist clergyman.

Górski's perception and, consequently, interpretation of the 16th-century Reformation vocabulary with an emphasis on ideological conditions was influenced by the author's perceived analogy to the Stalinist era, in which identification of views and ideological affiliation was made precisely on the basis of language features – Górski draws attention to this inspiration of modern times in a discussion following the paper [Górski 1962: 277–278].

The path paved by Górski was followed by Magdalena Hawrysz – in the sense that she focused her interest on the work of a representative of the extreme faction of the Reformation, Marcin Czechowic [Hawrysz 2012]. The similarities in approach are also revealed in the fact that Hawrysz, like Górski, emphasizes the role of vocabulary as a denominational (self-)identifier, which is justified insofar as the researcher focuses primarily on the vocabulary of the Polish Brethren [Hawrysz 2010; Hawrysz 2012: 215–247]. In particular, such words as *chrystyjanie* (from the name of Christ, to mark the difference from *chrześcijanie* (*Christians*), whose name evoked sound associations with *chrzest* (*baptism*)) and *ponurzanie* (baptism of adult believers) are considered to have had a distinctive function for this community of believers. Hawrysz, however, draws her conclusions from a comparison of this portion of the lexis with the vocabulary of the Reformation in general: "The great effort of the reformist camp was focused on transforming its worldview into a corresponding terminology, which was done, among other things, by introducing a new lexis and by modifying the semantics of words already being used. Thus, lexical signs (identifiers) of community membership were created" [Hawrysz 2012: 216]; "[…] the newly created nomenclature demarcated the worldview space and thus the boundaries between the different factions of the Reformation. The vocabulary thus became a clear sign of belonging to a particular denomination […]" [Hawrysz 2010: 130]. Danuta Kowalska follows in the same vein: "Thus, lexis became an identifying factor for adherents of a particular confessional group, and the vocabulary used drew a clear line between factions of the Reformation [Kowalska 2021].

Iveta Rucka, author of a series of four articles published in "Slavia Occidentalis" in 1996–1999 [Rucka 1996, 1997, 1999] on the lexical representation of selected religious concepts, including excommunication, Eucharist and the Trinity, also succumbed to the suggestiveness of Górski's argument. The author devoted her last article to vocabulary related to the economic aspect of Protestant churches (*zbory*) [Rucka 2004].[6] Rucka's research covered the period 1555–1632, which was determined by the compactness of the main source she excerpted: *Akt syn-*

---

6 The author announces a larger work on the vocabulary of the Reformation [Rucka 1996: 69, 1999: 99], which, however, was not completed.

odów różnowierczych w Polsce, a three-volume work published by the University of Warsaw Library.[7] The author's area of interest in this publication included the documents of the Małopolska larger (Calvinist) church, the smaller (Arian) church, and the Wielkopolska Unity of the Brethren (Jednota Braci Czeskich). The echo of Górski's views is reflected in the way Rucka formulates her assumptions and research objectives: "The Reformation, when entering the Polish lands, created its own language, which was intended not only to signify new doctrinal and liturgical concepts and organizational principles (which was the primary reason), but also to differentiate itself from the language of the Roman Catholic Church [Rucka 1996: 71]. Among other things, her goal was to determine the range of occurrence of particular words that were characteristic of particular faiths [Rucka 1996: 70]. However, the confrontation with SPXVI material led the author to conclude that there was a significant body of lexis common to all confessions. This can be seen in words denoting excommunication. Words such as *anatema*, *anatematyzować*, *interdykt*, *klątwa*, *odłączyć*, *odrzucony* (*anathema*, *anathematize*, *interdict*, *curse*, *separate*, *rejected*), which "were used in their works by authors belonging to both opposing camps – Protestant and Catholic" [Rucka 1996: 77]. Although the lexical field under study is represented by as many as 38 words in total, most are expressed in single instances in either Rucka's material and/or SPXVI (or are found in the dictionary's other volumes), making it impossible to assign them to any of the denominations. A seventh word can be added to the common list, the confessional scope of which Rucka could not verify due to the lack of a corresponding SPXVI volume – this is the word *przeklęstwo* (*curse*) [SPXVI, entry for *przeklęstwo*, cf. Rucka 1996: 82]. Interestingly, in the conclusion of her article, the author no longer talks about the desire to differentiate at the level of lexis, but about "certain 'linguistic habits'". The Unity of Brethren usually *excluded* (*wyłączała*) sinners, Luther's followers favored *klątwa* (*curse*), and the 17th-century adherents of the 'Helvetic confession' usually *excommunicated* 'wicked brethren', calling them *excommunicants*" [Rucka 1996: 78]. Going beyond the 16th century, Rucka's research makes it possible to verify yet another thesis that has been perpetuated since Górski's dissertation – that dissenters preferred a native vocabulary. The author observes the arrival of borrowings in the language of Protestants over time.[8]

