

ÜBERSETZUNGSKULTUREN DER FRÜHEN NEUZEIT VOLUME 13

Elena Parina / Dagmar Bronner (Eds.)

Contents of Faith in Transfer

Texts and Contexts of Early Modern Catechism Translations

OPEN ACCESS

1682

J.B. METZLER

Übersetzungskulturen der Frühen Neuzeit

Volume 13

Series Editors

Peter Burschel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel; Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen Göttingen, Germany

Regina Toepfer, Lehrstuhl für deutsche Philologie, Sprecherin / Spokesperson des SPP 2130, Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany

Jörg Wesche, Neuere Deutsche Literatur und Digital Humanities Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany

Elena Parina • Dagmar Bronner
Editors

Contents of Faith in Transfer

Texts and Contexts of Early Modern Catechism Translations

1682 J.B. METZLER

Editors
Elena Parina
Institut für Anglistik, Amerikanistik und Keltologie
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn
Bonn, Germany

Dagmar Bronner
Institut für Anglistik, Amerikanistik und Keltologie
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn
Bonn, Germany



ISSN 2661-8109 ISSN 2661-8117 (electronic)
Übersetzungskulturen der Frühen Neuzeit
ISBN 978-3-662-72537-5 ISBN 978-3-662-72538-2 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-72538-2

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

Gefördert durch die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) – SPP 2130. / Funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) – SPP 2130.

Diese Publikation ist an der Universität Bonn entstanden und wurde durch den Open-Access-Publikationsfonds der Universität Bonn finanziert. / This publication originated at the University of Bonn and was supported by the Open Access publication fund of the University of Bonn.

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2026

This book is an open access publication.
Open Access This book is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.
The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Einbandabbildung: Logo des DFG-Schwerpunktprogramms: Übersetzungskulturen der Frühen Neuzeit

Editorial Contact: Oliver Schuetze
This J.B. Metzler imprint is published by the registered company Springer-Verlag GmbH, DE, part of Springer Nature.
The registered company address is: Heidelberger Platz 3, 14197 Berlin, Germany

If disposing of this product, please recycle the paper.

Chapter 8
Translation Quality Assessment in Theological Translation: The Case of the 1585 Middle Ukrainian Translation of the Little Catechism by Peter Canisius

Taras Shmiher

8.1 Introduction

Theological translation is a branch of religious translation and is often overshadowed by other fields, such as biblical and liturgical translation, in terms of academic research and attention. By its nature, it bears similarities to sci-tech translation, as its primary motivation lies in verifying the applicability of terminology. The asymmetrical semantic correspondence and cultural loading of terms continue to challenge translators, but, much like in political discourse, the precision and exactness of terminology in religious discourse can sometimes be flexible. This flexibility often depends on the ontological conditions of the reading communities, which shape their distinct experientiality and interpretation.

The focus of this paper is on the features, challenges, deviations, losses, and gains involved in translating key terms from the 1585 translation, aimed at the Orthodox population of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, of Peter Canisius's Roman Catholic catechism (written in Latin and published in 1558). As a *tertium comparationis*, the English-language terminology is also examined in the 1633 translation published in France. The specific aims of the study are twofold: (1) to explicate the challenges associated with using a term system to represent a community's cultural experience in intercultural communication (as based on the lexical network 'sin'); and (2) to evaluate the problems of rendering political and institutional associations which appeared in religious discourse because of historical dynamics (via the prism of the terms describing the macroimage of the Church).

T. Shmiher (✉)
Кафедра перекладознавства і контрастивної лінгвістики імені Григорія Кочура, Львівський національний університет ім. Івана Франка, Львів/Lviv, Ukraine
e-mail: taras.shmiher@lnu.edu.ua

© The Author(s) 2026

E. Parina, D. Bronner (eds.), *Contents of Faith in Transfer*, Übersetzungskulturen der Frühen Neuzeit 13, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-72538-2_8

8.2 Preliminary Prerequisites: A Catechism as a Text

Authorship of catechisms is regarded differently to that of any literary or academic text. In the absence of a copyright, the truth is the focus of its production. This view leads us to ask ourselves: what do we expect from the existence of a given text? Elisabeth Wennö once proposed dividing the strands of the exploration of criticism into two major ones: evaluation and knowledge.[1] Appreciation—the cultivation of artistic taste and attention to credibility—is to be rejected, as theologians typically never strive for beauty in doctrinal texts. Unsurprisingly, clarity takes precedence over aesthetics.

Knowledge is truly the parameter that canonists wish to see in both the written text and the oral exegesis of the same text later among the faithful. Wennö has proposed viewing knowledge as either "criticism as explanation" (seeing a text as a cultural phenomenon and as a linguistic phenomenon) or "criticism as interpretation" (treating a text as a sign system (a structure of potential meanings) and as an interpreter (models for understanding reality)).[2] In liturgical translations, priests usually forget about the gap between potential meanings in a secular speaker's mind and in a priest's mind. Similarly, priests underestimate the relevance of the doctrinal models among the faithful. It is important to determine whether the catechetical text creates more problems like this or whether it simplifies some challenges.

For Wennö, the awareness of interpretation coincides with meaning and manipulation,[3] a fundamental principle for theological translation, though other concepts—the awareness of signification, history, and form—should not be overlooked. Meanwhile, as Leszek Jakoniuk has stated, "translations do not exhaust the interpretative potential of the original text, hence the process of searching for the meaning of the original never really ends".[4]

Researchers of translated catechisms do not always pay sufficient attention to the voluminosity of the term 'literal'. Some think that a word-for-word translation is already a satisfactory criterion for judging deviations in catechism translations.[5] In part, they are absolutely right: by containing no omissions or serious deviations, the original idea and intention are preserved. Yet, it is imperative to remember that there are multiple cultural interpretations of even the most basic terms and phenomena. A reading community's experience decides a lot.

Insightful theoretical principles and analytical tools for exploring a catechetical text have been developed in previous research:

1. Reading as an individual act of encountering a text incorporates the assessment of a literary text along with exegetical techniques. The existential perspective of

[1] Wennö (2000), pp. 256–257.

[2] Wennö (2000), pp. 256–257.

[3] Wennö (2000), p. 262.

[4] Jakoniuk (2017), p. 336.

[5] Cf. Neuser (2009), pp. 683, 696.

reading in the context of religious experience deepens the gap between construing and explicating.[6] Various text-oriented metaphors can assist in decoding implicit, hidden, and far associations.

