**Mihai-Bogdan Atanasiu • Anca-Diana Bibiri •
Emanuel Grosu • Alina Moroşanu •
Constantin Răchită**
(Editors)

CULTURAL DYNAMICS OF VALUES

The book of proceedings of the conference
Interdisciplinary Perspectives in Humanities and Social Sciences
9th Edition: Rethinking Values in Interdisciplinary Research (27-28 October 2023)
Institute of Interdisciplinary Research
Department of Social Sciences and Humanities
"Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi

Scientific Reviewers:
Prof. Adina Dornean, PhD habil.
Senior Researcher Marius Chelcu, PhD habil.
Language revision of texts in English:
Senior Researcher Anca-Diana Bibiri, PhD

Book editor:
Emanuel Grosu
Marius-Nicuşor Grigore
Coverage: Manuela Oboroceanu

Mihai-Bogdan Atanasiu is a senior researcher, director of the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Institute of Interdisciplinary Research, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iaşi. He has a PhD in History, awarded in 2012 at the same university. His research activity focuses on the political, social and cultural history of Moldavia in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Most of his scholarly contributions have focused on social history, genealogy, prosopography, history of the Church, history of mentalities, as well as on editing documentary sources.

Anca-Diana Bibiri is a senior researcher at the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Institute of Interdisciplinary Research, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iaşi. She has a PhD in Philology, and a postdoctoral fellowship in linguistics from the same University, and her main areas of research are: prosody, phonetics and dialectology, computational linguistics, natural language processing, lexicography, and sociolinguistics. Co-editor of the PHSS Proceedings (2014-2019).

Emanuel Grosu is a senior researcher at the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Institute of Interdisciplinary Research, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iaşi. He has a PhD in Philology. He published studies, exegesis and translations from medieval Latin authors (Paulus Diaconus, Dungalus Reclusus, Anselm of Canterbury, Marcus of Regensburg, Marco Polo), the diachronic evolution of central literary themes and motifs of medieval Latin culture constituting the main research direction. Co-editor of the PHSS Proceedings (2014-2019).

Alina Moroşanu is a senior researcher at the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Institute of Interdisciplinary Research, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iaşi. She has a PhD in in Cybernetics and Economic Statistics, awarded in 2011 at the same university. Her research interest include: questionnaires development, healthcare management analytics, project management, statistical analysis, statistical software (R, SPSS), surveys, human resources analytics.

Constantin Răchită is a research assistant in the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Institute of Interdisciplinary Research, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iaşi. He has a PhD in Philology. His primary research focuses on the translation and interpretation of ancient texts in Old Greek and Latin. Throughout his career, he has participated in various translation and editing projects. Currently, his research interests encompass interdisciplinary approaches to biblical and patristic texts, exploring issues related to translation, transmission, and their influence on contemporary society.

Contents

History & Theology

Economics

Language in the Church:
Orthodox Religious Terminology in Polish
and the Role of Translations in Establishing Lexical Norms

IRINA-MARINELA DEFTU[*]

Abstract: *This article seeks to provide critical insights into the standardization of Orthodox terminology within the linguistic frameworks of Romanian and Polish, emphasizing the Church's role in fostering linguistic unity and the influence of translations on the establishment of lexical norms. It further explores the creation of an extensive Christian conceptual repertoire, contributing to the refinement of a suitable literary vocabulary. Within the context of Romanian culture, a distinctive confessional identity rooted in Orthodox religious language has emerged, stemming from the perception of the Romanian language as the predominant medium for the majority Orthodox population. Consequently, the literary Romanian language evolved through the translation and adaptation of religious texts from antecedent cultural languages during the 17th and 18th centuries. The nascent literary Romanian language, originating in the 16th and 17th centuries, exhibits a symbiotic relationship with written languages such as Greek, Slavonic, and Latin, thereby shaping its identity with an ecclesiastical style. In the Polish language, the individualization of Orthodoxy occurs at the lexical level. Since the acquisition of autocephaly by the Orthodox Church in Poland, particularly in the late 20th century, the role of the Polish language in the liturgical and spiritual domains of Orthodox adherents has expanded. The incorporation of the Polish language into Orthodox religious communication, coupled with the infiltration of Orthodox vocabulary into the general language, underscores the burgeoning need for unification, systematization, and codification of this vocabulary. Despite the frequent borrowing of Orthodox terminology from Church Slavonic and Greek, challenges persist in standardizing this terminology within the Polish linguistic landscape. This paper aims to address contemporary challenges in Orthodox terminology within the Polish context, identifying discernible inconsistencies in normative works. Additionally, it offers observations on the ongoing standardization of Orthodox terminology in Polish, highlighting the insufficiencies in*

[*] PhD, Assistant professor, Faculty of International Business and Economics, University of Economic Studies, Romania; irinadeftu@yahoo.com.

the systematic study of the lexicon of Orthodox versions of the biblical text in Polish from the perspectives of cultural and theological-dogmatic conditioning. Thus, the article contributes through the presentation of critical reflections on the ongoing standardization of Orthodox terminology in both Romanian and Polish linguistic spheres.