---

7   In addition, the author also used *Akta synodów Jednoty Litewskiej* from 1611–1625, published in Vilnius in 1915, and the Lutheran and Calvinist agendas, as well as the text of the Sandomierz Confession [Rucka 1996: 69, 1997: 113, 1999: 99, 2004: 33].

8   In Czech translations, e.g. the Kralicka Bible, the transcription of religious terms was a standard, e.g. *publikán*, *faryzeus*, *satan* was used [Dittmann, Just 2016: 239–240, 281]. I would like to thank the reviewer of the article for drawing attention to this fact.

It is well known that the Reformation, appealing to the broad masses of society, tried to polonize religious language, avoiding foreign words, but in some cases it could not do without them, and in the 17th century, under different historical and linguistic conditions, borrowings and Latin interjections are increasingly frequent in Evangelical documents [Rucka 1996: 72].

Undoubtedly, the strength of Rucka's two articles is the inclusion of numerical figures.[9]

In a different context (no longer the doctrinal dependencies that so interested Górski, but bringing to the fore a philological approach to the source), and using different research procedures, the topic evoked by Górski has been taken up recently, that is, in the 21th century, by Tomasz Lisowski [Lisowski 2008; Lisowski 2021]. The material the Poznań scholar has been working on comprises 16th- and 17th-century biblical translations: four Protestant translations (NT from the Brest Bible, NT from the Budny Bible, NT from 1606 edited by Daniel Mikołajewski and NT from the Gdansk Bible) shown against Catholic translations (the Leopolita Bible, NT translated by Jakub Wujek and NT from the Wujek Bible edited by the Jesuit censor commission). Lisowski examined the equivalents of the doctrinally important Greek words εκκλησια and μετάνοια in all New Testament occurrences, taking into account contextual meanings. A systematic analysis led him to question the thesis popularized by Górski's article. The Poznań scholar concludes that in the selection of lexemes, the Bible translators were guided not so much by doctrinal considerations as by the principle of philological adequacy to the original. What prevailed was not the intention to nominally and conceptually differentiate from the previous (hated, abhorred, as Górski suggests) nomenclature of the Roman Church, but the desire to reflect the semantics of the source text as faithfully as possible, which was especially important in view of the Reformation principle of *sola Scriptura*. Also not without significance, according to Lisowski, was the native translation tradition, to which the translator of the *New Testament* published in Gdansk in 1606, for example, was not indifferent [Lisowski 2008: 297], but also the translation strategies used by Czech translators, on which they were modeled [Lisowski 2021].

The value of Lisowski's deliberations lies in his comprehensive treatment of the subject within the researcher's strictly defined scope, including the addition of numerical data, objective conclusions, and erudite interpretation of

---

9 Frequency data was not included by the author in two articles dedicated to the Eucharist [Rucka 1997] and the Trinity [Rucka 1999].

empirical material. It is worth directing our attention to the possible influence of Czech translations in the choice of Polish equivalents, which seems likely, not only because of Lisowski's proven correlation between the *Gdansk Bible* and the *Kralice Bible*, but also in light of numerous metalinguistic statements by 16th-century authors. The use of translations from related languages in case of translation difficulties was advised by theorists from Reformation circles of the time, such as Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski in his polemic with Stanislaw Hozjusz:

> For when, for example, a Pole and a Czech speak the same language, but only different dialects, it will be easy to translate one into the other, and while not everyone can do this, there are many Poles who understand Czech speech and, conversely, many Czechs who understand Polish speech. [...] The Ruthenians have the Bible written in their own language. I also saw decades ago the Bohemian Bible printed in Venice. If these two nations have done it, so can others, especially since they could receive considerable help from those who have accomplished it. [cited after Otwinowska 1974: 159]

A shortcoming of Lisowski's articles is their "low visibility" due to their publication in difficult-to-access so-called multi-author monographs.