2. As a shared semantic structure, *sacrum* (the transcendent and inviolable experience and belief, often connected to memory, emotion, and symbolic significance) transcends the historical religion and is a constructed definition, imposed on an entire society.[7] It shapes "the modality of belief",[8] which can be interpreted via verbal codes and common cultural presuppositions.
3. A value as a textual parameter is a sense which defines the reader's perception and imagination. In translation, axiological modelling determines how a translator restructures the source-text lexical microsystem deliberately or unintentionally (depending on the cultural conditions) according to the accepted values.[9]
4. The social representation of religious concepts is well elucidated by Ślósarz's conception of "ideological matrices",[10] i.e. a collection of acquired judgements, coded values, and semantic networks or mappings embedded in secondary texts, which are derived from specific literary and broader primary sources. Within this framework, there is an intermediary space that bridges the microsystem of terms as well as facilitates the interpretation of particular contexts and the discourse-level value system. This intermediary space encompasses the value system inherent in the central theme of a text, bestowing upon it a distinct and unique identity.[11]
5. In order to discern the axiological connotations associated with the semantic portrayal of the institutional representation of the Church, it is fitting to employ the conceptualisation of linguistic and cultural space as a model for interpretation.[12] Given that language constructs the human experience by shaping a value-laden version of reality through linguistic perception[13] and that the matrices encompass linguistic and cultural space as a framework for interpreting semantic systems and cultural texts,[14] the concept of spatial coordination prompts analysts to explore both proximate and distant associations in interpreting specific lexemes (terms). Hence, it is advisable to distinguish between immediate associations and related concepts associated with a given term.[15]

[6] Regiewicz (2016), pp. 14, 24.

[7] Hervieu-Léger (2007), p. 74.

[8] Hervieu-Léger (2007), p. 104.

[9] Shmiher (2019), p. 214; Шмігер (2018), pp. 309, 311.

[10] Ślósarz (2013), p. 15.

[11] Shmiher (2019), p. 222; Шмігер (2018), p. 337.

[12] Андрейчук (2011), pp. 85, 87.

[13] Андрейчук (2011), p. 89.

[14] Андрейчук (2011), p. 102.

[15] Shmiher (2019), p. 225; Шмігер (2018), p. 344.

8.3 Preliminary Prerequisites: The History of the Texts

This paper draws attention to *A Little Catechism for Catholics*, published by St Dr. Peter Canisius in 1558.[16] It was so popular that it was immediately translated into many languages and numerous editions were published. The Slavs could read it in two versions: the 1583 translation was impacted by the Croatian language and, thus, limited to use among southern Slavs; the 1585 translation was aimed at eastern Slavs.[17]

By the 1580s, a number of catechisms had been introduced to Roman theology. The popularity of catechisms distributed by the Jesuits was motivated by the very nature of this religious order. Antje Flüchter has observed that "the Jesuits are both global and local: As an order, it is a global actor, and with many members in virtually all parts of the world, this order consists of a multitude of local actors who interact with one another, as well as with the global network".[18] The potential translation of Canisius's catechism emerged as a tool that could help the Jesuits spread Roman Catholicism and was inspired and commissioned by Cardinal Antonio Possevino. This study focuses on the translation published in 1585. Surprisingly, this edition, published in Vilnius, 'ideally' reflects the practice of rendering the author and the translator invisible. The complete title of the pamphlet is *A Catechism or A Very Beneficial Instruction for All Orthodox Christians*. It contains no information about the author or the translator, but it does mention that it was published "with the permission of the Elders".

Little is known about the identified translator, Vasyliy Zamaskyi, as reliable data about his life are difficult to find. Adam Fałowski did his best to reconstruct the translator's biography,[19] but much of this information is more hypothetical than factual. What is known for certain is that Zamaskyi was one of Possevino's two interpreters. Since the other was the "Lithuanian" Andrzej Połoński, and Zamaskyi was a "Ruthenian",[20] the typical system of ethnonyms in this region in the early modern period provides a solid basis for assuming that Połoński was actually Belarusian (ethnically, locally, from today's perspective), and Zamaskyi was really Ukrainian.

A contemporary reader might wonder why a Slavonic book was published in Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, where the majority of residents did not speak any Slavonic language. However, in the Middle Ages and a bit later, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania did write in the language of the medieval state of Kyiv and of Halych and Volyn (both states were officially named 'Rus') after the duchy incorporated most of the Ukrainian ethnic territories and all of the Belarusian ethnic areas as part of its expansionist policies. As a result, Vilnius became the official capital for the

[16] For citation, the text used is Canisius (1817).

[17] Fałowski (2003), pp. 14–16, 24–25. The main text for citation is Канизій (1585).

[18] Flüchter (2017), p. 10.

[19] Fałowski (2000).

[20] Fałowski (2000), p. 43.

Ukrainians and the Belarusians (at least until 1569) and their important cultural centre (for much longer). Some researchers consider all documents produced in Vilnius to have been written in the Old Belarusian language; sometimes, they like to include writers who were pure Ukrainian ethnically but published their writings in Vilnius. This approach has no solid, serious basis: the linguistic system of speech in the chancery of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania came from the chanceries of the states of Kyiv and Halych and Volyn,[21] although it indeed acquired some local features in local chanceries.[22]

The language of the catechism under consideration is the contamination of the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic (predominantly) and the Middle Ukrainian chancery language (some features). The early modern Ukrainian reader certainly decoded the text of the catechism according to their current concepts, although older semantic entities—like those from the eleventh to thirteenth century—were more voluminous and polysemantic.

Examining the very text of the catechism, Fałowski equated two terms: "Western Ruthenian" and "Belarusian".[23] From the viewpoint of Belarusian readers, this equation makes sense, since they deciphered the very text by means of their individual—and, thus, Belarusian-oriented—concepts. Similarly, it is correct to apply the experience of Ukrainian readers when decoding the same text, which they were also able to understand. Still, from the wider perspective of historical linguistics, it is more insightful to refer to the older variant of the language as it appeared in chanceries in Rus' (also known as Kyivan Rus') in order to show the dynamics of historical semantics. What should be reiterated is the fact that the dominant linguistic form of the catechism is the Church Slavonic form, originally shaped in Kyiv (though it is the altered variant of the Old Church Slavonic or Old Bulgarian language). It is also worth remembering that the Old Church Slavonic language and its later recensions were shaped under the strong influence of the Byzantine Rite and the Patristic Greek. The target audience was predominantly Orthodox, i.e. they worshiped according to the Byzantine Rite.

This is why we turn our attention to the average Middle Ukrainian speaker, whom the text was directed at and whose mentality it would ultimately impact, in our verification. The most helpful dictionaries for interpreting the texts under study are historical and partially etymological.[24]

To better study the civilisational milieu of early modern Europe as well as its linguistic reverberations and consequences, one more text is considered in this exploration: the 1633 English-language translation published in France.[25] Canisius's catechism was a popular book in Britain, too. Four English editions, one Lowland

[21] More debate in Гумецкая (1965); Мойсієнко (2005).

[22] I believe that, in Renaissance Europe, Neo-Latin stayed in the same position: Neo-Latin is not part of Italian, French, or Spanish, but European authors who wrote in Latin must have applied concepts from their vernaculars in Latin texts.

[23] Fałowski (2003), pp. 41, 57.

[24] All the dictionaries used are listed in a separate section of the bibliography in this paper.

[25] Canisius (1633).