Keywords: *Biblical text; Biblical translation; Comparative analysis; Lexical norm; Orthodox terminology.*

Introduction

Currently, we have many translations of the Bible, which can be used directly and freely for the individual needs of believers. Furthermore, the Bible does not lose its status as a holy book through its translations. Regarding the Christian cultural heritage and considering the translation and cultural transfer of biblical content into the Romanian language, for example, within this transfer, both the Greek terminology, as well as the rhetoric and typical elements of the Hellenic world, were transmitted, but not only these. Considering Romanian culture has benefited from a well-defined religious language, specifically Orthodox, "due to the representation of the Romanian language as the language of a predominantly Orthodox people"[1]. In this way, for Romanian culture as well, literary Romanian was created through the translation and adaptation of religious texts written in earlier cultural languages in the 17th and 18th centuries. Old literary Romanian, whose beginnings date back to the 16th and 17th centuries, is characterized by its contact with the models of written languages: Greek, Slavic, and even Latin. In the stylistic framework of the Romanian language, the identity of literary Romanian is determined by the church style. In the Polish language, the confessional individualization of Orthodoxy is achieved at the lexical level.

Since the Orthodox Church gained autocephaly in Poland, and especially since the end of the 20th century, the role of the Polish language in the liturgical and spiritual life of Orthodox believers has significantly increased. As the use of the Polish language in Orthodox religious

---

[1] Felicia Dumas, *Dicţionar bilingv de termeni religioşi ortodocşi român-francez*, Editura Doxologia, Iaşi, 2010, p. 30.

communication has become more prevalent and Orthodox religious vocabulary has entered the general language, the need for the standardization and systematization of this vocabulary has become increasingly apparent.

Orthodox terminology in Polish, however, is mostly borrowed from Church Slavonic and Greek. Church Slavonic is the liturgical language of the Polish Orthodox Church.

In Old Polish, a considerable segment of Christian terminology exhibited alignment with Church Slavonic forms, with certain lexemes pertaining exclusively to matters of Orthodoxy. In this paper, I aim to present the contemporary status of this lexicon, listing some of the visible discrepancies of several normative works on Orthodox terminology in Polish and making some observations on the standardization of Orthodox terminology in Polish.

Literature review

Our research represents a significant contribution to the linguistic approach of both Romanian and Polish linguists to study confessionally conditioned religious discourse within the framework of a discursive religious tradition, a particular stylistic model, and a church language that is reluctant to innovate and that imposes and obliges strict adherence to certain principles of construction. Furthermore, the identification and description of Polish Orthodox terminology must take into account the current status of the vocabulary, based on the analysis of the contemporary religious language of the Roman Catholic Church in Poland, with individual emphasis on terminological problems. Our analysis aims to provide a list of titles of works, studies, articles, dictionaries that offer Orthodox terminology in the Polish language along with their descriptions. Our analysis consists of observations on the scope of works on Orthodox terminology, noting that terminological discrepancy still represents a significant problem in Polish Orthodoxy. These discrepancies manifest in both the diversity of notation, the pattern of borrowing usage, and the lack of systematic rules by the Polish language orthographic rules. The corpus analysed in our research consists of dictionaries and lexicons, studies and articles that record terminology, and thus constitute a useful research tool.

In our article, we will refer to the terminology in Polish and Romanian of the Polish and Romanian Orthodox Church, respectively, taking into account the liturgical terminology, the ritual of worship, and the cult texts. However, these works present some discrepancies and gaps, with differences in the graphic representation of words due to a non-unified method of adapting borrowings and non-standardized rules for word spelling. Thus, the dictionaries and lexicons used in our analysis are: Pokorzyna Ewa, *Słownik terminologiczny wyposażenia świątyń obrządku wschodniego z przydatkiem ikon maryjnych* (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo DiG, 2004), Smykowska Elżbieta, *Liturgia prawosławna. Mały słownik* (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Verbinum, 2008), Smykowska Elżbieta, *Ikona. Mały słownik* (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Verbinum, 2013), Smykowska Elżbieta, *Prawosławni święci. Mały słownik* (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Verbinum, 2008), Smykowska Elżbieta, *Zwyczaje i obrzędy prawosławne. Mały słownik* (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Verbinum, 2007).