Magdalena Gozdek and Ewa Woźniak [Gozdek, Woźniak 2023] came to conclusions analogous to those of the Poznań scholar but based on other sources. The subject of the overview analysis by these authors was the vocabulary of religious polemics of Erasmus Gliczner, whom Reformation historians count "among the leaders of the Church of the Augsburg Confession not only in Wielkopolska, but also in the entire Republic" [Grzywacz 2017: 102]. Gozdek and Woźniak looked at two groups of doctrinally important words: (1) *pokuta – pokajanie* (*penance, repentance*) and (2) *kościół – zbór* (*church* vs *Protestant church*) The same criterion – doctrinal relevance – was adopted earlier by Lisowski. The research shows that Gliczner uses only the word *pokuta* and mostly the word *kościół.* It is interesting to note that Gliczner's lack of *pokajanie* was also noted by Górski (who included three of this author's writings in his material), but he treated this fact as a peculiarity. He considered Gliczner either a "marauder" who did not keep up with the changes, or, on the contrary, a "forerunner" in the field of restoring the traditional religious vocabulary [Górski 1962: 250]. However, it seems that the biography of this Lutheran author is an argument for treating the situation observed in his writings not as exceptional, but typical of the denomination of which he was a leading representative.

Gozdek and Woźniak's attention was also drawn to the frequency of *pokuta* and *pokajanie* entries in SPXVI. This reference book recorded *pokuta* 848 times,

and this number does not include examples from Gliczner's works outside SPXVI sources.[10] *Pokajanie*, on the other hand, was recorded 62 times in SPXVI. This is not a large number for a word intended to be a recognizable lexeme for Protestants, especially since they have extensive religious polemics, and the understanding of the term by Catholics and Evangelicals has been one of the subjects of theological dispute.

Izabela Winiarska's monograph *Słownictwo religijne polskiego kalwinizmu od XVI do XVIII wieku* (*Religious Vocabulary of Polish Calvinism From the 16th to the 18th Century*) [Winiarska 2004] should also be considered as a publication that verifies Górski's conclusions. Winiarska explored the years from 1550 to 1736, distinguishing within it two periods falling within the 16th century under discussion: period I (1550–1569) and period II (1570–1595). The sources used by Winiarska are of a different nature than those Górski selected. The researcher focused on church documents and evangelization and catechetical materials.[11] Outside her area of interest were religious polemics, as well as biblical translations. Despite the use of the synchronic cross-section method, however, Winiarska treated the studied vocabulary of the Protestant Reformed denomination globally and mostly with reference to its entirety, rather than to particular periods (for example, the 16th century), she also drew conclusions. She did not conduct a quantitative analysis. When formulating her conclusions, the author of the cited monograph speaks about the construction of two different worlds (religious spaces) by means of the same vocabulary, about the essentially artificial division between Calvinist and Catholic terminology, and also states that the autonomy of Calvinist lexis is extralinguistic – in the sense that it "meets the communicative needs of the Church, develops with the evolution of evangelicalism" [Winiarska 2004: 321, 326].

Summarizing the achievements of Polish scholars in the field of research of confessional diversity of religious lexis in the 16th century, it is worth noting that they do not repeat the mistake made by the pioneer of this research, and limit the source materials to only one type of text, for example, only biblical translations [Lisowski 2008, 2021, 2023], or only church documents [Rucka 1996, 1997, 1999, 2004]. Of greatest interest to researchers was the new vocabulary through which the differences found in their own religion were manifested by the Polish

---

10 Only Erasmus Gliczner's earliest and best-known work *Książki o wychowaniu dzieci*, which, however, was written before Gliczner declared himself a Lutheran, is included in the canon of sources.

