

СТАТИИ / СТАТЪИ / ARTICLES

Agata Kawecka, Ivan Petrov, Małgorzata Skowronek (Łódź, Poland)

OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC – POLISH TEXTBOOKS, GRAMMARS AND
DICTIONARIES

The present publication discusses some of the topics relevant for the long-term collective research project entitled *Issues in the translation of the old literature in the Slavia Orthodoxa into Polish* (*Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski*), conducted at the University of Łódź since 2009¹. Although its main objective is to create a commented bibliography of Polish translations of Slavia Orthodoxa texts written in the Old Church Slavonic language (henceforth OCS), including its regional recensions, as well as in Church Slavonic (henceforth CS)² or in New Church Slavonic (henceforth

¹ In the initial phase, the project had no formal framework; its later stages have been financed from the following sources: a) The Faculty of Philology of the University of Łódź (funding for the members of the Chair of Southern Slavic Studies, granted to: Dr. A. Kawecka, Dr. I. Petrov, Dr. M. Skowronek): Polish translations from the literature of the Slavia Orthodoxa in diocesan and parochial libraries and archives in Eastern Poland (*Przekłady literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski w bibliotekach i archiwach diecezjalnych i parafialnych Polski Wschodniej*, no. 545/041, in the year 2011), An electronic database of Polish translations from the literature of the Slavia Orthodoxa (*Elektroniczna baza danych przekładów literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski*, no. 545/375, in the year 2012), Old Church Slavonic – Polish textbooks, grammars and dictionaries: a history and bibliography of translation resources (*Podręczniki, gramatyki i słowniki staro-cerkiewno-słowiańsko – polskie: historia i bibliografia warsztatu translatorskiego*, no. 545/949, in the year 2013); b) National Science Centre, Kraków; project entitled *The reception of literature and folklore from the Slavia Orthodoxa literature and folklore in Poland – a history and bibliography of translation work* (*Recepcja piśmiennictwa oraz literatury ludowej kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa w Polsce – historia i bibliografia twórczości przekładowej*), carried out at Centrum Ceraneum, University of Łódź (program: Sonata Bis 1, decision no. DEC-2012/05/E/HS2/03827, 2013-2018) by the following personnel: Dr. A. Kawecka, Dr. I. Petrov, Dr. M. Skowronek, Dr. Izabela Lis-Wielgosz (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań), Dr. Jan Stradomski (Jagiellonian University, Kraków).

² The series of publications summarizing the intermediate steps of the project encompasses a number of articles presenting and briefly describing the bibliography of Polish translations of the relevant literature: K a w e c k a, A., I. P e t r o v, M. S k o w r o n e k. *Z problematyki przekładu starej*

NCS), it has also crucially involved collecting and categorizing publications helpful in teaching the OCS language (textbooks, compilations of teaching materials) and sources useful for the very process of translation into Polish, i.e. dictionaries and lexica³.

All those who have ever tried their hand at translation are aware that translating a literary work is not merely an emulative, but also a productive process, requiring a substantial intellectual effort as well as a sound command of the language in question (not to mention the pivotal role such an enterprise plays in propagating the relevant cultural heritage). Translating texts written in “dead” languages, or at least in languages not used in everyday communication, is an even more challenging task. (O)CS no doubt belongs to this category, since only a small percentage of Poles ever had any contact with this language. Naturally, the degree to which such a language can be mastered largely depends on one’s own perseverance, determination and talent, but the effort would nevertheless remain quite futile were it not for the indispensable didactic tools, created to enable training specialists in the field⁴. The latter process is connected mainly with academic institutions offering programs in Slavic (as well as Russian or Polish) studies. The advancement of historical-comparative studies in the domain of Slavic at the turn of the 19th and 20th century caused the development (also in Poland) of the interest in OCS as the first vehicle of Slavic literacy. The language started to be taught at philological programs devoted mainly (though not exclusively) to the study of the south and east parts of the Slavic area. The

literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski. Part 1. – *Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne*, 4, 2009, 247–273; Part 2. – *Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia Litteraria Rossica*, 3, 2010, 175–193; Part 3. – *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego*, 56, 2011, 67–90; Part 4. – *Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne*, 6, 2011, 309–325; Part 5. – *Roczniki Humanistyczne TN KUL. Seria: Słowianoznawstwo*, 60, 2012, fasc. 7, 193–218; Skowronek, M. O przekładach piśmiennictwa cerkiewnosłowiańskiego autorstwa prof. Ryszarda Łuźnego na tle innych polskich publikacji tego typu. – *Roczniki Humanistyczne TN KUL. Seria: Słowianoznawstwo*, 61, 2013, fasc. 7, 119–137. The project in its entirety has also been described in the following articles: Петров, И. Кирилло-мефодиевские источники и памятники древней славянской книжности в переводах на польский язык: из истории рецепции. – *Palaeobulgarica*, 35, 2011, № 1, 71–79; Kawecka, A., I. Petrov, M. Skowronek. Polskojęzyczne translacje tekstów kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa: o projekcie systematyzacji i dokumentacji. – In: *Latopisy Akademii Supraskiej. T. 3. Język naszej modlitwy – dawniej i dziś*. Białystok, 2012, 183–188.

³ Full bibliographical references concerning the publications discussed here are to be found at the end of this article.

⁴ The article itself as well as the accompanying list primarily comprise those textbooks, teaching materials and dictionaries that have been or can be utilized in university level instruction. Available publications directed at those using the CS language in daily religious practice are thus left out of our survey. An interesting and unique example of this kind of work is e.g. Капłanow, М. Старославянский без тайн. Старославянский без тайн. Бiałystok, 2009, containing basic information regarding the alphabet and a guide to pronunciation and accentuation of CS words (without a systematic presentation of the grammar), enabling the Old Believers living in Poland to deepen their understanding of the prayers and the principles of their faith. Such publications, catering first and foremost to the needs of Orthodox Christians living in Poland, are certainly far greater in number.

end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century are characterized by the reverse process; diachronic linguistic research is becoming less and less popular in Poland and abroad, which results in the ongoing reduction of the relevant courses in the curricula for the aforementioned programs. Although this significant decrease has also noticeably affected the status of the OCS language, which is the object of our interest in this article, its basics continue to be taught at universities – therefore, the demand for teaching aids is still exists.

Since instruction in OCS is a vital issue for the wider context of our project (in view of the fact that its knowledge forms the basis of the translator's skill set), it is a worthwhile task to present some of the dictionaries and lexica of the language⁵, pointing out their key features as well as the characteristics that ease or impede the teaching process (or, ultimately, the translation). Although the list appended to this article also contains a number of works published before the 20th century, the article itself only describes post-World War Two publications in greater detail.