In the analysis, we also considered some bilingual dictionaries that present contemporary attempts to systematize terminology, such as: Lewicki Roman, *Chrześcijaństwo. Słownik rosyjsko-polski* (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Pax, 2002), Fediukina Helena, *Leksykon terminologii prawosławnej rosyjsko-polski* (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Warszawska Metropolia Prawosławna, 2014), Markunas Antoni/ Uczitiel Tamara, *Leksykon chrześcijaństwa rosyjsko-polski i polsko-rosyjski* (Poznań, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1999).

Two other bilingual studies in dictionaries of ecclesiastical and theological terminology that provide insight into the translation of specific words of the ecclesiastical language into Polish are those of Fr Znosko Aleksy: *Mały słownik wyrazów starocerkiewno-słowiańskich i terminologii cerkiewno-teologicznej* (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Chrześcijańska Akademia Teologiczna, 1983) and *Słownik cerkiewnosłowiańsko-polski* (Białystok, Wydawnictwo Prawosławna Diecezja Białostocko-Gdańska, 1996). There are other studies that document historical terminology and, thus, provide a research tool, but they do not usually take into account contemporary variations and occurrences, such as Maria Karpluk's articles, *Z polsko-ruskich związków językowych: Słownictwo cerkiewne w polszczyźnie XVI*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Energeia, 1996.

In addition to these works, words from the Orthodox terminology in Polish can be found in other studies, but these terms are separated from the actual text. Thus, it becomes difficult for researchers who will attempt to define and develop the terminology of the Orthodox Church in Polish to operate with these terms. Some of these dictionaries, which among the many words in the Christian sphere also contain terms used by the Polish Orthodox Church, are the following: Klich Edward, *Polska terminologia chrześcijańska* (Poznań, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 1927); *Słownik języka polskiego*, red. Nauk. Mieczysław Szymczak, t. 2, (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 78–81, 1999); *Słownik Nowego Testamentu*, red. Xavier Léon-Dufour, przekł. Kazimierz Romaniuk (Poznań, Wydawnictwo Św. Wojciecha 1981, II wyd. 1986); *Słownik terminologii biblijnej*, red. Xavier Leon-Dufour, przekł. Kazimierz Romaniuk (Poznań, Pallottinum, 1994); *Słownik wiedzy biblijnej*, pod red. Bruce M. Metzger, Michael D. Coogan (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Vocatio Oficyna, 1996); *Leksykon teologii pastoralnej*, pod red. Ryszarda Kamińskiego, Wiesław Przygoda, Marek Fiałkowski (Lublin, Wydawca Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolichiego Uniwersytetu, 2006), *Słownik wyrazów obcych*, pod red. Elżbieta Sobol (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Naukowe PWN, 1999); *Nowy leksykon teologiczny*, Herbert Vorgrimler (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Księży Werbistów VERBINUM, 2005); *Leksykon pojęć kościelnych i teologicznych*, Gerald O'Collins SJ, Edward G. Farrugia SJ (Kraków, Wydawnictwo WAM, 2002); *Leksykon teologii fundamentalnej*, pod red. ks. Prof. dr. hab. Mariana Ruseckiego (Lublin-Kraków, Wydawnictwo M, 2002); *Leksykon duchowości katolickiej*, pod red. Ks. Marka Chmielewskiego (Kraków, Wydawnictwo M, 2002); Rahner Karl, Vorgrimler Herbert, *Mały słownik teologiczny*, przekł. Tadeusz Mieszkowski, Paweł Pachciarek (Warszawa, Wydawnictwo PAX, 1996).

Although the dictionaries and lexicons mentioned above do not focus exclusively on Polish Orthodox terminology, they record both similarities and differences between Roman Catholic and Orthodox terminology, and the terminology of Protestant churches with Roman Catholic or Orthodox equivalents.

In the Romanian context, there are several works that provide standardization of Orthodox terminology in Romanian, including: Ioan Mircea, *Dicționar al Noului Testament*, Bucureşti, EIBMBOR, 1995; Felicia

Dumas, *Dicţionar bilingv de termeni religioşi ortodocşi român-francez*, Iaşi, Editura Doxologia, 2010; Ene Branişte, Branişte Ecaterina, *Dicţionar enciclopedic de cunoştinţe religioase*, Caransebeş, Editura Diecezană Caransebeş, 2001; Ion Bria, *Dicţionar de teologie ortodoxă A-Z*, Bucureşti, Editura Institutului biblic şi de misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1981; Radu Ciobanu, *Mic dicţionar de cultură religioasă*, Timişoara, Editura Helicon, 1994; Nae Ionescu, *Îndreptar ortodox*, Bucureşti, Editura Artemis, 2013.

