



The Significance of Antitrinitarian Translations of the Bible into Polish in the Dialogue between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Eastern and Western Europe

RAJMUND PIETKIEWICZ 

Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Wrocław, pietkiewicz@pwt.wroc.pl

Abstract: The author of this essay poses the question about the significance of antitrinitarian translations of the Bible into Polish for the exchange of ideas and achievements of science between Eastern and Western Europe in the second half of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries. In an attempt to systematize various facets of this significance, the author will deal with the bibliographical and bibliological aspects of the editions of the Bible in the Polish language, the dynamics of the development of Polish antitrinitarian biblical translations and biblical editing against the background of the history of the Polish Brethren in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the sources of the translations and the influence they exercised in the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and abroad. The author's research made it possible to identify two directions of the exchange of ideas. The first direction is the reception in Central and Eastern Europe of the achievements of Western biblical philology and exegesis. The second is related to the Polish Brethren's contribution to Western Europe's science and culture. Particularly noteworthy here is the voice of Polish Antitrinitarians in the field of research into the criticism of the biblical text, although this impact was limited due to the language barrier. Of much greater importance were the translations of the Polish Brethren in the East (the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Muscovite lands), where the language barrier was less significant. They also popularized the philological and exegetical achievements of the West among the Karaites and Tatars of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Keywords: Antitrinitarians, Polish Brethren, Socinians, translations of the Bible into Polish (16th and 17th centuries), biblical philology

The period of the activity of Polish Brethren in the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth – that is, during the second half of the 16th and the first half of the 17th centuries – coincided with the unprecedented development of philological studies, with particular emphasis laid on the Holy Scripture texts.¹ Polish biblical translations were compiled by recourse to European philological and biblical literature. Biblical versions, translated in this way and regarded as popular and readable

The present paper has a basically similar version written in Polish: Pietkiewicz, “Polskie antytrynitarские przekłady Biblii.” The English version was financed from the subsidy for maintaining the research potential granted by Ministry of Science and Higher Education for 2018 (project “Biblia Polonorum,” No. 7/2018).

¹ Cf. Pietkiewicz, *In Search*.

books, became a tool for popularizing achievements of biblical philology and biblical studies of the period. Since in the 16th and 17th centuries, the greatest development of this type of research took place in Western Europe, we can regard Polish translations of the Bible to be the tools for popularization of the West's scholarly attainments in the Central and Eastern parts of the continent. Furthermore, if we consider the fact that, for instance, the development of Western European Hebrew studies drew on those conducted by Arab and Jewish scholars as early as the 10th century, then the scope of the above-mentioned exchange and dialogue between the East and the West will expand even more in terms of culture, geography and chronology.² The same is true of the studies on ancient Greek in Renaissance Europe, initially made mainly by refugees from Byzantium.³

While studying the phenomenon of cultural exchange, we should consider the influence of Polish translations which later became the foundation for the production of other Eastern and Western language versions. In an attempt to systematize the significance of Polish antitrinitarian translations of the Bible, Parts 1–5 of this essay will deal with their bibliographical and bibliological aspects (2), the dynamics of the development of Polish antitrinitarian biblical translations and biblical editing against the background of the history of the Polish Brethren in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (3), the sources of the translations (4), the influence they exercised in the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (5) and abroad (6).

The assessment of the influence of Polish Antitrinitarians poses a challenge. Undoubtedly, the phenomenon of the Polish Brethren, who acted as intermediaries in the cultural and academic dialogue between the West and the East, is an exceptional one and surely worthy of a closer look. However, we should remember that the evaluation of their influence, conducted from the point of view of orthodox Christianity (which professes the creed laid down by the first Ecumenical Councils), is decisively negative for dogmatic reasons. The author of this essay only makes an attempt to present – exclusively by way of description of the historical phenomenon – the significance of antitrinitarian translations of the Bible as tools of reciprocal influence exerted by different parts of Europe and distances himself from theological or denominational evaluation completely.

² Pietkiewicz, *In Search*, 23–98.

³ Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406) founded the first Department of Greek in 1396 in Florence. Greek scholar Manuele Crisolora (1355–1415), who came from Byzantium, was the first lecturer there in the years 1396–1400, whose role was described by Antonio Rollo (“Problemi e prospettive,” 85) as “il ponte tra due culture.”

1. Description and Appraisal of Sources

The first biblical impressions that can be considered antitrinitarian appeared just after the disintegration of the Reformed Church of Little Poland into the Antitrinitarian “Minor Church” (*Ecclesia Minor*) and the Reformed “Major Church” (*Ecclesia Maior*). These were two 1566 reprints of the Brest Bible: four Gospels in the form of Evangelical Harmony and The Acts provided with the commentary by Tritheist Tomasz Sokołowski (Tomas Falconius) (Falconius 1566; Falconius, Acts 1566).⁴

Subsequent translations were made by Szymon Budny (1530–1593). In 1570, he published *Księgi, które po grecku zową Apokryfa, to jest kryjome księgi* (*Books Which Are Called in Greek Apocrypha That Is Secret Books*) along with the New Testament (Budny 1570). The printer of the work, Daniel of Łęczycza (c. 1530–1600?), printed the largest number of sheets of the translation, which were distributed as a separate book with individual title pages and a colophon. The unsold sheets were used to produce the 1572 Nesvizh Bible, translated by Budny (Budny 1572). The typographer used 91% of the 1570 impression and printed only six new sheets containing fragments of the New Testament which differ in translation, punctuation and spelling.

Much the same can be said about Budny’s New Testament translation. The text appeared in 1574 (Budny 1574). Next – to enable the translator to introduce changes significant for the critical approach to the text and dogma (Budny renounced some of his radical views by 1589) – about 4.5% of the New Testament text was printed anew (three sheets), which when combined with those which remained from the 1574 edition, resulted in the 1589 version (Budny 1589). On account of the above, we cannot treat the 1570, 1572 and 1574, 1589 impressions as separate editions of Budny’s translations. The whole 1570 impression should be regarded as almost a part of the 1572 Bible, whereas the 1589 New Testament as a variant of the 1574 edition.⁵

In 1577, Marcin Czechowic (1532–1613) made a subsequent translation of the New Testament (Czechowic 1577), with the second edition appearing in 1594 (Czechowic 1594). Some studies and bibliographies assert that it was Walenty Niegalewski in Choroszów near Ostrog who in 1581 translated Czechowic’s text into vernacular Ruthenian.⁶ Unfortunately, the author of this article has neither managed to find a copy of that work nor confirmed this information.

The Antitrinitarians also used the translations made by the Evangelicals. In 1587, Aleksy Rodecki (?–1605) financed for his own purposes the second edition of the paraphrase of almost the entire Book of Psalms together with prayers, translated and elaborated by Reformed Evangelical Paweł Milejewski (?–before 1578) (Milejewski 1587). The date and place of the first edition remain unknown (Milejewski 1563).

⁴ Misiurek, “Falconius”; Górski, *Studia*, 129–130.

⁵ Pietkiewicz, “Nowe ‘pilne weźrzenie.’”

⁶ Kot, “Czechowic,” 308; Pollak, *Bibliografia literatury polskiej*, 107.