Scots version, and one Welsh edition were published in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[26] Unfortunately, this translation is anonymous, but it will serve as a *tertium comparationis* for contrasting the Latin and Ukrainian linguacultures.

8.4 Sins and Their Ethnical Interpretations via the Prism of Translation

Viewing a term system as a representation of a community's cultural experience, one should identify the central term as well as the boundaries of a lexical network. It is easy to see that in the moral interpretations of catechetical teaching, the key term is 'sin', but its classifications are more diverse and astute than an average believer might think. Canisius debated all the relevant terms in Chapter 5 of his *Little Catechism*.

The key term 'sin'. The definition and comprehension of the core term establish the patterns of interpretation for further derivative and hyponymic terms (semantic is collected from the following dictionaries: OLD; Medieval Latin; Срезневскій; Словник; OED):

The definition of 'sin' in Latin, Ukrainian, and English		
Peccatum	Грѣхъ[a]	Sin[b]
an error, mistake	Old Ukrainian: an error, mistake (miss the target)	a transgression of the divine law
a moral offence, misdemeanour, lapse	a violation of some religious and moral dogmata	an offence against God
Medieval: sin	misdemeanour, crime	a violation (esp. wilful or deliberate) of some religious or moral principle
	guilt	'for my sins' is freq. Employed in a trivial or jocular way
	a vice	

[a]Church Slavonic and Middle Ukrainian words are typed not in the Church Cyrillic script but in the Civil Cyrillic script for the sake of simplified typographical conventions.
[b]English spellings are modernised for the sake of easier reading and verification in today's dictionaries.

The origin of the 'sinful behaviour' lies in erratic acts: physically, an archer misses the target; socially, a person occasionally offends another person. This logic of development towards wrong moral behaviour is visible in the ancient and medieval usage of Latin.

In Old Ukrainian, however, the relevant lexeme was still ambiguous: it contained the idea of occasional or unintentional wrongdoing, but this word already came to represent crime, guilt, and vice in Middle Ukrainian.

[26] Walsham (2015), pp. 300–301.

The English counterpart was always oriented toward 'a transgression of the divine law'. The reason for this is known from its etymology: the Latin *peccatum* was not borrowed in English. The Germanic stem, however, is linked to another Latin lexeme, *sons* (Skeat; OED), which signified 'a guilty person'. This is why the flair of legal judgement is so well recorded in all relevant historical contexts.

This predisposition shapes the lines of perception among laypeople, depicting God more as a strict father or a nurturing parent. George Lakoff called it "two models of Christianity",[27] and this dichotomy partially overlaps with the contradiction of the doctrines of the Western and Eastern churches.[28] The search for a moral authority, which demands punishable obedience to strict commandments, is opposed by the presence of a nurturer who advances no strict rules but rather empathy and compassion for the benefit of others.[29] These mental conditions shape the religious mentality of believers and their wish to transform it under external circumstances.

Qualitative types of sins. The catechism resembles a textbook on theology, and it has elements of purely academic taxonomies and visions. It is not surprising that the necessity to introduce term systems sporadically appears, and sins are even given several classifications. One of them reveals the essence of Christian salvation, which is rooted in the Fall of Man (dogmatically, it was a human transition from the state of innocent obedience to God to that of guilty disobedience, as described in Genesis 1–3). This is how the 'initial–recurrent' dichotomy arose:

The dichotomy of 'initial–recurrent' sins in Latin, Middle Ukrainian, and English		
originalis[a)]	первородный	original
actualis	оучинъковый	actual

[a]Although the Latin *peccatum* uses the neutral gender, the decontextualised examples of adjectives are masculine.

The etymological semantics are very clear in Latin: *originalis* indicates something which took place at the beginning; *actualis*, which developed in the Middle Ages and meant 'practical' (a result of praxis), derived from *actus*, which stood for both an action and a behaviour, especially a moral way of life (Medieval Latin). So, biblical history perfectly superimposed its dogmata upon the existing cultural matrix. *Originalis* began referring to the sin once committed by Adam and Eve; *actualis* the sins regularly committed by humans.

Первородный is a compound noun, and its semantics are unambiguous: 'of the first genus/generation'. The historical or cultural (biblical) component is obvious, much more visible than in the Latin original. *Оучинъковый* is a successful equivalent denoting the result of a deed or act. This lexeme corresponds better to the vernacular, and it sounds good even to today's readers.[30] According to a slightly later

[27] Lakoff (2002), pp. 245–262.

[28] One case is the different interpretation of the theological concept 'grace'. See more in Шмігер (2018), pp. 174–177.

[29] Lakoff (2002), p. 260.

[30] Cf. Ґізель (2012), p. 93.

theological treatise by the Ukrainian Orthodox (although ex-Socinian) theologian Innocent Gizel (Giesel) (1669), the relevant term is *дѣлательный*, which is more oriented towards the Church Slavonic heritage (although it is semantically clear as well).

The English equivalents derive from Latin and—more importantly—Latin-language Christianity. The expression 'original sin' does not initially depend much on the evident semantics (even the semantics of the term 'birth sin' are more pronounced (OED)), but the long and active cultural use of this phrase has long made it the best acceptable term. Similarly, the term 'actual' comes from Latin Christian dogmatics, and its borrowing created an exact equivalent, which was already well incorporated into the system of other senses (like 'practical', 'active', 'typical').

The relationship with God is encoded in the dichotomy of mortal and venial sins (table below). 'Mortal' is not seen as the cause of actual human death, but it reveals the significance of such acts after physical death (similarly, the 'mortal' sacraments are baptism and communion because they turn humans into citizens of God's state). 'Eternal death' and 'the death of a soul' do not appear to be suitable expressions, as death relates to a living organism (i.e. our body) but not to our spiritual emanation. The idea of a relationship with God is more justified, as it shows that some sins cause a separation from God's saving grace, and some do not.

The dichotomy of 'mortal–venial' sins in Latin, Middle Ukrainian, and English		
mortalis	смертнїи	mortal
venialis	повсѧдныи	venial

The Latin lexeme *mortalis* unquestionably requires an additional theological explanation. In ancient times, it meant 'subject to decay, perishable' (OLD) and could be overinterpreted as 'the destruction of the very sin'. In the Middle Ages, it elaborated the senses of 'entailing capital punishment' and '(specifically of a sin) causing perdition' (Medieval Latin). Yet, the stress of separation from God after death is not vivid. The word *venialis* is directly connected to kindness and forgiveness, and its medieval senses are 'pardonable' and 'admissible'. The degree of gravity is greatly lessened, and more hope is in this word in terms of improving one's moral behaviour.

In Old Ukrainian, the lexeme *съмьртнъıи* denoted both 'subject to death' and 'causing death', and the Middle Ukrainian word *смертный* retained the sense of causing death. This sense portrays the essence of this sin type ideally. The word *повсѧдныи*, however, is not recorded in the historical dictionaries. It may be an occasional neologism or a hybrid of the Polish *powszechny* ('universal') and the Middle Ukrainian *повсюдный* ('common'). Accordingly, it may have meant 'common' or 'frequent' (thus 'lesser' and 'minor').