11 The author distinguishes five types of sources used: church documents, "symbolic confessional books – sources of doctrine and teaching", liturgical books, catechetical texts, and polemical publications [Winiarska 2004: 26].

Brethren [Hawrysz 2010, Lisowski 2023]. The numerical data featured in the studies are also of great value [Rucka 1996, 2004, Lisowski 2008, 2021, 2023].

2. Research postulates

There is a pressing need to return to the study of the confessional diversity of Polish religious lexis in the 16th century after more than half a century since Konrad Górski's pioneering research. The theses contained in the article *Zagadnienia słownictwa reformacji polskiej* (*Issues in the vocabulary of the Polish Reformation*), despite the fact that – as I have tried to show – they were not only unsupported by the material presented by Górski himself, but to some extent (biblical translations) already verified and questioned – are still present in historical and linguistic discourse, and are also disseminated in studies with didactic aims. A second systematic look at this issue is prompted by the ready availability of source texts and more alphabetically-arranged SPXVI data, as well as electronic tools that allow the introduction of quantitative data that will allow for more objective conclusions. In turn, the metalinguistic comments of 16th-century religious polemicists, when confronted with declarations about the use or non-use of controversial words, indicate a need to include the pragmatic or discursive aspects of such statements in the analysis. We should remember, for example, Jakub Wujek's declaration in his *Preface* to the NT that he was wary of words "from heretics invented",[12] such as *upamiętanie* (*commemoration*) or *pokajanie* (*repentance*). Meanwhile, Lisowski's research has shown that Wujek did not hesitate, however, to use the words *upamiętanie, upamiętać się, pokajać się, nawrócić się* as equivalents for the Greek μετάνοια in those contexts where they better conveyed the sense of the original [Lisowski 2008: 99].

One set of sources that demand special attention, in my opinion, are religious polemics, which fall outside the research area of Izabela Winiarska, Tomasz Lisowski and Iveta Rucka. They were also used to a limited extent as canonical sources in SPXVI, as evidenced by the non-inclusion of Erasmus Gliczner's dictionary of polemical writings in the dictionary's sources. Although there is a study falling within this trend by Magdalena Hawrysz, *Polemiczna twórczość Marcina Czechowica w perspektywie genologicznej* (*Polemical creativity of Marcin Czechowic in a genological perspective*) [Hawrysz 2012], it concerns the writings of a representative of an extreme faction of the Reformation, from which representatives of other confessions distanced themselves.[13] There are many

---

12 See e.g. https://www.staropolska.pl/renesans/proza/Wujek.html.

13 The essentially niche position of the writers, who have so far attracted the greatest interest among researchers, is evidenced by the remark on the (re)baptism of adults, known as *ponurz*, a rite that was controversial not only among other denominations, but also within the

indications that the return to traditional Catholic lexis that can be observed after the first discharges of the "Reformation storm" (to use Górski's figurative metaphor) was motivated by concerns of being suspected of sympathizing with Arianism. It thus also seems important to reverse the perspective taken by Konrad Górski. Who wanted to distinguish themselves and from whom? Protestants from Catholics? Trinitarians from Antitrinitarians? Antitrinitarians from other denominations? Previous research shows that lexical innovations were primarily used by Arian writers [Hawrysz 2012: 216; Lisowski 2023]. One must also ask whether and to what extent terminological distinctions were also sought by Catholics.

Another key postulate is the call to move away from examining what stands out as different and therefore seems attractive and noteworthy, and return to what is typical. By focusing on Arian writing, the former route was chosen (this was done by Górski, Hawrysz,[14] or even the literary historian Katarzyna Meller [2012]); however, the second route – the study of what is more representative, typical, average, widespread – remains open.

Still largely unexplored is the vocabulary of Polish Lutheranism. It was outside the spectrum of the interest of Winiarska, whose monograph covers the religious vocabulary of Calvinism contrasted against Catholic terminology [Winiarska 2004: 12]. The language of the Evangelical-Augsburg Church also deserves attention because, despite the fact that Lutheranism had fewer adherents in the Polish-Lithuanian state than Calvinism, it was, after all, Martin Luther's theological thought that initiated the intellectual, cultural, social and confessional changes that ultimately led to the Reformation [Grzywacz 2017: 95].