In 1606, the Racovian New Testament was published, which was the Czechowic version (Racovian 1606) reviewed by Walenty Szmalc (1572–1622), Hieronim Moskorzowski (1560–1625), and Jan Licinius Namysłowski (?–after 1633).⁷ The second edition appeared in 1620 (Racovian 1620). The third one was printed in Raków in 1638. Its printing was, however, discontinued when the Raków printing house was closed.⁸ The Racovian New Testament came out once again in 1686 in Amsterdam, edited by Jan Kreliusz (Racovian 1686). In 1630, a German version appeared (Racovian 1630) in Raków.⁹ Karol Estreicher connects the German edition elaborated by Jeremias Felbinger (1616–ca. 1690) and printed in Amsterdam in 1660 by Christoff Cunraden (d. 1684?) with the Raków text: “This edition is precious to us because Felbinger mostly sticks to the German translation printed in Raków, on which the Polish Socinian translation, which was printed in Amsterdam in 1686 draws.”¹⁰

The rhyming translation of the Book of Proverbs was compiled and published by Józef Domaniewski. His work appeared in two 1623 editions in Latin–Polish (*Proverbiorum* 1623) and exclusively Polish versions (*Przypowieści* 1623).

The community of Polish Brethren also produced Polish commentaries to biblical texts. The above-mentioned works of Falconius are an example. Walenty Szmalc also published his commentary on the Prologue to John’s Gospel (John 1:1–18). His work appeared in two editions in 1607 and 1613 (Szmalc 1607; Szmalc 1613). Unfortunately, it is extant only in German (Szmalc 1611) and Dutch translations.¹¹

2. Antitrinitarian Translations of the Bible against the Background of the History of Polish Brethren

The extent of the impact of biblical translations on a given religious community depends on whether the texts corresponded to the particular requirements of the recipient group. As far as the Polish antitrinitarian translations are concerned, their history runs concurrently with the troubled history of the Polish Brethren in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Budny’s translations were occasioned by the split of

⁷ This information comes from Szmalc’s diary on the planned meeting of the staff for February 19, 1606, which involved people mentioned above. The other source is a handwritten note put on a copy of National Library of Poland in Warsaw XVII.3.2713, which explicitly states that the team undertook the work of editing Czechowic’s New Testament (Czerniatowicz, “Niektóre problemy,” 86–87; Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Ariańskie oficyny*, 53).

⁸ Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Ariańskie oficyny*, 66.

⁹ Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Ariańskie oficyny*, 53, 197.

¹⁰ “O tyle nas zajmuje to wydanie, że Felbinger przeważnie trzyma się niemieckiego przekładu w Rakowie drukowanego – i że na nim opiera się przekład polski socyniański wydany w Amsterdamie 1686.” Estreicher (*Bibliografia polska*, 43) provides this information after Bock, *Historia Antitrinitariorum*, 349–352.

¹¹ Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Ariańskie oficyny*, 276.

the Reformed Church of Little Poland into two congregations. The Antitrinitarians disapproved of the translation of many passages of the Evangelical Brest Bible and, starting with the 1567 Synod of Skrzynno, held debates over its errors, paving the way for a new translation.¹² Budny's views on the unreliability of the witnesses to the New Testament text and his preference for the Latin Vulgate over the Greek original caused much controversy (of course, Budny translated from Greek; he only relied on the Vulgate for the passages which required critical approach).¹³

Marcin Czechowic's texts, which better suited the aspirations of the Antitrinitarian left wing, appeared in opposition to Budny's translation, which the Polish Brethren deemed very much controversial in terms of doctrine and the philological point of view. Thus, the works resulted from dogmatic and social disputes in the "Minor Church" in the 1570s and Czechowic's aspirations, as he wanted to take charge of the congregation.¹⁴

The 1578 arrival of Fausto Paolo Sozzini (1539–1604) (known in Poland as Faust Socyn) in Poland heralded a new epoch for the Polish Brethren. Over a few years of polemic between Marcin Czechowic and Jan Niemojewski (c. 1526/1530–1598) on one side with Faust Socyn on the other, the latter assumed leadership in the "Minor Church." He succeeded in suppressing doctrinal disputes and introducing tolerance of varied dogmatic views. The system he created put emphasis on the ethical dimension of religion and was permeated with rationalism. The new face of the antitrinitarian movement entailed the need to re-elaborate the New Testament, which now had to be purified of everything unclear or ambiguous and all allegory, but first and foremost of dogmatic views and interpretations which Socinians regarded as incorrect and misleading.¹⁵ The new direction taken by Socinians brought about a consecutive edition of the New Testament, compiled by the heirs to Fausto Sozzini's thought.

This cursory overview of the origin of the most important antitrinitarian Polish translations of the Holy Scriptures explains their popularity and, at the same time, delineates their impact. Each and every version was dedicated to a particular target group. Moreover, the atmosphere fraught with disputes and conflict, which accompanied their emergence, widened the circle of recipients who used the translations to combat their confessional opponents, who, in turn, were forced to address the argumentation contained in them, promoting a further exchange of views. Undoubtedly, those impressions attracted the attention of a large readership, enabling, at the same time, the reception of the expounded views and the sources from which they originated.

¹² Cf. Budny 1572, b1r–v; Merczyng, *Szymon Budny*, 48.

¹³ Cf. Budny 1574, c3v–6v; Budny 1589, c3v–5r; Frick, "The Biblical Philology," 334; Moszyński, "Biblia Szymona Budnego," 41–43.

¹⁴ Szczucki, *Marcin Czechowic*, 98.

¹⁵ Grabowski, *Literatura ariańska*, 306–307; Racovian 1606, *2r–3r.

3. Sources of Antitrinitarian Translations of the Bible into Polish

The sources of antitrinitarian translations of the Bible into Polish can be divided into two groups: (1) the texts of the Holy Scriptures constituting the basis for translation and (2) meta-text sources, i.e., annotations, commentaries, introductions, and other supplementary material accompanying a biblical text.

In the case of Thomas Falconius's works (Falconius 1566; Falconius, Acts 1566), the text and annotations are derived from the Brest Bible. Falconius used them to refer his readers to the same sources as the creators of the Brest Bible did: the New Testament in Greek,¹⁶ the Latin Bible (Geneva 1556–1557) of Robert Stephanus (1499–1559), which contained commentaries on the New Testament by Theodore Beza, and to Calvinist editions of the Bible in French (Genève: Nicolas Barbier – Thomas Courteau 1559).¹⁷ When it comes to the sources of the commentary, which is of pastoral and moralizing character, Falconius remains silent and does not reveal its sources. The chances are that these are his own elaboration compiled on the basis of sermons given at the court of Mikołaj “the Black” Radziwiłł (1515–1565).¹⁸

Szymon Budny's translations show the whole gamut of sources used by the translator. However, particular editions that he drew on are not easily identifiable as he gives a very vague description: Bible texts in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and also in the vernacular, writings of the Church Fathers plus ancient and contemporary Christian writers and commentators (Lorenzo Valla [1407–1457], Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus, and Theodore Beza).¹⁹ Using the Old Church Slavonic version as one coming from ancient sources was a novelty.²⁰ In his notes, Budny points to the works of John Calvin (1509–1564), François Vatable (c. 1493–1547), Sebastian Münster (1480–1553), David Kimchi (1160–1235), Sébastien Castellion (1515–1563), Targum Jonathan, and the works of Jewish scholars as the sources he used for his Old Testament translation; he also referred the ancient historian Flavius Josephus.²¹

Budny did not follow the originals strictly, which makes the identification of his sources difficult.²² He tended to alter the text in the original language available in editions of the time in keeping with his critical approach (mainly in passages that

¹⁶ Czerniatowicz (“Niektóre problemy,” 35, n. 5) posits that it could be the so-called polyglot Bible by Robert Stephanus (Geneva 1551), which contained the Greek text, a version of Vulgate and Latin translation by Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus (1469–1536). Kwilecka (“Die Brester Bibel,” 1552–1563) points to the Greek-Latin edition as elaborated by Theodore Beza (1519–1605), printed in Basel in 1559.