Since the English correspondent terms were borrowed from Latin, the necessary senses were transferred from the source linguaculture into the target linguaculture, and they created no issues for translators.

Another attribute is provided to emphasise the main status of several sins:

The 'capital' sin in Latin, Middle Ukrainian, and English		
capitalis	главный	capital

The original Latin lexeme is really powerful: it immediately refers to the death penalty and capital punishment (OLD). Later, it acquired emotionally neutralised senses, such as 'foremost', 'central', and 'prominent vassal' (Medieval Latin), though they cannot be considered to be senses without power and emotion.

Etymologically, the Ukrainian word *главный* repeats the Latin semantic logic, but it lacks the association with capital punishment. In the modern era, the English counterpart adds further semantic components associated with the financial sphere. This extension gives some reason to believe that the meaning was narrower and more focused on the severity of punishment. While it has retained the necessary sense today, its borders with the other sense are blurred and intertwined, minimising the power of the traditionally proven associations.

Surprisingly, these taxonomies represent Catholic and Protestant theology, but not today's Orthodox theology. From a historical perspective, it makes sense to assume that some ideas were developing in Catholicism and were brought to Protestantism naturally. This is why it is astonishing that these taxonomies are found in Innocent Gizel's 1669 theological treatise *God's peace with man*. Perhaps the author's Protestant background influenced his views, but as he converted to Orthodoxy and kept a crucial ecclesiastical position, his views still mirrored the official dogmata of the Kyivan Metropolitanate.

Sins and their network. The following group of sins does not represent a theological taxonomy. Rather, the aim is to identify whether their names possess any local—ethnic or national—semantic components or typical associations. The most important thing to remember is that a sin is an act; thus emotion or attitude must have an 'action-oriented' interpretation:

The network of sins in Latin, Middle Ukrainian, and English		
superbia	гордость	pride
avaritia	лакомъство	covetousness
luxuria	нечистота	luxury
invidia	зависть	envy
gula	объѣдение	gluttony
ira	гнѣв	anger
acedia	лѣность	sloth
desperatio	тоуга	desperation
obstinatio	жестосѣръдиє	obstinate stubbornness
impænitentia	нѣтруженїе	impenitence

Superbia is based on arrogant behaviour, especially arrogance and haughtiness, which derive from some action or possession. From this semantic perspective, the Latin and English terms are very close, almost identical. The Old and Middle Ukrainian word *гордость* was more sin-oriented than the modern variant *гордість*, which is also treated positively. It meant arrogance and haughtiness and was coupled with the absolute synonym *гордыня*, whose meaning has not changed since then. The latter lexeme is a better term today but was equally suitable in the sixteenth century.

Gizel identified four types of pride: selfishness, arrogance, love for power, and vanity. These types of behaviour are based on elevated self-esteem, and they perfectly portray sinful activity.[31] The etymological background of this term will not provide the reader with much new information.

In its Latin origin, *avaritia* lies somewhere between 'greed for grain' and 'miserliness'/'meanness'. It is not surprising that its theological focus is on the culpable desire for undue possession (and other actions). It was well represented in the English lexeme 'covetousness'.

The Old Ukrainian term *лакомъство* signifies voluptuous behaviour; this shifted to greedy behaviour in Middle Ukrainian. Ideologically, it contains the concept of possessing something that belongs to someone else. However, the better term is *лихоимство* (in use since the eleventh century and applied by Gizel), which was associated with this sin.

Two senses of the Latin lexeme *luxuria* are sin-oriented: 'unruly behaviour with disregard for moral restraints' and 'excessive indulgence in good living'. These senses are quite broad, and the sexual component is present but not vivid. The contemporary English word 'luxury' is similarly semantically voluminous, but at the time of the translation, *luxury* had a precise sense of 'lust'. It is clear that the need to substitute 'luxury' for 'lust' gradually increased, and the latter term is dominant now.

The Old Ukrainian *нечистота* combined two, rather differing senses: 'wantonness and vices' as well as 'unclean and forbidden food'. In the Middle Ukrainian time, it was used for 'viciousness' (according to Pamvo Berynda's 1627 dictionary (Берында)). The early modern Ukrainian and English terms coincided with the etymological idea of the old Latin term, but theological requirements have since changed the understanding of it to imply sexual behaviour, and theologians have found more exact terms (like 'lust' and *хтивість*).

Invidia is a complex and complicated word to interpret. It encompasses 'ill will', 'spite', 'indignation', 'jealousy', and 'envy'. Today, readers are inclined to treat them as different concepts and phenomena. This Latin word incorporates all of them and has prompted various lines of interpretation. The theological idea is to signify the opposition to love as Jesus Christ formulated it in the Two Great Commandments ('love thy Lord' and 'love thy neighbour'). This is why the obsolete senses of the English word 'envy'—'malignant or hostile feeling; ill-will, malice, enmity' or 'active evil, harm, mischief'—corresponded well to the ancient concept of ill will and its practical implementations. This concept is identical in the Old and Middle Ukrainian term *зависть* and the New Ukrainian *заздрість*. Perhaps, the main problem of interpretation is caused by personal emotional experience.

The Latin word *gula* initially meant an organ of a human body: a throat. Figuratively, it designated the source of appetite and taste. Gradually, excessive appetite enabled the broader use of this phrase, contextually interpreted as a possibly immoral demeanour.

[31] Ґізель (2012), pp. 196–197.

The OED describes ‘gluttony’ as ‘the vice of excessive eating’ (which, in a way, excludes excessive drinking). The Old Ukrainian *объѣдениѥ* can be structured as a two-sense lexeme, where the meaning shifts from the broader sense of ‘saturation’ to the narrower sense of ‘edacity’. Thus, the historical associations of these terms could and can develop differing lines of interpretation between the orientation towards the body, the orientation towards eating, and the orientation towards saturation. The latter term seems to provide a better foundation for a semantic extension to the theologically defined standards of behaviour.

Ira can be defined as ‘rage’ or ‘violence’, and its sin-oriented interpretation may denote any brutal act constituting a malefaction. The obsolete English sense for ‘anger’ dating to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is ‘an act of producing pain and suffering’. Today’s current sense refers to ‘the active feeling provoked against the agent’. Logically, the feeling can materialise as a practical deed. The Ukrainian term is focused on a person’s emotional state, though the Middle Ukrainian term also contains the sense of ‘punishment’. Gizel has explained that the sin of anger lies in the indecent wish for vengeance.[32] This idea is not etymologically related to the primary term, and this is a severe concern when it comes to laypeople’s perception.

Acedia came from Greek; in the Middle Ages, it meant ‘mental weariness’ or ‘gloom’. Carelessness may be interpreted as sinful behaviour. The English lexeme ‘sloth’ and the Ukrainian *лѣность* stress physical or mental inactivity and are applicable when the subject exhibits disinclination to action, exertion, or labour. However, including it in the term system of sins requires a solid theological foundation.