Methodology

In this article, I aim to study the dynamics of the lexicon of modern Polish and modern Romanian in the sphere of Romanian and Polish religious translations from a synchronous perspective, taking into account the works in which Polish Orthodox terminology, more precisely, Orthodox religious terminology in Polish, is identified and described, as well as the role of translations in setting lexical norms.

The analysis undertaken is one from an interlinguistic and contrastive perspective, where the comparative approach in the context of observing their dynamics is a critical study of the two languages "in their countless confrontations, interferences, convergences and divergences"[2] it highlights significant similarities and differences between them at the lexical, morphological, phonetic, and syntactic levels, taking into account the detection of linguistic universals and the ways of thinking that can be conveyed despite linguistic and sociocultural diversity. Thus, the comparative analysis of the two languages provides us with the "possibility to control semantic innovations"[3], "observation of subtle changes and nuances"[4] analysis of the linguistic behaviour and attitudes of translators, construction of the denominative imagery in both languages, etc.

Therefore, we mention right from the beginning that our intention to address various aspects of linguistic interference from the perspective of cultural and theological-dogmatic conditioning has a teleological character.

---

[2] Mario Wandruszka, *Perspectives interlinguistiques, Cursurile de vară şi colocviile ştiinţifice*, Sinaia, 1972, (30 p. multigraf.), p. 3. *Apud* Eugen Munteanu, *Lexicologie biblică românească*, Editura Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2008, p. 11.

[3] Eugen Munteanu, *Lexicologie…*, p. 10.

[4] *Ibidem*.

On the one hand, we examine the biblical text through the lens of delimited confessional biblical tradition, and on the other hand, we study the ecclesiastical tradition in the strict sense – the Orthodox editions of various cultures.

Studying religious terminology from the perspective of cultural and theological-dogmatic conditioning (Orthodox terminology) is important because the terminology is specific to a particular confessional dogma and, in doing so, supports or promotes its teachings of faith:

> Although a Christian dogma is not based on a single term or verse, certain verses or concepts have proved essential in the economy of dogma formulation. Once a particular dogma is articulated, it becomes a canon of interpretation for other verses and concepts, which are translated in a way that aligns with the previous doctrinal understanding. The result of this "harmonization" process is that verses that might not have been significant in supporting a dogma become arguments that reinforce it[5]. (Author translation)

Another method of analysis used in this approach is from a semasiological perspective, starting from the signifier (i.e. starting from the word, from the form, to study the meaning and the change of meaning[6]), to investigate the substance of the content, as opposed to the onomasiological analysis, which "starts from the designation, from the 'content of thought' that is intended to be expressed, and which becomes expression in a given language"[7].

The Orthodox terminology in Polish

The Orthodox terminology in Polish is associated with the presence of the Orthodox Church in Poland. Thus, the Orthodox terminology in Polish "results from a long period of mutual dependence between theology, hymnography, or exegesis expressed in Church Slavonic language and the

---

[5] Emanuel Conţac, *Determinări culturale şi teologice în traducerea Noului Testament*, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi, 2015, p. 27.

[6] Cf. Constantin Frâncu, *Curente, şcoli, direcţii şi tendinţe în lingvistica modernă*, Casa Editorială Demiurg Plus, Iaşi, 2016, p. 136.

[7] Eugen Coşeriu, *Omul şi limbajul său. Studii de filozofie a limbajului, teorie a limbii şi lingvistică generală*, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi, 2009, p. 107.

functioning of the Polish state, Polish culture, and the Polish language"[8]. The Orthodox Church in Poland uses Church Slavonic as a liturgical language, while Polish is used as the language of theological dogma, description of history, homily, or catechesis.

A preliminary description of Polish terminology can be made by considering several factors that influence its complexity and its confessional-theological conditioning (dogmatic, canonical, ecclesiastical, liturgical, etc.). The Orthodox terminology in Polish includes both terminology that functions in the Polish language, close to the common lexicon, as well as resources from the original languages, mainly "Greek, Old Church Slavonic, Ruthenian Church Slavonic, based on the terminology of national and ethnic minorities in Poland, including Belarusians, Greeks, Lemkos, Russians, Ukrainians"[9], as well as borrowings from Roman Catholic Church terminology.