¹⁷ For discussions on the sources of the Brest Bible, see: Kwilecka, “Biblia brzeska,” 115; Kwilecka, “Die Brester Bibel,” 1534–1563; Kwilecka, “Staropolskie przekłady Biblii,” 284–285; Półćwiartek-Dremierre, “Humanizm i reformacja,” 231; Pietkiewicz, *In Search*, 206, 217, 274.

¹⁸ Falconius 1566, **1r (the first page of the letter of dedication).

¹⁹ Budny 1574, a1v; Budny 1589, d1v–2r.

²⁰ Czerniatowicz, “Niektóre problemy,” 54–56.

²¹ Kamieniecki, “Zapiski językowe,” 152; Pietkiewicz, *In Search*, 195–275.

²² Pietkiewicz, *Biblia Polonorum*, 218–219.

posed a challenge) and compared the text with other available ancient or parallel versions.²³ To establish the basis for translation, he would correlate many variants (of printed critical editions) and resort to biblical quotations from the Church Fathers, ancient and contemporary Christian writers, and commentators.²⁴ He did not follow Masoretic vocalization blindly.²⁵

The translator based his first works (Budny 1570; Budny 1572) on the Greek version of the New Testament, which he considered the most adequate. Yet, in the 1574 edition (Budny 1574), he admitted that his attitude was wrong and ascertained that Latin translations were more accurate. Hence, whenever in his opinion, it was warranted, he corrected the Greek text based on the Vulgate.²⁶ While assuming a critical approach to dogmatically disputable fragments, Budny did not follow the established principles consistently but prioritized extra-textual (theological) argumentation to preserve his dogmatic concepts.²⁷

For his texts, Budny also used non-printed sources. For example, while working on the transcription of proper names in Hebrew, he drew on contemporary Jewish pronunciation. In contrast, while searching for appropriate words to reflect the original biblical terminology, he resorted to Polish dialects used in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth – those spoken around Cracow, Sandomierz, Masovia and Podlasie – and to Ruthenia.²⁸

Marcin Czechowic presents a list of the most important sources he used in the foreword to the first edition of his New Testament translation. The first item is the Brest Bible, whose text he edited on the basis of the Greek version.²⁹ Of all the New Testament Greek editions, he largely adopted the 1534 Parisian text by Simone de Colines, the 1549 Parisian text by Robert Stephanus, and the 1553 Genevan one by Jean Crespin. He also used other Greek editions: the Antwerp Polyglot, the Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus version, one by Nicholas Tacitus Zegers,³⁰ and others. While working on commentaries, he drew on the Church Fathers and other contemporary or past commentators. He also resorted to the Vulgate as an ancillary text.³¹

The Racovian New Testament (Racovian 1606; Racovian 1620; Racovian 1686) is the Czechowic revised version. Its editors confronted the work of his predecessor with the Greek text, aiming at a more accurate translation. Rather than selecting one

²³ Czerniatowicz, “Niekóre problemy,” 57–61.

²⁴ Budny 1574, d1v; Budny 1589, d1v–3r.

²⁵ See, e.g., notes to Gen 12:6 and 45:19 in Budny 1572. Budny would mark places in his notes where, in his opinion, a translation error occurred in the text: see, e.g., notes to Num 13:26 and 21:24.

²⁶ Budny 1574, c3v–6v; Budny 1589, c3v–5r.

²⁷ Czerniatowicz, “Niekóre problemy,” 48–53, 61.

²⁸ Budny 1572, c1r.

²⁹ Czechowic 1577, *2r–v, †1v.

³⁰ It must have been a version by Desiderius, published in Louvain by Stephanus Valerius in 1559, edited by Zegers.

³¹ Czechowic 1577, †2r–v; Czerniatowicz, “Niekóre problemy,” 63–64, 67–68.

Greek version as the basis, they chose the prevalent readings from several editions, trying to avoid the rarer variants.³²

Józef Domaniewski neither directly pointed to his sources for translating some passages from the Book of Proverbs, nor was it necessary because in one of the editions of 1623 (*Proverbiorum* 1623), he provided the Latin poetic version next to the Polish text. The origin of the Latin text is unknown: it may have been Domaniewski's own composition, which is suggested by the book's title page (*Proverbiorum Salomonis interpretatio poetica Iosephi Domanevii*). The analysis of glosses sheds some light on the poet's sources. To some, he added a footnote *Vatab*. Most probably, these were the remarks to the Hebrew Bible, attributed to Parisian Hebrew scholar François Vatable (c. 1493–1547). The notes, collected and elaborated by Robert Stephanus (1499–1559), were published in Latin editions of the Bible in 1543 (along with the text of the Zurich Bible translated by Leo Jud [1482–1542]) and 1556–1557 in the so-called Stephanus Bible (popular in Poland and used by the Brest Bible translators, among others), which – like the Vulgate – contained the literal Latin translation of the Santes Pagnini (1470–1536/1541) Hebrew Bible.³³ Domaniewski's Latin marginal notes are reminiscent of those attributed to Vatable³⁴. Furthermore, the poet allegedly alludes to the Leo Jud translation in his Latin poem *Ad Lectorem (Nec mihi displicuit voluisse Leonis Judae | Biblia Sacra manu)*, from which we can conclude that he may have referred to one of the Latin Bible editions provided with notes attributed to the French Hebrew scholar.

The above examples show that the antitrinitarian translators of the Holy Scripture used a significant amount of biblical literature produced in Western Europe. This way, they made their philological and exegetical research findings available to Polish-language readers. However, it should be noted that Polish antitrinitarian biblical literature also made use of East-European sources – though to a much smaller extent (the Old Church Slavonic version of the Bible; the Ruthenian language) – and Jewish sources (rabbinic biblical studies and assistance in the translation of proper names).

In discussing the sources of biblical translations, attention should be drawn to certain research issues. The plethora of literature quoted both by translators and literature commentators does not necessarily mean that the final form of the meta-text accompanying a translation makes it an original work. Rather than drawing on the quoted sources directly, Polish biblical scholars are likely to have resorted to Western publications made on their basis. Therefore, the whole gamut of Western achievements made available to Polish readers could be of second-hand nature. These

³² Czerniatowicz, "Niektóre problemy," 87–88.

³³ Vatable denied having written the notes. For Vatable's history of notes, see Pietkiewicz, *In Search*, 78–80.

³⁴ The author of this article compared Domaniewski's notes to the Book of Prov 2:3 and Prov 31 with notes from the Stephanus Bible.

suppositions have been supported by recent studies of the sources of Polish biblical translations conducted on the Brest Bible³⁵ and the translations of Jakub Wujek.³⁶ On account of the absence of detailed and systematic studies on source usage accompanying the translations and biblical commentaries by the Polish Brethren, it is now impossible to formulate any final and reliable conclusions. One thing seems certain, though, Szymon Budny appears to have been the most independent and self-reliable (and by the same token, the most controversial) translator among the antitrinitarian biblical scholars.

4. The Impact of Polish Antitrinitarian Translations of the Bible on the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth

The social impact that the printed works of specific religious groups exert depends on their number, the number of editions, and circulation, in other words, on the publication volume in its various aspects. The interest in and demand for such works testify to their popularity, which stimulated supply. The analysis of the impact of the works of specific groups entails the examination and comparison of the quantitative scale of their publications.