Desperatio designates a state of such despair that all hope has been abandoned. Although it is typically associated with the deteriorated condition of one’s health, it also indicates apathy towards doing anything. Thus, humans do nothing for their salvation because they give up hope. In contrast, the great Ukrainian poet Lesia Ukrayinka’s poem “Contra spem spero” (1893) was largely inspired by the Christian ideology of creating and producing.

The English term ‘desperation’ is borrowed from the Latin word, and it is not surprising that it retained all the original senses: ‘hopelessness’ and ‘recklessness arising from despair’. The Middle Ukrainian *моуга* is not as emotionally fatiguing as its Old Ukrainian counterpart, which denoted ‘oppression’, ‘suffering’, ‘despair’, ‘grief’, and so on. It still underlines the emotional status more starkly than its behavioural associations and actions (compare the citation: “Потреба есть всегда молитися, а не тоужити собѣ” (‘It always needs praying instead of grieving’)[33]).

Obstinatio can be interpreted as ‘pertinacity towards good deeds, moral teaching or divine laws’. The English translator wanted to emphasise the behavioural feature with the tautological expression ‘obstinate stubbornness’. The Old Ukrainian term *жестосьрдиѥ* can be summed up as ‘harshness on the verge of cruelty’. Pamvo

[32] Ґізель (2012), p. 251.

[33] Тимченко (2002–2003), vol. 2, p. 403.

Berynda explained it with a nice metaphor: ‘stone-hearted’ (Берында). However, this vivid image requires profound theological commentary; otherwise, a layperson could also interpret it as ‘violent, hurting, careless, and self-indulgent behaviour’, which could portray another sin—that of impenitence.

Impœnitentia came from the awareness of not regretting what could be considered a deliberate act against divine laws in the name of evil. The definition of the English term ‘impenitence’ does echo the moral teaching of the above Ukrainian term *жестосѣрѣдиє*: ‘hardness of heart, obduracy’. Nevertheless, it focuses on the lack of repentance. The 1585 term *нѣтруженїе* is somewhat obscure. Fałowski deduced its meaning from the context,[34] but the search for associative, in-depth connections between labour and repentance appears to be unreliable, albeit not impossible. Another hypothesis might be that the diacritical abbreviation mark *titlo* applied to a different word combination. Additionally, the word might have been misprinted. Thus, this term could be read as *несъкроушениє*/*несокроушениє*, which is connected with a repentant moral state.

Sin and syntax. Several sins are described in the form of more extended expressions:

The extensive descriptions of sins in Latin, Middle Ukrainian, and English		
præsumptio de misericordia Dei vel de impunitate peccati	Всоуѣ надежда о милости Божїей або ли о ненаказанїи грѣху	presumption of the mercy of God or impunity of sin
agnitæ Veritatis impugnatio	Глаголанїе противоу оузънанъньє истинъны	impugning of the known truth
fraternæ charitatis invidentia	милѡсти братнеѧ заизренїе	envy of fraternal charity
homicidium voluntarium	моуже оубїиство доброволнє	wilful murder
oppressio pauperum, viduarum atque pupillorum	оутисненіе оубогіхъ, вдовіцъ ї сїротъ	oppression of the poor, widows, and orphans
merces operariorum defraudata	наемъ рѡботникомъ задѣръжанѡ	defrauding labourers of their wages

The contexts help laypeople to understand the main idea of sinful behaviour. Furthermore, these contexts are based on actions or deeds. Indeed, each word can offer some space for deviant interpretation. For instance, today, many believers—Ukrainians and Poles alike—interpret the last sin from the list as ‘the postponement of a payment’ when a withheld or unfair payment is clearly meant in the Latin phrase. In this way, the syntactic extension makes it possible to avoid the pitfalls of the typical ethnic and interpersonal experience.

Theology or culture. In the taxonomies of sins, one sin is especially culturally marked:

The sin of ‘sodomy’ in Latin, Middle Ukrainian, and English		
Peccatum Sodomiticum	грѣхъ садомъскїи	sin of Sodom

[34] Fałowski (2003), p. 78.

This refers to a specific historical place and event. The story of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (along with three more cities) has often been reiterated as an authoritative parable.

Today, this term is applied only in the context of same-sex intercourse between men. Originally, the Rabbinic tradition (e.g. the views of Rabbi Jehudah in the third century CE) accused the Sodomites of four types of sins: sexual immorality (quite a broad notion), sin with money (such as the refusal of financial help to the poor), blasphemy, and bloodshed.[35] The prophet Ezekiel (also quoted by Gizel[36]) described the sins of Sodom in this way: "Behold, this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom, pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness was in her and in her daughters, neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy" (Ezek 16:49).

It is unclear why Christian theologians opted for the sexual narrative of the parable, although this narrative offers profound insight: a society that is not built on mercy is doomed to perish. The violation of historicity is quite a recurrent phenomenon in religious discourse; it enables doctrine to prevail over the historical truth.

Together, these contemplations provide important insights into the understanding of a term system as a macroidea. The terms which derived from general words (a common word became a term or acquired a specific 'technical' sense) tend to be more broadly and abundantly interpreted among laypeople. This interpretation can be more emotional (more experience using the relevant term) and even more prone to misinterpretation and subjective heretical understanding.

The terms which appeared after the search for successful 'containers' of relevant dogmata are limited to imposed interpretation, but they are either borrowings or calques. This use creates a perceptual asymmetry when compared with different languages. Some terms are native to one culture and foreign to another, but in the end, the interpretation of dogmata by various reading communities is still different.

The coexistence of Church Slavonic and Middle Ukrainian terms (especially their identical forms) undeniably created a conundrum for those interpreting them. It is logical to presume that a layperson without deep theological awareness and without the knowledge of Church Slavonic substituted intentional Church Slavonic terms for their own contemporary concepts.

8.5 The Vision of the Church as a Political Institution

The Church is an institution of social control, and it is not surprising that its function and position were often intertwined with secular political powers. History is replete with examples of the fusion of two authorities, their rivalry, and the subjugation of one by the other. These approaches have shaped the political vision of the Church, which can be appropriately attributed to the explanation of Article 9 of the Apostles' Creed: 'the Holy Catholic Church' (Chapter 1 of the catechism).

[35] Loader (1990), pp. 239–240.

[36] Ґізель (2012), p. 278.

The key word is the very word *ecclesia*, which is typically translated with ready equivalents, but whose interpretations were quite vast:

The key term ‘church’ in Latin, Middle Ukrainian, and English		
Ecclesia	церковъ, храмъ	church

The semantic development of the Latin lexeme *ecclesia* moved from the human, community-centred aspect in antiquity (‘the assembly of the people; a meeting of the assembly’ (OLD)) to a much broader concept of the Christian world in the Middle Ages: ‘a congregation of Christians, a church’, ‘the congregation of all the Christians, the Church’, ‘Christendom’ (Medieval Latin). This interpretation is perfectly in keeping with the Creed, which promotes the idea of unifying all Christians in the world and creating one major, homogeneous community. Although the sense of the place (or building) where Christians congregate is also present, the idea of community certainly prevails.