The detachment of Orthodox terminology in the Polish language from the usual lexicon is a difficult task, requiring special attention to the identification and extraction of those terms that will enter the nomenclature of a religious discursive tradition, in ecclesiastical language, and their validation through usage in written or spoken productions. Thus, it is imperative to distinguish terms that function in Polish and refer strictly to the Orthodox Church. Within these terms, there are both words exclusively attributed to Orthodox theology and words that have different meanings for the Roman Catholic Church or other churches and religious communities, which can be considered terminological homonyms. An enlightening example is the term *ksiądz*[10], which has not been officially accepted in the Orthodox Church. However, it functions in both colloquial and official spheres and is derived from the words *władca/ kniaź*, 'leader' (in Old Polish, *kniądz* 'priest'). According to Kostiuczuk et al. (2016), the term is not related

---

[8] Jakub Kostiuczuk, Jerzy Tofiluk, Marek Ławreszuk, Włodzimierz Misijuk, Jarosław Charkiewicz, *Specyfika polskiej terminologii prawosławnej. Koncepcja normatywizacji pisowni*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, Białymstok, 2016, p. 159.

[9] *Ibidem*.

[10] 'duchowny chrześcijański posiadający święcenia kapłańskie' (cf. https://wsjp.pl/haslo/podglad/2209/ksiadz, accessed on 05.01.2023). In Romanian, 'un preot creştin hirotonit'.

to the historical development of Orthodox terminology. Since the end of the 14ᵗh century, the term has been used in Polish as a courtesy title for the clergy. Regarding semantic nuances and acceptance within the usage of various religious communities, Kostiuczuk et al. (2016) also mention that if we consider the term *ksiądz* ('priest') as an honorary title for a person belonging to the clerical order, the use of the term *presbyter* (the second degree of priesthood) to address a deacon or bishop is not appropriate. This issue arises from the lack of a universally accepted and commonly used form of the term *presbyter* in Polish language, as the term appears very rarely in both Roman Catholic and Orthodox terminology. In Polish, the term *ksiądz* is used and universally accepted as a universal honorific. If the term *ksiądz* is used as a universal honorific, Kostiuczuk et al. (2016) mention that other universal honorifics should also be used, such as *ojciec, czcigodny, przewielebny/ wielebny* 'father, venerable, reverend'[11].

Debates regarding the translation of this term have existed in the past, between Catholics and Anglicans, for example, or even between Orthodox and representatives of the Reformation doctrine, where various denominations such as *bătrân*, *preot*, *presbyter*, etc., can be found. The diversity of terms used in Orthodox translations into the Romanian language draws attention to the translators' hesitation regarding what a πρεσβύτερος actually is. Therefore, the problem of issuing an official, unambiguous definition of priests (*presbyters*) requires the propagation of this term in written texts and its synonymous use with the commonly used terms *ksiądz* 'priest' and *ojciec* 'father'. Thus, one of the priorities of the work related to terminology is to specify those words that function as borrowings from Church Slavonic or Greek, and even from other languages, in the Orthodox terminology in the Polish language. Furthermore, the terminology is constantly developing and faces the challenging issue of choosing the most relevant functional equivalents in terms of meaning and value, of clear and theologically correct rendering of the content, of the ecclesiastical Greek and Slavonic terms which are used in Orthodox theology, but which currently lack a standardized form in the Polish language, thus considering the need to lexicalize some concepts. Therefore, it is very interesting to observe the process of establishing lexical norms, as

---

[11] Jakub Kostiuczuk et al., *Specyfika polskiej terminologii...*, p. 107.

it is currently ongoing, not yet perfected, and thus represents a vast and not sufficiently explored domain, "which has taken more than a century in traditional Orthodox cultures, overlapping with the process of literary language formation"[12].

From a lexical perspective, Orthodox terminology in Polish represents a relatively new but highly dynamic phenomenon. This is an Orthodox liturgical language in the process of formation and development in Polish. Thus, the main method of constructing this language is the exercise of translation since "the act of translation [...] is a gesture of reverence and esteem for the «target-language», deemed worthy to carry a message previously spoken, originally and better, in another language: «To truly translate means to adapt into one's own language what has been said in another language», writes Martin Luther in a sermon"[13]. There are institutions that propose and are involved in translating texts and standardizing this terminology in the Polish language. Among the translators also representatives of the Orthodox Church in Poland are: Jerzy Betlejko and Warsonofiusz Doroszkiewicz. Important texts for the Orthodox ritual, for liturgical use, and other uses are translated from the Orthodox worship. The issue of establishing a satisfactory translation of liturgical texts that could be common to all parishes and communities has often been raised[14]. Furthermore, Orthodox magazines in Polish, such as the official magazine of the Polish Orthodox Church, *Vestitorul bisericesc* (Warsaw), serve as a "common testimony of Orthodoxy"[15] in countries where Orthodoxy is a minority. These religious authorities strive to find an intelligible Polish language for contemporary individuals and recognize the need to incorporate the religious message into the everyday experience. Therefore, they aim for the text proposed in Polish to be written in "intelligible language, but not trivial"[16]. Thus, the issue of the tension between modernizing the language of biblical texts, for example, and the dignity of the inspired text, has drawn attention to the colloquial aspect of

---

[12] Felicia Dumas, *Dicționar bilingv…*, p. 30.