* * *

Over a dozen OCS textbooks were published for the Polish market after the year 1945, a few of which should no doubt be singled out as particularly popular and “well-proven” in teaching generations of students. All of these publications, though representing diverse didactic approaches, are in principle structured in a similar way. Beside an introduction to the structure of the OCS language itself (covering the areas of phonetics/phonology, morphology and – less frequently – syntax), they present varying amounts of information on the relationship between OCS and Proto-Slavic; furthermore, they describe the deeds of the holy brothers Cyril and Methodius and the related origins of Slavic literature (especially the mission to Moravia), and they provide basic information on the oldest texts of the canon⁶. In order to facilitate mastering the grammar, most of the textbooks present inflectional paradigms of the respective parts of speech (often in Romanized form, by either transliteration or transcription),

⁵ The appendix does not list the available readers in primary texts, although the authors of some of the textbooks do enhance their works with chrestomathies and glossaries. Such supplementary materials can be useful in the teaching process as well. Cf. e.g. Słownik, S. Wybór tekstów starosłowiańskich (starobułgarskich). Lwów, 1926; 2nd ed. revised and completed Warszawa, 1952; Chrestomatia słowiańska, cz. I. Teksty południowo-słowiańskie ze słowniczkami. Pod red. T. Lehra-Splawińskiego. Kraków, 1949.

⁶ Needless to say, the amount of information conveyed and the way it is presented crucially depends on the state of the research on a given question at the time of publication, the competence of the author and the type of reader that the publication is directed at, e.g. a student of a given language program. In spite of the ongoing marginalization of historical linguistic courses, an OCS textbook should be composed differently when it is intended for a full-time student of Russian or Bulgarian than when it is to be used in a part-time program in Polish studies. Some textbooks written in Russian have also been published in Poland for students of this language, e.g. Rott - Żebrowski, T., W. Skukowski. Gramatyka języka starosłowiańskiego: z ćwiczeniami dla rusycystów. Olsztyn, 1986; 2nd ed. completed: Lublin, 1988, with only the front cover in Polish.

accompanied by a selection of reading samples from original texts (going beyond the examples referred to in the explanations) for independent study, enabling the reader to apply the newly acquired skills in practice⁷.

The samples of (O)CS offered by the authors to the students typically contain, on the one hand, excerpts from canonical texts (fragments in Glagolitic are usually presented in Cyrillic transliteration), on the other hand – excerpts from later texts (up to the 16th–17th c.), exemplifying the various recensions of the language. As a result, students taking the course are exposed to pieces excerpted from sources such as the *Codex Zographensis* and *Marianus, Kiev Missal, Euchologium Sinaiticum, Psalterium Sinaiticum, Glagolita Clozianus, Sava's book, Codex Suprasliensis*, but also from the *Ostromir Gospels* or the *Lives of Sts. Constantine-Cyril and Methodius*. These texts (both normalized and presented as facsimiles of the originals, or almost entirely reprinted from earlier editions and chrestomathies) are represented for the most part by excerpts from the Gospel of Matthew (roughly 75% of all samples); the second most popular source are the Psalms, followed by the Book of Genesis, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles, and others. Some of the samples only consist of single verses, while others are much longer, covering e.g. pericopes from liturgical books or entire parables.

From the practical point of view, it is only through the analysis of samples from original texts that students can fully internalize the features of OCS grammar, and it is these samples that form the basis for practicing particular forms and grammatical structures, or tracing the historical development of the language. It is likewise clear how crucial it is to be able to correctly interpret grammatical forms when analyzing any kind of text, let alone a multi-dimensional one like the Bible. Regrettably, actual teaching practice shows that the OCS language is more alien to the Polish learner than could be expected. Even students of Slavic studies are frequently at a loss to use their knowledge of modern Slavic languages to translate simple OCS sentences. In view of this, even the small glossaries found in most of the textbooks and created on the basis of the text samples used there turn out to be valuable (in the case of translating and analyzing longer or more difficult texts, referring to specialist dictionaries and lexica as well as to modern Polish translations of the Bible proves indispensable)⁸.

The first exceptionally well-received post-war publication⁹ for teaching OCS

⁷ Some of the publications, e.g. the textbook by H. Ułaszyn (cf. appendix), even aspire to the status of self-study guides.

⁸ Since no Orthodox translation of all the books of the Old and New Testament into Polish is available, we have no choice but to refer to the existing translations of single books or to the widely used *Millennium Bible* (Biblia Tysiąclecia), the modern translation generally considered standard in Poland).

⁹ The first post-war (i.e. new, not previously published) publication is Stanisław Słowski's *A Grammar of Old Church Slavic (Old Bulgarian)* (cf. S ł ó Ń s k i, S. Gramatyka języka starosłowiańskiego (starobułgarskiego). Warszawa, 1950). As mentioned in the foreword by the author himself, the original version of the book was ready for printing already in 1938, but all the existing materials were

was Tadeusz Brajerski's *The Old Church Slavonic Language*¹⁰. The book was republished seven times before 1990, twice under a partly modified title (here and henceforth: cf. appendix), and for many years it was unquestionably one of the most important textbooks of OCS. The contents are divided into four parts: the first one contains exercises connected with the relevant grammar sections covered in the later parts of the book (it is noteworthy that the samples from original texts are selected so as to match particular grammatical issues), the second one conveys basic information on the OCS language (including the deeds of Cyril and Methodius as well as the basic terminology referring to OCS and Proto-Slavic), the third one describes the linguistic system of OCS and addresses issues in phonetics and inflection (with paradigms, but with no elements of syntax), and the fourth one is a dictionary. A notable advantage of this textbook is no doubt the fact that it contains shorter and longer reading samples (both normalized and non-normalized) from most of the extant OCS texts published up to the time of its completion; as a result, even nowadays it is often used alongside chrestomathies as a repository of auxiliary material for teaching.

Ten years later Janusz Strutyński published his concise textbook *Basics of Old Church Slavonic grammar*¹¹, but reprinted many times since. The book is directed chiefly at students of Polish studies (including those in half-time or extramural programs), so that the information is presented in a noticeably simplified way. It should be noted that in certain places the textbook is unfortunately marred by inaccuracies or even errors. The structure of the book does not diverge from the usual pattern found in publications of this sort – it contains information on the origin of the OCS language and its main texts, some discussion of phonetics and inflection, grammar exercises, a small selection of reading samples and a dictionary.