The historical development of the ideological matrix of this concept in Ukrainian and English should ideally have been the same, but their semantic components and associations construct different patterns—slight in some semantic domains, grave in others. By applying the matrix principle, one can utilise fundamental attributes to define its features—aesthetic categories, ethical models, and ideological intentions.[37] On the basis of the lexicographic corpora, it is possible to interpret the value system of the lexemes *Ecclesia—церковъ/храмъ*—‘church’ as depicted in the following table.

The ideological matrix of ‘church’ in Latin, Middle Ukrainian, and English				
	Latin linguaculture	Ukrainian linguaculture		English linguaculture
	Ecclesia	церковъ	храмъ	church
Aesthetic categories	(non-visible?)	glory, beauty	perfection, treasury	glory
Ethical models	Christendom	justice, morality	sacredness	Christendom
Ideological intentions	community, power, monastic life	highest power, spiritual peace	house, worship, tabernacle, home	house, worship, community

These identified axiological codes help explain why the idea of ecclesiastical conversion and reconciliation transforms into the chaos of schism and heresy. Surprisingly, aesthetic associations are not so strong, as they can be easily traced in Ukrainian and English metaphorical contexts. The second surprising feature is the strong link to architecture: a building is just a building, albeit public and Christian (with certain exceptions). It is difficult to link symbols and buildings, but ‘home’ is another powerful symbol which can be attributed to ‘church’ (‘the home of God’ in Ukrainian linguaculture).

[37] Ślósarz (2013), p. 16; cf. Шмігер (2018), p. 349.

What unites medieval Latin and English linguacultures is their association with Christendom, which derived directly from the appreciation of the community. In the Ukrainian linguaculture, Christendom is not strongly encoded in the lexemes *церковъ* and *храмъ*. It is easy to conclude superficially that individualism and localism prevail over universalism, and there is indeed some evidence for this.

In today's speech, people do not seem to understand the term 'Catholic' according to its whole meaning, though even early translations offered some interesting options:

The term system 'Catholic' in the Latin, Middle Ukrainian, and English texts		
Catholicus	повселеннаѧ	Catholic
universalis	повселеннаѧ	universal
toto orbe diffusus	по всемоу мироу розширена	spread through the whole world
unus	єдиныи	one

Historically, this term was applied to the ancient Church, when it existed undivided, prior to the Great Schism of 1054, i.e. the separation of the Christian East and West. Later, it underlined historical continuity with the ancient Church and was claimed to be identical to it in terms of doctrine, discipline, orders, and sacraments. In the East European context, all 'Greek Catholic Churches', which were never ethnically Greek (Ukrainian, Slovak, Romanian, Hungarian, etc.), stress their universality through the term 'Catholic' (being officially part of the Roman Catholic Church) but retain their 'Greek' (Byzantine) Rite.

The terminological distinction between Catholic and Orthodox as representatives of the Roman and Byzantine rites began to evolve in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance. In the sixteenth century, the term 'Catholic' was still very powerful, but already ambiguous. It was so doctrinally important that the Roman and Byzantine churches eagerly deployed it in their rhetoric and writings. The Middle Ukrainian lexeme *католицкий* refers both to the Roman Church and to the Universal Church.

Etymologically, the earliest Latin meaning was 'general' (OLD), and gradually, the sense of 'general' was accompanied by two more senses, stressing the identity of the Roman Church: 'concerning the Roman Church' and 'conformable to Catholic doctrine' (Medieval Latin).

This word came to English from French sometime in the thirteenth century. Due to the Reformation, it acquired a sense strictly connected to the Roman Church, but this was one of many. In general, the meaning has more senses associated with universality. Astonishingly, the OED links a sense of the word 'catholic' to medication: 'universally applicable or efficient; spec. of medicines, remedies' (OED).

The Latin and English linguacultures drove the author and the English translator to employ more synonyms in order to reiterate the idea of ecclesiastical (doctrinal?) universality but also to avoid the ambiguity caused by the Roman identity. This is evidenced by the synonym *universalis*/"universal" and the synonymic attributive description *toto orbe diffusus*/"spread through the whole world". The Ukrainian translator utilised the same lexeme *повселеннаѧ*, for which there are two possible

reasons: either to avoid ambiguity or to emphasise universalism (perhaps even as propaganda for and legitimisation of the Roman Church among the faithful of the Byzantine Rite).

The final contextual synonym *unus* was intended to promote the indivisibility of the Church or of Christendom, and it was correctly rendered in both translations. Surprisingly, the Ukrainian translator never utilised the lexeme *соборнъıи*, which had the sense of 'universal' in the eleventh century (recorded in the Old Ukrainian Synaxarion of 1073) and belonged predominantly to the ecclesiastical sphere.

Judging by the synonymic variety, it is easy to deduce that the integrative function of religion—or of the specific church—was a decisive motive in this piece of the catechism. The Ukrainian translator might have endorsed the opinion of the 'Orthodox possession', where the Orthodox were expected to recognise their spiritual ties to the same doctrine and thus join the administration of the Roman Church. The same was true for the English translator, who effectively associated the country with the independent Anglican Church.

A serious conflict between religious speech and current speech arises when the social image of the Church is intertwined with concepts which are identical in administration and bureaucracy:

The administrative terms in the Latin, Middle Ukrainian, and English texts		
Caput	глава	head
Rector	владети (?)	governor
Sponsus	възлюблєнны	spouse
Vicarius Christi	в настоѧнїю исоусъ хв҃ѣ	Vicar of Christ
Divi Petri successor	на месцоу петровомъ	St Peter's successor

Associations enhance communication effectiveness by establishing shared reference points and mutual comprehension among individuals. Immediate associations reveal specific semantic characteristics and elements, forming what is referred to as the "inner horizon", whereas interconnected ideas enrich the thematic backdrop, referred to as the "outer horizon".[38] Political authority as an idea influences the conceptualisation of the relationship between a believer and God as a state and affects a believer's attitude towards theological issues.

Historically, the earliest Christian mentality was more teacher-oriented than now. The metaphorical background of the Latin lexeme *caput* encompassed the senses of 'the prime mover or leader; principal' and 'the leading person or persons; the capital; the headquarters' (OLD). Later, it developed the president-like or (royal) court-based sense: 'management', 'superior court', 'commander', and 'ruler' (Medieval Latin). In the context or sense of authority, the Middle Ukrainian *глава* evolved from the Old Ukrainian 'chieftain (of a tribe)' to a more complicated hierarchy-immersed 'principal'. This coexistence of senses pushes readers and listeners to interpret the most important person not only as a spiritual leader on the inner horizon, but also as a political ruler on the outer horizon. The overlap of the Church and

[38] Андрейчук (2011), p. 86.

the State fashioned the mixture of the desired group ethic (the author's intention) and the individual moral code (a reader's perception stained with their state-based attitude, which lacks high morality and pious sacredness).