[13] Eugen Munteanu, *Lexicologie…*, p. 120.

[14] Felicia Dumas, *Dicționar bilingv…*, p. 7.

[15] *Ibidem*, p. 8.

[16] *Ibidem*.

language. This could lead to the rejection of religious language, which is equivalent to rejecting a Christian worldview.

Thus, through these cultural translations, the lexical norms that define and individualize Orthodox religious terminology in the language are established. This process transfers a specific linguistic and confessional reality from countries with a tradition in Orthodoxy into the Polish cultural space[17]. Confessional specificity is noticeable at the lexical level, i.e. at the level of terms representative of Orthodoxy. Thus, we can talk about Orthodox religious terminology in Polish, specialized and precise, characterized by unambiguous denominations, similar to other terminologies. Orthodox religious terminology in the Polish language is a cultural and confessional terminology constructed through the translation of Orthodox texts and "imposed by its usage within this confessional paradigm"[18].

Translators of the biblical text for Orthodox liturgical use fulfil their mission by converting the biblical message into Polish, thus establishing the linguistic norms of Orthodox terminology in the Polish language. They also aim to provide intelligible versions of the Polish biblical text to Orthodox Poles. Therefore, they refer to other existing translations used in Orthodox liturgy to remove any doctrinal inconsistency resulting from lexical choices that do not conform to Orthodox tradition. The imposition of these lexical norms can only be achieved "through their validation at the level of usage, in written or oral productions"[19].

Thus, it can be observed that in the Polish language, there are specialized terms that designate the doctrinal, theological, and spiritual realities of Orthodoxy, which is to say, a well-defined Orthodox terminology resulting from the establishment of lexical norms proposed through the translation of fundamental Orthodox texts. In this way, translators also fulfil their role as "normative actors"[20], carrying "linguistic and confessional responsibility"[21] toward the text they are translating. Since Orthodoxy is a minority religion in Poland, the need to lexicalize new

---

[17] *Ibidem*, pp. 10-11.

[18] *Ibidem*, p. 11.

[19] *Ibidem*, p. 18.

[20] *Ibidem*, p. 30.

[21] *Ibidem*.

concepts becomes imperative when translating religious texts, forcing translators to respect the confessional requirements of the organization of the sacred message, perceived and analysed in the source language, and to offer new forms of lexicalization in the target language. Therefore, it is fascinating to follow the process of fixing lexical norms that is currently taking place, not yet perfected.

Standardization of terminology

From a lexical perspective, Orthodox terminology in Polish represents a relatively new but highly dynamic phenomenon. It is an Orthodox liturgical language that is currently in the process of formation and development in Polish. The conclusions of existing studies, including dictionaries, encyclopedias, and various articles on this topic, indicate terminological discrepancy as a major issue within Polish Orthodoxy. These discrepancies are manifested both in the diversity of notation, in the adopted pattern of borrowing, and in the lack of systematic rules in Polish language orthography rules. In many cases, differences in the use of source terms can be observed, where some dictionaries suggest borrowings from Greek (e.g., *epigonation*, *epitrachelion*), while others propose borrowings from Church Slavonic or Polonized forms (e.g., *poruczy*[22] or *narękawki*[23], *jepitrachil*[24]).

The problem of the lack of a set of rules providing guidance on the technical editing of loans or their adaptations and their introduction into the nomenclature of the Orthodox Church language consists, among other things, of spelling inconsistencies, such as capitalization or lowercase usage of certain terms, for example *Ewangelia – evangelical*, *Liturgia – liturgia*, *Święty Jan – święty Jan*, etc., different spelling of certain structures, such as *Święto Narodzenia Chrystusa* 'Sărbătoarea Naşterii lui Hristos' – *Boże Narodzenie* ' Naşterea Domnului (Crăciunul)', *królewskie drzwi*[25] – *święte*

---

[22] 'entrusted'[tr. n.].

[23] As vestments of the priest, the presbyter, "mânecuţele"; *narękawki* (gr. ἐπιμάνικα/ ἐπιμανίκια, cs. по́ручи).

[24] The vestments of the priest, presbyter, or bishop include the epitrachelion; *epitrachilion* (gr. ἐπιτραχήλιον, cs. епитрахи́ль).