Published one year later, the textbook by Józefa Kobylińska, entitled *Old Church Slavonic grammar with exercises*¹², is divided into two parts. The first one contains general information on the objectives of the study of OCS, the

destroyed in the turmoil of World War Two and the textbook had to be written anew. Since the book only appeared in one edition, it is not presented here in greater detail. Tadeusz Lehr-Spławiński's *Outline of Old Church Slavonic Grammar in a Comparative Context (Phonetics – Inflection)* (cf. L e h r - S p ł a w i ń s k i, T. Zarys gramatyki języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego na tle porównawczym (głosownia – fleksja). Kraków, 1949) was published one year earlier. However, it was in fact a new edition of a pre-war textbook, with a modified title. Finally, the chronologically earliest was Mieczysław Małecki's *The Oldest Literary Language of the Slavs*, was made possible by T. Lehr-Spławiński (M a ł e c k i, M. Najstarszy literacki język Słowian. Kraków, 1947). Initially designed as a textbook of OCS for students of Polish studies and novice Slavicists, it was unfortunately unfinished due to the author's death. Hence, the publication only contains general information about the language, while the part on grammar is missing. For this reason, the book is left out of the list appended to the present article.

¹⁰ B r a j e r s k i, T. Język staro-cerkiewno-słowiański: podręcznik dla polonistów. Lublin, 1964.

¹¹ S t r u t y ń s k i, J. Podstawowe wiadomości z gramatyki języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego. Kraków, 1974.

¹² K o b y l i ń s k a, J. Gramatyka języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego z ćwiczeniami. Kraków, 1975.

alphabets, abbreviations and diacritics occurring in the texts; the second one is a description of the grammar of the language. It comprises a quite detailed picture of the phonetic system (including the principal Proto-Slavic processes), inflection (nouns, pronouns, adjectives, numerals, verbs) as well as some, though not all, peculiarities of syntax (dative absolute, dative with infinitive). Almost every topic in the grammar is supplemented by exercises; in addition, the textbook features an OCS–Polish dictionary. Three more editions of the book appeared (the most recent one in 1992).

In 1981, the textbook *The basics of Old Church Slavonic grammar in a comparative context* by Czesław Bartula was published by Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN¹³, one of Poland's leading academic publishing houses. It may be noted that it was not the author's first attempt at an exhaustive description of the OCS linguistic system: already in the 1970s, he had completed his *Old Church Slavonic grammar with exercises*¹⁴, and even earlier, in the late 1950s – together with T. Lehr-Spławiński – a new edition of the latter's *Outline of Old Church Slavonic Grammar*¹⁵. Nevertheless, it is his *Basics...* that became the best-received textbook among Polish Slavists, as evidenced by the fact that seven more editions have been published since (not taking into consideration several reprints), essentially with only minor modifications. Among the textbooks presenting the OCS linguistic system, the one under discussion is undoubtedly still the most popular and the best adapted to teaching practice. The book consists of five parts. The first one presents the general information about OCS (also in comparison with other languages), its origin, alphabets and extant texts. The second part is divided into 15 class-length units, devoted to particular issues in grammar (the theoretical sections are always supplemented by aptly chosen exercises, sometimes featuring invented sentences meant to illustrate the point under discussion). The third part complements the grammatical material presented in part two, also including tables with inflectional paradigms for different parts of speech (an exceptionally useful teaching tool). In the fourth part, the author offers extensive samples from OCS texts, which may either be analyzed in class or used by the student for independent work. Finally, the fifth part contains a dictionary created on the basis of the reading samples used in the book, as well as a list of abbreviations and bibliographical references.

1984 saw the publication of another book widely used in the Slavist community – Leszek Moszyński's *Introduction to Slavic philology*¹⁶, another edition of which appeared in 2006. The scope of the material covered here is considerably wider than what is currently taught in OCS courses. The book has a bipar-

¹³ B a r t u l a, Cz. Podstawowe wiadomości z gramatyki staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiej na tle porównawczym. Warszawa, 1981.

¹⁴ B a r t u l a, Cz. Gramatyka języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego z ćwiczeniami. Kielce, 1976.

¹⁵ L e h r - S p ł a w i ń s k i, T. Zarys gramatyki języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego. Poznań, 1922–1923.

¹⁶ M o s z y ń s k i, L. Wstęp do filologii słowiańskiej. Warszawa, 1984 (1st ed.).

tite structure: the first part is devoted to the Slavic scripts and texts, the second one – to the language (mostly Proto-Slavic, less prominently OCS and its later recensions). Apart from discussing issues of grammar, the publication also contains samples of texts from different recensions (Bulgarian and Macedonian, Serbian and Croatian, Russian) a sample of a Church Slavic text from Romania as well as excerpts from the OCS canonical texts (including facsimiles of older editions). The vocabulary from the texts is compiled in the accompanying glossary, which facilitates the analysis. As the author himself remarks in the foreword¹⁷, “the aim of this book is to awaken the passion for Slavic philology, present the beginnings of the Slavic language and writing, accessibly present all the issues that must be grasped in order to enable the correct understanding of the historical grammar of any Slavic language and the comparative grammar of Slavic”.

Another OCS textbook was published 10 years later: *Grammar of Old Church Slavonic* by Halina Karaś¹⁸. As noted by the author herself, the book “presents the material on the basis of several existing academic textbooks of OCS, as well as provides glossed reading samples in semi-phonetic transcription”¹⁹. The textbook is designed for use in extramural programs in Polish studies. The theoretical part provides the basic information on the origin of OCS and its position among the Slavic languages, as well as its phonetics, phonology and inflection. The second part is a modest selection of reading samples, with explanations regarding their analysis and interpretation. The normalized OCS texts in semi-phonetic transcription are excerpted from the books by T. Brajerski and T. Friedelówna, Cz. Łapicz (see appendix). Each sample is followed by a small glossary, featuring the principal parts of lexemes occurring in the texts as well as some additional information (e.g. the case government of verbs). The textbook also contains reproductions of some OCS texts. For the first three, information on the origin and location is missing; the other samples stem from the *Psalterium Sinaiticum*, *Codex Zographensis* and *Codex Marianus*. Three editions of the book appeared, the last one in 2001.

One more OCS textbook used in university-level teaching is Teresa Friedelówna and Czesław Łapicz’s *Old Church Slavonic language*²⁰, designed by the authors as a text for students of Polish and other Slavic languages. The most recent edition consists of four parts. The first, theoretical one delivers the basic information on the language as well as a description of its grammatical system (phonetics and phonology, inflection, syntax). The second one contains commented texts meant for practice, and the third one contains guidelines for readers interested in self-study. Finally, the fourth part consists of an OCS–Polish

¹⁷ Ibidem, 1st ed., p. 5; 2nd ed., p. 13.