In relation to other religious groups, the Polish antitrinitarian volume of biblical publications was the lowest and reached 13.2% (766.75 sheets) of the whole (Catholics – 44.4%, Protestants – including Lutherans, the Reformed and Bohemian Brethren – 28.6%). In comparison, the antitrinitarian Polish printing house run by Aleksy Rodecki (?–1605) and Sebastian Sternacki (?–1635) in Cracow and Raków printed at least 5458 sheets, that is on average about 87 sheets a year between 1574 –1637.³⁷

The antitrinitarian production peaked in 1566–1577 (582.75 sheets), just after the split of the Reformed Church of Little Poland into two parts. In this period, the Polish Brethren mounted determined opposition to the Reformed Church and

³⁵ The Brest Bible, with its notes and commentaries, appears to have been based on the Stephanus Bible (see Pietkiewicz, “*Hebraica veritas* in the Brest Bible,” 44–62).

³⁶ Recently, the researchers (Nicko-Stępień, “Louvain Edition of the Vulgate”; Nicko-Stępień, *Nowy Testament w tłumaczeniu ks. Jakuba Wujka*) proved that the critical notes in the 1593 New Testament by Wujek were taken from the Louvain Vulgate (Antverpiae: Plantinius 1574) and noticed that the commentary to the Wujek New Testament comes mostly from the English New Testament edition (Rhemes: Fogny 1582). Wujek translated those commentaries from English, adjusting them to Polish conditions – so he must have known English or resorted to somebody’s help – along with footnotes and references to sources (e.g., the Church Fathers and contemporary writers), whom he may not even have consulted. Also, other resources which can be found in the Wujek New Testament come from the English edition, e.g., synoptic tables (Frick, “Anglo-Polonica”; Pietkiewicz, *Biblia Polonorum*, 465–468; Rubik, “Czy Jakub Wujek znał angielski?” 236).

³⁷ Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Ariańskie oficyny*, 126.

questioned the authority of the Reformed Brest Bible, which was supplanted by Budny's translations. The disputes in which the Polish Antitrinitarians were embroiled in that period also played a role and led to Czechowic's translations. Religious controversies and divisions appear to have fostered Polish biblical translations, the increase in their publication, and certainly the enlargement of their readership. In the twenty years that followed, the production of antitrinitarian biblical impressions gradually fell: 51 sheets in 1578–1597, 88 in 1598–1617, and 45 in 1618–1638. It must have been due to the organizational and doctrinal stabilization of the Polish Brethren Church. After 1638, the antitrinitarian publications in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth ceased.

The figures (Table 1) suggest that Polish Catholic and Protestant biblical printing must have had a much more significant impact than that of the Polish Brethren. There is no evidence in the form of circulation data to prove it for the Renaissance. Generally, an average circulation of 500 copies per edition is assumed for that period.³⁸

Table 1. The number of publications of biblical prints in Polish (1518–1638) by denomination in 1518–1638³⁹

	Bible			New Testament			Psalter			Biblical Commentaries			Small Prints			TOTAL		
	1 st eds.	eds. altog.	pr. sh.	1 st eds.	eds. altog.	pr. sh.	1 st eds.	eds. altog.	pr. sh.	1 st eds.	eds. altog.	pr. sh.	1 st eds.	eds. altog.	pr. sh.	1 st eds.	eds. altog.	pr. sh.
Catholics	2	3	1,197	3	8	606.625	5	16	540.76	1	1	6	12	23	221.34	23	51	2,571.725
Protestants	2	2	459.75	4	10	645.915	5	14	348.765	2	2	168	18	23	36	31	51	1,658.43
Antitrinitarians	1	1	194	3	5	319.5	–	–	–	3	4	236.5	1	2	16.75	8	12	766.75
PsKoch.	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	28	799.25	–	–	–	1	1	1.5	3	29	800.75
	5	6	1,850.75	10	23	1,572.04	12	58	1,688.775	6	7	410.5	32	49	275.59	65	143	5,797.655

1st eds. – first editions; eds. altog. – editions altogether; pr. sh. – printed sheets; PsKoch. – Psalter translated by Jan Kochanowski

³⁸ Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Z dziejów polskiej książki*, 122.

³⁹ The data published by Pietkiewicz (*Biblia Polonorum*, 550–567) provide grounds for detailed explanations of the calculations. The Psalms translated by Kochanowski were separately counted because they cannot be assigned any particular faith orientation (27 editions of the whole of the Psalter, one edition of the melodies for the Polish Psalter by Mikołaj Gomółka of 1580, and one with seven penitential psalms of 1579). The chronology is as follows: 1518 – the appearance of the first biblical print in Polish (*Poczautek swiate ewangelie podług swiatego Iana, in Septem canoniche epistole beatorum apostolorum Jacobi. Petri. Joannis et iude* [Kraków: Haller 1518/1519]); 1638 – the closure of the Raków printing house and the end of the Renaissance for Polish printers (Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Z dziejów polskiej książki*, 23).

The evaluation of the impact of Polish Bible translations must not be restricted to production volume alone. It is also crucial to indicate areas of influence where permanent marks were left.

Budny's contribution to the Polish language cannot be overrated. To better convey the meaning of Hebrew and Greek words, he would coin neologisms. It was him who introduced such terms as "całopalenie" (burnt offering), "napletek" (foreskin), or "rozdział" (chapter), which have been in use ever since. Budny was affectionate towards the Polish language and preferred creating new words derived from Slavic languages rather than resorting to Latin, German, or Italian so that "we could use our own mother tongue" and not "despise" it.⁴⁰

In the 16th and 17th centuries, the Polish Brethren were engaged in disputes within their community and with religious opponents over Polish antitrinitarian translations of the Holy Scriptures. As mentioned above, the internal doctrinal and philological arguments centered around the dispute between Czechowic and Budny⁴¹ and between the followers of Sozzini with both of them. These brought about the Czechowic (Czechowic 1577) and the Racovian New Testaments (Racovian 1606).

Also, Father Jakub Wujek argued with Budny and Czechowic. On numerous occasions within his commentary on the New Testament, he expressed his disapproval of the Polish Brethren because of their radical critique of the text and controversial doctrine.⁴² However, Wujek, as a Catholic, agreed with Budny that priority must be given to the Vulgate, which conveys the text better than the Greek version.⁴³

It has to be said, though, that Budny and Czechowic had some influence on Wujek, not restricted to merely motivating him to undertake his translation. Wujek borrowed words from Budny, for instance, "rozdział" (chapter) and "całopalenie" (burnt offering).⁴⁴ He probably made use of commentary notes from the Nesvizh Bible, though he never admitted to it or revealed it for religious reasons.⁴⁵ Today we have indications of the influence of the Czechowic New Testament on the Wujek translation.⁴⁶

Budny's controversial innovations sparked polemic around his person and his translations. His renderings were opposed by Jesuit theologian Mikołaj Cichowski (1598–1669), Cistercian theologian and polemicist Stanisław Zdzeszek Ostrowski

⁴⁰ "...zebychmy swoim własnym a przyrodzonym" językiem "nie gardzili" (Budny 1572, b4v); see also Budny 1572, b3v–c1r; Budny 1574, d1r–v; Pietkiewicz, *In Search*, 190–191; Moszyński, "Biblia Szymona Budnego," 43–44, 46–48; Moszyński, "Zur Sprache der Bibelübersetzung," 415.

⁴¹ Frick, "The Biblical Philology," 334.

⁴² Wujek 1593, 4–8 (of the first pagination), 67–68, 288, 305, 306, 555, and many others; Frick, "The Biblical Philology," 335.

⁴³ Wujek 1593, 15 (of the first pagination).

⁴⁴ Smereka, "Wstęp," XL; Pietkiewicz, *In Search*, 204.

⁴⁵ Pietkiewicz, *In Search*, 201, 204, 212.

⁴⁶ Czerniatowicz, "Niektóre problemy," 83.