A comparison with the current state of this matter in other languages that in the 16th century reflected a religious situation similar to that in Poland may prove particularly interesting [see e.g. Vykypělová 2013, Dittmann 2019].

Translated by Magdalena Perdek

---

camp of the Polish Brethren itself, gaining full support "only in the Kuyavian community, which was under the direct authority of Czechowic" [Hawrysz 2012: 225].

14   Hawrysz's choice of research area is directly motivated by the fact that the Polish Brethren "were a unique group among the Reformed churches" [Hawrysz 2010: 126].

References

Dittmann Robert (2019), *Czech Language in Confessional Clashes of the 16th Century*, in: *Languages in the Lutheran Reformation. Textual Networks and the Spread of Ideas*, ed. Mikko Kauko and others, Amsterdam, p. 105-128. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/9789048531219.006.

Dittmann Robert, Just Jiří (2016), *Biblical Humanism in Bohemia and Moravia in the 16th Century*, "Europa Humanistica" series, vol. 18, Turnhout.

Gozdek Magdalena, Woźniak Ewa (2023), *Słownictwo religijne a reformacja. Głos w dyskusji nad konfesyjnym zróżnicowaniem polskiej leksyki w XVI wieku*, "LingVaria" 18, no. 1, p. 167–178. DOI: https://doi.org/10.12797/LV.18.2023.35.12.

Górski Konrad (1949), *Studia nad dziejami polskiej literatury antytrynitarskiej*, Kraków.

Górski Konrad (1962), *Zagadnienia słownictwa reformacji polskiej*, in: *Odrodzenie w Polsce. Materiały sesji naukowej PAN 25–30 października 1953 roku. Historia języka*, vol. 3, part 2, eds. Maria Renata Mayenowa, Zenon Klemensiewicz, Warszawa, p. 233–270.

Grzywacz Małgorzata (2017), *Reformacja wittenberska i szlaki jej transferu. U źródeł obecności luteranizmu w Rzeczypospolitej XVI w.*, in: *Luteranizm w kulturze Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej*, ed. Katarzyna Meller, "Hermeneutics of Values" series, vol. 8, Warszawa, p. 90–109.

Hawrysz Magdalena (2010), *Terminologia jako wyznacznik granic wspólnoty (na przykładzie wyrazu* ponurzać *i wyrazów pokrewnych)*, in: *Żywe problemy historii języka*, eds. Marcin Kuźmicki, Marek Osiewicz, Poznań, p. 125–135.

Hawrysz Magdalena (2012), *Polemiczna twórczość Marcina Czechowica w perspektywie genologii lingwistycznej*, Zielona Góra.

Kowalska Danuta (2021), *Język polski w ruchu reformacyjnym*, in: *Historia języka polskiego jako doświadczenia wspólnotowego*, vol. 2, eds. Stanisław Borawski, Marzanna Uździcka, Zielona Góra, p. 75–87.

Lisowski Tomasz (2008), *Między doktryną a wiernością przekładu. Grecki leksem* εκκλησια *i jego polskie ekwiwalenty w protestanckich tłumaczeniach Nowego Testamentu z XVI i XVII w.*, in: *Język doświadczenia religijnego*, eds. Grzegorz Cyran, Elżbieta Skorupska-Raczyńska, Szczecin, p. 285–298.

Lisowski Tomasz (2021), *Leksemy* pokuta *i* pokutować *w Nowym Testamencie* Biblii Gdańskiej *(1632) jako przejaw oddziaływania wzorca czeskiej* Biblii Kralickiej *(1579–1593) na tle polskiej renesansowej tradycji przekładowej*, in: *Styl jako kategoria badawcza języków, tekstów i kultur słowiańskich*, vol. 2, eds. Władysław Śliwiński, Anita Račákova, Gabriela Olchowa, Banská Bystrica, p. 92–105.