¹⁸ Karaś, H. *Gramatyka języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego*. Warszawa, 1994.

¹⁹ Ibidem, p. 3.

²⁰ Friedelówna, T., Cz. Łapicz. *Język staro-cerkiewno-słowiański*. Toruń, 1997.

glossary; it is accompanied by an annex containing John Paul II's encyclical *Slavorum Apostoli* as well as bibliographical references. As a side note, it should be mentioned that Friedelówna and Łapicz also published a more basic textbook of OCS under the same title (1979 and 1983), containing only the description of the grammatical system of the language, but no text samples or glossary.

* * *

For many years those working on the translation of (O)CS texts into Polish had no advanced lexicological or lexicographical tools at their disposal, since publications of this kind were extremely sparse²¹. This lacuna has been gradually filled since the 1990s, when both more general works and resources covering specific smaller areas started to become available. These publications are valuable and needed, helpful both for experienced translators of old Slavonic texts and for their less advanced colleagues (although the usefulness of a given resource for translation work largely depends on the character of the text in question). Needless to say, the currently available dictionaries and lexica vary with regard to the number of lexemes covered (since they were created on the basis of diverse source material); they also display divergent approaches to presenting the vocabulary, frequently using strategies different from those found in popular bilingual dictionaries. Especially in thematically arranged lexica, the structuring the entries is often a demanding task for the authors, exposing *inter alia* the lack of Polish equivalents of the lexemes translated; the methods subjectively chosen by the authors are not always in line with the expectations of prospective readers. It should also be noted that all of the resources made available so far are of a unidirectional, (O)CS–Polish character, although the ability to locate the (O)CS equivalent of a given Polish lexeme would also be beneficial for the process of translation. It is, therefore, worthwhile to provide a more detailed description of the recently published dictionaries.

In the first place, we shall discuss the two large and exceptionally important dictionaries authored by Aleksy Znosko and Stanisław Eustachy Strach (both priests of the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church), published in 1996 and 2012, respectively (here and henceforth: cf. appendix). They are based on liturgical texts of the Orthodox Church.

²¹ We disregard the oldest handwritten and printed CS–Polish lexicographical works, such as the so-called *Supraśl Lexicon* (*Leksykon Supraski*) printed in 1722: *Лѣнконъ снрѣчъ словесникъ славенскій нимѣющъ в себѣ слова первѣ славенскія, дзвѣчныя, посемже полскія. [...] въ типографіи монастыря Общественнаго свраскаго* (Editions: 1. [appendix to the book] Strach, St. Krótka gramatyka języka cerkiewnosłowiańskiego. Białystok, 1994; 2. Супрасльскій церковнославяно-польскій словарь 1722 г. Сост. Ю. А. Лабынцев, Л. Л. Щавинская. Минск, 1995; 3. Słownik cerkiewnosłowiańsko-polski. Red. L. Citko. Białystok, 2012). Works like this can nowadays be viewed as historical monuments rather than working tools, and they are all listed (6 titles in total) e.g. in the following publication: Николеев, С. И. Польско-русские литературные связи XVI–XVIII вв. Библиографические материалы. Санкт-Петербург, 2008, 28–31 (also published in Polish: N i k o l a e v, S. Polono-Rossica: polsko-rosyjskie związki literackie w XVI–XVIII wieku: materiały bibliograficzne. Kraków, 2009).

The objective of A. Znosko's *Church Slavic – Polish dictionary*²², encompassing over 16 000 entries, is “to present the Polish terminological equivalents of items selected from Old Church Slavonic and theological lexical resources”²³. Thus, we find here “Church Slavonic lexemes, frequently used in the Books of the Old and New Testament, [...] theological terms, [...] some specialist vocabulary, names and surnames of people widely venerated by the Church, those who played a significant role in the life of the Church and Christianity; entries of an informational character, connected with the Church”. The index entitled *Other bibliographical abbreviations (Inne skróty bibliograficzne)*²⁴ tends to be somewhat imprecise; next to the separately indicated services, prayers and rites, or lections for particular days of liturgical commemoration, it refers very broadly to “John Chrysostom” or the “Council of Carthage”. However, as noted by the author, “the work on this Dictionary was impeded by a peculiar practical difficulty, namely the lack of Polish equivalents. [...] Thus, equivalents for e.g. the following entries were found: “Christa radi jurodiwyj” – *saloita* (instead of the incorrect, colloquially used *szaleniec Chrystusowy*), “Nierukotworennij Spas” – *Chrystos Acheiropita*, “żena mironosica” – *niewiasta myrofora* [...]. At the same time, one of the objectives of the work is to unify the meaning and terminological spelling of the individual entries. Thus, in some authors the item “altar” occurs as “ołtarz” (instead of “prezbiterium”), “głas” – as “głos” (instead of “ton”, from the word *tonacja*)”²⁵. This problem also proves relevant for other lexicographical works published in the later years, some of them of a different character (cf. below).

It should be stressed that in Znosko's entries the pronunciation is always spelled out in the Roman alphabet. For nouns, the nominative and genitive singular forms are given. In the case of verbs, the dictionary is less consistent: usually the infinitive together with the first and second-person singular present is specified, but just as often the infinitive alone is provided. A great majority of the entries contain information regarding their occurrences, e.g. a reference to the Bible or another text (e.g. Min. 6:10; Prol. 1:8 > *mineja, prolog; Irmos Kanonu Bożego Narodzenia ton 1, pieśń 3; czw. Niedz. Palm., Ryt spowiedzi*). A great number of entries feature a parallel Greek term, transliterated/transcribed in the Roman alphabet (e.g. *злострадание* > *kakouchia*).

Strach's CS–Polish dictionary²⁶ constitutes the second part of his study devoted to the syntax of the CS language²⁷. Beside Znosko's it is perhaps the

²² Z n o s k o, A. Słownik cerkiewnosłowiańsko-polski. Białystok, 1996.

²³ Ibidem, p. 5.

²⁴ Ibidem, p. 8.

²⁵ Ibidem, p. 5.

²⁶ S t r a c h, St. Składnia języka cerkiewnosłowiańskiego okresu nowożytnego z podręcznym słownikiem cerkiewnosłowiańsko-polskim. Zabkowice Śląskie, 2012.

²⁷ See K a w e c k a, A., I. P e t r o v, M. S k o w r o n e k. Z zamięłowania do cerkiewszczyzny [review of: S t r a c h, St. Składnia...]. – Przegląd Prawosławny. Orthodoxy, 8, 2012, 43–45.