[25] With reference to the doors of the iconostasis, *uşile împărăteşti*, this structure in the Polish language occurs mostly in texts: *królewskie drzwi* (gr. βασιλική πύλη; initial

drzwi[26] – *królewskie wrota*[27] – *carskie wrota*[28]), or the existence of multiple lexemes that refer to the same referent, for example: *paramonarz*[29] – *ponomar*[30] – *prysłużnik* – *akolita*, *płaszczanica*[31] – *epitafion*, *liturgia* – *Liturgia Święta* 'Sfânta Liturghie' – *Boska Liturgia*[32] – *Liturgia Boża* – *obiednia* – *msza*.

The Council for the Polish Language (Rada Języka Polskiego)

Some of the issues mentioned have been discussed and resolved as a result of the work carried out by the team responsible for religious language (Zespół Języka Religijnego) within the Council for the Polish Language. The proposals described by Przybylska/Przyczyna 2011 primarily focused on the terminology of the Roman Catholic Church and did not take into account the specificity of the Orthodox Church, for example[33]. A group of theologians

---

the term *królewskie drzwi* referred to a door in the nave, it was not until the 16th-17th centuries when they began to be identified with today's meaning.

[26] With reference to the central doors of the iconostasis, *uşile sfinte* (gr. ὡραία πύλη from ὡραῖος 'frumos, fermecător, timp potrivit, anotimp potrivit' + πύλη 'uşă, poartă, intrare').

[27] The term *wrota* appears in Polish translations of liturgical texts, *porţile împărăteşti*.

[28] Referring to the main door of the iconostasis, intended for the priest who performs the liturgy (or the ruler on Coronation Day), *uşile împărăteşti*.

[29] Polishized form of the Russian term.

[30] A church clerk who takes care of a church building and performs some services in worship, *pălămar*, *paracliser*.

[31] An object that is a religious symbol for Orthodox worship is also the epitaph – *epitaful*.

[32] *Dumnezeiasca Liturghie*. gr. Λειτουργία**. In Kostiuczuk *et alii* 2016 it is specified that the term *msza*, which is specific to Roman Catholics, should not be used to describe the Eucharistic and other services in Orthodox worship, and on another page it is stated that "in the Orthodox Church, the term *liturgy* is generally used exclusively for the Eucharistic Mass" (Jakub Kostiuczuk et al., *Specyfika polskiej terminologii...*, p. 69), and as an exception, the names for the individual parts of the liturgy are written in lower case (*slujba euharistică, liturghia catehumenilor şi liturghia credincioşilor*), and the Eucharistic Mass is written in upper case: *Boska Liturgia*, *Święta Liturgia*, *Liturgia* or write the word *Liturghie* if it is synonymous with the *Euharistia*.

[33] Przybylska Renata, Wiesław Przyczyna, *Pisownia słownictwa religijnego*, Wydawnictwo Biblos, Tarnów, 2011.

and philologists developed a system for standardizing the orthography of Orthodox terminology between 2014 and 2016, which was published in 2016. Kostiuczuk et al., building upon the principles and norms formulated by Przybylska/Przyczyna 2011, addressed the issues that had been overlooked previously, such as the diverse terminology related to dogmatic theology, liturgical life, and religious practices, official proper names of local Orthodox Churches, and also introduced word formation patterns for terms in foreign languages that had not yet found their Polish equivalents. The principles developed in this work represent a first attempt at systematization, indicating, for the first time, the historical differentiation of the names of the Orthodox Church and other Christian churches. Kostiuczuk et al. does not encompass the entire Orthodox terminology in the Polish language, nor does it suggest that its rules are the only possible ones. Instead, it primarily proposes further research directions that should lead to the development of a comprehensive dictionary of Orthodox terminology in the Polish language.

Regarding the proper names of God and the names of saints, for example, where the category of holiness is absent in Roman Catholic terminology, the solutions presented in the works are analytical descriptions. The Orthodox Church does not limit itself to describing a person as *święta* ('saint') or *błogosławiona* ('blessed'), as is the case in the Roman Catholic Church, but distinguishes separate terms that indicate categories and groups of saints, such as *praojcowie*, *prorocy*, *męczennicy*, *wyznawcy*, *apostołowie*, *święci hierarchowie*, *świątobliwi*, *darmo leczący*, *saloici*, *sprawiedliwi*, *prawowierni*. Unlike Roman Catholic terminology, these terms already carry the meaning of 'sacred,' so for message consistency, it is sufficient to describe a saint with a single qualifier, for example, *świątobliwy Izaak Syryjczyk*, without the need to add the term *święty* ('saint'). The same applies to the following contexts as well: *apostołowie Piotr i Paweł*, *archanioł Gabriel*, *darmo leczący Kosma i Damian*, *prawowierni Borys i Gleb*[34]. Regarding the terms used to identify affiliation with the Orthodox faith, the works emphasize the depth and theological complexity of dogmatic terminology, for example: *chwała* 'slava dumnezeiască'[35], *uwielbienie* 'adoraţie, veneraţie',

---

[34] Jakub Kostiuczuk et al., *Specyfika polskiej terminologii...*, pp. 9-10.