(c. 1550–after 1596), Jesuit Marcin Łaszcz (writing under the pseudonym of Szczęsny Żebrowski, 1551–1615), humanist Fr. Stanisław Reszka (1544–1600), and Jesuit Piotr Skarga (1536–1612),⁴⁷ who were outside the circle of Polish biblical scholars-translators. The Czechowic translation was critiqued by Marcin Łaszcz (*Recepta na plaster Czechowica*, Kraków 1597). However, more often than not, those disputes boiled down to deriding, mocking, and disparaging the opponent without giving substantive reasons for the criticism. Against this background, Wujek's objections stand out as substantiated.

The antitrinitarian biblical impressions also targeted Ruthenians living in the eastern provinces of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and across its eastern borders. It is evident in the chapter titles rendered as Ruthenian “zaczała” in the Budny and Czechowic translations. Budny did it “at the request of kind Ruthenian brothers.”⁴⁸ Czechowic followed suit for similar reasons.⁴⁹ Wujek, too, applied Budny and Czechowic's idea.⁵⁰ The requests of the Ruthenians testify to their interest in antitrinitarianism and biblical texts translated for this circle.

This interest went even further. Belarusian Antitrinitarian Wasyl Ciapiński (c. 1530–c. 1604), an acquaintance of Budny, drew on the latter's translation while rendering the Gospels into Ruthenian in the 1570s. Also, the Nesvizh Bible is thought to have been among the versions collected by Prince Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski (1526–1608) to prepare the text of the Holy Scriptures in Old Church Slavonic – the so-called Ostrog Bible (1580–1581). In addition to that, in 1616, in Vilnius, a hugely popular collection of sermons in Ruthenian was published by Meletius Smotrytsky (c. 1577–1633) – originally an Orthodox clergyman (c. 1616–1627), and then a Uniate convert, the son of Herasym, one of the editors of the Ostrog Bible, who translated the Gospel passages from Budny's texts. In 1638, Petro Mohyla (1597–1647), an Orthodox Metropolitan of Kyiv, issued the corrected version of sermons, in which he changed parts of the Gospel texts to Ruthenian versions, compiled on the grounds of the Wujek and the Danzig Bibles, leaving the remainder as the old translation based on Budny. Thus, for many years of the 17th century, Uniate and the Orthodox believers would listen to Gospel texts penned by one of the most radical antitrinitarian translators, considered in no uncertain terms a heretic. Of course, the fact that they drew on Budny was kept secret and never revealed by the authors and printers of the above-mentioned works.⁵¹

The translations by Budny and Czechowic were also familiar to Lithuanian Karaites professing non-Talmudic Judaism. Isaac of Troki (1533–1594), a Karaite polemicist, exegete, and apologist, used them (mainly Budny). The Christology of Budny

47 Kamieniecki, *Szymon Budny*, 130–135; Frick, “The Biblical Philology,” 312, 334–336.

48 “...na żądanie braciej milej z narodu ruskiego” (Budny 1574, d3r).

49 Czechowic 1577, ††4r.

50 Wujek 1593, 24–25 (of the first pagination).

51 Frick, “The Biblical Philology,” 336–338.

and Czechowic and the fact that Budny undermined to some extent the credibility of the New Testament (obviously Budny would not have agreed with this statement, even though his criticism of different New Testament versions was perceived in this way by his opponents) presented a source of plausible arguments for Karaites, who did not believe in Jesus's divinity and messianic mission, and declined the divine authority of the New Testament writings.⁵²

Also, the influence of Budny's translations on the Muslim Tatars of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth is worth mentioning. They used Budny's biblical texts for disputes with the Christians and possibly with the Jews or Karaites. A copy of the Nesvizh Bible, kept in the Library at the University of Warsaw (shelf mark: 614.300), features handwritten notes in Polish and Turkish in the Arabic script and quotations from the Qur'an corresponding to the biblical passages, which testifies that these two books underwent comparative studies. Quotes from the Nesvizh Bible can also be found in 17th-century Tatar polemical manuscripts, which were written in Polish though employing 17th-century Arabic script⁵³ and in other manuscripts dating from the 16th, 17th, or even 19th centuries.⁵⁴ The choice of Budny's translation does not seem accidental; rather, his text satisfied their concern for the purity of God's word (Budny would translate from the original almost literally) and better corresponded with the doctrine of Islam due to the dismissal of the dogmas of the Holy Trinity and the divinity of Christ. It also fitted in with the spirit of the Reformation, in which the scriptural arguments were of great importance. Furthermore, the Tatar settlements were situated in the neighborhood of antitrinitarian centers, where Budny was active (Kletsk, Trakai, Ashmyany, Vilnius) and where beyond any doubt, Budny's impressions were readily available.⁵⁵

5. The Influence of Polish Antitrinitarian Translations of the Bible across the Borders of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth

Translations of Polish Antitrinitarians became known in Western and Eastern Europe. The language barrier limited their influence in Western Europe, which explains

⁵² Frick, "The Biblical Philology," 339–341.

⁵³ The manuscript which contains four polemic works under the same title "Where did idols come from" (Minsk, the Central Scientific Library of the National Academy of Sciences in Belarus, shelf mark P97; Тарэлка – Сынкова, *Адкуль пайшлі ідалы*, 422; Kulwicka-Kamińska, *Kształtowanie się polskiej terminologii*, 27).

⁵⁴ E.g. prayer books, by the so-called *Chamaila* (Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, shelf mark B.OR.280); *Chamail of Mustafa Koryski* of 1802 (Gdańsk Library of Polish Academy of Sciences shelf mark akc. 692); Drozd, "Wpływy chrześcijańskie," 10, 22.

⁵⁵ Drozd, "Wpływy chrześcijańskie," 9–13, 17, 32–33; Tarėlka – Synkova, *Адкуль пайшлі ідалы*, 422–424; Kulwicka-Kamińska, *Kształtowanie się polskiej terminologii*, 26.

why Budny started to popularize his views on the Holy Trinity, Christology, and baptism of children, and writing theological treatises in Latin. In this way, he sought to involve Protestant theologians and biblical scholars from Switzerland and England in debate.⁵⁶ As far as we know, Josias Simmler (1530–1576), a Zurich professor of the New Testament exegesis and an eminent Reformed philologist,⁵⁷ and Johann Wigand (c. 1523–1587), a Lutheran bishop of Ducal Prussia, polemicized with Budny over textual criticism and dogma. Italian Jesuit Antonio Possevino (1533–1611) was also active in Poland and familiar with Budny's views.⁵⁸

Budny's achievements, especially in textual criticism, namely his theory presented systematically in the 1574 "Preface to the New Testament" ("Przedmowa na Nowy Testament"),⁵⁹ are worth emphasizing because, for all practical purposes, the translator gave preference to denominational viewpoints. Budny believed that different versions of the biblical text should be subjected to rational criticism, just like other ancient texts. Such criticism was to be based on methodical work with various witnesses to the text. Budny classified and described types of mistakes made by copyists and ancient translators, evaluated the quality of subsequent versions, presented principles of establishing variants, and drew attention to the need for a critical approach to the age of witnesses (the older ones do not mean better). As can be seen, the 1574 "Preface to the New Testament" constitutes an introduction of sorts to textual criticism and is reminiscent even of contemporary works of this type. Such an approach was very avant-garde in the 16th century. Richard Simon (1638–1712), regarded as the father of modern criticism of the biblical text, formulated principles of biblical text criticism in 1678 and 1689, which resembled Budny's rules.⁶⁰ Unfortunately, because of the language barrier and critical approach to the Antitrinitarians of the Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed communities, Budny's critical and textual proposals in 16th and 17th century Europe (apart from some exceptions – see above) were practically unknown. Also, the Sozzini followers developed a critical attitude toward the text of the New Testament. However, compared with Budny's, their criticism was of a much-simplified character (priority was given to prevailing readings or to those included in versions that were considered best).⁶¹

The transformation of Polish Antitrinitarianism into Socinianism, which aimed at creating a universal ethical-philosophical system, brought about a new phase in

56 "De duabus naturis in Christo" and "Contra paedobaptismum" and a letter which was sent by Simmler to John Fox (1516–1587) "Brevis demonstratio, quod Christus non sit ipse Deus qui Pater nec ei aequalis" (Kot, "Budny Szymon," 97–98) – two lost texts are meant.