Headwords in Strach's dictionary are only given in Cyrillic, no romanized form is provided (contrary to the practice in A. Znosko's work). Furthermore, although part of the entries are identical in both dictionaries (or almost identical, if differences in the composition of the entry itself are taken into account), the books themselves are not: some entries only occur in one of the two, and the amount of information given varies. Let us illustrate this with the following sample entries:

Нерастворённый – nierozpuszczony (szczerzy), czysty, jednolity, bez domieszki; такъ чаша въ ршцѣ гдѣнъ вѣна нерастворѣна, не полнѣ растворѣнѣа, и оуклѣнн ѿ сеа въ сѣд Ps 74:9 – por. pol. „bo w ręce Pańskiej jest (w cs. składnik dom.) kielich wina szczerzego, pełen mieszania, i nachylił tu i tam (dosł. z tego w tamten)” (BW2). Uwaga: Kielich pełen goryczy lub wina odurzającego oznacza często w Piśmie Świętym gniew Boży, tj. karę, którą wyznaczył Pan dla grzeszników³⁰.

Уветшаніе – zużycie, zniszczenie, zestarzenie się; starość, zgrzybiałość, niemoc, słabość³².

³³ W a t r ó b s k a, H. Słownik staro-cerkiewno-rusko-polski. Kraków, 2010, p. 6.

Радъ *m* kolejnoś ■ напеча ■ ꙗ ■ словесъ ■ а ■ неконн бѣ слово ■ н прочаѧ по радѹ ^{34,10} * nieprzydatny
(ad ne въ радѹ) ■ Камень негоже не в редѹ створиша знѹюще съ бѣ въ главоу оуглоу ^{110,13}
То *conj* то ■ аще обращеть са ѧгода въ грѣзѹ ■ то не погочѧю грѣзна того ■ нъ спсѹ ^{Н_{18,2}} * *conj*
а ■ а ты злымн грѣхы о сѣгрѣшающн ■ н беззаконны тмамн дѣющн ■ то себе не осѹдн-
шн ^{28v, 18} * *part* то ■ Т. Равн соутъ то ■ нже слоужать боу ■ н волю него творать ■ а не родѹ ■ н
рожанцамъ ^{18v, 7} * *part* zaś, bowiem ■ азъ бо есмь самъ хлѣбъ скоро възпѣцаѧ са ■ н бываѧ
всѣмъ жнвѹтъ посланыи ■ а жеже то хочеш ма поноудити ■ то створи гѣн ^{181v, 8}
Преложити *pf* przetłumaczyć ■ по н ■ лѣ ■ възнесеныи хлѣа ■ преложи же ■ Нw ■ ꙗ Кѣрѣнска ѧзыка
■ на Кѣлннскъ ^{33v, 18} * *pf* zmienić ■ Самого бо нз грѹа члѣва преложнлъ естъ на нетлѣныи гдѣ
сѣшьдъ въ адъ ^{78v, 9} * *pf* przenieść ■ дѣлготрѣпа людн рече ■ ѧко снѹ преложнхъ ■ тако
прнведѹ плѣнныи люднн монхъ ^{80v, 6}
Прельстити *pf* skusić ■ не могы ннако ннкакоже прельстити ■ оумна н смысльна члѣка бѣзмъ
створена ^{154, 6} * Т. Мързѹщн бо бѣш быша ꙗ прельщенихъ ■ ѧко вода сквърнава мнмотекоу-
щн ^{86, 8}

Among the thematically arranged lexica, especially noteworthy is Ewa Pokorzyna's *Terminological dictionary...*³⁵, a publication attempting a wholesale systematization of CS terminology and the relevant Greek and Polish equivalents, enhanced with over 30 tables and 90 types of portrayals of the Theotokos. The terminology collected here "concerns the Orthodox and Eastern Catholic churches, referred to in Poland as Uniate, Greek Catholic or Byzantine Ukrainian"³⁶. The introduction features a number of remarks and proposals of unification to remedy the "lack of consistency in applying the nomenclature" in works that concern "the objects of the cult of the Orthodox Church", especially since "oral tradition played a non-negligible role here, leading to the emergence of numerous variant and synonymous terms due to differences in spelling and pronunciation, as well as some errors in the transmission". As stressed by the author, "the present publication is the first endeavor aimed at unifying and systematizing the spellings".

³⁶ Ibidem. 7–8.

The *Introduction* is, as a matter of fact, entirely devoted to discussing the strategy of shaping/forming the entries (especially the lemmata): whether and why the entries should be headed by Greek, Slavicized Greek, Church Slavic, modern Russian, Polish, Polonized or even Latin items. Ultimately, “it was decided to treat Greek terms as basic in the majority of cases [...]; Church Slavonic terms are restricted to items and concepts only occurring in the Russian Church [...]; Polish appellations refer mostly to items that have non-controversial equivalents in our language or to those that have multiple Greek and Church Slavic counterparts, but where the Polish word retains the original sense and can be treated as the ‘broad’ term [...]”. Additionally, words are presented in transcription, meant to “ease the pronunciation of Church Slavic, Russian, Ukrainian” terms, as well as in Roman transliteration³⁷. As a result, we obtain the following construction of the entries (original spelling retained):

Bogoglasnik cs. bogoglasnik; gr. theofónikon („theos“ Bóg + „foni“ głos);
epitrachelion gr. („epi“ na + „trachelos“ „trachelion“ kark, arteria, tchawica), peritrachelion, petrachēlion; cs. *jepitrachil* epitrachíl; ukr. *jepitrachyl* jepitrachíl; pol. epitrachylion;
Horologion gr. (księga godzin); cs. *časosłowec* časoslóvec, *časosłow* časoslów; pol. czasosłów;
kapłaństwo, cs. *swiaszczenstwo* svjaščénstvo;
ladan cs. ladan, *ladon* cs. lădon, *liwan* cs. lívan, *fimian*; gr. ladanon, ledanon, libanos (od nazwy drzewa „liban“ cedr libański), fimián, thymíama;
omoforion, gr. omophórion („omos“ ramić + „phoreo“ nosić), omophoron, ōmophortion, naphorion, maphortion; cs. *omoforij*, *omofor*, *maforij*, *nadramienije* nadrámenie, *naramnik* (niepoprawnie);
orlec cs.; gr. aetós, pol. pot. orlik;
Prolog cs. prológ lub prólog; gr. prólogos;
skufia cs.; gr. skuphos (kubek, miseczka), skouphía;
Sticherarion gr. (gr. „sticherá“, cs. „stichéra“, ukr. „stichíra“ stychiera, hymn liturgiczny); cs. *stichirar*’, ukr. stychyryr stichirár; pol. stychierar, stychierarz.