Initially, the English lexeme 'head' also changed from a rather general sense of 'a person to whom others are subordinate; a chief, captain, commander, ruler, leader, principal person, head man' to more specific senses. The Early New English senses dealt with 'a principal of a college', 'position of leadership, chief command, or greatest importance', 'a collection of persons holding a position of command or leadership', and even 'a body of people gathered; a force raised, esp. in insurrection' (OED). In the context of government-centred discourse, the outer horizon of a reader's perception will cause current political concepts (and misconceptions) to overlap with ideas which are to be spiritual or religious without any connection to political reality.

This statement is especially true when interpreting the ancient Latin word *rector* (OLD):

a) 'the helmsman of a ship' (when life is often viewed as a sea, and God could assist us to rule our life best);
b) 'one who controls animals either as a rider or as a driver; a guide' (a very bright biblical reference);
c) 'a person in charge or control of others' (the value of responsibility for others prevails, a reasonable spiritual interpretation);
d) 'the ruler, governor, controller of an organised body/institution (applicable to the supreme deity or to a supreme military commander)' (this sense can still correlate with the feeling of *numinosum* among the faithful);
e) 'a preceptor, tutor, guide' (another reasonable spiritual interpretation).

In the Middle Ages, more radical social and political senses developed that make it difficult to discriminate a reader's potential associations from the author's intended ones:

a) 'a duke';
b) 'the foremost court dignitary';
c) 'the king's provincial official';
d) 'those who are in charge of the churches, like bishops and abbots';
e) 'an owner of a private church or monastery';
f) 'officials having the care of the material concerns of a church or monastery, managers of ecclesiastical estates' (Medieval Latin).

The noble motive of spiritual guidance is blurred by politically marked ideas.

The Ukrainian translator failed: the dominant senses of the lexeme *владети* (a verb [sic]) are 'to possess' and 'to dominate', which easily apply to the serf-like life of many Christians. It is not easy to see any spiritual guidance in ecclesiastical matters through the prism of this word.

The English translator identified the peril and picked a satisfactory equivalent, 'governor', which represents 'a steersman, pilot, captain of a vessel' (in accordance with the original etymological sense), 'one who governs, or exercises authoritative

control over, subjects or inferiors; a ruler' (a broad sense which covers spiritual and social aspects, including the sense of 'said of the Deity, or of the persons in the Trinity; also of a heathen divinity'), and 'an official appointed to govern a province, country, town, etc.' (OED). Similarly, it cannot be guaranteed that the 'political' outer horizon will not become the inner horizon in a given context, but at least in early modern times, the spiritual parameter of this text and lexeme was likely stronger than it is now.

Vicarius proved to be another hard nut to crack. Initially, it meant 'a person who acts in the place of someone, a substitute deputy' or 'a person who takes over from another, successor' (OLD). Gradually, it gained senses which more specifically refer to Christ, Christianity, or society: 'Christ, representing God', 'the pope, representing Christ/St Peter', 'papal legate', 'bishop', 'abbot acting as a viceregent of a bishop', 'altarist', 'royal official' (Medieval Latin). It used to be close to the neighbouring synonym *successor*: 'one who succeeds a person in an office; one who succeeds another as leader' (OLD).

The Latin background of the English helped the translator. The sense of 'one who succeeds another in an office, dignity, function, or position' successfully made its way into everyday English speech and was acceptable for early modern readers. In both languages, the ideas of hierarchy and office are obvious and could be decoded effortlessly.

The Ukrainian text lacks the parameter of the office-holder's position in the descriptive terms used: *настоѧнїѥ* (occasional word; contextually, 'in the position (standing) of'; an abstract noun) and *месце* ('place'; a metaphorical paraphrase). Perhaps the translator perceived shortcomings in the synonymic palette of relevant terms, or he intentionally changed the rhetorical texture. His message better suits the relations between a spiritual leader and followers or between a teacher and disciples. The official strictness of the original is lost anyway.

The word outside of the office-oriented term system is *sponsus*, which designates 'an affianced husband' (OLD; Medieval Latin) but is a deep traditional biblical metaphor (usually explained with the assistance of the "Song of Songs"). Unsurprisingly, the English lexeme "spouse" has such a desirable Christian sense: 'applied to God or Christ in relation to the Church (or its members) or to women of religion' (OED). The Old and Middle Ukrainian *възлюблєнны* (literally 'beloved') refers directly to Christian love and a community based on it. Although the original term has a family-centred character and is altered differently in the two translations, the spiritual intention is clear and not violated by additional political reverberations.

The 'narration' of the catechism is made dynamic by applying verbs:

The administrative verbs in the Latin, Middle Ukrainian, and English texts		
gubernare	?	govern
regnare	*царствоувати*	reign

After the Middle Ages, these two verbs were applicable to both guiding and political control. The verb *gubernare* primarily had broader meaning: 'to guide the course of, steer (a ship)', 'to direct, control, govern, administer' (OLD). Gradually, it acquired a sense that fit the political hierarchy: 'rule, sway' (Medieval Latin).

Similarly, the ancient senses of the lexeme *regnare* explicated the actions of exercising power: 'to rule as king, reign' and '(of gods) to enjoy supremacy' (OLD). Historically, its noun *regnum* transformed into the close and synonymic concepts 'majesty', 'realm', 'crown', and 'throne' (Medieval Latin). In English, the meaning is similarly polysemantic; it generates the understanding of the Church as both a spiritual tutor and a social institution. The tendency to opt for a spiritual or political sense depends upon the reader's predisposition as well as the immediate preconditions of a specific reading community (e.g. the influence of political events or philosophical meditations).

The Ukrainian text lacks a direct equivalent for one lexeme and deploys the verb *царствоувати* as an equivalent in the second case. This verb derived from the noun, which is etymologically a transformed form of the word 'Cesar'. The usage of this word invokes an interpretative question: what memory is the author or translator going to pass on? The lexeme 'Cesar' originates from an actual historical human, the Roman Emperor Gaius Julius Caesar (100–44 BCE). Thus, a doctrinal doubt arises as to whether it is proper to deploy a human-based word for describing the Divinity, especially when a word without human-oriented links or associations is available.

From the perspective of readers and researchers, sacredness is perceived either emotionally or logically, and it is conceptualised differently in liturgical and catechetical texts. The associative expressiveness of these texts is believed to influence—by either deepening or facilitating—the communication between a believer and God.

Ecclesiastical life is often referred to as a religious and political utopia,[39] but such a conceptualisation is historically evidenced by not only the complicated relations between the Church and the State but also efforts to construe a clear image of God's Kingdom. This is why the political parameter of ecclesiastical concepts has serious axiological potential to foster their interpretation and later incorporation into (or, alternatively, resistance to) the target nation's mentality.

8.6 Conclusions

In catechetical matters, translations serve as a tool for legitimising new denominations. A denomination becomes its 'own' religion or faith via translation. This could even be described as possession by translation. This is how the authority of a new tradition is established: the originally shared text becomes a communal asset, a shared good and value.