57 Frick, "The Biblical Philology," 336.

58 Kamieniecki, *Szymon Budny*, 130; Kot, "Budny Szymon," 97.

59 Budny 1574, b1r–d3r.

60 Simon, *Histoire critique du texte du Vieux Testament* (1678); Simon, *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* (1689).

61 Czerniatowicz, "Niektóre problemy," 88.

the movement's history. The followers of Sozzini wrote and printed books in Latin and other languages, mainly in German, which greatly facilitated the popularity of their doctrine all over Europe.⁶² With this in mind, an attempt was made to publish biblical impressions also in German. The Racovian New Testament was published in German in 1630 (Racovian 1630), and the commentary to the Prologue to John's Gospel (Szmalc 1611) by Walenty Szmalc was published in 1611. The latter also had a Dutch edition printed outside Raków in 1623 (and maybe in 1611).⁶³

The translations made by Polish Antitrinitarians were known across the eastern borders of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. With the reform implemented by Moscow's Patriarch Nikon (1605–1681) until 1751, when the first authorized Bible in Old Church Slavonic was published, work was carried out in the East of Europe to correct this version. To this end, Polish translations, including those by Budny, were also used. The polemical presentations of Evfimiy, a monk of Chudov Monastery in Moscow, who defended the authority of Septuagint in 1703 and objected to using Latin versions, mostly Polish (particularly by Wujek), testify to the popularity of Polish Bible translations in the Moscow region. In his treatise, the monk presents a very critical attitude to the translations of Budny and Czechowic, drawing attention to “unorthodox” renderings of some texts crucial for Christology.⁶⁴

Jewish scholar and poet Hezekiah David Abulafia, who lived in Italy in the 18th century, was familiar with the achievements of Budny, whom he praised for his knowledge of the Talmud.⁶⁵

Conclusions

While studying the antitrinitarian translations of the Holy Scriptures in terms of their relevance to the exchange of thought between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Eastern and Western Europe, we should point out two directions of this exchange. The first direction is the reception through translations in the Polish-speaking territories of the achievements of the East and West of Europe with particular regard to the Western European philology and biblical exegesis in the spirit of the Reformation, even the radical one. The influence of the East in this matter was far less significant. The second direction concerns the contribution of the Polish Brethren to European scholarship and culture. The impact of Polish scholars on Western thought was much weaker due to the language barrier. The scholarly contribution

⁶² Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Z dziejów polskiej książki*, 67.

⁶³ Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Ariańskie oficyny*, 276.

⁶⁴ Frick, “The Biblical Philology,” 338–339.

⁶⁵ Rosenthal, “Budny,” 421.

of Polish Antitrinitarians to biblical research deserves particular notice in the field of biblical textual criticism. The translations of the Polish Brethren gained a much greater significance in the East (Moscow territory), where the language barrier was not so much of a hindrance. It should be mentioned that in their anti-Christian polemics, the Karaites and the Tatars of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania drew on the exegetical-theological inferences of the Polish Brethren, promoted through translations and biblical commentaries. In other words, the antitrinitarian translations of the Bible had an inter-religious impact.

Walenty Szmalc, who prepared the German version of the Racovian New Testament (Racovian 1630) and a commentary on the Prologue to John's Gospel (Szmalc 1611), made attempts to overcome the language barrier between the Polish thought of the followers of Sozzini comprised in the editions of the Bible and that of Western Europe. Still, they all appear to have had limited success. No wonder – Europe, flooded by different editions of the Bible, did not need to use those produced in Poland. Other works of Polish Antitrinitarians played a much greater role in the exchange of thought, among which the Racovian Catechism, which in the 17th century was translated into Latin, German, Dutch, and English, and the biblical commentaries in Latin,⁶⁶ played a leading role.

Bibliography

Sources

Commentaries on the Gospels by Tomasz Falconius

Sprawy y słowa Jezusa Krystusa Syna Bożego / ku wieczney pociesze wybranym Bożym napisane przez świadki y pisarze na tho od Boga zrzędzone / a tu wykłady krotkiemi są objaśnione (Brześć Litewski: [Cyprian Bazylik] 1566, 2°) (shelf marks: Kraków, Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich, Cim.787/III adl.; Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, XVI.F.4098 adl.) (= Falconius 1566).

Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles by Tomasz Falconius

Wtore księgi Lukasza świętego / ktorych napis iest / Dzieie abo Sprawy Apostolskie / krotkiemi wykłady objaśnione (Brześć Litewski: [Cyprian Bazylik] 1566, 2°) (shelf marks: Kraków, Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich, Cim.788/III adl.; Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, F.4099 adl.) (= Falconius, Acts 1566).

Translations by Szymon Budny

Księgi ktore po Grecku zową Apokryfa / to iest kryiome księgi. Nowy Testament z Greckiego na polski ięzyk s pilnością przełożony (Nieśwież: Daniel of Łęczycza 1570, 4°) (shelf marks: Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, XVI.Qu.2337) (= Budny 1570).

⁶⁶ Koryl, "Hermeneutyka braci polskich."

Biblia. To iest / księgi starego y nowego Przymierza / znowu z ięzyka Ebreyskiego / Grecskiego y Laćińskiego / na Polski przełożone (ed. Maciej Kawieczynski; [Nieśwież, Zasław or Uzda (?): Daniel of Łęczycza 1572, 4°) (shelf marks: Warszawa, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Sd.614.300; Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, XVI.Qu.2336; 2338; 2339; the printer used here about 91% of the edition of the New Testament and the Apocrypha from 1570 – no. 3) (= Budny 1572).

Nowy Testament znowu przełożony / a na wielu mieyscach za pewnemi dowodami odprzysad przez Simona Budnego oczyszczony / y krotkimi przypiskami po kraioch objaśniony. Przydane też są na końcu tegoż dostateczniwsze przypiski / ktore kaźdey iak miarz odmiany przyczyzny ukazuią (Łosk: [Daniel of Łęczycza] 1574, 8°) (shelf marks: Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, XVI.O.191; Kórnik, Biblioteka P.AN, Cim.O.261) (= Budny 1574).

Typographical variant of the edition 1574 with about 4.5% pages changed: [the New Testament translated by Szymon Budny (Łosk: Feliks Bolewski about 1589, 8°)] (shelf mark: Warszawa, Biblioteka Narodowa, XVI.O.858) (= Budny 1589).

The New Testament, translated by Marcin Czechowic

NOWY TESTAMENT. To iest Wszystkie pisma nowego Przymierza / z Greckiego ięzyka na rzecz Połską wiernie y szczerze przełożone. Przydane iest rozne czytanie na brzegach / ktore się w inszych księgach nayduie: y Reiestr na końcu ([Kraków]: Aleksander Rodecki 1577, 4°) (shelf mark: Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, XVI.Qu.1773) (= Czechowic 1577).

NOWY TESTAMENT. To iest Wszystkie pisma nowego Przymierza / z Greckiego ięzyka na rzecz Połską wiernie y szczerze przełożone ([Kraków]: Aleksander Rodecki 1594, 8°) (shelf marks: Kraków, Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich, Cim.1645/I; Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Cim.550) (= Czechowic 1594).