The 329 entries are not grouped alphabetically, but according to their meaning, arranged into the following categories: parts of the temple, including equipment; other elements of temple equipment; liturgical utensils; distinctoria; Eastern Church clerical clothing/vestments; liturgical books (selection); various kinds of equipment.

E. Pokorzyna’s opinion concerning terminological problems is also shared by the authors of other works. According to Elżbieta Smykowska, the author of a series of concise dictionaries dealing with particular terminological areas (*Ikona* (The icon), *Liturgia prawosławna* (Orthodox liturgy), *Prawosławni święci* (Orthodox saints) and *Zwyczaj i obrzędy prawosławne* (Orthodox rites and customs), 2002–2008)³⁸, “the difficulty lies in the fact that Church Slavonic termi-

³⁷ All citations from: *ibidem*.

³⁸ Cf. appendix.

nology does not in fact have systematized and standardized equivalents in the Polish language”, although at the same time “Church Slavonic terms function in the perception and awareness of Orthodox Christianity in Poland and do not cause any kind of discord”³⁹. Hence, a characteristic feature of Smykowska’s dictionaries is “presenting a Polonized transliteration alongside Church Slavonic terms, as well as alternatives with reference to Church Slavonic terminology” – in fact sometimes also Greek, e.g.:

chirotonia (gr. *cheirothonia*, od *cheir*, „ręka“, *teino*, „rozciągam“; cs. *rukopoloženije*, „nakładanie rąk“) [*Liturgia prawosławna*];

pawoloka (ros. *pawolka*, „przykrycie“, „osłona“, „pokrowiec“) [*Ikona*];

litijnijj sosud zob. błogosławiaństwo chlebów [*Zwyczaje i obrzędy prawosławne*];

namaszczenie św. olejem (gr. *hagias tu hagiou eleiu*; cs. *jeloopomazanije*) [*Zwyczaje i obrzędy prawosławne*];

Niedziela Palmowa (gr. *Enksodos tu Kyriu Iesu Christu eis Hierusalem*; cs. *Wchod Hospodien wo Ijerusalim*) [*Zwyczaje i obrzędy prawosławne*].

Therefore, the works under discussion are not dictionaries listing a referent’s appellation in different languages, but mostly explaining in Polish an item referred to by a CS term. Entries in Polish (or Polonized and functioning more or less unproblematically in the language) are in the minority, cf. e.g. *absyda*, *adoracja Krzyża Świętego*, *akatyst*, *ambona*, *anafora*, *anamneza*, *antyfona*, *antymins*, *Antypascha*, *archidiakon*, *archimandryta*, *autokefalia*. Sometimes the Polish/Polonized term refers the reader to CS, e.g. *aklamacja* > *aksjos*, *Liturgia Katechumenów*; *artoforion* > *daronosica*; *asterysk* > *zwiezdica*. A substantial number of Smykowska’s lemmata appear in a CS or even Russian form (e.g. *agiasma*, *agniec*, *altar*, *analoj*, *archierej*), sometimes with a cross-reference to an item that only differs phonetically, e.g.: *akafist* > *akatyst*; *amwon* > *ambona*; *anamneza* > *anamneza*; *antifon* > *antyfona*; *antifonar* > *antyfonarz*; *antimins* > *antymins*; *apsida* > *absyda*; *archidijakon* > *archidiakon*; *archijepiskop* > *arcybiskup*; *archijerej* > *archierej*; *archimandrit* > *archimandryta*.

Two Polish translations of mystagogical treatises and explanations of Orthodox liturgy published in 2007 are supplemented by glossaries, the scheme of which was conceived by Georgi Minczew. The first one, the *Terminological dictionary* (*Słownik terminologiczny*) appended to the edition of Symeon of Thessalonica’s treatise *On the Holy Temple*, covers a hundred lexemes – liturgical and architectural terms found in the source text. The entries range from *agnec* to *żertwennik*, and are presented both in Polish/Polonized form (np. *ambona*, *anafora*, *antyfona*, *archimandryta*, *chryzmonamaszczenie*) and in transcription/transliteration from (O)CS (eg. *czasosłow*, *mandia*, *mnogoletie*, *poruczy*, *służebnik*) and from Greek (eg. *euchologion*, *syntronon*, *templon*, *zeon*). The author explains the structure of the entries in the following way: “The Church

³⁹ All quotations from: S m y k o w s k a, E. *Liturgia prawosławna. Mały słownik*. Warszawa, 2008, p. 5.

Slavonic translation does not always correspond to the meaning of the Greek term (cf. e.g. the entries *oltarz*, *prestoł*, *żertwennik*). I do not indicate the CS term as long as it approximates the Greek form (e.g. *Diskos*, gr. δίσκος ‘dysk’; but *Ekfoneza*, gr. ἐκφώνσεις ‘aklamacja, zawołanie’; cs. βογλαшение”). In this way, the dictionary underscores the “differences between the form and meaning of some terms in the times of Symeon and the modern liturgical practice”⁴⁰.

On the other hand, the *Liturgical dictionary* (*Słownik liturgiczny*) complementing the Polish translation of the *New Tables* by Archbishop Veniamin contains 185 entries⁴¹. The size of the dictionary is no doubt conditioned by the fact that the *New Tables* covers a significantly wider range of topics than the liturgical commentary by Symeon; apart from the description of the temple, service and liturgical utensils it also discusses certain liturgical texts and incantations or gestures made by the officiators. Nonetheless, in view of the character of both the editions under discussion, the dictionaries overlap to a large extent; they were also compiled with the help of almost the same sources. All of the headwords from the *Terminological dictionary* appended to Symeon’s treatise also figure in the glossary accompanying the edition of the *New Tables*, although there is an occasional difference with regard to entry length (e.g. *troparion* and *typikon*, longer in the *New Tables*) or merely the graphic form (in the order *On the Holy Temple – New Tables*, e.g. *Bema* vs. *Bima*, *Dary ofiarne* vs. *Dary Ofiarne*, *Diskos* vs. *Dyskos*, *Nabiedrennik* vs. *Nabedrennik*).

The lexicographical principles adhered to by the authors of the first volume in the series *Library of European Spirituality* (*Biblioteka Duchowości Europejskiej*), 2004–; originally published in Gniezno, later in Kraków were retained in the further volumes as well⁴². Each of the first three volumes features a *Glossary* (*Słowniczek*), containing 53, 81 and 37 entries, respectively, and edited by Izabela Lis-Wielgosz. Numerous items found here concern terms for literary genres in Church Slavonic literature (such as: *akrostych*, *akatyst*, *chajretyzmy*, *ikos*, *irmos*, *kanon*, *kondak*, *oktoich*, *pochwalne słowo*, *triod*, *żywot* etc.) as well as Orthodox theology, liturgy and liturgics (e.g. *liturgia*, *minea*, *omoforion*, *prosfora*, *szużba*). Volume 4 of the series contains (alongside the *Dictionary of anthroponyms and toponyms* (*Słownik antroponimów i toponimów*) a 106-entry long *Dictionary of liturgical and theological terms* (*Słownik terminów liturgicznych i teologicznych*), written by Georgi Minczew and Małgorzata Skowronek, where headwords in

⁴⁰ Słownik terminologiczny. Opr. G. Minczew. – In: Symeon z Tessaloniki. O świętyni Bożej. Kraków, 2007, 95–96.