Lisowski Tomasz (2023), *Polish equivalents of Greek* ἐκκλησία *'a (religious) congregation',* μετάνοια *'repentance',* μετανοέω *'to repent',* βάπτισμα *'a diping or sinking',* βαπτίζω *'to dip, sink' in Renaissance Nontrinitarian renderings of the New Testament as lexical*

determinants of the confessional community of the Polish Brethren, "Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Linguistica", no. 57, p. 11–31. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18778/0208 -6077.57.01.

Meller Katarzyna (2012), *Słowa jak ziarna. Reformacyjne idee, książki, spory*, Poznań.

Otwinowska Barbara (1974), *Polski dwugłos o języku narodowym w Kościele (Hozjusz – Frycz)*, in: *Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski i problemy kultury polskiego odrodzenia*, ed. Tadeusz Bieńkowski, Wrocław.

Rucka Iveta (1996), *"O wyklęciu albo wyłączeniu…" – słownictwo związane z karą ekskomuniki w kościołach reformowanych w drugiej połowie XVI i początku XVII wieku*, "Slavia Occidetalis", no. 53, p. 69–86.

Rucka Iveta (1997), *Nazwy eucharystii w polskich kościołach różnowierczych XVI wieku*, "Slavia Occidentalis", no. 54, p. 113–121.

Rucka Iveta (1999), *Słownictwo związane z dogmatem Trójcy w polskich kościołach różnowierczych XVI wieku i jego dalsze losy*, "Slavia Occidentalis", no. 56, p. 99–114.

Rucka Iveta (2004), *Godzien jest robotnik zapłaty swojej (1 Tym 5, 18), czyli o słownictwie związanym z utrzymaniem ministrów i zborów różnowierczych przełomu XVI i XVII w.*, "Slavia Occidentalis", no. 61, p. 33–50.

SPXVI – Mayenowa Maria Renata (ed.), vol. 1–34, Mrowcewicz Krzysztof (ed.), vol. 35–39 (1996–2021), *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*, Wrocław, Warszawa.

Vykypělová Taťána (2013), *Wege zum Neutschechischen. Studien zur Geschichte der tschechischen Schriftsprache*, Hamburg.

Winiarska Izabela (2004), *Słownictwo religijne polskiego kalwinizmu od XVI do XVIII wieku na tle terminologii katolickiej*, Warszawa.

Winiarska-Górska Izabela (2017), *Z zagadnień recepcji protestanckiej hermeneutyki biblijnej w przekładzie Nowego Testamentu Stanisława Murzynowskiego (w ujęciu komunikacyjnym)*, in: *Luteranizm w kulturze Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej*, ed. Katarzyna Meller, "Hermeneutyka wartości" series, vol. 8, Warszawa, p. 110–163.

Ewa Woźniak

The Confessional Diversity of Sixteenth-century Polish Religious Lexis. Recapitulation and Research Postulates

The author summarises the research conducted so far on the confessional differentiation of Polish religious lexis in the 16th century, which was initiated in the 1960s by Konrad Górski, a literary historian. In his publication *Zagadnienia słownictwa reformacji polskiej* (*The Issue of the Polish Reformation Vocabulary*), the scholar argued that Protestants used different words than Catholics to designate important religious concepts, and that lexis was an important factor to identify the denomination. This thesis had

a significant impact on the assumptions and research objectives formulated by subsequent scholars who addressed the relationship between denomination and vocabulary. In the section of the article containing research postulates, attention is drawn to the necessity of verifying Górski's position, which was already initiated to a limited extent, mainly in the works by Tomasz Lisowski, who pointed out other than confessional determinants of lexical choices in the 16th-century translations of the Bible. It is considered necessary in the postulated research to broaden the resource base, to take into account the pragmatic diversity of the source texts (sender-receiver relations, intentions), to introduce numerical data objectifying the conclusions, as well as a comparative reference to the status in other languages.

Keywords: history of the Polish language – 16th century, religious lexis, Reformation vs language

Ewa Woźniak – University of Lodz, Department of the History of the Polish Language, Institute of Polish Philology and Logopaedics. Her research interests include the history of the Polish language, historical stylistics and semantics, and religious language.