The David Psalms, translated by Paweł Milejewski

[PSALMY Dawidowe / na modlitwy Chrześcijańskie przełożone. Przydana iest k temu rozmowa o modlitwie / y modlitwy ludzi świętych z Bibliey wybrane {unknown place and printer, about 1563–1578, probably 12°}] (lost) (= Milejewski 1563).

PSALMY Dawidowe / na modlitwy Chrześcijańskie przełożone. Przydana iest k temu rozmowa o modlitwie / y modlitwy ludzi świętych z Bibliey wybrane ([Kraków]: Aleksander Rodecki 1587, 12°) (shelf mark: Warszawa, Biblioteka Narodowa, XVI.O.409) (= Milejewski 1587).

The Racovian New Testament

Nowy TESTAMENT: To iest, WSZYTKIE PISMA NOWEGO Przymierza, z Greckiego ięzyka na Polski z nowu wiernie przełożone. Przez Niektore sługi Słowa Bożego, tajemnic niebieskich, y ięzykow do takiey prace potrzebnych wiadome, y Starsze tych Zborow, ktore wyznawiaią, że nikt inszy, iedno Ociec Pana naszego Iezusa Christusa, iest onym iedynym Bogiem Izraelskim, a że on człowiek Iezus Nazaranski, ktory się z Panny narodził, a żaden inszy oprócz niego, abo przed nim, iest iednorodzonym Synem Bozym (Raków: Sebastian Sternacki 1606, 4°) (shelf mark: Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, XVII-1472) (= Racovian 1606).

NOWY TESTAMENT: *To iest, WSZYTKIE PISMA NOVVEGO PRZYMIER.ZA, z Greckiego ięzyka na Polski znowvu vviernie przełożone. Przez Niektore slugi Słowa Bożego / tajemnic niebieskich / y ięzykow do takiey prace potrzebnych wiadome / y Starsze tych zborow / ktore wyznawaią / że nikt inszy / iedno Ociec Pana naszego Jezusa Christusa / iest onym iedynym Bogiem Izraelskim, a że on człowiek Iezus Nazarański / ktory się z Panny narodził / a żaden inszy oprócz niego / abo przed nim / iest iednorodzonym Synem Bozym* (Raków: Sebastian Sternacki 1620, 12°) (shelf marks: Kraków, Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich, 25177/I; Cluj (Romania), Academia Annexa III (Collegium Unitariorum), R.1850; 1892) (= Racovian 1620).

Das Neue TESTAME.NT, Das ist / Alle Bücher des newen Bundes / welchen Gott durch Christum mit den menschen gemacht hat / Trewlich aus dem Griechischen ins Teutsche versetzt (Raków: [Sebastian Sternacki] 1630, 8°) (shelf mark: Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 585302.I; Kr BKC 25074.I def.; Warszawa, Biblioteka Narodowa, XVII.2.1045; Wr BU 307910) (= Racovian 1630).

Nowy Testament, to iest wszystkie Pisma nowego Przymierza, z greckiego ięzyka na Polski znowu wiernie przełożone, przez niektore slugi Słowa Bożego, ięzykow do takiey prace potrzebnych wiadome, y Starsze tych Zborów, ktore wyznawaią, że nikt inszy, iedno Ociec Pana naszego Jezusa Christusa, iest onym iedynym Bogiem Izraelskim. a że on człowiek Jezus Nazarański, ktory się z Panny narodził, a żaden inszy oprócz niego, abo przed nim, iest iednorodzonym Synem Bożym (Amsterdam: Jan Krelliusz 1686, 8°) (see: <http://www.estreicher.uj.edu.pl/staropolska/baza/57640.html> [access 22.12.2022]) (= Racovian 1686).

Proverbiorum Salomonis, translated by Józef Domaniewski

PROVERBIORUM SALOMONIS: *versio Poëtica. Iosephi Domanevii* (Lubecae Lithvanorum: Piotr Blast Kmita 1623, 4°) (shelf mark: Toruń, Książnica Kopernikańska, TN 23018 adl.) (= Proverbiorum 1623).

PRZYPOWIEŚCI SALOMONOWE: *Przekładania Iozefa Domaniewskiego* (Lubcz nad Niemnem: Piotr Blast Kmita 1623, 4°) (shelf mark: Warszawa, Biblioteka Narodowa, XVII 3.5840) (= Przypowieści 1623).

Commentary on John 1:1–18 by Walenty Szmalc

[*Krotki wykład na poczontek Ewanieliey Iana Świątego* {Raków: Sebastian Sternacki 1607, 4°}] (lost; see Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Ariańskie oficyny*, 276, no. 230) (= Szmalc 1607).

Kurtze auslegung Uber den Anfang des Evangelii des Heiligen Iohannis. Durch eine Unterredung Gestellet / fur vier Jahren in Polnicher [!] sprache / nu aber auch in Deutscher / Durch VALENTINUM SMALCIUM GOTHANUM Lehrer der Gemeine zu Rakaw in klein Polen (Raków: [Sebastian Sternacki] 1611, 8°) (shelf mark: Kórnik, Biblioteka P.AN, 12705; Kraków, Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich, 29060.I) (= Szmalc 1611).

[*Krotki wykład na poczontek Ewanieliey Iana Świątego* {Raków: Sebastian Sternacki 1613, 4°}] (lost; see Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Ariańskie oficyny*, 276, no. 231) (= Szmalc 1613).

The New Testament, translated by Jakub Wujek (Catholic)

Nowy Testament Pana naszego IESVSA CHRISTVSA. Z nowu z Laćińskiego y z Gręckiego na Polskie wiernie a szczyrze przełożony: y Argumentami abo Summariuszami każdydych Książg / y Rozdziałow / y Annotacyami po brzegach objaśniony. Przydane są Nauki

y Przestrogi mało nie za każdym Rozdziałem: Porównanie Ewangelistów SS. Dzieie y drogi rozmaite Piotra y Pawła S. y Registr rzeczy głownieyszych na końcu. Przez D. Iakvba Wvyka, Theologa Societatis Iesv. Z dozwoleniem Starszych. Pod rozszak Kościoła S. Powszechnego Rzymskiego wszytko niech podłże (Kraków: Andrzej Piotrkowczyk 1593, 4°) (shelf marks: Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, XVI.Qu.3065; Kórnik, Biblioteka P.AN, Cim.Qu.2729) (= Wujek 1593).