⁴¹ Słownik liturgiczny. Opr. G. Minczew. – In: Nowe Tablice czyli o cerkwi, liturgii, nabożeństwach i utensyliach cerkiewnych. Objasnienia Beniamina arcybiskupa Niżnego Nowogrodu i Arzamasu (wybór). Kraków, 2007.

⁴² With the exception of the fifth one, where instead of preparing a standalone dictionary the authors decided to explain selected terms in comments appearing in the form of footnotes: Święci Konstantyn-Cyryl i Metody. Patroni Wschodu i Zachodu. T. 1–2 (= Biblioteka Duchowości Europejskiej, 5/1; 5/2). Kraków, 2013.

Polish or in a Polonized form are juxtaposed with their (O)CS and Greek equivalents.

It appears that all of the above-mentioned dictionaries and lexica have the potential of becoming the foundation for a future Polish–(O)CS dictionary.

* * *

APPENDIX

In the following, we present an exhaustive list of the textbooks, grammars, dictionaries and lexica relevant to our topic – both those discussed in the article and all of the remaining ones. While gathering data on regular, printed publications we made systematic use of the online central catalogue of Polish scholarly and academic libraries (*Narodowy Uniwersalny Katalog Centralny NUKAT*: www.nukat.edu.pl). A great majority of the publications (including the separate editions) were also examined *de visu*.

(OLD) CHURCH SLAVONIC TEXTBOOKS AND GRAMMARS WRITTEN IN POLISH⁴³

Ks. A. D. z W a l a w y. Grammatyka języka starosłowiańskiego: iakiego Sławianie obrządek grecki wyznający w księgach swych cerkiewnych używają. Przemysł, 1837.

Ł o ś, J. Wykłady gramatyki języka starosłowiańskiego (starocerkiewnego). Cz. 1. Fonetyka. Cz. 2. Morfologia. Kraków, 1903 [copied manuscript].

Ł o ś, J. Gramatyka starosłowiańska: głosownia, morfologia, składnia. Lwów–Warszawa–Kraków, 1922.

L e h r - S p ł a w i ń s k i, T. Zarys gramatyki języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego. Poznań, 1922–1923⁴⁴; 2nd ed.: Lwów–Warszawa, 1930; 3rd ed.⁴⁵ with a modified title: Zarys gramatyki języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego na tle porównawczym (głosownia – fleksja). Kraków, 1949; 4th ed. completed: L e h r - S p ł a w i ń s k i, T., Cz. B a r t u l a. Zarys gramatyki języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego na tle porównawczym. Wrocław–Kraków, 1959; 5th ed.: 1965; 6th ed., revised and completed: 1973; 7th ed. – reissue of the 6th ed.: 1976.

U ł a s z y n, H. Język starocerkiewnosłowiański. Zarys gramatyki. Ćwiczenia. Teksty. Słownik. Lwów, 1928.

S ł o ń s k i, S. Gramatyka języka starosłowiańskiego (starobułgarskiego). Warszawa, 1950.

B r a j e r s k i, T. Język staro-cerkiewno-słowiański: podręcznik dla polonistów⁴⁶. Lublin, 1964; 2nd ed.: 1966; 3rd ed. with a modified title: Język staro-cerkiewno-słowiański:

⁴³ Thanks to the ongoing digitalization of library collections, some of the works presented here have now also become available online <http://www.fbc.pioner.net.pl>.

⁴⁴ The same version of the textbook was published by different houses: 1922: “Nakładem Koła Polonistów Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego z zasiłkiem Ministerstwa W.R.I O.P. czcionkami drukarni Zjednoczenia Młodzieży w Poznaniu”; 1923: Poznań: “Fiszer i Majewski”, Warszawa: “F. Wende i sp.”, Łódź: “L. Fiszer”, Toruń: “Towarzystwo Wydawnicze „Ignis”” (information found on the title pages of the respective editions).

⁴⁵ Corrections and addenda to the previous two editions are found on pp. 107–108.

⁴⁶ The different titles are found in the NUKAT database. The editions available to us, examined *de visu*, bear the title Język staro-cerkiewno-słowiański.

- skrypt dla studentów KUL: 1970; 4th ed.: 1973; 5th ed. with a modified title: Język staro-cerkiewno-słowiański: 1976; 6th ed.: 1977; 7th ed.: 1990.
- S t r u t y ń s k i, J. Podstawowe wiadomości z gramatyki języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego. Kraków, 1974; 2nd ed. revised and completed: 1979; 3rd ed. revised and completed: 1991; 4th ed.: 1993; 5th ed.: 1996; 6th ed. revised: 1997; 7th ed.: 1998; 8th ed.: 1999; 9th ed.: 2002; 10th ed.: 2006.
- B ą k, S. Zasady transliteracji, transkrypcji i interpretacji tekstów staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskich. Wrocław, 1975; 2nd ed.: 1977.
- K o b y l i ń s k a, J. Gramatyka języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego z ćwiczeniami. Kraków, 1975; 2nd ed. revised: 1980; 3rd ed. revised: 1988, 2nd reissue: 1992.
- S m o c z y ń s k i, P. Gramatyka opisowa języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego: przewodnik metodyczny dla słuchaczy studiów zaocznych II roku filologii polskiej i rosyjskiej. Lublin, 1975.
- B a r t u l a, Cz. Gramatyka języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego z ćwiczeniami. Kielce, 1976; 2nd ed. revised: 1978.
- F r i e d e l ó w n a, T., Cz. Ł a p i c z. Język staro-cerkiewno-słowiański. Toruń, 1979; 2nd ed.: 1983.
- B a r t u l a, Cz. Podstawowe wiadomości z gramatyki staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiej na tle porównawczym. Warszawa, 1981; 2nd ed. revised: 1987; 3rd ed.: 1994; 4th ed.: 1997; 5th ed.: 1998; 6th ed.: 2000, reissue: 2001, 2nd reissue: 2003; 7th ed.: 2004, reissue: 2006, 2nd reissue: 2008, 3rd reissue: 2009, 4th reissue: 2011.
- M o s z y ń s k i, L. Wstęp do filologii słowiańskiej. Warszawa, 1984; 2nd ed. revised: 2006, reissue: 2012.
- K a r a ś, H. Gramatyka języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego. Warszawa, 1994; 2nd ed.: 1998; 3rd ed.: 2001.
- S t r a c h, S. Krótka gramatyka języka cerkiewnosłowiańskiego. Białystok, 1994; 2nd ed. completed: Hajnówka, 1999.
- F r i e d e l ó w n a, T., Cz. Ł a p i c z. Język staro-cerkiewno-słowiański. Toruń, 1997; 2nd ed.: 2003; 3rd ed.: 2008.