[35] In one of the works it is mentioned that the term prawosławie ortodoxie' is equivalent to the Greek term *orthodoxía* (in Greek ὀρθόδοξος, ὀρθός 'drept, propriu', δόξα 'slavă, părere, sentinţă' (*ibidem*, p. 10).

kult, cześć, przebóstwienie 'îndumnezeire', *apatheia, teandryzm, perychoreza* sau *acedia*. Moreover, it can often be seen in several works that new solutions are proposed, new words in Orthodox terminology to designate certain realities, for example *katholikon, katapietasma, kukol* sau *posoch*.

In some works, the proposed terminological rules also draw attention to the evident issue of differentiating the writing of terms adopted from Church Slavonic and Greek languages. The inconsistent transcription or adaptation of these terms into Polish has led some authors to present several norms related to creating equivalents for terms from both the Greek and Church Slavonic languages.

The actuality of this problem

The language of the Orthodox Church in Poland is diverse and constantly developing. The terminology of the Orthodox Church in Poland is based on the linguistic norms of the Polish language, but at the same time it retains a certain independence which derives from dogma, from specific principles of faith. Therefore, the undeniable ecclesiastical, anthropological, or dogmatic differences that are visible in the theological discourse within the Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church do not allow for the uncritical acceptance of all terms introduced into Orthodox terminology in the Polish language. For example, the role of the God Mother in the redemptive work of Christ in the Roman Catholic Church (the dogma of the Immaculate Conception) allowed the introduction of several terms about the God Mother, presenting her in the context of the dogmatic teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. Regarding the historical sources of Orthodox theological thought, it is impossible to adapt these terms to the context of Orthodox Church teachings. Another lexical differentiation that arises from a different liturgical tradition is the evening service. In the tradition of the Roman Catholic Church, it is called *nieszpory*, referring to the evening prayer service. In the Polish Orthodox Church, the evening service is sometimes equated with *wieczernia*, which is similar to the Roman Catholic *nieszpory*.

Conclusions

The current state of Orthodox terminology in the Polish language may not provide a complete picture of it. Thus, on the one hand, Orthodox terminology in the Polish language has been functioning for centuries and is largely consistent and in line with the terminology of the Roman Catholic Church. On the other hand, however, there are discrepancies and issues regarding the unambiguous understanding of the terms used in the Church. Current studies and dictionaries emphasize the need for the creation of a normative dictionary that records the existing terminology, systematizes it, and provides guidance on developing terminology based on linguistic rules and standards.

Bibliography:

Conţac, Emanuel, *Determinări culturale şi teologice în traducerea Noului Testament*, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi, 2015.

Coşeriu, Eugen, *Omul şi limbajul său. Studii de filozofie a limbajului, teorie a limbii şi lingvistică generală*, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi, 2009.

Dumas, Felicia, *Dicţionar bilingv de termeni religioşi ortodocşi român-francez*, Editura Doxologia, Iaşi, 2010.

Frâncu, Constantin, *Curente, şcoli, direcţii şi tendinţe în lingvistica modernă*, Casa Editorială Demiurg Plus, Iaşi, 2016.

Kostiuczuk, Jakub, Tofiluk, Jerzy, Ławreszuk, Marek, Misijuk, Włodzimierz, Charkiewicz, Jarosław, *Specyfika polskiej terminologii prawosławnej. Koncepcja normatywizacji pisowni*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, Białymstok, 2016.

Munteanu, Eugen, *Lexicologie biblică românească*, Editura Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2008.

Przybylska, Renata, Przyczyna, Wiesław, *Pisownia słownictwa religijnego*, Wydawnictwo Biblos, Tarnów, 2011.

Przybylska, Renata, Przyczyna, Wiesław, *Pisowni słownictwa religijnego*, Wydawnictwo Diecezji Tarnowskiej BIBLOS, Tarnów, 2018.

Wandruszka, Mario, *Perspectives interlinguistiques*, *Cursurile de vară şi colocviile ştiinţifice*, Sinaia, 1972 (30 p. multigraf.).

https://wsjp.pl/.