Studies

- Bock, F.S., *Historia Antitrinitariorum, maxime Socinianismi et Socinianorum quorum auctores, promotores, cætus, templa, ministri, praeceptores, officinae typographicae, bibliothecae [...] ex fontibus [...] recensentur* (Regiomonti – Lipsiae: Hartung 1779) I/1.
- Czerniatowicz, J., “Niektóre problemy naukowe grecożytyki w pracach bibliotów polskich XVI i XVII w.,” J. Czerniatowicz, *Teksty greckie a polskie przekłady* (Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków: Ossolineum 1969).
- Drozd, A., “Wpływy chrześcijańskie na literaturę Tatarów w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej: Między antagonizmem a symbiozą,” *Pamiętnik Literacki* 88/3 (1997) 3–67.
- Estreicher, K., *Bibliografia polska* (Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności 1894) XIII.
- Frick, D.A., “Anglo-Polonica: The Rheims New Testament of 1582 and the Making of the Polish Catholic Bible,” *The Polish Review* 36/1 (1991) 47–67.
- Frick, D.A., “The Biblical Philology of Szymon Budny: Between East and West,” *Biblia to jest Księgi Starego i Nowego Przymierza. In der Übersetzung des Simon Budny. Nieśwież, Zasław 1571–1572. Księgi Nowego Przymierza* (eds. H. Rothe – F. Scholz; Biblia Slavica. Serie 2. Polnische Bibeln 3; Paderborn et al.: Schöningh 1994) 305–349.
- Górski, K., *Studia nad dziejami polskiej literatury antytrynitarskiej XVI w.* (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności 1949).
- Grabowski, T., *Literatura arińska w Polsce 1560–1660* (Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności 1908).
- Kamieniecki, J., *Szymon Budny – zapomniana postać polskiej reformacji* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego 2002).
- Kamieniecki, J., “Zapiski językowe Szymona Budnego (Stary Testament),” *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej WTN* 21 (1995) 145–153.
- Kawecka-Gryczowa, A., *Arińskie oficyny wydawnicze Rodeckiego i Sternackiego* (Wrocław et al.: Ossolineum 1974).
- Kawecka-Gryczowa, A., *Z dziejów polskiej książki w okresie Renesansu. Studia i materiały* (Wrocław: Ossolineum 1975).
- Koryl, J., “Hermeneutyka braci polskich. Wprowadzenie,” *Antytrynityzm w Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej w kontekście europejskim. Źródła – rozwój – oddziaływanie* (eds. M. Choptiany – P. Wliczek; Kultura Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej w Dialogu z Europą. Hermeneutyka Wartości 10; Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski 2017) 219–261.
- Kot, S., “Budny Szymon,” *Polski słownik biograficzny* (eds. W. Konopczyński et al.; Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności 1937) III, 96–99.
- Kot, S., “Czechowic Marcin,” *Polski słownik biograficzny* (eds. W. Konopczyński et al.; Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności 1938) IV, 307–309.

- Kulwicka-Kamińska, J., *Kształtowanie się polskiej terminologii muzułmańskiej. Na podstawie piśmiennictwa religijnego Tatarów litewsko-polskich* (Prace Wydziału Filologiczno-Filozoficznego 37/1; Toruń: TNT 2004).
- Kwilecka, I., “Biblia brzeska – jej dzieje i znaczenie,” *Nauka* 3 (2006) 111–121.
- Kwilecka, I., “Die Brester Bibel: Kulturgeschichtliche und sprachliche Fragen der Übersetzung,” *Księgi Nowego Testamentu – Kommentare* (eds. H. Rothe – F. Scholz; Biblia Slavica. Serie 2. Polnische Bibeln 2; Paderborn et al.: Schöningh 2001) II, 1486–1660.
- Kwilecka, I., “Staropolskie przekłady Biblii i ich związki z biblistyką europejską: Zarys problematyki,” *Biblia a kultura Europy* (eds. M. Kamińska – E. Małek; Łódź: Uniwersytet Łódzki 1992) II, 272–293.
- Merczyng, H., *Szymon Budny jako krytyk tekstów biblijnych* (Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności 1913).
- Misiurek, J., “Falconius, Sokół, Sokołowicz,” *Encyklopedia katolicka* (eds. L. Bieńkowski et al.; Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL 1989) V, 21–22.
- Moszyński, L., “Biblia Szymona Budnego. Charakterystyka przekładu,” *Biblie staropolskie. Teksty wykładów wygłoszonych na sympozjum naukowym zorganizowanym przez Komisję Sławistyczną Oddziału Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Poznaniu 28 października 2002 roku* (ed. I. Kwilecka; Poznań: PAN 2003) 41–48.
- Moszyński, L., “Zur Sprache der Bibelübersetzung Szymon Budnys von 1572,” *Biblia, to jest Księgi Starego i Nowego Przymierza. In der Übersetzung des Simon Budny. Nieświęz, Zaslav 1571–1572. Księgi Nowego Przymierza... [Kommentare]* (eds. H. Rothe – F. Scholz; Biblia Slavica. Serie 2. Polnische Bibeln 3; Paderborn et al.: Schöningh 1994) 351–415.
- Nicko-Stępień, P., “Louvain Edition of the Vulgate and the New Testament in the Translation by Jakub Wujek from 1593 Study of Matthew 16:13–20,” *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* 61/ Special Issue (2017) 147–166. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12775/OiRwP.2017.SI.07>.
- Nicko-Stępień, P., *Nowy Testament w tłumaczeniu ks. Jakuba Wujka z 1593 roku. Studium wykorzystania źródeł na przykładzie tekstów Piotrowych* (Doctoral dissertation; Papieski Wydział Teologiczny we Wrocławiu; Wrocław 2018).
- Pietkiewicz, R., *Biblia Polonorum. Historia Biblii w języku polskim. I. Od początku do 1638 roku* (Poznań: Pallottinum 2016).
- Pietkiewicz, R., “Hebraica veritas in the Brest Bible,” *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 17/1 (2015) 44–62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1179/1462245915Z.00000000068>.
- Pietkiewicz, R., *In Search of ‘the Genuine Word of God.’ Reception of the West-European Christian Hebraism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Renaissance* (Refo500 Academic Studies 73; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2020).
- Pietkiewicz, R., “Nowe ‘pilne weźrzenie’ w biblijne przekłady Szymona Budnego,” *Abychmy w ten przekład pilnie weźrzeli. Wobec tłumaczenia tekstów dawnych* (ed. A. Bielak; Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski 2014) 129–146.
- Pietkiewicz, R., “Polskie antytrynitarские przekłady Biblii w dialogu Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej ze wschodnią i zachodnią Europą,” *Antytrynitaryzm w Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej w kontekście europejskim. Źródła – rozwój – oddziaływanie* (eds. M. Choptiany – P. Wliczek; Kultura Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej w Dialogu z Europą. Hermeneutyka Wartości 10; Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski 2017) 262–286.

- Pollak, R., *Bibliografia literatury polskiej. Nowy Korybut. II. Piśmiennictwo staropolskie* ([s.l.]: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy 1964).
- Półćwiartek-Dremierre, D., "Humanizm i reformacja. Dialog wartości w polsko-francuskich stosunkach literackich i kulturalnych od XV do końca XVI wieku," *W przestrzeni południa. Kultura Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej wobec narodów romańskich: estetyka, prądy i style, konteksty kulturowe* (ed. M. Hanusiewicz-Lavallee; Kultura Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej w Dialogu z Europą. Hermeneutyka Wartości 2; Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski 2016) 200–257.
- Rollo, A., "Problemi e prospettive della ricerca su Manuele Crisolora," *Manuele Crisolora e il ritorno del greco in occidente* (eds. R. Maisano – A. Rollo; Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale 2002) 31–85.
- Rosenthal, H., "Budny, Simon," *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/3801-budny-simon> (access 22.11.2022).
- Rubik, T., "Czy Jakub Wujek znał angielski? 'Nowy Testament' z 1593 roku i angielskie źródło jego paratekstu," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 109/4 (2018) 236–250. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18318/pl.2018.4.15>.
- Simon, R., *Histoire critique du texte du Vieux Testament* (Paris: Billaine 1678).
- Simon, R., *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam: Leers 1689).
- Smeraka, W., "Wstęp," *Nowy Testament w przekładzie Ks. Dr Jakuba Wvika T.J. z roku 1593* (ed. W. Smeraka; Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne 1966) VII–XLVIII.
- Szczucki, L., *Marcin Czechowic (1532–1613). Studium z dziejów antytrynitaryzmu polskiego XVI wieku* (Warszawa: PWN 1964).
- Tarełka, M.U. – Synkova, I.A., *Adkul' pajšli idaly. Pomnik rėlihijna-palemičnaj litaratury z rukapisnaj spadčyny tatarau Vjalikaha Knjastva Litoŭskaha* (Minsk: Tėchnalohija 2009).