Like other theological texts, catechetical translations contribute to the expansion and homogenisation of historical and religious memory. They build a common background through a group moral code and attitude. In this way, they may initiate a new tradition, which, however, has to find its place alongside older traditions (even older beliefs and religions).

[39] Cf. Hervieu-Léger (2007), p. 131.

The importance of the doctrinal sense or interpretation prevails over the etymological, historical, and usual meaning. Still, at the same time, it threatens the semantic invariant of the word and the very act of information transfer. This is why it is so important to map the reader's or listener's potential perception matrix in order to avoid possible misunderstandings and deviations. The catechetical text in translation does not simplify the translator's job; as a basic text, it must convey the message clearly and precisely, without involving strange or unnecessary associations (which can lead to future misconceptions). The most elementary terms are usually very challenging, since they refer to the core and essence of a denomination or religion.

From a historical perspective, it is worth initially applying simplifying domestication strategies without the slightest cultural load. Later—by means of other texts or media—the translator can deploy more complicated—but theologically more correct or exact—vocabulary, which will be duly appreciated by target readers and listeners. The dynamics of translation evolve from initially domesticated versions, which prioritise simplicity and cultural familiarity, to more foreignised renditions that embrace the subtle complexities and nuances of the original text, often challenging the reader's expectations and understanding.

Bibliography

Sources

[Canisius, Petrus]. 1633. *An introdvction to the Catholick faith, containing a brief explication of the Christian doctrine; togeather with an easie method to examine the conscience for a general confession. Whereunto is added a dailie exercise of deuout prayers*. [Rouen]: I. Cousturier.

Canisius, Petrus. 1817. *Parvus catechismus catholicorum*. Mechlinia: Typis P.-J. Hanicq.

Ґізель, Інокентій. 2009. Мир з Богом чоловіку (1669). In *Вибрані твори*, Інокентій Ґізель, т. 1, кн. 2. Київ/Львів: Свічадо.

Ґізель, Інокентій. 2012. Мир з Богом чоловіку. Пер. з церковнослов. Р. Кисельова. In *Вибрані твори,* Інокентій Ґізель, т. 1, кн. 1, 55–475. Київ/Львів: Свічадо.

[Канизій, Петро]. 1585. *Катехизмъ или наоука всѣмъ православнымъ хр[и]стіѧномъ к повченїю велми полезно*. З латинскогѡ ѣзыка на роуский языкъ ново преложоно. Вільнюс: s.n.

Research Literature

Fałowski, Adam. 2000. Rusin Wasyl Zamaski i jego rola w próbie zjednoczenia Kościołów w okresie przed unią brezską. In *Harmonijne współistnenie kultury Wschodu i Zachodu na Ukrainie*, ed. Włodzimierz Mokry, 43–49. Kraków: Szwajpolt Fiol.

Fałowski, Adam. 2003. *Język ruskiego przekładu katechizmu jezuickiego z 1585 roku.* Kraków: Universitas.

Flüchter, Antje. 2017. Translating Catechisms, Translating Cultures: An Introduction. In *Translating catechisms, translating cultures: the expansion of Catholicism in the early modern world,* eds. Antje Flüchter, and Rouven Wirbser, 3–49. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Hervieu-Léger, Danièle. 2007. *Religia jako pamięć*, 2nd ed. Transl. Magdalena Bielawska. Kraków: Nomos.
Jakoniuk, Leszek Marius. 2017. The French and Polish Versions of the Catechism of the Catholic Church: An Examination of Certain Passages of the Catechism's teaching on the "Mysterium Ecclesiae" from a Philological and Translational Perspective. *Rocznik Teologii Katolickiej* 16(3): 317–338. https://doi.org/10.15290/rtk.2017.16.3.21.
Lakoff, George. 2002. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*, 2nd ed. Chicago/ London: The University of Chicago Press.
Loader, J[ames] A[lfred]. 1990. The sin of Sodom in the Talmud and Midrash. *Old Testament Essays* 3: 231–245.
Neuser, Wilhelm H. 2009. Die Übersetzung des Genfer Katechismus (1542/1545) ins Deutsche durch Zacharias Ursinus im Jahr 1563. *Koers* 74(4): 683–700.
Regiewicz, Adam. 2016. *Kerygmatyczne figury interpretacji*. Kraków: Universitas.
Shmiher, Taras. 2019. St. Petro Mohyla's Catechism in Translation: A Term System via the Prism of Axiological Modelling and Cultural Matrix. In *Languages – Cultures – Worldviews: Focus on Translation,* ed. Adam Głaz, 211–236. Cham: Springer Nature / Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28509-8_9.
Ślósarz, Anna. 2013. *Ideologiczne matryce lektury a ich konteksty: postkomunistyczna Polska, postkolonialna Australia*. Kraków: Universitas.
Walsham, Alexandra. 2015. Wholesome milk and strong meat: Peter Canisius's catechisms and the conversion of Protestant Britain. *British Catholic History* 32(3): 293–314.
Wennö, Elisabeth. 2000. Why Study Literature? In *The Evidence of Literature: Interrogating Texts in English Studies*, eds. Sven-Johan Spånberg, Henryk Kardela, and Gerald Porter, 255–264. Lublin: UMCS.
Андрейчук, Надія. 2011. *Семіотика лінгвокультурного простору Англії кінця XV – початку XVII століття*. Львів: Вид-во Львів. політехніки.
Гумецкая, Л. Л. 1965. Вопросы украинско-белорусских языковых связей древнего периода. *Вопросы языкознания* 2: 39–44.
Мойсієнко, Віктор. 2005. Про національний статус "руської мови" в часи Великого князівства Литовського та Речі Посполитої. *Мовознавство* 1: 67–82.
Шмігер, Тарас. 2018. *Перекладознавчий аналіз – теоретичні та прикладні аспекти: давня українська література сучасними українською та англійською мовами*. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка.

Dictionaries

Medieval Latin: *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. 1976. Composuit J. F. Niermeyer. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
OED: *Oxford English Dictionary*. 1989. 20 vols. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press.
OLD: *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. 1968. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Skeat, Walter. 1991. *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Берында, Павмо. 1627. *Лєѯіконъ славенорωсскїй и именъ тлъкованїє*. Київ.
Словник української мови XVI – першої половини XVII ст. 1994–. Львів: Інститут українознавства імені І. Крип'якевича.
Срезневскій, Измаилъ. 1893–1912. *Матеріалы для словаря древне-русскаго языка по письменнымъ памятникамъ*: в 3 т. Санктпетербургъ: Отделеніе Русскаго языка и словесности Императорской Академіи наукъ.
Тимченко, Евген. 2002–2003. *Матеріали до словника писемної та книжної української мови XV–XVIII ст.*: у 2 кн. Київ: Інститут української мови Національної академії наук України; Нью-Йорк: Українська Вільна Академія Наук у США.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