(OLD) CHURCH SLAVONIC – POLISH DICTIONARIES

- Z n o s k o, A. Mały słownik wyrazów starocerkiewno-słowiańskich i terminologii cerkiewno-teologicznej. Warszawa, 1983.
- S t r a c h, S. Szkolny słownik cerkiewnosłowiańsko-polski. Hajnówka, 1996 (edition reissued: Hajnówka, 1999).
- Z n o s k o, A. Słownik cerkiewnosłowiańsko-polski. Adjustacja, opracowanie ortografii części cerkiewnosłowiańskiej, korekta tekstów cerkiewnosłowiańskich i ekwiwalencji znaczeniowej części polskiej słownika, uzupełnienie haseł: ks. protojerej Stanisław Strach. Białystok, 1996.
- W ą t r ó b s k a, H. Słownik staro-cerkiewno-rusko-polski. Kraków, 2010.
- S t r a c h, S. (Eustachy). Składnia języka cerkiewnosłowiańskiego okresu nowożytnego z podręcznym słownikiem cerkiewnosłowiańsko-polskim. Ząbkowice Śląskie, 2012.

DICTIONARIES AND TERMINOLOGICAL LEXICA

- Ma ł e k, E., J. W a r z y ń c z y k. Mały słownik terminologiczny folkloru i literatury staroruskiej. Łódź, 1991; 2nd ed. revised and completed with modified title: Mały słownik terminologiczny literatury, folkloru i kultury staroruskiej. Łódź, 1995.
- M a r k u n a s, A., T. U c z i t e l. Terminologia kościelna. Mały słownik opisowy polsko-ukraiński i ukraińsko-polski. Poznań, 1995.
- M a r k u n a s, A., T. U c z i t e l. Лексикон христианства русско-польский и польско-русский – Leksykon chrześcijaństwa rosyjsko-polski i polsko-rosyjski. Poznań, 1999.
- M a r k u n a s, A., T. U c z i t e l. Popularny słownik sakralizmów polskich i ukraińskich. Poznań, 2001.
- P o k o r z y n a, E. Słownik terminologiczny wyposażenia świątyń obrządku wschodniego z przydatkiem ikon maryjnych (=Biblioteka Muzealnictwa i Ochrony Zabytków. Seria B. T. 103). Warszawa, 2001.
- L e w i c k i, R. Христианство. Русско-польский словарь / Chrześcijaństwo. Słownik rosyjsko-polski. Warszawa, 2002.
- S m y k o w s k a, E. Ikona. Mały słownik. Warszawa, 2002; 2nd ed.: 2008.
- S m y k o w s k a, E. Liturgia prawosławna. Mały słownik. Warszawa, 2004; 2nd ed.: 2008.
- S m y k o w s k a, E. Zwyczaje i obrzędy prawosławne. Mały słownik. Warszawa, 2006; 2nd ed.: 2008.
- S m y k o w s k a, E. Prawosławni święci. Mały słownik. Warszawa, 2008.

MYSTAGOGIES AND LITURGICAL COMMENTARIES (GLOSSARIES APPENDED TO EDITIONS)

- Nowe Tablice czyli o cerkwi, liturgii, nabożeństwach i utensyliach cerkiewnych. Objaśnienia Beniamina arcybiskupa Niżnego Nowogrodu i Arzamasu (wybór). Przeł. I. Petrov. Kraków, 2007 (Słownik liturgiczny. Opr. G. Minczew, 271–288).
- Symeon z Tessaloniki. O świątyni Bożej. Przeł. A. Maciejewska. Kraków, 2007 (Słownik terminologiczny. Opr. G. Minczew, 95–109).

THE SERIES *BIBLIOTEKA DUCHOWOŚCI EUROPEJSKIEJ* (APPENDED GLOSSARIES)

- Kult Świętego Mikołaja w tradycji prawosławnej. Wybór i opr. A. Dejniewicz. Gniezno, 2004 (Słowniczek. Opr. I. Lis, 119–129).
- Święty Benedykt w tradycji chrześcijaństwa Zachodu i Wschodu. Wybór i opr. A.W. Mikołajczak, A. Naumow. Gniezno, 2006 (Słowniczek. Opr. I. Lis, 172–187).
- Franciszek Skoryna z Połocka. Życie i pisma. Wybór tekstów, przekład i oprac. M. Walczak-Mikołajczakowa, A. Naumow. Gniezno, 2007 (Słowniczek. Opr. I. Lis-Wielgosz, 219–227).
- Uczniowie Apostołów Słowian. Siedmiu Świętych Mężów. Opr. M. Skowronek, G. Minczew. Kraków, 2010 (Słownik terminów liturgicznych i teologicznych. Opr. G. Minczew, M. Skowronek, 209–213).

СТАРОЦЪРКОВНОСЛАВЯНСКО-ПОЛСКИ УЧЕБНИЦИ, ГРАМАТИКИ И РЕЧНИЦИ

(Резюме)

Статията съдържа коментиран преглед на всички познати старобългарско-полски и църковнославянско-полски речници, граматики, учебници и други научни, учебни и преводачески помагала, отпечатани преди всичко през XX и началото на XXI в. Авторите се спират по-подробно върху най-важните и най-популярни в университетската преподавателска дейност публикации, през дълги години и до днес използвани в полските славистични средища (за всички области на славянската филология – включително русистика и полонистика).

Отделно се коментират лексикографски и лексикографско-енциклопедични трудове, предназначени за поляци, които могат да бъдат използвани в превод от старобългарски (и неговите по-късни редакции) на полски, като се отбелязват характерните им методологични черти и разлики в подхода към тълкуването на езика и реалиите на *Slavia Orthodoxa*.

Представянето е придружено от подробно библиографско приложение, в което са изброени всички печатни издания на полски език (заедно с информация за тяхното преиздаване).

*Агата Кавецка, Иван Петров, Малгожата Сковронек,
Лодзки университет*